UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 6

MARCH 29, 1966, TO APRIL 18, 1966
(PAGES 6873 TO 8284)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1966

J
11
.R
v. 112
pt. 6

stacks
DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
6-4-67

Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 29, 1966

(Legislative day of Friday, March 25, 1966)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. James P. Archibald, minister, St. Paul Methodist Church, Chevy Chase, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, upon whom we are always dependent if we are to do what is right, we are grateful for Thy presence here. We thank Thee for the great history written in this hallowed Chamber, and for those who were able to envision the Nation which we now enjoy. Make us always mindful of the sacredness of each individual person, even those who are not governed by this body. Help these, who have been chosen by Thy people, that they may guide our country toward the elimination of human conflict and the day when no nation feels the need to train men to kill.

In these days, when pressure is on all those who seek to serve their countrymen, we ask for Thy sustaining help in the home and family of each Senator. Encourage them with the knowledge that, amid all the loud cries of harsh criticism, there is a great unspoken chorus of praise.

Refresh them with the ability to see the humor in the trivial and to be able to obtain refreshing rest at the end of each day, with the national affirmation, "In God We Trust."

In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 25, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 26, 1966, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2614) to provide for U.S. participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the centennial of the Alaska purchase.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2394. An act authorizing the planning, design, construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States; and

H.R. 10403. An act for the relief of Edward F. Murzyn and Edward J. O'Brien.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period until 12:15 p.m. for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements or speeches limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I also ask unanimous consent that the transaction of routine morning business be resumed after the vote at 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDIAN-AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Last night President Johnson proposed to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi the establishment of an Indian-American Foundation in education. The proposal is one of originality and reflects the determination of the administration to respond in an appropriate fashion to the circumstances which characterize United States-Indian relations at this point in time. The President's proposal mixes idealism with practicality. It provides the machinery for the evolution of one-sided aid into a new concept of genuine mutual assistance. In so doing, it recognizes the growing technical capacity of India itself to meet many of its own basic problems of modernization and to contribute itself in the vanguard of international science and education.

As I understand it, the binational foundation which the President proposes would operate in somewhat the same fashion as the great foundations which offer such vital assistance to education in the United States.

The Foundation would encourage new and experimental projects in science, technology, and agriculture.

It would be organized under the laws of India, be governed by an independent board composed of nine outstanding Indian leaders and nine distinguished Americans familiar with the needs of developing nations.

It would function as a grant-making foundation, using largely accumulated and presently idle aid-rupees, in pursuit of goals which support the development goals of both the Indian and American people, in education, health, agriculture, science, and industry.

This wise and imaginative proposal is likely to find wide sympathy and approval both in India and the United States. The Senate, the Congress, and the Nation, I am confident, will look forward to the unfolding of the details with interest and with a predisposition to aid in the realization of the proposal. I should like to commend the President and his administration for setting forth this concept. To have advanced it at this time, moreover, it is a fitting tribute to the charming and brilliant leader of the Indian people on the occasion of her first official visit to the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for some years we have discussed in this Chamber the question of what to do with the currencies of other countries that have piled up to our credit. No good plan has been submitted, up to now, that was feasible or that undertook, in any large measure, to dispose of those currencies. That is true of nearly every country of which I have knowledge.

On one occasion, a plan was suggested whereby our tourists abroad would be required to convert their dollars into the currency of the country they intended to visit. The difficulty there was that those countries, in every case, refused to accept the convertibility of the currencies that we had already acquired; so that plan offered no out.

I am informed that we have at present $300 million worth of rupees to our credit in India, and the question is how to suitably and properly utilize them for the good of India and for the good of mankind.

When I discussed this matter with the White House some time ago, I gave it my unqualified approval. In addition, I have talked with a number of Members on my side of the aisle, and found sympathetic response. I think it is an excellent idea to use those funds in this fashion, because among other things it takes us away from fields that have been regarded as highly controversial; and I believe a great deal of good will redound as a result of the proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, has seen fit on this occasion to lend his support to such an auspicious proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last night, President Johnson unveiled a proposal for the establishment of a major new foundation in India, dedicated to education and science. As I see it, this proposal will offer a statesmanlike way to make a positive contribution to India's future with U.S.-owned rupees obtained from foreign currency sales under title I of Public Law 480.

Such a binational foundation, chartered under Indian law as an autonomous, non-profit-making trust or corporation, could provide invaluable assistance by encouraging innovation and diversity beyond the normal range of publicly supported projects.

Drawing on the successful experience of private foundations, the new Indian-American Foundation could serve as a focal point for a wide range of educational and scientific activities which would serve as a positive force for overcoming many barriers to progress.

The proposed Foundation's board of 18 experienced members, drawn, in the main, from the ranks of science, education, and the professions, could exercise independent judgment in making grants for adult education, agricultural research, teacher training, mass communications, program evaluation, and a host of other projects.

Thus, this proposed Indian-American Foundation, to be endowed initially with U.S.-owned rupees, would serve as a continuing source of finance for new initiative and for the further support of promising future projects, both public and private. This constructive proposal will add a further dimension to the United States effort to assist the people of India.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Government Operations; the Committee on the District of Columbia; the Committee on Commerce; and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Supplemental Appropriations, 1966, for Various Agencies (S. Doc. No. 85)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations and provisions for the fiscal year 1966, in the amount of $180,843,000, for various agencies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Report Entitled "A 10-Year Program of Federal Water Resources Research"

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report entitled "A 10-Year Program of Federal Water Resources Research" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committees on Finance and Public Works.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, jointly, on Federal aid to highways, be referred jointly to the Committees on Public Works and Finance.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] and myself, I send to the desk a certified copy of resolution passed by the General Court of Massachusetts, and ask that it be approximately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting to veterans of World War I pensions comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I

Whereas the national policy of the United States has been to grant assistance to veterans of the United States by a pension, in consideration of their military services; and

Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension to veterans of World War I comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth, and to the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States.

House of representatives, adopted March 11, 1966.

William C. Maiers,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, March 15, 1966.

Thomas A. Chadwick,
Clerk.

Attest:

Kevin H. White,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1090)

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 47, 89th Congress, 1st session, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit a report entitled "National Penitentiaries," and ask that it be printed.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Montoya in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joseph Palmer 2d, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be U.S. Governor of the Asian Development Bank;

William S. Guad, of Connecticut, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the Asian Development Bank; and

Bernard Zagorin, of Virginia, to be U.S. Director of the Asian Development Bank.

REPORT ON EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the report of the Committee on Commerce concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by that committee in 1965 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Foster, William:											
Italy	Lira	72,030	115.50	71,470	114.50	25,050	40.00	20,200	32.00	188,750	302.00
Netherlands	Guilder					3,618.00	1,006.12			3,618.00	1,006.12
Subtotal			115.50		114.50		1,046.12		32.00		1,308.12
Hartke, Vance:											
United Kingdom	Pound	55.0	154.00	39.0	109.20	80.9	224.83	13.10	36.80	187.19	524.83
Germany	Deutsche mark					3,010.40	756.76			3,010.40	756.76
Subtotal			154.00		109.20		981.59		36.80		1,281.59
Markel, Daniel:											
France	Franc	891.40	182.40	1,027.40	209.80	620.80	126.30	654.40	131.30	3,185.00	649.80
Italy	Lira	69,200	111.00	57,300	91.68	105,100	168.08	18,400	29.44	250,000	400.20
Netherlands	Guilder					3,397.06	944.68			3,397.06	944.68
Subtotal			293.40		301.48		1,239.06		160.74		1,994.68
McGee, Gale W.:											
Austria	Schilling	1,573.58	61.11	798.25	31.00	1,363.00	52.95	260.00	8.00	3,935.00	153.06
Denmark	Krone	694.39	100.87	289.13	42.00			48.19	7.00	1,039.50	149.87
France	Franc	954.23	194.74	882.00	180.00	2,251.55	459.50	408.75	83.42	4,495.80	917.66
Germany	Deutsche mark	515.04	128.76	480.00	120.00	4,589.60	1,154.37	400.00	100.00	5,989.60	1,503.13
Italy	Lira	74,675	199.48	43,750	70.00	62,568	100.11	6,250	10.00	187,568	299.59
Norway	Krone	202.49	28.44	128.16	18.00			24.92	3.50	356.50	49.94
Spain	Peseta	2,846.45	47.52	2,156.40	36.00			988.35	16.50	5,991.00	100.02
Sweden	Krona	107.60	20.82	103.36	20.00			46.51	9.00	257.50	49.82
Switzerland	Franc	293.72	68.07	258.90	60.00	712.00	164.05	90.62	21.00	1,359.95	313.12
United Kingdom	Pound	34-13-8	97.20	28-10-10	80.00	72-9-0	202.38	7-17-0	22.00	143-12-0	401.58
Subtotal			867.01		657.00		2,133.36		280.42		3,937.79
Pertschuk, Michael:											
Rumania	Lei	3,192	266.00	1,728	144.00	672	56.00	408	34.00	6,000	500.00
Poland	Zloty	1,900	78.00	2,500	104.00	32,155.20	1,339.80	1,500	60.00	38,055.20	1,581.80
Subtotal			344.00		248.00		1,395.80		94.00		2,081.80
Scott, Hugh:											
Netherlands	Guilder	612	170.00	468	130.00	1,532.80	426.28	13.15	3.66	2,626.04	729.94
France	Franc	735	150.00	735	150.00					1,470.00	300.00
Switzerland	do	1,186.35	273.35	1,186.35	273.36					2,372.70	546.71
Unitd Kingdom	Pound	44.69	124.45	44.70	124.45					89-3-9	248.90
Netherlands	Guilder					2,753.20	765.64			2,753.20	765.64
Brazil	Cruzeiro	540,000	247.50	110,000	47.70	546,000	299.18			1,196,000	594.38
Germany	Deutsche mark					2,051.40	512.85			2,051.40	512.85
Subtotal			965.30		725.51		2,003.95		3.66		3,698.42
Total			2,739.21		2,155.69		8,799.88		607.62		14,302.40

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	14,302.40

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce.

MAR. 24, 1966.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 3141. A bill for the relief of Wong Ock Wah (Sheck See Hom) and his wife, Mon Hing Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3142. A bill to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions brought by the Government; and

S. 3143. A bill to avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for the collection of claims of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 3144. A bill for the relief of the estate of Patrick E. Eagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3145. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain certain parking facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3146. A bill to make certain expenditures made by the city of Roanoke, Va., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3147. A bill to extend for 5 years the temporary provisions of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, and to make certain improvements in the provisions of such law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. FONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3148. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MILLER, Mr. FONG, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. COTTON, Mr. TOWER, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MORTON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. THURMOND, and Mrs. SMITH):

S. 3149. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. JACKSON) (by request):

S. 3150. A bill to make further provision for the retirement of the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3151. A bill for the relief of Anthony Serdar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 3152. A bill for the relief of John G. Kazas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 3153. A bill to make it an unfair labor practice to require a person who conscientiously objects to membership in a labor organization to be a member of such an organization as a condition of employment; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dominick when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 3154. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of chiropractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 3155. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Randolph when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3156. A bill for the relief of Bill Yu Chong Louie; and

S. 3157. A bill for the relief of Jin Sook Simpson and her two minor children, Eleanor Ra and Julie Ra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. Bennett) (by request):

S. 3158. A bill to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Robertson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York:

S. 3159. A bill to provide that individuals 65 years of age or older may be permitted to enroll, at any time during 1966, in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits established by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy of New York when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE THE DISPOSITION OF CLAIMS BY AND AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills designed to improve the disposition of claims by and against the Government.

The first of these would establish statutes of limitations for certain types of actions brought by the Government. The rule is that there is no limitation of time against the Government for bringing an action unless it is specifically authorized by statute. There are a few exceptions to this rule. For example, a civil suit brought by the Government on a false claim must be filed within 6 years; suits for penalties or forfeitures under the customs laws must be brought within 5 years; 2 years is the limit within which the Federal Housing Administration must sue to recover an overpayment on a guarantee of a home improvement loan. There are, however, no time bars against the great majority of Government claims.

Additional time limitations are desirable for a number of reasons. Application of statutes of limitation in tort and contract actions would make the position of the Government more nearly equal to that of private litigants. A corollary to this objective is the desirability of encouraging trials at a sufficiently early time so that necessary witnesses and documents are available and memories are still fresh.

Presently the cost of keeping records and detecting and collecting on Government claims after a period of years may exceed any return by way of actual collections. Also, this measure should encourage the agencies to refer their claims promptly to the Department of Justice for collection minimizing collection problems arising with respect to debtors who have died, disappeared, or gone bankrupt.

Accordingly, it is proposed that statutes of limitations be applied to important general areas where none are now in effect. The proposal would impose a 6-year limitation on the assertion of Government claims for money arising out of an express or implied contract or a quasi-contract. This time-bar corresponds to the 6-year limitation on those who sue the Government on similar claims under the Tucker Act.

Suits in tort are to be brought within 3 years, except those based on trespass to Government lands and those brought for the recovery of damages resulting from fire on such lands, and actions for conversion of Government property for which the limitation period will be 6 years.

A 6-year limitation would be imposed upon suits by the Government to recover erroneous overpayments of wages and other benefits made to military and civilian employees of the Government.

The second proposal seeks to ease court congestion and improve and accelerate the disposition of Government claims.

Each year, tens of thousands of Government claims arise out of the great variety of Government activities. Many of the agencies in which these claims arise have limited authority to take effective collection action with respect to such claims. With few exceptions, the agencies have no authority to negotiate a compromise when the amount of the indebtedness, or even the fact of the indebtedness, is in dispute or where there is a question as to the debtor's financial capacity to pay.

Because of this lack of agency authority, many claims are referred routinely to the General Accounting Office and the Department of Justice for collection when they could be disposed of more satisfactorily at the agency level. The proposed legislation should permit more effective collection efforts by the agencies.

It also should reduce the volume of private relief legislation before Congress each year. A substantial number of these bills involve relieving Government personnel, especially servicemen, from liability to refund erroneous payments they had received. In most cases these errors were entirely the fault of the Government, and the individual is left with no remedy except such legislation. During the first session of this Congress, for instance, 16 percent of all private bills were for this purpose.

This bill would impose upon Government agencies the obligation to seek to collect debts due the United States as a result of their activities, and would afford them the flexibility to compromise claims when compromise is warranted or to suspend collection action on claims when they are found to be uncollectible or inequitable. Agencies would not, however, be authorized to compromise or terminate a collection activity on a claim which exceeds a principal amount of $20,000. Neither could they act upon claims as to which there are indications of fraud or misrepresentation, or which arise out of antitrust violations.

Efforts at collection and compromise would be considered by the agency under regulations prescribed by the agency head and in conformity with such standards as may be promulgated jointly by the Attorney General and the Comptroller General.

It is clear that the legislation will not increase or diminish the existing authority of the head of any agency to litigate claims, nor will it diminish existing authority to settle, compromise, or close claims, nor will it affect the authority of Congress to consider private claims bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of these bills be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Ervin, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3142

A bill to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions brought by the Government

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding thereto the following two new sections:

"§ 2415. Time for Commencing Actions Brought by the United States

"(a) Subject to the provisions of section 2416 of this title, and except as otherwise provided by Congress, every action for money damages brought by the United States or an officer or agency thereof which is founded upon any contract express or implied in law or fact, shall be barred unless the complaint is filed within six years after the right of action accrues or within one year after final decisions have been rendered in applicable administrative proceedings required by contract or by law, whichever is later. *Provided,* That in the event of later partial payment or written acknowledgment of debt, the right of action shall be deemed to accrue again at the time of each such payment or acknowledgment.

"(b) Subject to the provisions of section 2416 of this title, and except as otherwise provided by Congress, every action for money damages brought by the United States or an officer or agency thereof which is founded upon a tort shall be barred unless the complaint is filed within three years after the right of action first accrues: *Provided*, That an action to recover damages resulting from a trespass on lands of the United States, including trust or restricted Indian lands; an action to recover damages resulting from fire to such lands; an action to recover for diversion of money paid under a grant program; and an action for conversion of property of the United States may be brought within six years after the right of action accrues.

"(c) Nothing herein shall be deemed to limit the time for bringing an action to establish the title to, or right of possession of, real or personal property.

"(d) Subject to the provisions of section 2416 of this title and except as otherwise provided by Congress, every action for the recovery of money erroneously paid to or on behalf of any civilian employee of any agency of the United States or to or on behalf of any member or dependent of any member of the uniformed services of the United States, incident to the employment or services of such employee or member, shall be barred unless the complaint is filed within six years after the right of action accrues.

"(e) In the event that any action to which this section applies is timely brought and is thereafter dismissed without prejudice, the action may be recommended within one year after such dismissal, regardless of whether the action would otherwise then be barred by this action. In any action so recommended the defendant shall not be barred from interposing any claim which would not have been barred in the original action.

"(f) The provisions of this section shall not prevent the assertion, in an action against the United States or an officer or agency thereof, of any claim of the United States or an officer or agency thereof against an opposing party, a co-party, or a third party that arises out of the transaction or occurrence that is the subject matter of the opposing party's claim. A claim of the United States or an officer or agency thereof that does not arise out of the transaction or occurrence that is the subject matter of the opposing party's claim may, if time-barred, be asserted only by way of offset and may be allowed in an amount not to exceed the amount of the opposing party's recovery.

"(g) Any right of action subject to the provisions of this section which accrued prior to the date of enactment of this Act shall, for purposes of this section, be deemed to have accrued on the date of enactment of this Act.

"(h) Nothing in this Act shall apply to actions brought under the Internal Revenue Code or incidental to the collection of taxes imposed by the United States.

"§ 2416. TIME FOR COMMENCING ACTIONS BROUGHT BY THE UNITED STATES—EXCLUSIONS

"For the purpose of computing the limitations periods established in section 2415, there shall be excluded all periods during which—

"(a) the defendant or the res is outside the United States, its territories and possessions, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; or

"(b) the defendant is exempt from legal process because of infancy, mental incompetence, diplomatic immunity, or for any other reason; or

"(c) facts material to the right of action are not known and reasonably could not be known by an official of the United States charged with the responsibility to act in the circumstances; or

"(d) the United States is in a state of war declared pursuant to Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States."

SEC. 2. The table of sections at the head of chapter 161 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following items:

"2415. TIME FOR COMMENCING ACTIONS BROUGHT BY THE UNITED STATES

"2416. TIME FOR COMMENCING ACTIONS BROUGHT BY THE UNITED STATES—EXCLUSIONS."

S. 3143

A bill to avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for the collection of claims of the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Claims Collection Act of 1966."

SEC. 2. In this Act—

(a) "agency" means any department, office, commission, board, service, Government corporation, instrumentality, or other establishment or body in either the Executive or Legislative Branch of the Federal Government;

(b) "head of an agency" includes, where applicable, commission, board, or other group of individuals having the decision-making responsibility for the agency.

SEC. 3. (a) The head of an agency or his designee, pursuant to regulations prescribed by him and in conformity with such standards as may be promulgated jointly by the Attorney General and the Comptroller General, shall attempt collection of all claims of the United States for money or property arising out of the activities of, or referred to, his agency.

(b) With respect to such claims of the United States that have not been referred to another agency, including the General Accounting Office, for further collection action, and that do not exceed $20,000, exclusive of interest, the head of an agency pursuant to regulations prescribed by him and in conformity with such standards as may be promulgated jointly by the Attorney General and the Comptroller General, may (1) compromise any such claim, or (2) cause collection action on any such claim to be terminated or suspended where it appears that no person liable on the claim has the present or prospective financial ability to pay any significant sum thereon or that the cost of collecting the claim is likely to exceed the amount of recovery. The Comptroller General or his designee shall have the foregoing authority with respect to claims referred to the General Accounting Office by another agency for further collection action. The head of an agency or his designee shall not exercise the foregoing authority with respect to a claim as to which there is an indication of fraud, the presentation of a false claim, or misrepresentation on the part of the debtor or any other party having an interest in the claim, or a claim based in whole or in part on conduct in violation of the antitrust laws; nor shall the head of an agency, other than the Comptroller General of the United States, have authority to compromise a claim that arises from an exception made by the General Accounting Office in the account of an accountable officer.

(c) A compromise effected pursuant to authority conferred by subsection (b) of this section shall be final and conclusive on the debtor and on all officials, agencies, and courts of the United States, except if procured by fraud, misrepresentation, the presentation of a false claim, or mutual mistake of fact. No accountable officer shall be liable for any amount paid or for the value of property lost, damaged, or destroyed, where the recovery of such amount or value may not be had because of a compromise with a person primarily responsible under subsection (b).

SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall increase or diminish the existing authority of the head of an agency to litigate claims, or diminish existing authority to settle, compromise, or close claims.

SEC. 5. This Act shall become effective on the 180th day following the date of its enactment.

ESTATE OF PATRICK E. EAGAN

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide relief for the estate of Patrick E. Eagan.

Mr. Eagan was an employee of the Post Office Department beginning on October 19, 1956. From that time until April 27, 1962, Mr. Eagan received overpayments from that Department in the amount of $4,271.36.

The overpayments from the Post Office Department were the result of an administrative error by an employee of the Department who failed to deduct from Mr. Eagan's salary the amount of a civil service retirement annuity Mr. Eagan was receiving.

This was not a case where Mr. Eagan had failed to report the annuity in his application for employment. He did report the annuity. Unfortunately, it was not noticed by clerical assistants in the Department until April 27, 1962. The record should be clear that Mr. Eagan accepted the overpayment in good faith, having had no knowledge of the Department's failure to note that he was receiving an annuity and believing he was being paid only that amount to which he was entitled. On September 10, 1962, 4 months after the error was discovered, Mr. Eagan was separated from the Federal service. On October 3, 1962, the Post Office Department submitted a Government claim to the Civil Service Commission and from October 19, 1962, until August 8, 1964, the Civil Service Commission withheld Mr. Eagan's annuity payments totaling for that entire period $1,639.60.

In the 88th Congress, more specifically, on January 22, 1963, I introduced a bill for the relief of Patrick E. Eagan. S. 416. That bill was reported favorably with an amendment by the Senate Judiciary Committee on September 14, 1964, Senate report No. 1543, and passed the Senate on September 24, 1964.

Unknown to me and to the Senate, Mr. Eagan had died on August 8, 1964, of cancer for which he had been hospitalized for some time. Mr. Eagan was survived by his widow who now resides at Yakima, Wash. Technically, there is a balance of $1,229.11 owing the Government. This amount may legally be charged against Mr. Eagan's estate. It is my belief this legal technicality should be removed by a private bill. It is my intention by introducing this bill today to remove not only that technicality but to repay to the estate that which already has been withheld.

Removing further liability for the amount still outstanding is obviously fair and just and should be done. Repaying to the estate the amount withheld by the Government during Mr. Eagan's life is justified in my view for several reasons. First of all, the overpayment was made as a result of an administrative error.

Second, Mr. Eagan received the overpayments without knowledge of the error and in good faith. Third, the withholding of Mr. Eagan's retirement annuity after he had been separated from the Post Office Department to repay the debt technically owed the Government was an extreme hardship on Mr. Eagan and his wife, especially after he had been hospitalized for cancer. Further, the annuity was withheld after January 1963 until Mr. Eagan's death in August of 1964 contrary to a promise made to me by the Post Office Department in January 1963 that further annuity checks would not be withheld pending consideration of my bill S. 416. Necessary steps were not taken within the Post Office Department to carry out the promise made to me in writing. I was completely unaware that the annuity checks were continuing to be withheld until after Mr. Eagan's death in August 1964.

In summary, Mr. Eagan and his wife were placed under extreme economic hardship as a result of not one but two administrative errors on the part of the Post Office Department. I have been unable to discover that Mr. Eagan was in any way at fault in this matter. I feel the U.S. Government should correct this injustice to two of its citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3144) for the relief of the estate of Patrick E. Eagan, introduced by Mr. Bartlett, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AID EXTENSION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend and extend for 5 years Public Law 815 authorizing Federal financial assistance for construction of schools in districts where enrollment has increased because of Federal installations and activities in the area.

My bill provides that any child residing on Federal property who has a parent in one of the uniformed services of the United States would be considered federally connected for purposes of Public Law 815.

This would make Public Law 815 conform with a companion act—Public Law 874—which provides aid to school districts for operating expenses incurred because of federally connected children. Under Public Law 874, if a parent in the uniformed services who is living with his family on Federal property is transferred to a distant base, schoolchildren in the family may still be counted in the "A" category as long as the family continues to live on the Federal property. But, under the same circumstances, such children cannot be counted in the "A" category under Public Law 815. My bill seeks to remedy this.

In these times when we are increasing the numbers of military personnel, and when thousands of them are being sent overseas leaving their families behind, some school districts may experience hardship in providing educational facilities for the children involved. My bill would make Federal financial assistance available in such cases, whereas at present it is not.

My bill also includes American Samoa in the definition of "State." The effect of this would be to permit American Samoa to be considered for school construction aid under Public Law 815. As this area is a possession of the United States and as our Government is endeavoring to promote education, health, and economic development in Samoa, it appears to me appropriate now to include this area under the Federal program of aid for school construction with large federally connected enrollments.

The third purpose of my bill is to extend the temporary provisions of Public Law 815 for 5 years. Under existing law, these provisions would expire June 30 this year.

The temporary sections provide assistance on account of children whose parents either work or reside on Federal property, in contrast to the permanent provisions which relate primarily to children whose parents reside and work on Federal property.

The President has not proposed to extend the temporary provisions beyond June 30 this year.

I have been informally advised that it would cost an estimated $50 million a year to continue the Public Law 815 program as is—that is, a combined program of the permanent provisions and the temporary provisions extended. I am told the $50 million estimate breaks down into approximately $27 million for temporary provisions and $23 million for permanent provisions.

If the temporary provisions expire, the remaining permanent program based on children of Federal employees residing and working on Federal property would not be $23 million—but more probably about $8 to $10 million. This is because the eligibility requirements of the temporary and permanent provisions are interrelated and if the temporary provisions expire, fewer districts would qualify for aid under the permanent provisions.

Thus, by discontinuing the temporary provisions of Public Law 815, the program of school construction aid for federally connected children would be reduced approximately 80 percent.

From fiscal year 1951 through 1965, my State of Hawaii has received $20,137,562 under Public Law 815. No firm breakdown is available to show how much of this total was received under the temporary provisions and under the permanent. In any event, I would not want to see this vital education program cut back drastically as it would be if the temporary provisions expire this year.

Public Law 815 has proved very important over the years in providing facilities for education of federally connected children throughout America.

During its 15 years of operation, Public Law 815 has aided in construction by local educational agencies in 50 States and 3 territories of approximately 58,099 classrooms and related facilities to house 1,687,838 pupils. In addition, funds authorized for Federal construction of school facilities on Federal property went to build an estimated 3,867 classrooms for about 116,559 students.

Local educational agencies have added some $764 million for acquisition of school sites and construction of projects to the $1,054,953,644 they received in Federal funds under Public Law 815.

Public Law 815 is a tried and proven program. I believe it should be continued. Therefore, I propose a 5-year extension of the temporary provisions so that the entire program can go forward as it should.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3147) to extend for 5 years the temporary provisions of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, and to make certain improvements in the provisions of such law, introduced by Mr. Fong, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ENROLLMENT UNDER THE MEDICARE ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, supplement B in the medicare bill would end registrations as of the 31st of March. It is my understanding that some 5 million persons, who are of eligible age, have not been registered.

I propose, therefore, that, without suspending the operation of the act, which commences the 1st of July, the registration period be extended through the 31st day of August.

I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 18 of the Social Security Act to make such provision. A comparable amendment is being offered in the House today.

Mr. President, the cosponsors of this measure are the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond]. Mr. President, there may be other cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be held at the desk for the balance of the afternoon and that the names of additional cosponsors may be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 3149) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend those sections of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, relating to retirement benefits of the Comptroller General of the United States.

The bill would provide for the continuation of coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act of any appointee to the Office of the Comptroller General who at the time of appointment is or has been subject to the provisions of that act. At the same time it would permit the appointee to elect at any time, but not later than 60 days after the expiration of his first 10 years of service as Comptroller General, to be covered by the retirement system prescribed for the Comptroller General in the Budget Accounting Act.

The purpose of the legislation is to prevent an appointee to the Office of Comptroller General of the United States from losing valuable rights and protection which have accrued through years of service under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Until an election is exercised the appointee will continue under the Civil Service Retirement Act and have deductions made from his salary in the same manner as other employees subject to that act. The bill confers no special or additional benefits under either retirement system but merely grants a Comptroller General a right to select the system of his choice. I strongly endorse the bill to prevent an inequity which otherwise might occur when the person appointed as Comptroller General is a career official, who has had many years of service in the Federal Government in positions subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3150) to make further provision for the retirement of the Comptroller General, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. JACKSON), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN MEMBERSHIPS IN UNIONS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice to require a person who, because of his religious beliefs, objects to membership in a labor organization to be a member of such an organization as a condition of employment.

There are many religious denominations in the United States which object to their members being forced to join a labor organization, financially support a labor organization, or participate in certain activities of such an organization. Their membership is relatively small, and they constitute only a minority of working men and women in this country. But the fact that their number is small should not deter us from assuring them that the dictates of their conscience will be fully protected.

My bill would do this by allowing the members of such religious denominations to work for an employer without being required to join or financially support a union organization.

I think it is important to note that this bill would not pave the way for freeloaders who would undermine the financial security of our labor organizations. It provides that, in lieu of paying dues, the individual must contribute an amount, equal to union dues, to any nonreligious charitable fund exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. The particular charity will be designated by mutual agreement of the individual employee and the union.

So, any person who merely wants to get out of paying dues is not going to benefit from this bill.

Mr. President, our American tradition has long recognized the right of each individual to live his life according to the dictates of his conscience. This concept of religious liberty has been one of the most important contributions that America has made toward the goal of a humane and tolerant society. This bill would correct a situation which has inadvertently arisen and will put our practices back in line with our expressed principles. I strongly urge the passage of this bill and ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk until the close of business on April 6 for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 3153) to make it an unfair labor practice to require a person who conscientiously objects to membership in a labor organization to be a member of such an organization as a condition of employment, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, by request of the administration, and for appropriate reference, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966.

The measure would authorize an increase of $4.9 billion in the appropriations for the Interstate System, including authorizations for an additional year until June 30, 1972, and would authorize use of the apportionment factor contained in the 1965 cost estimate of completion in making apportionments of interstate funds for fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

The bill also authorizes the appropriation of funds for the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems and extensions thereof within urban areas for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969, and authorizes appropriations of funds for other highways in Federal domain areas for those years.

The proposed measure would increase the authorization for reconstruction of disaster-damaged highways for fiscal year 1967 and thereafter from $30 to $50 million annually, provides for a 2-year carryover of unexpended authorizations for that purpose and provides for reimbursement from the general fund of the Treasury to cover the Federal share of the cost of reconstruction of roads not on the Federal-aid systems.

Finally, the bill would modify the prohibition against use of the highway trust fund for making appropriations for highway beautification to limit this prohibition to appropriations made during fiscal year 1966, and would provide contract authority thereafter for such purposes as are now applicable to the regular Federal-aid highway program.

I ask that the bill and a section-by-section analysis be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3155) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3155

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966."

SEC. 2. REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM.—Subsection (b) of section 103 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $1,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $3,300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the additional sum of $3,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the additional sum of $3,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the additional sum of $3,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the additional sum of $2,685,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972."

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF COST ESTIMATE FOR APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS.—The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make the apportionment for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and 1969, of the sums authorized to be appropriated for such years for expenditures on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, using the apportionment factors contained in Table 5 of House Document Numbered 42, Eighty-ninth Congress.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETION OF SYSTEM.—(a) The second paragraph of section 101(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "fifteen years" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixteen years" and by striking out "June 30, 1971", and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1972".

(b) The second and third sentences of section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, are amended by striking "1971" where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1972", and by striking "fiscal year ending June 30, 1971", at the end of the penultimate sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal years ending June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972".

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code, the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) For the Federal-aid primary system and the Federal-aid secondary system and for their extension within urban areas, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The sums authorized in this paragraph for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditures as follows:

(A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system;

(B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and

(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary highway systems in urban areas.

(2) For forest highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(3) For public lands highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(4) For forest development roads and trails, $85,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $110,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(5) For public lands development roads and trails, $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(6) For park roads and trails, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(7) For parkways, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(8) For Indian reservation roads and bridges, $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

SEC. 6. HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION.—(a) The last sentence in subsections 131(m) and 136 (m) of title 23, United States Code, is hereby deleted and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

"No part of the Highway Trust Fund shall be available to carry out this section before July 1, 1966. The provisions of Chapter 1 of this title relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid primary highway funds, except as determined by the Secretary to be inconsistent with this section, shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section after June 30, 1966."

(b) The last sentence in subsection 319(b) of title 23, United States Code, is hereby deleted and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

"No part of the Highway Trust Fund shall be available to carry out this subsection before July 1, 1966. The provisions of Chapter 1 of this title relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid primary highway funds, except as determined by the Secretary to be inconsistent with this subsection, shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection after June 30, 1966."

SEC. 7. EMERGENCY RELIEF.—Subsection (a) of section 125 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary is hereby granted standby authority to expend, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of this title, including existing Federal-aid appropriations, and subject to the provisions of this section and section 120(f), the sum of $50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and a like sum for each fiscal year thereafter, for the repair or reconstruction of highways, roads, and trails which he shall find have suffered serious damage as a result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States. The unexpended balance of such authorization shall remain available for expenditure for a period of two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sum is authorized. Expenditures under this section on any of the Federal-aid highway systems shall be reimbursed by appropriations from the Highway Trust Fund, and expenditures under this section for highways, roads, and trails not on any Federal-aid highway system shall be reimbursed by appropriations from the general funds of the Treasury, which appropriations are hereby authorized."

(b) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 125 of title 23, United States Code, are amended by striking the words "from the emergency fund" where they appear.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. RANDOLPH, is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1966

Section 1 cites this act as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966.

Section 2. Revision of authorization of appropriations for Interstate System: Extends for 1 fiscal year (until June 30, 1972) the authorizations and increases by $4.9 billion the total amount authorized for completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The revised amounts to be authorized are as follows:

1. An additional $300 million (totaling $3,300 million) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968;
2. An additional $600 million (totaling $3,600 million) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;
3. An additional $600 million (totaling $3,600 million) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970;
4. An additional $715 million (totaling $3,600 million) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and
5. The sum of $2,685 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

Section 3. Authorization of use of cost estimate for apportionment of funds: This section authorizes use of the cost estimate contained in table 5 of House Document No. 42, 89th Congress, by the Secretary of Commerce in making the apportionment for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and 1969, of the sums authorized to be appropriated for such years on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

Section 4. Extension of time for completion of system: This section provides a conforming amendment to take into account the amendments made to section 108(b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 by section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 which extends the authorization for completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways for an additional year, until June 30, 1972.

Subsection (a) would declare it to be the intent of Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over the period of availability of the 16 years appropriations authorized for the purpose of expediting its construction, reconstruction, or improvement through the fiscal year ended June 30, 1972.

Subsection (b) extends by 1 year, until June 30, 1972, the application of the formula for apportionment of funds for the Interstate System. It further authorizes the Secretary, upon the approval of Congress, to use the Federal share of such approved estimate in making apportionment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

Section 5. Authorization: This section provides authorizations for projects on the Federal-aid primary system, the Federal-aid secondary system and extensions of these systems in urban areas, for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969. The section also authorizes funds for these fiscal years for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, public lands development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian reservation roads and bridges, and public lands highways. For the Federal-aid systems, the following sums are authorized for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969:

[In millions]

	1968	*1969*
Primary	$450	$450
Secondary	300	300
Urban	250	250
Total	1,000	1,000

The following sums are authorized for forest highways and public lands highways on the Federal-aid system for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969:

	1968	*1969*
Forest highways	$33	$33
Public lands highways	7	7

The amounts requested for these programs are the same as were authorized for fiscal years 1966 and 1967. However, expenditures of funds for forest highways and public lands highways would be limited to those on the Federal-aid systems, and these funds would come from the highway trust fund.

The section also authorizes appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for certain categories of roads administered by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, as follows:

[In millions]

	1968	*1969*
Forest development roads and trails	$85	$110
Public lands development roads and trails	2	3
Park roads and trails	25	30
Parkways	9	11
Indian reservation roads and bridges	18	23

Section 6. Highway beautification: This section amends the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 to remove the prohibition against the use of the highway trust fund during fiscal year 1967 to finance the highway beautification program. The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 prohibits the use of the highway trust fund for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 in carrying out the provisions of sections 131, 136, and 319(b) of title 23, United States Code, relating to control of outdoor advertising, control of junkyards, and promotion of landscaping and scenic enhancement.

This section also makes applicable the Bureau's contract authority, as relates to Federal-aid primary highway funds, for implementation of the above sections of title 23, United States Code, after June 30, 1966.

Section 7. Emergency relief: This section increases from $30 to $50 million annually the authorization for the repair or reconstruction of highways, roads and trails damaged in disasters. Any unexpended balance would remain available for the 2 years succeeding the year for which authorized. Expenditures on any of the Federal-aid highway systems would be reimbursed from the highway trust fund, and expenditures for highways, roads and trails not on any Federal-aid system would be reimbursed from the general fund of the Treasury.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SUPERVISORY BILL—AND NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have today received a letter from the administration, signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler; the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr.; the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Honorable John E. Horne; and the Chairman of the Board of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Honorable Kenneth A. Randall, enclosing a bill which would strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations. Its title is the Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966.

The letter from the top officials of the four Federal agencies supervising financial institutions strongly urges immediate consideration and prompt approval of this bill. The bill has been the subject of extensive study within the Government and with the associations representing financial institutions over the past several years.

I have introduced the bill, which will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill, a copy of the letter of transmittal, and the memorandum containing a section-by-section analysis accompanying the bill be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

In view of the unusual nature of the support for the bill within the Government represented by the signatures affixed to the letter and in view of the President's support for the general principles of the proposal as set forth in the Economic Report of the President, and in view of the fact that this matter has been under discussion with the interested industry associations for months, in fact years, I have agreed to hold hearings on the bill beginning Monday, April 4, 1966, at 10 a.m., before the Financial Institutions Subcommittee.

I hope that we will be able to conclude hearings by the Government witnesses during the week of April 4, so that the following week, after the Easter recess, we will be able to hear testimony from the interested industry associations and other interested parties. It is my hope that we will be able to conclude hearings by Friday, April 15.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this bill are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3158) to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3158

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966".

TITLE I—PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD AND THE FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

SEC. 101. Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1464(d)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d)(1) The Board shall have power to enforce this section and rules and regulations made hereunder. In the enforcement of any provision of this section or rules and regulations made hereunder, or any other law or regulation, or in any other action, suit, or proceeding to which it is a party or in which it is interested, and in the administration of conservatorships and receiverships, the Board is authorized to act in its own name and through its own attorneys. Except as otherwise provided herein, the Board shall be subject to suit (other than suits on claims for money damages) by any Federal savings and loan association or director or officer thereof with respect to any matter under this section or any other applicable law, or rules or regulations thereunder, in the United States district court for the judicial district in which the home office of the association is located, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and the Board may be served with process in the manner prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

"(2)(A) If, in the opinion of the Board, an association is violating or has violated or is about to violate a law, rule, regulation, or charter or other condition imposed by or agreement entered into with the Board, or is engaging or has engaged or is about to engage in an unsafe or unsound practice, the Board may issue and serve upon the association a notice of charges in respect thereof. The notice shall contain a statement of the facts constituting the alleged violation or violations or the unsafe or unsound practice or practices, and shall fix a time and place at which a hearing will be held to determine whether an order to cease and desist therefrom should issue against the association. Such hearing shall be fixed for a date not earlier than thirty days nor later than sixty days after service of such notice unless a later date is set by the Board at the request of the association. Unless the association shall appear at the hearing by a duly authorized representative, it shall be deemed to have consented to the issuance of the cease-and-desist order. In the event of such consent, or if upon the record made at any such hearing the Board shall find that any violation or unsafe or unsound practice specified in the notice of charges has been established, the Board shall issue and serve upon the association an order to cease and desist from any such violation or practice. Such order may, by provisions which may be mandatory or otherwise, require the association and its directors, officers, employees, and agents to cease and desist from the same, and, further, to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from any such violation or practice.

"(B) A cease-and-desist order shall become effective at the expiration of thirty days after service of such order upon the association concerned (except in the case of a cease-and-desist order issued upon consent, which shall become effective at the time specified therein), and shall remain effective and enforceable, except to such extent as it is stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the Board or a reviewing court.

"(3)(A) Whenever the Board shall determine that the violation or threatened violation of law, rules, or regulations, or the unsafe or unsound practice or practices, specified in the notice of charges served upon the association pursuant to paragraph (2)(A) of this subsection, or the continuation thereof, could cause insolvency (as defined in paragraph (6)(A)(i) of this subsection) or substantial dissipation of assets or earnings of the association, or could otherwise seriously prejudice the interests of its savings account holders, the Board may issue a temporary order requiring the association to cease and desist from any such violation or practice. Such order shall become effective upon service upon the association and, unless set aside, limited, or suspended by a court in proceedings authorized by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, shall remain effective and enforceable pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to such notice and until such time as the Board shall dismiss the charges specified in such notice or, if a cease-and-desist order is issued against the association, until the effective date of any such order.

"(B) Within ten days after the association concerned has been served with a temporary cease-and-desist order, the association may apply to the United States district court for the judicial district in which the home office of the association is located, or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for an injunction setting aside, limiting, or suspending the enforcement, operation, or effectiveness of such order pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice of charges served upon the association under paragraph

(2)(A) of this subsection, and such court shall have jurisdiction to issue such injunction.

"(C) In the case of violation or threatened violation of, or failure to obey, a temporary cease-and-desist order, the Board may apply to the United States district court, or the United States court of any territory, within the jurisdiction of which the home office of the association is located, for an injunction to enforce such order, and, if the court shall determine that there has been such violation or threatened violation or failure to obey, it shall be the duty of the court to issue such injunction.

"(4)(A) Whenever, in the opinion of the Board, any director or officer of an association has committed any violation of law, rule, or regulation, or of a cease-and-desist order which has become final, or has engaged or participated in any unsafe or unsound practice in connection with the association, or has committed or engaged in any act, omission, or practice which constitutes a breach of his fiduciary duty as such director or officer, and the Board determines that the association has suffered or will probably suffer substantial financial loss or other damage or that the interests of its savings account holders could be seriously prejudiced by reason of such violation or practice or breach of fiduciary duty, the Board may serve upon such director or officer a written notice of its intention to remove him from office.

"(B) Whenever, in the opinion of the Board, any director or officer of an association, by conduct or practice with respect to another savings and loan association or other business institution which resulted in substantial financial loss or other damage, has evidenced his general unfitness to continue as a director or officer, and, whenever, in the opinion of the Board, any other person participating in the conduct of the affairs of an association, by conduct or practice with respect to such association or other savings and loan association or other business institution which resulted in substantial financial loss or other damage, has evidenced his general unfitness to participate in the conduct of the affairs of such association, the Board may serve upon such director, officer, or other person a written notice of its intention to remove him from office and/or to prohibit his further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of such association.

"(C) In respect to any director or officer of an association or any other person referred to in paragraphs (4)(A) or (4)(B), the Board may, if it deems it necessary for the protection of the association or the interests of its savings account holders, by written notice to such effect served upon such director, officer, or other person, suspend him from office and/or prohibit him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the association. Such suspension and/or prohibition shall become effective upon service of such notice and, unless stayed by a court in proceedings authorized by subparagraph (E) of this paragraph, shall remain in effect until terminated or set aside by the Board. Copies of any such notice shall also be served upon the association of which he is a director or officer or in the conduct of whose affairs he has participated.

"(D) A notice of intention to remove a director, officer, or other person from office and/or to prohibit his participation in the conduct of the affairs of an association, shall contain a statement of the facts constituting grounds therefor, and shall fix a time and place at which a hearing will be held thereon. Such hearing shall be fixed for a date not earlier than thirty days nor later than sixty days after the date of service of such notice, unless a later date is set by the Board at the request of (i) such director, officer, or other person, and for good cause shown, or (ii) the Attorney General of the United States. Unless such director, officer, or other person shall appear at the hearing in person or by a duly authorized representative, he shall be deemed to have consented to the issuance of an order of such removal and/or prohibition. In the event of such consent, or if upon the record made at any such hearing the Board shall find that any of the grounds specified in such notice has been established, the Board shall issue such orders of suspension or removal from office, and/or prohibition from participation in the conduct of the affairs of the association as it may deem appropriate. Any such order shall become effective at the expiration of thirty days after service upon such association and the director, officer, or other person concerned (except in the case of an order issued upon consent, which shall become effective at the time specified therein). Such order shall remain effective and enforceable except to such extent as it is stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the Board or a reviewing court.

"(E) Within ten days after a director, officer, or other person has been suspended from office and/or prohibited from participation in the conduct of the affairs of an association under subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, such director, officer, or other person may apply to the United States district court for the judicial district in which the home office of the association is located, or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for a stay of such suspension and/or prohibition pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice served upon such director, officer, or other person under subparagraphs (A) or (B) of this paragraph, and such court shall have jurisdiction to stay such suspension and/or prohibition.

"(5)(A) Whenever any director or officer of an association, or other person participating in the conduct of the affairs of such association, is charged in any information or indictment, or complaint authorized by a United States Attorney, with the commission of or participation in a felony involving dishonesty or breach of trust, the Board may, by written notice served upon such director, officer, or other person, suspend him from office and/or prohibit him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the association. A copy of such notice shall also be served upon the association. Such suspension and/or prohibition shall remain in effect until such information, indictment, or complaint is finally disposed of. In the event that a judgment of conviction with respect to such offense is entered against such director, officer, or other person, and at such time as such judgment is not subject to further appellate review, the Board shall issue and serve upon such director, officer, or other person an order removing him from office and/or prohibiting him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the association. A copy of such order shall be served upon such association, whereupon such director or officer shall cease to be a director or officer of such association. A finding of not guilty or other disposition of the charge shall not preclude the Board from thereafter instituting proceedings to remove such director, officer, or other person from office and/or to prohibit further participation in association affairs, pursuant to subparagraphs (A) or (B) of paragraph (4) of this subsection.

"(B) If at any time, because of the suspension of one or more directors pursuant to this subsection (d), there shall be on the board of directors of an association less than a quorum of directors not so suspended, all powers and functions vested in or exercisable by such board shall vest in and be exercisable by the director or directors on the board and not so suspended, until such time as there shall be a quorum of the board of directors. In the event all of the directors of an association are suspended pursuant to this subsection (d), the Board shall appoint persons to serve temporarily as directors in their place and stead pending the termination of such suspensions, or until such time as those who have been suspended cease to be directors of the association and their respective successors take office.

"(6)(A) The grounds for the appointment of a conservator or receiver for an association shall be one or more of the following: (i) insolvency in that the assets of the association are less than its obligations to its creditors and others, including its members; (ii) substantial dissipation of assets or earnings due to any violation or violations of law, rules, or regulations, or to any unsafe or unsound practice or practices; (iii) an unsafe or unsound condition to transact business; (iv) willful violation of a cease-and-desist order which has become final; (v) concealment of books, papers, records, or assets of the association or refusal to submit books, papers, records, or affairs of the association for inspection to any examiner or to any lawful agent of the Board. The Board shall have exclusive power and jurisdiction to appoint a conservator or receiver. If, in the opinion of the Board, a ground for the appointment of a conservator or receiver as herein provided exists, the Board is authorized to appoint ex parte and without notice a conservator or receiver for the association. In the event of such appointment, the association may, within thirty days thereafter, bring an action in the United States district court for the judicial district in which the home office of such association is located, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for an order requiring the Board to remove such conservator or receiver, and the court shall upon the merits dismiss such action or direct the Board to remove such conservator or receiver. Such proceedings shall be given precedence over other cases pending in such courts, and shall be in every way expedited. Upon the commencement of such an action, the court having jurisdiction of any other action or proceeding authorized under this subsection to which the association is a party shall stay such action or proceeding during the pendency of the action for removal of the conservator or receiver.

"(B) In addition to the foregoing provisions, the Board may, without any requirement of notice, hearing, or other action, appoint a conservator or receiver for an association in the event that (i) the association, by resolution of its board of directors or of its members, consents to such appointment, or (ii) the association is removed from membership in any Federal home loan bank, or its status as an institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is terminated.

"(C) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, no court may take any action for or toward the removal of any conservator or receiver, or, except at the instance of the Board, restrain or affect the exercise of powers or functions of a conservator or receiver.

"(D) A conservator shall have all the powers of the members, the directors, and the officers of the association and shall be authorized to operate the association in its own name or to conserve its assets in the manner and to the extent authorized by the Board. The Board shall appoint only the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as receiver for an association, and said Corporation shall have power to buy at its own sale as receiver, subject to approval by the Board. The Board may, without any requirement of notice, hearing, or other action, replace a conservator with another conservator or with a receiver, but any such replacement shall not affect any right which the association may have to obtain judicial review of the original appointment, except that any removal under this paragraph (6) shall be removal of the conservator or receiver in office at the time of such removal.

"(7) (A) Any hearing provided for in this subsection (d) shall be held in the Federal judicial district or in the territory in which the home office of the association is located unless the party afforded the hearing consents to another place, and shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act; but such hearing shall be private, unless otherwise ordered for good cause found. After such hearing, and within ninety days after the Board has notified the parties that the case has been submitted to it for final decision, the Board shall render its decision (which shall include findings of fact upon which its decision is predicated) and shall issue and cause to be served upon each party to the proceeding an order or orders consistent with the provisions of this subsection. Judicial review of any such order shall be exclusively as provided in this paragraph (7). Unless a petition for review is timely filed in a court of appeals of the United States, as hereinafter provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, and thereafter until the record in the proceeding has been filed as so provided, the Board may at any time, upon such notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify, terminate, or set aside any such order. Upon such filing of the record, the Board may modify, terminate, or set aside any such order with permission of the court.

"(B) Any party to the proceeding, or any person required by an order issued under this subsection to cease and desist from any of the violations or practices stated therein, may obtain a review of any order served pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph (other than an order issued with the consent of the association or the director or officer or other person concerned, or an order issued under paragraph (5) (A) of this subsection), by filing in the court of appeals of the United States for the circuit in which the home office of the association is located, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, within thirty days after the date of service of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Board be modified, terminated, or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Board, and thereupon the Board shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, as provided in section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, such court shall have jurisdiction, which upon the filing of the record shall except as provided in the last sentence of said subparagraph (A) be exclusive, to affirm, modify, terminate, or set aside, in whole or in part, the order of the Board. Review of such proceedings shall be had as provided in the Administrative Procedure Act. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(C) The commencement of proceedings for judicial review under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of any order issued by the Board.

"(8) The Board may in its discretion apply to the United States district court, or the United States court of any territory, within the jurisidction of which the home office of the association is located, for the enforcement of any effective and outstanding order issued by the Board under this subsection (d), and such courts shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance therewith; but except as otherwise provided in this subsection no court shall have jurisdiction to affect by injunction or otherwise the issuance or enforcement of any notice or order under this subsection, or to review, modify, suspend, terminate, or set aside any such notice or order.

"(9) In the course of or in connection with any proceeding under this subsection, the Board or any member thereof or a designated representative of the Board, including any person designated to conduct any hearing under this subsection, shall have power to administer oaths and affirmations, to take or cause to be taken depositions, and to issue, revoke, quash, or modify subpenas and subpenas duces tecum; and the Board is empowered to make rules and regulations with respect to any such proceedings. The attendance of witnesses and the production of documents provided for in this paragraph may be required from any place in any State or in any territory at any designated place where such proceeding is being conducted. Any party to proceedings under this subsection may apply to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or the United States district court for the judicial district or the United States court in any territory in which such proceeding is being conducted or where the witness resides or carries on business, for enforcement of any subpena or subpena duces tecum issued pursuant to this paragraph, and such courts shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance therewith. Witnesses subpenaed under this paragraph shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. All expenses of the Board or of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation in connection with this subsection shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses.

"(10) Any service required or authorized to be made by the Board under this subsection may be made by registered mail, or in such other manner reasonably calculated to give actual notice as the Board may by regulation or otherwise provide.

"(11) The Board shall have power to make rules and regulations for the reorganization, consolidation, liquidation, and dissolution of associations, for the merger of associations with other institutions the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, for associations in conservatorship and receivership, and for the conduct of conservatorships and receiverships; and the Board may, by regulation or otherwise, provide for the exercise of functions by members, directors, or officers of an association during conservatorship and receivership.

"(12) (A) Any director or officer, or former director or officer, of an association, or any other person, against whom there is outstanding and effective any notice or order (which is an order which has become final) served upon such director, officer, or other person under paragraphs (4) (C), (4) (D), or (5) (A) of this subsection, and who (i) participates in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of such association, or directly or indirectly solicits or procures, or transfers or attempts to transfer, or votes or attempts to vote any proxies, consents, or authorizations in respect of any voting rights in such association, or (ii) without the prior written approval of the Board, votes for a director or serves or acts as a director, officer, or employee of any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(B) Except with the prior written consent of the Board, no person shall serve as a director, officer, or employee of an association who has been convicted, or who is hereafter convicted, of a criminal offense involving dishonesty or a breach of trust. For each willful violation of this prohibition, the association involved shall be subject to a penalty of not more than $100 for each day this prohibition is violated, which the Board may recover by suit or otherwise for its own use.

"(C) Whenever a conservator or receiver appointed by the Board demands possession of the property, business, and assets of any association, or of any part thereof, the refusal by any director, officer, employee, or agent of such association to comply with the demand shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

"(13) (A) As used in this subsection—

"(1) The terms 'cease-and-desist order which has become final' and 'order which has become final' mean a cease-and-desist order, or an order, issued by the Board with the consent of the association or the diretcor or officer or other person concerned, or with respect to which no petition for review of the action of the Board has been filed and perfected in a court of appeals as specified in paragraph (7) (B) of this subsection, or with respect to which the action of the court in which said petition is so filed is not subject to further review by the Supreme Court of the United States in proceedings provided for in said paragraph, or an order issued under paragraph (5) (A) of this subsection.

"(2) The term 'territory' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any possession of the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"(B) As used in paragraph (4) of this subsection, the term 'violation' includes without limitation any action (alone or with another or others) for or toward causing, bringing about, participating in, counseling, or aiding or abetting a violation.

"(14) As used in this subsection, the terms 'Federal savings and loan association' and 'association' shall include any institution with respect to which the Federal Home Loan Bank Board now or hereafter has any statutory power of examination or supervision under any Act or joint resolution of Congress other than this Act, the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and the National Housing Act. For the purposes of this paragraph (14), references in this subsection to directors, officers, employees, and agents, or to former directors of officers, of associations shall be deemed to be references respectively to directors, officers, employees, and agents, or to former directors or officers, of such institutions, references therein to savings account holders and to members of associations shall be deemed to be references to holders of withdrawable accounts in such institutions, and references therein to boards of directors of associations shall be deemed to be references to boards of directors or other governing boards of such institutions. Said Board shall have power by regulation to define, for the purposes of this paragraph (14), terms used or referred to in the sentence next preceding and other terms used in this subsection.

"(15) The provisions of this subsection, as amended by the amendment by which this sentence is added, shall not be applicable to or with respect to any proceeding for the appointment of a conservator or receiver pending immediately prior to the effective date of said amendment or any conservator or receiver appointed as a result of such proceeding, or to or with respect to any supervisory representative in charge, conservator, or receiver in office immediately prior to said date, or any successor of any of the same, or to the appointment of any such successor, and the provisions of this subsection as in effect immediately prior to said date shall be and remain applicable to all of the foregoing."

SEC. 102. Section 407 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1730), is hereby amended to read as follows:

SEC. 407. TERMINATION OF INSURANCE AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS.

"(a) VOLUNTARY TERMINATION OF INSURANCE.—Any insured institution other than a Federal savings and loan association may terminate its status as an insured institution by written notice to the Corporation specifying a date for such termination.

"(b) INVOLUNTARY TERMINATION OF INSURANCE; NOTICE AND HEARING.—(1) Whenever, in the opinion of the Corporation, any insured institution has violated its duty as such or is engaging or has engaged in an unsafe or unsound practice in conducting the business of such institution, or is in an unsafe or unsound condition to continue operations as an insured institution, or is violating or has violated an applicable law, rule, regulation, or order, or any condition imposed by the Corporation or any agreement entered into with the Corporation, including any agreement entered into under section 403 of this title, the Corporation shall serve upon the institution a statement with respect to such violations or practices or condition for the purpose of securing the correction thereof, and shall send a copy of such statement to the appropriate State supervisory authority.

"(2) Unless such correction shall be made within one hundred and twenty days after service of such statement, or such shorter period of not less than twenty days after such service as (A) the Corporation shall require in any case where the Corporation determines that its insurance risk with respect to such institutions could be unduly jeopardized by further delay in the correction of such violations or practices or conditions, or (B) the appropriate State supervisory authority shall require, or unless within such time the Corporation shall have received acceptable assurances that such correction will be made within a time and in a manner satisfactory to the Corporation, or in the event such assurances are submitted to and accepted by the Corporation but are not carried out in accordance with their terms, the Corporation may, if it shall determine to proceed further, issue and serve upon the institution written notice of intention to terminate the status of the institution as an insured institution.

"(3) Such notice shall contain a statement of the facts constituting the alleged violation or violations or the unsafe or unsound practice or practices or condition, and shall fix a time and place for a hearing thereon. Such hearing shall be fixed for a date not earlier than thirty days after service of such notice. Unless the institution shall appear at the hearing by a duly authorized representative, it shall be deemed to have consented to the termination of its status as an insured institution. In the event of such consent, or if upon the record made at any such hearing the Corporation shall find that any violation or unsafe or unsound practice or condition specified in such notice has been established and has not been corrected within the time above prescribed in which to make correction, the Corporation may issue and serve upon the institution an order terminating the status of the institution as an insured institution; but any such order shall not become effective until it is an order which has become final (except in the case of an order of termination issued upon consent, which shall become effective at the time specified therein).

"(c) DATE OF TERMINATION OF INSURED STATUS.—The effective date of the termination of an institution's status as an insured institution under the foregoing provisions of this section shall be the date specified for such termination in the notice by the institution to the Corporation as provided in subsection (a) of this section, or the date upon which an order of termination issued under subsection (b)(3) of this section becomes effective. The Corporation may from time to time postpone the effective date of the termination of an institution's status as an insured institution at any time before such termination has become effective, but in the case of termination by notice given by the institution such effective date shall be postponed only with the written consent of the institution.

"(d) CONTINUATION OF INSURANCE; EXAMINATIONS; NOTICE TO MEMBERS; AND PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS.—In the event of the termination of an institution's status as an insured institution, insurance of its accounts to the extent that they were insured on the effective date of such termination as hereinabove provided in subsection (c), less any amounts thereafter withdrawn, repurchased, or redeemed, shall continue for a period of two years, but no investments or deposits made after such date shall be insured. The Corporation shall have the right to examine such institution from time to time during the two-year period aforesaid. Such insured institution shall be obligated to pay, within thirty days after the effective date of such termination, as a final insurance premium, a sum equivalent to twice the last annual insurance premium payable by it. In the event of the termination of insurance of accounts as herein provided the institution which was the insured institution shall give prompt and reasonable notice to all of its insured members that it has ceased to be an insured institution and it may include in such notice the fact that insured accounts, to the extent not withdrawn, repurchased, or redeemed, remain insured for two years from the date of such termination, but it shall not further represent itself in any manner as an insured institution. In the event of failure to give the notice to insured members as herein provided the Corporation is authorized to give reasonable notice.

"(e) CEASE-AND-DESIST PROCEEDINGS.—(1) If, in the opinion of the Corporation, any insured institution or any institution any of the accounts of which are insured is engaging or has engaged or is about to engage in an unsafe or unsound practice in conducting the business of such institution, or is violating or has violated or is about to violate an applicable law, rule, or regulation, or any condition imposed by the Corporation or any agreement entered into with the Corporation, including any agreement entered into under section 403 of this title, the Corporation may issue and serve upon the institution a notice of charges in respect thereof. The notice shall contain a statement of the facts constituting the alleged violation or violations or the unsafe or unsound practice or practices, and shall fix a time and place at which a hearing will be held to determine whether an order to cease and desist therefrom should issue against the institution. Such hearing shall be fixed for a date not earlier than thirty days nor later than sixty day after service of such notice unless a later date is set by the Corporation at the request of the institution. Unless the institution shall appear at the hearing by a duly authorized representative, it shall be deemed to have consented to the issuance of the cease-and-desist order. In the event of such consent, or if upon the record made at any such hearing the Corporation shall find that any violation or unsafe or unsound practice specified in the notice of charges has been established, the Corporation shall issue and serve upon the institution an order to cease and desist from any such violation or practice. Such order may, by provisions which may be mandatory or otherwise, require the institution and its directors, officers, employees, and agents to cease and desist from the same, and, further, to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from any such violation or practice.

"(2) A cease-and-desist order shall become effective at the expiration of thirty days after service of such order upon the institution concerned (except in the case of a cease-and-desist order issued upon consent, which shall become effective at the time specified therein), and shall remain effective and enforceable except to such extent as it is stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the Corporation or a reviewing court.

"(f) TEMPORARY CEASE-AND-DESIST ORDERS.—(1) Whenever the Corporation shall determine that the violation or threatened violation of law, rules, or regulations, or the unsafe or unsound practice or practices, specified in the notice of charges served upon the institution pursuant to subsection (e)(1) of this section, or the continuation thereof, could cause insolvency or substantial dissipation of assets or earnings of the institution, or could otherwise seriously prejudice the interests of its insured members or of the Corporation, the Corporation may issue a temporary order requiring the institution to cease and desist from any such violation or practice. Such order shall become effective upon service upon the institution and, unless set aside, limited, or suspended by a court in proceedings authorized by paragraph (2) of this subsection, shall remain effective and enforceable pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to such notice and until such time as the Corporation shall dismiss the charges specified in such notice or, if a cease-and-desist order is issued against the institution, until the effective date of any such order.

"(2) Within ten days after the institution concerned has been served with a temporary cease-and-desist order, the institution may apply to the United States district court for the judicial district in which the principal office of the institution is located, or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for an injunction setting aside, limiting, or suspending the enforcement, operation, or effectiveness of such order pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice of charges served upon the institution under subsection (e)(1) of this section, and such court shall have jurisdiction to issue such injunction.

"(3) In the case of violation or threatened violation of, or failure to obey, a temporary cease-and-desist order, the Corporation may apply to the United States district court, or the United States court of any territory, within the jurisdiction of which the principal office of the institution is located, for an injunction to enforce such order, and, if the court shall determine that there has been such violation or threatened violation or failure to obey, it shall be the duty of the court to issue such injunction.

"(g) SUSPENSION OR REMOVAL OF DIRECTOR OR OFFICER.—(1) Whenever, in the opinion of the Corporation, any director or officer of an insured institution has committed any violation of law, rule, or regulation, or of a cease-and-desist order which has become final, or has engaged or participated in any unsafe or unsound practice in connection with the institution, or has committed or engaged in any act, omission, or practice which constitutes a breach of his fiduciary duty as such director or officer, and the Corporation determines that the institution has suffered or will probably suffer substantial financial loss or other damage or that the interests of its insured members could be seriously prejudiced by reason of such violation or practice or breach of fiduciary duty, the Corporation may serve upon such director or officer a written notice of its intention to remove him from office.

"(2) Whenever, in the opinion of the Corporation, any director or officer of an insured institution, by conduct or practice with respect to another insured institution or other business institution which resulted in substantial financial loss or other damage, has evidenced his general unfitness to continue as a director or officer, and, whenever, in the opinion of the Corporation, any person participating in the conduct of the affairs of an insured institution, by conduct or practice with respect to such institution or other insured institution or other business institution which resulted in substantial financial loss or other damage, has evidenced his general unfitness to participate in the conduct of the affairs of such insured institution, the Corporation may serve upon such director, officer, or other person a written notice of its intention to remove him from office and/or to prohibit his further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of such institution.

"(3) In respect to any director or officer of an insured institution or any other person referred to in subsections (g)(1) or (g)(2), the Corporation may, if it deems it necessary for the protection of the institution or the interests of its insured members or of the Corporation, by written notice to such effect served upon such director, officer, or other person, suspend him from office and/or prohibit him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the institution. Such suspension and/or prohibition shall become effective upon service of such notice and, unless stayed by a court in proceedings authorized by paragraph (5) of this subsection. shall remain in effect until terminated or set aside by the Corporation. Copies of any such notice shall also be served upon the institution of which he is a director or officer or in the conduct of whose affairs he has participated.

"(4) A notice of intention to remove a director, officer, or other person from office and/or to prohibit his participation in the conduct of the affairs of an insured institution, shall contain a statement of the facts constituting grounds therefor, and shall fix a time and place at which a hearing will be held thereon. Such hearings shall be fixed for a date not earlier than thirty days nor later than sixty days after the date of service of such notice, unless a later date is set by the Corporation at the request of (A) such director, officer, or other person, and for good cause shown, or (B) the Attorney General of the United States. Unless such director, officer, or other person shall appear at the hearing in person or by a duly authorized representative, he shall be deemed to have consented to the issuance of an order of such removal and/or prohibition. In the event of such consent, or if upon the record made at any such hearing the Corporation shall find that any of the grounds specified in such notice has been established, the Corporation shall issue such orders of suspension or removal from office, and/or prohibition from participation in the conduct of the affairs of the institution, as it may deem appropriate. Any such order shall become effective at the expiration of thirty days after service upon such institution and the director, officer, or other person concerned (except in the case of an order issued upon consent, which shall become effective at the time specified therein). Such order shall remain effective and enforceable except to such extent as it is stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the Corportion or a reviewing court.

"(5) Within ten days after a director, officer, or other person has been suspended from office and/or prohibited from participation in the conduct of the affairs of an insured institution under paragraph (3) of this subsection, such director, officer, or other person may apply to the United States district court for the judicial district in which the principal office of the institution is located, or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for a stay of such suspension and/or prohibition pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice served upon such director, officer, or other person under paragraphs (1) or (2) of this subsection, and such court shall have jurisdiction to stay such suspension and/or prohibition.

"(h) SUSPENSION OF DIRECTOR OR OFFICER UNDER INDICTMENT.—Whenever any director or officer of an insured institution, or other person participating in the conduct of the affairs of such institution, is charged in any information or indictment, or complaint authorized by a United States Attorney, with the commission of or participation in a felony involving dishonesty or breach of trust, the Corporation may, by written notice served upon such director, officer, or other person, suspend him fom office and/or prohibit him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the institution. A copy of such notice shall also be served upon the institution. Such suspension and/or prohibition shall remain in effect until such information, indictment, or complaint is finally disposed of. In the event that a judgment of conviction with respect to such offense is entered against such director, officer, or other person, and at such time as such judgment is not subject to further appellate review, the Corporation shall issue and serve upon such director, officer, or other person an order removing him from office and/or prohibiting him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the institution. A copy of such order shall also be served upon such institution, whereupon such director or officer shall cease to be a director or officer of such institution. A finding of not guilty or other disposition of the charge shall not preclude the Corporation from thereafter instituting proceedings to remove such director, officer, or other person from office and/or to prohibit further participation in institution affairs, pursuant to paragraphs (1) or (2) of subsection (g) of this section.

"(i) TERMINATION OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK MEMBERSHIP.—Termination under this section or otherwise of the status of an institution as an insured institution shall automatically constitute a removal under subsection (i) of section 6 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of the institution from Federal Home Loan Bank membership, if at the time of such termination such institution is a member of a Federal Home Loan Bank; and removal of an institution from Federal Home Loan Bank membership under subsection (i) of section 6 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act or otherwise shall automatically constitute an order of termination under this section of the status of such institution as an insured institution, if such institution is at the time of such removal an insured institution.

"(j) HEARINGS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.—(1) Any hearing provided for in this section shall be held in the Federal judicial district or in the territory in which the principal office of the institution is located unless the party afforded the hearing consents to another place, and shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act; but such hearing shall be private, unless otherwise ordered for good cause found. After such hearing, and within ninety days after the Corporation has notified the parties that the case has been submitted to it for final decision, the Corporation shall render its decision (which shall include findings of fact upon which its decision is predicated) and shall issue and cause to be served upon each party to the proceeding an order or orders consistent with the provisions of this section. Judicial review of any such order shall be exclusively as provided in this subsection. Unless a petition for review is timely filed in a court of appeals of the United States, as hereinafter provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and thereafter until the record in the proceeding has been filed as so provided, the Corporation may at any time, upon such notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify, terminate, or set aside any such order. Upon such filing of the record, the Corporation may modify, terminate, or set aside any such order with permission of the court.

"(2) Any party to the proceeding, or any person required by an order issued under this section to cease and desist from any of the violations or practices stated herein, may obtain a review of any order served pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection (other than an order issued with the consent of the institution or the director or officer or other person concerned, or an order issued under subsection (h) of this section) by filing in the court of appeals of the United States for the circuit in which the principal office of the institution is located, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, within thirty days after the date of service of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Corporation be modified, terminated, or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Corporation, and thereupon the Corporation shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, as provided in section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, such court shall have jurisdiction, which upon the filing of the record shall except as provided in the last sentence of said paragraph (1) be exclusive, to affirm, modify, terminate, or set aside, in whole or in part, the order of the Corporation. Review of such proceedings shall be had as provided in the Administrative Procedure Act. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(3) The commencement of proceedings for judicial review under paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of any order issued by the Corporation.

"(k) JURISDICTION AND ENFORCEMENT.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, (A) the Corporation shall be deemed to be an agency of the United States within the meaning of section 451 of title 28 of the United States Code; (B) any civil action, suit, or proceeding to which the Corporation shall be a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, and the United States district courts shall have original jurisdiction thereof, without regard to the amount in controversy; and (C) the Corporation may, without bond or security, remove any such action, suit, or proceeding from a State court to the United States district court for the district and division embracing the place where the same is pending by following any procedure for removal now or hereafter in effect: *Provided*, That any action, suit, or proceeding to which the Corporation is a party in its capacity as conservator, receiver, or other legal custodian of an insured State-chartered institution and which involves only the rights or obligations of investors, creditors, stockholders, and such institution under State law shall not be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States. No attachment or execution shall be issued against the Corporation or its property before final judgment in any action, suit, or proceeding in any court of any State or of the United States or any territory, or any other court.

"(2) The Corporation may, in its discretion, apply to the United States district court, or the United States court of any territory, within the jurisdiction of which the principal office of the institution is located, for the enforcement of any effective and outstanding order issued by the Corporation under this section, and such courts shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance therewith; but except as otherwise provided in this section no court shall have jurisdiction to affect by injunction or otherwise the issuance or enforcement of any notice or order under this section, or to review, modify, suspend, terminate, or set aside any such notice or order.

"(l) Reporting Requirements.—(1) Whenever a change occurs in the outstanding voting stock of any insured institution which will result in control or a change in the control of such institution, the president or other chief executive officer of such institution shall promptly report such facts to the Corporation upon obtaining knowledge of such change. As used in this subsection, the term 'control' means the power to directly or indirectly direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of the insured institution. If there is any doubt as to whether a change in ownership or other change in the outstanding voting stock of any insured institution is sufficient to result in control or a change in the control thereof, such doubt shall be resolved in favor of reporting the facts to the Corporation.

"(2) Whenever an insured institution or an insured bank of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation makes a loan or loans secured (or to be secured) by 25 per centum or more of the voting stock an insured institution, the president or other chief executive officer of the lending insured institution or insured bank shall promptly report such fact to the Corporation upon obtaining knowledge of such loan or loans, except that no report need be made in those cases where the borrower has been the owner of record of the stock for a period of one year or more, or the stock is of a newly organized insured institution prior to its opening.

"(3) The reports required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall contain the following information to the extent that it is known by the person making the report: (A) the number of shares involved, (B) the names of the sellers (or transferors), (C) the names of the purchasers (or transferees), (D) the names of the beneficial owners if the shares are of record in another name or names, (E) the purchase price, (F) the total number of shares owned by the sellers (or transferors), the purchasers (or transferees) and the beneficial owners both immediately before and after the transaction, and in the case of a loan, (G) the name of the borrower, (H) the amount of the loan, and (I) the name of the institution issuing the stock securing the loan and the number of shares securing the loan. In addition to the foregoing, such reports shall contain such other information as may be available to inform the Corporation of the effect of the transaction upon control of the institution whose stock is involved. The reports required by this subsection shall be in addition to any reports that may be required pursuant to other provisions of law.

"(4) Whenever such a change as is described in paragraph (1) of this subsection occurs, the insured institution involved shall report promptly to the Corporation any change or changes, or replacement or replacements, of its chief executive officer or of any directors occurring in the next twelve-month period, including in its report a statement of the past and current business and professional affiliations of the new chief executive officer or director.

"(5) Without limitation by or on the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Corporation may require insured institutions and individuals or other persons who have or have had any connection with the management of any insured institution, as defined by the Corporation, to provide, in such manner and under such civil penalties (which shall be cumulative to any other remedies) as the Corporation may prescribe, such periodic or other reports and disclosures as the Corporation may determine to be necessary or appropriate for the protection of investors or the Corporation.

"(6) As used in this subsection, the term 'stock' means such stock or other equity securities or equity interests in an insured institution, or rights, interests, or powers with respect thereto, regardless of whether such institution is a stock company, a mutual institution, or otherwise, as the Corporation may by regulation define for the purposes of this subsection.

"(m) Ancillary Provisions.—(1) In making examinations of insured institutions, examiners appointed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board shall have power, on behalf of the Corporation, to make such examinations of the affairs of all affiliates of such institutions as shall be necessary to disclose fully the relations between such institutions and their affiliates and the effect of such relations upon such institutions. The cost of examinations of such affiliates shall be assessed against and paid by the institution. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'affiliate' shall have the same meaning as where used in section 2(b) of the Banking Act of 1933, as amended, except that the term 'member bank' shall be deemed to refer to an insured institution.

"(2) In connection with examinations of insured institutions and affiliates thereof, the Corporation, or its designated representatives, shall have power to administer oaths and affirmations and to examine and to take and preserve testimony under oath as to any matter in respect of the affairs or ownership of any such institution or affiliate thereof, and to issue subpenas and subpenas duces tecum, and, for the enforcement thereof, to apply to the United States district court for the judicial district or the United States court in any territory in which the principal office of the institution or affiliate thereof is located, or in which the witness resides or carries on business. Such courts shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance with any such subpena.

"(3) In the course of or in connection with any proceeding under this section, the Corporation or its designated representatives, including any person designated to conduct any hearing under this section, shall have power to administer oaths and affirmations, to take or cause to be taken depositions, and to issue, revoke, quash, or modify subpenas and subpenas duces tecum; and the Corporation is empowered to make rules and regulations with respect to any such proceedings. The attendance of witnesses and the production of documents provided for in this subsection may be required from any place in any State or in any territory at any designated place where such proceeding is being conducted. Any party to proceedings under this section may apply to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or the United States district court for the judicial district or the United States court in any territory in which such proceeding is being conducted or where the witness resides or carries on business, for enforcement of any subpena or subpena duces tecum issued pursuant to this subsection, and such courts shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance therewith. Witnesses subpenaed under this subsection shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. All expenses of the Board or of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation in connection with this section shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses.

"(n) Service.—Any service required or authorized to be made by the Corporation under this section may be made by registered mail, or in such other manner reasonably calculated to give actual notice as the Corporation may by regulation or otherwise provide. Copies of any notice or order served by the Corporation upon any institution or any director or officer thereof, pursuant to the provisions of this section, shall also be sent to the appropriate State supervisory authority.

"(o) Consultation With State Authorities.—In connection with any action under this section involving an insured State-chartered institution, the Corporation shall, to the extent compatible with the public interest, consult with the appropriate State supervisory authority and proceed with due regard for whatever power and intent such authority may have to effect the necessary corrective action.

"(p) Penalties.—(1) Any director or officer, or former director or officer, of an insured institution or an institution any of the accounts of which are insured, or any other person, against whom there is outstanding and effective any notice or order (which is an order which has become final) served upon such director, officer, or other person under subsections (g)(3), (g)(4), or (h) of this section, and who (A) participates in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of such institution, or directly or indirectly solicits or procures, or transfers or attempts to transfer, or votes or attempts to vote any proxies, consents, or authorizations in respect of any voting rights in such institution, or (B) without the prior written approval of the Corporation, votes for a director or serves or acts as a director, officer, or employee of any insured institution, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(2) Except with the prior written consent of the Corporation, no person shall serve as a director, officer, or employee of an insured institution who has been convicted, or who is hereafter convicted, of a criminal offense involving dishonesty or a breach of trust. For each willful violation of this prohibition, the institution involved shall be subject to a penalty of not more than $100 for each day this prohibition is violated, which the Corporation may recover by suit or otherwise for its own use.

"(A) The terms 'cease-and-desist order which has become final' and 'order which has become final' mean a cease-and-desist order, or an order, issued by the Corporation with the consent of the institution or the director or officer or other person concerned, or with respect to which no petition for review of the action of the Corporation has been filed and perfected in a court of appeals as specified in subsection (j)(2) of this section, or with respect to which the action of the court in which said petition is so filed is not subject to further review by the Supreme Court of the United States in proceedings provided for in said subsection, or an order issued under subsection (h) of this section.

"(B) The term 'territory' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any possession of the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"(2) As used in subsection (f) of this section, the term 'insolvency' means that the assets of an institution are less than its obligations to its creditors and others, including its members.

"(3) As used in subsection (g) of this section, the term 'violation' includes without limitation any action (alone or with another or others) for or toward causing, bringing about, participating in, counseling, or aiding or abetting a violation."

TITLE II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, AND THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Sec. 201. Paragraph (6) of subsection (j) of section 7 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(6)), is repealed and section (3) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1813), is amended by adding the following new subsection (q):

"(q) The term 'appropriate Federal banking agency' shall mean (a) the Comptroller of the Currency in the case of a national banking association or a District bank, (b) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in the case of a State member insured bank (except a District bank), and (c) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the case of a State nonmember insured bank (except a District bank)."

SEC. 202. Section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818), is amended by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) thereof as (p), (q), and (r) and by adding after subsection (a) thereof the following new subsections (b) through (o), inclusive:

"(b)(1) If, in the opinion of the appropriate Federal banking agency, any insured bank or bank which has insured deposits is engaging or has engaged or is about to engage in an unsafe or unsound practice in conducting the business of such bank, or is violating or has violated or is about to violate an applicable law, rule, or regulation, or any condition imposed by the agency or any agreement entered into with the agency, the agency may issue and serve upon the bank a notice of charges in respect thereof. The notice shall contain a statement of the facts constituting the alleged violation or violations or the unsafe or unsound practice or practices, and shall fix a time and place at which a hearing will be held to determine whether an order to cease and desist therefrom should issue against the bank. Such hearing shall be fixed for a date not earlier than thirty days nor later than sixty days after service of such notice unless a later date is set by the agency at the request of the bank. Unless the bank shall appear at the hearing by a duly authorized representative, it shall be deemed to have consented to the issuance of the cease-and-desist order. In the event of such consent, or if upon the record made at any such hearing, the agency shall find that any violation or unsafe or unsound practice specified in the notice of charges has been established, the agency shall issue and serve upon the bank an order to cease and desist from any such violation or practice. Such order may, by provisions which may be mandatory or otherwise, require the bank and its directors, officers, employees, and agents to cease and desist from the same, and, further, to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from any such violation or practice.

"(2) A cease-and-desist order shall become effective at the expiration of thirty days after the service of such order upon the bank concerned (except in the case of a cease-and-desist order issued upon consent, which shall become effective at the time specified therein), and shall remain effective and enforceable as provided therein, except to such extent as it is stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the agency or a reviewing court.

"(c)(1) Whenever the appropriate Federal banking agency shall determine that the violation or threatened violation of law, rules, or regulations, or the unsafe or unsound practice or practices, specified in the notice of charges served upon the bank pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of this section, or the continuation thereof, could cause insolvency or substantial dissipation of assets or earnings of the bank, or could otherwise seriously prejudice the interests of its depositors, the agency may issue a temporary order requiring the bank to cease and desist from any such violation or practice. Such order shall become effective upon service upon the bank and, unless set aside, limited, or suspended by a court in proceedings authorized by paragraph (2) of this subsection, shall remain effective and enforceable pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to such notice and until such time as the agency shall dismiss the charges specified in such notice, or if a cease-and-desist order is issued against the bank, until the effective date of any such order.

"(2) Within ten days after the bank concerned has been served with a temporary cease-and-desist order, the bank may apply to the United States district court for the judicial district in which the home office of the bank is located, or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for an injunction setting aside, limiting, or suspending the enforcement, operation, or effectiveness of such order pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice of charges served upon the bank under paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of this section, and such court shall have jurisdiction to issue such injunction.

"(d) In the case of violation or threatened violation of, or failure to obey a temporary cease-and-desist order issued pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of this section, the appropriate Federal banking agency may apply to the United States District Court, of the United States court of any territory, within the jurisdiction of which the home office of the bank is located, for an injunction to enforce such order, and, if the court shall determine that there has been such violation or threatened violation or failure to obey, it shall be the duty of the court to issue such injunction.

"(e)(1) Whenever, in the opinion of the appropriate Federal banking agency, any director or officer of an insured bank has committed any violation of law, rule, or regulation, or of a cease-and-desist order which has become final, or has engaged or participated in any unsafe or unsound practice in connection with the bank, or has committed or engaged in any act, omission, or practice which constitutes a breach of his fiduciary duty as such director or officer, and the agency determines that the bank has suffered or will probably suffer substantial financial loss or other damage or that the interests of its depositors could be seriously prejudiced by reason of such violation or practice or breach of fiduciary duty, the agency may serve upon such director or officer a written notice of its intention to remove him from office.

"(2) Whenever, in the opinion of the appropriate Federal banking agency, any director or officer of an insured bank, by conduct or practice with respect to another insured bank or other business institution which resulted in substantial financial loss or other damage, has evidenced his general unfitness to continue as a director or officer and, whenever, in the opinion of the appropriate Federal banking agency, any other person participating in the conduct of the affairs of an insured bank, by conduct or practice with respect to such bank or other insured bank or other business institution which resulted in substantial financial loss or other damage, has evidenced his general unfitness to participate in the conduct of the affairs of such insured bank, the agency may serve upon such director, officer, or other person a written notice of its intention to remove him from office and/or to prohibit his further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the bank.

"(3) In respect to any director or officer of an insured bank or any other person referred to in subsections (e)(1) or (e)(2), the appropriate Federal agency may, if it deems it necessary for the protection of the bank or the interests of its depositors, by written notice to such effect served upon such director, officer, or other person, suspend him from office and/or prohibit him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the bank. Such suspension and/or prohibition shall become effective upon service of such notice and, unless stayed by a court in proceedings authorized by subsection (f) of this section, shall remain in effect until terminated or set aside by the agency. Copies of any such notice shall also be served upon the bank of which he is a director or officer or in the conduct of whose affairs he has participated.

"(4) A notice of intention to remove a director, officer, or other person from office and/or to prohibit his participation in the conduct of the affairs of an insured bank, shall contain a statement of the facts constituting grounds therefor, and shall fix a time and place at which a hearing will be held thereon. Such hearing shall be fixed for a date not earlier than thirty days nor later than sixty days after the date of service of such notice, unless a later date is set by the agency at the request of (A) such director or officer or other person, and for good cause shown, or (B) the Attorney General of the United States. Unless such director, officer, or other person shall appear at the hearing in person or by a duly authorized representative, he shall be deemed to have consented to the issuance of an order of such removal and/or prohibition. In the event of such consent, or if upon the record made at any such hearing the agency shall find that any of the grounds specified in such notice has been established, the agency shall issue such orders of suspension or removal from office, and/or prohibition from participation in the conduct of the affairs of the bank, as it may deem appropriate. Any such order shall become effective at the expiration of thirty days after service upon such bank and the director, officer, or other person concerned (except in the case of an order issued upon consent, which shall become effective at the time specified therein). Such order shall remain effective and enforceable except to such extent as it is stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the agency or a reviewing court.

"(f) Within ten days after a director, officer, or other person has been suspended from office and/or prohibited from participation in the conduct of the affairs of an insured bank under subsection (e)(3) of this section, such director, officer, or other person may apply to the United States district court for the judicial district in which the home office of the bank is located, or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for a stay of such suspension and/or prohibition pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice served upon such director, officer, or other person under subsections (e)(1) or (e)(2) of this section, and such court shall have jurisdiction to stay such suspension and/or prohibition.

"(g)(1) Whenever any director or officer of an insured bank, or other person participating in the conduct of the affairs of such bank, is charged in any information or indictment, or complaint authorized by a United States attorney, with the commission of or participation in a felony involving dishonesty or breach of trust, the appropriate Federal banking agency may, by written notice served upon such director, officer, or other person suspend him from office and/or prohibit him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the bank. A copy of such notice shall also be served upon the bank. Such suspension and/or prohibition shall remain in effect until such information, indictment, or complaint is finally disposed of. In the event that a judgment of conviction with respect to such offense is entered against such director, officer, or other person, and at such time as such judgment is not subject to further appellate review, the agency shall issue and serve upon such director, officer, or other person an order removing him from office and/or prohibiting him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the bank. A copy of such order shall also be served upon such bank, whereupon such director or officer shall cease to be a director or officer of such bank. A finding of not guilty or other disposition of the charge shall not preclude the agency from thereafter instituting proceedings to remove such director, officer, or other person from office and/or to prohibit further participation in bank affairs, pursuant to paragraphs (1) or (2) of subsection (e) of this section.

"(2) If at any time, because of the suspension of one or more directors pursuant to this section, there shall be on the board of directors of a national bank less than a quorum of directors not so suspended, all powers and functions vested in or exercisable by such board shall vest in and be exercisable by the director or directors on the board not so suspended, until such time as there shall be a quorum of the board of directors. In the event all of the directors of a national bank are suspended pursuant to this section, the Comptroller of the Currency shall appoint persons to serve temporarily as directors in their place and stead pending the termination of such suspensions, or until such time as those who have been suspended cease to be directors of the bank and their respective successors take office.

"(h)(1) Any hearing provided for in this section shall be held in the Federal judicial district or in the territory in which the home office of the bank is located unless the party afforded the hearing consents to another place, and shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act; but such hearing shall be private, unless otherwise ordered for good cause found. After such hearing, and within ninety days after the appropriate Federal banking agency has notified the parties that the case has been submitted to it for final decision, the agency shall render its decision (which shall include findings of fact upon which its decision is predicated) and shall issue and serve upon each party to the proceeding an order or orders consistent with the provisions of this section. Judicial review of any such order shall be exclusively as provided in this subsection (h). Unless a petition for review is timely filed in a court of appeals of the United States, as hereinafter provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and thereafter until the record in the proceeding has been filed as so provided, the agency may at any time, upon such notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify, terminate, or set aside any such order. Upon such filing of the record, the agency may modify, terminate, or set aside any such order with permission of the court.

"(2) Any party to the proceeding, or any person required by an order issued under this section to cease and desist from any of the violations or practices stated therein, may obtain a review of any order served pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection (other than an order issued with the consent of the bank or the director or officer or other person concerned or an order issued under paragraph (1) of subsection (g) of this section) by filing in the court of appeals of the United States for the circuit in which the home office of the bank is located, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, within thirty days after the date of service of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the agency be modified, terminated, or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the agency, and thereupon the agency shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, as provided in section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, such court shall have jurisdiction, which upon the filing of the record shall except as provided in the last sentence of said paragraph (1) be exclusive, to affirm, modify, terminate, or set aside, in whole or in part, the order of the agency. Review of such proceedings shall be had as provided in the Administrative Procedure Act. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(3) The commencement of proceedings for judicial review under paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of any order issued by the agency.

"(i) The appropriate Federal banking agency may in its discretion apply to the United States district court, or the United States court of any territory, within the jurisdiction of which the home office of the bank is located, for the enforcement of any effective and outstanding order issued by the agency under this section, and such courts shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance therewith; but except as otherwise provided in this section no court shall have jurisdiction to affect by injunction or otherwise the issuance or enforcement of any notice or order under this section, or to review, modify, suspend, terminate or set aside any such notice or order.

"(j) Any director or officer, or former director or officer, of an insured bank or bank which has insured deposits, or any other person, against whom there is outstanding and effective any notice or order (which is an order which has become final) served upon such director, officer, or other person under subsections (e)(3), (e)(4), or (g)(1) of this section, and who (i) participates in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of such bank, or directly or indirectly solicits or procures, or transfers or attempts to transfer, or votes or attempts to vote, any proxies, consents, or authorizations in respect of any voting rights in such bank, or (ii) without the prior written approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, votes for a director, serves or acts as a director, officer, or employee of any bank, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(k)(1) As used in this subsection (1) the terms 'cease-and-desist order which has become final' and 'order which has become final' mean a cease-and-desist order, or an order, issued by the appropriate Federal banking agency with the consent of the bank or the director or officer or other person concerned, or with respect to which no petition for review of the action of the agency has been filed and perfected in a court of appeals as specified in paragraph (2) of subsection (h), or with respect to which the action of the court in which said petition is so filed is not subject to further review of the Supreme Court of the United States in proceedings provided for in said paragraph, or an order issued under paragraph (1) of subsection (g) of this section, (2) the term 'violation' includes without limitation any action (alone or with another or others) for or toward causing, bringing about, participating in, counseling, or aiding or abetting a violation.

"(l) Any service required or authorized to be made by the appropriate Federal banking agency under this section may be made by registered mail, or in such other manner reasonably calculated to give actual notice as the agency may by regulation or otherwise provide. Copies of any notice or order served by the agency upon any institution or any director or officer thereof, pursuant to the provisions of this section, shall also be sent to the appropriate State supervisory authority.

"(m) In connection with any action under this section involving a State bank the appropriate Federal banking agency shall, to the extent compatible with the public interest, consult with the appropriate State supervisory authority and proceed with due regard for whatever power and intent such authority may have to effect the necessary corrective action.

"(n) In the course of or in connection with any proceeding under this section, the appropriate Federal banking agency, or any member or designated representative thereof, including any person designated to conduct any hearing under this section, shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations, to take or cause to be taken depositions, and to issue, revoke, quash, or modify subpenas and subpenas duces tecum; and such agency is empowered to make rules and regulations with respect to any such proceedings. The attendance of witnesses and the production of documents provided for in this subsection may be required from any place in any State or in any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States at any designated place where such proceeding is being conducted. Any party to proceedings under this section may apply to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or the United States district court for the judicial district or the United States court in any Territory in which such proceeding is being conducted or where the witness resides or carries on business, for enforcement of any subpena or subpena duces tecum issued pursuant to this subsection, and such courts shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance therewith. Witnesses subpenaed under this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

SEC. 203. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 10 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1820(b), (c)), are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Board of Directors shall appoint examiners who shall have power, on behalf of the Corporation, to examine any insured State nonmember bank (except a District bank), any State nonmember bank making application to become an insured bank, and any closed insured bank, whenever in the judgment of the Board of Directors an examination of the bank is necessary. In addition to the examinations provided for in the preceding sentence, such examiners shall have like power to make a special examination of any State member bank and any national bank or District bank, whenever in the judgment of the Board of Directors such special examination is necessary to determine the condition of any such bank for insurance purposes. In making examinations of insured banks, examiners appointed by the Corporation shall have power on behalf of the Corporation, to make such examinations of the affairs of all affiliates of such banks as shall be necessary to disclose fully the relations between such banks and their affiliates and the effect of such relations upon such banks. Each examiner shall have power to make a thorough examination of all of the affairs of the bank and its affiliates, and shall make a full and detailed report of the condition of the bank to the Corporation. The Board of Directors in like manner shall appoint claim agents who shall have power to investigate and examine all claims for insured deposits. Each claim agent shall have power to administer oaths and affirmations and to examine and to take and preserve testimony under oath as to any matter in respect to claims for insured deposits, and to issue subpenas and subpenas duces tecum, and, for the enforcement thereof, to apply to the United States district court for the judicial district or the United States court in any territory in which the main office of the bank or affiliate thereof is located, or in which the witness resides or carries on business. Such courts shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance with any such subpena.

"(c) In connection with examinations of insured banks, and affiliates thereof, the appropriate Federal banking agency, or its designated representatives, shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations and to examine and to take and preserve testimony under oath as to any matter in respect of the affairs or ownership of any such bank or affiliate thereof, and to issue subpenas and subpenas duces tecum, and, for the enforcement thereof, to apply to the United States district court for the judicial district or the United States court in any territory in which the main office of the bank or affiliate thereof is located, or in which the witness resides or carries on business. Such courts shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance with any such subpena. For purposes of this section, the term 'affiliate' shall have the same meaning as where used in section 2(b) of the Banking Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 221a) except that the term 'member bank' in said section 2(b) shall be deemed to refer to an insured bank."

Sec. 204. The first five sentences of section 8(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(a)) are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. (a) Any insured bank (except a national member bank or State member bank) may, upon not less than ninety days' written notice to the Corporation, terminate its status as an insured bank. Whenever the Board of Directors shall find that an insured bank or its directors or trustees have engaged or are engaging in unsafe or unsound practices in conducting the business of such bank or is in an unsafe or unsound condition to continue operations as an insured bank, or violated an applicable law, rule, regulation or order, or any condition imposed by the Corporation or any agreement entered into with the Corporation to which the insured bank is subject, the Board of Directors shall first give to the Comptroller of the Currency in the case of a national bank or a District bank, to the authority having supervision of the bank in the case of a State bank, and to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in the case of a State member bank, a statement with respect to such practices or violations for the purpose of securing the correction thereof and shall give a copy thereof to the bank. Unless such correction shall be made within one hundred and twenty days, or such shorter period not less than twenty days fixed by the Corporation in any case where the Board of Directors in its discretion has determined that the insurance risk of the Corporation is unduly jeopardized, or fixed by the Comptroller of the Currency in the case of a national bank, or the State authority in the case of a State bank, or Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in the case of a State member bank as the case may be, the Board of Directors, if it shall determine to proceed further, shall give to the bank not less than thirty days' written notice of intention to terminate the status of the bank as an insured bank, and shall fix a time and place for a hearing before the Board of Directors or before a person designated by it to conduct such hearing, at which evidence may be produced, and upon such evidence the Board of Directors shall make written findings which shall be conclusive. If the Board of Directors shall find that any unsafe or unsound practice or condition or violation specified in such statement has been established and has not been corrected within the time above prescribed in which to make such corrections, the Board of Directors may order that the insured status of the bank be terminated on a date subsequent to such finding and to the expiration of the time specified in such notice of intention. Unless the bank shall appear at the hearing by a duly autnorized representative, it shall be deemed to have consented to the termination of its status as an insured bank and termination of such status thereupon may be ordered. Any insured bank whose insured status has been terminated by order of the Board of Directors under this subsection shall have the right of judicial review of such order only to the same extent as provided for the review of orders under subsection (h) of this section."

Sec. 205. Subsection "Fourth" of section 9 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1819 "Fourth") is amended to read as follows:

"Fourth. To sue and be sued, complain and defend, in any court of law or equity, State or Federal. All suits of a civil nature at common law or in equity to which the Corporation shall be a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, and the United States district courts shall have original jurisdiction thereof, without regard to the amount in controversy; and the Corporation may, without bond or security, remove any such action, suit, or proceeding from a State court to the United States district court for the district or division embracing the place where the same is pending by following any procedure for removal now or hereafter in effect: *Provided*, That any such suit to which the Corporation is a party in its capacity as receiver of a State bank and which involves only the rights or obligations of depositors, creditors, stockholders, and such State bank under State law shall not be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States. No attachment or execution shall be issued against the Corporation or its property before final judgment in any suit, action, or proceeding in any State, county, municipal, or United States court. The Board of Directors shall designate an agent upon whom service of process may be made in any State, Territory, or jurisdiction in which any insured bank is located."

Sec. 206. Section 30 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 77), is hereby repealed.

The letter and memorandum presented by Mr. Robertson are as follows:

Department of the Treasury;
Federal Reserve Board; Federal Home Loan Bank Board;
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1966.

Hon. Hubert Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Transmitted herewith is proposed legislation to strengthen and make more immediately effective the supervisory and regulatory authorities of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The President, in his January 1966 economic report, stated that appropriate regulations are clearly required to protect the safety of savings of American families and to assure the most efficient and equitable regulation of financial institutions. Among other measures, he recommended congressional action on financial legislation to "arm regulatory agencies with a wider range of effective enforcement remedies." The attached draft bill is designed to provide these remedies.

The continued economic growth of this country is clearly dependent upon the existence of financially sound and capably managed private lending institutions. The great majority, by far, of the financial institutions affected by this bill are soundly managed and operated. However, our financial system has not been entirely free from supervisory problems, and unlawful, unsound, or irregular practices have appeared in some cases. Even though few in number, improperly conducted institutions could cause public concern that might extend to the entire industry. In such cases, it is essential that the Federal supervisory agencies have the statutory authority and administrative facility to move quickly and effectively to require adherence to the law and cessation and correction of unsafe or improper practices.

Existing remedies have proven inadequate. On the one hand they may be too severe for many situations, such as taking custody of an institution or terminating its insured status. On the other they may be so time-consuming and cumbersome that substantial injury occurs to the institution before remedial action is effected.

The proposed legislation is designed to correct this situation by providing for two additional intermediate remedies, less drastic than seizure or termination of insurance:

First, the bill would authorize cease-and-desist proceedings in any case where an institution has violated law or regulation or has engaged in unsafe or unsound practices. Moreover, in conjunction with a cease-and-desist proceeding in the more serious cases, it would authorize issuance of temporary orders requiring the institution to cease the violations or questionable practices forthwith, pending the outcome of a full hearing.

Second, the bill would provide authority for the removal, after a hearing, of those directors or officers of institutions who have committed violations of law or regulation, or engaged in unsafe or unsound practices, or breached their fiduciary duty, causing substantial probable loss or damage to the institution, or serious prejudice to the interests of the depositors or shareholders. If the gravity of the charges warranted it, such directors or officers could be suspended, pending the hearing. In addition, any director or officer who is indicted for the commission of a felony involving dishonesty or breach of trust could be suspended, or, if convicted, removed from office.

The enactment of this legislation will result in substantial improvement in the supervision and regulation of banks and savings and loans associations. The provisions in the bill for administrative hearings and judicial review of final orders will adequately protect the rights of any insured institution and its officers, directors, or other persons against whom action proves necessary.

The proposed bill contains a number of other provisions which would strengthen the present statutes, the details of which are set out in the attached section-by-section analysis of the bill.

In summary, the bill provides valuable additional protection to major sectors of our financial system and to millions of our citizens who have entrusted their funds to it. We urge its early approval by the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

Henry H. Fowler,
Secretary of the Treasury.
William McC. Martin,
Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
John E. Horne,
Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
K. A. Randall,
Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SUPERVISORY ACT OF 1966

TITLE I. PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD AND THE FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Section 101 would amend subsection (d) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1464(d)), to provide as follows:

Paragraph (1), general provisions: Under this paragraph the Federal Home Loan Bank Board would be authorized to enforce section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act. In the enforcement thereof, or in any other action or proceeding to which it is a party, and in the administration of conservatorships and receiverships, the Board would also be authorized to act in its own name and through its own attorneys. The Board would be suable (other than on claims for money damages) in a United States district court by any Federal savings and loan association or any director or officer thereof with respect to any matter under section 5 of the Act or any other applicable law.

Paragraph (2), cease-and-desist proceedings: The Board could, in cases involving alleged violations of law, rules, regulations, or charter or other condition imposed by or agreement entered into with the Board, or unsafe or unsound practices, issue a notice of charges against a Federal savings and loan association. The notice would set a hearing not earlier than 30 nor later than 60 days after service of the notice (unless a later date was requested by the association) to determine whether a cease-and-desist order should issue against the association. Such hearing would be held under the Administrative Procedure Act. Failure of the association to appear at the hearing would be deemed to be consent to the issuance of the order. In the event of such consent, or if upon the hearing record the Board determined that any of the violations or practices specified in the notice of charges had been established, it could issue a cease-and-desist order requiring the association and its directors, officers, employees, and agents to cease and desist from such violations or practices and, further, to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from the same. (Subparagraph (A).)

A cease-and-desist order would, under subparagraph (B), become effective at the expiration of 30 days after service upon the association (except in the case of a consent order which would become effective at the time specified therein), and would remain effective and enforceable except to such extent as it is stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the Board or a reviewing court.

Paragraph (3), temporary cease-and-desist orders: This paragraph would authorize the issuance of a temporary order in advance of an administrative hearing, which would require an association to cease and desist from the violations or practices specified in the notice of charges issued pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2). The Board would have discretionary authority to issue such orders whenever it determined that the continuation of such violations or practices could cause insolvency or substantial dissipation of assets or earnings of the association, or could otherwise seriously prejudice the interests of its savings account holders. The order would become effective upon service upon the association and would, unless stayed by a court in proceedings under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, remain effective and enforceable pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice of charges and until such time as the Board dismissed the charges, or, if a cease-and-desist order was issued against the association after hearing, until the effective date of any such order.

However, an association could, within 10 days after service of a temporary cease-and-desist order, apply to the proper United States district court for a stay of the order pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice of charges against the association. (Subparagraph (B).)

In case of a violation or threatened violation of, or failure to obey, a temporary cease-and-desist order, the Board could apply to the proper United States district court for an injunction to enforce such order, and, if the court determined that there had been such violation or threatened violation or failure to obey, it would be the duty of the court to issue such injunction. (Subparagraph (C).)

Paragraph (4), suspension or removal of director or officer: This paragraph would give the Board authority to remove after hearing, and to suspend pending the hearing, directors or officers from office in Federal savings and loan associations. Such proceedings could be independent of or in conjunction with a cease-and-desist proceeding against the association.

Where a director or officer had committed any violation of law, rule, or regulation, or of a cease-and-desist order which had become final, or had engaged or participated in any unsafe or unsound practice in connection with the association, or had committed or engaged in any act, omission, or practice constituting a breach of his fiduciary duty as such director or officer, and the Board determined that the association had suffered or would probably suffer substantial financial loss or other damage or the interests of its savings account holders could be seriously prejudiced by reason of such violation or practice or breach of fiduciary duty, the Board could serve the director or officer concerned with a notice of its intention to remove him from office. (Subparagraph (A).)

Where a director or officer of an association, by conduct or practice with respect to another savings and loan or other business institution, or any other person participating in the conduct of the affairs of an association, by conduct or practice with respect to the association or another savings and loan or other business institution, resulting in substantial loss or damage, has evidenced his general unfitness to participate in the conduct of the affairs of the association, the Board could serve such director, officer, or other person with a notice of its intention to remove him from office and/or prohibit his further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the association. (Subparagraph (B).)

In cases where the Board deemed it necessary for the protection of the association or the interests of its savings account holders, the Board could serve such director, officer, or other person with a further notice suspending him from office and/or prohibiting him from participating in the conduct of the affairs of the association. The suspension and/or prohibition would, unless stayed by a United States district court upon application of the director, officer, or other person under subparagraph (E) of paragraph (2), remain in effect until the suspension and/or prohibition was terminated or set aside by the Board. (Subparagraph (C).)

The Board's notice of intention to remove a director, officer, or other person from office and/or prohibit his participation in the conduct of the affairs of the association would fix a time for a hearing not earlier than 30 days nor later than 60 days after service of such notice, unless a later date is set by the Board at the request of (i) such director, officer, or other person, and for good cause shown, or (ii) the Attorney General of the United States. Failure of the director, officer, or other person to appear at the hearing would be deemed to be consent to the issuance of an order of such removal and/or prohibition. In the event of such consent, or if the Board found upon the hearing record that any of the grounds specified in the notice had been established, the Board could issue such orders of suspension or removal from office and/or prohibition from participation as it deemed appropriate. (Subparagraph (D).)

Any such order would become effective at the expiration of 30 days after service (except in the case of a consent order which would become effective at the time specified therein), and would remain effective and enforceable except to such extent as it was stayed. modified, terminated, or set aside by the Board or a reviewing court. (Subparagraph (D).)

Within 10 days after being suspended from office and/or prohibited from participation, the director, officer, or other person could apply to a United States district court for a stay thereof pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the Board's notice of intention to remove him from office and/or to prohibit his further participation in the conduct of the affairs of the association. (Subparagraph (E).)

Paragraph (5), suspension of director or officer under indictment: The Board would have the authority to suspend, and/or prohibit further participation in the conduct of the affairs of an association by, any director, officer, or other person participating therein, who is charged in any information or indictment, or complaint authorized by a United States Attorney, with the commission of a felony involving dishonesty or breach of trust. Such suspension and/or prohibition would remain in effect until the information, indictment, or complaint is finally disposed of. If a judgment of conviction of such offense is entered, and is not subject to further appellate review, the Board shall order the removal of such director, officer, or other person from office and/or prohibit his further participation in the conduct of association affairs. A finding of not guilty or other disposition of the charge would not preclude the Board from thereafter instituting administrative proceedings against such director, officer, or other person for removal and/or prohibition from participation in association affairs. (Subparagraph (A).)

To insure that the suspension of some or all of the directors of an association, in proceedings authorized by the proposed section 5(d), would not leave the association without a board of directors legally capable of transacting business, the draft would provide that (i) if there shall be less than a quorum of directors not so suspended, all powers vested in the board shall vest in the director or directors on the board and not so suspended, until such time as there shall be a quorum, or (ii) if all of the directors are so suspended, the Board would be authorized to appoint persons to serve temporarily as directors in their place and stead pending the termination of their suspensions, or until such time as those who have been suspended cease to be directors of the association and their respective successors take office. (Subparagraph (B).)

Paragraph (6), appointment of conservator or receiver: The draft would eliminate the provision in the present section 5(d)(2) which authorizes the Board to appoint ex parte and without notice a Supervisory Representative in Charge to take charge of the affairs of an association whenever, in the opinion of the Board, a ground exists for the appointment of a conservator or receiver, and the Board determines that an emergency exists requiring immediate action. Instead, the Board would be given power and jurisdiction to appoint a conservator or receiver ex parte and without notice when, in its opinion, there exists one of the following grounds: (i) insolvency in that the association's assets are less than its obligations to its creditors and others, including its members; (ii) substantial dissipation of assets or earnings due to any violation or violations of law, rules, or regulations, or to any unsafe or unsound practice or practices; (iii) an unsafe or unsound condition to transact business; (iv) willful violation of a cease-and-desist order which has become final; and (v) concealment of books, papers, records, or assets of the association or refusal to submit books, papers, records, or affairs of the association for inspection to any examiner or to any lawful agent of the Board. Ground (i) is the same as ground (i) of the existing statute, and ground (v) is similar to existing ground (iii). Ground (ii) combines existing ground (ii) ("violation of law or of a regulation") and existing ground (iv) ("unsafe or unsound operation") but changes the concept of unsafe or unsound operation to unsafe or unsound practices and makes both factors dependent upon whether the violation of the unsafe or unsound practice has resulted in the substantial dissipation of assets or earnings. Ground (iii) is related to existing ground (iv); identical or similar provisions appear in a number of State laws. Ground (iv) is an addition to the present provisions of the statute.

Within 30 days after the Board appointed a conservator or receiver, the association could bring an action in the proper United States district court for an order of removal, if it wished to challenge such appointment.

Since any pending proceeding such as an action to stay a temporary cease-and-desist order, or a petition by an association for judicial review of a cease-and-desist order issued after hearing, would become moot if a district court upheld the Board's appointment of a conservator or receiver, the draft would provide for a stay, pending the outcome of the association's action to remove the conservator or receiver, of any other proceeding under the proposed section 5(d) which is pending before any court at the time of such appointment, and to which the association is a party.

Subparagraph (B) would also authorize the Board, without notice or hearing, to appoint a conservator or receiver in the event that (i) the association, by resolution of its board of directors, or of its members, consents to such appointment, or (ii) the association is removed from membership in a Federal Home Loan Bank, or its status as an insured institution is terminated. The latter provision is necessary in order to clarify the existing law which requires that each Federal association have Federal Home Loan Bank membership and insurance but does not make clear what is to happen when a situation arises involving the termination of a Federal association's Bank membership or its insured status. Such provision would also be consistent with present law with respect to the appointment of receivers for national banks. (See 12 U.S.C. 1818(b).)

Subparagraph (C) would, in effect, limit the jurisdiction of a court to order the removal of a conservator or receiver, except in an action for removal brought by an association under authority of paragraph (6)(A) of the draft, or, except at the instance of the Board, to restrain the exercise of the powers or functions of a conservator or receiver.

A conservator would have all the powers of the members, the directors and officers of the association, and he would be authorized to operate the association in its own name. As under the present statute, the Board could appoint only the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as receiver for a Federal association. (Subparagraph (D).)

Paragraph (7), hearings and judicial review: Subparagraph (A) would require any hearing provided for in the proposed section 5(d) to be held in the Federal judicial district in which the home office of the association is located, unless the party afforded the hearing consents to another place. All such hearings would be conducted in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, but the hearings would be private unless otherwise ordered by the Board for good cause found. The Board would be required to render its decision and order after hearing and within 90 days after notifying the parties that the case had been submitted to it for final decision.

Review of Board orders issued after hearing in proceedings under the proposed section 5(d) would be placed in the U.S. courts of appeals (rather than in the district courts as under the present statute) in line with numerous other statutes governing judicial review of agency action and in order that such review may be expedited. Such review would be governed by the Administrative Procedure Act. (Subparagraph (B).) Such remedy for judicial review of final Board action under section 5(d) would be exclusive.

Subparagraph (C) provides that the commencement of proceedings for judicial review shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of any order issued by the Board.

Paragraph (8), enforcement: This paragraph would authorize the Board to apply to the proper U.S. district court for the enforcement of any order issued under section 5(d), and such courts would be given jurisdiction to enforce compliance therewith.

Paragraph (9), subpena power: In proceedings under the proposed section 5(d), the Board or any member thereof or its designated representatives would have power to administer oaths or to issue subpenas and subpenas duces tecum. Any party to such proceedings could apply to the proper U.S. district court for enforcement of any such subpena. All expenses of the Board or of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation in connection with section 5(d) would be considered as nonadministrative expenses.

Paragraph (10), service: This paragraph would prescribe the manner in which the Board would be required to serve notices and orders provided for in the proposed section 5(d).

Paragraph (11), regulations for reorganizations, dissolutions, etc.: The Board would be authorized to make rules and regulations for the reorganization, consolidation, liquidation, dissolution, and merger of associations, for associations in conservatorship and receivership, and for the conduct of conservatorships and receiverships.

Paragraph (12), penalties: Under subparagraph (A), it would be a criminal offense for any director, officer, or other person who has been suspended or removed from office and/or prohibited from participation in the conduct of an association's affairs, to (i) participate in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the association, or solicit, procure, transfer, or vote any proxies in respect of any voting rights in the association, or (ii) without the prior written approval of the Board, to vote for a director or serve or act as a director, officer, or employee of any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Section 30 of the Banking Act contains a provision which corresponds in part to clause (i) of paragraph (12)(A). (See 12 U.S.C. 77.)

Subparagraph (B) would prohibit any person, without the prior written consent of the Board, from serving as a director, officer, or employee of an association who has been convicted of a criminal offense involving dishonesty or breach of trust. For each wilful violation of this prohibition, the association would be subject to a penalty of $100 a day. This provision is similar to section 19 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act which is applicable to director, officers, and employees of insured banks. (See 12 U.S.C. 1829.)

Subparagraph (C) would increase the penalty for refusing to comply with a demand of a conservator or receiver for possession of the property, business, or assets of an association, from the present fine of not more than $1,000 to not more than $5,000. The punishment by imprisonment for not more than one year, alternatively to or concurrently with punishment by fine, would be the same as under the present section 5(d)(2).

Paragraph (13), definitions: This paragraph would define the terms "cease-and-desist order which has become final," "order which has become final," and "territory," as used in the proposed subsection (d), and the term "violation" as used in paragraph (4) thereof.

Paragraph (14), application of section 5(d) to other institutions: The proposed section 5(d) would apply not only to Federal savings and loan associations but also to any institution with respect to which the Board has any power of examination or supervision under any Act other than the Home Owners' Loan Act, the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and the National Housing Act. Specifically, savings and loan associations chartered under the laws of the District of Columbia would, by this paragraph, be subject to the section 5(d) provisions of the bill since the Board is the examining and supervisory authority for such associations.

Paragraph (15), "grandfather" clause as to appointments of conservators or receivers: This paragraph provides that the proposed amendment to section 5(d) shall not be applicable to proceedings for the appointment of a conservator or receiver pending immediately prior to the effective date of the proposed amendment or to any Supervisory Representative in Charge, conservator, or receiver then in office.

Section 102 would amend section 407 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1730), to provide as follows:

Subsection (a), voluntary termination of insurance: As under the present statute, any insured institution other than a Federal savings and loan association could terminate its insured status by written notice to the Corporation specifying a date for such termination.

Subsection (b), involuntary termination of insurance: This subsection would revise the grounds in the present statute for involuntary termination of insurance. Such grounds would be violation of an institution's duty as an insured institution, engaging in an unsafe or unsound practice in conducting the business of the institution, an unsafe or unsound condition to transact business as an insured institution, violation of applicable law, rule, regulation, or order, or of any condition imposed by or agreement entered into with the Corporation. Including any agreement entered into under section 403 of the National Housing Act. (Paragraph (1).)

Unless correction of the alleged violations or unsafe or unsound practices shall be made within 120 days after the institution is served with a statement with respect thereto, or within such shorter period of not less than 20 days as (1) the Corporation shall require in any case where the Corporation determines that its insurance risk with respect to such institution could be unduly jeopardized by further delay in the correction of such violations or practices or condition, or (2) the State supervisory authority shall require, or unless within such time the Corporation shall have received acceptable assurances that such correction will be made within a time and in a manner satisfactory to the Corporation, or in the event such assurances are submitted to and accepted by the Corporation, but are not carried out in accordance with their terms, the Corporation would serve the institution with notice of its intention to terminate its insured status. (Paragraph (2).)

Such notice would set a date for a hearing not earlier than 30 days after service. Failure of the institution to appear would be deemed to be consent to the termination of its insured status. In the event of such consent, or if upon the hearing record the Corporation determined that any violation or unsafe or unsound practice specified in the notice had been established, and had not been corrected within the time prescribed in which to make correction, it could issue an order terminating the institution's insured status. However, any such order would not become effective until it is an order which has become final (except in the case of an order of termination issued upon consent, which would become effective at the time specified therein). (Paragraph (3).)

Subsection (c), date of termination of insured status: This subsection provides that the effective date of termination of insured status shall be the date specified in the notice given by the institution (subsection (a)), or the date upon which an order of termination issued under subsection (b)(3) becomes effective. The Corporation would be authorized to postpone such date of termination at any time before it becomes effective, but in the case of termination by notice given by the institution, the effective date could be postponed only with the consent of the institution.

Subsection (d), continuation of insurance; examination; and payment of premiums: The provisions of this subsection correspond to those of the present statute. They would provide that, in the event of termination of insured status, insurance of the institution's accounts to the extent that they were insured on the effective date of termination as provided in subsection (c), less any amounts thereafter withdrawn, repurchased, or redeemed, would continue for a period of 2 years, but no investments or deposits made after the effective date of such termination would be insured. The "first-in, first-out" rule (FIFO) applies to any withdrawal, repurchase, or redemption made after such date.

The Corporation would have the right to examine the institution from time to time for a period of 2 years after the termination of insurance.

The institution would be obligated to pay, within 30 days after such termination, a final insurance premium equal to twice the last annual premium payable by it. The institution would also be required to give reasonable notice to all of its insured members that it had ceased to be an insured institution, and, if it failed to do so, the Corporation would be authorized to give such notice.

Subsection (e), cease-and-desist proceedings: This subsection would provide for the issuance of cease-and-desist orders against an insured institution or an institution any of the accounts of which are insured, after notice and opportunity for hearing.

The provisions of this subsection, including the grounds for the issuance of cease-and-desist orders by the Corporation, would be substantially the same as those contained in paragraph (2) of the proposed amendment to section 5(d), with respect to cease-and-desist proceedings against Federal savings and loan associations. (See page 1, supra.)

Provisions for cease-and-desist proceedings against "any insured institution or any institution any of the accounts of which are insured" is designed to provide the Corporation with a remedy to protect its loss exposure against illegal or imprudent operations not only during the period that an institution is an insured institution, but also during the 2-year period following the termination of its insured status, for which time insurance continues of its insured accounts to the extent they were insured on the date of termination (less any amounts thereafter withdrawn, repurchased, or redeemed) (see subsection (d), supra).

Subsection (f), temporary cease-and-desist orders: The provisions of this subsection would parallel those of paragraph (3) of the proposed amendment to section 5(d) of the HOLA. (See page 2, supra.)

Subsection (g), suspension or removal of director or officer: The provisions of this subsection, which would authorize the suspension and removal of, and/or prohibition from further participation in the conduct of the affairs of insured institutions by, any directors, officers, or other persons participating therein, would be identical with those of paragraph (4) of the proposed amendment to section 5(d). (See pages 2–3, supra.) The Corporation could employ, in any case, any combination of this and the other remedies provided in the proposed section 407.

Subsection (h), suspension and removal of directors or officers under indictment: Paralleling the provisions of paragraph (5)(A) of the proposed amendment to section 5(d) (see page 4, supra), subsection (h) would authorize (1) the suspension of, and/or prohibition from further participation in the conduct of the affairs of insured institutions by, any directors, officers, or other persons participating therein, who are charged in any information or indictment, or complaint authorized by a United States Attorney, with the commission of a felony involving dishonesty or breach of trust, and (2) the issuance by the Corporation, in the event of conviction of such offense, of orders removing such directors, officers, or other persons from office and/or prohibiting their further participation in the conduct of the affairs of such institutions.

Subsection (i), termination of Federal Home Loan Bank membership: Termination under section 407 or otherwise of an institution's insured status would automatically constitute a removal, under subsection (i) of section 6 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, of the institution from Federal Home Loan Bank membership, if it is a member; and removal from Federal Home Loan Bank membership under subsection (i) of said section (6) or otherwise would automatically constitute an order of termination under section 407 of the institution's insured status, if it is an insured institution. This provision is consistent with other legislation introduced in this Congress (H.R. 108, p. 9, S. 2561, pp. 9–10), proposing the amendment of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and with existing law applicable to member banks of the Federal Reserve System. (See 12 U.S.C. 1818(b).) It is also consistent with paragraph (6)(B) of the proposed amendment to section 5(d) (see page 5, supra) which would make termination of insurance or of Bank membership ground for the appointment of a conservator or receiver for a Federal association.

Subsection (j), hearings and review of orders: The provisions of this subsection, which relate to hearings and judicial review of Corporation orders issued after hearing in proceedings under section 407 of the act, would correspond to the provisions of paragraph (7) of the proposed section 5(d). (See page 6, supra.)

Subsection (k), jurisdiction and enforcement: Paragraph (1) of this subsection would (A) make clear that the Corporation is an agency of the United States for purposes of title 28 of the United States Code, (B) provide that any action to which the Corporation shall be a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States and that the United States district courts shall have original jurisdiction of such actions, without regard to the amount in controversy, and (C) authorize the removal to a Federal court of any such action commenced in a State court. However, actions to which the Corporation is a party in its capacity as receiver for a State-chartered institution and which involve only the rights or obligations of investors, creditors, stockholders, and such institution under State law would not be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States. Moreover, no attachment or execution could issue against the Corporation or its property before final judgment in any action in any court.

The provisions of the proposed subsection (k)(1), with the exception of clause (A) thereof, would be similar to existing law applicable to Federal reserve banks (12 U.S.C. 632), and to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 1819).

Subsection (k)(2), which provides for enforcement of Corporation orders by the United States district courts, corresponds with paragraph (8) of the proposal section 5(d). (See page 6, supra.)

Subsection (l), reporting requirements: This subsection would, among other things, require the reporting to the Corporation whenever (1) there is a change in the outstanding voting stock of an insured institution which results in control, or in a change in the control, of the institution, or (2) an insured institution or an insured bank makes a loan or loans secured or to be secured by 25 percent or more of the voting stock of an insured institution. The reporting of such loans would not be required where the borrower had been the record owner of the stock for a year or more, or the stock was that of a newly organized institution prior to its opening.

The provisions of subsection (l) are somewhat similar to the amendment to the Federal Deposit Insurance Act enacted on September 12, 1964. (See 12 U.S.C. 1817(j).) They are intended to throw the light of reporting to the Corporation of disclosure on those in control of the institution and their actions.

Subsection (m), ancillary provisions: In connection with the examination of any insured institution. Board examiners would have the authority to make such examination of the affairs of any affiliates of the institution as shall be necessary to disclose the relations of such institution and its affiliates and the effect of such relations upon the institution. For purposes of this subsection, the term "affiliate" would have the same meaning as where used in section 2(b) of the Banking Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 221a. (b)). Such authorization would parallel the authority presently conferred upon examiners of the Federal Reserve Board to examine affiliates of State member banks (12 U.S.C. 338), and upon examiners appointed by the Comptroller of the Currency to examine affiliates of national banks (12 U.S.C. 481). (Paragraph 1.)

Also, in connection with examinations of insured institutions and affiliates thereof, the Corporation or its designated representatives would, under subsection (m)(2), have the authority to administer oaths and to examine and to take testimony under oath as to any matter in respect of the affairs or ownership of any such institution or affiliate thereof, to issue subpenas and subpenas duces tecum, and to apply for judicial enforcement of any such subpena. This provision is patterned upon the authority presently vested in national bank examiners and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation examiners. (See 12 U.S.C. 481 and 1820(b).)

The Corporation's subpena powers in connection with proceedings under section 407, which would be provided for in subsection (m)(3), would correspond to those contained in paragraph (9) of the proposed section 5(d). See page 6, supra. All expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board or of the Corporation in connection with section 407 would be considered as nonadministrative expenses.

Subsection (n), service: This subsection would prescribe the manner in which the Corporation would be required to serve notices and orders provided for in the proposed section 407.

Subsection (o), consultation with State authorities: This subsection would provide that the Corporation shall consult with the appropriate State supervisory authority in connection with any action under section 407 involving an insured State-chartered institution.

Subsection (p), penalties: The penalties provided for in this subsection parallel those of paragraph (12) of the proposed section 5(d). (See page 7, supra.)

Subsection (q), definitions: This subsection would contain definitions similar to those to be found in the proposed section 5(d).

TITLE II. PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, AND THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Section 201 would move the definition of the term "appropriate Federal banking agency" from section 7 to section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to make the definition of the term applicable throughout the Act.

Section 202 would add the following new subsections to section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act:

Subsection (b)(1): This subsection would provide for a cease-and-desist proceeding against any insured bank or bank which has insured deposits. The appropriate Federal banking agency could, in cases involving alleged violations of law, rules, regulations, conditions, or agreements, or unsafe or unsound practices, issue a notice of charges against the offending bank. The notice would set a hearing not earlier than 30 nor later than 60 days after service of the notice (unless a later date was requested by the bank) to determine whether a cease-and-desist order would issue against the bank. Failure of the bank to appear at the hearing would be deemed to be consent to the issuance of the order. In the event of such consent, or if upon the hearing record, the agency determined that any of the violations or practices specified in the notice of charges had been established, it could issue a cease-and-desist order requiring the bank and its directors, officers, employees, and agents to cease and desist from such violations or practices and, further, to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from the same.

Subsection (b)(2): A cease-and-desist order would become effective at the expiration of 30 days after service upon the bank (except in the case of a consent order which would become effective at the time specified therein), and would remain effective and enforceable except to such extent as it was stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the agency or a reviewing court.

Subsection (c)(1): This subsection would authorize the issuance of a temporary order in advance of an administrative hearing, which would require a bank to cease and desist from the violations or practices specified in the notice of charges issued pursuant to subsection (b). The appropriate Federal banking agency would have discretionary authority to issue such order whenever it determined that the violations or threatened violations or practices or the continuation thereof could cause insolvency or substantial dissipation of assets or earnings of the bank, or could otherwise seriously prejudice the interest of its depositors. The order would become effective upon service upon the bank and would, unless stayed by a court in proceedings under subsection (c)(2), remain effective and enforceable pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice of charges and until such time as the agency dismissed the charges, or, if a cease-and-desist order was issued against the bank after hearing, until the effective date or any such order.

Subsection (c)(2): The bank could, within 10 days after service of a temporary cease-and-desist order, apply to the proper U.S. district court for a stay of the order pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice of charges against the bank.

Subsection (d): In case of a violation or threatened violation of, or failure to obey, a temporary cease-and-desist order, the appropriate Federal banking agency could apply to the proper U.S. district court for an injunction to enforce such order, and, if the court determined that there had been such violation or threatened violation or failure to obey, it would be the duty of the court to issue such injunction.

Subsection (e)(1): This subsection would give the appropriate Federal banking agency authority to remove after hearing, and to suspend pending the hearing, directors, or officers from office in banks.

Where a director or officer had committed any violation of law, rule, or regulation, or of a cease-and-desist order which had become final, or had engaged or participated in any unsafe or unsound practice in connection with the bank, or had committed or engaged in any act, omission, or practice constituting a breach of his fiduciary duty as such director or officer, and the appropriate Federal banking agency determined that the bank had suffered or would probably suffer substantial financial loss or other damage or the interests of its depositors could be seriously prejudiced by reason of such violation or practice or breach of fiduciary duty, the agency could serve the director or officer concerned with a notice of its intention to remove him from office.

Subsection (e)(2): Where a director, officer, or any other person, by conduct or practice with respect to another insured bank or other business institution which resulted in substantial loss or other damage, has evidenced his general unfitness to hold such office or participate in the conduct of the affairs of such insured bank, the agency could serve the director, officer, or other person with a notice of its intention to remove him from office and/or prohibit his further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the bank.

Subsection (e)(3): In cases where the agency deemed it necessary for the protection of the bank or its depositors, it could serve such director, officer, or other person with a further notice suspending him from office and/or prohibiting him from participating in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the bank. The suspension and/or prohibition would, unless stayed by the court upon application of the director, officer, or person under subsection (f), remain in effect until the suspension and/or prohibition was terminated or set aside by the agency.

Subsection (e)(4): The agency's notice of intention to remove a director, officer, or other person from office and/or prohibit his participation in the conduct of the affairs of an insured bank would fix a time for a hearing not earlier than 30 days nor later than 60 days after service of such notice, unless a later date is set by the agency at the request of (A) such director, officer, or other person, and for good cause shown, or (B) the Attorney General of the United States. Failure of the director, officer, or other person to appear at the hearing would be deemed to be consent to the issuance of an order of removal and/or prohibition. In the event of such consent, or if the agency found upon the hearing record that any of the grounds specified in the notice had been established, it could issue such order of suspension or removal from office, and/or prohibition from participation, as it deemed appropriate.

Any such order would become effective at the expiration of 30 days after service (except in the case of a consent order which would become effective at the time specified therein), and would remain effective and enforceable except to such extent as it was stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the agency or a reviewing court.

Subsection (f): Within 10 days after being suspended from office, and/or prohibited from participation, the director, officer, or other person could apply to a United States district court for a stay of his suspension and/or prohibition pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the agency's notice of intention to remove him from office and/or prohibit his further participation in the conduct of the affairs of the bank.

Subsection (g)(1): The appropriate Federal banking agency would have the authority to suspend, and/or prohibit participation in the conduct of the affairs of the bank by, any director, officer, or other person who was charged in any information or indictment, or complaint authorized by a United States Attorney, with the commission of a felony involving dishonesty or breach of trust. The suspension and/or prohibition would remain effective until the information, indictment, or complaint is finally disposed of. If a judgment of conviction of the offense is entered, and is not subject to further appellate review, the agency shall order removal from office and/or prohibit further participation. Upon service of an order of removal upon the bank of which he was a director or officer, such director or officer would cease to be a director or officer of the bank. A finding of not guilty or other disposition of the charge would not preclude the agency from thereafter instituting proceedings to remove the director, officer, or other person from office or to prohibit further participation in bank affairs.

Subsection (g)(1): To insure that such suspension of some or all of the directors of a national bank would not leave it without a board of directors legally capable of transacting business, the draft would provide that (1) if there shall be less than a quorum of directors not so suspended, all powers vested in the board shall vest in the director or directors on the board not so suspended until such time as there shall be a quorum, or (2) if all of the directors are so suspended, the Comptroller of the Currency shall appoint persons to serve temporarily as directors in their place and stead pending the termination of such suspension, or until such time as those who have been suspended cease to be directors of the bank and their respective successors take office.

Subsection (h)(1): This subsection would require any hearing provided for in the section to be held in the Federal judicial district in which the bank is located unless the party afforded the hearing consented to another place. The hearing would be private unless otherwise ordered for good cause found. Any hearings would have to be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. The appropriate Federal banking agency would be required to render its decision and order after the hearing and within 90 days after notifying the parties that the case had been submitted to it for final decision. The agency could amend or terminate orders at any time before appeal.

Subsection (h)(2): This subsection would provide for the appeal of cease-and-desist orders to the proper United States Circuit Court of Appeals and would provide for review by the Supreme Court.

Subsection (h)(3): The commencement of review proceedings would not operate as a stay of any order unless specifically ordered by the court.

Subsection (i): The appropriate Federal banking agency could apply to the proper United States district court for the enforcement of any order issued under the section, and such courts would be given jurisdiction to enforce compliance therewith.

Subsection (j): This subsection would impose a penalty against a suspended or removed director or officer, or other person prohibited from further participation in the affairs of an insured bank, who acts as a director or officer of the bank and/or participates in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the bank.

Subsection (k): This subsection would define the terms "cease-and-desist order which has become final" and "violation."

Subsection (l): This subsection would prescribe the mode of service.

Subsection (m): The appropriate Federal banking agency, in connection with any action involving a State bank, would be required to consult with the appropriate State supervisory authority.

Subsection (n): In connection with any proceeding under section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the appropriate Federal banking agency, a member or representative thereof, or any hearing examiner, would be empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, to take depositions, and to issue, revoke, quash, or modify subpenas and subpenas duces tecum. Any party to proceedings under the section could apply to the proper United States district court for enforcement of any subpena or subpena duces tecum issued pursuant to the subsection, and such courts would have jurisdiction and power to require compliance therewith.

Section 203 would amend subsections (b) and (c) of section 10 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(b), (c)), relating to examinations of insured banks, subpena powers, etc.

Said subsection (b) would be amended by the addition of a provision thereto which would empower Corporation examiners making examinations of insured banks to make such examinations of the affairs of all affiliates of such banks as shall be necessary to disclose fully the relations between such banks and their affiliates and the effect of such relations upon such banks.

Said subsection (c) would be amended to provide that in connection with examinations of insured banks and affiliates thereof, the appropriate Federal banking agency, or its designated representatives, could administer oaths and affirmations, take and preserve testimony under oath as to any matter in respect of the affairs or ownership of such bank or affiliate thereof, issue subpenas and subpenas duces tecum, and apply to the proper U.S. district court for the enforcement of such subpenas. Such courts would have jurisdiction to order and require compliance with such subpenas.

Section 204 would amend section 8(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(a)), relating to proceedings to terminate the insured status of a bank, to—

1. Enlarge the authority of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to institute involuntary termination proceedings against an insured bank which had "engaged in", rather than merely "continued," unsafe or unsound practices, or was in an unsafe or unsound condition to continue operations as an insured bank, or had violated any condition imposed by, or agreement entered into with, the Corporation;

2. Make it clear that the Corporation would be required to give the State authority a copy of the statement detailing the practices or violations where the State bank involved was a State member bank;

3. Provide for an alternative and shortened statutory correction period of 20 days in those cases where the Board of Directors of the Corporation in its discretion determined that the insurance risk of the Corporation was unduly jeopardized;

4. Provide the State authority with power to shorten the correction period in those cases involving State banks whether member or nonmember banks;

5. Transpose the position of the fourth and fifth sentences so that the statute may flow in logical sequence; and

6. Provide a bank whose insured status had been terminated with a right of judicial review to the extent provided in subsection (h).

Section 205 would vest the U.S. district courts, without regard to the amount in controversy, with original jurisdiction over any action to which the Corporation is a party and authorize the removal of such actions to the Federal courts.

EXTENDING ENROLLMENT UNDER MEDICARE

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, legislation to extend eligibility to enroll for voluntary medical insurance under medicare until December 31, 1966. Some 2.5 million of our 18.5 million senior citizens have not signed up for this important program. Some 1 million of these have said they do not wish to enroll, and experts tell us that many of those who have declined have done so because of misunderstanding of the program. The other 1.5 million have not indicated their wishes one way or the other. They have simply not been reached. It would be unfortunate if these 2.5 million elderly Americans had to wait until the next enrollment period from October 1 to December 31, 1967, to have a chance to sign up for this coverage. Thousands of people, both inside and outside the Government, have engaged in massive efforts to reach everyone over 65 about this important coverage under part B of last year's historic medicare bill. But this program is so important that those who have not been reached and those who have declined should have a chance to participate during the initial enrollment period.

My bill, which Congressman JOHN FOGARTY is introducing in the House today as well, would allow them to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3159) to provide that individuals 65 years of age or older may be permitted to enroll, at any time during 1966, in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits established by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of New York, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 102 of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) If an individual was eligible to enroll under subsection (c) or (d) of section 1837 of the Social Security Act at any time during the calendar year 1966, but failed to enroll before the date (during such year) prescribed in such section 1837 as the close of his enrollment period, such individual may enroll pursuant to this subsection at any time during the period which begins with the date so prescribed and which ends with the close of December 31, 1966. In case of any individual who enrolls pursuant to this subsection, the coverage period (within the meaning of section 1838 of the Social Security Act) shall begin on the first day of the fourth month after the month in which he so enrolls."

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 508

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, S. 3155, introduced today by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. This amendment provides that authorizations proposed in that bill for forest roads and trails be increased from $85 to $170 million in fiscal year 1968 and from $110 to $170 million in fiscal year 1969.

An adequate transportation system is the key to full multiple-use management of our national forests. The construction of new high-standard forest conservation roads can provide the the means to keep pace with increasing demands for new recreation sites, for more forest products and for thorough management of soils, watersheds, and timber stands. We can see the great pressure which population expansion is placing on the utilization of forest resources but we have not taken effective action to deal with the problem. We are aware of the advantages both to conservation and to economic growth which the development of new forest transportation routes will afford but we have failed to seize the opportunity.

The waste in our forests each year is staggering. The North Idaho Forestry Association has informed me that the total annual mortality of trees in the northern Rocky Mountain region is estimated at 2.8 billion board feet. Because only a small amount of the dead timber can be salvaged economically this mortality represents the loss of enough lumber to build 280,000 five-room frame houses annually. The value of the lost stumpage alone is conservatively estimated at $10 million a year.

The fire warden of the Clearwater and Potlatch Timber Protective Association in Idaho has written me that in his district there are more trees going to rot and being devoured by insects than all of the mills of the area could use. In addition he conducted a survey of the cutting capacity of mills in just five Idaho counties showing that in 1 year production was 247,612 million board feet below capacity meaning that the mills were working at only 60 percent of capacity.

The major stumbling block to eliminating this immense waste is the forest transportation system which does not at present provide access for adequate disease control or feasible harvest of mature and overmature timber stands.

In asking for more money for forest roads and trails, I am not advocating speculative spending but the sound investment of general funds in a program which can stimulate generous returns to the economy. Spending for forest roads is commonsense spending. It is common sense to eliminate the waste of resources and replace this waste with good conservation management and regenerating productivity.

In recent years with such funds as have been made available, the Forest Service has done a creditable job on the forest road program. But, of necessity, much effort has been directed toward repairing the damages to extant facilities brought by natural disaster. Too little has been left for expansion of the forest road system. So little, in fact, that it is estimated that the modest 10-year forest road program introduced in 1962 will take 15 years to complete. And, it is admitted that when this program is finally completed, the achievement will still fall far short of the ultimate needs.

While the Forest Service has been able to give only limited emphasis to building new roads, the practice of tying road construction to timber sales has continued. This practice requires lumber operators bidding on timber to include in their bids the cost of roads which must be built to standards greater than that required for harvesting of timber alone. Since we envision forest roads as serving multiple uses it is inequitable to saddle a single user with a disproportionate share of the costs. Furthermore, this practice obviously works to the disadvantage of small operators. Thus the fairest and most effective basis for multipurpose conservation road construction is financing from general Federal funds.

It has been proposed that $85 million be authorized for forest roads and trails in fiscal 1968 and that $110 million be authorized for this purpose in fiscal 1969. In the aggregate these authorization recommendations represent only a token increase over the authorizations for the previous 2 years. They reflect a "go slow" policy for a program where rapid acceleration is clearly indicated. I am asking that $170 million be authorized for forest roads and trails for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 to get this program moving at a speed more in keeping with what the times require. Further deferment of construction of an expanded system of mainline forest trunklines can be accepted only at great cost in losses of mature and overmature timber now a prey to disease and harmful insects but inaccessible to harvest. Such deferment of action can be allowed only at the price of excessive pressure on existing recreational facilities and unwarranted harm to esthetic values in our forests.

New forest roads are avenues to new production, new employment, new tax revenues, new conservation applications, and new recreational opportunities. I am convinced that the time to build these roads is now. When this matter is brought before hearings, detailed testimony will be presented to support these broad contentions with more facts and figures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 508) was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

CHAMIZAL MEMORIAL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on March 2, my distinguished colleague from Texas, Senator YARBOROUGH, introduced a bill to authorize the creation of a national memorial in El Paso to commemorate the 1964 settlement of the Chamizal controversy.

The enactment of the Chamizal Treaty signified the friendly settlement between the United States and the Republic of Mexico over land on the Rio Grande between El Paso and Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. The term "Chamizal" is the Spanish name for the plants which once covered the ground in the area.

The Chamizal controversy originated under the imprecise terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848, which set the border between the United States and Mexico as the Rio Grande. But, as rivers in Texas sometimes will, the Rio Grande changed course in the Chamizal vicinity. The Chamizal Treaty of January 14, 1964, provided for a permanent relocation and channeling of the river in a concrete-lined bed, and ended the controversy by designating the center of the river as an international boundary. Approximately 630 acres of land were transferred to Mexico and 193 acres went to the United States, with a portion of the U.S. land going to the city of El Paso. This legislation I am cosponsoring today would set aside 55 acres of U.S. land for a suitable monument and a museum-information center.

The Department of the Interior, which has endorsed this legislation, says that development of the memorial will include administrative offices, parking facilities, and landscaping. The proposal has been heartily endorsed by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments. The bill S. 3007, is a companion to H.R. 7402 sponsored by Congressman RICHARD WHITE.

Mr. President, it had been my earlier intention to introduce a similar but much broader measure. After consultation with those of the El Paso area interested and involved in this matter, I now feel it would be best not to enlarge upon the recommendation of the Department of the Interior. Therefore I am requesting consent now that my name be added as a cosponsor of S. 3007, already introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. In joining as a cosponsor of this bill, I wish to urge my fellow Senators to support this legislation in recognition of the good will which exists on both sides of the Rio Grande. It is my opinion that the proposed national memorial will provide a fitting monument to the recognition of the rule of law amicable of negotiation of good will which exists between the Republic of Mexico and the United States.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

Authority of March 15, 1966:

S. 3089. A bill to provide a comprehensive program to combat alcoholism: Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

Authority of March 21, 1966:

S. 3107. A bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on agreements reducing duties on imported articles under certain conditions: Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.

POPULATION HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR MARCH 31, APRIL 5, APRIL 6, APRIL 7, AND APRIL 8

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this week and next the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures will continue its quest for information on the population crisis.

On Thursday, March 31, housing needs and future trends in the building industry and medical research which relates to the common dignity of man will be discussed. Scheduled to testify are Dr. Kermit E. Krantz, of Kansas City, Kans., and Mr. Arthur Watkins, of Piermont, N.Y. The subcommittee also hopes to learn more about the building of pleasing urban environments because Dr. Leonard J. Duhl who is a consultant on urban affairs for Secretary Robert C. Weaver, of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, will be with us, his schedule permitting. The subcommittee has also invited Dr. Donald N. Michael, a social psychologist with a background in the physical sciences, who is a resident fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C., to discuss city planning.

Writer-engineer Arthur Watkins has written extensively on various aspects of housing and building construction. He is the author of "Building or Buying the High-Quality House at the Lowest Cost" and other books and articles.

Dr. Krantz is chairman of the University of Kansas School of Medicine's Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics. He is a specialist in anatomy and genetics, a Markle scholar in medical science, author of numerous articles on human reproduction, and a contributor to the 1965 Life magazine four-part series entitled "On the Frontiers of Medicine: Control of Life."

SECRETARY GARDNER TO TESTIFY

The subcommittee has scheduled four public hearings on the population crisis next week.

The Honorable John W. Gardner, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will testify Thursday, April 7, and the Honorable David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, will appear the following day on April 8.

The hearings this week and next will be held in room 3302 of the New Senate Office Building, starting at 10 a.m.

Witnesses who will testify next week are:

Tuesday, April 5: Dr. Joseph Hall, Miami, Fla., superintendent of the Dade County public schools; and Mrs. Jane Roberts, Miami, Fla., chairman of the Dade County Board of Education.

Wednesday, April 6: State Senator John Bermingham, Denver, Colo., author of birth control bill which was approved by Colorado State Legislature; Dr. Joseph Martin, Cleveland, Ohio, Medical Associates, who with other medical doctors is working to make birth control information available to the poor who wish to have it, and a participant in the 1965 White House Conference on Health; Dr. William Vogt, New York City, ecologist, author, secretary of the Conservation Fund; Mr. Arnold Maremont, Chicago, Ill., industrialist, lawyer, president of the Maremont Corp., and former chairman of the Illinois Public Aid Commission.

Thursday, April 7: Hon. John W. Gardner, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Friday, April 8: Hon. David E. Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2282, THE ECOLOGY BILL

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, open public hearings by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on S. 2282, the ecology bill, originally scheduled for April 21, have been moved to Wednesday, April 27.

The date has been changed to better accommodate several important witnesses who wish to be heard on the bill. The measure, introduced by Senator Nelson, would authorize the Secretary of Interior to conduct a program of research, study and surveys, documentation, and description of our natural environmental systems.

The hearings will be conducted in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building starting at 10 a.m.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT L. BENNETT TO BE COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, President Johnson has sent to the Senate the name of Mr. Robert L. Bennett to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

We have scheduled a confirmation hearing for April 1, beginning at 10 a.m., in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, at which time the nominee will appear.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I ask that there be printed at this point in the Record a biographical sketch of Mr. Bennett, prepared and submitted by the Department of the Interior.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Robert L. Bennett

Born November 16, 1912, on the Oneida Indian Reservation in Wisconsin.

EDUCATION

Attended public and parochial schools in Wisconsin. Was graduated in 1931 from Haskell Institute (Indian school) at Lawrence, Kans., where he specialized in business administration. Holds degree of LL.B. from Southeastern University School of Law.

OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUND

From 1933 to 1938, served with the Bureau of Indian Affairs agency at the Ute Reservation in Utah. Also served in various capacities with the Ute Tribal Council and as treasurer of three Indian livestock associations in the area.

From 1938 to 1945, assigned to Washington office, Bureau of Indian Affairs, as specialist in tribal affairs.

From 1943 to 1944, private, first class, Marine Corps.

From 1944 to 1948, directed training program for World War II Indian veterans as member of staff of Phoenix, Ariz., office, Veterans' Administration.

From 1949 to 1951, rejoined Bureau of Indian Affairs in capacity of job placement office, Aberdeen area, serving Indian groups in the Dakotas.

From 1951 to 1954, reassigned to Washington, D.C., office, Bureau of Indian Affairs, to assist in tribal development programs.

From 1954 to 1956, superintendent of Consolidated Ute Indian Agency, Ignacio, Colo.

From 1956 to 1962, reassigned to Aberdeen area office and appointed assistant area director.

From 1962 to 1965, appointed area director of Indian affairs for the Alaska region, with headquarters in Juneau.

In 1966, appointed Deputy Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C.

ORGANIZATION AFFILIATIONS

American Academy of Political and Social Science.

American Society for Public Administration.

National Congress of American Indians.

Member of the National Advisory Committee for Indian Youth.

Board of directors, Arrow, Inc.

Rotary International.

FAMILY DATA

Married to the former Mrs. Cleota Minor Brayboy, of Baltimore, Md., a social worker. Six children: John, a Navy veteran now living in Phoenix, Ariz.; William, a Navy veteran now living in Livermore, Calif.; Leo, a Marine veteran living in Phoenix; and Joanne, David, and Robert, living at home.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM N. GOODWIN TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 5, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of William N. Goodwin, of Washington, to be U.S. district judge, eastern and western districts of Washington, to fill a new position created by Public Law 87-36 approved May 19, 1961.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska].

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF MILES W. LORD TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing on the nomination of Miles W. Lord, of Minnesota, to be U.S. district judge, district of Minnesota, vice Dennis F. Donovan, retired, has been rescheduled for Wednesday, April 20, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], chairman, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF COLLINS J. SEITZ TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, THIRD CIRCUIT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 5, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Collins J. Seitz, of Delaware, to be U.S. circuit judge, third circuit, vice John Biggs, Jr., retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska].

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harry M. Miller, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Kentucky, term of 4 years, reappointment.

Smithmoore P. Myers, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney, eastern district of Washington, term of 4 years, vice Frank R. Freeman, resigned.

Arthur C. Elliott, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of Ohio, term of 4 years, vice Fred F. Hoh, deceased.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, April 5, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 29, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2394) authorizing the planning, design, construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

THE JOHNSON ANTI-INFLATION RECORD: AN EXCELLENT DEMOCRATIC ISSUE IN 1966

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in recent weeks, there has been increasing talk, discussion, and debate about the prospects of inflation. This morning's New York Times estimates that the Bureau of Labor Statistics will announce tomorrow a one-half of 1 percent increase in the consumer price index for last month, the biggest 1-month price increase in many years.

We would be very naive indeed if we did not expect the debate and controversy over inflation to continue and to grow as we approach the fall campaign.

Certainly inflation is likely to be an issue in the election this fall. Frankly, if it is an issue, the Democratic Party should welcome it.

Mr. President, in my judgment there has never been an administration in the history of this country which has done more by specific action to fight inflation than has the Johnson administration.

I hastily add, in full knowledge of last month's price rise, that there have been few, if any, administrations that have been nearly as effective as the Johnson administration has been in doing this.

On other occasions, I have made a detailed exposition of the battle by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to hold down prices by using the so-called wage-price guidelines.

POLITICAL COURAGE IN FIGHTING HIGHER WAGES, PRICES

On this occasion, I will not go into the detail I did before, but let me simply say that wage-price guidelines do demand political courage on the part of the administration that intends to impose them.

It is predictable that they will be unpopular with labor. It is sure that they will be unpopular with business. It is clear that they will be misrepresented by both labor and business. In my judgment, it is also sure that they will serve the best interests of America because they rely strictly on voluntary cooperation of government, labor, and business without controls, without compulsion, to keep prices down.

Furthermore, only wage-price guidelines can get at the price behavior of big business and the wage behavior of big labor.

BIG BUSINESS, LABOR IMMUNE TO TAX, INTEREST POLICY

Big business is obviously immune to monetary policy. Consider simply the fact that the cash flow of our corporations exceeded $80 billion last year, which is a remarkable one-third higher than the total amount that business is expected to invest in plant and equipment this boom year.

Obviously, under these circumstances, the tightest money in the world will not prevent big business from geting virtually all the funds they need to expand investment in plant and equipment to their heart's content.

Generally, tax policy can do little to get at the availability of business funds or the disposition on the part of business to establish prices without regard to the conditions of demand.

Consider the fact that the steel industry is even now only operating at 80 percent of capacity and that many times in the past it has increased its prices when operating at 60 percent of capacity.

Obviously, a stringent tax policy calculated to reduce demand with a meat cleaver would not persuade a steel industry to modify whatever inclination it might have to increase prices, if it is going to do so even when capacity is low and falling, and this is precisely what it has done in the past.

What is true of steel is true of an enormous proportion of American industry. If there is one settled and established fact, in recent economic primers, it is that prices are administered in much of American industry, and indeed throughout virtually all of American industry where large units of production dominate, as in steel, automobiles, mining, tobacco, insurance and many, many other areas.

Mr. President, on at least 10 public occasions since 1962, the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have forthrightly and prominently prevented labor from increasing its wages to the point where increased wages would put inflationary pressure on prices, or business from increasing its prices, or Congress from increasing the wages of Federal employees to that point where the increase would put inflationary pressure on prices.

These actions have been extremely unpopular with many top leaders of business and labor. They have been specific actions to keep prices down that have been most effective.

Mr. President, the Johnson administration has not stopped with wage-price guidelines to prevent prices from moving ahead too fast. It has moved on other fronts, too.

MANPOWER TRAINING STEMS INFLATION

Unquestionably, one of the bottleneck areas of our economy that results in great pressure on wages and prices is the shortage of skilled labor.

If there is any hallmark of the Johnson administration, it has been the emphasis on providing education, vocational education, and manpower training of all kinds for labor. Indeed, by far the most common element throughout the antipoverty program is the stress it has put on converting an unskilled, often illiterate youth or adult, into a skilled, productive, well-motivated worker. This not only has great human value but also immense economic value, particularly under conditions of inflation such as the present.

ADMINISTRATION TAX POLICIES EXPAND PRODUCTION

Another big bottleneck that provokes inflation is the limit on the productive capacity of American plant and machinery. This administration and the Kennedy administration have acted with great skill to meet this limitation. The Kennedy administration did so, back in 1962, by providing for a drastic revision of depreciation guidelines that provided a much greater incentive than ever before for investment in new plant and equipment by business. The Kennedy administration also contributed immensely to breaking through this bottleneck in conceiving the investment credit and persuading the Congress to enact it.

Frankly, Mr. President, I voted against the investment credit and I want to hasten to say I was wrong. The investment credit has proven itself, it has served as a tremendously strong incentive to persuade business to invest at a greatly increased rate in plant and equipment. In doing so, it has not only increased the efficiency of American business, but it has also greatly expanded its capacity to meet demand, and in doing this, it has been a big element in keeping prices down.

RECENT TOUGH ACTION TO STOP INFLATION

Now, Mr. President, in spite of all this, I know that prices have gone up in some commodities, rather sharply in recent months. But let us recognize that the Johnson administration has been determined to keep down prices and especially food prices. The administration has taken tough action to do so within the last few weeks. This action has been against the interest of very powerful groups.

For example, the General Services Administration has told suppliers to use aluminum in place of copper wiring, plastic furniture instead of leather because cowhide prices have skyrocketed.

The Agriculture Department this month doubled its sale of corn for January and February; the result, there was a 10-cent corn price slide. This obviously takes the pressure off pork and beef prices.

Defense procurement officials are switching from canned fruit, which is rising in price, for the Armed Forces.

The Commerce Department has slapped a tough export control on cowhides. The result: two and a half million fewer cowhides will be shipped abroad than would otherwise be shipped. This obviously reduces the pressure on cowhide prices that went up 43 percent last year and makes some of our industries that depend upon cowhides less likely to increase prices.

BATTLE AGAINST RISING SHOE PRICES

Mr. President, just Saturday, the shoe industry promised the Government that it would follow a general hold-the-line policy on prices, if export controls were maintained to keep down the prices of hides and, hence, leather.

Mr. President, anyone who has children knows what a big element the cost of shoes can be in the cost of living.

The export controls imposed earlier in March have been bitterly criticized by cattlemen and hide interests, and by several Members of Congress from cattle-producing States.

But here is another example of the administration taking on a tough, big, powerful interest in order to keep prices down.

Consider what the administration faced: because of an increase of nearly 100 percent in hide prices over the last 12 months, shoe prices have recently shown one of the largest increases of any consumer item. The Consumer Price Index for footwear in January was 115.6, with 1957–59 taken as 100, up 4 percent from a year earlier. The wholesale price of leather was up 15 percent in the same period.

OIL IMPORT CURB REMOVED TO FIGHT INFLATION

Mr. President, on Friday it was announced that Federal controls on imports of heavy fuel oils were removed in east coast shipments. Major revision of the 10-year-old residual fuel oil program were announced by Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall. In making the announcement, Udall said that the action would "combat inflation by encouraging full and free competition in the marketplace."

Now, Mr. President, if there is any politically potential financial interest, it is the oil industry. To keep prices down, the Johnson administration has taken them on.

The Interior Department went on to say that the new program, "was designed to eliminate premiums that have attached to import licenses and which have the effect of forcing smaller consumers to pay higher prices for residual fuel oils."

Two of the outstanding Members of this body, Senator Pastore of Rhode Island and Senator Muskie of Maine, have worked with great diligence to overcome these import quotas and to make the price of fuel oil reasonable and competitive.

In this case, too, the administration deserves credit for coming through with action. This is a big area which will take the pressure off prices.

Mr. President, it is well known that the administration is pressing Congress for hearings to speed up disposal of Government stockpiles and to keep down prices on aluminum, platinum, vanadium, sisal, and asbestos.

L.B.J. ORGANIZED TO FIGHT INFLATION

In typical Johnsonian style, the President has organized this battle with real power and force as one who understands how to get things done. Here is the top organization:

The President has given Under Secretary of Agriculture Schnittker responsibility to keep food prices down.

The President has given GSA Administrator Lawson Knott responsibility for handling Government purchases and stockpiles to keep other prices down.

Joe Califano, one of the brilliant young men in the administration, a top Presidential assistant, is chief of staff in this war against inflation.

Mr. President, I have on occasion criticized the President. I have disagreed with him, both when he was a Senator and now as President.

But I would like to challenge anyone in this body to specify any administration in all American history that has done as much to stop inflation and has done so by specific action, as has this Johnson administration.

NO CONTROLS: RELIANCE ON VOLUNTARY ACTION

Consider that it has struggled to keep prices down without controls. It relies on a voluntary system. It has done all this while building the economy with more jobs, more opportunity, and more profits.

Of course there are inflationary pressures today. They are big and heavy.

Surely, there are temporary setbacks in the war against inflation, such as the recent announcement of the big February increase in the wholesale and retail price indices.

But, Mr. President, if the opposition wants to make inflation the issue in this campaign, let them.

CONCLUSION: RESULTS STILL GOOD

Consider that before this administration, from 1956 to 1960, a period during which there was growing unemployment and increasing availability of factory capacity, prices actually increased by 10½ percent, according to the Consumer Price Index.

Consider, by contrast, that from 1961 to 1965, a period during which unemployment was diminishing and the shortage of labor skills was increasing, demand was growing by leaps and bounds, and pressure on factory capacity was moving ahead steadily and relentlessly, prices increased not 10 percent or 9 percent, 8 percent, 7 percent, or 6 percent—but by only 5½ percent.

Consider, in no small part owing to the policies of the Johnson administration, that labor costs, as distinguished from wages, have literally been stable. They have not been rising at all in manufacturing in this country over the past 5 years.

Wages have been going up. But they have stayed within the guidelines and they have not exceeded productivity increases.

This has been an immense boon to this country in its balance-of-payments difficulty. It has been no accident. It has been the result of a deliberate, planned, and remarkably effective administration policy.

Consider the fact that prices in the past 5 years have not only been about twice as stable as they were in the last 5 years of the Eisenhower administration, but they have also been more stable than in any industrial country in the world by far.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in the New York Times for Saturday, March 26, written by Edwin L. Dale, and entitled "Shoemakers Vow Price Restraint"; and an article published in the New York Times, written by William Blair, and entitled "Import Curbs Ended on Heavy Fuel Oil."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 26, 1966]

SHOEMAKERS VOW PRICE RESTRAINT—GOVERNMENT OBTAINS PLEDGE BASED ON CONTRIBUTION OF HIDE EXPORT CONTROLS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Washington, March 25.—The shoe industry has promised the Government a general hold-the-line policy on prices if export controls are maintained to keep down the price of hides, and hence leather.

The export controls, imposed earlier this month, have been bitterely criticized by cattlemen and hide interests and by several Members of Congress from cattle-producing States. At present, however, the administration plans to stand firm.

The promise of restraint on shoe prices has been given by the industry to President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers. There was understood to be no pledge that every price would remain unchanged, but a general policy of restraint was indicated.

TWO MEETINGS HELD

Representatives of shoe retailers met today with Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council, and John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce. Shoe manufacturers had met with the Council earlier.

The industry is expected to start announcing prices for its fall lines next week.

Mainly because of an increase of nearly 100 percent in hide prices over the last 12 months, shoe prices have recently shown one of the largest increases of any consumer item. The Consumer Price Index for footwear in January was 115.6, with 1957–59 taken as 100, up 4 percent from a year earlier.

The wholesale price of leather was up 15 percent in the same period. Not all footwear contains leather.

In another example of the Government's effort, where possible, to attack specific inflationary situations with specific measures, Government in this case resorted to export controls on hides so as to add to the domestic supply and thus curb the price.

In the case of aluminum the Government used the threat of heavy sales from the stockpile to head off a price increase. In the case of heavy fuel oil, import controls were relaxed. But in most cases, such as steel and cigarettes, the Government has relied on general appeals for restraint.

Cigarettes are the only consumer item known to have involved Government intervention although the action on hides was aimed at influencing the price of an important consumer item, shoes.

A memorandum from the Council of Economic Advisers to the President last week said that without the export controls, hide and leather prices would have risen further, causing an increase in shoe prices of 5 percent or more.

Prices have already come down since the action, as reflected in futures trading on the commodity exchanges. Hide for delivery in July have dropped to 21 cents a pound from 26.

The export control regulations, imposed by the Commerce Department, will permit exports this year at about the level of 1964, still high by historical standards.

The chief complaint of cattlemen and other farm interests is that hide prices had only risen from an extremely depressed level and had still been well below the level of 1959 and 1961.

The National Grange farm organization earlier this week called the export control move "price breaking, which is indefensible." The American Meat Institute has said the recent decline in hide prices will cost the farmer $3 a head for a steer weighing 1,200 pounds.

Moves to bar the export controls by legislation, possibly by a rider on some current bill, are believed to be underway in Congress.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 26, 1966]

Import Curbs Ended on Heavy Fuel Oil

(By William M. Blair)

Washington, March 25.—Federal controls on imports of heavy fuel oils were removed today, opening the east coast to shipments.

Major revisions of the 10-year-old residual fuel oil program were announced by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, who said that the action would "combat inflation by encouraging full and free competition in the market place."

The Interior Department said that the new program was "designed to eliminate premiums that have attached to import licenses and which have the effect of forcing smaller consumers to pay higher prices for residual fuel oil."

Individual householders do not buy the heavy fuel oil, which is used by electric utilities and large heating plants, but consumers are affected by the cost of heat and power in large apartment and office buildings.

Oil quotas will remain under a Presidential proclamation but will have no effect.

Any importer may sell the heavy fuel by producing evidence of sales through invoices, bills of sale, or contractual commitments. Previously, eligibility was confined to importers of record in 1957, the base year of the program, and persons who owned or controlled deepwater terminals that could receive tanker cargoes.

The action, which coal operators and some domestic oil companies opposed, was forecast last December when Mr. Udall sharply increased the amount of fuel oil permitted to be imported to the east coast. The Government moved then to reduce fuel costs to consumers by heading off a threatened price rise, as it had done in aluminum, copper, and wheat.

The east coast is the major area for importers of residual fuel oil. Thus, other parts of the United States, which get their oil mainly from domestic sources, are unaffected by the Government's action today.

The bulk of the residual imports comes from Venezuela and the Caribbean area. Officials hesitated to speculate today on what effect the new program would have on prices.

SAYS PRICE WAS REDUCED

Senator John O. Pastore, Democrat, of Rhode Island, said that American officials, negotiating with Venezuelan exporters, had succeeded in lowering a proposed price of $1.80 a barrel to $1.75. He said he believed further negotiations would reduce the price 5 cents more.

Mr. Pastore heads a delegation of New England Members of Congress who have long sought an end to the Government's quota system.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, said the delegation would continue to push for complete removal of quotas "even in name." He said that, as long as the Presidential proclamation in quotas stood, "the situation could change."

"The retention of quotas as such" Senator Pastore said, "becomes merely a fiction. We would have preferred to see the quotas taken off completely, but, short of this, we feel this satisfies our needs."

The quota system was originally created as a national security measure to restrict and lessen dependence on foreign oil supplies, a requirement that Mr. Udall said was now without foundation. However, coal interests bitterly fought the lifting of quotas because coal competes with residual oil for use in producing electric power in the East.

The Interior Department said that the revised program was "responsive" to the advice of the director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Buford Ellington, who wrote to Mr. Udall last December 18.

In the letter, Mr. Ellington, who has since then resigned said that a thorough consideration of all issues "indicates that the control of these imports could be substantially relaxed without impairment to the national security."

He said this view was consistent with the view of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, "which takes into account the current military situation" in Vietnam and elsewhere.

For the year beginning April 1, the Government will retain the basic residual fuel import allocation for the east coast of 352,000 barrels a day, the 1957 level. This does not include 11,000 barrels a day assigned to the Defense Department and General Services Administration.

As of April 1, additional allocations will be made on the basis of evidence that importers have contractual agreements for sales. In effect, licenses to bring in more oil will be automatic and importers not now eligible will be able to participate.

For the year ending March 31, the ceiling on imports has been 755,000 barrels a day. In his action last December, Mr. Udall liberalized this to permit 35 million additional barrels by the end of March.

This had the effect of virtually ending the quota system. Since then, importers have brought in less than half the 35 million barrels.

WHAT SCHOOL MILK MEANS TEST WOULD MEAN IN DENVER, COLO.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, over the past few weeks I have spent a good deal of time examining the implications of the administration's proposal to slash the special milk program for schoolchildren by 80 percent. In order to illustrate the adverse effect that a means test standard would have on the program, I have gone over the forms being used by several school districts across the United States to qualify children for free lunches. These forms make it clear that most parents would prefer to have their children drop out of the school milk program rather than pass the kind of stringent means test indicated by the forms. Yet the administration's proposal would not permit the use of Federal funds to pay any part of the cost of a half-pint of milk for a child unless he attended a school without a lunch program or passed a means test.

Today, I want to draw the Senate's attention to the way Denver operates its free milk fund which is donated by the Lions Club. There is no reason to believe this procedure would be changed if the administration's proposals were accepted.

The statement of general policies for the administration of the program reads, and I quote:

> Eligibility for aid shall be determined by the genuine need of the pupil and the financial ability of the family to meet those needs—not alone by the scale of take-home pay outlined below. Each request should be investigated by the social worker or other person designated by the principal. The Social Work Services' financial form (form 888) should be completed for each family requesting assistance.

The form itself requests information on the monthly wage of father and mother, the names of their employers, income from others in family, income from welfare agencies, financial obligations—including rent, house payments, utilities, medical expenses, and transportation.

Mr. President, could anyone honestly believe that many families would subject themselves to such a searching examination merely to give their children a free half pint of milk twice a day in the schools? In fact, the families we should be trying to reach with these nutrition programs, and the illiterate who suspect and resent social workers, will be the very families who will refuse to go through this elaborate qualification procedure.

WISCONSIN MEDICAL SOCIETY CELEBRATES 125TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in 1841, 7 years before Wisconsin was admitted to the Union, the State Medical Society of Wisconsin was created by an act of the Territorial Legislature.

This year, the Wisconsin Medical Society celebrates 125 years of growth, professional achievement, and public service.

As long ago as 1856, the society urged the construction of facilities for the mentally ill. Before the turn of the century, the society boldly and imaginatively led the long but successful fight against blindness in infants and tuberculosis in our State. Through the society's unflagging efforts, an endowment of $1 million was created in 1919 for Marquette University School of Medicine.

The Wisconsin Medical Society annually sponsors the Wisconsin Work Week of Health which offers all interested persons—both lay and professional—a unique opportunity to exchange information and ideas on health problems facing the people of our State.

With a present membership of over 3,700 physicians, the State medical society of Wisconsin continues to merit both professional respect and public appreciation. For the Wisconsin Medical Society is far more than a personal service organization for the physicians. The society perceives as its prime responsibility—the preservation and improvement of the health of the citizens of Wisconsin.

Sports injury prevention among our youth, encouragement of fluoridation in our water supply, smoking education, medical student loan programs, and expansion of emergency call systems are merely a few of the society's daily labors in behalf of the public.

An outstanding example of the Wisconsin Medical Society's positive and enlightened outlook can be found in the society's statement of August 5, 1965, after the enactment of medicare. I ask unanimous consent to have the society's statement printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of the State Medical Society of Wisconsin on Public Law 89–97, Authorized by the Council and Officers on August 1, 1965, and Released August 5, 1965

Medicare has now become the law of the land through the democratic processes of our country, processes of which we may all be proud.

During debates upon the measure, the medical profession voiced its opposition, its reasons for that opposition, and presented alternative proposals. That is a fundamental privilege of the democratic process, a privilege which all citizens must cherish and protect.

But now that medicare is law, the State Medical Society of Wisconsin, through its members, will provide full measure of constructive leadership in its administration. Where we find improvement necessary, we will speak up. Where deficiencies become obvious, we will not hesitate to point them out. And where the law is effective, we will express our opinion on that as well.

Since this law is now a fact, it will require the kind of leadership that the medical profession, and only the medical profession, can provide. We will provide it.

Nothing less than that could we do in good faith to our patients and in satisfaction of our professional and civic conscience.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I salute the State Medical Society of Wisconsin for a century and a quarter of eminent accomplishments. It has earned the respect and appreciation of the people whom it serves. May its future be even more illustrious.

CHIEF JUSTICE MAURICE VICTOR BARNHILL OF THE SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 25, 1966, Maurice Victor Barnhill, Jr., and Rebecca Arrington Barnhill presented to the Supreme Court of North Carolina an excellent portrait of their late father, Chief Justice Maurice Victor Barnhill, who served with highest ability and distinction as a member of the court for 19 years.

Judge Barnhill rightly entertained the abiding conviction that apart from the fundamental principles of law embodied in the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the several States, no American has any security of life, liberty, or property. As a consequence, he interpreted the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of North Carolina and the statutes enacted under them according to their true intent, and in so doing, exhibited at its best the judicial virtue essential in any government of laws, that is, the judicial virtue of self-restraint. America would be a happier and a safer place in which to live today if all the occupants of high judicial positions would emulate Judge Barnhill's magnificent example in this respect.

Having had the privilege of serving with Judge Barnhill as a member of the Supreme Court of North Carolina during the 6 years next preceding my coming to the Senate, I was invited to make an appraisal of Judge Barnhill's career as a man and as a judge as a part of the proceedings in which the presentation of his portrait to the court was made.

In order that the record of service of this good man and just judge may be made available to many, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the appraisal of his career made by me at that time be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the appraisal was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Sam J. Ervin, Jr., in Presenting the Portrait of Chief Justice Maurice Victor Barnhill to the Supreme Court of North Carolina, March 25, 1966

It is fitting that our tribute to Chief Justice Maurice Victor Barnhill should be simple, and direct as befits the man, for in his lifetime he shunned rhetoric and hyperbole as he abhorred publicity and sham. Gifted with a precise, highly developed intellect, he used it in his life as in the law, to pare away the irrelevant, the nonessential and the valueless to reveal swiftly and meaningfully the hard core of truth. I was deeply honored to be asked to present this portrait to the court, for as a friend and colleague, Judge Barnhill will remain forever in my memory as one of the most remarkable human beings I have ever known.

Graced with sophistication in knowledge of many subjects, he yet retained that simplicity of manner and firmness of conviction that comes with self knowledge, belief in God, and an awareness of man's place in the universe. It was this self knowledge that lent to his work in the law a humanity which is the mark of a great human being. And it was his profound knowledge of the law and its meaning that tempered his work with the depth and objectivity which is the mark of a truly great judge.

From 1887 to 1963, his life spanned almost eight decades. Those years, most significant of our country's history, saw America undergo the Spanish-American War, two World Wars and the Korean conflict. They witnessed our growth as a world power, and our development into a great industrial Nation. They saw us sink into the depths of depression and rise again into the greatest economic prosperity known to a people in the history of the world. They have seen the rise of great cities and the increasing urbanization of our society, ideological clashes and intergroup strife and the resolution of our differences. Our governmental structure in this period has been altered by political, social, and economic changes, and the resulting bureaucracies have spread throughout the States. Yet we have prospered as a people and as a State. North Carolina has kept pace with these changes as Judge Barnhill kept pace with them. His life, I believe, epitomizes the challenges and the rewards which North Carolina offered in those years to an individual of conviction, dedication and perseverance.

And these were indeed traits of character with which Maurice Victor Barnhill was endowed by nature, his family, and his surroundings. Born on December 5, 1887, to Martin Van Buren and Mary (Dawes) Barnhill, he was raised on a farm near Enfield, in Halifax County, N.C. This country life enabled him to bring to his life's work the discipline and those rich qualities of spirit early instilled by the rural life and constant exposure to the beauties and forces of nature.

After attending private and public schools in Enfield and Elm City, N.C., he entered the University of North Carolina, where he affiliated with the Sigma Chi fraternity. Upon the completion of his academic studies there, he accepted the post of assistant cashier of the Toisnot Banking Co. in Elm City, which he retained until he could save enough from his earnings to undertake the study of law. Having accomplished this purpose, he attended the Law School of the University of North Carolina, where he graduated with distinction in 1909. Thirty-seven years later his alma mater bestowed upon him its honorary degree of Doctor of Laws.

Judge Barnhill brought to the bench extensive experience as a practicing attorney, and as a judge could draw on his own experience with the intricacies of preparing for litigation. Licensed to practice by the Supreme Court in February 1909, he entered into partnership with Walter H. Grimes, of Raleigh. In March 1910, he moved to Rocky Mount where he soon developed a large practice and dealt with much of the important litigation before the courts of that area.

His business experience as president and director of banks, his local government experience as chairman of the Nash County Highway Commission, and chairman of the board of trustees of the Rocky Mount Graded Schools, enabled him to better comprehend and judge people, issues, and institutions in the fields of business, commerce, and education. His service in the State legislature in 1921 afforded him broad and direct contact with the politics of government, the mechanics of legislating, and with the legislative personalities and attitudes which were shaping the statutory law of North Carolina. He had an opportunity to observe the influence of various groups and organizations and their style of operation. Because the cases before the courts often reflected these same influences and involved the activities of the same groups, this was invaluable background for a judge.

So also was his involvement in law enforcement as prosecuting attorney of Nash County and his service as judge of the county court at Nashville.

In addition to his activities in these areas, Judge Barnhill participated in the affairs of the Democratic Party, served as a steward in the Rocky Mount Methodist Church, and held memberships in the Nash County Bar Association, the North Carolina Bar Association, the Masonic lodge, the York Rite, the Mystic Shrine, and other organizations and fraternities. As chairman of the North Carolina Judicial Council, he made significant contributions to legal reform.

Judge Barnhill was most fortunate in his choice of a helpmate. On June 5, 1912, he married Miss Nannie Rebecca Cooper, the daughter of George B. and Alice (Arrington) Cooper, who was born at Rocky Mount on June 17, 1887, and died at Raleigh on February 21, 1962.

This happy marriage was blessed by a son, Maurice Victor Barnhill, Jr., and a daughter, Rebecca Arrington Barnhill, donors of the portrait being presented to the court. They honor us today by their presence. Maurice Victor Barnhill, Jr., who is one of the State's ablest lawyers, is accompanied by his wife, the former Ruth Margaret Zerbach, and his sons, Maurice Victor Barnhill III, a student at Stanford University Graduate School, and James Herbert Barnhill, a student at Harvard Law School.

Guided by a strong sense of duty, Judge Barnhill always viewed the law as an instrument of service to society. "Law," he wrote in 1931, "is nothing more than a rule of human conduct. The standard of government in a community is nothing more than the composite will and opinion of its citizens. It follows as a matter of course that each citizen by his individual conduct and his participation in his government either elevates or lowers that standard."

I remember how he applied those principles of duty to me on the eve of my appointment to the Senate and my resignation from the court in 1954. Senator Hoey had passed away, and Gov. William B. Umstead had the appointment of his successor under consideration. It was the end of the court's session. Judge Barnhill said he wanted to speak with me, and I went to his chambers. He shut all the doors in a somewhat conspiratorial manner, and then said, "The Governor wants you to call him. I suspect he is going to offer you the appointment to the Senate. If he does, I think you should accept. I would hate to lose you on the court, but I think it would be your duty to accept the appointment." It was typical of the man, that while others were viewing the position as an honor, he saw it as a call to public duty. And, loving the law as he did, he knew what it would mean to me to leave the court, even for such a high Federal post.

Throughout his life he tried to instill in others the devotion to the law and the sense of satisfaction in it which he felt so deeply. Speaking to a group of young lawyers in Forsyth, after he joined the supreme court, he expressed his belief in the written law as a chronicle of our civilization. "You can get our civilization as it has progressed through the years in our North Carolina reports, and the history and progress of North Carolina may be seen more clearly in these reports than in any other place," he said. He admonished them to turn to the records of the law for help in dealing with the future.

The law is a worthy profession, he reminded them saying: "To a person who doesn't love the law, it is a dry and uninteresting thing, but to the lawyer who has a love for his profession, it is live, vital, and interesting."

Although his education and experience were primarily legal, he was one of the most widely read persons it has been my pleasure to know. Steeped in the humanities and knowledgeable about current events, he probably, through his reading, has traveled more widely and lived more deeply than most men. He allowed no experience to escape him, for like Tennyson's Ulysses, he was a part of all that he met.

For 13 years from June 1924, to July, 1937, he served as Judge on the Superior Court of North Carolina. An outstanding trial judge, he was specially assigned to try many of the most important cases in the State during his tenure. Two of these in particular stand out in the legal history of the State. One of them was the sensational trial of Fred Beal and others for the murder of Gastonia Police Chief O. F. Aderholt during the 1929 textile mill strike (199 N.C. 278). The other was the trial of Luke Lea, Luke Lea, Jr., and Wallace Davis in 1931 for misuse of the assets and credit of the Central Bank and Trust Co., the largest bank in western North Carolina.

I wish to discuss these cases, for they illustrate well the judicial temperament and breadth of legal experience which Judge Barnhill brought to this court.

By the time he was 42 years of age, the judge had practiced law in two or three counties and been on the bench for 5 years presiding over the courts in eastern North Carolina. Although well known in his State as a painstaking and capable judge, he was little known outside North Carolina, and, as it was written of him at the time, "had been so quiet and free from even the suggestion of desiring publicity that he has not figured large in the public eye."

Then, suddenly, his picture was in almost every newspaper in the United States and abroad. He was faced with the greatest challenge of his judicial career as he received assignment from Governor Gardner to preside over one of the century's most controversial murder trials—a case born of all the burning religious, social, political, and economic issues of those depression years.

This trial of 16 strikers and organizers, several of whom were admitted Communists, grew out of a strike by the local branch of the National Textile Workers' Union at the Loray Mill in Gastonia. On June 7, 1929, during an encounter between city police officers and those in charge of union premises, Police Chief Aderholt was killed and several others were wounded.

Coming soon after the Sacco-Venzetti trial in Massachusetts, the Gastonia trial of alleged Communists seemed destined to challenge and at the same time symbolize the American system of justice. Many feared the defendants would be tried not for murder but for their religious, political, and economic theories. But their fears were groundless.

With the eyes of the whole world upon him, Judge Barnhill charged the jury in a classic statement of what constitutes a fair criminal trial.

"There is only one issue. Are the defendants guilty as charged? This must be determined in a quiet and orderly manner. It must not be clouded by any other issue."

He warned that the political, economic, and religious views and beliefs of the defendants had nothing to do with the case and their injection into the trial would not be permitted.

"When a person comes into court he comes on exact equality with every other citizen. He has no right to expect to be either exalted or condemned, to receive either more or less than is just on account of his race, color, or condition in life, or by his convictions upon social, economic, industrial, political, or religious matters."

One editorial stated the next day "those who have been most insistent that North Carolina's good name be unscarred and that the cause of justice prevail must necessarily have been strengthened after reading Judge Barnhill's charge to the grand jury and nothing the fairness, directness and fairness with which he spoke."

His first test came as the attorney for the defendants requested a change of venue. Judge Barnhill realized that with passions inflamed in Gaston County, it might be difficult for a jury from that county to hear the case objectively at that time and in that atmosphere. He therefore granted a continuance and the case was assigned to Mecklenburg County Superior Court at Charlotte with Judge Barnhill appointed to preside. This decision was received as firm indication throughout the State and the land that justice was to prevail as far as he was able to assure it, and that the trial of the case would be as free as possible from prejudicial publicity.

During the progress of the original trial, one of the jurors was incapacitated as the result of an emotional breakdown, and a mistrial was ordered. Although indictments were returned against 16 defendants, only 7 of them went to final trial, which resulted in convictions and sentences for second-degree murder and related crimes.

There were many difficult rulings during the course of the trial, as the judge sought an impartial trial, without artificial drama. Some of these rulings made judicial history and are today studied by students in North Carolina law schools. When the State introduced a life-size plaster figure of Police Chief Aderholt as evidence against the alleged murders, Judge Barnhill ordered the effigy removed from the courtroom.

Time and time again throughout the trial, he was cautious not to admit into testimony any evidence which might show the Communist connections of the defendants.

For purposes of impeachment Judge Barnhill overruled objections to questioning a witness about her belief in God, basing his ruling on the North Carolina Statute of Oaths of 1777, which stipulated that a witness must believe in divine punishment after death to qualify as a witness. He commented later "If I believed that life ends with death and that there is no punishment after death, I would be less apt to tell the truth."

This ruling received much strong comment throughout the country; both from those who favored and those critical of it.

When it considered this ruling as a possible error, the Supreme Court held this no interference with the right of conscience. Chief Justice Stacy said:

"The answers of the witness, taken in connection with her previous testimony, do not show that she intended to express disbelief in a Supreme Being, or to deny all religious sense of accountability, such as would have disqualified her as a witness" * * *. But, even if error were committed in not sustaining objections to the questions propounded, which is not conceded, it would seem that, in the light of the answers elicited, no appreciable harm has come to the defendants, if harm at all, and that the verdicts and judgments ought not to be disturbed on account of these exceptions.

To those who knew Judge Barnhill's fairness, it was no surprise that after examining the record, Chief Justice Stacy, speaking for the Supreme Court, was able to say:

"We are convinced, from a searching scrutiny of all that transpired on the hearing, to which exceptions have been taken, that substantial justice has been done, and that no reversible error has been made to appear" (199 N.C. 278).

The case of Luke Lea, Luke Lea, Jr., and Wallace Davis was even more complicated and controversial than the Gastonia case because of the many people involved and because of its effect on the politics and economics of the State. The trial was to test to the fullest Judge Barnhill's patience, knowledge of the law and good humor. In the latter part of the 1920's, land speculation, then prevalent in Florida, overflowed to the mountains of western North Carolina. The slogan was "Florida in the winter: the North Carolina mountains in the summer." Centering around Asheville, the speculation was so extensive that many farms were subdivided into "city lots." The city of Asheville and Buncombe County extended water and sewer lines into sparsely populated areas. The debt of the city and county rose rapidly with the fever of speculation. Prices became inflated beyond real values. Sometimes the same piece of land would change ownership many times on the same day. In the fall of 1930, the Central Bank and Trust Co. failed. Wallace Davis, the president, ex-Senator Luke Lea and his son, Luke Lea, Jr., of Nashville, Tenn., were indicted on multiple charges of criminal conspiracy to use the assets and credit of the bank for unlawful purposes.

Because of the involvement of city and county officials in some of the irregular, if not criminal, transactions of the bank, the fact that an ex-U.S. Senator was a defendant, and the multitude of transactions between the Leas and their associates in Tennessee and the bank in North Carolina, the trial attracted not only great local and Statewide interest, but also national attention.

In 1931, Judge Barnhill was assigned to hold special terms of the superior court of Buncombe County for the purpose of trying the resulting criminal cases.

As all trial lawyers know, the most difficult criminal case to try without committing reversible error is one involving books of account and records such as are normally maintained by banks. In the trial of the case against the Leas and Davis, literally scores of questions arose involving the admissibility of evidence and its application to the issues raised by the criminal indictments. The record on appeal to the Supreme Court consisted of 1,221 pages, and the attorneys for the defendant managed to state 300 exceptions. The Supreme Court of North Carolina was unable to find any reversible error in this voluminous record and the proceedings of a trial which continued for several weeks (203 N.C. 13). The court subsequently denied petitions for rehearing (203 N.C. 35) and for a new trial based on newly discovered evidence (203 N.C. 316). Petitions to the Supreme Court of the United States for writs of certiorari were denied (287 U.S. 649, L. Ed. 561, and 287 U.S. 668, 77 L. Ed. 576).

Maj. Lennox Polk McLendon, now of the Greensboro bar, was retained by the State Banking Commission with the approval of Governor Gardner to assist in the prosecution of the criminal cases growing out of the Central Bank failure. Speaking of the masterful way Judge Barnhill conducted the trial, Major McLendon said:

"The difficulties inherent in the case against Luke Lea, Sr., Luke Lea, Jr., and Wallace Davis were numerous. Not only did the case involve the usual problems growing out of the use of bank books and records; but, in addition, it involved serous difficulties with respect to the identity of securities and their ownership by the bank, the issuance of certificates of deposit without a contemporaneous recording of them on the bank's books, the disparity between entries in books of deposit issued to depositors, and the entries upon the bank's records and the authenticity of typewritten letters without written signatures or other usual internal evidence of authorship. Through a maze of documentary evidence and the testimony of the employees of the bank and of expert accountants, Judge Barnhill directed the trial of the case with extraordinary patience, good judgment and absolute fairness * * *. Through it all, he maintained the poise and dignity of a great judge. His charge to the jury was a masterpiece of clarity and fairness to both the State and the defendants. I really do not see how any judge could have done a better job under the extraordinary circumstances of this case."

When Gov. Clyde R. Hoey appointed Judge Barnhill an associate justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court on July 1, 1937, the appointment was acclaimed throughout the State as most fitting. He was elected to the associate justiceship for full 8-year terms in the general elections of 1938 and 1946, and served in that capacity until February 1, 1954, when Governor Umstead named him chief justice to fill the vacancy occasioned by the retirement of Judge William A. Devin. He was elected to the post of chief justice in the general election of 1954 and filled that office with great acceptability until August 21, 1956, when he retired and qualified as an emergency justice.

When Judge Barnhill joined the court as an associate justice, Walter P. Stacy, one of America's greatest jurists of all time, was chief justice. Other associate justices were Heriot Clarkson, George Whitfield Connor, Michael Schenck, William A. Devin, and John Wallace Winborne. Judge Barnhill also served with these later additions to the court during subsequent years: Aaron Ashley, Flowers Seawell, Emery B. Denny, the speaker, Murray G. James, Jeff D. Johnson, Jr., Itimous T. Valentine, R. Hunt Parker, William H. Bobbitt, Carlisle W. Higgins, and William B. Rodman, Jr. All who had the privilege of working with him on this court knew Maurice Victor Barnhill to be an intellectual and legal giant as well as a warmhearted friend.

All in all, Judge Barnhill served the law and the people of North Carolina for 19 fruitful years as a justice of this court. It would require a book to appraise the enduring values his opinions added to the law. Time does not permit me to undertake this task. I must content myself with brief comments on a few of his opinions.

Judge Barnhill preferred agreement among the members of the court but left room for dissent when a member felt his convictions required dissent. All of the justices on his seven-man court worked hard. It is not generally known, I find, that the Supreme Court of North Carolina hands down written opinions sooner after argument of cases than any other appellate court in the United States. It is seldom longer than 4 weeks after a case is heard that a decision is rendered. Because of the pressure of work, our discussions were usually serious. However, among the members there was a camaraderie born of a common isolation from the world outside, a common bond forged by that sense of seclusion and neutrality which society demands of its judges, and by the unity of our minds and hearts in a task often poorly comprehended by outsiders.

Although Judge Barnhill's opinions appear in 33 volumes of the Supreme Court Reports, from volume 212 through 244, his service on the Court is not reflected solely in the opinions he wrote. In conferences as we discussed cases and tried to reach decisions he lent the energies of his inquiring mind to the solution in every case, regardless of who was writing the opinion. So interested was he that frequently after a tentative decision was reached in conference, he went to the chambers of the judge who was assigned to write the opinion and made extremely valuable suggestions.

He possessed a remarkable ability to express himself clearly and understandingly in an opinion, and as a result of his distinguished career as a practicing lawyer and a trial judge, he believed firmly in the necessity for doing so. Appellate opinions, he believed, are helpful only insofar as they are clear and unambiguous and can be used as a basis for instructions to a jury or guidance to a client.

His reaction to the law, because of his training and knowledge, was often almost intuitive. He possessed an almost uncanny ability to respond immediately and accurately to a legal proposition, or to catch instinctively the significance of the mere mention of a decision in the course of an argument or discussion.

His attitude toward the role of regulatory agencies and legislative control of them is apparent in many of his opinions. Deeply aware of the extent of bureaucratic control which government in his lifetime had imposed on the individual and on the private institutions of society, he was quick to check its excesses. In a 1952 concurring opinion, for instance, he agreed that the State board of nurse examiners had exceeded its authority in dropping the Hamlet Hospital School for Nursing from the accredited lists without notice or a hearing. Revealing not only a sense of the importance of the regulatory agencies in society, but a knowledge of the special needs of educational and small professional institutions, he wrote:

"The legislature is the policymaking agency of the State government. The lawmaking function is assigned exclusively to it and it alone can prescribe standards of conduct which have the force and effect of law. This function, except where expressly authorized by the Constitution, cannot be delegated to any other authority or body." However, he noted, the legislature may create an administrative agency and authorize it to make rules and regulations to effect the operation and enforcement of a law within the general scope and expressed general purpose of the statute. This authority he stated "cannot lawfully include the power to make the law, for neither urgency of necessity nor gravity of a situation arising from economic or social conditions allows the legislature to abdicate, transfer, or delegate its constitutional authority to an administrative agency. Hence, an administrative agency has no power to create a duty where the law creates none" (234 N.C. 673).

His words, I believe, bear a special significance today for both State and Federal regulatory agencies. This opinion is typical of his sense of the social purpose of legislation. In seeking to accomplish the objective of assuring adequate training for nurses, admonished the justice, the board "should keep in mind the fact that the statute was not enacted for the benefit of nurses or to create a guild having the legal right to limit or proscribe competition, either of nurses or of hospital schools of nursing. It was enacted to promote the good health and general welfare of the people at large."

His opinions frequently revealed a dry humor and a sympathy for the parties which his strict adherence to the law could not always conceal. In *Singletary* v. *Nixon,* 239 N.C. 635, a civil action for compensation for personal injuries resulting from an automobile-tractor-trailer collision, the judgment of nonsuit was upheld because of the contributory negligence of the plaintiff by excessive speed or not keeping a proper outlook. At the end of his opinion, the chief justice sent a public message to the plaintiff, in these words:

"The plaintiff may, perhaps, draw consolation from the fact this record tends to show that he is the type of man who 'sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not.' Psalms 15: 4. In his examination and cross-examination he was afforded opportunities to modify his testimony to his own advantage. Yet he adhered strictly to his first statements in respect to the manner in which the collision occurred, his nearness to the truck when he first saw it, the time when he applied his brakes, and other circumstances which tended to prove his own want of due care. For this at least he is to be commended."

He felt very strongly about the role of the jury in our system of justice, and about the duty of a judge to uphold the jury, even when he did not agree. His frustration with the loopholes of the law sometimes broke through in such cases. One opinion in particular illustrates his attitude in this regard. This is *Jyachosky* v. *Wensil,* 240 N.C. 217, in which he wrote a concurring opinion deploring the fact that the jury misinterpreted the facts but, conscious of his oath, affirming the judgment, and calling on the general assembly to take action to help the court. He said there:

"Yet the jury adopted the bare, artificial inference of fact permitted by the statute and found that it was sufficient to override and outweigh all the positive evidence to the contrary. While we may grant new trials for errors of law committed by the trial judge, we are without authority to correct this error in the verdict. The jury was the final arbiter of the facts. Therefore we must affirm a judgment which compels the defendant to pay plaintiff $18,000 which he should not be required to pay. This offends my every sense of justice and fair play. I can only say that it is most unfortunate that judicial officers should be placed in a position where they must deny relief against injustice in the name of the law. While we need some statute such as G.S. 20–71.1, this act should be so amended as to afford the court an opportunity to grant relief in a case of this kind.

"Since the trial judge committed no error in the trial of the cause, I must, in compliance with my oath to administer the law as it is written, concede that the judgment entered must be affirmed. In so doing, I make my assent as negative as language will permit."

In *Kennedy* v. *Parrott,* 243 N.C. 355, Justice Barnhill wrote the court's opinion in a landmark decision holding, among other things, that the consent of a patient to a major internal operation will be construed as general in nature so that the surgeon may lawfully perform such operation as good surgery demands, even though this requires an extension of the operation further than was originally contemplated. Before this decision, an extension of such an operation, however necessary, might have resulted in an assault charge against the physician. Although it is almost a general rule today, it was among the first such decisions in the country. His attitude in dealing with an area of the law influx is typical of his recognition of the need to modify some strict common law rules to meet modern conditions. He cited conditions during the period which shaped the common law rule, "prior to the advent of the modern hospital and before anesthesia had appeared on the horizon of the medical world." In those days, he noted, even a major operation was performed in the home of the patient, and the patient ordinarily was conscious so that he could give his consent. If he was not, members of his family were immediately available.

"However," wrote the justice, "now that hospitals are available to most people in need of major surgery; anesthesia is in common use; operations are performed in the operating rooms of such hospitals while the patient is under the influence of an anesthetic; the surgeon is bedecked with operating gown, mask, and gloves; and the attending relatives, if any, are in some other part of the hospital, sometimes many floors away, the law is in a state of flux. More and more courts are beginning to realize that ordinarily a surgeon is employed to remedy conditions without any express limitation on his authority in respect thereto, and that in view of these conditions which make consent impractical, it is unreasonable to hold the physician to the exact operation—particularly when it is internal—that his preliminary examination indicated was necessary. We know that now complete diagnosis of an internal ailment is not effectuated until after the patient is under the influence of the anesthetic and the incision has been made.

"These courts act upon the concept that the philosophy of the law is embodied in the ancient Latin maxim: 'Ratio est legis anima; mutata legis ratione mutatur et lex.' Reason is the soul of the law; the reason of the law being changed, the law is also changed."

It was ill health which finally compelled Judge Barnhill to retire from the court he loved. Not many people realized the severe physical handicap under which he lived and worked throughout his adult years. From the time he was 18 years old, he was subject to severe attacks of asthma and it advanced through the years to emphysema. In 1950, he had a serious operation for a malignancy from which he never fully recovered. Toward the end of his career he had to see a doctor several times a day because of the emphysema. His daughter tells me that he often said to her that his poor health might have been a blessing in disguise and that he might have lived a different life if he had been well. As it was, he had to concentrate on his career and a quiet life of studying and reading.

"It isn't life that matters, but the courage you bring to it." Frosted Moses' advice in Walpole's Fortitude might well have been Judge Barnhill's daily reminder to himself throughout his life. A person of less indomitable will would have given up. Yet he never mentioned his affliction and struggled not to show it. The only personal reference to it is found in his opinion in *Lippard* v. *Johnson* involving plaintiff's reaction to a novocain shot. Judge Barnhill wrote:

"Practical application of the medical science is necessarily to a large degree experimental. Due to the varying conditions of human systems, the result of the use of any medicine cannot be predicted with certainty. What is beneficial to many sometimes proves to be highly injurious to others. A food or drink that one allergic person may use with impunity is highly injurious to another. The goldenrod is a thing of beauty to one asthmatic; to another it is a thing to be shunned. Even the expert cannot completely fathom or understand the reactions of the human system. Therefore, to say that an unexpected, unanticipated, and unfavorable result of a treatment by a physician invokes the application of the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur would be to stretch that doctrine far beyond its real purpose and to destroy its recognized usefulness in proper cases."

When I learned that Judge Barnhill had journeyed to the bourne from which no traveler returns, I thought of his great service as a judge and of the physical handicap under which it was rendered, and I called to mind the king's son in Edward Rowland Sill's inspiring poem "Opportunity."

"This I beheld, or dreamed it in a dream:—
There spread a cloud of dust along a plain;
And underneath the cloud, or in it, raged
A furious battle, and men yelled, and swords
Shocked upon swords and shields. A prince's banner
Wavered, then staggered backward, hemmed by foes.

"A craven hung along the battle's edge,
And thought, 'Had I a sword of keener steel—
That blue blade that the king's son bears,—but this
Blunt thing!' he snapped and flung it from his hand,
And lowering crept away and left the field.

"Then came the king's son, wounded, sore bestead,
And weaponless, and saw the broken sword,
Hilt-buried in the dry and trodden sand,
And ran and snatched it, and with battle shout
Lifted afresh he hewed his enemy down,
And saved a great cause that heroic day."

Instead of seeking "a sword of keener steel," Maurice Victor Barnhill made the most of what God had given him in body, in mind, and in spirit. When he died at Raleigh on October 12, 1963, he left to his family and his State the example of a life of service, a life well-lived.

And surely, he left the law, as a profession, as a science, and as art, not as he had found it, but enriched a thousandfold. Of his great legacy, this portrait of Judge Barnhill will remind the members of this court and all those who attend here in future years.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE TIRES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Friday, March 25, 1966, and the hour of 12:15 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2669.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2669) to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived for approximately 6 to 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVISED STATEMENT OF POLICIES FOR SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PLANS UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the heavy hand of Federal bureaucracy—without authority and with total disregard for what is right and just—threatens to disrupt the orderly education of thousands upon thousands of Georgia schoolchildren.

I am compelled to rise in vigorous protest of the revised guidelines for school desegregation announced recently by the U.S. Office of Education. These regulations purport to enforce the provisions of title VI of the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964, but they in fact amount to nothing less than a Federal blackjack to force school officials to take actions never required by the Supreme Court or any Federal statute. The Commissioner of Education claims title VI for his authority, but the fact is, Mr. President, these regulations exceed the scope and intent of the law to a shocking degree.

They are arbitrary and capricious. They are dictatorial. In many respects, they are impossible. In every instance, they are unwarranted and unreasonable. The penalty for noncompliance is to be literally starved out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. President, briefly stated, title VI forbids racial discrimination in Federal aid programs. The citizens of Georgia are a law-abiding people. They may not always agree with the laws they must live by, but contrary to certain militant segments of our society today, they take cognizance of the fact that ours is a nation of laws and not of men, and that the courts are the proper avenue for redress of grievances.

Georgians are well aware of the Brown decision of 1954. They know it to be an accomplished fact. They also view title VI as an accomplished fact.

I join the people of Georgia in support of all the constitutional rights of all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color. But one of the most cherished of these rights is freedom from regimentation and enforced togetherness, which thankfully is forbidden by the Constitution.

Mr. President, I submit that these regulations make a mockery of the constitutional guarantee of freedom of association. They make requirements of school systems that not even the Supreme Court has seen fit to make. There is no constitutional or statutory obligation upon any school system to take action to achieve any degree of racial balance, not in Washington, D.C., or New York City, and not in Georgia. In fact, Federal court rulings have been to the contrary.

Now comes the Office of Education demanding what the law nowhere requires or even contemplates. The imperative word "must" appears no less than 92 times in these regulations.

They call for the herding and busing of students from one school to another on the basis of arbitrary percentages, the juggling of school attendance zones and school bus routes to suit the whims of some bureaucrat in Washington, the mandatory transfer of teachers from one school to another, and the requirement for such a mountain of paperwork that teachers will be turned into bookkeepers and have little time left for the education of children.

Mr. President, these guidelines violate both the letter and spirit of title VI and the Civil Rights Act. It is clearly stated in section 407 that nothing in the act "shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance."

Moreover, the term "desegregation" is specifically defined as not meaning "the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

The language of the law is in keeping with the assurances given by the floor manager of the bill when it was before the Senate. Then Senator **HUMPHREY**, now Vice President and Presiding Officer of this body, stated in no uncertain terms that title VI does not authorize a Federal official to prescribe pupil assignments or to select a faculty.

Mr. **HUMPHREY** assured the Senate that nothing in title VI required the busing of schoolchildren from one school to another to eliminate racial imbalance.

Referring to a controlling Federal court case which was upheld by the Supreme Court, Mr. **HUMPHREY** told the Senate on June 4, 1964:

> This case makes it quite clear that while the Constitution prohibits segregation, it does not require integration. The busing of children to achieve racial balance would be an act to effect the integration of schools. In fact, if the bill were to compel it, it would be a violation, because it would be handling the matter on the basis of race and we would be transporting children because of race. The bill does not attempt to integrate the schools, but it does attempt to eliminate segregation in the school systems * * *. The fact that there is a racial imbalance per se is not something which is unconstitutional.

Whenever there is ambiguity about a bill, one must examine its legislative history. Mr. **HUMPHREY** made it eminently clear that title VI was designed to prohibit discrimination, not to enforce togetherness. However, this is precisely what the Office of Education now endeavors to do.

It is my hope that these high-handed tactics will be abandoned. I am alert to the problems involving the great social changes now sweeping Georgia and other States of the South, and because of these problems and the earnest efforts of the people to resolve them, I say that reason and commonsense must be allowed to prevail above all.

The school systems of Georgia pledged to obey the law and demonstrated good faith in so doing.

The Office of Education should do the same.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks resolutions adopted by the Georgia Education Association and departments thereof, and two newspaper columns relating to the guidelines which I have discussed today.

There being no objection, the resolutions and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE GEORGIA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Whereas the process of integration this current school year has been supported with amazing cooperation from most school systems in Georgia; and

Whereas the 1964 Democratic national platform declared, "True democracy of opportunity will not be served by establishing quotas based on the same false distinctions we seek to erase, nor can the effects of prejudice be neutralized by the expedient of preferential practices"; and

Whereas the recent Federal guidelines do require forced integration of faculties in a manner that sets established quotas and also eliminates or sharply restricts freedom of choice on the part of teachers; and

Whereas these same Federal guidelines will tend to destroy much of the good will that now exists between school boards, school administrators, and classroom teachers; and

Whereas the democratic process in our Nation is founded upon freedom of choice—to choose our vocations, to choose our avocations, to choose our places of residence, to choose the political party to which we would belong, and to choose the candidate whom we would support; and

Whereas it appears that teachers who have themselves been denied the democratic process of freedom of choice will not likely be the most apt teachers of the democratic process; and

Whereas this denial will tend to destroy the democratic process itself; and

Whereas these new Federal guidelines are being arbitrarily imposed by the same Democratic Party that approved the Democratic National Party platform in 1964: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government, which is presently controlled by this same Democratic Party, return to its own national platform for its position and for its approach to a solution of this national problem; and be it further

Resolved, That this position of Georgia teachers be made known to our Georgia Senators and Representatives.

Respectfuly submitted.

Resolutions Committee: Dr. Carl G. Renfroe, Chairman; Edwin L. Wynn, Elizabeth Williams, A. R. Henderson, William A. Russell, Roy F. Goolsby, Clifford G. Hale, Mrs. Mary Threatte, Mrs. Leslie Jo Bentley, Dr. James E. Greene.

MARCH 18, 1966.

RESOLUTION ON NEW CIVIL RIGHTS GUIDELINES OF THE GEORGIA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

The Georgia Association of School Superintendents resents the precipitate and arbitrary action on the part of HEW in demanding compliance with the new unrealistic guidelines in carrying out the Civil Rights Act.

The Georgia Association of School Superintendents deplores the lateness in informing school system of HEW's demands, and believes that such late notification tends to create confusion and preclude orderly procedures.

The Georgia Association of School Superintendents believes that a modification of the new compliance directives is necessary and essential.

The Georgia Association of School Superintendents believes that sudden drastic changes could best be worked out through consultations with those charged with the implementation of such types of change.

The Georgia Association of School Superintendents strongly urges the Georgia congressional delegation to exert every possible effort to effect a modification of HEW's new guideline demands.

The Georgia Association of School Superintendents invites other professional and nonprofessional groups, interested in the welfare of all of Georgia's children, to join in expressing similar views indicated in this resolution, and pledges its cooperation with such groups in a firm, positive professional approach, to seek a solution to this most serious problem.

Respectfully submitted,

Jasper Griffin, Chairman; Dr. Thord Marshall, W. M. Murray, J. H. House, Dr. Paul West, Leroy O'Neal, E. L. McCranny, W. L. Colombo, Marshall Guill, Mrs. Mary Lee, Mrs. Nell Hallford.

MARCH 17, 1966.

RESOLUTION ON GUIDELINES OF THE GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS

The Resolutions Committee of the GEA Department of Classroom Teachers—

Believes firmly that the foremost education priority is quality education for all boys and girls of Georgia;

Affirms its belief that quality education cannot be obtained under the new guidelines set up by the Office of Education and Justice Department of the United States;

Therefore, it believes that in order to achieve quality conditions of work for teachers that moderation must be exercised in the new guidelines.

Further, it abhors the directives which are aimed at the diminishing of the powers of school system and the denial of teachers' rights as to choice of placement;

Further, it actively supports any action instituted to achieve moderation in the new guidelines issued by the Office of Education and Justice Department of the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

ESALEE J. BURDETTE,
Chairman.
RALPH E. HOGAN,
ELIZABETH B. SCARBOROUGH,
WYNEMA WALLER,
President DCT.
G. W. TIBBETTS,
President-elect DCT.

MARCH 17, 1966.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 17, 1966]

THE TOLLING OF FEDERAL SCHOOL BELL

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

A few days ago, the U.S. Office of Education issued a bristling document entitled, "Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

In one sense, this arrogant edict is of interest only in the South, where dual school systems persist in many areas; yet in a larger sense, these formidable rules and regulations carry an ominous meaning for the country as a whole. Every locality in the Nation is learning what it means to become dependent upon Federal aid; and every locality may learn from this statement what is meant by Federal control. This is how the cold wind blows.

Title VI of the 1964 act is not long. It opens with section 601, establishing a basic policy to which no reasonable man could object:

"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Splendid. And it may be noted in passing that section 601 is properly phrased in the negative. It does not tell the localities what they must do, but what they must not do.

Under section 602 of the act, Federal agencies are directed to issue appropriate rules and regulations to carry out section 601. The law provides an orderly process of hearings before Federal aid may be suspended by reason of failure to comply with such rules. Section 603 provides for judicial review of any order cutting off funds. And section 604, to which further reference will be made in a moment, says that nothing in title VI shall be construed to authorize action by any Federal agency "with respect to any employment practice of any employer * * * except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment."

In April 1965 the Office of Education issued its first set of rules dealing with desegregation of public schools as a condition for receiving continued Federal aid. These regulations consisted of five loosely printed pages. Local school officials were told that "steps shall be taken" to eliminate segregated teaching staffs, that certain notices had to be sent to pupils under any plan of freedom of choice, and that certain reports had to be filed in Washington. The tone of these initial regulations was firm, but the provisions left something to the judgment of local officials. "Precise, up-to-the-minute statistics are not required. The material furnished should be what fair minded school officials believe to be true and what reasonable men would think necessary."

In the revised regulations just issued, this tone is abandoned. Here is no mention of "fair-minded school officials" or "reasonable men." The regulations have swollen to 10 closely-printed pages. The tone is harsh, peremptory, commanding. The mere "notices" of last year have become letters that must be distributed by first-class mail. "All these letters must be mailed on the same day. Each letter must be accompanied by a notice, in a form prescribed by the Commissioner."

The imperative "must" appears 92 times. To be eligible for continued Federal aid, a school system must act. Its plans must meet the Commissioner's requirements. School officials must assure, comply, submit, report, provide, furnish, and arrange. Despite the commandment of section 604 of the act, local school systems must employ their teachers in certain prescribed ways and must demonstrate "significant progress" in desegregating staffs.

School officials must encourage community support of their plans. They must furnish full information to newspapers and to radio and TV stations. "Publication as a legal notice is not sufficient." Attendance zones must conform to the Commissioner's requirements. Certain maps must be provided. Records must be retained.

Under the new regulations, the authority of parents is to be diminished. "A student may exercise his own choice of schools if he is exercising a choice for the ninth or higher grade, or has reached the age of 15." The "choice period" is elaborately defined. The Commissioner will "scrutinize with special care" the operation on any plan of free choice. If the 1965–66 school year saw 8 or 9 percent of a locality's Negro children transferring to white schools, the Commissioner will expect "at least twice that percentage" for 1966–67. If only 4 or 5 percent were so transferred in the current school year, the Commissioner will expect to see the number "at least triple" in the coming year.

It is impossible, in a short summary, adequately to convey the autocratic spirit of these regulations—the forms, the notices, the reports, the assurances, the compliances, the deadlines, the infinite commandments. And underlying the whole statement is the explicit threat:

Obey, or give up the Federal money.

The prevailing mood of the country, one comprehends, is that the South deserves what the South is getting. So be it. But public officials far from Dixie, not concerned with schools, owe it to themselves to read these regulations. The school bell tolls for them, too.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 21, 1966]

Racial Balance in Education

(By David Lawrence)

Resentment and bitterness are emerging in different parts of the country—North as well as South—over the efforts of the Federal Government to impose "racial balance" in the public schools. Throughout the debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1964 assurance was given that no attempts would be made to achieve "racial balances" in education, and that the Government's efforts would be confined to what the Supreme Court had ordered—namely, that public schools could not remain segregated on the basis of race and must admit students without regard to color.

But what happens if not enough students of a particular race apply for admission to a school?

The answer is that the Federal Government now is to step in and arbitrarily order a "racial balance." This objective has been denied by governmental authorities here, who insist they are not trying to fix racial proportions.

The new "guidelines" which have just been promulgated by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, however, reveal that certain percentages must nevertheless be attained if a school is to receive Federal funds in the 1966–67 school year.

Under the original "guidelines" issued in April 1965, many schools in the South adopted what are termed "free choice" plans. These were accepted by the Commissioner of Education as fulfilling the requirements of desegregation, but the new regulations now say:

"A free choice plan tends to place the burden of desegregation on Negro or other minority group students and their parents. Even when school authorities undertake good faith efforts to assure its fair operation, the very nature of a free choice plan and the effect of longstanding community attitudes often tend to preclude or inhibit the exercise of a truly free choice by or for minority group students.

"In districts with a sizable percentage of Negro or other minority group students, the commission will, in general, be guided by the following criteria in scheduling free choice plans for review:

"1. If a significant percentage of the students, such as 8 or 9 percent, transferred from segregated schools for the 1965–1966 school year, total transfers on the order of at least twice that percentage would normally be expected.

"2. If a smaller percentage of the students, such as 4 percent or 5 percent, transferred from segregated schools for the 1965–66 school year, a substantial increase in transfers would normally be expected, such as would bring the total to at least triple the percentage for the 1965–66 school year."

The regulations go on to set up various other percentages which admittedly would be used as criteria in scheduling free choice plans for review. If, after review, a particular plan is not found satisfactory, another plan can be imposed or Federal funds withheld.

Yet the Civil Rights Act of 1964 specifically defined the desegregation required in public education. It says:

"'Desegregation' means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but 'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

When the Supreme Court of the United States ordered desegregation of public schools it did not say that it was requiring integration or the correction of racial imbalance. Residential factors in a city or county or parental unwillingness to send a child far away from the home neighborhood could also have been responsible for the small number of Negroes attending a particular school.

Ever since the 1954 decision, spokesmen for the Government, including the late President John F. Kennedy, have insisted that there was no intention to bring about a racial balance. But it is evident that a change has just been made, irrespective of what the Supreme Court ordered.

School authorities now apparently are to be required by one means or another to influence more and more Negro parents to send their children to a particular school in order to achieve the approximate percentages set forth by the U.S. Office of Education. Otherwise, the schools may be denied Federal funds.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, if necessary, I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes. I do not know how much time remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUSSELL CALLS GUIDELINES TYRANNICAL

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my colleague on the statement he has made and I associate myself with his remarks.

I have observed Government for a long time, and I do not believe I have ever seen as unjustified and tyrannical use of Federal power, without any justification whatever, as that which is proposed by the Office of Education in its so-called guidelines.

We debated the Civil Rights Act, so-called, on the floor of the Senate for about 3 months, as I recall. It was not suggested by any proponent of the bill on the floor that the purpose of the legislation was any other than to see that no door of any schoolhouse anywhere in the country should be closed to any child on account of his race. That would enable the expression of free choice. The school officials of the State of Georgia and of other States have adopted what is called the free choice system, which permits any student to go to any school anywhere in that school district that he may desire. It has brought about a considerable amount of integration. It enables every pupil to attend the school of his choice. Our people have accepted this in good faith though many do not approve of it. Now we have Federal bureaucracy at its worst—fanaticism at its very zenith—in these guidelines to order or threaten to penalize a school district and lay down a policy which says in effect that it makes no difference if the free choice has been made by every student or teacher in the district, whether he is white or Negro, or yellow or red; that that is not satisfactory for the dictates of these bureaucrats.

This group of supermen who preside here in Washington demand that the school authorities find some way to compel a certain percentage or quotas of the races to go to school together, so many this year and so many next year.

We were told time and again during that debate that no quota system was envisioned, that all that was being proposed was absolute freedom for the individuals.

And now we are told that the free choice system means nothing, that we must comply with the orders of these allwise bureaucrats who have never been elected to any public office.

I point out to my colleagues they might take these so-called guidelines as a warning, although I do not expect them to do so. But we will have legislation coming up in this session on housing, and the great cry for this legislation is that we must have free choice on the part of every citizen as to where he shall live and as to the housing he will occupy in a certain section of the city. There will be no restriction.

Make no mistake about it, my colleagues, if you enact such a law as that you will have the same experience that we have in regard to the schools. You will have fanatics and do-gooders who will go into every city and every community in the country and say: "If you do not see that there is living in every block of your city people of every race and creed that live in the city we will withdraw all your Federal assistance funds, we will withdraw all your antipoverty funds, we will withdraw all your old-age assistance funds, and we will withdraw all your aid to education funds."

That is the kind of free choice you are going to get if you follow the promises which were read by my colleague and which were made here with all solemnity by the present Vice President, the former Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY.

Every statement made here on the floor in the debate as to what was expected in that bill was repudiated and flouted by the so-called guidelines that have been issued by the Office of Education.

If the Members of this body—and there will come a day when it will come up—are interested in maintaining any semblance of freedom in this country, then it should be left to every individual under this law to select the school of his choice and attend it.

If there is any violation of that, then let these bureaucrats come in and inflict all of the dire consequences that are threatened in these guidelines.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I quote from the last Democratic Party platform:

> True democracy of opportunity will not be served by establishing quotas based on the same false distinctions we seek to erase, nor can the effect of prejudice be neutralized by the expedient of preferential practices.

Does my able colleague recall that?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It was read on the floor during the so-called civil rights debate and stated to be the purpose of the bill that was passed. But it is now treated with the utmost contempt by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Education. They set themselves up as knowing more about the situation and more about the lives of our people, and the statements of political parties in their platforms, than Congress does when it enacts laws.

It was a very sad day in the history of the United States when such a tyrannical and unjustified compulsion was attempted to be imposed upon the school boards of this country.

It puts a burden on the school boards of going out, and bringing them in, and tying them in their seats to keep them there or lose Federal funds.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Mississippi wish to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia who had the floor, the junior Senator, and to make a brief statement.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], for that purpose, without losing the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr .STENNIS. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

I highly commend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] for his very pertinent and effective remarks that he has made here today. I endorse every word that he said. Moreover, there is nothing more important on the calendar here now or hereafter than this matter. This question goes not only from the standpoint of the schoolchildren but the constitutional document of our great Nation.

Would the Senator yield me one-half minute?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. In less than 2 years since the passage of the Civil Rights Act, *all but 3½ percent of the school districts* have filed assurance agreements and have placed in effect school desegregation plans. When it is realized that this has been done, in an almost complete reversal of educational and social systems developed for generations, it is *clear that little more could be demanded.*

But we are now told that this is not enough, and in order to accomplish what some groups demand, the Office of Education has now issued these new orders which are so extreme and unreasonable as to destroy all sincere efforts that have been exerted in recent months. They go far beyond any Federal court order and they certainly exceed any authority intended to be conveyed by Congress.

My remarks are not directed primarily toward those education officials at the national level who have attempted to work with the affected States in arriving at workable agreements. These new and harsh guidelines are the result of policy of higher authority brought about as a direct result of the pressure that is being placed upon them at the national level by groups and organizations who are interested more in advancing their own interests and the interests of certain civil-rights organizations than they are in really providing progress in education. These pressure groups should not be allowed to actually force education officials, national or local, to take action that is really contrary to the best interests of education and the schoolchildren.

The new guidelines go far beyond any legal requirement yet pronounced by the courts or the Congress and in fact make race a consideration when the Supreme Court has said this must not be done in any public policy determination.

The guidelines make school officials responsible for preparing students, teachers and all other personnel, and the community in general for the successful desegregation of the school system. If there is any group which should not be burdened with this responsibility, it is the school administrators and staffs. Their job is to establish and administer the best possible education program for all the children in the district. It is not to serve as a public relations representative for the Office of Education or any other group.

If allowed to stand, these new orders will completely disrupt the good progress that has been made. I, therefore, call on the Commissioner of Education, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the President of the United States to rescind these guidelines. If this is not done, I believe it is the solemn responsibility of the Congress to exercise *its constitutional authority by striking* down these regulations. Only by such action can our constitutional system be preserved and the welfare of all our people be protected.

I hope that we can in some way strike them down.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes without observing the rule of germaneness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to express my agreement with everything said by the senior Senator from Georgia, *the junior Senator from Georgia, and the* junior Senator from Mississippi on the subject of the guidelines laid down by the *Office of Education of the Department of* Health, Education, and Welfare.

These guidelines represent bureaucratic tyranny at its worst.

When title VI of the civil rights law of 1964 was before the Senate I opposed it and I prophesied then that under title VI Federal bureaucrats would use Federal grants to bribe or browbeat people throughout the United States into acceptance of their personal notions regardless of what the law of the land might be.

It has been held time and again by the Federal courts, that neither Brown against The Board of Education of Topeka nor the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment requires that schools be desegregated.

On the contrary these decisions say all that is required by Brown against The Board of Education of Topeka and the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment as interpreted in that case is that no child shall be excluded from any school on the basis of race.

These decisions say that if all the schools in a district are open to schoolchildren irrespective of race, the schoolchildren of the two races have a right to attend separate schools, just as they have a right to attend separate churches.

It has been said time and again that Federal aid does not result in Federal control. The administrators of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are doing all they can to show that this statement is not true. Professing to act under title VI, the Office of Education is seeking to compel every school district in the South to assign teachers to schools selected by it, and to assign schoolchildren to schools selected by it, in order to bring about what the 14th amendment does not require—desegregation contrary to the decisions of the courts and title VI and in some cases against the wishes of the people who live in those school districts.

These guidelines illustrate bureaucratic tyranny at its worst. They are without parallel in the history of the Nation, in that they seek to rob the people of the country of their constitutional and legal rights as declared by the Federal courts.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that the guidelines require that even the parents of students have no control as to where the children shall be assigned. I quote from section 181.42 of the guidelines. *Part 2 thereof reads:*

> A student may exercise his own choice if he (1) is exercising a choice for the ninth or a higher grade, or (2) has reached the age of 15 at the time of the exercise of choice. Such a choice by a student is controlling unless a different choice is exercised for him by his parent, or other adult person acting as his parent, during the period in which the student exercises his choice.

In other words, the Department is adopting a Hitlerite type of decree that takes responsibility away from the parents for the sending of children to schools and gives a *15-year-old* or a ninth-grader the right to make a choice against the wishes of his parents. Is *not that correct?*

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; it represents an attempt on the part of the Office of Education to dominate completely all the school districts of the South.

Mr. TALMADGE. It means that families are denied the right to exercise the parental authority to send their children to schools of their choice.

Mr. ERVIN. That is why I say that the guidelines illustrate bureaucratic tyranny at its worst. So far as I am concerned, from my study of American history, this action is without parallel in the history of the Nation.

Mr. TALMADGE. I agree with the able Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. It shows why Congress is foolish when it delegates to bureaucrats the power to make law instead of making law itself.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. NELSON obtained the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I had promised to yield to two Senators who were in the Chamber. First, what is the parliamentary situation? I understand that a vote is to take place at 2 o'clock, and that all the time that is now being consumed is being taken from the time for debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. He may yield if he wishes.

Mr. NELSON. Is the agreement that the Senate will vote at 2 o'clock still in effect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; and there is no control of the time.

Mr. NELSON. I shall yield 1 minute to each of the three Senators who are now seeking the floor, because I desire to offer an amendment and to make a speech concerning it before 2 o'clock.

I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

MARK S. WATSON—A JOURNALIST FOR ALL TIMES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last Friday death stole from among us one of the great journalists of our Nation—Mark S. Watson, military correspondent of the Baltimore Sun and a great Marylander.

Mark Watson exemplified the highest virtues of the journalistic profession—integrity, accuracy, insight, energy, persistence, affability, and objectivity. President Johnson called him "the newspaperman's newspaperman." Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said:

> If ever an American deserved the description, "gentleman of the press," it was Mark Watson.

Dean of the Pentagon's press corps, winner of the Pulitzer Prize and the Presidential Medal of Freedom, Mark Watson brought his enormous talent to bear on great public issues for nearly half a century as a member of the staff of the Baltimore Sun.

He was a man on the run, rationing his seconds, frequently filing two dispatches a day, and always dispassionately searching out the heart of the news for his readers.

Mark Watson's career as a journalist spanned 60 years. From his college days as reporter-editor-typesetter for the Plattsburgh, N.Y., press, to the invasions of Sicily and Normandy, and through the nuclear age, Watson pursued a life of vigor and adventure which followed and reported history all across our planet.

He got the first interview with Carranza during the Mexican upheavals of 1916. He enlisted and fought in France during the First World War, narrowly averting death when a shell from the German's giant gun Big Bertha fell beside his tent one night, but failed to explode. He went ashore with the great European invasions of World War II and, doubling as an interpreter for the lead column of our 4th Division, entered Paris with the liberating forces.

The Berlin airlift, the advent of the balance of nuclear terror, the Korean war, the creation of the ballistic missile, nuclear submarines, men in space, the war in Vietnam—one after another the milestones of military and national history were passed, scrutinized, and illuminatingly reported by this master of journalism, this giant among reporters, Mark Watson.

He died at 78.

We have lost a great man, a friend of truth, a reporter whose life was devoted to making the events of our time clearer and more meaningful to each of us. My family has lost a good friend, a respected associate in the public's service. For many years Mark Watson was one of my late father's close friends.

In the clutter and rush of day to day events, the words Mark Watson wrote will doubtless fade from mind. But Mark Watson will not. For what he was—truth, integrity, burning ability—stand as a timeless example of journalism's highest art.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a number of articles and editorials noting the passing of Mark Watson.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MARK S. WATSON

Throughout his life, Mark S. Watson set for himself a standard of excellence in all respects, and followed it with a rare distinction. As is so often the case with truly outstanding men, his influence and his personality radiated from him in a series of waves that reached far—from his family, at the center of his life, and his closest personal friends, through his scores of close associates in Maryland and in the Sun, through the correspondents, officials and men in uniform at the Pentagon who knew him as a military correspondent, and on through the thousands of others who could feel that they knew him through reading his dispatches.

All who knew him, in any of these ways, will grieve at the passing of a very great gentleman but will treasure their own memories of him. He was a unique combination of intellect, knowledge, ability, industry and patience, blended with an enduring sense of humor and modesty. His work, and his conversation, sparkled with the light that gives meaning and depth to life. He was dedicated to his profession and to this newspaper. His courtesy to his associates was proverbial. We have been fortunate, through four decades and more. to have him as a professional colleague and to share in his advice and friendship. The scene which he is leaving will suffer from his passing.

MARK WATSON

He was not only the dean of military correspondents who wrote with great authority and incisiveness, he also was a gentle humorist beloved equally by his press colleagues and the men whose activities he reported. Mark Watson of the Baltimore Sun, who is dead at 78, brought great credit on himself his newspaper and his profession because of his understanding and erudition. More than this, he was a constant gentleman and a warm and compassionate human being. His contributions enriched this Capital and the country alike.

[From the Washington (D.C.] Post, Mar. 26, 1966]

MARK WATSON, 78, DIES—NOTED AS MILITARY WRITER

Mark Watson, 78, veteran military affairs correspondent for the Baltimore Sun and dean of the Pentagon press corps, died yesterday at his Baltimore home.

He won the Pulitzer Prize in 1945 for "distinguished international reporting." In

1963 the reporter, writer, editor, and military analyst who covered four wars became the first newsman to be awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Mr. Watson, who said he was "perpetually in terror of being retired," wrote two or three stories a day for his newspaper until a few months ago when he underwent two eye operations. He suffered a severe postoperative complication Wednesday.

A champion of and expert on the military, the small, slight man who seldom walked but jogged to save time turned out pages of copy written in an old-fashioned individualistic style every day from the Pentagon.

ESTEEMED BY COLLEAGUES

An officer in the Pentagon said recently: "This man has keys to doors in this building that he doesn't even know about."

He had a gentle and courtly manner with generals and privates, professionals and cub reporters alike—and carried the esteem of all of them. Elton C. Fay, veteran military writer for the Associated Press, recently summed up this respect while complimenting him on his speaking ability.

"This fellow is a magnificent public speaker with quiet droll humor pumped into his talk at just the right places to kill off any idea that he is a pundit of the so-called Washington Press Corps."

HELPED PUBLIC UNDERSTAND

Yesterday Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara called Mr. Watson "one of the great figures of military journalism."

"Mark Watson devoted a lifetime to informing the American people about military events and decisions and about the men and women in uniform for whom he had both respect and affection. His coverage made over the years a vital contribution to public understanding of the importance of national defense."

A different kind of praise came not long ago from a retiring Navy public relations officer. "In heaven," he said, "I know all the reporters must be Mark Watson."

Mr. Watson was one of the first correspondents to enter liberated Paris with U.S. troops in World War II. In fact, he rode into the city in a French civilian's car leading a column of the Army 4th Division.

His stories from Paris, credited with cinching his Pulitzer Prize, noted the human and moving details under the surface of the war.

"PURE WATSON"

One passage, described by his colleagues as "pure Watson," described French underground fighters shooting at fleeing Nazi's. "* * * Each of them was usually attended by a handsome young woman, which seems a marvelous way to conduct policework."

He also was one of the three newspaper correspondents permitted to attend the first interview granted by Marshal Pietro Badoglio when he became head of the Italian state after the fall of Mussolini.

During the war a series of articles by him was credited by many Air Force leaders, including Gen. Curtis LeMay, with helping save the daylight bombing program. Some leaders in Great Britain had feared too many planes would be lost in daylight attacks.

After Korea, Mr. Watson wrote articles which urged the Army team of rocket experts under Dr. Wernher von Braun be kept intact. The team was transferred to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration installation, Huntsville, Ala.

NATIVE OF NEW YORK STATE

Mr. Watson was born in Plattsburgh, N.Y., and graduated in 1908 from Union College, from which he later received two honorary degrees. He first joined the staff of his hometown newspaper, the Plattsburgh Daily Press, but was with the Chicago Daily Tribune when he became a military correspondent. He followed Gen. John J. Pershing's forces in pursuit of the Mexican leader Pancho Villa in 1916.

He was in Washington for the Tribune at the outbreak of World War I. He entered the Army as an artillery private but rose to major in a year and edited the Armed Forces newspaper, Stars and Stripes.

Between the wars he served as assistant managing editor of the Baltimore Sun from 1920 to 1927 and as editor of the Sunday Sun from 1927 to 1941. During World War II he reported from England, Sicily, Italy, Normandy and China.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, Mar. 25, 1966]

MARK WATSON, SUN WRITER, DIES AT 78

Mark S. Watson, veteran military affairs editor of the Sun, Pulizer Prize winner and dean of the Pentagon Press Corps died today at his home on Merryman Court.

He was 78 years old and had been in failing health for some months.

During his 57 years as newsman, writer, editor, and military analyst, Mr. Watson received many honors from his own and other governments, including the Presidential Medal of Freedom granted only to those persons who have earned distinction in the civilian life of this country and the world.

FOUR MAJOR WARS

Mr. Watson's newspaper career spanned the four major and many minor wars of this century—World War I, World War II, Korea, and Vietnam.

And many of the firsthand and analytical reports he wrote about those wars influenced the way they were conducted.

During World War II, for instance, Mr. Watson was credited by Air Force leaders—including Gen. Curtis E. Lemay—with helping to save the daylight bombing program of the U.S. Air Force.

That program was in jeopardy because influential heads of Great Britain feared too many planes would be lost in daylight attacks.

Similarly, after Korea when the Nation was foundering in its space efforts and attempts were made to break up the Army's team of rocket experts assembled under Wernher von Braun, it was a series of articles by Mr. Watson that persuaded national leaders to transfer the Von Braun team intact to the NASA installation at Huntsville, Ala.

He was one of the first to recognize how the development of the atomic bomb and nuclear power would revolutionize not only military affairs but also diplomatic and economic affairs.

The high regard in which Mr. Watson was held is indicated by the fact that the Army's historical section selected him to write and edit key parts of the official history of the "U.S. Army In World War II." Mr. Watson wrote the volume dealing with the "Chief of Staff: Prewar Plans and Preparations."

MEMBER OF 1947 MISSION

He also was an official member of the Wedemeyer Mission to China and Korea in 1957.

Mr. Watson won many citations from the Department of Defense, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

One of the proudest moments of his life, he recalled recently, was the fact that a grandson, Mark Watson Eager, 9, was able to witness a ceremony last December when the Army and the entire Pentagon press corps presented Mr. Watson a citation for meritorious service.

In person Mr. Watson was a man of great gentleness. His mild manner served to mask his great determination and passion for accuracy.

PHYSICALLY, MENTALLY FIT

He believed in keeping physically as well as mentally fit.

And when he recovered from a serious heart attack in his sixties, he continued to play tennis every Sunday afternoon.

Surviving Mr. Watson are his wife, the former Susan Elizabeth Owens; a sister, Miss Ellen Frances Watson, of Chimney Point, Vt.; two daughters, Mrs. Bainbridge Eager, of Washington, and Mrs. Susan Barnes Crosland, of London.

During World War II, Mr. Watson reported military action—and interpreted its meaning—from five major fronts in England, Africa, and Europe.

Mr. Watson's dispatches from those fronts won him journalism's highest prize in 1945, the Pulitzer Medal for distinguished reporting on international affairs.

He was one of three newspaper correspondents permitted to attend the first interview granted by Marshal Pietro Badoglio when the latter became head of the Italian state after the fall of Mussolini.

He was the first correspondent to enter liberated Paris with U.S. troops, and with three other correspondents and two Army officers he "captured" an Italian town.

During World War I, after enlisting in the Field Artillery, Mr. Watson was attached to the U.S. general headquarters in France and, after the armistice, was officer in charge of the Army newspaper, Stars and Stripes.

FIRST CARRANZA INTERVIEW

Earlier, Mr. Watson reported the internal difficulties in Mexico, which nearly involved this country in a small war of its own, and obtained the first interview with the revolutionary President Carranza, who headed the Mexican Government at the time of the Pershing punitive expedition of 1916.

Mr. Watson was born in Plattsburgh, N.Y., the great-grandson of a rather well-known agriculturist who had introduced county fairs and more serious farming innovations to western New York.

Some years ago, Mr. Watson wrote the following account of his early years:

"I was born June 24, 1887, in Plattsburgh, N.Y., graduated from Union College A.B. 1908, served during college vacations on Plattsburgh Press, Chicago Tribune 1909–14, publicity director (shame on me) for Panama-California Fair 1914–15, then back to Tribune 1915–17, variously in Mexico (getting Carranza's first interview), Canada for Dominion-at-war survey, Washington bureau, New York bureau, and editorial writing."

ROSE TO MAJOR

"Enlisted field artillery: AEF from August 1917 to July 1919, returning as major, field artillery. Managing editor Ladies Home Journal very briefly."

The exact date of Mr. Watson's enlistment was April 6, 1917, the day this country declared war, when he joined the Illinois artillery battery.

He was transferred to an officer's training camp at Fort Sheridan, commissioned a second lieutenant and was sent overseas the following September.

Shortly thereafter, he was transferred to the U.S. General Headquarters at Chaumont, France, where he remained on duty in the intelligence section until given field duty in October 1918.

MADE LASTING FRIENDSHIP

Mr. Watson's assignment at general headquarters was to prove invaluable experience when he became a war correspondent 25 years later.

He was in daily communication with officers whose friendship he was to retain throughout the peace and into another war.

After the armistice in November 1918, Mr. Watson returned from field duty to general headquarters and was almost immediately assigned as officer-in-charge of the Stars & Stripes.

Mr. Watson's job on the Stars & Stripes was not a conspicuously easy one, for his was a high-spirited, if talented, staff.

In the notes previously quoted, he wrote of this assignment as follows:

"For anything which might have gone wrong, I, of course, would have been responsible.

"It ought to be kept in mind, however, that the paper's usefulness was as the voice of the enlisted personnel, and the staff which had been accumulated during 1918 (Harold Ross, former editor of the New Yorker; Alex Woollcott, John T. Winterich, et al.) was wholly competent to get out a paper with very little advice from any brass-hat emissary.

"INFURIATED OFFICERS"

"While I had been stationed at GHQ, one of my numerous functions was to work at long distance to keep that whole staff out of the angry clutches of infuriated general officers and outraged military police. As officer-in-charge this was still my function."

Mr. Watson came to Baltimore, and the Sun papers, as assistant managing editor of the Sun in 1920, after quitting his shortlived job with the Ladies Home Journal.

He was assistant managing editor of the Sun until 1927, when he became Sunday editor.

He married Miss Susan Elizabeth Owens in 1921.

UNION COLLEGE DEGREE

In 1933, Union College awarded Mr. Watson the honorary degree of master of arts.

Mr. Watson's first extended writing on World War II was done late in 1939, when he wrote two lengthy series of articles for the Sun on the state of American defenses, which he found to be dismal.

Among the first detailed examinations of the lacks in the U.S. Army and Navy, these articles stressed the fact that fully 18 months would be needed to equip even a small army of 1 million men for purely defensive war on our own soil.

In June 1943, Mr. Watson went to Britain for what was to have been a 6-week trip. Instead, he remained to report the war from England, and then, after a tour of the north African front, from Sicily and Italy.

IN SALERNO LANDING

He watched the initial landings in Sicily in July and then made the landing at Salerno and remained in Italy covering frontline action until mid-December, when he returned to the United States for a short rest.

It was in September 1943, that Mr. Watson's account of it was dispatched. Several correspondents and two officers got ahead of the advancing columns of the U.S. 5th Army and captured a small Italian town.

On the first of the following month, Mr. Watson entered Naples with an Army major, riding in a jeep. The major, sitting next to Mr. Watson, suffered a flesh wound from a stray piece of shell.

On at least one other occasion, Mr. Watson, an extremely agile man, was forced to leap from a jeep into a ditch to avoid being struck by enemy fire.

BADOGLIO INTERVIEW

The interview with Marshal Badoglio occurred "somewhere in southern Italy" October 20, and Mr. Watson's account of it was distributed on behalf of the combined American press.

After his return to this country in December, Mr. Watson did a series of articles on aircraft carrier training and operations and wrote, as he had done before going overseas, on military affairs from Washington.

In April 1944, he went again to England and was covering the Supreme Allied Headquarters when the second front was opened June 6.

In 2 weeks he joined the U.S. 1st Army on its march to Cherbourg. He then accompanied the 1st Army to St. Lo, and on to Aachen.

GUIDED TROOPS INTO PARIS

It was in the course of that sweep across France that Mr. Watson found himself guiding the first American troops into Paris.

"It was the sort of thing that never should happen outside of Hollywood," he said in relating the experience upon his return to this country.

"When the first bunch of Americans got to the gates of Paris," he reported, "they discovered that nobody in the group could speak French or German. So there was a hasty conference and the upshot was that they drafted me to lead them in and explain our peaceful purposes to any inquisitive citizens."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
Mar. 26, 1966]

President, Pentagon Pay Watson Tribute

(By Henry L. Trewhitt)

Washington, March 25.—President Johnson joined civilian and military leaders of the Department of Defense today in tribute to Mark S. Watson, military correspondent of the Sun, who died this morning.

In a note to Mrs. Watson, the President said that the death of Mr. Watson, "brings sadness not only to his family but to a nation that values truth and integrity."

"For 46 years Mark Watson illuminated the Baltimore Sun," the President continued. "He has been my personal friend for many years. I shared with his friends his triumphs—the winning of the Pulitzer Prize in 1945 for his war reporting in the European theater of war and persistence of excellence that emerged in a steady stream of factual reporting of this Nation's conduct in the defense of its security.

MEMBER OF "RARE TRIBE"

"Mark Watson belonged to that rare tribe—growing smaller each year—the newspaperman's newspaperman. His values never diminished, nor did his search for accuracy.

"He shall be sorely missed."

Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, said:

"Mark Watson devoted a lifetime to informing the American people about military events and decisions and about the men and women in uniform for whom he had both respect and affection.

"He was a warm and winning man, and he leaves a gracious and illuminating heritage of authoritative reporting.

"A newsman of the finest professional standards, he searched courageously and tirelessly for the story, in peace and on the battlefield.

"COVERAGE LAUDED

"His coverage of military events, beginning in World War I, was of the highest order and made over the years a vital contribution to public understanding of the importance of national defense. We mourn his loss and extend our condolences to Mrs. Watson and members of his family."

Mr. Watson's death was a subject of conversation and sadness far beyond the standard sources of information in the offices and hallways of the vast Pentagon, which he knew intimately.

Rear Adm. William P. Mack, Navy Chief of Information, said that "the passing of Mark Watson grieves us all here in the Navy who have come to have unlimited respect and love for him."

GREETED BY BAND

When Mr. Watson entered the city August 25, as he "hesitatingly" informed his Maryland readers in a dispatch, a French band played "Marching Through Georgia."

The late Lee McCardell, another Sunpapers war correspondent, had entered the city the preceding day, with the French Forces of the Interior.

After the American airborne landing at Nijmegen, in Holland, Mr. Watson accompanied the ground troops which pushed up to support the airborne troops and spent some time with the 28d and 101st Airborne divisions.

"NAZIS OUTSMARTED ME"

Returning later to the Aachen sector, Mr. Watson decided that things were sufficiently quiet to permit a visit to the "forgotten" front along the Loire River.

"And that's how I came to miss the big counteroffensive in the Ardennes," he explained later. "The Nazis outsmarted me."

A student of history and military affairs, Mr. Watson interested himself in the whole complex panorama that is modern war. He wrote movingly of the effect of war on noncombatant civilian populations and sympathetically of its destruction of the great works of art and architecture.

PICTURE OF TOTAL WAR

Conservative in his interpretations he always sought to relate the particular situation of his immediate concern to the larger picture of total war.

More than once, he was described as a professional soldier's war correspondent.

On one occasion, someone in Baltimore sent a number of Mr. Watson's clippings to a friend in the U.S. Air Force in Italy.

The officer was so impressed that he showed the clippings to the chief public relations officer of the 5th Army. He, in turn, was so impressed that he showed the clippings to Gen. Mark Clark.

As for General Clark, he was so impressed that he insisted upon keeping the clippings.

TRIBUTE TO "GREAT PATRIOT"

"Mark's great qualities were worn lightly and gracefully, a joy to all who were privileged to work with him. Journalism has lost a giant and our country has lost a great patriot."

The Secretaries of the Army, Air Force and Navy issued statements and sent messages of condolence to Mrs. Watson.

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said Mr. Watson had contributed directly to the national security with his keen analysis.

COUNSEL ANALYSIS PRAISED

"As a lifelong soldier, I consider it a privilege to pay tribute to Mark Watson, who was equally devoted over a lifetime to the defense of this Nation," Wheeler stated.

"His intelligent analysis, honest writing, and wise counsel contributed in their own effective, individual ways to the strength of the American Military Establishment. If ever an American deserved the description, 'gentleman of the press,' it was Mark Watson."

Gen. John P. McConnell, Air Force Chief of Staff, said that "the Nation's fighting men have lost a good friend and the national security a valued guardian." Mr. Watson, he continued, had been held in the highest esteem for his wisdom, courtesy and integrity.

Stanley R. Resor, Secretary of the Army, said the news of Mr. Watson's death was received "with profound regret by all members of the U.S. Army.

"Mark distinguished himself as a great writer and newspaper man. He endeared himself to members of the Army through his clear and concise analysis of military activities. We shall miss him."

Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, said that "to those of us who watched and worked with Mark Watson, his death constitutes a loss for which words offer small consolation.

"Mark Watsons do not come along every day, but when they do the profession is adorned. And when they leave us they bequeath something indestructible and precious.

"We say: 'There was a man.' "

Paul H. Nitze, Secretary of the Navy, said Mr. Watson "will be missed by his many friends, both military and civilian of the Navy and Defense Department, who have always held him in the highest esteem. His objective and enviable style of writing has established a high standard of journalism for his contemporaries in the Pentagon press corps and those who are to follow."

Harold Brown, Secretary of the Air Force, said in a statement of tribute that Mr. Watson "always had the respect and friendship of the Air Force. We have lost a great correspondent who was recognized as the dean of the press corps."

Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Army Chief of Staff, and Brig. Gen. Keith L. Ware, Army Chief of Information, were among those who sent messages of condolence to Mrs. Watson.

Adm. David L. McDonald, Chief of Naval Operations, said Mr. Watson was "a good friend who made no demands, a patient advisor who initiated me into the ways of the press, and a newsman whose ethics and discretion will remain as a model for military correspondents for a long time."

TIMES' BALDWIN PRAISES WATSON

A fellow military analyst, Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times, paid this tribute to Mark Watson yesterday:

"The Sunpapers, Baltimore and the Nation have lost with Mark Watson's death, a fine newspaper man, a great American and above all, one of the warmest human beings I have ever known.

"I am proud to have worked under him."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
Mar. 26, 1966]

MARK WATSON, SUN MILITARY WRITER, FREEDOM MEDAL WINNER, DIES AT 78—HONORS INCLUDED 1945 PULITZER PRIZE, RESPECT OF PENTAGON, AFFECTION OF COLLEAGUES

Mark S. Watson, military correspondent of the Sun, died yesterday at his home, 1 Merryman Court, following a short illness. He was 78 years old.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete.

In more than a half century of newspaper work, Mr. Watson had won the highest award of journalism, the Pulitzer Prize, and the supreme civilian accolade of the Nation, the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Professionally, he was known over a great part of the world for his perceptive and accurate reporting. But beyond these things, he was the object of unusual esteem and affection among the men closest to him: sergeants and lieutenants, generals and admirals, and his fellow newspapermen.

Witnessing two world wars, and much that occurred before and after each, Mr. Watson understood what he saw, and wrote meaningfully about it.

DISPATCHES FROM PARIS

He never lost his flair for the human and amusing details that too often lie just beneath the surface of momentous events. His dispatches from Paris in the days of that city's liberation from the Germans in World War II are a case in point, and a delight to read today.

Attracted to newspaper work from his student days at Union College in Schenectady, N.Y., he eventually acquired a reputation that prompted an officer in the Pentagon to remark a few years ago: "This man has keys to doors in this building that even he doesn't know about."

On another occasion, a naval public information officer, long harassed by a demanding Pentagon press corps, addressed his valedictory to that group by observing: "In heaven I know all the reporters must be Mark Watsons."

ALWAYS ON THE GO

Mr. Watson was an enormously energetic individual who, though short, could outpace a 6-footer when in a hurry, which was practically always.

He played tennis into his early seventies, and even in later years, scurried along Government corridors and the wide sidewalks of the Capital like a man late for a train, which he sometimes was. Mr. Watson lived in Baltimore and commuted to Washington.

A remarkably self-disciplined individual, he rationed the seconds of the day. He would humorously chide a motorist friend, with whom he drove about Washington, for not rushing through the city's crowded intersections as the traffic light turned yellow, thereby saving a minute for later use.

This sort of schedule permitted him frequently to write two dispatches a day for the Sun, while gathering facts for a weekend interpretive piece or preparing an article for a military periodical.

In addition, he regularly wrote book reviews for his own and other publications. (A veteran editor once indicated that Mr. Watson was one of the few men he knew who thoroughly read the books he reviewed.)

At night he often fell asleep in bed, with his glasses on the tip of his nose and a book on his chest. A member of his family would remove the glasses and book and turn out the bedside light.

TRIBUTE TO ENDURANCE

A colleague once summed up the man's remarkable endurance this way: "I've traveled with him thousands of miles—to the North Pole, to the Panama jungles, to Europe and the Far East. He will start earlier, go harder, and last longer than any of us."

Colleagues found him a fascinating character.

"To me," said Hanson W. Baldwin, military analyst of the New York Times, "much of the best part of Mark Watson has never seen the light of public print; his personal letters are inimitable.

"He never lets himself go in the same manner when writing for the public. He always has a phrase or phrases which typify symbolically what he is talking about, and he does it with the right sense of humor and the correct words, which I have found unmatched."

SPEECHES PRAISED

Elton C. Fay, of the Associated Press, now retired, particularly enjoyed Mr. Watson's speeches, often delivered at luncheons in the Pentagon for departing officers or civilian officials.

"I have known a whole passel of newsmen in the past 40-odd years," said Mr. Fay, a close friend whom Mr. Watson delightedly addressed as "Old Man Fay" though senior to him by some years.

"The ones who wrote good, readable, beautiful copy couldn't talk worth a damn when they had to make a speech. But this old fellow is a magnificent public speaker with quiet droll humor tucked into his talk at just the right places to kill off any idea that he is a pundit of the so-called Washington press corps * * *."

Mr. Fay recalled a trip to West Point where his old friend had been invited to address the cadets. The talk was followed by a question-and-answer session.

"The questions were tough from those bright youngsters in the class," the AP's military affairs writer recalled. "He never faltered, never failed to answer a question, fielded the tough ones better than any man in the Washington stable of officials ever could do.

"The cadets were delighted, applauded his speech, then swarmed around him after the meeting adjourned to ask more questions."

TWO TYPES OF COURAGE

Mr. Watson's gentle humor and graciousness were not substitutes for courage, moral or physical.

Upon one occasion he politely interrupted a Defense Secretary who was talking about tank production rates and suggested that the subject was a military secret, not to be discussed in public.

When a boy, Mr. Watson very nearly drowned and, for the rest of his life lived with an exaggerated fear of the water. Yet at the amphibious invasion of Salerno, in World War II, he waded ashore with a full pack, enduring the double dread of death, from enemy fire and from the sea.

Typically, he wrote his family of the ordeal, humorously describing how he feared the water more than the battle.

FATHER A JUDGE

Mark Skinner Watson was born in Plattsburgh, N.Y., June 24, 1887, the son of Winslow Charles Watson, a country lawyer and judge, and Ella Barnes Watson.

Though he rarely mentioned the fact outside the family, one of Mr. Watson's forebears was among the first to settle in old Plymouth colony.

There came to America with the Pilgrims a man named Edward Winslow, a London printer, who had heard that the separatists from the Church of England, then in Holland, were in need of his craft. Winslow joined them, sailed to the New World on the Mayflower and later wrote a history of the Pilgrims. Mr. Watson was a direct descendant.

Another ancestor, a great-grandfather of Mr. Watson, was Elkanah Watson, secretary to Benjamin Franklin when he was Minister to France.

The Watsons were New Englanders in background, but some of them lived in eastern New York State, having early chosen to settle in the hills west of Lake Champlain.

Mark Watson, then, was technically an upstate New Yorker, having been born in the town on the west side of the lake. Here he grew up and attended Plattsburgh High School.

In 1908, he was graduated from Union College, where he took a liberal arts course and won honors in history and philosophy.

During college vacations he worked for the Plattsburgh Press as a reporter, editor, and a "typesetter when all the printers were tight," he said in later years. He also observed in this reminiscence of the newspaper business that he was then "as guileless as I now am concerning the mystery of why advertisers pay to get in."

After college, Mr. Watson went to work for the Chicago Tribune until 1914 when he left newspapering temporarily to become publicity director of the San Diego Exposition.

"Shame on me," he wrote parenthetically years afterward when remembering this brief departure from journalism.

However, he was back at the Tribune in 1915. His absence presumably produced that favorable effect on his editors that all reporters contemplate in their daydreams. In the next 2 years Mr. Watson began skimming some of the cream of newspaper work, getting assignments that sent him to Canada and Mexico and to the paper's New York and Washington bureaus.

His journey south of the border during Mexico's internal difficulties of that period brought him a first-rate exclusive. He obtained the first interview with the revolutionary President Carranza, who then headed the Mexican Government.

On April 6, 1917, the United States entered World War I.

ENLISTMENT IN GUARD

Mr. Watson, in New York for the Tribune, took a train back to Chicago and enlisted in an Illinois National Guard artillery battery. He returned to Chicago without telling his editors, apparently fearing they would attempt to dissuade a civilian nearing 30 from rushing into a potential combat unit.

Some time after his enlistment he was transferred to an officers' training camp at Fort Sheridan. Commissioned a second lieutenant, he went overseas the following September.

Mr. Watson was sent to U.S. general headquarters at Chaumont, France, where he remained on duty in the intelligence section until deviously acquiring a field assignment in October 1918.

He wrote orders recalling Stephen Early (later press secretary to President Franklin Roosevelt) from the front, and assigning one Mark Watson to replace him.

BIG BERTHA'S DUD

By background and training, Mr. Watson had had certain ideas about death and its predestined arrival, illustrated by the following family story:

Sleeping one night in a tent outside Paris with a fellow officer, he heard a sudden, loud thud very near. He did not bother to investigate, and advised his companion to roll over and go back to sleep. Next morning, the two men discovered that a German Big Bertha shell had hit the ground just outside their tent. It was, of course, a dud.

After the November armistice in 1918, Mr. Watson was named officer in charge of the soldiers' newspaper, Stars & Stripes. This job required him to exercise some sort of supervision over a spirited and talented staff that included such later literary lions as Alexander Woollcott and Harold Ross.

The period was a trying one, despite some of the happy memories the association eventually engendered.

RECOLLECTION OF PAPER

After Ross had become the renowned editor of the New Yorker and Woollcott had achieved fame as an author, critic and raconteur, their old boss of the Stars and Stripes days described how the military newspaper was run.

"For anything that might have gone wrong," recalled the former Captain Watson, "I, of course, was responsible. It ought to be kept in mind, however, that the paper's usefulness was as a voice of enlisted personnel, and that the staff which had been accumulated in 1918 * * * was wholly competent to put out the paper with very little advice from any brass-hat emissary.

"While I was stationed at GHQ one of my numerous functions was to work at long distance to keep that whole staff out of the angry clutches of the infuriated general officers and outraged military police. As officer-in-charge this was still my function.

"The creative work had been done and my job was merely one of supervision with an extremely tolerant eye. Of course, I am glad I had the experience but I cannot decently claim of that job more than it was," he wrote with a degree of modesty that frequently exasperated his friends.

Woollcott and Watson kept in touch through the years. Woollcott, whose personality and experiences were reflected in the play, "The Man Who Came To Dinner," frequently came to breakfast at the Watson house when in Baltimore.

Mr. Watson's daughter, Ellen (Mrs. Bainbridge Eager) remembers a particularly unhappy Mr. Woollcott at the breakfast table one Sunday morning when he recounted with some irritation the previous night's dinner at the White House with Franklin Roosevelt.

Mr. Roosevelt apparently was not one to yield the dinner-table podium without a struggle, and Mr. Woollcott, who bowed to few in the conversational arts had had a bad time of it at the Chief Executive's board.

The "town crier" of radio days made his displeasure quite clear that morning at breakfast, Mrs. Eager remembered.

BACK TO JOURNALISM

In 1919, Mr. Watson returned to the United States a major and turned again to journalism. This time he picked a magazine, the Ladies' Home Journal, where he labored as managing editor, briefly.

Despite the lofty title, he soon departed for the old regimen of the daily deadline. He came to Baltimore in 1920 to work for the Sun as an assistant managing editor. He later became Sunday editor.

On September 24, 1921, Mark Watson married Susan Elizabeth Owens, a Sun reporter and sister of John Owens, later editor-in-chief of the Sunpapers.

They had two daughters and more than four decades of close family life. The Watsons' second daughter is Mrs. Anthony Crosland, of London, wife of a Member of Parliament and a member of the British Cabinet.

In addition to his wife and two daughters, Mr. Watson is survived by a sister, Miss Ellen F. Watson, of Chimney Point, Vt. Mr. Watson's brother, Richard P. Watson, also of Chimney Point, died last fall.

Miss Watson was in the reference department of the Enoch Pratt Free Library for many years before her retirement.

STUDENT OF MILITARY HISTORY

Mr. Watson was a student of military history for much of his life. Though not regularly involved in military reporting in the 20 years between the two World Wars, he maintained from the first conflict associations that were to prove helpful when the second war began.

Lieutenants and captains in the American Expeditionary Force had, by the late thirties, moved considerably higher up the chain of command.

The approach of World War II prompted the Sun to move Mr. Watson from an editor's desk to Washington for a thorough study of the Nation's military posture.

The Watson examination was not flattering. A series of articles he wrote on the subject is said to have irritated President Roosevelt.

SECOND CAREER BEGINS

In any event the former overseer of Stars & Stripes was now actively engaged in military reporting. Already past 50, he had, in a sense, begun a second career.

Before the U.S. entry into World War II, Mr. Watson wrote many analytical reports from Washington on the progress of the war in Europe.

His output increased, naturally, after December 7, 1941.

Now that the United States was directly involved, the editors of the paper apparently thought there was a need for a deeper understanding of events than straight news reporting would allow.

Here Mark Watson was in his element and his columns began to appear in the paper under such headings as "Watson Observes" or "Mark Watson's Comment."

Here, too, the reporter had an opportunity to exhibit his penchant for the rounded sentence and the well-turned phrase. Thus he wrote one morning of the Philippine retreat in late January 1942:

"The steadily increasing concentration of Japanese strength against General MacArthur's left front [on the west coast of Luzon's Bataan peninsula] now has forced the considerable southward withdrawal which was expected."

Looking at the desert war in Africa the next day, Mr. Watson began:

"Painful as is the news from Libya, it should not be wholly unexpected.

"When the adroit German commander Rommel extricated himself from the British pincers 2 weeks ago and settled down in his fastness near El Agheila, it was clear that the immediate British threat to him was about finished. From El Agheila, an admirable defensive position, he was in position to withdraw still further toward Tripoli if he chose."

Despite wartime censorship, Mr. Watson in Washington was able to discern the significance of far-off events and sometimes relate these happenings to their eventual place in history.

In early June of 1942, the United States defeated the Japanese in what later proved to be the most decisive sea battle of the war in the Pacific. Of that event, Mr. Watson wrote from Washington on June 7, 1942:

"On a Sunday afternoon exactly 6 months ago today this country learned from Pearl Harbor what destruction can be inflicted upon the stoutest warships, and military installations and national confidence by the enemy's bold and wholesale use of his airplanes. The course of history came very near being turned on that day.

FRAGMENTARY REPORTS

"Today, with still fragmentary and insufficient reports of Admiral Nimitz's great victory off Midway, we have a much pleasanter lesson of a somewhat similar nature.

"It is a demonstration of what our own airplanes can do to destroy the most powerful sea-air force which Japan has ever sent against us. And, again, this battle may be of great importance in determining the course of the war and of history."

The following year, Mr. Watson was in the European theater describing war firsthand, but still with an eye on history. In a dispatch from the front in Sicily in August 1943, he wrote:

"The approach to the battle on this front covers centuries, so to speak. As one comes in by air from North Africa where Hannibal once trained his armies, the plane swoops over cities where ancient Rome erected upon foundations which the colonizing Greeks had left."

By this time Mr. Watson had below his byline the title of "Sunpapers Military Correspondent." As the war moved up the Italian peninsula, a further notation appeared beneath his name on a few important dispatches—"representing the combined American press."

June 6, 1944, was the day the Allies invaded France. Mr. Watson's name had, by this time, become so familiar to readers of the newspapers that the front-page makeup of that day included this brief, two-column headline: "Watson—Tactics."

Under that heading the reader found the usual careful analysis of fast-moving events. With a London dateline, Mr. Watson proceeded to analyze the cross-channel operation.

In the days that followed, he frequently led the front page with dispatches describing a wide area of action.

"Fresh gains of great importance all along the Allied front in Normandy * * *" his cable began June 14.

"American forces on the Cherbourg Peninsula today overcame German counterattacks" his lead began June 14.

"American troops today crashed through the last German resistance on the neck of the Cherbourg Peninsula" began his London dispatch June 18.

Mr. Watson moved with the American 1st Army through Normandy and in late August literally led a column of troops into Paris. His account of that day and Parisian reaction to the arrival of the Allies is fascinating to read, even decades later.

Entering the Paris suburbs with the American 4th Division, Mr. Watson was frequently called to the head of the line by a lieutenant colonel having trouble understanding the excited and foreign directions of the French, who were doing their best to direct the Americans to the city.

"I was called forward so often to interpret," he wrote in his dispatch, "that the affair wound up with me being placed in a French civilian's car to lead the way for our particular column.

"That is the sort of thing a newspaper correspondent dreams of but usually encounters only in the movies."

"PURE MARK WATSON"

In the city, itself, he went on to describe the wild and happy scenes along the Champs Elysees, at the Place de la Concorde, in the Rue de Rivoli, and at the Arc de Triomphe.

One encounter with French riflemen firing at German snipers in a Paris building, Mr. Watson described thus:

"Then we saw the riflemen lying in the road and standing back of the trees firing toward the Grand Palais, each of them usually attended, we noted with interest, by a handsome young woman, which seems a marvelous way to conduct police work."

Any newspaperman who had known this reporter would almost certainly say that that paragraph was "pure Mark Watson," combining the flair of the unusual with wry observation in expressing what has been seen.

His reports from Paris reflected a level of exultation that would seemingly make the rest of the war anticlimatic, but Mr. Watson (now 57) moved on with the troops to Germany.

RETURN TO PARIS

He returned to the United States in early 1945 for a brief rest but was back at Allied headquarters in Paris when Nazi Germany began to fall apart that spring.

It was in 1945 that Mr. Watson was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for distinguished reporting on international affairs.

With the end of World War II, Mr. Watson was back in Washington writing about demobilization, war surplus, and the congressional investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack.

During the next 5 years, the Watson name was beneath newspaper headlines reporting the Berlin airlift, the early development of military missiles, and finally, Korea.

Another conflict had begun, and Mr. Watson was writing about it. At the end of 1952, he was in Korea describing Dwight Eisenhower's visit to the war-torn country after his election in November.

Through the rest of that decade, this aging but vigorous man continued with enthusiasm reporting the significant military developments of the passing years; the first H-bomb test; the launching of the first nuclear-powered submarine, the *Nautilus*, and the increasing importance of ballistic missiles.

With the arrival of the 1960's, Mr. Watson, still writing, began receiving a series of honors from the military and civilian departments of the Government.

Typical of these was a citation from the Navy in June 1962, just before his 75th birthday.

CITATION BY NAVY

At a ceremony in the Secretary of the Navy's office in the Pentagon, Mr. Watson was read the citation, which said:

"For his outstanding contributions to the Department of the Navy in the field of public information. Mr. Watson's extensive background of military and naval knowledge has enabled him to report naval affairs with keen insight and understanding of the role of seapower as an instrument of national defense.

"In view of his professional competence and experience as a military writer, Mr. Watson has been called upon frequently to advise the chief of information and other high naval officials on public relations matters. His guidance in this respect has been invaluable.

"He has also contributed materially to the Navy's public information mission by his interpretative, analytical, and well-researched articles on naval subjects that have enhanced public opinion on behalf of the Navy. In recognition of and appreciation for his services, this award is approved this 22d day of June 1962."

The following year, President John Kennedy selected Mr. Watson to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom, "the highest civilian honor that the President can confer for service in peacetime."

Mr. Watson was the only newspaperman in the group of 31 citizens who received the award. Among the others were Marian Anderson, Ralph J. Bunche, James B. Conant, Jean Monnet, and Thornton Wilder.

And a little more than 3 months ago, Mr. Watson stood in the office of the Secretary of the Army, Stanley R. Resor.

MANY GENERALS PRESENT

There, too, were the Army's top generals, their numbers strengthened by many in retired status.

Speaking for everybody there, Mr. Resor said the "dean of the Pentagon press corps holds the respect and affection of all of us."

"As a distinguished reporter and interpreter of military affairs he has made great contributions to public understanding of national security problems and the role of the Army forces."

The Secretary of the Army said Mr. Watson's correspondence "has been and is unsurpassed for its clarity, soundness, thoroughness, and its responsible, constructive quality.

"He is the prototype and prime operational model of the ideal military reporter."

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS CAN STRENGTHEN GOVERNMENT EFFORT

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield me 1 minute?

Mr. NELSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the proposed United States-India Binational Foundation will bring to bear the experience of other large foundations that have proved their worth in working on major projects closely allied with governments and their objectives.

The experience of the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations has shown that private foundations can carry out certain useful activities more effectively than governments can and thereby broaden the range of useful public service.

The Ford Foundation, for example, makes grants in the fields of educational advance, public and economic affairs, international affairs, and overseas development. The conquest of hunger holds first place among the fields in which the Rockefeller Foundation makes grants, closely followed by the economic development field. Both foundations have made distinct contributions in these areas.

Like these established foundations, the proposed new Foundation would function primarily, as I understand it, as a grantmaking, rather than as an operating organization. It would serve as a continuing source of financing for new initiatives in education and science and will be supplementary to existing programs both public and private. It would encourage innovation and diversity beyond the normal range of publicly supported projects.

By supporting experimentation and innovation, and pinpointing and attacking bottlenecks, the Foundation should offer real promise in attacking certain of India's problems that urgently need solution. This will be one of the better uses of the large quantities of Indian money that we now have.

UNCONTROLLED DOMESTIC INFLATION

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield me 1 minute?

Mr. NELSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, much has been said on the floor of the Senate and in the news media about a series of interrelated problems, one concerning domestic inflation which is taking place at a skyrocketing rate, and one concerning our continuing deficit in the balance of payments, which is creating problems not only with respect to our gold supply, but also with respect to our relations with countries overseas.

It strikes me that nothing very effective has been done, while at the same time some ideas have been urged which will not cure the problem at all, but will make it worse.

Only the other day, I received from a friend of mine, Mr. Felix Wormser, an article entitled "The Dollar Seen From Geneva," written by Wilhelm Roepke, a reporter, which was published in the National Review of March 8, 1966, just before Mr. Roepke's death.

In his article, Mr. Roepke pointed out problems which European countries have had that are causing our balance-of-payments problems. Mr. Roepke's excellent article would, I think, be most helpful in our consideration of the overall problem of inflation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOLLAR SEEN FROM GENEVA

(By Wilhelm Roepke)

In an essay prepared only days before his death, the world-famous economist described how the U.S. monetary sickness looks to a classic European.

Americans seem to have no idea of the bitterness with which informed opinion in Europe judges the American monetary policy of the last 10 years; no idea of the disillusionment which it inspires in us. Thinking that our views are tainted with anti-Americanism, they tend to defend their policies merely as a reflex of national pride. The fact that a man like General de Gaulle, backed by one of the foremost monetary authorities of our time, Jacques Rueff (who has done for France what Einaudi did in Italy and Erhard and Vocke in Germany; i.e., restored economic order and sound currencies), has joined the European critics of American policy is hardly apt to disarm our American partners in such polemics.

Not enough has been said of this aspect of the dollar problem. One of its worst features is that it gives rise to such quarrels. Whenever an institution or policy brings the "geography of knowledge" into play, there is a strong prima facie case against that institution or policy.

To most Americans it must come as shock to hear that we have the most serious grievances against the present international monetary system and therefore, since the dollar is its keystone, against the American monetary policies of the last decade. We hesitate to be quite frank about it for fear of appearing ungrateful for past American help and for fear of adding fuel to rampant anti-Americanism.

An international monetary order which is not a mockery must answer two vital conditions; to be ideal it would also fulfill a third condition. The vital conditions are (1) free convertibility (to be defined by the absence of exchange control) and (2) a mechanism or a reliable habit which sees to it that disturbances in the external economic equilibrium of the individual countries (deficits or surpluses of their balance of payments) are kept within tolerable limits and corrected. The third condition (not vital, but highly desirable) is that this be attained together with stable exchange rates—though at the same time I must add that stable exchange rates are detrimental if the two vital conditions are not first fulfilled.

No amount of mockery at the gold standard can do away with the unshakable fact that this has been an international monetary system under which all three conditions—the two vital ones and the one desirable one had been fulfilled and that, so far, all efforts to find another international monetary system which does the same have been in vain and, in all likelihood, are condemned to be perpetually in vain. The gold standard—and it is simply unscientific to ignore or to contest this—has been up until now the only international monetary order the world has known. It is up to the adversaries of the gold standard to prove that another one is feasible.

IMPORTED INFLATION

Instead of a genuine monetary order we have restored, in the developed industrial countries at least, the minimum of convertibility required by a system of reasonably free and multilateral exchanges of commodities and services (though, by no means, of international capital movements) but not a system of keeping disequilibria of balances of payments within narrow limits and of removing them quickly. In consequence, we have enormous and tenacious deficits of the balances of payments of some countries to which must correspond equally enormous and tenacious surpluses of the other countries. That means, however, that the deficits of the first countries engendering surpluses in the latter countries have become the sources of inflation in these surplus-countries, because here the surpluses of the balances of payments are changed into additional national currency. That is the shortest possible description of what I proposed calling "imported inflation" almost 10 years ago. In this way, our present international monetary system—which, I repeat, does not deserve the name of "order"—amounts to what one of the most prominent European experts, Dr. M. W. Holtrop, Governor of the Dutch Central Bank and President of the Basle Bank for International Settlements, has stigmatized as an "international machinery to produce inflation."

The "creeping inflation" of our glorious age has, to be sure, various sources, but there can be little doubt that, in the average of the last decade, the principal and initial kind of inflation in countries like Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and Italy (until about 1962 and the unhappy apertura a sinistra) has been the "imported inflation"; i.e., an inflationary push communicated from abroad by the "monetizing" of the constant surpluses of the balances of payments of these countries. Communicated by what countries? Naturally by those which have been producing continuous deficits in their balances of payments. The principal country of this kind, however, has been the United States. Consequently, the main source of international inflation throughout the last 10 years has been the huge and chronic American deficits of the balance of payments which have been showing up either in a constant outflow of gold or in continuous increases of foreign holdings of dollars and bank balances.

Now the salient point is that this has happened because the United States is unique in combining two characteristics: (1) because the dollar is the main reserve currency of the present international monetary system, the United States is the real world banker, and (2) the United States has failed to live up to the responsibility which this position as the world banker implies by indulging in economic, monetary, social, and fiscal policies likely to produce billions of deficits in the balance of payments and thus to spread an inflationary infection over the whole world.

By and large and neglecting Great Britain, we may say that the United States is able to go on year after year producing enormous balance-of-payments deficits and indulging in constant monetary expansion without worrying much about the consequences of all this. It is the present world payments system which takes care of these worries by blessing the countries observing a higher degree of monetary discipline with surpluses of the balances of payments and consequent inflation.

There is no denying that the United States as the main reserve currency country enjoys an exceptional position. That it is, indeed, a privileged position becomes clear when we compare it with that of a country like Italy. For reasons not too dissimilar from those working in the United States, Italy became some years ago a country of large and stubborn deficits of her balance of payments. But the lira is not, like the dollar, a reserve currency. In contrast to the United States, therefore, the Italian Government could not rely on the rest of the world to relieve it of the trouble of restoring the balance of payments by accepting lire instead of gold and by making all sorts of credit arrangements to bail it out. Consequently, Italy had only the choice between a devaluation of the lira (not advisable for various reasons) and a policy of restraining the internal creation of money. She had to swallow the classical medicine which Keynes had so strongly recommended in the last public utterance of his life. It was a bitter draught by which she had to atone for the previous sins of excessive creation of money by public deficits and reckless wage increases.

Everybody will be familiar with the standard arguments offered in order to make the American deficits of the balance of payments appear as something special which cannot be compared with all other cases which follow the pattern of Italy. But it is almost tedious to refute them once more, and I wonder how many really believe in them any more, at least outside of the United States.

We are told that the dollar problem has nothing to do with an international monetary overpressure since the trouble is with the American balance of capital movements, not with the American balance of trade and services. Similarly, it is constantly denied that such a monetary cause is working in the American case since there is relatively little inflation in the United States in the shape of noticeable price and cost rises, and so forth.

There is a convincing answer to each one of these arguments, but it is not possible to go thoroughly into these questions in the present context. May it suffice to say that solid theory and ample experience prove that it is the function of the balance of trade and services to balance the capital movements of a country and that, if that is not so, something seems to be fundamentally wrong with the balance of payments, meaning in the American case that the surpluses of the balance of trade and services are evidently insufficient to offset the deficits of the capital balance. They are insufficient because there is monetary overpressure in the country which makes imports too large and exports too small. At the same time it is the absence of a stringent credit policy which, while perpetuating the monetary overpressure, tends to make the deficits of the capital balance greater than necessary.

The privileged position of the dollar enabled the American Government, in contrast to that of Italy or of France, to do nothing really efficacious to combat the balance of payments deficits by removing its causes. A very strong temptation which any government will find it difficult to resist. In fact, the American Government did not resist it; it actually has done nothing about its balance-of-payments problem that might serve to remove its causes. It has been relying on the inflation exported from the United States into the surplus countries to restore international equilibrium at the other end. Responsible Americans have been even cynical enough to admit it and to encourage inflation in those other countries while expressing displeasure when they tried to combat it by more stringent credit policies and rising discount rates.

Now there is a special reason why the United States did so thoroughly succumb to the temptation offered to them by the present world monetary system, sometimes called the gold exchange standard. In theory, it is conceivable that such a system does not become an "international machinery of inflation" because it is not logically cogent that the reserve currency country actually makes use of its privileged position. But privileges are rarely left unused. Moreover, in the case of the United States (as in that of Great Britain) it is our common misfortune that, on top of everything else, their monetary policy is in the hands of men of strongly post-Keynesian and therefore decidedly expansionist ideologies. The trouble, in other words, is that the gold exchange standard today is working under the worst possible conditions. The two countries which are its pillars (one of them being a quite minor one), the United States and Great Britain, are precisely those where a sort of archaic Keynesianism is endemic. We have a gold exchange standard plus Heller, Ackley, Thomas Balough e tutti quanti. By a sort of vicious circle, it is the privileged position of these world strongholds of unreformed Keynesianism which in turn makes it so tempting to cling to it because its inflationary effects are being exported. We, the people in the European surplus countries, are paying for it.

It is unlikely that the United States could get away with such a policy of flouting the balance-of-payments problem and of deliberately keeping its causes in force. The world will react by a growing distrust of the dollar as a monetary reserve and, despite growing American counterpressure, tend to insist more and more on being paid in gold. No ridiculing or theorizing will change this auri sacra fames. What can the United States do in response? It will join the advocates of the creation of some international substitute for gold which would relieve the pressure of the American gold reserves. That is what the present cry for more "international liquidity" amounts to. It means nothing else than the desire to keep the "international machine of inflation" going in spite of everything and to escape the necessity of returning to monetary discipline. There was another thing, however, which the United States was always tempted to do. It might try what some other countries in a similar plight have tried, the classical example being Nazi Germany in the late thirties. It might turn to the fatal course of repressing inflation instead of removing its causes.

That is precisely what the Johnson administration has been doing, after some beginning made earlier under Kennedy. What this American "repressed inflation" amounts to is the attempt on the part of the Government to put counterpressure to the increasing inflationary pressure and thus, after having allowed the latter to happen and being loath to stop it, to forbid its economic consequences by exchange control and the control of prices and, to some extent, of wages, whether by legal force or by politico-moral pressure. The American Government is actually mounting the beginnings of Zwangswirtschaft (coercive economy) which, in principle, resembles disquietingly the former German model. We must not, of course, exaggerate this parallel; there are differences of degree and of the means employed. The further difference is that, in the German model of 30 years ago (to which Keynes, by the way, had paid tribute at that time in the preface to the German translation of his magnum opus), wages were kept under the strictest possible control so as to prevent any cost inflation.

There is not the slightest doubt that this return to repressed inflation is a most dangerous course. It is no permanent substitute for a policy which restores the equilibrium of the balance of payments by removing the causes of its deficits, i.e., by restricting the creation of money and credit. If these causes are allowed to continue to work, the system of repressed inflation will have to be reinforced gradually. That means, however, that the free economic order of the leading country of the West will give way more and more to collectivism, and to coercion, its indispensable prerequisite. It means further that it will undermine world confidence in a world banker who has recourse to such discreditable measures. And so the vicious circle will go on—until it is understood by the responsible American authorities that there is only one remedy for the sick dollar: the return to monetary discipline.

What is the final lesson of all this? Undoubtedly this: that in the long run the privileged position given to the dollar by our present monetary system is of a very questionable benefit even for the United States. It makes it very difficult for the United States to resist the temptations involved in this privilege and thus to refuse a course which, first, embitters her friends abroad against her and finally endangers her own economic and social system in its foundations. We may conclude that the United States, in the last resort, has become like us all the victim of a wrong system of international payments. The first step in the right direction is to recognize this and see the dollar as we are bound to see it from Europe. With regard to international control of money it is true that all power tends to corrupt. It is a rotten system which implies such power.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I said that some things have been done which were not helpful so far as either the balance-of-payments problem or problems of inflation are concerned. One is that the President has urged an increase in our trade with Soviet bloc nations. Obviously, this will create problems for us, because, at the same time that was being done, we would be urging that our own people be stopped from shipping their livestock hides to other countries.

The other day, the Maritime Union and the Dockworkers' Union announced that they would not load any cargo which was destined to any country that was shipping into North Vietnam. It seems to me that that is a magnificent step ahead. I should like to see the Government do the same thing and say that we will use trade with the Soviet bloc as a weapon of national policy, instead of as an instrument to strengthen the economy of those countries that are fighting us through North Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excellent, hard-hitting editorial entitled "Hurrah for the Dockworkers," published in the Mining and Natural Resources Record of March 10, 1966.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HURRAH FOR THE DOCKWORKERS

Union labor has had its share of criticism in the last few years—some of it in these columns. Much of the criticism has been merited. But every now and then a labor union does something which deserves real commendation. So a great big pat on the back should be given to the dockworkers of our American seaports who have announced they will not load or unload ships which have been carrying supplies to North Vietnam.

We are much concerned about what is going on over there. We sometimes wonder if we are being told the whole truth. We sometimes ask why that war is being fought like the war in Korea, where our soldiers figuratively had one hand tied behind their backs, and were not allowed to go in and win. We think there is something phony in Washington. Too, we have been afraid this country is beginning to be a little too complacent. We have been fearful it is beginning to go the way of former democracies. History shows that as democracies become rich and affluent their people lose interest in government and seek more and more a life of ease which eventually enables a dictator to take over.

We think if a vote were taken in this country today it would be overwhelmingly in favor of cleaning up the Vietnam mess in short order with every available weapon that we have, excepting poison gas and nuclear bombs. We think that the North Vietnamese coast should be blockaded. We think our "allies" in Europe should be told either join us and help clean up Vietnam or stay out and shut up until we finish the job. We should certainly tell them they cannot continue to put trade ahead of the welfare and the lives of American soldiers and at the same time expect us to continue giving them all manner of money and protection. We think every foreign vessel which attempts to unload supplies at the harbor of Haiphong should at once be seized and impounded until this struggle is over.

In short, we are getting sick and tired of seeing American boys needlessly killed or maimed because European countries not only lack the guts to get in there and help but actually protest against American boys fighting the communistic invasion of South Vietnam. What would happen to Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and adjoining nations if our soldiers were pulled out of Vietnam?

We note that Washington officials have said the seamen's union or the dockworkers union was wrong in refusing to load or unload such ships. We say the unions are right and more power to them.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE TIRES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2669) to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 18, beginning with line 3, strike out down through line 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"UNIFORM GRADING SYSTEM FOR MOTOR VEHICLE TIRES

"SEC. 10. In order to assist the consumer to make an informed choice in the purchase of motor vehicle tires, within 1 year after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prescribe by order, and publish in the Federal Register, a uniform quality grading system for motor vehicle tires. Such order shall become effective 180 days from the date on which such order was published. The Secretary shall also cooperate with industry and the Federal Trade Commission to the maximum extent practicable in efforts to eliminate deceptive and confusing tire nomenclature and marketing practices."

On page 22, line 6, strike out "or 8" and insert in lieu thereof "8 or 10".

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by changing "one year" to "two years" in line 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is so modified.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, unfortunately I could not be present when the Senator from Wisconsin offered his amendment to the committee amendment. I was attending a meeting in the majority leader's office.

The reason that provision is made in the bill for 3 years is that, to the best of my knowledge, the testimony from the Department of Commerce—which Department will be responsible for the administration of this legislation—is that they will require that much time, and perhaps even more time in some cases. It was felt that they might require 5 years, and the provision for 5 years was incorporated in the original bill.

The Senator from Wisconsin has worked hard on this matter for a long time. He has done yeoman service in pressing for legislation in this very important field of tire safety. The same thing is true of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. I believe that the sooner this is accomplished the better it will be.

I do not wish to push the Secretary of Commerce to the extent that he might do a haphazard job, in which event there might be confusion at the end of 1 year.

I think that perhaps a 2-year term would be sufficient. I see no reason that the job cannot be accomplished in that period of time.

Since the 5-year period was originally proposed, we have had much activity in the field. We have come along the road a long way, and perhaps the necessary period has been reduced a couple of years because of the activity.

So I shall be happy to accept the Senator's amendment, because he is very knowledgeable in the field, but would suggest for the RECORD that if the Department of Commerce feel they need more time, or that they can do it in less time—and I wish the RECORD to show we are hopeful that they can do it in less than 2 years, perhaps in 1 year—that they will have ample opportunity to bring the matter to the attention of the other committee in the House.

I repeat, I am happy to accept the Senator's amendment and get the bill on its way, which we wish to do as soon as possible.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator from Washington. He is correct in his historical statement of how long some were guessing it would take to develop a feasible quality grading system. When I first introduced the resolution in 1964, I had no notion how difficult the problem might be. Since that time, I, as well as many others, have had an opportunity to discuss the matter with experts in the field, who have advised us it would take much less time.

The Automobile Development Association of Princeton, N.J., under the direction of a very distinguished engineer, Mr. Heitzman, formerly a research engineer for General Motors, prepared, at the request of Mr. Ralph Nader, a system of grading for tire safety and quality. It took this engineering group only 30 days to do it.

It depends, of course, on how extensive a grading system is desired, but there is no doubt in my mind that the Secretary of Commerce could come up with a feasible grading system covering the obvious points, at least, without any trouble within a year. I called a distinguished authority in New York about it the day before yesterday, and he agreed that a year was sufficient time.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the distinguished chairman of the committee, this is a very important measure. This is the type of bill that, once it becomes law, will actually save lives.

I take this opportunity to give the strongest sort of praise to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for pushing this matter and calling to the attention of Congress and the country the importance of safe tires and of this proposal. The distinguished Senator from Washington, as chairman of the committee, was able to see the importance of the measure. He has brought to the floor today a very important bill, and I am wholeheartedly in accord with the measure and with the amendment suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me a moment—

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would like to add briefly to what I have said.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes; go ahead.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I concur with the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin that the fact is that a bill such as this could have been lying around Congress for half a dozen years and gone nowhere, except for the interest and concern of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Wisconsin.

I further suggest that we have another important bill in the committee on general automobile safety. I did not have the opportunity to say so when the Senator from Connecticut testified, but I know of no one who contributed more to the work of the committee than he, by his testimony that day. As a matter of fact, we threatened to keep him on, not only all morning—which we did—but even to put him on in the afternoon, because of his vast background.

It should be made absolutely clear that the grading system has very little to do with minimum safety standards. Confusion in tire marking is certainly an irritable and undesirable condition, but it does not involve the safety feature.

One of the reasons why it was thought advisable that some time be spent on this matter was because, in developing a tire grading system, we will be taking a very significant step. I believe this is the first time a manufactured product has been subjected to Government grading; and that fact poses some other questions pertinent to the whole field of grading of manufactured products.

That is another reason why there may be a little more to do than consider merely the problem of tire safety. When we get into the question how we are going to grade, what guidelines or precedents we are going to set on the question of the Government's subjecting a manufactured product to grading, there are many considerations involved. I think that should be made clear.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I think that the Senator from Wisconsin—I do not wish to speak for him, but I know I feel that grading is very important, because I think the exhaustive research done by the Senator from Wisconsin—and I have read his speeches with great care—makes the point that today the average consumer and buyer has not the slightest idea what he is paying for. Tires come with all types of fancy names.

There is absolutely no way to know the value you are getting for your money; and while the chairman is absolutely correct, that the grading has nothing to do with minimum safety standards, yet from the consumer's standpoint, I think he should be aware of what type of tire he is getting, and whether he is paying a proper price for it. Grading is important.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, it is very important.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would hope when the Secretary has the time, that he will take this into account and come up with a serious study and a set of feasible standards, so that the consuming public may know what they are buying and what they are paying for.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I agree with both Senators. I do not own an automobile, and I do not purchase tires; but since we have gotten into the matter. I have taken a look at some tires. I cannot tell what the descriptions mean to distinguish one from another; and I suppose the average member of the public is in the same situation.

I do think grading is important; but as I have pointed out, we are embarking on a new field, the entire question of the Government imposing standards on manufactured products. We wish to be practical, and to be sure that we are taking the right steps.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the part of the report, on page 6, under the heading of "Quality grading," which sets forth what we are trying to do.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUALITY GRADING

The committee knows of no consumer commodity more sharply characterized by confused and misleading nomenclature than the tire. Though no uniform grading system presently exists, the great majority of the private label marketers and domestic manufacturers market tires on the basis of an apparent grading system. Thus "premium," "first line," "second line," and "100 level," imply that an objective grading system exists. Yet these designations today have no uniform fixed meaning or definitive value. One marketer's "premium" is the inferior of another's "third line" tire—and a single manufacturer may market a tire under its own brand name as a "3d level" tire while his private label customer markets the same tire as a "first line" tire.

Tires are unlike many consumer items which are bought, rapidly consumed, and bought again. The tire consumer has little opportunity to sample and test for himself the quality of each of the multitude of brands marketed. Fortunately, he need not buy a new set of tires every week.

But while the manufacturers and marketers establish some individual grading system for their own lines, tire manufacturers insist that the uniform quality grading of tires is "impractical."

Because the committee lacks the technical capacity to proclaim whether a quality grading system for tires is indeed "practical," we would direct the Secretary of Commerce, under the bill, to determine the feasibility of such a grading system, and if such a system is indeed feasible, to determine how such system can best be implemented. As the Department of Commerce develops expertise in the field of tire grading, the committee feels that it should work closely with both the Federal Trade Commission and industry in efforts to eliminate current deception and confusion in tire nomenclature and marketing practices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Wisconsin to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senate is considering today a historic piece of legislation which will, for the first time, establish meaningful standards for automobile tires which will help to safeguard the American public and reduce the terrible toll of death on our highways.

On this occasion, it is appropriate to review the background of this legislation. We should review the grave public safety problem which brought it about, and what this legislation will do to meet this problem.

THE TIRE SCANDAL

I think that history will record 1965 and 1966 as the years when the American public discovered a scandal in automobile tires.

Last year, we killed 49,000 people on our highways. We inflicted disabling injuries on 1,800,000 people—enough to fill almost every hospital bed in America—and we inflicted nondisabling injuries on another 1,800,000. The dollar cost of automobile accidents last year has been estimated at $8 billion.

These facts have been cited by others on many occasions—so often in fact that the American public sometimes seems immune to them. To put them in perspective, let me point out by comparison that we killed 253 people on scheduled airlines during 1965. And the total of American deaths in the war in Vietnam presently stands at about 2,000. It seems probable that over the next 5 years we will kill on the highways of this country as many people as we lost to enemy action in all 4 years in World War II. In the next decade, we can expect to kill more than 500,000 people and injure about 40 million.

Among young people from 1 to 24 years of age, motor vehicle accidents are now the No. 1 cause of death. More than one-third of our highway fatalities are youngsters in this age group.

These death and injury figures are so staggering that we must move against them with every weapon at our disposal. The causes of automobile deaths are complex. We must take action at every level of government if we are going to make any meaningful effort to reduce them.

In the past 2 years, it has become crystal clear that automobile tire failure is responsible for a significant number of these highway deaths. No one can say exactly how many deaths are caused by tire failure, and no serious student of our highway safety problem would ever imply that tire legislation alone will solve the entire problem.

Nevertheless, since I first raised this issue, I have been swamped with letters from motorists all over the country telling the most appalling stories of automobile tire failures which led to accidents, injuries, and deaths.

Here in the Senate today, we will act on a significant piece of legislation which should be just one part of an aroused Nation's effort to meet the scandal of highway slaughter.

THE LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

I introduced the first tire safety legislation in May of 1964, in response to an alarm sounded by some of my own constituents who had had disastrous experiences involving tire failure. This was a modest proposal to have the Government draw up tire safety standards but involving no enforcement or compliance requirements whatever.

That proposal and the efforts of many others helped to touch off a nationwide discussion of the tire safety problem.

One of the most significant developments which followed was a series of hearings conducted by the Federal Trade Commission in January of 1965. Here for the first time, the shocking facts on automobile tires were told to the American people by the top officials of the American tire industry. They admitted under questioning:

First. That many new automobiles are being sold with tires which are not designed to carry the normal load for which the automobile was designed.

Second. That size labels on tires—the only basis a motorist has for determining load capacity—were never meant to indicate the precise size. An 8.00 by 14 tire, which official tables indicate should carry an 1,180-pound load, may actually be smaller than a 7.50 by 14 tire, which is supposed to carry only 1,090 pounds.

Third. That quality labels on tires, such as deluxe, premium, and first-line, have no meaning whatever and "there is no way to tell one tire grade from another."

Fourth. That the ply or ply-rating labels on tires—which are crucial in determining strength—have "no understandable meaning any more," in the view of one tire industry spokesman.

The FTC Commissioners were as shocked as I at these revelations. The FTC Chairman, Paul Rand Dixon, after hearing this testimony, commented that "anyone in his right mind" buying a new car would ask the dealer to install larger and safer tires than are normally supplied.

THE AUTOMAKERS REPLY

It seemed unbelievable to me, despite this impressive testimony, that the automobile industry would countenance a scandal as grave as this. For that reason, I wrote to the presidents of the four major automobile manufacturing firms to ask them directly whether the tires supplied with their new cars were adequate to carry the loads for which the cars were designed.

To my astonishment, not a single automobile manufacturer replied with an unqualified "Yes."

American Motors replied that its cars could safely carry a full load, provided the tires were specially inflated. If this was done, American Motors said its cars were "adequate for occasional full-load service."

General Motors stated that the design guide in selecting tires was three passengers, but that its sedans could safely carry six passengers plus 200 pounds of luggage, provided the tires were specially inflated.

Chrysler said simply that its tires were adequate "provided they are properly maintained." But it uses similar tires and its cars have similar weights so apparently the same principles apply.

The Ford Motor Co. said that it has been customary to make tire selections on the basis of a three-passenger load. But Ford said its sedans could carry six passengers plus luggage if the tires were specially inflated.

The complicated rules for tire inflation, the automobile manufacturers said, could be found somewhere in the manual supplied with each new car. They expect that each motorist will know the weight of his car, its occupants, and also its accessories, equipment and luggage to within a few hundred pounds, and that he will carefully inflate his tires so that they will be able to carry full normal loads.

I ask you to remember this injunction to the motorist—this responsibility for determining a tire's maximum tire-carrying capacity—in the light of expert testimony which I will cite later.

The May 1965 issue of Consumer Bulletin magazine, on the basis of apparently reliable statistics, stated that:

> The full-size Ford, Chevrolet, and Plymouth "have overloaded tires, and we suggest that the consumer order his car with tires of the next larger size."

PERSONAL CASE HISTORIES

These disclosures of brandnew cars with overloaded tires seemed to explain the strange instances of tire failure on new cars which have been pouring into my office since I first mentioned this subject.

For instance, Paul Worland of Cheyenne, Wyo., bought a new model of one of our most popular medium-priced cars.

> At 800 miles, I had my first blowout—

He wrote me—

> At 1,500 miles, I had my second, and when the car was 3 months and 21 days old, I had another blowout—just as I was passing another car. My wife was painfully injured. I totally wrecked my new car and damaged the other to the extent of several hundred dollars.

Clifton Hill of Northville, Mich., told of buying a new model of one of our high-priced cars in November 1963.

> When there was 6,000 miles on the car—

He wrote me—

> one tire blew out and caused me to cross over a median of a super highway in Canada and almost have a fatal accident. At 7,200 miles another tire blew out at Gaylord, Mich., causing me to go into a ditch.

Mrs. Richard Williams of Hermosa Beach, Calif., wrote me that her family had set out from California in a brand-new, medium-priced station wagon with five new tires.

> Before we returned, we had blown out all five tires—

Mrs. Williams wrote.

> While traveling through Arizona, out in the middle of nowhere, we blew two tires at one time.

These are random samples of several hundred letters I have received.

To me, this firsthand testimony, combined with the admissions of the tire industry officials before the FTC and the automobile manufacturers in their letters to me, proved the existence of an extremely grave tire safety problem.

As I stated at the time, it was obvious that thousands of American families were buying new cars in the belief that they were adequate for the use for which they were designed, filling them up with children and luggage, and setting out across our highways, often at high speed, unaware that they were driving on overloaded tires which could fail at any time.

NEW "BOMBSHELL" TESTIMONY

However, it was not until a lengthy court trial late last year in San Francisco, Calif., that we received the really conclusive testimony on the American tire scandal.

I want to point out that although a judgment for $207,375 was entered in this case against one of our major tire manufacturers, the B. F. Goodrich Co., the case has not yet been concluded. Goodrich plans to appeal. I do not wish in any way to prejudge the specific questions which were at issue in this case. I make no determination as to any negligence or liability among the various parties involved. Regardless of whether this case is ultimately decided in favor of the plaintiff or the defendant, the sworn testimony provided by top officials of the tire and automobile industries should shock the Nation.

This testimony should prove once and for all why tires are failing on some of our finest new cars and causing tragic injuries and death.

This case involves a 1961 six-passenger Chevrolet station wagon which was carrying six women. It was equipped with 8.00 by 14 Goodrich Silvertown four-ply rayon first-line tires—the model tire which was regularly supplied with such cars by General Motors and also the tire recommended for replacement purposes by Goodrich. The accident which led to this damage suit was caused when the inner sidewall of one of these tires blew out. The car veered across the highway and overturned. Two of the women were killed and four were injured. The owner of the car, whose wife was one of those killed, sued Goodrich.

The defense produced as its expert witness the western region service manager for the company, Harold J. Poole of Los Angeles. He was identified as a man with long experience with the company and an acknowledged authority.

This company expert made a detailed investigation of the accident and of the tire which failed.

He testified that this fatal blowout was not caused by any defect in the tire nor by any specific instance of abuse which it suffered. He said that the tire failed because it was driven in an overloaded condition, "either not enough air pressure or too much load on the tire, and either one will give you exactly the same appearance condition."

This tire company witness, and others who followed him onto the stand, testified in detail exactly why tires fail from overloading or underinflation.

SIDEWALL FLEXING BLAMED

The sidewalls of an overloaded tire bulge and undergo much more flexing than in a normally loaded tire. If this condition continues for some time, the tire can be permanently damaged.

Picking up the testimony at that point, let me quote this tire industry expert:

> If the tire is overloaded or underinflated, it can receive a blow in the sidewall which will start—maybe it won't break through at that point—but it will start a weakening of the cords. The cords will weaken and they will travel around the tire, either in this area (pointing to one section of the tire) or this area up here. When you see this (pointing to the tire) it may have started from a slight impact but it will always indicate that the tire was operated overloaded or underinflated.
>
> The failure of the tire can result from a flexing in the sidewall or shoulder area, which is due to overload or underinflation.
>
> The blow might not necessarily rupture the cords, but it will weaken the cords, and the continued flexing will cause the tire to fail. And it will show this flex break which is either in the shoulder or in the sidewall.

Referring to the specific blowout which caused this accident, this tire industry expert testified:

> I assume that the blow occurred when the tire was overloaded or underinflated, or occurred after the tire had been overloaded or underinflated, and the blow itself weakened the sidewall of the tire which was probably flexing abnormally due to the overload or underinflation. This probably broke through several cords and that is what started the flex break. * * * This was probably a very light blow that the tire probably should have been able to withstand if it weren't for the overload and underinflation which probably weakened the cords. Now, even if the injury * * * wasn't there, I believe that the tire would still have failed from the overload and underinflation condition.

RUPTURE WOULD BE EXPECTED

This tire industry witness was examined and cross-examined at length. He testified repeatedly that the tires on this car apparently had not been abused, except for overloading, and that he would normally expect the tires on this car to have lasted for another 14,000 miles or so if they had not been overloaded.

This witness was asked:

> Question. You would expect a tire that is overloaded to fail by a rupture?
>
> Answer. Yes, sir.

Once this tire industry witness had testified that he would expect an overloaded tire to rupture, the crucial question became the degree of overload necessary to cause such a rupture. After considerable give and take, he testified that he would expect the failure to occur in tires that were 25 to 50 percent overloaded.

In other words—

He was asked—

> assuming that the load capacity of this tire was 1,175 pounds, you would say that if that tire was driven carrying a weight 25 percent or more above its normal carrying capacity, that would be an abuse?

He answered—

> Yes, sir.
>
> Question. And you would expect such a tire to fail before its tread would wear out?
>
> Answer. I would expect it probably would. Now, the tire might deliver full service but there would be an expectancy that it would fail before the complete tread was gone.
>
> Question. In other words, by "fail," you mean there would be a rupture of the kind that you see here or some such thing?
>
> Answer. Yes.
>
> Question. Are you trying to tell us * * * that every one of your tires that would be run overloaded would be expected to rupture?
>
> Answer. There would be an expectancy. Yes, sir.
>
> Question. Every one would be expected to rupture before you would wear out the initial tread on it?
>
> Answer. There would be an expectancy.

The witness stated that—

> some tires are built well enough that they make it, but there is always an expectancy of failure.

CAR WEIGHT REVEALED

Having testified that he would expect a tire to rupture if driven more than 25 percent overloaded, the witness was handed engineering specifications supplied by the manufacturer of the make of car involved in this lawsuit. He was shown that a nine-passenger station wagon of this make of car had a weight of 3,430 pounds on its rear wheels when loaded with six persons weighing 150 pounds.

> Question. That would mean that each of the wheels would carry half of that weight?
>
> Answer. Yes, sir.
>
> Question. Or 1,715 pounds?
>
> Answer. Yes, sir.
>
> Question. Now, you have testified that the maximum carrying capacity of each of your tires of this particular model is 1,175 pounds. Is that correct?
>
> Answer. That is, according to the recommended inflation table, yes, sir.
>
> Question. That would mean, would it not, that on this particular model of station wagon on which this particular tire would be suitable, according to the B. F. Goodrich Co., that each tire would be overloaded by 540 pounds?
>
> Answer. Yes, sir.
>
> Question. And 540 pounds, if I divide correctly, means that each tire would be 46 percent overloaded, is that correct?
>
> Answer. Yes, sir.
>
> Question. Now, do you recall testifying yesterday afternoon that, in your opinion, if you drove one of those tires at an overload condition of 25 percent, that you would expect the tire to rupture before the tread would wear out?
>
> Answer. Yes, sir.

OTHER EXPERTS AGREE

To me, this testimony came as a bombshell. Here we have the sworn testimony of a tire expert selected by the tire manufacturer, testifying that the tires which his company supplies and with which one of our leading automobile manufacturers equips one of their most popular cars, would be "expected to rupture" if the car were driven with a normal full load.

This sensational testimony was no isolated incident in this trial. Similar testimony was given by an independent tire expert, also called as a defense witness. This was Arthur W. Bull of Clearwater, Fla., who served for 33 years as a top tire engineer for the U.S. Rubber Co. and who was once president of the Tire and Rim Association, the industry's principal source of data on tire loads.

This independent tire expert also examined the tire involved in this fatal accident. His conclusion was that it had been "very carefully driven," but that “it was probably run at more than its rated load for some periods of time.” He concluded that the tire probably had struck a chuckhole while overloaded and had then ruptured about 1,000 miles later because of a fabric separation. He testified that when overloaded tires strike objects such as chuckholes, the rubber on the sidewall tends to become separated from the tire cords and some of the cords tend to break. This allows air to work its way through the sidewall, sometimes raising a bubble on the sidewall. He testified in vivid language:

> I believe this went over some kind of obstacle to produce an extra deflection at this point which started the initial separation. It started the ply separating and when it did that, you began to get a rubbing and heat generation in this area and that progresses rapidly * * * as that heat builds up the cords become weaker * * * and this whole thing is working as a sandwich, and gets hotter and hotter, and finally these cords can no longer stand that stressing and that temperature and they break, and the air gets out, forms a bubble on here, and only a few minutes later the bubble gets far enough to rub, and it bursts, and the tire starts losing air at a fairly fast pace.

This independent tire expert was asked for his estimate on just how much overloading tires could stand before they would suffer this bursting process.

For 65-mile-an-hour driving, he said:

> I think 30 percent overload would begin to get you in difficulties.

This witness was then shown engineering specifications which indicated that the six-passenger station wagon involved in the accident had an official loaded weight of 2,815 pounds on the rear wheels or 1,407 pounds per wheel compared with a load rating for the tires of 1,175 pounds. The manufacturer's loaded weight figure assumes six passengers weighing 150 pounds each.

The plaintiff's attorney pointed out that one of the women in the car weighed 175 pounds.

> Question. If the other ladies were of average size, this vehicle would be substantially overloaded, would it not?
>
> Answer. The rear tires would be overloaded.
>
> Question. Would you say that putting out tires that were going to be subjected to an overload of this kind would create a dangerous situation?
>
> Answer. It would create a probability of early failure or unsatisfactory performance.

WHAT IS THE LOAD RATING?

Here again, we have the shocking testimony of the tire industry's own experts: Expert No. 1 testifying that tires on fully loaded popular cars would be “expected to rupture” and expert No. 2 testifying that “there would be a probability of early failure.”

The tire manufacturer, confronted with this testimony from its own witnesses, made the claim that the 1,175-pound-load figure, which came from the Tire & Rim Association yearbook, was not, in fact, a maximum load rating.

The tire manufacturer contended that this 1,175-pound-load rating applied only if the tire was inflated to 24 pounds pressure, and that the tire could carry greater loads if inflated to higher pressures. The plaintiff's attorney, however, read from the official Tire & Rim Association manual a statement which said that the carrying capacity of a tire could not be increased beyond the stated figure by increasing the air pressure. That drew this response from expert No. 3, Lawrence W. Keltner the senior engineer of the tire company and a 39-year veteran with the firm:

> That is what the Tire & Rim book says * * * but that is not a fact.

A fourth witness for the defense, Robert L. Collins, of Birmingham, Mich., the chassis design engineer for General Motors, testified that the Tire & Rim Association manual was “advisory only” and that any use by a nonmember of the association is “entirely within the control and direction of the user and is wholly voluntary.”

This caused the judge to comment:

> They get out from legal liability then, don't they?

The witness answered:

> Yes, your honor.

After reviewing this testimony, I am more convinced than ever that we need some new labels in the tire industry. It would seem that the tires on some of our most popular cars should be labeled “expected to rupture.”

And perhaps the official handbook of the tire industry, the Tire & Rim Association manual, should be labeled “Not a Fact,” or “Use at Your Own Risk.”

OVERLOAD IS DEFINED

Inasmuch as these tire experts have testified that they would expect overloaded tires to rupture, it becomes important to determine just what constitues “overload.” We will recall that the automakers expect each individual motorist to do this—to know exactly what load his tires will carry, for if they fail, it is he or his family who may be killed or injured.

Yet how is he to determine maximum safe tire loads when the top experts in the automobile and tire industries say that they are unable to do so?

In the San Francisco trial, expert No. 3, the senior engineer for the tire manufacturer, testified:

> Overload is defined as “* * * any load that is imposed on the tire that is greater than the recommended load for the given inflation pressure as set forth in the Tire and Rim Association recommended load tables.”

So this expert tire engineer tells us that overload is anything over the Tire and Rim Association recommended load tables.

Yet the Ford Motor Co. stated in a letter to me:

> The Tire and Rim Association yearbook load inflation tables have never indicated maximum capacity.

This position has been reiterated again and again—before the FTC, before the Senate Commerce Committee, in letters to me from the automakers, and in the San Francisco trial. When pushed to the wall, all segments of the industry repudiate the only source of tire load figures which have been available to the public.

HOW TIRES ARE SELECTED

In addition to its sensational disclosures as to why tires fail even on new cars, the San Francisco trial provided a wealth of information as to how tires are selected by the automobile manufacturers.

One might think that the procedure would be something like this:

The automobile manufacturer would design a vehicle to meet certain use requirements. It would then submit full engineering facts on that vehicle to tire manufacturers who would supply the tire best suited to meet the power, speed, and load requirements of the vehicle.

Actually the procedure which is followed is nothing like that. The testimony indicates that no serious consideration is given to engineering data or weight and load figures either by the automobile manufacturer or by the firm which supplies the tires.

As expert No. 3—Mr. Keltner—testified in the San Francisco trial:

> We fill the orders for the tires that are ordered. As far as what vehicle they are put on, that is entirely the determination of the automobile manufacturer.

He testified that the tires for the make and model of car involved in this accident were supplied to Chevrolet by Goodrich without any knowledge as to the weight of the car on which they were to be installed.

Expert No. 2, the former president of the Tire and Rim Association and a 33-year veteran from U.S. Rubber, told of the difficulties the tire makers face in getting the automobile makers to use proper tires. He testified:

> I have participated in discussions where we asked the car manufacturers to be more observant of the recommended loads.

He said that the car manufacturers would reply:

> We have tested this tire on this particular vehicle for thousands of miles * * * in our opinion this tire is adequate for this vehicle.

He was asked:

> Question. And even though it would appear to the tire manufacturer in that situation that the tire would be subjected to overloading, would the tire manufacturer still supply that tire to the car manufacturer?
>
> Answer. Well, he will. This is a competitive business. If he doesn't do it, somebody else will.
>
> Question. And even though the tire manufacturer would know that the person who buys that car is going to be buying an overloaded tire?
>
> Answer. Yes.

At another point, this same expert engaged in this exchange:

> Question. Is it generally the aim of the tire manufacturers to have their tires put on cars so that they will not normally be driven overloaded?
>
> Answer. I don't think that is a specific aim of the tire manufacturers. Their specific aim is to sell as many tires as possible.
>
> Question. In other words, they will put out tires, knowing that they * * * will be overloaded?
>
> Answer. I think that is correct. They know that a certain percentage of tires that they sell will be exposed to overloading conditions.

The fourth expert to testify in this trial, the veteran chassis design engineer for the automobile manufacturer, was asked how his firm selected a tire to use on a particular car. Do they use the Tire and Rim Association manual, he was asked?

He replied:

> We primarily use the Tire & Rim book to determine the maximum size of the tire section * * * we have to put enough room around all of the wheelhouses so that the tire doesn't strike the wheelhouse.

Obviously, the tire is selected for its shape and not for its load-carrying capacity. The plaintiff's attorney pursued this point:

> Question. Does General Motors make any attempt to determine the maximum carrying capacity of any tire?
>
> Answer. No * * * we made no attempt whatever to try to determine its maximum, which I believe would be rather difficult.
>
> Question. Do you at General Motors ever advise the purchaser of your car the amount of load they can carry in the car without overloading the tires?
>
> Answer. Not to my knowledge.
>
> Question. Would you tell us what you think overloading a tire means?
>
> Answer. I would say that a tire is overloaded when it does not satisfactorily perform its duty.

This top General Motors engineer insisted that the tires supplied with General Motors cars were fully adequate. He described a 35,000-mile test used by General Motors to test its cars and to test new models of tires at the same time. However, he was unable to state whether the kind of tire supplied with the car involved in the lawsuit had actually been put through this test. He made clear that the tires are tested for qualities such as "ride, stability, and steering feel" and not as to the carrying capacity. If the tires do not fail in this test, they are accepted as adequate. During the 35,000-mile test, the car's load is changed several times to determine performance with differing loads.

The GM engineer testified that in his opinion:

> A General Motors tire is not overloaded when it performs satisfactorily in riding, handling, and durability.
>
> Question. That is the only test that General Motors adopts?
>
> Answer. I don't know what other tests there are * * * they are the only tests that I am familiar with in my capacity as a tire engineer with Chevrolet at that time.

He was quizzed as to whether a nine-passenger station wagon could safely carry nine full-sized persons. Although he quarreled some over whether you could fit nine men into a nine-passenger station wagon, he did believe that the tires on such a car would not be overloaded, even if the car was fully loaded with adults—despite the fact that this put it well above the maximum tire load ratings indicated in the Tire & Rim Association manual.

But here again, the expert witness who was willing to give assurance that a normal carload of people would not overload the tires was forced to admit that he did not know what load the tires could carry.

> Question. How much weight in addition to the maximum recommended by the Tire & Rim Association could those tires carry without being overloaded?
>
> Answer. I couldn't give you an actual figure on that.
>
> Question. You don't know where you could go for that information?
>
> Answer. I don't believe so.

SIGNIFICANCE OF TESTIMONY

Think of the significance which this extensive testimony has for a nation faced with a critical highway safety problem.

We have more than 90 million automobiles on our highways today. It is perfectly legal for them to travel speeds of 60, 70, and, in at least one State, even 80 miles an hour. Cars are bigger, heavier, and more powerful than ever before. At a time when millions of people are racing about this Nation on highways, we are told by experts in the automobile and tire industries:

That many new cars have overloaded tires when all seats in the car are filled.

That the manufacturers of these tires expect them to rupture if they are driven in an overloaded condition.

That no determination was made as to their load-carrying capacity when these tires were fitted to the car.

That the manufacturer of the car cannot tell the driver of the car what load he may carry without overloading and probably rupturing his tires.

Is there any wonder why thousands of Americans are experiencing tire failure and tragic accidents? Is there any question as to whether millions of American families are speeding across the Nation on top of a time bomb?

The San Francisco trial is the missing link in the story of tire scandal in America. Now we have on record the sworn testimony of the tire and automobile industries' own experts. They concede that automobiles are being wrecked today, causing death and injury, because overloaded tires are rupturing. They admit that they deliver cars without any regard to the load their tires will carry. And they admit that it is impossible for the motorist to do what they have refused to do—to compute the load that an American automobile tire may safely carry.

This is a shocking and scandalous situation and the Congress and the American public should not rest until it is satisfactorily corrected.

BILL S. 2669 DESCRIBED

The bill we are considering today is a sound step toward correcting this scandalous situation. I do not suggest that the bill is a complete answer, but it is certainly a step in the right direction.

I want to commend the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and his staff for the long hours they have devoted to this legislation.

As I indicated earlier, I introduced a very mild tire safety proposal in May 1964. A year ago, I introduced S. 1643, a stricter bill, to require minimum tire safety standards and to establish a tire quality grading and labeling system.

The Senate Commerce Committee held hearings on my tire bill last summer. Those hearings confirmed most of the fears which we had about tires. The committee then made revisions in the bill and reintroduced it as S. 2669 with Chairman MAGNUSON as the author, and I joined as a cosponsor.

With some further revisions, the committee has now sent S. 2669 to the Senate.

This bill would direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish minimum safety performance standards for tires. The Secretary is to adopt interim standards immediately and to conduct a research and development program over the next 2 years, at which time new and permanent standards are to be established.

These standards will indicate the maximum permissible loads for each size of tire. The Secretary will direct the tire manufacturer to label his tires with accurate and appropriate safety information, such as size, load carrying capacity, and proper inflation pressure.

Thus, this bill will:

First. It should completely eliminate from the market the really shoddy, "cheapie," tires which are now offered to the public, often at so-called bargain prices.

Second. It will give the motorist some reliable facts as to size and load-carrying capacity so that he can select a tire to suit his needs and so that he will know what loads he may carry in his car.

Third. Direct the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe a uniform quality grading system for tires within 2 years.

The Federal Trade Commission, in issuing its new guidelines for tire advertising and labeling, said there was an urgent need for a system of tire quality grading.

I cannot believe that the development of a simple process to help the motorist intelligently choose between different qualities of tires is a monumental task. The Secretary of Commerce could and should develop a tire quality grading system within 1 year.

We should not lead ourselves to believe that we have dealt with our national tire scandal with finality until we have established a system of quality grading for automobile tires.

My concern is that the Commerce Department has shown very little enthusiasm for strong tire legislation. And they have been particularly reluctant to develop a grading system. They openly question the feasibility of such a system—and they maintain that its development presents a complex technical problem which would take years of study.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD at this time a grading system for tires developed by Mr. E. J. Heitzman of Princeton University. Mr. Heitzman's impressive résumé is contained in his report. He has been a research engineer at General Motors for the past 8 years. Now he is studying the adoption of aircraft dynamics technology to automobile problems at the Department of Aerospace and Mechanical Sciences at Princeton.

Mr. Heitzman completed this study at the request of Mr. Ralph Nader in approximately 30 days. I have spoken to a number of technical people who are familiar with the report and they all agree that it represents a fine beginning on a grading system.

One of these people, Mr. Irmin Kann, who is doing automobile safety research at the Stevens Institute of Technology, says that there is no doubt that a grading system can be developed within 1 year. The equipment is available now at Stevens and other universities throughout the country. After converting this equipment, which at Stevens I am told would take several months, work could begin immediately on the development of such a system.

This report is solid, technical evidence that a grading system is, in fact, sensible, feasible, and workable. Furthermore, it proves that such a system can be developed in a relatively short time. It is perfectly clear that the Commerce Department, the industry, and appropriate private and public representatives could get together and come up with a meaningful grading system within 1 year.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Automobile Development Associates report on a performance rating system for tire system printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT NO. 4-1—A PERFORMANCE RATING SYSTEM FOR TIRE SAFETY

(Requested by Mr. Ralph Nader, Washington, D.C.)

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Ralph Nader, acting on his own behalf, requested ADA to outline a meaningful rating system for automobile tires. This rating system was to include all factors which, in ADA's opinion, importantly affect automobile safety. It was to be capable of providing the buyer of an automobile or of replacement tires sufficient information for an intelligent decision on tire adequacy, and also of forming a basis on which the individual States or the Federal Government might legislate minimum tire standards.

RATING SYSTEM

A nine-digit, three group numerical rating; that is, 098–22–3566 is proposed, which is to be prominently marked on every tire, along with make, model, size, et cetera. The first group of numbers represents rated load to the nearest 10 pounds. For example, 098 equals 980 pounds, 104 equals 1,040 pounds, et cetera. The second group is the pressure for that load rating, so that 098–22 is to be read "980 pounds at an inflation pressure of 22 pounds per square inch." The last four digits are performance indexes, which correspond to individual tests for temperature-load endurance; traction or breaking ability on dry road surfaces; lateral stability, or cornering ability; and wet road performance.

Ratings in these performance categories are to be based on a 0–9 scale, according to arbitrarily fixed standards such as those outlined in following sections of this report. They are to represent guaranteed minimum performance levels for random samples, taken from production lines and tested by an independent facility.

One page in the owner's manual of each new car would be devoted to a description of the tire rating system. A sheet explaining the system would also be given with each replacement tire purchase.

LOAD AND PRESSURE

Many aspects of tire performance including heat buildup and lateral stability properties, depend to a great degree on a combination of tire pressure and tire load. These two factors are therefore listed first, as "independent variables" for the rating system. This means that the tire manufacturer is free to claim whatever he wants for the "rated" load; but a high rated load will adversely affect the ratings in the performance categories. From another viewpoint, if the tire manufacturer wants a high rating in the heat endurance, traction, and lateral stability categories, he will be forced to lower his rated load accordingly. For example, the same tire might conceivably be rated either 095–22–3553 or 080–22–7573.

The pressure for the rated load should be the intended inflation pressure for the tire. In case of new cars, it should be the car manufacturer's specified pressure.

Ideally, in the case of new cars, the pressure would be the normal pressure specified by car manufacturer, and the load would be that of the heaviest loaded wheel with a full passenger complement and a loaded trunk.

TEMPERATURE-LOAD ENDURANCE

This rating, on a 0–9 scale, should be based on a severe combination of load, ambient temperature, and speed. A good test condition would be 125 percent of rated load (25 percent overload), on a standardized rolling drum of about 7 feet in diameter, with a tangential (linear) speed of 100 miles per hour, in an ambient temperature of 150 degrees Fahrenheit. Tires would be rated on the basis of endurance time under this test condition.

A "zero" rating might be given for 1 hour or less and a "nine" rating for 20 hours or more.

This rating is important from the safety aspect because most highspeed tire failures are due to excessive heat buildup, which is caused by speed combined with overload and/or underinflation. It is realistic because temperatures in this range, measured over blacktop pavement, are common in many parts of the United States, and car owners do not typically increase tire pressure when their cars are heavily loaded.

Rolling drum test machines such as that mentioned here have been used by American tire companies since the 1930's.

DRY ROAD BRAKING

Braking or tractive force exerted by a tire is always accompanied by a slipping, or creeping motion within the contact patch between tire and road surface. Because of this motion, the tangential speed V_t of the tire tread is somewhat less in braking, and greater in traction, than the linear speed V_s of the wheel, as shown in figure 1. The quantity $(V_s-V_t)/V_s$ is called slip ratio. With no braking the slip ratio is zero, and with a locked-wheel skid it is equal to unity.

Figure 2 shows the relationship between the braking force (or wheel torque) developed by the tire, and the slip ratio. The force-slip (or torque-slip) characteristic is linear (portion A of the curve in figure 2) up to some slip ratio between .1 and .2, (portion B) at which the available braking force peaks. At higher slip ratios (portion C) the elastic deformation (creep) within the contact patch gradually changes to a sliding motion, the friction changes from "static" to "sliding," and the available force is reduced. (References 1–3.)

The proposed criterion for tire braking ability is the measured shape of this force-slip characteristic, as described later in this section.

A suitable test machine for tire braking performance would consist of a trailer equipped with removable weights for load adjustment, and with brakes controlled by an electrohydraulic servo system. A load cell between the trailer and tow car would be required to record braking force. Slip ratio would be obtained from the difference between the braked wheel speed and that of a free-rolling "fifth wheel."

In operation, the tow car would be run at a fixed speed. The pressure to the brakes would be modulated by the servo value to obtain "command" values of slip ratio. The data recorded would be that of figure 2.

The braking performance of a tire is nominally independent of speed, but it is affected by tread temperature. Because of frictional heating, the braking force will drop somewhat with length of skid (Reference 2.) For this reason, the braking test is best run on a programed time schedule, such that the slip ratio scale of figure 2 is equivalent to a time scale. The time duration in the skidding range will determine the degree of tread heating.

The brake test just described would result in a performance curve like figure 3. This plot presents four criteria for rating the tire's braking ability. These are: the slope of the linear portion A of the curve; the peak force at B; the sliding force at C; and the reduction in sliding force due to tread heating at D. These four criteria can be combined into one by simply taking the area under the curve. This area results in a single criterion which includes all four aspects of braking performance, with extra weighting given to skidding performance. It probably relates quite well to actual stopping ability.

Use of the programed time scale also results in an extremely simple mechanization of the experiment. The area under the force-slip curve is a simple time-integral (average) of the trailer drag force, which can be read on a dial or recorded directly. A description of the mechanization and a block diagram are given in appendix 1.

Because of the simplicity of this test, it is easily carried out on several representative road surfaces, with the results averaged for rating purposes.

CORNERING POWER

Tire cornering performance is the most important factor in the lateral stability of the automobile. A measure of this performance is "cornering power," or side force per unit "slip angle." "Slip angle" is defined as the angle between the plane of the wheel and its direction of motion, as illustrated in figure 4.

The mechanism of side force generation is shown in figure 5. For conceptual purposes, the tire tread is shrunk into a "meridian band," which is a narrow elastic band around the tire circumference at the center of the tread. When a side force is applied, a rolling tire is deflected sideways, so that a slip angle is developed. A point on the meridian line will lie in the center plane of the wheel until it approaches the contact patch between tire and road. It will then be stretched and forced into the direction of wheel travel until it leaves the contact patch and can return to the plane of the wheel.

The side force generated by the tire is the sum of the elastic forces generated by each increment of deformed meridian line length. Mathematically, this is the integral over the length of the incremental elastic force. It is directly proportional to the area under the deflected meridian line projection as shown in figure 6. The line of action of the resultant side force passes through the center of this area. Because of the triangular shape of the elastic curve, the center of area is behind the center of the contact patch, by a distance known as pneumatic trail. The product of side force times pneumatic trail yields a moment, called self-alining torque, which adds to the positive caster effect of the car's suspension.

At large values of slip angle the elastic force on portions near the rear of the tire contact patch exceeds the limit of adhesion and these portions begin to slide, as indicated in figures 5 and 6. As a result of the reduced length of the elastic curve triangle, the side force becomes less than proportional to slip angle. The pneumatic trail also decreases, also at high slip angles the alining torque may become negative. At very high slip angles, near 20°, the reduction in length of the elastic curve triangle due to sliding at the rear of the contact patch balances the increase in slope at the front, and side force levels off. Side force and alining torque are plotted against slip angle, for a typical tire, in figures 7 and 8.

As vertical load is increased, the tire deflects more and the length of the tire contact patch increases. The side force per unit slip angle is therefore increased, but at a rate less than proportional, because of side wall effects. Finally a load will be reached above which further increases cause lessened side force, as shown in figure 9.

Increased pressure increases the "tautness" of the elastic system, and therefore increases cornering power. This effect is shown in figure 10.

Alining torque contributes to "steering feel" or "steering feedback," when it is felt at the steering wheel. It is especially valuable when its reversal gives warning of very high slip angles and impending front wheel skid. However, this effect can be either masked or amplified in the design of the car steering and suspension systems, and it is therefore not explicitly considered in the proposed rating system.

Cornering power is important to safety because it determines the lateral stability of the car. For normal driving the cornering power at low slip angles is the important parameter. For violent maneuvering the maximum value of cornering power per unit load is of interest. For extremes of low tire pressure (due to owner carelessness), heavy loads (due to car overload and/or weight transfer in roll), and violent maneuvering, air-out and tread roll-under can both be problems. A rating system should present a fair balance of all these factors.

The proposed rating system is made up of the product of cornering power (side force per unit slip angle) at three degrees slip angle, multiplied by cornering coefficient (side force per unit load) at 20 degrees slip angle. Tests are to be run at rated load and pressure, and at 70 percent rated pressure combined with 125 percent rated load. The two results are to be averaged for the final rating.

These rating tests should be run on actual road surfaces. A suitable test rig could be similar to the fixed-base machine (moving road) used by General Motors Research Laboratories, or the moving-base machine (real roads) used by Cornell Aeronautical Laboratories. An ideal test rig in many respects is a large arm rotating about a vertical axis. This arrangement combines the advantage of both fixed base and moving base machines. Rotating arm machines of 35-foot radius exist at the Davidson Laboratory of Stevens Institute of Technology and at the David Taylor Model Basin. Although designed for towing-tank testing of ship models, they might easily be adapted for tire testing.

WET ROAD PERFORMANCE

Both braking and cornering performance of tires are degraded on wet surfaces, to greater or lesser degree, depending on surface roughness and drainage. Wet road performance can be generally divided into two categories: moderately wet surfaces which may become slick; and very wet surfaces on which tires may "hydroplane" at speed. (Refs. 2, 6, 7.)

According to reference 2, performance in the linear range of the brake force-slip ratio and side force-slip angle performance curves is not affected by moderate wetness, at least at low car speeds; however, the asymptotic values at high slip ratios or slip angles are determined by the road surface. This characteristic is shown in figure 11, which is reproduced from reference 2. Tire parameters which affect skid resistance on rough surfaces are primarily load, pressure, and tread rubber compound. On smooth surfaces the most important tire parameter is "tire drainage," or the ability of the tire tread design to channel water into grooves so that raised portions can "bite."

When road surfaces become flooded or covered with slush or water, vehicles above some critical speed (which may be as low as 50 miles per hour for passenger cars) encounter the phenomenon of hydroplaning. Tires under hydroplaning conditions become detached from the road surface and their ability to develop braking force or cornering force is almost entirely lost. Physical and mathematical explanation of tire hydroplaning and a description of its effects is given in reference 8.

According to reference 8, hydroplaning tendency is little reduced by increased load, because the tire deflects and its contact patch becomes larger. Hydroplaning tendency is greatly reduced by increased inflation pressure and by tire tread designs which provide good drainage grooves.

Rough-textured pavement surfaces also reduce hydroplaning tendency somewhat by giving the water someplace to go.

According to reference 8, linear as well as nonlinear portions of the brake-slip and cornering force-slip angle curves are affected by hydroplaning.

Tire braking and cornering behaviors are similarly affected by wet roads. For this reason, the wet road performance rating can be based on braking tests only.

The wet road rating should reflect the drastic loss in performance under high speed hydroplaning, as well as the more prevalent, but less severe, performance reduction on normally wet roads. It should also give consideration to the various road surfaces encountered in normal driving.

The proposed wet road rating system is based on the same type of test as performed for dry road braking. It should be an average of several braking tests run on different representative road surfaces. This average should be multiplied by the speed at which hydroplaning begins on water-covered concrete to obtain a final rating.

DISCUSSION

The tire tests described here are intended to be both comprehensive and fair. They include all factors which are considered to be important to safety, with greater weight given to phenomena which might produce catastrophic results.

No serious attempt has been made to call out specific rating numbers for each test, since further research is needed before this can be done properly. Some mathematical manipulation will be required to give the described test results the proper combination of realism and sensitivity. For example, even a very poor tire will have some area under a braking force-slip ratio curve, and so some "baseline" area will have to be subtracted from the test results to arrive at a realistic zero rating. Then some multiplier will be required, such that an exceedingly good tire is given a rating of six or seven. (Allowance for future technological improvement should be built into the rating system.)

The cornering power, dry road braking, and wet road performance tests could all be carried out in a single test facility, consisting of the rotating arm mentioned on page 10. Different road surfaces could be placed in concentric tracks, so that only the position of the tire along the arm would be changed between tests. In such a fixed indoor facility, controllable wetness of road surface is easy to maintain, and all-weather operation is possible.

With respect to the temperature-load endurance ratings, it might be argued that not everybody drives at 100 miles per hour (some cars won't even go that fast) and so testing at that speed is unnecessarily harsh. The obvious reply is that not every tire need rate very high in that or any category. A person who never goes over 50 miles per hour may be satisfied with a tire having a five rating. In Connecticut or New Jersey a one rating might be acceptable for a car to pass State inspection, while Arizona or Texas might require a minimum of three. The whole point of a rating system is that it gives a basis for intelligent choice; such a basis is not now available.

Nevertheless, since speed is a legitimate tire design parameter, comprehensiveness might require categorizing tires according to intended speed (low, medium, high); by adding L, M, or H to the numerical rating. In this case, a typical rating number might be M–080–22–7573. The temperature-load endurance ratings would then be based on something like 70, 100, and 120 miles per hour, for low, medium, and high speed tires.

REFERENCES

1. Heitzman, E. J., Unpublished notes on antiskid braking devices (1957).

2. Grime, G., and Stiles, C. G., "The skid-resisting properties of roads and tires," Papers on skidding and braking, The Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Automobile Division (1954–55, No. 1).

3. Sawyer, Richard K., and Kolnick, Joseph H., "Tire-to-surface friction coefficient measurements with a C–123 airplane on various runway surfaces," NASA (Rept. No. 20) (June 1959).

4. Chase, T. P., "Passenger car brake performance," SAE Transactions (vol. 13, No. 1) (January 1949).

5. Heitzman, E. J., Flight Mechanics Seminar on Automobile Dynamics, Department of Aerospace and Mechanical Sciences. Princeton University (November 1964).

6. Horne, Walter B., and Dreher, Robert C., "Phenomena of pneumatic tire hydroplaning," NASA (TN D–2056) (November 1963).

7. Horne, W. B., and Leland, T. J. W., "Influence of tire tread pattern and runway surface condition on braking friction and rolling resistance of a modern aircraft tire," NASA (TN D–1376) (1962).

8. Steckel, S. S., and Westberg, J. V., "Full scale evaluation of an airjet system as a means to eliminate the harmful effects of wet runways," Douglas Aircraft Co. (LB–32662) (Oct. 19, 1965).

EDWARD J. HEITZMAN, TECHNICAL DIRECTOR—RESEARCH

Academic background

Mr. Heitzman received the M.E. degree from Stevens Institute of Technology in 1956. He has done graduate work in mathematics, engineering mechanics, and servomechanisms at Wayne State University, Detroit; aerodynamics at University of Detroit; airplane dynamics, automatic controls, and instrumentation dynamics at Princeton University.

Professional experience

From 1956 to 1959 Mr. Heitzman was a research engineer at the General Motors research staff, where he worked on analysis of tire characteristics, automobile handling studies, hydropneumatic suspensions, brake design, and structures. In 1958, as a consultant to General Motors Styling Division, he helped set up the first of a continuing series of wind-tunnel tests. After suggesting a novel automobile structure which promised to reduce the amplitude of resonant body vibrations, he transferred to General Motors Styling Division in 1959 to direct its development. From 1959 to 1964 he directed design of structures and suspensions on research-stage future production cars, and carried out research in aerodynamics, vehicle handling, and body-chassis structures.

In 1964 Mr. Heitzman went to the department of aerospace and mechanical sciences at Princeton University to study adaptation of aircraft dynamics technology to automobile problems. He will join the research staff of the university in August 1966 as project engineer on a research program in automobile safety. The goal of that program is measurement of dynamic responses of human drivers in mathematical model form; theoretical study of stability of the car-driver system with average (50 percentile) and poor (1 percentile) drivers; and experimental verification using driver-analog autopilots in a variable stability car. Mr. Heitzman has designed the variable stability research vehicle and data acquisition system on which the project is based.

ROBERT CUMBERFORD, TECHNICAL DIRECTOR—DESIGN

Academic background

Mr. Cumberford studied industrial design at the Art Center School, Los Angeles, and the humanities at UCLA.

Professional experience

From 1954 to 1957 Mr. Cumberford was a designer in General Motors Styling Division, where he was assigned to special studio 5 and the Chevrolet studio before being made head of special studio X. His work at GM included formulation of the company's standard layout for instruments and controls which was adopted in 1955.

From 1957 to 1963, he was a freelance writer, living in San Francisco, New York and Mexico City. He has published more than 200 magazine articles in several countries, gaining a reputation as a critic of automobile design.

In 1959, he was design assistant to Mr. Albrecht Goertz, whose industrial design practice is worldwide in scope.

In 1963, he was chief designer for Holman & Moody, Inc., of Charlotte, N.C. In 1964, he formed Cumberford Design International, a consulting firm with offices in New York City, Mexico City, and Northampton, England.

Among the many operating cars which Mr. Cumberford has designed are the Cadillac Eldorado Brougham town car, six models of Chevrolet Corvette, the satirical Road & Track Cyclops II, a prototype world-market car for a Japanese firm, a Mustang station wagon and the recently introduced Griffith/Plymouth-powered sports car. He is currently working on a safety car which is based on normal industry techniques.

THOMAS M. O'BRIEN, CHIEF DESIGN ENGINEER

Academic background

Mr. O'Brien studied mechanical engineering and engineering physics at Lehigh University from 1950 to 1954.

Professional experience

From 1954 to 1956 Mr. O'Brien was a test engineer on the new devices test staff of Celco Corp. at Mahwah, N.J. His work was centered on developments in magnetic amplifiers and other electronic and electro-mechanical components.

From 1956 to 1959, he served as project engineer for Electro-Tec Corp. of Ormond Beach, Fla. Work responsibilities included design of switches and sliprings for missiles and aircraft.

In 1959, as an outgrowth of his hobby of sports car racing, he formed his own company specializing in the preparation of high-performance automobiles. In 1963 this company became a franchised dealership for Alfa-Romeo automobiles.

He has been recognized as a driver by Ferrari and Alfa-Romeo, having driven for both firms in international competition. He won the U.S. national championship (class D—modified) for Ferrari in 1964.

In 1963, Mr. O'Brien formed the Duralite Safety Equipment Corp. to manufacture and distribute roll bars, high-strength seat belt mountings, and other items intended to improve the safety characteristics of production cars.

Mr. O'Brien helped organize ADA in 1965. He is chief design engineer and manager of the fabrication facility and structural model laboratory.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, there are few bills considered by this body whose enactments will directly and immediately save lives. This is one of them. For this reason, I strongly support its passage.

Tire failure causes traffic accidents. This is so fundamental it hardly needs to be stated. The National Safety Council estimates that 7 percent of all traffic accidents are caused by faulty tires. But it is on the Nation's high-speed turnpikes that faulty tires take the most tragic toll. A 1962 New York Thruway study ranked tire failure as the most common cause of all vehicle-caused accidents. Ohio attributes 10 percent of all turnpike accidents to tire failure, New Jersey reports a figure of 9.2 percent. Officials of the Indiana and Pennsylvania Turnpikes say tire failure is second only to driver fatigue as a cause of accidents. It is obvious, then, that tire failure is a significant cause of accidents and that improved and modernized safety standards are necessary if we are to hold accidents caused by tire failure to a minimum.

We now have variation in both tire quality and in the minimum standards which each individual manufacturer sets for himself in the production of his tires. We are lacking the standards which are necessary to achieve greater uniformity in the tires produced by different manufacturers. We do not have the standards which will assure greater safety to the public which uses tires to travel our roads today.

What we need now is a system of minimum safety standards to give the consumer protection against inferior, weak, or defective tires. Up to now, the buyer has had no means of determining whether the tire he purchases is safe for his type of driving. Tires carry a variety of designations—"super quiet delux," "super safety special," or "nylon delux" and others—but it is impossible for consumers to tell which one is the better quality tire. Today's tire-buying is strictly a game of blindman's buff.

The essential first step in tire safety must be the establishment of standards for tire performance so that no new or used tire can be sold which does not meet minimum criteria of safety. There are 87 million cars on the road today. Allowing unsafe tires to be used as original equipment or sold to the public is like giving a loaded gun to an unsuspecting person. And let me emphasize that the automaker in Detroit has as great a responsibility as the tiremaker in Akron. Fifty-million tires are sold as original equipment. They are ordered by the automaker. He must be sure his standards are high. Let us not point the finger only at the tire industry. Detroit also is to blame for the present state of affairs.

What we need plainly and simply is a system for grading and labeling tires. This is essential in order that the tire consumer has the opportunity to choose what he wants on the basis of valid and effective information and in giving him a way of knowing that he is receiving what he has actually paid for. Without a system of grading and labeling, the consumer has no way of knowing that he is receiving what he thinks he has bought. At present he has no way of telling one tire grade from another. The free enterprise system works best when the buyer has complete and accurate information on the product. Then he can make an informed judgment and select the tire best suited to his individual needs.

This bill makes a start toward greater tire safety. It provides for the establishment by the Secretary of Commerce of interim minimum safe performance standards for new tires by January 31, 1967, and the setting of final standards for new and newly retreaded tires by January 31, 1969. A valuable feature of the bill would prescribe the maximum permissible load for each tire size. The bill also authorizes the Secretary to require that tires be "permanently and conspicuously labeled for such safety information as he determines to be necessary to achieve the purposes of the act." I hope the Secretary will liberally interpret this clause so as to promote maximum disclosure to the public of all relevant safety information.

Although the bill only calls for a study of the feasibility of a uniform quality grading system for tires, in my view, it is imperative that we adopt such a system. I hope the Secretary makes every effort to bring us a favorable report on this subject before January 31, 1969.

Mr. President, last year nearly 50,000 people were killed in more than 12 million traffic accidents. Property damage amounted to more than $8.5 billion. This bill will help reduce that terrible toll by upgrading the quality of tires.

I commend the chairman of the Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for bringing this bill before the Senate—and I think the Nation owes a debt of gratitude also to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], whose long and devoted service to the cause of safer tires and safer cars has contributed so much to the legislation we are considering today.

I urge the speedy enactment of S. 2669.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as chairman of the hearings conducted by the Commerce Committee concerning tire safety, I am in support of the passage of this bill.

In 3 days of hearings last year, held on May 25, June 7, and August 13, we had before us witnesses from tiremakers, auto manufacturers, retreaders, vehicle safety groups, Federal agencies, and a wide range of interested persons directly concerned with the problem. If any one thing became clear in the course of the hearings, it was that the confusion in the matter of tire standards is even greater than it might have seemed at the beginning of the hearings.

The nomenclature in the descriptive terms applied to tires offered for sale is highly confusing to the customer. One brand calling itself a firstline tire may be no better than another labeled as a second- or even third-line tire. What is a "two-ply four-ply rated" tire? Is it as good as a straight four-ply tire? Or is it even better?

Are auto manufacturers installing tires adequate for the use that can be expected of them in these days of the loaded vacationing family's car rolling down an interstate highway at 65 or 70 miles an hour in hot weather? How safe are retreaded tires and can adequate standards be set so that there will be no unsafe tires entering the market? How many accidents are caused by tire failure?

These are some of the questions with which we were concerned, and as we got into the subject further and listened to the technical discussions of tire engineers, we sometimes felt were compounding confusion as much as we were creating enlightenment.

Certainly, when experts from the manufacturers of tires and their associations are so widely at variance in their views with those of safety experts as appeared in some cases, the need for objective and well-tested standards is obvious.

This is not a harsh bill. It is a first step toward bringing order out of chaos. It is a bill which gives adequate time for compliance with standards, and adequate time for the development first of interim standards and then of more permanent standards as testing and standard-setting proceeds.

Too often unsuspecting families have had experiences such as that reported in the Hammond, Ind., Times, of June 16, 1965, an incident which occurred after the first two of our three hearings had been held. A front page three-column picture shows a tire whose tread came apart in the middle and separated from the casing around the entire circumference while a family was driving in its 3-month-old station wagon at 60 miles an hour.

The owner of the car was driving with his wife and three children at the time. He was quoted as saying:

> That car swerved all over the road. It scared the life out of my wife and kids. I think the only things that saved us were the power steering and because there were no other cars coming.

This tire, which "unzipped" after only 5,000 miles, is typical of all too many such incidents which came to our attention during these hearings.

A few days later the same paper carried an editorial which concluded with these words:

> American motorists should not be compelled to play Russian roulette with the lives of themselves and their families because manufacturers are allowed to make tires that are unsafe.

The problems of traffic safety are interrelated. We are, through the Interstate System, eliminating some of the causes of accidents which lie in highway engineering. I believe we should do more, and I have introduced bills for extending the system and for greater attention to spot improvements of unsafe and easily remedied conditions on roads which do not come up to interstate standards.

This week the Commerce Committee begins hearings on the traffic safety bills which we have before us, including S. 2871, the Hartke-Mackay bill, in which I have been joined by 14 cosponsors. This involves a whole range of safety measures, including automotive design and uniformity of traffic controls.

I hope we may continue and expand the efforts to which this tire safety bill is an introduction. Too long we have seen apathy on the part of the public, and even apathy on the part of the Congress, which, having the power through jurisdiction over interstate commerce, has until now failed to take strong measures to save lives and property on the highways to the extent that we are able.

This is a beginning. Let us make that beginning, and then get on to further substantial progress to eliminate the specter that haunts the highways, murder by motor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, are there further amendments to be proposed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the question of the passage of the bill, I ask for the "yeas" and "nays."

The "yeas" and "nays" were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPENSATION OF OVERSEAS TEACHERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of March 31, 1966, p. 7329, Congressional Record.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this is a unanimous report by the conferees of the Senate and the House. The bill provides for an increase of about $40 a month for the 6,700 teachers who comprise the faculties of our overseas defense installation schools.

The House bill would have limited all the teachers to 5 consecutive years of teaching abroad and would then have required that they return home to accept suitable positions of the nature for which they were qualified.

The conferees struck out that provision of the House bill and substituted a provision that the Military Department shall provide data with which to make a further study for a workable rotation program. We feel that this meets the desires without any need to require a fixed time for return after 5 years, and would lead to greater job opportunities for teachers when they return, rather than to propose administrative action limiting them to not more than 5 or 6 years abroad. I believe the report is a satisfactory compromise of the positions of the Senate and the House.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Then I shall yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee on the pending measure, I commend the chairman and the other members of the committee for and reaching what I believe is a very satisfactory agreement, an agreement which should be of great benefit to our school teachers in foreign areas.

I commend the chairman and all members of the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I, too, add my commendations to the members of the conference committee, especially to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] for the work they have done in this field.

Mr. President, the bill which we are about to pass marks the conclusion of a long effort to secure application of the principle of comparability of salary to the teachers in the overseas defense schools run by the Department of Defense. I am proud and pleased to see the adoption in this bill of essentially what I proposed in my bill S. 2228, the Senate companion to the House-numbered bill on which we act today. Its passage will restore to the 6,200 teachers in our 285 overseas dependents' schools all across the world a scale of pay equivalent to that in effect among city schools in the United States.

There is no need to go into details of the history of the inequity which we are now correcting. The Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act went into effect as Public Law 86-91 on January 1, 1964. It removed the teachers from their place under the civil service classification and placed them under the Defense Department. There was no intention of depriving them of increases which they would have received had they remained under civil service, and yet that was the result as year by year the civil service pay and benefits were enlarged much more rapidly than were those of the affected teachers.

There was no intention of depriving them of an opportunity to keep up with the improvements in teacher salaries being made in stateside schools, and in fact the law was specific in its intent. Yet they did not get those comparability gains. In fact, year by year they saw both those in the civil service grades they had left and those in civilian employment move up as they were left behind. By the end of 1963 the discontent had mounted to the point where teachers, granted a $100 raise for the first time in 3 years, were returning their checks to the Department of Defense saying that a $100 raise in 3 years was an insult.

It was because their spokesmen had repeatedly tried in vain to secure a high-level conference in the Defense Department without success, and because the president of the National Education Association was then my good friend Dr. Robert Wyatt, of Indiana, that I became interested well over 2 years ago. There had even been talk of a walkout by the teachers in December 1963. An appeal had been made to the President of the United States, but still, even after we had arranged for the long-denied meeting, the problem was no nearer solution.

The result was the filing of a suit on March 2, 1964, to compel the Department of Defense, which continued to plead inability to make the salary adjustments the teachers believed the law demanded, saying they were limited in their ability by the per-pupil limitation on funds spent for these schools under the appropriations. Yet there was no evidence that the Department had sought to secure a per-pupil figure large enough to include the salary increases.

Because of the meeting which I arranged, and which was attended by a delegation from the teachers' organization and a member of my staff, the suit was postponed from its originally scheduled filing date of February 14. The negative response of the Department of Defense, represented by Deputy Secretary Cyrus Vance and other Department personnel, led the teachers to the conclusion that suit was necessary.

I called attention to the deteriorated situation on the floor of the Senate more than 2 years ago, on February 16 and again on March 6, 1964. I noted then that the total salary losses, through failure to grant increases since 1960, amounted to more than $6 million. In the 2 years since then there have been further accumulated salary deficits, even though there have also been some increases, most notably $300 per year in the fiscal 1966 appropriations. But even this addition still left these teachers far behind. I quote from a letter of July 30, 1965, addressed to Chairman MONRONEY of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

> Enactment of S. 2228 would require an average teacher salary increase for the 1965-66 school year of approximately $785.

That $785 is the amount the overseas teachers have been shortchanged just in the current school year, and even after passage of the larger appropriation and the $300 increase. My bill called for retroactive benefits, and in view of the situation they were well deserved. However, I am happy that they will begin to get that long-deserved increase with the beginning of the first pay period after enactment.

Testimony before our committee showed specifically the way in which salaries have fallen behind for the overseas teachers. In June 1960, teachers with a bachelor's degree and 2 years' experience received, in urban districts of 100,000 or more population—the criterion of the act we now contemplate—$4,444. The figure in the Department of Defense schools was $4,350. By September 1964, the pay of the overseas teachers had gone up 4.3 percent to $4,535. But in the urban schools the increase had mounted by 18.5 percent to $5,265. It is a little wonder that the annual teacher resignation rate for the overseas schools had mounted to more than three times that of the national average in the United States. It may be worth noting for comparison that a clerk-typist, step 2, with 2 years of experience was receiving $4,600, or $465 more than the teacher with a bachelor's degree and 2 years of experience.

So it is obvious that in adopting this bill we are not in the least giving recompense to the teachers whom we have shortchanged, or who have been shortchanged through the policies of the Department of Defense in the past. We are, I hope, securing for them the opportunity to start off once more with the parity they had in 1960 when the law went into effect, and by this means maintaining it for them without the need of unrest, threat of walkout, or lawsuits against the Department of Defense.

I am happy that the conferees have seen fit to drop the unworkable rotation system which was included in the original House-passed version of the bill, a system which was not a part of my bill and which we rejected on the basis of convincing testimony during our Senate hearings. At the same time, I congratulate them on the recommendation of aids to facilitate the opportunities which will be available on a voluntary rather than a mandatory basis, opportunities to return for service in the public school system of the Nation and thus maintain a closer touch with what is going on at home to the benefit both of themselves and of their 170,000 pupils.

So it is with a sense of achievement, with the knowledge that we are, although belated, righting a wrong, that I vote for passage of this bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the great help that the Senator from Indiana has been in the passing of this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE TIRES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2669) to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, today there are tubeless tires on automobile wheels having drop center rims. From time to time plugs are placed in the tires and sometimes tubes are inserted.

I am informed that a very serious and dangerous situation occurs if one inserts a tube in a tubeless tire. In the event of a puncture, the drop center rim would create the same problem as would a blowout.

Would this measure take care of such a situation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the pending legislation is mainly directed at the sale of new tires and retreads.

The Secretary of Commerce would set these minimum safety performance standards. I am sure that the standards would include a prohibition on the sale of such tires as the Senator mentions. However, if somebody bought a tubeless tire and then purchased a tube and placed the tube in the tubeless tire, that situation would not be covered by this bill.

Every State has laws that require drivers not to proceed upon the highway with defective automobiles. I suppose that a highway patrolman in Montana could say to the Senator from Montana, if he were to take the steering wheel off his automobile and use some other steering device, that it was unsafe and that he could not drive the car in that condition.

States could prohibit someone from using on the highways tubeless tires with tubes inserted.

Mr. METCALF. That would be largely a State matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. The Secretary of Commerce could make recommendations to the States that they prohibit such a practice on the ground that it would not accord with the so-called minimum standards.

Mr. METCALF. I hope that, when the bill is passed, some investigation might be made along that line.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If anyone were to sell a tubeless tire, whether it be secondhand or new or retread, with a tube in the tire, the minimum standards would cover that situation and the man would be liable for violating the law.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, "Shall the bill pass?"

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], is necessarily absent because of the serious illness of his brother.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 60 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—21

Allott
Cooper
Dodd
Eastland
Fannin
Gore
Hayden
Holland
Inouye
Javits
Kuchel
Long, La.
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Murphy
Neuberger
Pell
Russell, S.C.
Williams, Del.

So the bill (S. 2669) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] is to be commended for his highly capable handling of the tire safety measure. Its passage was unanimous.

No greater tribute can be given to the floor manager of the bill than unanimous endorsement by the Senate. Success of such magnitude, however, is typical of legislation supported by the able and astute chairman of the Commerce Committee. His countless triumphs in this body alone speak highly for his deep and abiding devotion to the people. We congratulate him for another triumph today and we are grateful.

Additionally, we thank the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] for their splendid contributions, and also the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] for his assistance. The articulate support of these Senators helped greatly to assure the overwhelming success of this measure. And to the Senate as a whole I express my gratitude for swift and orderly action.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE FACTS ABOUT SENATOR SYMINGTON'S POSITION WITH RESPECT TO AIR ATTACKS ON NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last Friday, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] made a statement on the floor of the Senate incident to his inserting several newspaper columns into the Record, the first paragraph of which read as follows:

> Mr. President, during the debate on the supplemental appropriation bill for Vietnam earlier this week several distinguished Senators took issue with the view of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that further intensification of bombing in North Vietnam was not desirable.

The three Senators referred to in the columns in question were the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the senior Senator from Missouri.

The second paragraph of the statement of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania's statement read:

> Both the Secretary and General Wheeler spelled out in the course of the hearings, in what was to me a completely logical way, their reasons for concluding that it was not wise under the present circumstances either to start bombing the cities of North Vietnam, or to attempt to destroy the oil installation and storage facilities there, or to bomb or mine Haiphong Harbor.

The other two Senators can speak for themselves, but if there is any implication here that I am in favor of "bombing the cities of North Vietnam," the Senator from Pennsylvania could not be more incorrect. I have stated many times that I would oppose such attacks.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield on that point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Let me say that this point has been ever present during this whole discussion, the idea that someone was urging bombardment from the air of the cities in North Vietnam.

I have not heard that suggestion made by any Senators whatever. Even the military people, who have been very anxious to get the harbor in Haiphong closed, and have so testified before our committee, have not advocated the bombing of the cities of Hanoi or Haiphong.

I have not heard of any Senator—whatever his views may have been on the importance of putting a stopper in the bottle at Haiphong—advocating the bombing of those cities.

However, it has been used in headlines. It has been used in articles. It has been used in debate on the floor of the Senate, but it is a strawman which has been built up merely to be knocked down, because no Senator or no one in the military, so far as I know, has advocated any bombardment of northern cities which would endanger the civilian population there.

Of course, it is impossible to carry out any air raid anywhere without some danger to the civilian populace. But, so far as having such an attack as those which were carried out against Tokyo during World War II, when the habitations of thousand and tens of thousands of people were burned to the ground in a matter of hours, no one has ever advocated that—at least it has never come to my attention.

This is purely a "red herring" which has been dragged across the trail in this debate, when we are merely asking that a stopper be put in the bottle in the harbor at Haiphong, to be closed in a manner which our professional military men believe is somewhat desirable.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas permit me to address a question to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. PEARSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania for that purpose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will be happy to accommodate the Senator from Pennsylvania, but first I should like to comment on what the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee said, in effect that to the best of my knowledge no one, either in the Senate or in the Military Establishment today, on active duty, has ever recommended, informally or formally, that we bomb the city of Hanoi.

I am glad to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to join in that expression of the Senator from Missouri because while columnist after columnist has striven to set up a strawman, that some Senator has advocated the bombing of the cities of North Vietnam, so far as I know—and I am the third Senator referred to by the Senator from Missouri—none of us has advocated the bombing of any northern city.

If anything appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to that effect, it is in error so far as I am concerned, and it would be an inadvertent error. To the best of my knowledge, I have sought most carefully in public statements, in television and radio programs, and on the floor of the Senate, to make it clear that while I favor a blockade of the harbor of Haiphong or, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia stated, putting a plug in the bottle, I also would favor the mining of the harbor of Haiphong, and I have made that clear. But I have not, and do not now, advocate the bombing of the cities of North Vietnam—in the sense which the Senator from Georgia has made clear—of the kind of bombing which would result in civilian deaths of an indiscriminate character.

While several Senators have expressed support of a strategy of bombing military targets throughout the whole of Vietnam, North and South, I should like the RECORD to show—because one distinguished columnist from New York has included the names of three Senators in a commentary which would appear to indicate that we do so favor—that I have not heard the Senator from Georgia, or the Senator from Missouri, and certainly have not myself, at any time, advocate the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong, or of other cities of civilian populations, generally or indiscriminately.

I thank the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Missouri.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair would like to make an observation at this point, if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] will suspend for a moment. I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that the previous unanimous-consent agreement entered into by the Senate was to continue with morning business following the vote at 2 o'clock.

Therefore, technically, we are still in the morning hour, with a 3-minute limitation. The Chair wishes the Senate to be aware of that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the distinguished Senator from Kansas consider allowing a morning hour to be agreed to, with the proviso that at its conclusion the Senator from Kansas will immediately be given the floor?

Mr. PEARSON. I am very pleased to accede to that request.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may have 10 additional minutes to proceed.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri in connection with the remarks he is making on the floor of the Senate.

I have come to the conclusion that it is necessary, almost daily, to keep the record clear in connection with the proposal to bomb North Vietnam.

As the Senator from Georgia has mentioned, I do not know of a single military or civilian official who has ever advocated bombing in the north to obliterate cities. The discussion has been limited exclusively to power, ports, and petroleum, with references to certain airbases in addition.

I want to say to Members of the Senate that I think it is regrettable that day after day these allegations are made that anyone who advocates bombing in the north is desirous only of obliterating the cities in the north—which is simply not true.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri for the statement he has made on the floor of the Senate on this point.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Washington, a distinguished authority in this field.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania then refers to a column which raises another strawman to be knocked down; namely, the possible boarding of a Soviet ship by an American destroyer. I was not talking about anything of that character. These docks could be taken out of operation by air attacks, or by the same efforts against this North Vietnamese harbor that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese have made against the Saigon harbor of South Vietnam.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania then quotes some testimony of the Chief of Naval Operations, possibly implying that the Chief of Naval Operations opposes any attack on the transportation facilities at Haiphong because such an attack would not improve our military operations in South Vietnam.

If that was the idea, this deduction also is not correct.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, of course, support the decision of higher authority; but from a military standpoint all members of the Joint Chiefs and the Commandant of the Marine Corps who sits with them have testified before a joint session of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees that they were unanimous in believing a neutralization of the harbor facilities at Haiphong would help our military operations in South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If I may complete my statement, I will yield first to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

The testimony of the Joint Chiefs was deleted by the Defense Department, but because of the statement made by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, incident to his insertion of these columns I have urged the Department to declassify said testimony.

What could be more logical than neutralizing these docks, in that we have testimony that a majority of what is going down the Ho Chi Minh trails into South Vietnam comes through this harbor.

In a report to the chairman of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees last January 24 with respect to my trip to Thailand and South Vietnam, I stated:

> The time is approaching when we must decide—while the decision is still ours to make—whether we will move forward or move out. Whichever course we choose, we must take it with courage, with skill, and with realism. We must be equally realistic about the consequences of avoiding this difficult choice.

That was my position then and that is my position now; and I do not understand those who want us to just hang on in South Vietnam on a quantitative basis only, one against one, one fine American youth against an illiterate Vietcong guerrilla, a ground war in Asia utilizing little of the qualitative technological advantages which have given the United States superiority to the point of supremacy on the sea and in the air.

This is why I would prefer to either "move forward or move out," instead of continuing a policy of fighting it out "1 to 1"—at times 1 to 10—on the ground.

It is mathematical that the more we successfully attack meaningful military targets in North Vietnam, the less will be the number of American casualties in South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the able Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am delighted to know that none of the Senators who have spoken in the last few minutes wish to bomb the cities of North Vietnam. If this is a mere strawman, I am glad the Senator from Missouri and his colleagues have destroyed that strawman. It has been widely alleged in the press that there were individuals, both in the Military Establishment and in the Senate, who wanted, however, to destroy the cities of North Vietnam by bombing.

I am delighted——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, made a statement with which I agree without reservation. I have never heard of anyone, either a member of the Armed Services Committee or the Senate, or in the Military Establishment who wants to bomb the cities of Hanoi or Haiphong.

Mr. CLARK. As the Senator from Missouri well knows, because of the discussion, the information just received from the Pentagon makes public highly classified information which was not known by me at the time of my comments. I was unaware, until the Senator from Missouri made the statement, of the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I think the Senator will agree that one who read the hearings on the Vietnam supplemental appropriation bill was entitled to believe that General Wheeler and Admiral McDonald were supporting the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States. We have now been told they do not, and that their views were overruled by higher authority.

Mr. SYMINGTON. To make the record straight, I have urged the Defense Department that the detailed testimony of the Joint Chiefs, as well as the Commandant of the Marine Corps, who sits with them in their meetings, be made public on this subject.

Without going into any detail, I present to the Senate and the people today the fact that, from the military standpoint, all the Joint Chiefs were in favor of neutralizing the port of Haiphong; also that I have requested the details of this information be declassified by the Department of Defense.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. In my judgment, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and the President of the United States, who are higher authority in both instances than the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are correct in their present determination not to expand the bombing in North Vietnam to include the harbor of Haiphong and not to mine at this time the harbor of Haiphong; and not to take out, or attempt to take out, the oil storage installations in North Vietnam. I point out the danger of civilian casualties is not remote. To my way of thinking, this is a political decision correctly made by the President of the United States, under the advice of the Secretary of Defense, and I support them both.

I regret that the Senator from Missouri and his colleagues who have spoken do not support the present Secretary of Defense, but that is their perfect right. Certainly, the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Missouri, with their vast experience, not only as members of the Armed Services Committee, but in one instance as a former Secretary of the Air Force, have the right to have their opinion. But I support the President of the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Before I yield to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, let me say I am glad the senior Senator from Pennsylvania supports the President in his decision, and only wish he would support him in more decisions.

This, however, was not the purpose of my talk today. I know how the Senator from Pennsylvania feels about all this, because he often talks about it. He has made his position clear. Some of us do not agree with him.

All I wanted to do today was correct the RECORD from the standpoint of fact. It is a fact that the Joint Chiefs and the Commandant of the Marine Corps believe from the military standpoint, that it would cause less slaughter of young Americans if we took out the use of the docks at Haiphong.

I am one who believes, when we get into a war, it is logical to pay respect to those people in whom the American people have invested a great deal of money to learn how to be as successful as possible militarily at minimum cost and, what is more important, at minimum loss of life.

I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator give me the courtesy of permitting me to raise one more question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] had asked me to yield to him. Then I will be very happy to yield to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator request additional time?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I simply wanted to take this opportunity very briefly to make my position crystal clear so that there will be no misunderstanding with reference to proposals either to blockade or to mine the harbor of Haiphong.

I have expressed a personal opinion that the interdiction of the use of this harbor by these particular measures would be in the interest of terminating or reducing casualties and shorten the period of the war.

In doing that I recall that Gen. Maxwell Taylor stressed it was his personal opinion, and not in an official capacity—and he said it at one time not so very long ago—that he felt our strategy could afford to include the mining of the harbor of Haiphong. I think he spoke in an individual capacity.

I do not pretend to know as much as the experts know here. But I want to make it clear that what I say in this regard is not criticism of the Commander in Chief or the Secretary of Defense because they have not up to this time included these measures in their strategy.

I will support the President of the United States throughout in the conduct of the war. I have said so. I have never varied from that statement. I believe the President is following the right course. I believe his advisers are counseling him to the best of their ability.

When I make a comment which might vary from a specific aspect of the present policy governing the conduct of the war I wish to have it understood that it is a personal comment based not on any expertise on my part but on the limited information available to me. Of course, as I have just indicated, I support the President in his basic position with respect to the situation in Vietnam.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Pennsylvania and agree with him. I support the President's position. I will always support the President's decision when I think it is right.

The purpose of my remarks today however were, first, to present that there was no effort on the part of myself, and I know on the part of the Senator from Georgia or the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, or anybody we know of, to recommend the bombing of the city of Hanoi.

The second point is I am glad the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] has brought up the fact one of the ablest and most dedicated American patriots of today, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, who also has been our Ambassador to South Vietnam, reported in open hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee that he thought it would improve our military position in South Vietnam if we neutralized the harbor of Haiphong in North Vietnam. Finally, I present the military position of the Joint Chiefs on this matter.

Now, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania if the Senator from Pennsylvania would like to make further comment.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend. I think that I made my point as completely as I need to, but in view of the comment made a moment ago by the Senator from Missouri, I would like to suggest that if we examine the record of support for the President, the Senator from Pennsylvania will not fare badly in comparison with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Kansas for his courtesy in yielding.

VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, we in this Nation are extremely happy and proud to have the distinguished, beautiful, and intellectual lady of a great nation visiting us, the Prime Minister of India.

Nearly two centuries ago, President Jefferson spoke of liberty as being a contagion which would spread around the world. We have seen his prediction come true as people around the globe have demanded nationhood, individual liberty, and freedom from oppression.

Yet political liberty, we know, is worth little if there cannot also be liberty from hunger and disease. This is why another contagion has been spread by America: the contagious desire for freedom from starvation and illness.

The distinguished Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Gandhi, touched on this yesterday. Speaking of her desire to alleviate the hunger and sickness of her people, she quoted the President of the United States:

> Declaring unconditional war on the pockets of poverty in your own country—

She told the President—

> you have said, "We want to give people more opportunity. They want education and training. They want a job and a wage. They want their children to escape the poverty which has afflicted them."

In a brief but moving statement, Mrs. Gandhi concluded:

> Important as these words are for the American people, they cannot mean as much to them as they do to us in India who have so long been denied the very basic decencies of life.

Last night the President replied to her moving appeal with a challenging idea. He suggested that an Indian-American Foundation be established, endowed with excess rupees owned by the United States—rupees now lying idle while some use is sought for them which will not have a damaging impact on the Indian economy.

His proposed solution is welcome and interesting to me. I support it. I agree with the President that this proposal promises a "new and imaginative venture."

We are the ones who spread across the world the contagion of liberty and the contagion of ambition. We cannot—ignore the effects of that contagion on our neighbors.

I hope that the Indian-American Foundation will receive strong support from our people, and that it will go to work soon to improve life for our 500 million friends in India, Asia's largest democratic nation.

PROPOSED LOCATIONS OF ELECTRON VOLT—BEV.—PROTON ACCELERATOR

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, on Tuesday of last week the Atomic Energy Commission received a report from the National Academy of Sciences recommending six possible locations as the site for the proposed $375 million, 200-billion electron volt—Bev.—proton accelerator. It is my understanding that the AEC will now proceed to select the final site from among the six locations recommended by the Academy and its 12-member Site Evaluation Committee.

The recommended locations are Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory, Long Island; Denver; Madison, Wis.; Sierra Foothills, Calif., and South Barrington—or Weston—near Chicago. As the Committee said, it judges these six locations to be clearly superior to the other sites that were among the 85 proposals the AEC referred to the Academy for evaluation and recommendation.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not question the qualifications or the integrity of the members of the Site Evaluation Committee. They are all distinguished scientists of national repute.

However, I do challenge the geographic basis upon which the Committee based its recommendations. It seems evident to me that the Committee gave unfair and undue weight in its recommendations to locations which, in the main, already have considerable resources in the nuclear research field. The Committee appears to have given scant, if any, consideration to the long-term advantage to the Nation of using this accelerator project as a stimulus for developing new scientific strength and resources in other parts of the country such as my own which is struggling against great odds to achieve a scientific parity with the rest of the Nation.

Mr. President, the inevitable effect of placing the national accelerator laboratory in a location such as the Chicago area or California will be to promote an even greater geographic imbalance in our national scientific strength. It will mean a further concentration of this strength in a few areas of the country while placing a brake on the scientific development of other areas, such as the South.

Mr. President, the consequences of the Academy's site recommendations upon both the national interest and on the southern region is powerfully presented in a letter to Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, from the Honorable Eugene Patterson of Atlanta. Mr. Patterson served as chairman of the Accelerator Committee of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce and is the distinguished editor of the Atlanta Constitution.

I wish to read Mr. Patterson's letter into the RECORD.

ATLANTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
March 24, 1966.

DR. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In discharging their responsibility for recommending locations for the 200-Bev. accelerator the National Academy of Sciences unquestionably employed superior judgment and objectivity—based on the locational criteria made available by the Atomic Energy Commission. It is apparent that the factor of inequitable distribution of the Nation's scientific research installations was not introduced into the locational equation.

Realizing that the NAS report is in the form of a recommendation, and that the AEC is not bound to the selected sites, we want to again impress upon your office our view of the broader national interest involved in the selection of a site for this facility. We cannot believe the thought processes regarding this facility are short range in nature. If the principal aim is to get the accelerator in operation in the shortest possible time, five of the six selected locations are logical. The discipline of high energy physics is relatively mature in those places. But we believe long-range implicaions should prevail in an installation of this significance.

If national policy dictates geographical balance in other areas of our society, why not in scientific strength? The cycles that the South is striving to break in the long reach toward national standards will never be broken without clear recognition, and decisive action, by federally controlled agencies in their search for new sites for major research facilities.

We would point out that Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, and Houston were not rich with scientific talent until an outside influence dictated the desirability of moving there.

Placed in the South, the accelerator would serve a catalytic function that would do more to propel this region into the mainstream of scientific excellence than five times $375 million doled to our universities as grants. And this, we submit, is a consideration so consistent with the national purpose, and so vital to the development of the Nation's least developed region—the South—that we urge its inclusion as a primary criteria in your further deliberations on this project, in view of its projected magnitude.

Sincerely,

EUGENE PATTERSON,
Chairman, Accelerator Committee.

Mr. President, I want to state that I emphatically share the views and arguments that Mr. Patterson presents with great force and eloquence. I believe his rebuttal to the recommendations of the Academy Committee is too compelling to be ignored either by the Atomic Energy Commission or by the Congress, which will have the responsibility for authorizing and funding the 200 Bev. accelerator project.

I must in frankness say to the Senate that I have never entertained any illusions about the chances that the accelerator would be located in Georgia or, for that matter, in any Southern State. I have made this clear time and again to the citizens of my State who worked ardently to have our proposed sites considered. The truth that all of us recognized candidly from the beginning was that Georgia and the South faced obstacles—both real and contrived—so formidable as to make our prospects dim indeed.

However, I have insisted with all the vigor I could muster that my State be given full and equal consideration by the AEC and by the Site Evaluation Committee. At the very least, we deserved our day in court to present our assets and advantages without prejudice to those who are responsible for selecting the accelerator site. I do not believe we received such consideration from the Site Evaluation Committee of the National Academy of Sciences.

Initially, the Atomic Energy Commission received 126 proposals from 46 States encompassing some 200 candidate sites for the accelerator. Forty-four of these proposals were from the 11 States that we generally regard as Southern, including Texas, which may or may not any longer fall into this category.

The AEC itself weighed these proposals against the basic siting criteria that it had laid down in advance. Eight-five proposals survived the AEC screening, 34 of them in them in the 11 Southern

States. In the words of the official AEC announcement of September 15, 1965, the sites suggested in these 85 proposals "met the basic criteria established for the site."

These sites were then turned over to the National Academy of Sciences for evaluation and recommendation by the special committee chosen for this purpose. It was from these sites that the six finalists have been chosen.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if the 34 sites proposed from the Southern States were good enough by the AEC's own basic criteria to survive the initial screening that at least one of them might have been promising enough to impress the Academy Committee. But apparently none of them did for reasons best known to the Science Committee.

I have been advised that the Selection Committee made onsite visits to the six sites recommended, and perhaps a few others besides. But so far as I can determine through the staff of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, not 1 of the 34 southern sites—and most of these were groups of sites—was visited by the committee as such.

It is true that teams from the AEC staff visited all of the sites included in the 85 proposals and reported their findings to the Academy Committee. But my point—and the point which I submit is pertinent—is that not one site from a Southern State was inspected by the Committee itself, though it did find time enough to visit those it recommended.

Mr. President, I suppose that except for the six locations recommended by the Committee, the question of choosing the site for the National Accelerator Laboratory is now closed. But I do not intend to see the matter ended for my State and my section without expressing my great concern over the actions of the Site Evaluation Committee and, if this is to be the case, the acquiescence of the Commission in the Committee's recommendations.

I feel, and I believe the people of our section feel, that we have presented our case to a jury that had already reached its verdict. I do not believe this procedure can be squared with the national interest and I do not believe it constitutes a fair basis for deciding the location of a major scientific activity of the Federal Government which will be financed by great sums of tax money paid into the Treasury by the people of every section of the country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. In my State of Missouri we do not understand why none of the several sites offered were not considered further. I would hope that the remarks of the Senator from Georgia would be considered by those who made this decision. It is most unfortunate for the people of Missouri, as it is for those to whom the Senator from Georgia refers.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has made an excellent contribution to the thinking regarding the selection of the final site. Of course, there was strong competition throughout the country, but I cannot believe that there was enough difference in the available facilities to warrant the concentration to which the Senator referred.

In my State of Alabama, three sites were included in the final consideration. I accompanied the committee's representatives on a visit to one of the sites, and a representative from my office went with them when they visited the other two sites. They were well pleased and apparently submitted a good report.

I do not say that other sites were not equally good; but it strikes me, from a reading of the report, that there has been undue concentration, as the Senator from Georgia has so well pointed out.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It is particularly unfortunate that not one of the 34 Southern sites was even visited, after the matter left the hands of the Atomic Energy Commission. So the National Science Academy's committee was undoubtedly guided purely by the scientific atmosphere of the sites and made no effort whatever to visit any of the 34 sites in Southern States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I also wish to address myself to the question raised by the senior Senator from Georgia, because the Arlee site on the Montana Flathead Indian Reservation, was among the 85 locations considered before the number was reduced to 6. In that area we have inexpensive power. The soil is good and would furnish a solid foundation. Importantly too, there are good rail connections and air connections are relatively good. In short, the area seems well suited for the AEC project site.

But evidently these decisions are made, in large part, on the basis of the close proximity of educational institutions offering specialized facilities. As the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, that results unfortunately in a higher concentration in particular localities rather than in a broad dispersal of these projects throughout the Nation.

I hope that when a matter such as this arises in the future, the committee which makes the selection does not emphasize unduly the fact that the location should be near the same higher centers of learning, but considers instead the fact that State universities, State schools of technology, and State colleges also have a great deal to offer in the way of scientific know-how. In this way the Nation as a whole may share in a more expansive way the advantages brought by such projects.

The Senator from Georgia has performed a service in making his speech today. I hope it will be read with interest.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The tragedy is that not only does such a decision concentrate all the facilities in a few favored sections of the country, but it drives to those sections all the bright minds from other sections. Because of the vast expenditure of Federal funds, it is impossible to hold the best scientists in sections that are absolutely neglected so far as the expenditure of Federal dollars is concerned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not that remind the Senator of the passage in Scriptures:

> For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes—

> But from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HARTKE:

Address delivered by Postmaster General O'Brien at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Indianapolis.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Statement by him relative to Greek independence.

HARVARD ALUMNI BULLETIN FAVORS RETENTION OF NDEA LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I call attention to an article in the March 19, 1966, Harvard Alumni Bulletin which presents a persuasive case in favor of the retention of the National Defense Education Act student loan program, that the Bureau of the Budget and the administration recommended be phased out this year.

In addition to the arguments which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I raised in a colloquy on the floor of the Senate on March 2, the article written by Robert J. Samuelson raises some new issues as to why the National Defense Education Act student loan program ought to be retained, and why the so-called guaranteed bank loans will not take the place in our educational system of the student loan program.

For instance, under the guaranteed reduced interest bank loan program, with which the Bureau of the Budget proposes to replace the National Defense Education Act, would the banks be required to tell the college exactly how large the loan it granted was? This question is important because most colleges put together a student's financial aid package from a variety of sources: a scholarship, a National Defense Education Act loan, a part-time job. Mr. Samuelson points out that replacing the National Defense

Education Act would throw Harvard's technique of financing into confusion:

> If the university has no way of knowing exactly how big the student's loan is, then how can it rationally plan the rest of his program? No doubt, there are ways of finding out, but they involve additional paperwork and, if there is no mandatory procedure for disclosure, it still could be uncertain. Naturally, the university might well like to have a controlling influence over the size of the loans given by the banks.

Samuelson goes on to note that poorer students, because they would be less favored by lending institutions, might not get sufficient loan funds. For a wealthy college like Harvard the difference could be made up with the institution's own funds although even for Harvard, our wealthiest university, this would be a strain. The article states that—

> The university is perhaps concerned, however that some smaller colleges, with less formidable financial resources, might not be able to increase their own scholarship programs to meet any new costs.

This ratifies, as was brought out in the colloquy on the floor of the Senate among several Senators, that the so-called guaranteed bank loans will not replace National Defense Education Act loans and assure an education for the student of modest means.

Finally, the article quotes a recent editorial from the Harvard Crimson, which sums up very well the problem facing the poor student:

> Guaranteed loans are simply not appropriate for the country's neediest college students, those whose families will be unable to negotiate loans privately; National Defense Education Act loans are easily accessible to the poorest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article from the Harvard Alumni Bulletin be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNDERGRADUATE: MONEY FOR STUDENT LOANS—THE "BOSTON CRIMSON"

Lyndon B. Johnson and the powers that be in the American financial and educational establishments had a confrontation last month. And Lyndon B. Johnson did something that he rarely does: he retreated.

The clash came over the National Defense Education Act's form of student loans. The President proposed in his state of the Union message that the loans made by the Government be eliminated and replaced by a system of private guaranteed loans.

For the student, the change would mean added confusion and trouble. Instead of getting a loan directly through his college, the student would have to negotiate individually with a bank. All the complexities of the market situation would have been shifted to his shoulders. The loan guarantee provided by the States under the Johnson program would have been some safeguard for the needy student: with the guarantee, the poorest, who are automatically the poorest risks, wouldn't have been totally deprived of loans. But there was nothing to guarantee that banks would be able to loan to all needy students, and those left out might be the ones who needed it most.

That was exactly one of the things that troubled both leading educators and bankers. The bankers were worried that, if the National Defense Education Act revision were pushed through Congress, they would not have enough money to cover all the student loans. The burden for the market (most guessed it would be more than 200 million a year) was just too great for them to bear, at least without a little time to prepare themselves. The mere clerical complexities of the new system required, at the very minimum, a transition period.

The educators, for their part, had deeper concerns. Would all students be able to get the loans? Would not having bank insured loans make it easier for the relatively more affluent to get loans, thereby leaving the truly needy student without any support? (After all, banks are out to make money and, given the choice between a poor risk and a good risk, there is not much doubt as to which would be accepted.) Would, in fact, the new program attract people who would not ordinarily apply for loans, but who would be relatively good risks for banks?

The educators had other questions: Would the banks be required to tell the college exactly how large the loan it had granted was? Would the college have any control over the size of the grant to the student? For Harvard administrators, these questions might seem particularly important.

One of Harvard's chief concerns is putting together a student's financial package. If he needs help, the university will try to provide money from a number of sources: a university scholarship, a National Defense Education Act loan, a part-time job. Any of these tools can be supplemented with funds from private sources, though these are usually not within university jurisdiction.

What the National Defense Education Act replacement program does to Harvard's technique of financing is throw it into confusion. If the university has no way of knowing exactly how big the student's loan is, then how can it rationally plan the rest of his program? No doubt, there are ways of finding out, but they involve additional paperwork and, if there is no mandatory procedure for disclosure, it still could be uncertain. Naturally, the university might well like to have a controlling influence over the size of the loans given by banks.

Just as important, because the new loan system might make loans harder for some students to get, the university would face the prospect of having students whose insufficient loans left them too little money. For Harvard that would be unbearable, and the admissions office has made it clear that if there is any change, Harvard students will not suffer. The university is perhaps concerned, however, that some smaller colleges, with less formidable financial resources, might not be able to increase their own scholarship programs to meet any new costs.

The list of grievances against the new program, then, fell into two categories: the objections in principle to the new scheme, and the objections based on the speed at which the new program was to be implemented.

It was an impressive list, and there were many people who thought it represented a justifiable indictment of the new program. An indication of just how impressive it was came at the end of February when Harold Howe II, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, met with top educators and banking officials at no other place than the White House. The President didn't attend (or at least it was so reported), but the significance of a White House meeting was not lost.

The meeting, and whatever other behind-the-scenes pressure there was, must have convinced Lyndon Johnson of something, for when he sent his education measure to Congress, the student loan proposal was clearly a compromise. Johnson had not budged on principle: he still wanted the National Defense Education Act loan program ended (the reason: to save money, many observers suspected), but he was willing to phase it out over a period of years. For 1966–67, he asked for about $150 million in direct, old style National Defense Education Act loans, only about $40 million less than the originally anticipated amount.

Despite the President's concessions, most of the hard, fundamental questions about shifting away from National Defense Education Act to a system of guaranteed loans remain. There is a strong feeling among many at Harvard that National Defense Education Act ought to be retained. For example, the Crimson said:

"Guaranteed loans are simply not appropriate for the country's neediest college students, those whose families will be unable to negotiate loans privately; National Defense Education Act loans are easily accessible to the poorest. College administrators envision a two-headed Federal loan program; they would like to retain National defense loans, on a much smaller basis, and also establish a guaranteed loan program for middle-income families. If Congress wants to make the best and today that unfortunately means the most costly higher education available to rich and poor, it will follow the college's advice."

SUCCESSFUL FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS BEING CARRIED OUT IN RURAL SOUTH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an article in the March 28 New York Times tells of successful efforts at family planning programs in the rural South. The article states that "the experiments have implications for the worldwide effort to harness population growth since a preponderant majority in the population explosion areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are rural."

The success of pilot programs such as these is an added argument in favor of increased governmental support for these activities. The program is succeeding in each area, with both races.

An amendment which I have offered to the Food for Freedom bill on behalf of myself and Senators GRUENING, METCALF, and TYDINGS, would set aside 15 percent of the currencies that accrue in each country from sales of agricultural products for foreign currencies "for financing a program emphasizing maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, and family planning services, and research activities related to the problems of population growth."

Evidence continues to accumulate indicating that such efforts, if well planned, can make a significant impact upon population growth. We need expect no overnight miracles, but intelligent planning and execution can make a meaningful difference in areas of highest educational attainment, and it can similarly make an impact in the rural areas of the nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Birth Control Gains in the Rural South," written by Roy Reed, and published in the New York Times of March 28, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIRTH CONTROL GAINS IN THE RURAL SOUTH

(By Roy Reed)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., March 25.—Experiments being conducted in two southern States indicate that rural Americans, both white and Negro, can be induced to adopt modern birth control if information and materials are taken to them systematically and rationally.

The experiments are in 13 Black Belt (named for rich, black, limestone-derived soils) countries of southern Alabama, heavily populated by rural Negroes, and eight Appalachian Mountain counties of eastern Kentucky, inhabited largely by rural whites.

The experiments have implications for the worldwide effort to harness population growth since a preponderant majority in the population explosion areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America are rural.

The studies have uncovered no magic formula for reaching stand-offish country people. Success apparently depends on a variety of factors. However, one key seems to be the use of local residents, instead of polished, professional outsiders, to spread information by word of mouth.

It is too early to measure the results precisely, but researchers hope to do that in a final report by the end of this year.

Dr. Thomas J. Bogue, who is directing the studies, is director of the Community and Family Study Center of the University of Chicago.

"I am confident," Dr. Bogue said, "there will be a substantial effect on the birth rate."

The experiments are being financed by the Population Council of New York, and are being conducted with the cooperation of the Planned Parenthood League of Alabama, the Alabama Department of Public Health, the University of Kentucky School of Medicine and several private physicians.

PERCEPTIBLE PROGRESS

They are being conducted through public health clinics in Alabama and through private physicians' offices and clinics in eastern Kentucky.

A preliminary report showed that in the 13 Alabama counties, the number of new "family planning patients" had risen from 407 in the first quarter of 1963—before the experiment began—to 1,903 in the first quarter of 1965, after the experiment had been in effect for a year.

The experiment attracted 978 women in Kentucky, and at least 771 stayed with it.

Dr. Bogue said that to his knowledge the Alabama and Kentucky experiments were the first efforts to influence rural birth rates in this Nation in a short time even though the rural birth rate is 15 to 20 percent higher than that in urban areas. The Planned Parenthood Association of America concentrates almost exclusively on urban populations, he said.

Old wives' tales seem to be one of the main obstacles to acceptance of birth control in rural areas.

Mrs. Sinolia Mike, a Negro family planning social worker, with the Birmingham Planned Parenthood program, said that in her travels in Alabama she often encountered Negro women who believed that they should "breed again" to cure some physical ailment.

OLD WIVES TALES

"You will hear a woman say, 'I think maybe I should have another child and then I will not have this pain under my heart,'" Mrs. Mike said, "Or they will say, 'The Lord put me here to have babies.'"

To spread information effectively, the experimenters have hired a "family planning educator" in each Black Belt county. The educator is a Negro woman who is widely known, liked and respected in the community, a person able to talk informally with the women visiting the health clinics.

DR. MICHAEL E. DeBAKEY OF HOUSTON, TEX., RECEIVES 1966 JAMES F. MITCHELL FOUNDATION AWARD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Tuesday, March 15, 1966, the International Award Dinner of the James F. Mitchell Foundation for Medical Education and Research was held here in Washington, D.C.

The recipient of this year's award is Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, the brilliant surgeon from Houston, Tex., who received this year's James F. Mitchell International Award for his heart and vascular research.

Dr. DeBakey is the man who is conducting research into providing for living humans an entire, new artificial heart. Healthy parts of hearts have been installed in living humans and are working well. It is estimated that by 1970 it will be possible to place an artificial heart in a man having a diseased heart, thus enabling him to continue to live and function normally.

The Honorable Senator LISTER HILL of Alabama, chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, presented the award to Dr. DeBakey at the dinner and delivered a speech that should be preserved for the benefit of all to read because of Senator HILL's outstanding record in supporting legislation in the medical and health fields.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Senator HILL, the acceptance speech of Dr. DeBakey, and the text of a letter of congratulations sent by President Lyndon B. Johnson to Dr. DeBakey, which was read at the dinner, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR LISTER HILL OF ALABAMA UPON PRESENTING AWARD TO DR. MICHAEL DEBAKEY

The man we honor tonight is in the great tradition of John Hunter, considered by many medical historians as the father of surgery, for our honoree's broad knowledge of medicine and his passionate love of the history and the practice of medicine have combined to create "the compleat doctor."

As a young resident at Tulane University Medical School, Michael E. DeBakey sat at the feet of one of the greatest of all American surgeons, Dr. Rudolph Matas, who with his radical operation for aneurysm in 1903 made the first advance of this type of surgery since the time of John Hunter.

During these early years of what was to become a most illustrious career, Dr. DeBakey, frequently called the "Texas Tornado," exhibited a characteristic impatience with the imperfect techniques of his time by devising a roller pump that produced minimal trauma to the blood elements and eventually became a key element in heart-lung machines. Later, at Baylor University, he pioneered in the development of methods of repairing diseased or clot-obstructed blood vessels by the use of replacements of preserved human blood vessels and, subsequently, of artificial blood vessels composed of dacron and other synthetic materials.

In what is probably his greatest surgical contribution, Dr. DeBakey demonstrated that vascular lesions caused by generalized diseases like arteriosclerosis are frequently confined to well-defined, localized areas and are therefore amenable to highly successful surgical intervention. In the application of this concept, he showed not only skill but tremendous courage for he ventured into many areas considered previously inoperable—the entire aorta and many blood vessels all the way to the lower extremities, the brain and other vital organs. More than a decade ago, he did the first repair surgery on a carotid artery which had become clogged; since that time he, and his surgical team, have performed more than 1,000 operations to relieve the complications of stroke.

Our honoree might rightly be called "the indefatigable surgeon," for he performs some 6 to 10 delicate operations in the course of a day. Over the past three decades he has performed more than 10,000 operations—a record unexcelled in the entire annals of surgery.

But Dr. DeBakey is more than a great surgical technician. His deepest commitment is to the advancement of medical knowledge. At Baylor University, he runs the largest cardiovascular research center in the world. On innumerable occasions he has testified before congressional committees here in Washington on behalf of funds for medical research for research projects throughout the land and, as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee that handles these funds, I can tell you that there is no more knowledgeable, dedicated or persuasive advocate than Dr. DeBakey. He is always armed with an amazing array of facts and projects to Congress a deep and compassionate concern for every human being who suffers because present medical knowledge is insufficient to cure him.

Although his multiple careers as surgeon, teacher and research worker are most demanding, he has given unstintingly of his time over the past quarter of a century to serving our National Government in various capacities. During World War II, he was assigned to the Office of the Surgeon General of the Army as Director of the Division of Surgical Consultants; he devised the system of special treatment centers which brought emergency surgery immediately to our fighting men and saved thousands of lives.

At the close of World War II, he helped set up the first medical advisory committee to the Secretary of War and he is still a surgical adviser to the Department of Defense and to the Army. Serving on both the first Hoover Commission and the National Research Council, he was a major architect in creating a modern Veterans' Administration hospital system closely allied with our medical schools and capable of conducting significant research and training programs. He has given hundreds of hours of his time to the Veterans' Administration, and is as responsible as any one human being for its present high level of medical care and research.

He has been influential in the growth and development of the National Institutes of Health. Over the years he has served on a number of its advisory councils and was most recently appointed by President Johnson to his present position as a member of the Advisory Council on the Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke regional medical programs.

Many of you in this audience know that he was Chairman of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, but few of you know of the many days and nights he spent in attending Commission hearings and in shaping the final report of that distinguished Commission. His efforts, and those of his colleagues, produced a bold and revolutionary blueprint for a new attack upon these three diseases which claim 70 percent of all American lives each year. President Johnson, deeply impressed with the cogency and eloquence of the DeBakey report, recommended legislation in 1965 which the Congress enacted providing for a network of regional medical complexes to narrow the tragic gap between the research breakthrough and the clinical follow-through in the fields of heart disease, cancer and stroke.

A half century ago his beloved mentor Dr. Matas, in his great address, "The Soul of the Surgeon," described the prevailing passion which has consumed the heart of the man we honor tonight:

> "Let no one speak without reverence of that magnificent institution which is called surgery. Let us love the spirit which animates and guides her true knights, for she makes her sons better, nobler men; because surgery is a sublime inspirer of the most useful, the most humanitarian efforts, inspirer of sympathy, of kindness, and of pity for the feeble and the miserable and the unfortunate of our kind."

It is with great personal pride and pleasure that I have the privilege of expressing the appreciation of everyone here tonight in presenting at this time the first James F. Mitchell Foundation International Award for outstanding achievement in cardiovascular research to Dr. Michael E. DeBakey.

RESPONSE OF DR. MICHAEL E. DEBAKEY

Senator HILL, distinguished ladies and gentlemen, because there are so many distinguished ladies and gentlemen here that there is not time to name them. Indeed, the time that remains for me here, anyway, before I have to catch a plane makes it essential that I be brief. But I must tell you that my heart is filled with deep thanks, a profound sense of appreciation for the very eloquent, the very warm, very kind things that have been said about what I have tried to do, anyway.

I want to also express several other thoughts in addition to my profound appreciation for all that has been said. I want, of course, to express my profound thanks to the trustees of the Mitchell Foundation for the very high honor in selecting me for this award, and particularly the high honor of selecting me as their first awardee.

I must also take this occasion to express my thanks and appreciation to so many of my good friends, so many individuals in this audience whom I have the privilege of calling my friends, for whom I have so much admiration, so much respect. Many of them have come long distances to be here tonight, and in a sense this is an honor that I deeply appreciate.

Both Senator HILL and Congressman FOGARTY have referred to some of the things that I have done in such a fine way, but I must express the thought that crossed my mind as they were saying these things to you, and that is that it has been my very good opportunity to do some of these things because of the things they have done, because of the things that individuals like Mary Lasker have done, that so many of my associates and friends, my colleagues in medicine have done, who have worked hard to provide. It requires vision. It requires courage to work and fight for the things you believe in, and these are the kinds of things they believe in, that they made possible by their vision, by their courage, by their willingness to fight for them. I consider it a privilege to join this group in fighting for these same things.

Those of us who are intimately associated with patient care, with problems in clinical medicine, who have daily to be associated with the grief of the families of the patients that we have that we are unable to provide relief from suffering know how important it is to carry on research and to carry it on at a more accelerated pace than we are doing today. The need exists now for these people, not in the future. The need to find better ways of dealing with these problems is apparent to those of us who are facing it every day. We don't feel we can wait until all of the answers are available. We must find means of dealing with these problems at the present moment, when so many of the patients are suffering from them, so many of the problems to which we know the answers will be provided in time, but these answers will never be found if we don't start now looking for them.

That is why those of us who have asked the Congress, who have asked the administration, who have asked everyone we could ask, the voluntary organizations, to fight for more support for these activities. [Applause.]

Dr. Terry very generously referred to the program of our President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, and to the first three major recommendations to provide a better way of bringing to the sufferers of these conditions the knowledge that exists today in dealing better with these problems. He did not refer to our recommendations for the support required to do this. The program exists. Most of us believe in this program, as Dr. Terry indicated. But to implement this program it will require additional funds to what we now have. To implement it and to do it in the way we know it can be done to meet the needs that exist today, we must have the funds to do it, in the same fashion that there were 32 other recommendations in that report to advance research and medical education, because without the continued advancement of the whole movement in medicine, the whole medical scientific movement, the knowledge which exists today which we can apply in a more effective way if this program goes into effect, would become obsolete. Within a few years, we would have caught up with this knowledge, and we then have no more knowledge, or very little knowledge to apply this. That is why it is so essential to keep this movement going, to keep it going at a more accelerated pace, and that is why it is so important that we have the additional funds to support these activities, and to accelerate this whole program, because without research we will never get the knowledge that we need.

It is very well to talk about the great advances we have made in the past decade and a half in the cardiovascular area, to be sure, more advances than have ever been made in previous recorded history in this field, but it only came about because of the vision, the leadership, the courage of people like Mary Lasker, like Senator HILL, like Congressman FOGARTY, who have fought to establish organizations that could get the funds to do the job. Of course, one can almost chart these advances with the development, growth, and support that has come from the National Institutes of Health.

To be sure, the voluntary organizations have done a magnificent job. They had a great deal to do with the establishment of the National Institutes of Health. They lent their support and influence to it. They gave the public education that was required to give this support. But the major amount of funds required for these purposes today must come from Federal sources today. We must realize, we must be realistic about it, this is where the greatest source of funds exists, and after all, it is our money, whether it be on a voluntary basis or on a tax basis. For these purposes, I think it is extremely important that we recognize the National Institutes of Health as the major force in providing the support that has given us the advances in which we now can take great pride. It is for this reason that I think it is important that we continue to support these activities.

It is also for this reason that I pay great tribute to these leaders, these individuals who have given so much of their time and energy, who have had the vision to provide for the support to meet these goals.

I believe that we are able to visualize now, advances that we will look back upon in comparison to the advances we have made will be regarded as far more exciting than ever before. I think the future now holds much greater promise in the conquest of these diseases then ever before, provided we continue to support this movement as strongly as it has been supported in the past, and even more strongly. We can only achieve the goals which Congressmen FOGARTY so eloquently referred to a moment ago by this concerted effort, by this recognition of the need to support medical research and the need to support education in these fields.

I would hope that we will do this now and continue to do this in the future.

I would like again to express my deep gratitude for this high honor and for the wonderful things that these people in this audience and at this table have done to make it possible for me as a representative of medical science to receive this honor. Thank you so much. [Applause.]

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 15, 1966.

Dr. MICHAEL E. DEBAKEY,
Statler Hilton Hotel,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. DEBAKEY: I am happy to express publicly my warm admiration for your work.

The James F. Mitchell Foundation could have chosen no worthier recipient for its medical research award.

Your talent and your energy in this cause will live forever in the accomplishments which bear the DeBakey mark.

Your successful leadership in marshalling the resources of this Nation to bring to all mankind the maximum benefits of medical research has justifiably earned you the world's acclaim.

Your efforts as Chairman of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke have advanced an endeavor to which I have long been deeply committed.

Your Nation salutes you and your President commends you.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

TRIBUTE TO THE GREEK GOVERNMENT FOR ENJOINING GREEK-FLAG VESSELS FROM TRANSPORTING CARGO TO AND FROM NORTH VIETNAMESE PORTS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the Greek Government for a royal decree it enacted on March 2, 1966.

As a result of that decree all Greek-flag vessels are enjoined from the transportation of cargo of any kind to and from ports of North Vietnam.

As I pointed out before on the floor of the U.S. Senate, and I point out again today, Mr. President, ships flying the flags of allied nations—those with whom our country has mutual defense pacts—are delivering goods and commodities to North Vietnam.

A large majority of these ships fly the British flag.

Merchant shipping is the sole important industry of the Greek nation. So the initiative of the Greek Government in preventing ships flying its flags from trading with North Vietnam should receive public recognition.

This initiative of the Greek Government proves once more the sense of allied solidarity which Greece has already shown in other similar circumstances. Indeed, since 1949 Greece has restricted all trade with Red China, this in marked contrast with other allied governments, particularly West Germany, which has officially guaranteed the financing of a steel plant for the Red Chinese.

I cite another example. The Greek Government has barred all trade with the island of Cuba, the royal decree being signed on March 12, 1963, and September 24, 1963.

I am pleased today to publicly commend the Hellenic Government for its March 2 decree which prevents Greek-flag vessels from transporting cargo of any kind to and from the ports of North Vietnam.

This should be a source of great pride to the Greek-Americans, who are such an important part of our Nation. These warmhearted people have proved themselves through the years to be among the very finest citizens of our Nation.

Incidentally, last Friday, March 25, was the 145th anniversary of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire, which was won in 1821.

BUSINESS ALERTED CIVIL RIGHTS IMPACT GREATER AND BROADER THAN WAGNER ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the February–March issue of Trial, published by the American Trial Lawyers Association, entitled "Business Alerted Civil Rights Impact Greater and Broader Than Wagner Act."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

GUIDELINES FOR ENFORCEMENT—BUSINESS ALERTED CIVIL RIGHTS' IMPACT GREATER AND BROADER THAN WAGNER ACT

The U.S. Justice Department served notice it intended to increase enforcement of the antidiscrimination section of the Civil Rights Act.

Twenty-one Federal agencies handling grants for Federal assistance were given detailed guidelines from Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach on how they were to proceed under the Civil Rights Act, especially the antidiscrimination (title VI) section.

This section requires withholding of Federal monetary assistance from any program where discrimination is found.

The Attorney General disclosed he had asked the U.S. Civil Service Commission to develop and train officers and personnel in Federal agencies charged with enforcement of title VI.

WARNING TO BUSINESS

At the same time the Industrial Relations News—the weekly newsletter in the personnel and industrial field—called upon attorneys for business to realize that title VII (equal employment opportunity section) would have "a broader and deeper effect upon business than did the Wagner Act if the businessman would prevail competitively."

Quoting a prominent Washington, D.C., attorney, the IRN said: "What a corporation needs today to remain competitive is a corporate policy against discrimination backed by aggressive procedures, and definite action. Damage from an unjust accusation by a disgruntled employee could be devastating to a corporation image and sales before it proves the charges baseless and unjust."

The U.S. News & World Report magazine asked in a feature article if "enforcing civil rights laws would be a prohibition-size job."

With 631 full-time workers to enforce all the laws against racial discrimination, the Federal Government would have to police: 258,000 employers of 31 million workers; 220,000 restaurants; 67,000 hotels and motels, etc.; 27,000 public school districts; 27,000 public parks; 250,000 housing units and 190 Federal aid programs—to mention but a few listed by U.S. News & World Report.

The eight-page Katzenbach directive included requirements that the agencies hold hearings to determine whether or not a recipient of Federal aid is complying with the antisegregation law. Also included is a requirement that the agencies make continuing, periodic checkups to make certain compliance is continuing.

Katzenbach, who was given the task of enforcing title VI after that duty was taken from the Office of Economic Opportunity, said:

"There should be no mistaking the clear intent and effect of the guidelines. Title VI must and will be enforced. Assistance will be refused or terminated to noncomplying recipients and applicants who are not amenable to other sanctions."

Katzenbach said also the guidelines are not to be applied retroactively. Included in the guidelines was a policy statement: "It is clearly inconsistent with our national policy of fair play and justice if any citizen is excluded on racial grounds from programs or activities receiving financial aid from the Federal Government."

The guidelines are designed to assure that Negroes will receive, among other benefits, adequate care in hospitals, equal access to surplus foods, full participation in programs for higher education, and equal employment opportunities, he said.

DOUBLE LEGAL STAFF

To enforce the new civil rights laws the Justice Department has more than doubled its staff of lawyers and plans to add more legal assistance. Enforcement of the Voting Rights Act alone is expected to prove a major undertaking for the Justice Department.

Some indication of the problems that may arise came in an unusual suit filed by Alaska in the U.S. district court.

The Voting Rights Act provides that a State may use a voting test if the District Court at Washington, D.C. finds that the test is not used to discriminate on racial grounds. The Alaska Constitution provides that any citizen who is 19 years of age or older who can read or speak English and has resided in the State at least 30 days can be enrolled to vote.

Alaska Gov. William A. Egan and Senators ERNEST GRUENING and E. L. BARTLETT said this test never was used.

PUBLICATION OF ARTICLE BY SENATOR SPARKMAN IN THE VIRGINIA LAW WEEKLY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the law school at the University of Virginia was honored recently by having an article written by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] appear in the March 10, 1966, issue of the Virginia Law Weekly. The article was on real property matters, on which the Senator from Alabama is indeed an authority.

The history and development of the standard rule of procedure for trying condemnation of land cases, especially as it relates to the right to trial by jury, is discussed in this article. I have always favored protecting the right to trial by jury, and the Senate itself on two occasions has passed proposed legislation in line with the views expressed by the Senator from Alabama.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAL PROPERTY IN THE URBAN SOCIETY—SENATOR DESCRIBES NEED FOR JUST COMPENSATION

(NOTE.—JOHN J. SPARKMAN has served since 1946 as U.S. Senator from Alabama. For 10 years prior to his election to the Senate he served as a Member of the House of Representatives. In 1952 he was the Democratic nominee for Vice President.

(Senator SPARKMAN is chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee and is also chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business. He is ranking member on the Foreign Relations and Banking and Currency Committees.

(As a member of the Alabama bar, Senator SPARKMAN was active in the practice of law from 1925 to 1936. He received his A.B., A.M. and LL.B. degrees from the University of Alabama where he was a member of Phi Beta Kappa.)

(By JOHN J. SPARKMAN)

At the outset, I would like to take occasion to commend the law school at the University of Virginia and the Virginia Law Weekly for the very fine series of articles which have been called to my attention on the subject of real property and the problems both legal and governmental related thereto in the development of our society at the local, State and National levels. It is a privilege to respond to an invitation to comment on the basic subject of just compensation and the related programs for relocation aid which I consider in definite need of unification.

It is paramount in my concept of housing, urban renewal, open space, highway construction and all programs geared to aid both the individual and local public bodies, that the Congress as well as the courts should keep in mind a proper balance between private property rights as laid down in both State and Federal Constitutions and the exigencies of the times as motivated by an unprecedented population growth and a gross national product that would have staggered the imagination of both law students and faculty alike at this great institution of higher learning less than a generation ago. In fact, if the ghost of Thomas Jefferson walks occasionally amongst the pleasant and beautiful colonnades of the university that he founded, he must believe that in fact a better part of his battle against every form of tyranny over the mind of man must have been won or else no nation founded on freedom of the individual could have attained such greatness.

There is another side of the picture, however, and that is the lot of the individual who is thrown out of his property by the onrush of what might appear to be a tyrannical government with no place to go and with only an often too small sum of money in his hands that will not go very far in the modern world of high prices, to replace his castle that he called his home. He is the victim of the use of sovereign power as expressed, if need be, in eminent domain proceedings whether State or Federal—a power necessary to the public interest, but a power that should be used sparingly and with the aid of compassionate legislation which lets him know that his Government is willing to balance sovereignty with at least the spirit of the Bill of Rights without which our constitutional form of government would not have been brought into existence in 1789.

RIGHTS ADJUSTED

We have made several departures from our original guaranties in the Constitution as regards individual and property rights. This has been done by the developing tide of legislation to care for the masses of the people and to refurbish the economy. It has been done also under the doctrine that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says that it is. The Court in its own way has adjusted the Constitution somewhat to the temper and mores of the people of its generation or era.

As to the issue of just compensation, I have been extremely interested in seeing a landowner get full compensation under the fifth amendment since as a budding young lawyer in Alabama I tried my first condemnations case in Federal court. In those days prior to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Federal courts operated under the Federal Conformity Act, which meant that they would conform as nearly as practicable to the law of the State. All but four States allowed a trial by jury of the issue of just compensation as a matter of right. Naturally it followed that in Federal courts a jury trial was available when demanded. This rule was abolished when rule 71A(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures went into effect.

I am an open and firm advocate of keeping high and inviolate the right to trial by jury in criminal, civil and land condemnation cases. The courts have made inroads on these rights, perhaps in the practical interest of clearing out overcrowded dockets. In so doing they have narrowed the protecting scope of constitutional guaranties in criminal matters, mainly criminal contempt and in the right to jury trials in civil matters under the seventh amendment.

Court decisions holding in effect that the seventh amendment does not assure the right to trial by jury in condemnation of land cases paved the way for the arbitrary action of the Supreme Court in abolishing it as a right of promulgating rule 71A(h). See *United States* v. *Iriarte*, 157 F. 2d 105 (1st Cir. 1946), which was predicated on the common law clause of the seventh amendment. See also *Bauman* v. *Ross*, 167 U.S. 548 (1897).

When rule 71A went into effect on August 1, 1951, I had been in the Senate nearly 5 years. I remember distinctly the great alarm held by the late Senator Pat McCarran, of Nevada, then chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, over the Supreme Court in promulgating this rule assuming that its rulemaking authority extended to substantive matters such as the right to trial by jury. He felt, as I did and still do, that the Supreme Court should restrict itself to the matters delegated to it by Congress when it was authorized to promulgate rules of procedure and not statutory rules of substantive law. In other words, it could deal with the method of selecting the jury but not with the right to jury trial itself. Here it has clearly stepped over the bounds.

An unfortunate and delicate practical situation faced the Congress, however, because the rule had to be rejected within 90 days or it became law by silence. All of rule 71A which was the whole condemnation procedure and a good one at that, had to be rejected to get at the obnoxious part which was subsection (h). This subsection sounds innocuous in its statements that either party may demand a jury trial but it clearly gives the discretion to the trial judge as to whether he shall allow a jury trial, appoint commissioners or hear the issue of just compensation himself. In other words, he can do what he pleases with a sacred and traditional right that is protected by the constitutions or laws of practically every State in the Nation.

This is a right also which deals with the payment by the Government for the invasion of a basic property right which must yield to sovereignty. In this I have always felt that just compensation should not be merely the popular and honest sounding term "fair market value," but that something else in the nature of punitive damages should be allowed. Yet in the great maze of court decisions on this point I have not been able to suggest a clear rule that would seem to cure all of the inequities that might arise.

Senator McCarran in 1951 suggested to the Senate that in lieu of rejecting all of rule 71A, it pass a separate resolution and later a simple bill stating that if either party in a condemnation of land case demanded a jury trial of the issue of just compensation, it would be granted as a matter of law. I supported this bill and I would support another one in the future at any appropriate time. The Senate on two occasions passed this bill but unfortunately the House Judiciary Committee remained adamant and it did not become law. I cannot but feel that if and when this issue is laid squarely before the House of Representatives and is debated, then the right to trial by jury will prevail.

COSTLY APPOINTMENTS PREVAIL

Judges are only human and it is easy for a normal tendency toward clearing dockets by appointing commissioners to prevail. Commissioners may or may not allow as much compensation as juries. They cost much in fees and unnecessarily large records themselves, however, and the informality of their proceedings is a far cry from a court trial wherein a legal record according to the rules of evidence may be made and on which an intelligent appeal can be taken. Moreover, a report of a commission cannot be set aside and an appeal taken thereon unless it is clearly wrong—not just normally wrong. (See rule 53 F.R.C.P.) I have heard informally that judges here and there have tended to strain or abuse the discretion given them by rather consistently denying jury trial demands and appointing commissioners. Congress might well at some appropriate time look into this with a legislative purpose in mind of restoring the right to trial by jury. There has been a tendency in this direction in the field of criminal contempt and in civil rights laws. Judges can discipline themselves through judicial conferences. Above that, however, is the basic right of jury trial which the legislative branch should foster and protect, the rulemaking authority of the Supreme Court to the contrary notwithstanding. This should be done together with whatever added increments Congress chooses to give to the landowner whose property is taken or to the rental displacee whose business is destroyed or who must relocate his family in a home wherever one is available, and indeed they are not always easily available.

As a matter of fact, since the change was made in jury trial rights in 1951, Congress has enacted several laws giving added benefits to persons displaced by governmental action. By "added" it is meant that they are not a part of the court award or of the negotiated contract that led to the displacement of the landowner or the tenant. In urban renewal, court action, of course, is through State eminent domain proceedings.

This is a necessary and fair approach. Added increments as balancing compensation are but categorical responses to government intrusion. In another but related field; namely, the right of privacy, the Supreme Court has used the following suggestive language: "the need for a pervasive right of privacy against government intrusion has been recognized though not always given the recognition it deserves." *Gibson* v. *Florida Legislative Investigation Comm.*, 372 U.S. 539 (1963).

Every act of Congress giving added benefits to dislocated persons in a sense has been giving more and more recognition to the pervasive right against government intrusion.

I have supported the many bills that have been enacted into law (for the most part in the last 20 years) giving relocation benefits to persons and businesses dislocated by governmental action. Perhaps the most liberal set of laws on this subject at the present time is in the field of urban renewal, where as chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, which has handled this legislation, I have been in a fortunate position to be of aid on this worthy subject.

PAYMENT PROVIDED

These laws allow $200 moving expenses and loss payments to anyone plus adjusted payments of up to $500 for low- and moderate-income families and elderly persons. In the field of businesses, they allow $3,000 plus an additional $2,500 for firms with annual earnings of less than $10,000. For large business concerns, these laws allow compensation for actual total certified moving expenses on which an administrative ceiling was established by regulation at $25,000.

The problem does not stop there however. Urban renewal alone is putting thousands of small businesses into liquidation each year despite the battle that I and many others in Congress have waged successfully to have the small business laws amended to give more liberal treatment to small businessmen dislocated by governmental action. Evidence before Congress indicates that by 1972, 120,000 businesses will have been displaced by urban renewal alone and that at the present rate 3 out of 10 of these firms will liquidate.

Evidence adduced from studies, reports and hearings in Congress indicate that the general figures for all governmental displacement are running at an approximate rate of 85,550 per year of which 17,860 are business concerns and 3,660 are farmers. This figure is expected to reach 132,600 per year in the reasonably near future.

The large percentage of displacees who are in low income brackets makes the role of the Government more difficult. It owes a basic duty to lend a helping hand in this field in home, family and business reestablishment.

BENEFITS VARY

One cardinal fault of existing relocation laws is the diversity of their benefits. The American public tends to regard the Federal Government as being just that. Therefore, it is somewhat confusing when one arm of it treats displacees less or more liberally than another. It is conceivable that in the same block one family or business concern could get the full benefits of urban renewal relocation and a nearby family or business dislocated by the highway program could receive nothing because the highway benefits depend on State enabling laws and 28 States have not enacted them. Moreover, most of those enacted State laws are not as liberal as the Federal highway benefits, which in themselves are not as beneficial as urban renewal benefits. For example, no business moving expenses under the highway laws can exceed $3,000.

Defense Department relocation laws allow "fair and reasonable costs" but not to exceed 25 percent of fair market value of property taken (moving expenses, costs in search for replacement property, costs to obtain financing and closing costs for replacement property).

The Tennessee Valley Authority is authorized to advise and cooperate in readjustment of population displaced by its projects and to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies to that end.

In short, there are far too few relocation assistance laws for our Federal programs, and those that we do have should be unified.

I have urged a general and unified Federal approach to the issues of just compensation and relocation assistance for some time, and have encouraged committees in Congress and agency personnel to study the problem. In addition to introducing bills as far back as the 86th Congress, I addressed myself to this subject on the Senate floor on April 24, 1962.

Definite progress has been made. The bills that I introduced in the 86th and 87th Congresses (S. 2802 and S. 671) would have provided for a commission to study the question of land acquisition and its related problems of relocation with the goal of unification in mind. The Bureau of the Budget agreed with the objectives of this proposed commission, and as a result of the further suggestion of the Bureau that the study be made in the legislative branch, the House Committee on Public Works established the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition. After 3 years of extensive study, including hearings, this subcommittee rendered its report and recommendations in December 1964, entitled "Study of Compensation and Assistance for Persons Affected by Real Property Acquisition In Federal and Federally Assisted Programs." Inasmuch as I had encouraged the establishment as well as the work of this subcommittee, I found its recommendations for unification of Federal relocation programs and for a more generous general approach to this problem quite pleasing. Accordingly I placed these recommendations in S. 1201 which I introduced last year in this the 89th Congress, similar bills being introduced in the House of Representatives. In general this bill calls for a uniform, less abrupt, and perhaps more generous compensation policy of land acquisition. With regard to relocation payments it would definitely compel a uniform Federal policy, which is my paramount and prime interest.

ALL AGENCIES REGULATED

All Federal agencies would be under the policies and provisions of this bill. Moreover, State agencies acquiring real property would have to agree with the head of the appropriate Federal agency to provide to displaced persons fair and reasonable relocation payments in accordance with regulations established by the President. Briefly, the relocation payments would be as follows: In the case of a dislocated business the payment would be the average annual net earnings up to $5,000. All dislocated persons could receive a dislocation allowance of $100 and a moving expense allowance of up to $200 plus a $300 allowance to property owners. Farmers could receive a relocation payment of $1,000. The Small Business Act would be amended to allow the administration greater discretion in providing loans for the continuance or reestablishment of small businesses adversely affected by land acquisition under a Federal program.

My bill, S. 1201 has been given serious consideration by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, together with S. 1681 introduced by the Senator from Maine, Mr. MUSKIE, which is quite similar to S. 1201 with regard to providing uniform, fair and equitable relocation payments and assistance.

It is my firm belief that the treatment given by the Federal Government to landowners and others displaced by action under Federal programs should be uniform and fair. I trust that in the not too distant future, the Congress can consider, debate, and enact a progressive and fair measure in this very important field.

THE NORTHERN CHEYENNE INDIANS AND THE ST. LABRE INDIAN MISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in recent years periodic appeals have been distributed throughout the country by the St. Labre Indian Mission at Ashland, Mont. These appeals made up of letters, plastic dolls, and ornaments ask for funds to aid the mission in educating and caring for Indian children, mostly Northern Cheyenne Indians.

These circulars have prompted many outraged inquiries. The St. Labre Mission appeal is a legitimate one but there is need for clarification and understanding of responsibilities.

The Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation is located in southeastern Montana and has for many years been one of the most needy of the reservations in the Great Plains. The reservation has limited resources for the number of inhabitants. In recent years under the new administration within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, conditions improved considerably. The accelerated public works program was a shot in the arm for these people. Accelerated public works provided improved roads, management of timber resources, and other resources development. The Indian health sanitation program is bringing new water and sewer facilities to areas which have been without. Self-help and public housing projects are underway. Improvements are being made, and admittedly, there is considerable to be done. Several programs under OEO are being implemented.

The Northern Cheyenne people are a proud people, their needs are great, but they ask for little. Perhaps the major reason for the improvements and attitude is the president of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, John Woodenlegs. John is an old friend, a man devoted to the cause of his people. He is a quiet man, but determined in his effort to improve conditions and cast aside the unpleasant stigmas that have been attached to his reservation.

Next we turn to the St. Labre Indian Mission which is located at Ashland, Mont., in an area adjacent to the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation. The mission does provide food, shelter, and education for many needy Indian children. These children come from families who have migrated away from the reservation and have become dependent on local welfare and the mission. The mission work among the Indian children is financed from funds received from the appeals circulated by the mission. The plastic articles which are enclosed in the appeal are manufactured by a small factory located at Ashland. The factory was constructed by the Northern Cheyenne Tribe and employs some 30 Indians. I believe that the mission is the sole purchaser of these items, thus there is an interdependence between the mission and the Indians.

Quite frankly the St. Labre Indian Mission, in preparing its printed appeals, exploits a dramatic situation which is no longer associated with the entire reservation, but is somewhat limited to an off-reservation area. The situation highlights a continuing problem of who is responsible for the welfare of Indians who move away from their reservations. The Bureau of Indian Affairs' responsibility ends after a period of time and often local welfare agencies are hesitant to take on the additional load. In this instance, the mission is filling a void.

As I indicated earlier, the Northern Cheyennes are a proud people but they need help. The best way to see that they get this assistance is for all interested parties to work together, the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the St. Labre Indian Mission, and the State welfare and education departments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a series of newspaper clippings and reports which provide additional information.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 20, 1966]

AMERICAN INDIANS' SELF-HELP

To the EDITOR:

I would like to compliment the Times on Homer Bigart's news articles on Indian tribes in Montana and North Dakota (March 13, 14).

Montana's Northern Cheyenne tribe is today often cited by those who work in Indian community development as one of the most successful tribes in the Nation. In the last 5 years permanent employment and family income have doubled. Morbidity and mortality rates have been cut in half.

Under the leadership of President John Wooden Legs and the tribal council, the Cheyennes operate programs in land acquisition, livestock production, crafts, and tourism. There is a total of 332 new homes either under construction or scheduled for construction. The tribe has just established a $250,000 scholarship fund.

The Cheyennes are the first community in Montana to have a community action program approved by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Their CAP has component projects in health education and home nursing, preschool training, remedial reading and an "upward bound" precollege course. Its neighborhood youth corps has provided employment and training for more than 100 teenagers.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Much remains to be done. To boost employment "the Cheyennes are seeking to attract industry, to develop lumber production and to exploit their extensive subbituminous coal deposits. It has established a $670,000 industrial development fund to help realize these goals.

The Cheyennes are fighting to gain respect and understanding from their fellow citizens. The March 14 article will help to counteract national publicity caricaturing the Cheyennes as a hopeless "race of sorrows," totally dependent on the charity of others.

Thanks to their own initiative, the Cheyennes have in the last 5 years made remarkable progress. They serve as a model for what other Indian tribes can achieve through a coordinated attack on poverty, utilizing any available Federal, State, and private resources. We are certain that the Devils Lake Sioux and the Turtle Mountain Chippewas of North Dakota also can and will recover their strength, and independence.

WILLIAM BYLER,
Executive Director, Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

NEW YORK, *March 15, 1966.*

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Mar. 15, 1966]

ARE THE NORTHERN CHEYENNE INDIANS DESTITUTE? THERE ARE CONFLICTING VIEWPOINTS

(By Homer Bigart)

BILLINGS.—There are conflicting viewpoints on whether the "Morning Star People"—the

2,887 Northern Cheyenne Indians whose ancestors were brutally hounded by Federal cavalry after the Custer massacre—live in dire poverty.

The Reverend Emmett Hoffman, director of the St. Labre Roman Catholic Mission at Ashland, insists they do.

With injured pride, John Wooden Legs, chairman of the tribal council, denies it.

According to Wooden Legs, whose views are backed by Federal officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Father Hoffman has been exaggerating the tribe's poverty in his mass-circulated appeals for charity.

Prideful Cheyennes are in a quandary. Hoffman's powerfully emotional letters stimulate employment for 150 to 300 Indians who assemble the souvenir items that generally accompany the priest's requests for money.

There isn't much other work. The Northern Cheyennes, long isolated in hilly range country north of the Big Horn Mountains and east of the bigger, wealthier Crow Reservation, have made a slow adjustment to change.

In the Indian wars of the last century, few tribes were more abysmally treated than the Cheyennes. Embroiled in almost continuous fighting with the Americans from 1857 to 1879, the Cheyennes were often made to suffer for the more aggressive hostility of the Sioux and Comanches.

According to anthropologist E. Adamson Hoebel, some of these fights were "unprovoked assaults on friendly Cheyenne camps in which women and children were slaughtered along with the men who tried to defend them."

Northern Cheyennes joined the Sioux in the defeat and massacre of George Armstrong Custer's troops at Little Big Horn in 1876. But 2 years later, after the final destruction of its camps, the tribe was herded south by Federal cavalry and, as prisoners of war, forced to settle in what is now Oklahoma.

Decimated by disease and malnutrition, the tribe was soon driven to the point of desperation. In the summer of 1878, some 300 Northern Cheyenne men, women, and children under the leadership of Morning Star (survivors were to call themselves the Morning Star people) defied the Indian agent and the U.S. Army and began an incredible 1,500-mile trek back to Montana, fighting all the way. About 60 made it. In 1884 the Government gave up trying to ship them to Oklahoma and placed them on their present lands.

Today the tribe counts 2,887 enrolled members. Those observed in the small communities of Lame Deer, Busby, Ashland and Birney seemed to have enough food and clothing and appeared reasonably cheerful.

Hoffman conceded that conditions had improved among the Morning Star people.

But there is still some dire poverty, Hoffman said. He said he knew cases where Indians "died of pneumonia, but it was really malnutrition."

He scoffed at Wooden Legs' contention that the average family income was slightly over $3,000.

According to the Bureau of Indian Affairs 142 of the 423 resident families earned less than $3,000 in 1964.

"We admit some of our people are poor," Wooden Legs said in a letter of protest to the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star. The newspaper, moved by Hoffman's appeals, had run an editorial saying the Northern Cheyennes had "scarcely a bite to eat."

The Wooden Legs letter insisted, however, that conditions had "greatly improved in the past 3 years," that the tribe had a cattle operation with assets "in the million dollar category," was "negotiating with industrialists" for the development of coal resources, and was building many new homes as a result of a $3.9 million claim settlement from the Government.

Many new frame houses have been built. They are of standard design, costing about $4,750. Hoffman said they were poorly constructed, expensive to heat and "in 5 years will be worse than shacks."

The reservation superintendent, John Artichoker, a Sioux, said the greatest need was industrial development.

"Idleness is the worse curse," he said. "We have made good progress, but somehow it must be accelerated. The world is not going to stop and wait for the Indians to catch up."

Letter of Senator Mike Mansfield in Response to Inquiries About the St. Labre Indian Mission and Indians in Montana

U.S. Senate,
Office of the Majority Leader,
Washington, D.C.

With regard to your letter discussing the appeal you have received from the St. Labre Indian Mission, I am well aware of the fine work being done by the school and mission. Considerable assistance is given to the Indian children living in the area adjacent to the Northern Cheyenne Reservation.

The attached report from the Bureau of Indian Affairs is perhaps the best means of reporting on the conditions that exist on this reservation. You can be assured I will continue to work closely with the officials to continue to provide these people with all possible assistance.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Bureau of Indian Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

Statement Concerning the St. Labre Mission School, Ashland, Mont.

In response to numerous inquiries from persons who have received solicitations for funds from the St. Labre Catholic Mission in Ashland, Mont., adjoining the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, the attached fact sheet on the status of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe has been prepared by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The St. Labre Mission has recently constructed a new modern parochial boarding and day school and administration buildings. This mission school is one of several schools available to children of the area. Indian children also attend public schools at Ashland or at Lame Deer, a town on the reservation. In addition, there is a public high school at Colstrip and a Federal day school at Busby with facilities for boarding children from remote parts of the reservation.

Souvenir articles which generally accompany fund appeals from the St. Labre Mission are assembled in a plant at Ashland which is a subsidiary of Guild Arts and Crafts of New York City. All employees except top supervisory help are northern Cheyenne men and women. Their starting wages are $1.25 per hour, with $0.05 semiannual increases provided under current arrangements.

Because of the geographic isolation of the Northern Cheyenne Reservation, employment opportunities on or near the reservation are limited, and, conesquently, poverty is widespread. However, as the enclosed fact sheet explains, a variety of social and economic development efforts are underway. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, the U.S. Public Health Service, and the Office of Economic Opportunity are the chief Federal agencies providing assistance to the tribe.

The accompanying Bureau publications describe these programs in some detail.

Northern Cheyenne Fact Sheet

The Northern Cheyenne Indians call themselves the "Morning Star People," honoring a famous chief of the last century. They look to the future with optimism and desire to improve themselves as much and as rapidly as possible. Northern Cheyennes are U.S. citizens, as are all Indians, with all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities thereof. They are free to leave and return to their reservation at will.

POPULATION (SEPTEMBER 1965)

In order to understand better the progress that has been made by the Indians on the reservation, it is important to review some statistical data. About 20 percent of the Indian families reside on farms and ranches, with the remainder concentrated principally in the four communities of Busby, Lame Deer, Ashland, and Birney:

Enrolled Northern Cheyennes	2, 887
On reservation	2, 265
Off reservation	622

Elementary school facilities are available on the reservation in all four major communities. High school students attend the Federal Boarding and Day School at Busby, the St. Labre's Mission School at Ashland, and the public school at Colstrip, 22 miles north of Lame Deer. Many high school graduates are continuing their education in vocational or academic fields.

School attendance is remarkably high due to development of good attitudes toward academic achievement by the whole reservation populace. The upward trend is expected to continue with the Northern Cheyenne governing body arranging for tribal members to participate in the Office of Economic Opportunity and other programs.

Northern Cheyenne children in school (precollege)	861
In Bureau schools	255
Boarding students	131
Day students	124
In public school	353
In St. Labre school	234
In special schools	19
Schoolage children not in school	[1] 8
Total	869
Northern Cheyenne students in post high school	27
Vocational training	17
College or university	10

[1] Seven married and one mentally incompetent.

LABOR MARKET INFORMATION

BIA has worked with the Northern Cheyenne Indians in many ways to develop employment opportunities and to train the Indians for work. Under the direct employment program, families are helped with employment, transportation and subsistence enroute, and subsistence for 4 weeks at the job site. The family is also provided health services for 6 months, and in the event of family emergency, subsistence may again be provided. Under the adult vocational training program, the family is assisted in making a choice of type and place of training, transportation and subsistence enroute to training site, and subsistence for the period of training. Health services are also provided for the period of training, and upon completion of training, employment is developed for the family head. On the reservation, employment has been at an all-time high:

Number employable age	528
Employed on reservation:	
Permanent jobs[1] (75.4 percent)	398
Temporary jobs (3.4 percent)	17
Unemployed[2] (21.2 percent)	113
Employment assistance program:	
Direct employment placement	14
Training for employment	17
Dispatched for firefighting	954

[1] Includes an average payroll of 150 in Guild Arts & Crafts, Inc., which has payroll of $326,176 per year.

[2] Among unemployed are disabled, physically and familywise.

FAMILY INCOME, NORTHERN CHEYENNE TRIBE (CALENDAR YEAR 1964)

It is always difficult to obtain accurate information on individual and family incomes. However, surveys in connection with preparing plans for the use of judgment funds obtained by the Northern Cheyenne Tribe have added to the data previously available on this subject. The following data are the best estimates from all available sources:

Total number of resident Northern Cheyenne families, 423.

Range of income	Number of families	Percentage
Over $10,000	7	2
$5,000 to $9,999	115	27
$3,000 to $4,999	159	37
$2,000 to $2,999	50	12
$1,000 to $1,999	60	13
Unknown	32	9

AVAILABLE LAND AND LAND USE

Various programs are operated to improve the management, use, and conditions of the natural resources—timber and minerals. Road improvement and Indian use of Indian land have helped the Indians' progress in recent years. For instance, in the last year 14,402 acres of individually owned lands were leased out for $18,511. Technical services aid the Indians in forestry, irrigation, and ranching methods.

	Individually allotted	Tribally owned [1]
Indian use	186,982	238,737
Non-Indian use	7,750	488
Total	194,732	239,225
Total, all land available	433,957	

[1] Grazing lands are in near 100 percent Indian use.

TRIBAL GOVERNMENT

The Northern Cheyenne Tribe is organized and federally chartered. It is governed by a tribal council. Annually the tribe receives an income estimated at $140,000.

From the annual income, the tribe pays operating expenses for items such as tribal government, community services, and economic development. These expenditures are not restricted to services direct to tribal members. A sizable portion of the annual budget is used to finance cooperative programs with non-Bureau agencies. For instance, $7,000 is expended by the tribe to obtain and distribute to tribal members 298-849 pounds of surplus commodities valued at $66,896. Other funds furnish the tribe's required contribution for federally sponsored programs (sometimes as little as 10 percent of the total cost of the program).

JUDGMENT FUND PROGRAM

In 1964 the Northern Cheyenne Tribe received from the Indian Claims Commission a net judgment award of $3,912,426 for lands ceded to the United States nearly a century ago. From this, the tribe programed expenditures as follows:

Per capital payment	$270,000
Family improvement	2,700,000
Education	250,000
Economic development	690,000

The tribe's family improvement or family plan program authorizes $1,000 for each enrolled member to be used for long-term economic benefit for the family. This program from the dollar standpoint is 58 percent complete.

The education portion of the judgment fund program is set up as a trust fund to draw interest, which interest is to be used for college and other higher education assistance to Northern Cheyenne tribal members.

The money set aside for economic development is to be used for such projects as construction of community or tribal buildings, public utility facilities for the benefit of tribal members, industrial development (construction of buildings for factories, investments in companies to put factories on the reservation), land purchase, business investments, loan programs, recreation and tourism, business development, etc. The tribe has already used $101,000 of economic development funds to construct a building which is presently leased by Guild Arts and Crafts, Inc., an industry which provides employment and income for the Northern Cheyenne Indians.

The tribal council has primary responsibility for administering the judgment fund program and expenditures are required to be within the following criteria:

1. Housing.
2. Household furnishings.
3. Agricultural enterprises.
4. Investments in small business.
5. Education and training.
6. Savings.
7. Medical and dental services.
8. Other (as approved by administration committee and superintendent).

STATUS OF HOUSING (OCTOBER 1965)

Poor housing on the reservation has been serious and a contributing factor to retardation in education, health, welfare, employment, and most resources development programs. Members of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe have taken the necessary action to improve their poor housing conditions through use of family plan funds and establishment of a tribal housing authority under the Public Housing Administration. Units are being constructed under the mutual-help program:

Total number of homes under family plan program	395
New homes under family plan program	250
New homes completed	34
New homes under construction	29
New homes approved for construction	32
New homes-applications anticipated	155
Repair and remodeling to existing homes under family plan program	145
Repairs completed	8
Repairs underway	4
Repairs approved	20
Repairs-applications anticipated	113
New homes under mutual-help housing	50
Under construction	10
Construction planned	40
Total new homes for tribal members	445

FEDERAL SERVICES

The Bureau of Indian Affairs and Public Health Service provide members of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe a wide range of services, including education, medical and hospital services, welfare, law and order, adult vocational training, credit, etc. The emphasis on services is not limited to Bureau of Indian Affairs programs, per se, but includes efforts to qualify Cheyennes for taking part in non-Bureau programs for which they are eligible. In fiscal year 1965, public assistance was provided for Northern Cheyenne tribal members as follows:

	Cumulative total of cases	Cumulative total of persons	Total amount paid
General assistance	[1] 776	[2] 2,763	$48,613.83
Child welfare			11,799.98
Other welfare			6,550.59
County welfare (AFDC, OAA, AD, AB)			[3] 203,923.00
Social security			6,000.00
Total			270,887.40

[1] Average, 65 per month.

[2] Average, 230 per month.

[3] This figure is for fiscal year 1964; the latest one available. Would probably show an increase of around $10,000 for fiscal year 1965 due to increased costs.

BENEFITS FROM PARTICIPATION IN THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

The Northern Cheyennes are participating in the various provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act. They have benefited or are continuing to benefit from community action programs. A staff of 40, including administrators, nurses, teachers, community health workers, and aids, most of whom are volunteers, are directing special community health, remedial reading, and child development programs. Supplementary education services for 38 high school students were provided at Eastern Montana College last summer. At the same time, 120 preschool children were taught for 8 weeks in 3 different child development centers under the Headstart programs. The Neighborhood Youth Corps has provided employment for more than 100 youths, 16 through 21, in summer in-school and out-of-school programs at Busby, Lame Deer, and Ashland at Federal, public, and mission schools. Others have been employed at the agency, the health center, and by the tribe on various projects throughout the reservation. Ten VISTA workers are serving in a variety of ways throughout the reservation. Nearly a half-million dollars have been assigned to the Northern Cheyenne program—and the benefits from the amounts expended are already much in evidence.

[From the Congressional Record, Feb. 21, 1966]

Progress on Northern Cheyenne Reservation

Mr. Metcalf. Mr. President, thanks to their own initiative and understanding assistance from both Government and non-Government sources, some Indian tribes have made remarkable progress during the past few years. One such tribe is the Northern Cheyenne, in southeastern Montana. Evidence of the development underway on that reservation is contained in the February 14 letter from the chairman of that tribe, John Wooden Legs, to the editor of the Lincoln, Nebr., Star.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Wooden Leg's letter in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"February 14, 1966.

"Editor, Lincoln Star,
"Lincoln, Nebr.

"Dear Sir: I have received a copy of an editorial that appeared in the Star some time in January entitled 'How Good Are We?' This editorial concerns the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation of which I am president of the governing body.

"After reading this editorial, it seems to me that additional information should be provided to you with the humble request to ask that you more objectively view the problems of the Northern Cheyenne Reservation.

"For centuries, the Cheyenne has sought life of dignity. Even in our period of most extreme poverty, we sought dignity. We still seek dignity.

"We admit that some of our people are poor. They are poor economically and socially. This has been caused by a lack of opportunity and isolation from the rest of society. Our situation has greatly improved in the past 3 years, however, and we feel that you are entitled to some objective information and humbly beg your indulgence in more favorably portraying our situation by printing additional facts in your paper.

"Your editorial points out hopelessness in several areas on the reservation. The first area is one of education. The school at St. Labre that you mentioned in your editorial, is only one of several schools in and around the reservation. St. Labre has an enrollment of 245 Northern Cheyenne students. There is an eight-grade public school at Lame Deer, the center of the reservation, and many students from the reservation also attend public high school at Colstrip, Mont., north of the reservation. These two public schools have a combined total enrollment of 263 Northern Cheyenne students. In addition, there is a Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding and day school at Busby, Mont., with a total enrollment of 219 Northern Cheyenne students, 89 of whom are boarding students, 130 of whom are day students and a Bureau day school at Birney with an enrollment of 14 Northern Cheyenne students. There has been considerable public interest apparent on the reservation in the past few years in obtaining a public high school on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. Montana law at this time, prevents the Northern Cheyenne Reservation from obtaining a high school. We are hoping that through a publicity campaign on this situation, that the community will take action to have this law changed and eventually obtain a public high school on the reservation.

"The second area of hopelessness you indicated in your article was in the area of stockraising. You mentioned that, 'It takes 20 acres of their bleak reservation land to support one steer.' This area is considered some of the best cattle country in Montana. There is 100-percent range use by Northern Cheyenne Indians. The Northern Cheyenne Tribe has a tribal steer operation which has assets in the million-dollar category. This tribal steer enterprise occupies 19 percent of the Northern Cheyenne grazing land. In addition to this, there are 68 Northern Cheyenne cattle operators operating on other parts of the reservation. These operations vary in size from part-time operators owning 10 head to 1 individual with 900 head. What this means is that grazing operations provide income to more than 70 Northern Cheyenne families, in addition to the grazing rentals paid to individual landowners and the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.

"You mentioned, thirdly, in your article that there is a small handicraft industry at Ashland, Mont. We assume you are making reference to the Guild Arts and Crafts factory at Ashland. This plastic assembly plant employed an average of 150 persons in 1965 with gross earnings of $407,039.06.

"You indicate an area of hopelessness in the fact that the Northern Cheyenne Reservation has no minerals. The Northern Cheyenne Reservation comprises 444,000 acres of land. This land is almost totally underlain by subbituminous coal. The Northern Cheyenne Tribe is currently negotiating with industrialists who are interested in this coal, and are considering leases for the exploration of the coal deposits. These prospective buyers of our coal are considering industrial developments provided our coal deposits are extensive enough. There is a small mine in Lame Deer which is producing 5,000 tons a year of this coal for local consumption. The Northern Cheyenne Tribe receives a small, yet important sum of tribal income from this source. The Northern Cheyenne Tribe has let oil and gas leasing permits. These permits provide $53,374 per year income to the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.

"You have stated in your editorial that winter is in full blast at Ashland, Mont. This is true. We are in the middle of winter. You mentioned, however, that for most of the Cheyennes there is little shelter. The Northern Cheyenne Tribe received a $4 million claim settlement from the U.S. Government in 1963. We are building many new homes with part of this money. At present, we have completed 86 new homes, there are 35 under construction, 24 more have been approved for construction, and we anticipate that in addition to these, between 90 and 105 other new homes will be constructed. This will make a total of some 266 new homes purchased from judgment fund moneys. The Public Housing Administration is sponsoring a mutual help housing program on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. Ten new homes are nearing completion at Busby, Mont., and 40 more are scheduled for construction soon in other communities on the reservation. Family plan money has also been used to repair or remodel 16 other homes. This makes a total of 332 new homes either constructed or scheduled for construction on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation.[1] There are approximately 503 resident Northern Cheyenne families. In addition to this, we understand that the St. Labre Mission has plans for the construction of 40 houses at Ashland. There are still log shacks that people must live in but it is not correct to say that there is not enough shelter for my people.

"The judgment received by the Northern Cheyennes from the U.S. Government has also made possible a scholarship fund in the amount of $250,000. Negotiations with two banks are now underway to establish a scholarship trust fund. Proceeds from the trust will be used to send capable Northern Cheyennes to institutions of higher learning.

"The industrial development fund made possible from the judgment fund, presently totals approximately $670,000. From this fund, the tribe has built a $100,000 factory building, the cost of which will be amortized over a 20-year period. During the period of amortization the tribe will receive 4 percent interest on the unpaid balance. This money was invested to get the jobs at the handicraft industry at Ashland. A total of $19,000 was expended recently for a forest products feasibility study in an attempt to make use of the 80,000 acres of ponderosa pine on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. Two major blocks of this timber were advertised for sale in 1965, but there were no bidders. We need a timber sale in order to create additional jobs on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. We plan to advertise this sale again soon with lower stumpage rates than the earlier advertisement.

"You may inform your readers that there is capital available from this industrial fund which is available to reliable and responsible prospective industries. Perhaps you can help us in our effort to attract industry to the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. This would be much more beneficial and have a more far-reaching effect than charity. During the month of September, the Northern Cheyenne Reservation had the highest level of employment that it has ever achieved. We believe that it was the highest level of employment of any reservation in Montana. Even at this high level of employment, our unemployment was still 20 percent, which compares unfavorably, I realize, with the 4.5 percent national average of employment. However, the Northern Cheyennes are good workers. They want jobs. Many of them need jobs. That is one of the reasons I am writing you this letter.

"Not only are we Northern Cheyennes trying to help ourselves, but we are also receiving assistance in our efforts from many sources. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is helping us in many ways with their programs of credit, economic development, public works, education, vocational training, employment, community development, and in the upgrading of social services.

"Furthermore, we are benefiting from many provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council is sponsoring a community action program which has a staff of 40. This staff includes administrators, nurses, teachers, community health workers, and aids, most of whom are volunteers. They are directing special community health, remedial reading, and child development programs.

"The Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council also sponsors a Neighborhood Youth Corps which has provided employment for more than 100 youths, age 16 through 21, some are in-school and out-of-school programs at Busby, Lame Deer, and Ashland at Federal, public, and mission schools. Other Neighborhood Youth Corps workers are employed at the Bureau of Indian Affairs Northern Cheyenne Agency, the Public Health Service Center, and by the tribe on various projects throughout the reservation. Nine VISTA workers are serving in a variety of ways throughout the reservation. During the summer of 1965, 120 preschool children on the reservation were taught in child development centers under the Headstart program. The Headstart program has been continued on the reservation under the community action program. During the summer of 1966, we hope to have 35 college students from Montana universities working on the reservation in a work-study program. Nearly $500,000 has been assigned to the Northern Cheyenne Reservation from the Economic Opportunity Act, and we feel that benefits from the amount spent so far are already much in evidence.

"As a result of these Government programs, the employment at the Guild Arts and Crafts factory at Ashland, and through employment made possible through the construction of new homes on the reservation, the gross reservation income for 1965 was about $1.1 million. This means that there was a per capita income of approximately $500, or an average family income slightly in excess of $3,000 per year. With these salaries plus a tribal program for needy families of distribution of surplus commodities, I find it hard to believe your comment in your editorial that there is 'scarcely a bite to eat.'

"We are realistic, however, and know that our economy needs strengthening. We still have much that needs to be done in improving our reservation. It can only be permanently strengthened through the creation of additional year-round permanent employment. We want to attract industry. We know things can be better. We will do everything we can to help ourselves. Please print this letter in the hope that some industrialist interested in locating on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation may read it.

"Thank you very much for taking the time to read my long letter. I will be very happy to answer any questions you have about it.

"Sincerely yours,
"JOHN WOODEN LEGS,
"President, Northern Cheyenne Tribe."

A NEW LOOK AT SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, nothing is so heart warming to those who write annual reports as to discover that someone is reading them.

---

[1] These figures do not include 62 trailer houses which have also been purchased from family plan funds.

Nothing is so heart warming to those of us in Government, both in the legislative and the executive branches, who are concerned for the well-being of small business and who toil for its good and welfare, as to find small businessmen that understand and appreciate these efforts.

Those who wrote the 1963 annual report of the Small Business Administration have cause to be cheered indeed. An experienced and thoughtful American small businessman has taken that document and has selected from it information that especially impressed him, has added to that some further information from other sources, and has prepared in this way an extremely readable commentary on the health of small business in this Nation—and the efforts of the Federal Government to preserve that health.

The small businessman is Leon Sager, chairman of the board of Embosograf Co., of Illinois. His comments are contained in an article entitled "A New Look at Small Business," which was published in the December 1965 issue of Progress magazine, the handsome public information organ of the Department of Commerce and Economic Development of the State of Washington.

At my request, Mr. Sager has provided some footnotes to his article which were omitted in the version published in Progress magazine. While the statistical information on which this article was based is now more than a year old, its conclusions remain valid and useful. Mr. Sager's evaluation of the work and importance of the Small Business Administration is especially timely now, I should say.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles entitled "A New Look at Small Business," by Leon Sager be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW LOOK AT SMALL BUSINESS

(By Leon Sager)

It is startling to discover that small business concerns employed 22,186,000 persons in 1962—48 percent of all employment, agricultural employees, self-employed, and governmental employees, excluded.[1] As production forces are decimated by automation, a goodly number of these replaced people are finding their way into service industries, most of which are small business. Statistics of small business are revealing. The net income of unincorporated business has risen year after year: in 1964, it totaled $38.5 billion.[2]

President Johnson believes that the Economic Opportunity Act, the so-called antipoverty program, is one of the most important passed in 1964. One whole section of the bill is devoted to helping small business. This is based on the logical assumption that keeping people off the unemployment rolls is as important, and often easier, than creating new jobs. Should assistance to small business reduce by half the number of bankruptcies and other closures, it is estimated that over 650,000 persons would be kept off unemployment rolls.[3] Since the average employee provides for four individuals, this adds up to over 2½ million persons—a not-insignificant reduction of poverty in the country. If we add to this, Government assistance in the creating of new businesses, the total of potential job creation is impressive.

The importance that Government attaches to small business is indicated by the fact that four high-level Government committees and agencies have been created: The Senate Select Small Business Committee; the House Small Business Committee; the White House Committee on Small Business; and the Small Business Administration.

DEFINITION OF SMALL BUSINESS

What is small business? According to the Small Business Administration, it is one which is independently owned and operated, and not dominant in its field of operation; a business that can be overseen and managed with a great deal of knowledge and detail by one person. In general, it is one that employs less than 250 persons, with assets under $250,000.[4] Of the 4,860,000 businesses in the United States, 4,600,000 are small.

It might be well at the outset to dispel a widely held notion that small business is "on the way out." Quite the contrary is the case. Actually, the number of businesses in the country increases each year. In the past 10 years the number of small businesses has grown from 4,000,000 to 4,600,000—an average increase of 60,000 each year. Of firms with a net worth of $20,000 to $250,000—relatively small, 90 percent have been in business for 5 years. This is hardly the record of a dying or even a weak segment of our economy. It is rather a testament to the inner strength of small business and to its continuing appeal for men and women who have initiative and who want to be their own boss.

Though small business is a significant force in the economy, it is fairly obvious that big business is dominant and likely to continue to be. Nevertheless, a strong argument advanced for assisting small business is that it may help assure a competitive situation and prevent too great a concentration of business power. Indeed, efforts to avert monopoly go back before the turn of the century. Its first expression was the Sherman Act of 1890. From that time, antitrust activity has been continuous and expanding—presently as the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

"The balance between large and small business is, from the point of view of the small businessman, generally a precarious one. The Congress has wisely recognized this fact, and attempted in several areas to guard against the possibility of an imbalance. The committee believes that the Federal Government has a legitimate concern in maintaining the balance in such a way as best to serve the national interest."[5]

Aid to small business, though at the other end of the business spectrum, has the same objective—maintaining a competitive economy.

The Small Business Administration was created by Congress in 1953 on a year-to-year basis, and made permanent in 1958. In setting up this new department of Government, Congress reaffirmed the principle that:

"The essence of the American system of private enterprise is free competition. Only through full and free markets, free entry into business, and opportunities for the expression and growth of personal initiative can individual judgment be assured. Indeed, such security and well-being cannot be realized unless the actual and potential capacity of small business is encouraged and developed."

There is a wealth of evidence that small businesses, far from being handicapped, often have an advantage over their larger competitors. Small business firms are frequently more flexible, can make decisions more quickly, can switch to new products more readily, can operate more efficiently and economically. In Government purchasing programs, for example, often a small business produces a higher quality of product at an earlier date than the Government could obtain from the firm's larger competitors. In the space program, 24 of the 100 largest prime contractors were small business concerns; at the same time there were many thousands who contributed as subcontractors.

SERVICE—26 PERCENT OF GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

Let us look at service industries. In the 15 year period 1948–1963, consumer spending for services has risen from $56.9 billion, 22 percent of the gross national product, to $145.5 billion, or 26 percent. In the same period, the number of firms in service work increased by nearly one-third to more than 940,000 businesses, nearly all small concerns. By 1960, for the first time, the number of businesses supplying services surpassed those in the wholesale and in the retail trades. With our greater affluence it is not surprising that we are spending an even greater amount on all types of service, especially recreation. The industry is particularly well suited to small business, since most service businesses require a small initial investment and depend heavily on close personal supervision.

Or take steel. Surely this is one industry where it might be assumed that only big business need apply. Not so. Small business is not only able to compete in some branches of the business; it can even occasionally force the giants to bring their prices down. For example, an official of the Empire-Reeves Division of the Universal Cyclops Co. tells of a recent instance. "We saved one company about $4 a ton in freight differential," says an official. "Although we began providing only 5 percent of its steel requirements, major steel producers supplying the other 95 percent had to meet our price in order to keep their bookings position."[6]

---

[1] Were agricultural employees and the self-employed added—not illogical since farmers as well as many accountants, lawyers, doctors, and dentists are in effect small businessmen who employ others—the percentage of small businesses and their employees, would be far greater. Of these, 5,873,000 constituted about 35 percent of total employees on manufacturing payrolls; 8,753,400, or about 76.1 percent of total employees on wholesale and retail trade payrolls, and 5,901,400 or about 76.4 percent of total employees on service and miscellaneous payrolls.

[2] Unless otherwise specifically identified, the source of the many statistics, inevitably a part of this paper, is the 1963 Annual Report of the Small Business Administration.

[3] "The average annual number of firms that discontinued operations, including those that went through bankruptcy during the 10-year period 1953 through 1962 was 346,000." U.S. Department of Commerce. Half of this average figure is 173,000, and multiplying by 4 (an assumed number of employees per small business) totals 692,000.

[4] Though this is the general rule, there are exceptions. The Small Business Administration has found it desirable to vary the standards for measuring small business. In some industries annual receipts are used, in others the number of employees, and in some cases still other criteria.

[5] White House Committee on Small Business. "Small Business in the American Economy." P. 9. "The balance between large and small business is, from the point of view of the small businessman, generally a precarious one. The Congress has wisely recognized this fact, and has attempted in several areas to guard against the possibility of an imbalance. The Committee believes that the Federal Government has a legitimate concern in maintaining the balance in such a way as best to serve the national interest."

Lower prices benefit everyone, and often small business is a prime mover in this direction. For example, millions of us trade at Sears Roebuck & Co., the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.,the J. C. Penney stores, and the Woolworth chain, to name a handful of establishments. All are large companies and are known for their emphasis on lower prices, a benefit to all consumers. It is, however, important to realize that these lower prices would not be possible were it not that these, and other firms, do their buying from hundreds of thousands of smaller businesses. This practice is equally true among manufacturers. General Motors, for example, purchases parts and materials to the tune of $7.5 billion from 33,000 businesses. Du Pont sells 90 percent of its product to 75,000 smaller firms which process this material into finished products. Conversely, 30,000 smaller companies supply Du Pont with raw materials.[7]

We are proud of the freedom we enjoy which we point up as one of the distinguishing features of the free as against communist and totalitarian economies. But it is seldom that we give credit for a significant part of this distinction to small business. Consider the following facts.

SOCIAL VALUES CONTRIBUTED BY SMALL BUSINESS

In serving its own interest, small business in the United States and other free countries serves as a stabilizer, its very numbers acting as a safeguard against concentration of power in any one group.

Small businesses often act as a catalyst—producing new ideas, new inventions, and better products. Not infrequently, when such products are produced by big business, it is due to a merger—the big business has taken over the small, where the idea originated.

Many important commercial inventions of the past half century came not from large companies but from independent inventors and small business concerns. Among these are air conditioning, automatic transmission, the jet engine, continuous casting of steel, cellophane, magnetic recordings, the gyrocompass, and, most recently, the polaroid camera and the Xerox duplicating machine—a long and impressive list.

A searching study of 61 20th-century "fundamental inventions" had indicated that more than half were individual inventions in the sense that much of the work was carried on by men working in their own behalf without the backing of any research institution.[8]

Quoting a former vice president of the General Electric Co.: "In the electric appliance industry, the better clothes washing machines have not been produced by the monster companies, but by the relatively small, independent companies specializing in one or two products. This is also true of ranges, vacuum cleaners, radios, toasters, air-conditioning units, etc." Small businesses have been called millions of centers of initiative. They are a vast seedbed for technological development and innovation.

Small businesses help to promote democracy. Dictatorships invariably and speedily eliminate or severely curtail small business. This is true of Russia and was equally true of Germany and Italy under their dictators.

The figure of the independent entrepreneur; striving and succeeding in the competitive struggle, has a strong appeal as a legitimate typification of the free enterprise system. If we fail to broadcast this image sufficiently—and if we should fail to make the image a truthful one—we will have muzzied and misused a weapon of almost incalculable force in the never-ending battle for the minds of men.[9]

WHY SMALL BUSINESSES REQUIRE GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

But why, it may be asked, does small business need assistance? This can best be answered by observing the kinds of assistance being given. The most needed is finance. This was clearly stated by President Johnson in his message to Congress, January 24, 1964: "Revision of Our Tax Structure."

"Small business firms have less ready access to the capital markets, must depend more heavily for capital on internally generated funds, and are generally at a financial and competitive disadvantage."

Usually the small businessman lacks adequate capital and has difficulty acquiring adequate equipment, expanding his facilities, and broadening his operations—all needed if he is to compete effectively. Furthermore, unlike larger businesses he is often unable to secure bank loans because he lacks the required collateral. In most cases, he has not been in business very long or needs a longer loan than banks will provide. And by very definition he is seldom large enough to have access to the security market.

It is here that the SBA has been a friend, indeed. The loan program, which started a decade ago has grown to $426 million in 1964. The loans were made to almost 11,000 small firms. An important benefit from these loans was that the jobs of 115,000 employees were made more secure. Of the loans processed, two-thirds were in participation with local banks, indicating, incidentally, that the program supplements the activities of the banks rather than competing with or replacing them.

Equally interesting is the support given "small steel" by the Area Redevelopment Administration of the Commerce Department. The ARA was set up 5 years ago by the Kennedy administration to aid small business and create jobs. One example is the Mansbach's Kentucky Electric Steel Co. which received a 17 year 4 percent loan of $2.2 million. Their growth has been so rapid and successful that they are able to compete with big steel companies even in hot-rolled bars and structural products, traditionally made by big companies. "By the end of 1965 we'll be selling $7 million worth of steel products in seven states to customers normally served by the biggest steel producers," says Gerald Mansbach.[10]

OTHER GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS

American business is built on credit. Businesses depend on borrowing money—through issuing stock and bonds, for the long term, and through loans from banks to meet their short-term requirements. Small business is particularly vulnerable at this point, especially for long-term loans and equity capital. Here, the SBA has been extraordinarily helpful.

Congress has provided two avenues by which the SBA can assist small business with loans: one is by direct loans, the other through small business investment companies. By 1964, the direct loans had reached a total of $425.8 million to 10,707 businesses. Small business investment companies, with capital of over half a billion dollars, had made investments of $500 million, to 10,000 small firms. Banks are cooperating with the SBIC program; indeed, some are creating their own SBIC's; e.g., the Chase Manhattan of New York.

One help to small business which is of the greatest significance is wider distribution of Government contracts. Because of the tremendous amount of Government purchasing—some $35 to $40 billion a year—it is important for small business to be brought into the purchasing program. Failing this, we may find the industrial structure of the country altered simply through the size of Government procurement. Actually, 20.3 percent of defense prime contracts in 1965, went to small business. This compares with 18 percent in 1964. To help achieve this, one effective technique is to set up a joint set-aside program. Working closely with the Department of Defense and other major buying agencies, certain purchases are earmarked for small business bidding. In 1963 alone this program resulted in awards of close to $2 billion of contracts to more than 40,000 small concerns. Incidentally, procurement and technical assistance to small business often produces lower bids on Government contracts, hence is self-liquidating.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—3 PERCENT TO SMALL BUSINESS

That research and development are a vital aspect of our modern economy is shown by the money being spent. This amounts to $16 billion every year in the United States. What may not be so generally known is that though business concerns are extremely active in research and development, the Government is paying 65 percent of the bills.[11] Research and development has a great impact on technological change which influences the economic, cultural, political, and social institutions of our society. An increase in research and development contracts to small business would undoubtedly help to preserve competition and decrease the likelihood of excessive economic and political control. The contract awards to small business may seem large—some $356 million, yet they are less than 3 percent of the total of Government-financed research and development.

As suggested previously, small businesses are particularly effective in the fields of research and invention. A specific illustration will be instructive. Plywood is unquestionably big business—it plays a major role in construction and other fields. But a generation ago there was no plywood on a large scale. That it gained its high stature is partly due to the efforts of one small businessman—Mr. Irving Laucks. In his tiny laboratory in Seattle, Wash., Mr. Laucks discovered a means by which the almost valueless residue of soybean oil, after the oil is extracted, could be made into plywood glue. Prior to his creation the plywood industry was held back because casein, on which it depended, then being made by the Casein Manufacturing Co., a subsidiary of the Borden Co.—cost 40 cents a pound. Mr. Laucks sold his glue throughout the world, and the enormous plywood industry was born.

---

[6] "Small Steel's Surge"—Wall Street Journal, Oct. 30, 1964.

[7] It is true that some suppliers are too dependent for their own good. The wiser and stronger ones maintain their independence by having enough other customers.

[8] Op. cit., p. 6: Note No. 5. "A searching study of 61 20th century 'fundamental inventions' had indicated that more than half were individual inventions in the sense that much of the work was carried on by men working in their own behalf without the backing of any research institution."

[9] Op. cit., p. 6: Note No. 5. "The figure of the independent entrepreneur, striving and succeeding in the competitive struggle has strong appeal as a legitimate typification of the free enterprise system. If we fail to broadcast this image sufficiently—and if we should fail to make the image a truthful one—we will have muzzled and misused a weapon of almost incalculable force in the never-ending battle for the minds of men."

[10] Op. cit.: Note No. 6.

[11] Budget of the U.S. Government, fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; research and development.

That this is not unusual is attested by another small businessman—Mr. Hugh C. Bream.[12] Mr. Bream is an electronics manufacturer who has had wide experience with hundreds of large and small manufacturers as well as most branches of the U.S. Government.

Doing business with large organizations which get most of the research money from the Government is painfully slow and inefficient—and fantastically costly to the taxpayer. The small manufacturer, who can oversee everything going on in his plant, can run rings around the big fellow in both price and delivery.

A recent accomplishment of the SBA is the creation of Service Corps of Retired Executives, appropriately known as SCORE. Two complementary ideas are responsible: the importance of community development, and the unused capacities of retired businessmen. Our country's development, especially in urban areas, depends upon community leadership—its quality and dedication. Retired businessmen, many of whom have rendered distinguished service to the country, not only in business but in government—are available, often without compensation. At the very first suggestion, thousands offered their services. The task that the SBA has set for itself is how best to utilize this potential.

SMALL BUSINESS AIDS AREA DEVELOPMENT

An excellent illustration of the social benefit of Government assistance to small business is in area development. This has grown so rapidly that there are now over 14,000 economic development programs in operation, 70 percent started since World War II. This is in marked contrast to the past when economic thinking and policy were concentrated almost entirely on national problems. If enough individuals become interested and then involved in the development of their own localities, especially in urban areas, many difficulties may be solved simultaneously. Among the greatest of these are the problems of unemployment and making our cities livable. Indeed, even what may seem remote, the race problem could feel its effect.

A good example is Philadelphia. Here, the SBA operating through the recently formed Small Business Opportunities Corp., lends money to very small businessmen, about 40 percent of whom are Negroes. Dr. Thomas Roberts, who left the chair of economics at Villanova University to become executive director, is enthusiastic.

The small businessman has for some time been a victim of the cult of big business, but many social scientists feel that his day is coming back, that people are tired of being chain-served.

In "The Making of a Negro Middle Class," a case is made for the Negro small businessman. The writer, Hannah Lees, believes that, had there been a group of successful Negro small businessmen in Philadelphia, the recent explosions of rioting and looting might not have occurred. The Negro small businessmen would, she feels, have been an important stabilizing factor. Columbus Avenue, the scene of rioting, is the chief shopping place for thousands of Negroes. But its shops are at least 90 percent white-owned. If some of the money and effort that the Government is putting into equal job opportunities, is used for business opportunities, far more may be achieved. "For," the article concludes, "every Negro businessman who prospers starts a chain reaction: he achieves status; he brings leadership to his neighborhood; he reduces unemployment and raises the living standards of every extra man and woman he hires."

THE INDUSTRIAL-MILITARY COMPLEX

President Eisenhower, in his valedictory warning, expressed the belief that one of the greatest dangers facing our country is the industry-military complex. It may seem far-fetched to think that small business can do anything about it—but is it? One might argue that the very concentration of this tremendous power in the hands of a comparatively few corporations and individuals is in itself contrary to democratic concepts. Would it not be in the country's best interests if this vast amount—some $50 billion, were more widely dispersed among businesses, large and small? (Indeed, it might make far easier the gradual reduction of these expenditures and conversion to peacetime activities. Certainly it is widely believed and generally accepted that small businesses are more flexible and inventive than large.)

There is nothing wrong or even unusual about the SBA Government assistance. The Government helps other segments of the economy and would be derelict if it neglected the needs of small businessmen. One might, for authority, go back to the Employment Act of 1946 (which Walter Heller calls our economic Magna Carta). In this act the Government took on the responsibility for full employment. In 1956, a working Cabinet-level Committee on Small Business was established at the White House by the Eisenhower administration. The late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, considered the matter of helping small business of such importance that he created the White House Committee on Small Business, made up of top officials of those agencies that can contribute to the fostering of small business. Under President Johnson this agency has flourished.

In an age where technology is compelling ever-wider economic concentration, Government assistance to small business is in the interest of competitive democracy. However, one condition is imperative: the small businesses must be economically defensible—basically able to make their own way. The SBA takes this position and unless a business has promise of success, it applies for assistance in vain. In all cases a careful investigation is made. Indeed, a common complaint of the SBA is its slowness in action. It is a just complaint but the slowness is essential if the organization is to exercise sound judgment and receive the continuous backing of Congress, on which it depends.

COST OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

How much does the SBA cost the taxpayer? In 1963—$34,069,214. Of this approximately $7 million was administration, and $27 million the cost of administration of loans. In connection with the latter, the unusual aspect of many of the loans must be taken into consideration. Some are disaster loans. All are loans made only when normal bank loans are unobtainable. Most loans are small; hence credit is costly, and often made at great distances where bank loans are not easily obtained. As of June 30, 1962, losses in proportion to amounts loaned were estimated at an ultimate figure of 3.63 percent; actual losses at that date were 2.55 percent.

[Note by Senator SPARKMAN: I asked the Small Business Administration to check the foregoing paragraph. The agency gave me the following comment: "SBA is unable to reconcile these figures with its records. For calendar year 1963, SBA's costs for its procurement and management assistance activities, financed by direct appropriations, amounted to $6,359,929 and the net loss in the revolving fund, which finances the programs of investment and development company assistance and financial assistance, amounted to $22,235,009, for a total cost of $28,594,938. As of June 30, 1963, SBA's loss rate on business loans (losses in proportion to the amount loaned) was 2.5 percent, and for disaster loans was 3.63 percent."]

One social advantage of helping small business is to slacken the pace of change. Who can question that the growing malaise, of which nearly everyone is aware, is partly due to the uncertainties of life resulting from rapid change? Nothing is as it was a decade, let alone a generation, ago. What assurance has anyone that the skill or even the profession he is learning will be useful a generation hence? Is it possible to develop real friendships when families are so frequently compelled to move from one city to another or often one part of the country to another? And this includes high officials of big business. Small businessmen, for the most part, stay put. They are on pleasant, even friendly, terms with the folks about them, and their children go to the same schools.

On the other hand, starting a small business is not easy; and maintaining and building it to reasonable profitability is downright difficult. A new venturer must ask himself many questions: what business to start, where to locate, the status of competition, how to buy properly, how to manage advertising, personnel, and sales—these are but a few of his perplexities. In truth, a small business is beset with nearly every problem a big business has—and the small businessman has to go it alone.

PSYCHOANALYZING THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

The man who goes into business for himself is likely to be an egotist. In all probability he is also an optimist, sometimes to the point of foolhardiness. He is sure to be enterprising, and not too infrequently he has failed or become dissatisfied with other ways of making a living. Frequently he has know-how, technical skills, and often a pioneering spirit. His goal is far more likely to be selfish than social. He does not "go into business for his health." Even rendering some type of social service, which is essential for success, is generally incidental. In any event, profit and service are the two sides of the business coin—both are necessary.

There are other motivations for starting a business besides making money, and some are powerful. Certainly independence—being his own boss and decisionmaker, is high among them. He has the fullest opportunity for self-expression and the surest reward for any qualities of inventiveness and creativity, as well as the satisfaction of seeing his own ideas carried through to completion. He may become economically independent for the rest of his life, and may be able to offer greater opportunities for his children. He is aware that mergers are reducing the certainty of jobs even in giant corporations; on the contrary, he cannot be fired. Above all, borrowing from Samuel Pepys, he may say, concerning his business—"she's a poor thing, but she's mine."

Small businessmen have faults, of course; unfortunately this way of life produces all too many. This is particularly true of the very small businessmen, who comprise the vast majority—certainly 3 million or more. In a recent exhaustive study—"The Enterprising Man,"[13] the writers find the small businessman rather unlikable. He is, according to them, basically insecure, and his determination to succeed amounts almost to an obsession. Then there are the failures. Any attempt to account for those who fail in business would take into consideration that a great many who enter are totally unqualified. They should be doing something else—and in the not far distant future they will be.

---

[12] Hugh C. Bream, president, Stellarmetrics, Inc., Santa Barbara, Calif.

[13] "The Enterprising Man," Michigan State University, 1964.

Small businessmen are notoriously hard to organize. Probably they trip up on their own individualism. Of the innumerable attempts to get them to work together, in their own interests—and some date back half a century or more—few have succeeded. There are some exceptions. The National Association of Retail Druggists was created in 1898. Small manufacturers have created a council; there are sectional groups, such as the Smaller Business Association of New England; in Washington there is the National Small Business Association; and in Chicago, the Conference of American Small Business. Certainly one of the most effective organizations of small business is the National Federation of Independent Business located at San Mateo, Calif. It has a membership of 200,000. Spokesmen for the federation as well as other small business organizations, have repeatedly appeared before various departments of government in their behalf.

TAX REDUCTIONS HAVE HELPED SMALL BUSINESS

In recent years—under both Republican and Democratic administrations—the Government has demonstrated its interest in helping small business by tax reductions. The two most important bills were: the small business first-step tax revision bill of 1958, netting small business $260 million, and the recent Tax Revision Act of 1964, which benefited small business by $233 million. For this accomplishment considerable credit is due to the diligent and persistent efforts of several Members of Congress—high among them, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT. As far back as 1956 Senator FULBRIGHT joined with Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, in introducing bills to lower small business taxes, and this was followed by other bills introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT in 1958.

Another tax revision that would be highly beneficial to small business, and to the economy, is in the field of inheritance. Facts and figures disclosed by the Federal Trade Commission are of the highest significance:

The 200 largest manufacturing firms of 1962 have acquired, since 1950, more than 1,800 companies with combined assets of $14 billion.

In the past year, alone, 1,800 mergers took place.

During the past 10 years corporations with assets of $10 million have been taken over at the rate of 54 per year.

The Federal Trade Commission calls attention to the fact that a considerable number of these concerns were earning from 7.5 percent to 10 percent on net worth. It concludes that had they not been acquired they most likely would have continued as healthy economic enterprises capable of offering effective competition.

The principal reason that small businesses sell out is to anticipate the practically confiscatory death taxes. Since small firms are generally sold to their competitors the effect of these mergers is to eliminate successful small businesses and to reduce competition in many fields. If a competitive system is our goal this is hardly the way to achieve it.

THE STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

The purpose of this act is to promote economic growth by encouraging widespread dissemination of technological information to private enterprise. The act authorizes $60 million in matching funds to States over the next 3 years. The Department of Commerce will administer the program with the States designating agencies to be responsible for assembling and processing the needed information.

When signing this act President Johnson commented that some day the legislation might become known as the "sleeper" of the 89th Congress. He added that the act will do for American businessmen what the great Agricultural Extension Service has done for the American farmer for 51 years.

Important as is help to small business, it obviously leaves many serious economic problems untouched. Yet nearly all affect small business, and require solving if our free-enterprise system is to endure. Among these none is more important than concentration in the field of manufacturing. Two hundred corporations are making two-thirds of all manufacturing profits, and the 20 largest manufacturing corporations have assets equal of 419,000 of the smallest. More and more industries are centering their businesses in a small number of monopolistic corporations.[14] Senator PHILIP A. HART, chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, calls attention to the increase of conglomerate corporations. Here he finds organizations so large that they can use monopoly profits of one industry to destroy competition in another. Our economic problems have become so many and so diverse that the opinion of Clark Kerr, president of the University of California, seems hardly exaggerated. Mr. Kerr considers that we are undergoing the greatest ideological struggle in history—how to organize industrial society.[15]

We are no longer a laissez-faire economy. Opposed to monopoly, on the one hand, are the antitrust laws. On the other are minimum wage laws, social security laws, and a host of others. In a word, democratic government is playing an ever-wider part in promoting the general welfare. Nor, incidentally, is this at the expense of a larger payroll; the number of Government employees per 100,000 of the population dropped from 2,120 to 1,240 during the past 20 years.

It could be reasonably argued that small business is closer to democratic ideals than big business. By every definition a wider distribution of wealth is achieved through the extension of small business. Quite the opposite is true of big business which requires great concentration of wealth. If a wider distribution of wealth and opportunity is desirable, it seems altogether proper for the Government to promote small business. It is one means of achieving many centers of independent power.

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE SPEAKS ON PENDING FOOD AND FREEDOM LEGISLATION

Mr. LONG or Missouri. Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and I recently had the pleasure of attending and addressing a national farm conference sponsored by the Midcontinent Farmers Association in St. Louis, Mo. Secretary Freeman placed major emphasis on the pending food-for-freedom legislation.

In addition, Secretary Freeman expressed the position of the administration on other matter of current interest. Two of these subjects were the recent sales of grain owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the administration's Child Nutrition Act.

Mr. President, because of the timeliness of his comments, I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Secretary of Agriculture at this important meeting of agricultural leaders be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN

Only a few weeks less than a year ago I joined you who are in this room today—you who represent many thousands of our Nation's farm families—and made a plea for unity.

I said then that unless agriculture's voice became a single and sensible voice, the Congress would not pass the then-pending Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, and the commodity programs of the sixties which were steadily increasing farm income and cutting down on surpluses would thus be sacrificed on the altar of confusion.

Action taken in response to the facts underlined in that April 13, 1965, conference of farm leaders in Kansas City helped clear the legislative air, and made a significant contribution to adoption of the act—now recognized as the most comprehensive and constructive in all the history of food and farm legislation.

Again, I am in Missouri at your invitation.

I am here because I share your conviction that to put effective power into American leadership in the worldwide war on hunger we must pass the now-pending Food for Freedom Act.

Because I share your conviction that only by using its commodity programs to maintain economic strength and productive flexibility, will American agriculture be adequately equipped to carry out its critically important role in making the dream of a free and peaceful world a reality.

And I am here because I want to be associated with the statement issued earlier this month by leaders of the four major farm organizations in which they urged a maximum signup in the 1966 feed grains program. I concur in the judgment of these great Americans. I share their deep concern at what seems to be lagging support for the feed grains program, as indicated in the slow signup.

Feed grains constitute a dominant—although indirect—part of American diets. They are processed through livestock and poultry into the meats, milk and eggs our families like and can afford. If feed grains get out of balance, most of the rest of American agriculture suffers at the same time.

But it is the food grains—primarily wheat and rice—that dominate the diets of those we seek to help through the war on hunger. Tradition, and necessity, make them cereal eaters. Very little corn moves into the less developed countries. They find the conversion of grain into meat too expensive for both farmers and consumers. This means that even if our shipments of food grains increase rapidly as a part of the war on hunger, the oversupply of feed grains will not be much relieved.

Therefore, I want particularly to discuss with you—and through you with the farm families of the Nation—the importance of balanced production at home to a successful projection of our food, and our production and marketing technology, into the self-help programs of developing nations.

And, while we're together, I would also like to direct attention toward lifting the level of child nutrition here at home, toward expansion of opportunities for more people to live rewarding lives in the towns and small cities of rural America, and toward construction of a more stable credit base for the growth of our rural electric and telephone cooperatives.

---

[14] Wm. F. Mueller, Director, Bureau of Economics, Federal Trade Commission, statement before Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, U.S. Senate, July 2, 1964.

[15] John H. Bunzell "The American Small Businessman," 1962.

Then I would like to respond to some questions that my mail indicates are bothering farmers today.

But first, let's look at the center of the stage. It is occupied by farmers, by food, and by foreign trade and aid.

Never before at the start of a new food and fiber production year have American farmers commanded the interest and attention now directed their way. During the winter which reached its official end only yesterday, our farm men and women have become acquainted with a new type of surplus—a record-breaking volume of advice. Never have so many told so few what to do.

I am sure much of this advice has been well meant. Yet, our farmers have heard and read recommendations ranging from the immediate addition of 60 million acres to the crop production plant to abandonment of price support programs in favor of quick, big sales of every type of food to people who have no place to put it, no transportation systems to carry it, and no dollars to pay for it.

If I have learned anything from more than 5 years of experience as Secretary of Agriculture, I have for sure learned this:

The men and women who built the greatest free enterprise family farm system of food production any nation has ever known didn't do it with pre-fabricated, hand-me-down decisions, or by pursuing pie-in-the-sky propositions.

They built it by taking hard, probing looks at supply and demand and price facts, by analyzing responses to those facts, and then making their own decisions in the light of past experience and new knowledge.

If, in the spring of 1966, our farmers are equipped with factual information related to their responsibilities—and opportunities—here and abroad, I am confident the planting decisions will adequately respond to food and fiber needs while maintaining productive balance and economic strength in the family farm structure.

Let me then, briefly—and in the simplest and sharpest of terms—review basic facts of the current food and agriculture situation.

1. There are no food shortages. There are no empty shelves, bins, or cases in our own retail food markets. The pipelines leading from farms to those markets are full. We have no export commitments, either for dollars or in implementation of food aid programs, that cannot be filled.

2. We are equipped to maintain food abundance, and we have acted accordingly. The continuance of abundance requires an increased 1966 production of wheat, rice, soybeans and milk. Action has been taken under the Food and Agriculture Act to encourage boosts in the outputs of wheat, rice and soybeans. (a) A 10-percent increase has been made in the national 1966 rice acreage allotment. (b) Wheat growers—particularly spring wheat growers—are being encouraged to plant their full allotments rather than taking some of that acreage out of production. (c) Farmers cooperating in the feed grains program may plant soybeans on feed grains acres and remain eligible for the feed grains price support payment.

3. There is no need for greater production of any of the livestock feeds other than soybeans this year.

4. Federal policies related to 1966 production and price support programs for wheat, rice, feed grains and cotton are firm as they stand right now. There will be no further changes in program provisions related to those commodities—those now in effect have been carefully tailored to respond to food and fiber needs.

I am hopeful those points are ticked off in the decisionmaking processes being completed on every farm in the Nation this month.

It is not easy for any of us here, for any citizen of the United States, to take a down-to-earth, practical approach to the war on hunger. Like you and most of our fellow Americans, I contribute to the wave of compassion flowing across the oceans toward those billion men and women and children who began this day as they did yesterday and the day before—weak in body and in spirit because of hunger and malnutrition.

The majority of the hungry are children—and that increases the tug on our heartstrings.

You and I are familiar with the lusty cries which come from American babies when it is time to eat, from babies who quickly acquire ability to show vocal and physical impatience when parental response to their hunger seems slow.

How horrible it must be for a parent to hear a child whimper rather than howl about hunger, or look into eyes that plead so eloquently for so very little, and have no food, or maybe just a few grains of it, to give.

We care for those who suffer. So there is among us a very natural impulse to immediately engage our total productive plant in the alleviation of hunger with a massive, uninhibited, world food distribution program.

Yet, unless our compassion is enriched with common sense, we could speed rather than prevent the day of famine reckoning.

We must guard against doing more harm than good, at home and away, with our great food production capacity.

Let me spell out the results of a year of careful study and analysis of the world food and agriculture situation made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It shows:

1. The world food problem is not new. The size of it is. The fertility of people has outraced the fertility of agricultural land. Unless this trend is reversed—unless the rate of population growth is decreased while per capita food production is increased—a situation that is now critical will become a catastrophe.

2. American food can help the now-hungry nations buy time, time in which to raise the productivity and the economic and social levels of their agricultures, time in which to make family planning effective.

3. It will take more than American food to win the war on hunger.

4. If we had every acre of our farm lands in production right now, turning our maximum yields, the less-developed countries couldn't receive or distribute all we could give them—they do not have the facilities to handle that volume of imports.

5. Even if we assume that the developing nations could distribute all the food we could produce and give to them, the day would soon come when—if their present population and food production rates were maintained—that all our food would fall short of meeting the need. Then there would be mass famine, and not enough food anywhere to combat it.

6. The developing nations know what they have to do. The greatest contribution we can make comes from our experience in how to do it, how to effectively utilize agricultural inputs ranging from fertilizers and insect and weed control chemicals to credit, how to store crops, and move them to markets in an orderly manner, how to conduct 4-H and FFA-like programs for rural youngsters and Extension Service-like programs of adult education.

7. Great as the task is, for us and those we seek to help, we know that the goals can be reached. Last November I reported to the Food and Agriculture Organization in Rome on a study made by the USDA of 26 newly developed nations; some tropical, some semitropical, some in temperate climatic regions, differing in economic, cultural and educational levels. Twelve of these countries, between 1948 and 1963, had annually compounded rates of increase in crop output of more than 4 percent a year. The rates of increase ranged from 4.2 to 9.7 percent, and averaged 5.6 percent. This compares with an average of 3 percent in the United States, even during the war years in which we encouraged maximum production.

With our help and that of the rest of the more developed world, the less-developed countries can acquire the ability to feed themselves. And when this happens, they will provide cash markets for American farm products.

These basic facts about the domestic and world food and agriculture situations lead us to conclude that:

1. Passage of food-for-freedom legislation will give us new, essential tools for the war on hunger. We must win that war if our world is to be free and peaceful in the years ahead.

2. This war is not a short, seasonal battle. It must be fought with steadily rising intensity over many years, with developed and developing nations working shoulder to shoulder. And the key to victory, as President Johnson emphasized in proposing food-for-freedom legislation to the Congress, is self-help.

3. Making food-for-freedom efforts succeed requires that we make our domestic farm programs work smoothly year after year—and right now an effective feed grains program is of special importance.

The food-for-freedom bill is not the only legislation before the Congress that is of interest, and value, to rural families.

Other pertinent proposals cover child nutrition and rural community development, and soon to follow them to the Hill is a recommendation to accomplish adequate financing of rural electric and telephone systems.

While we seek to help developing nations shorten the distance between people and food, there is another gap—a nutrition gap which affects many children in our own country—which also must be closed.

There are today some 9 million children who do not have the benefit of school lunches because there are no food services in the schools they attend. Over a million of them are children of poverty.

That's one side of the nutritional gap. Another facet of this problem exists in the growing number of summer activity programs for youngsters, and in the day care programs for those of preschool ages. All too often the children in these programs do not receive adequate daily diets.

The Child Nutrition Act proposes to change these conditions. It adds new dimensions to the national school lunch program which, in the past 20 years, has become the largest single feeding activity of its kind in the world.

Under the Child Nutrition Act, the school lunch program will be available to more children in more schools—and to more children in the expanding preschool and summer training programs. While nearly 2 million schoolchildren are now receiving free or low-cost lunches, the Child Nutrition Act will insure that another 1.5 million will no longer go without adequate lunches because they cannot afford them. It is inexcusable and unnecesary that any American child be denied a health building diet. This nutrition gap must be closed.

The proposed community development district legislation will, if adopted, give new life and greater scope to the planning of a rural environment that will create more job opportunities and help correct the growing hazards associated with piling up too many people in cities while the benefits of rural living remain untapped.

The proposed REA legislation will enlarge the borrowing resources essential in enabling our electric and telephone cooperatives to maintain quality services for more members, while continuing the constructive credit role of the Federal Government wherever and whenever it is needed.

All these legislative proposals reaffirm an old truth—the fact there's no standing still in a dynamic society like our own. New problems, new needs, new opportunities unfold every year. They require a reassessment of Government programs and their relationship to the general welfare. They also demand reallocations of resources.

This places upon our President the heavy responsibility of recommending uses for the money our citizens invest in Government through taxes. These resources are not unlimited. Yet they must cover new domestic programs as well as the heavy demands of the conflict in Vietnam. Too, in a rapidly-expanding economy that is moving toward the long-desired goal of full employment, the hazards of overheating must be avoided so that inflation will not throw up its barriers to greater progress.

President Johnson, in his budget message, has asked for new money for new programs. He has also recommended priorities, and has recommended a shift of funds from programs which have substantially fulfilled their original purposes into those more responsive to new needs and new progress opportunities.

The Child Nutrition Act is a good example. When more than a million and a half of the children in an affluent society are known to be victims of a nutrition gap, it is imperative that action be taken to shift investments and emphasis toward closing that gap.

It is not asking too much when we ask those families who can afford it—like yours and mine—to spend a few cents more to buy that supplemental half pint of milk, the milk in addition to that served at lunchtime, so that youngsters now denied school lunches can get them.

Let me make it crystal clear that this new program to reach the most needy youngsters is an extension, not a retraction, of the school lunch program.

The budget recommendations of the President covering child nutrition and school milk, rural electric and telephone cooperative credit, and community development districts are proposals for expansions—not retrenchments.

They are not recommendations to "live with." They are well-developed mechanisms to "do with."

Finally, I would like to put into the record of this great forum of dedicated farm leaders the answers to questions my mail shows are being asked most often by farmers and some sections of the agribusiness community.

These questions center largely upon the Government's sales of grains from the stocks it owns, and upon the limitation of payments to cooperators in programs provided by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

Our Government, through the Department of Agriculture, has been acquiring farm commodities through the price-support programs—and selling them—for 30 years. That's what makes the ever-normal granary work. It is every citizen's ever-normal granary. The Congress has consistently reaffirmed the purpose of the ever-normal granary—to maintain farm income and protect farmers from the price hazards of surpluses, while maintaining adequate supplies and reasonable food costs for consumers.

Achievement of these objectives calls for adding to Government stocks when production exceeds needs, and selling them when demand and prices are strong. It is a two-way street. My friends, as the old saying goes, "we can't have our cake and eat it, too." If the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to acquire, then some day it must sell.

Your USDA has not, over the past 5 years, sought to create artificial scarcity by hoarding Commodity Credit Corporation stocks—nor has it put stocks on the markets needlessly.

Since the beginning of the current wheat marketing year, last July 1, we have sold 12 million bushels of wheat for domestic food use. They were sold to create needed balance in type and protein content for 1965 wheat moving to millers from farms. These sales represent less than 1 percent of the 1965 wheat crop. That's dumping?

Since the beginning of the current corn marketing year last October 1 we have been making sales from Government stocks for three purposes:

For blending with the high-moisture corn resulting from an abnormally wet 1965 harvest season; for a desirable speedup in response to orders from dollar-paying buyers overseas; and for the protection of livestock and poultry feeders, and for the consumers of those products, from unnecessary—and inflationary—price fluctuations. We have not been dumping corn. We have been using Government stocks in ways consistent with the objectives of the ever-normal granary.

Like the swallows, the proposals to impose an arbitrary limit on Federal payments to farm program cooperators come back every spring.

I am being asked for my opinion on this limitation recommendation. My opinion hasn't changed—I'm against it. And I think it is significant that the loudest voices raised in Congress in favor of payment limitation haven't changed, either—they have a consistent record of violent opposition to commodity programs at any price.

Our farm commodity programs today are voluntary programs. They work because farmers cooperate in diverting acreages from surplus crop production into soil-conserving uses. Many of them do this at a financial sacrifice because they know balanced supplies are in the interests of all farmers.

All cooperators earn, and are entitled to, reasonable compensation for this acreage diversion.

The man who works 40 hours a week for $3 an hour expects to be paid twice as much as one who works 20 hours a week for $3 an hour.

The farmer who is asked to divert 100 acres from surplus production expects to be paid about twice as much as his next door neighbor, with comparable land, earns for 50 acres of diversion. And why not?

Commodity program payments are not welfare grants. To be effective in balancing production they must fit into the free-enterprise concept that a man is rewarded in terms of the value of his contributions.

All farmers, large and small, should fight vigorously against being lured into a trap that would quickly erode, then destroy, their commodity programs.

In closing may I repeat, in summary, what I have earlier emphasized:

1. Peace and freedom can only be realized when the world wins the war on hunger.
2. Passage of the food-for-freedom bill is essential to the winning of that war.
3. American agriculture cannot put essential muscle into the fight over the long haul unless it retains economic strength at home.
4. Our farm families carry tremendous responsibility for national well-being, and for world progress in the war on hunger.
5. We must make our commodity programs work. Doing it requires continued farmer cooperation, including support for the feed grains program.
6. The ever-normal granary must function effectively, which means CCC must sell on occasion as well as acquire.
7. The child nutrition gap can no longer be tolerated. Every American child should have a school lunch.
8. We must continue to work to accomplish parity of opportunity on the countryside. The Community Development Act and a new supplemental financing system for rural electric and telephone cooperatives will speed progress toward that objective.

All these goals I've outlined are easily stated. Realizing them takes dedication and leadership. Our President is giving us both.

Each of you is known as an effective farm leader. You are dedicated, or you wouldn't be here today.

I am confident that once again—as in the years just past—you will lead the way to a stronger, and more responsive and responsible agriculture. And in the process our farmers will earn the recognition and the rewards which they justly deserve.

PACIFIC STATE AND ALTERNATIVES

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, since introducing a resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 50—last year proposing the inclusion of the Pacific Trust Territory in the State of Hawaii, I have received numerous endorsements of this proposal. The advocates generally take the long view of the concept. They realize, as I do, that no political change as innovative as this comes about overnight and that it will take time to bring it to fruition.

Because the idea of a vast Pacific State is relatively new, it is not easy to grasp. The initial reaction is likely to dismiss it as being impractical.

A similar reaction greeted the idea of making Hawaii a State when it was broached many years ago. It took Hawaii almost 60 years to become a State—the first island State of the Union, noncontiguous with the mainland United States. This geographic uniqueness no doubt made it more difficult for Hawaii to be admitted into the Union, even after the Hawaiian Islands had long previously fulfilled its apprenticeship qualifications as an incorporated territory of this Nation.

In view of this experience, the people of Hawaii are aware that it takes time for a new political concept to take hold and mature. It is important, therefore, that the idea be discussed and debated early and widely. Out of such a public airing of the question hopefully will come the best solution.

My purpose in introducing the resolution for making the Pacific Trust Territory a part of the State of Hawaii stemmed in part from my desire to call attention to the special status of these Micronesian Islands. By agreement with the United Nations Security Council, the United States is responsible for the administration of these Micronesian Islands. In effect, we are in the role of a colonizer—a role from which we should withdraw at a practicable opportunity.

In the interim, however, before the trust territory's political future has been eventually determined, there should be a great deal of sober reflection on the alternatives open on this subject.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin, which has delved deeply into this matter, has printed two editorials recently which effectively pinpoint the case for developing a large Pacific State. The editorials also take note of other available alternatives and demonstrate why they are not feasible.

The editorials take the long view of the Pacific State concept, to which I referred earlier in these remarks. At the same time, they underscore the need for serious thinking at this time concerning the future status of the trust territory.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the two Star-Bulletin editorials—one titled "Pacific State and Alternatives," dated March 9, 1966, and the other titled "Open-Ended Statehood," dated March 12, 1966.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Star-Bulletin, Mar. 9, 1966]

Pacific State and Alternatives

C. L. Sulzberger, one of the New York Times columnists we are honored to present on these pages, says the idea of a massive Pacific State is impractical.

In this case, we are honored to disagree with him.

His reaction is the typical first reaction of many people confronted with the rather shocking concept of a State embracing a watery 5,000-mile span.

What is more interesting is the second reactions of people forced to think hard about the Pacific—which Mr. Sulzberger wasn't at the time he made his quick comment.

The alternatives for the three U.S.-controlled territories in the Pacific—Guam, Samoa, and the trust territory—boil down basically to three: Independence, alliance with some other power, alliance with the United States.

Given the limited economic base of the areas, together or separately, independence strikes most students of the problem as impractical.

Alliances thrusting some other power into this militarily strategic section of the world are hardly apt to charm U.S. leaders and would hardly offer the residents the advantages that the United States could offer.

The third alternative—alliance with the United States—thus becomes a prominent one.

How to do it?

The present status may be all right for the immediate future—but it adds up to colonialism and that won't do for the long run.

Guam's present effort is focused on winning a locally elected Governor.

Samoa is moving forward under an aggressive appointed Governor who soon may be pulled away to another assignment.

The trust territory is on the move and getting used to the workings of its first Congress, which has only limited power.

Sooner or later these areas will want more if they stay in the U.S. orbit—full citizenship (only Guam's residents have it), internal self-government, a voice in Congress.

It is hard to see Congress ever granting two Senators to this area which now does not even have the population to justify one Congressman.

It is easier to see some sort of coadministration through a Pacific State.

The idea is far from dead.

More correctly, the idea of any pellmell rush toward change has been abandoned and the situation is being allowed to develop at a more reasonable pace.

The idea needs to be turned over at many levels—from Washington, D.C., to Tobi Island, 10,000 miles away.

More people at all locations need to do more hard thinking about the future of the Pacific islands and then try to plan a future that will jibe with the realities of world politics, the politically possible in Washington and the self-interest of the people in the Pacific. From all of this, some sort of Pacific State may eventually emerge.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Star-Bulletin, Mar. 12, 1966]

Open-Ended Statehood

When Hawaii was granted statehood by Congress 7 years ago today, the general disposition was to put a period at the end of the sentence. A struggle lasting more than a century had been brought to a successful conclusion, and that was that.

Today we know better.

Statehood for Hawaii didn't end in 1959. That was the beginning of a new era and the issue of statehood itself did not pass into history with President Eisenhower's proclamation 5 months later, on August 21, 1959.

For today we are very much concerned with a possible expansion of the boundaries of the State of Hawaii, and there is even some talk of a new Pacific State, made up of the other American islands in the Pacific combined with the trust territory. And, in the same vein, the question of statehood for Puerto Rico is still very much alive.

In the case of Puerto Rico, a 13-member Commission is studying the future status of the Caribbean Commonwealth and at least one economist thinks that by 1980 Puerto Rico will be economically ready for statehood. The economist, Arthur E. Burns, told the Commission that by that time—1980—the economic advantages of the Commonwealth status vis-a-vis statehood will have largely disappeared, and the political advantages of statehood could become a decisive factor in Puerto Rican thinking.

The Commission is made up of two U.S. Senators, two Representatives, two members at large and six members from Puerto Rico—three commonwealth advocates, two in favor of statehood, and one for independence.

It is the nature of profound political change to take place slowly and with mature deliberation. It is for this reason that we do not anticipate a decision soon as to the future of the Pacific islands now under the American flag, either as a United Nations trusteeship or as American possessions.

Hawaii, despite its cultural, political, and economic sophistication, had to wait nearly 60 years after annexation as a territory before it could convince Congress that it was a worthy addition to the Union of States. The Pacific islands, far less advanced politically and culturally, with anything but a viable economy, face what seem insurmountable obstacles if their goal is statehood on their own. Expanding Hawaii's borders to include them is something else again.

(During our own statehood campaign it was suggested, most often facetiously, that Hawaii could be annexed by California.)

It is true that the Pacific islands would be an economic drag on Hawaii, for the start at least. But, as was pointed out in these columns Wednesday, what are the alternatives? American colonialism? Independence? Domination by another power?

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska and independence for the Philippines reinforced the concept that there is no place for colonialism in the American scheme of government. Any status other than statehood is transitory. In the case of the Philippines, the colonial status developed into that of a commonwealth and finally to independence. In the case of Alaska and Hawaii, territorial status was preparation for statehood.

Sooner or later we will have to face up to the future of all of the territory under the American flag that is not included in one of the existing States. Unless we are prepared to adopt at this late date the discredited policy of colonialism against which we fought as colonies nearly 200 years ago, there are but two directions for dependent peoples under the American flag to go—into the Union as States (or annexed to existing States), or outside of it as free governments.

It is against our national security to allow the Pacific islands to separate from us and fall under the dominance of some other power, as well they might with their doubtful capacity for nationhood on their own. It is against our national policy to keep them as colonials, or force them into the Union against their will.

It thus becomes a matter of national self-interest to so govern the Pacific islands in this period of transition that they will consider their preferred destiny to be as a part of the United States.

The expected appointment of William R. Norwood, of Governor Burns' staff, as High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, suggests that Washington recognizes the value of Hawaii-Pacific links.

And so, on this anniversary of the passage of statehood legislation in Congress, it must be clear that the book isn't finished, the last period wasn't put in place 7 years ago.

THE LAWYER AS LOBBYIST

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an article which was published in the February issue of the American Bar Association Journal, entitled "The Lawyer as Lobbyist." The article was written by Charles D. Ablard, chairman of the Special Committee on Code of Federal Administrative Procedure of the American Bar Association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

The Lawyer as Lobbyist

(By Charles D. Ablard)

The role of the lawyer as an advocate before courts and administrative bodies is established and accepted by the legal profession. However, the role of the lawyer as an advocate in the formation of laws by the Congress and State legislatures is not only often misunderstood but frequently rejected as a proper role by members of the bar. Yet, there is as much need for the lawyer in the process of formulation of statutes by legislatures as there is after enactment in interpretation by the administrators and agencies to which they apply and in judicial review by the courts.

Part of the reason for this misunderstanding is the broad range of activities usually thought of in connection with "lobbying." While the more colorful aspects may be the subject of press comments, most of the effective and realistic work in the field of lobbying receives little attention.

Why should the lawyer be considered specially trained or qualified for lobbying? The lawyer is trained to interpret laws and provide legal analyses for his clients. The lawyer who can interpret and analyze existing laws can also analyze the need for remedial legislation and the specifics for achieving it. In addition, the lawyer is also trained as a skillful gatherer and interpreter of facts. And facts, properly presented and carefully analyzed, are the bases for most legislation.

There are an infinite number of possible problems and approaches with which the lawyer-lobbyist may be faced. He may be called upon to defeat an existing bill, create a legislative program for his client, seek clarifying legislation to overrule a decision of a court or regulatory agency, or substitute one section of a bill for another. He may enter the problem at any stage, including the earliest stage of developing a legislative program. It is almost as impossible to summarize lobbying as it is to summarize the scope of the practice of law.

For the purposes of this brief article, let us assume that the lawyer-lobbyist is asked to draft and obtain the passage by Congress of a bill that benefits his client. Let us also assume that he decided to begin his work in the House of Representatives rather than proceeding simultaneously in both the Senate and House, which is often procedurally difficult and more time consuming. After the facts have been analyzed with the client and the existing statutes and decisions checked, the bill is drafted.

The decision as to the House in which to proceed would have been based on the likelihood of favorable action by the committee to which the bill will be referred. A sponsor must be found, but first it should be determined to which committee and subcommittee of the House the bill will be referred when it is introduced. At this point discussion with the Parliamentarian of the House frequently is helpful. An effort should then be made to have the bill introduced by a member of the committee or subcommittee to which it will be referred, unless a member of the leadership will sponsor it.

The member of the subcommittee to which the bill has been referred knows the committee members and staff and is in a position to urge that hearings be held and to bring it to a vote within the committee. Most Members of Congress will urge the proponent of a bill to obtain as sponsor a member of the appropriate committee and will be hesitant to introduce a bill unless it relates to functions of the committee on which they serve.

Obviously, the ideal sponsor of any bill is the chairman of the committee or subcommittee to which it will be referred. If he declines, a member of the committee, an influential one—it is hoped—should be found to introduce the bill. Cooperation from the ranking minority member of the committee is of considerable importance, and he should be encouraged to introduce a companion bill.

Now that the bill has been drafted and introduced, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 261–270) requires registration with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of anyone who seeks to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation.

At this point a factor frequently overlooked should be considered. This is the submission of the bill by the committee to which it has been referred to the executive department or agency the bill affects. The reports of the department or agency, stating whether they have objections to the bill, are communicated to the committee. The final paragraph in these letters usually states that the Bureau of the Budget has examined the bill to determine not only the cost of administering the proposal but, more important, to determine whether it is consistent with the policy programs of the White House. Thus, the views of the department or agency and the Budget Bureau can have a material bearing on the outcome of the bill. An attempt to obtain support in advance from the department or agency and the Bureau of the Budget is frequently a wise course of action, if for no other reason than to evaluate the strength and depth of the opposition of the affected department or agency and the Bureau.

After the reports on the bill are filed, the chairman of the committee must be persuaded to schedule hearings. A strong adverse report frequently dissuades a committee from holding a hearing. When hearings are scheduled, the next question to be resolved is who will testify in support of the bill. Generalizations are dangerous but although lawyers generally make good witnesses, there are certainly poor lawyer witnesses and excellent industry witnesses. The lawyer is doing the job for which he is trained and proficient. If the bill is a technical one requiring expert engineering or scientific testimony, an engineer or scientist should present the principal testimony. One general exception to lay testimony is in testimony before the committees on the judiciary. Both committees are composed entirely of lawyers and are called lawyers' committees.

Questions are often used as the means for developing salient facts and analyzing the attitude of the Members of Congress who will vote on the legislation. These questions often can be suggested to the members of the committee and to the committee staff.

The lawyer who is retained to influence the passage or defeat of legislation should become acquainted with and fully brief the staff counsel to the committee considering the bill. Most staff members welcome discussions with interested parties or counsel, as their time is limited and is divided among various legislative proposals. These briefings and discussions save the time of the staff and assist it in the conduct of the hearings.

The lawyer-lobbyist will want to call on members of the committee or subcommittee after the hearings to ascertain their views and to urge favorable action on his bill. It is always desirable to have a brief summary of the reasons the bill should be enacted to leave with the Congressman for future reference. If possible, the summary should be confined to one page, as the lengthy memorandum usually will not be read. This is a challenge to a lawyer who has difficulty in writing a brief brief. When calling on a Congressman, one's discussion should be concise and to the point. The time of Congressmen is limited, and they are usually concerned with a great variety of problems, notably those of their constituents.

In addition to discussing the bill with the Congressman, the lawyer should confer with the Congressman's legislative assistant, and the same summary left with the Congressman should be presented to the assistant for study. It may be preferable to begin with a discussion with the assistant, for the assistant who favors the bill may be of great help with the Congressman.

After the committee has met and, it is hoped, favorably reported the bill, the lawyer-lobbyist will then want to work with the staff of the committee in preparing a report on the bill. He should offer assistance to the staff in this function, but it is not always accepted. Writing the report that creates the legislative history is often a most important part of the lawyer's role, for it prepares the basis for the later interpretation of his bill by the courts.

Once reported favorably by a subcommittee or a committee, most bills, unless highly controversial, are passed with only minor modification by the House. Thus, getting the bill out of committee becomes of paramount importance. When the bill has been reported favorably by the committee and a report written, it will then be brought to the floor for action by the House.

The bill can be brought to the floor of the House in a variety of ways. The first is the Consent Calendar, which means that there must be no objection to considering the bill. The second is under suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds vote of the House to consider and to pass the bill. The Congressman who brings the bill up in this manner must be recognized for this purpose by the Speaker of the House, and it can be done only on certain days. The third method is through a rule issued by the Rules Committee, which may be either a closed rule, which specifies that no amendments or limited amendments can be made to the bill, or an open rule, which permits amendments but may impose certain other limitations, such as the subject matter of the amendment and even who can offer it.

Time will usually not permit the lawyer-lobbyist to call on every Member of Congress, although on some occasions a brief letter urging support for the bill and outlining the need for its enactment might be addressed to each Member at least a week before it is considered on the floor. The bill is brought to the floor of the House by the chairman of the committee that held the hearings, who is usually the floor manager.

If the bill is passed by the House, it goes to the Senate and is again referred to the appropriate committee. If the bill is not of major consequence and little opposition has been developed in the House hearings, it is possible to have the bill brought directly to the floor of the Senate without hearings by a Senate committee. If hearings by a Senate committee are held, the same procedures followed in the House should be duplicated in the Senate. The Senate has no committee which functions as the Rules Committee does in the House, and thus the bill proceeds directly from the legislative committee to the floor of the Senate when favorably reported.

After passage by the Senate, the bill is sent to the White House for signature or veto by the President.

If he has done everything correctly and has had a little bit of luck, the lawyer-lobbyist may be the author of a new law.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McNAMARA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if Senator PAT MCNAMARA had had his way, the last word on his retirement would have been his own. But I doubt if the last word on Senator MCNAMARA will be written or said for some time, because there is just too much to tell.

And knowing Senator MCNAMARA's distaste for personal publicity, I doubt if he will willingly consent to listen to any of it. Certainly, Senator MCNAMARA would not have approved of the tribute paid him by Esther Van Wagoner Tufty's article, which appeared in a number of newspapers, including the March 23 issue of the Port Huron, Mich., Times Herald.

But I think it is an excellent profile of a man who has not only done so much for Michigan, but also for the Nation as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I refer be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Port Huron (Mich.) Times Herald, Mar. 23, 1966]

MICHIGAN'S MCNAMARA—WHAT MANNER OF MAN IS THE SENATOR?

(By Esther Van Wagoner Tufty)

Now that Michigan's senior Senator is retiring many people are trying, in tribute to describe what manner of man—and Senator—is this big, blunt-speaking Irishman, PATRICK VINCENT MCNAMARA.

This isn't easy. He is a simple man without pretenses who has an unfailing instinct for picking the political causes close to the people.

Looking back over nearly 12 years, one of his joys is his fulfillment of his major campaign promises "to do something for the aged" (medicare) and to improve education at all levels (Federal aid-to-education program).

That's not all, for most of the major social legislation enacted into law during the 1960's bears his name as primary sponsor or cosponsor.

He has Presidential pens to prove it. In one glass case he has mounted 18 pens used by the President in the White House signing ceremonies on social welfare bills. (In just 1 year of the 88th session he collected 19 more pens at such ceremonies and this prompted the Crisis Club of Detroit to send him a cheap pen to round out the number to 20.)

Washington reporters learned early that only hard news would be forthcoming from this news source. He pooh-poohs the press agentry many politicans think is necessary even if they personally blush at the ballyhoo.

Although the first Michigan Democratic Senator to be chairman of a standing committee, his name is not, nor is it likely to become, a household word. But he has monuments in Michigan. Credit must be given to him as chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee for the approval of new Federal buildings in Detroit and Grand Rapids, the Internal Revenue Center in Detroit, and the social security building in Pontiac. (On this Oakland County project he worked in cooperation with freshman Congressman Billie Farnum on the House Appropriations Committee.) Many harbors on the Great Lakes have been improved because of his insistence and committee power.

Not a phony, he never could be accused of fence sitting. A liberal, everyone knew where he stood on any issue. As Senator Philip Hart said on the day McNamara announced to the Senate his intention to retire, "Pat is a man who, after listening to 2 hours of involved argument, can cut to the heart of a problem with about five well-chosen words."

When he came to the Senate his Democratic Party in Michigan was split and this down to earth politician did much to establish a more united Democratic State organization without attempting to take over the party leadership when Governor John Swainson was defeated for reelection. That kind of party power, like publicity from riding the Washington merry-go-round of cocktail parties, was not for him.

He isn't palsy-walsy with other Senators and yet he's not a loner. They respect him and he works with the establishment. One of his early favorites was Alben Barkley, who sat next to him when Barkley returned to the Senate as "freshman" after being Vice President. He has a close relationship with Senator Hart and this is unusual, for in that most exclusive club jealousy for credit often abounds between the two men representing the same State. He's a special friend of Senators Edmund Muskie, of Maine, and Eugene McCarthy, of Minnesota, both liberal Democrats.

Pat has great respect for the office of the Presidency. So much, that he isn't one of the boys to call up the President for small favors. Humbly, he sometimes marvels out loud that he, the son of an Irish immigrant who had only an eighth-grade education, became a Senator. The day when his administrative assistant, Robert Perrin, had the pleasure of being the first to tell him he had been reelected, the Senator beamed, saying "the first was fine but to be reelected means the people like what I am doing."

Columnist Drew Pearson could never accuse Pat of junketing. He did go to Canada for the dedication of the St. Lawrence Seaway and he did go to Geneva, when appointed to the International Labor Organization convention, and once he went on a water resources trip to Norway and Sweden, but that's not junketing.

Why should this man, at the peak of achievement, choose not to run for reelection?

He says because of his health he "might not be able to do full justice to his Senate responsibilities." That operation in 1960 was more serious than he has ever cared to admit. But always the realist, maybe this 71-year-old man did not want to endanger shortening his life during a strenuous campaign thus providing a vacancy for Republican Governor Romney to fill with a GOP successor. But more than that, he didn't want to be one of those "Senators who stay on too long." While he doesn't brag about it he already has accomplished his major legislative objectives.

No doubt at the Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet Saturday in Detroit, given in his honor, there will be many glowing references made to his record as chairman of Public Works and ranking Democrat on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The main speaker is Senator Muskie, a brilliant orator, which McNamara is not. Like other men of simplicity he is at his best in giving sharp pungent answers to prickly questions.

Not a rich man, the Senator has through the years invested in the Government retirement program, and in addition to his 12 years in the Senate he will have credit for the 3 to 4 years as Detroit director of OPA back in World War II days.

He and his wife, "Shorty," live close to the Capitol and have not decided whether or not to move back to Michigan come January. Probably, like others, they will continue to be at home in both places.

BILL MOYERS ADDRESSES THE NATIONAL NEWSPAPERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, Bill Moyers is an unusual young man. He brings a uniquely experienced background to his present White House service which fits him exactly for his tasks there. By upbringing and training, he is a man of deep social conscience, well motivated, and highly articulate.

It was, therefore, no surprise to me that when he spoke recently in Washington to the National Newspapers Association, he spoke with a marvelous mixture of wit and wisdom, practical politics, and durable philosophy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks on that occasion be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of the Remarks of Bill Moyers, Special Assistant to the President, to the National Newspapers Association

For more than one reason I am glad to be here. It's good to get away from the White House—press corps.

At the last minute the President changed his schedule rather suddenly and I almost had to cancel. He has a way of doing that. Not too long ago he called me and said: "Bill, I'm going to Honolulu." I said "Fine, Mr. President; I'll come over and talk to you about it. Where are you?" He said: "Over Los Angeles."

A number of factors compound the frustration of my work, two more so than others: the President and the press.

The credibility gap is a problem, too. It is getting so bad we can't even believe our own leaks.

There have been so many leaks we are stamping our morning newspapers "Top secret."

And then there are planted questions. Every press secretary has dealt with planted questions, but I have moved on to planted answers. The President gives the answer and we let the reporters guess the question.

Of course, as I said, the object of planted questions is to make sure the American people get the real news—not just what is on some reporter's mind.

I have only been in this job 8 months. It took me only 8 hours to learn that it is good for a press secretary to keep his words soft and sweet—because he never knows when he will have to eat them.

This job changes you. Someone anonymously sent me a quotation with a note attached saying: "This is very appropriate for you." It read: "One is more honest in youth, and to the age of 30, than when he has passed it. It is only after that age that one's illusions are dispelled. Until then, one resembles the dog that defends the dinner of his master against other dogs; after this period, he takes his share of it with the others." At the end, my anonymous benefactor had written: "Arf! Arf!"

I guess that metamorphosis is a kind of occupational hazard. Earlier this week a former journalist who has been reduced to writing letters to the editor penned one note to a local newspaper in which he tabbed me with a new name: "Common Scold." And that was after he had described me as "a reformed divinity student who now seems determined to play the role of a nagging wife."

Today I want neither to scold nor to nag, but to talk to you as an exnewspaperman of limited experience who has sought to add to his knowledge with some intensive on-the-job training.

I have made a few tentative observations in the last 8 months on the virtues and vices of press secretaries. I emphasize "tentative" because in this town only the most dogmatic dares accept as final any conclusion embraced on the basis of available evidence at any given moment.

Six years ago I came to Washington as a kind of irreverent believer. Today I suppose I could be called a reverent skeptic—reverent because the stakes of what we are all doing are too high for superficial play-acting; skeptic because, in the final analysis, we are all—the best and the worst of us—play actors. If there is a contradiction in that posture, it is because truth in this city almost always rises from the clash of contradictions.

These observations I have generously decided to share with you today, not because the White House press corps is intolerant of any views other than those of the highest authority, but because you are a captive audience. And there is still in me enough of the parish elocutionist not to let a group like this go without first endowing you with the wisdom of the ages—all 31 of them.

I raise the subject of virtues and vices because as a Protestant I believe in public confession, and in the presence of such an unholy audience, it behooves me to practice a bit.

Of the former, I shall be brief. The best that you can say about the role of the press secretary is that while it is hell to be both a philosopher and a flak, it is also unique. Not since Moses scribbled on a slab of granite while the Almighty dictated has the role of Amanuensis been accorded so exalted a position in the society of men. The office that has evolved from Joseph Tumulty posting on an office door the daily list of Woodrow Wilson's visitors to Bill Moyers describing Lyndon Johnson's incision as "long enough," is the invention of necessity. Gone forever, alas, are the days of Andrew Johnson's administration when a young reporter, Henry Adams, describing his arrival in Washington, said: "The first step, of course, was making of acquaintance and the first acquaintance was naturally the President, to whom an aspirant to the press officially paid respect."

There is, of course, no substitute for the "horse's mouth," but when the horse is running, the spectators listen to the public address system. Press secretaries have escalated in role not only as the Presidency has become one continuous Hialeah, but also as reporting itself has moved from the periphery of public policy making ever closer to the center, where the action not only is, but from where it must be seen and interpreted.

The finest hour of a press secretary comes, all too infrequently, when he is simply a good reporter. I must confess that a certain exhilaration comes over me when I act as the President's reporter at a moment of high public concern. This happened soon after I assumed the office as the President and his advisers deliberated the turning decisions of Vietnam. It occurred again during his effort to move labor and management off dead center during the steel dispute, again at the hospital as an uncertain nation waited for news of the President's health. And I suspect that also on those occasions, when information became the bread of a people's need, my colleagues in the White House—your reporters—felt a similar exhilaration of relevance and an acute heightening of responsibility. Extraordinary trust, endowed by either the President or the people, or both, makes the most ordinary of us aware of the difference good reporting can make.

But if Moses recorded the Ten Commandments, he also broke them. And so, the vices.

The first to which press secretaries are susceptible is an affliction known as "Potomac fever," which causes one to swell without growing. This is far more dangerous than hammertoes (and far more common), for it tempts press secretaries down many a crooked path.

It can guide us, for example, into unquestioning certitude, even righteousness, in the defense of officialdom.

Or it can encourage us to dig redoubts for an administration's policies instead of searching for fresh perspectives to appraise whether what we are doing is being done well—or ought even to be done at all. The first casualty of righteousness—whether in the first, second, third, or fourth estate—is always that critical faculty which protects us—and our policies—from absolutism.

"Potomac fever" can produce a bloated sensation—particularly in the area of the ego—that causes press secretaries to take themselves much too seriously. There are many symptoms of this, including hypervexation over the annoyances and reporter—especially pathological troublemakers—can generate; myopia, which blurs their vision of things afar; and the tiger-in-the-tank syndrome manifested by supercharged reaction to criticism, justified and unjustified.

Soon after I took this job a friend presented to me a framed copy of Lord Macmillan's paragraph: "If you think of it, it seems a strange and ironical arrangement that when the country has entrusted to a particular group of men the arduous and delicate task of conducting the business of the Nation, we at the same time permit them to be harassed by every form of obstruction and vituperation. It is as if we had employed a surgeon to perform a delicate operation and had then arranged that his elbow should be jogged at the most critical moment."

It sounded nice, so I hung it on the wall of my study. Not long ago my attention meandered to it for the first time in months and I began to read it over—and over. And then I took it down. We are not surgeons, but stewards. And every man's elbow needs to be jogged if it rests too long on the top of the table. Voltaire warned that a sovereign is called a tyrant who knows no law but his caprice, and if you will scratch most of us lightly, you will uncover at least the inclinations of a bush-league tyrant.

Overheating has other effects, too, and has even been known to keep press secretaries in voluntary bondage to the grist mill when the baker's shelves are full. Or, put another way, press secretaries may choose the safe way of mastering the jots and tittles of supplying the press with its mechanical needs rather than hazard the uncertain depths of dialog with the press. This is regretful for both the press and the press secretary, although each must share the burden for the demise of dialog. The true heart, however, is the daily bread. There is a certain unperturbable security about a charade, but a genuine encounter on public policy accepts no bounds to its risks because only when everything is ventured is anything attained.

Let me speak of one more affliction common to the lot of press secretaries. It is known as "Montezuma's revenge" after that great Aztec publicist who opened Mexico to Spanish tourists. You know what it is; it led someone to remark that every press secretary approaches his job with an open mouth. I learned the hard way that there are times when we cannot—in the words of one of your former colleagues—"permit the priorities of the press to hustle the procedures of government." I have also learned that it is far better to remain silent and appear uninformed than to speak up and remove all doubt.

What is the cure for this affliction? A little mental scotch tape from time to time and a little more defiance of the temptation to worry about the credibility gap. For one thing, too much talk can increase that breach. Events can make a lie out of the most genuine promises—and the most unequivocal assertions. There is a season for everything, including silence. To equate one's responsibility as the President's spokesman with the necessity to speak on every occasion, is, I repeat, to stuff raw meat down the yawning maw of the credibility gap.

As Chamfort wrote: "Nearly all men are slaves for the same reason the Spartan assigned for the servitude of the Persians: lack of power to pronounce the syllable, 'no.' To be able to utter that word," he went on, "and to live alone, are the only two means to preserve one's freedom and one's character." I might add that they are also the way to keep Presidents out of trouble not of their own making.

The real test in the final analysis is whether we are willing to stand on the substance of what our administration does as the press finds and sees it—and as the people judge it. As far as that judgment is concerned, verbal extremism in the liberty of our defense will be no virtue.

Somewhere between good reporting and fatuous apologetics, therefore, a press secretary must take his stand—nearer the former if he is courageous and fortunate and sneer at veneration; closer to the latter if he is intoxicated with his own importance or the infallibility of his chief's mortality.

Wherever he stands, there will be tension. For his calling is daily to disprove the axiom that "No man can serve two masters." If he does well, he serves neither all of the time and both most of the time.

You can see the irony here, because the masters a press secretary serves are by nature protagonists. Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, summed it up:

"Our [the press] obligations are merely these in deciding whether to go into print with information: Is it true? Has it been legitimately acquired? Is it fit to print—public property or a private matter? These satisfactorily settled, the facts are ready for their bath of printer's ink.

"But the statesman has other considerations. Is it premature? Will publication make the going more difficult? Will publication tend to confuse, rather than clarify, the popular mind? These are some of the problems before him, particularly if he is President of the United States in a catastrophic hour, forcing the innermost fibers of his body and the full resources of his spirit into his colossal task."

The irony is deeper because truth is generated by encounter as fire is made by rubbing together two sticks, and the encounter between these protaganists has often been intensely personal.

I will illustrate by declassifying some material and reading from a report on a violent outburst at a Cabinet meeting. It was precipitated when someone mentioned a newspaper attack on the President. One of the men present later wrote:

"The President was much inflamed, got into one of those passions when he cannot command himself, ran on much on the personal abuse which has been bestowed on him, defied any man on earth to produce one single act of his since he had been in the government which was not done on the purest motives, that he had never repented but once the having slipped the moment of resigning his office, and that was every moment since, that by God he had rather be on his farm than to be made emperor of the world—and yet they were charging him with wanting to be king. That that rascal [the newspaper editor] sent him three of his papers every day, as if he thought he would become the distributor of his papers, that he could see in this nothing but an impudent design to insult him. He ended in his high tone."

So wrote Thomas Jefferson of George Washington.

What had been said of our first President? That he violated the Constitution, that he was "treacherous," "mischievous," "inefficient. That he was guilty of "ostentatious professions of piety," of "pusilanimous neglect," of "little passions," "ingratitude," "want of merit," and "spurious fame."

Of course, his response was ferocious, predictable, and understandable. Few human beings, and still fewer Presidents, are immune to what Edmund Burke called "the presumptuous judgment of the ignorant" upon their designs. The sensitivity of Presidents to criticism, I have observed, is matched only by the sensitivity of the press to criticism. As one of your colleagues recently told me with a smile: "We can give it but we are against taking it." We all are. Reality and common sense dictate no alternative but living with criticism, rejecting it when unwarranted, accepting it when reasonable, ignoring it when possible.

For both the President and the press, in the last analysis, know that each holds a peculiar public trust. The Presidency, after all, was created by the Constitution and the press protected by it. On each that document confers responsibility and privilege. When we in the Government exercise the right of free speech and are critical of the press, it may often be for reasons of pique, but it is also because we know how important reporting is and how much is lost when, like us, you have missed the mark.

The Presidents I know, and those I have studied, for all the pain afflicted upon them by the press, come back to the conviction once expressed by Thomas Jefferson. The Prussian minister, visiting Jefferson in his office, saw an opposition paper on his desk, attacking Jefferson viciously. He protested: "Mr. President, why do you permit such libels?"

Jefferson replied: "Put that paper in your pocket, Baron. And should you ever hear the reality of our liberty, the freedom of our press, questioned, show them this paper—and tell them where you found it."

Enough for one master. What can I say of the first I serve, the Presidency?

It defies simple definition, for its full meaning baffles its critics and eludes its observers who must interpret the Official but, like its occupant, can never freely grasp it. As Clinton Rossiter has pointed out, if the Presidency could speak, it would say with Walt Whitman:

Do I contradict myself?
Very well then I contradict myself.
I am large. I contain multitudes.

The Presidency is a place where power and purpose are wonderfully met. On its occupant are heaped the hopes and aspirations of a people's finest nature—and the fears and suspicions of their worst. In a world in which power is our lot, the Presidency "stands across the path of those who mistakenly assert that democracy must fail because it can neither decide promptly nor act vigorously." That office is occupied now by a man with a talent for power. If he fails, we all fail. If he succeeds, we all succeed. He is a man who has said that the office he holds "has made every man who occupied it, no matter how small, bigger than he was; and no matter how big, not big enough for its demands."

INDO-AMERICAN FOUNDATION CAN BE HIGHLY USEFUL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the President's proposal that India's progress be assisted by a new Indo-American Foundation comes as wise and statesmanlike recognition of the potential role of the independent foundation in assisting and speeding world economic development.

There are a number of foundations in the United States that are international in scope but two come to mind because they are well known in their contributions to agriculture—the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. In a number of countries, each of these foundations is carrying out active, helpful programs of agricultural improvement, closely allied to and reinforcing national development programs.

Both Ford and Rockefeller Foundations are supporting the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines, which is making significant progress in developing higher yielding varieties of rice that mature earlier, resist insects and disease, and flourish in areas with long hours of daylight.

Equally important, the Institute trains young scientists from rice-growing countries, helping to start them off as the agricultural leaders of the future.

In India, Ford Foundation is carrying out an active pilot program in selected areas to demonstrate how a package approach of related essential approaches can improve farm production and well-being of farmers.

In Latin America, Rockefeller Foundation has done outstanding work in developing grain varieties and production methods that are successful in tropical areas.

India needs this proposed Indo-American Foundation. With the wise leadership we would expect of its Indian-American board of directors, we would expect it to make a distinct contribution to India's development. I think this proposal is important, well conceived, and deserving of our enthusiastic support.

SS "HOPE" IS BUILDING GOOD WILL IN NICARAGUA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, today in Nicaragua a dedicated group of American doctors, nurses, and technologists are quietly at work helping the people of this small Central American nation to find better health. They are volunteers serving on the SS *Hope*, the famed white hospital ship, now on its fifth teaching and treatment mission.

Since the *Hope* arrived in January, thousands of Nicaraguans have received treatment aboard the ship or in shore-based *Hope* clinics. Perhaps more importantly, hundreds of Nicaraguan doctors, nurses, and technologists are working side by side with their American counterparts, learning new medical techniques which will remain with them when the ship leaves in November.

As has been the case in each country the ship has visited, *Hope* is having a tremendous impact on the people of Nicaragua. A reservoir of good will has been built which grows each day. As a result, many tributes praising this project have come from the Nicaraguan people.

An example of the warm friendship which has developed may be seen in the remarks of the Most Reverend Agusto Oviedo Reyes, bishop of Leon, who recently visited on board the *Hope*. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of these remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by the Most Reverend Agusto Oviedo Reyes, Bishop of Leon, on Visiting the SS "Hope"

In our character of bishop of the diocese in whose jurisdiction has anchored this famous and noble hospital ship, well known all over the world, we have come today to pay you a visit which is not merely a visit of courtesy, but it is a tribute and sincere acknowledgement of the noble action of the United States to help our brothers who suffer sickness and lack the means to cure their illness.

We know well that your task is difficult and requires your every effort. It brings you the satisfaction of contributing to increase the prestige of your noble Nation; and God, who is watching from heaven, will bless your efforts.

Excuse my desire to salute you in your own language. The pronunciation may not be correct or clear, but I do hope that it will clearly convey the gratitude of our hearts to you and your great nation, the Nation of Lincoln, that great country of yours which believes in brotherly love. Your country is no doubt guided by the postulates of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council containing the grave admonition of His Holiness Paul VI that the world is in great need of practicing the Christian spirit of helping those peoples which are in most need.

It is just and proper that we, as representatives of the Catholic Church, come to give you our heartfelt welcome to our country. We have felt throughout the whole nation a deep and sincere gratitude for all of you who labor together in these noble endeavors guided by the Christian spirit of charity.

Our priests, with their presence here today, wish to give testimony of admiration and appreciation for the work of the hospital ship *Hope*. As head of the diocese and in their representation we give you our warmest welcome to our shores and to our soil which we beg you to consider your own. May God bless your every effort in the noble task of this ship of hope which as our Ruben would say it is a true "Canto de Vida y Experanza," song of life and hope.

When you have finished your stay here and you go back, please tell the people of your country and your Government that your flag and ours were entwined together in friendship and in your honor, and that you conquered a victory more significant and glorious than those that can be reaped in wars and more lasting because it did not destroy but built upon the foundation of the human dignity.

REPUBLICAN EFFORTS TO INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS VINDICATED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention to a recent Associated Press dispatch which appeared in many newspapers around the country. This dispatch reports that the administration intends to seek increased social security benefits next year.

I am heartened by the administration's announced intention which, I point out, is the direct result of determined efforts in the Senate to enact the proposal sponsored by my able and distinguished colleague from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] and several other Senators, including myself, to blanket under the social security system, for minimum monthly benefits of $44, all persons over 70 years of age not now covered by the program. This proposal in the form of an amendment to the recently approved Tax Adjustment Act was not accepted in its entirety by the House-Senate conferees on this measure, but the principle therein is now on the statute books. This action by Congress under the leadership of Senator Prouty has evidently persuaded the administration that it is high time to give millions of elderly Americans, most of whom are poverty stricken, a decent break in the social security program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the dispatch to which I referred earlier be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Mar. 20, 1966]

Higher Social Security Benefits Appear Assured

Washington.—A surprise Senate vote for a help-the-elderly-poor amendment to President Johnson's tax bill may have speeded an upward revision of basic social security payments.

The amendment was kept in the final bill only in a watered-down form when it was sent to President Johnson.

But the inclulsion of the provision prompted both the President and Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey to say that the administration intends to do something next year about raising social security payments.

Many legislators and administration experts on social security long have contended that the system must be upgraded to give more adequate protection to the elderly poor. The minimum monthly payment for an individual now is $44.

But many of these have said privately they doubted whether anything could be done before the presidential election year of 1968 or possibly even 1972.

They pointed out there was a major revision of social security last year with adoption of medicare, and it normally takes several years to generate a new round of basic changes.

However, the upshot of the fight over the amendment added to the tax bill was that Johnson pledged to submit proposals next year to make social security benefits more adequate.

Republicans contend that the lion's share of the credit for this should go to mild-mannered Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY, Republican, of Vermont, who has pushed relentlessly for 6 years for just such a revision.

PROUTY has been proposing two basic social security amendments—

A minimum monthly payment of $70, with proportionate increases for those entitled to more than the minimum.

A blanketing under social security of all the 1.8 million persons over 70 not now covered.

In each case, he proposes the additional benefits be financed from the Treasury's general revenues.

This is in line with the views of most experts at the Capitol, who say the payroll tax which now finances social security has been scaled as high as it should go.

Under the law passed last year setting up medicare and raising regular social security payments 7 percent, the payroll levy on an employee and his employer eventually will reach a combined 11.3 percent.

A PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO RESTORE PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, few actions by the Supreme Court have raised as much controversy, posed as many unanswered questions, or fostered such legislative activity as the series of decisions beginning with the Engel against Vitale, or as it is more commonly known the school prayer case.

This decision and its successors have had the effect of forbidding the free exercise of prayer in public schools, where the action was formerly part of the daily activity by our Nation's youth. It is extremely unfortunate that this decision has had such an effect. It was clearly not the intention of the framers of our Constitution to forbid the populace to publicly practice religion. For instance, we here in the Senate open every day with a prayer to give us spiritual guidance.

The President of the United States must take the oath of office with his hand on the Bible, and part of his oath is an affirmation to Almighty God.

One of the mottos of our Nation is "In God We Trust"; certainly our forefathers did not mean to say that for a period of time it was all right to have public religious affirmations, and after a point, it was not.

I would like to quote one of America's foremost religious leaders—Billy Graham—referring to the decision:

> This is another step toward the secularization of the United States. Followed to its logical conclusion we will have to take the chaplains out of the Armed Forces, and the President cannot put his hand on the Bible when he takes the oath of office. The framers of our Constitution meant we were to have freedom of religion, not freedom from religion.

The question is then, Mr. President, whether the pupils who desire to join in a prayer at the beginning of each school day may do so. The recent decisions of the Court have effectively prevented many pupils who want to exercise their religious rights from doing so.

It is my hope that the Senate will quickly pass the proposed constitutional amendment so that religious freedom will be permitted again in our schools. This right of Americans which is as old as the Constitution itself, must again become a part of our heritage.

THE MOST PRECIOUS RESOURCE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, there are many ways to measure a community's contribution to the Nation's welfare.

Some communities grow food for our people. Others manufacture goods, and still others extract needed material from the land. The sum of such contributions is the Nation's strength, the resources which make a free society possible in a hostile world.

The Chilkat Valley in southeast Alaska is a community of about 1,000 residents.

Mr. President, while I have no way of knowing for certain, I believe this community is making a unique contribution to the Nation's welfare, for a large percentage of its most precious resource, its young men, are serving in the Armed Forces.

According to the Chilkat Valley News, 10 residents of the community are on duty in Vietnam. I understand that an additional eight young men from the valley are serving in their country's Armed Forces elsewhere.

As the Chilkat Valley News observed in a recent editorial, about 1 percent of the community's population is in Vietnam.

The News reasons, with justification I think, that—

> If all the communities in the United States had the same percentage of local residents in Vietnam that this area does, the United States would have 1,620,000 there. Since recent reports show something over 200,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam, some of the area's residents have reported the belief that this small community has one of the higher percentages of Americans there.

Because of what I believe to be a unique contribution to the Nation's welfare I will place in the RECORD the names of the Chilkat Valley residents serving our country.

The News lists those serving in Vietnam as Sp4c. David Land, Sp4c. Gene P. Strong, Sgt. John W. Berry, Sp4c. Stanley J. Alex, Larry Albecker, Ronald Martin, Gary Cranston, James Strong, and John W. Thompson. I understand that Howard MacRae also is in Vietnam, though his name was not listed by the News.

According to a letter from an area resident, Billy Albecker, Billy Blackmore, Murray Clayton, Paul Matsuno, Walter Weedman, Gene Martin, Jim Brouillette, and Pat Stevens are also on active duty.

Those who read the names closely will learn that three families have two sons in the service.

Clearly, Chilkat Valley is doing its part in this time of peril, for its most precious resource is serving where the peril is greatest.

JOBLESS PAY CHEAT JAILED FOR 360 DAYS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point a news story which appeared in the March 24 edition of the Washington Post entitled "Jobless Pay Cheat Jailed for 360 Days."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

JOBLESS PAY CHEAT JAILED FOR 360 DAYS

Norris N. Cooper, 37, of 425 Irving Street NW., pleaded guilty yesterday to defrauding the District Unemployment Compensation Board of $270 and received a stern lecture and a 360-day jail sentence from General Sessions Judge Charles W. Halleck.

Cooper was charged with telling the Board he was unemployed for 6 weeks last summer when he actually received more than $450 in salary from the Agnes Flower Shoppe, 6224 Georgia Avenue NW., during the period.

Halleck said, "I can sympathize with a hungry man who goes out and steals a steak but I have absolutely no sympathy with you. Our welfare laws are designed to support the poor and downtrodden, but we object violently when the money is taken by a cheat."

U.S. POLICY TOWARD CHINA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for the past several weeks, our Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has been holding a series of public, televised, and widely reported hearings on American foreign policy. During the first part of these hearings, emphasis was on the situation in Vietnam, our reasons for being there, our role in the conflict, and the alternatives confronting us with regard to that war; after that, we have been holding hearings on the various alternatives which we confront in maintaining an optimum foreign policy and national posture vis-a-vis Red China.

During these hearings, two presentations have stood out as having exceptional merit and logic in their persuasive appeal to objective-minded Americans. The first was the testimony of Secretary of State Dean Rusk in his presentation on Vietnam. I stated during the committee hearings that Secretary Rusk's presentation deserved to be published as a state paper and I understand it is now available in print to anybody writing the Department of State requesting a copy of it. It should be studied and analyzed by every citizen seeking to understand the American position in Vietnam.

The second presentation of exceptional merit and extraordinary importance was the testimony of former Congressman Walter H. Judd, of Minneapolis, Minn. Long recognized as one of America's most knowledgeable students of China—perhaps our foremost Chinese authority due to his having lived in China under both Communist and non-Communist regimes—his ability to converse fluently in Chinese, and his long service on the House Foreign Affairs Committee—Dr. Walter Judd, who served in China as a medical missionary, presented a 26-page analysis to our committee which was as compelling as it was authoritative.

It, too, deserves to be published as a state paper but since Dr. Judd is not a member of the executive branch of Government or of the State Department such action is unlikely. I therefore take this means of calling it to the attention of the Congress and the country and for making certain it is preserved in the archives of our American history where it can be alluded to by future historians who will be better able than those of us here today to evaluate its full merit on the basis of what is unfolded by the future in that area of the world.

Suffice it to say here, Congressman Judd presented to the committee a realistic, logical, and persuasive analysis of the Chinese situation which rather devastatingly exposed errors of judgment in the so-called containment without isolation approach to Red China. He also presented a convincing pattern of logical reasons why admission of Red China to the United Nations at this time would be more likely to produce than to prevent a military collision with Red China.

Unless one doubts the devotion of the Chinese Communists to their announced desire to expand their influence and to weaken or destroy America specifically and free governments in general, the presentation of Walter Judd is an eloquent argument against any suggestion that we strengthen the forces which are striving to weaken the United States.

In all events, this great analysis by this recognized expert on Chinese affairs deserved to be studied and analyzed by every serious-minded and objective citizen desiring to understand the basic factors involved in our American foreign policy decisions vis-a-vis Communist China.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Congressman Judd's presentation to our Foreign Relations Committee be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. POLICY TOWARD CHINA

(Statement of Walter H. Judd before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Mar. 28, 1966)

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, 27 years ago I was given the opportunity to testify before this committee on essentially the same subject as today: How to get and keep freedom and peace in Asia and thus security and peace for the United States. The threat then was Japan's aggressive military expansions. After months under the Japanese in China, I had become convinced that our best hope for our peace and security lay in stopping the vital aid, assistance, comfort being supplied by us to the aggressor, while doing all we properly could to strengthen and help the free peoples resisting that aggressor. Many considered such a policy too dangerous and costly—a confrontation with Japan might lead to war. Our Government was persuaded, until it was too late, to try to placate the aggressor. Perhaps we could change his attitudes toward us and others by carrying on normal trade and showing him our good will. Perhaps that might start an evolutionary process in Japan's military leadership leading to better relationships.

The policy did not lead to peace, it led to Pearl Harbor.

The same general approach to aggression in Asia is being advocated today as on that earlier occasion. Communist governments and their fronts are waging war against free peoples worldwide. At the moment the hottest spot, the test case for us, is Vietnam—as at other times it has been Greece, Berlin, Korea, Quemoy, Lebanon, Cuba.

But the issue is not Vietnam; it is how are disputes to be settled—by resolution through civilized means? Or by armed force?

The stake is not Vietnam; it is Asia—and ourselves and the world.

The problem is not Vietnam; it is aggressive Communist expansionism—this time from North Vietnam, backed up by the Soviet Union and Communist China.

No great expansionist movement has ever stopped until it was checked. Our choice—with Red China just as it was with Japan and Hitler—is not between checking and not checking; it is whether to check early, while we can, and with allies—or try to check the aggression later when it is stronger, closer, and we have fewer and weaker friends and allies.

The question is how to check it—with least risk and cost.

I

Since the beginning of the Korean war in 1950, America's policy toward Communist China under the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations has been a hardheaded realistic attempt to protect the security interests of the United States by resisting any steps that would further increase Chinese Communist influence and power. An indispensible part of the policy has been to support and strengthen all non-Communist governments that are trying to preserve their independence and thereby to keep their manpower, territory, bases, and resources out of Communist control.

Some say that policy has failed. Red China is still there, it is as hostile, and as dedicated to world domination by armed force as ever. Yes, it is there, but where would the countries around Red China have been without this policy of containment of the aggressor and support of the free? There are great problems ahead for Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Burma, as well as South Vietnam, Malaysia, and Indonesia. But all of them are still free. And who can believe they would have been free, and with at least the possibility of solving their problems, if it had not been for our firm containment of China?

II

From what I have seen in the press, most of the changes in American policy toward Communist China proposed by various witnesses before this committee appear to be based on certain assumptions which do not seem to me to be justified:

1. That the Communist regime now in control of the China mainland is here to stay.

The same was said of Hitler, of Khruschev, Sukarno, of Nkrumah. People are not so sure now of Castro. Despots generally appear invincible—until the last 5 minutes.

2. That the United States is stubbornly keeping Red China isolated and therefore we are responsible for its hostility and belligerence. The reverse is the truth; it is Red China's hostility and belligerence in its international attitudes and actions, that are responsible for its isolation.

Gen. George Marshall wrote on January 7, 1947, after he had spent a year trying the very policies now being recommended of friendliness, conciliation, bringing the Chinese Communists into the Chinese Government, and into the world community:

"I wish to state to the American people that in the deliberate misrepresentation and abuse of the action, policies, and purposes of our Government this propaganda (against the United States) has been without regard for the truth, without any regard whatsoever for the facts, and has given plain evidence of a determined purpose to mislead the Chinese people and the world and to arouse a bitter hatred of Americans."

The cause of Red China's hostility is not its isolation, but the Communist doctrine of the necessity for use of armed forces to achieve world revolution. To remove China's isolation now would prove that the ideology is correct and should be followed even more tenaciously.

3. That there is a better hope of getting Red China to change its attitudes and activities by giving in to it on matters like diplomatic recognition, trade, and admission to the United Nations than by resolute continuance of the policy of containment as long as Red China refuses to act like a responsible member of civilized society.

4. That changing our policy vis-a-vis Red China just might start an evolutionary process there.

But, of course, it might just as easily reduce the chances of such an evolutionary process. Everybody desires and hopes for "evolution" in Red China. The debate should be over what measures are most likely to produce it:

(a) Giving Red China greater prestige, influence, entree; that is, making it stronger? Or keeping it as weak and isolated as possible?

(b) Concessions from its intended victims—like the United States? Or pressures from its present victims—the Chinese within Red China, those on Taiwan and in southeast Asia, Muslims in Indonesia and Malaysia, etc.?

(c) Proving that Red China's truculence and stubborn defiance of the world succeeds? Or showing that it will fail?

(d) Taking the "mountain" (United Nations) to Mao? Of patiently and nonbelligerently insisting that Mao come to the mountain of better international conduct if he wants the benefits of Red China of membership in the international community?

What has caused the reported mellowing and evolution inside Yugoslavia, Rumania, the Soviet Union? Influences from without? Or failures within? If economic and other pressures from within and without are compelling some Communist governments to moderate their policies, at least toward their own people, shouldn't we keep the pressures up rather than reduce them by helping those hostile governments to solve their problems?

III

Let us look now at the changes in policy toward Red China suggested by some. They are mostly three: official diplomatic recognition by the United States, expansion of trade relations, and admission of Communist China to the United Nations. What would be the probable results of such changes, the gains and losses?

Almost no one so far as I have seen, goes further than expressing the vague hope that after these steps Red China may mellow, moderate, mature, evolve. But there is no evidence on which to base the hoped-for gains.

What benefits, economic or political, has Great Britain received from her granting of diplomatic recognition in 1950? Or France 2 years ago?

Prime Minister Nehru of India recognized Communist China in 1950 and worked out with Chou En-lai the "five principles of coexistence." He remarked that Americans didn't get along very well with the Chinese Communists because we are not Asians, implying that he being a fellow Asian could. I replied that I feared he would find that the Chinese Communists will not act as Asians but as world revolutionists. He was Red China's chief apologist and advocate—at the U.N. and elsewhere. How did his fellow Asians in Peking respond to his being their best friend? They invaded India, and left Mr. Nehru a broken man.

It is suggested that with diplomatic recognition we might get more information about conditions in Red China. But we have been getting plenty of information by a variety of means, especially from the thousands of escapees each year. Red China has not allowed any newspaper correspondent of any nationality to travel freely in that land unless it had reason to believe in advance that he was generally favorable. Our trouble is not lack of information but erosion of our steadfastness, our patience, our will—as Mao boasted would be the case.

In contrast, there is no uncertainty as to the losses that would result from the suggested weakening of American policy. Here are some:

1. It would pull the rug out from under our loyal allies on Taiwan. The Chinese are a realistic, even fatalistic, people. With no hope for reunion in freedom with their brethren on the China mainland, they would have little or no choice but to prepare for the inevitable. Americans who advocate admitting Red China and then add glibly, "Of course, we would support the defense of Taiwan," may be salving their own consciences but I think no Asians will be deceived. Twelve million Chinese could hardly maintain indefinitely the will or the capacity to resist 700 million, with the world organization for peace itself rejecting the 12 million and accepting the 700 million.

In 1944 an American Foreign Service officer stationed with the Communists in north China recommended in a secret memorandum that our Ambassador to China be sent on an official visit to the Communist headquarters. He added: "Public announcement that the President's representative had made a visit to the Communist capital at Yenan would have significance that no Chinese would miss—least of all the generalissimo."

He was right. When Ambassador Hurley was ordered to make the trip to Yenan, millions of Chinese understood that their cause was lost. Without full American support they could not hope to recover after the war and put down the Communist rebellion. Obviously America was not going to give them, its ally, full support.

The result of giving such status to the Communist enemy inevitably was deterioration of our ally's morale. It would be the same on Taiwan. At least some of those now advising such a course understand this psychological factor as well as did the foreign service officer. It enables them to appear resolutely in favor of containing Red China while recommending a course almost certain to lead to that policy's failure.

2. With weakening or loss of Taiwan our Pacific island chain of defenses would be breached. It is doubtful that the Philippines could long resist Communist pressures and blandishments. Filipinos remember that it was from Taiwan that their country was invaded by the Japanese. It would take vast intervention with American forces to save that new nation for which we certainly have a special responsibility in the Pacific. I have not found any responsible Filipino leaders who favor recognition of Communist China.

3. The 15 million or so Chinese living in southeast Asia, occupy key positions of power and influence in Vietnam, Malaysia, Thailand, Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines. The governments of those countries could not refuse to recognize Communist China once we did. That would mean every Chinese embassy and consulate in southeast Asia, and in the world for that matter, would become a protected center of Communist espionage, propaganda, sabotage, and subversion of the host government—as recently exposed in Indonesia and Ghana. Through these embassies and consulates the Chinese minorities would be under direct and almost irresistible pressure to support the aggressive policies of the Mao regime.

The stability of the strategic countries of southeast Asia would inevitably be weakened. Can anyone reasonably expect the governments of these smaller and weaker countries to be stronger and firmer vis-a-vis Red China than the great United States is?

4. If the United States were to show that it is not a dependable ally in Asia, our allies elsewhere including those in Europe, would know they cannot count on us either. What would happen to the whole system of collective security we have been building at such cost and effort and which is absolutely indispensable to our own survival as a free nation? Why should any country anywhere stand by us if it is not sure we will stand by it?

5. It would tell the neutrals and uncommitted nations that they were right all along and that they might as well give in to the winning side at once.

6. Perhaps worst of all, it would tell the 700 million people on the China mainland that we are accepting their subjugation, that we think there is more hope for peace for ourselves in deals with their oppressors than in standing steadfastly with them, the oppressed.

During the war and postwar years the United States relaxed under the skillfully built-up illusions that the Soviet Union was a peace-loving democracy, eager and willing to cooperate to build a world of order and peace, and that the Chinese Communists were just agrarian reformers. Perhaps our best hope of getting out of our present predicament and peril without a nuclear holocaust lies in the urge to be free that lives in the hearts of a billion human beings behind the Communist curtains. Unless these peoples are able from within to force their Communist regimes to change and eventually to abandon Communist world objectives, there is little hope of our avoiding an ultimate all-out clash. Is it intelligent or realistic to adopt a foreign policy that can cause those millions behind the curtains to abandon hope? If the strong accept the Communist overlords, how long can the weak continue to resist them?

IV

What would be the gains from resumption of trade relations? The Communists themselves have made clear on numerous occasions that their unwavering purposes are:

First, to get military and industrial equipment and supplies which they cannot yet obtain within the Communist bloc—not in order that they can trade more with us in the future, but so that they can become self-sufficient and not need to trade with us at all.

Second, to take advantage of a favorable trade situation wherever there is one that they cannot match even by exploitation of their own people and of their satellites.

Third, to induce countries to become more and more dependent on trade with the Soviet bloc, and therefore more and more at its mercy. This applies particularly to Germany and Japan.

Fourth, to divide the free world powers.

Our objectives in trade are to improve the lives of people, to improve relations between the countries involved, to promote peace and prosperity in the world, and in the process earn a profit much of which becomes capital for further expansion of production and trade with further improvement of living standards.

But none of these is or can be the objective of a Communist regime. All trade is conducted by Communist state organizations and monopolies that have as their single objective the strengthening of the state. They cannot trade under the accepted rules of the free world without ceasing to be Communist. They cannot cease to be Communist without their movement collapsing. Trade is as much a weapon of their expansionism as are missiles. It is to be expanded or contracted, to be directed here or shifted there, as those at the top determine to be advantageous in promoting the Communist world revolution.

This was dramatically illustrated some years ago when Japan established trade relations with Communist China. It soon found that Red China would not actually carry on trade unless Japan bowed to Red China's political wishes.

In 1953 when Pakistan appeared to be veering toward the United States, Red China cut its purchases of Pakistan cotton from $84 million in 1952 to $7 million in 1 year.

Where trade between Communist China and other countries does exist, it is only on sufferance of the Communist government and will be extinguished when it has served its purpose. This has never been denied by the Chinese Communist leaders. On the contrary, they have avowed on numerous occasions that complete nationalization of industries and trade and collectivization of agriculture has to come, but in stages—which means just as fast as they feel themselves strong enough to impose it. Would it be in our interest, economic or otherwise, to help them do it faster?

V

What would be the result of admitting Communist China to the United Nations? I cannot see any important benefits for us or for the U.N., but the benefits for the Communists would be enormous.

Admission would represent for Red China the greatest possible diplomatic victory. It would give the Mao regime the stamp of legitimacy and add immeasurably to its prestige and power all over the world. Why has every Communist government, party, and front in the world worked tirelessly for 15 years for Red China's admission if that would be bad for communism and good for us?

Some say, "But Communist China is a fact. We must be realistic. We cannot hide our heads in the sand and ignore it or pretend it is not there." But that is not a description of our policy. On the contrary, it is just because we recognize that Red China is indeed a fact, and such a powerful and dangerous fact, that intelligent concern for our own and the world's future require its exclusion from the United Nations until it is willing to meet the qualifications for membership. To admit it prior to that time would only make it more powerful and more dangerous.

The Communist regime in China avowedly is dedicated to the isolation and destruction of the United States. Should Americans help it into a better position to work for that objective?

It is a complete non sequitur to say that because Red China is there, therefore it ought to be admitted to the U.N. There are gangsters in each of our cities. We do not argue that therefore the city councils, courts and police force should take the gangsters in. Rather we demand that lawless elements be kept out of the forces responsible for maintaining law and order, or peace and security—which the U.N. Charter states is the purpose for which the organization was established.

It is said that the 700 million Chinese are entitled to be represented in the U.N. Certainly. But the Peking regime does not represent the Chinese people any more than the Quisling regime in Norway represented the Norwegian people. Whenever the Chinese people have opportunity to choose their own representatives in free elections, these representatives will undoubtedly be admitted promptly to the United Nations. Incidentally, is it not strange that free elections are demanded in Vietnam "to determine the peoples' wishes," even during a cruel internal war, but not demanded in mainland China?

To keep Red China isolated and weaker than it would otherwise be in not denying or ignoring its existence; it is the realistic way to deal with its existence.

It is said that the United Nations ought to be a universal organization with all existing governments in it. But the Charter makes perfectly clear that the U.N. was never intended to be a universal organization. That concept was discussed at San Francisco—and rejected. Why would the Charter have Article 6 providing for expelling "a member which has consistently violated the principles contained in the present charter," if the organization was supposed to be universal?

Article 4 reads: "Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving nations which accept the obligations contained in the present charter, and in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

What obligations? Article 2 reads, in part: "All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means", and "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other matter inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

For more than 10 years we have been negotiating with the Chinese Communists, trying to get them, among other things, to honor their solemn commitment at Panmunjon to release all American prisoners of war captured in Korea. If they would fulfill this commitment, there would be some justification for going ahead with further agreements. They have adamantly refused either to release or to account for the prisoners we know they had.

We have tried to get them to accept the membership obligations prescribed in the U.N. Charter and agree to refrain from the threat or use of force in their relations with their neighbors. They would then be eligible for U.N. membership. But they have refused.

So it is grossly untrue that the United States is stubbornly, blindly, arbitrarily keeping Communist China out of the United Nations, as is sometimes claimed. Red China is stubbornly keeping itself out. It simply refuses to qualify. I don't know any university that will admit a student without his meeting its entrance requirements—even if he has a gun.

Some ask, "But what's the difference between Communist China and the Soviet Union? The Soviet Union doesn't refrain from the threat or use of force either. Look at the missiles it put into Cuba." The answer is that the Soviet Union got into the United Nations at the time of its founding when it was pretending to be peace-loving and willing to cooperate for peace in international affairs. Red China does not even pretend. In fact, the essence of its quarrel with Moscow is over its unwavering insistence on the use of force.

It is said that if the United Nations is not to admit Communist China, then it ought to expel the Soviet Union. This is a good logical argument, but it is a useless one. The Soviet Union can veto its own expulsion.

If Communist China were to be admitted, it could not be expelled either, no matter what its conduct.

The fact that there are already some bad actors in the U.N. is all the more reason why we should not, knowingly, bring any more in.

Perhaps it might be useful to establish a new universal organization—a league of all existing governments, lawless as well as law-abiding. But the United Nations is not such an organization. Let us not destroy its character as a union of peace-loving states pooling their strength against lawlessness and aggression from whatever source.

It is hard to understand how some can advocate world peace through world law and at the same time advocate brazen violation of the nearest world law that we have, the Charter of the United Nations. One would expect that those genuinely wanting to build respect for international law and order would advocate amending the Charter according to its own provisions, rather than cynical nullification of it.

If some members of an organization break its rules and standards, that is not fatal to the organization. But if the organization itself votes to scrap its own rules and standards in a vain effort to appease some lawless members, that is starting down the road to its own destruction. I do not want to see the United Nations destroyed, as was the League of Nations.

It is suggested that if we recognize Communist China and admit it to the United Nations, it might improve the functioning of that and related international organizations. There is far more evidence that it would hamper their functioning. The only time the United Nations has been able to operate as it was intended to on a matter as serious as aggression was in 1950 when the Soviet Union was absenting itself from the Security Council in an effort to pressure the United Nations into admission of Red China—and thus was unable to veto U.N. action against the Communist aggression in Korea. Moscow is not likely to make the mistake of being absent again.

It is clear that Communist governments do not join the United Nations with the same purpose in mind as we and other governments do, namely, to help make it an effective instrument for resolving disputes. Obviously the Soviet Union joined in order to make sure the U.N. does not work effectively. It has a world organization of its own, the Communist Party with organized, disciplined, efficient units in every country. The Communists intend to win for their world organization. What could be more advantageous than to have seats in the other world organization also, particularly in the Security Council, where perfectly legally under the charter, they can keep the rival organization crippled and ineffective whenever they wish to. Almost all of the more than 100 Soviet vetoes have been against measures that were favored by the overwhelming majority of U.N. members and were in the direction of peace.

It is contended that it is necessary to have Communist China in the United Nations because no agreement on disarmament can be effective without its participation. But until there is some prospect of an agreement with the Soviet Union which already has deliverable nuclear weapons, what point is there in including Red China which most experts believe cannot have the capacity to deliver powerful nuclear weapons in a decade or more? If and when the day comes, and I hope and pray it may, that the Soviet Union will agree to effective disarmament proposals—which means inspection—there will be some point in negotiation with Red China on the subject.

But it is not necessary to have Red China in the U.N. in order to negotitate with her, on this or any other matter. We have had over 130 negotiations with it in the last 11 years—almost 1 a month—and more than any other non-Communist government has had.

It has been said that the Chinese Communist regime should be accepted because the Chinese people under it are better off economically. Such is not the case, as compared with Chinese in Free China. But even if it were true, it would not prove the point. People were better off economically under Hitler than in any other nation in Europe. Did the groups who now urge acceptance of Red China advocate acceptance of Hitler on that ground?

Then there is the old diversionary argument, "What about Chiang Kai-shek?" Well, what about him? History will decide his proper place and I predict it will be a high one. But our policy is not and has not been based on Chiang; if he were gone tomorrow, America's interests would be precisely the same. We are trying to help free peoples remain free; therefore, it is to our interest to support all peoples who will make determined efforts in that direction. The free Chinese on Taiwan certainly are making such efforts—and succeeding. They are ahead of every other country in Asia except Japan. We were able to stop our economic assistance to Free China last July.

So if one examines the results of the proposed changes in American policy toward China, it is apparent that the benefits would be minimal, if any. The dangers to the countries still free in Asia, to the United Nations itself, and to our own security and peace, would be certain and serious indeed. On the other hand, the policy of keeping Red China contained and isolated has proved successful in promoting the vital security interests of the United States.

Men have always found ways to bring down tyrants—and the Chinese will bring down theirs—if only we are not beguiled into throwing the ball game away in the last quarter by failing to stand fast—5 minutes longer. We are called upon by history to prove that free citizens have greater fortitude, stronger nerves and steadier patience and faith than do tyrants—faith in man and faith in God.

VI

So the key question for us is how best to keep Communist China contained until it fades or changes. What should we do to implement that basic policy in the period just ahead, and in the most crucial area of immediate contest—Vietnam?

1. We must recognize and state frankly that we are at war, however much it was unsought and unprovoked by us.

2. We must develop a national will to wage that war with greater vigor and skill by all the measures, economic and social as well as military, that are required of us by this enemy's new and different tactics. I will pass over a discussion of the measures most suitable for use in Vietnam. Professor George Taylor, I am sure, will deal with them most competently.

3. We must develop a greater unity in support of the total war effort and the heroic sacrifices being made in Vietnam by our own brave men and our valiant Vietnamese and other allies. It is unrealistic to ask or expect Vietnamese leaders to be more united in support of American policy than American leaders are. It is unreasonable to expect greater stability on this matter in Saigon than there is in Washington.

Furthermore, we cannot expect our allies in Vietnam to sacrifice their lives just to improve the position of the United States for bargaining with their enemy, the Vietcong. For us to negotiate with the Vietcong, as has been suggested, would undermine and demoralize the Government of South Vietnam as surely as negotiation with the Chinese Communists at Yenan in the 1944–46 period undermined the Chinese Government in Chungking.

4. We must remember that the objective of a war is political, namely, to change the will of the adversary, killing as few people as possible. How are we likely to change the will of this adversary in Hanoi? Just by constantly-repeated assurances that we will not make him suffer, no matter what he does? The administration has publicly stated repeatedly that we have "no desire for the overthrow of Hanoi or Peking." Is it any wonder that Ho Chi-minh has felt no need to negotiate? By going all out in South Vietnam, perhaps he can win the struggle for Asia by humiliation of the United States. If he does not succeed, then he can go back to the 17 parallel with no penalty to himself and his regime.

Surely the most effective way to change the will of the enemy is to make him know that his aggression, if continued, will become so costly and dangerous to his own position and power that it is to his advantage to call it off. It is troubles in North Vietnam, not killings in South Vietnam, that are likely to influence Hanoi.

VII

To achieve this objective of changing the will of the enemy I would stress several main steps:

First, we must continue what we are doing militarily in South Vietnam—that is, we must hold, and then advance, cleaning out Vietcong and pacifying liberated areas.

Second, we must achieve economic, educational, health, and therefore, political improvements, even while fighting a cruel war with every village a potential battlefield. The people of Vietnam are no less important in this people's war than the military. Whenever it is shown to the rank and file there is more for them to gain by supporting their Government in Saigon assisted by the United States, more and more of them will support it. To stay in their villages and near their land, as they would like most of all to do, is becoming intolerable.

They often are under Government forces during the day and under the Vietcong at night, with both men and women now being drafted to fight or to carry loads for the Communists. If they go over to the Vietcong, the latter simply do not have the resources to give the people better living conditions or any kind of security. This is the field in which we can run rings around the Communists more easily than in any other.

Even in refugee camps, the people can have better food and medical care and hopes of some education for their children than they can under the Communists or in no-man's land. Relieved from fear of reprisals, the people can give the Government the vitally important information they have about Communist bases, hideouts, and planned operations. This could start a tide that in shorter time than most now believe possible could force the Vietcong to pull back from their present positions and induce thousands of them to give up.

Gen. Edwin F. Black whom I have known for several years as one of the most astute workers in this field and who has served two tours in Vietnam has written, "The end to the peoples' war will come when the people make their choice."

A third essential step is to do our utmost to interdict supplies coming from or through North Vietnam. The one thing that seems to be unjustifiable is to ask an American or a Vietnamese soldier to risk his life for freedom, unless his government is doing everything it possibly can to cut down the supply of men and weapons which enable the enemy to take his life. Whatever the risks here, they must be taken.

Fourth, we should openly let the South Vietnamese do what they can to make trouble in North Vietnam, as they have wanted all along to do. It would give an enormous boost to morale to let South Vietnam conduct even a small "liberation front" in North Vietnam, making it more difficult for North Vietnam to operate its fraudulent liberation front in South Vietnam.

Fifth, should we bomb cities in the north? Not as we did in Germany and Japan. But we should bomb war plants, powerplants, oil tanks, whatever is important to North Vietnam's war. Why not openly announce to North Vietnam and the world a list of military targets that are going to be destroyed some time in the next few weeks or months. Won't Ho Chi Minh please get his people out of those plants or away from those areas because we don't want to kill North Vietnamese people; we want only to reduce his capacity to kill South Vietnamese people. There would be criticism. But the cheers in our country and around the world for such action would make the jeers sound pretty feeble.

VIII

Why haven't we done these things? Because an almost hysterical fear has been built up that, among other things, it might lead to war with Red China and "we must not get into a land war with Red China's masses."

Well, all things are possible; and there is no course without risks. But let us weigh realistically the small likelihood of such intervention against the absolutely certain dangers involved in going on as we are.

1. Red China would be justifying and inviting destruction by us of her nuclear facilities—her greatest trump in this world power struggle. There is nothing in South Vietnam that is a fraction as valuable to Red China as those nuclear facilities.

2. How would Red China supply masses of troops in South Vietnam? A Communist army, just like Napoleon's, moves on its stomach. The Communists are having all they can do to supply the Vietminh and Vietcong forces already in South Vietnam.

3. Red China cannot forget for a moment the presence on her own flank of powerful air and military forces on Taiwan. Most of mainland China's lines of communications run north and south and are within easy reach of the airbases we have helped the Chinese build on that island for the very purpose they are now serving—a powerful deterrent to Red China's entering the war and getting itself too far extended to the south. Some 700,000 to a million Red Chinese are tied down opposite Taiwan, on guard against possible action from that base. Red China also has to keep large numbers of troops on the long border with India, on the longer border with the Soviet Union, on the borders of Korea, and hundreds of thousands of soldiers are required to maintain order in Tibet, Mongolia, and at home.

4. If Red China were to get involved in southeast Asia, she would have to concentrate on it to a degree that would almost certainly make her lose her bitter struggle with the Soviet Union for control of the world Communist movement. That struggle is enormously more important to Red China than anything in Vietnam.

Despite powerful considerations like the above, many in Washington seem almost paralyzed by two words—"confrontation" and "escalation." They assert, without evidence to support it, that a firm confrontation with Communist aggression anywhere will lead to escalation into nuclear war—"and we must not have nuclear war."

Just to say that, of course, makes more likely the nuclear war we want to avoid. It encourages the Communists to believe we will surrender rather than have nuclear war, and that therefore at the right moment they can cow us into submission by the threat of it. It may well be that the outcome of this world struggle will be determined by which side appears to be less afraid of nuclear war.

Let us, however, look not only at reasons like the above, but at the record:

Eleven times in the last 20 years under 3 administrations we have accepted a confrontation with Communist expansionism—this is the 12th. Eleven times the United States has simply said "No. This we cannot take."

Did any one of those 11 confrontations lead to escalation, as was threatened by the Communists and feared by us? No, each led to deescalation. Each led to improvement of the situation, not worsening. In effect, each time the Communist said, "So sorry. We just wanted to know." And there followed a lessening of tensions.

What has led to escalation? Not confrontations, but hesitation indecision, division, vacillation, appearance of fear. From the standpoint of inviting or prolonging war, it is as dangerous to look like a paper tiger as to be one.

So I have no difficulty in deciding which is the wiser and safer course for the United States to follow with respect to Communist China. How foolish and shortsighted it would be to abandon the policy of patient firmness and strength in support of human freedom and of our commitments to friends and allies, the course which when consistently followed has brought peace, in order to make changes in policy which would inevitably weaken our friends and allies—the very advocacy of the changes has already shaken some of them—and would inevitably strengthen our enemies. Can we really believe that for us to prove to the Chinese Communist that their tough, unyielding belligerence gets results is the way to get them to abandon that belligerence?

Particularly would it be shortsighted and foolish to give such a smashing and wholly unnecessary victory to Red China right when it is in such trouble worldwide? Does it make sense to accept its representatives into our country and into the United Nations just when its representatives are being exposed and expelled from countries in Africa, Latin America, and Asia, countries that followed the very policies toward Red China we are now being urged to adopt?

Each year since 1954 is has been confidently predicted that Red China's admission was inevitable, probably at the next session of the General Assembly, that many came to believe it. Well, a dozen years have gone by and it has not happened. Last year saw the high watermark of support. But in these very last months the tide has been turned against Red China by its own actions. Countries that voted for admission are having their eyes opened. This is no time to close ours.

Mr. Chairman, administrations change, but facts do not. And the facts with respect to Red China's lack of qualifications for membership in the U.N. remain the same under President Johnson as under Presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy.

May I quote three points stressed before the U.N. General Assembly by Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, who can hardly be called a blind reactionary? Saying that "the whole future of the United Nations may be at stake," he urged the members to consider with great care the fact that—

"The step advocated (admission of Red China) once taken, is irreversible. We cannot try it and then give it up if it fails to work. We must assume that, once in our midst, the Peiping representatives would stay—for better or for worse.

"Secondly, there are ample grounds to suspect that a power given too such bitter words and ruthless actions as those of the Peiping regime, far from being reformed by its experience in the United Nations, would be encouraged by its success in gaining admission to exert, all the more forcefully, by threats and maneuvers, a most disruptive and demoralizing influence on the organization at this critical moment in its history.

"Thirdly, its admission in circumstances in which it continues to violate and defy the principles of the Charter, could seriously shake public confidence in the United Nations—I can assure you it would do so among the peoples of the United States—and this alone would significantly weaken the organization."

In summary, seating of Red China in the United Nations would be illegal. It would require violation of the organization's charter.

It would be immoral. It would almost certainly mean removal of a member that abides by the charter to seat a nonmember that brazenly refuses to abide by the charter. It would abandon 700 million people to Communist subjugation. It would properly be regarded as an attempt to buy peace for ourselves by sacrificing our principles and other peoples' freedom.

And it would bring no practical benefits. On the contrary, there would be certain and disastrous losses—with our allies; with the neutrals; with the peoples in Asia and everywhere else who desire to retain their freedom; and with the long-suffering millions now under Communist rule who long to regain their freedom. Do not break the hearts of the oppressed and their continued will to resist from within by accepting their oppressors.

Free Asia will crumble once it believes the Communists are winning. Admission of Red China to the United Nations would mean to much of Asia, as it should mean to us, that the Communists have all but won.

Having spent more than $100 billion to strengthen the will and capacity of free nations and peoples to resist communism, does it make sense now to strengthen communism?

The whole Communist movement worldwide is in serious trouble today. Why change policies that have contributed to its difficulties both abroad and at home, and thereby provided the free world its first ray of hope in years? We must always keep the door open to any genuine change on their part—as provided by deeds. We must keep the door resolutely closed to Communist threats, tricks, or promises not supported by performance.

Mr. Chairman, this is the time to stand fast for the basic containment policies that have proved sound and more successful during the last 15 years than most people believed possible. There is no course that does not involve serious risks; we are dealing with a ruthless and resourceful enemy. But such a course as outlined involves, I believe, far less risks.

Until someone can suggest policies that offer better prospects of success, based on something more substantial than speculation, wishful thinking or just hope, I can see no sound, sensible, or logical reason to change present policies and every reason to continue them, always being flexible in our tactics as required by developments as they come along.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR MUSKIE AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER IN DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 26, I had the pleasure of introducing the esteemed junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] as principal speaker at the Jefferson-Jackson dinner in Detroit.

The Senator treated the audience to exactly the sort of amusing and instructive speech that we have all learned to expect from him. Its polish and charm are all the more amazing because much of it he wrote in his hotel room only hours before the dinner.

For the benefit of those many of his colleagues who enjoy what we recognize as the Muskie style, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech Delivered by Senator Edmund S. Muskie to the Jefferson-Jackson Dinner, Detroit, Mich.

Chairman Gordon Traye, Toastmaster Nicholas Hood, Mayor Cavanaugh, Governor and Mrs. Williams, Governor and Mrs. Swainson, friends, a summer visitor in Maine tried in vain to strike up a conversation with a native. Finally, in complete frustration, he asked if the town had a law against talking. "Not a law," he was told, "but we've got an understanding not to say anything unless it improves on silence."

This New England story described that old New Englander, Pat McNamara—and I can think of no one who more effectively improves on silence when he speaks. To use a well-worn New England pun—you can take everything he says for "granite"—roughhewn and solid.

I first met Pat and Michigan democracy in 1954—a year when he and I were unlikely winners—but I had already pulled my surprise victory and his was still ahead of him. Ever since—my affection and respect for him have steadily grown.

This has been the result in part—I am sure—because he reminds me so much of our Maine people.

Consider his retirement statement. It reminds me so much of Annie Buckley's grandfather who isn't much help around the farm anymore because he says pushing 90 is all the exercise he needs.

But this gruff, blunt exterior is only the shell—the protective covering designed to conceal a warm and generous heart.

Pat is a practical, toughminded, commonsense man. His is the approach of the Maine farmer who rejected a young salesman's effort to sell him an encyclopedia of farming. "Hell, Sonny," he said, "I'm only farming half as good as I know how to now."

It is because he has this practical side that Pat has been able to convert his humane impulses into meaningful, effective legislation—medical care for the elderly, the education of our young people, civil rights, better wages and working conditions, resource development, the quality of our environment.

On this past St. Patrick's Day—Senator Mike Mansfield said of Pat:

"Pat McNamara is a man of immense heart and a burning sense of justice. He is—in my judgment—one of the great humanists of Senate history. He has never failed the people of the United States. He has stood for, by and with the most humble of Americans. His absence from subsequent Congresses will be a heavy loss to them—to the Senate and to the Nation."

Mike spoke for all of us in the Senate—and each of us has a special personal reason for appreciating Pat.

As a member of his Public Works Committee—I have seen the quiet determination of this toughminded, warmhearted son of New England bring out the best in his colleagues.

I have seen him stand like a rock against actions which offended his principles. And I have seen him compromise with grace to achieve his ultimate goals.

I have been the beneficiary of his friendship, his loyalty, and his uncompromising support.

I miss him tonight.

I will miss him when he leaves the Senate.

I must pay my respects to my other colleague from Michigan—whom I also met for the first time in 1954. I might be tempted to describe him as a jumbo, extra large, giant, or economy-size Senator except that he has persuaded us those labels are deceptive: and there is nothing deceptive about Phil Hart. He is all Senator, scrupulously fair, with an instinct for what is right and sound: and a master of the arts of quiet persuasion which gets things done. He is going to persuade us to pass that truth-in-packaging bill before this session is ended.

It has been a long time—12 years since that cold and windy Pulaski Day celebration in Hamtramck which somehow turned into a Democratic rally.

Some of us show a few signs of having aged in the intervening years. We run the risk of being asked the question a delightful old Maine schoolteacher was asked by one of her grandchildren: "Grandmother, what did you look like when you were new?"

It occurs to me that at this beginning of a new election year, we in the Democratic Party might well ask ourselves a comparable question: "What did we look like when we were new?"

The Democratic Party is, after all, the oldest organized—or disorganized—political party in the world. We have come a long way since Jefferson and Madison started the party under the guise of a botanical cruise up the Hudson. Our Nation has changed from a struggling band of States along the eastern seaboard to a mighty world power.

It wouldn't be surprising if we showed our age. After all—a party much younger than ours has tottered a bit in recent years.

A political party must, of course, renew itself constantly if it is to be vigorous, dynamic, and progressive. This requires new ideas and new blood; and it requires the continued contribution of those who remain young and fresh in ideas and spirit.

This has been the great quality of Pat McNamara. He has retained a fresh view of life. Undiscouraged in the hard years and unflagging in the easier years—he has kept the spirit of youth.

The look of Pat McNamara today is the same as when he was "new": A man who looks ahead and not behind; concerned with the worth of men and their perfectibility; a man of optimism and enthusiasm and deep-seated belief in our country and her capacity to meet the future.

And what of our country and our party—what did they look like when they were "new"—and let us never forget that the founders of our party were also among the founders of the Republic.

The Great Society was actually launched 177 years ago when a new Government—under a new Constitution—took office armed with two great mandates: (1) to preserve freedom and (2) to discharge effectively the responsibilities arising out of the needs and problems of its people.

The underlying assumption and goal was that a society would truly achieve fulfillment when it encourages and stimulates the fulfillment of the talents, the aspirations, the moral and intellectual capacity of each of its members.

This is what we looked like when we were new.

This is what we looked like in 1960 when we renewed our compact as a party with the American people.

This is what we have looked like in this 89th Congress—through which the American people have worked their will in dealing with a long-accumulating agenda of public business, designed to help individual Americans achieve dignity, opportunity, and fulfillment.

The statistical evidence of our economic growth over the past 5 years is impressive and without parallel: The longest unbroken period of expansion and growth in our peacetime history; an increase of 35 percent in gross national products and a projected further increase of 8.9 percent—$60 billion in this year 1966—an incredible and awesome performance; record increases in farm income; reduction of unemployment from 5.6 to 3.7 percent. Even in Maine, that rock-ribbed Republican State of old, we are facing labor shortages—and a Republican Governor eager to take credit for this invigorating Democratic prosperity.

I understand that is not unlike your experience here in Michigan.

It has been said that there is never an ultimate answer to a political problem—that, as old problems are met, new ones emerge.

Sometimes out of the answers to the old ones.

And so prosperity—which has reversed the downward trend of prices and wages of the 1960 recession, has generated upward pressures on both which must be carefully watched and restrained. However, the party which successfully handled the deflationary pressures of the recession which it inherited, can and will successfully manage the upward pressures of the prosperity which its policies and programs produced.

We have not been content with sheer economic growth—important as it is in producing opportunity for our people and the resources needed to perform essential public chores.

We have made bold new advances in civil rights, in attacking discrimination and in fighting poverty.

We have moved against threats of blight and pollution.

We have expanded educational opportunities at all levels.

We are working to make our cities vital and healthy urban centers—places of opportunity and not of despair.

And around the world, we are meeting our commitments to freedom in the struggle against tyranny and aggression.

We have done all this—and more—because, from the time of our beginning—when we were new—we have believed and we believe that only the fulfillment of man can bring justice, order, stability, and peace.

What of the future? Are we up to it?

We have so much of what so many sought and failed to achieve. Unmatched economic and military power. An unprecedented standard of living. Unequalled opportunities for most of our people. And freedom.

And still we have pressing and critical problems—at home and abroad.

Both at home and abroad; ironically, most of the problems with which we are struggling spring from the simple fact that most of God's children have too little of food, of shelter, of care, of opportunity, of love and of friendship.

And so they react, as we should expect, to the frustrations of hopeless dreams.

And others, as we should expect, exploit their frustrations and restlessness.

And still others choose to ignore the problem.

Confronted by such critical and serious problems—at home and abroad—what do we do?

Do we retreat? Do we stand still? Or do we advance; and, if so, in what direction?

Last fall I was privileged to travel with Senator Mansfield and three other colleagues from the Senate on a Presidential mission to 15 countries in Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East.

We engaged in some 50 formal discussions with the leaders of the countries we visited and with our representatives in those countries.

We traveled more than 30,000 miles in 37 days and 50 flying hours. Such a sweeping and swift bird's-eye view clearly presented the picture of a world of great diversity of geography, of climate, of peoples, of opportunities, of resources, of poverty, of wealth, of political systems, of languages, of history, of tradition, of hopes, and of dreams.

Technology has made the world smaller, but in the process, has made the world's problems greater.

It is by no means "one world" except in the sense that the stability of the whole is now inevitably affected by instability in any part of it.

We cannot escape such a world; we cannot ignore such a world; we cannot avoid influencing such a world; we are inevitably a force in such a world—good, we hope, rather than evil. But we cannot hope to run such a world exactly to our own specifications.

Whether we like it or not, countries and peoples, friendly and unfriendly, will pursue their own interests, and seek their own destinies, in ways of their own choosing.

Our concern is that, in the process, they do not make it unsafe for others to do likewise.

There is a wonderful story about a tourist who was traveling through our picturesque Maine towns. He was fascinated by the sturdy down-to-earth quality of the people he met. In one town, he met an oldtimer who was obviously very ancient, though vigorous. He asked him: "Sir, how old are you?" The old gentleman replied that this happened to be his 100th birthday. "Well," said the tourist, "Congratulations, I don't suppose you expect to see another hundred?"

"Don't be too sure, young fella," the oldtimer replied. "I am much stronger now than I was at the beginning of the first hundred."

And so it is with us. We are much stronger than we were in 1961, or 1954, or 1932, or 1800; and we have lost none of the qualities which made us a new, strange and wonderful force in the world.

There is no problem which poses a greater challenge, in this year of 1966, for our leaders, the candidates, and every citizen than that of southeast Asia.

Should we withdraw?

Should we launch an unrestrained and unlimited military effort?

Should we simply hang on, in the hope that our adversary will eventually tire and quit?

Or should we continue to apply unremitting pressure in a carefully measured response to the aggression of the enemy?

The last is my choice. It is the choice which, in my judgment, can command the greatest support in the Senate. It is the President's course.

The supporters of this course argue that it is the only realistic alternative to withdrawal; that only in this way can Hanoi be made to feel the pressure which will force it to the conference table; that there is a ceiling on Hanoi's ability to respond effectively without direct Chinese intervention; and that, although we should not overlook the risk of direct Chinese involvement, that risk can be avoided so long as the Chinese do not consider that our effort is a direct threat to their security interests.

It is not our objective to conquer any country or to destroy any regime. It is to stop aggression in South Vietnam. Why?

The reasons include the same reasons which prompted us to take a stand in Iran, immediately following World War II, in Greece and Turkey, in Berlin, in Korea, and in Cuba.

We believe that freedom is at stake. We believe that the right of small nations to work out their own destinies in their own way is at stake. We believe that containment of expansionist communism regrettably involves direct confrontation from time to time, and that to retreat from it is to undermine the prospects for stability and peace. We believe that the credibility of our word and our purpose as a nation is at stake; and that its loss would be an enormous setback for the forces of freedom. This assessment was underscored this past week in England and Germany where I found strong support for our basic policies in Vietnam.

What is happening in South Vietnam, in southeast Asia, and its outcome, will exert a strong influence on the shape of the next Asia and its impact upon the lives of hundreds of millions of Asian people and the stability of the world as a whole.

Hedley Donovan, editor in chief of Time, Inc., put it this way recently: "If southeast Asia, instead of being a temptation to aggression and a threat to world peace, became a strong point of economically vigorous and fully independent states, the beneficial effects would spread well beyond the peninsula itself. Communist China would be "contained" in the best sense, not just in military positions but in terms of performance, by the dynamism of Japan on the northeast and this healthy new growth center to the south. South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Burma, Indonesia would all benefit to some degree; even India's staggering problems would look a little less hopeless."

Is it in our interest to try to contribute to such an objective? I believe so.

TRIBUTE TO BASCO DE SOUSA JARDIM

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, an unusual event took place in Newark, N.J., recently. Basco de Sousa Jardim, retired editor-publisher of the Portuguese language weekly, the Luso-Americano, was decorated February 19 with Portugal's highest civilian medal, the Order of Prince Henry. The medal was bestowed by Portuguese Ambassador Vasco Vieira Garin at a testimonial dinner attended by 700 persons.

Mr. Jardim came to the United States in 1920 from Madeira Island and worked for several Portuguese newspapers in Fall River and New Bedford, Mass., and was a reporter for the old Fall River Globe from 1925 to 1927. He founded the Luso-Americano in 1939.

His son, Vasco, is assistant to the publisher of the Maplewood-South Orange, N.J., News-Record, and another son, Edward, is a copy editor for the Plainfield, N.J., Courier-News.

STATEMENT ON VIETNAM BY THE SMITH-COTTON HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN SEDALIA, MO.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the conflict in southeast Asia has inspired many people to think about the problems of international affairs.

Recently, the members of the 10th-grade world history class at Smith-Cotton High School in Sedalia, Mo., studied the situation in Vietnam and prepared a statement which I believe will be of interest to the Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Action Now—Peace Sooner

We, the undersigned, hereby state that we deplore the actions of minority groups who, in our opinion, have been undermining our free society by such acts as sending blood and money to the Vietcong.[1] There is evidence that most of the projects are organized and financed by Communists hiding behind pleas for "peace."[2] We believe this action is totally un-American, and that participation in such a movement is irresponsible. We all have a responsibility to our Government and we must fulfill this obligation to retain our freedoms.

American participation in Vietnam; and why?

1. In our opinion, Vietnam, without our help, will be engulfed by Communist ideology and thus will become a steppingstone for further Communist aggression.

2. The Vietnamese have asked our help, and we have given it. It is not right—nor is it in our nature to abandon them when the going is difficult.[3]

3. If we back out on our commitments in South Vietnam, our honor can be challenged, and as a result our prestige will suffer.

4. When the Communists realize that we will not quit, they will probably cease fire as they did in Greece (1947), in Philippines (1947), in Berlin (1948), in Korea (1950), and Malaya (1963); but if we withdraw,

---

[1] Associated Press news reports.

[2] Reader's Digest, January 1966.

[3] Department of State foreign affairs.

fresh outbursts will most assuredly erupt in these same countries.[4]

As long as the elected heads of our democracy continue to be responsible in their thinking and in the application of American democratic principles, we will support them to the utmost of our ability, now and as long as it takes for democracy to emerge victorious.

NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, last week, the distinguished Senator from Washington, [Mr. Jackson] introduced S. 3107, providing for a commission of seven private citizens to be established for the purpose of reviewing our national water resources requirements.

This seems to me a most worthwhile piece of legislation and, I have requested that I be listed as a cosponsor of the bill.

In his message of February 23, the President requested the establishment of a National Water Commission to review and consider our present and our anticipated national water problems. Such problems as flood, pollution, drought, water conservation, interwoven as each is with the other, would be the proper areas of concern for this panel. The membership of the panel shall all be private persons outside of Government service who will be able to provide fresh insight and more imaginative solutions to these problems.

As the Director of the Bureau of the Budget said in his letter to the Senate transmitting this legislation:

> A bountiful supply of clean water is essential to our health, our industry, our farms, and to the well-being of all Americans. * * * Yet we are confronted with critical water shortages in many sections of our country.

The Director, Mr. Charles L. Schultze, says in his letter that the proposed Commission would "identify alternative ways of meeting water requirements." Presumably the Commission's suggestions would be alternative to the proposals of the Water Resources Council—a Government board charged with coordinating the many activities of the various Federal agencies charged with solving our water problems.

Herein, I think, lies one of the major contributions of this legislation, and a means for providing a meaningful water resources program. Charging the Commission to provide workable alternative ideas to those proposed by the Government Council would insure a more productive and better planned water program.

I commend the administration for proposing this program and pledge my wholehearted support of the concept.

JAMES M. FLINCHUM, EDITOR OF THE WYOMING STATE TRIBUNE, WINS THE FREEDOMS FOUNDATION GOLD MEDAL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, a rare and unique honor has been bestowed upon the editor of Cheyenne, Wyo.'s leading daily newspaper, the Wyoming State Tribune. Mr. James M. Flinchum, who has edited the Tribune for the past 5 years, was notified recently that his lead editorial of June 12, 1965, had earned for him the George Washington Honor Medal Award from the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge.

The editorial speaks for itself. It concerns a document signed under duress 750 years ago by a cruel and oppressive dictator named King John. There were no pens handed out when King John signed the Magna Carta. He certainly was not pleased as he placed his signature on the document, for the Magna Carta divested him of much of the arbitrary power he wielded over the people. It gave the English-speaking world the cornerstone of its democratic principles. These principles reached their zenith in the drafting, some 550 years later, of the Constitution of the United States.

In writing "Magna Carta and Today's Free World," Mr. Flinchum concluded that:

> It must be remembered that the principle of the rule of law instead of the rule of men, is one that is not universal. The rule of men still continues in the dark areas of the world behind the Iron Curtain and in other dictatorships.
>
> Today's oppressors are the Communist rulers of a vast area of the world who have replaced the King Johns, but who nevertheless are as despotic and dictatorial as the ancient rulers of three-quarters of a millennium ago in the English-speaking world. The fight for liberty that the English barons began and forced on the King at Runnymede is a continuing one, on the battlefields of South Vietnam and elsewhere.

For the contribution made to the American way of life by Jim Flinchum's thoughts set to paper on June 12, the Wyoming State Tribune editor received some weeks ago a brief wire which said simply:

> The trustees and officers, Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, announce with pleasure the selection of James M. Flinchum by the distinguished national and school awards jury to receive the George Washington Honor Medal Award for editorial 1965 "Magna Carta and Today's Free World," an outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of the American way of life.

As I mentioned, the editorial and the notice of award of the gold medal are self-explanatory. I think it fitting that I digress a moment and talk about the man.

Jim Flinchum is a journalist, an American, a veteran, a patriot, a husband and father, a man with an unyielding sense of values, and an editor who drives himself harder than he drives any of his people.

He came to Cheyenne, Wyo., from Texas, where he was an executive with United Press International.

The Wyoming State Tribune has always been an editorial leader in Rocky Mountain newspapers, but under Jim Flinchum's guiding hand, it assumed a new and unique stature. Mr. Flinchum brought to the paper the discretion of a judge, the temperament of a revivalist, the recall of a history professor, and the insights of a soothsayer. In my view, Jim Flinchum has written much that deserves national recognition.

Jim was a platoon leader in the South Pacific during World War II and those of us who have sat across the desk from him in moments of nostalgia have heard war stories that would have done justice to Ernie Pyle.

I think it was Hemingway who called war the most virile of man's pursuits and perhaps war was in part the crucible from which came Jim Flinchum's judgment, acuity, and philosophy of politics and life which have given him such deep roots in the soil of American Government and people.

Mr. President, an editorial written 8 months ago has earned a unique award for Jim Flinchum. I am delighted that this recognition has come, and I am proud that it was earned by a friend. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the George Washington honor medal award-winning editorial, "Magna Carta and Today's Free World," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Magna Carta and Today's Free World

Two weeks ago Time magazine published a grimly impressive photograph of the body of a decapitated Vietnamese, his body sprawled grotesquely in death, his severed head propped up beside his corpse. This was one of the Viet villagers who have fallen victim by thousands to brutal atrocities of the Vietcong. The Communists are estimated to have killed between 6,000 and 10,000 village and district leaders since Ho Chi Minh began all-out guerrilla warfare against South Vietnam 6 years ago.

These murders of civilian officials and leaders follow an obvious pattern; they are conducted, as was the beheading described above, under the most horrible conditions as a fright technique; and they are aimed at decimating the civilian local-level civilian leadership of South Vietnam.

This should serve once again as a reminder of why we fight in Vietnam and in southeast Asia; but if we would need further strengthening of our moral fiber there is occurring this week and next an event of the greatest importance in the English-speaking world and indeed throughout much of the West. This is the observance of the 750th anniversary of the signing of the Magna Carta by King John. The liberties that grace our life today in the free world as we know it have been achieved over not mere decades but many centuries, and they basically begin with this very singular document.

They may be described in this fashion: That we live today in a free world because government is that which comes from the consent of the governed, and society is based on the rule of law, not of men. The foundation stone of that rule of law is the Magna Carta to which King John reluctantly assented at a gathering which assembled on June 15, 1215, in the open, grassy field of Runnymede beside the river Thames.

The Great Charter was a series of concessions wrung from the King, an oppressive and tyrannical monarch, by a group of barons who led a revolt against his rule. By presenting him with a list of grievances and demanding redress for each of them, instead of staging an armed rebellion against the King and possibly beheading him as was done in the case of King Charles I some 400 years later, the aggrieved nobles brought forth the first of a series of documents that have resulted in constitutional government as we know it today both in the British Commonwealth and the United States.

---

[4] Senior Scholastic magazine, Sept. 23, 1965, and the U.S. white paper from Vietnam: "History, Documents, and Opinions on a World Crisis," edited by Marvin E. Gettlemen.

In 63 articles the charter established what it described in its Latin phrases as "the law of the land"—a term that has survived to this day; creating among other things concepts of justice such as due process. These are embodied in the 38th, 39th, and 40th clauses to the Great Charter and its subsequent amending in 1225, and its reconfirmation, a matter which was forced upon succeeding Kings of England, until the year 1416.

These clauses read:

(38) "In future no official shall place a man on trial upon his own unsupported statement without producing credible witnesses to the truth of it."

(39) "No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any other way, nor will we proceed with force against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land."

(40) "To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay right or justice."

Thus we find this basic constitutional right as originally enunciated on the meadow of Runnymede, a living principal set forth today in the fifth article of the Constitution of the United States: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Government as we know it today in the English-speaking world thus was born on that June afternoon on the meadow of Runnymede, seven and one-half centuries ago.

Yet, reflecting on this long tradition and the intervening period which saw the implementation of these principles whereby we become freemen it must be remembered that the principle of the rule of law instead of the rule of men is one that is not universal. The rule of men still continues in the dark areas of the world behind the Iron Curtain and in other dictatorships.

Today's oppressors are the Communist rulers of a vast area of the world who have replaced the King Johns, but who nevertheless are as despotic and dictatorial as the ancient rulers of three-quarters of a millennium ago in the English-speaking world. The fight for liberty that the English barons began and forced on the King at Runnymede is a continuing one, on the battlefields of South Vietnam and elsewhere.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY JOHN A. SCHNITTKER, UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnittker recently delivered a very timely and important speech at the University of Maryland concerning soil and water conservation in our urban areas. He spoke at the annual public education meeting of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

Noting the progress now being made in Montgomery County, Md., to stop Potomac River pollution, Mr. Schnittker nonetheless called the waste of topsoil and damaging siltation of the Potomac River channel caused by soil erosion a tragic testimony to indifference by urban centers toward conservation of soil and water resources.

Fortunately, as Mr. Schnittker pointed out, we have the tools to do something about saving our soil and water. Methods have been developed for soil and water conservation on farms and ranches in rural areas over the past quarter century. The job now is to bring these tools into use in the urban centers. Mr. Schnittker warned that:

> The lesson learned on the farm and ranch must be learned in the populous metropolitan area. If, indeed, the city and its suburbs are to survive in the years ahead, soil and water conservation must become as much a household term in suburbia as on the farm.

In light of the importance of Mr. Schnittker's speech, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE JOHN A. SCHNITTKER BEFORE THE ANNUAL PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL MEETING OF THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN AT THE ADULT EDUCATION CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK, MD., FEBRUARY 17, 1966

Over the last weekend, about 1½ inches of rain fell in the Potomac Basin.

As a result of this rainfall and the melted snow of the recent blizzard, the Potomac River channel is flowing full, in sharp contrast to last fall's record low.

But the weekend rain was a mixed blessing. As the torrents made their way down the culverts, gullies and streams, they carried 100,000 tons of sediment into the Potomac River, according to U.S. Geological Survey estimates. This amount of topsoil, stacked on an area equal to the base of the Washington Monument, would tower 245 feet above this tallest structure in the Capital City.

This waste of topsoil and damaging siltation of the Potomac channel is tragic testimony to an appalling indifference on the part of the Washington metropolitan community that is all too typical of attitudes found in urban centers toward conservation of soil and water resources.

Fortunately, dedicated groups and individuals, such as you represented here today, do exist throughout the land to point the way and show by proven example what can and must be done to preserve our precious soil and water for the long-term benefit of the American people.

For more than a quarter of a century the Interstate Commission on the Potomac has been concerned with making the Potomac River Basin a model of sound resource conservation. Your contributions have led to a better understanding of the uses and misuses of this great river, its tributary streams, and its surrounding environment and potential.

The Department of Agriculture is proud to have had a leading role over the years in serving this common cause with you in the Potomac Basin, as part of the Department's countrywide program of resource conservation and development.

This program of land and water management is well underway in the rural areas of the Nation. Dramatic headway has been made toward solving the land and water problems that confront the Potomac Basin and other major watersheds. We still have a long way to go in rural America. But let us not fail to recognize, too, that we have come a long way in the past quarter century.

We are only just beginning to tackle the problems of soil erosion and stream siltation associated with urban and suburban development. The Department of Agriculture has cooperated with many municipalities and local organizations in promoting conservation of land and water in our rapidly developing urban concentrations. This work needs to be expanded—nowhere more so than in the Potomac River watershed.

President Johnson, in his state of the Union message last year, called upon us to make "the Potomac a model of beauty and recreation for the entire country."

The Federal Inter-Agency Task Force on the Potomac, in which the Department of Agriculture has a major responsibility, was established last March following the President's challenge.

This task force, composed of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Army, and Health, Education, and Welfare, has cooperated effectively with the Potomac advisory committee representing the States of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia.

This group, I feel, is making a particularly significant effort to define the problems and potentials of the Potomac Basin for the purpose of accelerating improvement of the waterway and its environs.

This work, inevitably, calls for major leadership and contribution by State governments. The cooperation of the task force and the Governors' advisory committee representing the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia and the District of Columbia, has resulted in a recommended program of action which is currently under review.

I want to talk today about the joint responsibility of all Americans to join in restoring the quality of our environment. The experts in pollution control have an awesome challenge before them. But the general public has no less a responsibility to assure that our rivers and streams no longer run as open sewers and that the air we breathe in our urban environments is far purer and healthier than it is today.

The Water Quality Act of 1965, which provides that the 50 States draw up reasonable standards of water quality for rivers and lakes, stresses prevention as the key to maintaining clean waterways. President Johnson said: "No one has a right to use * * * America's waterways, that belong to all the people, as a sewer."

The undisciplined growth of the Nation's urban areas concerns all thinking Americans. Too often in these areas, land developers and responsible officials fail to take advantage of the opportunities they have to help secure the foundations upon which a secure urban civilization must be based.

County governing bodies and other community officials often are too concerned with building up the tax base to put up roadblocks to unsound development. Yet, construction permits should not be issued unless developers provide adequately for control of erosion, and these measures should be subject to inspection and control of local government agencies.

There are dedicated forces at work in America to exalt humanity and to bring it to new heights. But there are other forces which would exploit the individual, the countryside and the political process to satisfy selfish ends, without regard for the public at large. Pollution of our streams is partly the result of failure to control these forces adequately. But pollution of our environment is the result also of widespread public apathy over many years.

The same crusading spirit and determined drive that brought land conservation measures to the Nation's farms, ranches, and other rural lands in the period since the mid-1930's needs now to be engendered on the urban scene.

The town is not unlike the country in this respect. The lesson learned on the farm and ranch must be learned in the populous metropolitan area. If, indeed, the city and its suburbs are to survive in the years ahead, soil and water conservation must become as much a household term in suburbia as on the farm.

The dramatic significance of coordinated planning and action programs to control pollution and sedimentation is revealed in facts about the sources of the sediment that constitutes a major form of pollution in this great river of ours. The region of the Potomac Basin below Great Falls, which includes the Washington metropolitan area, annually contributes six times as much sediment per square mile as the upper two-thirds of the basin.

In Montgomery County, Md., the county council, last June, formally approved a resolution setting up a sediment control program in cooperation with the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, the Montgomery Soil Conservation District and the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The program is voluntary, and area conservationists have expressed satisfaction with the cooperation of land developers and builders in this effort to help stop runoff and prevent flooding in the Rock Creek watershed.

The Montgomery County builders, I understand, through conferences with conservation experts, have published a guide to be used in construction to help prevent erosion. I heartily commend this happy development.

The soil survey, for many years the basis for sound planning of farmland, is now being used increasingly by urban planners and developers. Soil surveys on about a million acres a year in areas of urban expansion are made by the Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with local soil conservation districts. Some local groups are using part of the money granted by the Urban Renewal Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Agency for urban planning to cost-share with the Soil Conservation Service in the making of soil maps.

With more than a million acres of agricultural land being shifted to suburban housing, highways, industrial, commercial and other nonagricultural uses every year in the United States, soil information is essential for sound urban development.

Municipal and industrial wastes are of increasing concern in the rapidly growing urban areas of the Nation. Every community should provide for secondary treatment of its sewage which removes up to 90 percent of contaminants in wastewater. And continuing efforts must be made to provide still more effective methods of community waste disposal.

The 3,000 soil and water conservation districts that virtually blanket the Nation are devoting more of their time and energy to urban related problems—recognizing that town and country have a common interest and a common obligation to conserve the land. They should be given the necessary authority to serve urban areas more adequately.

In the Potomac watershed, the U.S. Department of Agriculture is providing technical and cost-sharing assistance to landowners and operators in the 11 soil conservation districts that cover the basin. This has led to major land use adjustments on lands of the 11,000 district cooperators, and effective erosion and flood control measures in watershed project areas.

Technical assistance is provided by the Soil Conservation Service to individual district cooperators in applying land treatment measures, and to watershed groups in developing watershed projects.

Cost-sharing assistance is provided by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service to farmers in application of conservation practices throughout the basin.

Credit is available to eligible borrowers from the Farmers Home Administration for financing soil and water conservation measures and for other purposes throughout the basin.

The extension service of the Department provides the people of the basin with information about needed improvements and the benefits they will provide.

Of the nearly 9 million acres in the Potomac Basin above Washington classed as agricultural land, about 4 million acres were authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 for works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention.

About 50 of 125 planned floodwater retarding dams in this region have been built or are under contract.

Elsewhere in the Potomac area the watershed protection and flood prevention program (Public Law 566) is available to deal with land use, and water and sediment problems. Two watershed projects are under construction in Maryland, and several others are awaiting approval. The Public Law 566 program has provided opportunities for wildlife and fish conservation, recreation, and water supply, in addition to watershed protection and flood prevention, in project areas.

The upstream reservoirs in the watershed improvement projects of the Department of Agriculture have great potential. Our conservationists tell us that at least 230 such sites, ranging in size from 10 to 300 acres, with a total surface area of about 18,000 acres, are suitable for recreational development. About 40 of these sites are located in national forests.

The Potomac Basin offers numerous opportunities for developing many miles of hiking and riding trails. Much of the George Washington and part of the Monongahela National Forests, administered by the U.S. Forest Service, are in the Potomac Basin. The Forest Service also participates with the four Potomac States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia in cooperative fire protection, tree distribution, and forest management programs.

With approximately 4¾ million acres of forest land in the basin under private and non-Federal public ownership, there is great need for acceleration of current programs of cooperative forest fire control, tree planting, flood control, and forest management and improvement.

Only about 6 percent of the basin's acreage is in urban and suburban use but development in these areas has greatly increased sedimentation of the river. These areas contribute, for example, an estimated 682 tons of sediment per square mile as contrasted with about 113 tons per square mile in the upper two-thirds of the basin—a sixfold difference, as I stated earlier. The region immediately around Washington contributes much more sediment than that. In particular areas under urban development, loss of topsoil may exceed by 100 times the soil loss from rural areas.

Erosion of the basin's land removes valuable topsoil, obstructs the navigable estuary, destroys aquatic life, and adds greatly to the cost of water purification. Over 50 million tons of soil in the basin is lost each year by erosion. Of this amount an estimated 2½ million tons of soil is discharged as sediment into the estuary of the Potomac River.

In some places near Washington, silt is more than 9 feet thick at the bottom of the river. It is estimated that the silt load deposited each year in the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers at Washington amounts to 2½ million cubic yards.

Our soil conservationists say it may cost as little as 3 to 5 cents a cubic yard to keep soil on the land, while it costs $1 per cubic yard to dredge it from the Potomac at Washington. Only by continuous dredgings are the navigation channels of the Potomac kept open in the metropolitan area of the Capital City.

The Department's program in the Potomac watershed can reduce sediment by an estimated 50 percent. This program, and other USDA erosion and sediment control programs throughout the Nation, should have the support cited by the President, for the benefit of all the people.

I believe that Americans do not look forward to living in domed cities, as a distinguished scientist recently suggested we might some day, where the environment is ideally controlled by artificial means. We need not build domed cities in order to have the air we breathe and the waters we use free of pollution. We can change those habits that make the natural environment less than ideal for human habitation. We are obliged to do so, by following more faithfully and with greater dedication sound measures of resource conservation and use.

Surely, there is developing in the urban communities an understanding of the great and growing need for restoring, protecting, and using wisely the land and water resources—just as understanding and acceptance of resource conservation principles have spread throughout rural America.

It is significant to note that we have become an urban Nation. Whether or not we shall have the will and the facilities to cope adequately with our resource problems in our small watersheds, and in our great river basins, has come to rest largely in the hands of urban people. They must understand, as perhaps too few do, that our national standard of living, our strength as a people, our greatness in the world society, are wrapped up in what happens to these soil and water resources.

I have faith that we shall meet the challenge. We who are working together on the Potomac have a tremendous opportunity to chart a course and pattern the action for the many other rivers of this land. The Potomac can be the clean stream President Johnson envisions. America can have sound cities and a beautiful countryside, clean-running streams and healthy air to breathe.

SOVIET ANTISEMITISM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the world's attention is focused today on a distant event fraught with significance and historic importance—the convening in Moscow of the 23d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

This Congress is the first since 1961, when the party's basic program for this decade was adopted. Nikita Khrushchev was riding high then, and that program represented his view of the world and his aspirations and ambitions for Soviet society at home and Soviet power abroad. Now, half a decade later and with Mr. Khrushchev gone for more than a year, the new Congress meets in an entirely different setting, and with new leaders at the helm.

Massive and portentous forces and events provide the framework for this meeting. One of the most momentous developments is the great clash between Russia and China within the international Communist movement. Not less important is the gradual development of greater autonomy and more independent directions within the East European Communist countries and among the many Western Communist countries and among the many Western Communist parties that follow Moscow's rather than Peking's lead. Finally, we dare not fail to note the process inside the U.S.S.R. of a gradual departure from the excesses of Stalinism, from rigid adherence to outmoded dogmas, and a very cautious experimentation with a certain amount of flexibility and openness in economic and intellectual life.

This has been a halting and glacierlike process but its existence—and its fateful potential—is unmistakable.

Equally significant developments in the world at large have come to the fore in the half decade since the last Soviet Party Congress. With the departure of Khrushchev, his flamboyant and volatile personal style has been replaced by a certain stability in the conduct of Soviet foreign affairs and in the general Soviet approach to the world. The commitment to peaceful coexistence, undertaken by Khrushchev in the light of the devastating potential of nuclear weaponry, has been continued by his successors in a more settled manner.

Even the great Vietnam crisis that has risen to the surface of the world's concern in the past 5 years has not seriously budged Moscow from that commitment. For, although the Soviet Union has been a massive military supporter of North Vietnam, it has nevertheless maintained a stable equilibrium in its relations with the United States. Perhaps the colossal scientific and technological breakthroughs made by both nations in recent years in space exploration have only served to underscore the realization in Moscow that the great rivalry betwen our two systems must not be allowed to go beyond the political, the moral, the intellectual, the economic—that recourse to a military solution of the protracted conflict between us would be disastrous for all and therefore intolerable.

In short, as this Communist Congress opens—with the participation of highest level delegations from Communist parties the world over—we see the Soviet ideology and the Soviet system of power at home and abroad in a process of profound flux. We are witnessing, for all its glacial gradualness, a historic shift—the end of which we are not likely to see for many years but which we can only hope and pray will enhance peace and liberty for all men.

Although the Soviet Union in recent years has demonstrated a commendable restraint in certain areas, we have not yet seen any overt attempts by the Soviet Union to seek for peace. But we can hope that this will be the next step.

This Soviet Congress faces the challenge and the opportunity to chart new courses that may in time reflect that fundamental shift. As we all know by now, the door was initially opened to that shift and to possible new courses by what transpired just a decade ago—at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Party. On that occasion, Khrushchev delivered his famous "secret speech" in which he spelled out many of the crimes of Stalin, and committed the new Soviet leadership never to revert to Stalinist methods. All the changes that have occurred in the Communist world since then can be traced to that epoch-making event. It is this gradual evolution of Soviet policy and Soviet society away from Stalinist terror that gives us all some hope for the future.

One great area of Soviet life has been left virtually unaffected by the gradual departure from Stalinist policy—and that is the continuing Soviet policy of repressing the Jewish community, of destroying its spirit, of preventing a revival of Jewish cultural and religious institutions. Under Stalin, there was a virtually total purge and liquidation of Jewish communal life in every form. And although there have been a few minor token changes in the last few years, the basic policy of irrational oppression and discrimination continues against the Soviet Jews.

Thus, the Jews remain a pointed exception to a noticeable process of liberalization occurring inside the U.S.S.R. today. Of all the ethnic, religious, and cultural groups in that country, the Jews are the only ones that are denied their natural right to group existence. Even among those groups whose institutions were shattered by Stalin there is visible a process of rehabilitation and reconstruction. But not for the Jews.

This is a unique tragedy. Russian Jewry was the matrix of an ancient and profound civilization, and it is now being doomed to extinction. The irony of it all is that the Soviet Union is unique even among Communist countries for its repressive discrimination against the Jews. In Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and other East European countries, the Jewish communities are not only permitted to exist, but their communal, cultural, and even religious institutions are supported and encouraged by the state.

This Soviet Party Congress has a historic opportunity to redress this wrong. Let it take decisions that will eliminate this pocket of irrationality in Soviet life. Let it take decisions to restore and enhance Jewish religious and cultural institutions—schools, classes, books, theaters, periodicals, research institutes, publishing houses, and so forth—so that the Jews will be able to perpetuate their group existence as of right, so that their continuity may be assured and their future secured. Let this Congress undertake a major nationwide educational campaign to eradicate anti-Semitic prejudices and discrimination in all walks of Soviet life, so that the Soviet atmosphere may be freed of this poison.

Above all, let this Soviet Communist conclave take a decision to permit free emigration for the many tens of thousands of Soviet Jews whose families were shattered by the traumatic events of 20th century war and holocaust and who ardently seek to rejoin their remaining kin in the United States, Israel, and other countries. This would be an act of justice and of mercy.

We in America have a moral right to make these demands. We do so as free men who are obliged to rise to great moral challenges such as this. We do so, above all, because we are entirely persuaded that a basic shift in Soviet policy toward the Jews is not only a moral but a practical necessity for the Soviets. Not only would it do justice to a community long deprived of justice, but it would remove an enormous moral, emotional, and intellectual barrier to greater understanding between our two peoples.

In the end, peace can only be secured in justice. Let it be done, and let it be seen to be done.

OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure heard Mr. Alfred Bexelius, the Swedish ombudsman, explain the function and nature of his office. The subject of ombudsman, as I said in my opening statement at the hearing, has unlimited possibilities here in the United States. In Sweden, as in many other countries of the world, the ombudsman is the man who "fights city hall," and helps the citizen obtain redress against unfair actions of their government.

It is to early to say whether the institution of ombudsman can work here in the United States. The Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure intends to hold a series of public hearings on this subject, with a view toward determining whether such institution can and should be created here in the United States and under what conditions it can successfully operate.

I am pleased, however, to see that this subject matter has created a lot of interest. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a broadcast made by Mr. Edward P. Morgan, an ABC commentator sponsored by the AFL–CIO. This excerpt appeared in the March 12, 1966, edition of the AFL–CIO news.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A U.S. OMBUDSMAN COULD BE "MR. FIXIT" FOR HARASSED CITIZENS

(By Edward P. Morgan)

(NOTE.—This column is excerpted from the nightly broadcasts of Edward P. Morgan, ABC commentator sponsored by the AFL–CIO. Listen to Morgan over the ABC network Monday through Friday at 7 p.m., eastern standard time.)

Anybody who reads the travel posters knows that Sweden has blondes and other beautiful scenery to recommend it. It also has something which should intrigue the hapless American citizen, particularly at this time of year when he is inundated by income tax forms, applications for automobile licenses and miscellaneous requirements demanded by an insatiable bureaucracy.

If he finds these demands arrogant and written in unfathomable language there is little he can do except grind his teeth and suffer in silence or take his outrage out on his wife. But in Sweden he could write his ombudsman. The office of ombudsman, which in Swedish means "one who represents someone," is a kind of nationwide equivalent to a department store complaint desk, a sort of "Mr. Fixit" for the general public, as Washington has been finding out.

Congress has just had an enthusiastic but "soft sell" on the job from Sweden's ombudsman himself, a former judge, benign and 62, named Alfred Bexelius, who has been at his post 10 years. Parliament created the office in 1809 as an independent guardian of people's rights. It has become a remarkably effective clearinghouse for justice.

If a Swede has a grievance against almost any bureaucrat and feels he's getting nowhere with it, he can ask the ombudsman to investigate. If the complaint is justified the ombudsman has the power to fine a judge for delaying suits, a policeman for failing to investigate a crime impartially, even a clergyman of the state religion for some unfairness.

"This wide area of penal responsibility of public servants," Bexelius told a Senate subcommittee, "—combined with the obligation to compensate for damage caused by an error—has restrained them from submitting to any undue interference or to neglect the rights of citizens."

Every citizen, he emphasized, has the right to complain to the ombudsman. Neither the Government nor Parliament can stop the ombudsman from investigating. No wonder Bexelius was able to testify that "the office, by its mere existence, counteracts tendencies to transgressions of authority and abuse of powers."

And no wonder that Congress, a jealous and tradition-ridden body, approaches the idea daintily, with the wariness of an inveterate smoker who thinks he's just been handed an exploding cigar. After all Congress contains the elected Representatives of the people. So who needs an ombudsman? The answer is, they do, desperately, and so do their constituents. The bursting population has made the case load of voters' requests to Senators and Representatives for action backbreaking. In 1911, when the House membership was set at 435, the average size of a congressional district was less than 211,000 persons. Today it's nearly 448,000 and by 1980 it will be some 564,000.

Representative HENRY REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has introduced a bill to create an ombudsman, American style—an "administrative counsel to Congress." Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, has introduced a companion bill in the Senate. REUSS' counsel would be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate for a term of at least 2 years.

But he would not get complaints directly. They would be filtered to him through the office of a Senator or Representative. REUSS reasons this would calm the fears of members that constituents' complaints would be taken out of their control. Also he doubts that due to the huge size and population of the United States the procedure could be run tidily any other way.

There is a real danger here, however, of creating "just another bureaucrat." Britain is now actively considering a Swedish-style ombudsman. Norway, Denmark, and New Zealand already have the system but without penalty powers. Bexelius does not think this is a weakness. The strength of the system is that any citizen who thinks he's been wronged has the right to go directly to the ombudsman with his grievance.

Bexelius is convinced that this access is the basis of the ombudsman's effectiveness, coupled with his authority to examine all documents, even secret ones, including committee testimony—with rare exceptions involving high levels of national security.

Would Congress or the executive branch stand for this? Perhaps they should be made to. A public official, elected or appointed, almost invariably comes down with an occupational disease which might be called defensive selectivitis. He knows better than anybody what the public should or should not be told. It might be a very healthful thing if he could be told: "The ombudsman will get you if you don't watch out."

SEE AMERICA FIRST—WITH THE FIRST INDIANS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, with vacation time just around the corner, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has issued a most interesting statement on a newly developing locale for rest and relaxation—Indian reservations.

It is to the credit of the tribes that they are utilizing the beauty of their lands and waters as a profitable resource, and at the same time sharing them with other Americans. The Bureau is also to be complimented for encouraging this development.

I ask, Mr. President, unanimous consent that the Bureau's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, news release, Mar. 27, 1966]

SEE AMERICA FIRST—WITH THE FIRST AMERICANS

With American families taking to the highways in greater numbers every year, often in search of a scenic trail or a restful campsite, Indian reservations are putting up welcome signs.

American Indians have discovered that they are the owners of some of the most scenic, unspoiled and undeveloped real estate to be found. As businessmen, they are turning these natural beauties into profits, with financial and technical aid from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Although there is small chance that another group of Indians like the Agua Caliente band of southern California will suddenly find themselves the owners of a resort like Palm Springs, there unquestionably are opportunities for Indians to tap the increasing flow of American travel business.

The very remoteness of most Indian reservations may be making them more attractive to persons who want to escape the crowds which now besiege the better known parks and scenic wonders. Some reservations, moreover, have fishing and hunting resources which are still relatively untouched.

In many cases, facilities are simple campground accommodations. In other places visitors may be installed in a luxurious lodge with every comfort.

Travelers are a familiar sight to the Cherokees of North Carolina, whose reservation boasts fine trout fishing, museums, a typical Indian village, and a tribally operated lodge and restaurant. The drama "Unto These Hills," based on episodes in Cherokee history, is presented in an outdoor theatre during the summer months and is an outstanding production.

In Florida, the Seminoles exhibit and sell their natives arts and crafts on their reservation at Dania.

The Miccosukees, kin to the Seminoles, are also in business. They are descendants of Seminoles and Creeks who hid in the Everglades to escape the Armed Forces sent by President Andrew Jackson to enforce a land-exchange treaty moving Florida Indians across the Mississippi. The group still calls the Everglades home. Recently organized as a tribal group in order to receive Federal aid, the Miccosukees are now the proud and successful owners of a beautiful restaurant—the only one on the Tamiami Trail, a highway that slices across the State from Miami to Tampa. Soon they will provide motel accommodations as well.

Vacationers in the Western States have ever greater choices. A traveler might swing through Oklahoma, once known as the Indian Territory, in time for the American Indian Exposition at Anadarko each July. Sponsored by the Indian Tribes of Oklahoma, this event features dances, exhibits, and displays of arts and crafts, and attracts thousands.

Continuing on to the southwest, there is an Indian welcome waiting in New Mexico and Arizona. States with a combined Indian population of about 140,000. The annual Inter-Tribal Ceremonials at Gallup, N. Mex., open August 12, for 4 days of fun and games, Indian style.

On the Fort Apache Reservation in Arizona, the White Mountain Apache Tribe operates what may be the largest privately-owned recreation area in the West. Continuously stocked trout streams and lakes offer fine fishing and there are more than 700 camping and picnic sites for outdoor living at its best. At Hawley Lake on the reservation, the Indians have developed and leased hundreds of summer homesites on which vacation cottages have been built. There are first class guest accommodations at the Hon-Dah Motel. "Hon-Dah" means "Be My Guest" in Apache language.

The Navajo reservation to the north, home of the largest American Indian tribe, spills over from Arizona into New Mexico and Utah. The Navajos operate motels and restaurants at Shiprock, N. Mex., and at Window Rock in Arizona. Last summer the Monument Valley Inn, an 80-unit motel complete with swimming pool, restaurant and curio shop, opened at Kayenta, Ariz. This sparkling new guest house is located on the highway leading to fabled Monument Valley, a spectacularly scenic section of the reservation considered a must by most visitors.

The Mescalero Apaches of New Mexico have made ready for winter visitors by operating a ski facility just north of their reservation in the Lincoln National Forest on Sierra Blanca, one of the highest peaks in the State. They are planning to open a larger resort in the Sacramento Mountains within the reservation area, with a hotel, swimming pool, golf course, and other facilities for outdoor sports.

The Apaches have been joined in the field of ski development by other tribes, including the Chippewa and Cree Indians of Rocky Boy's Reservation in Montana.

And the Santa Clara Pueblos, north of historic Santa Fe, have established new camping facilities to make life easier for vacationers with a yen to explore the ancient Indian ruins adjacent to their scenic canyon area.

On the aptly named Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon, not far from Portland, nature provides more than 300 sunny days each year. Here is Kahneeta, a hot springs spa opened by the Indians in May 1964. The Kahneeta development features a swimming pool of Olympic dimensions which serves about 300 swimmers on week days and 1,000 on busy weekends. There are attractive, furnished cabins and unfurnished teepees. A new restaurant built high on a rocky hillside soon will provide a spectacular view for diners.

While these are some of the major Indian tourist developments, other tribes are entering the field.

Beautiful Pyramid Lake, an unspoiled 175-square-mile body of water in the Pyramid Lake Reservation in Nevada, is just beginning to attract developers. While overnight accommodations are now limited, there is fishing, boating, and swimming in an incomparable setting. The Pyramid Lake Indians expect motel or lodge accommodations to be available before long.

For the traveler who prefers a vacation with simple surroundings there are ample camping facilities in Indian country. The Rosebud Sioux in western South Dakota now operate a large camping area with hunting and fishing privileges. On the reservation of the Cheyenne River Tribe of South Dakota, a picnic area to be known as Forest City is being developed on the shores of the Oahe Reservoir.

It is not for recreational opportunities alone that travelers return each year to be the guest of Indian tribes. Though the American Indians are adapting successfully to many 20th century ways, they still hold dear their ancient customs, ceremonials, and tribal ties. Today, in fact, their reluctance to lose their cultural identity may be stronger than ever before.

The traveler who has observed the dances and ceremonials of Indian America carries away a priceless memory. For the Indian, progress has not brushed aside timeless values or stored away enduring traditions on the back shelf of history's closet. That is probably the real fascination of a vacation in Indian country.

FRANK E. McKINNEY—AN INSPIRING LEADER

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in a period of great concern about how best to preserve the values of and to modernize our metropolitan centers, a leader has emerged who has provided great incentive and inspiration for Indianapolis, the capital and largest city in Indiana. The man of whom I speak is Frank E. McKinney, noted political activist, multimillionaire banker, president of the Indiana University Board of Trustees, a director of many companies, sports enthusiast, and one of our State's most patriotic and loyal Hoosiers.

Named by Mayor John J. Barton to head the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee, Mr. McKinney has advanced some significant suggestions for revitalizing his community. In the past he has made many outstanding contributions to his city, his State, and his Nation; today he is continuing his unstinting efforts to improve the lot of mankind and bring about a better world.

The Indianapolis Star Magazine on Sunday, March 20, paid a well-deserved tribute to Frank McKinney in a feature article. Mr. President, because this story presents both an inspiration and a challenge to all men, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Frank E. McKinney—Man in Motion

(Note.—A tough-minded Irishman whose life story sounds like it was written by Horatio Alger, McKinney doesn't believe in standing still, either for himself or for Indianapolis.)

(By John H. Lyst)

Francis Edward McKinney, his manner belying his power, sat quietly at a big walnut desk overlooking Monument Circle.

He talked of banking, of sports, of politics, and of Indianapolis.

In finance, McKinney, a multimillionaire, has been called "King Midas." He has been one of the most talked about club owners in major league baseball. He has had his time upon the national stage of bigtime politics.

His love affair with Indianapolis is a long one which McKinney, a tough-minded Irishman, explains simply:

"It's home."

About 18 months ago McKinney did something that not many other members of the family could have done with equal effect.

He said publicly that Indianapolis may be sick—not incurably sick, but unable to mobilize against the future by way of an affliction of civic imagination and leadership.

McKinney described the city's condition as "being on dead center."

The 1960's are certainly not years for civic senility. McKinney warned that unless there were changes, Indianapolis was in danger of becoming a third-class city within 25 years.

He made specific suggestions: A low-rent housing program was needed, urban renewal funds should be used as they are being used at Pittsburgh, Toledo, and Philadelphia; a civic hall should be built quickly, hotel accommodations bolstered, bonding power for parks expanded, work speeded on the interloop and other highway and street programs, and a search begun for a system of equitable taxation.

The problems, in his opinion, turned on a lack of organized effort, not a lack of interest or talent. He suggested a group of 25 to 30 outstanding community and business leaders might be given the authority to plan and act.

By June 1965, Mayor John J. Barton had named a Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee organized into 11 working divisions to attack 11 specific problem areas. Its object is not to collect reports—"good men and women in the past have prepared fine reports, but their reports are gathering dust"—but to act on problems.

The "action" includes the acquiring of Federal aid, long rejected locally, for certain of the projects.

McKinney believes that "the basic philosophy of Indianapolis has changed * * * we've finally recognized that the city has made as much progress as possible under old methods."

McKinney was a natural to become chairman of the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee, which is patterned somewhat after a group at Pittsburgh which counts the famous Golden Triangle among its accomplishments. But he is sensitive to any idea that he might be trying to run the city.

As things get moving, McKinney says, "I want to back off and stand in the wings."

But circumstances seem to have had a way of guiding McKenney's life, often against his will, and disallowing intended retirements.

Loyalty to Indianapolis is deep in the McKinney character; standing still is not.

Frank McKinney had to quit high school in his second year to earn his living. Last September 24, he was elected president of the Indiana University Board of Trustees.

The son of Roscoe and Anna McKinney, Francis Edward McKinney was born June 16, 1904, in a small frame house at 29 East LeGrande Avenue on the city's Southside. His paternal grandparents, George and Lydia McKinney, were born in Ireland. George McKinney was a soldier in the Civil War. Philip and Jacobena Moss, his maternal grandparents, were natives of Germany. Roscoe McKinney, later to be Indianapolis fire chief from 1948 to 1951, and his wife were born and married at Indianapolis.

Frank McKinney was a kid whose first trousers were cut down from a pair of frayed firemen's pants.

Roscoe McKinney, who died April 26, 1965, had in those days encouraged young Frank to be a baseball player or a priest, but the boy was bent early on becoming a banker or an accountant.

"He was interested in finances," his father is quoted. "He used to tell me he wanted to work in a bank and that some day, if he was lucky, he might even own one."

Young McKinney achieved that ambition by the time he was 30 years old, becoming probably the youngest bank president in the United States.

But before he was 45 he was also to be president and principal owner of the National League Pittsburgh Pirates and its 13 affiliated baseball farm clubs, and to receive from Francis Cardinall Spellman, representing the Vatican, the highest honor given a Catholic layman. He became the first man in Indiana to receive membership in the Knights of Malta. Nothing could have meant more to an Irish father.

The banker began his career in 1918 as a 14-year-old messenger for the old Meyer Kiser Bank and his Horatio Alger climb to the top got started in the 1920's.

He took some Indiana University extension courses and enrolled in a correspondence course with the LaSalle Institute of Accounting. When he was 18, Peoples State Bank hired him as an auditor.

One of his customers in 1923 was Mrs. Ellen Bush, mother of the famous Detroit Tigers shortstop, Owen J. Bush, who at the end of his major league playing career had become manager of the Indianapolis Indians baseball team.

McKinney had never met Bush, although he had heard much about him. Mrs. Bush was worried about her son's big heart, which was breaking his pocketbook. He loaned money to friends, and the story went that he frequently gave them double what they asked.

She suggested that the courteous young bank employe handle Owen's money.

From then on Owen Bush sent his checks to young McKinney. Things went fine until 1927 when a tornado hit Indianapolis' Eastside and flattened among other properties some owned by Bush.

Bush went down to the bank to discuss how he had been wiped out. But McKinney told Bush everything looked all right.

"What do you mean, all right?" asked Bush.

"Oh, I took out tornado insurance on all your stuff a year ago," replied young McKinney.

"And that was the clincher of our friendship," recalls McKinney.

Bush, now 77 years old and honored as "Mr. Baseball," was then a power in Democratic politics in the Southside's "Bloody Thirteenth" Ward.

McKinney had moved up to cashier at Peoples State Bank and was handling investment for him when Bush and County Treasurer William (Billy) Clauer decided to invest in McKinney himself. The party needed a bright young man for future leadership.

Politics were then farthest from McKinney's mind, but Clauer said he was tired of being treasurer and wanted McKinney to run. McKinney was concerned with the future because banks were closing all over the State. So he gave it a try, campaigned hard and, with the support of the organization, was elected in 1934.

As McKinney took office the pall of the Great Depression had begun to lift. Suddenly the county treasurer's office became the most lucrative office in the State of Indiana. By law, the treasurer was permitted to retain 6 percent of all delinquent tax money collected. There were a lot of back taxes in Marion County and for the first time in years, some money to pay them. Overnight the office of treasurer became good for $35,000 to $40,000 a year.

But McKinney's interest was still in the banking business. Even before he was in office be heard of a great opportunity. A large block of stock in the Fidelity Trust Co. was for sale. His dilemma was that he was on the verge of making money, but then and there he had hardly a dime. What little he had saved had gone into the campaign.

Faced with the problem of raising $100,000, McKinney went to a banker friend and made a deal. Renomination and reelection for a second 2-year term was a certainty in those days, so McKinney signed a $100,000 note payable in 4 years and backed it up with a $100,000 term insurance policy.

In January 1935, McKinney became Marion County treasurer and holder of the controlling interest in Fidelity Trust Bank, then the smallest in Marion County.

During McKinney's second term the 6-percent fee collected by the treasurer was cut to 3 percent. McKinney agreed with Gov. Paul V. McNutt that the general assembly had never intended to make the office so lucrative. McKinney had liquidated his $100,000 note in short order and owned his bank stock free and clear.

Later, when McKinney accepted President Harry S. Truman's request in 1951 to take over the national chairmanship of the badly split Democratic Party, he served without pay. His predecessor had drawn $35,000 a year.

In the late 1930's, McKinney, in his own words, was "working like hell" on Fidelity Trust. He changed it from a savings institution to a commercial bank.

The day McKinney sat down in the president's chair, the bank had assets of little more than $1 million. Within 15 years assets increased to nearly 30 times that amount.

He guided Fidelity through a complex series of mergers and acquisitions. Fidelity absorbed Marion County State Bank first, then Northwestern State Bank, Central State Bank, Bankers Trust Co., Oaklandon State Bank and Southport State Bank.

McKinney credits luck for his success. "It could happen to anyone," he contends.

But in the 1940's and 1950's it is apparent that luck was taking a back seat to brains and an amazing business sense.

He was ticking off scores of business ventures which netted him $10,000 to $150,000 without a single loss. He got into sports and broadcasting in a big way.

David M. Lewis, his long-time friend and attorney, describes the McKinney business sense as a talent of "tremendous economic foresight * * * he is always thinking years ahead of most of us."

The Federal Government in 1942 received its first benefit from the McKinney golden touch that has never seemed to fail. McKinney was asked to head a section of the War Department's new Advance Payment Loan Branch of the Army Finance Division, which made loans to war contractors. He drew the largest area, the Federal Reserve's New York district. The United States loaned $11 billion to war contractors. The guaranty fees of one quarter of 1 percent amounted to $7 million while losses amounted to about $1 million. Thus the operation netted the Government a profit of $6 million, and was the only branch of the Army to make money for the Government during the war. Colonel McKinney came home from Washington in 1945.

In the postwar era under Truman, McKinney held two Federal posts: vice chairman of the Office of Contracts Settlement and later chairman of the Military Housing Committee.

He rejected offers of a seat on the Securities and Exchange Commission and the post of Secretary of the Army.

Baseball had always been in the McKinney blood. During his Army years he had scouted around for an opportunity to buy an interest in a major league ball club.

He and Owen Bush had bought the Louisville Colonels in 1938—it was his first business venture outside of banking—and built up the team within 3 years to win the little world series. They bought it for a low price because it was in last place in the league, turned a profit on its sale in 1941 and then purchased the ailing Indianapolis Indians with half of the profit and started all over again. Attendance at the Indians' games trebled in their first year of ownership.

McKinney had the touch with baseball early. He had managed Sacred Heart High School's Young Men's Society semipro team to the city championship in 1932 and headed the club for years.

The Sacred Heart Voice of 1932 had paid this tribute to its young manager:

"The team of 1932 is justly proud of its championship victory and unbegrudgingly concedes a big share of the credit to their beloved manager, Frank E. McKinney. Year after year, Frank was the club's unqualified choice, they loved him for his fine knowledge of baseball, his manly attitude toward each player, his personality, his indisputable fairness, and perhaps most of all, for his kindly character."

Even McKinney's success with the Pittsburgh club—which he, singer Bing Crosby and two others, bought in 1946—has not dulled the fond memory of that city championship.

The Indianapolis Indians took the pennant in 1948 and the little world series in 1949. McKinney disposed of his interest in the Pirates in July 1950, but not before building a complex business organization which made it "rain dollars" in Pittsburgh (according to Saturday Evening Post) and prompted sports commentators to call McKinney one of the toughest traders in baseball history. When he sold out, McKinney "the rainmaker" is believed to have turned the corner on $1 million.

He planned to buy a small radio station to broadcast the baseball games here when he took over the Indians. He ended up with four big stations and later relinquished all but a fraction of his financial interest in the Indians.

During most of his career McKinney has wanted to make Indianapolis a big league city in baseball and football. Even during his tremendously busy business years he has managed to find time for enthusiasm for all sports. He was chairman of the Indianapolis Olympic Committee in 1959.

By 1959 Frank McKinney was a very wealthy man.

His uncanny pyramiding of Fidelity reached its climax that year with a merger with the American Fletcher National Bank and Trust Co. to create the largest bank in Indiana. With the merger, McKinney became chairman of American Fletcher National Bank and Trust Co.

McKinney, who started out with the smallest bank in the county, now had the 52d largest in the country with total resources of $525 million and authorization to make single loans up to $2.5 million.

It may be pure fancy to assume that large success provides any corner for relaxation. It has certainly provided little spare time for McKinney.

Within a year after the merger, he joined Clint W. and John D. Murchison of Texas to fight the greatest proxy battle in American corporate history—the war against Allan P. Kirby for control of the $7.6 billion Allegheny Corp.

In its way, the Allegheny fight was "the American Civil War of finance." The two sides spent $65 million for control of Allegheny.

The Murchisons won briefly, but Kirby remained the largest single stockholder and finally forced the brothers out. McKinney stayed on as a director and chairman of the executive committee of the fantastic holding company that controls the Investors Diversified Services complex of mutual funds and insurance companies, the New York Central Railroad, and huge blocks of other stock. He has since retired from the Allegheny and New York Central boards.

A measure of McKinney's financial power can be made by the number of chairs reserved for him in corporate board rooms.

Besides American Fletcher National Bank and Trust Co., McKinney is a director of Indiana Bell Telephone Co., Indiana Broadcasting Corp., Philadelphia Suburban Water Co., James Whitcomb Riley Center Corp., Indianapolis Power & Light Co. and U.S. Corrugated Fibre Box Co.

At various other times in his career he held other directorships, but in the last few years has tried to give up some of his business activities, especially those which require frequent out-of-State trips.

McKinney turned down an appointment last spring as U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica, explaining that business and civic commitments made it impossible for him to accept any post "at least for the present."

Although McKinney still may be interested in an ambassadorial post, possibly in Belgium, the Jamaica job probably was not McKinney's "cup of tea."

McKinney says he is more interested now in acquiring grandchildren than in acquiring new corporations. He and Mrs. McKinney—the former Miss Margaret K. Warner, whom he married in Indianapolis in 1932—have two sons, Robert W. McKinney and Frank E. McKinney, Jr., and two daughters, Mrs. James C. (Claire Marie) Clark, and Miss Kathleen McKinney, all of Indianapolis.

New business ventures are in the mill as they have always been for McKinney, but at least one of them, the M. & S. Ranch, is a combination of business and family pleasure.

The M. & S. (the S is for partner Harold Secoy, Indianapolis truckline owner) is the site of the McKinney summer home on Morse Reservoir in Hamilton County. During the rest of the year he resides in Williams Creek.

The cigar-smoking banker, an avid carpenter, is often up early in the summertime, building fence or furniture or checking the herd headed by an American Royal Charolais bull named "Sir Sam."

McKinney still finds it necessary to be away from home about one-third of the year, including usually two or three trips to Europe for international banking conferences and other reasons. When in Indianapolis he is usually at his desk by 9:30 or 10 a.m.

Recently much of his time has been devoted to work as chairman of the controller's committee to recodify the National Banking Act.

McKinney's only serious illnesses have been cases of sheer exhaustion. He has a reputation for working until he "drops."

In the words of Dave Lewis, McKinney has always been a "go-go man."

Unless committed to a luncheon or speaking engagement, McKinney eats either plain hamburger and cottage cheese or tea and cookies while working through the noon hour at a big desk located in his second-floor office of American Fletcher National Bank & Trust Co. headquarters on Monument Circle.

Miss Virginia Sparling, his longtime secretary, quotes her boss as saying that "I do not live to eat, I eat to live."

McKinney believes that money and power demand tremendous responsibility for duty to others.

"Money itself means nothing," he declares.

"Nobody pulls his own weight * * * if they claim they do you can always find that somewhere along the line they got a boost or a knock."

McKinney, the born optimist and the indefatigable worker, has had more than one opportunity to leave his native Indianapolis to take positions in banking and business than most men can only dream about. He has turned down these opportunities with regularity.

He has high hopes for Indianapolis, and as usual he is counting on "working like hell" with the kind of enthusiasm that has always prompted those around him to do the same.

A POOR POLICY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in recent months, the plight of the U.S. merchant marine has received public attention in articles and in speeches.

The plight of our merchant marine is, quite simply, that it is withering away at an alarming rate. Equally disquieting are suggestions by persons in positions of responsibility that the Government adopt a policy which would increase that rate and sound the death knell of the United States as a maritime power. If this Nation does forfeit its position as a sea power, the reverberations of the death knell will not be limited to maritime affairs.

In a speech delivered recently to the Newcomen Society of North America in New York City, John T. Gilbride, president of the Todd Shipyards Corp., poignantly pointed up the dilemma faced by this country's shipbuilding industry.

Mr. Gilbride traced the history of the Todd Corp., a history which reflects what I call this Nation's "crisis-oriented" maritime policy.

Just last year this corporation closed down its Hoboken, N.J., division because of the low volume of repair work available, Mr. Gilbride said.

Mr. Gilbride explained that between national crises the industry can offer only cyclical employment, with the result that there is a serious shortage of trained manpower.

Because of the demands of the war in Vietnam, shipyards on the west coast are now in a crisis situation without the trained manpower needed to handle the increased workload.

Mr. Gilbride promised—

> This shipyard work, of course, will be accomplished well and timely, by dedication, by longer hours, by stepped up training and by ingenuity.

The statement is reassuring for the short run, but it is quite clear if the Government's "crisis-oriented" policy is continued, someday there will not be enough of a shipyard industry left to somehow crank up for a crisis operation.

Mr. Gilbride looked to the future with this request:

> But I say to you, the stewards of our national maritime policy in Washington, please don't drop us 8 or 9 months from now or whenever the emergency is over as was done after World War I, World War II, Korea, and Suez.

I concur with that statement. The ability to build and repair ships is a national resource which must not be squandered if this country is to remain a great power. Mr. Gilbride's speech is interesting reading. I ask unanimous consent that the speech, delivered February 17, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow members of Newcomen, the time I spent preparing this paper would have been considerably less were it not for this first paragraph. I was determined that my opening remarks and acknowledgment of my introduction would be exciting and different, thus getting me off to a good start. But after spoiling reams of paper I decided that after all I just wanted to say thank you for the honor bestowed upon Todd Shipyards, Mr. Reilly and me tonight and to thank you Admiral "McNeil" for your generous introduction. Your presence here and the presence of those other ship operators who are gracing our function tonight, underscores the mutually dependent kinship which exists between ship operators and shipyards, a relationship which is the cornerstone of our existence.

This is an occasion which will long be remembered by the employees, officers and suppliers of the Todd Shipyard Corp. For this single event will, in a way not otherwise possible, memorialize the 50th anniversary of our corporation and its expanding role in the U.S. industrial and defense community. Let me express our lasting appreciation for this very unusual distinction.

I want to pause to say a well-deserved word of appreciation to our stockholders. It is indeed true that we have paid consecutive dividends throughout our 50 years of operation, but we know that the sentiment of loyalty which exists among most of our stockholders transcends market quotations and the ups and downs of the industry. You may be sure this spirit of loyalty extends from us to these owners of our business and motivates us daily.

The Todd story has been written by men of vision and courage. These have included William H. Todd, our founder and first president. John D. Reilly, chairman of our board of directors, who shares the spotlight with me tonight, and Joseph Haag, Jr., our president from 1953 until his untimely death in 1958.

Our progress has paralleled the growth of our great country—and the growth of the American competitive enterprise system for nearly a century. In concert with the balance of the U.S. shipbuilding and ship repairing industry, Todd Shipyards has shouldered unprecedented responsibilities in times of national crises. The Todd story truly reflects the fine traditions of our Nation and of our people as we know them to be. Although 1966 formally marks the 50th anniversary of our company, it all began more than 100 years ago with the construction of the ironclad *Monitor* during the Civil War days. The duel between the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac* at Hampton Roads in 1862 was, of course, a crucial and historic sea battle, but this combination of steel with iron for ships also introduced an entirely new era of shipbuilding in the United States. And, our shipyards have played an important part in this evolution, making significant contributions to the state of the art through the years.

We trace our history back to 1835 when a small plant came into being call Phoenix Foundry. William DeLamater, who joined this firm as a prime investor, had a close friend in the brilliant Swedish naval engineer, John Ericsson, and together they helped create the aforementioned *Monitor*.

Some time later DeLamater brought his son-in-law, John N. Robins, into his ship-repair activities and it was Robins who moved the business, in 1889, from Manhattan to Erie Basin in Brooklyn. The Clyde Steamship Co., a prosperous coastal line of the late 19th century, and a good customer of Robins, invested heavily in the firm at this time to promote its expansion. With this financial backing, Robins equipped his yard with five drydocks and a modern machine shop.

To help him with his expanding organization, John Robins hired an aggressive young man who was just completing a vital steel-working assignment in the construction of the battleship *Maine* at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. His name was William H. Todd, and his employment started a business relationship which has profoundly affected our company's destiny.

Mr. Todd's progress was spectacular. In 1904, he became vice president. Five years later, on the retirement of John Robins, he was elected president of the firm, at the age of 45.

Showing a genius for organization—for assembling men who were experts in their respective fields, Mr. Todd established the Robins yard as one of the foremost ship repair installations in the United States.

When, in 1915, the Clydes sought to withdraw from the business, they readily agreed to sell the yard to its 51-year-old president. Mr. Todd was given 6 years to pay the note. However, within a year, in a series of financial moves, he chose to liquidate the Clyde obligation and, at the same time, to expand the organization. Thus, on June 14, 1916, Todd Shipyards Corp. was born. It consisted of the Robins yard in Brooklyn, the Tietjen and Lang Co. in Hoboken, and the Seattle yard on the west coast.

War was raging in Europe and in less than a year the United States would be a combatant. The new Todd organization found itself faced with tremendous pressures—shipping became more scarce by the day, and orders streamed in to rehabilitate almost anything that could float and go to sea. Even in those days our country depended too largely on foreign ships to carry its international trade—and foreign ships were more concerned in hauling the necessities of war for their own armies. American products piled up on the piers, and the call went out for the construction of new tonnage. Talented hands were needed to set up new yards where such ships could be built—and Todd possessed such talent.

In September 1916, Todd Shipyards took over the Tebo Yacht Basin in Brooklyn, and this yard performed notably in constructing small navy craft for minesweeping and convoy duty. A few months later, we acquired the Clinton Drydocks in Brooklyn for ship repairs.

The cry for a "bridge of ships" became more incessant. Todd built from scratch a new yard at Tacoma, Wash., which in layout and equipment was well in advance of its time. By the end of 1918 the Tacoma facility had launched 67,500 tons of merchant shipping.

Todd was later to sell its original Seattle yard and develop another at a nearby site for ship repair work. This plant, now our Seattle division, has prospered and, with the addition of building ways, has given full range to our activities on the west coast.

Todd Shipyards' greatest contribution to the Allies' victory in World War I was in repairing ships and returning them promptly for sea duty. Some vessels appeared ready for scrapping when they entered our yards, and many records were made and near miracles performed in restoring them as military supply carriers. We take special pride in the fact that 90 percent of the first convoy to Europe consisted of ships converted in our yards.

The turmoil of war has always sparked industrial changes. Before our country had entered World War I, Mr. Todd recognized that events would hasten the transition of marine engines from coal to oil as primary fuel. He also accurately foresaw the same transition in the heating plants of office buildings, homes and industrial plants. In September 1916, he added to our corporate structure the White Fuel Oil Engineering Co., which manufactured oil burning equipment. It was the beginning of what is now our products division.

When the war ended, our company was operating five plants on the Atlantic coast and two on the Pacific. The entire industry made efforts to convince the Nation's policymakers and the American public that the rebuilt merchant marine should be kept in a healthy state for peacetime trade and future emergencies. But this proved a hopeless task. "The war to end all wars," had been won, it was said, "Why should we stay in readiness for another."

Doesn't this sound familiar?

Thus, shipyard activity generally declined sharply, and there was little the company could do other than cut back and reorganize. The Tacoma yard was closed, and our overall work force of 17,000 dropped to a low of about 2,000 during the depression period.

In gearing itself to the changing times, however, Todd saw the necessity for extending its services into the gulf area; yards were purchased in Mobile and New Orleans. Todd also became an international organization through the establishment of Todd Oil Burners Ltd., in London, now Todd Combustion Ltd. This expanded company continues to service commercial and marine combustion accounts in Europe.

In the death of William H. Todd, on May 15, 1932, Todd Shipyards Corp. suffered a great loss. Fortunately his legacy consisted of more than the strong, well-equipped ship repair plants on the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts. He also left behind a well qualified group of men to carry on the company's enterprises and traditions.

Among them was John D. Reilly whose remarkable energy, ability, and understanding had been key factors in the firm's growth. A capable administrator and executive, Mr. Reilly had been a director of the corporation for 12 years. As the logical man to guide Todd Shipyards through the difficult years ahead, he was unanimously elected president on May 25, 1932.

In the depression years of the 1930's, austerity and new thinking were the order of the day. The yard in Mobile, while successful, was beginning to feel the pinch—there was not enough work for two shipyards in that port. In what proved to be a profitable business venture, we leased our yard to our competitor there and subsequently in 1951 sold the yard to him.

At New Orleans, the same situation existed with respect to two competitors. In this case, however, the depression caused the closing of Jahncke Dry Docks, and we merged with Johnson Iron Works. This yard is now our New Orleans division and is a vital link in our three-coast chain of complete shipyard services.

Of Mr. Reilly's many individual contributions to our success, the one that stands out to this day was his decision to locate a plant in Galveston, Tex. Through his close association with the oil companies, many of whose vessels frequented our Brooklyn and Mobile yards, he knew that the "garden spot" for tanker repairs was the west gulf area. And in this area was a port, on the open gulf, past which sailed just about every tanker flying the American flag. This port was Galveston. On September 1, 1934, Todd opened a shipyard on the Pelican Island site of the old Galveston Dry Dock & Construction Co. The facilities left much to be desired, but the land area and waterfrontage were ideal. Thus was born our highly successful Galveston division.

Todd's most rapid expansion began with the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which created an atmosphere conducive to the rehabilitation of the Nation's merchant fleet. We made a successful bid for construction of a fleet of five twin-engined cargo motorships, enabling us to reopen in 1939 the Seattle-Tacoma Shipbuilding Corp.'s yard on the same Puget Sound site where the company had pioneered mass production methods during World War I. We launched the first of these five ships barely 11 months from the time ground was broken. Then a year later, at the Navy's request, we instituted a crash destroyer program at a new plant in Seattle where we were to build 45 in all before the cessation of hostilities.

When World War II struck, Todd Shipyards was among the first to be drafted to help counter the heavy toll of shipping as German U-boats strove to starve out England. In answer to the allied call for "ships and still more ships," Britain dispatched a shipbuilding mission to our country to contract for the construction of 60 "ugly duckling" cargo vessels, the forerunners of the vast Liberty ship program to which the firm of Gibbs & Cox contributed so much.

Significantly, this shipbuilding mission came to Todd to get the program started. Acting jointly with the Henry J. Kaiser interests and with Bath Iron Works in Maine, two shipyards were created out of mudflats for the task—one in Maine and one in California. This same combination expanded its efforts as the clouds of war came nearer to the United States. By the time Japanese planes bombed Pearl Harbor it had created a total of eight shipyards in Maine, California, Oregon, and Texas.

Todd was asked by the Navy in 1943 to build a plant in Barber, N.J., for construction of landing craft by our mass production methods. I am very proud to say that my late father, who was a vice president of our company, inaugurated and saw this program through to successful completion. In the same year the Navy asked us to take over a plant in San Pedro, Calif., which the Government had seized for nonperformance. After the war we acquired this yard and it now is our Los Angeles division, about which more will be said later.

The combination with the Kaiser interests was terminated in 1942 through an agreement which provided for Todd to release its equity in four yards on the west coast while Kaiser released its equity in four yards in Maine, Washington, and Texas.

Time does not permit a thorough detailing of Todd's accomplishments in World War II. In sum, however, we built 999 ocean ships and repaired and/or converted another 22,457—representing a total of over 117 million tons of shipping. At the peak of our efforts we employed 157,000 workers, many of whom had to be trained on the job.

While ship construction was the more glamorous phase of Todd's war operations, drydocking and repairs provided much of the sinew for the Nation's war efforts. During the year 1944 alone we repaired or converted 6,645 vessels. Each ship returned to service was equivalent to a new ship built at a time when tonnage for carrying supplies was a paramount necessity to the Nation.

A typical ship repair incident highlights the wonder of some of these accomplishments. A tanker master, viewing his ship as it was elevated in a drydock in Galveston, exclaimed: "If I had known she was that bad, we would have left her."

"She" had been torpedoed off Aruba and had limped to port held together by the deck and four strakes of plating on the sides of her hull. When we cut the ship in half for rebuilding, the final cut made a report that was heard all over the city of Galveston, such was the stress in this twisted mass of steel that sailed into our yard from the Caribbean. This vessel went back to sea within a few weeks, as good as new. Multiply this by several hundred similar jobs and you have the story of wartime battle damage repairs at Todd.

Today Todd is busy witth repair work, new construction, industrial and marine fabrication, extensive conversions, reactivations and manufacture of products.

Our seven shipyards border the United States from Brooklyn on the east coast; to Galveston, Houston, and New Orleans in the Gulf and to Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle on the Pacific coast. Each is fully equipped, specializing in all work of a marine and industrial nature, with a total of 21 drydocks and 6 building ways.

In addition to all types of ships and floating craft, our divisions have turned out such large projects as bridge sections; a subsonic wind tunnel for an aircraft plant; an underwater rocket launcher tube assembly for testing Polaris missiles, huge dam gates and gigantic butterfly valves that weigh 160,000 pounds.

Because of the Vietnam situation, our yards are busy with reactivation work on vessels the Government has taken from the lay-up fleets. To date, of the 88 vessels assigned for reactivation, Todd has in its areas of operation secured 44 jobs—a pretty good average.

In recent years we have reentered shipbuilding operations on the west coast and delivered five of the world's most modern merchant ships. Additionally, we have built for the Navy four guided missile destroyers, one guided missile frigate, and are now completing a second frigate.

Ship conversion—the taking of a particular unit and transforming it into something else—offers our greatest creative challenge. I could tell you of countless Todd conversions that are filled with interest and with imagination.

One is presently underway at our San Francisco yard. The Western Offshore Drilling Co. needed a particularly wide offshore oil drilling platform to begin service at Cook Inlet, Alaska, in June of this year. The solution to the problem was found in two surplus T-2 tanker midbodies, the byproducts of earlier jumboizing jobs, and required a high order of skilled surgery in steel. Each of these hulls was drydocked, cut lengthwise off center into a fat half and a thin half. The two larger segments were repositioned and welded together, thus forming a new hull 357 feet long and 82 feet wide. The new craft was then removed from drydock so that the remaining work of installing machinery, living quarters, and drilling equipment could be accomplished. This ambitious and interesting feat is a first in the records of the classification society involved. The completed drill rig results in a wider but more shallow vessel which is capable of drilling in iced-up areas. And—when we get through we expect to have enough salvageable steel left—from the two leftover thin sections—to create a barge with a 52-foot beam.

We have recently completed the upgrading of our Brooklyn division at a cost of $3½ million making it the largest and most completely equipped ship repair facility in the port of New York.

Our New Orleans yard is still working on ships damaged by the severe Hurricane Betsy last year. Indeed the yard itself suffered the loss of one of its drydocks during Betsy and it has been necessary to transfer the Houston division drydock to New Orleans to cope with a large backlog of drydock bookings.

As mentioned earlier, Galveston is the ideal yard for tanker repairs, being in the heart of the refinery center of our country. This, in addition to work on a substantial volume of gulf-domiciled dry-cargo fleets makes for a relatively large and steady production force easily augmented for conversion work which has become a hallmark of that yard. About 6 years ago, we expanded our nuclear activities into a fully operational nuclear division at Galveston. We have the contract for servicing and maintaining the nuclear vessel *Savannah*, and are subject to call for such servicing anywhere in the world. We have also participated with the Government in studies on the feasibility of nuclear power for the propulsion of merchant vessels.

Our San Francisco division, which we acquired in 1948, is extremely busy in the reactivation program. Of the first 12 vessels rehabilitated for the Vietnam emergency, 7 went to Todd San Francisco.

Our Los Angeles and Seattle yards are preparing for construction of 14 destroyer escort vessels, 7 at each, as part of the Navy's antisubmarine warfare program.

Recently Todd Los Angeles had no fewer than five vessels simultaneously on one drydock—an extraordinary maneuver, but one necessitated by the dictates of a heavy workload.

Our Los Angeles yard has a somewhat theatrical distinction. Several years ago it entered the realm of make-believe with the construction of the Disneyland fleet—the "Mark Twain," a replica of a Mississippi steamboat; the "Columbia," which is a facsimile of an old-time square rigger and the eight 52-foot submarines which carry passengers on underwater tours of the Disneyland seas.

Todd's Houston division, acquired in 1949, has become one of the Nation's foremost builders of every type of small craft including barges of every description, drill rigs, derrick barges, tugs, piledrivers, ferries, personnel boats, and missile carriers. It is also the manufacturing center of our products division.

Our newest subsidiary, acquired in 1964, the Lester Engineering Co., is located at Cleveland, Ohio. Several years ago, our management decided to diversify its interests to balance some of the vicissitudes of the peacetime marine industry. Founded in 1935, for the manufacture of die casting machines, Lester steadily evolved its talents to the field of plastic injection molding machines and is now a leading producer in both of these fields.

Lester's position is a commanding one, both nationally and internationally, and holds a prominent place in our present and future planning.

Our products division, at Brooklyn, handles the selling and servicing of our products in the oil and gas burner and insecticidal equipment fields. It also coordinates the activities of our subsidiary in London, Todd Combustion Ltd., which manufactures and markets a similar line of products in Western Europe.

During World War II, this same products division devised a smoke generating machine for laying down screens to shield naval vessels from enemy eyes. This machine has subsequently been employed commercially to create insecticidal fogs. We call it the Todd insecticidal fog applicator—TIFA for short—and it is marketed throughout the world to combat destructive, disease-spreading insects.

In the disastrous earthquakes in Iran a few years ago, more than 10,000 persons and thousands of animals were killed by the fierce shock waves. During the dreadful days that followed, clouds of disease-spreading flies descended on the area until it appeared an epidemic of cholera was inevitable. Two TIFA units were rushed to the scene and began fogging applications day and night. Thankfully, the epidemic was averted, and we are understandably proud of TIFA's part in preventing it.

Last year we reluctantly found it necessary to close down our Hoboken division, shifting its two larger drydocks to Brooklyn. The low volume of repair work available in this port made it impractical to keep two yards in operation. Todd Hoboken was the old Tietjen and Lang Co., one of the original members of our family—and, the decision to close it was not an easy one to make.

One of the major problems we and the shipyard industry face is a shortage of skilled manpower. During normal times (between national crises) we can only offer cyclical employment. There has not been enough work made available to the private shipyard industry to maintain a sufficient nucleus of skilled manpower on which to build for emergencies which means crash programs at the time of the emergency. Let's hope we always have the time as Government officials don't seem to grasp the fact that shipyard skills are a national asset. The harsh lessons of our wars and police action in terms of lives sacrificed needlessly and money wasted are forgotten almost immediately after peace is restored.

For instance, at this very moment, our shipyards particularly on the west coast, are hard pressed to obtain the necessary manpower to handle the work resultant from Vietnam. This shipwork, of course, will be accomplished well and timely, by dedication, by longer hours, by stepped-up training and by ingenuity, and the ships will sail. But, I say to you, the stewards of our national maritime policy in Washington, please don't drop us 8 or 9 months from now or whenever the emergency is over as was done after World War I, World War II, Korea and Suez.

I am reminded of Rudyard Kipling's verse in tribute to the British soldier—

"It's Tommy this, it's Tommy that and
chuck him out, the brute,
But it's saviour of 'is country, when the
guns begin to shoot."

How apt this thought is with respect to our merchant marine. How meaningless are the lessons of history in terms of our merchant seapower. This sort of philosophy has plagued our merchant marine since the turn of the century and still persists.

Some 4 years ago, Mr. James Farrell, Jr., president of Farrell Lines, and a member of our society, who is here tonight, made these observations at a Newcomen meeting:

"It takes a crisis, perhaps, to focus attention on the value of an American-flag merchant marine owned by American citizens and subject to the immediate call of our Nation. This is no hypothetical, academic benefit of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act. These periodic crises should tell us something else—that ships are indispensable. And we have learned that even our best friends and NATO partners do not always agree with our own objectives and national interests. We certainly cannot assume that their ships will always come to our aid."

How accurate Mr. Farrell's conclusions are in terms of Vietnam. That trouble is a perfect illustration of the roller coaster of indecision on which our merchant marine and our shipyards have been riding throughout most of this century. In this, as in all the emergencies of the recent past, we have found ourselves with a merchant fleet that is frail when it ought to be mighty—small when it ought to be large—old when it ought to be young. The political and military necessities of Vietnam command our attention now—and ancient ships 20 to 25 years in age, the veterans of other wars, are dragged from the layup fleets and expected to perform like new and modern vessels.

Of the shipbuilding nations of the world the United States ranks a sorry 12th. I wonder if another list of notable accomplishments exists on which our great country would rank so low and about which our Government could seem to care less. Japan and West Germany lead all other nations, indicating that they have made good use of the $1 billion in American aid which was made available to rehabilitate their shipyards destroyed in World War II. Ranked also ahead of our Nation are numerous Iron Curtain countries—and we know for whom they are building many of these ships.

The countries placed ahead of our own indicate that they build to keep pace with their nations' "needs" for shipping—which would seem to indicate that our country feels no such "need."

Today foreign vessels carry about 90 percent of our commerce—more than 80 percent of our peacetime maritime fleets consists of ships of World War II vintage, in various stages of obsolescence by any set of standards—23 private American yards have been forced to close their doors. Yet, as just mentioned, the shipyards of Japan and West Germany are bursting at the seams—and they lost the war.

In Washington we hear voices clamoring for the scrapping of laws that require American ships be built in American shipyards—this in total opposition to our Nation's balance-of-payments difficulties—this despite the devastating blow it would deal to America's shipyards which would stand to lose annual revenues of $500 million, with employment and associated industries suffering as well—this in spite of the fact that every other nation which aspires to greatness supports and encourages its ship operators and shipyards. It is both penny and pound foolish. Other prophetic voices in Washington predict that air transport will dominate the movement of men and materials in all future emergencies—yet as of today, over 95 percent of the troops and supplies are moving to Vietnam in ships.

We are the world's richest nation—its greatest importer and exporter, yet our maritime fleet is permitted to linger in strength far behind the fleets of numerous other nations. Though we strive to excel and exceed in all else that we do, America seems content to drift toward the day when we will find ourselves a second-rate maritime power—if we aren't that already. There continues to be no true evaluation of this sorry situation—no purposeful actions that are intended to correct or remedy—no clearcut planning that will insure Americans the security and prestige of a strong fourth arm of defense. If I had to characterize the efforts by Washington with respect to solving the problems of our merchant marine over the last decade, I would say the industry is being studied to death.

We see constant reminders that the Soviet Union moves rapidly in the construction of a mighty merchant fleet. Indeed, this program—the building of ships for the U.S.S.R.—has become the leading industry of Poland and East Germany. Though in all other areas the Russians must contend with a strongly competitive America—here, in the construction and maintenance of a merchant marine, they find themselves unrivaled and seemingly the only contender in the race. These are facts that sicken.

It is well and fitting that our country should compete zealously with the Russians in space explorations and in the race to the moon. But certainly it is a paradox that with our desire to lead the world in this respect, we seem to care so little about dominance of the seas. The American philosophy is steadfastly dedicated to preserving freedom and maintaining peace throughout the world. In planning for this American dream of a peaceful and progressive world, we must recognize that there will always be a need for ships—ships to protect and police—ships to carry our products to all corners of the world—ships to trade with the great family of nations and thereby enrich, develop, and enlighten each port that they touch.

Despite all these rather elementary and very obvious facts, the latest shock from Washington is that the Congress has been asked by the Department of Commerce to appropriate enough funds for the replacement this year of something like 13 ships. We greet this news with disbelief. As the list of ships that carry our flag on the trade routes of the world grows pathetically smaller—and as the Russians resolutely move to build hundreds of ships—we are only making token replacements. I hope you can understand and share our utter despair.

The function of government is to support all means that will contribute to a country's progress, protection, affluence, and prestige. We do this now in many areas of our society. Yet, of all the billions that comprise our annual budget, only a fraction of 1 percent is applied in any manner or form to our merchant marine. The seriousness of our shipping plight does not arouse a Government that seems indifferent nor a public that seems unaware. The days when our packets and clippers controlled the sealanes of the world are now far behind us—and our shipping arm continues to wither to the delight of all our adversaries.

Let us hope that America will experience a reawakening to this vital consideration. American shipping, shipbuilding, and repair are still strong enough and resourceful enough to rectify these omissions if given the opportunity, but time is fleeting. It would be a splendid accomplishment to solve and conquer the mysteries of outer space—but might it not seem a rather hollow victory if, at the same time, our Nation surrenders the seas of this world to others?

Our company observes its 50th birthday this year with a minimum of confetti but with a great deal of pride. We feel the problem of recognition and support of the maritime industry, of which we are a part, will someday be accepted and implemented because it is in the national interest. We will continue to speak out on this issue, work diligently, persevere, exercise ingenuity, and grow. We look forward eagerly to the opportunities of the future. We subscribe to the American dream of a contented and prosperous family of nations—and you may be sure that Todd will be ready, as always, to serve the ships of that community.

FUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM AND THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the superintendent of schools of Baltimore City which well documents the reason that many of us, following the leadership of the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] support the restoration of funds for the national school lunch program and the school milk program.

In this letter, Superintendent Paquin demonstrates in dollars and cents the adverse impact which these cuts would have on the children in Baltimore public schools. He says:

> Our present subsidized program has not only proved popular but has done much to encourage children to drink milk and eat balanced meals by making it available at a price they can afford.

I ask unanimous consent that Superintendent Paquin's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALTIMORE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Baltimore, Md., March 18, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I would like to express my concern over the decrease in funds budgeted for the Department of Agriculture. The proposed cut in funds from the 1966 appropriation for the national school lunch program from $202 to $183 million and the cut in the special milk program from $103 to $21 million will hamper our school program.

Specifically, these reductions will reduce the lunch subsidy from $.04 to $.03 per lunch—a decrease of 25 percent. Furthermore, the reduction of commodities, when added to the reduced subsidy, will make a lunch cost rise necessary. Price increase would diminish the number of purchases and create even higher costs.

Cafeteria service in the Baltimore City Public Schools is operated on a nonprofit basis and at present, we are able to serve a balanced lunch for $.30 to elementary pupils and $.35 to secondary pupils. Our cafeterias serve between 27,000 and 30,000 lunches daily, and sell 30,000 bottles of milk in addition to those served with lunches. Schools without cafeterias are selling between 13,000 and 15,000 bottles of milk daily. In addition to these services, we operate a nutrition program for needy children. With funds given us by the local government, the present subsidy enables us to provide needy pupils with 5,386 bottles of free milk and 1,103 free lunches daily.

Our present subsidized program has proved not only popular but has done much to encourage children to drink milk and eat balanced meals by making them available at a price they can afford. In addition to being an important means of improving the health and strength of the Nation, good nutrition is an essential factor in the learning process.

I urge you to do what you can to restore the proposed cuts. The national school lunch program and the special school milk program are two of the most valuable programs provided by the Federal Government for the children in our schools. At a time when schools are being given increased aid in many areas, it seems a questionable move to propose cuts in essential programs as basic as those involving nutritional needs.

Sincerely yours,
LAURENCE G. PAQUIN,
Superintendent.

TWENTY-FIFTH AMENDMENT IS MAKING PROGRESS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of the Senate the progress made by the proposed 25th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

On July 6, 1965, Congress submitted this amendment to the several States after giving it overwhelming approval.

The amendment, which is designed to solve problems relating to Presidential inability and vacancies in the office of Vice President, has been making remarkable progress. The States have been acting upon it at a rate that now holds out a glimmer of hope that it may be ratified during this calendar year.

To date, 29 States have acted favorably upon the amendment. Nine more must still ratify the amendment before it becomes a part of our fundamental law.

For the information of my colleagues, let me list the States which have ratified in order of their actions.

Those ratifying during 1965 were:

Nebraska, July 12; Wisconsin, July 13; Oklahoma, July 16; Massachusetts, August 9; Pennsylvania, August 18; Kentucky, September 15; Arizona, September 22; Michigan, October 5; Indiana, October 20; California, October 21; Arkansas, November 4; New Jersey, November 29; Delaware, December 7.

Those which have ratified the amendment in 1966 to date, include:

Utah, January 17; West Virginia, January 20; Maine, January 24; Rhode Island, January 28; Colorado, February 3; New Mexico, February 3; Kansas, February 8; Vermont, February 17; Alaska, February 18; Georgia, February 18; Idaho, February 25; Hawaii, March 3; Virginia, March 9; Mississippi, March 10; New York, March 14; and Maryland, March 23.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. President, that a sufficient number of other States will act as quickly as possible on the amendment so that the potential dangers created by this gap in our Constitution may be permanently averted.

NEW DEPARTURE IN FOREIGN AID

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the President's proposal to create a binational educational foundation in India, endowed with U.S.-held excess Indian rupees, is an important innovation in U.S. economic assistance. It offers the most constructive solution to what was promising to become an acute problem to the developing countries and to the United States—the problem of amassed U.S.-owned local currencies accumulated from sales of surplus U.S. agricultural products overseas. That problem in India, through the President's proposal, has been turned into a positive asset.

The balance of U.S.-owned Indian rupees reserved for U.S. uses amounted to $576.5 million at the end of 1965. The United States uses for official U.S. Government purposes and programs only about $40 million each year. Only a limited amount of the remaining funds can be converted into other currencies for programs in third countries without causing serious harm to the Indian economy.

The foundation would be established by agreement between the United States and Indian Governments. The President has proposed that $300 million of the funds designated for U.S. uses be applied to the initial endowment of the foundation. In addition, funds would come from the Government of India and through contributions of foreign exchange from private sources. No U.S. dollar expenditures would be involved.

Each rupee will multiply in value many times over by the impact of such a foundation on the lives of the Indian people. Much like the educational opportunities opened to the people of this Nation by our major private foundations, it will support experimentation and innovation in basic educational development. It will place particular emphasis on the improvement of agricultural education and technology to meet India's pressing food needs.

As a private institution, directed by outstanding leaders of both the United States and India, the foundation will inject renewed direction into the Indian structure by encouraging private efforts to work toward the realization of India's fullest development capacity. It will be able to bypass political, economic, and social pressures which tend to inhibit the ability of the Indian Government to deal effectively with the present problems in education and agriculture.

The President has proposed an imaginative program which realizes many of the recommendations made by Congress and the executive branch over the past several years in studying the problem of U.S.-owned excess foreign currencies. I hope that this united effort with the people of India will serve as a model for future foreign assistance programs.

THE INDO-AMERICAN BINATIONAL FOUNDATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, President Johnson's proposal yesterday for the establishment of an Indo-American binational foundation is wonderful news for all supporters of Indian development and Indian-American cooperation.

And it is a landmark step forward in our efforts to use our vast holdings of Indian rupees in ways which will benefit both India and the United States, by investing them in the development of the agricultural, educational, and scientific resources of the world's largest democracy.

Since my trip to India, I have become increasingly concerned with the problem posed by these American rupee holdings. As of December 31, 1965, the U.S. Government owned a total of $586.2 million in rupees in the fund reserved for U.S. uses. In addition, we held $732 million in an account from which we make development loans to the Indian Government. If we add these two amounts together, we presently hold better than $1.3 billion in rupees, or more than 15 percent of India's total supply of money.

And this amount has been rapidly growing. Chester Bowles, our brilliant Ambassador to India, has estimated that by the end of 1966 our U.S. uses fund would grow to $675 million. Since he made this calculation, it has become evident that the need for expanded Public Law 480 sales to meet India's famine will make rupees flow into our hands ever faster, and it has now been calculated by the Treasury Department that by July 1967, our U.S. uses balance will grow to $845 million. This means that, even if our country uses balance did not grow at all, we would have a total of $1.6 billion in rupees by the middle of next year if nothing was done.

These massive holdings have made the United States a juicy political target for Communists and other anti-American groups. In a recent Indian Parliament debate, the Communist leader of the upper house, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, attacked the present Indian Government for "mortgaging India to the United States." Others joined in this charge; one outspoken Member of Parliament reportedly said:

> Not another ounce of American wheat. They are trying to enslave us. We would rather starve first.

India's outstanding Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Subramaniam, blunted this attack by replying:

> If the honorable member will provide the example, I am sure that the people will be glad to follow.

But still our large rupee holdings remain an acute embarrassment to the Indian Government, and to all Indians who want to make cooperation with the United States a major tenet of their foreign policy.

The binational foundation announced by the President yesterday evening is a bold, progressive step which strikes at the heart of this problem, and transforms $300 million of our rupees from an unwanted curse to an undiluted blessing.

The President has announced that we will take $300 million in rupees from our U.S. uses fund and invest it in the future of India and Indo-American cooperation. These rupees will provide the endowment for a foundation which will, in the President's words, "be given a broad charter to promote progress in all fields of learning—to advance science—to encourage research—to develop new teaching techniques in farm and factory—to stimulate new ways to meet age-old problems."

I think it is fitting that our Nation should join with the largest democracy in the world in this joint undertaking, a new effort to attack the problems of poverty, hunger, and deprivation which plague this great friend of ours.

I had proposed the creation of such a foundation in my bill S. 2826, the World Hunger Act. I had proposed that the Congress provide specific legislative authorization for the organization of binational foundations for the improvement of agriculture in countries where we have excess currency holdings. However, if the same purpose can be accomplished by administrative action, then I am wholeheartedly in favor of this approach. For what counts is not how we act, but whether we act to invest our rupee holdings in the future of India and the future of cooperation between our two countries.

I am particularly pleased that the President has made the promotion of agricultural progress one of the main purposes of this foundation. The work of American foundations in India in support of the intensive agricultural district program there is clear evidence that such a foundation can act as a catalyst to spark needed innovations in Indian agriculture.

The Indo-American Foundation will bring the United States and India together in a joint endeavor, which will involve not only the Governments of the two countries but the private sectors of their economies as well.

It will be chartered under Indian law and its principal offices will be in India. However, the plan wisely provides for a joint governing board of 18 persons—9 Indian and 9 American. These people will be men and women of stature and broad experience, drawn particularly from the ranks of education, science, and the professions.

In its first 5 years, the Foundation will have an Indian chairman of the board and an American chief executive officer. Thereafter, one of these offices will be filled by an Indian and one by an American.

The governing Board will decide most questions by a majority vote. In other words, it will be a democratic organization in the best tradition, with every safeguard to insure that the views of both cooperating nations are reflected in its decisions and actions. The result should be programs which meet public and private needs on a truly binational basis.

Because of its unique nature, the impact of an institution of this nature could be far greater than the size of its budget would indicate. The $300 million in rupees will be invested in 3½ percent Indian Government bonds, so that the Foundation will have something over $10 million to spend each year. We have seen in the United States that our large foundations, because of their freedom to experiment, have often led the way in designing programs to meet major American social and economic problems. We have every reason to hope that this can be the case in India as well.

It would be wrong, however, to believe that creation of this Foundation provides the whole answer to the problem of our excess currency holdings in India. When the Foundation comes into existence later this year, there will still be well over $300 million in rupees remaining in our U.S. uses fund. This account is presently growing by about $150 million a year—we spend about $40 million annually for our Government expenses and certain special projects, while money is flowing in from new Public Law 480 sales and loan repayments at a rate of about $190 million a year. And with the increased food assistance to India brought on by the catastrophic drought, our rupees will pile up even faster.

So even with the binational Foundation in operation, we will have by the middle of next year close to $1.3 billion in rupees once again. Most of these will be in the country uses account, from which we make regular economic development loans. But a large amount—about $545 million by current estimates—will still remain in our U.S. uses account in June of next year, which is just about what we had last December.

And the excess currency problem is not limited to India. In Pakistan, for example, we also own about 15 percent of the money supply; we hold $250 million in Pakistani rupees, half of this in the U.S. uses account. In the United Arab Republic we own 18 percent of the currency; in Burma, 8 percent; in Tunisia, 5 percent; in Ceylon, 4 percent.

In Pakistan, funds are flowing into our U.S. uses account at the rate of $38 million a year, but we are only spending $14 million.

In all of these countries, and in India as well, we must continue our efforts to find constructive uses for our foreign currency holdings. We should consider setting up similar binational foundations in other countries. Perhaps, after the Indo-American Foundation gets underway, we can increase its endowment.

I hope also that serious consideration will be given to my proposal, incorporated in my World Hunger Act, that some of the money that would normally flow into the U.S. uses funds, as well as money from the country uses funds, be used for special grants and low-interest loans to support agricultural improvement.

For self-help in agriculture remains vital if poor countries are to avoid catastrophe on an unprecedented scale, and this would be one useful way of encouraging such self-help.

Let me express once again, Mr. President, my admiration for the bold step the President has taken in setting up this Indo-American Binational Foundation.

I ask unanimous consent that the following be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks: President Johnson's statement announcing the creation of the Foundation; a summary statement I have drawn up entitled "U.S. Holdings in Local Currencies"; the editorial in this morning's Washington Post, "An Inspired Act"; and an article in this morning's New York Times, "United States Gets Rupees in Sale of Food."

There being no objection, the material was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

Text of Johnson Proposal for United States-India Foundation

(Following is the text of President Johnson's toast tonight at a White House dinner for Prime Minister Indira Gandhi.)

Madame Prime Minister: I have heard—and do in part believe—that Queen Victoria—speaking in a different age and under different circumstances—once gave the following estimate of two of her Prime Ministers.

"Mr. Gladstone," said she, "talks to me as if I were a public meeting—but Mr. Disraeli speaks to me as if I were a woman."

Tonight I am pleased to tell our friends assembled here that we have spoken to our gracious visitor not only as a woman with an understanding heart—but also as a leader with a matchless sense of vision—and a builder with a valued view of faith.

India is a vast and varied land. The roots of freedom and justice run deep in the Indian past. Its culture was full and strong centuries before the dawn of the Christian era.

The world has listened to the wisdom of India spoken through the voice of an eloquent leader.

Once years ago he said: "Democracy demands discipline, tolerance, and mutual regard. Freedom demands respect for the freedom of others. In a democracy changes are made by mutual discussion and persuasion and not by violent means."

STRONG IN SACRIFICE

These were the words of Prime Minister Nehru. This was the belief of Prime Minister Shastri. Their fidelity to freedom's cause created, with Mahatma Gandhi, a new nation—conceived in struggle, grown strong in sacrifice.

Now, Prime Minister Gandhi comes to this house and this table, custodian of her nation's hope, and the steward of her nation's dreams.

Today we talked about the work and the sacrifice needed to make those dreams a modern reality. We discussed practical ways India and the United States can help build a world where life is hopeful and happier for all our peoples, and indeed the people of all lands.

Prime Minister Gandhi's goal is to weld the Indian nation into a land where the words of its founding fathers come true and their views of its future are real.

There is much that binds India and the United States together. Both our nations have the deep-felt obligation to the basic dignity of man—the conviction that people can solve their problems by free choice far better than they can under an arrangement by force. There is in India and this country the strong tradition.

I remember clearly my visit to India in 1961.

IMPATIENT TO KNOW

I remember what I saw and felt and heard in India. The thousands of students along the roads and in the cities—each of them impatient to know and learn—the teachers and the scholars—the public servants—the people, searching, discovering, hoping. I think of our young people here—what we have done in the last year to achieve a new revolution in education—beyond the wildest dreams of a decade of two ago.

How can we bring into closer union the spirit and the courage of both our countries?

Tonight I propose we mark the visit of Prime Minister Gandhi with a lasting endowment for the benefit of inquiring young minds in the Indian nation.

May we, Prime Minister, with your Government's permission—and that of the American Congress—launch a new and imaginative venture: an Indo-American foundation.

I propose this foundation be established in India and endowed with $300-million in Indian currency owned by the United States. Other foundations all over the world will cooperate, I am sure, with this new enterprise.

I suggest this foundation be organized as an independent institution—with the distinguished citizens of both our countries on its board of directors.

I further propose that the new foundation be given a broad charter to promote progress in all fields of learning—to advance science—to encourage research—to develop new teaching techniques in farm and factory—to stimulate new ways to meet age-old problems.

The journey to the future is over a long, winding road, every mile tested by challenge and doubt.

Together, Prime Minister, we can avoid the detours that intrude on our safe journey toward a time when—as your father promised—life will be better for all our people.

Ladies and gentlemen—let us honor the chief of state whose Prime Minister we welcome so warmly tonight.

Join me in a toast—to the President of India.

U.S. Holdings in Local Currencies

There are 10 countries in which the Treasury Department has determined that U.S. uses balances are in excess of foreseeable U.S. requirements through fiscal year 1967. Below is a table listing these countries, together with our balances in U.S. uses and country uses currencies as of December 31, 1965 (preliminary Treasury Department figures). These have been accumulated largely, but not exclusively, through Title I sales under Public Law 480.

[In millions]

	United States uses	Country uses	Total
Burma	$23.7	$15.3	$39.0
Ceylon	2.1	12.8	14.9
India	586.2	732.0	1,318.2
Israel	25.9	29.4	55.3
Pakistan	125.4	124.9	250.3
Poland	492.8		492.8
Tunisia	6.7	15.4	22.1
United Arab Republic	121.3	134.9	261.2
Yugoslavia	41.7	90.9	132.6
Guinea	4.5	19.6	24.1
Total (10 countries)	1,430.3	1,180.2	2,610.5
Total (all countries)	1,495.9	1,421.5	2,870.8

How our U.S. uses balances build up can be shown from Treasury Department figures. They estimate that, on June 30, 1965, our U.S. uses balances in India were $503 million. At that time, it was estimated that in the present fiscal year the following amounts would flow into this fund: $54.6 million from new title I sales; $41.3 million from the payment of rupee loans for economic development under Public Law 480; $60.5 million in repayment of Mutual Security Act and development loan fund soft loans (loaned in dollars but repaid in rupees); and $18.5 million from other sources, including interest. (Apparently interest from all accounts—U.S. uses and country uses—goes into the U.S. uses balance.)

These figures, when added to the original $503 million, come to $677.9 million at the end of fiscal year 1966. From this we can subtract the $38 million that Ambassador Bowles estimates we spend every year from U.S. uses funds, and get $640 million as an estimate for what the U.S. uses balance would be on June 30. And Bowles estimates that, by the end of 1966, our U.S. uses balance will be $675 million. This would seem, if anything, to be a conservative estimate.

This gives some idea of how rapidly this balance is piling up.

Present law restricts our ability to use the U.S. uses money (and to a lesser extent the country uses money) in the following ways:

1. Virtually all money spent out of U.S. uses funds (except for that sold to tourists for dollars) must be appropriated by the Congress. Our agencies see this money as part of their total budget which must be approved, rather than an extra resource they might be able to draw on.
2. As amended in 1964, Public Law 480 requires that 20 percent of currencies which accrue under title I agreements must be reserved for appropriation; that is, must go into the U.S. uses fund. Therefore, this 20 percent cannot be available for country uses; in India and a number of countries, it simply piles up beyond our ability to spend it.
3. Any proposal to grant any foreign currencies, or to use any of the principal or interest from loan repayments (which go into the U.S. uses fund), must be presented to the Senate and House Agriculture Committees, and they are given from 30 to 60 days to veto any such proposal.
4. Concerning country uses funds, no loans can be made at a lower rate than the cost of funds to the Treasury (now about 4.5 percent) unless the President specifically establishes a different rate.

S. 2826 seeks to make this situation easier by providing a lower interest rate, and grants as well, for use of local currencies for agricultural purposes. These grants would be exempted from the appropriations process; from the requirement that 20 percent of currencies be reserved for U.S. uses; and from the requirement that any grants or uses of loan repayments be required to come before the Agriculture Committees.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1966]

U.S. Gets Rupees in Sale of Food—Yield on Surplus Mounts Too Fast To Be Spent

WASHINGTON, March 28.—The rupees that will be used to establish an educational foundation in India, a project announced by President Johnson tonight, are part of the U.S. holdings of foreign currencies accumulated chiefly from the sale of surplus U.S. food under the food-for-peace program.

About 80 percent of the local currency proceeds of such food sales are normally lent back to the buying country for economic development purposes, such as public works, with the United States retaining the remainder for its own use.

In most countries of the world, the Embassy and other direct U.S. needs absorb all the U.S. share of the proceeds. But in 10 countries, of which India is the chief example, the United States has piled up far more local currency than it can possibly use.

The other countries in the category are Burma, Ceylon, Guinea, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic, and Yugoslavia.

HOLDINGS AHEAD OF SPENDING

Although the numbers of countries is small, the amount is huge. President Johnson's budget estimated that the total of excess currencies in the 1967 fiscal year would be $1.84 billion, including $840 million in rupees. The present excess holding of rupees is $575 million and heavy food shipments this year will raise the total.

Only about $40 million in excess rupees had been expected to be used in the 1967 fiscal year before today's announcement.

As an example of the problem, in India only about $40 million had been expected to be used in the 1967 fiscal year before today's announcement.

Apart from sales of surplus food, the United States also acquires local currency from repayment of loans. Under a program now discontinued, many of these loans were repayable in local currencies.

Local currencies also pile up as the excess deposits earn interest.

Although deposits in only 10 countries are classified as "excess," U.S.-owned holdings of local currencies have piled up in 11 other countries to the point where they are now classified as "near-excess." They are Brazil, Colombia, the former Belgian Congo, Finland, Indonesia, Morocco, the Sudan, Syria, Taiwan, Turkey, and Uruguay.

Sales of surplus food for local currencies, the chief source of the buildup of U.S. holdings began in 1954. Under the administration's proposals for a new program, sales for local currencies would gradually be phased out and the food would be sold for dollars on long-term credit.

In countries where there are excess currency holdings, one use found for them has been to pay some of the expenses of visits by congressional delegations.

In India, in addition, the Government has authorized the sale of excess rupees to American tourists. However, the initiative for this must come from the tourist, who gets no better rate than in his hotel or a bank. Thus this device has not proved very useful.

Local currency holdings are not the same as "counterpart funds," a term used in the days of Marshall plan aid for Europe and now discontinued. These were local currencies set aside by the aid-receiving country to match the amount of the aid. These funds were at no time owned by the United States, but the United States had some control over how they could be spent.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 1966]

AN INSPIRED ACT

Use of $300 million of the U.S. rupee accounts to set up a permanent binational educational institution in India is an imaginative and constructive piece of statesmanship. It will make available for the purpose of encouraging innovations in both child and adult education in India around $10 million a year by an ingenious plan for investing the principal in the bonds of India.

The President must have been delighted to disclose this scheme in his remarks welcoming to this country Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. It begins her visit here with the announcement of a joint venture that is at once a symbol of the present friendship of the two nations and an earnest of their mutual confidence in the future. For such an investment in education is an investment in the future.

Because the funds come from rupee accounts accumulated through the provision of Public Law 480 shipments of food, this venture happily combines present aid and future good. The 20 percent of the rupee credits for grain shipments have been set aside to the accounts of the United States, and the fund, already amounts to $575 million. This fund is for expenses of the U.S. Government in India. It could not be put to better purposes than this. The President has only to exercise the waiver provisions in the law and the transfer of rupees will take place unless Congress negatives the allocation. It certainly will not do so, and the educational effort—so like the work undertaken by some of our great American foundations—will go forward.

Half of the administrators of this great fund will be American citizens and half Indian citizens—drawn mostly from private life. The vision and generosity of Government will put into the hands of these educators an incredible opportunity for good works and great deeds. A century from now, men and women in India well may look back upon this day as one most memorable in the annals of education and in the history of two friendly peoples.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have always been concerned, as have a number of others, that money under the poverty program has not filtered down enough to those that need it most.

In view of this, I would like to submit this resolution adopted by the Shelby County community action program in Texas, and request that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Office of Economic Opportunity, operating under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, was organized to alleviate poverty; and the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity was organized to assist in the formation of local organizations to conduct and operate antipoverty programs on the local level; and

Whereas representatives of the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity informed local citizens in the counties of Shelby, Sabine, and San Augustine of the availability of funds to assist the local community in alleviating poverty by the conducting of work training programs for youth, community action programs to organize a communitywide attack on problems of poverty, adult basic education programs for illiterate education training, Headstart child development training, day nurseries for children of working mothers, programs for health education, elderly poor assistance, etc.; and

Whereas acting upon the recommendation of the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity open public meetings were held explaining assistance available to benefit the poor, and an organization was formed consisting of 150 citizens of Shelby, Sabine, and San Augustine Counties, representing all economic, social, and racial groups, all business, governmental, educational, and civic groups, for the purpose of assisting the lower income groups of the area in improving their lot, through the assistance of money available through the various programs; and

Whereas an application for a program development grant was filed in July 1965 requesting a grant for an organization to examine the cause and effect of poverty in the tricounty area, and recommended solutions for the problems; and

Whereas 6 months later the application was approved providing a staff to process applications for recommended programs, after thorough examination of the program development application, governing body, and the area to be served by representatives of the Office of Economic Opportunity, both at the regional office and in the area to be served, and after satisfying themselves of the honest intentions of the organization to use the group for the purpose of attempting to raise the economic level of the poverty families in the tricounty area; and

Whereas although the staff has worked diligently to provide applications for programs to assist in the alleviation of poverty, the only results thus seen have been the employment of 17 staff members, only about half of which are from low-income families. Applications which should be of benefit to the poor have become bogged down in redtape to the extent that approval of any project which should be of direct benefit to the target area population is nonexistent at this time; and

Whereas a vast difference exists in information presented by the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity, information presented by the Office of Economic Opportunity, including the CAP guide, and actual experience in attempting to negotiate the approval of projects through the regional office of economic opportunity, where different approaches and answers to the same question or procedure are often required, even to the extent that the recommendations of one staff member are rejected by another staff member of the same department to the extent that local agencies do not know what procedure, guideline, or recommendation to follow; and

Whereas the CAP guide is said to be obsolete, but no replacement for information contained in it has been received; and

Whereas consultation with other community action agencies throughout the State indicate that the problems faced by this local organization are not unique, but rather are indicative of those faced in practically all of the other agencies; and

Whereas we recognize that the entire organization of the Office of Economic Opportunity is new, and as such requires a time to become efficient in operation, but that it should by this time be fully operative and functional, with the potential of speedily approving requests for assistance in the war on poverty; and

Whereas members of the board of directors and local citizenry, representing both target area and affluent groups, are losing interest in the community action program because of its failure to fulfill stated objectives of alleviating poverty and because more money is being spent for organizational purposes than is being spent for purposes intended.

Furthermore, recognizing the vast need for programs of the type recommended in the war on poverty and the potential good to be gained by raising the economic standards of the poor of all races, and that the Office of Economic Opportunity has devised the best procedure to date for assistance in these areas, but has failed to implement the procedure with practical, workable policies and to keep local agencies informed on changes of procedures, policies, and guidelines; and

Whereas even officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity have recommended that the only way to secure action necessary for proper utilization of funds allocated to the war on poverty is to bring political pressure to bear on all levels of government, national and regional office of economic opportunity: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the executive committee of the Shelby County Community Action Program, Inc., representing the counties of Sabine, San Augustine, and Shelby, respectfully request that all levels of operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity be examined and investigated to determine why money allocated for the alleviation of poverty is not being used for that purpose, why such difficulty exists in getting the approval of projects, and why officials of that agency cannot agree among themselves on the proper procedures to be followed, much less issue correct guidelines to local agencies to assist local groups in carrying out to the letter the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Passed this 21st day of March, 1966.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SHELBY COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, INC.
By JAMES E. CAMPBELL,
Chairman of the Board.

Unanimously passed by the executive committee.

SOIL MAPS AND SUBURBS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the last session, I introduced a bill—S. 947—to strengthen and improve the program of the Soil Conservation Service. This bill has as its major objective the use of soil maps as an aid to planning of new suburban growth on what is now rural farmland.

The soil survey assistance which the farmer has received should now be given to the suburban dweller if he is going to be able to plan safely and confidently for his own future. Thousands of new homes will spring up in all parts of the Nation during the next few years, and community leaders must be equipped to deal with the numerous problems of sanitation and waste disposal which this will present.

These difficulties can be eased, and the well-being of millions of our future homeowners will be protected if we take steps now to find out more about the land on which we live.

The problems involved in this area are underscored in an article by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, in the February issue of McCall's magazine. Secretary Freeman reports that homebuyers and suburban developers are losing millions of dollars every year due to poor building sites.

S. 947 would enable the mobilization of additional needed manpower and would clear up the present confusion in the laws under which the Soil Conservation Service is now directed to act.

Secretary Freeman's article is an excellent discussion of this problem. I request unanimous consent to have Secretary Freeman's article in McCall's magazine be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Build Your Home on Solid Ground

(By Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture)

Every month a Washington suburban family makes still another payment on the mortgage of a $30,000 heap of brick, splintered wood, plaster, and clay where they once lived.

It is all that remains of a handsome house, built below a hillside. Shortly after the family moved in, the hill began to slide, glacierlike until it completely leveled the house and seriously damaged nine neighboring homes.

Another family bought a $40,000 home in a different outlying area of the Nation's Capital. Shortly, raw seepage from the septic tank percolated up in the backyard. The deep well was tested; its water found contaminated. The subsoil proved to be of a type through which water drained too slowly. Health authorities condemned the house, and several others in the vicinity.

Homebuyers and suburban developers are losing millions of dollars a year due to poor choice of building sites—losses they could avoid, if builders applied approved soil conservation techniques.

The experience of a small California subdivider illustrates the plight of many unfortunates who build on unsuitable land.

This subdivider bought and terraced sloping land with a beautiful view. He built fourteen attractive houses, one on each terrace.

The first prospective customer called in a contractor for an estimate on a swimming pool. His first move—using a soil auger to corkscrew soil samples to the surface—showed four feet of sand overlying soft clay. The contractor said that the clay would not support the weight of a pool, so the customer decided not to buy.

On checking the other home sites, the subdivider found the same conditions. Water from a golf course higher on the slope kept the clay butter soft. At least two foundations cracked as the builder was looking for ways to save his houses.

The similar mud slide problem presently plaguing some hill areas in California could largely be solved by using augers or test holes to expertly analyze the soaked soil's weight-bearing strength.

When ground cover is broken for construction operations, the land lies defenseless against the ravages of weather if conservation measures are ignored.

People in South River, N.J., will long remember the day the drought broke in June 1962. Work was advancing on two new schools and a housing development at the edge of town, with machinery churning clouds of dust around 45 acres stripped of vegetation.

Then came the deluge—4 inches of rain in 4 hours. Mud from the bulldozed earth poured across St. Peter's Cemetery. Onward, it swept to residential sections. Beds of mud layered the streets, gutters, and driveways.

By nightfall the damages totaled $100,000—all because of 45 acres of recklessly "developed" land.

There is little excuse for foolish builders in our time. Scientific data can usually tell beforehand if the footing for construction is sound.

The Department of Agriculture's soil surveys, long used as guides for farmers in growing crops, also show whether land can be utilized for buildings, underground sanitary or other utility systems, for streets or highways or for other community facilities.

Let's take a look at how they work. Before 1963, metropolitan growth in the Charleston, S.C., area was haphazard. Water control and drainage were designed to serve immediate purposes without regard to future developments. As a result, water stood around many homes in rainy weather. Septic tanks didn't work. There was flooding when spring tides coincided with heavy rainfall. Many residential subdivisions became slums as the original home buyers moved out.

Now a specially prepared soil survey and drainage plan is guiding local officials in the land use and water management problems arising from rapid urbanization.

Real estate developers and industry can select sites which present the fewest problems. Now roads are being located where there will be a minimum of drainage and construction difficulties. The Charleston County Planning Department is using this information to project sound future growth and zoning. Similar progress is being made in other city areas, such as a six-county region near Chicago. Here scores of satellite communities of the great Midwest metropolis are expected to grow during the next two decades.

The Department of Agriculture in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, has surveyed more than 822,500,000 acres. Its older surveys were primarily to help farmers. But because the need for soil information for cities and suburbs is becoming acute, recent soil surveys have included information gathered specifically to help both farm and nonfarm people.

What can you, as an individual homebuyer or homebuilder, do to avoid risking your investments through a hit-or-miss choice of land for home sites?

Before you build or buy, ask the county agricultural agent or the local USDA Soil Conservation Service office if a soil survey of the area has been made. The State land-grant universities cooperate with the USDA in making these. If no survey has been made, ask the county government if a soil scientist is available for consultation. See if commercial concerns such as a garden supply house or a seed and fertilizer dealer provide free consultative services on soils.

Finally, if no public or other free services are available, ask these sources where you can hire a competent soil scientist to make an investigation. The cost will not be great—certainly only a small fraction of a cent for each dollar you would lose if your home were to be built on unsuitable land.

If you are already established in a growing urban community, how can you see to it that good conservation practices will keep it from becoming a broken-down slum? Working through your women's clubs, you can:

1. Find out if the soil in your area has been surveyed by the Department of Agriculture or other agencies. If not, urge city or county officials to arrange for a survey.

2. Write to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250, for literature telling how other communities are meeting the problems of proper land use. This information aids in establishing guidelines for city, county, and State governments, enabling them to write laws, ordinances, and building codes to prevent improper use of land. Where these provisions already exist, your organizations should press for adequate enforcement. For example, construction permits should not be issued unless developers show that they will control erosion. In problem areas, a detailed investigation of soils and an analysis of building sites should be required before a building permit is issued to anyone.

By forethought and action now, you and your clubs, together with other organizations, can go far toward eliminating the tremendous losses and wastes caused by slipshod or unenlightened building practices which are burdening individuals, communities and the entire Nation. You can help assure that America will continue to be a land of beauty, as well as a nation of power and prosperity.

I can think of no heritage more worthwhile to pass on to future generations.

FOUNDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the abundance of American agriculture rests to a large degree upon the rural electrification program. Although almost all of rural America now has electricity, the demands for additional power and facilities are steadily increasing. This construction and financing has been funded largely through loans to local privately owned cooperatives from the Rural Electrification Administration. These loans bear an interest rate of 2 percent. Both customer-owned and investor-owned utilities receive these loans. The 2-percent loans for provision of electric service in rural areas have been made for the most part to cooperatives; however, a majority of the 2-percent loans for provision of telephone service in rural areas went to investor-owned systems.

These loans are no bargains, in that they carry with them the requirement that the recipient provide areawide service, often to remote areas. For example, revenue per mile of line for investor-owned electric systems is approximately 15 times that of revenue for the rural electric cooperatives.

It is essential that this 2-percent loan program be continued. The alternative is increased costs for essential services in rural areas. It is also essential, in my opinion, and in those of many other Members of this body who put their views in a letter to the President early this year, that the appropriation for rural electric cooperatives should be increased substantially from the level recommended in the budget, and that the Budget Bureau must release funds already voted by Congress.

Additionally, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has been studying ways to meet its supplemental financing needs, beyond the traditional and necessary 2 percent REA loan program. These studies, worked out through months of meetings around the country, with private consultants and Government officials, culminated in a proposed supplemental financing program adopted at the annual meeting of NRECA last month.

The need and justification for this supplemental financing program were spelled out in a speech by the acting general manager of NRECA, Jerry L. Anderson, and summarized in a resolution adopted by the convention.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Anderson's speech, and the resolution, printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech and resolution were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address of Jerry L. Anderson, Acting General Manager, 1966 Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, Nev., National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

The theme of this meeting is "Foundations for the Future," and during the next 4 days we will be discussing many important foundations. Because some of them are so basic to the future of our program, we're going to have considerable discussion and debate.

But about one, there can be no question. The strongest foundation for the future of this program is the presence here today of Clyde Ellis.

Few of us can comprehend the ordeal he has undergone in these past few months. A man with any less courage and determination could not have survived. For myself, and for all of his staff, I want to say to him and to you that his great fighting spirit has been an inspiration to us—and today, as always, we're proud to work with him and for him.

I'm glad that during most of this period we have been able to have Mr. Ellis' counsel and advice on major problems. Through close consultation with him, with President Tidwell and the board, with the statewide associations and with many of you, we think these problems have been approached with a sense of unity and purpose—and that our whole program is moving forward.

Together, for many years, we have been building our "foundations for the future." We started with the great ones, the REA lending program and the Federal power program. Block by block we have added to these and strengthened them; we have given them new dimensions of usefulness and we have defended them against all opponents.

As our systems grew and matured, we added other important foundations.

To provide a degree of independence in the all-important area of power supply, you developed the generation and transmission program. To provide yourselves with services and representation, you built strong statewide associations and NRECA.

You recognized that no matter how noble your purpose or how righteous your cause, you could not succeed without building strong internal organizations. So you began, through NRECA, a program of professional management training unmatched by any other industry in America. To attract and keep top caliber personnel, you developed jointly an outstanding insurance and retirement program.

A few years ago, as a matter of both enlightened self-interest and recognition of your responsibilities to the national interest, you began to broaden your foundations.

You pioneered in the development of programs to strengthen the economies of your areas and to combat rural poverty.

Under a nonprofit contract with the State Department, you began your widely acclaimed effort to export the REA pattern and bring what President Johnson has called "the healing miracle of electricity" to less fortunate people in other lands.

On these and other basic foundations you have built a strong program which has brought light and hope and dignity to millions of people here and abroad. You have achieved maturity, from a standpoint of both purpose and accomplishment.

Yet, what you have done to date is but a prelude to what you will do in the future. You represent a young and dynamic movement that is held in the highest regard throughout America. You are still building new foundations, and you'll be building them for many years to come.

Yet, it is paradoxical that in this surge toward greatness, we find ourselves today pausing in the building of new foundations to turn our attention once again to the oldest and most basic one of all—the financing of our program.

Everything else we build rests on this one foundation. If it should crumble, everything else would fall. Because if we cannot finance facilities necessary to meet the growing power needs of our areas, our people will turn to other organizations that have no such problems.

If this financing question were not so all-important, I would discuss several other issues in some detail this morning—including the shameful and senseless New England power blackout which could have been largely averted by the kind of interconnection and pooling policies which NRECA has advocated for many years. I would also have discussed the status of our FPC bill, which soon now will move into a critical stage. These and other important issues will be explored by other speakers.

Capital to finance essential expansion is the prime necessity of any type of utility. The electric power industry requires vast and continuous new amounts of capital. This certainly includes the rural electrics, which are growing even faster than the rest of the industry. Our systems will need twice as much capital in the next 15 years as they used in the first 30 years.

At present, we generally have only one source of growth capital—loans from REA. These loans in turn depend upon annual authorization from Congress.

I do not need to remind you again that in recent years Congress has been unwilling to authorize sufficient funds to meet our full needs. And we even have trouble getting the administration to lend all the money Congress does authorize.

It was the recognition of this hard fact of life that led you more than 2 years ago to authorize the study of ways and means of bringing supplemental funds into the program.

We carried out that study extensively and objectively. To assist us, we engaged one of the world's largest and most respected investment houses—Kuhn Loeb, of New York. We also called on many other experts, inside and outside of government. We remained in constant touch with you and your representatives, and you made major contributions to the study.

From all this study and consultation, the NRECA board of directors last summer evolved the concept of a sound supplemental financing program. Acting under instructions from the board, the staff presented these concepts to more than 50 statewide and special meetings. The financing plan was almost the sole topic of discussion at the 10 regional meetings last fall—and was endorsed by 9 of those 10 meetings.

We sought and received the widest possible reaction of the membership. We worked fully and sincerely with groups opposing the plan and others who advocated other approaches. As we developed the specific features of the plan following the regionals, we incorporated many new suggestions from the membership.

In mid-December, we held a 2-day meeting in Washington of NRECA board members, statewide presidents and managers, generation and transmission representatives and others to review the plan in detail and to consider alternatives.

The booklet, entitled "Supplemental Financing Program for Rural Electrification," which we mailed to all of you in early January, is the distillation of this great effort. The plan presented in these pages is a sound plan for the future financing of the rural electrification program. It has been analyzed, reanalyzed, discussed, debated, and publicized until surely anyone interested in the future of rural electrification must be familiar with it.

In our opinion, most of the people in the rural electrification program support this basic plan. There are some who would still like to see changes made in some of the features—and the plan can be modified without destroying its basic integrity and soundness. You may want to make modifications at this meeting. I can assure you on behalf of the staff, and I believe also for the board, that we welcome modifications if they are genuine improvements. I urge you, however, not to make basic changes without the most careful consideration and evaluations.

As we have gone through the development of this plan, the shaping of its features, the discussions with you, the administration, and leaders of Congress, several questions have arisen which I would like to discuss briefly with you, and give you our best judgment on them.

The first, of course, is the all important matter of the interest rate. There are many sincere and progressive people in our program who feel that we should have only one interest rate for everybody, even if it has to be higher than 2 percent.

All of our studies indicate a continuing need for the REA 2-percent program. Many systems, perhaps three-fourths of them, could not at this time pay more than 2 percent and still achieve the program objectives.

At the same time there are many systems which can, and even want to pay more than 2 percent. In our opinion the best way to maintain the 2-percent rate for those who must have it is to provide some alternative for those who can do without it. Our plan provides for a continuation of the present REA 2-percent loans, and it provides the alternatives.

There are others in our program who agree that we can have more than one interest rate but think there should only be two—the 2-percent REA loans and some higher rate set by the bank. Our plan as it was endorsed by you at 9 out of 10 regional meetings envisioned a 3-interest-rate program—2 percent for those who must have it, an intermediate rate which would be related to the Government's cost of money, and a third rate reflecting the additional costs the bank would have in raising outside capital.

As we went through the development of the plan, it became obvious that the program would work best if the intermediate plan were placed in the bank so that the bank made all loans except the regular 2-percent ones. The pamphlet on the finance plan which was mailed to you early in January contains this approach. It calls for the bank to make intermediate loans at 3 percent, and development loans at a higher rate, with provision for refinancing the principal.

Serious questions have since arisen as to whether the bank would not be a stronger institution and the whole program sounder if the bank charged a single interest rate. In this way the benefits of the Government capital contribution would be spread over a larger number of borrowers. The bank would achieve independence at an earlier date and the rate reflecting the blend of the various capital contributions would be reasonable and even attractive in the face of a tight-money, high-interest economy.

If we went this route, and if we could get it through Congress, and if we could get sufficient Government capital into the bank, it would mean, in effect, that we would have two programs—the regular 2-percent REA loans and a single, blended bank rate of between 4 and 4½ percent.

We think either approach is sound and each offers its own advantages. We have carefully reviewed them, and in our judgment we should keep the intermediate loan program in the plan. By doing so, we will maintain great flexibility in the operation of the bank and best meet the needs of our total program. The decisions made by the administration in recent days on its position on the financing plan strongly favor the retention of the intermediate plan.

With the exception of the interest rate, there has been more discussion about the criteria for determining who will pay what rate than anything else. This question was explored in some detail at our special meeting in December.

The Administrator of REA has made it very clear that objective measurements can be developed and applied for evaluating the ability of borrowers to pay a higher interest rate.

There are those who feel that the criteria should be developed and be included in the bill. We think there is great danger in doing this. This would make a political issue of the loan criteria and we are fearful it would lead to new restrictions on the lending program. It would be far better, we think, if the development of the criteria were left to REA. The criteria should be objectively determined and should be published for everyone to see. I am sure that there would be extensive questioning of the Administrator during the congressional hearings on the bill, so the basis for the criteria would become legislative history. After the most careful review, we recommend that the criteria not be included in the language of the bill.

There has been considerable discussion about the financing of the generation and transmission program under the new proposal. Depending on which part of the country we were in, we have heard arguments that the 2-percent program should be reserved exclusively for distribution systems or reserved exclusively for generation and transmission. We do not think any such distinction should be made.

The 2-percent money should be used where it is genuinely needed, whether this be by a distribution system or a G. & T. It is entirely possible that as we get further into this era of large scale generation and power pooling that many G. & T.'s could utilize higher cost money but by building larger plants and negotiating more desirable contracts with municipal systems, and others, achieve a power cost as low or lower than would be possible under the stringent restrictions accompanying the 2-percent program.

It is also possible, and in many cases might be desirable, for loans to either distribution systems or G. & T.'s to be made at a mixed interest rate. That is, a part of the loan could be made at 2 percent and part of it at the higher bank rate. This blend would produce an attractive and realistic interest rate.

Both our plan and the one we understand the administration will propose, call for the higher cost bank loans to be unamortized. In other words, a loan at the highest bank rate might be made at 5 percent, but the principal would not have to be repaid. This is the way the power companies and practically every other utility in the country raise their outside capital.

Finally, there are some in our program who maintain that we should do nothing at this point. They call for delay and inaction.

In our judgment we have already delayed too long. If the budget crisis in which we now find ourselves proves anything at all it is that this program cannot rely on any administration, or any Congress to provide all the capital the program needs. We have behind us everything we need to make a decision. We have all of the studies made by NRECA, our consultants, and by others who advocated different approaches. We have the benefit of studies made by REA. We have carried out the most extensive information program in NRECA's history to acquaint our membership with these proposals. Now the hour of decision has arrived and we believe a decision must be made.

There is absolutely no question that the administration intends to present a supplemental financing proposal to the Congress this year.

As we understand it at this time, the administration proposal will agree in principal with the one we have developed. This agreement was not easy to accomplish, because there were many who favored different administration positions, some of which would have been disastrous to our program. We owe a great debt to Secretary Freeman, Assistant Secretary John Baker, and Administrator Clapp for their vigorous and effective support when the chips were down. I can tell you that all of these months of effort and struggle came to a climax at noon on Friday, February 4, in the office of the President. President Johnson had to decide between two conflicting viewpoints on several vital questions regarding the future of our program. Some of his principal advisors urged that the entire 2 percent program be phased out as quickly as possible, and 2 percent for generation and transmission be discontinued immediately. Secretary Freeman argued forcefully for keeping the 2 percent program as it is now. The President had to decide. I am very happy to tell you that President Johnson decided in your favor. The administration position will call for a continuation of the present 2 percent program, including justifiable generation and transmission loans. The administration bill will go to Congress at an early date. It would be foolhardy for us to be placed in a position of blind opposition to these proposals without having constructive ones of our own.

We can profit from the experience of TVA when it was forced to seek self-financing in the late 1950's. For years, many TVA leaders had resisted all suggestions that the agency consider non-Government financing. It was slowly being starved to death for lack of funds. TVA finally had to go to Congress for self-financing legislation in a hostile political climate. It got the legislation, but at a high price. That's when the opponents of TVA built the Chinese wall around the service area. TVA was the victim of poor timing.

Until we can get a supplemental plan into effect, we are completely at the mercy of any administration in power and the Congress. The budget and the loan authorization procedure are the lifeblood of our program. The budget as originally proposed by this administration would have shut off that blood supply. We will fight with every ounce of strength and every resource we have to keep that from happening.

We have heard much in the past 2 years about the creation of a Great Society in America. This is a noble concept which most of us have applauded and generally supported. We have recognized that just as the unmet needs of the thirties led to the institution of such great social programs as rural electrification, so do the needs of the sixties cry out for bold and creative solutions. We have recognized that just as rural America was dark in the thirties, the cities are blighted in the sixties.

We have understood that poverty and hunger and ignorance are the common enemies of all our people whether they live in a slum in a city or a shack in the country.

We have long known that we could not build a shield of rockets around our country and ignore the needs and aspirations of those in other lands. We have responded to the request of our Government, and today rural electric people are working, or have worked, for our national interest in 22 countries from the jungles of Latin America to the swamps of South Vietnam.

A nation whose society can be called great demands from its citizens such understanding and such sacrifice. The rural electrification program is meeting its responsibilities to the national interest.

But responsibility runs in both directions. In its eagerness to build new programs, this administration cannot sacrifice the needs of the old ones. We can never have a Great Society in America without a dynamic rural electrification program.

The budget which this administration sent to Congress for fiscal 1967 is unrealistic, inadequate, and shortsighted. The request for only $220 million in new funds would not even cover the backlog of loan applications at REA to say nothing of your need for $413 million in new capital next year.

But what the administration proposed to do to this year's loan program was even worse. They proposed to loan only $270 million of the $402 million available and authorized. They would have impounded the rest, including the $60 million contingency fund and the $37 million you fought so hard to get released last summer.

The combination of the low budget request and the restriction on this year's program would have cut the heart out of the REA lending program. Our strong and immediate reaction to this folly, including the wires and letters you poured into Washington, had a quick and healthy effect—we hope. We have received assurances that the $37 million will be restored and the $60 million contingency will be made available if the need can be shown, and with REA's backlog I don't see how there could be any question of need.

But if we succeed in getting all of this year's program restored, we will only be back to where we were at the beginning of this year. We will not have won anything new. We will still be in the middle of a loan-fund crisis.

We have told the administration and the Congress that NRECA will use its full resources and will call upon those of all its allies in a fight to secure congressional approval of adequate funds for fiscal 1967.

We are told that the President was not fully aware of what the budget proposed to do to REA. We have been assured that he remains a strong champion of our total program, and I think he proved that in the showdown 2 weeks ago. In this spirit, we have urged the President to follow a four-point program to rectify this calamitous budget proposal. These steps are—

First. Issue a Presidential directive to the Budget Bureau and REA to use the entire $402 million authorized for fiscal 1966 to the full extent of need;

Second. Support an immediate REA deficiency loan authorization to reduce the loan fund application backlog to manageable size;

Third. Support an effort to either increase the fiscal 1967 budget request or to establish an adequate contingency fund to be used as needed for loans and not as window-dressing; and

Fourth. To join with us in seeking speedy passage of our supplemental financing plan.

This is an essential and minimum program which any administration committed to the welfare of rural America should endorse and support. Subject to your action in this meeting on the fourth point, it is the program NRECA will be fighting for in this session of Congress.

As he has been so often in the past, we hope our strongest ally will be the President of the United States.

Financing is our most important foundation for the future, just as it has been in the past. It is the most important thing to be discussed and decided at this meeting; it is probably the most important thing you as a group have ever decided.

Nothing in the history of our program has ever occupied the time and energy and talents of so many people as the finance plan you have before you. The board, the staff, and our consultants inside and outside government have done all they can do without further direction from you. Now, you have a decision to make, and only you can make it.

I think all of us who have worked on the plan would echo a statement from Clyde Ellis' new book, "A Giant Step." At one point, he says this:

"It is the duty of leaders to lead, to study, to think and then to take the facts to their people; once the people know the facts, they can be trusted to make the right decisions. Sometimes those decisions will not be the ones the leaders think they should make, but more often than not they will prove to be wise ones."

We believe that. And so once again, the future of this program is in your hands. We know you well enough to know it's in good hands.

RESOLUTION C-5

Resolution on supplemental financing program

Whereas the rural electric systems, in order to provide adequate and reliable service for their members, need increasing quantities of growth capital, estimated to total $9½ billion in the next 15 years; and

Whereas in recent years the amounts of loan funds budgeted by the administration and authorized by the Congress have not kept up with the growing requirements, causing a critical buildup of applications backlog; and

Whereas the loan fund shortage is an immediate problem affecting the future prospects of every rural electric system that needs to build additional capacity to keep up with the rising electric power needs of their consumers; and

Whereas most rural electric systems are still not financially strong enough, while meeting program objectives, either to operate successfully without the REA 2 percent, 35-year loans or to go individually to the private money market for the capital they need: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the administration and the Congress in the interests of a sound and ultimately financially independent rural electrification program to help us alleviate the rural electric loan fund shortage now upon us and provide for increasing capital for future growth by adopting a supplemental financing program substantially in accordance with the proposal set forth in the report entitled "Supplemental Financing Program for Rural Electrification" dated January 1966 and published by NRECA which would—

1. Continue the traditional 2 percent, 35-year REA loan program with adequate funding for those systems requiring such loans to meet program objectives;

2. Establish a Federal Bank for Rural Electric Systems which initially will be in USDA and will operate with Federal Government assistance but which, as the systems grow in maturity and invest more of their own funds in the bank, will shift from Government to borrower ownership and control;

3. Provide loans with sufficient flexibility of interest rates, amortization requirements and maturities to enable systems to achieve program objectives; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the administration and the Congress to make available to REA during fiscal years 1966 and 1967 sufficient funds to dispose of the accumulated loan applications and those yet to be received by REA, in order that the rural electric systems may move steadily onward with construction programs so vital to rural consumers, and in order that the bank may initiate operations on an orderly basis without gigantic loan demands exceeding its capabilities in the early years of its operation.

WORLD FOOD AND POPULATION PROBLEMS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in considering the food-for-freedom legislation proposed by the Congress both this body and the other House have held extensive hearings. The Agriculture Committee of the other body between February 14 and February 18 heard testimony from 10 demographers, economists, agronomists, and Public Health officials and others who are knowledgeable in and deeply concerned about the problems of world food and population. The staff of that Committee has prepared a most valuable summary of the testimony presented by these witnesses, a summary which indicates the extent of the world population problem, the difficulties in increasing food production to meet nutritional needs and the overall impact on U.S. foreign policy of the present world situation in which two-thirds of the world's people are literally starving while we in the United States live in agricultural abundance.

As one of the witnesses pointed out:

> This is the biggest, most fundamental and most nearly insoluble problem that has ever confronted the human race.

There are only two basic solutions: First, to increase agricultural production; and second, to reduce the population growth rate, which in turn means reducing birth rates.

Mr. President, because I feel that this summary is of great importance and will be helpful to the members of this body in their consideration of food and population problems, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD following my remarks the excellent summary of testimony to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAFF SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY PUBLIC WITNESSES IN REGARD TO WORLD FOOD AND POPULATION PROBLEMS, FEBRUARY 14–18, 1966

INTRODUCTION

Ten public witnesses, each of whom is an expert in his or her particular field, testified before the full committee during the first week of hearings. The following summaries are an attempt to concisely recap the major points and provisions in each of the detailed and carefully prepared statements. The full text of these statements, including questions by committee members and the witnesses' responses, will soon be published by the committee as a public record. These hearings will be available from the committee upon request.

WITNESSES (IN ORDER OF THEIR APPEARANCES)

1. Dr. Irene Taeuber, Office of Population Research, Princeton University, Monday, February 14

World Population Growth

In 1850 there were 750 million people in the world; in 1900 there were 1.5 billion; in 1960 there were 3 billion. In 2000, if present trends continue, there will be 7.5 billion.

The increase of the world's population is so awesome as to seem unreal.

Projections—World and major areas

Area	Annual percent increase	Years to double
World	2.1	33
More developed areas	1.3	54
Europe	.8	88
Northern America	1.6	44
Oceania	1.7	41
Less developed areas	2.5	28
Mainland middle America	3.8	18
Tropical South America	3.7	19
Southeast Asia	3.0	23
Middle south Asia	2.6	27
West Africa	3.3	21
Polynesia, Micronesia	4.0	17

Continuation of present trends in India will mean a population increase from 432.7 million in 1960 to 1,233.5 million by the year 2000 (in other words, nearly triple). If India's birth rate is cut in half, her population by the year 2000 is expected to more than double to 908 million.

No developed nation has a birth rate above 30.

Eight Hypotheses Developed

1. Population growth as it is now occurring will not continue indefinitely.

2. Modernization is conducive to later marriage, smaller families, and greater opportunity for children.

3. Advancements of biomedical science have made the extension of family planning feasible.

4. The control of fertility is not a panacea.

5. Retrogression in health and nutrition would slow the development processes that are associated with declining birth rates.

6. There are no immediate demographic solutions to problems of hunger and malnutrition. (Example: Everyone who will be age 35 in the year 2000 is already born.)

7. Unless family planning is accorded a priority, the situation is likely to be worse.

8. Economic, social, and health advances are inseparable aspects of the development process.

History of United States and Developed Countries

Example: United States—In early history 1 million Indians lived marginally—today 194 million Americans eat well. U.S. population growth rate high (5.5 percent) in early development.

Time and Priorities

1. Meet the present crisis.
2. Reduce the growth of population.
3. Solve longrun problems of welfare and development by speeding the decline of birth rates to low levels.

Problems in less-developed countries are discussed at length.

Four Recommendations

1. Correct the imbalance in science and technology—research in physiology of reproduction, biomedical sciences, communication, motivation, and administration.
2. Include population factors in development plans and strategies.
3. Focus on long-run economics and social problems.
4. Accord a priority to population programs appropriate to the modernization process.

Summary

The critical question in the future of population is the future of fertility in the less-developed areas * * * both governmental activities and economic and social advance.

2. Dr. Roger Revelle, Director, Center for Population Studies, Harvard University, Monday, February 14

Three Propositions

1. A livable world cannot long exist where two-thirds don't get enough to eat and one-third are overfed—that is the present world.
2. The future of mankind is now being ground out in India. If no solution, all the world will live like India does now.
3. The foreign aid program cannot end—it will be continued for the next two generations and it must be expanded. (One-half of 1 percent of our GNP should be expanded to 5 to 10 percent.) There are no panaceas. A broad effort is needed.

Attack the Food Crisis on Four Fronts

1. Human fertility. (Slow—can't change picture new.)
2. Increase agricultural production in underdeveloped nations.
3. Food aid—for at least 15 years.
4. Increase quality of diets—particularly proteins.

U.S. tendency in thought is for quick, easy solutions such as—

1. Birth control.
2. Food from U.S. production capacity.

But the key is helping them produce their own food. This is the most important. Will take 15 years.

The world needs a 50 percent increase in grain in the next 15 years to hold the status quo.

The world needs an $80 billion capital investment—about one-third of this by foreign aid.

Agricultural Inputs Needed—All Needed at the Same Time

1. Water.
2. Seeds.
3. Fertilizer.
4. Soil practices.
5. Insecticides and pest control.
6. Management.
7. Capital investment.
8. Credit.
9. Storage facilities.
10. Roads.
11. Education.
12. Communication.

Increment of high quality protein—Possible solutions

1. Genetic changes in grains to increase proportion of amino acids.
2. Dietary supplements made from cereals, legumes, and oilseeds.
3. Improvement in oilseed processing.
4. Development of low-cost protein extract from fish.
5. Use of petroleum or sugar for protein-producing micro-organisms.
6. Manufacture of amino acids to be used as supplements to flour and other foods.

Food Aid

1. Should be geared to needs of recipients.
2. Should be international in scope and with joint efforts with other nations.
3. Should be used to build up domestic agriculture.
4. Should be used to build up storage capacity.
5. Need to export people and technology.

Human Fertility Control

"Some persons apparently believe that we should neglect public health in favor of birth control. I would contend that this is exactly opposite to the true situation. Although there are great differences between the problems of death control and birth control, a direct relationship exists between birth rates and death rates, particularly rates of infant and child mortality. In many countries, grownup children who will support their aged parents are the chief form of social security. If a man and his wife do not have at least one adult made child, they have little to look forward to when they can no longer work to support themselves. Under conditions of high child mortality, the average married couple needs to produce many children to be sufficiently certain that at least one boy will survive to become a man. Only in this way can they insure their own future security. Whenever infant and child mortality can be brought down to a low enough level, the probability in an individual family that a male child will survive becomes very much greater, and the pressure for large numbers of children correspondingly lessens. This is one of the principal reasons the profession of public health needs to be deeply involved in problems of family planning and population control."

3. Dr. Max F. Millikan, director, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Tuesday, February 15.

Why Are Agricultural Requirements Expanding?

1. Population growth. Until 1600, the rate of world growth per century was about the same as it is now each year, namely 2 to 4 percent.
2. Nutritional standards need improvement. There is considerable malnutrition and undernutrition in the two-thirds of the world which is underdeveloped.

Can the rapidly growing food requirements of the underdeveloped world be supplied by imports from the developed countries?

1. Surpluses can be helpful in the very short run, but these surpluses in the developed countries will very soon be totally inadequate to meet the requirement.
2. The bulk of the underdeveloped world must meet its own growing food requirements themselves.

Sociopolitical case for expanding agricultural production in the underdeveloped world

1. Most of the people are farmers or live in rural areas.
2. Rapid industrialization not in prospect in next couple of decades.
3. Lack of marketings for industrial goods.
4. Use of limited foreign exchange for food not good for economic development.

Discussion of recent USDA-ERS report on the performance of 26 major developing nations in agriculture—1948 to 1963

In 12 nations increase in crop input averaged over 4 percent per year.

In 21 nations crop output increased by somewhat more than the population.

In 10 nations there were increases of more than 1.5 percent per year in output per capita.

In 11 nations per capita growth rates were between zero and 1.5 percent per year.

Generally poor results were found in India, Brazil, Nigeria, Egypt, and Thailand.

Generally good results in Israel, Mexico, Sudan, Tanzania, and Taiwan.

What are prospects for increasing yields on existing land?

Prospects are good, but the question remains why yields haven't gone up in underdeveloped nations.

MIT interview and conference with agricultural experts (summer of 1964).

General finding: "We could make a reasonably good prediction as to both the diagnosis and prescription if in advance we knew the discipline in which the expert was trained." Examples: Agronomists stressed seeds; fertilizer enthusiasts suggest fertilizer; water management experts seek irrigation; economists look for economic solution, etc., etc.

Finding: Each expert was right, yet all must be working together at the same time in order to increase yields. Comparable to a "systems problem" in engineering. No single factor can be isolated and identified as the most important. Each case and each country has its own peculiar circumstances. Key shortage in most underdeveloped countries is neither capital or foreign exchange, but a shortage of managerial talent. Suggest proper approach is to increase yields dramatically in only relatively small areas * * * not spread the effort too thin.

Summary

The fact that the problem is complex does not mean that it is insoluble. Most important aspect is that all concerned be imbued with a spirit of experimentation, innovation, and the adaptation of techniques geared to special needs of individual communities.

4. Mr. John J. Haggerty, vice president and research director, Agriculture Research, Inc., Manhattan, Kans., Tuesday, February 15

The challenge that faces us is to duplicate in terms of food production within the next 35 years everything that mankind has learned and achieved since the beginning of time. The key word in this challenge is "time." We are engaged in a race against time.

Some basic questions: Do we have enough soil in the world to grow food for 6 to 7 billion people? Where is it? And what is it going to take to bring it into production?

1. There are now some 3.5 billion acres of cropland in the world. This includes all tree crops, regular fallow, and rotational pasture—about 1 acre per person today.
2. USDA and FAO estimate potentially arable land in the world (including present cropland) to be 6.6 billion acres.
3. It would be a massive task to reclaim substantial new lands. The cost would be fantastic * * * nearly a half a trillion dollars ($450 billion). Example: Aswan Dam in Egypt. It will increase agricultural land by 30 percent, at a cost of $1 billion, but population by 1980 will be up 35 percent. Thus Egypt will be running an exhaustive race just to stay in substantially the same place.
4. A brief agricultural look at the globe:

(a) Successful agriculture is concentrated in the Northern Hemisphere. (Most of the Southern Hemisphere is water.)

(b) About 70 percent of the earth's surface is water.

(c) The remaining 30 percent of the earth is land (some 33 billion acres).

(1) One-twentieth is under polar ice or tundra; (2) one-fifth is mountain chains (Rockies, Andes, Alps, Atlas, Carpathians, Caucasus, and Himalayan); (3) great land masses are in subpolar regions of Canada,

Alaska, and Russia (possible for 10 percent or 320 million acres to be potential agricultural areas); (4) one-fourth is desert (usually in 20- to 40-degree latitudes)—these include the dead heart of Australia, the Kalahari and Sahara in Africa, the Atacama and Patagonian deserts in South America, the Sonora in North America, the Arabian, the Thar of India, and the Turkestan and Gobi deserts of Asia; (5) it is possible for perhaps 20 percent (or 800 million acres) of savannah lands (between deserts and tropical rain forests) to be developed—these include the Llanos and Compos Cerrodos of South America, the Sudan and Veldt in Africa, Northern Australia, and the "monsoon savannahs" of Java, East India, Vietnam, etc.; (6) almost empty of people, the world's great remaining land resource is the tropical rain forest belt (Amazon Basin, Central America, Congo region, Indonesia, and Malaysia—this area accounts for 2.8 billion acres, with a potential 35 percent of it arable. More research is needed to develop these areas which represent three-quarters of the earth's potential new cropland.

5. Conclusion: In view of the practical problems, the conclusions is inescapable that increased food production must be obtained for the most part by enhancing the productivity of soil already under cultivation.

A campaign to maximize world food production must be undertaken without delay if a common human disaster is not to overtake us all * * * if it is not, indeed, already too late, at least for some countries and some peoples.

An essential precondition for food aid would seem to be that each country adopt policies to assure economic growth in the shortest possible time. In addition to food, America has an enormous contribution to make in "know-how—show-how" to increase production.

5. Dr. George Harrar, president, Rockefeller Foundation, Wednesday, February 16

The rapidly widening imbalance between world population increase and food production is a worsening situation that can become catastrophic for mankind.

These remarks concentrate on the difficulties involved in producing vastly greater quantities of food and then distributing it to every-growing numbers of people.

1. It is unrealistic to believe that there will be a solution through technological breakthrough. (Example: Micro-organisms, petrochemicals, farming from the seas, etc.).

2. World food output must go up 5 percent per year to keep up with population and begin to correct the present deficit.

3. The donation of food by developed nations, while humanitarian, is not enough and ultimately, without self-help, would result in a common economic denominator for all. The only workable plan requires the mobilization of knowledge, methods, materials, and technology, in a consortium of effort to bring about improvements in all aspects of agricultural technology in underdeveloped nations.

4. Many problems exist in underdeveloped nations, and it is a simpler matter to suggest a solution. Unfortunately, implementation of these generalizations is seriously complex. The first requirement is an understanding of the problem among the hungry nations.

5. Recommendations:

(a) Emphasize and reinforce agricultural research, education, and extension.

(b) Provide supervised credit.

(c) Develop transportation and marketing facilities.

(d) Make available vastly increased quantities of inorganic fertilizers and pesticides.

(e) Consider other factors of agricultural planning.

(f) Emphasize self-help. There are not enough funds anywhere for indefinite assistance through donation.

Summary

In the last analysis, success in correcting this undesirable and ominous situation depends on the degree to which outside help from the advantaged nations and self-help combine to bring agriculture everywhere into a state of increasing production, with emphasis on both the quality and the quantity of the product. If, simultaneously, significant progress is made toward stabilization of populations, then the future will be brighter.

6. Dr. F. F. Hill, consultant and former vice president, the Ford Foundation, Wednesday, February 16

This statement starts from the premise that future increases in population are going to be such that the United States, even with the help of other food-surplus countries, cannot possibly close the gap between the prospective food needs of the developing countries and the amount of food they are currently producing.

Importance of Increased Output Per Acre

It is critically important to increase output per acre of food crops in the developing countries. Nearly half the world's population live in developing countries, such as India and Pakistan, in which almost all of the land suitable for cultivation is already in use. These countries must look to increased yields per acre and to multiple cropping (where possible) for most of the additions to their food supplies.

Three Basic Requirements for Increased Yields

1. Constantly improving methods of technology.

2. Ready access in all farming areas to improved seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, and other production inputs.

3. Profitable prices for farm products to stimulate production.

Discussion

1. Improve technology:

Governments of developing countries and technical assistance agencies, with a few notable exceptions, have been slow to recognize that high-level adaptive research, systematically carried on in the developing countries themselves, is essential if these countries are to achieve substantial, sustained, and reasonably rapid increases in food production. It should be emphasized that the job to be done is one of developing and testing for local suitability, combinations of improved practices that together are capable of producing substantially increased yields. It is varieties with high yield potential and appropriate applications of fertilizer and good plant protection and improved soil and water management, etc., that pay off.

"Many of us in the technical assistance business have relied much too heavily upon the notion that it is both possible and relatively easy to transfer American agricultural technology and know-how to developing countries as a means of quickly solving their food production problems. Transfers of improved production technology from one country to another, directly or with adaptive modifications, are both possible and important. But such transfers are not easy, and they take time."

Research is very important; progress in developing improved production technology in less-developed countries is being made, but it is not being made fast enough. What is needed is a mobilization of domestic and foreign resources, including that scarcest of items, first class research personnel; provision for adequate research facilities; and provision for adequate operating budgets and sufficient budgetary flexibility to enable research staffs to get on with their assignments.

2. Agricultural inputs—fertilizers, seeds, and pesticides, etc.: Developing countries have been slow to use fertilizers. The same is true of pesticides and other agricultural inputs. This must change.

3. Profitable farm prices: "Lastly, governments in many less-developed countries have been slow to recognize the importance of incentives to increased production. Farmers are sometimes said to be unprogressive, bound by custom or tradition, or unable to recognize their own best interests when they fail to adopt the production practices recommended to them. A large percentage of the farmers in many developing countries cannot read and write. But I have yet to meet one who cannot figure where his personal interests are concerned."

Summary

The emphasis placed in this statement on the need for (1) substantially improved production technology; (2) for adequate supplies and ready availability of improved seeds, fertilizers, pesticides equipment, and other production inputs; and (3) for price incentives for increased production is not intended to suggest that these are the only steps necessary to enable developing countries to achieve yields comparable to those of developed countries. It represents essential first steps without which other measures are likely to prove ineffective. These steps have not been sufficiently emphasized in the past in most of the assistance programs to help developing countries increase food production.

7. Dr. Don Paarlberg, professor of economics, Purdue University; coordinator of the food-for-peace program, 1960–61; Thursday, February 17

This statement first reviews briefly the factual situation in regard to world food supplies and world population and then concentrates on the interpretation of these facts.

The world food problem is no new thing, though it takes on new forms and responds to new influences. Throughout history, unbeknown to most American people, a considerable share of the earth's inhabitants have lived on the borderline of want. Thomas R. Malthus wrote, 168 years ago, that the population tends to outrun the food supply. This is a very old and a very great problem, properly arousing our compassion.

Clearly, the food situation is now very difficult in India and in a number of other countries. Our help there is constructive and welcome. The world picture, however, is far better than one might think from reading the headlines. Consider these facts:

1. During the past 20 years, agriculture around the world has generally kept ahead of the population explosion, so that the average person in the less-developed countries, though still poorly nourished, now eats better than his father did.

2. There has been no major famine in the world during these postwar years. There is no known previous time period of equal length of which this could truthfully be said.

3. Prices of agricultural products have been declining in world markets, having fallen about 9 percent since November of 1963. This is hardly an indication of a serious general deterioration in world food surplus.

4. Per capita real incomes have risen in almost all of the countries of the world.

To treat the present and prospective situation as a crisis is both too alarming and too reassuring. It is too alarming because, measured objectively, the situation is better than it has been. It is too reassuring because to consider it a crisis infers that some sudden act could solve the problem. The problem calls not for short-run dramatics but for compassion and prudence, wisely blended and of long-run nature.

The relationship between people and their food supply is highly complex and poorly understood. Several myths have arisen. These are as follows:

1. The myth that the needy countries want all the free food they can get.

One would think that a country with hunger and malnutrition would gladly take all the free food that would be made available. To the amazement of many people, this is not so.

2. The myths about American food supplies.

American capacity to supply food under our special export programs is surrounded by two conflicting myths: one, that if we wished to do so we could feed the world; the other, that we find ourselves helpless because our surpluses are gone. Neither of these is correct.

3. The myth that technical assistance to foreign agriculture will hurt American farm exports.

There is a deep-seated belief that if we help the less-developed countries with their agricultural production, we will reduce exports of American farm products. There are no doubt individual cases in which this is true. But the great weight of experience is to the contrary. Consider these facts:

(a) From the beginning of U.S. agricultural assistance under point 4 in 1948 to 1965, commercial agricultural exports for dollars increased from $2.0 billion to $4.6 billion.

(b) Our best commercial export markets for agricultural products are those countries whose agriculture is the most advanced—Canada, Western Europe, and Japan.

(c) A number of countries to which we have given both technical assistance in agriculture and food for peace have graduated from the food-for-peace group and are now taking American farm products for dollars. Among them are Japan, Italy, and Greece.

Three recommendations

1. Public Law 480 should be altered to authorize the procurement, in the market as well as from Government stocks, of the agricultural products and production goods needed in the food-for-peace program. The entire program should be changed, as Congress has already changed it for dairy products, from a surplus disposal operation to an effort intended to meet the needs of our foreign economic policy.

2. The technical assistance part of our overseas agricultural programs should be greatly expanded, so as to help these people help themselves.

3. When we supply short-term food assistance and long-term technical assistance, we also require of the receiving nations that they commit an increased amount of their own resources to improving their agriculture. While much effort of this kind is already being expended, the magnitude of this effort should be greatly increased, and we should use our position as suppliers of food and technical assistance to help bring it about.

Summary

Of all the things the Committee on Agriculture might do, no other action would better meet the prospective world food situation than to use wisely, in the mutual interest of ourselves and our friends abroad, the agricultural capability we possess. In part this consists of food presently in government stocks. In part it consists of food which might be procured in the market or food which might be grown. It also consists of fertilizer, insecticides, and other production items which might be purchased and made available. Above all, it consists of American knowledge, American institutions, and American technicians—our most useful agricultural resources.

8. Dr. W. Henry Sebrell, Jr., professor, public health and nutrition, and director, Institute of Nutrition Science, Columbia University, Thursday, February 17

Magnitude of the Problem

The problem which your committee is considering is much more serious than most people realize. It constitutes a major crisis which is already upon us and which is going to continue for many years to come. Actual famine is already here in some parts of the world, as indicated by the current food crisis in South India, and we are faced with the prospect that famine almost certainly is going to appear in other parts of the world, even in our own hemisphere within the next 10 to 20 years. We are engaged in a race between the increase in the world's population and the increase in food production. As of today, we are losing the race. The famine in South India, which is attributed largely to the drought, is one which would have occurred anyhow in the next few years. The drought merely brought it on a little earlier by causing an unexpected decrease in the amount of rice available at the fixed government price. The rapidity with which the population is increasing will create a similar shortage in the next few years in other areas without the assistance of a drought.

World Population Growth

Although it took all of human history up to about the year 1850 to produce a world population of 1 billion people, it took only 75 years to produce the second billion, 35 years to produce the third billion and at the present rate of growth, it will take only 15 years to produce the fourth and then only 10 years to produce the fifth billion. Furthermore, the population of Latin America is growing even faster than the world rate and is actually the most rapidly growing major area in the world. Its population is increasing about one and a half times faster than the rest of the world.

Malnutrition grows because of—

1. Population increases.

2. Movement of large numbers of people to cities.

3. Transportation problems in getting food to cities.

The tragic result of lower per capita food supply in the future will not be mass famine or obvious starvation but instead a rise in the death rate, especially in children.

Some basic facts about human nutrition

1. The human body must have a supply of energy (measured in calories). The source for this energy is carbohydrates and fats.

2. Proteins (made up of eight amino acids) are essential for growth of human tissue. If any of the eight amino acids is missing, the body does not function properly. The lack of protein does not produce hunger pains nor the drive to secure food that occurs in starvation, but its lack can cause a weak, undernourished and underdeveloped population.

3. Vitamins and minerals are also necessary. Iron-deficiency anemia, for example, is a worldwide problem.

Therefore, it is not enough to look at the world's food deficit only in terms of calories available per capita. There are many problems in combating malnutrition and lack of protein.

1. Local food habits: The present situation in south India is an example. Protein calorie malnutrition is widespread and serious in the state of Kerala. It is resulting in the death of large numbers of children there. Yet Kerala has a long seacoast and there is a large seafood industry. This seafood is a rich source of good protein and if fed to these children, would cure or prevent the malnutrition. However, the shrimp and lobster tails are frozen for export. Many are shipped to New York. This income is used to purchase rice. Since rice is now in short supply, the fisherman needs more money to buy rice at black market prices in order to meet his energy requirements and is, therefore, under more pressure than ever not to feed the seafood to his family.

2. Lack of trained personnel capable of recognizing the problem and who can appreciate the difficulties and the scope of the solution.

3. Problems of ignorance and low market prices of farm commodities in underdeveloped nations.

4. Inadequate governmental and public health nutrition programs which have often neglected the food industry in their planning.

Summary

We cannot possibly meet the urgent world food deficit by increased production in the United States alone. The demand for food in developing countries is steadily increasing at a rate which indicates now that we cannot possibly meet the demand 20 years hence. It is courting disaster to increase the dependence of the developing countries on food imports from the United States instead of building up their own agriculture to meet their food requirements.

Long-range programs for permanent improvement must be considered in relation to the development of entire communities. They must consider the motivations, the wishes and the economic limitations of the population concerned. Nutrition must be part of a program involving the total welfare and development of the community.

The United States leads the world in the ability to produce food, in advanced food technology and in our knowledge of nutrition and its relation to health. We have an obligation and an opportunity to show the rest of the world how this knowledge and ability can be used to raise the health and economic status of other countries so that the productivity and dignity of their people can be maintained. Failure to meet the challenge will exact an intolerable price in human suffering and degradation.

9. Dr. Raymond Ewell, Vice President for Research, State University of New York at Buffalo, Friday, February 18.

Scope of the Problem

The world food problem is of such massive proportions and of such complexity that it is difficult to grasp it until one has observed it and studied it over a period of years. Moreover, it is almost impossible to understand this problem unless one has spent at least some time in Asia, where poverty and undernutrition reach their greatest depths.

In 1980, some 15 years from now, world population will probably increase by 1.2 billion people, from 3.4 billion to 4.6 billion. By the year 2030, world population will reach 14 billion if present trends continue. Most of the increase will be in Asia, Africa, and South America.

An acute disparity between food and population will grow in underdeveloped nations during the next 15 years. In 1980 India's population will probably increase from nearly 500 million to 700 million * * * an increase of 200 million. If these trends continue, mass starvation will inevitably result on a scale never before experienced.

Impact Upon U.S. Foreign Policy

1. During the past 20 years there have been two major forces that have shaped American foreign policy, namely, communism and the nuclear arms race. Practically all of our foreign policies and actions have been determined by these two major forces. But the food/population problem is now rising as a third major force—and it may be the most powerful of these major forces.

2. Mass starvation in Asia, Africa, and Latin America will probably develop into a force majeure or major force in the next few years. A force majeure is a force of such magnitude that it forces a government, or an individual, to make decisions and take actions that they do not want to take. In other words, it reduces the number of rational alternatives open to a government.

3. The political and economic consequences of widespread famine in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are certain to be massive and far reaching. It seems unlikely

that stable governments can be maintained in countries where a large part of the pop-

This is the biggest, most fundamental and most nearly insoluble problem that has ever confronted the human race. The problem is massive and therefore programs to solve it will have to be massive if they are to have any chance of succeeding.

What is the answer? What is the solution? There are obviously two approaches:

1. Reduce the population growth rate, which means reducing the birth rate,

2. Increase agricultural production.

Birth control alone can't do the job. And improved agriculture alone can't do the job. Both approaches will have to be used—and used on a massive scale. In the short-term of the next 10 to 15 years, birth control cannot have a really major impact. Therefore, improved agriculture will have to be the principal solution to the food/population problem during the next 10 to 15 years. Birth rates will probably drop significantly during this period, but not enough to have a major effect on the need for food and other agricultural products. However, after 1980 or 1985, birth control will have to become the major factor since improvement of agriculture cannot keep up with the growth of population beyond that time, no matter how optimistic one is about improving agriculture.

Five specific suggestions

1. Step up shipments of food under the food-for-peace program. The immediate crisis in India will have to be met this way. Probably other food crises will have to be met this way during the next decade.

But the United States can't expect to make up the food deficits of Asia, Africa, and Latin America indefinitely.

2. Send fertilizer and other agricultural inputs to food-deficit countries.

3. Help food-deficit countries to produce their own agricultural inputs.

This means helping food-deficit countries to build factories to produce fertilizers, pesticides, and farm equipment, as well as to develop and produce improved seed varieties themselves.

4. Supply technical manpower. All these efforts toward agricultural improvement would take a lot of technical manpower besides money and materials. The countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America could use effectively 5,000–10,000 agricultural specialists. This compares with less than 1,000 such specialists at present in all the developing countries from all the advanced countries.

5. Step up research on agriculture in the food-deficit countries. This means more research on agriculture in the tropics. It has been estimated that of all the money ever spent on agricultural research, 95 percent has been spent on temperate zone agriculture and less than 5 percent on tropical agriculture.

10. Dr. Theodore W. Schultz, professor of economics, University of Chicago, Friday, February 18

This statement concentrates on particular policy choices in the area where food is yoked to population and agriculture.

1. In the realm of population, the winds of public understanding supported by new birth control knowledge have taken a favorable turn.

2. In agriculture, also, there is now underway in many of the less developed countries a marked change for the better to improve the technical and economic possibilities for agriculture production.

Necessary Distinctions

To see the policy issues clearly, it will be necessary to untangle the following factors:

1. We must distinguish between the losses in agricultural production that have been caused by bad monsoons in India (also reaching into Pakistan) and what would otherwise be normal agricultural production in India.

2. We must also distinguish between food aid as an additional resource contributing to their economic growth and the tendency that it has of weakening the economic incentives for agricultural production in the countries receiving such aid.

3. In our efforts to help these less developed countries modernize their agriculture, a sharp distinction must be drawn between aid in the form of food and aid to provide fertilizer, farm machinery and equipment including funds for agricultural research, extension, and schooling.

4. In the area of population we must distinguish between the awesome 20- to 30-year population projections, which seem to make it appear that any and all efforts will be futile, and the favorable possibilities of reducing appreciably the very high birth rates during the next 10 years, in view of the willingness of many of the governments in these countries to act, the revealed preference of many parents in these countries to reduce the rate of births to adjust to the marked decline in death rates, and the new, much better and cheaper birth control techniques now available.

5. We must distinguish between old types of agricultural surpluses that were in large part a consequence of past farm price policies, and the newly revealed comparative advantages that our agriculture has in production.

On Population

1. Consider, first, the changes that have occurred in our public attitudes and social behavior. There has been dramatic progress during the past decade which enlarges greatly the opportunities in what can be accomplished during the next decade.

2. Abroad, too, in many of the less developed countries there has been progress on this score. But it is obviously much more difficult for them.

Proposal: I propose that at least a small part of the real resources that are henceforth made available to the less developed countries in the form of food aid be earmarked by them for public and private programs in family planning complemented with modern birth control techniques.

On Agriculture in Less Developed Countries

In this area, Congress should not again make the public policy mistakes of the past.

1. One mistake has been to invoke restrictions to keep underdeveloped countries from increasing their production of so-called competitive crops, thus weakening efforts to modernize their agriculture.

2. Other mistakes of the past, some of which are now being rectified are:

(a) The post-war dogma so widespread among the less developed countries that modern economic growth is dependent wholly upon industrialization. With a few notable exceptions, agriculture has been neglected and often exploited as a consequence. There is now underway a strong tendency to correct the economic neglect of agriculture.

(b) Until recently, U.S. missions in these less developed countries, with few exceptions, also were bitten by the industrialization bug which made them either indifferent or antagonistic to agricultural development. But this particular policy bias has been corrected.

(c) There can no longer be any room for doubt that the large deficiencies in food in parts of Asia cannot be permanently satisfied except by large increases in agricultural production in these countries along with a marked reduction in population growth. Vast quantities of free food from abroad can at best only serve particular transitory objectives.

(d) Although we have developed an outstandingly productive agriculture in the United States, we have not done well as builders of agriculture abroad. We have long been hampered by the extension bias and as a consequence agricultural research has been postponed, put off, and grossly neglected. When research has been undertaken, altogether too little attention has been given to the development of viable agricultural research centers.

On Agriculture in the United States

The basic question is: Should our Government mobilize U.S. agriculture during the next 5 years to provide large additional quantities of food to alleviate hunger in the world?

From a humanitarian point of view the answer would appear to be in the affirmative. Also, the self-interest view of some agricultural group would support a strong affirmative answer. Ample funds could be made available to do so. Why then the quandry?

The answer depends on how long a view we take. (The situation in India is cited as an example.)

Summary

Agricultural policy should be reshaped to guide U.S. agriculture toward its economic strength and away from products in which it is competitively weak. There is no doubt that U.S. agriculture has a real comparative advantage in producing soybeans, in responding to the rapidly increasing domestic and world demands for the type of high quality proteins provided by soybeans. The world demands for feed grains is also increasing rapidly, and in this area, too, we have a considerable comparative advantage. But with respect to food grains—wheat and rice—looking beyond the present food emergency, exemplified by circumstances in India, the increases in world demand are likely to be at a relatively low rate. Thus in taking a 5-year view, we should in general guide U.S. agriculture toward relatively more production of protein foods both in crops and in animal products.

DEATH OF CHARLES C. CARLIN, JR.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Washington area and the journalistic community was saddened last week upon the news of the death of Charles C. Carlin, Jr., editor of the Alexandria Gazette. Mr. Carlin had been in ill health for a number of years.

Mr. Carlin had been associated with the Alexandria Gazette for 44 years. He took over the newspaper in 1922 from his father, a former Member of Congress who had acquired the paper in 1911. Mr. Carlin was also active in the affairs of another northern Virginia newspaper. When he purchased it, the paper was known as the Arlington Sun, and now it is published by other interests and is known as the Northern Virginia Sun.

This courageous man sought the Democratic nomination for Congress in 1952, the year in which the 10th Congressional District was created. Even though he lost the race, he was widely respected for the kind of contest he ran.

He was an active member of the Washington Street Methodist Church and had an ironbound policy that the Gazette would not accept advertisements for alcoholic beverages.

Mr. Carlin was born in Alexandria in 1900 and was admitted to the Virginia State Bar in 1923, a year before his graduation from the University of Virginia. Besides his wife, he leaves two children by his second marriage and two children by a former marriage.

Mr. Carlin was a man of splendid character and integrity, and an able newspaperman. He did not hesitate to follow a course he thought to be right. We are all the poorer now that he is no longer among us.

A DECLARATION OF THE NATIONAL INTER-RELIGIOUS CONFERENCE ON PEACE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on March 15, 16, and 17, the National Inter-Religious Conference on Peace met in Washington to give new force to the search for peace. Distinguished representatives of the major religious groups of the Nation assembled to find ways in which spiritual insights could be brought more effectively to bear on the problems of peace and war. Constructive and worthwhile initiatives were generated by this important conference.

I ask unanimous consent that the declaration of the conference be printed at this point in the Record together with a partial list of the officers and sponsors of the conference.

There being no objection, the declaration and list were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Declaration of the National Inter-Religious Conference on Peace[1]

The National Inter-Religious Conference on Peace, assembled in Washington, D.C., is testimony to a shared conviction that different religious traditions are mutually supportive in their efforts to help people find solutions to the issues of war and peace. This conference speaks for itself. It addresses this declaration to organized religion everywhere as well as to the general community and our Government.

THE RELIGIOUS AND MORAL IMPERATIVES

Foremost is our concern that much of the discussion involving our Nation's posture on foreign policy and especially on the war in Vietnam has taken place without serious probing of the religious and moral issues involved. Members of the religious community too often seem to accept the world's belief that naked power reacting to threat, real or imagined, is all that really counts in the modern world. Our religious profession, however, does obligate us to proclaim the moral and religious dimensions in all relationships between all peoples and governments. We are called to repentance, forgiveness, and compassion, to faith and hope, to working for justice, to love against hate, to the task of peacebuilding rather than warmaking. We recognize the claims of God and His covenants with men in fulfilling His purposes in history. We cannot leave to soldiers and statesmen alone the great problems of conscience being raised in these days of conflict.

THE CONFERENCE GENERAL AREAS OF CONCERN

Our discussions involved first, confronting the changing Communist world. Changes in today's world may be seen, in part, as manifestations of divine judgment to which we of the religious communities are challenged to respond in new ways. Our task is to press for peaceful solutions of conflicts between the United States and Communist governments that will respect the legitimate national interests of all parties. We believe our unique contribution can be expressed through personal contacts and intensive dialogue across ideological lines in order to break through the barriers which now prevent us from perceiving as, and communicating with fellow human beings who live under social and political systems different from our own.

Secondly, in discussing the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the conflict in Asia, we agreed that statements of the declared policies of the PRC, the United States and all other concerned parties should be carefully examined and evaluated against actual practice. Recognition of this divergence between declared and the actual policies could lead to changes that might reduce enmity between the United States and China. The specific changes in policy which the Conference has recommended include several unilateral initiatives that need not require agreement from the Chinese or endanger legitimate interests of the United States or the security of those nations and peoples who rely on the United States.

We explored, thirdly, the forms of intervention in terms of moral responsibilities and limitations. All acts of nations having effects on the internal affairs of other states must be scrutinized carefully against a background of moral and religious judgment. When particular acts involve military force with drastic consequences for the people of the affected nation searching questions should be raised and answered concerning the possibility of substituting for unilateral intervention, United Nations or other international action. Furthermore, the claims of human beings, whether allies, foes or neutrals, as children of God must be a major factor in any moral assessment of available policy alternatives.

A STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

We, the members of this National Inter-Religious Conference on Peace, ever mindful of the important formal statements on the war in Vietnam which have been made separately and recently by Pope Paul, by the Synagogue Council of America, by the National Council of Churches, by the World Council of Churches, and by other official groups; deeply concerned by the continuing and increasingly tragic consequences of that war; keenly sensitive to the moral issues involved in this entire sad situation, and especially in the consequential taking of many lives of innocent civilians; fully aware that the matter is complex and intense and solutions are not easy, do request and authorize the cochairmen of this conference to ask a number of other major leaders of American religious bodies to join with them and together to seek a personal conference with the President at the White House for the purpose of respectfully urging upon the President that he: (1) consider respectfully an immediate halt to the bombing in Vietnam; (2) announce the readiness of the United States to join in a cease fire of indefinite duration, beginning Good Friday, 1966, with no continuation of the buildup on either side; (3) pursue every possible avenue, including channels of the United Nations, that may create more favorable circumstances under which negotiations can begin; (4) adhere steadfastly to the principle that there cannot be a satisfactory military solution to this problem, and until a negotiated settlement is achieved, not to permit a change in the character of the conflict through military escalation; (5) agree to the direct representation of the National Liberation Front as well as the other concerned parties in any negotiations; (6) maintain a determination to promote social and economic change and progress in South Vietnam and to provide the people of that land an opportunity at an early date to choose their own government; (7) continue providing reconstruction assistance and long-range economic development funds for southeast Asia; and (8) direct that high priority be placed in Vietnam upon patient, persistent peace-building programs, to overcome the dehumanizing and brutalizing effect, especially upon youth, of the 20-year war.

We do further state expressly that we have confidence that this delegation of religious leaders will make their presentation to the President with a thoughtful and understanding knowledge of the conflicting advice and pressures to which he is ever subject and of the awesome responsibility and heavy burden which he now carries in the White House. For him and all sharing his onerous responsibilities, we pledge our prayers.

We further suggest that most congressional leaders would welcome similar conversations and representations in which the delegates here bring to bear the thinking and moral guidance which legislators need in groping with the problems of maintaining the peace of the world.

A PROPOSAL FOR CONTINUING CONFERENCE

We ask the cochairmen of this conference to continue the National Inter-Religious Conference on Peace Committee and to explore the possibilities for calling a World Inter-Religious Conference on Peace in 1967, encompassing participation of all the world's religious traditions.

We request the Synagogue Council of America, the National Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and other religious bodies jointly to join us in our call for a National Conference on Religion and Peace, along the lines of the earlier National Conference on Religion and Race.

We urge all religious, interreligious, and community groups to intensify their work for peace. We recommend regional and local interreligious conferences.

We commend the findings of this conference to the national religious organizations and to local membership of all religious bodies for study and—hopefully—guidance.

We urge all to pray, with us, for clarity of mind, integrity of spirit, and a deepening interreligious fellowship, such as we have found together here that, under God, we may be guided through a night of our own making to a day when men shall know and love one another as God's children.

National Inter-Religious Conference on Peace

Cochairmen: Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, Rt. Rev. John E. Hines, Archbishop Iakovos, Bishop John Wesley Lord, Most Rev. John J. Wright.

Secretary-treasurer: Msgr. Edward G. Murray.

Sponsors (partial list): Dr. Harold A. Bosley, Dr. Andrew W. Cordier, Bishop Daniel Corrigan, Bishop William Crittenden, Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, Prof. Robert Gordis, Rabbi Morris Lieberman, Dr. Albert J. Penner, Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, Rev. Harry Scholefield, Sister M. Thomasine, Rabbi Jacob Weinstein.

Executive committee: Rabbi Jacob B. Agus, Dr. Norman Baugher, Mrs. John C. Bennett, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Miss Jane Evans, Dr. Robert Fangmeier, Mr. Alfred Hassler, Dr. Arthur N. Holcombe, Msgr. Francis J. Lally, Mr. Stewart Meacham, Dr. Paul Peachey, Rabbi Michael A. Robinson, Dr. W. Harold Row, Dr. Howard Schomer, Gov. Harold Stassen.

Secretariat: Rabbi Balfour Brickner, Rev. Leonidas C. Contos, Rev. Clifford Earle, Rev. John H. Eberly, Mr. James Finn, Dr. Alan F. Geyer, Rev. Herschel Halbert, Dr. Homer A. Jack, Mr. Herman Will, Jr., Dr. E. Raymond Wilson.

Administrative secretary: Mrs. Kay Shannon.

---

[1] Approved by the final plenary session of the National Inter-Religious Conference on Peace, Mar. 17, 1966.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY'S WORLD-WIDE CAMPUS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, one of the amazing developments which has taken place in higher education during the last two decades has been the great increase in participation by American colleges and universities in learned activities throughout the world. Under the sponsorship of private foundations, corporations and Government agencies, or through their own resources, many institutions, both large and small, have assumed major roles in international education. Faculty members, students, administrators and other research scholars have gone abroad in ever-increasing numbers, studying, investigating, and assisting foreign schools in nations throughout the world. At the same time thousands of students from other lands have flocked to our colleges and universities for training in a wide variety of disciplines.

One of the leaders in international education has been Indiana University. Under the guidance of Chancellor Herman Wells, who served as president of the university from 1937 to 1962, Indiana's foreign study, research, and educational assistance programs reach every continent and encompass great diversity in subject matter and relationships, and more than 1,000 students from foreign countries are enrolled at the Bloomington campus. The Louisville Courier-Journal on February 27 published an excellent account of these farflung educational activities of Indiana University. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Feb. 27, 1966]

Indiana University Campus Stretches Around the World—Farflung Activities of Students, Faculty Reflect Its Spreading International Scope

(By Gordon Englehart)

Bloomington, Ind.—Hoosiers who fret that Indiana University has grown too big "on the banks of Jordan River" may be startled to learn how farflung the university really is.

Indiana University students—up to 200 a year—are poring over books in universities along the Elbe River in Germany, the Manzares in Spain, the Rhine in Germany, the Reno in Italy, and the Lower Rimac in Peru.

Indiana University faculty members are directing Government or Ford Foundation projects near the Indus River in West Pakistan, the Rio Negro in Uruguay, the Orinoco in Venezuela, the Ganges-Brahmaputra in East Pakistan, and the Chao Phraya in Thailand.

Other Indiana University faculty members—at least 70 this year—are studying, teaching, or doing research close by famous rivers all over the world, including the Naktong in Korea.

It's a two-way street. Some 1,000 students from countries around the globe are enrolled every year at Indiana University.

Lynne L. Merritt, Jr., vice president for research and dean of advanced studies, stood last week beside an enormous world map on his office wall.

PINS ON THE MAP

Here, there, everywhere, in every continent, were stuck tiny flags and pins with colored heads—denoting places where Indiana University people are at study and work.

"This is an international university now, in a way, in part," said the towering Merritt, drawing slowly on a cigar.

"I've been here 24 years, and when I look back, the university has really changed. We had few students from abroad. There were a few foreign faculty members, but not many."

The change, Merritt said, "is due almost entirely to Wells (Chancellor Herman B. Wells, who served as president from 1937 to 1962).

"Wells is a remarkable person. What I suspect is, he started out early to make Indiana University a major institution. He did it by going around and picking up the best professors, some experts on various areas, some of them natives from these countries.

"He would meet outstanding students abroad, and pretty soon they'd show up at Indiana University, saying they had met Wells one place or another."

Out of all this grew Indiana University's present major programs for training and research in African, Asian, Latin American, Russian and East European, and Uralic-Altaic studies.

"It's been a very gradual evolution," Merritt said.

The Latin American program is typical. To start with, Spanish and Portuguese were taught. These courses in turn "tended to create a few courses in culture" and—finally—a comprehensive area-studies program.

Today, a student is offered a wide choice of courses dealing with races, geography, history, social problems, folklore, and literature of all Latin American nations. The other area programs cover the same fields.

WAR SPEEDED PROCESS

World War II helped speed up the internationalizing process. Indiana University during the war was called on by the Army to train people in "critical languages."

"At the end of the war, there was a big spurt in special languages," Merritt said. "Then, about 1954, the AID (U.S. Agency for International Development) and the foundations started coming in with overseas contracts."

Under such contracts, the AID or the Ford or other foundations pay the costs of Indiana University people carrying out specific projects all over the world.

In Thailand, for instance, Indiana University personnel spent 8 years setting up an institute for training teachers, and 9 years establishing an institute for training public administrators. That project has since been expanded to cover business administration, statistics, and economic development.

One result Merritt noted proudly, "We probably have more alumni in Thailand than any other university in the world."

Among many "contract" jobs over the years: training medical school teachers in West Pakistan; training clerks, typists, and secretaries in Indonesia; training nurses in Korea; audiovisual instruction for Africans.

Indiana University today is administering eight contracts:

Starting an institute of education and research in West Pakistan.

Training vocational-education teachers at the University del Trabajo in Uruguay.

Teaching audiovisual techniques in Nigeria.

Observing a Peace Corps project in Sierra Leone. Peace Corps men have trained at Indiana University.

Upgrading the economics department of Catholic University of Caracas, Venezuela.

Upgrading business methods of the National University of San Marcos, Peru.

Setting up an institute of business administration at the University of Dacca, East Pakistan.

The continuing Thailand project.

Indiana University's international-studies program got a tremendous boost in 1961 from a $2.8 million grant by the Ford Foundation. And this year, Ford threw in $3 million more.

FOUR UNIVERSITIES JOIN

Ford in 1964 also made a $3.5 million grant to the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA), composed of Indiana University, Wisconsin, Michigan State, and Illinois.

With this money, the four universities are joining in various projects, in Nigeria, Peru, Thailand, Okinawa, and other countries, and are "sweetening" related research by their own graduate students.

Indiana University also has joined six other universities in another consortium to help develop sciences at Mindanao State University in the Philippines. This, too, is Ford financed.

In 1959, Indiana University opened a study center for Indiana University students at the University of San Marcos in Lima, Peru.

Last September, along with Purdue University, it opened similar centers at universities in Hamburg, Germany; Madrid, Spain, and Strasbourg, France. By itself it opened another at the university in Bologna, Italy.

About 30 students each are enrolled at Lima, Hamburg, Madrid and Strasbourg and nine at Bologna.

Every student is proficient in the language of that country. Most are language and literature majors, but Indiana University is trying to interest students in other major fields. One Indiana University or Purdue faculty member oversees each center.

By last May, the internationally oriented programs at Indiana University had grown so rapidly and in such profusion that the board of trustees established an International Affairs Center to coordinate them all.

TRAINING FOR FACULTY

The center, directed by Robert F. Byrnes, not only rides herd on the campus programs, the overseas contracts, the foreign college study centers, and folklore, international business and international development research programs.

It also has charge of student and faculty exchanges with other schools, the summer honors program for high school students who are sent to Mexico, France and Germany, and a "nonwestern studies project" which provides training for faculty members from 34 Indiana colleges. And there are other programs.

Why this great reaching out by a landlocked State university in a State that has long been viewed—rightly or wrongly—as insular and isolationist?

"It's just a matter of living in a modern world," Merritt said simply.

"Back in the 1800's, a person in Indiana didn't expect to go abroad; he didn't expect to see someone from abroad; this country itself didn't have much to do with foreign countries.

"Nowadays you have to know what's happening abroad. It's a proper part of student training."

The university, Merritt said, has teaching, research, and service obligations "to the State, the country and the world."

"Contracts abroad are part of our service obligations, not just to the State and the world, but to the United States. The United States, for instance, has an interest in seeing that Thailand remains free. And this is tied up with its economic development.

"Universities are the only places that can carry out some of the contracts sponsored by the AID. Many involve establishing or bettering educational systems abroad."

The university has benefited, Merritt added, through a faculty that has become much more knowledgeable and experienced.

Another boon is a larger faculty. Professors on overseas contracts are paid by the AID or the foundation. State money that had been provided for their salaries is used to hire replacements on the campus.

REPLACEMENTS RETAINED

When the contract professors return in a couple of years, they are absorbed back onto the State payroll, while the replacements are retained.

Merritt said this practice is justified because of normal growth of the university and its departments.

Sometimes a topnotch man is hired away from another university specifically to take on an overseas contract. When that's finished, he returns to Indiana University.

Earlier this month, the Indiana University international program drew high praise in a 300-page report by Education and World Affairs, a private, nonprofit organization that studied Indiana University, Cornell, Michigan State, Stanford, Tulane, and Wisconsin.

The report said there's no ready explanation "why this small frontier college should grow into a university with a worldwide reputation and strong international commitments."

But it suggested that it "is attributable to the interplay of three elements:

"The individual enthusiasm on the part of faculty members; the backing of the administration, especially the internationalizing influence of Chancellor Wells, and the resulting climate on the campus, which helped stimulate more and more international involvement."

Whatever the reasons, Merritt obviously enjoyed telling about a recent trip he took through Africa with some fellow MUCIA representatives.

"No matter where we go, way out in the bush, we always run into a graduate of Indiana University," Merritt quoted one of his companions as saying.

SENATOR HARTKE CALLS FOR UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO MEET ON VIETNAM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, much has been said, and needs to be said, concerning the American position in southeast Asia, and particularly in Vietnam. The singular fact remains that we are pursuing a unilateral course to all intents, without benefit of real or promised troop support in the field by the majority of our free world allies. On Saturday, March 26, in Indianapolis, Ind., during the course of a speech that covered many topics, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] made a suggestion of value which I should like to bring to the attention of Congress. The Senator suggested that a special session of the General Assembly be requested by the United States so that other free world nations may shoulder with us the obligation to stop Communist aggression.

I ask unanimous consent to have this portion of his remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANCE HARTKE, OF INDIANA

A cloud hangs over our beloved country * * * as our manpower and our national resources are channeled into a war whose ending is not yet in sight.

Much as I regret that American youths are in a body-to-body confrontation with Asians, the fact remains that they are there.

We are locked in a battle that we can and will win. But I do not want this to become a major war, a world war or a nuclear war in the process.

If this world is plunged into the holocaust of thermonuclear war, we here tonight need never again be concerned about another election * * * or anything else.

By encouraging Senate debate and open hearings, I helped to open a window to let in some fresh air, by inviting public opinion to sit at our policy table, by urging free and open discussions within bounds of national security, so that more Americans may understand what led us into our present entaglements.

A survey of American thought recently conducted by Stanford University in cooperation with the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago says:

"In common with other political polls, this study shows that President Johnson has the support of the majority of the American people. Sixty-one percent of the respondents on this survey approved of the way in which the President is handling the Vietnam situation. Unlike other studies, our more complete investigation also shows widespread support for moderate deescalation of the conflict, and a reluctance to pay the increased economic and manpower costs which a substantial escalation would involve. Americans are opposed to the extreme solutions of either a massive escalation or a sudden withdrawal leading to a Communist takeover in Vietnam."

That is what VANCE HARTKE has been saying.

Believe me, VANCE HARTKE has not changed.

More than ever, I am for the principles and programs for which we fought and won in 1964. I do not want to see us lose the great gains in social legislation achieved by Congress, the principles for which our party stands.

Our deep involvement in Asia, however, is eroding, one by one, programs for which we worked so long, the school milk fund, national defense education loans and scholarships, to aid federally impacted school districts which may mean higher property taxes in nearly 100 Indiana school districts, rural electrification, on and on it goes.

Then there are the excise taxes.

After 20 years—with full sanction of the administration—we finally removed most of this national sales tax, for the betterment of business, for the betterment of jobs, for the betterment of our national economy which has shown a steady upturn since we turned out the Republicans in 1960 and elected the great and beloved John F. Kennedy.

Then we laid the enduring foundations of the Great Society with another great President, whom history will record as one of the greatest, a man whom we support and for whom we pray—Lyndon B. Johnson.

Among my proudest moments are the opportunities I have had of working with Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, to make medicare a reality, to begin to erase poverty and the causes of poverty and ignorance in our rich Nation, to guarantee of voting rights for all, in higher education as an investment in America's future, for clean air and pure water, for interstate highways, and to cut taxes.

Now I offer our Nation, and you, a possible solution to the worldwide soul searching of our course in southeast Asia. I hope that in the near future Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur J. Goldberg will ask for a special session of the General Assembly (where there is no veto) so the entire free world may shoulder with us the obligation to stop Communist aggression.

IS WAR ON POVERTY BECOMING WAR ON BUSINESS?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the March issue of Nation's Business, entitled "Is War on Poverty Becoming War on Business?" by Paul Hencke, associate editor of the publication.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

IS WAR ON POVERTY BECOMING WAR ON BUSINESS?

In some American cities the war on poverty seems dangerously close to becoming a war on business.

Consider these recent examples of this new and militant trend:

In the front window of a "consumer education" office on a boulevard near the Capitol in Washington, tax paid poverty fighters have plastered a handbill depicting the profit-bloated, horned caricature of a business leader in the act of snatching bread from the outstretched fingers of children.

In a similar center run by antipoverty workers at another Washington address, an ex-labor lobbyist—whose salary also comes largely out of tax funds—proudly shows off an exhibit of well-known foods, soaps, and cosmetic products. She uses the items to warn low-income shoppers against what she calls "the deceptive packaging practices" of some firms.

In Baltimore, poverty workers on the public payroll accompany housewives on shopping field trips, urging them to buy at large chainstores and pass up the small neighborhood markets they have traditionally patronized.

In San Francisco, the director of a pilot project in consumer action freely concedes that "consumer advisers" in his federally subsidized, $256,000 program get many of the buying hints they pass along to shoppers from cooperatives, the columns of the labor press and from the pages of product-rating consumer magazines.

Back in Washington, a high-spirited band of social workers, civil rights activists and others on the poverty program payroll turned out on a workday recently to help the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) stage of citywide boycott of the D.C. Transit Co. in protest against a proposed 5-cent fare increase. The boycott snarled traffic and cost the privately owned bus facility an estimated 150,000 fares.

Each of these incidents suggests that the escalating consumer education phase of the Government's war on poverty is being fought with some questionable weapons and on fronts a good deal larger than those Congress had in mind when it passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Businessmen are well aware of the plight of the poor; with other Americans, they applaud the accomplishments of those who are struggling to eliminate poverty. At the same time, businessmen can hardly accept unquestioningly some of the things that are occurring under the guise of a war on poverty.

The 1964 Antipoverty Act, for example, did not give poverty fighters the right or mission to subject businessmen to vitriolic public ridicule. And yet this is happening.

The act did not empower poverty program operatives to propagate their own judgments as to what constitutes "deceptive" packaging. Yet this is happening—and at a time when Congress itself is still undecided about enacting so-called truth-in-packaging legislation.

The act did not authorize persons whose salaries come from Federal funds to direct customers into or away from specific places of business. Yet this is happening.

Nor did the act call for massive mobilization of the poor for purposes such as boycotts, or buyers' strikes. Yet this is happening. The potential consequences of this development alone, when considered in the light of the racial tension in some cities, are sobering cause to question the course a Government-initiated program can take, once begun.

It should be stressed that an antibusiness posture is not the conscious intent of responsible antipoverty warriors. From the press-wary front office at the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, down to the most naive neighborhood antipoverty worker, the expressed goal is the same: To show the indigent and uninformed how they can stretch their buying dollar, and to help them avoid the few merchants who exploit the poor through high-pressure salesmanship, high-interest installment buying, trick contracts, or other devices.

It is in the execution of this objective that the program has jumped the tracks.

A poverty war adviser working in a consumer information center will step beyond simply giving poor people advice on how to draw up a family budget and tell them to avoid buying one brand because it costs more than another. Or the shopper will be urged to patronize chains, on the theory that the chains buy in large volume and are likely to charge less than a low-volume, independent retailer. This leads to naming chains and naming the smaller stores.

If a shopper is unable to read, or is slow witted, the poverty program employee may go along to pick out items for her. In one instance, a young woman assigned as a consumer aid in Washington escorted an employed, middle-aged man into an appliance store. Once there, she talked him out of buying one kind of TV set he had decided on, and into buying another, lower priced model. This young woman told Nation's Business that whenever shoppers ask her advice on buying washing machines, she always tells them: "Whatever you do, don't get a ———. I have one of those myself, and it's lousy."

Large-scale federally supported consumer education programs now are operating in six cities—Washington, Baltimore, St. Louis, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Providence, R.I.—and OEO officials say consumer-related services are available on a smaller scale in upward of 75 other communities where they are currently spending $24 million. Federal poverty officials admit that they don't know the exact number.

In some of the larger consumer centers, a help-seeker can get anything from hints on how to use Federal food stamps to advice on planned parenthood (together with free contraceptive supplies). Legal aid, credit unions, and other related services are frequently tied in, and one consumer office in Washington even sports a coffeehouse next door. There the poor of the area assemble on weekends to hear poetry readings, a jazz combo, and lectures on handwriting analysis.

Edna Johnson, director of Baltimore's consumer protection program, an activity subcontracted by the OEO through the Urban League, says the poor sometimes are more to blame than unscrupulous merchants for the buying fixes they get themselves into.

"Some of these people are trying to get something for nothing," she asserts. "They plunge into big debt apparently thinking they can get out of paying it. They know what they are doing, but they do it anyway. Why, I had a man call up the other day and ask me what he should do about $45 worth of parking and traffic violation tickets he had accumulated."

But Mrs. Johnson has equally critical words for merchants who prey on the gullible poor. She cites a recent case handled by her office in which an 80-year-old Negro man purchased what he thought was a $40 mattress, only to discover later that he had signed an order for a $270 orthopedic model.

In some city neighborhoods, consumer advisers have set virtually no limits on the scope of their activities for and with the needy.

Washington is a conspicuous example of this open-ended operation. Poverty program personnel working under the United Planning Organization, the city's local agency for the Federal program, canvass entire slum neighborhoods. They acquaint residents with the new services available to them and urge the poor to form their own units for concerted action against store owners and landlords against whom they may have a grievance, whether over store conditions, credit policies, inventories, rents, or whatnot.

HOW TO RUN A BOYCOTT

The boycott of the D.C. Transit Co. discloses just how potent such organizing efforts can be.

While the boycott was sponsored by SNCC, publicly paid antipoverty workers throughout the Capital left their regular duties to join in. They participated in the preboycott planning, posted and distributed leaflets announcing the boycott (and bitterly attacking D.C. Transit Owner O. Roy Chalk) and drove special "freedom cars" that carried hundreds of both low- and middle-income Negro and white residents to and from their jobs during the protest.

Various rider-strike command posts were set up around the city for the boycott. Tax-salaried antipoverty workers, as well as SNCC representatives and unpaid volunteers, planned their strategy in military fashion on large maps of Washington which had been hung, war-room style, on office walls.

At one point before drivers scrambled for their cars, an otherwise soft-spoken social worker who heads up UPO activities in southeast Washington raised his voice to issue this order: "Don't forget, stop wherever you see people waiting for a bus and tell them, 'Don't ride D.C. Transit!' "

The man who issued the strident command—like most of those who were listening to him—is paid, at least in part, from UPO's Federal input of $4.7 million.

On the morning of the boycott, traffic moved at a slow pace through streets and intersections patrolled by specially assigned police. Arteries leading into Washington over its Anacostia River bridges were thick with automobiles and almost empty buses. Some buses and trucks owned by churches and other groups were pressed into emergency service. Many workers were late in reaching their jobs and others stayed home. By the time the day was over, SNCC pronounced the boycott a "90-percent success," and began at once to lay plans for similar demonstrations.

Less dramatic, but equally vigorous, efforts to organize people for protest action are being directed by E. Pauline Myers, who runs a federally funded UPO consumer center in one of Washington's poorest districts.

Miss Myers is a stout, outgoing woman whose background is not in home economics, as you might expect, but in what she likes to call "propaganda." As early as the 1930's she was a Washington lobbyist for the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and the National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches. Among other things, she lobbied for the first fair employment practices legislation. It is in her office that the truth-in-packaging exhibit is displayed. It was loaned to her by a Maryland co-op.

Her manner, like that of many in the antipoverty program, is engaging and warm. For the most part, living conditions in the area she serves are deplorable, with basements of some old buildings split up into two and even three apartments that rent separately for as much as $60 a month.. Many residents collect welfare payments. The crime rate is high. The Black Muslim movement, in Miss Myers' words, is "growing at a disturbing rate," especially among men who have prison records.

Her voice seldom changes in its soft and even tone, but she drops an occasional phrase that sounds jarringly militant.

"We're about to have confrontations with some of the merchants," she said at one point, while being interviewed by a Nation's Business editor. "We've had complaints about unsanitary conditions in one of the big markets in particular, and we are going to get the manager and some of our neighborhood people together here for a confrontation."

CRACKDOWN ON SMALL MERCHANTS

The effectiveness so far of Washington's "confrontations" is not really clear. Some small merchants, when visited by delegations of neighborhood residents and antipoverty personnel, have promised to do what they can to improve the appearance of their stores and to eliminate conditions deemed unsanitary by the complaining parties. Major changes are difficult for most because they don't have the capital.

Some small merchants are understandably bitter about being pressured at all. In many instances they have been doing business in low-income neighborhoods for many years, have granted long-term credit to their patrons and have made other personalized services available—such as storing in their freezers turkeys and cuts of meat too large to be safely kept in their customers' antiquated iceboxes and refrigerators.

One store operator, who asked that he not be identified, complained to Nation's Business: "I don't understand. Suddenly I'm being told what to do and what not to do. They want me to stock more and to spruce up the place, but I haven't got the money for that. At the same time, the poverty people are telling my oldtime customers to use the bigger stores.

"The two things don't jibe. Do they want me here or not? If they keep on encouraging people to buy somewhere else, I am going out of business for damned sure."

James Love, a well-groomed young high-school dropout who now works as a consumer aid in a neighborhood near the Capitol, enthusiastically told how he had organized people in a five-block area to protest unsanitary conditions in a corner grocery.

"Some of my people said, 'Let's close him down'," the youth recounted, "but I explained that we didn't want to run the man out of business—just get him to clean up his store, put in some new window glass and offer more variety in the things he has to sell. We went over there and met with the man and he has done a few things. He fixed one of the windows, anyway. Took down a wooden partition that was keeping out light and put in some real glass."

Out in San Francisco, where Art Danforth runs the federally subsidized Bay Area Neighborhood Development (BAND) consumer-action program, the picture is somewhat different. Low-income Negroes and whites, including many Spanish-speaking immigrants, live in the three areas BAND covers. Mr. Danforth has a number of field workers on his total staff of 48 full- and part-time people, but they stick to "budget and fraud counseling" for the most part and have not yet moved into any militant large-scale organizing.

However, Mr. Danforth feels that something along these lines will probably develop in time.

"When people have lived in frustration for years and years, as many of these poor people have, they finally want to do something," he says.

At centers in Hunter's Point-Bayview, North Oakland, and the Mission District, BAND's consumer advisers offer people who phone in or drop in advice on what they conceive to be the best buys in "groceries, cars or whatever." Not all of the advisers are fully qualified to be doing this, Mr. Danforth admits, so they rely on the recommendations of product-rating consumer magazines and materials issued by cooperatives and the Federal Government. Some quote Sidney Margolius, whose consumer-oriented column has long been featured in the AFL-CIO News and other labor papers.

Mr. Danforth's last job, before he took over at BAND, was as educational director of the Consumers Cooperative Society of Palo Alto, Calif., and before that in community fundraising. To get the necessary 10 percent of local capital needed to match the 90 percent available from the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity, he turned to California Associate Cooperatives of Richmond, Calif. At one point he was accused of "trying to organize one huge cooperative among the poor of the Bay area," but he says this charge was baseless.

HELP FROM BUSINESS

Concerned business groups, including the National Dairy Council, a furniture house and a meat firm, recently have been giving BAND staffers coaching in how to explain to people what to look for, and what to avoid, when they buy products in those fields.

Business has moved to help the poverty fighters in other parts of the Nation, too, but the effort to date has been limited. In Washington, for example, some firms have donated kitchen equipment for use in homemaking instruction, canned goods for distribution at "food banks," sewing machines, fabrics, utensils and other items.

But the incongruities crop up even here. In a large, privately owned apartment project, for example, the owners provided space free of charge for a complex of antipoverty services, including an office for neighborhood organizers, a food and clothing bank, and rooms to house field placement personnel of the U.S. Employment Service. And yet, some of this same business-donated space was used during the Washington transit boycott for hanging SNCC handbills in which the president of the transit company was pictured as a snarling "buslord" who demanded 30-cent fares from passengers at gunpoint.

Some businessmen are surprised when they learn of the extent of the consumer services now being offered as a result of the Johnson administration's war on poverty, and some admit to a feeling of "sheer fright" over the influences which people lacking a business grounding can bring to these activities.

Others react differently.

One group of businessmen recently spent a day with consumer education specialists in a major eastern city, and found much they could do to help. These men came away concerned that some of what they had seen and heard did not make much sense in terms of hardnosed economists ("They are teaching some people skills that aren't in demand," grumbled one member of the delegation) but impressed with the zeal of the antipoverty team. Before returning to their offices, they huddled to plan ways for putting together special training materials that could be productively used in the program they had inspected.

"You know," mused one gruff entrepreneur in the group, "this war on poverty isn't going to go away. The poor are on the move. I think we'd better get in there and make sure the job gets done right."

JAMES SYMINGTON: NEW CHIEF OF PROTOCOL

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the happiest and most appropriate appointments made by President Johnson is his selection of James Symington as the State Department's chief of protocol. I had the privilege of working with Jim Symington when President Kennedy appointed me to head up the food-for-peace program with Mr. Symington as my deputy in 1961–62. He served in that capacity with unusual effectiveness. It always seemed to me that he added a sensitivity to the program that contributed to the successes of food for peace in the early 1960's.

The son of our colleague, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, Jim Symington has emerged as an effective and much admired individual in his own right. Washington columnist, Mary McGrory, has written of the new protocol chief, "It is difficult to find anyone who doesn't like Symington." As one who greatly admires Mr. Symington's unusual musical talent, I agree with Miss McGrory's further observation that: "It is impossible to find anyone who does not appreciate his minstrelsy." The new protocol chief is highly skilled in the use of languages, music, and human relations.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss McGrory's article in the March 27 issue of the Washington Star, and also a news item on Mr. Symington's appointment in the current issue of Time magazine be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Mar. 27, 1966]

(By Mary McGrory)

SYMINGTON A POPULAR CHOICE

When Lloyd Hand suddenly ducked out of his job as chief of protocol to seek his political fortunes in California, President Johnson called for a list of bright young men in the administration which had been prepared for just such contingencies.

His eye fell on the name of James W. Symington, 38, Executive Director of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency. He decided on the spot that he wanted Symington to switch from handling dropouts to handling diplomats.

It is the most popular appointment the President has made since he plucked Arthur J. Goldberg from the Supreme Court and dispatched him to the United Nations.

In this testy town, it is difficult to find anyone who doesn't like Symington. It is impossible to find anyone who doesn't appreciate his minstrelsy. An accomplished guitarist, he has a sweet tenor voice and sings ballads, some of his own composition.

The choice pleased both Johnsonians and Kennedyites, hawks and doves, classical and jazz buffs. Symington's favorite composer is Mozart, but he swings with the pop art set, too.

His wife, Sylvia, is also musical and charming. His children, Julie, 11, and Jeremy, 8, are singularly well-mannered. At Symington's swearing-in ceremonies, they stood in the receiving line and greeted well-wishers with great aplomb.

Symington, a slim lawyer who speaks three languages, is trained in diplomacy. He served John Hay Whitney for 2 years in London and one of his chores was to arrange the visit of then Vice President Richard M. Nixon in 1959.

He provided the only soothing notes of the 1960 Democratic Convention. His father, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, made a small bid for the presidential nomination. It came to naught, but had the matter been decided by those grateful auditors who heard Jim Symington singing gentle anti-Eisenhower ditties in his father's headquarters, it might have come out differently.

Symington joined the New Frontier as Deputy to the Administrator of Food for Peace, GEORGE MCGOVERN, who has since become a Senator from South Dakota. McGOVERN says Symington has a knack of adapting to foreigners and understanding them.

His second boss was then Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY. As an administrative assistant, one of Symington's jobs was to tour campuses to find out how foreign students were faring in American universities, which has turned out to be a relevant assignment.

Since June 1965, Symington has been the Justice Department's expert on juvenile delinquency. One of the proudest boasts of the interdepartmental group was its successful negotiation of peace between the teenagers of Hampton Beach, N.H., and their elders.

He was always a featured performer at the annual Justice Department Christmas parties for the poor children of Washington.

He would say, "I wish you kids would stay in school" before he struck up "I Ride on Ole Paint" or "Liza Jane."

Attorney General Katzenbach regards Symington as uniquely suited to his new duties. In addition to being polite, says Mr. Katzenbach, he is droll.

Symington got started in a great flurry. Within an hour of being sworn in, he was in the yellow Oval Room presenting his first ambassador, Amim Ahmad Hussein of the Sudan, to President Johnson.

His voice quivered a trifle, but his pronunciation was fine. He had been briefed on the ritual in the limousine on his way to the White House by his deputy, Chester Carter.

He was already immersed in preparation for his first big test, the historic and unprecedented visit of the first woman prime minister to come to America, Indira Gandhi of India.

Symington and his wife are now busy studying photographs of the members of Mrs. Gandhi's entourage. A phonetics expert is coaching them in the pronunciation of Indian names.

He is also studying a huge briefing book full of statistics and discussions of Indian issues: Food, economy and relations with Pakistan. While a chief of protocol must be a past master of small talk, he must also be ready for that moment when a weary head of state wishes to discuss, with the ever-present guide and escort, some matter of substance.

Symington is greatly looking forward to the moment when he steps forward to welcome Mrs. Gandhi, in the name of President Johnson, speaking his name and his new position.

When she goes back to New Delhi, he will address himself to getting in touch with his new constituency, the representatives of 113 countries on embassy row. He wants to communicate with them and find out their interests, views and problems and, as he says, "readily, speedily and accurately transmit them to the executive department."

[From Time magazine]

FOLK SINGER IN STRIPED PANTS

Special clothes hangers had to be found to accommodate the Indian Prime Minister's flowing silk saris. Red roses—her late father's favored flower—were arrayed around Blair House. As to whether Indira Gandhi should address the all-male National Press Club or the ladies' press corps or both, it was diplomatically decided that a joint session was called for. Executing such arrangements would be delicate even for old protocol hands. Yet this week's state visit—the first ever by a woman premier—marked a last-minute premiere for a novice. Unruffled, James Wadsworth Symington recalls his stint as a Marine private. Said he: "You learn that you always 'land running.'"

Symington, 38, who since last May served as the President's adviser on juvenile delinqency, started running the moment he was sworn in last week as the State Department's Chief of Protocol, succeeding Lloyd Hand, who resigned to enter California politics. He had been in office less than an hour when he presented Sudan's new Ambassador, Amin Ahmed Hussein, to the President. Apart from preparing for Mrs. Gandhi's visit, Symington was also busily readying himself to handle the myriad problems of the 113 foreign mission chiefs in Washington—his new "constituency," as Johnson called it.

OUVREZ LA BOUCHE

By background and experience, blue-blooded, boyishly handsome Jim Symington has unusual qualifications for the job.

His father is Missouri's Democratic Senator Stuart Symington, his mother the daughter of the late Senator James Wadsworth and granddaughter of Secretary of State John Hay. After eastern schooling (Deerfield Academy, Yale, and Columbia Law), he was deputy director of the food-for-peace program, later was a top assistant to Bobby Kennedy when he was Attorney General.

Hitherto, young Symington has been best known in Washington society as a baritone folk singer and guitar player who performed for Queen Elizabeth II while he was special assistant (from 1958 to 1960) to his cousin, John Hay Whitney, then Ambassador to Britain. When the Symingtons went to Washington, he began entertaining foreign visitors at informal songfests, usually in duet with his petite, chestnut-haired wife. An accomplished pianist and harpsichordist, Sylvia Symington has worked as a volunteer music teacher to Washington slum children, in 1960 organized a group of women to help wives of African diplomats overcome their awe of bustling Washington. Proficient in French, she even accompanied her wards to the dentist's office to relay such instructions as "Ouvrez la bouche, s'il vous plait."

TIME TO LEARN

Symington shares his wife's belief in personal diplomacy, still talks about the time he invited an Asian student for dinner. "He couldn't believe it," the new protocol chief related. "He said he'd been in this country 3 years and had never been invited to an American home." From such experiences came a lesson later conveyed in a song the Symingtons composed by the swimming pool of their comfortable white house in Georgetown. "It takes time to know your neighbor on the other side," runs one verse. "Time to learn to labor in the vineyard of his pride."

INDIANA FARMERS UNION NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the war on poverty is making steady progress. Although there have been charges made about isolated instances of mismanagement in the poverty program, thousands of public-spirited citizens have been striving to improve the economic and social well-being of their fellow men. The many constructive programs enacted during the first session of this Congress are now in full gear.

It has been rewarding for me to read first-hand reports of the accomplishments made in my State. Many schoolteachers, principals, and parents have written to praise the benefits derived from the Headstart program; others have commended the work-training, community action, and work-study programs. All too often, Mr. President, positive achievements of the antipoverty legislation are known only to those directly involved.

For this reason I ask unanimous consent that a splendid representative of these achievements, typified by a report on the Neighborhood Youth Corps sponsored by the Indiana Farmers Union, be printed in the Record. It is clear from this report that the Neighborhood Youth Corps project sponsored by the Indiana Farmers Union, which has been operating in 29 counties with more than 600 enrollees, has been very successful, and I commend the excellent job which the project director, Mr. Alvah F. Troyer, and his assistants have done in administering it.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report of Neighborhood Youth Corps Project—Sponsored by Indiana Farmers Union

LOCATION OF PROJECT

Our project was signed on November 1, 1965, allowing for a maximum of 480 in-school enrollees and 600 out-of-school enrollees. Many counties were in a position to put the enrollees to work within a short period of time, a number of the counties beginning before the end of that week. The program is operating at the present time in 29 counties: Bartholomew, Brown, Clark, Crawford, Daviess, Dearborn, Decatur, Delaware, Dubois, Fayette, Gibson, Harrison, Jackson, Jay, Jefferson, Jennings, Johnson, Knox, Lawrence, Martin, Morgan, Ohio, Orange, Pike, Ripley, Scott, Shelby, Switzerland, and Washington.

We have already applied for permission to serve in 3 additional counties and present records indicate there are about 30 additional counties in the State that could qualify for such assistance in case the local leaders would obtain and review the basic information required to establish their own county's eligibility to participate in the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Our project has a full-time project director and five part-time assistant directors living in various areas of the State. The secretary-treasurer is on a part-time basis with Neighborhood Youth Corps. The office staff consists of three full-time typists and one part time.

At the county level a Neighborhood Youth Corps advisory committee is required. This is made up of from 8 to 15 persons representing various segments of the economy, local community, and local government. We urge that committees include representatives of the county boards of welfare, township trustees (who administer township poor relief), probation officers, school administrative officers, and at least one school guidance director. Additional members of the committee generally represent schools, local governments, ministerial associations, industry, labor, agriculture, State employment services where available, and others interested in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

We, as sponsor, give the local committees the rules and regulations regarding the Neighborhood Youth Corps program and work with them in finding the eligible enrollees and places for them to perform their Neighborhood Youth Corps work.

WORK STATIONS

Over 90 percent of our enrollees are performing their work at $1.25 per hour at tax supported facilities including public schools and various departments of county, city, and town governments. To name a few of our cooperating user-members—county hospitals, county highway departments, county extension offices, county auditors, clerks, assessors, etc.; city government offices, street departments, park departments, sewage disposal plants, etc.; town board offices, street departments, etc. The smaller percentage of our enrollees perform their work in such places as parochial schools, nonprofit hospitals, retarded children's homes, national guard offices, and day nurseries. Each facility furnishing work and supervision for the enrollees is required to sign a user-member agreement with Indiana Farmers Union, the sponsor, this agreement containing the responsibilities of both the sponsor and user-member. At present we have approximately 300 different user-members who are cooperating with the program.

TYPE OF WORK

We have eight work classifications: Teachers aid, maintenance and grounds, general office, hospital aid, public protection trainee, library aid, lunch room aid, social worker. The greater percentage of the female enrollees are working under the general office classification, while the greater percentage of the male enrollees are working under the maintenance and grounds classification. Most of our enrollees work as individuals with a supervisor; however, in some instances two or three enrollees will be working under one supervisor. The working time is kept by the user-member and they send a time card each 2-week period to the State office for each Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee. The time card is signed by both the enrollee and the supervisor.

WORKING TIME

The Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee in the in-school program (still attending high school) may work a maximum of 15 hours per week with the county average not to exceed 12 hours per week. The out-of-school enrollees work an average 30-hour week.

Enrollees are required to receive their counseling on their own time and in an amount that equals approximately 2 percent of their working time.

NUMBER OF ENROLLEES

As of this date we have had approximately 650 enrolled in the program, of which approximately 650 enrolled in the program, of which approximately 80 have terminated from the program, most of them on a voluntary basis and many of them because of having found permanent employment resulting from their Neighborhood Youth Corps experience.

RECORDS

Each county Neighborhood Youth Corps advisory committee completes and keeps on file a duplicate record of applications, time cards, and termination reports. At the State office an individual file is maintained for each enrollee.

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE

According to the verbal and written reports that we have from the various counties we can honestly say that the public reaction to our program has been at least 95 percent on the "good" side. This same percentage would also hold true so far as the reports we have had from the various user-members. We have not encouraged overpublicizing the program at the State or county level; however, in most counties local newspapers and radio have carried news items concerning the program, of which very few could be classed as detrimental publicity.

EVALUATION

After our experience in sponsoring a Neighborhood Youth Corps project for 12 weeks during the summer of 1965 and our 3-month experience so far in our current Neighborhood Youth Corps project, we believe that by and large most of the enrollees are receiving work experience that will be of benefit to them the rest of their lives and help them to obtain permanent employment, and thereby take their proper place in society.

The $1.25 per hour that the enrollees receive for working is of course a benefit, as all enrollees must be from a family whose income is below a given level according to the size of the family. Granted and realizing the age qualifications of the Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees (16 through 21), some of the money is spent in a manner which many of us today might consider wasteful until we might look in a mirror and see ourselves as being in that age group today. But also apparent is the fact that much of the earned income is used for additional family support: clothes, books, doctor and dentist bills, and many other things that we would have to consider as being worthwhile. In a number of cases enrollees have continued their high school work or have entered vocational or business training due to the wages received.

The No. 1 value that we believe is coming from the Neighborhood Youth Corps program is not in work experience or dollars, but rather in the changes that take place within the personality of most of the enrollees. These changes include the change of attitude in one who has developed a complex from being "looked down upon"; changes in the attitude toward work; changes in attitude about respecting the rights and property of others; noticed changes in attitude toward work supervision; and particularly with many of the female enrollees a change in personality to the point that they can within a few short weeks learn to greet a stranger with a smile and say, "Good morning, can I help you?"

SUMMARY

We are of the firm belief that although our Neighborhood Youth Corps program operation may not have been perfect, it has been highly successful. This success we attribute to the willingness, understanding, and cooperation of many hundreds of lay people at the county level who are willing to spend time and effort in learning the goals, rules and potential of the program and then putting forth the effort to make it work to the best of their ability.

ARE PRESENT TOOLS ENOUGH?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Nation's conservationists gathered last week in Pittsburgh, Pa., for the 31st North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. The theme of this year's meeting was "Renewing Our Resources Environment." The sessions of the conference devoted attention to air and water pollution, natural beauty, the pressures of urbanization on resources, fish, wildlife, and many other timely and important subjects.

An annual feature of the conference was the presentation by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, dean of American conservationists and the president of the Wildlife Management Institute. Dr. Gabrielson's comments on developments in the natural resources field and his analysis of problems and opportunities always provide a valuable source of information about the American conservation scene.

His remarks this year were focused on the question: Are present tools enough? He found need for more pertinent research, earlier application of its findings, acceptance of new technology, and a broader choice of alternatives where public works projects involve long-term commitment or permanent destruction of resource values.

He found, too, that—

> Despite our preoccupation with new programs and our search for new laws, we already have the capacity to make much more immediate progress by honoring and fully implementing statutes already on the books. There is a tremendous unexploited margin for constructive good in going programs which are suffering from a lack of appropriations, a lack of interest, or a lack of vigorous administrations.

One need not agree with every point made by Dr. Gabrielson to recognize and benefit from his valuable and expert advice on the conservation needs of this Nation. I look forward to and benefit from his report each year, and commend a careful reading of it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Gabrielson's March 14 speech printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE PRESENT TOOLS ENOUGH?

(By Ira N. Gabrielson, president, Wildlife Management Institute)

Natural resources conservation is more popular and more widely accepted in this country than ever before. Political careers have been wagered and won on platforms promising clean water, natural beauty, and outdoor recreation. Foremost commentators and writers now explore conservation crises of all kinds, where only a few years ago they were content to leave the field to others. Prime TV time and the impact pages of newspapers and magazines are given to the subject.

In addition, an informed and responsive public showers letters, telegrams and statements on committees of Congress, State legislatures and local governing groups. Women march against bulldozers, and Presidents send comprehensive conservation messages to Capitol Hill. The climate is favorable and the growing season could be long.

This maturing of conservation as a political and social force is an impressive, heartening, and long-awaited development. But is it all above reproach? Is it all to the good? As I see conservation projects ebb and flow in response to the pulsations of public and political enthusiasm, I wonder if this national outpouring is capable of creating enduring human benefits. Can our soil, our wildlife, our forests and waters be administered so as to assure continuing contribution to society's material and cultural well-being without destruction of the resource capital itself? What more needs to be done?

Despite our preoccupation with new programs and our search for new laws, we already have the capacity to make much more immediate progress by honoring and fully implementing statutes already on the books. There is tremendous unexploited margin for constructive good in going programs which are suffering from a lack of appropriations, a lack of interest, or a lack of vigorous administration.

To be sure, some new programs and authorities are needed, particularly those that recognize and give meaning to ecological implications of resources use and management. There is no justification for continuing to build big dams willy-nilly, for example, simply to keep a Federal construction agency alive and its clientele happy. Electrical energy, water supply, and flood control often can be obtained by less costly and less destructive alternatives.

Much more pertinent research is needed, too, along with earlier application of its findings. The public and the Congress must be given alternative choices so that wise decisions can be made regarding the long-term commitment or permanent destruction of resource values. There is an urgent need for such a policy right now in the case of the lower Colorado River project which would impair Grand Canyon National Park and Monument. New and proven technology must be accepted and applied if it assures better results with less resource capital loss than conventional systems.

All of these things need to be done, and more. But getting them done will be difficult because conservationists both in and out of Government are devoting more attention to ballot-box conservation than to the muscle and bone of the resources themselves. Long-range resources thinking and management, in too many cases, is subservient to short-term expedients. In others, the tough decisions simply are not being made on conflicts of private and public interests.

Ballot-box conservation is the fusion product of public and political interest in natural resources matters. It has much value in that it is expedient and that it gets things done. But it can be grossly inefficient as well as needlessly harmful if not carefully oriented and controlled.

It has made possible the strengthened Federal water pollution control program and the land and water conservation fund. It has started to bring coherence to outdoor recreation from the local to the national level. There also are the wilderness act, the multiple use acts, the several new seashore and recreation areas, and the water research and planning council acts, to name a few. Other significant proposals, such as the wild rivers bill and the rare and endangered animals program may be approved this year.

These things are good, and represent progress, but the weakness and the inherent danger in ballot-box conservation is that it is engrossed more with the future and less with the present; it searches the surface, but seldom the depths.

New authorizations signify change and progress, but they are only promissory notes at the most. Each promises that such and such will be done and that so much money is pledged to a specific purpose. The catch lies in getting the program underway, in drafting and adopting regulations that are responsive to the intent and purpose of this law, and in getting the money and the manpower to make the whole thing go.

Passing a new law or calling for a new program is only part of the conservation battle. Many individuals, unfortunately, seem to believe that is what natural resources conservation is all about. They are more attracted to the tinsel than to the tree.

In the remainder of my time this morning I want to look around as well as ahead, to probe the depths beneath the surface so as to bring the question, Are present tools enough? into better perspective.

Let's look first at national parks. Currently there is great excitement and justifiable enthusiasm for creating a Redwood National Park in California. The argument is not whether there should be a park, but about its size and location. Surely, preservation of an ecological unit of the world's tallest living trees from the highest watershed ridge down to the sea is in the national interest.

This the administration's plan would not do. It is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough. It responds to public interest not in terms of what is needed, but rather in terms of expedience. It offers a redwood park that would contain few redwoods not already protected as State parks.

Many conservationists will be reluctant to settle for a Redwood National Park of lesser stature than that proposed in H.R. 11723 and H.R. 11705, similar bills by Congressmen COHELAN, of California, and SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, or the identical amendment 487 to the administration's plan in the Senate.

Look at the northern Cascades of Washington where some would create a new national park on wild and beautiful land already in public ownership and under the administration of a capable natural resources agency. An agency, by the way, that pioneered wilderness preservation long before much national attention was given this important program. What ratio of urgency is there between the creation of a Redwood National Park in an area now headed straight for the sawmill and one where the landscape remains largely untarnished from the time it was first known? Some people suggest that the exclusion of thousands of acres of unspoiled rain forest from the nearby Olympic National Park is the price to be paid for establishment of a northern Cascades Park. Is this acceptable to conservationists? I doubt it.

Let's look at the national parks in the context of another serious problem. This is the thoughtless destruction of the Everglades National Park, the fabled river of grass, whose profuse plant and animal life evolved from the historic surface flow of fresh water from central Florida. This natural cycle has been broken; largely by the investment of public funds in a so-called flood control district, and the park is dying.

A recent joint announcement of the Interior and Defense Departments of a temporary program to alleviate the water storage still offers no permanent solution. The agreement is weak. It contains no guarantee that the park will receive any minimum allocation of water. It has a further weakness in that although the agreement calls for providing 500,000 acre-feet of water to the park, the Corps of Engineers is requesting funds to pay for the pumping of only 300,000 acre-feet.

Perhaps conservationists should go to work to cut off all further Federal funds for the flood control project until money is provided and construction completed on all the pumps and ditches necessary to assure adequate water for the park. A second and perhaps quicker solution would be for President Johnson with his great interest in national parks to use his well-known powers of persuasion on the Army Engineers and their supporters.

If something isn't done, and soon, I earnestly suggest that the ruined Everglades Park be dedicated as a monument to the stupidity of letting engineers, land speculators, and other local promoters dictate the use of water in any region.

The controversy at the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, over the construction of a transmountain road across undisturbed back country, gives force to the suggestion that regional master plans should be prepared for all park system units. Highways, public accommodations, and service facilities should be placed outside parks as much as possible. The construction of another restaurant, souvenir shop, or highway subtracts from, but never adds to, the natural environment that the great national parks are supposed to preserve.

Perhaps new authority is needed, as was granted wildlife refuges years ago, to acquire land outside of parks for visitor accommodations and other nonconforming facilities. National park administration also should be reexamined, as it has evolved and is being applied, from the standpoint of new techniques for public visitation. It is clear that new concepts must be employed. This is a research project that should be initiated by some conservation group if not by the Park Service itself.

A final observation about national parks. Authorization of a full-fledged park often is more preferable for local political and commercial reasons than some lesser designation, such as national monument or recreation area. A number of proposals for parks really do not qualify under the longstanding national park guidelines. Without thinking this through, however, some conservationists support these proposals because they carry the park label. Should their efforts be successful, they will have helped to erode park standards and principles on a national basis.

Another important facet of resources conservation is the preservation of water quality. Despite all the fanfare of legislative accomplishment—and it was a major accomplishment—woefully inadequate progress is being made. Pollution abatement is a costly, complex, continuing, and unspectacular necessity. Its urgency and its virtue are chronically understated until there is water shortage.

The amended Water Pollution Control Act authorizes Federal financial grants to municipalities for the construction of waste treatment plants at the level of $150 million a year. Appropriations last year and in previous years failed to provide the full amounts authorized for this vital program. Since 1957, when construction grants were authorized, Congress has appropriated about $40 million less for this purpose than the law allows.

A summary of where we stand today in water pollution control was published recently by the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. It comments on the administration of the present program, contrasts accomplishment with need, and suggests new authority that will help in the future. The subcommittee places a $20 billion price tag on adequate national water cleanup, an unreasonable and unattainable cost, some say. But how unreasonable, how impossible, is it? What is the true cost of not abating water pollution? What will be the permanent losses to our industrial society in terms of its financial, social, and material well-being if water is permitted to get dirtier and less and less usable?

As I said earlier, one of the most pressing things we need today is a system for choosing alternatives. There now is under discussion, for example, a national network of scenic roads and parkways that could cost up to $8 billion over the next 10 years. Not considering for the moment whether this Nation can afford to have additional millions of acres of land placed under concrete for the less-than-serious purpose of pleasure motoring, I question the commitment of $8 billion to nonarterial roads when that money could be used for a concentrated assault on water pollution abatement. Who is to make the choice? Or do we allocate a little money to both, to keep people happy, and not make an effective start on either?

Another example of this is offered by scenic parkways and natural beauty, where there is much to be gained. Is a constructive contribution being made if we succeed in having scenic vistas and pleasant placements of industrial and residential areas, if those same factories and residences are dumping pollutants into the streams the parkways overlook? Effective conservation must have depth as well as a good front.

Many bills have been introduced to further expand the Federal water pollution control program. President Johnson, in a recent message to Congress, recommends many changes in the national water pollution control program. He urges new attention be given demonstrations, enforcement, and research and suggests better local, State, and national cooperation. He also recommends that the new Water Pollution Control Administration be transferred to the Interior Department. There is some logic in this but it raises questions in the minds of those who fought for years to get the pollution program away from the Public Health Service and its narrow concept of water pollution. There has been no strong objection to it going to Interior, but supporters of the program wonder if this will mean it is to be downgraded.

Many wonder what will happen when vigorous pollution control enforcement is attempted on strip mines, acid mine wastes, oil and gas wastes, irrigation returns, and so on. Will the Bureau of Mines or the Office of Oil and Gas, for example, support or oppose these efforts? Others wonder if this period of transition means more delays in implementing the program.

If this is the beginning of an effort to put all water resource management agencies together, what about the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers? Shouldn't they be transferred also? Perhaps they should be the first.

Congressional hearings undoubtedly will be held and testimony taken, but it is doubtful if the program actually can be improved this year. I want to emphasize, however, that if and when the basic law is improved—and I urge that this be done—that words on paper serve little purpose alone. Manpower and money are the fuels that make a program go.

These same fuels could make the program of the Bureau of Land Management go, too, but the proclivity of ballot-box conservation for the new and spectacular, has ignored the needs of the Nation's largest land-administering agency for years.

The results of this are all too obvious. Large areas of public domain grazing lands remain in a deteriorating and unsatisfactory condition. The few developments that money is provided for, such as soil and moisture conservation, siltation, dams, and range rehabilitation, lose much of their planned useful life because of the lack of manpower for followup management.

BLM has only 15 wildlife biologists, 1 for each 35 million acres it administers. Less than one-third of its staff is resources oriented. BLM is aware of these inequities, but it gets little help in overcoming them. There is danger, too, that reform of BLM's resources programs may be held back for 3 to 4 years until the Public Land Law Review Commission's study is done.

Wildlife interests have been surface feeding when they should have been probing the depths in the case of the duck stamp. From that program, conceived more than a quarter-century ago, the concept has emerged that waterfowl hunters should carry the burden of wetlands preservation. Through the $105 million accelerated wetlands purchase program, they are buying lands today with money that must be repaid tomorrow.

Sadly, Federal agricultural assistance for drainage has destroyed more wetlands in a shorter period than conservationists ever could hope to save by use of duck stamp funds. Sportsmen no longer can go it alone. The few dollars received from the duck stamps and through advance appropriations are incapable of stemming the tide of drainage made possible by the easy availability of hundreds of millions of dollars for agriculture assistance programs. And even if there was enough money to preserve wetlands for waterfowl by acquisition, it is doubtful if sufficient land could be purchased in critical areas by State and Federal agencies.

The cropland adjustment program of the Department of Agriculture, with its welcome but untested emphasis on wildlife habitat and outdoor recreation, offers renewed hope that a way can be found to incorporate wetlands maintenance as one of its compensable conservation features. Payments for the retention of wetlands, rather than for their destruction, are consistent with stated national wildlife and agricultural objectives. Farmers and ranchers hold the key to what happens to much of the wetlands in the United States.

New thinking is expressed in a resolution of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, passed only last month, urging that "through the cropland retirement program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, or through the wetlands acquisition program of the U.S. Department of the Interior, establish a water bank which would provide for annual payments to farmers for nonagricultural use of wetland areas, and the maintenance of these areas in a condition most suitable for wildlife." Such an approach, I believe, is urgently needed. It is long overdue.

In these prepared remarks I have commented on some subjects at greater length than others. Some I have not mentioned at all. This does not mean that I believe they are less important. The subjects I have singled out appear to be of a more critical nature, and their mention is because of that aspect rather than any attempt to be comprehensive.

For example, more attention rightfully could have been given to the implementation of the wilderness act, the passage of which took much time and effort. Contrary to what some may believe, the work of preserving wilderness is mainly ahead of us. The agencies have been slow to issue their regulations under the act so reviews of the national forest primitive areas, national parks and wildlife refuges and game ranges can get underway. More than 100 areas await review and recommendation by the President to Congress for inclusion in the wilderness system. One-third of them must go through the review procedure by September 1967. Time is short. We have the tools for saving wilderness but we are slow in putting them to work.

Another potential problem that should be mentioned is the resolution adopted last year by the American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association which expresses favor for abolishing the excise tax on fishing tackle items. This is the same excise tax through which sportsmen finance the valuable Dingell-Johnson Federal aid in fish restoration program. From what I have been able to learn, the resolution apparently pledges the industry to work for dropping the tax on the very questionable theory that more money could be obtained for an enlarged program through direct appropriations. All of you who have gone through the appropriations struggle know the hazards of such an undertaking. It holds much more promise of harm than it does for good. The administrators of the State fish and wildlife departments had better be prepared to go to work should any serious effort be made to press this viewpoint.

Vigilance also is recommended to the threat of the huge Rampart Dam on the Yukon River of north central Alaska. By blocking the Yukon and by flooding 8 million acres or more of the Yukon Flats, this project would do great harm to fishery resources and to migratory waterfowl, furbearers, moose, and other animals. Rampant's supporters urge its construction, at the cost of billions of dollars, as a panacea to the economic ills of the State of Alaska. How much of a contribution would it actually make? Is a massive one-shot project the best contribution that the rest of the States can make toward the development of Alaska? I think not. Much more can be done for Alaska that would make a positive and enduring contribution without needlessly sacrificing so many scarce resources. I urge you to listen attentively to Dean Spurr on Wednesday afternoon when he speaks on "Alaska's Economic Rampart."

Dr. Spurr's comprehensive report represents the work of an expert team whose studies were commissioned by the Natural Resources Council of America. This kind of coordinated, independent review should be used more frequently by the national and regional conservation groups and societies to obtain an objective outlook on some of the complex projects that are being advanced. By pooling their generally limited resources they would be able to secure a more balanced and expert analysis than any one group could obtain alone.

I am not faulting the required study reports of the various Federal or State agencies by this observation. We all know, however, that the commitments of an administration, as well as the history of operation of an agency, can strongly influence the recommendations that are made.

My suggestion, in conclusion, is that conservationists not look entirely to tomorrow for solution of all the problems in which we are interested. To do so, would be to blind ourselves to the many opportunities for getting full horsepower out of the things we have. True conservation progress still is measured in terms of what we get done, rather than what we hope to do.

TIME MAGAZINE COVERS THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the cover story in the current issue of Time magazine is devoted to Vice President Hubert Humphrey. I think Members of the Congress will find this article of considerable interest. The authors have effectively captured some of the many highlights in the career and personality of our distinguished Vice President. The Time editors used a particularly apt phrase when they described the Vice President as "a man of artesian eloquence and visceral conviction, of bright spirit." I ask unanimous consent that the cover story article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Vice-Presidency: the Bright Spirit

Vice President Hubert Horatio Humphrey had never before been known to lapse for long into total silence. Yet throughout 1965 he was unwontedly and unhappily subdued in the shadow of a center stage President. Not until January did Humphrey finally find an effectual and demanding outlet for his energies. It was then, at Lyndon Johnson's behest, that the Vice President publicly helped shoulder the increasing burdens of the war in Vietnam.

Since then, Humphrey has become the administration's most articulate and indefatigable exponent of United States-Asian policy. From New Delhi to New Zealand to New York, before sexagenarian Senators and teenage Thais, the pink-cheeked, peripatetic Vice President has rehearsed America's aims and achievements in Vietnam with all the evangelical fervor he once brought to such causes as civil rights and disarmament.

Seldom have man and mission been better mated. Humphrey may not, as the President once boasted, be the world's "greatest coordinator of mind and tongue." He is nonetheless a man of artesian eloquence and visceral conviction, of bright spirit—which his first name literally means. For the President's purposes, moreover, Humphrey's fame as a liberal crusader has assured him a respectful hearing from foreign governments and segments of American society that had discredited the administration's motives in Vietnam. As for Humphrey, he has risen to the challenge with all the old gusto and with new-found gravity and grace.

ASIAN SPUTNIK

"Communism in Asia," he told a union convention in Washington last week, "is not a subject of academic discussion. It is a matter of survival. Vietnam today is as close to the United States as London was in 1940." At Georgetown University next day, he said: "Our problem today in Asia is that we are abysmally ignorant of that part of the world. Out of the tragedy of war comes an impetus and incentive for knowledge." On a flying trip to Manhattan, he alighted in the penthouse of the Carlyle Hotel and, pounding the arms of John F. Kennedy's old rocking chair, mused aloud: "The war is doing for us what the Sputnik did in the space field. It's forcing us to come to grips with Asia."

For an audience of high school and college editors in New York, the Vice President answered the rote objection that the Saigon Government is unstable, undemocratic, and unpopular. "For many centuries," explained Old Teacher Humphrey, "the Vietnamese people lived under mandarin rule. Then came generations of colonial domination followed by 25 years of almost constant warfare. This is stony soil for democracy to grow in." He noted by contrast that there had been little protest from liberals over U.S. support for Greece during its struggle against Communist insurgency in the late 1940's. Yet, he pointed out, Athen's governmental gyrations in that time exceeded even Saigon's changes of regime.

Whites only? When Senator Robert Kennedy suggested in February that the Vietcong's political arm, the National Liberation Front, should be included in a postwar government of South Vietnam, it was Humphrey who retorted that any such concession would only dignify "banditry and murder." On the same issue, Humphrey argued last week: "The National Liberation Front is not national, and it liberates no one. The only honest word is that it's a front. It is a front for the Communist Party out of Hanoi, backed by the Peking Communist Party."

On a 2-day trip home to Minneapolis, Humphrey told a Jefferson-Jackson Day audience of 3,000: "There are people who talk about Asians as if they lived on some other planet. We even hear that only Asians should concern themselves with Asia. If we heeded such counsel 25 years ago, where would we—and the Asians—be now?" He continued: "Are we to be put in the position of saying that we are able to keep our commitments to white people, not to brown people and yellow people?" Next day, Minnesota's Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party's State central committee unanimously passed a resolution supporting the administration's war policies.

NEW SOCIETY

Nonetheless, it is the "other war," as he calls it—the struggle for social and economic progress in South Vietnam—that has most deeply stirred the Vice President's imagination and energies. Kneading the air with freckled hands, arching his circumflex eyebrows and managing to speak about twice as fast as any teletype can relay his words, he declares: "There is a new spirit there, because we have not only said that we wish to defeat aggression, but we wish to defeat social misery, and here is where we all come in. We are seeking to help build with the South Vietnamese a whole new society."

For South Vietnam's long-term future, in Humphrey's view, recent inspection tours by HEW's John Gardner and Agriculture's Orville Freeman—"with 14 of the outstanding agriculturalists of America"—promise even more potential benefit than any victory of arms. He chafes because congressional committees have a "thousand questions" for military commanders but have yet to call in Freeman or Gardner. In all fairness, reasons Humphrey, Congress should accord equal time to the field marshals of the other war. "Let's learn something," he says.

LEADER

One of Humphrey's greatest satisfactions is the increase in the number of nations that are giving South Vietnam nonmilitary aid—and his own role in that increase as a roving envoy in Asia. Since his last trip, the number of cooperating countries has risen from 32 to 39, with contributions ranging from a

West German hospital ship to Israeli agricultural and medical teams.

On the wing and in full, rasping voice, HUMPHREY maintains that he is crusading for the same causes that he has always championed. In early youth, he revered Woodrow Wilson's concept of collective security ("the right of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life"). He fought isolationism in his native Midwest in the 1930's. From the first, he supported the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and NATO. To him, history is of one piece. "You can't be a world leader," he reasons, "and want to lead only in Western Europe and Latin America." That distinction is particularly relevant to the U.N., which for the sake of its own credibility must eventually demonstrate that it is as much concerned about Asia as it is about Africa or Europe.

It was not until World War II that a President actively enlisted the No. 2 man's talents. Yet, though Henry Wallace performed many chores for Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman during his 82 days as Vice President rarely saw F.D.R. and was not even informed of the atomic bomb's development.

Dwight Eisenhower's distaste for political maneuver brought Richard Nixon to the front as the top party campaigner. Eisenhower included Nixon in Cabinet meetings, and when the President was absent, Nixon presided over both Cabinet and National Security Council. John Kennedy brought Lyndon Johnson closer to security affairs, sent him on a series of good-will missions abroad. But there was no closeness between the two men. "What ever became of Lyndon?" was by summer 1963 a real, rather than a funny, question. Nonetheless, by HUMPHREY's time the Vice Presidency, as Historian James MacGregor Burns has written, had been largely "integrated into the structure of Presidential power and decisionmaking."

PRAIRIE POPULISTS

The biggest factor in HUMPHREY's reemergence is his unusually close personal rapport with L.B.J. HUMPHREY, 54, and Johnson, 57, are a pair of old prairie Populists with a common rural background, the instincts of teachers and a shared lifelong devotion to the New Deal. When they arrived in the Senate on the same day in 1949, HUMPHREY was generally regarded as a brash young radical, a "black knight," as he puts it, intent on tilting against the senatorial establishment ruled by Democrat RICHARD RUSSELL and Republican Robert Taft.

He owed his national reputation to his fire-and-brimstone speech on behalf of a plank at the 1948 convention, which separated the Democrats from the Dixiecrats in short order. Senator HUMPHREY established himself as one of Washington's most voluble men—Johnson was later to say that "the time it takes HUMPHREY to prepare a speech is the time it takes to draw a deep breath"—and he offended many of his seniors, including those who controlled committee assignments and the fate of the bills he introduced in profusion (the first was for a medicare program).

Cooler, shrewder and no great civil rights advocate at the time, Johnson was soon admitted to the Senate establishment. Despite early differences, the two men became close. "Johnson was the first southern Senator I could talk to," HUMPHREY said later. With Johnson as mentor—a facet of their relationship that has held constant—HUMPHREY learned to make his peace with his elders, to accept compromise and delay as the price of worthwhile legislation. HUMPHREY's contribution to the partnerships was to be Johnson's link to the liberal wing in his drive for a commanding position in the Senate.

Even HUMPHREY's initial opposition to Johnson's successful bid for the Democratic Senate leadership in 1953 failed to disrupt their association. Johnson helped HUMPHREY onto the Foreign Relations Committee that same year. By 1964, Johnson was confident that his protege was the man "best qualified to assume the office of President, should that day come." Nor was there any doubt in HUMPHREY's mind that he wanted the vice-presidential nomination.

IN ON EVERYTHING

After a rip-roaring campaign, HUMPHREY soon learned that filling the Vice Presidency could be less exhilarating than running for it. He was depressed by the President's mordant musings over his mortality. "You be good to your Vice President," Johnson said to one reporter. "He could be your President tomorrow morning." After he had been in office a few days, HUMPHREY received a 2 a.m. call from the Secret Service informing him that Johnson had been taken to Bethesda Naval Hospital. Only an hour or so later did he learn that Johnson's trouble was merely a bad cold.

A more chronic concern for HUMPHREY was just what his role in the administration would be. Johnson gave his Vice President more responsibilities than he himself was given by Kennedy: chairmanship of the Cabinet task force on youth, honorary chairmanship of the advisory council to the Office of Economic Opportunity, responsibility for coordinating civil rights affairs. In addition, HUMPHREY inherited the chairmanship of the Space and Peace Corps councils and membership on the National Security Council. "If HUBERT had to take over the Government tonight," says a White House hand, "there would not be one slip because of lack of information on HUMPHREY's part. He is in on literally everything."

URIAH HEEP

Despite the ego-building assignments, there were inevitably frustrations and uncertainties. For the first session of the 89th Congress—the better part of 1965—Johnson wanted HUMPHREY to spend much of his time at the Capitol doing convoy duty on the passage of Great Society legislation. He had vast knowledge of the Senate and the issues, and excellent relations with many Members of Congress. Yet HUMPHREY found, as Johnson had as Vice President, that his influence had largely evaporated. "I am in the club," as he put it, "but no longer a member." He had little to offer in exchange for votes. He could serve Johnson well as an intelligence officer in Congress but not as a field commander.

His Capitol Hill assignment, followed by Johnson's gallbladder operation and protracted convalescence, prevented HUMPHREY from doing much long-distance traveling during his first year. The press made a great show of counting how many trips he was not taking, starting with Winston Churchill's funeral. Many Washingtonians had the impression that Johnson simply wanted HUMPHREY held on a short leash. One newspaper reported that some of HUMPHREY's friends considered Johnson "the great emasculator," and HUMPHREY himself added to his image of a White House Uriah Heep with occasional spasms of turgid praise for the boss.

Johnson, never exactly celebrated as an easy employer, periodically vented his spleen on the Vice President. As a function of his office, HUMPHREY maintained a busy speaking schedule, but Johnson was nettled by the newspaper space that HUMPHREY garnered as a result. "When I was Vice President," Johnson said ominously, "I never held a press conference, and I don't think the Vice President should." Johnson grumbled that HUMPHREY's staff was too large (it numbers 45) and too publicity conscious. For his part, HUMPHREY pulled a few notable gaffes, such as his assurance before a labor group last year that the administration was going to ask for an increase in the minimum wage. "I see by the papers," rasped Johnson, who had no such intention at the time, "that I have a minimum-wage program."

CONSTITUENCY OF ONE

Despite such minor strains, the Johnson-Humphrey relationship on the whole has been intimate, harmonious, and creative. The Vice President has had to swallow his pride and deprecate his contributions to their partnership. "I am Vice President because he made me Vice President," HUMPHREY has remarked. "There are no Humphrey policies, there are no Humphrey programs." HUMPHREY usually imparts his ideas during his frequent private talks with Johnson over dinner or drinks rather than at formal meetings of the Cabinet or NSC. Johnson, comprising what HUMPHREY calls his "constituency of one," listens earnestly to HUMPHREY's expositions on Vietnam, Latin America, farm programs, space exploration, or any of a dozen other subjects. "He knows more about more things than any man up at the Capitol," Johnson has said proudly.

Though the Admirable Crichton role is certainly what the contract calls for—plus an average 14-hour workday—HUMPHREY was unprepared for the public reaction to his first year's performance. A Gallup poll in December reported that 58 percent of those interviewed said they did not want him as President. In a February survey matching him in a presidential race against Richard Nixon, HUMPHREY came out only two points ahead, 47 percent to 45 percent, with 8 percent undecided, whereas in March, ROBERT KENNEDY led Nixon 54 percent to 41 percent. A slightly more encouraging Louis Harris poll last week concluded that most Americans (54 percent to 45 percent) have a "positive" opinion of HUMPHREY.

HARD TALK, HARD LOOKING

When the first Gallup poll was published, Johnson was completing his convalescence and the congressional session was already over, leaving HUMPHREY free for a foray abroad. His first swing around the Philippines, Formosa, South Korea and Japan was a rapid, if not vapid, display of good will. The real turning point for HUMPHREY came last January, when Johnson sent him to India for Lal Bahadur Shastri's funeral. There he conferred privately with Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygen, and on his return gave the President a shrewd analysis of the Russian leader, whom he regards as strictly a team man. The two Asian jaunts stimulated speculation that the administration was simply trying to boost HUMPHREY's box-office ratings. "Operation Help HUBERT," sniffed Barry Goldwater, "the most valiant rescue effort since the evacuation of Dunkirk."

HUMPHREY himself silenced the critics in February, when he took on his most challenging assignment to date. Dispatched by the President to confer with officials of nine Far Eastern countries as a follow-up on the Honolulu conference, he managed to combine a minimum of Hubertian high jinks with a maximum of hard talk and hard looking. On his return, Johnson saw a singular opportunity to deploy HUMPHREY's talents in the increasingly confused domestic debate over Vietnam.

JELLY BELLIES

Inevitably, some liberals trumpeted forthwith that HUMPHREY had "sold out" his principles. The Progressive, a Wisconsin monthly founded by Robert La Follette in 1909, mourned the transformation of its old friend HUMPHREY into a "hatchetman," arguing that he had "become more royalist than the crown" on the subject of Vietnam. (Brandeis Prof. John Roche, who, like HUMPHREY, is a charter member and sometime national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action and a supporter of the U.S. commitment to Vietnam, compares such critics to John Birchers.) By contrast, Foreign Relations Committee Chairman WILliam Fulbright, a perennial civil rights opponent, is now a darling of the liberals because of his unyielding criticism of Vietnam policy.

Humphrey accepts abuse from old friends as part of the game, though not without private barbs at "nitpickers and jelly bellies." Says he: "I'm not quite manageable on the Vietnam issue, and a lot of my liberal friends resent it. But I don't think a liberal proves he's a liberal by sitting around and blinking his eyes at acts of terror. It just proves you're a little blind." (On the same point, Secretary of State Dean Rusk says: "Don't ask me to call a man a liberal who wants to turn over to a totalitarian regime more than 14 million South Vietnamese.") Humphrey knows, too, that if the war in Vietnam drags on indefinitely, it could stir a reaction against the administration and doom his own ambitions. "That," says he, "is the price of responsibility." While losing some liberal friends, Humphrey inevitably picks up supporters elsewhere in the political spectrum. There was more truth than comedy in a New Yorker cartoon last week that depicted two crusty country-club types at golf. Said one with obvious approval: "As Hubert Humphrey so aptly put it."

Far from reflecting political expediency, Humphrey's views on Vietnam are a distillation of his oldest and most deeply held convictions. He learned to be an internationalist and social reformer from his father, a small-town South Dakota pharmacist who was bankrupted by the depression. Young Hubert's education in political science at the University of Minnesota was interrupted by financial troubles for 6 years. Before he finally received his degree magna cum laude, he had worked as a druggist, soda jerk, janitor, and hog inoculator. After marrying a hometown girl, Muriel Buck, and fathering the first of their four children, Humphrey went to graduate school and wrote his master's thesis on the New Deal. Settling in Minneapolis, where his first teaching job was for the WPA, he inevitably became involved in local politics.

MAN ON SPRINGS

After running second in a mayoral election, Humphrey brought about a lasting merger of the rival Democratic and Minnesota Farmer-Labor Parties. He won the mayoralty in his second try at age 34. A Minneapolis newspaper reported at the time: "He seems to be a wonderful and meteoric young man, bouncy and gay, built on springs, with a fierce face and pleasant young grin. He puts firecrackers under everything." After two explosively successful terms as a reform mayor, Humphrey became the first Democrat ever popularly elected to the U.S. Senate from Minnesota.

On Capitol Hill, he promoted bills on every subject from water pollution to soybean research. "I like all subjects," he said. "I can't help it. It's glands." Though few got anywhere at first, many of Humphrey's proposals later became law, usually under other men's names. Besides urging a medicare program he fought for Federal aid to education, proposed the Peace Corps 4 years before the Kennedy administration embracked the idea, and recommended a Youth Conservation Corps along the lines of the poverty program's Job Corps. Humphrey's successful appeals to send U.S. farm surpluses to India and Pakistan were the precursors of the food-for-peace program, which now represents 45 percent of all U.S. nonmilitary foreign aid.

Humphrey's involvement in world affairs led to his appointment by Eisenhower as a delegate to the United Nations, the World Health Organization and UNESCO. He traveled extensively, attended the Geneva disarmament talks, had his celebrated 8½-hour Kremlin exchange with Nikita Khrushchev in 1958 and became chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, whose recommendations helped pave the way for the 1963 nuclear test ban treaty. Appointed majority whip in 1961, Humphrey finally had the power to influence landmark legislation, notably in civil rights, for which he had been working throughout most of his career.

NO LETUP

He became preoccupied with Vietnam in early 1964. He conducted a private correspondence with Henry Cabot Lodge, an old friend from U.N. days, who was then in his first tour as Ambassador to Saigon. Humphrey picked the brains of Pentagon and State Department experts—he has little time for reading—and became an apostle of Edward Lansdale, a retired Air Force major general and counterguerrilla expert whose controversial theories on pacification are now being tested in Vietnam.

Though it is his role as foreign-policy exponent that propels Humphrey into the headlines and TV screens these days, he has not let up on the myriad other duties of his office. On a typical day last week, he attended a White House meeting on agricultural policy, met individually with four Congressmen, presided over the Senate during the crucial vote on Vietnam appropriations, conferred with Ceylon's Prime Minister Senanayake, taped a television program, flew to New York for a 2-hour private session with some magazine editors, then attended a dinner given by Engenie Anderson, a fellow Minnesotan who is a member of the U.N. delegation. He was not in bed until 1:30 a.m., slept his normal 6 hours and by 9:15 a.m. had boarded his Air Force jet for the trip back to Washington. After shedding 15 pounds in 2 months of dieting, he appears to be in excellent trim (170 pounds).

VEEPEE TEPEE

Humphrey divides his time in the capital between Lyndon Johnson's old office off the Senate floor and an eight-room suite in the Executive Office Building downtown, a short walk from the White House. What remains of his private life he divides between two homes. He still lives in the suburban Washington house he bought for $28,000 in 1949. It is too small for official entertaining, and the Secret Service has taken over the basement.

Though successive administrations have discussed giving the Vice President an official residence, Humphrey's quandary prompted Congress last week to authorize $750,000 for a manison on the Naval Observatory grounds. Despite Republican gibes at the prospect of "a tepee for the veepee," the bill passed the House, 197 votes to 184, and won unanimous approval in the Senate.

UNFORGETTABLE EXPERIENCE

The other Humphrey house is on Minnesota's Lake Waverly, where he horses around with his pet jackass Pietro, pots at clay pigeons with proficiency or, depending on the season, fishes for bluegill, picnics in the woods, sails, water-skis or plays classical recordings. He also has a reconditioned model A Ford like the one in which he and Muriel set off from Huron, S. Dak., 30 years ago on their honeymoon—and promptly ran down a cow. It is in Waverly that Humphrey is at his earthiest. Though he maintains earnestly that a "politician must never forget he's just one of the folks," his gregariousness reflects a human need rather than a political ploy. "He craves people around him," says an acquaintance, "the way an alcoholic needs the bottle."

His compulsive capers, the irrepressible ebullience, the inexhaustible stream of verbiage, have created for Humphrey what might be called a mystique gap. The Kennedys, by contrast, can seem downright frivolous on occasion—yet curiously enough, the Kennedy brothers have always managed to project a reserved and serious private persona. This may prove a sizable asset to Robert Kennedy if and when the time ever comes to challenge Humphrey directly for the presidential nomination.

As of now, the Senator from New York is treading warily, embellishing his national identity and reportedly building strength in local Democratic organizations across the United States. He received unsolicited help last week from Senator Wayne Morse, who said that he would support Bobby for the Presidency in 1968 provided he continued his criticism of the administration on Vietnam. The endorsement will not be fatal.

No one who was mowed down by the Irish mafia as Humphrey was in 1960 could forget the experience. Last week, after hearing rumors that Kennedy had contributed handsomely to several key gubernatorial campaigns, a Humphrey aid groaned: "Bolt the door, boys. Here they come again."

In fact, the issues, circumstances, and personalities could all change beyond recognition by 1972. It is even conceivable that by then both factions may decide that a Humphrey-Kennedy ticket is preferable to another Humphrey-Kennedy duel. And if Humphrey should succeed to the White House between elections, as eight Vice Presidents have done before him, the presidential succession amendment (already ratified by 28 States) would empower him to appoint his own Vice President. His choice might well be a Kennedy.

TOTAL IMMERSION

No introvert, Humphrey wastes little time brooding on this or any other problem that is patently beyond his control. He sees the road ahead as two parallel lines. First, in full awareness that his prospects for the foreseeable future rest almost entirely in Lyndon Johnson's hands, he intends to discharge his vice-presidential duties precisely as the President prescribes. Second, Humphrey aims to maintain his own political links around the country, has already stumped enthusiastically on behalf of Democratic candidates and the party coffers, and will doubtless intensify his campaign efforts as the November elections—and future Novembers—near.

After the uncertainties and disappointments of last year, Humphrey is now surer than ever of himself and of Lyndon Johnson's confidence. He is totally and contentedly immersed in his job. He is unalterably committed to being himself. And if his advisers complain that this course can only damage his standing in public opinion surveys, he has an answer: "Harry Truman was a great President, but I never noted his mystique. I did observe he had a lot of character. What is important are your convictions, character and commitments." Already, in the hyperactive second phase of his Vice-Presidency, Hubert Humphrey has clearly shown his own credentials.

OUR LAST GREAT OPPORTUNITY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on December 9, 1965, the Evansville, Ind., Chamber of Commerce saluted Mead Johnson & Co. on its 50th anniversary. In response, the president and chief executive officer of the company, D. Mead Johnson, delivered a significant address entitled, "Our Last Great Opportunity." Mr. Johnson said in part:

> Evansville and comparable cities may be the wave of the future—if they prepare for it. None of our forefathers and none of us ever could make a more certain investment than creating an atmosphere for living a good life in a clean and satisfying environment—the entity that will be in greatest demand in the next generation.

The difficult problems of urban growth are not confined to vast metropolitan centers, but neither are the opportunities. With adaptability, innovation, and creativity, our smaller and medium sized communities can become choice locations for the industry of the future. But, as Mr. Johnson stresses, cities must dedicate themselves to constant renewal.

Mr. President, because of its importance to modern urban America, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of D. Mead Johnson be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR LAST GREAT OPPORTUNITY

(An address by D. Mead Johnson, president and chief executive officer, Mead Johnson & Co., presented at 50th anniversary salute to Mead Johnson & Co., by Evansville Chamber of Commerce, December 9, 1965, at Evansville, Ind.)

It has been said that no man ever felt the deficiency of language so much as the grateful. It is not possible to express fittingly our profound gratitude for the honor you have bestowed on us.

It is to the 4,000 people throughout the world who are Mead Johnson & Co. that this recognition rightfully belongs. These men and women know of our pride in them, but as you honor them here today, I am sure you do so not so much for what they have done, but for what they will do. Since they cannot all be here, perhaps you will permit me to honor and present the officers of the company.

They are in the line of individuals who have enriched our human and corporate history and renew confidence in our true destiny.

I praise them, not out of loyalty and affection, but out of pride and conviction.

We can all reflect nostalgically on the past 50 years. There are pleasant memories, I am sure, for all of us in our times here in Evansville. Nostalgia is a bittersweet pleasure, but the best use of the past is to learn how best to use the future. And the lessons of the past 50 years—a period that embraces the lifetime of many of us—are fortunately very clear and incisive. They say to us: To thrive, we must change. In this age of great uncertainties, there is only one thing we can be certain of: The future will be very different from today.

In 1915 changes came so imperceptibly that plans were made to fit conditions as they were, and the goal of most companies and most people was to eliminate the uncertainties—for most changes were looked on as threats, rather than opportunities.

AN AGE OF REVOLUTIONS

Today changes are so numerous and so rapid that it may well be called the age of revolutions. We have the revolution of the underdeveloped countries; the revolution of totalitarianism; the revolution of race relations; the revolution of lower death rates and higher birth rates; the revolution of education; the revolution of aspirations, with everyone clamoring for better, fuller lives; new upheavals of thought in religion and morality; new attitudes toward the role of government and the rights of the individual.

There is a broad chain reaction among these, because each area in ferment creates great changes in other aspects of life. Any company, institution, community, or nation that seeks to stand unmoved in this turmoil is certain to decay. We are living through an age of revolutions—and in all revolutions, those who anticipate and move with the course of the future will succeed; those who try to cling only to what served in the past will be swept aside.

CONTROL OF THE FUTURE

Today the prudent man, company or community is one that anticipates its role under changing conditions and moves in time to fill that role. Survival in the 1960's and 1970's will go not to the immutable, but to the adaptable.

This realization in itself may be the most important change of all, for in the past survival was considered the reward for resisting changes from established precepts.

But, preparing for a new future, about which we can be certain only that it will be different, is a new and great challenge to man's courage and creativity. It is far more than adaptability, for being able to go only whichever way the latest wind blows is to be nothing more than opportunistic.

It may well be that one of the most important developments of the past 50 years is one we never hear mentioned with the dramatic advances of aviation, space flight, wonder drugs, television, automation, and the rest. This is the conscious application of creative intelligence—and innovation—to the knowns and the unknowns that make up the future—to be astride the future rather than behind it. To plan intelligently is to wrest control of the future from chance. In this way we must cope with poisoned air and water, strangling transportation and communication inadequacies, population pressures, water shortages, and the rapidly growing ills of our burgeoning world.

In the early 1950's, we at Mead Johnson, as a matter of decision, engaged in a program of self-renewal—not knowing exactly what the future challenges would be, nor what course our own changes would bring, but certain that decay would result from standing still. We knew we would go through trials and travail—and we have. We knew we would be traversing unknown paths, and that we would never feel the satisfaction of "having it made." But, we are molding the course of our future.

No man and no company stands alone. Our company is dependent on conditions in business generally, in medicine and health, in government, in international affairs, in education—and in our community. So you may well ask, what does Mead Johnson & Co. expect to become, because this will have an influence on what the future may hold for the community. And we ask, what will Evansville become, because this will have an important influence on what becomes of Mead Johnson & Co. and other businesses of the present as well as those of the future.

By 1975 Mead Johnson & Co., will have achieved global sales volume of approximately $250 to $300 million—an increase of 2½ times.

RESEARCH FOR LIFE

The investment in research and development, which tripled in the past decade, will increase at a much greater rate. This effort is at the forefront of change and is the heart of our future. In essence, our business is research for life.

In the next 5 years we expect to spend $30 million over the world to speed our growth. Of this, $20 million will be invested to build and equip new research, manufacturing and administrative facilities in the Evansville area. For the community, this means major contributions to the economy, increased employment at our facilities, employment for construction workers, greater purchases from local suppliers of materials, additional tax income for local government, and participation by a larger, well-educated work force in local community, educational, and governmental functions.

But, these plans cannot be executed in a vacuum. They must be executed in a living climate that is hospitable for what must be done.

No company's future can be any better than the caliber of people it is able to attract. This is increasingly true in all industries, where research and development are so essential and managerial excellence is vital. New ideas come from exceptional people—the best educated, the most alert, the most dedicated. These are the exceptional people who are rare in any society, and for whom there is a bitter rivalry. This type of person is in great demand, and his own demands from life are high. He measures his worth in terms of his aspirations. He aspires to fulfillment of his own potential, to recognition of his uniqueness as an individual, to making important contributions to human welfare, to economic security. These aspirations a company can hope to meet . . . but he also aspires to the good things of life that come from how he and his family live: beauty, stimulating companionship, good education for his children, various recreational facilities, comforts and satisfactions such as libraries, music and drama, art and ideas.

He aspires to greatness as an individual, greatness in the company he works for—and greatness in the society he lives in. Achieving the Great Society is not just solving the massive social problems of our Nation, but more intimately, achieving the kind of community the individual wants to spend his life in.

THE NEW WAVE OF OPPORTUNITY

For many years there has been a polarization of talented people to the vast metropolitan centers of New York, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco. Too many parents in cities like Evansville have seen their sons and daughters go through college and move on to a vast urban center that seems to offer more challenge, more excitement, than the hometown.

But now we have a shifting again—and perhaps the last great opportunity for Evansville. People are asking in alarm, "What's wrong with New York?" "Can the sickness of the big cities be cured?" People are realizing what overpopulation can do to these cities. They are asking themselves in an age of television and videophone, jet planes and facsimile pictures, whether the price of living in an urban center is a necessary price to pay.

Seldom has opportunity been so sharply outlined—yet largely unrecognized. Evansville and comparable cities may be the wave of the future—if they prepare for it. None of our forefathers and none of us ever could make a more certain investment than creating an atmosphere for living a good life in a clean and satisfying environment—the entity that will be in greatest demand in the next generation.

In 1958, the community organized to meet a crisis. Those who have been involved in the progress of the community since those dark days know that not only must the momentum be maintained, it must be increased if this city is to achieve self-renewal.

Great things are seldom done by unanimity or even consensus—they are done by a few imaginative, creative leaders. A community is the lengthened shadow of its prime movers. Leaders who want to get things done can inspire the people—as New Haven has done in renewing its central city; as Houston is doing in becoming the space center of the United States; as Chicago is doing in overcoming crime and slums. Even small cities can lift themselves—as Stratford, Ontario, did with its annual Shakespeare Festival; as Green Bay does with its support of a major football team.

It's not climate or even location—it is people and the pride of people that make the difference. Look at Minneapolis and St. Paul—just a river apart. St. Paul for generations was the king city of its region. But the leaders in Minneapolis were the ones who had the imagination, the creativity and the desire, and look at how the two cities compare today.

Let us also remember that if we don't move ahead, we're most certain to move back. Even young America is pocked with communities that were once thriving and modern, but now are ghost towns.

WHAT WE CAN ASPIRE TO

And what rewards there are to contemplate. By providing what the future demands, we will create new security, a better way of life, preservation of our freedom, and a glowing sense of accomplishment. What more can we ever hope to gain from our energies and our capital?

We at Mead Johnson pledge our full support, individually and collectively, toward achieving the goal of Evansville's self-renewal. We are eager to join with others similarly dedicated.

I have tried to indicate where I believe our aspirations should lead us. Let us renew our dedication to the challenge and grasp this last great opportunity.

WHO KEEPS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN CHAINS?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of the handbill which is being distributed in the District of Columbia by the Free D.C. Movement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WHO KEEPS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN CHAINS?

In chains 400 years—and still in chains in the District of Columbia.

Washington, D.C., the Capital City of America, the land that promises freedom to its people, is still in chains, is still the unwilling victim of political slavery.

WE DEMAND THE RIGHT TO VOTE NOW

Nowhere else in this great country, not in any city, not in any county, and not in any State are people governed solely by Congress and denied the right to elect their own local government.

Washington is the last and only place where people are not legally free and are denied man's most precious freedom—the right to vote.

WHO KEEPS US IN POLITICAL SLAVERY?

Senator BYRD has kept our children hungry by denying us aid to dependent children while the children in his State get food. Senator BYRD sends welfare investigators into our homes in the middle of the night and violates the rights of our women.

Congressman MCMILLAN has killed laws that would have given us the right to vote.

BYRD and MCMILLAN and their southern friends who hate us have gotten together with the moneylord merchants of the District of Columbia. The moneylord merchants of the District of Columbia pay low taxes and make big profits. But we have to pay high taxes. The moneylord merchants charge us high prices for goods and high prices for credit. We have to pay the taxes that the moneylord merchants of the District of Columbia should be paying. The white segregationists praise the moneylord merchants in opposing our right to vote.

Boycott the moneylord merchants who help to steal our vote. Shop only at the stores with the "Free D.C." sign.

We can't hurt BYRD and MCMILLAN, but we can hurt the moneylord merchants. Why should we spend our money with people who are our enemies? Why should we spend our money with people who help to hold us in political slavery? Why should we spend our money with the moneylord merchants who help to keep the vote away from us?

Join the Free D.C. Movement for the right to vote.

Volunteer your help—Call—SNCC, boycott headquarters, 107 Rhode Island Avenue NW., phone 387-7445.

What can we do?

LOUSY SCHOOLS

A person with a good education earns $100,000 more in his lifetime than a person with a bad education. (45 years worked times $2,200 more income per year.)

18,000 young people have dropped out of school in the District of Columbia in the last 5 years while only 15,000 have graduated. The lifetime income loss that will be suffered by these 18,000 dropouts during their working years will total the staggering sum of $1.8 billion.

The southern white Congressmen and the moneylord merchants are responsible for the District of Columbia's lousy schools.

Boycott the moneylord merchants who help to steal our vote. Shop only at the stores with the "Free D.C." sign.

COPS CUSS US

The southern white Congressmen and their unscrupulous friends, the moneylord merchants, of the District of Columbia control our government. They control the appointment of the cops.

The cops recruit and hire southern white men who hate us. The cops beat us, cuss us, mistreat us and put us in jail for nothing.

The southern white Congressmen and the moneylord merchants get special treatment. They get their traffic tickets fixed.

Boycott the moneylord merchants who help to steal our vote. Shop only at the stores with the "Free D.C." sign.

FILTHY HOUSING

The slumlords are the allies of the southern Congressmen and the moneylord merchants.

Congress has passed laws called urban renewal and slum clearance. What urban renewal really means is Negro removal. What slum clearance really means is Negro clearance.

After they tear down our houses, the moneylord merchants and Buslord Chalk buy the land. They build big apartment buildings and charge high rents. We can't afford to pay the high rent they ask for the nice apartments.

After Negro removal and Negro clearance, there are fewer places left for us to live so the slumlords crowd us tighter in filthy houses and raise the rents. The only answer to the slumlords is to get the right to vote and run the slumlords out of town.

Boycott the moneylord merchants who help to steal our vote. Shop only at the stores with the "Free D.C." sign.

PEOPLE POWER

What can we do? By ourselves we can do nothing. United and joined together, we can develop people power. The answer to the southern white Congressman and the white power structure is people power, people joining with other people to work together.

We won the bus boycott with people power. We will win the vote boycott with people power.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PROPOSED INDIAN-AMERICANS FOUNDATION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, President Johnson's proposal to use Indian currency which the United States holds as a result of food-for-peace sales to finance an Indian-American Foundation can make a unique contribution toward India's betterment through education, science, and agriculture.

This proposal can bring new initiative and imagination into play, and can create new sources of strength and inspiration for the host of programs in many fields.

The Foundation would be led by a distinguished group of 18 Indian and American men and women of science, education, and other professions. It would be authorized to make grants for a variety of projects leading to India's further educational, scientific, and agricultural development.

These are some of the programs which might be supported:

Pilot and other projects in literacy and adult education.

Programs in farmer education, farm services, and agricultural research and development.

Improvement of techniques of communications, stressing the transfer of research knowledge to farmers.

Development of educational centers and scholarships for advanced study.

These activities would be authorized by the Foundation on the basis of objective and systematic studies of priority needs. There is urgent need to improve agricultural production and the Foundation could provide in important stimulation for projects in this area. The proposed Foundation would add an important new dimension to current efforts, both public and private, to deal effectively and decisively with the problem of raising India's food production. For the mutual benefits of our nations, we should join together in strong support for this constructive use of U.S.-owned rupees.

ELWOOD INTERNATIONAL DAY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, one of the best ways in which the United States contributes to better understanding among peoples of the world is through its student exchange program. Understanding and communication come easily to young people, and the exchange program is working admirably at the high school as well as the college level.

This year one Indiana secondary institution, Wendell Willkie High School, of Elwood, invited foreign exchange students studying in central Indiana to visit Elwood for an international day in order to share their experiences with each other and with American students. During this event, students from the high school met with some 25 young people from many nations to discuss their respective cultures.

Many American youngsters as well as the visiting foreign students profited greatly from this inspiring event. A description of this recent international day appeared in an article published by the Elwood Call-Leader of Elwood, Ind. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-FIVE FOREIGN STUDENTS OF 17 COUNTRIES HERE

More than 250 persons attended the second annual Elwood International Day banquet held Friday evening at the Oakland School dining room which climaxed Willkie High School's international week program.

Twenty-five foreign students from 17 different nations were guests of the evening and each spoke briefly about his or her homeland and gave some of the impressions they received of America.

The foreign students visited classes at the high school all day Thursday and each discussed some of his experiences while here in the United States at an all-school gathering held in the high school gymnasium Friday afternoon.

Most of the exchange students are staying a full year and while living with their American sponsors they study American subjects during their stay here at local high schools throughout the State.

All of the students are staying with families located in the central part of the State.

James Hiatt, facility sponsor of Elwood's foreign exchange program, served as master of ceremonies at the affair and introduced various people who helped make the program possible and stated that he was very pleased with the turnout, and that this year's banquet was a complete success.

Hiatt said that he was looking forward to next year with hopes of a much bigger and broader program.

The purpose of the program was to acquaint Elwood students and Elwood citizens with the many foreign students in this part of the State and to give the foreign students themselves an opportunity to get acquainted with each other.

Willkie High Principal Blair Sullivan announced the selection of an Elwood student who would represent this city as a foreign exchange student this summer. Carol Yarling was chosen from several junior year students as the foreign exchange student to represent Willkie High School.

TIMBER ALLOWABLE CUT—PART III

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on January 17 and on February 16 I addressed the Senate on the subject of "Allowable Timber Cuts on Federal Lands in Oregon—A Tempest in a Teapot." In those statements I made it clear that I would continue my stanch defense of a sound conservation program in connection with Federal timber cutting in Oregon and elsewhere in the Nation. Recently a publication of the Portland Chamber of Commerce contained an article illustrative of the need for better understanding of what constitutes conservation management and its proper application in the State of Oregon and other States where there are large federally-managed timber holdings.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, an article by Mr. Charles E. Young from the January issue of the publication, "Greater Portland Commerce."

These being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC HIGHLIGHTS

(By Charles E. Young, director, Economic Services & Market Research, Western Wood Products Association)

Oregon's growth in the next two decades can range from stagnant to impressively solid, depending partly on the success of the solid work that is going on to attract new industries and expand industries already here—but also depending to a major extent on the future course of the forest products industries, which now account for more than half of the State's manufacturing employment.

What will happen to the forest industries of Oregon depends, in turn, on their supply of raw materials. Until the past few years, the bulk of raw materials for Oregon's forest products came from privately-owned forest lands. In recent years, the volume of logs produced from private lands has declined sharply, and now all but a very few forest products companies in Oregon rely heavily or completely on government-owned timber for their log supply.

Beginning about 1958, the two Federal agencies holding the bulk of the Government-owned timber stepped up their timber sale activities, and the volume of Government-owned timber cut in western Oregon more than doubled in the following 5 years, offsetting a simultaneous drop in the volume of private timber cut. This increase brought the cut of Government-owned timber up to the calculated "allowable cut" for the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

Now there is increasingly lively discussion as to whether these calculated allowable cuts of Government-owned timber really represent the proper level of activity, taking into account the many decades of undercutting of Government-owned timber in the past, and the presently declining production from private lands that were overcut in the past.

The Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, the research arm of the Forest Service in this region, released a report in 1963 entitled "Timber Trends in Western Oregon and Western Washington." The report, which had been prepared in 1960 by Dr. William A. Duerr of Syracuse University, presented projections of log production based on continuation of present trends. For the Douglas-fir region as a whole (western Oregon plus western Washington), the report projected a decline in log production from private timber holdings of more than 20 percent, only partly offset by increased production from Government-owned timber. The net result would be a reduction of about 10 percent in total log supply for the region from the 1960's to the 1980's and 1990's. With the probability of further increases in use of logs for plywood and for pulp, the drop in logs available for lumber production would be much sharper.

Although this projection for the entire Douglas fir region was serious enough, the projection for the five southwest Oregon counties was virtually catastrophic. It called for a drop of nearly 50 percent in log production from private holdings between the 1960's and the 1990's and a drop in total production from all ownerships of nearly 25 percent.

Under present policies of the Forest Service and other Government timber owners, then, the output of forest products in western Oregon, especially lumber, is clearly headed for a decline over the next 20 to 30 years, because of a limited raw material supply.

In mid-October of 1965, the Interim Committee on Public Lands of the Oregon State Legislature brought to light a 25-page section of Dr. Duerr's draft report which had not been published by the Forest Service because it was contrary to the Forest Service's even-flow policy of timber cutting, and because it was not sufficiently documented. The missing section dealt with the possibility of accelerating the cutting of Government-owned timber to offset the reduction in cut from private lands. One possibility that was considered was an increase in annual production of logs from Government-owned timber in the Douglas-fir region from slightly over 4 billion board feet in 1960 to a peak of 10 billion board feet around 1985; it would then drop back in the next 25 to 30 years to around 6 billion board feet. The rise, but not the subsequent drop, received considerable publicity in the press during October and November.

From a forestry standpoint, there is no question that liquidation of Government-owned old-growth timber on a much faster basis that the present allowable cuts, and replacement of these overaged stands by well-stocked young stands, would greatly increase timber growth for the future. The problem, of course, is to maintain an adequate supply of usable raw material at any given time, Government-owned timber reserves are more than adequate to do this, even with accelerated cut over a period of 20 to 30 years.

Usability, of course, is a relative matter. Logs are being used today of species, sizes, and grades that would have been left in the woods a generation ago. There is little question that a generation ahead, with an accelerated pace of technological development, smaller logs from younger trees can be made to serve, with large timbers, beams, etc., achieved by lamination. Thus it is not essential that rotation ages be as great as have been used in the past.

Further, managed second-growth stands are already being made to yield more growth per acre than the untended forest of the past. Also, the availability of raw material of more nearly uniform size and quality will permit substantial production economies through mechanization.

Additional light is about to be shed on these discussions of how much Government-owned timber can and should be cut. Bonneville Power Administration is about to publish a report on "Prospective Economic Developments Based on the Timber Resources of the Pacific Northwest," prepared for Bonneville under contract by the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station of the U.S. Forest Service. This will be the first published projection based on the new timber resource estimates as of January 1, 1963.

What this report will show is that the cut from Government-owned timber in western Oregon can be increased substantially over the production in the 1963 report, resulting in a slightly rising total log production from all sources through the 1970's and 1980's. The report will further show that, for the Douglas-fir region as a whole, the log supply will support substantial increases in the production of veneer, plywood, and wood pulp, with only a nominal reduction of lumber production between 1962 and 1985.

These projections still do not reflect the possibility of accelerating the cut of Government-owned timber during the decades ahead while the second-growth trees on millions of acres of private lands are growing up to usable size. Although there is little likelihood that the boom-and-bust pattern of acceleration discussed in the Duerr report will be adopted, there is at the same time no question that the cut from Government-owned timber can prudently be increased substantially over the present allowable cuts, and even above the levels projected in the forthcoming Bonneville report.

As the situation now stands, not only the health of the forest products industries, but the whole economic growth of Oregon over the next 20 to 30 years is endangered by the present timber-cutting policies for Government-owned timber. There is well-documented evidence that these policies can and should be revised in the direction of increased cut. They must be, if total employment and incomes in Oregon are to continue to grow.

Under present conditions of an urgent demand pressing on the restricted supply of Government-owned timber, Government timber auctions in the Douglas-fir region are bringing the world's highest prices for softwood timber, at the expense of hard-pressed operators who must buy or die. The Government agencies set an appraised price on these timber sales representing their best estimate of fair-market value. Many of the auctions have ended with the lucky (?) winner paying two to three times the appraised price.

These high costs of timber and logs put Northwest producer of lumber, plywood and pulp at a serious disadvantage in competition with British Columbia and the South. Douglas-fir and hemlock, the principal coast species, are consistently being bought from their Government by British Columbia producers at less than half the prices paid for Government-owned timber by Oregon operators. This, coupled with lower water transportation costs to the east coast of the United States, has enabled British Columbia producers to take over two-thirds of the east coast lumber market, formerly an Oregon-Washington stronghold.

Softwood plywood has been an outstanding growth industry nationally over the past 10 to 15 years, primarily because of its growth in western Oregon. This industry, too, is coming under increasing competition from other regions whose freight costs to eastern markets are substantially less than from western Oregon. Although most of the popular attention has gone to the recent start and rapid expansion of softwood plywood production in the south, new capacity is also being expanded rapidly in the Mountain States and in the inland portions of Washington and Oregon. This growing competition from other regions is likely, for one thing, to slow the growth of softwood plywood production in western Oregon. It also means that it will become more and more impractical for western Oregon plywood plants to continue to pay the record-high prices for raw materials that recent sales of Government-owned timber have brought. Here again, a solid base of Oregon employment is threatened, not only by the artificial scarcity of Government timber, but by the accompanying high costs that threaten the competitive position of Oregon mills.

It may appear to some readers that in this article I have been a special pleader for the troubles of forest-product producers. What I want to stress is that forest products are such a basic and essential part of Oregon's total economy that their troubles are everyone's troubles. If the production of forest products in Oregon is curtailed by artificial scarcity of raw material from Government timber holdings, and by the necessary corollary of excessive raw-material costs, it can bring to naught the costly and diligent efforts by so many peoples to bring healthy economic growth to Oregon.

The administrators of Government timber are dealing with a renewable resource, not a shrinking board. Millions of acres in Oregon are rapidly growing new crops of trees. The latest information indicates that, if they view the Oregon timber situation as a whole, including both Government and private ownerships, the managers of Government timber can provide the raw-material needs of a thriving forest-products base for Oregon's growth. If they do not, alert citizens may well ask, why not?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Young is now the Director of Economic Services and Market Research for the Western Wood Products Association. Previously he was an economist on the staff of the Weyerhaeuser Co. and most recently operated his own economic consultant firm.

Mr. Young bases his observations on the proposition that the cut from Government-owned timber can prudently be increased substantially above present allowable cuts. He asserts there is well documented evidence that cutting policies for Federal timberlands in Oregon could and should be revised in the direction of increased cuts. Just what evidence and who possesses it Mr. Young does not say.

The issues Mr. Young is raising are the same issues over cutting policies on the National Forests and other public forests which were at the root of the controversy over the so-called Duerr Report on which I spoke at some length on January 17. Oregon forests contain about one-fifth of the total volume of sawtimber in the Nation and provide nearly one-fifth of the total annual cut of forest products. Approximately 70 percent of the timber volume in the State of Oregon is in Federal ownership. However, this is an issue with significance far beyond the borders of the State of Oregon.

Mr. Young asserts that the economic growth of Oregon for the next 20 to 30 years is endangered by present timber cutting policies for Government-owned timber. He cites the projections from the 1963 Forest Service publication, "Timber Trends in Western Oregon and Western Washington," which includes an estimate that for the five counties in southwestern Oregon the cut on privately owned and managed timberlands will decline by 50 percent. Thus he concludes the total cut from all lands will decline by 25 percent, between the 1960's and 1990's. Mr. Young terms such a trend catastrophic, and well it may be. But when he attributes this projected decline in total cut to the present policies of the Forest Service and other Government timber owners, the bona fides of his case deserve scrutiny. This is a most puzzling assertion when we consider that all of the expected reduction in cut is due to depletion of privately owned and managed timberland.

The cure for declining production on private lands is not to abandon sustained yield conservation management on Federal lands by increasing cutting rates beyond sustainable perpetual harvest levels for the public forests.

A policy of trying to balance decreases in the ability of private timber in Oregon and other western States to sustain communities by automatically increasing allowable cuts on Federal timberlands would mean junking the whole concept of conservation.

The word "conservation" shares its origin with the term "conservative"—both of which have the same Latin root, conservare—to keep in a safe or sound state, to preserve from destruction.

I have long held that conservation is not the sole province of the States or the Federal Government. It is a private responsiblity. So before people advance the theory that the State and Federal Government should overcut the public forest because the private owners have liquidated the private forests, they have an obligation to address themselves to the private responsibility.

The public agencies have responded wholeheartedly to the increasing dependency of the forest products industry of the West on federally managed timberlands as privately owned timber has been cut out. I believe that if the question were put to the people of Oregon they would say: Log production on public lands must be limited to their sustained yield capabilities.

What does the record show? In the peak year 1952, log production from private holdings in western Oregon reached 8.1 billion board feet—international ¼-inch rule. By 1964 cutting on private lands had declined to 4.2 billion board feet. This was a reduction from private lands of 52 percent, a drop of 3.9 billion board feet.

The cut on national forest lands in western Oregon, on the other hand, has nearly tripled since 1952 from 1.1 billion board feet—international ¼-inch rule—to 2.9 billion board feet in 1964. The cut of timber on BLM and State lands likewise increased substantially from about 1.2 billion board feet in 1952 to 2 billion board feet in 1964. This was an increase of 2.6 billion board feet from State and Federal forests. This increase was within sustained yield allowable cuts.

Since 1952 annual log output has varied from as high as 10.4 billion board feet in 1952 to as low as 7.1 billion board feet in 1961. Log production in 1964, amounting to 9.1 billion board feet, was about 3 percent below the average for the early 1950's. The net effect of these conflicting trends has been a steady increase in the cut from public forests, a general decrease of the cut from private lands, and a fairly stable total cut.

Much of the recent concern over the rate of timber cutting in Oregon stems from the fact that employment in the forest industries has been declining more rapidly than log production. In the period 1950–52, for example, an average of 74,650 workers were employed in logging and wood manufacturing plants in western Oregon. Employment in 1964 amounted to 69,400 workers in these activities, or 7 percent less than in the early 1950's.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks pertinent portions of the text of "Manpower Use in the Wood-Producing Industries of Oregon and Washington, 1950–63" published by the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station of the Forest Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I commend the entire publication, with its excellent graphs, to any who wish to study all of the facts. However, there is substantial evidence that the change in employment stems from other factors than log availability.

We should note carefully the material of this publication that shows a general decline in employees per million board feet of logs harvested in four study areas, eastern and western Oregon and eastern and western Washington. This decline occurred despite the fact that in 1963 log production in western Washington and western Oregon was as high in 1963 as in 1950. Even more significant was the indication that the timber industry in eastern and western Washington provides substantially more employment per million board feet of logs harvested than do the Oregon mills.

Mr. Young also alludes to a new projection of cutting trends recently prepared by the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station of the Forest Service for the Bonneville Power Administration. I am told this 1965 study indicates a prospective rise in log output in western Oregon over the next 20 years of perhaps 3 percent above output in 1963. This more promising outlook reflects new inventory information obtained since the 1960 study of "Timber Trends" and reflects recent upward revisions of allowable cut determinations of the Federal timber managing agencies.

In spite of this projected stability of future log production, resulting largely from recent upward revisions of the allowable cut on Federal lands, Mr. Young appears to propose even further increases in cutting rates on the national forests and other Federal and State lands to offset declining employment in the forest industries of western Oregon.

If this continuing downward trend in employment in forest-based industries is a result of the introduction of better machinery and marked improvements in technology it would be folly to pursue a policy of cutting beyond sustained forest growth to stabilize employment. This proposal also overlooks recognizing that some part of the reduction in direct employment in logging and wood manufacturing plants may be offset by increased employment in factories producing logging and plant equipment, and by increased employment in servicing wood-based industries.

Nevertheless, the need to create new employment opportunities for our expanding population is one of our most critical problems. It is a problem we will face in many industries and in many States. Ours is a dynamic economy; its hallmark is change. By further development of our forest resources we can provide more raw materials for the timber industries and more of the jobs needed for continued economic growth. By refining the output we can add to the utility of wood products. This in itself can mean more jobs.

I believe that all those concerned with our forest policy would agree that any expansion of cutting on the national forests and other Federal and State forests must be based upon sound forestry principles. I believe they would reject any change in timber cutting policies that resulted in a boom-and-bust timber economy. For example, for some 60 years the Forest Service has managed the national forests under the principles of sustained yield. I cannot conceive that a departure from this policy is an acceptable alternative. This is the concept of forest conservation that I have supported for many years. It is the concept of forest conservation in which the people of my State believe.

In the final analysis the true permanence of our forest products industries rests on the fact that timber is a renewable resource and if cut and managed under sustained yield we will enjoy the benefits of the forest in perpetuity. Only to a minor degree are its forest products industries processing trees less than 100 years in age. According to the forest experts, the western timber industries now and continuing beyond the year 2000, will depend primarily on old-growth timber. Second-growth timber in the volumes required to replace old-growth supplies for the forest industries of Oregon and other Western States must, to a major degree, still be grown. This means, I am told, that in order to have continuity of forest industries, the rate of cutting of the old-growth timber must be gaged to make it last until second-growth in the volumes required is ready for cutting.

Today and for the next three decades carefully calculated amounts of old-growth timber on Federal lands in Oregon and other western States are to be withheld from cutting to supply industry with raw materials after the year 2000. To characterize such foresighted provisions as the promotion of an artificial timber scarcity is a disservice to the local welfare and community stability. This is particularly true when the private forests continue to be cut far faster than their sustained yield growth capacity.

This regulation of the rate of cutting of old-growth timber on the federally managed timberlands of the West unavoidably entails deferment of income, mortality losses, and some loss of potential growth. The acres occupied by old-growth timber will not be producing new crops at the magnificent growth potentials of Oregon's forest lands. These are costs the Federal Government and State is assuming to provide continuity of support to forest-dependent communities. This is the heart of the term "conservation"—for it looks at the whole long-term need.

Allowable cut determination for Federal and State timberlands must necessarily take into account estimates of tree growth, cutting methods, utilization standards, and market demand for almost a century in the future. Allowance must also be made for the impacts during this period from competing needs for primary use of commercial forest land for scenic beauty, recreation, and watershed management. It is fitting and proper that these estimates of future development be kept under constant scrutiny as significant events, better data, and better evaluation processes develop.

Unquestionably the people of Oregon want sustained-yield management with continuity of support of forest industries, for the federally owned timberlands. They want full and well-rounded conservation management which protects scenic values, provides for outdoor recreation needs, and maintains watershed values as timber is grown and harvested. I think they would like to see the private forests more conservatively cut.

They also want intensified timber management to provide the sound basis to increase log production beyond the levels now projected if this can be done under sustained yield.

Completion of the system access roads on these national forests, for example, would permit the recovery of large volumes of timber that are now lost to insects, windthrow, and other destructive agents. Extension of this road system would also make possible other timber management activities. It would open up new areas for recreation and other nontimber uses of the land.

Prompt planting or reseeding of cut-over areas and burns adds significantly to the region's growing stock and log output in future years by shortening the time required to grow new crops of timber. On the national forests of Oregon, for example, there are some 138,000 acres of nonstocked commercial forest land that were deforested primarily by wildfire. Good progress is being made in reforestation of such areas. More remains to be done to achieve further increases in log production. There are even greater acreages in private ownership that need reforestation.

An expansion of thinning programs, and greater salvage of timber now lost during logging, would also increase log supplies from the national forests and other Federal and State lands.

There is also a need for accelerated research to develop and apply new technology that will open up new possibilities for increasing log supplies. New systems for aerial logging, for example, must be developed to make accessible the timber in many steep mountainous areas where conventional logging is precluded by watershed or recreational considerations.

Thus, intensified timber management is the means by which economic opportunities and employment can be increased in the forest products industries of the Pacific Northwest. The progress made in expanding forestry programs will determine the rate at which allowable cuts can be increased. Merely accelerating the liquidation of old-growth timber without provision for its replacement would not be a sound policy for management of these national forests, other Federal forests, or State forests.

The conservation and development of Oregon's forest resources is of vital concern to Oregon, and thus to the Nation. These forests belong to all the people. While the present and future of our forest-dependent communities is of far-reaching importance, it is the well-managed forest that provides jobs in perpetuity.

The rapid liquidation of our private forests is not being matched by a commensurate private effort to get private forests on a sustained yield basis. Unless the forest industries and conservationists join hands to reverse this trend at a faster rate than is currently occurring, pressures to overcut the public forests will mount.

The pleas I make to this vital industry is that it look reality squarely in the face. Panaceas will not cure the problems that will confront you when the private forests are gone.

Public opinion will not permit the public forests to be liquidated to preserve an industry that has not renewed a renewable resource.

As long as I have the responsibility of public office placed on me, I intend to assure that the people have the facts so that they can determine what our public policy should be.

I want to make it clear, however, that I intend to assist this timber industry in its legitimate aspirations to meet its resource requirements.

EXHIBIT 1

[Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service, Research Paper PNW 28, 1965]

MANPOWER USE IN THE WOOD-PRODUCTS INDUSTRIES OF OREGON AND WASHINGTON, 1950–63

(By Richard C. Smith and Donald R. Gedney)

FOREWORD

This study of employment in the wood-products industries during the period 1950 to 1963 was undertaken in response to the need for a sound, up-to-date basis for projecting the future development of the Pacific Northwest forest economy. This need became particularly apparent when the Bonneville Power Administration undertook its comprehensive study entitled "Pacific Northwest Economic Base Study for Power Markets." In order to develop this information, Bonneville Power Administration contracted with the station and provided the funds necessary for an appraisal of output and employment in the forest-products industry.

Dr. Richard C. Smith temporarily joined our staff while on sabbatical leave from the University of Missouri forestry staff. This cooperation by the University of Missouri is very much appreciated. Donald R. Gedney is resource analyst in our forest survey project.

The Oregon Department of Employment and the Washington Employment Security Department supplied data on employment in the wood-using industries. The Western Wood Products Association, American Plywood Association, and many industrial firms supplied data on volume of wood processed, hours of labor expended, and other useful information. Labor and industry leaders, foresters, and numerous other individuals gave their suggestions and appraisals of trends in the industry which were invaluable in the analysis of the statistical data. All of this cooperation is greatly appreciated.

PHILIP A. BRIEGLEB,
Director, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station.

SUMMARY

In Oregon and Washington during 1963, 138,900 persons were employed by the wood-using industries. This was more than one-third of all manufacturing employment. During the 14 years from 1950 through 1963, employment in the wood-using industries declined 11 percent. This overall reduction resulted from various changes in the separate industries making up the total. It is the result of a complex of factors including changes in total production, increases in the efficiency of manpower, and changes in kinds of products and in the amount of product refinement. Logging employment decreased by 5,000 workers, or about 18 percent, although the volume of logs harvested increased 14 percent. Sawmill employment decreased 44 percent, or by 32,300 workers; however, lumber production dropped only 2 percent. The decrease of 900 workers employed in miscellaneous wood manufacturing resulted largely from a declining output of millwork and boxes. A threefold increase in plywood production was accompanied by an increase in employment of 81 percent, or 14,800 persons; in the paper and allied products industries, production doubled but employment increased by only 33 percent, or 6,600.

In 1963, the average number of employees per unit of annual wood input was:

[International ¼-inch rule]

Industry:	*Number of employees*
Logging (per million board feet)	1.41
Sawmills and planing mills (per million board feet)	3.60
Veneer and plywood (per million board feet)	7.31
Paper and allied products, 1962 (per thousand cords of wood used)	3.48

Manpower use, per unit of wood input as shown above, decreased substantially in these industries in the years between 1950 and 1963:

Industry:	*Percent*
Logging	26
Sawmills and planing mills	42
Veneer and plywood	50
Paper and allied products (1962)	36

These reductions in manpower use resulted from plant mechanization—particularly for handling of materials, increased worker skill, and the use of more efficient machinery of greater capacity—and development of a mix of products that is processed with fewer workers.

INTRODUCTION

The wood-products industries comprise a large sector of the manufacturing economy of Oregon and Washington. They employ one-tenth of the entire labor force. In many communities, logging contractors and manufacturers of wood products offer the only source of employment other than retail trade and services. Trade and services businesses prosper because of employment and activity in these industries. Almost 139,000 persons worked for wood-products industries in 1963, more than one-third of the number of employees in all manufacturing. They received $827 million in wages.

The purpose of this study is to determine current employment in the major wood-products industries in Oregon and Washington, to indicate trends between 1950 and 1963 in total manpower use and in employment per unit input, and to show variation between 1957 and 1961 in monthly employment.

The statistics averaged in this report encompass wide variation in individual plants. Mills differ in number of products manufactured, their sizes and grades, and the extent of finishing or remanufacturing. Firms manufacturing essentially the same products often differ in the kinds of equipment operated and degree of mechanization. At individual plants, worker ability and performance, age and condition of machines, transportation, timber supply, and product specifications may be different than for other manufacturers.

The employment data, upon which the bulk of the statistics is based, include only workers directly employed by wood-using industries and as recorded by the Washington Employment Security Department or the Oregon Department of Employment. No attempt was made to include other less direct employment such as for service to equipment used in wood-products industries.

In addition, a survey was made of randomly selected firms within each industry group to show manpower use by job function. Data were obtained from a mailed questionnaire or by personal interview. Information supplied by individual firms was weighted by volume of wood processed to arrive at average manpower use. The total manpower use for each industry, obtained by this sampling was found to be in general agreement with that based on published information for all firms by State subarea.

TOTAL EMPLOYMENT IN THE WOOD-PRODUCTS INDUSTRIES

Employment in 1963

In 1963, more than one-half of the manufacturing labor in Oregon was employed by the forest-products industries.[1] In Washington, with a more diversified industrial base, one-fourth of the employees in all manufacturing worked in the wood-products industries.

For the two States, 17 percent of the 138,900 employees in the forest-products industries were engaged in supplying logs to mills and plants (table 1). Close to 42,000 persons, 30 percent, worked for sawmill and planing mill firms, and 24 percent worked for veneer and plywood companies. Paper and allied products firms employed 19 percent, and about 10 percent were engaged in miscellaneous wood manufacturing. More than one-half of the workers in miscellaneous wood manufacture and 72 percent of those in paper and allied products were employed in Washington (table 2). In the other major forest-products industries, almost two-thirds of the workers were employed in Oregon, including 73 percent of all veneer and plywood employees.

TABLE 1.—*Average employment in manufacturing and wood-using industries in Oregon and Washington, 1963*

Industries	Employees	Percent of wood-using industries	Percent of all manufacturing industries
Wood-using:			
Logging	23,669	17.0	
Sawmills and planing mills	41,772	30.1	
Veneer and plywood	33,040	23.8	
Paper and allied products	26,170	18.8	
Miscellaneous wood manufacturing	14,274	10.3	
Total	138,925	100.0	37.6
All other manufacturing	230,395		62.4
Total, all manufacturing	369,320		100.0

---

[1] Statistics were compiled from monthly employment data provided by the Oregon Department of Employment and the Washington Employment Security Department. The nature of data, method of compilation, and definition of industries are described later in the report.

TABLE 2.—*Average employment in wood-using industries in Oregon and Washington, by State subregion, 1963*

Industries	Oregon		Washington		Total
	Western	Eastern	Western	Eastern	
Logging	11,054	1,503	9,514	1,598	23,669
Sawmills and planing mills	18,554	7,407	11,048	4,763	41,772
Veneer and plywood		[1] 24,007		[1] 9,033	33,040
Paper and allied products, total		[1] 7,366	17,740	1,064	26,170
Pulp	229			[1] 2,311	2,540
Paper, paperboard, building paper, and building board		[1] 5,412		[1] 13,512	18,924
Paperboard containers and boxes	665			[1] 1,751	2,416
Other paper and board products	1,060			[1] 1,230	2,290
Miscellaneous wood manufacturing, total	5,302	1,267		[1] 7,705	14,274
Special product sawmills	788		2,351	40	3,179
Millwork	1,787	1,050	2,627	621	6,085
Prefabricated structures and parts		[1] 904	612	23	1,539
Wooden containers	445	58	408	129	1,040
Wood preserving		[1] 460		[1] 408	868
Other wood products		[1] 1,077	394	92	1,563

[1] Eastern and western combined to avoid disclosure of employment by individual firms.

In all wood-using industries combined, 55 percent of the workers were employed in Oregon and 45 percent in Washington; table 2 shows 1963 employment within each State.

Trends in employment, 1950–63

Employment down 12 percent: Average annual employment in all wood-using industries decreased from 156,000 persons in 1950 to 139,000 in 1963. Periods of business recession are reflected in low employment during 1954, 1957, and 1958. Peak employment occurred in 1951, 1955, and 1959. Employment in Oregon wood industries was consistently higher than in Washington during this period. The number of workers declined in both States, and the losses occurred at a slightly greater rate in Washington.

Decrease in sawmill employment largest: The largest decrease in employment in the forest-products industries during 1950 to 1963 was in the manufacturing and processing of lumber (table 3). In 14 years, employment in sawmills and planing mills decreased from 74,000 to 41,800. This decrease took place between 1950 and 1961. Employment stayed at about the same level in 1961, 1962, and 1963.

Plywood, pulp, and paper employment up: The veneer and plywood industry recorded a substantial gain of 81 percent between 1950 and 1963. The only other major wood industry increasing was the pulp and paper industry with a more moderate gain of 33 percent. In both of these industries, the gain in employment was relatively steady and constant during the period.

TABLE 3.—*Employment in the major wood-products industries in Oregon and Washington, 1950 and 1963*

Industry	1950	1963	Change
	Number	*Number*	*Percent*
Logging	28,664	23,669	−17
Sawmills and planing mills	74,053	41,772	−44
Veneer and plywood	18,261	33,040	+81
Miscellaneous manufacturing	15,199	14,274	−6
Pulp and paper	19,605	26,170	+33
Total	155,782	138,925	−11

EMPLOYMENT IN THE LOGGING INDUSTRY

Trends in annual employment down

Employment loss greatest west of the Cascades: Employment in the logging industry in Oregon and Washington decreased from about 29,000 persons in 1950 to 24,000 in 1963. Most of this reduction took place on the west side of the Cascade Range, with the greater loss occurring in western Washington. Although changes in employment were not great east of the Cascades, some decrease in logging employment took place in eastern Oregon, but a slight gain was registered in eastern Washington.

A comparison of the log production statistics, with employment shows that production and employment do not always follow the same trend. In western Oregon, both employment and log production decreased; in western Washington, employment dropped although log production stayed relatively level. In eastern Oregon, employment decreased and log production increased, and in eastern Washington, both log production and employment increased.

Annual manpower use in logging decreasing: Average manpower use for logging during the 14 years was different among State subregions. Both western Washington and eastern Washington were higher in manpower use per unit volume logged than the two Oregon subregions. Differences in rate of change were also broadly apparent, with western Oregon showing only relatively moderate decline over time compared with the more pronounced downward trend in other State subregions.

Manpower used for logging in 1963 in western Washington was 1.73 workers per million board feet of logs harvested, 35-percent higher than in western Oregon.

Manpower use by job function

Almost half annual manpower use expended in woods: Almost one-half of the labor effort in logging was actually expended in the woods in the processes of falling, bucking, yarding, and loading (table 4). Hauling and other jobs, including maintenance and shopwork, took another 36 percent. The number of workers was significantly greater on the west side than on the east side for all job functions except hauling, but the percentage distributions of total manpower among the job functions were similar. The manpower use shown in table 4 for road construction and maintenance is undoubtedly too low for constructing a major access road. However, this average figure includes many logging operations that do not require much road work in relation to timber volume harvested.

Output per man-hour by job function: Data supplied by the firms sampled were also compiled to show current average rates of output per man-hour for production workers by job function during 1962 (table 5). Maintenance employees, overhead, and others not directly engaged in the production process were not included by job function but were included in the computation of the overall rate of output per man-hour for all employees on all job functions.

TABLE 4.—*Logging manpower use, by job function and number of employees per million board feet of logs harvested annually in Oregon and Washington and by subregion, 1962*

Job function	West side [1]		East side [2]	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Falling, bucking, yarding, and loading	1.06	47	0.87	48
Road construction and maintenance	.21	9	.14	7
Hauling	.38	17	.46	25
Supervision and clerical	.19	8	.11	6
Other, including maintenance and shop	.43	19	.26	14
Total	2.27	100	1.84	100

[1] West of the Cascade Range.
[2] East of the Cascade Range.

Source: Data supplied by 37 firms that harvested 648,000,000 feet of logs, Scribner scale.

The data shown in table 5 of output of logs per man-hour by job function should not be used as a basis of comparison of differences for specific job functions between the west and the east side. Although part of the differences are real and reflect differing output per man-hour, these are obscured by the use of local log rules that measure the same volume differently.[2] On the east side, the use of a "short log" Scribner rule [3] results in higher volume estimates than if the same log were measured by the "long log" scaling practice common to the west side. Thus, the data shown in this table, and in other presentations in this report showing values for both the east and west side and using log volumes, Scribner scale, as a basis for comparison, do not measure relative efficiencies in worker output between the east and west side. Instead, they simply provide a measure of output in units of production unique to the particular area.

TABLE 5.—*Logging output of logs per man-hour in Oregon and Washington, by job function and subregion, 1962*

[In board feet, Scribner rule]

Job function	West side [1]	East side [2]
Falling, bucking, yarding, and loading	483	586
Hauling	1,342	1,095
All employees, all job functions	224	277

[1] West of Cascade Range.
[2] East of Cascade Range.

Source: Data supplied by 37 logging firms that harvested 648,000,000 feet of logs, Scribner rule.

Logging output per man-hour has increased most in pine region: Logging output, per man-hour of production workers employed by firms reporting to the Western-Wood Products Association. An increase per man-hour on west-side operations from 175 feet, Scribner scale, in 1950 to 235 feet in

---

[2] Staebler, George R. Long logs or short logs with the Scribner scale. Timberman 54(10): 66, 68, 70, illus. 1953.

[3] In general, where results of industry canvasses or association studies are reported, the log rule used is not converted to the standard Forest Survey unit of measurement of board-foot volume, the ¼-inch International rule. The Scribner scale is approximately 80 percent of the comparable International ¼-inch volume on the west side and 91 percent on the east side. In other instances, such as the general figures of production shown in the inset graph in figure 3, the volume is shown in the ¼-inch International rule.

1962 is substantial, but logging output per man-hour in the pine region increased from 260 feet in 1950 to 470 feet in 1961. Data for the pine region include reports from portions of 12 Western States, a broad heterogeneous area, here referred to as the pine region and used to reflect trends in eastern Oregon and eastern Washington. Data reflecting westside conditions include some mills in California but represent well the conditions in western Oregon and western Washington.

The association data differ from those previously shown because they include production workers only. According to the 1958 census of manufactures, for the Pacific Northwest the proportion of production workers in logging to all employees was 89 percent. Thus, output per man-hour based on association data is higher than if the ratios were based on all employees.

EMPLOYMENT IN SAWMILLS AND PLANING MILLS

Employment in sawmills down 44 percent

Western Oregon has greatest reduction: Employment statistics by industry groups show where gains and losses occurred. The largest change took place in sawmills and planing mills, a decrease from 74,000 in 1950 to 41,800 in 1963, or 44 percent. Unfavorable years for the lumber industry are reflected in low employment during 1954, 1957, and 1958. The decrease in employment was much greater than the decrease in lumber production, which was 2 percent during the same period, from 11.8 billion board feet in 1950 to 11.6 billion in 1963. Two-thirds of the reduction in sawmill and planing mill employment occurred in western Oregon, where the number of workers decreased from 39,000 to 18,600. Western Washington sawmill employment dropped somewhat less, from 20,000 to 11,000. In eastern Oregon, the decrease was from 10,500 to 7,400; however, in eastern Washington little change occurred. All of these changes are not directly associated with changes in local production. This can be seen by comparing the production data in the inset graph of figure 6 with the employment data. For example, western Oregon 1963 employment was 48 percent of that in 1950, but 1963 lumber production was 89 percent of that in 1950. Similarly, western Washington 1963 employment was 55 percent of that in 1950, but lumber production was 84 percent of 1950 output. Although lumber production increased in eastern Oregon and eastern Washington, employment did not.

Sawmill manpower use per unit input requires fewer employees: Manpower use, by all of the sawmills and planing mills, decreased from approximately 6.2 employees per million board feet of logs[4] used in 1950 to about 3.6 workers in 1963. Despite relatively wide annual fluctuations in employment per million board feet of logs used, a reduction in manpower use occurred in all subregions. For the industry as a whole, manpower per unit of wood used was reduced 42 percent in the past 14 years.

Manpower use in Oregon plants generally lower: In 1963, sawmills and planing mills in western Washington used 37 percent more labor per unit input than mills in western Oregon. East of the Cascade Range in the two States, the sawmill manpower needs are more nearly alike. However, Washington sawmill employment per unit on both sides of the Cascades is higher than in Oregon.

Manpower use by job function

Million board feet of lumber produced annually by three to four employees: In the sawmill and planing mill group, about 40 percent of the manpower use was in the sawmill operation, from pond to green chain, for the three major size classes (table 6). Class A mills (8-hour capacity, 120,000-plus feet board measure) required 1.22 man-years per million feet of lumber output; class B (8-hour capacity, 80,000 to 119,000 feet), 1.46 man-years; and class C mills (8-hour capacity, 40,000 to 79,000 feet), 1.70 man-years per million feet. The larger mills probably used less labor because of more complete mechanization and faster operating speeds.

TABLE 6.—*Man-years of employment in sawmills and planing mills per million board feet of lumber output, by job function and mill-size classes, in Oregon and Washington, 1962*

Job function	Mill-size class					
	A (120+)		B (80-119)		C (40-79)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Sawmill operation [2]	1.22	38	1.46	45	1.70	42
Kiln-drying	.33	10	.37	11	.23	6
Planing mill	.66	20	.53	16	.87	22
Yards, sheds [3]	.54	16	.44	14	.61	15
Other employees [4]	.52	16	.47	14	.60	15
Total, dry surfaced lumber	3.27	100	3.27	100	4.01	100
Remanufacturing, other processing	7.89		8.86		8.28	

[1] Thousand-board-foot capacity per 8 hours.
[2] Pond through sawmill and green chain.
[3] Includes shipping, yard transportation, fire protection, and powerplant.
[4] Primarily supervision, office, and unassigned maintenance.

Source: Data supplied by 56 firms that produced 2,294,000,000 board feet of lumber.

The manpower use for kiln drying differed for mills of different size classes but required only a small amount of labor in any mill, one-third of a man-year per million feet of lumber dried. Other job functions required approximately the same proportion of the total labor requirement in each mill-size class.

Total manpower for manufacturing dry surfaced lumber was 3.27 man-years per million feet for both A and B mills. In C mills, 4.01 man-years per million feet were used. Statictics for the smaller D mills (8-hour capacity, up to 39,000 feet) are not given because of wide variation among firms observed.

Remanufacturing and further processing, other than drying and planing, converts lumber into various kinds of cut stock and finished products and thereby adds about eight men per million feet of annual output—more than twice the labor needed for making dry, surfaced lumber.

Average manpower used for the sawmill operation (pond through sawmill and green chain) was generally lower in east-side mills than in west-side mills (table 7). Although the difference was very slight between B mills, differences of 0.26 man in A mills and 0.21 man in C mills for west side versus east side are apparently significant.

Output per man-hour: Average output of lumber per man-hour in sawmills and planing mills by mill-size class is shown in table 8. In the sawmill operation, output per man-hour was greater in large mills. The high kiln-drying per man-hour is due to the small amount of labor involved—time, heat, and machinery do the work. Output per man-hour of all employees was 156 and 151 board feet in A and B mills, respectively, and was 128 board feet in C mills.

TABLE 7.—*Sawmill manpower use in employees per million board feet of annual lumber output, by selected mill-size class in Oregon and Washington and by subregion, 1962*

[Number of employees]

Mill-size class [1]	West side [2]	East side [3]
A (120+)	1.28	1.02
B (80-119)	1.47	1.44
C (40-79)	1.83	1.62

[1] Thousand-board-foot capacity per 8 hours.
[2] West of Cascade Range.
[3] East of Cascade Range.

Source: Data supplied by 56 firms that produced 2,294,000,000 board feet of lumber.

Sawmilling output per man-hour has increased steadily: Trends in output per man-hour for sawmills and planing mill firms that reported to the Western Wood Products Association are essentially parallel. West-side mills increased from 115 board feet per man-hour in 1950 to 145 board feet in 1962. Output per man-hour in mills on the east side averaged about 10 board feet per man-hour less during the same period.

TABLE 8.—*Output of lumber per man-hour by operation for sawmills and planing mills in Oregon and Washington, 1962*

[Board feet]

Operation	Mill-size class [1]		
	A (120+)	B (80-119)	C (40-79)
Sawmill [2]	417	350	300
Kiln drying	1,558	1,367	2,209
Planing	743	961	588
Yards and sheds [3]	952	1,158	833
All processes [4]	156	151	128
Remanufacturing, other processing	65	58	62

[1] Thousand-board-foot capacity per 8 hours.
[2] Pond through sawmill and green chain.
[3] Includes shipping, yard transportation, fire protection, and powerplant.
[4] Weighted average, including supervision, office, and unassigned maintenance.

Source: Data supplied by 56 firms that produced 2,294,000,000 board feet of lumber.

In the Pacific Northwest, the proportion of sawmill production workers to all sawmill employees was 90 percent in 1958.[5] Thus, these, output data are higher than if all employees were included.

EMPLOYMENT IN THE VENEER AND PLYWOOD INDUSTRY

Plywood employment up 75 percent

Oregon gain greatest: Veneer and plywood employment increased by 80 percent, from 18,300 workers in 1950 to 33,000 in 1963. Oregon plywood employment increased sharply and steadily from 7,000 to 24,000 but, in Washington, employment dropped from 11,300 to 9,000. Plywood production increased at a much greater rate,[6] than employment, going from 2.4 billion square feet, 3/8-inch rough basis, in 1950 to 8.6 billion square feet in 1963, an increase of 260 percent. In 1950, slightly more than 1 billion square feet of plywood were produced in Oregon and 1.3 billion in Washington. Mill capacity expanded rapidly in western Oregon, and by 1963, Oregon mills produced 6.8 billion square feet, and Washington had increased production slightly to 1.8 billion square feet. During this 14-year-period, veneer and plywood employment in Oregon increased 240 percent but production increased by 530 percent; in Washington, employment dropped 20 percent although production increased 36 percent. Primarily, these changes reflect the movement of the plywood industries south from Washington and their rapid expansion in southwestern Oregon.

---

[4] International ¼-inch rule. Log scale and lumber grade are assumed to be equal.

[5] U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1958 census of manufactures. 1961.

[6] Production data in Oregon from U.S. Bureau of Census, "Current Industrial Reports, Softwood Plywood and Veneer, 1959–62,"

Manpower use in veneer and plywood plants down sharply: Veneer and plywood plants use approximately twice as much labor per unit of wood input as sawmills. Washington plants employed 16.7 workers per million board feet of logs used annually in 1950; by 1963, the manpower needs per million feet of logs used had dropped sharply to 9.8 workers.

Oregon veneer and plywood firms required 12 workers in 1950; by 1963 only 6.7 employees were needed.

Plywood output increasing at rate of 10 square feet per man-hour per year: Information supplied by the American Plywood Association was used to determine trends in output per man-hour in plywood plants. Data, reported to the association each month by plywood firms, were averaged for the years 1955 to 1962 and were weighted by quantity produced. Only firms that produced all veener needed and sold none were included. The proportion of total production in sheathing varied among individual plants, but the average proportion in all plants sampled in a single year was between 26 and 40 percent and averaged 35 percent. A straight line fitted to annual averages indicates that output per man-hour increased from 96 square feet, 3/8-inch rough, in 1955 to 166 square feet in 1962. The average annual increase was 10.07 square feet per man-hour. These rates are based on production workers only. According to the 1958 Census of Manufactures, this includes only 92 percent of all employees. Thus, the rates are higher than if the ratios included all employees.

The proportion of sheathing in total output influenced production rates markedly in selected years. In plants that produced sheathing exclusively, output per man-hour in 1956 was 50 percent greater than in plants that produced all sanded grades of plywood; in 1959 it was 32 percent greater. By 1962, significant changes in the rate of production of sheathing had taken place—output per man-hour was 228 square feet, or 69 percent more than in plants that produced no sheathing.

Manpower use by job function

Output of veneer and plywood per man-hour during 1962 in 11 plants was:

	Square feet, 3/8-inch rough basis
Job function:	
Veneer	315
Plywood (layup, etc.)	226
Integrated plant employees (all)	151

Plywood manufacture, with more employees handling each sheet, has a low output per man-hour compared with veneer. In an integrated plywood plant, production per man-hour, including nonproduction employees, drops to 151 square feet.

In integrated plywood plants that peel green veneer and also manufacture their own plywood from this green veneer, almost two-thirds of the employees were engaged in some phase of plywood manufacture—laying-up, pressing, trimming, patching, and sanding (table 9). Only 21 percent of the workers were engaged in peeling and drying veneer. In the plants sampled, one-third of the output was sheathing.

TABLE 9.—*Plywood plant manpower use by job functions; number of employees per million feet of logs used annually in Oregon and Washington, 1962*

Job function	Number of employees	Percent
Veneer	1.71	21
Plywood	5.21	65
Other	1.17	14
Total	8.09	100

Source: Date supplied by 11 plants that produced 518,000,000 square feet of plywood, rough 3/8-inch basis.

EMPLOYMENT IN THE PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY

Employment trend shows steady gain

Pulp and paper workers up 34 percent in 14 years: Employment in paper and allied products increased about 34 percent from 19,600 in 1950 to 26,200 persons in 1963. Oregon increased its number of pulp and paper workers from 5,500 to 7,400 by the addition of new plants and by expansion of existing ones. Meanwhile, 4,700 workers were added in Washington to bring its total employment to 18,800 persons in 1963. During this period (1962 was the last year the production data were available) pulp output increased steadily in both States from 2.4 million tons to 4.6 million and Washington pulpmills[7] consistently produced about 75 percent of this pulp.

Mills manufacturing paper, paperboard, and building paper show largest gain: Figure 14 shows that the largest part of the increase in employment in paper and allied products took place in mills that manufacture paper, paperboard, and building paper. Increased paper output is primarily responsible, but part of the increase may be due to the way the employment statistics are reported, as this industry classification includes some pulpmills combined with papermills and not separately reported.

A look at the composition of employment in the total paper and allied products field shows that almost 19,000 out of the total 26,200 employees in 1963 were working in the manufacture of paper, paperboard, and building paper. This is also the group showing the greatest increase in number of employees from 1950 to 1963. The number of workers in the other industries have all increased substantially, ranging from 24 percent gains in pulpmills to 156 percent in the manufacture of paperboard containers and boxes. Some caution is needed in interpreting figure 14 because the employment statistics for some mills producing paper and allied products, including pulp, do not differentiate as to exact nature of employment.

A compilation of capacity for pulp and papermaking in 1950 and 1962 (table 10) shows that pulp capacity doubled in both Oregon and in Washington. Paper capacity doubled in Washington and almost tripled in Oregon. Pulp capacity in Washington remained at 1.7 times that of paper. In Oregon, a 1950 pulp capacity of 1.3 times that of paper declined to 1.0 by 1962. Currently, pulp produced in Oregon is largely made into paper by mills within the State.

TABLE 10.—*Production capacity of pulpmills and papermills in Oregon and Washington, 1950 and 1962*[1]

Product	Capacity, 24 hours		
	1950	1962	Increase
Oregon:			*Percent*
Pulp (tons)	1,836.00	3,796.00	107
Paper (tons)	1,380.00	3,638.00	164
Ratio, pulp to paper	1.33	1.04	
Washington:			
Pulp (tons)	5,078.00	9,819.00	93
Paper (tons)	2,877.00	5,725.00	99
Ratio, pulp to paper	1.76	1.72	

[1] "Lockwood's Directory of the Paper and Allied Trades," 75th and 87th editions.

Employment in industries that convert paper into paperboard containers and boxes and in industries that convert paper and paperboard products into other products more than doubled in 14 years. Most of the increase took place prior to 1956. These two classifications in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual[8] include all firms that buy paper and board for conversion into products, but do not include employees engaged in converting products at pulpmills and papermills.

Pulp and paper manpower use per cord declined more in Oregon: Annual manpower use in the pulp and paper industry in Oregon and Washington decreased during 1950–62 from 5.5 employees per thousand cords per year to 3.5. The decline in Oregon was steady, going from 7.8 employees per thousand cords in 1950 to 3.8 in 1962. In Washington, a generally downward trend occurred between 1950 and 1957, but since then employment has been relatively level per unit of wood consumed. During the 13-year period, employment per thousand cords decreased 1.5, from 4.9 in 1950 to 3.4 in 1962. The number of employees per thousand cords of wood consumed approached 3.5 men in both States in 1962.

Manpower use by job function

Data were collected from 15 pulp and paper plants that consumed 51 percent of all the pulpwood in 1962. The following is an estimate of the average number of employees per thousand cords of pulpwood used annually for various phases of the pulp and papermaking process:

Operation:	*Number of employees*
Pulp:	
Production workers	0.84
Other employees	.23
All employees	1.07
Paper and paperboard:	
Production workers	1.31
Other employees	.35
All employees	1.66
Converted products:	
Production workers	3.65
Other employees	.97
All employees	4.62
Total, all operations	7.35

Less than one production worker was used per thousand cords of wood used to make pulp. Like many chemically oriented processes, pulping is highly mechanized, and a small number of employees can produce large quantities of pulp. Paper and paperboard manufacture needed an additional 1.66 men

---

and "Census Facts for Industry, Softwood Plywood and Veneer, 1953, 1955–58, Softwood Plywood 1950–53." For Washington, American Plywood Association figures were used because census data include Idaho and Montana with Washington production.

[7] Based on census data. Production figures for Washington include Alaska since 1954.

[8] Prepared by the Technical Committee on Industrial Classification, Office of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President. 1957.

per thousand cords. The conversion of paper into products had a high labor need of 4.62 men—70 percent more than the manpower used for pulp and papermaking combined. Thus, employment in the Pacific Northwest pulp and paper industry at a given level of paper output is markedly influenced by the degree to which paper is converted to products in plants within the region.

Fifteen paper and allied products plants provided data from which output of production workers was computed. In pulping, 741 pounds of pulp were produced per man-hour. In paper and paperboard manufacture, 490 pounds were produced for each man-hour worked. Data on output of converted paper and board products were not available, but in terms of paper input to be converted to other paper products, average consumption of paper and board was 173 pounds per man-hour worked.

EMPLOYMENT IN OTHER WOOD-USING INDUSTRIES

Employment shows moderate decline in 14 years

Trends not well defined: Employment in other wood-using industries in Oregon and Washington decreased from 15,200 persons in 1950 to 14,300 in 1963.

Although a comparison of employment at the start of the period with that of the end indicates some gains and losses, trends are not well defined. In general, it appears as if employment in this category, although somewhat variable, has stayed relatively constant.

Trends in employment in individual industries varied: In order to learn more about this composite group, the 1950–63 pattern of annual employment for individual industries within the group was determined. Although the record of employment is complete in Oregon, only since 1956 has Washington kept employment records by digit code, necessary for identification of each industry group. Consequently, the graphs making up figure 17 show Oregon trends from 1950 through 1955; then they are merged with those of Washington to show the common trend for two States. The only exception is the container industry where data is complete for both States over the entire time period.

Trends in employment are varied. Employment by firms that make prefabricated structures and parts shows a generally increasing trend. From 1956 through 1963, employment increased from 900 to 1,500 workers, reflecting the increasing acceptance and use of laminated-wood structural members, prefabricated wall sections, and other construction components. Another upward trend, at least in recent years, occurred in the special-product sawmills, which make alder furniture stock, cedar shingles, and small quantities of miscellaneous items. They are located in western Oregon and western Washington, with about three-quarters of the employment in Washington. Employment in this group increased from 2,600 in 1956 to 3,200 in 1963; much of this increase is attributed to an increased output of both furniture stock and cedar shingles.

A similar rise in employment has also occurred in the "miscellaneous" industry classification, with employment in recent years increasing from 1,300 in 1956 to almost 1,600 in 1963. Apparently the principal reason for this increased employment is the growth of the particle board industry which is included in this category.

Although 1963 employment in millwork reached a new high for the industry, past trends indicate an erratic pattern with no apparent long-term trend of either decreasing or increasing employment.

The continuous record of employment for the wood container industry indicates a gradual downward trend, from 2,600 in 1950 to 1,000 in 1963, due to competition from paperboard boxes and other containers. The large upswing in numbers of employees in 1958 may have been caused by several factors; but it is most likely associated with the reclassification of industries following revision of the Standard Industrial Classification in 1957. Employment in the wood preservation industry indicates a rather static situation without strongly observable trends. Employment between 1950 and 1956 in Oregon was about 300; the inclusion of Washington employment data in 1956 raised the total to about 1,000. Since 1956, the trend has been gradually downward, with 1963 employment being 870.

Man-use per unit of production for the "other" products industries was not determined because of the difficulty of obtaining adequate records of volume of output.

AVERAGE MONTHLY EMPLOYMENT IN OREGON AND WASHINGTON, 1957–61

Variation in total employment

Previously in this study, employment in the forest industries was reported as average annual number of workers. Employment in all forest industries fluctuates, more or less, during the year. For example, the seasonal nature of employment in logging is well known.

During the period 1948–53, employment in Oregon and Washington in lumber and other wood products combined varied from 15 percent below average employment to 10 percent above.[8] Seasonal variation in total employment in both States was substantially less, but was greater than that for total employment in the United States.

Statistics of employment by month in forest-based industries were analyzed for the period 1957–61 to determine monthly variation in employment as a percentage of average monthly employment during the 5-year period. All industry groups showed a somewhat similar seasonal pattern of employment, generally lowest during January, February, and March, and highest during July, August, and September. With the exception of converted paper products and preserved wood, most wood products are further processed by other manufacturers, used in commerce, or used in construction. Requirements for wood products fluctuate with the activity of these industrial purchasers. Thus, employment in the forest industries is strongly influenced by activity in other industries and trade.

Industries differ widely in amount of variation

Seasonal fluctuation large in logging industry: Logging employment varies substantially from summer to winter. In the monthly averages for the years 1957–61, August was the peak month in western Oregon, 22 percent above average monthly employment; but in western Washington, employment peaked earlier, reaching a high of 17 percent in June. Employment in both western Oregon and western Washington dropped to near average by November and reached a low point during January and February. Increased logging activity in the spring resulted in a return to average monthly employment by the end of April. In eastern Oregon and eastern Washington, seasonal fluctuation is more severe. In eastern Oregon, the range was from 24 percent above normal during August and September to 48 percent below in March; in eastern Washington, the extremes were even greater, ranging from 35 percent above normal to 60 percent below. Logging activity apparently is more strongly influenced by unfavorable winter weather east of the Cascade Range. Logging employment showed a decidedly uniform cycle from summer to winter each year during the 5-year period.

Range of monthly sawmill employment ±8 percent: Employment in sawmills and planing mills (excluding special products sawmills) shows less variation with almost identical seasonal patterns in Oregon and Washington. During the study period, the range in Oregon was from 8 percent above average in August to 8 percent below in January and February. In Washington these same months marked a 6-percent high and a 7-percent low in monthly employment. No differences were apparent between mills in eastern and western Oregon, but in eastern Washington the range in monthly employment was much larger from summer to winter than in western Washington.

The seasonal pattern of sawmill and planing mill employment is generally similar to that for logging. Lumber manufacturing is influenced both by log supply and seasonal requirements for lumber and other mill products. The Nation's construction industry, the largest consumer of lumber, is most active during summer months.

Less seasonal variation in plywood and paper industries: Employment in veneer and plywood plants shows the least variation in employment from month to month. Employment in the 5-year period ranged up to 2 percent above the annual average for 7 months of the year and dropped to only slightly less than average—3 percent in Oregon and 4 percent in Washington—during the off-season months. No regular cycle of monthly employment was apparent from year to year, although Oregon employment was highest in June in 4 out of 5 years.

Firms primarily engaged in making pulp, paper, and paperboard in Oregon experienced stability in employment comparable to that of the plywood industry. Employment varied from 4 percent above average in July to 2 or 3 percent below average from October through March. Peak summer months of employment were experienced each year.

Employment in building-paper mills in Oregon varied slightly more from summer to winter months, but regular yearly cycles were less evident. Only 1958 and 1961 showed pronounced gains in summer employment. Oregon paperboard container manufacturers experienced minor variation in employment from 4 to 5 percent above average in the summer to 3 to 6 percent below average employment from December through May. Each year had a uniform cycle which peaked in July and dropped to a low in January.

A similar analysis of the paper industries was not made for Washington. However, the nature of the industry would indicate relations generally comparable to those in Oregon.

Other industries show similar seasonal pattern but varying amount: Millwork employment was fairly stable, from 6 percent above average to 6 percent below average monthly employment. Here, as for the remaining "other" industries, the relatively small size of each industry group made it desirable to report variation in monthly employment for Oregon and Washington combined.

Employment in prefabricated structures and parts varied by 30 percent between August and February. This industry makes products on prior order, and it depends on seasonal construction activity. Millwork firms also supply the construction industry but rely less on custom work.

Wooden container manufacture was also highly seasonal, ranging from a high of 18 percent above average in July and August to a low of 16 percent below average in February. This was repeated in uniform cycles during the 5-year period.

Special product sawmills, primarily producers of alder furniture stock and wood shingles and shakes, exhibited a pattern of employment similar to general sawmills and planing mills during peak periods of employment. However, during the off-season period from January through March, employment in special product sawmills decreased more than in general sawmills.

---

[8] Mead, J. W. "The Forest Products Economy of the Pacific Northwest." Jour. Land Econ. 32(2): 127–133, May 1956.

Employment in wood preservation, though cyclic from summer to winter, varied only 7 percent above and 8 percent below average employment.

Thus, with the exception of logging, prefabricated structures, wooden containers, and special product sawmills, employment in the wood-products industries, though exhibiting seasonal fluctuation, varied less than 10 percent from the annual average number of workers.

COMPILATION OF EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Employment in the forest industries for the period 1950 to 1963 was compiled as the annual average number of employees. Data furnished by the Oregon Department of Employment and Washington Employment Security Department were based on reports of average monthly employment and payrolls submitted by employers whose workers are entitled to benefits provided by State unemployment laws. The method of reporting, based on the payroll period which ends closest to the 15th of the month, may obscure fluctuations resulting from employment of part-time workers. Part-time employment chiefly affects the number of employees reported by small logging contractors. Employment in all wood-using industries is subject to more or less seasonal fluctuation. The use of annual averages tends to level seasonal fluctuation to the equivalent number of full-time workers employed during the year.

Employment statistics include all employees of a firm: production workers, maintenance and other plant workers, clerical, supervisory overhead, technical and staff workers, and company officials, but they do not include owners. The practice of reporting all employees in the main business of the firm distorts some of the classifications. A sawmill operators' report may combine both a logging crew and millworkers. The number of workers is classified under "2421, Sawmills and planing mills, general," because lumber manufacture is the main business of the firm. Similarly, employees of a pulp and paper manufacturer, including both workers in the pulpmill and those in the papermill, may be classified under "2621, Papermills, except building paper mills." Such combinations occur chiefly in the reports of small firms where the number of employees is few. Whenever possible, State agencies obtain separate reports of employment where more than one classification of workers is employed by a firm. The effect of such combinations, as used in this study, is minor. The Standard Industrial Classification was revised in 1957. Changes in the timber industries were accounted for or they did not materially affect classification in the industries as grouped for study.

In Washington, all employees in the manufacturing sector, regardless of size of firm or amount of payroll, have been covered by employment security legislation since before 1950. In Oregon, from 1950 to 1955, firms with less than four employees were not required to report, and from 1956 to 1959, firms with one employee did not report. No adjustments were made in the reported figures for lumber and wood-products employment, as firms employing less than four persons prior to 1956 or less than two prior to 1960 are not significant in the employment picture for this classification.[10] Since 1960, coverage has been complete in the manufacturing sector.

STATISTICS ON VOLUME OF WOOD USED BY FOREST INDUSTRIES

Volume of logs harvested was taken from annual reports of log production, issued by the Forest Survey, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, Portland, Oreg. This was converted from the reported Scribner log volume to International ¼-inch volume by use of a factor of 1.25 on the west side and 1.10 on the east side of the Cascade Range.

Volume of logs used by sawmills was based on reports of annual lumber production by State, issued by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce: "Facts for Industry," Series M24T (formerly M13G), and "Current Industrial Reports," Series M24T. Log volumes, when in terms of the International ¼-inch rule, were considered the equivalent of lumber production. Lumber production was allocated to State subregion according to the percentage of total lumber production reported for the west side by the West Coast Lumbermen's Association's Statistical Yearbook, 1959–62, and for the east side by circular 483 of the former Western Pine Association.

Volume of logs consumed in making veneer and plywood in Oregan was obtained from the Bureau of the Census "Facts for Industry," Series M24H (formerly Series M13B), and, in recent years, from "Current Industrial Reports," Series M24H. Census data were not used for Washington as they include Idaho and Montana production. Instead, production data for Washington were from American Plywood Association. Production data were converted to Scribner log scale on the basis of an output of 2.4 square feet, ⅜-inch rough, per board foot of log consumed. Scribner volumes for logs were converted to International ¼-inch volume as reported above.

Statistics of pulpwood consumption, contained in Bureau of the Census "Facts for Industry," Series M14A, and "Current Industrial Reports," Series M26A, were adjusted, using data from several sources. Adjustment was necessary to account for data withheld to prevent disclosure of information concerning individual firms and inclusion of pulpwood consumption for areas other than Oregon and Washington.

TRENDS IN OUTPUT PER MAN-HOUR

The results of increasing labor efficiency, substitution of machines for hand labor, improved plant layout, organization of the labor force, and product specifications can be expressed as increased output per man-hour or as decreased manpower use per unit of wood input. Since the source of data or number of employees cannot be used to accurately determine number of hours worked and since number of employees includes nonproduction workers, other sources are needed to get measures of output per man-hour. The Western Wood Products Association (formerly West Coast Lumbermen's Association and Western Pine Association) and the American Plywood Association (formerly, Douglas Fir Plywood Association) have the necessary data from mills reporting directly to them for the number and plywood industry. Similar data are not available for the pulp and paper industry. The association data for manpower use differ from those previously shown because they include production workers only. According to the Census of Manufactures in 1958, the proportion of production workers to all employees in the Pacific Northwest was:

Industry:	*Percent*
Logging	89
Sawmills and planing mills	90
Veneer and plywood	92

Thus, output per man-hour, based on association data, is approximately 10 percent higher than if the ratios were based on all employees.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMINISTRATION'S WAR ON INFLATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, during the past few years this Nation has enjoyed an expansive and expanding prosperity—and all Americans are rightfully thankful. Yet within the past several months the fateful shadow of inflation has darkened and spread—and all Americans are rightfully troubled.

Inflation and inflationary pressures are technical terms, words of art in the financial and economic lexicon, but they may be translated to the workingman or his housewife, to the retired, to the pensioner or to the wage earner by having his income buy less because of rising prices and a steady increase in the cost of living.

Mr. President, what we seek is true prosperity. Not prosperity and inflation. Not prosperity coupled with war. Not prosperity created by Government spending. Not prosperity which is merely a statistic. Not prosperity so imbalanced by inflation that one group in our society or any one sector of our economy is forced to make sacrifices not demanded of others, or where economic privileges and benefits are not shared by all in proportion to their effort.

Mr. President, what we seek is to know the truth about a national policy concerning a national problem. Inflation affects every citizen. We think of it in terms of wages earned and the price of clothing, food, and shelter. In reality it faces every citizen in many ways for it affects the very vitality and strength of the Government itself and our role in the free world. Thus, what is to be done about inflation is a public policy decision of far-reaching magnitude.

Now at this point I assert with conviction that this administration has not told the American people the truth about inflation, the problem, its causes, its cures, and the reasons for its economic policies. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it was only very recently that this administration has officially acknowledged the possibility of spiraling inflation as a real and present danger. As a matter of fact, it was even more recent—within days—that this administration has acknowledged that its actions were in response to the inflationary problem.

The tardy or evasive history of this administration's response to inflation has been, first, to deny its existence; second, to deny that they caused it; third, to deny that its economic actions were for the purpose of controlling inflation; and lastly, to finally concede that inflation is a present problem and that their actions were an attempt to be responsive to this danger.

---

[10] "Trends of Employment in Oregon, 1950–60." P. 111. Prepared for the Boneville Power Administration by the Bureau of Business Research, University of Oregon, February 1962.

Throughout all this policy statement hopscotch, these great questions have not been subjected to the full and searching debate they deserve. But now, as late as it may be, the debate is underway in the press and in the Congress.

Yet to date the debate mentioned has focused on the monetary and fiscal policy of the Government; whether or not interest rates should be raised; whether or not spending by the Federal Government for domestic programs should be reduced; whether or not tax rates should be increased. Mr. President, I have serious doubts, as do many who sit in this Chamber, as to whether the Government's current spending and taxing policies are those best designed to achieve the goal to which all Americans aspire, that is, true prosperity without inflation.

But, Mr. President, there is another dimension to the Government's policy in fighting inflation which should command our attention and that is its use of indirect price and wage controls.

Let me make one point with precision. I would not now propose the imposition of statutory, mandatory price and wage controls. This is perhaps one of the most drastic actions that a government may take and is associated with the very existence of a national emergency. On this matter there is agreement, to a degree, with the administration.

In a recent speech before the Economic Club in Detroit the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, vigorously reasserted the administration's position that "direct price and wage controls" are not now needed. He went on to predict that the estimated future scale of the war in Vietman would not require the imposition of such controls as was the case in the Korean conflict and World War II. Parenthetically I might note that the Secretary of the Treasury's estimate of the future commitment in Vietnam is more reassuring than the representations made by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State.

But it is precisely because of my hope that such legal, direct, and bureaucratic controls will not be required again that I urge the administration to move along the road of economic reality, of economic fairness, of economic responsibility, rather than down the road of political expediency.

Mr. President, regardless of whether we all share the hope that direct price and wage controls shall not again be imposed, it is a basic fact that the administration is actively pursuing a policy of price and wage controls through indirect and often unannounced methods. It is pursuing such a policy because it obviously hopes that its scheme of indirect price and wage controls will keep the economy booming, control inflationary pressures, permit the Johnson administration to continue its high spending program, prevent the necessity of tax increases, and not make direct price and wage controls necessary. This, I fear, is the case of having your economic boom and eating it too.

Mr. President, I wish the administration well because I wish the country well. But their program has been deceptive in planning and execution, applied without fairness and ineffectual in purpose.

Mr. President, the Federal Government can apply direct, mandatory, and specific price and wage controls only after Congress has passed enabling legislation of a detailed, comprehensive, and justifiable plan. The need and specifics of price and wage controls are debated and known to all. Why should not indirect price and wage controls be subject to the same democratic processes? The administration's policy of indirect price fixing, however, is quite different. Federal Government control is done without express authorization of Congress. Public policy has been made and is executed in a manner quite different from the process involved in the imposition of direct controls. The result is that the administration has promulgated a policy without publicly announcing it and executes it without adequate consideration of all its potential ramifications. The results are controls which are in many instances unclear, unjustified, unfair, and ineffectual.

Mr. President, briefly examine the manner in which the administration is currently engaged in indirect price and wage controls. As previously stated, the executive branch cannot set definite, well-defined limits on prices and wages without express and enumerative authorization from Congress. But it is a central fact of modern political economy that any administration has at hand enormous political and economic powers which it can bring to bear so as to influence price and wage levels. Aggressively used, as at present, they may act as a club across the head of both industry and labor, but they are not now used to carry out an effective, across-the-board, all-embracing control policy and cannot, I fear, be engaged as an effective weapon against inflation.

The use of these political and economic powers in the hands of this administration, Mr. President, gives rise to several conditions.

First. The implementation of price and wage controls will of necessity be selective in the various sectors of our economy.

Second. Controls will be exercised in relation to those segments of the economy over which the administration has the greatest power and influence.

Third. Congress and the American people, while generally advised of the guidelines or objectives, are ignored or inadequately informed as to the reasonableness of the actions taken or the results achieved.

Fourth. The use of political and economic weapons designed for one purpose by Congress, but used for another purpose by the President, creates deception or semisecretive actions.

Stated in brief form, the administration's war on inflation is selective and exercised in relation to our economy where Government control is greatest by the deceptive use of powers not granted by Congress for price and wage control purposes.

Mr. President, to illustrate, look at the current situation. We are told of the Johnson administration price and wage guidelines. Yet we do not know how, when, or where this policy is to be executed, what exceptions are to be made, what political or economic weapons will be used, or whether the actions of the administration are reasonable or even effective.

The public debate on the administration's price and wage guidelines has to date centered around the question of whether or not the administration is applying the price-wage guidelines with equal persistency and with equal firmness to both business and labor. This is a proper and necessary question and, I think, needs to be asked with greater frequency and with greater precision. For myself, at least, I find the administration's answers to date on this point to have been evasive and inconclusive.

But, Mr. President, I submit that there is another question here of equal or greater importance. In addition to the question of whether or not the administration is applying a double standard, intended to favor business over labor or labor over business, there is the real question of whether or not in the attempt to keep its price and wage guidelines the administration has favored some segments of business and industry over other segments of business and industry and whether some sectors of the labor force are being favored relative to other sectors of the labor force.

And, Mr. President, the issue here is not limited to the question of whether or not the administration is executing its policy in a way calculated to favor certain groups over others. Even if the administration is not deliberately practicing this type of economic favoritism and discrimination, the inherent nature of its policy of indirect controls means that economic favoritism and discrimination will almost inevitably occur.

This is so because efforts by the administration to control prices and wages is, and has been, selective and because the administration acts only in those situations where it can effectively marshal the multivaried powers that it has at command.

Thus, we all recognize that the administration had little difficulty last fall in forcing a rollback in the price of aluminum. I spoke, Mr. President, of the administration's failure to advise the American people of the purpose of their acts. Indeed, we all remember the incident last fall when the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert McNamara, and other administration spokesmen steadfastly echoed the official position that the Government's threat to dump thousands of tons of aluminum on the open market was in no way related to the administration's efforts to get the aluminum industry to roll back the price of aluminum.

Mr. President, I knew better. Every Congressman knew better. The American public knew better. My 16-year-old son even knew better. It was, in short, a display of political cynicism. It was unbecoming to the administration and it was demeaning of the American people. And, I might add, Mr. President, whether or not the action of the Kennedy administration was wise in forcing a rollback in steel prices in 1962, he at least stood up and told the American people what he was doing and why he was doing it.

This same Johnson style of performance is being repeated over and over again as the administration goes about its business of fixing prices and wages, while adhering with few rare exceptions to the official line that it is not in fact practicing such policies.

But the point I was making was that the threat of massive sales of Government-owned aluminum stocks was dramatically and effectively used as a club to force the industry to rescind its announced increase in prices.

The administration has the same power over other industries where the Government owns large stockpiles. It also has great power where Government use of a product is of such magnitude that a deliberate change in Government purchasing can alter the demand situation enough to effectively control prices. Most producers of war-related materials are subject to this type of control. The power to withhold Government contracts is also a potent weapon.

Yet despite this power to influence several prices, there are many businesses, industries, and commercial operations whose products may not be stockpiled by the Government, whose materials may not be purchased in large quantities by the Government, and industries not dependent upon Washington for contracts. These products are immune to such pressures. Thus, if inflationary pressures continue to become stronger and persist over a period of time many segments of business and industry will be able to raise prices relatively at will. The result is a situation where certain sectors secure economic gains that are far greater than other sectors. And, I repeat, this is so even though it may not have been deliberately planned. If this administration's policy of indirect price controls ever successfully serves as a restraint on the average price index it will be almost inevitable that certain prices will have been frozen while others have been moved upward.

The same principle applies to wages. There are certain segments of both organized and unorganized labor where the administration can bring greater economic and political power to bear than in others. Thus, it is quite likely that wage increases in certain areas will follow very closely the administration's guidelines while in other labor areas because of the lack of effective restraining influence from the administration, wage levels will increase rapidly, again creating great inequities.

Mr. President, in pointing out what I believe to be the weaknesses in the administration's policy of indirect price and wage controls, I am not recommending direct or statutory controls. The administration became involved in this position because of its propensity to view economic facts as they wish them to be rather than as they really are—and particularly because its own spending policies are a vital force in creating the problem itself.

Indirect price controls could be created by Congress which are necessary and fair and effective if subjected to the searching debate that is so vitally important to the democratic process.

Mr. President, let me direct the Senate's attention, considering the observations just made, to the administration's policy of controlling the prices of agricultural commodities.

The administration's official position is that such a policy does not exist. But official disclaimers notwithstanding, it has become increasingly evident that there is a conscious and deliberate policy of agricultural price control.

Before going any further, it must be noted, of course, that agricultural production is of special importance in the cost-of-living index. When inflation moves out of control food and fiber prices cannot be immune. The American farmer does not want or expect special treatment. But by the same token the American farmer does want assurances that any sacrifices he is asked to make in the war against inflation will be disclosed in an open, honest, and direct manner. And he has the right to demand that such sacrifices are fair in relation to other inflationary pressures and that they will contribute to a responsible solution.

Mr. President, two things about the administration's current agricultural price control efforts are particularly disturbing.

First. While Government agencies are endeavoring to put a ceiling on agricultural prices, administration spokesmen at the same time are maintaining a public official position that obscures this fact from both the American farmer and the Congress.

Second. On the basis of evidence currently available, there are serious doubts that such controls are justified or that they will have any significant anti-inflationary effects. If this is true, the farmer is being forced to make economic sacrifices which have no broader effect than simply reducing his already thin and tenuous income.

Let me cite some examples. On March 17, I called the Senate's attention to the administration's recent imposition of drastic export quotas on cattle hides. This action rolled back the cattle-hide prices and in turn weakened the price structure for live cattle.

These export quotas did not bankrupt the hide industry or cause a rash of ranch foreclosures, but there was an adverse economic effect and the real issue was whether the price rollback was justified or reasonable for any purpose. Although hide prices were increasing, they were recovering from depression levels and not moving into inflationary heights. Moreover, no one has any reason to believe that there would be a similar rollback in the price of finished leather goods. Indeed, the Wall Street Journal of Monday, March 28, carried an article which indicates that shoemakers will lift fall prices 3 to 8 percent despite hide export limitations by the White House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOEMAKERS TO LIFT FALL PRICES 3 TO 8 PERCENT DESPITE HIDE-EXPORT LIMIT BY WHITE HOUSE

The Johnson administration's recently imposed controls on hide exports apparently weren't enough to prevent a price increase by the Nation's shoemakers.

As they had indicated earlier they would do, manufacturers are raising prices 3 to 8 percent on their fall line of shoes. The increase could average out above the 5-percent boost posted last September on spring models.

The latest increase will add an estimated $1 to $2 a pair to the retail cost of men's and women's shoes planned for introduction this fall and to be shown this week at the National Shoe Fair in New York. Most of the new price lists will be distributed to retailers and suppliers during or after the semiannual conclave of the shoe industry.

In Washington, administration economists didn't have any specific comment on the shoe price increases, but they expressed a belief the increases would have been larger if it weren't for the Government's decision to limit hide exports. In response to industry pleas, and to "provide adequate supplies for domestic needs," the Commerce Department on March 11 established quotas for the export of hides. The quotas, which will cut 1966 exports of cattle hides by about the size of last year's increase in imports, were regarded as an attempt to reduce hide costs and thus forestall a shoe price increase.

SECOND BOOST IN 6 MONTHS

Only last Tuesday, Under Secretary of Commerce Leroy Collins told the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains that the hide controls "will eliminate or minimize the need for further shoe price increases this spring."

Nonetheless, shoemakers are sticking to their previously indicated intention of raising prices for the second time in 6 months. Of the major manufacturers, only Genesco, Inc., has already announced an increase, boosting its prices 5 to 7 percent. But Interco, Inc., the Nation's largest shoe manufacturer in terms of shoes produced, probably will post increases ranging from 4½ to 8 percent, according to M. R. Chambers, president. Several other concerns said privately they will raise some or all of their prices, with the increases ranging upward from 3 percent.

Following the Government's export-control action, hide prices backed off about 3 cents a pound to near 18½ cents a pound for heavy native steers. This was about the same as the prevailing price last August and September when manufacturers announced their 5-percent price increase. But this time, higher hide prices aren't receiving as big a share of the blame as they did in the earlier round of shoe price boosts.

HIGHER COSTS A FACTOR

Increased operating and labor costs have played a major role in determining the latest increases, industry sources say. "The hide market can go down to even lower levels and the price of shoes is still going to go up," said an official of one big company. "Regardless of the cost of hides, the price of shoes must go up to maintain already low industry profit margins," he contended.

But many industry executives agree with Government economists that the hide controls did ease some of the pressure for price increases. George Langstaff, director of footwear distribution for Genesco, said the quotas didn't delay the increases, but probably did have a "damping effect" on them.

Industry officials appeared to be only slightly concerned about the administration's reaction to the higher prices. At a March 7 meeting between major manufacturers and the President's Council of Economic Advisers, one shoe executive confided, "We didn't accomplish a darn thing." He added: "They were only interested in leather prices, and not in problems we share with other industries."

During those discussions Washington sources say, the shoe manufacturers indicated their pricing actions would be substantially influenced by anything the Government would do to increase the availability of hides, and thus reduce the price of their chief raw material. But one Government official said the manufacturers, didn't make any specific price pledges, and the administration didn't seek any.

RETAILERS JUST GO ALONG

Last Friday, the Council's staff held a similar "informal fact-finding" meeting with a delegation representing 10 major shoe retailers. But as one shoe producer noted, "There isn't too much the retailers can do about it" if manufacturers raise their prices.

The Council's chairman, Gardner Ackley, commented in a television interview over the weekend on the general price outlook, without mentioning the shoe situation. While food and farm product prices have caused about two-thirds of the overall price increase in the past year, he said, he is "fairly confident" they won't continue to spearhead the advance. Much of the change is due to the prospect of larger pork output, he remarked, noting that the short "pig crop" last year pushed up prices of all protein products.

Increases in various prices in recent months, however, will make it difficult for the Government to achieve its forecast that prices generally won't rise any more this year than last year's increase of about 2 percent. Mr. Ackley said on NBC's "Meet the Press." Asked if increases of 3.5 to 4 percent would require direct price controls, Mr. Ackley reaffirmed this position, that controls still would be "unnecessary and inappropriate." It would be "poor management," he said, for the Government to "stumble" into price controls.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, here is a situation, then, where farmers, ranchers, and hide dealers have been forced to endure an economic setback in vain. Again, no one can foresee the probability that the retail price structure of leather goods will be affected.

Mr. President, an even more disturbing aspect of this affair is the manner in which it was executed and explained by the administration. As noted in my statement of March 17, the official explanations provided me by the Department of Commerce were evasive, misleading, and insufficient. They were designed to obscure the real objective behind the move and were inadequate in explaining why such a move was necessary.

Mr. President, as nearly as anyone can tell, the principal reason why the administration took this action is simply due to the fact that this happened to be a point at which the administration could control a price and so it decided to do so without being able to fully justify the act or to guarantee that this action would, in fact, make a genuine contribution to the anti-inflation effort.

Mr. President, there have been other actions taken by the administration which have had adverse effects on agricultural prices without reducing inflationary pressures.

On March 15, I noted for the Record steps recently taken by the Department of Agriculture increasing sugar imports which resulted in a weakening in raw sugar prices without significantly affecting retail prices.

Consider also action by the administration in the recent mass dumping of corn on the open market by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In this case, what the administration said and what it did have no relation to each other.

In December 1965, the Agriculture Department announced that very limited amounts of Government-owned corn would be sold on the open market during 1966. But, Mr. President, in less than a month after this announcement, Government corn sales were skyrocketing. In January 1966, the CCC dumped into the market seven times as much corn as it had in the previous January. Government sales in February and the first week in March were at the highest level in 4 years. As a result of these massive sales, corn prices at Chicago dropped from $1.33 in February to $1.26 last week.

Mr. President, price declines in such a basic commodity as corn inevitably are translated into lower prices for other commodities, particularly livestock and other feed grains. The impact on the entire farm economy is of far-reaching magnitude.

The Wall Street Journal of March 7 reported:

> Agriculture Department officials won't discuss their reasons for increasing sales of corn.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, has rejected queries as to whether these sales were aimed at depressing grain and livestock prices as "a lot of political noise."

But, Mr. President, it is interesting to note that on March 10, Gardner Ackley, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, stated in an NBC television interview that the Government was trying to hold down the price of corn with the aim that this would act to increase pork production and thus also lower hog prices. These extraordinary Government corn sales have been rather widely cited in the public press as an example of the administration's undercover war on inflation.

Under existing agricultural laws, the Department of Agriculture is authorized to sell stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation on the open market under certain specified conditions. It would serve little purpose at this time to debate the point as to whether or not the exising laws are reasonable. But recall the fact that those laws provide for Government sales for the sole purpose of implementing the Government's price support and production control program. Congress did not intend that these laws be used by the administration as weapons in its scattergun attempts to fight inflation. If these laws are in fact being used for this purpose, as certainly appears to be the case, then the administration should openly admit as much.

Mr. President, relating to the administration's efforts to control agricultural prices, an article by William Chapman in the March 13 issue of the Washington Post is particularly revealing. Mr. Chapman quotes a White House aid as follows:

> The President is determined that we don't see the kind of inflation—particularly of foods—that we had in the Korean war.

As examples of the administration's selective commodity-by-commodity approach, Mr. Chapman cited the Government's massive corn sales, and the clamping down of export controls on cowhides. Mr. Chapman also reported that the Agriculture Department was substituting margarine for butter in food distribution programs in order to keep down the price of commercial butter. He also revealed that the Department was scanning its purchasing list for other possible substitutes, particularly for agricultural products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the article just referred to by William Chapman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 13, 1966]

Items Range From Canned Fruits to Cowhides—Administration Fights Inflation on Several Fronts

(By William Chapman)

Stirred by renewed admonitions from the President, the Johnson administration has put more force into its drive to combat inflationary price pressures on a selective, commodity-by-commodity basis.

In the past week it has acted to keep the price lid tight on such items as cowhides and corn and is considering similar moves on such disparate goods as the canned fruit served to soldiers and the type of coverings stitched on Government furniture.

"The President is determined that we do not see the kind of inflation—particularly on foods—that we had in the Korean war," a White House aid said this week.

Here is what some agencies are doing:

The General Services Administration has told suppliers it wants to see substitutes used for materials that are under strong price pressures. It is asking that aluminum or aluminum alloys be used in place of copper wiring where possible and is considering switching from leather to plastic furniture coverings because cowhide prices have skyrocketed.

The Agriculture Department last week began selling corn from Government stores at an even faster pace than before, almost doubling the totals of January and February. The result has been a nearly 10 cents-a-bushel slide in Chicago corn prices since January. Agriculture is substituting margarine for butter in food distribution programs in order to increase commercial butter supplies and combat a 5-cents-a-pound increase in the last 2 months. A further tightening is expected when milk support prices are pegged later this month.

Defense procurement officials are scanning their entire purchasing list for possible substitutes, particularly food products, and will begin with such minor steps as switching the kind of canned fruit offered on Armed Forces' menus.

The Commerce Department Friday clamped down export controls on cowhides to help turn back a price upsurge that amounted to 43 percent last year. It will limit U.S. exports to 11.5 million hides, 2.5 million less than probably would have been shipped abroad in the absence of controls this year.

Administration forces turned on the heat on Capitol Hill and won a promise of early hearings for at least a dozen bills permitting the Government to dispose of stockpiled commodities, some of which can affect market prices significantly. Representative L. Mendel Rivers, Democrat, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, allowed the stockpile subcommittee to start hearings on March 21. Among the items affected by the bills are aluminum, platinum, vanadium, sisal, and asbestos. But the administration still has not decided whether to seek authority to dispose of another 200,000 tons of copper, the major weapon against inflation in that key metal.

Top officials in several departments have been scouring their fields to find other ways to combat price pressures. In the Agriculture Department, Under Secretary John A. Schnittker is charged with watching food prices and GSA Administrator Lawson B. Knott, Jr., is handling Government purchases and stockpiles. From the White House, Mr. Johnson has assigned Joseph A. Califano, Jr., a special assistant, as impromptu coordinator.

Food prices are getting the closest scrutiny now. Officials recall that in the first 2 years of the Korean war, prices leaped 22 points as measured by a 1957–59 consumers' index. They are rising again now, but not nearly so fast.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, rising consumer food prices can have an inflationary impact. However, Mr. President, you cannot control a general inflation by controlling agricultural prices. Retail food prices that the farmer gets for commodities he produces constitute only a part, often an extremely small part, of the final price for food items actually purchased by the consumer. For example, of the total price that a housewife pays for a loaf of bread less than 3 cents goes to the wheat farmer. There is less than 3 cents worth of farm-produced corn in a 12-ounce package of cornflakes. Looking at food purchases as a whole the price paid to the farmer represents only a third of the total cost.

But a much more important fact is that a freeze or a rollback in agricultural prices will more than likely have no effect on retail prices. Recent history, in fact, reveals just the opposite. The yearly retail cost of farm food for the average American family rose 15 percent from 1947–49 to 1963, but, Mr. President, during this same period the farm value of this food actually dropped by 15 percent—the same percentage.

Mr. President, this brings up a fundamental point and that is that the small rise in farm prices over the past few months represents an increase from extraordinarily low levels. Farm prices have been depressed ever since the early 1950's. All this while the farmer's cost of production has increased sharply. He was caught in a price-cost squeeze that played havoc with the farm economy. Even though the farmer's position has improved slightly recently his prices have not even begun to catch up with his costs. The parity ratio, the relationship between the farmer's prices and costs, today is only about 80 percent.

Mr. President, for the past decade the farmer has suffered from low prices. But his loss has been the consumer's gain. If farm prices had been keeping up with other prices the cost of food to the consumer would have been far greater. Mr. President, no group in this country has done more to fight off inflation over the past decade than our farmers. To drive down his prices at this stage, as this administration has done, while his operating costs continue to mount and retail price of food continues to rise would be a mockery of justice and fair play.

Mr. President, in this connection, I note that the press yesterday reported that the prices of phosphatic fertilizers widely used by farmers have just been increased by 3½ percent. Moreover this is the second such price increase within the year.

Mr. President, the evidence reviewed suggests that the administration's current policy is creating numerous economic inequities. This is particularly true in regard to agriculture. In fact, I fear that the Johnson administration's undercover war on inflation is, as much as anything else, a direct war on agriculture.

But the full extent of these inequities, whether they be in agriculture, labor, or business, can be identified and measured only through a thorough and searching study and debate entered into by both the administration and the Congress. Once this has occurred the American people can judge.

Therefore, Mr. President, in the interest of sound democratic policymaking, and in view of the fact that we are all united in the goal of preventing inflation and doing so in a way that no group is forced to suffer unnecessarily, it is imperative that the administration act immediately to inform Congress and the American people of its intentions and plans.

I should think the first necessary step would be for the administration officials to come before an appropriate congressional committee or committees so that the American people can have the opportunity to study and debate that policy, openly and freely.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of March 30, 1966, p. 7221, Congressional Record.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the conferees on the part of the Senate tried to present the amendment adopted by the Senate as strongly as possible to the House conferees.

The conferees on the part of the House were not only unanimous in opposing the amendment, and adamant in yielding, but they also called attention to the fact again, as referred to on the floor of the Senate the other day, that the vote in the House on the bill was 292 to 93 and that various amendments were considered which were similar to and of the same nature as the amendment adopted by the Senate. They felt that adoption of the Senate amendment would open the way to splitting the States in many parts of the country and thus would defeat the main purpose of the bill—that is, to enable people to have certain time, and to have railroad, airline, bus, and all other kinds of schedules made uniform and informative, in order to prevent constant confusion which wastes many millions of dollars.

In view of their position and the reasons they presented, the Senate conferees receded. I hope—which I believe is a unanimous hope of the committee which presented the bill—that the report of the conference committee will be adopted.

I do want to point out that the bill still provides for State action, to keep an entire State on standard time if the legislature so wills, and the bill still permits adjustments in time zone boundaries which may be of aid in easing some of the problems which may arise.

Mr. President, for many years I have been working to secure a time bill which would relieve confusion. I sincerely trust that we will not jeopardize the bill, even though I am cognizant of the situation which it presents to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], which was the reason he offered the amendment in the Senate and is the reason I tried to secure full and fair consideration in conference.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield so that I may comment?

Mr. PEARSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri, under the same conditions as before.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I regret deeply, speaking for many of the people in the State of Missouri, that the House has not seen fit to accept what, to me, was a logical and constructive compromise on this bill incident to daylight saving time and its control.

It is hard for me to understand why they refused a request to allow a State a single line running north to south in order to control time, especially difficult in that it was not a question of the rural part of the State of Missouri as against the urban part, because there is a major difference of opinion on the subject between the two large cities of Missouri; namely, St. Louis and Kansas City.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, based on what the able distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has stated on the floor of the Senate, and told me personally, I do not wish to take further time of the Senate in what apparently would be a hopeless effort.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I share the views of the distinguished Senator from Missouri on the conference report now before the Senate. I recall the determined fight pressed by him and his junior colleague, Senator LONG, on the floor of the Senate last week when this matter was last before us.

I recall also how in cooperation with the senior Senator from New Hampshire he worked out a formula which if accepted would have been reasonable as applied in the State of Missouri.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], has labored many years for this proposal. At the conference he represented the Senate to the best of his ability and no one could have been more diligent or more persuasive in attempting to obtain House approval of the Symington-Long-Cotton amendment.

That he was unsuccessful takes nothing away from his determination, nor from the determination of the two Missouri Senators.

While I am disappointed, I must applaud the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for the selflessness which he has shown, and also for his great efforts and those of his colleague in representing and defending the interests of the State of Missouri.

It is a difficult question. It has ramifications in other States. Unfortunately the Symington proposal has not been accepted, but the parliamentary situation leaves us no further opportunity to modify the provisions of the measure.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his gracious remarks.

I would add that my colleague from Missouri, Senator LONG, would have been here at this time except he was unavoidably detained.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the able and distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who, despite his great interest in this bill over a period of years, was kind enough and constructive enough to suggest a compromise in this legislation that would have been entirely satisfactory to my State. Although it is unfortunate, as I mentioned before, that the House would not accept even this small compromise, I do want to say to him I am very grateful for his consideration.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, like the distinguished majority leader, I pay tribute to the distinguished senior and junior Senators from Missouri. They have been alive and alert to this problem from the very beginning. They did not wait. They were in touch with our committee before the question of adopting the report came up. They have left no stone unturned to protect their State. I wish we could have been of more help to them, but certainly no one could have done more than they for the State of Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his typical courtesy in dealing with this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adopting the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RESEARCH ANIMAL CARE IN OREGON

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senate Commerce Committee yesterday concluded hearings on proposals authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation. These bills are of great interest to the medical schools of our Nation, because these schools are the center of much of the medical research using animals.

My own State of Oregon is fortunate in having at the Oregon Medical School one of the most modern and complete animal care facilities in the Nation. Recently, the Pendleton East Oregonian carried an article describing the open door policy of the medical school concerning its animal care program, and I ask unanimous consent that the article, from the March 19, 1966, edition of the paper, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, *as follows:*

OF CABBAGES AND KINGS

(By J.W.F.)

"'The time has come,' the Walrus said, 'to talk of many things. Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—of cabbages—and kings.'"

You may have noted that there have been letters to the editor recently regarding legislation on laboratory animal care. The letters have alleged that there is great and inexcusable cruelty in the treatment of animals that are used in laboratories for research purposes.

We cannot judge that charge, but we do know that the welfare of mankind has been benefited in many ways by experiments with animals. And that being so, it seems to us that it should be possible to develop legislation that will protect animals from cruel treatment and at the same time not sacrifice human life and health and human progress.

In the January-February bulletin of the National Society for Medical Research we have read a story that tells how the University of Oregon Medical School developed for the public the story of its use and treatment of laboratory animals. We think you will be interested in a part of that story. Here it is:

"The University of Oregon Medical School has gone a step farther than unlocking the doors. The doors to the animal facilities have no locks.

"Discussion of the use of animals in medical research has traditionally been a taboo topic in most institutional public information programs. This was true at Oregon Medical School until a little over 2 years ago when this tradition was tossed out. An about face was made.

"There was nothing to hide. Our animals were extremely well cared for. So it was decided not only to establish an open door policy but to present to the public, through various news media, information about how animals are used in medical research, how they are cared for and their contribution to medical science.

"Shortly after deciding to initiate an information campaign, the Medical Research Foundation of Oregon purchased a 180-acre farm for the medical school to use in breeding and housing animals. This purchase gave an excellent starting point for the information program. Families on neighboring farms and ranches were visited and informed as to the type of facility the farm would be. A caretaker was hired from the area. He knew everyone nearby and was well liked.

"News stories about the farm and plans for its use were prepared in the public affairs office. These were sent to newspapers, radio, and television stations. When new animals arrived at the farm they were photographed and the pictures were provided to the news media.

"During this developmental period the new nine-story research building was under construction. The first two floors of the new building are devoted to animal quarters, experimental animal surgery, the animal morgue, cage washing facilities, etc.

"In December 1962, following a preview for the press, an open house for the public was held. One of the most popular areas, visited by several thousand persons, was the experimental animal surgery suite, where, with the use of department-store mannequins, a very authentic mock animal-surgery setup was presented. A member of the animal care department was on hand to answer questions and explain the use of the various pieces of equipment.

"It seemed extremely important to direct some of our efforts in this information program to youngsters. Last year a tour program of the school was arranged that included the animal-care department. The student groups ranged from high school students to youngsters 9 or 10 years old. We found that children of all ages spent more time in the animal quarters than anywhere else on the campus. During the past year more than 1,000 students toured our facilities. The animal-care department received a number of letters of thanks, not only from teachers and Scout group leaders, but from the children themselves.

"It is probable that in the years to come these youngsters will have a better understanding of the use of animals in scientific research. They will be less likely to be influenced by nonsensical antivivisection literature.

"A large number of adults also have toured our facilities. Responsible adults always are invited to go into animal surgery if they wish, provided they mask, cap and gown and observe the other sterile precautions. We feel it is important for them to see that our animal surgery suite compares favorably with a human operating room.

"The same open door policy is practiced at the farm. There are no gates to the driveway. Anyone is free to drive in and take a look for himself. When nothing is hidden it is amazing how much the whole approach to the animal situation is simplified.

"On several occasions people have called and said they were sure we had their dog. They were told that it was quite unlikely, but they were welcome to look at dogs in our kennels. After inspecting the animals they were not only satisfied that the school did not actually have their dog, they also were impressed by the fine accommodations provided for dogs at the medical school.

"We enrolled some of our breeding-colony dogs in canine club obedience classes. This not only resulted in well-trained animals for the medical school, but exposed other dog owners in the community to the fine care and treatment the animals get at the medical school.

"Also, each year some of the animals are entered in both the county and State fairs and they usually bring back their share of blue ribbons.

"At our invitation, the director of Portland's Humane Society and the mayor's administrative assistant spent a half a day in the animal quarters. This visit resulted in a good working relationship between the Humane Society and the animal care people of the medical school. Although the city ordinance still prevents the medical school from getting dogs from the Portland pound, the director of animal care was recently consulted by the mayor's office when a committee was working on a new ordinance to insure proper transportation and care of animals in pet shops and retail establishments.

"Although the animal information program is far from completed, here are some of the results to date.

"1. More animals are being donated.

"2. The public knows of the variety of animals now used in medical research.

"3. Recruitment of good animal care personnel has been possible.

"4. The faculty is pleased with changing public attitudes toward use of animals.

"5. Our 2,000 employees show an increased pride in our animal care facilities and are telling their friends in no uncertain terms that research animals are not mistreated.

"6. Because of the far-reaching implications which are involved for all institutions of higher education in America, we presented a summary of this public relations program in national competition of the American College Public Relations Association. We were pleased that it won first prize for distinguished achievement in a public relations project. However, we feel that the real value of entering the competition was to make other universities and colleges aware that research animals need not be a taboo topic but rather a subject that should be and can be explained to the public."

BROADCAST INDUSTRY FAILS SELF-REGULATION TEST ON CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, E. William Henry, today spoke to the members of the National Association of Broadcasters at their annual meeting in Chicago. One of the central themes of his oustanding address was the business as usual response of the broadcasters to the issue of cigarette advertising. As Chairman Henry remarked:

> The 1965 Labeling Act forbids any other Federal advertising requirements as to cigarette smoking for a period of 4 years. But it does not forbid broadcasters from adopting and strictly applying appropriate standards to reflect increasingly persuasive medical evidence, or the hazard labeling requirements of the law itself * * *. This is a major test of self-regulation for the broadcast industry.

It is the conclusion of Chairman Henry that "the broadcast industry has not only failed to pass this test of self-regulation—it hasn't even taken it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the section of the address concerned with cigarette advertising be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the section of the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

From the cigarette advertising presently being carried on radio and television stations, no one would ever know that a major public controversy is in progress as to the harmful effects of cigarette smoking on the American public. One could never guess from such advertising that the great bulk of medical opinion, including a Surgeon General's report, has concluded that there is an adverse causal relationship between cigarette smoking and health. Nor is there the slightest hint that the Congress of the United States last year passed a Cigarette Labeling Act which requires every pack to contain the warning—and I quote: "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health."

Despite all of this, the sign on broadcasting's door for cigarette advertisers reads "Business as usual."

A startling anomaly is thus created. Television viewers in particular are led to believe that cigarette smoking is the key to fun and games with the opposite sex, good times at home and abroad, social success, and virility. But as the individual approaches the tobacco stand and mystically changes from television viewer to cigarette customer, so the message changes. Life with cigarettes is no longer beautiful; the package warns that smoking may have ugly consequences indeed.

Yet in this important area, broadcasters are strangely silent.

In light of broadcasting's unique impact upon the public, broadcasting has unique responsibilities. Those responsibilities do not end when the commercial comes on.

The 1965 Labeling Act forbids any other Federal advertising requirements as to cigarette smoking for a period of 4 years. But it does not forbid broadcasters from adopting and strictly applying appropriate standards to reflect increasingly persuasive medical evidence, or the hazard labeling requirements of the law itself.

This is a major test of self-regulation for the broadcast industry—and I want to make it perfectly clear that it is only the broadcast industry I am discussing; not the tobacco industry. They have their own regulators and their own problems.

How has your industry—long preaching the virtues of self-regulation—reacted? Where are the clearly articulated, the comprehensive, and the meaningful requirements that might have been expected as to the time, the type, and the nature of permissible cigarette advertising? Where are the standards, designed to protect the public and to reflect the increased concern generated by medical findings? Where, indeed?

The truth is that the broadcast industry has not only failed to pass this test of self-regulation—it hasn't even taken it.

The Cigarette Advertising Code's approach seems to be that there must be study, study, and yet more study. Broadcasting magazine reported that Governor Meyner, the code's administrator, has engaged the services of "a prominent drama critic to make a study of what characteristics in programing have distinct appeal to teenage audiences," so that cigarette advertising in such programs may be avoided. It also reported his comments that the code study on this subject is now "complete," but that the results are "inconclusive," and that the code will therefore "try another approach."

On the question of which programs are designed to appeal to youth, the networks are apparently content to rely on the decisions of Governor Meyner's code. In this ludicrous Alphonse and Gaston routine, it seems that the Congress has turned the matter over to broadcasters; broadcasters have delegated responsibility to the networks; networks rely on the Cigarette Advertising Code; the code asks a drama critic; and the critic's study is "inconclusive."

This kind of self-regulation not only lacks teeth, it has soft and bleeding gums. Moreover, it fools no one.

The cigarette labeling law is due for reexamination in 1969. At that time, no doubt, many forces will be fiercely resisting change. What will your position be? Will you fight tooth and nail to preserve the status quo? Will you sit silently, afraid to take a stand, one way or the other? Or will you by then have developed positive new standards of your own—standards reflecting a mature consideration of your immense responsibilities to the American public? Time will tell—and the country waits to see.

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, NOVEMBER 28 TO DECEMBER 1, 1965—A REPORT TO THE SENATE AND TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the White House Conference on International Cooperation was held from November 28, 1965, to December 1, 1965. This is a report to the Senate and to the American people on that conference.

In recent months American foreign policy has come to be more and more preoccupied with events in Vietnam and China. As a result of this preoccupation, our attention has been drawn away from other matters affecting our relationships with the world which in the long run are far more vital to our national interest.

The sad fact is that we have become so mesmerized with the problems of conflict in the Far East that we have begun to lose sight of the potential for cooperation everywhere else.

The situation, while bleak, is far from hopeless—largely because of the collective efforts of thousands of individuals across the United States who through their enthusiasm and hard work have helped to keep our attention focused on the goal of international cooperation. During the past 12 months, there have been three major occasions bringing together in dramatic fashion citizens dedicated to the cause of peace. The first was the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations in San Francisco last June. The second was the Washington Conference on World Peace Through Law in September of last year, attended by 3,000 delegates—mainly jurists, presidents of bar associations, and lawyers—from 115 countries who met to discuss the extension of the rule of law in the international community. And the third was the White House Conference on International Cooperation.

For 3 days last year, from November 28 to December 1, 1965, 5,000 distinguished Americans met in Washington in response to a call from President Johnson "to search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace." The occasion for this "assignment of the century," as President Johnson called it, was the White House Conference on International Cooperation, the first meeting of its kind ever held in this and probably any other country.

Because it was my privilege to serve as a congressional delegate to the Conference, and to take an active role in its proceedings, I have undertaken the task of rendering this report to the Senate and to the American people. I shall deal not only with the background and the events leading up to the Conference, and its work and recommendations, but I shall also raise and suggest some answers to the vital question: Where do we go from here?

The idea for an international cooperation year derives from proposals and suggestions made by Pope John XXIII, Prime Minister Nehru of India, Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, and others. Prime Minister Nehru summed the matter up in these terms:

> We live in this world of conflicts and yet the world goes on, undoubtedly because of the cooperation of nations and individuals. Little is known, or little said, about this cooperation * * * so the conflicts go on and we live on the verge of disaster. Perhaps it would be a truer picture if the cooperative elements in the world today were put forward and we were made to think that the world depends on cooperation and not on conflict.

This proposal was taken up by the General Assembly of the United Nations, which on December 19, 1962, adopted a resolution on International Cooperation Year 1965.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall have a series of exhibits. I now ask unanimous consent that each of these exhibits, as I refer to them in the text, may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I shall not ask unanimous consent in each instance.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. After the Preparatory Committee had completed its work and filed its report, the General Assembly adopted a successor resolution on November 21, 1963, calling on member states of the United Nations to formulate plans and programs to promote the purposes of the International Cooperation Year.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. CLARK. In response to this call from the U.N., President Johnson issued a proclamation on October 2, 1964, in which he set 1965 as the International Cooperation Year in the United States, rededicated our Government to the principle of international cooperation, and started the wheels turning which ultimately led to the White House Conference

(For text of proclamation, see exhibit 3.)

Mr. CLARK. In presenting this proclamation to the American people, the President provided a framework for the work of the Conference and in doing so articulated what must be a fundamental axiom of American policy. He stated:

> For the United States, cooperation with other nations and other peoples is always uppermost in our minds and is the first aim of our policies, the central instrument of our foreign policy.

He made it plain that "international cooperation is simply not an idea or an ideal, it is a clear necessity to our survival."

President Johnson stressed the need "to carry the story of international cooperation and organization to the American people. Public understanding, public support, is vital and basic to our success in striving for world understanding and cooperation. You cannot be a statesman unless you get elected."

This could not be more true. Elected representatives will be able to move in the direction of international cooperation for peace only if a massive educational effort is mounted to build solid support for such a program among the public.

In summoning the talents and energies of the voluntary organizations dedicated to peace, President Johnson said:

> In this day and in this age man has too many common interests to waste his energies, his talents, and his substance in primitive arrogance or destructive conflict. In short, you are going to have to be the captains of a movement to lead people to love instead of hate. You are going to have to be the leaders in a movement to guide people in preserving humanity instead of destroying it. You are going to be the leaders in a crusade to help get rid of the ancient enemies of mankind—ignorance, illiteracy, poverty, and disease.

The problem of attaining peace, said the President, "is by far the most important problem we face. It is the assignment of the century for each of you, and if we fail in that assignment, everything will come to naught."

(For text of President's remarks, see exhibit 4.)

Mr. CLARK. Following the President's proclamation, there was set up, first, a Cabinet Committee on International Cooperation, representing 22 agencies and departments of the Federal Government, under the chairmanship of the Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, Harlan Cleveland. After Mr. Cleveland's appointment as Ambassador to NATO, his successor, Assistant Secretary Joseph J. Sisco, assumed the chairmanship; second, a National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation, composed of the Nation's most distinguished civic, business, scientific, educational, and cultural leaders, under the chairmanship of Robert S. Benjamin, brought together by the United Nations Association of the U.S.A.

In September 1965, Raymond D. Nasher, of Dallas, was appointed Executive Director of the Conference.

In close consultation with the Cabinet Committee and other Government officials, the Citizens' Commission formed 30 working committees dealing with different aspects of international cooperation.

These Committees were: Agriculture and Food, Arms Control and Disarmament, Atomic Energy, Aviation, Business and Industry, Communications, Culture and Intellectual Exchange, Development of International Law, Disaster Relief, Education, Finance and Monetary Affairs, Health, Human Rights, Labor, Manpower, Meteorology, Natural Resources Conservation and Development, Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, Peacekeeping Operations—U.N., Population, Research on Development of International Institutions, Science and Technology, Social Welfare, Space, Technical Cooperation and Investment, Trade, Transportation, Urban Development, Women, and Youth Activities.

At the same time, a number of parallel efforts for international cooperation for peace were being made in Congress. Ever since 1959 I have been submitting resolutions in the Senate calling for a far-reaching revision of the Charter of the United Nations so as to make the U.N. a more effective force for peace, and pressing for action to bring about general and complete disarmament under enforcible world law. Over the years support for these ideas has slowly increased, so that when I submitted the planning-for-peace resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 32—in April of last year, 25 Senators joined as cosponsors. This resolution expresses support for the President in his efforts to achieve peace and disarmament under legally effective controls and to develop international institutions capable of permanently keeping the peace.

(Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, see exhibit 5.)

Mr. CLARK. Even more encouraging was the almost universal support which the planning-for-peace resolution received during 2 days of hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am a member, in May 1965. With the exception of the representatives of the rightwing Liberty Lobby, and Americans for National Security, each one of the 19 nongovernmental witnesses expressed strong approval of the resolution. The testimony of the Government witnesses from the State Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, while not actually hostile, was somewhat less enthusiastic.

Many of the ideas incorporated in the planning-for-peace resolution were incorporated in another resolution, the International Cooperation Year resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 36—introduced at the request of the State Department by Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and cosponsored by five other Senators, including myself. The ICY resolution took note of the fact that the 20th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations was to be celebrated in San Francisco on June 26, 1965, and also noted that 1965 had been designated the International Cooperation Year. It then expressed the sense of the Congress that the United States rededicates itself to the principles of the U.N. and to the furtherance of international cooperation within the framework of law and order, and called upon the executive branch to review, among other things, the need to strengthen peacekeeping machinery and spur disarmament negotiations.

(Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, see exhibit 6.)

Mr. CLARK. After brief consideration in committee, it was passed without record dissent by both the Senate and the House, and an enrolled copy was carried by me to the San Francisco ceremonies.

In addition, the ICY resolution authorized the appointment of congressional delegates to the White House Conference on International Cooperation, and it was my privilege to be named a delegate. The other congressional delegates were: Senators CHURCH, RIBICOFF, BOGGS, MILLER, and PEARSON and Representatives FASCELL, FRASER, RESNICK, MARTIN of Alabama, QUIE, and ROBISON.

As work on the Conference progressed, I gave close attention to the work of 8 of the 30 Committees whose areas of study seemed most closely related to the problem of achieving and maintaining stable world peace: Arms Control and Disarmament, Development of International Law, Research on the Development of International Institutions, Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, Peacekeeping—United Nations, Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, Finance and Monetary Affairs, and Population.

Later in this report I shall be dealing primarily with the work of these Committees. While I would have liked to give equal time and attention to the other Committees, which were engaged in equally significant activity, and especially those concerned with the important subjects of Agriculture and Food, Human Rights, and Cultural and Intellectual Exchange, it was simply not possible for me to do so. Typical of the highly constructive and original suggestions made by these other panels, however, were such proposals as an international convention to govern human activity on the moon, patterned after the remarkably successful Antarctic Treaty of 1959; a massive worldwide attack on illiteracy to bridge the ever-widening gap between the developed and the developing nations; and, the launching of a nationwide campaign among Americans to encourage them to learn a second language.

In the original planning, each of the citizen panels was set up with a governmental counterpart committee, with which it was supposed to work hand in hand. Somehow, and for some mysterious reason, the governmental counterpart committee faded away in the weeks leading up to the conference, leaving the field to the nongovernmental panelists. That this occurred because the various reports in draft form were too rich for the blood of the bureaucrats in the State Department was suspected but never proved.

Each of the committees was fortunate in having its membership composed of outstanding citizens, many of them recognized experts in the areas to which their panels had been assigned, and some of whom had previously held high posts in the Government.

(The lists of the members of these eight panels, with appropriate titles and descriptive information, are attached as exhibit 7.)

Mr. CLARK. Before discussing the recommendations of the various panels, some general comments may be in order. In the period during which the several committee reports were being drafted, prior to the convening of the conference, it became evident to me that there was inadequate coordination of the work of the various committees with overlapping jurisdictions. Despite my suggestions to the State Department personnel in charge of arrangements, this defect was not remedied prior to the convening of the conference. As a result the conference adjourned without producing an overall coordinated plan for the achievement of peace through increased international cooperation which would then constitute its recommendation for the policy of the United States.

Although on the basis of the eight papers I studied I believe that the committees performed well within the limits set for themselves, nevertheless I fear that undue timidity marks the work of all of them. None of them addressed itself to the tough central problems which inhibit the growth of international cooperation.

Those problems arise from the unwillingness of most governments in general and the Government of the United States in particular to take the steps essential to meaningful and successful international cooperation in the cause of world peace.

The logic of the situation is expressed in these axioms:

World peace requires enforcible world law, or, as the Russians prefer to call it, strict international control.

Enforcible world law requires a limited but nonetheless significant yielding of national sovereignty to an international institution consisting of an executive, a legislature, and a judiciary capable of enforcing world peace through world law.

World peace requires general and complete disarmament.

World peace requires the automatic financing through an easily collectible world tax of the funds necessary to finance these international institutions.

World peace requires an international peace force under the command of the executive of the international institution to enforce the laws, judgments, and decrees of that institution.

World peace requires a far more effective and massive multilateral economic assistance program in support of the underdeveloped nations than presently exists, and this must include effective support for population control measures.

A resolution based upon these principles as proposed by me before the Arms Control and Disarmament Committee at the Conference and was ruled out of order on the ground that the format of the Conference did not permit either voting by participants or the adoption of resolutions either in the committees or in the plenary sessions of the Conference. I am confident, however, that if a vote had been permitted, the resolution would have received substantial support.

(For the text of the resolution, see exhibit 8.)

Mr. CLARK. Regrettably the fate of this resolution was symptomatic of the treatment accorded suggestions and recommendations which went beyond those contained in the printed committee reports which were prepared before the Conference convened. No amendments to the reports were permitted, although many new ideas were aired, some of which had widespread support. Some of these ideas are discussed in the brief summary reports on the panel discussions which were submitted after the close of the Conference.

Unfortunately, no stenographic report was made of the many useful talks, speeches, and comments made by several hundred of the participants in the Conference. The result was that there were merely panel discussions of reports, previously prepared, and the participants in the Conference had no opportunity to do more than to speak extemporaneously and briefly on the floor during the panel sessions, and no opportunity to put their views before the Conference itself.

It is true that some of the points raised by participants were covered in the summaries made by rapporteurs who were assigned the task of summarizing in each case a number of the different panel committee reports.

But by and large the Conference arrangements favored the support of the reports of the 30 committees, despite the fact that 2,000 distinguished Americans were invited to be participants and 3,000 more came to panel discussions as observers.

To remedy this defect, this report presents not merely the recommendations made in the panel papers, but also the ideas and suggestions which emerged during the Conference as a result of the work of nonpanel participants, which I can still recall.

The recommendations of the White House Conference on International Cooperation in the areas of arms control and disarmament, peacekeeping, international law, international organizations, population, and related subjects as elaborated by the participants, are as follows:

1. NONPROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

First. The United States should seek a nonproliferation treaty which prohibits the transfer by atomic powers of nuclear weapons and manufacturing capabilities. In this connection, the United States should work against the creation of new nuclear forces, while supporting greater involvement by our West European allies in the planning for use of U.S. strategic forces.

This proposal is in effect—and is known by the State Department to be—a condemnation of the multilateral force and the Atlantic nuclear force.

Second. The United States should seek to establish the conditions—military, political, and economic—in which both the nonnuclear and nuclear powers will perceive that their security and other interests are best served by preventing any further spread of nuclear weapons through adherence to a nonproliferation treaty.

Third. The United States should seek an agreement with the other nuclear powers pledging them (a) not to attack or threaten to attack with nuclear weapons a nonnuclear power and (b), if a nonnuclear power is thus threatened or attacked, to defend it with all necessary means.

2. COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN

The United States should seek a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty adequately verified, utilizing recent improvements in national detection systems making it possible to rely on challenge inspections or to otherwise bridge the gap in acceptable numbers of on-site inspections that appeared to prevent agreement in 1963.

3. CONTROL OF FISSIONABLE MATERIAL

First. The United States should seek a United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R treaty to cease all production of weapons-grade fissionable material.

Second. The United States should work for the transfer of agreed quantities of such material to the International Atomic Energy Agency for peaceful uses by the developing countries.

Third. The United States should work for elaboration and intensification of IAEA inspection and the subordination of all transfers of fissionable material to IAEA controls.

Fourth. The United States should continue to press for the universal adoption of IAEA safeguards and be prepared to place an increasing number of its civil applications involving nuclear reactors and related fuel processing and reprocessing installations under IAEA safeguards, as other nations reciprocate, aiming ultimately at the opening of all U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States atomic energy plants to IAEA inspection.

It is significant to note that the Soviet Union is already a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency and has been complying with its requirements respecting inspection.

Fifth. The U.S. Government should try to persuade all other suppliers of nuclear assistance to insist on acceptance of IAEA safeguards as a condition of such assistance.

Sixth. The IAEA should bear the cost of all inspections.

Seventh. The appropriate agencies of the U.S. Government should urge American labor and industry to support the safeguards program strongly, both nationally and internationally.

Eighth. The U.S. Government, industry, and labor should try continually to develop features in the equipment and operational procedures to improve the safeguards.

Ninth. The Department of State should recognize IAEA safeguards as an element of foreign policy by participation at the highest official level in the implementation of the program.

Tenth. The United States should consider the possibility of transforming the International Atomic Energy Agency, to which the Soviet Union belongs—as I noted a moment ago—into a true International Disarmament Organization as contemplated by the U.S. proposal for a treaty of general and complete disarmament which has been pending at Geneva since 1962.

4. NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES

The United States should encourage the development of nuclear-free zones in Latin America, Africa, and the Near East, beginning with a United States-Soviet Treaty establishing a zone of nuclear and conventional arms limitation under U.N. inspection in the Bering Straits and including comparable areas in Alaska and Siberia.

5. REDUCTION AND LIMITATION ON THE DEPLOYMENT OF STRATEGIC HARDWARE

To limit and reduce strategic delivery capabilities, the United States should seek agreement with the Soviet Union and, if feasible, with the other nuclear powers on the following sequence:

First. A moratorium of at least 3 years on the deployment of antiballistic missile—ABM—systems.

Second. A freeze on the number of strategic delivery vehicles.

Third. A reduction in total numbers amounting to one-third of each party's medium- and long-range delivery vehicles, beginning with the destruction of obsolete stocks.

6. CURBING CONVENTIONAL ARMS RACES

The United States should seek to have controls established over the traffic in arms by (a) major-power agreement to refrain from introduction of sophisticated weapons; (b) regional nonacquisition agreements; (c) U.N.-supervised agreements regarding sale and acquisition; (d) the establishment of a U.N. monitoring system to record the traffic in arms.

7. PROVIDING SECURITY FOR LESS DEVELOPED NATIONS

The United States should join with other major powers to provide adequate security for the less developed nations, at the same time supporting the establishment of U.N. peacekeeping procedures to the same end.

8. EUROPEAN SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS

To further reduce tensions in Europe and move toward settlement of the outstanding East-West differences:

First. The United States, working with its allies, should seek a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization.

Second. The United States should explore arms control, related security provisions, and other measures which would help lead to German reunification; and in this connection, the possibilities for balanced reductions of United States and Soviet troops and weapons in Central Europe should be examined.

Third. The United States should give consideration in consultation with other nations to a series of arrangements between West and East Germany covering such matters as trade and the movement of persons, which could lead ultimately to some kind of Confederation of East and West Germany.

I regret that the State Department has recently expressed its opposition to all three of these last suggestions, on the ground that the time is not ripe. Assistant Secretary of State Leddy, appearing before the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee, which was conducting hearings on the subject of an Atlantic Union, in response to questions from me, indicated this opposition of the State Department earlier this week.

9. MAINLAND CHINA

The United States should attempt to bring the People's Republic of China into a genuine dialog on disarmament and other security matters: First, by seeking bilateral talks on arms control matters of joint concern; second, by ascertaining the conditions under which mainland China could qualify for and accept the responsibilities of membership in the United Nations; and third, by supporting efforts to bring mainland China into the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference or in the alternative, a World Disarmament Conference such as the one called by the resolution of the U.N. General Assembly by resolution unanimously adopted November 29, 1965. In Senator PASTORE's words, spoken on the floor of the Senate on January 18, 1966:

> Wherever there is a disarmament conference, wherever peace is the topic, let China be invited to come.

There was encouraging word from Ambassador Goldberg, at a press conference held yesterday, that the State Department is reviewing our present China policy in the light of the hearings which have been conducted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Yesterday, three "hard line" witnesses supported our present State Department China policy. They were preceded and will be followed by other witnesses of equal if not greater competence, largely but not entirely from the academic community, urging, at a minimum, the suggestions with respect to mainland China which were included among the recommendations of the Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament at the White House Conference.

That Committee was composed of a number of distinguished Americans, with Dr. Jerome Wiesner, presently dean of the School of Science of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and formerly scientific adviser to President Kennedy and briefly to President Johnson, as Chairman. Dr. Wiesner is a man deeply versed in the complexities of arms control and disarmament.

Another member of the Committee was former Under Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric, who joined in the recommendations.

10. PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

It seems clear to me, and I am confident that I reflect the views of millions of other Americans, that we will never have an effective system for the peaceful settlement of disputes until we have established a system of enforceable world law, which requires:

First. Courts and other quasi-judicial institutions capable of rendering judgments, decrees, and decisions determining all international disputes, political as well as purely legal, which threaten to erupt into violence.

Second. Either a vastly strengthened United Nations, revised to create adequate executive and legislative powers capable of supporting the decisions of these judicial tribunals or, in the alternative, a new international institution, worldwide in membership, of all nations presently having a significant military capability. We could perhaps start at Geneva, inviting Communist China to participate.

Third. General and complete disarmament under strict international controls, so that no nation state will have the capability of defying the decisions of the international institutions mentioned above.

Fourth. An international peace force, recruited individually and not by national contingents, capable of enforcing the decisions above referred to, not only against nation states but against individuals within those states.

Fifth. An automatic method of financing these international peacekeeping activities, possibly by a small self-assessing tax on transactions in international trade, or by making the surplus of the World Bank available to the U.N. through an IDA-type soft loan.

Sixth. A vast multilateral international program for assisting the underdeveloped countries with special emphasis on food, education, public health, housing, and population control.

Regrettably, the proposals of the Panel on Peaceful Settlement of Disputes did not go that far. However, they did propose:

First. That the United States support the position that all states, including those not members of the United Nations, have a responsibility (a) to resort to measures of peaceful settlement before initiating the use of force in disputes in which they are involved and (b) to continue to pursue efforts at peaceful settlement even after embarking upon a justified use of force.

Second. That more frequent use be made of commissions whose sole or initial responsibility would be to ascertain the facts and to report them to the political organ.

Third. That more frequent use be made in U.N. organs and committees of rapporteurs who would attempt to achieve a consensus of view and report this to the organ or committee involved.

Fourth. That the United States propose to the General Assembly that it reconstitute its Panel on Inquiry and Conciliation, with appointments made by the Secretary General of an outstanding group of approximately 30 individuals with extensive experience in mediation and conciliation. The members of the panel would be appointed for 2- or 3-year terms and would have indicated their willingness, if possible, to be available to the Secretary General, to the Security Council, or to the General Assembly for missions of factfinding, of mediation, and of conciliation. Each year the Presidents of the preceding five General Assemblies would be exofficio members of the Panel. The members of the Panel would meet once each year with the Secretary General to consider measures for improving the ongoing peaceful settlement activities of the U.N.

Fifth. That greater flexibility be introduced into the U.N.'s mediation process by avoiding a strict timetable for reports by those who have been assigned mediation and conciliation responsibilities.

Sixth. That the political organs, and in particular the Security Council, make more frequent use of that provision of article 37 of the charter which permits recommendations for settlement to be made to the parties in dispute.

11. UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING

A number of citizen panels made recommendations in this area, proposing:

First. That the United States support the creation of a U.N. Peace Force, perhaps composed of two parts, (a) standby forces committed by member nations and (b) an elite force of one to two thousand men recruited—presumably individually—by the United Nations.

Second. That the United States offer to provide training and logistic support for the U.N. Peace Force and encourage others to do so.

Third. That the United States support the development of an effective U.N. Peace Observation Corps recruited by and available to the Secretary General.

Fourth. That the United States and other nuclear powers commit a fraction, such as one-half of 1 percent, of their annual defense expenditures to support the U.N. Peace Observation Corps and other peacekeeping activities of the U.N.

Fifth. That the United States encourage regional and worldwide nonaggression arrangements embodying the proposals made by President Johnson in January 1964.

Sixth. That the United States devote further study to mechanisms to facilitate peaceful change, such as a World Court of Equity to deal with political disputes, as well as ways and means of making greater use of the International Court of Justice and regional tribunals to deal with juridical matters.

Seventh. That the United States continue to support the view that within the United Nations matters relating to threats to the peace should first be considered by the Security Council—which has primary but not exclusive responsibility for the maintenance of peace—and also its support of the respective and complementary roles of the Security Council and General Assembly in the authorization and conduct of peacekeeping operations.

Eighth. That the United States encourage greater efforts to improve political coordination and smoother working relationships between the United Nations and regional organizations.

Ninth. That the United States encourage a more widespread acceptance of true third-party attitudes in the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations and greater utilization by members and by the organization of third parties in mediatory, conciliatory, and all other forms of peacekeeping efforts.

Tenth. That the United States continue to encourage the initiative of other members in making Armed Forces units available under a flexible callup system for United Nations operations and in increasing regular exchanges of information among themselves and with the organization in order to improve the utilization of such units.

Eleventh. That the United States offer, to countries interested in making such preparations to participate in United Nations peacekeeping activities but having inadequate resources of their own, the military and financial assistance already available under its foreign aid legislation for the training or equipment of such units.

Twelfth. That the United States extend its initiative in pledging logistical support to the United Nations by making its commitment more specific and by a continuing exchange of information with other members and the Secretariat.

Thirteenth. That the United States explore, in appropriate consultation with governments in whose countries its overseas bases lie, the possible use of those bases in connection with United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Fourteenth. That the United States encourage the Secretariat and members with peacekeeping experience to prepare and make available documentation and studies on all aspects of such operations, in particular for the benefit of governments pledging troop units and other support for future peacekeeping operations.

Fifteenth. That the United States encourage the Secretary General to strengthen the fact-gathering capacity of the organization in relation to its problems in peacekeeping, in particular by strengthening his staff of military advisers.

Sixteenth. That the United States seek to strengthen the role of the Secretary-General in the management of peacekeeping operations by such means as insisting on greater precision in Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and by encouraging the use of advisory committees to assist him on policy matters.

Seventeenth. That the United States encourage universal financial support of peacekeeping operations by members and avoid, by its own example, making exceptions in support of particular operations.

Eighteenth. That the United States encourage the United Nations to charge an appropriate committee with the study of alternative plans for financing peacekeeping, with special emphasis on the possibilities of nonobligatory apportionment of costs by means of a special scale and of establishing a peace fund.

Nineteenth. That the United States propose the establishment by joint action of the Security Council and General Assembly of a widely representative committee of members to raise funds, when necessary, for special peacekeeping purposes.

Twentieth. That the United States, when time and circumstances seem favorable, make a contribution on the order of $25 million to assist in restoring the solvency of the organization.

12. REPEAL OF THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT

Repeal of the Connally amendment to the resolution of adherence to the treaty creating the International Court of Justice was recommended by the Committee on the Development of International Law, the Committee on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, and the Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament.

13. THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

These recommendations were made by the Panel on International Law:

First. That the United States develop a program for legal assistance to new nations.

Second. That the United States develop a program for exchange of government lawyers with other countries.

Third. That the United States propose to the United Nations the establishment under U.N. auspices of an international law reporter system.

Fourth. That the United States ratify the United Nations and the World Bank arbitration conventions.

Fifth. That the United States ratify the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union.

Sixth. That the United States support a court for the adjudication of lower level international disputes.

14. THE NEED FOR ENFORCIBLE WORLD LAW

Despite my approval of the recommendations of the Committee on the Development of International Law, in the course of my statement before the panel I made plain my keen disappointment at the failure of the committee to discuss, much less recommend, steps looking toward the achievement of peace through general and complete disarmament under enforceable world law. I then listed a number of things which can and should be done without further delay to get us back on the track toward the creation of enforceable world law:

First. The United States should take the initiative in prodding the Sixth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly, which has jurisdiction over legal matters, to get to work on its enormous agenda.

Second. A United Nations Charter Revision Conference should be called. In connection with such a conference, a plan for a comprehensive revision of the charter to make the U.N. more effective in its peacemaking activities should be prepared and circulated. The proposals of Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn for revision of the United Nations Charter contained in "World Peace Through World Law" should be dusted off, taken out of the archives, debated and circulated, and adopted.

Third. The clauses of the United States "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmanent in a Peaceful World" now pending at Geneva which deal with the International Disarmament Organization, the International Peace Force, and the International Court of Justice, should be prepared in detail. The Committee of Western Jurists which has been given the job of preparing a common negotiating position on these matters should be given greater support by the United States and spurred to greater efforts.

Fourth. Most important of all, a series of officially sponsored conferences with the Russian bar and bench should be arranged, on the model of the Pugwash international scientific conferences. International legal development will not be very effective without the Russians, the Eastern Europeans, and the Chinese. There should be an all-out cooperative effort by lawyers to coordinate Western legal thinking, first with Russian and then with Chinese legal thinking in the area of peacekeeping machinery and enforcement. The work of the World Peace Through Law Center in Geneva, initiated and nurtured by Charles S. Rhyne, former president of the American Bar Association, should be given strong support.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY, of New York, took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in addition, I offered a suggestion with respect to the recommendations of the committee dealing with developing just and workable legal systems in underdeveloped countries. We are all aware of the frightening lack of trained lawyers in many of these areas, particularly Africa. It is said for example that when Belgium pulled out of the Congo there was hardly a single qualified Congolese lawyer in the entire country. For the overwhelming majority of the people, the only available justice was tribal justice.

The United States, through AID, should summon the resources of the law schools of our country to establish law schools in all of the underdeveloped countries of the world where they do not now exist. Each such new law school should, as soon as the progress of its students permits, offer courses in international law with special reference to disarmament, the peaceful settlement of disputes and international peacekeeping procedures. Such an effort should produce, in 10 years or less, a legal leadership group knowledgeable in the procedures necessary to achieve world peace.

15. RESEARCH ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The Committee on Research on the Development of International Institutions performed a valuable service in pointing out the utter inadequacy of research for peace. It is frightening to contemplate the billions upon billions of dollars which the President recommends and the Congress gladly votes for research to invent and improve weapons for mass destruction of the human race, as compared to the scanty thousands of dollars reluctantly and grudgingly granted for research into methods of achieving world peace. One of the most shortsighted acts of the first session of the 89th Congress was to cut back both the authorization and the appropriation for the research into peace activities of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Surely we need to take another hard look at our sense of values, our priorities, and our private and public budgets in order to adjust our activities in the modern world.

We need—and so do the Russians and Chinese—less research into weapons of war and more research into ways of achieving and keeping world peace.

The Committee recommended the appointment by the President of a mixed public-private commission to recommend how to carry out our efforts for peace through investigation, the marshaling of existing knowledge, and the acquisition of new knowledge which could be applied to the resolution of international conflict.

In my comments before the committee, I noted that there should really be no need for the creation of such a commission, although there clearly is one. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was created in 1961 on the recommendation of President Kennedy to do exactly the job the commission would do. However, despite the existence of the ACDA, and a considerable body of research into the ways and means of achieving peace, the job has not yet been done.

What is needed is a closer coordination of existing research activity, and more effective use of agencies now in being—although this recommendation need not conflict with the creation of the commission urged by the panel.

However, if we are really committed to the proposition that peace is "the assignment of the century," as President Johnson has said, then it is incumbent upon the United States, as the richest nation on earth, to mobilize its great resources—its scholars, scientists, lawyers, and statesmen—in a new Manhattan project to unlock the secrets of peace, just as the first Manhattan project unlocked the secrets of the atom.

16. INTERNATIONAL MONETARY COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

The Committee on International Monetary Cooperation and Development Finance recommended that work should promptly be begun on reform of the international monetary system and establishment of a system based on collective reserve units which would be freed from the limitations inherent in continued dependence on the gold exchange standard.

Second. The World Bank should play an increasing role in coordinating development assistance furnished by the industrial nations, recognizing that the efforts of the developing countries are basic.

Fortunately, both of these recommendations are now being carried out by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund under the very able leadership of Mr. George Woods for the bank and M. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer for the Fund.

In my appearance before the committee, I made the following three major proposals, which at the time seemed to fall on rather deaf ears:

First, the bankers of the world, who have a special interest in the maintenance of world peace—for without peace they could not do much banking—and a special competence in financial matters, should take it upon themselves to work out a system for providing adequate and reliable financial support for the operations of the United Nations. The best solution would probably be a small and easily collectible tax on transactions in international trade.

This tax could be based on the value of the invoice, which is always a part of the transaction.

However, consideration should be given to an IDA-type soft loan from the World Bank to the U.N., which would permit the U.N. to make use of the Bank's large undivided profits.

It is curious to me that this suggestion had not been taken up earlier. The International Development Association has had great success in terms of making soft loans to underdeveloped countries whose finances are in precarious condition. There is no institution, national, private, or public, whose financial condition is more precarious than that of the United Nations today. Without the United Nations it would be difficult indeed for the World Bank to function. One would hope, as a matter of survival and protection, if for no more generous motive, that the Bank would look into the possibility of assisting in the financing of the United Nations.

My second recommendation is that the Soviet Union should be invited to join the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

We are all aware that the Soviet Union is one of the two great gold producing countries in the world, the other being the Union of South Africa. The Soviet Union is engaging in trade with both the underdeveloped countries and free world countries. One would think it would want to join the World Bank in view of its interest in the United Nations as well as the other trading countries of the world. It is my understanding that no invitation has been extended to the Soviet Union since the days of Bretton Woods. I would hope an invitation would be made to the Soviet Union and kept open for it to join.

Third, the United States should not slacken its own bilateral development efforts while we are trying to strengthen and develop new cooperative multilateral programs to raise living standards around the world.

17. POPULATION

First. The U.S. Government should encourage schools and universities here and abroad to study population in all its relevant aspects—particularly at the graduate level in relation to such fields as medicine, public health, public administration, theology, economics, and other behavioral sciences.

Second. The U.S. Government should greatly expand its support, both at home and abroad, of research related to the population problem—particularly research on the interrelation between population growth and economic development, on new or improved techniques, of family planning, on the means of communicating these techniques and on the administration and management of family planning programs.

Third. The U.S. Government should set an international example by cooperating with State and local governments and private organizations to make family planning services and information readily available to those in the United States who wish to have them, with the understanding that there be no coercion and that in tax-supported facilities there be full freedom of choice of methods to be used in regulating pregnancy.

Fourth. The U.S. Government should greatly expand its program of training U.S. and foreign personnel who can themselves train doctors, nurses, auxiliary personnel, communications specialists, administrators, and others needed in the implementation of family planning programs in the United States and all around the world.

Fifth. The U.S. Government should be prepared to make available upon request up to $100 million a year over the next 3 years to help other countries implement programs of family planning and strengthen national health and social services necessary for the support of family planning programs.

Sixth. U.S. assistance to other countries in all of these areas should be related to the maximum possible extent to the work of multilateral agencies, particularly the relevant agencies of the United Nations, including the World Health Organization, the U.N. Children's Fund, and the U.N. Development program.

Seventh. Private organizations should be encouraged to expand their work in all of these areas, particularly in those fields where government assistance is not readily available and public and private sources should be encouraged to give more generous support to such organizations.

Eighth. A White House Conference on Population should be held within the next 2 years to consider domestic and international population trends and the appropriate measures to deal with them.

Ninth. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should appoint a committee to prepare this Conference through careful advance planning and research and to advise the U.S. Government on steps that may be taken before the Conference to deal with domestic and international population problems.

Tenth. The Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should undertake improvements in organization, staff, and budgets necessary to discharge their increased responsibilities pursuant to the above recommendations dealing with the population problem.

The Chairman of the very able Committee on Population of the International Cooperation Year was Mr. Richard Gardner, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization, presently a member of the faculty of the Columbia Law School, and a consultant to Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to the United Nations.

It was the drive and energy of Mr. Gardner in leading his able colleagues which resulted in this exceptionally able report by the Committee on Population.

I have no hesitation in saying that one of the most pressing problems related to the question of war and peace is the problem of how to curb unwanted population growth, which is cutting back the progress of underdeveloped areas.

Unless we can have peace, we have little hope of leaving to our children and our grandchildren as good a world as our fathers and grandfathers turned over to us.

Although the work of the committees constituted the most important part of the Conference, those in attendance also had the opportunity to hear addresses by Vice President HUMPHREY—who read a message from President Johnson—Chief Justice Warren, United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, Presidential Assistant McGeorge Bundy, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

(The texts of these speeches are printed in order as exhibits 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.)

Mr. CLARK. At the conclusion of Secretary Rusk's speech, which did not deal with disarmament, I asked the following question from the floor:

> Does the State Department support a treaty of general and complete disarmament as proposed by President Kennedy?

Secretary Rusk responded:

> Yes, yes and we've spent a great deal of time on it at conferences and in bilateral discussions. We have a lot of reasons for being very serious about disarmament.

(The complete text of Secretary Rusk's response appears in exhibit 13.)

Mr. CLARK. However, apart from this instance, by and large the spokesmen for the administration, and particularly those of the State Department, were far behind the panelists and participants in their thinking. They have a sort of inbred devotion to the status quo, which resulted in almost every representative of the State Department taking a negative view of the recommendations made by the various committees during the panel discussion.

My overall assessment of the Conference is that it was enormously useful. Each of the committees consisted of able men and women well qualified to ponder and report on the particular area of international cooperation assigned to them. Each of the reports was well prepared and showed evidence of good solid thought. My own understanding of these subjects was significantly advanced by attending the Conference and I would guess my experience was not unique.

The some 5,000 participants who were not committee members made a real contribution to the Conference. They were diligent attendants and shrewd questioners. Most of them were experts in one or more of the subjects under discussion. They helped sharpen and define issues. They contributed new ideas well worth further exploration.

On February 18, 1966, Ambassador Goldberg made a report on behalf of the United States to, first, Ambassador Paul Tremblay, Chairman of the United Nations Committee on International Cooperation Year, and, second, to His Excellency U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations.

This report by Ambassador Goldberg will be found in exhibit 14.

I regret very much that this report makes no reference to the congressional delegation which attended the Conference and participated quite actively in the discussion. Further, it makes no reference to Concurrent Resolution 36, which I have referred to earlier, which was unanimously passed by the Congress, and which I had the honor of taking to the 20th anniversary celebration of the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco in June of 1965.

Further, I am disappointed that the magnificent address of Chief Justice Warren at the committee meeting and panel session on international law, which I have also introduced as an exhibit, was not referred to by Ambassador Goldberg.

The fact is that while the executive branch of our Government necessarily took the lead both in preparing for the Conference and in guiding to some extent—not always constructively—the thinking of the panels and of the committees, there was significant cooperation from both the judiciary and the legislative.

I would hope that the participation will be recognized when the results of the Conference are assessed.

Where do we go from here? What is to become of the recommendations of the Conference?

It would be a tragic waste, in my view, if the interest and enthusiasm generated by the Conference were simply to be dissipated through lack of a followup. Through the Conference we were able to bring to bear the experience and talents of many of our best intellects on the problems incident to the search for peace and improved international cooperation. In addition, the Conference has generated widespread public discussion of the great issues at stake. This momentum must not be lost.

I wish to read into the RECORD an assessment of the Conference made at the time by an experienced and able journalist who said:

> Last November 28 nearly 5,000 distinguished Americans met in Washington for what President Johnson described as "the assignment of the century": exploring means by which the Government and citizenry of the world's most powerful nation can lead mankind to a golden age of peace through international cooperation.
>
> Known as the White House Conference on International Cooperation, it was, in many ways, the conference of the century. It was, first, the largest, most comprehensive joint planning effort ever undertaken by American citizens and Government officials. Indeed, as the President observed in a written welcome to participants, the 3-day Conference was nothing less than a "town meeting of leaders of the Nation."

In order to sustain this forward movement, I recommend:

First, the various citizen panels of the White House Conference on International Cooperation should be kept in existence, and they should be requested to make periodic reports to the President and to the appropriate committees of the Congress, revising and updating their recommendations in the light of changing conditions.

I have already written to the President urging him to take this step. I hope that his response will be positive.

Second, in order to provide effective liaison between the citizen committees and the Government, there should be created in the office of the Vice President a small coordinating office or secretariat for citizen liaison. Since the Vice President served as Chairman of the White House Conference, he is the most logical person to oversee this operation. Coordination on the citizen side should be provided through the creation of a Citizen Steering Committee, made up of five or six of the chairmen of the various committees to the Conference.

Third, the United Nations Association of the United States and the hundreds of other nongovernmental organizations which contributed so greatly to the success of the Conference should be encouraged to stimulate wide public debate on the great issues of international cooperation raised at the Conference, and to continue to play an active role, in partnership with the Government, toward the end of increasing international cooperation, by making specific recommendations for governmental action and pressing for their implementation.

Fourth, I believe that the Congress—and particularly the Senate—has a responsibility to pick up where the Conference left off, by pressing ahead to consider the required action where congressional action is called for by a Conference recommendation.

After all, under article I, section 1 of the Constitution, legislative authority is vested not in the President but in the Congress. It may well be that we have been somewhat remiss in performing our constitutional legislative responsibilities during the last several years.

Congress should also exercise its oversight and investigatory powers as to those recommendations affecting the executive branch. Each committee of the Senate which has jurisdiction over any Conference recommendation should consider itself obliged to weigh that proposal as it would a request from the executive, authorizing studies and holding hearings where necessary.

This will mean, first, building on the recent peace offensive of which the Conference is a key element, and pressing ahead on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the "Planning for Peace" resolution; second, calling hearings, particularly in the Foreign Relations Subcommittees on Disarmament, International Organizations and International Economic and Social Policy Affairs, to develop just what the executive branch is doing about the recommendations of the Conference, if anything; third, giving maximum publicity to the recommendations of the various committees through floor speeches in the Senate and mailings; fourth, working for Senate approval of the United States-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Consular Treaty and repeal of the Connally amendment, as recommended by the various committees; and fifth, pressing our delegation to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva to propose and urge on the Conference in general and the Russians in particular, agreement on not only the arms control proposals recommended by the Wiesner Committee, but also on the treaties of general and complete disarmament under strict international controls—that is, enforcible world law—which have been gathering dust in the files of the Palais des Nations since they were tabled by ourselves and the Russians in 1962.

Mr. President, I conclude this report to the Senate and to the American people by returning to President Johnson's charge to the White House Conference on International Cooperation:

> To search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace. That five-letter word is the goal of all of us. It is by far the most important problem we face. It is the assignment of the century, and if we fail in that assignment, everything will come to naught.

We cannot, and I believe we shall not, fail. But our success can come about only through the tireless efforts and steadfast dedication of the millions of Americans in private life who are committed to the cause of peace and international cooperation, and the millions more who will join with them if adequately stimulated to do so. We are closer to success today because of the work of those who labored so long and so hard to make the White House Conference on International Cooperation a success, and out of whose talent and wisdom and devotion have come the many recommendations of the Conference. Let us hope—and let us work—to make these recommendations for strengthened international cooperation a reality, so that tomorrow we shall be closer still to that goal for which we all strive: enduring worldwide peace under the rule of law.

EXHIBIT 1

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

([Without reference to a Committee (A/L. 419 and Add. 1)] 1844 (XVII). International Cooperation Year)

The General Assembly,

Deeply convinced that wider and more intensive international cooperation would provide one of the most effective means of dispersing international tensions,

Noting that a large measure of international cooperation in various fields exists among the peoples and nations of the world,

Believing that the world would be well served both by an increased awareness of the existing level of international cooperation and by a marked increase in the number of projects in diverse fields jointly undertaken on an international basis,

Realizing that increased international cooperation can most readily be brought about by expanding and building upon the activities of existing organizations and institutions, particularly the United Nations,

Confident that an appropriate way of celebrating the 20th anniversary of the United Nations is through a year of increased international cooperation and joint efforts and undertakings,

Convinced that a designated period may serve both to direct attention to the common interests of mankind and to accelerate the joint efforts being undertaken to further them,

1. Requests the President of the General Assembly to nominate a Preparatory Committee of up to 12 Member States to meet at United Nations Headquarters;[1]

2. Requests the Preparatory Committee to consider the desirability of designating 1965, the 20th year of the United Nations, as International Cooperation Year, and to report to the General Assembly at its 18th session on the feasibility and financial implications of this proposal;

3. Requests the Preparatory Committee to report to the General Assembly at its 18th session on measures and activities that might be undertaken by member states and by and through specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, in pursuance of the present resolution and in furtherance of its objectives;

4. Invite nongovernmental organizations having consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, and any other appropriate organizations in member states to begin making plans for special efforts and projects for the International Cooperation Year, and to render all assistance to the Preparatory Committee;

5. Requests the Secretary General to provide all the necessary facilities to the Preparatory Committee for the accomplishment

---

[1] At the 1202d plenary meeting, on Dec. 20, 1962, the President informed the General Assembly that the nomination of the members of the Preparatory Committee would be announced at a later date.

of its tasks (1198th plenary meeting, December 19, 1962).

EXHIBIT 2

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

([Without reference to a committee (A/L 433/Rev.1)] 1907 (XVII). International Cooperation Year)

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming its resolution 1844 (XVII) of December 19, 1962,

Noting the report of the Preparatory Committee on the International Cooperation Year.[1]

Conscious of the many grave international problems which remain unresolved and of the consequent need for international cooperation,

Considering it essential that member states should endeavor to promote measures aimed at the elimination of international tension,

Convinced that increased public awareness of the extent and significance of existing everyday cooperation would lead to a better appreciation of the true nature of the world community and of the common interests of mankind,

Convinced that devoting a year to international cooperation would help to bring about increased world understanding and cooperation, and thereby facilitate the settlement of major international problems,

1. Designates 1965, the 20th year of the United Nations, as International Cooperation Year;

2. Expresses appreciation to the Preparatory Committee on the International Cooperation Year for its work;

3. Takes note of the general criteria, the suggested activities and the publicity proposals recommended by the preparatory committee in its report;

4. Calls upon all member states, the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the nongovernmental organizations concerned:

(a) To take note of the designation of 1965 as International Cooperation Year;

(b) To publicize to the widest extent feasible the activities of international cooperation in which they have been and are at present engaged and their efforts to strengthen and expand these activities;

(c) To formulate such plans and programs as seem to them appropriate to promote the purposes of the International Cooperation Year;

5. Decides to establish a committee for the International Cooperation Year, which would be composed of not more than 12 members to be appointed by the president of the General Assembly;

6. Requests the committee:

(a) To draw up and coordinate plans for the International Cooperation Year, taking into account the views and intentions of the governments of member states, the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the nongovernmental organizations concerned;

(b) To organize and prepare for suitable activities for the International Cooperation Year to be undertaken by the United Nations, bearing in mind the report of the preparatory committee;

7. Invites member states, the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the nongovernmental organizations concerned to make available to the committee, as appropriate, information on their plans and intentions for the International Cooperation Year;

8. Requests the Secretary General, taking into account United Nations participation in the International Cooperation Year, to provide within existing budgetary limits all necessary facilities for promoting and carrying forward the International Cooperation Year;

9. Requests the committee to submit an interim report to the General Assembly at its 19th session (1262d plenary meeting, November 21, 1963).

The President of the General Assembly, in pursuance of paragraph 5 of the above resolution, appointed the members of the Committee for the International Cooperation Year.

Accordingly, the Committee for the International Cooperation Year is composed of the following member states: Argentina, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Finland, India, Ireland, Liberia, Mexico, and United Arab Republic.

EXHIBIT 3

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has designated the year 1965 as International Cooperation Year; and

Whereas the year 1965 also marks the 20th anniversary of the United Nations; and

Whereas international cooperation is essential to the achievement of a peaceful world order; and

Whereas international organizations are vital in the modern world and provide the necessary foundation for a peaceful world community; and

Whereas the world has moved rapidly toward international cooperation and organization in recent years—especially within the family of the United Nations agencies; and

Whereas the movement for international cooperation has had, and will continue to have, the enthusiastic support of the Government of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is highly desirable to assess this development and examine promptly what further steps can be taken in the immediate future toward enhancing international cooperation and strengthening world organization:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the year 1965 to be International Cooperation Year in the United States of America; rededicate the Government of the United States to the principle of international cooperation; and direct the agencies of the Executive Branch to examine thoroughly what additional steps can be taken in this direction in the immediate future.

I also call upon our national citizen organizations to undertake intensive educational programs to inform their memberships of recent progress in international cooperation and urge them to consider what further steps can be taken.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 2d day of October in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 189th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK, *Secretary of State.*

EXHIBIT 4

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION YEAR GROUP IN THE STATE DINING ROOM, OCTOBER 2, 1964

President JOHNSON: If you have never been late to a meeting, you won't understand my position, but I do ask your indulgence and do thank you very much for what I hope is your understanding. I have been running late all morning. I didn't know we had as many majority leaders in the Congress as we have. They are all hoping that they can go home this week. I am hoping that they go home, too.

I have just left more ex-presidents of the American Bar Association than I ever realized existed, but since they were lawyers for Johnson, I am glad they were there. I had to meet with them, so please forgive me and I promise to try not to be so tardy in my public appointments in the future.

I am very proud to welcome this most distinguished assembly of most distinguished Americans. I regret that one of the most distinguished of all cannot be with us this morning—Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. He is otherwise engaged in Cleveland and Chicago in a pursuit that I regard as no vice.

You have come here and we are brought together by a very old and a very honored American interest—the interest of fostering international cooperation instead of international conflict. We are here today to proclaim 1965 as International Cooperation Year in the United States of America.

This observance will be commemorated around the world by the members of the United Nations. For the United States, cooperation with other nations and other peoples is always uppermost in our minds and is the first aim of our policies, the central instrument of our foreign policy, and it is the central goal of administrations of both parties—the great leaders of which many are in the room today.

I know that the American people would not have it otherwise. The value of international cooperation and understanding is recognized by all of us. The extent of cooperation that is in existence is realized by too few. Today the United States participates in some 80 international organizations. We take part in nearly 600 international conferences, and we faithfully honor 14,300 treaties and agreements that we have made with other nations in the world.

Two points are clear:

First, international cooperation is simple, not an idea nor an ideal. We think it is a clear necessity to our survival. The greater the nation, the greater is its need to work cooperatively with other people, with other countries, with other nations.

Second, international cooperation is no longer an academic subject; it is a fact of life, as I have just illustrated. Our challenge is not to debate the theory or the concept, but our challenge is to improve and to perfect and to strengthen the organizations that already exist.

In 1965, it is the hope of your Government that International Cooperation Year may be used for a useful review and purposeful planning. For this end, I am appointing a special Cabinet Committee to direct this work and to develop all possible proposals for the future.

It is my thought that we can find many areas to encourage much more progressive and purposeful labor among the nations of the world. This is what we shall be doing. I have asked you here this morning to make a special appeal to you and to request your labors, too. I hope that each of you will help me and the Secretary of State and others of your Government to carry the story of international cooperation and organization to the American people.

Public understanding, public support, is vital and basic to our success in striving for world understanding and cooperation. You can't be a statesman unless you get elected, and it is pretty difficult for us to be successful in a movement of this kind if we do not have the broad, solid support of the people, because under our system they are the masters.

More than that, I hope that your talents may be turned to systematic study of the next steps that private organizations may take to further this cooperation. There is more extensive interest in this on the private level than I think there has ever been before. Business organizations, farm organizations, labor unions, universities, church bodies, women's groups, professional societies, are all expanding their interests and their operations abroad and are all concerned with what is happening in the other 120-odd nations in the world to an extent that has never been equaled before, I say pridefully and proudly.

---

[1] A/5561.

There is much going on in this field in this country and throughout the world. There is much energy and enthusiasm and interest to do even more if we have the right kind of leadership. So your task is to help bring these together, how to harness these resources and channel them in the proper direction. Those with the experience and background that you have must make known what is going on, what the next steps are, and how those with time and resources can most usefully join these labors.

In this day and in this age man has too many common interests to waste his energies, his talents, and his substance in primitive arrogance or destructive conflict. In short, you are going to have to be the captains of a movement to lead people to love instead of hate. You are going to have to be the leaders in a movement to guide people in preserving humanity instead of destroying it. You are going to be the leaders in a crusade to help get rid of the ancient enemies of mankind—ignorance, illiteracy, poverty, and disease—because we know that these things must go and we also know from our past that if we do not adjust to this change peacefully, we will have to adjust to it otherwise.

As a great leader said in this room not many years ago, "If a peaceful revolution is impossible, a violent revolution is inevitable." So I believe that the true realists in the second half of this 20th century are those who bear the dream of new ways for new cooperation.

You will be frowned upon. Some will call you an idealist. Some will even call you a crackpot, and some may even call you worse than that. They may say you are soft or hard or don't understand what it is all about in some of these fields, but what greater ambition could you have and what greater satisfaction could come to you than the knowledge that you had entered a partnership with your Government that had provided the leadership in the world that had preserved humanity instead of destroyed it.

So this year and next year and in the years to come, international cooperation must be an enduring way of life in the community of man.

If I am here—I am speaking now politically and not physically—I don't anticipate any violence, but if I am here, I intend next year to call a White House Conference and I want all of you to start thinking about it now. I want you to talk to your friends about it. I want to call a White House Conference to search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace. That five-letter word is the goal of all of us. It is by far the most important problem we face. It is the assignment of the century for each of you and if we fail in that assignment, everything will come to naught.

If we succeed, think how wonderful the year 2000 will be; and it is already so exciting to me that I am just hoping that my heart and stroke and cancer committee can come up with some good results that will insure that all of us can live beyond 100 so we can participate in that glorious day when all the fruits of our labors and our imaginations today are a reality.

It now gives me a great deal of pleasure to sign the proclamation designating 1965 to the International Cooperation Year in the United States of America. I am very proud this morning that I am a citizen of a country and the leader of a nation that can have voluntarily assembled in the first house of this land the quality and quantity of talent that faces me now. To each of you, for the time you have taken and waited, for the money you spent in coming here, for the thought that you have given, but more important, for what you are going to do, on behalf of the Nation, I say we are grateful. Thank you very much.

EXHIBIT 5

S. CON. RES. 32

Whereas it is the policy of the United States, as stated by President Johnson in his communication to the Congress on arms control on January 15, 1965, to be "vigilant for opportunities for improving the hopes for peace"; and

Whereas the steps taken toward peace in the past four years, including the adoption of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, the hot line agreement, the United Nations resolution against weapons in space, and the pursuit of a policy of mutual example in reducing excessive defense expenditures, have contributed to the relaxation of international tensions; and

Whereas these developments have enhanced the prospect for the negotiation of further international agreements based upon mutual interest and calculated to advance the cause of world peace; and

Whereas the basic purpose of United States foreign policy is the achievement of a just and lasting peace, which can best be attained through the development of the rule of law in the international community; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, at its fourteenth session, unanimously adopted "the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control", and called upon governments "to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem"; and

Whereas President Eisenhower stated on September 22, 1960, to the Fifteenth General Assembly, "Thus, we see as our goal, not a superstate above nations, but a world community embracing them all, rooted in law and justice and enhancing the potentialities and common purposes of all peoples"; and

Whereas President Kennedy stated on September 25, 1961, that we must create "worldwide law and law enforcement as we outlaw worldwide war and weapons", and stated further on June 10, 1963, that "our primary long-range interest" is "general and complete disarmament—designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms"; and

Whereas the United States program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, introduced at the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, defined the objective of the United States as "A world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control" and the "institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations" and called for the creation of an International Disarmament Organization to insure compliance with disarmament obligations, a United Nations Peace Force to keep the peace during the period of disarmament and thereafter; and improved processes for the peaceful settlement of international disputes; and

Whereas President Kennedy, in addressing the eighteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 20, 1963, called for the revision of the Charter of the United Nations to permit the development of that body into "a genuine world security system", and declared that the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations must be strengthened by the adoption of sound financial arrangements and the maintenance of standby peace force contingents by member nations, and that resort to special missions for the conciliation and adjudication of international disputes be increased; and

Whereas the realization of these goals through international negotiations, United Nations Charter revision, or otherwise, is a matter of urgency because (1) technological and political developments have given rise to new perils to peace through the increasing spread of nuclear weapons, as evidenced by the successful detonation of a nuclear device by the Chinese Communists, the continued development of an independent nuclear deterrent by France, and the possibility that several other nations, which have the capacity to make nuclear weapons, will follow a similar course; and (2) the increasing cost of the arms race is preventing human needs from being met in all the countries of the world; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, during recent sessions, has resolved to keep in being the Committee on Arrangements for the purpose of reviewing the charter, and has further resolved to ask the Committee to submit periodic reports, with recommendations, to future sessions of the General Assembly; and

Whereas the achievement of an international accord for general and complete disarmament under effective controls and the development of international peacekeeping machinery require not only the support of the Congress, but also an informed public opinion in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President should be supported in his efforts to achieve peace and disarmament under legally effective controls and to develop international institutions capable of permanently keeping the peace.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to formulate as speedily as possible specific and detailed proposals for the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the United States regarding the establishment of an international authority to keep the peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament effectively guaranteed by adequate inspection and controls. In formulating such proposals, the President is requested to consider whether the development of effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace, including (1) an International Disarmament Organization; (2) a permanent World Peace Force; (3) world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiations; (4) other international institutions necessary for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law; and (5) appropriate and reliable financial arrangements for the support of such peacekeeping machinery, may best be achieved by revision of the Charter of the United Nations, by a new treaty, or by a combination of the two.

SEC. 3. The President should make such proposals available to the Congress and to the public generally.

SEC. 4. The President is requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the heads of government of all of the nations of the world and to urge them to initiate within their governments studies of matters germane to this resolution and to formulate and make generally available recommendations based upon such studies.

EXHIBIT 6

S. CON. RES. 36

Whereas the year 1965 marks the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations, which will be celebrated in San Francisco on June 26, 1965; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has designated the year 1965 as "International Cooperation Year"; and

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed 1965 as "International Cooperation Year"; and has set up a broad program within the executive branch to review our present international policies in cooperation with a bipartisan group of distinguished private citizens; and

Whereas the President has charged those participating in the International Cooperation Year program to "search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace"; and

Whereas the International Cooperation Year program will culminate in a White House Conference on International Cooperation which the President has announced he will convene in November 1965; and

Whereas during the twenty years of its existence the United Nations has played an important, and at times crucial, role in pursuit of one of its stated purposes "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind"; and

Whereas during that time the United Nations has also performed a valuable service through the specialized agencies and otherwise in helping to establish human rights and to eliminate those ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States of America rededicates itself to the principles of the United Nations and to the furtherance of international cooperation within the framework of law and order; and that all other members of the United Nations are urged to do likewise.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that in connection with the examination for International Cooperation Year of United States participation in international cooperative activities, the executive branch should—

(1) review with a high sense of urgency the current state of international peacekeeping machinery with a view to making specific suggestions for strengthening this machinery, (2) review other major elements of international community and cooperation with a view to making specific suggestions to promote the growth of institutions of international cooperation and law and order, and (3) review urgently the status of disarmament negotiations with a view to further progress in reducing the dangers and burden of competitive national armaments.

SEC. 3. In order to provide for participation by the Congress in the White House Conference on International Cooperation, subject to an invitation by the President, there is hereby created a congressional delegation of twelve members to be composed of six members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and six members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Any vacancy in the membership of the delegation shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointments.

Passed the Senate June 16, 1965.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON, *Secretary*.

EXHIBIT 7

(List of names on panelists of the eight panels may be found in the following exhibits:)

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT, NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Chairman, dean, School of Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, former Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology.

Dr. Donald G. Brennan, Hudson Institute.

Fredrick M. Eaton, Esq., of the New York bar, former representative of the United States at the 10-Nation Disarmament Committee.

Dr. Vernon Ferwerda, assistant general secretary, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States.

Mr. John Fischer, editor, Harper's.

Roswell Gilpatric, Esq., of the the New York bar, former Under Secretary of Defense.

Joseph J. Johnston, Esq., of the Montgomery, Ala., bar.

Dr. Carl Kaysen, Littauer professor of political economy, Harvard University, former Department Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

Dr. Robert Martin, professor of political science, Howard University.

Mr. John M. Mitchell, executive vice president, Aluminum Co. of America.

Dr. William V. O'Brien, Chairman, Institute of World Policy, Georgetown University.

Mrs. Josephine Pomerance, civic leader, Cos Cob, Conn.

Rev. Richard Spillane, S.J., director, center for peace research, the Creighton University.

Harold E. Stassen, Esq., of the Philadelphia bar, former Special Assistant to the President and U.S. Representative to the Disarmament Subcommittee.

Committee staff: Dr. Walter C. Clemens, Jr., executive officer, assistant professor of political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

This report was prepared by a committee of the National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation for presentation at the White House Conference on International Cooperation.

While preparing the report the committee had the benefit of consultations with Government officials; the recommendations are those of the National Citizens' Commission Committee.

SUMMARY

The arms limitation agreements reached in 1963-64 demonstrate that progress is possible in reducing the dangers and costs of military and political competition. But this committee believes that additional steps are urgently required to deal with a series of problems that, left unresolved, threaten to disrupt seriously whatever uneasy equilibrium has been achieved in world politics.

Two imperatives are uppermost: First, to halt the spread of nuclear weapons beyond the present five atomic powers; second, to curb and then reduce the arms buildup taking place among and within these same five countries, a spiral driven upward by new technological possibilities and by the uncertainties resulting from nuclear proliferation.

These major challenges are closely related to four other pressing problems: First, the buildup of conventional arms, particularly in the developing countries, which inflames national sentiments, threatens to bring on war in several regions of the world, and wastes vital economic resources; second, the still unresolved security problems of Central Europe; third, the failure so far to engage the People's Republic of China in a genuine dialog exploring possible common interests in arms limitations; and, fourth, the structural inadequacies of the United Nations for internal peacekeeping missions and for the supervision of arms limitations.

To deal effectively with these challenges will require that the governments and peoples of the world set aside fear, chauvinism, cynicism, and inertia to invest the resources, courage, and good will required to build mutual security in ways less costly and dangerous than primary reliance upon strategic autarchy.

The committee believes that the control of nuclear armed forces is becoming more difficult with each passing year and that a major effort must be made now to halt the drift toward international anarchy. There is a desperate need to reestablish confidence in the capability of the United Nations to insure the peace. We believe that the United States, as the most powerful nation in the world, can take the lead in seeking agreements on measures of collective security and of arms limitation and reduction and should do whatever can usefully and safely be done unilaterally as well as jointly. Toward that end we propose a series of steps which taken together would make a systematic and significant beginning to more far-reaching disarmament.

In arms control as in medicine, prevention is more attainable than cure. Therefore many of the measures we recommend are designed to prevent further deterioration of the present situation, but they also may facilitate larger accomplishments not now within reach.

The merit of specific recommendations is open to debate. What is incontestable is the urgency of a renewed commitment—in this country and others—to an intensified program that will halt and reverse the perilous trend of competition in arms before new rounds of weapons development and deployment are initiated. Immediate steps are needed in the next year to put a brake on developments that can only hinder progress toward comprehensive disarmament measures under law which stand as our ultimate goal.

I. WHERE WE STAND

A. Challenges and opportunities

Twenty years have passed since the founding of the United Nations and the onset of the nuclear age—two decades of struggle in man's efforts to control the instruments of force and reduce the incentives to use them. But as the likelihood of conflict has ebbed and flowed, efforts to achieve limitations on arms have had frighteningly little success.

The initial U.S. attempt to establish a United Nations monopoly over atomic energy foundered. A new superbomb, dwarfing the atomic bomb in its capacity for destruction, was developed and deployed. By 1955, arms control negotiators in East and West had conceded that the strictest international inspection might not detect hidden reserves of fissionable materials with sufficient reliability to permit their controlled elimination. And 5 years later no one was able to prevent the enormous and still continuing expenditures on massive deployments of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM). These failures can be measured in the trillion dollars that the world has spent for armaments in 20 years, and they can be measured in the capacity of either of two governments to destroy in hours hundreds of millions of persons.

Simultaneously with these failures has come one important success: a widespread acceptance of the axiom that general war is inconceivable as a rational instrument of policy; and a corollary interest in methods of harnessing the mutual concern to prevent it. Other achievements are smaller.

They include: a rapid communication link between Washington and Moscow for grave emergencies; a treaty preventing all but underground nuclear tests, thus halting the radioactive pollution of the atmosphere by the superpowers; a U.N. resolution reflecting the intention of the major powers not to place weapons of mass destruction in outer space and calling upon others to refrain from doing so; a set of simultaneous announcements of intentions to slow down the production of fissionable material.

In addition the United States has made a major effort to construct elaborate controls and handling procedures for the weapons constructed and to devise and adapt strategies consistent with them. Finally, the U.S. Government has organized and supported the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

But the world's problems continue to multiply, and the drift to international anarchy is perceptibly quickening. First of all, the number of nations now possessing nuclear weapons or seriously considering their construction is so large that the reciprocal expectations of mutual restraint, upon which efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons are ultimately based, are weakening. A failure to surmount this crisis of confidence and to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries promises to be at least as costly as some of the major failures of the last 20 years: in the time and attention of statesmen taken from more positive tasks; in expenditures; in the exacerbation of tense political relationships; and in increased risks of nuclear violence.

Indeed, the spread of nuclear weapons has already threatened to spark a second problem by encouraging one or both of the major nuclear powers to seek protection from less powerful nuclear states in antimissile systems, systems quite capable of catalyzing a new round of offensive weapons.

Third, the unresolved problems of Central Europe stand as festering sores in East-West relations, complicating other problems of arms limitation, increasing misunderstanding and friction, and remaining a source of potential military conflict.

A fourth concern of growing seriousness is the buildup of nonnuclear armaments, especially in the developing areas of the world, where internal instability and endemic political differences have recently erupted in conventional war. Further buildup threatens more violence.

Underlying many of these issues is a fifth problem, that of Communist China—her absence from the United Nations, her contempt for it, her incipient atomic capability, and the threat that she poses to her neighbors.

Sixth, there is the failure so far of the United Nations to establish any but the most rudimentary and improvised machinery for peacekeeping. Related to this is the propensity of the great powers to bypass the United Nations in the settlement of disputes.

These six fundamental problems are all related all urgent, and all inescapable; these are the issues to which this committee has addressed itself and concerning which it believes further efforts must be made. The merit of our suggestions is, of course, open to debate and further analysis. What is incontestable, however, is the need for a renewed commitment on all sides to efforts that will reverse a continuing and dangerous trend of competition in national armaments and total reliance upon them.

Finally, the panel believes that the United States, as the strongest Nation in the world, can afford to make the largest effort. And as a group of American citizens, we naturally direct our recommendations to our own Government. However, the Panel by no means believes that U.S. governmental actions alone can bring about the results desired. Further, the Panel recognizes and values the considerable efforts that the U.S. Government has been and is making.

B. Guidelines and assumptions

The issues considered by this Committee have given it reason to be grimly concerned about the future. Mankind can ill afford another 20 years of failure to deal with the realities of the nuclear age. For this reason especially, the committee is determined to point to the problems that must and can be dealt with now, in the present, problems that will otherwise quickly become more difficult. This applies especially to the problems of proliferation; what we cannot stop, we shall have very little hope of rolling back. And it applies also to the irrecoverable costs of another round of strategic weapon procurement.

In our concern for present problems, we do not mean to slight much more comprehensive measures of arms reduction and much more significant measures for improvements in collective security that the world must continue to seek. But we are aware that the "modest" steps proposed in this report taken together—and some taken separately—would represent more negotiated progress than has been achieved in two decades, and would greatly facilitate further progress. Thus, if we emphasize negotiable measures requiring minimal inspection of Soviet and U.S. territory, it does not mean that we are any less devoted to seeking the maximum degree of general disarmament that can eventually be achieved. It suggests only that we are anxious to achieve what is eventually desirable by making a start with what is presently possible. In particular, we believe that the world military balance is such that there are many measures that can be taken by United States-Soviet agreement, or by parallel action, that will improve our security whether or not other nuclear powers accede to them at once.

Because only the farsighted and the powerful can conceive or venture the actions necessary to turn down the arms spiral and to shape a more peaceful world, we believe that the United States is obligated to take the lead in proposing measures of collective security and of arms limitations; obligated to using its influence to secure their acceptance; and obligated to make every effort to conduct its affairs so as to avoid impeding their progress. This is a responsibility of world leadership. In addition, we believe that America's own most urgent security interests lie ever more clearly within the domain of arms control and that we can no longer seek national security chiefly in arms and alliances alone. A nation's gains in turning down the arms competition, in reducing the likelihood of conflict throughout the world, and in improving the prospects for a world of "cease-fire and peaceful change" have become first-priority concerns, we shall make progress in resolving them only when we recognize them as such and act accordingly.

We assume that accomplishments in one area of arms control will facilitate work in another and that "package agreements" can be useful. And we believe that progress toward political settlements, in Central Europe for example, will both facilitate and benefit from arms control and disarmament agreements. The notion that progress is impossible in one area, e.g., curbing the spread of nuclear weapons, until agreements have been reached on other problems of arms control is a notion we reject. Finally, we recognize that much of what we say will bear on issues treated by other panels.

II. HALTING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS [1]

A. Key elements of the problem

The spread of nuclear weapons threatens to bring about a painful, expensive, and dangerous reorganization of international relations. It threatens to add new dimensions to the very fears that encourage it: new concerns in the struggle for Arab-Israel understanding; new barriers to a permanent easing of Indian-Pakistani tensions; and new setbacks to improved relations between Western and Eastern Europe. It threatens established political relationships between countries and within them; dissension over the hard decisions it entails in governments already torn by dissension; realinements associated with shifting power in nonalined areas; and, for those in major-power alliances, the premature assertion of an unreal independence based on nuclear status alone. There are, in these problems, the seeds of a hundred crises.

Nuclear weapon systems are expensive—more expensive than they appear to be at first—and many of those who want them most can afford them least. Will nuclear deployment replace economic development in parts of Asia, Latin America, the Near East, and will misery and suffering be prolonged in this way? Will the United States be forced to pay indirectly in economic aid for nuclear weapons that it opposes? Or will her refusal to do so alienate her friends? Alternatively, will she be forced to supply nuclear weapon systems, to those who should never have demanded them, in an ignominious effort to avoid either being cheated or being hated?

Nuclear weapons are dangerous. The United States devotes a great deal of effort to controlling the circumstances under which its weapons might be used, and rightly so. But the spread of nuclear weapons will put them in circumstances incomparably more dangerous than one of our own weapons out of control not only to others but to ourselves.

The spread of nuclear weapons requires a reorganization of international relations as well. Do we prefer an enforced interdependence or the spurious equality in which countries large and small threaten one another in an anarchy of violence-producing potential? The world must be brought together; nuclear weapons can pull it apart.

Finally, we must count it a most serious cost of proliferation that the best hopes and aspirations of the world may be put off for many years while wisdom and labors are devoted to diminishing dangers and resolving problems that might still prove avoidable by prompt and timely efforts.

These are real dangers and urgent ones. We urge immediate steps to avoid them, and these steps need not and should not be restricted to arms control measures. The desire for nuclear weapons stems not only from security concerns but also from political aspirations. And, in any case, it may be amenable to political methods of solution that are not always closely related to guarantees of security. The full weight of U.S. influence and U.S. capacity for constructive diplomacy should be placed at the disposal of this critical problem at this critical time.

B. Nonproliferation: Breaking the East-West deadlock

The key elements of a nonproliferation agreement are already set forth in the Irish resolution adopted unanimously by the U.N. General Assembly in 1961 and endorsed repeatedly by the United States: first, that the nuclear states "refrain from relinquishing control of nuclear weapons and from transmitting the information necessary for their manufacture to states not possessing such weapons"; second, that the nonnuclear powers "undertake not to manufacture or otherwise acquire control of such weapons."

---

[1] Problems of Communist China are treated in sec. VI.

Recent attempts to reaffirm this agreement in a treaty have confronted an apparently basic divergence between the Soviet Union and the United States on the issue of nuclear arrangements in NATO. What the Soviets have viewed as proposals for further diffusion, the United States has with equal logic argued are safeguards against possible future diffusion. It is clear that the matter is most important; it is equally clear that it cannot be settled in a merely bilateral Soviet-U.S. context. This issue is accordingly examined in section IV "Europe and Disarmament."

In any case, however, it would be a most serious error, if as a result of Soviet unwillingness to enter a nonproliferation agreement, the United States and others felt precluded from negotiating or encouraging such agreements as may prove possible. The Soviet Government is very likely to respect them. It is opposed to proliferation; it has long ceased to contribute to Communist China's nuclear program; it has recently supported mandatory safeguards for fissionable material monitored by the International Agency for Atomic Energy (IAEA), and it has repeatedly voiced opposition to the further spread of nuclear weapons.

C. The longer run

But even were every nonnuclear power to declare its present intent not to seek nuclear weapons, there would be the longer-run problems posed by the continuing incentives to do otherwise, incentives that must be eliminated or reduced if nuclear weapons are to remain restricted to the five present nuclear powers.

First and foremost among these incentives are the security problems of the nonnuclear powers. Nonnuclear states must be protected from the threat of such force as would persuade them that nuclear weapons were an easy, a necessary, an urgent counter. This requires that nuclear powers commit themselves to refrain from the use, or threat of use, of nuclear weapons against nonnuclear ones. It requires that nuclear powers must pledge themselves to defend the victims of such aggression with all necessary means. But perhaps most important it means that nuclear and nonnuclear powers alike must commit themselves to refrain from the use of force across national boundaries and must commit themselves, in as wide a variety of circumstances as possible, to prevent others from doing so. So long as boundaries are or might be changed by force, so long will nuclear weapons appear a potentially useful deterrent to aggression.

We therefore support the formulation and ratification of suitable regional agreements aimed at guaranteeing borders to the satisfaction of those countries most tempted to purchase nuclear weapons for this purpose. In addition, of course, we stress the importance of institutionalizing the peacekeeping arrangements discussed below in section VII.

The committee recognizes, however, that some of the incentives for nuclear proliferation are political, requiring for their diminution either evidence of major-power willingness to cooperate to keep the peace or, to the extent that nuclear renunciation is a sacrifice, evidence that the major powers are themselves showing a comparable restraint in their effort to halt the "vertical" proliferation of their own arsenals. To this end, the committee suggests six measures on which immediate agreement should be sought:

(a) A comprehensive ban on nuclear testing, adequately verified. New improvements in national detection systems might make it possible to accept a treaty in which inspection followed a challenge based upon a threat of withdrawal; ultimately any quota of inspections is no more dependable than such an arrangement would be. Alternatively, new improvements in seismological instruments might make it possible to close the small gap in views of the two sides on acceptable numbers of on-site inspections whose existence prevented agreement in 1963.

(b) As an earnest of their intention to limit and reduce strategic weapons, a pledge by the nuclear powers to commit an agreed fraction, such as one-half of 1 percent, of their military expenditures to appropriate UN organs for peacekeeping and economic assistance.

(c) A complete halt in the United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. of production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons, as has been recently proposed by the United States; alternatively, such more gradual measures as would be acceptable to both sides and essentially symmetrical in their effects.

(d) A transfer for nonweapons uses of agreed quantities of weapons-grade uranium 235 by the United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. to the IAEA for the benefit of developing countries. Safeguards should permit the repossession upon demand of any such material used in an unauthorized manner, e.g., in research which is directed toward the development of nuclear weapons.

(e) Elaboration and intensification of IAEA inspection and the subordination of all transfers of fissionable material to IAEA controls.

(f) Whether the halt be gradual or complete, an opening of all United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. atomic energy plants to IAEA inspection to insure compliance with the agreement. The U.S. initiative in opening the Rowe, Massachusetts, reactor to IAEA inspection should be broadened, unilaterally if necessary, and it should be matched by the willingness of others engaged in peaceful uses of atomic energy to permit inspection.

In addition, the United States should seek an experimental Alaskan-Siberian zone of nuclear and conventional arms limitations centered around the Bering Straits. The Committee believes that this step would be a sound, significant, and imaginative initiative in the development of arms limitations in other parts of the world. Such a zone would involve comparable areas on each side, and the arrangement could be implemented with bilateral or United Nations inspection and supervision.

More generally, the Committee believes that nuclear-free zones in Latin America, Africa, and in the Near East are among the most feasible arms limitation agreements at this time and among the most hopeful ones for a long-term barrier to nuclear diffusion in those areas. In certain cases, the creation of these zones may make necessary minor modifications in present U.S. security practices, modifications of far less importance to the Nation than the securing of a nuclear-free zone; the small problems that these changes will raise should not obscure the larger interest.

III. CONTROLLING STRATEGIC WEAPON SYSTEMS

A. Containing the arms race

Just as we stress containing the spread of nuclear weapons, we also place high priority on containing the competition in weapon procurement of the United States and the Soviet Union—not least because success in the latter will be useful in the former. At a minimum, and for its own sake, the major powers must strive to check a competition that will otherwise lead periodically to the expensive procurement, deployment, or redeployment of entirely new weapon systems. It is, after all, the continuing competition to perfect and deploy new armaments that absorbs quantities of time, energy, and resources that no static strategic environment would demand; that exacerbates U.S. and Soviet relations with unreal considerations of strategic advantage or disadvantage; that keeps political leaders in both great powers off-balance and ill-prepared for far-reaching agreements; that fixes the attention of both sides on the most threatening aspects of the opposing posture; and, especially, that provides heightened risks of a violent spasm of procurement—one spurring to new levels the cost, distrust, and the explosive dangers of an unending competition in arms.

We also stress containing the arms race because it is an objective that may well be far easier to realize than reductions of strategic weapons, or, put another way, because an ounce of prevention may be worth a pound of cure. This was, for example, the principle underlying the U.N. resolution calling for a ban on weapons of mass destruction in orbit. Perhaps an even more important instance of the potential application of this principle concerns antiballistic missile systems (ABM).

B. ABM: A 3-year moratorium

We urge both the United States and the Soviet Union to agree—explicitly or tacitly—to a moratorium of at least 3 years on new deployment (but not on the unverifiable research and development) of systems for ballistic-missile defense. While the ostensible purpose of the immediate deployment of ABM defenses (at least in the United States) has now become that of dealing with the limited threat posed by China's potential nuclear forces, a United States or a Soviet ABM system would almost certainly induce both superpowers to step up their strategic weapon programs in an effort to insure their respective deterrent capabilities.

The reason for our proposal is simple; this committee does not believe the time is appropriate for a decision to deploy. First of all, there remains the basic question of the military value of the system. Here many technical questions remain to be answered. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, in his 1965 testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, summed up the status of the ballistic-missile defense system as follows:

"Although the Nike X development is progressing satisfactorily, there are many technical problems still to be solved, and I believe it is still premature to make any commitment to production and deployment at this time. Over and above the technical problems there are even greater uncertainties concerning the preferred concept of deployment, the relationship of the Nike X system to other elements of a balanced damage-limiting effort, the timing of the attainment of an effective nationwide fallout shelter system, and the nature and effect of an opponent's possible reaction to our Nike X deployment. Accordingly, we propose to continue the development of the Nike X system on an urgent basis, and a total of about $400 million has been provided in the fiscal year 1966 budget for that purpose, including $10 million for some preliminary production engineering."

Beyond the technical and military-economic questions, the Panel believes that the United States has not given the political consequences of the ABM deployment sufficient thought and certainly has not yet explored the ways in which the United States and the U.S.S.R. could avoid unintended effects of the systems on the other's deterrent force. There are many other questions still unanswered and unconsidered. Shall the systems be emplaced in Europe? Will they be sold to allies by ourselves or by the Soviets? Can we and the Soviet Union devise ways by which we acquiesce in reduced, but still enormous, deterrent capabilities? Will our action simply play into the hands of the Communist Chinese effort to disrupt U.S.-Soviet relations in general and arms limitation efforts in particular?

Does the Chinese threat really require immediate action on the part of the United States and the Soviets? And how far are we and the Soviet planning to go in building active defenses? The costs involved in the systems under discussion are measured in tens of billions of dollars; their strategic implications are enormous and long lasting; and their political impact may be the most startling of all—especially in Europe. The matter deserves the closest and most intense discussion and thought; a 3-year moratorium would produce it.

We also believe that the political posture of the Soviet Union is delicately poised at the moment; it is very clearly in the U.S. interest to avoid such actions as might deflect the Soviet Government from a course of improving its relations with the West. Encouraging the start of a new round of expenditures and dangers at this moment therefore seems inopportune. And in 3 years' time, it may be possible, not only to see more clearly what strategic threat the People's Republic of China will and will not soon present, but also what the response of both the United States and Soviet Union should be.

C. A freeze on strategic delivery vehicles

In the absence of a moratorium, and assuming that ballistic-missile defenses are built, the United States will have to rethink its suggestion of early 1964 that a freeze on offensive and defensive weapons and their characteristics be considered by the United States and Soviet Union and discussed with their major allies. This is because an agreement along these lines would not be possible during the construction of ballistic-missile defenses; because it seems technically difficult to design a proposal that would freeze a dynamic contest between deployed ballistic-missile defenses and the weapons designed to surmount them; and because it may be more difficult, though this is somewhat controversial, to reach agreement on a freeze of offensive weapons while the defenses that neutralize them were uncontrolled.

These considerations argue against ballistic-missile defenses, and they argue for redoubled efforts to achieve quickly whatever appropriately balanced freeze can be negotiated. In this regard, the Committee believes that the United States should not restrict herself to the details of the initial formulation but should reaffirm her willingness to consider different kinds of freeze proposals from every quarter. Thus, the United States need not freeze as of any given date but might agree on specified weapon levels. Further, she need not freeze characteristics of weapons if no more than a freeze on numbers of weapons seems negotiable. Nor need the United States focus on restrictive, detailed, and technically complicated freezes. She might propose instead a freeze so simple and general that it could be "ratified" by simultaneous coordinated announcements and inspected by continually improving unilateral methods—those same methods upon which she would rely in the absence of agreement as well, for that limited part of her preparedness that depends upon knowledge of Soviet actions.

D. Toward a reduction of strategic delivery systems

Of course, the United States cannot be content with containing the competition or freezing it. At a minimum she should continue to seek coordinated methods, with or without formal agreements, to destroy weapons deemed obsolete and superfluous. Such acts would have primary importance as signals of readiness to cooperate; we have noted earlier how important this signal can be in nonproliferation efforts.

More generally, we consider much deeper cuts in strategic inventories— on the order of a one-third cut—to be worth serious consideration. The United States has already accepted the notion that some comprehensive arms control agreements need not include inspection of operational weapon inventories; the U.S. 1964 freeze suggestion made this point. The Committee believes that verification of destruction would be sufficient for some reduction agreements as well.

We also note that the imbalance between United States and U.S.S.R. strategic forces is not so great as is often implied—if targets in Western Europe, as well as in North America, are matched against targets in the U.S.S.R. This increases the feasibility of agreement because disarmament agreements can be based on a Soviet willingness to balance part of American reductions with reductions in their threat against our European allies.

E. Reaffirm prohibition against nuclear weapons in space

The recent announcement by the United States of her intention to carry out experiments for the purpose of learning about the military uses of satellites gave use to serious misinterpretation and led some observers to the erroneous conclusion that the United States was repudiating her intention, now embodied in a U.N. resolution, to refrain from placing nuclear weapons in space. To insure against this possible misunderstanding, the U.S. Government should continue to reaffirm, as Ambassador Goldberg recently has, her commitment to the General Assembly resolution against weapons of mass destruction in outer space.

IV. EUROPE AND DISARMAMENT

A. The present situation

Since 1945, the confrontation of the United States and the Soviet Union across the German zonal boundary has been a central political fact affecting the arms race. In the early postwar period, the temporary nature of the German partition, the unsettled conditions in Western Europe, Soviet maintenance of troop levels despite substantial Allied disarmament, Soviet probes in other areas of the world, and the general Soviet posture under Stalin generated widespread fears of a Soviet attack across the boundary. The Berlin blockade and the Korean war seemed to confirm these fears. A rapid buildup of Western arms followed, and the Warsaw Pact nations replied in kind, probably further stimulated by American talk of "rollback" of the expansion of communism into Eastern Europe.

Over the last decade and for a variety of reasons, the threat of Soviet attack has been waning. In particular, it has become increasingly obvious to both sides, first, that neither will retreat under pressure from central European positions taken up after the Allied victory and, second, that resort to violence would be irrationally risky. For example, even the abortive uprisings in East Germany (1953) and Hungary (1956) did not result in Western military action in Eastern Europe; the risk of Western attack, as perceived by the Soviet Union, was thus reduced. For the United States, the Soviet split with China and the growth of Eastern European independence within the Soviet bloc have been among the factors diminishing the supposed risk of Soviet attack. In addition, a general recognition of the possibility of unintended war has been still another factor inhibiting the use or threat of violence. But the confrontation continues, while parallel interests in avoiding war provide an overriding motive on both sides for resolving this central and most dangerous issue: an unsettled and divided Germany.

Looked at in terms of current realities, the German problem shows a tangle of partly conflicting, partly parallel interests as among the United States, the Soviet Union, and Germany. To make progress in solidifying the reduction of tension sufficiently to permit more progress in arms control and disarmament requires that the parties concerned see parallel interests as outweighing conflicting ones.

The German people—articulately in the West and silently in the East—want reunification. The United States has backed them in this desire; indeed, American spokesmen voiced it before the Germans felt strong enough or self-confident enough to do so. Now the demand for reunification has become a sufficiently strong factor in West German public sentiments that its continued support by the United States is crucial to relations with the Federal Republic.

The United States has sought the integration of the West Germany into Western Europe and a close-knit alliance between Western Europe and the United States. This has been one of the most important persistent strands in United States foreign policy in the postwar period. Its purposes have been twofold: to promote within Germany a stable, responsible, Western-oriented, democratic government, living in harmony with the countries of Western Europe that Germany had conquered and occupied in World War II; to contribute to the strength, military and other, of the Western Alliance. As ultimate goals, to which the Alliance and integration contribute, the U.S. wants peace and stability in Europe.

The Soviets have sought security, especially the security of the new borders and the legitimation of the regimes of the Warsaw Pact states. In some of these states and in the Soviet Union as well, there is also a genuine fear of Germany, reflecting both the experiences of World War II and the belief that the "German problem" might be the cause of another conflict. In addition, the Soviets have sought continued hegemony in East Germany, both as an end in itself for political and economic reasons and as a means of ensuring the security of Eastern Europe. They probably judge—rightly—that East German cannot stand on its own as a viable Communist state in the face of the superior numbers, strength, prosperity, and freedom of the Federal Republic.

The great common interest of the United States and the Soviet Union in Europe is in a settled political situation that would result in enough reduction of the tension of confrontation to insure continued peace. Germany remains the great issue of the confrontation, and the one most likely to become the occasion of conflicts from which neither can readily retreat. Joint interest in avoiding such conflicts leads to joint interest in resolving this issue. Since the stability recently experienced may well prove temporary under the pressure of the conflicting goals described above, the importance of the U.S. interest in avoiding conflict is underlined. If a conflict ever arose, it would probably begin with the devastation of Germany, and the interest in peace is at least as important for the Germans as it is for the Soviets and the Americans.

The key question, of course, is whether this common interest is important enough to overcome the conflict of interest on all sides. The United States' insistence on close military integration of West Germany within the alliance, and German reinforcement of that insistence, is inconsistent with the German and American desire for reunification, given the Soviet concerns for security. On the other side, the Soviet desire to legitimate the postwar settlement is in conflict with continued Soviet support of the independence of East Germany, since it is now impossible for the Soviets to expect West Germany and her allies to accept the division of Germany as permanent.

Reconciliation of these conflicts must, logically, include some change in military arrangements in both parts of Germany, in connection with a process that makes continued movement toward reunification possible. In general, such evolution can probably take place only in an atmosphere of increasing détente and increased freedom for the Eastern European states in relation to the Soviet Union. The alternate possibility of bringing about a Soviet retreat from East Germany by maintaining or increasing Western pressures (or seizing the opportunity of an unforeseen crisis to force a sudden retreat) is, as a practical matter, excluded. The evolution of the military balance makes it ever less likely that such a risky course could succeed. Further, it is doubtful that our European allies would really favor any such attempt at forcing a Soviet retreat.

The search for détente and the loosening of the ties of the pact in the East has implications for the Western Alliance. The military element in Western relations must not be viewed as central, and accordingly should be given less emphasis. Some general loosening of alliance ties must also be accepted, since alliances inevitably show greater solidarity in periods of threat than in periods of calm. Neither of these changes means the withdrawal of the United States from Europe or the lessening of the security ties between America and Western Europe. Rather, the opposite is true, since the defense of Western Europe remains vital to the security of the United States and the evolution of military technology continues to make effective European self-defense more rather than less difficult and costly.

B. Recommendations

The most important contribution that arms restrictions can make toward peace in Europe lies in measures that signal and encourage détente and help to perpetuate and solidify whatever degree of relaxation can be achieved.

Thus the Committee suggests first that the United States take the lead in seeking a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organizations. Within the next 3 years, the NATO Treaty comes under review by its signatories. It would be highly desirable to reaffirm the mutual commitment of North America and Western Europe to their joint security interests in a context which formalizes the defensive nature of these interests. A nonaggression pact would do no more than recognize explicitly what has already been recognized tacitly, that the situation in Central Europe—including the situation in Berlin—can be changed only by mutual consent, not by force. Nonetheless, formalizing this recognition can be an important step in institutionalizing the détente.

Second, the Committee believes that the United States should lead its allies in the search for means to reduce, rather than increase, the buildup of nuclear weapons in and near Central Europe. In this connection, solutions to the nuclear problem of the alliance should be sought in arrangements that do not result in the creation of new nuclear forces. One possible method which meets this condition is the "Select Committee" that the Secretary of Defense has recently suggested.

Properly developed, this would provide for more involvement of our Western European allies, especially Germany, Great Britain, France (if she so desires), and Italy in a genuine dialog on the detailed business of planning for the alliance's strategic force. The point of such a Committee is to give practical institutional substance to the proposition that the U.S. nuclear forces are the alliance strategic force.

In this connection, it is important that the Committee function not only at a high ministerial level but also with reference to the whole executive apparatus, military and civilian, through which governments do their work. Further, this principle of more intimate association at the working levels of actual decisionmaking in major allied capitals can usefully be extended to nonnuclear matters as well.

One desirable consequence of this procedure could be a more fruitful involvement of the principal NATO allies in discussions of disarmament and arms control. This is especially important in relation to the problems of Europe and in regard to Germany. Heretofore, NATO consultation on disarmament has usually offered little that is positive. This in turn has reflected its sporadic character; when it springs from an ongoing participation in the central military problems of the Alliance, it can reasonably be expected to be better informed and more constructive.

Third, the Committee believes that the United States should seek agreement both with her allies and with the Soviets to measures which could reduce the danger of surprise conventional attack in Europe. These could include the manning of fixed observer posts at selected points in NATO and Warsaw Pact countries and the extension of the Huebner-Malinin agreement covering mobile observers more widely through the NATO-Warsaw areas. Both these measures could best be proposed in the context of a NATO-Warsaw nonaggression pact, thus giving such a pact substance.

Fourth, we believe that the United States should encourage an examination of the problem of parallel troop reductions in West and East Germany by the United States and the Soviet Union. Reductions are not to be conceived as tantamount to withdrawal, which would change the military balance; but rather, as adjustments equitable for both sides which would preserve the balance at less cost and strain for each. An exploration in these terms would have to begin with the Western allies most concerned, but, if it is to have any effect, it must proceed to exchanges with the Soviet Union.

Finally, we believe that the United States should explore, first with Germany and the other Western allies most concerned, the nature of the security arrangements with respect to Eastern Europe that progress toward reunification would demand and permit. To take one possible example, a series of arrangements might be concluded between the Federal Republic and East Germany to cover trade, the movement of persons, and the like, leading ultimately to some kind of confederation when agreement could be reached as to how steps beyond confederation could be taken and what final security arrangements were appropriate to that stage.

V. CONVENTIONAL ARMS RACES IN THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Intense conventional arms races are taking place in several areas of the world at great costs to the participants, at the risk of the peace and tranquillity of their regions, and at the risk of appalling destruction should war break out. Thus, United Arab Republic and Israel have per capita rates of military expenditures among the highest in the world. Between them they spent approximately $1 billion on armaments in 1963. Pakistan and India, in a situation complicated by the threat from Communist China, had accumulated weapons at an increasing rate until conflict broke out between them. And Africa, has not been free of an arms buildup.

The international traffic in arms which makes these buildups possible is extremely complex, ranging from direct government-to-government arms sales to the transfer of superpower arms technology from those who have acquired it to those who have not. To some extent this trade is already regulated in the major exporting countries. With minor exceptions, armaments do not enter the world market without the active consent of the governments concerned, both sellers and purchasers. But there is at present very little international coordination or agreement concerning the types of weapons that should be supplied and the types of clients that may receive them.

In general, the Committee believes that serious efforts should be made to control the arms traffic and that these efforts, like those directed at nuclear proliferation, should aim first at measures to regulate the traffic directly and second at reducing incentives for conventional arms buildups.

Consequently the major arms suppliers should refrain from further introduction of sophisticated weapons such as bombers, tanks, and submarines into underdeveloped areas. The past record of both the United States and the Soviet Union is bad. Efforts should be made to encourage the developing states themselves to explore, presumably on a regional basis, the possibility of agreement not to acquire such weapons. Agreement should be sought through the United Nations to limit the sale and acquisition of conventional arms. This appears to be most feasible in the context of regional agreements as a first step and is discussed below. At the least, the United Nations could revive the practice of the League of Nations of printing an "armaments yearbook" on international arms transfers. Such a document would go some distance toward removing some of the exaggerated fears that may develop in relative secrecy.

In the long run, however, as with nuclear proliferation, peacekeeping arrangements will be necessary to allay the anxieties and dampen the ambitions that motivate purchase of arms on the world market. This is discussed in section VII.

VI. COMMUNIST CHINA AND ARMS LIMITATIONS

With the explosion of two nuclear devices, China has reminded the world that she intends to develop a formidable nuclear and conventional military capability. In the long run, any system of world security and any extensive nuclear or conventional disarmament will have to include Communist China.

But the long run can be very long. At the present time and for a considerable number of years to come, any agreement that might conceivably be negotiated between the United States and the Soviet Union—even including a very substantial reduction in strategic forces or a nuclear freeze—could, from a strategic point of view, be safely implemented while the Chinese continue their efforts to develop their own nuclear force. Even forces much larger than the present Soviet force would not find it possible to destroy the present U.S. retaliatory capability diminished by fractions of one-third or one-half. Nor would the United States lack, under the terms of a reduction agreement, the strategic forces necessary to respond to less comprehensive Chinese threats than an all-out attack. Whatever future bombers, land-based missiles, or submarines were retained for protection against the Soviet Union could be designed to be retargetable to Chinese targets.

The Soviet strategic force and technological change will remain the most serious threats for many years, and U.S. force size is not so finely calculated that it cannot cope, albeit with some modifications, with the relatively minor additional strains placed upon it by China.

Peking's nuclear strength, for some years, will be capable only of acting as a catalyst on fears and uncertainties; a catalyst that uses the strategic instabilities and interactions between the United States and the Soviet Union to stimulate responses wholly disproportionate to its threat. Thus, a ballistic-missile defense designed to shoot down Chinese missiles might nevertheless lead the Soviet Union into building more missiles or into a corresponding defensive system that would have the same effect on us.

That it is in Communist China's political interest, as presently conceived in Peking, to attempt to weld this catalytic power and thus to disrupt Soviet-American relations is likely; that the United States should guard against the failures of nerve and perception that permit disruption is an equally obvious corollary.

With respect to proliferation, analogous problems exist. While Communist China's nuclear explosions have made nothing impossible except her own forgoing of nuclear weapons, her continued detonations and missile firings will make the attainment of agreements far more difficult. Again, this is not necessarily for strategic reasons but may also be for political ones; China's actions and the anxiety aroused by her political intentions are equally important.

For these reasons we believe that there are advantages, with respect to limiting both proliferation and the arms race, in bringing Communist China into a dialog that will dispel whatever fears are illusory and permit the world to grapple, in a concrete way, with those that are not. The United States wants to know whether China plans to spread atomic weapons to other countries; whether she wishes to provoke or restrain her neighbors from producing a nuclear capability comparable to her own; whether she would participate in a constructive or a destructive way in formal disarmament talks; and so on. From the standpoint of arms control as well as from others, this information would be of great value. In the long run, the United States will have to talk to China about arms control, and analogous discussions with the Soviets have proven much more useful than was initially anticipated. Moreover, since discussions would be especially useful if undertaken soon, we see no point in delay.

We believe that efforts should be made to open bilateral talks on arms control with the People's Republic of China, similar to those carried on in Warsaw but devoted to arms control. We favor an exploration of conditions under which the People's Republic of China would qualify for and accept the obligations of the U.N. Charter, and could join the United Nations. We would support suitable initiatives to achieve these ends. And should a World Disarmament Conference be convened, as recommended by the U.N. Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly, we would favor the invitation of the People's Republic of China to that Conference.

VII. CONFERENCE IN PEACEKEEPING AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO NATIONAL ARMAMENT

The important problems of peacekeeping, of peaceful settlement of disputes, and of assuring peaceful changes are being treated by two other panels. We look forward to seeing their reports. But these problems take on a special significance for our committee, because without their solution, much of the arms control for which we have argued would be far more difficult to attain. Without confidence in adequate peacekeeping machinery, nations will continue to arm themselves, and their neighbors will respond in kind. Without confidence in the feasibility of peaceful settlements, nations will prepare to settle their disputes by force. And in the absence of machinery for change that is peaceful, nations will anticipate change that is violent. Limitations on arms demand confidence that peace is possible even as they provide it. This is especially important in the developing areas, where the pace of conventional and nuclear preparations is likely to be critically dependent on confidence.

For these reasons, we want to strengthen a growing expectation that world opinion in general, the United Nations in particular, and the major powers especially, will be ready and willing to prevent armed conflicts and, if they occur, to prevent them from being fought to a military conclusion. Such preventive action will obviously require a broad spectrum of military, political, and other capabilities.

To this end, we propose, first, the creation of a versatile United Nations peace force under the control of the Security Council and responsive to the General Assembly. Such a force could be composed initially of two elements: standby units voluntarily earmarked by the member states but controlled and supported by them until requested by the United Nations for deployment in a specific operation; and a small elite force of about one to two thousand men available for immediate deployment as a "fire prevention brigade." Such a force could be deployed or developed on a regional basis, if that were desired.

The United States could play a decisive role in the evolution of a United Nations Peace Force by assisting in the development of the necessary U.N. military staff; by providing logistic support and, upon request, training programs for designated military contingents; and, above all, by encouraging and assisting other nations to pledge the necessary forces.

The Committee also recommends that the International Law Commission and the U.N. Legal Counsel's Office undertake comprehensive studies on the applicability of international law to international peacekeeping forces.

Second, with or without a United Nations peace force, confidence in international mechanisms for providing security would be enhanced by the existence of a functioning U.N. Peace Observation Corps, preferably recruited and trained by the United Nations and available to the Secretary General. Its main function would be to focus the eyes of the international organized community on a situation which if ignored could endanger the peace. For the purpose of creating a climate conducive to arms control agreements, this mechanism would provide confidence that, at the very least, the international community would take formal cognizance of disturbances of the peace.

For those who would place confidence in the functioning of international guarantees and of international opinion, it is especially important that the Peace Observation Corps be capable of rapid deployment. To this end, the Secretary General should be authorized to activate the Corps on the basis of preliminary reports that a disturbance has arisen. Units of the Corps could be stationed throughout the world. So that the circumstances and early stages of an outbreak of violence might be report at firsthand, prior consent for factfinding on their territories by as many states as possible should be a component of the agreement. The Peace Observation Corps could also be utilized to investigate possible violations of arms control agreements.

Third, ways and means of providing continuing financial support for the U.N. Peace Force and the Peace Observation Corps should be an integral part of the arrangements creating them. We continue to support the prescriptive principle that all U.N. members should pay their fair share of the cost of peacekeeping operations. But we recognize that an objectively reliable method of financing would be useful in a variety of circumstances under which operations might be authorized despite the unwillingness of all to contribute to their costs. Our earlier recommendation that the nuclear powers voluntarily commit a small fraction of their military expenditures, such as one-half of 1 percent to a U.N. fund would provide one sound method, utilizing commitments insignificant in comparison to national defense expenditures. One can hardly regard the desire for international security arrangements as a serious one if financial commitments so modest as these are not forthcoming.

Fourth, we recommended that the United States continue to work toward the establishment of a U.N. Disarmament Organization. While most of the arms limitations proposed in this report can be verified by national means, some—such as the zonal arrangements in the Bering Straits—should be administered and inspected by the United Nations. The United Nations could acquire valuable experience by its involvement in such operations, thus helping to prepare it for the task of administering more comprehensive arms limitations.

Fifth, in addition to having confidence in the security afforded by a U.N. peace force and Peace Observation Corps, nations acquiescing in arms limitations or restraints will wish to be assured that effective nonmilitary sanctions can be applied against aggressors. The United Nations should conduct continuing studies of the ways in which collective action of this kind can be effective.

Sixth, criteria for defining aggression will be necessary to persuade the peaceful that violations of their integrity will not go unrecognized for what they are. This requires the clarification of nonaggression provisions; the United States should take the lead in putting forward a nonaggression treaty embodying the proposals made by President Johnson in January 1964. This might be formulated as a variety of regional arrangements. And the United States should support agreement on what constitutes illegal threat and use of force along the lines of a protocol drafted by a U.N. special committee in 1964 as follows:

1. Every state has the duty to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of a state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

2. In accordance with the foregoing fundamental principle, and without limiting its generality:

(a) Wars of aggression constitute international crimes against peace.

(b) Every state has the duty to refrain from organizing or encouraging the organization of irregular or volunteer forces or armed forces within its territory or any other territory for incursions into the territory of another state.

(c) Every state has the duty to refrain from instigating, assisting, or organizing civil strife or committing terrorist acts in another state, or from conniving at or acquiescing in organized activities directed toward such ends, when such acts involve a threat or use of force.

(d) Every state has the duty to refrain from the threat or use of force to violate the existing boundaries of another State, or as a means of solving its international disputes, including territorial disputes and problems concerning frontiers between states.

3. Nothing in the foregoing paragraphs affects the provisions of the charter concerning the lawful use of force.

While the foregoing measures might go some distance toward tranquillizing the fears that would otherwise make themselves evident in weapon procurement, they are not in themselves sufficient in the long run. Not only must they be supplemented eventually by much greater peacekeeping efforts, but they must be complemented by the evolution and strengthening of mechanisms by which problems are resolved without arms—methods of peaceful settlement and change. U.S. influence could do much to encourage rather than impede such progress. The Committee recommends further study of such possibilities as a World Court of Equity, a Standing Panel of Mediators, and a Board of Arbitration. We believe that the United States should reconsider its hesitation to ratify a number of relevant and longstanding conventions. And we recommend the repeal of the Connally amendment—we cannot expect others to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court if we ourselves are not willing to strengthen it. It may well be that these are the kind of measures that will finally prove to be most effective in the control arms. For we understand that it is in the ultimate growth of world law that arms and the problems which they present will eventually be subdued.

VIII. STRENGTHENING THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The very creation of the ACDA by the United States in 1961 was a significant and long overdue achievement. But ACDA has not yet achieved an effectiveness commensurate with its responsibilities. In part, this reflects the lack of widespread public understanding of, and support for, its purposes and programs. Therefore, we urge a reconsideration by the Congress of its elimination from the original arms control and disarmament bill of a public services department.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. To halt the growth and spread of nuclear arsenals we recommend the following steps:

1. That the United States seek a nonproliferation treaty that prohibits the transfer by atomic powers of nuclear weapons and manufacturing capabilities and their acquisition or manufacture by nonnuclear powers.

2. That the United States seek to establish the conditions—military, political, and economic—in which both the nonnuclear and nuclear powers will perceive that their security and other interests are best served by preventing any further spread of nuclear weapons through adherence to a nonproliferation treaty.

3. That the United States seek an agreement with the other nuclear powers pledging them (a) not to attack or threaten to attack with nuclear weapons a nonnuclear power and (b), if a nonnuclear power is thus threatened or attacked, to defend it with all necessary means.

4. That the United States seek acceptance of a series of other measures to halt the buildup and spread of nuclear weapons:

(a) A comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty adequately verified, perhaps utilizing recent improvements in national detection systems making it possible to rely on challenge inspections or to otherwise bridge the gap in acceptable numbers of on-site inspections that appeared to prevent agreement in 1963;

(b) A United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R. treaty to cease all production of weapons-grade fissionable material;

(c) The transfer of agreed quantities of such material to the IAEA for peaceful uses by the developing countries;

(d) Elaboration and intensification of IAEA inspection and the subordination of all transfers of fissionable material to IAEA controls;

(e) Opening of all U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States atomic energy plants to IAEA inspection.

5. That the United States encourage the development of nuclear-free zones in Latin America, Africa, and the Near East, beginning with a United States-Soviet treaty establishing a zone of nuclear and conventional arms limitation under U.N. inspection in the Bering Straits and including comparable areas in Alaska and Siberia.

II. To limit and reduce strategic delivery capabilities we recommend that the United States seek agreement with the Soviet Union and, if feasible, with the other nuclear powers on the following sequence:

1. A moratorium of at least 3 years on the deployment of antiballistic missile (ABM) systems.

2. A freeze on the number of strategic delivery vehicles.

3. A reduction in total numbers amounting to one-third of each party's medium- and long-range delivery vehicles, beginning with the destruction of obsolete stocks.

III. To curb conventional arms races among the underdeveloped countries we recommend the following initiatives:

1. That the United States seek to have controls established over the traffic in arms by (a) major-power agreement to refrain from introduction of sophisticated weapons; (b) regional nonacquisition agreements; (c) U.N.-supervised agreements regarding sale and acquisition; (d) the establishment of a U.N. monitoring system to record the traffic in arms.

2. That the United States join with other major powers to provide adequate security for the less developed nations; in addition, the United States support the establishment of U.N. peacekeeping procedures to the same end.

IV. To further reduce tensions in Europe and move toward settlement of the outstanding East-West differences we recommend the following measures:

1. That the United States, working with its allies, seek a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact organization.

2. That the United States seek to insure that measures to improve Western security arrangements do not result in the creation of new nuclear forces, but instead provide for greater involvement of our Western European allies in the planning for use of U.S. strategic forces as well as other military planning and arms control problems.

3. That the United States explore arms control, related security provisions, and other measures which would help lead to German reunification; and, in this connection, the possibilities for balanced reductions of U.S. and Soviet troops and weapons in Central Europe be examined.

V. That the United States attempt to bring the People's Republic of China into a genuine dialog on disarmament and other security matters: (a) by seeking bilateral talks on arms control matters of joint concern; (b) by ascertaining the conditions under which Communist China could qualify for and accept the responsibilities of membership in the United Nations; and (c) by supporting efforts to bring Communist China into the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference or a World Disarmament Conference, if held.

VI. To make the law of the U.N. Charter more effective and to strengthen U.N. peacekeeping machinery we recommend:

1. That the United States support the creation of a U.N. Peace Force, perhaps composed of two parts, (a) standby forces committed by member nations and (b) an elite force of 1,000 to 2,000 men recruited by the United Nations.

2. That the United States offer to provide training and logistic support for the U.N. Peace Force and encourage others to do so.

3. That the United States support the development of an effective U.N. Peace Observation Corps recruited by and available to the Secretary-General.

4. That the United States and other nuclear powers commit a fraction, such as one-half of 1 percent, of their annual defense expenditures to support the U.N. Peace Observation Corps and other peacekeeping activities of the U.N.

5. That the United States encourage regional and worldwide nonaggression arrangements embodying the proposals made by President Johnson in January 1964.

6. That the United States devote further study to mechanisms to facilitate peaceful change, such as a World Court of Equity to deal with political disputes, as well as ways and means of making greater use of the International Court of Justice and regional tribunals to deal with juridical disputes.

7. That the United States repeal the Connally amendment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A report such as this cannot possibly use the phraseology and embody the precise views and nuances of philosophy that all the Committee members, the Chairman included, might express if called upon to write it alone. However, this report represents the consensus of this Committee and is subscribed to by each of us in principle, even though not in every item. Members of the Committee worked alone and in panels, often with the aid of outside consultants, to produce sections of the report which were woven into the final document. The integration of the work of the various panels was carried out under the direction of the Chairman. The document has been discussed at several meetings of the Committee and revised to take account of these deliberations, prior to its submission here in final form. We are particularly grateful to Jeremy J. Stone, Louis Sohn, Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Amelia C. Leiss, and Morton H. Halperin for their assistance in thinking through or helping to draft portions of the report.

The Committee had the benefit of numerous discussions and consultations with officers of Government agencies, and areas of agreement and disagreement with Government positions were discussed in detail. In its final report, the committee exercised its independent judgment.

Donald G. Brennan, Fredrick M. Eaton, Vernon Ferwerda, John Fischer, Roswell Gilpatric, Joseph J. Johnston, Carl Kaysen, Robert Martin, John M. Mitchell, William V. O'Brien, Josephine Pomerance.

Richard Spillane, S.J.; Harold E. Stassen; Jerome B. Weisner, Chairman; Walter C. Clemens, Jr., Executive Officer.

GOVERNMENT CONSULTANTS

Mr. Jacob D. Beam, Assistant Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. Arthur W. Barber, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Mr. Raymond L. Garthoff, Department of State.

Dr. George Rathjens, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. (Until September 30, 1965.)

Mr. Jerome H. Spingarn, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. Lawrence D. Weiler, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Report of the Committee on Population, National Citizens' Commission, the White House Conference on International Cooperation

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON POPULATION OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Mr. Richard N. Gardner, Chairman, professor of law, Columbia University.

Mr. Eugene R. Black, former President, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Mr. Cass Canfield, chairman, executive committee, Harper & Row.

Dr. Leslie Corsa, Jr., director, Center for Population Planning, University of Michigan.

Mr. Gardner Cowles, chairman of the board, and editor-in-chief, Cowles Magazines & Broadcasting Co.

Mr. A. W. Dent, president, Dillard University.

Mr. William H. Draper, Jr., partner, Draper, Gaither & Anderson.

Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, president, Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation.

Mr. David E. Lilienthal, chairman, Development and Resources Corp.

Mr. John D. Rockefeller 3d, chairman of the board, Population Council.

Mrs. Edith S. Sampson, Circuit Court of Cook County.

Mr. George N. Shuster, assistant to the president, University of Notre Dame.

Dr. Aaron Stern, psychoanalyst.

This report was prepared by a Committee of the National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation for presentation at the White House Conference on International Cooperation.

While preparing the report the Committee had the benefit of close and continuous consultations with Government officials; the recommendations are those of the National Citizens' Commission Committee.

SUMMARY

The unprecedented growth in world population poses unprecedented problems for the future of mankind. The high rates of population growth now occurring in many countries, particularly in the less developed areas of the world, impede economic and social development, threaten political stability, and jeopardize man's search for a lasting peace. Action to reduce these high rates of population growth is now urgently required if we are to preserve and extend human dignity in the United States and around the world.

In the last few years some important first steps have been taken toward an understanding of population problems and toward effective measures to deal with them. But the ratio of talk to action is still distressingly high. Much more needs to be done to enlarge our understanding of population problems, to improve techniques of family planning, and to implement effective programs which reduce the rate of population growth.

A substantial expansion of U.S. Government efforts could hasten progress in each of these fields, particularly if maximum encouragement and support are given to private institutions and to international organizations, including the United Nations and its family of agencies. Enlarged U.S. Government support is particularly needed for research and training in all relevant aspects of population problems both here and overseas. In addition to Federal assistance to State and local health facilities at home, our Government should be prepared to make available upon request up to $100 million a year over the next 3 years to help other countries implement programs of family planning and strengthen national health and social services necessary for the support of family planning programs.

Population policy, both at home and abroad, should encourage the dissemination of knowledge and freedom of choice. Individuals who wish to limit family size should have access to the best family planning information and services that are available and should be afforded full freedom of choice among the many different methods of regulating fertility.

The population problem can be dealt with in a manner which is consistent with the values of a free society—provided action is taken on a sufficient scale and is taken now. Mankind is already dangerously late in waking up to what President Johnson has well described as "humanity's greatest challenge * * * second only to the search for peace."

THE PROBLEM WE FACE

The facts about the world population explosion are now well known. It took hundreds of thousands of years, from the beginning of life on earth to the beginning of this century, for the population of the world to reach 1.5 billion. In the first two-thirds of this century, this number doubled to the present total of something over 3 billion. In the last one-third of this century, if present trends continue, this figure will more than double to over 7 billion.

This unparalleled increase in man's numbers is causing problems even for highly developed countries. The United States, with a population growth rate of about 1½ percent a year, is likely to see its present population of 190 million reach more than 300 million by the year 2000. A recent report by the National Academy of Sciences has revealed a variety of problems which this growth rate is causing, especially among the poor and uneducated—problems involving maternal health, infant mortality, and morbidity, family life, housing, and opportunities for education, employment and a better standard of living. The rapid growth in population is adding to other strains on our society in the form of air and water pollution, the breakdown of mass transportation, overcrowding in urban areas, the depletion of precious natural resources, and the destruction of needed recreation areas and open spaces.

Our search for a Great Society in the United States is complicated by present population trends not only for these reasons but particularly because of the relatively faster increase in that portion of the population which does not share the benefits of the affluent society. Parents in our least fortunate economic group have nearly twice as many children as parents in the most fortunate bracket. The relatively high birth rate in poverty-stricken families is not only an important contributing cause of their poverty—it condemns a significant portion of the American people to living in conditions of economic and cultural deprivation.

The results of population growth are even more ominous in the less-developed countries of the world. The average annual increase of population in these countries is approximately 2.5 percent—sufficient to double population every 28 years. In many countries the annual growth rate has reached 3 percent or more. In Latin America, the region of the world where population growth is highest, total population will rise from something over 200 million today to approximately 600 million at the end of the century if present trends continue.

Public discussion of the population problem has focused attention on the relation between the number of people and the supply of food. In the less developed areas as a whole, food production has barely kept pace with population growth—and in Latin America, food production per capita has actually declined. The Food and Agriculture Organization has estimated that world food production will have to increase at least threefold by the end of the century to provide an adequate diet for the world's increased numbers. Such an increase seems impossible without a thoroughgoing transformation in existing agricultural institutions and techniques in the less developed areas.

Thus—as a consequency of present population trends—the threat of starvation in many countries is very real. Yet the reason for reducing present rates of population growth in the less developed countries is not exclusively—nor even primarily—that of avoiding starvation. These countries, whose citizens have an average income of little more than $100 a year, are seeking rapid increases in their living standards. To achieve these increases they must achieve a substantial rate of investment as well as meet their current consumption needs. Yet, all many of these countries can do is enlarge total economic product as fast as the additional mouths to feed—so that little or nothing is left over for additions to capital stock.

The United Nations has set as the goal of its development decade the achievement by 1970 of an annual growth rate of 5 percent a year in the national income of less developed countries. At the present time the rate of investment required to reach this objective is not being achieved in many of these countries because resources which might otherwise be available for investment must be used to provide necessities for a rapidly growing population. Moreover, even if the United Nations 5 percent target should be achieved, present rates of population growth would greatly dilute its impact on individual levels of welfare. For the many developing countries with population growth in the region of 3 percent a year, achievement of the United Nations target figure would mean increases in individual living standards of only 2 percent a year—in other words, average annual increases per capita of about $2.

Nor can the menace of population growth be calculated in economic terms alone. For the United States and the world, the measure of progress should not be the growth of aggregate statistics, nor even the growth of per capita living standards, but the degree by which each person is assured the ingredients of a full and satisfactory life. These ingredients include not merely the basic necessities such as food, housing, shelter, health and education, but the satisfaction of political, cultural and spiritual needs that are fundamental to all men.

U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur J. Goldberg put the matter eloquently in his address to the 20th U.N. General Assembly. "The ultimate object of any organized society, domestically or internationally," he said, "is man—the individual. The effect upon his lot, his fate, his well-being—that will remain the final measure of our success—and our failure. And if we talk about the competition between states, that is the only worthwhile competition—as to which system, which society, best improves the lot of man and upgrades human dignity."

In the opinion of this Committee, a society devoted to supporting maximum numbers of people at bare subsistence levels is repugnant to the values of modern civilization. The fact that such a society may be registering impressive increases in gross national product and other supposed indices of progress is largely irrelevant.

We believe the central objective of U.S. policy both at home and abroad should be the improvement of the quality of life for the individual human being. If this is so, then the United States must have a rational population policy. So long as we are concerned with the quality of life, we cannot fail but to be concerned with the quantity of life. For these same reasons, it should be clear that the objective of population policy should not be the restriction of life, but the enrichment of life.

From this broader perspective, it is apparent that in many countries population growth—even when accompanied by modest increases in per capita income—may threaten the basis of the good life and perhaps the very foundations of civilized society. The population increase and migration from the countryside have outstripped the capacity of many of the world's great cities to supply minimum levels of housing, sanitation, education and transportation. Uncontrolled fertility has been accompanied by increasing resort to abortion—both legal and illegal. Moreover, increasing numbers of illegitimate children are growing up without the benefits of family life. These conditions multiply individual frustrations and take their toll on society in the form of delinquency, crime, revolution, and even war.

The evidence available from history and the social sciences suggests that man, given the opportunity, will liberate himself from rates of population growth which threaten such serious consequences for the social order. Experience in the United States and abroad indicates that most men and women will limit the number of their offspring if they have an opportunity to do so. In our judgment, freedom to limit family size to the number of children wanted is a basic human right. Yet this basic right does not yet exist, or cannot yet be implemented, in many parts of the United States and in many other countries of the world. It has been estimated that nearly two out of every three couples in the world today lack access to family planning information and services.

The central aim of U.S. policy in the field of population should be to correct this state of affairs—to make the information and the means for family planning available to all who wish to have them. Fortunately, there are now methods for the regulation of pregnancy that are acceptable and appropriate in every cultural and income level both in our own country and abroad. Each individual should have the opportunity to limit his family size through free choice among all the means that are available.

A free society must necessarily make free choice rather than coercion the basis of its population policy. But time is of the essence. The rate of growth of world population is so great—its consequences are so grave—that this may be the last generation which has the opportunity to cope with the problem on the basis of free choice.

Unfortunately, there are no quick and simple solutions to the many problems associated with rapid population growth. It will take time before appropriate measures for the limitation of births can be made available to all who would make use of them. And even if birth rates decline, future increases in population will result from the population growth of the past as more people pass through the childbearing years. Moreover, the application of modern science and medicine in less developed countries will further reduce the death rate and spur population growth.

Thus the United States must base its policy on the assumption of large and continuous increases in population both at home and abroad. Family planning will not quickly or easily alter the demographic facts of life. Nor can it be a substitute for other measures to preserve and extend human dignity—such as the war on poverty at home and economic assistance to less developed countries abroad.

Nevertheless, the success with which the world applies a policy of voluntary family planning in the next few years can spell the difference between rates of population growth that are compatible with human dignity and those that spell certain misery for an increasing minority in the United States and a growing majority overseas. In the words of Dr. B. R. Sen, Director-General of the FAO: "The next 35 years, till the end of the century, will be * * * a most critical period in man's history. Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and to stabilize population growth, or we will face disaster of an unprecedented magnitude. We must be warned that in the present situation lie the seeds of unlimited progress or unlimited disaster, not only for individual nations but for the whole world."

WHERE WE STAND

There are at least three prerequisites to effective action on the world population problem: (1) adequate information about the demographic facts, the economic and social implications of those facts, and the means of influencing the demographic facts through changes in individual attitudes toward child bearing; (2) techniques of family planning which are acceptable and effective in different economic, social, cultural and religious environments; and (3) the implementation of nationwide action programs of family planning.

Significant progress has been made during recent years in each of these key areas:

In the field of information, much has been done in the United States and overseas to improve knowledge in all aspects of the population problem—in census taking and vital statistics, in the ability to project future population trends, in the interrelationship between population trends and economic and social development, in individual attitudes toward child bearing, and in the factors which may cause these attitudes to change.

Private organizations have made a major contribution to progress in this area. The International Planned Parenthood Federation, with member organizations in some 35 countries and territories, has played a leading part in encouraging the people of the world to use effective and acceptable means of voluntary family planning. Together with its American affiliate, Planned Parenthood-World Population, Inc., it supports conferences, public information, publications, and research designed to make responsible parenthood a universal reality. The Hugh Moore Fund, the Population Reference Bureau, and other organizations have also heightened public understanding of the population problem. The Population Council and the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations have vastly expanded scientific knowledge through their support of research and analysis in demography and in the economic and social consequences of population growth. Special population centers have been created in leading American universities, including Brown, California, Cornell, Chicago, Georgetown, George Washington, Harvard, John Hopkins, Hawaii, Miami, Michigan, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin.

This extensive private effort has been supplemented by growing support from governments and international organizations. The Agency for International Development, in collaboration with the U.S. Public Health Service, the Bureau of the Census, and universities, has supported research, training institutes, and conferences on population problems. The governments of other countries, in many cases with encouragement and support from AID, have greatly improved their capacities in such fields as census taking, the gathering of vital statistics, the projection of changes in population size and composition, and the analysis of the consequences of such changes for their overall economic plans as well as for particular sectors such as health and education.

National and bilateral efforts are now strongly supplemented by the work of the United Nations and its family of agencies. A population unit in the U.N. Secretariat has provided useful studies of national and world population trends. The U.N. Population Commission has stimulated the gathering of demographic and other information necessary for the implementation of family planning programs. U.N. regional economic commissions in Latin America, Africa, and Asia and the Far East have devoted increasing attention to population problems, and U.N. regional demographic research and training centers have been established in Santiago, Cairo, and Bombay. Under U.N. sponsorship two world population conferences, one in Rome in 1954, the other in Belgrade in 1965, have facilitated significant exchanges between scholars and government officials concerned with the scientific study of population.

Progress has also been impressive in the development of family planning techniques. Research in recent years has sought to improve the reliability of the rhythm method for the regulation of pregnancies. Laboratory studies and extensive field trials, including some in the developing countries, have confirmed the effectiveness of birth control pills (progestational steroids) and plastic intrauterine device (IUCD). The IUCD in particular has stimulated hope for relatively rapid reductions in birth rates in less developed areas because it is cheap, highly effective, and requires only a single act—insertion of the device—to bring long-lasting protection from pregnancy.

Research by government and by many of the private organizations mentioned above, especially the Population Council and the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, has helped significantly in the development of these and other effective techniques for the regulation of pregnancy. The World Health Organization has also begun a program of research in human reproduction which should help to broaden the narrow geographic base which now exists for work in this field.

Progress has also been made, though much more slowly, in the actual implementation of family planning programs. In the United States, an increasing number of State governments are supporting family planning services through local health and welfare programs. The number has risen from 12 in 1960 to 26 as of mid-1965. On June 7, 1965, the U.S. Supreme Court declared the restrictive Connecticut birth control law unconstitutional. The Federal Government supports local family planning services through general health grants-in-aid to States under a program administered by the U.S. Public Health Service; through a grant-in-aid program for maternal and child health administered by the Children's Bureau of the Welfare Administration; through the program administered by the Bureau of Family Services of the Welfare Administration; and through community action programs supported by grants from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

An increasing number of less developed countries have instituted nationwide programs of family planning. Korea, the Republic of China and Tunisia are well on the way to establishing effective family planning programs. The United Arab Republic, India and Pakistan are significantly expanding their efforts—although these still reach only a small fraction of the population. Turkey is about to embark on a national effort after repeal of a 40-year-old law against contraception. Pilot projects are underway in Malaysia and Ceylon.

Until very recently, no government in Latin America, with the exception of Chile, had an active program of family planning. Now this situation is beginning to change. Increasing emphasis has been placed on the population problem in meetings of the Alliance for Progress, and the first Pan-American Assembly on Population Problems was held in Colombia in August. Peru and Venezuela have now established population units within their Ministries of Health, and Colombia has done the same within its Association of Medical Faculties.

President Kennedy committed the United States to the task of making more knowledge about family planning more available to the world. With his encouragement, the United States initiated a policy of providing assistance in the population field to other countries upon request. In his state of the Union message of January 4, 1965, President Johnson pledged to "seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity of world resources." Under his leadership, the executive branch is now fully committed to action on the population problem.

Growing concern with the world population problem—and support for U.S. assistance to other countries which seek it in implementing family planning programs—have been voiced by leaders of both political parties. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower has stated that the United States should tell other nations "how population growth threatens them and what can be done about it." Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon has called on the U.S. Government to take leadership in developing "population control programs which are consistent, to the extent possible, with the religious traditions of the nation involved." Legislation designed to stimulate U.S. action in this field has been introduced in Congress under the leadership of Senators such as ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, and JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania.

The U.S. Government is now making a major effort to help other countries deal with their population problems. The Agency for International Development has extended its assistance beyond the statistical, demographic, and public health fields to the direct support of family planning programs. In accordance with a message dispatched to AID missions on March 3, 1965, the Agency will now respond positively to requests for technical, financial, and commodity assistance in support of family planning programs. This message placed particular emphasis on the following points:

That each AID mission should assign one of its officers, as Latin American missions had already done, to become familiar with the problems of population dynamics and program developments in the country and to keep the mission director, country team personnel and AID headquarters in Washington appropriately advised.

That AID does not advocate any particular method of family regulation, and that freedom of choice should be available in any program for which technical assistance is requested.

That requests for AID assistance in this field, as in others, will be considered only if made or approved by appropriate host government authorities.

That AID is now prepared to entertain requests for technical, commodity, and local currency assistance in support of family planning programs.

That AID does not consider requests for contraceptive devices or equipment for manufacture of contraceptives, since experience has made it clear that the cost of these latter items is not a stumbling block in countries that are developing effective programs.

The United States is not the only Government prepared to offer assistance in support of family planning programs overseas. Sweden has been doing so for years, and Great Britain and Japan have recently entered the same field. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has begun to study the implications of population growth for the assistance programs carried on by its member countries. This may well stimulate the expansion of existing assistance programs in the population field and the establishment of new ones.

The rising tide of determination to deal with the population explosion was reflected in the United Nations debate on population in December 1962, when a large number of countries expressed concern with population trends and a desire to do something about them. This debate concluded with the passage—by 69 votes in favor, 27 abstentions, and not a single negative vote—of a resolution calling for intensified international cooperation in research and study of the population problem.

The pace of United Nations activity increased significantly in 1965. The World Health Assembly for the first time called on its Director-General to provide advisory services in support of family planning programs. The Governing Council of the U.N. Children's Fund instructed its Director to prepare a statement on possible activities in the population field. The Economic and Social Council formally requested the Secretary General of the United Nations to offer "advisory services and training on action programs in population." The United Nations sent an expert mission to India to advise on that country's family planning program.

These achievements—in the study of population problems, in the development of family planning techniques, and in the actual establishment of family planning programs—are all impressive. But they are not enough. More needs to be done in each of these areas if the world is to cope effectively with the population problem. Having examined what has already been done, we now need to consider the tasks that lie ahead.

FUTURE GOALS—AND HOW TO ACHIEVE THEM

The overriding objective toward which population policy should be directed can be stated simply—it is to defend and enlarge the essential values of modern civilization now threatened by unrestricted population growth, by putting every couple in a position to determine the family size it wants.

It would be contrary to everything our country stands for to implement a population policy by coercion. U.S. policy in this area should be guided by two fundamental principles: dissemination of knowledge and freedom of choice. The fact that at present substantial groups in the United States and overseas do not have access to family planning information and services by virtue of limited educational, economic, or other circumstances, constitutes a particularly objectionable form of de facto discrimination. Government action to eliminate such discrimination enlarges human freedom, promotes individual dignity, and more effectively implements the historic purposes of our country.

To accomplish these objectives, the three elements of population policy must be implemented with a new sense of urgency:

We must intensify our efforts to increase information on all aspects of the population problem. Private organizations should be encouraged to continue their efforts in this field. The U.S. Government should substantially increase its aid to other governments, on their request, in ascertaining the facts about their population situation and the significance of these facts for economic and social development. AID, in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, should expand its training of foreign personnel in the collection, processing, publication, and analysis of essential data. United Nations agencies should also be encouraged to enlarge their research and technical assistance in this field. International organizations can be particularly valuable in building a broad consensus on population problems and what should be done about them.

Special attention needs to be given also to the problem of communicating family planning information. Family planning programs can only be effective to the extent that they motivate individuals to utilize available techniques for regulating pregnancy. In many areas of the world where birth rates are high, much more needs to be known about how to adapt educational programs to the needs and values of the people.

More attention needs also to be given to the administration and management of effective population programs. Strong research and evaluation units should be established close to the top administrative structure of official agencies to assure that modern techniques of management planning are being fully applied in implementing population programs.

Work should be greatly expanded in the search to improve existing techniques of regulating pregnancy. More effort is needed to increase the reliability of the rhythm method, to enhance the effectiveness of the intrauterine device, and to discover other methods of family planning. The research programs supported by private agencies, by the United States and other governments, and by the World Health Organization in the field of human reproduction should be enlarged as rapidly as possible in order to stimulate further progress in family planning techniques.

The need for intensified effort is greatest of all in the actual implementation of family planning programs. The various U.S. agencies concerned with population problems need more staff and funds to meet their growing responsibilities in this critical field. Moreover, the work of these agencies could be made more effective through high-level coordination.

As foreign governments initiate and expand nationwide programs of family planning, they will increasingly call upon the United States for assistance. The Governments of Pakistan, India, and Turkey, for example, have already indicated a desire for U.S. financial support of programs to train family planning workers in large numbers; for U.S. consultants in all fields bearing on the development of countrywide family planning programs; for funds to supplement professional salaries for family planning workers; and for transportation and mass communication equipment.

U.S. direct support of overseas family planning programs in these and other ways should be greatly expanded. We should remember, however, that family planning programs are dependent in the long run on a nation's network of health and social services. An enlargement of U.S. assistance to help other countries strengthen health and social services would not merely be desirable for its own sake; it would provide the essential foundation for the implementation of population policies.

There is a large measure of speculation involved in placing any dollar figure on the amount of assistance that is here required. We believe, however, that the United States should be prepared to make available over the next 3 years up to $100 million a year in technical, financial, and commodity aid for direct and indirect support of family planning programs overseas. This aid should be related to the maximum possible extent to activities of regional or United Nations agencies, and maximum effort should be made to enlarge the flow of such assistance from other developed countries.

A White House Conference on Population, held within the next 2 years, could provide a useful stimulus to further action, both in the United States and abroad. To help make such a conference as productive as possible, it should be preceded by careful research and planning by a committee of experts appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of all these considerations, the Committee on Population makes the following recommendations:

1. That the U.S. Government encourage schools and universities here and abroad to study population in all its relevant aspects—particularly at the graduate level in relation to such fields as medicine, public health, public administration, theology, economics, and other behavioral sciences.

2. That the U.S. Government greatly expand its support, both at home and abroad, of research related to the population problem—and particularly research on the interrelation between population growth and economic development, on new or improved techniques of family planning, on the means of communicating these techniques, and on the administration and management of family planning programs.

3. That the U.S. Government set an international example by cooperating with State and local governments and private organizations to make family planning services and information readily available to those in the United States who wish to have them, with the understanding that there be no coercion and that in tax-supported facilities there be full freedom of choice of methods to be used in regulating pregnancy.

4. That the U.S. Government greatly expand its program of training U.S. and foreign personnel who can themselves train doctors, auxiliary personnel, communications specialists, administrators, and others needed in

the implementation of family planning programs in the United States and around the world.

5. That the U.S. Government be prepared to make available upon request up to $100 million a year over the next 3 years to help other countries implement programs of family planning and strengthen national health and social services necessary for the support of family planning programs.

6. That U.S. assistance to other countries in all of these areas be related to the maximum possible extent to the work of multilateral agencies, particularly the relevant agencies of the United Nations, including the World Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, and the United Nations development program.

7. That private organizations be encouraged to expand their work in all of these areas, particularly in those fields where Government assistance is not readily available and that public and private sources be encouraged to give more generous support to such organizations.

8. That a White House Conference on Population be held within the next 2 years to consider domestic and international population trends and the appropriate measures to deal with them.

9. That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appoint a committee to prepare this Conference through careful advance planning and research and to advise the U.S. Government on steps that may be taken before the Conference to deal with domestic and international population problems.

10. That the Department of State, the Agency for International Development and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare undertake improvements in organization, staff, and budgets necessary to discharge their increased responsibilities pursuant to the above recommendations.

GOVERNMENT CONSULTANTS

Dr. Leona Baumgartner, special adviser to the Administrator, Agency for International Development.

Dr. Peter Bing, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President.

Dr. Edward Dempsey, Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. Bruce Jessup, Director, Population Reference and Research Branch, Agency for International Development.

Dr. Philip Lee, Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Albert Moseman, Assistant Administrator for Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development.

Mr. Robert Smith, Associate Assistant Administrator for Programs, Agency for International Development.

Dr. Lewis Spellman, Council of Economic Advisers.

Dr. Conrad Taeuber, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Census.

Mr. Leighton Van Nort, Officer in Charge, International Economic Affairs, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State.

Mr. Herbert Waters, Assistant Administrator for Material Resources, Agency for International Development.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS, NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION, THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Andrew W. Cordier, chairman, dean of the Graduate School of International Affairs, Columbia University.

Mr. Frank Altschul, vice president and secretary, Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Donald G. Brennan, former president, Hudson Institute.

Mr. Clark Eichelberger, vice president, United Nations Association of the United States of America.

Mr. Ernest Gross, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosel.

Mr. Joseph E. Johnson, president, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Mr. Sol Linowitz, chairman, Xerox Corp.

Mr. Francis O. Wilcox, dean, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University.

Miss Ruth E. Russell, coordinator (rapporteur), the Brookings Institution.

This report was prepared by a committee of the National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation for presentation at the White House Conference on International Cooperation.

While preparing the report the Committee had the benefit of close and continuous consultations with Government officials; the recommendations are those of the National Citizens' Commission Committee.

SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION

Our objective for the United Nations in the field of peace and security has been well described by Ambassador Arthur Goldberg as "a workable and reliable international peace system" that will be "in the national interest of all members." To achieve that, he added, "We must find new strength and new capabilities for building, brick by brick, the community of man."

Even in a world rent by dissension and overshadowed by the threat of nuclear war, there are hopeful signs of the acceptance of that objective, if not of an equal acceptance by all governments of the necessity to cooperate in every field of international activity to bring it about. The development of novel kinds of peacekeeping operations through the United Nations, which have succeeded in partly controlling the frequent outbreaks of violence that threaten world peace, is one of the more constructive elements in the contemporary international picture.

Peacekeeping and the United Nations security system

The charter declares the first purpose of the United Nations to be the maintenance of international peace and security, through collective measures for preventing and removing threats thereto, suppressing breaches thereof, and bringing about peaceful adjustment or settlement of disputes and situations capable of leading to a breach of the peace. The system of collective enforcement of the peace provided for in the charter depends upon a degree of unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council, which has been generally unattainable in the circumstances of world political conflict that have marked the entire life of the United Nations.

To the degree that political accord has been possible in relation to specific international disputes, however, the organization has often been able to function effectively as a factor in the control of international violence by assisting the parties in a conflict to "keep a peace" they have agreed to observe between themselves. The theory underlying the charter concept of security was that, when violence was thus contained, the forces of pacific settlement could then be brought to bear to resolve the underlying dispute; only the peace would need to be enforced, as the charter commitments of members to settle their conflicts peacefully would reinforce the limited powers of recommendation granted the organization in the field of settlement. It has not always worked out in that way, however.

In the unsettled world in which we live today, fear of the unknown consequences has at times been sufficient to bring about enough consensus to call a halt to open violence; and even to maintain for years on end an odd sort of twilight situation between war and peace—as in Kashmir and Palestine—under the more or less powerless supervision of the United Nations. Peacekeeping operations of this sort, field activities in support of pacific settlement endeavors by the main political organs of the United Nations, have been undertaken at the direction of both the Security Council and the General Assembly on numerous occasions since the first years of the organization. They have included such functions as observation, factfinding, mediation, conciliation, assistance in the maintenance of law and order. And they have encompassed both political and military missions, the defining factor being their function as an adjunct to pacific settlement endeavors, rather than the civilian or military character of the personnel involved.

It should hardly be necessary to stress this definition in view of the organization's experience over some 20 years; but unfortunately, it was developments in this very field that brought about the constitutional and financial crises that still handicap the effectiveness of the United Nations as guardian of the peace. A central point still at issue among the members is precisely the definition of "peacekeeping operation." Hence the necessity of establishing its meaning for purposes of this report.

Peacekeeping and pacific settlement

Such peacekeeping operations have been effective, moreover, in the sense of leading to final settlement of the conflicts that called them into being, only to the degree of the political accord underlying them. Thus, in both Yemen and Cyprus, where serious efforts were made to combine the peacekeeping efforts of the military field missions with the peace fostering efforts of political officials, the inability to bring about final resolution of the underlying political conflict handicapped the effectiveness of the peacekeeping missions. We have yet to learn how to generate that frame of mind and spirit that makes it possible to move on from the state of suspended violence, which a peacekeeping operation seeks to sustain, to the state of willingness to accept the costs of settlement.

Nevertheless, it remains vitally important whenever the peace of nations is threatened to be able to act through the Organization to control actual or impending violence, while the forces of settlement are strengthened. We agree with the Secretary-General that the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations, "however improvised and fumbling," must be developed "to deal with the sudden antagonisms and dangers of our world, until we can evolve more permanent institutions * * * We must have the confidence and the means to sustain them and the determination to develop out of them a reliable and workable system for the future."

But we only deceive ourselves if we ignore the limitations inherent in these operations and fail to recognize that they must be reinforced by a greater willingness on the part of all member states to fulfill their most important obligation under the charter: to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered." There is no short cut to peace.

BACKGROUND

The charter provided basically for the continued use by the United Nations of the many means of pacific settlement that had been practiced since before the days of the League of Nations—directly by the parties to disputes, as well as by third parties in a mediatory role of some sort, as individual governments or as international judicial or political agencies.

The Security Council, which was made primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security [art. 24] immediately became involved in 1946 with disputes threatening violent conflict. Many of them it could dispose of through Council discussion or by reference of a matter to direct negotiation, with persuasive assumptions of cooperation by the parties in conflict. Reinforced by supporting diplomacy outside the Organization, these efforts sufficed to settle many difficulties with no need for the Council to make formal recommendations of substance. Additional supporting field action has sometimes been necessary, however, when disputes have reached the stage of open violence.

1. Establishment of peacekeeping patterns, 1945–50

In December 1946, the Security Council first utilized a subsidiary Commission of Investigation to check the complaint of Greece that border violations by its neighbors constituted a threat to the peace. When Soviet vetoes blocked further Council action, the case was removed from its agenda in 1947 and taken up by the Assembly. It, in turn, established a first subsidiary field organ: the Special Committee on the Balkans, to observe the situation and assist the parties in reaching settlement.

Similar field operations were undertaken at the Council's direction to help maintain the ceasefire it had called for and that Indonesia and the Netherlands had agreed to in 1947. Violence in both Kashmir and Palestine was similarly dealt with in 1948 and 1949, by the same combination of action within the United Nations supplemented by field observation and reporting and conciliatory efforts. In Palestine, the Assembly was also deeply and cooperatively involved with the Security Council in support of mediatory and truce-observation activities.

The first such missions, following League precedent, were composed of delegates of the members, who used military officers (also provided by their governments) for essential observation work. Such national personnel in time came to be seconded to the Secretariat while on their international missions—a practical development as their service became prolonged. The missions were at first serviced by regular Secretariat members on a very limited basis. With increasingly complex and continuing functions to fulfill, larger Secretariat staffs were needed and more responsible activities were assigned them.

The financial pattern was also established in those early years. Initially, each government delegation on a field mission was responsible for its own expenses, with the few United Nations Secretariat personnel paid from the organization's budget. Supplies and equipment—especially transportation equipment—were of necessity largely provided, on loan or as contributions, by the participating governments. The salaries of national personnel seconded to the United Nations were usually continued by their government, with a per diem payment by the organization. Thus a mixture of charges under the U.N. budget and of contributions from the national governments became the established method of financing peacekeeping operations.

In 1950, in Korea, the first large-scale military operation under United Nations auspices was an enforcement action, whereas the earlier peacekeeping missions had been undertaken only with the consent of the countries concerned. When Soviet vetoes led to a shift of action from the Security Council to the Assembly, the now-famous uniting-for-peace resolution was passed, which introduced a procedural change enabling the Assembly to be convened more rapidly than before; but in general followed a well-established practice of interplay between the two major organs in handling threats to the peace. The costs as well as the size of the Korean action were astronomically greater than those of earlier field operations, and no attempt was made to include them in the United Nations budget. Expenses of the (political) Commission on Korea and of the United Nations Cemetery in Korea, however, were handled in the usual mixed fashion.

2. Experience with large-scale peacekeeping UNEF and ONUC

When an Israeli invasion of Egypt in 1956 was followed by British and French intervention on the plea of protecting the Suez Canal, Anglo-French vetoes blocked Security Council action. The Soviet Union then joined the uniting-for-peace procedure to invoke the emergency Assembly session that established the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF). Although far larger in scale than any previous peacekeeping mission, its function was similarly part of measures to contain the threat to peace pending settlement of the dispute through the Organization. Its commander was even drawn from the Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine. UNEF oversaw the agreement of the parties to a cease-fire and withdrawal of foreign troops. Its size and the character of its organization (some 6,000 men voluntarily provided in national contingents by 10 countries, rather than seconded as individuals to the organization), plus the fact that this organized military force was under the Secretary General's operating control (although politically under Assembly direction), made it at the same time a revolutionary step in the development of international organization.

UNEF depended, not on military strength, but on the authority of the United Nations and on the consent and cooperation of the host country and the various contributing members to provide both its means of action and its freedom to act within its limited authority. Although a true armed force, it could use its arms only in self-defense which, as developed by U.N. experience, meant never initiating the use of force and never applying more than the necessary minimum. Its financial pattern basically followed the standard mixture of voluntary contributions by members combined with various costs assessed by the Assembly annually. Because of the emergency situation and the unusual size of UNEF, the Secretary-General recommended a separate account for UNEF costs, but the Assembly apportioned them on the usual basis. From the beginning, however, a number of countries refused to pay their assessed shares, most importantly the Soviet Union.

The same basic characteristics have applied to all subsequent peacekeeping operations involving the use of military personnel, regardless of their varying sizes, mandates and details of organization. These included an observation group in Lebanon, another force in the Congo (ONUC), an observation mission in Yemen, a small security force in west Iran, and a third substantial force in Cyprus. Of them all, only ONUC became a serious bone of contention in regard to its functions and the methods by which it sought to carry out its mandate. Because it was extraordinarily large and costly in U.N. terms—over 20,000 men at its height, at an annual cost of over $100 million—the political controversy over its operation was reflected in even more widespread refusal to pay its assessed costs.

3. Development of financial difficulties

By 1961, the financial deficit of the Organization due to these arrears in peacekeeping payments was large enough to threaten its future. An emergency bond issue of $200 million was authorized by the Assembly to meet immediate needs. At the same time, the International Court was asked for an advisory opinion on whether the costs of UNEF and ONUC were, as the majority maintained, expenses of the Organization in the meaning of article 17(2) and thereby properly assessable against the membership.

In a 9-to-5 opinion, the Court did so advise in 1962; and the Assembly later accepted the opinion. In the majority view, this meant that the arrears could be included in calculating the deficit of a member (equaling 2 years' assessments) that would bring the sanction of article 19 into effect: namely, loss of its vote in the General Assembly. This led a number of states to pay assessments they had previously held not to be binding; but the two major states in arrears, the Soviet Union and France, continued to deny the binding nature of Assembly actions.

Between 1962 and 1964, in spite of special efforts to find acceptable arrangements to finance both the current expenses of UNEF and ONUC and any future operations, the budgetary situation continued to deteriorate. The Assembly continued to vote special assessments for UNEF and ONUC, much of which was not collected, and members did not respond to their own resolutions urging voluntary contributions to make up the deficit. Meanwhile, new peacekeeping ventures, both military and civilian, were financed on a wholly voluntary basis. Either the parties in conflict divided the costs (as in West Irian) or participants shared them with other voluntary contributors (as in Cyprus).

By the end of 1964, the Soviet Union, France, and 10 other states were enough in arrears under the existing method of calculation to be subject to the article 19 penalty. By then, however, that issue was inextricably involved with the constitutional issues of authority to initiate and finance peacekeeping operations. The fundamental problem was therefore one of charter interpretation, the two extremes being represented by the United States and the Soviet Union.

4. The matter of article 19

The Soviet Union refused to pay the UNEF and ONUC assessments on the grounds that: (1) only the Security Council has authority to take action for the maintenance of peace and security—hence the peacekeeping operations were illegal to start with; (2) the Council's exclusive authority extends to decisions on the financing of peacekeeping activities—hence no assessments voted for them by the Assembly had been legal; (3) article 17 (and by extension article 19) applies only to ordinary administrative expenses of the organization, and only such costs can be assessed against the membership on a binding basis—hence the claim that the Soviet Union was subject to loss of vote was wrong; and (4) the advisory opinion of the Court and the related resolutions of the Assembly in any case had only recommendatory effect, and were therefore not binding on the members. France has refused to pay primarily on the basis of points (3) and (4).

The United States maintained that: (1) the various peacekeeping operations, not being enforcement actions under chapter VII, had been properly authorized and undertaken in terms of charter authority for the Assembly as well as the Security Council to recommend measures and to establish subsidiary organs for the maintenance of the peace; (2) article 17 clearly gave the Assembly the right to assess members for the legitimate "expenses of the organization", including those for peacekeeping operations as the International Court advised; (3) once so assessed, those expenses were binding on the members and properly counted in the total due when calculating the deficit that automatically brings article 19 into play; (4) the Assembly was therefore following the correct procedures of many years when, by large majorities, it levied assessments to finance peacekeeping operations and authorized a special bond issue in 1961 for the same purpose; and (5) its acceptance of the Court's opinion in 1962 by "an overwhelming majority" properly made that the law of the charter.

Both the Soviet Union and France have gone along in the past with the majority of the organization in authorizing and financing various peacekeeping operations in ways they now claim were improper. Beginning in 1963, however, the former refused to pay also for certain assessments under the regular budget (for the United Nations Cemetery in Korea and the Palestine Truce Supervision Organization, for example), as well as for UNEF and ONUC. Both governments also refused to pay their assessed shares of principal and interest on the bond issue, now in the regular budget.

Although numerous states are in some arrears in practice, the great majority have always accepted the legality of the operations undertaken, the principle of collective financial responsibility for them, and the binding character of Assembly assessments. They have sought, however, for a special scale of assessments for costly operations, under which the permanent members of the Security Council and other economically stronger powers would accept higher proportions than for the regular budget. The United States has resisted this approach, conscious of a 1952 Act of Congress that prohibits Government representatives from accepting, without specific authorization, any apportionment above one-third of the United Nations budget. Any special peacekeeping scale would inevitably raise the U.S. assessment well above its normal 32.02 percent. The Government has preferred to avoid the resulting dilemma by making generous voluntary contributions, which have been utilized to reduce the percentages owed by smaller countries.

Inconsistency in practice has thus been a monopoly of no country. While a large majority have consistently upheld the same legal position as the United States, so far as the principles of authorizing and financing are concerned, it was clear by the beginning of the 19th General Assembly that they had also come to think that it was a mistake, in existing political circumstances, to have pushed the principle of collective financial responsibility to the point of bankrupting the Organization and of threatening its political existence over the issue of applying article 19. The result was general acceptance of a nonvoting Assembly session, which avoided the need to raise the issue. Unfortunately, it also brought the Assembly to a near-halt.

5. The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations

The Assembly accordingly set up a Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations in February 1965, and adjourned to allow it to tackle the whole problem and to report in June. But at that time, it could only note its accord that the United Nations should be "strengthened through a cooperative effort," and that the Assembly "must conduct its work according to the normal procedure"—without mentioning article 19. The United States insisted that only the Assembly could decide that issue; while the Soviet Union argued that the Committee must declare the article inapplicable in the future also. Both governments eventually decided not to press these points.

Moreover, reference in plain language to the need for voluntary financial contributions also had to be avoided, because it was impossible to settle the terms of the request. The issue was directly linked to the article 19 positions: the United States maintained that unless the voluntary contributions from members in arrears were sufficient to reduce them below the 2-year limit, then the states in question would still be subject to article 19; the Soviet Union claimed that such an interpretation would, in effect, destroy the voluntary nature of the payments.

When the Committee reconvened in August, however, the United States had decided to accede to the general feeling of the Assembly and to refrain from raising the article 19 issue (although reserving its legal position). This allowed the Committee to report a meaningful consensus to the final session of the 19th General Assembly, on September 1, on the two major points: (1) that the current financial difficulties of the Organization should be solved through voluntary contributions, and (2) that the new Assembly should return to normal procedures, including voting, with the understanding that article 19 would be considered inapplicable to assessments for the costs of UNEF and ONUC.

In the Committee, some members suggested that revision of the charter articles in dispute would resolve the controversy over their precise meanings; but the President and Secretary General found it "evident that the vast majority [were] confident that with good will and cooperation [an] acceptable formula" could be found within the terms of the charter. The political difficulties over the meaning of existing provisions could clearly not be resolved by agreed amendments. The reason for the proposal, however, goes back to the fact that the charter contains no provision for authoritative interpretation.

6. On charter interpretation

The great majority of delegations at San Francisco in 1945 favored giving the International Court of Justice "compulsory jurisdiction" in legal conflicts, which would have made its interpretation of disputed charter provisions authoritative. Both the United States and the Soviet Union strongly opposed either such general authority for the Court or a grant of specific authority to the Court or Assembly to interpret the charter. On the ground that the nature of the Organization precluded any equivalent to a final national authority, such as the U.S. Supreme Court, the matter was left as it had been under the covenant: with each organ responsible for interpreting parts of the charter pertinent to its functioning.

At the same time, the Conference declared that: "It is to be understood, of course, that if an interpretation made by any organ of the Organization or by a committee of jurists is not generally acceptable it will be without binding force. In such circumstances, or in cases where it is desired to establish an authoritative interpretation as a precedent for the future, it may be necessary to embody the interpretation in an amendment to the charter."

The United States rested its case for the legitimacy and binding nature of the peacekeeping assessments, and consequently for automatic application of the article 19 sanction, on the procedures followed in establishing those points: "overwhelming majorities" in the Assembly in support of the principles of collective financial responsibility and in a lengthy series of assessment resolutions, in the authorization of the bond issue, in the request for an advisory opinion, and in the acceptance of that opinion, by a vote of 76 to 17, with abstentions. That was more than the necessary two-thirds but considerably less than unanimous—leaving still open to question the meaning to be given to the San Francisco phrase, "generally acceptable."

The Assembly's authority to make those earlier decisions is not in question; but the lack of a final authority on charter interpretation also left it free to decide whether to apply the principle of collective financial responsibility in the particular way originally followed. The application of article 19, to deny 12 members sufficiently in arrears the right to vote in the Assembly, came to seem to the majority more likely to result in the organization's disruption than in its receipt of payments for those arrears.

As one delegate put it, most members felt that in a situation where there was a conflict of principles and also some ambiguity in the charter, "all you could do was to seek a compromise solution." That compromise resulted in the consensus of the special committee which, as noted, maintains the general principle of collective responsibility—by declaring that article 19 will be inapplicable to the UNEF and ONUC assessments alone—and which looks to voluntary contributions to wipe out the past and restore the solvency of the organization. The resulting situation may be unsatisfactory to those who want to see a stronger United Nations peacekeeping capacity; but it appears legal enough, given the international nature of the organization.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

The present situation concerning United Nations peacekeeping activities is far from satisfactory either on the constitutional issues involved, the question of financing, or the state of preparations for future operations.

1. The authorization issue

The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations reported last June that it had been unable to agree on a generally acceptable definition of "peacekeeping operations," listing the varying viewpoints on authorization, control, and financing method that have been noted above. It submitted a set of guidelines, derived from a summary of its discussions by the Committee President and the Secretary-General, for the views of members on their suitability in connection with future peacekeeping operations. These sought to present the areas of agreement in terms most hopeful for future negotiation of some compromise on the basic question of the extent of the Security Council's "primary responsibility" for the maintenance of peace and security, and on the related issues of peacekeeping authority and procedures.

On the two most fundamental issues, the guidelines simply noted: (1) That the functions and powers of the Security Council and General Assembly in the maintenance of peace and security "should be understood as complementary and not as contradictory," and (2) that financing should be "in conformity with the provisions of the charter," with the Assembly and Council "cooperating" in this respect.

Most responses so far received raised specific questions about the guidelines, but appeared to share the attitude that "an acceptable formula" could be found "within the terms" of the charter. The Soviet Union, however, emphatically declared that the list of principles was "at variance with" the charter, which makes the Security Council the "only organ empowered to take action" in the peace and security field. It also rejected what it termed an "attempt" in the guidelines to "define the functions and powers of the Security Council and General Assembly in peacekeeping matters on the basis * * * mainly of the past practice of these organs when violations of the charter were allowed to occur." Neither the United States nor France had submitted formal responses as of this writing.

In principle, the authorization and control issues thus remain in dispute. Conflicts requiring the utilization of peacekeeping machinery will therefore probably continue to be handled on an ad hoc basis. And since no member has challenged the "primacy" of the Security Council, there will no doubt be a strong tendency to turn first to that organ.

2. The article 19 issue

In acceding to "the consensus of the membership" in the Special Committee, that the Assembly should proceed normally, the United States reserved its position that article 19 is applicable and regretfully concluded that the General Assembly was not then prepared "to carry out the relevant provisions of the charter in the context of the present situation." Ambassador Goldberg also added that, if any member could make "an exception to the principle of collective financial responsibility with respect to certain activities of the Organization," the United States reserved the same option. At the same time, he affirmed the importance of continuing to support in practice the sound principle of collective responsibility.

The official U.S. position thus remained somewhat ambiguous. It did not protest the statement of Committee consensus, which the reconvened Assembly adopted on September 1, and which restricts the nonapplicability of article 19 to the extraordinary peacekeeping expenses of UNEF and ONUC. Nor did the Soviet Union protest the statement, although it had shortly before reiterated its position that it would not make any voluntary financial contribution without guarantees that the issue of applying article 19 would never again be raised.

For the time being, article 19 is not in question with respect to arrears relating only to the regular budget assessments. Only time will show whether the binding nature of those regular assessments continue to be denied by the Soviet Union and France in connection with payments on the bond issue or other accounts related to peacekeeping actions.

3. The immediate financial situation

Sixteen members have made contributions totaling $20,113,000 toward defraying the indebtedness of $100 million for peacekeeping operations. They are as follows:

United Kingdom	$10,000,000
Canada	4,000,000
Sweden	2,000,000
Italy	1,500,000
Denmark	1,000,000
Norway	700,000
Finland	600,000
Sudan	100,000
Iceland	80,000
Greece	50,000
Ghana	20,000
Nigeria	20,000
Zambia	20,000
Jamaica	10,000
Liberia	8,000
Uganda	5,000

This splendid initiative on the part of the 16 member countries should encourage a similar action by other members, including those who have not contributed to the financial costs of UNEF and ONUC. It is the belief of the committee that the United States, as its contribution to the solvency of the Organization, should make a grant on the order of $25 million subject to such arrangements as the Secretary General might be able to make in securing substantial contributions from other members, including those who have not contributed to the financial costs of the two major peacekeeping operations.

Payments on the regular budget must also be speeded up in order to rebuild the depleted Working Capital Fund and to repay borrowing from other temporarily available funds.

FUTURE GOALS

1. Peacekeeping procedures within the United Nations

The primary goal sought by the United States is to strengthen the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations. The great majority of member states share this objective.

There is complete agreement by all on the Security Council's primary responsibility for maintaining peace and security. That position could be reemphasized by an undertaking that all cases threatening the peace should first be considered by the Council; that if raised in the Assembly, that body should promptly refer them to the Council for action. Beyond this, it does not seem either wise or desirable to lay down detailed procedures in any rigid formula. If the Security Council proves unable to act in a matter that appears seriously to threaten the peace, and if the majority of members are concerned to continue efforts through the organization to bring the threat under control, the General Assembly must remain able to do what it can in the situation. Where a conflict appears less urgently threatening, on the other hand, time may well permit the Assembly to refer it back to the Council for further consideration on the basis of the former's recommendations; but this must result from the Assembly's decision in a particular case, not from curtailment of its authority to recommend to the members directly.

The preponderant majority of members share this view of the Assembly's more limited competence in the maintenance of peace, including residual authority to recommend measures when the Council is unable to act for the peaceful adjustment on settlement of disputes or situations likely to lead to a breach of the peace. As noted earlier, these complementary roles of Council and Assembly have been the basis for peacekeeping operations by the organization since its founding. Although the Soviet Union originally objected to such a role for the Assembly, it ended by accepting the view of nearly all governments at San Francisco, which was embodied in articles 10, 11, 12, and 14 of the charter.

Since any significantly greater development of peacekeeping operations through the United Nations clearly depends on greater accord between the Soviet Union and the majority of states on this point, the Assembly should continue the discussions of the Special Committee and the endeavor to define the complementary relations between the two major organs. Nonetheless, a formal compromise seems unlikely in the near future. Should the Security Council prove unable to act in a serious crisis, whether the case is taken up in the Assembly will probably continue to depend—as it has in the past—more on the extent of the membership's willingness to support a specific international action, than on opposing constitutional arguments. In this connection, it is therefore vital that the United States seek through all available channels a clearer understanding among the permanent members of the Council on the authorization and financing of future peacekeeping operations.

2. Relationships between the United Nations and regional organizations

It is as easy to state the goal, as it is difficult to generalize the means of attaining it, in this area. Ideally, the relationship between the world Organization and regional agencies should be a complementary one; action to settle conflicts through one or the other in a particular case should depend on which seems most suitable in the circumstances.

Where a regional organization exists, the states within the area may be able to act more speedily through its machinery, or find it more congenial to their tastes because of greater familiarity, or simply because the conflict in question may be more easily contained within a regional framework where fewer states are involved. The charter, after all, urges states to seek settlement first by means of their own choice (art. 33), and instructs the Security Council to encourage settlement through regional agencies (art. 52(3)). The situation is less clearcut when a dispute becomes violent in a way that may call for a peacekeeping type of operation, especially one involving military personnel. Difficulties then arise both from the terms of the charter (art. 53) and from the disparate character of existing regional agencies.

There are more regional groupings for specialized military or economic purposes than there are geographically based organizations with general political aims as well. Only three, in fact, might presently so qualify. The Organization of American States (OAS) is not only the oldest of these and the one most important to the United States, it also has the most fully developed structure and a range of programs in its region paralleling those of the United Nations. The Organization of African Unity (OAU) also has similarly broad-based interests, but has not yet developed fully either its structure or programs. The Arab League, while expressing broader aims, has neither the structure nor programs of a full regional organization.

Moreover, these three agencies have one aspect in common that makes it impossible for them in some cases to fulfill a peacekeeping role in the same sense as the United Nations. This is the fact that, in each area, the majority of member states have declared their opposition to common membership with—or even to the continued existence of—certain other governments in the region: the OAU against the "white European" governments of southern Africa, the Arab League against Israel, and the OAS against Communist governments in the Western Hemisphere. Since article 53 declares that regional agencies should not undertake enforcement action without Security Council authorization, disagreement over the meaning of "enforcement" in this context has occurred in relation to peace and security actions of the OAS, most strongly in the recent intervention in the Dominican Republic.

The position of the United States in this respect has not been wholly consistent. It has always favored OAS action in regional disputes, and has maintained that only military sanctions against a government are "enforcement" in the above meaning; but has varied in its reactions to the desire of Latin American states to take a conflict at times to the United Nations. After the United States intervened in the recent Dominican Republic crisis, however, the United States recognized the right of the Security Council to concern itself with the dispute; but questioned both the need and the wisdom of United Nations intervention in the field when the OAS was dealing with the situation through an Inter-American Peace Force and a conciliation commission.

The nature of that force, however, was itself in question. Originally, as a result of revolutionary violence in Santo Domingo, U.S. Armed Forces had intervened as a military mission to rescue endangered foreigners. Their role was then extended to the maintenance of law and order while trying to get the Dominican factions to agree on a new government. The OAS, when called to consider the situation, readily sent political mediators to the island, but was more reluctant to accept the U.S. offer to put its troops under an Inter-American Force as a peacekeeping operation. While this was eventually done, there remained an essential difference between this regional force and United Nations peacekeeping forces. The former is supposedly maintaining order to allow the free election of a non-Communist government; United Nations forces are expected to maintain a true third-party impartiality as between all the parties in conflict either different governments or different factions of any political color within a state, as in Cyprus and the Congo.

The few United Nations officials subsequently sent to the Dominican Republic by the Security Council had only a factfinding and reporting mandate, so there was no question of any direct conflict with the Inter-American Force. Theoretically, the representatives of the two organizations should have been able to cooperate since both were presumably concerned with the same aim. In practice, there appeared at first to have been more competition than cooperation between the two missions, especially when there was no speedy resolution of the political situation. As a harbinger of possible difficulties on future occasions when both the global and regional agencies may be involved in a conflict situation, the Dominican Republic operation points up the need for improved relationships between such groups.

3. Peacekeeping in the total pacific-settlement process

The record of United Nations peacekeeping operations shows that they have been more successful in bringing a halt to violent outbreaks than in leading to final solution of the underlying political conflict that caused the original breakdown of peace, which is the ultimate goal of all such operations.

The explosion between India and Pakistan, after 19 years of an unstable cease-fire observed by a United Nations Mission, resembles in this respect the breakdown of peace in Egypt in 1956, 7 years after the Palestine armistice agreement and the establishment of the Truce Supervision Organization. The more recent operation in Cyprus, which from the start combined political conciliation with a peace-supervising force, has similarly failed to bring real progress toward settlement. The same limitation applies to civilian peacekeeping missions as well: in Borneo (where a factfinding group ascertained that the local majority favored federation in Malaysia), Indonesia failed to carry through its undertaking of peaceful settlement on the basis of that finding.

Where such groups or other United Nations presences have successfully completed their missions—as in Lebanon and Jordan in 1958, or in West Irian in 1963—it has been because they were reinforced by other diplomatic forces strong enough collectively to bring about political settlement of the underlying dispute.

This is not to be construed as criticism of the peacekeeping operations; it is simply to recognize a limitation inherent in their nature as impartial, third-party, elements in the total settlement process. When the parties in conflict, or outside supporters of one or another side, have sought to hamper the functioning of a peacekeeping group or to turn it into a partisan operation—as occurred most notably in the Congo—its purpose is frustrated and its effectiveness diminished. A better understanding of this limitation on all pacific-settlement actions, and of the need for going beyond the temporarily calming result of instituting a peacekeeping mission is essential for greater success in attaining the real goal of all peacekeeping operations, which is settlement, not merely pacification.

4. Preparation for future operations

So long as the United Nations is charged with these various kinds of peacekeeping activities, it should obviously have the men, materiel and money necessary to carry them out. This goal is accepted by the great majority of members, but they have been less than prompt in producing the means needed to accomplish the mandates they have set the Organization.

There is no serious problem in finding individuals or small groups for minor peacekeeping missions (either from the Secretariat or seconded by governments), nor in meeting their expenses (either through the budget or by agreement of the parties in conflict). But on every occasion when serious violence has appeared to threaten peace and to require a relatively large peacemaking operation, and the members have agreed on its establishment, it has been necessary to organize and deploy the group almost from scratch. Especially since the Suez crisis, every such operation has also led to proposals for improving United Nations readiness to handle the next emergency.

The needs are obvious, on the part of both the members and the Organization. The governments should hold ready, under a flexible callup system, men, equipment, supplies, and facilities of kinds and in quantities likely to be needed by the United Nations for such operations. As the nature of future calls cannot be foretold, the more extensive the types of skills and equipment available, the better. Among more obvious needs will be demands for technically trained observers, military police, engineers, medical and relief services, and so forth. It seems to us that at this stage it would be better to have such personnel available for callup, rather than to establish some more formalized, standing organ that may not meet the particular need of the next operation.

To plan, organize and conduct peacekeeping operations in accordance with United Nations principles, the Secretary-General should have an adequate staff of military and political advisers at headquarters, and properly detailed and organized information on the men, material, and logistical support available at any time. Then, on appropriate decision of either the Security Council or the Assembly, the fielding of a peacekeeping operation even on a fairly large scale would not be the ad hoc performance it always has been.

Experience has not only shown the need for such intelligent preparations, however. It has also demonstrated that in contemporary conditions of world conflict only an emergency situation, when fear of action outside the Organization becomes greater than fear of action through it, produces enough international consensus to support a large peacekeeping operation. Once that period is over, the interest of governments lags if the operation goes well, or differences develop among them over the operation itself (as in the Congo). In either case, national willingness to cooperate in the short-run is not followed by equal willingness to make commitments for unspecified future undertakings.

Nonetheless, a small group of middle powers—led by Canada and the Scandinavians—have set admirable precedents, both in earmarking some of their own forces for future international needs, and in cooperating among themselves and with the Secretary General to improve readiness for future United Nations undertakings. Informal conferences in Oslo and Ottawa have set the example of widening the exchange of experience and the standards of preparatory measures. We believe that wider participation by more countries in these preparatory arrangements is desirable in order to enhance the truly international character of future operations.

More could and should be done on a similarly informal basis. The Secretariat and members with peacekeeping experience could prepare documentation and studies on numerous phases of such operations, especially on those which differ most from equivalent national undertakings. One such study that is needed is an examination of the application of the relevant provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1949 to United Nations personnel engaged in peacekeeping operations, as well as to affected civilians. There are other aspects on which private research could be of use both to members and the Secretariat. Such information should be made available to all members, in particular to those interested in pledging troop-units or other callup support for peacekeeping.

The political characteristics of a peacekeeping operation are such that it is normally conducive to its pacifying aim if the great powers are kept out of the exercise. For this reason, troop contributions by any permanent Security Council member are normally excluded. But the United States has provided essential logistical and financial support to most peacekeeping missions, and has also undertaken to do the same in future. Moreover, authority already exists in the Foreign Assistance Act (Public Law 87–195, sec. 505) for the Government to furnish military assistance to enable a country "to participate in collective measures requested by the United Nations" to maintain or restore international peace. We feel that use should be made on this authority to help broaden the participation of members in preparatory arrangements.

Great Britain, too, has announced that it will maintain in readiness certain logistics facilities; and in the peculiar circumstances of Cyprus, British troops form part of the United Nations force. East-West suspicions are probably still too deep, however, to permit involvement by U.S. troop contingents—even of technical elements only—in any on-scene military operations. We commend the idea of a broader and more specific commitment of the Military Air Transport Service, as proposed by a group of Republican Congressmen, to "permanent call * * * for the transport of men and materiel in any United Nations peacekeeping operations." Other transportation facilities might also be specified, and possibly various types of equipment.

The commitment of national governments to international undertakings in the peace and security field, it must be admitted, is still weak, as demonstrated in the reluctance of governments to pay even for the ones they approve. Also, the commitments that are made for call-up forces and facilities are subject to the willingness of each government on each occasion to fulfill its general undertaking. Both approval of the operation in question, and the absence of any more compelling national need for the earmarked men or resources, are necessary before the call of Security Council or Assembly through the Secretary General will be responded to.

5. Financing of peacekeeping operations

The long-run goal can only be to have U.N. operations financed on the basis of the principle of collective financial responsibility and through the budgetary procedures of the organization. This would be in line with our interpretation of the charter; but it need not mean that all peacekeeping assessments should be apportioned on a single scale. By the same justification for basing the graduated income tax on a sliding scale, relatively costly peacekeeping activities might be allocated on the basis of a special scale.

To some extent, the same effect has been gained by virtue of the method of regular budget allocations combined with generous voluntary contributions from the United States and other governments that have actively supported the organization's operations; but ideally it would be more satisfactory to regularize the situation. This would not only require all governments recognized to be in arrears to meet their earlier obligations; it would also require Congress to remove the rigid limitation it has set on the portion of the U.N. budget that the U.S. delegates may commit this country to contribute without further authorization. Acceptance of such a degree of collective responsibility is clearly not yet in sight; but the United States should give every support by its own actions to those other members who regularly and voluntarily accept their share of all peacekeeping costs.

It is politically understandable, although regrettable, that the United States placed itself on record before the Special Peacekeeping Committee as reserving "the option to make exceptions" in supporting U.N. operations "if, in our view, strong and compelling reasons exist for doing so." From the beginning the United States has given powerful support to the United Nations. Indeed, without the support the organization would have failed. The "privilege" we ask for is at its expense. Based upon our national record and the strong coincidence of interest of the United States and the United Nations, it may be assumed that we will seldom, if ever, resort to this privilege. But the reservation shook the faith of the faithful and encouraged those seeking easy ways to avoid their responsibilities.

The political views supporting this reservation stem in part from the assumption that the United States is paying "more than its share" of the expenses of the organization, which in turn are becoming "burdensome." On the first count, it is important to note that more than a dozen countries make a larger contribution in terms of their individual capacity to pay than does the United States. On the second, United Nations costs can in no sense be regarded as burdensome. They are trivial in comparison with defense costs and those incurred in direct military action. For this reason, we do not feel that it would be out of order for the United States to contribute something like $25 million toward meeting the current deficit of the organization. The time and manner of so doing might be decided in light of actions taken by the Soviet Union and France.

It is not only inefficient, it is unseemly, for the Secretary General to have to go hat-in-hand to members in order to obtain the necessary financing for actions those members have authorized. Even though most peacekeeping missions may for the time being have to be paid for on a voluntary basis, it would be both fairer and probably more effective if the necessary fundraising for especially costly operations were made the responsibility of a special committee of members. A large and representative group should be established for this purpose by joint action of the Security Council and General Assembly. It would then be available when needed in support of undertakings authorized by either organ, and could serve in an advisory capacity to the Secretary General on financial matters.

RECOMMENDATIONS

United Nations peacekeeping operations

1. That the United States continue to support the view that within the United Nations matters relating to threats to the peace should first be considered by the Security Council—which has primary but not exclusive responsibility for the maintenance of peace—and also its support of the respective and complementary roles of the Security Council and General Assembly in the authorization and conduct of peacekeeping operations.

2. That the United States encourage greater efforts to improve political coordination and smoother working relationships between the United Nations and regional organizations.

3. That the United States encourage a more widespread acceptance of true third-party attitudes in the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations and greater utilization by members and by the Organization of third parties in mediatory, conciliatory, and all other forms of peacekeeping efforts.

4. That the United States continue to encourage the initiative of other members in making armed forces units available under a flexible callup system for United Nations operations and in increasing regular exchanges of information among themselves and with the Organization in order to improve the utilization of such units.

5. That the United States offer, to countries interested in making such preparations to participate in United Nations peacekeeping activities but having inadequate resources of their own, the military and financial assistance already available under its foreign aid legislation for the training or equipment of such units.

6. That the United States extend its initiative in pledging logistical support to the United Nations by making its commitment more specific and by a continuing exchange of information with other members and the Secretariat.

7. That the United States explore, in appropriate consultation with governments in whose countries its overseas bases lie, the possible use of those bases in connection with United Nations peacekeeping operations.

8. That the United States encourage the Secretariat and members with peacekeeping experience to prepare and make available documentation and studies on all aspects of such operations, in particular for the benefit of governments pledging troop units and other support for future peacekeeping operations.

9. That the United States encourage the Secretary General to strengthen the fact-gathering capacity of the Organization in relation to its problems in peacekeeping, in particular by strengthening his staff of military advisers.

10. That the United States seek to strengthen the role of the Secretary General in the management of peacekeeping operations by such means as insisting on greater precision in Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and by encouraging the use of advisory committees to assist him on policy matters.

Financing peacekeeping operations

11. That the United States encourage universal financial support of peacekeeping operations by members and avoid, by its own example, making exceptions in support of particular operations.

12. That the United States encourage the United Nations to charge an appropriate committee with the study of alternative plans for financing peacekeeping, with special emphasis on the possibilities of nonobligatory apportionment of costs by means of a special scale and of establishing a peace fund.

13. That the United States propose the establishment by joint action of the Security Council and General Assembly of a widely representative committee of members to raise funds, when necessary, for special peacekeeping purposes.

14. That the United States, when time and circumstances seem favorable, make a contribution on the order of $25 million to assist in restoring the solvency of the Organization.

GOVERNMENT CONSULTANTS

Mr. David H. Popper, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

Mr. John T. McNaughton, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Mr. Arthur W. Barber, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs (Arms Control).

Mr. Jacob Beam, Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH ON DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION, THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Joseph A. Amter, Esq., chairman, president, and executive director, Peace Research Organization Fund.

Frank Altschul, vice president and secretary, Council on Foreign Relations.

Harry S. Ashmore, chairman, executive committee, Fund for the Republic.

Roger N. Baldwin, founder and international affairs adviser, American Civil Liberties Union.

Mrs. Emily Otis Barnes, cofounder, New Mexico chapter of UNA–USA.

George A. Beebe, director, Institute for International Order.

Dr. Donald G. Brennan, Hudson Institute.

Erwin D. Canham, director, World Peace Foundation.

Dr. Ben M. Cherrington, director, Rocky Mountain office, Institute of International Education.

Dr. Rufus E. Clement, president, Atlanta University.

Dr. Harold J. Coolidge, Director of Pacific Science Board, Office of the Foreign Secretary of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council.

Most Rev. John J. Dougherty, president, Seton Hall University.

Dr. Peter F. Drucker, director, Council for International Progress in Management.

Erik J. Eriksen.

Dr. Luther H. Evans, chairman, U.S. Committee for Refugees.

Dana L. Farnsworth, M.D., director, university health services, Harvard University.

Irvin M. Frankel, Esq., president, American Society of Travel Agents.

Ernest A. Gross, Esq., Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle.

Dr. William W. Hagerty, president, Drexel Institute of Technology.

George M. Harrison, vice president, AFL-CIO.

Dr. George W. Hoffman, professor of geography, University of Texas.

Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher, Denver Post.

Dr. Eldon L. Johnson, president, Great Lakes Colleges Association.

Dr. Joseph Kaplan, professor of physics, University of California.

Dr. Arthur Larson, director, Rule of Law Research Center and professor of law.

Charles A. Le Maistre, M.D., professor of internal medicine and associate dean, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School.

Forrest D. Murden, Jr., member, executive committee, board of directors, UNA–USA.

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union.

Maxwell M. Rabb, president, U.S. Committee for Refugees.

Irving Salomon, chairman, board of directors, Royal Metal Manufacturing Co.

Donald A. Schmechel, Esq., member, board of directors, UNA–USA.

Mrs. James Schramm, member, executive committee, board of directors, UNA–USA.

Dr. Thomas K. Sherwood, member, National Academy of Sciences and National Academy of Engineering.

Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, president, University of Colorado.

Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, principal, New Lincoln School, New York.

Dr. Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System.

Governor Harold E. Stassen, Stassen, Kephart, Sarkis & Kostos.

William P. Steven, former editor, Houston Chronicle.

Jesse W. Tapp, director, Bank of America.

J. Cameron Thompson, retired chairman, Northwest Bank Corp.

This report was prepared by a committee of the National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation for presentation at The White House Conference on International Cooperation.

The recommendations are those of the National Citizens' Commission Committee.

SUMMARY

The Committee for Research on the Development of International Institutions undertakes to explore how U.S. institutions, concerned with international affairs, can fulfill what President Lyndon B. Johnson termed the "assignment of the century * * * to search, and explore, and canvass, and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace."

In order to obtain a broad consensus on this topic, this Committee has communicated with thousands of knowledgeable foreign policy experts; research institutes; presidents of colleges and universities; editors of leading newspapers and other citizens interested in international cooperation. We received a massive outpouring of thoughtful and knowledgeable statements which are summarized in this report. The Committee staff also reviewed the role that the Department of State and its affiliated offices and bureaus play toward the fulfillment of the "assignment of the century," interviewed Government officials, and made intensive examination of public records, to procure the data which is set forth in the report.

This consensus, and the accompanying data, indicate that our search for peace primarily consists of military preparation for ourselves and our allies. We have expended $1,000 billion during the past 20 years to insure our military security. Our respondents indicate, however, that military power alone cannot insure peace, but that military power joined with intellectual power may do so. They believe we must find the political, social, economic, psychological, and other formulas to reduce tensions and dissolve major problems that can lead to war.

Both military and scientific circles agree that an exclusive military solution may lead to international suicide. They desire to find scientific solutions through research that may insure international cooperation. These informed individuals believe that the President's request to search, explore, examine, and discuss connotes research. Everyone understands the importance of research in this technological era; that it is synonymous with better living, and that it carries the world forward to undreamed of realms of material and scientific progress. However, it strangely does not occur to many that it is possible to utilize research for an analysis of problems relating to war and peace, for an understanding of the people of other lands, and for understanding how to deal with them.

Research is not esoteric, it means, "studious inquiry or examination; a critical and exhaustive investigation or experimentation having as its aim the discovery of new facts and their correct interpretation." The importance of research to the Federal Government is illustrated by the fact that it has expended almost $100 billion for research during the past 20 years. In 1964, this reached a peak of $16.2 billion, 90 percent of which is allocated to the Department of Defense and related agencies. That same year, however, the Department of State was allocated only $12.5 million for external research, of which it retained only $83,000 for what might be truly deemed research on policymaking or decisionmaking concerning important foreign policy problems.

Total allocations for research in the social sciences and disciplines relating to peace appear to be minimal. Most U.S. Government departments utilize research freely. In 1964, they budgeted over $4.5 billion for pure research. One of the smallest allocations was to the Department of State and its related agencies (table I).

In 1964, the AID, USIA, and ACDA agencies, which presumably assist State in research for policy planning and decisionmaking, seem to have engaged in only a minimal amount of research for these purposes. The research conducted seemed to lack coordination, focus, and utilization although attempts to correct this are in process.

Internal and external research by the Department of State likewise appear to languish. Research is also defined as "critical and exhaustive investigation, having for its aim the revision of accepted conclusions, in the light of newly discovered facts." This type of research on the requirements of peace is not easy to generate under the conditions of the cold war. Respondents believe that our foreign policy has a tendency to remain "frozen" during all previous administrations as the aftermath of McCarthyism. Respondents likewise contend that the U.S. decisionmaking forces have been provided inadequate resources, staff, and facilities to match the increased responsibilities, entailed by America's increased power and world leadership responsibilities. In 1964, the United States allocated $51 billion for pure security purposes, but only a fraction of 1 percent of this amount—$347 million to the State Department for all of its U.S. and overseas obligations. Respondents contend that State nevertheless performs its gigantic responsibilities, in an admirable way, despite its meager resources.

Hundreds of college and university presidents wrote to the Committee from the private sector. Their consensus is that only negligible funds are now available to these institutions "to search, explore, examine, and discuss every avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace." Research institutes and individual social scientists express the same opinion. They stand ready to assist whenever the President requests them to do so, and makes it possible. Some citizens believe, however, that all our efforts should be devoted to the defeat of communism: then it will be time to draw a blueprint for an enduring international peace, or that the research we are conducting now is sufficient.

Suggestions made by respondents for new institutions, to fill the gaps that exist, are set forth in this report. This Committee believes that it has established the need for the strengthening of existing institutions and the development of new ones. It recommends that the President establish a new commission comprised of representatives from all sectors to ascertain how to implement the assignment of the century by marshaling existing knowledge, and its application to national policy and the resolution of international conflict.

The Committee joins with its thousands of respondents to express thanks and appreciation to President Johnson for his call to search, explore, examine and discuss every avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace. We concur in their belief that the President may have planted the seed for the beginning of a new era.

INTRODUCTION

On October 2, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson proclaimed 1965 to be International Cooperation Year in the United States of America and rededicated the Government of the United States to the principle of international cooperation. He also said: "I intend next year to call a White House Conference * * * to search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace. That five-letter word is the goal of all of us. It is by far the most important problem we face. It is the assignment of the century for each of you and if we fail in that assignment, everything will come to naught."

The National Citizens' Commission has established committees to prepare reports to this White House Conference. Our committee assignment is (1) to explore how research is being utilized by U.S. institutions concerned with international cooperation, (2) to determine what the gaps are, and (3) to ascertain how these and additional institutions might be developed.

In order to obtain an informed consensus on this topic, we solicited the opinions of hundreds of knowledgeable individuals nominated by members of our committee and others. These individuals include academicians, foreign policy experts, authors of important books and treatises on foreign policy questions, etc. Included among those contacted were individuals who have from time to time during the past 20 years been closely identified with the affairs of government and foreign policy implementation.

We corresponded with a wide segment of professors and research scientists in all of the disciplines with recognized academic records; particularly those who have shown a dedicated and professional interest in the President's objective.

We likewise communicated with the presidents of all colleges and universities in the United States and inquired about the role their institutions have played and wish to play in the fulfillment of the "assignment of the century."

We requested editors of most leading newspapers and other citizens having an interest in international cooperation to send us their practical viewpoints on the subject of our inquiry.

We also contacted officials of known research institutes devoted to the study of foreign policy, and requested them to outline the resources available to them for policy, background and peace research and to state their informed opinions on our topic.

We asked the following basic questions of the individuals described above:

1. Have sufficient financial resources and brainpower been utilized by private or Government institutions to search, explore, examine, and discuss every avenue that could lead to peace?
2. Do we now have, or should we have, a research and development program and institutions, with sufficient resources and brainpower, to assist our policymakers to procure all the information necessary for achieving constructive and peaceful solutions for international problems—one that can give them the same effectiveness that is provided our military establishment by their research and development programs?

The response to our communications was overwhelming. We received literally hundreds of letters, statements, and documents of all types pertaining to our inquiry. Our questions were answered thoroughly, thoughtfully, and knowledgeably. We had originally hoped to make a comprehensive digest of this material for presentation in this report, but it became apparent that this digest would be of such length that it would exceed the space limitations of this report.

The committee chairman, therefore, will undertake to express the predominant conclusions and, as simply as possible, the essence of the communications. He will attempt to capture their spirit and to set forth the general consensus of the respondents.

The report will also present published data on the utilization of research by our Government which were collected by our staff. In addition, opinions and comments concerning the present and future role of Government institutions in the fulfillment of the "assignment of the century," were procured through interviews with representatives of Government in the Department of State and affiliated offices and bureaus that utilize research on foreign policy questions. No official opinions were solicited or received.

BACKGROUND

Research definitions

Most of the individuals who responded to the questions we propounded believed that the President's request that we "search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace," connoted research. Webster's Third International Dictionary defines research as follows:

"Studious inquiry or examination; critical and exhaustive investigation or experimentation having for its aim the discovery of new facts and their correct interpretations, the revision of accepted conclusions, theories, or laws in the light of newly discovered facts, or the practical application of such new or revised conclusions, theories or laws."

Everyone understands the importance of research in this new technological era. Research has become synonomous with better living and material progress, but even in the face of this it does not occur to many that it is possible to utilize research for the solution of our foreign policy problems; for an analysis of international problems relating to war and peace; for an understanding of the people in other lands; and for understanding how we might learn to deal with them so that war may be avoided.

We think of research in terms of test tubes, major scientific knowledge, and the physical, mathematical and engineering sciences. This is known as research in the physical sciences, and there seems to be no limit to the amount of resources that we are willing to employ in them.

Research, however, is also widely used in the social sciences. They include those sciences directed toward an understanding of the behavior of social institutions and groups of individuals as members of a group, such as cultural anthropology, economics, history, political science, and sociology. Social scientists have also developed procedures, methodologies and techniques that assist them, often with the utilization of computers and data processing equipment, to do objective, careful surveys that enable them to eliminate guesswork on many of the facts and factors that must be known for objective, unemotional evaluation of problems that otherwise might be decided purely by conjecture.

In the social sciences, as is the case in the physical sciences, there are two primary types of research: (1) basic research: the acquisition of fundamental knowledge, (2) applied research: the utilization of knowledge for practical purposes. For the purpose of this report, we will use the term background research to describe basic social science research to provide policymakers with comprehensive background data, and researched information, to enable them to understand all the facts and factors underlying problems that may need solution. And, we will use the term policy research to describe applied social science research intended to supply decision and policymakers in government with scientifically analyzed information upon which to base decisions and formulate policies.

When we refer to peace research (which has not as yet been accurately defined), we conceive it to be a value-oriented field of inquiry built around the value of peace and about peace; research that explores the conditions of peace and is concerned with the avoidance of war, as well as the integration and development of the world; research that is interdisciplinary, basic and applied.

Use of research by the Federal Government

The extent of the research revolution being experienced by the United States is the best seen in the chart below (not printed in the RECORD). A sixteenfold increase in less than two decades represents a fantastic rate of growth.

The growth, however, has not always been at a steady pace. Starting from a level of less than $700 million in 1947, Government research obligations rapidly increased during the Korean conflict to over $3.3 billion. The decline in the 1953–55 period was followed by an incredibly rapid take-off after Sputnik, to a peak of over $16.2 billion in 1964.

Ninety percent of this research budget is allocated to the Department of Defense and defense-related agencies. Nondefense and nondefense-related research (Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, National Science Foundation, Interior, etc.) receive only 10 percent of the research funds. Of particular interest here is the fact that the research budget of the Department of State for 1964 was $12.8 million, or 1 part in 1,333 of the total Government research budget (0.07 percent). Of every $1,333 budgeted for Government research, $1 was budgeted for the State Department (and 98 cents of that dollar was allocated to the Agency for International Development). In contrast, of every $1,333 budgeted for Government research, $1,199 was allocated to the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The above chart (not printed in the RECORD) indicates that the amounts allocated to the physical and life sciences have grown from less than $1 billion to almost $5 billion in the last 10 years. During the same period, the amounts allocated to the social sciences have grown from only $31 million to $103 million in 1964 (one-fiftieth of the physical and life science total). This extremely small allocation is shared by hundreds of applications of social science which are not directly related to peace research as described in this report, such as allocations for research pertaining to juvenile delinquency, retraining the unemployed, research among the aged, etc. In recent years, the physical sciences have received over 60 percent of all Federal research funds annually. However, the social sciences have been alloted only 2 percent. Policy, background, and peace research come within the purview of the social sciences. It becomes apparent from this chart that if there is an interest in the development of research in this area, and in the development of students, faculty, and researchers to implement the program, there must be a major reevaluation of research expenditures by the Federal Government.

Table I presents the Federal research budget (excluding plant and development obligations) deemed necessary in 1964 and shows the manner in which these funds were distributed.

TABLE I.—*Federal obligations for research, by agency and field of science, fiscal year 1964 (estimated)*

[In thousands]

	Total research	Life sciences	Psychological sciences	Physical sciences	Social sciences	Other
Departments:						
Agriculture	$175,236	$104,648		$47,268	$23,202	
Commerce	38,031		$321	33,371	3,812	$527
Defense	1,644,531	100,437	23,283	1,432,088	4,250	84,473
Health, Education, and Welfare	790,608	670,138	57,843	18,636	41,922	2,150
Interior	84,953	25,001	415	57,149	2,388	
Labor	7,085			156	6,929	
Post Office	362			362		
State	12,823	7,220		964	4,639	
Treasury	518			518		
Agencies:						
Atomic Energy Commission	304,532	62,092		242,197		243
Federal Aviation Agency	4,180	2,928	179	1,073		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1,294,151	33,157	4,735	1,254,801	1,458	
National Science Foundation	164,815	45,100	6,800	103,400	9,500	15
Smithsonian Institution	4,958	1,659		1,563	1,736	
Tennessee Valley Authority	3,491	762		2,262	467	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	4,800	140	82	1,345	1,625	1,608
Veterans' Administration	33,601	30,572	2,758	271		
Other agencies	1,755		157	411	1,156	31
Total	4,570,520	1,083,854	96,573	3,197,835	103,202	89,066

Source: National Science Foundation.

The above table indicates that $4.5 billion was obligated for research in the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government in 1964. Of this amount only $12.8 million was allocated to the Department of State for research. $103 million was allocated for all of these groups for the social science research and of this amount only $6.2 million was allocated to the combination of the State Department, AID, USIA, and ACDA. Many respondents, whose summarized opinions appear on subsequent pages of this report, believe that since the practical value of research has been supported and demonstrated by all other departments of government, the State Department should also demonstrate its value and the need for comparable support "to search, explore, examine, and discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace."

WHERE WE ARE NOW

Research as conducted by the Department of State and its affiliated agencies, offices and bureaus

Directly connected with the Department of State are four agencies known as—

1. Agency for International Development—AID.

2. United States Information Agency—USIA.

3. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—ACDA.

4. Foreign Area Research Coordination Group—FAR.

One of the functions of some of these agencies is to assist the Department of State in policymaking, decisionmaking, and coordinating these endeavors.

This function is best expressed by Secretary of State Rusk in a statement to a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on February 16, 1965, at which time he said:

"The Bureau of Intelligence and Research has organized the Foreign Area Research Coordination Group, in which 20 agencies participate, to insure cooperative effort in research activities, prevent duplication between agencies and encourage maximum use of the results of government and private research.

"We have brought into being with your committee's assistance, and the support of the Budget Bureau, AID, USIA, and ACDA, a long-range project whose goal is an integrated system for processing foreign affairs information so that the policymaking and decisionmaking officers in our Government can base their judgments on accurate, relevant, and timely consideration."

We will set forth in the following pages data concerning these agencies procured from public records and supporting comment expressed repeatedly by the respondents to our survey, particularly as they pertain to the utilization by these agencies of "policy research" or "background research." These opinions, supported by the data which are described on these pages, seem to indicate a minimal utilization by these agencies of policy research or background research capable of being used pragmatically for decision making on the urgent problems of the Department, or for policymaking or long-range planning that can point toward the understanding and solution of basic problems.

Agency for International Development—AID

The Agency for International Development was established by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. It is headed by an administrator who holds the rank of Under Secretary of State. It has the responsibility for coordinating economic and military assistance and the overseas operation of the food-for-peace program. It has also been given the responsibility of undertaking research on behalf of the Department of State.

The sum of $12,823,000 was appropriated to the Department of State and AID for research in fiscal year 1964. Of this amount, $12,740,000 was allocated to AID for its research use. The Department of State retained only $83,000 for its own research program.

The use to which these funds were put by AID is indicated by the widely circulated information on their contract program in research and analysis. A large portion of the sums devoted to research by AID appears to be allocated for research on human resources, agriculture and social systems. Other projects are concerned with public health, material resources, system analysis and operation analysis. The following sample projects illustrate the types of research contracted:

Economic factors associated with changes in agricultural production.

Malaria eradication and insecticide techniques.

A demonstration educational research institute in Central America.

A program of studies on relations between transportation and development.

A program of studies on land tenure and reform—Latin America.

Formulation of improved planning and planning assistance criteria.

Evaluation of three prototype resettlement projects—Egypt.

Substantial sums are expended for these research projects. A few individual projects cost in excess of $1 million; more will entail expenditures in the area of $500,000; and a great many more cost lesser, but substantial, amounts.

Respondents contend that although the projects upon which research is undertaken may be important, constructive, and useful for the purposes for which they are intended, they cannot be properly classified as "policy," "background," or "peace" research, for use in critical policy decisions.

U.S. Information Agency—USIA

The U.S. Information Agency was established to assist the Department of State in its implementation of foreign policy. The following chart and explanation of the utilization of research by the USIA, taken from the records of the 1966 hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, is self-explanatory.

Summary of requirements

	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate	Increase
I. Positions:				
Research activities	103	104	104	
Agency library	38	38	38	
Total, positions	141	142	142	
II. Funds:				
Research activities:				
Employee compensation and benefits	$1,009,694	$1,137,639	$1,143,152	$5,513
Travel	15,674	16,537	16,537	
Research studies	340,756	352,000	452,000	100,000
Subtotal, research funds	1,366,124	1,506,176	1,611,689	105,513
Deduct reimbursements	−107,000	−107,000	−107,000	
Total, research activities	1,259,124	1,399,176	1,504,689	105,513
Agency library activities:				
Employee compensation and benefits	315,827	320,654	322,908	2,254
Reference materials	28,929	27,427	27,427	
Supplies and equipment	5,725	5,720	5,720	
Subscriptions, staff use	10,248	10,156	10,156	
Total, library activities	360,729	363,957	366,211	2,254
Total, direct obligations	1,619,853	1,763,133	1,870,900	107,767
Deduct pay act supplemental		−64,919		
Total, 1965 regular appropriation		1,698,214		

Explanation of Requirements

Research activities: Research studies (1964 actual, $340,756; 1965 estimate, $352,000; 1966 estimate, $452,000; increase, $100,000). Research studies are undertaken to provide information on public attitudes and opinions in foreign countries relating to basic Agency objectives, to determine the characteristics of influential population groups, to find out through what communication channels people get their information, and to help assess the impact of Agency programs and products on foreign audiences of primary concern to the Agency.

Research activities are organized in five functional areas, as indicated on the following table:

	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate	Increase
1. Basic beliefs and attitudes	$33,854	$29,000	$32,000	$3,000
2. Current opinions trends	80,313	126,200	140,500	14,300
3. Target audience studies	109,710	23,500	33,000	9,500
4. Communications studies	44,736	50,900	58,500	7,600
5. Program impact studies	72,143	122,400	188,000	65,600
Total	340,756	352,000	452,000	100,000

The potential of the USIA as an agency for background and peace research is illustrated by the following statement of the USIA Director of Research and Reference Services who said: "Through its research program, the Agency must seek to learn more and understand better the underlying beliefs and attitudes of the foreign peoples who should be informed and persuaded. The research program is a prime means by which agency staff can know and appreciate the current opinions and preoccupations, the hopes and fears of confused and restless people caught up in a rapidly changing world; can delve into the ideas and motivations of leadership groups; can seek the best means and methods of reaching these audiences with telling effect; and can evaluate this effect so as to sharpen information programs and output."

Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—ACDA

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was established by act of Congress in September of 1961. Its original supporters hoped to create an agency that could operate independently to conduct research for the exploration of peace and the resolution of conflict. However, in title 3, section 31, the act establishes limitations on the types of research the Director is authorized to conduct.

The following chart indicates how its research funds have been expended:

Contract research program—Long-range program plans

[In millions of dollars]

Category	Fiscal year 1964 (actual)	Fiscal year 1965 (planned)	Fiscal year 1966 (requested)	Fiscal year 1967 (projected)	Fiscal year 1968 (projected)	Fiscal year 1969 (projected)
I. Measures directed at the control and reduction of armaments and armed forces	0.901	0.722	1.02	1.1	1.3	1.3
II. Measures calculated to lessen the risk of war	.008	.574	1.10	1.1	1.2	1.2
III. Inspection and verification	.976	1.672	2.18	2.3	3.0	3.0
IV. Arms control field tests	1.005	1.000	1.40	1.6	2.6	2.6
V. Economic social international political and other factors related to the achievement of arms control	.600	.546	1.10	1.1	1.1	1.1
VI. The impact of arms control and disarmament measures	.356	.510	1.00	1.0	1.0	1.0
VII. Supporting activities	.138	.376	.40	.4	.5	.5
Total	4.084	5.400	8.20	8.6	10.7	10.7

Congress has appropriated to ACDA for its research responsibilities the comparatively modest sums of $600,000 in 1962, $3.9 million in 1963, $4.1 million in 1964 and $5.4 million in 1965. The above chart illustrates the fact that ACDA in 1964 utilized very little of its research funds for policy, background, or peace research. Likewise, its projection indicates an intent to utilize only a relatively small portion of its funds for research of this type.

There is a consensus among our respondents that, as presently constituted, the ACDA lacks the focus, and perhaps the authorization, to fulfill the requirements of the President's objective. Many believe that the ACDA has become symbolic of the U.S. commitment to search for formulas which may be useful as steppingstones for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Many assert that this ACDA military-orientated focus does not and will not produce these formulas. They contend, likewise, that research projects, conducted by ACDA for the most part, merely parallel similar research conducted by the Defense Department on purely technical phases of arms control and disarmament measures.

Many contend that ACDA has become symbolic as the agency that conducts the search for peace, but it does not truly do so. They believe that if this search is to be the true role of ACDA, it should be reorganized with this dedication and given the mandate and resources for a dynamic fulfillment of this purpose.

Foreign Area Research Coordination Group—FAR

In December 1963, a group of Government research administrators representing nine agencies met to fulfill "an urgent need to establish an interdepartmental mechanism to coordinate contract research on foreign affairs." It was agreed that the State Department External Research Staff should take the lead to set up such a mechanism. Thereafter, "for the first time," the estimated magnitude of Government's contract research effort in the social sciences related to foreign areas and international affairs was "fixed" at an annual minimum level of $31 million for 1964.

The first annual report of FAR, published in June 1965, outlines intensive work on the part of committees and subcommittees that were established. The official purpose of FAR outlined in this report is as follows:

"The central objective of the group is the systematic coordination of government-sponsored foreign area and cross-cultural research in the social sciences. The group will attempt to insure cooperative effort in research activities, to prevent duplication between agencies, to encourage maximum use of research results, and to promote efficient use of private research capabilities."

Several of our respondents have expressed the belief that the concept for this endeavor represents the best effort made by government to date to help bridge many serious gaps that have existed in the procurement, coordination, and utilization of external research by the Department of State and other departments of the Government. The formation, deliberations, and activities of this group enabled those participating to begin to focus on the problems that existed. There was a recognition of the grave need for cooperation with appropriate individuals and organizations in the private sector; the need to develop experts' and scholars' capabilities for research in important areas; the need to bring together the most important information; the need to provide information centers and data banks to improve the work in the field of social science research on foreign areas; the need for these government agencies to receive information concerning social science efforts underway in the private sector.

Our respondents indicate that despite the high hopes with which FAR was established, the high caliber of its staff, and the dedicated efforts that have been expended, the endeavor has received very limited support. The usual bureaucratic difficulties plague its activities. It has received very grudging financial support and has not known from month to month the extent to which it could expect financial continuity. Is it possible that this new agency, given the authority and required financial support, might begin to fill some of the glaring gaps indicated by these respondents?

Foreign Affairs Information Management System—FAIMS

An interagency group has recently been formed to develop a plan for modernizing flow and traveling of information within and among the Department of State and its offices, agencies, and bureaus. The Bureau of the Budget is exploring (or has explored) the possibility of enlisting the services of a qualified organization to develop a plan and program for modernizing the flow and handling of information within and among the Department of State, ACDA, USIA, and AID, and to make other studies.

We are informed that one of the primary objectives of these studies is to develop a methodology and systems to identify categories of information needed for different levels and types of action officers and decisionmakers. Disciplinary skills that are noted as involved in the management and communication of foreign affairs information include competence in disciplines, such as political science, economics, communications technology, statistics and mathematics, management science, information technology, and ADA technology.

In view of the fact these studies and their implementation appear classified, it is not possible to comment on how this program is progressing. The effort appears, in any event, to be a serious endeavor to rectify many of the "gaps" that were noted by the respondents whose comments have been summarized in this report. It seems probable, however, that even this vitally needed project may find difficulty obtaining the kind of support necessary for its ultimate fulfillment.

Internal and external research as conducted by the Department of State

The distinction between internal and external research is as follows: internal research is conducted within the Department by its own staff and its fully employed social scientists; external research is conducted by members of the private research and academic community (or other Government agencies) who are awarded contracts for specific research projects.

Internal research

Many comments were received from our respondents concerning internal research that is conducted by the Department of State. These comments were made by individuals who, from time to time, have been closely affiliated with the Department, who noted, however, that they were not familiar with some present classified activities of the Department in this area. The gist of these opinions is that they do not believe it is possible, at the present time, for the Department to engage in any considerable amount of internal research that can logically be classified as background, policy, or peace research for the effective use of policymakers and decisionmakers in the Department.

It was noted, however, that a massive amount of information and intelligence reports are available to the Department that cannot be necessarily classified as research. For example, their foreign policymakers and decisionmakers have access to press reports and observations of foreign correspondents and voluminous foreign service reports, and, in addition, the intelligence community provides access to elements of foreign societies not directly available to the foreign service officials. There is no evidence, however, that this information was obtained in such scientific form that it would be digested and readily used by policymakers.

For example, it is not known as to whether or not this information, when received, is scientifically indexed, coordinated, and analyzed in such a way that it can have practical value for policy and decisionmaking. The educated guess of the respondents is that it probably is not. This report indicates that serious efforts are now being made in the Departments to improve this situation. In any event, there seems to be no question in the minds of the respondents that there is a need for a tremendously expanded utilization of all of the types of research relating to peace that we have described in this report.

External research

The external research staff is an information clearinghouse and coordinator of foreign affairs research, serving both Government agencies with international interests and the private academic community. The staff seeks to further cooperation between the Government and private scholars in the study of foreign relations. Located in the Department of State since 1948, the staff is supported also by a number of other Government agencies which encourage private research on international affairs.

Most respondents contend that under previous administrations, and at the present time, there has been very little utilization of external research by the Department of State. These conclusions were substantiated by our staff examination of research funds allocated for use in the social sciences. Projects for which these funds were allocated were, for the most part, far removed from crucial policy problems.

Amounts spent for external research is a matter of public record. Projects for which contracts are let are well known. The feeling expressed by many academicians was that the value of external research as now conducted is limited.

Among the reasons given were: First the research projects for which contracts are let cannot be classified as policy research as defined in this report. Few could be classified as peace research projects or as true background research projects.

Second, there is little evidence of any major utilization by the Department of the resultant research. Third, the Department has not sufficiently provided for the digesting, indexing and presentation of resultant ideas so as to make them available to policymakers or decisionmakers. Fourth, there is a need for closer cooperation by the Department and the individuals who do this research.

It was pointed out that research, to be effective for policymakers, must have the characteristic that it pertains to the particular problem that needs solution and that it be generated from and supervised by the policymaker who requests the research to be conducted. Parties doing research are often not acquainted with the true problem that needs to be solved. Many of the problems that need solution are classified. Likewise, they are not acquainted with the form that would be most desirable for transmitting the results of the research in order that they might have immediate value and be studied and utilized for whatever application they might have.

The above limitations apply not only to research specifically authorized by the Department, but also to research voluntarily conducted by social scientists, and individuals who write books and manuscripts that set forth research undertaken by them to voluntarily provide government with knowledgeable data and research that might be useful for decision and policymaking.

What is needed, according to many extremely well-informed individuals who communicated with us, is a major reevaluation of the resources and responsibilities of the Department of State, particularly as they pertain to long range planning and the utilization of research, both internal and external. This reevaluation must start at the top. Once it has been accomplished, the program must be placed under the direction of an individual who is given almost unlimited authority to implement and coordinate the research activities of all departments and bureaus that are being, or could be utilized for research and international cooperation for peace.

INTELLECTUAL POWER PLUS MILITARY POWER EQUALS SECURITY

Comparative expenditure of Defense and State Departments

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	All purposes		Research and Development	
	Department of Defense [1]	Department of State	Department of Defense	Department of State
1930	703	[2] 15	(³)	(³)
1940	1,799	24	26	(³)
1950	13,439	351	652	(³)
1960	45,691	[2] 267	5,654	(³)
1964	50,953	347	7,516	12.8

[1] National security purposes do not include any costs of the Veterans' Administration, interest on war debt, atomic energy, or space expenditures, etc.

[2] Estimated.

[3] Not available.

Source: U.S. Government documents.

The consensus of our respondents is that there has been a failure by the United States to implement or utilize its full intellectual, decisionmaking, and policymaking power. This contention is illustrated by the above table which indicates the trend, during the past quarter century, of total expenditures allotted to the Department of State for the conduct of foreign policy and research, compared with total expenditures allotted to the Department of Defense for military defense, and its research and development.

The chart indicates that since 1950 annual military expenditures for defense and security purposes have been increased by over $37 billion. At the same time, expenditures allotted for the Department of State have actually decreased. We do not have the comparative figures concerning the allocation for research to the Department of State from 1930 to 1964. The total allocation in 1964, however, was only $12.8 million. It is believed that this is the maximum amount that has been allocated to date. In the light of this major disparity, the fact that the amounts allocated up to that time were probably less is significant but not important. This report indicates elsewhere that all but $80,720 of the State's appropriation was utilized by the Agency for International Development.

Our respondents contend that the relatively minor financial implementation for the total activities of the Department of State, not to mention the infinitesimal amounts available for research by the Department, indicates a continuing lack of awareness of the importance of research for policymaking and decisionmaking. They believe that the Department of State, in conjunction with the Executive Department, is in reality our second line of defense and that our ultimate goal should be an attempt to make it our first line of defense. The ultimate management and control of all of the expenditures that the Nation finds necessary for its defense rests upon the policymaking and decisionmaking power that is vested by our Constitution in the President and the Department of State. Upon their decisions rests the fate of the Nation, and with it our lives, our fortunes, and our destinies. Any expenditure that could increase the intellectual power and research power of these adjuncts, in order that they may work concomitantly with our military power for our defense, would be justified.

During the same period a major premise was established, which has remained as fixed policy, with little possibly of objective review. This premise, which seems to have almost total acceptance, is that the only path to peace is the establishment and maintenance of a military power so vast that no nation would dare to challenge it and, therefore, our peace and security would for all time be unimpaired.

To insure our safety, therefore, we have expended for military preparedness over this period an amount in excess of one thousand billion dollars. To further insure the fact that we would have, and continue to have, the most modern and effective weapons that science could produce and strategies as unimpeachable as the minds of men could conceive, we expended for military research and development during this period an amount equal to approximately $100 billion. During the same period little credence was given to the necessity for the development of institutions that could produce an executive foreign policy machine comparable in its breadth and power to the military machine that was produced.

Many of our respondents have attempted to explain why institutions in the United States have neglected to utilize research to any great extent toward the fulfilling of the "assignment of the century." Many believe that this endeavor has been inhibited by the cold war, in the same manner that it might have been during the existence of a hot war.

When a hot war is in progress, it is customary to pray for peace, but it is not always permissible to discuss or do research on the terms, conditions, and requirements of peace. Patriotic considerations tend to make this the sole responsibility of contending governments. During World War II it was plainly stated that until opposing forces agreed to unconditional surrender, the terms and conditions for peace would not be discussed.

It appears that under the circumstances of the cold war, private and even Government research on the requirements for peace have been minimal. Even the word peace came into disrepute and became an instrumentality of national policy. We believe that when the Soviets discuss peace they mean peace with revolution. When we discuss peace, the word is usually qualified with "peace with honor, with freedom, with security, with prosperity, with justice." Perhaps it is also true during this battle of ideologies, that both a large segment of our people and our government have waited until there would be an unconditional surrender by our opponents "of their ideological concepts."

Many respondents engaged in the following conjecture: Is it possible under these conditions for the President to receive a comprehensive analysis of problems that need solution? They enumerated the constraints noted above which impede objective decisionmaking and long-range policy planning. The major premise on which our foreign policy has been based is the threat of domination by "international" communism. The constraints generated by the McCarthy era, that are even today not totally eliminated, need not be enumerated. Under these circumstances it was only possible to maintain the status quo. For the past 20 years, therefore, our foreign policy may have been substantially frozen by what amounts to a doctrine of stare decisis.

Many respondents also contend that the U.S. executive decisionmaking forces, including the Department of State and its affiliated bureaus, have been provided inadequate resources, staff, and facilities to match the increased responsibilities entailed by America's increased power and world leadership responsibilities.

We know the gigantic power our Military Establishment possesses. We know the military power possessed by our prospective opponents. The responsibility of our decisionmaking and diplomatic forces to utilize their intellectual power to forestall the necessity for the utilization of military power by anyone, requires almost a superhuman effort. Decisionmakers and policymakers are always in the thick of battle. They are true and stalwart soldiers. They bear the brunt of the pressures from all existing forces that sometimes believe we have no acceptable alternative to war. "Theirs not to make reply; theirs not to reason why; theirs but to do and die."

Our Military Establishment fortunately does not always have to be in use. Our policymaking forces, however, are almost always under this constant pressure. They are faced daily with urgent and important problems that need solution. The pressure of urgent problems is so great that memorandums concerning important problems must usually remain in a "pending" file. Decision and policymakers in positions of great responsibility have a work load that staggers the imagination. They move from problem to problem with insufficient time for long-range policy planning. It is sometimes stated, therefore, that our foreign policy is based on day-to-day reaction to the conduct of other nations rather than on research and long-range policy planning.

We appear to have become resigned to the inevitability of conflict, and to have no faith in the possibility of purposeful efforts to accomplish a peaceful solution of the political problems that could lead to conflict. As a consequence, the instrumentalities of war have become institutionalized, but no concomitant institutions for peace have been established. A great portion of our time, effort, and resources have been dedicated to the preparation for war. Powerful groups have acquired a vested interest in the perpetuation of this establishment, but no powerful institutions now exist that have a vested interest in preparing for peace. The overwhelming consensus of the respondents is to the effect that we must now mobilize our intellectual forces, and add their power to our military power, to insure lasting peace.

THE PRIVATE SECTOR

On the following pages we will set forth comment received from knowledgeable individuals concerning the role that might be played to assist Government efforts by the private sector.

The role of colleges and universities

As part of our survey, we communicated with over 2,000 college and university presidents. We propounded the questions upon which we have elected to focus our report, as set forth above, and, in addition, we requested their knowledgeable answers to questions pertaining to the utilization of research funds by colleges and universities in the social and behavioral sciences to "search, explore, examine, and discuss the avenues of cooperation that could lead to peace." We asked whether or not this research endeavor should be undertaken by universities and colleges. We inquired as to whether or not educational institutions should conduct significant educational programs in this area and whether or not these programs should be financed independently or by grants from the Government.

We received responses from a substantial portion of these communicants. The answers, for the most part, were thoroughly prepared and gave detailed replies. They were thoughtful, pertinent, analytical, and revealing. Their answers indicate that the total proportion of research funds or grants allocated or utilized by colleges and universities for policy research, background research, or peace research is infinitesimal. Most of the presidents indicated that no funds have been available in colleges and universities for this type of research.

Several indicated, however, that approximately 5 percent of their available research funds were utilized for research that could be deemed pertinent to our inquiry. A few others indicated that 3 percent, 2 percent or 1 percent of their research funds were so utilized.

Presidents of important universities indicated the need for a great deal of basic work, in a wide spectrum of established disciplines to enable them to come to grips in scientific terms with the central problem of our concern. They believe that the social sciences need first to do major work toward the proper development of methodologies to be used in the study of phenomena.

Almost all of the presidents believe that this research endeavor should be undertaken by universities and colleges. Many believe that this endeavor should be undertaken by separate institutes directly connected with their institutions.

A major portion of these institutions indicated an urgent need to develop important educational programs on the requirements of peace. Some expressed a strong and startling concern to the effect that the majority of political scientists remain unconcerned with, and have meager knowledge of the requirements for either research or education in the area of peace research. It was contended that less than 10 percent of the American political science profession devote their attention to international relations. Most presidents believe that there is a need for entirely new approaches in the education of the undergraduate to the requirements for peace; that special curriculums should be constructed for training the kind of people who are critically needed to become policymakers, policy research specialists, background research specialists, and peace research specialists.

Many college presidents indicated that the survey that we have conducted was a very valuable and pertinent endeavor, to ascertain how research for the development of the institutions they represented might be inaugurated. There was a clear indication of the belief that it is the duty and responsibility of the universities and colleges to assume leadership in an effort to close the gaps that exist in the area of our discussion. Many indicated that they had experienced almost a sense of shock at the sudden realization of how little was now being accomplished in these areas.

Their responses to our question concerning how such research and/or educational programs should be financed were mixed. Nearly all of the presidents felt the financing should be undertaken by both private and Government resources. All felt, however, that the support should be without strings, so that research and education could have the required objectivity.

The overriding impression that was obtained from these statements, indicates a major frustration among America's most knowledgeable individuals, caused by the circumstances that have in the past not made it possible for them to assist in the President's "assignment of the century." They look upon this mandate as a beacon of hope that they can now begin to help close the gap that has existed. They stand ready to assist.

It is obviously not possible, in the space we have here, to begin to thoroughly summarize the hundreds of important and brilliant statements that were received. Therefore we have briefly summarized statements made that were most pertinent to the topic we are discussing. We hope at a later date to compile all the important statements we received in a significant, substantiating document.

The role of independent and university-connected institutes

It appears from communications we have received that almost the same state of affairs exists in the independent institutes and, to a lesser extent, in the university-connected institutes that engage in policy, background and peace research.

A survey of such research institutes indicates that only approximately $4 million annually in private funds were available to the fifteen reporting independent institutes in 1964. Approximately $3 million of this amount was utilized by three of these institutes. The combined annual budget of the remaining twelve was only $1 million. Twelve university-connected institutes reporting indicated that the annual total of only $1 million in private funds was available to them, of which one-half was utilized by three institutes. The other nine utilized the remaining $500,000.

In addition to the above private funds, some of the institutes receive substantial Defense Department funds for "research," few of which were granted for research in the social sciences. Data from the Rand Corp. is not included in these figures. This "private" institute, which expends approximately $20 million annually (all but $1 million of which is derived from government contracts), does research primarily at the request of various units of the Department of Defense, particularly the Air Force. An excellent social science research department also exists at Rand, but in relation to the whole it is comparatively limited.

The role of individual social scientists

Thousands of unsolicited articles and manuscripts, derived from research, are produced annually. Few are published and fewer find their way to the policymaker for effective utilization. As a result, academicians, who engage in policy, background or peace research, usually meet, discuss their own papers, and their intercommunication results only in a release of their own frustrations and their mutual education on the various topics that are studied. There is little opportunity or incentive for the competent social scientist to engage in this endeavor professionally. He usually does so in his spare time and those who attempt to do so professionally, generally remain on a near starvation level. This is in contrast to the physical scientists, about 52 percent of whom (on a full- or part-time basis) are utilized by Government and the military, and among whom are found some of the most highly paid academicians in the country.

Comment received from individuals, most private research institutes, and specialists who are not provided with Government contracts with which to conduct research can only be described as desperate. They live a precarious existence, and carry on only because of their dedicated and patriotic desire to do their part to provide knowledgeable research information, which may some day save the Nation from military destruction. Most individuals, regardless of their dedication and expertise, are eventually forced to relinquish this specialty and go into other fields where it is possible to earn a living.

Representative negative comment

We have explained the nature of the questions that were propounded by us to the thousands of individuals with whom we communicated. In essence, we ask if sufficient financial resources and brainpower are being utilized privately, or by Government for research on the requirements of peace, and if not, is there a need for substantial additional research?

Academicians and research specialists agreed, almost unanimously, that there was a critical need for additional research. However, we received a number of significant replies to the contrary. We set forth below two such statements that were received:

The editor of one of America's leading circulation newspapers said, briefly, but to the point: "I believe that no amount of money and brainpower will further the cause of international peace so long as the Communist world persists in its determination to conquer the rest of us. All our effort should be devoted to the defeat of Communism: then it will be time to draw a blueprint for an enduring international peace. True international cooperation cannot be obtained as long as the world is divided between Communists and anti-Communists. Either we destroy Communism, or it destroys us."

The president of an important highly regarded foreign policy institution said: "I don't at all agree that 'the amount of effort, resources, finances, and brainpower that has been, or is being expended for this crucial purpose (i.e. the search for avenues to peace) is infinitesimal.' It seems to me that lots of people are concerned about, studying and writing about approaches and avenues of cooperation that can lead to peace. Beyond the people in universities, special institutes, government organizations and inter-governmental organizations, there is the positive role being played by our defense establishment and by our military alliances, which are extremely important avenues of cooperation that could lead to peace.

"I sense from your letter an exaggerated faith in the results to be obtained simply by 'working scientifically toward a solution of our international problems,' and a neglect of the importance of differing national interests and of the role which persuasion rather than research has to play in building the structure of international peace. We already know far more about how to achieve peaceful cooperation that most participants on the international scene are prepared to put into practice."

A few similar replies came from individuals who are representative of the public, mass media, and nongovernmental institutions who are closely affiliated with, and respected by, government officials. It is fair to presume that a number of individuals who failed to respond to our communication would have concurred with the above statements had they responded.

Representative suggestions for new institutions

We have received hundreds of suggestions for the implementation of the President's objective "to search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace." They are too numerous to catalog in this report. We have also received suggestions from knowledgeable individuals for the establishment of new institutions to assist in this process. We list below a few of these suggestions as examples only.

Council on International Relations: An NGO organization with a charter from the Government to cast the light of knowledge and understanding upon the factors involved in the political field, as the National Academy of Science does in the realm of the physical sciences.

Department of Peace or Department of International Cooperation. This Department would be headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank. This Department would have Under-Secretaries and be organized to fulfill all functions that are required for long-range policy planning and all concerted efforts on the requirements for peace. The Department of State would continue in all of its present activities. (This suggestion was the one most often received.)

National Committee of College and University Presidents: This Committee would work in cooperation with designated representatives of Government to mobilize college and university resources in order to produce some useful guidelines for utilizing research and education in order that the intellectual community might make a more significant contribution to the problems of world peace. Independent and university-connected institutes could also have representation on this Committee.

National Peace Foundation: This foundation would be similar to the National Science Foundation, and would be organized by Government to provide both coordination and financial support to research in the social sciences on the requirements for peace. This group would work in very close cooperation with private foundations and other private groups involved in the same quest. It should function independently of Government control and other Government departments.

Peace on Earth Research Center: To ascertain the combinations of conditions under which the people of the world will live at peace with each other; to identify feasible routes of getting from our present morbid conditions to these healthy ones; to utilize experts and computers in conflict resolution.

Psychological Strategy Board: This Board would be similar to one that has existed under previous administrations. It would consist of experts within the Government, as well as experts from outside the Government, who can focus the best knowledge in the several disciplines, in order to recommend changes that can be applied to issues of peace. The Board would include political scientists, psychologists, anthropologists, sociologists and economists, as well as members from all other pertinent disciplines.

Regional Centers of Technology, Economics and Science: These Centers, staffed by Government and non-Government personnel, would undertake to ascertain how best to apply accumulated technical, economic and social knowledge to regional problems of technical, economic and social development. They would likewise undertake to supervise the training of local technicians, economists, sociologists, entrepreneurs, educators, and other individuals instrumental in the fulfillment of the Centers' objectives.

Rand type institution: Implemented and staffed as fully as the present Rand Institution but concentrating its endeavors solely in the social science field, to undertake and supervise research in non-military-connected foreign policy matters.

COMMITTEE MESSAGE

This report represents a true citizens' endeavor. No Government counterpart Cabinet Committee was established to assist in its preparation. It, therefore, does not represent the official thinking of any member of Government. This citizens' committee, however, enlisted the thinking of hundreds of knowledgeable individuals whose opinions have been summarized.

The Chairman gratefully acknowledges the cooperation of the members of this committee. Opinions and material furnished by its distinguished members were considered with the opinions of the other knowledgeable citizens who participated, and they are summarized with them in the report. The comments and opinions contained in this report, therefore, do not necessarily represent the opinions of this Committee as a whole, or the opinions of any member.

The committee extends its thanks to the PROF Foundation whose financial support made its extensive activities possible and to its competent staff who, assisted by a distinguished group of academicians, made the important contribution of obtaining and preparing the statistical data and reviewing, under the direction of the Chairman, the voluminous material and statements that were received in response to the survey which was conducted.

The Committee also extends its sincere thanks to the respondents for the thoughtful and important contributions voluntarily submitted. Space requirements made it impossible to list examples of the hundreds of recommendations we received for specific policy, background, and peace research projects; or to include many important manuscripts furnished us; or to list the names of the respondents. We trust that our inability, in this initial report, to demonstrate the power of research by listing "prime examples" does not lessen the reader's basic comprehension of the need for research which we fairly presented. A new major endeavor is necessary to determine how to fulfill this need.

Scientists know that you cannot foretell the results of research. It is not always possible to ascertain at the beginning what you intend to discover. With this requirement, the great discoveries of this era would not have occurred. Atomic energy, or the resultant possibility for the exploration of space, would have been difficult to foretell. These achievements were the outgrowth of thousands of prior research projects which made possible our great technological era. The ultimate achievement of peace may come about in the same way, through research in the social sciences and humanities.

The Committee joins the thousands of its respondents who expressed thanks and appreciation to President Lyndon B. Johnson for his statesmanlike call for a White House Conference to search, explore, examine and discuss every conceivable avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace. We join in their conviction that the President thereby planted the "seed" for the beginning of a new era.

We trust that the President may now nurture this "seed" to insure its ultimate growth, and enlist the help of every citizen of this land who stands ready to assist, to fulfill his "assignment of the century." We, therefore, present the following recommendation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee believes: That the consensus of the opinions obtained indicates the urgent need for the planned development and strengthened utilization of existing or additional institutions concerned with systematic investigation of the requirements of international cooperation and world peace;

That conversion of the consensus into concrete recommendations is still lacking; how to utilize the competence of colleges and universities, institutes, and foundations is still unresolved; and how better to link research results and national policies is yet to be proposed.

The Committee recommends: That a Commission be established by the President, to be comprised of designated representatives from the government sector and designated representatives from the private sector, including members from colleges, universities, research institutes, foundations, and the public; and

That this Commission be provided with a qualified professional staff and sufficient time and resources to make specific recommendations on how best to develop existing or additional institutions, to carry out the "assignment of the century" through independent investigation, the marshaling of existing knowledge and the acquisition of new knowledge, and its application to national policy and the resolution of international conflict.

Respectfully submitted.

COMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS,
JOSEPH A. AMTER, *Chairman*.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, BEFORE THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, NOVEMBER 28 TO DECEMBER 1, 1965

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Charles S. Rhyne, Chairman; president, World Peace Through Law Center.

Richard R. Baxter, professor of law, Harvard Law School.

Bruno V. Bitker, chairman, Governor's committee on United Nations, Wisconsin.

Charles F. Brannan, attorney, Denver, Colo.

Herbert W. Briggs, professor of law, Cornell University.

Michael H. Cardozo, executive director, Association of American Law Schools.

Abram Chayes, former legal adviser, Department of State.

Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., attorney, New York, N.Y.

Oscar Cox, attorney, Washington, D.C., formerly U.S. Assistant Solicitor General.

Hardy Dillard, dean, University of Virginia School of Law.

Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean, Boston College Law School.

G. Homer Durham, president, Arizona State University.

Albert A. Ehrenzweig, professor of law, University of California (Berkeley) School of Law.

Samuel D. Estep, profesor of law, University of Michigan Law School.

John N. Hazard, professor of law, Columbia University Law School.

Bert E. Hopkins, dean, University of Connecticut School of Law.

Sarah T. Hughes, U.S. district judge, northern district of Texas.

Marion K. Kellogg, professor of law, University of Virginia.

Heinrich Kronstein, director, Institute for International and Foreign Trade Law, Georgetown University Law Center.

Arthur Larson, director, Rule of Law Research Center, Duke University.

Marjorie McKenzie Lawson, formerly judge, juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

Peter James Liacouras, professor of law, Temple University School of Law.

Richard B. Lillich, director, international legal studies, Syracuse University.

John Lyons, professor of law, George Washington Law School.

Charles E. Martin, past president, American Society of International Law.

Soia Mentschikoff, professor of law, University of Chicago Law School.

H. C. L. Merillat, executive vice president, American Society of International Law.

Newton N. Minow, attorney, Chicago, Ill.; formerly Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

Wallace N. McClure, formerly assistant legal adviser, Department of State.

Myres Smith McDougal, professor of law, Yale Law School.

James M. Nabrit, Jr., president, Howard University.

Jess Nathan, attorney, Washington, D.C.

Charles B. Nutting, dean, George Washington Law School.

Joseph A. Sinclitico, Jr., dean, University of San Diego School of Law.

Charles M. Spofford, attorney, New York, N.Y.

Robert G. Storey, president, Southwestern Legal Foundation.

E. D. Surrency, professor of law, Temple Law School.

Leonard V. B. Sutton, justice, Supreme Court of Colorado.

Samuel D. Thurman, dean, University of Utah College of Law.

Kenneth Wang, professor of law, St. John's University School of Law.

Robert R. Wilson, professor of law, Duke University.

Quincy Wright, professor of law, University of Virginia.

SUMMARY

The development of international law is a basic purpose of the International Cooperation Year. The rapid growth of international law in various cooperative fields gives ground for hope that adequate peacekeeping machinery may be developed to handle effectively the problems that inevitably arise in international relations.

The National Citizens' Committee on Development of International Law has a task which is central to the purpose of International Cooperation Year. Its seven recommendations aim to improve the contribution being made by the United States to develop and strengthen law in the world community. The Committee report lists these recommendations and offers reasons why they should be adopted. The recommendations and highlights of the supporting discussion are given below.

Recommendation No. 1: That the United States delete the Connally amendment to its reservation to the declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and the reservation regarding disputes involving multilateral treaties.

Supporting discussion: The Committee believes that the deletion of the Connally amendment would remove an important barrier to the peaceful settlement of international disputes by strengthening the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Deletion of its reservation to multilateral treaties would strengthen the exercise of the Court's statutory power to pass on treaty disputes and would demonstrate faith in the Court by the United States.

Recommendation No. 2: That the United States develop a program for legal assistance to new nations.

Supporting discussion: Effective international cooperation requires that new nations have an adequate legal system and a strong legal profession. To attain this objective the Committee suggests the creation of a separately funded Federal program to furnish technical legal assistance through services of qualified members of the legal profession and by providing needed legal materials.

Recommendation No. 3: That the United States develop a program with other countries for exchange of government lawyers.

Supporting discussion: Such a program would contribute to international cooperation and would further the development of international law by a study of public law problems common to both countries.

Recommendation No. 4: That the United States propose to the United Nations the establishment under U.N. auspices of an international law reporter system.

Supporting discussion: The inaccessibility of many legal materials is a substantial impediment to the development of a broadly based international law. The establishment of an international law reporter system would be an important step toward the elimination of this impediment, and would encourage the emergence of a universal legal consensus.

Recommendation No. 5: That the United States ratify the United Nations and the World Bank arbitration conventions.

Supporting discussion: The ratification of these conventions would encourage resort to international arbitration and would make more widespread the recognition of the binding force of international arbitral awards.

Recommendation No. 6: That the United States ratify the consular convention with the Soviet Union.

Supporting discussion: A developing feature of international law is the right of citizens of one state in the territory of another to have the protection of their Governments if subjected to arrest. Ratification of this convention would represent a recognition of this right for U.S. citizens visiting Russia. An estimated 20,000 U.S. citizens visited Russia last year.

Recommendation No. 7: That the United States endorse the establishment of a court for the adjudication of lower level international disputes.

Supporting discussion: The absence of a simple, effective, and readily accessible court to resolve lower level international disputes is a significant defect in the present international legal system. Establishment of such a court could be effected by multilateral treaty between such friendly, neighboring states as Mexico, Canada, and the United States, with the possibility of adherence by other states.

I. INTRODUCTION

Law is a touchstone and a measure of civilization. Among nations as among men, devotion to the methods of law and adherence to its commands are indispensable elements in a public order that encourages material progress and promotes essential human values.

Within the nations of the world, the level of adherence to the rule of law which men have achieved—in their private affairs and in government—is an unfailing indication of the stage of advancement their nation has achieved. In the world arena, the history of the development of international law is a chronicle of the struggle to civilize international society and to make it serve the true needs and purposes of mankind.

The Committee on Development of International Law believe that the subject of our task is central to the purpose of International Cooperation Year. The subject is one that infuses every other to which efforts are being devoted by the respective ICY committees. Yet it has a separate identity. If the processes by which law is developed and applied are neglected—if adherence to the rule of law is not adequately cultivated—all efforts to achieve progress in international affairs must surely fall short of the mark.

Public attention is constantly focused on the failures and breakdowns of law in the international arena. And it must be recognized that the processes of law remain weakest in the very areas, such as peacekeeping, which are most important to us all. On the other hand, it is clear that international law is a growing force in world affairs, and that, indeed, there has occurred in the last 20 years an explosive growth in transnational law and in the contacts, processes, and procedures by which it is made and applied. This growth gives ground for hope that the nations of the world will learn in time to subject all their relations with each other to the moderating and civilizing force of such law. It is our task to determine what immediate steps the United States should take to insure that it makes the most effective possible contribution to that end.

The purpose of this report is to put forth responsible recommendations for improving the contribution being made by the United States toward the development and strengthening of law in the world community. Although progress in all 30 of the fields to which ICY committees have been assigned will require an enabling framework of law, the Committee on Development of International Law concluded that it should avoid a duplication of effort and focus its own attention upon proposals for advancing the rule of law itself. This is the common theme of the following recommendations.

The Committee recognizes that the cause of international law may be served by cooperation among nations in solving common legal problems of a domestic nature. It is toward the international development of law—and not exclusively of international law—that the following recommendations are directed.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the United States delete the Connally amendment to its reservation to the declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and the reservation regarding disputes involving multilateral treaties.
2. That the United States develop a program for legal assistance to new nations.
3. That the United States develop a program with other countries for exchange of government lawyers.
4. That the United States propose to the United Nations the establishment under U.N. auspices of an international law reporter system.
5. That the United States ratify the United Nations and the World Bank Arbitration Conventions.
6. That the United States ratify the consular convention with the Soviet Union.
7. That the United States endorse the establishment of a court for the adjudication of lower level international disputes.

III. SUPPORTING DISCUSSION

1. That the United States delete the Connally amendment to its reservation to the declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and the reservation regarding disputes involving multilateral treaties.

(a) The Connally amendment: In its declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice the United States has reserved therefrom "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America 'as determined by the United States of America'." The single quoted words constitute the so-called Connally amendment. It has been the consistent and avowed policy of the United States that international disputes should be settled by peaceful means. One such means is the resolution of international disputes by the International Court of Justice, the judicial organ of the United Nations. Accordingly the United States accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. The Committee is of the view, however, that its acceptance is belittled in the eyes of other nations by the Connally amendment. The amendment enables the United States in every international dispute brought before the International Court of Justice to which the United States is a party to decide unilaterally whether the dispute falls within the terms of its declaration accepting the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.

The Committee believes that the United States in deleting the Connally amendment would be making an important contribution to international acceptance of the principle that the rule of law should govern the settlement of disputes between nations. A willingness on the part of the United States to permit the International Court of Justice to decide for itself what are essentially matters of domestic jurisdiction would encourage other nations to follow the same course.

It is also believed that this would be in the national interest of the United States. At the present time, under the principle of reciprocity, the Connally amendment can be used by any other State which is brought before the Court by the United States to oust the Court of jurisdiction. Deletion of the amendment would permit the United States to use the Court to resolve disputes with those States which have accepted equal obligations regarding the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.

(b) Multilateral treaties: The United States has also reserved from its declaration accepting the Court's compulsory jurisdiction "disputes arising under a multilateral treaty unless (1) all parties to the treaty affected by the decision are also parties to the case before the Court, or (2) the United States of America specially agrees to jurisdiction." The United States is a party to numerous multilateral international agreements. It will seldom be the case in such situations that all States will be parties to litigation before the Court involving multilateral treaties. The multilateral treaty reservation therefore operates in its practical effect to preclude the court for exercising its statutory power to pass upon treaty disputes involving the United States where the treaty is multilateral. The deletion by the United States of this reservation will further demonstrate its faith in the International Court of Justice as a vehicle for the settlement of international legal disputes.

2. That the United States develop a program for legal assistance to new nations.

Effective international cooperation requires that new nations should have an adequate legal system and a strong legal profession. These are vast undertakings and require the services of experts in various fields of law. Many of the new countries understandably do not have the necessary legal expertise. The Committee believes that the United States can do much in this regard. While private agencies in the United States are active in the field, their activities should be supplemented by the Federal Government. The Committee suggests for consideration the creation of a separately funded Federal program to meet the need. The operation of the program should be the responsibility of one or more qualified private agencies under contract with the Federal agency designated to administer the appropriated funds. The Committee envisages that each contracting private agency would survey the legal assistance needs of interested foreign countries and seek to meet them in one or more of the following ways:

(a) Enable qualified members of the legal profession in this country (including scholars, administrators, and practicing lawyers) to accept invitations to temporary posts at foreign law schools and law centers.

(b) On request, locate and in exceptional cases finance opportunities for advanced or specialized training here for legal personnel from those foreign countries.

(c) Receive, evaluate and refer, or in appropriate cases and as necessary, fill requests for legal materials needed in such countries.

3. That the United States develop a program with other countries for exchange of government lawyers.

While there have been exchange programs between the United States and other countries involving private lawyers, the Committee is unaware of any exchange program involving government lawyers. The Committee believes that such a program would contribute to international cooperation and uniformity in the legal field and would further the development of international law. Lawyers engaged in government work and State and Federal judges develop a specialized knowledge and skill in the administration of public law. Many countries have common public law problems the solution of which might well be assisted by first hand observation of how these problems are handled by other countries. The Committee therefore recommends the establishment on an experimental basis of an exchange program of U.S. Government lawyers and judges and their counterparts in other countries. It is contemplated that the participants in the program would function principally as observers. The Committee recognizes, of course, that security considerations are a factor in some areas of Government work. The program, therefore, would be confined to areas which do not involve security considerations.

4. That the United States propose to the United Nations the establishment under U.N. auspices of an international law reporter system.

The Committee believes that a substantial impediment to the development of a broadly based international law is the inaccessibility of many of the legal materials upon which such a development must be founded. This, of course, is not true with respect to matters governed by treaties. On the other hand, many aspects of international law are not covered by treaties. As to these aspects, evidence of the views of various states, as reflected in their respective practices, has not yet been made widely and readily available. The problem is not merely that there are too few translations of basic documents into other languages, but that there are serious deficiencies in the available documentation.

International law outside of the treaty field develops largely through the convergence of practices on the part of states. But those practices must first be stated, explained and publicized. Hitherto, this task has been largely performed by a small number of Western States. The statements of international law best known to the world today still bear their imprimatur. The development of an international law recognized in all quarters to be universal will require vast cooperative efforts on the part of all nations.

The present recommendation is submitted with a view to encouraging such an effort. The United Nations, acting in cooperation with the governments of individual nations, is a suitable instrument for the undertaking. What is required is a systematic compilation and digest of materials which reveal the existing practices of states, supplemented by periodic reports on current developments in the field. The Committee contemplates that each government would be asked to submit evidence of its own practices for inclusion in the periodic and cumulative reports. These materials would be translated into various languages and made available to governments, libraries, and scholars throughout the world. The reporter system of compilations and digest could be developed, maintained on an up-to-date basis and disseminated worldwide by the use of modern technology. Available government and university expertise could aid in this program.

The Committee recognizes that particular states may not always be prepared to state their own positions on matters of international law. The proposed United Nations reporter system would nonetheless provide helpful legal points of view and practices already adopted by many states. By setting forth in systematic form the cumulative legal experience of states willing to contribute, the United Nations reporter system would encourage the emergence of a universal legal consensus, and would thereby contribute significantly to the development of international law.

5. That the United States ratify the United Nations and the World Bank Arbitration Conventions.

The United Nations Arbitration Convention of 1958 and the recent World Bank Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes reflect an increasing reliance on the legal device of arbitration for settling disputes. The United States has not signed the U.N. Arbitration Convention; it has signed the World Bank Convention. The committee believes that ratification by the United States of both conventions would constitute a progressive step in the development of international law.

The U.N. Convention would, in essence, require the courts of one state to recognize and enforce arbitral awards made in the territory of another state. Although the Convention is not limited to commercial disputes, it authorizes reservations by a state so as to limit the application of the Convention to awards which it considers to have arisen from commercial matters.

The World Bank Convention would establish an autonomous international institution, to be known as the International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes. The Center would maintain panels of impartial conciliators and arbitrators to settle disputes which both parties—a state and a national of another state—have consented to submit to the jurisdiction of the Center. An arbitral tribunal constituted under the provisions of the Convention would be required to apply the law agreed upon by the parties. Every contracting state would be required to recognize the award of such a tribunal as binding and to enforce it as if it were a final decision of a domestic court.

At the present time, the enforcibility of international arbitral awards is uncertain, mainly because of discrepancies in, the controlling law of various jurisdictions. The basic obligation of each State to recognize international arbitral awards as binding and to enforce them in accordance with its usual rules of procedure is a major advance in international law which these conventions would effect.

The Committee believes, moreover, that the United States could meet the obligations imposed under both Conventions without disrupting Federal-State relationships through the enactment of appropriate implementing Federal legislation based largely on the commerce clause of the Constitution. Such legislation would give the Federal courts exclusive jurisdiction over the recognition and enforcement of arbitral agreements and awards covered by either Convention, and allow a defendant who properly raised the issue in an action brought in a State court to remove the case to a Federal court which would be empowered to stay the State court proceeding.

6. That the United States ratify the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union.

From the standpoint of the development of international law, the proposed United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Convention, now pending before the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification, is its "notification and access" provision. Each Government would be obliged to notify the other within 3 days of the arrest of any of its citizens and to afford access by officials of his Government to the arrested person within 4 days of arrest.

A developing feature of international law is the right of citizens of one state in the territory of another to have the protection of their governments in the event that they are subjected to arrest. Recognition of this right by the governments of the two most powerful states would represent an important step in the advance of international law and could lead to other advances on the part of each in their relations with the other.

Ratification of the Convention would redound especially to the benefit of the United States. The United States has frequently encountered difficulties in trying to aid American citizens who have been arrested or detained in the Soviet Union. Last year, moreover, 20,000 American tourists went to the Soviet Union, compared with slightly over 1,000 Soviet citizens who came to the United States. The United States therefore has more to gain than lose, practically speaking, from a provision which accords legal protection to citizens of each country while traveling in the other.

It has been urged in some quarters that ratification of the Consular Convention would increase the capacity of the Soviet Union to conduct espionage in the United States. The Committee notes that the Secretary of State, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 30, 1965, stated that the Consular Convention would not materially affect the problem of Communist espionage and subversion.

7. That the United States endorse the establishment of a court for the adjudication of lower level international disputes.

The absence of a simple, effective and readily accessible court to resolve lower level international disputes is a significant defect in the present international legal system. Numerous disputes arise which are not considered important enough to be referred to the International Court of Justice. The structure and history of the International Court of Justice show that it was designed to handle only cases of the highest importance. The potential utility of a court to resolve these lower level disagreements is suggested by the rapid expansion of the relations between States. Such a court could handle certain disputes which are a cause of friction because they cannot readily be solved through diplomatic channels. A lower level court would be of value to both legal and political officers of governments. The type of court envisaged would merit the respect of practicing lawyers. It should appeal to political officers because it would provide them with a practical optional means for resolving disputes which is not now available.

A formula for jurisdiction which would permit a realistic treatment of international disputes where informal methods of settlement are considered inadequate might therefore be as follows: (1) In disputes in which a settlement would involve a monetary or property transfer type result, there would exist a presumption that recourse would be had to the tribunal when one party considers that this means of settlement is appropriate, subject to nonconcurrence by the other State; (2) In the case of disputes where a nonmonetary or nonproperty transfer result would be involved, recourse could be had to the court if the parties so desired. The distinction is the slight but significant presumption in the first category. It appears acceptable to introduce the slight pressure of such a presumption without seriously impeding the political judgment which is retained.

The most effective means by which a lower level court structure could be created is probably by a multilateral treaty, which would set out the organization, jurisdiction, and procedure of the court. At the start the number of judges should be small; other judges could be added later if desirable. Extreme care should be taken to assure the highest integrity and professional quality of judges.

A start could be made by the United States and friendly, neighboring States, such as Canada and Mexico. These States could draft a treaty establishing a court which could be easily expanded by adherences of other interested states. The structure and jurisdiction of the court should make it possible later for the court to handle cases not only between friendly neighboring states but also between a state and any other state.

Appeal from decisions of the lower court could be allowed if deemed desirable by the participating states. Various simple means for achieving appellate review can be envisaged. If states stress the importance of prompt settlement of disputes it might be thought sufficient for the court to serve, as does the International Court of Justice, as a court of first and final recourse. As a practical matter a sound court structure could function effectively with or without appeal arrangements.

The question of enforcing the judgments of the proposed court need not present a serious problem. A minimum inducement to compliance would be provided by state acceptance of the multilateral treaty creating the court. States would ratify such a treaty only if they felt that to do so was in their self-interest. Failure to abide by a court decision would risk suspension from the system. And even if implementation of a decision were refused, it would not be irreparable, since the state suffering from the grievance could turn to other available dispute-resolving devices. The time factor and the nature of the disputes suggest the desirability of relying on informal pressures to achieve compliance.

The establishment of a lower level court system would be a first step in the development of a strong overall system. It would not interfere with the functioning of existing institutions but would complement their efforts by filling a gap in the present system. It could start out independent of the U.N. and International Court of Justice and later become linked with them if that proved to be desirable. The law to be applied by the court, the rules of procedure to be adopted, and other important points could be agreed upon in the treaty creating the court.

GOVERNMENT CONSULTANTS

Norbert A. Schlei, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice.

Leonard C. Meeker, Legal Adviser, Department of State.

Lee Loevinger, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission.

Thomas L. Farmer, General Counsel, Agency for International Development.

Fred B. Smith, Acting General Counsel, Department of the Treasury.

Leon Ulman, Second Assistant, Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, BEFORE THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, NOVEMBER 28 TO DECEMBER 1, 1965

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

James N. Hyde, Chairman; counselor at law.

Donald Straus, president, American Arbitration Association.

Kenneth Boulding, professor of economics, University of Michigan.

SUMMARY

The peaceful settlement of international disputes has proved a perpetual challenge, because of the inability of international organization to regulate some of the most vital questions of peace and war. The two main approaches to this problem here suggested call for the combined efforts and insights of the Government official with his responsibility for deciding on policy alternatives; the scholar and expert outside Government whose approach may be that of historical research or the conceptual framework into which the policy decision fits; and both groups as they consider the obligations of states as members of the United Nations and its procedures as methods for carrying out policy decisions. It is fully recognized that some states do not consider the peaceful solution of a dispute is in their national interest.

The first approach is the development and maintenance of United Nations procedures, and continuing study under the auspices of the General Assembly of the process of peaceful settlement as a charter obligation. Such study would draw together the views of the many states who have become United Nations members since the last such studies in 1950. Especially useful are third-party institutions for objective development of facts, and the mediator to suggest paths of settlement. In negotiations looking toward a permanent settlement, a panel of mediators appointed by the Secretary General is recommended, reconstituting and emphasizing the rarely used Panel for Inquiry and Conciliation created by the General Assembly 15 years ago. The importance of flexibility in the instructions of mediators and the timing of their activities and reports is also developed. One indication of a well-ordered community is the use of judicial methods for settling disputes. Wider use of the International Court of Justice is to be encouraged. One move toward such wider use would be withdrawal by the United States of its own self-judging reservation to the Court's compulsory jurisdiction. While these procedural alternatives are not new, they are available, should be practical for use, and well understood by states. United Nations members have a charter obligation first of all to seek a solution by one or more of the peaceful alternatives.

But there remains the hard question of settlement of a dispute when the policy of one party involved is to keep the dispute unresolved, to apply the direct or covert use of force or subversion, or to dictate a unilateral solution. The procedures outlined do not of themselves provide response to such a policy. In some cases, such a policy may be drawn in part from a disputant's very different conceptual approach to international organization from that here developed. Long-term attention should be given to the conceptual framework for policy decisions. The General Assembly as part of its studies might consider the art of mediation and the extent to which the experience in handling labor disputes within a State can be transferred to the handling of international disputes.

The second approach, a continuing conceptual study involving a dialog of the Government decisionmaker and the scholar is an investment likely to produce insights about the nature of existing international systems. It suggests a learning process about the need for peaceful change and could demonstrate the common interest of states, even those with differing values, in this process over the long term. This is an approach and not an answer. It suggests looking beyond the familiar to some of the new ideas of the social sciences, thus drawing on a wider area of scholars. Such a study would develop possible classifications of types of disputes, relating them to overall relations between the states involves. It would examine psychological factors, such as how each party sees a dispute and its own role in it. This has been called the reality image. Suggested investigation should range from historical research so organized as to provide data for new measurement techniques, to the more experimental techniques of the social sciences, including simulation techniques and construction of models. The study would necessarily involve a critical examination of assumptions about the United Nations, such as the effect, if any, of its economic and social activities on its political activities, and the nature of the concept of self-determination in relation to lasting political settlements. Research would include the broad concept of stable peace as a problem of social systems.

Here, then, is a task for the present—the strengthening of procedures for peaceful settlement and for the next two decades, if so much time is given—the conceptual study of organized society. This task deserves all the wisdom and vision which can be brought to bear on it.

INTRODUCTION

The ability of mankind to settle its disputes peacefully is neither a Utopian dream nor is it an established reality. It is a skill which man learns slowly in the course of his development and progress toward maturity. Over the long term of history man moves toward the things that pay off for him; and the development of skill in the peaceful settlement of disputes has enormous payoffs. In the absence of this skill, man falls continually into wasteful uses of his resources, into unprofitable and unmanageable conflict which stops his development. The increase of skill in the peaceful settlement of disputes, therefore, is an essential part of the whole development process of mankind, by which he learns to expand to his full capacities.

One must, therefore, see disputes themselves as part of that long teaching process by which the world teaches us to be more fully human. There are two sides to this learning process. One is the development of what might be called mature conflict behavior on the part of the parties themselves. This is the sort of thing that we see in the development of "security communities" such as between the United States, Canada, and the British Commonwealth after 1817, or among the Scandinavian countries, and now, it is to be hoped, in the whole Atlantic area. The most fundamental element in the development of mature conflict behavior is the learning of longsightedness, and the realization that a decision which may result in a temporary benefit at the cost of someone else can easily result in a long-term loss. Critical difficulties and interruptions in the developmental process can occur when one party is longsighted and the other shortsighted, for unfortunately long-sightedness in one does not always produce the appropriate response in the other. This points up the need for the second process, which is the development of third-party institutions, the law, the courts, the police, the conciliator, the mediator, the marriage counselor, and the United Nations. These operate mainly by increasing the penalties for shortsightedness, by mustering the forces of society against those who break the social contract. In the international system one sees a steady rise in the third-party institutions representing the larger community of mankind, as it is embodied today in the United Nations. The United Nations itself, however weak as an institution, nevertheless represents the legitimacy of the future and the hopes of the planet.

If it were to die, something new would have to be erected on its grave.

As this report suggests, the actual task of learning skills of peaceful settlement is difficult, and there is still a very long way to go. We are convinced, however, that there is somewhere to go, and that we must seek the path, for unless man learns the skills of peaceful settlement, it is likely that his tenure on earth will be short.

One goal of the United States is the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Yet how to approach this is a most stubborn question which has been a perpetual challenge—the inability of the international sector of law and organization to regulate most vital questions of peace and war, with the unregulated use of force a constant threat. With some disputes, the understanding and the availability of procedural alternatives may be sufficient to invite their use. Also, there should be emphasis upon the treaty obligations of members of international organizations, regional, self-defense and United Nations systems to resort to these alternatives. With some of the wide controversies of a world in revolution, particularly in relation to the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China, a specific dispute must be considered in relation to an overall conflict of aims and of interests, the conceptual approach of both sides, and the extent of willingness of all parties to resort to peaceful methods of control or settlement.

It is here that something more than a traditional examination of the instances of conflict resolution by international organizations is required. Insights into the process of conflict resolution may involve a continuing dialog between the Government decisionmaker and the scholar. This is the first side of the learning process referred to above.

In considering the potentialities of the United Nations this report examines the second side of the learning process and the usefulness, if possible, of broadening its ability to deal with a wider range of controversies. Where there is a disposition by parties to adjust their dispute, the technical procedures should be ready and their use understood. This report proceeds on the basis that international organization in general and the United Nations complex in particular have a practical relation to any long-term approach to conflict resolution. The procedures for pacific settlement are themselves more than policy alternatives available to states minded to use them; they have become an imperative of any community of states.

To formulate the goal of the pacific settlement of disputes without carefully considering how this is or may represent a political reality with which responsible decisionmakers must be concerned would be an unreal approach. The procedural suggestions and discussion which follow form only one approach. Another is to be found in the view developed below that assumptions made on the basis of past United Nations experience need reexamination, and that there is more to be learned by the decisionmakers in government and by the academic community about the nature and dynamics of conflict resolution and control. Therefore, there should he a heightened and continuing dialog between government officials and those working in the social sciences. This conceptual approach does not guarantee an answer to the hard question, but it will involve a critical examination and articulation of assumptions through which the reality of international organization and its procedures can be tested.

This report has not attempted to focus on current political crises and the policy questions they present, the gravity of which is fully appreciated. But the approaches suggested have some relevance to these crises. This report is rather an attempt to organize and develop ideas considered in meetings of the Committee, and by others consulted both inside and outside government.

It is not suggested that the answers to some of the hard questions are to be found in these pages, but methods for working at possible answers are suggested, and ways of drawing on new insights and ideas about conflict resolution. At several points the importance of such concepts has been mentioned because it may be determined that some of the most stubborn conflicts involve an idea versus the use of force.

While the potentialities of United Nations political organs are not the only possibilities in the peaceful adjustment of international controversies, this report proceeds from the conclusion that it is important to consider methods of making United Nations procedures both available and effective.

In addition to the obligations of states as parties to the charter, the existence and experience of the organization is a positive fact which has some degree of usefulness for the future. This is an appropriate time to examine in a realistic way what precisely the potentialities are.

BACKGROUND

Peaceful settlement as a method of conflict control and resolution—its relation to the regulated and unregulated use of force

As a political process, conflict resolution and control involve considerations in addition to any procedures which states may use for the adjustment of a particular controversy. Therefore, after considering the practical procedures which exist or may be created in international organizations which may facilitate peaceful settlement, a longer study of the conceptual nature of this process will be outlined.

In some current discussions the term "peacekeeping" has been used to include those situations in which contingents of national forces have been used under the general plan or authority of a United Nations organ, as means of enforcing a cease-fire or stabilizing a situation for which no permanent political settlement is in prospect because of the unwillingness of the parties to agree on one. The phrase can thus be extended to cover all conciliatory and mediatory processes which are not mainly directed at seeking, with the consent of the parties directly involved, a permanent settlement. Hence, there may be some overlap with the report of the ICY Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. This report on peaceful settlement ranges over procedures for conflict control and resolution and is not limited to those measures where the consent of the parties immediately concerned is obtainable. Of course, insofar as United Nations members are involved, the very fact of membership represents their consent to the use of the procedures provided in the charter, particularly chapter VI. The practical meaning and effect of these provisions are to be given realistic consideration.

The procedures for peaceful settlement are included in the language of article 33 of the charter: negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means chosen by the parties to a dispute.

United Nations members have an obligation "first of all" to attempt one or more of these peaceful methods. Yet there have been instances where a state, seeing a threat to its national security or responding to an armed attack, has resorted to the use of force. This report will not go into the implications of article 51 of the charter and the use of force in individual or collective self-defense before recourse to the Security Council. It is to be noted that this subject deserves detailed analysis, including the concept that any United Nations remedy be exhausted before any resort to force. Nor will this report consider the use of force in relation to the theory of intervention as defined in the Charter of the Organization of American States. These important policy matters are closely related to current cases. Yet from the use of force in such cases it clearly does not follow that the obligation of a state to seek a peaceful solution is at an end. Nor in such cases are peaceful settlement procedures to be considered unrealistic alternatives to the use of force in conflict resolution. It thus is a misapprehension to see negotiation and force as alternatives. U.S. policymakers have not posed these alternatives. In the case of Korea it was the U.S. position that the use of force for the self-defense of an ally was a prelude to the negotiating process looking toward the control of the controversy in response to an attack.[1]

Thus the peaceful settlement procedures are a continuing obligation when force is being used. It is recognized that in the Korean case the collective defense was a U.N. operation based on Security Council resolutions. The posing of the alternative of force or negotiation is a potentially dangerous oversimplification, and absolutes do not exist in international relations.

A sophisticated and realistic assessment of the political realities of pacific settlement necessarily involves the most careful consideration and use of the intangible but important power of public opinion to be mobilized in support of the control of international controversies. Therefore, a critical reexamination is proposed of various major premises in the thinking about U.S. participation in international organizations which have as their concern collective security and pacific settlement. As an introduction to such a reexamination, the views of Dean Rusk, when Assistant Secretary of State for U.N. Affairs, contain ideas that remain as relevant today as at the time at which he stated them in the context of the Palestine situation in 1948.

---

[1] Goodrich, "Study of U.S. Policy in Korea" (1956).

"Some have stated that the United Nations is helpless in maintaining peace because it has no police force and that the result is excessive and fruitless debate. That conclusion is tempting but a little naive. A realistic assessment of the proper role of force and negotiation in the settlement of disputes will show that a readily available police force is not necessarily a magical panacea. Disputes come about in situations where emotions are high, where public opinion is inflamed, where national prestige has been engaged, and where the parties have made commitments from which it is difficult for them to extricate themselves. The role of negotiation and debate is to reduce the fever, to find common points of agreement, to introduce the calming effect of impartial opinion, to mobilize world opinion against the overreaching and excessive view, to bring the contestants into direct touch with each other, to allow public opinion in the disputing countries to subside and to place upon the United Nations as a group political responsibility for results for which the parties could not readily accept political responsibility." [2]

Thus the body of ideas developed in the United Nations as strictures on the use of force may be interpreted as the growth of the notion of legitimacy in opposition to war.

The nature and range of disputes

Before considering methods of dispute settlement, it is useful to consider the spectrum of widely differing types. This outline is not an attempt at definitive classification, but some distinctions may be noted. These distinctions may suggest differing methods of handling disputes. They also may throw light on how and why a particular dispute develops and the relationship between peaceful and nonpeaceful approaches to it. This involves a consideration of the presence or absence of shared values among the disputants, and the relation of a particular dispute to any overall conflict situation.[3]

Disputes may be approached by considering who are the parties in interest. The classic controversies between States may have easily identifiable parties, but where a State is faced with what has come to be known as indirect aggression, or what the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China call a war of liberation, the identity of the parties may itself be an issue of fact. Of course, a dispute may well have more than two easily identifiable parties. It may involve individual governments or groupings of governments, including alliances, neighboring governments or widely separated ones; friendly, neutral and hostile governments; ideologically similar or opposed governments. Also the parties may not all necessarily be governments or alliances, but may include an international organization or a private person or organization.

Then one may consider the nature or quality of the dispute. It may be a comparatively small technical controversy such as the dispute between the United Kingdom and France over islets in the English Channel which the parties put before the International Court for decision. It may be a long-term controversy concerning territory for which the prospects of settlement seem remote, but which is in suspense as a result of the parties' acceptance of control measures. The India-Pakistan dispute over Kashmir was in this situation for over 15 years. A dispute may be one specific of the East-West struggle, such as Berlin, or it may be a controversy involving the rising imperialist policy of the Peoples Republic of China toward the West.

A more detailed classification would include disputes arising out of the violations of the rights of the nationals of one party by others, disputes arising out of alleged violation of international legal obligations such as arms control arrangements, conventions governing trade relations, the United Nations Charter or conventional international law.

In evaluating the intensity of disputes, the differentiating character is the extent to which the issues have or have not engaged the commitment of the parties, or have or have not become important in their domestic politics, thus rendering adjustment difficult for the executive branches of the government parties. This is a distinguishing characteristic of disputes arising out of major political or ideological causes, which may take one or more of the forms described above.

The degree of intensity of a dispute is likely to affect what the parties will recognize as alternative methods of control or settlement. This involves their respective images of the dispute and of their own roles in relation to it. One or more parties to a controversy may seek a range of peaceful alternatives whereas another party may see its own national interests or aspirations leading it inevitably to the use of force unregulated by international organization, or leading toward keeping the dispute active and unresolved.

These suggested classification approaches are helpful in suggesting the range of disputes and also criteria for critical evaluation of generalizations which may apply to one type of dispute but not another. However, this should not be taken as a rigid classification and thus meaningful in itself. This report has not attempted to describe cases illustrative of these variables, but such data would form one line of study in the continuing approach suggested in one of the recommendations. It is clear that a combination of these variables is to be found in a concrete dispute upon which the decisionmakers must concentrate.

International organization, its nature and possibilities for growth

The present posture of the United Nations, with some states or regimes not members, the recent political crisis over financing, and the long history of the veto of collective security and peaceful settlement resolutions in the Security Council, might suggest concentrating on regional organizations. However, this report is based on the conclusion that United Nations political processes remain worthy of serious consideration and contain present and potential reality. Since the days of San Francisco in 1945 one can discern several policies for the political organization of the world: spheres of influence for the United States and the U.S.S.R., often suggested by the latter, regional collective security organizations, and the United Nations operating on the basis of some ad hoc degree of unity between the United States and the U.S.S.R. Now the situation is further complicated by the rise in power of the Peoples Republic of China, not now a member of any formal international organization. As one reviews United Nations potentialities, these considerations are all to be borne in mind.

If the United Nations is to develop in the political area of peace keeping and peaceful settlement on the widest basis, this will involve some degree of tough bargaining with the Soviet Union and the sort of great power unity resulting from such a process. It will also involve points of contact with the Peoples Republic of China to draw it into a dialog on conflicts to which it is a party. The United Nations will live if the great powers and small states see it as useful and important to their own national interests and therefore use its procedures. To the extent that the organization reflects world opinion, it will be increasingly difficult for any power great or small to ignore its processes.

The United Nations must have a continuing relation to reality. It must have a growth factor in that its financial needs for administration and for operation must be secure. But it has reality for small states, as Dag Hammarskjöld observed more than once, and it has stood for an element of legitimacy in a world of disorder, offering the place and the means for hammering out peaceful change as the alternative to the unregulated use of force and subversion. These considerations enter into any realistic assessment, weighing the current organizational crisis.

Therefore, it is concluded that it is in the interest of the United States to lend its support to the maintenance of a political role for the United Nations in conflict resolution. At the same time it is recognized that initiatives looking toward conflict resolution by peaceful means may in some instances involve initiative outside the United Nations.[4]

Given the present situation of the United Nations, one must of necessity go behind myth and hope to see what the organization has to offer to member states and others in handling those conflicts of national interest which are inevitable. McGeorge Bundy told the ICY National Citizens Committee at its first working meeting that in his view the notion of international cooperation is not essentially good or right just because it is international or because it is cooperation. He considered there is force in the argument that there are disputes and that there are various ways of settling them. Thus, he warned against putting more weight on a pattern of cooperation than it is able to carry. His point of view was thus an invitation to undertake this sort of examination.[5] An English commentator[6] has concluded that after 20 years nations have a hazy idea of what the United Nations is really for, and whether they really need it. It has just about "run out of gush" and the case for keeping it going or enlarging it has to be argued matter-of-factly.

In the area of peaceful settlement, the organization has a record and some capabilities that are generally understood. The forum and the meeting place for quiet diplomacy represent realities for the control of conflicts in a world in revolution where ideas as well as subversion by military means are weapons. Nor lightly to be vacated is a meeting place with representatives of the new states of Asia and Africa.

How the United Nations process can be used as something more than propaganda can be seen from the discussion of parliamentary diplomacy and quiet diplomacy by

---

[2] "Universal, Regional and Bilateral Patterns of International Organization," Department of State bulletin, Apr. 3, 1950, p. 529.

[3] See Fisher: "Fractionating Conflict," Daedalus, summer 1964, and another version as a chapter in "International Conflict and Behavioral Sciences: The Craigville Papers" (1964); cf. Finkelstein: "Comments on Fractionating Conflict," Daedalus, summer 1964.

[4] Bloomfield, "The U.N. and National Security," Foreign Affairs, July 1958, p. 597; Fulbright, "For a Concert of Free Nations," Foreign Affairs, October 1961, p. 1, 4.

[5] State Department bulletin, Apr. 19, 1965, pp. 562, 564.

[6] Boyd, "The U.N. at Twenty," the Economist 3–9, April 1965, p. 39.

Dean Rusk,[7] Philip C. Jessup,[8] and Dag Hammarskjöld in the midfifties. Their approach is relevant today in considering United Nations potentialities. Rusk defined parliamentary diplomacy as a type of multilateral negotiation containing at least four factors: (1) a continuing organization with interest and responsibilities; (2) regular public debate exposed to the mass media of communication; (3) rules of procedure; and (4) formal conclusions ordinarily expressed in a resolution. Jessup applied this analysis to a series of political controversies in the United Nations.

About the same time Hammarskjöld[9] suggested that the United Nations should develop to give greater emphasis to itself as an instrument for the negotiation of settlement, rather than as a forum to debate the issues. He pointed out that the charter does not envisage settlements imposed by force. But the obligations of states to settle their disputes by peaceful means does not mean that the principles of justice and international law are to be discarded. He saw the charter as emphasizing the obligation of peaceful negotiation in which the full weight of world community under charter principles is brought to bear on an issue.

FUTURE GOALS: METHODS OF APPROACH

Peaceful settlement is approached with frank recognition that permanent settlements have proved difficult tasks for United Nations bodies and there are but few to which one may point. Two main methods of approach are here suggested involving several related specific recommendations:

A. Developing and maintaining United Nations procedures for peaceful settlement: (1) Strengthening United Nations facilities; (2) insuring the availability of skilled and experienced mediators.

B. Longer term studies involving the government decisionmaker and those outside government: (1) Continuing study of the art of mediation; (2) conceptual approaches to conflict resolution including experimental approaches in the social sciences.

A. Strengthening United Nations facilities

In general, the procedures or methods of peaceful settlement have been under study throughout the life of the United Nations, and no radical new ideas or suggestions have evolved. The problem is to provide available alternative peaceful methods, all of which have in common the notion of an impartial third party working with the parties to a controversy to get the facts on the table and, if possible, the parties around the table, and then to work first of all for a deflation and stabilization of the controversy and, if practicable, toward a long-term solution. Yet, as suggested above, it may not be easy in a local war to determine who the parties are. As part of the negotiating situation there is the constant charter obligation of United Nations members to exhaust one or more of the alternative methods of peaceful settlement mentioned in article 33.

A flexible approach to methods is preferable to any attempt to define a step-by-step approach to what the parties to a controversy should do. Here some insights which may be developed through the approaches to be suggested for long-term study, such as the analogies to dispute settlement in labor disputes, can be distinctly useful.

Article 13 (1.a.) of the United Nations Charter provides that the General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international cooperation in the political field. Within this context, in 1948–50 the Interim Committee of the General Assembly undertook studies in the field of pacific settlement which involved the United Nations delegate, as a diplomat, looking beyond current controversy to questions of methods. The U.S.S.R. boycotted the Interim Committee and its active life ended when the 1950 Uniting for Peace resolution asserted a broader role for the Assembly. Yet the studies were valuable because they involved diplomatic representatives in the types of questions on which this report will make recommendations. The studies analyzed the manner in which United Nations commissions and individual negotiators had operated. Consideration was given to United Nations procedures in relation to those of regional organizations. Out of the analysis the Interim Committee's Peaceful Settlement subcommittee proceeded to make recommendations.

A majority of members of the United Nations have joined the organization since these 1950 studies. It would be appropriate and useful for the General Assembly, with this increased membership, to pursue the consideration of peaceful settlements under the mandate of article 13 (1.a.) in seeking more fruitful United Nations approaches. Such a new approach would provide an opportunity to weight what has been learned about conflict resolution in the last fifteen years and to plan initiatives for the next fifteen. How most effectively to organize these tasks is beyond the scope of this Report. The General Assembly in considering a smaller more expert body may well look to the new United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) or to a special committee.

An examination of United Nations experience of its first 20 years suggests the following general conclusions:

1. The unique third-party role of the Secretary General, with his explicit and implied powers under article 99 of the charter.

2. The value, in conflict situations in which the emphasis is on achieving a settlement, of the single U.N. mediator—as against the intergovernmental U.N. commission.

3. The utility, in situations in which the emphasis is on impartial factfinding, of the three-member commission.

4. The desirability in many conflict situations of allowing the U.N. mediator flexibility in the timing of his report to the political organ.

5. The need for more frequent use by U.N. political organs of the power given in article 37 to recommend the terms of settlement.

These conclusions indicate a general development of the U.N. peaceful settlement process toward greater use of the Secretary-General and of other skilled individuals, and of these U.N. representatives having more flexibility than in the past in their relations with the appointing organ. The exceptions to these general conclusions probably lie principally in situations in which fact-finding is the primary U.N. objective. Here fixed timetables are frequently essential, and utilizing three-member commissions can add to the authority and political weight of a report.

Methods for third-party elucidation of facts have at least two purposes. They can provide a surveillance of trouble spots, a sort of distant early warning service; and they can provide reliable background, distinct from self-serving declarations of the parties, on the basis of which the mediatory process can proceed. Otherwise the dispute may be destined to remain in an atmosphere of more general hostility. There have been uses of these methods by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretary-General. In situations of indirect aggression, with which the United Nations may be called to deal with increasing frequency the evident authority and impartiality of a report is an important factor.

This experience has been transferred into United Nations procedure from the League of Nations as the system of having a rapporteur[10] to relieve a political organ from having to act on the uncorroborated statements of the disputants or their partisans. The organ handling a dispute should have a report as objective as possible covering the essential facts at issue and the position of the disputants. This is an essential first step. Therefore, this report recommends the development and use of this fact-finding device.

In practice, preliminary fact elucidation may involve delicate questions of national sovereignty of member states, as opposed to community interest in involvement of United Nations peaceful adjustment procedures to anticipate an unregulated use of force. As part of a continuing study of United Nations capabilities, procedures of this sort need attention.[11]

This study of United Nations experience also suggests the usefulness of the political organs more frequently than in the past, recommending terms of settlement. In certain cases this might mean supporting the recommendations of a special representative or a rapporteur previously appointed. In other situations the political organ might develop its own recommendations, with the assistance of a rapporteur. In either case, such action could have the effect of marshaling international political opinion around a particular form of settlement. General Assembly action in 1947, recommending a partition of Palestine, while not taken under article 37, was essentially of this character.

The development of international law is under study by another committee, but it may be noted that the procedures here being discussed themselves constitute one method by which law is developed by United Nations political organs. The legal ingredient in political procedures and decisions deserves attention, as does its absence from such decisions.[12]

---

[7] Rusk, "Parliamentary Diplomacy—Debate versus Negotiation," World Affairs Interpreter, summer 1955, pp. 121, 124:

"Certain of these questions are involved with popular myths which are growing up, myths which impose burdens upon and restrict the freedom of action of those who are responsible for the conduct of your foreign affairs. There is an impression that negotiation means appeasement. The impression that vigorous debate means positive action, the impression that a favorable vote is itself a diplomatic victory, and the impression that it is a useful thing to 'know where we are' and to 'cause others to stand up and be counted'."

[8] Jessup, "Parliamentary Diplomacy—An Examination of the Legal Quality of the Rules of Procedure of Organs of the United Nations," Hague Academy of International Law, Recueil Des Cours 1956, p. 185, et seq.

[9] Foote, "Dag Hammarskjöld/Servant of Peace—A Selection of His Speeches and Statements," Introduction to his annual report to the General Assembly 1955–56, the "Role of the U.N. in the Changing World," pp. 120–122.

[10] B. V. Cohen, "The United Nations in Its 20th Year," David Niles Memorial Lecture, Hebrew University, Apr. 27, 1965. Adapted in the New Republic, May 8, 1965, p. 13.

Gardner, "The Development of the Peace-Keeping Capacity of the United Nations," Proceedings ASIL 1963 pp. 224 231; republished in "Pursuit of World Order" (1964).

Jackson, "Developing the Peaceful Settlement Functions of the United Nations," Annals American Academy of Political and Social Science November 1954 p. 27.

Wilcox and Marcy "Proposals for Changes in the United Nations" ch. V. "Peaceful Settlement of Disputes" p. 124 (1955).

Hyde, J. N. "Peaceful Settlement: A Survey of the Studies of the Interim Committee of the General Assembly International Conciliation," October 1948.

"The Development of Procedures for the Peaceful Adjustment of Disputes" Ninth Report, Commission To Study the Organization of the Peace, August 1955, p. 153.

[11] See: Gross, "The United Nations Structure for Peace," "Peace Observation and Enforcement," pp. 75–80 (1962).

While the great and dangerous struggles of our day do not lend themselves to the processes of judicial settlement, the International Court of Justice has resolved a considerable number of disputes between nations. Nor has the lack of sanctions prevented compliance with the decisions of the Court in these cases. Yet the number of such disputes submitted to any international adjudication is still too small. More nations could submit to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, and then it is likely that the Court would be used more frequently. One of the indications of a well-ordered community is the judicial settlement of disputes. Therefore, this report recommends that the United States withdraw the self-judging reservation to its own acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court as a move toward the wider use of the Court.

International arbitration by special tribunals is not to be overlooked. There are various instances in which states have requested the President of the Court to assist in the selection of a member for an arbitral tribunal. Also the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in essence a panel of arbitrators with a secretariat and certain rules of procedures, has provided facilities for such arbitration between states. Both the President of the Court and the procedures of the Permanent Court of Arbitration have also assisted in the judicial settlement of international commercial transactions, in which one party is a state.

These are all important inter-related procedures for the judicial settlement of controversies in the international sector.

It is also appropriate to mention the settlement of disputes between commercial enterprises of different nationalities. The voluntary use of arbitration by the parties to such disputes has been one of the most effective means of their settlement. However, broader use of this procedure has been handicapped by the absence of international agreements making such awards enforceable. There are now 31 States parties to a 1958 Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards. Accession to this Convention by the United States without further delay is likely to add to its effectiveness.

Insuring the Availability of Skilled and Experienced Mediators

Without here drawing technical distinctions between mediation and conciliation, it is through these processes that the skills and, indeed, the art of a disinterested individual (or body) can be brought to bear in a conflict situation. The mediator or conciliator can lead the parties toward stabilization and perhaps settlement. Several persons consulted had knowledge and personal experience with this process in the area of labor mediation and international mediation. They have for some years studied possible analogies to be drawn from the settlement of domestic labor disputes and international disputes. Therefore, this approach is emphasized at several points in this report. It is an obvious advantage to have available a group of persons of whose background something is known, who are available as mediators and conciliators. Such persons, usually recruited as need arises, have assisted each United Nations Secretary-General with his heavy negotiation load.

Early in the Interim Committee study of peaceful settlement, it recommended the creation of a panel for inquiry and conciliation. That proposal, as adopted by the General Assembly, provided for a list of persons nominated by governments but who might be called to act in a personal capacity. The United States has let its own nominations expire. The panel has only been used on one occasion. Nominations to this panel by governments have been uneven.

This report recommends that the Panel receive added emphasis in the organizational structure of the United Nations. On the basis of consultations by the committee, it is recommended that the Panel be reconstituted with appointments to be made by the Secretary-General rather than by member states. Appointments to the Panel could be for 2 or 3 years, with those appointed indicating in advance an intention, if possible, to be available for missions of mediation or conciliation—at the call of the Secretary-General, the Security Council, or the General Assembly. The Panel could be limited to 30 persons in any one year. Appointments to the Panel should be from those who have already demonstrated their skill in dispute settlement and who, as a result of these and other activities, have been given responsibilities involving public leadership and trust. The presidents of the five preceding General Assemblies should each year be ex-officio members of the Panel. The members of the Panel would meet once each year with the Secretary-General to consider measures for improving the ongoing peaceful settlement activities of the U.N.

No single institutional development can fully contain the resources of the United Nations community for pacific settlement. But the reconstituted Panel could provide a resource of experience personnel and a continuing focus for U.N. considerations in this field. Its formation, the availability of its members for important assignments, and its annual meeting, would help in keeping the attention of the international community centered on the possibility, and the necessity, of dispute settlement. The arrangements for the annual meeting of the Panel might be made, at the Secretary-General's request, by the U.N. Institute for Training and Research.

B. Longer term studies involving the government decisionmaker and those outside government

The hard questions of why governments do not use the peaceful alternatives discussed above and whether it is possible to lead them to do so remain to be considered. This report attempts no answer, but suggests several approaches to the goal of peaceful settlement, involving study and a two-way dialog between the decisionmaker in government and those outside, especially in the academic community, who give time and attention to the framework in which these questions may be considered.

Here one may distinguish policy, the selection of alternatives; concept, the framework or way of thinking about a social system which is the setting for a policy decision; and procedure as the instrument or method of carrying out policy. The emphasis of this report is on procedure and concept, areas where those outside Government can contribute most directly to the decisionmaking process which must remain the responsibility of the Government official in making policy choices.

The data on the history of the handling of disputes in international organizations, including the League of Nations and the United Nations, has been collected and organized by various scholars but it cannot be concluded that this task is now at an end or that the most complete use has been made of such historical research, provided it lends itself to use by those using differing techniques in its analysis.

Continuing Study of the Art of Mediation

Mediation is an art which, when combined with certain indefinable elements of trust in the mediator and effective support from the institutional setting, facilitates conflict settlement. But an art can be learned, and experience in pursuing it can usually be transmitted to others. This has proved to be the case in industrial and other disputes within national communities. To a more limited extent it has proved true in international disputes.

There is some evidence, confirmed by those with successful experience in resolving disputes in the national and international communities, that the dispute settlement process does involve a series of steps that can be defined with some precision.[13]

It is clear, however, that additional analysis of the dispute settlement process is needed. It is an area in which the variables are legion, and in which the analysis must constantly be tested against the experience of those who have been most successful in the field. There clearly are no easy answers. The sharing of experience and skills should be accelerated, in a setting in which lessons for the future can be learned.

Conceptual Approaches to Conflict Resolution Including Experimental Approaches of the Social Sciences

Continuing conceptual study may provide insights into the process of conflict resolution, especially since this involves articulating assumptions. For example, Lloyd Tree describes the relevance of psychological aspects of peaceful settlement:

"In our transactional psychology (developed principally by Hadley Cantril), we find that every individual participates in creating his own reality world. This comes about because he builds up assumptions through experience in trying to accomplish his purposes; and these assumptions vitally condition what he sees as the realities of the world in which he lives and the significance he attaches to what he thinks he perceives.

"In disputes between nations, very often what is at the basis of the disputes—or what reinforces the dispute or makes the parties more intransigent—is the differences in the reality worlds of the disputant. They simply don't see things the same way." [14]

This report thus recommends a continuing dialog between the governmental official and the academic community, because the continuing study of certain germinating ideas seems a worthwhile risk for the long term. Without attempting a comprehensive list of topics which may throw some light on the problems of the Government official who is concerned with conflict resolution and which relate to any general view of international organization; the following are suggested as important illustrations:

A critical examination of some of the premises involving the functioning of international organization in peaceful settlement:

This would be an attempt to look for preconceptions behind policy decisions. It has far broader implications than the peaceful settlement function of the United Nations. Several implicit assumptions might upon examination be found to deserve reformulation that international cooperation in nonpolitical activities leads to cooperation in political activities;[15] that the principal of the self-determination[16] of peoples is a norm of the United Nations Charter and stands for the legitimacy of peaceful change; that the history of controversies in the United Nations shows that there have been holding operations and controls, but no peaceful, i.e., long-term settlements, except perhaps in the cases of Indonesia, Greece and Iran; that economic development produces political stability; that time and delay in international conflicts is likely to have a cooling off effect; that the absence of the Peoples Republic of China from United Nations membership limits the range of controversies the U.N. may be expected to adjust; that the structure and procedures of the United Nations, including the notion of peaceful change, represent largely Western conceptual thinking. This might involve comparative studies of the approach of non-Western cultures to conflict resolution and peaceful change in their national law and administration.[17]

---

[12] Schachter, "The Relation of Law, Politics and Action in the United Nations," Hague Academy of International Law, Recueil des Cours, vol. I, 1963, p. 170.

"The Quasi-Judicial Role of the Security Council and the General Assembly," 58 AJIL 960, October 1964.

Cf. Comment of Dean Rusk on United Nations Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States, Speech before ASIL Apr. 23, 1965, Proceedings 1965, p. 247.

[13] Jackson, "Meeting of Minds," pp. 24 to 38; and ch. V (1952).

Ikle, "How Nations Negotiate" (1964).

[14] Letter to Committee Chairman from Free, Director of the Institute for International Social Research, Princeton, N.J., of which Hadley Cantril is chairman of the board (June 16, 1965).

Approaches of the social sciences:

Here one considers the social system and how conflict resolution forms part of the system. Since these are experimental approaches this quality must be weighed before determining the extent to which the process or the result is to be relied upon by the Government official with responsibility for policy decisions. However, the development and application of a framework could be a rewarding undertaking over future years of research.

One concept of research on conflict in relation to a social system has been developed by Kenneth Boulding, a member of this Committee who summarized it thus:

"The problem of stable peace is a problem in social systems, yet we persist in trying to solve it as if it were a problem in physical systems, in weapons, in armament, and in things which are merely the parameters of social systems. We have a prejudice, perhaps, against scientific research into social systems because we feel that we understand them already, that all we need is the wisdom of the politician or the diplomat or the State Department official. Unfortunately, the systems have been changing too rapidly for wisdom, for wisdom is based upon the experience of earlier years, and the system of earlier years on which this wisdom is based has totally passed away."[18]

Some of the specifics of such research might include, dynamics of communications systems in international relations; the psychological aspects of pacific settlement, including public opinion surveys;[19] the use of models and simulation techniques to improve the decisionmaking process.

This report does not attempt a recommendation on the most effective method of communication between the decisionmaker and the academic community. It should occur well in advance of the operations stage of a particular case, or as evaluation thereafter. Also a common language is important since the decisionmaker is not likely to devote time to "translation" of a special vocabulary. The general purpose would be to make it possible for the busy Government official to do more than skim academic literature. The experience of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the Department of Defense has led to a degree of continual conceptual thinking, often using the device of the 50-page or longer study in depth and the 3-page summary. Perhaps when the State Department has an investment in the particular study, its officials may be likely to turn to it. Also, this sort of collaboration can be expected to provide a reservoir in the academic community of people suitable for special Government missions. Whether the newly created Foreign Affairs Research Council[20] will play such a role depends on the extent to which it will provide a relation of give-and-take with Government decisionmakers contributing to a dialog. Reporting and condensation would not necessarily provide this role. Perhaps the National War College and the Foreign Service Institute might also be parties to such dialog.

Within the United Nations the dialog could be conducted through the facilities of the new Institute for Training and Research.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This report has evolved from meetings and consultations whose insights it has attempted to organize and interpret. No one member of the Committee necessarily accepts every notion and phrase. There is support for its general analysis and recommendations consistent with strongly held individual views and some differences on matters of emphasis.

The report recommends:

1. That the United States support the position that all states, including those not members of the United Nations, have a responsibility (a) to resort to measures of peaceful settlement before initiating the use of force in disputes in which they are involved and (b) to continue to pursue efforts at peaceful settlement even after embarking upon a justified use of force.

2. That more frequent use be made of commissions whose sole or initial responsibility would be to ascertain the facts and to report them to the political organ.

3. That more frequent use be made in U.N. organs and committees of rapporteurs who would attempt to achieve a consensus of view and report this to the organ or committee involved.

4. That the United States propose to the General Assembly that it reconstitute its Panel on Inquiry and Conciliation, with appointments made by the Secretary General of an outstanding group of approximately 30 individuals with extensive experience in mediation and conciliation. The members of the Panel would be appointed for 2- or 3-year terms and would have indicated their willingness, if possible, to be available to the Secretary General, to the Security Council, or to the General Assembly for missions of factfinding, of mediation, and of conciliation. Each year the Presidents of the preceding five General Assemblies would be ex officio members of the Panel. The members of the Panel would meet once each year with the Secretary General to consider measures for improving the ongoing peaceful settlement activities of the U.N.

5. That greater flexibility be introduced into the U.N.'s mediation process by avoiding a strict timetable for reports by those who have been assigned mediation and conciliation responsibilities.

6. That the political organs, and in particular the Security Council, make more frequent use of that provision of article 37 of the charter which permits recommendations for settlement to be made to the parties in dispute.

7. That the United States withdraw its self-judging reservation to its acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

8. That continuing emphasis and study be given to the procedures and conceptual framework of conflict resolution by peaceful means, drawing on the data of historical research, considering the potentialities of the United Nations and the approaches of the social sciences, with a view to providing insights and perspectives to parties involved in international disputes.

9. That in such study as recommended in 8 above there be a continuing dialogue between those in the Department of State with responsibility for policy decisions and those outside, especially in the academic community, engaged in this common undertaking.

GOVERNMENT CONSULTANTS

George Bunn, General Counsel, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Lawrence S. Finkelstein, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Elmore Jackson, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

Leonard C. Meeker, Legal Adviser, Department of State.

Stephen M. Schwebel, Assistant Legal Adviser, Department of State.

William E. Simkin, Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION, THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

COMMITTEE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Dr. I. I. Rabi, chairman, professor of physics, Columbia University.

Mr. Alan F. Burch, director of safety, International Union of Operating Engineers, AFL–CIO.

Dr. Melvin Calvin, professor of chemistry, University of California.

Mr. W. Kenneth Davis, vice president, Bechtel Corp.

Dr. Robert J. Hasterlik, professor, department of medicine, University of Chicago.

Dr. Alexander Hollaender, director, biology division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Mr. John R. Menke, member, board of directors, United Nuclear Corp.

Mr. Charles Robbins, executive manager and secretary, Atomic Industrial Forum.

Dr. Philip Sporn, chairman, system division committee, American Electric Power Service Corp.

Mr. William Webster, president, Yankee Atomic Electric Co.

---

[15] See Rock, "A Strategy of Interdependence—A Program for the control of Conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union," appendix "Human Behavior and Control of Conflict" (1964).

Haas, "Beyond the Nation-State: Functionalism and International Organization" (1964).

Van Wagenen, "The Concept of Community and the Future of the United Nations" International Organization, summer, p. 812 (1965).

[16] Emerson, "Self-Determination Resuscitated in the Era of Decolonization," Center for International Studies, Harvard (1964).

[17] See, for example, McDougal and Laswell, "The Identification and Appraisal of Diverse Systems of Public Order," 53 AJIL p. 1, 28 (1959).

Bozeman, "Representative Systems of Public Order Today," Proceedings, American Society of International Law, p. 10 (1959).

[18] "Is Peace Researchable?" Paper for Center for Research on Conflict Resolution, University of Michigan (undated).

[19] See footnote 14 concerning work of Cantril and Free at the Institute for International Social Research involving the sampling of public opinion;

Also Iklé, "How Nations Negotiate," introduction p. xii (1964):

"At Rand I learned that relations between modern states can be subjected to systematic analysis and calculation without at all neglecting the emotional and irrational components of human behavior."

[20] Described in Evans, "Research in Action: The Department of State's Bureau of Intelligence and Research" State Department bulletin, Aug. 30, 1965, p. 359.

For another method of liaison through a national research organization, see: Hilsman, "Planning for National Security, a Proposal" Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, May 1960, p. 93.

Dr. Walter H. Zinn, director, nuclear division, vice president, Combustion Engineering Corp.

Mr. Aston J. O'Donnell, manager of development, Bechtel Corp., committee coordinator.

This report was prepared by a committee of the National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation for presentation at the White House Conference on International Cooperation.

While preparing the report the committee had the benefit of close and continuous consultations with Government officials; the recommendations are those of the National Citizens' Commission Committee.

SUMMARY

The United States has 40 agreements for cooperation on the peaceful uses of atomic energy—with 35 nations and West Berlin and two international organizations—under which it has provided nuclear materials such as enriched uranium, heavy water, plutonium, U^{233}, and radioisotopes. Large amounts of technical and scientific information have been made available. Power reactors are being sold to countries needing economical and abundant power. Foreign students and scientists have been trained in U.S. facilities. Nevertheless, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy has found areas in which cooperation might be expanded and to which greater emphasis might be given.

Since its establishment in 1957, the International Atomic Energy Agency, with strong U.S. support, has become the focal point for international cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. One of the Agency's most important activities is application of its system of safeguards to assure that special materials provided or produced will not be used to further any military purpose. The Agency also has entered into agreements with parties cooperating in the civil uses of atomic energy to apply its safeguards to the assistance supplied. Over 20 countries cooperating with the United States have agreed to submit these arrangements to IAEA safeguards.

The Committee believes that, in light of current expanding nuclear energy programs, the greatest importance should be attached to universal adoption of IAEA safeguards against the diversion of nuclear reactors and materials used or produced in the reactors from peaceful to military purposes. It, therefore, devoted a large part of its deliberations to the question of how to make international safeguards more effective and acceptable. To date, IAEA safeguards have been found not to be unduly burdensome with respect to the operation of the Yankee atomic power reactor which the United States voluntarily placed under the IAEA safeguards system, and they are believed to be generally acceptable to American industry. The Government, industry, and labor must all seek to achieve a greater understanding of these safeguards both at home and abroad.

Nuclear powerplants appear to be economically competitive with other power sources in many situations. The committee believes that the United States should continue to promote the sale and construction of power reactors abroad to help provide economical and abundant sources of electrical energy to peoples everywhere, to aid in the conservation of reserves of conventional fuels, to aid the U.S. balance-of-payments position, and to assure that these reactors and the nuclear materials they produce will be subjected to appropriate safeguards. Radioisotope-fueled power units may be attractive in specialized applications such as remote weather stations or harbor buoys. The United States should continue its leadership in desalting of sea or brackish water by nuclear power, which adds new hope to man's quest for adequate water resources. The committee believes that IAEA or equivalent safeguards should be a requirement for the construction abroad of a dual purpose plant.

Collaboration in the field of high energy physics has been long standing and successful among the United States, Western Europe, and the Soviet Union. The scientific interest in this fundamental field is high, and the exchange of information, scientists, and research teams should be continued on an expanded scale.

The biological control of certain insect pests by radiation offers to man an opportunity to rid himself of age-old blights on his environment, which do not respect national boundaries. Accordingly, though costs may be high, and research may be long and tedious, international programs in this field should be emphasized and expanded.

After many years of research, it is beginning to appear practical to preserve food by irradiation. The committee believes the United States should offer to assist other countries in developing their own food preservation research programs.

The committee considered the Plowshare program at length. It believes that, while it would be premature to make a recommendation for a specific project under this experimental program, it would be appropriate to continue research and development and studies of possible Plowshare projects.

Though much has been done, many things remain to be done to assure that nuclear energy will not be used to the detriment of man's health and safety, and that radioactive materials may move freely and safely in international trade. The work of the IAEA in developing transportation regulations is well regarded and should be further encouraged by the United States. Assistance and advice through the IAEA on siting of reactors and reactor safety should be encouraged and the United States should stand ready to assist the Agency's efforts. The United States should also urge the IAEA to encourage its members to conduct epidemiological studies of uranium miners to hasten the day when uranium can be mined with minimal hazards.

Some countries may not be equipped or prepared to handle a serious radiation accident. The United States should not only continue to be prepared to render assistance should such an accident occur, but also support an international arrangement on assistance in the event of a serious nuclear accident.

And lastly, the Committee recommends that a more active role be undertaken by the IAEA in coordinating measurements of nuclear data and in providing for the comparison of methods of measurement. Internationally agreed upon nuclear data standards are an integral part of international cooperation in all fields of nuclear energy.

INTRODUCTION

The atomic age began on December 2, 1942, in a squash court under the stadium of the University of Chicago. On that day, a team led by Enrico Fermi, the Italian-born American physicist, was able to achieve for the first time a self-sustaining chain reaction in a nuclear reactor. This achievement was the culmination of the work of scientists in many countries over a period of almost 50 years to force the atom to release the energy stored within it.

This newly released energy was first applied only for military purposes. Men of goodwill in the United Nations and other forms sought unsuccessfully from the end of World War II to reach agreement on international control of atomic weapons. In its second decade, atomic energy entered a new phase when President Eisenhower announced the atoms for peace program with his pledge before the General Assembly of the United Nations that the United States would "devote its entire heart and mind to find a way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

This determination was reflected in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which committed the United States to international cooperation for the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy. Other countries rapidly accepted the opportunity, and the International Atomic Energy Agency, European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom), the European Nuclear Energy Agency, and the Inter-American Nuclear Energy Commission were established to develop and promote the peaceful atom. Through international cooperative efforts atomic energy began to provide tools for daily use in industry, agriculture, medicine, and research. Early in its third decade, the peaceful atom is on the verge of achieving economic electrical power from nuclear reactors.

This maturing technology and experience affords new promise of conquering some of the age-old problems of mankind, such as inadequate energy and water resources, and new achievements of far-reaching advantages, ranging from dramatic medical advances and pest control, to massive construction projects. At the same time, it poses hazards, not only because of the danger to health and safety from the uninformed use of atomic energy, but also because nuclear materials, technology, and experience useful for peaceful purposes is also to some degree applicable to military purposes.

The growth of the peaceful uses of atomic energy requires strong international as well as national regulations to protect public health and safety and to protect against the diversion of peaceful programs of materials to military purposes. From the beginning of the atoms-for-peace program, the United States has insisted on the importance of safeguards against such diversion. This position has received the support of other nations, recently including those of the Soviet bloc, in developing effective International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. It is of the utmost importance that this cooperation continue, and that the safeguards system continue to be refined and its applicability extended.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

Cooperation with international organizations

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA): Ninety-three states now belong to the International Atomic Energy Agency, a member of the United Nations family. It was established in 1957 through U.S. initiative. The purpose of the Agency is tied to the recognition that atomic energy has implications that transcend national boundaries, that atomic energy needs to be controlled and regulated, and that these controls should range from verification to prevent diversion to military use to the development of standards to protect the general public from the harmful effects of radioactivity. The Agency has also provided a forum for the development of East-West technical contacts and effective discussions. Recent U.S.S.R. support for safeguards applicable to reactors larger than 100 thermal megawatts significantly strengthens the Agency.

The United States supports the IAEA by: providing scientific and technical information; recruiting people to serve the Agency; supporting research projects; providing special nuclear materials and equipment; placing IAEA Fellows in U.S. facilities; reviewing requests to the IAEA for equipment grants; reviewing and commenting on guides and standards proposed by the Agency; and participating in IAEA sponsored conferences and symposia. Over 20 countries receiving U.S. materials or equipment (either directly or through the IAEA) have agreed to submit these arrangements to IAEA safeguards.

European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom): The two U.S. Agreements for Cooperation with Euratom, authorize the transfer of up to 70,000 kilograms of contained U^{235} and 500 kilograms of plutonium; 3,623.5 kilograms of U^{235} contained in 96,553.2 kilograms of total uranium and 11.31 kilograms of Pu have been sold or leased to Euratom through July 31, 1965.

As a corollary to the AEC-Euratom fast reactor information exchange, the United States agreed to sell Euratom for its fast reactor program about 415 kilograms of plutonium and the enriched uranium requirements of the program through 1967 (estimated at about 1,700 kilograms of U^{235}).

Among the more important formal cooperative undertakings between the United States and Euratom in implementation of the two agreements are—

Joint power reactor program: Three U.S. type power reactors (involving contracts with U.S. reactor manufacturers) have been or are being built in the community under this program (SENN–150 electrical megawatts, boiling water reactor in Italy; SENA–266 electrical megawatts, pressurized water reactor in France; KRB–237 electrical megawatts, boiling water reactor in Germany). The United States will obtain operating experience information and will supply, through sale or toll enrichment, fuel requirements for 20 years.

Joint R. & D. program: Each party will spend about $37 million for the period from 1959 through 1969 in its own territory. They will exchange all information and patent rights on this work, which is aimed primarily at the improvement of the performance of the types of reactors under the joint reactor program and at lowering fuel cycle costs.

Fast reactor information exchange: Information will be exchanged on all fast neutron reactor programs for civilian central power station application, including research and development, with which the AEC and Euratom are associated before mid-1974.

European Nuclear Energy Agency (ENEA): The main objective of the ENEA, the atomic arm of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, is to promote cooperation among the 18 European member countries in developing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The United States and Canada are associate members of the ENEA, and Euratom also takes part in its work.

Since 1958, the United States has provided experience and information related to ENEA activities. In some instances, such as the Halden project (the heavy boiling water reactor in Norway) and the Eurochemic chemical reprocessing plant in Belgium, the United States has also assigned technical personnel. The United States recently agreed to contribute three tons of heavy water to the Halden project. The United States has participated in the standing committees on reactor physics and neutron data, and has agreed to exchange neutron cross-section data and computer codes. The United States and ENEA have recently cosponsored two international seminars in the United States, at the Brookhaven and Argonne National Laboratories.

Inter-American Nuclear Energy Commission (IANEC): IANEC was established by the Council of the Organization of American States in 1959 to facilitate consultation and cooperation among the member governments in matters relating to the peaceful applications of atomic energy. The United States has provided IANEC with technical advice and assistance, and has contributed technically and financially to all five IANEC symposia.

Other: The United States cooperates closely with the World Health Organization, Pan American Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Meteorological Organization, the International Commission on Radiation Protection, the International Standards Organization, and the Centre Européen pour Recherche Nucléaire (CERN). Equipment has been provided and U.S. personnel have served these organizations in various capacities.

Transfer of nuclear materials

The AEC supplies enriched uranium for fueling reactors abroad either under appropriate bilateral agreements for cooperation or through the IAEA, with safeguards applicable to the reactor and fuel in either case. Fuel for power is usually sold, but material can be leased with a waiver of use charges for a period of time if technical or economic information of sufficient interest to the AEC is expected. Heavy water, plutonium, U^{233}, and various transplutonium elements for use in research and development projects are also sold or leased abroad.

Through June 1965, $84.6 million in revenue has been received for materials valued at $141.7 million that have been transferred. The Commission estimates the total value of materials sold or leased abroad will reach $700 million by 1970 and $8 billion by 1980.

Exchange of information

Forty major technical information exchanges have been developed. In 1965, for example, agreement was reached with the United Kingdom for extending the exchange on advanced gas-cooled reactor systems. The United States and Canada have had an active exchange on the development of heavy-water power reactors since 1960, with the United States spending $1 million a year in this country over a 10-year period in support of the Canadian program. Canada in turn has provided extensive information to the United States on the heavy-water-reactor concept. The United States and Australia have exchanged information and personnel on high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor technology since 1961.

Beneficial exchanges of visits and information have taken place under the two United States-U.S.S.R. memoranda for cooperation on utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Since 1959, the chairmen of the AEC and their Soviet counterparts have exchanged visits, and 14 scientific delegations have been exchanged in such fields as high-energy physics, controlled thermonuclear reactions, radioactive waste disposal, and power reactors. Furthermore, there have been long-term exchanges of research specialists in high-energy physics. There has also been an extensive exchange of documents.

The largest source of nuclear information the United States provides abroad are the depository libraries the AEC has distributed to 87 countries and international organizations. They are kept currently supplied with U.S. publications, and the recipients provide the United States with their publications in nuclear science and technology.

Copies of the monthly periodical, "Radiological Health Data," are distributed by the Public Health Service—Division of Radiological Health to 26 countries. From March 1964 to April 1965 the PHS–DRH distributed 165 training manuals to persons in 23 countries.

The U.S. Geological Survey provides information about USGS activities in the geological sciences, including subjects related to atomic energy, to about 630 foreign libraries or agencies on a reciprocal basis.

Training of foreign nationals

Approximately 3,000 people from 67 countries have been trained in nuclear science and technology in the United States since 1955. The Puerto Rico Nuclear Center continues to offer a specialized program for foreign nationals, but the other specialized AEC programs have been replaced by U.S. universities and domestic programs established by many of the foreign atomic energy commissions. Foreign nationals still participate in unclassified research in AEC national laboratories and other facilities as appropriate.

From 1963 to 1965, 368 nationals of 36 countries attended short PHS–DRH courses dealing with various aspects of radiological health. Foreign students also enrolled in the radiation science courses at universities supported by PHS–DRH training grants. These foreign nationals are not eligible for stipend-support under this grant program.

To date the Geological Survey has conducted, arranged, or supervised training and specialized programs for about 787 earth scientists and technical personnel from 70 countries. Forty-seven, from 15 countries, were sponsored by atomic energy organizations or had interests directly related to radioactive materials.

Sister laboratory program

This program helps a developing country which has received an AEC research reactor grant to utilize its facilities more effectively. A major research institute in the United States accepts responsibility for advising the country in planning, organizing, and executing a research reactor program, and for providing minor items of equipment not readily available. These "sister" laboratory arrangements are developed on a case-by-case basis subject to the availability of AID funds.

To date, the Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) has assisted the Turkish Cekmece Nuclear Research and Training Center and the Argonne National Laboratory has assisted the atomic energy establishments in Korea and the Republic of China. An arrangement was concluded in October 1965 between the Puerto Rico Nuclear Center and the Colombian Institute of Nuclear Affairs. In prospect are arrangements between BNL and the Democritus Center in Greece and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and the Thai atomic energy project.

Exhibits and conferences

The United States supports atomic energy exhibits abroad and participates in international scientific conferences and symposia.

Exhibits have made substantial contributions to the understanding overseas of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Major exhibits were mounted at the Geneva Conferences of 1955, 1958 and 1964. The AEC's two traveling exhibits have been shown in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America to over 5.9 million people. A new exhibit especially designed for developing nations was shown in El Salvador in February–March and in Guatemala in August–September 1965.

The conference program includes support for the three Geneva conferences and for a much larger number of smaller specialized symposia. There were 21 such symposia in 1964 covering such subjects as radiation preservation of food, marine biology, biophysics, isotopically labeled drugs, human genetics, and reactor technology. In 1965, support will be offered to approximately 35 symposia.

Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission

The ABCC is a collaborative Japanese-American enterprise to study the continuing nuclear effects on the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and their descendents. It has the support of the Japanese Ministry of Health and the cooperation of the population of the two cities. The AEC provided the National Academy of Sciences about $3,225,000 to support the project in fiscal year 1965, which consists of about 900 staff, including approximately 40 U.S. nationals. In addition the USPHS provides 7 to 8 PHS medical officers annually, and the Japanese Government provides 35 professional and administrative personnel as concrete evidence of its support.

Exchange in field of raw materials

The AEC's raw materials personnel advise friendly nations on uranium exploration and development programs, and plan to visit all major foreign developments periodically. These visits are reciprocal. The Geophysical Survey cooperates with foreign agencies, institutes, and scientists in such matters as the exploration for raw materials, joint scientific and technical studies, and in the training of foreign nationals.

Exchange of visits and assignments

There have been hundreds of exchanges of visits between U.S. Government and contractor personnel and foreign nuclear scientists. In addition, U.S. personnel receive long-term assignments to foreign nuclear projects, and foreign personnel receive similar assignments at U.S. facilities. These exchanges are made under special arrangements and represent an outstanding contribution to the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy and knowledge of radioactivity.

Desalting

The Department of the Interior (Office of Saline Water) and the AEC are studying dual-purpose nuclear power/water desalting plants, while the Departments of State and the Interior, the AEC and other appropriate Government agencies are represented on an Interagency Committee on Foreign Desalting Programs. Over the past 2 years the United States has participated in five IAEA panel meetings to exchange information on desalting with 25 other countries. Some 60 countries were represented at the First International Symposium on Water Desalination held in Washington, October 4–9, 1965. The United States is also carrying out activities in the field of desalting with certain specific countries.

Israel: A team of United States and Israeli experts conducted a preliminary survey of Israel's power and water needs, which indicated that a dual purpose nuclear plant producing 100 to 150 million gallons per day and 175 to 200 electrical megawatts may be economically attractive. A detailed engineering study to be completed late this year will consider the technical and economic feasibility of this means of meeting Israel's water and power needs.

Soviet Union: In June 1964, President Johnson announced a United States-U.S.S.R. cooperative program for the exchange of technical information in the nuclear power-desalting field. After meetings in Washington and Moscow, and reciprocal visits by desalting experts to desalting and reactor facilities, a formal agreement for cooperation in the field of desalting (including nuclear energy) was signed in November 1964.

United Arab Republic: A U.S. nuclear power-desalting team visited the United Arab Republic in 1964 to investigate the use of dual-purpose power-water plants for specialized agriculture along the Mediterranean Sea coast.

Mexico: Mexico, the United States, and the IAEA executed an agreement on October 7, 1965, to study large nuclear power-desalting plants for the States of California and Arizona and the States of Lower California and Sonora in Mexico.

Italy: A technical team from Italy recently visited U.S. facilities, and there have been preliminary discussions regarding cooperation in the field of desalting, including the use of nuclear energy.

Cooperation on Plowshare

The United States has indicated its willingness to consider international cooperation in its program for the peaceful uses for nuclear explosives (Plowshare). There have been expressions of interest from several countries and exchanges of technical information relevant, in some cases, to specific projects. Australia sent a technical team to the United States for 2 months to study the scientific, engineering, and safety aspects of Plowshare.

Radiation applications

The United States has participated in several international projects concerning isotopes applications, especially the radiation preservation of foods. For example, a cooperative program among the U.S. Army, AEC, and the Atomic Energy of Canada, Limited, has been arranged to study the radiation pasteurization of freshly killed chickens. Staffing assistance has been furnished to the ENEA food irradiation project at Seibersdorf, Austria, by arranging for the services of an American scientist through the IAEA. Israel has been loaned 7,800 curies of Co^{60} for investigating the radiation preservation of citrus products. The United States has assisted the World Health Organization's studies of possible radiation preservation of foods in South America.

The Agricultural Research Service has underway two programs with international aspects: the screw-worm eradication program in the Southwest and a program to prevent the introduction of the Mexican fruitfly into California. Both programs are conducted with the cooperation of the Mexican Government.

High-energy physics

High energy physics is a particularly fruitful field for international collaboration. The scientific interest in this fundamental field is high and the possibility of commercial, industrial, or military application of the research results is remote. In addition, large accelerators are presently available in the United States, in Western Europe, and in the Soviet Union, and the scientific results obtained by the use of these facilities are already made available everywhere.

International collaboration in high energy physics, including participation of scientists from Soviet bloc nations, has thus been remarkably successful during the past years and good relationships have been established. This collaboration has been principally in the form of: (1) a considerable informal exchange of information on scientific results through the ready availability of scientific journals and preprints; (2) numerous international scientific meetings; (3) exchanges of individuals and research teams, on both short-term and long-term bases; and (4) the exchange of data source materials such as exposed nuclear emulsions.

There has been extensive informal discussions among scientists from the United States, Western Europe, and Soviet laboratories of their respective plans for the design and construction of accelerators. At present there is no formal coordination of plans nor are there any jointly managed accelerator construction projects involving the United States and other countries.

FUTURE GOALS

With the atoms-for-peace program entering its second decade, cooperative programs are generally well established. The Committee has found, however, areas in which cooperation might be expanded, and to which greater emphasis might be given. We must continue to seek new and improved applications of nuclear energy under effective safeguards.

International safeguards

For more than a decade, the United States has been sharing the benefits of its progress in the peaceful utilization of the atom with other nations through the atoms-for-peace program. From the beginning, the United States has recognized that the technologies of producing nuclear power for peaceful purposes and of producing fissionable material for weapons purposes are related. Thus, the agreements for cooperation between the United States and other countries or groups of countries have included provisions designed to guard against diversion of materials, equipment, and facilities, including the right of the United States to inspect to assure compliance. Realizing that the administration of safeguards against diversion should be as general, as uniformly effective, and as clearly unbiased as possible, the United States has encouraged the development and strengthening of the safeguards function of the International Atomic Energy Agency. As the Agency has established sound procedures and the ability to apply them, the United States has amended its agreements for cooperation to require the application of IAEA, rather than United States safeguards. Other supplier nations have been encouraged by the United States to do the same. This effort should be continued, with the aim of persuading all supplier nations to require IAEA safeguards as a condition of export.

Concurrently, the United States should seek to strengthen IAEA over the next decade, and to utilize its developing capacity fully. This would involve the efforts not only of the Government but also of the nuclear industry and labor, in increasing the support of IAEA, and assisting in the continuous refinement of safeguards to assure their effectiveness while minimizing the interference with the peaceful operations of the facilities to be inspected. The agency system provides general procedures for applying safeguards to all parts of the reactor fuel cycle; however, specific procedures have not yet been elaborated for fuel element fabrication and spent fuel chemical processing plants. Consideration should be given to early development of these procedures.

Moreover, countries should be encouraged to accept IAEA safeguards voluntarily upon facilities which are entirely domestically developed. The United States made a start about a year ago in voluntarily submitting a large private power reactor, the Yankee Atomic Power Reactor, to IAEA inspection. The U.S. offer also extended the period of application of agency safeguards to three other reactors originally submitted in 1962. In June 1965, the United Kingdom offered to place its Bradwell Nuclear Power Station under IAEA safeguards. In August, a number of American industry and Government representatives met at the Yankee site in Rowe, Mass., to discuss the role of private industry in safeguards. The results were encouraging: The Yankee experience to date has disclosed no unduly burdensome problems (that is, interference with operations, increased costs, or disclosure of company confidential information). The industrial representatives present indicated that widespread industrial acceptance of safeguards could be anticipated, but that care should be taken that safeguards not become a burden to the inspected. This meeting represented a significant achievement; the dialog between Government and industry concerning safeguards should be continued, both here and abroad.

The total costs to the IAEA of inspections will increase as more facilities come under IAEA safeguards. These IAEA safeguards give all nations of the world equal assurance, unbiased and credible, of the continuing commitment of atomic energy projects to peaceful purposes. It is recommended that the IAEA bear the cost of all inspections to afford assurance of their independence.

International safeguards for nuclear facilities and materials have been accepted as a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy. Accordingly, the committee points out that the effective development of this position necessitates the continuing, consistent, and informed participation by Department of State officials at the highest level.

Finally, the United States should be willing to consider any other proposals to increase the protection against the diversion of nuclear materials to military purposes. However, it is important that full consideration be given to all ramifications of any such proposals, to assure that they would not unnecessarily complicate the problem, rendering the controls more cumbersome and less effective.

Nuclear power

Intensive international cooperation in the supply of nuclear powerplants should be continued since they appear able to supply a critical need for economical and plentiful power in many parts of the world. The sale of U.S. power reactors abroad not only aids the U.S. balance-of-payments position, but also assures that a safeguarded reactor is constructed.

The United States has already contributed to the growth of nuclear power overseas through wide dissemination of information on the active U.S. civilian power program and through assurances of the long-term availability from the United States of enriched uranium. AID and the Export-Import Bank have financed foreign nuclear powerplants; a limited deferred fuel payment program is available. With the passage of legislation authorizing the private ownership of special nuclear material, the United States offered to sell uranium enrichment services (toll enrichment) after January 1, 1969. The U.S. policy of nondiscrimination between foreign and domestic users in the pricing of nuclear materials and services should be continued.

The United States might further encourage the construction of nuclear power reactors to provide needed power in the developing countries through the selective lease or loan of enriched uranium and heavy water.

Large scale nuclear powerplants appear on the verge of achieving economic competitiveness in the United States. Developing nations may find such plants too large for existing utility system capacities and near term growth projections, while nuclear powerplants ranging from a few tens of megawatts to perhaps 200 or 300 megawatts may offer special advantages in selected regions of the world. The development of improvements for this size plant should continue to be encouraged. Even smaller power outputs from units fueled with radioisotopes may be attractive in specialized applications such as remote weather stations or harbor buoys and in medical applications such as radioisotope powered cardiac pacemakers. Initial demonstrations of such devices have been very encouraging and development of a larger market should result in cost reductions. The IAEA should continue, and perhaps intensify, its efforts to identify situations in which nuclear power might be helpful to developing areas.

Water resources

Fresh water is necessary to support life; an adequate supply is basic to the stability and economic viability of a society. Shortages of potable water are reaching critical stages in many parts of the world. Extensive water resources studies are being undertaken by several countries in an effort to meet area water needs. Recent events have underscored the real and present problem of water shortages not only in many foreign countries, but in the United States as well. It must be attacked by vigorous programs—both domestic and international.

One way to meet the needs for fresh water is the desalting of sea and brackish waters. This method is unique because it, alone, increases the supply of fresh water as a supplement to that naturally available. Moreover, desalting can draw on another major technological advance of the 20th century—nuclear power. The conjunction of these two new technologies adds a new dimension to man's quest for adequate water by allowing us to take advantage of the nearly limitless energy resources available from atomic energy and the favorable economics of large size desalting plants.

A domestic program of evaluation, research and development, and pilot and prototype plant construction has been underway for sometime. An expanded domestic program projected to cost $200 million over the next 5 years has been approved by the President. From this technology, water costs of about 25 to 30 cents per thousand gallons are expected from dual purpose nuclear plants with a capacity of several hundred megawatts of electric power and 100 million gallons of water per day capacity. This cost is acceptable in many areas for water required for industrial and municipal use. In the more distanct future, very large plants with substantially lower water costs should be feasible.

Through an aggressive and growing program of the Department of the Interior, development of a number of processes applicable to the processing of brackish waters, as well as sea water, is proceeding with encouraging results. These processes will greatly increase the range of aplication for desalting technology from small plants for isolated communities to large regional plants so that many areas and communities, inland as well as coastal, small as well as heavily populated, may benefit from it.

As a first step toward the application of this new technology, the United States has been cooperating in technical and economic studies on two projects—one with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and the other with Israel. A third study was initiated in October 1965 between the United States and Mexico under the auspices of the IAEA. This study will consider large nuclear-power desalting plants which could provide electric power and supplemental water for the arid regions of the two countries near the Gulf of California.

The committee recognizes that the construction overseas of nuclear desalting plants could further complicate the nuclear proliferation problem. The committee, therefore, fully and strongly supports the policy that any U.S. assistance to a nuclear desalting plant constructed abroad would be conditioned on the acceptance of IAEA safeguards to insure the peaceful use of the facility and the plutonium produced.

The United States should continue to offer assistance to foreign scientists and technicians in their efforts to understand and solve their national water resources problems. The type of training needs will necessarily vary from country to country. For example, the preparation of a good handbook or textbook would be helpful.

The committee believes that the First International Symposium on Water Desalination, held recently in Washington, is an excellent example of an International Cooperation Year activity. The committee noted with pleasure President Johnson's announcement of October 7 to the symposium delegates of a water for peace program. The committee is hopeful that this program may provide a practical solution to many of man's water problems.

High-energy physics

International cooperation in the field of high-energy physics is expected to increase in the next 5 years as a number of unique, new or upgraded facilities are completed and become available in different parts of the world. In particular, the United States could investigate the possibility of additional long-term exchanges with the Soviets wherein U.S. scientists would be allowed to perform research with the Soviet Serpukov 75-Bev. accelerator which is expected to become operational in 1967.

Accelerators of the 200-Bev. class are within the capacity of the United States, Western Europe, and the Soviet Union to construct and operate as national projects. A joint accelerator construction and management undertaking in this energy range, in addition to the obvious administrative difficulties, presents scientific disadvantages because the research needs of the numerous scientific groups could not be met effectively by a single international accelerator.

Accelerators of an energy of the order of 600 to 1,000 Bev. and higher are expected to be so large and costly to build and to operate that it will be necessary to investigate carefully the possibility and the consequences of an international collaborative effort for such a facility before a final commitment is made to construct and operate an accelerator in this class as a national undertaking.

It is clear that a large accelerator of the 1,000-Bev. energy range, constructed and effectively managed jointly by the United States, Western Europe, and the Soviet Union would be a significant achievement in many ways and the feasibility of a joint undertaking of this kind should continue to be investigated. It is recognized, however, that the likelihood of such a project materializing may be remote in view of the many complex technical and nontechnical problems which would have to be resolved before such international collaboration could become effective.

An intermediate step, between the informal procedures mentioned earlier and full-scale collaboration among Western Europe, the Soviet Union, and the United States on a major accelerator project, might be to explore the possibility of the United States funding and equipping an experimental area at the CERN storage rings, which are now approved as an adjunct to the CERN proton synchrotron. U.S. participation in research with the CERN storage rings would keep American physicists on the forefront of this area which is particularly important for achieving interaction energies higher than those to be provided by a 1,000 Bev accelerator. Certainly, U.S. scientists will, at the least, be highly interested in preparing special experiments for this facility for which instrumentation may be shipped to Europe. In a reciprocal arrangement, perhaps we could offer similar opportunities to CERN at the Sanford Linear Accelerator Center, at the proposed 3 Bev high energy electron-positron storage ring or, at a later date, at the proposed 200 Bev accelerator. Arrangements such as these would provide for fuller exploitation of these facilities as well as provide CERN scientists with an excellent opportunity for preparing for research with their proposed higher energy scientific device for Western Europe.

Biological control of insect pests

Sterilization of insects by exposure to radiation with subsequent release of the sterile insects to achieve control of reproduction has proved practical for controlling two types of insects: the screworm, a serious pest of livestock, and tropical fruit flies, such as the Mediterranean fruit fly, melon fruit fly, and oriental fruit fly. Research is in progress on the possibility of the development of practical ways to aid in the control of the following insects by use of the sterility principle: codling moth, tobacco hornworm, ping bollworm, boll weevil, tsetse fly, cattle warble fly, coffee leaf miner, cereal leaf beetle, and sugar cane borer.

Two general approaches to achieve sterility in insects for release are being investigated. One involves the use of gamma irradiation; the other certain synthetic organic chemicals.

Another line of research underway involves the evaluation of gamma radiation as a means for destroying insect infestations in fruit and vegetable products, to meet quarantine requirements without the possible hazard of toxic insecticide residues.

The joint IAEA/Food and Agriculture Organization program has been concentrated on flies, especially the Mediterranean fruitfly, the olive fly, and more recently, the tsetse fly. A large-scale project was initiated this year in Central America to demonstrate that the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly is scientifically and economically feasible.

The committee is aware that both in the United States and abroad long, complicated, and costly research is necessary before a field attack on any particular insect can be launched. The committee believes, however, that in view of the deleterious effects of some insects on man and his environment, research on the biological control of these pests should not only be continued but expanded. Since international action is required for the eradication of some insect pests, the work now underway in this field by the IAEA and FAO should be encouraged.

Food preservation

The U.S. Government program using radiation for preservation of food is now entering into the development of economic processes after its initial emphasis on research. While this developing technology is not past the pilot plant stage, possible applications of practical value are beginning to appear and to attract financial support. Within a year or two the Army plans to begin procurement of sterilized bacon and shortly thereafter a series of commercial developments should be initiated. Because of the need to obtain clearances by the Food and Drug Administration item by item (or at least by class of item), individual foods will be ready for the market at widely different times.

The IAEA, FAO, World Health Organization, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development have sponsored activities in the field of food preservation by radiation. Also, national programs in various parts of the world, e.g., Venezuela, Austria, Israel, and Japan, have developed a considerable knowledge in this field of activity. Two promising applications include the irradiation of mangoes, one of the world's most common fruits, for control of seed weevil and the irradiation of papayas for shelf life extension. Another promising product is the banana. Based upon limited data, an extremely low and economical radiation dose will delay the ripening process and double the shelf life.

In view of the existing international interest and the vitality of national programs, the Committee believes the United States should stand ready to extend the benefits of knowledge already available and being developed for applications to other countries. The United States, for example, could provide support for research and development, equipment, aid in the establishment of pilot plants to demonstrate the feasibility of the process, and encourage and support the standardization of wholesomeness regulations. The work presently underway in the various international organizations should be continued. Greater emphasis should be given to the exchange of information on the economics of food handling, since such data are the basis for the development of any sound food preservation program.

Plowshare program

The Plowshare program (AEC's program to develop peaceful uses for nuclear explosives) presents both problems and promise. Most interest has been shown to date in nuclear excavation. If complications relating to the limited test ban treaty can be resolved there are a number of international cooperative projects that might be undertaken in this area. In addition, nuclear explosives might be used in a number of peaceful underground engineering and scientific applications not complicated by treaty limitations. For example, contained nuclear explosions might be used for copper leaching, mining by block caving, gas and oil recovery, underground storage, and water resource development. Scientific applications include geophysical studies, neutron physics measurements, and the production of heavy elements.

Pending the solution of the present political and experimental problems in excavation and the actual execution of a practical underground engineering project, it might still be advisable to examine possible cooperative projects with other nations to determine their feasibility. Advantages of such an examination would be to obtain: (1) a clearer assessment in specific cases of the economic feasibility of the various aplications, (2) the definition of research problems which would need attention, and (3) the development of wider understanding of this program. This latter advantage might be particularly desirable in Latin America, where the possible use of nuclear excavation is being considered for construction of a sea-level transisthmian canal.

Health and safety

Health and safety play a twofold rôle in the international development of uses of nuclear energy. Uses in individual countries must be under conditions that gain and hold public confidence, while international commerce is highly dependent upon mutually acceptable standards of health and safety, both in commercial products and in their transport.

The IAEA has, through its publications and convening of panels and symposia, aided in the development of international health and safety standards. The United States has greatly assisted these efforts and should continue to do so. For example, recognizing that radioactive and fissile materials must be safely packaged and handled under standards acceptable to the States through which they move, the IAEA began the development of international regulations for the safe transport of such materials in 1959. Building on regulations adopted by the U.S. Interstate Commerce Commission about 1946, the Agency developed, by 1961, procedures for handling and criteria for packaging large quantities of radioactive and fissile materials. Work on criteria for the packaging of irradiated fuels is continuing with active support by U.S. participants. The United States should, of course, support and participate in the panel that is being formed for further review of existing Agency regulations and consideration of suggested amendments.[1]

The IAEA, in cooperation with WHO, International Labor Organization, and the European Nuclear Energy Agency, is initiating a study looking to the development of international standards for the use of radioactive materials in consumer products. The committee notes with pleasure that the first phase of the study will be conducted by a consultant provided by the United States.

Injuries or fatalities may occur from the misuse of radioisotopes. Fortunately, to date such incidents have been relatively rare. In view, however, of the growing uses of radioisotopes in medicine, industry, and agriculture, the committee believes that the IAEA should be encouraged to explore further means of reducing potential health and safety risks from international commerce in radioisotopes.

The IAEA has carried on an extensive program on technical assistance to states engaged in the development of uses of nuclear energy, ranging from the conduct of small research programs to evaluation of reactor hazards and of procedures for the disposal of radioactive wastes. The United States should continue to participate extensively in these activities.

The mining of uranium is associated with an increased risk of lung cancer in underground miners. While techniques are available for evaluating the conditions creating the risk and some advances have been made in early recognition of the disease, more extensive epidemiological data on miners are required. The United States is one of the first countries to assemble modern epidemiological data on this subject; these data would acquire much greater significance if extended and compared with similar data from other countries.

The committee understands that all uranium-producing countries recognize this problem, but the number of uranium miners in any one country is small. The committee believes that a carefully planned international study of this problem could advance knowledge of how best to control the hazard much more rapidly than were each country to go its own way, and could serve as a model for the development of international standards for control of other potential dangers in the nuclear energy field.

Assistance in the event of a nuclear accident

Many countries with atomic energy programs are not equipped or might not be prepared to handle an accident involving a serious radiation hazard or damage.

The IAEA has taken the initiative in drafting and attempting to obtain agreement among its member states on general arrangements (administrative, legal, and financial) under which emergency assistance by the IAEA and among the member states can be provided as soon as possible. The Agency has entered into an agreement with the Scandinavian countries which is similar to these general arrangements. The United States has agreed in principle to support a worldwide arrangement and is participating in the Agency's work toward this end.

In the meantime, the United States should stand ready to render any assistance that might be required in the event of an accident. The IAEA has prepared lists of what assistance is available from member states, including the United States, and has circulated this information to all members.

Nuclear data standards

With the growing worldwide activity in nuclear science, there is an increasing need for expanded activity in nuclear data standards. While a great deal of nuclear standards work is carried on in the AEC's National Laboratories and the National Bureau of Standards, at the International Bureau of Weights and Measures at Sevres, France, and at BCMN, Geel, Belgium, there is a definite and growing role to be played by the IAEA in this field. To date, two committees of experts have been established to foster cooperation in the measurement of nuclear data and information exchange. One of the committees is the European-American Nuclear Data Committee (EANDC) which operates under the auspices of the OECD; the other is the International Nuclear Data Scientific Working Group (INDSWG) which operates under the auspices of the IAEA. Because of the need for comparison of measurements and absolute measurements, the need for nuclear standards of reference will increase, as will the activities of these data committees.

---

[1] Transportation in the United States is regulated by the ICC, the Coast Guard, the FAA, the AEC and the Post Office. In the regulation of transport of dangerous materials, the ICC receives the assistance of the Bureau of Explosives of the Association of American Railroads. Regulatory activities concerned with radioactive and fissile materials are coordinated through an interdepartmental committee on which all of these agencies are represented. The interdepartmental committee recognizes the necessity of amendments to bring U.S. regulations into conformity with those developed by the IAEA for international use, but drafting of acceptable amendments has not been completed.

The IAEA is the natural international agency to carry a major responsibility in the standards field. Because a small but significant role is already being played by the International Bureau in Sevres, the activities undertaken by the IAEA should be coordinated with that Bureau.

The problems of standardization in the nuclear data program are difficult and numerous. The Agency could specify and develop an area within the standardization program and make the required measurements at its laboratory in Seibersdorf. This, however, would involve a commitment in capital and operating funds which may be too great at the present state of the Agency's development. The IAEA, assisted by its international nuclear data committee, however, should be able to foster such measurements in a number of countries and provide a meeting ground for comparison of measurements and methods.

RECOMMENDATIONS

International safeguards

1. That the United States continue to press for the universal adoption of IAEA safeguards and be prepared to place an increasing number of its civil applications involving nuclear reactors and related fuel processing and reprocessing installations under IAEA safeguards as other nations reciprocate.

2. That the U.S. Government increase its efforts to persuade all other suppliers of nuclear assistance (raw materials and equipment) to insist on acceptance of IAEA safeguards as a condition of such assistance.

3. That the IAEA bear the cost of all inspections.

4. That the appropriate agencies of the U.S. Government urge American labor and industry to support the safeguards program strongly, both nationally and internationally. It is believed through the efforts of American industry and labor, better understanding of safeguards can be achieved at home and abroad.

5. That the U.S. Government, industry, and labor try continually to develop features in the equipment and operational procedures to improve the effectiveness, and ultimately to lessen the costs, of safeguards.

6. That the Department of State give appropriate recognition to international safeguards as an element of foreign policy by assuring participation at the highest level of officials in the implementation of the program.

Nuclear power

1. That the United States continue to share civil nuclear technology with other nations in the spirit of the atoms-for-peace program and that these programs of technical cooperation be conducted in a manner which will encourage and assure that others also share the results of their research and development efforts.

2. That the established policy of offering materials and services under terms which do not discriminate between foreign and domestic users be continued.

3. That increased attention be given to international cooperation toward wider use of radioisotope power sources for special applications such as remote weather stations and harbor buoys and in medical applications such as radioisotope-powered cardiac pacemakers.

Water resources

1. That the United States press vigorously in acquiring and sharing experience in all areas of water resource technology, including nuclear desalting.

2. That in situations where nuclear energy is utilized, the United States continue to insist that international safeguards be a requirement for the construction of the facility outside the United States.

3. That in view of the importance of acceptance of IAEA safeguards, the United States consider placing under Agency inspection nuclear plants which are used for desalting.

4. That training programs for interested foreign scientists and technicians be designed to equip them to evaluate and solve their own national water resource problems.

High-energy physics

1. That the United States press forward with its high-energy physics program because of its scientific importance and because of the need to maintain leadership in this field.

2. That the United States investigate the possibility of additional long-term exchanges in the field of high energy physics with the Soviet Union through which U.S. scientists would be allowed to perform research with the Soviet Serpukov 70-Bev. accelerator, expected to become operational in 1967.

3. That the United States take the steps necessary to provide for further cooperation with CERN by appropriate fiscal arrangements to provide for use of new facilities under development at CERN.

Biological control of insect pests

1. That research in the United States on the biological control of insect pests, including the use of radiation, be continued and expanded.

2. That the United States urge the IAEA and the FAO to expand their efforts in the control of economically and medically important insect pests.

Food preservation

1. That the United States express readiness to assist other countries in establishing cooperative programs in the field of radiation preservation of food by making available equipment and technical advice.

2. That the United States propose that the IAEA and the FAO consider greater exchange of information on the economics of food handling (food spoilage, distribution problems, etc.).

Plowshare

1. That, while it is premature to make a positive recommendation for a specific cooperative project, it is appropriate for the United States to continue research and development and studies of possible Plowshare projects.

Health and safety

1. (a) That the United States encourage the development by the appropriate international organizations of health and safety standards governing the many and varied applications of atomic energy.

(b) That in this development U.S. representatives to these international organizations make every effort to ensure that the recommendations of the various organizations are in accord with each other.

2. That the United States actively participate in the IAEA program of periodic review and further development of international transportation regulations.

3. That the United States facilitate its own participation in international commerce by closely following international developments with appropriate amendments to its own transportation regulations.

4. That the United States continue to make available to the IAEA its own services, both in the development of standards and in the evaluation of hazards associated with the siting and operation of proposed reactors.

5. That the United States urge the IAEA to encourage member nations to supplement U.S. epidemiological studies of the biological hazards of exposure to high concentrations of radioactive decay products of radon in uranium mining.

6. That the United States press vigorously the further development of criteria for radiological protection.

Assistance in the event of a nuclear accident

1. That the United States support an IAEA international arrangement on assistance in the event of a nuclear accident involving a serious radiation hazard or damage.

Nuclear data standards

1. That the United States propose that the IAEA play an active role in cooperation with the International Bureau of Weights and Measures in coordinating measurements on nuclear data and in providing for the comparison of methods of measurements.

GOVERNMENT CONSULTANTS

Mr. John G. Palfrey, Commissioner, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. John A. Hall, assistant general manager for international activities, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Arthur W. Barber, Deputy Assistant Secretary, International Security Affairs, Department of Defense.

Dr. Donald R. Chadwick, Chief, Division of Radiological Health, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. D. L. Crook, manager, nuclear projects, Maritime Administration.

Mr. Clyde C. Crosswhite, national security affairs officer, Department of the Treasury.

Mr. Morgan D. Dubrow, Office of Assistant Secretary for Water and Power, Department of the Interior.

Mr. L. M. Hale, Office of Engineering, Agency for International Development.

Dr. R. W. Johnston, executive assistant to the Director, National Science Foundation.

Mr. W. D. Maclay, director, research program development and evaluation staff, Department of Agriculture.

Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr., Assistant Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Ambassador Henry D. Smyth, U.S. Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Mr. George C. Spiegel, foreign affairs officer, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND MONETARY AFFAIRS, NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION, THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND MONETARY AFFAIRS OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

David M. Kennedy, Chairman, chairman of the board, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co.

Eugene R. Black, Special Adviser to the President on Southeast Asia Economic and Social Development.

Arthur H. Dean, Sullivan & Cromwell.

Emile Despres, Research Center in Economic Growth Stanford University.

Fredrick M. Eaton, Shearman & Sterling.

Thomas S. Gates, chairman of the board, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.

Kenneth Hansen, vice president, Syntex Corp.

Charles H. Percy, chairman of the board, Bell & Howell Co.

Maxwell M. Raab, attorney.

Jesse W. Tapp, director, Bank of America.

J. Cameron Thomson, retired chairman, Northwest Bank Corp.

Frazar B. Wilde, chairman of the board, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

Robert P. Mayo, committee coordinator, vice president, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co.

This report was prepared by a committee of the National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation for presentation at the White House Conference on International Cooperation.

While preparing the report the committee had the benefit of close and continuous consultations with Government officials.

SUMMARY

Cooperation in monetary affairs

International cooperation in monetary affairs must characterize the future if we are to achieve our goals of sound and vigorous growth of world trade, investment, output, and employment.

A strong dollar, commanding the confidence of all, is an indispensable element of a strong international monetary system. An end to U.S. balance-of-payments deficits is, therefore, an essential element in the improvement of the international monetary system.

Sustained equilibrium in the U.S. international balance of payments over time is essential, and should be accomplished without heavy reliance on measures which are now necessary on a temporary basis.

There is no overall lack of international liquidity at present, but steps must be taken now against the day when U.S. deficits no longer supply, as they have supplied in recent times, large annual additions to monetary reserves.

The following broad lines of approach to improvement of the international monetary system are already in use and would, in the opinion of the Committee, be worth continuing and even expanding:

The use of bilateral instruments and techniques now serving as short-term buffers; continued search for ways to make the use of the International Monetary Fund's resources an even more valuable reserve asset, in appropriate amounts and under appropriate circumstances; extended and more general use of medium-term credits in the form of foreign currency denominated bonds or similar instruments; and study and evaluaton of proposals to provide a method for creating a supplementary reserve asset should this prove necessary. The payments system of the future should rest upon the foundations of discipline—appropriate fiscal, monetary, and other economic policies—in each of the countries concerned, and should be such as to avoid continuous payments deficits or surpluses (but without resort to destructively abrupt adjustments.)

The course of careful exploration to arrive at a consensus with U.S. trading partners in the spirit of mutual cooperation on appropriate future improvement of the international system is sound.

Cooperation in development finance

International cooperation in development finance should give emphasis to:

1. Cooperation through the World Bank and regional multilateral banking institutions, such as the development banks of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The World Bank should play an increasing role in coordinating development assistance furnished by industrial nations.

2. Development finance institutions should seek to broaden and improve the base for resources, through means such as cooperative action to strengthen capital markets generally.

3. The sharply rising burden of foreign debt service of the developing countries should get concerted attention; as one element, all developed nations should support and help strengthen the International Development Association.

4. It should be fully recognized that the basic effort in economic development is in the hands of the developing nations themselves, who must, among other things, provide an environment condusive to domestic and outside capital investment.

5. Fresh emphasis should be placed upon the role of private enterprise in developing countries, including sound partnership arrangements between United States and local companies, and early approval of the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN MONETARY AND DEVELOPMENT FINANCE MATTERS

Over the past two decades international cooperation in the fields of monetary affairs and development finance has become a deeply ingrained operational habit among governments, both broad in scope and intensive in detail. Side by side, and to an increasing degree in concert with such institutional development, the role of private financial and business entities has grown in importance and in contribution. Both of these developments have facilitated the very substantial progress achieved in the post-war world economy. To assure the continuation of the progress that has been made, it is essential to take stock of the present and consider our course for the future in all important segments of international finance.

CHAPTER I. THE BACKGROUND

A. International monetary cooperation

A well-functioning international payments system is essential to the expansion and balanced growth of world trade, output and employment. The central features of the present system include the dollar as a major trading and reserve currency in fixed relation to gold, the continued role of sterling, private credit facilities for financing trade and payments, and, on the official level, a growing network of international monetary cooperation. In the broad sweep of the past two decades this monetary and payments system has effectively met the demands placed on it. Highly flexible and adaptive, it has facilitated vast gains.

Restrictionism, competitive devaluations and other "beggar my neighbor" policies characteristic of the thirties have been largely averted. Reconstruction and peacetime growth were strenghtened. In the past decade alone, world trade has doubled and very substantial increases in output in real terms have been common. While there have been problems, economic gains made in many parts of the free world have been most encouraging.

The foundation for postwar international monetary cooperation was laid in 1944 when 44 nations met at Bretton Woods. Even in the midst of a great world war nations assembled there were mindful of a need to find an alternative to the exchange tactics and trade restrictions of the thirties by which governments, often at the expense of each other, vainly sought to maintain employment and uphold living standards. The alternative was conceived as a comprehensive structure that would institutionalize cooperation in exchange policies as a normal mode of behavior for nations at peace. The result was the International Monetary Fund, brought into being just two decades ago.

International Monetary Fund

The Fund's objectives were defined as the promotion of international monetary cooperation, exchange rate stability, and the elimination of exchange restrictions. These aims were regarded not as ends in themselves but as means of facilitating the expansion of international trade and helping all Fund members to achieve and maintain high levels of production, employment, and income. Rules of conduct were prescribed and resources and technical know-how were mobilized with which the Fund could assist members, when necessary, to follow these rules.

As a medium-term credit institution, the Fund stands ready to provide its members with monetary resources to enable them to overcome temporary payments difficulties through orderely and constructive measures rather than internationally destructive ones. Its transactions take the form of sales of foreign currencies to members in exchange for the member's own currency. Through its policies and operations, and through consultations with its members, the Fund is an effective instrument in international financial and monetary behavior.

The Fund began operation with resources totaling $7.2 billion, consisting of country quotas which determined for each member its contribution, voting strength, and the general limits of its ability to call on the Fund's resources. Quotas were generally required to be paid 25 percent in gold and the balance in national currency. The drawing rights created in return for the gold payment (technically, the "gold tranche") has come to be recognized as an international monetary reserve asset, since foreign currencies equal to the gold tranche can be obtained from the Fund practically without question.

Additional medium-term credits may be obtained of up to 100 percent of the quota, and in rare exceptions even somewhat beyond this limit. Progressively stricter performance criteria must be satisfied as a country uses increasing amounts of Fund credits. Repayment to the Fund, that is, repurchasing its own currency with gold or convertible currencies, is required within 3 to 5 years.

Fund quotas now stand near $16 billion. To further strengthen the Fund and with it the world payments system, members are now engaged in implementing a general 25-percent increase in quotas. This, along with some special additional increases, will raise the total to about $21 billion, including $5.2 billion for the United States. "Gold tranche" positions or quasi-automatic drawing rights, which now stand at $5.6 billion overall, will be increased to $6.8 billion as a result of this action.

The Fund has been especially active in recent years in both developing and developed countries. Dollars, which the Fund used extensively in providing credits in earlier years, have in recent years come back to it in repayments and with beneficial effect to the United States in financing its own deficit. In the last 2 years, the United States has itself made relatively small technical drawings from the Fund, and in July 1965 for the first time made a regular drawing of $300 million. The United Kingdom in substantial operations drew $1 billion in 1964 and $1.4 billion in 1965. In both cases calls were made on the Fund's gold and on the General Arrangements to Borrow to obtain the needed countries, as the Fund's regular resources in those currencies had become limited.

The Group of 10

The General Arrangements to Borrow, better known as the GAB or The Group of 10, took shape in 1962 for an initial 5-year period. It came into being as it became evident that the resources of the Fund in the form of currencies other than dollars and sterling might prove to be insufficient in the event of a threat to the stability of the world monetary system. A significant innovation in the payments system, it consists of the 10 principal financial centers within the membership of the Fund (with Switzerland, which is not a member of the Fund, subsequently associated through special arrangements). The 10 countries agreed among themselves to lend to the Fund, in case of need, amounts of their own currencies totaling $6 billion. In the course of this financial association the Group of 10 has also provided a framework for other cooperative activity. The Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors comprising the 10 meet from time to time, and their deputies even now are considering measures for improving the functioning of the international monetary system.

Other Forms of Monetary Cooperation

The return to convertibility in the late 1950's brought with it the problem of dealing with highly volatile movements of capital between financial centers, at times placing a strain on the system. Sudden exchange market pressures need to be met firmly and promptly, lest there be growing waves of disruptive speculation.

To meet such situations, the United States in cooperation with 11 major industrial countries and the Bank for International Settlements established, beginning in 1962, a swap network of short-term facilities totaling over $2½ billion. Because of their nature and purpose, these swaps are essentially bilateral in construction and operation.

Under these arrangements, the United States is able to acquire currencies needed for exchange market operations through short-term swap operations rather than selling gold to foreign monetary authorities. When the temporary outflow of funds reverses itself, the swap can then be reversed. The market operations, spot and forward, themselves have undergone developments and refinements, so that in a short span of years they have become smooth working techniques.

Another recent addition to international liquidity takes the form of special nonmarketable securities denominated in the currency of the creditor which the United States has issued to foreign monetary authorities. These range in maturities of up to 2 years. Such special securities presently outstanding exceed $1.1 billion and are generally held as reserves by foreign central banks.

In the last few years, new scope and importance has also been attached to more frequent consultations among those directly concerned with policy and operations in the financial centers. A specialized subgroup of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Working Party 3, consisting primarily of senior officers of treasuries and central banks, meets frequently to come to grips with problems in the balance-of-payments field and in related monetary operations. These consultations are importantly supplemented by the frequent meetings of central bank representatives under the aegis of the Bank for International Settlements in Basle, Switzerland. More broadly within the OECD forums exist for consultation on the broad range of economic policies and programs being pursued by individual countries which have major international financial and monetary consequences.

B. Cooperation in development finance

Just as the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944 sought to further monetary cooperation, it also sought to attack the financing problems of reconstruction and development. Long-term financial resources were needed at reasonable rates by the countries destroyed by war, as well as by nations whose economic potentials have not yet been developed. The World Bank was established for these purposes to complement the proposed medium-term International Monetary Fund in the payments field.

The World Bank

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) established at the end of 1945, has grown to a membership of over 100 countries—all also required to be members of the Fund. Its authorized capital has been increased from an original $10 billion to the present $22 billion. Almost 90 percent of the capital is callable and serves as backing for bonds which the World Bank issues in world capital markets. The Bank has borrowed a total of over $4.5 billion in eight currencies to finance its loan operations. In addition, the Bank has sold $1.8 billion of loans from its portfolio to private investors, and generally has promoted both a broadening of private capital markets and increasing the return of many of its borrowers to these markets.

In the early postwar years, the Bank made almost a half billion dollars of loans to speed reconstruction in Western Europe. Since then its principal focus has been on lending to the developing countries.

The bulk of the Bank's $8.8 billion total lending has been in such basic fields as electric power and transportation, dams and roads, railroads and ports. More than a billion dollars has been lent for industrial development, and over a half billion for agriculture. The Bank has recently begun to move in new directions in its lending with loans for advanced and technical education projects, water supply projects, and for relending through local agricultural credit institutions. These efforts are bearing fruit.

Affiliates of the World Bank

The Bank has grown from a single institution into an integrated family of institutions. The International Finance Corporation (IFC), established in 1956, concentrates exclusively on financing private enterprise development. Essentially as catalyst for much larger private investment, IFC has a small revolving capital and has made net commitments of over $115 million in a broad variety of private industrial enterprises located in 30 countries. The IFC has recently obtained authority to borrow from the World Bank, and thus has increased substantially its resources available for private enterprise lending.

The International Development Association (IDA) as established in 1960, represented a new response to the need for sound credits on easy repayment terms for the poorer countries. Its 50-year, interest-free terms are designed to permit countries facing a serious problem of servicing further external debt on conventional terms to maintain the momentum of their development through external borrowing without aggravating their payments situation. IDA has now committed over $1 billion for development projects on its own especially favorable terms. Its original $1 billion capital is being replenished and consideration of further resource needs will soon be undertaken.

Regional and Other Development Institutions

On the regional level, the Inter-American Development Bank, established in 1959, met a financial need for hemispheric cooperation among the American Republics. It has made great strides and has become in a real sense the bank of the Alliance, its principal financial arm. During 1964, the African Development Bank came into being, and Asian plans for an Asian Development Bank are rapidly taking shape.

Effective international cooperation requires effective international coordination of the lending policies, philosophies, and practices of donor countries and institutions in the various phases of development finance. This has been recognized for some time by the United States whose major role both in its own programs and through the multilateral institutions in the development effort is well known. The World Bank has brought capital exporting countries together in major consortia and has started consultative groups on several developing countries. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD located in Paris and numbering 14 of the major countries providing development assistance also provides an important method of consulting on direct assistance efforts. These consultative techniques are generally receiving increasing emphasis.

The Private Sector

Increasingly from the latter period of the Marshall plan and through the period of steady growth of the developed countries, private banking and investment has fulfilled an essential need for credit and capital resources. In this the U.S. capital markets and direct investment of U.S. capital overseas have played a substantial role. This flow was indispensable to an expanding world economy, particularly at a time when other industrial countries were short of capital.

In the developing countries, increasing efforts to channel and attract private resources have been markedly assisted by the example and support of international financial institutions.

The role played by private resources, initiatives, and effective demand has been accentuated by having to compensate for lack of adequately developed capital markets abroad.

CHAPTER II. WHERE DO WE STAND?

International financial and monetary cooperation have become commonplace in the postwar period. While occasional failures or frictions in cooperative efforts tend to command attention, the very sizable positive achievements are clearly manifest.

A triple-faceted structure of international cooperation now exists to meet a variety of financial stresses and strains on the system. An efficient network of immediately available foreign exchange swap facilities among the key central banks provides a first line of defense for threats in the major foreign exchange markets. The International Monetary Fund, supplemented by the general arrangements to borrow, provides a second line of defense for all its members with medium-term resources. Finally, the international attack on intolerably low levels of well being in the lesser developed countries is centered in the World Bank family which provides long-term financing for development.

This three-pronged institutional structure is buttressed and interlocked with a number of consultative techniques. At many levels and in many forums face-to-face discussions among financial officials now provide an important lubricant for the smooth and coordinated functioning of the formal machinery that has been built. These include, for example, ad hoc meetings of experts, monthly meeting of Central Bank Governors, periodic meetings of Working Party Three, of the OECD, and annual meetings of the Governors of the 103-nation IMF and World Bank.

(a) Short-term official credits: In the 1930–31 period it proved impossible to raise $150 million in central bank credits to cope with an imminent threat to the world's monetary system, which soon materialized. This is in sharp contrast with 1964 when $3 billion was quickly mobilized in short-term official credit for the United Kingdom. These have now been funded into medium-term credits through the IMF and breathing time for corrective actions made possible. Recent further action to extend lines of credit to the United Kingdom in a less critical environment is also notable.

The defenses of the dollar include a ring of reciprocal swap commitments amounting to about $2½ billion which gave it assured short-term credit facilities in all the major currencies. At the same time these facilities give support to each of the partners of the United States. These accomodations and related market techniques, now fully tested and confidently employed by monetary authorities, proved their value in meeting shocks to the international payments system such as during the Cuban crisis and following the assassination of President Kennedy.

As an initial buffer against serious threats to stability in the foreign exchange market and as tailored to meet the needs of the partners in particular circumstances, the instruments and techniques now in operation not only demonstrate the adaptability of the system but point to their potential in the future.

(b) Medium-term credits: The International Monetary Fund, as a central and basic element of monetary cooperation, provides an international pool of gold and currencies, that governments have already unconditionally committed to it. Moreover, with its regular resources supplemented by the general arrangements to borrow, the Fund can call upon up to $6 billion in major currencies.

Today, we have in the Fund a proven mechanism. This, however, does not mean that the monetary machinery provided by the Fund cannot be further perfected or that it can substitute for effective efforts by major countries to manage their international accounts appropriately over the longer pull. There may, for example, be a need to perfect our methods of adding to the growth of international monetary reserves through some supplementary type of reserve creation at some time in the future. Recurring strains on sterling exchange has drawn attention in the monetary field. The persistent surplus of continental Europe, reflected in a near tripling of reserves in the last decade, and the persistent deficit in the U.S. balance of payments with its associated large gold outflow, are widely recognized as circumstances requiring fundamental attention.

(c) Long-term development financing: Unlike an earlier period, we now have in being an international institutional framework designed to assist in the effective transfer of needed resources and techniques from developed to developing countries. Nations are joined together in a common effort to help raise dangerously low living standards in an era where modern science and technology has collapsed distances and the benefits of growing economies and world trade are apparent to all.

Some part of this—hopefully an increasing part—can be provided by private business and the financial community. The role of international cooperation at the Government level remains vital, however. At the center is the World Bank family operating on a worldwide basis: providing development financing on conventional and on easy repayment terms, as well as equity and loan capital for private enterprise projects. Attuned to regional needs but working in close cooperation with the worldwide institutions, independent multilateral banks serving the continents of Latin America, Africa, and Asia are in being or in the process of consideration.

To be sure, improvements of the existing framework are and will continue to be necessary; some of these are going forward today. The attack on development is, in a real sense, itself still in the developing stages. The development finance institutions, as they seek to tap the private capital markets for added resources, are confronted also with the task of stimulating the development of some of those very markets they seek to enter. New problems are arising as the burden of repayments of the capital-needy developing countries increase. Are the potential consequences only on the developing countries or also on the fabric of the international credit structure as well? How do the multilateral development finance institutions play their proper role not only in coping with emerging problems, but with the existing ones as well? The problems are by no means all financial and involve questions of the transfer and utilization of real resources, skills, and technology. In a number of cases solutions must be ad hoc, but these and myriad other problems are high on the current agenda.

Thus, it can be seen that international cooperation in monetary and development finance today contrasts sharply with the 1930's. Short-term financial pressures have been eased, orderly economic adjustment supported, and growth and development encouraged. Nevertheless, real problems exist. What is the future of these various approaches toward meeting emergency problems? How can these institutions be further developed and the techniques and operations refined, the economies upon which they depend for ultimate resources further expanded? And how can the role of private enterprise in developing countries be furthered by means consistent with our economic traditions?

CHAPTER III. THE FUTURE

A. International monetary cooperation

The international monetary system, in the future as in the past, must insure adequate financing to meet the needs both of the private and public sectors in transactions transcending national boundaries. In the private sector it is a matter of insuring the financing of an expanding international trade and facilitating needed private investment abroad; in the public sector of insuring the ability of financial authorities to deal effectively with pressures on the system. The continuing growth in the volume of international transactions may increase the amplitude of swings in payments surpluses and deficits which must be financed in an appropriate manner.

The dollar has played a key role in facilitating the international exchange of goods and services. It may be noted that free world exports in 1954 totaled $78 billion—in 1964, $152 billion. The dollar has proven its benefit to the payments system as a monetary instrument which can flow smoothly through the exchange markets, through private hands and through official channels. The dollar will continue to serve as the world's primary trading currency and, indeed, continue to play an important role in foreign monetary reserves as well.

Dollars held abroad privately have about doubled over the past decade, a rate closely parallel to the increase in world trade. These now total about $12 billion in private hands, and there is another $15 billion held as official reserves; together they clearly point to the essentiality of sustaining unimpaired confidence in the dollar's value and usefulness, both at home and abroad. It demonstrates the need to achieve equilibrium in the U.S. balance of payments. That will be a prime factor in assuring that outstanding liquidity—the means of payment in the international economy—does not shrink as a result of heavy demands on the U.S. gold stock.

There is, and must be, no question of the intent of the United States to maintain unimpaired the confidence in the value of its currency—to maintain a strong, sound, and stable dollar and behind it a strong and competitive economy. The United States has substantially improved its competitive position internationally over recent years. It is of fundamental importance that wage-price developments do not jeopardize this relationship. In this regard, the substantial shrinkage in our trade surplus so far this year provides a reminder of the need to be alert to any adverse trends. U.S. performance in this area of its balance of payments is doubly important since it will play a major role in establishing the basis for "thawing out" the measures taken over recent years to curtail the outflow of dollars and thus cut the balance-of-payments deficits more immediately. Action on the immediate problem was appropriate under the circumstances—but the measures must, in fact as in planning, prove clearly temporary. Extended reliance on measures of restraint can be self-defeating in the longer run. The U.S. capital market can be expected to have an important role to play in the world economy of the future and can promise an element of strength to the balance of payments.

There are sources of strength in our balance of payments that should show through increasingly, and current developments should also aid in attaining a position when temporary measures can be reduced or eliminated. No one can predict the timing with any precision—but the favorable factors include, in addition to a strong trade account, heavier returns on U.S. investments abroad, greater participation by our allies abroad in meeting the needs of the developing nations, the development of capital markets and the fashioning of a broader range of fiscal and monetary tools abroad for achieving better adjustment to payments imbalances. Spending by the U.S. Government must of course continue to be scrutinized closely and every saving made that can be made within the carefully defined limits of national policy. The needs of the developing nations must not be set aside and our contribution—directly and through the international lending agencies whose activities should be closely defined and coordinated—will continue to be important.

We are also aware that just as there is a responsibility on the part of the United States to remove the deficit in its balance of payments, there is also a responsibility on the part of those nations with persistent surpluses, the counterpart of the U.S. deficit, to adjust their payments balance and reduce pressures on the international monetary system. Fiscal tools can usefully play a larger role in many such countries.

We have noted earlier in this study that the current payments system both reflects and requires a measure of international financial cooperation on many levels. The payments system, as now developed and reinforced, includes cooperative actions in foreign exchange markets, provision of bilateral short-term swap credits by central banks and expanded medium-term credit facilities at the International Monetary Fund. This system has served the free world well in facilitating greatly enlarged volume of international trade and in meeting speculative outbursts or other threats to orderly foreign exchange markets. These arrangements appropriately expanded and reinforced can also serve well in the future—and, indeed provide the underpinning for further steps that might be taken within the scope of a free enterprise economy to insure a payments system attuned to developing needs.

We do not see any overall lack of international liquidity at this time or in the immediate future. Although it may seem premature to some, it is, nevertheless, essential to gain international agreement on the steps that might appropriately be taken if and when any threat of a lack in international liquidity tends to inhibit the mutually beneficial exchange of goods and services.

As the United States achieves and maintains balance-of-payments equilibrium, the question as to ways to assure a sufficient supply of liquidity will be timely. Clearly, the future supply of gold alone cannot give this assurance. Just as clearly, the United States cannot be expected to incur a deficit simply to meet that need. Current planning therefore is essential to meet potential needs of the future. This underscores the appropriateness of the efforts now being undertaken by the Group of Ten as a first step in response to the announcement by the Secretary of the Treasury of U.S. readiness to participate in an international monetary conference which would be preceded by careful preparation and international consultation for agreement on basic issues.

We cannot in this report set forth any "plan" for a new "reserve asset" or the precise system that should characterize the future. Nevertheless some broad lines of approach already in use seem clearly worth continuing—even expanding.

First, we would not wish to exclude an appropriate role in any arrangement for the bilateral instruments and techniques that now serve importantly to safeguard against abrupt and serious threats to stability in the foreign exchange markets and serve at the same time to meet particular needs of the two parties concerned. These techniques, tailored and flexible, are a line of defense that protects, and even expands liquidity when it is temporarily needed.

Second, to the extent that the problems ahead are viewed as those of assuring that financing is available to deal with short-lived fluctuations in private balances or recurrent swings in national balance-of-payments positions, the solution could lie, at least largely, in the range of improvel credit availability. Further reinforcement in the International Monetary Fund's resources could well serve this purpose. There also may be ways of making Fund resources in appropriate amounts and over time an even more valuable reserve asset commanding greater automaticity in its use.

Third, the provision of medium-term credits through the use of foreign currency denominated bonds or other imaginative devices should not be overlooked. They might also play a useful supplementary role for handling flows of funds unrelated to the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. There might, for example, be an expansion of such securities among other countries to provide bilateral reinforcement to the system, just as there might be, over time, some stretching out of the maturities of these securities.

Fourth, the system might be further reinforced as a result of concerted action to devise supplementary assets to be held in official reserves. Various proposals designed to provide a method for creating a supplementary assets should continue to be studied, evaluating them in the light of our national interest as well as international need. The International Monetary Fund should continue to play a leading role in the payments system and any arrangement should use the framework of this experienced organization based on recognized adherence by member governments. Moreover, the arrangement should be subject to voting and other procedures of an acceptable type.

Fifth, the system should be so constructed that it rests solidly on foundations of economic discipline in each of the participating countries—including appropriate fiscal, monetary and other economic policies. It should neither facilitate the running of continuous balance-of-payments deficits by any nation, nor should it require shortsighted, abrupt, adjustment regardless of the consequences nationally and internationally.

In conclusion, the course of careful and patient exploration to arrive at a consensus with U.S. trading partners in the spirit of mutual cooperation on appropriate future improvement of the international monetary system is sound. Monetary cooperation, so fruitful in the past, must characterize the future if that future is to prove equally or more rewarding.

B. Future cooperation in development financing

In the years ahead, even more than in the past, international cooperation in economic development financing will rely heavily on the World Bank as a channel for the flow of capital from the developed countries into the developing world. It will be bulwarked on the regional level by the Inter-American Development Bank, the recently established African Bank and the emerging Asian Development Bank. The spectrum of hopes, realities and responsibilities in carrying out this cooperative effort is broad. Only a few will be touched upon here.

In carrying out their primary function of channeling resources from the have to the have-not nations, the development finance institutions must effectively mobilize resources on the one hand and insure their careful application on the other. If these institutions are to retain their multilateral character, they cannot be heavily dependent on one or a few countries for resources. An important task of the future will be the broadening of the base of available resources. In terms of capital markets, there is the need for more intensified development of those capital markets and techniques which will maximize the accumulation of savings and direct them into investment abroad where the needs are great. The development finance institutions have a role to play in the strengthening of the markets they seek to enter, just as they have a role to play in strengthening the ability of developing countries to mobilize their domestic savings. And the development of other capital markets becomes even more urgent at those times when the United States faces balance-of-payments strains. Urgent attention needs to be given to broadening the base of financial support of development institutions and calls for cooperative action to strengthen capital markets generally.

A second major problem is presented by the sharply rising burden of foreign debt service of the developing countries. In some cases the threat of default, with potential heavy cost to lender and borrower alike, was imminent. The problem has many facets. The International Development Association is an outstanding example of creative adaptation to meet this emerging need while contributing to sound development, on a basis in which all the capital exporting countries share in the cost. The question of replenishment of IDA resources is now before the World Bank members. It has already committed the bulk of its $1.5 billion resources for sound loans on its easy repayment terms where this was required. New governmental contributions from all developed nations on a substantial scale will be necessary if its important work is to go forward. These nations should fully support the continuation and strengthening of this experiment in international development cooperation.

In strengthening the fabric of development institutions on the regional level, there may be an even more important role for Inter-American Development Bank as the financial arm of the Alliance for Progress. In Asia, a strong start has been made toward the early establishment of an Asian Development Bank especially adapted to meet the needs and aspirations of the countries of the region. It is already showing its potential to mobilize resources within the region and to attract funds from a wide number of countries outside of it. Present plans call for a capital structure of $1 billion, of which the United States and Japan would each provide up to $200 million, and other industrial countries, both regional and nonregional, would provide a further $300 million. Once established, the Asian Development Bank could serve not only as a financing institution but also as a focus for regional cooperation on a broad front.

Apart from these immediate steps to strengthen the institutional arrangements for cooperation in development financing, there is a wide scope for long-range improvement in the coordination of bilateral aid programs and aid policies. The World Bank has pioneered in the process of coordinating aid programs of multiple donors in particular recipient countries through aid consortia and less formal consultative groups. If numerous bilateral aid programs are to provide the maximum contribution to development, and resources are to be applied to the highest priority uses, and performance in developing countries is to be more effectively elicited, the number of key countries for which such coordination arrangements are available will have to be increased.

The importance of the role of private enterprise in the development process also requires fresh emphasis in the years ahead. An all-out effort of the developing countries to attract private capital is essential. The encouragement of well-conceived partnership arrangements between the United States and local companies is especially important to the future development of many nations. And the development finance institutions have an important part to play in contributing to a fresh emphasis. Recent actions to enlarge the capacity of the International Finance Corporation is one example of a move in this direction. As another important action, early ratification by the United States and other countries of the World Bank-sponsored Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes would contribute importantly to this new impetus for private investment.

Satisfactory progress on the fronts outlined will by no means automatically solve all the serious financial problems confronting the developing country finance effort. Much remains to be accomplished and basic to all is what is done by developing countries themselves and their will and determination toward integrating their economies with the free world community. We look forward to various approaches to the problem which will assure the full emergence, soundly based, of the developing countries into the mainstream of world trade, the increasing satisfaction of the basic wants of their peoples, and with it all, the development of the full potential in these lands and around the world.

CHAPTER IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. International monetary cooperation

1. International monetary cooperation must characterize the future if that future is to prove rewarding in providing an expanding and balanced growth of world trade, investment, output, and employment.

2. In building on the present system, there must be no doubt about the ability of the dollar to serve as a world trading currency and to play an important role in international monetary reserves. Behind a strong, sound, and stable dollar must be a strong and competitive U.S. economy.

3. There is no overall lack of international liquidity at the present time; it is essential, however, to gain international agreement on steps that might be taken if and when lack of liquidity threatens mutually beneficial exchange of goods and services.

4. The Committee does not set forth any plan for the precise international payments system of the future; nevertheless, there are some broad lines of approach already in use worth continuing and even expanding.

(a) There should be an appropriate role in any new arrangement for the bilateral instruments and techniques that now serve as short-term buffers to threats to the system.

(b) The International Monetary Fund should continue to play a leading role in the payments system. Ways should be sought to make its resources, in appropriate amounts and at appropriate times, an even more valuable reserve asset.

(c) Medium-term credits through the use of foreign currency denominated bonds, or similar instruments, should continue to have a place in the system. Consideration should be given to an expansion of their use among other countries, and over time, some stretching out in their maturities.

(d) Various proposals to provide a method for creating a supplementary asset to be held in official reserves should be studied and evaluated in the light of our national interest as well as international need.

(e) The payments system of the future should rest on the foundations of effective economic disciplines in each of the countries, neither facilitating continuous balance-of-payments deficits nor surpluses nor requiring shortsighted and destructively abrupt adjustments.

B. Development finance

1. International cooperation in development finance through the World Bank and the regional banks in Latin America, Africa,

and Asia should be an essential ingredient of the future to help assure the full emergence soundly based, of the developing countries, and with this the further advance of the economies of all nations.

2. In effectively mobilizing resources, the development finance institutions should seek to broaden the base of available resources, and in this regard cooperative action to strengthen capital markets generally is important.

3. The sharply rising burden of foreign debt service of the developing countries requires concerted attention. At one element in this, all developed nations should fully support the continuation and strengthening of the International Development Association as an affiliate of the World Bank.

4. The World Bank should play an increasing role in coordinating development assistance being furnished by the industrial nations, and recognizing that basic to all are the efforts of the developing countries themselves.

5. The importance of the role of private enterprise in the development process requires fresh emphasis in the years ahead. One element in this should be the encouragement of well conceived partnership arrangements between United States and local companies. Also early approval of the World Bank sponsored Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes would be helpful.

(NOTE.—A supplementary comment by two members of the Committee is show in the annex.)

ANNEX—SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENT

The undersigned agree with many statements and recommendations in the report which describe the past accomplishments and potential future contributions of the various international monetary institutions and financial mechanisms. There are certain key areas, however, where a different outlook might usefully be expressed:

1. We would place greater emphasis on the magnitude of the tasks confronting international financial institutions to marshal capital and skills for the less developed countries in the decade ahead; indeed, we feel that the net flow of capital resources in the immediate period ahead, and forward financing commitments and arrangements—both bilateral and multilateral—will fall short of amounts needed to cope with the growing needs and to do justice to the growing absorptive capacities of the less developed countries.

2. We believe there is a much more urgent need than is implied by the report for developing international monetary arrangements. In our opinion, trends toward reduced flows of capital are restraining healthy free world economic growth. As a substitute for these constraints, we urge that, as the primary means of achieving true equilibrium in international payments, the full weight of U.S. efforts should be applied to establish further expansion of reciprocal financing devices and continued use of the dollar as an international asset. To do otherwise would have an adverse impact on efforts to achieve greater trade liberalization, provision of more development assistance and stimulation of international competition and private investment. The indispensable role of the United States as a free world banker must be recognized in framing new international financial arrangements.

KENNETH R. HANSEN.
EMILE DESPRES.

OCTOBER 18, 1965.

GOVERNMENT CONSULTANTS

Merlyn N. Trued, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs.

J. Dewey Daane, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

William B. Dale, U.S. Executive Director, International Monetary Fund.

Harold O. Folk, Associate Assistant Administrator for Finance Development, Agency for International Development.

Ralph Hirschtritt, Deputy to the Assistant Secretary for International Finance and Economic Affairs, Treasury Department.

Arthur M. Okun, Council of Economic Advisers.

Anthony M. Solomon, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

EXHIBIT 8

TEXT OF RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Resolved, That this Committee reaffirms its strong belief in the necessity for a comprehensive worldwide treaty of general and complete disarmament under strict international controls as advocated by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, as approved by President Johnson and as evidenced by the United States and U.S.S.R. draft treaties filed at the ENDC at Geneva in 1962. The Committee believes that the successful negotiation of the McCloy-Zorin 18-point agreement on general and complete disarmament in 1961 indicates the desirability for continued and strenuous negotiation between the U.S.S.R. and the United States with the assistance of the other nations represented at Geneva in order to eliminate the remaining areas of disagreement with respect to the procedures required to make general and complete disarmament effective, enforcible, and reasonably safe from the point of view of our national security.

The benefits of such a treaty are so great in terms of the survival of civilization as presently threatened by the continuing and accelerating arms race that every effort of the U.S. Government should promptly be expended to reach a satisfactory agreement with the U.S.S.R.

It is the considered view of the committee that enforcible world law in the limited area of disarmament and war prevention is an essential requirement of any such treaty.

The Committee believes that either a drastic revision of the Charter of the United Nations or the creation of a new international peace-enforcing institution possibly arising out of deliberation of the major military powers at Geneva or elsewhere is essential to the attainment of these ends.

The skeleton, but neither the flesh nor the blood of such an international institution, is set forth in the draft outline of the treaty of GCD tabled by the United States at Geneva in 1962.

The Committee recommends that the Congress pass promptly Senate Concurrent Resolution 32—the planning-for-peace resolution.

[From the Department of State Bulletin, Dec. 20, 1965]

EXHIBIT 9

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY, NOVEMBER 29

It is a politician's highest reward to speak to people who are already convinced. It is my reward today.

I do not delude myself into thinking that I will today create any converts to the cause of international cooperation. But perhaps, together, we can spread the gospel to those who could stand an occasional sermon on that subject.

Churchill said that jaw, jaw is better than war, war. In this conference we will apply that principle.

There was a crusty old farm leader in Washington during the early days of the New Deal. His name was George Peek. George Peek said: "The common characteristic of all uplifters is an unquenchable thirst for conversation. They are all chain talkers."

So be it. Let us talk. Let us think. Let us agree and disagree.

But this conference can result in more than talk alone, and international cooperation can result in more than the avoidance of war alone.

Our task here is to increase the areas of man's interdependence so that we may decrease the areas of possible conflict—so that we may ourselves be more secure.

But it is also our task to bring about practical, positive steps which men may take together, to make life not just safer but also happier and more rewarding for all mankind.

It is easy for people and for governments, even a government as responsive to its citizens as I believe ours is today, to follow paths of least resistance, to stay with the familiar and comfortable. You can help us break out of familiar and comfortable paths.

I have seen the recommendations of your working committees. Many of those recommendations can lead us to new paths. Many of them are controversial. So much the better.

NEW INITIATIVES SERVING MANKIND

In the past 20 years great international achievements have come from proposals that broke from the old patterns. The Marshall plan, point 4, the United Nations, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, the International Monetary Fund, Food for Peace, the Asian Development Bank—these have come from international initiatives worthy of our position of leadership. These have been initiatives serving both world security and human betterment. (And I am proud of my own association with these initiatives.)

I am proud of the support our country has given to building an effective inter-American system in this hemisphere, based on the Organization of American States. The inter-American system is a flexible instrument, capable of institutional development to meet new needs.

The Alliance for Progress was a bold response to the glaring need for modernization of the political, social, and economic institutions in the nations of our hemisphere. This past week at the Rio de Janeiro Conference Secretary Rusk conveyed President Johnson's pledge to continue our assistance under the Alliance into the next decade.[1]

Just as the Alliance for Progress developed to meet new pressing needs in our hemisphere, so we now face the necessity of developing new institutions to guarantee the immunity of all American nations to subversion.

We must keep in mind the distinction between the challenges posed by shocking social and economic inequality and the threat to individual nations posed by armed intervention or internal subversion.

The Alliance for Progress is designed to meet the first, and I am confident it will do so. To meet the second, however, to meet it in a way that is both effective and that safeguards the legitimate independence of individual nations, we must develop new peacekeeping machinery within the inter-American system.

No American nation desires unilateral intervention in the affairs of another. But all American nations know that effective multilateral institutions are needed to preserve peace and democratic institutions in our hemisphere.

U.S. LEADERSHIP IN THE UNITED NATIONS

I am proud, too, of the dramatic leadership the United States undertook in the founding of the United Nations, and of the leadership we have offered there since.

---

[1] Not shown in RECORD.

While our Nation was still in the midst of world war, President Franklin Roosevelt dreamed of new institutions of peace. And President Truman after him, in a time when this Nation stood in a position of unchallenged prestige and strength in the world, committed our prestige and strength to the cause of the United Nations.

The United Nations has survived 20 tumultuous years—and that in itself is a saving miracle. But it has done much more than survive; it has grown in prestige and in power for good.

The United States is wholeheartedly committed to building even further its importance as an international instrument, as President Johnson made abundantly clear when he appointed Arthur Goldberg as a worthy successor to Adlai Stevenson.

There is, in fact, no better testimony to our faith in the United Nations than the stature of the citizens appointed by successive American Presidents as our Ambassadors to the U.N.; from Warren Austin to Mrs. Roosevelt, to Ambassadors Lodge and Stevenson, to Ambassador Goldberg today.

In an age in which old and new nationalisms have multiplied and jostled one another for a place in the world, it has offered the means to channel national energies and ambitions for constructive purposes and to achieve, more often than most people realize, a general consensus of mankind.

The United Nations is more than a place where the world's peoples gather and talk. It and its specialized agencies—FAO, the Special Fund, UNESCO, ILA, WHO, UNICEF (which was recently and rightly honored by the Nobel Prize)—these and other U.N. agencies are where the people of all nations work together for the common good.

But the U.N. has an even greater function than the work of these specialized agencies. That greater function is peacekeeping. High on the agenda of the United Nations, with full support of our Government, should be the reaching of an agreement on creation of a permanent peacekeeping force, ready to respond and to act when peace is threatened in this world.

The U.N. is the most articulate expression of modern man's desire for international cooperation and of his recognition of interdependence—cooperation without domination, interdependence without dependence.

How far the U.N. has brought man indeed: Last week members of the General Assembly—including, I am proud to say, the United States—voted for a resolution calling for the convening by 1967 of a world disarmament conference to which all nations, including Communist China, would be invited.

It was 9 years and 9 months ago that some of us in the Senate advocated discussion by all nations of the preeminent problem confronting mankind—the threat of nuclear weapons.

Although the hour is now late, it is never too late to face frankly the risks of continued nuclear competition. Although there is no certainty that all nations will respond, there is certainty about the validity of the initiative. For every day the arms race proceeds, man not only increases his risk of annihilation but decreases his possibilities for a more satisfying life on earth.

If the arms race is a strain on the economy of rich nations, it is an intolerable burden on that of poor nations. A pioneer statesman of the nuclear era, the late Senator Brien McMahon, proposed almost two decades ago that resources diverted from the arms race could be set aside to meet the unmet social and economic needs of mankind. His counsel remains valid today.

Both rich and poor might well take heed.

PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT—BUSINESS OF ALL MEN

The business of peace and peaceful development is the business of all men. For today two-thirds of mankind continues to live in squalor, sickness, poverty, and illiteracy. The world is filled with hundreds of millions of striving, hungry, and fearful people—people exposed to modern communication who see unshared affluence in the world around them, who desperately seek their own place in the sun.

No little ideas, no little plans will bring the world safely through this volatile time. Nor will little ideas or plans be worthy of an American nation which professes—I think rightly—to lead a world revolution toward freedom, justice, and human dignity.

There are those with a highly developed sense of realpolitik who scoff at such starry-eyed "evangelism." But to them I reply: You are the ones who misread reality.

To be realistic today is to be visionary. To be realistic is to be starry eyed.

Today man bounces signals off distant stars and walks in space. Today man conquers illness which once was hopeless.

The devices of our computer-geared, technologically interconnected world society leap over international frontiers. Space vehicles, communication, medicine, meteorology, art, and ideas pay little attention to the imaginary boundaries men have drawn between themselves.

Interdependence is a fact and cooperation proceeds already on many levels, even among countries divided by wide political gulfs.

This is what Prime Minister Nehru told the U.N. General Assembly in 1961, when he first proposed an International Cooperation Year. "Even today," he said, "between countries which are opposed to each other in the political or other fields, there is a vast amount of cooperation. Little is known, or little is said, about this cooperation that is going on."

You do not have to reconcile conflicting ideologies to agree on international safety standards for aerial navigation, on the international allocation and use of radio frequencies, and on a global weather reporting system. The technological imperatives of the modern world have long since transcended national frontiers.

We are coming to recognize, also, that human needs are the same the world over. The pains of disease are the same, the pangs of hunger the same. Illiteracy shuts off its victim not only from his own written language but from all languages. And we are beginning to accept the need for a common, concerted attack upon these ancient enemies of mankind.

We have agreed that there shall be no physical frontiers in Antarctica. We are on the way to agreeing that there are no frontiers in human needs and aspirations.

When the technology exists to make international cooperation a sensible affair, when national leaders perceive the existence of a common interest in working together and when international institutions exist or can be designed, you have all the necessary elements for another step forward in international organization for some definable, specific purpose.

We need big blueprints and ideas.

We need, too, small and practical steps in every part of human activity where men can find any possibility of common effort.

We must create a world environment in which the habit of cooperation is learned by doing and becomes ingrained, an environment where, in time, men may learn to put aside their quarrels as irrelevant obstacles to great and overriding goals of all mankind—a better life, a fuller human dignity, and above all, peace. That means, among other things:

Making sure that every child everywhere in the world is sufficiently well nourished to attain full stature in body, mind, and spirit;

Making education so widely available that every human being has the opportunity to realize his full potentialities;

Making the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights as effective in fact as it is eloquent in words;

Making the atom the servant rather than the master of mankind;

Making science and technology not monopolies of nation states but rather tools for improving the state of man;

Making peace not only in our time but for all time.

It is to these causes that our American power must and will be devoted. It is to these causes that we must rally all the nations of the world—developed and developing, strong and weak alike—in a spirit of both self-help and mutual benefit.

Here is the long-term significance of our great wealth, our great industrial and agricultural systems, our great scientific community and—yes—our great social inventions which have created a nation dedicated to the opportunity and welfare of all citizens while retaining a free economic system.

These incomparable material and political assets, along with our deep spiritual and cultural tradition, represent our true power, our ultimate ability to influence the world in the direction of peace and order and tolerance and prosperity.

When nations undertake cooperative action on the basis of fairly sharing the responsibility, the very weight of our economic, financial, and technical resources requires us to accept a position of leadership.

Let there be no doubt about it. Our capacity to help build a cooperative and progressive international community, based on common interest, is unequaled—and we shall use that capacity.

If we do not lead, who will?

Well, I have enjoyed this sermon to a congregation of true believers. In these next few days I hope that you will renew yourselves and your devotion to our cause. For it is the true believers who, inevitably, must provide the hard thought, hard work, and dedication—as you have—so that others may follow.

On behalf of the President, I thank you for your efforts and ask for more. In his words: [2]

"The American covenant called on us to help show the way for the liberation of man, and that is our goal. Thus, if as a nation there is much outside our control, as a people no stranger is outside our hope."

International Cooperation, a Necessity of Our Age

(Statement by President Johnson, read by Vice President Humphrey at the opening plenary session of the White House Conference on International Cooperation on November 29. White House press release, Austin, Tex.)

I have called this Conference for one reason: I am determined that the United States shall actively engage its best minds and boldest spirits in the quest for a new order of world cooperation.

This Nation recognizes that international cooperation is not merely a lofty ideal. It is a fact of life, a necessity of our age.

The General Assembly of the United Nations has designated this year International Cooperation Year, and by proclamation of its President and resolution of its Congress, the United States rededicated itself in 1965 to the ideal and practice of international cooperation.

Throughout its history, by word and deed, this Nation has always demonstrated its understanding of the wisdom of cooperative efforts to solve world problems. And we know that a great nation remains great because it remembers that it can always do better.

I believe this Conference will show us specific ways to do better. I have directed the agencies of our Government to participate in your deliberations and to study your recommendations with a view to immediate action.

---

[2] Bulletin of Feb. 8, 1965, p. 162.

Together we seek—

New ways to raise the world's millions up from poverty;

New policies to conserve and develop the world's resources;

New methods to rid the world of destructive disease;

New means to increase commerce between nations;

New safeguards against the overriding danger of war;

New avenues to world peace.

This Conference is a town meeting of leaders of the Nation. Its purpose is peace and cooperation.

Let us raise our sights to the limits of this goal.

And let us free our imaginations to the tireless pursuit of this high ideal.

EXHIBIT 10

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, NOVEMBER 30, 1965

This Conference has been called by the President of the United States to evaluate and recommend new ideas and practical programs to advance world peace through international cooperation. The White House Conference is a part of our Nation's response to International Cooperation Year and our role in this Conference is to focus upon ways and means to develop international law.

International cooperation is the key to development of international law. Whether it is a treaty agreed upon by nations or rules which have acquired the status of international law through long-accepted custom, international law depends for its existence upon international cooperation among men and nations.

The history books teach us that, from the dawn of recorded history until now, mankind's greatest need has been for peace. The advent of nuclear power has transformed that need into dire necessity. Development of methods other than war for the settling of disputes between nations is the imperative of our day.

Another lesson from history is that whenever and wherever a just rule of law prevails, peace prevails. When the rule of law breaks down, society is beset by fear, chaos, and danger. Therefore, we must seek to achieve a world ruled by justice according to law, for such a world would be a peaceful world.

This hope for world peace through law is not an empty dream. On the contrary, it is now, more than at any previous time in history, a practical possibility which men and nations must pursue with all the energies at their disposal. The lesson written in blood upon the battlefields of yesterday and of today is that war cannot even serve the imagined interests of those who resort to it, let alone the interests of mankind. In short, the instruments of war have failed. And for this reason, the supreme practical question of our time is whether the instruments of peace can be strengthened sufficiently to take over the conduct of international affairs. By extending the rule of law in the world community, we shall answer that question affirmatively, for law is the greatest instrument for peace that mankind has ever devised.

Especially today, when man has learned how to destroy the world, his greatest need is for instrumentalities and institutions which can save mankind from the mass extermination of nuclear war. It is absolutely clear that mankind must learn to live together or else see civilization as we know it perish in the senseless devastation of war. The sands of time to create a peace structure for this purpose have about run out in the hourglass of our civilization.

Of course, the task of building and enforcing a structure of laws and legal arrangements to insure world peace will not be an easy one. The world is sundered by differences of language, color, creed, and political belief. And yet, the rule of law within and among nations is a concept universally understood as an ideal by men of good will. It therefore offers a common ground which mankind possesses upon which to erect an edifice for peace.

Law is the safeguard of freedom, the arbiter of justice, and the protector of the rights of men and nations. No person is so big that he is above the law and none so insignificant that he cannot look to the law for protection. The aim of the rule of law is to insure equal justice by providing a single standard of rights and duties which apply to each individual and each nation in a similar situation. The term "rule of law" connotes due process, adherence to fundamental moral principles, and respect for the dignity and the worth of the individual. It also implies the traditions, procedures, and institutions which give practical effect to these ideals. Within nations it is expressed in limitations on legislative power, in safeguards against abuse of executive power, in equal access to the law and equality before the law, and in protection of individual liberties by independent courts. Internationally it implies the development of traditions, procedures, and institutions which aim to reduce international tensions, resolve international crises, and eliminate international violence by the substitution of law for violence. In all these implications, the term "rule of law" is universally understood. It is also coming to be more and more widely understood that civilization must be built upon respect for law and can be healthy only in an environment of respect for law. The rule of law is thus an ideal around which the hopes and yearnings of humankind can be rallied in a mammoth effort to erect a realistic structure of world peace.

The idea of a peaceful world ruled by law was born centuries ago. Grotius and his predecessors, as well as his successors, sketched its outlines in many languages and thereby fired the imaginations of men of their day. That the idea has never died, but in fact, has grown in acceptance down through the ages attests to its validity in our day.

We live at a time when the whole world is being made over socially, economically, scientifically, and even intellectually. Our era has witnessed such dramatic achievements as flight faster than sound, the splitting of the atom, miracle drugs, and manned satellites hurling through space. Rapid and turbulent changes in the scientific, economic, and social fields, almost too numerous to name, daily defy evaluation on the basis of prior standards and experience. Vistas of endless space have opened as man's horizons have widened to encompass the universe. At a pace beyond dreaming the whole pattern of our existence is being reshaped. To insure that these changes work for the benefit of mankind, law must be developed rapidly enough in the world community to cope with the problems they raise and to harness their potential for peaceful and productive ends.

Due to rapid communications and transportation, ours is also an indivisible world. Age-old barriers such as mountains and seas, weather and climate, even time and distance are fading into insignificance. The many economic relations and intellectual exchanges between nations are steadily increasing. The interdependence and interconnection of all peoples is a fact few will deny. Therefore international cooperation is an overriding necessity of our time. And it is above all through international cooperation in the development of law that the world can turn this fact of its own indivisibility to good account.

* * * * *

Other evidence will occur to you as you make your own evaluation of international law and of the laws which are necessary to strengthen its scope.

We all realize, however, that much work remains to be done in this field. Let me mention briefly four areas of concern which deserve particular emphasis, and which, I am glad to note, are in fact emphasized by the report of the Committee on Development of International law.

First, the most pressing challenge of all: How can we strengthen the habit of substituting reason for violence as a method of deciding international disputes? The record of the United Nations in this respect has, on the whole, been encouraging. But in disputes between nations, reliance is still too often placed upon brute force, with tragic consequences. The absence of sufficient laws and of sufficiently active courts for settling disputes in the world community is perhaps the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization. We need to develop effective peacekeeping machinery and this means developing more law and more legal institutions. We must formulate a world concensus favoring peace through law and develop the atmosphere which makes the use of peacekeeping methods a habit.

Second. What legal institutions can be developed to facilitate the expansion of trade, investment, and economic progress on a worldwide basis? If we succeed in closing the growing economic gap between the rich and the poor nations, we shall have taken a long stride on the road to world peace. One way of tackling this problem is to strengthen and to increase the effectiveness of special adjudicative processes for the settlement of disputes in the economic field.

Third, what can be done to enlarge international recognition of the rights and duties of individual human beings relative to the world community? Under this heading would be included recognition of basic civil rights of citizens of any country while traveling or residing in another country.

Fourth, and most fundamentally of all, what can we do to intensify the processes of legal education at all levels throughout the world; to facilitate international exchanges in the field of law; and to render universally accessible the growing corpus of national and international law? Even the most serious obstacles in the way of achieving a worldwide rule of law can be overcome if the nations will pool their resources to promote legal education and to universalize the comparative knowledge of legal systems and legal points of view.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men," wrote Shakespeare, "which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune * * *." And in the words of Victor Hugo, "nothing is as powerful as an idea and nothing can stop an idea whose time has come." I sincerely believe that now is the time for all mankind to unite to achieve and maintain world peace. And no unifying idea is more powerful, more universally understood, or more accepted worldwide than the idea of world peace under the rule of law. I urge this conference and men of good will throughout the world to do the essential work to develop international law to the point when indeed the time of the law will arrive internationally. It can be done if we but take a leaf from the notebook of the scientists and concentrate enough manpower, brainpower, and money to bring this towering idea to fruition. Let us move with confidence and do the job that must and can be done by men of the law.

I believe that it is the destiny of our generation to lead the world toward world peace under law. We all know that when the rule of law prevails in a city, in a State, in the world community, and in endless space, then and then only can any man, woman, and child live happily in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

EXHIBIT 11

[From the Department of State Bulletin, Dec. 20, 1965]

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG, NOV. 30

(Press release 277 dated Nov. 30)

I welcome this opportunity to speak to you about history's most ambitious and important undertaking in international cooperation—the United Nations. Your presence at this conference affirms your faith in its high concept and in the ideals that give it life, ideals that are no less urgent because they are visionary.

Too frequently do we give credence to the notion that endeavors, because they are idealistic, are to be shunned or abused. Let me remind you that the Founding Fathers of this country were unashamed idealists and visionaries not afraid to dream or to admit that they dreamed. And their dreams gave rise to a free and tolerant land where there is room for men of all races, religions, and ancestries. Their vision found strength in a diversity of traditions freely honored and cherished in a new kind of society—equal, just, open, and forever respectful of conscience.

It is therefore only natural that we, as Americans, support the dream of a society of nations banded together in a cooperative quest to better the lot of man and to practice the art of peace.

That the hopes of the U.N.'s founders must still await fulfillment in many areas in no way lessens their validity. Neither does it alter the fact that a working relationship, forged in hardships and crises of 20 years, has been established among the nations.

It is not yet the partnership that we would want it to be, and it is experiencing both successes and failures as the nations daily test how their fragile experiment in international cooperation can best serve the opportunities of the future.

Certainly the success of our own American democracy proves that agreement is frequently best compounded out of clashing ideas and even purposes. It is a method we hope will ultimately lead to the equal success of the United Nations and thereby the entire concept of international cooperation.

As Adlai Stevenson once put it, "Men can proceed on their journey to peace even though they may disagree on the length of the next step they should take."

The key, it seems to me, can be found in what our own Declaration of Independence terms a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind." This respect has always been an integral part of our foreign policy; I commend it not only to all members of the United Nations but to those among us who may have forgotten this basic concern of our Founding Fathers and who, therefore, may not realize that negotiation is not appeasement, agreement is not surrender, cooperation is not weakness, and leadership is not bluster.

AN AUDACIOUS GOAL

True international cooperation will not be achieved on those terms, not by us or by any other nation. It will be achieved when all nations learn to accommodate narrow national interests to the wider international concerns of all mankind.

This, in truth, is an audacious goal, but the U.N. has demonstrated many times and in many areas that it can advance toward it without sacrificing the vital interests of the members.

Each time it does, the U.N. builds and nourishes the entire concept of international cooperation, and here we find the great—but largely overlooked—revolutionary fact of our day. Surely and irrevocably, it is shaping the history of our world.

It is shaping it indirectly at a time when we are pressing the limits of bilateral aid and we are looking for new multilateral forms to advance the vital tasks of helping more than half the world catch up with the fewer but richer and developed nations.

The practical implementation of the Mekong River development program is a key illustration of what I mean. So is the new Asian Development Bank now being organized to finance that program, which dwarfs our own TVA.

The U.N., of course, has played a vital role in an existing Mekong River program, and it has an even greater role to play in the future. For our ultimate hope is that all the nations of the region, regardless of political differences, will work together economically for the common good of all. And international cooperation will be enhanced not only in southeast Asia but everywhere.

Let me take the concept a step further directly into the area of political disputes that frequently divide us in the U.N. The United States believes in parliamentary democracy, and ours is not merely a fair-weather belief, to expound only when the vote goes our way. We proved this conclusively some months ago on the troublesome issue of financing peacekeeping operations when we agreed to abide by a consensus of the membership even though we did not fully agree with it.

It is a tribute to the underlying good sense of the overwhelming majority of members that despite many difficulties—past and present—the U.N. is now carrying out vital responsibilities in the peacekeeping area. I should stress it is doing so even though no one member is fully satisfied with all the current arrangements for initiating, supervising, and financing the various operations.

This partial success points up the need for the U.N. membership to avoid the fallacy of assuming that total agreement on all issues of principle is a precondition of cooperating in U.N. activities.

Of course, the crucial ingredient in the United Nations capacity to keep the peace is political and moral. It is our determination to rely on the United Nations, to use the United Nations, to have confidence in the United Nations operating capacity.

The stakes are so high that we should be willing to take chances on the United Nations capacity to act, and to back it up even when some of its particular decisions may go against our immediate national desires. We should be willing because of our confident belief that our long-range national interest is best served by a peaceful and stable world. Moreover, the risks of a United Nations without the capacity to act are far greater than the risks of a United Nations with that capacity.

The differences that exist among the member States—whether the issue is peacekeeping or any other—will not disappear overnight, and the greatest contribution the American citizen can make is to understand this inevitable fact of international life. Time is our immediate frustration; but in the long run it can also be a most effective ally.

THE PRICE WE PAY

"What we obtain too cheaply," Thomas Paine once said, "we esteem too lightly * * *. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods."

The price we pay of patience, persistence, and faith in the goal we seek—universal peace under an equitable law for all men everywhere—is certainly not too great.

It has taken us nearly 190 years to develop our own domestic attitudes, and we are far from finished. Can we say, then, that 20 years is too long to develop the attitude of international cooperation?

It is important, therefore, for all Americans to understand that the United Nations has become an indispensable part of their everyday lives. It is equally important, I believe, for them to express their opinions about our membership and our role in the United Nations as, indeed, it is in the overall conduct of our foreign policy. For public official and private citizen must keep a dialog going in this country that will constantly examine and probe how that policy is coming along.

I do not fear such a dialog; I welcome it, and so does the President, as he himself made clear only the other day, because it is the expression of a free people determined to remain free.

Debate and discussion are keystones to that freedom, and the right to participate in them is not limited only to voices that agree with any given policy or action. The price of our freedom includes that of criticizing our elected officials and disagreeing with their policies.

I do not subscribe to the idea that the grave problems of today demand unanimity of opinion. We are a mature people, and we should not fear dissent. It is, of course, more powerful when its aims are constructive, but we in our free and open society must live with it even when the opposite is true. If we do not, we face the danger of embracing for our own those ends we fight to prevent abroad.

But our adversaries should not take the American right to dissent as a sign of weakness or wavering of purpose. Rather they should regard it as a sign of our virility as a nation and a source of strength both at home and wherever we are committed.

I am sure that many of you recall the Oxford Oath that swept across virtually every British and American campus in the late 1930's. But when Hitler attempted to impose his will upon the world, the same young people who sincerely vowed not to fight in any war became the heroic frontline of our defense.

The American people, in brief, with their belief and trust in the blessings of freedom, will ever draw new strength from their unfettered right to express divergent and even unpopular views, but at a time of testing they stand together to resist tyranny.

Peiping and Hanoi, therefore, should make no mistake about our basic unity of purpose in opposing force or be misled by a freedom they do not understand.

THE UNFINISHED TASK

And here we come to the central paradox of this conference—the hope for international cooperation in a day marked by all too many continuing instances of man's inhumanity to man. Strive for it as we do, it remains an unfinished task, an unaccomplished reality.

Certainly any appraisal of the existing world situation—beginning with Vietnam—would illustrate the obstacles that have kept international cooperation from its full potential in 1965:

We seek a better means of peaceful existence with all nations, but we are still far from a genuine détente with the Soviet Union. Its spokesmen say that Vietnam stands in the way. If so, I can but reiterate our repeated assertions that we are ready to go to the conference table with no conditions attached and ask why we receive no adequate reply from any source.

If we turn to the subcontinent we see two nations friendly to us locked in combat. The U.N. has attained a cease-fire, but we have not yet found the key to a permanent peace settlement. It is vital that we do.

In Africa, the peace and security is being threatened by the misguided leaders of a white minority in Rhodesia. If it is not contained in time, this threat may well engulf all of the area in violence and disaster.

Our close NATO allies, Greece and Turkey, as well as the descendants of their two great peoples on Cyprus, find themselves in bitter conflict in spite of the best efforts and intentions on all sides.

Neither we nor anyone else has been able to bring peace and understanding to the Middle East.

Meanwhile, the chains of poverty, disease, and illiteracy are holding back the forward surge of half the world into the affluence and light of the 20th century.

And overriding all these is the most urgent problem facing mankind—that of disarmament. I take heart in the fact that the General Assembly has voted unanimously in one case and overwhelmingly in the other on resolutions calling for a nonproliferation agreement and a comprehensive test ban.

We need desperately to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and agreement on a genuine and meaningful comprehensive test ban treaty would be an important complement to a nonproliferation agreement.

I am sure that, if all the nations invited to participate in the proposed world disarmament conference are sincere and if appropriate preparations for it can be made, the voice of reason may yet be heard in the nuclear wilderness. It is a hope I would encourage. We should always be prepared to talk with anyone, anytime, about peace and disarmament. Nothing less than civilization itself is at stake.

There are more, sadly, many more obstacles I could mention. But even this brief list points up how lonely is the quest for peace and how far we still stand from the goal of true international cooperation.

A SEARCH FOR NEW ANSWERS

But if it is cause for grave concern, it is even more reason for creative thought and statesmanship. For every problem there is opportunity that must be embraced and met, not with gloom and pessimism but with a determination to find the evasive solution.

And that, I believe, should be your mood when you conclude your conference tomorrow—determination that not even the bad habit of past disharmony will diminish eloquent hope of future world law and order.

You are already setting an exciting example for all Americans to follow as you search out new answers to the international concerns of poverty, disease, a fair share of the earth's bounties, the peaceful uses of the atom, the benefits to be derived from outer space—every concern, in short, that seeks to elevate the equality and the well-being of the earth and its inhabitants.

I congratulate you, for yours is an effort in full keeping with the rich heritage of our past and the proud hopes we have for the future. It is my hope that, when you return to your home communities throughout the country, you and the work you do will spearhead a new wave of cooperation and understanding. In this fashion will we as Americans, make a notable advance in our effort to fulfill man's sacred stir for justice.

On the calendar International Cooperation Year will end in another month, but on the agenda of man it must continue for all time. There is no other way of building a world of peace and order.

Neither is there any other way of heeding the simple truth spoken so clearly and poetically in the UNESCO charter, "that since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constucted."

EXHIBIT 12

ADDRESS BY MR. BUNDY, NOVEMBER 29

It's a great pleasure to have a chance to meet with you here in the first day of the White House Conference on International Cooperation and to have the opportunity to cut my remarks short in obvious deference to your desire to hear from yourselves and not from the rest of us.

You're absolutely right; that's the purpose of this meeting. It's only in universities that you can get people to pay to come and hear a lecture. You have paid for this lunch—not for the purpose of hearing me but for the purpose of continuing this 3-day effort to straighten the Government out.

That's what the meeting is for. That's why the President called this conference in 1964. That is what the very impressive collection of reports is about. It is also true that, the reports having been prepared by panels, they will now be improved by the rest of you in the 3 days of this meeting. Some of them will be advantaged by that discussion, I think, just as we have been advantaged already in the Government by the work that you have done.

IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING

The first thing I would like to say to you, all fooling aside, is that it is very good for us that you are here, very good for us, as we try to go about your business, that you are willing to take the time to express your convictions, to organize your thinking, to frame recommendations as comprehensive and as varied, and yet as often interlocking, as those which already appear in the preliminary papers.

I think it's very easy to forget, when one is outside of Government, and even when one is inside Government, how much the process of the framing of policy in the United States is inevitably a process which must engage not only those who work in any given administration, not only the professionals who work from one administration to another, but the American public as a whole. It remains true, complex and recondite as some of our problems are, immediate and urgent as some of our decisions may be that the actions of the United States in the world depend upon the understanding and support of the American people.

It is also true that there is no way in which Government alone can undertake to express of its own initiative and of its own insight alone the thinking of a country as rich and varied in human resources as our own. So it has always been true—either in organized or relatively organized fashions, like this one, or in the constant back and forth of communication and exchange and comment and criticism and complaint—it has always been true that the process of government, as a democratic process, depends upon the kind of thing that you have been doing.

It is already clear to me, from a hasty reading of all of the recommendations and of some of the reports, that you have done your job. Many of your recommendations, I think it is fair to say, have already been in the in-box of the Government. And that is not surprising, for the problems we work on and the problems with which you have concerned yourselves are the same problems. There ought to be a reasonable overlap between the next items on our agenda and those which you recommend to our attention. Some of the things in some of the reports had already found their way to the out-box of Government. But they will get another look because you have called them again to our attention.

A few of the recommendations seem, to me at least, to be quite wrong, but I can assure you that the Government is no monolith and I know of no recommendation that will not find its advocate somewhere within the vast and varied forces of the executive branch. In fact, from time to time it has appeared to me that someone whose idea was not fully accepted within the process of Government might conceivably have been communicating with some citizen in the private sector so as to insure that the follies of higher authority were corrected by the appeal to public opinion. I do not at all mean to question the perfect discipline and internal security of the Government but only to point out that there are these means of communication and that we expect it to be so.

The circles of cooperation to which your panel reports are addressed are varied in size and perhaps in a sense varied in their importance. We cannot claim that every change which we would like to make in the process of commerce or in the advancement of this or that new industry compares in overall importance with the questions of peace and of human survival to which some of the panel reports are quite explicitly addressed. That variation in importance is not a variation in immediacy or a variation in the usefulness of what each participant has done.

One of the things I hope that you may have a chance to do—that I would wish to do if I were able to participate in your sessions continuously—would be to look at the work, and perhaps listen to the discussion, in one or more of the panels not related to the line of your own immediate professional or personal interest. I, at least, have had my attention drawn once again to the breadth of the concerns of the people of this Nation, as they look to the question of international cooperation in all its forms.

Some of the things which are recommended are really internal recommendations from one group of private citizens to another. That also is as it should be. Cooperation is very much of that nature—in our history and in our present—a process of people-to-people and of citizen-to-citizen communication and of branches of human activity communicating with their counterparts in other countries. Some of it is at least implicitly recommendation to other governments. And that also is important. But centrally what you are doing is producing the kind of counsel to your own Government which is in the great tradition of our country. And we are deeply grateful to you. Indeed, as we review your work and as we think of what this Conference means we can only be struck by the fact that there are not many nations in which this kind of process can be carried forward. And we must hope that the example which you set will be followed in as many other nations as possible.

SPIRIT IN WHICH CONFERENCE WAS CALLED

Now let me say before I turn the meeting to those who have questions or comments of their own, let me say finally that in saying all this I am quite confident that I speak in the sense in which the President was thinking when he called this meeting. You have already heard from the Vice President of his message of greeting. But it seemed to me that perhaps I might recall to you the spirit in which he called this Conference, if I were to take just a minute to repeat some words which he spoke to many of us—to many of you and to many of us in the Government—in the meeting in which he first announced in October of 1964 his intention to have a White House Conference.[3]

He was late to that meeting (this was not the only time in which people were not precisely on time in the months of September and October, but the test of the activities of those months was registered a month later), but those of us who waited, I think, felt as I did, that when the President came, it was quite clear that he had come to a place and to a group whose purpose in coming to the State Dining Room he shared.

What he said then in part was:

"As a great leader said in this room not many years ago, if a peaceful revolution is impossible, a violent revolution is inevitable. So I believe that the true realists in the second half of this 20th century are those who bear the dream of new ways for new cooperation.

---

[3] Ibid., Oct. 19, 1964, p. 555.

"You will be frowned upon. Some will call you an idealist. Some will call you a crackpot, and some may even call you worse than that. They may say you are soft or hard or don't understand what it is all about in some of these fields. But what greater ambition could you have and what greater satisfaction could come to you than the knowledge that you had entered a partnership with your Government that had provided the leadership in the world that had preserved humanity instead of destroyed it?"

The President went on to say that if he was there in the White House in the following year—he was speaking, he said, politically and not physically—if he was there, he intended to call a White House Conference.

"And I want all of you to start thinking about it now. I want you to talk to your friends about it. I want to call a White House Conference to search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace. That five-letter word is the goal of all of us."

And I think that as we look back on the work that you have done, and the work that you have still to do in these wider sessions of the coming 3 days, it's fair for me in closing to paraphrase the President and to say, in words like his of last October, that I am very proud this morning that I am a citizen of a country that can have voluntarily assembled, under the auspices of the first house of this land, the quality and quantity of talent that face me now. To each of you, for the time you've taken and waited, for the money you've spent in coming here, for the thought that you've given, but more important, for what you are going to do, on behalf of the Nation, I say that we are grateful.

Thank you very much.

EXHIBIT 13

REMARKS BY SECRETARY RUSK, DECEMBER 1

I do want to make just a few preliminary remarks before turning to your questions. Your chairman was very tactful in saying that I would be willing to take some questions. I understand that you want me to say as little as possible, and get to your questions right away, which I shall try to do.

But I do want to add my own personal thanks to those which you have had from others, for the work that you are giving to this Conference and to the committees. There is no unimportant committee among the 30. And I say this because the work for peace stretches across the entire spectrum of human endeavor.

One of the most stimulating and encouraging elements in this present world situation has to do with the unseen work for peace that goes on all the time. It makes up 80 percent of the work of a department like the Department of State. It involves more than 600 intergovernmental meetings each year, most of which you never hear about—meetings ranging from attempts to control nuclear weapons to attempts to control hog cholera. That work is making up what Wilfred Jenks called a common law of mankind.

Brick by brick there is evolving an enormous and stable structure of international cooperation, based upon the necessity for men to consider their common interests as men inhabiting this small planet. It's important that we can get a report from a particular country that there was no indigenous case of malaria last year. It's important that another country can report that there was no indigenous case of measles among its children for all of last year. It's important that I could read in a newspaper that an American naval doctor went out into the Atlantic, at a considerable distance from our shores, to tend the master of a Soviet vessel who had encountered a medical crisis. And it's also important that I read about it in the newspaper, and it was not a policy problem on my desk. The policy was taken for granted.

Now this is going on all the time, and the work of all 30 committees can contribute enormously to that building of a decent world order, to the building of cooperation that affects almost everything we do in our own daily lives, as human beings trying to work out some sort of decent existence.

I would like to underline that the problem of peace is a different problem today than it has ever been in our history before. President Eisenhower in his second term, President Kennedy, President Johnson have had to think about problems that no other American President has ever had to think about, because in the midfifties a full nuclear exchange began to be possible. The notion of the survival of the human race has moved from metaphor to operational reality.

Perhaps some of you may have heard me say this before, but at the close of World War II we all tried to sit down and think long and hard about what kind of world we wanted to live in. We drew the lessons from that war—we wrote the United Nations Charter. We shall not have that chance again. We shall not be able to sit down after world war III and draw its lessons and start over again. We've got, somehow, to get deeply into our spirits the lessons that we know are there and use them to prevent that war—if there is to be anything like a decent life among men on this planet.

I think there would be, in general, agreement on that idea, right around the globe. I find it hard to take completely seriously statements in Peiping that they hope to persuade their fellow Communists not to take such a dismal view of war. They say this is the problem with the "revisionists." Well, we're not revisionists, as Peiping speaks of them. But I can tell you we take a very dismal view of war. And we would hope that there is a practicality and sufficient sanity among those who talk about a dismal view of war to give us a chance still to build a peace.

I think we can be encouraged by the fact that I think all governments—and I don't qualify "all governments"—these days probably realize that a full nuclear exchange is an irrational act and cannot be considered as a rational instrument of policy. I think we're very close to being able to say, with reasonable confidence, that the sending of mass divisions across the frontiers is recognized as too dangerous, and too reckless in the modern world, to be a suitable instrument of policy.

But we still have in front of us the problem of the use of force, infiltration, attempts to impose one's will on other people by forceful measures, short of a general war, and so we are driven back to the question as to how we can best establish the peace. And on that question, let's admit, among frail human beings, that this is a question which makes pygmies of everyone. And if there are those here who feel that they have a sure, complete, solid answer, take care, take care. Approach these problems somewhat on your knees. What the leaders in the world today need are your prayers and not your imprecations, because these are difficult questions.

We who are older have the problem of forgetting those things which we ought to forget, and those who are young have the problem of trying to grasp the reality of the things which they've had no chance to remember. And so we all have difficulties.

What do we do about the phenomenon of appetite? The doctrine of appetite is clear and in front of us, put forward in its harshest form by Peiping, with a violence which has caused great problems even within the Communist world—quite apart from the problems it has caused for the free world. How do we deal with those who are determined, by their own declarations and their own conduct, to impose their views and their will upon others by force?

Do we say, once again, that perhaps this next step will be enough? And that they will be satisfied? Or do we make it clear that every nation, large and small, has a right to live its own life, even though it is within the reach of great power. There are some things that it is difficult to forget.

I was in the Oxford Union in 1933 when C. E. M. Joad moved the motion that "this house will not fight for king and country," and in uniform a few years later I saw a statement by C. E. M. Joad saying to that same generation of young people, "Now, chaps, this fellow Hitler is different—now get out and fight." He did not add in his statement, "and without the weapons and the training which I helped to deprive you of." And so a friend of mine in the Black Watch told me that his battalion charged Nazi panzers at Dunkirk with naked bayonets in order to help a few more of his comrades get off the beach.

And there were those in this country who said, "This is not our war," and Hitler listened to them. And then came Pearl Harbor, and most of those said, "Oh yes, yes, it is our war after all, it is our war after all."

The problem is how to organize the peace, how to assure the peace, in the face of appetite and ambition. Since 1945 we have seen this problem posed in many ways. We have not been ourselves directly involved in all of the instances in which this problem has been posed. But nevertheless we and others have joined, at times at considerable sacrifice, to say to the aggressor, "No, gentlemen, this won't do; we're not going to let that chain of events get started; the place to stop it is at the beginning." And so, in one place after another, one country after another, it has been necessary to meet appetite.

But on the other hand it has been necessary to meet appetite with prudence. War was not waged against Greece's northern neighbors during the Greek guerrilla affair. Major units of the Armed Forces were not committed at the time of the Berlin blockade, but rather an airlift was used. Nuclear weapons were not used in Korea, despite the casualties. The Congo was handled painfully and with patience in the United Nations. President Eisenhower built into the placing of troops in the Lebanon a peaceful settlement of that problem. President Kennedy took very special pains to leave open the doors of peaceful solution of the Cuban missile crisis. We waited more than 4 years of infiltration in southeast Asia before striking the North.

Now, the purpose is to recognize that events must be allowed to take over, that the possibilities of peaceful settlement must remain open, that we should not elect a large war in place of a small war, that we should not let the infection of violence spread further and faster than it is humanly possible to control, because it is too late in history to solve these issues by war.

These are not easy problems. It is tragic that in the 1960's young men should be faced with what is for them a world war, when they must go and do their duty. It is tragic, in the 1960's, that discussion, private or public, cannot find a solution to these problems at the conference table rather than on the battlefield.

In South Vietnam—I know this is much on your minds; I can assure you it's very much on the minds of all of us—the essential elements of the problem are that there are tens of thousands of infiltrators being sent from North Vietnam into South Vietnam to impose a solution by force upon the people of South Vietnam. If you have any doubts about the facts, you can easily run them down. If you wish to deny them, I can assure you that the other side is no longer denying those facts; so you may be a little out of date.

The second element is that we have a commitment there. We don't have commitments everywhere—not every dispute is ours—but we do have important commitments in different parts of the world, and South Vietnam has been one of them. I can go into the details, but I think time does not require it. We know we have a commitment, and the Communist world knows we have a commitment, the rest of the world knows it. And I would say to you that the character of the American commitment is the principal pillar of peace in this present world situation, because there are capitals which could make a monstrous miscalculation if they should come to the conclusion that the American commitment is not worth very much, and we would be confronted with dangers which are extremely difficult even to imagine.

Nevertheless, the path of peaceful settlement has been, and is, wide open. When President Kennedy became President in 1961, he reviewed the situation in southeast Asia deeply and personally and he decided to try to bring that matter to a peaceful solution. He discussed this with Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna in June 1961. They were able to agree in principle as far as Laos was concerned: We all ought to leave those 2 million people in that small landlocked country alone and let them work out their own future. Everyone leave them alone.

That led to the Geneva Conference on Laos and an agreement on Laos. The difficulty is that Hanoi did not bring itself into compliance with that agreement for a single day following its signature. Thousands of North Vietnamese troops remained in Laos, and they continued to use Laos as an infiltration route into South Vietnam, both specifically contrary to that agreement which they had solemnly signed in 1962.

President Kennedy was not able to get an agreement with Mr. Khrushchev on Vietnam in that discussion. But from that time to this, the possibilities of peace in southeast Asia have been discussed, at every opportunity, on public occasions and private occasions, through public channels and private channels. And the problem simply is that there are those who are determined to bring about a result in South Vietnam by force, regardless of what the South Vietnamese people themselves might think about it and in the face of a commitment by the United States and others to South Vietnam.

So we have some problems in front of us, but we should, I think, recognize the stimulating prospect that we can take considerable encouragement from the growing recognition that formal and major war is rapidly moving out of the picture, and that if we can find an answer to this thing which is miscalled "wars of national liberation" and get it deeply understood on the other side that peaceful coexistence is their best attitude and their best policy, as well as ours, then the human race may be able to look ahead for a considerable period into the future without the threat of a general war on the horizon.

And that is the stake. It's not just South Vietnam, although that is important; not just southeast Asia, although that is critically important. It's the prospect of organizing a peace, and for that purpose no one will find the United States one half step behind, but rather one half step in front, searching for that day, because that is at the heart of the simple and decent purposes of the American people, and those purposes are the source of our greatest strength, as well as the source of the greatest promise for the future.

That's why we value the work of your 30 committees. That's why we value the talent that is assembled here to help us in this great task. That's why we feel that men at their best can do a great deal to overcome the tragedy of men at their worst.

Now I'm ready for your questions.

QUESTION-AND-ANSWER PERIOD

Question. Mr. Secretary, in the near future, do you see, sir, an opportunity for a return to a normal relationship with Cuba?

Answer. It has been said many times, by the hemisphere as well as by our own Government, that Cuba would be welcomed back into the family of the Western Hemisphere if they would give up their attempt to subvert and terrorize the other nations of this hemisphere and cut their military ties with nations outside the hemisphere. Thus far we have not seen any indication that the present authorities in Havana are prepared to consider either one of those two elementary notions. And in the face of that I think there would be the general view around the hemisphere that there is not yet a place for Cuba in the family of the Western Hemisphere.

Question. Mr. Secretary, the question that I have before me is really not a question, but it's a statement, it's a message for you from someone here—

Answer. Please——

Question. I think it really reflects the mood in which this conference is greeting you, because he says, Mr. Secretary, whatever the question, whatever the answer, you have our deepest sympathy and our cooperation.

And then a question: In this country the people are expected to participate in the dialog with Government, in the determination of policy, but what can be done when the CIA seems to be making policy, completely removed from the public and even from Government control?

Answer. Well, in the first place, the CIA does not make policy and is not engaged in activities unknown to the policy offices of the Government. There is at the present time, in certain other countries, an organized effort, through forgeries, through lies, to implicate us in situations in which we're not at all implicated. Now this is a difficult problem, but I would emphasize to you that CIA is not engaged in activities not known to the senior policy officers of the Government. But you should also bear in mind that beneath the level of public discussion there is a tough struggle going on in the back alleys all over the world. It's a tough one, it's unpleasant, and no one likes it, but that is not a field which can be left entirely to the other side. And so once in a while some disagreeable things happen, and I can tell you that there is a good deal of gallantry and a high degree of competence in those who have to help us deal with that part of the struggle for freedom, as in other parts of the struggle for freedom.

Question. Mr. Secretary, the following represents a combination of many questions on the same subject, summarized for us by Mr. Norman Cousins after consultation with many groups and individuals.

Do you believe, Mr. Secretary, it is possible for Americans who are as strongly opposed to the spread of communism in the world as is the present administration, Americans who are fully informed about the activities of the Vietcong, Americans who know of the difficulty of getting Hanoi to the conference table, Americans who believe just as deeply as does the administration in the cause of self-determination, whether in Vietnam or the Dominican Republic, or anywhere else, Americans who have a fairly sophisticated understanding of the national interest—Mr. Secretary, do you believe that these Americans can feel that they are nonetheless loyal, responsible, and constructive in opposing U.S. air bombing in Vietnam as contrary to America's historical and moral stance, as less rather than more likely to bring about negotiation and can therefore call for an immediate end to the bombing, as being both in the American interest, the human interest, and the interest of world peace?

Answer. As you suggested, sir, there are a number of questions in that statement. Let me try to sort out two or three of them.

Of course we know the difference between disloyalty and dissent. Now, the apparatus of the Communist Party, directed from abroad, is busy in this country; we know that. But I hope you will understand that we also know how to draw the distinction between the apparatus and decent, loyal American citizens who are concerned and have differences of view with us. We've never tried to put those two together. Don't ask me to close my eyes to the fact that the apparatus is busy; it is, I know it. But, nevertheless, these are matters on which citizens can have differences of view and differences of judgment.

On the bombing, this is not something that one has to speculate about. One can say, "If you stop the bombing, the other side might do x, y, or z." Now, we're in touch with the other side, regularly—every week—and our contacts with the other side are completely adequate to the problem of finding out whether the stopping of the bombing would be a step toward peace, whether it would lead to discussions on negotiations, whether it would cause the stopping of the bombing of our own people—the South Vietnamese and our own people in the South. We don't have to speculate about that. I can recall the private contacts which resolved the Berlin blockade, the private contacts which brought the Korean war eventually to an end. We've been trying to find out, in view of our public statements that we could stop the bombing as a step toward peace, what the effect would be, what the results would be, what would happen if we did. The other side has had that question in front of it, regularly, and in the process through which they would find it easiest to give an answer—not to your resolutions, not to proclamations, not to public statements—they've been unwilling to give an answer.

Now, it's not just a debater's point—it's not just a debater's point to remind you that we started with a 4-year pause, through stepped-up infiltrations, increasing violence, accompanied by a persistent effort through diplomatic channels to find a peaceful settlement for the problem of southeast Asia. We didn't say, "Oh, our face is involved; we can't talk to you about this matter if you are bombing our people in South Vietnam." We didn't say that. We talked to them about it, tried to find out how we could resolve this question by peaceful means.

It's not just a debater's point to say, when we did pause for several days, that on the third day of that pause we had our answer from each of the Communist capitals involved. And they didn't say to us, "Well, extend the pause for a while so that we can be in touch with you; let us talk this over a bit." They didn't say that. They said it was an insult, or they refused to answer. Or in the case of another capital, they said, "Even if you pause, there will be no negotiations."

Now, I can understand your concern about this problem, and I am not now excluding the possibility of a stopping of the bombing as a step toward peace. But I want you to know that, sitting where I sit, it is not necessary to conjecture about this point. We're in touch with those who can give us the answer, regularly, on this question. So we shall continue our effort to bring this matter from the battlefield to the conference table. Thus far we have not succeeded.

Question. Mr. Secretary, we have had a number of questions dealing with the United Nations and China. This one seems to crystallize many of them. Under what circumstances would the United States remove its opposition to mainland China's representation in the United Nations?

Answer. Well, you asked me for a statement about the future; I would prefer to hold off on that for a while. Let me say that our problem with Peiping has not been lack of contact. We've had 127 talks with Peiping. I think it's fair to say that we've had more talks with Peiping on serious subjects than any government that has diplomatic relations with them, with the possible exception of the Soviet Union. In each of those talks they begin by saying, "There is nothing to discuss, unless you're prepared to surrender Formosa." And when we say that we can't surrender 11 million people to you against their will, then the conversations become rather difficult, and they take the line of the publicly known positions of both sides over the years. When the question of disarmament comes up, when the question of southeast Asia comes up, when the question of exchanging some newsmen comes up, or exchanges of doctors, this is the reply: "Nothing to discuss until you're prepared to surrender Formosa."

The problem is not one of contact. The problem is that with contact, with contact, it's very difficult to find a basis for improvement of relations. Now, as far as Peiping's present attitude is concerned, a great deal, a great deal, turns upon what judgments they make about whether their present policy is successful or not. We feel that, in the absence of any indications from them or anyone else to the contrary, anything which makes them feel that they're getting along just fine confirms them in a policy and an attitude that clearly points toward war. Now, I was told by someone who could not be charged with being a capitalist, just a few weeks ago, that the No. 1 question in the world today is trying to turn Peiping to this path of peaceful coexistence. If I had said that, I suppose it would have been greeted as capitalist propaganda. But this is true. There's a lot in that.

Now, Peiping has found itself rejected in Africa, when its foreign minister comes to Africa and says Africa is ripe for revolution, because the governments of Africa know that Peiping is not talking about decolonization, they are talking about the governments of Africa. Peiping has received a setback in Indonesia. They were not able to pursue what semed to be their threats against India in the India-Pakistan affair. They have some problems. I would hope that those problems would cause them to have some sober second thoughts about the difference between militancy and peaceful coexistence, and if they're prepared to embark upon the path of peaceful coexistence, there will be many around the world, including the people in this country, who would be glad to see them do it and not stand in the way.

Question. Sir, this question from the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK, the distinguished U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania. Does the State Department support a treaty of general and complete disarmament, as proposed by President Kennedy?

Answer. Yes, yes, and we've spent a great deal of time on it, at conferences and in bilateral discussions. We have a lot of reasons for being very serious about disarmament. I mentioned certain ones of them when I talked to you about the problem of war and the necessity for peace in my opening remarks. I suppose you realize that since 1947 the United States has spent $800 billion in defense budgets. Let your 30 committees' imaginations range over what could be accomplished in the world if we could spent $800 billion for some other purpose. What a different world this would be, and for the other side too, because on their economic base they have spent probably at least as much, if not more, relative to the economic base.

Now, we must continue to work at this problem of disarmament, and I hope we can find additional points where we can meet and agree as we did in the nuclear test ban treaty, rather than simply by occupying each other's rear with proposals, a dozen or so on each side, which don't touch the real interests of the other side, or the points of agreement. There is one important problem that stands in the way, apart from certain of the tensions caused by, say, Vietnam or other particular issues of that sort, and that is the problem of confidence, the problem of how to deal with fear and suspicion in the absence of assurance. On these matters peoples are not likely to trust each other, but what we can do, it seems to me, is to organize machinery which makes the question of trust irrelevant.

Now, I daresay that practically everyone in this room is relaxed about the nuclear test ban treaty, because we can tell you that we do not believe the nuclear test ban treaty is being violated. Suppose we were not able to say that to you. Suppose we had to hold open the prospect of cheating; then the erosion of confidence around the world and the flareup of tension and hate and fear would be extremely difficult to restrain.

Now, let us confess that on this issue we are asking—when we ask for inspection or assurance—we are asking for what might be called a unilateral confession from the Soviet Union, because when they look at us, they're pretty well taken care of. We have an open society; that takes care of about 98 percent of it. You add a few talkative officials to a few energetic reporters, and you add just a little soupçon of espionage, and they've got it made. They know what we're doing and what we're not doing.

But when we look at them it's quite a different matter—it's quite a different matter—a closed society, where we can't give our own people assurances they would be able to give their people if we had an agreement without some sort of inspection or assurance. This turns up in a number of ways on the matter of a comprehensive test ban. We have said recently, and repeatedly: "This is not for us a policy question; this is a technical and scientific question. If the technical and scientific people on both sides would tell us what was possible in terms of assurance, then our policy will adjust to that. Therefore, why don't we let your scientists and technicians, and ours, sit down and see what can be done, and perhaps conduct some joint experiments, to determine what can be done?" The answer is: "No. For us this is not just a scientific and technical question; it's also a policy question. There won't be any inspection."

On the question of defense budgets we have suggested that we should have some what might be called technical discussions on the subject of what goes into a defense budget. In the case of the Soviet Union their research and development budget is outside of what is normally called a defense budget. Our research and development relevant to the military is very heavily inside of our own defense budget. These are things we ought to talk about. They have shown no readiness to sit down and talk over the component elements of the respective defense budgets. But we'll continue to gnaw at it. We've got to; we can't afford to let delays or discouragements turn our hand away from the effort. But it is not a simple thing to bring great powers to a point where they can build a confidence between them, so as we reduce our arms, we can live in confidence with each other.

I'm afraid—I'm afraid I have time, or you have time, for about one more question—you're supposed to be reconvening in another session.

Question. Yes, thank you. Mr. Secretary, with our best summarizing we still have a number of questions which we are sure you will be glad to have referred for someone to review, but you get a feeling that this is a very serious group of conferencegoers who want to know what will happen after this conference, and this question really summarizes what's in many of them. It says: "Many recommendations will come out of this conference. Many of them are not currently a part of our Government's policy. Can you tell us in what ways these recommendations will find a hearing and how we may learn of their consideration by our Government?"

Answer. Well, we shall be—I was planning to comment on that later this afternoon when I receive your reports, but I can assure you that we will be studying the recommendations very carefully and very intensively, and they're not going to be brushed suddenly under the rug or something of that sort. We will be in touch with the committees. I don't think this has been officially said, but I expect to be in touch with the members of the committees to let you know what has happened to your recommendations in due course. Some we can act upon very quickly, others will take a little more time. Would you mind if I were to say also, I will let you know which of your suggestions have already been tried out on the Russians and have been turned down.

EXHIBIT 14

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 15, 1966.

Memorandum for:
ICY Cabinet Committee.
ICY Committee Chairmen.
ICY Committee Coordinators.

Subject: Report to the United Nations.

There is attached for your information a press release from the U.S. Mission to the United Nations which includes:

1. Text of a letter from Ambassador Goldberg to Ambassador Tremblay, Chairman, U.N. Committee on ICY; 2. text of a letter from Ambassador Goldberg to Secretary General U Thant; 3. the U.S. response to the General Assembly resolution on ICY.

SAMUEL E. BELK III,
Government Coordinator for ICY.

U.S. MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, PRESS RELEASE NO. 4808, FEBRUARY 18, 1966

(Following is the text of a letter from Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Representative, to Ambassador Paul Tremblay, Chairman of the United Nations Committee on International Cooperation Year.)

DEAR AMBASSADOR TREMBLAY: I am happy to transmit to you and to the United Nations Committee on International Cooperation Year (ICY) a copy of our report of February 18 to the Secretary General on the observance of ICY in the United States. I had earlier transmitted to the Secretariat of your committee the reports submitted to the White House Conference on International Cooperation, November 28–December 1. This, as you may know, was the culmination and the major event in our observance of the year.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal conviction of the importance and effectiveness of this year's observance in reaffirming our faith in the high concepts and ideals that gave life to the United Nations 20 years ago. That the hopes of those early years still await fulfillment in many areas in no way lessens their validity. Neither does it alter the fact that a working relationship, forged in the crises of two decades, has been established among nations.

As the reports previously submitted will show, extensive study of our international cooperation programs in more than 30 different fields in preparation for the White House Conference confirms our belief that despite the too prevalent instances of man's inhumanity to man, the world abounds more in cooperation than in conflict.

The United Nations itself is history's most ambitious experiment in international cooperation. If in these years it has not brought peaceful solutions to all the conflicts and threats of conflict that trouble our world, neither has it permitted them to plunge mankind into holocaust. I know we all share the determination that the United Nations will continue to progress, however slowly, toward a rule of law in the world.

His Excellency Mr. Paul Tremblay,
Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations.

During these years too, the United Nations has, with imagination and persistence, moved forward in the cooperative quest to better the lot of man and improve his life. It would be difficult to find an area of human endeavor in which the U.N. is not active * * * from the fight on disease to the desalting of sea water; from the eradication of illiteracy to the control of locusts; from building bridges to preventing floods; from increasing food supplies to the monitoring of radio frequencies. In these and a thousand other ways the United Nations is building the only true foundation for peace * * * a world in which man can live in dignity and sufficiency.

It is second nature for us in the United States to be deeply committed to this task. For, as President Johnson has said, what we seek at home for ourselves, we seek for all mankind. Our foreign policy in the past—from the Marshall plan to Atoms for Peace to the Alliance for Progress—has always reflected this belief, and it will continue to do so in the future.

This is why we have joined with full hearts and energies in the United Nations International Cooperation Year Program. On the calendar it has ended, but on the agenda of the world's business it remains an unfinished task. We are determined to use the resources of our Nation in concert with others to transform the concept of international cooperation into the most potent force the world has ever known.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Goldberg.

February 18, 1966.

His Excellency U Thant,
Secretary General, United Nations.

Excellency: I have the honor to submit a report on the U.S. response to General Assembly Resolution 1907 (XVIII) of November 21, 1963, proclaiming 1965 an International Cooperation Year (ICY). This document covers the observances of ICY in the United States starting with the signing by President Johnson of a proclamation designating 1965 as International Cooperation Year (ICY) in the United States, on October 2, 1964, and ending with the White House Conference on International Cooperation November 28–December 1 at which more than 400 recommendations for action in 30 fields of international cooperation were submitted to the President.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

Arthur J. Goldberg.

THE U.S. RESPONSE—GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1907 ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION YEAR

In response to General Assembly Resolution 1907 (XVIII) of November 21, 1963, designating 1965 as International Cooperation Year (ICY), President Johnson on October 2, 1964 signed, in the presence of some 250 distinguished citizens, a proclamation designating 1965 as International Cooperation Year in the United States. The President said: "In 1965 it is the hope of your Government that International Cooperation Year may be used for a useful review and purposeful planning * * *. I believe the true realists of the 2d half of this 20th century are those who bear the dream of new ways for new cooperation." The President asked the Department of State to take the lead for the Government in developing and implementing an ICY program. The Secretary of State subsequently asked the United Nations Association of the United States of America to take the lead in the private sector, in carrying out an ICY program based on a unique partnership between the American public and Government. Since October 1964 the following developments have taken place:

1. On November 24, 1963, the President appointed a Cabinet Committee on which 22 agencies and departments of the Government were represented. Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland was designated Chairman of the Cabinet Committee. A National Citizens' Commission, with Robert S. Benjamin as Chairman, was formed in the private sector, consisting of approximately 230 distinguished Americans representing all aspects of American society. By mid-March 1965, the Cabinet Committee and the National Citizens' Commission had formed 30 working committees, covering areas of International cooperation ranging from arms control to youth activities.

The 30 Committees dealt with the following subjects: Agriculture and food, arms control and disarmament, aviation, business and industry, communications, culture and intellectual exchange, development of international law, disaster relief, education and training, finance and monetary affairs, health, human rights, labor, manpower, meteorology, natural resources conservation and development, peaceful settlement of disputes, peaceful uses of atomic energy, peacekeeping operations, population, research on development of international institutions, science and technology, social welfare, space, technical cooperation and investment, trade, transportation, urban development, women and youth activities.

The task of the Committees was to prepare reports to be submitted, in due course, to the President. The reports would (1) inform the President and the people where we now stand internationally in the major functional areas of international cooperation; (2) suggest what our goals ought to be in each of these areas; and (3) recommend how best to achieve those goals. The President on March 4 called for a White House Conference on International Cooperation to be held November 28 to December 1, 1965, when the reports would be fully discussed and presented to the President.

2. On March 23, 1965, under the auspices of the Department of State, the National Citizens' Commission, the Cabinet Committee, and other Government officials met to plan the work that lay ahead. The spirit of the meeting was succinctly expressed by Special Assistant to the President McGeorge Bundy, who said:

"It is a pleasure for me to tell you that the President takes the deepest interest in this undertaking. He started it during the heat of a campaign last October. He has continued to follow its work in the months since then. The President means exactly what he has said—that the work of the Government in supporting your work in International Cooperation Year is of high importance."

During the course of the spring, the United Nations Association engaged more than 450 nongovernmental organizations in the ICY program by inviting them to prepare reports and recommendations in fields involving international cooperation, which would be presented to the President at the White House Conference.

3. A meeting of the Committee Chairman, the Cabinet Committee, and other Government officials was held in the Department of State on June 2. Plans for the remaining months of work were discussed and ideas were exchanged among those who would be primarily responsible for the final reports and recommendations for the White House Conference. As a result of the June 2 meeting, it was clear that the program, as it was then developing, would serve other important purposes in addition to making recommendations in fields of international cooperation, i.e., (1) focus attention on highly important international programs that are often obscured by international crises; (2) serve as a marketplace and laboratory for new ideas; and (3) reflect a broad consensus between the Government and the citizenry as well as political bipartisanship. The spirit of the meeting was reflected by Vice President Humphrey, who said:

"The building of peace is like the building of a beautiful cathedral. It is a work that may not be done in my lifetime nor shall it be done in yours. But you ought to add a stone to it. There ought to be at least one spiral that is yours or one edifice that belongs to you. You ought to be able to point to it and say that I helped place that building block in the cathedral of peace. I think that is what the International Cooperation Year is."

4. Meetings of the 30 committees continued to be held throughout the summer months. As the reports and recommendations began to take final form, the emphasis began to shift from the committees toward the White House Conference itself. Invitations to attend the Conference were sent to approximately 2,000 private citizens and 400 Government officials. It was decided to have a panel session at the Conference for each of the 30 committees. Vice President Humphrey agreed to serve as chairman of the Conference. At the request of the Secretary of State, Raymond D. Nasher of Dallas, Tex., who was chairman of the ICY Urban Development Committee, agreed to serve as executive director of the Conference.

In addition to those who were invited by the President to participate in the Conference, some 3,000 additional citizens attended individual panel sessions as observers, thereby involving a total of some 5,000 Americans in the Conference that culminated ICY in the United States.

As a prelude to the Conference, a cultural program was presented to the participants on the evening of November 28 in the Department of State. The program was jointly narrated by Norman Cousins, chairman of the ICY Committee on Cultural and Intellectual Exchange, and Charles Frankel, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. The program consisted of music by the Claremont String Quartet, the Howard University Concert Choir and the reading of a poem written for the occasion by the distinguished English poet, Stephen Spender.

The Conference was especially fortunate to have outstanding speakers at the two plenaries, two official lunches and one official dinner. These included the Vice President, the Secretary of State, Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, Assistant Secretary Joseph J. Sisco, who had succeeded Harlan Cleveland as Chairman of the Cabinet Committee, the Honorable McGeorge Bundy, the Honorable Douglass Cater, Robert S. Benjamin, and Raymond D. Nasher. The Vice President read a message from the President to the Conference which stated:

"I have called this Conference for one reason. I am determined that the United States shall actively engage its best minds and boldest spirits in the quest for a new order of world cooperation.

"This Nation recognizes that international cooperation is not merely a lofty idea."

At the final plenary, on December, 1, Secretary Rusk, on behalf of the President, received the Committee reports which contained recommendations from Mr. Benjamin. He also accepted the reports from the nongovernmental organizations. In so doing, Secretary Rusk said:

"This White House Conference on International Cooperation has achieved a great deal * * * it is almost unique to our own country. * * *

"And we would hope very much that no one of you would consider that this Conference ends today, that you will continue to follow these matters wherever you live and whatever your particular occupation, in order to keep your talents available and your contributions coming forward." * * *

"And so your job is not finished and the work that you have done just cannot end today. The search for greater international cooperation and world peace remains long and hard, but it will continue to require the very best that any of us can put into it. * * *"

In keeping with Secretary Rusk's promise the departments and agencies of the Government now have under careful review more than 400 recommendations contained in the reports, copies of which have been placed on file in the United Nations Library. Many of the recommendations already are being implemented; others are scheduled for implementation in the future; still others will require extensive study before a final judgment can be made.

The White House Conference on International Cooperation received heavy coverage by the news media throughout the country. Some 400 members of the working press registered at the Conference. Some of the panel sessions were covered by television and radio. One prominent journal reported the Conference as follows:

"Last November 28 nearly 5,000 distinguished Americans met in Washington for what President Johnson described as 'the assignment of the century': exploring means by which the Government and citizenry of the world's most powerful Nation can lead mankind to a golden age of peace through international cooperation.

"Known as the White House Conference on International Cooperation, it was, in many ways, the conference of the century. It was, first, the largest, most comprehensive joint planning effort ever undertaken by American citizens and Government officials. Indeed, as the President observed in a written welcome to participants, the 3-day conference was nothing less than a 'town meeting of leaders of the Nation.' "

HIRING AND EMPLOYEE STANDARDS FOR OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FACILITIES

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, several national newspapers have carried accounts of a startling incident which, in my judgment, cries out for discussion on the Senate floor.

The Bureau of Reclamation, which runs the Office of Economic Opportunity's Job Corps Center at Casper, Wyo., hired a camp instructor last October despite the man's admission that he had a criminal record. The instructor, Lee Palmer Banks, was hired even though the policy for trainees at the camp, as explained to Casper city officials, precluded any with criminal records. Why it was deemed bad policy to have trainees with criminal records and good policy to have instructors so identified has not been explained.

On January 3 of this year, Mr. Banks was arrested in connection with the severe beating of a Casper businessman. The businessman went to the hospital. After arraignment, Mr. Banks went back to work.

On January 17, someone in the Civil Service Commission decided that the Bureau of Reclamation ought to be let in on a secret that had been held close to the vest since early in December. The little secret concerned the history of Mr. Banks.

Through a national agency check, the Civil Service Commission had learned that in addition to the offenses acknowledged on the job application—form 57—Mr. Banks had a lengthy arrest record for such varied offenses as rape, assault and battery, larceny, and attempts to escape, among other things. The record dates to 1954 and is much more than Banks acknowledges in his job application.

The most recent arrest prior to that which stemmed from the beating occurred only a few months before Banks was hired for the Job Corps. He was arrested in Des Moines, Iowa, in February 1965, a fact which the Bureau presumably had not known.

Mr. Banks was hired by the Bureau of Reclamation on October 30, 1965. He resigned from the Job Corps Center at Casper on February 28, 1966.

The resignation came 4½ months after he falsified his job application by failing to admit his long arrest record; 4 months after he was hired by the Bureau of Reclamation and placed in charge of underprivileged youths; 3 months after his rap sheet was sent to the Civil Service Commission; 2 months after his arrest for brutally beating a man on a downtown Casper street; and a month and a half after the Civil Service Commission let the Bureau of Reclamation know of Banks' history.

I am appalled by the paradox of a program which theoretically precludes exconvicts or persons with criminal records as trainees but apparently OK's them as instructors. I can see neither good judgment nor good policy in the hiring of men with criminal records to direct the development of underprivileged youths. Many of the under-21-year-olds in the Job Corps camps have lived most of their lives in loose-with-the-law environments. They should have something a little better to look forward to when they travel thousands of miles from their homes to be groomed by their Government for productive roles in society. I doubt that a man with a 17-count arrest record and a history which includes a stretch in the penitentiary is the citizen which underprivileged youths should be encouraged to emulate.

In a memorandum dated March 3, 1966, the Director of the OEO's Community Action Program, Theodore M. Barry, sets forth standards which the community action program is to follow in personnel matters. I am informed that the memorandum does not relate directly to the Job Corps. However, I think that one reference to the memorandum is germane.

Under employment and recruitment, Mr. Barry says that "each grantee and delegate agency is expected to employ only capable and responsible personnel who are of good character and reputation." Further in that paragraph is this sentence: "Recent convictions of a crime involving moral turpitude shall be considered strong evidence as failure to meet" the standards of the community action program.

This declaration of standards is certainly welcome news to those of us who have followed the spotty history of the Office of Economic Opportunity. But it is shocking that 2 years after the OEO, its Job Corps, and its community action program were created by the 88th Congress there would exist the necessity to issue an affirmative statement that "only capable and responsible personnel who are of good character and reputation" are to be hired.

I am informed by the Job Corps that although such standards are implied in that program, there has been no memorandum or no clear spelling out of the standards. They obviously did not exist in the hiring of Lee Palmer Banks.

The sequence of events leading to the dismissal or retirement of Mr. Banks is rather interesting. He had signed his Job Corps application—form 57—on the 19th day of October 1965. He admitted one arrest and acknowledged that he had been absent without leave from the Army on two occasions while stationed at Ford Ord, Calif.

Despite these admissions of certain moral turpitude, Mr. Banks was hired October 30, 1965, as a resident worker at the GS-3 level. He was technically an employee of the Bureau of Reclamation, not being at the job level which would have placed him under OEO control. The general policy of the camps, however, is a matter of OEO control.

The job application to which Mr. Banks affixed his signature is not a casual document. Those who answer the nearly 40 questions must attest to the veracity of their responses through a prefaced oath which hardly leaves room for honest error. The oath and preface state:

> ATTENTION: READ THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH CAREFULLY BEFORE SIGNING THIS APPLICATION
>
> A false or dishonest answer to any question in this application may be grounds for rating you ineligible for Federal employment, or for dismissing you after appointment, and may be punishable by fine or imprisonment (United States Code, title 18, sec. 1001). All statements made in the application are subject to investigation, including a check of your fingerprints, police records, and former employers. All information will be considered in determining your present fitness for Federal employment.
>
> CERTIFICATION
>
> I certify that all of the statements made in this application are true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and are made in good faith.
>
> Signature of applicant_________. Date____.
> (Sign in ink)

This, Mr. President, is the clearly prefaced oath to which Mr. Banks affixed his signature. It is printed on the form 57 directly below the question which asks:

> Have you ever been arrested, taken into custody, held for investigation or questioning, or charged by any law enforcement authority?

After the question is space in which each date of arrest must be listed.

As the preface to the oath clearly states:

> A false or dishonest answer to any question * * * may be punishable by fine or im-

prisonment (United State Code, title 18, sec. 1001).

Mr. President, this section of Federal law is quite specific. Again I quote:

> Whoever, in any manner within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

Despite the unequivocal language of that Federal law, no legal action has been taken against the man who fraudulently completed his Federal job application by admitting only one in a long string of arrests.

The authorities of the State of Wyoming and the courts will make the proper disposition of Mr. Banks in regard to the beating of a Casper businessman, and it is not in this context that I make these remarks. Nor is this an effort to cause harm to the Job Corps concept. What does concern me are the machinations involving the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Civil Service Commission which permitted a man like Banks to be hired and retained in the face of contradiction. I am no less concerned at the casual reaction to the falsification of his job application.

As I have pointed out, representatives of the Office of Economic Opportunity assured the people of Casper, when that city was being considered for a Job Corps center, that the center would not serve as a rehabilitation area for youths with prior law violation records. It was partly on this assurance that Casper approved the concept and recommended that Governor Hansen okay the creation of a center there. Early this year, two trainees of the camp were involved in the stealing of a car. An investigation revealed that they had records in other States and that they were in fact "youths with prior law violation records" of the type which OEO had assured Casper would not be sent there.

There is apparently no more discretion given to criminal tendencies of trainees of Job Corps camps than there is to persons who supervise them. Assistant Natrona County Attorney John Burk has termed the Job Corps camp a "junior penal farm." He warned that the Casper camp could be "a farm for advanced juvenile delinquents."

I ask, Mr. President, that an editorial relating Mr. Burk's comments, together with a copy of a letter sent to Sargent Shriver from Casper Mayor James Barlow, together with various clippings relating the incident of Mr. Banks' arrest in Casper be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I might add that despite the thoroughly proper nature of the inquiry raised by the mayor of Casper, the Office of Economic Opportunity did not acknowledge the letter of February 10 until more than a month had passed.

As I was preparing this statement, a letter from the Civil Service Commission's Bureau of Personnel Investigations reached my office. Before I comment on it, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 18, 1966.

Hon. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: This is information requested by telephone in the case of Lee Palmer Banks, resident worker, Bureau of Reclamation, Casper, Wyo. (Job Corps project).

Our records show that Mr. Banks was given a temporary appointment pending establishment of the register to the position of resident worker on October 30, 1965. In his application he admitted an arrest for fraud and deceit in October 1960 involving a commitment for 16 months and 9 days. The Bureau of Reclamation has advised us that they accepted Mr. Banks' application because of representations made in his behalf by the Episcopal Church in Casper and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

In accordance with proper procedures the agency submitted his application, fingerprint chart, and other papers to the Civil Service Commission and the case was indexed for a national agency check and inquiry in our San Francisco region on November 22, 1965. The national agency checks, including the fingerprint check, are done by our central office and our records show that on December 29, 1965, the record checks were completed and sent to San Francisco. These checks included the report on the fingerprints from the FBI which was searched by them on December 7, 1965. On January 17, 1966, our San Francisco office directed a letter to the Bureau of Reclamation in which they advised them of Mr. Banks' previous arrest record as indicated by the search of the FBI fingerprint files. On January 24, 1966, the file was referred to our Denver region which has jurisdiction over Wyoming for consideration as to conversion for further investigation.

On February 1, 1966, the Denver region, after reviewing the national agency checks, directed a letter of interrogatory to Mr. Banks in which they asked him to comment upon his arrest record and his failure to admit this on his application. His reply was dated February 15, 1966, and on February 21, 1966, the file was referred to the Bureau of Reclamation.

Consideration was given to removal action by the Denver region, but was not taken because of the level of the position involved, the fact that the agency was aware of the most serious arrest at the time of appointment, and because of subject's apparently satisfactory employment record since he had moved to the Casper area in 1962.

The delay between the date of the FBI fingerprint search (December 7, 1965) and the final closing of the case to the Bureau of Reclamation was occasioned by normal operating requirements. Prior to the transmittal of the national agency checks to San Francisco it was necessary to await checks other than the FBI report which were pending in Washington. It does not appear that the delay in processing served to keep Mr. Banks in the Casper area through the period of the above-mentioned assault since he had previously been a resident of Casper and even if separated by the Commission or the agency would probably have remained in the area.

The Commission did not submit the report of Mr. Banks' false statements to the Department of Justice for prosecution under title 18 of United States Code since it has been our experience that persons who are separated and no longer Federal employees are very rarely prosecuted.

If you have further questions we will be glad to answer them for you.

Sincerely yours,

WOODROW L. BROWNE,
Acting Director.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, as I mentioned, the assault on a Casper businessman was the incident which brought the matter of Mr. Banks to light. There is an apparent allusion to this fact in the sixth paragraph of Mr. Browne's letter when he opines that foot dragging by the Civil Service Commission in reporting Banks' arrest record to the Bureau of Reclamation had not "served to keep Mr. Banks in the Casper area through the period of the above-mentioned assault since he had previously been a resident of Casper."

Now, this is the most curious reference for a number of reasons.

In the first place, there is nothing in the preceding five paragraphs which fits the reference to the "above-mentioned assault." I assume someone with a blue pencil got to the reference in an all-too-hasty editing.

Secondly, it is the purest unsubstantiated conjecture that Banks would have remained in Casper had he been dismissed by the Bureau of Reclamation following the January 3 attack. In this same context, Mr. Browne asserts that Banks had "moved to the Casper area in 1962." This information was taken from the form 57 on which Banks listed his residence.

If Mr. Banks had lived in Casper since 1962, he certainly went far afield to get in trouble. In February of 1965, he was arrested in Des Moines, Iowa. Iowa is the State in which he served his penitentiary sentence for attempting to obtain narcotics by fraud and deceit. Mr. Banks has a record of 12 other arrests in Iowa.

Mr. Browne writes in his letter:

> The Commission did not submit the report of Mr. Banks' false statements to the Department of Justice for prosecution under title 18 of United States Code since it has been our experience that persons who are separated and no longer Federal employees are very rarely prosecuted.

Banks left the Job Corps February 28.

I assume that Mr. Browne is not speaking for the Department of Justice in this matter. I would certainly hope that Mr. Katzenbach does not hold to the view that a person's employment status compromises his obligations to the laws of the United States.

As I read title 18, United States Code 1001, there is no provision for exemption on the basis of employment. If Mr. Banks is liable to prosecution for falsifying his job application, I cannot, as a lawyer, comprehend why he would be less liable simply because he has changed employers.

Mr. Browne seems to suggest the application of a paradox about which

Washington Columnist Mary McGrory wrote recently. She coined the term "instant ineligibility" for the tactic the Johnson administration uses with such finesse to destroy, not people, but positions on which people base their power.

It would appear that in the Banks' matter there was a selective sort of "instant ineligibility" established to exempt the former Job Corpsman from prosecution under Federal laws. I certainly hope that the Justice Department does not acquiesce in all of this, because the Civil Service Commission seems bent on creating a new principle of law based on the Banks incident, to be known perhaps as "the Banks principle of selective prosecution." It would hold that "a person can avoid prosecution for a Federal offense by quitting his job when the offense is discovered."

Granted, there is little justice in the world and perhaps less in Washington, but I somehow doubt that the Department of Justice would go along with the Banks principle. It would mean, for example, failing to prosecute the employee of a bank for embezzlement if the employee quit after his embezzlement.

This sort of selective prosecution has no precedent in American law. As a lawyer, I have yet to find in any law book or case history an example in which a person has escaped punishment for a Federal offense by quitting his job.

In my view, it behooves the Civil Service Commission to refer the matter of Mr. Banks to the Department of Justice so that if selective prosecution is Mr. Katzenbach's penchant, he can so inform Congress rather than having this view propounded on his Department's behalf by another.

If the matter of Mr. Banks had been handled in a responsible manner, and if he had been suspended from his position with the Job Corps immediately upon discovery that he had falsified his form 57, he might have remained in Casper. He might also have crossed paths with the Casperite who was severely beaten on January 3. It is possible, but highly improbable.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I have listened to the recitation of facts by the Senator from Wyoming. This is a serious situation.

I think that the Senator from Wyoming should be commended for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and of the American people. It is a matter that involves more than the State of Wyoming and the city of Casper. It involves the entire administration of justice and the entire administration of the program in which we are interested.

The Senator has performed a valuable public service in going into this matter in such detail. Many lessons are to be learned from this. All of us will benefit, not only in the legislative branch of the Government, but also in the executive branch of the Government. Obviously, we will always encounter some difficulties in the administration of programs. There will always be imperfections. However, I think that the Senator has brought to the attention of the Senate and of the country a situation which is really intolerable and which must be avoided at every cost.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his statement. I commend him for his statement expressed here.

No Senator is better qualified than is the distinguished junior Senator from New York with respect to the application of the law, he being a former Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am surprised at the explanation that has been given as to why there was no prosecution under title 18, section 1001 of the United States Code. I never heard that explanation given on any other matter while I was Attorney General of the United States.

The Senator from Wyoming has expressed some concern and surprise with relation to this matter. I am also surprised. I can understand that there might perhaps be other mitigating facts and circumstances as to why it was not possible to prosecute this man Banks. However, this is a flagrant case in which it is obvious that Banks had omitted on form 57 some important matters while applying for this position.

If we are going to try to avoid prosecuting persons at a later time for filing false statements with the U.S. Government by saying, "They left the Government service and will not be prosecuted," I would be surprised. I would be very interested to learn whether the matter has been submitted to the Department of Justice.

I did not understand that where there appears to be a violation of the law, that was a decision that could be made by the particular agency or department. I would have felt that that would be a decision that would be made by the Department of Justice, or the particular section or division thereof, which would be the Criminal Division, rather that the agency or department deciding by itself that no violation of the law had been committed.

Does the Senator know whether in fact the matter was submitted to the Department of Justice?

Mr. SIMPSON. That is what we are attempting to find out now, through the agency. Certainly that is a matter of interest not only to the Senator from New York and myself, but to all Senators.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What surprises me is that an official in some other agency or department would undertake to decide on his own that this was a matter which should not be followed up, when on the face of it, I think the Senator will agree—of course, nobody is here deciding the guilt or innocence of any individual—it is a false statement which, under section 18, title 1001, is a criminal offense, and carries a greater penalty than a false statement under oath. It is a very serious violation of the law. It was a material falsification on an extremely important matter. These were very serious circumstances: First, there appears to have been a flagrant violation; second, there was much hardship involved in this case; and third, the statement was very material to the question of whether the man would be hired. For somebody in an agency or department to make a decision, as I gather was done, that this would not be submitted to the Department of Justice, or to decide on his own that there was no violation because the man is no longer working for the Government—I cannot understand such reasoning.

Mr. SIMPSON. Nor can the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Of course, mistakes will be made in the administration of any agency or department. As long as the administrators are human beings, there will be frailties. But not to come forward and give the people the full facts, not to give the Senator from Wyoming the full facts—who I think is considered by his fellow Senators to be one of the most fair and judicious of all the Members of the Senate, who represents the area involved and should be entitled to all the facts—in such a case, in my judgment, the Senator from Wyoming should have the full support of all of his fellow Senators, and I commend him for bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate. I should like to join with him in seeking to find out the rest of the facts in connection with the matters: No. 1, how the man was hired; second, how it was possible that such mistakes or errors were made during the course of his employment; and third, the explanation for somebody in one of the bureaus or agencies making a decision that there would be no prosecution in the case, when, on the face of it, it would appear to be a matter that should by all means be presented to a grand jury, and let them decide, not for some individual in an agency or department to make a determination or judgment.

I hope the Senator from Wyoming will follow through on the matter, and seek a full explanation from the agency involved.

Mr. SIMPSON. I say to the Senator from New York, I am very happy that he stayed on the floor and indulged in this colloquy, because with his questions and observations he has made a very important contribution to the question.

I assure the Senator that I did not intend to indulge in any reflections on the Job Corps or the Office of Economic Opportunity, but because of the very peculiar attitude taken by Mr. Browne of that particular agency, without even consulting with the Department of Justice, I felt it was a matter which should be brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the point is that Mr. Banks was not suspended or dismissed, and when he was charged with aggravated assault and arraigned on that charge, it was not as a private citizen. It was as a Job Corps employee. Had Mr. Banks been suspended or discharged, the incident of January 3 would not have been a direct reflection on the management integrity of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Civil Service Commission. It would not have done damage to the Job Corps concept which is certain to suffer the most from this incident.

An altercation involving Lee Palmer Banks, private citizen, would hardly have been a matter adversely affecting a national program to aid underprivileged youths in finding productive niches in society.

Had Mr. Banks been dismissed from the Job Corps immediately after his arrest record came to light, a very large and ominous question mark which now hangs over the incident could have been prevented, although the question of why he was hired in the first place would still remain.

Mr. President, I have directed letters to Mr. R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Honorable Floyd E. Dominy, Director of the Bureau of Reclamation, asking for written reports on the Banks incident. I ask unanimous consent that copies of those letters be printed in the RECORD with the material at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. SIMPSON. I hope that the three most fundamental questions stemming from this incident will be adequately answered because the Congress, which created the Job Corps, has a right to know:

Precisely why a man like Lee Palmer Banks was hired to supervise underprivileged youths.

Why the man was allowed to remain in a responsible position for nearly 3 months after his lengthy arrest record was brought to light.

And why the Department of Justice has not been called on to prosecute him on a charge of falsifying his civil service job applications.

I have since received a reply from the Bureau of Reclamation, and I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I hope that from this incident will come a number of constructive changes, the most important of which would seem to be the drafting of moral standards for persons hired under the myriad of programs associated with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I would hope that in the future, when it is discovered that an employee at any OEO facility has secured his position by deception or fraud, he would at least be suspended while his case is under investigation.

I would hope also that from this incident will come a much better system of communication among the Civil Service Commission, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Justice, and the agencies which direct OEO's Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and other activities.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

CITY CONTACTS SHRIVER ON JOB CORPS CAMP

At a special session of the city council at noon Thursday, Mayor James A. Barlow, Jr., received the council's backing for a letter regarding the Job Corps camp to Sargent Shriver.

The letter follows:

"Hon. SARGENT SHRIVER,
"Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

"DEAR MR. SHRIVER: At the time Casper was being considered as a site for a Job Corps camp the city of Casper was advised by representatives of the OEO that the camp would accommodate only the economically deprived and would not serve as a rehabilitation center for youths with prior law violation records.

"Based on this advice the city formally approved the concept and recommended to Gov. Clifford Hansen that the Casper site be approved. This, of course, was subsequently done by the Governor and the camp was established.

"Recently an incident occurred involving two corpsmen which indicates that there may be some deviation from the eligibility standards as outlined to us. The enclosed press materials cover the situation in detail.

"Needless to say the community reaction has been one of concern and, typically, the entire complement of the camp is held suspect because of the actions of a few.

"On behalf of the city council I request that we be given full information on the backgrounds of the Casper corpsmen, without revealing personal identities. Also we would appreciate a statement concerning the screening and selection criteria employed by the Job Corps. We feel, as those responsible to the citizens of Casper, that these data should be available to us.

"Please be assured that the city has formed no conclusions in the matter;

"We therefore await your reply with anticipation.

"JAMES A. BARLOW, Jr.,
"Mayor."

Thursday morning, after an informal session with the board of the chamber of commerce the night before Mayor Barlow said:

"It would be unfortunate if this incident should be made into a political football," Barlow commented. "After all, society has a major interest in the rehabilitation of these 100 boys at the Job Corps camp."

ATTACK VICTIM CRITICAL AFTER BRUTAL BEATING

Robert Lee Towery, 38, of 1361 Forest Drive, was in critical condition at Memorial Hospital Monday night with a serious skull fracture and other head wounds suffered when he was beaten on a downtown Casper street Monday morning.

Hospital authorities said that X-rays had revealed the fracture, and doctors felt that Towery was in critical condition.

Towery is manager of the sporting goods department at the J. C. Penney Co. store in Casper.

Lee Banks, 35, of 501 East L, a worker at the Casper Job Corps Conservation Center, was being held by Casper police on a charge of aggravated assault in connection with the beating, according to Chief of Police Paul V. Danigan.

Banks was driving along Durbin Street in the 300 block, when Towery walked slowly in front of his car, the police chief said.

Banks "braked, jumped out of the car and yelled" at Towery, Chief Danigan said. "He knocked him down, and knocked him out, then carried him into a parking lot, got back into his car and drove off, according to witnesses."

Banks is employed as a resident worker at the Job Corps Center, Director John Anderson said Monday afternoon.

"It is hard for us to picture him doing this," Anderson said of Banks, who is 6 feet, 3 inches and weighs 320 pounds. "He has been with us approximately two and one-half months."

The Job Corps Center director said it is "too early to say right at the moment" what action, if any, will be taken by the Corps in regard to Banks.

"All of us are concerned about Towery's welfare," Anderson said. "We don't like this. It's not the kind of example that we like."

The Corps knew that Banks had been "in trouble" before he was hired, Anderson said. "He appeared to be rehabilitated and had a good attitude and felt he had seen his error.

"We knew that he had been in trouble before," Anderson said. "He had been working with a church, and they recommended him highly. As far as his work out here, he has been satisfactory. He helped with the recreation program."

Anderson said that Banks had Government classification G–3, which starts its pay schedule at $4,100.

BANKS RELEASED ON $10,000 BOND

Lee Banks, 35, charged with aggravated assault in the daylight beating Monday of Robert Lee Towery, 38, in downtown Casper, was released from county jail Tuesday afternoon on $10,000 property bond.

The bond was posted by Mrs. Ernest Wilkerson, wife of Banks' attorney, Ernest Wilkerson of Casper, according to Justice of the Peace William Barnes.

The victim of the beating was reported in fair condition, with a fractured skull, by Natrona County Memorial Hospital officials Tuesday night.

Banks pleaded innocent in an arraignment in the court of Justice Barnes Tuesday morning, and a hearing was set Friday, January 7, at 3 p.m. justice court.

The 6-foot, 3-inch 320-pound Banks faces a fine of not more than $1,000 and imprisonment not to exceed 1 year in the county jail, if convicted of aggravated assault under a statute in the Wyoming Session Laws of 1961, according to Robert Jerry Hand, deputy county attorney.

Wilkerson said Tuesday morning that if the matter comes to trial he will probably request a change of venue out of the county.

OTHER ATTACK

Another incident involving Banks was revealed Tuesday afternoon by Donald B. Scott, 1102 South Melrose, night custodian at Willard school.

Banks, a worker in the recreational program at the Casper Job Corps Conservation Center, was with a Job Corps basketball team playing in the community recreation program at Willard school, Scott stated.

"I told him to put out a cigarette, no smoking in the building," Scott said. "The next thing I knew he was pasting me in the side of the face, and then he tore my shirt."

Scott said that the blow bruised his jaw quite badly, so that he was unable to eat solid food for several days, and had to eat soup.

The school administration advised him not to file charges against Banks, Scott stated.

TRIAL OF BANKS IS SLATED TO BE HELD IN CASPER

Ernest Wilkerson, attorney for Lee Banks, who is charged with aggravated assault, said Wednesday the trial of Banks will be held in Casper.

Wilkerson said, "Because the right to fair trial of a client is involved, I must break a rule of mine concerning comment in the press about any case in which I am attorney. I am quoted in several editions of the local newspapers as saying that if Mr. Lee Banks, who pleaded innocent to a charge of assault, is to be tried, I will 'move it out of the county.'

"This trial, when it occurs, will be held here in Casper. I have confidence in the fairness of our people. I believe they will accord a man, any man, of any color, his day in court. I believe they deem a man innocent until he is proved guilty.

"Thus," Mr. Wilkerson said, "in spite of some of the most vicious and inaccurate journalism it has been my misfortune to see, I am sure Banks' fellow citizens here in Casper will accord him a fair hearing."

Casper Star-Tribune reporter Steve Nickeson said Wilkerson had told him after Banks' arraignment before Justice of the Peace William E. Barnes Tuesday morning that "if the case is tried I'll have to ask for a change of venue."

Robert L. Towery, the man Banks is charged with assaulting, was reported released from the intensive care unit at Memorial Hospital Wednesday. His condition was reported to be "fairly good."

BOND FOR BANKS REDUCED TO $1,000

Bond for Lee Banks, 35, of 501 East L, Casper, was reduced to $1,000 Friday, in a continuation of the justice court arraignment begun Tuesday morning, according to Justice of the Peace William Barnes.

Banks is charged with aggravated assault in connection with the beating of another Casper man, Robert Lee Towery, 38, of 1361 Forest Drive, Monday morning on a downtown Casper street.

"It was a continuation of the arraignment, for the purpose of answering a motion on a reduced bond and also setting a hearing date far enough ahead so the doctor may be present and any witnesses can appear," Justice Barnes said.

The date of the preliminary hearing is indefinite, and may be called at any time, with 72 hours' notice to the defendant's attorneys according to John Burk, deputy county attorney.

Burk said the State "does not oppose" the reduction in bond, during the continued arraignment.

TOWERY IMPROVED

Towery, who suffered a fractured skull in the beating about 9 a.m. Monday, in the 300 block of Durbin Street, was in improved condition Friday night, according to a hospital spokesman.

"Towery is conscious," the spokesman said. "He talks and is able to feed himself, and he got out in the chair in the room a couple of times today. His blood pressure is normal again. He should be all right."

Police Chief Paul V. Danigan said Friday night that the investigation into the assault was progressing well.

"We have two or three eye witnesses" to the incident, the chief said.

In a statement earlier in the week, Chief Danigan said that Banks was driving slowly along Durbin Street in the 300 block, when Towery walked slowly in front of his car.

Banks "braked, jumped out of the car and yelled" at Towery, Chief Danigan said in the earlier statement. "He knocked him down, and knocked him out, then carried him into a parking lot, got back into his car and drove off, according to witnesses."

BANKS AT WORK

Banks was not present at the arraignment Friday, because he had to be at work on his job with the Job Corps at 3:30 p.m., Burk said.

Banks returned to work, as a member of the Casper Job Corps Conservation Center staff in the recreation program for corpsmen, Thursday on the 4 p.m. shift, according to Lloyd Bowman, acting Bureau of Reclamation project manager.

"He returned to work I believe yesterday on the 4 p.m. shift," Bowman said. "He hasn't been tried one way or the other, and until such time as he does come to trial, I assume that a man is innocent until proven guilty."

The question of Banks returning to work was discussed "with our Denver office, and they feel that he should be allowed to return to work" until such time as he comes to trial, and then review the situation, Bowman said.

Bowman indicated that "Denver also talked to Washington" on the question of Banks returning to work.

BANKS HEARING SET IN FEBRUARY

A preliminary hearing on aggravated assault charges for Lee Banks, 35, of Casper, has been set Monday, February 14, at 9:30 a.m. in the court of Justice of the Peace William Barnes.

Banks was charged in connection with the daylight beating in downtown Casper Monday, January 3, of Robert Lee Towery, 38, of 1361 Forest Drive, Casper, manager of the sporting goods department in the local J. C. Penney store.

Towery, who was admitted to the hospital with a fractured skull, was released January 11, a hospital spokesman said Monday night.

Ernest Wilkerson, an attorney for Banks, said in an earlier statement that Banks' trial will be held in Casper.

"The trial, when it comes, will be held in Casper," Wilkerson said. "I have confidence in the fairness of our people. I believe they will accord a man, any man, of any color, his day in court. I believe they deem a man innocent until he is proved guilty."

[From the Casper (Wyo.) Star-Tribune, Jan. 30, 1966]

DISAGREEMENT IN BANKS CASE IS PROCEDURAL

A procedural disagreement has arisen between the defense and prosecution in handling the charge of aggravated assault against Lee Banks of Casper, according to John Burk, deputy county attorney.

A preliminary hearing on the charge has been set February 14 at 9:30 a.m. in the court of Justice of the Peace William Barnes, and the procedural matter must be settled before that time, because the defense contends that the action should be a justice court trial, rather than a preliminary hearing, Burk said.

"Our only disagreement is procedural, as to whether there can be a preliminary hearing on a misdemeanor," Burk said. "The possible fine on the charge is $1,000, which exceeds the jurisdiction of the justice court, which court can only levy fines up to $100, plus court costs.

"Since Wyoming has been a State, cases of this nature have been nicknamed high misdemeanors, and have obviously been tried in district court. Aggravated assaults have always been tried in district court."

The date for the hearing "is rather firmly set," Burk said, "and the question which is going to have to be settled between counsel is whether it's a trial or a preliminary hearing.

"Mr. Wilkerson is one of the finest attorneys in the State," Burk said, "and I feel confident that we will have reached an agreement based on a deep research into the origin of our criminal procedure statutes, before the time for the hearing.

"I want to make it clear that Mr. Wilkerson's contention is not facetious or delaying," Burk said.

"Wyoming criminal procedures are poorly written," the deputy county attorney said. "There are more gaps in the procedures than there are stepping stones.

"In order to get through a full-fledged district court trial, there has traditionally had to be a certain amount of cooperation and understanding between the prosecuting and defense attorneys.

"His (Wilkerson's) reasoning is legitimate," Burk said. "If you read the statutes one way, his is a thoroughly correct view, and if you read them another way, an equally reasonable conclusion is that they mean the opposite of his contention."

Banks, 35, a Job Corps employee, was charged in connection with the daylight beating in downtown Casper, Monday, January 3, of Robert Lee Towery, 38, of 1361 Forest Drive, Casper, is manager of the sporting goods department in the local J. C. Penney store.

Tower, who was admitted to Natrona County Memorial Hospital with a fractured skull, was released January 11.

BANKS BOUND OVER TO DISTRICT COURT

A 35-year-old Casper man, Lee Banks, was bound over for trial in district court Monday morning on a charge of aggravated assault.

Justice of the Peace Alice K. Burridge continued bond for the Job Corps worker at $1,000.

Banks is charged with assaulting 38-year-old Robert Towery of Casper on January 3.

At a preliminary hearing Monday morning Bank's attorney, Ernest Wilkerson argued that Banks should not be tried in district court saying that the charge of aggravated assault was not a felony and was under the jurisdiction of the justice of the peace court.

Assistant County Attorney John Burk maintained that the case should be tried in district court because of the severity of the penalty for those convicted on the charge.

Judge Burridge overruled Wilkerson and ordered the preliminary hearing to continue.

The State called only two witnesses in the 45-minute hearing, Robert Towery and Police Capt. Con Delgarno.

Towery testified that on the morning of January 3 he parked his car near the Village Inn and started to walk to his job at the J. C. Penney store.

He said he crossed Durbin Street and heard a horn blow as he stepped onto the sidewalk.

He turned toward the car, Towery told the court, to see what the man wanted.

He said he was only 3 or 4 feet from the vehicle and walked to the front fender.

At that point, the retired marine said, Banks got out of the car and said something to him.

Towery said because the wind was blowing he did not understand what Banks said.

"I asked him, do what?" Towery testified. "He put his hand out toward my face, not in an aggressive manner, and I turned my head away. That's all I remember."

Towery was hospitalized for 8 days after the incident, he said. He was unconscious for 2 of those days.

During the course of his testimony Monday morning the State introduced two color photographs of Towery in the hospital.

He described them as being pictures of himself showing a bruise on his left arm, two black eyes and a cut on his temple.

Under cross-examination by Wilkerson, Towery reiterated that he did not remember what happened after he turned his head. He said he understood from the press that Banks claimed, "I called him a name." Towery denied this saying he would take a lie-detector test regarding the allegation.

Captain Dalgarno testified that he had interrogated Banks on the morning of January 3.

Wilkerson objected to any testimony from Dalgarno on the grounds that Banks did not have an attorney present at the interview.

The State countered this saying Banks had stated he did not want an attorney at that time.

Dalgarno testified that Banks had told him he had driven into town from the Job Corps camp at the airport and that he was angry about an incident at the camp.

"He said," Dalgarno stated, "that he was driving toward a church where he was once employed (St. Mark's Episcopal) to see if there was anyone he might talk to."

The captain said Banks told him a man jay-walked in front of his car and that he believed the man deliberately slowed down in crossing the street.

"He said he got out, asked the man what was the matter, did he have bumpers on his rear," Dalgarno said.

The officer testified that Banks told him the man asked him what he had said, that Banks repeated his statement and that the man then called him a "black S.O.B."

"Then," Dalgarno stated, "he (Banks) said he hit him."

In a closing statement, Wilkerson maintained that because there was testimony as to only one blow being struck he believed the charge against Banks should be simple assault rather than aggravated assault.

Wilkerson maintained the press had tried and convicted Banks and that his client had been "journalistically lynched." He said anyone might have done what Banks did if they were called what Banks was allegedly called by Towery.

Judge Burridge ruled that the charge of aggravated assault was proper and bound Banks over to district court for trial.

A date for the trial will probably be set in the near future, according to the county attorney's office.

Former Wyoming Job Corps Worker Had Criminal Record

(By Dan Thomasson)

Washington, March 10.—Federal officials hired a Job Corps instructor who served a 2-year prison term for narcotics violation and has a history of arrests on charges ranging from rape to grand larceny.

The instructor, Lee Palmer Banks, 35, resigned his job as recreation instructor at the Casper, Wyo., Job Corps Center on February 28—nearly 2 full months after he was arrested for beating a Casper businessman.

The U.S. Civil Service Commission had been informed by the FBI of Banks' record, dating back to 1954 in Des Moines, Iowa, early in December 1965. But the Commission didn't notify the Bureau of Reclamation, which operates the camp in conjunction with the Office of Economic Opportunity, until some time in January.

A spokesman for the Reclamation Bureau said even then the word came as a routine report with no recommendations.

RECOMMENDED

Banks was hired by the Bureau's Casper office in October 1965, on recommendations from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and an Episcopal church in Casper, where he had been employed.

He was assigned as a temporary resident assistant whose main duties were guiding recreation activities of the center's trainees, all underprivileged youths between the ages of 16 and 21.

After Banks' arrest for assault in connection with the beating of Robert Lee Towery, 38, a Casper store manager, the 6-foot, 4-inch, 320-pound Negro was released on bond and resumed his camp functions.

At the time, Camp Director John Anderson was quoted as saying he knew Banks had been "in trouble" before but thought he had been rehabilitated.

Just how much trouble Banks had been in was revealed here Thursday.

POLICE RECORD

His police record lists arrests for assault with intent to commit rape in 1954; assault and battery in 1955; rape in 1958; robbery with aggravated assault in 1959; larceny, attempt to escape, in 1960, among other things.

In 1961 he was convicted for trying to obtain narcotics by fraud and was sentenced to 2 years in the Iowa State Penitentiary at Fort Madison.

He was back on the police blotter in Des Moines only a few months before he was hired by the Job Corps. He was arrested for investigation in February 1965.

Jim Kelleher, assistant director of public affairs for the Poverty Corps, said his office had no knowledge of Banks' record. He said screening of applicants in cases where camps are run by another Federal agency is strictly up to civil service.

"However, it's a deplorable situation," he said. "There must have been a real breakdown in communications."

PUSH INQUIRY

That's what Casper officials thought when they asked Poverty Corps Director Sargent Shriver to give them the background of all Job Corps center personnel after Casperite Towery was hospitalized with a fractured skull. The case also has come to the attention of Senator Milward Simpson, of Wyoming, who intends to push an inquiry.

The Reclamation Bureau, which has the responsibility of hiring personnel and managing the camp, said it had no idea the extent of Banks' record.

The Civil Service Commission said Banks was in a nonsensitive job and therefore wasn't investigated until after his appointment had been made.

Sometimes, when the record shows a serious case, the commission fires off a hurried advance report to the hiring agency, but apparently the commission didn't feel Banks' history merited this, even though the check, according to Brown, showed he had falsified his application by listing only one arrest.

Poverty War Officials Knew of Instructor's Prison Record

(By Dan Thomasson)

Washington, March 11.—Poverty war officials were aware of Palmer Lee Banks' prison record before they hired the 35-year-old Negro as a Job Corp instructor.

"But we balanced that against the recommendations to hire him from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the minister of the church where he was employed," said Charles Boatner, information director for the Interior Department.

The Department's Bureau of Reclamation is in charge of operating the Casper, Wyo., Job Corps Center.

Boatner said "our faces are red" over the Banks case, which was revealed by the Rocky Mountain News.

NARCOTICS VIOLATION

Banks, who stands 6 feet 4 inches tall and weighs 320 pounds, was working as a resident assistant at the camp despite his conviction on a narcotics violation and a long history of arrests on charges ranging from rape to grand larceny.

He finally resigned February 28, nearly 2 months after he had been arrested and charged with assault in the beating of a Casper businessman.

Banks, arraigned Friday in Casper District Court, pleaded innocent to a charge of aggravated assault stemming from an alleged attack January 3 on Robert Lee Towery, 38. Trial on the charge was set for June 9.

Asked why Banks was allowed to continue his camp functions as dormitory monitor, recreation instructor and laborer after his arrest in Casper in January, Boatner said:

"We were trying to lean over backward not to fire him on a charge for which he had not been convicted."

IOWA INVESTIGATION

Boatner said Banks listed the fact he served 16 months in the Iowa State Penitentiary on his Federal civil service application. Banks had not, however, included his arrest record which dated back to 1954 in Des Moines, Iowa. He was booked for investigation in Des Moines only a few months before he was hired by the Job Corps.

Neither the Interior Department nor the Civil Service Commission could explain why something wasn't done earlier about Banks. The Commission had his record in hand early in December of last year but didn't bother to inform the Bureau of Reclamation about it until more than a month later.

Boatner said Banks wasn't checked out thoroughly before he was hired because he had a "nonsensitive" job. Banks was rated a G–3 and earned about $4,300 a year.

The Department official also said the need for workmen at the camps is so pressing that pre-employment checks would slow down the process tremendously.

He did say, however, that since the Banks case some thought has been given to improving the screening procedure.

Other Federal agencies are being queried about how they handle screening of this type employee.

[From the Casper (Wyo.) Star-Tribune, Feb. 9, 1966]

Junior Penal Farm

"But the young people should have been notified we were getting a junior penal farm." We are quoting John Burk, deputy Natrona County attorney, from comments which he made regarding two Job Corps trainees who were arrested with a friend and charged with grand larceny of an automobile in Casper.

A further quotation from Attorney Burk is interesting. He said:

"This wasn't the type of boy which the advance notices led us to believe would be in the Job Corps," Burk said. "I'd understood that they were going to be from areas that are economically depressed. If these are any guide, this is going to be a farm for advanced juvenile delinquents."

Upon the arrest of these two for the theft of the automobile it was found that both the trainees and their friend are under the jurisdiction of Utah and Montana for offenses committed before they were 18.

How is it then, that they wind up in the Casper Job Corps Camp?

When the idea of a Job Corps was first broached to the Casper Chamber of Commerce that group was emphatically assured by the Job Corps organizers that men with criminal records would not be sent here. They were supposed to be boys from poor economic circumstances who had failed to attain an educational level beyond the fourth grade. Their rehabilitation was to be educational.

The Casper Chamber of Commerce on the basis of these reassurances then recommended to Gov. Clifford Hansen that he agree to the camp being established here. The assent of the Governor was needed before the Federal Government would establish the camp.

To us there seems to be a great breach of faith here. What has been guaranteed has not been done. The chamber of commerce is now in the unhappy position of having endorsed an institution which the deputy county attorney characterizes as a "junior penal farm."

This needs a sweeping and immediate investigation. How many of the Job Corps trainees have similar criminal records? Is the camp turning into a rehabilitation farm for juvenile delinquents from other parts of the country? Can the chamber of commerce continue to lend its support to this type of institution?

And such an investigation should be made by an actual examination of the records by an independent agency. Perhaps the Casper police department, or the Natrona sheriff's office. Questioning Job Corps officials at a noon luncheon downtown will result in little light being shed on the matter, if previous performances are any criterion. They have their jobs to protect.

What began as a charitable gesture and economic stimulant has now become a much more serious question. Are Casper and Wyoming to play host to the delinquents of other States? In the beginning we were assured this would not take place. But it has.

The Casper Chamber of Commerce has a responsibility in this.

PROSECUTOR CALLS JOB CAMP JUNIOR PENAL INSTITUTE

The Casper Job Corps Camp at the airport was described by John Burk, deputy Natrona County attorney, as a "junior penal farm."

Burk made the comment after two trainees and a Billings boy were returned to their States' juvenile industrial institutes after car theft charges were dropped by Casper authorities.

The county prosecutor said he was "very disappointed" in the Job Corps after learning that the boys had been under juvenile jurisdiction in other States before being sent to the Casper camp.

"This wasn't the type of boy which the advance notices led us to believe would be in the Job Corps," Burk said. "I'd understood that they were going to be from areas that are economically depressed.

"If these are any guide, this is going to be a farm for advanced juvenile delinquents.

"These boys need this training more desperately than just the financially deprived boys, because unless these boys are straightened out, it is going to be a big financial drain on the county or State that they live in for the rest of their lives.

"The people should have been notified we were getting a junior penal farm."

It was recalled the Casper Chamber of Commerce had endorsed the job camp in the belief that it would help underprivileged boys, particularly school dropouts, from economically depressed areas.

The trainees, Lewis Franklin Combs, 19, from Montana, and Alvin Jones, 18, a friend of Combs from Billings, will be picked up by Montana officials and taken to the industrial institute at Miles City. Another trainee, David Montez, 18, will be flown at Job Corps expense to the industrial institute at Ogden, Utah, Burk said.

The trainees will be separated from the Job Corps, he added.

Charges will not be dropped until the boys are on their way, Burk said, in order to keep them in continuous custody.

The boys were apprehended in Rawlins early Saturday, January 8, and charged with grand larceny in the theft of a car in Casper, Friday, January 7, Police Chief Paul V. Danigan said at the time.

The owner of the car, Floyd Day of 1834 South Beverly, missed the vehicle January 7 at about 8:30 p.m. from Albertson's Downtown Commissary parking lot, the police chief stated. The three were returned to Casper Thursday, January 13, by Natrona County sheriff's officers.

JUVENILE JURISDICTION

"All three of the boys are under juvenile jurisdiction in other States until they are 21," Burk said. "Montana and Utah acquired jurisdiction over these boys before they reached 18 years of age.

"This places us in the following situation: Because of their ages, we can only treat them as adult felons," Burk said. "With the past record these boys have, the local authorities would have little choice other than to send them to the Wyoming Penitentiary.

"Technically, they are probation violators of other States," he said.

"I elected to return them to the other States as probation violators, and to drop the charges here," Burk said. "This will allow Montana and Utah to make another attempt at rehabilitating these boys.

"When it comes right down to it, I couldn't be the one to put the label of felon on them for the rest of their lives, and make second-class citizens out of them, as long as it was still possible for them to receive rehabilitation," Burk said.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Feb. 10, 1966]

A SICKNESS IN THE GREAT SOCIETY

Back a year and a half ago when the Job Corps phase of the war on poverty program was getting started, there was some talk of locating one of these camps in the Iron Mountain area about 35 miles northwest of Cheyenne. Fortunately, some of the ranchers there raised strenuous objections, and nothing was done about it.

A similar project was conceived for the centennial area west of Laramie, but again, ranchers along the Little Laramie River protested.

The only Job Corps camp that has been established in Wyoming since the program started is located at Casper. It was set up by the Office of Economic Opportunity in 1964, after it was endorsed by the Casper Chamber of Commerce and Casper City Council, and with their backing, was approved by Governor Hansen, since the law requires a State Governor's okay.

Now, however, the people of Casper apparently are having some serious second thoughts about the Job Corps camp there.

Recently, a member of the Casper Job Corps camp's staff was charged, and is currently facing trial in connection with an assault on a local businessman.

A month ago, two trainees from the Casper camp were arrested in Rawlins and charged with larceny in the theft of a car in Casper. They are being returned to juvenile industrial institutions in their home States.

"The people should have been notified we were getting a junior penal farm," says Natrona Deputy County Attorney John Burk. "This wasn't the type of boy which the advance notices led us to believe would be in the Job Corps. I understand that they were to be from areas that are economically depressed. If these are any guide, this is going to be a farm for advanced juvenile delinquents."

Natrona County State Representative D. Thomas Kidd, a Republican, told this newspaper: "They sold us a bill of goods (about the Job Corps program)." Mr. Kidd further avers that the war on poverty people are guilty of a deliberate misrepresentation, at least in the Casper case, by sending problem youths to fill out their quotas. He thinks Washington is changing the program.

The Casper Star-Tribune noted that the Casper Chamber of Commerce was reassured by the Job Corps organizers that trainees with criminal records would not be sent to the camp, and that the chamber thereupon recommended to the Governor that he agree to the camp, since the Governor's approval was needed before it could be established by Washington.

"What began as a charitable gesture and economic stimulant has now become a much more serious question," says the Casper newspaper, adding: "Are Casper and Wyoming to play host to the delinquents of other States? In the beginning we were assured this would not take place. But it has."

On top of all this, and on the very same day that the Natrona deputy county attorney loosed his blast against the Job Corps, Senator McGEE announced in Washington that the Casper Job Corps camp would be doubled from 105 to 200 trainees.

Perhaps the Senator wasn't aware of all the furor at the local level over the camp there, but he should have been, since he has a local representative on the scene.

Thus, while the Casperities are burning over the Job Corps camp, Senator McGEE throws fuel on the fire.

The moral of all this seems to be that the ranch people of the Little Laramie Valley and Iron Mountain were right after all in their prior reservations about the Job Corps.

The problem with the Casper Job Corps camp is not the only such difficulty that has been reported nationwide in this phase of the much-heralded advance toward the Great Society. The Job Corps and many other facets of the war on poverty have been similarly plagued—by squabbles over sharing the loot, maladministration, a tendency to fatten the bureaucracy rather than the poor, and all of the ills that are merely symptomatic of the general disorder resulting from such a vague, poorly designed, and questionable undertaking whose only purpose is the squandering of billions of dollars.

EXHIBIT 2

MARCH 17, 1966.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER, Jr.,
Director Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: I am certain that you are aware of the recent publicity accorded the activities of Lee Palmer Banks, a former Job Corps instructor at Casper, Wyo. Mr. Banks was hired by the Bureau of Reclamation for the Office of Economic Opportunity on October 30, 1965. An investigation revealed that he had a much longer arrest record than he had revealed in his job application.

Mr. Banks resigned from the Job Corps Center at Casper February 28 and is apparently still in Casper awaiting disposition of charges against him for beating a Casper businessman January 3 on a downtown street.

I would appreciate a reply from your office at your earliest convenience revealing whether the Office of Economic Opportunity had contact with the Civil Service Commission in regard to Mr. Banks' arrest record or the aforementioned incident of January 3. I should like to know also whether steps were taken to dismiss Mr. Banks following the revelation that he had falsified his form 57 or the adverse publicity which focused on the Job Corps as a result of the January 3 incident in Casper.

In addition, I should like to know what standing policies did or do exist in regard to the character of Job Corps employees, and whether or not your office gave assurances to the city officials at Casper, Wyo., during the period in which negotiations for the Job Corps Center there were being discussed that no trainees with criminal records would be accepted.

A reply in some detail would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senator.

MARCH 17, 1966.

Hon. FLOYD E. DOMINY,
Bureau of Reclamation,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FLOYD: I am sure you are aware of the recent publicity regarding the hiring by the Bureau of Reclamation of Lee Palmer Banks who, until February 28, was an instructor at the Casper, Wyo., Job Corps Center run by your Bureau.

Would you please direct the individual in charge of your Bureau's Job Corps projects to apprise me by letter as soon as possible of the circumstances which led to the hiring of Mr. Banks. I understand that considerable pressures were brought to bear by the Casper chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

In addition, I should like to know:

What policy exists in regard to the moral character of Job Corps instructors?

Would Mr. Banks have been hired had not the aforementioned NAACP pressures existed?

Was there an attempt made by the Bureau to dismiss Banks following the January 3 daylight attack on a Casper businessman?

On what date did the Civil Service Commission notify the Bureau of Reclamation in regard to the falsification of Mr. Banks' form 57?

What action was taken following that notification?

Did Mr. Banks in fact resign from the Job Corps February 28 of his own volition, or was his resignation the product of action by the Bureau?

Has this incident produced a policy change relating to the employment of instructors at any or all of the Job Corps centers?

What is the relationship, in regard to these centers, which exists among the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Civil Service Commission?

To what extent is the Bureau autonomous in the management and control of the camps?

Floyd, I would appreciate your attention to a quick reply to this letter. I am sure that you understand that this incident has done damage to the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and most importantly, to the concept of training disadvantaged youths to occupy productive roles in our society. It is these youths who will suffer most until and unless the policy question raised by the Banks' incident are resolved.

Sincerely yours,

MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senator.

EXHIBIT 3

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1966.

Hon. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: This will reply to your letter of March 17, concerning the employment of Mr. Lee P. Banks at our Job Corps center, Casper, Wyo.

When staffing was initiated for the center at Casper, it immediately became apparent that there were no civil service registers of eligibles appropriate for filling many of the positions. This was true for the position of resident youth worker, GS-3, the position to which Mr. Banks was subsequently appointed. Accordingly, our Casper office was given authority by the Civil Service Commission to conduct its own recruitment. In line with our standard practice, vacancy listings were furnished to a number of organizations including the Casper chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. That organization referred the name of Mr. Lee Banks to us. In his application for employment, Mr. Banks showed that he had been arrested in October 1960, and had served some 16 months in prison. He talked freely about this during his interviews, indicating that he felt he had been rehabilitated. A check with his only local employer, the Episcopal Church in Casper, appeared to verify this; we were advised that he was a good worker and had been very effective with youth groups and organizations. On this basis, on October 30, 1965, he was given a temporary appointment that was subject to investigation by the Civil Service Commission. This was in line with normal procedures for appointments to positions of this nature. We do not feel that any pressure was put on our Casper office by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. It was believed, however, that Mr. Banks' appointment was in line with national objectives relating to equal employment opportunity.

Responses to your specific questions are given in the following paragraphs:

Job Corps staff members are required to meet the same high standards of ethical and moral integrity that we expect of all other employees of the Bureau of Reclamation. Had we known of Mr. Banks' complete record we would not have employed him as a resident youth worker or in any other position in this Bureau.

As indicated above, no pressures were exerted by the NAACP. That organization was a factor in Mr. Banks' employment only by reason of the referral of his name to us.

No attempt was made to separate Mr. Banks as a result of the January 3 incident involving him and a Casper businessman. The decision in this regard was made by this office and was based on the consideration that (1) Mr. Banks was charged with a misdemeanor and not a felonious assault, and (2) he, like any other American citizen, was entitled to be considered innocent until proved guilty. In this connection, we understand that Mr. Banks' trial has now been set for June 9.

By letter of January 17, 1966, the San Francisco region of the Civil Service Commission furnished the Bureau a preliminary report of information disclosed up to that time as a result of the investigation initiated at the time of Mr. Banks' appointment. The official and complete results of the investigation were furnished by the Denver region of the Civil Service Commission by form letter (CSC form 352) dated February 21, 1966. This referral, which contained no recommendation for action, was furnished direct to our Casper office. Because of the previous involvement of this office in the case, the file was forwarded here. It was received on February 28. Before a decision could be made as to action to be taken, Mr. Banks submitted his resignation effective February 28.

Mr. Banks did in fact resign of his own volition. While no pressures had been exerted on him, he was aware of the results of the Civil Service Commission's investigation. He no doubt concluded that prompt action would be taken by this office to effect his termination and decided to resign instead of being dismissed.

This incident has caused us to initiate a thorough review of procedures being used in staffing Job Corps centers. We are also checking to insure that all required investigations are conducted expeditiously and the results carefully evaluated. We are also causing a review to be made of the backgrounds of all center personnel with a report to be furnished this office of any derogatory information that may be disclosed. We shall insure that only persons who meet high standards of ethical and moral conduct are retained in employment.

Our Job Corps centers are administered by this Bureau under terms and conditions contained in an agreement between the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of the Interior. While we have had some problems of coordination, these have not been any more numerous than would occur with any new program. Also, we observe that improvements are being made and we have every reason to believe that this will continue. The role of the Civil Service Commission in regard to Job Corps centers is the same as for any other Bureau work; this involves such matters as appointment procedures, investigation of appointees, suitability requirements, etc.

As indicated above, the Bureau is not completely autonomous in the management and control of Job Corps centers. All regular Civil Service rules and regulations must be observed in regard to staffing. Also, the terms of the agreement between the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of the Interior must be observed, both in regard to staffing and to enrollees. Problems which existed immediately after center activation are being resolved and we have every confidence that there will be continuing improvement.

We completely endorse the program for training disadvantaged youths to take on productive roles in our society, and sincerely hope that an isolated incident, such as that reflected by the Banks' case, will not be permitted to disrupt the progress we are making. We are strengthening our staffing procedures to insure that there is no repetition of such a case and assure you that our efforts will be unremitting.

Please let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

N. B. BENNETT,
Acting Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). What is the will of the Senate?

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 1966

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Friday, April 1, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 29 (legislative day of March 25), 1966:

U.S. MARSHAL

Alvin Grossman, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of New York for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

Franklin D. Besecker for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 1, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey.

Eugene M. Braderman, of the District of Columbia.

G. Marvin Gentile, of Maryland.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

John C. Fuess, of Massachusetts.

Turner B. Shelton, of California.

Charles Wilson Thomas, of Utah.

John L. Kuhn, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consular officer of the United States of America.

James E. Goodby, of the District of Columbia, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consular officer, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

Robert G. Kemp, of Washington, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Donald Keith Guthrie, of New Mexico, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consular officer of the United States of America.

Mrs. Lillian Peters Mullin, of Illinois, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

Eli William Bizic, of Texas.
Arthur B. Corte, of New York.
Robert W. Farrand, of New York.
Cord D. Hansen-Sturm, of New York.
Ambler H. Moss, Jr., of Maryland.
J. Brayton Redecker, of Connecticut.
Eugene J. Schreiber, of Missouri.
John B. Thompson, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

Edward A. Casey, Jr., of New Jersey.
Carl B. Cunningham, of California.
Herbert J. Horowitz, of Michigan.
David T. Kenney, of the District of Columbia.
John C. Kornblum, of Michigan.
James DeW. Perry, of Connecticut.
Gary S. Posz, of California.
Randolph Reed, of the District of Columbia.
William W. Struck, of Kentucky.
Charles H. Twining, Jr., of Maryland.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Bruce A. Abt, of Massachusetts.
John K. Atchley, of Virginia.
Harry C. Blaney III, of New York.
Paul P. Brocchini, of California.
Philip C. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
Richard E. Combs, Jr., of California.
Thomas M. Coony, of Virginia.
John D. Folger, of the District of Columbia.
Kenneth A. Guenther, of the District of Columbia.
Donald A. Guerriero, of New York.
F. Allen Harris, of Texas.
John L. Hirsch, of New York.
Richard A. Holmes, of Michigan.
David H. Hutchison, of Kansas.
Lars H. Hydle, of California.
Miss Karen D. Jenkins, of Virginia.
James F. Mack, of New York.
Edward M. Malloy, of New York.
John J. Maresca, of Connecticut.
Miss Kathryn E. Markley, of Illinois.
Henry Young McCown, Jr., of Texas.
Joseph W. Moyle, of Minnesota.
Robert A. Peck, of Iowa.
Donald L. Picard, of Minnesota.
David M. Ransom, of the District of Columbia.
William F. Schrage, of Illinois.
George A. Trail III, of Pennsylvania.
Paul V. Ward, of Florida.
Richard H. Williams, of Utah.
Joseph A. B. Winder, of Indiana.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert B. Boettcher, of Texas.
Miss Michele M. Bova, of Maryland.
Bruce W. Clark, of California.
Wayne L. Cooper, of New York.
Arthur S. Decad, of New York.
Miss M. Dell Fleming, of Louisiana.
Kent V. Frank, of South Dakota.
Charles W. Freeman, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Edward W. Gallagher, of New York.
Miss April Glaspie, of the District of Columbia.
Ralph D. Griffin II, of Missouri.
Michael J. Habib, of New York.
Michael M. Hornblow, of New York.
Louis F. Janowski, of Illinois.
John P. Lyle, of New York.
John D. Marks, of New Jersey.
Robert M. Maxim, of New York.
Howard L. McGowan, of Ohio.
Kevin J. McGuire, of New York.
Thomas W. Neely, Jr., of New York.
John L. Nesvig, of Minnesota.
Roger G. Nord, of Wisconsin.
Robert S. Pace, of Pennsylvania.
Wesley H. Parsons, of Arizona.
Edward W. Runden, of Illinois.
Eeton Shanley, of New Jersey.
Miss Mary C. Smith, of California.
Clifton C. Stanley, Jr., of California.
Michael C. Stephen, of Ohio.
Larry C. Thompson, of Oklahoma.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

Howard T. Bane, of Virginia.
Dwight S. Burgess, of New Jersey.
J. Foster Collins, of Connecticut.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consular officers and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Thomas E. Carroll, of Massachusetts.
William D. Fisher, of Maryland.
Edward G. Griffin, of Connecticut.
Geoffrey P. Gwaltney, of the District of Columbia.
Myron L. Hoffmann, of Illinois.
Eugene L. Jeffers, Jr., of Ohio.
Harold J. McCoy, of Virginia.
William L. Mosebey, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Chester E. Norris, Jr., of Maine.
James D. Porter, of Virginia.
Charles L. Randolph, of Maryland.
Joseph D. Ravotto, of California.
Richard S. Sampson, of the District of Columbia.
Jacob R. Scott, of the District of Columbia.
John W. Sears, of the District of Columbia.
Harrison L. Shaffer, Jr., of Colorado.
Miss Carol M. Sheehan, of Virginia.
John R. Stockwell, of Texas.
Robert W. Stone, of Texas.
James C. Sworobuk, of Michigan.
Richard B. Umstead, of Maryland.
Paul E. A. Van Marx, of Connecticut.
Wilbur I. Wright, of Michigan.
Miss Carol Jean Young, of Missouri.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

Francis A. Arenz, of Texas.
Miss M. Sharon Baber, of Missouri.
William T. Keough, of Pennsylvania.
Saul Moskowitz, of New York.
Ralph L. Nider, of Pennsylvania.
Ralph G. Saucedo, of California.
James A. Smith, of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Col. Maurice S. Kleinberg, Chaplain, U.S. Army, Staff Chaplain, Military District of Washington, offered the following prayer:

I Chronicles 29: 11:

Thine, O Lord, is the greatness and the power and the glory and the victory and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is Thine; Thine is the kingdom O Lord, and Thou are exalted as head above all.

Let us pray:

O Eternal God, we stand in awe before Thee as we seek Thy blessing upon the deliberations and decisions of this day.

Humbly we beseech Thee to grant a measure of Thy divine insight unto the leaders of this great Nation so that what transpires here today and every day may reflect a measure of justice and righteousness according to Thy will.

Give us the capacity for reasonable doubt and shield us from becoming precast in the mold of inherited assumptions.

Shed Thy divine light upon our quest into the vast expanse of truth and keep us constant in our awareness that though today's accepted hypothesis may become tomorrow's fallacy, man's search for truth is not in vain.

Give us the faith that will sustain us through troubled times and bring us to that victorious day when all men as brothers shall invoke Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WORK PLAN FOR MONROE-ANNABELLA, UTAH

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

March 28, 1966.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on March 22, 1966, considered the work plan Monroe-Annabella, Utah, transmitted to you by Executive Communication No. 1108, 88th Congress, and referred to this committee, and unanimously approved the plan.

Sincerely yours,
Harold D. Cooley,
Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on the Federal Aid Highway Program and the Subcommittee on Roads, of the Committee on Public Works, meeting jointly, be permitted to sit during general debate today and for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. Mr. Speaker, all of us remember the words of our late President Kennedy, who said:

> We must never—at any summit, in any treaty declaration, in our words, or even in our minds—recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe.

During 1920, Byelorussia became a captive nation of Soviet Russia. Only 2 years before, on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born. Yet, despite all the sacrifices of its brave people, this new nation was unable to preserve its independence against the relentless onslaught of overwhelming Communist forces.

We of the Western World have often mistakenly considered Byelorussia as a part of Russia itself. It is, however, a fact that since the beginning of history Byelorussia developed quite independently of Russia, and the Byelorussians can proudly boast of their long and glorious history which antedates the history of Russia. To preserve their independence, the Byelorussians had to endure severe trials and untold hardships over the centuries. To this day the stouthearted Byelorussians have kept their longings for freedom and independence in their hearts and minds notwithstanding the ruthless regime of their present Red overlords who take orders from the Kremlin. The Soviet authorities employed their well-tried methods against the people of that land, such as execution squads, mass deportations, and the spreading of terror.

I should like to point out that the present Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is nothing but a mere puppet of the Russian Government in Moscow and that it does not, in reality, represent the Byelorussian people.

In recognition of the right of a free people to national self-determination, the U.S. Government has firmly and consistently stood by its declared policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of once free nations. That is the reason we here in the Congress of the United States take note of the occasion of the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence. The eloquent speeches made this day by our colleagues, who are the duly elected representatives of the American people, are proof positive of our concern for people who suffer aggression. We cannot, and indeed, must not, turn our backs on the less fortunate peoples of enslaved nations. Our noting of this day materially assists in forming world opinion and thus hastening the time when Byelorussia will once again achieve meaningful and true independence and freedom for its land from the evil forces which pose a threat to the entire free world.

FRANCE SHOULD REPAY DEBTS TO UNITED STATES

Mr. **WOLFF**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WOLFF**. Mr. Speaker, American schoolchildren have long been taught that there are no people with whom our Nation has more cause for a spirit of kinship than with the people of France.

Our traditional friendship with that great people springs from the timely and courageous help given to the colonies by France in our war for independence.

But such help has not been a one-way street.

Many French towns have two American military cemeteries, one from each World War; 60,000 Americans are buried on French soil.

We have poured gold as well as blood into the defense of France against her enemies. Since World War II the United States have given France assistance totaling $11 billion, including $4 billion in outright grants.

Yet, in the years since Charles de Gaulle came to power, an increasing hostility has become the official French attitude toward the United States. And France continues to drain our gold.

Rarely has one people helped another as we have helped the French.

And rarely, if ever, has such help been rewarded with such ingratitude.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the French people, who have watched two generations of American soldiers fall in their defense, support M. de Gaulle in his studied hostility to the United States.

At any rate, the time for patience is over.

Last year I called upon the De Gaulle government to begin repayment of the $6.5 billion France still owes the United States from World War I.

I reiterate that call today.

Mr. Speaker, the renunciation of the traditional friendship of one people for another is a grave step for a leader to take.

M. de Gaulle has taken that step.

Let our Government then respond with firmness, while remaining ever mindful that national leaders sometimes drift away from the better interests of those they lead.

Our long friendship with the people of France permits us to hope that the present situation will pass, and that our peoples will once again enjoy the friendship their mutual sacrifices merit.

Mr. Speaker, the following article from the U.S. News & World Report speaks for itself, and I include it in the Record.

What United States Has Done for France

(France, under President de Gaulle, is giving America a lesson in hard-boiled politics. The moral: Generosity and good will in today's world aren't always repaid with gratitude. After billions in aid to France over a 50-year span, De Gaulle wants to cut American ties with his country, force the United States out of Europe.)

Over span of nearly half a century the American people probably have done more for France and the French people than any nation ever did for another.

Americans, at a very high cost in lives and money, came to the rescue of France in two major wars. Americans then underwrote the rebuilding of the French nation from those wars. It was Americans who defended France during the postwar years when the threat of communism was hanging over Western Europe.

Now the payoff is taking place, and it is not proving pleasant for the American Government.

France under President Charles de Gaulle wants to replace the United States as leader of the defensive alliance in Europe—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The French Government has done what it could to embarrass the United States in its effort to prevent a Communist takeover in South Vietnam. France has been striving to undermine the American dollar and to block American efforts to find some other, more flexible, way to settle accounts in world trade than through sole dependence on gold.

Also, De Gaulle, is preparing to go to Moscow on a mission that tends to arouse suspicion among diplomats in the United States and in many European countries.

De Gaulle is pictured as seeking to restore France to "grandeur" and to a role of leadership in Europe and in the world. To accomplish that, he needs to try to undermine and downgrade the United States, in the opinion of those shaping American policy.

This is not regarded by U.S. officials as a very rewarding response to the huge investment in lives and in money that the American people have made, over the years, in France and Europe.

PRICE: 36,000 LIVES

In World War I, the American investment in Europe that saved France from defeat came to 36,000 lives and 224,000 wounded. In dollars, the direct cost to the United States in military aid was $27 billion, not counting $12.2 billion in loans. All this was in dollars of far greater value than today's dollars.

PRICE: 184,000 LIVES

In World War II, France surrendered to Germany without making a real fight.

In rescuing a defeated France and subduing its conqueror, the American people sacrificed 184,000 lives and suffered 479,000 wounded. They poured more than $200 billion into direct costs of the war in Europe, while giving total lend-lease and other aid of nearly $50 billion.

Since World War II, the United States has given France gifts and credits totaling about $11 billion. That includes outright grants of $4 billion, partly in Marshall plan aid to get the industry of France on its feet.

In addition, the American people have supported large military forces in Europe through the postwar years. The aim has been to assure against a new military attack on the area and to relieve the people of Europe—including the French people—from bearing a heavy burden of armament.

For all of this, Americans asked nothing in return except a willingness among the people of Western Europe to cooperate in trying to build a unified defensive force that, in the future, could do more to protect itself.

Then, too, the American Government deliberately encouraged an outflow of gold from its own stockpile so that other nations could regain liquidity of their finances as well as soundness of their currencies.

FLOW OF TOURIST DOLLARS

At the same time, Americans were encouraged to travel abroad so they would spread dollars around the world. The original postwar worry had been that the world would face a dollar shortage.

Americans traveling abroad have for many years been spending more than $100 million annually in France alone.

In addition, American military personnel stationed at NATO bases in France have poured millions into the French economy in recent years. In 1965, such spending by

U.S. military men and their families amounted to an estimated $150 million.

So generous has been American policy and so ready the American people to share other people's burdens that there is now a surfeit of dollars in the world, and it is the U.S. dollar whose stability is becoming suspect. The French franc, which long was one of the world's prime examples of a weak currency, has managed, thanks in part to U.S. generosity, to become one of the strongest currencies in the world, backed by a gold reserve of more than $4.7 billion.

So the France for which the American people have done so much over the years now feels strong enough—as American officials see it—to kick the United States in the shins.

A POLITE REMINDER

American officials have tried to remind France, in a polite sort of way, of one more point.

In the World War I period, the U.S. loaned France $4.1 billion, which were dollars that would buy far more than today's dollars. By June, 1925, the French had paid off 65 million of this loan and had paid 221 million in interest. The loan then was refinanced at 3.34 billion, and by 1931 France had paid 39 million in interest and 161 million in principal.

After that, interest and principal payments were ended and the loan was in default. However, this huge debt has never been formally written off the books by the United States.

Result: Interest and principal on this French debt now totals $6.7 billion. De Gaulle shows no inclination to pay. The World War I debt owed by the British actually now is bigger—9.5 billion—because Britain's original borrowing was larger. Neither of the two nations is interested in repayment. Britain lacks the means to pay, but De Gaulle in view of his country's boasted financial strength and growing hoard of gold, could be helpful in honoring a debt now in default.

IF U.S. GETS OUT

Against the background of experience running back about 50 years, American officials are beginning to wonder about something much more current.

In the period since World War II, the American people have invested heavily in France to build defensive bases and supply facilities. Military highways have been constructed, pipelines built, ports improved, air bases established. Supply depots have been created and stocked. The investment is estimated at about $2.5 billion.

Now the government of France says that it wants the United States to get out of the country.

Question: What becomes of this investment in property in France paid for by Americans? Such physical installations as highways, air bases, ports, supply depots and pipelines can't be shifted. The thought is that perhaps De Gaulle expects to take over these facilities for French use. There is some uncertainty about whether or how much the French President will want to pay for what he gets.

U.S. PRIVATE HELP

Then there is still another side to the situation that Americans have come to face in De Gaulle's France.

In recent years, American businessmen have invested heavily in France. The total now comes to more than $1.6 billion.

It is this sizable American private investment that has done so much to help modernize a French industry that had been lagging.

In one instance, in the computer industry, a large infusion of capital and know-how by an American company was required to keep the French in the running. In so basic a field as that of food canning, an American company took the lead in establishing modern processes in France.

As private investment by Americans grew, De Gaulle became disturbed and began to warn about a threatened "takeover" by American capital in Europe. To date, however, there has been no direct French threat to the large-scale American investments.

PICKING UP A BURDEN

Americans today are carrying a heavy load in southeast Asia because of French failure to maintain a position there.

At the end of World War II, in spite of U.S. urging, the French Government refused to end the colonial status of Indochina—the area now included in all of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. A colonial war followed, which Communits exploited.

When defeated in a big battle of that war, the French simply gave up and pulled out.

The burden of trying to maintain stability in that part of the world fell principally on the United States. The cost of that load in this year alone is fixed officially at more than $10 billion.

In lives the cost in Vietnam is mounting. Already more than 2,000 Americans have been killed and 11,500 wounded, and the end is not in sight.

Against that background, the French under the leadership of De Gaulle are found by the U.S. Government to be doing what they can to encourage the Communists and to complicate the problem of the United States.

It is this situation that tends to cause U.S. officials to question whether good will, great help and generosity on a scale not before seen in the world actually pay off when the chips are down.

The experience with France is not regarded as encouraging.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Ashley
Battin
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Carter
Casey
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Conyers
Diggs
Duncan, Oreg.
Farnum
Fuqua
Hall
Hanna
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Holifield
Huot
Jarman
Jones, N.C.
Keogh
Leggett
McMillan
MacGregor
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Moss
Murray
Nix
O'Konski
Powell
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rooney, N.Y.
Scheuer
Scott
Senner
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stephens
Todd
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Willis
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14012), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate thereon be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14012, with Mr. O'HARA of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, last week we concluded consideration of the first supplemental appropriation bill of this year, a bill providing $13 billion plus for the continued prosecution of the war in Vietnam.

Today, we begin consideration of the second supplemental appropriation bill for the current fiscal year 1966, and although it is considerably smaller in size, it will be considerably more controversial among the Members of the House.

This is very good indeed. At times I despair over the lack of a broad enough interest in the country in the money bills which are presented to the Congress and in national fiscal affairs generally.

Appropriation bills ought to be thoroughly discussed. There should be deep probing of the consequences of these actions of the Congress. When we take action, we ought to take action deliberately after full consideration. So I hope that the reports which have been in the press are correct, and that we will have a thorough discussion of Federal fiscal policy in connection with the consideration of this bill.

If we are going to discuss the bill adequately, it would seem to me that the first thing we should do is to ascertain generally what is in the bill.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE BILL

I would like to turn to page 2 of the report accompanying the bill and briefly outline what the bill provides.

The bill calls for the appropriation of $2.5 billion plus. Let us break it down into compartments and see just what is in it.

The total amount is $2.5 billion—precisely, $2,564,872,568. Now, if there is very serious opposition to the bill, I assume that probably amendments will be offered to reduce it by half a billion dollars, or something of that general magnitude. That is, to cut it back from $2.5 billion possibly to $2 billion. If this bill is bad, let us operate on it, in the public interest. If it is good, then let us endorse it and vote for it. I say to you that I think the bill, on balance, is reasonably good. It is a creature of numerous compromises. No one achieved everything he wanted. Each of those who helped write the bill is disappointed to some extent.

So here we are. If there is something radically wrong with the bill, certainly amendments to reduce it by hundreds of millions of dollars will be presented and Members will have a chance to vote on them according to their views.

There is half a billion dollars in the bill—$552,600,000 to be more exact—or 21 percent of the total recommended, for mandatory-type expenditures under laws enacted prior to the first session of this Congress, that is, prior to the first session of the 89th Congress. At this stage, provision of these funds is more or less a matter of arithmetic. We have no real discretion at this point. Included among these funds is $381,000,000 for public assistance matching grants and $136,000,000 for veterans' compensation and pensions of one kind or another.

Congress, in its actions last year, assumed that with rising employment the need for public assistance would be diminished from the amount then budgeted, and we cut the request for public assistance by $242 million.

But it turned out, despite the high level of economic growth and activity the requirements for public assistance did not decrease so we had to put this money back because under the matching provisions of the law there was no alternative. Such mandatory items make up 21 percent of the bill.

Approximately $1.1 billion of the funds recommended in the bill, or almost half of it, 46 percent to be more precise, is for the cost of increased pay rates enacted in the last session for military and civilian personnel. That takes up $1,171,400,000 of the total. This could not be put in the original fiscal 1966 budget last year because the laws had not been enacted. I think more than 90 percent of the Members voted for the military pay increase, and the increased pay for civilian workers passed easily. The executive branch is absorbing 11 percent of the cost of the military pay raise and 32 percent of the cost of the civilian pay raise. The pay increases have been running since last fall, so we have no practical alternative to this $1.1 billion. These two categories, 46 percent for pay for military and civilian personnel, and 21 percent for mandatory-type expenditures, total 67 percent or roughly about two-thirds of the funds in the whole bill.

There is $694,300,000 in this bill, or 27 percent of the total recommended, which is related to legislation, other than pay acts, enacted in the last session of Congress.

The minority views talk about new starts and say that we should not have any. If the programs I have placed in this category are interpreted as new starts, perhaps someone will want to move to strike out half a billion dollars, or more, of the $694 million that is provided here.

We can discuss this if we want to. Roughly half of this amount, $335 million, is nondiscretionary at this stage, involving additional veterans' compensation and pensions and the extra obligations incurred under an over-allotment formula written into the new elementary and secondary education appropriation last year.

Mr. Chairman, another $125.8 million is associated with the health insurance or medicare program.

So, Mr. Chairman, as a very practical matter, there seems to be little room here in which to make further substantial reductions.

Mr. Chairman, $146,600,000 in this bill, which represents 6 percent of the total, is for the kinds of items generally thought of when supplemental appropriation bills are mentioned. For instance, Mr. Chairman, for the postal service, where the volume of business is increasing, $81 million is provided. Another item is $45 million with which to replenish the President's Disaster Relief Fund.

Mr. Chairman, certainly no one would propose slicing off amounts as small as $10 million, or $20 million, or $30 million, of this bill and claim to be making a really major reduction in the rate of public spending.

This is the general nature of the items in the bill now pending before us.

I believe it is very healthy as I said in the beginning, for us to discuss fully the fiscal affairs of the Government.

THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL 1967

The President, in submitting his fiscal 1967 budget, cut very deeply into many programs.

The President used the paring knife upon the budget requests of the departments, carving out billions of dollars of funds that they had requested. He made some choices—painful choices. He used considerable restraint. Members of the Congress who have spoken to me from day to day have expressed more concern about the cuts that were made by the President than about the amounts that were requested.

Thus I believe that the problem in this Congress, probably, will be to hold the line on the President's budget. The likelihood of exceeding it may be much greater than the likelihood that the budget will be reduced.

Mr. Chairman, it can clearly be shown that the President made some basic and meaningful cuts in preparing his fiscal 1967 budget. The members of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as other Members of Congress, are now in the process of evaluating these reductions. Committee hearings are well advanced on the various departmental items.

I have before me a compilation of recently enacted authorizations and budget requests that were made thereunder by the President in the budget for 1967.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, copies of this hearing book to which I am referring are available and are on the Committee table.

In the Federal Aviation Agency's Federal aid to airports program, for which the authorization for 1967 is $75 million, $71,100,000 has been appropriated and the 1967 budget requests rescission of $21 million, leaving $50 million or two-thirds of the authorized amount.

Mr. Chairman, the point I would make is that a lot of restraint has been used by the President and by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in making up this 1967 budget. The difference between the available recently enacted authorizations that we have provided and the amount requested is more than $2 billion. A great deal of restraint was exercised before this budget came to us.

Another example, Mr. Chairman, is the item for sewer and water grants. Sewer and water grants are very popular with our constituents and Members of the House. The full program authorized for fiscal 1967, is $200 million. But what did the President do? He sliced it in half; that is what he did.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I am sure that the gentleman from Texas realizes there is more money in the 1967 budget, however, for sewer and water grants, than was available in the 1966 budget, because of the program changes and the program shifts to other areas in which this same kind of grant exists. Insofar as the airport money is concerned, what the President is asking for is to rescind $21 million of authority that already exists insofar as the airports are concerned.

That is a rescinding authority to spend in this particular area, but it is still at a level higher than the current level.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is helping me to make my point, and that is that the President did use a great deal of restraint in making reductions before this budget came us us. I have mentioned the Federal aid airport program and the sewer and water grants. We could mention a great number of other programs here. There is a long list in this hearing book I have in my hand.

Vocational education in the 1967 budget has been held to $249 million, as compared to the permissible ceiling of $318 million.

It is very obvious that the President is trying to hold spending within bounds and for that reason has submitted requests far below what would otherwise probably have been submitted and what could have been submitted within the authorization laws, except for the necessity to exercise restraint in view of the threat of inflation and the costs and the seriousness of the Vietnam situation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Texas realizes, however, that this budget is an increase and we are well over the figure for 1966 with this authorization. We hear a lot of talk about how low authorizations were going to be kept in the fiscal year 1966. We are well over $125 billion in new obligational authority when this bill passes today.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman knows that the estimated budget expenditure for the current fiscal year 1966 is about $106 billion. The presently estimated budget expenditure for fiscal year 1967 is $112 billion, plus. The appropriation budget for the current fiscal year 1966, including this bill today, is for $128 billion, plus.

It is true that the costs of the war in Vietnam and other costs have run up the expenses of Government. There is no controversy about that. But what I am trying to say is that the President, in submitting his budget, exercised restraint and did not request the total amounts authorized and available for him to request within the legislative enactments of the Congress.

A further specific example is the highway beautification program. The authorization available for fiscal year 1967 for highway beautification is $160 million.

The President confined the request for highway beautification work to $90 million for 1967.

So you will see examples such as that throughout the budget.

There has been a great deal of restraint in the formulation of the budget that has already been submitted to us.

Under leave to extend, I am including the full list from which I have been picking examples at random.

The following is taken from pages 62 to 64, hearings of January 31, 1966, by the Committee on Appropriations, on the budget for 1967:

NEW LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS IN 1966 NOT FULLY FUNDED IN 1967 BUDGET

Mr. MAHON. Now I wish you would make a list of new legislation of last year that this budget fails to fund to the full authorization, pointing out the disparities.

Mr. SCHULTZE. I have such a list.

(The following was furnished for the record:)

Comparison of available authorizations and the 1967 budget request

[In millions of dollars]

	Authorization available in 1967	1967 budget request (NOA)
Commerce:		
Economic Development Administration:		
Development facility grants	500.0	170.0
Economic development revolving fund	170.0	81.0
Economic Development Center assistance	50.0	40.0
Technical assistance and planning grants	25.0	19.0
Regional planning assistance	15.0	7.0
Total, Public Works and Economic Development Act (Public Law 89-136)	760.0	317.0
Office of State Technical Services (Public Law 89-182)	20.0	8.0
High-speed ground transportation research and development (Public Law 89-220)	35.0	24.0
Highway beautification (Public Law 89-139):		
Landscaping and scenic enhancement	120.0	60.0
Control of outdoor advertising	20.0	15.0
Control of junkyards	20.0	15.0
Total, highway beautification	160.0	90.0
Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (various agencies):		
Agriculture	14.0	4.5
Commerce:		
Development highways	[1] 160.0	130.0
Other	7.0	5.0
Corps of Engineers	4.0	2.0
Health, Education, and Welfare	59.0	13.0
Interior	19.0	11.0
Appalachian Regional Commission	1.0	1.0
Total, Appalachian Regional Development Act	305.0	201.0
Health, Education, and Welfare:		
Vocational Rehabilitation:		
Research, training, and expansion	[2] 104.0	67.0
Other	23.0	13.0
Office of Education:		
Impacted areas:		
Operating grants	416.2	183.4
Construction grants	22.9	22.9
National Defense Education Act:		
Student loans	201.0	[3] 0
School equipment and related programs	99.0	63.0
Graduate fellowships	89.0	82.0
Guidance counseling and training	37.0	32.0
Language and area studies	16.0	16.0
Research in educational media	5.0	4.0
Teacher institutes	50.0	40.0
State statistical programs	2.0	2.0
Subtotal, NDEA	500.0	239.0
Vocational education	318.0	249.0
Higher educational activities:		
Community service and continuing education	50.0	20.0
College library grants	50.0	25.0
Library research and training grants	10.0	7.0
Library of Congress	6.0	3.0
Scholarship grants	124.0	122.0
Work study grants	165.0	134.0
Teacher fellowships	160.0	43.0
Teacher Corps	65.0	31.0
Instructional equipment	66.0	17.0
Subtotal, higher education	696.0	402.0
Grants to land-grant colleges	12.0	0
Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued		
Office of Education—Continued		
Training of teachers and research relating to education of the handicapped	38.0	33.0
Public Health Service:		
Medical education:		
Construction grants for medical-dental schools	160.0	135.0
Loans for medical-dental and nursing students	42.0	[3] 0
Improvement grants to medical-dental schools	40.0	30.0
Support to diploma schools of nursing	10.0	6.0
Support to schools of professional public health training	5.0	4.0
Community immunization	11.0	9.0
Hospital and medical facility research	10.0	7.0
Solid waste disposal program (HEW portion)	14.0	11.0
Community mental health staffing grants	40.0	34.0
Construction community mental health centers	65.0	50.0
Health research facilities construction grants	[4] 280.0	15.0
Regional medical program	90.0	43.0
Medical Library Assistance Act	23.0	14.0
(Construction grants)	(10.0)	(7.0)
(Regional and branch libraries)	(4.0)	(0)
(Research and development)	(3.0)	(1.0)
Welfare Administration:		
Grants for child welfare	50.0	46.0
Training grants for professional personnel	5.0	4.0
Administration on Aging: Grants to States	8.0	6.0
Veterans' Administration: Grants for construction of State nursing homes	5.0	4.0

	Authorization available in 1967	Portion becoming available	1967 budget request
Housing and Urban Development:			
I. Appropriations:			
Urban planning grants	117		35
Community development training grants	30		5
Sewer and water grants	300	200	100
Advance land acquisition	45	25	5
Neighborhood facilities grants	88	50	25
Public works planning advances	45		
Rehabilitation loans	160	100	
Urban transportation [5]	185	150	130
Housing for the elderly loans	175		50
II. Other new obligational authority becoming available in 1967:			
College housing loans (borrowing authority)		[6] 300	[7] −300
FNMA—Special assistance functions (borrowing authority)		[6] 450	[7] −450
Urban renewal grants (contract authority)		[6] 725	
III. Additional authorities:			
Rent supplement payments [8]	65	35	35
Public housing annual contribution	460	47	200
Federal Aviation Agency: Federal-aid airport program [9]	75		50

---

[1] $840,000,000 authorized for 5 years; $200,000,000 appropriated for 1965 and 1966: amount assumes $160,000,000 for each of remaining 3 years.

[2] Represents authorization ceiling, not a 1967 guideline.

[3] The budget contemplates proposed legislation to terminate direct student loans and to continue (1) aid for college students through guaranteed loans (for which capital is supplied by the private credit market) and (2) special cancellation benefits for doctors, nurses, and teachers.

[4] For 3 years.

[5] 1967 NOA provided in 1966 appropriations act.

[6] Authority enacted in Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

[7] Receipts from proposed sales of participations in pools of loans will permit a cancellation of NOA otherwise becoming available.

[8] Amounts represent maximum annual payments that may be provided in rent supplement contracts.

[9] $75,000,000 is authorized. Congress enacted advance authority (as is customary) of $71,000,000. The 1967 budget proposes to rescind $21,000,000 of this amount.

Yesterday there came to your desks, my colleagues, a document entitled "Federal Spending Facts," from the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. This is a very conservative organization. Members of the council in this report, which I hold in my hand—it is dated March 28—they say with respect to the antipoverty program:

> It is probable that the budget request for 1967 would have been at least $2 billion instead of $1,750 million if it had not been for the substantial expansion of defense spending.

So, this reduction is taken account of and credited in this very conservative publication.

Reading further from this publication:

> The budgeted appropriation for this program—

And the program being referred to is for the elementary and secondary education—

> The budgeted appropriation for this program in 1967 would undoubtedly have been appreciably greater than proposed except for the rising Vietnam war needs.

Here is a conservative and well-known organization that by these statements tends to corroborate what I have been trying to say, that the President desires to keep Government expenditures from getting completely out of line. The President is trying to hold the lid on.

Further evidence that he is keeping at the departments to hold spending down is shown by a memorandum which the President sent to the heads of the departments and agencies of Government only 2 weeks ago—March 15. He said to them, and I quote:

> Last November, I wrote certain departments and agencies that it was imperative to hold 1966 expenditures to the absolute minimum required for carrying out essential responsibilities.

Of course, everyone realizes that big Government spending is inevitable for a great and growing country in times like this, with a war and all the problems that confront us.

Continuing in this memorandum, the President said:

> Today, the need is doubly imperative. As the rising costs of Vietnam are added to the private demands generated by a prosperous highly employed economy, the necessity to guard against inflation takes on added urgency.
>
> In this period, your careful control over every dollar of Government spending will not only avoid direct waste of our resources, but will also help prevent the indirect and inequitable waste that results from the deterioration of the dollar's value.

The executive branch is acutely conscious of the problems of inflation, conscious of the problems of big government, and conscious of the pressures that great sums be expended; and the President is trying to hold the line.

I am hopeful that when this Congress is over that we will have held the line and not exceeded the President's budget. That is probably one of the major problems that is going to confront us as this session moves along. We ought to find ways to restrain our fiscal inclinations and do everything reasonably prudent as we process these appropriation bills.

I hope that Members will give much consideration to the matter.

There has been some talk about one item of this $2.5 billion bill which we are considering today. I understand that an amendment will be offered to delete the $12 million for the so-called rent supplement program. That would not be a very big slash in a $2.5 billion bill. It would be a small reduction in the pending bill but, of course, the implications of this decision could run to about $480 million in 40 years. But this is a question which I think we should give some thought to as we consider this bill.

Last year, Congress approved the authorization for the rent supplement program. Maybe you did not vote for it; I did not vote for it. But it was approved by Congress, and the bill was signed by the President. We had a vigorous debate on this subject in the House in consideration of the appropriation bill last year, and the House cut out the appropriation for the rent supplement program. The Appropriations Committee had scaled down the amount. The committee had circumscribed it within certain limitations and brought in a very reduced program. Nevertheless, the House rejected the program. Admittedly there was much uncertainty as to what the regulations really were to be.

The bill then went to the other body and the other body put money into the bill for the rent supplement program. But the House Members opposed the actions of the other body and the House position prevailed in conference. We wanted to proceed with caution in connection with this new and expensive program. We were not satisfied.

Here is what those who favored the program and those who were against the program said in the conference report on October 21, 1965, in House Report No. 1198:

> Funds for rent supplements are denied at this time without prejudice.

We have to agree to something in conference if we are going to move legislation. The report further stated:

> Congress has only recently authorized legislation for this program and the new Department should have more time to develop sound plans and criteria which can be reviewed when funds are sought early next year.

Officials have now developed firmer plans and the situation is improved over what it was last year. As explained in the committee report on the pending bill:

> Subsequent to consideration of this proposition by the Congress last fall, much has been done to clarify issues raised at that time. Rent supplement payments will be made to owners or developers of certain private housing in order to help make more housing available to low-income persons. The Secretary has clearly stated that only those of low income will be helped. In no case will income limits be above those established for low-rent public housing. An asset limitation has been set at $2,000 for low-income families, or $5,000 in the case of the elderly.

It is now late March. The committee has finally, after cautious, careful consideration and hearings, brought in a rent supplement appropriation. The President's request has been scaled down from $30 million to $12 million by the committee, and restrictions have been written in. It would seem to me that, as a compromise matter, we have done as well as we could with a difficult situation.

We all know that for many decades our cities have been blighted with horrible and unspeakable slums. Some of us try constantly to do something about the farm program. We provide $4 billion annually for support of various farm programs. We are interested primarily in rural areas. But we must be interested also in urban areas, if we are to fulfill our national obligations.

Our leaders generally, Democrats and Republicans alike, have tried to find a remedy for the slum situation which has confronted this Nation for generations. We all know that the slums are the spawning ground for much of the crime in this country. Of course, they are not the only spawning ground for crime. We have both the underprivileged and the overprivileged who break the law. But certainly, the conditions involved in the slum areas of our Nation do cost us a lot of money in productivity losses and in losses due to crime and the cost of crime prevention.

Many years ago, in 1937, we enacted the public housing program. Some of us voted against it. I did. But nevertheless, this program has undoubtedly done some good and has cleaned up some of the blighted spots. To date it has cost about $1.8 billion. If we should carry out all of the present commitments over the period of the next 30 or 40 years, it will cost us about $10 billion over that long period.

Public Housing has been expensive and it has not, of course, fully solved the problem, but it has been an effort to solve the problem.

We cannot brush under the rug the existence of this problem and we cannot gloss over the fact that slums are costing the American taxpayers many billions of dollars.

J. Edgar Hoover said that crime is costing us $27 billion a year. Crime does not all, of course, result from slums. I would not indicate that at all. But much of it is the result of inadequate and improper living conditions in the crowded urban areas of our Nation.

Democrats and Republicans alike have been knitting their brows for years, trying to figure out a better answer to the situation.

Last year, the Congress approved the rent supplement approach to the problem. This was different from the public housing approach. This is the free enterprise type approach, in which taxes will be paid on the property in the regular way, the property will be privately owned, and the owner will have a direct stake in the success of it.

This approach was approved by the Congress. The Committee on Appropriations, in view of the law enacted and the will, I believe, of the majority of the Members, has brought in a limited start for this program.

Let me quote from the hearings before our committee on this bill, from page

315. Many feel that public housing ought to be phased out and that we ought to embrace the rent supplement approach instead.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Stephens] appeared before the subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins]. Mr. Stephens spoke ardently in favor of the rent supplement program. In the colloquy which took place between him and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas]—and there is no finer Member of the House, no more able and dedicated Member of the House, and nobody more familiar with the situation than Mr. Jonas, a member of the committee—Mr. Jonas said:

> I think this program is superior to public housing, and agree with much of what you said except I am not satisfied that this program will replace public housing.

I hope it could replace much of public housing. But here is an authority in the House saying that, whatever we think about the rent supplement program, it is superior to the public housing program.

The political platforms of both parties have talked about the problem of the slums and the need for better housing.

The 1964 Democratic platform said:

> The goal of our housing program must be a decent home for every American family.

The Republican platform committee of 1964 was chaired by the able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], who himself is a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations. In the Republican platform the following language appears urging "emphasis upon channeling more private capital into sound urban development projects and private housing."

That is in the Republican platform. It is somewhat comparable to the rent supplement program—not entirely so.

The Republican platform complained, referring to the Democratic administration:

> This administration has refused to take practical free enterprise measures to help the poor.

The rent supplement program is designed to be a free enterprise measure to help the poor. Whether it is practical or not is up to us to decide. But we were importuned to take steps in this general direction by the Republican platform.

The Republican platform stated further, referring to the Democratic Party;

> It has failed to stimulate new housing and attract more private capital into the field. In the past 3 years, it has fallen short by 1,500,000 units of meeting its pledge of 2 million new homes each year.

The bill before us is a compromise measure. The President asked for $30 million. We provide here for the $12 million amount, with very firm restrictions, which we think will avoid some difficulties. As a result of the give and take among reasonable men, this is the program which is submitted to you today.

Furthermore, this program has a much greater opportunity to succeed because of the limitations which we have placed in the bill.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has talked about the limitations that have been placed into this bill for the rent supplement program. Will the gentleman detail those for us?

Mr. MAHON. The restrictions recommended by the committee are to insure that local communities will have a voice in the operation of this program. The committee believes that if the program is to be successful it will have to have acceptance by the local communities. They will have to participate. If they do not want it, they do not have to have it. After all, the local people know their problems and needs better than anyone else.

The bill provides that rent supplement projects be part of a workable program—a provision applied to many other urban programs—or be officially approved by the local community concerned. This has been a dominant theme in recent legislation and the bill today includes rent supplements under this concept.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. I think the gentleman recognizes that buildings do not make slums. It is people that make slums.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the time has come for our Committee on Appropriations—and for that matter, the entire Congress—to fish or cut bait in our handling of the administration's appropriation requests for the balance of this year and for all of the 1967 fiscal year.

I, for one, am ready to do some fishing to see if we cannot arrest the expansions of Great Society programs and expansions of other nonessential or low-priority domestic spending.

If we in Congress do otherwise, we shall be encouraging disastrous inflation or the imposition of additional taxes on an already tax-burdened public.

The New York Times yesterday quotes an administration aid as saying that this is D-day insofar as domestic spending programs are concerned this year. I say, let us accept that designation. If this is D-day on domestic spending, let us demonstrate our determination to wage and win a battle against extravagance in time of war. It will be a great victory for the American taxpayer.

It is apparent from the supplemental requests for 1966 and the budget requests for 1967 that the administration has made no plans to curtail any Great Society spending and very little in other domestic spending. The budget-cutting proposals it has made in the 1967 budget are largely directed toward programs of considerable appeal to the public. Moreover, if I have correctly interpreted the mood of House Members with respect to cutting some of the public's more favored and longstanding programs, I think it is safe to assume that the planned reductions will not be realized, as my distinguished chairman has said.

In time of war—and make no mistake about it, we are at war in Vietnam just as surely as we were at war in the forties and in the early fifties—the administration and the Congress have an obligation to the American people to adequately finance the war and, at the same time, practice economy here at home rather than just pay lipservice to it, as the administration has done to date.

Our Nation has a commitment in Vietnam, which will require the services—and in some instances the limbs and lives—of a great many more of our young men. It will also require much additional war material, which will constitute a drain on our resources and a strain on our economy. We have no choice but to provide the men and material to defeat the enemy and restore peace to a troubled world. But we do have a choice—in fact, in my opinion, an obligation—to protect the economic wellbeing of our great Nation from the ravages of inflation, from the awesome burden of increased taxation, and from the chains of statutory wage and price controls—which at best are the ineffective tools of a bungling bureaucracy.

If we are to honor that obligation to the Nation's economic stability, we should begin now to curtail the excesses in Federal spending for domestic programs.

WHAT IS THE RECORD ON DEFENSE NEEDS?

It is obvious that our defense needs and expenditures were understated in the January budget of last year and they are underestimated in the fiscal 1967 budget. They were understated last year to pave the way for Great Society spending proposals and to preserve the facade of a $100 billion budget for 1966. They are underestimated for fiscal 1967 to pave the way for expansions of Great Society programs and to support the fiction of a $1.8 billion administrative budget deficit.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for pointing out the underestimation of defense needs as far as the 1966 budget is concerned. This request which we have before us today is the third add-on for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1966 and the fourth add-on so far considered by this 89th Congress. The 1967 budget was out of date 2 days after it was sent to this Congress as far as our national security needs are concerned. I think it is necessary for all Americans to understand that most clearly, especially on a day when the administration announced that the cost of living has increased by another one-half of 1 percent.

But in our hearings it has already been developed—and I believe the gentleman from Ohio shares this concern with me and with other Members of the Committee on both sides of the aisle—that the national security needs of our country are still underestimated, not only as far as new obligational authority is concerned, but insofar as the expenditures are concerned.

The manpower limit on the Department of the Army was removed 2 days after the budget was sent to us. This, in expenditures as well as new obligational authority, will mean over $1 billion, and those supplementals for fiscal 1967 are already under consideration in the Department of Defense at this very moment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the concern that every Member of the Congress should share at this time—the fact that new obligational authority was underestimated in 1966 by over $15 billion, and new obligational authority, as well as expenditures, have already been proven to be underestimated insofar as 1967 is concerned.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin.

In May of last year, a little more than a month before the 1965 fiscal year ended, we were presented with a $700 million supplemental defense appropriation request which Congress enacted immediately. If that request had been provided for in the 1966 budget, no harm, whatsoever, would have been done to our war effort. In August when the Senate had the regular defense appropriation bill under consideration, the administration sent us a further appropriation request for an additional $1.7 billion, which Congress approved. And it was only last week that we gave final approval to the President's request for $13.1 billion of additional defense appropriations for the balance of this fiscal year, which ends next June 30.

It is a virtual certainty that we will be called upon to honor additional defense supplementals late in this calendar year or early next year.

The administration should be requested to furnish the Congress with a more realistic assessment to our overall national security needs for fiscal 1967. It should also establish a schedule of priorities on domestic spending to the end that those of low priority could be deferred, at least until a just peace is reached in Vietnam. If the administration is unwilling to provide the Congress with a reassessment of defense needs and expenditures and a schedule of priorities on domestic spending, then I think we shall be forced to do it for them and for the good of the economy.

WHAT IS AHEAD?

Inflation is already eroding the purchasing power of the dollar. The wholesale price index was up seven-tenths of 1 percent in February—and every housewife knows that the price of food is increasing steadily.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin just said, we now have a one-half of 1 percent increase in the cost of living for this year, and for the balance of the year, if it continues, we will have a 6-percent inflation on the basis of the figures that we have up to this date. This inflation will represent an additional 6-percent tax increase, actually, upon the American people.

The administration is concerned over the inflationary pressures that are building steadily. Only last week the President was quoted in the press as having ruled out the possibility of new taxes at this time. He did not, however, rule out the possibility of tax increases later in the year.

Now, we all know that inflation is a pernicious form of taxation that has its greatest impact upon middle-income citizens and upon the very same low-income citizens that the Great Society programs are intended to help. To halt the upward spiral of inflation by imposing further taxes on these low-income citizens would constitute an artful and scandalous trick of giving with one hand and taking away with the other.

There is a much fairer way of halting the upward spiral of inflation. If the administration and the Congress will just slow down the rate of increase in controllable, nondefense domestic spending, inflation can be contained and we can continue to have relative stability in wages and prices in 1967.

If as planned, the administration pumps into the economy an additional $10 billion of cash payments to the public over and above the $135 billion scheduled for this year, there will be little or no hope that we can contain inflation except through tax increases.

If Congress goes blindly along with the administration on its nondefense spending plans for 1967, the administrative budget deficit will very likely be nearer $5 billion than the $1.8 billion forecast by the administration.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I was interested in the comment of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio about inflation. My recollection is that there was some announcement made yesterday or last night about the continuing increases in the cost of living.

Mr. BOW. I have just referred to that. It is one-half of 1 percent. This would amount to about 6 percent increase this year, when expressed on an annual basis.

Mr. JONAS. That is on an annual basis?

Mr. BOW. Yes.

If the Congress goes along with the administration, I think we are going to have a $5 billion deficit excluding Vietnam. It is unlikely that the Department of Defense can sustain the $1.6 billion of planned defense economies in 1967.

It is reasonably certain that the administration will not be able to market all of the $4.7 billion of Government loan assets it has set aside for sale. That is figured in the budget to keep it at $1.8 billion. Already, administration officials are contacting Members of Congress for their support of Federal discounts—subsidies—to make these assets more attractive to the banking community. In other words, we will pay subsidies to increase interest so the banks will buy these assets. With interest rates on the upswing, discounts would have to be large enough to produce about an 8-percent return before the assets could be made attractive to bankers. And even then, some banks would not participate simply because they would be unwilling to invest in assets that were of questionable investment value when they were originally negotiated even though we give them a subsidy.

Interest on the public debt will rise more rapidly than was forecast in the budget for 1967 coming out again with a higher deficit.

Savings of $268 million of expenditures in 1967 on longstanding and public-favored programs such as school lunch, school milk, land-grant colleges, impact school aid, and cooperative-State research in agriculture probably will not be realized.

The 1967 budget is misleading in that it implies a fiscal program that is in near balance, and it is inflationary because of its expansionary thrust, particularly in the Great Society programs.

THE BILL BEFORE US

The second supplemental appropriation bill, which we are discussing today, would provide $2.5 billion of appropriations, a reduction of $249 million from the budget request of $2.8 billion. The reductions from budget requests largely constitute paper or bookkeeping cuts since over $200 million was cut from the request for budget funds to finance the supplementary medical insurance trust fund and the Federal hospital insurance trust fund. To the extent that additional funds are needed for these trust accounts, we shall be obliged to provide them.

This bill provides funds for the initiation of nine new programs which were authorized by Congress last year and extension of four programs under legislation also enacted last year. As desirable as these programs may seem, I do think the rates of their financing could have been held down to lower levels without adverse effect on operation of the programs. Certainly, there is no pressing need, in fact as I see it, no need at all for funds to initiate the National Teacher Corps and the rent supplement program. Once these programs are funded, they will grow by leaps and bounds. They are included in the 1967 budget for substantial increases above the funds provided in this supplemental for 1966. I also seriously question the provision of $41 million for impact school aid.

I know what a favorite that is with many Members of this Congress—that there was no budget request and that the President asked you not to put it in.

In many impact school aid areas, Federal activities are largely responsible for their economic well-being.

I will have something to say on that later in the day. The administration did not request these funds and I feel the committee made a mistake by including them.

Further meaningful reductions could be made in this bill if it were given additional study by the committee.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I should repeat that we are on the threshold of runaway inflation. The administration apparently expects to halt this inflationary thrust by requesting the imposition of additional taxes on an already tax-burdened public. The administration and the Congress can halt this spread of inflation by cutting back on appropriations and expenditures for domestic spending. We have an obligation to the American public to do just that. If the administration is unwilling to honor that obligation, then we in Congress should do it for them.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has discussed in detail this second supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, there are four items in this supplemental appropriation bill included in chapter II—the Independent Offices Appropriations.

Let me discuss each of these four items briefly.

First. The Selective Service System requested a supplemental appropriation of $12,681,000—our committee has approved $10,180,000—we have made a cut and reduction of $2,501,000.

Most of the increases recommended are for selectee travel. Our subcommittee has been advised that the draft call of 36,000 last January has been reduced to 22,000 in April. There is thus a reduction in the number of draftees and selectees. Moreover, General Hershey proposed increasing and "beefing up" the draft boards by 880 new jobs. We felt that, as the boards are operative at this time, this number was not needed. And so we have, for these reasons, cut and reduced the fund request of Selective Service System.

The committee feels that the $10,180,000 is adequate as the regular bill is pending currently before the Congress.

Second. The Veterans' Administration has requested $188 million for compensation and pensions and $5 million for readjustment benefits—a total of $193 million.

Let me remind my colleagues that in the last session the Congress passed five new legislative measures, providing substantial increased benefits for our veterans. These measures provided for increased compensation and pensions, increased disability compensation rates, death gratuity payments up to $5,000 each to beneficiaries of veterans who died in service between January 1, 1957, and September 28, 1965.

And there were other liberalized benefits. By an act of Congress 4 million men who served in the Armed Forces were made veterans—4 million new veterans. And there are a lot of additional men being discharged, adding to the veterans' rolls daily.

We have provided all the funds requested in this supplemental for the Veterans' Administration.

There are no funds or salaries for administration. All the funds are for benefits. And one more reminder—there will be other increases in veterans' benefits soon to be presented to the Congress for the new GI bill—for the cold war veterans benefits bill recently signed into law.

Third. Disaster relief: The Office of Emergency Planning asked for $75 million for additional payments for disaster relief.

Our committee has approved $45 million—we have made a cut of $30 million.

There were 12 major disasters in 16 States last year—the highest ever. As a consequence the present disaster relief fund has been reduced. Most payments have been made. However, there is a balance on hand of some $13,500,000. Annual appropriations to this fund in this fiscal year will be $100 million.

Our committee feels that the $45 million recommended will be adequate.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. Chairman, concerning the rent supplement program, our committee is recommending $12 million for contracting authority and $100,000 for payments.

We have reduced the funds budgeted for this program by $18 million.

The rent supplement program has been authorized by Congress for a period of 4 years.

The 4-year authorized program is as follows: $30 million contract authority for fiscal year 1966; $35 million for fiscal year 1967; $40 million of fiscal year 1968; $45 million for fiscal year 1969.

That is a total authorization by the Congress of $150 million in contract authority through 1969.

We have approved only $12 million for this year. This will provide for 20,000 units of the 250,000 units authorized.

This program has been authorized by Congress. It is needed; it is necessary. And the funds here recommended should be approved.

FREE ENTERPRISE

The rent supplement program has been discussed and aired for months and at great length. The basic issue has already been resolved by Congress. The rent supplement program is a move in the direction away from public housing.

This program will shift the emphasis in housing assistance from public housing to free enterprise. This trend is both desirable and healthy.

I repeat: There is a great need for housing in the low-income field.

There is a housing shortage in this area.

And private enterprise is being called upon to help to provide this housing.

Private enterprise will construct the housing.

Private enterprise will own the housing.

Private enterprise will maintain and operate the housing.

The property will remain on the local tax rolls—and local and State taxes will be paid on the properties.

None of these things occur in public housing programs.

The best approach to the problem of a shortage of low-income housing is a joint Government-free enterprise effort in the rent supplement program. This places the basic responsibility for construction—for ownership—and for management and operation—on private enterprise.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Is it not true that in addition to private enterprise there are also church groups, cooperative groups, and organizations of that kind which seek the privilege and the right to build housing for lower income people?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. There is great interest in the program.

The long-range effect of the program will be to reduce emphasis on public housing. In this connection, I would like to point out that the Federal Government has been in the rent supplement business for more than 25 years in the public housing program—since the Housing Act of 1937.

The basic objections raised against this rent supplement program last year have been resolved.

INCOME AND ASSET LIMITATIONS

The program is tied to public housing—or below public housing—in the amount of income and assets allowed for persons to be eligible.

The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development has set an asset level at $2,000 for an individual or a family to be eligible for rent supplements—or $5,000 for the elderly.

Dr. Weaver, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has stated this plainly and firmly in testimony before our committee.

He has drawn regulations to this effect.

And I have a letter from Dr. Weaver confirming this fact in writing.

I repeat: Only those with assets of $2,000 or less—or $5,000 in case of the elderly—will be able to qualify for rent supplements.

This is below the standards set for public housing.

An individual with assets of $5,000 can get into public housing—which is owned, controlled, and managed by Government.

An individual with assets of this amount—$5,000—cannot qualify for the rent supplement program. If an applicant for a rent supplement has assets of $2,025, he cannot get in.

I repeat: Asset limitations are set at $2,000 for an individual or family—and at $5,000 for the elderly—below the requirements for public housing occupancy.

So, Mr. Chairman, the objections raised to this program last year have been resolved. And the assurance that these objections have been resolved is given in testimony, in regulations, and in writing.

In addition to asset limitations, persons must meet the following statutory conditions to be eligible.

They must be either displaced by Government action; 62 years of age or older;

handicapped; occupying substandard housing; or to be a disaster victim in a disaster area. These standards are written into the law.

WORKABLE PROGRAM

In addition to these standards written into the law, Mr. Chairman, and the assets and income limitations set by regulation—the Committee on Appropriations has added the workable program concept to the rent supplement program.

We are all familiar with the workable program concept.

This has been written into all phases of the public housing program—into slum clearance, into urban renewal, and into other housing programs.

Our committee has added language in this bill limiting the use of funds under this program—and I quote "to those projects which are either part of a workable program or which have been officially approved by the local community concerned."

This action serves to strengthen local planning and assures local participation similar to that in other programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

All of us are familiar with the slums and the ghettos and the substandard housing situation that exists in many of our big cities and in other areas throughout the country.

We are so familiar and so much aware of this situation that a lengthy discussion should not be required to emphasize this problem of housing for low-income groups.

All 50 States have expressed an interest in the private enterprise concept of building the additional, needed housing.

The special task force that studied this program has found that 342 localities in all of the 50 States are needing additional housing. They have indicated an interest in the rent supplement program.

Some 560 projects are pending.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut—a valued member of our committee.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks, and say this: It is true that we have been engaged in the public housing program for many years. Under this rent supplement program we are trying to find a new approach to the solution to the problem. Is that so?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GIAIMO. I think it should be clearly understood, Mr. Chairman, by the department which will administer this, since they ran into some difficulty last year in defining their qualifications for this program, that this program is designed to help those people in the low-income bracket and is designed to create a reasonable method of solving this problem—so that we can substitute this, for public housing—it should be stated that the qualifications standards should not be broadened to include people who have more assets or more income than is set forth in this program.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend—the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I join with the chairman of the subcommittee in the argument he is making. I think it ought to be emphasized again, as the gentleman emphasized, that we have been subsidizing public housing for the past 25 years to the tune of billions of dollars.

As a matter of fact, in the current fiscal year, we will pay under this authority to the public housing authorities around the Nation $247 million, as a subsidy to public housing. In fiscal year 1967, the amount will jump to $260 million, as a subsidy to public housing.

This new rent supplement program is, in the judgment of this committee, one which will in the long run, give us better housing for low-income groups. I think this is a very vital program. It will tend to reduce the subsidy we are now paying to public housing.

I am sure that when Members of the House look upon this program in that fashion, they will see that this new program in the long run will improve public housing.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, expressions of interest have been received for the building of from 90,000 to 100,000 units—to house families presently living in substandard housing.

A total of 6 million families currently live in substandard housing.

We are all familiar with the Watts situation in Los Angeles.

We know that recently there has been a second outbreak in Watts.

We do not want—and we do not need—any more of these acts of violence.

A solution must be found—and the rent supplement program—the private enterprise concept—is a step in the right direction.

This bill will result in the construction of much needed housing for low-income persons.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this supplemental appropriation as reported by the committee.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement evidencing the dire necessity for this legislation, but I must make an objection to this appropriation, because I think it is wholly inadequate. I think that there are so many people who are living in slum areas throughout the country that something should be done for them. I think that $12 million, as I said a moment ago, is wholly inadequate. I am going to offer an amendment at the proper time to increase this sum to $30 million, which was originally intended by the administration to be included in this bill.

So, although I want to show my appreciation for the efforts of the gentleman on the floor, I want to say to him, and I want to repeat it again and again and again, that the sum provided here is wholly inadequate, especially in view of money expended for other projects.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman recognizes that some people wanted $30 million. Some people did not want any appropriation at all. The committee agreed on a compromise figure of $12 million. I think this amount should be appropriated. We should stand by the committee.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. It should be pointed out that this is a supplemental appropriation for the present fiscal year and there is not much time left in this fiscal year. They want to enter into those contract obligations. They will be in and are in at the present time asking for their full amount for the coming fiscal year. It should be stressed that this is a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. We are currently hearing the Secretary and officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs with respect to their various programs for fiscal year 1967.

We held hearings on this item last year and again this year. The amount of funding included in the pending bill has been fully justified.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, first, although I do not see the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the committee, on the floor here now, I do want to tell him how much I appreciate his complimentary remarks. He did not read all of the RECORD or he would have found that I expressed sentiments somewhat different than those he quoted, although he did quote me accurately as saying that I think this rent subsidy program is superior to public housing. I have always said that and I repeat it today. It is superior to public housing in several respects. First, the property stays on the tax rolls. That is one of the objections to public housing. It is nontaxable to the local community which provides services. This housing will be.

Second, this housing will be managed by private management concerns or individuals. That makes it superior, because public housing is managed by public housing authorities or public bodies. It is superior also in that while the profits are limited, one classification of sponsorship is a limited dividend corporation. The profit is limited to dividends of 6 percent of the money invested. So in those respects I say again, as I did at the hearings, that I think this program is superior to public housing. If it were being offered here today as a substitute for public housing, I would have no difficulty supporting it. I think the problem we have here is that this is not offered as a substitute for public housing but it is another subsidized program superimposed on public housing.

Before I get too far into a discussion of the program, I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] in saying to the Committee that the bill, or our section of the bill before you and the one to which I am now referring, was the basis of a compromise in the subcommittee.

There were those on the subcommittee who opposed the entire program. I do not mind saying that I am opposed to the program if for no other reason than that I do not think it ought to be started in a supplemental bill. We held hearings yesterday in the subcommittee on the regular appropriation bill for 1967. It has $35 million in it for an extension of this program, which is the second installment of it. There were others who wanted the full $30 million without any limiting language. In order to get the limiting language, we finally worked out a compromise to include $12 million plus the limiting language.

Now, I am not going to offer any amendments to strike it. We just heard in the Committee a minute ago that an amendment will be offered to increase it. I will certainly oppose that. I will decide how to vote on other amendments when they are offered, but this is, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, the development of a compromise within the subcommittee in order to have a bill that we could report to the full committee and to this Committee of the Whole in order that it may work its will and decide what to do.

I have said that this is a program that is superimposed on public housing. I think it would be in order to remind the Committee today of exactly what is involved in our commitment to public housing already. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland], in his colloquy with the chairman of our subcommittee a moment ago, brought out the fact that this last year we appropriated approximately $240 million to pick up the tab, to pay the subsidy for public housing units now in occupancy. Let me show you how that is growing. That was $240 million in 1966, but do you know how far it will grow by 1967?

They are asking for $280 million in 1967, of which $260 million is subsidy and $20 million is for administrative costs. That is what it costs us, the taxpayers, just to administer the public housing per year.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the subsidy, which is growing by leaps and bounds—and I would ask those who have the feeling that this may be a program that is to be substituted for public housing—to turn to page 266 and they will see a table there, put into the record by Dr. Weaver himself, which shows that instead of public housing going down as this new program is funded, public housing is scheduled to increase. It will increase over the next four years by 258,000 new units, 158,000 of which are dwelling units, 60,000 of which are acquisitions of existing structures and improvements to existing ones, and 40,000 units that will be leased.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the members of the Committee know what it costs in subsidy to run the public housing program per unit? It costs $698 a unit. This $280 million to which I have just referred, as contained in the President's budget for public housing subsidies for 1967—should be multiplied by 40, because the contracts run for 40 years—you will see that, instead of talking about $280 million, we actually should be talking about 40 times that sum. Members of the Committee will find that if they do multiply it out, it represents about $11 billion, if we do not increase the units any beyond the ones presently in existence and which are occupied today.

Mr. Chairman, I would also remind the members of the Committee that we are talking—and the very distinguished gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, made somewhat light of the effort that will be made here today to eliminate this $12 million; he rather ridiculed it as an infinitesimal part of the bill we are considering today—but I will tell the members of the Committee how important it is and why it is not insignificant. Once we give this contract authority to spend $12 million for rent subsidies, you have to multiply that by 40 because it runs for 40 years. So instead of talking about $12 million being involved in this item, we should be talking about $480 million. And, Mr. Chairman, that is not all, because in the program envisioned in fiscal 1967, on which we had hearings just yesterday, the administration is asking for $35 million more. It will ask for $40 million, in the next year and for $45 million in the fourth year, at which time this program will be costing $150 million a year. Multiply that by 40, and you will find that we are talking about inaugurating a brandnew program here today, superimposed on the existing costly public housing program, of which there is not one word in the Record that will justify an assumption that it is going to be discontinued, which has a maximum price tag of $6 billion.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman from North Carolina arrives at the $480 million figure by multiplying 40 by $12 million, which we are proposing to supply in the supplemental bill.

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. BOLAND. But is it not entirely conceivable that a number of these people whose rents will be supplemented during this period could easily go off the program?

Mr. JONAS. Oh, yes; but I am quite sure they will be replaced by others.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as I understood the testimony before the committee, that figure could be reduced by a couple of hundred millions of dollars.

Mr. JONAS. The $6 billion is the maximum cost.

Mr. BOLAND. This is really the outside figure. It is conceivable that it would not reach this figure, though.

Mr. JONAS. That just depends on how popular this program is and how many people get into it. Something has been said here about changing the regulations or making them more practical. It is true that this has been done. Maximum limits have been placed on assets and income. But I would like the Committee to understand that whereas there is a limitation on the amount of rent that could be paid, it is tied to the cost of the unit. Now the maximum limit of rent for a three-bedroom apartment would be $140 a month, of which the Government would pay the difference between the economic rent and 25 percent of the income of the family. But there is another provision which says that in high-cost areas of the country, the Administrator can increase these limits by 25 percent. So wherever you cannot build one of these housing units for $12,500—by whatever the amount it has to be increased to construct them—the $140 limit would be raised, and it could go to $175 a month.

Mr. BOLAND. I do not question that point. I was only saying that when you multiply the 40-year period by the $12 million that we are supplying in this supplemental appropriation, it would not necesarily mean $480 million because, again I say, a number of these people would be going off the program—just as quickly as their income would be sufficient to pay their entire rent, without any subsidy. These families would stay right in this supplemental rent housing and they would pay the total amount of rent that the nonprofit organization or the limited profit or cooperative housing corporation has set under the rent subsidy. So it is not necessarily so that we would be actually paying $480 million over the 40-year period because enough of them might reach that amount of income that would no longer qualify them for a rent subsidy.

Mr. JONAS. That is right. I agree with the gentleman that there is no binding commitment that this is going to cost $480 million. It will depend on many things, including the points that the gentleman made. But it cannot be denied that the costs could go to $480 million from this initial $12 million and to $6 billion maximum if we fund the 250,000 units as authorized and as contemplated in the administration's program.

I do not blame people for wanting better housing. I hope all the people in America who live in substandard housing will enjoy better housing. But I would say when you talk about a program applicable to the lowest income people, $175 a month rent is quite high.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am interested in the colloquy that is taking place between the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from North Carolina. To me the indication is that the cost would increase if the administration has its way because already the administration has requested more money than the Congress has allocated.

But one thing that disturbs me is that here we are embarking upon this kind of program when the administration just last fall cut out 8,500 units of military housing for servicemen. Now if we are going to deny our servicemen and the record is clear as to the need for military housing—if we are cutting or deferring 8,500 units for military families and coming in instead with this kind of a program, I have serious question about the merits of the program. But even if I did not, I think at this time it certainly ought to be deferred in the light of our other commitments especially in the area of defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, this is serious business we have before the House today. It is serious business because included in this supplemental appropriation bill is an appropriation to make effective two pieces of legislation, the authorizing legislation which never should have been passed in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I am referring, of course, to the rent subsidy bill and to the Teachers' Corps bill, neither of which should have been passed and certainly the funding for which should not be in this piece of legislation.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I commend the committee for cutting the President's request from $30 to $12 million for the rent subidy and the Teachers' Corps from $13.2 to $10 million, but let me point out that this is still a foot in the door. It is a breach in the dike and will soon let the flood waters wash out the entire dike.

How can this Nation embark on a multibillion dollar program of paying house rent for what soon will be a sizable portion of the American population?

How can we embark on this Teachers' Corps program, a program which will make the Education Department in Washington a virtual czar over every school district in the Nation?

It is true these authorizations were passed last year, but unless they are funded by this supplemental, or the regular appropriation bill, they will not go into effect.

These two provisions must be stricken from this bill. There is in this bill much needed money, but if these two funds are left in the bill, the bill itself should be killed.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, the remarks I am about to make refer to a study of the 1967 budget prepared in cooperation with former Director of the Bureau of the Budget Maurice Stans. Mr. Stans is a recognized authority on Federal fiscal matters. I doubt if there is anyone inside or outside of Government who is more knowledgeable in this field than Mr. Stans.

DIMENSIONS

President Johnson's 1967 budget calls for expenditures of $112.8 billion and revenues of $111 billion, leaving a deficit of $1.8 billion. The message accompanying the budget states that the expenditure level is designed to support the struggle in Vietnam and also continue unabated the advance toward a Great Society at home.

The last time the Federal budget was balanced was in 1960, under President Eisenhower. Expenditures in that year were $76.5 billion and revenues were $77.7 billion. Since then the annual deficits have totaled $36.4 billion, including the one proposed for 1967. The overall cost of running the Government has increased 47.5 percent in just 7 years.

MAJOR CHANGES

The President's budget message claims that outside of Vietnam, budget expenditures will rise by only $0.6 billion, or about half of 1 percent. It is interesting to see how this figure was reached, according to Budget Bureau Director Schultze:

	Billions
Increases:	
Great Society programs	$3.2
Interest costs	.8
Government pay increases	.3
Workload increases and contractual commitments	1.0
Total	5.3
Decreases:	
Increased sales of assets	1.6
Defense costs other than Vietnam	1.6
All other reductions	1.5
Total	4.7
Net increase	.6

The "other" decreases totaling $1.5 billion are in the space program, the postal service, agriculture, education—student loans, aid to federally affected schools—and smaller items.

Interpreted differently, it could be said that, apart from Defense, budget expenditures will increase $5.3 billion; and these are financed in part by increasing the sales of assets by $1.6 billion and by budget reductions of $1.5 billion, leaving a net increase, apart from Defense, of $2.2 billion. However, as is shown later, many of the so-called reductions are suspect and some of the increases appear to be understated, with the result that the net increase in nondefense programs will very likely turn out to be much higher than $2.2 billion by the end of the budget year.

UNUSUAL FEATURES

Many elements of the press have criticized the 1967 budget as being full of "gimmickry," in terms that reflect on its integrity.

Detailed analysis of the elements of revenue and expenditure comprised within the current budget discloses many unusual items that, taken together, cast doubt upon the inference of a nearly balanced financial program. In particular:

First. There are many expenditure estimates that appear to be unduly low, considering the character and momentum of the programs involved. Included in these are interest costs on the national debt, payments under the Alliance for Progress and for foreign development loans, and the costs of ship construction, the postal service, veterans pensions, and many other items.

Example: Interest costs on the Federal debt are based on rates in effect at the beginning of calendar 1966; they have already advanced substantially above that level.

Second. There are a number of items in the budget in which revenue increases or expense reductions depend upon new legislation, much of which the Congress has refused to pass in prior years. They include the proposed assessment of fees for meat and poultry inspection, the transfer of forest highway and public lands highway costs to the highway trust fund and other similar proposals.

Example: Fees for meat and poultry inspection would total $66.2 million, which is applied to reduce expenses of the Consumer and Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture; the Congress has refused on at least five occasions to enact such fees.

Third. There are a number of onetime savings in expenditures through changes in disbursing procedures or methods of accounting. These include the public assistance funds, highway beautification, surplus agricultural products, and other items.

Example: Public assistance expenditures are reduced approximately $150 million by rescheduling the dates of payment; this is obviously a nonrecurring "saving."

Fourth. There are reductions in levels of certain going programs which the Congress is not likely to accept. These include the school milk and school lunch programs, agricultural research, payments to federally affected school districts and to land-grant colleges and others.

Example: The school milk program is reduced from $89 million to $37 million by making the milk available only to needy children; it is doubtful that the Congress will permit this distinction.

Fifth. Expenditure totals are reduced by expected credits of $4.7 billion for sales of Government-owned loans and mortgages, and other similar credits of smaller amount.

Example: Loans and mortgages totaling $4.2 billion which are not salable as such will be pooled into units of participation and sold; the Government will subsidize the interest rates to permit their sale to investors in the market.

Sixth. There are other proposals that tend to reduce both revenues and expenditures in equal amounts, but which the Congress has refused to accept in prior years. These involve revolving funds for rural electrification and for power marketing agencies.

Example: The proposed revolving fund for REA would decrease Federal revenues in 1967 by $196 million and expenditures by the same amount; this tends to hold down the spending level but does not change the deficit.

In many cases both spending authority and estimated outgo of funds have been held to very close figures. The budgets of some of the departments and agencies are very tight, considering the responsibilities they carry.

Except for its lavishness in about 20 different Great Society programs, the entire budget document has the tightly corseted appearance of a design to make the total costs of Government seem to be less than they are. The most notable examples of this strain are in the forecast that appropriations for disaster costs will reduce from $130 million in 1966 to $15 million in 1967, and the needs for farm conservation emergencies will subside from $24 million in 1966 to only $5 million in 1967. It seems doubtful that the administration can exert such effective control over the forces of nature.

The following is a rough table of these elements:

	Millions
Probable underestimate of expenditures in authorized programs and in interest	$800
Reductions that depend on new legislation, much of which the Congress has refused in previous years	200
Nonrecurring savings through changes in accounting or procedures	400
Budget cuts which the Congress is not likely to accept	200
Sales of loans and other assets	4,900
Proposals for revolving funds	(1)
Total	6,500

[1] No net effect on the deficit.

Even assuming that some portion of the heavy sales of assets can be considered normal, it is evident that expenditures in total are abnormally low by as much as $4 to $5 billion, as a result of all the foregoing.

ILLUSTRATION

The budget of the Department of Agriculture is a good illustration of how such items are used. Its expenditures are shown to decrease by $1,090 million in 1967 from 1966. Here are the major items making up that decrease:

	Millions
Proposal to convert REA into a revolving fund so that it can use its own receipts out of Government revenues instead of asking for appropriations	($196.0)
Proposal to charge fees for meat and chicken inspection, which Congress has regularly refused to do	66.2
Reduction in school milk and school lunch programs, which the Congress is unlikely to accept	70.0
Reduction in cost of removing surplus agricultural commodities, a permanent appropriation, which is used instead to finance the food stamp program by a bookkeeping transfer	135.2
Reduction in cost of Commodity Credit Corporation farm price supports and foreign aid food programs	387.0
Sales of participations in farmers home loans	549.0
Increased sales of loans from Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	104.7
Smaller items—actual net savings	$12.4
Total	1,325.5
Less increases in cropland adjustment program, net	191.5
Food stamp program	43.9
	235.4
Reduction per budget	1,090.1

Thus, the actual economies which are reflected in this reduction amount to a net figure of only $12.4 million.

The indicated "saving" of $387.0 million in the costs of the farm price support programs of Commodity Credit Corporation is a highly questionable one, despite indications of improvements in farm conditions. In the last 6 fiscal years, the actual expenditures of the Department of Agriculture have averaged about $800 million a year above the budget estimates, mostly because of underestimating in the costs of these farm programs.

REVENUES

On the revenue side, the budget contains many nonrecurring items which will not prevail in future years, at least not to the same extent. The nonrecurring corporate and individual tax collections are $3.6 billion; the seigniorage on coins is about $1.3 billion higher than normal because of the large amount of silver coins being replaced; the sales of commodities from stockpile are probably $600 million higher than normal; rents and royalties on the Outer Continental Shelf are apparently abnormal by more than $200 million; and there are other unusual items. Altogether, the total of abnormal, nonrecurring, and doubtful budget receipts is about $6 billion.

GENERAL FINDINGS

On the whole, these facts lead to the conclusions that: (a) The budget is misleading in its implications of a fiscal program that is in near-balance and which is a step toward a balanced budget soon in the future; (b) The budget, with its continued expansionary thrust, is the wrong plan for the present time because the deficit will prove to be larger than indicated and the result will be inflationary.

More specifically, a careful reading of the details of the budget proposals produces these findings:

First. It is very probable that the deficit at the end of the year will be much higher than the $1.8 billion which the President expects. There are many factors that can and probably will get out of hand and it is likely that the actual red figure will be in excess of $5 billion. If the Vietnam war is ended, this may not be much different because the budget message indicates that in such case more funds will be applied to domestic programs.

Second. A squeeze in corporate profits, which some economists are predicting for 1966 and 1967, could increase the deficit much above that. Roughly, every 10-percent drop in pretax corporate profits will reduce tax payments and increase the deficit by about $3.5 billion. A significant drop in corporate profits could produce a very large deficit.

Third. The true deficit base of the 1967 budget, from which future budgets have to be built, is probably in excess of $12 billion. This amount is computed by eliminating the abnormal and nonrecurring amounts in revenues and expenditures. This being the case, a balanced budget is a long way off, even under highly favorable conditions.

Fourth. The future is affected also by the buildup in spending authority. The proposed appropriations for 1966 and 1967 amount to $28.7 billion more than the actual net expenditures for those years, adding that much to future spending pressures. The unobligated balance at the beginning of fiscal 1967 will be $115 billion; adding the newly requested authority to this makes a total of $236 billion available for fiscal 1967. After expenditures and lapses, there will be $122 billion available for 1968 and later years. The Great Society programs are barely beginning and are sure to grow at a fast rate. And no one knows what our military needs will be in Vietnam or elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, it should be clearly evident to every reader of these remarks that we urgently need truth in budgeting from the Johnson administration.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlemen from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I have read the minority views on this bill, and when the fine words in these views are stacked against the performance of the minority party, I think the political gimmickry becomes just about as transparent as cellophane.

The minority is zeroing in now on the rent supplement, which is $12 million. Of course, they opposed the program when the authorization was entered into, and it is to be expected that they would oppose the appropriation.

But, at the same time as they are complaining about this $12 million in the interest of economy, we hear scarcely a murmur about the fact that our committee has added an additional $41 million for federally impacted areas over that which the administration recommended through the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point on the question he just raised?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes, I will yield, but before I do I would like to acknowledge that the gentleman from Ohio has made a statement and has definitely gone on record as opposing this $41 million.

Mr. BOW. I wanted to say further to the gentleman that I will give everyone who is loyal to the administration an opportunity to go along with the administration and vote against the $41 million. I will offer an amendment to strike it.

Mr. JOELSON. I will predict that the majority of the minority will not follow the gentleman from Ohio when he offers that amendment.

Mr. BOW. I am rather inclined to agree with my friend the gentleman from New Jersey, for a change.

Mr. JOELSON. Of course, the reason is crystal clear. The reason is that there are over 300 Members of this House who have these impacted areas within their districts, and it seems that the desire for economy has a tendency to disintegrate under the hot winds of political reality.

We are soon going to have a public works bill here, and I am going to predict again that a majority of the minority are going to support that bill. They will rise above principle, because there are going to be some "goodies" in that for many of the districts of the Members of the House.

When I was first appointed to the Appropriations Committee I made an offer.

I offered my services to the minority, and I would like to renew that offer. I believe economy is like charity; it begins at home. Every Member knows his own congressional district the best. If you will just tell me what spending you want eliminated in your congressional district—perhaps you have a flood-control project that you want taken away or a defense contract that you want eliminated—please tell me. I will compile the list. I know it will be tedious and time-consuming, but I volunteer to do it, and I will turn it over to the chairman.

The fact is that the Republican Members do not hesitate to add significantly to the administration's spending proposals. I have in mind the GI bill of rights legislation. I voted for that bill, and I think it is a good bill, but I think we should bear in mind that this will cost us $250 million a year beyond the recommendations of the administration. I did not hear any crying from the minority side about the fact that we are spending this money. Again I am sure that this will not be the last time in this session of Congress that restraints recommended by the administration will be ignored and that we will spend beyond the recommendations of the administration.

We hear a lot about sacrificing because of Vietnam. I agree that we should sacrifice, but it seems to me cruel that we should ask the poor of this Nation to do all the sacrificing, because they can least afford it. When the minority talks about the Great Society programs, they are talking about programs to help poor people. I say that instead of attacking the programs that help the dispossessed and the disadvantaged, we should face up to our responsibilities.

We do have a problem about revenues. We do have the very present danger of inflation. I would say that, instead of asking the poor people to sacrifice, we had better consider something positive. I would like to suggest that we consider removing that 7-percent incentive on investments for tax purposes that we gave to the corporations of this country. It was placed in effect at a time when we were faced with some serious unemployment. We felt that it would stimulate employment. Now we are faced with the opposite situation. We have a manpower shortage. I think if we want to stop inflation and increase our revenues, we had better look very carefully at this unfair advantage that the corporations get at the expense of the individual taxpayer.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, while our subcommittee has cut the requested amount for implementation of the National Teacher Corps from $13.2 million to $10 million, and provided for 10 percent local contribution as against 100 percent Federal financing, and have also required that the State education offices be brought into the picture, I am still opposed to the concept in principle. My earlier fears of the program have been more than borne out in the testimony given to our subcommittee in support of this request for money. As a matter of fact, the hearings on this proposition before our subcommittee are the only extensive ones in depth held in the House. The hearing record is a good one and every Member of this House ought to read it thoroughly and digest the contradictions and the confusion of the statements.

After hearing much of the testimony, I was moved to ask the Commissioner of Education what the real thrust of this program is supposed to be. I am sure that Members of Congress were given to understand that this program was designed to upgrade and enhance the educational opportunity of underprivileged kids, but the more testimony we listened to, the more it was quite apparent that much more attention was going to be given to providing master's and doctor's degrees for those who already have bachelor's degrees and to make them beholden to the Federal Government for the cost of upgrading their own education or professional standing.

The National Teachers Corps was conceived according to Francis Keppel, the Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education, to bypass certification requirements imposed by the various States. You are well aware, of course, that throughout the country those desiring to go into the teaching profession have got to meet certain minimum standards, education hour requirements, and so forth. It is a good thing and we ought to strive to raise those standards.

Mr. Keppel as Commissioner of Education made a speech on February 13 before the annual meeting of Educational Writers Association in Atlantic City, in which he pointed out that many returning Peace Corps volunteers had not been able to obtain employment as teachers because of outmoded and artificial certification requirements imposed by the various States.

There are those, and I believe it was brought out in the discussion of this proposition in the other body, who are of the opinion that any young American who has "taught school under difficult circumstances in underprivileged parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America should at least be given a chance to teach school in the United States."

Well, now, is not this just ducky? Those of us who have traveled all round the face of the globe, throughout Africa and through those underdeveloped countries of southeast Asia, are aware that one can be qualified to be a teacher in those countries with a fifth-grade education. That is how bad the situation is. Now I do not mean to be downgrading our Peace Corps volunteers, for I supported this proposition from its very inception, but I believe it is completely erroneous to take the view that because volunteers have spent some time teaching the natives the domestic tricks of the trade in their locale that this in itself qualifies them to teach in American schools.

Under careful questioning the Commissioner of Education admitted that the prime objective of the National Teacher Corps would be to train prospective teachers—the "interns"—to work with disadvantaged students. Secretary Gardner, however, stated that the National Teacher Corps "was not designed as a program to assist teachers or the members of the Teacher Corps."

In the hearings the Assistant Secretary of the Department, Wilbur Cohen, denied that a means test or economic determination would be used to decide on a school district's application eligibility for participation in this program. On the other hand, the National Teacher Corps Preliminary Guidelines on page 41 state:

> In order to be eligible to participate in the program in the fiscal year 1966–67, the local education agency must have included * * * one or more schools with attendance areas in which at least half of the families were low-income families. Participating schools will therefore be asked to estimate the percentage of their students who come from families with an income of less than $3,000 per year.

The Comptroller of the Department testified that mothers who at one time had taught and whose families have grown up could become members of the Corps. This is true if they do not object to being interns. The guidelines prescribe that the experienced teachers or team leaders be expected to have had at least "5 years' recent," note that, "recent satisfactory experience in teaching."

Commissioner Howe indicated that it is possible to have a title I project under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Public Law 89–10—analogous to NTC. The Commissioner said that this type of program "would depend on having university resources available and developing cooperative arrangements with universities for awarding credit to these teachers while they are in training. These features are not usual features of an inservice training plan within a school district."

In a letter I submitted to the Office of Education I posed several questions that follow, with the answers that I received:

> Question. Is it possible for a group of school districts, if it wished, to allocate major portions of its title I funds to set up a teacher training arrangement analogous to the arrangement planned for the Teacher Corps?
>
> Answer. A group of individual local school districts entitled to financial assistance under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, may elect to have a combined program in cooperation with an institution of higher education that would involve the training of teachers for specific assignments under a title I program to provide for the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. Such a combined project,

> however, must meet with the approval of the State educational agency.
>
> Question. Is it possible for a group of school districts to submit an acceptable proposal for title III funds to set up a teacher training arrangement analogous to the arrangement planned for the Teacher Corps?
>
> Answer. Under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act a proposal may also be submitted by a group of school districts for teacher training as an exemplary model for regular school programs. Under the title, the Office of Education is obligated to consult with the State educational agency but final approval rests with the Commissioner of Education.
>
> Question. Have any such proposals under title I or title III been submitted?
>
> Answer. Proposals have been made under both title I and title III for teacher training but in all cases have been limited to the geographical area to be covered by the proposal. In the title III projects, teacher training has been part of a larger program, such as curriculum improvement.
>
> Question. You cited "mobility" as a key feature that distinguishes the Teacher Corps from a title I or III proposal. Could you again state an example as you did on the phone of what you mean by "mobility"?
>
> Answer. The mobility factor involved in the National Teacher Corps that does not have a corollary under titles I and III involves the stimulative effect of a nationwide recruitment and selection effort. The reason for this mobility is the fact that those individuals who may wish to join the National Teacher Corps would reside in areas where little need exists, and conversely, those school districts most in need of teachers would have little supply available. It would be our objective to have Teacher Corps members assigned to university training programs in the same locality as the school districts requesting their teaching services. The fiscal year 1966 budget estimate includes an amount of $1,875,000 to pay for the travel costs involved.

If, as the Commissioner and the Office of Education would have us believe, the local school district, the State education agency and the university cannot involve themselves in a program of inservice training without Federal level help, why do the National Teacher Corps guidelines on page 25 state:

> It is expected that the universities will develop their proposals in cooperation with local school systems * * *. Similarly, the local education agencies should prepare their proposals in cooperation with a university or universities which would be capable of conducting the preservice training.

I think that it should be pointed out that presently about $50 million is being used on inservice training of teachers under title I of 89–10, five times what is being sought here.

In addition to this the Higher Education Act of 1965 authorizes the award of 10,000 fellowships for graduate study to persons interested in a career in elementary and secondary education; in another section—title IV–B—it authorizes 100-percent loan forgiveness for student borrowers who subsequently teach in schools having large numbers of disadvantaged children. This is to say nothing of National Defense Education Act institutes for teachers who are going to work with disadvantaged pupils.

All of these programs exhibit a wild confusion of purpose in Federal programs which overlap, duplicate, and compete. The only thing that is truly different about the National Teacher Corps is that it will permit "interns" by Federal edict to enter the local school district without certification that would be normally required of beginning teachers. This program will not only overlap, duplicate, and compete—it will cause friction and conflict in the schools that can least afford it.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman is not opposing the two provisos which were inserted in this bill, and the amendments which I offered in the committee—the first providing for local matching by the local school districts of whatever State up to at least 10 percent of the cost of a teacher under the Teacher Corps program.

Mr. MICHEL. No; I am not opposing that because this is, as I said I believe at the outset of my remarks, a definite improvement.

Mr. LAIRD. The second proviso which was added and this I feel is needed, provides teachers will be assigned, the Teacher Corps personnel, by the chief State school officer in each of the 50 States. As the legislation originally passed, the Commissioner of Education could deal directly with 10,000 school districts in the Nation. It seems to me the Commissioner of Education should be limited in dealing only with the top school administrators in each of the 50 States. This proviso which was offered in the subcommittee and adopted by the full committee is now in this bill and I think these limitations do strengthen the original legislation.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is altogether correct. As he knows I wholeheartedly supported his meritorious motions in committee.

Secretary Gardner told the committee that the National Teacher Corps interns would work full time for their salaries, but the guidelines provide that "interns are expected to spend approximately half time in graduate study leading to an advanced degree." How many regular school district teachers, who are just beginning at the rate of a beginning National Teacher Corps intern salary level, will not consider this a gross injustice?—especially when they consider the fact that the intern comes with only a preservice training that Mr. Howe, himself, describes as "quickie" training. He went so far as to admit that educationally deprived pupils in low-income neighborhoods would be used as "guinea pigs" by National Teacher Corps. This would be done while the intern was pursuing a master's degree in such an item as guidance counseling as permitted by the guidelines.

What would be the cost of one of these National Teacher Corps interns? A breakdown follows for a full 2-year program:

Preservice training—10-week institute:	
Stipends ($112 per week, p. 72, hearings)	$1,120
Instruction ($91 per week)	910
2-week orientation to the community of assignment:	
Briefing sessions for exchange teachers ($50 per week)	$100
Travel	100
Total	2,230
Inservice training:	
Master's degree ($2,500 per year, p. 53, guidelines)	5,000
Maximum beginning salary of the local school ($5,000 per year, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 7, p. 8947)	10,000
Total	15,000
Change of residence: Average allowance (p. 72, hearings)	500
2-year total cost	17,730

The average intern benefit a year as permitted by the National Teacher Corps will be over $8,800. That is not bad for a "quickie" trained part-time teacher of "guinea pigs."

This bill does not include the funding for teacher salaries that will be required to finance this program.

In conclusion, for those who would cite section 516 as proof of the lack of Federal control in this bill I would like to refer you to the following statements found in the guidelines:

> The team leaders' * * * secondary duty will be to provide a liaison between the local school administration, the university, and the teacher-intern group to assure adherence to program goals (p. 16).
>
> The individual teachers * * * may provide guidance in the development of specialized curriculum for students, or engage in classroom demonstrations of effective teaching methods and procedures (p. 16).
>
> The local education agency must afford teacher-interns time, aside from teaching duties, for a training program developed according to criteria established by the Commissioner of Education and carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher (who is team leader) in cooperation with an institution of higher education (p. 19).
>
> Selection of NTC members will be the responsibility of the NTC alone (p. 30).

The contradictions, the conflicts, the confusion, and the chaos of this program would be better forgotten. The many other programs that are available for in-service training should be more fully explored and used.

More than anything else in education today, we need a consistent, orderly Federal policy directed at strengthening State and local school systems, reaffirming the independence and integrity of our education structure, and helping to solve the basic problems which stand in the way of achieving equal opportunity for a higher quality education. This so-called Teacher Corps would not only hamper that effort considerably, but would leave our teachers tied to Uncle Sam's purse strings and subject to his control.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

HIGH INTEREST RATES DETRIMENTAL TO NATIONAL SECURITY AND GREAT SOCIETY PROGRAM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the main controversy about this bill is the rent supplement program. I look upon the rent supplement program as one of the most meritorious provisions in this bill. It will help poor people help themselves.

Mr. Barratt O'Hara, our esteemed colleague from Illinois, one time gave a good illustration. Coming from Chicago he said that back in times gone by, oftentimes an aged person would not have enough money to sustain himself in living quarters, and there was not room in the poorhouse. At that time we had real poorhouses.

Back in those days, the neighbors would collect money among themselves to provide aged people with sufficient money so that they would have a place to live.

That is really what this supplemental rent program does. It helps people who cannot help themselves.

The rent supplement program is a basic part of the Johnson administration's effort to make decent housing a reality for all Americans. It is an imaginative new tool which provides a steppingstone between public housing and privately financed housing.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS HELP RELIEVE PRESSURE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

Rent supplements will do much to relieve the heavy demand for public housing units. When we considered the 1965 Housing Act last summer, there were more than 500,000 persons waiting in line for public housing. Rent supplements will help relieve this demand.

The rent supplement program brings the American free enterprise system into full play in meeting the housing needs of low- and moderate-income Americans. It helps provide for the needs of these income groups and, at the same time, gives a substantial boost to the private building industry.

Many of those who oppose the rent supplement program are the same ones who have fought against public housing. So when the administration moved to relieve the pressure on public housing through the new rent supplements program, its critics shifted their attack. The opponents of rent supplements are from the same group that forms the basic hard-core opposition to all Federal housing programs. They are the same people who oppose FHA, VA college housing, and all of the rest of the programs.

Mr. Chairman, in recent days, our Republican colleagues have expressed great concern about prices, wages, and what they like to describe as inflation. They now attack all programs in the name of inflation.

Now to set the record straight, it should be noted that both the Republican and the Democratic Parties are opposed to inflation. Neither party has a monopoly on protecting the public interest in this area.

DEMOCRATS DON'T FEAR PROSPERITY

At the same time, I do not believe that the great majority of the Democratic members of this body share the trembling and fearful approach to prosperity as evidenced by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Frankly, I feel that this country is big enough and strong enough to withstand the great benefits of prosperity without falling into the trap of inflation.

However, I am sure that my distinguished Republican friends are quite serious in their concern over prices. These same men, however, while seeking to deprive the poor of this country from having adequate housing, press down upon them the thorns of high interest rates.

Interest rates are something that we all have to pay. The cost of money is reflected in every item in the economy from a simple pair of work shoes to a super deluxe Cadillac. It is reflected in the Federal budget and in every local and State budget.

Interest rates now take $13 billion annually out of the national budget. Interest rates are the biggest single item in the cost of a house—more than the lumber, the land, the workmanship combined.

So I ask my Republican friends who have expressed such concern about prices to join me in this crusade to keep interest rates down. Frankly, I was surprised that so many of the leading Republican members rose to defend the Federal Reserve Board when it raised interest rates by 37½ percent last December. Certainly that December interest rate increase has done more than anything else to put heavy upward pressure on the price of every item in the economy. If the Republican Party is indeed serious about holding down prices, then I submit that it must be equally serious about holding down interest rates.

However, I am fearful that the silly-season is upon us and our Republican friends, predictably, are up to their old tricks of opposing good works designed to help the American people. Naturally, this latest partisan GOP stunt is not funny to people living in crime- and vice-ridden slums in Los Angeles or to poverty-ridden children in Appalachia whose parents are so poor that they cannot even afford to pay teachers for the one-room, fire-trap shacks they call school buildings.

Not satisfied with massive corporate tax rate cuts, high bracket personal income tax cuts, accelerated corporate depreciation schedules and the 7-percent tax credit on new facilities, our Republican colleagues are now singing the same old refrain from their favorite theme: Everything for big business—they can do no wrong—and what is left over can trickle down to the ordinary citizen. Big business does not want public programs, Mr. Speaker, because for every tax dollar the Government spends on people there is that much less for dividends to stockholders. But what better investment can ever be made than a sound investment in the future of our own people? It is a firmly established principle of economics that improvement at the grassroots level creates purchasing power which is made and is spent over and over again—percolating up and throughout the entire economy to the benefit of all—rich and poor alike. But our GOP friends seem firmly dedicated to the "trickle-down" theory which has been repeatedly discredited at the polls. It will happen again in this congressional election year of 1966 just as in 1964. These people, the Republicans, seem fiercely determined to remain a permanent minority party. The way they are going now they may well succeed. What their programs are and how they expect to benefit the citizens of this great land I am unable to divine. In any case, there can be no doubt that our traditional two-party system faces extinction, and it is certainly not the Democrats who deserve the label of the antipeople party.

GUNS VERSUS BUTTER IS PHONY ISSUE

But that is exactly what the GOP is when it raises the phony issue of "guns versus butter." They claim that because of $13.1 billion for Vietnam, we cannot afford to take care of those now in slums who would be rescued by a modest rent supplement request. They downgrade our economic ability when they carp that we cannot extend a pittance of help to underprivileged children barely subsisting in our worst poverty-stricken areas. They are trying to mislead the American electorate—I say electorate because it is nothing but a cheap political trick they are trying to pull here. They hate for anyone else to benefit from public policies except big business. So they try to frighten the people into thinking that these public programs will bankrupt us. But they do not have the facts—these Republicans—and if they do have them, they hide or distort them. They would cheat the needy by deliberate misrepresentations, by downgrading our record-shattering prosperity.

In 1960, Federal Government purchases of goods and services amounted to 10.6 percent of gross national product; in 1965, Federal Government purchases of goods and services amounted to only 9.8 percent of gross national product. At the end of fiscal 1961, the total public debt amounted to 56.8 percent of gross national product; but at the end of fiscal 1965, the total public debt amounted to only 47 percent of gross national product. The source of these figures is the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and all necessary adjustments have been made.

These figures prove beyond a doubt that the "guns or butter" issue is a phony one. We are in a much better financial position now than we were under the last Republican administration. We can afford to protect American interests in resisting the spread of communism abroad and take care of necessary domestic problems at the same time. Even making adjustments for possible price increases and a Vietnam deficit, our total public debt as a percentage of gross national product will fall further to about 45 percent.

It is true that the December 6, 1965, action of the Federal Reserve—taken in defiance of the President and the Congress—is putting a severe strain on housing developments in all parts of the country. Already, there is talk of interest rates of more than 7 percent on home mortgages. And with the supply tightening, money, even at that extortionate rate, will be unavailable.

Unless something is done to halt these rising interest costs, we may be heading for a long period of stagnation in our efforts to provide decent housing and adequate public facilities. In recent days, the financial pages of the newspapers have reported decisions by dozens of local and State governments to postpone bond issues because of the rising cost of money. That means that sewerage plants, water plants, parks, and schools will not be built.

Even one of the members of the Federal Reserve has been very candid about the effect of the interest rate increases on the housing programs. Federal Reserve Governor Sherman Maisel, in a speech shortly after the December 6 increase, said that residential construction drops as much as 24 percent in a period of tight money. That was back in December, and today interest rates have gone even higher and money is becoming in shorter and shorter supply.

But, even accepting Governor Maisel's figures at face value, I do not believe the country can afford a 24-percent drop in housing construction. I do not believe we can afford a 24-percent cutback in providing parks, sewerage, and a multitude of other necessary public facilities.

FEDERAL RESERVE ADDS $750 MILLION TO BUDGET

The higher interest rates have put a new strain on the Federal budget—thus limiting the funds available for new housing programs. That December 6 interest increase forced President Johnson to add $750 million to the fiscal 1967 budget just to pay the additional interest costs on the national debt. If we had not had that December 6 increase, the $750 million could have been applied to housing or some other badly needed program. Instead, that sum will go to the banks. So while people do without housing, we will have a Federal aid program for bankers—courtesy of the Federal Reserve Board.

The $750 million added to the interest charges brings the total annual interest cost of the public debt to $12.750 billion for the next fiscal year.

In 1952, in the last year of the Truman administration, the interest charges on the national debt stood at $5.859 billion. This means that the Federal Reserve has added $6.898 billion to the annual cost of financing the public debt.

It is tragic when you realize that the American people have been forced to pay almost $60 billion in excess interest costs because of rising interest rates since 1952. This amounts to almost 10 percent of the gross national product and more than half of the estimated Federal budget for fiscal 1967.

We could have done wonderful things in housing, urban development, and rural development if this money could have been channeled into something more productive than paying the bankers increased interest.

All of this plainly points up the fact that high interest rates are a cruel and unfair tax on the poor, on the low-income and the moderate-income family—the people least able to pay. It is not, as the Federal Reserve Board would have us believe, a means of curbing inflation.

HIGH INTEREST RATES ADD TO COST OF ALL PRODUCTS

In fact, rising interest rates add to the cost of nearly every item in our economy. So, to the extent that higher interest rates increase prices, they are inflationary. Monetary policy is a highly ineffective tool in fighting inflation. There are many other more meaningful tools at hand, including taxes, particularly taxes on excess profits during a wartime period.

But, the Federal Reserve uses inflation as an excuse for its actions. It does not tell the public the true facts about the reasons behind these constantly skyrocketing interest rates. The fact is, of course, that higher interest rates are a means of providing the financial institutions with higher profits. Most interest rate increases over the past decade can be traced simply to the desire of the larger banks for increased profits.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE DOES NOT REPRESENT THE PEOPLE

The Federal Reserve System has gotten outside the Government. The spiral of higher interest rates imposed by the Federal Reserve has greatly increased the national debt.

The people who are running our Nation's monetary affairs are not elected by the people. There is no way to punish them. The Federal Reserve makes one mistake after another, in an effort to help the big bankers, but who can do anything about it?

They are beyond us. They cannot be punished. If it were left up to the Members of the Congress, elected by the people, and to the President of the United States, elected by the people, the people could hold us responsible. We could be punished for this action. But the unelected people who have charge of our money system and our credit system cannot be punished.

Who has charge of our money system? Unfortunately, the people who can profit most by high interest. It has been to their advantage over the years to keep raising interest higher and higher and higher.

The banks have gotten control of the monetary and credit privileges and rights which should belong only to the American people. The banks have usurped with these privileges and powers.

THE BURDEN OF INTEREST RATES

The success of the President's Great Society programs are hindered and handicapped by two major problems. One is the Vietnam war, which is costing us about $13 billion this year. The other is that the Federal Reserve System which has and continues to defy the President. This defiance is costing the people several times $13 billion this year—several times $13 billion.

Yields on long-term Government bonds, by months, 1939–52

[Percent per annum]

	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Year
1939	2.47	2.44	2.34	2.30	2.17	2.13	2.16	2.21	2.65	2.60	2.46	2.35	2.36
1940	2.30	2.32	2.25	2.25	2.38	2.39	2.28	2.25	2.18	2.10	1.97	1.89	2.21
1941	1.99	2.10	2.01	1.96	1.92	1.91	1.90	1.94	1.94	1.88	1.85	1.96	1.95
1942	2.48	2.48	2.46	2.44	2.45	2.43	2.46	2.47	2.46	2.45	2.47	2.49	2.46
1943	2.46	2.46	2.48	2.48	2.46	2.45	2.45	2.46	2.48	2.48	2.48	2.49	2.47
1944	2.49	2.49	2.48	2.48	2.49	2.49	2.49	2.48	2.47	2.48	2.48	2.48	2.48
1945	2.44	2.38	2.40	2.39	2.39	2.35	2.34	2.36	2.37	2.35	2.33	2.33	2.37
1946	2.21	2.12	2.09	2.08	2.19	2.16	2.18	2.23	2.28	2.26	2.25	2.24	2.19
1947	2.21	2.21	2.19	2.19	2.19	2.22	2.25	2.24	2.24	2.27	2.36	2.39	2.25
1948	2.45	2.45	2.44	2.44	2.42	2.41	2.44	2.45	2.45	2.45	2.44	2.44	2.44
1949	2.42	2.39	2.38	2.38	2.38	2.38	2.27	2.24	2.22	2.22	2.20	2.19	2.31
1950	2.20	2.24	2.27	2.30	2.31	2.33	2.34	2.33	2.36	2.38	2.38	2.39	2.32
1951	2.39	2.40	2.47	2.56	2.63	2.65	2.63	2.57	2.56	2.61	2.66	2.70	2.57
1952	2.74	2.71	2.70	2.65	2.57	2.61	2.61	2.70	2.71	2.74	2.71	2.75	2.68

Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, "Banking and Monetary Statistics," 1953; Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1958; and Treasury Bulletins.

Our burden of interest today, my friends, is much higher than you think. It is almost as high as our entire national budget. So the people of this country not only pay over $100 billion in our national budget, but also they are paying $100 billion in interest for all purposes, including our national debt.

That is burdensome. It is more than that. It is immoral and unconscionable.

Go back to World War II. We had 12 years there when the Federal Reserve Board worked in the public interest. Mr. Roosevelt was President of the United States. He insisted on a fair rate of interest. He tried to get Congress to pay more of the cost of the war out of taxes as the war progressed, but we refused to do it as Members of Congress. He wanted us to pay 50 percent of the cost of the war as we went along, but the Congress provided only 25 percent.

Then Mr. Roosevelt said, "If we have to finance so much of the war without taxes and through the issuance of public debt, we will keep the interest rates low." We had cooperation of the Federal Reserve Board from June 30, 1939, to June 30, 1951, for 12 years. They were the hardest, roughest years in the history of any civilized country. We had many millions of unemployed. We had long breadlines. People actually starved during that time, and families suffered.

INTEREST RATES KEPT LOW DURING WORLD WAR II

We had inflation, we had a war, and we were shooting away a quarter billion dollars a day on the battlefield. Yet despite these hardships and the financial strains they brought notwithstanding that terrific period of 12 years, the money rates on long-term bonds never exceeded 2½ percent.

Did you know that not one person was ever required to sell his bond below par? Not one. So bonds were kept at par, and the interest rate never exceeded 2½ percent.

The question is, If you can maintain that 2½-percent rate in such a hard time as that, over a 12-year period, why can you not do it at any time?

You can, with the help of the Federal Reserve Board. If the Federal Reserve Board will help, you can do it. If the Federal Reserve Board will not help, interest rates will go skyrocketing. For instance today, Government-guaranteed obligations are being sold for 5.75 percent. It is a shame and a disgrace in a civilized country that we permit things like that to go on. It is absolutely shameful.

FEDERAL RESERVE SEIZED "INDEPENDENCE"

But this is happening right here today in broad daylight because the Federal Reserve has declared and seized independence. They have seceded from the Government. They are thumbing their nose at the Congress. They are thumbing their nose at the President of the United States and are defying him. Until we get them back in the Government we are in for a very hard time—the people are in for a very hard time.

Now, where is all of this money going? If you pay out $1 billion a year—and, of course, only $12 million is provided in this bill for rent supplements, which goes to poor people in the low-income groups who spend it quickly and put it into the channels of trade and distribution—it travels around in the community where it is spent. Statistics show that from 8 to 12 to 15 times different people touch it. It begins to percolate up. The big rich get ahold of it, too. They are entitled to the use of it just like the very poor. Funds in the hands of the poor are spent and percolate up to the top—through the economy.

However, if you pay in the money at the top expecting it to trickle down, it just does not trickle down. It goes to the first big bank and goes into their vault. It goes to a big corporation and it goes into the assets of that corporation, and that is the end of it. But if you pay the money to the low-income and they spend it, then by the time that dollar has traveled through many people and transactions in the course of a year, as the figures disclose it will, then the Government can actually get its money back and more by the time the year has expired. This point was recently proven by the excise tax reduction. We reduced our excise taxes considerably. That meant the poor people were permitted to hold that money and not pay it in in taxes but spend it for things they needed in the local communities. That money was spent. In the course of a year it traveled among 50 to 75 people. As a result Federal tax revenues, even after the reduction in excise taxes increased.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Mr. Chairman, I am not charging that the members of the Federal Reserve Board or the Chairman, Mr. Martin, are unpatriotic or un-American, but I do say that the Board in its handling of monetary and credit policies is making it very difficult for patriotic people to defend their country in time of war.

The high interest policies of the Federal Reserve System are very profitable to the big banks and money lenders generally but these policies are making it awfully hard on the people.

There are a few points that the Members of Congress should seriously consider at this time:

First. The Federal Reserve System has seized power to control monetary and credit policies of the Government including the power to increase interest rates and to make money tight. These powers have been used against the public interest.

Second. It was never intended that the Federal Reserve be the fourth branch of the Government or apart from the executive or legislative branch. It is a part of the executive branch of Govment. There is not anything in the law or discussions of the bills in Congress in either House, before the enactment of the Federal Reserve laws or amendments thereto, that indicates in any way that it was the intention of Congress to make the Federal Reserve System independent. That claim is a fake—pure and simple. There is not one word of truth in it. It is used by Wall Street interests to feather their own nests and the fact that it makes it very hard on the people does not seem to deter them.

Third. The Federal Reserve has taken $40 billion of U.S. Government money and credit and bought $40 billion worth of U.S. Government interest-bearing bonds and is holding these bonds in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. These bonds have been paid for once; no one questions that. However, the Federal Reserve is still requiring the Treasury to take the taxpayers' money to the extent of a billion and a half dollars a year to pay interest on these bonds which have been paid for once. The Fed, after spending all of this billion and a half that the Federal Reserve banks want to spend along with the Federal Reserve Board and the remainder goes over into the Treasury. The Fed is willing therefore to have the people pay interest on bonds that have already been paid for once in order to get funds that will keep them from having to go to Congress to get appropriated funds for their operations like other government agencies compelled to do by law. In this way, the Federal Reserve is evading the Constitution of the United States. They are determined not to go to Congress like other Government agencies.

Having money of their own obtained in this sordid way, they can claim to be independent of Congress and go their own way. That is what led up to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Martin, actually going upon the President's own property in Texas and insulting him and the people of the Nation by defying the power given to the President under the elective processes of a democratic government.

Fourth. Not only has the Federal Reserve manipulated the Government's affairs in a way that the Fed is not compelled to permit Congress to know about its operations, but it is not audited by the General Accounting Office of the United States, as are other Government agencies. In fact, the Congress does not know what the Federal Reserve is doing; it has not been audited by the General Accounting Office since it was organized in 1913 yet, they are handling hundreds of billions of dollars of the people's money.

Fifth. The Federal Reserve operating in secret. Every 3 weeks the big bankers of the Nation, along with the Federal Reserve Board—12 bankers to 7 members of the Board—meet in secret session here in Washington. There are 30 or 40 staff people who meet with them. They make decisions that would enable people who have the information to make millions—even billions—of dollars. They claim this information does not leak out; however, the 12 bankers that know everything that is going on and are a part of it who were elected by the boards of directors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks naturally report back to their banks and directors—6 of the board of directors of each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks composed of 9 members—are elected by the private banks in each of the 12 banks. No doubt there are some 500 people who know what is going on in secret but the President does not know, and Members of Congress do not know. No elected representative of the people is allowed to have the information until it is several years old. Yet, this is happening right here in broad daylight and tolerated by the Congress of the United States. Congress is not doing its duty; Congress is failing to do its duty. Congress is not protecting the people properly in this respect. Congress is allowing a few people to accumulate the wealth of the Nation to the detriment of the people.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this rent supplement appropriation.

The fact that the amount of the appropriation has been cut from $30 to $12 million makes no difference. It is still a multibillion-dollar scheme.

All the administration wants this year is some level of appropriation to get the program moving and once it starts moving, believe me, it will be unstoppable.

The amount of the appropriation is unimportant. It is the idea—the program—that is dangerous to our American way of life. A vote for this program will put a foot in the door for residential socialism.

A vote for $12 million here today is a vote to fund an insidious $6 billion scheme for the economic integration of the United States.

A vote to put this $6 billion Trojan horse on the road is a vote to undermine and destroy the incentives of Americans to better themselves by their own efforts—a traditionally American economic philosophy.

A vote for $12 million here today is a vote endorsing the full program in all its meanings.

The rent supplement program is a fraud. In the first place, the program is not aimed at providing the maximum number of low-cost housing units. The administration is not interested in housing per se. It is interested in using housing as a tool for economic integration.

The proponents of this scheme are interested in destroying neighborhoods and tampering with residential makeup of political districts.

If this administration is really interested in providing the maximum number of low-cost housing units—if it really cares about housing needs and not economic integration—it would be building more public housing. It would be improving public housing—making it more imaginative and humanizing it as it has been done in Europe.

No one questions the fact that rent supplements are a much more expensive way of housing the same family than public housing. The Government pays a premium to achieve economic integration.

When Mr. Ira Robbins, president of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, testified before our Subcommittee on Housing, he told us that the average subsidy for a $4,000 a year family under the rent supplement program would be $66 per unit per month. But, in public housing, he said, the cost would be $37 per unit per month.

Mind you, twice as many families would be housed for the same cost if the administration dropped its plans for economic integration and concentrated on pure and simple housing for the poor.

The administration is out to grab middle-income taxes and use them to subsidize tenants in the same apartments that middle-income people are scrimping and saving to afford. All of this will be done in the name of economic integration. The poor families that could have been given public housing will be sacrificed. This is exactly what you will be voting for if you approve this appropriation.

Economic integration is unfair, its unjust and its uneconomic and the administration ought to have the courage to put its economic integration plans on the line instead of talking tripe about helping low-income people and their housing needs.

Let me make another point crystal clear. Only middle-income level housing can profitably be built under the rent supplement which means that tenants who are subsidized will be subsidized at greater expense of the taxpayers.

According to some experts, rent supplements would have to be boosted to several billion a year to do the economic integration job this administration wants.

A vote for $12 million today will be a vote for the biggest Trojan horse ever dragged before this Congress.

The proponents of this program say that the rent supplement program has been changed to make it workable. It has been changed alright—changed to get it through the Congress.

They will tell you that the program will not help anyone but low-income persons. There is nothing between the present regulations and complete revision but Secretary Weaver. These regulations can be changed at any time. Besides, we are kidding ourselves if we think even today's regulations are any good.

Let me give some shortcomings in the present regulations.

First, there is no dollar limit as to the amount of rent subsidy any family can receive.

Secondly, there is no limit as to the percentage of any family's rent that can be paid by subsidy. It could be 25 percent. It could be 50 percent, and it could be more. Because unlike public housing, the rent supplement program does not aim at providing the maximum number of units at the lowest possible cost. The rent supplement has to be open ended—it has to be without dollar subsidy limitations—because it is utilizing uneconomic housing units.

If the program was aimed at providing the maximum number of low-cost units, it would not have to be openended because there would be no question of extravagant subsidies. The openended subsidy provision in rent supplements is necessary to achieve economic integration.

There is another loophole in the regulations. The Secretary is the one who defines "income." Income is whatever he decides it is. It does not matter what income limits are set if the definition of what is income and what may be excluded in calculating it is left up to him. This unlimited power makes the income limit meaningless.

I do not see how anyone who looks at these regulations carefully can be misled into thinking they are safe. They are not. They are still a Pandora's box of tricks.

If the administration really wants to build the maximum number of housing units for poor people, it should build high rise public housing units in our crowded cities. But this is not the goal. The social planners have insisted on economic integration.

I think economic integration is unfair to most of the people affected. I do not see why middle-income people should suffer crushing tax burdens so that other people can live in similar apartments without paying the full rental. This type of thing has collectivist overtones.

I object for two reasons. First, because it is unfair to tax the typical hard-working middle-income taxpayer for this sort of luxury and secondly, because this type of program discriminates against the bulk of the low-income people needing housing.

As I said before, twice as many people could be housed if economic integration was not being given priority over housing needs.

The question before the House is plain: Is economic integration worth this kind of unfairness, extravagance and discrimination? That is the $12 million question we are voting on today.

Let us not be fooled by the proviso in this bill which says that rent supplements cannot be used in communities without community development plans. This proviso is supposed to keep rent supplements out of the suburbs. It will not. This proviso is a red herring.

The administration cannot allow rent supplements to be kept out of the suburbs—this is the keystone of the administration plans for economic integration. The proviso is a trick—so do not be fooled by it.

The reason the proviso has to be sacrificed is that the rent supplement scheme will work only if supplements can be used in the suburbs. Only 221(d) (3) markets interest rate projects can be used for rent supplements and it is not economic to build them in downtown areas. They must be built in the outskirts of cities and in the suburbs.

In late February, Secretary Weaver said that costs would be kept below $15,000 per unit for rent supplement housing. The archdiocese of New York has told me that this means that the program can be used to build units only in the outskirts of cities and in the suburbs. This is fine for the administration because that is the kind of housing it wants.

But I do not think this is what the Congress wants. Do we want to vote for wasteful construction in the suburbs to house subsidized families at twice the cost of downtown public housing?

Let me take my own New York area. Rent supplement housing will not be built in the blighted areas of Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx. Instead, the program will be used to push economic integration in Staten Island, Queens and the north Bronx—and even more in places like Yonkers, Pearl River, Glen Cove and nearby New Jersey and Connecticut suburbs.

This housing will be built in wasteful fashion. There will be many abuses of income limits. The documentation on this is available. The Washington Post has written articles on how FHA income limitations have been maladministered right here in Washington. We can be sure that rent supplements—where the FHA resents the limitations—will be more sloppily administered. Speaking of sloppy FHA administration, the April Reader's Digest has a very interesting article entitled "The Stench at FHA." It seems that FHA pays wasteful and absurd prices for housing no one wants, and then get stuck with the housing. The article went on to say that one reason FHA likes the rent supplement is that they can fill up these lemon projects with rent supplement tenants to cover up their mistakes.

I have another answer to this whole problem. It is this. Let us defeat the rent supplement appropriation and force the administration to come clean and start fresh. I am sure that if they think about it, they can produce a program that is aimed at housing needs and not economic integration.

The people do not want rent supplements. The rent subsidy idea was overwhelmingly beaten a few years ago in a New York State referendum. All the suburban and upstate counties voted overwhelmingly against it. So did my urban Bronx district and other city districts. I understand that out of dozens of congressional districts surveyed in questionnaires not one favors the rent supplement.

This program is a fraud. It seeks economic integration and not maximum provision for low-income housing. It looks and sounds more like a $12 billion than $12 million scheme.

This program should be voted down. The people have spoken. They have told us. They have told us this program is wrong, and doubly wasteful while we are at war. I wish our boys in Vietnam could have a referendum on this waste. They would tell us our duty. Let us show the people we know our duty by defeating this appropriation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of this Congress we heard a great deal about the new Republican image that was about to be created. We were told that a new image of the Republican Party was about to come into being. If the gentleman from New York is the spokesman for the new Republican image, may I say that the Democrats need have no fear in the forthcoming election. The Republican hierarchy has been most vociferous in stating their determination to find new ways to win the big city vote.

Again I say that if this opposition to rent supplements is an example of the way the Republicans intend to campaign in the cities to try to get votes, we Democrats need have no fear. This is the old hard line Republican opposition to human needs and presents nothing new.

This is an example of the ancient, typical Republican program of cutting expenditures at the expense of human needs.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program that is vital to the people of all the big cities. It is a program that is necessary to save marginal neighborhoods from sliding into slum neighborhoods. This is a program that offers hope to the people who now are forced to live in slum neighborhoods to obtain decent housing at prices within their income. It will give them the chance—the outside chance of raising their children in decent neighborhoods, of carrying out the promise of the Housing Act of 1949 of providing housing for all American families. This program will permit the owners of old housing, housing which desperately needs to be rehabilitated to bring new housing up to date.

For months I have been working with my civic and neighborhood groups to find the channels for recovering and giving life to blighted neighborhoods and to marginal neighborhoods. It is almost impossible because of high land and construction costs. This program offers hope—it offers a tool to the people to help themselves.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York who, may I say, refused to yield to my side.

Mr. FINO. My time was limited.

Mr. YATES. Of course. I have an unlimited 5 minutes. The gentleman from New York, of course, had only 13 minutes.

Mr. FINO. The gentleman apparently did not listen to what I had to say.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman listened completely to what the gentleman from New York had to say. He understood his points completely.

Mr. FINO. Then I am glad that the gentleman listened and listened carefully. I said that under the regulations and under the law there is a limitation on the amount of money that can be spent per unit, and that limitation is $15,000 per unit. The archdiocese of New York City stated, and I am sure the archdiocese of Chicago will feel the same way and will express the same sentiment, that with labor costs, as the gentleman from Chicago indicated, and the land costs, it is physically impossible to build any of these projects in the city of New York, and they will only be able to be built in the outskirts and in the suburbs. The gentleman has shown such great concern about housing in Chicago. I appreciate that because I am also concerned about housing in New York City. But this is not the program under which you can do it.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is completely wrong because this is the program under which could permit it to be done in the cities. The gentleman advocated the building of the same huge high rise public housing projects rather than this program. Again, he is wrong. The only way that you can get away from that kind of institutionalized high rise housing—and every expert on public housing is unanimous in the opinion that we ought to get away from that kind of public housing—the only way you can get away from housing of that type is through a program of this kind. The poor, the disabled, the elderly, the displaced who now have only a most limited housing market desperately need this appropriation.

In a conversation I had with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY], who last year led the fight against this program, Mr. HARVEY indicated that in view of the changes that have been made in the regulations, he has changed his mind. The gentleman is one of the enlightened Republicans who appreciates what is happening in the Nation's cities, and who sees the needs of the people of the cities for this program.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. What is wrong with building this type of program in suburban areas?

Mr. YATES. Let me ask the gentleman from New York to answer that question since he raised that point.

Mr. BOLAND. Let me finish my question. Are not these people of low income entitled to God's sunshine and greener pastures? What is wrong with building these projects in suburban areas?

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from New York objected. I say to him answer if you will.

Mr. FINO. I have no objection to providing adequate and suitable housing for poor people. But under this bill you are providing luxury apartments for the poor people.

Mr. YATES. Luxury apartments? The gentleman has a strange idea of what is luxurious.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 3 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding. I just want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that the gentleman from New York is a very knowledgeable and capable Congressman. He is on our committee. He does a splendid job, and I am quite sure, he does not want to mislead the Members of this House.

Mr. YATES. May I point out to the gentleman that even a most perfect Congressman can be wrong at times.

Mr. BARRETT. I am quite sure you are correct. I know the gentleman from New York would not come on this floor and mislead Members on either side. He knows the luxurious high-rise apartments that he speaks about being used for rent supplementations could not be used because the law provides they must be used only where there is substantial rehabilitation.

No luxurious apartment can be used. It has to be a modest-cost structure.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman. Let me point out that every big city in this country has declared war on slums. How are they going to eliminate the slums if they do not have a program of this type to help them do it?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman who is a ranking member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the gentleman from New York knows this. There are 100,000 persons waiting to get into public housing in the city of New York alone.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to my friend from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the fact that the gentleman now in the well is one of the best authorities in this House on public housing. When I came to the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, I served with the gentleman from Chicago before he left the Congress a few years ago. No one was a better champion, no one had more knowledge of this program than the gentleman who is now in the well. No one understands the program any better than he does.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Chicago whether or not in his judgment he believes this program on rent supplements is a better program than public housing in the long run and is probably the answer to some of the difficult problems that now occur in public housing?

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his encomium. I think it is ill deserved, but I am grateful for it, nevertheless.

For years, experts in the field of housing have been looking for alternatives to the huge, high-rise buildings in the cities with which people of low income are housed. This program is one of the constructive alternatives which has been proposed. It deserved to have a trial. That is all we seek. Every big city in the country needs this program to stop the mounting blight and decay in their older neighborhoods. They want to eliminate the slums. This is one way they can do it. Let me give you a few facts about the program.

Congress authorized this new approach to better housing for poor people last summer, but failed to provide funds. In my district, and I am sure this is true in yours too, there is great interest in the rent supplement program, and people are wondering when it is going to get underway.

In cities like my own city of Chicago, housing for poor people has become critical. We know that public housing is not the answer, although it can continue to help. We need to enlist the active support of private enterprise and the support of public spirited private groups to help solve this problem before it gets worse.

That is why the rent supplement program is so important. For the first time, we have found a way for private enterprise to supply decent, safe, and sanitary housing for the poor.

At the same time, this program does not penalize poor people when their situation improves. A family will not be forced to move when that family's income increases. The family can continue to occupy the same living unit indefinitely, if it chooses to do so.

However, as a family's income goes up, the rent supplement will go down. The family will pay 25 percent of its income toward the rent, and the supplement will make up the difference. The supplement will be paid directly to the housing owner on submission of monthly statements for tenants who have been previously determined by FHA to meet eligibility requirements, as set forth in the law.

Every tenant will be required to recertify his income once a year. FHA will check the statements of income and will make adjustments in the amount of supplement. In addition, each lease will require the tenant to report immediately if his income increases to the point where he is no longer eligible for a supplement. But, as I said before, he will not have to move even if he no longer receives a supplement.

I want to see private enterprise given a chance to provide housing for the poor. Only private nonprofit groups, limited dividend organizations, or cooperatives can sponsor rent supplement projects. They will be subject to cost certification and rent control; and sponsors will be carefully screened to make sure they are capable of successfully developing and operating housing projects for low-income people.

May I point out that the National Association of Real Estate Boards has given its approval to this program?

Does the gentleman from New York consider this group as the one which favors socialized housing?

We cannot afford to spend money for education, job training, and social guidance, and leave the poor in their slums. Nor can the Federal Government, or the cities, build or finance the housing that is needed. Rent supplement projects will be privately built and owned, they will be privately financed by private lenders at market interest rates, and they will be privately managed and operated. They will either be nonprofit, or profits will be strictly limited and rents will be controlled.

Only families and individuals whose gross income is low enough to qualify them for public housing will be eligible to receive rent supplements. In addition, they must be living in substandard housing now, or must be elderly, handicapped, displaced, or victims of a disaster which has destroyed or severely damaged their home.

Both new housing and rehabilitated housing will be eligible for rent supplements. The rehabilitation must be substantial. This is not a bailout program. Each project will have to be approved and insured by FHA.

In Chicago, and I know this is true in other cities, there are many sound buildings which are too good to be torn down, and which could be rehabilitated under the rent supplement program to provide decent housing. Also, there are sites where new housing can be built, even within the modest cost limits that will be set.

Private builders, realtors, lenders, churches, and other nonprofit groups, and their spokesmen have voiced strong support for this program. It is unusual, and very significant, in my opinion, for a program of this kind to develop such widespread interest and support.

Since last summer, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and we in Congress have had an opportunity to study this program carefully. Rules and policies have been developed for its administration which will make sure that rent supplements will go only to low-income people, as Congress intended. Asset limitations have been modified, so that only those with assets of $2,000 or less will be eligible for rent supplements. An exception will be allowed for persons 62 years of age or older, where the asset limitation will be $5,000.

Income limits have been furnished us for all of the larger cities and many of the smaller ones, so that we know these limits will be the same as for admission to public housing in the same cities. They will actually be lower, because gross income of all persons in the family will be used to determine eligibility for rent supplements. In public housing, most local housing authorities permit some deductions for children and other dependents.

The need for this program is urgent. The unrest in our cities cannot be allowed to fester in the slums without hope. The time to do something about it is now. I urge the House to vote up this appropriation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois has made somewhat of a political issue of this in accusing the Republicans of not being interested in these people in the slums. I think this is an unfair accusation.

May I point out that the Democrats have had the control of this House for about 32 years. They have done nothing about it. That is the reason why the Republicans are beginning to move into the cities, because the Democrats have failed. They have made these promises for years and have not done anything about them.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman used my name.

Mr. BOW. No, I did not. I called him the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. That is right. Let me point out to the gentleman, it is because of the programs of the Democratic Party over the last 32 years that so many Democrats are elected from the cities and so few Republicans are.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is mistaken about that, and time will tell.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it eminently clear at this point that the Mr. HARVEY who was referred to by the gentleman from Illinois was not the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am pleased to yield to my friend.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the observation that the Republicans who win the big cities do so by going around constantly denying the fact that they are running on the Republican ticket.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman's remark deserves no answer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this item for rent supplements which was in the supplemental appropriations bill of last October was deleted chiefly because Congress had done such a poor job in authorizing the rent supplement program in the legislation which passed the House on June 30th of last year. One of the main arguments against the bill was that everything was left to the Secretary; that he had too much discretion in administering the program. The regulations that were promulgated by the Housing and Home Finance Agency last fall were the best evidence, in my judgment, that these allegations against the bill were well-founded. It was obvious that the program to be administered had become not a program for the low income groups, but a program for the rich.

This House on October 14, 1965, by a vote of 185 to 162, made clear that it did not approve of the regulations which had been drafted, nor the manner in which this program was going to be administered. That vote reemphasized the clear language contained in section 101 (c) of the authorizing legislation; namely, that a qualified tenant under the rent supplement program must be one who had an income below the maximum amount for occupancy in public housing. In other words, we said this program is going to be one for the low income groups or there would not be any program at all. My point is—that because Congress was willing to rise up and assert its authority; to stand firm for the program it had originally intended; we can now take pride and point to a much better program. Several important changes have been made:

First. Income limits for the rent supplement program have been established. These limits are, in each instance, within the limit set for public housing and, in some cases, they are substantially below that of public housing.

Second. Stringent asset limitations have been established. Last October, I could argue, in theory at least, persons with assets of $25,000 could still qualify for the program, but that is no longer true. Individuals or families will not be eligible to participate in the rent supplement program if their assets exceed $2,000, except that in the case of the elderly the applicable limit will be $5,000. This is well within the asset limit in all localities, and substantially below the limit in many. I believe it is a reasonable requirement to qualify.

Third. In addition, specific dollar rental ceilings and mortgage ceilings have been established. These limitations make clear that these are going to be low cost units.

All in all, I believe the program has been substantially improved. I point out to you also that the National Association of Real Estate Boards, who last fall agreed that the regulations were so loosely drawn that they could not support the program, have now reversed themselves and they completely support the present effort.

It is true that not all of the objections to the program have been removed, and it can still be argued with merit that too much discretion is within the administrator; that, at best, these changes are written only into the regulations and not into the law; and that the regulations themselves can be changed once again by the administrator just as swiftly as they have been in the past. I fully recognize the merit in this argument, but I want to state that I have complete confidence and trust in the honesty of Secretary Weaver and his associates. I point out to you that it was their basic honesty in promulgating regulations last fall, before the program had been properly funded, that got them into trouble. I have been assured by Secretary Weaver in writing that these changes will all be included in the administration of this new program, and I will secure permission to insert a copy of his letter into the Record immediately following my remarks. I have no doubt in my mind that these changes will be carried out.

To many of you who still do have doubts, however, let me remind you that the rent supplement program will have to be funded again in 2 months and then again each year thereafter. I personally intend to keep following it closely in order to learn how well it does the job.

I am satisfied in my own mind that there is in America a great need for low-income housing. I feel strongly, as Senator Robert Taft so aptly stated in a speech he gave on January 25, 1949, and I quote:

> I believe that the American people feel that with the high production of which we are now capable, there is enough left over to prevent extreme hardship and maintain a minimum standard floor under subsistence, education, medical care and housing, to give to all a minimum standard of decent living and to all children a fair opportunity to get a start in life.

I might say to you that the title of this speech by Senator Taft, which was given at New York University before the Graduate School of Business Administration, was "Private Enterprise Has Not Solved the Housing Problem." Senator Taft stanchly defended public housing. Just listen to his words:

> Many have denounced public housing as a communistic or socialistic enterprise. Of course, to a certain extent it is true that it is socialistic in nature. But this question of socialism is a relative matter. We have long socialized our public education in the primary and secondary schools. We have socialized medical care to the extent that we provide medical care to the poor through public hospitals. But this does not mean that we have socialized medical care as a whole, or the medical profession. The public housing program is in no sense a socialization of the building industry, or of the housing industry. It is intended to reach only those whose income is so low as to prevent their renting the minimum of decent housing.

As a mayor in Michigan I found that public housing was a useful tool in meeting head on the problems of both low income and minority groups. To the best of my knowledge, it has never interfered with the private market for housing.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that anyone would quarrel with the statement that this program is now vastly improved. Frankly, I believe that Congress ought to do this more often. It serves a useful purpose to occasionally send a program back and say, "No, this isn't the way we intended it to be administered." We have not done this nearly enough in Congress.

But now that the rent supplement program has been improved, I think we ought to recognize the need for low-income housing that exists and give this program a chance so that we might learn whether it can assist in solving the problem.

The $30 million which Secretary Weaver requested has already been cut to $12 million. I believe this is a modest and reasonable sum for a beginning. What Senator Taft said about public housing is equally true about this rent supplement program:

> It is intended to reach only those whose income is so low as to prevent their renting the minimum of decent housing.

Let us give this program a chance to see whether it can help provide housing for the low-income groups in America.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following letter:

The Secretary of Housing
and Urban Development,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1966.

Hon. James Harvey,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Harvey: In view of your continuing interest in the rent supplement program, I want to take this occasion to inform you of the actions we have already taken to conform this program to the intent of the Congress. I also want to give you my firm assurance that the Department of Housing and Urban Development will administer this program strictly in accord with that intent.

With respect to income limits under the program, we have established maximum dollar amounts for localities. These amounts are in each instance within the income limit established in the same locality for public housing. The income limits for the rent supplement program applicable in 51 cities with a population of over 250,000, and in 20 cities with a population under that figure are enclosed.

In New York City these limits will be below those established locally for the public housing program for families having five or more persons. In the communities where there is at present no low-income public housing, we will establish by appropriate surveys what the income limits would be if such a program were active, and those limits will apply to the rent supplement program.

In addition, we have established stringent asset limitations. Individuals or families will not be eligible to participate in the rent supplement program if their assets exceed $2,000, except in the case of the elderly, where the applicable limit will be $5,000. This is well within the asset limits usually imposed in the public housing program by local housing authorities.

To help assure that the rent supplement program will provide only housing of modest standards, we have imposed specific dollar rental and mortgage ceilings that cannot be exceeded in any locality. These ceilings will be made more restrictive in each individual locality where lower cost levels make tighter mortgage ceilings and monthly rental ceilings possible. These will be determined on the basis of prototype projects of modest design and costs. Such items as swimming pools, two bathrooms, and air conditioning will not be permitted in these projects.

Finally, our procedures will require annual recertification of the income of all families (except the elderly, who are exempted from this requirement by the statute); and in addition, we will require families to report interm increases in income which make them ineligible to receive rent supplement assistance.

As you can see, we have made a careful effort to restrict the rent supplement program to families of low income and to assure that the housing provided is of modest design.

In administering this program, we will of course follow the intent of the Congress as expressed during the appropriations process as well as during the enactment of the enabling law. In this connection, I am enclosing for your information the statement which I presented to the House Committee on Appropriations and the departmental justification for funds for the rent supplement program.

Sincerely yours

Robert C. Weaver,
Secretary.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the rent supplement appropriation contained in this bill. The reasons for launching this program were pressing last year, when we voted in favor of the authorization bill for rent supplements. Today, the same reasons exist, and they daily grow more urgent.

So many of the problems of our Nation's cities are outgrowths of the existence of large, ghettolike areas of substandard housing. Many of these problems have grown more serious than the housing and education problems in which they are rooted. Crime and unemployment among unskilled and undereducated citizens of these areas have become primary and costly concerns of Government in the past decade.

The rent supplement concept has the unique feature of providing decent housing to low income families, while at the same time helping to break down the slumlike uniformity and stagnation of ghetto areas. It does this not by mammoth and testeless public housing projects which do little to change the character of poor neighborhoods, and not by setting up the Federal Government as a ghetto landlord, but by working within the private enterprise system of real estate and housing development.

The real estate board in my constituent city of Rochester, N.Y., has forged a profound argument in favor of this program. Donald A. Lum, a realtor and chairman of the Greater Rochester Development Committee, supplied me with this statement, which because of its special relevance to the discussion of this appropriations bill, I would like to submit it at this point in the Record:

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF THE RENT-SUPPLEMENT CONCEPT, BY THE REAL ESTATE BOARD OF ROCHESTER, N.Y.

The problems are not basically housing, not basically color; the problems are people and neighborhoods. Yet the problem also is our whole city structure.

The city is a complex fabric woven from the dreams, imagination, skills, sweat, and the will of the people who live there and derive their livelihood; who use and contribute to the industries, commerce, arts, religious, educational, and cultural facilities.

The city has been described as one of the great achievements of man because the city can be created only through the cooperation and utilization of the energies and thoughts of many people of diverse interests and backgrounds working toward common goals.

As realtors we are convinced of the desirability and feasibility of rebuilding our cities, of renewing those sources of strength and vitality which makes the city the dynamic living organism it is today, and will be increasingly, in the future.

We are convinced that it is not necessary to wait for obsolescence and deterioration to take their toll completely before embarking on programs to rebuild those areas and sections which have outlived their usefulness to the rest of the community. We can afford to pay the price. We are willing to pay the price not only in terms of money, but in terms of frustrations, setbacks, loss in services, and conveniences so long as it is apparent that what we are doing will result in neighborhoods having the dynamic stability required for the healthy growth and development of families, businesses, industries, churches, schools, and other institutions which are the city.

Many of our urban problems arise today from the inability of people to establish themselves as an identifiable part of the community. This problem becomes increasingly acute as the economic pressures resulting from inadequate incomes increase the difficulties and the uncertainties surrounding the individual.

Today, inadequate income is most frequently an indicator that other basic problems of health, training, education, or attitudes exist.

It is the low income family that is most in need of the stabilizing influences available in the healthy, established neighborhoods.

It is these same stabilizing influences that low-income families are deprived of when the urban renewal bulldozer goes to work, or when vast public housing projects are built.

The common procedure in past projects, such as the two in Baden-Ormond area and the numerous other projects including inner loop, and civic center, has been for the families and businesses who are best able, to move out of the neighborhood at the earliest indications that a clearance project would take place. The vacancies left behind frequently were filled by people substantially less well off economically and generally less suited to carry on the leadership functions.

The process continued, frequently over a period of 2 to 3 years, with the proportions of newcomers increasing and with practically all vestiges of stabilizing influences being removed, until finally the day came when the bulldozers took over.

As the families were bulldozed out of this neighborhood into the next, they found that neighborhood to be in transition also, with the more able families leaving and single-family dwellings being converted for occupancy by two, three, and four families; with apartments being turned into rooms and with kitchens and bathrooms being shared by several persons or families. It is doubtful whether people of normal income, normal health, normal competency could face these conditions without cracking up.

The problem frequently is compounded when people see their life savings, represented by investments in homes and businesses, wiped out or at least seriously depreciated by the costs of moving and by the inequities of the present system of paying for these properties which must be acquired by the city.

Realtors are aware that the shocks and problems of dislocation must be minimized and that it is not sufficient to answer all objections by saying that you've got to break the eggs in order to make the omelet. After all, cities are for people.

We recognize the seriousness of the problems and the diversity of the people and of the neighborhoods which comprise our city. We recognize further the importance of maintaining a traditional landlord-tenant relationship between people, as contrasted with the Government agency-client relationship of public housing. We recognize the need for ingenuity, flexibility, adaptability, and speed in meeting the problems. We believe this can be developed when private enterprise is offered adequate incentive. Realtors have long favored rent supplement concepts coupled with code enforcement as a means of producing housing within the framework of our American way of life at prices and under conditions that will meet the needs of lower income families.

While the final details of the proposals for rent subsidies endorsed by President Johnson have not been finally ironed out, we believe the proposed FHA rent supplement program, provided that it is limited to families within the eligibility ranges of public housing, will be of incalculable assistance in providing housing for elderly families, for families displaced by governmental action, for the physically handicapped and for those living in substandard housing. We believe such a program will result in construction of substantial amounts of new rental housing and rehabilitation of housing within the inner city for low-income families. Such housing would pay its full share of local taxes and would pay going interest rates. Subsidy would be to the mortgagor rather than to individual tenants; neighborhoods would be strengthened rather than destroyed. Many investors and nonprofit organizations would be interested in participation in this type of housing development in the neighborhoods where it is most needed.

Fernwood Village, Ramona Park, and Norton Village have all demonstrated the feasibility of limited profit housing and the acceptance of this form of subsidized housing by both the community as a whole and the tenants themselves.

We believe that a rent supplement program together with the intelligent administration and persistent enforcement of the minimum standards housing code as long advocated by realtors, offer two of the most important tools available for rebuilding our neighborhoods, for assuring decent, wholesome, adequate housing for families at all income levels, for establishing and maintaining the dynamic stability and the diversity of neighborhoods required for a healthy community.

People tend to seek out neighborhoods where they will find a community of interests similar to or compatible with their particular aims or problems at that particular stage of their life. As their interests and requirements change, most people tend to seek neighborhoods that fulfill their requirements at that time.

Let's recognize that we are dealing with people whose problems are not the usual ones, whose standards are not necessarily compatible with the middle-class white standards which govern the conduct of major portions of the city.

Let's concentrate effective services in areas where they are needed. Let's have the schools, the teachers, the police, the social services, the firemen, the city officials who are ready and able to meet the challenges of the neighborhoods that are "different."

Let's recognize that we don't solve problems by building huge new public housing projects, creating new ghettos, substituting Government agencies for normal landlord-tenant relationships. We can't hide our problems in these projects no matter how vast nor how cleverly concealed.

We can't give people decent housing or decent jobs or decent schools or decent stores or decent government. We can help people to achieve these goals if we and they really want them. We have the tools if we will use them. We have a city dedicated to rebuilding. Let's use the proper tools. Let's have the will to do the job, let's rely on the forces of private enterprise operating within a framework of intelligent government participation, and community responsibility. Let's not try to foist these problems off onto the housing authority or other Government agency, then stand back and say we've done the best we could.

In closing I'd like to read a biting little poem by John Ciardi, poetry editor of the Saturday Review:

"IN MY FATHER'S HOUSE THERE ARE A FEW MANSIONS, MORE HOVELS, AND PROBABLY EVEN MORE RANCH HOUSES

"Some men live in, say, houses and some in their own monuments. The poor live in what they can get; the rich, in what they can imagine of themselves; the clerks, in

> what they are told to imagine through the picture windows.
>
> "Given the money for it, a man can begin to buy whatever it is that furnishes his imagination. Given no money, he is left to live without the furniture for his own attitudes. Given some—more or less—money, a man fits his attitudes to the furniture he is allowed to buy with what he is given.
>
> "Given a picture window, citizen, make sure it looks out onto something. Which is also to say, out from something, preferably, I suggest, a self.
>
> "JOHN CIARDI,
> "*Poetry Editor,*
> "*The Saturday Review.*"

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, if anyone has been deluded into believing that the Johnson controlled, rubberstamp Congress intends to heed the danger signs of inflation, this bill should disillusion them.

Today for the second time since Congress convened last January, this House of Representatives is called on to vote money under a supplemental bill. In other words, the President is now saying that he did not ask for enough money last year; either that or in other cases he deliberately withheld his request for money for other reasons—some perhaps justified, some not—but the result in either case was to make the budget deficit appear smaller when it was submitted. Instead of the $5.3 billion deficit as originally estimated, now it looks like it will run $6.4 billion.

Aside from the various reasons that resulted in this bill and the $2½ billion it would appropriate, as I said at the start, it now becomes clear that the Johnson administration is in no mood to cut down domestic spending or to defer new domestic programs even in the light of the spiraling costs of Vietnam.

For example, this bill contains $12 million for the controversial new rent supplement program to have the Federal Government pay up to two-thirds of a family's rent in certain cases. Thereby the Federal Government will embark and be on its way with the new L.B.J. 40-year, $6 billion Great Society program.

Also in this bill is $10 million for the new Federal Teachers Corps under which the U.S. Commissioner of Education will recruit, indoctrinate, and pay the salaries of a group of schoolteachers and thereby could well initiate a new encroachment into local schools.

I oppose these new programs as such, but aside from that, at this time it seems especially ill advised for Congress to fan the fires of inflation with new costly programs. In this connection, a recent Gallup poll has reported living increases so that it costs a family of four about $18 more a week to meet its expenses this year than it did a year ago. The situation requires fiscal restraint by Government or increased taxes or perhaps both.

Meanwhile, the administration, as someone said, wants to discipline the people instead of itself.

Mr. Chairman, this bill as reported by the committee represents much unnecessary Government domestic spending and unless substantially reduced I intend to vote against it.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, there is a particular feature among several in this, the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1966, which we can do particularly well without at this time. I refer to the provision for funds to start up a new program of subsidies for rent.

This program was rejected last year when Congress refused to provide funds for it. I voted against both the authorization of the program and the funds to start it up. All the reasons which applied then are just as valid today. In addition, extraordinary new costs for the war in Vietnam have been added to the burdens of the American people. And, if that were not enough, the country is facing a serious threat of inflation.

This is not a time to embark on new programs of doubtful value and enormous, nearly incalculable potential cost to the people. This is a time for prudence; a time to husband the resources of the Nation; a time to conserve, to tighten our belts; a time to bend all our efforts to the immediate tasks of defense and vital domestic programs.

It was in this spirit of prudence that I voted last week against commencing the construction of a mansion for the Vice President. That measure did not fit the sense of priority we must have in these times. This rent-subsidy program does not fit it either.

What a paradox is presented in this bill. Last year, Congress voted to provide urgently needed new housing facilities for our men in uniform. The administration put these spending plans on the shelf as an economy measure. But now it comes to us seeking permission to begin a wholly new, unproven civilian housing program. This does not make sense to me nor does it fit my idea of justice.

PEOPLE OPPOSE RENTICARE

Mr. Chairman, every responsible poll I have seen, including one that I conducted myself, indicates clearly that the American people oppose the concept of subsidized rent. The feeling appears to be overwhelming in my district. After the vote last year, I sent out a questionnaire to postal patrons in the Second Congressional District of New Hampshire. To the question concerning rent subsidies, "In general do you favor President Johnson's proposal to subsidize rent for low-income families in lieu of additional public housing?", 1,528 answered "yes" and 4,339 answered "no."

It is true that since the defeat of renticare last year, Federal authorities have modified their regulations. Under the plan before us today, it is no longer possible for high-income families or families with small fortunes to qualify for the Federal aid, but the limits are still excessive. In any event, I want to point out that what can be made by regulations can be changed by regulations.

Mr. Chairman, let us defer this proposition; let us exercise economy, prudence, and commonsense by rejecting this new spending plan.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, the proposal before us today is to modestly fund a privately owned, privately operated, and privately financed housing program. The Federal Government is involved only to the point of providing some small assistance to low-income families and individuals in order to insure they may be able to participate in the privately financed, owned, and operated housing that will become available under this program.

When you consider the potential of the program, you quickly realize that rent supplements could provide the key to the problems that have plagued public housing for so many years. For the first time, we are recognizing that only with the cooperation and support of the private segments of our economy will we be able to make available an adequate supply of decent housing for the poor. For this reason, the program has the support of the National Real Estate Association, the United States Conference of Mayors, and the National League of Cities.

What actually is involved? What are the specifics? First, who is eligible? The persons eligible for rent supplement payment are those of low income who are displaced by governmental action; those who are elderly; physically handicapped; and those who are living in substandard housing, or housing destroyed or extensively damaged by a natural disaster.

What are the income limitations? Income limitations are the same or below those who are eligible for federally aided low rent public housing programs. For example, in Los Angeles, the largest city in the State of California, a family of four whose income is $4,300 a year or less would be eligible. Total assets of the family could not exceed $2,000. Assets of the eligible elderly could not exceed $5,000.

What if a family's income increases? All those who receive payments will be required to report immediately any increases in income that would make them ineligible for further payments. In addition, there will be an annual recertification of income that will result in a corresponding adjustment of rent supplement payments.

What kind of housing will be included? Any type of new or rehabilitated residential projects are eligible. However, mortgage and rent limitations will require that the housing be modest and economical. FHA will guarantee the development of such housing at 5¼ percent, plus the one-half of 1 percent mortgage insurance premium. Already in California some 17 different housing projects are being contemplated, housing close to 5,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, under this program any eligible low-income family would have to put 25 percent of their monthly income toward rent. This rent payment would go directly to the landlord, and the Government would make up the difference.

Mr. Thomas J. Foley, a staff writer for the Los Angeles Times Washington Bureau pointed out in an excellent article in the February 27, 1966, edition of the Times that most of the opposition directed against the rent supplement program is on the basis of monumental misunderstanding. Those who oppose the program say that it is a radical departure from traditional American precepts. But, as Mr. Foley points out in his article, our history is full of examples of our Government coming to the assistance, in order to make even stronger the private segments of our economy.

Mr. Foley rightly points out that the rent supplement program is not a departure in policy, but rather an imaginative continuation of Government support for past programs such as railroad and airline expansion, oil depletion allowances, and aid to the maritime industry. In each case, Mr. Foley points out, Government help was forthcoming and appreciated on the basis that it was in the broad national interest to maintain these industries. And, as Mr. Foley suggests, it is in our broad national interest to get the poor out of substandard housing.

Most crucial in this plan is its imaginative program for partnership with private enterprise. This fact itself is important not only because private enterprise is the pillar of our economic success, but also because local cities will not suffer any decrease in revenues as a result of public housing not bearing their share of the tax burden as is now the case.

Mr. Foley concludes his article by commenting that the rent supplement program is certainly worth a try. I am in full agreement.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, although I intend to vote in favor of today's supplemental appropriation because I support the programs which it is primarily for, I want to point out that I do so with grave reservations concerning that portion of these funds that will be used by the selective service system.

I still feel, as I felt when I voted against a 4-year extension of the draft in 1963, that a full review of the program, procedures, necessity, and effect on civilian manpower needs should be conducted. This study should be made within the next year, before Congress is asked to vote on another extension in 1967.

The inequities of a system that may have been equitable in 1940, when the law was first passed, are becoming more and more evident. Most of these discriminatory aspects are not the fault of the selective service boards or the officials of the selective service system. They are the result of changes in the Nation's social structure.

Mexican-Americans, Negroes, and those persons generally in the less affluent sector of our society, bear a heavier burden than most, simply because they do not qualify for or cannot afford the methods of obtaining deferment status—primarily, attendance at an institution of higher learning.

I recently discovered another problem that is the result of our failure to update procedures, whether or not it actually results in discriminatory selection procedures it certainly could have such implications, and is a matter that should be corrected.

The problem involves the fact that in the areas in Los Angeles County where we have an extremely heavy concentration of Mexican-American citizens, there are three selective service boards operating, and only one member from these boards is of Mexican-American descent. In fact, in all of Los Angeles County, with more than 600,000 Mexican-American citizens, there seems to be only this 1 draft board member from this ethnic background.

I hasten to add that I have contacted the Selective Service System concerning this situation and have received full cooperation and courtesy. It appears that we will be able to bring about corrective action in the near future. But, this leads me to wonder what the situation is in other parts of the Nation.

Other discriminatory aspects are well known. Little has been done in the way of seeking alternatives to the draft. It is not known what effect the new Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act will have on enlistments. The rash of draft card burnings and demonstrations are an indication of the need for a complete review. The present system of practically autonomous local boards results in the deferment or drafting of some men in some communities who would have been given a different status in a different community. For instance, married men in one community are drafted, while another community with a surplus of qualified single men does not have to take any married men to fill the quota.

Adequate pay scales and other incentives may be less expensive than the Selective Service System. The cost of the high turnover of personnel in the armed services may be higher than the cost of making career service more appealing. This could also give us a defense capability manned by more experienced and better trained soldiers in general.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for a change.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, the second supplemental appropriations bill, contains a controversial item. I refer to the rent supplement program. Last year I opposed the program as presented and particularly because of its proposed loose and generous application. But changes in the proposed rules and regulations now make it clear most of my former objections have been met. It is now clear that in no case will income limits be above those established for low-rent public housing. It is now clear that in addition to having a low income those qualifying must either be elderly, handicapped, displaced by Federal project, the victim of a natural disaster or living in slum housing. These are stringent, restrictive qualifying provisions. I agree with them. I now find a program which will be in the national interest. I might add that I see also the possibility that this will replace public housing which would meet with my approval. This approach has a free enterprise flavor to it which I like.

Mr. Chairman, I favor the proposal as presented.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, at the March 22, 1966, meeting of the House Republican Policy Committee a policy statement regarding the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1966 was adopted. As chairman of the Policy Committee, I would like to include at this point in the Record the complete text of this statement:

Republican Policy Committee Statement on the Second Supplemental Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1966

It is becoming increasingly clear that the Johnson-Humphrey administration is engaging in a tragic game with this Congress. Unfortunately, the stakes in this game may be the American economic system that has produced unparalleled opportunities and abundance for our people.

In recent weeks a combination of alarming factors have created grave concern over this country's economic condition. In February the wholesale price index increased 0.7 percent, the sharpest rise since the Korean war. The cost of living continues to mount. A recent Gallup poll reported that, according to the American public's own appraisal of living costs, it takes a family of 4 about $18 more a week to get along this year than it did a year ago. And this is at a time when this country is experiencing the effects of accumulated deficits of 6 years of unbalanced budgets and sharply increasing defense demands.

In spite of this serious inflationary situation and the spiraling costs of a massive war in Vietnam, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has continued to insist upon a large number of new programs.

For example, in this bill there is money for rent supplements and for the Federal Teachers Corps. This is money that was requested, considered, and then rejected during the first session of this Congress.

Once an appropriation is made for rent supplements, the Federal Government will be on its way to a 40-year, $6 billion program. Also, even though the proposed regulations governing allowable income limits and assets have been tightened since last year, if funds are appropriated, Congress will have little or no control over future regulations.

The Federal Teachers Corps has had an even more checkered career. In the House of Representatives, only one witness testified on this proposal. It then was added to the Higher Education Act by the Senate. House Republican conferees refused to sign the conference report and moved to recommit the report with instructions to delete the Teachers Corps. Thereafter, the $13.2 million that would have been used to finance the Teachers Corps was removed from an appropriation measure.

Objections to the Teachers Corps center on the fact that it will be a federally financed project in which the U.S. Commissioner of Education has the extraordinary authority to recruit, select, train, and pay the salary of teachers and then choose the district, from among those that apply, in which such teachers would be assigned. Certainly, this is a new and dangerous extension of Federal power into local school districts.

The record now reflects that in fiscal 1966 the Johnson-Humphrey administration underestimated the escalating Vietnam military needs by $15 billion. And this undoubtedly will be repeated in fiscal 1967. Until such time as a realistic appraisal of the Vietnam costs is forwarded to Congress, all new and nonessential spending must be curtailed. Under the circumstances, it is both reckless and dangerous to feed the fires of inflation as this appropriations bill would do. Certainly, in this period of grave uncertainty, new starts on broad and expensive programs should not be called for in a supplemental appropriations bill. In times such as these, new spending requests should be contained in a regular appropriation request and given the careful scrutiny they deserve.

All too often, the democratically controlled Congress has earned its rubberstamp characterization. It has winked when the occasion demanded firmness. It has grinned when it should have gagged. We hope that this time Congress will respond to the challenge.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote today to appropriate funds for the rent supplement program because I believe that this program can provide an effective, efficient, economic, and needed new tool in the so far losing battle to eliminate the extensive neighborhoods of decrepit and overcrowded housing still persisting, still growing in this Nation. This trial program, conceived and proposed as a hopeful potential alternative to the yet insufficient, trouble-filled conventional public housing program, relies on and stimulates locally planned, locally financed, and locally supervised efforts to construct and renovate adequate housing, under private and cooperative ownership. Surely one of the leading causes of the social upheavals which in recent years have beset our cities is the seeming hopelessness of the situation which millions of our low-income city families perceive themselves in today. This bill, providing limited funds to allow an experimental program to get underway, deserves the support of all Members who are sincerely concerned about disturbing evolution of our cities.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the supplemental appropriations bill which we are considering today the Washington Post this morning declared:

> It will provide the first real test of whether Congress is willing to build a Great Society at home and fight a war in Vietnam at the same time.

In other words, the issue is clear and simple—can we afford guns and butter as the President believes, or is now the time for a sober reassessment of our responsibilities faced as we are with a major war and wild inflation? Shall we spend more for the Great Society at home? Shall we spend more to defend our interests abroad? Shall we go further into debt thus fanning inflation? Should we reduce some of the low-priority programs? And, last but certainly not the least of the many questions facing us is "will a tax hike be necessary?"

Mr. Chairman, I supported the supplemental defense appropriations bill last week to finance the war effort, and I shall continue to support our boys in Vietnam. I support much of this bill including the 100-percent funding of the impacted school aid despite opposition from the White House and plans to cut next year's school aid by half.

But I shall not support the highly questionable rent supplement program or the unpopular Teachers Corps as contained in this bill. I shall not support new, unnecessary, and low-priority programs that will fan the fires of inflation through increased Government spending.

Looking for a moment at the history of these two programs, we find that Congress last year refused to provide funds for both in spite of the pressure placed upon us to railroad it through with the rest of the Great Society proposals. Originally, the President asked for $30 million to start a rent subsidy program that would grow in 4 short years into an annual $150 million outlay. Multiply that times 40 years as requested and you get some idea of the magnitude of this new proposal. In it the administration suggested that a family should not pay more than a quarter of their wages for rent, and anything above and beyond this arbitrary, bureaucratic determination would be paid by the Federal Government. Loose wording permitted individuals with salaries up to $10,000 in New York City to be eligible to receive monthly subsidies. For example, a family earning $9,600 annually or $800 a month should pay only $200 for rent, but should they desire to rent a $250 apartment Uncle Sam would pick up the $50 difference. Not only this, but the original administration plan allowed individuals to have assets up to twice the annual income. Thus our friend with an income of nearly $10,000 could have almost $20,000 in stocks, bonds, and other assets and still get Federal payments for his rent while his home-owning neighbor struggles to pay his mortgage.

Now socialism is something you do not talk much about, but when the Government provides for everything from the womb to the tomb, and then proposes to pay for housing too, I contend we are destroying the individualism that made this country great and the private initiative displayed by our present system of home ownership and personal payment of rent. This is why I and 184 of my colleagues last October refused to vote for funds for this boondoggle against the 163 faithful mustered by the President and his Democrat leaders in the House of Representatives.

In the face today of all this the administration marches back up Capitol Hill with a plan to supplement rent. This bill carries a request for $12.1 million as a starter and limits the recipients to public housing eligibility incomes as an added inducement to get the needed votes. This is a transparent guise to slip through a program—buried among dozens of others—that Congress has previously rejected overwhelmingly.

But there is a logic in this apparent madness. If Congress refuses to go along many of my friends on the other side of the aisle can claim they have thwarted the President and emerge as champions of economy, free enterprise, and individualism. Those who support the bill can claim the original request has been cut and the regulations tightened thus making them believers who have followed thrift and economy. This is blatant hypocrisy in my humble opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we must learn from history not to ignore it. In the early thirties while we were in the midst of that terrible depression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt eloquently proclaimed that one-third of this Nation was "ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed." Now after over 30 years of experience in public housing our President in his state of the Union message declares:

> In some of our urban areas we must help rebuild entire sections and neighborhoods.

If we believe what we are told, we are as bad off today as we were in 1934.

The President in the same message said "we must change in order to master change." Certainly it is time for a change away from the failures of the past and for a change back to the proven tenents of private initiative, self-reliance, and free enterprise. The highly respected Barron's Business & Financial Weekly magazine recently stated:

> For a generation cities have been defaced with thousands of public housing projects which officials now candidly label "high-rise ghettos."

We must learn if we hope to improve as we change.

And there is a great deal of change to master. Since Congress last defeated the rent supplement request the administration has escalated the war in Vietnam and the gnawing flames of inflation have burst into full flame.

Last week we approved over $13 billion more for Vietnam because the original request was deliberately kept low so the budget would look balanced and more could be set aside for unproven poverty programs. This also kept the deficit down to under $2 billion so that the administration could claim a victory, after all it could have been much more. This is hypocrisy to claim a savings because the debt is less while the books are still going further in the red.

Last year Congress appropriated funds to provide additional housing for the military in response to urgent appeals by the Defense Department. Yet as of today, Secretary of Defense McNamara has refused to use this money, over $160 million. This refusal to build family housing, military schools, chapels, and troop quarters makes it possible to come up with a smaller deficit in 1965. In a masterful public relations "tour de force" the Department of Defense announcement claims the administration is practicing economy despite Mr. McNamara's earlier testimony before Congress when he stated:

> As soon as feasible, we shall push forward vigorously, as we have done during recent years, to build thousands of new military family housing units.

The DOD announcement proudly states:

> Although we have not met the full need for military housing units, the substantial costs of military operations in southeast Asia dictate a deferral of authorized and funded new construction in fiscal year 1966.

So on the one hand the administration is not building facilities for our soldiers sacrificing their lives to defend their Nation, but can come here to us today and ask for $12.1 million to subsidize rent. I do not agree that we can have both guns and butter as the President has promised. The Great Society can become the high society where we have our cake and eat it too, but only with higher taxes, higher prices, higher spending, and higher deficits.

To continue to travel down this road will bring a Texas-style inflation that has already started to frighten the wits out of many. And, we know that recession usually follows runaway inflation. Inflation is caused by Government spending more than any other single factor since, after all our Federal Government is the biggest single spender in the world.

The Government admitted today that the increase in inflation last month was the highest since 1951. The wholesale price index jumped more than in any single month since the Korean war, by seven-tenths of 1 percent. The journal of the financial world, Business Week, has combined the increase in January and February, multiplied these 2 months by six to get the yearly total, and points out that if projected this increased cost of living is boiling along at an alarming rate of around 7 percent.

Last year Congress increased social security by 7 percent but what good is that when a decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar wipes out the total social security increase? All it does is win some votes and through added spending push up inflation.

Inflation is no more than legalized robbery. It steals from the pension check and the pocketbook. Housewives are not so much concerned about the $2.50 a ton increase in steel as they are in the $500 a ton increase in the price of bacon. Ironically, the single largest increase in the cost of inflation last month came in higher food prices where the low and middle income Americans are hit the worst. It is the rich and powerful who benefit from uncontrolled inflation, not the ones we are supposed to be helping in these so-called antipoverty programs.

Mr. Chairman, the President's budget contains $3.25 billion for new domestic programs and the expansion of other domestic programs. This bill according to page 39 of the committee report contains one-half billion dollars to start new, unproven programs. I cannot in good conscience support these at a time when we are in a major war and are faced with growing inflation. I cannot accede to these requests at a time when the President asks for a cutback in school lunch and milk programs, aid to impacted areas, college scholarship and loan programs, agriculture research and other proven programs.

If we must have higher taxes then the President must honestly face up to reality and not after November 10th. If we must spend more on the war then we must cut low-priority programs to keep from going further into the mire of debt. I believe we can no longer operate on a "business as usual" basis. We must do as Will Rogers suggested long ago in another regard, "fish or cut bait."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, so far as the rent subsidy proposition is concerned we have before us today a bill which symbolizes the Great Society and its insincerity of purpose. In his omniscient view of our affairs, President Johnson has said:

> But even a prosperous nation cannot meet all its goals all at once (budget message of the President, p. 7).

And, to back up this view, a look at the statement which accompanied the defense budget reveals that the President was so concerned, that he virtually eliminated defense housing, using these words to defend the action:

> Provision is made in the following schedules to proceed after 1966 with the construction of the 8,500 family housing units authorized and funded in 1966 but deferred in December 1965 following a review of Defense Department expenditures focused on meeting higher priority requirements in direct support of combat forces in Vietnam and elsewhere. On this basis, no additional funds are required in 1967 for new family housing construction" (appendix to the budget, p. 350).

In the light of the two statements above, it is rather phenomenal that we are considering this proposition at all. This is a new program. It may have some desirable features. However, there is a war on. The administration is talking about increasing everyone's taxes to pay for the war. If this is necessary, why are we considering a bill which would fund an expensive, entirely speculative program? What it amounts to simply, is a program that would allow the Federal Government to place people in areas that it wants them to live. In the Soviet Union this is called coercion. In the country it is called "renticare," or the rent supplement program.

It cannot be reasonable, with American GI's fighting and dying in the swamps and jungles of Vietnam, for us in Congress to enact this program. Our own President, whom I quote above, considers the war effort so important that he has cut off the building of GI housing. How can we, in good faith, enact this program which sets up Federal standards for rent across this Nation?

This bill would set up Uncle Sam as the Nation's landlord. I believe that it is significant that the pilot programs which are now underway have as their key provisions the element of secrecy. The people in New York, Miami, and other cities that are getting renticare are doing so secretly. The director of the New York Public Housing Authority has admitted that this is necessary, because the people who are paying their own rent would object if they knew that their taxes were paying the rent of their next door neighbor.

I cannot believe that any program which must be conducted in secrecy, with public money, is sound. I cannot believe, when we cannot fund housing for our GI's, that we have any business launching a program of Federal rent subsidies.

Does not this administration realize there is a war on?

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty support of the provisions of this bill which provide funds for a rent supplement program for the balance of this fiscal year. In my city of Cleveland, in excess of 85,000 families have an income of $4,000 per year or less. At the present time most of these families are compelled to live in substandard dwelling places and in slum areas.

The more we study the problem of the inner cities and the spread of blight throughout all portions of the urban area, the more it is related to the income limitations, the inability of families of low income and the elderly to acquire living accommodations at prices within the limits of family income. The rent supplement program may be by far the least expensive approach to the problem in that it involves private resources and private capital in the initial construction and rehabilitation. It also provides a procedure that can move at once without prolonged delay.

In the city of Cleveland at this moment, two nonprofit groups are already in motion to create 358 units of sound housing under the rent supplement program. One of the sponsors plans to rehabilitate 158 units of rundown central city housing. The other intends to build 200 new units. Each group is already in possession of its site.

Comparatively, these 358 units may not seem like many, but it is a beginning. There are some 1,500 families in my city who face or who have recently faced the need to relocate because of urban renewal projects and highway improvements. These 358 units which can be immediately started if the rent supplement program is enacted will constitute a start which will ultimately change the face of the city.

The rent supplement proposal for which we seek to appropriate funds today is a modest but necessary approach to the problems of the city. The rent subsidy is certainly worth a fair chance.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, we have been the recipients of the usual guns versus butter or rifles versus ruffles arguments today from the other side of the aisle. Knowing of some of the programs in which my colleagues are interested, I am not impressed with such arguments. It is obvious the appropriation committee took out the "fat" before the issues came before us

The attack is on the so-called new programs. Let us consider rent supplement first.

The Public Housing Administration, as of February 28, 1966, has made available 2,414 units—2,334 of which are available for occupancy—for the part of my district encompassing Dayton, Ohio. The number of active public housing applications on file as of November 30, 1965, were: 1,692; elderly or handicapped 787; displaced families 41; for a total of 2,520.

This leads me to the inescapable conclusion that there are as many low income families eligible under public housing standards, awaiting placement, as there are those who have been admitted. Furthermore, the 1960 estimate of low income families in substandard housing in Montgomery County stood at 6,000, 3,000 of whom were living in the city of Dayton.

When this bill first came before the Congress, some of my colleagues and I, on this side of the aisle, found fault with the aims, objects, and purposes of this legislation. To the everlasting credit of an alert, responsive, and responsible administration, the Banking and Currency Committee sponsored its own amendment restricting the system to those who qualify for public housing. To my way of thinking this was a sensible approach.

The income provisions still seemed too high and the administration again adjusted its original concept of this new program and brought the policy guidelines unmistakably within the framework of public housing limits.

This responsiveness to the will of Congress and particularly those of us who are newcomers, should not go unrewarded especially when the appropriation committee again responded to the national purse reducing the program to "bread" not "butter," and only a half a slice, at that.

A factor not made as clear as it could or should be is this program could be a real tool to relieve, at long last, the Watts ghettos of our cities resulting in redistribution of low-income families into less explosive areas.

Another point so often overlooked is the relationship of this new program to private enterprise. Quite frankly, the rent supplement program will make it possible for private nonprofit and limited dividend corporations and cooperatives to build housing of modest design.

Qualification within the public housing limits requires that families, in addition to being low income, must be elderly or handicapped, displaced by government action, living in slum housing or in homes destroyed by an act of God. The rent supplement is the difference between 25 percent of the tenant's income which would normally be paid as rent and the regular economic rent on the unit to be occupied. Family assets cannot exceed $2,000, generally, except that elderly families may receive income up to $5,000 and still qualify. To insure that units will be of modest design, cost ceilings which are below the public housing limit, have been established.

The new program, incorporating the changes above mentioned which I helped to accomplish, has the support of the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, many church groups, senior citizen organizations, unions, and others.

The 89th Congress once again can begin to fund a people's bill in a long-neglected area through the cooperation of private enterprise and the Government, on one hand, and those in society who most need our help, on the other. While $12 million is inadequate, it will have to suffice for the time being because of other unavoidable commitments. Let us at least give crumbs of bread to begin a new program needed here at home.

In connection with the Teachers' Corps program, it is true, my district may find little need for this but there are areas where teachers are desperately needed as there are countries who rely upon our Peace Corps volunteers. The limitations attached by the subcommittee are sound although I had hoped for more than $10 million to be appropriated for this program. Considering the importance of education as related to the war on poverty, a National Teachers Corps could be a useful tool in areas where there are large pockets of poverty, particularly in those States where educational standards fall behind the Nation's average.

The committee, under title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965, has recommended $11 million for the funding of the library program and $41 million under the provisions of Public Law 874, as amended, to cover 100 percent entitlement for the deficiency in impacted school areas.

For the most part, Mr. Chairman, when the Congress believes that a program is worthy of authorization, reasonable funds should be appropriated. The war in Vietnam has little to do with our needs at home and within reason, I feel both should be supported.

The Appropriation Committee should be commended for rendering yeoman service to the Congress. It came before us with a reduction of nearly one-quarter of a billion dollars and cutting where there is need is sometimes more difficult than screening where there is abundance. This was a tremendous task and I support the committee's efforts.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I feel the issue before us today is the first real test as to whether Congress is willing to fulfill its obligations at home and fight a war in Vietnam at the same time.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, in the minority report on the housing bill we warned against the possibility that the rent supplement program would set national rental standards. By agreeing to pay subsidies for rentals over 25 percent of the individual's income, the Government has, in fact, established a national rental standard.

But in so doing, I wonder if my colleagues are aware of the fact that 37 percent of the people in the United States now pay over one-fourth of their income for rent? Does the administration plan to subsidize 37 percent of the people in the United States?

Ridiculous—no, not really, as a matter of fact, we have an example right here in the District of Columbia. Earlier this month an article appeared in the Washington Post relating the testimony of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe, the National Capitol Planning Commission's chairman, before the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. Mrs. Rowe said that a National Capitol Planning Commission study showed that between 83,000 and 144,600 families in the District pay more than 25 percent of their income for housing and, therefore, are eligible for some kind of public assistance. Of these, 45,000 presently live in structurally sound dwellings and are not overcrowded. Mrs. Rowe went on to say:

> More than 37 percent of the city resident's are eligible for, or need, public assistance in housing: Only 5.8 percent are receiving it.

Mr. Chairman, this is only one example that has come to my attention, but I wonder how many other studies are in progress across the country showing that all families who presently pay more than 25 percent of their income for rent, need public assistance?

Mr. Chairman, does the House fully comprehend what havoc such a national rental standard could play with our housing policies across the country?

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, last year, as we all know, the Congress appropriated $450,000 for administrative expenses for the rent supplement program so that the Department of Housing and Urban Development could prepare plans and criteria for the administration of this new program.

In addition, the Department was to explore the extent of demand for this program. All reports clearly indicate the demand is present.

But, my interest at the moment is in what changes have been made in the administrative guidelines since we last considered the question of funding this program.

It certainly seems to me that DHUD has given particular attention to the questions and objections voiced by the Congress in its consideration of last year's request for appropriations for the program. The following four points are the major changes in policy made as a result of this review:

First. Income limits on eligibility for rent supplements. To be eligible for rent supplement payments a family must have an income at or below the income limits established for entrance to public housing in the various communities. In those communities which have public housing programs the income limits established for the rent supplement program are in almost every instance identical with the public housing income limits in that area. In the few localities in which there is no public housing program, rent supplement income limits will be established at the same level which would have existed if there were a public housing program.

Second. Assets limitations for eligibility for rent supplements. To be eligible for rent supplement payments a nonelderly family must have assets no greater than $2,000 and an elderly family must have assets no greater than $5,000. This asset limitation is well within the limits usually imposed in the public housing program by local authorities, and considerably below asset limitation contained in the provisional rent supplement regulations made public last year.

Third. Adjustment of rent supplement payment with changes in tenant income. All tenants receiving rent supplements will be required to recertify with appropriate documentation their current incomes each year. This recertification will be reviewed by FHA and a corresponding adjustment or elimination of rent supplement payments will be made. Families who experience increases in income sufficient to put their incomes above those required for eligibility will be, as a condition of their lease, required to report immediately to the housing owner and to FHA such increases in income. In these cases immediate adjustment of rent supplement payments will be made.

Fourth. Quality of housing to be supported by rent supplements. Housing approved by FHA for mortgage insurance and rent supplement payments may be either new construction or rehabilitation. Rehabilitation projects will be accepted only if they involve major rehabilitation or consist of projects made up largely of substandard units which will, through rehabilitation, be made into standard units. Mortgage limits and other restrictions that will be imposed by FHA will limit new construction to housing of modest design and cost. Luxury items such as swimming pools and two bathrooms will not be permitted.

I think DHUD has done a good job. I think these changes are in the right direction, and I think it is now time we give this program a chance to function.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, the second supplemental appropriations bill, before us today, includes $1 million for the operation of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965. This measure was enacted last year, and resulted in what I thought then was the culmination of one of my fondest legislative desires. For years I had endeavored unsuccessfully to generate sufficient interest in a loan insurance program for students in business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. Last year, by a vote of 300 to 0, my bill was passed by the House. It was soon thereafter passed unanimously by the Senate.

I followed this program closely in the administrative halls of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, satisfied that this category of student would no longer be denied financial assistance to pursue a chosen career. I soon found, however, that appropriations to fund the program were not among the first to be requested.

My patience has been satisfied today, as I rise to support these vital appropriations. Literally thousands of postsecondary vocational school students are awaiting these funds to pursue or continue their academic desires in a field of trade. They are well aware of this program for I have learned that they are a particular kind of student—their desire to learn is all-consuming and their personal responsibility is a matter of pride to this country.

Mr. Chairman, we need the energies of these future tradesmen and women. America cannot thrive alone on college graduates. We will never abolish our need for craftsmen, business aids, and other products of vocational schools. Let us, therefore, act positively and with urgency in advancing the reach of this program to ambitious students throughout the country.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, when the Committee on Appropriations met last week to consider this second supplemental appropriations bill we were advised that this legislation now brings total appropriations for fiscal 1966 to approximately $127 billion, and this may not be the final total either.

What a sizable escalation there has been in that highly publicized budget of less than $100 billion which the President submitted to Congress in January 1965?

Of course, we know there has been substantial escalation of the U.S. military commitment to the war in Vietnam. The first of these was for $700 million. Then $1.7 billion for Vietnam expenditures was added to the regular defense bill, and only last week we completed action on an additional $13.1 billion to support American boys in Vietnam.

It is very likely that there will be the need for additional supplemental requests later this year and early next year to make up for deficiencies in the 1967 budget.

However, emergency appropriations actions have not been limited to meeting urgent defense needs. In this bill before us today, we are asked to appropriate over $2.5 billion. It contains the initial funding of nine new programs.

We know that the situation in southeast Asia is far different today than it was when these Great Society programs were enacted last year.

For some time I have pointed to the need to establish a system of priorities on the administration's plans for domestic nondefense spending for the balance of this fiscal year and the 1967 fiscal year starting July 1, 1966.

The fires of inflation are burning brightly. There is talk of a tax increase; higher interest rates; elimination of the investment credit for industry; business and labor have been warned to hold the line on prices and wages. We hear all of these possible remedies to curb inflation. But suggestions that the administration take a new look at the budget and curtail nonessential domestic spending and defer the start of certain new programs are ignored.

In examining this appropriations request, it becomes obvious that Congress will have to take a second look at the new spending programs, in the light of the cost of the Vietnam effort, and establish some system of priorities.

When this supplemental request came to Congress, it contained requests of $30 million to fund the rent supplement program and $13.2 million to finance the new National Teacher Corps. These were programs that the House considered and then rejected during the first session of this Congress.

However, the administration failed to request sufficient funds to provide 100 percent entitlements to over 300 school districts throughout the Nation who depend upon Public Law 874 assistance to help meet their budgetary needs. The Committee on Appropriations has included a $41 million item in this bill which will permit the Federal Government to honor its commitment to local school districts.

Years ago when this law was enacted it was the intent of Congress to assume responsibility in partnership with the local school district at any place where Federal activities have created an especially defined problem for the local community.

In Kansas, we have many school districts which annually plan their budgets on the basis of receiving Federal assistance for students who come to them for education solely because of Federal activities in their area.

These school districts were assured last year by the Office of Education that they would receive 100 percent entitlements during fiscal year 1966.

There were changes in the law made late in the last session and enrollment changes occurred which have caused the deficiency of $41 million.

The mail which I have received from Kansas school officials, and I know many of my colleagues in the House have received similar communications, forecast serious crises for many school districts unless these funds are provided. Long ago, school boards drew up and approved their 1965–66 school year budgets on the basis of receiving full entitlements under this law.

If Congress is to assume the responsibility for establishing priorities, then I believe we must support long-standing programs of education such as Public Law 874.

Mr. Chairman, following is a tabulation of the impacted school districts in the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas including the full entitlement for fiscal year 1966 under Public Law 874 along with the amount they would receive without this supplemental appropriation:

4th Congressional District of Kansas entitlements under Public Law 874 with and without supplemental appropriations for 1966 fiscal year

School district	Without supplemental	With supplemental
Derby	$563,189	$639,987
Community School District No. 127	90,754	103,130
Minneha No. 137	8,880	10,091
City of Wichita No. 1	1,699,047	1,930,735
Clearwater No. 133	12,786	14,530
Valley Center	24,381	27,706
Mount Hope No. 44	3,311	3,763
Maize No. 83	10,385	11,801
Haysville No. 187	154,568	175,646
Newton	21,522	24,457
Cheney No. 141	4,967	5,644
Sedgwick No. 10	4,816	5,473
Goddard No. 142	17,609	20,010
Halstead No. 52	2,409	2,737
Lindsborg	3,010	3,420
Burrton No. 50	1,806	2,052
Abilene	13,696	15,564
Herington	6,772	7,696
Dickinson County Community High Schools	6,618	7,521
Solomon No. 1	2,709	3,078
Viola	1,957	2,224
White City No. 27	4,545	5,131
Dwight	3,911	4,444
Seltzer	10,836	12,314
Joint Rural High School No. 4, McPherson	1,806	2,052
Cheney High School No. 190	2,709	3,078
Mammoth Cave	4,816	5,473
Council Grove No. 50	2,409	2,737
Rural High School No. 91, Sedgwick County	60,503	68,753
Dwight No. 4	1,957	2,224
Oatville No. 186	2,558	2,907
Florence	1,806	2,052
Marion	4,061	4,615
Total	2,757,079	3,133,045
State of Kansas	7,317,968	8,315,870

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Secretary

Rent Supplement Program

For rent supplements authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $100,000: *Provided*, That the maximum payments in any fiscal year for rent supplements required by all contracts which may be entered into under such section shall not exceed $12,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against lines 6 through 22 on page 4 of the pending legislation, and desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the language contained in lines 15 through 22 are a clear violation of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, wherein clause 2 states:

> No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

Lines 15 through 22 constitute an obvious violation of that which is commonly referred to as the Holman rule in that legislation proposed in an appropriation bill must indicate by its terms an unqualified reduction of expenditures to fall within the exception to the rule.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make a point of order that the gentleman is not addressing himself to the language against which he has raised a point of order.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

I think the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin included lines 6 to 24. I think the lines are from line 10 through 22. The gentleman from Wisconsin may have used the committee print at the time he drafted his point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, my point of order applies to the complete section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he understood the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin to apply to the language in that entire paragraph beginning on line 6 and running through line 22 on page 4.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I can assure my colleagues that I am directing my full attention to the language that appears in this bill on page 4, from line 9 through line 22.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the language in lines 15 through 22 would require the utmost of speculation for one to assume that any retrenchment whatsoever in expenditures would occur. On the contrary, the language might increase expenditures significantly in that under existing law there is no requirement for either a workable program or for local approval by a community desiring rent supplements. These workable programs require a great deal of administrative expenditure at the Federal level prior to their approval by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Because at the present time communities wishing to participate in rent subsidies are specifically exempted from the provisions of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 requiring workable programs, the language of the proviso would demand additional administrative costs by the Federal Government.

Second, the law is clear in stating that any contract for rent supplements would not be between Federal and local governments, but rather between the Federal Government and private builders and or private nonprofit, limited dividend, religious and philanthropic organizations. Any retrenchment in expenditures resulting from this language, therefore, would be purely speculative.

Third, lines 15 through 22 would require further speculation in order to arrive at the conclusion that fewer communities would participate under the rent subsidy program. There is no reason to believe that every single community in the United States would not willingly follow the requirements imposed by the proviso.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it would be purely speculative to assume that the full $12 million appropriated by this bill would not be used in its entirety by participating communities. The Committee on Appropriations has received testimony indicating that communities which have elected to participate, including those that already have a workable program, have submitted requests for rent subsidy projects far exceeding the $12 million contained in this bill.

The rules of the House demand that the reduction of an expenditure must appear as a certain and necessary measure and not as a probable or possible contingency.

Further, to come within the exception to the rule prohibiting legislation on an appropriation bill, it has been held on numerous occasions that it is not within the province of the Chair to speculate upon the contingencies which might or might not operate to retrench expenditures.

If, on the other hand, lines 15 through 22 be considered a limitation on an appropriation, rather than an exception to the rule prohibiting legislation on an appropriation, then it must be negative and in the nature of a veto. When it assumes affirmative form by direction to an executive in the discharge of his duties under existing law it ceases to be a limitation and becomes legislation.

The language says, "*Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program" or which is without local official approval. In short, no appropriations may be used for projects which are not—an obvious double negative construction resulting in a positive direction of officials administering the program. On May 29, 1924, the Chair held that an amendment proposing an affirmative direction through use of a double negative, though in the form of a limitation, was not in order on a general appropriation bill.

Moreover, it has been ruled on numerous occasions that a limitation upon an appropriation must not be accompanied by provisions requiring affirmative action by an executive in order to render the appropriation available.

In the matter before us, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would be required affirmatively to approve a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. Presently, section 101 of the Housing Act of 1965 authorizing a rent supplement program is exempt from the provisions of section 101(c) of the 1949 act, as amended, requiring a workable program by communities seeking to become eligible for certain other Federal aid housing programs. With passage of the bill before us, however, the Secretary would be required, by law, affirmatively to approve workable programs prior to permitting the expenditure of any of the appropriations contained in the bill before us. The bill sets forth new standards demanding affirmative action, not negative. To presume that the language contained herein would require that the Secretary first say "No" to each and every one of the thousands of communities without workable programs is too ridiculous to consider seriously. One does not veto a nonaction. Rather, one approves or disapproves an application meeting the requirements of the proviso, and there is nothing in that proviso that presupposes a veto on his part.

Instead, the proviso is directed in its entirety to the nebulous motives of communities that may or may not desire rent supplements. Nobody knows how many—if any—communities will fit that description and, therefore, be affected by the proviso. It could be many, it could be none. If none, the proviso does not constitute a limitation. Of course, he would await proper application by the local community desiring rent supplements, which community might or might not already have a workable program, and then the language before us would demand that he affirmatively approve that workable program as a prerequisite to further consideration for rent supplements where none previously existed.

On May 11, 1920, the Chair ruled in a similar situation:

> While consideration must be given to the form of the amendment proposed as a limitation for the purpose of determining whether it is in fact a limitation, still the question whether it is a limitation or not must in the last analysis be determined by whether it is negative upon the appropriation or an affirmative direction addressed to the discretion of the officer for whose department the appropriations are made. While the pending amendment is in the form of a limitation applying to the entire appropriation, it in fact undertakes to direct the discretion of the Secretary of Labor in a matter in which he now has full discretion.

The point of order was sustained.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that lines 15 through 22 do, indeed, undertake to direct the discretion of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in a matter in which he now has full discretion. This is not a matter of conjecture, it is a matter of record and law. Presently he has full discretion to approve rent supplement projects anywhere in the country; lines 15 through 22 undertake to direct his discretion by demanding a positive act of approval meeting the requirements set forth in the proviso.

It has been further held by the Chair on January 31, 1925, that while the House may by limitation deny an appropriation to recipients lacking certain qualifications, a professed limitation which by interdiction of certain qualifications restricts lawful executive action is not in order. Likewise, in the matter before us, the imposition of additional duties upon the part of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in approving or disapproving certain requirements of local communities not presently required by law constitutes legislation.

On January 14, 1929, the Chair held that a proposition to restrict administrative functions vested in an executive by law is legislation and is not in order as a limitation. Section 101(f) of Public Law 89-117 amends section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, by specifically removing from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development the burden of having to first approve a so-called workable program for community improvement prior to granting funds for rent supplements. The proviso therefore represents a restriction of administrative functions vested in an executive by prior law. In this regard the ruling of the Chair last October 14 was based upon a misleading contention by the gentleman from Ohio who made the point of order.

It was stated to the Chair that amendments were considered and rejected by the Committee on Banking and Currency that would have required workable programs prior to approval by the Secretary for rent supplements. This may or may not be true, but in so stating, my distinguished colleague may have left the impression that section 101 rent supplement applications merely were not required, rather than specifically exempted from the provisions of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. The gentleman should have stated that section 101(f) authorized the Secretary, in his discretion, to approve rent supplements, notwithstanding the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949. In fact, the Committee on Banking and Currency considered this matter and wrote it into the law. In short, on this point, the law of the land is not silent.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I contend that lines 6 through 22 on page 4 of the bill constitute neither a limitation on an appropriation nor a retrenchment of expenditures under the exceptions to the rule and should be held to be not in order.

This language will not affect expenditures to the extent of $1 and therefore is not clearly a limitation.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the entire language is negative and does not require any additional duties. Moreover, I would point out that the language in this bill is identical to the language that was in the bill last year, without any change, and this was ruled upon on October 14, 1965, at which time the point of order was overruled.

My friend has cited irrelevant cases in other departments, but I would cite him one, just on the point, with the specific, identical language which has already been ruled upon—and a precedent has been established.

Moreover, the language in the Urban Renewal and Housing Development Act of 1965, title I, places responsibility on the Committee on Appropriations, stating as to the aggregate amount of contracts to be made, that payments shall not exceed the amounts approved by the appropriation acts. So a duty is placed on the Appropriations Committee. This matter has been ruled upon, and ruled upon before, and I ask that the point of order be not sustained.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order on line 12, which reads "in any fiscal year." Is it in order to make that point now, or should it be made at the conclusion of the Chair's ruling?

The CHAIRMAN. It can be made now. The Chair will rule on both points of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on line 12, page 12, to the words "any fiscal year," on the grounds that it is legislation on an appropriation bill which binds the appropriations for all future times.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the language in this section is the same as in the bill last year. The only difference is the amount of money. The language is identical.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the point of order I made, while it is true, as the chairman of the subcommittee said, that the point of order to all the language was overruled, I do not think a point of order was made to the language that I have brought forward, and I believe it is a different point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I accept the inclusion of the point of order by the gentleman from Illinois, and under the terms of Hinds' Precedents, my point of order is raised against the entire section and I would include the point made by the gentleman from Illinois against the entire section.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). The Chair will pass on both points of order at this moment, and the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the decision of the Chair on H.R. 11588, a bill providing for supplemental appropriations, on the 14th of October 1965, did include language identical to that subject to the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin and identical to that subject to the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois. At that time both points of order were ruled upon by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, Mr. Harris, of Arkansas. He ruled that the proviso constituted a limitation negative in nature that did not impose additional duties upon the administration and overruled the point of order on both points.

The Chair, on the basis of the ruling of the Chairman on the 14th of October 1965, referred to, overrules the point of order of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 4, strike out lines 6 through 22, inclusive.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I doubt that I shall take the 5 minutes allotted to me on this, because it has been discussed quite at length, but I would assume there are many others who will want to discuss the question of the rent subsidy bill. I think we should consider this for exactly what it is.

Now, let us stop talking about $12 million. This is not $12 million. It is, in fact, $480 million, because the subsidy runs for a 40-year period. But if the current authorization is funded, we will reach $150 million by the fourth year, which will result in a $6 billion program over the 40-year period. So what we are starting in this supplemental bill today is a new program of $6 billion and at a time when we are on the eve of inflation and faced with a fiscal situation of not knowing exactly what is going to be needed for requirements in Vietnam. It would seem to me this is a good time to vote this program down and not fund it and get it underway. Until we find out what is going to happen in the funding of Vietnam or whether we are going to have continued increases in the cost of living, we should not fund this. With the increase in the cost of living shown today we will have an increase of probably 6 percent in a year. How many of these new programs are we going to embark on which are constantly eroding the fiscal situation in our country today?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get the gentleman's interpretation of the words to which I made a point of order in view of the fact that he has called this a multibillion-dollar program. These are the words that appear on line 12 of page 4, "in any fiscal year."

I understand that language seeks to bind for the foreseeable future, in using the words "in any fiscal year" the program to a limitation of $12 million. How then does the gentleman make a multibillion-dollar program out of it?

Mr. BOW. The gentleman knows very well that next year this can be changed. This reminds me of what we are talking about here today and how everybody is so happy about the regulations today. They have made some changes in the regulations. Last year we defeated this because of the regulations. Now everybody is happy and my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY], and others are happy because the regulations have been changed. I do not know whether they are not going to be changed tomorrow morning after we fund it back to what we had last year.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Even if the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], had been sustained and the words "in any fiscal year" had been stricken, it would still have had $12 million in contract authorizations per year for 40 years, which makes $480 million.

Mr. BOW. That is the point I made originally. It was $480 million.

Now I wish to yield to my delightful friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding. May I remind my colleagues that we are not talking about regulations only but are writing these standards into the law. So the regulations which you suggest may be changed will not be changed next year. I suggest that the thing to do is defeat the gentleman's amendment and these regulations, limitations, and standards will be written into the law.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In reply to my statement, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] said that even at the rate of $12 million this totals up to a program of $480 million. As I understood the gentleman's original statement, he pointed to a program of $6 billion.

Mr. BOW. No. If the gentleman was listening carefully—and I am sure he does at times——

Mr. YATES. I always listen attentively to the gentleman's words.

Mr. BOW. I am afraid he was not, because the first thing I said was we should stop talking about a $12 million program, for it is, in fact, a $480 million program, since it is a program for 40 years. Then I said if the current authorization is funded, we will reach $150 million in the fourth year, which results in a $6 billion program over 40 years. I am sure I cleared it up in the gentleman's mind. Now let us give some of our other colleagues an opportunity.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today one of the most important pieces of domestic legislation which will be enacted by this Congress this year. The dollar amount involved is relatively small, but the principle it represents is fundamentally important. Our vote today will decide whether or not we will make a reality of our long-sought goal of enlisting private initiative to the fullest extent in our efforts to provide decent housing for low-income families.

And that is exactly what the rent supplement program is all about.

Last year the Congress authorized the rent supplement program to enable private nonprofit and limited dividend corporations and cooperatives to sponsor housing projects for low-income families with the Government making up the difference between what these families could afford to pay out of their meager incomes and the regular economic rent. This housing will be privately sponsored, privately financed and privately owned. The housing must be of modest design and the cost limitations announced by the Department are actually lower than those for regular public housing.

The families who live in them will be those with incomes no higher than public housing limits and the Department has announced very conservative limitations for family assets. For families generally, no more than $2,000 in assets will be allowed while for the elderly, in recognition of their special needs, the limitation will be $5,000. This is well below the asset limitation generally applied in regular public housing. In addition, only those who are elderly or handicapped, displaced by government action, now living in substandard housing, or who are the victims of a natural disaster will be eligible. Certainly no one questions the fact that these families need aid. In fact, every family eligible for rent supplement would be eligible for public housing in any case, but what we are doing with this program is enabling private sponsors to offer their services.

It is clear from this that the rent supplement program is even more conservative than the existing public housing program. Not only must families be within the public housing range but the limitation on assets which a family can have and still be eligible will be generally more restrictive than now imposed under public housing. In addition, only those low-income families who fall into one or more of the five categories I have just mentioned will be eligible. This will assure that the program will meet the most urgent housing problems facing us. For example, we are all familiar with the serious housing problem facing so many of our senior citizens. Their incomes in general are very low and their housing needs are also special. All too few dwelling units are now available that take into account their present and potential physical needs as well as their need for a congenial environment.

In 1959 we made an important forward step toward meeting this problem by the enactment of the senior citizens housing loan program which provides for 3 percent financing for this kind of housing. However, it is clear that something more is needed, particularly for senior citizens of lowest income whose only alternative now is public housing or slum housing. The flexibility in establishing rents under the rent supplement program will enable us to take care of a much wider range of our senior citizens so that they can live their lives in relative comfort. Already over 400 applications from nonprofit groups and cooperatives have applied for these loans representing churches, unions, civic groups, fraternal organizations, and the like. These are the kinds of groups who are ready, willing and able to make the benefit of rent supplements available to the elderly.

Much the same problem confronts victims of physical handicaps who need some special consideration in the design and location of their housing and whose incomes are limited as a result of their misfortune. Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], who is a member of the Housing Subcommittee led the fight to give recognition to the problems of the handicapped in our existing programs and I am sure he will agree that the rent supplement program would be a most important further step in meeting their needs.

The next category of eligible families—those displaced by urban renewal or other federally aided construction—is one which holds a high claim for help in meeting their housing needs. I was most pleased to support the amendment offered by the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], which was included in last year's act to give equitable treatment to displacees. However, to fully live up to that commitment I feel we should make every effort to assure that decent housing is available to these people at rents which they can afford and the rent supplement program will do just that.

Another group who would be eligible for rent supplements are those low income families who are now living in slum housing. It is true that these families would be eligible for regular public housing but we all know that there simply is not enough public housing to meet this need and that there are some 800,000 families in this, the richest country the world has ever known, who are on waiting lists to get into public housing. There are also many more who are discouraged from ever applying because the lists are so long and there are those who for one reason or another do not want to live in public housing. Many of these families are now paying exorbitant rents for delapidated, overcrowded, rat-infested slum housing because they have no other choice. We can never eliminate slums unless we provide additional housing within the means of these families so that they can share in the dream of America and have clean and decent homes and neighborhoods in which to live and raise their children.

Finally, those whose homes have been destroyed by a natural disaster would be eligible for rent supplements. Those who have seen the devastation brought by floods or hurricanes such as the destructive storm which swept Louisiana last fall know the plight of these people whose homes are gone with everything in them. Many of these families find themselves destitute and often deeply in debt. For these stricken families who fall within the income and asset limitations, rent supplement housing can be a godsend to help them get back on their feet.

When the appropriation request came before the House last fall, there was some criticism of the tentative regulations then available and the Congress directed that further study be made by the Department and funds were appropriated for that purpose. That study has been made and the new regulations, I believe, meet every objection that was voiced at that time. The income ceilings have been nailed down at the public housing limits or even lower, the asset limitations have been cut to public housing limits or even lower—not more than $2,000 generally and no more than $5,000 in the case of the elderly—and the construction cost ceiling has been set below public housing limits. Certainly, these changes fully answer the main points that bothered some Members last year.

The rent supplement program has unusually broad support. When the bill first came up for a vote last year, it was endorsed by unions, senior citizens groups, churches, civic groups and others including the National Association of Home Builders, which ranked it very high on its list of priorities.

Now we have important support from a new quarter. The National Association of Real Estate Boards which opposed the bill last year, has reexamined its position and now wholeheartedly endorses the program. I feel that this is particularly commendable and it is a measure of the real stature of that organization that it is willing to reexamine its position and is not afraid to change its mind if it feels the facts justify a change. With this kind of support I do not see how the House could fail to approve the modest appropriation before us today.

Personally, I regret that only $12 million was recommended and I had hoped that the committee would see fit to make the full $30 million authorization available. However, the important thing is to get this program underway. I am confident it will prove its value and continue to gain support as time goes on. I also regret that the committee has attached a rider which imposes an unnecessary administrative burden. Again, however, it is important to make a start as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support the appropriations for the rent supplement program.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman's position—he would like to have more money appropriated. There are others who would like to cut it all out. But the gentleman's position is that he is supporting the Committee on Appropriations; is that correct?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes, that is correct. Certainly I am greatly concerned about the appropriation being cut down to $12 million. I was hoping that we could get $30 million. However, the Committee on Appropriations has worked its will, and I believe this House should support the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman made a very important point when he said that the benefits of this act would not be available to all people of low income. As a matter of fact, there are restricted classes who would be able to benefit from this program; is that not correct? And are not the classes those who are displaced by governmental action; second, people who are elderly; third, the physically handicapped; fourth, those who live in substandard housing; fifth, those who occupy or did occupy housing which is destroyed or extensively damaged by a natural disaster?

Are those not the classes of people who are the only ones to qualify—the only classes of people of low income who would qualify for the benefits of this program?

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted it would really strike at the small margin which is aimed at the start of promising efforts to provide decent housing for our most underprivileged citizens, and to provide medical benefits for the elderly as well as to provide educational benefits, where most urgently needed, in urban and rural areas.

Mr. Chairman, those who vote for this amendment forgot to realize just what this amendment constitutes and what the results will be. It will hit the most deserving people among the American community.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman from Massachusetts is right. May I add this: It was stated here earlier that public housing makes it unnecessary to fund this program to house the people who are in dire need for decent, safe, and sanitary housing. The gentleman failed to tell the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union here today that the Public Housing Authority over the last 30 years—three decades— has been able to build only 718,000 units. Today, we have a backlog of 500,000 waiting now to enter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARBSTEIN

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARBSTEIN: On page 4, line 14, strike out "$12,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000,000".

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York since the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is pending.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is a perfecting amendment to the paragraph, which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio would completely strike out. Since the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is a perfecting amendment, it is in order.

The gentleman from New York is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate and it occurs to me that if the law were amended to read $30 million over a period of 40 years, it would total $1,200 million. Now what is so terrible about $1,200 million being spent over 40 years to enable the poor and the underprivileged to live in decent housing?

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the gentleman the Department is asking for $35 million for the 1967 fiscal year in the regular budget, which we are taking up this very week. The subcommittee thought that $12 million for the balance of the 1966 fiscal year in a supplemental appropriation was not unreasonable. In other words, the Department feels it can only contract for and obligate $35 million in fiscal year 1967 so it did not make sense to us to give $30 million in a supplemental budget for the fiscal year 1966.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I must say it makes sense to me.

Mr. GIAIMO. It would make sense if they could use that much money and obligate it. But we cannot just shove money at them which they cannot properly obligate and make contracts with.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Well, let the housing authority worry about that.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. Is it not better and is it not more beneficial to those who need decent, safe, and sanitary housing to get this program moving? I would want $30 million but the committee has worked its will and the committee has decided that $12 million will be given for this period of time in the fiscal year on this program. So why not take the $12 million and follow the wishes of the committee and cooperate with the committee.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I am satisfied to take the $12 million if I cannot get the $30 million. But first I want to try to get the $30 million and I want to give the Members of the House the opportunity to express their views on that and to let the House work its will on the question of whether they want the $30 million or the $12 million.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to increase the appropriation for rent supplements from $12 to $30 million, which the President originally requested.

I have listened to the debate this afternoon and am convinced now more than ever that the supplemental rent program is needed, but in the amount of $30 million.

If we can spend $4 billion for a farm program, why not $30 million for this program?

In the large cities we have an admitted housing shortage and cannot obtain sufficient funds for low-cost public housing. Then why not permit church groups, labor groups, cooperatives, and limited-dividend housing groups to build for low-income people—for the underprivileged.

Private housing is constantly being demolished for roads and other public purposes. Yet no adequate replacements are built. What is to happen to these displaced families? I contend that not alone is $12 million a mere pittance, but that even the $30 million called for by my substitute amendment is inadequate. At least it will be a halfway decent start.

Rent supplements will also allow low-income tenants to live among middle-income people in better homes. We hope it will give them the incentive to pull themselves up by their bootstraps. They will be able to upgrade their living habits. When their income increases and they are no longer eligible for low-income apartments, families will not be dispossessed, but will be given the opportunity to live in the same apartments without a subsidy.

Despite the cost limitations which will be placed upon the construction of rent supplement housing, it can be built and be helpful in the large cities in the country. We have State laws which permit municipalities to allow tax abatement for housing available to people of limited income. We also have many urban renewal sites that can be utilized for such housing. Both of these factors will be helpful in building nonprofit limited-dividend or cooperative housing under the rent supplement program in New York City. Certainly, it will be possible to build many of the efficiency and one-bedroom units that will be required for elderly people now living in substandard housing.

Another large potential for rent supplement program activity in New York City lies in the rehabilitation of thousands of older tenements. Many of these structures which have been in existence for 50 or 60 years can remain standing another 50 or 60 years, but they need a great deal of modernization. They need new plumbing facilities; they need new ventilation; they need redesigning of interiors. With all of this required work, these older structures will still be able to produce housing at relatively low costs. Substantial rehabilitation projects of this type could be carried out under the rent supplement program.

Such a plan would alleviate the search for available land sites—a problem which has plagued many would-be public housing and moderate-income housing projects in New York City. We could utilize the existing sound structures but make them more livable, and with rent supplements make them available to the low-income people who cannot otherwise obtain standard housing. I hope the amendment prevails.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday my wonderful friend and our beloved Speaker chided me and those of us on our side of the aisle because he felt that we lacked vision. The Speaker made this allegation inasmuch as we on our side of the aisle were nearly unanimously going to oppose the rent supplemental program in this bill today.

Naturally, I disagree with the distinguished Speaker in his allegation. I respond by saying that it seems to me the vision of my Democratic friends, or a substantial number of them today, is blurred a bit by some unwarranted rose-colored glasses. May I add, on this particular issue I think they are looking a little cross-eyed.

We on our side are looking at the cold, hard realities of the merits or the lack of them, and are looking at a drastic change in circumstances between last October and today, both fiscally speaking and from the point of view of inflation.

Some very strange things are going on in the Nation's Capital today. I have in my hand here a statement from the UPI to the effect that President Johnson is trying to cool off the business investment boom, that the White House would be pleased if businessmen go slow in investment at this time.

As we all know, a few weeks ago the Secretary of Defense arbitrarily withheld funds for the construction of 8,500 military housing units. I am told that the President has been conversing with State and local authorities urging those governmental units to hold back their spending and to limit their programs of one sort or another.

It is paradoxical, I think, at the same time to have the White House assistants, headed by Lawrence O'Brien, former administration lobbyist and now Postmaster General, weaving in and out of the various House Office Buildings urging Democrats to stick with President Johnson's request for funds for the rent supplement program. I am confused with the administration wanting business, the military, and State and local agencies to cut back on their spending and, on the other hand, the President urges the Congress to authorize at least a $480 million rent subsidy program here this afternoon.

Then I had called to my attention just a few moments ago a statement from the ticker which reads as follows:

> President Johnson indicated today he may ask Congress to increase taxes by $5 billion more or less perhaps as early as next month if prices increase.

Let me say this. This amendment and the debate today has put the spotlight on the problem of inflation, on taxes, in addition to the basic issue of whether this whole rent subsidy program has merit or not.

First, let me say a word or two about the rent subsidy program itself. Congress in the last session did approve the authorization bill for rent subsidies by a narrow margin of 4 votes in the House. Later the funds were disallowed on a rollcall vote. The principal reason for the adverse attitude of the Congress, for the narrow vote on the authorization and the subsequent defeat of the funds, was the unrealistic ceilings on income and on outside assets.

The original proposal from the White House, what really is in the heart of the people who propose it, was an income limitation of $11,000 and outside assets of approximately $25,000. They finally retreated from that and went back to a figure of $8,000-plus for an income limitation and $24,000 in outside assets.

Now we are told these limitations will be imposed by executive action. Is this sufficient assurance for a program of this magnitude?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have no faith, none whatesoever, in these proposed or existing regulations. May I make a point? I fail to understand why Congress has so much faith in nonexistent regulations that supposedly insure that this program will benefit truly low-income families.

In 1961 we were told the very same thing about the below market interest rate program, the so-called section 221(d)(3) housing program. On this very floor, we were assured that this program would replace public housing. We were assured that if only the Congress would trust the people in the housing agency, regulations would be so written and so enforced.

Today, 5 years and several hundred million dollars later, the regulations governing this program make a mockery of these promises. In New York, a family with three children can earn $9,450 and still qualify for this indirect subsidy of approximately $30 per month.

What I am saying is, when you approve this program today—if we do, and I hope we do not—in effect we are giving contract authorization for 40 years, committing Congresses up to the year 2006 at a figure of at least $12 million per year. I do not think the Congress today should take such action.

But let me say a word about the problem of those who voted for the authorization or the appropriations in 1965. The circumstances today in two areas have changed dramatically and would fully justify anybody who voted for the authorization or for the appropriation last year to change his position.

The President directly and otherwise has conceded that this country today is in the throws of swirling inflation. The President in his economic message has said that inflation is the most unjust and capricious form of taxation.

What are the facts concerning inflation? About 10 days ago the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that we had a 0.7-percent increase in the wholesale price index in the month of February, the biggest jump in 12 years. If you annualize this 0.7-percent increase, the total increase in the wholesale price index in a 12-month period will be over 6 percent. Furthermore, this morning, the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that in the month of February we had a 0.5-percent increase in the cost of living. If you annualize this, it is a 6-percent increase in a 12-month period. And we have had a 1.5-percent increase in the cost of living since last October.

To conclude, let me say this on this point: The United States today is in the midst of wartime inflation. We are suffering a wartime increase in the cost of living. In this crisis, the Congress has a responsibility to cut back and hold the line of domestic spending. Those who do vote for rent supplements are in effect voting for a tax increase, which the President says he will send to us within the next month. Those who vote for rent subsidies today are voting for added inflation across the board.

One more point on the budget: In October of last year, it was anticipated that we were to have a budget deficit for fiscal year 1966 of $5,300 million. The January forecast was a deficit this fiscal year of $6.4 billion. We really know that deficit will be close to $8 billion on June 30.

If we take the President's budget for fiscal year 1967, and if we take his supplementals for fiscal year 1966, in effect we are voting for higher prices, higher taxes, higher deficits, higher costs. The Great Society will be the High Society.

We will have to meet that challenge in the political arena in 1966.

You will have to meet that challenge in the political arena in 1966.

Mr. Chairman, on the merits, because of inflation, because of taxes, because of the deteriorating fiscal situation, we must approve the Bow amendment to strike rent subsidies from this bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat chagrined at the appellation my distinguished friend used in describing those of us on this side of the aisle. He said we are cross eyed. But I think an examination of the record will disclose that most of my friends on the other side have been blind for 35 years. They have only elected two Congresses in all that time. They have been blind in their opposition to progressive legislation; blind in their concern for human beings; blind to the significance of the era in which we live.

I think this proposal for a modest amount for rent supplements is a very significant and important part of this appropriation bill though not particularly significant in size. I think my friends on the other side just refuse to change. Every time the Democrats in Congress try to do something for the American people they oppose. They have been opposing year in and year out. It used to be the depression. We could not afford it, they said. Then it was something else. Then it was the Korean war. Now it is the Vietnamese war. Then it is inflation. In the 1912 campaign Woodrow Wilson said that the Republican Party had not learned a thing in 40 years. That was 54 years ago, making 94 years in all.

I think we are just as opposed to inflation as anyone else, but we do not run for cover every time the word is mentioned. Last month our friends were talking about guns or butter. Do I see my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. LAIRD], here? He changed that, after the speaker had taken him on, to rifles or ruffles.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. LAIRD. I did not develop this guns or butter issue and never referred to it as such—this our distinguished speaker knows full well.

It was developed as far back as the time of the Civil War that this descriptive slogan was used. But, representing a district in the Congress which produces more milk and cheese than any other district, I would rather use other terms. However, the administration has now taken the butter away from our serviceman and is now using substitutes not only for butter but for many other items in the conduct of the war and in the outfitting of our troops.

Mr. ALBERT. I did not accuse the gentleman of originating that idea. He joined the Speaker in abandoning it. I think the gentleman will find himself now, if he adopts the slogan of rifles or ruffles, to be taking on the women of the country or the garment manufacturers of the country or both. I am sure my Republican friend would not want to do that.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. As one from a consumer State which produces very little milk and butter, although of the highest possible quality, I might point out that margarine has great benefits, especially if one worries about cholesterol. They should start taking some of the fat out of their talk and some of the fat out of their butter, and then they might do better.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the rent supplement program which we are considering today will give new vitality to our efforts to provide decent housing for the poor. There is a need for this legislation. There are some 500,000 names on waiting lists for public housing throughout the country. There are another 4.5 million people whose low incomes keep them out of standard, decent housing, which I think is the goal of each of us. Last year we enacted legislation to authorize a rent supplement program. Unless we appropriate funds to make this program workable, the entire concept of a decent home for American families becomes a shallow promise. We can shut our eyes if we choose to do so.

But, Mr. Chairman, this state of life without hope is a real thing in too many American cities. And it is a dangerous thing in every American city in which it exists.

It contributed to the rioting in Watts, and it can explode into rioting and civil disorder in many great cities in the land.

We must act positively to eliminate one of the basic causes of unrest by helping our poverty-stricken families get better and more decent housing.

Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about it, we are talking about poor people. This program is restricted to families whose income would make them eligible for public housing, and it is limited to five specific categories. In addition to that—and may I say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], who has looked upon this as so much window dressing—what we have said about this today is a part of the legislative history of this appropriation act. This is, in a sense, a directive to the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. And may I say that when the Department comes back next year this Congress will still control the funding and this Congress will have the last look in any case.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Michigan, but I must go on.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman concedes, of course, that these limits are not a matter of law; they can be changed tomorrow, they can be changed next week. I am sure the gentleman would also admit that agencies of the Federal Government over the years on many occasions have totally disregarded directives from the Congress. They have totally disregarded legislative history that we have made on the floor of the House. So I have no faith in their decisions.

Mr. ALBERT. I can say to the gentleman that this is a part of the legislative history.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that Congress will have the last word when it considers the regular appropriation bill, within the next few months, and when it considers additional appropriations hereafter.

The program is geared to private enterprise, and will at last allow the private sector of the economy to attack the problem of providing homes for low-income families.

Funds to finance the projects will come from regular private mortgage markets. The projects will be built by private builders. Mortgages will be insured by the Federal Housing Administration at a market rate of interest and the only Federal funds involved will be for the supplement itself. The rent supplement itself will in time, we hope, take the place of the supplement which the Federal Government is furnishing to those who occupy public housing units.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the able gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT], circulated a letter yesterday in which he attached an article from Reader's Digest which purports to deal with FHA procedures and practices. I have read the article. In my opinion it is without perspective, and we would be without vision if we were to follow the Lorelei call away from a program that would help our poor.

Mr. Chairman, through the Federal Housing Administration we have become a nation of homeowners. More than 1 million units of rental housing have been produced. The agency's total volume is over $100 billion, and the agency has been a moneymaking agency for the Federal Government. While I do not condone impropriety or malpractice, I believe that articles such as this should be considered against the total activity of this agency. The question we have before us is whether or not we will help the poor people of our country and if we want to offer private enterprise an opportunity to do the job. If the Republicans fear inflation, why do they not jump on larger programs in this bill instead of this modest appropriation for the poorest people in our land?

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this only for the purpose of asking my good friend, the majority leader, a question. The gentleman a moment ago mentioned that the Republicans were constantly referring to inflation.

Mr. ALBERT. Referring to what?

Mr. ARENDS. Referring to inflation—using the word "inflation" too much—that Republicans were constantly using the word "inflation."

Mr. ALBERT. That is not the only cliché that the Republicans use, and that is the way the word is being used by them today, in my opinion.

Mr. ARENDS. I just want to state to the gentleman that what prompts me to take the floor at this particular moment is what recently took place before the Armed Services Committee and on this matter I would ask the gentleman's attention.

When Mr. Vance, Assistant Secretary of Defense, stated before our committee that he had determined along with Secretary of Defense McNamara, that there should not now be any additional military housing provided in this country—because of what?—because of inflation pressures. Those were his words—not my words. If we are going to deny servicemen housing because of inflation pressures we had better take a good look now at what is being proposed to be done in the legislation presently under consideration.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. You do not have to quote Mr. Vance All you have to do is to go back to December and recall what Mr. McNamara said as the reason for deferring the construction of the 8,500 units of military family housing. He took the responsibility—a Cabinet officer—of freezing the money that we appropriated last year to build 8,500 houses for the families of servicemen at military installations in the United States. He stated the reason he was doing that was not because the housing was not needed—oh, no—it was because of the increased requirement for additional spending to finance the war in Vietnam. He said, in effect, that the time had come to do without some things that we can postpone while we have this increased obligation to finance the war in Vietnam. I have heard people here today say that those who would receive rent subsidies should not be the only ones to make sacrifices. I would say that the servicemen and their families should not be the only ones called upon to make sacrifices. If we can do without the military family housing that was justified before our committee last year as being absolutely necessary to keep these military families from living in substandard housing—if we can do without that in the interest of providing funds to take care of the war in Vietnam and curb inflation, I think we can postpone this program also.

Mr. ARENDS. I will simply say to the gentleman from North Carolina that he is absolutely correct in what he has said. Not only has Congress authorized but we have likewise appropriated money for military housing and it has come to a dead stop because Secretary Vance is the man who stated before our committee that he in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, without regard to the budget and without reference to the administration, had determined on their own, had reached their own conclusion that there should be no military housing in this country because of inflationary pressures.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I yielded to several other Members and did not get time to discuss the question of inflation and the consumer price index, which matter was raised by my distinguished friend, the minority leader.

Mr. Chairman, the one-half percent rise in the Consumer Price Index for February, announced today, has led some to conclude that inflation is already here, and that something must be done about it right now.

I have no wish to minimize either the dangers of inflation or its evils. Nor would I dispute for a moment the need for our national economic policies to be adjusted promptly to whatever extent would be required to prevent a new inflationary spiral from getting started. We have had enough experience with inflation to want no part of it. But we must not jump to conclusions without weighing the evidence.

The Consumer Price Index reflects the average impact of price changes on the average family. But the month-to-month movements of that index do not furnish a reliable indicator of the pressure on prices. In December the index rose appreciably; in January it did not move at all. Did anyone conclude last month when the January index appeared that the danger of inflation had disappeared? There is no more reason to use the rise in February to conclude that inflation has suddenly arrived.

The February increase in consumer prices was almost entirely due to increases in prices of food and services. Service prices have been rising for a long time—largely because productivity does not grow very rapidly in some major kinds of services, and because we cannot fully and truly measure the improved quality of such services as medical care. Whatever the cause, the February increase in service prices is nothing new. And it has little to do with general economic conditions or the proper direction of economic policy.

Food prices rose 1.5 percent from January to February, accounting for about three-fourths of the total increase. Neither can we judge the state of the economy from that change.

The rise in food prices in the past few months mainly reflects temporary changes in the supply of farm products—particularly a reduced supply of pork, which also has affected prices of beef and poultry. Does anyone contend that this Nation does not have adequate power to produce—at stable costs and prices—all the food we can use, and to have enough left over to ease the burdens of hunger around the world?

Moreover, the February index reflects a situation which has already changed distinctly for the better. Prices for food on the farm have already begun to ease off. Since mid-February, hog prices have declined 13 percent, butter prices have receded from their peak, and many other food prices already have or are now expected to level off or decline. None of these events is reflected in the February index. It will take a month or two before they are fully reflected. But we should not let ourselves be panicked by statistics which do not reflect the current situation. The February index is past history.

Far more significant than prices of services or food, as an indicator of the pressure on prices in our economy, is what is happening to nonfood commodity prices. They rose exactly 0.1 percent in February.

That increase, at the rate of 1.2 percent a year, is only a little faster than the 0.9 percent increase of 1964—when no one was talking about inflation.

There is more pressure on prices in 1966 than in earlier years. That is only to be expected when output is increasing rapidly. To have achieved an unemployment rate of 3.7 percent with so small an increase in the basic level of costs and prices is a remarkable feat. It shows how much latent productive power our economy possessed. It shows that those who make price and wage decisions are taking their responsibility for the national interest seriously. And it also reflects the efforts of the President and his administration to remove bottlenecks in supplies of materials and manpower.

Now that we have finally achieved a high level of employment and of capacity utilization, we must proceed with care not to overtax our economy. We must watch every aspect of the economy to judge whether the balance between supply and demand has been upset. But the Consumer Price Index is only one of many indicators—and it does not give reliable signals for action. We must wait until the returns are all in before we judge whether more restraint is needed.

And in reaching that judgment we must be conscious of the forces of restraint that have already been set in motion. Last December's tightening of monetary policy is only now beginning to work its way through our economic system. The $6 billion payroll tax increase effective last January will make its effects felt with some lag. And the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 is yet to come into effect.

If further restraint is necessary, I for one will support it. But what happened to food prices in February is of little use at the end of March in deciding whether we need restraint now.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am certain that the argument we are hearing here this afternoon will be heard for the rest of this session. As a matter of fact, I am informed that another amendment will be offered when the pending amendment is disposed of. I hope the pending amendment will be voted down. Another amendment, I understand, will be offered to strike the provision in this bill which provides for the Teacher Corps.

Mr. Chairman, the argument here is whether or not this country, the greatest Nation on earth, must now turn back—must now limit all of its activities at home that involve our people in so many aspects of their daily lives—whether we must, as I say, now turn back and limit our efforts along these lines because of the commitments we have to defend freedom elsewhere in this world.

That is what the argument is about.

Our friends here in the Republican Party are not really being inconsistent, as the distinguished majority leader pointed out a moment ago. For one reason or another during the past generation or two they have managed to find an excuse for opposing most of the constructive and progressive legislation proposed since the turn of the century.

The record, of course, speaks for itself. I can cite them one after another: Social security back in 1935. I do not know how many Republian votes there were for social security, perhaps 10. It has been that way throughout the years.

What are the issues as we see them on our side of the aisle? A party which has sought to respond to the needs of our people at home and to the challenges of our country abroad.

No. 1, we reject the notion that we live in a static society. The Republican notion seems to be is that everything must remain the same for now. We know that we have to move ahead. We have to move forward. Can we afford to move ahead now and still maintain our commitments abroad?

Let us look at the base from which we operate. Back in 1941, when we entered World War II, we had a gross national product of a little over $100 billion. We had inherited a depression from the great Republican administration that preceded Franklin Roosevelt. It took us a long time to get back production in our country. We had 14 percent of our people unemployed for many years. We had a depression, a recession, despondency, and the loss of hope all over our Nation.

But we fought a war with a base of of about one-seventh of what we have now.

In 1950, when we went into Korea, we had a gross national product of a little more than $200 billion. Now with our commitment in Vietnam we have a gross national product approaching $725 billion.

Vietnam, under present estimates, requires about 2 percent of that gross national product, compared to a much larger percentage in 1950 and a much, much larger percentage in 1941, and the early 1940's and, of course, a much greater percentage back in 1918.

So what we are debating here is whether or not, with this kind of national wealth, we can afford to continue in a modest fashion with some programs that my good friends over here have opposed all along. They are being consistent. I am not being critical.

But I maintain, members of the Committee, that we cannot afford to do otherwise. The distinguished majority leader gave you some figures as of today, just a moment ago. They will be elaborated upon in the record as it is built here this afternoon. The Democratic members of the Joint Economic Committee dealt with these matters in detail in the report just filed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. The cost of food, the biggest item in the budget of the average family in our country today, is less, percentagewise, than it has ever been. It is about 18 percent of what the average family earns. This is less than it has ever been in the United States, and it is by far the least of any nation on God's green earth. Nevertheless, we are still concerned about the cost of food and every effort is being made to prevent increases.

Let us look at some of the other factors. Would we curb inflation if we cut back on this modest program, if we did not adopt this program, if we did not adopt the Teachers Corps? Would eliminating this $12 million stop inflation? Or would it not send forth the message that we had put the brakes on developing our own society at home because we did not have faith in our capacity and in our people?

We talk about our men in Vietnam. Are we say to those who come from the poorer families, "No, we shan't do anything for your folks back home. Let them live in the slums. Let them remain there while you fight in Vietnam."

Do we say to the young men who need education, "No, we must hole up. We cannot appropriate funds now for education because we are committed in Vietnam"?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I have just a minute, but I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I just wonder how the men in Vietnam feel when their families are not housed at home, and how we justify this affluent society.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman makes a very good point. That is exactly the point I am making here. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Now, let me go ahead.

We are growing, whether we like it or not, at a rate of about 4 million a year—4 million new Americans. That is about the population in my State. It is more than the population of many States in this Union.

We cannot be a static society. We have to face up to these problems. We cannot fall for the argument now being advanced by people who have traditionally, historically, consistently opposed constructive programs now that they find a more convenient weapon, a more convenient slogan to tie their time-honored opposition to.

I appeal to my Democratic friends who believe in this country to support these programs.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the distinguished majority leader talk to us about the problems of the poor, the infirm, the disabled, the retired, and how these 18,000 units that we are discussing here today have a major effect upon the poor, the infirm, the disabled, and the retired.

This question of inflation, he says, is a cliche, but what he fails to mention is that this "cliche" has a very real effect on millions of Americans from one end of this country to the other. It has an effect because it comes close to their homes and their food and their rent and everything they do.

We have before us the President's budget for 1967. In the revenue estimate in this budget, it is clear the President himself anticipates a cost of living increase of 3 percent. Most of the top economists in this country think that these revenue estimates, which are based upon a cost of living increase of 3 percent during fiscal year 1967, have been overestimated.

What happened today? Another one-half of 1 percent increase in the cost of living has been announced. You know what has happened in each of the weeks since January: one-tenth of 1 percent increase in the wholesale price index every week during January; almost two-tenths of 1 percent each week during the month of February. The wholesale price index is moving at a more rapid rate than it has at any time during the last 9 years.

Yes, inflation is the same as the levy of a national sales tax on every single individual in America. The national sales tax levied, because of the fiscal, monetary and other policies of our Federal Government in the last 12 months, has amounted to some 2½ percent, and it will be more than 3 percent in fiscal year 1967, making a total assured national sales tax of over 5.5 percent during the term of this 89th Congress alone.

Mr. Chairman, there are many programs in the domestic budget of the President that are desirable. But are they necessary at this time? The distinguished majority leader wondered why we take this one program in this one amendment today. Under the parliamentary procedure that we face here in the House of Representatives, it is necessary for us to take these items one by one.

I can assure the majority leader that there will be other amendments considered during this session of Congress in an effort to dramatize this spending issue.

We are going to be faced with a tax bill in the latter part of this session. All we have to do is look at the wire service reports today, and those who are serving on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee know full well, from the classified testimony before that committee, that the defense estimates for 1967 are not realistic as far as expenditures are concerned. They know full well that the Defense Department's manpower ceiling, as far as the Department of the Army is concerned, was outdated 2 days after the budget was submitted to this Congress. They know that when that manpower ceiling was lifted for the Department of the Army, it meant an additional billion dollars, at least, in that one appropriation item alone.

We on this side of the aisle ask why is not that supplemental, why is not that budget amendment here for us to see now while we are working on some domestic programs that many feel are desirable but that every Member of this body knows are not entirely necessary at this time.

If the last session of Congress is any guide, and it appears here today that it is a very good guide, this administration again hopes to see this Congress pass all of these domestic appropriation items and then, just as last year, we will find on our doorstep supplemental after supplemental to finance the cost of the national security of our country. With more than 235,000 American servicemen in Vietnam today and with prospects of hundreds of thousands more before the end of fiscal year 1967, we seem to be misplacing our concern of what should come first in our consideration and concern.

Mr. Chairman, we in the minority—especially when the majority seems to abrogate its obligations—have a responsibility to have a confrontation of ideas so as to debate this issue here in the Congress of the United States so the people of this country will know it is not the farmer, it is not the laboring man, it is not the housewife, and it is not the businessman that is responsible for this inflation we are experiencing today.

Inflation has never been referred to in my vocabulary as any kind of a "cliche." It refers to the cost of living, to the purchasing power of the dollar.

You cannot blame the farmer, you cannot blame the businessman, you cannot blame anyone else. The responsibility rests with us in Congress because of the fiscal policies of our Federal Government.

So, when the majority leader asks us why do we take this amendment first, I say that we are starting a program here which is a 40-year program and which will cost some $6 billion but that affects only 18,000 individuals. However, inflation in the cost of living affects 190 million people. Let us remember that as we vote on each of these amendments as they come up throughout the year.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much emotion here and I hope I will be pardoned if perhaps I become emotional, too. I heard a great cheer go up from one part of this House when it was mentioned that we have not provided funds for the families of servicemen at camps but we are coming in here and asking for this money. Somebody else asked, Is this necessary?

I would remind you that our servicemen were civilians yesterday. Their elderly mothers and fathers, for whom this type of legislation is enacted, are living in the slums. I wonder what you think their morale is when they know they are laying their lives on the line in Vietnam and an ungrateful nation back home does nothing for their families and consigns them to live in stinking holes. I would ask you gentlemen some day to go to the homes of some of these young men who are now in Vietnam. I went to the home of one not long ago. When I walked into that home I realized we had dishonored that boy. There are many boys who will be on the casualty lists whose parents will be mourning for them in pigpens and hovels.

So, if you ask me is this type of bill necessary, I say to you, you bet your life it is. It is one of the most necessary things we will consider in this session of Congress.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. If the gentleman's argument has logic, then why, if we have 270,000 men in Vietnam, is he not fighting for 270,000 units under this bill instead of only 18,000.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If your argument is consistent, then why did the President, even in his own message, say we cut out this year and next year 8,500 units for military families? I wonder if the gentleman visited some of the places our servicemen have to live in. Should they not have a priority here?

Mr. JOELSON. But this bill covers the aged and the people in substandard housing.

Mr. CEDERBERG. What about the servicemen? If it is important to cut out servicemen, is it not important to defer this program?

Mr. JOELSON. But servicemen are not covered by this act. If you want to broaden it, it is fine with me.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The servicemen will be covered by this act.

Mr. JOELSON. They are not now.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move tc strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised to hear the majority leader and the majority whip refer to this problem of inflation as a cliche and relate it to the Republicans. This is not a partisan issue.

President Johnson in his economic message to this Congress——

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe the gentleman from Missouri misunderstood the use of the word "inflation" as being a cliche, and not inflation genuinely.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, all right.

President Johnson used the words in his Economic Report to the Congress—and I believe I can quote them with respect thereto:

> Perhaps inflation will be the most serious issue facing this country this year.

Mr. Chairman, the majority party members of the Joint Economic Committee, including the majority whip, apparently and evidently did not read what the majority said, they certainly said in their report to the Congress just filed within the past 10 days or 2 weeks that, indeed, inflation was a serious matter, and recommended tax increases. Certainly the minority agreed—the minority on the Joint Economic Committee agreed about the seriousness of inflation.

The disagreement occurs because the administration puts tax increases ahead of expenditure cutting.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Did the gentleman from Missouri say that the majority whip [Mr. BOGGS], who just castigated the Republican Party for being concerned about inflation, signed the report of the Economic Committee on which he serves as the gentleman from Missouri has stated, which report states that inflation is a serious problem? Can that be true? Why that is incredible.

Mr. CURTIS. He certainly did; and he made this recommendation. It is a little strange. And it is a little strange, I might say, for this House to be wondering whether or not inflation is with us inasmuch as already this year we have followed the recommendation of the Committee on Ways and Means that we increase taxes. And we did vote the increase in excise taxes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, since he used my name?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman since I did use his name.

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad the gentleman mentioned my name. I might say to the gentleman that I am prepared to do whatever is required to maintain price stability in this country and to combat inflation. But I am not prepared to cut all programs that are needed to help our own country and to help particularly this poor section of our economy. The report of the Joint Economic Committee made that very clear.

The joint economic report——

Mr. CURTIS. No; wait a minute. I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. The report makes that very clear.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is not addressing himself to the point. The point was that the majority whip said that inflation was not a serious matter. The gentleman is now arguing something else, as to what priorities we might exercise in our expenditure policy. This is the area of disagreement. Apparently the administration still is not willing to curtail or set priorities of expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that I took the floor was the amazement I experienced in hearing the leaders of the Democratic Party talk about inflation as if it were not serious, and the majority leader coming down to the well of the House and saying "Oh, well, the consumer price index has just gone up in the area of food."

For Pete's sake, what concerns the people the most if it is not food? That particular item is contained in the Consumer Price Index.

Let me say that the industrial prices just now are going up, and this represents the very area that the administration has been engaged in "jawboning" and using the various stockpiles, illegally, I would say, to try to hold these prices down.

Mr. Chairman, against what are they fighting if it is not this underlying inflation? Of course it is, and it is just putting this debate on the wrong basis to try to persuade the House, the Democrats or the Republicans, that inflation is not a serious matter, a matter that is presently with us.

We probably are going to have to increase taxes again and, probably, we might even have to have controls voted. We will continue to have the price index rise, and for those who are so concerned—and I am a Republican—more about the low-income groups, let me tell you in your own words, because at least your leaders in the economic field say that nothing is more dangerous to the low-income groups than inflation. It hits them the worst and the most.

Mr. Chairman, if you are really concerned about the low-income groups, you will treat inflation with seriousness, and you will not demagog it. It will not go away by referring to it as a Republican cliche.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I think we ought to get back to some of the basic points in the amendments that have been offered. Let us talk about them for just a minute. Let us talk about the rent supplement program for a few minutes.

I want to bring out six specific points, some of which have been overlooked by the Members of the House in debate.

First of all, we have a rent subsidy now and have had a rent subsidy since the first public housing bill was passed. This is not a new thing to America. That is the first thing.

The second point is that free enterprise is asking for this legislation. They are asking that we pass this legislation. It has been endorsed by the National Home Builders Association, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the Georgia Association of Real Estate Boards, the Augusta, Ga., Home Builders Association, and others.

The third point, which has not been brought out, is that in this particular bill no project will be approved unless it has the approval of local officials.

The fourth point that I would call to your attention is that it would be a method to accelerate the building of houses that we are not able to do with public funds by extending the public housing program.

We also know, and this is a point that has not been brought out, that if we accelerate the war in Vietnam, it is not only military housing that is going to have to be provided for people, but also private housing for civilians will have to be built.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think it is quite interesting that at Fort Gordon, which is in the gentleman's State, this is a military installation where the building of barracks is being deferred. I visited Fort Jackson in South Carolina last year during the recess and they were putting up tents there and are deferring the construction of barracks for our military men. I do not think the gentleman is being consistent.

Mr. STEPHENS. I certainly appreciate my colleague calling that to my attention.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am delighted to call it to your attention. Perhaps the gentleman did not realize that that was the situation.

Mr. STEPHENS. Of course, I know Fort Gordon was cut. Evidently, the gentleman has not seen the record of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of which the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] is chairman. I appeared before the subcommittee and made the statement that I wanted to have the military construction program restored. I ask for it now publicly again that it be restored. I did not cut it off. I was not in favor of cutting it off and will vote to put it back.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman will yield further, I am going to offer an amendment so that none of this money will be spent until this is restored. Then if it is subject to a point of order, some Member on the other side can make a point of order against it.

Mr. STEPHENS. We will get to that question in the proper way after the report from the Subcommittee on Armed Services is made. That is the proper time to put it back in, and not at the present time because it would be merely a red herring across this particular trail.

But I say in all candor, I appeared before the subcommittee and asked that the military construction cut be put back. I think it is a military necessity to do so. I think that to provide civilian housing is also a military necessity.

Now the other point that I want to emphasize about the rent supplement is the fact that only those people who are eligible for public housing anyway will be eligible under the rent supplement program as we have it here.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I must repeat my point of order that the Committee is not in order. This is a most important piece of legislation that we are considering and our colleague is entitled to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order. The gentleman's point of order is well taken. The Committee is not in order. The gentleman from Georgia will suspend until the Committee is in order.

The gentleman from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, let me develop one or two points about the rent-subsidy program.

First of all, when we talked about the housing bill last year not one single protest—not one single word was said about the subsidy that we now have in public housing. I am not opposed to public housing but want free enterprise to take part also.

Let me point out what I mean when I say a subsidy in public housing. I got these figures yesterday in my home community in Athens, Ga. I found out that the persons who are eligible for the housing in public housing were limited by the rule that, if one person had an income of $2,400 or more, that person could not get in.

It has to be $2,400 or under. The maximum is set at $4,500. That maximum is for a family of 10, and it would include five bedrooms.

Under the rental program, one person with $2,400 would get his one-bedroom apartment for $40, and that would include his utilities.

I checked on the private-enterprise scale and I found that not a single privately owned one-bedroom apartment was available in Athens, Ga., at that rental of $40. They rented for $100, and that included utilities. That is the lowest one-room apartment that I could find.

There was one other, and that was a one-bedroom apartment in a private apartment house that rented for $90, and that included the water, but it did not include the rest of the utilities and this would exceed a $100 cost. So there is subsidy already.

This private enterprise approach is to take the $12 million that we are now asking for and to put it into the rental program and let private enterprise put the capital into it.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. What would be the cost to the Federal Government of that $40-per-month apartment in public housing?

Mr. STEPHENS. The cost to the Government is 100 percent, except for the $40 that is paid by the man that is living in the apartment.

Mr. BROCK. What is the net cost?

Mr. STEPHENS. The net cost would be 100 percent less $40.

Mr. BROCK. What amount less $40?

Mr. STEPHENS. The cost.

Mr. BROCK. What is the cost?

Mr. STEPHENS. One hundred percent of the cost, whatever it might be, whether it would be $100,000 or $10,000.

Mr. BROCK. In other words, the gentleman does not know what the cost would be?

Mr. STEPHENS. I do not know what the building cost would be.

Mr. BROCK. It makes a whale of a lot of difference in my opinion.

Mr. STEPHENS. What difference does it make here? The criterion that you are talking about is the cost. Under the public housing program, the cost is paid 100 percent by the Government and under the rent supplement program 100 percent by private enterprise.

I point that out and add that the cost is immaterial. What is important is who is going to pay it? It is material whether the taxpayers of America pay it, certainly. I am asking you to support a program under which the taxpayers are not paying the full 100 percent cost of erecting and conducting public housing but letting private enterprise come into it in the same measure. The only difference is that the U.S. Government is assisting in the rent but not footing the whole bill.

We are proposing the rent subsidy for one purpose, and that is to accomplish what was in the platform and has been in the platform of both political parties for quite a number of years. That is to give Americans better housing and better living conditions.

In understanding the rent-supplement proposal, the purpose of housing legislation should be remembered. The entire purpose of the legislation is to provide better housing for Americans. This is a national objective. It has been in both party platforms for many years. That is the purpose of the rent subsidy. Do not forget the purpose.

Also do not forget there are detailed restrictions which must be understood, too, on this rent subsidy.

First, as to who may be a beneficiary of rent supplements; second, restrictions on income of beneficiaries; third, restrictions on who may be the landlord of the housing unit.

The first of these restrictions limits beneficiaries of the rent supplement further by saying only four categories may be involved—the elderly, the handicapped, those displaced by governmental action; and to people who are currently living in substandard housing. Under the amendment I sponsored, only people whose income is so low that they are eligible for public housing can qualify for any rent supplement.

In prior housing laws there is precedent for the Federal Government assisting all of these categories of persons. The general justification is the ambition of all of us to assist by providing Americans with a good place in which to live and to rear their children. As far as aiding people displaced in urban renewal projects is concerned, the Housing Act of 1964 recognizes the justice of giving a rent supplement because these people were dislocated by action of the Federal Government. Our humanitarian interests impel us to recognize the elderly and disabled persons and it justifies assistance here. The next justification is in the rent supplement section with the income limitations. Before any persons in the category of eligibility can participate they must not have an income over public housing standards.

After the House cut the appropriation for the rent subsidy in order to assure that regulations would meet my amendment, the Housing and Home Finance Agency issued as the highest maximum income in America which a person could have and still qualify would be $6,500. This would be a high rent area for a family of 7 to 10, requiring 5 bedrooms for decent living.

The final restriction is one that should appeal to all of us, because the method for financing the housing that would be eligible for the rent supplement assistance is by private enterprise. There is a requirement, however, that the legal entity owning such housing eligible for rent supplements shall be a nonprofit corporation, a cooperative association, or a limited dividend corporation. No money is paid directly to the tenant but to the landlord.

All of the legal entities and their objectives shall be approved by the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency to assure conformity with these requirements.

The projects will not only be constructed with private capital, but will remain on the tax digest to be subject to city, county, and State ad valorem taxes just as any other private enterprise. I repeat what I have said before. The projects will be privately owned, privately run, privately built, and privately financed.

The assistance to people who fall in this low income group could be done by an expansion of public housing. This would be at public expense, because public funds build, own, and operate public housing. Local ad valorem taxes are not paid.

The choice of rent subsidy is choice of private enterprise. Providing this assistance by rent subsidy to the people in need of good housing is to move away from public housing. It should be acceptable by people who would like to see no further expansion at public expense.

In the October 1965, issue of the Mortgage Banker, the trade magazine of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, Maurice G. Read, president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, is quoted at page 32 as saying that the proposal is a step toward private enterprise in housing:

> While the rent supplement is not what we sought, it does—for the first time—provide a procedure under a Federal program for putting families of inadequate income into adequate housing, without disturbing the function of private ownership of property or private financing of the private owner's mortgage debt.
>
> Along with the new departure authorized for local housing authorities, it may well usher in a much wider scope of service for private mortgage financing.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, if I voted against the rent subsidy proposed, I feel as if I would be voting against private enterprise.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to undertake to agree on a time limitation. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes and that the committee have the last 3 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I object.

MOTION OF MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Motion offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: "I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the motion.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is what we were looking for. This is the time of day that we get into a big hurry, you know, so that we can adjourn on Wednesday or Thursday and take the rest of the week off. That has happened many times. I have been sitting here trying to get some time to speak. I dislike using the preferential motion route to get recognized, but when the leadership is trying to limit debate, it seems to be necessary to resort to this procedure.

In the first place, I want to talk to you about some sense. This is a supplemental appropriation bill. It is the second supplemental appropriation bill, if you please.

A few years ago we had to have supplemental appropriation bills because we did not appropriate enough money in the regular appropriation bill. So we made up where we had made some mistakes, or where there had been more expenditures than we thought were necessary at the time the regular bill was passed.

Then, though I do not know when it started, we began to have second supplemental appropriation bills to appropriate more money.

I do not know how in the world anything like a rent subsidy ever got into a supplemental appropriation bill except they say that this is a rent supplement bill. So it should go into a supplemental appropriation bill. That is the only excuse you can have for it, for here we are being called upon for money to start a new program. This is not a supplemental appropriation. It is an initial, original appropriation which opens the door, and the deluge will follow. Again, I repeat, this is not a supplemental appropriation for a rent supplement program, so it has no business in the bill, to start with. That is the first point.

Someone may say, "Well, you are against rent supplements." That is correct. I am against rent supplements, but the reason I am against rent supplements is I believe that is going contrary to what I was taught in my youth. We have preached all of our lives that we believe in the democracy in the United States.

What are we asked to do in respect to this rent subsidy today? We are asked to pattern our life after that of the people of the Soviet Union. I visited over there a few years ago, and I saw some of their housing projects. What do they do there? If a fellow has a large family, he may get a big apartment, and if he has a small income he will pay only a little bit of rent. If the fellow has a larger income, but a smaller family, or possibly just a man and wife, they give him a small apartment and charge him a high rent.

That is what we are talking about taking on here.

Gentlemen and ladies of the House, when will we get back to our principles? I am not so worried about the $12 million as I am worried about the principle involved here today.

I do say, I am a Democrat. This is not a partisan matter at all. I have prided myself on being a responsible Democrat, and I want to pay the bills when they come due.

There has been some talk about inflation here today. I do not believe there is a person in this room who will deny that we are facing inflation. I do not believe there is a person in this room who has kept up with the news, who has read the newspapers, who has listened to the President, and who has attended meetings of any committee around here who does not believe, as I stated last June, that we are going to have another tax increase. I said that when the House passed the bill the other day, "We are going to have another tax increase before this session is completed." I stand by that statement. But, I do not think it would be necessary if we faced up to our responsibilities, and quit adding on, and starting new programs.

Some of the Members had better go back home and talk to the people, to find out what is going on.

I do not mind spending money for anything which is going to benefit the country and benefit the people, but I was in my hometown last week, and I ran into some statements there, which convinced me, and reaffirmed my belief that Congress has not been acting in a responsible manner.

We have all this educational program, under the poverty program, and we are providing teacher aids. Imagine what confusion it causes when a teacher's aid is put into a room, with a teacher who does not want her. When one asks what the teacher aid does, the statement is made, "she erases the blackboard," among other duties designed to relieve the teacher. When I was a youngster I always wanted to erase the blackboard myself, because that gave me an opportunity to go outside and dust off the eraser, to get some time off. Now they have teacher aids, and pay them to do that.

I ran into this when I was home last week. Some of the poverty program people have gone to some school districts there and have told their money was being allocated to them if they could find ways to spend it. They do not have a program, but the money is being given to them, and the statement is made, "You can take this money under one condition; that is, if you will spend it before June 30." They do not have a program for it.

I am stating now that it is time to wake up to the responsibilities of our office and to quit appropriating money when a need has not been shown for it. There has not been a need shown for this thing. It has no business in a supplemental appropriation bill.

If the House wishes to fund a supplemental rent program, I say the House should do it in a regular appropriation bill, rather than to put it into a supplemental appropriation bill. It can come back in June or July in a regular bill. It will require more money but at least let us act in an orderly and responsible manner.

I say to some of you folks that you do not know what is going on around here, and you are going to face trouble this fall in the coming election. You are going to find out that the poor are not getting any benefit out of many of the programs you have been appropriating millions for, and they will show their resentment at the polls.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, we said at the outset of the debate on this bill that it was wholesome for legislation to be thoroughly discussed in the House.

It seems to me that we have thoroughly discussed the issue about the rent supplement program. I shall undertake to obtain consent to end debate on this section of the bill and all amendments thereto.

I asked unanimous consent that the debate conclude in 13 minutes. I shall again undertake to get a limitation. If not successful, I expect to move that the debate close after a certain number of minutes of time.

It should be pointed out that subsidized housing is not new in this country. Twenty-nine years ago the Congress passed the public housing bill. Neither Congress nor the executive branch has let that program get out of hand. Of course, there have been mistakes. During the 29 years of the public housing program the Federal Government has spent about $1.8 million.

After 29 years of experience with public housing, it has been suggested that we should undertake to provide housing under a free enterprise program, financed by free enterprise.

There are subsidies or the equivalent of subsidies in many Government programs. There are subsidies in the transportation of air mail, the merchant marine, farm programs, and programs of many types.

It is hoped that the rent supplement program will eventually result in the elimination of the public housing program. We have not let public housing get out of hand, and we will not let this rent supplement program get out of hand. I am sure the Congress will continue to control carefully the legislation and the appropriations.

The Committee on Appropriations, after much consideration last year and again this year has worked out a compromise package. It was the best we could do under the circumstances.

In the conference report last year it was indicated that Congress would give further consideration early this year to the rent supplement matter, if a program appropriately circumscribed with regulations and restrictions was submitted.

As I pointed out earlier in the debate, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, has said himself that while he is not wholly in accord with this program:

> I think this program is superior to public housing, and agree with much of what you said except I am not satisfied that this program will replace public housing.

We are just trying to work out a better way in which to cope with the problem of slums and all of the economic losses incident thereto, and with the crime which is generated in part as a result of the slums. Crime is costing the American taxpayer $27 billion a year according to J. Edgar Hoover. This is not only an effort to help the underprivileged, but an effort to help our whole country.

I urge support for the committee position.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, if it is appropriate at this time, that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not think the preferential motion has been disposed of as yet. Second, I am a member of the committee and I have not had an opportunity to discuss the matter at all. I would like to have 5 minutes for our side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The question occurs on the preferential motion.

The preferential motion was rejected.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in 15 minutes has been agreed to. The Chair heard no objection. The gentleman from Michigan has already had 5 minutes allotted to him and is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be appropriate to call to the attention of the House an item that just appeared on the UPI ticker entitled "Taxes." I quote:

> Johnson described controls as distasteful and virtually ruled them out. The President said he has asked Budget Director Charles Schultze to try and make further cuts in the budget during talks with Cabinet officers but Congress was resisting his economy measures in the school milk and aid to education areas and probably would add to overall Government spending.

This is a very appropriate time to begin to assist the President in cutting out this very unnecessary and questionable program when our country is in the kind of position it is now in.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Has the gentleman from Michigan seen the whole big headline of the Washington Evening Star tonight which reads "Prices Climbing; Tax Rise Hinted." It further goes on to say that President Johnson may ask for an income levy boost in April. If anybody votes for this program, they are voting for wartime higher prices and wartime higher taxes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I may say further, Mr. Chairman, that this is the time here today where we can stand up and be counted on this very issue.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. The majority leader referred to "inflation as a cliche." It seems to me that the American people are going to be referring to "inflation as a tragedy."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes, I yield briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, there is another edition of the Evening Star, the headlines of which should be noted: "Prices Still Rising, and Sharply. Johnson Supports Drive To Curb Inflation Trend."

The first paragraph says:

> President Johnson has launched an intensive personal campaign to persuade business leaders to curtail further capital investments in an effort to stem an inflationary trend of the economy.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman from California.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me just refer once more to this item: Here is the budget presented by the President for fiscal year 1967. On page 350, under Military Construction, which is handled by the subcommittee on which I serve of the Committee on Appropriations, page 350 of this appendix to the budget for fiscal year 1967, under "Family Housing" here is what the President said:

> Provision is made in the following schedules to proceed after 1966 with the construction of the 8,500 family housing units authorized and funded in 1966, but deferred in December 1965 following a review of Defense Department expenditures focused on meeting higher priority requirements in direct support of combat forces in Vietnam and elsewhere. On this basis, no additional funds are required in 1967 for new family housing construction.

Mr. Chairman, in the hearings last year, on page 303 of the Department of Defense appropriation hearings, here is what Secretary of Defense McNamara said:

> I strongly urge the Congress to support our fiscal year 1966 request for 12,500 units. The President has stated that he wants our uniformed citizens to be first-class in every respect, and wants their families to know only first-class lives. We feel that provision of adequate family housing is one of the foundation stones in providing first-class treatment to our Armed Forces, and these have been deferred because of questionable expenditures on the Vietnam war.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say to the members of the Committee that if this is the case, and military family housing is deferred then certainly the rent supplement program can be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair observed on their feet at the time of the unanimous-consent request fixing the time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] for 1 minute.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon our able majority leader appropriately stated the case, pointing out how time after time the blind opposition offers excuses for voting against progressive social legislation. A year ago the rent supplement program was offered as a meaningful new approach to the housing problems of our low-income families living in the urban ghettos, but unfortunately the funds were not appropriated. Now the Committee on Appropriations has cut the supplemental appropriation request by 60 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Bow amendment, and at the same time I believe we should fully fund this program, up to the $30 million which has been requested by the administration. Therefore, I support the amendment to increase the appropriation to $30 million; $12 million means only 20,000 units of housing under the rent supplement program. This means for the city of New York approximately 2,000 units. This is totally inadequate. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has 70,000 applications pending.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year in asking the Congress for $30 million for the rent supplement program President Johnson characterized rent subsidies as the "most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city."

I can only observe that, after emerging from the Appropriations Committee, this program is a most misshapen instrument indeed.

By slashing the President's request from $30 million to $12 million, and by inserting a provision that would give local public officials authority to veto any project in their community, the entire rent supplement experiment has been seriously impaired.

The concept of the subsidy plan was to build new housing through private, nonprofit or limited dividend concerns for occupancy by low income families. Federal payments would be made to landlords to make up the difference between the rent charged and 25 percent of the occupants' income.

Through the device of rent supplements we could expand significantly the number of units available for low-income families. Furthermore, it was hoped that, by employing rent subsidies, we could assist in moving low-income families out of the slums and ghettos and into the mainstream of American life.

The President saw the rent supplement program as being "vital to our efforts to improve the quality of life in America."

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has received expressions of interest in the subsidy program from potential sponsors of nearly 70,000 new units. The $30 million request would have covered reservation of contract authority for 50,000 rent supplement housing units. The estimate is based on the assumption that the average annual rent supplement per unit will be $600 or a monthly rate of $50 per unit.

Cutting the $30 million request by 60 percent to $12 million will reduce the number of new units that can be constructed to about 20,000.

At a time when our housing needs on a nationwide basis are mounting at an alarming rate, it is unconscionable to cut back on what could be one of the most farseeing and progressive housing programs drafted in the last 30 years.

I have contended from the very beginning of the debate over this program that the $30 million figure was much too modest in the face of the Nation's housing needs.

At a time when we should be constructing on the order of 200,000 new low-rent units a year, at the most 35,000 new units annually are authorized under the public housing program.

Officials in the Department of Housing and Urban Development testified recently before the House Housing Subcommittee that there are some 500,000 families on waiting lists for public housing throughout the country. In New York City alone more than 125,000 are on the waiting list.

Despite the billions of dollars spent on housing programs in the last three decades, the Nation's housing situation continues to deteriorate at an ever quickening pace.

In New York City recently the results of a community renewal program survey of the city's housing inventory disclosed that 500,000 families, or 22 percent of the city's households, were ill housed. Some 400,000 of these families are in the low-income category, having incomes of less than $6,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, for the last 20 years each housing bill is thought of as a fresh start in what will develop into a massive national attack to bridge the gap between the demand and the supply of economical housing for low-income families.

Yet the massive attack that is required to provide every American with decent, safe, and sanitary housing never materializes.

To conceal this, each year the housing program is put in a new package. What the program lacks in substance it makes up for with illusions. Disguised as something brandnew, as something bold, the package is merchandised as the breakthrough that will lead to a dramatic solution to our acute housing problems.

But after removing the tinsel ribbon and tearing away the layers of tissue paper, we find disappointment.

Last year hopes were raised higher than ever because of the claims that were made on behalf of the rent supplement program. So masterful—even artful—was the packaging of the rent subsidy program that even the most skeptical found the plan arresting.

The point of the rent subsidy plan was a simple one—to increase the supply of housing available to the very poor. The plan was to be accomplished in partnership with private developers.

The rent subsidy program would be applicable either for constructing new units or for bringing about the rehabilitation of old but deteriorating dwellings. Potentially it could be employed on a large scale to ease the problems of the slum ghettos by promoting the movement of low-income families out of the urban slums into suburban and other surroundings that more nearly reflect mainstream American life.

How can these objectives be achieved with the rent supplement program that is before us now?

The $12 million is totally inadequate for the magnitude of the task ahead. Even the $30 million request of the President's was a disappointment.

But beyond that, the provision permitting local communities to have a veto power over the program is even more disturbing. Clearly, this limitation has been written into the bill to block the possible exodus of low-income families into communities outside the central core of our cities. Local officials in these lilywhite bedroom suburbs can be expected to exercise this veto power to prevent the have-nots from coming into the community and mixing with the haves.

At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to strike out this local veto.

Moreover, as a Representative of the largest city in the Nation—a city plagued by staggering housing problems—I am discouraged that the cost ceilings on rent supplement housing are so limited that New York City may not be able to participate in the program on any large scale. The regulations issued by the Department set unrealistic ceilings for the big cities.

The cost ceilings, below the public housing limit, will not permit the construction of three-bedroom apartments costing more than $15,000. According to the Committee on Housing and Urban Renewal of the Archdiocese of New York, the cost of housing which it is sponsoring in the Tompkins Square Urban Renewal Area is in excess of $21,500 per dwelling unit.

Mr. Chairman, I might also point out that the asset and income limitations are below the limits usually imposed in public housing. Why this should be so is a mystery.

Because of the deficiencies and inconsistencies which I have outlined I must be restrained in my enthusiasm. I hope that the conferees from the other body will insist upon a larger appropriation and upon eliminating the restrictions which have been written into this bill. The local veto is a most serious obstacle to the implementation of the original concept embodied in the rent subsidy program, and I urge support for the amendment which I intend to offer to eliminate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser] for 1 minute.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I refer to a headline in the night final edition of today's Washington Evening Star in which President Johnson appeals to business leaders and will hold a dinner tomorrow night in a further appeal to these business leaders to curtail capital investment as an anti-inflationary move.

One of the subheadlines in this same article says that the climb in the cost of living is the biggest in February since 1951.

I would remind the House that it was after that rise in February 1951, that we were forced to accept price and wage controls in this country.

I raised the question here today—are we going to defy the advice that President Johnson gives to businessmen to curtail capital investments and expenditures? Are we going to ignore his advice and then bring ourselves to a situation where we will have wage and price controls and a tax increase to boot?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] for 1 minute.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. Bow the time allotted to him was granted to Mr. Cederberg.)

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be appropriate to try to point out that in discussing family housing for the military not only is military family housing involved but enlisted men's barracks in many of our military locations around the country.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Stephens] was speaking a while ago from the well of the House and I thought I should call to his attention what was happening in the State of Georgia.

An enlisted men's barracks complex for $8,895,000 was deferred at Fort Gordon.

An enlisted WAC's barracks for $604,000 was deferred at Fort Gordon.

These are necessities for our military men and women who need housing. If you do not believe this, go to some of these installations. You will see they are installing tents and living in tents while some of this construction has had to be deferred.

How can we make any commonsense out of voting for this rent supplement program at this time? I say even if it is justified, under the present circumstances this is a matter that ought to be deferred and what we ought to do is to help President Johnson cut the budget as he is requesting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] for 1 minute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I only rise to reiterate the arguments that have been made here before.

If we vote for the rent supplement program, a program that has a 40-year commitment—that will last until the year 2006—if we commit ourselves and future Congresses to the expenditure of $480 million for this period of time, we are in effect stimulating the problems that we see on the headlines of this paper and the problems that will be on the headline of every paper of the United States for the next 24 hours—that prices are climbing and that taxes are going to go up because of the lack of fiscal responsibility in the Congress and in the White House.

I hope and trust that we in the Congress will defeat this rent subsidy proposal so that the Congress can make its contribution along the line of fiscal responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino] for 1 minute.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bow amendment and against the Farbstein amendment.

As I said in general debate, this is a new scheme for economic integration and not, as suggested by friends on the other side of the aisle, for adequate housing of the poor.

This rent supplement experimental scheme is contrary to our American way of living. It will definitely undermine and destroy American incentive to improve oneself by his own efforts.

Let us make no mistake about this scheme: It will not provide the maximum number of low-cost housing units we need to house our poor.

But it will provide middle-income housing for some of the poor with our hard-earned taxes in the form of subsidies.

This rent supplement scheme is a more expensive way of housing people than our program of public housing.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in general debate, said something to the effect that the "situation has been vastly improved." I would assume from his talk that he referred to the Department's regulations.

Well, let me say that the regulations have been changed and improved but not sufficiently to prevent abuses.

The Secretary still has the power to hand out unlimited amounts of subsidies because there still is no dollar limit as to the amount of rent subsidy any family can receive.

There is still no limit as to the percentage of any family's rent that the Secretary can pay out in subsidies. It could be 25 to 50 percent or even more.

There is still no safeguard on the definition of "income."

The Secretary will still decide what is "income" and what may be excluded in calculating income.

The rent subsidy scheme is still unfair—more particularly unfair to middle-income taxpayers who must shoulder the extra taxes to provide similar apartments for others who cannot afford the full rental in the same building.

The chairman, in his remarks, talked about this being only a $12 million appropriation. That it was cut from $30 million requested by the administration. It might be a small amount in comparison to the budget. But, let us not forget that once we get the rent subsidy foot in the door, this will be the beginning of a $6 billion program running for 40 years.

The chairman expressed great concern about our blighted cities—our slums.

Let me tell you that this program will not clean out our slums because under the limitation of $15,000 per unit costs, no cities with slums will benefit because the cost of labor and land will make it imposible to build in our cities. I do not say this—the archdiocese of New York says it—and it will force rent supplement to the suburbs.

I might also point out that I do not agree with the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, when he says that this is the "private enterprise approach." It might be a private enterprise approach but with almost twice of the taxpayers' money to subsidize the rents.

This rent subsidy scheme is wrong and wasteful and should be scrapped.

In this period of war, we cannot afford to sacrifice guns for frills and gravy—we cannot afford to experiment—and that is what we will be doing under this scheme.

With inflation at our heel, with rising costs and higher taxes facing our taxpayers, now is certainly not the time to waste our taxpayers' money on experiments of rent subsidies. I hope the majority of the Members of this House will have the courage to vote for the Bow amendment and defeat this rent subsidy scheme.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for 1 minute.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the comment made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, let me say I am perfectly willing to be counted on this issue and I am sure that every Congressman from the big cities is willing to be counted on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, housing is not stopping. Construction is not stopping. There are approximately 1 million units that are going to be built this year. But they are going to be built for people who can afford to pay for that housing.

The people who will not be able to enjoy the new construction and the new housing will be those whom the rent subsidy program seeks to help; namely, the poor, the disabled, and the elderly.

That is why this Bow amendment must be voted down.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make is that the decay of our cities is not stopping because of the war in Vietnam. That decay must be stopped. The cities need every kind of tool that they can get to try to stop decay. They need urban renewal. They need programs of this type in order to provide housing that is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN] for 1 minute.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, when the administration's rent supplement plan was first presented, I voted against it twice—on both authorizing and funding it. Although approving the intent of the program, I felt its original eligibility provisions were unrealistic and unworkable.

As a result of revisions which have since been made, I now support the program. Lower income limitations and other eligibility restrictions have won broad public support. The National Association of Real Estate Boards, which also opposed the original measure, now supports the program—as do the national league of cities, the U.S. conference of mayors, organized labor, senior citizens, and most church groups.

This program probably represents the best formula ever devised to help poor people obtain adequate shelter and remove civic blight without the bad features of public housing.

I have determined that under this measure, San Diego will be able to launch programs to improve conditions for many families and aged couples now in substandard housing. Among these is a Methodist Church project now pending under the 221–D3 program. If anything else were needed to obtain my support for rent supplements, this factor provided it.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, what kind of shortsightedness does it take for this body to see the President request that business stop investment in capital expenditures because of inflation on the same day that we begin a subsidy program like this? Those productive facilities will provide the very means by which the poor can take themselves out of the slums and out of the poverty. Can we claim the same for this bill? It is incredible to me that we are not willing to listen to the advice of the people.

You have all seen the result of polls taken in every different part of the country. In California the voting was 2 to 1 against it, in Chicago 5 to 1 against it, in Pennsylvania 10 to 1 against it. I think it is inexcusable that we take this action today, accepting the dual standard of an administration which insists on reducing investment by business in production facilities, an investment which creates long-range employment, while advocating a 40-year subsidy.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, we have heard many arguments against this rent subsidy program. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] made a point that struck home to me because I, too, had a chance this fall to visit the Soviet Union. The people of the Soviet Union today are proud of their public housing. They openly brag about their fine new apartments. These apartments are extremely poor by our standards, however. They are designed by the Central Government and they are all alike, whether the apartments are in the cold climate of Leningrad or the warm tropics of Tashkent. They are drab, colorless, four stories high without elevators, overcrowded, and of extremely poor construction. While we in this country might never go this far in centralizing our housing, we can certainly expect under a rent subsidy program all kinds of Federal guidelines and standards.

What we want in the United States is more individual initiative, not more Federal control of our housing in a program that will take away for many Americans the desire to own their own individual homes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to put the question before us today in focus. There is a request for $12 million for a 3-month appropriation to furnish units under the rent supplement program. There is in existence a rent certificate program for which 3,000 units have been prescribed already. Three thousand more units are requested. That is in existence. It will furnish immediate housing. The rent supplement program would take at least 1 year for units under rehabilitation and modernization and over 2 years on new construction. If anyone thinks there will be any immediate relief under the rent supplement program, they are just plain not thinking it through.

There is a program on the books, the rent certificate program which, if used and utilized with funds available to the administration, we could get immediate relief throughout the United States. Governor Brown of California says that California can use 15,000 units under that program immediately. This program is in being and the funds are available.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] for 1 minute.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we have had wholesome debate on this matter. I think we all recognize that it is preferable to move in this direction of private enterprise in houseing construction. I repeat that this is a free enterprise bill in concept. The project calls for privately financed, privately owned, privately built, and privately managed and operated. The Home Builders Association of this country supports the bill. They say it is a worthwhile program.

If private enterprise think they can build the needed housing why not give them an opportunity to do it? The outlay of public funds would be considerably less under a rent supplement program than under the public housing program. This program would be financed 30 percent under public housing costs to the Government.

The Democratic platform in the last several years and the Republican Party platforms have stated that we should move faster in the field of providing a program of better housing for the poor and those living in substandard housing. This is a national objective of both parties. We should get on with the job that needs to be done.

The regulations and standards we have discussed should be written into law. The amendment should be defeated and this bill passed.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAHON. What is the issue before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is about to state the question. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Ryan: On page 4, strike out lines 15 through 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Bow and Mr. Evins of Tennessee.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 153, noes 183.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CEDERBERG

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Cederberg: On page 4, line 22, after "program" and before the period add, "*Provided further*, That no part of these funds shall be obligated until funds made available for the construction of family housing for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Defense agencies in Public Law 89-202, have been obligated."

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late. The Chair was about to state the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question had not yet been put. The Chair was about to state the question, but the question had not yet been put. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it relates to funds previously appropriated and which are not carried in this bill and interferes with executive discretion given to the President under existing law to do what he wishes with the funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan briefly on the point of order.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to try to be sure that our military families are given an equal opportunity to have family housing that has been deferred. This matter has adequately been discussed in the debate previous to this time. I had hoped possibly out of the generousness of the hearts of the gentlemen on the Democratic side that they would not raise a point of order and therefore obviously deny our military service families the right to have these houses that they so desperately need.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'Hara of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan places an unrelated contingency upon the use of funds provided in this paragraph, and as such is legislation in an appropriation bill, and not germane to the paragraph.

The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

> For the National Teacher Corps authorized in part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $10,000,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 per centum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teacher Corps: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be spent on behalf of any National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to approval of such program by the State educational agency of the State in which the school system is located.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against lines 21 and 22——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against lines 21 and 22 on page 9, and lines 1 through 8 on page 10 of H.R. 14012, on the basis that the language contained in lines 4 through 8, beginning with "*Provided further*," impose additional duties upon the State educational agencies in any of the States participating in the program, these additional duties being not contained in the basic legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I cite Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, section 6884, and I quote:

> A point of order being made against an entire paragraph, and being sustained because a portion only is out of order, the entire paragraph goes out; but it is otherwise if the point is made only against the portion out of order.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I contend that lines 4 through 8 on page 10 of the bill should be held not in order and that the whole paragraph therefore, beginning with lines 21 and 22 on page 9, and extending through lines 1 through 8 on page 10, be held not in order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the language does not provide any additional duties of any kind. There is not a word in the four lines that have been cited by the gentleman from Ohio that would require additional duties of any kind.

Previously this afternoon when the point of order was raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin on the rent supplement program, the language on page 4 of the bill is just about the same in that paragraph as is in the paragraph cited by the gentleman from Ohio. That was ruled germane by the Chairman earlier this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I submit there is not one single, solitary word in this language that would impose any further duties upon anyone. We do not tell anyone to do anything. It is the exact same language as was ruled germane on page 4 earlier today.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state in view of the ruling earlier today on the rent supplement paragraph, it would seem to me this language should be ruled in order.

No State superintendent of public instruction or State director of education is required to perform any additional duties because of this language.

The amendment was offered in the committee and in view of the previous ruling, it would seem the language does not require an affirmative act. The State superintendent could do absolutely nothing and the Teachers Corps would not apply in that State.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the point here is very clear so far as I can see. The Chair has already ruled today on a similar point of order and this is exactly the same language.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] wish to be heard further?

Mr. BOW. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we do have a different situation here than we did on the matter on which the ruling was made earlier.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this provides that none of these funds may be spent on behalf of the National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to the approval by the State educational agency. This is an affirmative action which must be taken by a State before the funds can be used. It is not a limitation but is a requirement for an affirmative action to be taken by the States before this becomes effective.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is no affirmative action to be taken by anybody. This is completely negative. The argument of the gentleman from Ohio, with all due deference, does not apply here and the situation here is exactly the same as with reference to the language on page 4.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The Chair finds that the language to which the point of order is directed constitutes a valid limitation on an appropriation and is negative in nature and does not impose any affirmative duties or additional duties on the administration.

The Chair rules for the reasons set forth by the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentleman from Wisconsin, and as stated by the Chairman in the ruling on the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin earlier, that the point of order is not sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF OREGON

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon: Strike out all of lines 21 and 22 on page 9 and lines 1 through 8 on page 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon in support of his amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I further ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, with the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I present this amendment with a little trepidation after hearing the distinguished minority whip characterize the individual who is going to offer such an amendment of being pretty much in the role of a villain.

You know I am not much used to wearing a black hat and riding a black horse and I hope I will be forgiven if I discard the costume that has been assigned to me and put on my white hat and mount my white charger to give you the reasons why I am opposed to this section of the bill and why I think it ought to be deleted.

I suppose one of the main reasons is inflation. Of course, this has been discussed and cussed, perhaps sufficiently, here this afternoon. I want to express myself and let the people of my district and this country know that I feel that next to the hazards and difficulties of Vietnam, this specter of inflation is a problem that worries me as much as any other problem facing us today.

This Government is not ignoring the problem. As you know, the rediscount rate has been raised. The prime interest rate has been raised.

Social security taxes will take $6 billion out of the economy this year. We have raised excise taxes. These actions will tend to stabilize the economy, and I think we should be careful not to move too rapidly or too vigorously and start a disastrous decline. We can also help by exercising discretion and care at the appropriation level. This does not mean that we should vote "no" on every appropriation, but it does mean that we should carefully evaluate the relative priorities.

In my judgment, the Teacher Corps is a prime candidate for deletion. The minority whip suggested that we should not be stopping programs that we have already started. I suggest to him that this is not a continuing program. This is a new program that has never been funded. He says that we should not turn our backs on progressive programs. I suggest that that is not even an issue, because I think there is no Congress, except the 88th, that has a better record than the 89th Congress when it comes to progressive legislation, and most of that, but not all, I have supported.

Even today on the rent supplemental bill I supported the administration and supported the committee, primarily because of its relevance to the problems of the many "Watts" areas around the country smoldering in bitter resentment as the benefits of our economy pass them by.

Enough on the inflationary end of it. Turning to the merits of the proposal itself, we had Mr. Howe, the Commissioner of Education, before our committee. He agreed, except for the timing, that there was nothing they could do under the Teachers Corps bill that they could not do under title I of the primary and secondary education bill, except possibly give the Federal Government the power to assemble and train these teachers. This, in my judgment, is not necessarily a desirable feature, a desirable responsibility, to place in the hands of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, this is the feature that poses the most difficulty in the minds of those who oppose this program on its merits.

The budget for 1967 contains a figure in excess of $1 billion for title I of the primary and secondary education bill. Title I money serves areas with concentrations of children from low-income families as does the Teacher Corps program. Title I money is available to improve the educational programs to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children. It is available for a program for handicapped children, for the expense of school curriculum, for decreasing class sizes and so the teacher's time may be free of extracurricular activities. All of these functions are the functions of the Teacher Corps. They are interchangeable and the Commissioner of Education confessed, and I use that word advisedly, that "we could perhaps get title I funds operating this way, but I think it would be a shift in emphasis."

It was suggested by another of the witnesses that a difference was that title I relied on school districts to propose projects. But certainly we have been assured many times that the Teacher Corps contemplates local initiative and that none will be commenced except on the request of the local community.

The only thing that can be done under a Teacher Corps that cannot be done under title I is the Federal assemblage and training of teachers, the Federal payment of the salaries and, according to this bill, matching contributions of 10 percent. And this is the very point of controversy on the merits that will be eliminated if this Teacher Corps program is eliminated.

It has been suggested that problems will arise because these Teacher Corps people will be paid full-time salaries for part-time work. This problem would not exist if we reject this program.

Frequently, we discern duplication in programs that we have approved where none was anticipated. We strive to eliminate it and are critical of the Executive for tolerating it. Unless we approve the Duncan amendment, we are knowingly creating and funding unnecessary duplication and doing it at a time when our economy and the stability of our dollar cannot stand it.

The majority whip says that this will create no inflation—that we must have "faith" in our system.

Well, I have faith in our system. I think the actions of this Congress and its fiscal policies have created and sustained the prosperity we enjoy. But there are two sides to this fiscal policy. Faith alone is not enough. It requires our courageous and affirmative action to make certain that we apply the restraints as readily as we apply the stimuli when the situation so demands.

I want the economy sustained. I do not want the fruits of what we have done destroyed by a devalued dollar. Should this occur it will hurt most the very people we are trying to help.

The President was quoted in the morning papers as asking for voluntary restraint on private and governmental spending. Our President has asked us to "help" him restrain Government spending. Here, in my judgment, is a chance to "help" him and I am going to try. I hope you will join me and delete this very marginal Teacher Corps program which, at the very least, can await the termination of the crisis in southeast Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. When time was limited, the following Members were observed standing: Mr. MICHEL, Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. BOW, Mr. MAHON, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. GROSS, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. GOODELL.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement each Member will be recognized for 1¼ minutes, with the exception of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the most striking aspect of this proposal—which has never been considered by a substantive committee of the House—is its utter lack of relationship to other Federal programs. Under careful questioning the Commissioner of Education admitted that the prime objective of the National Teacher Corps would be to train prospective teachers—the "interns"—to work with disadvantaged students. In fact, he made clear that the training component was the only feature that distinguished National Teacher Corps from projects already funded under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Yet the Higher Education Act, enacted in 1965, authorizes the award of 10,000 fellowships for graduate study to persons interested in a career in elementary and secondary education; in another section—title IV–B—it authorizes 100-percent loan forgiveness for student borrowers who subsequently teach in schools having large numbers of disadvantaged children. Moreover, title XI of the National Defense and Education Act authorizes summer and full session training institutes for teachers who are going to work with disadvantaged pupils.

The point is that each of these programs, although having a slightly different focus, either is directed or could be directed toward the identical purpose of getting more persons into the schools to work with disadvantaged children. And each program competes for the same pool of college graduates and teachers. The schools, meanwhile, often using Federal money, are competing with each other and with the Federal programs for the services of the same group of individuals.

This exhibits wild confusion of purpose in Federal programs which overlap, duplicate, and compete. The introduction of a Federal Teacher Corps on this scene adds but another complication in a situation that is passing rapidly out of the control of local school administrators who have the primary responsibility for staffing our schools.

There is a shortage of experienced teachers which is even more acute among those whose experience is in slum schools. Yet it is precisely these individuals who would be drained off by the National Teacher Corps to be placed at the disposal of the Federal education agency. The journeyman teachers who would work under them would also be drawn from hard-pressed school systems. The subsequent reassignment of these individuals to other systems would not represent a net gain to education.

This leaves only the "interns" to establish any additional value in the program, and that is a questionable proposition.

Even the Commissioner of Education admitted that educationally deprived pupils in low-income neighborhoods would be used as guinea pigs by National Teacher Corps. Yet these are the children who need the most expert instruction and guidance, rather than experimental help from "interns" who themselves are trying to discover whether they wish to be teachers. The proposal is not responsive to the real needs of slum schools or to the problems of school administrators.

If the Federal purpose is to assist school administrators in getting more teachers, and particularly more experienced teachers, into schools serving disadvantaged pupils, then greater emphasis should be placed on the National Defense Education Act institutes for teachers of the disadvantaged and upon the fellowship program for teachers. These, in conjunction with title I projects, should provide a flow of qualified teachers into schools where they are most needed. They do not complicate educational administration by draining experienced personnel out of one program to be used in another.

CONFLICTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The Commissioner of Education as asserted—as have each of his predecessors—that there is a shortage of experienced personnel in the schools. It is curious, therefore, that Federal programs should compete with the schools, and among themselves, for personnel in short supply. Yet this unquestionably is true. The Job Corps, for example is draining counseling and guidance personnel from the public schools at substantially higher salaries than school systems can pay. The same is true of vocational teachers who must be relied on by both the public schools and the Federal manpower and development and training program.

Meanwhile, between school systems—and within them, for that matter—title I projects and title III supplemental centers require the same kind of experienced teachers, therapists, counselors, and other professional personnel that are also required in the regular school program, with the result that competition increases. Within the same State, a wealthy school district—such as Montgomery County, Md., the wealthiest in the Nation—nevertheless gets funds for title I projects and thus extends its competitive advantage over poor districts in obtaining experienced personnel. Between States the title I formula—based upon her pupil educational expenditures—produces even a greater disparity, and hence greater competitive advantage in the high-expenditure States.

The funding of the National Teachers Corps would introduce yet another element of competition and confusion, to say nothing of the dangers inherent in the concept.

A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

We have heard no justification for paying 100 percent, or 90 percent, or any part of the salaries of some public school teachers that would not apply to all teachers similarly situated. The National Teachers Corps teachers and interns would be federally supported personnel available to those schools selected by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. However rationalized, it always comes down to that fact which must be justified.

How are these personnel different from experienced teachers, or beginning teachers, already employed by the schools and already assigned to classes with a high concentration of disadvantaged children? Moreover, how are they different from any other public schoolteacher, assuming that all children have an equal right to an education without regard to family income?

We are setting a dangerous precedent which—as described in a memorandum prepared in HEW—might ultimately involve Federal responsibilty for the salaries of 2 million local employees.

Moreover, we are moving also in the direction of creating Federal schools for one class of children set aside on the basis of family income. In our judgment there should be the most complete and searching study of the implications of this for our educational system, our Federal structure, and for our society. We know of no such examination of the proposal.

FEDERAL CONTROL INHERENT

No type of legislative or statutory disclaimer can avoid the inherent Federal controls in this proposal.

First. It is the Commissioner of Education who would select among applicants for the National Teacher Corps. Local administrators could only choose among the chosen. The Federal Government, except under unique circumstances such as Indian schools and Department of Defense dependents' schools, has never been in the business of recruiting teachers. We feel this to be a State, local, and private responsibility best kept out of Federal hands.

Second. The Federal Government would select the institutions which would provide National Teacher Corps training. This is not a critical point, but it is an additional Federal leverage in the program.

Third. Except for appropriations language, part of which may be subject to a point of order, State education agencies have no say in the program, which puts the Federal Government in a direct relationship with local school districts in a manner foreign to our whole structure of education. Obviously, the authorizing statute needs careful revision at this point which cannot be supplied by the Committee on Appropriations from year to year.

Finally, even if a positive role for the State agency were written into the authorization in the manner we have done, the U.S. Commissioner of Education alone has the power to pick and choose among the local school districts applying for such aid. This is the real power, often obscured, wielded by the U.S. Office of Education.

In any such program, there is extensive "discussion" between the applicant and the Federal agency. Clearly, when the Commissioner and his delegates make this final determination, it is made on their terms and conditions. The fact that this process is largely informal makes it no less lethal as a Federal weapon to shape local school practices. It is precisely the point at which Federal control is effectively exercised.

CONCLUSION

Much more could be said about the NTC proposal. Significantly, the public reaction of education organizations, teachers, and school administrators has mostly been that of cool silence; it masks a deep private hostility. The rejection of this proposal would in itself strengthen the independence of local school administration.

More than anything else in education today we need a consistent, orderly Federal policy directed at strengthening State and local school systems, reaffirming the independence and integrity of our educational structure, and helping to solve the basic problems which stand in the way of achieving equal opportunity for a high-quality education. Far from contributing to the development of such a policy, the National Teacher Corps would further confuse and fragment a Federal educational effort which is becoming chaotic.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion, because in my judgment we will be doing harm to the war effort if we were to adopt the gentleman's motion. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act that we enacted last year has been received well throughout this Nation and has challenged the imagination and resources of our educators and of our local educational systems. This new legislation increases the capacity of local educational agencies to acquire the equipment, provide closed circuit television, teaching machines, numerous other improvements, but all these things cannot be effective unless we have a good teacher in that classroom.

Last fall more than 240,000 beginning teachers were needed for the Nation's schools. The mark was missed by more than 100,000. This shortage was most severe and evident in the schools that could not pay for enough qualified teachers.

The Teachers Corps proposal zeroes in on this important aspect of enhancing the effectiveness of our new elementary and secondary school programs in those schools that need them most. It was our hope that we would be able to improve the quality of education of those children in the disadvantaged areas by increasing the number of teachers and equipping them with the necessary training with which to deal with the educationally deprived youngster.

Let me emphasize that this proposal is not one to establish a Federal employee in the local school classroom, but rather it is a means by which teaching personnel may be trained and made available upon the request of local school systems for work in the classroom under the direct supervision of local school administrators. Members of the Teacher Corps, after a minimum training period of 3 months, would go by invitation to our disadvantaged schools districts to supplement the teaching force. In all instances, the corpsman would be employed by the local school district. The district would have direct control over them deciding where they are to be assigned and transferred and what they are to teach. Federal funds which we are voting on today would be provided to the school district to cover corpsmen's salaries but corpsmen would be on the local district's payroll.

In the local school district members of the corps would be paid salaries comparable to those of local teachers in similar teaching assignments. In my judgment this program will provide the means by which we may attract qualified persons not only into the field of teaching but into the specialized field of teaching the disadvantaged child in the disadvantaged school system. I urge the concurrence of all the Members of the House in the funds reported by this committee, and I would take this occasion to extend my sincere appreciation to the fine work done by the Appropriations Committee in bringing this important legislation to the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODELL yielded his time to Mr. QUIE.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon and I want to talk only on the merits of the National Teacher Corps.

Last year, when the National Teacher Corps was before us, the Congress did not study this legislation. The House spent virtually no time studying it. The House does not know whether this is a wise measure or not if it depends on the hearings for information. We did not hear testimony from anybody from the administration before the Committee on Education and Labor. In fact, we heard testimony from only one person, a Member of the other body.

With that little study, this program was really forced on us in conference when it came over from the other body. This we do know about the National Teacher Corps. It throws the Federal Government further into an influence on education than any other measure we have had before us. This was well developed recently before the Appropriations Committee and can be read in the hearings, and the gentleman from Oregon was just alluding to it. You can see in the hearings where Commissioner Howe said that in any other programs, such as title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act, the State school people will have authority to develop programs. Here they will not, except the decision as to whether they will accept a teacher.

I can point to a memorandum that was sent to the majority Members last year by the administration, wherein they said that "We also believe it will be better from the viewpoint of an internal control of personnel for the school district to make the major payment of teachers' salaries." In this bill the teachers are funded 90 percent by Federal funds. That is not the major payment by the local school district.

The local school district may choose whether the teachers may come or not. But when the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the cost, all the school districts will want the teachers. If there are more school districts asking for teachers than there are teachers, the Federal Government, as pointed out by the Commissioner of Education, will make the decisions as to the schools to which the teachers will go.

The school can decide whether the teacher remains or not. The school cannot fire teachers from the Corps. This is decided by the commissioner.

The commissioner selects every person who goes into the program. He will set up contracts with the universities or make decisions on the kind of training program they will have.

This will be a huge step toward Federal standardization in our schools and a precedent will be set where the Federal Government pays most of the salaries of schoolteachers. It is an unwise action. It is important that local school districts not the Federal Government pay the major portion of teachers salaries. I hope you will support the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon.

We don't know what the future has in store for us with the passage of a bill funding the National Teacher Corps. In answer to a question by Mr. FOGARTY on page 10 of the hearings about planning for the future, Commissioner Howe said:

> In this program not a great deal, and yet I make this observation—that planning for the future here is going to depend on the first year's experience with this and, secondly, that planning for the future of this eventually means an increase in the scope of it. But I think this is a reasonable scope for the first year's start. We have some things to learn in the planning process here, in selecting these people, training them, and getting them into the schools. We will be ready for a major move, I hope, after the first year's experience.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON yielded his time to Mr. BRADEMAS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable regret that I must rise in opposition to the amendment of the next U.S. Senator from the great State of Oregon and I do so only out of a desire to see the Teacher Corps retained.

I hope very much that his amendment will be defeated. I remind the Members of the House that last year, in a rollcall vote on the Teacher Corps proposal, the Members of this House made clear their strong support of Teacher Corps by voting to retain it by a margin of 74 votes.

What is the purpose of the Teacher Corps? I think we need to have that in mind if we are to understand the issue before us. The Teacher Corps has two primary objectives: first, to help break the cycle of poverty through more and better training of the children of poverty; and second, to attract, train, and retain interested, dedicated persons to the field of teaching the disadvantaged.

Under title V–B of the Higher Education Act, dedicated and able young men and women—like those who have made the Peace Corps such a success—will be recruited and trained to teach where they are most needed, in city slums and areas of rural poverty across the Nation. Teacher Corps members will be recruited nationally on the basis of talent and promise and will be trained by the Nation's colleges and universities. They will serve up to 2 years—side by side with local teachers—on request from State and local educational authorities. Some will be experienced teachers; others, teacher interns who will work in teams under the direction of experienced teachers. All will get university preservice training as well as a program of in-service graduate education leading to an advanced degree.

As we know from the debate on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of last year, there are some 5 million school-age children in this country who are members of families the annual income of which is $2,000 or less. We need to bring bright young teachers into the school systems where such children are concentrated in order to help improve the education of these children.

Mr. Chairman, through recruiting able young men and women to teach in pockets of poverty, the Teachers Corps will add to our source of schoolteachers generally throughout the Nation.

My good friend from Minnesota has suggested that he does not like the idea of so much Federal financing. I would remind him that it was he who suggested that we should have 100-percent Federal financing of the Teachers Corps if it were confined to providing teachers of children in Headstart-type programs.

So I think it is not a fair point for him to make that substantial Federal financing is inappropriate when applied to teachers at the elementary and secondary school level. I think it is also important to respond to the criticism which was made that the Teacher Corps is a harbinger of some sort of Federal teacher program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to grant 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana be given 2 minutes of his time. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the time has not been fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed. Under the order fixing the time, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] has the last 5 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would, in response to the criticism made by my friend from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] that the Teacher Corps is moving in the direction of some sort of Federal teacher program, a point to the language in section 516 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 which makes clear that members of the Teacher Corps are under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agency to which they are assigned. These local school districts retain the authority to assign teachers within their system and to make transfers of teachers within their system and to determine the curriculum they are to teach as well as the terms and continuance of assignment of such members within their system. So it is simply not accurate to suggest there will be a heavy Federal hand from Washington telling these teachers what to do and teach.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the next Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Cannot all of these things which you are suggesting, be done under title I of the Primary and Secondary Educational Act under which $1 billion is being requested next year?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I think one answer to the question of the gentleman is, "Not at all adequately or sufficiently." Let me give the gentleman just one example. Right now in the Subcommittee on General Education of which the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], is the chairman, we are considering Mr. Perkins' bill which would authorize funds for the construction of facilities for elementary and secondary school students because title I is just not adequate to this purpose.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield again, the Commissioner of Education took a contrary view. This amendment gets around all of these problems raised in connection with the Teacher Corps of Federal intervention and controls whether they are realistic objections or not.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I do not find it necessary, I may say to my friend from Oregon, always to agree with the distinguished Commissioner of Education, much as I respect him. I hope Members of this Congress and members of this and other committees of Congress are entitled to have the right to express their own viewpoint on this and other matters.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], for 1¼ quarter minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I regret we have so limited a time on such an important subject matter, but the real thrust of this program is not the disadvantaged kid that you all thought was going to get a better education, but the real thrust is to give the person with an undergraduate degree a master's degree and a doctor's degree at Government expense. As for the quality of teachers in the intern program listen to this from the hearing record, page 42. Mr. Duncan asked a question in the hearing as follows:

> Actually you are going to have minimum training before you put them on the job?

Mr. Howe answered:

> They will have this summer which is a "quickie" and then there will be on-the-job intensive supervision with master teachers in the program.

On the next page I asked:

> In effect what you are doing is using disadvantage children as guinea pigs for somebody in practice teaching?

Mr. Howe says:

> In part this is true.

That is exactly what you are doing here. Taking people with inadequate preparation to teach and no minimum hours of education and saying to them "you are going to get in the education program and teach disadvantaged kids." You are not giving the so-called disadvantaged kid a better advantage by embarking upon this kind of program. You are dead wrong if you think otherwise. What the gentleman from Oregon said is correct, under titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Act you can do all of these things. I will place in the Record an exchange of correspondence to bear this out and will also include the hearing record wherein the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Duncan], and I take the subject matter apart with the Commissioner of Education Mr. Howe and his associates.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1966.

Mr. Norman Karsh,
Assistant Commissioner for Administration, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Karsh: As you know during the supplemental appropriation hearings on the Teacher Corps and again on title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act the question of financing a Teacher Corps type project under title I of E.S.E.A. was discussed.

In order to verify the telephone conversation with respect to this matter that you had with my office today, I would like to have your answers in writing to the following questions:

1. Is it possible for a group of school districts, if it wished, to allocate major portions of its title I funds to set up a teacher training arrangement analogous to the arrangement planned for the Teacher Corps?

2. It is possible for a group of school districts to submit an acceptable proposal for title III funds to set up a teacher training arrangement analogous to the arrangement planned for the Teacher Corps?

3. Have any such proposals under title I or title III been submitted?

4. You cited "mobility" as a key feature that distinguishes the Teacher Corps from a title I or III proposal. Could you again state an example as you did on the phone of what you mean by "mobility"?

I would appreciate your reply to these questions at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: In answer to your letter of March 18, 1966, regarding the Teacher Corps, the following is provided:

1. A group of individual local school districts entitled to financial assistance under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, may elect to have a combined program in cooperation with an institution of higher education that would involve the training of teachers for specific assignments under a title I program to provide for the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. Such a combined project, however, must meet with the approval of the State educational agency.

2. Under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a proposal may also be submitted by a group of school districts for teacher training as an exemplary model for regular school programs. Under the title, the Office of Education is obligated to consult with the State educational agency but final approval rests with the Commissioner of Education.

3. Proposals have been made under both title I and title III for teacher training but in all cases have been limited to the geographical area to be covered by the proposal. In the title III projects, teacher training has been part of a larger program, such as curriculum improvement.

4. The mobility factor involved in the National Teacher Corps that does not have a corollary under titles I and III involves the stimulative effect of a nationwide recruitment and selection effort. The reason for this "mobility" is the fact that those individuals who may wish to join the National Teacher Corps would reside in areas where little need exists, and conversely, those school districts most in need of teachers would have little supply available. It would be our objective to have Teacher Corps members assigned to university training programs in the same locality as the school districts requesting their teaching services. The fiscal year 1966 budget estimate includes an amount of $1,875,000 to pay for the travel costs involved.

Sincerely,

N. KARSH,
Assistant Commissioner for Administration.

HEARING WITH THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, MR. HOWE

SELECTION OF TEACHERS CORPS MEMBERS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS

Mr. LAIRD. The act authorizing a Teachers Corps stipulates that a teacher must be requested by the local school district. Is it true that the local school district can only request teachers who have been previously selected or trained under standards set by the U.S. Commissioner of Education?

Mr. HOWE. It certainly is true, sir, that they will not request specific individuals by name, but rather people who are involved in the program, having been selected under the program.

Mr. LAIRD. Having been selected by you?

Mr. HOWE. Having been selected, yes, by——

Mr. LAIRD. Whoever you delegate the authority to?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. Under the law you are the only one who has the responsibility for selecting these individuals.

Mr. HOWE. That is right, and we will run a selection process and screening process.

Mr. LAIRD. And the standards that are established as far as training are standards which you establish?

Mr. HOWE. As far as the training offered in the universities is concerned, yes.

Mr. LAIRD. Isn't it a fact that the Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the salaries of the teachers who go into these school districts as members of the Federal Teachers' Corps?

Mr. HOWE. The Government will pay 100 percent of their salaries; yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. How likely is it, if you, as Commissioner, decide to offer teachers who fit your standards but do not fit those of the local school districts, that the local school districts would turn down a 100-percent federally subsidized teacher, even if it means altering their own standards or the curriculum content?

Mr. CARDWELL. Mr. Laird——

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the Commissioner.

Mr. CARDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWE. My guess is that a local school district, because it wanted a teacher, would be willing to take one of the members of the Corps in spite of the fact that there was not an exact fit between its view of what constituted proper training and what training these Teachers Corps members had received. I would guess, however, the problem here is not one of major degree. I think we must remember, in this, that the trainees the local district will receive will be people who have had only a summer's quick exposure and, primarily, an exposure to learning how to work with the youngsters and being with youngsters in a summer institute.

Mr. LAIRD. Let's take an example now. If, we will say, the school district involved teachers old math and you, as Commissioner, decide that the Teacher Corps members would teach new math, what will happen in this case? What if you decide only new math would be taught by the Teacher Corps members?

Mr. HOWE. First of all, we would not get into the kind of detail that sets this sort of arrangement in the curriculum pattern of the summer institute or teacher training classes. We would leave these matters up to the university.

Mr. LAIRD. You already answered my question that you would only offer teachers to those districts that met your standards.

Mr. HOWE. Excuse me, sir. I didn't intend to say that, if I did. I said we would offer teachers to any district that requested them. I thought your question involved just what would happen when a teacher was requested and we came up with a person who had somewhat different training than that district preferred. I think my answer there was that the district would probably take the person because the differences are not likely to be large or even significant.

Mr. LAIRD. In answer to my first question, when I discussed with you whether it was you as U.S. Commissioner that was going to be able to establish the standards, you answered that you were, for all purposes, the person who would establish the standards.

Mr. HOWE. That is right for the training. It is my obligation under the law.

Mr. LAIRD. During periods of service in the Teachers' Corps under the law you still have that responsibility.

Mr. HOWE. The actual work in the school is completely uncontrolled by the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. LAIRD. You are going to establish the standards for these teachers. What if these standards are different standards than the local school district has?

Mr. HOWE. If these are different standards from the local school district, then I think there will be some possibility of not quite as good a fit between the people that are available and the people that the local school district would like to have working for it. But it seems to me that we really depend on the universities who are doing the training job, and the details of what will be offered to these teachers will be set in universities which are in the local areas where the teachers will indeed be teaching. It will be the accustomed kinds of curricula activities that those universities traditionally offer for the service of schools in those areas. We in the U.S. Office are not going to spell out a control of curriculum. We have never done this and certainly have no intention of doing this.

Mr. LAIRD. Are the universities going to set the standards in the areas involved?

Mr. HOWE. I think our problem here is around this matter of "standards." We will require certain proportions of practice teaching, certain times in the classrooms working with youngsters, a certain proportionate time, perhaps, in course work in the university; but the exact detail of the nature of mathematics which is made available in California or New York or wherever will be predominantly set by the teacher training pattern of the university serving these interns in their training process.

Mr. LAIRD. It will be up to the university, then, in the area to set these standards?

Mr. HOWE. Here again the word "standards," I think, is getting in my way. The patterns of training, if these be standards in terms of requirements of time and all, will probably have to be set by us. But the exact subject matter, if that is standards, will have to be set by the universities because they are close to the schools and know what the schools of the local area really require and use.

Mr. LAIRD. I am just not completely clear on that. Perhaps you can clear that question up, Mr. Cardwell. You have been anxious to say something.

Mr. CARDWELL. I would attempt to. I understood your original concern to be directed to the issue of local right of determination as to subject matter to be taught. I think I am interpreting you correctly.

Mr. LAIRD. I am trying to get at what the standards will be as far as the individual in the Teachers Corps is concerned, the educational background, system that is to be used within the school district itself.

Mr. CARDWELL. The law, as you probably know, specifically requires that the local community be assured of the right to determine the subject matter to be taught, what will be taught, how it will be taught, and so forth. As this relates to the issue of teachers' standards and competence, the question is answered in the law, and the Commissioner of Education is bound to execute the law as it is stipulated.

RIGHT OF LOCAL SCHOOL OFFICIALS TO DISMISS CORPS TEACHERS

Mr. Laird. It is my understanding that the school district superintendent can fire a Federal teacher, if he wishes, at any time. Is this true?

Mr. Howe. Yes, although I would qualify this and say this is not really a Federal teacher. It is one of his teachers, he is receiving funds for helping him pay for the teacher, and this is why he can fire the teacher as he can the others he is paying.

Mr. Laird. He is 100 percent federally financed as opposed to the local teacher, and I think would be classified as a federally financed teacher. I don't want to quibble over the term, but certainly it would be a Federal teacher as opposed to one that is financed locally.

Mr. Howe. He can get rid of his trainees or his teachers if they don't serve according to his standards.

Mr. Laird. If a teacher is fired, how will it affect his status in the Federal Teachers Corps?

Mr. Howe. Right now our view of this is that we would be willing to reassign this teacher if we think the person has a chance of success when reassigned. Sometimes the situation in which a teacher will be leaving is more of a problem than the person himself. So we would examine this situation without prejudice and would be willing to try to replace the person if it seemed wise to do so. There is a process of judgment involved here.

QUESTION OF FEDERAL CONTROL

Mr. Laird. Isn't it true that the very fact that you, as Commissioner of Education, determine which districts will get the Federal teachers, and the Federal Government pays 100 percent of their salaries, that this creates a situation where the absence of Federal controls will be based solely on your good intensions as U.S. Commissioner of Education?

Mr. Howe. I don't determine beyond a certain point. I don't give these teachers to anybody who doesn't ask for them. So the original determination is created by the request of the district for a teacher. Secondly, I am required by law to place these teachers in districts which have a fairly high proportion of disadvantaged youngsters. So here again it is not a matter of discretionary determination, but required by law. So it seems to me that I am really not in a determining situation of placing a teacher somewhere; I am making a teacher available to a place which has asked for one.

Mr. Laird. Don't you think this is quite an incentive—a hundred percent of the financing of the teacher's salary—to a local school district?

Mr. Howe. Yes, I do, indeed. Yet we must keep in mind, in regarding this as an incentive, that this does not take away any of the cost of that school's regular operation, because this is a supplementary, additional service above what the school district regularly supplies.

BROAD ELIGIBILITY OF SCHOOLS TO PARTICIPATE

Mr. Laird. Every school is going to have to increase its educational offering because the schools are growing. So there is no school that would not qualify under the criteria you just used. Every school has had to expand its educational program.

Mr. Howe. Right.

Mr. Laird. There is no school in America that would not qualify under the definition you just used.

Mr. Howe. This would enrich the program of any school.

Mr. Laird. Yes.

Mr. Howe. Absolutely.

Mr. Laird. So there is no school in America that should not be interested in having a Federal teacher where they get the whole salary paid.

Mr. Howe. This is really a matter of local determination. I suspect there will be various feelings about this, and some will not apply.

Mr. Laird. They are going to have to increase their teaching personnel. Why wouldn't they want a Federal teacher?

Mr. Howe. I can't examine their motives on this, but I do know there are school systems which are not accepting aid under title II of the Elementary-Secondary Act out of their own desire not to have it. I assume this same thing will happen with this particular program.

Mr. Laird. In other words, they might make this determination because they feel that you, as commissioner of education, might be in a position to influence, or control, the curriculum content or other facets of local education. Wouldn't that be the basis on which they make that determination?

Mr. Howe. I would expect individual school systems might have people with that feeling, but I would regard the feeling as completely unjustified.

Mr. Laird. You do possess, under this act, all of the power you need to give the local school districts a choice of either "all I prescribe or nothing" as far as the Federal teacher is concerned.

Mr. Howe. If I were to try to figure out how to use this act to control the schools, I really think I would have a hard time doing it.

ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS WHERE DEMAND EXCEEDS SUPPLY

Mr. Laird. You are not going to be able to fulfill all of the requests for these Federal teachers, are you?

Mr. Howe. That is right.

Mr. Laird. Because you are going to pay 100 percent of their salaries. This just stands to reason. Anyone can understand it, I think, if you are going to go in and pay 100 percent of the salary.

Mr. Howe. This is why I think the act directs me to place the teachers where there are the largest proportion of disadvantaged youngsters.

Mr. Laird. But you are going to be in a position here where you can do certain favors for some school districts and not for others, and you are going to favor those school districts that follow the program of education that you feel is the proper program.

Mr. Howe. No, sir. I don't think that I have any feeling about what program they ought to be following. I think my effort here, really, as determined by the act, is going to be to try to decide rationally who has the greatest need in terms of services to disadvantaged youngsters.

Mr. Laird. That's a personal opinion, a personal decision you make.

Mr. Howe. Yes, sir.

Mr. Laird. That decision is not made on the basis of any calculation that can be made, it is a human decision.

Mr. Howe. Of course, we all know these decisions are not made personally by the Commissioner. They are made by a process the Commissioner establishes which prevents them from being personal decisions, and which brings advisory people and continued committee consultation into the process of decisionmaking.

MECHANICS FOR PAYING TEACHERS

Mr. Laird. We have talked about it, and it is established that the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the salaries of the Federal teachers assigned to the local school districts.

Mr. Howe. Right.

Mr. Laird. How does the Federal Government actually pay these salaries—directly to the teachers involved or to the local school boards?

Mr. Karsh. They would be paid on a reimbursable basis. The local school boards would pay the salary of the interns and experienced teachers, and we would reimburse the school boards.

Mr. Laird. You would pay directly to the school boards and not to the State department of public instruction?

Mr. Karsh. That is correct.

Mr. Laird. And they would make the disbursements to the individual Federal teachers?

Mr. Karsh. Yes.

ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS TO SCHOOLS

Mr. Laird. We have already established that you have the sole authority to decide which school districts will get these Federal teachers.

Mr. Howe. In terms of their requests and in terms of the provision of the act regarding disadvantaged children, yes. These are the guidelines.

Mr. Laird. Those are the only guidelines?

Mr. Howe. As far as I know, within the framework of the definition of disadvantaged youngsters under the Elementary-Secondary Act, yes.

CONTROL OF TEACHERS AFTER ASSIGNMENT

Mr. Laird. Once a Federal teacher is assigned to the local school district he will be subject to all the rules and regulations of the local school district.

Mr. Howe. He will be a local schoolteacher and subject to all the rules and regulations.

Mr. Laird. Isn't it true that the local school district must make "arrangements" for the use and development of such teachers with you as Commissioner of Education?

Mr. Howe. Yes. There will be, certainly, plans for the effective use both of the teachers in training and the expert teachers to provide the training. These will be plans for which we will provide guidelines.

ROLE OF STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Mr. Laird. You completely bypass the State departments of education as far as the Teachers Corps program is concerned?

Mr. Howe. I believe we are told in the act to consult with them. I will have to find the reference.

Mr. Laird. I think you can have a discussion with them, but as far as any actual contact——

Mr. Howe. It says "consultation in appropriate cases with State educational agencies and institutions of higher education."

Mr. Laird. But they have no authority to recommend which district within a State should receive a Federal teacher?

Mr. Howe. No authority as such.

Mr. Laird. That authority rest only with you as U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Mr. Howe. Again, within the qualifications we have discussed——

Mr. Laird. Yes.

Mr. Howe (continuing). Of requests and the category of youngsters to be served.

Mr. Laird. As we look down the road, doesn't this principle, coupled with similar provisions in other educational programs, such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, really set the stage for the eventual replacement of State direction of education by the Federal Government.

Mr. Howe. I would say not. I would say the Elementary and Secondary Act probably does more to build up the direction of education by State governments than it does the opposite. In fact, I would assert that it does.

Two specific items under this generalization: One, the fact that the largest piece of money in the Elementary and Secondary Act is awarded at the discretion of the State superintendents of instruction under title I of that act. And item two, the fact that the act provides funds for the strengthening of

State departments of education through title V.

Mr. Laird. You don't think they are qualified to handle the Federal teacher program?

Mr. Howe. I didn't say that. I said we are simply providing funds to strengthen them. I think we will consult State departments of education.

Mr. Laird. Would you object if we put language in this appropriation act that would limit the assignment of these Federal teachers to those school districts as recommended by the State departments of public instruction?

Mr. Howe. I would be concerned about this, first of all, in terms of timing. If we must now start negotiating with 50 States and set up systems for assignment, I think we have got an additional job here.

Mr. Laird. Wouldn't this be easier than negotiating directly with thousands of school boards throughout the United States?

Mr. Howe. I don't know, really, because I haven't had a chance to look into it.

Mr. Laird. You want to go directly to thousands of school districts throughout the United States and bypass the 50 States. If you could deal with the 50 State departments—and we assume they are becoming stronger. At least, Commissioner Keppel testified last year of the progress that was being made. I think we should be able to put a little faith and trust in these State departments.

Mr. Howe. We certainly try to put faith and trust in them and work closely with them. It seems to me that we may run into difficulties with such an assignment to State departments, depending on how it is arranged.

Mr. Laird. But you personally would rather go to each of the school districts?

Mr. Howe. No, I have no objection in principle to being involved in a planning relationship with State departments of education to get this job done. I am hesitating about it because I am thinking of the plans we have already tried to make, and of shifting gears between now and next June in a very complex program.

Mr. Laird. How many school districts have you made plans with? It just doesn't seem to me you have had any authority to make any plans with any school district. You haven't had any money.

Mr. Howe. We haven't made plans with school districts.

STATUS OF PLANNING FOR THE PROGRAM

Mr. Laird. What plans have you made? Let's get this out on the table here. For the first time I hear these plans have been made. How were they financed?

Mr. Howe. We were authorized to go ahead with planning activities and money for this purpose has been authorized.

Mr. Laird. When was that authorized?

Mr. Cardwell. Under "Salaries and expenses" in the appropriation. The specific request was approved.

Mr. Laird. Where in the justification for the 1966 budget is it?

Mr. Cardwell. I can insert it in the record, sir.

Mr. Karsh. In the 1966 budget under "Salaries and expenses," specifically identified.

Mr. Laird. For the Teachers' Corps?

Mr. Karsh. Yes, sir.

Mr. Laird. What page of the justification is that?

Mr. Cardwell. We can insert it.

Mr. Laird. How many people were assigned?

Mr. Karsh. Sixty were identified. We have not hired any of those 60.

Mr. Laird. You haven't hired any. Who has been doing all of this planning with the school districts for teachers? I would like to find this out, if it is such a big problem to retrace and go to the State departments of public instruction. If you have made all of these contacts and have all of this planning going, I would like to know about it.

Mr. Howe. We have not made elaborate contacts with school districts. We have, however, developed a number of policy statements and have developed tentative guidelines which we have in the printing process, and this kind of thing, so that we can get this program launched if it is approved. I can't answer honestly whether a reshuffle here would cause us major complexities or not. I would like to ask Mr. Zellers, who has been doing the detailed work in some of the planning for this program, to say a word about what a shift involving State departments might create for us.

Mr. Karsh. Before he does, I would like to say that Mr. Zellers is detailed from his current position as executive officer in one of our bureaus, the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, to work on the development of the Teachers' Corps.

Mr. Laird. Mr. Commissioner, first I would just like to say I am just trying to develop this to see why it is such a big problem to shift to a limitation in the appropriation which would provide funds only would be available for Federal teachers as approved by the State departments of public instruction. When I get an answer that this has gone so far, then I find that none of the 60 people have been hired. I am trying to figure out how this has gone so far, how it was financed. I think it is a legitimate question to ask.

Mr. Howe. Certainly. It is authorized, as has been stated, and we will put into the record the exact authorization for this.

Mr. Laird. But you say you haven't hired any of these people.

Mr. Howe. We have detailed people within our staff to this activity—and this has involved a considerable amount of work—in order to get into the posture of being able to move if it is authorized.

Mr. Laird. Let's hear from Mr. Zellers.

EFFECT IF PROGRAM CHANGED TO DEAL THROUGH STATES

Mr. Zellers. I think the only answer I can give on that, Mr. Laird, is if the change were made today, right now, we could probably shift our program in the direction of working with the States and launch the program just as rapidly as if we were working directly with local educational agencies. But if the amendment has to go through a long process, the program is going to be delayed.

Mr. Laird. How much would you save as far as administrative expense if you dealt with 50 State departments of public instruction instead of dealing with thousands upon thousands of school districts all over the United States?

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS TO PARTICIPATE

Mr. Zellers. We are not going to deal with thousands and thousands. We are thinking in terms of approximately 300 or 400.

Mr. Laird. You are only going into 300 or 400?

Mr. Zellers. This is all we are going to be able to fund the first year.

Mr. Laird. In answer to Chairman Fogarty's question a little earlier, we were told this was merely a start, and once you start this program won't it get up to thousands of school districts?

Mr. Zellers. This depends upon the size of the appropriations.

Mr. Laird. It would seem to me you would have requests from thousands of school districts. Seems to me that 90 percent of the school districts in the country will go for a Federal teacher when you have 100 percent of the salary being paid for. And it would seem to me, although you are only funding 300 or 400 school districts, perhaps, under this request, you are going to have to deal with thousands of them. Aren't you going to have to investigate each request?

Mr. Zellers. The best estimate we have until we have a year's experience is that around 1,500 will be interested.

Mr. Laird. Only 1,500 will request, and you will narrow that down to 300 or 400?

Mr. Zellers. Yes, sir.

Mr. Laird. So my statement of thousands is wrong; it should be 1,500.

Mr. Fogarty. 1,500 out of how many eligible?

Mr. Laird. How many are eligible in all of the United States?

Mr. Zellers. We don't know how many. It isn't a question of how many are eligible. There are some 20,000 school districts in the country.

Mr. Laird. And you only think 1,500 will apply?

Mr. Zellers. Yes, sir.

Mr. Laird. For 100-percent Federal financing of Federal teachers?

Mr. Zellers. Mainly because the initial announcement will contain the information that they have to have a high concentration of children from disadvantaged families located in specific schools in order to qualify.

Mr. Laird. As this program expands you are going to have to deal with thousands.

Mr. Zellers. As the program expands, of course, any prediction you want to make might be a possibility.

Mr. Laird. Do you really want to deal directly with all of these school districts around the United States? Is this one way of establishing the standards from Washington in these various school districts? Why do you want to deal directly with these school districts? There must be some reason.

Mr. Zellers. I haven't made the decision to deal directly with them. The statute contains that provision. I have no objection to dealing directly with the States.

Mr. Laird. That answers my question.

DRAFT OF NOTIFICATION TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. Fogarty. What about the notification you are going to send out to the school districts? Do you have that ready now?

Mr. Zellers. We have draft letters to go to chief State school officers and to local school districts.

Mr. Fogarty. May we have a copy? May we see a copy of it?

Mr. Zellers. Yes.

Mr. Laird. May we put a draft in the record at this point, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Fogarty. Yes, I think it would be a good thing.

(The information follows:)

"Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education,
"Washington, D.C.

"Draft.

"State Superintendent.

"Dear Sir: You are asked to join us in planning and carrying out a program which can have considerable impact on the education of our Nation's impoverished youth.

"The National Teacher Corps is designed to bring able teaching aid to those schools which need specially equipped personnel to assist with the education of disadvantaged youth. Under this program, experienced teachers and teams of teachers, composed of experienced teachers and teacher-interns, will be recruited and trained in teaching the disadvantaged.

"Each school district in your State is being sent detailed information for formulating project proposals. These proposals will be submitted simultaneously to the National Teacher Corps and the district's State education agency.

"Your assistance is sought in several areas: first, local education agencies are to send copies of project proposals to you which we would want to evaluate; second, we request that you identify local school districts particularly in need of help and then provide them advice in developing proposals; finally, we would hope that you could use your agency's resources to bring this program to to the attention of eligible teachers.

"As you can readily see, your cooperation is crucial to the effective operation of this program. Any advice or assistance that you may provide us will be greatly appreciated. The staff of the National Teachers Corps will be glad to discuss any aspects of the program and supply you with additional information.

"Sincerely yours,

"——— ———,

"U.S. Commissioner of Education.

"Write or call National Teacher Corps, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Washington, D.C., 20202, Area Code 202-963-5266."

"DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
"Washington, D.C.

"Draft.

"Superintendent of Schools.

"DEAR SIR: You may wish to join us in planning and carrying out a program which can have considerable impact on the education of our Nation's impoverished youth.

"The National Teacher Corps is designed to bring able teaching aid to those schools which need specially equipped personnel to assist with the education of disadvantaged youth. Under this new program experienced teachers and teams of teachers, composed of experienced teachers and teacher-interns, will be recruited and trained for work in local school districts requesting them. Selected Corps teachers will receive 3 months of training in teaching the disadvantaged before actual assignment to schools where the need for special assistance is greatest.

"The enclosed information includes a detailed description of the program and a form for requesting additional materials for developing a project proposal. Your prompt consideration is necessary to insure adequate planning for the initial year of the program, since the project proposals must be received by the National Teacher Corps no later than (date to be inserted).

"Sincerely yours,

"——— ———,

"U.S. Commissioner of Education.

"Write or call National Teacher Corps, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Washington, D.C., 20202, Area Code 202-963-5266."

"NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS DESCRIPTIVE MATERIAL

"PURPOSE

"The National Teacher Corps (NTC) administered by the U.S. Office of Education, assists school systems in areas of urban and rural poverty, to obtain teaching talent.

"As established under part B, title V, of the Higher Education Act, NTC encourages experienced teachers and teacher-interns to serve in areas where they are most needed. It attracts able and dedicated young people into the teaching profession and provides an opportunity for experienced teachers to broaden their skills. It also encourages colleges and universities to broaden their teacher preparation programs to include the kind of training necessary for the successful teaching of disadvantaged students.

"PROGRAM

"Members of the NTC will supplement, not replace, regular school staff. They will be utilized in a great variety of ways, both within the school and within the community. They will serve as teachers, relieving regular staff members of some of their burdens. They will, in some instances, develop special curriculum programs. They will undertake projects that a school has not had the opportunity to develop. They will provide extra guidance and counseling. They will work with the families of students, with courts, welfare agencies, health clinics, and with other institutions that are involved in the total development of a youngster.

"In most instances, NTC members will operate as teams with an experienced teacher serving as team leader for a group of three or four teacher-interns. In some instances, experienced teachers will be assigned to schools as individuals.

"Programs will be locally operated but will be financed by the Federal Government. It is expected that each program will operate for a 2-year period.

"MEMBERS

"The National Teachers Corps expects initially to enroll 3,750 members, both experienced teachers and teacher-interns. NTC candidates exist wherever there are persons eager to express their commitment to helping young people realize their full potential. NTC candidates exist in many segments of the population—college seniors, currently employed teachers, housewives with grown children who are ready to return to work in a challenging program, returned Peace Corps volunteers, persons from business and industry.

"Selection

"Selection will depend on basic eligibility requirements, satisfactory completion of a 3-month preservice training session, and suitability for kinds of tasks to be performed in the local school. In all stages of the program, the NTC depends for its success on the participation of State and local education agencies as well as on the participation of institutions of higher education.

"Those selected will serve as teacher-interns and team leaders. The teacher-interns will be men and women with a bachelor's degree and either no experience or only 1 or 2 years of teaching experience. The team leaders will be experienced teachers with a minimum of 3 to 5 years of teaching experience and the ability to work with disadvantaged students.

"Training

"All members of the NTC will begin an intensive 3-month preservice training program, in June 1966, in a number of universities across the Nation.

"This period of training will provide Corps members with academic and practical knowledge required for effectively teaching disadvantaged children, and will also give them an understanding of the socioeconomic milieu in which they will be working. They will usually receive this training near the area to which they will be assigned in September. The training institution will plan its program in cooperation with the local school systems whenever possible. National Teacher Corps members will normally receive graduate credit for this training program.

"In addition to the preservice training program, teacher interns will take part in an ongoing training program while they are working in a local school. They will spend approximately half their time working in the schools and half in further training under the supervision of a university. From this ongoing training program teacher interns will earn credit toward M.A. degrees. Again, the formal training program will be designed in cooperation with the local school agency.

"Salary and other benefits

"During the 3-month preservice training period members of the NTC will be paid training stipends similar to those given for National Defense Education Act institutes. They will also receive allowances for transportation, etc. When they enter service in the local schools they will receive, if needed, travel allowances for themselves and their dependents.

"Teacher interns will be paid salaries equal to the lowest salary paid by the local agency they join for full-time teachers in that grade and school. Experienced teachers will be paid at a salary rate equal to their experience and grade, and, if they are team leaders, an additional amount as agreed upon by the Commissioner of Education and the local agency. For the currently employed experienced teacher, arrangements, in many instances, will be made with local school systems for 1- or preferably 2-year leaves for National Teacher Corps service which will protect their tenure, retirement and health insurance, or any other teacher rights.

"Teacher Corps teams will work in the local school system at the expressed request of the local and State education authorities. Once they have been assigned to and accepted by a district, they will be under the direct supervision of the local school authorities. The school district will have control over the individual assignments within the school system, transfers within the system, subject matter to be taught, and the term and continuance of the corps members within the school system in accordance with the terms of the contract with the Office of Education. The inservice training aspect of the program will be a joint local-State-Federal responsibility undertaken in cooperation with the institutions of higher education.

"The National Teacher Corps will enter into contracts with universities and local school systems to carry out these programs. To be eligible to receive NTC teams, local school districts must have one or more schools with a student population at least half of which have family incomes of below $3,000. The selection of local school districts for NTC participation will be directed toward obtaining a cross section of problems and circumstances encountered in educating the disadvantaged, toward including both urban and rural areas, and toward directing NTC personnel to areas in greatest need of help.

"Universities and local school districts are invited to submit proposals for the training and utilization of National Teacher Corps members. More detailed information, helpful in developing proposals, is available upon request."

POSSIBILITY OF CORPS SALARIES DIFFERING FROM LOCAL SALARIES

Mr. LAIRD. Let's look at this salary schedule just a minute. I would like to quote from Congresswoman EDITH GREEN of Oregon, who made the following statement on October 20 in the debate on the conference report in the House. She said it had been accurately pointed out in debate that—

> "in a given school district this bill, as drafted, may create a great deal of friction between the permanent teachers who are working under a fixed salary schedule and a Teachers Corps team of interns and one experienced teacher who may be paid salaries completely out of line with the local schedule."

Mrs. GREEN then went on to express the gravest concern that:

"It would be a very high price to pay for a Teachers Corps team if there were any possibility that the local salary schedule would be upset and the morale of the permanent teachers seriously impaired."

Would you comment on the validity of Mrs. GREEN's statement?

Mr. HOWE. The provision for payment of the teaching interns is at the local salary schedule, at the lowest level of it; and the provision for the experienced teachers is at the regular salary they would receive as experienced teachers in the school system. So it seems to me there is no possibility that these kinds of contrasts suggested in Mrs. GREEN's remarks can develop.

PREVIOUS STAND OF ADMINISTRATION ON 100 PERCENT FEDERAL FINANCING

Mr. LAIRD. Do you have a memorandum—perhaps you don't have it with you—that was circulated by the Office of Education in opposition to 100 percent financing of these Federal teachers? There is no mention of it here in the justification. I haven't heard it come up in the discussion here at all. Let me quote from parts of that memorandum. It states:

"Local districts should be required to give some support to the Corps as an indication of their belief in it. Otherwise there will be a strong tendency for school districts to apply for the 'free ride,' taking all of the experienced Teachers Corps volunteers they can get, all paid for by Washington. We believe that it is an unwise precedent for the Federal Government to begin paying 100 percent of the salaries of local employees. While the administration is concerned with the improvement of teachers' salaries wherever they are inadequate, we question the wisdom of a precedent in which the Federal Government could ultimately be held responsible for 100 percent of the salaries of some 2 million local employees."

Still quoting from the memorandum from the Office of Education:

"We also believe it would be better from the viewpoint of internal control of personnel, for the school district to be making the major payment of teachers' salaries."

What has happened in this intervening period to alter the very sound thinking of the administration as expressed in the report that I just quoted?

Mr. HOWE. Could I ask who signed this report?

Mr. LAIRD. This is a memorandum from the administration that was circulated to Members of Congress prior to the vote on the 100 percent financing. I think you have a copy of this memorandum in your files.

Mr. HOWE. I believe I have seen it.

My only comments here are two things: (1) Many school budgets will be set by the time this enterprise appears at all, and therefore the local school districts will have no flexible funds to launch new enterprises. A matching fund arrangement would guarantee that the program would not be launched.

(2) I think that the school districts which have the greatest need for these kind of teachers are those that are least able to pay. Even though they had time in which to set aside matching funds, they do not have the funds. So it seems to me that, in order to get a worthwhile enterprise going, it would be worth it to go on a 100-percent basis. This is not to load the conversation against sometimes moving into matching funds, but with the timing that we have to launch this program I think we have got to have 100 percent Federal funds to make it go.

Mr. LAIRD. But there has been no slowdown in this program. You didn't plan to do anything, according to the testimony from your own budget people, until June of calendar year 1966.

Mr. HOWE. As far as being able to notify school systems that anything was definitely going to happen and that people would become available, we still can't do that. Until there is an appropriation by Congress on this we would probably be unwise to do that.

OPINIONS ON REQUIRING LOCAL MATCHING

Mr. LAIRD. How would you feel about putting a limitation in the appropriation requiring that the fund shall be made available only in those school districts in which 10-percent matching is available from the local school district?

Mr. HOWE. I think that that will make it harder for the school districts that need these funds the most to get started with this program.

Mr. LAIRD. That is not the position taken by Commissioner Keppel, nor was it the position taken by Under Secretary of HEW Wilbur Cohen. Even right up to the markup of the bill they were over there arguing for at least 10 percent.

Mr. HOWE. I would not quarrel with the matching fund idea in a second year of this program or in a year in which school districts had time to adjust to it. It seems to me that if we are going to get it started in September 1967 in the schools, 100-percent funding is probably the only practical basis on which to get it going. These teachers are needed in those districts that don't have flexible funds.

Mr. LAIRD. Once you start this 100-percent nonmatching fund, I think you are going to have a difficult time putting your philosophy, which seems to be in favor of matching, into effect.

Mr. HOWE. Perhaps. Yet it seems to me a perfectly logical position to take, to get it launched. The 100-percent funding does make sense.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you think that if a school district really wants to use these Federal teachers that 10-percent contribution is asking too much?

Mr. HOWE. I don't think it is asking too much. But I think that in a school district, school Y, which has a very tight budget and is going to find these teachers available after that budget is solidified, would have to forgo the possibility of having them for next September. This is why it seems to me, for launching the program, 100-percent funding is a useful device.

Mr. FOGARTY. In answer to Mr. Laird's question, What harm would be done if that 10-percent provision were in, if we wrote it into the appropriation act?

Mr. HOWE. I cannot answer how much harm would be done, because I do not have figures that show me what school districts would be able to shake loose some funds for this.

Mr. LAIRD. This is the administration's position?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. You know that, the 10 percent, this is your position. I am stating that here.

Mr. HOWE. Well, the position I am taking on this is that for a launching program 100 percent is a useful device.

Mr. LAIRD. I sometimes have to come to the defense of this administration. I am just trying to state——

Mr. HOWE. We are glad for the assistance.

Mr. LAIRD. I am trying to state the administration's position. As I understand it, it was stated in this communication. This is the first communication I have seen in which you have referred to 2 million Federal teachers. This must include——

Mr. HOWE. I would be surprised if that communication——

POSSIBLE FUTURE SIZE OF CORPS

Mr. LAIRD (reading):

"We question the wisdom of a precedent in which the Federal Government could ultimately be held responsible for 100 percent of the salaries of some 2 million local employees."

Mr. HOWE. I would go along with that. That does not deny anything I said about getting this program launched in the places where it is needed.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you envision this program getting that large ever?

Mr. HOWE. I would be very much surprised if a teacher training program of this sort would ever get into the scope of 2 million trainees.

Mr. LAIRD. Who picked that figure out of the hat over in the Office of Education? This figure seems to me to envision putting every teacher on the Federal payroll through this program, if you read the memorandum from the Office of Education, and interpret literally.

Mr. HOWE. I assure you there is no such intention.

ADMINISTRATION'S VIEW ON 100 PERCENT FEDERAL FUNDING

Mr. LAIRD. What does that mean? "We question the wisdom of a precedent in which the Federal Government could ultimately be held responsible for 100 percent of the salaries of some 2 million local employees." That must cover all of the teachers in the United States.

Mr. HOWE. That would be a figure of about 25 kids for each teacher and that comes pretty close to that.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you know anything about that?

Mr. KARSH. That is the first time I ever heard reference to it or seen it. It is obviously not the position of the administration now. The position that full 100 percent——

Mr. LAIRD. This memorandum was used by the administration as an argument for a matching formula as the bill was being marked up in the Senate. After the bill was marked up, you have changed positions again. The executive branch can change a little more rapidly than we can here in the legislative branch.

Mr. KARSH. I can only speak to the——

Mr. FOGARTY. He was not in the act last year, neither of these three people. Mr. Kelly, sitting back there, may know about it.

Mr. LAIRD. He probably wrote the memorandum.

Mr. KELLY. I think it is very clear, Mr. Laird. The administration is endeavoring to carry out the will of the Congress. It is true that the administration witnesses did suggest that the Congress give consideration to a matching arrangement and it was the conclusion of the committees of Congress which supported the bill before that this ought to be done.

Mr. LAIRD. For that reason it was not funded last year.

Mr. KELLY. As the Commissioner indicated to you, it is the view of the administration that we ought to start this program at 100-percent Federal salary financing as concluded by the Congress, but that there would be no objection to reorganizing and forewarning the school districts that in second and subsequent years they might be expected to make some partial participation in the program.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you not think they should be notified in advance though, the idea they are going to get under this program and then you are going to come back next year and say, "Well, school is out. We are going to require 20 or 30 percent matching."

Mr. KELLY. I would think one of the ways to accomplish it is to adopt your suggestion, if it is the attitude of the Congress that second and subsequent years should include a participation, that you put the school districts on warning in the report which acts upon this bill. The Commissioner has indicated that he does not think this is out of keeping with the concept that you launch the program and get it started on a 100-percent Federal basis and put the school districts on notice that some degree of participation would be expected in subsequent years.

HOUSE HEARINGS ON TEACHER CORPS

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Commissioner, this is the first hearing that has ever been held in the House of Representatives on this Teacher Corps program. There has never been a hearing before the Labor and Education Committee or any other committee in the

House of Representatives on this program; is that not correct?

Mr. Howe. I didn't know that.

Mr. Laird. Do you know of any hearing that has ever been held in the House of Representatives on this new concept of Federal teachers?

Mr. Cardwell. Was it not considered as a part of the basic legislation?

Mr. Laird. Can anybody in the room tell me where this has ever been considered in the House of Representatives?

Mr. Fogarty. No; it was considered in the Senate. We, of course, considered the conference report in the House but I think that was all.

Mr. Kelly. On appropriations.

Mr. Laird. Was it ever considered by any legislative committee of the House of Representatives?

Mr. Kelly. I know it was considered on the floor of the House at some length. I don't recall the legislative history.

Mr. Laird. I have never known of any hearings held by the House of Representatives on this very important program and the long-term effect it is going to have on our whole educational system. I think this is the first hearing ever held here in the House.

I am concerned that this is sent to us as a supplemental appropriation without the recommendations which I understood represented the position of the administration.

Mr. Howe. Without the matching?

POSSIBILITY OF DEALING THROUGH STATES

Mr. Laird. Without the matching. I understand that you would prefer it to deal with the States?

Mr. Howe. Again let me say in regard to the States—my reservation about that has nothing to do with the principle of having the States assist us and even take a major role in this enterprise, but rather has to do with the fact that we have been working along, as the law is now framed, to develop some plans. My reservation about working with the States had to do with having to shift gears in midstream while carrying responsibilities to get a program launched next September.

Mr. Laird. There were some of us who had some questions about this last year. It came to us cold in a conference. It seemed to me time was needed for the administration to come back and get corrective legislation for the matching formula which they believe in and for dealing with the States, which I understood was one of the things they wanted—to work closely with the State departments of public instruction to build them up, not to bypass them. I thought that was going to be done.

Now here we are and neither of those things has been recommended.

NEED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR PUBLIC LAW 874

Mr. Commissioner, this is a supplemental for funds that you made no commitment to anybody on, any school district in the United States or any State department of public instruction?

Mr. Howe. That is correct. That is right. Or university.

Mr. Laird. Or any university.

Mr. Howe. Yes.

Mr. Laird. Why have we not got a supplemental before us on Public Law 874? Did you request a supplemental of funds on Public Law 874?

Mr. Karsh. At the time that the 1967 budget was being formulated, a review of the 1966 programs was also made. At that time it was decided within the Department that we would not request a supplemental appropriation for Public Law 874.

Mr. Laird. Why did you make that decision? Why did you give priority to this program where you did not have a commitment and where you have school districts all over the United States that are short $40 million under the terms of a commitment you have already made to them?

Mr. Cardwell. Mr. Laird, in the case of the Public Law 874 appropriation request, the 1967 budget which has already been presented to this committee proposes an absorption program.

Mr. Laird. I am talking about 1966.

Mr. Cardwell. I know that you are. But having——

Mr. Laird. Let us talk about 1966.

Mr. Cardwell. I am.

Mr. Laird. You estimated when you came to us with the budget for fiscal year 1966, 100 percent financing of Public Law 874. You notified every school district that you would request 100-percent financing before this committee; is that not correct?

Mr. Cardwell. With an eligibility factor. Yes, sir.

Mr. Laird. The question was asked by the chairman of this committee, is this sufficient to fund 100 percent of the needs under Public Law 874 and that was answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Cardwell. The chairman of this committee quite recently asked that question and I think the answer was in the negative.

Mr. Laird. I am talking about the hearings on the 1966 bill. You defended that estimate as adequate to fund 100 percent. Mr. Kelly who is sitting right here was at the hearings that day. He insisted that 100-percent financing was provided in that estimate that came to this committee. He did not hedge on that estimate.

Mr. Kelly. When we appeared before the committee last year, it was our best judgment that the estimate that we presented for your consideration would pay 100-percent entitlement.

Mr. Laird. Every school district in the United States that operates under 874 is expecting 100-percent financing?

Mr. Kelly. Two things occurred. First, the developments indicated that our estimate was wrong both as to numbers of students eligible and as to average cost per student. Second, the Congress changed the law and modified it so as to provide certain liberalizations which would require additional funds.

As Mr. Cardwell said, because the administration is proposing to the Congress that it amend the law, and these amendments to the law would substantially reduce the amounts of funds required for these school districts, it was decided not to request a supplemental to finance 100-percent entitlement in 1966. It was believed that this would aggravate the situation rather than assist it.

Mr. Fogarty. The question Mr. Laird asked was answered by you. I did ask the question and I ask it every year.

Mr. Kelly. Yes, sir.

Mr. Fogarty. "Are these sufficient funds to cover 100 percent of what these districts are entitled to under the law?" The answer I remember was in the affirmative.

Mr. Kelly. That is correct.

Mr. Laird. You have decided as Commissioner of Education that these funds are not needed?

Mr. Howe. I would not put it exactly that way.

Mr. Laird. What have you decided? You have not asked for them. What have you decided?

Mr. Howe. It seems to me, since we are making a transition to a different program under Public Law 874, with somewhat lower funding, that to move ahead with larger funding is just asking for a greater disparity when we go to the new program; and that therefore it makes sense to taper this off on a pro rata basis.

Mr. Laird. To go under this new program requires an act of Congress.

Mr. Howe. Yes, sir.

Mr. Fogarty. That is right. It is not "somewhat lower funding"; it is a cut of over 50 percent. What do you call "somewhat?"

Mr. Laird. You are taking this upon yourself to amend the law rather than wait for Congress to act, by refusing to come to the Congress with a request? You feel that these funds are not needed?

Mr. Howe. It seems to me in terms of the total program that we are trying to advance that this kind of supplemental would simply create a greater contrast when we got into the new program.

Mr. Laird. Do you not think you have a commitment to these school districts that is even a prior commitment as compared with Federal teachers?

Mr. Howe. Actually I have not had these things in my mind as being set against each other.

Mr. Laird. The only reason they are in the same ball park is that they are in the form of supplementals. This is a supplemental request we have here. There is a supplemental that should be asked for if we are going to live up to the 100-percent commitment that Mr. Kelly and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education said they were requesting for fiscal year 1966. Every school district that is under that particular program felt that they were going to get 100 percent, after the testimony that was given to this committee, and given to the U.S. Senate.

I have serious questions about the program but I don't have questions about what commitment was made. I think that you—and I am talking about your predecessor and the Office of Education as well as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—did indicate that you were favoring 100-percent financing in fiscal year 1966.

I would like to know how or what kind of rationale you can use to get out of that commitment.

Mr. Howe. You mean 100-percent financing in 874?

Mr. Laird. Yes.

Mr. Howe. The only rationale that I can give you is the one that I just stated. In terms of our plan this seemed to make sense.

Mr. Laird. I guess I will not pursue it any more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fogarty. I think you ought to. I go along with you on this, as you know. I think they are all wrong. I think the administration is entirely wrong in this thing. I think that the Commissioner of Education knows they are wrong.

Mr. Laird. It seems to me they are establishing a priority and this commitment would seem to be a prior commitment as far as supplementals are concerned. I think they have committed themselves to these school districts by their testimony before this committee last year on the 1966 budget.

Mr. Howe. We have so stated in years past that we made these commitments and we requested funds.

Mr. Laird. I do not want to ask any more questions.

Mr. Fogarty. Take your time. We want to give this a good hearing today.

Mr. Laird. Thank you.

Mr. Fogarty. What about the land grant colleges?

Mr. Laird. I have gotten into enough today. This just amazes me, that this comes in the form of a supplemental in this way. When they turned their back on the school districts to whom they had previously made a firm commitment all over the United States. They want to fund the Federal teachers program ahead of these firm commitments they made to these school districts all over the United States.

Mr. Fogarty. I made a pledge to the President that I would try to get this supplemental through the committee. We will get it reported out. I hope that you will support me on that and also in taking care of this shortage for Public Law 874.

Mr. Duncan?

Mr. DUNCAN. I have just a few questions. More than anything else directed toward clarifying the cross-examination that was just gone through here.

As I understand your final question——

Mr. LAIRD. I was just asking questions here. I hate to have it referred to as cross-examination.

Mr. DUNCAN. You will certainly allow the same latitude of characterizing your questioning as you demand for yourself in characterizing the actions of these witnesses, would you not?

It was good cross-examination. As I understand it, it boils down to this: Basically your program and your request here is to fund the law as it was passed by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. HOWE. That is correct, with the reservation that we are asking for a somewhat lower level of funding than was authorized in the law.

OPINIONS ON REQUIRING LOCAL MATCHING

Mr. DUNCAN. I understand that. Insofar as the law itself was concerned, your requests are consistent, if not with the position taken by the department of education on prior occasions, at least with the final action of the Congress of the United States in the authorizing legislation?

Mr. HOWE. Absolutely.

Mr. DUNCAN. Then I would understand further, however, that as the head of the department, you have no objection to putting this program on a matching fund basis?

Mr. HOWE. In the long run, none at all in principle.

Mr. DUNCAN. We understand that the position of the department last year was not a long-run position but it was their position at that time that they wanted matching funds at the outset of the program?

Mr. HOWE. I assume that and not having been directly involved in that I cannot speak for that 100 percent.

Mr. DUNCAN. Let me ask Mr. Kelly. The position of the department while the legislation was under consideration was that it should have been a matching fund program?

Mr. KELLY. I think so. But it was anticipated that the enactment of the legislation this way would have been the advanced notice to the school district.

DURATION OF PROGRAM

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you conceive of this Teachers Corps program as being a permanent program or an emergency program of less than permanent duration?

Mr. HOWE. I would think of it myself as a program of some length. "Permanent" is quite a word. I would consider it as a program that would have 10 or 15 years' life and be reexamined from time to time.

Mr. DUNCAN. You do not consider it to be in any way a temporary program, a temporary boost to encourage the local school districts to supply a higher level of teaching both in quantity and quality, and being a program from which the Federal Government could withdraw?

Mr. HOWE. The reason I give the answer I do is that it ought to have considerable longevity and that I honestly don't believe we are going to handle the problem at which it is directed in the short run.

This is the problem of the disadvantaged youngsters in both urban and rural slums.

RELATIONSHIP OF LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS TO STATE AGENCIES

Mr. DUNCAN. Are not most school districts in the United States independent of the State departments of education? Do they not operate with a considerable degree of autonomy?

Mr. HOWE. There are varying degrees of autonomy from State to State. It varies a great deal.

Mr. DUNCAN. Is there a geographical pattern to this variation?

Mr. HOWE. I never thought about it in these terms. I would say that in New England the tradition of local independence of the school system from the State is probably of longer run and it is a more vigorous local tradition than in some other places. Actually, it probably could be measured by looking at the percentage of State funding for schools, and you would probably find the degree of autonomy related to a large extent to the proportion of local money provided as opposed to State money. I cannot give you a geographical distribution beyond that statement about New England——

RELATIONSHIP OF GRANT FUNDS AND LOCAL AUTONOMY

Mr. DUNCAN. The more State money that goes into the local school districts, the less autonomy they enjoy?

Mr. HOWE. I think this is a fair statement.

Mr. DUNCAN. Would that same analogy hold true, you think, with regard to Federal money going to school districts?

Mr. HOWE. If you were to ever get into the posture of having the proportions involved of Federal money that are involved in the State-local relationship, you might want to raise this issue. The proportions involved are so minor and will be for so long that I hardly think we confront the issue in those terms.

TOTAL FUNDS FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. DUNCAN. What are we talking about in terms of the total amount of money spent on primary and secondary education in the United States? Is it $40 billion a year?

Mr. HOWE. I have heard figures ranging from $25 to $40 billion. It is in that bailiwick.

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you know how much Federal money is going currently into primary and secondary education in the country now?

Mr. HOWE. Roughly two and a half——

Mr. KARSH. $2.5 to $3 billion from all Federal sources.

Mr. DUNCAN. Not only the Department of Education, but all the departments of Government?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. I had heard of the $40 billion figure.

Mr. HOWE. I think the $40 billion figure is probably a figure that is more inclusive than just elementary and secondary. I think they will run nearer to $25 and $28 billion.

Mr. DUNCAN. At the present time somewhere between $2.5 billion to $3 billion Federal money is going into that?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. I cannot remember the precise percentage of State funds that go to school systems in Oregon but I do not think it is much more than 30. I am likewise satisfied that a high degree of autonomy is enjoyed by the school districts in Oregon.

EXTENT OF ELIGIBILITY FOR CORPS TEACHERS

You have indicated that with the amounts of money requested here that you would not have funds to make available to all school districts in the country. As I gather the testimony, all school districts in the country perhaps would have eligibility. Is that last assumption a correct one?

Mr. HOWE. Not all school districts in the country will have eligibility.

Mr. DUNCAN. Most of them? 90 percent of them?

Mr. HOWE. The eligibility factor here is a comparative matter related to the numbers, or proportions of disadvantaged youngsters, so that there will be a focus of eligibility in relatively few.

Mr. DUNCAN. Every school district will have some disadvantaged youngsters?

Mr. HOWE. If the funds were to be built up to a very large program you would then get into larger numbers of school districts.

Mr. DUNCAN. Where do you suppose the major impact of this initial appropriation would be?

Mr. HOWE. It would be first of all in certain States. We have got some figures here that show that some 20 States have 80 percent of the disadvantaged youngsters. Therefore, you can bet that within these 20 States you would have considerable focus of this.

Secondly, you would have a relatively high focus in the South and in certain urban areas.

Mr. DUNCAN. Harlem, for instance?

Mr. HOWE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DUNCAN. Watts?

Mr. HOWE. I am not sure of California in this picture. They are relatively high in this category. Very high.

Mr. DUNCAN. Some of these areas are rather critical from a social standpoint right now, are they not? Harlem and Watts, for example?

Mr. HOWE. Absolutely. The States that have the largest numbers of disadvantaged youngsters are Texas, California, North Carolina, and then New York giving this as a quick reading.

Mr. DUNCAN. North Carolina is the only Southern State you read in that list?

Mr. HOWE. I am giving the top of the list.

Mr. DUNCAN. Read a half dozen more.

Mr. HOWE. South Carolina, picking up Southern States, Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Tennessee, Florida, Kentucky, Virginia, are all on this listing of States with very large numbers of disadvantaged youngsters.

Mr. DUNCAN. What State did you come from to the Department?

Mr. HOWE. I came from North Carolina. I have been there only 2 years so I am not a real Tar Heel.

Mr. DUNCAN. We are actually, initially at least, talking about trying to get some funds in the most disadvantaged areas of the country and those areas particularly where we have had rather graphic examples of social unrest in the last few months.

Mr. HOWE. Yes, that is right. Getting them there for a particular purpose.

Mr. DUNCAN. Would basically these school districts be those with a pattern of colored students, Puerto Rican, Negro?

Mr. HOWE. There would be a high proportion of Negro youngsters in the communities involved. Puerto Rican only in a few places, of course.

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you find even in a wealthy State such as California, for instance, which generally has a high level of support for its schools, there are school districts occupying a different status and that have a tax base so low which even when combined with State support makes it unlikely that they would furnish the quality and quantity of teachers demanded by the local neighborhood?

Mr. HOWE. You have got to qualify the answer to this by asking whether the teacher training institutions in California are training teachers with the kind of focus with which this program is concerned—really training them in their practice teaching and all their background work to work with disadvantaged youngsters. This program really focuses on that.

FUNCTION OF CORPS TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS TO WHICH ASSIGNED

Mr. DUNCAN. These teachers will be actually handling special classes as opposed to moving in and assuming a parallel function of teachers already hired?

Mr. HOWE. These teachers will be providing what you might describe as supplementary additional services in the schools rather than taking over regular classes. These teachers will not be relieving the school system of any costs. They will be providing additional services, such as remedial reading—special small group services over and above what the school system normally provides.

Mr. DUNCAN. They would not go in to relieve a lot of students in a course in new math, for instance? Assume a situation where they have got 45 students per teacher. You would not plan to use these teachers simply to improve the teacher-pupil ratio?

Mr. HOWE. They might be used to improve the pupil-teacher ratio for groups of youngsters who have special needs. Perhaps new math is not a good example because the chances are that new math would not be focused on disadvantaged youngsters.

Take the realm of reading, or social studies, or English classrooms in the junior high school—I think that these teachers might well be used to cut down division size to give the regular teachers a smaller group to work with on a more intensive basis while they were supervising other activities with a portion of the group.

Mr. DUNCAN. In each instance they follow the curriculum and follow the texts used by other teachers?

Mr. HOWE. Absolutely.

COMPLAINTS REGARDING FEDERAL CONTROL

Mr. DUNCAN. Have you had complaints as you have been administering your programs of assistance to the primary and secondary schools of the country about Federal control of the educational processes in those States?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. You have had some?

Mr. HOWE. On a regular basis.

Mr. DUNCAN. In any quantity?

Mr. HOWE. I wouldn't say in large quantity, no.

I think you have a genuine concern on the part of people in local areas, as they try to get involved in our programs, that our programs not control what they do. We are trying to run our program in ways to avoid this. But we are a new element in the picture so that the concern does get expressed and we receive it.

Mr. DUNCAN. Is this concern as to prospective acts of the Department or current procedures?

Mr. HOWE. I think sometimes it is a concern about current procedures in the sense that people will feel that the applications we make them fill out in order to get grants of Federal funds are complex. We are endeavoring to repair these kinds of problems. But there are those, I am sure, who look way ahead and wonder where we are heading with this.

Mr. DUNCAN. Can you describe some of the other complaints? I do not want complaints from persons acting in their individual capacities. I am thinking about complaints from school board members, teachers, departments of education, and so on. I am curious as to the nature these may take.

Mr. HOWE. If I can make an observation about these, I think that one of the great sources of complaint that we receive stems from our civil rights activity and not our program activity. I think that the complaint very easily gets transferred over from feelings about the civil rights activity to the program activity. To the degree that is the case it seems to me that the complaint is not legitimate because the nature of our responsibility in the realm of civil rights is very different from the nature of our responsibility in administering programs.

It is a legal responsibility to enforce certain kinds of things.

Mr. DUNCAN. Without suggesting anything as to the validity of those, do you have complaints about programs?

Mr. HOWE. I think the concerns about programs are those which come from people whom we have turned down for grants, and there is the natural disappointment of having done some work and not getting the grant they hoped to get. Sometimes this generates complaints. I think rarely are these complaints justified. We do a lot of work going back over the ground trying to explain to people why the decisions were reached—what was wrong with the submissions they gave us, how they can improve them and resubmit them. We get complaints about specific submissions.

We do get complaints about procedures that we require. We walk a very difficult line between trying to have enough procedures to guarantee that we are spending Federal funds fairly and wisely, and little enough procedures so that we don't annoy the people with whom we are dealing.

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you have complaints that you are imposing restrictions on curriculums, for instance, or types of textbooks used?

Mr. HOWE. We have this question raised but I have never known it to assume the status of a complaint that had any evidence connected with it.

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you in fact assert any jurisdiction, real or fancied, over what textbooks are to be used?

Mr. HOWE. No, we can make a very good case that the activities of the U.S. office in the realm of curriculums really confront the school districts with more choices than have been available to them in past years.

Our whole effort is in the realm of a pluralism of curriculums rather than a single control.

POSSIBILITY OF DEALING THROUGH STATE AGENCIES ON TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM

Mr. DUNCAN. In view of the nature of the school districts to which these initial funds at least would be directed, is there any problem to be anticipated, if the State board of education were to have a voice between the department and the school district insofar as getting the funds to the disadvantaged youngster is concerned?

Mr. HOWE. I don't think any real problem. We are doing this already in title I of the Elementary-Secondary Act. The only concern that I expressed about this in the earlier testimony was the problem of our shifting gears on a plan. I think that with that reservation there certainly is the possibility of having States submit plans or develop programs which we then use as a basis for farming out to them much of the activity involved here.

Mr. DUNCAN. There has been no question in your mind insofar as State plans submitted so far under other aspects of this bill that the funds are getting to the area they are intended to go.

I am thinking, for instance, of problems if California should submit a plan that should exclude Watts, for instance, not that I think they would.

Mr. HOWE. This is why I suggested if we were to move into this relationship with the States on the Teachers Corps program, we would want to have a relationship which involved State planning that had been approved before we went ahead to transfer funds. We would ask that that plan be of such a nature it would include a district like Watts.

INCREASE IN TEACHER SUPPLY THROUGH TEACHER TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

Mr. DUNCAN. You are not really creating a new teacher for this program, are you?

Mr. HOWE. I think we are.

Mr. DUNCAN. How?

Mr. HOWE. By setting up a program which in its first days brings some 2,700 people who are not now teaching into training work in the schools, offering supplementary services. We foresee that a high proportion of these will leave the program in 2 years with teaching certificates. What proportion we cannot tell you until we have the experience.

Mr. DUNCAN. These are people who would not have graduated from a teacher training course or a major in education. They would have graduated with a major in some other discipline?

Mr. HOWE. They will in all likelihood, in high proportion, be people defined as you define them.

Mr. DUNCAN. How are these people going to acquire certificates? Are not those certificating agencies pretty rigid in the requirements for educational courses a teacher has before he is eligible for a certificate?

Mr. HOWE. Certification is a State matter entirely. It varies from State to State. The 2-year period in which these people will be in training will have built into it certain course work in addition to their actual work in the schools. So they will have opportunity to pick up certification if they wish to do so. We have not gotten the complete details of this worked out yet but that will certainly be one possibility for the people.

Mr. DUNCAN. This will have to vary from State to State?

Mr. HOWE. There will be some variation from State to State. We would hope there would be real variations in the teacher training programs that are approved at different universities. This is because we are not sure that anyone has the magic formula by which you train people to work with disadvantaged youngsters. We would like to see several approaches to this.

Mr. DUNCAN. Actually you are going to have minimum training before you put them on the job?

Mr. HOWE. They will have this summer which is a "quickie" and then there will be on-the-job intensive supervision with master teachers in the program.

Mr. DUNCAN. Are there any problems in the State teachers organizations in permitting these interns to come into the schools?

Mr. HOWE. I have not heard of them. I would like to ask Mr. Zellers if he had any reaction on this.

Mr. ZELLERS. We have not had any reaction. We have a meeting with that group this week and I will know more early next week than today on that subject.

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you plan to use any retired teachers in this program?

Mr. HOWE. The focus is certainly going to be on training relatively young teachers who have a career before them. There will be some additional focus on getting housewives who are bachelor degree graduates, maybe about 35 to 40 years old, to come into the program. I would expect we would use retired teachers only in the master-teacher category if they are capable and alert people.

Mr. DUNCAN. I think that is all.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Michel?

BASIC GOALS OF PROGRAM

Mr. MICHEL. Commissioner, what is the real thrust of this program? Is it to get more people interested in teaching? Is it to improve the level or quality of the teaching profession? Is it to expand the effort in the disadvantaged kids of this country? I confess from the colloquy this afternoon I do not know what the real thrust of it is.

You talk of training people, about training the already trained, the already educated. I thought the real thrust of this program was to help those poor devils who are not getting the very rudiments and fundamentals the way they should. What is the thrust of this program?

Mr. HOWE. The real thrust of this program is to serve disadvantaged youngsters by training teachers specifically in the schools working with them.

Mr. MICHEL. Has the educational process in this country and the institutions fallen down in properly educating people for the teaching profession?

Mr. HOWE. I wouldn't offer it in as broad a generalization as that. I would say we have fallen down in preparing people to really do a constructive job of teaching with the kind of kids who have disadvantaged backgrounds.

CALIBER OF TEACHERS IN PROGRAM

Mr. MICHEL. How in the devil, if we have been lacking in this area thus far, can you expect to take a trainee with 3 months of training, not prepared with education hours, and thrust him into a situation as you have described and say you are giving the disadvantaged kid a better education than he was getting before?

Mr. HOWE. Personally——

Mr. MICHEL. To me, I do not know. You are the Commissioner of Education. Tell me where I am wrong.

Mr. HOWE. First of all, the trainee is providing a supplementary service to the regular teachers in the school over and above what that youngster would have had if the trainee were not there. This is an additional service. Secondly, the trainee is under the supervision of an experienced teacher assigned there for the purpose of helping to develop both training and the quality of teaching.

Mr. MICHEL. In effect what you are doing is using disadvantaged children as guinea pigs for somebody in practice teaching?

Mr. HOWE. In part this is true. We believe that probably the best way to learn to teach disadvantaged youngsters is to teach disadvantaged youngsters under intensive supervision and criticism. You can never learn to teach disadvantaged youngsters by teaching other kinds of youngsters. You can never learn the kind of adjustment needed by the teacher, if you don't actually confront the person you are worried about in the classroom. This is the basis on which this program is set up.

RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR OPERATING PROGRAM

Mr. MICHEL. Have the rules and regulations been promulgated yet that apply to the Teachers Corps?

Mr. HOWE. They have not been promulgated. There has been some preliminary work on them. If you want to go into details of that, I would ask Mr. Zellers to speak about them.

Mr. MICHEL. I would like to know how soon we could have these rules and regulations in printed form.

Mr. ZELLERS. They are in a working draft form now with about two more chapters to go. Within 2 or 3 weeks we expect to have them in final draft form for the Commissioner's action.

Mr. MICHEL. There was a request made for the record here for an item in draft form. What was it?

Mr. ZELLERS. This was a letter to the chief State school officers announcing the program.

Mr. MICHEL. That is all we have asked for the record?

Mr. ZELLERS. Yes. We are not far enough advanced with the guidelines, Mr. MICHEL, to have anything to submit for the record at this time. We will have in a matter of days.

Mr. MICHEL. Taking a leaf out of the experience with respect to the rent subsidy program, and the fact that the rules and regulations were drawn up before the money was funded, we found out how lousy those regulations were and therefore denied the money. Is that the reason why you have not yet gotten them? You have had as much time as they had in housing.

Mr. ZELLERS. I am not familiar with their program. We have had no staff.

EMPLOYEES NOW WORKING ON PROGRAM AND ESTIMATE FOR FUTURE

Mr. MICHEL. Did I hear earlier in this hearing that there were about 60 people drawing up these plans so far? How many people have been detailed to this?

Mr. KARSH. You heard there were 60 identified in the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation last year and which Congress acted on favorably. We have hired nobody in those permanent positions. We have detailed people like Mr. Zellers.

Mr. MICHEL. How many people have you detailed to this particular program or any phase of this program?

Mr. KARSH. I believe we have had about a dozen or so people working on that.

Mr. ZELLERS. On a part-time basis.

Mr. MICHEL. In this first year of operation, how many administrators or people in administrative capacity are involved with this program other than actual teachers and trainees?

Mr. ZELLERS. You are referring to the Federal part of the operation?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

Mr. ZELLERS. Approximately 55 or 60.

Mr. MICHEL. When you say "Federal" will there be State people also involved?

Mr. ZELLERS. I was contrasting that with the local educational agency people.

Mr. MICHEL. Under this salary schedule, as I understand it, both the mother or father superior, whoever he may be, plus the trainees or interns, are at the salary level of whatever might exist in the district where they are asigned. Is that correct?

Mr. HOWE. Right.

PAYMENTS TO TEACHERS

Mr. MICHEL. What other emoluments will come to these teachers or trainees? Living expenses?

Mr. HOWE. Not living expenses. If they are displaced and have to move from State to State there is some compensation for that process. If the experienced teachers are moved out of the retirement system they are in, provision is made to carry over the provisions of their retirement system to the school they may be moved to.

Mr. MICHEL. These folks would not be considered to be Federal employees, would they?

Mr. HOWE. No. They are local employees.

Mr. MICHEL. They would not be subject to the Federal retirement program?

Mr. KARSH. No. They are covered by the Compensation Act only for injury or death; and only in this sense would they be considered Federal employees.

Mr. MICHEL. Would these teachers and trainees be permitted or obliged to join the teachers' union?

Mr. HOWE. That is a question I had not thought about. I would assume not. There is, as far as I know, no school system where the teachers are required to join the teachers' union, even though the teachers' union may be the bargaining agency for the school system. Therefore I would think these people would be free to exercise their choice in any way they wish.

LOCATION OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Mr. MICHEL. I think you said 80 percent of the disadvantaged students come from roughly 20 States. Do we have those States listed in the record? You mentioned a few of them.

Mr. HOWE. No, I do not believe they are listed in the record. I can furnish them for the record.

* * * * *

Mr. MICHEL. Where does my State of Illinois rank in this order of priority?

Mr. HOWE. You have 230,000 students in this category and in rank among the 20 States I would say you are roughly in the middle.

Mr. MICHEL. Does this suggest that the 30 States that apparently have only 20 percent of the disadvantaged students will be way down in priority when they apply for participation in the program?

Mr. HOWE. I would think this is the way the formula which we are required to use under the act would operate. Is that correct?

Mr. KARSH. That is correct. They would be eligible for teaching teams in the same way they are eligible under title I.

Mr. MICHEL. As I understand, many of the 20 States are in the South.

Mr. HOWE. Fourteen are Southern or border States.

Mr. MICHEL. In those Southern States is it not true salary schedules for teachers are below those in the industrial States?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

INDUCEMENTS FOR TEACHERS TO JOIN PROGRAM

Mr. MICHEL. What is the inducement for a teacher or a trainee to come in this program if they know they will be assigned to a State that has a salary scale lower than they could get if they put themselves on the market to teach in my State or any other State?

Mr. HOWE. This program will not work if it has to work purely on the basis of financial inducement. This program will have to work on the basis of service by people willing to make a sacrifice. In this sense it has some of the elements of the Peace Corps, VISTA, and so on. We have, particularly among young people these days, a willingness to make that kind of sacrifice, and I think the way this program is packaged and sold will certainly ask for people to be involved on that basis.

The same will be true of the experienced teachers connected with it. I think this is an important part of the whole program, trying to get citizens interested in working on a problem they have got.

Mr. KARSH. There is another very obvious inducement to a teacher intern. While he is at a local school we will be paying for his training toward a graduate degree, and this could induce many individuals to come into the program.

Mr. MICHEL. This is a point the chairman started to develop and I will pursue it because it suggests in part that the NDEA program is somewhat of a failure because we have not attracted enough people through the 50-percent loan forgiveness feature. Now we get into a Federal program to induce people to upgrade their own education, and you are talking not about the disadvantaged child but people who want to get a master's degree or a doctor's degree. How much emphasis is placed on this side as opposed to the child down the line?

Mr. KARSH. Considering where the teachers will be located during the 2 years, they will be right at the site where the need of these disadvantaged children is. They will be teaching for 2 years in an area that not only needs the new enthusiasm they may supply, but also where the teacher shortage is so great. We would be filling an existing shortage and getting an innovated type of teachers.

Mr. MICHEL. Are the shortages more prevalent in the rural areas or the urban areas?

Mr. HOWE. I am not sure about that.

Mr. MICHEL. What happens when this area of the disadvantaged is far remote from a university where they can get the so-called training in conjunction with their teaching?

Mr. HOWE. They will have to move back and forth somewhat. We have to devise patterns depending on the geography. For example we may pair some of these teachers and have them work half a year and go to the university half a year. The training in certain universities will make the disadvantaged children in a rural area available to them. People will have to move around some in this process.

Mr. MICHEL. You mention the motivation in the Peace Corps and VISTA and perhaps several others that I think is very good. There has to be dedication to go to work for $75 a month or whatever it is, but here the inducement, in large measure, is an opportunity for those not altogether qualified for the teaching profession to upgrade their own education to become teachers or to get that extra degree, and then we get into definite competition for the educational requirements in all States of the country that you say are hurting for competent teachers. This is what disturbs me.

Mr. Howe. I think the focus on working with the disadvantaged is the more important feature of this program.

Mr. Michel. That is what I thought.

Mr. Howe. It is not reaching into other realms. It is definitely placing these teachers in training with a group of youngsters who have not had teachers from most schools of education. One of the things we need is to devise a process by which schools of education can prepare the teachers.

Mr. Michel. Will an intern have to have a minimum amount of experience?

Mr. Howe. No. He must have a bachelor's degree, in accordance with the law.

Mr. Cardwell. May I make a point there? On your point about the individual intern or teacher gaining the advantage of a higher degree, which is in some sense a personal advantage, there is an accruing advantage to the community involved because the teacher who gets the degree will be gaining also specialized experience in teaching deprived children. So it is a twofold gain.

Mr. Flood. And under proper supervision.

Mr. Cardwell. Yes, under proper supervision. An individual might gain an advantage, there is an inducement, but education also gains, the deprived child gains, and the community where the teacher teaches gains. It is more a matter of emphasis on the deprived child.

Mr. Duncan. Will you yield?

Mr. Michel. Yes.

RELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I TO PROPOSED ACTIVITIES OF TEACHER CORPS

Mr. Duncan. The more I think of this the less reason I see for having a special program of the Teacher Corps. I do not see why everything you mention cannot be done under this title I, for which you are asking over $1 billion. I cannot see why we cannot just forget all about this Teacher Corps program and handle this whole thing under title I. You have your local control, financial assistance to local educational agencies with concentrations of children from low-income families, and it seems to me the disadvantaged children are covered by title I and I cannot understand why you cannot do everything you propose to do here under title I and maybe do it better.

Mr. Howe. I suppose the answer to that is that it will not happen. This takes a coordinated program to bring into being a specific effort to train teachers for the disadvantaged. Title I is farmed out en bloc to the States and farmed out by them to each local community. You would have to ask a local community to move its program over to the kind of thing we are talking about here. You would have to interfere with its freedom of choice in terms of what it wants to do with those funds. You would have to have an accelerated program with the universities, setting up workshops. It might be possible to do this in urban areas but to serve the rural areas would be extremely difficult. Also, our request for next year is only sufficient to continue what is launched this year.

Mr. Duncan. Is your title I money serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families?

Mr. Howe. Yes.

Mr. Duncan. And is it not being used to improve the educational programs to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children?

Mr. Howe. Yes.

Mr. Duncan. And does it not include a program for handicapped children?

Mr. Howe. Yes.

Mr. Duncan. And does it not include a program for the expansion of the school curriculum?

Mr. Howe. Yes.

Mr. Duncan. And for decreasing class sizes so the teacher's time may be free of extracurricular activities?

Mr. Howe. It includes all those elements.

Mr. Duncan. What will the Teacher Corps do that cannot be done under title I?

Mr. Howe. Specifically, you do not find mentioned the actual teacher training program. You do have in the whole organization of title I at the present time a situation on which we have given States a basis for operation. It is a going concern. I would accept your point that it could be done under title I if we were to shift gears in title I and tell the States, "You have to stop doing what you did last year. We have a new program we want you to do."

Mr. Duncan. Which they can use if they want it, because that is all you tell them under the Teacher Corps program.

Mr. Howe. But in my judgment you would not achieve a careful focus on a teacher training program for the disadvantaged. A community that had a strong teacher training institution and title I funds, if it wanted, could elect to do this under title I. But I think you would find no comprehensive program for teacher training.

Mr. Duncan. I do not know much about education but it seems to me you have indicated that title I could be used to cover the Teacher Corps program because if you do not have confidence this could be done, I do not see how you can have confidence these other objectives would be carried out.

Mr. Howe. We have launched these objectives and they are working. We could perhaps get title I funds operating this way, but I think it would be regarded by the States and communities as a shift in emphasis, as a new element; and I do not think we would get the kind of focus we want in teacher training. Perhaps under title I the various elements of this program could be funded. I would have to examine them one by one. It would depend, I suppose, on various legalisms under title I.

Mr. Cardwell. There is a structural difference under title I and the Teachers Corps. Title I relies on the school district to propose projects under a State plan.

Mr. Duncan. Does not the Teachers Corps contemplate local initiative?

Mr. Cardwell. There is a fundamental difference. In the case of a need for new and better trained teachers, the structure of title I authority does not give much opportunity for the local school district to develop this. Under the Teachers Corps the Government says, "Here are teachers at your option. You may choose these teachers and use them at the local level to solve your problem." Under title I they have that option.

Does this in a general way satisfy you?

Mr. Duncan. No; because you have a provision here for teachers' aids and I do not see that you have anything much different except you call them by a different name. It seems to me it gets around many of the objections that have been voiced here—Federal control, Federal payment of salaries, matching contributions.

I will not prolong this any longer, I am utilizing your time, Mr. Michel, and I apologize.

Mr. Michel. Not at all. I will have to subscribe to the points you make. All these things seem to be embodied in title I and it seems to me it would be better handled in that way rather than going far afield as we are doing.

ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS

In this assignment of teachers, will these folks who become interns or teachers in the program have any voice in where they go?

Mr. Howe. At least in the first year of this enterprise we are going to try to get the experienced teachers assigned on a basis of being near where they have been teaching rather than jumping them all around the country. But the interns who will be in training probably will be moved around quite a little and will serve in a variety of places.

WORKING THROUGH STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Mr. Michel. I certainly have to express my concern and dismay that your plans do not call for working through our State education offices.

Mr. Fogarty. We will make it that way.

Mr. Michel. I appreciate the chairman's observation there because it is quite obvious to me that if that shop did not like a particular superintendent of schools in Illinois or did not like the way a particular district was being run, they could discriminate against it by awarding this free teacher where there happened to be a superintendent they liked or a program they liked. This could be very well done in my State. I know why you would like to go directly to districts without going through a State office, but, as the chairman says, we may have something to say about this.

TEAM CONCEPT IN ASSIGNMENTS

How, specifically, will these districts qualify if they get a team? Do I understand you will not dispatch these people without anything less than a mother superior and intern?

Mr. Howe. We hope to group most of them in teams. The team concept will prevail if we can set it up to do so. You need supervisory arrangements and you should not call on the people in the local school district to provide that. You might elect one of their people a member of the team and have his salary paid by the funds we provide, but you free him of his obligation in order to make this possible. So generally it is a team operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is recognized for 3 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, there is not anything unusual in this appropriation request today. Detailed hearings were held last year on the Senate side on the authorization. It was included in the authorization bill by the Senate. The House-Senate conference accepted it and the House accepted it, on a record vote, by a substantial majority. When the Senate included it in the appropriation bill last year it was not accepted by the House because we had no hearings before the Committee on Appropriations on the House side. We have now held hearings, and rather extensive hearings. So we have ample background on which to make intelligent decisions on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, the National Teachers Corps is a partnership between Government and the public and private education community. It is a partnership to enliven education at its weakest point, schools in the slums of our cities and the low-income areas of our countryside.

The Federal Government will recruit career teachers and teachers-interns, participate in their initial selection, and arrange to place them in preservice training programs in colleges and universities across the Nation.

At the same time, local education agencies will study their own school needs and submit proposals for the types and numbers of Teachers Corps men and women most needed in their poverty schools.

The colleges and universities—in cooperation with nearby local education agencies—will design and operate preservice training programs which combine course work and practice keyed specifically to teaching the disadvantaged. Teachers Corps men and women will be graduated on the basis of aptitude and motivation.

Teachers Corps members who complete their training will be carefully matched to local school district requests, and the local education agencies will themselves accept or reject candidates. Once Teachers Corps members enter the local school system, they will take their direction from the education agency of that area.

Local school districts will employ Teachers Corps members and pay their salaries at their own rates, and their costs will be covered by Federal funds. Colleges and universities, too, will be reimbursed by the Federal Government for training costs.

The National Teachers Corps is a federally financed effort to bring together qualified, committed men and women who want to use education to defeat poverty. Not only is it a new challenge for the gifted teacher who may well be able to serve near his home, but it is also a promising invitation to new and older college graduates—public service-minded college seniors, housewives, retired professionals, officeworkers, business people—to launch a new career in teaching in depressed areas all over America.

Our Nation needs all its human resources. To break the chain which today threatens to keep our 5 million schoolchildren of poverty from realizing their full potential, we must use every way possible to give these youngsters as much education as they can use. One bold new answer is the National Teachers Corps.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I have voted for the amendment to strike out the $12 million item for rent supplementals. I shall vote for the amendment to strike out the item for the Teachers Corps. A motion to recommit is to be made in which we will have an opportunity to record our votes on the rent subsidy issue. With that in mind I should like to express my views about this proposal.

Let us bear in mind, once and for all, that far more is involved here than just the $12 million. It would be more accurate to say we are voting to begin a program which will ultimately cost $6 billion. It is just that simple.

It is true that last year the Congress, by a very narrow margin, approved authorization for a rental subsidy program. It cleared the House by six votes and was approved in the Senate by seven votes.

Under this law the expenditure of $30 million was authorized for the first year, and by 1968 the annual appropriation could be $150 million, for a period of 40 years. That adds up to $6 billion.

So, let us realize what the issue is: Do we want to inaugurate a $6 billion program? This is what we are asked to do.

Only last October this House, by a 185-to-162 rollcall, voted against initiating this $6 billion project. But we are told that pressures are being applied, and that the result will be different this time.

It would seem, however, that upon reflection the members would be reluctant to give the green light to a $6 billion expenditure at a time when the war in Vietnam is costing more than $10 billion a year. And particularly since no one seriously contends this new venture in Federal spending is essential in any sense of the word.

Mr. Chairman, this program is not only nonessential; it is also unsound. We have already spent billions to provide low-cost housing for the needy, and have witnessed that program expand to cover thousands who are not in the low-income brackets. Yet this scheme has been evolved ostensibly to help the needy.

Let us examine it for a moment. Copied from a similar British plan, adopted as a part of the British version of the welfare state, the proposal would have the Federal Government pay a portion of monthly rent bills for hundreds of thousands of so-called low-income tenants. The eligible tenant would be required to pay no more than 25 percent of his monthly income on rent; the balance would be paid by the Federal Government.

It is said that to be eligible the tenant could not be making more than $5,000 a year and could not have more than $2,000 in the bank. But that is determined by regulation of the Federal Housing Authority. The criteria can be changed. Last October when we were debating the same issue, the same law, it was pointed out that an eligible family could conceivably make up to $11,000 a year and be eligible. The law has not been changed since them. That being so, what assurance can we have that the $5,000 ceiling will not be raised by action of the housing authority—next week or next year?

Since there can certainly be no need for this program in order to provide housing for low-income people, just what is the reason for this new and expensive venture in welfare? What is the attitude of the administration concerning the motivation for this novel method of shifting low-income tenants into projects covered by this subsidy?

On September 28, 1965, the Federal Housing Administration issued instructions which revealed the primary purpose. In those instructions it stated:

> Important criteria with regard to approval of a rent supplement project will include full consideration of its contribution to assisting in integrating income groups and furthering the legal requirements and objectives of equal opportunity in housing.

Thus it is made crystal clear that the primary purpose of paying rent supplementals is not to provide for housing needs for the eligibles, because they are already taken care of, but rather to promote social, economic, and racial integration. In short, it is desired to channel more low-income tenants into middle-income neighborhoods—a sort of integration by scatteration. But is not $6 billion quite a price to pay for this new concept?

This is to be a boondoggle in more ways than one. The landlords will profit handsomely because, once approved, they will be guaranteed full occupancy for a period of 40 years, with the Federal Government supplying the tenants and paying the required portion of their monthly rentals. The limited income corporations, who are authorized to own and rent projects to these tenants, may make their 6 percent on the investment, and then add to that substantial tax benefits from depreciation.

The law enacted last year even authorizes churches to borrow money from the Government and erect apartment buildings for this purpose. While the operation is to be nonprofit, the costs of managers, auditors, attorneys, janitors, and scores of others will provide a constant source of profit for untold numbers who get on the payroll. It would seem that churches would have something more spiritual and divine to claim their attention. But the Congress has invited them to get into the housing business, to be underwritten by the Government.

More important than the bonanza for investors is the inherent danger in this new concept of direct monthly grants for certain selected tenants. Would this not tend to undermine the incentive of individuals to better themselves by their own efforts? It has been said, with good reason, that such subsidies will impose a penalty on honest achievement in a free-enterprise society, and a bonus for shiftlessness and other defects of individual character. It discourages homeownership and rewards those who are content with becoming wards of the State.

The motion to recommit, which if adopted would strike out funds for rent subsidies, should prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 128, noes 156.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. For what purposes does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, much of the remaining portion of this bill deals with pay increases provided for military and civilian personnel.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, and be subject to points of order and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the remainder of the bill?

If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 10, strike out lines 9 through 11 inclusive.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I was wondering if we could decide on some time limitation to end debate on this amendment and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 6 minutes with the last minute to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would have to object to a reservation of time to the committee at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have moved to this side to address my colleagues because at this time I am representing the President of the United States. I am delighted to be able to do it. There is in this bill an unnecessary and unbudgeted item of $41 million for the funding of Public Laws 815 and 874.

There have been three administrations that for nearly 10 years have been trying to reduce this impacted school area fund. The President left it out of the budget entirely and the President has asked the Congress not to fund this.

I know how popular this program is with so many people and I know how difficult it would be for you if you went on the record voting against it. But let us kind of do what the President wants.

I do not know whether Larry O'Brien, when he was talking about the rent subsidy program, discussed this with you or not. That was an increase in the budget that he was talking about. But I rather hoped that he presented also the President's views on this particular subsidy.

Let me give you an idea, if I may, and then I will yield. I would like to make one or two points. Take the last 15 years of this impacted school area fund and its use in the very prosperous suburbs of the city of Washington. They received $75,829,071 for the construction of schools under Public Law 815.

In the last school year the same jurisdictions were eligible for $17 million.

Let us examine what the impact really is. Let us consider Montgomery County. The richest county in the United States, according to the people who live out there. That is the boast of their citizens. The average per capita income in Arlington, Alexandria, Falls Church, and Fairfax County is well above the national average, because a great many Federal Government employees make their homes there.

Prince William County in Virginia and Prince Georges County in Maryland are among the fastest growing counties in the country, all because of Federal employees being there.

What kind of impact have we created in those areas? Let me say this to you, my friends: Just because a pilot of the United Airlines plane lands out at the Washington National Airport and lives in Virginia, his children get this impact area money. If somebody is born and raised out in one of the adjoining counties, never intends to leave, never expects to, but works for the Federal Government, although he is paying taxes and taking care of his obligations the same as the next door neighbor, he gets the impact school money.

What has happened out here? Take Montgomery County. In 1953 the assessed valuation of the property there was $879,974,000. That has gone up to $1 billion. It is over $1 billion now. Because of this impact, these areas are growing. They are prospering. Supermarkets are being built. Go out Route 70S, for instance. Take a look at what has happened along Route 70S. We have constructed facilities for the Bureau of Standards and the Atomic Energy Commission. You say that is an impacted area. But if you look around, you will find the entire countryside with new homes built there, new communities, completely new cities being built there because of the Federal impact.

I would like to ask some of these people who are objecting to that Federal impact to let me have some of those industries back in my part of the country, and I promise you that we will not ask for this impact money, if we can build these areas the way they have been built around here. I raise this question knowing what is going to happen to this amendment. I am for impact area funds, but I think the legislative committees ought to amend these laws so we have a true impact school area where you have the impact from the moving of military groups or the Indian situation that we have. But it is perfectly ridiculous to observe that in the last few years $75 million has gone into areas adjoining Washington to build this metropolis of large cities from sleepy little villages.

It has been done because the Federal Government is here and because of the so-called impact. There is no impact that should demand this kind of money being paid into those areas. There are proper impacts, but it seems to me that we ought to begin to take a look at it, and this will be a good time to help the President save $41 million. He is disturbed about it, as we see in the press.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, and I shall take only a moment. I do want to say that I think there is much merit in some of the statements which have been made by the gentleman from Ohio in support of his amendment to delete the $41 million. But the bill before us is a bill which was worked out over a period of weeks on a give and take basis and I see no alternative at this stage other than to support it.

Many compromises were made in order to achieve agreement. This is the only feasible way to handle differences in legislative matters.

I myself feel that it is time to change the system with respect to aid to impacted areas, and I agree with the President, and I agree with the gentleman from Ohio that something should be done to improve the situation. Some aid to impacted areas is required but the present system should be drastically changed.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not authorized to speak for the President, but I believe he would like me to welcome the gentleman from Ohio to his side.

I am sure the gentleman realizes that he is foredoomed to failure, because despite the great economizers that we have here, there are 315 Members who have impacted areas.

The gentleman does not have them in his district, and I do not have any impacted areas in my district, so I am going to join the gentleman in his great statesmanship and support his motion to strike this appropriation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the President has been helping us all day with his news conference and with other information that he has put forward with respect to inflation and the rising cost of living on this particular day, and we want to help him now.

Mr. JOELSON. I am glad you are helping him, because after all you are trying to strike out $12 million from the budget and adding on $41 million. That is real economy.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out the difficulty we have in amending educational legislation, once it gets on the books. Last year we passed the Elementary and Secondary School Act. We just agreed to the Teachers Corps money, which will go in this bill when it is enacted. There are many features of it that will be unwise in the future. It will be very difficult to amend the bill.

Efforts have been made by previous administrations, as well as this administration, to amend Federal impact aid to reduce the aid to certain areas where it should not go. Mention was made of Montgomery County, Md., which is a prime example. Never can we get this done. Never is the Congress really willing to amend impact legislation other than to expand it, for fear that the money will be delayed and pass the budgeting date for the local districts.

This is to me an indication of why it is unwise for the Federal Government to expend aid to elementary and secondary education without thoroughly studying the measure before we pass it. This is why it is so unwise for us to fund the National Teachers Corps, poorly drafted, no study, no contribution in its development by educators.

Now that the National Teachers Corps will be funded, we will see that school districts which will receive this 90 percent federally financed Teachers Corps will be asking their Congressmen to be sure to keep that money coming so that they can continue to have those teachers come to their districts, just as they ask their Congressmen to continue sending the impact aid money whether justified or not.

This is a vicious circle we have gotten into. In my congressional district we do receive some Federal impact aid, but I think it is so unwise to continue it as we have in the past, that I am going to vote with the gentleman from Ohio, because we have much better educational use for this money than we do here in the Federal impact aid.

I would like to see the Bow amendment prevail, so that we can at least give an indication that we will not continue to provide money where it should not be expended and the people know that mistakes in education legislation in the future can be corrected.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment to strike funds for Public Laws 815 and 874.

The impact of this amendment, if adopted, would be disastrous in many school districts of the country. I am sure it will be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased by the action of the House in defeating the amendment to kill the Teacher Corps and appreciate the committee's action in providing the funds for title I financing under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

As we improve the breadth and the quality of educational opportunity in this Nation we strengthen the entire fabric of our democracy.

I feel sure this bill will be approved by an overwhelming majority, thereby continuing the role of this 89th Congress as "the education Congress."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, when the appropriation for schools in federally impacted areas was acted on by Congress last year we had been assured by the Office of Education that the amount would cover 100 percent of entitlements according to their best estimate. This was clearly set forth in the hearings and reports. The schools made up their budgets depending on this. They had every right to do so.

Then in the closing days of last session this Congress amended the authorizing legislation and liberalized it. Largely because of this the appropriation is now $41 million short of being sufficient to cover 100 percent of legal entitlements.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has a strong moral commitment to meet fully what the law entitles these schools to receive. In many instances, if we do not, it would actually deprive children of education they would otherwise receive, for it is too late for the schools to make up the deficit in their budgets from other sources. I, therefore, strongly urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bow amendment and in support of H.R. 14012, the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1966.

It is abundantly clear from the committee's report that the bulk of the recommended appropriations is largely nondiscretionary in nature; that is, most of the requested funds represent mandatory-type expenditures to cover such obligations as matching grants under the public assistance program, veterans' compensation and pensions, and the Federal pay rate increases.

Some of the recommended appropriations, however, are obviously discretionary in character, and I am of the opinion that the Committee on Appropriations deserves our generous applause for including them in the bill. Among these I would cite the recommended supplement for financing title I of Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; the initial funding for the National Teacher Corps; and the suggested $11 million for the college library assistance program under title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965. But as an even more praiseworthy suggestion than the foregoing, I would single out the recommended supplemental appropriation in the amount of $41 million for payments to school districts under Public Law 874, the operation and maintenance segment of the federally affected areas program.

Ever since the budget for fiscal year 1967 was made public, the program under Public Laws 815 and 874 has been a good deal in the news, and, I am sure, a good deal in the thoughts of many Members of this body. That budget, you will no doubt recall, asks for a drastic cutback in the level of financing under both of the acts—a cutback that would amount to about $233 million under Public Law 874 alone. Now, although I am opposed to a decrease on that order, I realize this is not the time to discuss it. I bring it up simply because one of its byproducts is most germane to the issue we have presently under our consideration.

Stated simply, it is this: in the furor—and I do not think the word will prove to be too strong—which has arisen over the requested 1967 financing of the federally impacted areas program, it has been rather easy to forget about the actual 1966 financing of the program. The able gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and his colleagues on the Appropriation Committee did not forget, however, and again I congratulate them on their clearsightedness.

The unfortunate situation which their recommendation would remedy is actually quite simple. For fiscal year 1966, the Office of Education estimated that funding in the amount of $347 million would be necessary to pay all school districts the full amount of their entitlements under Public Law 874. The Office has been making such estimates for 15 years now, and they usually run pretty close. Consequently, we appropriated the estimated amount, $347 million, to finance the program for fiscal 1966.

If the provisions of Public Law 874 were the same now as they were when the Office of Education made its estimate for fiscal 1966, the $347 million would, in all probability, be sufficient to cover all entitlements in the current fiscal year. That is not the case, however. The 1st session of the 89th Congress enacted several amendments to the already much-amended basic legislation. Most of these amendments moved toward liberalizing payments under Public Law 874. Most notable of the changes was the so-called big city amendment in Public Law 89-313, under which 18 of our largest school districts, including the Dade County school system of Miami, become eligible for the first time for payments under the program.

Largely as a result of these amendments, the $347 million we have already appropriated for the program this year will not be enough to pay full entitlements. The big city amendment itself will call for an estimated $19 million. A total of $41 million in additional appropriations is required if entitlements under the amended act are to be paid in full. This is the amount the committee has recommended; that is the amount I sincerely hope we will be able to agree upon.

If the supplemental sum is not forthcoming, the program will literally be decimated. The amount of payment to each eligible district would have to be ratably reduced with the result that each obligation entered upon by a district in the expectation of 100 Federal dollars would have to be met by them, somehow, with an actual payment of about 90 of those dollars. I believe this Congress undertook to reimburse the local school districts, already hard pressed, for the Federal burden placed upon them, not for nine-tenths of that burden. For that reason, I commend the Committee on Appropriations once again for their action, and I urge the passage of this legislation with the funds for Public Law 874 intact.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask at this time for a vote, and that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise the membership that there will be a motion to recommit. The motion to recommit will include the rent supplement program, upon which I will request a call of the roll.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

May I inquire, sir, if the provision under chapter IX, page 18, from lines 3 through 9, the sum of $10,250,000 includes a claim of Melville L. Owings?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. This claim will be paid through this appropriation. Other claims will be covered where adjudication has been taken to a court.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would call attention of the Chair to page 13 of House Document No. 414, telling us about Mr. Owings' claim, that there are two instances involved in this claim. The larger is for $9,544, for the death of 5,935 turkeys, when low-flying National Guard aircraft stampeded turkeys and they were destroyed.

I had assumed a turkey of this size would be called to our attention by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. Chairman, that turkey is not as big as the one dragged out for our consideration by the gentleman from New York, who earlier today urged us to defeat the rent supplement program and expand the public housing program, as he put it, European style.

Shortly after we were burdened with this advice, another gentleman from that side of the aisle, the gentleman from Georgia, gave us a graphic description of drab, colorless public housing which he observed in Russia.

If we are to find a consensus of advice from our friends on the Republican side, I assume it is that we pattern socialism, European style west of the Ural Mountains.

Now it is patently clear that the concept of a rent supplement program is to give the private sector of our economy the tools with which to solve a serious social and economic problem—the problem of inadequate housing for those among us of very limited means.

The truly troublesome part of the case of the gentleman from New York was his constant warning that "integrated" housing would be inflicted on the suburbs under the rent supplement proposal. Now, the gentleman did use the words "economic integration," but there can be little doubt as to the thrust of his argument. He fears that undesirables from the slums of our big cities will be thrust into the suburbs to live with the nice people. This sounds to me much like an echo from the cave of the winds which was the 1964 Republican convention in San Francisco.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'Hara of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14012) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER.** Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 4, line 6, strike out lines 6 through 22, inclusive.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 198, answered "present" 3, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—190

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
George W.
Andrews,
Glenn
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callaway
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Goodell
Greigg
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Keith
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Natcher
Nelsen
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—198

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson,
Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Callan
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Fogarty
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kupferman
Landrum
Long, Md.
Love
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Sullivan
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Weltner
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolff
Yates
Young
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Conte
Pike
Tunney

NOT VOTING—40

Ashmore
Battin
Burleson
Cameron
Carter
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Dorn
Dowdy
Fallon
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gettys
Hanna
Hays
Jones, N.C.
Keogh
Leggett
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Mills
Murray
O'Brien
O'Konski
Rivers, S.C.
Rooney, N.Y.
Scott
Senner
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Todd
Toll
Whalley
Willis
Wright

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pike for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Tunney for, with Mr. Cameron against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Ashmore for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. O'Brien against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Todd with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Willis with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI** changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. **TUNNEY**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. Cameron]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **PIKE**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I have voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **CONTE**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, nays 122, answered "present" 2, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—269

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Berry
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Callan
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kupferman
Landrum
Long, Md.
Love
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—122

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashbrook
Baring
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callaway
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Collier
Conable
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Herlong
Hull
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Minshall
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Selden
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stanton
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Cederberg
Utt

NOT VOTING—38

Ashmore
Battin
Burleson
Cameron
Carter
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Dorn
Dowdy
Fallon
Fuqua
Gettys
Hanna
Hays
Jones, N.C.
Keogh
Leggett
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Mills
Murray
O'Brien
O'Konski
Rivers, S.C.
Rooney, N.Y.
Scott
Senner
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Todd
Toll
Whalley
Willis
Wright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.

Mr. Cameron for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Ashmore against.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Battin against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Gettys against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Todd against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Chelf with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Mills.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Willis.

Mr. **UTT**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **CEDERBERG**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, last night, at a state dinner in honor of Prime Minister Gandhi, President Johnson added a practical proposal to his tribute to the great leader of India. He said:

> Tonight we mark the visit of Prime Minister Gandhi with a lasting endowment for the benefit of inquiring young minds in the Indian nation. May we launch a new and imaginative venture—an Indian-American Foundation. Such a Foundation—

The President said—

> would be given a broad charter to promote progress in all fields of learning, advance

science, encourage research, and develop new teaching techniques in farm and factory to stimulate new ways to meet age-old problems.

I have discussed this idea with the Secretary of Agriculture, with officials on the President's staff, and with responsible persons in the State Department. I am convinced that this Indian-American Foundation is a worthwhile and promising proposal.

The serious problem facing the Indian people, as with those facing every nation, will be solved ultimately by the application of native knowledge and determination, not only by financial resources.

This Foundation, dedicated to educational, scientific and agricultural progress, will be a way of achieving such solutions. I heartily endorse the President's idea. I trust that those in the Congress whose support is needed to expedite this program will readily give their support to the establishment of the Indian-American Foundation. It is at once an organization of practical significance and a symbol of cordial relations between our two nations.

INDIAN-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the majority leader for the very fine statement that he has just made with respect to the action taken by our Government on the occasion of the visit of the gracious Prime Minister and First Lady of India, Mrs. Gandhi.

I had the pleasure of being in India not too long ago. Many people pointed out to me how wise it would be to utilize the accumulation of funds there which had been brought about through Public Law 480 and other programs such as the food-for-peace program in operation in that great nation. This is indeed a very sensible step by our Government.

The Indian-American Foundation will become an important new resource in helping India attack the persistent and vexing problems of illiteracy, poverty, hunger, and malnutrition.

It is an imaginative and sensible plan.

The Foundation has the potential for doing a vast amount of good for the Indian people, at minimum cost to the United States.

Under the food-for-peace program, we have sold large quantities of our surplus food to India for Indian rupees. In so doing, the United States has become the owner of nearly $300 million in Indian rupees, most of which cannot legally be converted into dollars or other "hard" currency. This accumulation of Indian currency is far more than is needed to carry out U.S. Government purposes and programs in India.

By putting these funds to constructive use, we not only find work for idle funds to do, but can bring a fresh approach to India's problems in education, science, and agriculture at virtually no cost in U.S. dollars.

It is recognized by all that educational and scientific development is vital to the growth of sound economies in which every natural resource is harnessed for the betterment of the people. It is the aim of the Indian-American Foundation to hasten this process.

The Foundation will serve as a continuing source of finance for new initiatives in education and science and for the further support of promising projects already underway. It will support individual and institutional efforts to supplement existing programs, both public and private. It will encourage pioneering, innovation, and diversity beyond the normal range of publicly supported projects. It will, in short, do things which the Indian Government cannot undertake to do.

The program, while details have yet to be worked out, will be aimed at unlocking the latent skills and dormant resources of this keystone of democracy in Asia. The program will develop centers for research, provide scholarships for higher education and advanced study, help establish teacher training schools, provide special skill training for the "educated unemployed" and provide enlarged opportunities for American and other area studies and research in India and for Indian studies and research by American students and scholars.

The program content will reflect the results of a continuing, objective, and systematic study of Indian educational and scientific needs.

The Foundation can contribute much toward furthering India's plans for lasting social and economic growth and can have far-reaching impact in improving the lot of her 490 million people.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege last night to be among the guests at the White House dinner for Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India.

On that occasion President Johnson, in a toast, proposed the establishment of an Indian-American Foundation to be financed by $300 million worth of Indian currencies held by the United States through the sale of surplus agricultural products.

The President is to be commended for this imaginative, productive, and farsighted use of these funds to aid in the progress of learning in India.

The Indian-American Foundation will put to practical use funds which now are lying idle, of no benefit to the United States or to the people of India.

Unfortunately, there is no chance of converting these currencies into dollars at present or in the foreseeable future without doing grave harm to the Indian economy.

To leave the funds unused, however, is contrary to the interests of all concerned who seek that all available resources be put to work in the interests of economic progress.

I am particularly pleased that the chief objectives of the Foundation will be the development of agriculture and education in India.

Last fall a study mission of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific visited India. The report of the study mission, of which I was chairman, emphasized the importance of increased emphasis on both agriculture and education if India is to become economically self-sustaining.

The Foundation has many advantages. It will not require repeated or continuous appropriation of funds. It will operate on the interest of its endowment and will attract donations from private sources. It will have no inflationary effects on the Indian economy.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this Foundation is yet another American contribution to international cooperation and institution-building, based as it is on the uniquely American concept of the large, independent foundation supporting innovation and experimentation without Government support or control.

The idea of the binational foundation may have similarly beneficial applications elsewhere. For example, perhaps the Philippine War Damage Special Fund might be used to endow a permanent educational foundation, the income of which could be used to assist public and private education in the Philippine Islands.

A similar suggestion was contained in the final report of the Philippine-American Assembly which met last month in Davao, Republic of the Philippines, and which was attended by distinguished citizens of both countries.

As President Johnson said in his toast last evening:

> The journey to the future is over a long, winding road, every mile tested by challenge and doubt.

By proposing the Indian-American Foundation, the President has lighted a lamp along that road to the future.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1966

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Committee on Education and Labor on the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966, will today be filed in this body. This legislation is vital to many of our programs and, in particular, to the declared war on poverty. The bill has enjoyed incredible success to date. I believe this to be true because it is an equitable measure for all concerned. It extends the coverage of minimum wage protection to over 7.2 million workers. It further raises the minimum wage, in gradual increments, to $1.60 an hour.

I am submitting the summary of provisions of our bill so that Members may analyze its content. I am hopeful that this legislation will soon meet the favorable consideration it deserves.

Any Member of Congress who finds that some of the provisions of the act are not quite clear and he has any questions about them, I shall be happy to sit down with him and try to clear it up for him.

The summary is as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT AMENDMENTS AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, MARCH 21, 1966

I. PURPOSE

A. To extend minimum wage and overtime protection to certain employees.

Minimum wage protection will be extended to employees in the following:

Retailing, including auto, truck, and farm implement dealerships;

Construction;

Laundering and drycleaning;

Transit and taxicab systems;

Restaurants and food service establishments;

Logging;

Agriculture and agricultural employees;

Hotels and motels;

Hospitals and related institutions; and

Federal Government.

Overtime protection will be extended to employees in the following:

Retailing, including auto, truck, and farm implement dealerships (excluding salesmen and mechanics);

Construction;

Laundering and drycleaning;

Transit and taxicab systems (excluding operating employees);

Logging;

Agricultural processing;

Hospitals and related institutions;

Gasoline service stations; and

Federal Government.

B. To raise the minimum wage

Employees	Hourly rate	Effective date
Presently covered (29,600,000)	$1.40	Feb. 1, 1967
	1.60	Feb. 1, 1968
Newly covered (nonfarm) (6,093,000).	1.00	Feb. 1, 1967
	1.15	Feb. 1, 1968
	1.30	Feb. 1, 1969
	1.45	Feb. 1, 1970
	1.60	Feb. 1, 1971
Agriculture (485,000)	1.00	Feb. 1, 1967
	1.15	Feb. 1, 1968
	1.30	Feb. 1, 1969
Federal employees (665,000)	1.40	Feb. 1, 1967
	1.60	Feb. 1, 1968

C. To provide overtime protection for newly covered employees:

A newly covered employee must receive compensation at a rate not less than 1½ times the regular rate at which he is employed for hours of employment in excess of—	*Effective date*
44 hours in any workweek	Feb. 1, 1967.
42 hours in any workweek	Feb. 1, 1968.
40 hours in any workweek	Feb. 1, 1969.

II. EXTENSION OF MINIMUM WAGE

Estimated distribution of nonsupervisory employees who would be brought under minimum wage protection of the act in 1967 and 1969 by the bill:

[In thousands]

Industry	Employees added to minimum wage coverage			Total employees subject to minimum wage provisions
	1967	1969	Total	
Retail trade	1,155	345	1,500	4,086
Restaurants	300	125	425	432
Hotels and motels	240	35	275	275
Hospitals and related institutions	1,471		1,471	1,471
Miscellaneous services	20	30	50	349
Laundries	505		505	523
Agriculture	485		485	485
Transit systems	60	5	65	65
Agriculture in area of production	90		90	90
Taxicabs	75	25	100	100
Logging	37		37	37
Cotton ginning	34		34	34
Construction	581		581	2,994
Federal Government	665		665	665
All other industries	570	390	960	25,230
Total	6,288	955	7,243	36,836

NOTE.—These estimates do not reflect coverage of employees of employers providing contract services for the United States.

III. BRIEF SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Title I—Definitions

Section 101. Tips: Provides that the wage paid by an employer to a tipped employee shall be deemed to be increased on account of tips by an amount determined by the employer, but such amount shall not exceed 35 percent of the applicable minimum wage rate during the first 2 years from the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966, 40 percent during the third and fourth years, and 45 percent thereafter. Directs the institution of a procedure for reconsideration of the amount attributed as tips upon appeal by the employee.

Defines "tipped employee" as an employee engaged in an occupation in which he customarily and regularly receives more than $20 a month in tips.

Section 102. Definition of enterprise: amends definition of "enterprise" and "employer" to include public and private, proprietary and nonproprietary hospitals (excluding Federal Government hospitals) and related institutions and, also, institutions of higher education regardless of whether or not such institutions are public or private or operated for profit or not for profit. Further amends definition of "enterprise" and "employer" to include public and private, proprietary, and nonproprietary transit systems.

Also amends the definition of an "enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" to include an enterprise which has employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and which (1) during the period February 1, 1967, through January 31, 1969, has an annual gross volume of sales of not less than $500,000, or is a gasoline service establishment with an annual gross volume of sales of not less than $250,000, (2) beginning February 1, 1969, has an annual gross volume of sales of not less than $250,000, (3) is a laundry or drycleaning enterprise or a construction enterprise, or (4) is a hospital, nursing home, institution of higher education, or other related institution (regardless of whether or not such hospital, institution or school is public or private or operated for profit or not for profit). There is no dollar volume test for laundries, drycleaning, construction, or hospital and related institutional enterprises. "Mom and Pop" establishments remain excluded. Individual retail or service establishments with annual sales of less than $250,000 are excluded under the amendment made to section 13(a)(2) of the act.

Section 103. Agricultural employees: Excludes from definition of employee, for the purposes of computing "man-days" of agricultural labor, "the parent, spouse, child, or other member of the agricultural employer's immediate family," and "any individual who is employed by an employer engaged in agriculture if such individual (A) is employed as hand harvest labor and is paid on a piece rate basis in an operation which has been, and is customarily and generally recognized as having been, paid on a piece rate basis in the region of employment, (B) commutes daily from his permanent residence to the farm on which he is so employed, and (C) has been employed in agriculture less than 13 weeks during the preceding calendar year." Defines "man-day" to mean any day during which an employee performs agricultural labor for the employer.

Title II—Revision of exemptions

Section 201. Hotel, restaurant, and recreational establishments; hospitals and related institutions: Repeals the minimum wage exemptions for such establishments (except seasonal recreational and amusement establishments). Maintains overtime exemptions for such establishments (except hospitals and related institutions).

Exempts any employee employed by any retail or service establishment (but not employees of laundries or drycleaning establishments or employees of hospitals and related institutions) which are doing less than $250,000 of business annually.

Section 202. Laundry and drycleaning establishments: Repeals minimum wage and overtime exemptions.

Section 203. Agricultural employees: Amends minimum wage exemption to maintain such exemption for agricultural employees employed by the same employer unless such employer uses more than 500 man-days of such labor during any calendar quarter of the preceding year. Members of the employer's immediate family are also exempt from the minimum wage. Maintains overtime exemption for agricultural employees, including livestock auctioneers.

Section 204. Agricultural processing employees: Repeals minimum wage and overtime exemption for agricultural processing employees in the "area of production"; repeals minimum wage but maintains overtime exemption for employees of country elevators located in "area of production"; repeals minimum wage but maintains overtime exemption for cotton ginning employees; repeals minimum wage but maintains overtime exemption for certain fruit and vegetable transportation employees.

Amends 14-week overtime exemption for seasonal industries (other than agricultural processing) to require compensation for hours of employment in excess of 10 in any workday or in excess of 48 in any workweek at 1½ times the regular rate.

Amends exemptions applicable to agricultural processing to provide for a single 14-week overtime exemption for processing of highly perishable agricultural or horticultural commodities in their raw or natural he is entitled to much commendation and praise for his achievements and contributions which have gone far beyond the call of duty.

Of special note has been the constant support and sustaining encouragement of his gracious wife, and I am proud indeed to extend my gratitude and appreciation to this very fine couple and wish them and their dear ones all choicest blessings in the future.

It is most pleasing that the Freedoms Foundation has chosen to extend special recognition to this outstanding young man who has chosen the United States as his adopted land. Located at Valley Forge, Pa., the foundation is a truly unique organization, dedicated to inspiring a greater appreciation of the freedoms guaranteed by the American Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Each year, the foundation through its freedoms award program singles out individuals, organizations, and schools for significant contributions to the American way of life.

I am happy, indeed, as his friend, to extend my heartiest congratulations to Rene Pichard and his lovely wife and family for the great honor which has come to him, and I wish for him, and for them, many happy returns of these honors and continued good health and much success and happiness for many years to come.

I have to include as part of my remarks Mr. Pichard's outstanding winning essay: "To: All Americans."

To: All Americans

As a naturalized American, I have something to say to many native Americans: You have no idea how lucky you are to be American. I say this because I have known a different way of life.

When the Nazis occupied my native country, I had the choice of working at the Ford Motor Co. near Paris or of being deported to Germany as a slave laborer. I chose Ford and there heard about America's plenty and freedom. I resolved that if I survived the war, I would go to America myself. My wish was granted; in 1945, after many difficulties, I arrived in New York with my country's delegation to the United Nations.

What impressed me in America? The warmth with which Americans of all social classes received me, an unknown foreigner. The many churches of all creeds so crowded on Sundays. Complete freedom in the newspapers and in speech. American law, by which a man is considered innocent until proven guilty. Factory parking lots crowded with workers' cars, and the comfort in which the workers lived. The civic consciousness of so many ordinary Americans as reflected in charity drives, youth organizations, voters' leagues. The encouragement given education—scholarships, part-time jobs for students, night school classes for adults. (In my country, if one did not have the family backing to attend college in youth, a college education was forever ruled out.)

After 6 months in America I felt this way: The real greatness of America was not in the multitude of cars and refrigerators that American technical skills turned out, but in the ideals of liberty and justice that sponsored the wide distribution of these goods, and the free enjoyment of life with equal opportunity for all. Certainly these ideals had not been achieved in full, but Americans were striving hard to achieve them; they were living ideals.

Wanting to be a part of America, I found a way to apply for citizenship. When the Korean war began, I joined the Air Force, in order to serve my new country in uniform. I am still in uniform.

The Air Force has made it possible for me to get an education and to develop myself in a way I could never have done in my native land. I can never do one-tenth as much for America as America has done for me. I have never for one moment regretted becoming an American. My only regret is that I am not eloquent enough to make some native Americans realize how precious are the freedoms they enjoy so effortlessly.

Our freedom are not something we can take for granted. If we are to keep them—and to extend them to every last one of our citizens, as we must in order to keep them—we will have to work and to make sacrifices.

As one of the newer citizens of the world's oldest democracy, I think our freedoms are well worth the sacrifice.

PROPOSED INDO-AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATION

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposed Indo-American Foundation for education is a lasting investment in democracy—a united investment with a country whose democratic roots run deep and wide in its history.

The people of India and the United States have always shared a sincere, abiding tradition of freedom and dignity of man. In the United States this belief can be realized by every person through our unlimited opportunities to learn, to better ourselves by our own choice through education. Constantly there are innovations in our educational systems at all levels to offer the best curriculum, the best methods—the best of our society—to our children and our young adults so that they can know true freedom through knowledge.

The Foundation is just this promise for the future to the inquiring young minds of India. It is this promise to a nation, which believes in its obligation to better the lives of all its people and only in fulfilling this obligation lies the strength and progress of the country.

The Foundation will have a broad assignment—to advance the fields of science, to foster research and technological development, to bring about new teaching techniques, to pinpoint the particular problems of India in its social and economic development and to solve them. It will leave an indelible mark on the future of India. In so doing, it will build an international bridge of understanding between the people of India and the United States.

I feel that such an institution is a necessity at this time. India is facing a great food shortage, and unless technology soon solves the gap between food and population the country is headed for disastrous problems. She must have knowledgeable men and able institutions to solve these immediate concerns. But she must have men and institutions which can undertake improvements in general schooling, fight illiteracy, break down outmoded social barriers, and lead a nation in planning for future generations.

The Foundation can be such a center, offering new solutions to the immediate problems of technology, new directions in the broad field of education, and innovation to social and economic traditions.

The United States has this opportunity to help bring about progress through our local currency reserves in India. It is not a matter of more dollars in foreign aid. It is in our own interest—the interest of peace and progress for mankind which knows no national boundaries and has no price tag.

UNIFORM TIME ACT OF 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STAGGERS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 806 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be composed of thirty-two members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPER PROCEDURES SHOULD GOVERN IMPOSITION OF EXPORT CONTROLS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 22 in a letter to the House Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains I testified that the Export Control Act, under which controls had on March 7 been imposed on exports of U.S. hides and other leathers, does not contain proper consultative procedures. I outlined my reasons for believing that even the meager procedures provided for by section 4 of the act had not been followed in the case of hides.

Just as I am concerned with the application of export controls on hides, I am also concerned with the manner in which export controls were imposed on U.S. exports to Rhodesia. The manner in which these controls were promulgated on December 28, 1965, under the foreign policy authorization in section 2 of the 1949 Export Control Act as amended last year.

Therefore I have asked the Secretary of Commerce not for a clarification of his legal authority to impose such controls, but for an account of the procedures he used in applying controls on exports to Rhodesia.

It is too easily forgotten in curtailing the exports of the United States that we are in essence cutting off the foreign sales of U.S. businesses, large and small, in every part of the country. In the case of hides, the Commerce Department took action against U.S. exports which it had sought for several years to intensively develop as part of the same Department's export promotion policy. Then suddenly, without adequate consultation, hearing, and public notice, the U.S. industry had its foreign sales summarily cut off—cut off literally by Government fiat.

I would like to point out that the manner in which Congress has allowed controls to be placed on exports is in direct contradiction to the way the Congress controls imports. The raising and lowering of tariffs on foreign goods requires legislative approval. No such action can be taken without fullest public consideration. Why should not controls on U.S. exports, which can have the same depressive or stimulative effects on sectors of the U.S. economy, be subject to at least a modicum of public consideration?

With unanimous consent my March 22 letter to the Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee, and my March 25 letter to Secretary Connor follow immediately.

March 22, 1966.

Hon. W. R. Poage,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I have received notice that your Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains is holding hearings to examine into the matter of export controls on cattle hides, calf and skins and bovine leathers. I would like to take the opportunity to comment on two important aspects of this problem which are of immediate concern.

First, the export controls in question are essentially a device to effectuate the administration's policy of using artificial market controls in order to bring about price stability. The President's action on hides is thus directly comparable in intent to his action to rescind price increases on aluminum, steel, copper, and cigarettes, and his attempts to control prices of agricultural commodities by dumping stored supplies. It is a resort to specific controls to contain price rises caused by the inflationary forces generated by administration fiscal and monetary policies. As in all cases of resort to short term expedients which benefit a particular sector of the economy, the President has damaged the opportunities of another sector. Such a policy is both bad economic theory but also will hurt the United States by diminishing the contribution of hide exports to our balance of trade.

Second, the Export Control Act does not contain adequate procedures for consultation both among Government agencies legitimately concerned and with domestic industries affected by export controls. Section 4 (a) and (b) of the Export Control Act provides for such consultations, but administrative procedures for implementing the legislative requirement of the act are not spelled out, as they are, for example, in the case of consultative procedures under the 1962 Trade Expansion Act. Adequate consultative procedures are lacking in part because the Export Control Act is not subject to the Administrative Procedures Act, which conditions the Executive's use of most authority delegated to it by Congress.

That even the limited consultative procedures provided by section 4(a)(b) were not followed in the imposition is clear. I quote from comments made on the floor during debate on export controls on hides on March 16 (Congressional Record, p. 6028):

"There are a few guidelines in the statute, however. I think one of the most damning things about this thing is that the Department of Commerce has not even abided by the few guidelines that are in the law.

"I refer to section 4(a) of the act which I would like to read, if the gentleman will permit me. It is as follows:

" 'Section 4(a). In determining what shall be controlled hereunder and in determining the extent to which exports shall be limited, any department, agency, or official making these determinations'—

"And I want to emphasize this point: 'shall seek information and advice from the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports.'

"Now the record shows, because I have checked on this, that the announcement of the export controls on hides was made on Monday, March 7. The decision, incidentally, apparently was brought out during the preceding week. The State Department was consulted as of the date of Wednesday, March 2.

"Now here is the thing that I am particularly interested in, being one of the four congressional delegates to the Kennedy round at Geneva.

"The special trade representative was not consulted until Friday, March 4, when he learned about the extent of the Department of Commerce's decision by accident. He was not called in to consult by the Commerce Department as required by section 4(a).

"It was then too late to influence the decision.

"In other respects it is quite clear that the Department of Commerce did by no means consult with the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned on the aspects of this matter.

"Second, I would point out the other standard set out in section 4(b), if I may read that section:

" 'In authorizing exports, full utilization of private competitive trade channels shall be encouraged insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchants, exporters, as well as producers and established and new exporters'—

"And here is what I want to emphasize—'a provision shall be made for representative trade consultation to that end.'

"It is my understanding—and the gentleman can perhaps verify it—that the industry involved here; namely, the U.S. hide and leather producers, were not informed of this action until Friday, March 4, at this meeting to which they were called by the Office of Export Control.

"It appears to me that the Congress had better amend the Export Control Act to establish proper procedures that are very clear so that the interests of our domestic industries and all concerned can present their case, have rights of appeal, and so forth. None of these provisions apparently exist, although I again point out there are some general guidelines in the law right now which clearly were violated. In other words, I think the Commerce Department acts are illegal. This is just one other example, I may say, of this administration using power that it does not have and not following the laws that are established where they might utilize certain powers.

"The wage-price guidelines is another area; the use of stockpiles still another to enforce these guidelines."

If, as the hearings progress, the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grain finds that strengthened procedures are necessary it might recommend to the Committee on Banking and Currency: (a) that standard Federal administrative procedures be applied to that part of the export control program which is concerned with adequacy of domestic supplies, and (b) that further amendments to the Export Control Act be made to provide consultative procedures and safeguards, and to provide for adequate additional opportunity for consultations with affected foreign interests as represented in this country.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Curtis.

March 25, 1966.

Hon. John T. Connor,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: On March 10 your General Counsel, Robert Giles, replied to my letter of March 1 giving the source of your authority to impose controls on U.S. exports to Southern Rhodesia under the foreign policy authorization in section 2(1)(b) of the 1949 Export Control Act as amended.

In my view the Export Control Act's section 4(a)(b) does not provide adequate procedures for consultation with other Government agencies and domestic interests directly concerned with a given export control action.

This lack of proper consultative procedure is manifest in your Department's imposition of export controls on hides and certain leathers on March 7 under the "short supply" authorization of the Export Control Act. I have expressed on the floor of the House (Congressional Record, Mar. 16, 1966, pp. 6028–6029) and before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains on March 22, the opinion that your action in imposing export controls on hides did not observe even the meager procedures provided for in section 4 of the Export Control Act. In the enclosed copy of my letter to Congressman Poage, chairman of the Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee, you will find my recommendation that the subcommittee propose that the Export Control Act be made subject to the standard Administrative Procedure Act, and that further consultative procedures be spelled out in the act.

It is my view that even in cases of the use of the foreign policy and national security provisions of the act fully adequate consultative procedures should apply. These procedures would require at minimum publication of proposed action in the Federal Register, hearings of interested domestic and foreign interests, and full consultation with concerned Government agencies.

Therefore, I would like to have an accounting of the specific ways in which your department took action to satisfy the requirements of section 4(a)(b) in imposing controls on exports to Southern Rhodesia. What agencies did you consult in the imposition of these controls, and when did you consult them? What U.S. industries and other interested groups did you consult, and when did you consult them? What regulations have you promulgated as guidelines for the conduct of your department in administering the Export Control Act?

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Curtis.

EUROPEAN INCOMES POLICY FAILS TO STOP INFLATION

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the administration is placing primary reliance on its wage-price guideposts to hold down mounting inflationary pressures in the economy. An article in the New York Times on March 23 by M. J. Rossant points out—on the basis of European experience—the futility of this policy.

The European experience has shown that an incomes policy is more effective in holding down prices than in restraining wages. Where unions are strong, they are much more likely to resist guideposts than businessmen, who are more sensitive to pressures applied by Government.

The result, of course, is rising costs for businessmen and squeezed profit margins, which ultimately hold down the level of investment and economic growth.

The European experience also indicates that when labor is scarce and industry is operating at or near capacity the guidepost policy is rarely successful. If the administration follows European practice, it will try to strengthen the guidepost approach by moderating its supposedly voluntary character.

Under unanimous consent I include the article referred to in the Record at this point:

Test for Guideposts—Administration Effort To Curb Wages and Prices Seen Facing Difficulties

(By M. J. Rossant)

The Johnson administration's controversial attempts to combat inflation through its wage-price guideposts seems to be following the pattern established in Europe, where experience with techniques of wage-price restraint have a long and checkered history.

Most European countries have not been very successful in applying incomes policy, which is their name for wage-price guideposts. But that isn't stopping them from trying any more than it is stopping the Johnson administration.

The administration obviously felt that it scored a significant victory in getting the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. to cancel the price increase it had posted for cigarettes. Its critics think that the administration suffered an even more significant defeat when a New Jersey engineers' union refused to heed pleas to moderate a wage settlement with contractors that far exceeded the 3.2-percent guidepost ceiling.

These contrasting results emphasize the hit-or-miss character of the guideposts. They are in line with the observation of Allan Sproul, former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, who pointed out that the guideposts "mostly hit prices and miss wages."

But they also conform to the European pattern, where prices have generally risen less than wages. In Britain, where the trade union movement is especially strong, wages rose by over 8 percent during the last 12 months while prices were increasing by about 5 percent.

A similar trend developed in the Netherlands, which has a long involvement with incomes policy. Last year, wages were up by 10 percent and prices by about 5 percent.

Like American businessmen, those in Europe seem more sensitive to pressures than labor leaders. They do not like guideposts, but they like tangling with their governments even less.

Labor, though, is prepared to resist pressures bought by governments, especially in countries where unionism is well established. They feel that they would be abdicating their responsibility if they accepted a governmental decision that sets out just what share of the economic pie they are entitled to get.

American labor union leaders have much the same attitude. They refuse to abide by the 3.2 percent figure set by the administration almost as a point of honor.

European experience clearly suggests that voluntary restraint on wages and prices is rarely successful when labor is scarce and industry is working at capacity. As these conditions were not present in the United States until recently, the prospect is that the administration's wage-price guideposts face even rougher going in the future than they have to date.

According to Richard MacNabb, economist for the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, the guideposts had "some effect in restraining wage and price settlements" earlier but have now "outlived their usefulness." But if European practice is followed, the administration may well decide to strengthen its guidepost approach.

Britain's Labor government, for example, has been toying with the establishment of an early warning system that would compel key unions and companies to provide advance notice of any price and wage changes and would provide for a 4-month cooling-off period before changes could take effect.

Neither British industry nor its trade unions are entirely happy about this plan, but the failure to hold down prices and wages under current arrangements make it clear that the guidepost approach must be strengthened or abandoned.

Yet some European countries that already possess machinery for advance warning on price and wage changes have achieved only scattered successes. Their experience indicates that restraint cannot be effective unless voluntary cooperation is replaced by coercive measures.

Most European countries have been able to maintain some sort of voluntary guidepost policy only by making their yardsticks fairly elastic. They have given up attempts to use a precise ceiling, like the administration's 3.2 percent, which is vulnerable to piercing.

In contrast to European experience, the administration has won considerable acceptance of its yardsticks without any real debate. But if it seeks to strengthen its approach by some sort of statutory legislation, an extensive debate over both the theory and practice of the guidepost approach cannot be avoided.

Here again European experience indicates that debate over who should get what share of the national pie is unlikely to reach firm conclusions. But debate has been useful in drawing public attention to the need for restraint and in making politicians aware that they cannot rely exclusively on voluntary restraint to hold back inflation.

H.R. 13346, TO REGULATE DEALERS OF ANIMALS FOR RESEARCH

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, people throughout our country are shocked and outraged by the abuse and stealing of animals by certain dealers who sell them to laboratories. The lead article in the February 4 issue of Life magazine gave photographic evidence of the suffering of the animals from starvation, thirst, long exposure to extremes of temperature, confinement to crates in which they are so tightly packed that they are unable to stand when released.

The Life article and numerous press reports of the theft of animals and the arrest of dealers for cruelty have greatly—and rightly—increased nationwide indignation. They have also increased the public demand for effective legislation which will begin the reform of the inhumane conditions under which dealers now collect, hold, and transport animals.

On March 7 I introduced H.R. 13346, a bill for the regulation of dealers in a form which has overwhelming public support in every part of the country.

The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Helstoski] and six other Members of the House are sponsors of the same form of dealer legislation.

The measure is moderate, workable, and the very minimum that should be considered for the licensing and regulation of dealers.

But the House Agriculture Committee on March ordered reported a bill which cannot possibly provide what is needed. The bill ordered reported by the Agriculture Committee is not in accord with the public wish for the regulation and reform of dealers. Following are some of the glaring weaknesses which render it unacceptable:

First. It permits the continued sale of animals at auction and by body weight, a method of sale of animals for research in which the worst abuses occur and in which a great many stolen and fraudulently acquired animals change hands quickly then to be rushed to another part of the State or across State lines so that the frantic owner has no hope of recovering his animal. The overwhelming majority of pending dealer bills, from the time of the introduction of the first bill last year, would ban the sale of animals at auction or by weight.

Second. It fails to give the legislative intent of the humane standards the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to promulgate.

Third. It fails to require bills of sale as a safeguard against the theft and fraudulent acquisition of animals by dealers.

Fourth. It fails to require inspection of dealers' facilities and transport.

Fifth. It fails to call for the revocation of dealers' licenses for violations and calls for an inadequate fine.

Sixth. It calls for the licensing of both the dealer and the laboratory. Since the licensing of the laboratory would be only in its capacity as a purchaser, the dual licensing is unnecessary and confusing.

In contrast to the foregoing deficiencies and lack of clarity of the bill reported by the House Agriculture Committee, my bill, H.R. 13346 and the identical bills sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] and six other Members of the House would do the following:

It would license dealers only and require laboratories to purchase animals only from licensed dealers; prohibit the sale of animals at auction or by weight; protect not only dogs and cats but also other animals whose suffering is no less than that of cats and dogs; provide the legislative intent of the standards the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to promulgate to insure the humane housing, handling, and transport of animals by dealers; require legitimate bills of sale to prevent the theft and fraudulent acquisition of animals by dealers; require Federal inspection of dealers' premises and transport of animals; require revocation of dealers' licenses for violations of the act or of the anticruelty laws of the States and calls for an adequate penalty.

The features of H.R. 13346 and the identical bills which I have just listed are the very minimum required to effect the regulation of dealers. Without those features, a Federal license for dealers would do more to protect dealers than it would to protect animals and the owners of lost and stolen animals. For example, if a dealer is licensed but not adequately regulated by Federal law, it will be virtually impossible for humane organizations, acting in their law enforcement capacity by enforcing the anticruelty laws of the States, to secure a conviction of a dealer for cruelty and neglect.

It speaks well for our country that the public is outraged by the activities of conscienceless dealers who steal and maltreat animals and insists upon legislation that will not merely license the wrongdoers but will correct a wrong. The public voice on this subject, which is reflected also in the press, is testimony of the fact that we as a nation are mindful of the rights not only of mankind but also of the defenseless and inarticulate creatures of the animal world.

We shall be acting in the public interest and in the interest of justice and decency by refusing to accept an unacceptably vague and permissive measure and insisting upon clear and mandatory legislation in the form of H.R. 13346.

Under unanimous consent at this point I insert in the RECORD the following excellent editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Saturday, March 26, 1966:

WEAK PET BILL

The House of Representatives apparently is going to have the opportunity to pass a weak, almost meaningless bill in the field of animal protection against the vicious practice of pet stealing.

Activity of pet thieves, their cruel treatment of animals before selling stolen dogs and cats to careless medical research clinics, has been exposed by national magazines and wire services. There has been a rush of bills designed to regulate the conditions under which animal dealers and laboratories may secure animals for experimentation. The practice is interstate.

Unfortunately, the House Livestock Subcommittee has approved a bill sponsored by its chairman (W. R. POAGE, Democrat, of Texas) that is permissive. It also was approved by the full Agriculture Committee. It merely leaves all standards—and presumably enforcement—in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture. Unless amended, it would not solve the problem. For example, it does not forbid specifically auction sale of animals, "by the box" transactions that rightly infuriate people who are concerned over cruelty to animals.

It would not be a case where this bill's passage would be "something better than nothing." The Helstoski bill, a stern measure that would require realistic regulations, is available. To their credit, Ohio's Representatives FRANCES P. BOLTON and ROBERT E. SWEENEY have supported the latter bill. Congress should pass a tough bill here.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION LEGISLATION NEEDS YOUR HELP

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be invited to address the Inland Daily Press Association membership at the association's winter meeting in Chicago on February 21, 1966.

I took the opportunity of appearing before the association to discuss one of the most important legislative proposals to be before the Congress in the past 20 year, the public records law or freedom-of-information bill.

My remarks follow:

FREEDOM-OF-INFORMATION LEGISLATION NEEDS YOUR HELP, CONGRESSMAN URGES

(NOTE.—Representative DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois, a member of the Moss subcommittee, cites examples of unjustified government secrecy and describes the obstacles facing the freedom of information bills.)

Government secrecy, I suppose, is as old as government, and certainly no one would suggest that government secrecy is a problem that comes up only during the administrations of but one political party.

Certainly this distinguished group—above all others—is acutely aware that our system of government, to function properly, requires that the people have access to information on the conduct of government if they are to exercise their citizenship responsibilities intelligently and thoughtfully.

As you, I strongly believe that the public's business should be conducted in public to the extent that it is humanly possible. Only in this way will our system of government by the people continue.

The problem today is really almost too big to define. There is no way to detail the literally hundreds of instances of government secrecy or news manipulation. The problem is a serious one, as the following illustrative examples will show.

DISCUSSES CREDIBILITY GAP

Increasingly in recent months, you have all seen comments about "credibility gap," and "crisis in confidence," or "truth in government." These are not my phrases. They are not the phrases of the opposition party. They are, in some cases, the words and phrases of government officials charged with the responsibility of executing the policies of government, and in some instances, they are the words of members of your profession.

I have a clipping from an article in the New Republic of January 29, 1966, by a Mr. Deakin, and in it he says:

"The essential veracity of American Government has seldom been a prolonged cause of doubt. This is why persistent charges of a credibility gap in the Johnson administration merit examination.

"A great question of the credibility of the American Government has been raised, and a great crisis of confidence may indeed be at hand, as Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, our representative to the United Nations, acknowledged last month."

LOSS OF CONFIDENCE SHOWN

He goes on to refer to a public opinion survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corp. wherein they determined that 67 percent of the American people today believe that their Government only "sometimes" tells the truth; and that 13 percent said they thought that it "almost never" gave the truth in official statements about Vietnam; and that only 15 percent said they thought that Government always told the truth. Clearly, within recent years, increased Government secrecy has resulted in a marked loss of confidence by the people in their Government.

Instances of the withholding of information are, of course, not restricted to foreign affairs.

Mr. Deakin goes on to note that the Washington Post reported recently that the President would ask for an excise tax cut of about $4 billion. The President spread the word that that was not correct. The press secretary said, "That figure bears no relationship to any decision that has been made." A few months later, the President asked for a cut of $3.964 billion instead of $4 billion.

We all recall the situation involving the steel price increases in January of this year.

The administration seemed to want us to believe that the whole settlement with United States Steel came about as a sort of pleasant surprise to the President over the news tickers. Even after the settlement was reached the press secretary told reporters he did not know "with whom any of the steel companies might have met."

He said he did "know there were no meetings at the White House and no meetings involving White House officials."

QUOTES RESTON ON STEEL CASE

Mr. Reston, reporting in the New York Times of January 7, 1966, stated:

"What is generally believed is that the administration put severe pressure on the steel companies not to go along with Bethlehem's $5-a-ton price increase, that at least one member of the Cabinet discussed what would be acceptable to the administration, and that all this was done with the knowledge of the President."

It is known that "Roger Blough, the president of United States Steel, was (in Washington) talking to a member of the Cabinet—apparently Secretary of Defense McNamara," Reston added.

Then there was the question relating to the price increases and stockpile sales, which were commented on in the New York Times of November 2, 1965. Here the administration vigorously insisted that the sales from the Government aluminum stockpile were completely unrelated to its pressure to hold the line on aluminum prices. When the aluminum companies agreed to refrain from increasing prices, the threatened sale from the stockpile was withdrawn.

REPORTERS' NAMES TAKEN

The Deakin article also stated that: "A couple of week ago, Moyers admitted that White House telephone operators were taking reporters' names when they called staff members, on orders of Presidential Assistant Marvin Watson. The purpose, Moyers said, was to measure the workload of the staff and see who needed more or fewer phone lines. He called it an economy measure. A record simply of the number of incoming and outgoing calls—not names—would have sufficed for this, however."

An article in the Chicago Sun-Times of December 5, 1965, by Thomas B. Ross, in which he reported on a press conference, quoted the Secretary of Defense as saying, "The trouble is our credibility was destroyed."

Mr. Ross states: "The United States, as this reporter recently learned during an extensive trip through Africa and the Middle East, is suffering from a crisis of credibility.

"Not only doctrinaire leftists and neutrals but even those who consider themselves friends of the United States have come to suspect the official statements of the U.S. Government.

"They have developed an uneasy feeling that information about Government policy is being manipulated in such a way that even the conscientious citizen is being deprived of the rudimentary material upon which to base an informed opinion."

SDX GIVES EXAMPLES

Sigma Delta Chi held its annual meeting—last November, I believe—and issued a report citing the Post Office refusal to release the names of the hundreds of part-time employees hired during the summer program in 1965. There was obviously no excuse. Certainly there was no security problem involved.

It seems it was clear that they were withheld from the press and the public simply to protect the pork barrel politics from public view. The efforts of the able Minnesota Congressman, Al Quie, finally forced disclosure of this information.

The Sigma Delta Chi report goes on to comment on the Johnson administration's efforts to defeat the proposed Federal Public Records Law, which I will discuss in detail in a moment.

The report also cites the Defense Department's directive, the Sylvester directive which is still in force, requiring all military and civilian personnel to report all contacts with the press to Sylvester's office before the close of business that day. Admittedly, however, this is not as sophisticated an approach as Mr. Watson uses in the White House.

The Sigma Delta Chi report also mentions the increased centralization of information releases at the White House, and the increased sensitivity over leaks of information that have no connection with national security problems.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT CLAMPS LID

As I was leaving Washington, my secretary called to my attention a notice in the Federal Register, Volume XXXI, No. 34, for Friday, February 18. It amounts to a new rule or regulation issued by the Department of Agriculture involving the "clarifying of departmental procedures relating to the production and disclosure of records under subpena, or order, or other demand."

Under paragraph (c), title, "Procedure in the event of an adverse ruling," an adverse ruling meaning that the Department is ordered to disclose certain information, it concludes by stating:

"If a court or other authority declines to stay the effect of the demand in response to a request made in accordance with paragraphs (a) or (b) of this section, pending the receipt of instructions from the agency head or Secretary of Agriculture, the officer or employee upon whom the demand shall have been made shall respectfully decline to produce or disclose the records, material, or information demanded."

CITIES INVALID STATISTICS

An example of Government misinformation occurred on the eve of the 1962 elections.

Six days before the election, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz announced that unemployment had reached a 3-year low during October and that the number of unemployed had declined by 2 million since the Kennedy administration took office. The Washington Post, on November 3, 1962, editorialized that this looked like election eve partisan politics.

After the election, Wirtz admitted to the then Chicago Daily News reporter and now city editor, James McCartney, that his statement had contained "invalid" statistical comparisons because the figures were not seasonally adjusted (Chicago Daily News, Dec. 12, 1962).

Mr. Wirtz also said that "4,500,000 more Americans have jobs than when this administration took office in January 1961." Again an error of omission was made. The seasonally adjusted, and therefore the valid, figure was later shown to be only 1,224,000. But the corrections were not made until well after the election. This is distortion at its worst because of the great difficulty a reporter—or the public—would have in attempting to learn the correct figures and put the achievements of the administration in their proper perspective.

GAO DOCUMENTS SECRECY CASES

Even the Government Accounting Office (GAO) has documented cases relating to the Government information problem.

In a report dated June 3, 1964, the Comptroller General of the United States testified:

"In our examination into the accuracy and reliability of selected information pertaining to the accelerated public works program we found that the reports contained significant overstatements of the number of jobs estimated to be created by accelerated public works projects. We found also that the reports contained overstatements with respect to the number of actual man-months of work created by Community Facilities Administration approved projects already under construction.

"A comparison of the estimated 21,814 man-months of work reported by the Area Redevelopment Administration for the 190 projects included in this review with the 9,533 on-site man-months actually worked on these projects shows that the estimates were overstated by 12,261 man-months, or about 128 percent.

"If what we found in the 190 projects is true for the other Community Facilities Administration projects, the 55,300 on-site man-years of work estimated for the 2,842 projects approved by the Community Facilities Administration as of November 1, 1963, would appear to be overstated by about 31,000 man-years of work.

"The total number of man-years of work estimated to be created by all projects approved by the various participating departments and agencies as of November 1, 1963, was 93,400. Our examination also disclosed that the 50,853 on-site man-months reported as having actually been worked on 497 Community Facilities Administration projects were overstated by 23,008 man-months, or about 83 percent. Projecting this percentage of overstatements to that agency's 1,228 projects under construction at November 1, 1963, indicates that the reported man-months of work were overtsated by about 60,000 man-months."

BUCHWALD CRITICIZES PLANTS

Probably the most telling criticism of the Johnson Administration's information policies has come from the saber-tongued humorist, Art Buchwald. On January 18, 1966, his column discussed the confession of Presidential Press Secretary Moyers that he plants questions with reporters in advance of Presidential press conferences.

Buchwald's imaginary conversation between Press Secretary Moyers and the President said, in part:

"Now, what we're doing at this press conference to facilitate matters, Mr. President, is we're putting the answers to the spontaneous questions on the teleprompter. Therefore, you have to call on the people in order."

"That makes sense. I'd hate to be asked about Vietnam and give an answer that had to do with Luci's engagement. I did have another problem last time and that was the TV lights were so bright I couldn't see the people who were supposed to ask me the questions I had the answers to.

"We've reserved the first four rows for reporters with the planted questions. What I would suggest is that you look all around the room, but only recognize someone in the first four rows.

"You seem to have covered all the bases, Bill. Have you planted any questions I can get a laugh out of?

"I gave one to Sarah McClendon about your beagles, but I told her to ask it only if we had time.

"Where should I insert this sentence about my belief in a free press and the public's right to know what their President has on his mind?

"Between the spontaneous question on steel prices and the spontaneous question on Arthur Goldberg's visit to the Pope."

An article in the Washington Evening Star of May 5, 1965, by Doris Fleeson, said in part:

"News management in the Nation's Capital is currently more deliberate and sweeping than it ever was during World War II or the Korean period. * * * Before the wellsprings of public discussion are further damaged or dried up, the Johnson administration urgently needs to recognize that there is no point in trying to win the world while doing irreparable injury here at home."

IN NAME OF EXPEDIENCY

The last example I will comment on before turning to the specifics of the proposed freedom of information legislation is from the New York Times of April 23, 1965, which says, very simply, "The credibility of the U.S. Government is a precious thing. It has been sacrificed too often in the name of expediency."

I realize that this has been a necessarily sketchy outline of what the types of problems are in Washington. As I have said, there is no way to wrap it up and put a ribbon on it. It is a day-in-and-day-out problem involving, at various times, withholding, manipulation, and/or news misinformation.

The Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, on which I serve, has been investigating instances of withholding over a 10-year period. These investigations have resulted in thousands of pages of printed hearings and reports which prove conclusively—to use the words of the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Congressman John Moss of California—"the unfortunate fact that Government secrecy tends to grow as Government itself grows."

While Government secrecy is not new, certainly it has to be said that in recent years the administration has been particularly skillful and imaginative in its use of secrecy and news manipulation as a protective device.

CONGRESS NOT WITHOUT FAULT

Before I proceed, let me say the problem of Government secrecy is not reserved exclusively to the executive branch. Congress, and this is a problem which concerns me greatly, is not without fault.

I testified recently before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Among other aspects of Congressional reform, I urged an end to the increased trend toward closed committee hearings on nonsecurity matters; secrecy as it relates to the fact that we in Congress continue to pass major pieces of legislation by voice vote, so there is no way the people across this country can know how the Members actually cast their votes. We passed a bill involving $15 billion with no record vote being taken. We passed the compulsory railroad arbitration legislation by voice vote, to mention but two.

This I think is wrong and clearly unnecessary.

Also, there is the whole question of the disclosure of members' and their staffs' outside business activities, as they may relate to the problems of conflict of interest, which we have seen cropping up in recent years. The Congress has a job to do in this area if it is to change its image away from the Bobby Baker Congress.

CALLS LAW TOO VAGUE

But the crisis of credibility and government secrecy is not hard to understand when one understands what the law is today.

Section 3(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act, which is the Federal statute involving disclosure, provides that "save as otherwise required by statute, matters of official record shall in accordance with published rule be made available to persons properly and directly concerned except any information held confidential information for good cause found."

That covers just about everything.

It is obvious that this so-called public records section of the Administrative Procedure Act is not really a disclosure section; rather, it is a tool for any determined bureaucrat to withhold information; and this is exactly how it has been used. Note that there is no real definition of the words, "properly and directly concerned," or of "for good cause found."

QUOTES CREED BLACK

As Mr. Creed Black, managing editor, Chicago Daily News, testified for the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

"One of the lessons that has become increasingly apparent to us in experience with the Administrative Procedure Act is that too much discretion was left in the hands of individual agencies.

"Our position is that the Administrative Procedures Act and the other laws which are on the books have been inadequate in one important respect, and that is recognizing—writing into law—the public's right to know. The fact is that in the present situation, as we see it, the burden of responsibility for public knowledge of Government affairs is fundamentally misplaced. It shouldn't be up to the American public, and the press is simply their representative, to fight daily battles just to find out how the ordinary business of their Government is being conducted. Rather, it should be the responsibility of their employees, who conduct this business, to tell them."

This is what the records of the Subcommittee on Government Information of the Government Operations Committee, over a period of 10 years, shows; what the Sigma Delta Chi organization has shown in its report; and it is the problem that I have set forth in my earlier comments here today. The present law is an open-end invitation for Government officials to withhold—legally—and this is how it has been used.

FORTY CONGRESSMEN SPONSOR BILLS

But, there is an answer, and the answer is the legislation that has been passed by the U.S. Senate and at the present time is pending in the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information.

It was drafted because it became increasingly obvious to all of us that there was no way the subcommittee could fully solve the problem by attempting to deal with these matters on an item-by-item basis. There is just too much Government today involved in so many aspects of everyone's life for one subcommittee to police it without some basic statutory provisions to assist in this role.

On February 17 of last year, this effort started with about 20 Members of the House and Senate. Today, there are over 40 Members who have sponsored this legislation, H.R. 5012, S. 1160, and identical bills.

The purpose of the proposed law is to require the Federal agencies to "make all records promptly available to any person"—note this is "any person," not someone who would qualify as being "properly or directly concerned" necessarily, but to any person—and to provide for the first time for court action to guarantee this right of access, with the exception, properly, of certain specified categories of sensitive Government information which would be exempted from disclosure requirements.

ONLY WHITE HOUSE OPPOSED

The hearings were completed in April 1965. Every witness who testified on the legislation testified in favor of it, except for every witness who was sent down to the subcommittee at the request of the President and the administration, and who was, in fact, employed by the administration. Every witness who testified for the executive branch was against it; but every other witness was in favor of the legislation.

The White House opposition resulted in a stalemate in the House of Representatives last year.

The executive branch, and particularly the Justice Department, has been working for a complete revision of the bill, which would have represented a total concession to the President and which would have written into law and codified congressional support for executive secrecy under the concept of executive privilege. Clearly, as the Sigma Delta Chi report indicated:

"The administration tried to warp the legislation into an unlimited authority for the President to establish broader secrecy policies."

BILLS BASED ON THREE PRINCIPLES

These bills are based on three principles: First, that public records, which are evidence of official Government action, are public property, and that there should be a positive obligation to disclose this information.

Second, these bills would establish a procedure to guarantee the individual access to specific public records through the courts.

Finally, the bills would designate those categories of official records which must, to maintain the propriety of Government and protect the Nation, be exempt to disclosure.

Immediately after the last session of Congress, there was a great deal of discussion across the country about what a productive session it was, and as I look back at it, I would suspect that a great percentage of everything that was introduced became law, except the public records legislation, the proposals aimed at the question of the public's right to know. The only conceivable reason for this legislative failure is the well-known and well-publicized White House opposition.

ONLY HOUSE ACTION REMAINS

I consider this bill to be one of the most critical measures to be considered by Congress in the past 20 years. Only House action remains. The Government Operations Committee has a job to do for the American people. Hopefully, it will act promptly and wisely.

The press reports are pessimistic on the prospects for this legislation, attributing the poor prospects to the strong administration opposition. I, for one, am still hopeful, for how could an administration which claims to be interested in encouraging the participation of all citizens in Government stand in opposition to this legislation? Why should President Johnson have asked the Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965, for example, if his administration is intent on denying the public access to the information it needs to draw informed conclusions? Why should the administration have any objection to the goal of assuring the people's right to know about the conduct of Government? Why should the President on the one hand speak frequently of his interest in people and on the other hand deny those people their constitutional right to information on the conduct of Government?

On Thursday, before I left Washington, I called my colleague and friend, Congressman JOHN MOSS, the able chairman of the subcommittee, and I discussed this legislation with him. I was told by him that the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information probably would be able to take up the Senate-passed bill and pending House bill by mid-March.

I believe that our subcommittee, knowing the members on it, will favorably report out a sound bill. Then, the bill would be before the full Government Operations Committee.

At that point, of course, it is anyone's guess. It has to pass the full committee, and it has to pass the Houes of Representatives. And the administration is against it.

But we in this country have placed all of our faith, all of our hope, on the intelligence and interest of the people. We have said that ours is a Government guided by citizens. From this it follows that Government will serve us well only if the citizens are well informed.

Our system of government is a testimony to our belief that people will find their way to the right solutions given sufficient information. It was a magnificent gamble, and it has worked.

DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT

I could, in closing, rant and rave and talk about the free press and free speech, and the need for the public to have accurate information, up-to-date information. I will not, because you know all of that.

I will simply say that the people in this room—above all others—have a responsibility because you are knowledgeable about this problem, and because you are in a position to do something about it. You are, at an earlier point, aware when information is withheld. The public may not be; and it is often through you they are so informed. You as an organization, as an industry, and you as individuals, have a responsibility to protect the public's interest.

CALLS SECRECY DANGEROUS

Today I think government secrecy is particularly dangerous for two very important reasons.

First, increasingly, government is becoming involved in more and more aspects of every citizen's personal and business life, and so the access to information about how government is exercising its trust becomes increasingly important.

Next, our Nation faces a communications crisis, if you will. Today, people are so busy bringing up families, making a living, and, at the same time, the problems facing this country are becoming increasingly difficult and complex. As a result, it is that much more difficult for a person to keep informed and knowledgeable on the great national and international problems facing our country. Without government secrecy, it is difficult. With government secrecy, it is impossible for a citizen to become and remain knowledgeable enough to exercise his responsibilities as a citizen thoughtfully.

SAYS PUBLIC MUST BE EDUCATED

If you do not help in the public education job that needs to be done so that we in this country, in this session of Congress, will see the passage of the freedom-of-information legislation—if you do not help, I do not believe anyone will.

I would suggest to you that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation we have seen in Congress in the last 20 years. Certainly to your industry it is more important than any of the hundreds of bills which passed Congress last year.

I would suggest to you further that this problem is as important to your industry as advertising or circulation.

Thus far the job has not been done.

A CLEAR RESPONSIBILITY

In closing, I will simply say that the political organization that goes by the name of the United States of America consists of no fewer than 150,000 governing units, school boards, conservation districts, municipalities, States, the Nation, and so forth. It is operated by some 1 million elected officials, ranging from mosquito district trustee to President, and by some 6 million full-time employees. Our Government is so large and so complicated that few understand it well and others barely understand it at all. Yet we must understand it to make it function better.

As has been said, the power, for good or evil, of this American political organization is virtually beyond measurement. The decisions which it makes, the uses to which it devotes its immense resources, the leadership which it provides on moral as well as material questions, all appear likely to determine the fate of the modern world.

This means that the power of the people is virtually beyond measurement, and each of us as citizens—and particularly your industry with the trust you hold of major responsibility in this area—have a clear responsibility.

TWO GREAT PROTEST MOVEMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there have been two great protest movements in the United States: One is, of course, the civil rights movement and the other the current protest over policy in Vietnam. Those dissenting from the prevailing view have had their arguments questioned and challenged; this is as it should be in a society which values freedom of expression.

But in addition there has been a more subtle and far more insidious form of attack that, completely ignoring the substance of the protesting arguments, attacks instead the very right to protest. Sometimes this is done in a crude and blatant way by equating dissent with treason. Such people evidently believe that "Whatever is—is right" and that the highest loyalty one can give one's country is not to its ideals but to the official policy of the moment.

At this point in the Record, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an editorial from the New York Times which gives short shrift to the "If you are not wholeheartedly with me, you are against me" type of attack:

Chauvinism Versus Democracy

The effort to separate all of American opinion on the war in Vietnam into two—and only two—distinct categories was assiduously promoted by Governor Reed of Maine, speaking at the White House the other day.

It seems that a vast majority of Americans, who alone are patriotic, "wholeheartedly" back President Johnson on Vietnam. In contrast, says Governor Reed, there is "a very small number who participate in demonstrations, draft-card burnings and so on, who represent an infinitesimal small portion of the people of the United States." There is, apparently, nothing in between.

That is evidently Governor Reed's version of current history, a version endorsed in a thousand different ways by many official spokesmen and their unofficial press agents. We say that this kind of nonsense should be stopped. We say it is a gross distortion of the actual state of public opinion in this country. We say it is degrading to the ideal of American democracy that the moderate critics of various aspects of administration policy on Vietnam should be lumped together with draft-card burners, extremists or traitors because they do not go along "wholeheartedly" behind the President in every phase of Vietnam policy.

It is mere jingoistic demagoguery to equate dissent, debate, and constructive criticism of the Vietnamese policy, as Governor Reed apparently does, with the extremists as though there were in truth nothing in between. There is a great deal in between. There are perfectly honest, logical, and patriotic reasons to question the way the Vietnamese war and the overall policy in southeast Asia are being carried out. It is absurd to classify such questioning as appeasement or as the equivalent of the scuttle-and-run policy asked for by only the tiniest minority of the dissenters.

The Vietnamese war is a great crisis in modern American history. It holds the most fateful kind of possibilities for the future. There is a wide field for controversy over methods, tactics, and long-range policies. Such discussion has already had constructive results in the past; and we have no doubt that there will continue to be room for beneficial argument over the course of the war in Vietnam among moderate and patriotic Americans for a long time to come.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there are more sophisticated and more elusive attacks upon the freedom of expression. There is, for example, the expert theory which implies that anyone not engaged in policymaking is not fully informed and therefore unqualified to criticize official policy. There is also the compartment theory of citizenship which says students should study, teachers should teach, ministers can preach—but only in their own parish—and so on. In other words, it is all right to theorize about the great issues of the day and to form opinions but it is not all right to make one's views meaningful in the real world.

Fortunately there have always been those among us who are not content with an abstract defense of freedom and justice. They have interpreted literally the guarantees of our Constitution and responded to the promptings of conscience which bid them be involved with mankind. In recent days my attention has been called to a speech given by Theodore Sorensen honoring one such man, Father Richard Morrisroe, who believed that freedom was his responsibility. He is dead now, having been gunned down in his native land for trying to make the promises of that land real to all its inhabitants. But Mr. Sorensen has eloquently defended Father Morrisroe's personal commitment to the ideals of his faith and of his nation from the attack of those who subscribe to the "compartment" theory of a citizen's responsibility.

For as Mr. Sorensen said:

The United States of America is not so rich in intellectual and inspirational leadership, or so certain of its course in the world, or so perfect in the treatment of its citizens, that it can afford the suppression or repression of any thoughtful view or voice—and that includes the views and voices of our preachers as well as our teachers, editors, authors, and others. We cannot afford to listen merely to spokesmen for the state and the status quo, for the comfortable and the conformed. We have enough timidity and stupidity in our ranks without saying "Sit down" to the Richard Morrisroes of this world who are willing to stand up and be counted.

Mr. Speaker, I have permission to include at this point in the Congressional Record the full text of Mr. Sorensen's speech, which appeared in the March 16, 1966, edition of the Christian Century:

Let No Drum Be Muffled

(An address delivered by Theodore C. Sorensen, February 22 at the Chicago Catholic Interracial Council's John F. Kennedy Award dinner honoring Father Richard F. Morrisroe)

(Note.—Mr. Sorensen, special counsel to the late President Kennedy, is an attorney with the New York law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton, and Garrison.)

We honor tonight with words a man whose deeds have done honor to us all. In an age still riddled with complacency Father Richard Morrisroe showed conviction. In an atmosphere of fear he had courage. Encountering hate, he responded with love. To those with malice he offered charity, and for seeking peace he suffered violence.

John Kennedy, for whom this award is justly named, would have approved of its being conferred upon Father Morrisroe—not because they were both Catholics but because they both despised injustice and defied inaction, not because they were both gunned down in the course of duty but because they both believed that "one man can make a difference and every man ought to try." John Kennedy went to Dallas, Tex., and Richard Morrisroe went to Hayneville, Ala., not in an act of bravado or a gesture of defiance but on missions of reconciliation.

"A man does what he must," wrote the author of "Profiles in Courage," "in spite of personal consequences, in spite of * * * dangers—and that is the basis of all human morality." Clearly, President Kennedy would have saluted Richard Morrisroe as another profile in courage.

I

But, of course, not everyone has—not even all those who deplored the violence that befell him. While Father Morrisroe lay critically wounded in a Baptist hospital where nuns came to pray for his life, while black men north and south offered tears for this white man's recovery, while Father Morrisroe's friend and companion, the young seminarian Jonathan Daniels, lay dead as the result of the same shotgun assault, the county solicitor in Hayneville was quoted as saying to a reporter, in tones clearly shared by most of his constituents: "If they had been tending to their own busines, like I tend to mine, they'd be living and enjoying themselves today."

If they had been tending to their own business—if they, in short, had been back in their own pulpits in their own cities—if they had only accepted the common notion that a preacher's business is but to preach—then everything would have been all right. That doctrine, I regret to say, has not been applied to Father Morrisroe alone, nor has it been expressed by southern racists alone. It has been increasingly applied to that increasing number of clergymen of all faiths who have chosen to engage in direct action on behalf of civil rights in the North, or peace in Vietnam, or better treatment for the poor. It has been expressed by businessmen and by bishops, by politicians, and professors, by fellow clergymen, and communicants. It underlies a growing debate in this Nation's churches today, from Albany to Sacramento, from Milwaukee to Mississippi.

That debate is not confined to the Catholic Church, as many assert. The issue may be newer to most Catholics. Their traditional concepts may be more sharply exposed. But clergymen of other faiths have also been warned or forced to cease and desist their social action activities—warned or forced by their superiors, by their financial supporters, by their trustees, or by their congregations. "In the past," said Robert McAfee Brown, a leading Protestant observer, "controversial ministers were burned. Now they just get fired." Clergymen of all faiths in Mississippi and Alabama denounced what they called the "outside intervention" of their northern colleagues. Protestant ministers in California have bitterly assailed those taking part in a local agricultural strike. And one of the most famous Protestant preachers had chided his fellow pastors for "going far beyond the Ten Commandments."

In a sense they have. Particularly since a man named Kennedy in 1963 and a place called Selma in 1965 galvanized them into action on civil rights, more and more clergymen—and nuns—have been found in picket lines, in protest marches, in the organization of boycotts, and even in jail. They have expressed a concern over Vietnam that goes far beyond traditional religious pacifism. They have encouraged strikes by the underpaid and demonstrations by the underprivileged. They have stirred division and dissension in their own churches and communities, embarrassed established business and political interests, involved themselves in issues not traditionally or directly related by most people to the Gospel and subjected themselves to indignity and humiliation. It is not, therefore, surprising that some of them—not all, not even most, but some of them—have been silenced without explanation, or driven from their pulpits, or shipped out of the country, or forced to cancel speaking engagements, or opposed as outsiders by local clerics, or denied the funds they needed to carry on the work of their churches and church schools.

The meaning of this debate for our churches has been weighed in the religious press and by clergymen concerned over these negations—particularly in some parts of the Catholic press, including an excellent recent issue of Ave Maria magazine. But I speak tonight because I believe it is time that someone who is not a Catholic or a clergyman was heard on this issue. I think it is time that we weighed the effects of such repression not only on the church but on the country. I leave to theologians (and to more regular churchgoers) the question of a clergyman's obligations to his superiors. I am talking about his obligations to his country.

No man has been more concerned than I, after my experiences in the campaign of 1960. about the appropriate role of clergymen in public affairs—but no man is more concerned than I today about the disastrously narrow limits which have been placed on that role in some quarters.

II

The United States of America is not so rich in intellectual and inspirational leadership, or so certain of its course in the world, or so perfect in the treatment of its citizens, that it can afford the suppression or repression of any thoughtful view or voice—and that includes the views and voices of our preachers as well as our teachers, editors, authors and others. We cannot afford to listen merely to spokesmen for the state and the status quo, for the comfortable and the conformed. We have enough timidity and stupidity in our ranks without saying "Sit down" to the Richard Morrisroes of this world who are willing to stand up and be counted.

I do not say that any of these movements—civil rights, peace, antipoverty and others—would wholly collapse if clergymen were not allowed to take part. But I do say that these ministers of the Gospel have a special contribution to make. Unlike political and business leaders, unlike the often competitive leaders of civil rights and other kinds of organizations, churchmen are in an ideal position to remain above suspicion of self-interest. By casting out fear and hate as they have been trained to do, they can prevent the extremists from taking over these movements. Father Morrisroe can testify otherwise, but their very presence can also discourage violence. As one of the churchmen involved in the California grape strike explained it, "No one wants to be cited in the newspapers for beating up a minister."

The man who shot Father Morrisroe in the back and killed Jonathan Daniels was acquitted of murder on the grounds that these clergymen carried weapons. Indeed they did—not knives or guns but the weapons all clergymen should carry: love and reason and trust. And these are the very weapons the civil rights and other movements must carry in the difficult days ahead.

Some of our more tolerant observers have declared that social action by a clergyman is perfectly permissible so long as he makes it clear that he is acting as a private citizen, not as a churchman. I reject that view. I am not certain that a clergyman, like a President, is ever a private citizen, wherever he may be and whatever collar he may be wearing. I am not certain the public could or would distinguish between the clergyman's role as prophet and his role as private citizen. And I am not even certain the clergyman could. For his vocation is to protest evil and injustice—not merely with an empty, ill-heeded string of "thou shalt nots" from the Sabbath pulpit but with daily deeds that back up his doctrine. His obligation is to live as he lectures, to give active as well as verbal witness to the Gospel's meaning for modern problems.

Acting, therefore, not as a private citizen but as a churchman, he may often find himself in conflict with the views of those to whom he reports. I repeat that I have no desire to argue church structure here tonight. But I question whether the minister of any church is simply a hired hand, wholly the creature of his superiors or parishioners. wholly bound to accept their dictates and doctrines on matters unrelated to dogma, wholly unable to act in accordance with his own conscience and sense of justice.

To be sure, he should not purport to speak for them. He should not deliberately pressure or embarrass their position. But surely there is a 2,000-year-old precedent for a preacher's going beyond good words to good deeds, and then going beyond those good deeds to a direct challenge of both religious and secular authorities, and then going beyond even that direct challenge to enduring imprisonment and violence in order to alter man's ways. Surely, as one clergyman has put it, the members of his profession were not intended to be nothing but an ancient Greek chorus, merely standing on the side of the stage and offering occasional comments as the tragedy unfolds. Was it not Cardinal Newman who told Gladstone he would propose a toast "to conscience first and the Pope second"?

Most men of the cloth, one critic recently charged, are not competent to deal with such issues. But who among us is competent to solve the problems of Vietnam or Watts? The stakes are too great to leave war to the generals, or civil rights to the professionals, or poverty to the social workers. And why should moral battles to right old wrongs, in scriptural fashion, be left entirely to the laymen of the church? Clergymen, like all the rest of us, must learn by doing, by involving themselves in the practical problems of men. The civil rights bill of 1964, according to Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, passed because "those damned preachers had got the idea it was a moral issue." Indeed they had—and indeed it was.

III

Of course, there will always be churches and churchmen who shun the problems of the world, who preach and prefer a religion of pomp and ceremony unrelated to public affairs, who measure their success by the number of "decisions for Christ" which look to another life and another world. Clergymen involved in the California grapepickers strike were accused by the local ministerial association of not staying within the "spiritual area." Questions of race, said certain other critics, have nothing to do with questions of religion; while it was interesting to note in Selma a year ago which of our famous clergymen were there, it was equally interesting to note which were not. As Msgr. George Casey, of Lexington, Mass., has observed, "There is more danger of the church becoming irrelevant than radical."

But these reverend leaders of irrelevance are not, I am convinced, the leaders of the new and future church. More and more clergymen including the recent winners of this award (all of whom, interestingly enough, know the inside of a jail) recognize that their ministry belongs most with those who need it most—not with the white middle class and upper class establishments but with the poor, Christ's favorite people, with the peacemakers, with the oppressed. The spirit of renewal in the Catholic Church—and indeed all churches—has been advanced by religion's most enlightened leaders not merely as a matter of new vestments and new liturgy but of atoning for the church's own guilt on these basic issues of race and poverty and peace, of suffering with the world's sufferers in order to communicate better with them, and of granting more freedom to the church's own clergymen in order to gain more freedom for the church.

Is all this really so new? Richard Morrisroe in Hayneville was simply following the path of St. Francis of Assisi; to sow love where there is hatred, pardon where there is injury, hope where there is despair, light where there is darkness. He was not an "outsider." For injustice is never local. Our concern cannot be geographic. And ours would be a poorer world if Christ had never left Nazareth, or Paul Tarsus, or Pope Paul the Vatican, or Martin Luther King, Atlanta, or Richard Morrisroe, Chicago.

Let us not assume, however, that there are no limits to this kind of clerical activity. It is a basic right because it is a basic responsibility, to be exercised responsibly—not indiscriminately, not imprudently, not impetuously. Rash, unprepared action can undo gains carefully achieved. Positive, constructive actions have a higher value than protests that primarily seek publicity. Clergymen should not let themselves be used as mere symbols or shields. Not every possible cause and every tiny fragment of a problem need be tackled with a burst of defiance and disorder. Public opinion, after all, must be won, not alienated. Opposing sides must be reconciled, not polarized. The good of the church and its spiritual code cannot be forgotten. The participation of laymen must not be excluded.

Above all, the mote in our own eye should not be ignored. We should not go to Hayneville or to Jackson or to Birmingham in order to forget about Chicago or New York or Boston. The mere fact that our cities already have local ordinances against discrimination is no cause for relaxation or even pride, as can be seen by a comparison of white and Negro unemployment figures in northern and southern cities.

It was easier in many ways to march at Selma last year than it is to admit today that this problem is not just the South's or the Nation's, or even the mayor's or the school board's, but ours—and we white liberals are part of the Negro's problem. As this issue moves more rapidly from south to north, the pressures on our northern churches are going to increase—pressures from parishioners who want no Negroes in the neighborhood, pressures from important contributors and important church leaders and important politicians. Then will be tested the courage and commitment of your churches far more than they were tested by the events in far-off Selma.

IV

One final word of caution. While the church must resist improper State pressures on these matters, so must it refrain from improperly pressuring the State. The lessons of 1960 are too fresh in my mind to permit me to endorse tonight any weakening of church-state separation, even for the good causes here discussed. I am as opposed now as I was then to any church's or churchman's dictating to, or being dictated by, any government—or being singled out for any special privilege or punishment—or becoming the tool of any party or administration. I hope that those clergymen who are newly active on what are necessarily political issues will nevertheless refrain from endorsing political candidates or political parties.

But church-state separation does not mean disregarding the moral issues involved in public controversies. Church independence from state control does not mean independence only to support the state's views. Nor can I understand, frankly, why some high clerical authorities who had no compunctions whatsoever about interfering with other public policy decisions—on education, for example, or birth control—now refuse to let their subordinates work on the issues of Vietnam or civil rights.

I hope that they will, upon reconsideration, let these men work. I hope that they will let them speak out—not only for the good of the church, which I do not judge, but for the good of the country.

My fellow citizens: in the darkest period of the French Revolution, Edmund Burke begged that his body be beaten into a drum to arouse all Europe against tyranny. We want no such sacrifice today. John Kennedy is gone. Jonathan Daniels is gone. Richard Morrisroe's body has been beaten enough. The whole civil rights movement has too many martyrs already. But at least let no drum be muffled now. Let no voice of conscience be stilled. Let no man of God be silenced. For as John Kennedy said, "this Nation, for all its hopes and all its boasts, will not be fully free until all its citizens are free."

REBUILD THE HOUSE?

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary a statement in which I outlined a proposal which would provide for alternating 2- and 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives.

My proposal calls for a congressional election in a State each time an election is held in the State for a normal 6-year senatorial term. Since there are two Senators from each State, and since the two Senators from a given State are not elected for full terms in the same year, this would, in effect, create a system of alternating 2- and 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives.

In an article published in the Johns Hopkins magazine of March 1965, written by Robert L. Peabody, entitled "Rebuild the House?" the 4-year term proposals are discussed. Mr. Peabody speaks favorably of the alternating term proposal. I request permission to reprint his article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

REBUILD THE HOUSE?

(By Robert L. Peabody)

(NOTE.—Robert L. Peabody is an associate professor of political science at Johns Hopkins. He is the author of "Organizational Authority" and coeditor and contributor to "New Perspectives on the House of Representatives." Under a Social Science Research Council grant, Dr. Peabody spent a leave of absence last year in close study of congressional bargaining, hierarchy, and legislative outcome. He is currently the acting director of the American Political Science Association's study of Congress.)

The present 2-year term requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning—depriving the Nation of the fullest measure of both their skills and their wisdom. Today, too, the work of Government is far more complex than in our early years, requiring more time to learn and more time to master the technical tasks of legislation. And a longer term will serve to attract more men of the highest quality to political life. The Nation, the principle of democracy, and I think, each congressional district, will be better served by a 4-year term for Members of the House. And I urge your swift action—President Lyndon B. Johnson, state of the Union message, January 12, 1966.

The President proposes that our Representatives serve 4-year terms. Is his case a sound one?

Should Congress pass a constitutional amendment extending the term of Members of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years?

If so, should the terms of office be staggered? Or should they run concurrently with the term of office of the President?

What would happen, under either version, to executive-legislative relationships and the system of checks and balances upon which our Government is based?

If the questions are perplexing, we can take comfort in the knowledge that debate over the length of the House term is as old as the Constitution itself. The present 2-year term was a compromise between those who favored annual elections, and others, including James Madison, who advocated 3-year terms. Madison later defended the compromise version in "The Federalist Papers":

"As it is essential to liberty that the Government in general should have a common interest with the people; so it is particularly essential that the branch of it under consideration [the House] should have an immediate dependence on, and an intimate sympathy with the people. Frequent elections are unquestionably the only policy by which this dependency and sympathy can be effectively secured."

The question then, as now, was how frequent House elections must be in order for one branch of the Government to maintain "an intimate sympathy with the people."

Senators, on the other hand, were granted relative independence from the short-term changing moods of the country. Each Senator was to be elected for 6 years, with one-third of the Senate up for reelection every 2 years. The resulting check and balance of the two Houses upon each other, and of Congress upon the executive branch and the courts, has effectively prevented usurpation of power by any one institution of our National Government.

Sporadically, since 1787 the issue of longer terms for House Members has made its appearance. In 1950, the American Political Science Association's Committee on Political Parties issued a report, "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System," which advocated 4-year terms for House Members running concurrently with the President as a means of promoting legislative-executive party solidarity. This recommendation, by no means uniformly endorsed by political scientists, was but one of a series of proposals designed to bring about more centralized political parties in this country.

Fortunately, like most proposals drafted without the participation of the people to be affected, almost nothing came of them.

The passion for reform and the particular fondness of some political scientists for political parties modeled after the more disciplined parties of Great Britain has never completely died out. James McGregor Burns gave these themes their most eloquent recent restatement in his book, "Deadlock of Democracy." For Burns and other political scientists who are executive branch oriented, 4-year terms running concurrent with the President would tend to reduce what they perceive as a "deadlock" between the two branches.

Ironically, the election of 1964 and the subsequent legislative successes of the 89th Congress took away much of the pressure behind congressional reform at the same time that heavy Democratic majorities in Congress increased the probabilities that major changes could be implemented.

The issue of 4-year terms for House Members had generated considerable interest in the 89th Congress even before President Johnson endorsed the idea in his state of the Union message early this year. Representative FRANK CHELF, Democrat, of Kentucky, third-ranking member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, had waged a vigorous letter-writing campaign to secure support among his colleagues for his own resolution. His version, introduced in March of 1965, called for staggered 4-year terms, with one-half of the 435 Members of the House to be elected every 2 years.

A Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress had been created at the beginning of the 89th Congress, and it added further impetus to the drive for 4-year terms. Last year 18 House Members and several Senators testified before the committee in favor of 4-year terms. Senate supporters included BIRCH BAYH, Democrat, of Indiana, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, under whose jurisdiction such resolutions would come. Several of the House Democratic Members of the Joint Committee on Organization, including one of its two cochairmen, Representative RAY MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana, were pushing strongly for 4-year terms as part of the committee's recommendations.

What moved this particular constitutional amendment beyond the realm of congressional dreams and academic speculations was President Johnson's strong endorsement in his January speech.

Why did he make this recommendation? The President is not a reformer of political institutions by inclination. He has made the existing system work well for him. As Democratic floor leader in the Senate from 1953 through 1960, he was by general agreement the most skillful and successful floor leader in recent memory. His record as President during the epic first session of the 89th Congress had already established him as one of the most effective presidential coordinators of legislation in all history.

Perhaps uppermost in President Johnson's decision to endorse 4-year terms for House Members were three factors. First, the amendment appeared to be popular with many House Members. A 1965 poll conducted by Representative Chelf showed 251 Members for, 41 against, and 65 in doubt, of 357 replies received. Sentiment in the Senate, the traditional source of opposition to such proposals, seemed favorable. Of 50 responses, 31 were for Chelf's staggered-term proposal, 7 against, and 12 doubtful. And indeed, Johnson's endorsement of 4-year terms drew more applause from Congress than almost any proposal put forth in his state of the Union message.

Furthermore, it generated a great deal of positive publicity in many national newspapers and magazines.

Finally, and most important, this proposal would add nothing to the mounting costs of carrying on the Great Society programs and the war in Vietnam.

In a special message sent to Congress on January 20, accompanying a draft of his proposed amendment, President Johnson set forth in detail three arguments in favor of 4-year terms for House Members. These arguments, all quite sound, can be reduced to the following essential points:

(a) The United States of America has undergone tremendous expansion. The legislative process has increased in scope and complexity. Demands upon Congressmen are ever more time consuming.

(b) The costs of campaigning every 2 years are becoming more and more burdensome, if not prohibitive.

(c) Four-year terms would attract more and better-qualified candidates.

Before turning to a fourth and, in my judgment, the crucial argument, each of these points needs brief development.

There is no question but that the United States and its political institutions have undergone great change since the Constitution was ratified. In 1789, America was a very small country. Most of its people lived in relative isolation. Of its 4 million population, only about 200,000 lived in cities and towns of over 2,500 persons. New York City, then the Capital, had a population of 33,000. Washington, D.C., was only a swamp. The First Congress was composed of but 26 Senators and 64 Representatives. A Member of the House represented but 30,000 inhabitants. Only 144 bills were introduced in the First Congress, 108 of which became laws.

Today, the population of the United States numbers more than 190 million people. Almost two-thirds of the people live in urban areas. Social mobility, ease of travel, television, and newspapers have brought more and more people into communication and contact with one another. As the Federal Government has grown and the role of Government in the economy has increased, the demands on Congress have multiplied. Each House Member now represents, on the average, 430,000 constituents. The workload of Congress has increased in volume and complexity; over 14,000 bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 89th Congress alone, and of these, 349 became public laws. Congressional sessions increasingly run for 10 months or more of the calendar year.

In his first two or three terms, a House Member's effectiveness as a legislator is reduced by his need to build a firm base of district support. As he gains in experience, of course, his ability to check upon and ameliorate the impersonal impact of the Federal bureaucracy on his constituents is increased. As he begins to master the skills of serving his campaign and his constituency, a Congressman can afford to devote more and more of his time to committee work and influencing the outcome of legislation.

He must still face the hazards of mounting campaign costs. Federal and State expenditure ceilings are ineffective and totally unrealistic. While campaign costs vary considerably from "safe" to competitive districts and from rural to urban districts, expenditures of $50,000 to $60,000 per campaign are not uncommon. Attempts to unseat incumbents can send these costs much higher. For example, a freshman Democrat from New York filed campaign expenditures of almost $200,000 in a successful bid to defeat a Republican incumbent in 1964.

As another freshman Democratic member argued: "Four-year terms would prevent congressional offices from being 80 percent campaign headquarters and only 20 percent offices for legislative activities. As it is now, I am constantly involved in fund-raising."

The most direct approach to these problems, however, would be sensible revision of laws governing campaign expenditures and contributions.

Third, it is argued, 4-year terms would probably attract more and better-qualified candidates for public office. By reducing the frequency of elections and the costs of continual campaigning, presumably more people would consider running for public office. The caliber of Congressmen, already quite high, would no doubt be improved.

Sound as this argument may be, from a political standpoint it may be self-defeating. For this argument, unlike the others, can cut two ways in terms of mobilizing support for this constitutional amendment.

A fourth and crucial argument, used by many advocates of 4-year terms for House Members, is that it would enhance the influence of the President by centralizing party organization and making Members more responsive to presidential programs. Members running with or against the President would be forced to campaign on national issues. "Coattail effects," or the tendency for congressional candidates of the same party to benefit from the size of the vote for strong presidential candidates, would be magnified.

President Johnson did not make use of this argument in his Presidential message. However, Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, did emphasize the impact of concurrent terms on executive-legislative party unity. Under this proposed amendment the President and Congress would be more likely "to be able to carry out a program without unreasonable deadlocks."

The rationale for closer harmony between the President and Congress is given its more positive statement in Senator Joseph S. Clark's book, "Congress: The Sapless Branch." If a House Member, Clark argues—

"Comes from a competitive district, he will be more of a statesman and less of an errand boy if he runs always at the same time and on the same ticket as the presidential candidate of his party. The strengthening of the national interest in terms of the effective dialog on issues which such a procedural change would bring about is substantial. The strengthening of the national parties is even more so. The strengthening of the hand of the President, who alone speaks for all Americans, is the most substantial of all."

There rests the case, a strong one, for longer terms for House Members. The first three arguments are especially appealing. A much stronger case, however, can be made for maintaining the present system of 2-year terms.

The argument turns on commitment to the principle of coordinate branches of Government. The practice of "separate institutions sharing power" is insured by multiple checks and balances built into our Constitution. Variation in the lengths of terms among our political leaders is one of the most fundamental safeguards against any single leader or institution dominating all the others to the detriment of democratic freedoms.

In our Government, the House, Senate, and President frequently represent quite different political interests. These different interests deserve a hearing and need to be reconciled if public policy is to reflect the will of substantial majorities. Members of the House act as spokesmen for local, sometimes even parochial, interests. At the same time, they are called upon to legislate in the national interest.

Which interest should House Members represent? Edmund Burke, in his "Speech to the Electors of Bristol" in 1774, presented what has become of the classic argument in favor of representation of the national interest over local concerns. As Burke said: "Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests; which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates; but Parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole; where, not local purposes, not local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole."

What is sometimes overlooked is that hostility among the electors of Bristol to Burke's national views later forced him to withdraw as a candidate from this constituency.

In our country, a Representative must remain sensitive to the wishes of his constituents. He recognizes that they can turn him out if he does not vote in their best interests. If a legislator decides, as he not infrequently does, that national interests outweigh local considerations, then he does so at some risk.

It is this sensitivity to the will of the people which 2-year terms of office help to preserve. This continuing tension between local and national interests is a strength, not a weakness, of the representative process. Many factors in our political system are at work to reinforce the impact of national interests: 2-year terms assure that local needs will not be overlooked in an era increasingly characterized by expanding Federal powers.

Furthermore, the elections of House members that occur between presidential elections perform several basic functions which add to the stability of our political system and strengthen our two-party system. Off-year elections provide an opportunity for a review of presidential policies. The results can either extend the presidential mandate, as the election results of 1934 and 1962 were largely interpreted, or dampen it, as in the elections of 1918, 1946, 1954, and 1958. The election of 1966 may well turn on the success or failure of President Johnson's policies in Vietnam.

Midterm elections also provide the "out" party an opportunity to increase its strength in Congress. Since 1900, the party which does not control the White House has averaged a net gain of 38 seats in off-year elections. In only one midterm election, 1934, was the party in power able to make a net gain of House seats. When the same party controls the White House for 8, 12, or a longer period of years, midterm contests may become crucial for preserving a minority that can successfully criticize and provide alternatives to the majority.

A third and related point is that 2-year terms provide a fundamental check on the powers of the Presidency. As the Federal Government has grown, the power of the President has increased. Four-year terms running concurrently with the President would weaken Congress at the same time that it would enhance the powers of the President. Some Democratic Congressmen clearly owe their seats to the length of the President's "coattails" in the election of 1964. Yet few of these Congressmen would welcome the idea of becoming more dependent upon presidential favor and national party, as distinct from congressional campaign committee, contributions.

Supporters of 4-year terms may argue that these would give Representatives greater independence from interest-group and constituency pressures. But they can hardly argue that it would make them less susceptible to White House pressure at the same time that they say that it would lead to greater executive-legislative party solidarity. Four-year terms would remove one of the most effective shields now used by Congressmen to withstand pressure. Almost every Congressman has, at one time or another, found it convenient to take refuge from executive "armtwisting" by the simple but almost irrefutable argument: "My people back home are opposed to this measure, and I am up for reelection next year."

Thus, it is for the very reasons that Burns, Senator Clark, and others support 4-year terms running concurrently with the President, that this constitutional amendment should be opposed. Such a change would drastically alter the separation of powers and checks and balances upon which our governmental system is based. Congress needs to maintain its independence from the Presidency. Reelection every 2 years furthers this independence, helps to maintain a viable minority party, and thus promotes the balance of power within the Government.

The staggered-term proposal advocated by Congressman Chelf would counter this danger, but impose further problems of its own. Each State delegation would be divided by lot into two classes as equal as possible. One-half of the Members would run with the President and the other half would run in midterm elections. Such a proposal runs the risk of splitting the House of Representatives into two classes of Congressmen: those disposed to support the President, and those Members elected in the off year who would likely oppose Presidential programs. This might well lead to greater "deadlock" and prevent the occasional extraordinary Congress, such as the 89th, where legislation comes of age and productivity is exceptionally high.

In short, 4-year terms concurrent with the President would promote a Congress overly responsive to the President. Staggered terms, on the other hand, would create a class of half the Members who quite likely would be unresponsive. Reapportionment and redistricting would create still further problems.

One possible way out of this dilemma has been suggested by Representative Donald Rumsfeld, Republican, of Illinois. His proposal calls for alternating 2- and 4-year terms for each Member. Over a 12-year period a Member would run four times, as compared with the present six elections: twice during presidential years, and twice in nonpresidential years. This would seem to mitigate a division of the House into two classes, one overly responsive and the other unresponsive.

Such a proposal seems preferable to still a fourth variation: 3-year terms for House Members with one-third of the Members up for relection every year. Yet, both run the risk of further confusing a relatively uninformed, if responsible, electorate.

What are the chances that any of these variations will end up a constitutional amendment? In passing, let us note that constitutional amendments are difficult to create. More than 20,000 have been proposed in the history of the country and only 24 have become the law of the land. The Founding Fathers provided for change but they did not intend for change to come about easily. Hence the requirement that constitutional amendments receive two-thirds of the votes of both Houses, followed by ratification of three-fourths of the State legislatures.

For the current proposals to tamper with the 2-year terms for House Members, the probabilities of adoption are becoming increasingly slim. Hearings held before the House Committee on the Judiciary in February 1966, have, if anything, dampened some of the early enthusiasm for either the President's or Representative Chelf's proposal. A January poll by the Congressional Quarterly revealed a stiffening opposition. Of those Members who replied, the vote was 105 to 90 in favor in the House and 19 to 20 opposed in the Senate.

Among key Democrats who oppose 4-year terms are Emanuel Celler of New York, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary; Frank Thompson of New Jersey, an influential House liberal; and, predictably, a number of southern conservatives, including Howard W. Smith of Virginia. The two most influential House Republicans, Minority Leader Gerald Ford of Michigan and Republican Conference Chairman Melvin Laird of Wisconsin, have been issued statements warning of the inherent dangers in the 4-year-term proposals.

Most of what support remains for 4-year terms comes from the younger Members of the House, particularly those associated with the Democratic study group (of which Frank Thompson is chairman), an informal grouping of some 175 northern and western Democratic moderates and liberals.

Behind the growing opposition are practical considerations as well as the constitutional arguments. A major stumbling block, heretofore, has been opposition from U.S. Senators. Without built-in restrictions against running for other statewide offices, a 4-year term would be a virtual invitation for sitting House Members to take on incumbent Senators or Governors up for reelection in the off years. Presently a House Member almost always is forced to give up his own seat in order to campaign against a Senator or Governor. These public officials would prefer to keep it that way. A similar argument has been used against 3-year House terms; this arrangement would allow State legislators with 2- or 4-year terms a free crack at incumbent House Members.

The President's proposal has done away with most Senate opposition on these grounds by including a section which prohibits Members of Congress from running for the other House unless the Member resigns 30 days prior to such an election. The Chelf resolution goes even further. It would prohibit a House Member from seeking nomination or election to any office, other than a vacancy, unless he resigns in advance.

A final argument from the standpoint of practical politics is that 4-year terms may lead to greater, not less, turnover among House Members. There is virtual unanimity among successful Congressmen that elections are really won in the odd years. Non-election-year activities provide them with opportunities to make nonpolitical speeches and emphasize their role as spokesman for all their district's interests. Incumbent Congressmen have many advantages, including franking (free mailing) privileges, the assistance of a trained staff of up to 10 members, and multiple chances to build good will and develop favorable publicity. So great is this advantage that, over the years, more than seven out of eight incumbents who run for reelection are victorious.

At first glance, 4-year terms would seem to improve an incumbent's chances of being reelected. He would, after all, have 3 nonelection years to solidify his position. But this view may be misleading. If a Member were not up for reelection every 2 years, the pressures on him to return to his district would be lessened. Polls reveal that, even now, as few as one-third of the electorate can name their Congressmen. Elections every 2 years provide a Congressman with an opportunity to get his name before the public.

The existence of off year elections are particularly valuable, since they allow Congresmen to establish their independence from the national ticket. This independence is especially important in areas where the national party or its presidential candidate is not popular. Thus, a number of southern liberal Democrats were able to withstand the Goldwater tide in their States because they had developed name familiarity and independence from the national ticket. Similarly, a number of northeastern liberal Republicans, most notably John Lindsay, were able successfully to divorce their 1964 campaigns from a losing national cause.

Four-year terms would probably lure additional candidates from private and public life into competition for House seats. Districtwide races would almost inevitably be lower in cost than statewide Senate campaigns. Young lawyers, labor leaders, businessmen, and other professionals might find running for the House almost as attractive as a Senate seat. Present incumbents will undoubtedly think twice before they vote for an amendment which poses the threat of increased competition and the danger of potentially greater turnover among House Members.

Congressmen are overworked. Given their high responsibilities, heavy expenses, and the burden of frequent trips to and from their districts, annual salaries of $30,000 make Congressmen, if anything, underpaid. Many must start fund raising, if not campaigning, almost as soon as the last election is over.

Yet, as the Washington Post recently commented in an unusually sympathetic editorial, "no one compels these men to run for Congress. Presumably they seek election to Congress because they like it, because they want the salary or because they see opportunity to render a national service, and we surmise that they will continue to do so regardless of how long the term is."

The Constitution requires that all Members of the House of Representatives be elected every 2 years. Every 4 years they must run with the President of the United States, thus providing an opportunity for a strong presidential candidate to bring Members along with him who will be sympathetic to his programs. Every 4 years, at midterm elections, House Members have their own contests. For the most part, these are relatively insulated from the forces which shape the outcomes of national presidential elections. From time to time they provide a mechanism for endorsing or rejecting administration policies.

It is a relatively simple and uncomplicated election system which has withstood the test of time. Occasionally the House responds slowly, or not at all, to the demands placed upon it by the President and the executive branch. On other occasions, its Members may overreact to crisis. But the House continues to come closer to reflecting the will of the diverse local interests of our country than any branch of our National Government.

On the whole, the House of Representatives has proven its worth as a viable and responsive legislative assembly. Two-year terms of office have been basic to the maintenance of this responsiveness to the will of the people.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO END PRACTICE OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT LEASING FOREIGN-MADE VEHICLES

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is presently the policy of the Post Office Department to lease foreign-made vehicles as replacements for the three-wheeled mailster cars to conduct its operations. I am introducing legislation today designed to put an end to this practice.

It may well be that this contract arrangement is motivated simply out of the concern of postal officials for short term economic reasons. Nevertheless, even should such a practice be of some benefit in terms of a Post Office budget it is, I submit, shortsighted in terms of the larger interests of our country. It simply does not make sense in light of the problems we have been having with our balance of payments for our Government to unnecessarily encourage the flight of tax dollars abroad. Certainly our Government's "Buy America" policies designed to improve our balance-of-payments position should not be subverted in any way by the governmental purchasing or leasing practices however well intentioned. To do so would be unquestionably penny wise, pound foolish.

Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have received numerous protests from postal patrons and workers against the leasing of German-made mail vehicles. One man wrote me:

> I resent driving these foreign-made vehicles and I am embarrassed to have to answer my mail patrons' questions regarding the decision of the U.S. Government to use foreign-made vehicles instead of American-made ones.

In the past I have successfully sought to amend our defense procurement practices to insure that our gold flow problem was not aggravated further through the purchase of foreign-made vehicles for military use. It is this same concern that I express here today with respect to the Post Office Department and I urge that expeditious action be taken by the leadership.

ADDRESS BY HON. HUGH L. CAREY, 61st ANNUAL DINNER OF FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on March the 17th, my distinguished colleague, Mr. HUGH CAREY, of New York, delighted a great gathering of the people of Scranton who were assembled to celebrate St. Patrick's Day. He was the principal speaker on that occasion, and I know that many of my other colleagues here in the Congress would enjoy the opportunity to read his enlightened words of that evening. With your permission, therefore, I will enter it in the RECORD at this point.

ADDRESS BY HON. HUGH L. CAREY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AT THE 61ST ANNUAL DINNER OF THE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK, OF LACKAWANNA COUNTY, PA., HOTEL CASEY, SCRANTON, PA., MARCH 17, 1966

Last year on this night, I addressed the friendly sons of Providence, R.I. Now I find that your city, before it was Scranton, was once "Ye Sixth Town of Capoose" and after that was also known as Providence. I've come a long way in a full year to get from Providence to Providence.

I feel rather like my granduncle Dermid who came walking backward into the door of his house under the eyes of his Brigid.

"Dermid," she said, "What ails you to be walking kithoge like that?"

"Ah, 'tis nothing," said Dermid, "I had a slight seizure as I left McGiniss at the pub and for every step forward I made two steps backward. Sure I was making no headway at all until McGiniss kindly turned me around and walking like this, I made it in half the time."

Through divine providence, the digging of coal and the forging of iron, Scranton is a great town tonight and I salute you on the hundredth year of the birth of your great city.

It is a great pleasure for a CAREY to come to Scranton where the glories of the Caseys are in such evidence.

In your fine city an Irish name is a distinguished name. I speak not only of your scion of Scranton, your own Bob Casey, candidate for Governor of this great Commonwealth, but the other great Caseys as well—Gene Casey, widely known and widely loved, and Al Casey, who is happily with us tonight.

I look back at Scranton's great gifts of leadership in the person of your own Congressman, my distinguished colleague, JOE McDADE, a member of the Appropriations Committee, who serves with coruscating brilliance, watching very carefully over the expenditure of Scranton's money.

He is in the succession of a splendid line of public servants like the late Congressman Pat Boland, whip of the House of Representatives from 1936 until his death in 1942. In that succession also were Scranton's Congressmen, John William Murphy and Henry Patrick O'Neill.

I suppose that you don't have to be Irish to get elected in Scranton, but it helps.

This Nation, of course, will always look to Scranton with pride and appreciation because you gave America such men as the late Edward Lynett, who was not only a great publisher but a great philanthropist; our beloved Postmaster General, Frank Walker, and, of course, that towering figure of the church, the Archbishop of Washington who grew up, I am told, right here on the campus of Marywood College, Archbishop Patrick O'Boyle.

THE GREEN SOCIETY

It is a thrill and an inspiration to be among the friendly sons, the great Gaels of Scranton, tonight.

I have not seen such fine spirits flowing since I dropped my grandfather's last case of homebrew on the stone floor.

They say the strongest strain of national stock is a mixture of Scotch and Irish—and no strain at all—we're growing stronger by the minute. Stronger we are and stronger we should be for tonight—not only are we the age of the Great Society—we are even more blessed for we are this day, by birth or inheritance, members of the green society—sons of Kathleen ni Houlihan and descendants of Patrick.

Has there ever been a year like this for the Irish and the green society?

Not only is it a great year for Scranton, 100 years young, but I hope that there will be something left in town to commemorate, when we finish celebrating the golden anniversary of the Easter rebellion—the 50th birthday of Irish freedom after the insurrection that followed the feast of the resurrection in 1916.

Make no mistake about it, the fireworks have already begun in this golden year of the green society. On this day we celebrate, let our memories grow green and our spirits soar high as we think of Irish writers, Irish fighters, and Irish dynamiters.

The dynamiters—didn't they do a job on old Nelson and his pillar—all 138 feet of it. Now the whole world tends to misconstrue this act as they always fail to appreciate this sometimes mystic intent of the Irish.

My friend, Congressman ROBERT SWEENEY, of Ohio, has stated this was just a form of Irish urban renewal. But he's just covering up for the sake of security. The truth of the matter is that to start the year right for the commemoration of the time of the trouble it was decided that this was to be the first launch in the Irish space program. Can't you see the appeal of it to Irish pride?

Here is Soviet Russia sending up colonels and majors and dogs and monkeys and the United States orbiting captains and commanders. But did anyone risk an admiral?

Just think of it. There would be Nelson orbiting in space with every American and Russian astronaut bound to salute him as he goes by. What a gift from Ireland to England.

Too bad the blastoff didn't go all the way. It was unquestionably due to the shortage of gunpowder. However, I am informed that Irish science is on the brink of a breakthrough in a process that will turn potatoes first into poteen and then into liquid rocket fuel. And believe me, if you've tasted poteen there isn't much difference or very far to go.

Now, once the poteen propellant is perfected I strongly urge that the dynamiters of the green society be brought under the provisions of the nuclear test ban treaty. Unless this is done no monument pointing toward the skies will be safe from their projections.

Imagine the Clan Na-Gael looking into General Washington's record and finding out that he was once in the employ of the English. Goodbye Washington Monument!

We've already had one frustrated attempt on the Statue of Liberty, a gift from France, but that was before the I.R.A. thought of retribution for the Norman invasion.

No, the dynamiters have only begun. Just look what they've done besides Nelson's pillar in the last few years.

First, they blew an Anglo-Irish earl off his pedestal in St. Stephen's Green. Then they blew the side out of Dublin's Track Stadium because there were sprinters from Northern Ireland allowed to compete there. Lastly, after five separate attempts in Phoenix Park they finally blew Lord Gough off the horse he was riding in an equestrian statue. The trouble with the Irish dynamiters is that their zeal for the cause has been greater than their competence, so they do not always hit the right end with their justifiable means. This was so well expressed in this verse written by a Dubliner about Lord Gough's statue:

"For the cause of our land with a light in their hand
Bravely the foe they did face.

Without showing fear, they kept themselves clear
Expecting to blow up the pair.

But they nearly went mad their aim was so bad,
They made the poor stallion a mare."

However, I believe men of good will need have no inordinate concern for the missile program of the green society. I believe that the Irish dynamiters like the Irish fighters will be both discriminating and sophisticated in their choice of targets and projectiles. They will not go flinging contraptions wantonly at Venus and Mars and the moon like the Russians and Americans.

Let others fill the heavens full of hardware making beeping sounds and bouncing signals all over the skies. Ireland will be more inventive and artistic as behooves men of great culture. They will lift a harp into the skies so that the heavenly airs of "Macushla," and "O'Donnell Abow," and "Shan von Vacht" will sound over all the earth and set men dreaming and dancing.

Huge payloads of barrel upon barrel of nectar will lift off into orbit until the Allen belt will mean that belt after belt of Irish mist will fall like gentle dew into the parched throats of the whole human race.

The Irish scientist, of course, will scorn any effort to zero in on everyday bodies and common planets in the universe. If I know the psyche of the Irish they will shoot for the celestial constellation of Aquila.

You may not find Aquila in any astrology guide but you will find it in Dante's "Divina Comedia." Seven hundred years ago Dante wrote that this constellation was reserved in heaven for just and benevolent kings and leaders of men. The truth is that while the scientists of East and West are racing to put a man on the moon the Irish already have placed a whole platoon on heavenly Aquila.

It is peopled with leaders like Brian Boru, Hugh and Owen Roe O'Neil, Wolfe Tone, Sarsfield, Emmet, O'Connell and Parnell, and Burke and Barry.

Now in that constellation in the golden year of the Green Society there is the newest and brightest star in the constellation of kind and courageous, just and benevolent leaders of men.

A son of Wexford, a gallant young man stars in those heavens side by side with heroes of Clontarf, Boyne Waters, Limerick, and the Easter Rebellion.

I refer, of course, to our beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who once and for all took down the sign from the White House "No Irish Catholic need apply."

He truly allows all of us of the friendly sons and the green society to lift our heads a little higher and look to heaven with every green remembrance that in our time his "special grace of intellect" made this a better world for all men.

Yes, Irish fighters will be discriminating as they have always been precise in their assault on the foes of freedom. Let us look at the Easter rebellion of 50 years ago this April.

First, the Irish Grenadiers heeded Blacker's words of "Oliver's Advice."

"For happy homes, for altars free
We grasp the ready sword
For freedom, truth,
And for God's unmutilated word these,
These the war cry of our march
Our hope the Lord on high
Then put your trust in God, my boys
And keep your powder dry."

With powder dry and ready swords—where did they attack? Did they raid the Bastille like the French, or the Alamo like the Mexicans, or the walls of Jericho like Joshua?

Why, of course not.

Sick and tired of being regarded as clods and illiterates they attacked the Dublin post office to show the English they were men of letters and gave them a little special delivery, man to man, in the bargain.

Speaking of post offices, isn't it fitting in this golden year of the battle of the post offices, that Larry O'Brien himself is sitting as general in the U.S. post office in Washington and will soon be handing out green stamps for Irish mail?

Who would speak of Irish fighting men and neglect to mention the fine tradition of Irish soldiery so well established in the annals of great Pennsylvania in our own American revolution?

In the Pennsylvania Line of Ireland Regiment more than half of the foreign born were from mother Ireland.

Need I tell Pennsylvanians in Scranton what happened when that Pennsylvania Line Regiment had a little family quarrel with its officers? The British thinking to make the most of a playful mutiny attempted to bribe the barefoot, frozen, hungry Irish with offers of rum and gold and warm clothing if they would defect to the Crown. With characteristic gentility we Irish did them a favor. They decapitated the British emissaries to save their souls so that no such notions would ever enter their heads again.

Joseph Galloway, speaker of the Pennsylvania Assembly appeared before a committee of the British House of Commons. The committee asked the composition of the American Revolutionary Force.

Said Galloway, "I can answer that question with precision. They are scarcely one-fourth native, one-half Irish, the other fourth English or Scotch."

And when the surrender of Lord Cornwallis was announced, Lord Mountjoy said, "England has lost America through the exertions of Irish immigrants."

The glorious account of the Irish-Americans in all the wars of this country is a legend in itself. In the Civil War, said the Times of London, speaking of the Pennsylvania line at Fredericksburg:

"Never at Fountendy, Albuera or at Waterloo was more undaunted courage displayed by the Sons of Erin than in those six frantic dashes they delivered against the position of the foe."

Speak of the world wars and the names of the Kellys and Walshs and Sullivans leap into immortality.

Think of the battleline across the angry sinister jungles and swamps of Vietnam and you know the spirit of the fighting Irish lives in the heart of Roger Donlon—our first Congressional Medal of Honor winner—in this war that must be won and will be won.

One cannot speak of Irish fighters without talking of Irish writers for we would know little of Irish fighting if it were not for Irish writing.

The whole clamor and terror of 1916, the centuries of Irish insurgency, "The holy dungeons and the sacred scaffolds" are called into life in the words of Yeats in this verse from "Easter 1916."

"Too long a sacrifice can make a stone of the heart,
O when may it suffice, that is Heaven's part,
To murmur name upon name, as a mother names her child
When sleep at last has come on limbs that had run wild
What is it but nightfall. No, no, not night but death
Was it needless death after all, for England may keep faith
For all that is done and said, we know their dream.
Enough to know they dreamed and are dead.
And what if excess of love, bewildered them till they died,
I write it out in a verse:
' "MacDonagh and MacBride
And Connolly and Pearse
Now and in time to be,
Wherever green is worn
Are changed, changed utterly,
A terrible beauty is born.' "

And we would not have Irish pens like Yeats and Keats, Wilde and Mangan and all the rest. If it had not been for the Irish schoolmasters, the Hedgerow scholars.

These were the smugglers of contraband knowledge who gathered children in the corners of the fields and the hollows in the hills to teach them of the church, the classics and the culture of Erin during the time of the oppression.

From 1691 to 1829 the Irish under the heels of tyrants were forbidden the exercise of religion, to receive education, to take a profession, to hold office, to own a horse worth more than 5 pounds, to inherit land—think of it—Irish who were born to love the "Sonship of Land" could not even rent land worth more than 30 shillings a year. Not only could an Irishman not hire a Catholic teacher to school his children, but he was forbidden to send his child abroad for an education or in dying could not leave his infant children under Catholic guardianship.

In these dark hours how did the fire of faith and the flame of culture, first lighted on the hills of slane, survive in Ireland? We have the answer in the lines about the real heroes of Ireland "The Hedge Schoolmaster" by Seumas MacManus:

"When the night shall lift from Erin's hills, 'Twere shame if we forget,
One band of unsung heroes whom freedom Owes a debt,
When we brim high cups to brave ones then, Their memory let us pledge,
Who gathered their ragged classes behind a friendly hedge,
By stealth they met their pupils in the Glen's deep-hidden nook,
And taught them many a lesson was never In English book.
There was more than wordy logic shown To use in wise debate,
Nor amo was the only verb they gave to Conjugate.
When hunted on the heathery hill and Through the shadowy wood,
They climbed the cliff, they dared the Marsh, they stemmed the tumbling flood,
Their blanket was the clammy mist, their Bed the windswept bent,
In fitful sleep they dreamt the bay of Bloodhounds on their scent,
Their lore was not the brightest nor their Store, mayhap, the best,
But they fostered love, undying in each Young Irish breast.
And through the dread, dread night, and Long, that steeped our island then.
The lamps of hope and fires of faith were Fed by these brave men.
The grass waves green above them, soft Sleep is theirs for aye,
The hunt is over, and the cold; the hunger Passed away.
O hold them high and holy, and their Memory proudly pledge,
Who gathered their ragged classes behind A friendly hedge."

The work of the hedgerow scholars was such that a century later Irish shepherd boys in the hills were quoting Horace and Ovid, passing on the classics by word of mouth from generation to generation.

No wonder that Irish martyrs spoke as scholars as they gave their lives in saintly sacrifice.

The words of Robert Emmet standing in the dock as he was condemned to death will echo through the ages as a message of courage in magnificent eloquence:

"My Lords, you are impatient for the sacrifice. The blood which you seek is not congealed by the artificial terrors which surround your victim. It circulates warmly and unruffled through its channels, and in a little time it will cry to heaven—be yet patient. I have but a few words more to say—I am going to my cold and silent grave—my lamp of life is nearly extinguished. I have parted with everything that was dear to me in this life, and for my country's cause with the idol of my soul, the object of my affections. My race is run—the grave opens to receive me, and I sink into its bosom. I have but one request to ask at my departure from this world, it is the charity of its silence. Let no man write my epitaph, for as no man who knows my motives dare now vindicate them, let not prejudice or ignorance asperse them. Let them rest in obscurity and peace, my memory be left in oblivion, and my tomb remain uninscribed, until other times and other men can do justice to my character. When my country takes her place among the nations of the earth, then and not till then, let my epitaph be written. I have done."

As we approach Easter of 1966, there are those who would now write an epitaph for the Irish. Is the green society now only a fable we resurrect once a year on this day we celebrate? Are the lovers of freedom and national independence gone to seed for lack of a cause? Are the pens of the Irish run dry since the tears of the widows and children of martyred heroes made them flow?

Erin go blaah, says Jimmy Breslin who writes for the Herald-Tribune and mourns the passing of Brendan Behan. Irish writing has gone to seed says Jimmy and he defeats his own argument for Jimmy himself is a mixture of Broun and Benchley with the pepper of a Pegler thrown in for spice. Jimmy states that all the writing the Irish are doing today are real estate conveyances, insurance policies, and traffic tickets.

Perhaps Breslin judges too harshly and in haste and writes our epitaph too soon.

I know a place where Irishmen are writing history every day. Down in Congress, MANSFIELD and MCCORMACK of the green society are writing the legend of the Great Society and they have plenty of help.

Look at O'BRIEN, of New York, who brought Alaska and Hawaii into the Union and is now fixing his eye on all 32 counties of Ireland as the 51st State. (Pity the poor Irish—700 years, under the heel of the tyrant and now O'BRIEN wants to saddle them with our national debt.)

There stands FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, who has written so many acts to preserve the health of America that the undertakers are organizing against him as a restraint on trade.

Like Finn McCool—JIM DELANEY, of New York, rose to his feet and roared: "I shall not vote to legislate discrimination" and he held his ground until they passed a school bill to educate every child in America in public or parochial schools on equal terms.

MICHAEL KIRWAN, of Ohio, great architect of the dams and rivers, harbors and highways, will not rest till all America is as green as Galway and lovely as Killarney.

I shall not speak of your great Pennsylvania delegation which is writing its own chapter in history in Congress, save to say that DAN FLOOD, of Wilkes-Barre, is symbolic of your delegation—and no finer Member of Congress ever entered the Chamber of the House.

I could cite a score more names of the Irish in the green society in Congress who are carrying the cause of freedom and human dignity in this House but I do not seek to convince by citing numbers.

I am content that as we look to Easter 1966 that history will record that the Irish are doing their share of writing the greatest chapter in human history.

Before I leave the Irish writers of history today I submit that the world of religion and the world without religion both felt the touch of a new fire of Slane when Father John Courtney Murray drafted the great schema on religious freedom at Vatican II.

The legend of the green society in the past and in the present is something more than Irish name dropping and number counting adding up poets and dividing by heroes and subtracting villains.

Statistics to the contrary, the green society is growing day by day. One hundred and fifty years ago there were nearly 8½ million people in Ireland. After one and a half million died in famine and millions emigrated, Ireland has less than 3½ million residents today. Yet, I insist, there are more Irish, more Gaels, more Hibernians, more members in the green society today than ever before.

The difficulty today is that the Irish, being so lovable, have been so well assimilated that you will find them under new labels like Cohen and Caruso and Kluczynski.

Make no mistake about there being nothing in a name to help you recognize the members of the green society all over the world. You can only detect the Irish in a man by knowing the signs and countersigns of the green society.

First are the signs of the great loves in Irish hearts. There is first the great love of God and His servant, Patrick, of religion, of faith, of mystery, and martyrdom. Then there is the love of country, of political freedom, and individual rights. It is this love that should put the Irishmen in the forefront of the crusade for human rights for all men, remembering that the Irish, like the Jew and the Negro share the burden and the memory of history's worst oppression and now must make freedom's greatest gains.

The great love of learning is a sign of the Irish. It is the sign of the scholar who risked his very life to pass on the truth and beauty of knowledge in the darkest days of enforced ignorance.

Love abounds in the Irish for poetry and music, the minstrelsy and cadence of which lifts the spirit to heavenly joy no matter how low the earthly trials.

Can an Irish heart be filled with hate? Hardly—for the love of the Irish crowds out hate.

While they cannot bother to hate, the Irish do despise false pride, love of wealth, treasons, sermons without eloquence, and rules without reason.

Above all, the Irish hate big lies which are the abomination of truth just as much as they love the little green lies which are part of flattery or frolic or fetish. These little green lies are, of course, the blarney which is the last great countersign of the green society.

Now that we see these signs and countersigns are they not characteristic of other races? Of the Poles, Lithuanians, Italians, Lebanese, Scandinavians?

Of course they are—all except the little green ones in the green society we call the blarney. And it is the blarney we use tonight to make this great city of Scranton all Irish. Polish-Irish, Italian-Irish, Jewish-Irish, east, west, north, and south Irish. Irish you are and blarney you've had.

One last favor I ask. It is the matter of common belief that at the wish of St. Patrick, in the last judgment, Ireland will be flooded 3 days before the rest of the world so that the Irish will be the first to be judged by Patrick himself.

From the warmth and friendship and sincerity I have seen in your great Gaels of Scranton, I am certain you will be judged early and hold high places in Heaven. On that day use your best blarney and put a good word in for the rest of us with St. Patrick himself. In Scranton let no man write our epitaph.

The green society is alive tonight.

God bless you.

"PSYWAR" BOOST IN VIETNAM URGED BY SERVICEMEN

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, I made a speech calling for stepped-up psychological warfare in Vietnam and gave a few examples of ways to play the Vietcong's superstitions back on them. Even before I made the speech, two of our eager-beaver colleagues grabbed copies of it and proceeded to utter hee-haws. So quick were they to smart off, that they rushed pell mell to make their snide remarks before I even had a chance to deliver the speech. My speech is found at page 2403 of the RECORD for that date, while their wise cracks are found at pages 2291 and 2385. Since that time some people who have considerably more knowledge of the subject have been making some comments about it of quite a different nature. I have received unanimous consent to have two of the later category reproduced below. The first item is from the Washington Daily News for March 28, and the second is from the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram for March 13:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 28, 1966]

"OUR JOB IS SIMPLE—TO KILL THE VIETCONG"

(By Julian Morrison)

Lt. Patrick Gilstrap, of 5508 Huntington Parkway, Bethesda, is only 24, but he is old beyond his years with the kind of grim maturity that comes to soldiers who leave home as boys and return as men.

For 7 months he led a platoon of tough young "kids" of the 1st Battalion, 9th Marines, from their outpost on the Marble Mountain near Dansang, but it wasn't the Vietcong that finally got him; it was amoebic dysentery.

Flown back to the Bethesda Naval Hospital to recover, Lieutenant Gilstrap today is a mirror of the thousands of American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who are still fighting half the world away.

He is, as they are, "disturbed" by the bearded, unwashed "Vietniks" and the draft card burners. It bothers him, as it bothers them, that many Americans back home don't seem to understand why he was in Vietnam.

And, at the same time, he was cheered by the "mountains" of Christmas mail—much of it addressed simply to "a marine" or "a soldier" that poured into the camps saying, "we're with you."

But he can't see any quick end to the war.

"No, we don't have enough men there, and even if the fighting stops, it will be a hell of a long time before the country can have free elections as we know them.

"As long as there is one Vietcong operating you're still, technically, in a guerrilla war.

"We're trying to convince the South Vietnamese that we can protect them, but then you have to have enough men there to do the job.

"The Vietcong operate on terror and they need these people desperately. They need the food, the rice they get from them, and what we're trying to do is protect the farmer so that they can't come back and take his rice.

"Our job is really very simple. It's to kill the Vietcong. If they can't get rice they have the choice of staying up in the mountains and starving to death or coming down after it where we can kill them.

"We're learning from them—we almost never lose a man to a booby trap now—but they're learning from us at the same time."

LOOKING BACK

What the marines are doing, he said, is some old-fashioned on-the-spot improvising—"some off the wall ideas, crazy ideas. But they work."

American forces no longer use .30-caliber weapons but the Vietcong have been shooting at the GI's with captured M-1 rifles.

"So this GI thought up the idea of taking the powder out of .30-caliber bullets and filling them with dynamite and leaving them lying around in villages where the Vietcong would be sure to spot them.

"We haven't any proof of what happens when one of them pulls the trigger, but you can imagine it," he said.

"But some people can't seem to understand these crazy ideas. Like the Congressman who was practically laughed out of the House when he suggested dropping plastic figures of women and running dogs on the Vietcong."

(Representative Craig Hosmer, Republican, of California made the suggestion last month and was immediately belittled by Democratic Representatives Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio, and Frank Thompson of New Jersey.)

(Representative Hosmer's proposal was based on the fact that the sight of a woman or a running dog the first thing in the morning is considered the worst kind of bad luck by the superstitious Vietnamese.)

"I'm here to tell you," Lieutenant Gilstrap said, "that it might work."

"Why not try it if it would save lives? It wouldn't cost much and these are the most superstitious people in the world. They won't do anything without consulting the paper burner or the stick shaker. Astrology is their life.

"If we dropped a million horoscopes on those people saying that 1966 would be the worst year in history for them if they didn't surrender, they'd be coming in in droves," he said.

"There should be nothing wrong in trying unconventional things. After all, this isn't a conventional war."

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent Press Telegram, Mar. 13, 1966]

LAUDS HOSMER PLAN

Editor: As a former enlisted man who served with a psychological warfare unit in Vietnam, I want Congressman Craig Hosmer's constituents to know how very right he is to suggest turning these people's superstitions back on them.

It would be the best weapon we could use. So, for the sake of the United States, and all the boys fighting over there, I hope they use his ideas. It could save a lot of American lives.

You can be proud of Congressman Hosmer.

Bob J. Dienethal.

SUMMARY STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Republican coordinating committee met here yesterday and unanimously adopted a task force report on the most pressing domestic problem facing the American people, the fact that the United States is in the treacherous, swirling currents of dangerous inflation as a result of the unrestrained spending policies of the Johnson-Humphrey administration.

It noted that inflation contains the seeds of recession and called upon the President to resubmit his fiscal 1967 budget after balancing it by elimination or postponement of nondefense expenditures.

The distinguished task force which prepared this excellent study on "The Rising Costs of Living" was headed by Mr. Maurice H. Stans, who was the very able Director of the Budget Bureau under President Eisenhower.

I commend it to all who are concerned with this threat to the savings and financial security of every American. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the full text of the summary statement adopted by the Republican coordinating committee:

A MESSAGE FOR EVERY AMERICAN

The cost of living is rising. Food, housing, services, and other necessities of life are regularly going up in price. The American housewife sees it every time she goes shopping. The American worker feels it every time he pulls out his wallet.

The United States is on the threshold of dangerous inflation. The cause is the fiscal, monetary, and other economic policies of the present Democratic administration in Washington.

Inflation is a hidden tax that falls heaviest on those who have the least. It is especially harsh in its effect on those living on pensions or fixed incomes. It eats away the value of savings and insurance.

Inflation also contains the seeds of recession. The greater the excesses during a period of inflation, the more likely it will be followed by recession, and the more severe that recession will be in terms of unemployment and of decreased income and opportunity.

The present administration believes some inflation is "acceptable" and is ready to "trade it off" for faster growth. But history has shown that a stable price level, not a rising one, is the best foundation for vigorous, sustainable growth. Inflation tends to feed on itself and grow out of control.

Throughout history, countries have suffered from severe inflation as a result of policies similar to those of the administration in Washington. Americans dare not assume that it could not happen here.

Only a change in the policies of the administration—or a new administration—can save us from serious suffering and loss.

On August 30, 1965, the Republican Task Force on Federal Fiscal and Monetary Policies, in its report entitled "The Balance of Payments, the Gold Drain and Your Dollar" warned on page 21: "The administration's easy money policies have expanded credit twice as fast as the rise in real production * * * sooner or later credit inflation brings price inflation * * * Further credit inflation could involve the heavy risk of a boom and bust pattern."

The accuracy of this forecast of a rapidly rising cost of living due to administration policies is now apparent to all.

Therefore, we urge in the strongest possible terms that every American read this new report most carefully, and give fullest consideration to its analysis and recommendations.

REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

SUMMARY

I. The economic policies of the present Democratic administration are rapidly bringing about a critical situation:

The facts

In 1965, the overall cost of living advanced more than 2.0 percent, the highest increase in 7 years; most economists expect the increase to be even higher this year.

The food that a housewife bought early in 1965 at a supermarket for $10 cost her $10.45 a year later, and prices are still going up.

Wholesale prices were up 3.4 percent last year, after virtual stability since 1957, and are advancing at an even more rapid rate early in 1966.

In 1965, the United States lost $1.7 billion of its gold supply to foreign countries, and its international balance of payments was in deficit by $1.3 billion.

The Federal budget has not been balanced since 1960, under President Eisenhower; since then, Democratic administrations have produced deficits totaling $34 billion, and a further substantial deficit is planned for 1967.

In the last 4 years, the supply of money (including time deposits) has been allowed to grow excessively, at almost double the rate of increase in production of goods and services.

The total debt in the United States—Government, corporate, and individual—increased 7.5 percent in 1965, again significantly greater than the increase in physical production.

The war in Vietnam is increasingly costly; the 1967 budget forecasts expenditures of $10.5 billion for that purpose, and there is no way of knowing how much more money may be required.

The significance

The United States is on the verge of joining the procession of nations which, by overexpansionary fiscal and monetary policies, have started down the road to serious inflation.

Prospects are that the trend of higher prices will continue to accelerate, with many economists predicting that the cost of living will go up in 1966 by 3 to 4 percent; some are estimating even more.

As prices go up, people tend to buy more goods in anticipation of still higher prices, and businessmen increase their inventories more than usual, thus creating a climate that can build an uncontrolled spiral of inflation.

The Government's management of the Nation's monetary and fiscal affairs has shaken the confidence of other nations in its ability to find a lasting solution to our balance-of-payments problem.

The economy is developing imbalances which in the period ahead could cause serious economic disturbance resulting in readjustments painful to the American people.

Unless these conditions are corrected quickly by sound Government action, they can lead to even higher prices, loss of a large part of the value of the dollar, loss of vigor in our economy, and loss of jobs, welfare, and security for individual Americans. This in turn can cause a major deterioration in our position of world leadership.

II. The Democratic administration has not only failed to recognize and deal effectively with these conditions but has contributed to making them worse:

1. By following excessively expansionary fiscal and monetary policies, it has caused the cost of living to rise, thereby imposing a hidden tax on all Americans.

2. It has been unwilling to apply proven means of fiscal and monetary restraint, and has relied instead upon unworkable and discriminatory wage and price guideposts.

3. It has, by its fiscal and monetary policies, brought the United States close to the point at which there is danger that so-called voluntary guideposts will be replaced by mandatory controls on business, labor, and the consumer, thus weakening further the structure of the free market system.

4. It has stimulated excessive increases in the supply of money and credit.

5. It has, by its current budget policy, demonstrated fiscal irresponsibility and added to inflationary pressures.

6. It has mortgaged the future of the United States with a host of "legislate now, pay later" spending programs which could exceed the resources of the people to support.

7. It has failed to solve the critical international balance-of-payments problem, as evidenced by the continued outflow of gold from our dwindling stock, and has thereby risked our position of world leadership.

8. It has progressively undermined the integrity of the Federal budget by employing manipulative devices to understate the deficit between expenditures and receipts.

9. It has wasted the taxpayers' money at home and abroad by disorganized, ill-managed programs of government spending, including fields where private initiative and investment would produce superior results.

10. It has needlessly expanded the Federal Government's economic influence in local and State affairs and thereby concentrated political power in the Central Government, thus adversely affecting the responsibilities and rights of the States and of the people.

11. It has persistently restructured our society by forcing our citizens to spend more and more of their time in finding ways to get along with the Government, instead of on productive activities.

12. Through its policies encouraging dependence on government, it has undermined the self-discipline and self-reliance by which free people respond to opportunity and incentive.

III. Republican recommendations: The Republican Party makes the following recommendations:

1. That the administration prepare and submit promptly to the Congress a new budget for fiscal 1967 which reflects a valid surplus, achieved by postponing or eliminating nondefense expenditures.

2. That the costs of Vietnam be financed within annual balanced budgets by reduction or postponement of domestic programs, not by tax increases.

3. That in times of high-level prosperity and employment, the administration provide a significant surplus in the Federal budget to reduce inflationary pressures and help protect the dollar.

4. That the administration pursue prudent fiscal and monetary policies that will make it unnecessary to have the so-called voluntary wage and price guideposts, which are inconsistent with a free market economy.

5. That the administration lend support to monetary policies which will hold increases in the supply of money to a pace consistent with inflation-free economic growth.

6. That the administration respect and defend the role of the Federal Reserve System as an independent agency within Government.

7. That the Congress amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make general price stability an explicit objective of Government policy, along with maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

8. That the Congress remove the unrealistic interest ceiling on Government bonds, to permit noninflationary management of the national debt.

9. That, rather than relying on inflationary monetary and fiscal policies to reduce residual unemployment in a high employment economy, the administration place emphasis on selective programs of job training, counseling and placement, as provided in the Republican-sponsored Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; and have the Bureau of the Census undertake a survey of job vacancies and a census of the unemployed at intervals to provide a factual basis for such activities.

10. That the administration give high priority to developing a solution to the balance-of-payments problem which will be lasting and constructive for the rest of the world as well as for ourselves (see "The Balance of Payments, The Gold Drain and Your Dollar," a report of this task force, Aug. 30, 1965).

11. That the administration enhance the integrity and value of the Federal budgeting process by:

(a) The annual dissemination of a 5-year budget projection for all departments and agencies, to assist long-range consideration of the fiscal consequences of new programs.

(b) An annual reporting, as part of the budget, of the unfunded commitments of the Government for future spending which have to be met by the taxpayers.

12. That the administration consolidate and, where appropriate, eliminate as many as possible of the overlapping and duplicating Government programs and, where practical, take steps to turn their administration over to States and local governmental bodies.

13. That the Congress create, at regular intervals, an independent, bipartisan, adequately staffed, Hoover Commission type organization, composed of Members of the Congress and the public, to review the budget, Government programs, and Government organization.

This Republican program will halt inflation, protect the value of the dollar, and thus preserve the value of personal savings, insurance and pensions.

It will lessen the risk of recession, substituting instead a steadily expanding prosperity, minimal unemployment and stability in the cost of living.

It will aid in reestablishing the checks and balances essential to the separation of powers within the Federal system and serve to arrest the increasing concentration of power in the Central Government, and especially within its executive branch, before that trend passes the point of no return.

It will rebuild the confidence of the world in the stability of the U.S. currency, and assure that our strength will not be undermined by financial mismanagement.

It will protect the economic rights and freedoms of our people, and in so doing, help preserve their political rights and freedoms, as well.

It will provide a program of balanced economic policies, operating in harmony with our political traditions, that will insure maximum possible attainment of all the legitimate goals of a free and independent people.

All Americans can proudly and confidently support this program and its objectives.

NEW CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING FEASIBILITY OF NAVIGATION PROJECTS SHOULD BE RECONSIDERED BY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months, there has been mounting concern over criteria announced by the Chief of Engineers for the determination of navigation benefits from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects.

This criteria was set forth in a letter entitled "Waterway Improvement Studies—Navigation Benefits," dated November 20, 1964, from the Director of Civil Works of the Corps of Engineers to certain corps division and district engineers. The present controversy concerning navigation benefits arises from that letter.

Every Member of Congress and every citizen of this Nation who is interested in the comprehensive development of our Nation's water resources, especially the development and improvement of our rivers and waterways for navigation, should be concerned about the serious problems which may well arise from the new criteria.

The Flood Control Act of 1944, Public Law 74–738, provides for the Federal Government to improve navigable waters or their tributaries for flood control purposes, if the benefits to whomever they may accrue are in excess of the estimated cost, and if the lives and social security of people are otherwise adversely affected. Although that act expressly pertains to flood control projects, it has generally been accepted as a definition for benefits from navigation projects as well.

Briefly, in benefit-cost computations, the costs are the annual charges which are derived from the investment in the project, plus the operation, maintenance, and any other cost involved, and the benefits are the average annual value of the goods and services which are expected to be produced over the life of the project. The benefit-cost ratio is subsequently obtained by dividing the costs into the benefits. A benefit-cost ratio of more than unity indicates that there is a return on the investment in excess of the costs and that the project is therefore favorable. The costs and annual charges are based upon engineering and accounting estimates, and the navigation benefits of inland waterway projects are the savings in the costs of transporting commodities by the waterway in relationship to the costs of transporting the same commodities by competing routes of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, in essence, the new directive of November 20, 1964, would result in a comparison between the barge rate and a probable rate that the competing modes of transportation might adopt in the future during the life of the waterway project. Such probable measurements of competing transportation rates could tend to greatly reduce the benefits from navigation projects and frequently result in unfavorable action on reports on such projects.

Should the competing modes of transportation place such probable rates into permanent effect, there would be little argument; however, they are not required to put them into permanent effect.

Mr. Speaker, the new directive is so ambiguous that considerable disagreement persists, even among engineers, as to its application. Few can agree on its interpretation. It seems to me to be a shortsighted policy to insist on criteria which would tend to perpetuate a static climate for industrial growth by the continuation of high transportation rates that the navigation project would materially reduce.

The problems which have arisen and which will continue to arise, unless something constructive is done about a further revision of these criteria, can be very serious and can unnecessarily disrupt progress on a number of major navigation projects throughout this Nation.

Ordinarily, the present controversy arises where the competing mode of transportation is a railroad. Based on the criteria set forth in the new directive, a railroad might very easily indicate future lowering of rates in an area of a proposed navigation project so as to reduce the volume of projected waterway traffic and thereby reduce the benefits from the project. However, if such reduced benefits make the navigation project economically unjustified, and it is therefore not built, there will be no compulsion for the railroad to reduce its rates. Consequently, if on the basis of projected railroad rates the benefits from an otherwise justifiable navigation project can be so depressed as to result in its rejection, because of the resulting benefit-cost ratio, the railroads could practically control the development of our waterways for navigation purposes.

Mr. Speaker, railroad costs are very difficult to identify and to measure, and, after wrestling with this problem for many years, the Corps of Engineers has concluded that the measurements of railroad costs are adequately reflected in railroad rates for the purpose of comparison with a proposed waterway project in determining the benefit-cost ratio of such project. The use of railroad rates in making this determination is speculative at best, but when projected future railroad rates are used we are really in a never-never land. It is beyond my comprehension as to how anyone could make an educated guess at what railroad rates would be 50 or a 100 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, these criteria have become increasingly important because they may affect a number of large navigation projects which are already authorized, but which are not under construction and are subject to subsequent economic analysis before appropriations are made, and projects which are now being surveyed for later appropriation. The principal projects include the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal which is now being reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the Trinity River, Tex., project which was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1965 with a proviso for reanalysis of the navigation portion before construction using standards current at the time, the Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway which is authorized, the authorized Red River project in Louisiana, Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma, the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal, and the central Oklahoma project for which the survey report has been sent to State and Federal agencies for comment.

Of particular interest to me, is the effect these new criteria may have upon the Intracoastal Waterway between St. Marks and the Anclote River, Fla. This is the vital "missing link" in the Intracostal Waterway on the west coast of Florida. The report on this project is scheduled for completion in 1967, dependent upon receipt of necessary funds. This project is highly important to barge transportation in the Gulf of Mexico, which is growing every year in importance to shipping, and to our national defense.

I think the magnitude of the changes which these new criteria can have upon the benefit-cost determinations is clearly indicated by the amazing fact that since the promulgation of these new criteria the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has not favorably reported a single major navigation project.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the probable effects of this new criteria upon previously authorized projects which are, as to cost-to-benefits ratio, subject to review by the Appropriations Committee and upon projects which are in the pipeline to Congress for authorization, I think it is essential that the Committee on Public Works hold hearings on and thoroughly investigate this new criteria and the effect its application will have upon the orderly development of the Nation's waterway transportation.

I sincerely hope that the Corps of Engineers will reconsider the implementations of the November 20, 1964, directive in the light of the critical problems resulting therefrom.

OUR DETERIORATING BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS POSITION

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, administration spokesmen were speaking confidently of achieving approximate equilibrium in our balance of payments in 1966. A report in the New York Times this morning, March 29, by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., now indicates that a Cabinet-level committee on the balance of payments has received a report that the deficit this year may actually increase by about 40 percent over last year.

The primary significance of this development is the effect it will have on the stability of the world monetary system and the prospects for meaningful monetary reform.

Reports from Paris indicate that France is dragging her feet on monetary reform. The reason suggested is while the United States runs a large deficit France believes the creation of new reserve assets is neither necessary nor desirable. Once again the chronic U.S. balance-of-payments deficit is jeopardizing needed efforts to achieve reform of the international monetary system, which alone can insure future free world economic stability and growing international trade.

The administration's position on the balance of payments has been unrealistic. Its hope for a significant increase in the trade surplus this year is out of the question in the face of an inflationary and overheated domestic economy. Its hope for gains from restraints on capital outflows is shortsighted and self-defeating. A recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board, for example, shows that capital restraints, if applied too long, will impair the position of American business overseas and actually worsen our basic balance-of-payments position.

Where will the administration go from here? The Times article suggests that a further tightening of capital controls and restraints on tourist spending may be tried. If this is the administration's approach, we can expect a further erosion of the freedom to trade, travel, and invest. This is the last thing which the world's key currency country and leading financial power should do.

In the 1966 report of the Joint Economic Committee, issued on March 17, I joined with the other minority members in commenting on the balance-of-payments problem and offering suggestions to promote a basic correction in our position without the use of damaging and self-defeating controls and restrictions.

Our analysis indicated that there would be little or no improvement in our position this year and suggested that the primary reason—and the main area requiring remedial action—is the inflated overheated domestic economy. Domestic costs and prices must be stabilized through a moderate combination of fiscal and monetary restraint. Thus far the administration has resisted making anything but token gestures toward cooling down the boom.

It is now evident that this soft line on inflation is hurting our country's international position as well as our domestic economy and the millions of working and retired men and women who have no adequate defense against the rising prices that are now becoming endemic throughout the Nation.

The February increase of 0.7 percent in the wholesale price index—the largest since the Korean war—and of 0.5 percent in the Consumer Price Index is dramatic proof that inflation is getting out of control. If the administration waits much longer to take effective action, we may find ourselves facing a major international financial crisis and the beginnings of a domestic boom-and-bust cycle.

Under unanimous consent I insert the article from the New York Times and excerpts from the minority views of the Joint Economic Committee's 1966 annual report in the Record at this point:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1966]

United States Is Concerned Over Payments—Government Studying Report That Deficit for This Year Could Exceed 1965's—$1.8 Billion Total Seen—Vietnam, Trade Surplus, and Investment Abroad Cited in Change of Outlook

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Washington, March 28.—The Government is pondering with deep concern a new analysis that indicates the Nation's balance of international payments, far from improving this year as expected, will actually show a larger deficit than last year.

The Cabinet-level Committee on the Balance of Payments was given a report last week estimating a deficit in international payments for the year of $1.8 billion, it has been reliably learned. Last year's deficit was $1.3 billion, and the target for this year was, in effect, to eliminate the deficit.

The official target, announced last December by the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, was a swing of $250 million either side of absolute balance. Mr. Fowler has subsequently indicated that further measures would be taken if necessary to achieve this target.

As far as can be learned, the Government has not yet decided on any additional measures as a result of the new projection of a worsening of the deficit. However, such measures are possible, and the sensitive sector of tourism will probably be examined once again.

THREE FACTORS CITED

Three factors are understood to have worsened the outlook since projections of several months ago suggested that the target of balance could be achieved.

First, the balance-of-payments cost of the war in Vietnam promises to be greater than the earlier projection of about $700 million. Figures of $1 billion and more are mentioned, though no official professes to know precisely what the war will cost in dollar outflow.

Second, the Nation's trade surplus, exports over imports, now appears likely to show little, if any, improvement this year over last year's $4.8 billion surplus.

Although exports are expected to rise, imports are now expected to rise about as much, as a result of the boom in the economy. An improvement in the export surplus of about 1 billion had been counted on.

NEW FORMULA ISSUED

Third, the balance of payments will realize less savings than expected in the crucial sector of direct investment abroad by private corporations.

A new formula to govern such investment under the Government's policy of voluntary guidelines was issued late last year. According to reliable sources, the 900 corporations affected by the formula have shown in reports to the Government that they intend to abide by it.

However, the savings in dollar outflow will not be as much as the $1 billion expected, because of the nature of the formula. It established an overall ceiling for investment abroad in the 2 years, 1965 and 1966. It now turns out that investment in 1965 was less than had been thought, thus leaving room under the ceiling for a larger outflow this year.

This outflow will certainly be less than last year's. But the reduction will be well under $1 billion, according to present estimates.

TIGHTENING OF FORMULA

The possibility of some tightening of the formula, or other changes in the voluntary guidelines for business, is being explored. But it is understood that the Commerce Department, which administers the program, is resisting any change in the guidelines.

One possible remedy for the balance-of-payments problem is to slow down the domestic economy by a tax increase. This would eventually have an effect in slackening the growth in imports, which move in close relationship to the growth of the gross national product.

Thus reemergence of the balance-of-payments problem may supply an additional argument for a tax increase. Up to now, President Johnson has made no decision on an increase on either domestic or international grounds.

The Cabinet's Balance-of-Payments Committee took up the payments problem at a meeting Friday. There also was reportedly a meeting at the White House.

[From minority views, 1966 Report of the Joint Economic Committee on the Economic Report of the President]

The Balance of Payments and the Gold Drain

Administration officials have painted a misleading picture of the progress that was made in reducing our chronic balance-of-payments deficit in 1965. The payments deficit and the gold outflow continued at a high level last year, and we see little prospect for improvement during the current year despite the heavy price paid for the time being bought.

A committee of distinguished experts appointed by the administration to review our balance-of-payments statistics unanimously recommended last April that the official settlements basis should be the main measure of surplus or deficit. The committee said that "the United States has a deficit which cannot be indefinitely continued * * * if its reserve assets are declining and/or if the claims of foreign monetary authorities on the United States are rising."

By this test the United States continued in serious deficit in 1965.

Although the administration incorporated the official settlements figure in its balance-of-payments statistics as a result of the committee's recommendation, its statements on the results for 1965 have played down the official settlements computation and have stressed instead the improvement registered by the liquidity measure.

On the official settlements basis the deficit for 1965 was $1.38 billion, compared to $1.25 billion in 1964. The official settlements deficit actually was slightly larger than the deficit on a liquidity basis. This is particularly meaningful since from 1958 to 1964 the official settlements figure was lower by about $900 million a year than the liquidity measure.

LARGE GOLD LOSS

The deepening of the deficit on an official settlements basis reflects the growth in official foreign dollar balances last year as well as the large gold losses which the United States sustained. The gold drain totaled nearly $1.7 billion between December 1964 and December 1965, following a loss of only $125 million in 1964. Increases in official dollar holdings represent an additional threat to the diminishing U.S. gold stock.

Short-term dollar liabilities to foreigners, both private and official but excluding international and regional organisations, reached $24 billion in 1965. Our gold stock today covers only 57 percent of these liabilities. This compares with ratios of gold to the same liabilities of 65 percent in 1964 and 73 percent in 1963. Clearly the improvement in the balance of payments on a liquidity basis is being accompanied by a heightened vulnerability of our existing gold stock to large and sudden withdrawals. This represents one of the greatest sources of instability in the present international monetary system.

Even the improvement on the liquidity measure is, in a sense, artificial and bought at a very high cost in terms of the movement away from a more open international economy. It depended on the existence of what the administration terms "temporary" and "voluntary" restraints on U.S. private direct investment and bank lending. While these programs have achieved temporary short-term results, their long-term effectiveness in reducing capital outflows is open to serious question.

The short-term effectiveness of these programs also masks a serious deterioration in other items of our balances of payments. Principal among these was a shrinkage of our trade surplus by $1.9 billion in 1965. Partly as a result of a booming domestic economy combined with a slowdown of growth in Europe, U.S. exports rose only 4 percent while imports increased by 15 percent. This development was particularly disturbing in the light of the administration's optimism about the trade surplus expressed in its 1965 Economic Report.

Another reason for the decline in the trade surplus was the worsening of our competitive position overseas. From 1964 through the third quarter of 1965 prices of U.S. exports rose slightly faster than export prices of the rest of the developed world. A recent report by the United Nations showed that during the first 9 months of 1965 Western Europe strengthened its trade position in the developing world relative to the United States. While our exports to the less developed countries rose only 3 percent during this period, those of Western Europe rose 12 percent. Also, for the first time in years, wholesale prices have been rising faster in the United States than in most countries of Western Europe.

INVESTMENT LINKAGE TO EXPORTS

The close linkage of U.S. private investment and our export trade raises another fundamental question about the degree to which the voluntary program of capital restraints contributed to the sharp reduction in the rate of increase of our exports. The linkage between overseas investment and exports was recently studied by the Department of Commerce. The results showed that exports from the United States to foreign affiliates of U.S. firms comprised 25 percent of total U.S. exports in 1964 and one-third of nonagricultural exports. Moreover, exports to affiliates grew by 18 percent from 1963 to 1964, faster than exports as a whole. In addition, some U.S. businessmen have complained that the reduction of bank lending abroad has curtailed export financing and contributed to the difficulties of increasing their exports.

Restraining capital outflows not only diminishes our trade surplus, but the program will have the inevitable effect of reducing income from foreign investments, which again in 1965 was one of the strongest elements in our overall payments position. The longer the voluntary program continues (and its promised termination next February is now in grave doubt), the more prolonged and serious will be the ultimate reduction in foreign income flows.

We commented at length in our minority views last year on the self-defeating character of capital controls. Not only are the immediate benefits of the program offset in part by reduced exports, but they will result in reduced income flows. Most seriously, perhaps, they undermine the financial leadership of the United States. The United

States is a capital-rich country. The rest of the free world depends on U.S. funds very heavily in order to develop and strengthen their own economies. This in turn strengthens the U.S. economy and the entire free world.

If 1965 was not as good a year for the balance of payments as the administration claims, the current year is likely to be little better. The administration already is hedging its earlier predictions that the United States would be in approximate balance this year. The blame is laid at the door of Vietnam spending.

TRADE SURPLUS INCREASE UNLIKELY

The administration expects a substantial increase in the trade surplus to offset the foreign exchange costs of the Vietnam war. It would be more realistic to assume that the booming domestic economy and sharp increases in the wholesale price index would make an improvement in the trade surplus exceedingly unlikely. In addition, the tourist deficit will continue to widen. The balance of payments will also fail to benefit this year as it did in 1965 from large and essentially one-shot repatriations of liquid funds by financial and nonfinancial corporations in response to the "voluntary" program.

There will be some offsetting gains. Private investment income will continue to grow and direct investment outflows may continue to moderate. But on balance we look for little or no improvement in the balance of payments this year. If the costs of the Vietnam war—which have been consistently underestimated—grow sharply, or if domestic inflation accelerates, there will surely be a worsening of our payments position.

We strongly urge that the program of "voluntary" restraints on capital movements be abandoned at the earliest possible time.[1] They should be replaced by a balance-of-payments program which deals with fundamental economic forces as well as certain Government policies which lie at the root of our chronic deficit. Such a program should include:

1. Elimination of inflationary pressures in the domestic economy: Unless domestic costs and prices are controlled, other policies to correct the balance-of-payments deficit will be superfluous. For the first time in a number of years the requirements for a stable domestic economy and a more favorable balance-of-payments position coincide. The sharp worsening of our trade surplus last year lends particular urgency to the need to control costs and prices at home. A stepup in cost and price inflation will produce massive deterioration in our trade position. Under these circumstances, preventing a collapse of international confidence in the dollar probably would require the imposition of compulsory controls over capital outflows and tourist spending. Certainly present programs would be inadequate to do the job of keeping our overall deficit within tolerable bounds under these conditions. Since every effort must be made to avoid compulsory controls, we urge implementation of our recommendations for stabilizing the domestic economy as also being essential for an improved balance of payments.

2. Redoubled efforts to stimulate U.S. exports: The administration's efforts to expand U.S. exports have been feeble and unimaginative. Some of its policies have actually resulted in a decline of exports. We urge that the administration make new proposals to create interest among businessmen in selling abroad, stimulated foreign interest in U.S. products and devise new and improved methods of financing exports. Vigorous efforts are needed to bargain down tariff and nontariff barriers to our exports and to remove discriminatory ocean freight rate differentials. We also believe that ways of rebating the corporate taxpayments to U.S. exporters should be a subject for negotiation in the Kennedy round in order to bring our practices into line with that of many other foreign countries.

3. Reexamination of military and foreign aid expenditures overseas:[2] The added requirements of the war in Vietnam lend special urgency to finding means of reducing the foreign exchange costs of other expenditures by the U.S. Government overseas.

The administration has called for a new look in foreign aid, an objective which the Clay Committee recommended as long ago as 1963. We urge support for these efforts to streamline the foreign aid program and increase its efficiency and effectiveness. At the same time, we believe the administration should press for implementation of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid in order to speed the flow of private capital to the developing countries.

Deployment of American troops, particularly in the NATO countries, should be reexamined in the light of Western Europe's increasing strength and the Nation's growing airlift capacity. The administration should also make an effort to increase offset agreements, involving allied purchases of U.S. military equipment, with those countries possessing large and growing international reserves.

4. Promoting foreign investment in the United States: We urge the passage of legislation to provide tax reciprocity for foreign investment in the United States.

5. Promoting foreign travel to the United States: Greater efforts should be made to increase foreign travel to the United States. A proposal designed to achieve this by strengthening the U.S. Travel Service has been introduced by Senator JAVITS and cosponsored by a bipartisan coalition in both the House and Senate.

6. Achieving international monetary reform: We have been gratified that discussions have finally started on reform of the international monetary system. For the past 2½ years we have strongly urged that the administration take the initiative in this area in order to prepare for the day when the United States eliminates its balance-of-payments deficit. It is clear, however, that any serious deterioration in the U.S. balance of payments during the current year will undermine the work that has been done and delay needed improvements in the system.

Agreement on a rational method of creating reserve assets is particularly urgent in the light of the sharp slowdown in the growth of reserves over the past year. The reserve assets created by international agreement should be large enough to provide for the growing needs of world trade and payments and should be distributed in equitable fashion not only to the rich industrial countries but to the developing nations as well. We urge the administration to move forward with this work while undertaking fundamental correctives to alleviate our continuing balance-of-payments problem. It must be constantly emphasized that improvements in the international monetary mechanism are no substitute for correcting our balance-of-payments deficit.[3]

NATIONAL FOOD IRRADIATION PROGRAM

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1966, I commented before this body on the unfortunate publicity which had been accorded our national food irradiation program due to notoriety given to the results of a study sponsored by Cornell University on the effects of irradiated sucrose solution on the growth of certain plants cells—page 2475. At that time I submitted for the RECORD letters written to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Food and Drug Administration, commenting upon that study and the possible implications to our national food irradiation program.

I now also have a letter from the Department of the Army to the Joint Committee on this subject, dated January 13, 1966. This letter, signed by the Honorable Willis Hawkins, Assistant Secretary of the Army—Research and Development—is a forthright statement which also concludes that the Cornell study had no relevance to the Army's food irradiation program. In addition, the letter cited extensive investigation of the wholesomeness of irradiated foods as carried out by the Department of the Army over a period of years. Submitted with the letter were detailed scientific evaluations of the Cornell study prepared by Dr. Edward S. Josephson, Associate Director, Food Division, U.S. Army Natick Laboratories, and Dr. Nicholas Raica, Chief, Irradiated Food Research, U.S. Army Medical Research and Nutrition Laboratory. The evaluations cited earlier data acquired through comprehensive studies of the effects of radiation on the wholesomeness of foods. Deficiencies in the Cornell study were pointed out. References were made to a substantial body of literature which had been developed by the Army investigators and others who have studied this problem in depth. The overwhelming evidence points to the validity of the Army conclusion that the results of the Cornell study bear no relationship to the detailed evaluations of specific irradiated foods which have been successfully tested in both animal and human systems.

---

[1] Senator JAVITS has long opposed the interest equalization tax and has pointed out that the voluntary program of restraints on private capital outflows is counterproductive, especially if maintained over a long period. He would prefer to see a more selective approach that would not impair U.S. financial leadership abroad. He would emphasize expanding exports and reform of the world monetary and credit system.

[2] Senator JAVITS continues to believe that foreign economic and military aid is on a parity with military expenditures in terms of the national interest. He believes we must look over our worldwide responsibilities notwithstanding the Vietnam struggle.

[3] While Senator JAVITS believes that the recent levels of U.S. balance-of-payments deficits have been too high, he does not feel that immediate elimination of the deficit is a necessary or desirable goal in view of the key currency role of the United States, our position as banker for the world, and the important part dollars have played in increasing international liquidity.

I would like at this time to include in the Record the Army letter and the accompanying evaluations. In my own mind there seems to be no logical interpretation of the Cornell experimental data which would have any adverse inference with respect to the present Army and AEC programs in this field. It is unfortunate that the speculation resulting from the Cornell study was allowed to run rampant throughout the news media causing undue concern in connection with the well-conceived and well-conducted programs we have in this country for the preservation of food by irradiation.

Headquarters, Department of the
Army, Office of the Assistant
Secretary,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1966.

Mr. John T. Conway,
Executive Director, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conway: In reply to your request of January 3, 1966, the following information is furnished regarding the recent unfavorable publicity on the preservation of foods by ionizing radiations.

The adverse publicity which questioned the wholesomeness of irradiated foods was triggered by an article by R. D. Holsten, M. Suggi, and F. C. Steward, entitled, "Direct and Indirect Effects of Radiation on Plant Cells: Their Relation to Growth and Growth Induction," published in Nature, volume 208, pages 850–856, November 27, 1965 (enclosure 1). The investigators reported that irradiated sugar (sucrose) is detrimental to the growth and development of carrot-tissue explants. A conclusion was drawn that the work has other and obvious implications for radiation sterilization of foods, especially in those cases in which the material so radiated is relatively rich in sugar.

A comprehensive scientific evaluation and critique of the article has been compiled by Dr. Edward S. Josephson, associate director for food radiation, Food Division, Natick Laboratories, Natick, Mass. (enclosure 2). The article was also reviewed by Dr. Nicholas Raica, Jr., Chief, Irradiated Food Research, Chemistry Division, U.S. Army Medical Research and Nutrition Laboratory, Fitzsimon General Hospital, Denver, Colo. (enclosure 3). The observation that sucrose solutions subjected to electromagnetic radiation have deleterious effects on plant cells grown in tissue culture has been known to the scientific community for over 30 years. Similar effects have been observed using sucrose solutions which have been sterilized by autoclaving (heat) or treated with ultraviolet radiation. The conclusions of Holsten et al. pertaining to the wholesomeness of irradiated foods are not supported by published data obtained from exhaustive animal feeding studies of food exposed to 5.6 megarads of gamma irradiation or 10 Mev. of electron irradiation. Irradiation sterlized foods with high sugar content such as pineapple jam, sweetpotatoes in sugar sirup, peaches in sugar sirup, and fruit compote have been fed for a period of 2 years or to four generations of rats, dogs, monkeys, or mice, and no deleterious effects have been observed.

The article by Holsten et al. has no relevance to the Army's food irradiation program beyond the adverse publicity in the news media. The program will continue as presented at the hearings before the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States, June 9–10, 1965.

Willis M. Hawkins,
Assistant Secretary of the Army (R. & D.).

Critique of Article by Dr. R. D. Holsten, Dr. M. Sugii, and Prof. F. C. Steward, Laboratory of Cell Physiology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., Entitled, "Direct and Indirect Effects of Radiation on Plant Cells: Their Relation to Growth and Growth Induction," Nature, Volume 208, Pages 850–856, November 27, 1965

(Compiled by Dr. Edward S. Josephson with the assistance of key staff members of Food Division and Pioneering Research Division, NLABS, and Army Medical Service, Jan. 5, 1966)

In vitro testing of materials in biological systems is a well-known technique used for many years. This technique has been employed in searching for new drugs, vitamins, hormones, antimetabolites, carcinogens, insecticides, etc. The technique generally is useful for screening purposes because tests can be conducted rapidly and inexpensively. Leads obtained from studies of this kind are then pursued further in intact higher animals or plants depending upon the desired end use of the biologically active material. The reason for this is obvious. Candidate compounds having activity in vitro may be dropped from further consideration after in vivo testing because they may be inactive or unsuitable for reasons such as dilution in body fluids, rapid removal by tissue-sited protective mechanisms or failure to be absorbed in the complex biological system for which they are intended (false positive). Conversely, substances which have been found to be inactive in vitro may have strong biological activity in the higher animal or plant (false negative). In the case of mammals, if the active material is eaten it must be able to be absorbed across the gastrointestinal barrier, transported by the circulatory system and reach the site where the biological effect under study can be achieved. An example of lack of correlation between in vitro and in vivo findings is the work of Josephson et al. which antimalarial drugs, particularly of the 8-aminoquinoline family (J. Inf. Dis. 88, 163 (1951); ibid 93, 257 (1953); Proc. Soc. Exp. Biol. & Med. 76, 700 (1951)). Some drugs which were active in vitro were inactive in vivo. Others active in vivo were inactive in vitro. (Reprints attached.)

In the report by Holsten, Sugii and Steward, the in vitro system used is carrot cells grown in tissue culture. Since these are plant cells, they have metabolic characteristics quite distinct from those of mammals. Plant cells respond to plant hormones such an indole acetic acid and 2, 4-D whereas animal cells will not. Plant cells are capable of synthesizing complex organic substances such as necleoproteins, proteins, fats and carbohydrates from simple compounds such as minerals, carbon dioxide, water, and inorganic nitrogen, whereas mammalian cells cannot. Therefore, findings from in vitro studies with higher plant cells grown in tissue culture may serve only as leads for effects in the intact mammal. Extrapolation of data from an in vitro system with plant cells to the intact mammal in vivo is scientifically unsound without conducting actual testing in the intact mammal. In order to determine the effects on intact mammals the ultimate experiments must be conducted with intact mammals. The authors of the paper published in Nature indicated that their findings should be tested further before irradiated foods high in sugar content are fed to the human population. They have, however, ignored (yes, ignored, because they were informed on August 16, 1965) the fact that the very work that they recommend be done, that is animal feeding studies, has already been completed. The Army Medical Service has reported that irradiated foods high in sugar content, such as pineapple jam, peaches in sugar syrup, candied sweet potatoes, and fruit compote, when fed to two species of animals for 2 years or for four generations, in amounts consisting of 35 percent of the total daily caloric intake throughout the entire period, and irradiated to doses as high as 5.6 megarad, are wholesome. (The article by Holsten et al. is enclosed. The AMEDS' findings are embodied in the published hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States, June 9–10, 1965, pp. 91, 105, 106, and 749–819.)

The investigators reported that sugar solutions subjected to gamma irradiation used to supplement a basal medium for in vitro cultivation of carrot cells had cell stimulation effects if the irradiation dose was low and inhibitory effects if the irradiation dose was high. This finding, except for the fact that the system used was carrot cells, has been well known to the scientific community for over 30 years. The following three papers by Blank et al. and by Sears and Black in the Journal of Bacteriology indicated that sugar solutions irradiated with X-rays or ultraviolet rays inhibited cultures of Bacillus subtilis (J. Bact. 27, 453 (1934); ibid 30, 21 (1935); ibid 30, 507 (1935)). Other investigators have reported on the similarity in effects of gamma irradiating and autoclaving sugar on mammalian tissue cultures (Berry, Hills and Trillwood, Int. J. Rad. Biol, 9, 559 (1965)). The findings of the investigators are, therefore, neither unique nor new. It is regrettable that the literature on the so-called radiomimetic effects of irradiated sugar solutions was not searched more thoroughly by the authors before they came to their dramatic speculation.

The biological model used by the authors is now described. They used a small piece (2–4 mg) of phloem tissue from a mature carrot root. When placed on White's medium (inorganic salts, B vitamins, sucrose) cells will synthesize nucleic acids and enlarge, but only very few may divide. When coconut milk is added to the above medium, following a lag of 4 to 5 days during which cells enlarge and synthesize nucleic acids, cells begin to divide rapidly. This transformation is accompanied by an increase in water content to over 90 percent and a great increase in protein synthesis. This protein (unlike the situation with mammalian tissue or with the intact animal) is synthesised from the carbon skeleton of sugars (sucrose) and inorganic nitrogen. Amino acids present are usually not utilized or are incorporated into a metabolically inert protein associated with the cell wall fraction. Once the transformation has occurred, you have a callus culture which can be maintained on coconut milk medium or on a defined medium containing sucrose, salts, and certain growth factors. The transformation of mature nonproliferating cells to an active dividing state may thus be separated into two phases:

Phase 1: Initiation of cell division. This requires coconut milk, occurs after a finite time, and is sensitive to cyanide, hydroxyproline, carbon monoxide, and low doses of radiation. This is the reaction inhibited by irradiated sucrose. Initiation requires upsetting a delicate balance between inhibiting and stimulating factors that may exist in the resting cell. The solids in coconut milk have been fractionated into about 85 percent carbohydrates including sugars, sugar alcohols, hexitols, etc.; about 10 percent reduced nitrogen including mostly amino acids; and about 1 percent an active fraction containing diphenylurea, xanthine, leucoanthocyanins, and a number of auxin-like compounds.

Phase 2: Maintenance of cell division once initiated. Growth regulation in established cultures is largely regulated by auxins such as indole acetic acid that cause cell enlargement and kinins such as 6-furfuryl amino purine that cause cell division. This stage is much less sensitive to irradiated sucrose.

Ultraviolet radiation (UV), electromagnetic radiation, and certain chemical agents have been classic mutagenic tools for many years. They are widely and constantly used in the study of bacterial genetics. The effect of UV on E. coli cells is a classic experiment in elementary bacteriology. The substrate-mediated mutagenic or chromosomal effects, in particular, have been reported for many years. The authors entertained a conventional thought, performed a conventional exercise and added one more experimental demonstration. The only original contribution is the use of a carrot free-cell culture for their growth-inhibition experiments. The experiments with the Vicia root-tips and fruit flies are classic textbook elementary classroom exercises. A thorough examination of the literature will generate a flood of similar, if not identical, observations. While one may agree to the authors' extended word of caution based on the broad concept of comparative physiology, one must recognize the vast difference between in vitro free-cell behavior and the in vivo highly complex multicellular and multiorgan physiology. It has been generally accepted that such experimental demonstrations in unicellular and lower animal and plant systems, while academically valid and informative, cannot and must not be extrapolated to higher mammalian organisms, until direct evidence is obtained.

The direct evidence has been amply sought and amply presented. The evidence demonstrated that irradiated substrates (prototype foods) had no deleterious effect on mammals including man.

The following direct remarks are offered:

(a) Table 1 [not printed in the Record]: Authors have not amply attempted to isolate or quantitate the indirect effect. Cells, suspended in water or proper ionic solutions, should have been included to account for the direct effect per se, and, hence better define the indirect or mediated effect.

(b) Tables 2, 4 [not printed in the Record]: The evidence does not indicate whether the mediated effect is cell death, cell metabolic injury, cell competitive inhibition, or simply cell starvation. It merely demonstrates an overall sucrose effect. It may be nothing more than either the lack of the proper level of a metabolite or nutrilite, or the generation of a competitive antimetabolite. The model the authors chose is unfortunately one that is notably sensitive to minimal nutritional or hormonal imbalances. A mere interplay among the nutrients in the medium may cause identical results. These cells are not inherently ever-dividing or ever-growing cells. They are cells that in situ will differentiate and soon become resting or functional cells. Hence, a physiological shift that is artificially induced would render such cells particularly exacting metabolically and particularly sensitive to minimal hormonal or nutritional changes. The stimulant effect at lower radiation level suggests the generation of a useful intermediate (nutrilite or hormone like) at that level. It also supports the concept that the whole phenomenon may be attributed to the upsetting of a delicate hormonal or nutritional balance. The substrate-mediated effect was inhibitory only toward cell division, whereas the cells continued to enlarge, namely to exercise a vast biosynthetic cell machinery, a further support to the concept of a peculiarly delicate nutritional or hormonal balance.

(c) Tables 3, 5 [not printed in the Record]: The negative response of the 7- and 10-day cultures is further evidence supporting the nutritional concept. It does also emphasize the differential cytological and/or metabolic traits among even the same cells of the same progeny, only a few days older. It is another reason to exercise caution in extrapolating this difference toward the ultimate complexity of a mammalian system.

(d) Table 6 [not printed in the Record]: Provides further support that the irradiated sucrose-mediated effect may be mere inhibition of cell division. Lines 2 and 4 project two apparently similar cells (see cells/ugm and ugm/cell), only the former being incapable of division. The authors have not noted or explained why the inhibited cell in this case has not enlarged in contrast with effects mediated by irradiated total basal medium or coconut milk (tables 2, 4). There is no evidence to show that the authors attempted to determine the mode of the sucrose-mediated effect. How would fresh inocula preexposed to irradiated sucrose or explants from line 2 behave, if washed and resuspended in the normal basal medium? This simple addition would show whether the cells were permanently intoxicated or simply inhibited or deprived. The authors could have also sought this fact in a simple conventional competitive inhibition experiment.

(e) Table 7 [not printed in the Record]: It is not clear whether the authors have accounted for the effect of pH and Eh that are admittedly drastically changed by irradiation and/or heating. Neither is it clear whether the authors accounted for the effect of autoclaving sucrose alone versus autoclaved in basal medium.

(f) It is not evident whether the authors have attempted a very simple and a very direct microscopic examination of the carrot cells in their model system to hunt for so-called cytological abnormalities or chromosomal aberrations. The carrot system provides all cellular stages in free living or intact cells.

(g) In the Tradescantia microspore experiment the reported evidence for a specific effect is not apparent. The chromosomal abnormalities could have been equally induced by multitudes of other simple environmental factors, again related only to the specific cytochemical makeup of such cells. A simple case of ionic imbalance or hypo- or hyper-tonicity may very well induce such changes. However, the important question still remains unanswered: Is it all damage, inhibition, or deprivation?

(h) As to table 9, this is truly not compatible with careful scientific work. The authors state that the data are derived from an undergraduate class in cytological techniques.

(i) The data in table 10 demonstrate that irradiated sucrose had no significant effect on sex-linked lethal mutation rate, as admitted by the authors.

The authors have not done a thorough job in searching the literature insofar as it might yield clues as to the active component formed by radiation. Reference is made to work published by Goldblith, Science, volume 109, page 519, 1949; "Advances in Food Research," volume 3, pages 180–196, published by Academic Press, 1951; Pigman and Goepp, 1948, in "Chemistry of the Carbohydrates," pages 69–70, published by Academic Press of New York; Singh, et al, Journal of American Chemical Society, volume 70, pages 517–522, 1948; Wolfrom, Binkley, and McCabe, Journal American Chemical Society, volume 81, page 1442, 1959; M. A. Khenokh, Zhurnal Obschchei Khimii, volume 11, 776 (1941); volume 17, 1024 (1947); volume 20, 1560 (1950); M. A. Khenokh, Doklady Akad. Nauk S.S.S.R., volume 104, No. 5 746 (1955); Trudy, 1st All-Union Conference on Radiation Chemistry, 1958 (p. 188); M. A. Khenokh, "Dissertatsiya" (Ph. D. thesis), Leningrad, 1959 (p. 44).

These references are being used as a basis of chapter 6, titled "Effect of Ionizing Radiation on Carbohydrates," published in the Russian book, "Radiation Biochemistry" pages 89–97, by A. M. Kuzin, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Institute of Biophysics, Moscow 1962.

Based on the authors' ultraviolet absorption curves showing that the active component or components absorb strongly from 260 to 290 mu., the literature articles suggest that the active component from irradiated sugar may be 5-hydroxymethylfurfuraldehyde, levulinic acid, or dihydroxiacetone. The absorption spectra found by Khenokh are identical with those reported in nature by Holsten et al.

Among the products of sucrose breakdown by radiation reported in the literature are the following: fructose, glucose, glucosone, D-glucurone, D-gluconic acid, D-arabinose, dihydroxyacetone, glyoxal, and formaldehyde.

Berry et al. have attributed the in vitro cytotoxic effect of carbohydrate solutions irradiated to sterilizing doses to the production of glyoxal. The same authors implicate the in vitro cytotoxic effect of autoclaved sugar to one of the short-lived precursors of hydroxymethylfurfural. They caution against the wanton extrapolation of these findings to the intact animal.

The article by Holsten et al. consists of six pages each containing two columns of very fine print. In the entire article only three sentences (lines 4–9 and lines 24–30 on the right hand column of page 855) refer to radiation sterilization of foods. The speculations embodied in these three sentences are totally unconnected with the experimental portion of the paper; they ignore all published work on wholesomeness of irradiated foods. The very work which the authors state must be done before there is widespread use of radiation sterilized foods with high-sugar content has been completed. The results of this work using mammals as test organisms show that there was a complete absence of occurrences postulated by the authors. There is massive literature based upon direct feeding studies in higher animals indicating safety in consuming irradiated foods. The article by Holsten et al would have little or no scientific bearing on this issue whatsoever save for the publicity it has received in the press.

Review of a Research Paper

December 30, 1965.

Holsten Sugii, and Stewart in their paper, "Direct and Indirect Effects of Radiation on Plant Cells" (Nature 208; 850–856, 1965), have concluded that irradiated sucrose is detrimental to the growth and development of carrot-tissue explants.

They suggest, therefore, that irradiated foods, particularly those which contain sugars, may be unwholesome for human consumption. This suggestion is not supported by the published data which have resulted from exhaustive animal feeding studies with foods which were irradiated to 5.6 Mrads with Co^{60} or 10 Mev. electrons. Twenty-one such treated foods were fed for 2 years or four generations to rats, dogs, monkeys, and mice. Of these 21 foods, 3 were very high in sugar content: canned peaches in heavy sucrose sirup, pineapple jam and sweetpotatoes.

It is know that irradiation either directly or indirectly through free radical production can alter or bind essential nutrients. The authors of the paper in question made no attempt to determine the nutritional adequacy of their irradiated diet. This irradiation effect can be important if essential nutrients were present in suboptimal amounts.

While irradiation degradation products may be absorbed by a simple cell, extensive studies in mammalian species did not provide data to support that gastrointestinal adsorption or internal accumulation of these products occurred. Furthermore, the higher animals have a remarkable capability to detoxify and destroy foreign or unwanted chemical compounds.

Radiomimetic effects such as those described by the authors have been reported in root tips from wheat and other plants. Adverse effects such as chromosomal aberrations and mutations have been produced by irradiated water, electrolysis, irradiated and nonirradiated cooking oils, as well as by a nonirradiated standard plant growth medium.

The reported radiomimetic effect of water on root tips is important from the standpoint of relating radiomimetic effects in plant cells to animal cells. Since all of the irradiated foods contained large amounts of water, unwholesome effects should have been readily observed in the irradiated food feeding studies.

Irradiation inactivated Hela cells have been successfully used as feeders for the subsequent growth and reproduction of single-cell plants of Hela cells in a nutritionally deficient medium. Toxic products, if formed in the irradiated feeder cells, are not transmitted to the new cell plants.

Summary: The authors of this article have concluded that their work has obvious implications for the radiation sterilization of foods program, especially in those cases in which the irradiated material is relatively rich in sugar. However, published data which have resulted from exhaustive long-term animal feeding studies conducted with 21 different foods, including 3 substances with a very high sugar content, have revealed no deleterious effects.

NICHOLAS RAICA, Jr., Ph. D.,
Chief, Irradiated Food Branch, Chemistry Division, U.S. Army Medical Research and Nutrition Laboratory.

REFERENCES

Fisher, H. W. and T. T. Puck, "On the Functions of X-Irradiated Feeder Cells in Supporting Growth of Single Mammalian Cells," Proc. NAS 42: 900–906, 1956.

Natarajan, A. T. and M. S. Swaminathan, "Indirect Effects of Radiation and Chromosome Breakage," Ind. J. Genetics and Plant Breeding 18: 220–223, 1958 (irradiated water, whites medium).

Chopra, V. L., A. T. Natarajan, and M. S. Swaminathan, "Cytological Effects Observed in Plant Material Grown on Irradiated Fruit Juices," Radiation Botany 3: 1–6, 1963.

Swaminathan, M. S. and A. T. Natarajan, "Chromosome Breakage Induced by Vegetable Oils and Edible Fats," Current Sci. 12: 382–384, 1956.

Ahnstrom, G. and A. T. Natarajan, "Chromosome Breakage Induced by Electrolytically Produced Free Radicals," Nature 188: 961–962, 1960.

Muller, H. J., "The Nature of the Genetic Effects Produced by Radiation," Radiation Biology 1: 351–473, 1954.

Wolff, S. and H. E. Luippold, "The Production of Two Chemically Different Types of Chromosomal Breaks by Ionizing Radiations," Proc. NAS 42: 510–514, 1956. (Versene caused chromosome breaks.)

Swaminathan, M. S. and A. T. Natarajan, "Cytological and Genetic Changes Induced by Vegetable Oils in Triticum," J. Hered. 50–51: 177–187, 1959–1960.

Ehrenberg, L., "The Concept of Stored Energy (Radiomimetic Effects Produced by Irradiated Foods)," Proc. of FAO/WHO/IAEA technical meeting on the wholesomeness of irradiated foods, Brussels, 1961.

Natarajan, A. T., "Stored Energy and Indirect Biological Effects of Radiations," Riso Report, No. 16, 39–41. Danish AEC Research Estab. Riso, 1960.

WHY THE POUND IS WEAK

Mrs. **REID** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SCHNEEBELI**. Mr. Speaker, the Times of London recently published its analysis of the many reasons why Britain is becoming increasingly involved in fiscal difficulties. This self-analysis is penetrating and certainly has created a sharp impact on public opinion. It seems that we, too, can learn from some of the plain spoken language and critical observations of Britain's excesses.

[From the London Times, Mar. 10, 1966]

WHY THE POUND IS WEAK

The economists and financial technicians have their own learned and to themselves no doubt lucid reasons why the pound is weak in the markets of the world. For the ordinary reader they can be stated much more simply.

The pound is weak—

Because Britain is living beyond her means.

Because neither the Labor government nor the Bank of England nor the British people overcame the crisis a year ago; the foreign lenders did so.

Because Britain is still so heavily in debt abroad.

Because Government spending abroad goes on rising.

Because no Government has the courage to face the British people with the truth.

Because the world sees Mr. George Brown's union—the largest in the country—defying the system on which the Government's economic policy rests.

Because the "trial" by workers in Oxfordshire of some of their fellows who refused to join them in an unofficial strike is regarded as symptomatic.

Because full employment has led unions to overuse their powers and employers to underuse their labor.

Because British industry has continuously lost its share of world markets.

Because whenever the mildest deflation begins to work, it is discontinued before it can even half finish its job.

Because extra leisure is put before extra effort by too many people in all classes.

Because too many working hours are turned into gambling hours.

Because money is regarded by too many people of all classes as something to be got or won rather than earned.

Because under present conditions the trade unions are responsible to no one, and no government has been prepared to bring them under reasonable control.

Because the world knows that the trade unions know this.

Because the Labor government is showing it has learned nothing; it has committed itself, if returned, to proceed with the irrelevance of nationalizing steel.

Because if a conservative government is returned after a so short a spell of opposition, the workers are likely to resume their class warfare.

Because Britain, never having been defeated, still refuses to see she is up against it.

Because the world fears that devaluation will ultimately be chosen as an alternative to deflation, and the world knows this will not solve Britain's long-term problem.

Because while France, Germany, and Italy have had their "economic miracles," Britain has as yet not shown the willingness or the capacity to make the effort to achieve her own "miracle."

Because in all too many cases Britain loves the old instead of the new, seeks reasons not to do things rather than to do them.

Because too many managements have been supine or unimaginative.

Because the change from privilege to talent has been too slow in all too many board rooms.

Because there is on both sides of industry still too much hankering after restriction and too little eagerness for competition.

Because in the last analysis economics is a matter of human nature and not of formulas; no country can be saved if its people will not save themselves.

Because for 20 years leadership has been lacking; soft words have been substituted for hard facts; exhortation has never been followed by deeds; rights have come before responsibilities; the national philosophy has been all take and no give.

Because the world knows that, however slow the descent, the abyss is still at the end of the road.

The pound could be strong if the British people had the ears to hear, the eyes to see, and the will to recover their native sense and energy. They have done it time and again in wars; why can they not do it just once in peace? This is what the general election should be about.

SHOE PRICE HIKES PROVE FOLLY OF HIDE EXPORT RESTRICTIONS

Mrs. **REID** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **LANGEN**. Mr. Speaker, the administration's shabby treatment of the U.S. cattle hide industry, performed in the name of forestalling a rise in the prices of leather shoes, has now been stripped of its credibility. I refer you to a story published in yesterday's Wall Street Journal that the Nation's shoe manufacturers are raising prices an average of 5 percent on their fall lines of shoes for men and women.

I was particularly interested in the statement by an official of one big shoe company who said that the hide market can go down to even lower levels and the price of shoes would still go up. In fact, he said that "regardless of the cost of hides, the price of shoes must go up to maintain already low industry profit margins."

It is now obvious that the shoe industry planned to raise prices anyway, which casts a grave shadow over the Commerce Department action on March 11 that established quotas for the export of U.S. cattle hides for the purpose of lowering the price of hides.

It has been almost 2 weeks since I joined with a number of our colleagues in protesting the Commerce Department action. The White House was quick to note my opposition to the export controls on American hides and promptly sent me a memorandum from the Council of Economic Advisers, dated March 17, 1966, defending the action. Let me quote from it:

> This action (controlling exports of hides to roll back prices) will prevent a substantial rise in shoe prices.

Shoe producers assured us they would cooperate in holding down prices.

Asking hide producers to forgo a temporary windfall in order to hold down a rise in shoe prices is fully justified.

Increases in hide and leather prices would have forced an increase in shoes prices of 5 percent or more.

It should now be obvious, Mr. Speaker, even to the Council of Economic Advisers, that the shoe industry had no intention of holding down prices, and that the price of leather had little if anything to do with their plans to increase the price of a pair of shoes by $1 to $2. The big fuss over controlling the export of hides to provide lower leather prices here at home was merely a smokescreen when you consider there is only about 70 cents' worth of leather in a pair of shoes.

The Commerce Department should promptly rescind the hide export restrictions in light of the obvious facts. It is time for this Government to abandon its deliberate efforts to reduce farm income. And that is exactly what has happened in too many cases, not only in the restrictions on hides, but in Commodity Credit Corporation sales of Government stocks and other income-limiting devices.

NO LETUP ON UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. CONSULAR PACT

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there still are some few voices in Congress who, despite the macabre Newcomb Mott case, the current "hate America" propaganda from Moscow, and the Russian military and economic backing of the Red totalitarian regime in Hanoi, would have us appease Moscow with a Senate ratification of the Consular Treaty between the United States and the U.S.S.R. The logic of this position is most difficult to fathom.

Even if one were to assume the nonexistence of these events and conditions, there are many other solid and deeper reasons why this poorly contrived pact should not be ratified by the Senate during this session in the 90th Congress, or ever. We have been fortunate that since June 1964, when this pact was signed, nationwide organizations such as the National Captive Nations Committee, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and several others have conducted educational drives to inform our citizens of the absurdities and dangers of this treaty.

Regardless of any expedient postponement of action on the pact, this educational campaign must be continued so that the fallacious and self-defeating contents of the treaty will receive maximum public understanding and evaluation. A very thorough analysis of the treaty and the circumstances surrounding it has been made by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, in a pamphlet, titled "Ten Reasons Against the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty." Every Member of Congress received this compact study at the start of this session. I commend it to every interested and alert citizen. Because some occasion in the future may be seized upon to appease the imperio-colonialist Russians further by railroading this ill-conceived treaty through the Senate, I wish that this analysis be printed in full text in the permanent RECORD, followed by a popular interest example from the Arizona Republic:

TEN REASONS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. CONSULAR TREATY

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

There are 10 solid reasons why the U.S. Senate should emphatically not ratify the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty which the Committee on Foreign Relations reported out favorably last August. Most of these reasons were scarcely touched upon in the somewhat superficial public discussion that was precipitated by the committee's sudden action. This condition, however, should be no cause for wonderment. Since the signing of this second treaty of Moscow on June 1, 1964, every attempt has been made to keep the convention out of the arena of public discussion as much as possible.[1]

When the consummate attempt was made to railroad this seemingly innocuous pact through the Senate, numerous legislators and organizations joined in a strong protest against its blind ratification. Interestingly enough, some of the press distorted this fact into some sort of rightwing opposition. One paper, for example, painted it in terms of a deluge of letters inspired by the "Liberty Lobby and other rightwing organizations," though these groups expressed themselves marginally and in the final phase of last summer's episode.[2] An editorial in another organ supporting the treaty observed with guarded overtones, "most of the opposition seems to be made up of organized letter-writing members of such ultraconservative groups as the John Birch Society and the Liberty Lobby."[3] Employing this same smear tactic, a third proponent of the convention showed little esteem for the general intelligence of the Senate when it recklessly charged that the Senate was scared off by the Liberty Lobby which "saw to it that the Senators were bombarded with protest letters."[4]

Anyone who has followed closely the developments surrounding the treaty even before it was signed, cannot but view such reporting and editorializing as crassly inaccurate and misleading. As early as March 1964, the National Captive Nations Committee publicly opposed this pact, 3 months before it was signed in Moscow.[5] In June of that year several national ethnic organizations declared their opposition to the pact. When a number of Senators and others joined this growing chorus of bipartisan protest to the pact's ratification, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee decided not to consider the convention until the next Congress.

With the new 89th Congress in being for its 1st session, periodic inquiries were made as to the scheduling of open, public hearings on the treaty. Some serious discussion of it was being fostered by interested parties.[6] The consistent reply given to the inquiries was that no hearings were as yet being set.[7] As late as July the same position was maintained.[8] In that month, however, citizen groups observing the seventh Captive Nations Week observance throughout the Nation registered their strong opposition to the treaty, and again the call was raised for public hearings. At about this time it was announced that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had authorized the chairman to schedule public hearings.[9] The now-on-now-off treatment caused one committee member to assert that this latest action came "as a complete surprise to me."

Contrary to the quoted press reports and editorials, the opposition to the treaty was markedly cross sectional, including liberals as well as conservatives, Democrats as well as Republicans. Objectively speaking, the reasons offered by so-called ultra-right-wing groups should be evaluated on their own merits rather than substituting for them labels of invidious distinction. The same rule in objective reasoning would apply to any stand taken by their counterparts on the left. Moreover, what was not generally known about the 1964 summer episode was the quiet effort of a concerned Congressman who appraised 57 Senators of the defects in the treaty and even threatened to have the House Foreign Affairs Committee conduct open and fair hearings on the issue.

Examples of the replies to the Congressman's initiative make for perspectived reading. Thanking him for his critical observations, one Senator adds, "I have not as yet had an opportunity to study this treaty carefully, but my present inclination is to vote against it." Another prominent Senator states, "You find me in complete agreement with your views on this most important subject. It is my intention not only to vote against the convention when it is considered by the Senate but to do all that I can to persuade others to vote against it." Concerning the critical material given him, a third Senator reflects the aroused interest of scores of others in the Senate when he comments, "It will help me to better evaluate the treaty when it comes up for a vote in the Senate."

These facts should be adequate to convince one of the slanted reporting indulged in by a few newspapers that clamored for the treaty's ratification without even open and fair public hearings on the issue. Evidently, they were stunned by the outcome last August and had no other recourse but to wade in the muck of invidious labelism. Now for the 10 reasons.

I. NO PUBLIC HEARINGS

Viewing this whole development in all its aspects, any objective observer would have to conclude that the deliberate attempt to preclude open, public hearings on the issue is cause enough for the rejection of the convention. Every significant treaty requiring Senate ratification has been accorded this normal, democratic procedure so that legislators may weigh the various arguments surrounding it. Those who claim that the consular pact is an ordinary and insignificant treaty are either unaware of its basic significance and thus would profit from such hearings or employ this contention to abet the possibility of a blind ratification. By all evidence the proponents of the pact have displayed a morbid fear of public hearings and wide discussion on the issue.

---

[1] For a detailed background on this see Lev E. Dobriansky, "The Second Treaty of Moscow," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 2, pp. 2160–2163.

[2] E. W. Kenworthy, "Rightists Oppose Pact With Soviet," the New York Times, Aug. 19, 1965.

[3] "The Consular Treaty," the Evening Star, Aug. 24, 1965.

[4] Scared Off," editorial, the Washington Post, Aug. 23, 1965.

[5] Communications to chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mar. 10, 1964.

[6] "New Myths, Old Realities," editorial, the Richmond News Leader, Feb. 16, 1965.

[7] E.g. "No Hearings Set on United States-Soviet Consular Treaty," the Evening Star, Feb. 15, 1965.

[8] "Senators Delay Consular Pact With Russians," the Evening Star, July 12, 1965.

[9] "Hearings Due on Russian Consular Pact," the Washington Post, July 22, 1965.

The evidence also shows quite clearly that an attempt was made toward the close of the last session of Congress to railroad the treaty through the Senate. Fortunately, the maneuver was thwarted by the alert action of numerous groups and individuals. For example, in a press release the National Captive Nations Committee called for "open and frank public hearings" on the convention and protested against "the maneuver of ramming this ill-advised and harmful treaty down the throats of our people without fair and open hearings."[10] Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois, performed an invaluable service in his persistent charges against the railroading of this treaty.[11] A striking editorial in one critical paper began "Details are now at hand concerning the swift railroad job, with Senator FULBRIGHT as chief engineer, which was done to get the Soviet Consular Treaty out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee some days ago."[12]

Not to have the maneuver appear too crude and arbitrary, the committee heard testimony from Secretary of State Dean Rusk and several State Department associates. The committee print that followed contains all the marks of swift maneuver and haphazard publication. For example, the title of the pamphlet is "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," but on page 3 a caption reads "Consular Convention With Russia." If at this stage of American understanding the concepts of Soviet Union and Russia are held to be synonymous, then we are in real trouble with respect to some reasoning on this issue.

To mention another example among the many, the dialog between the chairman and Senator HICKENLOOPER makes for absorbing reading. In his opening statement Senator FULBRIGHT lets the cat out of the bag by stating "The committee met in executive session July 20, 1965, to consider the convention and decided at that time to take it up formally and submit it to the Senate for its advice and consent."[13] Senator HICKENLOOPER follows by stating, "I want to correct a misunderstanding. I understood you to say in the opening statement that the committee had decided to submit this to the Senate for confirmation."[14] Contrary to his opening statement, the chairman covers himself by replying "The committee would have to vote on it after we have had committee hearings." Then, in the print, the dialog is interrupted by the insertion of the President's message and the convention itself, and 15 pages later Senator FULBRIGHT further contradicts his original, plain statement by saying "We had decided to proceed with hearings if the committee so voted. That is what I meant to say."[15] His words scarely reveal such meaning.

Despite much talk about hearings at this point, only one staged hearing was held. Secretary Rusk was heard on points emphasizing the protection Americans in the U.S.S.R. would receive, the little difference between this treaty and other consular conventions, the risks of espionage we have to assume in our open society, the inadequacies of our Embassy in Moscow, the need for normalizing relations, mutual understanding, the improvement of communications, and other equally vague generalities. As the writer stated in a letter criticizing one of our papers, "by virtue of his antiquated and misleading conceptions of the Soviet Union, which even the late Adlai E. Stevenson tactfully repudiated in November 1961, Secretary Rusk can scarcely be regarded as the sole, adequate witness."[16] These salient points in the Rusk testimony will be answered in the remaining reasons against the ratification of the treaty.

How much of all this was pitifully misinterpreted can be gleaned from this statement of a Senator supporting a blind ratification of the pact: "Those writers are ignorant of the fact that hearings were held."[17] The official publication of the committee is accurately titled "Hearing," but the Senator insists hearings, governmental or public, were held. He also believes the treaty is with Russia. Moreover, some verbal legerdemain was detected in the distinction drawn between the treaty and the actual opening of consulates.

According to the State Department, one shouldn't be too concerned with the treaty because "the question of opening consulates * * * will be the subject of separate negotiations."[18] Why then all these pressure tactics concerning the treaty's ratification? Actually, the formal and legal basis provided by the treaty is most essential to the question of opening consulates. It is also worth while to note the haste on the part of the Department in exacting appropriations from Congress for a consulate in Leningrad with several $500 water coolers, extra bedrooms for single girl secretaries and what have you.[19]

Again, this first reason is reason enough to justify a rejection of the treaty. Its proponents apparently fear a full and open examination of it in the public forum. Without open, public hearings, a ratification of the pact would be an arbitrary and blind one. The democratic staging of such hearings would necessitate thoughtful consideration for the nine remaining reasons.

II. A DIPLOMATIC AFFIRMATION OF MOSCOW'S INNER EMPIRE

The second reason for rejecting the treaty is that it constitutes a diplomatic affirmation, a stamp of approval and acceptance of Moscow's inner empire. I'm aware of the fact that most Americans cling to the myth that the Soviet Union in Russia, that the U.S.S.R. is a country like ours, indeed, that this inner empire of many nations is a nation like ours. One superficial account of last August's episode misleads readers in this fashion, "If ratified, it would be the first bilateral treaty between the two nations."[20]

We can allow for such ignorance in an ordinary newspaper article, but for our leaders of state to believe that the U.S.S.R. is a nation is plainly unpardonable. If we should ever lose the cold war, it would be basically because of this fundamental gap in our understanding of the U.S.S.R. as an empire-state, a prison house of many captive nations, the inner and basic sphere of the present Soviet Russian Empire. Despite other objectives and purposes, both Napoleon and Hitler lost hot wars in this area of Eastern Europe because of substantially the same gap in understanding.

This fallacious notion of the U.S.S.R. as a "country" and other basic myths are reflected in the convention, which of course cannot but satisfy the propaganda and psychopolitical efforts of Moscow to the utmost. The treaty is founded on the mythical conception that the U.S.S.R. is a nation-state comparable in character to ours. American consulates in any of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. would tangibly reinforce this myth, needlessly abet Russian policies aimed at unifying this primary imperium, and thus nullify any leverage for peace we may have in at least recognizing the freedom goals of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

In the past 45 years the United States has committed many shortsighted errors bolstering and strengthening this inner empire of Soviet Russia. Ratification of this treaty would add another chapter to this sordid record. In a letter to Senator FULBRIGHT, the writer emphasized this point when he stated, "a blind ratification of the convention would form another chapter in our long, inept dealings with the Russians and expose us to the charge of being a nation of hypocrites when the President and others proclaim our 'devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.' This treaty is a confirmation of Russia's imperio-colonialism within the U.S.S.R. and further evidence of our diplomatic ineptitude in the cold war, not to say our grave lack of understanding of America's prime enemy."[21] In terms of power and ambition, we delude ourselves if we think Peiping rather than Moscow is the prime enemy.

Before taking action on the treaty it would profit each Senator to read a recent official study prepared for one of the Senate's own committees on the empire within the U.S.S.R. "Western scholars of Soviet affairs," it observes, "agree on the imperial-colonial character of the U.S.S.R."[22] Commendable as it is, even this study doesn't cover all aspects of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in the U.S.S.R. For succinct, deep insights into this inner empire each Senator would do well to read Adlai Stevenson's remarkable memorandum on the subject in the United Nations.[23] After reading these he would have to ask himself, "Could I as a Senator, representing people in a democracy and republic dedicated to principles of national independence and self-determination, vote for a treaty which explicitly and implicitly misrepresents a state and in effect places a stamp of approval on a tyrannical empire?" Each in his own conscience would have to answer this question.

This reason for not ratifying the treaty is basic to all others. It hinges on the most fundamental issue of the contemporary struggle—Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism versus freedom and national independence. It offers us another opportunity to fill in the gap of American understanding of the U.S.S.R. The first was Congress Captive Nations Week resolution (Public Law 86-90) in 1959, which for the first time recognized the freedom aspirations of all the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Ratification of the treaty would contradict the very essence and spirit of that resolution. Also, Secretary Rusk and others argue that the treaty would improve communications between the two "countries."

---

[10] "FULBRIGHT Urged To Hold Open and Frank Hearings on Consular Convention," Aug. 3, 1965.

[11] E.g., William Moore, "DERWINSKI Hits Plan for Russ Consulates," Chicago Tribune, Aug. 10, 1965.

[12] "Normal Relations," the Richmond News Leader, Aug. 13, 1965.

[13] Consular Convention With the Soviet Union, hearing, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 1965, p. 1.

[14] Ibid., p. 2.

[15] Ibid., p. 17.

[16] "Consular Convention With the U.S.S.R.," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 16, pp. 21093–21094.

[17] "Proposed Consular Convention With Soviet Union More to Advantage of United States Than to Russia," Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 15, pp. 20606–20608.

[18] John C. Guthrie, "Communication," May 14, 1964.

[19] "Daniel Rapaport," United Press International story, May 8, 1965.

[20] Murrey Marder, "United States-Soviet Treaty," the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1965.

[21] Communication, Aug. 4, 1965.

[22] The Soviet Empire, Committee on the Judiciary, 1965, p. 166.

[23] U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Memorandum to U.N. delegations, the United Nations, Nov. 25, 1961.

Aside from the rudimentary fact that it is hardly within the purview of consular activity to communicate or negotiate between countries, what improvement in communications could be achieved between the United States and the many nations in the U.S.S.R. under a treaty which slights and ignores the presence of all but one of these nations? To our own detriment, the very opposite would be achieved.

III. LEGAL INVALIDITIES OF THE TREATY

A third substantial reason for rejecting the treaty is its numerous legal invalidities. If some of our lawmakers in the Senate still find the second reason difficult to grasp at this point, surely the legal contradictions and invalidities of the pact would fall more readily within their immediate attention. In a court of law any patent misrepresentation of parties to a contract or blatant contradictions to fact would be sufficient to throw the case out of court. The consular treaty is pitted exactly in this situation.

Throughout the text of the treaty one reads about "a national of the sending state." [24] This makes sense in the case of the United States, a citizen of a nation generally called about the world "an American." Who is the national of the Soviet Union? A Russian, Lithuanian, Georgian and so forth? If language and words have any meaning, a "national" is an individual member of a given nation. On the impregnable basis of all evidence provided by Moscow itself, the Soviet Union is no nation but rather a so-called union of many nations. Legally, there is no such animal as a "Soviet national" other than a fictional image in the minds of some who wallow in the myths of the U.S.S.R. being a nation or anyone in the U.S.S.R.—worse still "Russia"—being a "Soviet," which is a council of workers and peasants.

Clearly, if some can extricate themselves from the unreasoned, semantic mess indicated here, they would begin to see that the convention contradicts the very essence of the U.S.S.R. Constitution, which though largely semantic is nonetheless a nominal compromise with the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. By this kind of misrepresentative language the pact violates also the authenticity of every official map of the U.S.S.R. and contradicts reams of official Moscow pronouncements on the multinational composition of the U.S.S.R. In their desire to reap the psychopolitical advantages of the treaty the Muscovite rulers would prostitute anything and, as in everything else, accuse the other party of the perversions. By allowing this to take place we exhibit our own psychopolitical immaturity.

Further examples of legal invalidity are, in the case of the Soviet Union, provisions for "the national flag of the sending state" and "the national coat of arms of the sending state." [25] Of course, in objective circumstance there is no such flag or coat of arms for the U.S.S.R. Each republic has its own flag and emblem. The flag and coat of arms of the U.S.S.R. shown at any Moscow-established consulate in the United States would be another perversion of fact permitted by the legal invalidity of the treaty.

Speaking of legalities, no one has raised the question of accumulated legacies left by Russian emigrees and others in behalf of known or unknown parties in the Soviet Union. How many millions of dollars is colonialist Moscow seeking to acquire under article 10 of the treaty? The Russians are employing every trick, including "the economic independence of the satellites," to build up their stock of foreign currencies; the treaty is another means. It would be interesting to see what the Department of State can furnish on these accumulated legacies. Mr. Rusk and others vaguely argue that the pact would abet "mutual understanding." With whom? The imperio-colonialists in Moscow? What of the various nations and peoples in the U.S.S.R.? How would all these allowed perversions and open risks mold our bonds of mutual understanding with them? In the long run, they will prevail, not the ruling Russian totalitarians.

IV. AN AMERICAN ASSIST TO RUSSIFICATION

The fourth objection to the treaty is that its provisions engender an American assist to Russification within and outside the U.S.S.R. The provision in the pact for the use of the Russian language to process the fictitious Soviet national is in every sense an inadvertent assist to the well-known Russification policies of Moscow.[26] In effect, here too we would be buttressing Moscow's colonialist policy of enforcing the use of the captor's language among the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

Here, too, before he casts his vote on the treaty it would do well for each Senator to scan another recent congressional study on cultural Russification and linguacide in the U.S.S.R.[27] Do we want to be placed in the position of confirming and abetting this vicious genocidal tendency further? It is bad enough that functional necessity compels us to accede to it on the ambassadorial level, though this could be rectified, too, by a diplomatic alternative of a more realistic nature.

With a premium on verbal generality Mr. Rusk and others argue for the treaty because it would "normalize relations." What are they seeking to normalize? The inner Soviet Russian Empire, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, or Moscow's Russification policies? The treaty would abnormally relate us to these ugly phenomena in the seeming position of even accepting them as "normal." Aside from the essential factor of comparative advantage in the cold war, what a political posture we are asked to assume by ratifying this treaty. The Nation of the American Revolution and all the perennial principles this implies is urged in the name of normalization to place stamps of diplomatic approval on the worst institutional hallmarks of its basic enemy. Also, what is most curious is that those who talk loudly today about "the liquidation of the Communist monolith," "growing nationalism in Eastern Europe," "a world of diversity," and "good Communists and bad ones" are normally those who, for whatever reasons, stop at the borders of the U.S.S.R., the determining inner empire itself, with these supposedly new notions.

V. THE VERY DIFFERENT DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY

The preceding three reasons for nonratification of the pact received far less attention last August than the next two. Yet in the broader context of understanding the contemporary struggle, its prime sources of tension and longrun dangers to world peace, they carry greater weight than the next two objections, which by themselves, of course, are adequate to justify nonratification. It is noteworthy how much more adept and knowledgeable the Chinese Reds are in utilizing essential facts concerning the inner Soviet Russian Empire, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, Moscow's Russification program, and the captive status of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. than we are.[28] Their ends are different, but they at least do not accommodate the Russian totalitarians in their worst features.

Contrary to the baseless contention that this consular convention is no different or is even slightly different from other conventions, the pact is very different not only in its relation to our prime enemy in the cold war but also in its incredible provision of diplomatic immunity to consular personnel for all crimes, including espionage.[29] It is sad enough that the treaty's assumptions and contents seriously depreciate our general political posture as a democratic free world leader, but this provision is an open invitation to Red subversion of our Nation.

Every other existing convention grants immunity only from punishment for misdemeanors. The reader can now understand why I entitled an article on this subject "The second treaty of Moscow." The pact was made to order—in Moscow. Even our allies don't enjoy this unprecedented consular privilege.

In view of the concentrated discussion on this point last August, it is unnecessary to belabor it further. Mr. Leonard C. Meeker, the State Department's legal adviser, admitted in unqualified terms that this immunity from criminal jurisdiction "is not present in other consular conventions to the same extent." [30] Mr. Meeker, who is under the illusion that some "Soviet national" animal exists, tried to moderate the immunity provision by pointing out that it "will extend only to those consular officers and employees who are agreed to by the two governments." [31] As though in actual practice this would make any significant difference.

The views expressed by opponents to the treaty in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are quite firm on this immunity provision.[32] Publicized discussion of the point led many to the conclusion which one Senator put in these words: "It is this last section that is inimical with the best interests of the United States. It is the last section that clearly indicates that this convention was negotiated by the Soviets, not as a bilateral pact for improving Soviet-American relations, but as a cold war maneuver to enhance and expand the intelligence gathering network of the U.S.S.R." [33]

Mr. Rusk and others argue that the treaty would offer greater protection for Americans touring and visiting in the U.S.S.R. This protection argument, covering some 12,000 Americans annually, is supposed to counterbalance the lapse in it as concerns the immunity provision. Much is made of the notification and access provisions regarding arrests. Actually, this so-called Russian concession should have been demanded long ago on the purely ambassadorial level, and should be so demanded on the simple principle of reciprocity. U.S.S.R. representatives and tourists are accorded the privileges and benefits of our democratic criminal code; pure reciprocal relations would demand the same for our people. To hook the notification and access provisions as a notable Russian "concession" to the consular treaty indicates that our negotiators had already walked into the bear trap. It is as much a concession as a thief giving up stolen property.

---

[24] E.g., Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 8, 9, 10, etc.

[25] Ibid., p. 11.

[26] Ibid., p. 8.

[27] See "Nations, Peoples, and Countries in the U.S.S.R.," study of population and immigration problems, House Committee on the Judiciary, 1964.

[28] See "Sino-Soviet Border Potential Powder Keg," the Ukrainian Bulletin, New York, Apr. 1–15, 1965, p. 35.

[29] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 12.

[30] Ibid., p. 22.

[31] Ibid., pp. 34–35.

[32] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," minority views, Aug. 10, 1965.

[33] Senator NORRIS COTTON, "The Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 6, pp. 22000–22001.

VI. INTENSIFIED POLITICAL WARFARE IN THE UNITED STATES

Espionage was the leading word for the next popular objection to the treaty last August. Our FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, was quoted at length in support of this criticism. In earlier testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. Hoover had emphasized that U.S.S.R. "consulates in many parts and the country * * * will make our work more difficult."[34] A later statement by him stressed the following: "One Soviet intelligence officer in commenting on the agreement spoke of the wonderful opportunity this presented his service and that it would enable the Soviets to enhance their intelligence operations."[35] So effective were these points that the President subsequently issued a directive to officials to support administration policies, aiming it particularly at Hoover.[36]

There are several aspects to this sixth reason for nonratification that need some clarification. First, though public hearings were barred, it obviously behooved the Foreign Relations Committee to invite Mr. Hoover, as another Government witness, to testify on the pact. Surely he is far more qualified to discuss the likely espionage effects of the treaty than is Secretary Rusk. Second, it is certainly no strain on one's imagination to envisage the expanded opportunities for Soviet Russian espionage with consulates ranging cross-country from New York to Chicago and San Francisco.

However, considering the huge spy apparatus now maintained by Moscow in this country, one can rationally allow for only a relatively small increase in overall effectiveness with the presence of consulates. The economic law of diminishing return applies in this field as in others. Doubtless the establishment of consulates would make Hoover's work more difficult, but it is doubtful that the condition as concerns espionage activity would be unmanageable. Moreover, as I argued elsewhere, spying is a two-way street. On the other hand, since alternatives for different diplomatic arrangements exist, there is no reason whatsoever to accommodate the Russians in this risky respect.

Especially is this so when a broader view is taken of Soviet Russian activity in this country. The problem entails more than just espionage. It can best be described as one of intensified political warfare, signs of which have already appeared in civil rights riots, campus agitation, peace demonstrations, overt U.S.S.R. Embassy propaganda on the Watts riot,[37] and a variety of actions striking against civil and political authority. Strategically situated consulates would not only be additional spy nests but also active sources of conspiracy, propaganda, blackmail, and intimidation against those with relatives in the Red Empire, and media for undermining ethnic and other anti-Communist groups. With the type of immunity offered them, they should make bold efforts along these lines.

Mr. Rusk and others talk glibly about our "open society" and the espionage risks we have to take. They fail to see the broader problem involved here with long-arm ramifications extending to our actions in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and almost everywhere else. Regarding espionage solely, a more naive observation by the Secretary cannot be found than when he testified, "I do hope that the Convention will reduce misunderstandings and particularly be of assistance in not letting private citizens, tourists, businessmen, exchange people, and others get caught up in the atmosphere in which this other type of problem arises."[38] Projected into the future, this type of uncritical thinking would virtually guarantee the closing of our open society.

VII. BASIS FOR INTENSIFIED POLITICAL WARFARE IN LATIN AMERICA

Speaking of ramifications emerging from a shortsighted ratification of the treaty, the next four reasons for nonratification indicate what we can expect from this further appeasement of Soviet Russian desires. It should be evident now to the reader that all of these reasons against ratification are integrally related, though any one is sufficient cause for rejecting the treaty. To the recurring distinction made between the treaty as a body of guidelines for consular activity and the actual establishment of the consulates, which some even suggest the State Department might act upon devoid of any treaty, one can reasonably maintain the virtual inseparability of the two and the political certainty of no consulates if these many reasons, individually, in combination or as an integral whole, lead to a Senate rejection of the pact.

Thus, the seventh reason for nonratification is that a Senate confirmation of this treaty would open up a Pandora's box of Soviet Russian pressure against every free government in Latin America. The immediate objective would be similar consular conventions; the ultimate objective would be a really intensified political warfare in the area. This at a time when many of our own officials have been warning us to expect stepped-up Red subversion throughout the continent.

Strangely enough, this reason against ratification was scarcely brought up in the August discussion. Few even knew that as of now no U.S.S.R. consulates exist in the Western Hemisphere. In a cogent rebuttal to a newspaper editorial, Congressman DERWINSKI stated the case eloquently: "Acquiescence of the United States to Soviet consulates would set an oblivious precedent that would soon find the Communist rulers of Moscow spreading their influence in Latin America by means of consular activities. What Latin American government could refuse the request for a consulate after the leader of the free world has extended this benefit to the rulers of the Kremlin?"[39]

Need more be said on this point of consular proliferation for extended Red subversion in the Western Hemisphere? The ratification of the treaty would create a solid basis for intensified Russian political warfare in Latin America. As in the area of trade with the Red Empire, our lack of firm and consistent policy will be another government's rationalization for its actions under pressure.

VIII. A TRADE WEDGE

Another reason for not ratifying the pact is the obvious use made of this treaty as a diplomatic wedge to liberalize and increase trade with the Soviet Union and the Red empire in general. Time and time again in his testimony Mr. Rusk spoke of the prospect of "increasing trade between our two countries."[40] At times it appears this argument of dollars and cents carried more weight with him than the argument of humane protection for Americans in the U.S.S.R.

The issue of increased trade with the U.S.S.R. and the Red empire is a controversial problem in and of itself. This writer has pointed out in testimony and in emphatic terms that any such liberalized trade would not be the first time the United States has contributed myopically to the economic strengthening of the Soviet Russian Empire—always, of course, in the interests of "peace," "normal relations," "relaxation of tensions," and other self-legitimations.[41] Up to now those seeking such East-West trade have been careful to distinguish between our trading more liberally with the captive states in central Europe and that with the U.S.S.R. The former is supposed to unlatch these Red totalitarian states from the chains of Russian domination, though for years Moscow itself has pursued the empire policy of division of national labor.

Now, curiously enough, we see Secretary Rusk injecting the trade issue into this consular one with evident abandon of the distinction mentioned above. Our fighting men in South Vietnam should take great comfort in this switch since economic trade support of the U.S.S.R. should in turn bolster Moscow's support of Hanoi for an even more challenging conflict in that area.

The fragmented policy of our government conduces to many blatant contradictions. This tactic of arguing for the treaty on the basis of trade prospects which in turn would facilitate the economic means of Moscow's global cold war operations against our interests is a gem of policy making fragmentisms. It's cause enough to reject the treaty as a trade wedge.

IX. THE MOST-FAVORED-NATION SIEVE

As in the area of trade with the Red Empire, the most-favored-nation sieve exists in consular agreements. This ninth reason for not ratifying the treaty was emphasized by several scrutinizing Senators who wisely oppose the extension of the immunity privilige to twenty-seven other nations and states, including Yugoslavia and Rumania.[42] As they pointed out, as many as 400 consular personnel would be eligible under the treaty and their covering conventions with the most-favored-nation clause for immunity from prosecution for all crimes.

On this point Secretary Rusk affirmed that "others would have the right to raise with us establishing various privileges, but only on a basis of reciprocity."[43] It is interesting that this concern for reciprocity shows itself here but not with the protection of American citizens in the U.S.S.R. on the ambassadorial or full diplomatic level. With this sieve the risks mentioned earlier become all the more magnified. Also, Red governments with no consular agreements at present would seek the inclusion of the most-favored-nation clause in any future conventions.

The snowball effects of the treaty's provisions are thus not difficult to determine. They all point to a substantial net disadvantage for us. Recently, for example, our officials have uttered some tart remarks with regard to Japan's apathy toward the Vietnam war and its warm behavior toward the Red empire. Encouraged by our action, Japan, too, is on the road to signing a consular agreement with the U.S.S.R.[44] If in short time it judges the U.S.S.R. to be a far greater threat to the free world than Red China could possibly be in the next decade, it would have a self-legitimating basis for establishing similar and probably closer relations with Peiping.

---

[34] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," minority views, p. 2.

[35] Ibid.

[36] "L.B.J. Policy Edict Tied to Hoover," the Washington Post, Aug. 21, 1965.

[37] "Top Soviet Intellectuals Castigate United States on Riots," the Washington Post, Aug. 22, 1965.

[38] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 29.

[39] Edward J. Derwinski, "The Consular Treaty," the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Aug. 27, 1965.

[40] E.g., "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 33.

[41] Lev E. Dobriansky, "Five Perspectives on East-West Trade," East-West Trade, hearings, pt. II, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 1965, pp. 94–104.

[42] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," minority views, p. 4.

[43] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 23.

[44] "Japan, Russia Are Negotiating," Reuters, Moscow, June 10, 1965.

X. THE BALTIC DILEMMA

A final reason for nonratification bears on the Baltic dilemma to which the treaty exposes us. This reason is logically a derivative of the second reason we considered, as well as being based on an act of U.S. policy. The United States does not recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia in the U.S.S.R. Yet, despite the silent treatment proferred by the State Department's legal counsel, any consular activity in these republics cannot but in practice and in time constitute de facto recognition.[45] With the allowable establishment of consular districts there, this condition would become crystal clear. At least Secretary Rusk admitted, "We do have a bit of a dilemma there, Senator."[46]

In conclusion, there are many dilemmas, contradictions, and risks posed by this consular convention. From Moscow's viewpoint, as an instrument of the cold war it is fraught with innumerable advantages—imperial legitimacy, propaganda, legacies, political warfare penetrations, espionage and so forth. Our viewpoint is already so beclouded that many cannot see a real diplomatic alternative to this disadvantageous arrangement which would satisfy most of the reasons given for ratification of the convention, including the inadequacy of our Embassy in Moscow, and yet realize a substantial net advantage.

Before alternatives can be examined, the treaty itself should be subjected to full, critical examination. This has not as yet been done. The question is a simple one: blind ratification or open, public hearings?

[From the Arizona Republic, Mar. 16, 1966]

The People Speak: Captive Nations Committee Opposes Consular Treaty

Editor, the Arizona Republic:

Americans have generally met whatever demands have been made of them for their survival and the survival of their allies. They have performed well on the battlefields, but, sad to say, around diplomatic tables, they seem never to have learned anything.

In application of open force they are masters; in the use of threat of force, feeble amateurs. They simply cannot understand that being a "good Joe" is viewed by some as a reflection of cowardice and weakness.

In our dealings with the Soviets, we have tried to appease them repeatedly with no measure of success but we continue. We tried communication through various conference tables of neutrals, still no success. We invent new means of communication, propose "hot lines" and grant consular privileges not available to our friendliest ally—but we wonder, if problems of communication occur, are they not caused by the Soviets' determination not to listen.

Inside our own country we scold ourselves for not permitting a Communist to attack us viciously for to do so would violate his constitutional rights. Strangely we haven't asked ourselves when a Communist has ever exercised any responsibility to preserving that Constitution. More generally he says the Constitution must go as well as the moral concepts of our various religious establishments.

The consular treaty is a rehashing of old ideas each of which has failed in the past—unilateral communication and appeasement. What sort of idiot would permit criminal immunity to the Kremlin butchers, permit the expansion of Red subversion which adds to the load of the already overworked FBI, to advance a condition whereby our citizens may be intimidated by threatening their loved ones in a captive nation? How can we allow a network of Soviet consulates to cover us from New York to Los Angeles and not expect at least one consulate in each Latin American Republic?

It takes little imagination to observe the obvious advantage to the Reds, in their crusade for world domination. These items of Senator Fulbright's sponsored consular convention treaty. A stranger could wonder with a reasonable basis whether Senator Fulbright and Dean Rusk have an allegiance beyond their country and constituents.

Still one cloudy point more—the treaty mentions U.S.S.R. and Soviet Russia. We are indeed in trouble if we assume they are one and the same. The Soviet Union includes many nations held captive in a large prison by Soviet Russia—are each of these to be represented? If so, does this mean a final burial of all these small nations and that this burial receive the official acceptance and approval of the United States?

We do not question the patriotism of our citizens, nor their fortitude, nor their willingness to accept adversity and sacrifice. We do observe apathy and slumber. This is dangerously a weakness to which Communists have been alerted for many years. They have used it with skill and persistence and with tremendous success.

No one expects all of us to be crusaders for freedom nor superpatriots nor to assume the same risks as the men in Vietnam at this time but it might not be a bad idea. We do plead with you to arouse yourself from apathy and slumber and to review your responsibilities.

We have a suitable petition protesting the consular convention treaty with many signatures already. If you readers, and especially parents of servicemen, would care to join us, please add your name to our petition. This petition is presented for signature at the American Legion, 364 North Seventh Avenue, at the blue room at 8 p.m., Thursday, March 17, by the Captive Nations Committee. If unable to come, please mail us a post card stating:

"I am against the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Convention Treaty." Your signature and address.

Mail your post card to National Captive Nations Committee, Arizona Branch, 2522 West Highland, Phoenix, Ariz.

Walter Chopiwskyj,
President, Arizona Branch,
National Captive Nations Committee.

LET'S LOOK BEFORE WE LEAP, AMERICA

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a nation, just as an individual, is often tempted to forget the lessons of yesterday and to ignore the stern warnings which history provides.

In the present very difficult situation in Vietnam it would be easy to allow wishful thinking to influence our judgment. It would be all too easy to fall into a trap simply because we are naturally anxious to bring the fighting to an end.

I was greatly impressed by a recent newspaper column which discusses this problem. This article, by one of Indiana's most respected writers, Wayne Guthrie, follows as it appeared in the March 23 issue of the Indianapolis News:

Let's Look Before We Leap, America

(By Wayne Guthrie)

History has a way of presenting to people and nations a time for sober thinking.

It does more than that—it affords them an opportunity to take a tip from history and, perchance, to guide them in their decisions.

Such a situation faces America today.

Sweeping across our land is a mounting wave of agitation for some sort of promise, agreement, armistice, or treaty that will end hostilities in Vietnam.

It is not surprising that such a wave—however motivated—appeals to men of good will because their greatest hope is for peace.

But, they wish nothing short of a permanent and lasting peace—not simply an interlude or lull that will afford the avowed enemies of human freedom opportunity to recoup or, perhaps, to shift their nefarious designs and activities to some other spot on the globe.

Taking a tip from history, it might be well for America to look before it leaps into any such arrangement. That is, to try to learn from facts at hand what the possible effect will be before it is too late.

What is the avowed and publicly acclaimed aim, design, and ultimate goal of communism?

Has communism kept its promises in the past and/or given us any reason to think it will in the future?

To that end there is no better guide than the old adage of the law—the record is the best evidence.

We determine the intentions of nations, as we do those of individuals, in two ways—what they do and what they say.

By its writings and the public pronouncements of some of its leaders communism has left no room for doubt that its ultimate goal is to conquer the world with its Godless, materialistic philosophy and thus destroy the free way of life liberty-loving people cherish.

Are we naive enough to think or believe communism did not mean what it has said and has not denied?

Before World War II many peace-seeking persons refused to believe Hitler's pronouncements. The result was Munich, its broken pledges, the overrunning of innocent nations and the maelstrom of World War II.

One example of what communism proposes is set forth in the statement attributed to Dimitry Z. Manuilsky at the Lenin School of Political Welfare in Moscow in 1930:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 to 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fists."

What about communism's record for keeping pledges? Does that record give America any reason to believe communism will keep any future agreements? It would do America well to recall the diplomatic pledges communism has made and subsequently violated. Here follows a portion of those pledges whose terms were violated by successive Soviet regimes:

To recognize Finland's independence.

To renounce sovereignty over Latvia and Lithuania.

To recognize self-determination of Ukraine.

To prohibit Bolshevik propaganda in Great Britain.

---

[45] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 26.

[46] Ibid., p. 25.

To end hostilities with Poland.

To conclude a friendship agreement with Czechoslovakia.

To renounce all privileges, concessions and rights of extraterritoriality in China.

To refrain from any propaganda, subversion or espionage in the United States.

To guarantee Rumanian sovereignty.

To obey the principles of the League of Nations.

To pledge adherence to the tenets of the Atlantic Charter.

To honor principles of the U.N. Declaration.

To remove all military forces from Iran within 6 months after close of World War II.

To return to the United States all undestroyed lend-lease weapons.

To establish a free and independent Austria.

To create a democratic and unified Korea.

To honor democratic processes in China and Eastern Europe (Yalta Conference).

To abide by the U.N. Charter.

To unify Germany and to provide for democratic procedures in Eastern Europe (Potsdam Conference).

To support Nationalist China.

To return all German prisoners of war within 2 years.

To end the Berlin blockade.

To establish armistice in Korea.

To restore peace in Indochina and to prohibit troop buildup.

To discuss German reunification at the Geneva Conference.

Does that list of broken promises give America any cause to feel communism will abide by any future agreement?

Through that list history seems to be reminding America that there is little hope of lasting peace with a force that is bent on nothing less than the destruction of the free way of life—a force that without hesitation will break any promise whenever it deems such violation to be in the best interests of its program of worldwide materialistic conquest.

America must not lose sight of this fact—that with communism the ultimate goal is achievement of its plan for world conquest. If expedient or necessary at times to make concessions it will not hesitate to do so—but it will not surrender its goal.

It goes to ends that often are paradoxical. For instance, when any Communist or communistic front gets in trouble in America it hides for protection behind one of the sacred rights embodied in our Constitution, which instrument their own nefarious world plot would destroy.

America would do well to look before it leaps.

THE FUTURE OF THE POTOMAC

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 25, many Marylanders joined me in celebrating the 332d anniversary of the founding of Maryland.

As we reviewed the past, present, and future of our great State, it seemed especially appropriate this year for us to focus our attention on the great Potomac River Basin, for the beauty and resources of the Potomac, and the strength and industry of the people of the basin, have nourished and invigorated Maryland throughout its history.

The wealth of the Potomac Basin is diverse and durable—but we have recognized that it is not indestructible. We have recognized the tremendous problems which threaten its land and water—and we have pledged ourselves to a great conservation effort, to preserve the basin's riches for future generations.

This year we must decide whether our pledge is to be simply repeated, or truly renewed.

For many years, dedicated groups and individuals have worked to protect specific segments of the basin, to develop particular recreation areas and facilities, and to promote their intelligent and compassionate use. Countless friends of the C. & O. Canal have fought for more than 15 years to restore that historic waterway and rescue it from neglect. In this decade, interest in basin water supply has expanded from relatively isolated pockets of concern to comprehensive consultation and debate. Finally, on February 8, 1965, President Johnson gave national importance to our regional efforts by declaring that the Potomac "should serve as a model of scenic and recreational values for the entire country."

Like many others, I welcomed the President's pledge, and endorsed the full commitment of Federal talents and resources which that pledge implied.

Now a year has passed, and much has been accomplished. The four Potomac Basin States and the District of Columbia have established effective channels of cooperation through the Governors' Advisory Committee. The Federal Interdepartmental Task Force and four subtask forces have been set to work. An interim report has been produced, and proposals more detailed and technical than those of the interim report are now being developed.

But I wish that more momentum had been gained. I wish that Federal concentration on the Potomac had been more constant, and that Federal emphasis on Potomac planning as a "model for the Nation" had not appeared more rhetorical than real.

I wish that the President, in his message to Congress this year on pollution and conservation, had been able to give a report on Potomac progress, rather than mentioning the river only in passing.

If the President's promise of 1965 is to be renewed in 1966, the following steps should be taken at once:

First. Qualified personnel within the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Water Pollution Control Administration, and the Corps of Engineers should be formally assigned full-time to Potomac Basin planning. No matter how talented and dedicated the public servants involved, a full-scale Federal effort cannot be made with part-time help.

Second. Energetic and openminded consultation between Federal and State agencies and private organizations and groups involved in Potomac projects should be greatly expanded, and formal means to continue liaison and information sharing should be established. The development of truly comprehensive programs for this region requires all the information and imagination we can bring to bear—and many private groups and organizations possess deep knowledge of and experience with basin problems, knowledge, and experience too important to be ignored or overlooked, and too extensive to be duplicated without great waste of Federal energies.

Third. An active, candid public education and consultation program should be initiated throughout the basin by the Federal task force without delay. Although many excellent public discussions have been organized by private groups, it is essential that the Federal Government's interest in full public participation be more directly and vividly expressed. The residents of the basin, whose support will determine the success of any plan, should be encouraged now to become full, informed partners in planning.

Perhaps the most important product of our efforts in the year since the President's message is that we have learned how much we have to do—and how extensively we must cooperate in doing it.

Significant steps have been taken toward developing the basin's full recreational potential. The apparent agreement not to build a high dam at Seneca at this time is most welcome, and should end an unfortunate preoccupation with that one aspect of Potomac plans. The completion of State outdoor recreation plans under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act brings us closer to the actual development of sites and improvement of facilities in many parts of the basin. The full mapping of trails is another vital advance.

But the hard questions still lie before us. We have not yet defined, or even fully and publicly discussed, the types of policies required to insure that increasingly valuable lands along the main stem of the Potomac and around its tributaries will remain open for public enjoyment in years to come.

The concept of a comprehensive Potomac Valley Park is bold, sweeping, exciting—and vague. It seems clear that cost alone would prohibit massive Federal land acquisitions in the valley, so that federally owned park lands will be confined to selected acreage and the central strand of the C. & O. Canal. It also seems clear that the States cannot bear the burdens of acquiring all remaining acreage within this park. We will need full local cooperation in employing new tools, including scenic easements and protective zoning. These techniques cannot be evolved and accepted without extensive study, without thorough public discussion, and without amiable, continuing consultation between Federal and State officials and the officials and individuals of counties, cities, and towns. Federal efforts to encourage discussions—starting now—would help to prevent crises of communication later.

One difficulty which will become more and more obtrusive in the near future is the dependence of recreational development upon the resolution of water supply and water quality problems. Obviously parks cannot be shaped around reservoirs until the reservoirs have been built, nor can swimming, boating, and fishing areas be completed until water or suitable quality has been secured. Water remains the central challenge of Potomac planning.

In mapping our campaign against Potomac Basin water pollution, we should not forget that tactical questions, such as the location of dams and the size of treatment works, cannot be answered until strategic problems have been resolved. The continuing controversies over many basic issues suggest that our definition of strategy may still be hampered by a lack of knowledge of the causes of pollution.

Laymen can learn the outlines of Potomac pollution problems—the complexity of rural and urban, chemical and organic sources—the particular challenges of sedimentation. But even skilled engineers and scientists do not yet know enough. An intensive basinwide research effort should be systematically pursued, with coordinated efforts being made by Federal agencies, private organizations, universities, and industry.

I had hoped that the President, while recommending expanded water quality research in his message on pollution and conservation, would suggest a model research program specifically for the Potomac Basin.

I had hoped that he would place greater emphasis on the problems of sedimentation.

I was disappointed that he did not emphasize the contributions to pollution research and prevention which can be made by enlightened industry, and did not advocate tax incentives to encourage industrial construction of adequate waste treatment works. While the threat of strong legal action may compel industries to comply with water quality standards, I believe that only more positive approaches will bring business and industy effectively and beneficially into the conservation partnership.

Above all, I regret that the President chose not to emphasize the staggering financial investment which must be made, on all levels of government, if any major rivers—much less all of them—are to be cleaned up and kept clean.

It may not be possible in this decade to allocate to water quality control as many billions as will have to be spent if the whole job is to be done. It is possible, however, to make more effective use of available funds by redistributing the cost burdens involved. Eliminating unrealistic ceilings on Federal participation in waste treatment projects is one constructive step. Authorizing Federal matching of State contributions, up to a total Federal investment of perhaps 60 percent of total cost, could also ease the financial problems of many communities. Such an advance would also encourage substantial State participation in projects with direct or indirect statewide benefits.

Given the limitations of funds and—more important—of our knowledge, we should recognize that comprehensive solutions to pollution problems cannot be reached, or even drafted, at once. It seems important, therefore, to develop realistic interim priorities—to meet the most urgent needs for increased water supply, to begin action in those areas where delay could be most costly, and to reduce delays in recreational and other development projects dependent on water quality and supply improvements. All these projects should be analyzed and assessed, and priorities set, not in closed councils but in open, candid consultation among Federal and State planners, legislators, administrators, local officials, and—above all—the people whose lives will be affected and whose tax dollars will support the work.

We all face a tremendous challenge, the challenge of shaping our own progress and employing our own talents to secure the future of the great region in which we live. No single plan, no matter how comprehensive, can be more than a guide—and we should be sure that the guidelines which we follow are sound and clearly understood. At this point, we should encourage skepticism, criticism and debate. For if it seems that all our questions have been answered, then we have not asked all the right questions, or have not asked them in all possible arenas.

Each of us now has particular responsibilities. The Federal Government, having assumed formal leadership in Potomac planning, must exert that leadership in fact. State officials, having recognized how much they can do in concert, must also recognize how little public servants can do without full public understanding and support. Local officials, having grasped the need for planning, must further expand formal and informal communication among themselves and with other levels of government. Private organizations must assert themselves in areas of their special competence.

Above all, residents of the basin must exercise their right to seek information, to ask questions, and to ask more questions. And no one should wait for formal invitations before becoming involved.

The Potomac Basin is a mighty region—rich in history, strong in resources, unique in beauty—combining wilderness and towns, open country and crowded metropolitan areas. To preserve this basin is a mighty task, requiring a new breadth of insight and a new depth of cooperation among all who care. Some of the controversies which have already enlivened our planning will be with us for a long time—and some should be. But we should not shrink from creative conflicts, just as we should not be timid in seeking agreement, or in acting when and where informed agreement has been reached. For we will never have a greater opportunity than we have this year, when the Potomac's meaning is in our hearts and its future is squarely in our hands.

ADDITION TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House of an addition to the program.

Tomorrow H.R. 5147, amending the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act, will be called up, and it will probably be the first order of business tomorrow.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the authorization for the appropriations under the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964—Public Law 88-269—expires June 30, 1966. It is in the public interest that this vital legislation be extended and expanded. The Federal assistance has been a needed stimulus to State and local efforts in developing library services and facilities.

At numerous appropriation hearings, testimony has been abundant and clear to show that the people in the 50 States and the 5 territories have benefited enormously by the original Library Services Act of 1956, and by the extensions of it.

Public libraries, however, are still lacking the necessary financial resources, both from State and local funds, to enable them to perform their essential functions for this great Nation.

Rapid advances in science, technology, education, business, culture, and everyday life have increased the indispensability of the public library as a basic source of knowledge, understanding, and increased competency for people of all ages and of all educational and economic levels. Moreover, the rapidly growing population with its diversity and new patterns of living has added to the complications.

Despite the noted progress in library services and facilities under the present library legislation, more than 15 million people in the United States still have no public library service and more than 100 million persons have service woefully inadequate to their needs. In addition, the needs for cooperation among libraries and for specialized State library services must be fully recognized and met. Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill "the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966," which consists of four titles, each of which contributes to the development of sound libraries taken as a whole:

Title I—Public Library Services.

Title II—Public Library Construction.

Title III—Library Cooperation.

Title IV—Specialized State Library Services.

TITLE I—PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES

As shown by a 1965 survey, conducted by the American Association of State Libraries, on the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, the State library agencies—in order to fulfill their responsibilities to the Nation—need urgently a permanent program of Federal assistance for the development of public library service in rural, urban, and suburban areas. This bill provides for a 5-year authorization as a minimum to permit sound planning and proper perspective. It authorizes a gradual specified increase annually of Federal funds for the fiscal years of 1967 through 1971:

[In millions]

	Authorization
Fiscal year 1967	$35
Fiscal year 1968	45
Fiscal year 1969	55
Fiscal year 1970	65
Fiscal year 1971	75

After $25,000 is allotted each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and a basic allotment of $100,000 is made to each State, the remainder is apportioned on the basis of the ratio of a State's total population to the total population of the United States. The Federal share of payments is made on the basis of relative per capita incomes of the States.

TITLE II. PUBLIC LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION

The bill provides a 5-year extension for library construction with authorizations as follows:

	Millions
Fiscal year 1967	$40
Fiscal year 1968	50
Fiscal year 1969	60
Fiscal year 1970	70
Fiscal year 1971	80

After $20,000 each is allotted to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and a basic allotment of $80,000 is made to each State, the remainder is apportioned to the States on the same basis as in title I, and so is the Federal share of payments to the States.

Many of the existing public library buildings are overcrowded, inefficient, and largely inadequate to serve the educational, business, technical, cultural, and other daily needs of an expanding population.

Information received recently from the States shows that $400 million is required just to meet the backlog of needed public library construction.

Expenditures by State library agencies for administration in connection with the construction programs may be taken from the State's allotment for title II.

TITLE III—LIBRARY COOPERATION

This title authorizes grants to State library agencies for 5 years to develop cooperative library services and joint use of facilities involving public libraries, school libraries, higher education libraries, and/or research libraries.

It calls for authorizations to increase as follows, with matching after the first year on the same basis as titles I and II:

	Millions
Fiscal year 1967	$5
Fiscal year 1968	7½
Fiscal year 1969	10
Fiscal year 1970	12½
Fiscal year 1971	15

This new title is essential to insure the maximum effective use of the funds available for the development and improvement of library service. It should insure that the tax dollar go further in the purchase of services and buildings.

TITLE IV—SPECIALIZED STATE LIBRARY SERVICES

A new title IV assists the States in providing greatly needed specialized State library services. The State agency authorized to submit plans is the same State agency as under titles I, II, and III. Title IV is in two parts:

Part A—State institutional library services: This part includes a 5-year authorization to strengthen library services to persons in State institutions (correctional, health, welfare, aged, blind, orphanages, and so forth) but excluding State-operated day schools and institutions of higher education. Funds are authorized for services and equipment but not for construction. The amounts authorized are:

	Millions
Fiscal year 1967	$5
Fiscal year 1968	7½
Fiscal year 1969	10
Fiscal year 1970	12½
Fiscal year 1971	15

Federal aid is needed to strengthen library services to populations in State institutions. Although the authority is implicit in the present LSCA, the States have not generally developed these programs because of the limited funds available; and the priorities have been given to extending public library service to communities. These specialized State institutional library services, which are also public in nature, would be aimed at improving library programs in institutions of correction, health, welfare, and so forth, for the benefit of the handicapped, the aged, the blind, the mentally retarded, and children in orphanages, but excluding State-operated day schools or institutions of higher education.

Funds may be used for services and equipment but not for construction.

Part B—State plans for library services to the physically handicapped: This part includes a 5-year authorization which would enable the State library agency and other public and nonprofit organizations in the State to provide improved library service to the blind and to other physically handicapped persons. Because of the cost of such service, which is considerably higher than that of conventional library service, and because the program heretofore has been limited exclusively to the blind, the States have not been able to provide sufficient funds to give adequate library service even to the blind and have allocated practically nothing for library service to other physically handicapped readers. The amounts authorized are:

	Millions
Fiscal year 1967	$3
Fiscal year 1968	4
Fiscal year 1969	5
Fiscal year 1970	6
Fiscal year 1971	7

This provision would complement the present Library of Congress national books-for-the-blind program and assist in meeting an urgent need of our physically handicapped citizens.

Because of the great import of this legislation and its rapidly approaching expiration, the Select Subcommittee on Education will hold 3 days of hearings on April 19, 20, and 21. I hope that we can report a bill shortly thereafter.

It is hoped that this bill, based on the experience of the original Library Services Act, will constitute a significant landmark in library development in the increased education and culture of all our people.

COVERAGE OF DRUG COSTS UNDER MEDICARE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the voluntary program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged. I am privileged to join our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, in sponsoring this legislation.

On many occasions, I have addressed myself in this House to the often prohibitive cost of prescription drugs, and I want to underline the seriousness of this problem once again.

We moved resolutely last session to enact a broad and necessary health insurance plan. Commendable as that program is, I feel that until the related coverage of medical drugs prescribed by the patient's doctor are included, the plan falls short of its objective. The prohibitive cost of drugs is a major obstacle to a completely realistic medicare program, and the passage of the bill I offer today would help provide economic security against illness. Comfort and cure from acute illness depends not only on the physician and proper hospital or nursing home care, but equally upon access to high-cost medicines.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing this bill in the hope that it will become an integral part of the supplementary benefit program which takes effect July 1, 1966, and I am confident that the gentlemen on the Ways and Means Committe will share the belief that this provision will give our senior citizens protection from a serious insurance gap.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM IS BAD LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, we witnessed today a good example of the disposition of this administration and the Democrat majority in Congress to plunge the American taxpayer into one more extravagant Federal program. The rent supplement program is a time bomb which is ignited by a small $12 million fuse but will be a multibillion-dollar program over the next two decades.

Anyone who thinks it will not expand into $50 to $100 million per year in the very near future is not reading the clearly expressed intent of the bureaucrats.

Its whole theory is totally socialistic. Tax the American people to subsidize the rent of other Americans to live far beyond their means. It will mean a hopeless deadening of interest for many who will be moved into neighborhoods which they must move out of if they go above certain income limitations. Once more we heard the members of the other side cry for the poor but never give a thought to the poor taxpayer. In theory this legislation is wrong. Take this example. A family is entitled to live in public housing at a rental of $60 per month. They now can go out and get an apartment of $175 per month with the Government paying the difference between the amount they would have paid in public housing or $105.

What incentive will there be for this family to stand on its own two feet so it might have to move into an apartment which would cost them $125 per month which would all come out of their earnings? You tell me that this is an incentive to them and I will rank you with those who thought the income tax would never get higher than 5 percent.

This bill is a landmark piece of legislation. It will create a permanent class of boarders who will be putting their feet under the taxpayers' table until the millenium comes. It is a part of the grand scheme of the sociologists to disperse 20 percent of the American families into new neighborhoods with their thrifty neighbors picking up the tab. Do not let anyone who voted for this tell you any different. It is one of the most costly and unfortunate pieces of legislation which I have seen in my 10 years of legislative experience. The first vote today was just a ripple on the waters. Just wait to see what they have in store in the way of expenditure and program. The American people reject this type of foolishness and will hold those who voted for it accountable at the polls.

DEMOCRATS ON POVERTY

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **GOODELL**. Mr. Speaker, you could write a book of criticisms of the war on poverty by quoting Democratic proponents alone, even though they lard their critical statements with lavish praise of scattered results accomplished at extravagant costs. Here are some examples:

> Job Corps dropouts and malcontents are being coddled and complimented for their derogatory behavior (Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana).
>
> New York City has had a disastrous experience thus far in the poverty program (Congressman JAMES SCHEUER, Democrat, of New York City).
>
> We must try to elevate other programs now mired in the swamp of mediocrity, such as Camp Kilmer; Phoenix, Ariz.; Los Angeles and Washington, D.C. (Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL).
>
> There is a riot and a runaway of ineffective programs proliferating all over New York City, but not an effective attack upon the basic problem of poverty (Congressman HUGH CAREY, Democrat, of New York City).
>
> The rural areas * * * are going to get lost in the shuffle, and have already been lost in the shuffle (Congressman CARL PERKINS, Democrat, of Kentucky).
>
> I can certainly say that with respect to Los Angeles, and to title II, the program is in an awful mess, and unless something is done about it, further disorders can be expected (Congressman AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, Democrat, of Los Angeles).
>
> If we have this mayors' veto, then I'm ready to wash this war on poverty right down the drain and forget it (Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, after hearing that 15 mayors had been given an absolute veto over their local community action programs).
>
> The fact is that a lot of bleeding-heart Ph. D.'s and professional poor people have succeeded in superimposing themselves on what are supposed to be action programs and are converting them into grandiose sociological studies and antisocial protest movements (Democratic Congressman HUGH CAREY).
>
> The staff has done a lousy job getting ready for hearings and so a good portion of our staff was fired over the holidays (Congressman WILLIAM FORD, of Michigan, with reference to POWELL's $200,000 investigation of the war on poverty).

The solution is obvious and readily available in the Quie-Goodell opportunity crusade, H.R. 13378.

BYELORUSSIA: A TRIBUTE 48 YEARS LATER

Mr. **VIVIAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HELSTOSKI**. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence. On that date the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born. In spite of all the sacrifices, the young Byelorussian state was unable to preserve its independence against the onslaught of overwhelming Bolshevik forces. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic which was created in its place is nothing but an administrative arm of the Moscow government and does not represent the hopes of the Byelorussian people. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic actually is a new form of subjugation of the Byelorussian nation.

This is why March 25 is being celebrated by Byelorussians throughout the free world as a symbol of their national aspirations. Americans of Byelorussian descent in this country also celebrate the 25th of March as their national independence day, which occurred 48 years ago.

History—

Wrote James A. Froude, the English historian—

> is a voice forever sounding across the centuries, the laws of right and wrong. Opinions alter, manners change, creeds rise and fall, but the moral law is written on the tablets of eternity.

The noble people of Byelorussia have helped write that history, that moral law, which speaks across eternity, just as we in this country have helped, but the history that has been kind to the United States has recorded little but crimes and misfortunes and sadness inflicted on the people of Byelorussia. If history is philosophy by example, what can the histories of America and Byelorussia contribute to the progress of mankind?

In the few moments I have with you today, I should like to explore with you that "moral law written on the tablets of eternity" as it applies to free America and enslaved Byelorussia.

In the course of recorded time, Byelorussia has been a free nation for but a minute, yet it is a minute we must cherish in the hope that it will someday give rise to a long era of freedom. After centuries of enslavement, the Byelorussian people received hope and inspiration with the fall of the Romanovs in 1917, but little could they realize that the power replacing the hated czars of of imperial Russia would impose an oppression more intense than any they had experienced through long centuries.

But they realized little of this, and their lives and their fortunes were focused on the horizon of a better day. After several months of internal struggling, reminiscent of all nations which find themselves on the brink of independence after years of oppression, the Byelorussian people through their National Council—headed by three patriots, Lutskievich, Vatslav, and Lastovski—declared themselves an independent nation on March 25, 1918.

When the Imperial Germany of the kaisers collapsed, Russia, now under control of the Communists, told the war-weary world that the declaration of independence and the national council had just been a horrible prank, and on January 1, 1919, Byelorussia was declared a Soviet state. The Red army moved across the country; and within a month, all of Byelorussia was again under Russian domination. For less than a year the Byelorussian people had breathed the air of freedom.

In the rounds of peace agreements and treaties that followed World War I, and the miscegenation of European boundaries, the U.S.S.R. and Poland divided hapless Byelorussia between them. But in 1939 as war clouds loomed and the Nazi war machine was preparing to sack Europe, the Soviet Army took over all of Byelorussia. In one of those "happenings" the Communists ludicrously refer to as an "election," the Soviets announced to the world that the Byelorussian people themselves, in a "plebiscite," had opted to be part of the Soviet Union. Today, more than 8 million Byelorussians live in a colony of the Kremlin.

History is more than a "register of the crimes and miseries that man has inflicted on his fellowman," as Washington Irving said; it is also the register of hopes, and dreams and aspirations that more fortunate nations hold out to those who have known only oppression. It is that "moral law written on the tablets of eternity" that America holds for all to see. What is there in the American experience that nourishes the souls of those who would seek their own destiny? The American Declaration of Independence.

Our own Declaration of Independence has applicability to all who will listen, for it was not a specific revolutionary document, for a specific people at a specific time in history. Rather it speaks of ideas and ideals about man's relation to his fellow man, and man's relation to his government, for all time, in every place.

The Declaration spoke of political justice and of government based on the consent of the governed. It is the moral law of nations "written on the tablets of eternity," and as such is morally defensible, that these truths are self-evident: "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

Our Declaration of Independence was not primarily written just to declare independence—although it certainly did just that—but more importantly, it was an expression of beliefs as to why independence was declared.

Listen to the words of that mighty document:

> That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

This Declaration of Independence spoke of "opinions of mankind," addressed itself to "all men," mentioned "among men," referred to "mankind," and finally made reference to "any form of government that becomes destructive."

The principles of the American Declaration of Independence have universal appeal. They appeal to the Byelorussian people today just as they appealed to the citizens of 18th century colonial America. The principles give hope. They nourish mankind's oldest and most cherished dreams. We offer this hope to the Byelorussians on the 48th anniversary of their own independence.

Those of us living in free America, sending out our hopes and wishes to the Byelorussian people, know that whenever freedom gains the entire world benefits.

Thank you.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in 1964, at the request of the President, a thorough study of the Federal assistance program to federally impacted areas was conducted. This study revealed, among other things, that: First, Public Law 874 was inequitable in its payments insofar as those school districts that just meet the 3-percent requirement—that is, 3 percent of the school enrollment consists of children whose parents work and/or live at Federal installations—get paid for all the federally connected children in their districts while those that just fail to meet the requirements get no Federal payments; second, financial burdens created by Federal activities vary from district to district.

With the aforementioned in mind, I would like to introduce to this House a bill amending Public Law 874 that will rectify this and will help the Federal Government to more fully meet its responsibility as a normal citizen in a community—that is, it will relieve the burden imposed upon school districts by Federal activities.

This bill first, lowers the requirement that 3 percent of the entire enrollment consist of children whose parents live and/or work at Federal installations to 1 percent so as to meet the burden of those communities that are presently not able to receive compensation for the burden thrust upon them by Federal activities; and second, makes payments on a per pupil cost of education in each particular district, thus allowing for the disparity between districts and meeting the burden imposed on that particular district.

Therefore, in an effort to remove the aforementioned inadequacies, I have submitted this bill and now seek the support of my colleagues so that the shortcomings of Public Law 874 may be rectified and its original intent more fully realized.

HAWAII REMEMBERS AND HONORS PRINCE JONAH KUHIO KALANIANAOLE

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on March 26 the people of Hawaii observed the anniversary of the birth of Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole, Hawaiian chieftain, nobleman, proponent of democratic reform, American patriot, and defender of Hawaiian principles.

Prince Kuhio passed to his reward some 44 years ago, while serving as a Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii. But the passage of time has in no way diminished his reputation and esteem among the Hawaiian people.

Although reared as a member of a royal family, with the probability ever before him that he would some day be king of the Hawaiian Islands, Prince Kuhio was democratic by nature, taking part in all athletic sports and excelling at football and rowing. He was an expert horseman, and there was nothing he enjoyed more keenly than going with the cowboys after wild cattle and horses on the rugged slopes of Mauna Kea, or spearing wild boars from the back of a horse. He was also talented as a marksman, a fisherman, a yachtsman, and a golfer. In fact, he was an all-around sportsman.

The prince attended St. Matthew's College in San Mateo, Calif., and the Royal Agricultural College in England. At the conclusion of his college days he visited Japan, and upon returning home took a position in the Department of the Interior. In the year 1893 a revolution overthrew the Hawaiian monarchy and Prince Kuhio was imprisoned. This was the end of his position as heir-apparent to the throne. Henceforward, he was to be a commoner, like the great mass of his fellow men.

Upon being released from prison Prince Kuhio got married and took an ocean voyage. He considered for a time the prospect of never returning to Hawaii, but abandoned the idea and went home in 1901. Immediately upon his return he threw himself into politics, joining forces with the Home Rule Party, strongly opposed to American rule. In short time, however, disgusted by the bigoted racial views and undemocratic practices of the Home Rule Party, he transferred allegiance to the Republicans.

In the ensuing campaigns the Prince went forth among his people in all the islands and argued, pleaded with them, and persuaded them that the proper course for them to pursue was to accept American annexation, become good and loyal American citizens, and make the Territory of Hawaii an American Territory in the highest sense and a respected and favored part of the American Nation. No other person would have succeeded in this effort as he did. He was a polished orator, beloved by his people, and one of the reasons that so many of the native Hawaiians at that time objected to American rule was because they had wanted him for their future king. He preached the gospel of American citizenship and democracy and taught them the precepts of our form of government. His mission was wholly sucessful. In 1902 he became the Republican candidate for congressional delegate, and in the ensuing election was overwhelmingly elected.

Following this initial victory, Prince Kuhio was never defeated, and proceeded to serve in office for 10 consecutive terms. In every election he was supported by the great majority of the white residents of Hawaii, as well as his own people. And yet, as a pure-blood Hawaiian, he was in fact dedicated to many programs looking solely to the benefit of the Hawaiian population.

Aware of the tendency of his people—those of original Hawaiian blood strains—to congregate in Hawaiian cities, under difficult economic conditions, Prince Kuhio introduced in Congress a bill to modify the public land section of the organic act. The measure was signed by the President in July 1921. Under its provisions Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians were to have the opportunity to leave congested urban areas and settle on the land as homesteaders. It was hoped that the act would bring into existence a class of Hawaiian farmers independent of the whites. In little more than two decades 4,000 Hawaiians were living in the homestead communities.

The act prevented Hawaiian settlers from speculating with their land or disposing of it. Many small residential and subsistence homesteads, moreover, have been set up in the environs of the cities and towns where many of the native Hawaiians are employed.

The passage of this particular legislation was a realization of Prince Kuhio's great ambition in Congress. It was not his sole accomplishment, however. As a patriot, in 1917, he rallied the people of Hawaii to the American cause against the aggressions of the Kaiser.

Prince Kuhio was a prince in every regard—a prince of royal blood, a prince among men of every kind. A person of sterling sincerity and strong convictions—he always stood for what he deemed right, yielding to no weakness and manly in the face of all adversity. He will long be remembered in his native land, for he was truly a remarkable man.

In hailing Prince Kuhio at this particular time, it is altogether proper, I believe, to emphasize his relationship to the success of the campaign for Hawaiian statehood.

He was not, of course, on hand to engage in the final phase of the struggle, and when he was a Delegate in Washington there was no real chance for statehood. The fact remains, however, that success of the statehood campaign sprang from a strength of position—a strength provided by the patriotic response of the Hawaiian people to every American crisis. And of all Hawaiian political leaders, none can be said to have exceeded Prince Kuhio in promoting the loyalty of Hawaii to the cause of American democracy.

Originally dedicated to the interests of his family, his island traditions, and the monarchistic way of life, Prince Kuhio came to recognize the value of democracy, and once converted to it was ready to defend it with everything at his command. In this case, as in all others, he rose above self-interest and mere custom in the name of the general good.

He was, indeed, a prince, in the true meaning of the word.

CONGRESS MUST REVIEW TELEVISION RATINGS SERVICES

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, trying to measure audience reaction to television programing is like looking for a black cat in a dark cellar under the present system of TV program ratings services. And it is clear that the TV industry is an unwilling captive of the present system.

Evaluation of TV programing has absorbed much energy and attention from such distinguished groups as the National Association of Broadcasters, and others. In 1963 and 1964 the television ratings industry was probed by the House Special Subcommittee on Investigations. I was pleased to have served on that subcommittee, an adjunct of the House Commerce Committee, and still do serve on the subcommittee, now under the capable leadership of Chairman Harley Staggers.

In view of recent criticisms of TV programing, the ratings systems, the turnover of programs on national networks, and press reports concerning a former staff investigator who has released additional information regarding ratings, I urge that congressional review of this whole matter be reinstituted.

DISCRIMINATION IN JURY SELECTION

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the last remaining formidable bastion of Negro discrimination in the United States lies in the selection of juries. As the walls of discrimination crumble in American schools and voting booths, the lily-white jury—often serving in areas of large Negro population—still remains to trouble our conscience.

Ironically, jury discrimination prevails in areas which are today relatively free from voter discrimination, such as Texas, Arkansas, and Tennessee. Of course, it is prevalent throughout the Deep South.

Discrimination against prospective jurors is often hard to prove, harder than voting discrimination. The reason for this is there is usually no occasion for specific rejection of a prospective Negro juror, since he has not been selected as a member of the panel in the first place, and no clear-cut case of discrimination can be seen in the courtroom when the actual jurors are finally selected. Since democratic jury selection lies at the heart of our entire judicial structure, it is essential that jury discrimination be ended immediately, and that the fastest and most effective means be found to accomplish this end.

The fair jury selection bill, which I have introduced today, will in my judgment achieve this desirable goal. The Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964 demonstrated conclusively the futility of a piecemeal, county-by-county approach in ending voter discrimination.

My bill is deliberately modeled after the administrative rather than the judicial machinery of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The major differences are that my bill preserves State jury qualifications, and delegates to the Attorney General, as well as the courts, power to release from the requirements of the act those areas which have not discriminated against prospective Negro jurors.

Past litigation has established the difficulties of proving jury discrimination from scanty records. Therefore, title 1 requires State courts to fill out Federal jury forms for the purpose of obtaining "comprehensive specific information concerning the process of jury selection and racial composition of juries in courts bound by this title". This would apply to every State of the old Confederacy. The trigger is thus considerably broader than that of the Voting Rights Act, although the consequences—keeping federally financed records—are much less onerous.

Title II provides for a Federal officer to compile venire lists of persons qualified under State law from comprehensive lists supplied by the Bureau of the Census. Title II applies only to counties over 10 percent Negro population which first, fall below statistical standards of fair jury selection; second, refuse to comply with title 1; third, discriminate according to court findings; or fourth, stop using voting lists as sources of jurors when Negroes were put on the voting lists.

STATEMENT ON CHILD NUTRITION ACT

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, good nutrition is vital to the children and young people of our Nation. It is a steppingstone to alert minds that can learn better and to healthy bodies to keep America strong.

A balanced, nutritious lunch at school has become a way of life for children in a majority of schools—lunches fostered and supported in part by the national school lunch program. School lunches in this country today represent the largest institutional feeding activity of its kind in the world.

The nutrition of children is a major concern of the Congress and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Another step forward is the proposed Child Nutrition Act now being considered by the Congress, which would encourage food service to children in many group situations away from home—especially those children from low-income families. I hope my colleagues will take early and affirmative action on these proposals.

The proposed legislation would authorize:

First. Extension of the national school lunch program in essentially the same form in which it has operated so well over 20 years but with extra emphasis on reaching more schools in areas of economic need and making the lunch program more available to needy children in schools that now have the program.

Second. A special milk program that will concentrate available Federal funds where they are most needed—in reaching children who have no other food service available in school; in reaching children who may have a lunch program available but whose nutritional need is so great that additional servings of milk should be offered. I want it clearly understood that this is separate and apart from the existing special milk program, since, like many of my colleagues, I feel that this program should not be cut back.

Third. A pilot school breakfast program to help schools start or expand a breakfast program in schools that draw heavy attendance from low-income areas and in schools where the children enrolled travel long distances.

Fourth. Initiation of a new pilot nonschool food service program to help fill those gaps that exist particularly during the summer months when most schools are closed and there is no lunch program. This nonschool program would also be available to needy children enrolled in preschool and child-care centers.

Fifth. Grants-in-aid to States to provide food preparation equipment to schools and child-care centers where local resources are inadequate to finance such equipment.

Sixth. Limited amounts of administrative funds to the States to strengthen the child food service staff.

Together, these new authorities, plus the continuation of the long successful regular school lunch program, will make possible the kind of comprehensive child nutrition program which has long been needed. I feel this legislation is vitally important to the youth of our Nation and I am confident that in the years to come this new venture will be hailed as a great landmark of progress in the field of child nutrition.

POWELL'S "BLACK POSITION PAPER"

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 28, 1966]

Powell's "Black Position Paper"

(By David Lawrence)

Racial consciousness has been condemned in recent years as not in keeping with the spirit of the times, but, strangely enough, the concept now has been extolled by a Negro leader—Representative Adam Clayton Powell, of New York, who is chairman of the all-important House Committee on Education and Labor.

He has just issued to a Negro gathering what he calls a "black position paper," with 19 points which he says represents a summation of "my life's philosophy." Here are the points:

"1. We must give our children a sense of pride in being black. The glory of our past and the dignity of our present must lead the way to the power of our future.

"2. We must insist that black organizations be led by black leadership. Italians lead Italian organizations. Irish lead Irish organizations. This kind of honest pluralism is a happy fact of American life.

"3. The black masses must accept the responsibility of financing their own organizations.

"4. The black masses must demand and refuse to accept nothing less than the proportionate share of political jobs and appointments which are equal to their proportion of the population and voting electorate.

"5. Black people must support and push black candidates for political office first—occasionally taking the risk of even electing an 'Uncle Tom.' But after you elect him, unfrock him and replace him.

"6. Black people must seek audacious power.

"7. Black leadership in the North and South must differentiate between and work within the two-pronged thrust of the black revolution: economic self-sufficiency and political power. As chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I control all labor and education legislation. This is legislative power. This is political power. Above all, this is audacious power.

"8. Black masses must produce and contribute to the economy of the country in the proportionate strength of their population.

"9. Black communities in this country—whether it is New York's Harlem, Chicago's South and West Sides, or Philadelphia's North Side—must neither tolerate nor accept outside leadership—black or white.

"10. The black masses should only follow those leaders who can sit at the bargaining table with the white power structure as equals and negotiate for a share of the loaf of bread, not beg for some of its crumbs.

"11. What is left of this black leadership * * * must come back to the Negroes who made them in the first place or be purged by the black masses.

"12. Demonstrations and all continuing protest activity must be nonviolent.

"13. No black persons over 21 must be permitted to participate in a demonstration, walk a picket line or be part of any civil rights or community activity unless he or she is a registered voter.

"14. Black people must continue to defy the laws of man when such laws conflict with the law of God.

"15. Black people must discover a new and creative total involvement with ourselves. We must turn our energies inwardly toward our homes, our churches, our families, our children, our colleges, our neighborhoods, our businesses and our communities * * *. This is no time for cotillions and sips and to run around sipping martinis in the homes of suburban white families when black families are starving in the inner city.

"16. The war on poverty must become that more productive crusade for jobs.

"17. The battle against segregation in America's public school systems must become a national effort, instead of the present regional skirmish that now exists. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act outlaws de jure racial segregation. It has no meaning or application to the hard-core pockets of de facto racial segregation in northern schools which is just as malicious, just as destructive of the human spirit.

"18. We must put pressures on our predominantly black colleges to shift their emphasis from teacher education to nuclear physics and aerodynamics.

"19. Every black man who considers himself an American must become a registered voter."

Mr. Powell further emphasizes racial consciousness when he says:

"Let us take pride in our black skins in this white man's civilization."

Now, it may well be wondered how long any Member of Congress, particularly the chairman of a committee, would survive public criticism if he issued the above 19 points, but substituted the word "white" for "black." He would be castigated from coast to coast as a "racist."

But Powell does have a point when he stresses pride of color. He is not the first to do so. This correspondent recalls a speech made by the late W. E. B. Dubois in 1918 to newspapermen traveling on a ship to the Paris peace conference. The Negro writer decried any feeling of inferiority and stressed in eloquent words the importance of pride of color. He said the real trouble with the white man is that, unfortunately, he is "pale-faced" and doesn't have any color.

INDIAN-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, some of the best news to come out of the visit of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the respected Indian Prime Minister, is the announcement of plans to create a major new foundation in India.

This institution, to be developed presumably along the lines of our Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, will be established with a substantial endowment of Indian rupees owned by the United States and surplus to our needs. These funds have accumulated from sales of agricultural commodities to the Indian Government.

Mr. Speaker, I think the President, the Agency for International Development and the Indian officials responsible should be congratulated for such a constructive plan for the use of these funds.

A foundation such as this, which would be governed, as I understand it, by an independent board of Americans and Indians, could promote effective study and research into many of India's major problems of economic and social development.

Independent of the Government, the Indian foundation will work in educational, agricultural, and scientific areas with considerably greater freedom than can the Government, constantly subject to political and other pressures.

As in the United States, the effectiveness of the Indian foundation will stem from its ability to encourage objective investigation and independent thinking leading to fresh ideas and new methods. It should be flexible in its ability to identify and attack bottlenecks.

I am told that the foundation's programs, while autonomous, would be consistent with Indian Government plans. No doubt the foundation would attack one of India's greatest problems, the need for improvement in agricultural production and an increase in farm productivity.

I would be hopeful that such a program would attack not only the technical problems of agriculture—such as soil improvement, use of fertilizers, and improved seed varieties—but also such economic problems as credit and marketing.

Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a most hopeful step and again I want to congratulate the administration in following through with this constructive use of surplus U.S.-owned rupees.

INTRODUCING A BILL DESIGNED TO PAY OFF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gilligan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to pay off the national debt.

It is a companion bill to S. 2708, introduced in the Senate by the Honorable Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois.

Income from publicly owned lands rich in oil shale would be used to erase the national debt if the bill is enacted.

I wish to make clear at the outset that the bill is not in any way concerned with establishing rules or guidelines for the leasing of the oil shale lands.

It does not seek to affect in any way the 1930 Executive order of President Hoover which put the lands in reserve where they cannot be released to private companies for development.

If the Congress is to act in this controversial area it will not come under provisions of this bill.

For my colleagues interested in the policy aspect of the leasing of these lands, I call to their attention the Februrary 1965, interim report of the oil shale advisory board, and to the hearings before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs dated May 12, 1965.

The bill is tuned to what should be done with the income from oil shale lands when they are leased. It provides that however the lands are disposed of, all money received from sales, bonuses, royalties and rentals shall be paid into a special account of the Treasury.

The Secretary of the Treasury in turn, the bill provides, will use the special account to reduce the public debt.

The public debt by June 30 is expected to be $320 billion based on receipts and expenditures of the current budget.

It is estimated that once these oil shale deposits on public lands are developed, a one-eighth royalty—12½ percent—could amount to more than the $320 billion national debt.

Estimates of the amount of petroleum that can be processed from organic-rich shale on Government land run to 1.1 trillion barrels worth as much as $3 trillion.

This staggering potential wealth to the American public comes primarily from their lands in Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado.

The authoritative Oil and Gas Journal in its March 9, 1964, issue described oil shale as not really being shale but rather marlstone rocks, deposited as bottom sediments in lakes 50 to 75 million years ago.

From this marlstone, oil, kerosene, gasoline, diesel fuel, jet fuel, and fuel gas can be processed. Estimates of the amount of oil shale in the rocks of Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah, according to the Oil & Gas Journal:

> Enough to dwarf every other deposit in the world * * *. This could become the biggest oilfield in the world.

The Journal also points out that experimental stations in Colorado already have produced shale oil products that have fueled autos, trucks, and railroads.

Title controversy clouds ownership of some of the oil-shale lands. But the advisory board noted that the Federal Government still has clear title to about 72 percent of the total oil-shale acreage.

An idea of the extent of this wealth can be found in the Senate Interior Committee hearings.

Senators were told by Interior Department officials that roughly 360 billion barrels of conventional oil have been found in the United States compared with 2 trillion barrels in oil shale.

The hearings also revealed that at this time, production of petroleum from oil shale has not been perfected to the point of being cheap enough to compete with petroleum produced in the conventional manner. However, it was pointed out that the gap has narrowed and continued research is expected to even the competitive odds.

For those of us who are not geologists or oil experts, I think it is of great interest to note that from what is considered a low grade of oil shale, Red China produces 33,000 barrels of oil a day.

The oil shale deposits in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, both federally and privately owned, constitute the world's largest known resource of hydrocarbons, according to John A. Carver, Jr., Under Secretary of the Interior.

Because this bill is aimed at erasing the national debt, I also want to point out that the idea of a national debt frequently is misunderstood by our people.

It is a balancing of receipts and expenditures and does not take into consideration the vast real and personal property assets of the National Government.

Using outdated and therefore very conservative acquisition costs of these properties, an estimate of their value comes to $315.2 billion. It is very obvious that the publicly owned property assets of the Federal Government are far greater than the national debt.

To erase the national debt with these properties would mean selling or leasing them.

The bill I have introduced today seeks only to assure that subsequent income from leases of oil shale lands would be used to pay off public debts.

But a word of caution I think should be added. The Government should move carefully in an effort to receive a fair and just return for the value of its properties, and to assure pollution control of oil shale processing methods.

More research is needed to adequately determine the proper value of these oil shale lands owned by all the people.

The oil shale advisory board agreed on the need of caution in proceeding toward development until the oil shale problems are better understood.

Understanding is the key. It seems that the American public generally is unaware of this vast wealth on their land. A decision on policy questions of how it should be disposed, it seems to me, must wait on a public opinion familiar with these assets.

While I am sure all of us in the Congress are concerned about policy matters involved in the leasing of these valuable lands, I repeat that the bill I am introducing is not concerned with leasing policy, land title, or development questions.

RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation—long needed if the interest of justice to postal workers is ever to be served—which would automatically raise all postal employees in the first four levels to the level immediately above that which they now occupy.

Several of my colleagues on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service have introduced similar bills. We feel that this is the kind of bold and imaginative step that is needed if we are ever going to free the postal workers from the economic straitjacket, that phony comparability has forced upon them.

When the Congress passed the Pay Reform Act of 1962, it was admitted that it didn't really achieve comparability between postal and private industry wages, but, we were assured the difference would be made up in subsequent pay bills.

The exact opposite has happened. The comparative situation of postal workers has become worse, not better. The present proposal of the administration which would give letter carriers and postal clerks an insulting 2.4-percent pay increase to take effect next January 1 would give these employees comparability with the pay that unorganized women officeworkers were getting two and a half years previously.

If this is the best excuse the administration can offer for comparability, then I think you will agree it is high time that we junk the program in its entirety and start afresh on finding a way to grant equity to our postal employees.

I should mention, Mr. Speaker, that we must start doing that if we are going to preserve the postal service in any reasonable kind of shape. From every large metropolitan area in the country we hear of great difficulties in getting desirable and qualified young people to apply for post office work as a permanent career. The pay does not interest them.

And this is hardly surprising. To quote one example out of many: The city of Oakland, Calif., recently ran advertisements desperately seeking men to apply for the job of streetsweeper—at a starting wage of $490 a month. That works out at $5,880 a year—entrance wage. A letter carrier or a postal clerk, Mr. Speaker, would have to spend 2 years—on the average—as a substitute and then 6 years as a regular—or a total of 8 years—before he could earn as much money as the city of Oakland is giving its streetsweepers as a starting wage.

Is there any wonder that recruiting is a little difficult at the Oakland post office?

Policemen and firemen, in days past, were traditionally bracketed with letter carriers and clerks as far as wage levels are concerned. That day is gone forever. Policemen and firemen have moved with the economic time; letter carriers and postal clerks have been roughly held back. Today the wages of policemen and firemen average more than 25 percent higher than do those of level 4 postal employees.

It is a remarkable thing in my opinion that the postal service in this country is as good as it is. We are getting a whole lot better service than we are paying for.

This speaks very well indeed for the dedication of the people who work in the post offices of the Nation. But, how long have we the right to expect this dedicated self-sacrifice to continue? How long can we expect postal workers to continue to perform their difficult, exacting tasks when easier jobs in private industry paying far better salaries can be had almost for the asking? How long can we expect postal workers to make financial sacrifices not demanded of any other civilian workers in the United States?

As long as phony comparability is used as a club to beat down the wages of postal employees in level 4 and below, there is no hope whatsoever of achieving economic justice for the rank-and-file postal worker. The only way to achieve economic justice is to raise their entire level—and then we can start building a praiseworthy and equitable wage structure that will indeed compensate these people decently and fairly.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that the legislation which my colleagues and I have introduced is worthy of the serious attention of every Member of this body. I sincerely believe it will correct serious inequities existing in the present pay structure of postal employees and it will prevent major inequities from burdening it in the future.

REMOVE THE 7-PERCENT INVESTMENT CREDIT

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall shortly introduce a bill to amend the income tax laws to remove the 7-percent credit enacted in 1962 as an incentive for corporations to invest in new buildings and machinery. This bill should be passed at the earliest possible time as a check against inflation.

I opposed the measure when it was passed. It is doubtful that it was ever needed, but it is certain that at the present time it feeds inflation.

The original purpose of the investment credit when proposed by the Kennedy administration was to stimulate employment. Such a device is no longer needed in the face of a manpower shortage.

The removal of the 7-percent investment credit would not only stem the inflationary tide. It would also provide needed revenues to the Government, and remove an unfair tax windfall which has been enjoyed by corporations at the expense of individual taxpayers.

IMMIGRATION CHANGE CERTIFICATION PROCEDURE

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have long been a proponent of a fair, reasonable, and liberal immigration policy. I have supported every measure to reform our immigration policy. In August of 1965, when the first general revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act was debated on the floor of the Congress, I welcomed this legislative approach directed to the repeal of the discriminatory national origins system. I joined with my colleagues in support of the provisions in that legislation which were designed to protect the American workingman, his job, and his scale of living. I still stand steadfastly behind the theory of this purpose.

However, my attention, and the attention of many of my colleagues has been directed to the difficulties that have arisen from the new labor provisions. I specifically refer to section 10 of Public Law 89–236 which amended section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Prior to December 1, 1965, the Immigration and Nationality Act provided in section 212(a)(14) that, first, aliens were subject to exclusion only when the Secretary of Labor certified that either there were sufficient workers in the United States, able, willing, and qualified, at the alien's destination, to perform the skilled or unskilled labor to be undertaken by the alien or that, second, the employment of the alien would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed. Section 212(a)(14) at that time placed the burden of proceeding on the Government—the Labor Department—to certify that admission of the alien would not be economically feasible. Now, by virtue of Public Law 89–236, the procedure is substantially changed and the burden of proceeding is placed upon the shoulders of the alien seeking to enter our shores. Thus, the intending immigrant must obtain clearance from the Secretary of Labor prior to the issuance of a visa, a clearance which certifies that there are not sufficient workers in the United States at the alien's destination who are able, willing, and qualified to perform the skilled or unskilled labor and, additionally, that the employment of the alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the U.S. citizens similarly employed.

Under the best planned regulations and well-considered procedures this requirement is at best circuitous, cumbersome, and complex. An unfair burden is placed on the intending immigrant.

The success of any legislation depends upon reasonable administration. I do not wish to cast stones at any one segment of our Government. Nevertheless, the misguided and stringent enforcement of section 212(a)(14), as amended, has, in effect, resulted in what is referred to as the "alien exclusion act of 1965." The complaints that have come to my attention have come from not only families of intending immigrants, but from prospective employers, labor representatives, volunteer agencies, and interested citizens. True, the intent of the provision was to give unemployed American workers first chance at available jobs; however, this intent has been seized upon by the Department of Labor and has been redirected so that the required labor certification has given the Secretary of Labor an extension to the job placement service. When cases come to my attention where the Department of Labor has directed employers to fire or discharge aliens—aliens whom they have sought and have enticed into their employment, so that the Department of Labor could place an American in that job—I feel that our immigration policy has been relegated to a job-finding apparatus.

I do not take the floor today merely to criticize existing legislation. I do take this opportunity to stress the reason why I join with other Members of this body in sponsoring legislation to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act—to remove the awkward requirement placed upon the alien and to reinstate that provision of the law as it existed prior to December 1, 1965.

A thorough study and review of that section of the law, before amendment, has fully satisfied me that it was sufficient, and its sufficiency has been demonstrated on numerous occasions, to protect our workers and our wage standards and our working conditions from unfair alien competition. In fact, as late as December 1, 1965, the day the new immigration legislation became effective, the Secretary of Labor actually signed a certification that the admission of certain workers would displace U.S. citizens and adversely affect working conditions.

As one reviews the labor certifications over the years, it is noted that on relatively few occasions has it been necessary for the Secretary to certify various occupations under the excludable category.

Therefore, I submit that the relatively few certifications found necessary to be presented by the Secretary of Labor prior to December 1, 1965, establish without question that the stringent labor requirements established by Public Law 89–236 are without justification. These provisions have resulted in a mockery of our new, rational immigration policy. The Congress has made great strides in eliminating discrimination, both domestically and in our immigration policy. Our steps forward, unfortunately, are overshadowed and darkened by a procedure which is actually anti-immigration but disguised as a protective measure for the workingman.

I respectfully submit that labor, the economy, and working standards can and will be adequately protected if this harassing labor certification is repealed. The removal of this administrative monstrosity will permit our new sound immigration policy to be praised, not criticized.

AGE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AIRLINE STEWARDESSES

Mr. VIVIAN Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last year the Select Subcommittee on Labor, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland], held hearings on employment problems of the older worker, in the course of which we were led to examine one of the most flagrant cases of age discrimination to be found anywhere in the labor market. I refer to policies followed by several major American airlines under which a stewardess is considered to be to old after she reaches the age of 32.

In the course of those hearings, several Government agencies were asked if they felt that this policy violated the terms of Executive Order No. 11141, which states:

> It is the policy of the executive branch of the Government that (1) contractors and subcontractors engaged in the performance of Federal contracts shall not, in connection with the employment, advancement, or discharge of employees, or in connection with the terms, conditions or privileges of their employment, discriminate against persons because of their age except upon the basis of a bona fide occupational qualification, retirement plan, or statutory requirement.

I was delighted last February to be advised by the Department of the Air Force that the Labor Department had found these airline practices contrary to that enunciated policy. Now, J. Edward Conway, of the New York State Commission for Human Rights, has also delivered a formal opinion to the effect that these maximum age restrictions, as applied to airline stewardesses, are not based on a "bona fide occupational qualification." I look forward with confidence, Mr. Speaker, to affirmative action by the various agencies of the executive branch which have contracts with the offending airlines to see to it that the terms of Executive Order No. 11141 are observed.

I include Mr. Conway's opinion in full at the conclusion of these remarks:

Report of Findings After Investigation in the Matter of Airlines Industry, Maximum Age Requirements for Stewardesses

On December 17, 1964, the Commission authorized an informal investigation on a statewide basis into the age ceilings for employment of airline stewardesses. I was designated by the Chairman of the Commission as the investigating commissioner with respect thereto.

The plan of the investigation has been, generally, to determine the policy and practice in this area of age ceilings for stewardesses on an industrywide and statewide basis by affording to the airlines, individually and collectively, and to the stewardesses, individually and collectively, opportunities to present facts and arguments in support of their positions; and, finally, to report as to whether granting of an industrywide bona fide occupational qualification is warranted under the New York State law against discrimination.

This report is confined to age ceilings for continued employment as stewardess; a separate report will be made as to age ceilings for initial hire of stewardesses.

While the Commission has before it individual verified complaints by stewardesses and applicants for stewardess positions charging specific airlines with discrimination based on age, the merits of these complaint cases are not the subject of this inquiry; they will be dealt with separately, upon the facts and the law pertaining to each complaint.

This investigation, as conducted by me with the assistance of the Commission's Employment Division, consisted of three main phases:

Phase 1: A field investigation, conducted during the first half of 1965, which included interviews by Commission staff with key personnel representatives of three airline companies (American Airlines, Trans World Airlines, and United Airlines) and with officers of the two major stewardess unions (Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association, Local 550, Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, and Air Line Pilots Association, Steward and Stewardess Division, AFL–CIO).

Phase 2: A mail questionnaire, sent in July 1965 to the presidents of the 17 other airline companies flying into the State of New York, to which all but 1 responded.

Phase 3: An informational hearing, held on December 7, 1965, at the Commission's offices at 270 Broadway, New York City, to which were invited each of the 20 airlines flying into the State of New York, the Air Transport Association, and the 2 major stewardess unions.

At the informational hearing, representatives of the two unions testified orally, submitted written evidence, and responded to the Commission's questions—all relating to the issues raised by the specification of age ceilings.

Each union appeared by counsel: Herbert A. Levy, Esq. (of Cohen & Weiss of New York City), on behalf of the Air Line Pilots Association, Steward and Stewardess Division, AFL–CIO; and Asher W. Schwartz, Esq. (of O'Donnell & Schwartz of New York City), on behalf of the Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association, Local 550, Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO. The union representatives testifying included the following: Colleen Boland, president, Air Lines Stewards and Stewardesses Association, Local 550; Francis A. O'Connell, legislative director, Transport Workers Union; Deloros Kidder, vice president, Air Line Pilots Association, Steward and Stewardess Division; and Marjorie Cooper, regional vice president, Air Line Pilots Association, Steward and Stewardess Division.

None of the airlines accepted the invitation to present testimony or argument on the merits through their own executive or staff personnel. Jesse Freidin, Esq. (of Poletti, Freidin, Prashker, Feldman & Gartner, of New York City) noted his appearance on behalf of 13 airlines and the personnel relations conference of the Air Transport Association.

Counsel for the airlines challenged the Commission's jurisdiction on various grounds; his request for an adjournment to December 15, 1965, in order to afford the airlines a further opportunity to decide whether to appear and submit evidence or argument on the merits, was granted. On December 10, Mr. Freidin informed me that he would not avail himself of the opportunity to appear before the Commission on December 15, but would instead seek to challenge the Commission's jurisdiction in court, and he requested a reasonable period of time within which to prepare to do so, which was granted. It is noted that on December 7 Mr. Freidin, stating he had full authority to speak for the airlines in this regard, rejected my suggestion that the airlines which fly into the State of New York and have a maximum age policy for airline stewardesses refrain from dismissing any person from the position of stewardess on the basis of age pending the resolution of this problem.

To date, no action in court has been taken by Mr. Freidin, and it is my opinion that no further extension of time is warranted. Accordingly, and based on the facts and arguments before me, I am herewith issuing my report and recommendations.

The three phases of the investigation combined to yield the following background information and basic facts relating to the use of age ceilings by the airlines for continued employment of stewardesses:

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(a) On the airlines, the job titles of "stewardess" and "hostess" are interchangeable; those of "flight service attendant" and "cabin attendant" cover both stewards and stewardesses; those of "purser" and "senior flight attendant" cover both males and females in a higher classification.

(b) The 38 U.S. airline companies currently employ some 15,000 stewardesses, and this number is expected to increase during the next few years. There is a high turnover rate in the stewardess classification; the average length of service is about 2 years; each year over 5,000 new stewardesses are hired from an estimated 100,000 applicants. Despite this high turnover rate, there are currently in active flight service several hundred stewardesses who have been flying between 10 and 30 years and whose ages range between 30 to over 50 years.

(c) Of the 38 U.S. airlines, 20 fly into the State of New York and 9 of these have stewardess bases in the State of New York. Stewardesses based in New York State start and end their flight duties at airports within the State (for example, at John F. Kennedy International and La Guardia airports).

(d) Pursuant to regulations of the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA), airline stewardesses are required to pass, at least annually, various examinations relating to their continued ability to perform their duties in flight service; these include examinations for emergency evacuation procedures, familiarity with the airplanes in service, and personal health.

2. AGE CEILING FOR CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT AS STEWARDESS

(a) The first airline stewardess was hired in 1935. Until the 1950's, no airline had set an age ceiling for continued employment as stewardess. A few airlines introduced such an age ceiling in the 1950's—setting it at age 32 or 35; others introduced it as recently as 1964.

With but few exceptions, the policy has been instituted unilaterally by the company and not as part of its contract with the union. With but two exceptions, the policy when instituted was not made retroactive, those employed prior thereto being permitted to continue flying until the employer's mandatory retirement age (generally 60 or 65).

The first application of a special maximum age ceiling (age 32) to produce discharge of a stewardess occurred in 1963; since then, others have been discharged or removed from flight duty because they reached the special maximum age ceiling (age 32 or 35) for continued employment as stewardess.

(b) The setting of an age ceiling for continued employment as stewardess is not a general industry practice. Of the 38 airlines in the United States, 24 do not have this policy.

Pan American World Airways, the major U.S. international airline, does not have this policy. Of the group of domestic airlines frequently referred to as the "Big Four"—namely, American Airlines, Eastern Airlines, Trans World Airlines, and United Airlines—only two (American Airlines and Trans World Airlines) had this policy at the time of the informational hearing. (The Commission is more recently in receipt of information that United Airlines is now seeking to establish an age ceiling for continued employment of its new stewardesses.)

In 1963–64, Airlift International and Central Airlines, both of which had had such an age policy, discontinued it.

Available information on foreign airlines is that on seven of them the age ceiling generally fall in the forties and fifties, up to a maximum age of 67 in Norway.

(c) No similar age ceiling for continued employment for stewards exists of any airline. According to the information on hand, the job duties of stewards and stewardesses are the same.

SUMMARY

1. None of the evidence on hand gives warrant for the establishment of an industrywide policy setting a special arbitrary chronological age for continued employment of airline stewardesses—whether age 32 or 35, or any age below that of the standard mandatory retirement age for company employees.

2. The evidence on hand does support the opposite position; namely, that termination as an airline stewardess prior to the employer's standard mandatory retirement age should be predicated solely on the individual stewardess' continued ability to perform the duties of the position at the level of performance required by each airline company for its stewardesses.

3. On the basis of the evidence before me as Investigating Commissioner, I do not find that, under the New York State law against discrimination, there is support for a claim that a bona fide occupational qualification based on age for continued employment properly applies to the airline stewardess position on an industrywide basis.

J. EDWARD CONWAY,
Investigating Commissioner.

MARCH 23, 1966.

AN IMPORTANT ANNIVERSARY

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the New Jersey State Department of Agriculture. On March 29, 1916, the act reorganizing the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture and the New Jersey State Agricultural Convention and establishing the New Jersey State Department of Agriculture was enacted in Trenton.

For the past half-century, the New Jersey system of agricultural government has served the Garden State's farming population through programs promoting health of livestock and poultry, control of harmful insects, increased yields of farm products, modern marketing, and better quality foods, the benefits of which have been shared by consumers.

I feel the golden anniversary of the New Jersey State Department of Agriculture merits recognition by our State in which farmer and city man are close neighbors, enjoying the products of each other's industry.

As proof of these sentiments, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note that earlier this month the State department of agriculture estimated that the realized net income per farm family in the Garden State had reached $6,873, an increase of 24 percent from the previous year. On a per-farm basis, New Jersey's showing in 1965 was a ranking of fifth in the Nation in gross income per farm and seventh in the Nation in net income per farm.

It is obvious that the New Jersey State Department of Agriculture, under the guidance of State Secretary of Agriculture Phillip Alampi, continues to improve the lot of our farmers and the quality of the products our State grows, thus benefiting not only our farm population, but the consumers of the Nation as well.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add my congratulations to those being received in Trenton today and am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to this important anniversary.

INDO-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Indo-American Foundation can provide new impetus in solving the most serious problem facing the people of India today—adequate food for a growing population.

The United States demonstrated its compassion for friendly nations abroad when the Congress enacted Public Law 480 more than a decade ago. Over the years, we have broadened the scope of this legislation to provide more emphasis on economic development programs. Now we have another opportunity, using currency accumulated from sales of U.S. agricultural products to India for rupees, to support the establishment of a binational foundation which can make a further contribution to those same goals.

Our support is particularly critical at this time. We are currently engaged in a massive effort to alleviate hunger in India. But we all know that the United States cannot produce enough food to fill the widening gap between food production and population growth in that nation. Therefore, we must use every resource at our command to help India meet its problems of food and people.

This new Indo-American Foundation can make a major contribution. Operating essentially as an independent body, the Foundation will be free to make grants for farmer education, agricultural research, population studies, and a host of other related educational and scientific projects. These projects, initiated by a select group of outstanding Indian and American men and women of science, agriculture, industry, and the professions, can add a new dimension to current efforts to improve agricultural productivity in India. Let us give our strong support to this new practical tool for helping India to improve itself.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE TRANSYLVANIA QUESTION

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Transylvania forms the eastern part of the Danubian Basin, a land surrounded everywhere, except in the northwest—by the Carpathian Mountains in the east and south and the Bihar-Bihor Mountains in the west. Transylvania, a country of scenic beauty resembling Switzerland, is rich in mineral resources, including coal, iron, alloy metals, natural gas, and hydroelectric power, and its economy is well suited to the development of chemical and steel industries. As a matter of fact, the Communist Rumanian Government built its industrialization plan around the Transylvania resources as the pivot.

Hungarians have lived in Transylvania at least since the end of the ninth century. Historical research showed about 70 percent of the river and place names to be of Hungarian etymological origin, and only about 5 percent of the same names have Rumanian origin. In the 13th century, as Transylvania remained an exposed outpost of the kingdom, the Hungarian kings settled Germans from the Rheinland region, called in Transylvania, Saxons. It is about this time when Rumanians started to infiltrate through the Carpathian Mountains from south and east as shepherds, using the unoccupied mountain pastures with their sheep flocks. However, except in two countries, Rumanian mass immigration began only in the 16th and 17th centuries when Rumanians from the Danubian principalities of Moldavia and Valachia fled into Transylvania in the wake of Turkish raids, incessant civil wars, and cruel taxation by their Fanariot princes. The high altitudes and dense forests of the Carpathians provided a secure refuge for them, and the westernized state system offered a more humane and civilized life.

Transylvania, however, failed to escape the Turkish wars either. Though never a Turkish province like the Danubian principalities and central Hungary, Turkish raids in the 17th century and wars with the Habsburgs decimated its Hungarian population living in the valleys and on the central plateau. The mountaineer Rumanians herding their sheep suffered considerably less from marauding soldateska.

Despite the heavy blood losses, the 16th and 17th centuries were the golden age of Transylvanian culture and political power. An independent principality, only loosely connected with the Hungarian Kingdom ruled by the Habsburgs, Transylvania was ruled by the three political nations, Hungarians, Szekler—old Hungarian frontiersmen, and the German Saxons. Rumanians were in the 15th and 16th centuries still in such a minority that when the nobility made the pact in 1437 they were not recognized as a nation.

One of the first princes of Transylvania, Stephen Bathori, became also King of Poland for more than a decade and under Gabriel Bethlen and George Rakoczi I, Transylvania was internationally recognized as a belligerent on the French side in the Thirty Years' War. Several hundred Transylvanian students were also studying at Western universities, and German, Italian, and even French teachers were teaching at Transylvanian colleges.

With the reconquest of central Hungary by the Habsburgs, helped by Hungarians and soldiers from many Western nations in a last crusade, Transylvania could no longer continue as an independent principalitiy as it had always been regarded at home and abroad as a part of the Hungarian Kingdom.

Between 1691 and 1867, except for 1848-49, Transylvania was administered by the Habsburgs as a grand duchy belonging to the Hungarian Crown. The governor was usually a Hungarian nobleman from Transylvania, but there existed a separate Transylvanian chancery in Vienna, usually headed by a Hungarian chancellor from Transylvania and staffed in the majority by Saxons from Transylvania and Austrians. The Habsburg rule promoted the Saxons and even the Rumanians, but not the Hungarian majority which had to fight in order to continue its role in the Diet and the local administration.

The major accomplishment of the period was the education of the Rumanians and the subsequent awakening of national consciousness among them and the Hungarians and Saxons as well.

The Hungarian princes of the Reformation period had already translated the Bible into Rumanian and tried to convert the Greek Orthodox Rumanians to Protestantism. They failed to achieve much success. The Roman Catholic Church was temporarily more successful after 1701 when the majority of the Orthodox clergy accepted the supremacy of the Pope in exchange for keeping their own Greek-Rumanian rites. In the Union of Gyulafehérvár—Alba Julia—the Rumanian clergy became Uniate and soon its seminaries, especially the one at Balázsfalva—Blaj—were to become the cradles of Rumanian national consciousness. It was there that the idea of Daco-Roman origins of the Transylvanian Rumanians was conceived on the basis of Hungarian Renaissance historians who tried to show as many ties between the Latins and the Hungarian King, Mathias Hunyadi—Corvinus as possible. By 1848 national consciousness was well developed among all nationalities in Transylvania. The Magyars—Hungarians—wanted the abolition of the separate Habsburg administration of Transylvania and favored a political union with Hungary proper that would have its liberal constitution and freely elected, responsible government. They also wanted to abolish serfdom for all nationalities alike. The German Saxons favored the continuance of the status quo that enabled them to influence Transylvanian affairs to an extent incommensurate with their number.

The Rumanians were by now well provided with nationalistic leaders, including the Greek Orthodox Archbishop Andreas Saguna and the half insane, cruel guerrilla leaders around Avram Iancu. When in September 1848, the Vienna court decided to revoke the laws of April 1848, resulting in the political union with Transylvania and the liberal political reforms, it promised autonomy to the Transylvanian Rumanians in order to gain their military alliance against Louis Kossuth's Hungarians. Subsequently, the southern Transylvanian Rumanians rose under Iancu against the Hungarians, committing grave attrocities and massacres among the Hungarian population, only to be chased by Kossuth's armies into the mountains a few months later.

In 1849, just before the combined Austrian-Russian invasion which ended the Kossuth regime, Rumanians and Hungarians seemed to have come to an agreement on the nationality question but, of course, this remained dead paper because of the collapse of Kossuth's Hungary.

During the coming 17 years Hungarians and Rumanians alike were suppressed by the absolutist Habsburg regime. Thus by 1867, despite the realization of the political union between Transylvania and Hungary proper, the Rumanians were willing to accept the situation, especially after the passing of the very liberal nationality law of the Hungarian Government in 1868.

Much has been written about the postcompromise period of Transylvania both by Hungarians and Rumanians. Eliminating the obvious propaganda on both sides, it must be said, with J. Cabot Moore's "The Racial Conflict in Transylvania," that the 50 years were years of development, culture, and progress. Even industrialization was begun and the cultural accomplishments in literature, architecture, sculpture, and theater were impressive. Politically, however, especially the last 15 years before the First World War, were years of increasingly acute nationality conflict. Rumanian deputies in the Hungarian Parliament fought almost all the administrative and educational measures of the Government as Magyarizing and anti-Rumanian and the Liga Culturalea of Rumania sent money and agitators into Transylvania where the new Rumanian savings banks succeeded in buying up more and more land. At the same time, there were administrative abuses against the Rumanians on the Hungarian side, and both sides became bitter toward each other. Yet, it must be said that the expansion of public and parochial schools enabled Rumanians to educate their children in their mother tongue—there were high schools and 2,800 grade schools where Rumanian was the language of the instruction in 1914 in Transylvania.

The number of Rumanian Deputies in the Budapest Parliament, though lower than proportional representation would have accorded it, was considerably higher than, later on, the number of Hungarian Deputies in the Rumanian Parliament after 1920. The Hungarians scolded the Rumanian politicians both for their preference to Vienna—A. Popovici in 1912 was the author of the most detailed book on how to reorganize the monarchy on ethnic basis—and for their suspected irredentist motivation and connections with the Rumanian Kingdom. The Rumanians, in turn, complained about highhanded Hungarian administration, and the failure to receive autonomy in the Rumanian areas.

The outcome of the First World War drastically changed the fate of Transylvania. First, Rumania, a German ally, changed sides in 1916 and attacked Austria-Hungary. In return for such a switch, the Allied Powers promised Transylvania and other parts of the Hungarian Kingdom to Rumania. Yet, Rumania was defeated by the German and Austro-Hungarian armies and had to sign a peace treaty in May 1918, at Bucharest, which restored the prevailing frontiers. On November 7, 1918, several days after the armistice of Austria-Hungary with the Allies, Rumania again declared war on the nonexisting state, and proceeded to occupy Transylvania. Resisted only by one volunteer division of Szeklers and Hungarians, Rumanian advance remained still very slow, and only in March 1919 could they occupy Transylvania after the Allied High Command forced the Hungarians to withdraw.

On December 1, 1918, the Rumanians of Transylvania, after some bitter debate, voted for the incorporation of Transylvania into the Rumanian Kingdom, a step which was not followed by the Hungarians, and accepted by the Saxons only after personal guarantees of the Rumanian leaders that the peace conference already assigned Transylvania to Rumania.

In the peace treaty of 1920, Rumania was given substantially the same area as promised to her in 1916. Minority protection clauses were included into the treaty. They were never kept fully but at least prevented an even more intense persecution of the Hungarians. About 150,000 Hungarians were forced to leave and the rest became second-class citizens.

Yet the Transylvanian Rumanians also had a sorry lot as their brethren from the Rumanian Kingdom took over. Some of the leaders, Vajda-Voevod, Maniu, Goga were the bitterest critics of the new regime though certainly they were not friendly toward the Hungarians. Corruption, political and financial, flourished encouraging extremist movements on the right—Iron Guard—and aggravating the situation of the Hungarian minority, still numbering 1.6 million. The land reform hit the Hungarians as Rumanian estates were usually excluded under false pretexts, the language requirements were made too severe so that civil servants of Hungarian descent, even in the railroad and post offices, were always in the danger of being fired, as they often were. Hungarian students were seldom allowed to pass the Rumanian university and high school exams, administrative abuses were numerous, and schools were closed right and left.

By 1936 many a volume of the League of Nations was full with the complaints and proceedings of the Hungarian minority in Transylvania. It is interesting to note that though Rumania was a French ally, the League of Nations ordered at least partial relief in 40 percent of the cases of complaints.

By 1940 the situation changed internationally, Rumania abandoned the Anglo-French guarantee in the wake of France's surrender to Hitler's armies and Hungary pressed for a revision of the frontiers. The Soviet Union, under the secret protocol of the German-Russian Treaty of August 23, 1929, that led to the partition of Poland as well, demanded Bessarabia back from Rumania in June 1940. Rumania had no choice but to yield to the Soviet demand. Hungary's turn was next, but the subsequent negotiations led into a dead end street. War seemed to be imminent between the two countries, and Germany and Italy did not want any war while they were concentrating their activities against England and stepped in at Rumanian request. The result was the second Vienna award of August 30, 1940.

The decision restored about 40 percent of Transylvania to Hungary, including most of the Hungarian-inhabited areas and some Rumanian areas as well, as there could not be a clear-cut ethnic division of the province. Yet the solution was not regarded by anyone as final. The Germans used it as a bait both to the Rumanians whom they promised restoration of northern Transylvania if they act as loyal allies, and to the Hungarians whom they promised southern Transylvania as well if they follow the Fuehrer to "final victory." The British and Soviet Governments, in turn, promised the northern part of the province to that state which leaves the Axis Powers first.

As Rumania was the more easternmost German ally, she changed sides first on August 23, 1945, and the armistice provided for Rumanian administration of northern Transylvania. Yet, the atrocities of the returning Rumanian armies and guerrilla bands were such that the Red army itself expelled the Rumanian administration from the region and established a Russian military government. Only after the Yalta Conference, when upon Molotov's pressure the Rumanian king appointed a pro-Communist government, was the region returned to Rumanian administration, a decision confirmed by the Paris Peace Conference of 1947. It is interesting to note that the State Department was in favor of returning some of northern Transylvania to Hungary in 1946 and it was only the Soviet veto at Paris which prevented the United States to provide for such a frontier revision. The reason for the Soviet veto was that Rumania was already in the Soviet orbit, while Hungary was still holding out, to be absorbed later.

At this time started the severe persecution of the Hungarians in Transylvania. First, thousands of Hungarians have been arrested, mostly former soldiers, politicians and government employees, with the pretext that they have supported the Germans during the war. Most of them have been sent to forced labor camps without any previous investigation, mostly to camps located in the marshy regions of the lower part of the Danube; others have been sentenced by the people's courts to 5 to 20 years of imprisonment and some of the victims have been mercilessly executed.

The land reform, which has been carried out after the First World War in the early twenties has been reassumed, the greater part of the remaining Hungarian properties have been completely confiscated, and some of the properties have been reduced to a maximum 100 acres.

During the spring of 1949, on a certain day, all the landowners have been detained and deported with all their family members to designated cities. This regulation involved all landowners, without any difference if they still owned some land or not, and included the Rumanian landowners as well. Thus, this entire class lost all its property, forced to leave behind all their belongings and allowed to take along only the amount of 10 to 20 kilograms of their personal belongings. In the cities they had to move to designated dwellings, which consisted for a family of one room in the worst tenements, basement, or very often in an empty stable. The interned people were not allowed to leave the city and had to report regularly to the police department. This regulation has only been lifted in 1963.

The Hungarian schools have been closed down gradually by reducing first the classes given in Hungarian and then the number of Hungarian schools themselves. The University of Kolozsvár—Cluj—has been first permitted to function, but the buildings had been taken over by the Rumanian University and the Hungarian University had to move to a former high school building and to other buildings. The medical department of the university has been transferred to Marosvásárhely—Turgu Mures. Later both universities—Rumanian and Hungarian—have been merged by the establishment of parallel classes, and soon the number of Hungarian classes and their teachers have been gradually replaced by Rumanian classes and teachers, so that by now only Hungarian language and Hungarian literature is taught in Hungarian.

The Communist system is always opposing the religious life and this was a good excuse to oppress the Hungarian churches in Rumania. The Hungarian clergymen have been arrested in great number, accused of being enemies of the system. Among the first ones was Aron Márton, Catholic bishop of Gyulafehérvár—Alba Julia—who was regarded by all Transylvanian Catholics as their leader and who was also greatly admired by the Transylvanian Protestants, Aron Márton was imprisoned for many years since a few years he lives in Gyulafehérvár—Alba Julia—under modified house arrest. The youth are educated in an antireligious manner by the schools. The state employees—in the Communist regime everybody is employed by the state, indifferently, if they are workmen or white collar workers—are forced by their supervisors to avoid church services, thus the churches are only visited by elderly people.

By the nationalization of the stores and industries, these have also been taken away from their Hungarian owners. The same happened with the land owned by the Hungarian peasant who had to join the collective farms. Thus every property in Transylvania came under Rumanian Communist leadership and jurisdiction.

All this happened before 1956. The Hungarian revolution of 1956 was only an excellent excuse for the Rumanian Communist government to continue with even greater energy and without any restrictions or repression of the Hungarians in Transylvania, thus hoping to force them into complete assimilation.

The procedures and measures of the Rumanian Government since 1956 may be subdivided into the following categories:

Forced transfer of the intellectual and professional elite among the Hungarian minority;

Abolition of the Hungarian schools and severe abridgment of any Hungarian language instruction in educational institutions;

Rumanization of the of the cities and Hungarian areas by the use of administrative power;

Continuous erosion of surviving local administrations; and

Economic discrimination against members of the Hungarian minority.

In addition, the Government also violates basic human rights of all its citizens but particularly those of Transylvanian Hungarians in regard to freedom of speech and assembly; freedom of political association; freedom of worship; freedom of choice of employment and domicile.

FORCED TRANSFER OF THE INTELLECTUAL AND PROFESSIONAL ELITE AMONG THE HUNGARIAN MINORITY

University graduates in most professions have to sign a previous contract in the Government to work the first 3 years after graduation at a place assigned by the Government. We know of hundreds of individually documented cases when university graduates in the medical, engineering, law, and teaching professions were brought to work in areas outside of Transylvania or into those rural areas which are overwhelmingly Rumanian.

By accepting such positions they lose their housing license in the city of their origin and may return to it only with the permssion of the State authorities in their profession and in the city department of housing. Furthermore, better grade jobs for Transylvanians are advertised by State employment offices only for areas outside of Transylvania.

By assignment, deprivation of the right of domicile, and forced transfers within state enterprises, the Rumanian Government already succeeded in detaching several thousand of the ever decreasing number of Hungarian professionals and intellectuals from the Hungarian community in Transylvania. That this is not due to arbitrary action of low grade officials is shown by the fact that in the categories of technicians, skilled workers, and lower grade civil servants, there is an abundance of vacancies listed in the state employment offices of Muntenia, Moldavia, and Dobrudja, while none of these jobs are advertised in the state employment office of the Mures-Magyar autonomous province or of Transylvanian cities with Hungarian majority.

ABOLITION OF THE HUNGARIAN SCHOOLS AND SEVERE ABRIDGMENT OF ANY HUNGARIAN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Between 1957 and 1963, all the 1,700 Hungarian schools in Transylvania were either abolished or merged with Rumanian institutions of the same educational level. While no exact statistics are available, spot surveys based upon depositions by persons recently returning from Transylvania show that in most areas the Hungarian language sections in schools are gradually abolished. Outside of the Hungarian villages in the Mures-Magyar Autonomous Province and some districts close to the Hungarian-Rumanian border, Hungarian sections, especially on junior high and high school level, are disappearing fast; for example, in the nine high schools of the cities of Satu Mare—Szatmárnémeti—Carol — Nagykároly—and Baia Mare—Nagybánya—only three Hungarian sections survive and they are also restricted to upper classmen only. At Cluj—Kolozsvár—several Hungarian sections were abolished in every class in September 1965 in two of the merged Rumanian-Hungarian high schools and the only Teachers' College reserved to Transylvanian Hungarians till 1964 now has 40 percent Rumanian student body. Even in Hungarian sections 2 hours of Rumanian language and literature is taught every day and graduates of these sections have considerable difficulty entering Rumanian universities and technical colleges. Measures recalling the worst excesses of the interwar period regarding university admissions have been taken by the Rumanian Ministry of Education and Cults in the summer of 1965 when a large percentage, in some districts, over 50 percent of the graduates of the Hungarian language high school section were failed by the graduation commissioners sent from Bucharest to Transylvanian cities.

RUMANIZATION OF THE CITIES AND HUNGARIAN AREAS BY THE USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE POWER

The prevailing shortage of housing, a direct consequence of the criminal neglect by the Government of the needs of the population, is now used by the Rumanian Government as a lever for Rumanizing the cities of Transylvania and to settle Rumanians in the midst of Hungarian areas in the Mures-Magyar autonomous province.

Witnesses testify that the number of new settlers in the South Transylvanian city of Brasov—Brassó—amounts to more than 35,000 in the last 5 years only. The population of Cluj—Kolozsvár—expanded from 105,000 in 1948 to an estimated 170,000 to 180,000 by 1965 and as a result the share of Transylvanian Hungarians fell from 76 to 47 percent. Baia Mare—Nagybánya—which according to 1947 Rumanian census still had a 55-percent Hungarian population has now a solid Rumanian majority, and even the capital of the Mures-Magyar Autonomous Province Turgu-Mures—Marosvásárhely—is becoming a mixed city, though formerly it was overwhelmingly Hungarian.

The administrative procedure for encouraging the settlement of Hungarians and closing the city to new Hungarian settlers is by the allotment of settlement licenses. The housing commissioners in the cities are ruled by Communist Rumanian officials following the party line in the selection of new settlers for the city. A Transylvanian Hungarian often has difficulty of receiving such a license even if he has a job waiting for him in the 25 Transylvanian cities which were classified as housing shortage areas in the province. At the same time the state is promoting the building of low quality, but modern, apartment houses on the outskirts of the cities, in which flats are assigned on the basis of party reliability and nationality.

In order to avoid any refutable charge of discrimination, some Hungarian families with impeccable class background and party connections are also housed in these apartment projects but according to the depositions of most visitors and resettlers 75 to 80 percent of the tenants are Rumanians with good political cadres. If a person moves from the city to another area either for the purpose of studying or the purpose of job transfer he loses his settlement license within a short period of time and has tremendous difficulties in ever receiving it back. A blatant example is a high school professor who was born and raised in Cluj—Kolozsvár—and who accepted a teaching position 38 miles west of the city at Huedin (Bánffyhunyad) and even upon his transfer to a high school in Cluj—Kolozsvár—has been unable to secure a settlement license there and is commuting every morning 38 miles on the not so reliable Rumanian railroad system to the city while in his rooms at his parents' house a Rumanian family is living at the present.

CONTINUOUS EROSION OF SURVIVING HUNGARIAN LOCAL ADMINISTRATIONS

Before 1952 certain local autonomy was permitted to Transylvanian Hungarians if they supported the party line. Thus members of the Communist Party who were of Hungarian origin were allowed to exercise considerable administrative power in Hungarian areas of Transylvania through the participation in the Workers Federation.

After 1952 the constitutional situation of the Hungarian minority was changed by the establishment of the Magyar Autonomous Province with an 80 percent Hungarian population. Here administration was to be bilingual and Hungarian cultural institutions were to be allowed to develop freely. No similar provisions were made for the Hungarian areas along the Hungarian Rumanian frontier or for Transylvanian cities with a Hungarian majority. As the autonomous Province comprised little over 30 percent of the Transylvanian Hungarians the differentiation of the rights of those living in the Province and outside of it was already an abridgment of the rights of the minority as a whole.

However, even the limited self-administration of the Magyar Autonomous Province has been severely eroded since 1956. First, a parliamentary decree of December 1960 changed the name and territory of the autonomous Province. The new Province named Mures-Magyar Autonomous Province now comprises several districts east of Cluj—Kolozsvár—with overwhelmingly Rumanian population while the purely Hungarian districts of Trei Scaune—Háromszék—were attached to the mostly Rumanian Province of Brasov—Brassó.

Thereby, the Hungarian population of the Province was reduced from 80 to 63 percent and changes in administrative personnel followed. Today the provincial First Party Secretary, the Chairman of the Provincial Council, and most of the police personnel are of Rumanian origin and only their Deputies are Transylvanian Hungarians. This situation persists down to sectional and district levels of party and government, that is, even the President of the Health Council of the Province is a Rumanian from Cluj. Several witnesses testified that even in a purely Hungarian town like Odorhei—Székelyudvarhely—police refuse to talk Hungarian and all forms have to be filled out and signed in Rumanian.

The cultural and educational life of the autonomous Province is becoming increasingly Rumanized. There are hardly any villages left—not to speak of towns—where the name of the locality or street is printed in Hungarian even below the Rumanian sign. The performances at the Hungarian theater of Turgu Mures—Marosvásárhely—are in Rumanian four times a week and attendance of these performances by Hungarian state employees is often enforced by the Communist Party. Except at the village councils, no authorities conduct business in Hungarian, and Rumanian state security forces are settled in almost every town and village to control the Hungarian population.

ECONOMIC DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MEMBERS OF THE HUNGARIAN MINORITY

There is economic discrimination against members of the Hungarian minority. Discrimination in promotion, vocational training, seniority, housing, wages by Rumanian party and state authorities against Transylvanian Hungarians can be documented in innumerable cases. As regard to vocational training a spot survey of the names of students graduating from vocational institutions in the summer of 1965 in major cities of Transylvania—Cluj, Kolozsvár; Turgu Mures, Marosvásárhely; Odorhei, Székelyudvarhely; Brasov, Brassó; Oradea, Nagyvárad; and Alba Julia, Gyulaferérvár—clearly shows that the percentage of Hungarian-named students was far below their ethnic percentage in these cities. Not only in vocational education, but in the lower echelons of technical engineering work as well, Transylvanian Hungarians are discriminated against unless they are ready to move outside of Transylvania. In civil service they are again scattered into Rumanian areas and kept in the lower and medium grades. Even in the Magyar Autonomous Province the highest town officials are Rumanians. Among teachers they are often passed over in promotion and the younger generation usually sent to villages outside of the Hungarian areas of Transylvania.

David Binder, writing in the New York Times, February 5, 1966, relates the belated promotion of some Transylvanian Hungarian professors at the University of Cluj clearly implying that none were promoted since the merging of the university in 1959. Depositions under oath were made to the fact that in some cases not even the wages voted by trade unions in state enterprises are paid in full to Hungarian workers and technicians. The only way the Transylvanian Hungarian may look forward to a successful career in any field is to Rumanize his name, cease speaking Hungarian, send his children to the Rumanian sections of the schools and, if of the right social background, join the Rumanian Communist Party.

Economic discrimination is also used in order to break the ties of the population with the Hungarian language churches, especially the Roman Catholic and Calvinists congregations. No state employee who has a position higher than that of a semiskilled worker can afford to send his children to religious instruction or regularly attend services. There were instances where the threat of immediate dismissal was used against Transylvanian Hungarians just because they let the parents be buried by a priest. For teachers, journalists, and lawyers any suspicion of believing in any of the Christian religions is reason for immediate firing by their professional association, association which is in turn domiciled and dominated by party officials. Under these circumstances the freedom to hold religious services by the various churches becomes a complete farce.

GENERAL VIOLATION OF HUNGARIAN HUMAN RIGHTS

In addition to the discriminatory measures directed against Translyvanian Hungarians the Bucharest Government maintains a systém of abridgment of political and human rights of the population as a whole.

First, freedom of speech does not exist. The fear of the people of the secret police—Siguranza—is more widespread than anywhere in Eastern Europe with the exception of Bulgaria and Albania. Any criticism of the regime if brought to the attention of the state results in loss of employment and because of the centralized personal files system in the country, the individual can no longer find a job in his profession but will have to work the rest of his life as a laborer. And this is still the better of the alternatives; the other alternative being arrest and conviction for antistate activity. Despite the 1964 amnesty which undoubtedly freed many unjustly convicted persons, these practices of economic ruination and or arrest toward discontented persons still persist.

The lack of freedom of assembly is proven by the rules that only one political party can exist and by the institutional and personal control of the Rumanian Communist Party over all professional, social, and economic associations still in existence in Rumania.

There is only a severely abridged right of worship. The churches are open and services are regularly held but instruction of the youth in religion is practically nonexistent. Even the relatively less persecuted Rumanian Orthodox Church has no freedom of religious instruction of the youth at all. There is serious interference with the selection of ecclesiastical dignitaries by the Rumanian state. At the recent election of Hungarian Calvinist Bishop of Cluj—Kolozsvár—the present incumbent originally received only 1 vote out of approximately 100 votes and was elected only because state authorities indicated that they would not accept any of the other 3 candidates. State interference with the appointment of Orthodox dignitaries is almost an open secret. Four of the five Roman Catholic sees remain vacant and the only surviving Roman Catholic bishop, Aron Márton, of Alba Julia, Gyulafehérvár, is still restricted in his movements and has not been permitted to attend any of the meetings of the recent Vatican Council.

ADMIRAL RICKOVER REPORTS FROM OUR NEWEST POLARIS SUBMARINE THE U.S.S. "JAMES K. POLK"

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter and a most interesting report from Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover sent incident to the first sea trials of our 35th Polaris submarine, the U.S.S. *James K. Polk.* In Tennessee we are especially proud that the President and the Navy Department decided to commemorate the memory of one of our most illustrious sons by naming this most important submarine for him. We are also extremely proud of the great contribution Admiral Rickover has and is making to this Nation. Certainly no naval officer in the past 100 years has made such a large contribution to the security of the United States.

The report received from Admiral Rickover is still another manifestation of his great energy, intellect, skill, and devotion to country. So that others may have access to this most interesting report, his letter follows:

ON BOARD U.S.S. "JAMES K. POLK,"
March 14, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our 35th Polaris nuclear submarine. The U.S.S. *James K. Polk* was built by the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn. We also have in operation 22 attack-type nuclear submarines, making a total of 57.

This ship is named for James K. Polk (1795–1849), ablest President between Jackson and Lincoln, and one of the few who rose from log cabin to White House. Born in North Carolina, the eldest of 10 children of a plain farmer, Polk grew to manhood in Duck River, Tenn., a rude frontier settlement on the edge of the wilderness. His ancestors were Scottish Covenanters who migrated to Ireland early in the 17th century and to America a hundred years later, settling first in Maryland and later moving westward in search of a freer and better life. The future President's family found in Tennessee the hoped-for land of promise where unremitting toil was all that was needed to attain prosperity and an honored place in the community. Young Polk worked long hours on the farm and, since there were no schools, was taught the three R's by his parents. He was good at mathematics and liked to read. When he reached 17, his father was able to grant him his wish for an education leading to a professional career.

Though never in robust health, Polk was all his life a prodigious worker. He accomplished much because he had enormous drive and great talent for systematic and sustained mental labor. It took him but 3 years of formal instruction to make up his educational deficiencies. At 20, he was admitted to the University of North Carolina with sophomore standing, graduating with first honors in mathematics and classics. He read law and, before he was 26, had become one of the leading practitioners in Columbia, Tenn., as well as a promising candidate for public office.

After one term in the State legislature, he entered the U.S. House of Representatives where he served from 1825 to 1839, the last 4 years as Speaker and leader of the Jacksonian forces. Polk would have preferred to remain in Congress but was drafted by his party to run for Governor of Tennessee, to save the State for the party. Elected in 1839, he lost in 1841 and 1843—the only setbacks in an otherwise uniformly successful career. In those days, rival candidates used to travel the country together, putting up at the same inns, often sleeping in the same bed, taking turns addressing the same meetings to which voters flocked from distant parts, as much for entertainment as for political discussion. Polk ran on his record as Governor. He had given his State an excellent administration, rescued it from near bankruptcy, and initiated significant reforms. His rival, semiliterate but shrewd, never discussed issues but took pains to amuse the audience. He won, it seems, chiefly because he was the better storyteller.

Polk was being considered for Vice President when the Texas and Oregon issues burst upon the country causing a deadlock that could be broken only by nominating Polk as a compromise candidate for President. The 1844 election was one of the most hotly contested the Nation had ever experienced. The issues between Democrats and Whigs were sharply drawn, feelings ran high, the country was almost evenly divided. Odd as it seems today, the candidates for the Presidency did not campaign actively since it was then considered unseemly to give the appearance of seeking this high office. Polk won with 170 electoral votes to 105 for Clay. Though at 49 he was the youngest President, he was committed to a more ambitious, more precisely stated administration program than any of his predecessors. All of it was carried out in the single term to which he had limited himself voluntarily when accepting the nomination of his party.

In the domestic field, Polk's achievements proved ephemeral, but his views, consistently Jacksonian, still have historic interest. He was a strict constitutionalist because he was certain this alone could preserve the Union. He opposed the protective tariff because he deemed it "unjust to tax the labor of one class of society to support and fatten another." He feared that Federal funds for internal improvements would destroy State sovereignty. It was better to live as free men in a trackless wilderness than ride as vassals down a broad highway. He wanted Federal funds kept separate from the private banking system to prevent their being used for credit expansion and cheap money. The Federal Government, he thought, should be brought back to "what it was intended to be, a plain economical Government." In the foreign field, Polk's success was both spectacular and of enduring importance to the Nation. An ardent expansionist, as was natural given his pioneer background, Polk added more territory to the United States than any previous President except Jefferson.

He settled the 40-year-old Northwest boundary dispute by skillful diplomacy and admirable nerve in face of a possible two-front war, inducing Britain to relinquish her longstanding demand for a boundary along the Columbia River, which would have cost us the State of Washington, in exchange for abandonment of our claim to what is now British Columbia. On the basis of discovery and settlement, this was the most we could justifiably ask or, for that matter, realistically hope to obtain without resorting to war. Our Southwest boundary was moved to its present location as a result of Polk's able management of the Mexican War and the ensuing peace negotiations. Mexico was generously compensated for the loss of California and New Mexico though not of Texas which had been lost 10 years earlier in exactly the same way as Mexico herself had been lost to Spain—by a successful indigenous revolt. We paid Mexico considerably more per acre than Napoleon had charged us for the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. When Polk left office, the United States stretched from "sea to shining sea."

Polk stood out among leading figures of his day in his unfaltering devotion to the national interest, uninfluenced by personal or parochial considerations, yet most 19th century historians accused him of precipitating the Mexican-American War in the interest of slavery expansion. This verdict has since been reversed in consequence of the publication early in this century of relevant official documents from the archives of Texas, Mexico, and Great Britain, which made it possible to see the issue more accurately. When Polk took office, the annexation of Texas was already an accomplished fact. Having warned us she would consider this "equivalent to a declaration of war," Mexico promptly severed diplomatic relations. Both sides moved troops to the Mexican-Texan border. Unfortunately, the two countries disagreed as to whether the Rio Grande or the Nueces constituted the boundary. It was in the disputed territory between these rivers that hostilities broke out spontaneously and a war that neither country really wanted began.

That Polk was able to execute his entire domestic and foreign program is the more remarkable in that he was neither a charismatic leader identified with some great popular movement, nor a politician adept at manipulating people and events. How he was able to resolve the great issues pressing upon him can best be understood by reading the diary he kept while in office.

The President emerges from its pages an able and astute administrator who approached every problem with a logical mind and a keen sense of political realities, who gained his objectives by stating them with precision and justifying them with well-reasoned argument. One cannot but feel that he understood the issues he dealt with better than most of his experts, whether they involved war strategy, military supply, diplomatic negotiations or how to get congressional approval for his measures when the nominally dominant Democrats were so rent by faction that every executive request was attacked by at least one element in his party, enthusiastically supported by the Whigs.

Written for personal use, as a reminder of the official happenings crowding his overfull days, the diary gives an intimate glimpse into the Executive Office during a transitional period in our history; a time when, as a result of war, technological change, and the physical growth of the country, certain aspects of the democratic process, certain political habits had become outmoded, but the American people were not yet prepared to relinquish them. Take the fine old tradition that every citizen has access to the President. It had become an intolerable burden, for the business of the Nation was now so large it demanded all a President's time and energy.

Polk found that "no President who performs his duty faithfully and conscientiously can have any leisure." He rarely took even a brief vacation and often had to toil far into the night to complete official tasks for which he found no time during the day, so beseiged was he with people wanting to shake his hand or pay their respects, and with officeseekers and patronage-soliciting politicians who, as he wryly put it, seemed to feel that providing jobs was "the chief end of government."

Or take the persistence of divisive geographic and ideological interests which, in Polk's time, tended to take precedence over the national interest. So much so that politicians in all sections of the country indulged in the mischief of threatening to break up the Union whenever national action went against their parochial interests. The well-publicized quarrels in the Senate, which were caused by intrusion of these divisive factors into every foreign policy issue, were a serious handicap to Polk when he was engaged in difficult negotiations with Britain over Oregon, or sought by diplomatic means to end the war with Mexico. The American people and their leaders had not yet accepted the maxim we now take for granted that "politics end at the waters edge."

One cannot read Polk's diary without warming to this thoughtful man of uncompromising integrity whose political philosophy, as he once said, "was not of yesterday," but "formed upon mature consideration," and adhered to whether it was expedient at the moment or not. Having achieved the objectives of his administration, he refused renomination and retired to private life. He died 3 months after leaving the White House.

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

THE CHALLENGE IN PANAMA

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a complete listing of United States-Panama relations as regards the Panama Canal since World War II is a long, complicated and, at times, tedious story but when reduced to essentials it is relatively short and simple. Such condensation was undertaken by Prof. Larry L. Pippin, of the University of the Pacific, in an article in the January 1966 issue of Current History under the title of "The Challenge in Panama."

While there are a number of key phases of the interoceanic canal problem not covered by Professor Pippin and there are authorities of eminence who differ with some of his assumptions, especially as to noncompliance by the United States with provisions of Panama Canal treaties, the donation to Panama without consideration of the Panama railroad terminals and other valuable properties of the United States, the question of site and type of a new canal, and the feasibility of nuclear excavation, the thesis does supply one of the best summaries of recent diplomatic-political events concerning the isthmian question that I have read. Professor Pippin is the first recent writer to point out that the original indemnity of $250,000 was the same amount paid to Colombia for the railroad rights alone.

Featured with the banner headline, "New Canal Would Be Disaster for Republic of Panama," in the February 13, 1966, issue of the Sunday American, Panamá, Republic of Panama, the article serves to emphasize some of the grave dangers into which radicals in Panama have led their country. Unfortunately, the paper fails to deal with the treaty rights of Colombia in the Panama Canal enterprise, which rights are enumerated in the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed on March 30, 1922, and are recognized with respect to the levy of tolls in the Panama Canal Reorganization Act of 1950—Public Law 841, 81st Congress.

In order that all agencies of our Government and the Nation at large may have the benefit of the Panamá, Republic of Panama, Sunday American news story accompanying Professor Pippin's contribution in addition to the article itself, I insert both as parts of my remarks:

[From the Panamá (Republic of Panama) Sunday American, Feb. 13, 1966]

New Canal Would Be Disaster for Republic of Panama

A new sea level canal in the Darien region would be a disaster for Panama, according to noted historian, Larry L. Pippin, a professor of political science, in a report in the January issue of Current History.

In a long report entitled "The Challenge in Panama," Pippin expresses the belief that a sea level canal could cause the collapse of the present economy.

He adds that although Panama could expect sizable aid from the United States to cushion the impact of a sea level canal, the U.S. Government would not be willing to absorb the full impact of the isthmian crisis.

Pippin also warns that Panama could not expect much money from a new sea level waterway as the amortization of a new canal would require 40 to 50 years.

Further, Pippin warns, Panama would not be allowed to set tolls unilaterally—as the biggest user, the United States will insist the tolls be kept reasonable (not much higher than present rates, Pippin believes).

Pippin, a professor at Elbert Covell College, University of the Pacific, has also taught at the Universities of Nevada, Kansas, Wisconsin, and Stanford.

He has lived on the Isthmus of Panama for more than 3 years and returned for a visit in July last year. He was at one time assistant editor of the Hispanic American Report and is the author of a book on Panamanian politics (the Remon Era; Stanford, Calif., Institute of Hispanic American Affairs, 1964).

Pippin's report, which also predicts the collapse of Panama's ruling oligarchy with the inauguration of a new sea level canal, is as follows:

"[From Current History, January 1966]

"THE CHALLENGE IN PANAMA

"(By Larry L. Pippin)

"Panama has a plethora of problems. The economic and political questions confronting the isthmian nation are both old and new. All of them are affected, in one way or another, by the changing relationship between Panama and the United States.

"Following the announcement by President Lyndon B. Johnson on December 18, 1964, that the United States was prepared to build a sea-level canal across Central America and to replace the 1903 Panama Canal Treaty, deliberation between the United States and Panama got underway. The order of priority followed in the talks was that established by Panama and the basic discussions concerned the replacement treaty for the 1903 document. A sea-level waterway and defense considerations were to be covered under separate treaties.

"The first of the new instruments was to be based upon Panama's demands for a share in the management and profits of the existing waterway. Spelled out, the demands included the termination of the existing system of government in the Canal Zone. The Panamanians wanted the right to legislate for the region, as well as the power to administer justice. Panama asked that, with few exceptions, services in the zone be provided exclusively by Panama.

"It was the intent of Panama clearly to establish the sovereignty of that nation over the waterway. Panama did not want its dominion in the zone affected by any rights, power, or authority granted to the United States with respect to operating the canal. All ships using the canal would fly the Panamanian flag while in transit. Panama's tax laws would be enforced in the Canal Zone. Jurisdiction and authority over, as well as the administration of, the waterway itself would be the joint responsibility of Panama and the United States.

"Panama called upon the United States to return to the Republic lands, islands, waters, drydocks, ports, and airports which were no longer necessary for the actual operation of the canal. The Isthmian Republic wanted the zone opened to agriculture and livestock raising, as well as to trade, commerce, and industry, which would be under the jurisdiction of Panama law. Further, Panama requested that it receive concessions enabling it to export more of its products to the United States. Residents of the Republic, Panama insisted, should have equal opportunities for employment in the canal's operations. In addition, Panama wanted Panamanian stamps used exclusively in the Canal Zone postal system and Spanish to become the only official language of the Canal Zone Government.

"Panama claimed that the right to fix tolls on ships and cargo passing through the canal should fall to that nation actually sovereign over the waterway. Panamanian authorities held that tolls should be levied on the value of the cargo, rather than on the basis of the cargo-carrying capacity of a ship, as under the present plan. According to the Panama formula, expensive cargo should pay more than is currently collected, while cheap bulk cargo should pay, perhaps, even less than it now pays.

"Six weeks after the Johnson statement, Secretary of the Army Stephen T. Ailes and the then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Thomas C. Mann, departed for Central and South America to hold exploratory talks on the building of the new sea level waterway. The countries visited by the American officials were those containing the best possible canal sites: Panama, Colombia, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. These visits were the first of a series of steps that would have to be taken. The Washington government would have to make site surveys to determine the best route for any sea level construction. The surveys, in turn would have to be preceded by bilateral agreements indicating the willingness of the Latin countries to be host to the proposed canal.

"In their conversations, the Americans attempted to remove the Latins' emotional blocs on such questions as sovereignty, operation, and revenues. The line followed by the negotiators in their talks with the Latin American officials was that the United States would not make demands affecting the sovereignty of any host nation. However, the host nation would have to acknowledge that it had no right to restrict access to the waterway nor to set tolls unilaterally. The major U.S. requirement was said to be that any treaty guarantee the right of access on a nondiscriminatory basis at a reasonable toll. Regarding the right of access and the determination of tolls, Washington was ready to accept in principle the participation of some international group. And, although they encountered more difficulty in Panama than in the other countries visited, Ailes and Mann reported, upon returning, that a successful exchange of views had been achieved.

"The Johnson administration asked the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee to provide $7.5 million for financing the work of an Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission. The multimillion-dollar request was for the partial financing of route studies in Panama, as well as in Central America and Colombia. In August 1965, the U.S. President urged Congress to take prompt action on the $7.5 million request so that the actual surveying in Panama could begin in January 1966, during the dry season. Completion of the route studies would take 3 years. A new sea-level passage would require 10 years to dig.

"Winning a waterway

"Well before the original 1903 Panama Canal Treaty, a transisthmian canal had been a longstanding goal of the United States. It was a basic necessity for a country with two coasts so distant from one another. However, for the goal to be realized, the projected waterway had to be built and protected by the United States. Great Britain respected U.S. designs on the isthmus. Colombia did not. Thus, Washington found it necessary to resort to other means to achieve its canal. The coveted opportunity was soon to present itself.

"The Panamanians had long regretted their decision in 1821 to join neighboring Colombia. During several periods in the 19th century, separatist campaigns flourished on the isthmus. A short-lived sovereign state of the isthmus was formed in 1855, and when a chaotic Colombia was recovering from the thousand days war (1899–1902), its most recent period of severe internal disorder, the independence movement revived.

"Panama could count on powerful allies in 1903. The concession to French private interests for the construction of a waterway was about to revert to Colombia. The capitalists from Gaul stood to lose their investment unless they could sell their holdings. The United States could not buy the French company's assets until it had gained the legal right to construct an interoceanic waterway. The Colombian Congress had just closed the door on the U.S. isthmian objectives by rejecting the Hay-Herrán Treaty.

"Panamanians, aided by the Frenchman Philippe Bunau Varilla, then obtained the support of the U.S. Government for their November 1903 separation maneuver against Colombia. When the ranking officers in the expeditionary force sent by Colombia to put down the latest outbreak of Panamanian insubordination crossed the isthmus ahead of their troops, the latter were not allowed to follow because of the menacing presence of U.S. warships and lack of cooperation of U.S. troops and railroad officials. For, by coincidence, the United States possessed the right to keep order on the route of the U.S.-built transisthmian railroad. Three days after the declaration of November 3, proclaiming the independence of Panama from Colombia, the new regime on the isthmus was recognized by the United States as the de facto government of Panama. De jure recognition followed on November 13.

"Although the Panamanians had willingly utilized a great power to gain their independence, they were not psychologically prepared to pay the humiliating price demanded for the cooperation. A treaty embodying generous concessions to the United States was negotiated by U.S. Secretary of State John Hay and the soon-to-be-despised Bunau Varilla and was signed on November 18, 1903. The alternative to accepting the conditions imposed on the tiny isthmian nation by the pact was a possible withdrawal of the U.S. guarantee of Panamanian independence, without which the fledgling nation would undoubtedly have fallen once again before the relatively overwhelming might of Colombia.

"The most objectionable treaty concession made by the new Panamanian Government was that conceding sovereignty over the waterway to the United States in perpetuity. In addition, Panama was saddled with a provision allowing for unilateral intervention by the United States in the internal affairs of the isthmian Republic. Vexing, too, was the right of the United States to take any Panamanian territory outside of the Canal Zone that it wanted, if it was thought necessary for the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and defense of the canal. Also annoying was the annuity provision of the Hay-Bunau Varilla accord.[1] Panamanians were equally displeased with the competition that retail outlets in the zone represented to commerce in the Republic.

"A revision movement took root almost immediately. A 1904 convention, drawn up by U.S. Secretary of War William H. Taft, proved beneficial for Panamanian business. When the U.S. Government made known that it would no longer abide by the Taft agreement, the Panamanians pushed for a renegotiation of the canal treaty. The limited concessions made by the United States were incorporated into the treaty of 1926. The Panamanian National Assembly angrily rejected the 1926 instrument.

"The approach of World War II, the fence-mending good-neighbor policy of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration and the world economic crisis precipitated a renegotiation of portions of the 1903 pact. The Hull-Alfaro Treaty of 1936 netted numerous gains for the isthmian nation. Although there were no concessions made by the United States on the sovereignty issue, the northern nation agreed to end the protectorate status of Panama for forfeiting the 1903 right to intervene unilaterally in its internal affairs.

"The U.S. Government promised to reduce commercial activities in the zone, which competed with like activities in the Republic. The United States gave up its right of eminent domain in the cities of Panamá and Colón. An adjustment in the annuity (from $250,000 to $430,000) was made to compensate for a devaluation of U.S. currency in 1934. Beyond this the United States agreed to permit Panama to join in the defense of the waterway—a provision detailed in a separate treaty, signed in 1942.

"Noncompliance by the United States with certain provisions of existing treaties, and changed conditions after World War II, caused a renewal of the revision movement. A treaty on defense sites was negotiated in 1947. After the 1947 bases pact was rejected by Panama, the United States would not engage in revision talks. When strong man Col. José Antonio 'Chichi' Remón gained the Presidency of Panama in 1952, in what was interpreted as a stabilizing move, he undertook an integral revision of the treaties with the United States. The new Dwight D. Eisenhower administration proved willing to make some concessions to Panama in areas other than sovereignty. The United States reiterated its intention of reducing the level of commercial activity in the Canal Zone. Real property outside of the zone no longer needed for the operation of the Canal was returned to the Republic. The annuity was to be increased to $1,930,000. A single basic wage scale was devised for all North Americans and Panamanians employed in the zone. The Isthmians were to be given additional employment opportunities in the zone.

"Subsequent to the 1955 Remón-Eisenhower treaty, the United States did make some concessions on the sovereignty issue. In the aftermath of the 1959 invasions of the Canal Zone by Panamanian elements, President Eisenhower approved a plan allowing visual evidence of Panama's titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone. At a designated spot along the Canal Zone border, a Panamanian flag was allowed to fly next to the U.S. banner. The incoming Kennedy administration, after exchanging views in Washington with the then President of Panama, Robert F. Chiari, set up a joint commission to handle the flag issue and other outstanding problems between the two countries. Before the commission disbanded, it agreed to the flying of Panama's flag alongside that of the United States at most outdoor sites where the U.S. standard was flown by civilian authorities. Representatives of the two nations agreed that foreign consuls possessing exequaturs issued by the Republic of Panama might perform their functions in the Canal Zone. A binational labor advisory committee was authorized to consider labor disputes in the zone.

"At the beginning of 1964, when U.S. officials were carrying out their orders to display the colors of both nations at prearranged locations in the Canal Zone, a flag incident at Balboa High School erupted in violence taking the lives of 21 Panamanians and 4 U.S. soldiers. Panama ended diplomatic relations with the United States, and discussion of outstanding differences was not resumed until after relations were reestablished in April 1964.

"A canal economy

"The economy of Panama has been characterized neither by diversity nor flexibility. A canal economy, it has become geared to the provision of goods and services for the operation and maintenance of the waterway. Panama admits that some 60 percent of its foreign exchange comes from the canal sector. Frequently the Panama Canal generates annual expenditures in Panama—related to the maintenance, operation, protection, and sanitation of the canal—equal to the total amount of the Panamanian budget. The U.S. Government is the largest employer on the isthmus, presently hiring around 16,000 Panamanians.

"Much consideration has been given to the problems of diversifying the economy of Panama, but little in that direction has been accomplished. The elemental development of commercial agriculture has been strongly influenced by foreign capital and technicians. However, their impact on the nation's agriculture has been negligible. Panama's farming methods have been equated with those existing in the time of the Pharaohs. Because of the primitive nature of the rural economy, it has been argued that industrialization is the panacea for Panama. There are many factors alined against this course, not the least of which is the lack of purchasing power of most Panamanian citizens.

"Fiscal tightness has characterized national finances in the last decades. Budgetary deficits have become the rule. The deficit for the current fiscal year was expected to be in excess of B2.5 million (B1 equals US $1). Collections were expected to reach B84 million, or B11 million more than the amount collected during the preceding fiscal period. The increase was attributed to partial tax reforms and the application of stringent collection methods. The situation will not appreciably change until the tax structure has been modernized and made more progressive. The enforcement machinery must be institutionalized and not made dependent on the zeal of a given finance minister.

"Panamanian authorities have sought increases in revenue from other sources. The Government has installed gaming casinos. It has instructed consular officials to solicit additional registrations of ships under Panama's flag of convenience. A select committee appointed by President Marco H. Robles was expected to recommend a B6 million issue of gold coins, on which the Government could anticipate considerable profit from both the seigniorage and any premium assessed over their face value. Robles' attempt to gain an additional B2.5 million through increased custom duties was defeated in the National Assembly.

"The burden of servicing the external and internal debt, currently costing more than $12 million a year, precludes the possibility of large-scale borrowing from international sources. Even so, Panama obtained a $3.5 million budget support loan from the United States in October 1965. The loan, at 4.5 percent interest payable in 10 years, was to cover outstanding local debts of the Panamanian Government and to stimulate business. In spite of the problems its repayment might cause, the loan was justified by the fiscal authorities on the basis of its beneficial short-term effect.

"One of the economic features of the canal treaty being negotiated in 1965[2] was a provision calling for greater participation by Panama in the profits of the organization. Some Panamanian officials have reviewed the recommendation of a decade ago for a 50–50 split of gross revenues from the waterway. Whatever the formula decided upon, more toll revenue from ships transiting the canal will find its way into the Panamanian treasury annually than at any time since the construction of the waterway.

"Unusual circumstances, such as the 1964 riots, with their consequent slowdown of commercial activity and tourism, have aggravated the financial picture. While the economic growth rate in 1964 reached 5.7 percent, that for 1965 was expected to be above 10 percent.

"A disaster-level unemployment situation persists in spite of an impressive growth rate. It is estimated that around 25 percent of the working force is idle. Canal operation and maintenance requires fewer workers each year. Strikes of workers continue to beset the Robles administration. Panama's unemployment index only increases the pressures on the seriously overpopulated terminal cities of Panamá and Colón, burdened by a high rate of population growth (2.8 percent each year nationally) and internal migration. The housing situation in Panama, urban as well as rural, is among the most desperate in the world. Although one-fourth of its annual budget is allocated to education, Panama counts more illiterates each year.

"Partisan strife

"Today the political life of Panama is unstable. Political unsteadiness is not new to the isthmus.[3] It has accompanied the white minority rule of a predominantly mestizo and mulatto country, where democratic processes, such as fair elections, have been honored more in theory than in practice. Although coups are incessantly in preparation, there have been no successful attempts to overthrow the Government since 1955.[4]

"The erosion of Robles' public support began with the controversy over the fairness of the 1964 elections. Once in office, Robles honored certain campaign commitments. One of them called for his instituting long overdue tax reforms. Higher income groups, which had supported Robles, turned on his government because of its fiscal policies.

"The main opposition to Robles, outside his own tricky coalition of electoral groups, comes from twice-deposed ex-President (1940–41; 1949–51) Arnulfo Arias, Robles' principal opponent in the 1964 presidential race. Arias' Panameñista Party is bigger than any other and has the most representatives in the National Assembly. From that strategic location, the political allies of Arias have been obstreperous; they even boycotted Robles' address opening the 1965 session of the assembly, alleging that Robles had usurped the presidential office. However, it is unlikely that Arias' militant Panameñistas would succeed in any coup attempt because of the opposition to Arias and his followers presented by the leadership of Panama's Guardia Nacional, a 3,000-man armed force. Probably Arias is exploiting the canal treaty issue to heighten his image before the electorate as a defender of national interests. A skillful politician, as well as an undeclared candidate for the presidency in 1968, Arias has rallied most of the opposition to Robles in a united front movement. Ostensibly, the purpose of the front is to curb any intervention by Washington in the internal affairs of Panama.

---

[1] "The $250,000 annual payment to Panama for the combined transisthmian railroad and ship canal concessions was the same amount that had been previously paid to the Colombian Government for the railroad rights alone."

[2] For the Sept. 25, 1965, progress report on this treaty by President Johnson, see Current Documents in this issue, p. 49 [not printed in RECORD].

[3] "Panama had three Presidents in the first 2 weeks of 1955; Colonel Remon was assassinated and his successor, Jose Ramon Guizado, was forced out of office. Between 1948 and 1952 seven persons held the presidency for longer or shorter periods."

[4] "However, it has been claimed by the 'losers' that the presidential elections of 1956 and 1964 were rigged in favor of the government candidate."

"Operating secretly, the outlawed Communist Party has seized upon the negotiation issue in an effort to weaken the Robles government. The student movement, one of the strongest pressure groups in Panamanian politics, has recently been plagued with internal strife to such an extent that it has not taken a leading role in the antitreaty activity.

"Most of the opposition manifested against the Panamanian Government has fitted within the bounds of conventional political warfare. When it was reported that the Guaymi Indians of western Panama were about to turn to guerrilla activity, the Robles government moved rapidly to meet their demands. The existence of guerrilla training camps in Panama has been rumored. Past attempts at guerrilla movements by local political aspirants have failed; for example, Pacora (in 1962) and Cerro Tute (in 1959).

"It is unlikely that the Robles government would be overthrown during its negotiations with the United States over a settlement of the Panama Canal dispute, especially since reports have indicated that Panama would get most of what it asked. However, this is not to suggest that the President enjoys the backing of all political forces in the treaty talks. The administration has been jolted by the unfavorable reaction of politicians and the public to its negotiation effort and also to the joint statement of Presidents Robles and Johnson on September 24, 1965, explaining the treaty talks.

"U.S. support for the Robles regime was manifested in the willingness of the former to enter into negotiations leading to a settlement of the longstanding dispute over the canal. The December 1964, announcement by the United States that it would abrogate the 1903 treaty was timed to deflate political pressures mounting against the fledgling Robles government. The September 1965, progress report on the negotiations, issued simultaneously in Washington and Panama, was calculated to give Robles added political advantage with the volatile National Assembly.

"According to Panamanian officials, the U.S. Government was ready to authorize a budget support loan arranged in 1964. The extension of the loan, which had been contingent upon Panama's bringing its budget into balance in 1965, would require forgiveness on the part of the United States for Panama's failure to do so.

"A rejection of the 1965 treaty by the National Assembly is conceivable. The unpopular Robles regime could then attempt to reopen the negotiations with the United States, hoping to gain more favorable terms for Panama regarding the present waterway. Assembly rejection of the projected treaty might delay the negotiation of a new basic document on the locks canal until after the holding of a presidential election. Hopefully, the next chief executive would enjoy a wide enough base of popular support to see a waterway pact ratified. Will the mounting pressures of world commerce for a sea-level facility wait for Panamanian politicians to stop bickering?

"It is impossible to conceive of Panama recovering from the loss of the mainstay of its economy. Economic and political chaos would result if a sea-level route were located elsewhere. Panama offers two acceptable locations for the sea-level construction: the site of the present canal and another in Darién Province, 110 miles east of the existing waterway. The former route has the disadvantage that the canal would have to be constructed by costly conventional methods. The Sasardi-Morti route in Darién would be less expensive to develop, for nuclear explosives could be employed. But, of course, development of the Darién route would turn the present terminal cities of Panama and Colon into ghost towns.

"The impact of a sea-level passage on the present economy, geared to the provision of goods and services for the operation and maintenance of the present waterway, could cause its collapse. The Republic of Panama could expect sizable grants-in-aid from the United States for the economic dislocations caused by the conversion of the transisthmian route, but the U.S. Government would not be willing to absorb the full impact of the isthmian crisis.

"Construction of a new canal with the use of nuclear device would contribute very little to relieve Panama's grave unemployment situation. Once completed, a force of no more than 500 to 1,000 workers would be required to operate and maintain a sea-level route in Panama. Some 15,000 jobs in the Canal Zone would disappear, as well as countless jobs in Panama that were dependent on satisfying the demands of the Canal Zone.

"The United States has already warned the countries possessing feasible sea-level routes that the host nation could not anticipate the accrual of significant revenues from tolls on the water route. According to U.S. authorities, the amortization of a new canal would require 40 to 50 years. Also, the authorities indicated that the host nation would not be allowed to set tolls unilaterally. As the biggest user, the United States will insist that tolls be kept reasonable: not much higher than the present rates.

"The switch to a sea-level canal would not be without political reverberations in Panama. It is unlikely that the ruling oligarchy could survive the dislocations accompanying the inauguration of a sea-level route.

"Yet Panama would have to face still another problem regarding the new canal: its defense. How long would nationalistic sentiment, manifest on the isthmus, allow foreign troops on Panamanian soil? It is clear that Panama could not hope to muster a force sufficient for repelling a major aggressor. Therefore, Panama would have to press for the neutralization, and probably denuclearization, of the region.

"How would the sea-level canal be administered? The U.S. Government is on record as favoring international operation of the canal, extracontinental participation in its financing and construction, and wide participation in the determination of access and tolls. Important political figures have declared themselves in favor of internationalization of the transisthmian route. Others have called for its inter-Americanization.

"The Panamanian Government is in the process of making decisions and redefining relationships that will influence not only the economic life of every present and future citizen of Panama, but may affect the very form of Panama's political system."

SALUTE TO JOHN PAUL JONES

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during recent months I have noted an apparent revival of public interest in the career of John Paul Jones—an interest no doubt inspired by the ever-ascending role of our Navy in the Vietnam war and the part that it has played in the recovery of our gallant astronauts from the perils of their landings on the seas.

As a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy, I have often visited the crypt of the chapel and viewed the magnificent black Pyrenees marble sarcophagus in which the last mortal remains of Jones are enshrined and studied his keen face as portrayed in the magnificent bronze bust of him by Houdon, the sculptor of Washington.

Back in 1940, when the people of our country began to sense the great importance of our Navy to the security of the United States in the period before our involvement in World War II, Harry W. Frantz and his wife, Kathleen Hargrave Frantz, both of whom are gifted writers, visited the crypt of John Paul Jones and were inspired to undertake a joint article about him. After considerable research and observation, they produced a biographical essay, "Salute to John Paul Jones," that was published in the June 1940 issue of Sea Power.

In order that this most interesting short story of the No. 1 hero of our Navy may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress and thus inspire similar efforts by other writers, I insert it in the RECORD as part of my remarks today:

[From Sea Power, June 1940]

SALUTE TO JOHN PAUL JONES

(By Kathleen Hargrave Frantz and Harry Warner Frantz)

We motored to Annapolis for the sole and particular purpose of finding out why John Paul Jones has always been rated the Navy's No. 1 hero, and we issue herewith our summary findings.

Long we had wondered at the perennial enthusiasm for the great Revolutionary "sea dog," who even today inspires frequent news stories, magazine articles, boys' battles, paintings and heroic novels. Somewhat like Napoleon he was, in his power to inspire an infinite interest and to keep men forever guessing as to the sources of his strength and the depths of his grandeur.

That was a hard assignment that we gave ourselves, what with the drum-taps of parade in the air, and a brilliant arboreal panoply overhead as we strolled down the long leafstrewn brick promenade called Chauvenet Walk, and the magic blue Severn all dotted with white sailboats and the eager murmur of voices talking hopefully of the Army baseball game!

But we clung with Jones-like tenacity to our appointed task, and scarcely took note of the vibrant happy Academy as we hastened to the crypt of the beautiful ivy-clad chapel to render our reportorial but reverent salute to the memory of one who will be forever a toast in patriotic company, and an inspiration to the brave and free.

There in a black sarcophagus of Pyrenees marble, surrounded by eight monolithic columns enchained with golden rope, are the last mortal remains—transplanted from an original burial place in Paris—of John Paul Jones. Even today in that darkened and silent crypt you cannot pause to reflect without seeming to hear those thrilling words from the deck of the embattled *Bon Homme Richard*, "I have just begun to fight." Inscribed in the floor are those splendid names—of schoolboy memory—of ships under command or capture by Jones: *Serapis, Alliance, Alfred, Bon Homme Richard, Ariel, Providence,* and *Ranger*.

Near the visitors' rail is a bronze bust of John Paul Jones, replica of that made in Paris by Houdon, and in its clear eager face one may still sense the confidence and power of sharp observation which often turned the tide of defeat to victory. The head is round and small and firm, the hair brushed smoothly back in the fashion of the time. He wore a stock, and an unbuttoned coat, but the dull bronze could not suggest the rich blue and red and gold which was characteristic of his favored dress.

Recessed cases in the wall nearby contained Jones' broadsword of shining steel with gold hilt, and a loosening golden thread-wrapped handle; and a sword presented to Jones by Louis XVI. The latter was a double-edged rapier, blued for part of its length, inlaid in gold with the fleur de lis, the motto "Vive le Roi" and other insignia of the Paris monarch. It was given to Jones during his visit to Paris after the capture of the English *Serapis*.

On alternate days sailors and marines act as guard of honor at the crypt, and at other special shrines in the academy. On our day the Marine on guard was Walter C. Woolum, private, of 18 months service, from Harlan, Ky. He was a friendly chap, and evidently took pride in his post. When we asked him questions and paused to make notes, he suggested that he, too, "could write a big story" about Admiral Jones.

"What would you write?" we asked.

"I'd tell where he was first buried and how he was brought back here," he replied. (We looked up those facts later, at the library, and found that Jones died July 18, 1792, age 45 years, and was buried in the St. Louis Protestant Cemetery in a quarter of Paris known as "le Combat"; that his body was located in 1899 by Gen. Horace Porter, U.S. Ambassador to France; that it was returned from France by an American squadron in 1905, under orders of President Theodore Roosevelt; that Congress provided for the magnificent chapel and crypt; that on January 26, 1913, Jones' body was taken to its present and eternal resting place.)

Woolum did not volunteer this information, and we asked his opinion as to why Jones is regarded so great.

"The Marines and the Navy think that he was the greatest sailor that ever sailed the sea," Woolum replied. "He is the background of the Navy."

"Why?" we pressed.

"Because he would do so good in his fights, and he knew how to get around," he replied. "He was skillful, knowing how to sink the ships and fight. To the men he was one of the best admirals they ever had."

Mentally, we checked the latter statement against the historical fact that Jones, after a reputation in the merchant marine as a hard master, learned lessons from experience, became careful and even sympathetic in the handling of men, abandoned flogging aboard his ships, and was able to command tremendous exertions from his crews without complaint.

Amid the marbled and golden splendor of John Paul Jones' final resting place, it is difficult to believe that his birthplace could have been a humble cottage at Arbigland, Kirkbean, Scotland, which long since might have vanished but for the affectionate and generous action of Lt. A. B. Pinkham, U.S. Navy, who in 1831 provided for its restoration at his own expense.

We looked through many books for a moving account of this birthplace, and finally found it in a small guidebook entitled "Paul Jones Country," published at Dumfries, Scotland, as recently as 1938. Therein, Rev. John Douglas Cochrane wrote that Jones' birthplace stood near a headland of the sea.

"From his earliest years he was never far from the sounding ebb and flow of Solway's waters," Cochrane wrote. "On the headland beyond his cottage home he listened to the call and dreamed his dreams. The scene was one of surpassing beauty. At the base of the headland lay the farm Powillowmont; away to the north towered Criffel majestically; southward the coast of England, fringed with the townships of Maryport, Workington, and Whitehaven, stretched to far distant St. Bees. Shimmering in the blue were the mighty peaks of the hills of Cumberland and Westmoreland. In the center of all the sea, its waters surging and calling, calling.

"As he lay on this headland, fleets, phantom and real, passed by. The Viking ships of the Norsemen, the fleet of Alexander III on its way to invade the Isle of Man, the fleet of Edward I, bringing forces to subdue the Scots, traders, tobacco laden from far Virginia, wine ships from Oporto, smugglers from the Isle of Man, with the humble coaster and the sails of the fisherman's boat bringing up the rear. The soul of the boy thrilled. Someday, yes, he would be a leader and commander, out there in the great waters."

Jones' father was John Paul. His mother's maiden name was Jeannie Macduff. He was born July 6, 1747, and was the youngest of five surviving children of whom three were girls. He adopted the name Jones many years later in America, for reasons shrouded in mystery, but not impossibly from a desire to break his identity with a troubled past in the West Indies. During his boyhood he lived for a time with a relative, William Paul, in Fredericksburg, Va. To that vicinity he returned in the years between his merchant marine service and his command in the American Navy.

From the Bancroft Library, where Assistant Librarian Louis H. Bolander had aided our quest, we went to the new Naval Academy Museum. There good fortune presented us to an old friend, the curator, Capt. H. A. Baldridge. Captain Baldridge collects for this museum with unrivaled fervor, an immense personal knowledge of naval tradition, and a well-developed publicity sense that keeps Navy relics on the feature pages of New York papers.

Our enthusiasm for John Paul Jones was an easy cause to serve, and our host quickly revealed to us some priceless relics of the great commander.

One was Jones' quadrant, delivered by the mayor, D. L. MacLaren, of St. John, New Brunswick, to President Franklin D. Roosevelt and reposed by him in the naval museum. The President, we learned, has already visited the museum; inspected its treasures with much enthusiasm, and doubtless compared its naval prints with his own priceless collection.

Another memento, besides the quadrant, is a statement of "recognition signals," in the handwriting of John Paul Jones.

Another is an exquisitely painted "miniature by the Countess of Lowendahl, a Parisian friend of Jones," showing the commander in resplendent uniform of blue with red lapels and golden epaulettes. How desirable, we thought, that the case might some day contain a relic of another friend, Catherine the Great.

Pride of the museum is the Letter Book of John Paul Jones, containing copies of his correspondence as commander of the *Ranger* and the *Bon Homme Richard,* in the years 1778 and 1779.

Beside it is that strangely human letter written by Jones aboard the *Ranger,* at Brest, on May 8, 1778, to Lady Selkirk, in which he revealed that he had intended to kidnap her husband, Lord Selkirk, during a recent raid on St. Mary's Island in Scotland. "It was fortunate for you, Madam, that he was from home;" Jones wrote, "for it was my intention to have taken him on board the *Ranger* and to have detained him until thro' his means, a general and fair exchange of prisoners, as well in Europe as in America, had been effected."

In the case also is a corselet of coat of mail, worn by Jones during his fight in the *Bon Homme Richard* against the British frigate *Serapis* on September 23, 1779.

Also, there is an ordinary red brick, said to have come from The Grove, "the North Carolina home of Col. Wyllie Jones, who in 1774 befriended a young man named John Paul, better known later as John Paul Jones."

The afternoon wore old: we had spent more than 5 hours trying to fix impressions or resurrect information about John Paul Jones. The sun illumined that great bronzed dome of the chapel. We felt vaguely that we had barely touched the hem of a wonderful garment, scarcely seen the margin of a million-paged book.

Yet we already knew that Jones was a soul of very great contrasts, whose weaknesses served only to give depth and shadow to the radiant fire of his incomparable courage. Every man, studying Jones, could find the binding tie of his own suffering, perplexity, and occasional failure, but could see in his struggle to achieve an ever-ascending ladder.

We knew, too, that Jones had a marvelous gift of imagination; that quality by which, Napoleon said, nations are ruled. And we wondered just how far this might have been cultivated when, amid hard times, he lived as an actor in the Antilles.

Then, we reflected, there were those good years ashore in Virginia and Carolina, when Jones had warm friends, and respite from trouble, and the love though not the hand of an unknown woman.

We heard a gun somewhere and that disturbed our reverie. We found ourselves envying those naval fellows. They want to honor someone and they have only to load up the cannon for a salute, or call out a guard or hoist some flags. While we reporters have to ask a thousand questions and struggle at a typewriter with some inexpressible ideas. Yet, for better or worse, we add our salute to John Paul Jones.

FLEET ADM. CHESTER WILLIAM NIMITZ, U.S. NAVY 1885–1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, most of the commanding figures of our Armed Forces in World War II have passed away. The latest was Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, former commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet.

The obituary notice in the March 1966 issue of Shipmate, the monthly magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association, gives an authoritative summary of Admiral Nimitz' career.

In order that this account may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress and thus become more widely known and serve as an inspiration to the youth of our country, I quote it as part of my remarks today.

Article follows:

[From Shipmate, Mar. 1966]

Fleet Adm. Chester William Nimitz, U.S. Navy, Class of 1905, U.S. Naval Academy

Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, who commanded the Pacific force of 2 million men and 5,000 ships that drove the Japanese back to their homeland in World War II, died at his home on Yerba Buena Island in San Francisco Bay on February 20. He was the last of the five-star admirals.

The former commander-in-chief of the Pacific Fleet suffered a cerebral thrombosis in early January and was hospitalized at Oak Knoll Naval Hospital in Oakland, from where he was released on February 1. He had a relapse and was in the care of Navy medical officers at his home at the time of death. He would have been 81 years old on February 24—the day he was interred in Golden Gate National Cemetery.

Chester William Nimitz was born in Fredericksburg, Tex., in 1885. During his youthful years his grandfather, a retired sea captain, told many tales of the sea, but young Chester's dreams were not of being a sailor, but a soldier. While a senior in Tivy High School at Kerrville, Tex., where the family had moved, he tried for an appointment to West Point. When none was available he took a competitive examination for the Naval Academy and was accepted at the age of 15, before he was graduated from high school.

Forty-four years later, at the age of 60, he returned to the high school wearing his uniform and decorations and riding in a buckboard pulled by a team of roan horses. This was the occasion for his receiving the diploma he had missed in 1901 when he left to enter the Academy. He was probably the only person ever to graduate from high school in the uniform of a fleet admiral.

At the Naval Academy, Chester Nimitz excelled in mathematics, stroked the crew, and stood 7th in a class of 114. Recalling his first experience on the water, when he crossed the Chesapeake Bay to Kent Island, he later said:

"I got frightfully seasick, and must confess to some chilling of enthusiasm for the sea."

In 1909 young Nimitz was ordered to submarine training with the 1st Submarine Flotilla. At 24 he was given command of the floatilla as well as U.S.S. *Plunger*. In February 1912 he took command of U.S.S. *Skipjack*, and the following month saved a seaman from drowning. Awarded the Silver Lifesaving Medal by the Treasury Department, he wore this medal throughout the remainder of his career, along with the four Distinguished Service Medal awards for wartime exploits.

In 1913 Lieutenant Nimitz wrote a friend: "On April 9, I had the good sense to marry Catherine Freeman of Wollaston, Mass." She was the daughter of a shipping broker.

That summer he had detached duty studying diesel engines at Nuremburg, Germany, and Ghent, Belgium, then returned to the New York Navy Yard where he was instrumental in the development of the Navy's first diesel engines.

During World War I he became aide, then Chief of Staff, Commander Submarine Force, Atlantic Fleet, and was awarded a commendation by the Secretary of the Navy for his services.

Between wars Admiral Nimitz had varied duties; he served on the staff of the Chief of Naval Operations and on the Board of Submarine Design; he was executive officer of the battleship *South Carolina*, then commanded the cruiser *Chicago*, with additional duty as commander of Submarine Division 14 based at Pearl Harbor. In August 1926 he set up and commanded one of the first campus Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps units—at the University of California. Then followed several years of sea duty, including command of the cruiser *Augusta*, flagship of the Asiatic Fleet.

While serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Navigation he was promoted to the rank of rear admiral. Admiral Nimitz broke his first seagoing flag as a cruiser division commander and shortly thereafter commanded Battleship Division 1, Battle Force. In 1939 he was appointed to a 4-year term as Chief of the Bureau of Navigation. Before the term was completed, however, the United States was at war.

When the news of the Pearl Harbor attack was announced Admiral Nimitz was at his home in Washington listening to a symphony on the radio. Picking up his hat, he went immediately to the office of the Chief of Naval Operations for orders. A few days later he was on his way to Pearl Harbor.

The 65 million square miles of the Pacific Ocean were to become very familiar to Admiral Nimitz during the next several years while he labored to organize the work of rebuilding a fleet which had many of its ships at the bottom of Pearl Harbor. He was quick to see that a great weakness lay in the lack of forward repair station and maintenance squadrons. While waiting for the U.S. yards to turn out the ships he needed, he built up his combat teams commanded by Adms. William F. Halsey, Marc A. Mitscher, Richmond K. Turner, Raymond A. Spruance, John S. McCain and Thomas C. Kincaid. When these fleets and forces came into being, the Navy was ready to take the fight to the Japanese.

The first major Pacific naval battle after Pearl Harbor came on May 8, 1942, in the Coral Sea—which was the world's first naval battle fought entirely in the air, without the carriers even sighting each other or a shot being exchanged between surface vessels. For this successful action Admiral Nimitz was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal by the Navy Department.

President Roosevelt presented Admiral Nimitz with his second DSM, awarded in the name of Congress, for services as commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet during the critical war period following the Pearl Harbor attack.

On October 7, 1943, the grade of fleet admiral was established by act of Congress for certain officers of the active list. On December 19, 1944, Chester W. Nimitz was promoted to that grade.

On the historic date of September 1, 1945, Fleet Admiral Nimitz was one of the signers for the United States when Japan formally signed the surrender terms aboard the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay.

During ceremonies in Washington, D.C., on "Nimitz Day," October 5, he was presented a Gold Star in lieu of the third DSM by the President for exceptionally meritorious service during the final phase in the battle for victory in the Pacific.

On November 24, he hauled down his flag at Pearl Harbor, nearly 4 years after hoisting it aboard the submarine *Grayling* in a harbor littered with the wreckage of American warships.

On December 15, Fleet Admiral Nimitz relieved Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King as Chief of Naval Operations. It then became his job to demobilize all but a fraction of the most powerful Navy in history—one which he had helped build. For this service he was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of a fourth DSM.

After the war Fleet Admiral Nimitz continued to be honored for his wartime service. He was decorated by 14 nations and received honorary degrees from 19 universities. In 1949 he was named by the United Nations Secretariat to supervise a proposed plebescite to determine whether Kashmir should become a part of India or should be linked to Pakistan. Due to international complications the commission did not function. He became, however, a roving "goodwill ambassador" of the United Nations.

Fleet Admiral Nimitz took an active interest in community affairs, and aided in restoring goodwill with Japan by helping raise funds for the restoration of the battleship *Mikasa*, Admiral Togo's flagship at Taushima in 1905. For 8 years he was regent for the University of California.

He is survived by his widow and four children: Rear Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, Jr., U.S. Navy (retired), of Norwalk, Conn.; Catherine Vance, the wife of Capt. James T. Lay, U.S. Navy (retired), of Newport, R.I.; Miss Anne Elizabeth (Nancy) Nimitz of Topanga, Calif., and Sister Mary Manson Aquinas of the Dominican Convent, San Rafael, Calif.

TRIBUTES

President Johnson paid tribute to the late Fleet Admiral Nimitz as a man of "quiet courage and resolute leadership." In a statement released by his press secretary, the President said:

"Admiral Nimitz loved his country and the sea. His devotion to one inspired his mastery of the other, earning for his quiet courage and resolute leadership the undying gratitude of his countrymen and an enduring chapter in the annals of naval history."

In a statement by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, he said: "It is my sad duty to announce to the Armed Forces of the United States the death of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz on February 20, 1966.

"The world has lost a distinguished citizen whose energies and vision were devoted without stint to a long lifetime of service to freemen everywhere.

"In the death of Admiral Nimitz the Nation has lost one of our greatest leaders. A superb sailor, university regent, and dedicated citizen, he served his country and his state with full measure of devotion. All in the Armed Forces salute his life of achievement with the words, 'Well done.' "

From Secretary of the Navy Paul H. Nitze came this word:

"The Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps and I join with all Navy and Marine Corps uniformed and civilian personnel in mourning the death of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, U.S. Navy, in San Francisco, on Sunday, February 20.

"During his lifetime, marked by many significant accomplishments in the naval service, he was an inspiration to all of us. He graduated with distinction in the Naval Academy class of 1905 and served on various ships, and commanded two, before undergoing submarine training. After many commands and duties, he laid one of the cornerstones in the foundation of the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps program when he installed, and instructed in one of the first units at the University of California at Berkeley.

"He was designated commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet on December 17, 1941, and led U.S. Forces in the Pacific Ocean area to victory, culminating in the signing of the surrender documents on U.S.S. *Missouri* on September 1, 1945, in Tokyo Bay. He relieved Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King as Chief of Naval Operations in December 1945, and served in that capacity for 2 years. He was then assigned as special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy with offices in San Francisco. There he continued to serve his country, in many ways, always with distinction. His passing is a great loss to the U.S. Navy and to the Nation, but his deeds and character will be an inspiration and standard for us all in the years to come. Typical of Fleet Admiral Nimitz, he requested simple ceremonies incident to his burial at the Golden Gate National Cemetery, a final resting place close to the service personnel who died in the Pacific. Fleet Admiral Nimitz will be buried on Thursday, February 24."

NAVIGATION PROJECT—PLANNING MARINE EXPERIENCE, THE TRUE CRITERIA

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, my studies over the years of interoceanic canal problems and history, together with experience as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, have made me acutely aware of the necessity for marine operational requirements as a major feature in the design of works affecting navigation, which include our major inland waterways, great seaports, and the Panama Canal.

Among the organizations long interested in the planning of our harbors is the American Association of Port Authorities of Washington, D.C. This institution publishes an annual volume containing the proceedings of its annual meetings where its members deliver papers and exchange views based upon their experience.

The 37th annual meeting of the American Association of Port Authorities was held September 28–October 3, 1948, on board the SS *Quebec*, on a cruise originating at Montreal, Canada, which included stops at ports on the St. Lawrence and Saguenay Rivers.

One of the principal speakers on that occasion was Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., representing the Secretary of the Navy. An experienced naval officer, whose studies of Panama Canal problems are recorded in professional and lay literature and who was then head of the Navy Department Isthmian Canal Studies under the orders of Secretary James Forrestal, Captain DuVal gave a most illuminating address, derived from his own broad naval career. Recognized by those present for its realistic approach to navigational planning, the address became a topic of much discussion among members attending the meeting, which included both operating and engineering officials, with representatives from various countries including Canada and the United States.

What Captain DuVal so aptly stated on that occasion concerning navigational needs and requirements in the design of navigation projects, applies with special force to plans for the major improvement of the existing Panama Canal or for the construction of a new Isthmian waterway at another location. Current legislation, as I have stressed on previous occasions, makes no provision for such navigational consideration yet this is of primal and vital necessity.

In order that the indicated address, which is just as applicable today as it was when delivered, may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress and thus become more widely known, I quote it as part of my remarks:

"NAVIGATION PROJECT PLANNING: MARINE EXPERIENCE, THE TRUE CRITERIA"—ADDRESS BEFORE THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PORT AUTHORITIES, ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, CANADA, OCTOBER 1, 1948

(By Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., U.S. Navy)

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Association of Port Authorities and guests. In the presence of the rugged scenes of this far famed river which we have been viewing, the Saguenay, I am moved to recall another voyage in October 1945 to another land of scenic ruggedness—Shantung Province of China. That voyage, like this one, made indelible impressions not merely because of the strange sights but because of the lessons it afforded.

We anchored in the bay off the artificial Tsingtao Harbor (H.O. 5489). The wind was fresh from the north. Blowing across the harbor entrance channel, it required vessels entering the channel on their way to the piers to be extremely cautious to avoid drifting down upon the leeward shore. The wind was also a problem when landing at the pier.

There were at this time no pilots at Tsingtao to advise and no tugboats to assist. Under these circumstances vessels, piloted by their captains, entered the harbor channel, taking care to keep to the windward of the channel center line. Inside the harbor, the piers were located at a convenient angle for approaching at reduced speeds when the high bow of a vessel falls off with the wind more rapidly than the stern, and the stern moves to port when backing. The docking at Tsingtao was easily accomplished in a short time in spite of the strong cross winds.

The departure from Tsingtao Harbor was even more expeditious than entering it although the wind continued fresh. The vessel was located on the leeward side of the pier. The stern lines were let go. The wind caused the stern to drift slowly away from the pier into the slip which was 600 feet wide. When the vessel arrived at a convenient angle with the pier, the bow lines were let go and the engine backed full speed. The vessel gradually gained sternway. As she moved out of the wide slip, she swung slowly into the wind in a continuous movement, without tug assistance, into a strangely shaped dredged area, also at an angle appropriate to this particular maneuver.

When in a safe position the engine was stopped, the rudder reversed and the engine placed on full speed ahead. The vessel then swung rapidly to the required heading and cleared the harbor in a surprisingly short time.

What is the true explanation for the ease and safety of these two maneuvers? It is simply that those who planned this harbor considered the controlling marine operational factors as the basis for their plans. In addition to placing the docks at a special angle coordinated with the entrance channel, they had dredged what may be called a backing into the wind basin.

The layout of this harbor is entirely too logical to have been a mere coincidence. These planners obviously made the needs of the navigator the primary premises for their planning.

Another striking example of functional planning is the saw-tooth dock arrangement we observed at Montreal. Constructed to replace a straight wall layout at which the strong current of the river caused unavoidable hazards, these docks, by enabling vessels to land and depart without regard to vessels in adjacent berths, have eliminated the major hazards. This saw-tooth plan, apparently unique, has already demonstrated its value in the reduction of marine accidents. It is obviously the solution of the special marine problem at Montreal.

These cases bring up the question: What are the needs of navigation in harbor planning?

The paramount operational needs of different ports and waterways naturally differ depending upon a wide variety of circumstances some of which may be insurmountable. But there are universal problems that all shiphandlers at times must face. They are:

1. Currents which have always been a primary cause in groundings, collision and maneuvering difficulties.

2. Tides which change the depths of channels and affect the maneuverability of vessels, especially near piers.

3. Winds that cause vessels to drift across channels and complicate their handling at docks.

4. Fog, mist, falling snow and heavy rain that blind navigators, often forcing vessels to anchor under hazardous circumstances.

5. Hazards of restricted channels, as may be caused by insufficient channel depth or width, excessive curvature of channel bends, and discontinuities in the banks.

6. Machinery and steering gear failures that frequently force vessels to anchor in emergencies when they swing according to the direction of the current, and at times to the wind.

7. Maneuvering characteristics of vessels, for example, single-screw ships whose sterns move to port when engines are backing, the tendency of all vessels to back into strong winds; the sinking, squatting, and sheering which occurs when vessels pass through restricted waters.

8. Use of tugboats in connection with assisting vessels berthing and unberthing.

The variations of these problems are numerous and involved. There is a vast literature dealing with some of them but not all. But all of them have some very definite implications in harbor planning that should be considered.

The most recent constructive contribution to this literature is the investigation of "Ship Performance in Restricted Channels," recently completed at the Taylor Model Basin of the Navy at the request of the Governor of the Panama Canal. A summary of these studies was published in the proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers for April 1948.

A unique feature of their conduct was the participation of naval architects, civil engineers, and Panama Canal pilots. This collaboration of technical and operational authorities makes these channel investigations unusually authoritative for the selected test conditions. As a result of these studies there is now a basis for a better understanding of many problems of ship handling in restricted waters which, for more than a century, have baffled navigators, pilots and engineers. These studies most certainly will assume a greater importance in the future as they become better known.

Information for marine planning is by no means limited to theoretical channel studies. Probably the most useful indicators of the soundness of marine planning are marine accidents. A plot of their locations in any waterway of heavy traffic density will be helpful to planners and port authorities. It is not contended that such plots alone would be sufficient for the economic justification of major undertakings but it is contended that such studies are essential preparations for sound marine planning.

A very constructive contribution toward port operation is a pamphlet on "Handling Tub Boats in the Panama Canal" by an experienced Panama Canal pilot, Capt. A. T. Luther, whom I encouraged to undertake this study in 1942 while I was captain of the port of the Pacific terminal of the Panama Canal shortly before he retired from the canal service. In this pamphlet, Captain Luther described the fundamental positions of tugs when assisting vessels, illustrated with diagrams of the special situations faced at Panama. So far as I have been able to determine this is the first such work in English. Distributed to the pilot and tug master forces in the Canal Zone, it proved its value by passing along in convenient form the highlights of a lifetime of experience of one who had served as both pilot and tug master. Such pamphlets should be developed for every major port. A study of the tugboat problems will certainly emphasize the need for adequate space between piers to permit the most effective operation of tugs assisting vessels in berthing.

Perhaps the greatest store of information not yet fully tapped is the accumulated knowledge of pilots. These men through their own experience, at times tragic, know the grave dangers and the serious navigational problems of the waters in which they operate. Their knowledge is a reservoir of information gained by years of observation which should be sought whenever navigational problems are presented.

Unfortunately, much of this knowledge has not been recorded and has been lost. But much of it has been passed on by word of mouth. Some needs interpretation in the light of exact engineering data. But there is a great deal of value that is always readily available to those seeking that type of specialized knowledge.

Many navigators, when passing through waterways, have often observed port layouts which have puzzled them. Some of these arrangements may be explained on the grounds of the excessive costs of securing better solutions or as involving insurmountable obstacles. But many of these puzzling propositions have been due to the fact that qualified authorities on navigational problems were not consulted or because of a failure to appreciate the need for the navigational advice which only the ship handler can supply.

In some instances the navigational situations created in these layouts have been so serious as to require major modifications of the original plans which could easily have been avoided by sufficient preliminary studies of navigational problems.

Now that the problems of operation are better understood it is squarely up to the mariners and port authorities to study their operational needs and to state them with requisite accuracy. When that is done the engineering planners can develop plans with greater confidence.

What future changes are in store for our waterways and harbors no one can predict, but those of you who control their planning will find the marine world most willing to assist in any possible way with their knowledge. The records of marine accidents, the accumulated experience of pilots, and the restricted channel navigation tests together form a background of material that should go far toward better operational planning.

The basic thought expressed in these remarks is not stated as being new; rather it is old. Certainly the central ideas have nowhere been so well epitomized as in the words of one of America's great builders of harbors, who in 1915 stated: "There is no profession in which experience is a greater factor than that of the engineer, especially as to the design of works affecting navigation; the adaptability of such works to the needs of the navigator, the chances of accidents and the necessary appliances to reduce such chances to a minimum are questions that experience largely determines." These words, so meaningful to ship operators and port authorities today, are the words of a great engineer. They are the words of Gen. W. L. Sibert.

In line with that philosophy let me urge that in the future no development of port facilities affecting navigation be undertaken without first securing all the relevant navigational advice that is available, especially from pilots and other ship handlers.

HEARINGS ON SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs is conducting hearings on the U.S. policy toward South Africa.

The hearings, under the able leadership of Chairman O'Hara, have given proponents and opponents of the South African Government a chance to state their views. A number of outstanding witnesses have appeared.

One of the best statements on the conditions in South Africa was given by Rev. Kenneth N. Carstens, a minister of the Methodist Church in South Africa. Reverend Carstens gives a thoroughly documented review of the effects of the apartheid policy in South Africa.

He points out in his speech:

> One does not have to be a wild-eyed, angry young man to say that apartheid has produced the most vicious, and ruthless, and dehumanizing society that I know.

In order that all Members will be able to gain the benefits of Reverend Carstens' testimony, I insert his statement in the Record in connection with my remarks:

Testimony of the Reverend Kenneth N. Carstens at the Hearings of the African Subcommittee of the Congressional Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 17, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I thank you for your invitation to participate in your study of what you, Mr. Chairman, in your letter to me, referred to as the "crisis in South Africa and the steps required to deal with it effectively."

Since I am a minister of the Methodist Church of South Africa, I should make it clear that I am not authorized to speak on behalf of my church, nor on behalf of anybody, or institution, or party, in South Africa or anywhere else. I am speaking in my personal capacity as a South African Christian who was born and educated in South Africa, who has traveled in every province and most regions of the country, has worked for commercial enterprises there, and later served in parishes in Namaqualand, South West Africa, and in the city of Port Elizabeth. I have come to the United States for graduate study which I have been privileged to undertake at the Harvard Divinity School and at Union Theological Seminary in New York, where I am presently enrolled.

However, although I am empowered to represent no party or institution, I cannot help but feel—and this is merely subjective—that I have the duty and the privilege to speak to you on behalf of at least one major group of my compatriots, namely, those 13 million nonwhite South Africans [1] who have no vote and no voice whatsoever in the government of their homeland and mine. (This is because, as you know, government is carried out exclusively by whites, who represent a minority of 3.4 million.)[2]

My testimony today would have been either unnecessary or very different if it were not for those 13 million of my compatriots, who have been completely disenfranchised; [3] who are kept in perpetual poverty by the industrial color bar and the laws against collective bargaining and strikes; [4] who have been deprived of freedom of speech,[5] movement,[6] and assembly,[7] in over 87 percent of the country (the white area [8]); who, in urban areas, are at the mercy of a disrupting, demoralizing, and immoral migratory labor system which is rigidly controlled by government labor bureau; [9] who live in constant fear of being classified as "surplus labor" or "politically suspect" by an administrative officer, robbed of job and livelihood, and transported to some remote and impoverished rural area known as a "tribal homeland"; [10] who, in rural areas, are "reduced to serfdom by laws which make it a criminal offense for any farm laborer to leave his employment without the written permission of his employer; [11] who cannot acquire freehold title to land; [12] and who have even been robbed of the right to live with wife and family in an urban area.

Because of these facts (of which there are far more than can be mentioned in 1 month's hearings), each of which is reliably documented in my footnotes,[13] one does not have to be a wild-eyed, angry young man to say that apartheid has produced the most vicious, ruthless, and dehumanizing society that I know.

This is not to say that there may not be other tyrannies in the modern world; no doubt there are. But, as far as I know, the injustices that are perpetrated in countries outside Southern Africa, are not sanctioned and legislated by the national governments concerned; and in those cases in which, perhaps, they are, the injustices are based upon ideological and other factors that can be chosen by the victims of the injustice. For example, if an atheistic government were legally to prohibit the belief and practice of the Christian faith, the citizen would be free, if his own conscience allowed, to reject or pretend to reject the Christian faith, and to accept or pretend to accept the national ideology, and thus avoid persecution. But in the Republic of South Africa the social system is based on something entirely different; it is based on something that no man can control, namely the pigmentation of his skin. According to skincolor, every South African is classified in what the government calls "races" or "nations," and on that basis, a rigidly ascribed principle of inequality operates. This principle places a total and permanent ban upon all normal economic, social, and political aspirations of nonwhites, and subjects them to a permanent state of dependency, keeping them on the lowest level of society; while it assigns to every white person, regardless of ability, education, or skill, the permanent and automatic privilege of being a "master." In short, apartheid is a racial caste system in which every white is a "Brahmin" and every nonwhite an "Untouchable."[14]

---

[1] The 12.2 million Africans and 600,000 Asians are voteless. The 1.8 million coloreds are not technically voteless, since they are allowed to vote (on a separate voters' roll) for four white representatives.

[2] The coloreds have token representation only. See note 1.

[3] By the Promotion of Bantu Self Government Act of 1959; the Xhosa vote in the Transkei is merely an exercise in a severely limited form of local self-government. Every matter of importance in the Transkei (except, theoretically, education) remains under the strict control of, and economically dependent upon, the white government. See: "A survey of Race Relations in South Africa," compiled by Muriel Horrell for the South African Institute of Race Relations and published in Johannesburg in 1960 (covering the years 1958–59), pp. 47–68, for a full summary of this act.

Every act subsequently referred to in this statement will be found in an issue of this summary, and will be indicated with "Summary" and the years covered in its issue.

[4] Industrial Conciliation Act, as amended.

[5] Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1953, sec. 2(b); Riotous Assemblies Act of 1956, sec. 3(1)(3), sec. 17.

[6] Bantu Laws Amendment Act of 1964.

[7] Innumerable municipal bylaws and regulations made under powers conferred on local authorities by sec. 38(3)(r) of the Natives (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act of 1945.

[8] An obviously erroneous term since whites in every city, town, village, and farm are outnumbered by nonwhites.

[9] Bantu Laws Amendment Act of 1964.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Nielsen, Waldemar A., "African Battleline," New York, Harper & Row, 1965, p. 64.

[12] Land Act of 1913, and Natives Trust and Land Act of 1936.

[13] The South African Government Printer, of course, produces most of the documentation by printing the laws enacted by the all-white Parliament.

These are facts (and judgments which I believe the facts patently confirm) which justice, patriotism, and loyalty to my people (not only the ruling white minority but to all my people), compel me to speak about.

President Johnson said in New York on February 23, 1966, that the "Four Freedoms" which former President Roosevelt sought, "can never be secure in America if they are violated elsewhere in the world."[15] Speaking in Honolulu on February 6, 1966, President Johnson also rejected the "logic that tyranny 10,000 miles away is not tyranny to concern us—or that subjugation by an armed minority in Asia is different from subjugation by an armed minority in Europe."[16]

South Africa is the world's foremost example of subjugation by a heavily armed minority. We do not read about it in the American press because the subjugation of the nonwhites by the white minority is so complete that the heavily armed nationalist government forces no longer have to massacre unarmed, peacefully demonstrating African men, women, and children, as they did at Sharpeville and Langa 6 years ago this month. The armored cars, the police dogs, the jails, the torture chambers, and the Africans' own poverty, can now be relied upon to perpetuate that subjugation until the whole thing explodes in our faces.

THE CLAIMS OF THE NATIONALIST GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

In these introductory remarks, Mr. Chairman, I have been making general statements which, because of the notoriety of apartheid, you and your committee have no doubt heard before. But now, with your permission, I shall address myself a little more specifically to the frequent assertions of the Nationalist government that it represents in Africa the stablest and strongest form of what the Government is pleased to call "Western democracy" and "Christian civilization" and can therefore continue to count on the material support of the Western World even though that support is accompanied by moral condemnations of and exhortations against the armed subjugation known as apartheid. The nationalist government also claims that it is promoting the welfare of the South African population—which I think the Government acknowledges to be one of the necessary functions of the state.

Such assertions are patently contradicted by the principles, the policies, and the practice of the nationalist government. But the falseness of the Government's claims can be exposed more explicitly.

The claims of the Nationalist government to be the representative of "Western democracy" and of "Christian civilization" must be assessed mainly by value-judgments based upon facts, policies, interpretations, because there is no blueprint, no comprehensive set of principles that is universally accepted as the canon, the indubitable criterion by which any state can be declared to embody either "Western democracy" or—and especially—"Christian civilization." In short, my judgments on these questions will probably be more subjective that objective, determined by the values, commitments, and presuppositions that I bring to the enterprise.

But I can at least mention some of the facts upon which my judgments are based. Moreover, assessing the Government's claim to be promoting the welfare of its citizens, is rather less dependent upon subjective criteria.

I recognize, of course, that ethical commitments and presuppositions operate to a greater or lesser extent in the assessment of any and every situation. But if you are to assess a father's claim that he is promoting the welfare of his children, there are some ethical presuppositions which operate universally regardless of culture. For example, if that father systematically denies them equal educational, social, and economic opportunities; assigns to four of them all the meanest and dirtiest work in the household with totally inadequate rewards, and gives all the privileges, all the pleasant work, and disproportionately high rewards, to one; and if that father, moreover, brutally punishes the four children by beatings and torture, and even severely punishes the privileged one when he protests against these injustices; then it seems to me that unquestionable human values would ineluctably oblige every fairminded person and every responsible citizen not only to condemn that situation utterly, but also to take immediate legal action to rectify it.

This is precisely the analogical situation in which the international community finds itself vis-a-vis South Africa, and this situation has existed for many years—even before the Second World War (when General Smuts' racial policy was criticized in the League of Nations), although it is only since 1948 that the Nationalist Party began to entrench and petrify every conceivable aspect of the racial caste systems in the largest and most comprehensive body of racist legislation in existence today (and probably in the whole recorded history of mankind).

PROMOTING WELFARE

The concepts of welfare and justice seem to me to be not only inseparably related to each other, but also indivisible in the sense that a state cannot be considered to be "promoting the welfare of its citizens" when that state consistently, on principle, and as a matter of avowed policy, invariably promotes and perpetuates the social, economic, and political privileges of one exclusively defined minority of its people (viz the 3.4 million whites) at the expense of the perpetuation and exploitation of the disabilities and poverty of the underprivileged majority of its citizens (viz, the 14,400,000 nonwhites).[17]

African poverty: I shall mention only a few of the innumerable examples of this cruel perpetuation of the social and economic disabilities of nonwhites in general and of Africans in particular. But first, in order that we may better understand the condition of the victims of the government's welfare, let me mention a few facts concerning the unequal distribution of wealth in South Africa.

It was reported[18] in 1964 that nonwhites made up 99 percent of the unskilled workers in industry, 66 percent of the semiskilled, and 17 percent of the skilled workers. In 1964 it was estimated by the South African Institute of Race Relations[19] that the poverty datum line for the average African family in Johannesburg was £26.6.6 per month and that the effective minimum income necessary for health was just under £40. But the average income of unskilled workers in Johannesburg in that year was £19.6.4—26 percent less than the poverty datum line and less than half of the effective minimum income. Since the overwhelming majority of unskilled workers are Africans (and the rest are coloreds and Asians) it is not unreasonable to conclude that the majority of Africans live below the breadline. And it is a fact that some areas of South Africa boast the highest recorded infant mortality rate in the world.

This picture becomes more shocking when the wages of whites and the wages of Africans are compared.

According to the official Bulletin of Statistics for 1962,[20] the average annual wage paid to Africans and whites in manufacturing industries was £196 and £977 respectively, in construction work it was £183 and £995 respectively, and in mining it was £74 to Africans and £1,217 to whites.[21] In a doctoral dissertation at the Government University of South Africa, it was stated that, in 1960, the annual per capita income for whites was £476, while for Africans it was £43.10—i.e., less than 10 percent of the white per capita income.[22]

Even more shocking is the disparity in pensions paid to whites and nonwhites. Take for example the pensions paid to the blind as set forth in the Government Gazette Extraordinary, April 27, 1962, page 23: All whites, whether they live in urban or rural areas, get £72 a year. Africans in towns get £9 a year and Africans in rural areas get £6 every year.

Between 1947 and 1961 whites' wages rose by 35 percent and African wages by 11 percent[23] while the price of food alone rose by 17 percent between 1958 and 1965.[24] African poverty, malnutrition, and starvation is therefore increasing, while the whites reap all the benefits of the booming economy—an inevitable consequence of economic and political bondage, and a flat contradiction of the argument that a booming economy will alleviate and liberalize the situation.

Education: In 1963 over 21 percent (730,347) of the white population (3.4 million) were attending primary, secondary, and high schools, and these white children had 33,364 teachers—which meant that on the average every white teacher had 22 white pupils.[25]

In 1965, only about 8 percent (1,563,149)[26] of the African population (12.2 million) were in primary, secondary, and high schools,

---

[14] Van den Berghe, Pierre L., "South Africa, a Study in Conflict," Middletown, Wesleyan University Press, 1965, p. 19 f, 52–56, and Legum, Colin, and Margaret, "South Africa: Crisis for the West," New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1964, p. 6 f.

[15] New York Times, Feb. 24, 1966.

[16] New York Times, Feb. 7, 1966.

[17] Government estimates of the mid-1965 population are as follows:

Whites	3, 395, 000
Nonwhite:	
Africans	12, 162, 000
Coloreds	1, 742, 000
Asians	533, 000
Total	14, 437, 000

[18] Segal, Ronald, (ed.), "Sanctions Against South Africa," Middlesex, Penguin Books, 1964, p. 34.

[19] "Survey" 1965, p. 205f.

[20] Cited in Cope, John, "South Africa," New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1965, p. 31.

[21] Housing, food, and medical attention supplied by the mines would probably bring an additional £100 worth to the Africans.

[22] "Survey" 1965, p. 205.

[23] Leiss, Amelia C. (ed.), "Apartheid and United Nations," New York, The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1965, p. 69.

[24] "Survey" 1965, p. 203 f.

[25] Report 285 of the Bureau of Statistics, cited in "Survey" 1965, p. 256f.

[26] Letter Jan. 6, 1965, of the Secretary of Bantu Education of the National Advisory Educational Council, cited in "Survey" 1965, p. 247.

and they had only 30,119 teachers[27]—which meant that, on the average, every African teacher had 52 African pupils. Moreover, in 1962, about £6.10 was spent on the education of every African child, whereas £72.10 was spent on every white child,[28] which meant that for every pound spent on African pupils, 12 pounds were spent on white pupils. This disparity is increasing. As the need for and cost of education continues to rise, and as more money is spent on white education, the percentage of the net national income spent on African education steadily decreases: nearly three-fifths of 1 percent (0.57 percent) of net national income was spent on African education in 1953–54; this had dropped to less than two-fifths of 1 percent (0.39 percent) of net national income in 1963–64.[29]

African teachers are similarly discriminated against: the top salary paid to African teachers with university degrees in 1963 was £894, while the top salary to white teachers was £2,175.[30] On average last year, the salaries paid to African male teachers was 41.9 percent of that paid to whites with the same qualifications, while African female teachers got 37.9 percent of the salary paid to white females.

The facilities of African schools are woefully inadequate. Most of the African schools are still working double shifts,[31] and some still have three shifts—i.e., three different sets of pupils every day. In Pretoria, for example, the three different sets of children start, respectively, at 7:30 a.m., 10:30 a.m., and 1:30 p.m.,[32] which means that these pupils are getting only 3 hours of inadequate schooling a day, furthermore, some unqualified teachers are used in the third shifts.[33]

As to the nature of African education (Bantu education) let the Prime Minister of South Africa, Dr. Verwoerd's own words describe it for us, lest I be accused of hyperbole:

"When I have control of native education, I will reform it so that natives will be taught from childhood to realize that equality with Europeans is not for them * * *. People who believe in equality are not desirable teachers for natives * * *. When my department controls native education it will know for what class of higher education a native is fitted, and whether he will have a chance in life to use his knowledge." "What is the use of teaching the Bantu child mathematics when it cannot use it in practice? * * * That is quite absurd."

"The Bantu must be guided to serve his community; there is no place for him in the European community above certain forms of labor."[34]

Pass laws and the urban African: The pass laws have been a constant source of hardship and steadily mounting resentment to Africans ever since the pass laws were introduced in the 19th century. In a cynically named natives (Abolition of Passes and Coordination of Documents) act of 1952, the Nationalist Government, far from abolishing passes, multiplied them and combined them into one reference book. This reference book with the passes it contains has to be in the possession of the 4 million urban Africans at all times and in all places; and after the curfew—which, of course, applies only to Africans—they have to have an additional pass, which is valid for only 1 night, to avoid immediate arrest.

Failure to be in possession of any single document (or pass) in the reference book means at least arrest and imprisonment or a heavy fine,[35] and at worst, "endorsement out"—which means that the victim has to get out of the urban area and go to a life of hopelessness and poverty in some overcrowded rural slum known as a tribal reserve. Tens of thousands of African men and women are thus endorsed out every year, even though it usually means breaking up a family. In 1964 some 14,000 women and over 84,000 men were endorsed out of nine urban areas.[36] The toll in broken families will never be known. Hundreds of thousands of Africans are arrested every year for offenses under pass laws—that is, for doing things that would be considered perfectly normal and lawful in any civilized society—and probably most uncivilized societies, too. Indeed, over the past 12 years, about a thousand Africans are arrested every day for these so-called offenses under laws which apply only to Africans.[37] In 1964, nearly 2,200,000 crimes were reported (with a total population of only 17 million). As a New York Times reporter pointed out, of those crimes, nearly one-third were crimes that only black men could commit—"by being in the wrong place, with the wrong papers, at the wrong time."[38] "In 1963 and 1964, 257 Africans were sentenced to death in South Africa; 164 were actually hanged. In the same 2 years only nine whites were executed."[39]

But the most devastating and vicious racist legislation of all is the Bantu Laws Amendment Act No. 42 of 1964, some of the effects of which I mentioned in my introductory remarks. This act reduces millions of people to mere units of labor, in a thinly disguised form of slavery.[40]

This kind of discrimination and exploitation, of which I have mentioned only a very small part, cannot, it would seem to me, support the claim that the Government is promoting the welfare of the South African population.

WESTERN CIVILIZATION AND CHRISTENDOM

With unconscious irony, the Prime Minister, in a speech in support of the unconscionable and notorious "No Trial" Act, said in April 1963, that South Africa might yet be called upon to "save" Western Civilization and Christendom.[41]

Apartheid and the Christian faith: Since the Nationalist Government and most of its supporters are very religious and constantly invoke and claim divine sanctions for their ideology and policies, let me address myself very briefly to this phenomenon.

Every major church in the world—Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestant[42]—has clearly expressed its abhorrence of racialism in any form as contrary to the Scriptures and a violation of Christian ethics. The most representative ecumenical statement that addresses the South African situation was drawn up by an international delagation of the World Council of Churches who met with South African member churches at Cottesloe, Johannesburg, in 1960.

The following are some of the clauses of the Cottesloe consultation statement that was approved in plenary session:[43]

"The segregation of racial groups carried through without effective consultation and involving discrimination leads to hardship for members of the groups affected.

"There are no Scriptural grounds for the prohibition of mixed marriages.

"We call attention once again to the disintegrating effects of migrant labor on African life. No stable society is possible unless the cardinal importance of family life is recognized, and from the Christian standpoint, it is imperative that the integrity of the family be safeguarded.

"It is now widely recognized that the wages received by the vast majority of the nonwhite people oblige them to exist well below the generally accepted minimum standard for healthy living. Concerted action is required to remedy this grave situation.

"The present system of job reservation must give way to a more equitable system of labor which safeguards the interest of all concerned.

"Opportunities must be provided for the inhabitants of the Bantu areas to live in conformity with human dignity.

"It is our conviction that the right to own land wherever he is domiciled, and to participate in the government of his country, is part of the dignity of the adult man, and for this reason a policy which permanently denies to nonwhite people the right of collaboration in the government of the country of which they are citizens cannot be justified.

"It is our conviction that there can be no objection in principle to the direct representation of colored people in Parliament."

Every one of the clauses cited is a direct condemnation of a particular or general set of circumstances, the injustice of which is entrenched by legislation enacted mainly by the nationalist government since 1948.

The nationalist government's apartheid policy is a flagrant violation of Christian ethics. And it is a direct contradiction of the most fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. It is at enmity with humanity. It is a morally indefensible and spiritually repugnant ideology which systematically destroys the rights of man. Because apartheid is deeply, and by its very nature, it will either continue to try to pervert that faith, or it will try to destroy it. At present apartheid is trying to undermine the faith by subterfuge, by trying to pervert basic Christian doctrines; and with some success. But if this subtle form of attack should fail, and if apartheid maintains its present ideological form and mode of operation, then by an ineluctable process of logic, it must eventually try to destroy the faith by other means.

The indications of this began to appear in 1963, when the Christian Institute of Southern Africa was formed. The Christian Institute is an entirely nonpolitical, nonpartisan, interracial and ecumenical body of Christians, whose only purpose is to serve the church in obedience to Holy Scriptures. It immediately became the object of innumerable slanderous attacks by the Government, the nationalist press, and by other Government supporters inside and outside the church. Last year the institute's offices were raided by the security police. Any person and any institution that tries to obey the Scriptures and regain the integrity of the church in South Africa will more and more become the object of this kind of intimidation and, eventually, persecution. The model of this was Hitler's Germany.

---

[27] Report of the Department of Bantu Education R.P. 29/1965, p. 11, cited in "Survey" 1965, p. 253.

[28] Cope, op. cit., p. 20.

[29] "Survey" 1965, p. 242.

[30] Cope, loc. cit.

[31] "Survey" 1965, p. 249. According to the Minister of Bantu Education (Assembly Hansard 16, column 6297), 64 percent of the schools had double shifts in 1957, 57 percent in 1964.

[32] Rand Daily Mail, May 22, 1965.

[33] Ibid.

[34] These statements were made by Dr. Verwoerd, when he was Minister of Native Affairs, as he was introducing the Bantu Education Act. His full exposition was published by the Department of Native Affairs under the title "Bantu Education Policy for the Immediate Future."

[35] Even what for whites would be the lightest fine is to Africans a heavy fine because of their poverty.

[36] Minister of Bantu Administration and Development in the Assembly (Hansard 12, column 4430), "Survey" 1965, p. 155. Some of these ejections may have been for other offenses than pass law offenses.

[37] "Survey" 1965, p. 76.

[38] New York Times, Jan. 23, 1966.

[39] Ibid.

[40] For a full summary of this act, see "Survey" 1964, pp. 174–184.

[41] "Christendom," if this signifies a political entity, has, of course, ceased to exist.

[42] The South African Dutch Reformed Churches are the main exceptions.

[43] Hewson, Leslie A. (ed.), "Cottesloe Consultation," Johannesburg, 1961, p. 75. The Synods of the South African Dutch Reformed Churches which were represented at the consultation, later dissociated themselves from the entire statement, and resigned from the World Council of Churches.

But worse even than opposition and persecution, is the blasphemous claim by the Government that its ideology is remotely related to the Christian faith except as an enemy. Such claims are gravely inimical to the faith and work of the church, and are doing the church the greatest disservice and damage. In short, both by its insidious operations and by its outward opposition to the true faith of the church, the Nationalist Government has become by far the most dangerous enemy of the Christian faith that I know in Africa. Anyone, therefore, who does anything to help and support apartheid in any direct or indirect way, is helping an enemy of man, an enemy of God, and an enemy of the Christian church.

I know of no reputable theologian who has not similarly condemned racialism. But the Government's claiming Christian sanctions for its social policies and their brutal implementation is so patently false that there is no need to adduce further evidence. There is, however, one statement made by the renowned theologian, Karl Barth, which leads me to my next point. When asked to comment on a racial tenet held by certain churches in South Africa, Professor Barth, who vigorously opposed Hitler's nazism in the churches in Europe, said that the tenet was "Nazi theology."

Nazism: The connection between South African racialism, its rationale, and its implementation, and the racialism and methods of Hitler's national socialism, is neither rhetorical nor accidental. During the first World War, the Afrikaner Nationalists looked hopefully toward Germany to "save" them from the cultural and economic superiority of the British South Africans. In the 1930's the secret Afrikaner nationalist society called the Broederbond (bond of brothers) greatly admired Hitler's nazism, and many mutual contacts were established. When World War II broke out and General Smuts (Prime Minister) led South Africa into the war against Hitler, the Afrikaner nationalists were bitterly opposed to the move.

Dr. Verwoerd, who is now Prime Minister in South Africa, was editor of the Afrikaner newspaper, Die Transvaler, gave unambiguous support to the Nazis. In 1943 a judgement delivered by Justice Millin in the Witwatersrand Division of the Supreme Court of South Africa, stated that "Dr. Verwoerd did support Nazi propaganda, he did make his (news)paper a tool of the Nazis in South Africa, and he knew it."

The next most powerful man in the present South African Cabinet is the Minister of Justice, Mr. J. B. Vorster. Mr. Vorster was apparently more active in his support than Dr. Verwoerd. Mr. Vorster was detained in a cell in Port Elizabeth from September 23 until December 15, 1942. He was then kept in an internment camp in Koffiefontein until February 11, 1944, by which time the tide had turned against Hitler. Mr. Vorster was then kept under house arrest in Robertson, in the Cape Providence, until April 15, 1944, when he escaped. He was rearrested in Springs in the Transvaal Province and later freed.

Many more examples of South Africa's present political leaders' connections and sympathies with the Nazis could be mentioned. But there are also inner connections of logic with nazism. For example, one of the early actions of the Nazis when they came to power in Germany was to proclaim the Nurenberg Decrees, forbidding sexual intercourse between the Herrenvolk Aryans and the Jews. In South Africa, among the first laws passed by the Afrikaner Nationalists when they came to power in 1948, were the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act and the Immorality Amendment Act, which similarly forbade intercourse between whites and nonwhites. Such prohibitions are among the characteristics of a racial caste system.

Moreover, there is an alarming similarity between the Nazis and the Afrikaner Nationalists in their mode of operation. Let one general example suffice, torture.

Torture: In 1963 the Nationalist Government enacted a "law" that finally ended the rule of law in South Africa. It was the General Law Amendment Act No. 37, commonly known as the "no trial" act. Among other things, this "law" enabled the Government to keep persons in jail, for life, without trial,[44] and to keep persons in solitary confinement without warrant or trial until the victim has "replied satisfactorily" to all questions put to him.[45]

Let me quote one example of the use made of these arbitrary powers. Mrs. Lettie Sibeko of Capetown was detained for nearly 8 of the 9 months of her pregnancy—5 of those months in solitary confinement. She was released in February 1964 a matter of days before her baby was expected. She was never charged with any offense. The police were simply looking for her husband and had hoped that, with sufficient persuasion, she would supply the information they wanted.

Within a few months of the passage of the "no trial" act, persistent allegations of torture began to appear in the form of affidavits and sworn statements, scores of which I have had the painful experience of reading.[46] These allegations began to appear in the press and other publications—including United Nations documents—before the end of 1963, and have continued intermittently ever since.[47]

Ill-treatment and torture in prisons was not something that began only after the passage of the "no trial" act. The Minister of Justice himself admitted that in 1962 there were 17 cases of policemen assaulting witnesses in criminal trials and 44 assaults by the police on prisoners.[48] Several times State witnesses admitted in court that they had been tortured and forced to sign "confessions" and statements written by the police.[49] And several policemen and wardens have been convicted in South Africa's courts for beating, torturing, and even murdering prisoners.[50]

This unconscionable and systematic pattern of violence and torture was finally dramatically exposed by an extraordinarily courageous newspaper editor,[51] Laurence Gandar, who painstakingly gathered a mass of convincing evidence and several witnesses, including prison officials, finally published a series of articles in June and July last year,[52] which described prison conditions and torture of political prisoners. Mr. Gandar called for a full inquiry.

The government's reaction was characteristic. First, a high official tried to stop the publication of the articles, but failed. The security police (South Africa's Gestapo) then raided the offices of the Rand Daily Mail four times without a search warrant. On one of the raids they confiscated a great deal of evidence which Mr. Gandar and his staff had gathered in support of their allegations. The government then proceeded to charge one after another of Mr. Gandar's chief witnesses with perjury. One after another they are being found "guilty" on the very questionable evidence of, inter alia, interested parties, and of other prisoners who may themselves have been forced to give evidence under threats, torture, and brainwashing, which are the very issues in question. "Confessions" have also been used. The dubious character of this kind of evidence has even been commented on by one of South Africa's judges. In July 1965, Mr. Justice Steyn of the Transvaal Bench, said that it was fantastic that, when no evidence was available against a suspect, confessions were brought to light; but if evidence were strong enough, confessions were conspicuous by their absence.[53]

An eminent and respected political leader in South Africa whose name I cannot disclose lest harsher measures be taken against him, commented, in a recent letter, on trials of witnesses of police torture. He said: "It is a terrible situation when, if 50 people tell the same lie it becomes by a kind of miraculous conversion, the truth, and the one person who is telling the truth becomes a liar. * * * The other trials which are pending seem set to produce their fair share of tragedy too."

CONCLUSION

It seems to be utterly incredible that a regime which seems to be following so closely in the footsteps of Hitler, whose atrocities forced most civilized countries to take up arms against him, should claim and expect the allegiance, respect, and support of any civilized nation. It is even more fantastic that, although the Nationalist Government has lost the respect of most nations, it still receives their material support.

Nazism, whether of the South African or the German brand, often lurks beneath the surface of our culture; but it is obviously a sharp and dangerous deviation. It would therefore seem to be in the interests of the Western World as well as humanity at large, to deal firmly with this aberration.

Racial discrimination has become fundamental to every conceivable aspect of South African society, including the law. There is no institution remaining in South Africa to which the nonwhites can appeal for redress. The whites, who hold all the power, are trapped in a mounting spiral of fear and injustice. All the nonwhite leaders are exiled, banned, jailed, or executed. If the powerful and responsible members of the international community continue to do nothing but utter empty moral condemnations of apartheid, to what can the Africans appeal but to the blind and destructive forces of violence and terror?

---

[44] Vorster said he'd keep Robert Sobukwe in jail until "this side of eternity." Mr. Sobukwe's offense was to organize and lead a peaceful demonstration against unjust laws.

[45] This clause (No. 17), suspended nearly 2 years later, was followed by the Criminal Laws Amendment Act of 1965 with even harsher and more arbitrary provisions, which has effectively taken over the functions of that clause.

[46] Carstens, Kenneth N., "Torture and Mind-Breaking in South Africa," "Christianity and Crisis," XXIV, 9 (May 25, 1966) pp. 97–101.

[47] e.g., The Observer (London) Nov. 3, 1963; Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 25, 1964; Motive (March 1964), and United Nations Document A/AC. 115/2.53.

[48] The Honorable J. Hamilton Russell, "90-Day Torture in South Africa," (London 1964) p. 6. Mr. Hamilton Russell was an eminent member of the parliamentary opposition party, from which he resigned when his party voted with the Government on the "no trial" act. Replying to a question in the house, the minister said that between 1956 and 1958 549 policemen were found guilty of assault. Lawyers allege that very few cases became public.

[49] Russell, loc. cit.

[50] Ibid; the Observer, Mar. 15, 1964; the Times (London) Oct. 1, 1965.

[51] Gandar's courage has won for his paper the World Press Achievement Award for 1966; see New York Times Feb. 25, 1966.

[52] Excerpts were published in the New York Times Magazine, July 25, 1965.

[53] Cited in a Rand Daily Mail editorial, July 12, 1965.

If those blind forces should be allowed to take over the situation, the whole international community may well find themselves involuntarily drawn into a conflict that would hold every potential of developing into a racial war. As the Secretary General of the United Nations said in 1964: "There is the clear prospect that racial conflict, if we cannot curb and finally eliminate it, will grow into a destructive monster compared to which the religious or ideological conflicts of the past and present will seem like small family quarrels. Such a conflict will eat away the possibilities of good of all that mankind has hitherto achieved and reduce men to the lowest and most bestial levels of intolerance and hatred. This, for the sake of all our children, whatever their race and color, must not be permitted to happen. (Apartheid in South Africa, II; New York, United Nations, 1965, p. 11.)

No major power was able to remain neutral in Hitler's war precisely because of its racial character.

If my nonwhite compatriots are left the victims of a grotesque aberration of Western culture; if my white compatriots are left the victims of their fears compounded with their demonic dreams of racial purity and privilege; if no one will act to save my people—white and nonwhite—from their headlong rush toward moral and national suicide; the Western World will be guilty of a gigantic crime of omission, the victim of its own moral and political impotence.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today's Byelorussia is hardly more than a geographic term, almost lost in the huge and expansive Soviet Empire. This historic home of one of the oldest Slavic peoples was at last separated from the old Russian Empire, and 48 years ago its inhabitants proclaimed their national independence. That was done toward the end of the First World War, on March 25, 1918.

The Byelorussian people, constituting some 10 million stouthearted workers and fighters in their historic homeland, had long been suffering under the oppressive regime of czarist Russia. Though they had endured the heavy foreign yoke imposed upon them for centuries, they had retained their indomitable spirit of freedom and were always prepared to fight for independence. Their one real chance came in 1918, after the overthrow of Russia's decrepit autocracy. The valiant Byelorussians were quick to take advantage of this situation; they proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918, and established the Byelorussian National Republic.

Thenceforth for nearly 3 years they divided their time between working and fighting to assure their hard-won freedom. They worked to rebuild their ravaged country and fought against their implacable foes on many fronts. But their enemies were too numerous and powerful, and one among their foes proved fatal for their independence. The reorganized and aggressive Red army finally overran the country and put an end to the Byelorussian National Republic, which was made a part of the Soviet Union.

This brief interval of Byelorussian independence marks a turning point in the lives of the Byelorussian people. Though the long-sought period of independence was quite short and vanished like a dream, its inspiring afterglow still survives in the hearts of liberty-loving Byelorussians, who observe with dedication this anniversary of their independence. Mr. Speaker, on the 48th anniversary of that memorable event all friends of the Byelorussian people join them in their fervent desire for freedom from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

VERRAZANO DAY

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the great Italian sailor and explorer, Giovanni de Verrazano, in keeping with the occasion of Verrazano Day, April 17, on which we hail his name and his accomplishments.

As far as we know, Verrazano was the first European to visit the area that in time would become New York City. He sailed into New York Harbor, and undoubtedly saw the mouth of the Hudson River in 1524.

As a sailor, Verrazano was one of the best among a great number of outstanding Italian seahawks of the 16th century. In his youth he sailed in the Mediterranean, and probably elsewhere, until 1522, when he settled in France. In 1524 he was commissioned by the French King, Francis I, to explore the coast of North America, and did so, in company with the French explorer, Jacques Cartier, bringing back the first maps of what is now the New York City area.

Verrazano deserves a prominent place in the history of American discovery, side by side with his fellow Italians, Columbus and Vespucci. Together they made a remarkable team. Columbus concentrated on the West Indies, Vespucci explored the coast of South America, and Verrazano reconnoitered the east coast of North America, from Florida to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, in a way that had never been done before.

The practical result of Verrazano's voyage was the rekindling of French interest in the New World, which in turn led to the great struggle between England and France for North American predominance.

A man of determination and daring, Verrazano became concerned, following his initial discoveries, with European attempts to find a passage through the American continents to the Pacific. In March 1528, he sailed again from France at the head of an expedition bound for the Americas. Beset by cannibals, at the height of his explorations, he gave his life in behalf of discovery and the quest for expanded human knowledge.

A shining tribute to Verrazano exists today in the form of a mighty and beautiful structure—the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, connecting the borough of Brooklyn with Staten Island, a suspension span of 4,260 feet, the longest in the world, exceeding even the San Francisco Golden Gate Bridge by some 60 feet.

It is altogether fitting that the name of Verrazano, tied by history to the great traditions of New York, should be commemorated in so illustrious a manner. Fitting, also, that the people should pay homage to his memory as an annual event. For here was a man of courage, wholly worthy of our praise in every particular; and outstanding hero of American history.

THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the history of our country is, like all history, the history of people. Part of the history of our people is the story of the American labor movement.

The Seafarers Log, a newspaper published by the Seafarers International Union, has published the story. I commend the first two of these articles to the attention of our colleagues:

ALL THIS HAPPENED: THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR—PART 1 OF A SEAFARER'S LOG FEATURE

(The story of American labor is a vital part of American history. It is a story that is too often neglected and distorted in the schools. It certainly has been distorted in the press. It is a story that should be told. The history of American labor is a stirring story of people—in most instances unnamed people—and their continuing struggle to realize the hopes and aspirations of the American people. We and our children should be reminded of what the labor movement is and what it has achieved. On these pages, the Seafarers Log begins "The Story of American Labor," which will be continued in future issues.)

The American trade union movement goes back to the very birth of our Nation in the years immediately following the Revolutionary War. Low wages, long hours and poor working conditions were the basic reasons behind the earliest labor organizations. Workers in many States didn't have the right to vote, nor were their children able to get a decent education. From the very beginning organized workers had to fight antilabor bosses in addition to courts, newspapers, and political organizations controlled largely by moneyed classes—as is often the case today. In addition to these disadvantages, early labor organizations, because they were laying the groundwork, had little or no experience on which to draw. They had to proceed mainly on a trial-and-error basis and made many mistakes in those early days. What they lacked in experience however, they more than made up for in enthusiasm. They learned quickly from their mistakes, and the strength and success of organized labor today can be credited, in large measure, to the devotion, determination, and ability of those earliest trade unionists.

Prior to the War for Independence this country had no trade unions in the modern meaning of the term, and the early trade union cannot be fully understood in today's terms. It must be remembered that we are dealing with a time when manufacturing of any kind was just beginning in America. Pittsburgh was just a frontier village and Cincinnati was the Far West.

During the early colonial period, the American economy was based on farming—with wealthy landowners, who had been given huge grants of land in the colonies by the British Crown, supervising the labor of indentured workers. To meet the demand for labor, the colonies depended on bound white labor and Negro slaves who constituted 80 percent of the immigrants to America before the Revolution.

Labor in colonial America was divided into three kinds: The indentured servants, who were the most important source; free labor, who were hired for wages, and seafaring labor which included sailors, fishermen and whalers.

The indenture system was nothing more than a form of slavery—but for a specific time, usually about 5 years—after which the indentured person became a free man (or woman). Many poor workers and even entire families, without hope in Europe, indentured themselves in return for the passage to America which they could not otherwise afford. These were often skilled craftsmen—blacksmiths, carpenters, weavers, shoemakers, silversmiths, etc.

The original indenture contract bound the worker to pay the ship's captain all of his wages for a 5-year period as payment for his passage to the New World. What happened, however, is that the ship captain, to get a quick turnover on his money, sold the worker, with the indenture, at public auction as soon as the ship docked. Mothers, fathers and children were often separated. The indentured were virtual slaves for the indenture period. They received no wages, could not marry without their owner's permission, were clad in castoff rags and could be flogged at the owner's whim. Instead of finding freedom and opportunity in the New World, most of these immigrants found even harsher conditions than those they left.

By the early 1750's, however, thousands of these bondsmen had worked off their period of indenture, become freemen, and had gone into business for themselves. Being craftsmen, they usually opened small shops in towns and villages.

When the master craftsman got more orders than he could handle alone, he hired a journeyman. The journeyman was less skilled than the master and was willing to put in long hours for modest pay in order to learn from the master and improve his skill. When the journeyman felt he had developed his skill sufficiently, he set up a shop of his own as a master.

In addition to journeymen, many master craftsmen also employed several apprentices—usually young boys bound to the master for a period of years to learn the trade. They received no wages, but were fed, clothed and housed by the master—eventually becoming journeymen and then master craftsmen.

Various labor bodies existed within a trade, but they were mainly benevolent and fraternal associations—not labor unions in today's meanings. These associations of shoemakers, weavers, etc. looked out for fellow craftsmen in times of sickness or financial stress, paid doctor bills and made small loans to get fellow members back on their feet in time of need.

The Revolutionary War and the ratification of a Constitution in 1791 changed all that. As an independent nation, unfettered by colonial status and ties to the British, America's great economic expansion began. Tariff walls between the States were broken down. Foreign capital and credit entered the new nation. The frontier began to expand westward past the Alleghenies. Canals and new roads facilitated transportation. Manufactured goods were now needed in far-off places and the craftsman could no longer deal directly with his customers. This situation gave rise to a new and special type of businessmen—a middleman, wholesale jobber or merchant capitalist.

He was basically a distributor. He produced nothing. He was not interested in making goods but in making money. He bought and sold, and his motto was "buy cheap—sell dear."

The merchant did everything he could to depress the price of the goods he bought, and the craftsman, who was now under the power of the middleman, had only two ways to reduce the cost of the goods he made—lower the quality of what he produced and cut wages and working conditions for his journeymen and apprentices. Thus, the master craftsman was slowly forced to become an employer in the modern meaning of the word.

The merchant middlemen put further pressure on the master craftsmen by importing vast amounts of cheap foreign goods manufactured in Europe by child labor or prison labor. They also encouraged the division of labor where each worker performed only one part of the total operation and therefore could be relatively unskilled, low paid, and replaced if he complained about wages or hours.

Under these conditions the old master-journeyman-apprentice system began to break down completely. Busier than ever but making less on each item, the employer-master cut wages and increased the hours of his journeymen, often replacing them, entirely with young unskilled apprentices. Friendship between master and journeymen soon vanished under these conditions and for the first time there were "workers" and "employers." The journeymen began banding together in their own organizations, formed to protect them from the abuses of the master-employer. The American trade-union movement was born.

America's first trade union came into being in Philadelphia in 1794 and was called the Federal Society of Journeymen Cordwainers (shoemakers). This was a true trade union. Its purpose was to resist cuts in wage scales. It was designed to be a permanent organization with a constitution, dues, elected officers and regularly scheduled meetings.

The cordwainers called the first organized strike in 1799. There had been numerous strikes or turnouts previously called by various small groups of journeymen organized into societies for the purpose. Some, like the journeymen printers who struck in New York in 1786 for a $1 per day wage, even succeeded. But their organizations were not permanent, and soon dissolved after their demands had been met. With the union dissolved it was usually not long before the employer withdrew the pay raises and the workers were right back where they started.

The cordwainers had a permanent organization, but were destined to learn an even tougher lesson about the difficulties of fighting for improved wages and working conditions against unscrupulous bosses. They discovered that the courts and the Nation's press were usually just as antilabor as the employers and would help the employer destroy the union by every means at their disposal.

The cordwainers struck in 1799 to resist further reductions of wages that averaged from only $6 to $11.25 per week. One of the members was paid to picket by making the rounds of Philadelphia's shoemaking shops to make sure that all the cordwainers had left work. A union committee then presented the master employers with a list of demands, including a demand that current wage scales be retained. After 9 weeks of negotiating the workers won their demands. Not long after, however, the roof fell in on them.

In 1805, the union asked for a modest raise in wages and was flatly refused. Again the cordwainers resorted to a strike—but this time the employers were ready for them. The cordwainers soon found themselves indicted on trumped-up charges of criminal conspiracy—based, no less, on old English common law.

The employers had planned well. The cordwainers' crime was having formed a union. The conspiracy was banding together to raise wages. The press poured out invective against the strikers. The judge openly favored the employers throughout the trial. The jury was made up of 12 businessmen who did not even try to hide their bias against the striking workers. Not only were the cordwainers convicted on these trumped-up charges based on nonexistent law, but the conviction was upheld by a higher court. The decision not only doomed the Nation's first union, the Federal Society of Journeymen Cordwainers, but by extension made all trade unions illegal in the United States.

The Philadelphia defeat did not stop the organization of trade unions, however. As wages, hours, and working conditions continued to deteriorate, journeymen workers everywhere banded together in trade unions. At the same time, the employers continued to refine their tactics of union busting, including increasing reliance on violence by hired scabs.

Newspapers were more than willing to support the bosses by stirring up public sentiment against the workers. Boston carpenters were depicted as "foreign agitators" when they struck for a 10-hour day. Tailors in Buffalo, ship carpenters in Philadelphia, cabinetmakers in Baltimore all got the same treatment from the press. During strikes by painters, stonecutters, and day laborers in New York, the police usually proved to be just as antilabor as the courts and newspapers.

Strikers by the score were beaten, maimed, and sometimes killed by police and employer-hired goons, and were often unceremoniously jailed by the police for picketing.

As if conditions were not bad enough for American workers during these years after the Revolutionary War, they were destined to become infinitely worse following the War of 1812.

The War of 1812 between the United States and Great Britain was fought for a variety of economic and political reasons, but was touched off by one of the most infamous practices ever used against workingmen—the impressment of American merchant seamen on British naval ships. American merchant ships were being intercepted on the high seas by British men-of-war, and the youngest and strongest of the American crewmembers were forced to board the British ships as virtual slaves. Conditions aboard British naval ships of the time were unbelievably bad—that was the main reason they could not get British seamen to take the jobs and resorted instead to this worst form of piracy. The United States and Britain went to war over the issue. British troops even managed to burn Washington, the Nation's Capital, but were eventually defeated. America was victorious.

With the supply of British manufactured goods cut off by the war, however, the American economy turned another corner which was to spell misery for millions of American workers for the next hundred years. Factories began springing up all over the Nation, bringing with them child and women labor, actual starvation wages, 18-hour workdays, illiteracy, slums—and for the factory owners unprecedented profits at the expense of unprecedented human misery.

All This Happened: The Story of American Labor—Part 2 of a Seafarer's Log Feature

The U.S. victory in the War of 1812 against Great Britain signaled the beginning of a period of vast industrial growth for the Nation, and of unimagined hardships for American workers. Economic boons and busts followed one another rythmically. Each economic cycle, as it rolled across the land, ground the vast majority of American workers further down into poverty and despair.

It was a time when almost every attempt by desperate workers to better their condition was met and suppressed by force and violence. It was a time when giant corporations, vastly wealthy and inhumanly callous, would hire thousands of armed thugs to break a strike. If these hired goons did not succeed in breaking the strikers' will, they often found themselves faced with armed militia—dispatched to break the strike by a government which had ears only for the demands of rich corporations. If even that failed the courts were always willing to issue injunctions making the walkouts illegal—which then justified the jailing of the strike leaders and the eventual collapse of the strike. And all the while the press poured out a constant stream of invective against the workers and their legitimate aims.

These years saw the "long strike" in the Pennsylvania coal fields and the "great strike" by railroad workers, the homestead strike and the pullman strike—all of which were viciously broken by an antilabor combination of the corporations, the courts and the government. It was the heyday of the "Pinkerton Finks." It was the time of the "Baltimore Massacre" and the "Haymarket Square Massacre" of the workers.

But it was also the period in which the infant American labor movement drew strength and grew—learned hard lessons and fought back against immense odds to carve out a place for American workers in the Nation's future.

The growth of factories began with a vengeance in the United States when War of 1812 cut off our supplies of manufactured goods from Great Britain. As a direct result of the new factory system, one of the worst abuses of labor that ever existed took root on a large scale in the United States—child labor. By 1820 more than half the factory workers in the United States were between 9 and 10 years old. They worked an average 13-hour-day for as little as 33 cents a week.

Economic exploitation of children, and later of young women, was a direct result of growth of factories. Skill was not necessary, cheap labor meant bigger profits, and children or young women could be hired for much less than a worker, even unskilled, with a family to support. These working children received no education at all and remained totally illiterate. They toiled long, exhausting hours in dark, dirty, unhealthy factories without reward or hope. And as more and more children became "productive" by entering the labor market, more and more skilled adult workers, with families and responsibilities, became unemployed.

In addition to the competition of child labor, American workers suffered another serious blow in 1819 when the first of what was to prove a cycle of economic and financial depressions struck the Nation. Unemployment, already widespread, became mass unemployment as bankruptcies shut factories, shops and stores all over the Nation. Hunger stalked the American worker. Those mills and factories that remained open sliced wages and increased working hours, knowing that their workers had to accept whatever was offered.

The depression, which did not end until 1822, wiped out many trade unions. But as business picked up and workers again found employment, labor unions were again formed with new zeal. In 1827 labor took a significant step.

In that year the carpenters in Philadelphia launched a strike for a 10-hour day. Facing bitter employer opposition and receiving no aid from other Philadelphia unions, the carpenters were defeated. But they recognized the flaw in organization which had defeated them, and that same year the first central union council, the Mechanics Union of Trade Associations, was formed by the Philadelphia unions. It was the first citywide labor organization in the world and no longer would a striking union in Philadelphia stand alone against the bosses.

At the same time another "first step" was taken by Philadelphia workers, when they formed the world's first political labor party—the Workingmen's Party. The idea caught on and by 1834 spread to many cities, working politically for free public education for their children, the abolition of imprisonment for debt, the outlawing of child labor, the universal 10-hour day and other reforms.

Attacked by the press as "antireligious," "unwashed rabble" and "dirty shirts," their rallies invaded and disrupted by goons hired by local politicians, their adherents fired from their jobs for supporting their platform, the various Workingmens' Parties remained active only a few years. In that short time, however, their success was astonishing. As a result of their efforts, imprisonment for debt was abolished and in 1834 the Nation's first free public school system was set up in Pennsylvania.

Meanwhile, the Nation grew, opening new markets. Roads and waterway traffic pushed westward, and to these traditional modes of transportation were added the new railroads. Gold strikes in the Far West opened new markets and demand for products grew faster and faster. To feed these demands for manufactured items simple factories grew into huge industries. The machine age dawned with a flood of immigration which swelled the labor force and spelled new trouble for American workers.

As industry grew more complex, with operations in many States, the need for unions to organize on a nationwide, instead of a citywide basis, grew as well. The first of these was the National Typographical Union, the first permanent national union, founded in 1852. Following the lead of the NTU, about 10 national unions came into being between 1850 and 1860.

From 1861 to 1865 the Nation was torn by the Civil War, which in more ways than one was brought about by the rapid industrialization going on in the United States. It was basically a conflict of national interests between the industrial North and the agrarian South. The primary issue of slavery, over which the war was fought, was itself produced by the introduction of a machine, the cotton gin, which made cotton a profitable crop and led to the southern plantation system, with its dependence on vast numbers of enslaved Negro laborers. Until the invention of the cotton gin in 1793 there were few Negro slaves in the United States. By 1860, however, there were over 4 million Negro slaves in the South, where "cotton was king."

After the Civil War, cotton was deposed and industry was king. As industry was king, the captains of industry who controlled great wealth in concentrated capital, ruled like feudal lords over a labor force swollen with immigrants from foreign lands and newly freed Negroes. Labor was considered a commodity to be bought as cheaply as possible and discarded at will. As hugely wealthy industrialists became ever more powerful American workers were threatened with the loss of even those gains they had already made. Labor needed an organization through which action could be taken on a major national scale. For this purpose the National Labor Union was formed in 1866, the first nationwide federation of labor unions.

The NLU did not last long, mainly because it pinned its hopes for improving working conditions on political action instead of on militant trade unionism. By 1873 the NLU had disintegrated, but not before it had achieved two major goals—repeal of the Contract Labor Act of 1864 and the establishment of the 8-hour day for Federal employees.

The Contract Labor Act was nothing but a return to the indenture system of colonial times, under which European workers were brought to the United States by American employers, pledging their first year's wages to repay transportation costs and further year's wages to repay their maintenance costs for the first year. This gave employers virtually free labor which they used to depress American workers' wages.

The 1870's began with the promise of unparalleled prosperity for the United States. Big business was booming, speculation was plunging wildly ahead, money flowed freely, fortunes were made overnight. The frenzied business activity had no real foundations however, and in 1873 the bubble burst, plunging the Nation into another long depression, far worse than the depression of 1819.

The "Panic of '73" left 4 million American workers jobless out of a total work force of only 38 million and brought on conditions which could only be described as chaos. Men, women and children in industrial cities starved for lack of the few pennies to buy bread. The depression of 1873, which was to last for 7 horrible years also signaled the beginning of two decades of all-out war waged by American capital against American labor.

In city after city, gatherings of unemployed workers seeking jobs through which to earn money to buy food for their families were brutally broken up by club-swinging mounted police and militiamen. Men, women and children were trampled and beaten. Newspapers again jumped into the fray verbally, calling the unemployed workers "anarchists" and "foreign agitators." With so many unemployed, wealthy industrialists cut wages to the bone, and prepared to meet strikes by desperate workers with club-swinging goons, armed scabs, State militia, Federal troops, court injunctions and a callous disregard for human suffering.

In 1874–75 the "Long Strike" paralyzed the Pennsylvania coalfields. To break the strike the mineowners brought in the most infamous of the union-busters—Allan Pinkerton. Pinkerton sent his own agent, James McParlan, as a labor spy to join the strikers' union—the Workingmen's Benevolent Association—and destroy it from within. Violence flared frequently during the long, bitter strike, and several mine foremen were shot. Although the union had nothing to do with the violence in spite of much provocation, a secret organization of embittered miners, known as the "Molly Maguires," waged a long war of terror.

Pinkerton's spy managed to round up lying "witnesses" and hearsay evidence for a willing court to indict many of the "Mollies" and striking union's leaders. Convicted by the boss-oriented court, 10 men died on the gallows and 14 were sentenced to long jail terms. The "long strike" was broken and the names Pinkerton and McParlan became infamous. To insure future labor "peace," the mineowners promptly recruited a private, heavily armed army called the Coal and Iron Police who did not hesitate to use whip, gun, or club on any worker who complained about wages, hours, or working conditions.

An even larger strike was soon to break out in the railroad industry however. When the depression of 1873 hit the Nation, railroad companies had seized the opportunity to slash wages by 25 percent although they continued to earn record profits. Then, in 1877, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad announced another wage cut of 10 percent. Faced with starvation wages, B. & O. train crews walked off the job. Others followed throughout the whole system and soon the line was paralyzed. The so-called Great Strike was on.

The railroad magnates reacted quickly. Although the walkout was completely peaceful, they demanded protection for railroad property from the State capitals. State politicians, indebted to the hugely wealthy railroad magnates for many things, responded quickly with armed militia. Instead of "protecting property," these armed militiamen were used to break up strike meetings—firing first into a meeting of strikers in Martinsburg, W. Va., leaving several dead strikers in their wake. Enraged nonstriking townspeople attacked the militia in turn, destroyed rolling stock and telegraph wires and even ripped up tracks in their anger. Unjustified violence gave the strike momentum, and the strike spread from coast to coast.

State militia fired on strikers again and again and the death toll climbed. Finally many militiamen, disgusted by what they were called upon to do, deserted and joined the workers' picket lines rather than fire on their fellow townsmen. The enraged railroad millionaires screamed for Federal troops and the big business-oriented Government of the time was quick to comply. Federal troops soon arrived, enraging townspeople even more. In the infamous "Baltimore Massacre" troops shot down 10 strikers in cold blood. In 1 month over 100 American workers were shot dead and over 300 wounded by American soldiers. Confronted by the entire U.S. Army, the strikers were beaten and the "Great Strike" was broken.

To prevent strikes in the future, State governments built armories crammed with heavy weapons and militiamen in many towns. The railroads themselves hired armed hoodlums as "special police."

RENT SUPPLEMENT AND TEACHERS CORPS

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gilbert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I support the supplemental appropriation for the rent supplement program this year, as I did last year, because it will help to provide much needed housing for low-income families in my 22d District, Bronx, N.Y., and in similar areas throughout the country.

One of the most urgent needs of the poor is decent housing, and the rent supplement program is designed to provide such housing at reasonable cost with maximum participation by local communities and private enterprise. It will increase the availability of urgently needed low- and middle-income housing by making a substantial addition to the supply of decent housing. The program will make it possible for private and nonprofit and limited dividend corporations and cooperatives to build housing of modest design for families within the public housing income limits. The income limits for eligibility for rent supplements in my city of New York will be:

Number of persons in family and income limits

New York, N.Y.:	
1	$3,888
2	5,256
3	5,760
4	5,760
5	6,100
6	6,100
7 or more	6,100

As I understand the guidelines for eligibility, only those of low income who are first, displaced by any government action; second, elderly; third, physically handicapped; or fourth, living in substandard housing, would qualify for this program. In my congressional district there are thousands of families in these categories, many of whom are desperately in need of an alternative to public housing.

I supported the request for $30 million for this program and I regret the amount was cut back. This should be increased to at least $30 million and I support the amendment to provide this amount.

May I also state that I feel strongly the need for full funding of this program in the 1967 regular appropriation. Rent supplements will never accomplish what it is intended to, as long as Congress fails to fully implement it. I supported this program last year for the good it can do, and I support its full funding at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the dwellings to be built under the rent supplement program will have to be built within mortgage limits and construction costs will have to be held down, especially in larger cities. In places where it will be difficult to produce housing under the cost restrictions, the nonprofit sponsors will have to obtain urban renewal project sites and, wherever possible, local tax abatement. The combination of these two contributions will serve to hold down costs and rents and make it possible to build rent supplement housing in large cities so that the low-income people in these cities will benefit from the program. In my district in New York City this may be the case, and I am certain that sponsoring organizations will meet the challenge with imagination and vigor.

Mr. Speaker, I support the appropriation for the National Teachers Corps which, like the rent supplement program, is vital to the success of the war on poverty. The Teachers Corps will help to revitalize our educational system in low-income areas by attracting and directing teachers to these areas where they are needed most. It will bring able and experienced teachers to disadvantaged schools where children have been deprived by poverty of educational opportunities available to other children.

We have passed major and important legislation in all levels of education—elementary, secondary, and higher education—but we have a serious shortage of teachers in poverty-stricken school districts. The programs and educational expansions under the recently enacted aid-to-education bills, together with the growing school populations, have created even greater teacher shortages. The National Teachers Corps program for recruiting talented teachers, and for the teacher-intern program for college graduates, seems to me to be the most efficient and the quickest means of eliminating our teacher shortage. The Teachers Corps men will be welcomed in our low-income area schools, just as our Peace Corps men have been welcomed in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

I have urged my colleagues to join me in voting the necessary appropriations for the rent supplement program and the National Teachers Corps.

MRS. GANDHI'S VISIT

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Springfield, Mass., Daily News, published in my home city, says in an editorial that the visit of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi to the United States "cannot be merely a ceremonial one, because there are too many critical problems to be considered." I include the editorial of March 26 at this point in the Record.

Mrs. Gandhi's Visit

For the first time in history, a woman head of government will arrive in our country tomorrow.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi has been in the United States before, and indeed has been in western Massachusetts. However, this is her first trip to the United States since becoming India's Prime Minister.

Her visit cannot be merely a ceremonial one, because there are too many critical problems to be considered. India now consumes half as much of our annual wheat production as we do ourselves. However, it is one thing to feed the Indians; it is quite another to equip them to fight another army which we also equip.

When the India-Pakistan war broke out in September, the United States suspended its economic and military aid programs to the participants. The United States now promises to allow the sale of nonlethal military supplies to the two countries, but not to beef up the rival forces in anticipation of another clash.

Also, the United States has indicated that it would like to see some evidence that India is seriously dealing with its own problems, involving agricultural development, bureaucracy, tax inequities, and inefficient distribution systems, before pumping in more American aid.

Also, the United States would like to have India send at least a hospital unit to South Vietnam as a token of Indian support for the American position there. Mrs. Gandhi, seeking arms for India as protection against China, may hesitate to reject an American request for some token assistance in Vietnam.

So, Mrs. Gandhi's 4-day visit must include more than parades and receptions. The 180 million Americans, who don't want to finance a war between our supposed friends, and the 480 million Indians, who want to eat, demand much more from the next 4 days.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PROPOSAL FOR AN INDIA-AMERICAN FOUNDATION IS MOST WELCOME

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the visit of the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the President has announced his intention to establish a new binational foundation in India. This action by the President is most welcome.

In the United States, foundations have played an important role in mobilizing resources and efforts needed to improve education and research and to meet a wide variety of social needs. I believe that the foundation just proposed by the President can do the same thing for India. It will permit and encourage Indian educators, scientists, teachers, and students to study and work on new solutions to the age-old problems confronting their country. It can support the fight against illiteracy, the teaching of improved farming techniques, and a broad range of programs to strengthen Indian education. As it is envisioned, a governing board, half Indian and half American, will operate independently within a broad charter.

This foundation, with its great potential for aiding progress, will be a lasting memorial to the effectiveness of American farmers and to the abundance of our farm production which we have shared with India. The food-for-peace program has helped to feed and clothe the multitudes of India. Under this program the United States has accumulated nonconvertible Indian rupees, of which only a fraction is needed for American activities in India.

The President proposes that $300 million worth of the now idle U.S.-owned Indian rupees be allocated for the establishment of the Binational Foundation. This endowment will constitute a revolving fund assuring the perpetuation of the institution. Although some few dollars will be needed, the Indian Government has agreed to suppy them so that no dollar appropriations by the United States are expected to be requested for the Foundation.

Thus the food-for-peace program will lay the basis for continuing contributions to the growth and development of India.

President Johnson is to be congratulated on this step. He has paved the way for a creative new joint endeavor between the two countries based on mutual respect and devoted to progress.

CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, a distinguished citizen and public servant, Chief Justice Earl Warren, celebrated his 75th birthday.

Across the Nation, tribute was paid this man who has served as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court for over 12 years.

Earl Warren has been likened to John Marshall in his personal impact on the Court. History will be the final judge but, certainly, his role as defender of individual rights has been established even now.

The Oakland Tribune, the home newspaper of the Chief Justice recalled:

> In 1953, after his appointment, to the Nation's highest court, someone asked how he classified himself. He quoted Lincoln: "I am a very slow walker, but I never walk backward."
>
> Warren added: "And so I like to feel that while I also am a slow walker, I always like to walk forward and it is always a sad day for me if I go to bed at night thinking we have not made some progress."

The San Francisco Chronicle editorialized:

> Earl Warren, the Chief Justice of the United States, is 75 today, and in the opinion of many he is entitled to be considered among the greatest Chief Justices of our history. One has only to consider how, since his coming to the Supreme Court in 1953, it has altered the most fundamental considerations of American society, such as the equality of white and black skin and of the rural and urban voter, in order to understand this admiration for him. Under the present Chief Justice, the Court has undoubtedly done more to strengthen the rights of the individual than it ever did in all the years up to his appointment.
>
> In California, the warm, friendly, familiar Earl Warren is unforgettable as its Governor through the war and through the strains of postwar growth, change, and betterment. It would not be true to say he is receiving the universal tribute of good wishes from his fellow citizens today—there are too many of the Birchite "Impeach Earl Warren" billboards around to justify that statement, but he may be assured that he has our affectionate regards.

The Los Angeles Times said:

> It cannot be said of him yet that he has outlived his critics. But he has lived to see his concepts of American society accepted by most of the country despite bitter and still continuing criticism.
>
> He failed in his ambition to become President of the United States, yet came to exert an influence on American life that has been matched by few Presidents.
>
> Although his career until 13 years ago had been confined largely to local and State affairs in California, he now enjoys throughout the world a unique reputation among his contemporaries for humanitarianism and libertarianism.

The Sacramento Bee noted:

> After 13 years of the Supreme Court he is the strongest and most influential Chief Justice in American history, with the possible exception of John Marshall.
>
> As the Marshall Court created sovereignty of the Federal Government over the States, saving the grand experiment of national union from chaos in its days of origin, the Warren Court has confirmed the personal liberties of the people, has enforced the separation of state and church, has created new protections against unreasonable seizure and search.

The Washington Post said:

> Not since the formative days of the Republic when John Marshall presided over its deliberations has the Supreme Court played so dynamic a part in American affairs as during the dozen years since Earl Warren became Chief Justice of the United States. Great issues of individual rights, not yet ready for judicial decision in the first century and a half of the country's territorial and economic development, presented themselves inescapably for adjudication. A willingness on the part of Justices to meet issues when they become ripe for resolution * * * is really nothing more than a recognition of the Supreme Court's responsibility to serve effectively as guardian of a living Constitution related to current realities—and to serve especially as guardian of the spirit of liberty characterizing that Constitution.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch cited:

> In three fields, the Warren Court has caused profound alterations in the fabric of national thought and action. The school desegregation decision of 1954 paved the way for the civil rights revolution and made clear the Federal Government's long-ignored responsibility to oppressed Negroes.
>
> Subsequent civil rights decisions kept the promise held out by the first.
>
> Decisions on legislative reapportionment beginning in 1962 ultimately will affect the makeup of legislatures in all 50 States. The Court established the principle that now has become a slogan—"One man, one vote."
>
> Police procedures and the rights of persons suspected of crimes are undergoing a metamorphosis as a result of Supreme Court actions dating to 1957. The constitutional right of a poor man to a lawyer and of an ignorant man to protection against self-incrimination were established for the first time by the Warren Court.
>
> More and more, Justice Warren is being hailed as one of the great Chief Justices in history, a towering figure ranking with John Marshall and Charles Evans Hughes as the leading lights among the 14 men who have led the Nation's highest court.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the California State Legislature, it was my privilege to introduce a resolution which was unanimously passed by that body and which I presented to the Chief Justice on the 10th anniversary of his appointment as Chief Justice of the Court. I would like to read a portion of that resolution into the Record at this time:

> Whereas Chief Justice Earl Warren was born in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 19, 1891, the son of Methias and Chrystal H. Warren, and attended Bakersfield public schools and the University of California in Berkeley, where he received his J.D. in 1914 and thereafter was admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of California; and
>
> Whereas Chief Justice Warren began his public career in 1919 as clerk of the assembly judiciary committee, and later served as deputy city attorney for the city of Oakland, deputy district attorney of Alameda County from 1920 to 1923, chief deputy district attorney from 1923 to 1925, and district attorney from 1925 until his election as the attorney general of California in 1938; and
>
> Whereas the people of California elected Earl Warren as California's Governor in 1942, an office which he held and in which he served with great distinction, until September 30, 1953, when he was appointed Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court by President Dwight D. Eisenhower; and

Whereas, as Chief Justice, Earl Warren has lent the weight and prestige of that high office to the struggle for equal rights for all persons and has been an outspoken defender of the civil liberties guarantees of our Constitution.

INDO-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has certainly set the pace and mood of this vital conference with Prime Minister Ghandi. This spirit of a coadventure and cooperation to solve national and world problems is so necessary in these times of increasing world strife.

In brief form, our Government will use approximately $300 million of U.S.-owned excess Indian rupees to endow a major new Foundation—much like the Ford and Rockeller Foundations—to assist the Indian Government in dealing with problems of education, science, and agriculture. The people of India are pressing for rapid expansion, and this Foundation should be a catalyst to allow the Indian Government to meet the challenge of constructive change.

The Foundation would be established by agreement between the United States and India and organized under Indian law. An independent board, composed of 18 individuals, half American and half Indian, will govern and guide the Foundation. The $300 million will be invested in Indian 3½ percent Government bonds.

The programs of the grant-making philanthropy will emphasize improvement in agricultural education and farm technology. I doubt if any of us is able to realize the suffering of the Indian people because of the current famine conditions. I doubt if any of us can even imagine the conditions in India during one of the "good" years. I sincerely feel that this cooperative Foundation will go a very long way in lessening the suffering and starvation of the Indian population in coming years.

But, more important, the people of India and the United States have always shared a sincere, abiding tradition of the freedom and the dignity of an individual human being. In the United States, this belief can be realized by every person through our unlimited opportunities to learn, to better ourselves by our own choice, through education. Constantly there are innovations at all levels of our educational system, the best methods—the best of our society—offered to our children and our young adults so that they can know true freedom through knowledge.

This Indo-American Foundation is just this promise for the future to the inquiring young minds of India. It is this promise to a nation which believes in its obligation to better the lives of all its people, and only in fulfilling this obligation lies the strength and progress of the country.

The United States has this opportunity to help bring real progress to India. It does not entail more foreign-aid dollars. We are only putting to good use idle local currency reserves in that country. This action is in our own selfish interest. But, more important, however, it is in the interest of world peace and progress which knows no national boundaries and has no price tag attached.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable reluctance and only after long and careful study that I voted today for the second supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 14012. I want to make it clear that I did so despite opposition to some of this bill's components and serious misgivings about others.

For example, some activities in the public works area, such as the $5,500,000 to liquidate obligations under the Federal-aid highway program, could easily be delayed.

And there does not seem to be the least justification for a supplemental appropriation of $381 million for unemployment and related payments, in view of the fact that Congress last year reduced these payments by $242,100,000 because of expected and realized decreases in unemployment and the hundreds of millions of dollars already committed in the fight against poverty. This supplemental appropriation not only would restore the reduction authorized by Congress last year, but throws in an additional $140,000,000 despite the drastic decrease in unemployment. I see no justification for such an expenditure at a time when our commitments in Vietnam are increasing and the impact of inflation becomes more serious every day.

I want to record my most strenuous objection to the questionable but common practice of omnibus supplemental appropriation bills. We are faced today with a bill which has appropriations for such worthwhile programs as veterans' pensions, vocational rehabilitation and aid to federally impacted areas. These are lumped together with appropriations that are controversial and which deserve consideration by this body on an individual basis. Funds for new programs should be included in the regular appropriation bills submitted by the various departments so that Congress may analyze them thoroughly and intelligently.

Perhaps the worst aspect of these omnibus supplemental appropriation bills is that virtually no justification is given for the individual components. The committee report contains only one or two lines of general description for each item, and some of the material borders on sheer nonsense. Take, for instance, the item I mentioned, about the unemployment and welfare appropriations. It says:

> The bill includes $381 million, the amount of the request, which would make a total of $3,603 million available for this purpose for fiscal year 1966. When Congress acted on the regular annual bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1966, it reduced the request for grants to States for public assistance by $242,100,000 on the basis that we have been appropriating hundreds of millions of additional dollars every year for the past few years for programs that are aimed at combating dependency, and the outlook for a reduction in the rate of unemployment was better than it had been for a long time. Of course, unemployment rates have gone to even lower levels than was anticipated when Congress acted on the original appropriation for 1966. Yet, in the face of this fact, the request for a supplemental appropriation is not only to restore the reduction made by Congress last year but for an additional amount of approximately $140 million. Of course, this is purely a mathematical calculation and nothing can be done under the law but to pay the bill.

Based on this statement, how could one support the appropriation? There may be good reasons, but they certainly are not stated here.

In these days when inflation represents an ever-increasing danger to our economic health, every appropriation deserves careful and individual consideration.

FOR THE CONSUMER

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The Baltimore Sun had an illuminating editorial recently on the wide range of laws which President Johnson has requested to protect the consumer from a number of merchandising hazards.

As the Sun declares:

> It should be possible to write a law that insures the consumer of honest information quickly and easily without imposing either hardship or standardization on the manufacturer and the merchandiser.

Since others may read the editorial with benefit, I am making it available to the RECORD for publication in its entirety.

[From the Sun, Baltimore, Mar. 23, 1966]

FOR THE CONSUMER

President Johnson has asked for a wide range of laws to protect the consumer from a number of merchandising hazards. Some of these should produce no controversy. For instance, further steps to assure that foods, drugs, cosmetics, and children's toys are no threat to health or life are certainly a Government's responsibility. About some of the other parts of the President's program there will be, as there already has been, fierce debate. He asks that the true cost of credit be made known to borrowers and those who buy on the installment plan. He asks that packages be clearly labeled as to contents and in some cases ingredients, and that the size or shape of the package not be deceptive. Proposals of this kind have been around Congress for years, but special interest groups have been able to keep them from becoming law.

The argument in opposition to "truth-in-lending" bills usually is that it is difficult to figure out interest in many cases. This seems a strange argument. It has in the past been aimed at the requirement that an annual interest rate be computed. The President did not specify that that be done in new legislation, so perhaps the new proposal will satisfy all: retailers and loan agencies and the public.

The arguments often heard against truth-in-packaging are that it would require so large a number of packages in so many sizes and shapes that the cost would damage the manufacturer, and that it would standardize packaging. These seem to be contradictory, but even if not it should be possible to write law that insures the consumer of honest information quickly and easily without imposing either hardship or standardization on the manufacturer and merchandiser.

SOL TAISHOFF, IMMIGRANT BOY, EDITOR-PUBLISHER OF BROADCASTING TELEVISION MAGAZINES, WINS INDUSTRY'S HIGHEST AWARD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Distinguished Service Award made annually by the National Association of Broadcasters was presented this year to Sol Taishoff, editor and publisher of two leading magazines in the industry—Broadcasting magazine and Television magazine. Both of these publications are recognized as the printed voices of broadcast arts-advertising-communications. This award was made to Mr. Taishoff yesterday in an impressive ceremony during the 44th annual convention of the National Association in Chicago, Ill.

The winner of this award was an immigrant boy, brought to the United States by his parents when he was 2 years old. At the age of 14 he became a copy boy for the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press and has spent his adult life in the field of journalism. He is a pioneer in the journalistic field of broadcasting and television.

Mr. Taishoff was chosen for "The Man of the Year" award in recognition of his "significant and lasting" contribution to the American system of free broadcasting. He is the first publisher to win this coveted award by the National Association of Broadcasters.

Mr. Speaker, by leave granted, I include a copy of the acceptance remarks made by Mr. Taishoff:

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS OF SOL TAISHOFF AT THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD CEREMONIES OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

This is a coveted award. I accept it with pride, satisfaction, and humility.

It is not innate modesty that makes me regard these honors as recognition, not of an individual, but of an organization—the people who, along with me, are responsible for our publications.

It has taken far more than the luck, sweat, and hopes of one man to produce the journals that I represent on this occasion. Ours has always been a team effort. Some of the people have changed, but their replacements have shown no less zeal, dedication, and devotion to our common purpose of publishing honest magazines.

During these past 35 years I have seen freezes, thaws, refreezes, allocations, reallocations and re-reallocations; intermixture, deintermixture, and un-deintermixture. I've seen 40 FCC Commissioners and chairmen come and go, and at one time or another I've tilted with practically all of them.

I have seen many men of great ability and dedication come into broadcasting and move it forward. I've also seen a few charlatans and wayfarers invade it and set it back, and we have tilted with them, too.

Few of the pioneer broadcasters had any real notion where their radio hobby would lead them. There were, of course, the Sarnoffs and the Paleys, the George Storers, the Walter Damms, the Fritz Morencys, the John Fetzers, the John Elmers, the John Shepards, and the Harold Houghs who had the vision and the determination to make of radio something more than a passing fad or bargain basement.

And there were in Washington such legal minds—giants in their profession—as the late Louis G. Caldwell, Horace L. Lohnes, and Philip G. Loucks, and Paul M. Segal, the last now in retirement, who did their utmost to prevent a stampede toward serfdom for broadcasters—a project that then had Government ownership under the so-called European plan as its clear objective.

In your own national association, there were notable leaders in the persons of Mr. Morency, the late Mr. Loucks, Neville Miller, Judge Justin Miller and the late Harold E. Fellows and now, Vince Wasilewski, all valiant warriors in the broadcasters' cause.

Please indulge me in a few additional moments of reminiscence which I intend to share with my dwindling contemporaries and to force upon my many juniors in the belief that there may be pertinence to the problems of today.

The first National Association of Broadcasters convention that I covered for Broadcasting magazine was contained in not much more space than is occupied this morning by the distinguished escorts who accompanied me to the stage. It was held in 1931. The association's active membership numbered a grand total of 135, some of whom had even paid their dues. In that year of 1931 gross revenues were $50 million for all of broadcasting—spelled with a small "b." The broadcasting that starts with a capital letter took in about $5 that year, or at least that is the recollection of the resourceful lady who managed the Taishoffs' household budget at that time, even as she manages it now.

Look about you this morning. You are assembled as representatives of a broadcasting complex comprising 7 nationwide networks, 604 commercial television stations, 4,056 AM stations and 1,467 FM stations, a system that this year will approach $3 billion in revenues. I assume that Rheingold will permit me to observe that you too must be doing something right.

The explosive development of radio and television in physical size, gross billings, sophistication of equipment, and impact on the American culture and economy needs no further documentation here. All of us in this great hall know what broadcasting is today. Those of us who were there at or near the beginning know how it got this way. What is important now is to consider the shape and nature of the system as it may be 10 or 20 years from now.

The American system of television and radio in 1976 or 1986 will be at least as different from the system of today as the system of today is from that of 1931. The National Science Foundation tells us that 90 percent of all the scientists who ever lived in the history of the world are living now. A good many of them are working on devices and techniques of communication.

I do not pretend to know whether the broadcast station of the future will be orbiting in space or carried in a man's vest pocket, whether it will transmit its signals in the frequencies we use today or by laser beam or wire. I do not pretend to visualize the shape and size of the home receiver that the station of the future will serve. We would all be unimaginative indeed, however, if we assumed that the transmission and reception system of 1966 is going to stay just the way it is, however earnestly we will it.

One year ago, during the annual convention of this same National Association of Broadcasters, television followed a live camera to an impact on the moon. Some of us were old enough to compare that remarkable performance to the first radio coverage of an event of national interest: the voting returns in the 1920 presidential election. Stop for a moment to consider this: At some point in the 1969–70 or 1970–71 season regular programing will be interrupted for coverage of an astronaut debarking to set a human foot upon the moon. And within the life expectancy of most delegates to this National Association of Broadcasters convention television will journey with man to a planet.

The coverage of those events will deserve station clearance whether they occur at 9 p.m. Sunday or 8:30 p.m. Tuesday, or 9 p.m. Thursday. The broadcasters—or, let us say, communicators—of that time will respond to the drama of the incidents as they have always responded in the past. They will recognize them as moments of high historical significance and will unhesitatingly discard whatever else they may have programed for those periods.

By the time our spacemen fly to Mars we earthlings will be equipped with home information and entertainment centers that will deprive us of any excuse to remain ignorant or bored. We will be able to record, store, and retrieve for display, at our convenience, a much wider range of intelligence and diversion than is available in any home or any hall today. There is no doubt in my mind that the newspaper of the future will be delivered electronically.

Now, who is to feed these versatile machines that will make the American home a library, theater, newsstand, and crossroads of the universe? The assignment can be carried out only by a new breed of communicators whose versatility of production can match the capabilities of the machines. This new breed must be incubated in the broadcasting system of today. It will not emerge from the egg, however, unless it is given the proper stimulus.

It saddens me to say that the current climate of the broadcasting business is not especially conducive to imaginative ventures and risky progress. The dominant attitude in the power centers of television is conservative. All across the country broadcasters rally to the cry: "Don't rock the boat."

We have seen in the past year the organized broadcasters, with only few dissents, petition the Government for economic protection against a competitor. And they just might get what they want. If they do, they must expect to give up something in return. What they will give up, of course, is another piece of their freedom. They have little enough left as it is.

I am speaking now, as all readers of our editorials will recognize, of the regulation of community antenna television. On that subject we have taken a position that is unpopular to say the least. Yet we have taken it in what we conceive to be the best interests of those who find it least attractive: the television broadcasters who are much too big, much too influential, much too important to this country to be petitioning the Government to impose controls that must inevitably lead to restrictions on television's own ability to grow in response to the public's tastes and desires.

As we have said from the beginning, television broadcasting is entitled to a change in the law that will eliminate what is now the essential unfairness in the competition from CATV. It is unfair, and indeed we think it immoral, that CATV should be permitted indiscriminately to purloin any broadcast signal it wants without the consent of the originating station or of the owners of the program product. But to go beyond a correction of that condition and to seek protection that is clearly economic in its motive is to scurry for a type of shelter that must eventually prove suffocating. If these broadcasters get their way, it will be interesting to see how the victim answers that first letter to a television station from the Secretary of the FCC asking it to justify its profit of, say, 35 percent on net sales in the light of its scarcity of local live programing.

We should know by now that the only thing constant in broadcasting is change.

Now, resistance to change and fear of new competition are by no means unnatural to any enterprise that is doing well as things are. I have a vivid recollection of an earlier occurrence of those phenomena when the television business that is now so successful—and so terrified—was just beginning to take shape.

It was in the late 40's. Radio was riding an ascending curve of popularity and profits. But a few operators in major markets had ventured into television, and limited networking had begun. In accord with what we deemed to be our responsibilities, we reported television developments in the detail that we thought they deserved.

Editorially, we urged radio broadcasters to get into TV because it, in our judgment, was their heritage and their business.

Does it surprise you now to hear that a number of influential radio broadcasters boycotted Broadcasting magazine and even circularized their colleagues in an attempt to persuade us to quit reporting television news?

There are hazards in the practice of journalism. It can at times be an exceedingly uncomfortable profession. But if it is comfort and complacency that you're after, you're in the wrong business. For journalism is your business, ladies and gentlemen. Yours is a type of journalism that has never before been seen on this earth. It presents more opportunities for public enlightenment than have ever been offered to any other medium.

Forgive me if I suggest that not all of the opportunities have been fully exploited.

At that 1931 National Association of Broadcasters convention that I mentioned a while back a principal speaker was then U.S. Senator Wallace White, the architect of the Radio Act of 1927, which was then in effect. Senator White spoke warmly of his work and neither in Broadcasting's coverage of the occasion, which was comprehensive in other respects, nor in my own memory, can I find any demurrer to his claims. If the delegates felt oppressed by that legislation, they kept their thoughts to themselves.

It may come as news to some of you that the Radio Act of 1927 contained the same political broadcasting section that was written into the Communications Act of 1934 as section 315 and stood as law until it was amended in 1959. That is the section, as if any of you didn't know, that requires equality of opportunity for rival political candidates. The 1959 amendment exempted several kinds of news broadcasts from the equal-time rule, but, at the same time, it incorporated into law what until then had been a somewhat vague FCC policy requiring broadcasters to afford reasonable opportunity for the airing of conflicting views on controversial subjects: the so-called fairness doctrine. The effect of the 1959 amendment, as interpreted by the FCC, has been to extend the fairness doctrine to all kinds of broadcasters.

Section 315, both before and after its amendment, has done more to arrest the development of broadcast journalism than anything else I can think of. It is a handy alibi for the timid broadcaster who prefers not to be in journalism anyway. It is a constant worry and often a legal expense to the broadcaster who attempts a schedule of meaningful news presentation. It is doing no one any good, except possibly other news media that would be more rapidly eclipsed if broadcasting were allowed to function with editorial freedom.

If anything is being done to get rid of section 315, the movement is too small to be seen by the naked eye, and I assure you that we keep several naked eyes focused on the U.S. Congress. Ask most knowledgeable broadcasters whether they think there is any hope of repealing section 315 and you will get a negative answer. They are right, of course. There will be no repeal of section 315 until there is a genuine demand for it by many broadcasters who sincerely believe in the journalistic mission of broadcasting.

I won't quote to you the language of section 315. As a professional journalist, I get slightly ill when I read it. I will, however, read a passage from an earlier work that may interest anyone who is thinking of going into journalism. I quote:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for redress of grievances."

That language seems to compare favorably with anything I recall reading in either the Communications Act or the FCC rules. Yet you have let it be ignored by Government officials who decided long ago that the first amendment afforded less protection to broadcasting than to other information media. Broadcasting, according to their clever reasoning, uses a natural resource, the spectrum, and is therefore subject to unique controls.

Isn't it time that broadcasters began answering back with a description of what it is the public owns?

The phrase, "the public's airwaves," connotes a natural resource that needs husbanding or a facility constructed at public expense. The spectrum is neither.

Oilfields, forests, mineral deposits—all the resources that are subject to conservation controls—have one quality in common: They are depleted by use. The spectrum is permanent and cannot be consumed. Its capacity only expands with advances in technology.

Neither was the spectrum created at public expense. It is a natural phenomenon that, in the broadcast frequencies, has been activated by privately financed transmission systems. To the degree that the public has invested in broadcast receiving sets, the action has been entirely voluntary and individualistic.

The television broadcast service now occupies frequencies that were wholly unexplored when Senator White wrote the Radio Act of 1927. The 492 megacycles of spectrum space that television now occupies existed in 1927, as they had since the dawn of time, but they were utterly worthless to the public—until private venturers created the equipment to move pictures and sound through the air.

Right now television and radio occupy less than 2 percent of the 40,000 megacycles of spectrum space under FCC jurisdiction. If there is a squandering of the public airwaves, whatever they may be, the place to look for it is elsewhere than in the broadcast services.

Still, nobody objects effectively when the FCC, presiding as the guardian of its mythical natural resource, draws the noose a little tighter around your necks. Take, for example, the radio reporting form that was adopted pretty much with your acquiescence last summer. With this new form the applicant for license renewal can hang himself with practically no trouble at all. The process couldn't be easier:

In making up the schedule of programs he promises to carry in the next license period, the wise applicant consults an advisory that the FCC has handily attached to the reporting form. This advisory describes 14 types of programing that are, "usually necessary to meet the public interest." All 14 types will be represented in the planned schedule of the applicant who wishes to avoid querulous letters and a delay in the approval of his application. The applicant must also describe the quantity of advertising he proposes to broadcast. For this he lacks an official guide, although the FCC has let it be known that the National Association of Broadcasters code is a useful criterion.

The applicant who has conformed to the FCC's guide to programing and has read the right tea leaves on commercial content will get a license good for 3 years.

Now it is time to seek renewal. If his performance has not matched the promises he made, he is sure to be confronted by the awkward need to explain discrepancies—as some of you can testify from personal experience. If he is allowed to stay on the air, he must make a new set of promises in the knowledge that they will be compared with his performance at the next renewal time. There is nothing basically new in this process of exacting a promise and forcing a performance to match, but it can be made to work more efficiently—and insidiously—with the new radio form.

The FCC is in the final stages of producing a television form that in a good many respects will follow the pattern of radio. Is anybody up in arms over that?

Please do not misunderstand me. We are not conditioned to mindless opposition to anything the Government does. We are opposed only to its actions that without good reason inhibit your freedom of editorial choice. In addition to the 40 FCC Commissioners, I have known even a greater number of influential members of the FCC staff. With remarkably few exceptions they have been sincere and dedicated men. With remarkably few exceptions they have been sincerely dedicated to chiseling away your freedom.

Louis Brandeis, the distinguished ultraliberal Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, wrote a passage back in 1928 that says something to us today: "Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evilminded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

It's high time broadcasters mounted a meaningful resistance movement to turn back those neutralizing Federal controls. It's time that broadcasters developed a sense of mission as large as the opportunities that new technology is certain to present. I'd like to think that the future generation of communicators who supply that profusion of art, of culture, of divertissement, of knowledge to the electronic center of the American home will descend from this generation of broadcasters.

But, if these great things are to come about, the deadening hand of Government must be lifted from the nontechnical controls of our broadcasting structure. Eventually the Communications Act of 1934 and all its patchwork of amendments must be scrapped and replaced by a law that takes its thesis from that first amendment that I read to you.

Idealistic? Certainly.

Possible? Definitely.

Worth it? That answer must come from you.

Thank you.

BINATIONAL FOUNDATION IN INDIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to present before this House several thoughts on the President's proposal for a Binational Foundation in India.

The concept of an independent foundation, endowed with a portion of the rupees held by the United States, is a logical extension of the philosophy embodied by the Congress in Public Law 480. This act has made a major and direct contribution to relieving hunger throughout the world, and in India in particular. The problem of hunger is greater now in India than it has been for many years, for the recent drought has brought to a hideous climax the long lag in India of food production behind human reproduction. India has not yet been able to solve its longrun problem of food production, despite the fact that in India nearly everybody works at producing food. This plan of the President would be an important contribution to the solution of a crucial and growing problem and thus avert the human unrest that could erupt in a future Indian Vietnam.

But to relieve man's hunger today, and perhaps tomorrow, is not enough. Our whole development effort in India today aims to create a climate for change, for moving forward to eventual self-sufficiency. This change cannot be fully imposed from outside; it must come in large measure from India itself. The Government of India, constrained by the totality of its development problems, is simply not able to seek out and extend support to those individuals who can potentially make important contributions to progress and economic growth.

This then is the essence of the foundation. It shall support—through grants to individuals and institutions—programs in the primary fields of agriculture, education, science, and health, and such other areas as may be appropriate. These grants are to be financed from the interest earnings on an endowment to be established with the investment of a portion of the rupee holding of the U.S. Government, derived from sales of commodities under Public Law 480. Through its program, the foundation would seek out the creative, encourage research and trial, support innovation and test the unconventional. It shall be an autonomous institution, independent of constraint, free in its selectivity and constantly aware of its purpose and function.

This foundation, as envisaged in the President's proposal, will not be a giveaway program by another name; it will be a sound investment in capable men and women working to better themselves and in so doing help better the lives of their fellow men and speed the process of development in India.

The best thing about this project is that it will not cost the American taxpayer a single additional dollar, since it merely puts to work money we have already given, but which is being held in idle balances as a result of legal prohibition on its use. Under the President's plan, this money can now be put to work. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN IMAGINATIVE USE OF U.S.-OWNED INDIAN RUPEES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Indian-American Foundation proposed by President Johnson during the visit of India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi offers an imaginative and effective use of foreign currency accumulated from sales of U.S. farm products to India under the food-for-peace program.

At a state dinner in the White House last night President Johnson announced that the United States would contribute $300 million which it holds in Indian rupees for the establishment of an Indo-American Foundation. The United States actually holds more than $570 million in rupees paid into the American account in India for food and other aid shipments.

President Johnson said the object of the foundation would be to encourage all fields of learning. Its board of directors would be made up of citizens of both countries. Other countries, and foundations, as well, would be urged to contribute to its funds. It would operate along the lines of the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie Foundations which have made such major contributions to our Nation's growth and advancement.

President Johnson called the new foundation "an imaginative new step to encourage and to facilitate" Indian education.

It is clear that this foundation can provide a new dimension for our common effort to bring greater progress, prosperity, and a fuller life for those millions among India's population who have never experienced even the most basic comforts of modern life. The foundation would operate basically as a free and independent organization.

The foundation, then, can help bring about innovation and action above and beyond the public and private programs now existing. It would be endowed with a grant of 300 million equivalent in U.S.-owned rupees which are not now being used. It would be able to provide funds for such important projects as teacher training, agricultural research and development, farmer education, improving the flow of information from research centers to farm communities, and a wide variety of related activities.

Private foundations have proven their ability to help foster scientific and educational progress in many nations. The President's prosposed Indian-American Foundation, while new as an institution, would not be new or experimental in concept. It would be able to draw upon the rich experiences of other private foundations which are helping to solve problems similar to those faced by the people of India.

I hope that the Congress of the United States, as custodians of the public trust, will join in strong support for this imaginative but realistic approach toward helping our friends in India solve their development problems.

INDIAN-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the elements that have contributed most to this Nation's agricultural and industrial development—and, indeed, to general economic and social growth—is research.

I am speaking of the practical type of research that has linked basic science with technology so as to provide us with better ways of doing things on the farm, in the factory, in the school, and in the home.

I am speaking of the type of research that has helped our farmers to increase their production yields so that each can grow enough to feed as many as 25 persons, compared to two or three earlier in this century. On the research that, by gaining new knowledge or by applying old knowledge in new ways, has helped to build our giant industries to positions of leadership in the world.

While our industrial community and our academic institutions have played leading parts, our unique private foundations have made tremendous contributions to research. They have provided grants to individuals and to universities, and in some cases facilities. Above all they have created a vital atmosphere of freedom to explore uncharted fields.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the announcement by President Johnson that the United States is helping the Government of India to create a foundation in India patterned after some of our own great institutions.

The new foundation will be endowed with Indian currency funds which have accrued to the U.S. Government as proceeds of sales of U.S. agricultural commodities under the food-for-peace program.

I understand that one of the areas in which the foundation will focus its resources is agriculture.

We all know that India's greatest economic problems stem from the shortage of food for an ever-increasing number of mouths to feed. I would hope that the new foundation will attack these twin problems with scientific research to help India grow more food and moderate the surge of population growth.

Such a foundation will harmonize with the best concept of the foreign aid program: helping people to help themselves. President Johnson said in his food-for-freedom message.

> The developing countries must make basic improvements in their own agriculture.
>
> They must bring the great majority of their people—now living in rural areas—into the market economy.
>
> They must make the farmer a better customer of urban industry and thus accelerate the pace of economic development.
>
> They must begin to provide all of their people with the food they need.

I can think of no better investment for these Indian rupee funds which are owned by the United States and are surplus to our needs. For research is, indeed, a gilt-edged investment in the future of any nation, and the future of India is important to the future of the whole free world.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Rooney of New York (at the request of Mr. Fogarty) for an indefinite period on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Quie (at the request of Mrs. Reid of Illinois) for 1 hour, March 31, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mrs. Reid of Illinois) for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mrs. Reid of Illinois) for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Goodell (at the request of Mrs. Reid of Illinois) for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Feighan, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Long of Maryland, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Farnum, for 60 minutes, on April 5, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDowell, for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Cohelan, for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia, for 30 minutes, on March 30, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Feighan, for 60 minutes, on March 30 and 31, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Vivian, for 20 minutes, on March 30, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pucinski, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Michel, to include tables and extraneous material with his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. Mahon, to revise and extend his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole, and to include tables and extraneous matter.

Mr. Patman (at the request of Mr. Mahon), to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today, and to include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. Reid of Illinois), and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Berry.
Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Utt.
Mr. Robison.
Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Bell.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Vivian) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Fascell.
Mr. Burke.
Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Joelson.
Mr. Boland.
Mr. Gonzalez.
Mr. Gilligan.
Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
Mr. St. Onge in two instances..
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10403. An act for the relief of Edward F. Murzyn and Edward J. O'Brien.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 30, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2247. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the semiannual report of Department of the Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement, covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-188; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2248. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the regulation in the District of Columbia of retail installment sales of consumer goods (other than motor vehicles) and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2249. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

2250. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for judgments for costs against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2251. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation titled "Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TUCK: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13935. A bill to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157); without amendment (Rept. No. 1363). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 837. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Bond Week"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1364). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 597. Concurrent resolution relating to the Centennial Year of Prospect Park of the city of New York, Borough of Brooklyn; without amendment (Rept. 1365). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 13712. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON. Committee on Government Operations. House Resolution 756. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; without amendment (Rept. No. 1373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 799. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 707, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1378). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 800. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2829, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1379). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 801. Providing for the consideration of H.R. 3606, a bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research; without amendment (Rept. No. 1380). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 802. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2729, an act to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1381). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2719. An act to provide for the the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2831. An act to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2835. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association; without amendment (Rept. No. 1384). Referred to the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 1404. An act to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1385). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 943. An act for the relief of Frantisek Vohryzka; without amendment (Rept. No. 1367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2696. An act for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1233. A bill for the relief of Lee Chung Woo; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1822. A bill for the relief of Won Loy Jung; without amendment (Rept. No. 1370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Schulz; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4063. A bill for the relief of Mr. Leonardo Tusa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4458. A bill for the relief of Michael Fahim Elias; with amendments (Rept. No. 1374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3774. A bill for the relief of Wanda Olszowa; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7508. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Bossio; with amendments (Rept. No. 1376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1414. A bill for the relief of Jacobo Temel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 14033. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 14034. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 14035. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 14036. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the purchase or hire by the Postmaster General of vehicles for mail delivery which are manufactured outside the United States other than vehicles owned by postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 14037. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 14038. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 14039. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14040. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 14041. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prevent certain employees of community action agencies and Volunteers in Service to America from engaging in pernicious political activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14042. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 14043. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title and to make related changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 14044. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 14045. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 14046. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 14047. A bill to increase the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 14048. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish REA electrification and telephone loan accounts and Federal banks for rural electric and rural telephone systems to provide supplemental financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 14049. A bill to establish a Bread and Butter Brigade for the purpose of implementing the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening the agricultural economies of friendly nations, improving agricultural skills and knowledge in such nations, promoting world peace and friendship, and combating the threat of world food shortages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 14050. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14051. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction for expenses incurred in making repairs and improvements to his residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 14052. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 14053. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 14054. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 14055. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 14056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the application of the investment credit to property used in possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 14057. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed service of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 14058. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 14059. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 14060. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 14061. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 14062. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 14063. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the voluntary program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 14064. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 14065. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds for such planning and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14066. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 14067. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 14068. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 14069. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14070. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from 10 to 15 percent the depletion allowance for coal produced from deposits in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 14071. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14072. A bill to permit all patients currently using the drug Krebiozen to obtain same in Illinois for use in any State until a clinical test on cancer patients is completed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 14073. A bill to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the dollar ceiling on the amount of combat pay received by commissioned officers which may be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 14074. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 14075. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay certain claims arising out of the taking of the 1960 decennial census; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 14076. A bill to mobilize and utilize the scientific and engineering manpower of the Nation to employ systems analysis and systems engineering to help to fully employ the Nation's manpower resources to solve national problems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14077. A bill to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14078. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 14079. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit vertically integrated companies from engaging in discriminatory practices against independent producers and distributors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14080. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit vertically integrated companies from engaging in anticompetitive pricing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14081. A bill to require certain companies engaged in dual distribution to disclose separate annual operating data on each of their establishments which compete with independent customers of such companies in the sale and industrial use of their products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 14082. A bill to reauthorize the project for flood protection on Alameda Creek, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 14083. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 14084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 14085. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 14086. A bill to establish a cooperative Federal-State child nutrition program under the direction of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 14087. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 14088. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 14089. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through June 30, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 14090. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 14091. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 14092. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend to September 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 14093. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 14094. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14095. A bill to provide that individuals 65 years of age or older may be permitted to enroll, at any time during 1966, in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits established by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 14096. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 14097. A bill relating to the reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 14098. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 14099. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 14100. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend to September 1, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 14101. A bill for granting the consent and approval of Congress to the compact between Missouri and Illinois creating a Missouri-Illinois-Jefferson-Monroe Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 14102. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 14103. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through December 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 14104. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14105. A bill to make available to individuals having a total disability income provision under section 602(v) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (as in effect on October 31, 1958) liberalization of coverage similar to that provided under Public Law 88–355; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 14106. A bill to authorize the acquisition, transfer, conveyance, and lease of certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organizations of American States, as sites for other international organizations, and as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 14107. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of increased pensions to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 14108. A bill to amend title I of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to the method of computing payments thereunder; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 14109. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to give the Federal Communications Commission certain additional regulatory authority over communication common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 14110. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child may be entitled to benefits as the child of a deceased worker if adopted by the worker's surviving spouse within 4 years after the worker's death (rather than only if adopted within 2 years after such death as under existing law); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14111. A bill to assure the fair selection of jurors and enforce the equal right to jury service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 14112. A bill to assure the fair selection of jurors and enforce the equal right to jury service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 14113. A bill to assure the fair selection of jurors and enforce the equal right to jury service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 986. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.J. Res. 987. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 988. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 989. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.J. Res. 990. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.J. Res. 991. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.J. Res. 992. Joint resolution providing for a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.J. Res. 993. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.J. Res. 994. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.J. Res. 995. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 996. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. Res. 797. Resolution to create a position of Special Assistant Doorkeeper, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 798. Resolution relating to the salary of the clerk, official reporters to committee; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 803. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or any subcommittee thereof to travel to the Republic of the Philippines and South Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Res. 804. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12606) to amend the House Employees Position Classification Act to revise and improve the classification system for certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 805. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12606) to amend the House Employees Position Classification Act to revise and improve the classification system for certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

435. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to an appropriation for vocational education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

436. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to providing funds for certain agricultural programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

437. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to education in impacted areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

438. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to establishment of the Sawtooth Mountains National Recreation Area and Wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14114. A bill for the relief of Maria Giovanna Trombino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 14115. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Armata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14116. A bill for the relief of Maria do Carmo Pires; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 14117. A bill for the relief of Hessamedin Karami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14118. A bill for the relief of Oil-Gario Lobo Depina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 14119. A bill for the relief of Mr. Robert Hendrick Arnoldus Sammelius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 14120. A bill for the relief of Vincente LaRuffa and his daughters, Rosa (Rosita) LaRuffa and Pascualina LaRuffa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (by request):

H.R. 14121. A bill for the relief of Alice Bondfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Byelorussian Independence Day 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

For almost half a century now Byelorussia has suffered under the rule of Soviet Russia. And prior to domination by the Soviets, the Byelorussians suffered for over a century under the rule of czarist Russia. Because of the history of Russian colonial domination during the last two and a half centuries, some people have made the mistake of identifying the Byelorussians with the people of great Russia. Actually, the history of the Byelorussian people developed quite independently of that of the Russians until they were forced together at the end of the 18th century. In fact, for over five centuries, from the beginning of the 13th to the end of the 18th, the history of Byelorussia represents a long and courageous fight on the part of this valiant nation to preserve its independence against almost unbelievable odds.

At the end of the 18th century the Grand Duchy was finally incorporated into the Russian Empire, but even then the Russians were to find that the Byelorussians had never completely given up the fight. The czarist regime was forced to put down three major uprisings and fight several small border wars before the Russian Revolution of 1917.

The fall of the czarist regime in 1917 and Lenin's initial proclamation of independence for the nationalities filled the Byelorussians with renewed hope for complete freedom and independence. On December 18, 1917, the first Byelorussian National Congress was convened at Minsk and attended by 1,872 deputies from throughout the nation.

But once the Bolsheviks began to consolidate their power within Russia their policy toward the nationalities was immediately reversed. Bolshevik troops were sent to Minsk; the congress building was surrounded; the delegates were dispersed, and several leaders were arrested. For the long-suffering Byelorussians, this new form of Russian domination was the last straw. On February 20, 1918, the city of Minsk erupted in a general revolt that drove the surprised Russian troops over 50 miles from the city. The Byelorussians quickly formed a new democratic republic. On March 25, 1918, they officially announced their independence from Soviet Russia.

Unfortunately, the Byelorussians were not able to enjoy their independence for long. The brutal force of the Red army eventually subdued the proud citizens of Byelorussia into a determined passive resistance which continues to this day.

Today, 48 years later, it is easy for us to forget the plight of the Byelorussians and the other captive nations of the Soviet Empire. They seem so far away, and their problems are easily lost in the endless crises that appear on the international horizon. But forgetting would be a mistake. For as long as other nations, nations who value their freedom no less dearly than we do ours, remain the captives of foreign rule our freedom cannot be secure. As long as our friends and the relatives of our neighbors remain enslaved, we cannot be entirely free.

That is why we commemorate the anniversary of Byelorussian independence, each year on March 25. We set aside this day to remind ourselves of their plight, and to renew our pledge of support to the cause of freedom and independence for Byelorussia.

Watershed Projects Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget has taken another swipe at rural America in its deplorable action which limits the number of new watershed conservation projects which can be started by the Soil Conservation Service in 1967.

The Budget Bureau has also stripped $500,000 in regular funds from the watershed program of the Soil Conservation Service in order to cover a special grant to Appalachia, an area which has already received more than $1 billion in aid in the last year alone. Consequently, countless projects and new obligations in South Dakota and the other States of the Midwest are being curtailed while one region of the country gets preferential treatment.

These planning limitations are unfair, both to the SCS and more importantly to the local people who are awaiting approval of watershed planning requests. It is imperative that the Budget Bureau remove this outrageous limitation policy. The projects which can be approved both for watershed planning and construction next year have been limited to 50, far under the present permitted level of 100.

If the planning limitations for fiscal years 1966 remain in effect, it will be very unfair to those local organizations who have spent countless hours of effort in preparing their plans to the SCS for approval and are awaiting decisions on them.

In fairness to those who have invested so much time and effort in these matters, the Bureau of the Budget should lift its planning limitations for the current fiscal year and for 1967. Congress must refuse to put this additional $500,000 frosting on the Appalachian giveaway package and restore the economy to the Soil Conservation Service funds which help all areas of the country which need to have their projects initiated.

Basic Protection for the Traffic Victim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the contributions that scholars at Harvard and other universities have made in the public interest on a wide variety of emergent problems. I am pleased now to commend to the attention of my colleagues another such service—a proposed new form of insurance plan which would do away in large measure with the flood of negligence actions that are plaguing our courts. The plan and the text of a proposed model statute to place it into effect at the State level are set forth in a book entitled "Basic Protection for the Traffic Victim," published by Little, Brown & Co. It was written by Prof. Robert E. Keeton, of Harvard Law School, and Prof. Jeffrey O'Connell, of the University of Illinois, College of Law. The study out of which their proposal emerged was conducted at Harvard Law School. Throughout the study the authors had the advice of a distinguished panel of experts on insurance and related law. This panel includes Profs. Frederick M. Hart and James M. Smith, of Boston College Law School; William J. Curran, director of the Boston University Law-Medicine Research Institute; Prof. Daniel G. MacLeod, of Boston University Law School; Profs. Harold J. Berman, Louis L. Jaffe, and John H. Mansfield, of Harvard Law School, and Profs. Alvan Brody and David J. Sargent, of Suffolk University Law School.

In essence, the plan proposes a basic protection insurance which would reimburse a person for his financial loss arising from an automobile accident without, in most cases, raising the question of blame. The injured person would be reimbursed the doctor bills, hospital bills, and lost wages month by month as the losses occur, rather, than as at present, receive a lump sum as and when the injured party settles with the insurance company or receives judgment as the result of litigation.

This new form of insurance would be coupled with a State statute that would waive claims based on negligence unless the damages for pain and suffering are likely to exceed $5,000 or recovery for all other causes—medical expenses, loss of wages, et cetera—would exceed $10,000.

The authors of the proposal contend that their plan would sharply reduce the overhead of our present insurance system which, according to reliable figures, delivers less than 50 cents of the premium dollar to the victims. The authors also believe their plan would cut insurance costs and remove the inducement for fraudulent claims. I am advised that legislation to implement this new plan has already been introduced in Michigan and is being given consideration in other States. I think we can all agree that the time has arrived for some sort of reform in automobile negligence actions. The proposal by Professors Keeton and O'Connell is worth serious consideration.

Mr. Earl E. Johnson Elected President of the National Association of Supervisors, Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Supervisors, Department of Defense, held their 28th national convention in Washington, D.C., from February 28, through March 2, 1966.

I was most pleased that, during these meetings, the association reelected Mr. Earl E. Johnson, of Brockton, Mass., as their national president. Earl, an outstanding citizen of my 11th Congressional District, is respected and admired by all of his many friends.

He and his wife, the former Arlene Hayward, of Brockton, resides at 11 Cushing Avenue with their three sons who are all attending Brockton schools. Earl is a member of the South Congregational Church, and has in the past served his community with distinction as president of the Men's Club, and the Huntington School PTA.

A veteran of World War II, Mr. Johnson has been employed since 1940 by the Boston Naval Shipyard where he presently holds the position of supervisory production shop planner.

The national association of which Mr. Johnson is president was organized in Washington, D.C., in 1913 with a nucleus of seven locals—all Navy. It enjoyed progress until 1922 at which time, due to the large reduction of employees in naval establishments, it was disbanded. It was reactivated in 1933, and the first annual convention was held in 1939. By 1944, there were 11 locals, and there has been steady growth since. In 1950, as a result of the Unification Act of the Armed Forces, the association was expanded to the National Association of Supervisors, Department of Defense, with 33 locals. There are currently 54 active chapters with a membership of in excess of 8,000 members working for Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

This organization is the bargaining agent for all civilian supervisors in the Department of Defense, and has been responsible for solving many problems that could not have been satisfactorily resolved at a lower level. The national is officially recognized by the Department of Defense as representing civilian supervisors; it also enjoys "formal recognition" with the Navy Department under Executive Order No. 10988.

Sir Stuart Mallinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, April 9 the unveiling of the new statue of Sir Winston Churchill at the British Embassy will bring a host of British dignitaries to Washington among whom will be a distinguished gentleman—Sir Stuart Mallinson, who has been an outstanding friend and benefactor to the Armed Forces assigned to England.

Members of the 20th Tactical Fighter Wing—which is one of the oldest fighter wings in the Air Force—through a committee headed by Col. Farley E. Peebles of San Antonio are planning to honor Sir Stuart while he is in our country. Therefore, I thought it would be fitting to call to the attention of my colleagues and to the American public through this media the numerous contributions which Sir Stuart has made to closer ties between Great Britain and the United States.

During World War II when he was high sheriff of Essex, Sir Stuart initiated and was responsible for the formation of the Essex Anglo-American Community Relations Committee when units of the U.S. Air Force returned to England in 1952 and has served as chairman since that time.

He has often personally planned and sponsored functions where Britons and Americans can meet and develop lasting friendships, and has been responsible for eliminating problems and resolving crises of varying magnitude between the bases and local individuals and organizations in his country. The diplomacy and tact by Sir Stuart in resolving these difficulties have precluded embarrassment to the United States and to Her Majesty's Government.

A case in point is the housing development at Weathersford, England, which has been used exclusively by U.S. servicemen and their families, and which owes its continued existence to Sir Stuart's efforts to prevent it from being closed.

The George Washington Ball, held on the Friday nearest the 22d of February each year, was initiated by Sir Stuart 9 years ago and has been held annually since then at a site alternating among the military bases and the local villages and towns.

Sir Stuart has sponsored a garden party for 8 years now at his home, which is known to many Americans as the White House of Woodford Green, Essex. On these occasions Sir Stuart has made possible a rare exchange between some of England's most noted statesmen and dignitaries and American servicemen with their wives. His guests in recent years have included Earl Clement Atlee and Field Marshal Sir B. L. Montgomery.

American Gen. Louis Norstaad, NATO commander, was presented by Sir Stuart to the English Speaking Union in a gesture of the close relationship between the British and American forces.

The list of good deeds of Sir Stuart could go on indefinitely. Other examples of his work include his being instrumental in dependent personnel of American servicemen being invited to participate in functions with their counterparts in British schools, and the presentation of Christmas trees to American forces for the last 8 years in England. Sir Stuart organized the original Anglo-American Thanksgiving service held each year in the Chemsford Cathedral. He also was the originator of the idea of establishing a memorial window at this Cathedral for Essex-based servicemen who lost their lives during World War II. He has given tickets for numerous international and national sporting events to our service personnel and on many occasions has taken servicemen to these events as his personal guests.

One of our commanders once said:

> Our base owes much to Sir Stuart whose aim has been to draw together in the bond of friendship the members of the Armed Forces and the people of the surrounding community. This he has done in a most outstanding manner.

President Johnson Proposes an Indo-American Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the versatility of Public Law 480 is a tribute to the many people in Congress and in the executive branch who down through the years have labored to improve this marvelous piece of legislative machinery and put it to work for human betterment.

The latest evidence on this point is the proposal by President Johnson to use the grant authority in the act to endow a binational foundation jointly administered by Indian and American leaders to strengthen the country of India and ease some of the economic problems that plague it.

The foundation would receive its initial capital in the form of an endowment of Indian rupees under the grant authority contained in section 104(e) of Public Law 480.

Through the years, that authority has been used to finance valuable economic development projects. Grants have been made for agricultural development, for industry and mining, for transportation, for health and sanitation, for school construction, for rural community electrification and water supply, and other creative projects that provide employment and fight poverty over the world—from Brazil to Burma, from Pakistan to Peru.

Under the President's proposal, a private foundation, operating in close alliance with governments, might be expected to open up new horizons for the grant authority contained in Public Law 480.

I am happy to endorse this creative and imaginative use of a sound and farsighted piece of legislation.

Support of the Indian-American Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, recently several of my Republican colleagues and I proposed a variety of suggestions as to the new directions which we believe our Nation's foreign aid programs must take if they are to contribute in an effective way to the changing world and the revolution of rising expectations which so characterizes the ferment of countries which have gained their independence in the past two decades as well as those which, like our neighbors in Latin America, have been independent for some time.

Social development and political education and development were prominent among the goals which we listed.

In some of these nations our country has on reserve large sums of local currency, generated by sales of Public Law 480 food, which should be put to use in achieving these goals.

There are also in every underdeveloped country a sizable number of private citizens who need financial aid to carry out their progressive plans for economic and social development. Their own governments are sometimes too interested in the grander scheme of economic development, too bogged down in administrative detail, and too encumbered by rigid rules and regulations to help them. In some cases the ideas and principles that these people wish to develop are too controversial or too new to receive government support.

Aid from foreign governments cannot reach them due to the government-to-government nature of foreign aid, or else it carries with it the stigma of identification with the specific policies and position of the foreign country. Some aid is provided by independent private foreign foundations, but support from this source is limited.

The people I am talking about are the community leaders, the business groups and the professional groups which cannot afford indentification with the government of a specific foreign power such as the United States because of national sensitivity, but who share many of the principles and views which have made this country the richest in the world.

The just announced independent Indian-American Foundation could be an important source of support for these people. It would not be identified with a foreign government, and it would maintain a perspective independent of the Government of India. I might add this independence from government support would represent a strength for which the Soviet bloc and the Chinese Communists have no counterpart in their foreign aid programs.

The Foundation would concentrate its support in education and agriculture. Progress in these areas is absolutely essential to economic development, and it is in these areas that innovation and experimentation are critically needed. However, it is in these areas that the governments of underdeveloped countries most often find it politically difficult to bring change or even to support change.

The professional educator resents government interference in his field, and the farmer has always had more taken from him by the government than he has received from it—a situation which is not limited to the underdeveloped countries. The independent Foundation does not suffer from this reputation, and it has already proven its effectiveness in these areas.

The Indian-American Foundation could also perform another function that the Government or Government-supported organizations are not able to perform because of their complex regulations and political sensitivities. The Foundation could quickly tap the technical resources of organizations such as universities, labor unions, cooperatives, and professional and business groups to meet development bottlenecks.

There is no doubt that the Foundation will have an impact, an influence, and an importance to the economic development of India far greater than the size of its budget.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the brave citizens of Byelorussian origin living in this country on the anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic on March 25, 1918.

In past centuries Byelorussia was an independent nation. It was conquered by Russians in 1795. Several attempts were made by the Byelorussians to regain independence, culminating with the 1918 proclamation.

The new nation was overrun by the Russian Communists in August of 1920, before it had been able to rebuild its strength against a strong foe. Following World War II another attempt to regain freedom was made but again Russia overpowered this determined people. Byelorussia today, including only part of its original territory, is completely subordinate to Moscow and has suffered national persecution and severe exploitation and oppression.

The captivity of this valiant nation is a reminder to us that freedom is in constant danger. As long as the forces of communism press for world domination we must continue to be vigilant. We join the Byelorussians in celebrating their independence day and renew our efforts to hasten the day when freedom will return to the nation of Byelorussia.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, we are in the unfortunate position of celebrating the 48th anniversary of Byelorussian independence. I say "unfortunate" because instead of being able to offer our best wishes to a free and independent people, for the present we are only able to commemorate a brief moment in history when a brave people enjoyed a temporary respite from tyranny.

On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian National Council proclaimed an independent republic. The opportunity, after many years of war and oppression, was created by the German occupation of the western portions of the country. Although the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which signified the official peace between the Central Powers and the new Soviet Government, ignored the yearnings of the Byelorussian peoples for their own state, these aspirations were not to be denied after so many years. It was quite evident that other countries were sympathetic to Byelorussia's independence: over a dozen countries accorded de jure recognition, and consulates and legations were set up in a number of foreign capitals. Before the new country, however, could properly defend and establish itself, the Red Army descended upon this hapless people. By the end of 1918, Byelorussia had come under Soviet domination.

Concerned to maintain the pretense that the many subjugated peoples of the Soviet Empire were really "constituent republics," the Soviets allowed the Byelorussian S.S.R., as it was now called, some special status. It was permitted to become a signatory of the United Nations Charter, received separate membership in that organization, and even signed the recent test ban treaty as an individual state. In fact, of course, as we are all aware, such seemingly independent actions are a sham, and the Byelorussian people have been completely subjugated, along with the many, many other peoples which the Soviet Government holds in bondage behind the Iron Curtain.

Because this country is irrevocably devoted to freedom and self-determination for all peoples, it is both fitting and proper that we join with Byelorussians throughout the free world and especially those in our own country in celebrating that brief moment when the flame of freedom burned in their beloved homeland. We rightfully take time to assure the Byelorussian people that their desire for freedom and independence has not been forgotten by those who enjoy these selfsame advantages. It is our devout hope that the day will soon come when all men will enjoy them, and that the Byelorussians will at that time take their rightful place in the family of free nations.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Miami Local 172 of the United Federation of Postal Clerks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is aware of the valuable assistance which he receives in carrying out his legislative responsibilities from the various postal groups throughout the country. In the forefront of these groups is the AFL-CIO's United Federation of Postal Clerks.

Such is the stature of the United Federation and the readiness with which its accomplishments in the area of Government-employees relations are accepted as integral parts of our postal and civil service regulations, that it is difficult to believe that a scant half century ago such was not the case.

Half a century ago, when south Florida was still considered the Everglades and largely populated by alligators and Indians, when there were more horses than autos, and when the average pay for a postal clerk was less than $20 per week, the laborers of this country were fighting for decent wages and working conditions. Among those who did so much to secure workers their rights were Government employees and most notably those of the postal service.

Fifty years ago a small part of the struggle for better working conditions began in Miami when a handful of postal clerks first gathered together in a secret then illegal meeting to organize their efforts. Out of that meeting was born what was to become the Miami Local, No. 172, of the United Federation of Postal Clerks.

Today close to a thousand members of local No. 172 are preparing to celebrate the 50th anniversary of those early meetings. Many of the dreams of those who gathered secretly in 1916 have become reality.

The U.S. postal service is the finest in the world. It has the highest tradition of production and service to our citizens. At the low rates charged, the U.S. mail user get the best bargain in the world. Furthermore, working conditions are the best anywhere and, under the continuous impetus of postal employees, are constantly being improved.

The struggle for comparable wages still continues despite the fact that the U.S. postal worker is better paid than ever. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, postal employees by their perseverance, courage, and farsightedness have achieved by Executive order the right to and the recognition of their organizational effort and representation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my congratuations to the present members of local No. 172 for their first 50 years of achievement. Their activities and those of their predecessors have always been in the finest tradition of our democracy.

I am certain that I reflect the sentiments of my colleagues when I say that we are all glad that this Nation has had benefit of the courage of men like those in Miami's local No. 172.

Economic Picture of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made many references about inflation during debate on the supplemental appropriations bill. They cite wholesale price indexes and cost of living increases as the major villains in the war to hold the line on price increases.

In the light of what has been said, I would like to quote a few figures from the March 26, 1966, Business Week magazine where a weekly tabulation is made on the economic picture of our Nation.

While the distinguished minority leader was citing figures based on February price indexes to prove his point about inflation, I would like to call your attention to current March figures.

Production in steel, electric power, oil, coal and paper are all almost equal to or above production of a year ago. Retail and department store sales are far ahead of 1 year ago and business failures are below a comparable period last year.

While it is true that the food prices have risen over the past 12 months, a look at the figures clearly shows that food prices today have declined from the February figure by 2.1 points. Today, the food price index is only 0.3 higher than the 1957–59 average. One can hardly call this "swirling" inflation.

Personal and farm incomes have made dramatic gains in the past year. Farm income has gone up almost 25 percent and personal income has increased by a huge 52.3 percent. When compared with a wholesale price index rise of 5.3 points, it is quite evident that the economy is able to sustain this rise without dire consequences.

Sometime I wish the opposition would argue a bill on its merits without resorting to the devious method of bringing in fears about matters that cannot stand the test of investigation.

Mark S. Watson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mark S. Watson of the Baltimore Sun was one of the greatest gentlemen of journalism in this century. His colleagues, friends, and admirers around the world were deeply saddened by his death last Friday, for we will greatly miss his intelligent and ironic perceptions, his sense of humor, and his calm and accurate observations on world affairs.

Mr. Watson was a man of extraordinary wisdom, outstanding ability, and unflagging energies. His career in journalism spanned more than a half century, during which his work won him the highest accolades which can be awarded to a reporter: the Pulitzer Prize, which he received in 1945; a special citation from the Department of Defense in 1961; the Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award, given to him in 1962; and finally the Presidential Medal of Freedom, awarded him in 1963.

Born in Plattsburg, N.Y., in 1887, Mr. Watson graduated with honors from Union College in 1908 and worked for the Chicago Tribune until 1917. During World War I he received his first exposure to military reporting as a commissioned officer in charge of Stars and Stripes, supervising a staff which included Alexander Woollcott and Harold Ross.

After the war, Mr. Watson joined the Baltimore Sun, and served with the Sun in several editorial capacities for over 20 years. He then began a second career on the battlelines during World War II, and his distinguished dispatches from Washington and the field brought him even greater renown. He was one of the first journalists to enter Paris after its liberation, and won many exclusive interviews with European statesmen.

I need not recount all his achievements during the last two decades, for his thoughtful and informed reporting on complex military affairs is familiar to us all. Intimately familiar with fast-changing military technology, Mr. Watson was able to advise lay readers accurately and sensibly on military science and weaponry. Among the great developments which he covered were the first hydrogen bomb test, the launching of the first nuclear-powered submarine, and the development of ballistic missiles. In sense as well as in seniority, Mr.

Watson completely merited the title of "dean of the Pentagon press corps."

Mr. Speaker, because Mark Watson never retired, there was no opportunity for his colleagues and friends to pay full tribute to this perfect reporter and perfect gentlemen. I wish to offer my small tribute now, and to extend my heartfelt sympathies to Mr. Watson's wife and two daughters.

Our understanding of the world in which we lived was far greater because Mark Watson taught us through his work.

Representative Charles S. Gubser Supports Public Law 874

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, today I testified before the General Subcommittee on Education in opposition to a proposal by President Johnson which would seriously curtail the benefits to education of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, which have worked so effectively since 1950.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES S. GUBSER, IN SUPPORT OF PUBLIC LAW 874, BEFORE THE EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE, MARCH 29, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as President Johnson has stated in the past few months, "the education of our people is a national investment. There is no greater challenge than that of providing our children and youth with the opportunity to develop fully their talents and interests. Education is vital to the achievement of a Great Society and is our major weapon in the war on poverty."

It is difficult to reconcile these admirable and well-accepted views with the current proposal to amend Public Law 874 and Public Law 815.

William Carey, Executive Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget stated in a recent letter that "the reduction in the impacted area program is * * * a reflection of the hard choices which are necessary to meet critical domestic needs in a time of extraordinary requirements for our international commitments."

Yet President Johnson does not find it difficult to dim his enthusiasm for education—and logic—to the point where he will sacrifice $190 million in funds for a well-proven, successful program at the same time that he requests about nine times as much—$1.75 billion—to finance his poverty program which all too often has turned into an administrative tangle embroiled in local feuds and is, as Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL commented on March 8, "mired in the swamp of mediocrity."

Furthermore, it is simply not true that new educational assistance programs will make up for the loss in Public Law 874 funds.

Money under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 goes to districts with large numbers of low-income families and must be spent in a specific way for additional programs superimposed on the educational program already being sustained. Public Law 874 funds generally go to entirely different districts—those that have more students than normal due to tax-exempt Federal Government activities in the area. It is one of the few programs which assist the local taxpayer in meeting day-to-day operating costs of the regular school program. Any loss here will mean reductions in basic school programs.

It is significant that Federal control under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 has been kept to a minimum, a goal which this Committee and the Congress has often stated. No other form of Federal assistance has produced so little erosion of local control.

My district is strongly opposed to any change in Federal aid to impacted school districts. As one person put it, "The caliber of people brought here by Federal aerospace and electronic activities demands a high level curriculum taught in good schools. We have been making giant strides, and thus far we have been able to provide this curriculum. Loss of Public Law 874 funds would present an enormous crisis to our district. Our taxpayers are already heavily burdened to keep up our schools. We would prefer that less money be spent on the programs of the Great Society and antipoverty programs as a means of economizing."

There is great justification for upgrading the level of education of the disadvantaged who live in areas of poverty. Such an improvement is unquestionably an addition to our national assets.

But we all agree that the objective of education must go beyond bringing the disadvantaged up to a norm. It must also concentrate on the very fertile minds of those whose backgrounds have blessed them with special aptitudes. Here is our source of scientists, technologists, and intellectuals who will be leaders of tomorrow and whose skills can build a better life for all—rich and poor alike.

It is a fact of life that students with these aptitudes are often concentrated in areas of Federal impaction. We cannot afford in this crucial time of technological and ideological competition with the Communist world to cut back on the accelerated educational programs which we now offer talented and superior students. Yet this would be the inevitable result of the President's recommendations regarding Public Law 874.

Eighteen school districts in my congressional district will receive approximately $1,485,450 this year under the terms of Public Law 874. Under pending administration proposals, only nine districts will receive $207,766 for a net loss of $1,277,684.

Under California law, the State will automatically assume from the State school fund an average of 25 percent of the Federal cutback. The State fund, however, is already showing a deficit for this year. As a result these make-up funds may not be available, and the current budget crisis which the California legislature is facing increases this likelihood. This deficit and the loss caused by the Federal cut will result in reduced State equalization which is paid to most school districts in the State—not just to those receiving Federal funds.

In addition, the districts receiving Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 funds are not rich in terms of local tax dollars. Most of them are at the maximum tax rate allowed by law and are bonded to their legal capacity. In almost every case the districts will have to turn to the State for additional help beyond the amount they will receive automatically. If this help is to be forthcoming it will require special action of the legislature and will be an additional burden on the State taxpayer.

Dollarwise, local schools will take a drubbing if Public Law 874 is not continued as it is.

It cannot be said that the loss of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 aid will be offset by application of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Since this is a law with nationwide application, its benefits and provisions are now available to all school districts and its application should be nondiscriminatory. But if, because of this newest law some school districts are forced to surrender the payments they have received for a Federal impact which has narrowed the local tax base, then those districts are the victims of discrimination. They are prevented from taxing a Federal installation which contributes children who must be educated at partially local expense and they receive no more, probably less, Federal aid. In the sense that local citizens are asked to shoulder what is properly a Federal responsibility, they are the victims of discrimination.

I strongly support continuing Public Laws 874 and 815 as they are presently written because the programs have been successful and have involved a minimum of Federal regulation, because of the bonafide need the programs are designed to meet, and because their maintenance will prevent discrimination between school districts.

One hundred and ninety million dollars is such a small commitment to the education of tomorrow's leaders.

Harold Harper of West Springfield, Mass., Honored as Newly Elected Governor for Massachusetts District, Order of AHEPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Harold Harper of West Springfield, Mass., newly elected governor of Massachusetts District 8 of the Order of AHEPA, was honored at a testimonial dinner held at the Kimball Towers in Springfield Saturday night.

More than 400 attended to pay tribute to Mr. Harper as he assumed an important position in the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, including Dr. Kimon Doukas, supreme president of AHEPA, Peter Bell, past supreme president of AHEPA, Charles Georgeson, chairman of the national advisory board of the Sons of Pericles, and Mrs. Bessie Langadinos, district governor of the Daughters of Penelope.

I had the pleasure of being the guest of Mr. Harper on March 14 for the 17th national banquet in honor of Members of the 89th Congress, sponsored by the Order of AHEPA, and held here in Washington.

I was not able to be present for the testimonial Saturday night in honor of Mr. Harper, but I sent this telegram which is to be printed with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with excerpts of a news story taken from the Springfield Sunday Republican of March 27:

MARCH 26, 1965.

CHARLES S. PAPPAS,
Chairman, Altis Chapter 85 of AHEPA, Testimonial Dinner to Gov. Harold Harper, Springfield, Mass.:

Sincerely regret that I cannot join you personally in this fine tribute to Gov. Harold Harper. Altis chapter has a right to be proud of the honor of having Harold Harper in a key position of the great Order of AHEPA. He has the ability, the dedication and the personality to render great service in his honored position. I had the privilege of attending the great Washington AHEPA banquet and met and talked with AHEPA's national officials.

I congratulate President Kimon Doukas and AHEPA for its outstanding educational and progressive policy. I applaud Altis chapter 85 for what it has done and will continue to do for the Hellenic people of our community. Convey my best personal wishes and felicitations to Harold Harper and all of his assembled friends.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

The Springfield Republican said:

Dr. Doukas went on to say, "Tonight, however, we are taking the occasion to assemble some of our past and present officials to show the growth and progress of our great order in disseminating and advocating the noblest attributes of Hellenism and the wonderful tenets and precepts of Americanism which is a living practitioner of the ancient Hellenic thought, the basis of Western civilization."

"Mr. Harper deserves the appreciation and gratitude of all AHEPA members," Dr. Doukas said, "for dedicating his life to the practices of democracy within his district."

ACHIEVEMENTS NOTED

Dr. Doukas said, "Our order comprises mostly Americans of Hellenic origin from one end of the country to another and proudly displays among its members some outstanding Government leaders, such as Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and many Federal, State, and city officials."

Recalling recent achievements of the organization, Dr. Doukas noted the tribute paid by AHEPA to former President Harry S. Truman, by having a monument erected in his honor at a central square in Athens, Greece.

"We are currently engaged in advocating an educational program for our members whereby scholarships and other financial aid is granted to American students at universities and colleges in Greece," Dr. Doukas said.

GOOD-WILL AMBASSADORS

He mentioned that last year, "We held a convention in Athens where we transported by air 10,000 members and their families as official ambassadors of good will. They took the greetings of the American people and American Government to the people and the Government of Greece."

Among other distinguished guests were Basil S. Milonas, James A. Mzarakos, William P. Tesaffaras, and Peter Carellas, supreme trustees, Rev. Stephen Papadoulias of St. George Greek Orthodox Church, and Michael Vortsos, former supreme treasurer of Ahepa.

Since joining the organization in 1951, Mr. Harper has served as secretary, treasurer, and president of Altis Chapter 85 of this city. Mr. Harper and his wife, the former Claire Granger, live at 12 Sylvan Street with their five children.

Dr. Doukas was elected supreme president at the organization's supreme convention in Athens last August. He was awarded a degree of bachelor of science in economics, a master of arts in finance, and government and a doctorate of philosophy in public law and government degrees by Columbia University; and a doctor of jurisprudence degree by New York University.

He has authored several articles and professional reviews.

Members of the committee included: Nestor Cokkinias, secretary; Charles S. Pappas, ex-officio chairman; Menas Demetrion, treasurer; George George and Mairo Kacoyiannakis, tickets; Nicholas Hassiotis, entertainment; John Taloymis and Peter J. Alphas, arrangements; Mrs. Eva Hassiotis, and Miss Diamond Cokkinias, publicity; and George Klotsis, hall.

Postmaster General Speaks in Indianapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on Saturday evening some 6,000 Hoosiers gathered in Indianapolis for the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner. The honored guest and speaker of the occasion was a man well-known to all of us, a man of long and intense experience in politics, the Postmaster General of the United States, Lawrence F. O'Brien.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. O'Brien on that occasion may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, MANUFACTURER'S BUILDING AT THE STATE FAIR GROUNDS, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MARCH 26, 1966, 7 P.M.

It's good to be back in Indiana for a number of reasons.

I recall many visits in 1959 and 1960 traveling across this State meeting and working with many of you.

During that time I soon recognized that your State Democratic Committee was not one of those unfortunately all too common organizations that relies more on good intentions than hard work, on hopefulness rather than organization.

I rapidly learned that Indiana had a State committee of professionals—men and women who knew the business of politics—who knew that aspiration is not enough, that inspiration is not enough, and even perspiration is not enough—without the kind of organization which insures that everyone works together effectively and with purpose.

That's the kind of State committee you have here, and I think you should be proud of it. It's the kind of party that produces Governors of the caliber of Matt Welsh, who was a candidate during my early visits, and Roger Branigan, whose record as Governor is a solid list of achievements.

It is the kind of party that has given this State one of the finest congressional delegations in the country. In your two Senators, BIRCH BAYH and VANCE HARTKE, both of whom I have been pleased to know for many years, you have young effective Senators who are not letting their colleagues forget for a minute that Indiana is the "crossroads of America," and I'm sure the people of Indiana recognize their effectiveness on behalf of this State. And, for the first time in far too long, Indiana is being served as it deserves to be served in the House of Representatives: JOHN BRADEMAS, WINFIELD DENTON, LEE HAMILTON, ANDREW JACOBS, RAY MADDEN, and J. EDWARD ROUSH. You just can't beat a list like that. Effective hardworking Congressmen, whose ability is widely respected in Washington. But now that I think of it, there is one way that you can beat that list; 6 out of 11 is good—but you should have an even higher batting average, which would be better for this State and better for the country.

And believe me, under my old friends Gordon St. Angelo and Dick Stoner, along with Agnes Woolery and Dorothy Elmore, you have the organizational leadership that can do it.

I treasure the memories of campaigning in Indiana for a young Senator from Massachusetts who came here and asked you for your help.

I remember those midnight motorcades, and how the Hoosier crowds responded to him.

There are still echoes of his voice as he spoke at the coliseum in October 1960.

Many of you were present and I remember your enjoyment when he said, "Mr. Nixon in Boston the other day said that I was another Truman, and I returned the compliment and said he was another Dewey. And he has not said I was another Truman since."

And I can hear him reciting Robert Sherwood's poem that hailed the coming of F.D.R.'s administration—you remember:

"Plodding feet, tramp, tramp,
The Grand Old Party's breaking camp,
Blare the bugles, din, din,
The New Deal is moving in."

And then that November the plodding feet were again on their way out, and the blaring bugles sounded the beginning of the New Frontier.

Those were great, exciting days.

Today we rightly take pride in the fact that we have carried out the promises of the New Frontier. That is the greatest monument to President Kennedy. Today we are working together to help President Johnson build a Great Society in which all our people can find opportunity to share in our abundance, and in which the quality of our lives can begin to match the abundance of our resources.

For half a decade the opposition, the army of plodding feet, has been in disarray, their cohorts milling about, torn between those who would move toward the past quickly by jet and those who would merely go slowly by covered wagon. It's almost—almost—sad to see their banners wilt.

Their tired old slogans have bowed before democratic programs, that we were told over, and over, and over again, would lead us to national catastrophe, but which have instead brought unprecedented prosperity—year after year after year. Last year, alone, just the increase in our gross national product was more than the total—the total—gross national product of all but 7 of the 130 nations of the world. Some catastrophe.

Of course, it is a catastrophe for those who have little faith in America. It is a catastrophe for the professional criers of doom and gloom. It is a catastrophe for those who feel that the government is best which does least.

But it is certainly anything but a catastrophe for the American people.

Since 1961, we have enjoyed 61 months of uninterrupted economic growth, the longest period in our history. The cycle of recessions after every 2 or 3 years of prosperity has been halted.

The Democratic Party believes that we have to work to keep America prosperous. It doesn't come about automatically. The party of Jefferson and Jackson is a party that recognizes problems, believes they can be solved, and actively seeks solutions.

And today we can clearly recognize a number of basic problems.

Some of these problems are domestic; others are international.

Some are close, and simple as the conversation I read about between two little girls walking aimlessly along a trash-littered alley, returning from a school that is unable to teach them, to a home that is no home.

One turns and shouts, "Just nothin'. I don't want to be nothin' when I grow up." And the playmate's reply full of withering truth, "You're already nothin'."

Other problems are as distant and complicated as the movement of hostile troops, saboteurs, and terrorists into a neighbor's land.

Some problems deal with the fact that large numbers of our fellow citizens, large areas of our national life, are not participating in our general affluence.

Solutions to all of these problems involve a common element—a search for social justice.

That search must be rooted in an understanding that as our gross national income soars far above $700 billion a year, as we produce nearly 10 million automobiles, as we add an annex to the horn of plenty, we cannot, we must not, forget those who are being ground down by the iron heel of poverty and deprivation.

That search lies at the heart of the President's call for a war on poverty and his crusade to assure that every American child gets as much education as he can absorb—first-class education, befitting a first-class country.

And let me digress here and say that when generations yet unborn read in their history books about the United States in the middle of this century—I am convinced we will be hailed not for our production of material wealth, but as the generation which, under President Johnson's leadership, created opportunity in education through such landmark legislation as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

This legislation dealt with problems that had baffled and frustrated sincere effort for many years. It removed in one clean, masterful effort conflicts and suspicions that had for too long held back the broad diffusion of general knowledge.

It struck a heavy, hopeful blow to the door of opportunity. And that door is opening, opening to millions for whom it would otherwise have been closed.

The President's leadership in this area has produced programs designed to give people a chance who now have no chance. It will provide ways for them to discover, develop, and employ their abilities and capacities. It will assure that all Americans have the same access to opportunity that we ourselves enjoy.

One of the finest of such programs is Project Headstart. Though modest in scope, it is enormous in its potential and its goal—which is no less than to reach poverty's youngest children before the scar tissue produced by the grimness of their lives has constricted their ability to learn and to grow.

But in a world of 15,000-mile-an-hour ballistic missiles that nation which concentrates on its own problems alone is pursuing a shortsighted, dangerous, and potentially disastrous policy.

In a world shrunk by the speed of jet and rocket, that nation which aims to secure social justice at home, while ignoring the destruction of social justice abroad, is abdicating leadership and only postponing the ultimate reckoning.

In this, the time of the "long twilight struggle, year in and year out" the erosion of freedom anywhere in the world weakens freedom here at home.

We hear much these days about the complexities of the struggle in Vietnam.

The air is full of falling feathers from hawk and dove.

The papers tell us of conflicts between New Left and Old Right.

There is, indeed, so much discussion of the war, that sometimes the essential facts are like the soil around active volcanoes—covered over with layer after layer of fine ash.

But I will say here, that President Johnson hasn't lost sight of the basic issue. And I have heard him say again and again: "The basic issue in Vietnam is whether we are going to stand idly by and watch a slowly budding freedom being crushed by superior force."

All this talk of hawks and doves, all of the arguments about escalation and de-escalation, all this controversy between left and right, are secondary to the question of what is right and what is wrong.

Just a month ago a young mother and her three children entered the President's office in the White House. They met there for a sad and solemn cremony: the posthumous presentation of the Medal of Honor Award to S. Sgt. Larry S. Pierce, a young American who had fallen on the field of battle in Vietnam. Sergeant Pierce had thrown himself on an exploding mine and thereby saved many lives at the cost of his own.

The President addressed himself to the same questions that trouble all of us when violence snuffs out the brightness of a brave, young life.

Why should this sacrifice have been necessary?

"Why," the President asked, "was this brave American called upon to give up the promise of his youth? Why are his comrades still called upon to fight on after him?"

"The answers," he said, "are to be found in Hanoi and Peking where greed and ambition reach out to strangle peaceful nations.

"And they are to be found woven in the very fabric of American tradition where freedom—any man's freedom—is prized above life itself.

"From Saratoga to the Marne to Okinawa and now Vietnam—the Sergeant Pierces have come in legions to light the darkness and drive out tyranny and war. They do so today * * *. They will defend the idea and pursue the dream forever."

And then the President added, "We at home must be worthy of their sacrifice. We must be united in our purpose to create a world where terror will not go unchallenged—where aggression and violence will shatter on the rock of our courage and our conviction.

"We must be committed as individuals to a common pledge: Freemen shall not stand alone against the enemy that menaces all freemen."

This elemental fact was understood in the time of Jefferson and Jackson. That is why freedom survives and flourishes today.

Now that we are the most powerful nation in the world, should we hold freedom more cheaply than we did as a weak nation in the days of Jefferson and Jackson?

If there is one single sentence that sums up our position in Vietnam, it is the President's statement: "We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else."

Yes, my friends, it is not easy to wear the mantle of responsibility during troubled times.

But if we do not stand firm, who will?

If we cannot support freedom in Vietnam, who will?

If we cannot keep our commitment to that embattled nation which has suffered heavy casualties—civilian and military—day after day, year after year, rather than bend the knee to communism, where then will we keep it?

If we do not keep our trust with those who trust us now—who will trust us or rely on us in the future?

If we turn our eyes away from the harsh, unpleasant, but real facts of international life, will the appetite of communism decrease—or will it grow?

Do you, incidentally, think for a moment that Indonesia, the sixth largest nation in the world, would have the courage to rise up and throw out communism if it weren't for our example of standing firm in Vietnam?

These are the hard questions, the kind of questions I saw John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson grapple with.

My friends, I do not for one moment believe that the line of American courage and clearheadedness that runs through our history ends in this generation.

There was no more peace-loving man than Thomas Jefferson, but let us not forget that he was the author of a declaration which signaled the beginning of the real conflict with England; and he was President when we refused to pay tribute to north African pirates.

America honors these great figures of her past because their leadership gave to us our heritage of freedom. Their deeds made it possible for a Statue of Liberty to be at home here.

That heritage means something. That statue means something.

They do not mean that because the assassination, and kidnaping, and torture, and sabotage occur in a small country, far away, to a people about whom we know little, we should wash our hands of concern, and stand aside and let the aggressors do their worst.

That is not the policy of the America of Jefferson and Jackson.

And so my friends, when we defend justice in Vietnam as we advance it at home, when our President tells us that our commitment to building the Great Society at home must include protection of the basic rights of man which lie at the foundation of any great society, we are only doing what we, as concerned Americans, should do.

At the basis of building a Great Society here at home and protecting freedom abroad there is that same brilliantly burning, everlasting idea, that flowed from the pen of Thomas Jefferson, and that has guided our party through its long history: "that men are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

These are Jefferson's words. They tell us why we are building a Great Society * * * and why we are in Vietnam.

Certainly defending freedom is our historic position—it is our position now, and I hope it always will be. Every American who believes in our form of government—its accomplishments and its future—will, I am sure, give our President his loyalty, his support, and his prayers—as the President pursues his awesome task: the preservation of our democracy.

Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this month Americans of Greek origin and Greek people throughout the world are celebrating the 145th anniversary of Greek independence from the brutal domination of the Ottoman Empire.

Ancient Greece might well be termed the cradle of American liberty. Western concepts of representative government and the rule of law were originated by the ancient Greeks. It was in classical Greece that the great political theories antagonistic to tyranny which undergird so much of the political change of our own time were first formulated.

Apostles of freedom everywhere still look to ancient Greece for inspiration and knowledge.

Modern Greece has fought communism longer than any other member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. When the Germans were forced out of Greece in World War II Communist bands began moving in. But with U.S. help the tide was turned against the Communists, and Greece has become a bulwark of the NATO alliance.

It is a privilege for me to join with all of our Americans of Hellenic descent and indeed all citizens of the free world in celebrating the 145th anniversary of Greek independence.

U.S. Grant to Home for Mentally Retarded of Hamilton County, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare approved a grant of $70,000 to the Resident Home for the Mentally Retarded of Hamilton County in Ohio. There is an interesting story behind this grant, which is just one of thousands under Public Law 88-164.

As we all know, there are many gradations or degrees of mental retardation. It is best described as a "reduced capacity for learning." Most mentally retarded children, while having this reduced capacity for learning, have all the normal needs for love, comfort, a sense of belonging, as well as an increased need for achievement and recognition. Most mentally retarded persons, despite their basic intellectual limitations, can be taught to be at least partially self-sufficient and others with training can become fully productive members of society.

Mental retardation can be due to a hundred different causes and can strike any family. It is a cruel accident of life and, while great strides have been made in treating mental illness and other diseases, relatively little progress has been made in the field of mental retardation, largely because of public ignorance of the matter.

It is estimated that about 3 percent of the population are retarded, or twice as many as are affected by blindness, polio, and rheumatic heart diseases combined—according to statistics based on the late President Kennedy's Panel on Mental Retardation. In Hamilton County, where my district is located, this means that there are approximately 27,000 mentally retarded individuals. Nationally, there are over 5,400,000 so afflicted. Almost every one of us knows someone with a mentally retarded child, grandchild, or other relative.

In Hamilton County, about 1,000 of these mentally retarded children are currently committed to State institutions, the nearest of which is approximately 100 miles away from Cincinnati. About 4,000 are enrolled in special tax-supported classes. However, thousands of others are receiving no special training at all.

Present conditions for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded in Ohio draw heavily on obsolete theories of the past. At one time, mental retardation was considered hopeless and shameful. In the name of protecting society and preserving the rest of the family, the general practice arose of isolating these children in distant, large institutions. Parents were told to resign themselves to this because "there is nothing you can do for Johnny."

Today, it has been proven that the mentally retarded can be helped with love, individual attention, and training. Many become fully productive, others partially self-sufficient, and almost all achieve degrees of self-care that were undreamed of 50 years ago. Yet, there has been almost no change in the institutional system of providing residential care for the mentally retarded in Ohio. Distressed parents who have no other source of assistance must still resort to committing their child to distant State institutions.

These institutions destroy the natural bond between parent and child, are 35 percent overcrowded, are understaffed, are unable to provide significant programs of training, substitute rigid rules and regimentation instead of individual attention and emphasize conformity and submission to authority instead of self-sufficiency.

Not quite 3 years ago, a handful of parents of mentally retarded children in Cincinnati, started an organization to provide a better answer to the problem of the mentally retarded.

Their objective was to build a permanent resident home-regional center for the mentally retarded of all ages and handicaps in Hamilton County so that these afflicted persons might attain the highest possible degree of self-sufficiency.

Many hours have been spent and many bitter frustrations have been experienced to realize this goal. But this small group of dedicated people had known the pain and torment of having a mentally retarded child. They also knew the futility of trying to find help when there was no help. Instead of accepting the problem as insoluble, they had the determination and the zeal to succeed, not only for the sake of thier own children but for all the unfortunate mentally handicapped children.

Today this organization owns 32 acres of land; has several hundred members; has renovated a building on this land and is now conducting activity programs for mentally retarded children in it; has hired a full-time professional executive director; has raised over $100,000 in the community; has had its request for a $70,000 Federal construction grant approved and is ready to break ground on the first phase of its building program. The group was chartered as a nonprofit Ohio corporation in June 1963 under the name of the Resident Home for the Mentally Retarded of Hamilton County, Inc. It is a tax-exempt, charitable organization.

The corporation's bylaws require that 75 percent of its board of trustees be the parents of mentally retarded individuals. This was done to assure motivation and continuity of effort and to avoid any deviation from the primary objective.

The proposed residential center for the mentally retarded of Hamilton County closely follows the recommendations of "National Action to Combat Mental Retardation," the report of President Kennedy's panel, dated October 1962. This report strongly recommends that facilities for the mentally retarded be provided within their own communities. Facilities, it says, should include residential and nonresidential services and modern day care, recreation training, and vocational rehabilitation services. A residential population of 300 is considered highly desirable for optimum effectiveness.

Located within the boundaries of Cincinnati, easily accessible to all in the community, the residential center being planned will have the advantage of being able to offer the child professional services heretofore not available in the community, individual attention and loving care that he needs, while maintaining continuity of contact with parents while they live. Primary emphasis will be placed on encouraging earliest possible return to the home and the community and training to permit the mentally retarded to live their lives as close to normal as possible.

Located close to the community, the residential center will be able to draw on specialized educational, medical, and recreational facilities already in existence; utilize the personal services of the community's many dedicated service organizations who will want to become a part of this community project and donate their time as volunteers; and enrich the community by providing a training and research center for students of nursing, medicine, psychology, and so forth. This endeavor would also contribute experience to the inadequate fund of knowledge which is a worldwide handicap in combating and alleviating the problems of mental retardation.

The full-scale project will be undertaken just as soon as possible depending upon the availability of public assistance from county, State, and Federal sources. This will be a $3 to $4 million project, with funds from the private sector totaling $750,000 to $1 million.

When capacity is reached, according to the above concept, the development of another such center on the eastern side of the county will be considered.

Actually, then, the Federal Government has two objectives in helping to construct the first phase of this project: First, to contribute to the alleviation of at least some suffering caused by mental retardation in Hamilton County, and second, to help encourage the development of and concept of "partnership" of both private and public sectors of society in the solution of mental retardation problems so that others throughout the Nation can learn from this experience.

The $69,800 granted by Health, Education, and Welfare to the resident home probably would not buy the landing gear on one jet bomber but it represents some very important things to those who strove so hard to obtain it. It is 49 percent of the cost of the first residential structure; but, more important, it is the achievement of a first goal, the recognition of work well done, and the encouragement to finish what has been started.

Report to the 29th District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have requested unanimous permission to insert hereinafter in the RECORD the report which I plan to send to my constituents in the 29th District of California within the next few days. The report is as follows:

A REPORT TO THE 29TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BILLS INTRODUCED

Food for peace

I introduced a bill early this year that would, if passed, expand the food-for-peace program by establishing a national policy designed to deliberately produce more food on our farms that can be used to help erase worldwide hunger and malnutrition. We cannot, however, feed the world and would not want to try to do this if we could. Other nations might become too dependent on our food supplies and would not make sufficient efforts to increase their own food production.

This plan would also place a great deal of emphasis on stimulating and helping underdeveloped nations to increase their own agricultural industry. The food we would furnish would only be a temporary stopgap measure to prevent starvation right now. Within a few years our own population will have continued to increase so that we will need to divert this increased productive capacity to our own use.

Gun laws

I have received some criticism from hunters, gun collectors, and others for introducing this proposal to curb mail-order sales of guns by prohibiting interstate shipment of arms except by licensed dealers. The bill would also prohibit sale of any gun to persons under 18, and would require a dealer to determine the identity and place of residence of a purchaser before making a sale.

I do not believe that most of those persons who oppose this legislation understand it too well. They have been misled by false claims. It would not prevent legitimate hunters or collectors from purchasing guns. Juveniles and criminals, who can now easily obtain a gun through the mail-order business, would have a much harder time obtaining a gun.

The law would not wipe out crime, but would be a step in the right direction. President Johnson, the American Bar Association, practically all law enforcement groups, and hundreds of other organizations are supporting this type of action.

Humane treatment of animals

I also introduced a proposal to regulate the sale, transportation and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for research or experimentation. The theft of family pets and inhumane methods of handling by some dealers the primary targets of this proposal.

It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish standards for humane care by dealers, who would have to be licensed, wait 5 days between acquisition and sale of an animal, identify each animal individually, keep records for at least 2 years, and would not be able to ship sick, injured, unweaned or pregnant animals. Proper housing, feeding, watering, sanitation and shelter would be required and enforced by means of a regular inspection program.

Traffic safety

I introduced two bills recently aimed at helping to reduce the toll of death and injury on the Nation's highways. One of these bills would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to establish minimum standards for highway traffic safety. It would initiate research and development into safety standards and would then apply the results of this research by improving minimum standards on such things as driver training, traffic laws, traffic control devices, highways, motor vehicle inspection, and automobiles themselves. A National Highway Traffic Safety Center would be established to coordinate the programs, and State grants for inspection programs and driver education would be authorized.

The second bill would be known as the Tire Safety Act and would establish safety standards for tires, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a research and development program on tires, prescribe maximum loads for different tires, and develop a uniform grading system for tires. Currently, there is not even a standard meaning for the ratings given different tires from different companies and no requirements to tell us whether a tire of a certain grade or rating is actually safe for the job it is doing.

Space age techniques for national problems

A Federal application of a California-pioneered approach is embodied in a bill which I introduced that would utilize our scientific and engineering manpower to employ systems analysis and systems engineering to help solve national problems.

About a year ago, Governor Brown contracted with four California space firms to do feasibility studies, using scientific research and computer capabilities on crime, pollution, transportation, and information control. The results were most promising.

The proposal I have introduced would authorize the Federal Government to make grants to States or groups of States that would, in turn, use the grants to contract with universities, or other private, public or nonprofit organizations, for this type of study. The studies could include, but would not be limited to, problems in the area of education, unemployment, welfare, crime, juvenile delinquency, air pollution, housing, transportation and waste disposal.

Before making the grant the Secretary of Labor would have to be satisfied that the knowledge gained would have to be applicable to other States and the information would have to be made readily available to the Federal Government and to other States.

COLLEGE EDUCATION FOR VETERANS

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I was most pleased to have an opportunity to work on the development of the cold war GI bill, providing educational assistance for veterans who have served since early 1955. Previously I had introduced a bill similar to that which the committee recommended favorably and which was, later, signed into law by President Johnson.

The bill is not as generous as the World War II educational benefits—or the Korean GI bill. It is, however, a permanent plan and will apply to all servicemen from now on. It is also retroactive to January 31, 1955, as I mentioned above, and will allow all of these veterans to receive $100 per month in educational assistance as long as they are bona fide full-time students. If they have one dependent, they receive $125 per month, and $150 with two or more dependents. Lower benefits are provided if schooling is half time or three-quarter time.

Schooling that is covered includes college or high school education, and the same assistance may be obtained during training in trade, vocational, and technical schools. A veteran is eligible for 1 month's assistance for each month he has spent on active duty—up to a maximum of 36 months. This would cover up to the normal four 9-month school years necessary to obtain a college degree.

Included in the same law, farm and home loan benefits are also made available to this group of veterans, as well as non-service-connected medical care for those unable to pay for private care. They will also be eligible for civil service preference, and job counseling and placement.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Revisions in the excise and withholding tax laws were passed less than 2 months after the President presented his plan to Congress. Its major provisions establish a new system of graduated withholding on individual income taxes, using a scale geared to your income, plus the suspension of the reductions in automobile and telephone excise taxes which we adopted last year. The new law also provides for accelerated payment of corporate taxes and of social security contributions from self-employed individuals.

An amendment added later in the Senate authorizes a $35 payment under the social security program for any person over 72 years of age who is not eligible for social security benefits on any other basis.

The new graduated withholding rate for income tax eliminated the present flat 14-percent withholding rate and substituted a system of six graduated rates, running from 14 percent to 30 percent, designed to more accurately withhold the proper amount of tax from individuals. This will not only serve the purpose of bringing money into the Federal Treasury sooner, which is the President's desire because of the cost of the Vietnam efforts, but should correct the situation in which so many persons have found themselves this year of still owing a rather substantial sum on their tax when filing time comes around.

More controversial was the section that would suspend the excise tax reductions on automobiles and telephone rates. I opposed this plan, and voted against it, as I feel that needed funds can be obtained in more equitable ways than replacing what amounts to practically a sales tax on two necessities which will be paid by rich and poor alike, without regard to ability to pay. Telephone excise taxes had dropped to 3 percent on January 1, 1966, and will now go back to 10 percent, where they will remain until April 1, 1968, when present law calls for a cut to 1 percent. Automobile excise taxes had dropped to 6 percent and will now go back to 7 percent. Instead of dropping to 4 percent on January 1, 1967 and to 2 percent a year later, they will remain at 7 percent until dropping to 2 percent on April 1, 1968.

SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS COMMITTEE

Several days of hearings and executive sessions have been held in the Committee on Science and Astronautics concerning America's space program. These have been for the purpose of reviewing the budget proposals for fiscal 1966–67. A total authorization slightly more than $5 billion appears imminent—slightly lower than last year because of the pressures caused by the cost of the Vietnam war.

My work on this committee has also involved a great deal of time spent considering the role and functions of the National Science Foundation. In preliminary subcommittee discussions we have developed a proposal, which I have introduced in the form of a bill, that would make needed changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation. Hearings will begin soon on this proposal in order to perfect it.

The National Science Foundation is the nucleus of much of the Federal Government's activities in scientific research and education in the fields of mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering and social sciences.

VIETNAM SITUATION CONTINUES

The war in Vietnam continues but there seems to be a lull in the debate that was raging in Washington a few weeks ago. There is not a lull in the fighting in Vietnam, however, and I see no signs at this moment of further developments in the attempts to negotiate.

The hearings held by Chairman FULBRIGHT and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, receiving nationwide television coverage, were most welcomed and, I feel, very valuable. I have been advocating wide discussion of our goals and our policies in southeast Asia. This certainly fulfilled that desire—at least temporarily.

The reason the debate flared up was because of supplemental appropriations requests from the administration—one for additional foreign aid funds (including $275 million for Vietnam), and one to authorize an additional $4.8 billion for military supplies, followed by an appropriation of $13 billion from the Treasury, mainly to support U.S. operations in Vietnam.

Since these funds ostensibly are just for the purpose of finishing out the 1966 fiscal year (up to July 1, 1966), there is obviously a second round coming up when the regular fiscal 1967 money bills come up.

I believe that you can expect to hear a good deal more of the pros and cons on this matter during the next few months.

Personally, I voted against the bills listed above because of my conviction that we must make every effort to extricate ourselves from this war through a reasonable, negotiated solution and bring our troops home as soon as possible. I supported the President's efforts to negotiate and applauded our attempts to bring the whole matter before the Security Council of the United Nations. I am in favor of more concentrated efforts in this direction and it appears that we have slowed these attempts to find peace at the moment.

OFFICER CANDIDATE HALL OF FAME

I was surprised and pleased to receive a letter and certificate from Gen. George I. Forsythe, assistant commandant of the U.S. Army Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga., advising me that my name had been placed on the honor roll of the Officer Candidate Hall of Fame at Fort Benning. This hall of fame is intended to honor those graduates of the Infantry Officer Candidate School who have distinguished themselves in either military or civilian pursuits.

I was graduated from Fort Benning's Infantry Officer Candidate School during World War II (April 1945) and, as an alumnus of the school who has since been elected to an office of national prominence, I received this honor. It is also given to graduates who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor or who have attained the grade of full colonel while serving on active duty.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

We have just completed work in the House attempting to bring more uniformity into daylight saving time. This bill would require every State to adopt daylight saving time—starting next year—unless the State legislature of a State voted to keep the entire State on standard time. The bill also requires all areas to begin and end daylight saving time on the same dates—from the last Sunday in April until the last Sunday in October.

MEDICARE

Exhaustive efforts were made during March to make certain that all elderly persons had had the opportunity to sign up for the voluntary part of the medicare program before the March 31 deadline passed. The Social Security Administration, local, State, and Federal officials, the antipoverty program, and many private organizations all stressed the importance of signing up before the deadline. It was not necessary to sign up for the portion that covers hospital bills, but the $3 per month plan covering doctor bills and other medical costs was not automatic.

An assessment of the number who have not signed up will have to be made and it is very possible that there will be efforts to extend the deadline. Otherwise, a person who was 65 by January 1, 1966, will have to wait until the next general enrollment period during the last 3 months of 1967. Persons who reach age 65 in the future have a 7-month period in which to sign up—the 3 months before the month in which their birthday falls through the 3 months after.

Benefits for those now eligible will begin on July 1, 1966.

JOB TRAINING PROGRAM

It has been wisely observed that the quickest way to wipe out poverty is through jobs. I would only add that they must be good jobs. With the minimum wage still at $1.25 (meaning an annual income of $2,600 for a 40-hour week) it is still possible to be working full time and be classed as having a poverty-level income—usually set at $3,000.

With this in mind, I was very pleased to see approval of a substantial job training program for unemployed workers in the east Los Angeles area by the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare recently. Funded for about $1.5 million, training should be made available to 350 men and women under this project, which is scheduled to begin very soon. Large projects were approved for the south central Los Angeles (Watts) area and the Pacoima area, as well. It will be operated through the facilities of the California State Employment Service and free training plus training allowances for unemployed persons who qualify will be available in such occupational skills as auto mechanics, clerk-typist, hospital orderly, nurses' aid, welder, vocational nurse and machine operator.

Another project to give prejob counseling, tutoring, and work-orientation services to about 300 young persons from 16 to 21 who are both out of school, and out of work, costing $200,000, was also approved recently and will serve both east Los Angeles and south-central Los Angeles.

If we find the solution to high youth unemployment rates, I am sure we will also find the solution to many of the problems caused by high juvenile delinquency and youth crime rates.

President Lyndon B. Johnson presented me with one of the pens used in the signing ceremony at the White House to sign the cold war GI bill into law.

Because of the expanded workload for social security offices to administer the new medicare program, a new local office was opened in Monterey Park at 118 North Garfield Avenue. I was pleased to participate in the grand opening ceremonies with David Orozco, district manager. The new office will serve the East Los Angeles, Montebello, South San Gabriel, and Monterey Park areas.

I was able to visit with my son, Dale, during my last trip to California. Dale recently was graduated from boot camp in San Diego and is now training with the Seabees at Port Hueneme. There is a very good chance that he will see duty in Vietnam in the near future.

Submarine Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, in San Diego, California, the week of April 11 to 17 is Submarine Week. I know that those who are familiar with our Nation's history are aware of the vital role the submarine played in World War II, and what a major part of this Nation's defenses our submarine comprises today.

The saga of the submarine is one of overcoming tremendous technical problems.

It began on April 11, 1900, when the U.S. Navy purchased a 54-foot "steel submarine torpedo boat" for $150,000.

The story of the first U.S. submarine began in the village of Liscannor, County Clare, Ireland, where a young schoolteacher named John Philip Holland spent most of his spare time sketching plans for a submersible vessel.

In 1872, Holland emigrated to the United States and began teaching in Paterson, N.J. He also began building submarines, financing them through savings from his salary and personally testing them in the Passaic River.

Between 1872 and 1895, Holland built a variety of submarines with varying degrees of success. One of his major problems was underwater propulsion, since he was forced to use an air-consuming, highly dangerous gasoline engine.

In 1895, he began work on a craft named the *Holland* in which he solved the propulsion problem by employing electric storage batteries for submerged operation. The *Holland* was 54 feet long, displaced 75 tons and was armed with one torpedo tube and a pneumatic dynamite gun.

After a series of exhaustive tests which lasted more than 2 years, the Navy purchased the *Holland* and ordered six which were similar to it.

When the United States entered World War I, the Navy had a fleet of 59 submarines, most of them representing improved designs. In 1912, it had acquired the U.S.S. *Skipjack*, first of the E class submarines and first to use diesel engines for surface propulsion.

The diesel, inherently safer than the gasoline engine, gave the submarine greater cruising range and the *Skipjack* became the first U.S. submarine to cross the Atlantic.

An accelerated building program during World War I brought forth the O and S class submarines which were slated to be the workhorses of the undersea fleet for nearly a quarter of a century. Their durability is attested by the fact that during World War II, 10

"S" boats, which comprised but a small part of our submarine forces, alone sank 14 Japanese naval and merchant ships.

In the years following World War I, the United States, adhering to the Naval Limitations Treaty, restricted its submarine building program and new vessels were largely of the S class. However, durable as they were, technological advances were making them obsolete.

On November 21, 1933, an entirely new type submarine was launched at Groton, Conn. Named *Cuttlefish*, it was the forerunner of the fleet type of World War II fame. Larger than the S class, it had two distinctly new features—a partial double hull was partially welded rather than completely riveted—both of which enabled the submarine to dive deeper than its predecessors. A deck gun and 10 torpedo tubes made *Cuttlefish* a formidable fighting ship.

Following the *Cuttlefish* came the *Shark*, the first all-welded submarine and the development of the fleet-type submarine had begun. By World War II submarines were fairly standard, averaging 310 feet in length and displacing 1,500 tons. They were armed with either one or two 3-inch deck guns and had 10 torpedo tubes, 6 in the bow and 4 in the stern.

In the early days after Pearl Harbor the submarine became the Nation's primary sea weapon. The undersea Navy began offensive operations against the Japanese immediately after war was declared and by V–J Day had sunk more enemy shipping than the combined efforts of the surface fleet and the air forces. Comprising 1.6 percent of the Navy's wartime personnel, submarines accounted for 55 percent of all enemy shipping destroyed.

Following the war, extensive modifications were made in submarines. In an effort to increase underwater speed, superstructures and conning towers were streamlined; deck guns and other protuberances which created underwater drag were eliminated; the snorkel was introduced; and high alloy steels allowed the vessels to operate at greater depths.

Despite technological advances and design improvements of a half century, the submarine was basically the same craft developed by John P. Holland—a surface ship that could operate under water for a limited period of time. For example: at a speed of between 1 and 2 knots, an absolute minimum, a submarine could remain submerged for a maximum of about 48 hours. At its top underwater speed of about 8 knots, a submarine could operate submerged for no more than 1 hour.

Power limitations had long concerned submarine designers. In fact, John P. Holland had written in 1900:

> Larger (more than 200 feet long) boats will never be feasible, unless we discover some better system of storing electricity than exists today—a contingency which is exceedingly doubtful.

Holland failed to foresee the ingenuity of American industry, however, and eventually, storage batteries were developed which enabled submarines to go faster than ever and remain longer under water than before.

But it was nuclear power that finally turned the submersible surface ship into a true submarine capable of almost indefinite operation and no longer bound to the earth's atmosphere.

The first nuclear-powered submarine, *Nautilus*, far exceeded the hopes of her most optimistic supporters. During her first 2 years of operation, *Nautilus* steamed over 82,000 miles without refueling and established new speed and endurance records. On a second atomic core *Nautilus* went even further, pointing the way toward the Navy and Atomic Energy Commission goal of a nuclear core which would last at least 5 years.

Nautilus vividly demonstrated the new versatility of submarine in August 1958, when the submarine traveled from the Pacific to the Atlantic via the North Pole during a 4-day, 1,830-mile voyage.

Other nuclear submarines—*Sea Wolf*, *Skate*, and *Sargo*—pioneered new areas of submarine operation. *Sea Wolf* remained submerged for 60 days completely independent of the earth's atmosphere, proving that extended submerged patrols are feasible from both mechanical and human standpoints.

Skate made two trips under the arctic ice, one during the northern summer and the second during its winter. On the first trip, *Skate* surfaced nine times in lakelike openings in the ice. On the second, it surfaced by pushing its way through the ice and on March 17, 1959, surfaced at the geographic North Pole.

More recently, the *Sargo* spent 31 days under the arctic ice on an exploratory mission, and duplicated the *Skate's* feat of surfacing at the Pole.

These achievements proved that the Arctic Ocean is not only accessible to nuclear submarines but is actually an operational area, open to nuclear submarines regardless of the season.

The "Guppy" conversion, a streamlining of the hull configuration, began after World War II, and marked a major step in increasing underwater speeds. The name Guppy itself is an acronym for "greater underwater propulsion." Again, however, it was nuclear power that enabled a second revolutionary development—this one in the field of design. Naval architects had long known that a whale-shaped hull was ideally suited for subsurface operations. Holland, in fact, had designed his submarines along this line. However, power limitations made the surface craft design—sharp bow, superstructure deck and conning—the most practical for the prenuclear era.

With the new power source at their disposal, designers developed a radically new type of submarine—one with a whale-shaped hull and nuclear powerplant. First, however, it was necessary to test the feasibility of such a hull so the conventionally powered U.S.S. *Albacore* was built as a research submarine. Its success gave rise to the nuclear-powered *Skipjack*, a great stride in the submarine's history. With its whale-shaped hull, its sail with diving planes mounted on it, and its single screw propeller, the *Skipjack* became the world's fastest and most maneuverable submarine.

A third advance came with the fleet ballistic missile submarine, a nuclear-powered submarine armed with the Polaris intermediate range ballistic missile. These submarines were designed to launch missiles with nuclear warheads from beneath the surface, and because of their mobility are vital weapons in this Nation's deterrent arsenal.

The first Polaris-firing nuclear submarine, U.S.S. *George Washington*, was launched June 9, 1959, by General Dynamics and commissioned by the U.S. Navy the following December 30.

Brooklyn, Conn., School Joins National Honor Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn, Conn., School will receive a charter next month from the National Junior Honor Society as it inaugurates a chapter named in honor of Mrs. Gwladys Dorman, who recently retired after more than 30 years in the teaching profession.

I wish to congratulate Brooklyn School on joining the more than 3,000 chapters of the National Junior Honor Society throughout the country. Organized in 1929, the society is dedicated to the development of well-rounded students, scholars, and good citizens. The 91,000 active members of the society follow in the footsteps of countless distinguished citizens who early found encouragement and distinction in this organization.

Students are chosen by their respective faculties in our junior high schools using the highest standards of character as well as scholarship. The National Junior Honor Society helps develop the good citizens of tomorrow by recognition of those qualities of good citizenship in the students of today.

Brooklyn School is also to be congratulated for honoring Mrs. Gwladys Dorman, whose many years of devoted service to her pupils characterizes the best traditions of the teaching profession. A native of Wales, where she began her teaching career, Mrs. Dorman has served the Brooklyn School for more than two decades. Her service is best summed up in the words of former students, who in honoring her upon her retirement last year, spoke of Mrs. Dorman as both "friend and teacher."

I am delighted to have Mrs. Dorman as one of my constituents and wish her many long and active years, in good health, and enjoying the love of her dear ones and her numerous students.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

His Excellency, the Most Reverend Harold R. Perry, D.D., auxiliary bishop of the Catholic archdiocese of New Orleans, La., offered the following prayer:

O God, the strength of those who hope in You, graciously be present with us as we invoke You; and since mortal weakness can do nothing without You, give us Your divine assistance.

Grant to our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress a clear vision of the place and function of Government in mobilizing the human resources and wealth of this great Nation to combat poverty and illiteracy.

Although the prosperity of our Nation, O God, has progressed to a level surpassing any achieved in the history of the world, we humbly acknowledge that poverty continues to be the lot of a substantial number of our people. Yet we know that our Nation can only achieve its full potential if every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities.

May our mind and hearts be kindled with a greater zeal for eliminating the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty, by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity.

All these blessings we ask in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 23, 1966:

H.R. 432. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes.

On March 25, 1966:

H.R. 13546. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

On March 26, 1966:

H.R. 3584. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines.

On March 28, 1966:

H.R. 8030. An act to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2669. An act to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845) entitled "An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1404) entitled "An act to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1966.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Please find enclosed herewith a telegram from Mr. John L. Hill, secretary of state, Texas, stating that according to returns as canvassed and certified by the Commissioners Court of Harris County, that Mrs. ALBERT THOMAS was elected to complete the unexpired term of the late Honorable Albert Thomas from the Eighth Congressional District of Texas.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

AUSTIN, TEX., *March 28, 1966.*

RALPH ROBERTS,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bill Elliott, county judge, Harris County certified to this office that the Commissioners Court of Harris County has canvassed the returns of the special election held on Saturday, March 26, in the congressional Eighth District to fill the unexpired term of Albert Thomas, deceased. According to returns as canvassed and certified by the Commissioners Court of Harris County, Mrs. ALLBERT THOMAS received 6,120 votes and Louis Leman received 2,147 votes.

JOHN L. HILL,
Secretary of State.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Texas, Mrs. ALBERT THOMAS, be permitted to take the oath of office today. Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mrs. THOMAS appeared at the bar of the House, and took the oath of office.

TYPICAL DOUGHBOY OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, March 11 to be exact, Mr. Walter Ellis Gaultney, Sr., of Collinsville, Ill., died at age 70. He was a constituent of mine, whom I was honored to serve, as well as a friend.

Walter Gaultney was more than that, however; he was a doughboy of World War I. Corporal Gaultney, 11th Infantry, 5th Division, American Expeditionary Forces, was selected by his commander as his example of the finest type of soldier. For that distinction Corporal Gaultney was one of the soldiers chosen for a series of paintings done by Joseph Cummings Chase, an artist commissioned by the War Department to do a pictorial record of World War I.

When Walter Gaultney visited me at my office in 1962, we went to the Smithsonian Institute to see his portrait, "The Typical Doughboy of World War I," on display in the Arts and Sciences Building. While the portrait has since been taken down because the building is being remodeled, I know the spirit the picture captured will continue to have a permanent place in our hearts.

All of us are deeply indebted to Walter Gaultney and his fellow World War I veterans.

FIRST ACT OF 1966 ELECTION CAMPAIGN

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday before this body was unveiled the first act of the 1966 election campaign. As if on this one day a great catastrophe occurred; the other side of the aisle peddled their newspapers before the membership like hawkers with an old-time extra. It was one of the crudest attempts at fiscal quackery ever put to this body.

Inflation real and ominous suddenly erupted upon the scene.

As the profound remedy we were told we must cut the $12 million rent supplement program. Taking $12 million out of $2½ billion—nit picking. No cuts in new programs will significantly affect the mounting curve of prices. Any high school economics student knows you cannot reverse the price curve of a gross national product approximating $750 billion by sniping only at the $72 billion of Federal purchasing—less than 10 percent of the total.

If meaningful steps are to be taken and if we are to control inflation, then distasteful as it may be, there must be consideration of controls set upon wages and prices.

Mr. Speaker, such a proposal was advanced by the newspaper Newsday, in an editorial I caused to be inserted in the RECORD on January 13, 1966. That editorial proposed a national agency, composed equally of representatives from labor, business, and from the ranks of citizens, with guaranteed independence from political pressures similar to the Federal Reserve Board. This body would recommend wages and prices on the basis of individual situations and the national interest. I would like once again to associate myself with this constructive suggestion by editor Harry Guggenheim of Newsday.

Our economy should not be made a political football. Rather, Members of this distinguished body should consider sound and prudent measures to anticipate and ease the inevitable strains that occur in our economic system.

Let my Republican colleagues not play politics with the fiscal integrity of the American dollar and mislead the American people with more election campaign promises of doom.

Let us all join in an effective bipartisan effort to control inflation by considering wage and price controls.

FAMINE IN INDIA

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this House look with great concern upon the threat of a vast famine which hovers over the lives of millions of our fellow human beings in the great country of India. As difficult as it may seem for us in this country to comprehend, the ancient peril of famine still stalks the earth.

All men of compassion must be moved by this horrible threat, for as Matthew Henry said:

> They that die by famine die by inches.

This House knows of the efforts that our Government is making to alleviate this situation. Today I am proud to announce to my colleagues and to the country that the students at the University of Scranton have decided to do something about this. By Tuesday next it is their goal to raise contributions from each student which they will then use to buy food for the people of India to drive off the Pale Horse of Death.

What a marvelous demonstration of basic human decency. In an age when thousands of our citizens are marching up and down the streets with signs about Vietnam, these young men have given their blood for our soldiers in Vietnam—and they were the first university in the United States to do so.

In an age when we read of famine or talk of famine, these young men are raising money to eliminate famine—and they are the first university in the country to do so.

We can all hope that their example will spread through all the colleges and universities of our great Nation. It would be the greatest message from the people of America that Mrs. Gandhi could take back to the people of India.

INCREASES IN INCOME TAXES NOT NECESSARY

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the President has indicated he may soon be asking for increases in income taxes. This strains the credibility gap to the limit. Just a week ago, the same Mr. Johnson assured us that he could see no need for higher taxes. Now he blames high prices, and claims that higher taxes are a must. Why? The remedy is simple. The Federal Government can tailor its budget to fit outgo to income. This Government belongs to the people. We in Congress have the obligation to see that the Government serves the public and does not manipulate the public to serve the purposes of an overgrown, fat bloated Government.

There is no need for a tax increase. As long as the Federal Government is spending more than it takes in, a tax increase will not do a lick toward fighting inflation. The President is, in effect, telling the American people that they are smart enough to make the money, but only the Government is smart enough to spend it. He is overtaxing our credulity.

ROLLCALL VOTES REQUESTED ON MONDAY OR TUESDAY OF NEXT WEEK PUT OVER UNTIL WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcall votes, except on rules, which may be requested on Monday or Tuesday of next week be put over until Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the majority leader please explain to us the purpose, the intent, and the reason behind his request?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I have discussed this with the distinguished minority leader. The purpose of the request is to enable us to proceed with business on Monday and Tuesday, which are Jewish holy days. We do this only on rare occasions. It is only for that reason that we are asking to put over to Wednesday any votes which may be requested on Monday or Tuesday, except on rules.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader please advise the Members of the House as to whether or not it is the intent of this session, 89th Congress, which even the President has said he would hope to be finished by July 30 at the latest; for the House to honor all the primary election days that are coming up this year, and put off votes until after said primaries are held?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, we do not intend to put over any votes for primaries. It would be impossible to run the House efficiently during a primary year if we put votes over that came up on primary days.

Mr. HALL. I could not agree with the majority leader more, but we have in the past and I wanted the record clear. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader indicate, without being specific, whether we are going to have business on Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. We will have business. It is expected that we will have important business.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And all rollcall votes that would be requested for Monday and Tuesday would be put over to Wednesday, but any votes on rules or responses to quorum calls would be taken on Monday and Tuesday, regardless?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight, Thursday, March 31, to file a report on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1967.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Dakota rise?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on that bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota reserves all points of order on the bill.

UNIFORM TIME ACT OF 1966

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (Rept. No. 1385)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2 to the House amendments, and agrees to House amendments.

Harley O. Staggers,
Walter Rogers,
Samuel N. Friedel,
William L. Springer,
J. Arthur Younger,
Managers on the Part of the House.
Warren G. Magnuson,
Gale W. McGee,
Norris Cotton,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendments, insofar as they relate to "daylight saving time," provide that beginning at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday of April of each year and ending at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday of October of each year the standard time of each time zone shall be advanced one hour. However, any State could by law exempt itself from the provisions relating to the advancement of time, but only if the State by law provides that the entire State observe the standard time otherwise applicable.

The Senate amendments would have allowed any State by law to exempt either the entire State or a single contiguous part of such State from the provisions relating to the advancement of time. The Senate receded from both of its amendments; thus, the conference agreement results in a bill which is the same as that passed by the House.

Harley O. Staggers,
Walter Rogers,
Samuel N. Friedel,
William Springer,
J. Arthur Younger,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe that the details were worked out so that the conference report was adopted in accordance with the bill which was presented to the House, and the Senate yielded on all points. This conference report is the House version.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I should like to make a brief statement.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House with a vote of 292 to 93. The other body amended the House version of the bill in two respects, as the ranking member of the Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Illinois, pointed out. At the conference the conferees from the other body agreed to recede from their amendments. This action was adopted yesterday by the other body. Thus, the conference report now before the House returns the legislation to the precise posture which existed when the House acted upon it on March 16.

Unless there are any questions, I should like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Would the gentleman in a few words tell what the House version was in order that Members may know again exactly what the conference report contains?

Mr. STAGGERS. I shall try to recapitulate briefly the action taken on March 16 by this body. In plain language, the House bill states that any State that is on daylight savings time or will be on daylight savings time this year will start at a uniform date, the last Sunday in April, and end the last Sunday in October. That is simply all it does for this year. Next year, starting on April 1, 1967, every State in the Union will be on daylight savings time and start at a uniform date, unless the State legislature prescribes standard time, in which case, the whole State must be on standard time. This is the essence of the bill, very simply put.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In the consideration by this body there was considerable discussion about the legislation as it affected the State of Michigan. There was an amendment offered to correct the situation. The amendment was defeated. The bill, as it went through this body, complicated and did not resolve any problems in the State of Michigan. For that reason, many of us in Michigan, Democrats and Republicans, voted against it.

As I understand it, the Senate version would have given us in Michigan an opportunity to resolve the problem. As I understand further, the proposal, as it comes back to us today, is the House version, not the Senate version. Is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So the problem in Michigan is complicated, not resolved, by the bill before us today.

Mr. STAGGERS. With this exception, that I might explain to the minority leader. Section 4 of the bill provides that the ICC shall define by order the limit of each zone, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers and that any such order may be modified from time to time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if this proposed legislation is signed into law by the President, will it become effective April 24, 1966?

Mr. STAGGERS. Only for the purpose of establishing uniform starting dates and closing dates for this year.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, if the State of Michigan is to resolve its problem, it would be necessary to go to the ICC and to get an affirmative answer by April 24, otherwise the Northern Peninsula would end up on one time, and the Southern Peninsula would end up on another time; is that correct? Is the answer "Yes" or "No."

Mr. STAGGERS. I am trying to determine the intent of the gentleman's question.

I said that only starting and closing dates in any State that has the daylight saving time will be determined this year, 1966.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To further refine the question, before any relief can be obtained which would preclude the Upper Peninsula from being on one time and the Lower Peninsula from being on another time, the State of Michigan will have to go to the ICC and get the ICC to redraw the time zone line; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. If the State of Michigan does not agree with the way the zones are now, that would be the relief; they would go to the ICC and point out the problems. These are to be considered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The only relief the State of Michigan can get, if the bill should become law, is to go before the ICC and to get the ICC to redraw the time zone lines; otherwise the State of Michigan will end up with two times, one for the Upper Peninsula and one for the Lower Peninsula; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; in 1967.

I understand the gentleman's problem very well. And I believe the House does. In the consideration of these problems before the committee we tried to resolve, as much as we could, this problem, as it has existed through the years.

The gentleman from Michigan mentioned the amendments of the Senate. I am not certain that the amendments would have helped the situation to which the gentleman refers, because it referred to "contiguous" and there is a question whether a dividing river would divide these two time zones in Michigan, as they have it now.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The State of Michigan for approximately 30 years has solved this problem very, very successfully, and the net result has been that we have had continuous identical time in the Upper Peninsula and in the Lower Peninsula. Unfortunately, this legislation will change the whole picture. If this should become law, there will be people on one side of the Straits of Mackinac who have one time, and those on the other side, 8 miles away, will have another time. That just does not make sense.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today we have taken a bold step to end decades of costly confusion and unnecessary waste resulting from nonuniform observance of time in this Nation.

The bill will put an end to, for the most part, to the annual time scramble.

I wish at this time to thank my colleagues who supported this bill and commend those who argued against it for their honest discussion and comment which so sharply defined the issue.

Chairman STAGGERS also is to be commended for his efforts, without which this bill could not have come to the floor and for his able handling of the bill in conference which gave us strong and meaningful legislation.

Also, special commendation is due to Mr. Robert Redding of the Transportation Association of America for his work done in behalf of this bill through the Committee for Uniform Time Observance. Mr. Redding has worked tirelessly in this field for the past 3 years both in Washington and at the State level. This work has been done in addition to his regular duties with the TAA. He has in every way assisted me and cooperated with my office in our efforts to secure passage of this legislation as well as working with other Members and committees in both bodies.

Very few people will ever know or fully appreciate the work that Mr. Redding has done here but I believe I can say that without his tenacity, alacrity, and inexhaustible energy this bill might not have been possible at this time.

Passage of this legislation measured in dollars alone will mean literally millions is savings for business enterprise across the Nation. In terms of convenience it is going to mean a great deal to the conduct of commerce across the Nation.

For these savings and this convenience, Mr. Redding deserves commendation and acknowledgment for his work. He is the unsung hero in the success story of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 282, nays 91, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—282

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Fascell
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—91

Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Bandstra
Battin
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Callan
Callaway
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Curtis
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Gathings
Greigg
Gross
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hansen, Iowa
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kupferman
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
Love
McCulloch
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Mosher
Nelsen
Olson, Minn.
Poage
Randall
Redlin
Reifel
Roberts
Roudebush
Roush
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Stanton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watson
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams

NOT VOTING—59

Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Blatnik
Bolton
Brooks
Burleson
Cameron
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Corman
de la Garza
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Evans, Colo.
Farnum
Feighan
Fogarty
Fuqua
Gettys
Giaimo
Goodell
Gray
Hébert
Holifield
Keogh
Kirwan
Leggett
McMillan
MacGregor
Mathias
Matthews
Moeller
Murray
O'Brien
O'Konski
Pool
Purcell
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Rooney, N.Y.
St Germain
Saylor
Scott
Senner
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Toll
Udall
Whalley
Willis
Wright

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Holifield with Mrs. Bolton

Mr. Celler with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Ashmore.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Teague of Texas.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Matthews.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Gettys.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Murray.
Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Todd with Mr. de la Garza.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Farnum.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. HALL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 807

Resolved, That LERA (Mrs. ALBERT) THOMAS, of Texas, be, and she is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SUBCHAPTER S OF CHAPTER 1 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9883) to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 8, line 3 and 4, strike out "corporation to which this subsection applies—" and insert: "corporation—".

Page 11, after line 13, insert:

"(5) Section 46(a) (3) of such Code (relating to liability for tax for purposes of the credit for investment in certain depreciable property) is amended by striking out 'or by section 541 (relating to personal holding company tax)' and inserting in lieu thereof ', section 541 (relating to personal holding company tax), or section 1378 (relating to tax on certain capital gains of subchapter S corporations)'."

Page 11, line 17, strike out "Act" and insert: "Act, but such amendments shall not apply with respect to sales or exchanges occurring before February 24, 1966".

Page 13, after line 14, insert:

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations) is amended—

"(1) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new sentence: 'No election (other than an election referred to in subsection (f)) may be made under this subsection after the date of the enactment of this sentence.';

"(2) by striking out in subsection (c) ', except as provided in subsection (m),';

"(3) by striking out 'subsection (f)' in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsections (f) and (n)';

"(4) by striking out subsection (m); and

"(5) by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

" '(n) REVOCATION AND TERMINATION OF ELECTIONS.—

" '(1) REVOCATION.—An election under subsection (a) with respect to an unincorporated business enterprise may be revoked after the date of the enactment of this subsection by the proprietor of such enterprise or by all the partners owning an interest in such enterprise on the date on which the revocation is made. Such enterprise shall not be considered a domestic corporation for any period on or after the effective date of such revocation. A revocation under this paragraph shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations.

" '(2) TERMINATION.—If a revocation under paragraph (1) of an election under subsection (a) with respect to any unincorporated business enterprise is not effective on or before December 31, 1968, such election shall terminate on January 1, 1969, and such enterprise shall not be considered a domestic corporation for any period on or after January 1, 1969.'

"(b) Effective on January 1, 1969—

"(1) subchapter R of chapter 1 of such Code (relating to election of certain partnerships and proprietorships as to taxable status) is repealed;

"(2) the table of subchapters for chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out the item relating to subchapter R; and

"(3) section 1504(b) of such Code (relating to definition of includible corporation) is amended by striking out paragraph (7).

"(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) (2) and (4) shall apply with respect to transactions occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I certainly shall not object—I feel that the Senate amendments are appropriate but I do so in order that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] may explain the amendments.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9883 as passed by the House of Representatives on February 7, 1966, contained three provisions relating to the option for corporations and their shareholders to be taxed in a manner similar to partnerships and partners.

The Senate adopted the three House-passed provisions of the bill and added an amendment repealing the provisions of the subchapter R of chapter 1 which provides a special option for partnerships and proprietorships to be taxed basically like corporations. The amendment would also provide for the tax-free incorporation of these businesses in certain cases.

We may recall that subchapter R—section 1361—was originally added by the Senate as an amendment to the House-passed version of H.R. 8300, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

As stated in the committee report—Senate Report No. 1622, 83d Congress, 2d session, page 119:

> The privilege of unincorporated businesses to be treated as corporations for tax purposes is complementary to the similar option granted certain corporations. It permits the business to elect the form of organization which is most suitable to its operations without being influenced by Federal income tax considerations.

At the time when section 1361 was originally enacted, many States did not permit organizations such as brokers to incorporate. Today, many States permit such organizations to incorporate.

We are advised that the subchapter R companies at one time may have numbered as many as 1,000, but that they are continually declining, and it is believed that there are fewer than 500 in existence today.

This provision is to become effective January 1, 1969. A partnership or proprietorship which had previously made the election under section 1361 will be permitted to become an actual corporation in a tax-free reorganization. After the date of enactment of this bill, no partnership or proprietorship, which is not already under the election of section 1361, will be permitted to elect the corporate tax treatment.

A Senate floor amendment provided that the one-shot capital gains provision is not to apply with respect to installment payments in the future where the sale or other disposition took place in the past. It is my understanding that the intent of this provision is to treat such installment payments in the same manner as other income in determining the applicability of the one-shot capital gains provision. The effect of this in applying the one-shot capital gains provision is to treat the installment payments in the same manner as if they were not capital gains.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, with respect to these matters now pending and which I shall call up, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES TO SUSPEND THE DUTY ON CERTAIN TROPICAL HARDWOODS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7723) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive.

Page 3, line 1, strike out "Sec. 3." and insert: "Sec. 2."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I do so in order that the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], might explain the Senate amendments. I would, however, say this: I am in full accord with the action taken by the Senate.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment to this bill, H.R. 7723, relating to the suspension of duty on certain tropical hardwoods, simply struck section 2 from the bill and renumbered section 3. The effect of the amendment, as explained in the report of the Senate Finance Committee, is to eliminate that provision in the House bill which would have authorized the President to proclaim continued duty-free treatment for the tropical hardwoods affected by the bill beyond December 31, 1967, if he determined it was required to carry out a trade agreement entered into under the Trade Expansion Act. Under the bill, as amended, the duty on tropical hardwood would be suspended until January 1, 1968.

As further explained by the Senate Finance Committee report, the Trade Expansion Act permits the duty on many of the hardwoods affected by this bill to be eliminated immediately rather than by progressive reductions over a period of years, and this amendment does not cut back on that authority. Thus, in the event of a successful trade agreement permanent and continued elimination of the duty on most of these hardwoods could be assured.

There are some tropical hardwoods, however, notably mahogany, with respect to which the duty can be eliminated only over a period of years. If a trade agreement is entered into during the period of suspension of duty provided by this bill, it would have to provide for progressive elimination of the duty unless Congress later acted to terminate it altogether.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would add that the elimination of this provision is consistent with actions that the Committee on Ways and Means has subsequently taken on similar bills where a request has been made to delete this subsection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALTERATION OF DUTIES ON IMPORTATION OF COPRA, PALM NUTS, AND PALM-NUT KERNELS, AND THE OILS CRUSHED THEREFROM

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6568) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 5, strike out all after line 3 over to and including line 3 on page 7.

Page 7, after line 3, insert:

"Sec. 2. The amendments and repeals made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Page 7, after line 3, insert:

"Sec. 3. (a) The limitation for the calendar year 1965 contained in headnote 2(b) for schedule 1, part 14, subpart B of the Tariff Schedules of the United States is hereby increased by 28,308,955 pounds.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, entries during 1965 of coconut oil, which is a Philippine article (within the meaning of the Tariff Schedules of the United States), shall be liquidated or reliquidated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a), and appropriate refunds of duty shall be made, if request therefor is filed with the appropriate customs officer on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Page 7, after line 3, insert:

"Sec. 4. For purposes of applying paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 256 (19 U.S.C. 1886) and section 351(b) (19 U.S.C. 1981(b)) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and section 350(c)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1351(c)(2)(A))—

"(1) The rates of duty in rate column numbered 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States as changed by this Act shall be treated as the rates of duty existing on July 1, 1962.

"(2) The rates of duty in rate column numbered 2 of such Schedules as changed by this Act shall be treated as the rates of duty existing on July 1, 1934."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do so only that the chairman might give a brief explanation of the Senate changes, and shall appreciate it if the gentleman will do so at this time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as passed by the House on October 18, 1965, the bill, H.R. 6568, would make permanent the duty-free treatment, or lower rates of duty, that are now temporarily applicable to copra, palm nuts and palm-nut kernels; the oils expressed therefrom; and specified fatty acids, salts, and other chemical products derived from such oils. The temporary duty-free treatment or lower rates of duty applicable to such products, which are presently to be in effect until July 1, 1966, reflect the suspension of the processing taxes that were applicable under former section 4511 of the Internal Revenue Code.

As passed by the House, the bill would also have enlarged the duty-free quota for Philippine coconut oil for the year 1965 from 120,000 to 160,000 tons. A like increase for the years 1966 and 1967 was also provided for, conditioned on the waiver by the Philippine Republic of its existing preference on copra.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate left intact and accepted without change the principal part of the House bill, that is, the provisions of section 1. This is the section that makes permanent the temporary duty-free treatment, or lower rates of duty, temporarily applicable to copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, the oils expressed therefrom and certain derivatives.

The Senate deleted section 2 of the House bill, the provisions relating to enlargement of the duty-free quota for Philippine coconut oil for the years 1965, 1966, and 1967. Section 3(a) of the Senate bill, however, does provide for an increase in the duty-free quota on such oil only for the year 1965 by 28,308,955 pounds. The Senate Committee on Finance advises that this limited increase in the quota is in the nature of equitable relief for importers to whom customs officers have erroneously released certain coconut oil as being within the duty-free quota, all such releases having occurred in the period May 17 to June 11, 1965, after the quota was actually filled on May 17, 1965.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a Senate floor amendment added a new section 4 to the bill to provide that the rates of duty under this measure are the rates to be taken into account by the President in cutting or raising tariffs on these products.

Mr. Speaker, all the departments that have any interest whatever in this legislation have advised that they favor the bill as passed by the Senate. These include the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, Interior, Labor, and Agriculture. In view of the acceptance without change of the principal provisions of the bill as passed by the House and the favorable reports from the departments with respect to the Senate amendments, I recommend that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE ENTRY OF STAINED GLASS FOR CONGREGATION EMANUEL, OF DENVER, COLO.

Mr. **MILLS.** I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 4599, providing for the free entry of stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel, of Denver, Colo., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, after line 9, insert:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty the chipped colored glass windows set in cement imported before the enactment of this Act for the use of Saint Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nevada."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)".

Page 2, line 2, after "(a)" insert "or (b)".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colorado, and of certain chipped colored glass windows for Saint Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nevada."

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only in order that the gentleman from Arkansas, chairman of the committee, might give us a brief explanation of the bill and I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. **MILLS.** Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that H.R. 4599, as it passed the House, provided for the free entry of stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo. The situation involved was that chipped colored glass windows which were bonded or joined together by cement and which were valued at more than $15 per square foot were imported by the Congregation Emanuel. The Congregation Emanuel claimed these items to be free of duty. However, the customs collector denied free entry.

In 1960 a U.S. Customs Court decision held that this type of glass was entitled to free entry under the then existing tariff laws. However, the Bureau of Customs refused to follow this decision on the contention that such colored glass set in cement, even though imported to be used in houses of worship, was not entitled to free entry. Such glass set in lead was permitted free entry. In the new Tariff Schedules of the United States, which became effective on August 31, 1963, it was provided that such colored glass whether set in lead or cement was entitled to duty-free treatment. H.R. 4599, as it passed the House, provided such duty-free treatment because it was felt that in equity the importer was entitled to this treatment.

The Senate added an amendment involving the same type of glass which was imported for the use of St. Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev. The Senate amendment would also provide free entry for this glass. This glass, like the glass in the case of the Congregation Emanuel, was set in cement and, here again, the Bureau of Customs had refused to follow the Customs Court decision and the duty was assessed.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the same considerations apply to the colored glass imported by St. Ann's Church, and I hope that the House will be agreeable to accepting the Senate amendment.

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be added that the problem that confronted these two churches in 1963 and before that period has now been eliminated by basic changes in the tariff act.

Mr. **MILLS.** That is true.

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. **ALBERT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday, April 6, to consider the 1967 appropriation bill for the Treasury, Post Office, and executive offices.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader at this time, is it his intention to program this bill for Wednesday and the Interior Department appropriation bill on Tuesday?

Mr. **ALBERT.** That is the intention. The gentleman from Oklahoma who handles this bill is present and he has requested that it be scheduled for this Wednesday.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD.** I am informed by the minority ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] that he has no objection to this proposal and is in accord with the scheduling of this bill for Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING EXPENSES OF AN INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 94—U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. **FRIEDEL.** Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1387) on the resolution (H. Res. 614) to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of an investigation authorized by H. Res. 94, Eighty-Ninth Congress, for the purpose of making a complete evaluation and study of the operations of the United States Office of Education, incurred by the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees who will be engaged in the activities of the subcommittee, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the subcommittee, cosigned by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out all language on lines 2 and 3 and add: "chairman of the subcommittee, cosigned by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF AN INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 94—TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. **FRIEDEL.** Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1388) on the resolution (H. Res. 784) to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of an investigation authorized by H. Res. 94, Eighty-ninth Congress, with respect to a study and investigation of legislation relating to international education, incurred by the Task Force on International Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, not to exceed $15,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees who will be engaged in the activities of the task force, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such task force, cosigned by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF AN INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 94—AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1389) on the resolution (H. Res. 787) to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of an investigation authorized by H. Res. 94, Eighty-ninth Congress, with respect to a study and investigation of problems and legislation regarding handicapped children, incurred by the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Handicapped Children of the Committee on Education and Labor, not to exceed $45,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees who will be engaged in the activities of the ad hoc subcommittee, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such ad hoc subcommittee, cosigned by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOD CRISIS IN INDIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present to hear this message.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 51]

Anderson, Tenn.
Ashmore
Baring
Barrett
Blatnik
Bolling
Brown, Calif.
Burleson
Cameron
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Curtis
de la Garza
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Dowdy
Evans, Colo.
Feighan
Fraser
Fuqua
Gettys
Grover
Harsha
Keogh
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Moeller
Murray
Nix
O'Brien
O'Konski
Pool
Powell
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Rooney, N.Y.
St Germain
Saylor
Scott
Senner
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Toll
Udall
Whalley
Willis
Wright

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOOD CRISIS IN INDIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 417)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In recent months I have been watching with deep concern the emerging problem of world food supply. And I have been especially concerned with the prospect for India. During this past week I have discussed the Indian food problem with the Prime Minister of India, who has been our welcome and distinguished guest here in Washington. I am persuaded that we may stand at this moment on the threshold of a great tragedy. The facts are simple; their implications are grave. India faces an unprecedented drought. Unless the world responds, India faces famine.

Strong efforts by the Indian Government, and our help, have so far averted famine. But in the absence of cooperative and energetic action by the United States, by other nations and by India herself, some millions of people will suffer needlessly before the next crop is harvested. This, in our day and age, must not happen. Can we let it be said that man, who can travel into space and explore the stars, cannot feed his own?

Because widespread famine must not and cannot be allowed to happen, I am today placing the facts fully before the Congress. I am asking the endorsement of the Congress for a program that is small neither in magnitude nor concept. I am asking the Congress, and the American people, to join with me in an appeal to the conscience of all nations that can render help.

I invite any information that the Congress can supply. Our people will welcome any judgments the Congress can provide. The executive branch, this Nation and the world will take appropriate note and give proper attention to any contributions in counsel and advice that congressional debate may produce.

If we all rally to this task, the suffering can be limited. A sister democracy will not suffer the terrible strains which famine imposes on free government.

Nor is this all. The Indians are a proud and self-respecting people. So are their leaders. The natural disaster which they now face is not of their making. They have not asked our help needlessly; they deeply prefer to help themselves. The Indian Government has sound plans for strengthening its agricultural economy and its economic system. These steps will help India help herself. They will prevent a recurrence of this disaster. I also propose action through the World Bank and the Agency for International Development to support this strong initiative by the Government of India.

THE CRISIS

Since independence, India has done much to increase her output of agricultural products. Her agriculture has not been neglected. From 1950 to 1955 she increased food production 75 percent. This is a creditable achievement. But India has had to contend with a continuing and relentless increase in population. Her people have also consumed more from a higher income. Accordingly, she has remained heavily dependent on our help. Last year we provided, under Public Law 480, more than 6 million tons of wheat, equal to more than two-fifths of our own consumption. To keep this supply moving, the equivalent of two fully loaded Liberty ships had to put in at an Indian port every day of the year.

Now India has been the victim of merciless natural disaster. Nothing is so important for the Indian farmer as the annual season of heavy rain—the monsoon. Last year, over large parts of India, the rains did not come. Crops could not be planted, or the young plants withered and died in the fields. Agricultural output, which needed to increase, was drastically reduced. Not since our own dustbowl years of the 1930's has there been a greater agricultural disaster.

Indian leaders have rightly turned to the world for help. Pope Paul VI has endorsed their plea. So has the World Council of Churches. So has the Secretary General of the United Nations. So has the Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization. And so, in this message does the President of the United States.

I have said that effective action will not be cheap. India's need is for at least 11 to 12 million tons of imported grain from January to December 1966.

Food in this world is no longer easy to find.

But find it we must.

Here is what I propose.

THE PROGRAM

Last fiscal year we supplied 6 million tons of food grain to India. So far in this fiscal year, I have allotted 6.5 million tons of grain for shipment to India—more than the total of 6 million tons which we had planned to provide as a continuation of past arrangements. It is even more necessary in this emergency to keep the pipelines full and flowing and to insure that there is no congestion of rail or sea transport. India, furthermore, estimates an additional 6 to 7 million tons of food grain will be necessary through next December beyond what has already been committed or expected.

I propose that the United States provide 3½ million tons of that requirement, with the remaining 3½ million tons coming from those nations which have either the food to offer or the means to buy food. I invite those nations to match the amount which we will supply. For example, I am delighted to be informed that Canada is prepared to provide a million tons of wheat and flour to India.

Every agriculturally advanced country can, by close scrutiny of its available supplies, make a substantial contribution. I ask that every government seek to supply the maximum it can spare—and then a little more. I ask those industrial countries which cannot send food to supply a generous equivalent in fertilizer, or in shipping, or in funds for the purchase of these requisites. All know the Indian balance of payments is badly overburdened. Food and other materials should be supplied against payment in rupees, which is our practice, or as a gift.

It is not our nature to drive a hard mathematical bargain where hunger is involved. Children will not know that they suffered hunger because American assistance was not matched. We will expect and press for the most energetic and compassionate action by all countries of all political faiths. But if their response is insufficient, and if we must provide more, before we stand by and watch children starve, we will do so. I, therefore, ask your endorsement for this emergency action.

I have spoken mostly of bread-grains. The Prime Minister of India spoke also of other commodities which can meet part of the requirements or replace part of the need. In response to her needs, I propose that we allot up to 200,000 tons of corn, up to 150 million pounds of vegetable oils, and up to 125 million pounds of milk powder to India. The vegetable oil and milk powder are especially needed for supplementing the diets of Indian children.

In addition, India's own exchange resources can be released for food and fertilizer purchases if we make substantial shipments of cotton and tobacco. I am suggesting the allotment for this purpose of 325,000 to 700,000 bales of cotton and 2 to 4 million pounds of tobacco. Both of these commodities we have in relative abundance.

I request prompt congressional endorsement of this action.

I urge, also, the strong and warmhearted and generous support of this program by the American people.

And I urge the strong and generous response of governments and people the world around.

India is a good and deserving friend. Let it never be said that "bread should be so dear, and flesh and blood so cheap" that we turned in indifference from her bitter need.

FURTHER ACTION

The Indian people want to be self-supporting in their food supply.

Their Government has adopted a far-reaching program to increase fertilizer production, improve water and soil management, provide rural credit, improve plant protection, and control food loss. These essentials must be accompanied by a strong training and education program.

I have directed the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with AID, to consult with the Indian Government to ascertain if there are ways and means by which we can strengthen this effort. We have long experience with short courses, extension training, and similar programs. If they can be used, I feel certain that American agricultural experts would respond to an appeal to serve in India as a part of an Agricultural Training Corps or through an expanded Peace Corps. Many of our younger men and women would especially welcome the opportunity.

I am determined that in our assistance to the Indian Government we not be narrowly limited by what has been done in the past. Let us not be afraid of our own enthusiasm. Let us be willing to experiment.

The Indian Government believes that there can be no effective solution of the Indian food problem that does not include population control. The choice is now between a comprehensive and humane program for limiting births and the brutal curb that is imposed by famine. As Mrs. Gandhi told me, the Indian Government is making vigorous efforts on this front.

Following long and careful planning and after discussions in recent days with Prime Minister Gandhi, I have proposed the establishment of the Indo-U.S. Foundation. This Foundation will be financed by rupees, surplus to our need, now on deposit in India. It will be governed by distinguished citizens of both countries. It will be a vigorous and imaginative enterprise designed to give new stimulus to education and scientific research in India. There is no field where, I hope, this stimulus will be greater than in the field of agriculture and agricultural development.

Finally, in these last days, the Prime Minister and I have talked about the prospects for the Indian economy. The threat of war with China and the unhappy conflict with Pakistan seriously interrupted India's economic progress. Steps had to be taken to protect dwindling exchange resources. These also had a strangling effect on the economy. Indian leaders are determined now to put their economy again on the upward path. Extensive discussions have been held with the World Bank, which heads the consortium of aid-giving countries.

The United States interferes neither in the internal politics nor the internal economic structure of other countries. The record of the last 15 years is a sufficient proof that we ask only for results. We are naturally concerned with results—with insuring that our aid be used in the context of strong and energetic policies calculated to produce the most rapid possible economic development.

We believe Indian plans now under discussion show high promise. We are impressed by the vigor and determination of the Indian economic leadership. As their plans are implemented, we look forward to providing economic assistance on a scale that is related to the great needs of our sister democracy.

An India free from want and deprivation will, as Mahatma Gandhi himself once predicted, "be a mighty force for the good of mankind."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 30, 1966.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the message is referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANK SUPERVISION, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up the resolution (H. Res. 771) providing for consideration of H.R. 5147, a bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1965, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 771

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5147) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1965, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 5147, a bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 thus permitting certain additional health benefit plans to come within the purview of such act for Federal employees would not cost the Federal taxpayers a single penny, nor would it create additional administrative costs to make available an additional health benefit plan for Government employees.

The fact is that the U.S. Civil Service Commission charges 1 percent of all premiums paid on each health benefit plan to cover all costs of administering and operating programs under the Health Benefits Act, while their actual cost is currently running at only 0.6 percent.

Recently, one of the larger Government employee unions, affiliated with the AFL–CIO, expressed concern over substantial and continuing premium rate increases in some of the Federal employee health plans. A representative of the union stated that every effort will be made to have the Senate and House Civil Service Committees and the Commission investigate the "skyrocketing" hospital and medical costs relating to the Federal employee health program, and that the union would seek legislation to increase substantially the Government's contribution to the health premiums.

This concern is real amongst all Federal employees. There is, therefore, a real need for true competitiveness which would come about through the participation of larger insurance companies in the overall program. Thus the NAGE health benefit plan can be instituted if H.R. 5147 is passed by the Congress, a plan which would provide a broad comprehensive major medical program with maximum protection for NAGE Government members and their families at the lowest possible cost. The carrier for the NAGE plan is Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., of New York.

The NAGE plan is unique in that it offers only one high option plan. This has a three-fold purpose:

First. The plan competes more than favorably with all high option plans available to all Government employees.

Second. The one option approach reduces substantially the cost of administration to NAGE and the carrier involved.

Third. The Government employees have shown an overwhelming preference—90–10—for the high option plans.

Thus while present Government sponsored plans have been increasing their charges, the NAGE plan conceivably would hold the line for at least 5 years without any escalation of charges or costs.

The U.S. Civil Service Commission's objections to H.R. 5147 are unrealistic when they state:

> Each new plan adds to the already bewildering number from which employees may choose.

The Commission's statement is erroneous due to the fact that there are about 13 employee organizations offering such plans. A Government employee must be a member of one of these organizations in order to participate in their health benefit plan. Therefore, a Government employee has only, in fact, three choices: his organization's plan or one of the two Government-sponsored plans. A choice of three can hardly be considered a bewildering number from which to choose. The remaining 25 plans presently in force are small local programs around metropolitan areas of the Nation.

EMPLOYEE INTERESTS PROTECTED BY H.R. 5147

We feel that the Civil Service Commission's position is untenable when they state:

> Neither the Government's nor the employees' interest are served by admitting new union plans to participation in the health benefit program.

This statement infers that only the Civil Service Commission has the wisdom and foresight to direct what, in fact, is in the best interest of the Federal Government and its employees. Recently many of the present programs raised their premium rates. Certainly the Government and the employees interests were not served by these rate increases. New plans with wider areas of coverage are constantly being developed within the insurance industry to provide the broadest coverage at the lowest possible cost. Also, the present law practices a form of discrimination in that it prohibits any existing as well as any future employee organization from participating and securing a health benefit program for its members.

NO ADDITIONAL EXPENSE TO GOVERNMENT

The Civil Service Commission further stated to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that:

> Each new plan adds to the duties and responsibilities of employing agencies and the Commission, and increases the administrative complexities and expense of operating the health benefits program.

This objection raised by the Civil Service Commission is not factual. New plans do not add to the duties and responsibilities of employing Federal agencies. Actually these agencies have only to forward employee deductions plus the Government's contribution to the Civil Service Commission. Modern electronic equipment reduces these administrative complexities to simplicity. Further, the Civil Service Commission charges 1 percent of all premiums paid on each health benefit plan to cover all of their costs of administering and operating programs under the Health Benefit Act. Their actual cost is currently running at only 0.6 percent. This 1 percent has therefore proven to be more than enough to cover their administrative expenses and thus the financial objection is unrealistic.

BENEFITS AND COSTS

The minority report quotes the Civil Service Commission spokesman as stating that "new union plans could not possibly offer more health benefits for less money than do existing plans."

The testimony presented to the subcommittee convincingly demonstrated that this is not so. The plan described at that time is a broad comprehensive major medical plan intended to provide maximum protection at the lowest possible net cost—a cost which is approximately $1 per quarter less than that under the Government-wide service plan. The plan competes more than favorably with all high option plans available to all Government employees. And with the increased costs announced earlier this year for a number of existing plans, the cost comparison today is even more sharply defined.

It is my understanding now that if we open the act for one new additional organization, the National Association of Government Employees would like to come in under the program. They have submitted to the committee a plan which was offered by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., and which I shall put into the RECORD at this time.

The plan is as follows:

ADVANTAGES OF THE NAGE PLAN SUBMITTED BY METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE CO.

A. The NAGE plan is a broad comprehensive major medical plan intended to provide a maximum protection for NAGE employees and their families at the lowest possible net cost.

B. The NAGE plan is unique in that it offers only one high option plan. This has a threefold purpose:

1. The plan competes more than favorably with all high option plans available to all Government employees.

2. The one option approach reduces substantially the cost of administration to NAGE and the carrier involved.

3. The Government employees have shown an overwhelming preference (90–10) for the high option plans.

C. The specific plan benefits have the advantage of providing:

1. Broad semiprivate room and board and hospital special service benefits for 365 days for any hospital confinement.

2. Surgical allowances up to $450 under the basic benefits with supplemental surgical benefits on a reasonable and customary fee basis. (No schedules.)

3. Attending physicians' allowances of $10 for the first day and $5 for the next 364 days which are more than adequate in relation to current charges.

4. Diagnostic X-ray and laboratory benefits providing wide coverage, when such services are received other than on an in-patient basis with no deductible.

5. A nominal deductible of $75 per individual with a $150 maximum family deductible in a calendar year. This deductible is substantially less than the most popular plan available to Government employees.

6. A $40,000 reinstatable major medical maximum which is more than liberal in relation to the popular Government-wide plans.

7. A very ample maternity benefit for normal delivery while providing full regular plan benefits for Caesarean or complications.

8. A cost which is approximately $1 per quarter less than that under the Government-wide service plan.

Self only	$8.75
Self and family	23.50

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. Would he care to explain a little bit further why this particular organization is submitting a plan by a private insurance carrier such as Metropolitan, and why they would not deal directly with an insurance carrier for health benefit plans under and with that organization as an insurance carrier, rather than with the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959 as amended in 1963?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I am really not familiar enough with the legislation to answer the question. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], who apparently knows more about that subject.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the answer is that there are many private plans that are now in existence in addition to the Government's own plan. This simply would allow an additional organization to have its plan approved. There are many private plans, but they all have to be approved by the people who run the entire program.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would accept that, although I understand that in 1963, when this program was open to the same group, at that time, according to the hearings and the record, they preferred a private insurance carrier's plan to the Federal employees' health benefit plan.

There is considerable objection on the part of the Civil Service Commission to further opening and diluting the Federal Employees' Health Benefit Act by taking on additional members. I believe the gentleman remarked in his opening statement, insofar as the benefit plan of the group is concerned, that that is what would happen. Is that not correct?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Some objection has come from Mr. Macy, who represents the Civil Service Commission. Personally, I do not think too much of his objections. Apparently the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service did not think too much of them, either, because the subcommittee and the full committee approved the legislation. The Civil Service Commission felt that there were enough private organizations in at the present time, and they were reluctant to bring any more in.

As I understand this situation, an employee is, I believe, allowed three choices. Of the three choices he is allowed to choose among two various Federal plans and the plan of an independent organization, such as the union or an organization that he might belong to. He would have a choice of one of the three.

In the third category I think there are some 13 organizations or unions at the present time .

The bill would open the door to 13 more organizations to get into the third scope of this plan. But the NAGE is the only one interested in coming in. I think in view of the fact that we have 13 Federal employee organizations that currently have this choice, with 38 various plans, and in view of the fact that there are 72,000 members of this organization, they, too, should have the right to get into this plan.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS. I believe the gentleman is slightly in error as to the number of employee organizations involved. There are 13 employee organizations which have 38 plans with 57 options. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit another employee organization with one high-optional plan to participate in the program.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Do I correctly understand from your opening statement that the Civil Service Commission would have the option of accepting or rejecting a plan submitted by this NAGE after it was submitted, or would the legislation make it mandatory that it be accepted by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I advise the gentleman to read page 1 of the report of the committee.

Mr. HALL. I have read it.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The purpose of H.R. 5147 is exactly stated there.

Mr. HALL. Then the Civil Service Commission, or its Director, would have the option of turning this plan down if it were not a well-worked-out or properly balanced plan under option 3?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I am presenting the rule on the bill. The gentleman from Missouri would have to ask technical questions about the bill of members of the committee that handled the bill.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS. If the gentleman will look at page 2 of the report, he will see that the Civil Service Commission has approved this plan as one that meets the requirements of law. The only reason why the Civil Service Commission objects to it is because of the administrative responsibility and the alleged increase in cost.

I might say that as a result of our study of this bill we believe the administrative responsibility and cost are negligible.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the gentleman who has been so kind as to yield, that this can be taken up in the debate on the bill itself.

For the record, the reasons, in addition to administrative costs, are very plainly stated in the report, as follows:

> 1. Each new plan adds to the already bewildering number from which employees may choose.
>
> 2. Neither the Government's nor the employees' interests are served by admitting new union plans to participation in the health benefits program.
>
> 3. Each new plan adds to the duties and responsibilities of employing agencies and the Commission, and increases the administrative complexities and expense of operating the health benefits program.

The third item is the point made by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Let me refer to the rule itself. In view of the fact that there are excellent minority views stated, may I ask the gentleman whether the writers of the minority views were asked to appear in hearings before the Rules Committee before the rule was passed?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. No; they were not.

Mr. HALL. Were there any hearings on the part of the Rules Committee before the rule was passed? I find nothing wrong with the rule, but I am asking for technical information.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The answer is "no." Having been the sponsor of this legislation and a member of the Rules Committee, in executive session I moved that the rule be passed; and it was passed unanimously.

Mr. HALL. It was passed by a unanimous vote of those present?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. By a unanimous vote of those present.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wonder whether the statement that this is to correct an inequity is, in fact, correct, so far as the purpose of the bill is concerned, and I wonder whether it was considered in depth by the Rules Committee before being brought to the floor of the House.

I find nothing wrong with the rule. Apparently, insofar as the bill is concerned, these people had an opportunity at a previous time. I believe we are opening up a Pandora's box, to which the Civil Service Commission and others object, and I wonder whether a private plan would not be better.

I believe it involves a question of deciding who is to be involved and how long this is to be open under the rule and under the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the explanation of this bill and of the rule, already given by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL], together with the colloquy the gentleman had with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], has been adequate to explain the purpose of this legislation.

I wish to say one thing, because of the colloquy which took place between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. I was not personally present at the time the rule was approved.

I believe that perhaps the better part of wisdom, in the future, when there are minority views and when the matter involved is going to call forth some controversy—as apparently this will—would be to undertake some hearings and to have some people in. I say this without any criticism at all with respect either to the gentleman from Massachusetts or to the procedure which was employed in this case, but I believe it would be wise in cases of this kind to have a further hearing, with the summoning of witnesses and interested persons.

The purpose of the bill is to permit additional Federal employee organizations which have health benefit plans for their members to submit these to the Civil Service Commission for approval, in order to qualify the plans for participation in the overall Federal employees' health benefits program.

The original Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959 provided for the participation of such employee organizations. For an organization to be eligible, it must have applied to the Commission for approval of its health program prior to December 31, 1963. This date was an amendment to the original cutoff date of December 31, 1959, to enable many organizations to submit their plans.

The bill seeks to again reopen the date to allow organizations to offer their programs of health benefits.

The Civil Service Commission opposes the bill on the grounds that neither the Government employees' interests nor the Government will be served by admitting new plans. The committee answers that 38 carriers are already involved and that one more will not materially increase the administrative costs and will give employees a further choice of plans. There is no estimate of the additional costs available.

There are minority views signed by five members. They point out that the basic act was amended in the 88th Congress to allow carriers to present their plans for approval up to December 31, 1963, at which time the committee report emphasized that the extension was for this one period only. Only four employee groups offered plans for approval, and only two are in fact now participating.

Only one employee group testified for this bill, and it was one of those qualified to offer a plan prior to December 31, 1963. They did not do so then.

The organization is the National Association of Government Employees.

There are now over 2.2 million Federal employees enrolled in 38 different plans which offer 57 different options. Who needs another?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 771, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5147) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1965, certain additional health benefits claims to come within the purview of such act.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5147, with Mr. BROOKS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5147 is identical in purpose and effect as was the enactment of Public Law 88-59, approved July 8, 1963. Its objective is to allow additional Federal employee organizations to qualify for participation in the Federal employee's health benefits program, by submitting their plans to the Civil Service Commission for approval.

One of the fundamental principles of the Federal Employee's Health Benefits Act, upon its adoption in 1959, was to furnish the employee with a reasonably free choice of plans—a choice whereby he might select one of several plans he deemed to best fulfill his individual needs, and the needs of his family. This principle resulted in the approval under the program of 38 different plans.

Although this legislation proposes to permit any organizations or carriers of health benefits plans to submit their plans for approval, only one employee organization appeared before the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits in support of the bill under consideration. That organization, the National Association of Government Employees, has already submitted its proposed plan to the Civil Service Commission, and it is considered by the Commission to be one which would meet the requirements of law.

It is the opinion of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that the participation of one more carrier in a program that presently includes 38 carriers, will not appreciably add to the administrative burdens of the program. Any administrative expense of operating the program by the addition of but one more plan will be negligible.

Any objection to the enactment of this legislation on the grounds of immaterial cost or insignificant administrative burdens, in the opinion of the committee, is outweighed by the advantage that a limited number of employees would enjoy by having the free choice of an additional plan—a plan that could possibly fulfill their health care needs to a greater extent than their existing coverage.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the report on H.R. 5147 was not filed until after the contemplated effective date of the introduced bill, December 31, 1965, such date having since passed, an amendment to the title and text will be offered at the appropriate time to fix a prospective effective date.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill and the subsequent amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member of the committee that handled this legislation, I approve it, and I urge that it be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is any need to go into any further detail as to what we are talking about here. This is a very simple matter, really, and needs no extended debate as far as I am concerned. It has been amply explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS.]

But just to repeat, this is what it does: It makes it possible for an organization that was not prepared at the time this was opened up 3 years ago and now is prepared to submit its plan for approval. It simply opens it up for this organization now to present its proposal to the Civil Service Commission. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the statements that have been made that the objections of the Civil Service Commission are negligible. Certainly it should not, in my opinion, cost any significant amount of money and time, and so I would urge that this legislation be enacted.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, that there are some minority views. Nevertheless, I do not support them. I support the legislation under consideration.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this legislation. It was taken up very carefully by the subcommittee and by our full committee, and was gone into very thoroughly. All witnesses who wanted an opportunity to be heard had that opportunity. This bill was passed out of the subcommittee by a unanimous vote. When it came to the full committee it was passed out by a majority vote of 13 to 4.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this organization demonstrated and, certainly, by its testimony exhibited that with 100,000 members it was certainly eligible and certainly legally entitled to be able to be represented in this employees' insurance program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe they have made a good case. I believe that certainly it would be of tremendous benefit to these 100,000 employees to have this opportunity to join in this program and at the same time, insofar as expenses and costs of administration are concerned, that would be very nominal, because the expenses have to be taken into consideration along with the other 38 plans that are contained in this program. Any additional expense would be most nominal when added to the present costs.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see any reason in the world why we should not go ahead and pass this bill.

This bill, I believe, serves the best interests of a vast number of Federal employees and their families—a bill which I further believe is also in the best interests of the Government.

The enactment of this legislation will add little, if any, costs to the administrative expenses of the Federal employees' health benefits program. It will add little, if any, to the duties and responsibilities of the Government agencies toward the operation of the program. It will, however, grant to thousands of Federal employees an additional free choice of another health plan that could very well be the answer to their health care needs.

It is well established that it was the intent of Congress, when it adopted a health program for Federal employees, to give as many employees as possible a variety of choices of plans. Opponents of this legislation would have us believe that all employees have a bewildering choice to make. The truth of the matter is, however, that the bulk of employees have but three plans to choose from—two Government-wide plans and the organization plan that may be offered them if they are members of a union. To claim that a selection of, at most, three plans is bewildering, is a gross overstatement of fact.

The great majority of the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee realize that to improve this employee program, innovations and novations are essential. In order to provide for improved plans, it is necessary that Congress amend existing law so as to make such improved plans available to all employees. Yesterday's best, undoubtedly, is less than adequate today.

I urge this body to support this necessary and worthwhile legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I greatly regret that the Committee on Rules saw fit to pass out this bill, accompanied as it was by a minority report, without any hearings and without any notice to those of us on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service who signed the minority report.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the future, and in behalf of the process of orderly procedure, that this does not occur again, regardless of the nature of the bill. I insist that members of the minority are entitled to better consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill opens the door again to another association. On April 4, 1963, the House of Representatives was put on notice through the medium of the report, which accompanied a bill at that time, that it would close the door to additional organizations becoming involved in the Health Benefits Act. The report, No. 190, under date of April 4, 1963, contained the following statement:

> This committee further emphasizes that this action is not to be a precedent for similar action in the future. The so-called open season will exist for only this one period of time specified in the bill, and organizations desiring to apply for approval as carriers of health benefit plans will have only this one opportunity to do so.

The association to benefit through this legislation was on notice at that time and did not see fit to qualify or at least to get their plan in order.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELS. As the testimony indicates, they did not come up with a plan which was superior or that had benefits additional to the plans already in existence. However, they do feel today that the plan they have obtained from the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., is superior to some of the existing plans and this will afford their membership an opportunity to make a choice.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that. But I am sure the gentleman is aware of the fact that they were on notice at that time to come in if they wished to be considered for participation.

Mr. DANIELS. That is true. I am not disputing that. I said I was aware of that.

Mr. GROSS. The door was closed at that time and now we are opening it again. How can we deny it to others?

Mr. DANIELS. I would point out to the gentleman that where a superior plan is offered or if a superior plan comes into existence in the future, we should not deny Federal employees the opportunity to get the benefits of such superior plan.

Mr. GROSS. The Civil Service Commission, I will say to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, did not say in testifying before the committee that a superior plan was being considered under the terms of this bill.

The Civil Service Commission over the signature of the Chairman, Mr. John Macy, says:

> For the reasons stated, the Commission strongly opposes enactment of H.R. 5147.

If he thought the association to be benefited through the terms of this act offered an extraordinary plan, I cannot believe he would have made that statement.

The Commission went further, and I will quote briefly from the statement of Mr. Andrew E. Ruddock, Director of the Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

He says:

> 1. Each new plan adds to the already bewildering number from which employees may choose.
>
> 2. Neither the Government's nor the employees' interests are served by admitting new union plans to participation in the health benefits program.
>
> 3. Each new plan adds to the duties and responsibilities of employing agencies and expense of operating the health benefits program.

He also says:

> New union plans could not possibly offer more health benefits for less money than do existing plans.

There is a further statement by Mr. Ruddock on behalf of the Civil Service Commission, but since it is available to all Members on the floor today I will not read it.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated, I must oppose this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], a member of the committee.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to state that the gentleman from Iowa has very briefly outlined the opposition to this bill today. I subscribe to what he has stated here. He has read into the record some of the objections by Mr. Ruddock who is the director of the Bureau of Retirement and Insurance and also some of the objections for the record of Mr. Macy who is the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. I feel that these are very valid objections and that this committee and that this House should take these objections into consideration in considering this legislation today. I would also call to the attention of Members, the minority views in the committee report. These views are brief, to the point and outline in detail some of the objections to this legislation. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5147

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 2(1) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (73 Stat. 710, 77 Stat. 76; 5 U.S.C. 3001(1)), is amended by striking out "1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DANIELS

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. DANIELS: On line 6, strike out "1965" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as stated during the discussion of the rule and after carefully reviewing not only the report but the rule and the manner in which this was brought on the floor—and furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the minority report and the report of the then existing committee, report No. 190 for 1963 dated April 4 of that year, at which time this was considered, I would simply like to take a moment or so to further clarify the record.

Paradoxically, we are considering in H.R. 5147 today a bill which not only has a minority report but which has already been given substantive approval of the new plan, even though the legislation will authorize such plans to be submitted "for approval."

I think there is sincere question about the purpose of H.R. 5147 insofar as correcting any inequity is concerned. Although I am perfectly willing to acknowledge that there may well have been developments or further actuarial soundness found by this particular organization that seeks admission to the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

Mr. Ruddock who has already been quoted in the colloquy says:

> It is difficult to stretch any plan to the place where it can yield 110 percent without either divesting the Federal Treasury or the retirement plans of some of the principal in the gaining of benefits.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that the Civil Service Commission does oppose this. In fact, in the report of the committee itself on page 3, it says,

> For the reasons stated—

Which Mr. Chairman, I shall not repeat because I read them during the consideration of the rule—

> the Commission strongly opposes enactment of H.R. 5147.

Then just for the record, and referring to the committee report of 1963, I would like to say, at that time the committee emphasized that the action is not to be a precedent for similar action in the future. The committee stated:

> The so-called open season will exist for only this one period of time specified in the bill. Organizations desiring to apply for approval as carriers of health benefit plans will have only this one opportunity to do so.

Further, in the same report, after going over the reasons why the proposed amendment might open a Pandora's box to further such organizations in the future which attempt to divest 110 percent for the value that is put into them—and, of course, it comes from the General Treasury or from the principal of the retirement plan—they state that the Commission has not observed any need for additional employee organization plans. I, too, must, perforce, in view of the minority views and in view of the history of this legislation and in view of the legislative situation in which we find ourselves today, be opposed to H.R. 5147.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5147) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1965, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such act, pursuant to House Resolution 771, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended to strike out "1965" and insert in lieu thereof "1966."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TUALATIN FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 799 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 707) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 707, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 254), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 707 as passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 799 provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 707, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

The project authorized by the bill would be located west of the Portland metropolitan area in the valley of the Tualatin River, a tributary of the Willamette. The Tualatin project is a multiple-purpose development providing for the irrigation of approximately 17,000 acres, municipal and industrial water supply to several towns in the project area, recreation opportunities, and fish and wildlife conservation.

The unregulated natural streamflow of the Tualatin River is inadequate to meet the seasonal water requirements for the various water uses in the project area. While the Willamette River valley receives substantial rainfall annually, it is not evenly distributed throughout the year. On the average, only 1 or 2 inches of rain falls in the valley during the summer months, and for extended periods there is no rain. Dryland agriculture is quite limited as to productivity and variety of crops.

The owners of the land to be served by the project have expressed support for the project and a willingness to contract for the water service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 799, in order that H.R. 707 may be considered.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have my stock question on this particular resolution 799, making it in order to consider H.R. 707. Will the gentleman explain why all points of order against such bill are waived, in the wisdom of the Rules Committee?

Mr. DELANEY. There is just one possible objection, and that is the transfer of funds into a revolving fund, so that they can be reused from time to time. So that is necessary.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman think the contents of the bill here would make it possible to use funds earmarked in the wisdom of this Congress, after it has worked its will, for the reservoir development, or irrigation purposes, or conservation, or recreation, or anything else in the construction of the impounding dam itself?

Mr. DELANEY. I would not say so for reloans, and so forth. The revolving sum is to be given to other applicants, as they are paid off.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, is this another example of the transfer ability that would be vested in the Reclamation Authority or the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. DELANEY. In my opinion, it is not, but I yield to the gentleman who is the sponsor of the bill. He can explain further.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this does not take away from Congress any of its right at all to appropriate the funds and to designate where the funds are to be placed. This simply states that these funds, which are necessary to pay out what the users cannot afford or cannot pay out, will be taken from the Northwest fund that is atached to the Bonneville project. This does not affect our appropriation responsibility whatsoever, Doctor.

Mr. HALL. But it does allow us to take not only from this reservoir impoundment but from the whole area, the Bonneville area.

I ask the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, does this apply to the cost of feasibility effectiveness studies of this impoundment?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, not to the feasibility, or cost of impoundments, but of course the repayment of what the irrigation and M. & I. users cannot pay. There is an amount which they are unable to pay, which is a cost of this project. So it takes it, not from one power project in the Northwest, but from this whole group of revenues from all projects of the Northwest Basin.

Mr. HALL. In the opinion of the gentleman, is it germane and does it not violate the customs of the House as far as our prerogatives are concerned?

Mr. ASPINALL. My opinion is that this is germane. But there is a question as to whether or not this question might be raised, and this is the reason why I asked points of order to be waived.

Mr. HALL. But the distinguished chairman did ask for it? It was not inserted by the Rules Committee or any one else?

Mr. ASPINALL. It was inserted by the Rules Committee at the request of the chairman.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 799 provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 707.

The purpose of H.R. 707 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin reclamation project near Portland, Oreg., on the Tualatin, a tributary of the Willamette River. This is a multipurpose project providing for irrigation of approximately 17,000 acres, a municipal and industrial water supply for several towns in the area, recreational opportunities, and fish and wildlife conservation.

The construction cost of the Tualatin project is estimated to be $20,902,000. Under this legislation, as amended, the cost would be allocated among the project functions as follows:

Irrigation	$15,543,000
Municipal and industrial water	2,099,000
Fish and wildlife enhancement	2,052,000
Recreation	868,000
Highway transportation	290,000
Flood control	50,000
Total	20,902,000

Most of this cost will be reimbursed over a 50-year period by local water and power users. Additionally, approximately $400,000 in local funds will be used for recreational and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Of the $15.5 million projected costs for irrigation purposes, $5.1 million will be repaid by water users, and $10,388,000 will be repaid by local power users.

Several amendments have been added to the bill by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conform it to other acts. The surplus crops amendment will insure that irrigated land will not be planted in unneeded crops.

In conformity with another committee policy an amendment was adopted to place a ceiling of $22 million on the amount to be authorized to be appropriated. This amount includes $1,100,000 for construction of flood control outlet works at Scoggin Dam should studies presently being conducted show such works are justified. If these additional flood control works cannot be justified the project cost is expected to not exceed the $20,902,000, changed only as necessary to reflect changes in price levels.

As to waiving the points of order, I am advised that there might be a question of taking the money out of the Columbia River Basin fund to reimburse most of the cost of the dam.

The Department of the Interior supports the bill, as does the Bureau of the Budget.

There is no minority report.

Mr. Speaker, there is no objection that a rule be granted. Reserving the balance of my time, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2829, MANSON UNIT, CHELAN DIVISION, CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 800 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 800

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2829) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 2829, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 490), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 2829 as passed.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 800 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, waiving points of order, for consideration of H.R. 2829, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes.

The Manson unit is a reclamation project in Chelan County in central Washington, which is primarily for irrigation with incidental benefits from recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. The unit is designed to improve and extend the existing irrigation water collection and distribution system of the Lake Chelan Reclamation District. The lands in the unit area that are now irrigated are devoted almost exclusively to apple production, and it is expected that the new lands will also be developed as irrigated apple orchards. The existing irrigation system is a composite of several privately financed developments which have been enlarged and improved over the years. This system collects the water from the watersheds of seven streams above Lake Chelan and conveys it throughout the service area. A total of 5,770 acres will be served under the proposed plan of development.

The construction cost of the Manson unit is estimated at $13,344,000. Except for about $150,000 which is allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the entire cost of the unit is allocated to irrigation and will be repaid within a 50-year period plus the development period.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 800 in order that H.R. 2829 may be considered.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman who brings this rule from the Committee on Rules to the floor of the House if the gentleman can explain why in lines 7 and 8 all points of order against said bill are hereby waived?

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, did the gentleman say lines 7 and 8?

Mr. HALL. Lines 7 and 8 of House Resolution 800. It simply states, Mr. Speaker, that all points of order against that bill are hereby waived. Therefore it is not truly an open rule. It is a closed rule.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is for the same reasons that were explained just a few minutes ago. This will go into the general Bonneville area, and the money can be used and reused after the repayments are made, exactly for the same reason as explained in the other project.

Mr. HALL. It is not a question of anything contained in the bill being nongermane?

Mr. DELANEY. If the gentleman will yield further, nothing in the bill itself.

Mr. HALL. Nor does it represent a violation of the Ramseyer rule or any of the other rules? It is just the one question of recouping in case the people are not able to pay from the entire area reclamation project; is that correct?

Mr. DELANEY. The gentleman is correct, and that is the reason.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if these rules continue to come out with waivers of points of order, we must expect to vote on them. But I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and providing this information in this instance.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 800 provides a rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 2829.

The purpose of H.R. 2829 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam in central Washington. It is primarily an irrigation project with incidental benefits from recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

The existing storage reservoir system holds 2,500 acre-feet of water. The bill will enlarge this to 9,000 acre-feet by construction of one dam and the enlargement of another. The distribution system will also be enlarged to serve a greater area. Now 3,965 acres are served; the new total will be 1.525 larger. The existing facilities, besides being inadequate, are old and must be updated if they are to continue at their present level. Equipment failures are frequent now. Some equipment in use is over 50 years old.

The cost is approximately $13,344,000. It will be repaid within 50 years by the water and power users, with the exception of $150,000 used for fish and wildlife enhancement, non-repayable under law. All facilities will be operated by the Forest Service.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs amended H.R. 2829 to make it clear that not only the amount to be repaid by the water users would have to be repaid in the 50-year repayment period plus any authorized development period, but that the amount to be repaid from power revenues would also have to be repaid during this period.

The committee also amended H.R. 2829 to conform this legislation to the payout procedure now in effect for the Federal Columbia River power system. Under the amendment, the repayment assistance would be furnished from the entire Federal Columbia River power system rather than the Chief Joseph Dam project.

Other committee amendments conform this legislation to the recently enacted Federal Water Project Recreation Act and update the amount authorized to be appropriated.

As to waiving the points of order, I am advised that there might be a question of taking the money out of the Columbia River Basin fund to reimburse most of the cost of the dam.

The Department of the Interior supports the bill, as does the Bureau of the Budget.

There is no minority report.

Mr. Speaker, there is no objection that a rule be granted. Reserving the balance of my time, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TUALATIN FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 707) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 707, with Mr. Brooks in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers], chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation in the Committee, discusses what is involved in H.R. 707, I would like to make a brief general statement to set the stage for the consideration of this bill and the bill that follows, H.R. 2829.

H.R. 707 and H.R. 2829 authorize two relatively small Federal reclamation projects in the Columbia River Basin—the Tualatin project in the State of Oregon and the Manson unit in the State of Washington. These are two of four Federal reclamation projects in the Columbia Basin which have been approved by the other body. In addition, we have the legislation to authorize a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam which has also passed the other body and which will be before the House in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, the two projects we bring before the House today constitute another step in the development of the water resources of the Columbia Basin project. They are both good projects from an economic and financial standpoint and are urgently needed to bolster the economy of the areas they will serve.

The Tualatin project which H.R. 707 would authorize is an excellent multiple-purpose reclamation project and is very important to the continued economic well-being of the Tualatin Valley west of the Portland metropolitan area. The Tualatin project is truly a multiple-purpose development providing for irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply, recreation opportunities, and fish and wildlife conservation. Only 1 or 2 inches of rain falls in the Tualatin Valley during the summer months and this seasonal exhaustion of the natural water supply has prevented the expansion of irrigation and municipal use of water, and has effectively halted economic growth in the Tualatin Valley. The area is well suited by climate, topography, and proximity to major markets for the production of livestock, dairying, and to the raising of a variety of vegetable crops—but under present conditions, water is not available. The communities in the areas as well as other commercial and industrial water customers also have difficulty in obtaining enough water to meet their needs throughout the year. With a dependable supply of water to meet irrigation and municipal needs, the area should grow and prosper.

With respect to recreation and fish and wildlife, there is an ever-increasing demand in this area, as in all areas near heavily populated centers, for the additional water-oriented recreation opportunities which the project will provide. The recreation facilities will be administered by some local public body.

Mr. Chairman, we have placed all the amendments in this legislation that are necessary to conform it to the policies we are presently following. At the appropriate time an amendment will be offered to reduce the appropriation ceiling set out in the bill by $1,100,000, because the studies of the Bureau of Reclamation have failed to justify the inclusion of flood control works at the dam. The Tualatin project meets all requirements for authorization and construction at this time and I urge the approval of H.R. 707.

Mr. Rogers of Texas will discuss the bill in more detail.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the able, industrious, wise, and enterprising gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Wyatt], the author of this bill, in order that he may go to the well literally as well as figuratively in connection with this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes for the purposes stated.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in the First Congressional District of Oregon is one of the most important and significant reclamation projects ever proposed for the State of Oregon. It is the first reclamation project in northwest Oregon. The concept of water shortage in northwest Oregon is sometimes difficult to understand. However, the Tualatin River at one point has been flooded so that it is nearly a mile wide on a given occasion in the wintertime while at the exact identical spot in late August it is so narrow that you can literally step across it. The committee has photographs showing this.

This project would service a rich farm area. It would make possible growing row crops involving no agricultural surpluses. The tremendous boost to the agricultural economy of the area is almost beyond belief. At the present time there is a real shortage of industrial water. This project would supply adequate industrial water, permitting great expansion in this area. The growing of row crops plus the availability of industrial water would make feasible canning and freezing operations.

Municipal water likewise is in desperate need for the cities of Hillsboro Forest Grove, Beaverton, Tigard, and numerous water districts. Lake Oswego would also benefit.

By bringing 17,000 acres of land under irrigation it would change the summer desert-dry Tualatin Valley into one of the most important agricultural areas in the State of Oregon. The heart of this project is the Scoggin Dam. This dam will form a very substantial size lake which will be important to the entire area, including the city of Portland.

I commend the Bureau of Reclamation for their work on this important project. Likewise I extend my own personal gratitude and the gratitude of the residents of my district to Chairman Wayne Aspinall of the House Interior Committee and to Congressman Walter Rogers, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, for their prompt scheduling of hearings on this important project and their valued assistance in bringing this project to this point.

It is my urgent hope that this body will today overwhelmingly approve this project which was passed out of the Interior Committee with strong support from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], such time as she may desire.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the Tualatin Federal reclamation project will correct a quirk of an unsympathetic Mother Nature which for years has plagued the farmers in the valley of the Tualatin River with bad droughts in summer and worse floods in winter. I was pleased to hear the very distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee say this was one of the best projects from an economic standpoint.

I applaud the efforts of my able colleague, WENDELL WYATT, for his work on behalf of this valuable legislation. I am proud to say that I have worked with him and have supported him in this and that in previous years I cooperated with my good friend, the late Walter Norblad, to bring before this House, now, the product of 35 years of careful planning.

Authorization of this project will insure the Tualatin Valley of an adequate and sustained water supply; thus providing its many residents with irrigation, municipal and industrial water, control of floods, preservation of fish and wildlife, and expansion of recreation.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WYATT. I would like to acknowledge the contribution of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], and also thank her for her kind remarks. She has been most helpful to me in connection with this project.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to lend my support to H.R. 707, the bill authorizing construction of the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in Oregon.

Although the project is not in my district, I have been very interested in it for years, since it will serve people in one of the most populous portions of my State. Planning has been underway for approximately 30 years, culminating in this proposal, to harness the full potential of the water resources of this valley.

I am sure it is difficult for many to understand the unusual nature of the weather patterns in the western part of Oregon. Precipitation is almost nonexistent during the summer months, and at times becomes painfully abundant during the winter. All of you, of course, remember the hardships this section of our country endured during the disastrous Christmas week floods of 1964. The Tualatin River can be characterized as a stream which has extreme variations in its unregulated natural streamflow, dwindling to a mere trickle in late summer.

The economy of the Tualatin Valley is largely agricultural production of hay, silage, dairy products and a few specialty crops. About 40,000 acres now have a partial irrigation water supply. About 45 percent of the arable land currently used is in the production of crops which are in surplus. Construction of this project would stabilize streamflow and would capture the abundant winter rainfalls for use in irrigating 13,000 acres not previously irrigated and in providing full water supply for the 4,000 acres now partially irrigated. The effect on agriculture would be to bring about an adjustment from grain crops to the higher value row crops which are not in surplus. As a result of the shift in the agricultural economy, the area used in the production of crops which are currently in surplus would diminish from 45 percent to 10 percent.

Several of the small municipalities in the area now have difficulty obtaining enough water to meet their needs throughout the year. This project would provide a stable municipal and industrial water supply for the cities of Forest Grove, Hillsboro, Beaverton, the Tigard Water District and the Lake Oswego Corp.

The edge of this project would be only 15 miles from the suburban areas in Portland. There are few natural lakes in this area, and I believe that the recreation use of this 1,100-acre reservoir would exceed the estimates which have been made for this project.

This project would also provide benefits for sport fishing by creating a reservoir trout fishery, by low flow augmentation of the main stream of the Tualatin and by removing, by modification of the Oregon Iron & Steel Co. dam, an existing impediment to migration of anadromous fish in the Tualatin River.

The cost-benefit ratio for this project, computed over a 100-year period, is 2.12 to 1. The irrigators to be benefited by this project, in addition to the responsibility for paying for the operation, maintenance, and replacement costs allocated to irrigation, will repay 36 percent of the construction cost allocated to irrigation. The balance of the irrigation allocation will be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived from power sales by the Bonneville Power Administration. Although I think we still have some problems concerning the form that basin accounting for the Columbia River Basin will take, I approve this method of repayment to the reclamation fund.

The analysis upon which the Tualatin project report was predicated was made prior to the Christmas week floods in 1964. This natural disaster has brought about an awareness of the need to take a new look at allocations for flood control. Invariably, flood control allocations computed since the Christmas week floods have been greater.

Mr. Chairman, this project has my full and unequivocal support. I urge the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 707. I think that this piece of legislation is a fine example of the Federal Government's desire and ability to come into a region and, in cooperation with the local people, provide works for the benefit of the local citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As reclamation projects go, this is about as good as they come. It is not an expensive project in relation to most of the others that come up. It is slightly under $21 million. Repayment of the Government investment is assured. If there were never a nickel paid back by the irrigators, the electric power projects in the Pacific Northwest stand good for the sum. But there will be considerable paid by the irrigators.

It is my judgment that in time the ever growing city of Portland will extend its boundaries and its suburbs into this area that is now proposed to be covered by the Tualatin project, and that its financing will be further secured by arrangements within the bill which would permit the shift over to sale of water for municipal and industrial use and, as a consequence, make the economics of the project even more favorable.

The cost-benefit ratio is something over 2 to 1. There are a number of people who regard the cost-benefit ratio as somewhat of a myth. I think that regard is probably well taken; nevertheless, the supporting figures which were used to generate this ratio do indicate that this project will well repay the investment of the taxpayers.

It is a pleasure to join in support of H.R. 707 particularly because it was introduced by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT].

H.R. 707 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project. The project envisages a multipurpose development providing not only for the irrigation water needs for about 17,000 acres of agricultural land, but also for the expanding municipal and industrial water service and for new recreation and fish and wildlife conservation opportunities.

This legislation has widespread support among the people of the State of Oregon. The owners of the land to be served by the project formed the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District and, through it, expressed their support for the project. Witnesses representing the State and the Legislature appeared in behalf of the project as well as representatives of various groups.

Oregon, of course, is not usually regarded as an arid State, and the valley in which this project is to be located cannot really be so considered. Substantial rainfall is received annually in the area; it just is not evenly distributed throughout the year. The area is subject to heavy rains for part of the year, we were told, and to a virtual drought during 4 or 5 critical summer months.

As with other similar irrigation-reclamation projects, the costs of this one, which are beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay, are to be born by power revenues—in this case the Federal Columbia River power system. To insure that these costs are repaid within the usual 50-year payout period, your committee is recommending that section 2 of the bill be amended to require the return from power receipts to be made within that same repayment period.

Another committee amendment is designed to bring the bill up to date in light of the action which the Congress has taken since this bill was introduced. I am speaking of the amendment which strikes section 3, as it appears on pages 2 and 3, and inserts in lieu thereof a new section referring to the Federal Water Project Recreation Act which was adopted last year. The provisions which were embodied in the original section 3 are in substantial conformance with the new Water Project Recreation Act so that this is just a better way of handling the situation.

Although it is generally agreed that the land which would be served by this project would be used to produce crops which are not now in surplus, the committee felt that the customary amendment to prohibit the reclamation program from contributing to any surpluses should be incorporated in this bill; therefore that provision was added to H.R. 707 with the approval of the sponsor as section 5.

There are three other amendments which the committee is recommending which are worthy of mention in the course of this discussion.

No. 1 has to do with the deletion of the provision making water quality control a nonreimbursable cost in the project. Originally, section 1—at page 1, lines 6 and 7—would have allowed water quality control to be included on a nonreimbursable basis in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It was the feeling of the committee that considerable attention should be given this matter before authorizing any new nonreimbursable costs; therefore by deleting this provision the $2,021,000 attributed to water quality control had to be reallocated among the other project purposes and will, accordingly, be repaid.

Second, the committee added a new subsection 4(c)—at page 5, lines 4 through 6—providing that charges allocated to highway transportation should be nonreimbursable in accordance with section 208 of the Flood Control Act. As under the usual procedures, it is intended that cost of moving the same kind of road as presently exists will be repayable as a cost of the project. The effect of this amendment is to do the job right as long as we are doing it—to bring the road up to present day standards. To do this additional funds are necessary and it would be unfair to burden the water users with this additional responsibility. The amount involved in the item is estimated to be $290,000.

The third and last amendment which warrants some discussion is the new section 6 H.R. 707 originally provided an open-ended authorization; however, in recent years, it has been the general practice of your authorizing committee to provide a ceiling on the appropriations authorized. You will note that the amount which this bill authorizes is $22 million—the amount the project was expected to cost based on January 1965 prices.

Because the authorizing committee endeavors to keep these cost figures as realistic as humanly possible, it is my understanding that an amendment will be offered at the appropriate time reflecting a $1.1 million reduction in the amount authorized. This reduction is based on the most recent communication from the Secretary of the Interior indicating that the flood control benefits from this project will not justify the additional flood control works at the dam. This amendment reduces the authorized appropriations to $20,900,000.

I am pleased to join with the other members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in recommending your approval of H.R. 707.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 707 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in Oregon. This multi-purpose project would be located west of the Portland metropolitan area in the valley of the Tualatin River, a tributary of the Willamette. In addition to providing for the irrigation of approximately 17,000 acres, the project would provide municipal and industrial water for several towns in the project area and provide recreation opportunities and for fish and wildlife conservation.

The plan of development calls for construction of a dam and reservoir, about 70 miles of main canals, pumping plants, laterals, and drains. Of the 17,000 acres that would be irrigated, about 4,000 acres now have a partial irrigation water supply. The facilities to distribute stored water for municipal and industrial use would be provided by the municipalities and other customers for this water and not as a part of the Federal project. These customers have already expressed a desire to contract for municipal and industrial water from the project.

The reservoir provides an excellent opportunity for recreation development. The plan for such development calls for acquiring about 300 acres around the reservoir for public use and for the construction of recreation facilities including boat ramps, picnic tables, sanitation facilities, and parking areas. The National Park Service has estimated that visitor use for boating, swimming, water skiing, fishing, camping, and so forth, would be on the order of 98,000 visitor days per year.

Measures to conserve fishlife include fish passage facilities, fish trapping facilities at the dam, the installation of fish screens, and enlargement of an existing hatchery.

The construction cost of the Tulatin project, estimated at $20,902,000, is allocated equitably among all of the purposes to be served. About 75 percent, or $15,543,000, is allocated to irrigation, $2,099,000 to municipal and industrial water supply, $2,052,000 to fish and wildlife enhancement, $868,000 to recreation, $290,000 to highway transportation, and $50,000 to flood control.

The small amount allocated to flood control would be nonreimbursable pursuant to reclamation law. The allocation to highway transportation, which represents the incremental cost incurred in constructing relocated roads to current traffic standards, would be nonreimbursable in accordance with the provision of the Flood Control Act of 1962. The cost allocated to municipal and industrial water would be fully repaid with interest by the municipal water users within a 50-year period.

Of the amounts allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, $206,000 of the recreation cost and $190,000 of the fish and wildlife enhancement cost would be borne by non-Federal public entities pursuant to the provisions of the Water Project Recreation Act. These amounts represent one-half of the separable costs allocated to these two purposes. The remainder of the cost allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement would be nonreimbursable pursuant to the provisions of the Water Project Recreation Act.

Project construction costs allocated to irrigation would be repaid within a 50-year period plus any authorized development period. On the basis of the economic studies of the Bureau of Reclamation, it is estimated that the irrigation water users could repay $5,155,000, or 33 percent of the $15,543,000 allocated to irrigation.

The remainder of the irrigation allocation, amounting to $10,388,000, would be returned to the reclamation fund within the repayment period from revenues derived from power sales by the Bonneville Power Administration.

It is anticipated that parts of the project area will change in character in the years ahead and become part-time farms and suburban developments. Provision will be made in the repayment contracts for periodic adjustments to effect these shifts of water use from irrigation to domestic and industrial water supply.

The annual benefits attributable to the construction and operation of the Tualatin project exceed the annual costs in a ratio of 2.12 to 1.0, demonstrating a favorable economic justification for this project.

The committee amended the legislation to make it clear that the entire amount allocated to irigation including the amount to be repaid from power revenues would have to be repaid in the 50-year period plus any authorized development period.

The committee also amended the bill to delete "water quality control" as a purpose to be served. While recognizing that inclusion of water quality control is authorized under the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the committee believes that additional consideration must be given to this matter before nonreimbursable allocations are authorized in reclamation projects. This committee amendment necessitated the reallocation of $2,021,-

000 among the other project purposes and this reallocation is reflected in the amounts referred to earlier.

The committee also added the standard "surplus crop" amendment which has been placed in most reclamation project bills in recent years. Representatives of the irrigation district indicated their willingness to accept this amendment and assured the committee that newly irrigated lands would not be devoted to the production of so-called surplus crops.

The committee placed a ceiling of $22 million on the amount authorized to be appropriated which includes $1,100,000 for construction of flood control outlet works should studies show such works to be justified. Since the committee approved this legislation, I have been advised by the Secretary of the Interior that flood control benefits from this project will not justify the construction of the additional flood control works and, therefore, at the appropriate time, I intend to offer an amendment to reduce this appropriation ceiling from $22 million to $20,900,000.

The owners of the 17,000 acres of land to be served by the project have formed the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District for the specific purpose of contracting for water service, and the district has indicated its agreement with the proposed repayment arrangements. The committee received testimony favoring this legislation not only from the irrigation district but from the State of Oregon, the Oregon Legislature, numerous organizations in the State interested in water development, the towns in the project area, and numerous companies and individuals in the project area and in the State. The committee received no testimony in opposition to the project.

This project is needed to meet the seasonal water requirements in the project area. While the annual rainfall in the area is substantial, only 1 or 2 inches comes during the summer months. This has prevented the expansion of irrigation and municipal use of water and has effectively halted economic growth in the Tualatin Valley.

With a dependable water supply, there will be an increase in the production of livestock and livestock products as well as in a variety of vegetable crops including peas, sweet corn, beans, asparagus, and tomatoes. Under project conditions, the area can expect to prosper by virtue of its marketing advantage for dairy and specialty produce to be sold in the Portland metropolitan area. As the towns and cities in the area grow, their needs for municipal and industrial water will expand.

In summary, the Tualatin reclamation project provides for maximum use of the available water resources of the Tualatin Valley and is necessary for continued growth and prosperity in the area.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends approval of the Tualatin Reclamation project and the authorizing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] has some questions to ask of the chairman of the full committee, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the project planning report for the Tualatin project includes provision for certain recreation and fish and wildlife developments in connection with the project. Am I correct in this understanding?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas yields to me, what I understand the gentleman from Oregon wishes to do is to make a legislative record here, to assure the development of the recreation and fish and wildlife programs as a part of this project.

The gentleman's assumption is correct, in the question he asked.

Mr. WYATT. That is what I seek to do.

Mr. Chairman, these very necessary developments are also authorized by this bill, are they not?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. The first section of the bill authorizes construction of the project and, therefore, includes these developments. Even though there have been some questions raised as to the way the matter is referred to, nevertheless the gentleman is correct in his position.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, for the record, I wonder if you would explain the purpose of section 3 of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. That section refers to the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. It is necessary to insure that the recreation and fish and wildlife developments conform to the provisions of this recreation act in all respects—for instance, cost allocations, preliminary agreements with local agencies as to operation of recreation facilities, and the like.

Mr. WYATT. I have one more question; that is, does the amount authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the project in section 6 include funds for these recreation and fish and wildlife developments?

Mr. ASPINALL. The answer is, "It does."

Mr. WYATT. I thank the chairman of the committee, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Tualatin Federal reclamation project encompassed in H.R. 707 represents further orderly development of Northwest water resources. I believe it is important to emphasize to my colleagues that this project in Washington County, Oreg., will provide more than agricultural benefits to the citizens of my State and the Northwest area. The multipurpose benefits from the project will include irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, and fish and wildlife and recreation benefits. The benefit-cost ratio of 2.12 to 1 is considered highly favorable for this type of reclamation project.

This project will enable growers to produce greater quantities of fruits for fresh and canning uses and a large variety of vegetables. These products are in great demand by the consuming public and are not subsidized by the Federal Government. The attendant processing requirements for such crops provide additional employment for people in the immediate area. In short, the proposed project will do much to strengthen the economy of our Northwest area.

Due to the rapidly expanding population of this area, we must look to future reliable sources of domestic water supply. This project will allow further urban development with the knowledge that adequate water is available to accommodate growth. We in Oregon are also alert to the need for adequate flood control measures in view of the disastrous floods which hit our area in the 1964–65 winter. Many area residents have expressed support for the flood control features of the project. And lastly, the recreation aspects of the project will provide pleasure and relaxation for the thousands of people who visit this area throughout the year.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that my fellow House Members will support the measure before us today.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 707

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to supply irrigation water to approximately seventeen thousand acres of land in the Tualatin River Valley, Oregon, to develop municipal and industrial water supplies, to provide facilities for river regulation, water quality control, and control of floods, to enhance recreation opportunities, to provide for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto). The principal features of the said project shall be a dam and reservoir on Scoggin Creek, canals, pumping plants and water distribution facilities.

SEC. 2. Irrigation repayment contracts shall provide, with respect to any contract unit, for repayment of the irrigation construction costs assigned for repayment to the irrigators over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law. Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay shall be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Tualatin project shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by him.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the project areas such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of project lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other project functions. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities, or to dispose of project lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands and facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the foregoing undertakings and the costs of developments and operations for the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources, including an appropriate share of joint costs of the project, shall be nonreimbursable. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation development of water resource projects or to disposition of public lands for recreation purposes.

(b) Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife resources shall be considered as project costs and allocated as may be appropriate among other projects functions.

Sec. 4. (a) Costs of the project allocated to municipal water supply shall be repayable, with interest, by the municipal water users over a period of not more than fifty years from the date that water is first delivered for that purpose, pursuant to contracts with municipal corporations, or other organizations, as defined in section 2(g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187). Contracts may be entered into with water users' organizations pursuant to the provisions of this Act without regard to the last sentence of subsection 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, supra.

(b) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the costs of the project allocated to municipal water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue, and by adjusting such interest rate to the nearest multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum if the computed average interest rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wonder, if I support these bills being considered today, whether there will be any money left for a very valuable flood control project in the Third District of Iowa.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me to make an observation, there will be, because all of this money is going to be paid back.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot wait for the payback. That will be 50 years from now. That would involve a little bit too much economic loss in the meantime.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentleman from Texas will say that he is always glad to help the gentleman from Iowa. If there are floods, we will help. If we could divert this to my district, I believe we could get the money quickly.

Mr. GROSS. The best news I have had today is the assurance from the gentleman from Texas that he is going to help me. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out ", water quality control,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 13, after "repay", insert "during the repayment period".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 13, after "fund", insert "within said repayment period".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 20, through page 3, line 23, strike out all of section 3 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 3. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Tualatin project shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213)."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Aspinall to the committee amendment: Strike out the word "Projects" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Project."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, this is a clerical amendment to properly designate the name of the act referred to.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, after line 21, add a new subsection to read as follows:

"(c) Costs of the project allocated to highway transportation shall be nonreimbursable in accordance with section 208 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1196)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, after line 21, add a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user on the Tualatin project for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 19, strike out all of section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Tualatin project the sum of $22,000,000 (January 1965 prices) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved therein, and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said project."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Aspinall to the committee amendment: Page 5, line 24, strike out "$22,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,900,000."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, after we had our hearings and had written up the bill in the full committee, we were advised by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior that the facilities which were originally referred to before our committee could not be built because they were not feasible, the cost of which was $1.5 million. Therefore we have asked that this be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 707) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 799, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 799, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 254.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF TEXAS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. Rogers of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 254, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 707, as passed, as follows:

"That in order to supply irrigation water to approximately seventeen thousand acres of land in the Tualatin River Valley, Oregon, to develop municipal and industrial water supplies, to provide facilities for river regulation and control of floods, to enhance recreation opportunities, to provide for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto). The principal features of the said project shall be a dam and reservoir on Scoggin Creek, canals, pumping plants and water distribution facilities.

"Sec. 2. Irrigation repayment contracts shall provide, with respect to any contract unit, for repayment of the irrigation construction costs assigned for repayment to the irrigators over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law. Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay during the repayment period shall be returned to the reclamation fund within said repayment period from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Tualatin project shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by him.

"Sec. 3. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Tualatin project shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

"Sec. 4. (a) Costs of the project allocated to municipal water supply shall be repayable, with interest, by the municipal water users over a period of not more than fifty years from the date that water is first delivered for that purpose, pursuant to contracts with municipal corporations, or other organizations, as defined in section 2(g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187). Contracts may be entered into with water users' organizations pursuant to the provisions of this Act without regard to the last sentence of subsection 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, supra.

"(b) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the costs of the project allocated to municipal water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue, and by adjusting such interest rate to the nearest multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum if the computed average interest rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum.

"(c) Costs of the project allocated to highway transportation shall be nonreimbursable in accordance with section 208 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1196).

"Sec. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user on the Tualatin project for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

"Sec. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Tualatin project the sum of $20,900,000 (January 1965 prices) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved therein, and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said project."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers].

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 707) was laid on the table.

A MORE ADEQUATE NATIONAL PROGRAM OF WATER RESEARCH

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 801, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 801

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3606) to promote a more adequate national program of water research. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments hereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 3606, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 22), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 3606 as passed.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Quillen], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 801 provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 3606, a bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

The purpose of the bill would be accomplished by amending the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 to provide basic authority to the Secretary of the Interior for a program of extramural research into all aspects of water problems relating to the mission of the Department of the Interior. Under this program, research grants or contracts could be made on a matching or other basis with State water resources research agencies or other government agencies or with universities or other educational institutions or with private firms or individuals in order to fulfill the requirements of a sound research program. The objective of the program is to bring to bear on our national water problems the talents and research competence of our best trained scientists and the use of the best facilities available wherever they may be located. As amended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H.R. 3606 would authorize the appropriation of $85 million over a 10-year period.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 801.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding again. I have by now a standardized question on these rules that waive points of order. In lines 10 through 12 of the resolution, House Resolution 801, it says:

> It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

As to the bill now before us, can the gentleman assure me that the same reason for waiving points of order pertains as in the last two rules that were just discussed?

Mr. DELANEY. The same reason pertains—with one possible exception and that is as to the State matching funds. I will yield to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], for the purpose of answering that question.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there is also, as I understand it, a question here of the relationship between the executive and legislative departments. We have placed in the bill a provision for oversight authority for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The President in 1964 when he signed the parent legislation took exception to title II and has failed to implement it since then because he said that the action we asked for to have the contracts reported back to the Congress and give us in that legislation the power to negate those contracts trespassed upon the authority of the executive department.

So in this bill we are still keeping the oversight and we have made it necessary to report back to the Congress under subsection (b) of the first section, that is section 200, with this language:

> (b) No grant shall be made, no contract shall be executed, and no matching or other arrangement shall be entered into under subsection (a) of this section prior to sixty calendar days from the date the same is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and said sixty calendar days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die.

Now my position, and I think the position of everybody on our committee, is that this is germane. But if the question of germaneness was raised, it would take quite a bit of time perhaps to thrash it out.

What our committee has tried to do, if I may say to the good colleague from Missouri, is to retain our oversight authority on all of these programs so that we know specifically and in detail what is being carried on because with 1,450 plus contracts in being at any one time, the only way you know what is going on is to have the reports processed up to the committee. We are not doing anything about it except as the chairman of the committee or somebody from the committee where a contract might be made would take exception and would ask to have it held up and my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, knows that this would be very effective.

Mr. HALL. I certainly thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for his explanation.

If the gentleman from New York will yield further, may I say I have nothing but the greatest admiration for the surveillance and oversight which the gentleman plans to write into the bill.

Last year when the Committee on Armed Services on which I serve attempted to do the same thing under a section on military construction, it was actually vetoed for the same reason because there was a question of the transgression on the authority of the executive branch in the opinion of the President and his counsel and the Attorney General. Of course, the House of Representatives has no counsel of its own. You may recall this came to a final vote on the floor of the House at the insistence of the gentleman from Missouri. There is a question in my mind about waiving these points of order and not permitting the House to work its will when we eliminate all points of order or questions of germaneness in the rule and making the consideration of the bill in order. Such rules, of course, repeatedly come down from the Committee on Rules. That is the problem that is bothering me. I will say, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it bothers me not just as an individual but as a member of the Joint Committee with the other body on the reorganization of the Congress. We have this under very active consideration at this particular time including the rules of germaneness in this body. Of course, there is no such rule of germaneness in the other body, as my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, and the gentleman from New York, well know. It is for this reason that I am building up this dossier on waiving points of order in the rules that make otherwise perfectly good bills, with perfectly good intent, in order.

In doing this, may I say I am in full sympathy with what the committee and the distinguished chairman of the committee have in mind. I am seriously concerned about not being able as one elected Member of the people's personal Representatives in this House to make a point of order, whether the bill be for a good purpose, as in this instance perhaps—or for a bad purpose—when these rules are brought to us waiving such points of order. I take it in view of the explanation of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that he himself did ask for the waiver of all points of order in this rule?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct.

Mr. DELANEY. I can assure the gentleman that the Committee on Rules does not take lightly any request for waivers of points of order. Such requests are discussed at great length as this request was and we were satisfied with the explanation of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who explained it to the satisfaction of the Committee on Rules. Each time a request is made for a waiver of points of order, it causes quite a discussion and the committee is not inclined to grant waivers of points of order except where it is deemed proper after an explanation.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate that statement and I hope they are even more strict in the future about not granting such requests for waivers of points of order. There has been evidence here today about a rule coming out where all matters were not even present, although the chairman, the gentleman did not bring that out—the gentleman in the well did not bring that out. There has been some other evidence in this session of the Congress wherein waivers were apparently granted which were not requested either by the committee or the chairman—which is quite beside the point I know.

Mr. DELANEY. I know of no such waiver. I do not think the Committee on Rules has ever assumed during the years that I have been a member of the committee, the right to waive points of order unless that was requested by the chairman who presented the bill.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman would be good enough to see me later, I will be glad to document my statement.

Mr. DELANEY. I will be glad to see the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate it. Thank you, sir. If the gentleman will look back over the record, he will see that it was only a month or two ago, as I remember, in this session of the Congress that points of order in at least one, and perhaps two instances, were waived without the request of the chairman of the committee. I happen to serve on one of the committees from which no request of waiver of points of order was made.

Mr. DELANEY. I do not know of a single instance.

Mr. GROSS. There is on record one, and perhaps two.

Mr. DELANEY. It is possible that it might have happened, but I know of no instance.

Mr. GROSS. I do not want to engage in a discussion of semantics with my friend from New York, but I question that when he says the rule is an open rule waiving points of order that that is exactly correct. It seems to me that waiving points of order infringes upon the open rule.

Mr. DELANEY. A point of order may be made and the section to which it applies could be thrown out. But it would give you the right under an open rule to amend any part of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. I question whether it is a fully open rule when points of order are waived.

Mr. DELANEY. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 801 provides a rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 3606.

The purpose of H.R. 3606 is to improve current research programs in the field of water resources by amendment the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 to provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a program of research into all aspects of water problems under the control of the Department.

Under H.R. 3606, research grants and contracts on a matching or other basis are provided for State agencies, universities, firms, and individuals working in the field. The bill authorizes $85 million over a 10-year period.

The principle language of the bill was included in title II of the Water Resources Research Act. Additionally, only $1 million was authorized for each year of a 10-year period, and either Interior Committee could bar appropriations to fund projects. The President objected to this and no requests for funds under title II have been made.

The need for research into our water resources is evident in the testimony it received, according to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It has therefore determined to alter its previous position. The language approved here is much the same as was approved by House conferees in the 88th Congress during the passage of the act.

The $85 million authorized for 10 years—through fiscal 1976—is broken down as follows: Fiscal 1967, $5 million; $6 million in 1968; $7 million in 1969; $8 million in 1970; $9 million in 1971; and $10 million in 1972–76 inclusive.

There are two other major changes of the act contained in the bill: First, no contract or other agreement may be entered into until 60 days after it has been submitted to Congress during which Congress is in session; second, a broadening of the reporting requirement. Presently only an annual report is required. The bill requires a report by March 1 to the President and the Congress, giving a complete accounting of funds appropriated during the preceding year and a report on the results expected and conclusions reached in projects funded and underway.

There is a question that the language in section 307 might not be germane, and waiving the points of order would make it in order.

There are no minority views in the report.

Mr. Speaker, there is no objection that a rule be granted. Reserving the balance of my time, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

MANSON UNIT, CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2829) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2829, with Mr. Brooks in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers] will be recognized for 30 minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, when H.R. 707 to authorize the Tualatin project was being considered earlier, I indicated that these two projects constitute another step in the development of the water resources in the Columbia River Basin.

The plan for the $13.3 million Manson unit, which would be authorized by the legislation now under consideration, calls for rehabilitation of an existing pirvate irrigation system and extension of the system to serve some additional lands. In all, almost 6,000 acres will be irrigated. In addition to serving irrigation water, the reservoir will be developed for recreation. Since the reservoir will be in a national forest, the recreational facilities will be administered by the Forest Service.

Mr. Chairman, we find here a situation which is true of so many of our recent irrigation projects. The original facilities were built totally by private interests many, many years ago. The time has come when the facilities have deteriorated to the point where a major rehabilitation job is required and the cost of this major improvement plus the cost of extending the system to serve additional lands is beyond the ability of the local water users to repay. In the case of the Manson unit, the water users will repay almost 50 percent of the total project cost and the remainder will be repaid from the net power revenues of the Federal Columbia River Basin system—that is, net revenues that are over and above revenues needed to repay the entire power investment in the Federal Columbia River power system with interest within 50 years from the time each project or unit becomes operational.

Mr. Chairman, the committee concluded that the Manson unit meets all of the criteria for authorization and construction at this time. I urge the approval of H.R. 2829 as amended by the committee.

Mr. Rogers of Texas will discuss it in more detail. At this time I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to propose to the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, a question or two regarding recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, for the purpose of making legislative history.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand the gentleman, he wishes to have the same history made on this legislation as was made on the prior bill, so that there will be no question in respect to the matter involved.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct. I would ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, is it the intent of the committee that the Secretary of the Interior shall carry out such work as is required for recreation development and fish and wildlife enhancement in connection with the Manson unit?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes; to the extent that this is consistent with the Water Project Recreation Act. We have referred to the act and expect to have development carried on in conformance therewith.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it correct that this authority to do this work is found in the first section of the bill which both enumerates the purposes of the project and authorizes its construction?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. Will the chairman state, then, what is the purpose of section 3 of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, that it assure conformity with the Water Project Recreation Act. More specifically, it is to insure that agreements are signed as called for by that act and that cost allocations conform to the standards laid down in that act itself and that we do not vary from the provisions of the act, to which the Congress and the Executive gave their approval recently.

Mr. FOLEY. But is it correct that the recreation and fish and wildlife development are part and parcel of the project itself; that is, they are authorized by section 1 of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes; the gentleman is correct again. I add, the amount authorized to be appropriated includes an allowance for this work as well as for construction of the irrigation features of the project, and that the modes of repayment, whatever they may be, are in accordance with the provisions of the act referred to.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, just two questions, requesting technical information for the gentleman from Missouri, from the distinguished chairman.

Are these dams we are considering today in what is ordinarily referred to as high terrain—or rugged terrain—areas with boxlike canyons and steep walls or are we inundating alluvial soil in order to provide irrigation for other areas to be reclaimed?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have not seen the site of the reservoir referred to in the liquidation now under consideration, that is the reservoir that is to be enlarged. It would make very little difference in this particular instance if I understand my colleague correctly.

I have seen the reservoir site for the Tualatin project. There is a small amount of good farmland that will be inundated, but most of the area is hillsides and there would be very little of value that would be destroyed.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, my second question to the distinguished chairman is, in view of the statement that this one is entirely within a forest preserve or a national forest, would the 50 cents a day or the annual $7 fee for the Land-Water Conservation Fund be applicable for ingress into this area, since it is in another department, under the bill that we passed last year? Would that be in force, and is it contemplated that it would be imposed by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, under the President's recent Executive order?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will allow me, I cannot speak about what is in the minds of the Secretaries involved, but if there is any development which would lead to the necessity for an entrance fee, an entrance fee could be charged in this particular project.

On the other hand, a user fee will more than likely be charged. There is no question about the user fees. There is a question as to the entrance fees, because there has to be a substantial development that is perhaps a road providing for ingress and egress, or proper policing facilities, or such.

In this particular instance, I may say to my colleague, I would doubt if the entrance fees will be charged. I mean, this is a small reservoir. There is a question about entrance fees, but I am sure user fees will be charged.

Mr. HALL. The user fees pertain to those who actually use the water for hydrology, irrigation, and other purposes in general?

Mr. ASPINALL. No. I go a little further than that. If the Forest Service, in developing a recreation area, constructs recreation facilities, such as parking places or campsites or boat ramps, something like that, then charges will be made for these facilities, but not for the water. The use of the water itself carries with it no fees, as my colleague will remember.

Mr. HALL. I do remember. But that means the only way that you can gain ingress to the lake, which is "free of charge," is to float downstream on a contributing tributary.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think my colleague is correct, providing the administrating authorities wish to go that far and incur the wrath of some of the users. I know a difficulty is going on at the present time.

Mr. HALL. It is going on, of course, on some of the Corps of Engineers impoundments. That is why I wanted to make a record here without reference to this particular project.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it will be involved here.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as indicated by the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], this is economically a good project. Its cost-benefits ratio is high, for whatever value people place on the cost-benefit ratio.

Mr. Chairman, the project is estimated to cost a little over $13 million, somewhat less than the previous project.

Also, Mr. Chairman, like the previous project, even if the irrigators are unable to pay any money at all—which is not likely because testimony indicates they will be able to repay—the finances of the project are backed up by the power revenues of the Chief Joseph Dam.

Mr. Chairman, it is notable that the area to be served by the project is largely devoted to the growing of apples. If the escalation of inflation that we have now, and are going to experience throughout this year, leads us to some kind of an economic chaos and depression, probably there will be plenty of use for these apples for people to sell on the street corners.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I feel it is notable to note that this project is a Washington project. The previous project was an Oregon project, both projects being located in the humid West, the Pacific Northwest.

Over the years, Mr. Chairman, the Pacific Northwest has received the benefits of an enlightened and benevolent policy of the Federal Government to use national resources for the development of natural resources, particularly in connection with hydropower and irrigation developments such as this.

The growth and development of the Pacific Northwest has been underpinned by this policy, and I believe it has been of benefit to the Nation as well as to the residents of the great States of Oregon, Washington, and adjoining areas of the Pacific Northwest.

However, I believe it should be pointed out—and I referred this area as the humid West—another portion of the West is the Pacific Southwest, it is the arid West. It, also, is an area of great growth and also makes great contribution to the Nation. Inevitably, in the very near future, the arid Pacific Southwest must look outside its boundaries for the satisfaction of its basic needs for water. There is no secret that at the present time the arid Pacific Southwest—not only Arizona and California, Nevada, and New Mexico, but Texas also—is looking longingly at the Pacific Northwest for help to satisfy these growing requirements for life-giving water.

Annually after the Pacific Northwest has made entire use of the waters of the system, both for the development of electricity and for use in agriculture and industry, the Columbia River Basin flows upward of some 90 million acre-feet of fresh water into the Pacific Ocean. So, it is logical that the arid Pacific Southwest looks toward this water, the sole use of which now is the dilution of the salinity of the Pacific Ocean. It looks with hope for the generous understanding of our neighbors to the north in Oregon and Washington, who through the demonstrated benefits of these public projects by the Federal Government in its area, know the value of consolidating the use of water to the highest good of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, we do hope that the honorable gentlemen, our colleagues from those States, will look as favorably and as kindly upon the water problems of the Pacific Southwest as today we have looked upon their water problems as evidenced by the two projects before us.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to express in advance of expressions which I shall make later of the appreciation of the State of Washington and the people of my district for the cooperation and assistance of the gentleman from California in the preparation and hopeful passage of this act.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not feel that the gentleman wants to leave the impression, which I am sure he did not intend to do, that the only States in the West which have benefited from Federal expenditures have been the States of Oregon and Washington. I am sure the gentleman from California will concede that the great State of California, the largest and most advanced in the West, has had some paltry Federal expenditures over the years, such as perhaps the Central Valley project?

Mr. HOSMER. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that that is indeed true. We do share this knowledge which demonstrations have given us, of the benefits not only to ourselves, but to the rest of the Nation of such Federal programs. As a matter of fact, irrigation and reclamation development began almost the first year of this century, and has been making its contributions ever since.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I assume, based upon what the gentleman says, that he would certainly agree that the Federal Government in the State of California and its efforts have not benefited the people of that State alone, but have been of major benefit to the entire Nation, and that those projects such as irrigation and power development in California, which have been repaid to the Treasury—and many of them with interest by the people of the State of California—have represented a Federal investment which accrues to the interest of the entire Nation. Is that not correct? Will the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. HOSMER. That is true, and I might further advise the gentleman from Washington that in connection with our own projects in California, and those of our neighboring States to the east and to the northeast, and to the north, we have always regarded that the natural resources being developed in a State are subject to a first priority by the originating State.

I think there is no question that in the future we will adhere to the same philosophy. In other words, should we look to the north for supplemental water supplies, we would not look for any supply that is at any time needed in the originating Pacific Northwestern States. Only after those States have fully utilized their water resources, would we ask to step in and have the benefits of such water as otherwise would go to waste in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. FOLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's sentiments. I would also suggest, and I would hope the gentleman would agree, that throughout the history of Federal projects in the West and all of our States in the West, it has been not only the principle of respecting the priority of use in the State of origin, but the principle of the legislation to require and to expect that those States which would benefit by Federal expenditures show a clear feasibility and justification for the expenditure of Federal funds. I think, if I may suggest it today, that both the Tualatin project in Oregon and the Manson project in the State of Washington very clearly meet these feasibility standards—and exceed them; and I am sure the gentleman would agree that any future projects of any kind should meet the some standards of economic feasibility and justification when they come to the Congress and ask for the investment of Federal funds.

Mr. HOSMER. I must state that the gentleman from Washington with his latest declaration has me a little bit confused. He seems to be talking like a Republican instead of a Democrat.

The bill which we have before us at this time—H.R. 2829—authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project in the State of Washington.

It is important to point out that this is not an entirely new system. The existing system consists in part of aging wood-stave pipes and flumes which were constructed some 50 years ago. That system is in need of repair and rehabilitation if it is to continue to provide irrigation water for nearly 4,000 acres of irrigated apple orchards. Failures are frequent in the existing system and, most certainly, a major failure would jeopardize the continued productivity of these orchards.

In addition to providing for the rehabilitation of the existing system, H.R. 2829 provides for more adequate facilities for collection, storage, and delivery of water. The expansion of the system would enable it to serve 1,525 acres of presently dry lands—including 120 acres which now have only a partial water supply.

This land is, of course, in the apple country. The lands presently being irrigated are devoted almost exclusively to apple production and it is reasonably expected that the new lands will be developed primarily as irrigated apple orchards. Notwithstanding that fact, however, I do want to point out that your committee retained in this bill the customary provision which you will find at section 4 of the bill. Sections such as section 4 have been placed in similar bills in order to assure the taxpayers of this Nation that these early projects will not contribute to any unnecessary agricultural production so as to create unneeded and unwanted surpluses.

As has already been pointed out by the chairman of the committee, this $13.3 million project is principally an irrigation project which will be almost entirely repaid to the Treasury. To insure that the $13,194,000 allocated to irrigation is repaid within the established 50-year period—plus the development period—the committee inserted into H.R. 2829 at section 2—page 2, lines 16 and 17—the necessary wording to insure that the construction costs allocated to irrigation, which are to be repaid by power revenues, are to be returned to the reclamation fund within that period.

Another fundamental amendment which the committee made in the language of H.R. 2829 appears later in that same section—at page 2, line 19. Where the bill, as originally introduced, provided for the power revenues to be used to help repay the construction costs were to be derived from the revenues produced by the Chief Joseph Dam, the committee revised the bill to provide that repayment should be derived from the entire Bonneville Power Administration. The long-range effect of this amendment is to establish a basin fund in the Columbia River Basin and its tributaries.

This has been a matter of considerable concern to the committee for some time and it is a matter about which it is expected that this Congress will be again concerned when some other expected measures come before it. By working out a basin accounting arrangement such as we have in the Central Valley project and some others, a pool will be created from which necessary project costs can be drawn to pay allocations which the water users would otherwise be unable to repay.

I am pleased to join with the chairman of the committee in recommending this legislation to the House for its approval at this time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take only a brief moment to speak on the bill before the Committee.

It has been very succinctly and exactly explained by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], and I think the dialog that has taken place has clearly put before the Committee all the relevant information.

I would like to emphasize first of all, the imminent need of this project. There is in the Manson area an existing reclamation facility which was created and largely built over 50 years ago. That system is now so badly deteriorated and in such imminent danger of a breakdown, that it is not certain even if this bill were passed and funded today that it would be possible to construct the project and rehabilitate the system soon enough to prevent a major disaster in the area. We are living by the grace of Providence so to speak from day to day with reference to this project.

Last July 19 there was a serious breakdown of the works in a large and valuable orchard that was flooded and very seriously damaged. That could occur at any time with other orchards in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my very deep appreciation to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Colorado, for his consideration and foresight in bringing this legislation before the Committee today. My appreciation certainly goes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. Rogers], and certainly to every member of the Interior Committee, especially the ranking minority member and the gentleman from California who is here today from the minority side. All of them have cooperated splendidly on this matter which is, the record will show, the most economically feasible project to come before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in many, many years if not in its entire history. It is my hope that all Members of this Committee of the Whole will give their support to this much needed and valuable project and pass it unanimously today.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from California if he has any more requests for time?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Manson unit, a relatively small reclamation project in Chelan County in central Washington. The project is primarily for irrigation with incidental benefits from recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

The plan of development for the Manson unit calls for improving and extending the existing irrigation water collection and distribution system of the Lake Chelan Reclamation District. The existing system is a composite of several privately financed developments which have been enlarged and improved over the years. This system collects the water from the watersheds of seven streams above Lake Chelan and conveys it throughout the service area. The system would be rehabilitated and extended, and the existing reservoir would be enlarged. The rehabilitated and extended system would continue water service to 4,245 acres now irrigated and bring a full irrigation water supply to an additional 1,525 acres, making a total of 5,770 acres that would be served under the proposed plan of development. Recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities would be provided to the reservoir and would be administered by the Forest Service.

Lands in the unit area that are now irrigated are devoted almost exclusively to apple production, and it is expected that the new lands will also be developed as irrigated apple orchards. These orchards cannot exist without the irrigation system. A major failure would result in their destruction and, unfortunately, there is danger of a major failure unless the system is rehabilitated at an early date. Some of the existing works were constructed as long as 50 years ago and are in urgent need of repair or replacement.

The Manson unit would cost an estimated $13,344,000 and all of this amount, except for about $150,000, is allocated to irrigation and would be repaid under reclamation law. The economic studies of the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that about $6,051,000 can be repaid by the water users and that the remainder of about $7,143,000 would be returned from revenues derived by the Secretary of the Interior from the disposition of power marketed by the Bonneville Power Administration. The committee amended the bill to make it clear that the entire amount, the part to be repaid by water users and the part to be repaid by power revenues, would be repaid within a period not exceeding 50 years plus any authorized development period.

The amount of about $150,000 allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement is nonreimbursable pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Water Recreation Project Act. The facilities would be in the national forest and recreation, user fees would probably be established pursuant to the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The Manson unit has a benefit cost ratio of 6.5 to 1.0 showing that this is an excellent project from an economic standpoint.

The Manson unit not only has the full support of the irrigation district involved, which has agreed to the repayment arrangements, but it has the support of the State of Washington as well as groups and organizations in that State interested in water development. The committee received no testimony in opposition to this proposed development. This is a relatively small project but it is extremely important to the economy of the area it will serve.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recommends approval of the Manson unit and the authorizing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2829

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of supplying irrigation water for approximately five thousand eight hundred acres of land, undertaking the rehabilitation and betterment of works serving a major portion of these lands, conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and enhancement of recreation opportunities, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). The principal works of the unit shall consist of dams and related works for enlargement of Antilon Lake storage, related canals, conduits, and distribution systems, and works incidental to the rehabilitation of the existing irrigation system.

Sec. 2. Irrigation repayment contracts shall provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law. Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay during the repayment period shall be returned to the Reclamation Fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Chief Joseph Dam project. The term "construction costs", as used herein, shall include any irrigation operation, maintenance, and replacement costs during the development period which the Secretary finds it proper to fund because they are beyond the ability of the irrigators to pay during that period. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Manson unit shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by the Secretary.

Sec. 3. The Secretary is authorized, as a part of the Manson unit, to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities; to acquire or otherwise to include within the unit area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to assign water and reservoir capacity to recreation and to provide for public use and enjoyment of unit lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other project purposes. The Secretary shall transfer lands acquired for the unit within exterior national forest boundaries to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as national forest, and jurisdiction of national forest lands within the unit shall remain with the Secretary of Agriculture for recreation and other national forest system purposes: *Provided,* That the lands and waters within the flow lines of any reservoir or otherwise needed or used for the operation of the project for other purposes shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior to the extent he determines to be necessary for such operation. The costs of the undertakings described in this section, including costs of investigation, planning, Federal operation and maintenance, and an appropriate share of joint costs of the unit, shall be nonreimbursable.

Sec. 4 Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife resources shall be considered as project costs and allocated as may be appropriate among other project functions.

Sec. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user on the Manson unit, Chelan division, for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the Manson unit, $12,400,000 (October 1959 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said unit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 16, strike out "Reclamation Fund" and insert "reclamation fund within said repayment period".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 119, stirke out "Chief Joseph Dam project." and insert "Bonneville Power Administration."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 4, through page 4, line 6, strike out all of sections 3 and 4 and insert the following language in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 3. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Manson unit shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213)."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Aspinall to the committee amendment on page 4, line 10: Strike out the word "Projects" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Project".

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 12, strike out "Sec. 5." and insert "Sec. 4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 24, strike out "Sec. 6." and insert "Sec. 5."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 1, strike out "$12,400,000 (October 1959 prices)," and insert "$13,344,000 (April 1965 prices),"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2829) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 800, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 800, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 490.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF TEXAS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. Rogers of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 490 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2829 as passed, as follows:

"That, for the purposes of supplying irrigation water approximately five thousand eight hundred acres of land, undertaking the rehabilitation and betterment of works serving a major portion of these lands, conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and enhancement of recreation opportunities, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). The principal works of the unit shall consist of dams and related works for enlargement of Antilon Lake storage, related canals, conduits, and distribution systems, and works incidental to the rehabilitation of the existing irrigation system.

"Sec. 2. Irrigation repayment contracts shall provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by laws. Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay during the repayment period shall be returned to the reclamation fund within said repayment period from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration. The term "construction costs", as used herein, shall include any irrigation operation, maintenance, and replacement costs during the development period which the Secretary finds it proper to fund because they are beyond the ability of the irrigators to pay during that period. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Manson unit shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by the Secretary.

"Sec. 3. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Manson unit shall be in accordance with provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

"Sec. 4. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user on the Manson unit, Chelan division, for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

"Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the Manson unit $13,344,000 (April 1965 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said unit."

The motion was agreed to.

Then Senate bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at the appropriate place on H.R. 2829 and the bill H.R. 707, which the House passed just previous to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROMOTING A MORE ADEQUATE NATIONAL PROGRAM OF WATER RESEARCH

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3606) to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3606, with Mr. Brooks in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers], will be recognized for 30 minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation in the committee, discusses what is involved in H.R. 3606, I would like to take just a few minutes to indicate the need for water research generally and how the program authorized by H.R. 3606 fits into and is coordinated with our overall Federal water resources research effort. The bill we have before the House today, of course, is limited to research into water problems relating to the mission of the Department of the Interior.

It is the ever-increasing demands upon our limited water supplies throughout the Nation that have pointed up the importance of research in the process of matching water supply to such demands. Over the years, the nature of our water problems has changed and the size and scope of the solutions have increased until, today, far greater demands are pressing upon both our water resources and the technology required to meet our varied water needs.

In the past, our Nation's available water supplies were plentiful and we let ourselves become too dependent upon nature to meet our needs. We also became wasteful of our supplies. We have expected our streams and ground water sources not only to meet the needs of our expanding population for food, fiber, and industrial processing, but also, at the same time, to carry off the waste products of our homes, industries and farms. The result has been serious shortages of usable water in many parts of our Nation and the conclusion that our water problems may be expected to become more serious in the future. Research, of course, is not itself the answer to all our water problems but it will help provide the answers we need. It has become quite clear that, if we are to find the solutions necessary to meet this Nation's growing water problems, we must have a continuing and effective water resources research program.

On March 18, President Johnson transmitted a special message to the Congress emphasizing the need for expanding our water resources research effort. The report of the Federal Council for Science and Technology which was a part of the President's message, includes a proposed 10-year expanded program in water resources research and sets out the specific goals we should work toward in the years ahead. The program which H.R. 3606 would authorize would assist in attaining these goals.

The concern which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has had with respect not only to the program involved in this legislation but to the entire Federal water research effort has been that we have had inadequate coordination and have had duplication and waste. In an attempt to overcome this situation, we placed provisions in the 1964 act requiring clarification of Federal agency responsibilities for water research and for coordinating all Federal water resources research activities. We are pleased with the actions which have been taken pursuant to these provisions.

By Executive order dated October 24, 1964, the President has given this responsibility to the Office of Science and Technology and to the Federal Council for Science and Technology. A Committee on Water Resources Research has been established and staffed, and the testimony we received during the hearings indicates that progress is being made toward the elimination of duplication and waste in this field. Other actions which will assist in this effort include the cataloging of all research work by the Science Information Exchange in the Smithsonian Institution and the establishment of a Water Resources Science Information Center within the Department of the Interior.

The report, mentioned earlier, of the Federal Council for Science and Technology setting forth a coordinated 10-year program of Federal water resources research is a product of our efforts to coordinate all Federal work in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the water resources research program which will be extended by the legislation we have under consideration today is a meritorious program which is an important part of our overall Federal water resources research effort, and I urge favorable action on H.R. 3606.

I would advise my colleagues that under the provisions of this legislation we will be able to get into the water research program many capable and able scientists and scientific groups which we are unable to get into the program with the authority that we presently have under the provisions of the parent legislation, which is centered toward the land-grant colleges and those colleges associated with them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding. Do I understand that this is an $85 million bill, spread over a period of 10 or 15 years?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is spread over 10 years. The legislation that came over from the other body carried with it an open-ended authorization, no time limit on the activities of the research studies. It also carried with it additional money. But the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the House thought the program should be stepped up gradually. This is what we did with the original bill, as my friend knows so well. It was also thought that we should put a cutoff date, that we should have a definite term for this activity, and that if it were necessary to come back at the end of 8 or 9 or 10 years, and make a new case for additional authority, the agency would have to do that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is a step-up from the previous program of $1 million a year for 10 years. Is that right?

Mr. ASPINALL. What we did in the House, if my colleague will remember, when we were considering the Water Research Act of 1964, is that we had no title II. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommended that title II not be included within the legislation at that time, thinking that it would be sufficient to start out with the Water Institutes which were provided for in title I.

The other body, however, placed in the original bill, as they have this time, an unlimited authority for the Secretary in respect to the authorizations contained in title II.

We went to conference. As my friend so well knows, in conference there is a give-and-take. We finally came up with a decision by the conferees to authorize $1 million annually.

The House was able to retain, however, in that legislation that provision which said that the Executive would have to send to the Congress of the United States the contracts which were provided for under the provisions of title II, and that the different bodies of Congress would have 60 days in which either to approve or disapprove.

It was to this that the Executive himself took exception, and he has failed to implement the provisions of the limited title II that we provided for in the conference report in 1964.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on page 12 of the report I see brackets, in conformity with the Ramseyer rule, that apparently the language is stricken under the terms of this bill, which provides that the Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress of receipts and expenditures, and so forth. Is there any substitute for this in the bill today?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. We have substitute language. In this we created a new section. I do not have the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I think the gentleman from Iowa will find that on page 14 of the report, section 307, at the bottom of the page. That requires a more detailed report.

Mr. ASPINALL. What we had to do was work the reporting directive into both titles. This we have done. There is an annual report required. This report has to be made by March 1, so that the Congress of the United States will know what is going on before the appropriation authorities are able to make their decisions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that I think that is a very good provision. I compliment the committee upon section 307, now that I have seen it.

I ask the gentleman, will all this $85 million be spent upon research—exclusively on research—or how is the $85 million to be spent?

Mr. ASPINALL. The $85 million is to be spent by contracts entered into. Some of the moneys will be in grants, some of it may be in matching funds, and some of it will be in just outright payments for contract services.

Mr. GROSS. Is not the $85 million all Federal funds?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Then are there to be matching funds in addition to that?

Mr. ASPINALL. I might have misspoke myself in regard to the matching funds. The matching funds are contained in title I under the water institute program if I remember correctly.

Mr. GROSS. The Government is going to go out and hire consultants and research organizations of one kind and another? That is the purpose of the $85 million?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is the purpose.

Mr. GROSS. There is no actual cleaning up of streams, or anything of this kind? This is all in addition to that?

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to my colleague that the amount provided for water research activities is a very small amount of research funds expended by the Federal Government in its various activities. Two of the most important elements with which we have to live are air and water. The scientific studies which are involved in this area of research are manifold.

Mr. GROSS. I believe I understand the importance of it. On the other hand, I do not minimize $85 million being spent on research, even though it is expended over a period of years. I did not have time to read the hearings in justification of this expenditure.

I am willing to accept the gentleman's word that that much money is necessary and proper, for the purposes of research.

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will permit me to say—and when we think of these figures the gentleman knows what we are up against. There were over 1,450 contracts in existence for research in water matters during this last year. These were contracts by industry, contracts by the various agencies of the Government as well as by other organizations. There are six agencies or departments of Government engaged in this work. However, if it had not been that we provided for a clearinghouse, as it were, in the parent bill, the act of 1964, so that all research activities in water is coordinated at the present time and the reporting back procedures which we have in this legislation, I would have the same fears of my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa. However, I believe we have this pretty well wrapped up so that there cannot be anything but efficient and effective operation.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, so there will be no misunderstanding about the matching funds, the gentleman from Iowa is correct in his understanding that funds for this $85 million can be matching funds. This is another reason that we want it under section 307, and have these reports from the Secretary so we can see and take a look and provide the oversight that we feel the Congress should have over this program.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding that the act of 1964, and continued by this bill today, if passed, is interested primarily in doing a better job of research for the development of natural resources of water in their natural states, such as the basin development, the conservation of streams, et cetera?

Mr. ASPINALL. Only indirectly, I would say to my friend from California. As far as the overall basin development is concerned, we are not as interested here in the scientific study of water and how water can be made potable and usable and how its use can be extended as we are in the basin plans which come under the provisions of the legislation we passed for such purposes.

Mr. REINECKE. Perhaps I should ask the question differently: Are we concerned here more with water before it gets into the pipeline than after it gets into the pipeline?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. REINECKE. Before?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the work which has been done by the committee on this matter, and I sincerely hope that through the enactment of this legislation water conservation and utilization will continue into the period after the pipeline stage as well.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill for research. Now, today, being against research is about like being for sin. This is good, simply because the more knowledge we have the better off this country will be in every way.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join in the support of this bill which proposes research on such an important matter as water which is basic to our national life.

Now, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3606 provides for the expenditure of some $85 million on an escalating scale during the first 5 years. Some $35 million during the first 5 years, starting out at $5 million a year, and $50 million during the last 5 years at a rate of $10 million a year.

An authorization this far into the future—and, incidentally, this takes us to the 1st session of the 94th Congress—might be questionable because over that period of years the operations of the program could conceivably get far out of hand, and conceivably involve the wastage of a good deal of Federal sums that might be involved.

However, Mr. Chairman, I do not worry about that simply because—and I want to get this on the record—of the work and the responsible attitude taken toward this and every other measure which comes before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that calls for expenditure of Federal funds, by its chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and by the chairman of its Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

These gentlemen and other members of this important committee have, during all of the years of their service on this committee, nailed down tighter and tighter control over the expenditure of money that is authorized and voted by the Congress. That is all to the good.

This has not been an easy task. There are constitutional questions as to the line of authority between the legislative and executive branch.

The gentlemen whom I have mentioned have worked to hew as closely to that line as possible insofar as the constitutional prerogatives and duties of the Congress are concerned. They have done the difficult job at times of devising language that will accomplish that purpose and I am satisfied that because of this work and because of that zeal and because of this dedication, we do have a measure here which insofar as it is constitutionally possible by legislative oversight to guarantee the wise expenditure of money which may be appropriated in the years ahead, does so guarantee it.

H.R. 3606 provides authority to the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts and other arrangements for research on water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior. These research grants or contracts could be made on a matching basis or under some other arrangement with educational institutions or private foundations, private firms or with individuals. Water research under this program could also be conducted by Federal and State agencies. This program is designed to bring to bear on our national water problems the best scientific talent and research competence available whether it be in educational institutions or in private firms or in Federal agencies.

The program authorized by this act is an extension of the water resources research program we authorized in 1964 by the enactment of Public Law 88-379, the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. Under the 1964 act, Water Resources Research Institutes have been established in each State and that program is off to a good start.

During the hearings, the committee was advised that cooperative arrangements for conducting the research work of the research institutes in each State have been carried as far as possible under the limited funds available for the present program. However, there are still many strong and competent universities not in the program and with no prospect of being in the program unless the legislation we have under consideration today is enacted. Thus, the present program is not tapping the total research talent and competence of our universities.

For example, in my own State of California there are nine separate campuses in the University of California system not to mention Stanford, the University of Southern California, and the California Institute of Technology, all of which have research and training competence in the water field. There is no possibility of taking advantage of this talent under the present program because of the limited funds available and the excessive fragmentation of the one institute's allotment that would result.

In addition to the research talent and competence available in our universities, there are numerous nonprofit and private organizations which through years of experience have developed competence in certain specific areas in the broad research field of water resources.

Mr. Chairman, the committee received excellent testimony this year demonstrating the need for this expanded program to assist this Nation in resolving the many and ever-increasing water problems. Based on this demonstrated need, the committee is recommending enactment of this legislation. However, the committee intends to retain control of what is being done under this legislation.

Two years ago a limited program similar to the one that H.R. 3606 would authorize was included in the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. The President objected to language which Congress attached to that authority because it permitted the authorizing committees of the Congress to bar appropriations to fund water research projects.

The language which the committee has placed in this bill does not permit the committees to veto the projects but it does require that all research contracts and proposals be submitted to the authorizing committees 60 legislative days prior to their execution. This gives the committee an opportunity to review the proposed research work and advise the Secretary of any objections to the proposed projects.

The committee also amended the bill to limit the life of the program to 10 years beginning in fiscal year 1967. This will provide an opportunity for an overall review of the accomplishments and needs at the end of that period in order to determine whether the program should be extended. One other committee amendment requires a full annual report covering the entire program and a detailed accounting for the appropriated funds.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that H.R. 3606 authorizes a meritorious and much-needed program and that we have amended the legislation so that the program can be kept under control and on the right track. I am happy to join the chairman and other members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in supporting H.R. 3606 and recommending that it be approved by the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of commending the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] for the interest they have shown in this measure.

I had introduced a companion bill to H.R. 3606 which companion bill was H.R. 6282, and I have followed the hearings very closely.

I would like to point out to the House, that I think the committee has written language in this measure which not only provides worthwhile research funds but also has eliminated the possibility of duplication and waste as the chairman has said earlier.

When the Water Research Act was passed, I must confess I was somewhat disappointed because title I language was more or less restricted to the land-grant schools and title II funds were very limited.

This prevented a school like the University of Texas, which has a very large and effective water resource research program underway, from being able to contribute its talent and knowledge in this field.

This bill restores these funds and will enable the University as one school to go forth in this field.

I might add that a situation in Texas might be typical of the same situation as would have occurred in other States and that is, that some institutions, public and private, might now be in line for the administration of these funds.

Three schools in Texas, because of the caution that the chairman of this committee and his members have exercised, have finally gotten together and resolved their differences and have joined hands now in a written agreement to serve as an institute to handle these funds.

This has been a commendable development in our State because now we have

Texas Tech and the University of Texas and Texas A. & M. all joining hands to administer the funds.

So I want to express myself as being in favor of this measure and I commend the committee again for the advancement of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, worthwhile research needs adequate financial participation to extend over several years so as to afford adequate opportunity to pursue promising leads. I, therefore, seek support and urge passage of H.R. 3606, a bill that will promote a more adequate national program of water research. I think that the funds made available for research through this bill are necessary to thwart the acute water crisis and supply shortages that are spreading across the Nation. I also believe that the bill is a realistic compromise under present fiscal conditions.

I am pleased that three fine schools in Texas—the University of Texas, A. & M. University, and Texas Tech—have joined hands to provide a water resource research council within the State. The effects of this measure will be so comprehensive that it will cover nearly every river and watershed in the State of Texas—from the Red River to the gulf coast and from the Sabine to the Rio Grande in far south and west Texas.

Our expanding population is placing greater demands on our natural resources, and it behooves us as a nation to make available the tools to preserve our great natural water wealth.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has made reference to the University of Texas. He, of course, is not excluding other schools in Texas and in other States, which are not land-grant colleges which could be considered under this program. As the gentleman knows, I have a deep interest in Texas Technological College in my own district.

Mr. PICKLE. As the gentleman from Texas knows, now the three schools in Texas have joined and are on an equal basis in an institute to handle these funds. Texas Tech is a great school on the Plains. It is interesting to note in our State that three schools—Texas Tech, the University of Texas, and Texas A. & M.—cut across the high plains area through all the water districts down through the coastal areas, and this is good because every aspect is covered.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. You would let some of the Iowa schools and some of the other schools have a little of this research work; would you not? I just do not want it all divided up between you two Texans over there.

Mr. PICKLE. I am sure the Department of Interior would accommodate the gentleman and he will get his equal share, I am certain.

Mr. GROSS. I notice the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives on the floor. I wonder if the State of Massachusetts might figure on getting in on some of this research work.

Mr. PICKLE. I will let the chairman of the committee express himself on that. But, of course, all 50 States equally will participate as the gentleman from Iowa knows—even Iowa.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

YESTERDAY'S DEBATE ON INFLATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I simply take this time to refer to the debate that occurred yesterday on the appropriation bill as it is reported in the March 29, 1966, Record.

As those who were present—and there was a pretty full attendance—know, one of the issues developed was this question of inflation and the seriousness of it. I took the floor of the House after listening to some of the presentation on the part of the majority party particularly the majority leader and the majority whip when it appeared to me quite clearly that they were treating inflation quite lightly. In fact, reference was made to inflation being a Republican cliche. In my remarks which appear on pages 7111–7112, I was directing attention to that aspect of the debate. I said among other things that we should get this debate back in context of the seriousness of inflation. Now I read the Record and I find, and I have just spoken to the majority leader, his remarks on pages 7109–7110. There is a very scholarly—and I want to commend him for it—a very scholarly discussion of inflation and the inflationary pressures that indeed face us.

Had these remarks been made on the floor of the House—and, as he said, the gentleman did not have time to present them—I, of course, would not have made the remarks that I did. I was trying to bring the debate around to a serious discussion of the problems of inflation. I do wish to commend the gentleman and others in the majority party for now making the record quite clear that inflation is far from a Republican cliche and that it is a serious issue which is facing our society.

For years I have suggested that a reform be made as far as the Congressional Record is concerned. I think that which is said on the floor of the House during the debate should be in one type and that which is put in the Record later—and those matters should be put in, I want to say; I am not arguing against the right to extend one's remarks. I think these considered observations belong in the Record—but for those who read the debate the next day, or for those who want to read it in the future, particularly interpreting or setting legislative history, these kinds of remarks not subject to cross-examination or the rebuttal of those who are on the floor participating in the debate ought to show up in a different kind of type.

I hope that this reform will be adopted. I understand that at one time in the Senate they had a procedure whereby matters which were inserted in the Record were printed in one type and that which was actually spoken on the floor and subject to rebuttal appeared in a different type.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. The gentleman will concede that there were some Members on this side who recognized yesterday the danger of inflation.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, indeed so, and I am happy to say that the Record now shows quite clearly that we all, Republicans, Democrats, and the administration, do recognize that this is a serious situation that faces us. It undoubtedly will be a campaign issue, and it is just a shame, I would say, that the debate was not on that basis.

But, of course, the attempt yesterday by the majority leaders was to minimize inflation. It was on this basis that the majority were able to move forward this bill that had nothing to do with guns and nothing to do, really essentially, with helping the poor. It had to do with programs that could well have been deferred. Had the majority leaders presented inflation the way they did present it as one reads it in the Record today, I think the switch of the additional five votes that we lacked in order to cut back on nonessential expenditures might have occurred.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I wish to compliment the chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the other members of the committee for the fine work that they have done in cooperating in the solution of one of the most serious problems with which our Nation is faced, and that is the water problem. It is not a problem that is confined to any particular section of the country, although it is more acute at times and in some places. It is more serious in some places generally. But it is a problem that faces all of us.

I think that this bill has been designed to provide a means of implementing a program that we did start earlier, and will make it possible to tap the scientific brains in all segments of the economy of this country, whether in educational areas or in the corporate industrial areas. We are able to go clear across the board in trying to find solutions to these very serious problems, and certainly they are most serious in the West.

The legislation which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs brings to the House today is designed to promote a more adequate national program for water research. This purpose would be accomplished by extending the authority in the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. As Chairman Aspinall said, this expanded program is an important part of our overall national water resources research effort. H.R. 3606 provides authority to the Secretary of the Interior for a program of research into all aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior.

Research grants or contracts could be made on a matching or other basis with Government agencies or with universities or other educational institutions or with private firms or with individuals. The objective of this program is to bring to bear on our national water problems the talents and research competence of our best trained scientists and the use of the best facilities available wherever they may be located.

As amended by the committee, H.R. 3606 would authorize the appropriation of $85 million over a 10-year period beginning in fiscal year 1967.

Some of you may recall that the legislation which the committee recommends today authorizes a program which, 2 years ago, we deleted from the legislation enacted as the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. We disapproved it at that time because we favored a more modest beginning for this new program and because testimony at that time failed to show the immediate need for the authority requested.

In conference, 2 years ago, we reached agreement on the token title II program presently in the act, but that program has not been implemented because of language which permits the authorizing committees to bar appropriations for research projects.

The committee is now recommending the full title II program but we have placed in the legislation limitations which we believe are necessary if we are to meet our oversight responsibilities. We have limited the life of the program to 10 years in order to provide an opportunity for an overall review of accomplishments and needs at the end of that period and determine whether the program should be extended.

We have placed a provision in the legislation requiring that all contracts and other arrangements be submitted to the Congress 60 days in advance of execution in order to afford the committee an opportunity to review the research proposals and resolve any questions before the contracts or other arrangements are entered into.

We also have broadened the reporting requirement in the present act so that it covers the entire program and provides a detailed annual accounting of the appropriated funds.

All the testimony which the committee received during the hearings was designed to show that this additional authority under title II was needed if we were to take full advantage of available non-Federal scientific talent and research competence in the water field. This year a very good case was made for this legislation by the excellent testimony we have received.

The committee is now of the opinion that the title II program is needed and that it will greatly assist in resolving this Nation's ever-growing water problems. Contributing also to the committee's approval is the excellent start which has been made in getting the program authorized 2 years ago off the ground and the leadership exemplified by Dr. Roland R. Renne, Director, Office of Water Resources Research, in administering the program.

We believe that the 2-year delay in approving the title II program has been beneficial. This was brought out in the testimony. The many cooperative arrangements that have been worked out among universities for participating in the research work of the State institutes would not have been possible had the title II program been fully authorized 2 years ago. Also, with the present program having gone through the shakedown period, we have been able to determine more accurately the extent of the scientific talent and research competence which is available and should be called upon but which cannot be utilized under present authority.

Mr. Chairman, after full and complete hearings and extensive study of this legislation, we are recommending that the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 be expanded to include the program authorized in H.R. 3606.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. **HOSMER**. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3606

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 200 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 331, 42 U.S.C. 1961b) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 200. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, $6,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971, and $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1972–1976, inclusive, from which appropriations the Secretary may make grants to and finance contracts and matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations or other institutions, with private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are, in his judgment, adequate for the conduct of water research projects, and with local, State, and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior which he may deem desirable and which are not otherwise being studied.

"(b) No grant shall be made, no contract shall be executed, and no matching or other arrangement shall be entered into under subsection (a) of this section prior to sixty calendar days from the date the same is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and said sixty calendar days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die."

Sec. 2. The last paragraph of section 104 of said Act is hereby repealed and a new section 307 is added to that Act reading as follows:

"Sec. 307. The Secretary shall make a report to the President and Congress on or before March 1 of each year showing the disposition during the preceding calendar year of moneys appropriated to carry out this Act, the results expected to be accomplished through projects financed during that year under sections 101 and 200 of this Act, and the conclusions reached in or other results achieved by those projects which were completed during that year. The report shall also include an account of the work of all institutes financed under section 100 of this Act and indicate whether any portion of an allotment to any State was withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor."

Mr. **ROGERS** of Texas (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be considered as read in full and open for amendment at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3606) to promote a more adequate national program of water research, pursuant to House Resolution 801, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER**. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 801, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 22.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF TEXAS

Mr. **ROGERS** of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. Rogers of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 22, to promote a more adequate national program of water research, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H.R. 3606, as passed, as follows:

"That section 200 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 331, 42 U.S.C. 1961b) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'Sec. 200. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, $6,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year

1970, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971, and $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1972–1976, inclusive, from which appropriations the Secretary may make grants to and finance contracts and matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations or other institutions, with private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are, in his judgment, adequate for the conduct of water research projects, and with local, State, and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior which he may deem desirable and which are not otherwise being studied.

"'(b) No grant shall be made, no contract shall be executed, and no matching or other arrangement shall be entered into under subsection (a) of this section prior to sixty calendar days from the date the same is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and said sixty calendar days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die.'

"SEC. 2. The last paragraph of section 104 of said Act is hereby repealed and a new section 307 is added to that Act reading as follows:

"'SEC. 307. The Secretary shall make a report to the President and Congress on or before March 1 of each year showing the disposition during the preceding calendar year of moneys appropriated to carry out this Act, the results expected to be accomplished through projects financed during that year under sections 101 and 200 of this Act, and the conclusions reached in or other results achieved by those projects which were completed during that year. The report shall also include an account of the work of all institutes financed under section 100 of this Act and indicate whether any portion of an allotment to any State was withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The motion was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 3606) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 3606.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON FOOD FOR INDIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT Mr. Speaker, the President has forwarded for our consideration a message of great urgency and historic significance. His eloquent message combines humanitarian motives with very realistic and very practical considerations.

I do not think we can emphasize too greatly the humanitarian aspects of this message. But it is about the more earthy and practical considerations which I speak now.

First: the national interest of the United States is clearly involved here. In Asia, where democracy has only a tenuous foothold, India can boast a deep commitment to free institutions. We cannot allow the light of this beacon to falter.

More than 500 million people—one-seventh of the population of the world—are Indians. For this number of people and their nation to be shaken by a tragic food crisis would undoubtedly have serious consequences for U.S. foreign policy. The President is not merely giving us an opportunity to throw a lifeline to a neighbor in danger; he is warning us that we must help sustain our friends if we are to save ourselves.

Second. India, perhaps more than any other developing nation, has proven its capacity for self-help. She has proclaimed an agricultural revolution, increasing her agricultural budget by well over 30 percent in recent months. India's leaders, gravely concerned at population growth totaling a million persons a month, have made a major commitment to population control, dispensing family planning information to literally millions of villagers across the subcontinent.

Third. This commitment of resources is one which our wealthy Nation can easily afford. The President proposes to supply wheat and food grains, and fiber with a total market value of $400 to $500 million. This is a prudent and realistic commitment; we could go far higher without diminishing our wholly adequate grain and commodity supply at home.

I am deeply impressed with the force and fervor of the President's appeal but I am even more struck by its shrewd and pragmatic approach. It makes good sense.

For that reason, I urge that the Congress give its approval to the pending resolution. By doing so we will demonstrate not only our compassion, not only our solidarity with the President; we will give historic testimony to our realism and commonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in a forthright and frank message on the India food situation has laid the case before us.

Last year the rains did not come as expected over large sections of India. Farmers could not plant their crops in the dry soil. Other crops withered and died for lack of water. Indeed, as President Johnson pointed out, not since the Dust Bowl years of the 1930's here in America has there been a greater agricultural disaster.

This natural disaster is not the fault of the Indian people. In a year in which Indian food production had to rise to meet the needs of India's growing population, the drought could not have come at a worse time.

Unless we act—unless the world acts—to help India over this crisis, the people of India face hunger, deprivation, and hardship.

The President's program of providing 3.5 million tons of food grain and other commodities such as corn, vegetable oil, and milk powder—and asking other nations to contribute generously—deserves our consideration and support.

This is a humanitarian program, in keeping with the finest traditions of our democracy, of sharing our abundance with the needy. We shall not turn our backs. We shall lend a helping hand.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the President has laid before us a stark message of impending tragedy. The drought which has afflicted the Indian subcontinent is of such massive extent that unless India receives, during the present year, several million tons of food from abroad, she will soon be facing the specter of mass starvation.

Leaders of India have appealed for help. The President of the United States has responded with an emergency program to add 3½ million tons of food grain to the 6½ million tons of grain already allotted for shipment to India during this fiscal year. He has asked Congress to endorse these shipments, and I believe that we should do so immediately and overwhelmingly.

India has been making considerable progress in self-help. During the past decade and a half she has increased her food production by 75 percent. She is in the midst of programs to greatly expand production of fertilizer and to introduce modern methods of agriculture. But in the midst of this continuing struggle, she has suffered a natural disaster which is expected to reduce her food grain production from 88 million tons last year to perhaps 75 million tons this year. That is the fatal arithmetic of starvation.

Our Canadian friends have already announced plans to provide at least a million tons of wheat and flour to India. Other nations will come forward. Every civilized and humane people has a moral obligation to avert this terrible crisis. And that obligation rests heaviest on the people of America who are the wealthiest, most affluent people in all history.

We have never turned our backs to those who are in genuine need. We will not do so now.

The President has full authority to act on these emergency proposals without further congressional action. He could do so under Public Law 480. He has asked us, however, for our concurrence and endorsement. I am sure that this endorsement will be promptly forthcoming from our Agriculture Committee. Let us then by our vote on this floor, tell the people of India and of the world that America's heart is as great as our resources. Let us give a strong and generous response and let India then show her cooperation by pushing the production of food on land now devoted to the production of cotton.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on the India food situation is a remarkable document.

In an hour of need, our great democracy seeks to extend a helping hand to a sister democracy. The President has called upon other nations of the world to join in this great humanitarian effort.

The Congress now has its responsibility. It is to consider the President's proposal carefully. Let us do this. Let us then arise as one body to approve this truly worthwhile program placed before us.

People of India are confronted with an unprecedented drought. This natural disaster is not of their own making. Unless the world responds, India faces famine.

To stem hunger, India estimates that it will need an additional 6 to 7 million tons of food grain through next December—beyond what has already been committed or expected. The President's proposal contemplates the shipment of 3.5 million tons of grain by the United States to help meet this need.

Other nations have been invited to match our contribution. I know that the response throughout the world will be strong and generous. The action of Canada in preparing to provide a million tons of wheat and flour sets an example for other countries and other people to follow.

The Indian Government is moving to help its nation in vigorous and farsighted programs of self-help. Our action in endorsing the program proposed by President Johnson to help tide India over the crisis of the drought will show that we are committed to the cause of free men everywhere.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the President has requested congressional endorsement for increased shipments of agricultural commodities to India during the coming months. I think it noteworthy that the President has communicated this request to the Congress even though he already has authority to take the actions he contemplates under Public Law 480. This is an example of the President's continuing determination to act with the advice and cooperation of the Congress, and he is to be commended for it.

I urge that we endorse the President's emergency program forthwith. Let there be no doubt or question about what is at stake here: either India receives 11 to 12 million tons of imported grain during the present year, or millions of men, women, and children will starve to death on the Indian subcontinent. I do not believe that there is a civilized nation in the world that is prepared to stand by and watch such a calamity occur.

From my brief examination of the President's proposal, I judge that we are asked to send to India food grains of a market value of some $400 to $500 million. This is well within our resources. Furthermore, we can make these shipments without dangerously depleting our own agricultural reserves. It is worth noting, also, that India intends to pay for this grain with rupees which we may then turn back to India in the form of loans or other funding to help India move forward more rapidly into an era of modern agriculture.

I think the fact should also be recorded that India's present crisis is not of her own making. Contrary to what some believe, India's agriculture has been improving, year by year, and 80 percent of her effort in this direction has been self-financed.

Premier Gandhi has informed the President, I understand, that India intends to greatly expand its fertilizer program by encouraging more private foreign investment. There is to be a 30-percent increase in India's agricultural budget. Finally, it is the Prime Minister's intention to move forcefully to bring under control India's exploding population.

It is true that much more must be done and done faster and more efficiently. But the great human crisis now approaching India is the result of an unavoidable, natural disaster. India is now in the midst of one of the greatest droughts in human history. The magnitude of her problem can be seen from the fact that last year India produced a bumper crop of 88 million tons of food grains. With her population increasing by almost a million hungry mouths every month, she would have needed still more this year. But because of the terrible drought which has descended upon her, this year's production will be only some 74 to 76 million tons.

Unless the more fortunate peoples of the world now step forward and extend the hand of common humanity, this shortage will very soon be translated into the stark tragedy of starvation.

The President proposes to avert that tragedy. He urges—and intends to continue urging—other nations to do so. I wish to add my own voice to his, and to the pleas of decent men everywhere that help be sent—and sent now.

Let us not merely endorse the President's proposal. Let us endorse it overwhelmingly so that the world may see that the American people are staunch friends in time of need, no less than we are firm allies in times of war.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the President's message on food for India.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CREDIT SOARS, CREDITORS SCORE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Wall Street Journal carried an editorial entitled, "The Virtue of Profligacy." This editorial deals primarily with the rapid expansion of consumer credit in our country. It points out that in many cases credit is too easily obtained, a situation which has led to wage earners getting in debt over their heads.

Unfortunately, lenders too often encourage borrowers to "get in over their heads" because the creditors know full well that the law is on their side. For instance, among Inland Steel Co.'s 22,000 production employees in the Chicago area, nearly 10 percent have a portion of their wages withheld every payday to pay off delinquent debts. I am certain that many of these debts are bona fide obligations. However, interest rate laws in our country are shockingly lax and our courts in many cases have acted strangely in awarding debt charges and garnishments against debtors, who in many cases are never informed that they are being taken to court.

The debt judgment and garnishment procedures which follow have become far too automatic in our court system. It is time that our courts took a critical look at themselves to make certain that debtors are given every opportunity to present their side of the case and that high-pressure finance companies and other lenders are not gaining favorable positions in the eyes of the courts.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 29, 1966]

THE VIRTUE OF PROFLIGACY

Among Inland Steel Co.'s 22,000 production employees in the Chicago area, nearly 10 percent have a portion of their wages withheld every payday to pay off delinquent debts. While the Inland workers probably aren't typical of the whole population, their dreary credit record helps point up a growing national problem.

Consumer credit outstanding has nearly doubled in the past 7 years, rising to nearly $90 billion. Though most Americans use credit responsibly, an increasing number are submerging themselves in overdue obligations; the result, as a recent story in this newspaper reported, can be personal tragedy, even suicide.

Obviously, then, a cause for serious concern, and yet some of the approaches to the problem seem incapable of offering anything like a full solution.

Labor unions and other groups are urging new laws to defend beleaguered debtors, and perhaps certain changes are needed. It seems excessive, for instance, to allow Federal and State tax collectors to seize a man's entire paycheck or to permit Kentucky businessmen to take all but $16.87 a week.

There's more than a chance, however, that the process of legal change will go too far. As a number of businessmen and other creditors are arguing, the Nation has come a long way since the days of debtors' prisons; personal bankruptcy laws and other statutes now often make it possible for debtors to avoid paying most or all of their legitimate obligations.

Any further legal revisions surely should be fair to creditors as well as debtors, and not only for reasons of equity. Credit is essential to the present-day economy, and many businessmen simply may not extend it if laws are passed to unduly weaken their ability to collect from customers.

Evenhanded debt-collection laws, in any case, clearly can't make all Americans use credit rationally. Nor will it help much to require, as the administration proposes, that all lenders state credit costs in the same way. If a consumer is foolish enough to overburden himself with debt, it won't matter greatly whether his credit costs are high, low, or in between.

More productive might be an extension of credit education through the Nation's schools, a process that is already underway. Something can be said, too, for stricter enforcement of present laws to curb deceptive and dishonest lenders; they may be a small minority, but there's no question that they exist.

Beyond that, a lot of quite reputable businessmen can't escape a share of the responsibility for the troubles in consumer credit. High-powered advertising and promotion has helped produce vast changes in public attitudes toward debt over the past three or four decades. Maybe it was overly puritanical to consider borrowing almost a sin, as many of our fathers did, but the pendulum now perhaps has swung too far in the other direction. In not a few business establishments today a customer who wants to pay cash finds himself regarded as a bit peculiar.

In their own interest, lenders could stand a stronger dash of self-restraint. By paying a little less attention to boosting their business and a little more to a borrower's actual ability to repay, they not only would protect their own solvency but possibly head off new restrictive legislation.

It's more than slightly ironical that the source of some of that legislation probably would be the same Federal Government whose own carefree fiscal and monetary policies have done so much to foster an easy-come, easy-go philosophy among the public. The way Washington has been living it up, it may be surprising that a large proportion of the population still remains free of credit woes.

Many of these fortunate ones, of course, are sustained mainly by the present high level of prosperity. If more widespread trouble is to be averted in some perhaps not distant future, creditors, debtors and the Government all had better get over any notion that profligacy now is a positive virtue.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2669. An act to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

UNITED STATES BLOCKING ACTION AGAINST RIGHTS LEADER

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, recently in Atlanta, Ga., one Hosea Williams, a top aid to Martin Luther King, was found in possession of keys to a stolen car.

According to William B. Williams, of the Atlanta Journal, the FBI and the district attorney in Atlanta wanted to bring charges against Williams but were told by the Justice Department in Washington "to keep quiet about the matter involving stolen cars that ended up in the possession of persons involved with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference."

Mr. Speaker, if this be true, it is an outrage. It is a serious indictment against the Justice Department. I am today calling on the Judiciary Committee of this House to investigate this case thoroughly.

The Attorney General of the United States should also make an investigation.

Why should a grand jury in Atlanta be prohibited by the Justice Department in Washington from investigating a serious charge against anyone.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the front page story which appeared in the Atlanta Journal of March 18, 1966, under the headline "United States Blocking Action Against Rights Leader."

I hope every Member will read this shocking report.

[From the Atlanta Journal, Mar. 18, 1966]

UNITED STATES BLOCKING ACTION AGAINST RIGHTS LEADER

(By William B. Williams)

The Justice Department in Washington has clamped a muzzle on local Federal law enforcement officials to prevent them from taking action against a prominent civil rights worker, the Atlanta Journal has learned.

The newspaper has just concluded a month-long investigation in which Government officials in Washington and Atlanta and civil rights workers themselves were questioned.

One local Federal officer told a reporter that employees of his agency here were "sick at the soul" because of what they consider to be high-handed tactics by the Justice Department.

None would * * * on the record. They were afraid of losing their jobs. But * * * sources high in the Federal Government said, in separate interviews, the following:

The Federal Bureau of Investigation here is concerned about one stolen car, at least, which had keys that were kept by Hosea Williams, a top attache to Dr. Martin Luther King.

The FBI and the office of Charles L. Goodson, U.S. district attorney here, wanted to bring charges involving the prominent civil rights leader, Mr. Williams, but were told to lay off by the Justice Department.

The Justice Department sent from Washington two attorneys, Alfred E. Moreton and Frank J. Cunningham, to prosecute two men, Harold Belton Andrews and Morris Findley, for the theft of a single car.

The FBI and the district attorney and his staff were told to keep quiet about the matter involving stolen cars that ended up in the possession of persons involved with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

The persons involved paid for the cars. How much they paid and what the circumstances were is a secret known only to the persons involved and the high brass of Federall Government.

The investigation by the Journal extended from the offices of the Justice Department in Washington to the racial ghettos of Atlanta.

Many would not talk. Some made guarded comments. But three men of officialdom, their faces drawn, quietly closed the doors of their offices and told their stories.

"I've been fighting this thing since November, and I'm sick at the soul to think what our country is coming to. Today it is auto theft. Maybe tomorrow it will be murder," one official said.

"I have to presume Hosea Williams is innocent. But believe me, it is a matter for a jury to decide. Not the Justice Department in Washington," another official said.

"Don't let them tell you this isn't a cover up. They are covering up for civil rights groups that seem to be getting bigger and stronger than the U.S. Government," another said.

All said they would not admit anything publicly because of their jobs.

All had thought that somehow the Justice Department finally would come through and permit local Federal officials to do what they consider is their duty.

But on a Monday, March 7, without any fanfare, a Federal grand jury here returned an indictment against Harold Belton Andrews and Morris Finley, a printer who turns out work for SCLC.

The indictment was curt. It charged that Andrews and Finley transported a stolen 1965 Dodge Dart from Arlington to Atlanta. It did not say what person the car was stolen from, nor did it give the serial number or motor number.

Efforts to obtain this information failed. An FBI spokesman in Washington said he could not locate the information and the newspaper should call the local FBI office. The local FBI refused to discuss anything about the case.

The Justice Department in Washington had been called more than a month ago to determine whether Hosea Williams was involved in an investigation concerning stolen cars.

There was hesitation on the other end of the line. And Jack Rosenthal, top information specialist for the the Justice Department, said he did not know how to answer such a question. He said if there were any developments, he would inform the press.

After Andrews and Finley were indicted, Attorney Cunningham was telephoned at the Justice Department in Washington. He was asked if SCLC workers were involved in charges of possession of stolen cars and why he and Mr. Moreton were called into the case. It is rare for Washington attorneys to come down to Atlanta to handle an auto theft case.

Mr. Cunningham referred the call to Carl Belcher of the Justice Department. Mr. Belcher would not talk to the reporter, but told his secretary to refer the call to public information.

Mr. Rosenthal said he could not comment on why Washington attorneys were handling an auto theft case in Atlanta. He said that out of fariness to the defendants in the case, he could not discuss the matter.

Finley, who was indicted on the charge of transporting a stolen car, is president of Diamond Printing Co. His small shop in a seedy section of Cain Street was visited.

Finley said he feels that he is faced with the possibility of being forced to take the rap for something he did not do. He told a reporter that most of his business comes from SCLC and that he would rather "rot" in prison before he implicated SCLC.

He said that he had met a man he considered a used car dealer and bought a car from him. He said he used the car in his business. It was a 1965 Dodge Dart. Later, he said, he was told by law enforcement officers it was a stolen car.

He said that before learning this, he had introduced some "influential" people to the man. He said these people innocently dealt with the man. He added that he would not give the name of the "dealer."

Harold Behon Andrews, indicted along with Finley, has not been arrested. Officials at the U.S. marshal's office said they had sent the warrant to Macon. Macon officials said Andrews had not been located.

For more information, the Journal checked officials in DeKalb County. The county police had nothing on Andrews, but the sheriff's office did.

A warrant for his arrest, charging him with taking a car, was sworn out September 25, 1965, by Hertz Corp.

Andrews was charged with taking a car rented from the Hertz Corp. at 40 Auburn Avenue NE. It was a Chevrolet Impala, four door with engine number 164395a127033.

Max B. Barrett, manager of the Hertz branch office, said Hertz did not want to prosecute the case.

An employe of Hertz, however, said the car had been discovered in Madison, Ga., in the possession of civil rights workers.

Sheriff W. H. Knight of Morgan County said he remembers the arrest. The workers, headed by Peter Cave, were charged with driving a vehicle with improper registration, he said.

Records in his office showed the car had been missing since August 16. Sheriff Knight said the workers were arrested September 24, and were en route to racial demonstrations in Crawfordville.

He said the car contained a bill of sale to a man he identified as Lester Hankinson, a SCOPE worker. SCOPE, headed by Mr. Williams, is an arm of SCLC.

He said Mr. Cave said that Hosea Williams had given him the keys to the car.

State Trooper L. E. Miller and Sgt. Joe Henderson in Madison said that Cave had said although the car was in Mr. Hankinson's name, it bought for SCLC.

* * * * *

Trooper Miller said the license plate on the car had been stolen from an Augusta woman, Mrs. Della D. Armstrong.

He said the plate had been stolen from her Ford.

Hosea Williams told a Journal reporter he had no idea the car was stolen and that only one which subsequently proved to be stolen was involved in operations. R. T. Blackwell, program director for SCLC, acknowledged that "one or two stolen cars" had been connected with SCLC and "an investigation is being made."

He added that Mr. Williams was in charge of buying cars, and Mr. Williams had the bills of sale on the questionable cars notarized. He said SCLC and Mr. Williams never bought a car unless they believed they were dealing with a car dealer.

Mr. Williams said Mr. Hankinson had thought he had proper title to the car. He said that Mr. Hankinson left town on a mission and had left the car at home and turned the keys over to Mr. Williams.

The SCOPE leader said he had given the keys to the civil rights workers to participate in the demonstration. He added that Mr. Cave was incorrect if he told law officers that the car had been bought for SCLC.

Mr. Finley charged that some Government men used pressure to get him to lie about SCLC.

THE JAPANESE TRADE MISSION

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address by Mr. HANNA.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to visit here in our Capitol with a Japanese trade mission sent specifically to the Pacific coast to study and pursue possibilities of expanding new trade and eliminating or reducing problems in connection with existing trade relations. California enjoys a billion dollar business in Japan so we are understandably interested in and pleased by the visit of the outstanding delegates who make up this mission.

A substantial part of the goods sent from California to Japan are agricultural products such as soy bean, corn, wheat, and cotton. Coming, as I do, from one of the most productive agricultural areas in our great State, I am well aware of the very healthy trade my cottongrowers and other farmers enjoy with our Pacific neighbors. Far beyond my personal and parochial interest, however, I look on Japan and the other countries of the Pacific as holding rich and rewarding potentials for economic expansion of all the West.

Mr. Speaker, the spread of our national policy and influence in Europe has brought great advantages and prosperity to the Atlantic coast through the great ports of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Atlanta. We are a nation whose shores are washed by two great oceans. Why should not the Western States begin to enjoy, through constructive programs of partnership and cooperation, the benefits of Pacific trade flowing through the great ports of Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Stockton, Los Angeles-Long Beach, and San Diego.

At a noonday luncheon hosted by the Japanese-American Trade Council, and honoring the members of the Japanese trade mission, my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA], presented a very excellent and instructive address indicating the great amount of time and thought he has given to the problem. In addition, he made statements which I think challenge both Americans and Japanese to face up to certain realities.

Mr. Speaker, because of the enthusiasm with which Mr. HANNA's address was received and the challenge it affords, under unanimous consent, I make his remarks available to my colleagues in the House:

THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY: LET US BEGIN TO BUILD

(By Congressman RICHARD T. HANNA)

It is indeed a great privilege for me to be invited to address the members of the distinguished economic trade mission from Japan. I am certain that the mission is proving productive and beneficial both to its members as well as the American Government and business officials who have been participating in the conferences on the west coast, and here in the East.

At the reception held this morning by Congressman STAGGERS, at which time the members of the economic mission had occasion to meet many Members of Congress, I remarked to Mission Chairman Hiyama how productive I thought it was to have the chance to develop personal, informal contacts that are not restricted by the structured situations so often the rule among diplomats. I have long felt that international relations are just too important to be left entirely to the diplomats.

Some of the most beneficial sessions I had during my trip to the Far East last year were during informal meetings with businessmen and fellow legislators. The meaningful rapport that develops during these less structured meetings go a long way in breaking down the artificial barriers between people. Too often diplomats become so concerned with what I call the strictures of structure that they do not allow themselves the necessary flexibility to deal with the real problems.

I know this first Japanese trade mission of the postwar era has done much to open new channels of this personal and meaningful type of diplomacy.

I was pleased to note that the mission spent some time in my home State of California, and I hoped they received a definite and clear indication of the enthusiasm for trade and other relations between my State and Japan.

As you know my enthusiasm includes not only Japan, but the entire Pacific community. I am sure that by now this audience is sufficiently impressed with the mutual admiration society exchanges that recite all the present and future advantages accruing from Pacific development and trade. And it has occurred to me that you might well prefer to hear some frank remarks on the problems to developing Pacific community, as well as the potentialities that Pacific trade holds forth.

One problem is the misconception as to what community is. Community is not just the same geographical neighborhood. Living in the same neighborhood, even being next door neighbors, is no guarantee of community.

Mutual aims and mutual effort produce community. The knowledge that goals are similar, and that the attainment of those goals can be more easily reached by working together, are the vital elements of community. Certainly we who are concerned with developing a Pacific community are fully cognizant of the concept. However, it is going to take more than just the recognition that Pacific community is desirable, and can be. It is going to take tremendous effort. We are going to have to determine what our mutuality of interests are, and then we will have to carefully build the machinery that will make the community. The concept is here, now let us move on to the building process.

One way to build is to increase understanding. Here in the United States there is not enough understanding of the political, social, and economic problems faced by the nations composing the Pacific community. Here is an area in which we can make substantial progress if we are willing. Here is an important first step—mutual understanding of the problems of our neighbors.

Another problem faced by those of us who would hope to build Pacific community relates directly to trade. It is the old and ever present problem of protectionism versus expansionism. Those who look to protect what they have only concern themselves with the short-range goals. By protecting what already exists you open yourself to the danger of not recognizing the potentials of the future. The short-range people cannot afford to look to the future because of their fear of losing what little they have now. And so instead of bettering everyone's position the protectionist looks after his own, and, as a result, no one benefits.

Well, gentlemen, I can tell you that I have a commitment to the future. The short-range goals of protectionism are not the answer, for the burdens of protectionism far outweigh any of its advantages. The United States and Japan have the obligation to include the other Pacific community nations in the growing Pacific trade. We may well boast that more than 50 percent of the trade in the Pacific is dominated by the United States and Japan. But the volume of our joint sales is only $11 billion a year. Percentages do not impress me. Volume is the key that determines the health of trade. Why can't we work to have 20 percent of a $50 billion yearly trade. Certainly in terms of real money, we would gain more, and there would be a substantial slice for the other nations that make up the Pacific community. Yes, gentlemen, the future is in expanding our potential, not protecting the little that has already been gained.

I have noted with many other of my colleagues the strong growth of nationalism that has dominated the world scene in recent years. Many voices have been raised with concern that this emerging drive makes more difficult the building process. I prefer to believe that this modern nationalism is enlightened self-interest rather than blind chauvinism, and such enlightened nationalism is not incompatible with international cooperation.

The presence of the Japanese mission here has undergirded my confidence that at least in Japan modern nationalism is of the enlightened variety where self-interest is served by building institutions between nations, and not just for a nation. Certainly the historic meeting between the top level Cabinet Ministers of the southeast Asian countries to be held in Japan in April of this year to discuss intensified multilateral economic cooperation is another excellent example of this enlightened attitude.

As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee I believe it incumbent upon me to propose specific institutions that could serve in helping build and expand the potential of the Pacific. I have two such proposals to make today.

First, I think the time is now right to follow up the Asian Development Bank with a Pacific Trade Bank. The Asian Development Bank has been a significant step forward, but the Bank is designed to take care of one particular aspect of Pacific affairs—development loans. A Pacific Trade Bank would add additional momentum to developing Pacific nations by providing them with machinery that could make their trade currency more readily convertible. Convertible currency is the lubricant of healthy trade. Conversely, lack of foreign exchange is the main bottleneck stifling developing nations. Part and parcel with this we should strongly support Mr. Eugene Black's position that underdeveloped nations be given a position on the International Monetary Fund.

An institution on the order of a Pacific Trade Bank would have a tremendous stimulating effect on expanding trade potential within the Pacific community. The Bank would serve as a clearinghouse for settling accounts on an agreed formula to be worked out. And this Bank might also be used for types of commercial loans currently not being made by private commercial banks in the underdeveloped countries. Such loans, when made, might pursue and encourage participation by private banks now operating in the Pacific area.

Another institution that is long overdue in the Pacific is an association for Pacific bankers. There is a real need to promote communications which would facilitate an efficient flow of necessary information between the members of the Pacific banking community. An association of this nature would provide the vital machinery that would create and mold the contacts so essential for the smooth flow and expansion of business. Such an association could be an innovative and vital force in the promotion and support for the Pacific Trade Bank as well as other Pacific community building blocks of the future.

These, of course, are just two approaches that should be studied as means of building the Pacific community. There are many other imaginative and necessary areas that we must explore. We cannot afford to restrict our imagination or creativity. We cannot afford not to put all our great talent, energy, and ingenuity to the task of building; for the rewards will be astounding, and of significant benefit to all men. Our task is to begin constructing and expanding, and no obstacle, political, social, or economic, should be considered too formidable to overcome.

The great challenge before us today is insuring that the potentiality of the Pacific community is understood and pursued. Today we stand on the threshold. We cannot be satisfied with a small rice bowl with all the chopsticks crowded in trying to get their small share of the rice. We can, and must, work toward a tomorrow when there will be an ever larger and expanding rice bowl where all the chopsticks will receive an ever increasing portion.

George Bernard Shaw once commented that "We have no more right to consume happiness without producing it than to consume wealth without producing it." The potential of the Pacific community offers us our opportunity to produce wealth. To reach out and grasp this opportunity is the challenge.

DUMPING CORN TO CONTROL PRICES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, once again the farmer, particularly the corn farmer, is the victim of Secretary Freeman's corn marketing manipulations to regiment agriculture and control prices. During the past 3 months Government-owned corn has literally been dumped on the market. The obvious purpose of this action is to force farmers into the feed grain control program and to depress the price of corn so that meat prices will be lowered through an increase in production of hogs.

Instead of dealing realistically with the basic cause of the inflation that is rapidly engulfing our economy, the administration persists in employing the politically expedient stopgap method of trying to hold the line on prices. Instead of reducing nondefense spending on various social programs, that we may better meet the Vietnam defense demands, the administration uses the artificial approach of selling materials from our defense stockpiles, such as in the instance of copper and aluminum, and dumping agricultural commodities on the market, as has been done with corn these past 3 months.

It is true that overall food prices have been rising. But feed grain prices have been declining. The explanation of the increased food prices is to be found in the increased processing, packaging, and marketing costs, certainly not in the price of the commodities off the farm.

The farmer himself is a sufferer from the increase in industrial costs. The farmer has had to pay more to produce the commodities for which he receives less. The purchasing power of the farmer's income dollar has declined like the dollar of every one of us.

Notwithstanding, Secretary Freeman proceeds to depress the price of corn that there may be a stimulant to hog and cattle production and in due course lower the price of pork and beef. The administration seeks to regulate our economy by artificial extra-legal means.

Addressing the annual convention of the National Farmers Union in Denver on March 16, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman sought to defend the dumping of Commodity Credit Corporation corn and other farm commodities. He asserted that "recent sales of CCC grain stocks are consistent with the ever-normal granary principle."

His words strongly suggest that Mr. Freeman does not understand the ever-normal granary concept. His grain-dumping operations indicate he does not realize Congress chartered CCC to support and strengthen farm prices, not to break them. The Corporation is specifically charged with "stabilizing, supporting and protecting farm income and prices."

Nevertheless, Mr. Freeman has again undertaken a market-wrecking liquidation of Government-owned corn stocks. This appears to be a dual effort to undercut cattle and hog prices and, at the same time, force farmers into compliance with his so-called voluntary feed grains control program. Farmers previously went through all of this with the Secretary during the 1961–62 marketing year and the results were disastrous for both producers and consumers.

Nearly a billion bushels of CCC corn were dumped on the market in competition with sales by producers. The depressed corn prices which resulted cost farmers about $370 million dollars, according to a study by the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture. This was only the beginning. As many of us predicted at the time, an abundant supply of cheap feed would stimulate unsound expansion of cattle and hog numbers and marketings. The full effects were felt in 1963–64 when both cattle and hog prices plunged to disastrously low levels. Recordbreaking imports of foreign beef put additional pressure on the market. Most cattle feeders actually lost money on every steer they sent to market—as much as $40 to $50 per head.

This, Mr. Freeman might argue, gave consumers a break on meat prices. Temporarily, it did. But then what happened? Farmers cut back sharply on hog numbers and cattle feeding operations. Livestock prices started climbing and with this, of course, so did retail meat prices. Today the prices of many meat cuts are prohibitive for middle-income and low-income families. And they feel the strain on their pocketbooks even more because the costs of all goods and services are moving higher at the same time.

The average consumer has every right to complain about the rapid rise in the cost of living. At the same time, every American should remember that it is the inflationary policies of the Government itself which are largely responsible. Even Secretary Freeman's feed grain dumping program of 1961–62, which was launched as a price-deflating move, now has come back in the form of higher meat prices to haunt the administration.

But the Secretary seems determined to create another feast and famine cycle with his current liquidation of CCC inventories.

Livestock producers do not enjoy boom-and-bust prices any more than consumers do. They would much prefer more stability from year to year in hog and cattle prices, just as consumers would be far happier with less violent fluctuations in the cost of meats and other food products.

Today meat prices are high because livestock marketings are low. But price is only one factor in the farm income equation. It is price times volume, minus operating expenses, that determines net farm income. For many livestock producers, net inome today would be higher if they had more hogs and cattle to sell, even at somewhat lower prices. The consumer would also benefit. I fear, however, that Mr. Freeman is setting in motion another boom-and-bust livestock cycle which will be harmful to both farmers and consumers.

Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, recently made it clear that the current corn-dumping program is a calculated administration move designed to control meat prices. In a television interview on the "Today Show," March 10, 1966, he said:

> I mentioned the fact that increase in supplies of pork depend on the difference between the price of hogs and the price of corn, and we're trying to hold down the price of corn. The Government acquired large stocks of corn in its past price support operation; now we're releasing them into the market.

He makes it clear enough that Government-owned corn is being used to manipulate farm prices downward.

The Johnson administration might well look beyond farm prices, however, in its search for causes and cures relating to higher living costs. For example, more than three-fifths of the cost of the food the housewife wheels through the supermarket checkout counter is added after these commodities leave the farm.

Higher processing, packaging, transportation and handling costs, along with higher taxes and wages, have accounted for the major upward trend in food prices.

It is interesting to compare farm prices and retail food prices of February 1951, when the Korean war was at its height, with today's Vietnam war prices.

U.S. Department of Agriculture figures show that average prices received by farmers for the commodities they market were 13 percent lower in February 1966, than they were in the same month of 1951.

On the other hand, Bureau of Labor Statistics figures reveal that in 1951, it took $9.54 to buy at retail the same food which today costs $11.10—an increase of more than 16 percent.

With farm prices down 13 percent and retail food prices up 16 percent from America's last war to the present one, clearly you must look beyond the farmer for the explanation. The real villain is inflation—inflation created primarily by the policies of Government itself.

And among the principal victims of inflation are farmers. In 1960, for example, American farmers spent a total of $26.242 billion to meet their production costs. For 1965, farm production expenses were estimated at $30.249 billion. That represents an increase of $4 billion in farm costs over a 5-year period. To put it another way, had farm production costs remained stable over that period, net farm income in 1965 would have been $18 billion, instead of $14 billion.

Even though the administration keeps saying that net farm income in 1965 was the highest ever, Secretary Freeman admitted in his Farmers Union speech that the 1965 level had been exceeded "five times in this century." The years involved were those immediately following World War II and the Korean war years of 1951 and 1952.

The number of farm units in the United States has declined by about one-fifth since 1960 and the trend shows no sign of abating. So now it is fashionable in administration circles to talk about the improvement in net income per farm. If a pie is cut into a smaller number of pieces, obviously each slice will be larger. This is the statistical gimmick which is being used today to make it appear that farm income is steadily improving.

Another point which the administration conveniently overlooks—and this gets back to inflation again—is the fact that the $14 billion in net farm income reported for 1965 will buy only about as much as the $12.675 billion farmers earned in 1958. Inflation has chipped about 10 percent from the purchasing power of the dollar since 1957–59, the base period which the Government uses in computing its consumer price index. Inflation hits farmers just as hard as it hits urban residents.

Disenchantment with administration farm programs is illustrated in the refusal of many farmers to sign up for the 1966 feed grains program. The Secretary expressed some alarm over this in his recent Farmers Union speech. During the first two-thirds of the 1965 signup, 936,114 farms with a total base of 52.4 million acres came into the program. During the same period of the current signup, which ends April 1, 903,038 farms with a total feed grain base of around 46 million acres were enrolled. According to the Department of Agriculture's recent report of "farmers intention to plant," indications are that corn acreage will be up about 2½ percent this year.

Apparently many farmers are getting tired of participating in a program which requires them to reduce their planted acreage only to have the Secretary of Agriculture come along with a massive feed grain dumping program which clobbers market prices for their crop. Farmers may have decided that if Orville Freeman is determined to push prices down, their only alternative is to produce and market more bushels in an effort to increase income.

There is little doubt that the current corn-dumping program is designed not only as an exercise in unauthorized price control but also as a device to club farmers into compliance with the feed grains program. Appearing before the House Agriculture Committee nearly a year ago, the Secretary candidly admitted this was the purpose of the 1961–62 grain dumping operation. He said:

> We purposely sold in order to move our prices down far enough so that they would be way below the support level, the loan level, so that we could thereby get compliance. That was the whole intent and purpose and thrust of the program.

From the beginning of the crop year last October 1, through March 11, 1966, Commodity Credit Corporation sold 290 million bushels of corn for unrestricted domestic use, plus an additional 54 million bushels for export. During the single week ending March 4, CCC sales totaled 79 million bushels of corn. These sales were made in direct competition with farmer marketings and at a time when there would normally be a seasonal rise in corn prices. Instead, corn prices have dropped about 10 cents per bushel under the weight of Government selling.

By concentrating its heaviest sales in the January–February–March quarter, CCC has preempted much of the commercial corn market which farmers would otherwise supply from their own stocks. The Government's uncommitted inventory of corn was down to 215 million bushels by March 11 and must be considerably lower today. If CCC continues its present rate of corn dumping, the bottom of the bin will be reached shortly. The Government may be out of corn—with no uncommitted reserve supply—before the 1966 crop is even in the ground. This may be Mr. Freeman's concept of the ever-normal granary but it was not Henry Wallace's.

At the very time the administration is seeking legislation "to establish and maintain reserve stocks of agricultural commodities for national security," the Secretary of Agriculture is completing the liquidation of the Government's reserve supply of corn. It makes you wonder if the telephone line between the White House and the Department of Agriculture has gone dead.

In recent months, the copper and aluminum industries have had a taste of the same bitter medicine that farmers have been swallowing for several years. Dumping and threats of dumping Government stockpiles have been employed as a price-control mechanism. In the absence of specific legislative authority to control prices, the administration has used, insofar as possible, the sale of Government stockpiled commodities to impose price ceilings. The process has worked to some degree, on a selective basis, up to now. But there are relatively few sectors of the economy which can be singled out for this kind of treatment. The Government has no inventory of automobiles, homes, television sets, clothing or professional services which can be fed into the market to control prices. Neither does it have an inventory of manpower which can be thrown into the job market as a means of controlling wages.

The administration has clearly indicated it will continue to push for increased Federal expenditures on the home front at the same time it is channeling more and more billions of dollars into the war in Vietnam. The Nation's economy is in another inflationary spiral which will not be halted by efforts to deflate or control farm prices and metals prices alone.

Are we fast moving toward the time when all-out wage and price controls will be sought by the administration as the only alternative to galloping inflation?

POWER PLAY

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD what I consider to be an extremely well written article that appeared in the March 29 issue of the Wall Street Journal. It is based on a recent decision of the Supreme Court of Colorado that an electric generating plant constructed by a group of rural electric cooperatives would simply duplicate the already existing capacity of investor-owned utility corporations serving the area. This article shows how far the Rural Electrification Administration has strayed from its original purpose; namely, to bring electric power to family farms. More than 98 percent of the Nation's farms now have electricity, but the REA's program continues to expand as it builds more generating and transmission facilities that to a large extent serve nonfarm and nonrural areas and encroach more and more on fully taxed, investor-owned utility companies that have to pay the full market rate for the money that finances them.

In contrast to the investor-owned electric utility companies, REA cooperatives are financed with money borrowed from the Federal Government at the fantastically low rate of 2 percent. Yet the Government itself is now paying close to 5 percent on vast sums it owes the public. A bill that I introduced last January 6, 1965 (H.R. 1738), would put an end to this ridiculous 2-percent subsidy.

In its three decades of existence REA has advanced some $4.5 billion of loans to these cooperatives, and it estimates that its borrowers will want more than $3 billion of such loans in the next 15 years. If allowed to continue, what does this octopuslike growth, nurtured on 2-percent borrowings, presage, not only for the investor-owned electric utility companies but also, perhaps, for the whole system of free private enterprise?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 29, 1966]

POWER PLAY—COLORADO CASE SHOWS REA HAS STRAYED FROM ORIGINAL AIM

(By Roger W. Benedict)

High in the Colorado Rockies, just west of the Continental Divide, a new coal-fired 150,000-kilowatt powerplant sends out a steady flow of electricity for customers as far away as Nevada.

Until a few weeks ago, this 9-month-old plant, which with its network of long-distance transmission lines represents an investment of about $30.5 million, was the pride of thousands of the area's local residents, who technically own a share of it. But now it's suddenly become the source of considerable uneasiness to farmers and townspeople across much of the western slope, and even in neighboring States.

Last month, the Colorado Supreme Court ruled that use in the project of $22,867,000 of Federal funds was illegal, and that the State's public utilities commission erred in approving its construction. Now even the plant's most ardent backers hesitate to predict what's to become of it.

"This has been quite a shock to this community," reports Ora K. Harris, a lumber dealer in nearby Craig, Colo., one of the few who opposed the plant. "Most of the people around here knew this wasn't a feasible project, but they were spooked into supporting it as a boon to the local economy," he asserts. "Now they're worried about what's going to happen."

How the steamplant at Hayden, Colo., came into being is a murky, complex tale that's been largely shrouded in Government secrecy. But the controversy surrounding it is one of interest to power users and taxpayers throughout the country.

The Federal funds involved were borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration by Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Montrose, Colo., a group of 13 rural electric cooperatives and 1 public power district, which has taken preparatory steps toward appealing the Colorado Supreme Court decision to the U.S. Supreme Court.

If the ruling is upheld, it will become the most significant in the stormy 30-year history of REA, and it could well shape the future course of the federally financed rural electrification program. But even should it be overturned, the Colorado-Ute case holds significance far beyond its legal impact—which is limited by a number of factors—as it has become the focal point of a private versus public power controversy over the aims and purposes of REA.

THE POINTS OF LAW

The points of law in question are important, to be sure. The Colorado decision "confirms that it is in the public interest for a State to prevent unnecessary duplication of utility facilities that waste the consumer's money," declares Robert T. Person, president of Public Service Co. of Colorado, in Denver, one of the utilities that brought suit against the State commission. Mr. Person also heads the Edison Electric Institute, trade group for the investor-owned segment of the power industry.

"If REA must withhold funds in any project in litigation, as this decision holds, then utilities can simply stop up the whole program of REA-financed generating plants and transmission lines, through endless legal maneuvers," concedes Charles Robinson, staff engineer and general counsel for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C., trade group for 997 co-ops borrowing from REA.

Potential impact of the decision is tempered, however, by two factors: Utility commissions of only 16 other States, like Colorado, regulate rural electric cooperatives; Federal courts have repeatedly declined to rule on similar cases, holding that the actions of REA are accountable only to Congress.

As a result, the Colorado-Ute case may prove more important as part of a growing controversy over the marked changes that have occurred in the REA program since its inception. Both sides agree that REA is no longer what it started out to be, but they sharply disagree over what it has become.

REA was set up in 1935 as a means of encouraging, through Federal loans, the extension of power distribution lines to farms and rural areas lacking central station service. But it now makes subsidized outlays mainly to build powerplants and long-distance transmission lines that provide service primarily to nonfarmers.

In the last 5 years, REA has nearly doubled the Federal investment in rural powerplants and high voltage powerlines to $1.7 billion, which exceeds the funds Congress has appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and amounts to more than 43 percent of the total $3.9 billion REA has loaned for distribution lines over the first 30 years of the program. REA estimates its borrowers will need an additional $3.1 billion of such loans over the next 15 years.

Almost two-thirds of the 5.4 million customers served by REA borrowers are not farmers, and increasingly these borrowers are competing with conventional utilities to hook up suburban housing projects, factories, and shopping centers. At present 98.2 percent of the Nation's 3.3 million farms have central station power—about half of it supplied by REA borrowers—up from 11 percent of the 6.8 million farms when REA was launched.

REA borrowers get 35-year loans at 2 percent interest, although similar money currently costs the U.S. Treasury about 4.6 percent; over 95 percent of REA's loans have gone to cooperatives and public power agencies which are exempt from Federal income taxes; and unrecoverable costs of the REA program to the Federal Government, even after all loans are repaid, is already approaching $400 million.

Rural electric co-ops, which have received over 90 percent of REA's loans, view the program's new mission as a "socioeconomic" one not unlike the antipoverty program. They note that rural areas have over half the Nation's poverty and about two-thirds of its unemployment, and they assert that subsidized help and loans to build generating plants are necessary to their task.

"If it were not for generating and transmitting loans, the rates cooperatives pay for electricity purchased from utilities would be substantially higher than they are," asserts Mr. Robinson. "Without low wholesale rates on power," he says, "it just wouldn't be feasible to serve many rural areas." He notes that a recent survey shows co-ops average only 3.3 customers and $460 of revenues per mile of line, compared with 33.2 customers and $7,164 of revenues per mile for commercial utilities.

But utility executives charge that the new concept of REA is a far less beneficent one in which REA loans for generating plants and transmission lines have become the means of obtaining Federal financing for power projects Congress has refused to authorize for Federal power agencies. They say REA is now spending more for such projects than the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation.

CONGRESS' INTENTION

"Congress never intended that the Rural Electrification Act be used as a backdoor means of building a nationwide, federally subsidized electric system," declares Mr. Person. "The Colorado-Ute case brings into sharp focus the way in which REA officials have acted by administrative fiat to accomplish their aims in complete disregard of the law."

That such angry comments have some validity is indicated by the way the Hayden plant came into being. Prior to undertaking the project, Colorado-Ute was made up of just five small co-ops in northwestern Colorado, and was operating well in the red. Obviously too small to build a 150,000 kilowatt generating plant, it set out to build up its membership.

One new member was a subsidiary of Salt River Project Agricultural & Power District, serving over 100,000 customers in suburban areas of booming Phoenix, Ariz., 700 miles away. Colorado-Ute agreed to sell Salt River one-third of the plant's power at less than half the price to its co-op members, in return for a one-third investment in the plant. Another was Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc., made up of three co-ops in southeastern Colorado, across the Rockies. It, too, got a special low price.

Colorado-Ute also added seven more distribution co-ops. Why did they join? "We were informed that we'd no longer be able to buy power at low prices under our co-op preference rights from the Bureau of Reclamation," reports Mr. Harris, a director of Yampa Valley Electric Association, Inc., one of the seven. "But after the powerplant deal was completed, the Bureau of Reclamation said it was willing to sell us all the power we wanted at a price that's about half what the Hayden power costs us—but, of course, it was too late to do anything about it."

As a further inducement, Colorado-Ute bought Yampa Valley's powerplant "which was just junk" for $250,000, Mr. Harris reports. Colorado-Ute offered $1 million for three other co-op plants. Its offer for facilities of Bridger Valley Electric Association in Wyoming, however, was rejected by the Wyoming Public Utilities Commission, which noted that Bridger Valley could buy power cheaper from the Federal dam at Flaming Gorge than from Colorado-Ute, and pointed out that Colorado-Ute's indebtedness exceeded its assets by $2.1 million.

Mr. Harris, one of two directors on Colorado-Ute's 24-man board to oppose the Hayden project, asserts that most co-op members didn't know about all this maneuvering. "The whole thing was a crash project promoted, formulated, and pressured by REA officials, the Bureau of Reclamation, Salt River and the coal industry," he charges.

RECLAMATION BUREAU'S ROLE

Why would the Bureau of Reclamation be interested in promoting such a project? It, like all other Federal power agencies, got into the power business through hydroelectric projects incidental to dams purportedly built for flood control, navigation, and irrigation. Congress has refused to permit any Federal agency other than TVA to build coal-fired electric plants. But hydro power is principally useful when interconnected with coal-fired plants. Utilities also note that the country has nearly run out of economically feasible hydro projects, due to advances in power technology.

"REA is being used to get coal-fired plants to firm up Federal hydro power in an all-public power network," charges Edwin Vennard, executive vice president and general manager of Edison Electric Institute. "And not one of REA's loans for generating plants can be justified on the basis of either need or economics. Utilities are selling co-ops power for a lower average price than the average cost of generating electricity in REA-financed plants, and we have ample reserve supplies to handle their future needs."

Co-ops buy 43 percent of their power from utilities, 39 percent from Federal power projects and generate 18 percent.

The Colorado-Ute case is only the latest in a series of recent setbacks for REA. Senator HOLLAND, Democrat of Florida, chairman of a Senate Appropriations subcommittee, criticized REA this month for failing to follow special directives Congress placed on generating and transmitting loans in 1963. President Johnson has clamped a $270 million limit on REA loans in the current fiscal year, and recommended a cut to $220 million for fiscal 1967. And Congress has been critical of co-ops that invest or lend at higher interest rates part of the 2-percent money they get from REA.

REA could also be in more hot water in Indiana, where litigation is pending before the State supreme court on a $60 million power project that's already under construction.

"But don't underrate the durability of REA," says Mr. Vennard. Noting that fewer than 70,000 U.S. farms still lack central power, he adds, "REA's a classic example of the fact that Government agencies don't fade away when their original purpose has been accomplished—they simply find something else to do."

ADAM YARMOLINSKY

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week, some uncomplimentary remarks were made on this floor concerning a gentleman who is about to become a constituent of mine by virtue of the fact that he has been appointed a professor at the Harvard Law School. I refer to Mr. Adam Yarmolinsky, formerly special assistant to the Secretary of Defense, and now Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Some remarks were also made about Harvard University which belittled the important contributions members of that university have made to this country over many years.

Mr. Yarmolinsky has given distinguished and patriotic service to our Government over the last 5 years. Our late, beloved President, John F. Kennedy, had sufficient confidence in him to make him one of the key members of the group that sought out talented men to staff the highest levels of government. After completing this assignment for the President, Mr. Yarmolinsky was appointed to one of these important and sensitive positions himself as the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense. In this position, he was involved in projects vital to the defense of the United States, and acquitted himself with distinction. He advised the Secretary of Defense on critical aspects of the situation in Cuba during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. He was responsible for the primary stages of the reorganization of our civil defense program at a time when there was great concern over the inadequacy of civil defense preparations during the Berlin crisis of 1962. He also served as chief of the U.S. emergency relief mission to the Dominican Republic in 1965—a mission which made a significant contribution to restoring a measure of stability in that island after American troops were sent there.

President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara would not have given Mr. Yarmolinsky these and other delicate assignments unless they had the utmost confidence in his loyalty and patriotism, his ability and judgment. Mr. Yarmolinsky performed these assignments in a manner that justified their trusts.

His other contributions to the country have been valuable and wide-ranging. Eleven years ago, he headed a study of the Government security system which was highly praised in many quarters and which illustrated his personal commitment to a strong, fair, and effective loyalty and security program. More recently, he worked in the task force that set up the antipoverty program and was a key architect of many of the important innovations in that field.

Mr. Yarmolinsky will be leaving Government this summer, at his own request, to spend some time in academic life. I am personally delighted that he is becoming a constituent of mine. I think the Republic owes him a debt of gratitude. He was one of that group of young men of great talent and love of country who worked night and day to make the administration over the last 5 years a success.

At Harvard Law School he will join many other distinguished men including the former Solicitor General of the United States, Archibald Cox, former Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Robert Bowie, and the former legal adviser to the State Department, Abram Chayes, former counsel to the Department of State. All these men are terrifically able and loyal.

It is easy to repeat old canards about Harvard University. I prefer to recount its actual contributions. This university, through its superbly talented faculty, has continually performed important work for the country as well as turning out future leaders of the Nation.

I know there are many Members who join me in wishing Mr. Yarmolinsky well and in hoping that he will be able to continue to advance the security and welfare of the Nation in his new position as he did so oustandingly over the last 5 years.

LIBERAL PENSIONS FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND KOREAN CONFLICT

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced four measures calling for more liberal pensions for certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their survivors.

We have seen to it that the cost of living increase over the years has been taken care of in increased payments for those people dependent upon social security and there is now legislation before the Congress to adjust the pension payments of railroad retirees. We have adjusted the pay of Government employees and those receiving welfare assistance. We have adjusted the pay of those men now serving in our Armed Forces. Private industry has taken care of its employees by and large. But nothing has been done for many veterans who are dependent upon pension payments. Their cost of living has increased but their pensions have remained static. I feel that it is necessary for us to remember the veterans who gave so much when called upon to defend this country.

I have also introduced a measure calling for a special pension for the veterans of World War I, the passage of which, I feel, is imperative if we are to provide for these veterans, and their survivors, a decent, dignified existence in return for what they have done for their country. Those men were thrown into battle, in many cases ill equipped and poorly trained, and they did a yeoman's job in stemming the tide of the German armies in France. We will always remember the battles they fought. Let us not forget the men that fought them.

As these men grow older—the average age of the veterans of World War I is now 72—they become less and less able to provide for themselves and their families. If we do not at least start paying off the tremendous debt we owe these men we will soon find that it is too late.

U.S. COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for U.S. participation in the International Year for Human Rights to be observed in 1968.

This legislation is a direct outgrowth of a report made by the Committee on Human Rights to the White House Conference on International Cooperation which was held last November. This ad hoc group of distinguished private citizens suggested a number of ways in which the United States could take action to further universal respect for the rule of law.

The year 1968 was selected for International Human Rights Year by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations on July 28, 1965, and commemorates the 20th anniversary of the covenant: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Following passage of the United Nations' resolution, the International Commission of Jurists in Geneva, Switzerland, announced that a worldwide campaign would be undertaken and urged that 11 nations plan organized activity to explore the status of human rights and suggest ways to strengthen adherence to them.

In conjunction with the United Nations resolution, the U.S. Committee on Human Rights would be responsible for formulating effective programs for this country's meaningful participation in the efforts to advance international human rights. To accomplish this, the Committee would be authorized to conduct hearings and seminars, and enlist the cooperation of all departments of Government which might be involved. A final report would be submitted to the President not later than July 1967.

Action is needed now, at this session, because planning must be done sufficiently in advance of the start of the observance to insure the United States an active role and a place of leadership in the events of this important year.

My bill would provide for a committee of 11 members, 4 chosen from the legislative branch—2 from the House and 2 from the Senate—and 7 private citizens appointed by the President. The members would be representative of all sectors of American life, and some should be knowledgeable in international law.

In joining in International Human Rights Year, this Nation will be reaffirming a commitment to inherent universal human or individual rights which was made in our earliest days, and which remains the framework in which our laws are drawn and enforced.

Although we have on occasion, in some areas of our national life, neglected this concept, and have, for instance, delayed acting on several pending international human rights conventions, it is nevertheless the idea which prevails in all our pronouncements of the hope which we hold for the world's development.

Involvement in International Human Rights Year will afford us the opportunity to reassert our belief in the fundamental worth of the individual and his importance before the law. It will also enable us to help disseminate this idea to other parts of the world, particularly to the less developed nations, who sometimes tend to put this concept aside in favor of more immediate achievement and progress in the material sense.

I cannot suggest strongly enough that we act at this session to establish the U.S. Committee on Human Rights, and I am happy to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman Seymour Halpern, in supporting this measure.

I include a copy of the bill:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Section 1. That, in order to provide for effective and coordinated preparation for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968, designated by the General Assembly of the United Nations as "International Human Rights Year", there is hereby established an advisory and coordinating committee, to be known as the "United States Committee on Human Rights" (herein referred to as the "Committee").

MEMBERSHIP

Sec. 2. (a) The Committee shall consist of eleven members, as follows:

(1) Two Members of the House of Representatives, one from each political party, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(2) Two Members of the Senate, one from each political party, appointed by the President of the Senate; and

(3) Seven members appointed from private life by the President of the United States.

(b) The Committee shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(c) A vacancy in the Committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) The Committee is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as it deems advisable to conduct its activities.

(e) Members of the Committee each shall be entitled to receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of the powers and duties of the Committee, including travel time, and may receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

POWERS AND DUTIES

Sec. 3. The Committee is authorized and directed to conduct studies and formulate plans for effective and coordinated participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year". In the conduct of its activities, the Committee is authorized to—

(1) conduct studies, seminars, and meetings with appropriate parties in order to provide for effective participation in the observance of International Human Rights Year at the Federal, State, and local levels of government in the United States;

(2) explore the role of the United States in defining, expressing, and expanding the application of human rights principles in the United States and throughout the world;

(3) review past and present policies of the United States with respect to the universal application and preservation of human rights principles; and

(4) take such other action and conduct such other activities as may be appropriate to provide a basis for the observance by the United States of International Human Rights Year.

COOPERATION WITH COMMITTEE BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Sec. 4. (a) The Committee is authorized to request any department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government to furnish suggestions and information to the Committee in carrying out the functions of the Committee under this Act. The head of each such department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such suggestions and information to the Committee upon request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

(b) Upon request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Committee, the head of each department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government shall otherwise cooperate with the Committee in the performance of the functions of the Committee and shall provide the Committee with such additional assistance and services as may be available.

STAFF OF COMMITTEE

Sec. 5. (a) The Committee shall appoint an executive secretary without regard to the civil service laws, prescribe his duties, and fix his compensation at a rate not to exceed the maximum rate payable under the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (79 Stat. 1111, 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)).

(b) The Committee is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, and fix the compensation, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such personnel as it deems advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Committee may procure, in accordance with section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), the temporary or intermittent services of experts and consultants. Individuals so employed shall be paid compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Committee but not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2), for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

REPORT AND TERMINATION OF COMMITTEE

Sec. 6. (a) The Committee shall submit to the President, not later than July 1, 1967, for transmittal to the Congress, a report of the activities of the Committee under this Act, together with its recommendations, including recommendations as to the manner in which the most effective and coordinated participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year" may be accomplished and including recommendations as to the means by which the United States may contribute most effectively to the acceptance, observance, practice, and enforcement of the principles of human rights throughout the world in "International Human Rights Year" and thereafter.

(b) From and after the submission of its report to the President under subsection (a), the Committee shall, under the direction of the President, continue as an informational and coordinating clearinghouse and center of United States participation in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year" and, to carry out such purpose, shall perform such additional duties as the President may impose upon it.

(c) The Committee shall cease to exist at the close of December 31, 1968.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this Act.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Ellsworth] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 28 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives joined Congressman Robert T. Stafford, of Vermont, and me in a statement calling for a full-scale congressional investigation of the Selective Service System.

The 28 Members who joined with us on that statement are Representatives John B. Anderson, of Illinois; Mark Andrews, of North Dakota; James F. Battin, of Montana; Alphonzo Bell, of California; Laurence J. Burton, of Utah; William T. Cahill, of New Jersey; Barber B. Conable, Jr., of New York; Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri; Paul Findley, of Illinois; Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey; Charles E. Goodell, of New York; William H. Harsha, of Ohio; Frank Horton, of New York; Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts; Theodore Kupferman, of New York; Clark MacGregor, of Minnesota; William S. Mailliard, of California; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland; Joseph M. McDade, of Pennsylvania; Chester L. Mize, of Kansas; F. Bradford Morse, of Massachusetts; Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota; Ogden R. Reid, of New York; Howard W. Robison, of New York; Donald Rumsfeld, of Illinois; Herman Schneebeli, of Pennsylvania; Richard S. Schweiker, of Pennsylvania; and J. William Stanton, of Ohio.

Chairman Rivers, of the House Armed Services Committee, has announced that the Director of the Selective Service, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, will shortly be asked to appear before his committee, and that on the basis of General Hershey's testimony the committee will be able to decide whether a full-scale congressional investigation should be undertaken.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House the broad popular support for our proposal to undertake a congressional investigation of the draft. The proposal has received almost uniform endorsement by daily newspapers across the country.

Under unanimous consent I insert at this place in the Record selected editorials to this effect from 31 separate newspapers:

[From the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal, Mar. 3, 1966]

Demand Draft Probe

Thirty Republican Congressmen made out a pretty strong case in demanding an investigation of Selective Service.

Among their charges: The Pentagon is "not making maximum efficient use" of present personnel—for instance 9,000 enlisted men holding jobs in officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, golf courses, and commissary stores. Nearly 280,000 men classified 1–A are not available for the draft because their papers are "stalled in the beaureaucratic pipeline."

The GOP Congressmen cited several other reasons. But those two alone seem to bear out their contention there is "mounting evidence of gross inefficiency" in the draft system—certainly enough to warrant a prompt and thorough investigation.

[From the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette, Mar. 8, 1966]

Preliminary Probe

The request of 30 Republican Members of the House of Representatives for an investigation of the Selective Service System and its contribution to the war effort has been taken under advisement by the House Armed Services Committee. Representative L. Mendel Rivers, of South Carolina, the chairman, said the committee will hear Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey and then decide whether to investigate the military draft.

Hearing Hershey is itself an investigation of the draft, for he has been head of the service for a quarter of a century. He has directed the draft of 13 million young men—for World War II, Korea, and now Vietnam. He has pledged his cooperation to the committee, should it decide on a full investigation.

His ideas on the draft are well known. He is intolerant toward those who deliberately break the draft law—misguided adolescents who should be spanked, or maybe inducted. He fears that to most Americans, the Vietnam war is distant and dim and about unfamiliar people—much like the Korean war, with similar problems.

No doubt Hershey can clear up any questions about the workings of the draft. That it is essential and will be continued, there is no question.

[From the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald, Mar. 9, 1966]

Draft Discrimination Cry Misses the Mark

Rising draft quotas have led recently to growing pressures for congressional scrutiny of the Selective Service System. There are even suggestions that Gen. Lewis Hershey, who symbolizes Selective Service as J. Edgar Hoover symbolizes the FBI, might be asked to retire.

A close look at the draft and the way it is working certainly seems valid. There do seem to be problems of redtape gumming up the efficiency of the System.

Yet some of the criticisms are contradictory. One kick is that General Hershey has too much power to set draft policy, but another gripe is that inequities result from the fact that local boards are independent. A man drafted in one city might have been deferred in another.

It has become fashionable recently to bemoan the alleged fact that the draft favors the young men from families financially better off, since they can afford college and thus be deferred. The poor are "discriminated against," according to this theory, because they can't afford to go to college and get student deferment.

Andrew Tully indulges in this softheaded sophistry in his National Whirligig column today. It's a classic in muddleheaded generalization, in our opinion.

Let's overlook the fact that plenty of college students are getting their education on a shoestring created by their own efforts. College attendance is no proof of family affluence, nor is spending the day in a pool hall evidence that a fellow is disadvantaged and therefore shouldn't be drafted.

OK, forget the note on economics. But let's not forget the fact that college deferment until graduation do not necessarily let a young man off the hook forever. When he graduates, he is susceptible to drafting or callup if in a Reserve officer program.

But why should being called up for service in a time of national need be considered punishment, anyway? Actually, it's an opportunity—particularly for those underprivileged youths who have two strikes against them in civilian life. Now that a cold war GI bill is on its way, those who want an education after their service tour is done will have it financed by the Government.

And for many young men who haven't worked out a useful civilian niche for themselves, the military offers a lifetime career that can provide advancement, acceptance of responsibility, security, and satisfaction. Are we to believe it is a hardship for a young man to be snatched out of the slums of Harlem or the depressed villages of Appalachia, issued a uniform, given three square meals a day, trained to be a self-reliant soldier, and given a sense of pride and purpose?

True, the prudent man would not choose to place himself in position to be shot by Communists if any honorable alternative existed. Nor is the pay, in terms of dollars or piasters, adequate to compensate for long jungle marches. The pay in personal pride is something else.

And despite the tragedy and brutality of combat, by far the greater number will come back in better physical and mental condition than they went in. They will have won new self-respect from a sense of having contributed to something important.

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, Mar. 3, 1966]

A Game of Drafts

The call of 30 Republican Representatives, including Howard W. Robison, of Owego, for a congressional inquiry into the workings of selective service appears to be timely, and well justified by the widespread misgivings about the system.

The GOP contingent denies partisan intent and we hope it is possible to start a nonpartisan, searching examination of how military manpower needs should be filled.

The problem boils down to this: The burden of performing military service should be shared as fairly as possible, but the business of drafting some young men and not others of the same age and qualifications is clearly unfair.

The critical Representatives stress the inequities of selective service, in asking for an investigation by the House Armed Services Committee.

This is a good time to look into the matter. In peacetime, the draft is little thought about because relatively few are taken and those that are, put in a quiet couple of years before discharge.

In an all-out war, just about everyone has to go into service anyway. In this period of undeclared, limited warfare, however, everybody is thinking about the draft and the related possibility of combat service even while many escape being called.

It is important, for the sake of public confidence in the Government, for the Selective Service System to operate with scrupulous fairness according to well-understood rules.

At present, too much is left to chance (bureaucratic and geographical) and to the whims of local draft boards. The GOP House Members said that, of almost 550,000 young men classified 1–A in the draft, nearly 400,000 either have not yet been examined or are considered not available because their papers are stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline.

Knowledge that this is the way it works does not help the morale of the young man on his way to Vietnam, whose draft board saw to it that he was examined and his papers were not "stalled."

In Broome County, the month-to-month draft quotas have fluctuated wildly, with no apparent relation to national draft figures, since the start of the Vietnam buildup last summer. (The Broome quota was 31 in December, 92 in January, 23 in February.) This has never been explained fully, but apparently results in part from the numbers examined and "available" to be called in a given month.

Mr. Robison and his colleagues apparently have a point in complaining about a lack of clear priorities in drawing on various pools of manpower. There can be arguments about whether a specific group of young men should be drafted or not, but surely the rules that govern this should be spelled out clearly and applied nationally.

The statement of Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, national Selective Service Director, that "absolute equity has never been attained," does not reduce the need for improving the draft system. The whole idea is to get a little closer to "absolute equity."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Mar. 5, 1966]

Investigating the Draft

The House Armed Services Committee Monday opens regular hearings on the Nation's military posture. This time the inquiry will take in, among other things, charges by 30 Republican committee members that Selective Service is being run in a haphazard, inefficient manner and is seriously bogged down in redtape. The charges certainly merit a careful scrutiny.

In a statement issued this week, the Congressmen charged that more than half the men between 19 and 26 now classified 1–A are "not available" for the draft because "their papers are stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline between local draft boards and Army induction centers."

The Republican members also questioned plans to reexamine present deferments, arguing that enough men would be available now to meet induction and enlistment quotas if present procedures were used efficiently.

They pointed to a report by the Comptroller General's Office which said the Army, Navy, and Air Force were using about 9,000 enlisted personnel to work in officers' clubs, hobby shops, golf courses, and similar jobs, rather than hiring civilians for them. This report, they emphasized, considered only the most flagrant inefficiencies in the use of manpower; there are undoubtedly many more instances. Said the Republican members:

"It is ridiculous for the Department of Defense to insist upon drafting young men to be hurried into combat when it is not making maximum efficient use of the trained personnel it already has."

Presumably Selective Service officials will have some answers to these charges when they testify before the committee. But the charges obviously call for a thorough hearing that is also nonpartisan.

We hope the fact that these charges came from Republican Congressmen doesn't mean the Democrats will feel constrained to belittle them—or that the draft will become the center of a new hawks-versus-doves controversy.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Mar. 2, 1966]

Draft Needs Restudy

Congress Democrats and the administration should heed the demand of 30 House Republicans for an early investigation into the draft. It is an issue close to the hearts of the American people, and discontent is rising.

To charges that hundreds of thousands of potentially useful young men are escaping the draft through poorly drawn regulations, the Congressmen have added a sharply worded charge of bureaucratic bungling. Their statement declared: "According to figures supplied by General Hershey there are 545,000 men between 19 and 25 now classified 1–A. Of these, 117,825 have not yet been examined and another 279,676 are not available for the draft because their papers are stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline between local draft boards and Army induction centers."

Granting that draft officials should take time to be as fair as possible to the individual, the half-million men in 1–A would more than fill the manpower requirements for the next year. Congress will be justified in inquiring why fresh reclassifications have been set at such a high level when this reservoir exists.

Congress should also review Draft Director Hershey's proposed new program for massive interruption of college careers.

The philosophy prevailing until now has been that college students earnestly and successfully working for degrees were a special kind of national asset in an era when demands for highly educated manpower are skyrocketing. If the military needs are judged to be sufficiently great, the students should be drafted as needed, of course. But the public deserves a clear showing that the need is valid, and not created by bungling in selective service.

We believe that General Hershey, President Johnson, and Congress should bear in mind that today's circumstances are far different psychologically from the circumstances of December 1941.

Now there is no declared war, no manifest threat to the homeland, no clear connection between an all-out war effort and the avoidance of national calamity.

In these circumstances the public is likely to measure its sacrifices more carefully, and demand a clearer showing of need and of equity for such sacrifices as are asked. In the particular case of the draft, criticism has been building up—increasingly insistent and increasingly pointed as to alleged inequities and faults in administration. Now, as the manpower buildup gets underway, is the time for the faults to be brought into the open, studied, and remedied.

[From the Danville (Va.) Bee, Mar. 2, 1966]

About the Draft

The present Selective Service System "is haphazard and mired in a jungle of redtape"—at least that's what 30 Republicans in the House of Representatives are claiming.

For most of a quarter century, the draft has been in force. Although it was accepted as a "necessary evil" during World War II, the System was under constant attack as new classifications were called up. In 1948, the System was revived and proved its worth during the Korean action. Afterwards, when the calls fell to a trickle, there were few complaints, however, revisions were made as needed.

Escalation of the Vietnam war has resulted in large draft calls. Now, as the available pool of 19 to 26 year olds is being drained, other groups hitherto deferred are feeling a hot wind on their necks. Howls are heard and charges are hurled.

The GOP House Members have responded with four major complaints:

1. The Defense Department is using qualified fighting men in recreational and commissary jobs. (What this has to do with the Selective Service System is not clear.)

2. Nearly 280,000 men have been classified 1–A without being called because their papers are "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline." (The draft is designed to call men orderly, fairly, and as needed—not to grab everyone in sight at one time. It is quite likely that many in this group are the very ones fighting the hardest now to stay out.)

3. "There does not appear to be a clear order of priority," say the Congressmen. (A quick glance at the World Almanac refutes this. The framework is clear and local draft boards, made up of honorable citizens in thankless volunteer work, consider each case on its merits.)

4. Tests to determine deferments of college students discriminate, it is claimed, favoring those in courses of possible later military value. (If this is true, it still makes sense to develop these, rather than let college be a haven for those who attend solely to skirt the draft.)

Drafts always have been and probably will be unpopular—especially when the individual sees his name nearing the top of the list.

It is hoped here that the Republican Congressmen are truly sincere, rather than attacking an unpopular cause for political reasons.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Mar. 4, 1966]

Draft Law Needs New Look, Muller Says

(By Will Muller)

A group of House Members, unfortunately partisan in composition, is urging a congressional restudy of the military draft law and the fairness of its impact.

Stripped of political connotations—it is proposed by Republicans—the idea has obvious merit. The present Selective Service Act expires July 1, 1967.

The present act will either be extended—the easy way out of the past—or replaced.

The intervening 16 months is a short time in which to formulate and enact a military conscription policy for a changing world.

Daily, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, is battered by criticism, direct or implied. Some of it comes from his own Government, some from the Congress which wrote the draft formula he has administered so faithfully for so many years.

Asked whether he thought Selective Service should be reorganized, General Hershey replied, "No. You would not do something to something that's working."

This country owes much to General Hershey. He won its trust in World War II and has held it in the intervening years. One thing the country owes him is an updated draft law recognizing both equity and the altered requirements of limited wars.

The inclination of the military to retain old ways is axiomatic. It explains retention of U.S. cavalry units up to World War II even though the horse had met the machinegun in World War I.

The conscription system has been little changed from the total war conception of World War II, even though the one-handed, business-as-usual Korean fighting intervened. There remains unanswered the nagging question of how fairly to spread the limited manpower demands of limited war over all available as is done in all-out emergency.

The conviction prevailed from the Civil War to recent years that money and influence protected the privileged. Now arises the contention that membership in an intellectual aristocracy is the new refuge.

Late in December, the Selective Service said those volunteering for the Peace Corps or to train others in the war against poverty probably would not be drafted. But not exempted would be the less fortunate undergoing poverty war training. This is an odd ethic for teachers.

Selective Services concedes there are 2.2 million under educational deferment. It is proposed that the military fall back on Korean war precedent, draft those in the bottom bracket of scholastic standings.

Some are in the bottom bracket because they must both study and earn, some because their preparatory schools were inadequate. Some are slow learners. This raises the ethical question of whether the poor, the underprivileged and the C student are to be marked for the bullet by birth and circumstance.

Critics say that the present Selective Service Administration favors the science student over the liberal arts student for exemption. It is a greater catastrophe to send a promising nuclear student to die than another Alan Seeger, Joyce Kilmer, or Rupert Brooke? Is that what Congress intends?

Follow the philosophy of exempting the student to its ultimate end. Then our wars would be fought by school dropouts, by young men either unwilling or unable to go to college, or by those who have completed college and just started their careers. That, too, seems an odd formula.

For generations, this country has avoided universal military training, in peace or war. It has avoided the universal draft in wartime through a system of privileged, as well as obvious, exemptions. Though a more just system, that plan of universal conscription of manpower is hardly required in limited wars.

Discussion of the draft law's inequities by present social standards is almost universal in the land. It is a good time for Congress to wrestle with it in preparation for tomorrow.

It is the responsibility of Congress to declare wars, although some argue that responsibility has now been abdicated. It is the equal responsibility of Congress to devise beforehand as fair and sure a formula as humanly possible to decide who will fight them.

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) West Virginian, Mar. 5, 1966]

INVESTIGATING THE DRAFT

Holding that operation of the Selective Service System is neither "equitable nor efficient," a group of House Republicans have called for a congressional investigation. The point is well taken. The investigation should start with professional athletes who can take the heavy punishments of sports but who are allegedly physically disqualified for military service.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette, Mar. 3, 1966]

DRAFT REVIEW

Continued hassling over the Selective Service System can be expected until Congress finally gets around to making the System much more equitable.

No one likes a draft law, or the necessity for such a law. As long as the Government feels we need one, however, strenuous efforts should be made to have it as fair as possible.

We realize there will always be some inequities and there will always be those who are extremely unhappy about being called to active military service.

Nevertheless, there should be provisions in the System whereby everyone goes into some type of military obligation as soon as he reaches 18 or graduates from high school.

Putting every young man in the country into a program of active military training as soon as he graduates from high school or reaches 18 would, of course, put more men into the camps than the service is geared to handle. It could also cause a huge increase in the money required by the Armed Forces.

To put each young man into some type of active reserve duty, however, even if he did not go into full-time duty, would be more equitable than the system now in use.

The greatest inequities at the moment involve college students, including those who must maintain certain grades if they hope to finish their educations. What might be an "A" at one school, for instance, might bring only "C" at a school with higher standards. Keeping these young men on edge throughout their college studies is not going to do them or their schools any good.

Congress should accede to the wishes of those who would like to see a full-scale review of our current draft system.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald Dispatch, Mar. 4, 1966]

GOP DEMANDS PROBE OF DRAFT

There was never much doubt that Congress would approve the $4.8 billion requested by the administration for the Vietnam war. Only four House Members and two Senators—all Democrats—voted against the appropriation bill.

However, a sharp debate preceded passage of the bill in the House when Republicans demanded an investigation of draft procedures and said they wanted to determine what the administration is doing to obtain combat as well as noncombat manpower contributions from allied countries.

The Republican contingent said there is "mounting evidence of gross inefficiency in the Selective Service System and Defense Department administration of the draft."

Specifically, what Republicans would like to know is whether a redtape jungle has delayed the examination of more than 300,000 men classified as 1-A, or has stalled the transmission of their papers from local draft boards to induction centers.

They want to know whether it is necessary to reexamine numerous men who have been deferred but might be found to meet 1-A draft requirements. They ask what priorities have been established for calling various manpower groups for service and if such procedures are equitable in filling the 1-A pool.

They are curious about regulations which determine the availability of college students for drafting and demand to know when, if ever, the Defense Department plans to release results of a study of the Selective Service System which it began in 1964.

We believe the Republicans have asked questions which are in the minds of many people. They should, and no doubt will, insist on getting some straight answers.

[From the Jamestown (N.Y.) Post-Journal, Mar. 8, 1966]

DRAFT PROBE IN ORDER NOW

From all indications, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey intends to give little aid to any congressional investigation of the Selective Service System as proposed the other day in the House of Representatives. In fact, the longtime draft director took time out to go before television cameras and laugh off claims that the draft system is showing "mounting evidence of gross inefficiency."

There are others in the Government who would delay any investigation at the present time because of our involvement in the Vietnam war, claiming that now is not the time to delve into an operation which is performing the vital function of providing needed manpower for stepped-up military operations.

It seems to this newspaper that the opposite is true. Now, when the Selective Service System is operating at a stepped-up pace is the best time to determine if its methods are efficient and if it is performing in the best interests of all involved. Evidence that has come to light in the past few weeks would indicate that the Selective Service operation leaves something to be desired.

According to some Members of the House of Representatives, papers of thousands of draft age men are bottled up in a bureaucratic pipeline. This, if so, indicates that there is clear basis for claims of inefficiency on an administrative level.

Another situation which needs further explaining is the need to reexamine previously disqualified men when draft officials admit that nearly 445,000 men known to be physically and mentally qualified will be available through June 30. General Hershey's only answer to this is, "There does not appear to be a clear order of priority in which the administration is considering calling the various manpower groups for service."

One of the most valid points in favor of investigating the draft at this time is the charge that present procedures foster unfair treatment to certain individuals and groups. An example is the set of tests designed by the Selective Service System to aid local draft boards in deciding whether a college student should receive a deferment. General Hershey, himself, admits that these tests are easier for science students than for those taking liberal arts courses. Why, we would like to know, should draft tests be "loaded" in favor of a select group of students?

It is also difficult to understand the reasoning employed by Selective Service when it drafted a Midwest doctor who is the father of seven children. If this country was involved in all-out war with military manpower needs at a critical peak, then such an action would be understandable. At the present no such condition exists. In fact, there is ample evidence that the military is wasting a great deal of the manpower it already has.

A recent report by the General Accounting Office disclosed that the services were employing about 9,000 enlisted men in such nonmilitary activities as clerking in supermarkets and bowling alleys and tending bar, and waiting on tables in officers' clubs. Add to this many more thousands of highly trained specialists who are still required by the military to take time off from duties they were trained for to perform such menial tasks as kitchen police. While they are on KP, of course, their regular duties must be performed by equally highly trained specialists. This is efficiency?

Nearly 2 years ago President Johnson directed Defense Secretary Robert McNamara to make a study of the Selective Service System and offer recommendations to improve it. The Pentagon claims that the study has been completed, but General Hershey says he has never seen it. Even if he had seen it, it is doubtful that the draft director would voluntarily make changes in "his" system without prodding from Congress.

Members of Congress have ample reason to believe that many Selective Service procedures are inefficient and in need of change. The time to investigate and implement needed changes is now, not some future year when, hopefully, it returns to its between-war limbo status and is all but forgotten until need for it arises again.

[From the Lawrence (Kans.) Daily Journal-World, Mar. 1, 1966]

How About a Check?

If Republican congressional charges about selective service inefficiency are soundly based, the Johnson administration owes it to the American public to make some changes promptly.

Twenty-seven GOP Members of Congress, with Lawrence's Robert Ellsworth as spokesman, have outlined three "bones of contention" about what they consider inefficiencies and inequities in the draft system. Ellsworth first announced the step during a visit to Lawrence Monday and that matter was aired nationally at a press conference today in Washington.

The three points stressed by the GOP group:

While the Selective Service System talks about reclassification plans and increased draft calls, there appear to be some 279,000 men in 1–A classification whose papers are bogged down between their boards and their induction centers.

"This means 279,000 men are available right now if we can cut the inefficiency," Ellsworth said.

On December 31, 1965, the Comptroller General of the United States reported to Congress that the Army, Navy, and Air Force have over 9,000 enlisted men working at nonmilitary jobs like running officers' clubs, bowling alleys, golf courses, and such.

Except for South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand, none of the U.S. allies have any combat troops in South Vietnam and our European allies haven't even met their manpower commitments in Western Europe.

The most immediately disturbing of the three points to most Americans right now is the first—the charge that some 279,000 draft eligible young men already are snarled in Federal redtape while at the same time there are plans to ensnarl even more, probably at great cost and inconvenience.

Military service is a fact of life for virtually all young American males in this so-called "cold war" period, and it follows that everyone has to expect a certain amount of inconvenience, risk, and disruption of plans and timetables in the interest of defense and public welfare. But the Government owes it to the citizenry that pays the bills and supplies the men to minimize all this just as much as possible, with fair and efficient operation of the draft system.

Selective Service bungling, as charged by the Republican group, touches many lives in many frustrating ways.

Takes the student who is trying to complete his education; the young husband-father trying to get established on a new job; the businessman trying to keep a sound employee force. These are just a few of the examples. In a dangerous time of national emergency, all such people have to expect to make sacrifices of varying natures, but the Government owes it to them to keep the incidence as low as humanly possible.

Suppose there are as many 1–A young men available, as the Ellsworth group charges. Why not get maximum mileage from this group, with greater efficiency in Selective Service operations, before going into costly and inconveniencing reclassification and needless call-ups that waste manpower?

It would seem that such a 1–A pool could meet manpower needs for a long time to come, even with the Vietnam escalation, or at least until more thorough studies can be made to see just what needs will be. This could well be a case of the all-too-typical Government policy of using a shotgun to do the job of a rifle—of howling for far more than is necessary to make sure you get enough.

It will be interesting to see how the Johnson administration responds to these latest charges about the Selective Service setup.

Just about anyone who has been closely connected with administration of military bases and installations will admit that efficiency is not normally a long suit of such an agency. It stands to reason, then, that there are quite a few personnel in nonmilitary jobs such as the GOP group cites in its charges. However, there are a number of instances where such nonmilitary duties can be justified, particularly where base recreation programs are involved.

As for displeasure over the fact that allies have not responded in helping American efforts in places like Vietnam and Europe, that is understandable. This is a valid criticism. Chances are nobody would like to remedy this more than President Johnson. It is well to keep him aware that people want something done, but there are so many uncontrollable elements involved that it is unrealistic to expect miracles which will bring drastic changes.

The most vulnerable spot in the Johnson armor in this case would seem to be inefficiency and inequity in operation of the Selective Service System. If, as the GOP Congressmen say, there are problems due to mismanagement and red tape, the administration should swallow its pride and get something done in a hurry.

Selective service participants and their families can vote, too.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal, Mar. 3, 1966]

Improving the Draft

The war in Vietnam has brought to the front many questions about the fairness and efficiency of the Selective Service. Republicans in Congress have decided to make this a congressional issue.

These Republicans are demanding that Congress open an immediate investigation of the draft. This probably is past due but in an election year such an investigation holds the danger of lowering national morale and becoming a political football. Certainly this would have to be guarded against.

Not only are there questionable rulings in the Selective Service System but there is a wide variance in the interpretation by the local boards.

The System came under attack when students who took part in protest activities lost their student exemption. At issue is freedom of speech and protest, and that the Selective Service should not use the draft as a weapon against constitutional freedoms.

Now much criticism is being lodged against the procedures for determining the draft status of college students. Present standards call for the drafting of students in the lower levels of academic achievement.

This can be measured, according to Selective Service regulations, by grades. But this is neither fair nor accurate. Students receiving lower grades in more discriminating schools might have more academic potential than some in higher levels of schools with lower standards.

Moreover, as some professors have pointed out, this is a use of the grading system that was never intended. Quite literally, it could give a professor, who grades a student, a life and death influence over the destiny of that student.

Our economic and educational systems already have put an almost intolerable pressure on high school students to make high grades lest they fail to get into the college of their choice. Fear of the draft should not be added to the pressure for high grades.

Much preferable is the standardized testing of college students to determine the lower levels who would be drafted. Even this is not infallible, however. Complaints are made that, as the tests are geared, science students have an edge on those in the humanities. Students with educationally disadvantaged backgrounds could be penalized by the tests, as they are by grades.

The overriding unfairness of any educational deferments in the draft is that it tends to put the weight of war on the poor while others, who can afford it, can avoid or at least defer military service by prolonged schooling.

This is an aspect of the draft which can stand official examination and public discussion. Whether the system can be made any more fair, while still providing an educated citizenry, is by no means certain. But the effort should be made.

[From the Little Rock (Ark.) Democrat, Mar. 2, 1966]

Subjects for Inquiry

Much has been said recently regarding the inefficiency of the Selective Service program and we agree that steps should be taken to make the draft as equitable as possible. A group of 30 Congressmen have signed a statement calling for a congressional investigation of this matter, pointing out some glaring deficiencies.

One criticism refers to the redtape jungle which we don't doubt for a moment exists. The lawmakers declare that there are now 545,000 men between 19 and 26 classified 1–A, and of this number, 117,000 have not yet been examined and another 279,000 can't be put in uniform because their papers are stalled in "bureaucratic pipelines."

The draft system will always be the target of criticism, but this criticism cannot be lightly tossed aside. We think an inquiry is not out of order, and since a congressional investigation is the most effective tool of the lawmakers, that's the obvious solution.

However, the 30 Congressmen stepped into deep water when they asked that a congressional investigation also be held to examine the methods used to persuade our allies to supply manpower to Vietnam.

This sort of thing is best left in the hands of the diplomats and the President, who should deal directly with the heads of countries now standing on the sidelines. A congressional inquiry might rankle and irritate foreign statesmen, who might yet be persuaded to do as much for us as the gallant little nation of Korea is doing. An inquiry would only make sparks where genuine diplomatic heat is needed to get our allies to help us uphold our high ideals in southeast Asia by expanding their contributions.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, Mar. 9, 1966]

A Draft Restudy

Congress and the administration should heed the demand of 30 Republicans, including Representative Morse, of Lowell, for an investigation into the draft. It is an issue close to the hearts of the American people and discontent is rising across the Nation.

To charges that hundreds of thousands of potentially useful young men are escaping the draft through poorly drawn regulations, the Congressmen have added a sharply worded charge of bureaucratic bungling. Their statement declared: "According to figures supplied by General Hershey there are 545,000 men between 19 and 25 now classified 1-A. Of these, 117,825 have not yet been examined and another 279,676 are not available for the draft because their papers are stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline between local draft boards and Army induction centers."

Granting that draft officials should take time to be as fair as possible to the individual, the half-million men in 1-A would more than fill the manpower requirements for the next year. Congress will be justified in inquiring why fresh reclassifications have been set at such a high level when this reservoir exists.

Congress should also review Draft Director Hershey's proposed new program for massive interruption of college careers. The philosophy prevailing until now has been that college students earnestly and successfully working for degrees were a special kind of national asset in an era when demands for highly educated manpower are skyrocketing. If the military needs are judged to be sufficiently great, the students should be drafted as needed, of course. But the public deserves a clear showing that the need is valid, and not created by bungling in selective service.

We believe that General Hershey, President Johnson, and Congress should bear in mind that today's circumstances are far different psychologically from the circumstances of December 1941. Now there is no declared war, no manifest threat to the United States.

Criticism of the draft has been building up—increasingly insistent and increasingly pointed as to alleged inequities and faults in administration. Now is the time for the faults to be brought into the open, studied, and remedied.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Mar. 8, 1966]

Fair Draft Policy

The selective service program is a difficult one to administer because a "selective" plan by its very definition means that some will be called and others will be exempt from military service.

There are some who maintain a system of universal military service would be more fair, more efficient and would reduce the uncertainty in the minds of all those who are of military service age. But the selective type of service is the one which Congress has chosen and it is up to those in charge to make it work just as fairly and efficiently as possible.

A group of Republican Representatives has issued a statement expressing concern that the present system is not being run efficiently and that discrimination is developing in its operation.

The strongest point in the group's statement is the one which points out that President Johnson almost 2 years ago directed Defense Secretary Robert McNamara to make a study of the system and to offer recommendations for improving it. The Representatives say the Pentagon reports the study has been completed but draft director Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey says he has never seen it.

An explanation of what has happened in this tangle of bureaucratic redtape is the least that is due Members of Congress and the men of military age who live under this program.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 4, 1966]

Drafting Students

Criticism, much of it justified, is being heard about the inequitable, inefficient and seemingly haphazard way in which the military draft is being applied. Latest comes from a group of 30 Republican Congressmen who have called for an investigation.

By way of response, Selective Service Director Hershey has come forth with a batch of platitudes about the unpopularity of war in an alien land, the effects of soft living in America, and a warning about trying to overhaul military conscription in a time of crisis.

General Hershey's remarks are wide of the mark. Needed instead of platitudes is evidence of determination to administer selective service equitably.

Presently there are more than 10 million young men in the draft-eligible 19 to 26 age bracket. Under present standards of selection, less than half are likely to see any form of military service.

More than 2 million are at the bottom of the callup list, classified 1-Y, because they're not quite up to present mental and physical standards. Others are deferred for occupational reasons, a very loose category under prevailing conditions. Marriage before last August also is generally considered insurance against service. Bona fide college and graduate students generally are deferred until they complete their courses.

It is General Hershey's stated intention of dipping into the student category that is arousing much of the protest. Obviously educational deferments should not provide an escape hatch for those seeking to avoid military service. But care should be taken to avoid disrupting the academic schedules of young men whose brainpower and leadership will be needed in the future.

On the basis of experience in the Cuban and Berlin crises, Defense Secretary McNamara now recognizes the disruptive effects that a reserve callup can have on the Nation. The same measured judgment should be applied to cutting into the college manpower pool. Especially if, as the Congressmen allege, nearly 300,000 young are stalled in the selective service pipeline by "a jungle of bureaucratic redtape."

[From the National Observer, Mar. 7, 1966]

General Hershey: Like a Pitcher on the Diamond—Draft Inequities Stir People and Politicians

(By James Meagher)

When 30 House Republicans opened fire on the military draft last week, they had hit on a way to take political advantage of the public's uneasiness over the war in Vietnam.

The issue is quite legitimate—and, in the politicians' view, a natural. Voters may grow weary and confused from debates about enclave strategy, containment of China, and coalition governments. But they can easily grasp what a lawmaker talks about when he refers to "inefficiency and inequity" in the Nation's Selective Service System. In addition, attacking foulups in the draft needn't diminish the support Republicans have generally given President Johnson's Vietnam policy. Nor will tne attack interfere with foreign-policy squabbles among Democrats—squabbles that Republicans have concluded can be nothing but beneficial to the GOP.

Until last week most criticism of the draft came from opponents of the Vietnam war itself, exemplified in the extreme by draft-card burners. Some civil rights leaders, too, had complained that the poor—mostly Negroes—were bearing the burden of the war; college students are deferred, they argued, and college students come generally from middle- and upper-income families.

THEY SEEK ONLY AN INQUIRY

But the 30 Republicans have taken a much broader approach. The inequities they cite touch a wide segment of the population. So far they have merely raised questions; they have wisely proposed no alternatives to the present system—not yet. Their proposal so far is for an inquiry.

"There should be an immediate congressional investigation of the draft," their statement proclaimed, "and the methods used to persuade our allies to supply manpower to Vietnam and southeast Asia."

Among their specific complaints:

Of the 545,902 men ages 19 to 26 classified 1-A, 117,825 haven't been examined yet, and 279,676 aren't available for service now because their papers are tied up in redtape between local draft boards and induction centers.

The Johnson administration has announced no priority for the filling of the 1-A pool. For example, as the need for draftees grows, will college students be reclassified ahead of nonstudents previously determined unfit because they fell slightly below physical and mental standards?

Some 9,000 enlisted men are now being used in nonmilitary activities, such as waiting tables in officers' clubs.

In April 1964, Mr. Johnson ordered Defense Secretary Robert McNamara to make a study of the draft and to advise the Chief Executive on whether a better way to meet the Nation's defense-manpower needs could be devised. The study has been completed, but the public hasn't seen it. Nor, for that matter, has the Director of Selective Service, retired Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey.

And in a complaint that is even now being echoed by students and parents everywhere, the optional deferment test to be made available to college students this May will inevitably favor math and science majors, an admission from General Hershey himself. The test will provide local draft boards an alternative to class rankings as a guide to deferring students.

NO TIME FOR TINKERING

One or two of the camplaints are vulnerable. The McNamara study on the draft, for example, was to provide a long-range recommendation in how the draft could eventually be overhauled, or even eliminated. The administration could argue that now is no time for major tinkering. In addition, a certain amount of administrative confusion is inevitable until the draft system catches up with the armed services' increased requirements.

Yet the main thrust of the GOP attack is likely to draw little resistance from congressional Democrats, many of whom have individually voiced misgivings about the way the draft is administered. The Republicans' demand for an investigation, in fact, was unnecessary; Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, already had planned to summon General Hershey before his panel with a view to considering changes in the current Selective Service Act. The law is substantially the same as it was when enacted in 1940.

In addition, a House Education and Labor subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Oregon Democrat EDITH GREEN, has been holding hearings on a very narrow aspect of the draft: Whether stepped-up calls of college students will result in dangerous shortages over the next several years in key civilian professions. Among the witnesses called so far was General Hershey, and the questions fired at him indicate that the attack on the draft could run much deeper than the complaints listed in the Republican statement.

WHAT THE QUESTIONS ARE

Why should professors and college administrators, through the grading system, be compelled, in effect, to decide which students go to the Army?

Are the unpaid members of local draft boards, many of them from the upper crust of their communities, the best ones to judge who should be drafted and who should stay home?

Is the method of appointing draft board members—upon recommendation of Governors—open to political abuses?

Does the cherished independence of local boards contribute to inequities? A man drafted in San Bernardino, Calif., for example, might be deferred if he lived in Lexington, N.C.

Does the scarcity of Negroes on southern draft boards give rise to discrimination?

HE IS A DURABLE GENERAL

Is too much authority for setting draft policy vested in the 72-year-old Hershey? Changes in regulations generally come by Presidential order, but those orders usually are drafted by General Hershey, who has shown a remarkable degree of independence and durability during his 25-year tenure.

So far, General Hershey has taken criticism in stride. In his appearance before the Green subcommittee, he was a man who had heard it all before.

"Unfortunately," he good humoredly told the lawmakers, "I am a little like the pitcher out on the diamond, and the umpire says 'Play ball.' There is not a thing in the world I can throw to the batter that he won't hit out of the lot."

He maintains that there must always be inequity in a system that carries the word "selective" in its title. Maybe so. But, many a young man and many a parent might ask, if it isn't possible to eliminate inequity, isn't it possible to reduce it? The politicians already are asking that question.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Mar. 7, 1966]

BLAST AT THE DRAFT

If there is "mounting evidence of gross inefficiency" in the selective service, as a group of House Republicans has charged, then certainly it should be investigated by Congress.

Inequities in the draft, coupled with unnecessary delays in procurement of manpower, are unthinkable, particularly in the present war situation.

But at the moment, the GOP statement of criticism appears to have produced mixed reactions. The substance of these is that the draft system has its faults, but there is serious question as to whether they can be eliminated.

Draft Director Lewis B. Hershey, far from being irritated by the GOP call for inquiry, said it is Congress' business to "look into how well the laws they pass are being carried out." Hershey declared he, too, is not satisfied with the time it takes to run men through the manpower pipeline. He also said it was necessary to have about six times as many men in the pipeline at any one time as may be needed to fill the next monthly draft call.

This seems reasonable in view of the high rate of rejects, both mental and physical, which draft boards have reported ever since World War II days. These very rejections constituted the springboard for better education and physical fitness programs during the Kennedy administration.

Hershey also concedes inequities exist but insists, probably reasonably, that "absolute equity has never been attained." He supports the Justice Department finding that the draft should not be used as punishment against those who "defy the law." He believes most deferments for education are justified; declares "no one can show" that any man has been drafted because of his ideas, and affirmed the right of appeal of registrants.

The draft Director also admitted tests designed to aid local draft boards in deciding whether a college student should be deferred are easier for science students than for those taking liberal arts courses. It is, frankly, difficult to see how this could be otherwise since basically the difference between the specific and the abstract are involved and since scientists on the homefront are more essential to arsenal building than are poets. This may be a tragedy of our civilization, but it is truth.

Thus, how much there is to be investigated remains to be seen, at least until General Hershey testifies before the House Armed Services Committee, which he was going to do anyway.

Two more comments might be made. The protesting Republicans sought, and were refused, copies of a study ordered by President Johnson in 1964, which concluded the draft could not be abandoned, and may have suggested some changes. If national security isn't involved, it ought to be made available, at least to Congress.

Lastly, the leader of the Republican group, Representative ELLSWORTH, Republican, of Kansas, wasn't very convincing when asked why no Democrats had been asked to join the draft protest. According to the New York Times, Mr. ELLSWORTH denied the statement was issued for political reasons, but said there had not been time enough to enlist anyone outside the GOP.

If the Republicans really think a draft inquiry is needed, it might have been a lot more effective in a Democratic-controlled Congress if they had found time to make the protest bipartisan

---

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Mar. 3, 1966]

WHO DOES THE FIGHTING?

The 30 House Republicans who are calling for a congressional investigation of the draft and the overall problem of recruiting military manpower have opened a different side to the Vietnam debate. Its gist is not whether or how we fight, but who does the fighting.

The Congressmen urged that the war be prosecuted—it must be. But they are also saying that it can be prosecuted most feasibly and effectively with a broad base of international support for the South Vietnamese and, in America, by elimination of the anxiety-causing confusion and inequities of our present manpower procurement policies.

Whether we are doing all we can to persuade allies to provide troops, technicians, and economic assistance is a delicate matter of diplomacy best investigated in closed sessions. However, Congress can properly ask the question.

Domestically, any investigation of manpower procurement should start with the draft. Selective Service System Director Gen. Lewis B. Hershey defends the operations of his agency, but the statistics which describe the inefficiency of the draft (which, in fairness, includes the Army's operation of induction centers) are right out of his own office. In any case, an independent survey of conditions in the draft process could be profitably undertaken by Congress.

But the draft, so long ignored by Congress, is just one part of the manpower procurement problem. Indeed, the other parts—policies affecting regulars and reservists, and such as poverty program and Peace Corps personnel—usually have been treated apart from one another, and there is need for coordination. Inefficient utilization of the 3 million men already in uniform may seem at a tolerable level to the eyes of a particular military service, but if it means more draftees—married men or students, as examples—it should be a matter of high-level concern. The Reserves may worry solely over their responsibilities in case of activation, but if an incentive program for individual reservists to volunteer for Vietnam is feasible, it, too—as a prospect for relieving the manpower strain—is a proper interest of higher authority. Congress, until the manpower policies are reformed, should exercise that authority.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram and Sun, Mar. 3, 1966]

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE DRAFT?

The above question is one to which a band of 30 Republican Congressmen would like a congressional investigation to find answers.

The 30 lawmakers feel they know some of the answers already.

They cite a redtape jungle that makes hundreds of thousands of 1–A's "unavailable," inequity in apportionment of draft quotas among the States, misuse of the draft as punishment for political dissent and misuse of trained GI's for civilian-type chores at bowling alleys, golf courses, PX's and the like.

By and large, we don't believe that local draft boards and their members can be blamed for the draft's defects and abuses. Theirs are difficult, thankless jobs. Few critics of the draft could perform them better or even nearly as well.

The trouble is somewhere in the policymaking bureaucratic attitudes of the Defense Department and the draft system.

At any rate, inequity, inconsistency, inefficiency, and confusion cannot possibly help a war effort or engender the respect a democratic draft setup must command.

A congressional investigation—or, to put it positively, a constructive inquiry—appears amply justified.

[From the Niagara Falls (N.Y.) Gazette, Mar. 8, 1966]

MAKE DRAFT FAIR

Thirty Republican Congressmen, charging redtape and unfairness in the Selective Service System, have called for a full-scale investigation. They have some well documented evidence, including these counts:

Some 9,000 enlisted men who have military skills needed in combat instead hold jobs in officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, and golf courses.

Nearly 280,000 men now classified 1–A aren't available for draft because their papers are caught in what Draft Director Lewis B. Hershey calls the paper-jammed pipeline.

Tests given to college students to help decide who will be deferred tend, by Hershey's own admission, to favor those with a scientific background.

It may be that bureaucrats view such things only as minor irritations. But to young men planning their future, uncertainties and injustices are agonizing to accept.

Fairness in the draft system is vital. No man should be thrust into uniform unless and until he is really needed.

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Independent, Mar. 3, 1966]

WASTE OF MANPOWER

If you're one who likes to figure the odds, you can prove that a man taken into military service has a much greater chance of being handed some menial assignment during his hitch than he has of being killed in Vietnam.

Not that either is desirable, of course, but it's a mathematical fact. For every two men who die in Vietnam, nine hold jobs in officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, golf courses, and commissary stores.

Thirty Republican Members of the House of Representatives have cited these statistics to show that the Defense Department is not making maximum efficient use of present personnel.

Their charge of gross inefficiency and redtape jungle in the use of military manpower as well as in the Selective Service System warrants a full investigation.

Almost every man taken into service accepts the fact willingly that he must serve his country for 2, 3, 4 years or longer if necessary. Often he gives up a chance for further education, a marriage, homelife, or a chance for a good job, to do his hitch.

But then after basic training to be salted away in a hobby shop or bowling alley is an insult to his ambitions or potential. It is, to say the least, a pure waste of a man in time of national emergency.

Servicemen need recreation. That nobody denies. But do they need it to the extent that 9,000 of their buddies—the better part of a division—have to be tied down in full-time jobs supplying it?

Let's have the full story presented before a congressional committee, as the 30 House Members suggest. Most of them are veterans themselves and should know whereof they speak.

At a time when the Defense Department's budget is well up in the 60 billions of dollars, and with Congress having just acted on the administration's request for $4.8 billion in emergency funds to support the Vietnam war, the public has a right to demand the best use of manpower by the armed services.

Guns we support. Butter, too, unless that high-priced spread is being put on too thick. It's time to find out.

[From the Pawtucket (R.I.) Times, Mar. 3, 1966]

OUR DRAFT SYSTEM IS MALODOROUS

The method being used to draft American youths for service in Vietnam is about as undemocratic, unfair, discriminatory, and unconscionable as the mind of any bureaucrat could possibly devise.

A month from now, notices will be posted in colleges, post offices, other public buildings, and draft board offices announcing a test the Government will give. It might well be headed: "Attention, all students who would like to avoid being sent to fight in Vietnam." It will tell them they may report on one of three dates in May and June to take an exam that will consist of 150 questions and be divided into four sections: reading comprehension, verbal relations, arithmetic reasoning, and data interpretation. The results will be forwarded to draft boards, and the students who do well might win deferment because, in the words of a Selective Service official, "they are more promising" than those who score lower.

In addition to this test, the Government is attempting to have local draft boards furnish the class standing of college students; this is another facet of making dropouts, dullards and the economically deprived—those who find college beyond their reach—the prime prospects for battling and perhaps dying in the far-off rice paddies.

Gradually, the utter foolishness of the present draft structure is sinking in. For example, the dean at Brandeis University condemns as "totally absurd" the idea of deferring students whose marks are high, and seven professors there say they may stop giving grades at all. The dean makes a telling point when he says "high mark deferments" are unfair to schools with strict admissions policies. A Harvard educator is rebelling to the point of not sending records to draft boards if a student asks him not to. And now 30 Republican Congressmen, calling for an A-to-Z probe of the draft, say the upcoming tests discriminate against liberal arts students and favor those majoring in sciences.

What has happened to the old concept that in a democracy all who are physically able stand as equals in a Nation's hour of need? Every man's life is as precious to him as the next man's—be he rich or poor, an intellectual genius or a classroom plodder. Pinning price tags on human lives and sending the cheapest out to do the fighting is indefensible.

The United States is at war, albeit an undeclared one. Ignore for the moment the merits of our presence in Vietnam, and the question of "freedom" being at stake, and why other free nations don't see eye-to-eye with us on what's at stake, this fact remains: So long as this country is sending young men out to fight, they should be sent through a rigidly impartial draft system that brooks no distinction between the varied strata that make up our society.

It's time to get out the "pickle jar" and draw numbers, just as was done in World War II.

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times, Mar. 3, 1966]

DRAFT INVESTIGATION JUSTIFIED

The demand of 30 Republican Congressmen for an investigation of the Selective Service System is one which should be met promptly. The operation of the system is of vital interest to thousands of Americans, and there is enough controversy concerning it to justify a close look by Congress with the view to setting new and uniform standards of practice, even if the 30 Congressmen had not made their demand.

The Congressmen made these allegations:

1. That the draft system is inefficient. There are now 445,000 men classified 1–A "in the pipeline" between their local draft boards and the military services. Why, then, is it necessary to change standards to include men previously disqualified or exempted from draft calls?

2. There is no "clear order of priority" by which various groups of men will be called to service.

3. Tests which will be given this spring (for the first time since the Korean war) to college students as a basis for deciding whether they should be deferred to finish their education tend to favor students with a scientific background over those with a liberal arts background. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, selective service director, admits that this is true, and defends it on the basis that the Government would prefer the more scientifically inclined students to stay in school. At the level of education of most of these men, however, this is a very debatable basis for "loading" the tests.

4. A Defense Department study of the whole draft system, authorized 2 years ago, has been completed but never published or sent on to General Hershey. Why?

The U.S. Selective Service System has never been a very efficient operation, and its basic method of operation almost encourages inequalities in the application of standards. A local draft board is charged with producing a certain number of "warm bodies" periodically, on a quota system, and how it meets that obligation is left in very large part to its own discretion, under minimal direction on standards.

That's why draft policy seems so often to differ from city to city and district to district. It is often just a question of how many eligible men—or breathing men with two arms and two legs each—a draft board has available at a given time. If it has plenty, it can be generous with exemptions, especially when quotas are low. But when quotas go up or the available manpower pool is for some reason lower, the pressure is on the local board.

In wartime, that is excused as expediency. In peacetime, or periods of what we have called peace since 1945, it isn't much of an issue.

But under no circumstances is it a national policy. And a national policy should be what the Congress is looking for.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 2, 1966]

REDTAPE DRAFT JUNGLE

Congress should heed the call by 30 House Republicans for an immediate full-scale inquiry into this country's haphazard, inequitable, and inefficient draft system, mired in a redtape jungle—if further abuses are to be avoided.

Predicting early administration efforts to step up substantially the number of American fighting forces in southeast Asia, the group notes that some 9,000 enlisted men are working in officers' clubs, bowling alleys, hobby shops, golf courses, and commissary stores.

Nearly 280,000 classified I–A were not available for drafting because their papers were "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline," and there apparently is no "clear order of priority" in which the administration is considering calling various manpower groups into service, the Congressmen assert.

Also, the Representatives charge, liberal arts students are getting the short end of the stick in favor of science majors in tests designed to show which college students should be deferred.

Besides all this, a standby pool estimated at 444,793 men will be available to fill draft quotas through June—so why the proposed reexamination of deferments?

In addition, the House Members question the effectiveness of administration efforts to persuade our "allies" to send combat troops and other personnel to Vietnam. They urge that the Congress scrutinize that aspect of the situation and "consider and recommend new means of securing expanded allied contributions."

Representative TOM CURTIS, of Webster Groves, is one of the group, three of whom are members of the House Armed Services Committee, which plans hearings on the "authority to induct" section of the draft law.

All in all, it would appear the House group's concern over "mounting evidence of gross inefficiency" in the selective service system and the Defense Department's administration of the draft needs exhaustive scrutiny.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Mar. 2, 1966]

THEY'RE NOT SOLOMONS

Short of making military service universal, there are bound to be certain shortcomings in the draft that can't be helped.

Since it wouldn't make sense to force everybody into service regardless of whether or not they can be used effectively or are critically needed in essential civilian pursuits, the selective service ought to remain selective.

These points need to be kept in mind as the draft comes under growing criticism from several sources.

This week, for instance, 30 Republican House Members called for an investigation of the draft on the grounds that the present system is haphazard and tangled in redtape.

As a case in point, they cite a recent report that 9,000 enlisted men held jobs in officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, golf courses, and commissary stores. Moreover, they say nearly 280,000 men classified 1–A aren't available for the draft because their papers are "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline."

If true, such defects ought to be corrected immediately. On the whole, however, the Selective Service System seems to be doing a good job under difficult conditions.

There is, for example, the Selective Service System's policy of granting deferments only to those full-time college students who are doing satisfactory school work.

Although this policy has been assailed on the ground that a low-ranked student at a top school may be superior to a high-ranked student at a mediocre school, consider the alternative. Unless at least part of the cream of the crop gets inducted, the military could end up being composed strictly of the less educated and the less affluent. In a democracy, restricting military service to a particular social class would be intolerable—even dangerous in light of the lessons taught by the fall of the ancient Roman Empire.

Meanwhile, the handwriting on the wall should be pretty clear to any student wanting to retain a deferment: Buckle down to work and hit those books.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News, Mar. 4, 1966]

Draft Investigation Desirable

Investigation of the present draft system, as requested by 30 members of the House of Representatives, seems very much in order.

The Savannah Morning News for some time has been disturbed over the way our present draft system has been siphoning off the cream of America's young men for military service while many less desirables were not called.

We would not—as we never have—advocate filling the honored ranks of our military with unfits. But there are jobs that can be done by and done well by men now eluding the draft by reason of mental or physical shortcomings of present draft requirements.

In a one-two fashion, the present draft system has come under scrutiny of congressional leaders. On Tuesday, 30 Republiican House Members called for an investigation charging the present system is haphazard and mired in a jungle of redtape. Wednesday, Representative L. Mendel Rivers, of the House Armed Services Committee said his committee will hear Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, and then decide whether to investigate the draft.

The case set forth by the 30 House Members, if accurate, certainly seems to provide sufficient cause to prompt an investigation.

According to the group, there are at least 9,000 enlisted men holding jobs in officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, golf courses, and commissary stores. To be sure, some of these jobs required much knowledge, but it would seem reasonable to assume that many of these posts could be filled with professional football players who happen to have a trick knee or leg injury that doesn't bar them from playing the sport and collecting thousands of dollars in salary each year, but is keeping them from being drafted.

If, as the 30 Congressmen charge, nearly 280,000 men classified I–A aren't available for the draft because their papers are "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline," Congress and this Nation are entitled to know why.

If, as charged, tests scheduled to help determine which college students should be given deferments discriminate against liberal arts students (or any one particular group) and favor those concentrating on science courses, the public is entitled to know. And if there is not a clear and orderly priority established which the administration will follow in calling various manpower groups for service, this too should be made public.

The young manpower of this Nation is not a trinket to be toyed with or misused. Our Nation faces hard times at present with its role in the Vietnam war. How the requirements of our Armed Forces are met is a factor that will influence the future of this Nation, for we are dealing with the lives and future of tomorrow's leaders.

So important is this issue that we believe it would be in the interest of the Nation to have some of the facts made a matter of public record. If the 30 Congressmen can prove their charges, it is apparent the Nation has not been told all it should have been told. An investigation could correct that.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Mar. 2, 1966]

Probe of Draft Needed

Congressmen looking for something to investigate in connection with the Vietnam war—and few, apparently, are not—could do no better than to heed the call of 30 Republican House Members for an immediate investigation of the draft.

Manifestly, uniformed service, including the workings of the draft, can never be entirely fair in any ultimate sense. As in life, itself, some young men are more fortunate than others.

But the draft can be made a good deal more fair than the present system under which the well-to-do have a better chance of escaping service than those of limited income; too many men with obvious qualifications for service escape on technicalities, and call-ups sometimes are misused as a form of punishment.

In addition, as the concerned Republican Congressmen pointed out, scores of thousands of men classified 1–A are not available for the draft because their papers are "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline."

There obviously is no clear order of priority for calling up various manpower groups, and this lack has resulted in unnecessary anxieties and has contributed to public uneasiness over the whole conduct of the war.

Certainly the administration should be required to reply to assertions that the tests scheduled to help determine which college students should be given deferments discriminate against liberal arts students and favor those concentrating on science courses.

Actually, what is proposed—and needed—is not just an investigation of the draft but of the entire scope of military manpower use.

We realize that any enterprise involving millions of men is going to include many sorry examples of misplaced manpower, and that war by its very nature is wasteful.

That ought not to stop Congress from trying to achieve a good deal more efficiency and equitability than now exists in the manpower pipeline leading to Vietnam.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Mar. 2, 1966]

Check the Draft? Certainly

Selective Service's 72-year-old Director, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, indicated otherwise in a luncheon talk yesterday, but the proposal by 30 House Republicans for a congressional investigation of the draft system is sound.

The organization he has headed since 1941, General Hershey says, has an "unmatched record of efficiency," and besides, "you don't reorganize something that's working."

Nobody has said anything—yet—about reorganizing the System. The point is that the Republican group raised some definite questions about the draft's efficiency and fairness (and General Hershey himself concedes some reservations on the latter)—and it is to the benefit of the draft system itself, the armed services which get manpower from the draft, and the Nation that steps be taken to clear the air.

The Republican plea was based on four points, only three of which relate directly to Selective Service. They questioned whether the Defense Department is "making maximum efficient use" of present personnel, citing a recent report of 9,000 enlisted men in recreational and sales duties.

Most important of the complaints was that there are nearly 280,000 men now classified 1–A who can't be drafted because their papers are "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline." They also charged there did not appear to be "a clear order of priority" for calling up various manpower groups, and that the tests scheduled to determine college deferments favor those majoring in sciences over the liberal arts.

General Hershey, defending college exemption generally, says that for every two students deferred, five young men fail the draft's educational qualifications. He added he regretted part-time students can't be deferred, but said the law did not permit it.

The Republicans didn't go into recent complaints that General Hershey has ordered demonstrators and protestors against the draft to be put at the top of the induction rolls. But he himself yesterday said he believes Congress wants him to administer the law without reporting cases to the Justice Department any more than necessary—that is, that it's better to draft the Vietniks than prosecute them.

We wonder whether Congress agrees, and we are certain that the armed services do not agree. Whether any changes in the Selective Service law are required or not a congressional hearing on the draft has a number of possible accomplishments:

It can clarify Congress' position on draft versus prosecution.

It can draw a clear picture of draft group priorities.

It can either prove the System is as fair as possible, or take steps to make it so.

It can determine if the administration of local board affairs is as efficient as General Hershey maintains, or if a wholesale reorganization is really needed.

Obviously, the draft will be with us for a long while yet. There's nothing wrong, though, with a congressional inquiry which can either reassure citizens the System is as good as it should be or else take steps to insure that it is.

BADLANDS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill providing for the extension in size of the Badlands National Monument in South Dakota to include a scenic area extending south through the present gunnery range area, which will increase the size of the Badlands National Monument by approximately 25 percent.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, this is a compromise bill because, under the law, when the property is declared surplus to the needs of a Government department and turned over to the General Services Administration for disposal, all Government agencies are circulated to see if they have need for this property.

In this instance the National Park Service has filed on the entire gunnery range area, which is approximately 40 miles long and about 15 miles wide, but only a strip a few miles wide, running down through the center of the gunnery range, is actually needed by them. Most of this area, however, is owned by the Oglala Sioux Tribe and title was not taken by the Government at the time of the taking of the rest of the land during World War II.

The Park Service had planned to exchange the grazing land in the area with the tribe for their badlands. However, there is much more value in the land not needed by the Park Service than in the land which they wish to obtain by trade and exchange.

With this gunnery range area was taken over by the Army during World War II it was primarily Indian-owned land, it was all in the northern part of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation and the owners, feeling that by doing so, they were serving a patriotic purpose, let the Government take the land at a very nominal figure. Not a single landowner went into court under condemnation proceedings. It was their understanding that the Government was buying it even at this nominal price to use so long as it was necessary for military training purposes and when it was no longer needed that they would be privileged to buy it back.

Down through the years the Indians have expected that when this land was surplus by the Air Force that they would buy their land back at approximately the same figure the Government paid when it was taken.

For a number of years now the Air Force has had little or no use for this land for gunnery range purposes and I have introduced in each session a bill which would authorize the repurchase by the former owners at the price the Government paid the Indian owner, plus interest at a reasonable rate, and plus a reasonable carrying charge. However, this legislation is being opposed by the Park Service because they feel this is an opportunity for them to extend the Badlands National Monument with little or no Government cash outlay to pay for such extension.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is a compromise bill extending the Park Service and, at the same time, authorizing the original former owner, or his direct heir, to repurchase the land if he so wishes. It is my feeling that there will be ample land unredeemed for the Park Service to exchange with the tribe to get all the land they need for park extension.

CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

Mrs. **REID** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **POFF**. Mr. Speaker, four closely related events here in Washington yesterday clearly illustrate that our current economic situation, in its relation to our involvement in Vietnam, is in utter confusion and approaching complete chaos.

Yesterday, the very day the latest cost-of-living increase was announced, the President strongly hinted that taxes would have to be increased again. The self-same day, however, the Congress passed his urgent request to fund the rent subsidy, the Federal Teachers Corps, and several other multimillion-dollar new domestic spending programs. Also, that same day, the Defense Department indicated that more spending money may be needed in Vietnam.

I say that we do not have to endanger ourselves and our country with the runaway inflation these new programs, operating in the face of mounting war spending, will surely cause. Neither do we have to flatten ourselves out under the burden of confiscatory tax increases. Much, if not all, of the additional money required for the war effort can be assembled without raising taxes for the second time this year if we eliminate or delay some of our more nonessential domestic programs. In other words, instead of raising the people's taxes again and again, the Government itself should first try a little self-denial and a little self-imposed austerity in its domestic spending budget.

NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Mrs. **REID** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. Mr. Speaker, it is widely recognized that the reason we are compelled to spend large amounts of money for national defense programs is to prepare ourselves to deal with and protect against aggressive decisions and actions by the Communist world, which is headed by the Soviet Union.

It is also known that the Kremlin is providing to North Vietnam a wide range of weapons, equipment, and supplies to support Communist North Vietnam aggression, which results in the loss of American lives.

Is it logical and sound reasoning, then, for a U.S. Defense research publication to contain an abstract of its contents printed in Russian for the convenience of the Soviets?

It seems too incredible to be true but it is. The abstract appears in an Air Force aerospace research paper relating to temperature determinations in the upper atmosphere.

This study resulting in the report was originated and sponsored by the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories, L. G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass. It relates to upper atmosphere physics, temperatures, and related matters.

The cover of the report, besides containing the scientific title of the study, identifies it as a product of the Office of Aerospace Research, U.S. Air Force. The report contains various pages of text, including scientific charts and data, followed by a listing of 152 environmental research papers. On the last page of the report's text, at the bottom of the page, appears an abstract giving a summary of the document's contents. The abstract, unbelievable as it may seem, is printed in Russian.

Mr. Speaker, this raises serious and far-reaching questions as to the philosophy and thinking of the people whose task it is to help provide for our national security.

Just what conceivable purpose could be served by the inclusion of a Russian language abstract in such an U.S. Air Force report?

Certainly this could help facilitate research on the part of the Soviets, allowing their agents to review documents such as this speedily and easily to see if the subject covered is of interest to the Soviet military and industrial intelligence organizations.

But can anyone reasonably claim that it is in our national interest to provide a summary in Russian of the U.S. Air Force Office of Aerospace research publication?

The answer must be an emphatic "no." Certainly things have not reached such a point where we "deal in" the Soviets on research projects such as this. Actions such as this require a full and complete explanation to the Congress and American people.

MORE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS NEEDED

Mrs. **REID** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Mize] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MIZE**. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with several Members of Congress in the introduction of a resolution to call upon the National Science Foundation to make a study of the available scientific resources in this country and to come up with a plan by which we can have a more equitable distribution of Federal research and development funds.

Coming as I do from the Midwest, I naturally do not subscribe to the proposition that the bulk of our scientific know-how and capabilities are confined to a few geographical areas on the east and west coasts while the rest of the country remains a vast wasteland in the eyes of those who decide where research and development should be done.

Today, Federal research and development funds total between $15 and $20 billion. With all of the emphasis upon scientific advancements in what we call the space age, the totals for research and development are going to grow. I would hate to see the imbalance created by pouring the major portion of these funds into one, two or three areas, grow in direct proportion to the amount of the funds available.

Those who will take the trouble to look will find "centers of excellence" in the vast heartland of America. They will find fewer of the problems of overcrowding, over-pollution, over-taxation and over-discrimination that plague the areas where funds for research and development are now being concentrated.

So that none can say he was not aware of what we have, my State of Kansas has joined with a dozen other States in the formation of the Midwest

Resources Association, a bipartisan entity designed to point out our facilities, capabilities and resources of our region and promote its economic welfare.

We have facts and figures available through the association to prove our capability to handle a fair share of Federal research and development. We can present these to the National Science Foundation or any other agency interested in looking beyond the complexes on the east coast and west coast where a disproportionate share of the work is now being done.

It is appropriate, I feel, for the study proposed in the resolution to be made by the National Science Foundation and for the Congress to be prepared to act upon the recommendations. If a more equitable distribution of the research and development funds results, then I am certain the country will be the beneficiary of more scientific breakthroughs and a better balance of scientific knowledge.

FOOD TO INDIA PROGRAM DOES NOT FEED DESTITUTE

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President is today asking the Congress to express by resolution its approval of an additional $1 billion, perhaps more, in emergency food aid to India.

The food shortage in India is real and the American people must respond. In the past 5 years we have shipped about 19 million tons of grain to India on terms which are tantamount to donation. Of this only 5 percent has been distributed without charge to the destitute people of India. The rest has been sold through Government-operated local markets.

Unfortunately, there is no indication that even a single bushel of the additional 3.5 million bushels the President now proposes to send will be distributed without charge to poor people.

Up to now, our food to India has not been the feed-the-destitute program many people believe it to be.

It would be appropriate and helpful for the Congress, and the President, to stipulate that as much of this new shipment as possible be distributed without charge to needy people.

PULLOUT FROM FRANCE OF NATO OFFICES WOULD BE ILL TIMED

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, news reports today indicate the United States will soon demand that NATO political offices be withdrawn from France. I hope the reports were unfounded. If the proposal should come up for review, it should be rejected.

This action would be ill timed to say the least. It would further isolate France from the others in the alliance, harden opposing positions, add new fuel to rising anti-French fires and make reconciliation more difficult. It can hardly be argued that military necessity dictates this action. The Standing Group, which is officially the highest military authority in NATO, has been located for years in Washington, separated by more than 5,000 miles from political offices in Paris.

President de Gaulle has stated repeatedly France's desire to stay in the alliance, even though he finds the present military structure unacceptable. If we demand that the NATO Council and Secretariat be removed from France, would this not suggest a stubborn our-way-or-else attitude? Certainly it would be unbecoming of the alliance's ex officio leader.

I hope the President, as leader of the alliance, will not only reject this negative approach but step in personally with affirmative action to bridge the growing chasm between these historic friends before it is too late.

SHOE PRICE HIKE DEMONSTRATES FOLLY OF CATTLE HIDE EXPORT CONTROLS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, press dispatches in last night's newspapers reported shoe price increases of about 4½ percent by two of the Nation's large shoe companies.

On March 16, 1966, I joined with several of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the House in protesting the sudden imposition of export controls on the domestic cattle hide industry.

Two days later the White House took note of my opposition to the export controls on American hides and sent me a memorandum from the Council of Economic advisers, dated March 17, 1966, defending the action.

I would like to quote a few of the highlights of this memorandum:

> This action will prevent a substantial rise in shoe prices.
>
> Increases in hide and leather prices would have forced an increase in shoe prices of 5 percent or more.
>
> Export controls were imposed just before the time at which the shoe producers have to set prices for the fall season.
>
> Shoe producers assured us they would cooperate in holding down prices.
>
> Asking hide producers to forgo a temporary windfall in order to hold down a rise in shoe prices is fully justified.

Yesterday's announcement of shoe price increases demonstrates the folly of the Commerce Department's action of March 11 in imposing export controls on U.S. cattle hides.

It should now be obvious that the price of leather had little, if anything, to do with the plans of the shoe industry to increase the price of a pair of shoes. In fact, a 1965 study by the Department of Agriculture, revealed that on the average a $10 pair of shoes included only 68 cents worth of cured hides. This is another reason why the rollback of hide prices makes relatively little sense as a brake on inflation.

The Commerce Department, and others in the administration, should reconsider immediately its action of March 11. At the same time, I believe the Congress has a responsibility to study the procedures under which export controls are instituted.

In this regard, I fully concur with the statement of the distinguished representative from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who yesterday in the House pointed to the need for congressional review. He stated, in part:

> I would like to point out that the manner in which Congress has allowed controls to be placed on exports is in direct contradiction to the way the Congress controls imports. The raising and lowering of tariffs on foreign goods requires legislative approval. No such action can be taken without fullest public consideration. Why should not controls on U.S. exports, which can have the same depressive stimulative effects on sectors of the U.S. economy be subject to at least a modicum of public consideration?

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS AMONG THE STATES

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution the object of which is to achieve a better geographical distribution of the research and development funds that are granted, loaned, or otherwise made available by departments or agencies of the Government to institutions of higher learning for scientific or educational purposes.

There is no doubt in my mind that more equitable distribution of the almost $16 billion for research and development by the several Federal agencies can and must be made.

In the Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, on which it is my privilege to serve, I have come to know the importance of many of these research activities. No one challenges the need for intensive programs of science, research, and technology. There are vast frontiers yet to conquer.

The Congress has a responsibility of knowing whether or not these programs are being funded wisely and adequately;

and whether the full potential of the Nation's scientific and technological brains are being properly utilized.

No State, no region of the country has a corner on the ability to produce brainpower. We cannot afford intellectual underdevelopment in any part of our Nation. We must take steps to insure a more equitable distribution of the Federal funds for research and development which have become an integral part of maintaining academic excellence.

There is substantial evidence that a large percentage of the research grants awarded by several Federal agencies have gone to higher educational institutions in the East, Northeast, and west coast.

The resolution which I am introducing designates the National Science Foundation as the competent Federal agency to make a study and appraisal of our scientific resources and report to the Congress a feasible plan for equitable distribution of Federal research and development funds.

I urge that early consideration be given this legislation.

MINORITY ECONOMIC COUNCIL PROPOSAL ENDORSED BY SAN DIEGO UNION

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with economic matters of concern to every American represented by all Members of Congress, the state of the Nation's economy is a matter of personal interest to us all. At the present time, the ever-increasing cost of living and the danger of runaway spending concern thoughtful taxpayers and their families. Therefore, the suggestion made by Congressman Thomas B. Curtis, St. Louis County Republican, senior House member on the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee, and jointly introduced by him and Congressman Widnall, second ranking member of that committee, to establish a Minority Council of Economic Advisers to service the Congress deserves support and serious study.

It is interesting to note that economists and consultants who have served under Democratic administrations agree with scholars and economic experts who have worked both in Republican and Democratic administrations that whichever party is the minority in Congress needs a Council of Economic Advisers to help promote sounder scholarship in the economic field rather than abdicating this largely to downtown. The San Diego Union, one of the chief papers of the Copley chain, has said:

> Congressman Curtis has made an excellent suggestion that could lend checks and balances to the present problem of runaway economic ideas.

I join thoughtful students who seek to build a stronger and better American economic system and who are both Republicans and Democrats in supporting this constructive proposal and in helping implement it by Congress to serve Congressmen more effectively regardless of which party is in the majority in Congress. The complete text of the editorial of March 12, 1966, from the San Diego Union follows:

> [From the San Diego Union, Mar. 12, 1966]
>
> ### Fiscal Curb Is Needed—Danger in Runaway Spending
>
> It is one of the paradoxes of modern times that in a peak of prosperity the U.S. Government and the people of our Nation are going more deeply into debt.
>
> Granted it is not always possible for the Government or for a family to have a balanced budget. Extraordinary circumstances in a given year can lead to exceptions.
>
> On the other hand, it is also true that the extraordinary spending that produces deficits must be an exception rather than a rule. No nation and no individual can continue to go into debt year after year without reaching a breaking point.
>
> Logic dictates that the time to balance budgets and perhaps even pay off some of the past debts is in times of prosperity, such as we are having now. The present course, unfortunately, is just the opposite.
>
> Paychecks are fatter than ever, but rising prices and taxes have pushed personal indebtedness of people in the United States from $272 billion in 1955 to $320 billion today. Inflation threatens to continue the trend.
>
> Government indebtedness has reached a peak of $328 billion with $12 billion of the proposed budget for next year earmarked just for payment of interest. The Federal Government has had deficits in 30 of the last 35 annual budgets, and another is proposed next year.
>
> It is clearly a time for the Nation to pause and take stock so the trend can be reversed. Instead the prescription of the administration is a continuation of the Keynesian economics that fuels the boom through Federal deficits in spite of the clearly marked shoals ahead.
>
> Clearly, some new thinking on the subject is needed. An excellent idea has been proposed by Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri. He suggests Congress establish a "little" council of economic advisers to help the party out of power focus dissent on economic issues.
>
> Properly constituted such a council would serve the Nation well if the dissent were constructive. Individual minority leaders who have sought to focus constructive dissent unfortunately do not have the weight and public attention to accomplish the goals. Within the Federal Administrative structure there has been no courageous dissent with the exception of the Federal Reserve Board.
>
> Constructive opposition such as the "little" council of economic advisers could bring might, sharpen administration thinking by presenting another side of issues, have the stature and weight to focus public pressure, to correct mistaken thinking, and speak with studied authority.
>
> One of the biggest benefits it could bring would be a year-round continuing and profound study of economic factors instead of a reaction to a given proposal.
>
> Representative Curtis has made an excellent suggestion that could lend checks and balances to the present problem of runaway economic ideas.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today, there are over twice as many people on relief as there are unemployed. There are 3,200,000 now unemployed according to the Department of Labor, and there are about 7,800,000 on relief.

This is a costly business for the American taxpayer. Since 1963, when this administration took over, the cost of Federal, State, and local relief has gone up 37 percent—from $4.6 billion a year to $6⅓ billion.

The cold facts are these: there was a drop in the number of unemployed between February 1963 and February 1966 of 1,100,000 persons, according to Labor Department statistics.

Between 1963 and fiscal year 1967, those on relief increased by exactly the same number, 1,100,000.

The New Deal went in for work relief to give people jobs in a great depression; that is, to create jobs for the millions who were out of work. The Great Society is providing work relief when the Secretary of Labor informs us there is a shortage of manpower and when the President urges private business not to expand plant facilities.

The result of overspending in boom times is a squeeze for our people. The housewife is confronted with skyrocketing food costs and taxes are going spiraling up, too, right after this fall's elections.

CONTROLS ON FOREIGN PRIVATE INVESTMENT DO MORE HARM THAN GOOD

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an impressive study by the National Industrial Conference Board makes clear the dangers involved in the administration's controls on the outflow of U.S. investment capital. The principal conclusion of the study is the program is self-defeating because a reduction in new foreign investment is likely to cause earnings from abroad not only to cease to grow but actually to decline.

The study points out how the restraints on investment may actually cause a reduction in U.S. exports. Among the various regions of the world, those where U.S. investments have grown the most rapidly have tended to be those to which exports have expanded the fastest.

We may already be getting some depressing effect on U.S. exports from the investment controls. Exports last year rose only slightly, compared to a sharp jump in imports. The result was a $1.9 billion decline in the trade surplus.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 28, 1966, by George Shea, which discusses the National Industrial Conference Board study be included in the RECORD at this point.

THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

The United States may be nearing the limit of what can be done to improve its balance of payments through voluntary restrictions on capital investment abroad. But the forces of the free market may take over the task of helping U.S. cash inflow and outflow to come closer to a balance following years of substantial deficits.

The difficulty of improving the balance of payments by cutting new investment abroad is discussed in a new book—"U.S. Production Abroad and the Balance of Payments"—by staff members of the National Industrial Conference Board, a nonprofit business-supported organization engaged in economic research. The work, reflecting a study of 100 corporations, was undertaken because the U.S. Government has been trying to get business here to invest less abroad and bring back more earnings from old investments outside the country. This Government effort began mildly as far back as 1963 but early in 1965 took on the more serious aspect of formal guidelines.

The principal conclusion of the study is that in the long run the Government's double effort is self-conflicting. It suggests that any substantial reduction in the pace of new investment abroad is likely to cause earnings from abroad not only to cease to grow but actually to decline. Broadly speaking, the reason is simply that no enterprise can aim to remain static; it must seek to grow or it is likely to shrink.

There are no figures available as yet to support this thought with regard to investment abroad, because the reduction in such outlays is too recent. Indeed, the earnings from abroad are probably still benefiting from the expansion in such spending in recent years, and particularly in late 1964 and early 1965, before the program of restriction was formalized.

New direct investment of dollars in foreign facilities grew from $1.4 billion in 1959 to $2.4 billion in 1964, there being an increase each year but one. And the annual rate, adjusted seasonally, increased further to $3.3 billion in the fourth quarter of 1964 and to $4.6 billion in the first quarter of 1965.

The drop resulting from the restrictions showed up after last year's first quarter, with declines to annual rates of $3.6 billion and $2.1 billion in the second and third quarters. Even these figures are relatively high by the standards of any year prior to 1963, so that the testing period of possible depressing effect on earnings still lies ahead.

Aside from this point, the National Industrial Conference Board study suggests that also in several other ways restrictions on foreign investing are likely to end up by being self-defeating in their aim of ending or even slimming the U.S. deficit. For instance, the study takes up the frequent argument that production abroad replaces goods that might otherwise be exported from here. The survey found that often production was begun abroad in order to avoid losing exports that were threatened with local competition or local import barriers of some kind.

The businesses surveyed also said that in several ways investment abroad actually stimulates exports. The most direct way in which this happens is through the export of equipment needed to set up the foreign facility.

In addition, the survey found exports are stimulated through the shipment of new raw materials, parts and even finished goods, much as continuing sales of blades result when a safety razor has been sold. Also, the production of goods by newly established U.S.-owned facilities in foreign places may call attention to U.S. goods generally, spurring exports that may be seemingly unrelated. Finally, the success of new enterprises abroad spurs economic growth there, enhancing demand for goods from everywhere including the United States.

An indication that these suppositions are correct is furnished in a table offered in the book, showing that among the various regions of the world those where U.S. investments have grown the most rapidly have tended to be also those to which exports have expanded the fastest. For instance, U.S. investments in Europe from 1950 to 1964 grew 13.8 percent yearly while in Latin America the growth was only 5.1 percent yearly. Similarly, exports to Europe in the same period expanded 7.9 percent yearly while to Latin America the growth was only 2.1 percent annually.

But though the deficit-cutting effects of the restrictions on new investment seem likely to wane in the future, a new force tending to cut the balance-of-payments deficit has come into play. It is the rise in interest rates resulting from the fact that new borrowings in this country are running ahead of new savings.

For years interest rates lower here than abroad have tended to encourage capital to gravitate to foreign shores to seek the greater available returns. This differential has provided a form of unrelenting pressure tending to cause otherwise uncommitted funds to flow out of this country.

Now that rates here have climbed to a level generally the highest in 40 years, the differential between rates here and abroad has narrowed considerably. At least this one pressure tending to perpetuate the deficit in the balance of payments has moderated. How long this condition may last depends in part on how long the business boom lasts, for once business growth slows down interest rates are likely to slip back. But in the meantime the goal of reduction in the deficit may be approached more closely through the working of the forces of the market rather than through a formal program handed down in Washington.

THE BIG MONEY IS IN POVERTY

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, in March of 1964, Mr. Sargent Shriver appeared before our Committee on Education and Labor to argue for approval of President Johnson's war on poverty. He told us:

> It is also a prudent program. It is financially prudent * * *. It is prudently planned in that every dollar allocated will be spent to help the poor. There will be no leakage. There is no contemplated huge new bureaucracy * * *. I think that most people in the executive branch would state that I am not one who likes a lot of bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to report a fantastic leakage in funds intended to help the poor—a leakage of funds to a huge new bureaucracy. According to President Johnson's 1967 budget, it will take 6,484 permanent Federal employees to run Mr. Shriver's burgeoning bureaucracy—a poverty empire costing $53,489,000 in salaries alone.

The word has gotten around among civil servants in Washington that the big money is in poverty. Few know how big it is.

The 1,557 permanent Federal poverty employees will make $10,619 or more; another 1,032 community action workers will be paid $10,000 or more from Federal funds; an undetermined number of contract employees in 15 privately run Job Corps establishments will be paid over $10,000.

We have over 200,000 gallant men in South Vietnam, but we can be sure that there are not as many as 2,500 drawing $10,000 a year—the basic pay of an Army colonel with over 14 years' service. The poverty warrier-bureaucrats include at least 25 individuals who will be paid more than the base pay of General Westmoreland himself.

Astronaut Neil A. Armstrong, who with Lt. Col. David R. Scott heroically flew our most recent and most dangerous space mission, is a Federal civil servant grade GS–16. His job is one of incredible difficulty and danger, for which only a handful of men in the whole world are qualified. Yet 25 of Mr. Shriver's high-flying bureaucrats are budgeted for GS–16 positions; and 36 others are budgeted for even higher pay grades. Mr. Speaker, who would think that OEO had any jobs more demanding and difficult than that of Astronaut Armstrong?

Mr. Speaker, there are 2,350 permanent Federal employees budgeted for the Washington and regional offices of the Office of Economic Opportunity. This is the high-salaried palace guard of the Poverty czar. Nearly half—1,006—of this elite force will get $10,619 or more; at least 521 will be paid over $14,600; at least 54 will get over $19,600; 24 get over $25,000; and 6 will get between $26,000—the pay of the U.S. Commissioner of Education—and $30,000.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder so little gets done at the Office of Economic Opportunity? They have so many chiefs and so few Indians. They have more GS–15's than they have GS–9's; more GS–14's that GS–4's; more GS–13's than GS–7's, and exactly as many GS–16's at a base pay of $19,619 as they have GS–2's at a base pay of $3,814. The total salary bill for this palace guard next year will be $21,739,000.

Outside this inner circle at "poverty" headquarters there are 4,134 other permanent Federal employees budgeted at $31,750,000. They are to do the hard work farmed out to other Federal agencies, such as running the Job Corps camps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the adult education program, agricultural loans, and so forth. Only 551 of these unfortunates will be paid over $10,600 a year, of which at least 112 will get over $14,600. However, these 4,134 positions, listed in the budget under "Allocation accounts" do not include those who are paid by private contractors to run 15 of the 97 Job Corps establishments.

Incidentally, administration costs in the Job Corps are so high that the annual cost per enrollee now runs above

$9,000, enough to send two boys to Harvard. Even the budgeted cost next year is $7,880 per enrollee.

But, Mr. Speaker, not all the high salaries in poverty are accounted for by permanent Federal employees or employees of private contractors working on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. Federal funds also pay for the salaries of employees of local antipoverty agencies, and 1,032 of these employees now make $10,000 or more a year, of which 200 make $15,000 or more per year.

On the basis of the exact information available, I estimate—and this can only be an educated guess—that nearly 3,000 individuals are paid $10,000 a year or more from Federal antipoverty funds.

We do not know how many, if any, poor people have been helped to get out of poverty by Mr. Shriver's high-priced agents, but it is pretty obvious that thousands of employees have been kept out of poverty. Among these undoubtedly are many dedicated and able people, but we know all too well that the ranks also include a plentitude of political hacks.

Mr. Speaker, this is a scandal. It is nothing less than a scandal. And it is a scandal that Mr. Sargent Shriver defended before the Education and Labor Committee with the bland boast that his organization was only one-fiftieth the size of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

So I compared one part of HEW—the U.S. Office of Education—with the Office of Economic Opportunity. Here is the record on that.

The Office of Education is budgeted for $3.478 billion in fiscal 1967, compared to $1.724 billion for the Office of Economic Opportunity, yet OE will need only 2,861 permanent employees—hardly more than Shriver's palace guard—compared with OEO's 6,484 permanent employees.

If the U.S. Office of Education were administered like the Office of Economic Opportunity, it would require 12,968 employees to spent its $3.478 billion, or 4½ time the number it has budgeted.

The comparison in high-paying jobs in these two agencies is also interesting. Five individuals in OEO are paid more than the U.S. Commissioner of Education, who gets $26,000. In the grades GS-15 through GS-18, where the pay ranges from $17,055 to $25,382, the comparison looks like this:

GS grade	Salaries	OEO	OE
15	$17,055 to $22,365	249	125
16	$19,619 to $25,043	25	33
17	$22,217 to $25,325	17	10
18	$25,382	13	3
	Above $25,382	6	1
	Total	310	172

All but 37 of OEO's highest paid jobs are in Mr. Shriver's own palace guard headquarters staff of 2,350 permanent employees. These other 37 jobs with starting pay of $17,055 or more are scattered among the 4,134 permanent employees in other Federal agencies which are running such programs as the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, adult basic education, agricultural loans, and so forth.

I have made a chart showing the number of highest paid officials among the permanent Federal employees budgeted in fiscal 1967 for the Office of Economic Opportunity programs. It is broken down to show positions in the 2,350 strong palace guard which makes up Mr. Shriver's own administrative staff, and positions in the force of 4,134 assigned to handle major segments of the $1.7 billion program in other Federal agencies.

Positions budgeted for OEO in fiscal 1967

GS grade	Salaries	OEO palace guard	OEO programs run by other Federal agencies
	Above $25,382	6	0
18	$25,382	12	1
17	$22,217 to $25,325	16	1
16	$19,619 to $25,043	20	5
15	$17,055 to $22,365	219	30
14	$14,680 to $19,252	248	75
13	$12,510 to $16,245	230	173
12	$10,619 to $13,931	255	266
	Total	1,006	551
	Grand total for OEO programs	1,557	

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of some cogent remarks of my own chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, our colleague ADAM C. POWELL. He understands the true needs of impoverished citizens better than most. On January 21 of this year in a speech in Harlem he said:

> We do not need any more experimental or demonstration projects in Harlem. All we need are jobs. That's all. Jobs.

Chairman POWELL did not mean jobs for bureaucrats or jobs for politicians, but jobs for poor people. On March 8, in opening the hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act, Chairman POWELL pointed out that there are 97 people in the local Washington, D.C., poverty agency—UPO—paid over $10,000 a year with Federal funds, and observed:

> Congress appropriated this money to help the poor, not create a monolith of extravagantly paid functionaries.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with these remarks of Chairman POWELL. But despite the attempt by our committee to investigate the Office of Economic Opportunity, this administrative monstrosity goes its merry way. How far it goes and how wild it plans to become in hiring extravagantly paid functionaries is laid out in black and white—or in red ink—in the President's budget for fiscal year 1967.

In view of the facts I have presented here today, I renew my plea to the House to take action on my resolution, House Resolution 670, for a bipartisan select committee, appointed by yourself, to investigate the conduct of the war on poverty.

As I have pointed out before, if we do not take remedial action the entire antipoverty program is going to become so discredited, and be so ineffective, as to create massive disillusionment among citizens trapped in poverty. There is still time to avoid this tragedy.

THE DEPRESSED CONDITIONS OF THE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time under the special order—and I will not take all of the time in the remarks I now give—to bring to the attention of the House and to the various agencies of our Government a problem that I think needs careful consideration, at a time when we are looking at our economy and are gravely concerned about how we are managing it and where it is going, with the stresses and strains that are put upon it by the events of our day.

May I urge, Mr. Speaker, that in all of our deliberations and our considerations, besides quantitative analysis we have a little qualitative analysis.

I would like to urge the Members to keep constantly in mind that averages are only things of fiction, that they can only be understood when you realize the components of the averages, and that there can exist conditions which distort a situation that is very grave simply because it is buried in an average.

I think one such situation does exist at this time, which is an anomaly. It is the situation in which we have conditions of recession in the homebuilding field at a time when we are talking about a general condition that is moving in the opposite direction.

In the West, in particular, and in other areas which my further remarks will delineate, there has been overbuilding, which has caused great expressions of concern and some movement on the part of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to try to protect against a situation that would be unhealthy in the building industry.

But, at the same time and in some instances, strangely enough, existing side by side, there are great areas of need for addtional housing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to impress upon our body and the other agencies that should pay attention to it the realization that for some time we have had in some areas of the building industry in our great Nation a situation in which money was the motivator of building. Money markets were leading the building activity. That is not good. That led to problems of overbuilding. But it is just as wrong to have money policies suppressing building.

When can we find a situation in which the market controls building activities? Why should the money policies control in a situation in which we talk about our free enterprise system, which is based upon market response? We look about us and see that in one instance we let the market concept go by the board and the money policies encourage building not needed. Now we turn around and do exactly the opposite thing and say that the money policy will depress the building regardless of what our needs are.

I feel this is something into which we should look with a very critical eye.

Mr. Speaker, the great era in our building business, the great boom that existed from 1945 to 1965, resembled more than anything else the Oklahoma land rush, when everyone got into the act. As will be remembered by the Members, in the Oklahoma land rush, anyone who had anything at all to ride, from a swayback mare to a gracious coach and four took part in that great land exploitation. That was true in the building business for the last 20 years. There was so much available that everyone got into the act, whether they knew anything about building or did not. There was a great opportunity for those who followed where the dollars were, flaring their nostrils like a beagle hound on the trail of a coon. They came crashing into the building business. They became great land developers and builders.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that has happened in the slippage of the building business in 1957, and now the very critical situation that developed in 1965, and extends to today—it has shaken out of the operation these marginal builders, these promoters, the boom followers, and wildcatters, and that is not bad. I am not sorry to see that. But I hope we will see the need for continuing in a posture of performance the fine builders who over the past 20 years have done a tremendous job of meeting the challenge of both the quality and quantity of building needed, and doing a tremendous job in the face of great change.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not impose myself upon the time of our wonderful staff to further belabor this subject, but I would address the attention of my colleagues to the remainder of the remarks and the charts which will follow and which will be a part of this RECORD.

I hope that we will have the considered attention and the critical comment of both our colleagues and the people of the agencies who are involved.

Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out that "experience teaches slowly, often at the cost of mistakes." The home building industry is today suffering from a mistake that experience should long ago have alerted us to avoid.

Just recently the President's Council of Economic Advisers indicated there was the possibility of our economy in 1966 surpassing the phenomenal growth rate achieved in 1965. With certain signs of inflation now appearing, it is evident that various policies of a fiscal nature must be designed that will restrain the economy while insuring a continued balance growth.

Yet, with an ever-expanding economy, recent reports indicate that the home building industry is at its most depressed state in recent years. In some areas of the country, particularly on the west coast, the home building industry has fallen to a low in building starts for 1966 not seen since the recession of 1954. How do we account for the situation now faced by the construction industry—an industry that accounts for about 3 percent of our gross national product; an industry that employs over 4 million Americans?

Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that we are witnessing a reduction in demand for housing? Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that with an expanding population, an ever-increasing number of households, and higher employment and income, that Americans are somehow not interested in buying homes or in renting apartments? No. Demand, although a factor in a few areas, is not the primary reason for the sad state of the housing construction industry. Later I will show that the potential demand for housing is increasing.

What then is the reason? In opening this speech, I alluded to a mistake that has been made that experience should not have allowed. One major reason for the depressed state of America's housing construction industry is the paradoxical and almost ludicrous situation that restricted the availability of mortgage money in an expanding economy. The Federal Reserve's decision late last year to raise interest rates in order to curb inflation has resulted in continued expansion with no significant restraint on inflation while the tight money situation has caused serious depression in housing construction.

Today, just a few short months after the Federal Reserve's interest rate hike, the consequences of such a shortsighted policy are becoming abundantly evident. Inflation is becoming a more critical problem, and the interest rate hike is unfairly forcing an important segment of our economy to compete on an ever-tightening money market.

What is the current status of the home building industry? Nationally, the seasonally adjusted total for February of 1966 indicates that housing construction starts are off by more than 12 percent. Last year at this time annual construction starts were adjusted to an estimate of 1,482,000. February of 1966 calls for an adjusted annual figure of 1,318,000 starts, or a drop of some 164,000. See table No. 1.

My own State of California, where the homebuilding industry amounted to close to $2 billion in 1965, is faced with a 39 percent decrease in housing starts in February of 1966 when compared with February of 1965. This decrease represents the lowest annual adjusted rate of housing starts in California since 1954. February of this year saw a decrease of 85,392 housing starts in an adjusted annual figure, falling from 219,024 starts to 133,632 starts. See table No. 2.

Los Angeles, the largest city in California, seasonally adjusted total for February is 34 to 37 percent below the 1965 figure for the same month, and the San Francisco Bay area is off some 31 percent in single family dwelling starts when compared with the annual seasonal total for February of 1965.

In my congressional district, we may expect a 28 percent reduction in housing starts for the first quarter of 1966 when compared with the first quarter of 1965. The Sanford R. Goodkin Research Corp. estimates that during the first quarter of 1966, Orange County can expect a 5-percent reduction in the annual seasonal total for single family units and a 65-percent reduction in multiple family units.

The thought that immediately arises is that California is overbuilt, and the reduction in housing starts is a normal reaction to allow demand to catch up with availability. This was true for part of 1965, but the latest information available from the Real Estate Research Bureau, and the Stanford Research Institute, indicates that demand has just about caught up, and the serious decline in present housing starts in California is due to a combination of factors—nearing the top of the list is the scarcity of mortgage money causing high down payments, high interests rates, and high monthly payments.

California is not the only area where the building industry has been seriously affected as a result of tight money. The entire western region in general has a seriously depressed housing construction industry. Housing starts in the West are down 22 percent when the adjusted annual total of February 1966 is compared with February of 1965. The February 1966 figures indicate a total of 234,000 housing starts, down 69,000 compared to the 303,000 starts estimated in February of 1965.

Interestingly enough, however, is that the West is not as bad off as the northeast region of the United States which is down some 24 percent in February of 1966 compared to 1965. The north-central region of the United States, while showing an increase for February of 1966, nevertheless, is down an alarming 48 percent in seasonally adjusted annual housing starts between December of 1965, and January of 1966. The great drop in the north-central area is particularly bad in that it represents a serious seasonal decline in starts that was not picked up in the usually normal increase in housing starts during the first quarter of 1966. The southern region of the United States is suffering from a 9-percent decrease in housing starts.

New Orleans, La., faces a 33-percent reduction in the first quarter, and Baltimore can expect a loss of 16 percent of housing construction activity. Atlanta, Ga., is faced with a 14-percent reduction in activity, while Newark, N.J., will suffer a 28-percent reduction. Philadelphia, Pa., will be off 25 percent, and Flint, Mich., can expect a 29-percent reduction in homebuilding activity during the first quarter of 1966. See table No. 3.

Couple the nationwide reduction in building activity with the following facts and we have a problem of national consequence. The University of California at Los Angeles' School of Business and Finance estimates that the employment multiplier factor in the construction industry is 2.57. In other words, for each person directly employed in construction, there are an additional 2½ persons employed as an indirect result of the industry. The President's economic report indicates there are some 4 million people in the construction industry, meaning that there are approximately 10 million other people whose jobs are indirectly connected with the industry. People in the area of lumber production, home furnishings, major household appliances—refrigerators, ranges, and so forth—and many other segments of our economy, may soon begin to feel the pinch now being felt by the homebuilding industry.

The industry is feeling pinched because of the present tight money situation. The market is available, the money is not.

There are a number of factors working in favor of housing demand. First, and most obvious is the rise in our population. But even more significant is the middle 1940's baby boom. The Bureau of the Census indicates that the housing market can expect to begin to feel the impact of the "baby boom" in 1967–68. At this point, we may expect there will be great demand, first, for lower cost housing, and then substantially increasing as the mid-1940's generation becomes older and more affluent. It is estimated there will be a significant demand for more expensive housing beginning in 1970.

For the past 10 years, the Census Bureau reports, households in the United States have been growing at the rate of about 800,000 a year. However, it is predicted the growth rate of households will average over 1 million a year from 1966 through 1970. The Stanford Research Institute points up the corollary that the larger the number of households, the smaller the population per household. In other words, according to the Stanford Research Institute, the stronger the influence of those factors tending to increase the desire and ability of persons to occupy separate living quarters, the smaller the average number of persons per household. The history of our national trend in this area is toward smaller households. In 1910 the average per household was 4.6, falling all the way to 3.3 in 1960. Couple the trend in smaller numbers in a household thereby increasing the number of households with the avalanche ready to break over us from the mid-1940's baby boom and the question of demand for future housing becomes academic.

Other factors working in concert creating housing demand are the ever-increasing demolition of existing dwelling units. Urban renewal, the need for recreational areas, and freeways have been removing existing housing at an astounding rate. A second factor is the increasing mobility of our citizens. Internal migration is creating new demand while not seriously affecting the vacancy factor of many areas. Evidently mobility is so cross-replenished no one area suffers from any great loss of people that would substantially raise the availability of housing. See table No. 4.

A third very obvious factor is that with an expanding economy, and more affluence, there is the desire to move up to better housing. As our standard of living increases so too will our demand for even more quality living quarters. This will especially be true when the postwar "baby boom" generation, weened on affluence, demands the best.

Fourth, the U.S. Government, with the Housing Acts of 1961, 1964, and the rent supplement program just passed in the House yesterday, is creating housing demand. Add to this a fifth factor of better transportation facilities encouraging more and more people to begin housekeeping on their own, as well as creating easy access to new areas, and we have another significant element in creating housing demand.

Probably one of the most significant factors in facilitating demand is the availability of the necessary money to finance new mortgages. If this money is not available, no matter how great the demand for housing, the home buyer and builder is reluctant to go ahead if the borrowing costs are too high, the downpayments too large, the mortgage financing unavailable, monthly payments prohibitive, and credit costs increasing.

The irony of our present situation has prompted my remarks today. In a market where the demand is high for housing, we find the homebuilding industry of America stagnating partly because of means of translating the consumer demand for housing into housing has been restricted.

The tight-money situation created by the Federal Reserve's interest rate hike is resulting in a shortage of funds for home mortgages. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board estimates that total funds for home mortgages in 1966 will be $14.5 billion, down some $1.5 billion when compared with 1965. Yet the demands for new mortgage capital will approach the $17 billion mark creating a shortage of anywhere from 5 to 10 percent in mortgage money. See table No. 5.

Yet, because of restrictive policies, the primary mortgage lenders, the savings and loan institutions, have been facing a reduction in the inflow of money. Savings and loans had to face up to a substantial reduction in their net gains on savings. Commercial banks on the other hand saw an increase in their net flow of money in 1965, putting the homebuilding industry at a definite disadvantage since commercial banks lend only a very small percentage of mortgage money.

Additional problems caused by money restrictions resulted in a rise of one-half of 1 percent on interest rates for construction loans, while the limit a builder can draw money as a percentage of the value has declined. Interest rates for construction loans are as high as 6½ percent in many instances.

Federally guaranteed mortgage insurance administered under the auspices of FHA has long been a peculiar problem to the homebuilding industry. The March edition of the Savings Bank Journal pointed out that, although "February 7 brought the long expected adjustment in the FHA contract rate—from 5¼ to 5½ percent—the action also brought a chorus of comments from builders, realtors, mortgage bankers and investors that the new rate was still far out of line with market realities. These observers uniformly pointed to 5¾ percent as the more realistic rate in the present circumstances."

The Bank Journal went on to say:

> Given the far out-of-line 5¼-percent rate formerly in effect, discounts on FHA loans zoomed as high as six points, and averaging five points. These stiff discounts brought protests from builders, and reports that homeowners began to balk on putting their homes on the open market for resale with FHA financing.

Jack Justice, president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, pointed out that the raise in the FHA rate "would not rectify the problem in the West, where discounts are ranging up to six points," while MBA President Ewart Goodwin commented that the "belated adjustment of the maximum permissive rate on FHA-insured mortgages announced on February 7 was disappointing to everyone who is familiar with market conditions today."

Couple the FHA rate problem with rising conventional loan rates, about one-half of 1 percent increase since September of 1965, and higher conventional loan downpayments and you begin to get an idea of what is causing the depressed state in the homebuilding industry.

With rising construction interest rates, tight money making mortgage financing unavailable, an unrealistic FHA rate, and rising consumer interest costs and down payments, we have a segment of our expanding economy that is being restricted and discriminated against—not purposefully, but from ignorance.

Congress and the responsible housing and home financing agents must be made to realize that this very important element of our economy cannot continue under the present conditions. At the opening of this speech I pointed out that we are bound to suffer mistakes in the course of events. This, however, is a mistake that can and must be rectified quickly.

Experience, though it is slow, has taught us to act quickly when we discover a mistake. The homebuilding industry is being stifled because of shortsightedness on the part of those who attempted to overcome an evident problem in our economy. If we are to restore the building industry to its vital role in the economy, we must act with considered dispatch.

TABLE NO. 1.—*1965–66 comparison of seasonally adjusted annual housing starts on a regional basis*

[In thousands of housing units]

	Nation	West	Northeast	South	North Central
February 1965	1,482	303	326	574	279
February 1966	1,318	234	246	532	306
Percent change	−12	−22	−24	−9	[1] +8

[1] This percentage does not reflect the difference in housing starts between December of 1965 and January of 1966, during which time there was a net reduction in starts of 48 percent that was not picked up during the normal increase in activity for the 1st quarter.

TABLE NO. 2.—*Housing authorizations, seasonally adjusted annual rates, California*

	1964	1965	1966
January	322,960	195,048	154,884
February	310,116	219,024	[1] 133,632

TABLE No. 2.—*Housing authorizations, seasonally adjusted annual rates, California*—Continued

LOS ANGELES

	1965	1966	Percent change
January	9, 535	7, 351	−23
February	10, 650	7, 009	−34

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

	1965	1966	Percent change
January	3, 293	2, 293	−25
February [2]	1, 722	966	−31

[1] −39 percent when compared to 1965—the lowest annual rate since 1954.

[2] Information on single-family dwelling units only.

TABLE 3.—*Some metropolitan areas expected to have a reduction in housing construction for the 1st quarter of 1966 when compared with the 1st quarter of 1965*

	Percentage of reduction
Anaheim—Santa Ana, Calif	−28
Atlanta, Ga	−14
Baltimore, Md	−16
Boston, Mass	−5
Columbia, S.C	−8
Columbus, Ohio	−14
Denver, Colo	−3
Flint, Mich	−29
Fort Worth, Tex	−10
Lexington, Ky	−17
Little Rock, Ark	−30
Los Angeles—Long Beach, Calif	−37
San Diego, Calif	−9
Tucson, Ariz	−15
Newark, N.J	−28
New Orleans, La	−33
New York, N.Y	−4
Philadephia, Pa	−25

TABLE No. 4.—*Vacancy information for 1965*

	Percent of vacancies	
	Single family	Multiple family
Los Angeles	2.3	7.9
Orange County	4.6	20.8
Denver	3.6	3.6
Great Falls, Mont	3.3	5.0
Albuquerque	3.3	15.3
Houston	3.6	18.2
Casper, Wyo	4.3	11.5
Buffalo	1.4	4.3
Newark, N.J	1.0	1.8
Chicago	.9	2.5
Honolulu	2.0	2.9
Charlotte	3.4	8.7
Charleston	2.3	7.0
Cincinnati	2.2	7.6

NOTE.—Information prepared by the Federal Housing Administration indicates that the vacancy factor in single unit dwellings has remained constant over the past 3 years, and there has been an actual decline in vacancies in multiple dwelling units.

TABLE No. 5.—*Home mortgage holdings for 1965 and 1966 estimated by the Federal home loan bank board*

[In billions of dollars]

	1965	1966
Savings and loans	7.8	7.0
Mutual savings banks	2.8	2.5
Insurance companies	1.6	1.5
Banks	2.6	2.0
Individuals	1.2	1.5
Total funds for home mortgages	16.0	14.5

NOTE.—Demands for new capital, $16,000,000,000 to $17,000,000,000.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] for his excellent and timely presentation today. I too have been gravely concerned about the sharp downturn in home construction in California. The 89th Congress has shown great concern about national housing problems; only yesterday this body voted to fund the beginnings of a rent supplement program. Yet, at this time of great congressional concern and action, my own State faces its most serious housing crisis in many years.

I would like to supplement Mr. HANNA's presentation with further information about the housing slump in the San Francisco Bay area. I will also discuss how this home construction crisis in California relates to the economic issues which have been debated for the past weeks.

As 1965 drew to a close, predictions of a continued national building boom were easy to find. In December, the trade journal Building Construction editorialized that "1966 may well go down in the history of the building construction industry as the year of the dollar" because times "have been so good for so long." Construction Review, the Department of Commerce publication, reported in November that "new construction expenditures in 1966 should continue the steady climb that has prevailed since 1960," increasing by 6 percent above 1965's record high.

This statement, of course, came before the Federal Reserve Board acted to raise the discount rate. Yet even that action did not dim the enthusiasm of the builders. House & Home, which calls itself the management publication of the housing industry, explained that financial experts are right: The Federal Reserve Board's action raising the discount rate will not restrict the availability of mortgage money for builders. It will just make the money more expensive.

But optimism and cries for patience cannot hide what has been happening since the beginning of this year in my own district and elsewhere in the San Francisco Bay area. The figures before me show a decline of 25 percent in residential building permits in January 1966—compared with January 1965—and a decline in February 1966—compared with February 1965—which approaches 48 percent.

Employment figures in the building trades unions bear out the slump. Unemployment in the four-county San Francisco Bay area averaged approximately 22 percent, with the increases from the same period last year ranging from 10 to 35 percent. Nonresidential construction has kept out-of-work lists slightly behind the sharper decline in residential starts. But it remains the worst slump in several years. The building trades in Alameda County just completed a survey of their locals which showed an overall unemployment rate of 16 to 18 percent, with the plasterers local up at 40 percent and the cement masons close to 25 percent. Figures for Santa Clara County unions and crafts also reveal sharp declines:

Unions and crafts	Total membership	Unemployed	Normal employment
Painters Local 507	1, 100	200	1, 300
Plasterers	250	90	350
Hodcarriers	300	70	400
Lathers	197	45	260
Painters 388 (Palo Alto)	420	100	550
Sheet Metal Workers 309	450	75	600
Carpenters	6, 700	1, 100	(1)
Electricians	1, 074	200	(1)
Construction Laborers Union 270	2, 700	600	3, 000
Plumbers 393	1, 350	250	1, 400

[1] Not available.

These figures tell only part of the story. The cold figures cannot express the frustrations and fears of builders, workers, and buyers alike. This excerpt from recent correspondence from a developer in my district will illustrate the concern of people in the bay area:

> The recent increase in the allowable VA and FHA interest rate has failed to improve the supply of mortgage money. In fact, the situation is so confused and uncertain that we are unable to get commitments for future loan deliveries at any price. The constant worsening of the money situation, typified by yesterdays increase in the prime rate, has kept the mortgage money market reeling.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Unless something is stabilized in the next few weeks we may be forced, along with others in the industry, to evaluate whether we should build any more homes, even if they are presold.
>
> It appears to us that the opening of Pandora's box by the change in the rediscount rate late last year has brought about the most critical mortgage money situation in history. Some mortgage men claim that even if Brownstein raises the FHA rate another quarter to five and three quarters that the situation would scarcely improve.

Mr. Speaker, conditions in California and in my home district have made me listen closely to the many arguments about the state of our economy. Debate on the floor of this House in past weeks has focused frequently on the problems of inflation and the rediscount rate hike of the Federal Reserve Board. At this time, I cannot but conclude that the Federal Reserve Board's December action, done in the name of stability, has in fact been a major cause of our inflationary conditions today. Only intelligent economic action by this administration can prevent the Federal Reserve Board's action from going down in history with the Smoot-Hawley Tariff of 1930 as a monument to economic illiteracy.

Both builders and building unionists in my district feel that the Federal Reserve Board action was responsible for present slump conditions. This is however only partly true. For what is most interesting about the housing construction situation in California is that it has already been in a slump for 2 years. New home starts have been declining. Thus the Federal Reserve Board is not responsible for the decline itself. But the Board is responsible for maintaining and accelerating the decline. And, worst of all, the Board acted in the name of inflation to curb an industry which in fact was not inflating.

House & Home, in December 1965, surveyed market trends in 21 cities, and gave statistics for housing starts in these cities from 1961 to 1965. When added together, these figures show:

Total housing starts, 21 cities

1961	484, 538
1962	561, 221
1963	585, 433
1964	504, 940
1965	459, 770

Thus housing starts in 1965 in 21 key cities hit a 5-year low.

The Associated Home Builders of the Greater Eastbay prepared these figures for housing starts in the nine-county bay area:

Year	Total housing starts	Percent decline
1963	67, 516	
1964	58, 497	14. 4
1965	45, 934	21. 5
January 1966	2, 503	24. 0

Thus the Federal Reserve Board action has continued a 2-year downturn in the bay area as well.

This 2-year decline in homebuilding in California and in the Nation aggravated the economic problems of California builders. Mortgage money has always been in great demand in California. This demand gave rise to the extensive network of savings and loan associations which attract savers throughout the Nation by high-interest insured accounts. The Federal Reserve Board interest rate hike has made California mortgages less attractive to investors. Now, reading of newspapers in California reveals almost daily hikes in interest payments by individual banks and savings and loans. The Board action has produced a dangerous spiral: a spiral in the cost of money which may prove difficult to stop.

What we are seeing is this: people with money are getting paid more for it. As a result, people without money must pay more to get it. Credit costs more; installment buyers pay more; investors earn more. This, I would think, is inflation. Yet it is a product of a government action taken in the name of stopping inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly distressed because the recession-breeding inflation which we are seeing today is so serious in the housing field. No field of economic activity has been of greater concern to this Congress since the end of World War II. The Housing Act of 1949, supported by a bipartisan coalition that included Senators ELLENDER, LONG, PEPPER, Taft, and Lodge, made a declaration which is law today:

> The Congress hereby declares that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require housing production and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious housing shortage, the elimination of substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas, and the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family, thus contributing to the development and redevelopment of communities and to the advancement of the growth, wealth, and security of the Nation.

And this declaration has moved closer to reality through the actions of our own 89th Congress. We cannot at the same time stand silent while our actions are drained of meaning. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must note that our war in Vietnam hangs over this issue as well. The Federal Reserve Board action, the FHA/VA interest hike—all are interrelated in a complex of causal factors. The war in Vietnam is, unfortunately, also one of those factors. The December 1965 House & Home cites a discussion by Senior Vice President Proctor H. Barnett, of the Prudential Insurance Co., of a change in investor psychology triggered by the Vietnamese war. Barnett says:

> The typical investor has abandoned his fears of a slower rate of economic growth. The changed psychological climate—call it expectations—has contributed to marking up the mortgage rates.

Thus investors in this country are awaiting a new war boom. Profits from investing in the goods of a war economy are higher than the profits of the conventional economy. The men who develop, who build, and who work in peacetime must now wait for the cautious investors who are seeking a bigger killing.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] concluded, "Congress and the responsible housing and home financing agencies must be made to realize" that the home building industry "cannot continue under present conditions." We in California are waiting for signs that will allow us to proceed with confidence to build the Great Society. I am pleased to join the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] in stressing that such signs must come immediately.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DYAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment my colleague from California for calling the House's attention to a serious problem affecting our homebuilders in particular and our economy in general. Nearly all Americans want better housing. The House voted on a phase of this matter yesterday. Yet the homebuilding industry continues to suffer from extreme fluctuations between supply and demand. The phasing out of defense facilities has been a contributing factor.

The gentleman is representing Orange County; which like my own San Bernardino County right now is a comparatively bright spot in the dark picture of southern California building permits.

The Los Angeles Times advises that Orange and San Bernardino Counties are two major areas which showed a gain in the first month of this year over the previous year but a 1- or 2-month gain is not indicative of continuation. The comparison between January 1965 and January 1966 shows multiples down 51.7 percent and singles down 34.3 percent and valuations are off 11.9 percent. The weakness which is evident in the other counties will effect us and continue the pattern of fluctuation.

I am pleased that he has emphasized the unavailibility of mortgage money in an expanding economy. He is to be commended and I support and concur with the arguments he has made.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, as a Californian and a concerned member of the Education and Labor Committee, I want to bring to the attention of the House an unfortunate and shocking employment situation resulting directly from the faltering condition of the construction industry in California.

While the rest of the Nation rejoices with an overall unemployment rate that has crept to a seasonally adjusted 3.7-percent low, California's building industry is reporting the highest unemployment rate in years.

My own county, Los Angeles, is reporting a jobless rate of 17 percent. That rate has not been exceeded in the past decade. At the current rate of unemployment this means that the jobless are losing $4,420,000 per week, according to a special study carried out by the Los Angeles Building Trades Council which is described in excerpts of an article from the Los Angeles Times which I will incorporate into the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, California and her neighboring States are faced with a unique problem that requires special attention. I would hope that some of the suggestions we have heard here today may be implemented to rifle in on this critical situation.

The excerpts referred to above follow:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Jan. 23, 1966]

JOBLESS RATE REACHES PEAK OF 17 PERCENT IN BUILDING TRADES—CONSTRUCTION UNEMPLOYMENT IN COUNTY EQUALS WORST OF DECADE

(By Harry Bernstein)

Los Angeles building trades workers today are plagued by a jobless rate matched only twice in the last decade.

Unemployment among 130,000 construction workers in the county totals 17 percent, a peak which some union leaders say has been more prolonged than in either 1958 or 1961 when the rate was about the same as today.

The rate is nearly 4 percent above last year, a union study showed.

Part of the problem has been the weather which knocked out several construction jobs.

Herb Smith, of the Associated General Contractors, said overall the building industry in the area is in good health. But estimates on the employment situation among building tradesmen were made in a special study by the Los Angeles Building Trades Council, headed by John Cinquemani, and he is much less optimistic.

LABORERS HARD HIT

Cinquemani said the highest jobless rate is among laborers, where 42 percent or about

6,000, of the union members are without jobs.

Fewer starts in the homebuilding industry and new building techniques were blamed, along with the weather, for the high rate of unemployment.

While other industries have been gaining in total employment, the building industry in Los Angeles dropped by 5.3 percent between 1964 and 1965, according to State Department of Employment Researcher Gaylord Pitts.

RISE IN COUNTY

Overall in the county, total employment is up 2.4 percent over last year.

The State's population is going up nearly 600,000 a year, and the resulting pressure is helping to keep the overall jobless rate high.

Unemployment in California last month was 5.7 percent of the work force, or 39 percent above the 4.1 percent rate for the Nation as a whole.

In Los Angeles, the rate is 5.4 percent, down somewhat from last year's 5.9 percent, but showing no improvement of the kind seen on the national level where joblessness is the lowest since 1957.

The total employment in Los Angeles is now up to 2.9 million, and when the 148,700 jobless is added, it gives the area a total labor force of over 3 million for the first time in history.

MANY CARPENTERS OUT

The union survey showed that 16 percent of the area's carpenters are out of work, 14 percent of the cement masons, 10 percent of the plumbers, and 11 percent of the ironworkers.

The average wage, not including fringe benefits or overtime, is $4.93 an hour for building trades workers here, and this means the jobless are losing $4,420,000 a week at the current rate of unemployment.

Carpenters last year worked an average 31.2 weeks; asbestos workers, 41.6 weeks; operating engineers, 42 weeks; ironworkers, 42 weeks; painters, 35 weeks.

Boilermakers worked 8 months on the average; bricklayers and stonemasons 7 months; elevator constructors, 10 months, glaziers, 11.5 months.

Plasterers and cement masons worked 9.5 months of the year; marble masons, 9 months, lathers, 11 months, and laborers, who have the highest jobless rate of all the crafts, worked only 7.5 months.

CCC POLICY HURTS FARMERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest yet another action of the Commodity Credit Corporation, whose actions of late have run invariably counter to the best interests of the American farm community. CCC has created untold havoc among country grain elevator operators and farm livestock feeding operations by preparing to sell off all the CCC corn in country elevators across the entire upper Midwest. In other words, it will remove farmers' primary local source of extra feed and farmers will have to incur much greater expense to haul in feed from terminal markets. Paradoxically, the grain that farmers will have to haul in will be the very same grain that CCC intends to ship out of the local elevators, and the farmer will end up having to pay freight charges both ways on the corn he hauls in. Yet CCC refuses to allow elevator operators to buy enough grain before shipment to meet local needs in the spring and summer months. If ever there was inefficient, unfair treatment of farmers and their suppliers, it has been demonstrated by the CCC in this action. I wish to explain the situation more fully so that my colleagues can see exactly how the CCC has burdened the local farmers with higher costs in this action:

The Government supports the price of corn by buying large amounts in times of low demand. It does this through its purchasing arm, the Commodity Credit Corporation—CCC—which also has the right, within certain limitations, to dispose of these holdings according to various disposal programs and established patterns. Corn is stored in country elevators. These local warehouses are equipped for efficient and mechanized handling of the grain and are well disposed to load and unload the corn from both rail and truck transport facilities on a first-in first-out basis. If the amount of corn exceeds the capacity of the local warehouses, the Government has in many instances assembled bin sites, or temporary storage facilities, not so well equipped for loading and handling, and often less accessible to transportation.

In many local warehouses, the entire contents of the elevators are owned by the CCC. As local farmers need extra corn to feed livestock, as many of them do, they go to the local warehouse for that corn. The warehouse owner, who may be the farmers of a co-op, then buys the grain from the CCC and sells it to the local farmer. Plainly it is to the advantage of local warehouse operators to allow most of the corn to remain in the ownership of the CCC until they need it, since that way he can collect storage fees. This is simply good business, and CCC has not discouraged it since it is in the interest of the local farmers and farm communities. In the past, the warehousemen have been able to purchase the grain they expected to need if loading orders were forthcoming.

Two weeks ago the CCC sent notices to all the warehouse operators in the upper Midwest, saying that they would not be allowed to purchase any more grain from the Government, in effect freezing the holdings in many thousands of elevators across the midcontinent. CCC said that it was sending shipping notices to all warehouses, and that the grain must be moved as soon as possible, presumably to terminals in Minneapolis, Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, and so on, and to port terminals such as Duluth. Their reason for doing this is that they have been very busy in recent months dumping their holdings on the market in paper form, and were now being called upon to deliver. Much of the corn will be going to foreign markets, much to large terminal operations. And all of it will be at the direct expense of the local farmers for many reasons.

First. By freezing the local warehouse supplies of corn, the CCC has virtually eliminated the only local source of extra feed grain for hundreds of thousands of livestock feeders across the Midwest. This has been done totally without regard for the conditions of local regions. Minnesota has not been able to produce a good feed crop for the last 2 years, and last year many portions were declared disaster areas by the President for that very reason.

Second. The CCC action will have the effect of directly increasing farm costs at a time when the gap between farm prices and farm costs has been increasing rather than narrowing. This is because the local farmers will have to get their corn from the terminals or the bin sites, and either way they do it they will have to pay the transportation and handling charges. Those charges will represent not only the cost of bringing in the grain from Minneapolis or Kansas City, but will also include the cost to the terminal operation of bringing the corn in from the local warehouses in the first place. If the charge one way is 7 cents per bushel, the cost of grain to the farmer in the locality where the corn originally rested will be 14 cents plus any additional commission made by the terminal operation. This seems flagrantly inefficient.

Third. The railroads are already heavily overburdened, and are not able to meet their commitments as it is. The inefficient transport of grain to terminal and back will simply add to this load, and will mean that in many cases farmers will not have the corn they need when they need it. It simply does not make sense to force warehouses to ship out 100 percent of their holdings.

If the warehouses had been warned that upon a certain date they would be refused any further opportunity to purchase Government-owned grain, they would have purchased for their own stock enough grain to meet the demands of local farmers in the coming months. The CCC, however, chose to spring this decision on the warehouses, thereby making it impossible for them to take this precautionary step.

Some of the corn is being sold by CCC on a "to arrive" basis at less than it would bring if sold to the local elevator operator, thus putting CCC actively in the grain market in competition with the local elevators in spite of the CCC charter which requires CCC to use "the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade." It is in some cases being sold for less than it would bring locally, which represents an additional expense to the taxpayer, and is not in the interest of sound economy.

Further complications arise in the CCC demand that the corn be shipped out immediately. This poses problems to elevators which have promised delivery of previous commitments, as available boxcar space will now have even greater pressure than before, and will necessitate certain delays in deliveries. Another problem is that many Minnesota elevators are in the midst of crucial shelling and drying operations, which are essential if the wet and immature 1965 corn crop that plagued Minnesota is to be saved.

Increasing the hardships on local farmers, the CCC has made the further mistake of discriminating against crop disaster areas. Areas such as Dakota County, just south of the Twin Cities in Minnesota, were hard hit last year, and produced a poor corn crop. As a result, CCC estimated that these elevators would be needing the grain locally this winter, and did not place January and February orders in Dakota County elevators to meet early commitments. Outstate elevators were given 40-percent orders at that time, enabling local warehouses in some cases to buy enough corn to meet local needs through the spring. Meanwhile, demand in Dakota County was low, and the corn remained in the warehouses. When CCC ordered 100 percent of its holdings out of local elevators in March, however, it did not take Dakota County into consideration, and ordered 100 percent of its holdings there out just as in all other areas, corn deficit or not. This discriminated against farmers in the hard-hit county more than against the farmers in outlying counties, whose elevators at least had a chance to retain 40 percent on orders in January and February. What sense does it make to send Federal aid and relief funds into a disaster area, and then turn around and pull the rug out from underneath that same area with action like this? In agriculture, a disaster is a long-range thing; it is not over a day or a week after it occurs. The effects are far reaching, and extend well into the next year, if not longer. The CCC in its shortsightedness, has in effect undone many of the beneficial effects of the disaster relief funds of last year. Other counties have had similar experiences.

I have written to Secretary Freeman, asking him to reconsider this patently unfair and discriminatory decision by CCC, urging him to pay more attention to the welfare of the farmer.

The text of my letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1966.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ORVILLE: Out in the Midwest in the rural areas like the ones I represent, the farmers depend on their country elevators for an adequate source of feed grains after the corn which they raised on their own farms has been depleted. In response to correspondence and telephone calls from elevators in my district, protesting the recent CCC orders to ship all warehouse corn immediately, I contacted the Department of Agriculture and spoke by phone to Mr. C. H. Moseley, Assistant Department Administrator for Commodity Operations of ASCS. I was informed by Mr. Moseley that all the corn in the local warehouses in the entire upper Midwest has in effect been frozen without forewarning, pending the distribution by CCC of loading orders for 100 percent of the grain in the local warehouses.

I asked him what local farmers who had previously depended on the warehouse corn to supplement spring and summer feed shortages were expected to do this year. I was told that they would be afforded an opportunity to purchase feed on a weekly quota basis from the bin sites. This ignores the fact however, that many of the bin sites in Minnesota are empty, due to the recent bad crop years, and that sizable carrying charges would be required for farmers to bring in feed from remote bin sites or terminal operations.

As you know, 1964 was a drought year in southern Minnesota. A great deal of the local carryover of corn was used by the farmers in that locale. Last year, as you know, the corn kept extremely high moisture—some of it so bad that it could not be run through a dryer. It has to be fed up during the cold months of the year and a great deal of it spoiled and therefore had less feeding value. The country elevators knew of this of course, but did not purchase corn in their warehouses since it is naturally prudent to draw storage feeds from the Government until it was actually needed. In previous years, it has been a custom to permit local warehousemen to buy the corn in this warehouse prior to their receipt of loading orders. While I realize that you have every legal right to act as you have, I would point out that local warehouse operations could hardly have been expected to anticipate your action and purchase a reserve for local use. Had you notified warehouses that you intended to extract a certain percentage of your warehouse holdings each month, or even that you intended to extract 100 percent on a given date, they would have had a chance to lay aside reserves for local use.

I cannot see the wisdom of a farm policy that not only punishes the farmer by dumping corn to depress prices, but then forces the farmer to increase his farm costs by removing his primary local source of feed, forcing him to pay heavy transportation charges to bring back corn from remote terminals that had originally rested in local warehouses. Your policy of requiring that 100 percent of the local reserves be shipped out represents little more than bad business sense, and shows little concern for the welfare of the farmer. At the same time, it puts extra pressure on the already overburdened rail facilities that have been hard put to meet shipping deadlines in recent months.

Since I contacted Mr. Moseley, telephone calls, telegrams, and letters continue to pour in. Therefore, I take this more formal method of strongly urging that you reconsider your harsh decision before the grain is moved out of all the local warehouses, and allow local country elevators to buy the stored grain so it might remain in the local areas for feed purposes. This will amount to a great savings to farm feeders throughout the Midwest.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point 2 of the 10 major resolutions passed at the last convention of the Farmers' Elevator Association of Minnesota. I wish to call special attention to the first, in which it is pointed out that the CCC is acting in violation of the intent of Congress by bypassing the stipulation in the CCC charter which requires CCC to use the normal channels of trade:

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation has recently issued loading orders for moving corn from binsites in Minnesota with instructions that such corn cannot be sold to the local warehousemen; and

Whereas some of the corn is moved to terminal markets and sold on track for less than it would bring locally, which obviously is not in the interests of the taxpayers of the United States; and

Whereas some of this corn is being sold by CCC on a "to arrive" basis at less than it would bring if sold to the local elevator operator, thus putting CCC actively in the grain market in competition with the local elevators in spite of the CCC charter which requires CCC to use "the usual and customary channels, facilities and arrangements of trade": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Farmers Elevator Association of Minnesota, in convention assembled this 9th day of February 1966, does hereby request that CCC immediately stop making such sales and that they return to the principle of using the normal channels of trade by introducing their grain into the channels of marketing as close to the point of production as possible; namely, the country elevator level.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas the contract under which elevators store grain for the Commodity Credit Corporation—the uniform grain storage agreement—provide that a country elevator that ships grain of lesser quality than the loading orders call for must pay in cash for any deficiency in quality; and

Whereas this same contract provides that CCC will not pay in cash for better quality grain received but will establish a credit to the elevators account which can only be recovered by subsequently shipping lower quality grain; and

Whereas during the past year, CCC has made requests of storing elevators to ship high quality grain, even though they had credits on the books which would expire if not used: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Farmers Elevator Association of Minnesota, in convention assembled this 9th day of February 1966, does hereby go on record requesting CCC to change the uniform grain storage agreement and pay cash premiums for the quality grain they receive in the future, as they charge for cash discounts of grain they now receive.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a sample of letters from elevator operators in my district who have written to explain why the CCC decision is counter to any wise agricultural policy, and how it affects the welfare of local farmers and warehousemen. Each letter points out some specific problems, and each demonstrates the ill effects that will befall the local corn buyer once the local elevators have been emptied:

THE MINNEAPOLIS GRAIN
COMMISSION MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 22, 1966.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Members of the Minneapolis Commission Merchant's Association are terminal representatives for several hundred cooperative and independent elevators throughout the four States of Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana, and as representatives of these elevators and their owners, we vigorously protest the manner in which the recent sale of about 50 million bushels of corn, from elevators and bin sites, was made by the Department of Agriculture.

We understand this sale was made for unrestricted use and not necessarily for export. It was also publicly stated by one of their men that, under terms of the sale, it would be possible for corn moved out of a country position to be resold by the buyer at the terminal market and trucked back to the original starting point.

No advance warning was given to country elevators nor were they given a chance to buy any of this corn nor can they buy it now. A large number of elevators would have bought this grain had they known that the corn in their elevators, and that much of the corn in the bin site, was to be moved out as quickly as possible on loading orders which are presently in the process of being issued.

Many of these areas are deficit areas and the corn is badly needed in the local communities.

The price at which this grain was offered to terminals would also have appealed to these country elevators as contrasted with prices they had paid earlier on the purchase of CCC corn.

At the present time there is considerable grain in the country position which must be delivered against sales to arrive which carry penalties for late delivery.

This enormous volume of corn which was sold is to be moved as quickly as possible by both rail and truck and is going to seriously aggravate an already very serious transportation problem in our area.

This grain will be moved by both rail and truck and that portion to be moved out of bin site direct to terminals will bypass the country elevator, thereby denying warehouseman earnings which supplement the meager payments for services performed under the bin site service contract.

If country elevators permit the movement of warehouse grain by truck, they will lose the right to Federal appeal of the original grade.

Directing grain to the terminal and bypassing the country, is contrary to the charter under which the Commodity Credit Corporation operates as it specifies that the customary and usual channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce shall be used wherever possible.

A large proportion of the elevators of our area have cash grain on hand which was purchased before Commodity made their large sale of corn and much of that cash grain on hand was sold to arrive in the market place with specified delivery dates and which now are going to be very difficult to meet with this additional drain on these transportation facilities available.

This cash grain on hand in elevators has been paid for with borrowed money at the rate of 7 percent plus insurance costs and the longer this grain is obliged to remain in the country elevator, the less opportunity the country elevator man is going to have for realizing any profit whatever.

CCC simply specifies that regardless of these previous purchases by the country, they will, on receipt of loading orders, have to deliver car for car if they wish to obtain extensions on their storage termination dates.

We urge you to protest the manner in which this sale was made and the problems it provides for the country and we urge you to take whatever action is necessary to protect your constituents from any similar trades being developed.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD J. SUNDBERG,
Secretary-Treasurer.

GIL'S FARM SERVICE,
Farmington, Minn., March 22, 1966.

Hon. ALBERT QUIE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: I know in your district there has been considerable loading orders issued for corn. Today, we received our loading order for 100 percent of our corn that we have in storage. I think that all the other elevators in our immediate area received the same. A year ago, I wrote you regarding our disaster area which of course you know in our immediate area we have not received a decent crop in the past 2 years. Furthermore, our binsites have been emptied and sold so that Dakota County has no more CCC binsites. In referring to binsites, I am referring to Government-owned binsites. The buildings have been sold and the area has been returned to the original lessee.

Now, as a result of the present loading order, there will be no surplus corn available in Dakota County in any way, shape, or form except what small quantities that are remaining on the farm and over the past 2 years, a lot of farmers have purchased this back and what little is left really amounts to an insignificant amount. Now, furthermore, our corn crop of course has to be moved before the warm weather hits and in fact, it is being moved very rapidly right now. Coming next June, July, August, and September, we will not have any corn available in our area to supply large stock feeders who have been buying corn continually for quite a number of years. In our territory, we have been gradually moving into livestock numbers such as turkeys, hogs, and beef cattle.

The question comes up: Does this appear to you to be good business, from the standpoint of the Government, selling all of this corn into the terminals, making it available to terminal operations and they, in turn, sell it back out into the country again. This would add at least a freight rate of 7 cents per bushel to Minneapolis and it would be 7 cents per bushel back out which immediately adds 14 cents per bushel to the consumer's price. The other alternative would be to truck corn in from other areas. Of course, in Minnesota, all the Government corn is being sold out of the elevators and the only corn that would be available would be available in binsites throughout the territory. None of this, of course, would be available in our immediate area because the binsites have been dismantled. Now if this appears to you to be a practical approach in service to the best interests of agriculture, I am sure that I am not seeing the complete picture.

I just got through telephoning the man in charge of the CCC Office in Minneapolis, Minn., who is merely a branch man and does not have any real authority, indicating this was not their decision but the decision of Washington. I appreciate that you cannot be thinking about individual cases, but I merely point out that this situation could create a very serious corn shortage in our territory.

Now it would appear to me if the Government is insisting on reducing their inventory stocks of corn in areas where we have had very poor crops, where we have been labeled as a "disaster area" and if our 1966 crop appears to be better than it has in the past, the Government during the course of the summer, could give percentage loading orders such as 15 percent in June, 25 percent in July, etc., by new crop time the corn would be gone. We in turn, would be able to sell this out to local consumers and purchase it on a local level such as we have been able to do in the past rather than to put it into one centrally located spot like in this case, Minneapolis, Minn., when it is needed in the country it comes from.

I would appreciate your investigation of this situation immediately as I have my loading order now and I have to make some effort to start moving this corn in the next 4 or 5 days. This situation in my opinion is most urgent and time for acting becomes very short. I hate to burden you with these problems, but at the same time you are our Representative and it appears that we do not know where else to turn.

Sincerely yours,

GIL'S FARM SERVICE,
ELWOOD GILBERTSON.

MARCH 22, 1966.

Hon. ALBERT QUIE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: Today in Dakota County the CCC issued loading orders to all country elevators for 100 percent of their warehouse-stored corn. We here at Castle Rock, Minn., were among those in Dakota County to receive such an order. I would like at this time to acquaint you with the problem that this order may pose on agriculture in Dakota County for the summer months of 1966.

In 1964 our county was severely hit by drought, and by fall it was declared a disaster area by the Federal Government. At this time all country elevators in our county were called upon to disburse CCC-owned corn to drought stricken farmers. This program was successful and beneficial to the area farmers. When we looked at the crop for 1965, we see first the makings of a bumper crop and by harvest time we ended up with a wet, immature crop with little feed value. Because of the quality of this crop it has been necessary to dispose of it rapidly before the warm spring weather sets in. Very little of this corn can be carried through the spring and into the summer for feed. In the meantime the CCC started disposing of its own binsite corn, and has now completed this task.

After having a complete crop failure in 1964, a near failure in 1965, and the disposal of all CCC binsite corn we faced with the severe problem of no corn in our area for the months of June, July, August, and September. Normally the farmer could turn to his local country elevator for his feed supply, but with the loading out of 100 percent of his CCC corn we are no longer in a position to purchase this corn, and are therefore out of the corn business. If, instead, we could have orderly marketing of this corn through the summer months, I believe it would do a much greater service to agriculture.

With our supply of corn completely exhausted we in the country elevator must go to the grain terminals or somewhere else out of our area and have this corn hauled in. The corn we would purchase from the terminal would probably be the same corn which we loaded out for CCC this spring. Does this seem to be sound business, by first paying to have this corn hauled out of our area, then paying a commission, and then pay to have the corn hauled back into the same area in which it was grown. We do not believe that this is in the best interest of agriculture.

A secondary problem with this loading order, is the time in which the corn must be loaded and shipped. This comes at a time when we are trying to save what 1965 corn we can by drying. In order to fulfill the wishes of CCC, it will be necessary to stop all shelling and drying operations to meet the completion date set by CCC. Another problem this will pose on the farmer is the cleaning of grain for seed. The country elevator cannot perform this service and also load corn, due to the contaminating of the seed grain with corn, which cannot be removed with grain cleaning equipment. This could be a detriment to the farmer for his 1966 crop.

We would appreciate your immediate attention on this matter as there is little time and we must start loading out this corn. We are respectfully waiting your reply. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

FARMERS MILL & ELEVATOR,
CARROLL AUGE.
WILFRED AUGE.

CASTLE ROCK, MINN.

ROSEMOUNT, MINN.,
March 25, 1966.

Hon. ALBERT QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Just recently all country elevators in Dakota County, were issued loading orders on their warehouse stored CCC corn; 100 percent to be shipped out of our area. Here at Smith Grain Co., Rosemount, Minn., we also received orders.

Letting this corn leave our area, would cause many hardships on our area farmers; we had almost a complete crop failure in 1964, and what corn we raised in 1965 is immature and has to be used up fast. With warm weather it is rotting in the cribs. We have been shelling and drying, trying to conserve what we can, but the weather set in; also with the early thaws, road restrictions prevent us from hauling the wet corn in from the farms and returning the dry. What corn is still on farms will be used up by another 2 months.

We were relying on the CCC corn to help fill the gaps in the summer months. Shipping it out will force us to haul corn in from farther away areas or by complete feeds from feed manufacturers, which means they buy the CCC corn, put it into complete rations and sell it back to us at a considerable increase in cost to the feeder; this I am sure the Government farm program was not set up to do. This does not seem like good business, in trying to help the farmer.

All of our area binsites have been emptied and dispersed, leaving only what little corn is in country warehouses and some on the farm storage. This will all be needed here in Dakota County and still more has to be shipped in.

We would appreciate your immediate attention, as little time is left to stop this loading out. We also would appreciate a reply in this most serious matter.

Respectfully,

SMITH GRAIN CO.

THE JURY SELECTION ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, this has been called an historic Congress. Not only have we begun to recognize the challenge of poverty, and urban blight, but we have at last passed legislation which will help to make democracy a reality for all Americans. We have good reason to be proud of the Voting Rights Act which we passed last August.

But the scope of our legislative achievements last year in no way diminishes the magnitude of the challenges which continue to confront this Congress and this Nation. At last all Americans may now be able to participate in the political process. But how many Americans are kept out of the judicial process?

Mr. Speaker, on September 27, 1789, George Washington wrote Edmond Randolph:

> The administration of justice is the firmest pillar of government.

Yet as civil rights cases in the last year have illustrated, in some sections of the country the temple of good government has no judicial pillar at all.

In a special report published in October 1965, the Southern Regional Council analyzed the state of Southern justice. Noting that widespread publicity had dramatized the lack of justice in civil rights cases, the report concluded:

> The danger today is not that the public will fail to know about the double standard of justice, but that the public will think it limited only to civil rights cases, or will fail to act.

As the report makes clear, the failure of justice in well publicized civil rights cases is an illustration—not the embodiment—of the breakdown of justice in the South.

The Southern Regional Council pointed out that in this dual system of justice, "much of the problem is the selection of jurors. In almost no courts are jurors picked by thoroughly objective means to insure a true cross section of the community."

Since few counties keep records of jury venires, it is diffcult to assess the exact amount of segregation on Southern juries. But the available evidence indicates that integrated juries are about as rare as integrated polling places. In Alabama, for example, where about 30 percent of the voting age population is Negro, the council estimates that there are 5 or 6 Negroes on a typical jury panel of 110. In Arkansas, where about 20 percent of the voting age population is Negro, the council estimates that there are no more than 4 Negroes on a typical double jury panel of 50.

In an area where accurate statistics are available, the council pointed out that the 28 court clerks and the 109 jury commissioners attached to the Federal courts of the 11 States of the old Confederacy are solidly white—all appointed by the 65 white district judges.

The Southern Regional Council also cites statistics which demonstrate that a Negro convicted of a crime in the South is much more likely to be severely punished than is a white man convicted of a similar crime. For example, although more than one-half of all convicted rapists are white, 87 percent of all the persons executed for rape between 1930 and 1963 were Negroes convicted and sentenced by southern courts. Similarly, of 34 persons convicted and sentenced to death for nighttime burglaries and robberies, between 1930 and 1961, 28 were Negroes.

Nor does this unequal system of justice only affect Negroes who are convicted of major crimes. It also affects Negroes who are convicted of misdemeanors. In the 12 month period ending in June, 1962, 2,341 persons served terms in Georgia's State prison system for their inability to pay small fines. Seventy percent of these were Negro.

Mr. Speaker, the framers of the Constitution knew that the right to trial by jury is a cornerstone of democracy. In article III of the Constitution the framers wrote:

> The trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury.

When they added the Bill of Rights, 4 years after drafting the Constitution, our forefathers again addressed themselves to equal justice, lest anyone mistake their intent. Four of these 10 amendments deal with equal justice. They insure a trial by jury in suits at common law and in criminal prosecutions.

Mr. Speaker, let me read the language of the sixth amendment.

> In all criminal prosecution—

It says—

> the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed.

Let me underline those words once again, Mr. Speaker. The Constitution promises each citizen a public trial by an impartial jury. How well have we kept the faith?

Lest anyone should doubt the intent of the Founding Fathers, let me read another familiar quotation to this House:

> Freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of person under the protection of habeas corpus; and the trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us.

Those words, of course, are the words of Thomas Jefferson, speaking in his first inaugural address. One of the stars that guided our Founding Fathers, he reminds us, was the right to a "trial by juries impartially selected."

Mr. Speaker, we have a great challenge before us this session. We again have the opportunity to fulfill the promise of the Constitution. Two years ago, responding to the great confrontation of the civil rights movement in Birmingham and elsewhere, the Members of this House constructed a Civil Rights Act which tried to insure all Americans equal access to public accommodations, equal educational opportunities, and equal employment opportunities. Last year, responding in part to the Mississippi summer project of 1964 and the Selma march of 1965, we enacted the historic Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, today, I am asking my colleagues who have done so much to help fulfill the promise of America to join in supporting legislation to insure the desegregation of the third great branch of government. Yesterday our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON], and I cosponsored a bill to end discrimination in the juries of this great land. At the same time our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK], introduced a similar bill.

Mr. Speaker, once we have decided that this Congress shall seize the opportunity to desegregate juries, we must still decide upon the quickest and fairest way to accomplish this task. Happily, several formulas for the desegregation of Federal and State courts have already been proposed, and it seems likely that there will be more suggestions to come. We should, of course, welcome them all, for diversity is the father of legislative genius.

H.R. 14111, which I have introduced, is patterned after the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It is consciously not patterned after the voting rights provisions of 1957 and 1960. It tries to learn from their failures and to fashion a formula which—like the Voting Rights Act of 1965—will work quickly and fairly.

The Members of this House are, of course, familiar with the reasons for the failure of the early voting rights laws, and the reasons why last year's act was passed. Chief Justice Warren summarized the experience of the earlier laws in an introduction to the Supreme Court's unanimous opinion upholding the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in South Carolina against Katzenbach—March 7, 1966:

> The previous legislation has proved ineffective for a number of reasons—

He wrote—

> Voting suits are unusually onerous to prepare, sometimes requiring as many as 6,000 man-hours spent combing through registration records in preparation for trial. Litigation has been exceedingly slow, in part because of the ample opportunities for delay afforded voting officials and others involved in the proceedings. Even when favorable decisions have finally been obtained, some of the States affected have merely switched to discriminatory devices not covered by the

> Federal decrees or have enacted difficult new tests designed to prolong the existing disparity between white and Negro registration. Alternatively, certain local officials have defied and evaded court orders or have simply closed their registration offices to freeze the voting rolls.

Mr. Speaker, the House report on the bill made the same point:

> Four years (to press a voting suit) is too long—

It said—

> The burden is too heavy—the wrong to our citizens is too serious, the damage to our national conscience is too great not to adopt more effective measures than exist today. Such is the essential justification for the pending bill.

In short, the early laws did not work because they required individual suits in each of the counties charged with discrimination. The same situation exists in proceedings dealing with jury selection. Suits are expensive to bring; they allow for endless delaying tactics; and there is no guarantee that the district judge will be more helpful than the local jury commissioner.

In order to avoid the delays and difficulties inherent in a case by case approach, I have proposed a jury bill which uses an automatic administrative trigger similar to that employed in the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The bill requires that records be kept of the racial composition of all State jury venires in every State which has a nonwhite population of more than 10 percent and which either required racial segregation by law within the past 5 years or is subject to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. These records must be public and copies must be submitted to the Attorney General.

If the recordkeeping requirement is not complied with by any court, then the Attorney General must certify that court to the Civil Service Commission which will appoint one or more special Federal jury commissioners to function on behalf of the court.

Special Federal jury commissioners will also be appointed by the Civil Service Commission upon certification of the Attorney General that a certain disparity exists between the number of Negroes in a county and the number on the county's jury list. The disparity ratio is 1½ to 1 between the percentage of Negroes in the county, and the percentage of Negroes on the county's jury list.

In addition, the Attorney General is required to certify for the assignment of special Federal jury commissioners any county which discontinued or forbade the use of voter registration lists as a basis for jury venires after the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Special Federal jury commissions will also be assigned to any county in which a Federal court has found within the past 5 years that jurors have been disqualified on account of race or color.

I have enumerated the four conditions under which special Federal jury commissioners will be assigned automatically.

The bill also provides that the Attorney General or any resident of a judicial district or any party to a jury proceeding may bring an action in the U.S. district court for the enforcement of the act.

Federal jury commissioners will compile venire lists with the assistance of the Census Bureau which would be empowered to use a sampling technique to insure a venire which is a representative cross section of the jurisdiction without regard to race, color, sex, political or religious affiliation, national origin, or economic or social status.

The venire lists compiled by the special Federal jury commissioners would be the basis for the selection by lot of jurors by State courts. The special Federal jury commissioners would be entitled to supervise this process.

The bill provides a mechanism whereby a county may move in Federal court to be relieved of its requirements.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14111 is also addressed to the problem of discrimination in Federal juries. Under title II it would set up jury commissions in each Federal district court which would put into effect a sampling plan subject to the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts which would furnish a representative cross section of the population of the Federal district without exclusion on the basis of race, color, sex, religious or political affiliation, or economic or social status.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to acknowledge the assistance in the preparation of this bill of Leonard M. Ross, editor in chief of the Yale Law Journal; Don B. Kates, Simon Lazarus III, and Michael Mukasey, all of the Yale Law School, who drafted the basic provisions of title I.

I certainly hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on this bill and other bills pertaining to jury discrimination as soon as possible. Instance after instance of justice denied by Southern juries makes it imperative that the Congress act now to insure impartiality in jury trials, both State and Federal, in the South.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IN UNITED STATES AGAINST PRICE, AND UNITED STATES AGAINST GUEST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, no one who is concerned for the safety and freedom of our Negro citizens and civil rights workers who have gone to their assistance can miss the importance of the Supreme Court's decisions of this week in United States against Price and United States against Guest.

The first of these cases upheld indictments returned under 18 U.S.C. 241 and 242 against 18 persons who are charged with the murders of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner. The horror of this alleged reprisal for civil rights activities as engineered by State law enforcement officers is reflected in the bare legal terminology of the indictment, and in the restrained language of the opinion that—thankfully—allows prosecution of what the indictment portrays as a brutal conspiracy.

The Guest case sustains an indictment returned against six persons under 18 U.S.C. 241. They charged therein with the attack upon Reserve Lt. Col. Lemuel A. Penn, which resulted in his death. The asserted purpose of this act was to discourage free use by Negro citizens of State facilities and to restrict exercise of their right to travel freely in interstate commerce. Few can disagree that reinstatement of the Federal prosecution in this case is imperative to compliance with Federal civil rights laws in an important area of our country.

Mr. Speaker, as comforting as these decisions may seem on their surface and from the headlines in the press, they should not detract from the necessity for revision of Federal laws aimed at protecting individuals from violence because of their civil rights activities or belief. Careful study of the opinions reveals that grave technical difficulties must be overcome to secure justice in those cases, because of the inadequacies of present laws. Several members of the Court were sufficiently aware of and concerned by them in their opinions to forcefully suggest sweeping revisions so as more effectively to afford the legitimate Federal protection required in the tragic circumstances described in the two indictments.

The civil rights bill which I introduced together with 18 other Republican cosponsors on March 7, 1966, was designed to remedy the shortcomings of present Federal criminal laws. When placed beside these two landmark opinions, I am confident you will find our measures effectively responsive to the requirements of the situation. We ask the support of all Members of this body, by speedy enactment of these essential safeguards, to assure equal protection of the laws for all of our citizens regardless of their race and regardless of their State citizenship in our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carried an editorial which addresses itself to this matter in a most helpful way. I commend it to all who are interested in basic justice for all our citizens.

Protecting Citizens

By virtue of some rather energetic and ingenious artificial respiration, the Supreme Court has breathed new life into the 19th century post-Civil War statutes designed to protect the rights of emancipated Negro citizens from Ku Klux Klansmen and other desperadoes. These statutes, known as section 241 and 242 of the United States Code were dismissed by two Federal district court judges as moribund—or at least as inapplicable in the case of two monstrous attacks on Negroes. The Supreme Court's rescue of them does not make them very robust or reliable. But at least it makes possible the prosecution of some thoroughly despicable characters.

One of the two cases involves the 1964 murder of three young civil rights workers in Mississippi, Michael Schwerner, James Chaney, and Andrew Goodman. The sheriff and deputy sheriff of Neshoba County and a patrolman of the Philadelphia, Miss., police department, together with 15 other men, were indicted for conspiring to arrange their release from the county jail with the purpose of intercepting them and killing them on a public highway. Because this was a Federal, not a State, indictment, the charge was not murder but violation of section 242 forbidding the deprivation "under color of law of rights protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

The indictment was dismissed as against all but the sheriff, deputy sheriff and patrolman on the ground that the others were not acting "under color of law." Writing for a unanimous Court, however, Justice Fortas declared compellingly that "private persons, jointly engaged with State officials in the prohibited action, are acting 'under color' of law for purposes of the statute. To act 'under color' of law does not require that the accused be an officer of the State. It is enough that he is a willful participant in joint activity with the State or its agents." This seems to us unexceptionable.

The other case involved the wanton shooting of Lemuel Penn on a Georgia highway. No State officers were implicated in this heinous crime, and the indictment was for violation of section 241 which provides for a $5,000 fine and imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, for conspiracy "to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

Though somewhat confusingly divided in its reasons, the Supreme Court held this indictment valid, too, on the ground that the killing was part of a preexisting plot to deprive Negroes of constitutional rights—particularly the right to travel on the public highways.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the Court's several opinions in these cases is the ardent invitation they extend to Congress to strengthen the existing civil rights statutes. "Viewed in its proper perspective," Justice Brennan observed pointedly, section 5 [of the 14th amendment] "appears as a positive grant of legislative power, authorizing Congress to exercise its discretion in fashioning remedies to achieve civil and political equality for all citizens."

A measure introduced recently by Representative MATHIAS and a number of Republican colleagues would sharpen the provisions and enlarge the penalties for depriving anyone of constitutional rights, whether under "color of law" or not. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS civil rights proposal would similarly correct existing defects in the law. The Department of Justice, now pondering legislation in this area, will move forthrightly, it is to be hoped, in the same direction. The cases decided by the Court involve fiendish attacks on basic rights which the Government of the United States should be able effectively to prevent or punish.

WEAK PET BILL SHOULD BE REJECTED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the favorite pastime in Washington appears to be creating smokescreens. I am afraid that we are witnessing exactly that in the important and neglected field dealing with animal research. Where the need is overwhelming and the public interest is great, the legislation now agreed upon in answer to the glaring misconduct shown in animal trafficking by unscrupulous dealers, is weak and ineffective at best and a travesty on conscience at worst.

People throughout my district have been shocked at the abuse which has been shown in the acquisition of dogs and other pets for sale to laboratories and experimental stations. No issue has brought any greater response from our people and it is a credit to their sense of fair play and compassion to see their indignation. Frankly, I have been glad to see it because it has often been my opinion that people lack a sense of indignation and tacitly look the other way when their obligation should be clear. In this case there has been a genuine public outcry.

However, this indignation has not been transferred into what, in my opinion, would be a good legislative proposal to curb this illicit and cruel traffic. In its February 4 issue, Life magazine put the issue in proper perspective and portrayed the miserable conditions which were all too typical in treatment of animals gathered by collectors. To call their treatment inhumane would not even adequately convey the disgusting practice. I followed the testimony before the Agriculture Committee very closely.

Witnesses before the House Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the Committee on Agriculture, testifying on proposed legislation to regulate the sale, transportation and handling of dogs, cats and other animals, described cases of heartless theft and cruel abuse, cases in which veteran investigators of animal care organizations were sickened by the complete lack of sensitivity on the part of some animal dealers.

ABUSIVE TREATMENT SHOWN

All in all, the correction of these abuses is by no means a simple matter of Federal jurisdiction. For instance, there are generally three distinct categories of dog dealers. One, the grassroots dealer, actually collects dogs and cats in any given area. The second category is the middleman who travels throughout the country collecting animals for the large dealers. Thirdly, there is the dealer who operates on a tremendous scale involving thousands of dogs and cats yearly. It is this type of dealer who actually supplies research institutions, although he is not their only source of supply.

In the case of one dog dealer who supplied laboratories directly, his means of transportation was a horse trailer complete with a double deck to utilize as much cubic footage as possible to store animals while in transit. According to the witness before the House subcommittee who described the trailer and its contents:

> There were dogs on tops of dogs that were dead, and there were pans of water, but, because of the dogs being on top of the dogs, they could not get to them.

It was estimated that approximately 120 dogs were crammed into this trailer.

Adding to the complexity of the overall problem is the transportation of animals in interstate traffic. Animals are stolen, quickly transported across State lines where they change hands very rapidly, and in some cases wind up at the animal auctions, especially those in Pennsylvania. Local law enforcement is stymied once State lines are crossed. Conversely, State laws are unable to deal effectively with the traffic in stolen animals that originates outside their borders. At present, only 11 States and approximately 30 communities have enacted laws that protect pet owners and try to guarantee an adequate supply of animals for study.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined with all of those Members of this body who have demanded effective steps be taken to close the loopholes in this traffic and provide a framework for regulating those dealers who procure animals. My colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] took the lead in this fight and my legislation is identical to theirs. Judging from the public response, our legislation should have the widespread support of the American people.

COMMITTEE FAILS TO RESPOND

Yet, the House Agriculture Committee has reported out a bill which is weak and ineffective and cannot help but fail in its objective. A few of the glaring weaknesses which make it unworthy are:

First, it fails to require inspection of dealers' facilities and transport.

Second, it merely assesses a token fine for dealer violations instead of providing for revocation of dealers' licenses.

Third, it permits the terrible practice of sale of animals at auction and by body weight. This was shown to be the area of greatest abuse.

Fourth, it mysteriously overlooks one of the basic thrusts behind the legislation, namely, to put the imprint of Congress on a set of humane standards which the Secretary of Agriculture and other governmental officials would be required to promulgate. Of all areas, it is the hardest to justify the lack of concern on the part of the Federal Government for what its own agencies do. If we do not set standards for the National Institutes of Health, whose Poolesville Animal Center alone spends well over $100,000 per year for cats and dogs, it is a farce to tell any other person or laboratory what they should do.

Fifth, it fails to require bills of sale which would be one of the only sure safeguards against the theft and fraudulent acquisition of animals by unscrupulous dealers.

There are other objections but these are the major ones. It is argued that the bill I have introduced would virtually halt this traffic and make it very difficult to continue the operation of the dealers who now traffic in dogs and pets. To that charge, I plead guilty since it is my intent to make it impossible to continue the current practice where animals die in crates from starvation, thirst, or exposure.

The legislation which I support is severe, to be sure, but this situation calls for a quick, striking blow against this cruel and inhumane practice. My bill would license dealers only and require laboratories to purchase animals only from licensed dealers; prohibit the sale of animals at auction or by weight; protect not only dogs and cats but also other animals whose suffering is no less than that of cats and dogs; provide the legislative intent of the standards the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to promulgate to insure the humane housing, handling, and transport of animals by dealers; require legitimate bills of sale to prevent the theft and fraudulent acquisition of animals by dealers; require Federal inspection of dealers' premises and transport of animals; require revocation of dealers' licenses for violations of the act or of the anticruelty laws of the States and calls for an adequate penalty.

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES FOR MISTREATING?

On the national level the Federal Government has subsidized, however unwittingly, the traffic in stolen animals. Through Federal loans and grants the Government has been the major financial supporter of scientific experimentations. For example, an estimated 2¼ million dogs and cats were used in 1964 at hospitals and research laboratories receiving Federal money. Between $30 to $50 million was spent by these institutions for these animals. One Federal agency alone, the Poolesville Animal Center of the National Institutes of Health, spends well over $100,000 on cats and dogs.

Agencies such as the Defense Department, NASA, and the National Institutes of Health use animals for research, and NIH, for instance, has published procedures for the procurement of animals by that agency. However, what percentage stolen animals end up in Government laboratories would probably be almost impossible to ascertain in view of the varying estimates of the number of stolen animals throughout the country which are eventually used by research resources.

One market, no doubt, for stolen animals is the 1,500 research institutions of substantial size throughout the country which receive Federal funds. Although these institutions are instructed by the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to observe State and local laws in the acquisition of animals, and although the publication, Guide for Laboratory Animals' Facilities and Care, spells out for them the guidelines to be observed, abducted animals still end up in such laboratories due to the inadequacy of State and local laws and for want of a more rigid oversight of Federal programs by Federal agencies.

Perhaps if the Federal Government had shown as much zeal in enforcing its laboratory animal guidelines as it is presently demonstrating with its wage-price guidelines versus individual rights, the profits gleaned from this trade by some unscrupulous animal dealers might never have materialized at the outset.

COMMITTEE BILL WOULD BE LICENSED

While I have supported this direct effective approach, it would be equally obligatory that I oppose the reported bill which would do little more than license wrongdoing and give a legal cover to purveyors of mistreated animals. The bill reported out of Agriculture Committee, would, in effect, do more to protect the dealers than it would to protect the animals. Where the dealer is licensed by Federal law but inadequately regulated, how can any local authority properly enforce superior laws of the State or local government?

The reported bill is little more than an effort to scuttle all of our work and flies in the face of demonstrated public opinion. You can be sure that I will be doing everything possible to implement the mandatory provisions of the Bolton-Helstoski-Ashbrook bills which would set up standards that all animal lovers would approve.

TRIBUTE TO PROF. WILLIAM LEO HANSBERRY, LATE PIONEER IN AFRICAN STUDIES FIELD, BY RAYMOND J. SMYKE, SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR AFRICA, WORLD CONFEDERATION OF ORGANIZATIONS OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, for four decades the late Prof. William Leo Hansberry was the leading American historian on Africa. A graduate of Harvard University, Professor Hansberry came from a distinguished Negro family whose roots reach deeply into Mississippi, where his father was professor of history at Alcorn College. His late niece, Playwright Lorraine Hansberry, was the author of "Raisin in the Sun," and other famous plays for Broadway.

Having taught in his Howard University classroom, here in Washington, some of the great and outstanding African leaders of today, Professor Hansberry was very well known and esteemed abroad, but, ironically, almost unknown throughout his native land, the United States. He received honors from Ethiopia and Ghana, and the University of Nigeria named its school of African studies after him, the William Leo Hansberry School of African Studies.

Professor Hansberry was personally acquainted with and explored the leading sites of African antiquity. At the time of his death last November 3, he was working on a four-volume study of the history and prehistory of Africa, the first work of its kind by an American author.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Hansberry's contribution to both the Negro community in America and to the field of scholarship has materially affected the course of present day historical research on Africa. I include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD a testimony to Professor Hansberry, which appeared in the November 20, 1965, issue of the British publication, "West Africa," written by his devoted friend, Mr. Raymond J. Smyke, of Washington, who is the special assistant for Africa of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession. Mr. Smyke is a graduate of the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University and received his master's degree in Africa studies at Boston University.

In the following tribute, Mr. Smyke points out the true greatness of Professor Hansberry as a remarkable pioneer in the field of African studies:

PIONEER AFRICANIST

(William Leo Hansberry, who died peacefully on November 3 after 71 years, was a remarkable pioneer in the field of African studies. While a young man he undertook work singularly unpopular among his contemporaries. He soon outstripped the limited body of knowledge then available on the subject and was stranded in the no man's land of scholarship where no one was qualified to pass on his work. As a result he was rejected by the academic community he served; he was maligned by his own people and effectively blocked from achieving any recognition—academic or material—until the twilight years of his life. Only during the last 5 years were honors bestowed on him, not by America but by Africa. A true victim of the adage "publish or perish," William Leo Hansberry perished in the eyes of his academic contemporaries because he never published. However, there is universal agreement that he was a great teacher, in the mold of Dr. James Emman Kwegyir Aggrey. Their lives were remarkably similar.)

Hansberry was born in Mississippi, where his father was professor of history at Alcorn College, a small Negro institution. After a year at Atlantic University he entered Harvard University. Hansberry had a single purpose at Harvard, to resolve in his own mind the conflicting questions of Africa's past. He worked under anthropologist Ernest A. Hooten, who subsequently wrote, "I am quite confident that no present-day scholar has anything like the knowledge of this field that Hansberry has developed. He has been unable to take the Ph. D. degree in his chosen subjects here or anywhere else because of lack of proper persons to supervise his thesis and because there is no university or institution, so far as I know, that has manifested a really profound interest in this subject."

In 1921, with the mark of Harvard on him, Hansberry was convinced that Africa had a past which in many respects rivaled Europe during the Middle Ages and, further, that the cradle of civilization was indeed in central Africa. He proposed and taught that one of the primary destructive agents of Africa's past was the slave traders who not only destroyed African civilizations but suppressed knowledge of them to support their contention that the institution of slavery was a civilizing factor. This in the decade of the 1920's was sheer academic heresy. For holding these views Hansberry the academician was punished in a most brutal way.

In 1921 he took a part-time lectureship at Howard University in Washington so he could do research in the Library of Congress. In June 1922, an African civilization section was founded in the department of history with Hansberry as director. On June 3, and 4, 1925, a 2-day symposium was held under Hansberry's chairmanship, with 28 papers being delivered by his advanced students. It was formally titled: "The Cultures and Civilizations of Negro Peoples in Africa."

During this period Hansberry was giving three courses enrolling 814 students: "Negro Peoples in the Cultures and Civilizations of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Times"; "Ancient Civilizations of Ethiopia," based largely on the then most recent archeological findings of the Coxe, Liverpool, Oxford, Wellcome, and Harvard-Boston expeditions; and "The Civilization of West Africa in Medieval and Early Modern Times." With no textbooks, the students kept careful notes reproducing the charts and drawings presented during the lecture. Some of these notebooks are still preserved.

But within 5 years Hansberry was formally charged by some university colleagues with teaching wrong and fallacious doctrines which were damaging the university's standing. After he explained to the board of trustees what he was actually teaching, the board dismissed the accusers and cleared him. Shortly after this a small, clearly identifiable anti-Hansberry cult was formed which prevailed for 30 years. In 1937 his 2-year Rockefeller grant to Oxford was terminated after 1 year without explanation. A manuscript he had taken with him to be read by a colleague was published 3 years later without any mention of the real author. Debarred from promotion, Hansberry served his university as an instructor without tenure until World War II.

By 1939 a detailed outline of his proposed five-volume study on the prehistory and history of Africa was prepared and all the sources he intended to use for it were in his possession.

In 1947 he was virtually assured of a grant from the Rosenwald Fund to carry on research, strongly supported by Hooten and the renowned Egyptologist, W. F. Albright, of Johns Hopkins University, who wrote in January of that year: "Mr. Hansberry has covered the ground with extraordinary thoroughness and competence. Of course, it is humanly impossible for any one man to be a specialist in all the varied fields which are involved, including widely divergent anthropological and archeological techniques, as well as control of historical and philological methods not to overlook command of scores of languages, living and dead. But I find that Mr. Hansberry has missed virtually nothing of any relevance to his wide field, showing complete familiarity with the researches of Leakey, Dart, Broom, and Van Riet Lowe * * * Littmann, Asais * * * Reisner, Griffith, Garatant, Randall-MacIver, and many others. His judgment with regard to many highly controversial subjects proved excellent, and his knowledge of contemporary workers in the field is so thorough that he seems almost invariably able to pick out just the scholar, American or foreign, to advise him on any point. Last but not least, he shows considerable skill in writing, where he joins a vivid style and clearness and cogency." Incredibly, Hansberry did not get the Rosenwald grant.

In the postwar years he turned to counseling African students, who were then attending Howard in large numbers. From 1946 to 1959 he served as faculty adviser to foreign students. While some hold that this was a misuse of time that should have been spent on writing, it would be more accurate to look on this communion with African students as a sustaining factor. After 30 years of struggle, he was all but broken, realizing fully that he was blocked in carrying out his life's ambition. In spite of the support of his devoted and loyal wife and the students that a good teacher is rewarded with over the years, the difficulties of the three decades left him discouraged and disillusioned. His efforts to assist African students were a veritable substitute to consume his boundless energy.

At the insistence of friends he applied for a Fulbright research scholarship. Fearful of a repetition of the Rockefeller and Rosenwald experiences, he told no one outside a small circle that the application was even pending. But it was indeed awarded for the year 1953–54, which he spent visiting the antiquities he had so long lectured about. Yet 5 years later he was again dealt a shocking blow: His university, with a generous grant from the Ford Foundation, established a program of African studies, and Hansberry was not invited to participate, though he had been lecturing on Africa since 1922.

At about the same time a number of completely unexpected things occurred which in a sense caused the last 5 years of his life to be his most rewarding. In 1959 Dr. Kenneth Dike, then professor of history at University College, Ibadan, visited the United States. An arrangement was made for Dike and Hansberry to spend 45 minutes together, which lengthened into one afternoon. Dike observed that this lifetime work must at all cost be published, if for no other reason than to stimulate controversy in the new field of African history. Dike and Hansberry then appeared together at a university African program reception, to which the latter was not invited. This single act was a turning point, for while his detractors were prepared to attack Hansberry, not one felt safe enough to question Dike's judgment. A short time later Prof. Thomas Hodgkin of Oxford spent time with Hansberry, coming to the same conclusion as Dike. The neutralization of his detractors was followed in mid-1960 by an impassioned plea from Hansberry's former student Nnamdi Azikiwe, then President of the Nigerian Senate, offering to underwrite the publication of his projected study. Appealing as this offer was, Hansberry wished to have it brought out under American auspices because he felt it to be a uniquely American contribution. Shortly thereafter, two distinguished publishers totally unconnected with the African field—Bennett Cerf and Jason Epstein of Random House—contracted with him for half a million words on African history. This multivolume work was the project Hansberry was primarily engaged in when he died.

GIANT AND SMALL MEN

In addition to honorary degrees from Virginia State College and Morgan State College, he received some cherished honors from the African students he had served so well. In 1960 his friend Dr. Kwame Nkrumah offered him a professorship at the University of Ghana and invited him to publish his works there. His former student Azikiwe, by then President of Nigeria, conferred on Hansberry the University of Nigeria's second honorary degree. At the same time Azikiwe inaugurated the Hansberry School of African Studies at the university. In 1964 Hansberry was selected by the Haile Selassie Trust to receive their first prize for original work in African history, archeology and anthropology.

In 1953 he cofounded the Institute of African-American Relations, now the African-American Institute. He served as vice president and trustee. He was the prime mover in the establishment of Africa House, a student hostel in Washington, and was instrumental in founding the All-African Students Union of the Americas. He published articles and lectured frequently, gave of himself to African students and still found time to be a devoted father to his two daughters. His wife, Myrtle, has taught for many years in the public school system of the District of Columbia; but of more importance, she has been his research assistant, translator, grammarian, counselor and, during the difficult years, a source of strength.

The tragedy of Leo Hansberry is that which sometimes befalls giants surrounded by small men. His rejected views of 40 years ago are now generally accepted. His chief recognition came from Africa and Africans, not from the land of his birth. He suffered as no man should for what he felt was an accurate representation of Africa's past, and he died before his work was completed.

As to the future, a poignant statement was made by Helen Kitchen, editor of Africa Report: "Although Leo Hansberry received many honors from the other side of the Atlantic in his lifetime, he died before he was fully appreciated in his own country. Those of us who knew and loved him have a special responsibility: to make sure that the research to which he was so dedicated is completed and published, and that a book is written to tell his own courageous story."

THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today the task force on international education of the House Committee on Education and Labor began hearings on H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966.

Because this legislation is the only major new education measure proposed by President Johnson this year, I believe it may be useful if I report to Members of the House on the opening of the hearings.

Let me say at the outset that this proposal is a result of two major addresses made in recent months by President Johnson. The first was the President's address of September 16, 1965 at the Smithsonian Institution, on the occasion of the bicentennial celebration of the Institution. The second was the President's message of February 2, 1966, on international education and health. I have unanimous consent following my remarks to insert the texts of these two addresses in the Congressional Record.

The International Education Act is aimed at strengthening graduate and undergraduate programs in international studies at colleges and universities here in the United States. The bill authorizes grants to promote centers of excellence in dealing with particular problems and particular regions of the world.

Some weeks ago a task force of the House Education and Labor Committee was named by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Honorable Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., to hold hearings on this legislation. I have the honor to serve as chairman of the task force and its other members are my distinguished colleagues, Augustus F. Hawkins, of California; Carlton R. Sickles, of Maryland; William D. Ford, of Michigan; William D. Hathaway, of Maine; Mrs. Patsy T. Mink, of Hawaii; William H. Ayres, of Ohio; Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota; and Alphonzo Bell, of California.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make clear that the proposed International Education Act is a part of the broader program in international education which President Johnson moved to initiate with the appointment of a Presidential Task Force last fall and of which he spoke both in his Smithsonian address and his message to Congress of February 2. In his message, the President recommended some 20 new programs in health and education.

Authority for these programs is divided among several Government agencies including the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of State, the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and the U.S. Information Agency.

Of the 20 points proposed by the President, 10 concern the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Three of these require new legislative authority, and they form the major portion of the substance of the proposed International Education Act of 1966.

This act calls for three programs designed to enhance the international dimension of American college and university education by providing financial assistance in the following ways:

First, grants will be made to universities or groups of universities to organize graduate centers for international study and service. Centers may concentrate on either specific geographical areas of the world or on particular fields or on particular issues in international affairs.

Second, grants will be provided to improve undergraduate instruction in international studies through various projects and activities such as training faculty members abroad, expanding foreign-language courses and other aspects of international affairs, programs under which foreign scholars and teachers may visit American colleges and universities.

Third, the National Defense Education Act will be amended. Title VI of this act now provides some support for 98 language and area centers at 61 American colleges and universities. The National Defense Education Act would be amended to provide grants as well as contracts to the universities for the language and area centers, and the elimination of the present 50-percent matching provision. Also, support for Western European languages as well as for the presently covered uncommon non-Western languages.

These three are the principal points in the legislation before the task force.

The first witness to appear before the Task Force today was the distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, himself a widely recognized authority in the field of international education. A former president of the Carnegie Corp. and author of the report, "AID and the Universities."

Secretary Gardner stressed that:

> International education at home and educational relations with other nations are permanent and important aspects of our national interest, on the same level with other enduring aspects of national interest such as commercial relations with other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of Secretary Gardner's testimony at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. GARDNER BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, MARCH 30, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before you in behalf of the proposed International Education Act of 1966, contained in the identical bills H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452, introduced by the distinguished chairmen of the full committee and of this special subcommittee.

THE PRESIDENT'S SMITHSONIAN SPEECH

President Johnson emphasized the importance of international education in his remarks last September at the Bicentennial Celebration of the Smithsonian Institution. He repeated that emphasis in his Message on International Education and Health:

"Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes," the President stated in his message. "It must be at the heart of our international relations."

"Schooled in the grief of war, we know certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth:

"Ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace.

"The conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms.

"The knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when it is shared."

During the past 20 years, the world has moved, more fully and more awesomely, into the atomic age. We live in a world whose destruction could occur without further advances in knowledge or technology.

Perhaps half a century ago, or even a quarter of a century, the world could afford to regard international relations as an isolated and self-contained discipline, distinct from the principal domestic concerns of a nation. The results, while they might often be grave, lacked the potential of world catastrophe.

Today, however, international and domestic concerns are woven together inextricably in the fabric of life of people everywhere on earth. The nations of the world can ignore this only at their peril.

It is in this context that, during the past two decades, the United States has vastly expanded its international economic, cultural, and educational efforts, and it is in this context that the President has now proposed additional steps in the area of international education.

In his Smithsonian address, the President said that "once a nation commits itself to the increase and diffusion of knowledge, the real revolution begins." These words state an essential lesson of two centuries of history. Over the course of these two centuries, and with great rapidity in the last 20 years, education has moved to the center of the human stage. In short, never has mankind had the capacity to accomplish so much through education, and never has the need to advance education been greater.

We recognize that American economic and educational resources are limited, as are those of other nations. Educational development must be consonant with the economic evolution of a society. It must also be consonant with the natural desire of all countries to maintain the sovereignty of their educational systems.

THE PROGRAM AND ITS PREMISES

Accordingly, the program which the President has recommended and the legislation which I am here to support do not propose that the United States undertake to educate the world. Nor do these proposals represent a crash program for an emergency, intended to solve a problem quickly and then to go out of existence.

They are, rather, based on a new premise—the premise that international education at home and educational relations with other nations are permanent and important aspects of our national interest, on the same level with other enduring aspects of national interest such as our commercial relations with other countries.

Why is this true—why must we consider international education at home and educational relations with other peoples as matters of high national interest? The reason becomes plain when we think about the enemy we seek to conquer. That enemy is ignorance, inadequate skills, parochialism, and lack of sensitivity as to why people from different cultures react and behave differently.

We are interested in conquering that enemy not only for ourselves in the United States, but for our fellows in other countries, for mankind in general. We should not shrink from acknowledging our humanitarian motives. We want the men and women of other countries to have better education—as we want our own citizens to have it—so that they can be better people, can realize the fullest flower of their potential, and contribute the maximum of which they are capable to the progress of mankind.

But enlightened self-interest also plays a part. The United States cannot be secure in a world one-half of whose people are illiterate, totally unskilled, or inadequately trained. That is the stuff of which poverty, frustrated hopes, and political instability are built. As we know so well, the repercussions on the United States of such conditions in the world are immediate and serious. So our cooperative efforts to assist their educational development are not only just and humane, they are in line with our own best interests.

We should not assume, however, that in international education we have found a quick and easy answer to the world's ills. We certainly should not assume that we are fully prepared as a nation to go out and show the way to the less fortunate of other lands.

America, too, is a developing country. One of our areas of underdevelopment is our knowledge of other peoples and cultures, of their history and languages, of the processes of change and of economic and political growth. We must learn more about these matters—and more of us must learn about them—before we will be fully qualified to assume our end of the partnership.

Our shortcomings of understanding and skills for international education must be corrected for another reason—a reason that is almost unique in the case of the United States. We are in a very special position, possessed of awesome power yet basing our whole national being on a democratic system. If that power is to be wisely used in the world, if our responsibilities are to be exercised with compassion, it will be because we have succeeded in building on the bedrock of an educated, informed citizenry.

More than we could have imagined 20 years ago, we Americans must become a people attuned to the needs and problems of those from other traditions—and we must be aware of the cultural richness they give us. We must recognize ourselves as borrowers and learners, as well as lenders and teachers.

This, it seems to me, is what this program is all about. The essential genius of international education as one element of mankind's endless march toward our loftiest goals is its mutuality, its reciprocity. No American professor teaches abroad but that he learns and adds a new dimension to his personality. No foreign student comes to study at an American university but that he teaches us something.

PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSED ACT

With this concept of the two-way street as the firm foundation of our efforts, the bill you have under consideration places initial emphasis on the redoubled efforts we Americans must make. The advancement of education at home is an essential step to our becoming what we must quickly become: a body of citizens prepared to handle our world responsibilities, and capable of serving effectively as partners in the compelling tasks of worldwide educational progress.

Section 2 of the bill states concisely the fundamental need which leads to the present emphasis on strengthening the international dimension of American education:

"That a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding * * * between nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the full their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research and to assist the progress of education in developing nations, to meet the requirements of world leadership."

The International Education Act proposes three major steps to strengthen international studies and research in the United States. It would accomplish this by providing additional support under new and more flexible conditions for the work of American colleges and universities.

GRADUATE CENTERS

First, the act would authorize a program of "grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, for the establishment, strengthening, and operation by them of graduate centers which will be national and international resources for research and training in international studies."

The importance of this provision lies in its recognition, essentially for the first time, of the need to sustain and strengthen the institutions of learning on which we have drawn heavily in the past and will have to depend increasingly in the future. As the President stated in his message: "Over the past two decades, our universities have been a major resource in carrying on development programs around the world. We have made heavy demands upon them. But we have not supported them adequately."

Now we propose to correct this deficiency. In placing special emphasis on this provision of the bill, I wish to call your attention to certain opportunities which we believe the bill presents to us.

The first is the opportunity to use this authority for genuinely collaborative moves between the university community and the Government. The centers that will be established should indeed become "national and international resources" and the overall pattern of the centers should be influenced by calculations of national needs and priorities. But at the same time, the centers should express the particular combinations of strengths of individual institutions, the special contributions to our resources of knowledge and trained manpower which that university believes it is most capable of making. This means that the "centers" might not in every instance be a center in the conventional sense of something with physical premises, a professional staff, and a precisely defined program.

On occasion we will wish to use the opportunity opened up by this new authority to support broad universitywide programs to bring an international dimension to large parts of the institution, its facility and students. This may take the form of developing a capacity for international work in several of the professional schools—engineering, business, law, social work, and journalism, for example—a development long overdue in American higher education. Or the greatest promise of a particular university might lie in building solid bridges between those professional fields which have been active in overseas programs, and the social sciences and humanities where most of the teaching, and research in international studies have gone on.

A group of universities might wish to work together, in direct collaboration with a university abroad, to improve their capabilities with respect to some urgent world problem such as the improvement of science teaching or the development of competence in manpower planning. And there would also, of course, be centers in advanced international studies in the more conventional sense.

It is obvious that so important and complex a program must be undertaken soberly and carefully. I believe we should spend a large portion of our time and of the funds that may be available in the first year, on the essential tasks of planning, assessing, setting priorities and encouraging the universities to examine their own individual possibilities and to develop their new programs. We would propose to make program development or "stimulation" grants available to particular universities or combinations of universities. By offering this kind of support early and by establishing a system for close working relationships between the universities and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we believe it will be possible to move carefully, effectively, and with reasonable speed toward seizing the opportunity which this new authority in the bill holds out to us.

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

The second major provision of the bill makes grants available to institutions of higher education for comprehensive programs designed to strengthen undergraduate instruction in international studies. This provision will bring a new and necessary flexibility into the pattern of Federal support of undergraduate work in the international field. It will enable the colleges to find their own best way to bring a stronger international dimension into the life of the institution.

Important beginnings have been made through the recent support of undergraduate language and area studies under the National Defense Education Act. But that approach touches relatively few students and is intended to involve early those who will go on to become advanced specialists in area and language fields. It does not, even potentially, impart to significant numbers of American college students an appreciation of world affairs.

The frame needs to be broadened very considerably. Institutions of higher learning must be encouraged and supported in enabling most of their students to acquire the educated citizen's appreciation of other peoples and cultures and of the forces of change at work in the world. It is of greatest importance to American undergraduate learning that we expand from the NDEA training of specialists concept and establish a broad base in the colleges and universities for educating our young people as generalists and citizens. This is what this provision of the bill authorizes.

Projects and activities which could be supported as part of this effort include: faculty planning for the development and expansion of such programs; training faculty members in foreign countries; expansion of foreign language courses; work in the social sciences and humanities which is related to international studies; student work-study-travel programs; and programs to bring foreign teachers and scholars to American campuses.

In considering and approving grants to improve undergraduate international studies, we will give special consideration to three factors:

First, each institution would be required to plan a comprehensive program in which all of the elements were interrelated in such a way as to provide a meaningful program for both faculty and students. Although Federal grants would support a variety of specific activities and projects, these would have to be integral parts of a carefully planned program.

Second, while we would strive for an equitable geographical distribution of grants, we would give preference to institutions which most urgently needed such funds and which showed real promise of being able to use them effectively. Finally, we would expect the grants under this program to be used to supplement—and not to supplant—other funds already committed by institutions. In short, we are seeking a real expansion in undergraduate international studies, the comprehensive planning of programs, and their wide availability in colleges and universities throughout the United States.

AMENDING THE NDEA

The third major provision of the proposed act is designed to strengthen language and area centers in institutions of higher education which are provided for under title VI of the National Defense Education Act. The amendments to strengthen title VI, which are contained in the bill, would do three things:

They would remove the requirement limiting language instruction to those languages in which instruction is not readily available in the United States; they would remove the 50-percent ceiling on Federal participation; and they would permit language and area centers to be supported by grants as well as by contracts.

These proposals have grown out of nearly 8 years of experience with the language and area centers program. The contributions of the 98 centers which have been established at 61 American colleges and universities have been impressive. What we see now is the need to increase the number of such centers and the range of languages offered.

These provisions would not only result in an increase in the number of centers, but would also permit the establishment of centers in institutions which could not afford to underwrite half of the cost. By permitting instruction in a broader range of languages, the bill would enable such centers to reflect more fully our national needs in foreign language instruction. Present requirements prohibit support of languages that are "readily available," but there are a number of such languages in which additional opportunities for instruction are urgently needed.

These are the three principal substantive provisions of the bill under consideration: the establishment of centers for advanced international studies; the strengthening of undergraduate instruction in international studies; and the expansion of language and area centers.

Taken together, these provisions will benefit both students and faculty; they will increase our capabilities in international education at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; and they will enable us more nearly to meet our national needs for competence in foreign languages. Thus the emphasis in the proposed International Education Act is on strengthening American capabilities in international education. This is where we have to begin.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

At the same time, these provisions of the proposed act would be complemented by the other proposals contained in the President's message on international education. Our total program will be strengthened by various administration actions that can be taken under existing legislative authority, some of which the President outlined in his message. Certain of these would be carried out by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; others would be administered by other Federal agencies.

Through the provisions of the proposed bill and the actions which are planned under present legislation, we seek new knowledge and understanding, new avenues for meeting America's needs in international education at home and abroad, and new talents and dedication to enable us to travel those avenues.

In a world of great peril and great promise, the International Education Act of 1966 will help us to lessen the peril and to increase the promise—not only for our Nation but for people all over the world.

I urge your favorable consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and I would be pleased to try to answer any questions you or other members of the committee may have.

Mr. Speaker, accompanying Secretary Gardner today were the following officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Hon. Ralph K. Huitt, Assistant Secretary (Legislation); Hon. Francis Keppel, Assistant Secretary (Education); Hon. Philip R. Lee, Assistant Secretary (Health and Scientific Affairs); Hon. Shelton B. Granger, Deputy Assistant Secretary; Hon. Ralph C. M. Flynt, Associate Commissioner for International Education.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the task force will hear a number of distinguished officials of the executive branch, all of whom have an interest in international education and whose agencies will share the responsibility of forging a stronger program. Scheduled to testify are:

Hon. David E. Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State; Hon. Charles Frankel, Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs, Department of State; Hon. Leonard H. Marks, Director, U.S. Information Agency; Hon. Warren Wiggins, Acting Director, Peace Corps.

Mr. Speaker, here are the two major addresses of President Johnson concerning international health and education:

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, SEPTEMBER 16, 1965, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON THE OCCASION OF THE INSTITUTION'S BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Distinguished scholars from 80 nations, amid this pomp and pageantry we have gathered to celebrate a man about whom we know very little but to whom we owe very much. James Smithson was a scientist who achieved no great distinction. He was an Englishman who never visited the United States. He never even expressed the desire to do so.

But this man became our Nation's first benefactor. He gave his entire fortune to establish this Institution which would serve "for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

He had a vision which lifted him ahead of his time—or at least of some politicians of his time. One illustrious U.S. Senator argued it was beneath the dignity of the country to accept such a gift from foreigners. Congress debated 8 long years before deciding to receive Smithson's bequest.

Yet James Smithson's life and legacy brought meaning to three ideas more powerful than anyone at that time ever dreamed.

The first idea was that learning respects no geographic boundaries. The Institution bearing his name became the first agency in the United States to promote scientific and scholarly exchange with all the nations in the world.

The second idea was that partnership between Government and private enterprise can serve the greater good of both. The Smithsonian Institution started a new kind of venture in this country, chartered by act of Congress, maintained by both public funds and private contributions. It inspired a relationship which has grown and flowered in a thousand different ways.

Finally, the Institution financed by Smithson breathed life in the idea that the growth and the spread of learning must be the first work of a nation that seeks to be free.

These ideas have not always gained easy acceptance among those employed in my line of work. The Government official must cope with the daily disorder that he finds in the world around him.

But today, the official, the scholar, and the scientist cannot settle for limited objectives. We must pursue knowledge no matter what the consequences. We must value the tried less than the true.

To split the atom, to launch the rocket, to explore the innermost mysteries and the outermost reaches of the universe—these are your God-given chores. And even when you risk bringing fresh disorder to the politics of men and nations, these explorations still must go on.

The men who founded our country were passionate believers in the revolutionary power of ideas.

They knew that once a nation commits itself to the increase and diffusion of knowledge, the real revolution begins. It can never be stopped.

In my own life, I have had cause again and again to bless the chance events which started me as a teacher. In our country and in our time we have recognized, with new passion, that learning is basic to our hopes for America. It is the taproot which gives sustaining life to all of our purposes. And whatever we seek to do to wage the war on poverty, to set new goals for health and happiness, to curb crime, or try to bring beauty to our cities and our countryside—all of these, and more depend on education.

But the legacy we inherit from James Smithson cannot be limited to these shores. He called for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men, not just Americans, not just Anglo-Saxons, and not just the citizens of the Western World—but all men everywhere.

The world we face on his bicentennial anniversary makes that mandate much more urgent than it ever was. For we know today that certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth: that ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace; that the conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms; and that the knowledge of our citizens is the treasure which grows only when it is shared.

It would profit us little to limit the world exchange to those who can afford it. We must extend the treasure to those lands where learning is still a luxury for the few.

Today, more than 700 million adults—4 out of 10 of the world's population—dwell in darkness where they cannot read or write. Almost half the nations of this globe suffer from illiteracy among half or more of their people. And unless the world can find a way to extend the light, the forces of that darkness may ultimately engulf us all.

For our part, this Government and this Nation is prepared to join in finding the way. During recent years we have made much hopeful beginnings. But we can and we must do more. That is why I have directed a special task force within my administration to recommend a broad and long-range plan of worldwide educational endeavor.

Secretary of State Rusk has accepted my request to chair this task force. Secretary John Gardner of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has agreed to serve on it. Both these men have proved, in their past careers, how great is their devotion to international education.

I intend to call on leaders in both public and private enterprise to join with us in mapping this effort.

We must move ahead on every front and every level of learning. We can support [the] dream of creating a center here at the Smithsonian where great scholars from every nation will come and collaborate. At a more junior level, we can promote the growth of the school-to-school program started under the Peace Corps auspices so that our children may learn about—and care about—each other.

We mean to show that this Nation's dream of a Great Society does not stop at the water's edge. And that it is not just an American dream. All are welcome to share in it. All are invited to contribute to it.

Together we must embark on a new and a noble adventure:

First, to assist the education effort of the developing nations and the developing regions.

Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it.

Third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands.

Fourth, to increase the free flow of books and ideas and art, of works of science and imagination.

And, fifth, to assemble meetings of men and women from every discipline and every culture to ponder the common problems of mankind.

In all these endeavors, I pledge that the United States will play its full role.

By January, I intend to present such a program to the Congress.

Despite the noise of daily events, history is made by men and the ideas of men. We—and only we—can generate growing light in our universe, or we can allow the darkness to gather.

De Toqueville challenged us more than a century ago: "Men cannot remain strangers to each other, or be ignorant of what is taking place in any corner of the globe." We must banish strangeness and the ignorance.

In all we do toward one another, we must try—and try again—to live the words of the prophet: "I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart which shall not be put out."

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, FEBRUARY 2, 1966

(The following is the text of the special message dealing with international education on Feb. 2, 1966.)

To the Congress of the United States:

Last year the Congress by its action declared: the Nation's No. 1 task is to improve the education and health of our people.

Today I call upon Congress to add a world dimension to this task.

I urge the passage of the International Education and Health Acts of 1966.

We would be shortsighted to confine our vision to this Nation's shorelines. The same rewards we count at home will flow from sharing in a worldwide effort to rid mankind of the slavery of ignorance and the scourge of disease.

We bear a special role in this liberating mission. Our resources will be wasted in defending freedom's frontiers if we neglect the spirit that makes men want to be free.

Half a century ago, the philosopher William James declared that mankind must seek "a moral equivalent of war."

The search continues—more urgent today than ever before in man's history.

Ours is the great opportunity to challenge all nations, friend and foe alike, to join this battle.

We have made hopeful beginnings. Many of the programs described in this message have been tested in practice. I have directed our agencies of Government to improve and enlarge the programs already authorized by Congress.

Now I am requesting Congress to give new purpose and new power to our efforts by declaring that:

Programs to advance education and health are basic building blocks to lasting peace.

They represent a long-term commitment in the national interest.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is charged with a broad authority to help strengthen our country's capacity to carry on this noble adventure.

EDUCATION

Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes. It must be at the heart of our international relations.

We have long supported UNESCO and other multilateral and international agencies. We propose to continue these efforts with renewed vigor.

Schooled in the grief of war, we know certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth:

Ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace.

The conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms.

The knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when it is shared.

International education cannot be the work of one country. It is the responsibility and promise of all nations. It calls for free exchange and full collaboration. We expect to receive as much as we give, to learn as well as to teach.

Let this Nation play its part. To this end, I propose:

To strengthen our capacity for international educational cooperation.

To stimulate exchange with students and teachers of other lands.

To assist the progress of education in developing nations.

To build new bridges of international understanding.

I. To strengthen our capacity for international educational cooperation

Our education base in this country is strong. Our desire to work with other nations is great. But we must review and renew the purpose of our programs for international education. I propose to:

1. Direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish within his Department a Center for Educational Cooperation.

This Center will be a focal point for leadership in international education. While it will not supplant other governmental agencies already conducting programs in this field, it will: Act as a channel for communication between our missions abroad and the U.S. educational community; direct programs assigned to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; assist public and private agencies conducting international education programs.

2. Appoint a Council on International Education.

Our commitment to international education must draw on the wisdom, experience, and energy of many people. This Council, to be composed of outstanding leaders of American education, business, labor, the professions, and philanthropy, will advise the Center for Educational Cooperation.

3. Create a Corps of Education Officers to serve in the U.S. Foreign Service.

As education's representatives abroad, they will give sharper direction to our programs. Recruited from the ranks of outstanding educators, they will report directly to the Ambassador when serving in foreign missions.

4. Stimulate new programs in international studies for elementary and secondary schools.

No child should grow to manhood in America without realizing the promise and the peril of the world beyond our borders. Progress in teaching about world affairs must not lag behind progress made in other areas of American education.

I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to earmark funds from title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, so that our regional education laboratories can enrich the international curriculums of our elementary and secondary schools.

5. Support programs of international scope in smaller and developing colleges.

Many of our Nation's institutions have been unable to share fully in international projects. By a new program of incentive grants administered through Health, Education, and Welfare these institutions will be encouraged to play a more active role.

6. Strengthen centers of special competence in international research and training.

Over the past two decades, our universities have been a major resource in carrying on development programs around the world. We have made heavy demands upon them. But we have not supported them adequately.

I recommend to the Congress a program of incentive grants administered by Health, Education, and Welfare for universities and groups of universities—

(a) to promote centers of excellence in dealing with particular problems and particular regions of the world.

(b) to develop administrative staff and faculties adequate to maintain long-term commitments to overseas educational enterprises.

In addition, I propose that AID be given authority to provide support to American research and educational institutions, for increasing their capacity to deal with programs of economic and social development abroad.

II. To stimulate exchange with the students and teachers of other lands

Only when people know about—and care about—each other will nations learn to live together in harmony. I therefore propose that we:

1. Encourage the growth of school-to-school partnerships.

Through such partnerships, already pioneered on a small scale, a U.S. school may assist the brick-and-mortar construction of a sister school in less-developed nations. The exchange can grow to include books and equipment, teacher and student visits.

To children, it can bring deep understanding and lasting friendships.

I recommend a goal of 1,000 school-to-school partnerships.

This program will be administered by the Peace Corps, in cooperation with AID, particularly its partners of the alliance program. The chief cost will be borne by the voluntary contributions of the participating schools.

2. Establish an Exchange Peace Corps.

Our Nation has no better ambassadors than the young volunteers who serve in 46 countries in the Peace Corps. I propose that we welcome similar ambassadors to our shores. We need their special skills and understanding, just as they need ours.

These "volunteers to America" will teach their own language and culture in our schools and colleges. They will serve in community programs alongside VISTA volunteers. As our Peace Corps volunteers learn while they serve, those coming to the United States will be helped to gain training to prepare them for further service when they return home.

I propose an initial goal of 5,000 volunteers.

3. Establish an American Education Placement Service.

We have in the United States a reservoir of talent and good will not yet fully tapped: school and college teachers eager to serve abroad; professors and administrators who are retired or on sabbatical leave; Peace Corps volunteers who desire further foreign service.

To encourage these men and women to assist in the developing nations and elsewhere, I recommend that we establish an American Education Placement Service in HEW.

It will act as an international recruitment bureau for American teachers, and will provide supplemental assistance for those going to areas of special hardship.

In time, I hope this Service will lead to the development of a world teacher exchange—in which all nations may join to bring their classrooms into closer relationships with one another.

III. To assist the progress of education in developing nations

To provide direct support for those countries struggling to improve their education standards, I propose that we:

1. Enlarge AID programs of education assistance.

In my message on foreign assistance, I directed AID to make a major effort in programs of direct educational benefit. These will emphasize teacher training—vocational and scientific education—construction of education facilities—specialized training in the U.S. for foreign students—and help in publishing badly needed textbooks.

2. Develop new techniques for teaching basic education and fighting illiteracy.

Our own research and development in the learning process can be adapted to fit the needs of other countries. Modern technology and new communications techniques have the power to multiply the resources available to a school system.

I am calling on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to support basic education research of value to the developing nations.

I am requesting AID to conduct studies and assist pilot projects for applying technology to meet critical education shortages.

3. Expand U.S. Summer Teaching Corps.

The Agency for International Development now administers programs for American teachers and professors who participate in summer workshops in less developed countries. They serve effectively to support teacher-training in these countries. They also enrich their own teaching experience.

I propose this year that AID double the number of U.S. participants in the summer teaching corps.

4. Assist the teaching of English abroad.

Many of the newer nations have a vital need to maintain English as the language of international communication and national development. We must help meet this demand even as we extend the teaching of foreign languages in our own schools.

I have directed AID, supported by other agencies, to intensify its efforts for those countries which seek our help.

5. Establish binational educational foundations.

We have at our disposal excess foreign currencies in a number of developing nations. Where conditions are favorable, I propose that significant amounts of these currencies be used to support binational educational foundations. Governed by leading citizens from the two nations, they would have opportunities much like those afforded major foundations in the United States to invest in basic educational development.

To the extent further currencies are created by our sales of agricultural commodities abroad, I propose that a portion be earmarked for educational uses, particularly to assist technical training in food production.

IV. To build new bridges of international understanding

The job of international education must extend beyond the classroom. Conferences of experts from many nations, the free flow of books and ideas, the exchange of works of science and imagination can enrich every citizen. I propose steps to:

1. Stimulate conferences of leaders and experts.

I have directed every department and agency to support a series of seminars for representatives from every discipline and every culture to seek answers to the common problems of mankind.

We are ready to serve as host to international gatherings. I have therefore called on the Secretary of State and Attorney General to explore ways to remove unnecessary hindrances in granting visas to guests invited from abroad.

2. Increase the flow of books and other educational material.

I recommend prompt passage of legislation to implement the Florence agreement and thus stimulate the movement of books and other educational material between nations. This agreement was signed by representatives of the U.S. Government in 1959 and ratified by the Senate in 1960. This necessary congressional action is long overdue to eliminate duties and remove barriers for the importation of educational materials.

I also recommend that Congress implement the Beirut Agreement to permit duty-free entry of visual and auditory materials of an educational, scientific, or cultural nature.

Finally, we must encourage American private enterprise to participate actively in educational exchange. I urge the Congress to amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to permit improvements in the informational media guarantee program.

3. Improve the quality of U.S. schools and colleges abroad.

We have a potentially rich resource in the American elementary and secondary schools and colleges overseas assisted by the Department of State and AID.

They should be showcases for excellence in education.

They should make overseas service attractive to our own citizens.

They should provide close contact with students and teachers of the host country.

I request additional support to assist those institutions which meet these standards.

4. Create special programs for future leaders studying in the United States.

There are some 90,000 foreign students now enrolled in U.S. institutions. Many of them will someday play leading roles in their own countries. We must identify and assist these potential leaders.

I recommend that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and AID provide grants to enrich their educational experience through special courses and summer institutes.

THE CHOICE WE MUST MAKE

We call on rich nations and poor nations to join with us—to help each other and to help themselves. This must be the first work of the world for generations to come.

For our part, the programs in international education and health I am recommending this year will total $524 million: $354 million in the foreign assistance program; $103 million in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department program; $11 million in the Peace Corps program; and $56 million in the State Department cultural and education program.

As I indicated in my message on foreign assistance yesterday, these programs will be conducted in a manner consistent with our balance-of-payments policy.

We must meet these problems in ways that will strengthen free societies—and protect the individual right to freedom of choice.

Last fall, speaking to a gathering of the world's scholars at the Smithsonian Institution, I said: "We can generate growing light in our universe—or we can allow the darkness to gather."

In the few months since then, forty-four million more children have come into the world. With them come more hunger—and more hope.

Since that time the gross national product of our Nation has passed the $700 billion mark.

The choice between light and darkness, between health and sickness, between knowledge and ignorance is not one that we can ignore.

. The light we generate can be the brightest hope of history. It can illuminate the way toward a better life for all. But the darkness—if we let it gather—can become the final, terrible midnight of mankind.

The International Education and Health Acts of 1966 present an opportunity to begin a great shared adventure with other nations.

I urge the Congress to act swiftly for passage of both measures.

Our national interest warrants it.

The work of peace demands it.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Editorial reaction to the proposed International Education Act of 1966 has been thoughtful and favorable. I insert in the RECORD at this point three editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post which applaud the President's initiative, yet which note some of the difficulties involved in this aspect of the Nation's role as a world leader.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 1966]

CALL FOR A CRUSADE

President Johnson yesterday called on the American people to begin a major crusade against the ignorance and illness that are the lot of countless millions abroad. His message to Congress on international education and health presented an omnibus collection of measures he considers vital in this area. In effect, the hitherto largely domestic objectives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are extended far beyond this Nation's shores, and a major international element is added to that Department's already homeric assignment.

The desirability of the President's objectives—and the moral obligation of this country to try to fulfill them—are beyond dispute. The practical problem is how to realize them. Here the President's program comes up against the same difficulty that has impeded earlier efforts in this direction. The United States is itself suffering from shortages of highly trained educational and medical personnel, and those possessing the skills needed abroad are under strong economic and other pressure to use their energies here.

Evidence abounds in Mr. Johnson's message that he understands how difficult the skilled manpower problem is. He gives careful attention to measures intended to increase the supply of needed educators and medical personnel for service abroad. But much of this program is likely to yield fruit only in the long run, while the needs of the developing countries are urgent now. The imaginative idea of the Exchange Peace Corps may serve as a modest offsetting factor, but its overall contribution is likely to be small.

The shortrun problem of providing personnel for realizing the President's goals will be especially acute in the medical field. The country's existing shortage of doctors, nurses, and other technicians is being aggravated by the demands of the war in Vietnam. That deficit may rise much further when medicare begins in midyear. The course Mr. Johnson has charted is an admirable and inspiring one; the great question is the adequacy of the means to travel it.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1966]

NEW INITIATIVES IN AID

The President has ventured into relatively unexplored and highly promising avenues of international cooperation by providing for expanded education and health programs as part of U.S. foreign aid. In a supplemental aid message, the President elaborates on long-heralded new U.S. initiatives in aid ranging from population control and the training of more medical manpower in the developing countries to the strengthening of international affairs teaching in our own schools.

The President's plans for broadening aid efforts in the education field include creation of a corps of education officers in the Foreign Service, grants to U.S. universities to prepare them for aid responsibilities and enlarged budgets for direct U.S. help to educational institutions in the form of teacher training and the development of vocationally oriented secondary schools. These are all valuable programs, and it is encouraging that our efforts appear to be keyed mainly to indigenous educational enterprise arising out of the soil of recipient countries.

The only disquieting note in the message is a proposal for basic education research in the United States on the educational needs of the developing countries. Such research might well be employed as a guide to our own policy assessments of what others are doing. But the United States should not look on the problems of the developing countries as its own, assuming these problems as an American responsibility or mission and should focus its aid resources in those fields where local initiative has already made itself felt.

One of the most admirable elements in the President's education program is the provision of new funds for regional education laboratories designed to deepen the international affairs curriculums of American elementary and secondary schools. For as the President says, "no child should grow to manhood in America without realizing the promise and the peril of the world beyond our borders. Progress in teaching about world affairs must not lag behind progress made in other areas of American education."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1966]

EDUCATIONAL MISSION ABROAD

President Johnson's special message on international education and health sets the stage for a new concept of education's role in foreign affairs.

In the past, even the best educational work abroad has been considered an adjunct to economic aid. Consequently, the Government agencies and the universities involved in such efforts often handled them as avocations and afterthoughts. This—as John W. Gardner pointed out in his critique of such ventures more than a year before he was appointed Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—often corroded and corrupted the foreign educational mission of both Government and the universities.

By moving education to "the heart of our international relations" and by asking Secretary Gardner to establish within his Department a Center for International Educational Cooperation, the President has given notice that educational leadership rather than political thinking is to be at the controls. This innovation may go a long way toward allaying suspicions abroad which arise whenever a foreign government proclaims itself as the messenger of learning. American as well as foreign educators will feel far greater kinship with the education experts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare than with officials whose first concern is foreign aid.

One danger in Mr. Johnson's proposal is that it may make existing problems appear too easy to conquer. The obstacles are, in fact, formidable. Academic as well as governmental habits of thought and procedure will have to be changed. The low quality of instruction offered at many American dependents' schools abroad serves as a warning that successful international education requires high standards of personnel selection.

Domestic educational strength is indivisible from success overseas. Shortages of highly educated, competent, and committed manpower at home will continue to jeopardize the American impact in other lands. This is, of course, most dramatically shown in the fields of health and medicine. Many American hospitals are now staffed by foreign nurses and doctors, not for reasons of international cooperation but simply because of desperate shortages. Thus, a far greater effort will be required to raise at home, in quantity as well as in quality, the levels of the professional manpower reserve in order to meet the global promise.

AN END TO CHAOS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the House of Representatives on the vote it is about to take on daylight saving time.

Passage of this legislation, which I have supported throughout my two terms, brings to the United States a new uniformity of its time periods in place of the jumbled lack of uniformity that has plagued our Nation for so many years.

I regard this law, Mr. Speaker, as a triumph of conservation. For that is basically what it is—a conservation measure.

Lack of time uniformity has resulted directly in the waste of uncounted millions of dollars during the spring, summer and fall months. The new law will wipe out, with a stroke of the President's pen, the source of that waste.

The economic effects of the law will be measured by savings to the transportation industry because of the great simplification in timetables. The communications industry in general, and the broadcasting industry in particular, will benefit from the nationwide uniformity.

Equally important, but less easy to evaluate, will be the alleviation of the helter-skelter time zones that have driven travelers to distraction as they passed from one area to another, frantically setting and resetting their watches.

My own State of Minnesota perhaps epitomized the chaos that surrounded daylight saving time last year. The district I represent, Minneapolis, and most of Minnesota, went on fast time for about 3 months, from Memorial Day to Labor Day. But directly across the Mississippi River, in our sister city of St. Paul, daylight saving time started 2 weeks earlier and ended, along with the majority of States with daylight saving time laws, at the end of October. Several other Minnesota cities went along with St. Paul, with variations to suit the wishes of their local governments. As usual, several cities along the western border remained on central standard time in order to conform with North Dakota and South Dakota, which did not have daylight saving time. The city of Duluth, on the other hand, conformed with neighboring Wisconsin on the eastern border, and had fast time from late April through late October.

This hodgepodge may not have typified the situation in other States, but it certainly was no isolated exception. Some others, I am sure, had even more confusing difficulties.

By 1967, all this will be a thing of the past. States that vote to do so may remain on standard time, but those that do not will automatically go on daylight saving time from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in October.

This year, places that observed daylight saving time in 1965 will enjoy the benefits of uniform time from April 24 to October 30. Even those people who have opposed daylight saving time in the past will, I am sure, appreciate the countless advantages of the new uniformity.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee's Special Task Force on International Education, I have introduced a bill identical to H.R. 12451—the International Education Act of 1966. This bill is based upon President Johnson's message on international health and education, delivered to this Congress early in February.

I wholeheartedly concur with the President's suggestion that Congress add a world dimension to this Nation's outlook on education. To add this world dimension, the International Education Act of 1966 sets the following goals:

To strengthen the capacity of the United States for cooperation in international education, to stimulate exchange of students and teachers with other nations, to assist the progress of education in the world's developing nations, and to bring about a better spirit of understanding among all nations.

The act would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to American colleges and universities for the purpose of establishing and operating graduate centers for international study and research. It would authorize similar grants for undergraduate programs in the same areas.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the United States has long since cast off the concept of isolationism. In our role as a world leader, we have assumed new and vast responsibilities in widespread areas of the globe. The Federal Government, and private business concerns, have both been hampered by language barriers and inadequate knowledge of the many nations to which our international commitments have taken us.

An indication of our expanding world interests is shown in the growth of consulates and embassies abroad. Prior to World War II, the United States exchanged ambassadors with only 17 nations, and ministers with 43. Today, we have more than 100 ambassadorial posts.

The American people are joining in this expanding interest. During 1963–64, more than 18,000 students and over 4,000 teachers extended their education abroad. This is double the number of 10 years ago. The number of Americans traveling overseas, and the money they spend, also has doubled since the mid-1950s. In 1964, some 2.2 million Americans spent nearly $3.5 billion overseas.

In 1954, some $1.6 billion was spent by 1.1 million overseas travelers.

Congress made a significant advance in 1958, with the National Defense Education Act, which included provisions for establishing Language and Area Centers at colleges and universities. This program has helped immeasurably, but we still have a long way to go.

It is very clear that international understanding and cooperation is becoming more and more important. This can be accomplished largely through education, and that is what we hope to accomplish through the International Education Act of 1966. I urge my colleagues to give it their full support.

THE MAN IN THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of us realize that every day President Johnson is subjected to tremendous pressures and problems, both domestic and foreign, that would break a lesser man. These range from the bloody conflict in Vietnam to checking the spiral of inflation here at home. Just how well President Johnson is handling these problems is clearly spelled out in an editorial entitled, "The Man in the White House" in the March 26 issue of the weekly review, America, published by Jesuits of the United States and Canada. In the midst of carping we sometimes lose sight of the big picture.

The editorial which reads as follows clearly shows how the President is facing and handling the world's most difficult problem:

THE MAN IN THE WHITE HOUSE

If the country ever doubted that the ship of state had a resolute and steady hand on the wheel, the events of the past fortnight ought to be reassuring. One after another, the problems and challenges found their way to that lonely desk in the White House, and one after another the President, bearing the heaviest load in the world, handled them with poise and confidence.

The policy on Vietnam, constantly under review, was courageously reaffirmed. If some of his fellow Americans, including some U.S. Senators, had already forgotten the terrible lesson of the 1930's—that aggression appeased leads only to disaster—he had not. This Nation had pledged that the people of South Vietnam would have a chance to freely decide their future. If the Communist aggressors in Hanoi, supported in their fraudulent war of liberation by Red China and the Soviet Union, imagined that we would weary of the brutal conflict and supinely withdraw, they were tragically wrong. The Communists could have an honorable peace any time they wanted it. All they had to do was end their bloody aggression. Until they did, they would continue to feel the disciplined might of this Nation and its allies.

The Vietnamese war was challenge enough for any man, but the President had a major problem in the West also. To his desk came a letter from President de Gaulle telling him in substance that the sooner the United States removed its troops and installations from French soil—soil red with American blood—the better he would like it. Mr. Johnson met that exasperating démarche with precision and admirable patience. In a brief reply, he observed that since the French were really raising the larger question of the future of NATO, he would have no bilateral dickering with Paris. The 13 other nations that had a stake in the decision would have to be consulted also. The more specific problem of U.S. installations in France could be put off a while until the larger question was settled.

The President knew, of course, that he was powerless to prevent the expulsion of either NATO or the United States from France. What he sought to do in his reply, therefore, was to isolate President de Gaulle (without insulting or needlessly antagonizing him) and solidify our bonds with our remaining European allies. He appears to have done this.

Though pressing, foreign affairs were not the only worry. There was the problem of inflation at home. Business investment was headed for a big jump over last year. Scattered labor shortages appeared. In mid-February, the jobless rate tumbled to 3.7 percent, the lowest since 1954. For the second time in 3 months, banks raised the prime lending rate, and the Federal Reserve Board gave another twist to credit screws. Businessmen continued their vendetta against price restraints, and organized labor spurned the wage guideposts. Editorial warnings became almost hysterical.

The President refused to become panicky. If things started getting out of hand, he would seek heavier taxes. He was not convinced, however, that the inflationary threat was as immediate as many thought, since the evidence was by no means all on one side. And so he has stayed his hand for the time being, still hopeful that business and labor (along with the bankers) will rise superior to the law of supply and demand and help prolong the rich gains of the past 5 years.

It takes a man of steady nerves to run a risk like that. Carry on, Mr. President.

GREECE'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the 25th of March, marked the 145th anniversary of the independence of Greece from the domination of the Ottoman Empire. I know our colleagues join me in extending best wishes to the people of Greece and to their sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, relatives and friends, who have migrated to our shores, on this greatest of all holidays of the people of Greece. I am sure we are all aware of the Grecian contributions to art, literature, philosophy, science, and, indeed, to the concept of democracy which we all value so highly.

In the Fourth District of Florida—which I represent—we are most fortunate in having a large group of individuals of Greek ancestry who are among the most outstanding citizens in the community. Many of these individuals are active members of the Order of Ahepa, Lodge No. 14, in Miami. For the past 43 years these dedicated people have contributed to the welfare and well-being of their fellow man both in the United States and in Greece.

The lodge numbers among its members bankers, restauranteurs, educators, attorneys, and others in business and professional life. These individuals have left their mark whenever and wherever trouble arises, whether it be a flood in Mississippi, an earthquake in Greece, or the delivery of Christmas baskets to the needy. They have assumed leadership responsibilities in carrying out untold numbers of civic and community betterment projects.

Among the outstanding projects for which these individuals are entitled to sole credit—or at least a large share of it—are the Papanicolaou Cancer Institute of Miami, collections of books for libraries in Greece, the raising of several million dollars during World War II through the sale of war bonds, assistance to the Dade County Blood Bank and, as mentioned above, the collection of food, clothing, and funds for victims of an earthquake in Greece and floods in Mississippi.

Leaders of the Greek-American community in Miami and Dade County include the current president and supreme secretary of Lodge 14, Gus Laris and Pete Kouchalakos. Mr. Kouchalakos has previously served as president and supreme president of the lodge. Still active in the organization's many activities are five other former presidents: Nick Handgis who was its first president, Judge Thomas Balikes, George Karnegis, Gregory Constantine, and John Manos.

QUOTA RESTRICTIONS ON HIDE EXPORTS NOT SUFFICIENTLY JUSTIFIED

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Culver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed by the Department of Commerce's action in placing quota restrictions on the export of American livestock hides. The Department has not, in my opinion, offered sufficient justification for this action which poses a serious threat to beef producers in Iowa and across the Nation, and I have therefore today joined the efforts of the Committee on Agriculture and a number of my colleagues in the House and Senate in urging the Secretary of Commerce to reverse the order.

It seems totally inconsistent to me that such restrictions should be placed on this commodity at the same time that the Department of Commerce is exerting every effort to stimulate foreign trade. One of the most serious economic problems we face at this time is the adverse balance of trade. Yet these quotas will reduce exports by 3 million hides and result in an estimated $45-million increase in that adverse balance of payments.

Just last year the Department of Commerce opened an international trade office in Des Moines to increase Iowa interests in foreign markets. That interest has been stimulated and livestock hides have become a major source of Iowa exports. The quota restrictions will cost Iowa beef producers alone at least $12 million a year in reduced live cattle prices.

The present prices of hides at 24–26 cents a pound are high only in comparison to depressed prices over the past few years, before foreign trade was stimulated. Sufficient evidence of the damaging effect of this foreign trade on the domestic supply has not been forthcoming. Much of the hide being shipped at this time is of lower quality than the high standards of our own markets demand, and there is some question that the hides which will remain in this country as a result of quota restrictions can actually be sold domestically. Further reducing the demand at home is the steadily increasing use of synthetic materials by manufacturers, particularly in the production of shoes.

The order placing quotas on exports of hides contradicts our long-standing commitment to free markets, further increases our already serious balance-of-payments problem, and suggests that we are working at cross purposes with our present efforts in the Kennedy round to remove barriers to world trade.

I have requested the Secretary of Commerce to give full consideration to the widespread impact of quota restrictions on the export of livestock hides, and urged him to take immediate action to reverse the order.

NEW HEADQUARTERS FOR THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, I was pleased and honored to participate in ceremonies marking the dedication in Chicago of the magnificent new headquarters building of the American Dental Association. The distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, delivered the keynote address, and additional remarks were made by a number of other notable leaders, including my colleague, John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island, who has made so many major contributions to the Nation's health, and the Most Reverend John P. Cody, Archbishop of Chicago.

It is a great source of pride to me that the American Dental Association's beautiful new structure is located in my district and helps to form, together with a large medical and hospital complex and several leading professional associations, one of the world's most significant centers of health educational and professional activity.

As noted by Secretary Gardner in his address, this new building is a credit to the dental profession, to my own community, and to the entire country. The progressive attitude of American dentistry is well known; and this headquarters, permitting a marked expansion of the association's research and educational activities, is one more example of farsighted leadership. Particular tribute, I think, should be paid to those dental leaders who were especially involved in planning the new headquarters, including Dr. Maynard K. Hine, president of the association; Dr. William A. Garrett, its president-elect; Dr. Harold Hillenbrand, its secretary, and association past presidents Fritz A. Pierson, James P. Hollers, Gerald D. Timmons, and John R. Abel.

Because Secretary Gardner's remarks on this occasion were of such considerable interest, I ask unanimous consent for them to be placed in the Record at this point.

Remarks by John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as Delivered at the Dedication of the American Dental Association Building, Chicago, Ill., February 27, 1966.

A dedication is a time when congratulations are in order, and I am happy to add mine to the many you have already received. This new building—the visible result of long months of planning and working—is a credit to the dental profession, to this community, and to the entire Nation.

I am impressed by the building itself, its 280,000 square feet of floorspace and its splendid equipment. But I am much more impressed by what the building stands for and how it will be used.

The dental profession has a proud record of public service. You have demonstrated an awareness of professional and social responsibility and a willingness to work for the public good. I regard this occasion as a rededication to those ideals. I see this building as a home base for research, for service, for stimulating new ideas, for standards of excellence in all of the fields related to dental health.

Because it will serve as the headquarters for so many dental groups, because it will contain laboratories for research, because of its location in this hub of professional and educational activity, this building will be a focal point for all the occupations concerned with dentistry and a center for cooperative endeavor in health.

We need these kinds of centers, these rallying points of innovation and interlocking activities. Cooperative enterprise is the keynote of our health effort today. The partnership extends through professional and voluntary groups, the university world, and individual practitioners and consumers. Government is also a partner, not as a meddler or intruder, but as a helpful ally and a source of support and stimulation.

Our efforts are interwoven in almost every aspect of health. Together we are involved in developing and maintaining well-trained manpower for the health professions. Together we are planning and building health facilities shaped to modern needs. Together we are experimenting with new methods of service and new patterns of organization designed to make better use of our existing resources.

But we continue to fall short of the need.

The revolutions—social, economic, scientific—which have so greatly enhanced and so greatly complicated our ability to provide health services require no cataloging here. You are as familiar with them as I. But I would emphasize their results: a vastly more sophisticated people, one taught, and rightly so, to seek the full benefits that progress has made possible; a people who live longer and are thus more vulnerable to disease and dependency in later life; a society in which the gap between what is possible for some and inaccessible to others has widened and deepened; a society in which our performance lags far behind our potential.

The challenges are not going unheeded. Spurred by President Johnson's vision of a Great Society, the Nation has responded with a burst of creative activity.

Part of the response has consisted of a wide-ranging series of legislative actions in human welfare. Last year the Congress generated a tidal wave of legislation. Enacted into law were 25 major pieces of legislation to improve the life of the American people. More than half of these measures involved health or health-related programs.

Some of the legislation represents a new approach to old problems, as in the regional programs for heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

Some of the legislation represents a determination to deal with problems we have never faced up to adequately before—such as the measures dealing with mental health and mental retardation.

And some of the legislation is directed against relatively new problems, such as air and water pollution.

But all of the legislation is a contemporary response to an ever-changing world. All of it demonstrates a concern for the individual and for the maintenance of his freedom and integrity.

There are several other common threads in the legislative package: the recognition of the interrelationship of our major social problems; the preoccupation with manpower to carry out the programs; and the strengthening of the Nation's social institutions.

But perhaps the most significant characteristic of the new legislation is its commitment to equality of opportunity. This applies to health and education programs as well as to civil rights.

We want every child, however poor, to have access to a good education. We want every older person, however destitute, to have access to good health care.

But the existence of a potential benefit isn't enough if it never gets into the hands of those who need it. This applies to health services which are available to people in the middle-class part of town, but not to those who live in the slums a few blocks or a few miles away. Services must be organized so that they reach everyone who can profit from them. Otherwise, equality of opportunity becomes an empty phrase.

Nor is equality possible as long as discrimination exists. There must be an end to discriminatory practices of any kind, not only against patients but within the health professions. And the pace of integration must be speeded up. If moral suasion does not do the job, it must be backed by legal action.

Considerable progress has been made toward integrating the dental profession. You have made it clear that you are not willing to tolerate even the vestiges of a practice which denies membership in a professional association solely on the basis of color. This expression of good intent must be followed by firm and swift action. In doing so, you will be affirming your belief in human dignity and conforming to the highest ideals of the dental profession.

Equal opportunity was one of the prominent themes of the White House Conference on Health, held last November in Washington. Perhaps the most compelling statement of the problem was made by Dr. Alonzo Yerby, Commissioner of Hospitals of New York. He said: "Health care of the disadvantaged is piecemeal, often inadequate, underfinanced, poorly organized, and provided without compassion or concern for the dignity of the individual. It remains as a legacy of the poor law, little changed in concept or application, while discoveries in medicine and other health sciences have advanced with lightning speed."

Several of you here participated in the conference, which attracted more than 800 leaders from virtually every health discipline and interest. As you know, it was a freewheeling session, designed to develop ideas for the future. No formal actions were taken. Yet I believe the following goal emerged clearly: comprehensive, continuous health services should be available to all, whenever and wherever those services are needed.

To reach this goal, the following needs were identified: the need for better, more systematic planning; the need for more manpower along the entire spectrum of health; the need for better organization and delivery of health services; the need for more services for disadvantaged groups in our society—the poor, the aged, members of minority groups.

We must now give special emphasis to these problems. I want to discuss briefly two points that are of special interest to me.

The first is planning, which I regard as an imperative for the future.

Most health services have developed in a chaotic fashion, unrelated to each other or to the reality of the need.

Some areas are rich in hospitals or clinics, but essential laboratory and supporting services may be nonexistent.

Little thought has been given to the homebound or to the patient who needs to move freely or frequently from the hospital to the convalescent home to his own home.

Community programs are focused on disease categories instead of on people.

The result is a fragmentation of services, an inefficient use of resources and worst of all, inferior care for the individual.

Last year this Nation spent more than $38 billion for health and medical care. An infinitesimal fraction of this amount went into planning. Perhaps we could get along with improvised services in the past. The stakes are too high today.

I believe, therefore, that steps should be taken to increase the planning capability of States, communities, regions, and institutions. State and local agencies thus would be able to meet their problems with a great deal more flexibility than is presently possible. They could work toward improved productivity, fuller use of facilities, and better use of technology. And this would mean, of course, more and better care for more people.

The second matter I wish to consider has to do with manpower. I am sure I don't have to remind you of the dimensions of the need. Shortages are chronic while the demand for services is soaring.

We are beginning to see some rays of light. Through the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, we are helping to train highly skilled professional people. And the Vocational Education Act of 1963 has greatly strengthened the training of vocational workers in health.

But we have barely begun to consider the so-called middle level health worker—the college-trained therapists, medical technologists, dental hygienists, and others. Yet their services are vital to the modern health team.

It has been estimated that we will need 1 million more health workers in this country by 1975. Most of this army will be made up of the allied and supporting health occupations.

Physicians and dentists depend on these people almost every day. This dependence will increase in the future as health services become more complex.

In meeting the overwhelming demand of sheer numbers we cannot neglect quality of preparation. There is too much riding on the outcome—the lives and health of people—to settle for inferior or shoddy performance.

But training new health workers is only part of the answer. They must be used effectively and meaningfully. Their jobs must be made rewarding, not only financially but in terms of stature and respect. They must be given room to grow and develop. They must be a part of a flexible system which permits orderly advancement and encourages change.

For solutions to problems such as these, we must look to our schools and professional organizations. Society has always turned to professional agencies for leadership, guidance, and standard-setting. This is a time of cataclysmic change. You can guide that change in the direction of scientific and professional soundness.

We also have to increase our scientific knowledge. Research in dentistry, as you well know, offers seemingly limitless possibilities to prevent and control dental diseases. The American Dental Association has vigorously supported an expanded research effort.

The need is obvious. Dental decay is the most common physical defect found among school-age children. Americans are resigned to the fact that they will begin losing their teeth in middle age; yet the control of periodontal disease could halt this process. Mouth lesions are common, ranging from minor irritations to ulcerations that lead to cancer.

We are making headway against these problems. In fact, dental research has done a good deal of pioneering—in fluoridation, in the use of the electron microscope, in the development of germ-free animals. Dental scientists are exploring the association of bacterial infection with various dental diseases. And they are on the trail of preventive vaccines.

The research frontier is encouraging indeed. Far too many people, on the other hand, are not getting the dental care they need. Half of the children under age 15 in the United States have never been to a dentist. The ratio is much higher, of course, for children in rural or impoverished families.

It is against this backdrop of need that the American Dental Association has proposed a national dental care program for children. This proposal is in keeping with your constructive view of the role of a professional organization in modern society. This view is also reflected in your educational programs; in your innovations in continuing education for dentists; and in your leadership of dental prepayment plans.

These efforts augur well for your future. But remember that professions are subject to the same deadening forces that afflict all other human institutions—an attachment to time-honored ways, reverence for established procedures, a preoccupation with one's own vested interests, and an excessively narrow definition of what is relevant and important. In short, the future beckons, but you have to be equal to that future.

I hope that this building will be a source of growth and inspiration as you enter a new period in the profession of dentistry and in the services of your fellow man.

TRADING IN IRISH POTATO FUTURES ON COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hathaway] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Record an editorial which was published in the Portland Sunday Telegram on Sunday, March 13, 1966.

This editorial has reference to my bill, H.R. 6006, now before the Domestic Marketing Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. My bill would prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges.

Futures trading is limited to potatoes grown in Maine. The following facts are clearly supported by evidence submitted to the Agriculture Subcommittee.

Prices for Maine potatoes have steadily deteriorated in relation to prices of potatoes from the areas not using futures trading.

The potato futures market has a history of price movements which in no way have reflected supply and demand factors.

Futures trading has inhibited orderly marketing and merchandising.

Futures trading has frequently resulted in the delivery of poor quality of Maine potatoes due to delay while a carload may be traded many times.

At least 90 percent of Maine's potatogrowers and processors favor the elimination of futures trading on Maine potatoes. It is at their request that I submitted my bill.

The following Portland Sunday Telegram editorial briefly and clearly illustrates the opinion of most of the Maine press and, more importantly, the growers and processors directly affected.

Abolish Speculation

Maine potatoes get it in the neck when the speculators go wild on the commodity exchange. And, Congressman Hathaway, of Maine, rightly protests the damage that is done to the potato industry. It has long been evident that a relatively small group of speculators use the New York Mercantile Exchange to jockey the price—and since the trading is almost wholly in Maine potatoes, it is Maine that suffers.

The Congressman referred to the "frenzied" activity on the exchange a little over a week ago, when the number of contracts traded jumped nearly fourfold over the previous day and the price fluctuated widely. Such uneven activity is unhealthy for Maine potatoes, and it hardly reflects the actual supply-and-demand situation. The Maine potato needs price stability.

What is needed, of course, is passage of Hathaway's bill to abolish futures trading in Maine potatoes—a bill that Congressman McIntire sponsored before him. Congress still balks at the measure, but until positive action is taken to halt the speculation, Maine farmers are going to continue to be at the mercy of the speculators.

NEW SITES FOR THE AEC

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on March 22 when I rose to report on the status of the proposed 200 Bev. accelerator, I promised to continue to keep this House informed of all developments in this area.

Today I rise to introduce into the Record two documents that bear on the Atomic Energy Commission's considerations of a site for the proposed 200-Bev. accelerator. I ask unanimous consent that the documents I refer to be included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The first document is a letter from Dr. E. R. Piore, chairman of the National Academy's Site Evaluation Committee, reporting on the Committee's considerations of existing Atomic Energy Commission sites as a possible location for this large accelerator. As pointed out in Dr. Piore's letter, only the Brookhaven National Laboratory among the AEC sites was found to possess what the National Academy considered desirable requisites. That letter was delivered to the Joint Committee on March 26.

Today the Joint Committee received an AEC announcement which states that it will select a site for the proposed 200-Bev. accelerator from among the six locations recommended last week by the National Academy of Sciences. The names of the sites and the summary of the Academy's report to the AEC were placed in the March 22 Record on pages 6545 and 6546.

For convenience I shall repeat the list of sites. They are: Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, N.Y.; Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis.; Sierra Foothills, near Sacramento, Calif. and South Barrington—or Weston—near Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Seaborg, Chairman of the AEC, has pointed out that "the Commission has reached the conclusion that the best site will be found among those recommended by the Academy."

National Academy of Sciences,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1966.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Glenn: Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter from Dr. E. R. Piore, Chairman of the Academy's Site Evaluation Committee, concerning features of Atomic Energy Commission laboratories and facilities insofar as they relate to the proposed 200-Bev. accelerator laboratory.

Sincerely yours,
Frederick Seitz,
President.

Enclosure.

National Academy of Sciences,
National Research Council of
the United States of America,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1966.

Dr. Frederick Seitz,
President, National Academy of Sciences,
National Research Council,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Seitz: The Atomic Energy Commission asked the site evaluation committee to consider existing AEC laboratories and facilities insofar as they relate to the proposed 200-Bev. accelerator laboratory.

The Brookhaven site is one of the sites recommended. Brookhaven is an AEC general-purpose laboratory with strong programs in low energy nuclear physics, solid state physics, medicine, biology, and chemistry as well as high energy physics. The highly competent accelerator design group already there could serve as a nucleus for the staff of the 200-Bev. facility. While the new accelerator is being built, experimental physicists would be able to use the 33-Bev. machine that is now operating. This would materially aid in the recruitment of staff since experimental physicists must continue their own research while participating in the planning of the new laboratory's facilities. The experience of operating a high energy facility with effective coupling to users is another valuable asset of Brookhaven.

Four other recommended sites can, to varying degrees, benefit from AEC facilities. The South Barrington (or Weston) site near Chicago, Ill., is close enough to Argonne National Laboratory so that beneficial interactions between the two laboratories could take place. Experimental physicists on the staff of the new accelerator laboratory would be able to do some research on the ZGS machine at Argonne during the long construction and checkout phases of the new project. This would be true also if the new laboratory were located at the Madison, Wis. site which is about 2½ hours from Argonne by car. The Sierra Foothills site, near Sacramento, Calif., is within about 2 hours' drive of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory. The high energy physicists and the facilities there could be useful to the new project.

Site proposals associated with other AEC facilities were received from Oak Ridge, Hanford, Idaho Falls, and Savannah River. The committee considered these in detail along with the other 81 proposals referred to them by the AEC. In evaluating the proposed sites the committee, after being assured that a given site had suitable physical properties, assigned paramount importance to factors which affect the recruiting of personnel for the laboratory and the participation of the Nation's high energy physicists. For reasons given in the committee report, the committee found some sites to be clearly better than others from the standpoint of staffing and participation of visiting scientists.

There are indications that the physical properties of the Oak Ridge site are unsuitable for the proposed facility. It would be difficult for users to get to this site.

The Idaho Falls, Hanford, and Savannah River sites either do not have the university strength nearby or do not possess the existing design group that is considered desirable. Moreover, they are remote from the standpoint of users. The advantages that these AEC installations might offer would be related to the utilization of already existing facilities to the extent that such facilities are in excess of present needs. The committee believes that the small economies which might be realized by using these facilities are far outweighed by the disadvantages.

Sincerely,

E. R. PIORE,

Chairman, Site Evaluation Committee.

AEC To Select 200-Bev. Accelerator Site From Among Six Locations Recommended by NAS

The Atomic Energy Commission said today it will select a site for the proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator from among the six locations recommended last week by the National Academy of Sciences.

The sites are: Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, N.Y.; Chicago (South Barrington or Weston); Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis.; and, Sierra Foothills, near Sacramento, Calif.

In a statement, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, AEC Chairman, said:

"After a comprehensive review of the NAS report and the mass of data which was collected by the AEC, the Commission has reached the conclusion that the best site will be found among those recommended by the Academy.

"Therefore, we will proceed with whatever additional studies are necessary to enable us to make a final selection."

Initially, the AEC received 126 site proposals from 46 States. The Commission reduced the list to 85, and last September asked the NAS to evaluate the 85. On March 21, the Academy submitted its recommendations to the AEC.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED TO REMOVE BUDGET BUREAU LIMITATION ON SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE WATERSHED PLANNING AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BANDSTRA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced House Joint Resolution 994, which is aimed at removing a limitation on new watershed planning authorizations for fiscal year 1966 imposed by the Bureau of the Budget on the U.S. Soil Conservation Service.

It is my feeling that congressional action is needed now to insure the continued progress of the Soil Conservation Service watershed planning program, and also to preserve the intent of Congress with regard to fiscal year 1966 appropriations for watershed planning.

Last session, Congress appropriated $5,721,000 to help finance the planning of watershed projects under the U.S. Soil Conservation Service program during fiscal year 1966. These funds, to be matched by about $2.7 million from State and local sources, are needed to provide the technical assistance required in drafting plans for construction of watersheds at a future date.

In appropriating these funds, Congress said nothing about limiting the number of new watershed planning authorizations for fiscal year 1966. Instead, it was clearly the intent of Congress that Soil Conservation Service should spend these funds for the continuing progress of its watershed planning program.

Nevertheless, despite the lack of any authority from Congress, the Bureau of the Budget has imposed an arbitrary, hard-and-fast limitation on Soil Conservation Service, restricting the number of new watershed planning authorizations in fiscal year 1966 to no more than 100. This limitation appears in the fiscal year 1967 budget under the heading "1966 estimate." In fact, however, this estimate of 100 new planning authorizations is a strict limitation and Soil Conservation Service has been notified of this.

If the planning limitation for fiscal year 1966 is not removed, Soil Conservation Service will be hamstrung in providing planning assistance for worthwhile new watershed projects. According to its latest count, Soil Conservation Service has approved 90 requests for planning authorization during fiscal year 1966. Thus, if the Budget Bureau limitation remains, only 10 more new watershed projects will get planning authorization between now and June 30. Without the Budget Bureau limitation, Soil Conservation Service could approve as many as 30 new planning authorizations before the end of fiscal year 1966.

In short, the Budget Bureau limitation threatens to keep about 20 local watershed projects from receiving planning authorization this fiscal year. If these projects do not obtain planning assistance, some of them probably will never become a reality. This would be grossly unfair to the local people who have spent, on the average, about 2 or 3 years of preliminary planning for their watershed projects.

Moreover, the Budget Bureau also has imposed even more severe project limitations on the Soil Conservation Service watershed program for fiscal year 1967. These limitations, which also appear in the new budget as estimates, would restrict Soil Conservation Service to providing only 50 new planning authorizations and approving construction for only 35 new watersheds during fiscal year 1967. If these limitations are not lifted, the scope of the Soil Conservation Service watershed program would be virtually cut in half.

The fiscal year 1967 limitations can be removed by a statement of congressional intent accompanying new Soil Conservation Service appropriations, and I am hopeful that this will be done.

The most pressing problem, however, is the Budget Bureau limitation on new watershed planning authorizations for fiscal year 1966, and I feel that Congress should act as quickly as possible to remove this limitation.

The limitation can be lifted by enactment of House Joint Resolution 994, which makes clear that it is the intent of Congress that no project limitation shall be imposed on watershed planning authorizations during the current fiscal year.

The underlying purpose of House Joint Resolution 994 is to preserve a valuable and time-proven conservation program, and I urge my fellow Members to aid in this effort by lending their support to the resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 994 follows:

H.J. RES. 994

Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the intent of the Congress that the appropriations, in Public Law 89–316, of $5,721,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for small watershed investigations and planning (in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act) shall be expended as needed for the purposes for which the appropriation was made, and that it is the intent of the Congress that, to the extent consistent with the amount of such appropriation and with amounts available from previous fiscal years, no limitation shall be imposed on the number of watershed planning authorizations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

HIGHWAY SAFETY AND AUTOMOTIVE CRASH INJURY RESEARCH

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, two significant news releases have come to my attention which point up widespread interest in and concern for traffic safety.

The first expresses the attitude of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety which was established in 1959 by 3 insurance trade associations representing more than 500 auto insurance companies. The institute has carried on commendable activities to advance traffic safety and this group clearly favors a much stronger commitment of the Federal Government to first, step up spot improvement to eliminate accident-prone locations on our highways, second, increase grants-in-aid for State and local safety programs and, third, increase coordinated research as to accident causation.

The second release reports on splendid cooperation with the automotive crash injury research project of Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory by the Georgia State patrol, the Georgia Hospital Association, and the Medical Association of Georgia.

Since these releases were issued just a few days ago, three fine young Georgia Tech students were killed in a Florida crash which claimed seven lives.

We must give top priority to legislation aimed at mobilizing the capabilities of the Federal Government in attacking public enemy No. 1—the traffic accident, the greatest killer of our youth.

The releases follow:

[A news release from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety]

WASHINGTON, March 18.—Russell I. Brown, president of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, today said the insurance business welcomes and encourages Presidential and congressional attention to the traffic problem, as well as the support of any organization or agency wishing to prevent motor vehicle deaths, injuries, and property losses.

"The traffic accident problem is so extensive and so complex that the resources of the Federal Government are needed to supply the financial incentives required to stimulate and enable the State and local authorities to deal with it effectively," the IIHS head stated.

He said many States and many municipalities have done much for traffic safety, but no single State is employing all of the known and proved management methods to reduce traffic accidents. He said the States have as a guide, the highway safety action program that is the product of 50 years of study and experience. It embraces the major areas of laws and ordinances, traffic accident records, education, engineering, motor vehicle administration, police traffic supervision, traffic courts, public information, organized citizen support, and traffic safety research.

With reference to the Federal Government's role in traffic safety, Mr. Brown said his organization recommends the encouragement of State and local activities in the following ways:

"The Insurance Institute has a high regard for the Bureau of Public Roads' spot improvement program aimed at eliminating highway hazards at locations with high-accident rates. We urge that the States step up their participation in this program.

"The IIHS believes that the principle of dollar matching should be extended to State and local traffic safety programs, such as Federal aid to States for driver education.

"Research, especially relating to accident causes, could be stimulated by assigning to one central agency the responsibility for coordinating the Federal Government's diverse research in traffic safety fields. A comprehensive study of all traffic research should be made to determine what has been done, what is being done, what needs to be done—and what the priorities are."

Mr. Brown said the dissemination of such information would stimulate private agencies and institutions to make their research efforts more productive.

The IIHS president offered a suggestion for amplification of Federal traffic safety assistance efforts. He said there is a great need to establish a channel through which professional safety organizations can coordinate their activities with those of the Federal Government. The collective know-how of these organizations that represent the private sector have been and will continue to be of great help in expediting State programs, encouraged by Federal financing. Mr. Brown said such organizations could serve as an extension arm of the program proposed by President Johnson.

"The automobile insurance business believes that traffic accidents not only can, but, if these things are done, will be reduced," Mr. Brown said. "Although the responsibility rests upon the States, counties, and municipalities, most of these lack the finances necessary to control accidents effectively. The insurance business believes that strong, vigorous, productive traffic accident prevention programs will be developed in the State and local jurisdictions when they get the necessary financing, technical counsel, and legal authority. Some of this assistance must come from the Federal Government, because it is not available from any other source."

The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety was established in 1959 by 3 insurance trade associations representing more than 500 auto insurance companies.

[A Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., news release]

(NOTE.—Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., is an independent research laboratory devoted to applied research in aeronautics, astronautics, electronics, and associated sciences. Owned by Cornell University, it is a separate, nonprofit organization operating in Buffalo, N.Y.)

BUFFALO, N.Y.—Expressions of appreciation will be extended to public officials of the State of Georgia by representatives of the Automotive Crash Injury Research project (ACIR) of Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory at a luncheon on March 23.

The independent research group, which studies auto accidents to improve safety, will honor several Georgia State organizations whose members gathered data on auto accident injuries for use by ACIR. The organizations are the Georgia State Patrol, the Georgia Department of Public Health, the Georgia Hospital Association, and the Medical Association of Georgia.

Representatives of these groups have been invited to the luncheon at the Georgia Department of Health to receive the personal thanks of ACIR officials.

Georgia recently completed its second 2-year participation in the ACIR programs which currently has counterparts in 14 other States. Some 30 States have cooperated in an ACIR project, and Georgia has been a key participant in gathering vital injury data for two separate studies. The first data collection effort by the State was during the 1957-59 period. A total of 2,600 injury-producing accidents were investigated and reported for the ACIR by the cooperating State groups.

In announcing the luncheon, Dr. B. J. Campbell, head of ACIR's accident branch, voiced high praise for the voluntary efforts of the State patrolmen, physicians, public health workers and hospital staff members. "They have contributed greatly," Dr. Campbell said, "to research which has been influential in establishing new safety concepts."

Dr. Campbell noted that, "today, as never before, there is a great deal of discussion about auto safety. Much of this new interest centers on ways of making vehicles safer, which should be a source of great satisfaction to Georgia officials who, with ACIR, have labored in the field for many years."

Referring to Georgia, Dr. Campbell said that the State, "illustrated its farsightedness by entering into an auto accident study back in 1957, long before others recognized the need for such activity. As one of the forerunners in auto safety research activities, the State of Georgia can be very proud of its role because its officials saw a need before many others did and then acted to meet that need."

Plans for increased activity by ACIR were also indicated by Dr. Campbell. "Consistent with the times," he said, "our program is expanding. We are moving into areas of intensive study of accident causation and hoping to expand greatly our coverage of auto accident factors."

ACIR entered the auto safety research field in 1953. For a number of years it was associated with the Cornell University Medical College. In 1962 it joined the Transportation Research Department at Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, a nonprofit, independent research organization owned by Cornell University. ACIR is sponsored by the U.S. Public Health Service and the Automobile Manufacturers Association.

ACIR's research procedure is to accumulate large samples of accident data through the cooperation of various State agencies. The data is then processed and analyzed by ACIR at its headquarters in Buffalo. Reports are published on the findings and disseminated to Government agencies, industry, universities, research organizations and the national press.

Throughout its first 13 years, ACIR was primarily concerned with the so-called "second-impact problem." It studied the sources of injury during an auto accident such as ejection, and striking the windshield, dash and steering wheel. ACIR has also evaluated safety door latches, seat belts, dash padding and window glass. Its findings have been used extensively by other researchers, Government agencies and industry.

Pioneering in auto safety research, ACIR with the cooperation of Georgia and other States, spent much effort in developing statistical methods to study accident injuries and in identifying areas in need of immediate investigation. According to ACIR, the accident cases which Georgia has contributed, along with data from other States, have aided in the production of over 40 technical reports on auto safety through the years.

In all reports or discussions of its work ACIR has emphasized that its program could not have existed without the dedication of thousands of volunteers in police and medical groups throughout the country.

PASSENGER RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST, OR, ARE THE PEOPLE BEING RAILROADED BY THE RAILROADS?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the deterioration of passenger railroad transportation in the Southwest is one of the most serious regional problems in this area. The railroad industry should be as concerned with this problem as the passenger public. One would think that this industry which, to a large extent, is a creature of public subsidies, would acknowledge the problem, recognize the public interest in passenger transportation, and face up to its responsibilities. Unfortunately, there are persons within the industry too narrowminded to see the broad issues. To these people, passengers are a nuisance because they require some care and conveniences.

It is much easier and cheaper to haul freight. And so in many places in the Southwest and throughout the country, the people have been literally dumped off of the trains so that they may be used exclusively for freight. The railroad system has become a Frankenstein monster to a public that has given away its land for the railroads to build on and its money to support its operations.

To justify its "public be damned" attitude and its harmful actions, some railroad officials have concocted the story that the people do not want to ride trains. In the vernacular of the railroad officials, there has been a declining demand for passenger train services. This excuse for the deterioration in services was branded a fabrication and a fraud by a recent decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This decision was rendered on the application of the Southern Pacific Co. to discontinue two passenger trains between Tucumcari, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz. Upon the filing of the proposed action by Southern Pacific with ICC, an investigation was instituted. The results of the investigation and the findings of the ICC are shocking and scandalous. They suggest that the Government's policy toward the railroads and the traveling public needs to be reexamined. For the conclusions from this case and others like it are that not only have passengers been badly neglected but their rights have been violated as well.

In the Tucumcari-Phoenix case, Southern Pacific claimed that passenger demand for train services had declined and that a loss of revenues had resulted. But an analysis of the figures presented to ICC showed that the company had misrepresented its case. The ICC concluded that the net loss claimed was greatly overstated, and suggested that an accurate and fair evaluation of the figures might even reveal a profit for the two passenger trains involved. In the words of the ICC:

> It can reasonably be concluded that the net loss claimed by the carrier is greatly overstated, if indeed a deficit exists.

At the close of my remarks, I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of the ICC opinion in this case. The opinion should be read in its entirety to get the full impact of what Southern Pacific did and attempted to do to the passengers who simply wanted rail transportation from a common carrier between Tucumcari, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz. For the record shows that in this case the railroad company while complaining of a declining demand for passenger service was actually doing everything in its power to destroy that demand.

The overt acts committed by the railroad company against the passengers make up an incredible list and constitute, in my opinion, an indictment and a guilty verdict against the Southern Pacific for offenses against the public. Here are some of the ICC's findings:

First, that the company eliminated the two trains from its published train schedules.

Second, that the company's agents deny the existence of the trains to the inquiring public.

Third, that the Los Angeles ticket office is closed 2½ hours before one of the train's departure time.

Fourth, that only one passenger coach is provided for each train.

Fifth, that when the coach is shopped—sent to the shop for repairs—passengers at Phoenix and Los Angeles are denied transportation and their fares are refunded.

Sixth, that if the coach is put out of service between Phoenix and Los Angeles, a caboose is substituted for the passengers to ride in.

Seventh, that all employees of the company and other pass-carrying passengers are prohibited from using the two trains.

Eighth, that the company's witnesses testified that if the ICC required the continuance of passenger service on the two trains, then the company's legal department would be consulted to ascertain what steps might be taken to discourage passenger use of the trains.

Mr. Speaker, this is a record of both indifference and active animosity by the Southern Pacific Co. against the passenger public. Attempts on its part to claim a decline in demand for passenger services, in the face of this record, is contemptuous of the public, the ICC, and the Congress. It is no wonder that the ICC found in this case that Southern Pacific had discouraged use of the trains by passengers and, in fact, intensified its efforts in that direction even while the proceeding was pending. The ICC opinion states:

> The evidence in this proceeding makes it abundantly clear that Southern Pacific has continued to discourage use of these trains by passengers. In fact, it has intensified its efforts in that direction. Whenever it appears, as it does in this proceeding, that a carrier has deliberately downgraded its service in order to justify discontinuance of a train irrespective of the actual or potential need of the traveling public, the Commission will order the service to be continued.

The ICC did indeed quite properly order the passenger service to continue. But there is an unhappy sequel to this story.

Under the Federal law, the ICC has jurisdiction in discontinuance cases only if the railroad company files a notice of discontinuance with the Commission. I shall have more to say about this provision of the law later. The important point for now is that even where the ICC does obtain jurisdiction over a discontinuance case, its authority and powers in the case are severely limited.

The Commission is authorized, for example, only to require continuance or restoration of service for a maximum period of 1 year. At the end of that 1 year period, the Commision has no further authority in the case unless the company files another notice of discontinuance with it. If the company decides not to file a notice with the Commission, and decides to eliminate the service after the 1 year period, it may do so. In that case the ICC is powerless to act. In other words, the Commission loses its jurisdiction over the case at the end of the 1-year period.

Thus, in the present case, after the 1-year period expires next January, it will be possible for Southern Pacific to discontinue the passenger service without notifying the Commission. In that event, the Commission will have absolutely no authority to act, despite the investigation and the findings it has made in the case.

What will Southern Pacific do next January with respect to the two passenger trains that operate between Tucumcari, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz.? If anyone has any doubt that Southern Pacific will leap at the first opportunity to willfully and arbitrarily discontinue the passenger service, let me cite as another example of the corporate excesses and hostility against the passenger public by this railroad an even more recent case.

For many years, Texans and others have traveled on Southern Pacific's "Sunset Limited." This line has operated daily between New Orleans, La., and Los Angeles, Calif., stopping in several Texas cities along the way. It is a lengthy overnight trip from New Orleans or any of the Texas cities to Los Angeles. Pullman and dining facilities are therefore essential and necessary for the passengers, many of whom are elderly or sick and for a variety of reasons will not or cannot use any other mode of transportation. Yet, in January Southern Pacific discontinued diner service on these trains, and in February it discontinued pullman service.

Here, again, is an instance of a direct and deliberate move by the Southern Pacific to downgrade and discourage travel by rail. Now any sleeping by passengers making the long journey between New Orleans and Los Angeles will have to be done sitting up. Imagine a family with small children, or an aged couple, or a person who cannot fly or travel any other way because of a heart condition attempting this. In addition, travelers who would like to eat a decent meal at a table will now be forced to carry sandwiches or buy potato chips and candy out of vending machines which Southern Pacific has generously provided in place of the dining cars it has eliminated.

No doubt, Southern Pacific will try to show at a later time that there has been a decline in passenger travel on these trains, that they are not profitable, and that they will therefore have to be eliminated entirely. In short, it will try to do exactly what it tried to do in the Tucumcari-Phoenix case. I have no doubt whatsoever that an investigation of this case at the present time would turn up the same shocking facts, the same unbridled attack against the passenger public by Southern Pacific as was turned up and proven in the Tucumcari-Phoenix case.

An investigation would show, for example, that at the present time the trains are usually filled and that on a recent train it was necessary to put another car on to accommodate all those who wanted to travel on it. An investigation would show that prior to their discontinuance the pullmans were usually filled. An investigation would show that it has not been unusual for many trains to be short of seats. Further, an investigation would show a tremendous demand for passenger railroad service. This is all the more striking in view of the railroad's general failure to modernize and properly equip passenger trains, and to otherwise discourage travel.

A recent newspaper story from the El Paso Times, February 26, 1966, documents these facts. This story quotes one railroad official as saying that the recent action is only the first step toward the complete discontinuance of passenger service on these trains. To quote from the newspaper story:

> One crewmember, with more than 25 years service with Southern Pacific called the deletion of sleeping cars a "deliberate attempt to drive off customers and eventually eliminate all passenger service."
>
> The official, who would not give his name for fear of company reprisals, said: "This is the beginning of the end for the Sunset Limited. In January the company removed diners from the train and replaced them with vending machine cars.
>
> "This caused a lot of unhappy passengers. Now it's pullmans they are removing to further discourage business. Next they will cut down the number of chair cars and at the same time go running to the Government wanting to drop the whole train altogther because they are losing money hand over fist."

This railroad official went on to say that the pullmans on this train are usually filled and that on the last one the company had to add another one on.

At the close of my remarks I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the entire newspaper story. I will insert an editorial on the subject that appeared in the El Paso Times, February 27, 1966. In this editorial the antipassenger policy of the Southern Pacific and the Texas & Pacific Railroad is questioned. The editorial asks:

> I wonder what would happen if the Southern Pacific and the Texas & Pacific put on real first-class trains again, offering the best of service on pullmans and diners.

The editorial then cited this poignant example of the hardships imposed by the railroads' antipassenger policy:

> One El Paso woman telephoned me and asked what she was going to do. She formerly lived in Georgia and likes to return to her home frequently. She said she had always taken the Sunset Limited to New Orleans.
>
> I suggested she would have to fly. "I can't," she said, "I'm a heart patient." I suppose she will have to sit up all night or stay in El Paso.

One of the ironies of the situation is that the Federal Government is almost powerless to act. Earlier I referred to the section of the law that authorized the ICC to review a discontinuance of passenger service. This section of the law, 49 U.S.C. 13a, enacted by Congress in 1958, provides that a railroad company may but is not required to file a notice of discontinuance with the Commission.

As I have explained, this means that it is purely discretionary on the part of the railroad company whether or not to invoke the authority of the ICC. If the company does not file a notice of discontinuance with the ICC it may go through with the action without accounting to any Federal agency.

If the ICC cannot review the action of the railroad unless a notice of discontinuance is filed with it, the question may then be asked, why would the company ever file a notice? The answer seems to be that this provision was added to the law in 1958 for the purpose of giving the railroads an extra forum to shop around in for the relief they seek. Under the laws of some States a railroad must obtain approval from the State agency in order to discontinue passenger services.

However, under section 13a, if the railroad files its notice with the ICC, then the State law need not be complied with. Thus, the railroads have a choice of forums, the ICC or the State agency, if one exists, in each case.

It should come as no surprise then, after reading the ICC opinion in the Tucumcari-Phoenix case, that Southern Pacific has not filed a notice of discontinuance with the ICC in the New Orleans-Los Angeles case. So there will be no investigation of Southern Pacific's antipassenger policies in this case—at least not by the ICC. The ICC has no jurisdiction here.

And this situation, the lack of jurisdiction by the ICC in the New Orleans-Los Angeles case, raises an issue of perhaps greater importance than any yet discussed. That issue is this, suppose one day every railroad company in the Nation decided to stop running passenger cars. What could the Federal Government do about it? The answer is, nothing.

The Federal Government and the ICC specifically, would be powerless to act. A group of railroad officials sitting in a smoke-filled private railroad car could simply agree to stop carrying all those pesky people and concentrate on freight. And there would not be a thing we could do about it on the Federal level.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD copies of the ICC opinion in the Tucumcari-Phoenix case, and the news story and editorial from the El Paso Times, referred to in my speech:

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times, Feb. 26, 1966]

SUNSET LIMITED—NO SLEEP IN PULLMAN FOR PASSENGERS

(By Jeff Berry)

Sunset will not mean much to passengers on the once crack Southern Pacific's Sunset Limited.

Any sleeping they do from now on during their long journey between Los Angeles and New Orleans will be done sitting up.

Friday afternoon the historic train pulled into Union Depot with two pullman cars. Both left an hour later as the train pulled out for New Orleans, with two pullman cars. Both left El Paso on the Sunset Limited.

For Pullman Porter Thomas Hill who was on the last train, it will mean he won't be coming through El Paso any more, after 20 years on the route.

Hill, who has 31 years with the Pullman Co. said "we used to be an all-pullman train. And even in 1950 we ran about 5 pullman cars for each train. I'm very sorry to see the cars coming off the runs," he said.

He estimated for each pullman car withdrawn from service, about 15 railroad employees would lose jobs.

Passengers appeared surprised and disappointed the service was being discontinued, and members of the train crew were bitter about the change.

ALWAYS BY TRAIN

"We've always gone by train when we take long trips," said passenger Dr. Paul San Felippo of Chicago. He and his wife had been visiting in Tucson and were returning home aboard the Golden State Limited, which is combined as part of the Sunset Limited from Los Angeles to El Paso. In El Paso, the trains divided, one going to Chicago and the other going southeast to New Orleans.

"I'd never ride a train wihout pullman service for any distance," Dr. San Felippo said. "Why it's 59 hours to Chicago from Los Angeles and almost as long a time to New Orleans."

The Golden State train will retain its pullman cars for the time being, railroad officials indicated last month.

Another passenger, Mrs. Jane Hubbard, said, "I will just ride the Santa Fe if they take pullman service away. I have to ride a train because I am scared to fly."

One crewmember, with more than 25 years service with Southern Pacific, called the deletion of sleeping cars a "deliberate attempt to drive off customers and eventually eliminate all passenger service."

The official, who would not give his name for fear of company reprisals, said "This is the beginning of the end for the Sunset Limited. In January the company removed diners from the train and replaced them with vending machine cars."

UNHAPPY

"This caused a lot of unhappy passengers. Now it's pullmans they are removing to further discourage business. Next they will cut down on the number of chair cars and at the same time go running to the Government wanting to drop the whole train altogether because they are losing money hand over fist."

He said that the pullmans on the Sunset Limited were usually filled and that on the last train it had been necessary to put another one on. Friday's last train had 32 pullman passengers.

Explaining further, the crew member said "the tragic feature of all this is that there is a certain class of people who are forced to ride pullman cars. These are mostly the sick and elderly and now the service has been discontinued."

"The only thing which can be done to change this situation is to rally public opinion—and possibly bend the ear of a few Federal judges," he said.

Southern Pacific officials stated last month they were forced to curtail pullman service on the Sunset Limited as an economy measure. This is also the reason they gave for deleting dining cars.

The Interstate Commerce Commission recently ordered Southern Pacific to continue operating for at least another year its trains 39 and 40, between Phoenix, Ariz., and Tucumcari, N. Mex.

ACCUSE RAILROAD

The Commission accused the railroad of making "drastic attempts" to discourage patronage of the two trains, and deliberately downgrading service to justify discontinuance of the trains.

John Conner, an employee of the Labor Department in Washington, D.C., who was aboard the Sunset Limited, said he had been refused roomette accommodations in Phoenix and had to settle for a pullman bedroom. The next day he had been told a mistake had been made and that no room existed on the train.

"I threatened to complain to the Government then," he said, "and suddenly they found space for me." Conner said he has written Gov. Samuel Goddard of Arizona complaining of the shabby treatment of passengers by the railroad.

"I believe the railroad tried deliberately to keep me off the train, even though they had 16 empty spaces on their pullmans," he said.

Before pulling out of union depot at 6 p.m. Friday, passengers queued up to board the "money losing" Sunset Limited. It was full. Several would-be passengers of the Golden State were turned away for lack of seats.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times, Feb. 27, 1966]

Everyday Events

(By W. J. Hooten)

Judging by telephone calls I have received, the Southern Pacific and the Texas & Pacific are in poor favor with the general public for taking pullmans off their trains running in and out of El Paso and downgrading those trains in other ways.

I read with a great deal of interest the news item telling of refusal by the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit the Southern Pacific to take off trains Nos. 39 and 40, Those trains, formerly known as the Imperial, were first-class trains at one time. I have ridden them.

The ICC accused the Southern Pacific of deliberately downgrading those passenger trains in an effort to make it appear the public did not want them.

I wonder what would happen if the Southern Pacific and the T. & P. would put on real first-class trains again, offering the best of service on pullmans and diners.

I have no way of knowing, of course. But I do know that many people simply will not fly and they want to travel by pullman.

One El Paso woman telephoned me and asked what she was going to do. She formerly lived in Georgia and likes to return to her former home frequently. She said she had always taken the Sunset Limited to New Orleans.

I suggested she would have to fly.

"I can't," she said. "I'm a heart patient."

I suppose she will have to sit up all night or stay in El Paso.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times]

About Railroad Service

News that the Southern Pacific will take pullmans off the Sunset Limited brought forth this memorandum, to which I subscribe and which I think is well worth reading:

At the time the Southern Pacific consolidated the El Paso & Southwestern Railroad with the Southern Pacific, it was represented by the Southern Pacific at a dinner held in the Paso del Norte Hotel that the consolidation would not reduce the number of railroad employees which Southern Pacific and the Southwestern had in El Paso. Mr. Scott, general manager of the Southern Pacific at Houston, made this representation. Shortly after the consolidation was made the Southern Pacific removed most of the Southwestern employees from El Paso to San Francisco and very few employees were left in the old Southern Pacific Building on North Stanton Street. Thereafter, many of the mechanical employees were moved away from El Paso and finally division headquarters were moved from El Paso to Tucson.

According to the press, the Southern Pacific plans to remove all pullmans from the Sunset Limited between Los Angeles and New Orleans on February 24. The Texas & Pacific Railroad has already removed all pullmans from its trains. As a result, it is impossible for anyone going east to Dallas or southeast to Houston or New Orleans to travel by pullman. They are required to sit up all night in day coaches if they use the train.

It is said by the railroads that they cannot afford to operate passenger trains and particularly trains with Pullmans. It is strange that the railroads like the Southern Pacific cannot maintain a train with a Pullman to the east or that a railroad like the Texas & Pacific cannot maintain a train with a Pullman to the east. These railroads are land-grant railroads. They received tremendous grants of land and it seems like they should be required to furnish passenger service and not only freight service on their lines.

It is interesting to note that the Santa Fe Railroad, the Union Pacific Railroad, the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Chicago & Burlington Railroad, and several other railroads find it profitable to operate passenger trains.

It is unfair to the people on the Southern Pacific and on the Texas & Pacific not to furnish first-class passenger service. It seems that we have two classes of people. Those who live in the Southwest are second class and cannot ride the Pullmans. Those who live in the Middle West and East are first class and can ride Pullmans.

The railroads must know that their best contact with the public for getting good will is through first-class passenger service. No effort has been made by the Southern Pacific to keep their trains in first-class shape and no effort has been made by the Texas & Pacific to keep their trains in first-class shape.

After the Southern Pacific absorbed the El Paso & Southwestern it tore up the railroad track of the Southwestern from El Paso to Douglas and left the people in that area without railroad transportation. It has been a continuous process of destruction rather than construction.

It certainly is not good for El Paso not to be able to reach El Paso on a Pullman and to have to sit up all night or ride a bus or a plane. Such action on the part of the railroads is directly hostile to the best interests of El Paso and no steps should be left untaken to prevent it.

[Interstate Commerce Commission, Finance docket No. 23800, January 28, 1966]

Southern Pacific Co. Discontinuance of Trains Nos. 39 and 40 Between Tucumcari, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz.

Decided January 24, 1966.

Upon investigation, found that the continued operation by the Southern Pacific Co. of its passenger trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Tucumcari, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz., is required by public convenience and necessity and will not unduly burden interstate or foreign commerce. Such service ordered continued for a period of one year from the date hereof. Investigation discontinued.

John MacDonald Smith for Southern Pacific Co.

E. T. "Eddie" Williams, Jr. and Howard Peterson for Arizona State Corporation Commission, protestant.

Floyd Cross and L. C. Cypert for State Corporation Commission of New Mexico, protestant.

J. Abbey for city of Tucson, Ariz., protestant.

H. N. Smith, Herbert O. Paul, Bill R. Cowan, E. F. Jergins, James J. Corcoran, Charles R. McGown, J. F. Crawford, and W. W. Witt for protesting railway labor organizations.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION

Division 3, Commissioners Tuggle, Webb, and Tierney.

Webb, Commissioner:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 13a(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Southern Pacific Co., a common carrier by railroad subject to the provisions of part I of the act, filed a notice and supporting statement on September 2, 1965, in which it proposed to discontinue, effective October 6, 1965, the operation of its passenger trains Nos. 39 and 40, between Tucumcari, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz., a distance of 764 miles. Copies of the notice were served and posted in the manner prescribed by section 13a(1) of the act and the regulations of this Commission.

Upon receipt of petitions and letters of protest filed on behalf of individuals, business establishments, community organizations, labor associations, and by State regulatory commissions, we instituted, by order dated September 23, 1965, an investigation of the proposed discontinuance of service and ordered that the service be continued for a period not exceeding 4 months beyond the effective date of the notice.

Because of the statutory limitation upon the time available for investigation and decision, the order provided for the omission of an examiner's report and recommended order, and for certification of the record to us for initial decision.

Hearings were held at Phoenix, Ariz. Briefs have been filed by Southern Pacific and by the State of Arizona.

Trains 39 and 40 are part of a through operation between Kansas City, Mo. and Los Angeles, Calif., with the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co. (Rock Island) operating them on a daily schedule in each direction between Kansas City and Tucumcari, and Southern Pacific operating them between Tucumcari and Los Angeles. Phoenix is 1 of 10 intermediate stops eastbound and 1 of 11 intermediate stops westbound.[1]

These trains are consolidated with Rock Island's trains Nos. 21 and 22 operating between Tucumcari and Memphis, Tenn. Although trains 39 and 40 are not listed in the published passenger train schedules of the Southern Pacific, the record shows that train No. 39 leaves Tucumcari at 10:15 p.m. and arrives at Phoenix at 2:25 p.m. Train No. 40 leaves Phoenix at 11:40 a.m. and arrives at Tucumcari at 5:10 a.m. The schedules of the trains, the names of the points served, and their respective populations are set forth in appendix A attached.

---

[1] The issues in this proceeding are related to those considered in Finance Docket No. 23272, Southern Pacific Co. Discontinuance of passenger trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Los Angeles, Calif. and Phoenix, Ariz., decided Jan. 26, 1965, and in Finance Docket No. 23625, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co. Discontinaunce of trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Kansas City, Mo., and Tucumcari, N. Mex., decided Sept. 27, 1965.

The equipment of train No. 39 now consists of two diesel units, seven head-end cars and one passenger coach, between Tucumcari and Phoenix. One of the head-end cars is a railway post office (RPO) car. In addition, one mail storage car operates from Tucson, Ariz. to Phoenix; one express car operates between Tucumcari and El Paso; and one storage mail car operates between Tucumcari and Tucson. Train No. 40 consists of three diesel units, five head-end cars, including an RPO car, and one passenger coach between Phoenix and Tucumcari. In addition, one mail storage car operates from Phoenix to El Paso; and one baggage-mail car operates between Phoenix and Tucson. The crew consists of an engineer, fireman, conductor, brakeman, flagman, and one express-messenger. The carrier pays half of the wages of the express-messenger.

The carrier's general balance sheet as of June 30, 1965, shows total assets of $2.38 billion, including current assets of $239 million, special funds of $5.1 million, investments, less reserve for adjustment of investment in securities, $214.7 million, total properties, less recorded depreciation and amortization, $1.9 billion, and total other assets and deferred charges $17.3 million. Liabilities were: Current liabilities $146 million, long-term debt $768.9 million, including $35.9 million due within 1 year: reserves $36.6 million; other liabilities and deferred credits $21 million; capital stock $424.9 million; and retained income unappropriated $987 million.

Southern Pacific's income statements for the years 1963, 1964, and the first 6 months of 1965, show, respectively, railway operating revenues of $704,488,237, $728,577,557, and $374,903,392 net railway operating income $71,283,705, $60,304,529, and $36,350,794; and net income, after fixed charges and other deductions $67,052,889, $63,898,391, and $36,990,214. Between 1963 and 1964 total passenger revenues declined approximately $3.5 million and freight revenues increased $27.5 million. The carrier's ratio of total operating expenses to total operating revenues for 1963 was 78.53 and for 1964, 79.92. Passenger operating ratios for 1963 and 1964 were 123.35 and 122.28, respectively.

For the years 1963, 1964, and the first half of 1965, train No. 39 carried an average of 44.8, 33.7, and 16.3 revenue passengers per trip, respectively. During those same periods, train No. 40 carried an average of 44.8, 32.0, and 14.7 revenue passengers per trip. Based on these averages, train No. 39 transported approximately 16,352, 12,334, and 2,934 revenue passengers during the periods mentioned, while train No. 40 transported approximately 16,325, 11,712, and 2,646 revenue passengers. An analysis of passengers handled during a 1-year study period from October 1, 1964, to September 30, 1965, developed that out of a total of 6,818 passengers transported on train No. 39, 66.2 percent were received on the carrier's line at Tucumcari, and 30.3 percent detrained at the Los Angeles termination point.

Of the total number of passengers handled both on and off (6,818 times 2), El Paso had 11.2 percent, Tucson 12.2 percent, Phoenix 17.2 percent, and the six stops intermediate to Tucumcari and Phoenix 11.1 percent. The remaining 48.3 percent were handled at Los Angeles, Tucumcari, or intermediate stops between Phoenix and Los Angeles. In the reverse direction, of the 5,500 passengers transported on train No. 40, 60.6 percent traveled through to Tucumcari for transportation beyond on the Rock Island's lines. Only 13.6 percent of these passengers originated at Los Angeles with the balance accumulating along the line. Of the total number of passengers handled on train No. 40, both on and off, Phoenix had 18.8 percent. Tucson 13.8 percent, and El Paso 19.6 percent. The remaining boarded and/or detrained at other intermediate stations. In terms of the average number of revenue passengers carried per trip during this study period, train No. 39 had an average of 19 passengers and train No. 40 an average of 15 passengers. The data resulting from this study establishes quite clearly that the involved portion of railroad serves both as a local common carrier for El Paso, Tucson, and Phoenix, as well as a "bridge" carrier between the lines of the Rock Island and that portion of the Southern Pacific system lying west of Phoenix serving the Pacific coast area.

The carrier, in demonstrating the financial results of operating the trains between Tucumcari and Phoenix, conducted a 1 week study, from August 1 through August 7, 1965. The revenues and expenses derived from this study were multiplied by 52.14 weeks to arrive at an annual basis. Inasmuch as the consist of the involved trains was materially changed from their composition in 1964, such a costing procedure is basically reasonable. (See app. B.) However, the carrier does not confine its revenue and expense projections to the change in consist, but computes its expenses on factors such as different mileages, switching, etc., attributable to operations west of Phoenix, that are not used in its computations for 1963, 1964 and the first 6 months of 1965. Hence, no comparison can be made between the anticipated figures for the year 1965 and those of the previous years based on actual experience and confined to the pertinent Tucumcari-Phoenix operation.

Furthermore, most of the expense items are predicated on system averages applied to miles operated. The annual statistics of the involved trains, as provided by the carrier, and shown in appendix C cannot be reconciled in all categories. For instance the route miles of 763 for train No. 39 and 764 for train No. 40 are confirmed by reference to the carrier's passenger train schedule. Similarly the annual train miles and chair car miles reflect correct mathematical computations. (Distance times 365 days.) However, the remaining mileage statistics are irreconcilable with the distance involved. Considering that train No. 39 is powered by two diesel locomotive units, the diesel unit miles would logically be computed by multiplying the train miles by two or 556,990 miles, instead of 909,215 miles shown by the carrier. No explanation is found in the record to explain this large variance. In addition, some of the trains' annual statistics include mileage operated between Phoenix and Los Angeles. The carrier advances some arguments in support of the consideration of these additional mileage figures, but their effect on expenses incurred on the line of railroad under consideration herein is deemed speculative. Switching expense at the Los Angeles terminal is another cost item for which there is no substantive evidence upon which a proper evaluation can be made. Based on the foregoing criticism, and disregarding fully allocated costs, interest charges, and terminal expenses, no practical evaluation can be made of the cost evidence submitted by the carrier. The carrier recognizes the fact that these trains have a feeder value to its system, but did not include any feeder revenue in its statement of estimated revenues and expenses. It can reasonably be concluded that the net loss claimed by the carrier is greatly overstated, if indeed a deficit exists.

Although the carrier emphasizes the decrease in revenue passengers transported on these trains, it is all the more remarkable, considering the drastic attempts of the carrier to discourage patronge of these trains, that over 12,000 passengers were transported during the October 1, 1964–September 30, 1965 special study period.

Not only has the carrier eliminated these trains from its published passenger train schedules, ostensibly to save potential passengers from the ordeal of riding them, but the carrier's agents deny the existence of these trains to an inquiring public. The Los Angeles ticket office is closed 2½ hours before train 40 departure time. Only one passenger coach is provided for each train. When the coach is shopped, passengers at Phoenix and Los Angeles are denied transportation and their fares refunded. If the coach is put out of service between Phoenix and Los Angeles, a caboose is substituted for the passengers to ride in. All employees of the carrier and other pass-carrying passengers are prohibited from using these trains, and have been directed to use train Nos. 3 and 4 which operate over the involved route. Trains 3 and 4 are in such demand that during several months of the year they operate in two sections. They consist during the remainder of the year of between 18 and 21 cars. Even with that number of cars it has often been necessary to turn passengers away because of capacity loads. Under the circumstances, the carrier's action in discouraging use of trains Nos. 39 and 40 is most unusual.

In Finance Docket No. 23272, Southern Pacific Co. Discontinuance of Passenger Trains Nos. 39 and 40 Between Los Angeles, Calif. and Phoenix, Ariz., decided January 26, 1965, the carrier's witnesses testified, in effect, that if the Commission should enter an order requiring the continuance of passenger service on these same trains between Phoenix and Los Angeles, the carrier's legal department would be consulted to ascertain what steps might be taken to discourage use of such service. In our report in that proceeding we found a public need for the continuation of the service. In addition, we made it clear that any action by the carrier to undermine the service would weaken any argument that the service is not required by the public convenience and necessity.

The evidence in this proceeding makes it abundantly clear that Southern Pacific has continued to discourage use of these trains by passengers. In fact, it has intensified its efforts in that direction. Whenever it appears, as it does in this proceeding, that a carrier has deliberately downgraded its service in order to justify discontinuance of a train irrespective of the actual or potential needs of the traveling public, the Commission will order the service to be continued. See Pennsylvania R. Co. Discontinuance of Passenger Service, 320 I.C.C. 319, 323 (1963). The Commission will not find burdens on interstate commerce within the meaning of section 13a of the act to be "undue" if those burdens are voluntarily created by carriers for the purpose of obtaining a favorable decision from the Commission.

Various employee organizations opposed discontinuance of the trains in question but urged that, in the event discontinuance were permitted, conditions be imposed for the protection of adversely affected employees similar to the conditions prescribed in Chicago B. & Q. R. Co. Abandonment, 257 I.C.C. 700. In view of our findings herein, no further consideration of this matter is necessary.

Contentions of the parties as to facts or laws not specifically discussed herein have been given consideration and found to be without material significance or not justified.

We find that the continued operation by the Southern Pacific Company of passenger trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Tucumcari, N. Mex. and Phoenix, Ariz., is required by public convenience and necessity and that the continued operation thereof has not been shown to constitute an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce.

An appropriate order will be entered.

APPENDIX A.—*Present schedule trains, Nos. 39 and 40*

	Population	Train No. 40, eastbound	Train No. 39, westbound
Los Angeles	2,479,015	Leave 11:30 p.m.	Arrive 3 a.m.
Colton	18,666	Leave 1:05 a.m.[1]	Leave 12:30 a.m.[1]
Indio	9,745	Leave 3:25 a.m.	Leave 10:30 p.m.
Yuma	23,974	Arrive 5:55 a.m.[2]	Leave 8:20 p.m.[2]
Do		Leave 7:05 a.m.[3]	Arrive 9:10 p.m.[3]
Phoenix	439,170	Arrive 10:30 a.m.	Leave 6 p.m.
Do		Leave 11:40 a.m.	Arrive 2:25 p.m.
Tucson	212,892	Arrive 2:10 p.m.	Leave 11:45 a.m.
Do		Leave 2:40 p.m.	Arrive 11:15 a.m.
Willcox	2,441		Leave 9:05 a.m.
Lordsburg	3,436	Arrive 6:20 p.m.	Leave 7:50 a.m.
Do		Leave 6:30 p.m.	Arrive 7:40 a.m.
Deming	6,764	Leave 7:40 p.m.	Leave 6:50 a.m.
El Paso	276,687	Arrive 9:30 p.m.	Leave 5:20 a.m.
Do		Leave 10:30 p.m.	Arrive 4:20 a.m.
Alamogordo	21,723	Leave 12:07 a.m.	Leave 2:35 a.m.
Carrizozo	1,546	Arrive 1:05 a.m.	Leave 1:38 a.m.
Do		Leave 1:15 a.m.	Arrive 1:15 a.m.
Vaughn	1,170	Leave 2:56 a.m.	Leave 11:52 p.m.
Tucumcari	8,143	Arrive 5:10 a.m.[3]	Leave 10:15 p.m.[3]

[1] Flag stop. [2] Pacific standard time. [3] Mountain standard time.

APPENDIX B.—*Southern Pacific Co.—Estimated revenues and expenses of trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Phoenix, Ariz., and Tucumcari, N. Mex., based on current conditions*

Line No.	Description (a)	12 months (b)
	Revenues:	
1	Passenger	$239,400
2	Mail	2,022,900
3	Express	73,800
4	Other passenger train	1,200
5	Total revenues	2,337,300
	Expenses:	
6	Express messenger	
7	Wages: Train and enginemen	549,500
	Servicing:	
8	Diesel locomotives	130,100
9	Passenger cars	111,500
	Repairs:	
10	Diesel locomotives	488,300
11	Passenger cars	493,200
12	Casualties	18,800
13	Switching	58,900
14	Station employees	29,100
15	Increased wages and benefits for lines 8 to 13	17,500
16	Health and welfare for lines 7 to 15	49,000
17	Payroll taxes for lines 7 to 15	113,500
18	Train fuel	161,800
	Expenses—Continued	
	Depreciation:	
19	Diesel locomotives	$219,600
20	Passenger cars	79,300
21	Rents for passenger cars	3,900
22	Terminal companies	82,300
23	Subtotal, expenses on lines 6 to 22	2,606,300
24	Net profit or (loss) before expenses on lines 25 to 36	(269,000)
	Interest:	
25	Diesel locomotives	20,100
26	Passenger cars	38,900
27	Maintenance of way and structures	237,200
28	Station supplies and expenses	5,000
29	All other transportation	23,200
30	All other maintenance of equipment	33,700
31	Traffic	29,600
32	General	34,100
33	Haul of company material	30,900
34	Increased wages and benefits for lines 27 to 33	5,300
35	Health and welfare for lines 27 to 34	10,300
36	Payroll taxes for lines 27 to 34	23,900
37	Subtotal, expenses on lines 25 to 36	492,200
38	Total net profit or (loss)	(761,200)

APPENDIX C.—*Annual statistics of trains Nos. 39 and 40*[1]

Line No.	Description (a)	Train No. 39 (b)	Train No. 40 (c)	Total (d)
1	Train-miles	278,495	278,860	557,355
2	Diesel unit-miles	909,215	1,148,655	2,057,870
3	Passenger car-miles:			
4	Baggage car-miles	2,892,625	3,374,790	6,267,415
5	Refrigerator car-miles	173,010	17,155	190,165
	Passenger car-miles—Continued			
6	Chair car-miles	278,495	278,860	557,355
7	Total car-miles	3,344,130	3,670,805	7,014,935
8	Gross ton-miles (thousands)	291,095	339,313	630,408
9	Switching hours	852	973	1,825
10	Route miles	763	764	1,527

[1] Purported to be based on actual operations during 7-day period, Aug. 1-7, 1965, inclusive.

ORDER

At a session of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Division 3, held at its office in Washington, D.C. on the 24th day of January A.D. 1966.

[Finance docket No. 23800]

SOUTHERN PACIFIC CO. DISCONTINUANCE OF TRAINS NOS. 39 AND 40 BETWEEN TUCUMCARI, N. MEX., AND PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Investigation of the matters and things involved in this proceeding having been made pursuant to the order of said division, dated September 23, 1965, a hearing having been held, and said division, on the date hereof, having made and filed a report containing its findings of fact and conclusions thereon, which report is hereby referred to and made a part hereof;

It is ordered, That the Southern Pacific Co. be, and it is hereby, required to continue the operation of trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Tucumcari, N. Mex. and Phoenix, Ariz., for a period of 1 year from the date hereof; and

It is further ordered, That this investigation be, and it is hereby, discontinued effective 35 days from the date of service of this order.

By the Commission, Division 3.

H. NEIL GARSON,
Secretary.

FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCARTHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, too many years have elapsed since legislation was initially introduced to protect the consumer against deceptive and misleading packaging and labeling practices. Our distinguished colleague in the other body, Mr. HART, has labored long and hard over the past 4 years to protect the consumer.

Now, President Johnson has sent to Congress a comprehensive message outlining proposals which would give the consumer the protection needed.

Today, I am introducing a bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce which would prevent the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging and labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce. It does not overlap into previously enacted legislation.

My bill requires that the labeling on packages be clear and accurate stating the nature and the quantity of the contents. It prohibits packaging which is deceptive in shape or promise nonexistent savings through promotional gimmicks. And it provides that appropriate and reasonable weight standards be set up to facilitate comparative shopping.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that my bill is general enough so that it takes into consideration that there are individual manufacturing problems in different types of packaging.

American industry has made tremendous progress in providing attractive and informative packaging for the consumer. Its standards are the highest in the world. Nevertheless, there are too many instances of deceptive labeling and packaging, even though in many of these there is no deliberate intent involved.

This, however, does not help the housewife and her equally confused husband who are bombarded with vast rows of competing products. Their contents are similar, but their labels and packages are not. Thus, often, seemingly identical packages in weight and size are not identical. Giant, super giant, family, economy, and gimmick labels promising nonexistent savings are so confusing and misleading that it often becomes a complicated exercise in mathematics to do the weekly shopping.

Since the housewife usually shops at a self-service store, she has to rely heavily on the package and label as her source of information in making a choice. It is, therefore, imperative that products be packaged and labeled so that she does not need a slide rule, ruler, scale, and perhaps even an MIT graduate to calculate the best buy for her money.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to stress that my bill, originally introduced in the other body, provides the much-needed protection for the consumer, while at the same time does not place stringent and demanding controls on the manufacturers, nor would it make packaging less attractive and less efficient. And it would not prevent economy in scale packaging or impose costly restrictions.

I strongly urge this second session of the 89th Congress to give full and liberate consideration to this legislation and to enact a positive and meaningful law which would enhance the quality of American industry's packaging and labeling practices through a Fair Packaging and Labeling Act. I believe that this legislation would go a long way to further mutually beneficial consumer-manufacturer relations. And finally, I believe that this legislation would provide a positive measure, although not a fiscal control, to help curb the present soaring inflation.

GROWING FOOD SHORTAGES DEVELOPING AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have been watching over the months, the growing food shortages developing around the world. We have seen the evidence mount that the world is facing an increasingly severe lack of food. This, in spite of the fact that America, through the mechanisms of Public Law 480 has done virtually everything possible to help our neighbors and friends around the world solve this terrible problem.

Today our President has told us both in his message to Congress and at a personal briefing in the White House that we are no longer facing merely a food shortage in India, but a famine of a magnitude unknown in the modern world. Unless we act, and act swiftly, anywhere from 25 to 40 million Indians face death from starvation. The cause of this famine is as old as mankind itself—nature at its worst—a drought of unprecedented severity.

Our President has laid aside all considerations of political, ideology, and power politics and has responded to answer the cries of the hungry and starving men, women, and children of India.

He has proposed that we ship, in addition to the 6½ million tons of wheat already committed to India, another 3½ million. He further stated that in addition to this vast amount, India needs another 3½ million tons. He has called upon all the people of the world to provide these 3½ million tons. Up to this point Canada has responded with 1 million tons of wheat and flour while some 20 countries have pledged approximately $150 million to help stave off this disaster. But our President has said, and rightfully so I believe, that even if we have to ship the balance of 2½ million tons ourselves, we will do so. In addition to the wheat, India requires 200,000 tons of corn, 125 million pounds of dried milk, and 150 million pounds of vegetable oils, just to maintain a subsistence level for its growing population. As the world knows, America will keep its pledges and promises regardless of what sacrifices this may require at home. I think it is fair to say that this effort which will cost a minimum of $1 to $1½ billion will be reflected here at home either in higher taxes and/or higher food costs. Many times in America's short history we have been called upon to make sacrifices, not only of treasure, but also of the lives of our fighting men. Each time America has risen to the challenge and met the responsibilities thrust upon her and I have no doubt that the Members of this House and the American people will not shirk this responsibility in this most tragic hour of our brothers and sisters who live in India.

Mr. Speaker, I think this action by our President shows, once and for all, our true intentions in Asia. This is not the action of a country bent upon war and plunder and destruction. This is the action of a President leading his people to the most noble of all pursuits—the helping of fellow humans suffering the worst disaster that can be imagined—famine. This shows the world once again that what we truly seek all over the world is peace and a genuine desire to help those who need our help. This action refutes conclusively those here at home and abroad who cry we seek the destruction of mankind by our action in Vietnam. For what we are doing in India is exactly what we are doing in Vietnam—trying to help a people to help themselves to a way of life that will not be plagued by mankind's ancient enemies, hunger, pestilence, and ignorance. For our President has said not only will we help India in these terrible times with food but we shall send Americas, men and women to show the Indians the way to avert a tragedy, such as the one facing them now, from ever occurring again.

I think this is a time for all the nations of the world, regardless of their political beliefs, to join us and come to the aid of India. This is the time for Russia and China and those countries of Eastern Europe to put their money where their mouth is and help the starving children of India. This is the time for France to stop worrying about collecting gold and remember the times in the past when other countries helped her in her hour of need and to help the mothers of India live. This is the time for the members of the white Atlantic community who comprise 20 percent of the world and have 75 percent of the world's resources to realize that their responsibilities do not end at their own border. This is the time for all of us to remember the golden rule:

> Do unto others as we would have others do unto us.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I am speaking for all of my constituents when I pledge my unwaivering support to the President. Winston Churchill called Britain's role in World War II "Britain's finest hour." I think it is fair to say that history will regard this program of compassion for India as America's finest hour. History remembers many Kings, Prime Ministers, and Presidents for their leadership and courage in times of war. I am sure history will remember President Johnson for his leadership in rallying the peoples of the world to the aid of a stricken people and I believe this is the way he wants to be remembered.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ryan, for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Goodell (at the request of Mrs. Reid of Illinois), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Mathias (at the request of Mrs. Reid of Illinois) for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mrs. Reid of Illinois) for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Howard) to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Resnick, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Fraser, for 30 minutes, on March 31.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS to revise and extend his remarks made today and to include an article from the Atlanta Journal of March 18, 1966.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. MCVICKER in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. TENZER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 31, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2252. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report on the number of officers above lieutenant commander, by rank and age groups, receiving average monthly flight pay authorized by law for the 6-month period ended January 1, 1966, pursuant to Public Law 301, approved February 18, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2253. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts, during the period July 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82–557; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Concurrent Resolution 71. Concurrent resolution to approve selecting of the U.S. Olympic Committee and to support its recommendations that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games; without amendment (Rept. No. 1386). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 614. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1387). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 784. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; without amendment (Rept. No. 1388). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 787. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; without amendment (Rept. No. 1389). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300, long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2642. An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13365. A bill to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13367. A bill to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; with amendments (Rept. No. 1393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13368. A bill to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13369. A bill to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13371. A bill to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13373. A bill to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13578. A bill to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13579. A bill to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13580. A bill to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13663. A bill to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13774. A bill to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 14122. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 14123. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 14124. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 14125. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 14126. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14127. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 14128. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 14129. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 14130. A bill to provide for the best care, welfare, and safeguards against suffering for certain animals used for scientific purposes without impeding necessary research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 14131. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14132. A bill to increase the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14133. A bill to increase the rate of pension payable to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and their widows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14134. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14135. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the basis on which pension is payable, by eliminating the net worth eligibility test; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 14136. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, to increase by $2 the fee for such stamp; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 14137. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14138. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14139. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to implement the existing requirement that an applicant for a farm housing loan thereunder be unable to secure the necessary credit from other sources; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14140. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide more equitable tariff treatment for parts of ball bearings with integral shafts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 14141. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to State and local governments, Indian groups under Federal supervision, and volunteer firefighting and rescue organizations at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 14142. A bill to amend section 331 of title 46 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 14143. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make additional benefits available to certain veterans of World War I who have been permanently and totally disabled for 20 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 14144. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 14145. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate, as recommended by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 14146. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to eliminate the provisions of section 9 thereof concerning two or more members of a family in the competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 14147. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 14148. A bill to provide compensation for damages to certain facilities rendered inoperative or otherwise adversely affected as a result of the modernization of the Monongahela River navigation project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 14149. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Railway Labor Act to provide necessary emergency provisions for the protection of the public health, welfare, and safety in certain labor-management disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 14150. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 14151. A bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14152. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 14153. A bill to amend the act of October 10, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes" so as to control all types of illegal transportation of cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 14154. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the existing suspension of duty on manganese ore and related products shall apply with respect to such ore and related products imported from any available source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 14155. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Badlands National Monument in the State of South Dakota, to authorize exchange of land mutually beneficial to the Oglala Sioux Tribe and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 14156. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 14157. A bill to authorize the acquisition, transfer, conveyance, and lease of certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for other international organizations, and as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 14158. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 14159. A bill to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 14160. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 14161. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14162. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 14163. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14164. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 14165. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 998. Joint resolution providing for a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 999. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 1000. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as National Flag Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May in each year as Steel Mark Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H. Res. 808. Resolution relating to the distribution among the States of research and development funds made available by Government agencies; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H. Res. 809. Resolution relating to the distribution among the States of research and development funds made available by Government agencies; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14166. A bill for the relief of Filomena Luiga Serrao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 14167. A bill for the relief of Genowefa Libera Budzyna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 14168. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine B. Murphy, and dependent children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 14169. A bill for the relief of Roberto Inda-Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14170. A bill for the relief of Gerlando Murena and Vincenza Murena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 14171. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Soon Wol Yang (also known as Mary Yang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 14172. A bill for the relief of Artemio G. Pagdanganan, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 14173. A bill for the relief of Antonio Barquet Chediack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14174. A bill for the relief of Esteban Fernández Noda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 14175. A bill for the relief of Pietro Giuseppe Serini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Natural Disasters Strain SBA Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my unqualified support to efforts to pass S. 2729. This bill would increase the Small Business Administration's lending authority and would provide for two revolving funds for financing SBA functions.

The SBA has had a great impact on my district during the past year because of the devastating floods that hit the Denver area last June. Damage estimates were more than half a billion dollars. These damages included—in addition to public roads and bridges—homes and private businesses.

As of now, the SBA has made more than $35 million worth of loans to more than 1,200 people and businesses in the Denver area as a result of this flood. These loans—for 30 years at 3 percent interest—in many cases have meant the difference between hopeless ruin and the chance to begin again.

However, 1964 and 1965 were years with an unusually large number of such natural disasters. Floods struck California, Oregon and Washington and the Mississippi River Valley; Louisiana, Mississippi, and Florida were hit by especially damaging hurricanes.

These natural disasters put a strain on the funds available to the SBA. SBA had a statutory responsibility to meet disaster needs. In order to do so, SBA diverted money from other areas to handle disaster loan applications. The demand for such loans was so great that by last October SBA had to stop accepting regular business loan applications.

This legislation now before us would help prevent such situations by creating two revolving funds—one to finance the disaster loan program, and the other to handle SBA's remaining functions. Purpose is to prevent disruption of SBA's regular lending activities in the future because of unexpected disaster loan requirements.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is sound. SBA has demonstrated time and again that it is playing a vital role in our economy by helping people to help themselves. I strongly urge passage of S. 2729.

The 48th Anniversary of the Republic of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week, the Byelorussian people observed the 48th anniversary of the birth of the democratic Republic of Byelorussia. In honor of this occasion, I wish to express my admiration for their fortitude and steadfastness and hope that soon they reach their objective of freedom from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

The Byelorussian people lived under the Russian czars for several centuries in their homeland. During all that time they had jealously guarded many of their national traits and traditions, and steadfastly clung to their national goal, freedom and independence. Early in 1918, when they had the chance, they proclaimed their national independence on March 25. They set up their own democratic form of government, and in the short time allowed to them, they began to rebuild their wartown country.

Unfortunately, however, the Byelorussians were not to enjoy long their richly deserved reward. In December of that very year the ruthless Bolsheviks were on the warpath; eventually the Red Army overran the country and it was annexed to the Soviet Union, thus bringing about the enslavement of some 10 million Byelorussians by the Kremlin tyrant.

Since then, for more than 45 years, these people have been living under the oppressive yoke of their heartless overlords. They live as in a large prison house. Their tyrannical bosses are trying to extinguish all ethnic and national sentiments in Byelorussia, including all hope for freedom. But the Byelorussian people still cling to their national aspiration for independence. They naturally feel that they should not be robbed of their inalienable right to freedom, and in this they have the wholehearted sympathy of the peoples of the free world.

The 25th Anniversary of the USO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the United Service Organizations, Inc., was created to bolster the morale of the millions of young Americans about to engage in the great life and death struggle of World War II.

The methods of warfare have changed since then, but human nature and human needs have not. Winning the peace is still a lonely battle, and the USO, entirely supported through public contributions, has offered a service of friendship and support for a quarter of a century to the boys who must bear the burden in our fight to maintain freedom.

USO clubs are operating virtually around the world. From Anchorage to Istanbul to Saigon, they are acting to further the welfare of the members of the Armed Forces by offering a friendly, wholesome rendezvous point for our uniformed youth. About 80,000 civilian volunteers are working to make these clubhouses a home away from home. And, these volunteers, aided by the USO professional staff, are the backbone of the USO service. They are men and women of all ages, professions, races, and religions whose unselfish work is making possible this wide-scale contribution to military morale.

The USO comes to the young GI through no enforced legislation or military directive. It is a voluntary expression of the American people for the spiritual and moral well-being of our sons and daughters in the Armed Forces. The USO is a federation of six civilian agencies supported by the direct contributions of the American people through the United Fund and similar groups. The member agencies are the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Catholic Community Service, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army and the National Travelers Aid Association.

The $6 million USO budget for 1966 will provide off-post morale services which the command itself cannot create or achieve. One of the organization's most popular efforts is the sponsorship of live shows on the average of more than 2,500 a year. Groups of entertainers travel by plane, helicopters, even dogsled, to reach the most remote outposts of our troops.

One of the most beloved celebrities to lead the troupes of USO performers has for many years been the great comedian, Bob Hope. His humor has bolstered the spirits of a generation of American fighting men. In Vietnam last Christmas, his jesting comments were worth a hundred sermons in reassuring the men of America's support.

"I forgot to burn my draft card," he said, "and here I am."

At the request of the White House and the Pentagon last year, the USO embarked on an expansion program to achieve full wartime footing. The military buildup in Vietnam and the prospects of a long-term struggle means that thousands of young men will feel the loneliness of a far-off and war-torn land. But the USO clubhouses in Saigon, Danang, Nha Trang, and Tan Son Nhut will be there as a reminder that the American people will not forget nor neglect them. The friendly services of USO will offer a comforting welcome.

This week, as the United Service Organizations proudly celebrates its 25th anniversary at the Washington Hilton, a special award will be given to Bob Hope for his years of devoted service. Both USO and Mr. Hope merit our tribute and national thanks.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall the feeling of warmth and fellowship which the USO brought to me and to my fellow soldiers during World War II and so it gives me a great amount of personal satisfaction to note that my very able administrative assistant, John R. Buckley, has been unanimously elected by the Board of Directors of the National Capital USO to membership in the USO Corporation.

I am certain that he will bring to his new position with the USO the same tireless energy and unflagging loyalty with which he continues to serve me and the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida.

William C. Welch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, effective Monday, March 28, Mr. William C. Welch, Director of the Veterans' Administration Congressional Liaison Service, departed for an assignment to the Special Advisory Committee to the Administrator.

Bill has been on the Capitol Hill scene for a great number of years, and I know will be missed by his many friends. He has an enviable record of service to his country beginning with his military service in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1941 to 1945. Upon separation from the service, he furthered his education at Furman University and the University of Wisconsin, the latter under a Rockefeller scholarship. He did graduate teaching in history and political science from 1951 to 1953 at which time he joined the Central Intelligence Agency in liaison work.

Bill's service on Capitol Hill began in 1954 when he joined the staff of the late Henderson Lanham, of Georgia, and was with him until his tragic death in 1958. He became administrative assistant to Erwin Mitchell who was a member of my Committee on Veterans' Affairs from 1958 to 1961 at which time he assumed his duties of Director of the Veterans' Administration's Liaison Office.

I know all of his friends wish him well in his new assignment and know that he will perform most capably as he did in his previous assignment.

Need for Manganese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will permit the free entry of manganese ore and certain related products from any available source.

Manganese is one of the basic raw materials in the production of steel. With the demand for steel increasing each and every day, particularly due to Vietnam, the pressures on the supply of basic raw material becomes greater and greater. It is in our national interest to secure manganese from any source available.

The Congress recognized the pressures on raw material supplies in the 88th Congress, when we enacted Public Law 88–338, which suspended the duty on manganese imported into the United States from free world countries. In the House report accompanying the bill which became Public Law 88–338, H.R. 7480, our committee—the Committee on Ways and Means—stated:

> Your committee also believes that enactment of H.R. 7480 is desirable from the standpoint of domestic producers of ferromanganese and other manganese alloys. Suspension of the existing duty on the basic raw materials will reduce costs to these processors and should result in enhancement of the competitive position of domestically produced alloys in the market.

The report also pointed out that the principal use of the ore and the ferroalloy was in the production of steel.

In consonance with the suspension of duty on manganese ore, the 89th Congress enacted Public Law 89–204, which suspended the duty on nickel in various forms in a further effort to help stabilize the production costs of steel.

There remains only one other significant sources of manganese available to the United States and that is ore from the Soviet-bloc countries and primarily from Russia proper. The Russians are presently selling an estimated 600,000 tons per year to Western Europe. There has been none imported into the United States for a great many years due to the prohibitive duty on manganese from the bloc countries. It is believed entirely appropriate that the duty on manganese ore from the bloc countries be suspended in the same manner as is the case of that entering other free world countries, in order that sufficient quantities of manganese be available to meet our own growing requirements and to help hold down the costs of steel to U.S. consumers.

Public Law 88–338 referred to above expires on June 30, 1967. It is believed that the most expeditious way of improving the manganese situation is to amend the present law by expanding the suspension of duty on manganese to cover ore from the bloc countries. Such an amendment means that the matter would have to be considered in 1967 when the present legislation expires, but during this time, sufficient experience could be gained in endeavoring to buy from Russia to govern our actions in 1967.

In the November 22, 1965, issue of the Engineering and Mining Journal "Metal and Mineral Markets" there was a special study on manganese. This was one of a series of such studies made on various materials by this highly reputable publication. Among other things it concluded that with the current prosperous free world economy pacing the demand for steel and ferroalloys, a manganese ore shortage is not an impossibility. They also stated that the political situations in Africa, Brazil, and India reduces them as a dependable source of supply.

The most recent published report shows that over 127 million tons of manganese was consumed in the United States in 1964 as compared to 85 million tons in 1958. This significant upward trend has continued to date and we face a more serious problem as we superimpose the growing requirements of the Vietnam situation which are materially increasing the demands for steel and ferroalloys in various forms. The increasing demands for manganese has firmed up prices for manganese ores, ferroalloys, and metals. As the demand increases due to the Vietnam requirements, prices of the commodities must logically increase. This in turn will increase the cost of steel for our domestic users and defense effort.

As you know, our steel industry has been seeking every conceivable way to hold down its production costs. This is necessary not only because of the increasing competition from foreign steel in both domestic and foreign markets but to assist in holding their prices within the guidelines specified by the President.

It is recognized that some may object to this action because of their opposition to trade with bloc countries. However, our growing need for manganese from all possible sources should far outweigh this position. This is particularly true since the demands for manganese will grow stronger as we feel the effects of the heavier appropriations for Vietnam. I yield to no one when it comes to opposition to any proposal which gives any advantage to the Soviet bloc.

However, in this case it is obviously in our national interest to secure manganese from Russia since manganese is absolutely necessary to us in our steel production. This is the sort of trade with the Soviet bloc which no one can question redounds to our own benefit.

The acquisition of needed materials from Russia is quite common. One example is Russian chrome ore which is vital in the production of steel and ferroalloys and which enters our country free of duty. It appears entirely consistent that manganese be given the same treatment. In this connection it should be noted that Russia is supplying approximately 25 percent of the total chrome consumed in the United States and without it our steel industry would be severely handicapped. This is particularly true at the present time since chrome ore from Rhodesia, another large supplier, is not presently available due to the adverse political considerations which prevail today. In addition to chrome, other basic materials such as platinum, palladium, and potash are examples of materials which are acquired from Russia.

If enacted, the proposed legislation should lessen the pressure to increase steel prices due to the greater availability of a high-cost item in the production of steel. This in turn will help keep down the spiralling costs of the war in Vietnam and at the same time make American steel and ferroalloys more competitive in the markets of the world.

This should not be confused with the emotional, political question of trading with the Soviet bloc. The only relevant aspect involved is good hard American business.

Anniversary of Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that today is the 26th anniversary of the terrible Katyn Massacre of 15,000 Polish prisoners of war by Soviet Union officials. On this day in 1940, this incredible mass murder occurred in the Katyn Forest region of the Ukraine, and it has never been rectified.

A select committee of the House made a report on the Katyn Massacre in 1952, but Congress has not taken further action on the matter, and there has been only limited discussion of it since that time.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress must never permit such crimes by the Soviet Union to be forgotten since they illustrate the true nature of communism. That is why we must not only remind the American public of these historical tragedies by observing them on the floor of the House, but we must establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

I am sure that the three Members of the House who served on the special House Committee on the Katyn Massacre who still serve in the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI], will join me in urging all of the Members to review the report of the special committee and apply its message to current events.

Vietnam Debate Reflects the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, debate and discussion over our mission and obligation in Vietnam have been much in the news the last few months. There are those who feel such debate—coming, as it does, largely from within the ranks of the Democratic Party—hinders our Vietnam efforts.

I feel that such debate is not only fundamental to the American way of going about things, but also it aids in formulating a national resolve by thoroughly airing the complexities of the picture. I bring this up because Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, recently delivered a speech on the subject in Denver. I had the privilege of hearing that speech, delivered at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the Colorado Democratic Party. I want to share Senator PROXMIRE's excellent words with my colleagues, and I respectfully include that portion of the Senator's address pertaining to Vietnam in the RECORD:

> I support the administration position in Vietnam. I support it because it has wisely accommodated to the constructive criticisms of Democratic critics.
>
> Senators MANSFIELD, MORSE, ROBERT KENNEDY, and others have done far more than keep the U.S. Senate's tradition of debate and discussion alive. They have made explicit suggestions that have been accepted and have measurably improved the administration's position in Vietnam.
>
> As an administration supporter in Vietnam I say thank God for Senator FULBRIGHT's courageous insistence on holding open hearings on what we are doing to achieve negotiations and a defensible peace in South Vietnam.
>
> Those hearings not only vastly increased public understanding of the stringent limitations on our alternatives in Vietnam, they also forced the administration to rethink and clarify as well as defend its position there.
>
> The Fulbright followthrough with hearings on Red China have contributed a far greater understanding in Congress and the country of China, and how we can best pursue Asiatic freedom and peace—in Vietnam and elsewhere.
>
> This country has never engaged in a war in which the party controlling the Government has itself had such a monopoly on criticism or in which that criticism has been so consistent and powerful. And certainly we have never before so clearly incorporated that criticism so quickly into our national policy.
>
> Critics asked the President to call for a ceasefire. The President has done so.
>
> They called for a lengthy bombing pause. The President did just that.
>
> They asked the administration to put the controversy before the United Nations. It has done that.
>
> They called for our reaffirmation of the Geneva accords, and our request for reconvening the Geneva Convention to act as intermediaries. The President has done this.
>
> They called for a vigorous peace offensive. The President sent his top foreign policy officials throughout the world in the most vigorous peace offensive the Nation has ever engaged in.
>
> They asked that we call for a free election in South Vietnam and announce we would abide by the results even if the Communists won. President Johnson has done this.
>
> They called on the President to accept a Vietnam-wide election—north and south—and abide by the results. The President has agreed to do so.
>
> They have asked that the war be limited to military targets. It has been rigorously so limited.
>
> They ask that we not insist on unconditional surrender by the North Vietnamese. The President has made it clear that we do not insist on unconditional surrender; that we will not invade North Vietnam.
>
> We are not bombing Hanoi, nor blockading Haiphong; we covet not a foot of Vietnam territory, north or south; we want no base in Vietnam; we do not ask that South Vietnam align herself with us.
>
> Indeed, we offer a billion-dollar economic reconstruction program after the war to include North Vietnam itself.
>
> At the moment the difference between President Johnson's position and that of his toughest critics in the Democratic Party in the Senate is a narrow hair's breadth.
>
> Neither would withdraw from Vietnam.
>
> Neither wants a wholesale attack on North Vietnam.
>
> Both wants to negotiate peace as soon as possible.
>
> Both want the people of South Vietnam to decide their future freely.
>
> This is a national policy that unites the Democratic Party and the Nation. It does not divide our party or our country. It is no accident that the demonstrations, the teach-ins, the sign-carrying protests, the peace marches have all but ceased.
>
> We have at last a national policy in Vietnam that won overwhelming national support. And it has been won in the best American tradition—by debate, dissent, discussion.
>
> Of course, differences remain but they are differences over military tactics or political ambitions or just plain personal animosities, and as long as we're human those differences will always be with us.

Future Homemakers Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of National Future Homemakers of America Week—March 27 to April 2, 1966—I extend congratulations and best wishes for the future to the Future

Homemakers of America, a national organization of 600,000 high school students enrolled in home economics courses with local chapters in every State, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

We hear constantly these days about the delinquents, beatniks, and draft card burners, while the vast majority of our hard-working, serious and law-abiding youth, who prepare themselves to become our good citizens of tomorrow, receive little or no attention. This distorts the true picture of our youth. It is time we recognized and paid tribute to the virtues of this vast majority.

National Future Homemakers of America Week spotlights a 4-year program to help each member recognize and develop her abilities and to participate in family, community, and world projects. From their ranks will come the future mothers, wives, teachers, jobholders, voters, and opinion makers of our great country.

The Future Homemakers of America was founded in 1945. It unified under one organization the various State and local clubs of high school home economics students. Its membership grew from 100,000 at the end of its first year to its present 600,000 members. Twelve national youth officers direct its work programs and plan and preside over its meetings. High school teachers serve as local chapter advisers. It is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association.

Food to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the emergency shipment of an additional 3.5 million tons of food grain to India as proposed by the President deserves the full and immediate support of Congress.

It would be a moral wrong for our Nation to simply sit on its mountain of surplus food while millions in India face the threat of death through starvation.

The drought now sweeping India is the worst in modern history. Resources from all over the world will have to be mobilized if a monumental tragedy is to be averted.

These additional amounts of grain the President seeks for this humanitarian purpose, along with the 6.5 million we pledged earlier to this effort and coupled with the generous donations of other Nations, will mean that today's threat of famine can be replaced with hope for tomorrow.

We are being asked to give of what we do not need, of that which we do not require, to keep alive our bodies, our economy, and our Nation. Yet, this gift can mean life itself to a great nation.

It can mean that India can avert a tragedy and instead of going through a long period of recovery, face tomorrow with hope and confidence.

It can mean that India can concentrate upon the means of finding a solution to its own growing food problems.

Even after these surplus foods are donated to India, there will still be the monumental task of transporting this grain to India and to those parts of that vast country where famine is the worst.

I feel certain that these problems can be and will be solved by cooperative efforts between India, ourselves, and other friendly governments throughout the world.

Fino Blasts Farmers Home Administration Laxity and Loan Giveaway, Introduces Corrective Legislation To Tighten Loan Standards and Urges Cutback in Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would restrict the situations in which the Farmers Home Administration may make loans to country dwellers who allegedly cannot get other credit.

Under the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture can make loans to rural residents for rural housing at advantageous rates varying with the economic condition of the borrower if the Secretary decides that other credit is unavailable. Unfortunately, the Agriculture Department has been lax in establishing whether or not other credit is available.

The Comptroller General recently examined loans made in five States by the Farmers Home Administration and found that 20 percent of the total number of loans examined were made to applicants who could have obtained financing from other sources. The Comptroller General citing language of Congress stating that the program was not intended to supplant or compete with credit available from other sources, blamed the laxity of Farmers Home county supervisors.

My bill deals with this situation by requiring applicants to show, as a condition of getting loans, that they have been refused credit of a sort the terms and conditions of which they could reasonably have been expected to fulfill. This will make the program live up to the intent of Congress that it not compete with private credit.

There is a section of the farm housing title of the 1949 Housing law—section 502(b)(3)—which provides that some farm housing loans may, if the Secretary so decides, be required to be refinanced by the borrower through responsible private credit sources. I think that the Secretary of Agriculture should look into exercising his powers under this section with respect to the loans which should not have been made. Such refinancings could restore millions to our treasury.

A few weeks ago, I introduced legislation to provide that the loans of the Farmers Home Administration, the Small Business Administration, and other agencies cannot be put into the pools of Government loans in which the Federal National Mortgage Association—as agent for the agencies—is going to sell participations. My reason for trying to keep these loans out of the pools by restricting the pools to Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration insured loans is that, in addition to trying to stop a budget gimmick, I do not want to see programs like the Farmers Home Administration rural loan program get any bigger. It is big enough already and if the Comptroller General is correct, it is wasteful enough already.

If Government agency loans of all kinds can continually be put in pools, in which participations are then sold, this will greatly encourage the Government to take over an ever-increasing share of national loanmaking. The Government will make the loans at cheap rates. Then it will sell some kind of notes or participations at higher rates to get its money back. Then it will make more loans. It looks like Government is out to socialize lending. That is not surprising. The administration is out to socialize residential patterns, and the idea of socialized lending seems to go hand in hand. What is bad is that socialized lending is subsidized lending. Someone is being asked to subsidize someone else's loan. There is enough of this already.

The bill I am introducing today will tighten Farmers Home Administration loan requirements and hopefully take that agency out of some competition with private credit. My previous bill to keep Farmers Home Administration loans out of the proposed pools will, if passed, block a budget gimmick and head off the large-scale expansion of the farmers home loan program that would follow on the heels of use of the pools to steadily refinance loans and increase the supply of available funds.

The Comptroller General has put his finger on a program that needs scrutiny. My bills will do the job. I urge this House to act.

Statement of the Honorable George V. Hansen, of Idaho, Before the Appropriations Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the proposed reduction in funds for Public Laws 874 and 815—and the proposed reduction in funds for vocational education—are matters of grave concern to the people of the State of Idaho.

Following is a copy of a statement I made today before the Appropriations Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee, and also copies of two joint memorials I received from the Idaho State Legislature and which I included in my statement:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE V. HANSEN, BEFORE THE APPROPRIATIONS LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SUBCOMMITTEE, MARCH 30, 1966

Mr. Chairman I appreciate the opportunity of presenting my views on the proposed reduction in funds for Public Laws 874 and 815, and for vocational education to you and this committee.

Mr. Chairman, Idaho is a State rich in natural resources. Idaho has an abundant supply of fresh, clear water for domestic and municipal use; for use in irrigation and reclamation; for use in creating electric power; and for recreational use.

Idaho is rich in timber stands and in mineral resources. It has some of the richest farm lands in the United States.

Unfortunately for the citizens of Idaho, however, is the fact that two-thirds of the State is owned by the Federal Government—which pays no taxes.

It is also a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the population of many of Idaho's school districts have increased to a great extent in recent years through the influx of Federal employees and their families. This has placed a heavy financial burden on the local taxpayers but, with the help of Public Laws 874 and 815, they have been able to meet the demands.

Now, however, they are threatened with the loss of vital revenue through the proposed reductions in the Public Laws 874 and 815 programs. This cannot be allowed to happen.

Federal funds allocated to school districts through Public Laws 874 and 815 are not mere grants—or gifts—from the Federal Government. They are, in essence, a payment to those school districts in lieu of taxes with the Federal Government realizing its responsibility to the districts because of the increase in their school populations caused by actions of the Government.

The superintendents of school districts in my congressional district overwhelmingly oppose these cuts. Typical comments from these superintendents are: "This money is very essential * * * without these additional funds, our minimum school curriculum would need to be curtailed even further." "Reduction of funds will create very serious budget problems * * * tax base in serious disproportion to our student population due to high proportion of Federal employees." "Many schools including this school will be forced to cut their school programs back." "Would have a staggering effect on the Pocatello schools." "Our educational program would be drastically hurt."

The superintendent of one district, Mr. Chairman, said that 70 percent of the children were there due to an Air Force base. He said reduction in Public Laws 874 and 815 funds would make it impossible for the district to continue educating these children, and that the Air Force would have to establish its own school for them—which, he said, would cost the Government at least twice as much to set up and administer.

Also, the proposed reduction in funds for vocational training would seriously hamper occupational training in Idaho where plans have already been made for the 1965–67 biennium, based on the assumption that the Congress would not cut back funds for the program. I believe it is obviously quite unfair and unrealistic to encourage the States to establish programs based on a certain degree of Federal participation, and then to change the rules in the middle of the game.

Mr. Chairman, I most emphatically urge and request that these funds not be cut back.

To show the strong feeling in my home State on this matter, I request permission to include as part of my statement communications I have received. These include: joint memorials from the Idaho State Legislature; letters from Mr. D. F. Engelking, Idaho State Superintendent of Public Instruction and Mr. S. R. Glenn, director of the Idaho State Board for Vocational Education; a most comprehensive résumé of major educational programs supported by Federal funds, prepared by Idaho State University; and letters and telegrams from superintendents of individual school districts.

Thank you again for the opportunity of presenting these views.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 16

Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the impact of Federal programs has long been evident in the State of Idaho, and will continue to affect this State; and

Whereas such federally sponsored programs result in the immigration of large numbers of families, and children of these families must be educated; and

Whereas the education of these children places great burden upon existing instructional facilities and educational resources of this State; and

Whereas it is the heritage of our country and the right of all to receive the benefits of a good and competent educational program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to proceed with all due speed to extend Public Laws 81–874 and 81–815, as amended, authorizing the funds for educational purposes in areas burdened by the increased numbers of educable children, caused directly by the impact of Federal programs; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.
Attest:
DRYDEN M. HILER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 15

Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled.

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the sovereign State of Idaho, hereby respectfully represent that:

Whereas the Federal budget request for vocational education for fiscal year 1967 is considerably lower than the amount authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963; and

Whereas a reduction in Federal appropriations under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 will seriously curtail the development of public vocational education programs in the Nation, and reduce the number of youth that might otherwise benefit from such programs; and

Whereas a vigorous and expanding program of public vocational education is essential to the domestic and military economy of this Nation; and

Whereas the Federal-State-local relationship built up over the many years has proven itself for an effective program of vocational education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate the full amount authorized under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.
Attest:
DRYDEN M. HILER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Cigarette Smuggling Racket Cheats New York State and New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the growing practice of cigarette bootlegging is depriving State and municipal taxing authorities of millions of dollars in revenue. With New York State and the city of New York searching for new sources of revenue to meet the increasing costs of government operations and services, it is high time they plugged up the loss in tax revenues resulting from cigarette bootlegging.

Recent disclosures indicate that New York State and New York City may be losing approximately $50 million annually in tax revenue due to the growing practice of interstate cigarette smuggling. Other States and cities are also affected and I am hopeful that my colleagues will immediately review the picture of cigarette tax revenues in their own States and municipalities to determine the extent of loss of cigarette tax revenue.

Mr. Speaker, of equal importance is the effect of this unlawful trade upon the small businessman—the independent retailer—the backbone of our free enterprise system. The retailer not only loses the cigarette sales but also suffers the loss of other business resulting from other purchases which the customer makes when he comes to his shop. We cannot rely on the bootlegger or the smuggler to think about the small retail merchant—we must speak out—act promptly to protect his interests.

As if this is not enough damage, the smuggler and bootlegger are involving innocent merchants to dispose of the cigarettes they illegally transport in interstate commerce to evade city and State taxes. I have been told but I do not have confirmation that they are enlisting our youth, in plying their illegal trade in the sale of bootleg cigarettes, thus contributing to and promoting juvenile delinquency and disrespect for law and order.

The wholesale tobacco industry, the chain store, and the department store are also affected by the loss of sales of cigarettes and other products as well. These merchants are threatened with substantial damage and loss of business.

In 1949, there was a wide practice of advertising and offering for sale, tax-free cigarettes by mail. This occurred when there developed a wide difference between the selling price of cigarettes in one State and that of a neighboring State. State and city taxing authorities, retailers, wholesalers, and merchants complained and the Congress passed the Jenkins Act of 1949 which was later amended—15 U.S.C. 375–379.

The Jenkins Act was passed to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes for shipment into a State where a tax is imposed by requiring the seller to file a report of the sale with the taxing authorities of that State. When the Jenkins Act was signed the practice stopped. I am today introducing a bill to amend the Jenkins Act to require that any person or firm selling or transferring in excess of 5,000 cigarettes to file a report with the taxing authorities of the State into which the cigarettes are being transported. The purpose of the legislation is to eliminate the bootlegging of cigarettes and to protect the small businessman who suffers economic harm as a result of the illegal transportation of cigarettes in interstate commerce. Just as the original Jenkins Act effectively eliminated the mailing of cigarettes for tax evasion, so do I believe this amendment will effectively eliminate the practice of bootlegging of cigarettes in interstate commerce.

The expanded growth of cigarette sales in the nontax cigarette States like North Carolina and in low tax areas such as the District of Columbia for ultimate interstate transportation is producing a new breed of bootleggers which is not regulated by the present provisions of the Jenkins Act.

The following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 20, 1966, outlines the present loss in revenue to States and municipalities which impose sales and use taxes on cigarettes:

SMUGGLERS CUT CIGARETTE TAXES BY MANY MILLIONS

(By John G. Rogers)

The motorist in the Brooklyn filling station was paying for his 10 gallons of gasoline when he asked the attendant in a low voice: "Got any cigarettes today?"

The attendant sized up the motorist, decided to risk it, and nodded his head affirmatively.

"I'll take two cartons," the motorist said. "Cost you 6 bucks."

The motorist settled up and drove off. He was pleased because, against the going retail price of 43 cents a pack, he had saved 13 cents on each of the 20 packs in his purchase. The attendant was pleased because he had made a profit of 11½ cents on each of the 20 packs.

The big losers in the deal were New York City and New York State. Between them, they should have collected 16 cents a pack in taxes—a total of $3.20—but they didn't collect anything because the sale was a surreptitious one of cigarettes smuggled in the day before from North Carolina.

ESTIMATE

In various settings and through various characters, the sneak sale of smuggled cigarettes in New York City has reached the point where tobacco industry spokesmen estimate the city-State tax loss at up to $51 million a year.

Joseph H. Murphy, State commissioner of taxation and finance, will say only that the loss is "substantial." However, his current estimate for the State's annual tax share is at a rate that is $31 million less than in presmuggling days.

An educated industry guess is that legitimate cigarette sales in the city are off 22 percent. The industry believes legitimate retailers throughout the State are losing up to $138 million a year in cigarette business and, perhaps, another $60 million in related sales.

LUCRATIVE

It was inevitable that such a lucrative, subrosa racket would attract organized crime, including the Cosa Nostra. Law enforcement officials once accustomed to seeking small independent smugglers, are now beginning to see a pattern of large-scale, well-planned smuggling, especially into Brooklyn.

They know, though they didn't intercept it, that recently a trailer truck came in with 9,600 cartons, bought for about $18,000 in North Carolina, resaleable in New York for up to $10,000 profit, depending on the method of disposal.

Brooklyn District Attorney Aaron E. Koota estimates that a daily average of $50,000 worth of illegal cigarettes enter the borough by means ranging down to the small independents who stuff a few cartons under the back seats of private cars.

"The problem is serious and continually getting worse"—that's the summary of City Finance Director Roy M. Goodman.

"There are indications that such criminal elements as the Mafia are cracking down on independent bootleggers and have started to organize pickup and dropoff points for illegal cigarettes," says Morris Weintraub, managing director of the Wholesale Tobacco Distributors Association of New York.

The costly woe bedeviling the city, State, and cigarette industry traces back to April 1, 1965, when the State cigarette tax was doubled to 10 cents a pack. The price of a pack in this city of an estimated 3 million smokers shot up to between 40 and 45 cents, the highest in the Nation.

COUNTERFEITS

Almost immediately the smugglers began to roll, some in private cars, some in rented panel trucks and occasionally, some in king-size trucks. Traffic built up between New York and the two choicest supply points—North Carolina at $1.85 a carton, Washington, D.C., at $2.07.

Those are retail prices. North Carolina is favored for big operations because roadside dealers have storehouses bulging with the goods—cases which hold 60 cartons of 10 packs each.

With the cigarettes back in New York, small independents sometimes make the ultimate sales themselves, their volume not being large enough to fit in a middleman. It's not hard to sell a $1.85 carton in the city for $3. Large-scale smugglers may sell to storekeepers for perhaps, $2.75 a carton. The storekeeper then sells at the prevailing retail price of $4.30 or so.

TRAFFIC

In the beginning, small storekeepers simply risked selling packs that bore no New York tax stamps. Lately, many of the smuggled cigarettes bear counterfeit stamps. So far the State department of taxation and finance has identified 17 different varieties of phony stamps.

The smugglers' outlets have varied widely—barbers, gas station attendants, laundries, even housewives. In the first 8 months of the smuggling wave, 197 arrests were made in the New York area and 112 convictions were obtained. Prosecutors complain though that light penalties—often a $25 fine—are not rough enough to discourage a bigtime smuggler.

The State has made 746 seizures of illegal cigarettes, totaling 618,000 packs. The sale of the seized cigarettes to dealers willing to pay the required taxes brought in $325,445.

But, as the war goes on between the smugglers and the law, the State knows that more smugglers get through than are caught. One tactic found the State sending spies to North Carolina to watch for cars with New York plates loading up at roadside stands. Descriptions of cars and plates were telephoned ahead. Cooperative Maryland State Police alone seized 450,000 packs in a recent period from New York-bound cars.

Lately, however, the smugglers have been switching cars somewhere on the northbound trip, throwing off the surveillance of the law.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment to the Jenkins Act will help recoup for New York State and New York City, their respective shares of the taxes they are now losing of between $32 and $50 million per annum. Perhaps this will also stimulate the taxing authorities and the mayor of the city of New York to look into all other areas of possible tax losses and take steps to plug up the tax leaks to help meet their budget—every little bit helps.

One of the reasons I am concerned about the New York City tax situation is that the mayor of the city has proposed an income tax which would apply to resident and nonresident workers alike. I represent the Fifth Congressional District, New York, no part of which is located in the geographic boundaries of the city. However, a great segment of my constituents are employed in the city of New York. They are employed in factories, retail shops, service industries, wholesaling, manufacturing, brokerage, insurance, and banking as well as in all professions.

If one of my constituents owns property in New York City, he pays his real estate taxes. If he owns his business and pays rent, he contributes to a portion of the taxes paid by his landlord. If he rides the taxicabs—if he eats in a restaurant—if he goes to the theater—if he makes a purchase—whatever he does in the city of New York, he helps promote its economy and he contributes to the taxes collected by the city.

In only one way does the city subsidize him and that is with a subway ride for 15 cents which costs the city much more. I favor an increase in subway fare to 25 cents rather than any form of tax upon suburban residents. It is the fairest way to collect needed revenues. Just stop giving something away below cost. New York City residents should want to stop subsidizing each subway rider from out of New York City by giving him a ride which costs more than a quarter for only 15 cents.

By taking this step, the mayor of the city of New York will be taking a step in the right direction. The commuter or nonresident income tax would be a grave mistake. It will result in a loss to the city of New York of a great many service businesses and other small business which could operate out of the suburbs where their proprietors live.

On Sunday, March 27, 1966, the New York Times reported that New York City Investigations Commissioner, Arnold G. Fraimon stated that the city was losing about $9 million a year and the State of New York about $22.5 million a year as a result of interstate shipments of cigarettes to avoid the tax. The New York State tax is 10 cents a pack and the New York City tax is 4 cents a pack.

The legislation which I have introduced today would help bring about an increase in New York State's revenues of approximately $22.5 million and about $9 million to the city. In view of the difficulty in estimating the loss of revenue due to illegal operations resulting from cigarette bootlegging, this figure may be considerably higher. By plugging up such tax leaks and through an increased transit fare, if necessary, we can bring financial help to the city without a nonresidents and commuters tax.

This legislation will also help other States and municipalities to collect their just share of taxes levied on cigarettes. Where State and local legislation is required to effectively implement the proposed amendment to the Jenkins Act, it is expected that it will be forthcoming to the end that smuggling and bootlegging of cigarettes may be stopped.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Victor S. Koontz, First Christian Church, Disciples of Christ, Hoopersville, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Fountainhead of all wisdom, Creator of all existence, Author of life, and Preserver of peace, grant this day the visitation of Thy Holy Spirit upon the deliberations of this body as it seeks to unite our great Nation in the common good for all.

Give to each legislator wisdom and harmony in cooperating with and in the support of the interests of Thy people at home and abroad. May the actions of this assembly today become the will of God, the consent of the governed, and the choice of all who seek freedom.

Bless every effort expended toward the causes of man's questing for truth, justice, and peace with all others whom Thou hast fashioned after Thyself. Through Jesus, the Christ, our Lord, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee on mines and mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXPORT-CONTROL ORDER ON HIDES

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago eight Members of the House joined in a request to three of the major committees of this body to investigate certain aspects of the recent export-control order on hides. Our request followed information which was supplied to us by the Secretary of Commerce in a meeting in the office of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] that the price on military shoes was expected to go up or was already up about $1.75 a pair notwithstanding what they thought was a commitment by shoe manufacturers to hold the price of shoes down if they were able to get controls on exports of hides.

Since that time the Washington Star on March 29 has announced a 4½-percent price increase by two major shoe companies in St. Louis.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] has also received information from the Defense Supply Agency that the price for low-quarter shoes to the Army is going up from $5.75 to $8.75 on July 1, 1966, an increase of more than 50 percent in the price of low-quarter military shoes.

Now very obviously there needs to be an investigation of what appears to be war profiteering by some shoe companies, especially in view of the export-control orders which were placed on hides. I think the export-control orders should be terminated without delay and I think the shoe companies should be brought before the proper congressional committee and a thorough investigation conducted.

WHY SAVE HAIPHONG?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, not very long ago I made the statement on my own responsibility that there was on the high seas a Soviet ship which I conjectured was headed for Haiphong.

In order to keep the American people properly informed I would like to report to the House—and the American people—the fact that the Soviet ship *Sovetsk* arrived in Haiphong Harbor at 1:35 p.m., Saigon time, on March 23, or 10:35 a.m., March 24, Washington time.

This ship—I am reliably informed—is reportedly carrying 2 MI-6 Soviet helicopters.

These helicopters are reportedly the largest in the world, and have a lift and carrying capacity far in excess of anything we possess.

I saw them at the Paris Air Show last year.

They are big—and they are reportedly efficient.

If my information is correct, their delivery to the North Vietnamese—through Haiphong Harbor—and the courtesy of the sanctuary we have so far provided—will improve the supply situation of the Vietcong by a very considerable amount.

I continue to ask the question, "Why save Haiphong? Why save Haiphong?"

PLEASE—NO BULLETS FROM OUR FRIENDS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, our Government does not control the policies of the West German Government. Nevertheless, I hope that strong representations are being made to the West Germans against their plans to help build a steel mill in Red China. It should be very plain that the Red Chinese Government is a belligerent one, which is agitating the conflict in South Vietnam. It is known that the Red Chinese are the principal source of weapons and ammunitions which are being used by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese against our forces there. It is also known that Red Chinese labor forces in numbers estimated at 20,000 to 35,000 are in North Vietnam, helping to build, maintain, and repair roads, railroads, and bridges, which keep open the supply lines and troop routes to South Vietnam for the Communist forces.

A steel mill in Red China will certainly contribute to the economic strength of that nation and directly or indirectly to Red China's ability to provide weapons of war. It is very likely that American dollars spent for the development of West Germany would also contribute to build the steel mill in Red China. There is equal likelihood that such a steel mill would provide bullets to kill Americans in South Vietnam, or it would free other facilities to do so. It is not in any sense, in the best interest of the free world for this mill to be built. There is even less reason for a leading nation in the free world forces to make construction of the mill possible.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday, April 2, 1966, to file a report on H.R. 14025, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE ALBERT THOMAS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, at its meeting on March 25 the Committee on Appropriations adopted a set of resolutions memorializing the life and service of our late beloved colleague, the Honorable Albert Thomas, of Texas. I insert a copy of the resolutions in the RECORD at this point so that they may be included in the permanent compilation of eulogies on our departed colleague.

A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS CONCERNING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF THE LATE HONORABLE ALBERT THOMAS OF TEXAS

Whereas on the morning of Tuesday, the 15th of February 1966, the Honorable Albert Thomas of Texas, in his 30th consecutive year as a Member of the House of Representatives in the service of his country, crossed the great threshold in response to a call from his Maker; and

Whereas for more than a quarter of a century Congressman Albert Thomas served diligently and faithfully as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, providing outstanding service in the administration of the budgetary and appropriation processes of the Nation, accumulating a fund of knowledge about the operations of the agencies and departments of Government; and

Whereas Congressman Albert Thomas, combining this vast fund of knowledge with gifts of persuasion and great courage, was a tireless and talented legislator, an effective leader, who with force of character tempered by a just spirit of mind and heart, walked the corridors of power nobly; and

Whereas in the words of the late President Kennedy, Congressman Albert Thomas was characterized as a statesman with "a young man's interest in the future and a young man's hope for his country" who not only represented his district with distinction but also served well the United States; and

Whereas in the words of President Johnson, "of the qualities that made Albert Thomas a remarkable man, devotion to the people he served and loyalty to his friends stand higher than all": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Committee on Appropriations, recognize that in the passing of our colleague, Albert Thomas, we have lost a courageous leader and beloved friend; and be it further

Resolved, That we extend our deepest sympathy to his wife and other members of his family; and, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be entered in the journal of this committee, a copy sent to Mrs. Thomas, and that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations arrange to include a copy of these resolutions in the ceremonial proceedings of the House of Representatives.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the 25th day of April 1966, which is equivalent to the 5th day of Iyar in the Hebrew calendar, the State of Israel will celebrate its 18th year of independence. I intend to ask for a special order on that day—I am sure that many of our colleagues will desire to extend their greetings and felicitations to this new State, the bastion of democracy in the Middle East. I welcome their participation in my special order on April 25.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight Friday, April 1, to file a report on H.R. 7406.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WAR PROFITEERING IN THE SHOE INDUSTRY

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I joined with eight other Members of the House in a bipartisan appeal for an inquiry into the war profiteering that seems to exist in the shoe industry. Many of us in livestock areas have been shocked at the imposition of hide quotas by the Department of Commerce which are damaging greatly the economic stability of the livestock industry, which will cause an increase in the price of meat to the housewife, and which also harms our balance-of-payments position in the world.

In light of the Secretary of Commerce's supposed encouragement for American businessmen to seek cash export markets, we are at a loss to determine the reason for this arbitrary order. We had a conference with the Secretary and a number of individuals from the Department of Commerce last Monday, and the major reason they gave for this hide export quota was the fact that the price of military footwear had gone up approximately $1.75 per pair during the 7-month period from August 1965 to March 1966. They went from approximately $6.25 to $8 per pair. Information we have just received indicates that the price increase was even greater than the one the Secretary mentioned—all contrasting to approximately a 5-percent increase for civilian footwear for the same period of time.

Few Members of this House have any time for those who would profiteer in war and if this profiteering is the reason for the hide export order, certainly both the profiteering and the export order should be stopped immediately. I am happy to join my friend and colleague, ED EDMONDSON, in calling this serious matter to the attention of the House.

BOYCOTT OF TRADE WITH RED CHINA

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, at long last the administration has moved boldly to persuade our free world allies to boycott trade with Red China. Last week, the Treasury announced that it had negotiated agreements with Britain, Belgium, France, Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong, India, and Taiwan to ban from their exports to the United States wigs made from human hair obtained in Red China, North Korea and North Vietnam. That is cooperation with a vengeance.

Let me suggest that the administration got its signals crossed. The problem of free world trade with our Communist enemies is not to keep false hair—Red hair, if you like—off the heads of American women but to grow real hair on the chest of the State Department.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee may have until midnight Friday, April 1, 1966, to file a report on H.R. 14122, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATIONS IN BROADCAST RATINGS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 miute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an announcement.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have written the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to request specific data as to the extent of control over television programing which broadcast rating services exert today.

Furthermore, I have written the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission to request an examination by that agency of the possibility of monopolistic domination of the TV ratings industry by one company.

These actions are needed, Mr. Speaker, to obtain more concise information which should be useful to the Congress in determining whether additional legislative authority is needed for regulation of TV ratings.

UNITED STATES RELATIONSHIP TO CHINA

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, there has been much public discussion of our relationship to China. The opinion has been voiced widely that we should desist from past efforts to isolate the nation, and in particular, or more accurately, to cease isolating ourselves from contact with China. We could, for example, publicly state that we will issue visas to all citizens who desire to travel to China. We could relax our embargo on trade with China—an embargo which has become virtually ineffectual—by extending to China the same conditions for trade which we extend today to the Soviet Union. Now every evidence indicates that China will not at this time reciprocate to either of the above steps, for China, in turn, has said it intends to isolate us. But by removing restrictions on travel and trade, we will demonstrate to the younger men who soon will rule China, that this Nation does desire, and will take concrete steps toward, peaceful coexistence.

But finally, as all Members are aware, the most troublesome, unresolved question between the United States and China appears to be the status of Taiwan. Let me suggest on this question that, first, we acknowledge that China should now enter the United Nations; second, that Taiwan should relinquish its seat on the Council, and third, and most important, that a plebiscite first be held by the United Nations in Taiwan to determine whether the Taiwanese desire either to rejoin mainland China, or, I would hope, to be an independent nation. The United States should then support the people of Taiwan in whatever decision they would reach.

Mr. Speaker, our policies toward China, with its three quarters of a billion people, the most populous nation on this planet, cannot stay sterile. We must look toward the future, rather than stay entrapped in the past.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight Saturday night, April 2, to file a report on House Joint Resolution 997, supporting U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 52]

Andrews, Glenn
Ashley
Baring
Barrett
Bolling
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Cameron
Carter
Cederberg
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Conyers
Craley
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Dowdy
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Feighan
Flynt
Fuqua
Gettys
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Hardy
Holifield
Jacobs
Karth
Keogh
Leggett
McMillan
MacGregor
Matthews
Nix
O'Brien
Pool
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Rooney, N.Y.
Rumsfeld
Scott
Senner
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Vigorito
Watkins
Whalley
Willis

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. On this rollcall 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight on Monday to file a report on the Post Office, Treasury, and Executive Office appropriation bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMEND SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 802 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 802

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2729) to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 802 provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of S. 2729, a bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act.

S. 2729, as reported, would increase by $125 million the authorization for the Small Business Administration for the amount of loans and commitments that may be outstanding in SBA's regular business loan program, disaster loan program, prime contract authority, and title IV loans under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It would also increase the total amount which may be appropriated to SBA's present revolving fund by $125 million. This increase is estimated by SBA to be needed to continue these lending functions through June 30, 1966. Section 2 of the bill, as amended, would establish two revolving funds for financing SBA's lending functions effective July 1, 1966. One fund would be available for financing SBA's physical disaster loan program. No authorization ceiling is placed on this fund. The second fund would be available for the other programs of SBA. Three ceilings are placed on activities financed from this fund. A ceiling of $400 million is placed on SBA's functions pertaining to small business investment companies; a ceiling of $200 million is placed on its loans to State and local development companies; and a ceiling of $1,400 million is placed on its other activities financed under this fund; that is, the regular business loan program, displaced business disaster loans, trade adjustment loans, prime contract authority, and loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The bill would require SBA to make quarterly reports on the status of the two revolving funds, including its recommendations whenever 75 percent of any ceiling on outstanding obligations has been exceeded. The bill would transfer relevant portions of Public Law 87-550, authorizing SBA to make trade adjustment loans, to the Small Business Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 802 in order that S. 2729 may be considered.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us why points of order are sought to be waived on this bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Points of order are to be waived, I advise the gentleman from Iowa, because of the change in the funding of the program.

Mr. GROSS. Has this become a standard operating procedure in the Rules Committee, to bring out every rule in this way? It seems to me there were three bills yesterday to which points of order were waived.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, I believe there were.

Mr. GROSS. Yet the members of the Rules Committee call these open rules. I do not see how anyone can possibly call these open rules, since they waive points of order. This is the same procedure that was used yesterday.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Iowa that his point certainly has merit with regard to the waiving of points of order generally. In this case the waiver is necessary because of the question of germaneness in the last section of the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Do I correctly infer from the reply made to the gentleman from Iowa concerning the waiver of points of order by the committee which passed out the rule, the House Committee on Rules, that there has been no authorizing or legislative committee action insofar as the transfer of these funds is concerned, or the germaneness of that portion of the bill? Is this not the corollary of legislating on an appropriation bill, the so-called Holman rule of this House?

Mr. YOUNG. I am not sure that I understand the full import of the gentleman's question.

The bill, consideration of which the rule would make in order, does pertain to the change in the funding of this program. That is part of the reason why it is necessary to waive points of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, would it not be the proper procedure for the committee to bring in a bill asking for authorization instead of doing it through the process of the Rules Committee by waiving points of order? Why should not the committee follow the normal procedure and bring up a bill to authorize this? Let us settle the issue as it ought to be settled.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that this is a technicality with regard to the current legislation before the House. That is why the points of order are to be waived.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I have two other questions.

I wish to say first, that is exactly the point I make. The waiving of points of order by the Committee on Rules, whether at the request of the chairman or by direction of someone else or simply for the expedition of business of the House, is a procedure by which we are deleting and emasculating completely the power of individual Members of Congress to raise points of order, which, since the time Jefferson first wrote the Rules of Procedure of the House of Representatives, has been the prerogative of individual Members. It is for that reason I ask this question. I wonder if the gentleman would tell us further whether or not this was requested by the chairman, or whether it was merely done within the wisdom of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. YOUNG. My recollection is that it was requested by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

I would point out that this must stop; and, if necessary, we shall have to start making objections on the basis that a quorum is not present when the rules are presented for a vote.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I regret that I have a special meeting of my Defense Appropriations Subcommittee immediately, and I will not have the privilege of hearing the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, having jurisdiction over this bill, explain the bill, because I am sure in his direct statement he will answer the questions I am going to ask. But I would like to ask him now.

As the chairman knows, many of us have been receiving letters for some months from our regional offices to the effect that there are no funds available for Small Business Administration loans. He knows the gist of this problem. What relationship to these letters and to that problem does this bill have? What will we tell our people as soon as we pass this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the obvious purpose of this is to get SBA back into business. It is almost out of business, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. They are dependent on selling securities that they hold in order to stay in business. Besides, the budget for 1967 will have $428 million for regular business loan programs.

In addition to that, we have a bill now that will help, that will permit the SBA to sell participating certificates from a pool of securities, which will give them great security and more money to do business with.

I think all this is in the direction of doing what the gentleman would like to have—to get the SBA back in business as it was and making regular loans.

Mr. FLOOD. I am very anxious to do that, but may I say this to the gentleman from Texas, if the gentleman will yield further, it was said in the Committee on Appropriations, when the supplemental bill was before us last week, that there was no request in the supplemental appropriation bill for the SBA and, of course, there was not.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the supplemental bill?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct. It was also said—and this is what I am not clear about—it was also said by a responsible member of the Committee on Appropriations that in addition to that, or even more alarming than that, there was nothing in the coming budget for the SBA; is that so?

Mr. PATMAN. It is not; that is not correct.

Mr. FLOOD. That is not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. The budget estimate by the President in January contains a request for $428 million for loan programs under SBA.

Mr. FLOOD. And if and when that becomes law, the SBA will be back in business?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. FLOOD. And, finally, this: All of the letters we receive from the regional offices of the Small Business Administration—and by "we" I mean the gentleman from Texas and my other colleagues—the reason is that the SBA has been out of funds because of the tragic hurricane disaster in Louisiana.

Does this bill propose to meet that problem?

Mr. PATMAN. We believe it does. That has been appropriated for and the funds segregated.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young], House Resolution 802 does provide for 2 hours of debate under an open rule for consideration of S. 2729, to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act.

Mr. Speaker, the rule does waive points of order. I would like to have the Record show my understanding of this, why we have waived points of order on this bill. It is not a question of the Committee on Rules going up or down, or deciding or denying what things we spend it for under the language as contained on page 5 of the bill, the money that has heretofore been appropriated is in this one pot and that is what we are trying to unscramble today, and it will be unscrambled if this legislation is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, the only way we can do that is to waive points of order. If we do not waive points of order in my opinion it would be subject to a point of order, and we could not accomplish what we have started out to do.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Could not the proper legislative committee have brought legislation to the floor of the House which would have obviated the need for waiving points of order?

Mr. SMITH of California. This is exactly what this bill does. What else would you have it do? This is an authorization bill. Language is in there to do exactly what the gentleman from Iowa is asking to be done.

Mr. GROSS. If that were true there would be no necessity for the waiver.

Mr. SMITH of California. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that if the gentleman can tell me how to do it any differently than this I would be more than pleased to do it as the gentleman suggests, and bring it before the Committee on Rules at another date. But this is the best we could do under the circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would suggest that it be handled in such fashion as to bring a bill to the floor that provides for the handling of funds in the normal procedure.

Mr. SMITH of California. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that that is exactly what it specifically does.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, but it would be subject otherwise to a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of California. Of course; that is the only way I know how to do it. That is my explanation for it. We are not promiscuously waiving points of order. We have talked to the Parliamentarian about it, and that is my statement on it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] has very ably explained the bill and what it provides. I shall simply revise and extend my remarks, and not repeat it. My understanding of the bill is as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency has traced the natural disasters of 1964 and 1965 in its report, recounting the SBA's diversion of regular business loan funds into its disaster program. This series of events has given rise to this bill's two main provisions, an additional authorization for the remainder of fiscal 1966 and the division of SBA funds into two revolving funds in order to separate disaster funds from regular business funds.

The purpose of the bill is to make available for fiscal 1966 additional funds to cover the loans and commitments which may be outstanding in the regular business loans program, prime contract authority, and title IV loans under the Economic Opportunity Act. An increased authorization of $125 million for fiscal 1966 is made. The current revolving fund's appropriation may be increased by $125 million to carry out commitments which are current now.

Further, the bill will establish two revolving funds for SBA's financing of lending, effective July 1, 1966. One will finance the physical disaster loan program; no authorization ceiling is placed on this fund. The second will be available to finance the other SBA programs. Three ceilings are placed on this fund: First, a ceiling of $400 million on loans under sections 302 and 303—small business investment companies; second, a ceiling of $200 million on loans to State and local development companies; and third, a ceiling of $1,400 million on other activities under the fund, business loans, displaced business loans, trade adjustment loans, prime contract authority, and title IV loans.

SBA is required to report whenever 75 percent of any ceiling, in outstanding obligations, has been exceeded. The bill also transfers authority to make trade adjustment loans from Public Law 87-550 to SBA along with funds now available for that purpose, currently $1,500,000. No such loans have been made to date under these provisions.

Sums remaining in the revolving fund on July 1, 1966, will be divided between the two funds by the Administrator, in a ratio reflecting past experience.

There are no minority views to the committee report.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] will speak on this rule in just a moment, and will undertake to explain how we must go about unscrambling this pot.

I offered an amendment to a Senate bill last year designed to start the first unscrambling of this pot so that when we do have a disaster such as that which occurred in Alaska and Louisiana, we will have some money available with which to help the people in the disaster area who need the money at that particular moment.

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the purposes of this bill, to take care of the people affected in disaster areas.

Mr. Speaker, under the Economic Opportunity Act there is a window in most of the Small Business Offices. What we are trying to do is to unscramble that pot of money and find out how it is going to be used in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in 1953 the House Small Business Committee, when considering the proposed Small Business Act, unanimously supported elimination of the $100,000 loan limit the act contained. A higher loan limitation, subsequently established by the Congress at $350,000 was deemed essential if the agency was to operate effectively and provide maximum financial assistance to the Nation's small businesses.

The Johnson-Humphrey administration apparently seeks to alter the business loan program with drastic changes of traditional loan policy for the maximum direct SBA loan has been lowered to $25,000. Such a limitation prohibits assistance to those sizable, though technically small, businesses which require substantial loans and which, in turn, provide the great bulk of the Nation's production and employment.

SBA is consequently cast as a small loan shop whose penuriousness guarantees that no small business in need of financial assistance for growth can increase in size. Worthwhile assistance will not be available to serve the critical needs of those substantial, deserving, and qualified small businesses which would contribute to the Nation's economy.

S. 2729 increases the authorization of funds for the SBA business loan program. By its passage the Congress again demonstrates its willingness that adequate funds be provided the SBA business loan program. The past excuse of the present administration for curbing loan limitations has been proven, once again, to be without foundation.

I call upon the Small Business Administration to respect this mandate of the Congress and to restore immediately its business loan limitation to the sum of $350,000.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that a great number of the membership of the House have been concerned over the operations of the Small Business Administration.

The Small Business Administration since October of last year has refused to accept any applications under the business loan program which was a creature of the Congress. The reason that the Small Business Administration is out of business is that the Congress, from time to time, has suggested other uses for the corpus of the loan funds available to that agency for any one of a number of very meritorious programs. Particularly, this is true with respect to the responsibility for handling the disaster loan fund applications for all of the natural disasters that occur from time to time in the country. What we did not envision in the Congress at the time we placed this obligation upon the Small Business Administration is that a time would come when a natural disaster would absorb or would take all of the loan funds which the Congress had appropriated and therefore cause the basic small business loan program to close down because of the lack of funds.

That is exactly what happened in the case of Hurricane Betsy. That natural disaster was of such tremendous proportion that for the Small Business Administration to carry out its obligations, it took every dime which was available to that agency. The only choice the agency had, and I say this speaking, just as fairly as I can of the administration of that agency—the only thing they could do was to say to the small businessmen of the country, "We do not have any money now to respond to any loan application which you may desire to file—unless, you can get a bank to provide the money, in which case we do not have to put up any of the money, but we could guarantee a portion of that loan. This gave birth to the wide use of a program called the guaranty loan program. This gave the banking community veto over a Federal small business loan program in my opinion. So, what has happened and the reason the Congress is under some pressure is that the small businessman today goes into the regional office of the Small Business Administration in his State; the director is entirely sympathetic; the loan may have all the merit in the world, but the director has to say, "I cannot make this loan because we do not have any funds in the business loan program."

The wisdom of the legislation presented is obvious. It seeks to isolate or departmentalize or compartmentalize the funds which we authorize by this bill—saying that x number of dollars goes into a disaster fund; and x number of dollars is utilized for a small business loan and investment fund for about five other programs that the Congress has obligated the Small Business Administration to administer.

Therefore, it is anticipated, and I think this is the high merit of the legislation which is presented: We will never again have a natural disaster which will absorb all of the business loan funds, and which, for all practical intents and purposes, will force the Small Business Administration to refuse to receive a small businessman's loan application.

I have sent to the membership of this body a proposal to further guarantee the sanctity of the small business loan fund—and there is not a Member of this House who does not seek to do that. That is the very reason we created and made permanent the Small Business Administration: To see to it that the small businessmen of the country had a place to come if he could not obtain funds through private lending sources of the country.

Now what I seek to do is this. I only want to go one step further than the provisions of S. 2729.

They have separated the business loan program and the disaster program into two different funds. There is one area in which we have given the Small Business Administration responsibility wherein we could have a set of circumstances that by reason of that authority the Small Business Administrator would be obligated to take every dime out of the small business loan fund, just as he did on the disaster in Louisiana: To meet the commitments of title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act.

All I seek to do is that which, I believe, every Member of this body wants done, and that is: make secure the operation of the small business loan program and see to it that we do not have the maximum individual loan ceilings lowered below the $350,000 the Congress intended, that we do not have cutoffs, or have periods of time when applications cannot be received and processed.

I propose and will propose at the appropriate time that in this particular authorization bill a ceiling of $100 million be placed upon those funds which would be available for the operation of the poverty loan program under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Now, what does this do? Does this tie the hands of the Administrator of the program? The answer is an emphatic "No." As the report shows on page 7, it is anticipated that by the end of fiscal year 1967 the program would only absorb $69 million. You may say, "Well, Arch, if that is the case, what are you worried about?" Well, it is very easy to assume that an aggressive administrator—may set up a network of small business development centers—as provided by title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act and start obligating funds which we intended to go into the small business loan program.

You might say, "Well, no, it will never happen." But, we have seen the business loan program close down due to the drain of the disaster loan program upon a common fund. It can happen if this title IV program should similarly explode. So I say, the sound and sensible thing to do is to impose a ceiling in order to secure the operation of the small business loan program, the prime reason for this agency in the first place, and say, "We will put a limitation of $100 million on what you can use for poverty loans."

It is anticipated they will only use $69.7 million through fiscal year 1967. We will have provided, however, a ceiling; they cannot further invade the funds this bill authorizes for the operation of the small business loan program. To me the only argument that could be made against this is, "Well, they have not had a chance to study it in the Banking and Currency Committee. Perhaps they would have given it consideration had it been before the committee."

But, may I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the problem we have in the matter of the Small Business Administration. We have a Select Committee on Small Business of the House which has the responsibility of conducting investigations and hearings to protect and foster small business in the country. Yet, when it gets down to the legislative part of the program, another committee of the House has jurisdiction. I am not speaking critically of the committee that has the authority legislatively on this matter, but I daresay that they will not conduct a thorough examination of the Small Business Administration or its problems for another year or until again they once again must give consideration to that which is provided under the rule which we are discussing here today.

Yet, the Select Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] as chairman, and myself as the ranking minority member lives with the problems of the small businessman on a day-to-day basis. The only reason in the world that we have not presented this proposal of further compartmentalizing SBA funds is the limitations of the existing dual committee responsibilities. The right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

Beyond that, may I say, I should not sit down without remarking to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] that in bringing this bill to the floor today they have, in my opinion—and in the expediting of its consideration—made and will make a tremendous contribution to breathing new life into the Small Business Administration and the small business loan program of that agency.

I should like to have some assurance from them that they might accept this vital amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 363, nays 4, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—363

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.

Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
Watts
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—4

Ashbrook
Gross
Hall
Walker, Miss.

NOT VOTING—65

Barrett
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Conyers
Craley
Curtin
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Dowdy
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Feighan
Flynt
Fogarty
Fuqua
Gettys
Gibbons
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Hardy
Herlong
Jacobs
Johnson, Pa.
Keogh
Leggett
McCarthy
McMillan
MacGregor
Mackie
Matthews
Nix
O'Brien
Pickle
Rivers, Alaska
Rooney, N.Y.
Rumsfeld
Scott
Senner
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Teague, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Vigorito
Watkins
Weltner
Whalley
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Keogh with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Todd with Mr. Curtin.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. O'Brien with Mr. de la Garza.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Dent.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Hardy with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Vigorito.

Mr. Cameron with Mr. Carey.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Rivers of Alaska.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Weltner with Mr. Mackie.

Mr. Flynt of Georgia with Mr. Gettys.

Mr. Tuten with Mr. Gibbons.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be given until midnight to file a report on H.R. 14088.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMEND SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2729, to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2729, with Mr. ICHORD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under House Resolution 802, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I want to make it clear that the legislation before this body today—S. 2729—is truly a bipartisan measure. At no time in either the Senate or the House Banking and Currency Committee has there been an objection raised to any portion of this legislation. The minority members of your Banking and Currency Committee, under the capable leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] contributed many worthwhile suggestions to this bill.

SMALL BUSINESSMEN DEPEND ON SBA

I am certain that there is not a Member of this Chamber who has not received a letter from a constituent regarding the slowdown, and in some cases shutdown, of SBA lending activities which have been in effect since October 12. And I am fully aware of the heartaches that small businessmen across our Nation face when they find they need financial assistance. There is no place they can turn except to the Small business Administration. Banks long ago closed their lending windows to the small businessman. On occasion, banks will lend to a small businessman if the Small Business Administration will guarantee the loan and the bank can charge its normal interest rate, which is higher than the rate the borrower would be able to obtain from SBA. But how many of you have received letters from small businessmen complaining that banks would not even let them fill out loan applications?

S. 2729 would not only reopen the SBA lending windows for all loans, but would all but guarantee that such closings would not occur in the future.

The legislation is divided into two major sections: Section 1 would increase the total amount which may be outstanding from SBA's present revolving fund by $125 million. This authorization increase will allow SBA to spend funds which are available, but because of pressing ceiling limitations might not be able to be disbursed once the ceiling is reached. SBA officials estimated that at the end of March there will be $76.6 million available in its revolving fund. However, unless S. 2729 is passed, raising the authorization ceiling, SBA will be able to spend only $23.2 million of the revolving fund total before it reaches the authorization ceiling. In addition, as the revolving fund is increased through loan sales, SBA would still not be able to use the money if the ceiling is reached.

SOME LOAN PROGRAMS OPEN

SBA has not completely closed its lending program. It is still making loans under title 4 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; loans in the investment division; that is, small business investment company and local development company loans; as well as disaster loans, both physical disaster loans and loans made to small businesses who are displaced by some Federal project such as an urban renewal area or highway development. Some regular business loans are being disbursed but only on a guaranteed basis. Under this arrangement a private lender lends the funds to the small business concern and SBA guarantees a portion of the loan. However, even on a guaranteed basis, while SBA does not disburse the funds, it still must charge the entire amount of the loan against its authorization.

The situation is compounded because SBA must keep a loan reserve due to the threat of traditional spring floods in various areas.

The agency, however, has not been able to make regular direct business loans since October. During that time 5,097 loan applications, totaling more than $140 million, have piled up at SBA offices around the country. This backlog of loan requests consists only of those applications in which some preliminary checks as to credit statements and amounts of loan needed and other such information have been processed. It does not include the thousands of small businessmen who have requested that their name be placed on a list to be contacted as soon as the agency has enough funds to reopen its loan program.

COULD REOPEN SHORTLY

I was informed by SBA officials yesterday that if S. 2729 is passed, that the agency will be able to reopen its regular business lending program within several weeks after the President signs the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is not enough to apply merely a first-aid treatment to the statutes governing the Small Business Administration. Since 1956, SBA has had to cut back its lending program or suspend its operations on eight occasions. A situation as severe as this which threatens the very existence of small businesses throughout this Nation, requires more than a legislative "band aid." Your committee feels that it is well on the way toward solving SBA's ills through the actions encompassed in section 2 of S. 2729.

At the present time, SBA operates under one revolving fund. Under this arrangement, all appropriations, and loan repayments are lumped together. All loans are similarly made from that one fund. At the present time, the total amount which may be outstanding from the one fund is $1,841 million. S. 2729 would raise that figure by $125 million to $1,966 million. Under the existing law there are two ceilings contained in the revolving fund. Regular business loans and disaster loans and all other SBA lending activity not conducted by its Investment Division are limited to $1,375 million. Loans made from the Investment Division; that is, SBIC loans and State and local development company loans, are limited to not more than $461 million. The single revolving fund has proved ineffective, particularly in recent years where we have witnessed two unfortunate costly disasters, the Alaskan earthquake and Hurricane Betsy. Disaster loans in recent years have far exceeded their estimated figures. In order to make certain that there is enough money available for all disaster victims, SBA has had to borrow from other programs within the single revolving fund in order to replenish the disaster money. Conversely, the same might be true during a period where we had no major disasters and a heavy demand for regular business loans. In this kind of situation SBA would have to use funds otherwise earmarked for disaster loans and shift them to regular business loans.

REPLENISHMENTS REQUIRE TIME

Fortunately, SBA has always been able to replenish its revolving fund following a disaster loan drain. But, such restorations take time. In one instance it was 6 months before new funds could be appropriated to put back into the revolving fund money which had been used for disaster loans.

When we speak of disaster loans, we speak primarily of loans made to victims of hurricanes, floods, forest fires, earthquakes, or other similar natural tragedies. But it is as much of a disaster to a small businessman who is about to lose his business because he cannot obtain adequate financial help, as it is to a small businessman who has lost his business because of floodwaters. Who is to say which small businessman is more deserving of a loan; and if funds are available for only one loan, who gets the loan? S. 2729 provides the answer. On July 1, 1966, it provides that two revolving funds shall be established. The funds in the existing revolving fund will be separated into the two new funds under an equitable arrangement to be worked out by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. The first fund—the disaster fund—would not be limited as to authorization ceiling. This fund would still have to obtain its moneys either through appropriations, sales of outstanding loans to private investors, or repayments on loans. But it would not be hampered by an authorization ceiling which could slow down disaster loan processing if a large-scale disaster struck at a time when outstanding disaster loans were bumping the authorization ceiling. The second fund, which would receive its moneys through the same methods as the disaster fund, would house all other SBA lending activities.

THREE CEILINGS ESTABLISHED

In order to establish congressional safeguards, three ceilings have been placed on loans from this fund. Loans under the small business investment program would be limited to $400 million. Loans totaling $200 million would be authorized for State and local development companies. All other lending functions of SBA, including business loans, prime contract authority, and title 4 loans of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 would carry a ceiling of $1,000,400,000. As originally introduced, S. 2729 had ceilings which were $112,700,000 below those established in the bill reported by your committee. The original figures were supplied from estimates given by the Small Business Administration based on their projection for anticipated loan needs through fiscal year 1967. They did not, however, provide for any unforeseen lending increases. To offset this, your committee has raised the total dollar amount which may be outstanding to $2 billion, as opposed to $1,887,300,000, as contained in the original legislation.

INTERFUND BORROWING PROHIBITED

One of the most important features of S. 2729 is that it prohibits borrowing between the funds. In addition, repayments of loans and loan sales proceeds will be channeled back into the fund from which the loan was originally made. This arrangement will preclude a drain on one fund for the other. The interfund borrowing restriction will be of greatest value in the area of regular business loans, since the volume of loans to be made over a projected period is far more predictable than are disaster loans. Consequently, the bulk of SBA's budgeting goes into the business loan program. Since the inception of the agency, more than 65,000 business loans have been made by SBA, or nearly $2.5 billion of SBA funds. The monetary figure is much higher since many of these loans were made in participation with other financial institutions, and their share of the loan is not included in the $2.5 billion figure.

This legislation establishes further congressional controls in that it requires that the agency shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Banking and Currency of both the House of Representatives and the Senate quarterly reports on the status of each fund. This will provide Congress with an effective review policy.

Mr. Chairman, it would be foolish to state that S. 2729 will solve all of the problems facing the millions of small businessmen throughout our country. However, this legislation will enable the Small Business Agency to reopen its lending programs and reextend its helping hand to our small business industry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correctly informed that the chairman of the committee, or some member thereof, will offer an amendment to lines 21, 22, and 23 on page 3 of the bill to strike out the language "including its projection of the future needs of such funds, and its recommendations for such additional appropriations as it deems appropriate."

Mr. PATMAN. I shall be glad to read the amendment if the gentleman from Iowa would like to hear it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I would.

Mr. PATMAN [reading]:

> Page 3, strike out the comma in line 21 and all that follows down through the period in line 23, and insert in lieu thereof a period.
>
> Page 4, after the period in line 6, insert the following new sentence: "Business-type budgets for each of the funds established by paragraph (1) shall be prepared, transmitted to the Congress, considered, and enacted in the manner prescribed by law (sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 847–849)) for wholly owned Government corporations."

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the chairman will offer those amendments?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly. They have been worked out with the assistance of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], the ranking minority member, and we will agree to them, and it is my sincere hope that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will agree to it.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I support the amendments.

Mr. PATMAN. We know that they will be offered, and it is our hope that they will be accepted, and we believe they will be.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2729. As our chairman has stated this bill received unanimous support of our committee.

On January 14, 1965, I introduced H.R. 2860 to provide for an adequately financed separate disaster loan fund. As

I noted at that time, this was consistent with my position taken on behalf of the minority in 1962 when the loan funds for disaster and regular small business loans were combined over our objection.

When the Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on one of two emergency authorization requests last year, in May of last year, I received a promise from the then SBA Administrator Mr. Foley that the SBA would report on my bill the very next time they came before our committee. I also received the sympathetic interest of our chairman and of Senator PROXMIRE who testified before the committee at that time.

When SBA returned to our committee on October 21 of last year, asking for another emergency authorization, no report was available. I called this to the attention of this body on the floor that very day. I had earlier that day, in committee, offered an amendment to the bill, S. 2542, to set up separate, adequate funds for the disaster loan program, but it was rejected. The next day, the bill we have before us today was introduced by Senator PROXMIRE with cosponsorship by Senator McINTYRE. The necessary bipartisan support for the separate loan fund approach was assured.

In the meantime, SBA had come to a complete standstill on regular small business loans, not even accepting loan applications, and even disaster loans and economic opportunity loans under the poverty program were encountering delays.

In January 1966 I testified before the Senate committee on this bill, and urged the inclusion of language requiring more adequate reporting than we in Congress had been receiving from the SBA in the past. The amendment proposed by me calls for quarterly reports, and reports anytime that any fund has 75 percent or more in commitments that is now contained in the bill before you.

Finally, when this bill came before our committee, I offered an amendment based on the testimony by SBA Executive Administrator Ross Davis, which would provide for an authorization of $112,700,000 for fiscal year 1967. The original language of the bill carried the new authorization only to the end of the current fiscal year.

The three goals of adequate financing, separate disaster and regular business loan funds, and adequate, early reporting to Congress, hopefully, will now be achieved. I am pleased at the bipartisan support that this bill has developed and I think it is a particular tribute to the Nation's small business community. The effort to reach this particular plateau from which the SBA can go forward revitalized as it has not been for nearly 18 months has received support from many quarters, but I would be remiss if I did not call attention to the backing of my early bill by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who introduced similar legislation early last year. In addition, the efforts by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], and his colleagues on the Small Business Committee have proved very helpful. I urge immediate passage of this vital legislation.

This is only the first step, however, toward the revitalization of the Small Business Administration as a positive force on behalf of our Nation's small business community. President Johnson should forthwith appoint a Small Business Administrator, a post that has been vacant for over a year, and his administration should disclaim any intent to bury the independence and the effectiveness of the Small Business Administration in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, S. 2729 represents a significant improvement in the orderly operation of the loan funds of the Small Business Administration. To provide continuity to the business loan program, to assure sufficient funds to meet the ever-increasing demand of small businessmen for long-term credit at reasonable rates, to forestall "raids" upon business loan funds for disaster loan purposes, in short, to facilitate operation of SBA precisely as intended by the Congress in its establishment of the agency, passage of S. 2729 is essential. As far as it goes, I support the bill wholeheartedly.

I find, however, that an important provision has been omitted from this bill, which omission continues the threat to the survival of the business loan program.

Mr. Chairman, the original Small Business Act of 1953 established as SBA's key function a business loan program. The need for long-term loans at moderate rates of interest was critical then; it is even more critical today. If we are to support small business not by promises, but by beneficial action, the business loan program providing sound financing, on a first-come, first-served basis, to all qualified small businesses must be maintained. We have failed in the latter in that the Congress did not adequately protect the limited funds provided for the program. By satisfying other loan programs with funds intended for business loans, and by foisting onto one revolving fund the insatiable demands of other SBA activities, the business loan program was brought to a virtual standstill.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 provided another program of loans to businesses and individuals, a program intended to reduce long-term unemployment. The loan program is administered by SBA under a delegation from the Office of Economic Opportunity. Apparently we have not learned the full lesson from the fiasco of the disaster loan drain upon the revolving fund, for no limitation of Economic Opportunity Act loans short of the total revolving fund has been provided.

Thus the funds for the business loan program ardently sought for the millions of small businessmen throughout the land is now to be jeopardized, and I predict, again brought to a standstill by the drain of a program admittedly demanding or contemplating far less of the borrower. Under the EOA program, traditional SBA requirements of security and repayment probability may be lost in the emphasis upon character and promise. Loose operation could usurp the SBA program our constituents have so loudly supported since SBA refused to accept business loan applications last October.

Mr. Chairman, just as I have strongly supported a disaster loan program and one under separate authorization, I support the economic opportunity program and the loan assistance provided thereby. By this amendment, however, I am providing protection for the loan funds available for the business loan program of SBA. I am insuring that the demands of special purpose programs do not exhaust the available funds of programs long recognized as contributing greatly to the success of small business throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this is one of the unique authorization bills that comes before the committee. There is no other instance that I can think of in which a committee or the House considers legislation for a particular agency of the Federal Government as is done in this particular case. As the Members of the House know, we have a Select Committee on Small Business, made up of 15 members, who have the specific authority to investigate the problems of the small businessman across the country. They spend the greater portion of their time in contact with those responsible for the administration of the small business program.

But we have no legislative authority, regardless of the difficulties we may find throughout the country as far as the small businessmen are concerned. We must of necessity make recommendations to another committee of the House, the one that has legislative authority in the area. May I say we have, for the most part, received the cooperation of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the legislative committee which brings this authorization bill concerning funds for the Small Business Administration before us for consideration.

I daresay there are a lot of questions in the minds of the membership as to what in the world has happened to the Small Business Administration. Why has SBA been unable to provide funds for the small businessmen who seek to borrow from the Federal Government under a program that the Congress passed and the President signed into law? Very, very frankly—there is an easy explanation. In addition to—and I made this point when we were discussing the rule—the business loan program, which the Small Business Administration handles, the Congress has from time to time assigned the administration of other loan programs to SBA. A major responsibility has been the administration of a loan program for victims of the natural disasters that have occurred in the country. All of us are aware of the very devastating hurricane in Louisiana recently. The Small Business Administration proceeded as the Congress had directed them to do—to handle the receipt of applications for financial assistance after the disaster has been proclaimed. The Small Business Administration moved forthwith. The applications for funds, however, exceeded the funds that the Congress has made available for all programs SBA handles. Therefore, the Administrator or the Executive Director had to close down the SBA business loan program because of the lack of funds.

This was the program that we in the Congress originally conceived as the basic program of the Small Business Administration. Since October of last year, the applications for loans that have been accepted have been negligible—and that is, of course, with reference to the regular business loan program.

As a matter of fact, today in your congressional district, if you were a small businessman—and I daresay you have heard from some of them—if you wanted to borrow money from the Small Business Administration—and you were otherwise eligible and met all of the qualifications—you could go in and see the regional director but, regardless of how fine a character you might be and how good the references you might have, he would say to you, "I do not have any money to lend you." He would say, "Well, if you go to a bank and they will provide their funds, I will consider the guarantee of 90 percent of your loan, but we do not have any funds available of our own to lend you."

This is the point the Small Business Administration has reached. It has been severely handicapped for the past 8 or 9 months.

I want to call to the attention of the membership that, originally in 1953, when this program was established, we placed a ceiling on the dollar amount of the loan a small businessman might submit an application for. The ceiling of $100,000 proved to be inadequate. The demands of the small business community on the small business agency required higher lending authority. We in the Congress thus provided that they could make loans up to $350,000.

So what happened? When the demands from other sources on business loan funds absorbed the funds or measurably reduced them, the Administrator or the Executive Director or whatever the case may be, immediately and administratively lowered the ceiling on loans. In other words, he reduced the loan maximum, saying, "I won't accept an application in excess of $100,000."

Then the demands of disaster victims multiplied and he said, "I won't permit any more loans in excess of $15,000."

Finally his fund became completely bankrupt and he said to his regional directors, "You cannot accept any further loan applications."

What we now have, by reason of a number of circumstances, some of which we in the Congress must share the blame, is a situation in which we have had no funds available for the small businessmen of the country.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I think the gentleman should make it perfectly clear that every time the Small Business Administration has come to Congress for an authorization or an appropriation, the Congress has met the request. I do not think we share in that blame for the lack of funds in this agency.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is certainly correct. If that suggestion is made, to correct in the Record any suggestion I may have made that we have not given the agency the money requested, the gentleman is eminently correct. We have never failed to respond to the monetary requests for funds for the Small Business Administration. We have, however, thrust other things on this man's desk and told him to administer them. He has done the job we have given him even though it meant using funds that should have been used on other programs. He has had to close those programs down that the Congress has shown most interest in.

They did not come back and ask for funds, and that should be a firm point as far as our criticism of the administration of this program is concerned. They knew what the problem was, but they waited and waited. We would still be waiting for the Small Business Administration to come to Congress for funds had it not been for the initiative of the gentleman from Texas and the gentlemen in the other body who moved this legislation before us.

The point I am making is this: We shall have happen to us again exactly what happened due to the disaster loan program unless my amendment is adopted. The gentleman from Texas has very honestly stated what this bill proposes to do. It will isolate funds so that never again will the disasters, no matter how many we have, be given an opportunity to invade the corpus of the funds that are available for the business loan program. It is exactly what we want to do. I commend them for this.

I say there is within this legislation another opportunity for the same thing to happen again. It could occur if there were a rapid expansion of the loan program under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act. We gave the Small Business Administrator the responsibility of handling this program, and he could repeat the error of the present situation. Not a man in this body can tell me otherwise.

He could take the $423 million which we authorize in this legislation and put it all in one program and close the small business loan program down again, simply because of lack of funds.

At an appropriate time I propose to offer an amendment which I believe would be in the best interests of both the poverty loan program and the business loan program of the Small Business Administration. The amendment would place a ceiling on the title IV loan program. You do it in other places in your report with respect to other programs.

Look at the report that is before the House. Among other things it states that we are going to place three ceilings. I want to add a fourth ceiling. Three ceilings would be placed on activities financed from this fund. A ceiling of $400 million would be placed on SBA's functions under sections 302 and 303 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. That is the portion of the act in which small development corporations can come to this particular program for funding for new industry.

A ceiling of $200 million would be placed on loans to State and local development companies. A ceiling of $1,400 million would be placed on SBA's other loan activities. But, among its other activities are trade adjustment loans, prime contract authority, displaced business disaster loans and the regular business loan program, which every one of us want to protect, and the loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

I say that we should place a ceiling of $100 million on loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act, I am not hampering that act, I say to the Members, at all, in fact, I propose protecting it.

It is estimated, if we look at the report, that they will have in this program outstanding loans and commitments of only $69 million at the end of fiscal year 1967.

The only thing I seek to do, I say to the Members of the Committee, is to authorize $100 million for the title IV loan program, but not another dime.

We must keep the business loan program in operation. Applications must continue to be received from small businessmen in the various communities across the country.

If it were to be suggested that this is going to stop the title IV loan program in any way, I would say that my amendment proposes to provide almost twice as much for poverty loans as the legislation which is before us indicates has been projected through fiscal year 1967.

It would place a ceiling, so that we would not be in the same position as we are now in the disaster case, because disaster loans have absorbed all regular business loan funds. If we do not put a ceiling on title IV poverty loans, which I suggest be at $100 million, we will have title IV loans which may completely absorb the business loan funds, and the business loan program will be shut down again. I think it is our responsibility to see to it that this does not happen again.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask one question. In setting out the $100 million, do I correctly understand from the gentleman's remarks that this would then reduce the other ceiling that is set for funds by the $100 million, so that even though the predictions are that they would use only $69 million of it, we would be placing inactive, then, the $100 million? Or would the gentleman set that in a way in which it does not disturb the utilization of the other funds authorized?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is correct. I would construct it in such a way that the fund would be available up to $100 million, but not isolate those funds from the business loan program in the event they did not use that $100 million.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made an extremely valuable contribution. I agree with his views and, of course, join in his pointing to the disaster loan effects on the general loan program of small business.

Of course, as the report indicated on page 29, they underestimated that by 100 percent, $200 million instead of $400 million.

We had this before our committee when we were considering the Louisiana hurricane situation. At that time, I asked SBA specifically if they had enough authorizations and appropriations left to do the job in Louisiana. They said, "Yes, we do." But the facts and circumstances show that is not the case. Is that not true, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is correct. We have seen what happened. The small business loan program shut down.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman's proposal would prevent the same thing from happening in the other phases of the program. Is that correct?

Mr. MOORE. That is right. I would be certain the small business loan program operates and at the same time I would still make funds available for the title IV poverty loan program to operate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, the rural area which I represent is the kind of area one might expect would benefit most by the operation of the Small Business Administration. Or to put it another way, one of the reasons that the SBA was originally created was to help provide the needed financial stimulus to areas such as mine. This is true for several reasons. For one thing, small rural banks often do not have enough capital to provide the kind of financing needed for substantial business and industrial growth. For another thing, rural banks are traditionally far more conservative than city banks and are less willing to take a chance on any but the most conservative loan applications. Now that new emphasis is being placed on the importance of rural development, it is important for us to learn whether the SBA program is succeeding or failing in the rural areas.

Over the past year, in my many discussions with the farmers, businessmen, and bankers in my area, I have gained the distinct impression that the SBA was falling down on the job. As we all know, disaster loan demands placed such a burden on the organization that direct loans had to be suspended last October. But unfortunately, it seemed that even the loan guarantee plan was not meeting the needs of the community as it did not enjoy the confidence of the bankers. In an attempt to find out exactly where the problem lay, I recently wrote a letter to the 47 banks in my district. I wrote to them when I had learned that very few banks in our area have been interested in participating in the loan guarantee program. I said I was interested in finding out the reason for this lack of interest, in the hope that steps might be taken to make the program more attractive to local banks. Since the local bank's participation in the loan guarantee program would be extremely helpful to small businessmen in my district, I invited their comments to find out why they were not participating and what suggestions they had to make the SBA's loan guarantee program more attractive.

Replies to this request have been coming in and have been very illuminating. One bank described an incident with a guarantee loan program under which a loan was made for a factory building. When the loan became past due, the bank gave the SBA the required 30 days' notice to pay their participation in the loan. At that point, the bank tells me, instead of reimbursing the bank for their participation, the SBA began to look for technicalities in their agreement with the bank. Eventually the bank became so disgusted that they served notice on the SBA that they wanted to buy the SBA's participation in the loan, which they eventually did. The bank president wrote:

> Based on this experience, we are no longer interested in the guarantee loan program.

Another bank described procedural and administrative problems in dealing with the SBA. One client was told by the SBA that a loan application could be processed in 2 or 3 weeks. In this particular case, SBA approval arrived 4 months later. And this was in a situation where the collateral for the loan was appraised at three times the amount of the loan. Another letter describes the problems the bank has in obtaining prompt payments from the SBA on a loan where the SBA is handling receipt of payments. One banker comments:

> Having cited my experiences with SBA, you can understand my reluctance to mention this kind of loan to any of my customers.

Several of the aforementioned communications follow:

March 23, 1966.

Dear Sir: As you know, there has been a moratorium on Small Business Administration direct loans since last October, and the only type of SBA loan available is the loan guarantee plan, under which the bank makes the loan and applies to SBA for a guarantee of 75–90 percent of the amount loaned.

We have received many constituent requests asking our help in arranging loans through the SBA. Although we are happy to assist our constituents, there is little we can do for them directly in this area, except to try to expedite their applications.

We have found that very few banks doing business in the 28th Congressional District have been interested in participating in this program. We are very interested to find out the reason for this lack of interest, with the view in mind that perhaps there are actions we might take that would help make this program more attractive to our local banks.

We feel that participation in the guarantee loan program would be a helpful service to small businessmen in our district and we would like to see our banks involved to the maximum feasible extent.

Your comments on the SBA, and the guarantee loan program especially, would be greatly appreciated by this office. We hope that by knowing your point of view on this subject we can help you and the borrowers to take advantage of the SBA services. Please let me hear from you.

Cordially yours,

Joseph Y. Resnick,
Member of Congress.

Dutchess Bank & Trust Co.,
Poughkeepsie, N.Y., March 25, 1966.

Re SBA program.

Mr. Joseph Y. Resnick,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Joe: This is in response to your letter of March 23. We have participated with SBA in regard to one loan and have assisted a few customers in their endeavors to obtain SBA direct loans. We have also been aware of assistance that SBA has given to one of our customers in ironing out problems that our customer had with Government procurement agencies (regarding work in process) and in securing certificates of competency.

We have found personnel in the New York City office to be cooperative. To a large degree, we believe that SBA's usefulness is in the service it renders to small business as distinguished from its lending activities. Obviously, the two go hand in hand but in many cases, the service is the predominating benefit.

Our bank (and we believe this applies to many banks) is reluctant to participate with SBA or to use its loan guarantee program because of redtape in connection with both programs and uncertainty as to the bank's position under the guarantee program. We had one very sad experience in connection with a RFC-originated guarantee in which it was claimed that a technicality negated the effectiveness of the guarantee. The claim was made by a successor to RFC some 7 or 8 years after the loan was put on our books. As a result, we refuse to prepare closing papers in which a governmental lending agency participates. We believe that we can work out this problem with the SBA if a need arises, but we prefer to avoid controversy whenever possible. Thus, we shy away from SBA participations.

Sincerely yours,

Donald A. Moore,
President.

The Saugerties National Bank
& Trust Co.,
Saugerties, N.Y., March 28, 1966.

Mr. Joseph Y. Resnick,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: I would like to answer your letter of March 23 regarding banks' participation with SBA in loans by relating to you my experience with the SBA.

In August 1964, we submitted a loan application to SBA in the amount of $225,000 asking them to take a 75-percent interest. Incidentally, when a client seeks information from SBA regarding loans, they are told by SBA personnel that, if the bank is going to participate for 25 percent, it is only a matter of 2 or 3 weeks for the application to be processed. Well, in this case we received the SBA approval in December 1964, some 4 months later. I might add at this point that the collateral for this loan was appraised at three times the amount of the loan.

We have a 10-percent participation in another loan with SBA, and they are handling the receipt of payments on this loan. I wish it were the other way around. When the first payment was due, I called our customer and asked him if he had made his payment. He told me he had made the payment a week before. I then called SBA and asked where our share was. That was a mistake. (Let me warn you, sir. Don't ever call SBA unless you know exactly whom you want to speak to and what his extension is.) In any event I did speak to someone in the office, who explained the reason for the delay and said we could expect a check any day. Two weeks later, I wrote to SBA asking about the check due us. About 1 week later, and over 1 month after the payment had been sent, we received our 10 percent. We are still getting the payments about 1 month late, but I know our customer has made them; so I don't worry too much.

You might think that after this bitter experience we would give up trying to do business with SBA. We haven't, though; because on February 25, 1966, we sent in another application. This is another of the applications in which our bank is taking 25 percent, and which, as I mentioned before, we were told takes only a couple of weeks to process. Well, we have heard from SBA, but only because they wanted some additional information. If they had given us the forms for it in the first place, it could have been sent in with the original application.

I agree with you that the SBA guarantee loan program could be of benefit to many, but having cited my experiences with SBA you can understand my reluctance to mention this type loan to any of my customers.

The only constructive comment I could make at this time would be toward the improvement of the efficiency in the SBA offices. Perhaps you might consider the suggestion of an SBA office being established in the area of the growing Hudson Valley. That might be helpful in educating people to the SBA and in clearing up some of the delay in processing applications.

My comments are being made, Mr. RESNICK, in a spirit of helpful criticism, and I look forward to your reply in regard to them.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. CARNRIGHT,
Executive Vice President and Cashier.

THE KERHONKSON NATIONAL BANK,
Kerhonkson, N.Y., March 28, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: In your letter of March 23, 1966, you asked me for comments on Small Business Administration and especially the guarantee loan program.

Our one and only experience with the guarantee loan program was a very bad one. We made a loan to two young men in Ellenville, N.Y., for a factory building. The loan was guaranteed under this program. When the loan became considerably past due, we gave the SBA the required 30-day notice to pay their participation in the loan. At that point, instead of reimbursing us for their participation, they began to look for technicalities in the agreement with us as the servicing bank. When you look for technicalities, they are not hard to find, but basically, we had complied with every requirement. We eventually became disgusted, gave them the required 30-day notice that we wanted to buy their participation in the loan, which we did. Incidentally, the loan was paid out in a satisfactory manner.

Based on this experience, we are no longer interested in the guarantee loan program. I assume other banks have had similar experiences.

Sincerely,

A. J. ANDERSON,
President.

The letters SBA stand for Small Business Adminstration. Perhaps they should also stand for Small Bankers Administration, because I believe that one of the most important functions of the SBA is to back up smaller banks and especially rural banks in an attempt to help them play a more aggressive and vital role in the economic development of their communities. I cannot think of a better time than right now to look into the SBA's operations and ask ourselves whether it is doing the job that it was created to do; and more important, whether it is doing the job it should be doing in the light of today's social and economic goals. We must have an SBA that is streamlined and efficient, operating in a manner which makes banks want to deal with them, that exhibits a willingness to cut redtape. In short, a fast-moving, economic machine whose gears are meshing smoothly with the overall economic objectives of the Government, and which can make the proper contributions to the total growth of our business community. In addition, and what perhaps may be most important, the SBA must aggressively seek to improve its relations with the banks, so that banks will seek SBA assistance, not reject it as they now seem to be doing.

One problem that this legislation does not deal with is that of appointing an administrator so that the SBA can go forward and resolve some of its many problems. No organization can operate without an effective leader. The immediate appointment of a top-flight administrator will, I am certain, contribute to the more efficient operation of the SBA and permit it to meet the growing needs of our many hard-pressed small businesses. It goes without saying that in these days of tight money and higher interest rates the small businessman is the one who is hardest hit. Anything that can be done to make the SBA a more effective instrument to help these people should be done as quickly as possible.

I would like to state that I am in complete favor of this bill which will insure that the SBA's ability to make loans to small businessmen all over the United States will never again be impaired by unforeseen local disasters.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, there is no large corporate complex which has not been greatly aided by our Government by contracts, by tax benefit, by subsidy, by indirect assistance in transportation, by research and development of many types and kinds. Five hundred corporations have over 90 percent of the business assets in this country and are imposing giants in the business complex. Over a million corporations, partnerships, and individually owned businesses share the remaining less than 10 percent of business assets. Yet it is from these firms much of the dynamics of change comes. Innovation and flexibility are constant needs of our economy. The contribution of small business in this regard far outweighs the proportion of business assets they hold and control. Dark indeed would be the day that America lost the strength and vitality which issues from the small businessman.

I wholeheartedly support S. 2729, a bill designed to eliminate curtailments in SBA lending activities. Small business cannot survive in the United States without a strong Small Business Administration and the agency can be only as strong as the legislation with which Congress endows it. S. 2729 will help SBA to better serve small business concerns.

To many, one of the leading features of the legislation is the operation of two separate revolving funds with a prohibition from one fund borrowing from the other. The antiborrowing restriction will mean that in the event of a major disaster, there will be funds to meet this situation and that SBA can move in immediately to begin its lending operations.

Mr. Chairman, also it will mean—and very importantly—that in the event of a series of disasters the other lending programs will not be drained to meet these situations.

Mr. Chairman, under the present setup SBA operates with one revolving fund; and if large drains are made upon that fund for disaster loans the money is replaced, but it takes time. In one case it took 6 months to return funds expended for disasters to the revolving fund. We do not want that to happen again.

Mr. Chairman, S. 2729 raises the limits of loans outstanding under section 4(c). Now this limit, it should be understood by the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, includes, first, loans made by the SBA; second, loans guaranteed by the SBA; third, SBA loans subject to an SBA guarantee; or, fourth, it should be particularly noted, loans placed in a participation pool under legislation which has just been passed by the other body and which is being considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee to support this legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO].

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, since 1956, the Small Business Administration has had to suspend or curtail lending activities on eight separate occasions. It is impossible to estimate how many small businesses were forced to close their doors during these periods.

S. 2729 hopefully will prevent such future closings and will enable SBA to shortly reopen its closed lending functions. For these reasons, I strongly support S. 2729.

As the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, has stated, there are more than 5,000 applications for small business loans backlogged in SBA offices around the country. In addition, there are untold thousands of people on waiting lists to be considered once SBA reopens its lending functions. The eyes of the small business world are focused directly on this Chamber today. I feel certain that this bill will pass. But I am hopeful that it will pass unanimously so that the small businessman can be firmly assured that no Congressman has turned his back on this great segment of our economy.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2729 and the Moore amendment thereto.

The need for isolation of SBA's business loan revolving fund from the inroads of special purpose programs, such as disaster and title IV loans is demonstrated by the present moratorium on business loan applications. Every Member of this body, I am sure, has seen the injury rendered to small businesses throughout this Nation by their inability to obtain long-term financing at reasonable rates of interest.

I support the implementation and expansion of both the disaster loan program and the provisions for financial assistance under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The benefits of these programs and the importance of SBA's role in them has been clearly demonstrated. The increased authorizations provided each of these programs by S. 2729 is essential. Separation of the revolving funds, however, is a commonsense precaution against any fund, and thus any essential SBA program, being depleted at the expense of any other. This occurred last year when demands for disaster loans, resulting from Hurricane Betsy, depleted funds that would ordinarily have been available for the now virtually inoperative business loan program. With separate business and disaster loan revolving funds coupled with the reporting requirements stipulated in this bill, no SBA program should ever again experience this kind of a shutdown, at the expense of the small business community.

The Moore amendment carries the compelling logic of separating the funds of various programs one step further. The $100 million ceiling on total loans under the title IV program, and the establishment of a separate fund therefor, adequately provides for the contemplated growth of the program for the next 2 or 3 years.

Although individual program funds are protected in part under S. 2729 by the separation of disaster loan funds and business loan funds, further independence of all three programs, including title IV loans, is provided by the Moore amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is the responsibility of the Congress to do everything in its power to promote the efficient and continuous operation of each of the programs we have authorized under the Small Business Administration. The establishment of three separate revolving funds, the increasing of authorizations for all SBA programs, and the requirement of quarterly reports from the agency on its operations are essential steps in this direction, whereby SBA will perform the services to the small business community which the Congress has authorized it and intended it to perform.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to represent a district which, for many years, has been handicapped by the threat of disasters of the type about which we have been speaking today.

In 1938 a real hurricane hit Cape Cod and did hundreds of millions of dollars worth of damage, and took hundreds of lives. Many people found, to their surprise, that they did not have insurance which would cover the tidal flooding damage that accompanied the hurricane. There were some insurance companies which made adjustments—adjustments which perhaps were unfair to the insurance companies and to its other policyholders. Some claims were paid but, by and large, there was no protection for those whose losses resulted from tidal flooding.

Then, Mr. Chairman, again in 1944 we had another hurricane, and then in the midfifties we had two, one upon the other, in rapid succession. Tidal flooding losses, once again were not covered.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of those two hurricanes the Congress in the midfifties passed some legislation authorizing a disaster insurance program on the part of the Federal Government. However, there were no hurricanes in the years immediately following, and so the Congress did not fund this program. It lay dormant for many years, until recently prompted by Hurricane Betsy and under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], legislation was offered which funded further study so that we might eliminate the cause of all the expenditures which we have been discussing today.

And so, Mr. Chairman in the public works bill of last year, we authorized more than $1 million to study the problem of disaster insurance. It is my understanding that within a year from the date of the appropriation following that authorization, the Congress will have a report rendered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and that they are to recommend a solution to this problem under the joint sponsorship of Government and the insurance companies.

It is my understanding further that the question of the earthquake insurance will take some time longer but that too is being studied.

Hopefully, this study can point the way to a joint effort on the part of the insurance industry and the Government and the individual involved so that some program can be worked out so that this kind of small business assistance will no longer be required.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he has any knowledge concerning the nature and extent and the prospects for hearings as a result of that study?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman such time as is necessary, if he will yield to me to answer his question.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate the gentleman on the fine work he has done in connection with the proposal that he has which I consider a very constructive one and which I believe has the unanimous support of the Members of the Congress and I know it does have the unanimous support of our members of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The $1 million that the gentleman referred to which was appropriated under Public Law 89-309 last October in the first supplemental bill was made available at that time.

Now the study under the law is being carried on and must be completed within 1 year of last October. If any questions should arise that need the attention of the Congress which will further this very desirable project, I feel reasonably certain the Congress will respond and do what is necessary to make sure that it is completed. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. KEITH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I just simply want to read from a UPI wire report this morning something that is rather significant.

> President Johnson today addressed a fervent appeal—

Mind you, this is a fervent appeal—

> to all sections of the American economy from the housewife to the roadbuilder from the corporate executive to the union leader to cut down immediately on unnecessary spending to meet the rising threat of inflation.

Apparently, Mr. Chairman, the message has finally gotten through to the President of the United States that inflation is on his doorstep. I now anxiously await the President's message to the Congress saying, "Congress go thou and do likewise."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2729 and compliment the committee for presenting it in such a way that the Small Business Administration will be funded and stabilized and I am particularly pleased with the committee's action in accepting the gentleman from West Virginia's amendment which further protects the primary purpose of the legislation, yet works no harm on other programs. I hope and plead with the executive branch to enhance and abet this agency which creates jobs and is generally worthy, now that the Congress has spoken.

Recently, not knowing when this bill would be programed, I wrote and delivered by radio and mail to the district I am privileged to represent, the following:

> A battle is being waged in Congress to keep the Nation's small business community from being buried in the bigness of government. The fight is built around a premise with which I completely agree—that in this day of the great big society, there is still a place for the small shopkeeper, the small family farmer, and the small businessman, competing in the open marketplace.
>
> The loan program of the Small Business Administration has helped many thousands of small firms to get started, to expand, to grow, and to prosper. This independent agency of the Federal Government has, until recently, been sensitive to the needs of small business. To the disillusionment of the small business community, however, there has been a continuing effort in the executive branch of government to downgrade the Small Business Administration. And so effective has this effort been that, today, the SBA is operating without direction, and without funds. The Office of Administrator has been vacant since August of 1965.

Two years ago, SBA lowered its loan limits, and then, last October, stopped accepting loan applications altogether. Congress authorized the agency to use an additional $36 million to supplement the depleted loan fund, but the agency has neither requested nor used the money.

Adding to the disillusionment of small businessmen, is the fact that of the seven agency area directors appointed since 1960, not one has had prior SBA experience. Of the 30 regional directors, appointed since 1960, only 1 had prior SBA experience.

Now has come the latest move—one which many in Congress feel will bring about the complete extinction of the Small Business Administration. The executive branch wants to take away from the SBA its congressionally established independent status, by transferring the agency to the Commerce Department. To me, this concern is justified because such a move could mean that SBA activities would be buried in the impersonal machinery of a huge bureaucratic Federal department. Small businessmen, in this complex age, face difficult problems in starting and staying in business, and they need independent attention. It is for this reason that I have joined with my colleagues in urging the immediate enactment of legislation to keep the Small Business Administration separate from the redtape of a ponderous major department.

House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford, commented the other day: "The trend of the 20th century has been toward bigness—big business, big labor, big agriculture, big deals, big deficits, and big brother." The key to whether small businessmen survive in all of this, could well turn on our efforts to win the battle over the status of the Small Business Administration.

One bill, H.R. 8282, which may soon come before the House of Representatives, the administration proposal to federalize our unemployment compensation system, would further add to the problems of the small businessman today. One effect of the bill would be to increase unemployment compensation taxes, which are paid entirely by the employer, and thus increase his overhead costs of doing business. It would eliminate experience ratings of employers in all States. The large corporation with its financial resources may be able to stand these added costs, without going out of business, but, many small business firms, caught in the squeeze between rising costs and high taxes, are for the most part not able to absorb the additional expenses, which this bill would impose, without raising prices. In today's competitive markets, this upward price pressure could force many other small firms out of business. Our bankruptcy rate is now the highest on record. This means fewer permanent job opportunities.

Where this does happen, it is not only the small businessman who is the loser, but also the employees who work for him, and the consumers whose choice of products is further diminished. The bill to federalize unemployment compensation is still pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. In my opinion, that is where it should remain.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the provision of S. 2729 which provides for separate disaster and regular loan funds for the Small Business Administration has been badly needed for some time.

I believe that the amendment offered by my able and distinguished colleague from West Virginia is also required to fully perfect this bill.

Title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act is, in my opinion, one of the outstanding accomplishments of the present administration. I believe that small business development centers have great potential both in terms of encouraging small business enterprises and in assisting social stability in deprived areas. However, it is clear that this is a function quite separate and apart from the conventional loan programs administered by the Small Business Administration. Therefore, the same set of reasons which made it necessary to establish separate funds for disaster and regular loans require the adoption of this amendment to establish separate revolving funds for the Economic Opportunity Act programs.

I commend the gentleman from West Virginia on his foresight in offering this amendment and urge my colleagues to fully support his proposal.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to support S. 2729, under consideration today.

On February 14, 1966, I introduced H.R. 12790 to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act. On the same day I explained the provisions of my bill.

S. 2729 covers all the objections which my bill was designed to meet.

In addition, an amendment will be submitted by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] which will place a loan ceiling of $100 million under the Economic Opportunity Act loan program which will, in my opinion, further protect SBA loan funds.

I adopt today the remarks I made about my own bill on February 14, 1966, which will be found in the Record at pages 3013–3014 as being applicable to the bill under consideration today and unconditionally support the bill and urge the House to pass it.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly hope this House will wisely improve and promptly approve this bill before us, S. 2729, to amend the Small Business Act.

In summary, as it is now written, the major provisions of this measure direct increased authorizations of the Small Business Administration loan funds; separate the disaster loan funds from the regular loan funds in order to guard against the previous necessity of meeting the fund shortages of one program at the expense of the other and to insure the Congress will be given sufficient warning in advance about the development and danger of a shortage in either fund.

I believe that the great majority of Members here are in accord with the provisions of this measure and recognize the urgent need of its enactment.

However, many of us question the wisdom and the practicality in still permitting the revolving fund established by the regular business loan program to be subject to the requirements of the Economic Opportunity Act title IV program.

It would appear, therefore, that the effectiveness and even survival of the operation of the SBA's normal business loan program, so vital to a tremendous number of small businesses all over the country as a sole source of capital funds, is in danger in the same manner and fashion as it was through the drains upon it of the unforeseen magnitude of the disaster loans that were expended. It would seem, then, that we should now, or certainly in the immediate future, legislatively act to establish a separate revolving fund for the operation of the Economic Opportunity Act loan program administered by the Small Business Administration. Surely such action on our part would be in the national interest and it would project an imperatively important survival factor in the preservation of small business as the foundation of free, independent, private enterprise in this country.

On this score, I further urge and hope that at any and every appropriate time this House will overwhelmingly evidence its concurrence with the resolution recently adopted by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business that the Small Business Administration should be continued as an independent agency serving the vital needs of small business and thereby promoting the progress of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my enthusiastic support for S. 2729, which will help the small business enterprises of this country.

A series of unprecedented natural disasters, causing enormous suffering and losses, has struck the Nation during the last 2 years. Among these were the Alaskan earthquake, floods in California, Oregon and Washington, hurricane Betsy, floods along the Mississippi, tornadoes. They resulted in extraordinary drains upon the disaster relief funds of the Small Business Administration. This bill will replenish these depleted funds for the remainder of this fiscal year; that is, to June 30.

The heavy drain of funds in disaster loans has been at the expense of regular business loans: money which normally would have been available for normal business loans has been used up in disaster loans. This bill would separate the two kinds of loans for the first time so that, in the future, shortages in one program will not have to be met at the expense of the other program.

In addition, I wish to announce my support for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore], the ranking Republican on the Select Committee on Small Business. He proposes a third revolving fund to handle the loan programs assigned to the Small Business Administration under the Economic Opportunity Act. Unless this is adopted, these anti-poverty loans will present a continuing threat to the normal loan programs by draining away money that would otherwise go into normal loans.

Throughout all the deliberations on this bill, in committee and here today, our concern, the Republican concern, has been to see that the special needs of disaster areas and the war on poverty are met but not at the expense of the other small businessmen in the country. The small businessman is still the economic backbone of America.

The Moore amendment is still another responsive, constructive effort by Republican leadership to protect the rights of the individual in this too often overwhelming Great Society. Great Society programs bear down hard on small business. Material shortages, unwise and restrictive labor policies, redtape, unnecessary regulations, rising prices, advancing taxes, a reduced share of defense and other Federal spending, along with other pressures all have marked the Great Society approach to small business.

This bill, with the inclusion of the Moore amendment, will give the Small Business Administration the tools it needs to carry out its task of helping the small businessman to prosper and thus add to the betterment of the country.

I strongly urge that the Moore amendment be adopted and this bill be passed.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my strong support to the effort to pass S. 2729.

This legislation is urgently needed to provide sufficient funds for Small Business Administration's lending authority relating to flood disasters. The people of my region on the Mississippi River and its tributaries suffered serious economic losses from floods which struck in 1965 and again this year.

Many thousands of dollars of loans were made by SBA for 30 years, at 3 percent interest, and this certainly was a big help. In many instances, this permitted individuals to begin in business again.

The large number of national disasters which have occurred in the past year have placed a very heavy burden on the operations of SBA. The legislation before us will permit SBA to meet its responsibilities to the people who need help, as well as to continue its regular operations.

I urge passage of this legislation to meet our basic regional needs.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of the time remaining on this side.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended by striking out "$1,841,000,000" and "$1,375,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,966,000,000" and "$1,500,000,000", respectively.

Sec. 2. Effective on July 1, 1966, section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) There are hereby established in the Treasury the following revolving funds: (A) a disaster loan fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under sections 7(b)(1), 7(b)(2), 7(b)(4), and 7(c)(2) of this Act, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions; and (B) a business loan and investment fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under sections 7(a), 7(b)(3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, titles III and V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions.

"(2) All repayments of loans and debentures, payments of interest and other receipts arising out of transactions heretofore or hereafter entered into by the Administration (A) pursuant to sections 7(b)(1), 7(b)(2), 7(b)(4), and 7(c)(2) of this Act shall be paid into the disaster loan fund; and (B) pursuant to sections 7(a), 7(b)(3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, titles III and V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall be paid into the business loan and investment fund.

"(3) Unexpended balances of appropriations made to the fund pursuant to this subsection, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this paragraph, shall be allocated, together with related assets and liabilities, to the funds established by paragraph (1) in such amounts as the Administrator shall determine. In addition to any sums so allocated, appropriations are hereby authorized to be made to such funds, as capital thereof, in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Administration, which appropriations shall remain available until expended.

"(4) The total amount of loans, guarantees, and other obligations or commitments, heretofore or hereafter entered into by the Administration, which are outstanding at any one time (A) under sections 7(a), 7(b)(3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall not exceed $1,364,100,000; (B) under title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed $366,500,000; and (C) under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed $156,700,000.

"(5) The Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and House of Representatives, as soon as possible after the beginning of each calendar quarter, a full and complete report on the status of each of the funds established by paragraph (1), including its projection of the future needs of such funds, and its recommendations for such additional appropriations as it deems appropriate. If at the close of the preceding calendar quarter the aggregate amount outstanding or committed by the Administration in carrying out its functions under any of the sections or titles referred to in paragraph (4) exceeded 75 per centum of the total amount authorized to be outstanding or committed under such sections or titles, the Administration's report shall include its recommendations for such additional authority as it deems appropriate.

"(6) The Administration shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, following the close of each fiscal year, interest on the outstanding cash disbursements from each of the funds established by paragraph (1) at rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields on outstanding interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as calculated for the month of June preceding such fiscal year."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 7 of the Small Business Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Administration also is empowered to make loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lenders through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) to assist any firm to adjust to changed economic conditions resulting from increased competition from imported articles, but only if (1) an adjustment proposal of such firm has been certified by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, (2) the Secretary has referred such proposal to the Administration under that Act and the loan would provide part or all of the financial assistance necessary to carry out such proposal, and (3) the Secretary's certification is in force at the time the Administration makes the loan. With respect to loans made under this subsection the Administration shall apply the provisions of sections 314, 315, 316, 318, 319, and 320 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 as though such loans had been made under section 314 of that Act."

(b) Section 2 of Public Law 87-550, approved July 25, 1962 (76 Stat. 220), is hereby repealed. Any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore appropriated for the purposes of such section are hereby transferred to the business loan and investment fund established by section 4(c)(1) of the Small Business Act.

(c) This section shall take effect on July 1, 1966.

Mr. WIDNALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 11, strike out "$1,364,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,400,000,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 13, strike out "$366,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 15, strike out "$156,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof $200,000,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Patman: Page 3, strike out the comma in line 21 and all that follows down through the period in line 23, and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Page 4, after the period in line 6, insert the following new sentence: "Business-type budgets for each of the funds established by paragraph (1) shall be prepared, transmitted to the Congress, considered, and enacted in the manner prescribed by law (sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 847-849)) for wholly owned Government corporations."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, both of these amendments are minor and technical in nature and in no way change the intent or effect of the bill. The amendments have been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget, as well as the minority leadership of the Banking and Currency Committee.

The first portion of the amendments would merely make it clear that budget requirements and projections would still be handled through the Bureau of the Budget and would not come directly from SBA without consulting the Bureau of the Budget.

The second portion of the amendments would put SBA under the Government-owned Corporation Act so that the Appropriations Committee would still be able to review the funding of the agency every year.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments were carefully drawn with the support and help of the minority, and the Members on both sides agree to it. I do not believe there is any objection to it. I hope that it is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOORE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE: Page 2, line 4, strike "and" the first time it appears.

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,".

Page 2, strike the period in line 10, and insert: "; and (C) an Economic Opportunity Act loan fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions."

Page 2, line 16, strike "and".

Page 2, lines 18 and 19, strike "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,".

Page 2, strike the period in line 20 and insert: "; and (C) pursuant to title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall be paid into the Economic Opportunity Act loan fund."

Page 3, line 14, strike "and".

Page 3, strike the period in line 15 and insert: "; and (D) under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall not exceed $100,000,000."

Page 3, lines 10 and 11, strike "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,".

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is a very concise amendment. I made reference to it during consideration of the rule and made reference to it under the general debate. By this amendment, however technical it may sound in removing the "and's," "or's," and "but's," it is hoped that we would establish a separate ceiling of $100 million for the total dollar value of poverty loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

It limits to this sum that portion of the SBA revolving fund available for such loans and prevents a further drain of SBA funds, to the injury of the business loan program. It prevents a drain, similar to that which occurred by reason of demands of the disaster program, which we have heard alluded to here today.

What is the foundation of this amendment? Will it hurt the poverty title IV loan program? The answer to this is no. It is estimated that the total title IV loans outstanding at the close of fiscal year 1966 will be about $26.7 million. At the close of fiscal year 1967, it is estimated that $69,400,000 will be outstanding.

The authorization of $100 million, the ceiling which is proposed to be established by my amendment, I believe it is plain to see, will provide for the monetary needs of 2 years or more, on the basis of the projected operation of the poverty loan program.

The business loan authorization, however—the one which we in the Congress originally created for this agency to handle—will not be dissipated. There will be no chance for poverty loan requirements to invade and utilize all of the funds that are available through this legislation for the business loan program.

If the title IV program should accelerate, and there is every indication that it may—it is the fond hope of the Congress that it will—it is proper to suggest that we have a subsequent review or reexamination of it. But, if it should accelerate without restraint, it can very well again have the effect, as the disaster loan program did, of completely shutting down the small business loan program in the country.

So, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the committee for bringing this bill before us. I want to help. As the ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I live with the problems of the small businessmen on a day-to-day basis. I want to preserve the historic small business loan program. A program which is vital to the small business community of the United States.

I just hope that the Committee will recognize that my amendment is but a further step to protect that historic business loan program of the Small Business Administration.

If this is not done, what is going to happen? It did happen once and it can happen again. We may have a complete shutdown of the business loan program. That, basically, is what all of us are interested in preventing, even though, from time to time, we have thrust additional responsibility upon the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and had him taking other loan programs under his wing.

It is ironic that in every other respect the committee in bringing this bill to the floor has placed a ceiling in order to guarantee the operation of the business loan program.

They did not provide a ceiling, however, for the title IV economic opportunity poverty loan program. Therefore, I seek simply to provide this additional safeguard for the business loan program.

It is anticipated they will not use in excess of $69 million for poverty loans. That is the SBA figure. But, in the event that they do, they will not have the opportunity to destroy the basic program, which is the business loan program of the Small Business Administration.

I seek, Mr. Chairman, to improve the situation so that the membership may not at some future time need to ask, as we do today, "What happened? Why did we run out of funds? Why can't you get a small business loan?"

I think the record has been written well by the Small Business Committee as to the reasons. They are being restated here today.

The record of our investigation, however, was not submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency. As I explained to the membership, we have dual responsibility in the matter of the Small Business Administration. One committee investigates and another legislates. Very frankly, the one that investigates is rarely in contact with the one that legislates and vice versa. How in the world we can ever get the record of our hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee at an appropriate time I do not know.

I ask favorable consideration of my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, when we, in 1953, established the Small Business Administration, the business loan program was viewed as and intended to be the agency's most important activity. The need of small businesses throughout the country for long-term financing at reasonable interest was then and continues to be of critical importance.

Through the intervening 12 years, business loans totaling billions of dollars have been made to qualified small businesses unable to borrow needed funds elsewhere.

The 1962 merger of SBA regular business loan revolving fund with that established to meet financial needs of disaster victims caused an unprecedented financial drain such as the requirements for Hurricane Betsy to completely usurp funds available for SBA's principal loan activity.

The depletion of the revolving fund demanded a moratorium on all business loan applications effective October 11 of last year. It is still in effect. Meanwhile, thousands of qualified and deserving businesses have experienced irrepairable injury or ruin due to the denial of financial assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of S. 2729 and the Moore amendment thereto as a significant step toward the restoration of the SBA business loan program. Dedicated as I am to the small business segment of our economy, I fully appreciate the urgent need for increased authorizations and, I trust immediately forthcoming appropriations, to bolster the sagging fortunes of so many small businesses which have suffered of late. The earmarking of funds for SBA loan activities provides commonsense protection against raids upon the available funds of one program due to unanticipated drain upon another. It is a good business practice and should be employed.

May I again point out that the appropriation of funds is yet required before the SBA business loan program will be reactivated. I trust that the request for such funds will be immediately forthcoming.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I must oppose vigorously any amendment to S. 2729 which would set up a separate revolving fund for Small Business Administration loans made under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

SBA's proposed budget for fiscal 1967 provides $428 million for the regular business loan program, and $50 million for title IV loans made to poor people. This is ample proof, I believe, that SBA has no intention whatsoever of allowing the title IV program to claim a disproportionate share of SBA's total loan funds.

The total size of the title IV program is controlled by other factors besides the amount of loan funds available. Each loan must be made through a small business development center, which provides management assistance and other nonfinancial help to borrowers. During fiscal 1967 there will be only 70 of these centers in operation across the country—certainly a limiting factor on the size of the program. The number of such centers is controlled by the size of the regular budget appropriation made each year by Congress—certainly an effective, even though indirect, way of limiting the amount of loans made.

Should the title IV program continue to prove successful, and continue to grow—as I hope it will—adequate funds for it will be available without taking them from any other program—the regular business loan program included. A bill now pending—S. 2499—will permit SBA to sell participations in pools of its loans. Proceeds from such sales will be more than ample to allow all SBA programs to operate at realistic levels.

Besides, I believe that attempts to create broad distinctions between the title IV loan program and the regular business loan program fail to recognize their basic similarity. Both provide loans to businesses which need them. The fact that these business loans go to poor people under the title IV program, and to people who do not meet the definition of poverty under the regular business loan program overlooks the fact that in each case, small businesses are being helped.

I believe that attempts to set up artificial distinctions by creating a separate revolving fund for title IV loans are really attempts to prevent the Federal Government from carrying out the clear mandate of Congress expressed in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This legislation seeks to help small businessmen and potential small businessmen who do not readily fit into SBA's regular loan program.

I cannot believe that the Congress will now sabotage that sound program and deny assistance to poor people who have the capacity and the energy to build sound, productive small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that I know the gentleman from West Virginia is a very sincere and able Member of this House. He is a member of the House select committee to study small business problems. I happen to know something about that committee, since I offered the resolution that caused its creation in 1941 and was the chairman of that committee for over 20 years. I think that committee has performed wonderful services to small business—particularly under the chairmanship of the Honorable JOE EVINS of Tennessee—but, of course, it is not a legislative committee and was never intended to be. It is just like the small business study committee in the other body. This committee in the other body does not have legislative powers either. They have a Small Business Committee in the Senate, which is the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which handles legislative matters, just as we have in the House, and which handles problems of small business. The Committee on Small Business in the House, which is a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, considered this bill and approved it, as well as the full committee, and they approved it unanimously.

I am sure none of the bad things predicted by the gentleman from West Virginia will happen. The object of this bill which your Banking and Currency Committee unanimously reported has as its purpose to clear up the criticisms and objections that have been made by Members of Congress about the Small Business Administration.

We know this is a good bill. I do not think it is in accordance with good legislative procedure for an amendment to be brought up here at the last minute, a substantial amendment involving all kinds of technicalities to which no study has been given by the Small Business Subcommittee or by the Committee on Banking and Currency. This amendment, I understand, was brought to the attention of the Senate committee. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] appeared before the Senate committee. He brought several amendments to the attention of that committee, and they were adopted, but this particular one so I have been told, was not adopted. Therefore, the Senate is in the position of having turned this amendment down one time. If we were to adopt it now, I do not know whether they would accept it or not. We must assume the chances are it would not be accepted. That would mean, although the gentleman from West Virginia I know would not like to delay this bill, it would delay it. This bill is urgent and it is crucial. We must get it passed now, so we must not run that risk.

May I say to the gentleman from West Virginia, whom I always consider a good friend of small business, that I hope he will not insist on his amendment at this time. We have before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House now a bill to amend the Small Business Act. His amendment would be germane and, if he wants to go before the committee tomorrow or next week, we will give him that chance. However, do not expect us to take an amendment like this without consideration and without knowing how the different agencies and the administration would consider it or how anybody else would. I hasten to add that I am not necessarily against the gentleman's amendment. But it should and must be studied, and if it has merit I am sure this body will adopt it.

Now, the letter that the gentleman from West Virginia sent out about this amendment was dated today, March 31. That is this morning. That is the first time we had any knowledge of any kind of it. Your Banking and Currency Committee was in session when we received this letter, and we were there until 12 and then came over here and did not have time to consider it. We know that the Small Business Administration looks on this amendment as something of an obstacle to the proper enforcement of the very law we will have right now, but it still may be a good amendment. I suggest, if the gentleman will come before our committee, we will give him consideration now, or if he wants to offer a new bill and a new amendment, we will give him consideration. But to bring it on the floor of the House at the last minute is just asking too much of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. As able and as fine as the gentleman from West Virginia is, he has not consulted his colleagues about this any more than he has the committee. We would have given him a hearing on it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just a moment. I have not finished my sentence.

Mr. MOORE. That is what I am afraid of.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me finish my sentence.

The Committee on Small Business he refers to—and I am a member of that committee, and I was not conferred with about this—the Committee on Small Business, headed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] does not endorse this amendment to my knowledge.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Not right now.

I think I would have been notified about it, but I have not been. We value his judgment highly, but this amendment should receive proper and adequate consideration by the appropriate committee of this body in full and complete hearings.

Mr. Chairman, in the gentleman's letter it says in the last paragraph—it does not say that the Committee on Small Business endorses it; it does not say that any other Member of Congress endorses it—but it says that he and the 4.7 million small businessmen in this Nation welcomes your support. The gentleman from West Virginia is just asking for the support of himself and the small business organizations. But, Mr. Chairman, I invite the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that no small business organization has communicated with me or with any member, to my knowledge, to the effect that they are for this amendment. So I believe it is just the gentleman's own suggestion, and the gentleman may have a good suggestion.

I am not saying that this will not eventually have my support or the support of the committee. But I am just saying that it comes at a time when we are not in a position to give it adequate and full consideration.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have nothing to ask particularly except may I say to the gentleman from Texas that I have heard during the general debate several Members rise in support of this amendment. So there has been some support other than the support of the gentleman from West Virginia.

I am advised that I have the support of the minority on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and beyond that may I say that I, as the gentleman well knows——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, it was indeed interesting to listen to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] disclaim any knowledge of this amendment prior to today, although the gentleman says that someone took the amendment to the other body. He seemed to be aware of that, and aware of the contents of the amendment when it went over to the other body. But this has taken the gentleman by surprise today, apparently, and the gentleman claims no prior knowledge of the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] in order to ask him if, as it has been suggested, this amendment creates a revolving fund?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

Mr. MOORE. This is the point—and it follows generally along the line of the discussion of the gentleman from Texas—the gentleman is basically an artist in misleading this House of Representatives.

This amendment does not set up any revolving fund. It simply sets a $100 million ceiling upon the amount of funds in the bill which can be used for poverty loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act. Beyond that, it preserves the remainder of the funds, for which authorization is sought here today for the operation of the regular business loan program and prevents the poverty loan program from destroying the small business loan program.

May I further state to the gentleman from Iowa, we heard that the disaster program was not going to curtail the operation of the small business loan program. I believe the gentleman from Iowa will recall that, and what happened? We closed the Small Business Administration loan program down, because it did happen, the gentleman from Texas knows that is what occurred.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the objection on the part of the gentleman from Texas to this amendment is probably just as farsighted as his suggestion that the disaster program would not ever consume all of the regular business loan fund.

This does not, in direct answer to the gentleman from Iowa, create any new revolving fund at all. It just places a dollar ceiling upon the title IV loan program so as to preserve the small business loan program.

Mr. GROSS. And the denial of the gentleman from Texas that he was unacquainted with the amendment until it came here today was an attempt, apparently, to shed his unenlightenment over the rest of the House?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Of course.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Iowa is most nearly correct, but not absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I want to be absolutely correct.

Mr. MOORE. We tried for 3 days, I say to the gentleman from Iowa, to find out when the Committee on Banking and Currency was going to consider this authorization bill. But they delayed it for 3 days. Then at some hour, only known to the chairman, they called the bill up and had the Executive Director of SBA present, and no one else knew they were going to consider the bill.

I say that when others talk about the fact that this amendment would delay the funding of the Small Business Administration and the operation of that program, I can only say to you and to the Members of this House, Where has the administration been for 8 months?

Mr. GROSS. That is a good question and I assume the answer ought to come from President Johnson who is completely uninhibited when it comes to requesting less important legislation.

Mr. MOORE. And this amendment is only an insurance policy to make certain that the business loan program will continue to operate, and I know that every Member of this House desires to see this vital program maintained for the benefit of our Nation's small business community.

Otherwise, you may rest assured there is every reason to believe that we will come back to this House some day and be asking the same questions we are asking now—Why did they close down the small business loan program?

My amendment insures its operation and I ask the support of my colleagues for its passage.

Mr. GROSS. And it will in no way hamper the small business program?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is eminently correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, I think it will. But we ought to consider it and we can have a hearing right now before our committee. We ought to have a hearing on this before the committee I will say to the gentleman. Notification was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when we were going to have these hearings. The reason I brought that up about the other body is that I did not know about that, that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] had brought up his amendment, and we began to look around about what the other body had done and what others had done, and I found out after he brought up his amendment today, that it was actually suggested to the Senate committee and they did not accept it. They did accept a number of fine amendments which were suggested by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] but they did not accept this particular one.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman was well acquainted with the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. What is that?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman was well acquainted with the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. No, I was not. I do not yet know the provisions of it. You see this is a very technical amendment and we have not had an opportunity to look into it. We cannot vote for this amendment with a knowledge of what it actually contains because we do not know—it is, as I say, a technical amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. What is so technical about it, I ask the gentleman from Iowa? What is so technical about saying in this bill, we want title IV of the economic opportunity act in full operation but not in excess of $100 million so that we will have funds to continue the equally important regular small business loan program? Does that seem technical to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GROSS. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE. That is all the amendment does.

Mr. PATMAN. This will hurt the very poorest small businessman—the very poorest small businessman.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. I supported the poverty program on the floor of this House. How in the world anybody who has an ounce of responsibility can represent to this committee that this is going to hurt the poor when it actually insures that the money authorized to help the poor will be available when they need it? I simply do not understand the last remarks of my colleague from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. That is what we want to understand.

Mr. MOORE. I am not talking about the understanding of the gentleman from Texas. I am saying, I do not understand how the gentleman can represent to this body that the poor are going to be hurt when we would be making twice as much money available to them as he proposes under the bill before us.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. FINO. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Moore amendment. I think that it is commonsense to make the Economic Opportunity Act loan program a separate and limited part of the Small Business Administration program.

In doing this, we set a firm limit on the extent to which the Small Business Administration can be a pipeline of the poverty program in all its waste. If the Moore amendment is not passed, we are liable to see the SBA loan funds being drained away to support the poverty program. I am concerned that the Small Business Administration loan program do the job we set it up to do. I do not want it to be transformed into an auxiliary of the poverty program. That would be throwing good money after bad. The wastefulness and maladministration of the poverty program are well known—I do not think we should leave an open-ended amount of Small Business Administration loan funds subject to the requirements of the Economic Opportunity Act.

I read this morning that the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee feels that the poverty program should be multiplied by 5 so as to make it a $7 billion a year program. Now I think this is a pipe dream. The Congress would not dream of voting such extravagance. What I worry about is that the poverty people will take their money where they can find it. I do not want to give them a chance to find it in the loan funds of the Small Business Administration. That program was set up to help small businessmen. It was not set up to be an auxiliary of the poverty program. I support the Moore amendment to limit the Economic Opportunity Act loan program delegated to the SBA to a loan fund of $100 million.

I hope the Members of this House will support this amendment.

I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia that he has provided a ceiling much higher than what we had in mind for the poverty program.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman feel that it would be better if we gave the gentleman from West Virginia a hearing, at which time we could discuss the question and go into it as we should? The gentleman from New York did not bring this up in the committee. He is a very fine and distinguished member of our committee, but I do not believe he brought it up in the committee at all. I do not think it was discussed.

Mr. FINO. The gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of my committee, is absolutely correct. This was not brought before the committee.

But I do want to say to the chairman of the committee that this is not a very complicated amendment. It is a very clear and concise amendment. It has a purpose, and it is very clear to the Members of this House. I do not see any reason for any hearings. I think we should be happy to hear it right here and now, where all Members of the House are participating. I think it is a good amendment, and I do not see any reason why anyone should object to it.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not be in the position of the grandmother of the little boy who had exhibited some interest in bird life. So the grandmother sent him a book. After seeing the young man she said, "Well, son, how did you like the book on penguins?"

He said, "Well, grandmother, it told me a lot more about penguins than I wanted to know."

I do not know whether we are going to have to tell ourselves more than we want to know about the matter of the financing of the SBA, but evidently this is the crux of the matter.

What are we talking about? I should like to have the help of the chairman of the committee to see if we cannot put ourselves in some kind of possession of the facts. I understand that the existing fund for the SBA, as authorized by the Congress up to date, is $1,841 million. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HANNA. I understand under this act the total amount authorized for the SBA will now be $1,966 million, which is an increase of $125 million. Is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HANNA. It is my understanding that under the present law, out of the money that has been authorized, there is $1,375 million authorized for business loans, and the $125 million that we are putting into the authorization is going directly to this fund, and under this new law that amount will be $1,500 million. Is that not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HANNA. After July 1, 1966, we are going to have two funds. One fund will be for disaster, and there will be no limit on those funds. But under the authorization that the Congress has made, there will be set aside $1,400 million in the second fund. This will be the fund out of which we will operate the business loans.

As I see the further wording of the bill, this is what happens to that $1,400 million: $400 million will be available to SBIC. It does not necessarily have to draw that, but that will be the ceiling on what will be available. Four hundred million will be the ceiling that is available. Two hundred million dollars will be available for the State and local development companies. They may not use it, but it will be available.

So $600 million of the $1,400 million will not be utilized but may be utilized by those two activities. Is that correct?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I wish to be sure that, if I yield, we will be talking about the same thing.

Mr. MOORE. I wish to talk about the same thing which the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. That is not entirely correct, sir. In the report you will see three ceilings. You alluded to the $400 million for SBIC. Then there would be $200 million for State and local development companies.

Mr. HANNA. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Those funds would be outside the $1,400 million that is available for the general operation of the agency.

Mr. HANNA. I stand corrected. The gentleman is correct. The $1,400 million would be for all the other financing done by the SBA.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HANNA. Then I think where the gentleman stands is in this position. The gentleman's letter which went out states in the next to the last paragraph:

> I propose an amendment which will establish a separate revolving fund for the Economic Opportunities Act program.

That statement raises the question, Does the gentleman want to put his amendment in the same position as the $400 million of the SBIC and the $200 million for State and local development companies? Is that what the gentleman wants to do?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I certainly do, because I want an answer to that question.

Mr. MOORE. I thought I had answered that when he propounded his earlier question, because originally—the letter speaks for itself—the gentleman suggested a question to me at the time I was in the well, as to whether or not this was an isolation of funds which might otherwise be available for the loan program.

As a result of the gentleman's suggestion, I deleted from my amendment anything that would create a second revolving fund.

Therefore, the only thing I have done is to state that within the $1.4 billion, there will be a ceiling of $100 million for the operation of the title IV.

It was basically as a result of the suggestion of the gentleman from California that I deleted any reference to the revolving fund.

Mr. HANNA. This is an important point.

Mr. MOORE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. If we did not have this correction, we would be making the amendment as suggested in your letter, and I believe that would be a mistake.

Mr. MOORE. I agree with the gentleman, because it could conceivably—because of the fact they anticipate that only $69 million will be used—isolate $31 million of funds which otherwise could be used for the business loan program, which the gentleman is interested in, I understand.

Mr. HANNA. I think the gentleman can understand how the House may not have been considering the point made on the basis that we are now trying to make it, unless this clarification had been brought up.

Mr. MOORE. I appreciate the manner in which the gentleman has brought this up.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] which would create a ceiling of $100 million for economic opportunity loans. In January of this year, when I testified on behalf of S. 2729 before the Senate Subcommittee on Small Business, I suggested that the committee explore the possibility of a separate poverty loan fund. Actually this should have been set up at the time the Economic Opportunity Act was passed, but it is certainly not too late to do so now. I have not pressed the point of a separate loan fund before because I was under the impression that the poverty loans would be such a small amount of the total.

However, the figures have been revised upward of late. The $15 million estimate for fiscal 1966 has nearly doubled to $28 million. Fiscal 1967 figures, now available, indicate a prior projection of $40 million has now been revised to a budget estimate of $50 million, nearly doubling the 1966 total. It is obvious that the program is being projected forward at a highly accelerated rate. By the end of fiscal 1967, we will have at least $69 million in outstanding loans and commitments.

I now understand that currently there is a priority listing of loans with poverty loans on top, even above loans to disaster victims. And the ordinary small businessman is at the bottom of the heap again. I am in support of the poverty loan program, but I frankly do not believe that we should take the risk of having insufficient funds in the future for our regular small businessman, by keeping both poverty loans and regular business loans in one common fund. Why should an established small businessman, his employees, and his customers be asked to sacrifice again, after the events of the past 18 months?

The $100 million is well above the estimated demands to the end of the 1967 fiscal year. And I would remind you that the amendment contained in this bill which requires a report to the appropriate committees of Congress whenever 75 percent is outstanding in any one fund will protect against a lack of response to a sudden increase in needs. I will certainly support reasonable increases for the economic opportunity loans in the future. I would prefer to accept the Moore amendment now than have to subject the small business community to another 3½-year wait until the situation is corrected, and funds for poverty loan purposes under SBA are handled separately. The past experience with combined funds has proven that there are too many hazards for our small business community in that type of a wait-and-see approach. I urge adoption of the Moore amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having resumed the chair, Mr. ICHORD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2729) to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 802, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 373, nays 0, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—373

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Baring
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif
Teague, Tex
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—59

Ayres
Barrett
Blatnik
Bolling
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Cameron
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Conyers
Craley
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Dingell
Dowdy
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Feighan
Flynt
Ford,
William D.
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gettys
Hardy
Hays
Herlong
Johnson, Pa.
Keogh
Leggett
Long, La.
McCarthy
MacGregor
Matthews
Murray
Nix
O'Brien
Purcell
Rooney, N.Y.
Rumsfeld
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Tuten
Vigorito
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
Willis
Wilson,
Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Todd with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Nix with Mr. de la Garza.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Cabell.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Tuten.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Evans with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Cameron.
Mr. Craley with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Dent with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter upon the legislation just considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, due to a longstanding speaking engagement outside of Washington, I will be unable to be present this afternoon when the House considers S. 2729 so I want to take this opportunity to indicate my support for the bill. The series of natural disasters which occured throughout the country last year demonstrated the need to separate the natural disaster loan program of the Small Business Administration from the regular loan programs so that natural disasters, such as Hurricane Betsy, do not in the future completely disrupt the regular SBA loan programs.

However, I would like to point out that just before adjournment of the first session, Congress passed special legislation replacing the funds committed for the emergency loans. However, there is still a moratorium in effect on most types of SBA loans. The reason for this moratorium is, therefore, not the disasters of last year, as many people have thought, but is instead due to the fact that the important SBA loan programs are just not being adequately funded. Of particular concern to me is the fact that the special program of loans to businesses, which are either operated by or which employ poverty-stricken people has been severely restricted even though this program was exempted from the general moratorium on SBA loans. This special program, authorized by title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act, has been restricted to just a very few areas in the United States, a ceiling of $15,000 per loan has been imposed though the law authorized loans up to $25,000, and the program has been administered quite restrictively in determining eligibility for loans.

I strongly urge the Bureau of the Budget and the relevant committees of the Congress to greatly increase the amount of funds budgeted for the Small Business Administration loan programs, particularly title IV loans. Though measures such as S. 2729 and other bills now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee will be of some help in dealing with the crisis situation facing SBA, the only real answer is to drastically increase the budget for the Small Business Administration.

COMPENSATION OF OVERSEAS TEACHERS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the Conference Report on H.R. 6845, to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, ask for its immediate consideration, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1347)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845), to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered (1): That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered (1) and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 2 of the House engrossed bill, strike out line 13 and all that follows down through line 13 on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Section 5 of such Act (73 Stat. 214; Public Law 86-91; 5 U.S.C. 2353) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) On or before the 15th day of January in each calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the respective Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives the following information—

"'(1) The number of teachers separated from teaching positions subsequent to the close of the immediately preceding full school year;

"'(2) the number of such separated teachers who returned to the United States;

"'(3) the number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States following such separation;

"'(4) the number of such separated teachers returned to positions as teachers in the United States under voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States;

"'(5) the number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States through special placement assistance programs of the Department of Defense and the military department;

"'(6) the number of such separated teachers who (A) were separated at their own request and (B) were separated involuntarily;

"'(7) the number of such separated teachers who had served in teaching positions (A) three years or more and (B) five years or more;

"'(8) the number of new teachers appointed to teaching positions at the beginning of the school year current at time of the report; and

"'(9) the number of such new teachers obtained through voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered (2), (3), and (4): That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered (2), (3), and (4) and agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
J. H. MORRISON,
MORRIS UDALL,
H. R. GROSS,
JAMES T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.
MIKE MONRONEY,
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
By M. M.
FRANK CARLSON,
HIRAM L. FONG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. (1): This amendment struck out subsection (c) of the first section of the House bill which contained provisions to the effect that a teacher shall not be eligible to hold a teaching position or positions overseas for any period exceeding 5 consecutive years with the exceptions (1) that any teacher who returns to the United States for not less than 1 year shall be eligible again to hold a teaching position or positions overseas for an additional period not exceeding 5 consecutive years, and (2) that the Secretary of Defense may extend such 5-year period to not more than 8 years, when necessary in the public interest in individual cases.

The House recedes from its disagreement to amendment numbered (1) and agrees to the same with an amendment which adds a new subsection (c) to section 5 of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act requiring annual reports by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to teachers subject to such Act.

Specifically, the new subsection (c) provides that, on or before the 15th day of January of each calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of the conference agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives the following information:

(1) The number of teachers separated from teaching positions subsequent to the close of the immediately preceding full school year;

(2) The number of such separated teachers who returned to the United States;

(3) The number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States following such separation;

(4) The number of such separated teachers returned to positions as teachers in the United States under voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States;

(5) The number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States through special placement assistance programs of the Department of Defense and the military departments;

(6) The number of such separated teachers who (A) were separated at their own request and (B) were separated involuntarily;

(7) The number of such separated teachers who had served in teaching positions (A) 3 years or more and (B) 5 years or more;

(8) The number of new teachers appointed to teaching positions at the beginning of the school year current at time of the report; and

(9) The number of such new teachers obtained through voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States.

In reaching agreement with respect to amendment numbered (1), the committee of conference makes several observations with respect to the intent of such agreement.

This conference amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to report annually, to the respective Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives, certain statistical data with respect to the numbers of teachers who are appointed to overseas teaching positions, who are separated from such positions, who are returned to the United States after such separations, and who are placed in positions as teachers in the United States after such separations, as well as with respect to the number of years served by teachers in overseas teaching positions.

This amendment recommended by the committee of conference is intended, and is needed, to provide the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service complete, accurate, and timely information each year for the exercise of their legislative oversight responsibilities with respect to the programs for the improvement and revitalization of the overseas dependents school system and its corps of teachers which are to be placed in effect by the Secretary of Defense as set forth hereafter.

This part of the conference agreement was adopted in the light of strong and persuasive reports from the Department of Defense, the three military departments, and organizations of teachers that the "rotation" system provided by subsection (c) of the first section of the House bill is unworkable. To operate any plan or program of rotating employees between Federal positions overseas and in the United States, there must be a reasonable number of positions of the kind involved not only in overseas areas but within the 50 States. The military departments have over 6,000 teaching positions that must be filled overseas, whereas the Government operates only a relatively few schools in the United States. It is clear that the number of possible vacancies in federally operated schools within the United States would be completely inadequate to support a rotation program.

The managers on the part of the House feel, however—and conferees for the Senate expressed agreement—that the fundamental rotation principle involved in subsection (c) of the first section of the bill, as passed by the House, is sound and desirable and that its purpose should be implemented to the extent possible. An alternative to contribute to the achievement of those purposes, developed in negotiations with representatives of the Department of Defense, was considered favorably by the Committee of Conference. In the judgment of the managers on the part of the House, this alternative will provide policies and procedures that are eminently sound, workable, and in the interest of the Government and the teachers concerned.

To this end, the managers on the part of the House asked and received assurance that the Department of Defense will place in effect the following programs:

(1) In order to strengthen the overseas dependents school systems of the military departments; to facilitate the recruitment of qualified teachers into such systems; to provide, for teachers who return to the United States, necessary assistance for their placement in suitable teaching positions under school jurisdictions within the United States; and to maintain among such teachers a familiarity with American customs, beliefs, and culture, the Secretary of Defense will establish and maintain a program of negotiating voluntary reciprocal agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States, under which agreements qualified teachers will be made available by such school jurisdictions for assignment to teaching positions for specified periods of time and, in exchange, such teachers will be offered suitable teaching employment upon their return to the United States from such teaching positions.

(2) To assist teachers desiring to return to the United States to teach, the Secretary of Defense will establish and maintain a program under which teachers may file applications with the Department of Defense listing their qualifications, their teaching experience, and their preference of location for teaching in the United States, which applications will be made available to appropriate school jurisdictions in the United States, and also will include in this program procedures under which teachers will receive priority in appointments to positions of teachers in schools situated on Armed Forces bases in the United States.

(3) To provide for the development and maintenance of teaching skills and scholarly attainments which are necessary to facilitate the interchange of fully qualified teachers between overseas teaching positions and positions of teachers under school jurisdictions in the United States, and to justify recognition of length of service and the granting of appropriate levels of compensation and other rights and prerequisites for teachers interchanged, the Secretary of Defense will place in effect a program, consistent with standards and practices in appropriate school jurisdictions in the United States, to encourage and enhance professional development of teachers in overseas teaching positions. Among other matters, consideration will be given, in this program, to activities such as—

(A) The performance by teachers of postgraduate work directly related to their field of teaching;

(B) Participation by teachers in research projects;

(C) Organization of, or participation in, by teachers of professional workshops or institutions;

(D) Structured educational travel by teachers;

(E) University lecturing by teachers during summer months;

(F) Other professional activities by teachers approved by the Secretary of Defense; and

(G) Periodic performance of professional development activities by a teacher as a condition of advancement in salary and continued employment in overseas teaching positions.

Amendments Nos. (2), (3), and (4): Section 2 of the House engrossed bill provided that the amendments made by the House engrossed bill shall become effective as of the beginning of the first school year beginning after the date of enactment of the bill or which is in progress on such date of enactment, whichever first occurs. Amendments Nos. (2), (3), and (4) modified such section 2 so as to provide an effective date of the first day of the first pay period beginning after such date of enactment.

The House recedes.

Tom Murray,
J. H. Morrison,
Morris Udall,
H. R. Gross,
James T. Broyhill,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. UDALL (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman from Arizona tell us the differences between the bill that passed the House and the bill as passed by the other body?

Mr. UDALL. As the gentleman from Michigan will recall, we passed this bill last August. The other body passed it with two differences. The House version had a mandatory rotation feature. With certain exceptions overseas teachers would have to return to this country and teach for at least 1 year before they could return to a position overseas. The other body struck out this mandatory rotation provision.

Mr. Speaker, the second change was that their version of the bill would have made it effective last September, at the beginning of the current school year. The version of the other body makes the bill effective on the first pay period after enactment, which would be some time during the month of April, if the version of the other body were accepted.

In the conference, essentially, we accepted the provisions of the other body in both respects, the effective date, for one, and under the conference report that effective date will be the first pay period after enactment. But in accepting the elimination of the mandatory overseas rotation feature by the other body we agreed on language in the report and we worked out very carefully, in consultation with the Department of Defense, a voluntary system under which they will encourage the program of placing these teachers in schools in the United States, and they are to report to the Senate and the House committees annually.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to certain teachers who have been overseas for an extended period of time, they will report how many are involved in that category, and also report how many have been overseas for a brief period of time, as well as precisely what they have done with respect to setting up this voluntary system of rotation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I still believe that mandatory rotation would have been desirable. I admit that there was some administrative problem involved, and a problem which could have presented some difficulty, inasmuch as the overseas dependents school system has really no connection with any school system in this country. So there was no place where these teachers from overseas could have been automatically placed in a school system in this country.

I do feel that the proposal that has been worked out by the conferees, if administered in good faith, will probably achieve the objectives that many of us felt were necessary.

I am particularly pleased that there is this annual reporting system to the House and Senate committees.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I fully agree with the gentleman's suggestion. I believe the House has won substantially what it sought, and that is some assurance that we will not have teachers overseas who stay there for years and years, and lose contact with groups in this country engaged in education and politics, in science, and in the atmosphere of this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that under this agreement we have reached with the Department of Defense, the language we have written into the report, we have achieved substantially what we sought to achieve. I will say in this connection that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] has had a most constructive attitude throughout the consideration of this legislation, and I do not believe we could have worked out this legislation in the form it is now, and have resolved this problem and have cured this great inequity that exists, with respect to the overseas teachers, without the gentleman's support, and I want to thank the gentleman for it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to join with the distinguished minority leader in the remarks that he has made, and say that as one of the conferees on this bill I was disappointed in that there was not some mandatory rotation written into the legislation.

It does contain some mandatory provisions. However, I believe the gentleman from Arizona will agree that it is the understanding that the working of this bill will be carefully watched, and, if in the future it is necessary to come to the House with some form of mandatory legislation, we will undertake its enactment.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from Iowa has stated my position. We have discussed it along these lines and I believe that we will be able to work out something with the Department of Defense which in good faith they will be able to carry out.

However, Mr. Speaker, if there should be any difficulty in the future, as chairman of the subcommittee which originated this legislation, it would certainly be my intention to pursue it further, and perhaps write some provisions that would be mandatory.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman yield further?

Mr. UDALL. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe I can speak for the two conferees from our side, and say that the gentleman from Arizona was very cooperative with all of us—myself, and the two of them—and took a very constructive attitude in trying to resolve the problem favorably so that we could get this legislation back to the House of Representatives.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for his generous statement.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman not only kept us informed, but the gentleman sat down with us to work out some of these problems I wish to compliment him for his effort in making this legislation a reality.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from Michigan has brought my day to a very pleasant close, and I thank the gentleman for his very generous remarks.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee which considered the original House bill, providing for equitable salary increases and adjustment for overseas teachers, I am pleased with the conference report, and urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 4

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of the week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, we have finished the legislative program for this week and at the conclusion of the announcement of the program, I shall ask that the House adjourn over to Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day.

Also on Monday there are 19 bills to be considered under suspension of the rules. Of course, these bills may not be called up in the order in which I announce them, but as we have them listed these bills are as follows:

1. H.R. 14122: Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966.
2. H.J. Res. 997: Supporting U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India.
3. H.R. 1791: Great Salt Lake Lands, Utah.
4. S. Con. Res. 71: Regarding invitation for the 1972 Winter Olympic Games in Utah.
5. H.J. Res. 837: Proclaim State and Municipal Bond Week.
6. H.R. 13365: To authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile. (Amended.)

Mr. Speaker, the succeeding bills numbered 7 to 18 on this list all deal with stockpile disposals and related matters, and are as follows:

7. H.R. 13367: To authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile. (Amended.)
8. H.R. 13368: To authorize the disposal of bizmuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.
9. H.R. 13369: To authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile. (Amended.)
10. H.R. 13371: To authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.
11. H.R. 13373: To authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.
12. H.R. 13578: To authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile.
13. H.R. 13579: To authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile.
14. H.R. 13580: To authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.
15. H.R. 13663: To authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile.

16. H.R. 13774: To authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile.

17. S. 1488: To authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile.

18. S. 2642: To authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes. (Amended.)

Then No. 19—S. 2573—validating extension of 1955 leave year of certain Yosemite National Park employees.

Tuesday: The Private Calendar will be called and the Department of the Interior Appropriation, 1967, will be considered.

Wednesday and the balance of the week:

The Post Office Department and Treasury Department Appropriation, 1967.

H. Res. 803—authorizing certain travel and investigations by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservations, which I now make, that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the foregoing, the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. Mills], has advised that his committee has unanimously reported a number of bills which he hopes to call up under unanimous consent next week. We do not know exactly which day these bills might be called up, but he has asked me to announce them for the information of the Members.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Do I understand that these bills that the distinguished majority leader is referring to have been unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, they were all unanimously reported. Most of them are extensions of dates that are expiring. They include the following bills:

H.R. 8376: Suspension of duty on cork insulation.

H.R. 10998: Suspension of duty on heptanoic acid.

H.R. 11653: Suspension of duty on natural graphite.

H.R. 12262: Suspension of duty on shoe lathes.

H.R. 12328: Suspension of duty on tanning extracts.

H.R. 12461: Suspension of duty on istle.

H.R. 12463: Suspension and reduction of duty on chicory.

H.R. 12657: Suspension of duty on alumina and bauxite.

H.R. 12864: Suspension of duty on personal and household effects.

H.R. 12997: Suspension of duty on electrodes for producing aluminum.

H.R. 8188. Deductions for contributions for judicial reform.

Of course, these bills which were all reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means will be brought up, if they are brought up, under a unanimous consent request, and Members will have time to discuss them under their reservations of objections.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further program to announce at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman repeat the agreements that have been reached as to the procedure on Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad that the gentleman from Michigan has mentioned that.

Under the unanimous consent order heretofore agreed to, rollcall votes on Monday and Tuesday, except on procedural matters and rules, will be put over until Wednesday of next week. This arrangement is made because of the Jewish holy days.

The unanimous consent agreement does not apply to quorum calls, which will be in order on Monday and Tuesday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. May I inquire briefly as to the nature of this last mentioned bill, if I understood correctly, which has to do with contributions for judicial reform, which will be called up by unanimous consent, is from the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. ALBERT. That is one of the bills on the list which the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills] gave me.

Mr. GROSS. But it is from the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. ALBERT. It was on the list. I do not know any of the details about it. I suggest that the gentleman direct his questions to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader, yield for a question?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Under the unanimous-consent request that has been heretofore granted by the House to put all votes over, about which we had some colloquy yesterday, is it the belief of the majority leader, and will it be required by the leadership, that should objections be made and an automatic vote on any bill brought about which it is understood is to be put over, that that objection would have to be again made on Wednesday next, or would it automatically come up for a vote once it is put over under this agreement?

Mr. ALBERT. Under an automatic rollcall, that would be tantamount to the leadership infringing upon the prerogatives of the House. The House is in charge of the situation on those votes, and the House will be in charge when we meet again after the Holy Days on Wednesday. It depends on whether a majority is present, if that is the objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me phrase the question in another way and state a corollary, so to speak, thereof. If an objection was not made on Monday or Tuesday next, in view of the unanimous consent agreement into which we have heretofore entered, could one then make the request on Wednesday next when we reconvene for voting purposes for the first time as an objection to any bill that had passed either on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. Not if it had gone to final passage.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think the answer there would be, as I understood the question, that any bill which went through on Monday or Tuesday without any question being raised as to a rollcall vote would undoubtedly be approved by the House, and therefore you could not bring it up again on Wednesday.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I think we are encroaching on the prerogatives of the Speaker in discussing parliamentary questions. But the answer to the first question, I think, is clear, that the House would be in control on Wednesday, as to whether we would have an automatic rollcall vote.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I assure the gentleman that it is not the intention of the gentleman from Missouri to encroach upon the prerogatives of the Speaker. What I am trying to do is to see that the prerogatives of the individual elected Members of the House are not encroached upon. It seems to me rather strange that if an objection is made on one of these days which we have in our magnanimity granted because of certain religious reasons and others and will have votes of record on those days put over, and that a person was sick or stricken down, away on official business, in a hospital, or otherwise, that he, not being able to be there, would have to arrange for someone else to again make the objection, having once made it a matter of record during those times in which we will not be voting?

Mr. ALBERT. I have stated the rule as I understand it. The gentleman might address his inquiry to the Chair.

Mr. HALL. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the inquiry has been addressed to the Chair in times past and a ruling has been made. That is why I was trying to clear up the program at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, APRIL 4, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WATERSHED FUNDS

Mr. **TRIMBLE.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **TRIMBLE.** Mr. Speaker, a short 30 years ago the Congress provided to the people of the United States a valuable tool with which to begin effective measures to stop the erosion that was eating away our soil and silting up our streams, reservoirs, lakes, and harbors.

Since the Soil Conservation Service was established in 1935, the Congress has enacted several new authorities to give people more specialized tools for installing soil and water conservation practices.

Nowhere is there more impressive and dramatic example of how farmers and ranchers and other landowners took advantage of those tools than in Arkansas.

And nowhere can be found greater enthusiasm for and participation in applying programs and practices to develop our soil and water resources for greater benefit than in Arkansas.

All the farm and ranch land in the State is covered by soil conservation districts. All the soil conservation districts have signed modernized agreements with the Department of Agriculture.

Arkansas landowners are disturbed deeply by budget recommendations to reduce certain funds of the Soil Conservation Service, the agency that gives indispensable technical help in soil and water work.

In the 3d Congressional District which I am honored to represent, landowners, and operators are most perplexed by this nagging threat to the great progress they have made in this work.

With the tools provided by the Congress, landowners of our Congressional District, through their soil conservation districts, applied for, planned, and completed the Six Mile Creek Pilot Watershed Project in the 1950's.

Through the provision of Public Law 566, soil conservation district cooperators in our congressional district applied for, planned, and undertook construction of four small watershed projects.

And now, under authority of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, soil conservation districts, watershed districts and county judges of our congressional district are sponsoring the Arkansas River Valley Resource Conservation and Development Project—a comprehensive program to conserve, develop, and utilize natural resources of the valley.

I am sure that any number of my colleagues here can attest to similar initiative, industry, and foresight demonstrated by the landowners in their States who made good use of the tools provided by Congress.

I am especially disturbed by the proposal to reduce the item for soil surveys by $3.6 million, and the limitations for watershed planning and watershed construction starts.

The proposal to reduce soil survey acreage from 52 to 35 million acres and the number of soil scientists by about 400 is unwise, for soil surveys are the key to the entire conservation program. The budget proposes a limitation of 50 authorizations for watershed project planning assistance in 1967 compared to a current rate of 100. I oppose this. I also oppose the budget proposal to limit the number of new watershed project construction starts to 35, as compared to a current rate of 80.

The landowners are engaged in a war that men must win. It is no wonder that farmers, ranchers, and others throughout the land are appalled by proposals to withdraw support when we ought to be increasing it.

It will be sad, indeed, if after 30 years of successfully promoting a universally beneficial program we succumb apathetically to a cut in our budget.

I prefer to believe and to act otherwise, and I urge my fellow Congressmen to join me.

TEXAS CREDIT UNIONS HONOR ONE OF FOUNDERS

Mr. **PATMAN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PATMAN.** Mr. Speaker, it is always a happy occasion to see an old friend honored, especially one who has so unselfishly served the public. One such man is Mr. H. B. Yates, of Dallas, who is retiring after 35 years as a strong, dynamic leader of the credit union movement in Texas.

Mr. Yates has been my friend for many years, and it was with pride that I saw in the recent edition of the Texas Credit Union League Bulletin a moving tribute to a man who has done more for credit unions in Texas than any other one man.

I commend the following article to my colleagues:

YATES ELECTION A GREAT VICTORY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This editorial first appeared in the June 1953 issue of the Bulletin. It has since become history as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It seems appropriate to present it again on the retirement of H. B. Yates)

Honor and glory have come to Texas through the election of a Texas credit unionist to the presidency of the Credit Union National Association.

Natural pride arises in the hearts of Texans when they realize that such a man as H. B. Yates is a product of Texas. To become outstanding in the credit union movement, Texans have applied themselves diligently and their efforts have been successful through the guidance of leaders like Yates. Although Texans have a tendency to be somewhat loud and vociferous about their accomplishments, this is generally a subterfuge to disguise the humility in their hearts. This humility and realization that in order to make that long, hard, uphill financial pull, we all need a helping hand, has made credit union philosophy readily accepted in Texas.

Great though this victory may be for Texas, greater still is it for the credit union movement as a whole. Often it has been said the only danger we face is from within, that this philosophy of the brotherhood of man that we subscribe to may be weakened by selfishness and greed.

Under the leadership of H. B. Yates, we may be assured that these temptations will be warded off. Yates has long been a man of firm conviction, and a zealous proponent of credit union philosophy. In the face of opposition he has steadfastly defended his beliefs. At the risk of personal degradation, he has promoted the welfare of the credit union member.

All of us in this movement can be certain that with H. B. Yates as our president, that the thinking of our leadership will be clear, that our leader will be militant, that the bulwarks of this movement will be strengthened, and that our philosophy will be protected, so that we may continue to improve our service to our fellow man.

TALL TEXAN RETIRES

"Tall, slim, somber, thoroughgoing Texan."

This was the way H. B. Yates was described in the pages of the Bulletin in December 1955 when he was appointed as managing director of the Credit Union National Association.

Intervening years have only changed this man to broaden his knowledge and hone his sharp mentality.

Many thoughts came to mind as he retired in February as president of the Dallas Teachers Credit Union.

Looking back there are but few facets of the credit union movement, in Texas, in the Western Hemisphere, in the world, that have not been influenced by the touch of this giant in credit union circles, H. B. Yates.

His accomplishments are so numerous, it is difficult to mention them all. In January 1931 he was one of the 13 teachers who contributed $5 each to organize the Dallas Teachers Credit Union. He became its first president and served in that capacity until January 1966. Meanwhile this credit union had become the largest in the State with 16,085 members and $18,344,207 in assets.

A true disciple of credit union tenets, Yates spread the ideals by organizing other credit unions. His first was the Fort Worth Teachers Credit Union.

In 1934 he assisted in organizing the Texas Credit Union League. He served as a director from 1941 to 1956, and as president from 1942 to 1949.

He was also instrumental in organizing Member Mutual Insurance Co. in 1952. He was elected as secretary and served until 1956 when he resigned.

On the national scene, he served as a director of the Credit Union National Association from 1942 to 1956. He was a vice president and secretary and attained the presidency in 1953 and held this position until 1955. That year he became managing director of CUNA until he resigned in 1957.

He is one of the few men who has two conference rooms named after him.

When the Texas Credit Union League completed its new building, its conference room became the Yates Room. In January 1966 the membership of the Dallas Teachers Credit Union voted that "the conference room at the Dallas Teachers Credit Union be named the H. B. Yates Room in permanent appreciation of the 35 years of dedicated service which Mr. Yates has rendered the Dallas Teachers Credit Union and that a portrait of Mr. Yates be permanently displayed in this room."

To accomplish these notable deeds must have taken some time. And indeed this is true. It took some 74 years to mold this servant of man. His birthplace was Trenton, Tenn., in 1891. He earned a B.A. degree from Tennessee University and an M.A. from Columbia University and embarked on a career as a teacher. For 37 years he taught economics, history, and civics, meanwhile finding some time to coach a track team. In 1952 he retired as a teacher in Dallas.

So, now he retires from his last active connection with the credit union movement.

But we know that his vast treasury of knowledge and experience will still be available to the credit union movement and his fellow men for whom he has expressed in action his high regard.

To the tall, the slim, the somber, the thoroughgoing Texan, we express our deep appreciation for years of dedicated service.

REASONABLE INTEREST RATES CAN PROVIDE US WITH GUNS PLUS BUTTER WITHOUT INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, my Republican colleagues have expressed great concern about prices, wages, and what they like to describe as inflation.

Now to set the record straight, it should be noted that both the Republican and the Democratic Parties are opposed to inflation. Neither party has a monopoly on protecting the public interest in this area.

At the same time, I do not believe that the great majority of the Democratic Members of this body share the trembling and fearful approach to prosperity as evidenced by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Frankly, I feel that this country is big enough and strong enough to withstand the great benefits of prosperity without falling into the trap of inflation.

However, I am sure that my distinguished Republican friends are quite serious in their concern over prices. With this in mind, I would like to call their attention to the effect of interest rates on all prices in the economy.

Interest rates are something that we all have to pay. The cost of money is reflected in every item in the economy from a simple pair of work shoes to a super deluxe Cadillac. It is reflected in the Federal Budget and in every local and State budget.

Interest rates now take $13 billion annually out of the national budget. Interest rates are the biggest single item in the cost of a house—more than the lumber, the land, the workmanship combined. The impact of higher and higher interest rates is growing daily throughout the economy.

So I ask my Republican friends who have expressed such concern about prices to join me in this crusade to keep interest rates down. Frankly, I was surprised that so many of the leading Republican Members rose to defend the Federal Reserve Board when it raised interest rates by 37½ percent last December. Certainly that December interest rate increase has done more than anything else to put heavy upward pressure on the price of every item in the economy. The threat of inflation now is caused by the Federal Reserve Board's shocking interest rate increase in December 1965. If the Republican Party is indeed serious about holding down prices, then I submit that it must be equally serious about holding down interest rates.

WHAT PRESIDENT A. LINCOLN SAID ABOUT MONEY POWER

President Abraham Lincoln made the following statement:

> The money power has established a more vicious form of universal slavery over the American people than ever was established over the American Negro.

GUNS PLUS BUTTER TIMES REASONABLE INTEREST RATES DETERMINE THE ACHIEVEMENT OF GREAT SOCIETY PROGRAMS—WHAT LINCOLN SAID ABOUT THE MONEY POWER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as every housewife who has tried to balance her checkbook at the end of the month knows, mathematics is an exact science. Buying what one wants and needs, whether in the individual home or in the Nation, demands careful planning and budgeting. Although I am not a mathematician, I propose for the consideration of the House a new mathematical formula to assist us in our legislative deliberations.

The formula is as follows:

G plus B times RI equals GS

I am firmly convinced that the application of this formula as a guide in our efforts will aid greatly in maintaining our present prosperity and insure a proper rate of national growth. Simply translated the formula provides that "G" equals guns; "B" equals butter; "RI" are reasonable interest rates and "GS" stands for the Great Society programs. In other words the imaginative and needed programs for domestic growth—the Great Society programs—can be maintained in spite of our involvement in Vietnam if we can prevent inflationary rises in interest rates from placing the costs of these programs beyond the reach of the national budget.

Over the course of the next few weeks it is my intention to discuss in the House the necessity of giving appropriate consideration to the formula here proposed. Its application may mean the difference between the success and failure of important domestic programs. It will mean the difference between whether young people will be able to find decent homes or be forced to accept substandard conditions; whether schools will be built or classrooms will be overcrowded; whether communities and regions will be restored or will have to sink back into the decay of poverty.

I am in my 38th year in this House, and I am convinced that if we can control interest rates we can achieve the economic and social goals of the Great Society. I am equally convinced that the House will act to protect the best interests of the people.

WHAT A. LINCOLN SAID ABOUT MONEY POWER

President Abraham Lincoln in a direct quote attributed to him stated:

> The money power has established a more vicious form of universal slavery over the American people than ever was established over the American Negro.

CURTAILMENT OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE'S AUDIT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress with a long-established voting record in favor of economy and as a member of the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee closely involved in charting military expenditures, I am disturbed by any attempt to curtail or hamper the General Accounting Office's audit of defense contracts.

GAO has established a formidable record of ferreting out instances of waste, duplication, and even occasional corruption in the Federal Executive Establishment. It was created by the Congress as official watchdog over departmental and agency operations and has paid for itself many times over in the hundreds of millions of dollars it has saved American taxpayers.

As a former member of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have always taken pride in the committee's role in reviewing the manner in which taxpayers' money is spent. The experience I gained in keeping postaudit checks on the executive branch during my 4 years on the Government Operations Committee has been invaluable to me in carrying out my Appropriations Committee assignments. On both committees my colleagues and I have relied heavily on information contained in the factual reports supplied by GAO.

As a member of the Defense Subcommittee, I am thoroughly familiar with the Pentagon's sensitivity in the area of economy. The Secretary of Defense has shown no hesitancy in proclaiming the savings his cost-accounting methods are producing. But neither the Secretary or his aids have a corner on efficiency or integrity in the matter of uncovering conditions in defense procurement which could be corrected to the benefit of both the military and the civilian taxpayer. I could not agree less with the Secretary that GAO is duplicating his auditing processes at the Pentagon.

There is further the matter of the public's right to know involved in the proposal to limit the authority of the GAO. I agree that the rights of the contractor should be protected, but I find nothing to indicate unreasonable or arbitrary action by GAO in the past. As my colleagues, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD], state in their additional views to House Report No. 1334:

> The public's right to know the facts—not conjecture—must always be considered; and

when cases are responsibly reported, the public interest is paramount.

The Department of Defense in recent years has crept more and more into a shell of secrecy, not warranted by either national security or public interest. I can view the latest attempt to stifle necessary information regarding defense expenditures as a bold attempt to remove the people of this country from a realization of how their tax money is being spent. If there is waste in their Military Establishment, it should be disclosed and eliminated. The task of Congress and of responsible press media will be considerably hampered in this area if the report is approved by the Government Operations Committee is adopted.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial carried in Tuesday's Cleveland Press, which succinctly summarizes the pertinent arguments against the proposal:

SAVE THE GAO

For 45 years the General Accounting Office, headed by the Comptroller General of the United States, has been one of the best friends the taxpayers ever had.

This office is responsible only to Congress. It has broad power to investigate and audit agencies of the Federal Government. It has issued thousands of reports and saved or recovered many millions of taxpayer dollars. Its very presence is a guard against waste.

Now suddenly the House Government Operations Committee is out to cripple GAO's usefulness to the taxpayers. This was reported yesterday by Scripps-Howard Writer Jack Steele.

This committee already has pressured the former acting comptroller into agreeing to restrictions in his reports of overspending, especially in the Defense Department. It accomplished this before the new Comptroller General, Elmer B. Staats, could take office.

The committee objects to "critical words or phrases" in GAO reports, to identifying contractors, to making public its reports before Government officials or contractors have seen them, to making so many reports.

In short, the committee has buckled to complaints of the very people Congress created the GAO to investigate. It proposes to put shackles on the GAO.

In its report, the House committee begins by calling the GAO the watchdog for Congress, agrees it is an indispensible source of information for Congress, says it has done an outstanding job and so on. But the net of the report is to quiet the bark of the watchdog, reduce its indispensable role and hamper its ability to do an outstanding job.

The outcry from other Members of Congress—and from the taxpayers—should rattle the Capitol dome, and force the House Government Operations Committee into red-faced, high-tailed retreat.

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on an address delivered Tuesday in Chicago to the annual convention of the National Association of Broadcasters by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. E. William Henry.

According to press reports of his talk and from portions of Mr. Henry's talk inserted in the Congressional Record of March 29—the same day of his address, incidentally—he took the broadcasting industry to task for their continued acceptance of cigarette advertising.

Mr. Henry said:

From the cigarette advertising presently being carried on radio and television stations, no one would ever know that a major public controversy is in progress as to the harmful effects of cigarette smoking. One could never guess from such advertising that the great bulk of medical opinion, including a Surgeon General's report, has concluded that there is an adverse casual relationship between cigarette smoking and health. Despite all this, the sign on broadcasting's door for cigarette advertisers reads "Business as usual."

Chairman Henry then castigated the broadcasters for their lack of restraint and suggested that self-regulation in the broadcast industry should protect the public from cigarette commercials.

Has Chairman Henry so little to do, as head of one of our Government's major agencies, which has some troubles of its own in respect to broadcasting and proposed promulgations of rules relating to broadcasting and community antenna television—if my mail is any indication, that now he wants to assume the authority and responsibility delegated to the Federal Trade Commission? I had thought that up to Tuesday and Mr. Henry's speech in Chicago that the FTC was the Federal agency responsible for regulating advertising on radio and television.

Is Chairman Henry not aware that the Congress of the United States, which established the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission and from whence comes the authority of these agencies, has considered the question of cigarette advertising? In two lengthy hearings, in both the House and Senate committees, the subject of cigarette advertising was discussed at great length. Is he not aware that the question was discussed fully in both Houses of the Congress during the 1st session of the 89th Congress? Is he unaware that the Congress, after great and due deliberation, passed a law which specifically prevented the FTC and others from adopting any requirements on cigarette advertising, other than that already in effect, for a period of 4 years?

Does Chairman Henry now presume to willfully ignore the expressed intent of the Congress? Would he neglect and purposely violate the intent of the Congress? Would he superimpose his own will and judgment over that of the majority of the Members of Congress?

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest to the body that Chairman E. William Henry might better spend his time and his energy on matters and problems relating to the Federal Communications Commission and take off his Batman costume.

PROPOSALS TO EXTEND THE ENROLLMENT PERIOD FOR MEDICARE NEED IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome those of my colleagues who have joined me in bipartisan sponsorship of legislation to extend the enrollment period for the supplementary medical insurance program under medicare from March 31 to June 30, 1966. Since I first introduced such legislation, H.R. 12778, on February 10, no less than 19 of my colleagues in the House have recognized the inadequacy of the present deadline by introducing measures identical or similar to mine. In addition, 25 Members of the Senate have followed the lead of Senator J. Caleb Boggs, of Delaware, who first introduced such legislation in that body February 7.

There can be no question of the necessity of this legislation. Although over 16 million of the 19 million persons eligible for this program have enrolled to date, 1 million eligibles have refused to join and almost 2 million have not yet been informed of the potential benefits.

Not only is there a need to reach those who have not yet been contacted but there is also a need to give those persons rejecting the program additional time to consider their decision. It is quite possible that a number of persons in this last group were too pressed by the impending deadline to make a well-informed decision on whether or not to enroll.

Of the various extension dates which have been proposed, I believe June 30, 1966, to be the least arbitrary. Since the existing act provides that coverage will begin July 1, 1966, for those who enroll during the first period, a considerable period of bureaucratic confusion could be avoided by terminating the enrollment period prior to this date. Furthermore, an additional 90-day period seems an adequate length of time in which to contact the uninformed 2 million eligibles.

Since today is the final day provided by the existing act for enrollment in the supplementary medical insurance program, it is imperative that we move quickly to consider the extension of this enrollment period. It is my understanding that administration officials have not taken a position on the extension proposals because they did not want to undermine the concerted effort to make the established deadline by holding out hope for additional time. That deadline has now arrived and I ask my colleagues to join me in requesting immediate hearings by the Committee on Ways and Means in order that the enrollment period be reopened as soon as possible.

BILL TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR MEDICARE ENROLLMENT

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which would extend the March 31, 1966, deadline relative to medicare through August 31, 1966, and provide that anyone who files during any month within the allowed period will have coverage from the first day of the following month.

Under the present law those persons who reached the age of 65 in 1965 or earlier were required to enroll in the medicare program by March 31, 1966, in order to be eligible for the medicare benefits. The office of the Social Security Commissioner informs me that there are 19 million eligible for medicare, but only 16 million have signed up for the program. Of the remaining, 1 million have declined to enroll and 2 million have not been heard from. It is my view that those who have not yet enrolled should not be penalized and miss the benefits of the program because of an arbitrary deadline. Moreover, another 1 million persons, who declined to participate in medicare, should be given ample time to reconsider. The Social Security Commissioner reports that about 500,000 men and women who first declined enrollment in the medicare program, later changed their minds.

A PROGRAM TO COMBAT ALCOHOLISM

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, 1966, I introduced a series of four bills designed to combat and control the shocking problem of drug addiction and drug abusers which seriously affects New York City and the Nation. Today, I have introduced a bill designed to fight an equally severe problem—alcoholism. My bill would provide for a comprehensive program of research together with Federal grants-in-aid to the States for the treatment, rehabilitation, education, and prevention of alcoholism.

Under the bill, an Office of Alcoholism Control under the Surgeon General would be established to administer a program of matching grants to the States. In addition, the Office of Alcoholism Control would administer a program of research, training, and demonstration projects to universities and other institutions and would coordinate various alcoholic programs presently conducted by different agencies. The bill provides for a nine-man Alcoholism Advisory Council for the purpose of advising the Director of the Office of Alcoholism Control and to review project grants and programs of the Office. Moreover, the Council would have the power to make recommendations on dealing with alcoholism.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, who has recently introduced legislation in this field in the Senate, is keenly aware of the need for Federal help in this area. Senator JAVITS, recognizing alcoholism as the fourth most serious health problem in the United States, stated on January 25, 1966:

> There are an estimated 5 to 6 million alcoholics in the Nation—1 out of every 15 Americans who drink. Roughly, 250,000 persons each year join the ranks of alcoholics. * * * Alcoholism is a major menace. Yet while we expend some $380 annually to treat each tuberculosis patient, only 16 cents is spent on the average each year for treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics.

It is a known fact that alcoholism shortens life. Alcoholics have a death rate two and one-half times that of the normal population. There are 70 million people in this country who drink. Drinking presents no problem to some 65 million of these, but, according to the National Council on Alcoholism, Inc., as to an estimated 5,015,000 of them drinking has become enough of a problem to interfere with successful, happy living. These are the alcoholics.

I define the term "alcoholic" to mean any person who chronically and habitually uses or is dependent upon alcoholic beverages to the extent that he has lost power of self-control with respect to use of such beverages or who by reason of alcoholism endangers the health, safety, or welfare of himself or others.

Contrary to general belief, the great majority of the alcoholic population of 5,015,000 is not the visible skid-row type of alcoholic found in the Monday morning lineups, on the Bowery, in the jails, and in the city hospitals. Some 97 percent of all alcoholics are to be found in the homes, factories, offices, and communities of America.

There are many disastrous effects of alcoholism which are not easily reflected and appreciated by a perusal of alcoholic statistics. For example, what of the family of the afflicted individual? It is not possible for the breadwinner of the family to become afflicted with the disease of alcoholism without the entire family unit feeling the impact. In most cases where the father or mother or both are victims of alcoholism, there is a total breakdown in the family unit concept. Children are faced with the ruins. They are left to shift for themselves. It is not surprising that so many children of alcoholics become delinquents and eventually alcoholics themselves.

In another sense, alcoholism is highly impractical in that it is extremely costly. There have been conservative estimates that the cost to business and industry from absenteeism, inefficiency, and accidents resulting from alcoholism rates as high as $2 billion annually. In addition, the loss of valuable personnel who fall victims to alcoholism after years of investment in their training is costing industry an astronomical amount every year, not to mention the $432 million per annum reflected in lost wages because of absenteeism resulting from alcoholism.

Notwithstanding the dreadful consequences of alcoholism, relatively little governmental effort or money has been expended to deal with this problem. Efforts in the States, while helpful, have not met the need. The majority of the States have taken the significant legislative step of recognizing alcoholism as a medical problem and have provided some State funds for alcoholic treatment, education, and research. The fact remains, however, that the States need Federal help badly. For example, in New York State alone it is estimated that there are currently 700,000 alcoholics, and yet New York State's budget now, although high by comparison, is approximately $1 million.

The New York State Mental Hygiene Department presently operates 2 alcoholic treatment units in New York State hospitals; a 70-bed unit at Central Islip, Long Island, and one for 60 patients in Rochester, N.Y. Both are for men only. The department plans to establish 3 more units this year; a women's unit at Central Islip and two more for men, one in New York City and another upstate. The department hopes ultimately to establish a treatment unit in each of the 19 State hospitals. In addition to financial problems, it must have trained personnel such as recreational and occupational therapists and psychologists.

The alcoholic problem is of concern to the Nation and of particular concern to New York City. The city has the largest number of alcoholics in the country, some 258,000, as of 1963, and the number is on the rise. Most of them, according to the National Council on Alcoholism, are receiving no treatment whatsoever. The time has come for a comprehensive Federal program to deal with alcoholism. We must provide substantial money, aid, and support to the States to assist them in strengthening their present programs and initiating new ones. This bill, I believe, would be a major step in that direction.

I include a copy of the bill:

H.R. 14197

A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the control of alcoholism

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Alcoholism Control Act of 1966".

OFFICE OF ALCOHOLISM CONTROL

SEC. 2. (a) (1) There is hereby authorized to be established, within the Office of the Surgeon General, an Office of Alcoholism Control (hereinafter referred to as the "Office").

(2) The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws.

(b) It shall be the duty and function of the Office to—

(1) administer the programs authorized by sections 3 and 4 of this Act;

(2) assist the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General, in the planning and carrying on of any activities which relate to alcoholism, its con-

trol, prevention, treatment, or cure, and with respect to which such Secretary or the Surgeon General has or assumes any duty, function, or responsibility;

(3) collect, from other Federal agencies as well as from other sources, data relating to alcoholism, its control, prevention, treatment, and cure;

(4) prepare, publish, and disseminate educational materials dealing with the control, prevention, treatment, and cure of alcoholism; and

(5) in discharging duties, functions, and responsibilities, to cooperate with and coordinate its programs and activities with the programs and activities of other Federal agencies which have or assume any duty, function, or responsibility, for or relating to, alcoholism, its control, prevention, treatment, or cure.

GRANT TO STATES

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of enabling the Director to make grants under this section to States for the purpose of providing programs of alcoholism control, research into the causes and effects of alcoholism and means whereby its victims may be treated, cured, and rehabilitated, and of providing programs for the treatment, cure, and rehabilitation of alcoholics, there is authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

(b)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for any fiscal year, the Director shall reserve an amount (not in excess of 2 per centum of such sums) which he shall allot among Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, in accordance with their respective needs for funds to carry out the purposes of this section. From the remainder of such sums the Director shall allot to each other State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the population of such States bears to the total of the populations of all of the States of the United States.

(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required for such fiscal year in carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under subsection (c) shall be available for the reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Director may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such paragraph for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall similarly be reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be deemed a part of its allotment under paragraph (1) for such year.

(3) The amount of each allotment to any State for any fiscal year under this subsection shall be available to such State, if such State has a plan approved by the Director under subsection (c) in effect on the first day of such fiscal year, to pay not more than 75 per centum nor less than 50 per centum, of the total cost of carrying out the State plan. In the case of any State, which on such first day does not have such a plan and has not previously received a planning grant under this sentence, the Director may pay to such State not more than $35,000, nor less than $10,000, for the purpose of enabling such State to prepare a plan under this section and establish an alcoholism control program, and any amount so paid shall be charged to the allotment of the State to which it is paid.

(c)(1) Any State which desires to receive a grant under this section (other than a grant authorized under the last sentence of subsection (b)(3)) must prepare a State plan which is approved by the Director pursuant to this subsection.

(2) The Director shall approve a State plan under this section if he finds that such plan—

(A) establishes or designates a single State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") as the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the plan, which agency shall be the agency primarily responsible for the coordination of State programs and activities related to alcoholism or alcoholism control;

(B) provides for such financial participation by the State or communities therein with respect to activities and projects under the plan as the Director may by regulation prescribe in order to assure continuation of desirable activities and projects after termination of Federal financial support under this section;

(C) provides for development of programs and activities for carrying out the purposes of this section (as set forth in subsection (a)), including the furnishing of consultative, technical, or information services to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations engaged in activities relating to alcoholism or alcoholism control, and for coordinating the activities of such agencies and organizations to the extent feasible;

(D) provides for consultation with and utilization, pursuant to agreement with the head thereof, of the services and facilities of appropriate State or local public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations in the administration of the plan and in the development of such programs and activities;

(E) provides such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Director shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan; and

(F) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Director, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable him to perform his functions under this section and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Director may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(3)(A) The Secretary shall not finally disapprove any State plan, or any modification thereof submitted under this section without first affording the State reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(B) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of a State plan approved under this subsection, finds that—

(i) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of paragraph (2), or

(ii) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Director shall notify such State agency that no further payments to the State under this section (or, in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to such State under this section (or payments shall be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(C) A State which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Director under paragraph (2) or (3) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Director, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Director thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Director or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Director may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Director as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Director to take further evidence, and the Director may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Director shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subparagraph shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Director's action.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section the Director shall refuse to make a grant for any fiscal year to any State for the purpose of carrying out a plan of such State approved under subsection (c), if the Director finds, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, that a lesser sum of State and local funds will be expended on the alcoholism control program of such State during such year than was expended on such program for the preceding fiscal year. Any final action by the Director under this subsection may be appealed by any State dissatisfied by such action in the same manner as that provided under subsection (c) (3) (C) for appeals from final actions of the Director under subsection (c)(2) or (3).

(e) Payments of grants under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Director may determine.

(f) As used in this section, the term "State" means a State, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands.

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 4. (1) The Director is authorized to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution, or to engage by contract the services of any such agency, organization, institution, or of any individual—

(A) to conduct research into the causes and effects of alcoholism, the means which may be employed for its control, prevention, treatment, and cure, such research to include a study and evaluation of biochemical, pharmacological, socioculture, and psychological factors which are, or may be, significant to an understanding of alcoholism, its causes and effects, or its control, prevention, treatment, and cure;

(B) to provide training of professional and technical personnel in the approaches, methods, and techniques for the proper treatment and prevention of alcoholism and the rehabilitation of alcoholics;

(C) to provide appropriate fellowships for graduate study in social work, the behavioral sciences, chemistry, and biology, and medical residences and internships for qualified individuals desiring to receive specialized training in the prevention or treatment of alcoholism or the rehabilitation of alcoholics; and

(D) to establish and conduct demonstration projects to develop and evaluate new techniques, approaches, and methods in the treatment and prevention of alcoholism and the rehabilitation of alcoholics, such projects to include development of specialized courses relating to alcoholism in medical colleges and graduate schools of social work and behavioral science.

(2) In making grants and entering into contracts to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1), the Director shall impose such conditions, limitations, or other provisions as may be appropriate to assure that no individual shall be made the subject of any research, which is carried out, in whole or in part, with funds provided under this section, unless such individual explicitly agrees to become the subject of such research.

(b)(1) To the extent he deems it appropriate, the Director shall require the recipient of any grant or contract under his section to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project for which such grant or contract was made.

(2) Payments under this section pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Director may determine.

(c) The Director shall make no grant or contract under this section in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 3(c)(2)(A) unless the Director has consulted with such State agency regarding such grant or contract.

(d) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $12,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the following fiscal year.

ALCOHOLISM ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 5. (a) For the purpose of advising the Director on matters bearing on his responsibilities under this Act and of reviewing all project grants proposed to be made under section 3, there is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Alcoholism Advisory Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") to consist of nine individuals to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") without regard to the civil service laws. Members of the Council shall be selected from persons who are not otherwise in the full-time employ of the United States and who are skilled in medicine, psychology, government, law or law enforcement, social work, public health, or education, or who have demonstrated particular interest in the special problems of alcoholism.

(b) Each member of the Council shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment, three at the end of the first year, three at the end of the second year, and three at the end of the third year after the date of appointment. No individual shall be eligible to be appointed as a member of the Council after he has served as a member of the Council for two terms.

(c) Members of the Council shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Council or otherwise engaged on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(d) The Council shall report not less often than once each fiscal year to the Secretary and to the Congress on the work of the Office and other Federal agencies in the field of alcoholism.

(e)(1) Not less often than once each fiscal year, the Council shall submit to the Secretary and to the Congress a report containing full and complete information on (1) the work and activities of the Office, (2) the work and activities relating to alcoholism of other agencies of the Federal Government, (3) and the work and activities relating to alcoholism of the States, and the role assistance provided under this Act has played in such work and activities. The Council may include in any such report such suggestions and recommendations as it deems advisable, including suggestions and recommendations which would encourage and assist local communities in the establishment and expansion of alcoholism control facilities. The first such report submitted shall cover the period beginning on the date of the establishment of the Office and ending as short a time before the making of such report as is feasible, and each following report shall cover the period beginning with the day following the last day covered by the preceding report and ending as short a time before the making of such report as is feasible.

(2) In addition to the annual report, the Council is authorized to submit to the Secretary and to the Congress such reports, containing such information and such recommendations, as the Council deems advisable.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "alcoholic" means any person who chronically and habitually uses or is dependent upon alcoholic beverages to the extent that he has lost power of self-control with respect to use of such beverages, or who by reason of alcoholism endangers the health, safety, or welfare of himself or others.

(b) The term "alcoholic beverage" includes alcoholic spirits, liquors, wines, beer, and every liquid or fluid, patented or not, containing alcoholic spirits, wine or beer which is capable of being consumed by human beings and produces intoxication in any form or in any degree.

(c) The term "alcoholism" means any condition of abnormal behavior or illness resulting directly or indirectly from the chronic and habitual use of or dependence upon alcoholic beverages to the extent of loss of power of self-control over their use.

WE SHOULD SHORTEN POLITICAL CAMPAIGN TIME RATHER THAN REDUCE THE NUMBER OF ELECTIONS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I testified against increasing the terms of Representatives in Congress from 2 to 4 years. To minimize the well-known waste of time, energy, and money spent on prolonged campaigns, I advocate reducing the length of political campaigns rather than the number of campaigns.

The current British elections provide some good lessons about campaign practices and election procedures.

Columnist James J. Kilpatrick in the Washington Evening Star has made some useful observations.

I recommend that Members pass these suggestions along to their State legislators who are probably considering ideas to improve and shorten our prolonged, exacerbating, and wasteful political campaigns:

> The custom is to regard the British as slow and decorous fellows, famed for the leisurely pace and the long view. By contrast with the brisk Americans, who of course are men of action, the British are thought to be thinkers and cud chewers. We might imagine that their elections, like their cricket games, are at once interminable and incomprehensible, and broken only by recess for tea.
>
> The picture is wholly false. Consider, if you please, the admirable timetable of the British elections this week.
>
> First off, it was not even certain that Britain would have an election until the Queen's proclamation dissolving the Parliament. That was on March 10. Parties then had precisely 8 days to nominate their candidates. Two weeks, mind you, just 2 weeks, were then provided for campaigning. On Thursday, the voters go to the polls. On April 18, members of the new Parliament meet to elect a speaker. The Parliament itself will open April 21. Six weeks in all, and the job is over and done with.
>
> Contrast that crisp procedure with elections to the U.S. Congress. The even-numbered years begin in January with announcements, timid or bold, that candidates are thinking of responding to the urgings of their friends. February brings the beaming faces, peering like crocuses through the snow. It is late spring before the lists are complete. Then follows the prolonged period of the primary campaign, the summer doldrums, then another campaign, finally in November the election. In January, the new Congres assembles.
>
> In the course of this stupefying process, both candidates and voters are exhausted. After the first week, nothing new is said; no vote is changed; the speeches get worse, and the respect of the voter declines. By election day, the candidates have indigestion and the voters have earaches. For days on end, nothing sensible has been said. Why Americans are wedded to these endurance contests, no man can say, but the hoary rituals go on. It is a fair measure of the superior maturity of the British people that, while they listen to politicians, they don't listen to them long.
>
> Our system suffers by contrast with the British system in at least three other ways.
>
> Until the surgeons of the Supreme Court stropped up their scalpels 2 years ago in *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, our congressional districts varied fantastically in size. The situation is far from corrected today. Yet the British manage to keep each of their 630 constituencies at about 56,000 population through the firm ministrations of an official

commission. The system works as perfectly as the Buckingham guards in close-order drill. Meanwhile, we sputter along in a tangle of lawsuits and special legislative sessions.

Under the British system, every candidate for Commons must post a filing fee of $420. If he polls as much as 12½ percent of the vote, his fee is returned; if not, his fee is forfeited. The idea is to put a penalty on the crackpots and publicity seekers. As one reads the debates of Commons, it is clear that the rule has not functioned with total effectiveness, but the principle is sound.

For a third point, the British have managed to control campaign spending in ways that have eluded us here. Our own elections have become recurring scandals. How much EDWARD KENNEDY spent in his senatorial campaign, no man really knows, but some of the Boston writers put the total at close to $1 million. Brother BOBBY doubtless spent as much. Outlays in many a House race run to $100,000 or more. As a device for controlling spending, the Corrupt Practices Act is a farce. The ludicrous reports filed after each election have not even token value.

The British have demonstrated that campaign spending can be controlled. Candidates can spend either 2 cents or 2.5 cents per voter, depending upon the constituency, plus $450 as a basic sum, plus $280 for personal expenses. Every shilling has to be accounted for. No supplementary spending can be concealed in bogus "volunteer committees." And in practice these limitations are both enforced and respected.

Doubtless the brevity of the British campaigns contributes to this commendable system. It would be marvelous to see the English schedule emulated here. If the States prohibited announcements prior to September 15, allowed 3 weeks for a primary, then 3 more weeks for a general election campaign, the whole body politic would benefit thereby. The long-suffering voter would be spared 10,000 banalities; the candidates would find their expenses diminished; and the prospect might bring the election of superior men.

The British have their shortcomings, in the cooking of vegetables and the grilling of Rhodesia, but when it comes to running elections, they can teach us some useful lessons.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION SITUATION IN INDIANA

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of some of my colleagues who for some reason or other have not had occasion to contact the SBA offices in their respective States, as Indiana's only Congressman on the House Small Business Committee, I would like to direct a portion of my remarks to the SBA situation in Indiana. I believe it is representative of the problem facing the SBA loan program throughout the Nation.

Since the House Small Business Committee is not a standing committee, it was necessary in this instance for the House Banking and Currency Committee to consider this bill. At this time it seems appropriate to compliment the members of the Banking and Currency Committee for the attention they have given S. 2729 in reporting it to us today.

Essentially the thing that made this legislation necessary was through no fault of the Small Business Administration, nor is it a reflection on any poorly administered loans. SBA policy, as far as I am able to determine, is above reproach. The SBA ran out of money. It is just that simple, and we are here today to do something about it, I am happy to say.

Because of the tremendous number of disaster loan applications last year the SBA had no other choice but to curtail commercial loans, which it did in October of last year.

When I contacted the SBA office in Indiana last January, I found to my amazement that the office might just as well not have been in existence. I learned that there were 531 loans outstanding, without a dime to loan. I might point out, too, that since there were no funds available the loan applications have been slow in coming in. It is obvious that Hoosier small businesses have been seeking financial help elsewhere since October of last year.

In January, I also learned that there were approximately 16 loan applications that had been approved but were being held up because of insufficient funds. The total dollar figure on these 16 loan applications was in the neighborhood of $825,000. It is not known, unfortunately, how many jobs the $825,000 would have helped to create.

I am confident that the thing which happened last year, as it relates to the draining off of business loan funds to disaster loan funds, will not recur. The establishment of two separate funds, and the increase in the ceilings, is a logical and sensible solution to the problem and I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 2729. I am sure this legislation will provide a real boost to the recently lagging interest in small business, not only for Indiana but for the Nation as well.

RHODESIA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on March 8 one of the Members of this House attacked U.S. policy toward the Smith regime in Rhodesia. Among the objects of the attack were the British Government, the State Department "gang," all the governments of independent African nations, the American press, double standard liberals, and do-gooders.

The Member's speech and a report he presented on Rhodesia contain many errors. I would like to deal with a few of these errors.

First. The statement indicts the State Department because the United States has agreed to support our British ally in its attempt to topple the illegal Smith government through economic sanctions. It states:

> The Socialist government of Prime Minister Wilson is not helping us in Vietnam.

Yet the British Government has supported us more firmly on the issue of Vietnam than any of our other NATO allies. Prime Minister Wilson has stood by us in spite of the fact that a large segment of the British public opinion is against the U.S. course in Vietnam.

Second. It is claimed:

> Southern Rhodesia is a model nation for peace, stability, racial harmony with * * * increasing rather than decreasing efforts toward understanding between the races.

The racial peace of Rhodesia is the racial peace of Mississippi and South Africa. It is the peace of silent, coerced blacks and white supremacists.

In "The White Tribes of Africa," the well-known British journalist Richard West writes:

> Coon, kaffir, munt (from Muntu, meaning a man) and nigger are the words commonly used by white Southern Rhodesians about their black fellow citizens. * * * The whites and blacks in Salisbury scarcely mix at all. The only whites to visit the black townships are policemen, officials, and social workers. The mass of the white population talk to no blacks except their servants.

The racial peace alleged is so brutally obtained that the Rhodesian Bar Association was forced to protest the high-handed habits of the police force.

The stability is preserved through police-state methods. According to Nathan Shamuyarira, a Rhodesian African now studying at Princeton and the former editor of the banned African Daily News published in Salisbury, all or most Africans not living on the land must live in segregated townships clustered on the outside of the principal towns. These townships are surrounded by a security belt of vacant land, useful for moving troops and armored cars to strategic positions. A wire fence frequently encloses the area, which is penetrated by one access road. Water and electricity emanate from a central point in white hands outside the area. When a strike or protest threatens, the access road is blocked, food supplies are halted, and troops are moved into the township. In the center of the ghetto one usually finds a police station protected by a wire enclosure.

Mr. Shamuyarira also tells of three young Englishmen who deserted from the Rhodesian police force late last year and who stunned English audiences with descriptions of their training to provoke, disperse, and if necessary fire on groups of Africans who have gathered to demonstrate. In Salisbury or Bulawayo any group of more than 12 Africans is dispersed with dogs or tear gas.

Only last week the Amnesty International Organization reported that 1,100 Africans are being held in Rhodesian detention camps and prisons. The Smith regime has since expelled three workers of this organization from Rhodesia, including the granddaughter of historian Arnold Toynbee. Miss Toynbee said that she had been told she could stay in Rhodesia if she informed the police of the activities of African nationalists and white sympathizers.

The Rhodesian Government, like the Government in South Africa, has found it necessary to pass increasingly stringent laws with stiffer penalties. These laws have repressed not only Africans, but also whites who dissent from the Government's policies.

The Government has passed the Law-and-Order Maintenance Act, the Unlawful Organization Act, and other repressive legislation. Under these laws, political dissent is banned, persons are jailed or exiled, all public meetings are forbidden unless approved by the police, and persons are put to death for throwing gasoline bombs or Molotov cocktails. The Preservation of Constitutional Government Act, for example, provides for sentences of up to 20 years for organizing groups, either inside or outside the country, whose aim is to overthrow the Government by unconstitutional means. The ironic thing about this act is that it was passed by Smith's party in 1963, and now Smith himself could be charged with violating this act.

The Smith regime's restrictions on freedom also include press censorship. Rhodesia's two daily newspapers, which do not support Smith, used to be published daily with large amounts of blank space. The December issue of the monthly Central African Examiner carried the following message on its cover:

> In terms of the Emergency Power (Censorship of Publications) Order 1965, all material in this newspaper has been subject to Government censorship.

Lower down the page was the following:

> Special Christmas do-it-yourself issue. Lots of space in which you can write what you want to read instead of what we want you to read.

Virtually every page had large blank spaces. But even bank spaces became too threatening to the Smith regime, and it is now illegal to publish newspapers with open spaces.

John Parker, news editor of the Sunday Mail in Rhodesia, has been in and out of prison for refusing to divulge sources of a story the government disliked. Eric Robins, a reporter for Time-Life, was declared a "prohibited immigrant" by the Smith regime.

Third. Next it is claimed:

> The Smith regime is secure. It has the broad support of the European minority.

With such harsh laws against political dissent, it is not surprising that little open opposition appears against the ruling party and its policies. Nonetheless, some of the more outspoken members of the press have been joined by courageous church officials in protesting what is happening in Rhodesia.

On November 28 Catholic priests in Rhodesia circulated copies of a pastoral letter which called attention to the dangers of placing nationalism, race, or economics above a concern for man. The letter refuted the idea that white silence has meant consent. Rather, the silence is a silence of "fear, disappointment, and helplessness," it said. The letter condemned Smith for declaring independence and said that the country's racial policies were leading to future trouble.

The Catholic statement followed by 2 days a document circulated by the important Christian Council of Rhodesia, which counts among its constituents the Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregationalist churches. The statement read in part:

> We judge the proclamation of a new constitution of Rhodesia by a group of ministers, without the assent of Parliament, or of the Crown, to be an unlawful act. * * * We regret the great blow delivered by this act to the concept of constitutional law brought to Africa by a Western civilization nurtured in Christianity. * * * We believe that it is a betrayal of principle if those who condemn this act as wrong now remain silent. * * * We note that the intimidation of both black and white is increasing in many insidious ways, and as a result more people than ever are afraid to exercise their right of freedom of speech. * * * We are deeply concerned that information is frequently suppressed, a particularly serious instance of which is the means by which people are taken away from their homes, while it is an offense for friends to make known their whereabouts.

Further opposition to the Smith regime is indicated by the formation of a secret Rhodesian shadow cabinet opposed to the Unilateral Declaration of Independence. This was made known last February 5 in the New York Times, and was confirmed by a Smith regime attack on the shadow cabinet.

Fourth. The statement goes on to say:

> The Rhodesian people proclaimed that independence in a proper manner.

Which people proclaimed that independence? Certainly not the 4 million Africans; they were never asked to participate in a referendum. Certainly not the British Government which informed Smith, immediately after the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, that he and his Ministers were, as of then, private persons with no legal authority in Rhodesia and which directed all Rhodesians to remain loyal to the Queen and to recognize her authority.

Was it done in a "proper" manner? Not a single nation in the world has recognized Rhodesian independence. That, in itself, is an adequate judgment on the validity of the regime.

To be specific, the United Kingdom Government and our own administration have not taken a stand against Rhodesian independence per se—but against this unilateral act declared in the absence of certain guarantees. These guarantees were clearly enunciated by the British Commonwealth Office on October 9, 1965. The five principles without which there could be no independence were:

First, the principle and intention of unimpeded progress to majority rule, already enshrined in the 1961 constitution, would have to be maintained and guaranteed;

Second, guarantees were required against retrogressive amendments of the constitution;

Third, immediate improvement in the political status of the African population was demanded;

Fourth, progress had to be made toward ending racial discrimination—particularly in the landholding patterns; and

Fifth, the British Government would need to be satisfied that any basis proposed for independence was acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole.

Not one of these principles was seriously accepted by the Smith regime. Hence, independence was not obtained in a proper manner, but as an act of rebellion.

Fifth. In its conclusion, the statement asserts:

> As to the vote and the right of citizenship, the American liberal is adept at speaking in cliches and one-man, one-vote arguments which really do not say much. The Rhodesian has laid down no stricter criteria for the African than we have for the franchise in our Nation.

The right to vote may appear to be a cliche to some. It certainly is news to me that it is a liberal cliche. I had always understood it to mean that, through the vote and the election of representatives, men were able to protect their vital interests and further their welfare. And that is exactly what is at stake in Rhodesia. Disenfranchisement of the African majority is calculated to keep them in a servile position in the society. As former Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams said in a speech last December 16:

> We naturally have a stake in what is happening in Southern Rhodesia because of our traditional belief that government should be based on consent of the governed and that all men are created equal.

The great schism between white and black Rhodesia represents more than the franchise question. The discrimination which rankles deepest among Africans is the pattern of land ownership. Four million Africans have forty-four million acres reserved by law for them. The African lands are characterized as being in areas of low rainfall, remote from roads, towns, and railroads, and of generally poorer quality than European land. The government, moreover, has never displayed much interest in agricultural extension programs to better the lot of African farmers.

Education is another area of great discrimination. The Europeans comprise only 6 percent of the total population in Rhodesia. And yet half of the expenditures for education in 1965–66 were spent on the Europeans. The average expenditure per pupil was 10 times as great for a European child as an African child.

The Rhodesian Government has made very little effort to provide secondary and higher education for the African people. Of the 643,592 Africans in school, only 11,495 of these were in secondary school and only 1,042 of those enrolled were preparing to receive graduation certificates.

A country of 4 million people producing only 1,000 secondary school graduates in a year. So low a record of achievement is difficult to find elsewhere in Africa. The Rhodesian regime has made it clear that it will allow only "civilized" Africans any participation in the political and social decisions of the country. But by denying secondary and higher education to the African population, the regime forever dooms the Africans to remain outside participation in the system.

Sixth. Finally, it is urged that—

> The Rhodesian whites have a right to say a great deal about the future of their country

without meddling from do-gooders who have no resolution except chaos.

But the only chaos in Rhodesia right now is that which has been brought on by UDI. If the Smith government wants a real order and stability, let it negotiate with Britain on the basis of the five principles laid down by Prime Minister Wilson.

The statement suggests that the House Foreign Affairs Committee send a factfinding delegation to Rhodesia to analyze the situation there. It quotes Prime Minister Smith as saying, "We have nothing to hide," when asked if Rhodesia would receive a congressional delegation.

I am sure the Prime Minister of the illegal government is willing to welcome Congressmen who he knows are sympathetic to his cause of minority rule. But the people who have been critical of the Smith regime have not fared so well. In January three Members of the British Parliament were attacked by hoodlums from the white community at a public meeting in Salisbury. One of the M.P.'s then left the country, and the other two were ordered to leave. Subsequently, a scheduled visit by British Commonwealth Secretary Arthur Bottomley was canceled, because Prime Minister Smith would not guarantee Mr. Bottomley's safety while in Rhodesia.

I personally would be happy to see a delegation, appointed by Chairman O'HARA, of the African Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, visit Rhodesia. But this delegation should be free to talk to all political groups in Rhodesia, including the African nationalist leaders, and not just the Government officials.

I strongly urge the U.S. Government to energetically pursue a course which will bring majority rule to the country of Rhodesia. Majority rule does not have to happen today or next week. But there must be assurance to the African population that this will occur within a reasonable period of time.

The fact that the Smith regime was unwilling to come to an agreement on this with the British Government and instead made a unilateral declaration of independence from Great Britain is the reason I do not feel the Smith regime sincerely intends to work toward this goal.

For the present, I believe the United States should back our British ally in her policies designed to end the Rhodesian rebellion. If, after a few months, the present sanctions prove to be ineffective in toppling the Smith government, we should examine the possibility of taking further measures.

FOREIGN AID AND FAMILY PLANNING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose today to bring to the attention of the House and the Nation at large some disturbing facts about U.S. Government support of birth control programs abroad through foreign aid funds.

Almost daily the press carries a fresh account of U.S. activities in population control. Last December, for example, the New York Times headlined: "Birth Control Now a Major Part of U.S. Aid."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that any action programs which the Agency for International Development is supporting, or plans to support, in the area of population control are clearly outside the legislative authority granted the Agency by Congress.

Let me make my position clear: I am not opposed to the Federal Government fostering, sponsoring, or financing programs of family planning. It is my belief, for example, that the Office of Economic Opportunity has the right to support family planning programs on the local level when the consensus of local opinion is favorable.

I am, however, opposed to the unauthorized activities which have been carried on by AID. These programs have not been authorized by Congress, but simply established by bureaucratic fiat within the Agency itself. Whether or not one is an eager sponsor of birth control, it should be evident that when the United States is aggressively promoting population control abroad, the matter should rightly be subject to congressional consideration and authorization.

The reasons why I believe Congress should fully debate the desirability of such a program in our foreign assistance will be the subject of a subsequent address to the House. Today I want to document my contention that AID has been guilty of going beyond its legislative authority in providing support for birth control programs abroad. Let us review some legislative history:

In 1963 the Senate passed an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 which said:

> Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into problems of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control.

The House bill did not contain a similar provision and the House conferees were strongly opposed to the Senate amendment. The managers on the part of the House agreed to a modification of the language that restricted AID by providing that "funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into problems of population growth."

This provision was accepted by the House conferees because the population problems of the developing countries appeared to be such that research on those problems appeared to be warranted. But agreement was reached only on the understanding that no other authority was given to AID to act in the field of population control.

There were, however, early signs that AID intended to interpret the amendment to suit its own purposes.

In April 1964, the then Deputy U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Agency for International Development, William Rogers, made a speech before the Western Hemisphere Conference of the International Planned Parenthood Federation in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

In that address, he stated that:

> The U.S. Congress adopted the Fulbright amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. This amendment enabled AID to fulfill requests from Latin American Nations with respect to demographic aspects of development. This we are ready to do. Our efforts will be concentrated in the fields of information, training and research. We intend to cooperate closely with all responsible segments of society, church, private, and public organizations; and will constantly reflect the fact that such matters are in the last analysis the choice and initiative of each individual family.
>
> We intend to cooperate closely with national governments, indigenous scientific institutions, and educational institutions while respecting their particular cultures and moral values.

It appeared to me from these remarks of Mr. Rogers that the Agency for International Development was planning action programs under the so-called Fulbright amendment. For otherwise he would not have emphasized the element of choice for individual families. Research, it appeared, would not have required the consideration of such factors.

Other sources also found Mr. Rogers' speech a new departure. The Vision newsletter, a periodical devoted to Latin American affairs, termed his speech "a sharp reversal from past U.S. policy."

For that reason on May 13, 1964, I wrote to both Assistant Secretary of State Dutton and Director of Congressional Liaison for AID, Craig Raupe. In that letter I stated:

> On the face of it, Mr. Rogers remarks would indicate that the Agency for International Development has gone beyond the intent of Congress in its offer of assistance to Latin American countries.

That same letter asked for a report on current and proposed U.S. assistance in the area of population growth and control, and a restatement of U.S. policy on the population control question.

The reply to this letter came from Mr. Raupe on June 8, 1964. In it he assured me that the programs spoken of by Mr. Rogers were "carefully within the purpose and intent" of the amendment.

The letter further explained:

> In Latin America there is little, if any, basic structure for programs of research in population problems—personnel, background information, and research tools. Some effort toward the creation of institutions of study is essential if there is to be progress in research by Latin Americans. Personnel will have to be trained, information supplied, and research tools developed if these institutions are to be reasonably competent. The "information, training, and institution building" to which Mr. Rogers referred are those which are meaningful research efforts.

In the light of subsequent events, it is significant to note that Mr. Raupe justifies the statements of Mr. Rogers in the light of the Fulbright amendment. There is no indication that the Agency considered itself to have residual authority in this area from any other provision of the Foreign Assistance Act.

In the meantime, I had had an opportunity to quiz the then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Thomas C. Mann, on the issue. He was appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee during hearings on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964. Our colloquy follows:

> Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
>
> Mr. Secretary, in order to make it very clear that not all of us associate ourselves with the gentleman from New York on the question and method of controlling this population explosion, I want an affirmation that nowhere in this legislation has AID been given the authority to promote control of population growth by scientific devices. May I bluntly ask you the question: Is any money being spent for that purpose?
>
> Mr. MANN. No; it is not. What we do do is talk about it. It is a problem. We discuss it. As I said, Mr. ZABLOCKI, we work principally with private concerns who are largely engaged in an educational problem. I don't know of any money——
>
> Mr. ZABLOCKI. What concerns do you deal with?
>
> Do you subsidize them? Do you give them money?
>
> Mr. MANN. No.
>
> Mr. ZABLOCKI. In what ways do you work with them?
>
> Mr. MANN. Excuse me, sir. There is one item of $100,000 for research in demographic problems which has been given to an organization, Celade, in Chile, I am told. It is a U.N.-sponsored organization. This is for research.

From the Secretary's answer it seemed clear that the executive branch agreed that there was no authority anywhere in the Foreign Assistance Act to support programs promoting the control of population growth.

Satisfied by this assurance, unfortunately I did not catch the brief reference by the AID Administrator, Mr. Bell, when he came before the Foreign Affairs Committee in February 1965, to action programs being conducted by AID.

At that time he mentioned that Taiwan and Korea had significant family planning programs underway. What he failed to add was that the U.S. taxpayers were, in part, paying for those programs. The Agency had permitted the governments of those countries to use the currencies generated by the sale of Public Law 480 products to be used for family planning purposes.

Mr. Bell obviously sought to dispel any apprehensions that a policy change had occurred in AID on the population control issue when he said:

> The population field, as distinct from the food field, is not a field in which AID has any major activities. While I expect our activities will gradually grow, I foresee no big change in the immediate future.

It seems significant that only a month later, in a speech at Michigan State University, Dr. Philip R. Lee, Director of Health Services, Office of Technical Cooperation and Research, AID, was leaving a quite different impression.

In that speech, Dr. Lee was outlining the new Government organization which was being set up inside the Agency for International Development in order to administer action programs in population control. He said:

> We are prepared to entertain requests for technical assistance * * *. We are prepared to receive and consider requests for commodity assistance. The AID will not consider requests for contraceptive devices or equipment for manufacture of contraceptives. Experience has made it clear that the cost of these latter items is not a stumbling block in countries that are developing effective programs. Other items could be provided by AID, such as vehicles and education equipment for use in maternal and child health and family planning programs. We are also prepared to receive requests to assist in local currency financing of such programs.

A university audience, it seems, could learn more about U.S. policy on birth control assistance abroad than could Members of the U.S. Congress.

I did not learn of Dr. Lee's speech until fall 1965. I immediately sent a letter to Mr. William C. Gibbons, director of the AID Congressional Liaison, asking for an explanation. In a reply dated October 29, Mr. Gibbons informed me that the contents of Dr. Lee's message had been made known to the staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

When the information finally was received I was on my way to southeast Asia as the chairman of a study mission. It was not possible to reply to Mr. Gibbon's letter until December 27.

In the interim, the White House Conference on International Cooperation was held. At that conference a Committee on Population submitted its report and AID officials outlined a broad program of assistance to family planning abroad.

Among the speakers at that committee meeting was Dr. Edgar Berman, a consultant to AID. At the close of the meeting, a member of my staff who had attended asked Dr. Berman under what authority the Agency for International Development was promoting action programs in population control. He replied "The Fulbright amendment." When it was explained that the Fulbright amendment restricted AID to research only, he shrugged his shoulders and said only that AID's lawyers must have found some authority.

In my letter of December 27 to Mr. Gibbons I challenged this:

> All this activity would seem to be without any congressional authorization. As you know, the Foreign Assistance Act restricts U.S. activity to "research into problems of population growth." I am sure you will agree that recent activities and announced plans by AID go far beyond research.
>
> Therefore, I would appreciate knowing what authority and justification AID has for its family planning programs. It would appear that these steps have been taken without Congressional approval and in clear violation of the stipulation made in the Foreign Assistance Act.

The reply to that letter came from Administrator Bell himself, more than a month later, on January 28, 1966. At this point, I request permission to include the text of the letter:

> DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
> INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
> *Washington, D.C., January 28, 1966.*
>
> Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI: Mr. William Gibbons has passed me your letter of December 27 concerning AID activity in the population field. It arrived while I was on an inspection trip in Vietnam and other southeast Asian countries.
>
> In keeping with section 211 of the Foreign Assistance Act, which provides for the promotion of economic development "* * * with emphasis upon assisting the development of human resources * * *," we have long assisted the developing countries in improving their maternal and child health facilities and the work of their statistics offices and census bureaus. Section 251 of the Foreign Assistance Act provides similar authority with specific reference to Latin America. Development loan assistance, which is also available for this purpose, is provided for in sections 201 and 251 of the act.
>
> Section 241 of the Foreign Assistance Act, entitled "Development Research," covers programs of research and analysis. In 1963, Congress amended section 241 to provide specifically for "research into problems of population growth." This subsection was added on the recommendation of the Senate to encourage research in the field and to provide explicit authority for it. The original Senate amendment provided for "technical and other assistance" in addition to research. The conference committee deleted that reference, which went beyond the general subject matter of section 241. We have not interpreted the action of the conference committee as a legislative repeal or restriction on the general authority contained in other sections of the law.
>
> Since 1963, AID has contributed to a number of research projects in problems of population growth, which are being conducted at Pittsburgh University, Notre Dame University, and other institutions here and in Latin America.
>
> Sections 211 and 251 of the Foreign Assistance Act have provided the principal statutory authorities for AID's response to the guidance from President Johnson last year when he said in his state of the Union message that "I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion of world population and the growing scarcity of world resources." In March 1965, I instructed all AID missions that they should consider requests from host governments for assistance in family planning. I stressed that such assistance must be additive to the host country's own efforts and assistance from other sources. I stated that such requests to AID would be handled, as in any other field, on a case-by-case basis and that we would be prepared to entertain requests for technical assistance and local currency, as well as for commodity assistance, such as vehicles and education equipment for use in maternal and child health and family planning programs. I stressed that AID would not consider requests for contraceptive devices or equipment for their manufacture.
>
> I made two other very important stipulations; namely that, in no case would a family planning program be a condition for U.S. assistance; and that AID does not advocate any particular method of family regulation and requires that, in family planning programs supported by AID, every family have complete freedom of choice in this regard.
>
> As you know, President Johnson reasserted his views on the importance of family planning on at least two other public occasions during 1965 and again in his recent state of the Union message for 1966. In his June 25 address on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations he urged the entire world to "face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of the world." At the end of August, in a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations, on the occasion of the U.N. Population Conference, President Johnson reiterated his June 25 remarks and added his hope "that your great assemblance of population experts will con-

tribute significantly to the knowledge necessary to solve this transcendent problem which, together with man's search for peace, constitutes our greatest challenge." Then, on January 12, the President recommended that Congress give "a new and daring direction to our foreign aid program designed to make a maximum attack on hunger and disease and ignorance in those countries that are determined to help themselves—and to help those nations that are trying to control population growth," both through our research and through funds earmarked to help their efforts.

During 1965 we received both formal and informal requests for assistance from a number of countries. For example, Turkey has asked for a loan to purchase vehicles to transport family planning workers and for education equipment and materials. They also requested the services of a demographer and training grants for midwives and other family planning workers. Honduras is seeking training, education materials and help with the costs of initiating family planning services in rural health centers. South Korea is receiving local currency to support health and family planning clinics. The Republic of China on Taiwan continues to utilize local currency balances (which remained after the AID program there terminated last year) for an extensive family planning program. In addition, we are currently reviewing requests for technical assistance, vehicles, education materials, and training for Pakistan, India, and Tunisia.

We are also assisting selected American and foreign institutions to build up their facilities to train doctors and public health workers, both American and foreign, in family planning problems, so as to equip them for work in the developing countries. Johns Hopkins, the University of North Carolina, the Children's Bureau, the Census Bureau, and selected institutions in Latin America and Asia are among those receiving such contracts.

While I have described our activity in the population field in some detail, this is only part of a broad spectrum of health activities, combating malnutrition among infants, controlling or eradicating debilitating and killer diseases, and other efforts to improve health facilities in the developing countries. These health activities complement other AID efforts to help expand food production and, in many other ways, to further economic and social progress in the developing countries.

I should, of course, be happy to discuss your questions further with you before the hearings, and I do intend to testify on these matters.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Bell.

With the receipt of Mr. Bell's letter it became clear that AID was ignoring the legislative history of the Foreign Assistance Act in an attempt to give an aura of legality to its actions in fostering birth control programs abroad.

No longer was the Fulbright amendment being cited by AID officials. Now authority was being found in section 211 of the Foreign Assistance Act, a section providing for promoting economic development "with emphasis upon assisting the development of human resources."

My review of section 211 had indicated that nowhere in the legislative history of that provision is birth control aid mentioned or provided for. Further, it seems an utterly cynical interpretation of the phrase "development of human resources" to promote the prevention of human beings.

On this basis, I replied to Administrator Bell on February 16:

February 16, 1966.

Mr. David E. Bell,
Department of State,
Agency for International Development,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bell: This is in further reference to your letter of January 28 concerning AID activity in the population field.

Contrary to the interpretation by AID, it was the understanding of the House conferees in 1963 that the limitation of the original Senate amendment on aid to family planning precluded the Federal Government from expending any foreign aid funds in this field, save for research. The justification of AID's actions by citing section 211 is entirely inappropriate. The section calls for the development of human resources, not the prevention of human beings.

It is my conclusion, therefore, that the Agency has been guilty of a grave misuse of authority in providing any aid, other than research assistance, in the population field. Such a sweeping change in the focus of U.S. aid efforts should have been subject to congressional debate and vote. Unfortunately, this has not been the case.

I note in the press that a program of birth control aid to Pakistan is awaiting formal approval, the first time the United States has provided direct material assistance to another country for birth control work. It is my belief that no final decision should be given on this program unless, and until, Congress has given its approval to U.S. participation in this sensitive and important area.

As you know, I have long been a supporter of foreign aid. On many occasions I have taken the floor of the House to defend your Agency and its predecessors against attack.

But my enthusiasm ebbs significantly when I am confronted with what appears to be a deliberate flaunting of congressional will. If AID cannot be trusted to carry out the intent of the legislative branch in this one small area, can it be trusted to look after the massive economic development program for which it has been given responsibility by Congress?

I await your reply on this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Clement J. Zablocki,
Member of Congress.

Subsequently, AID has informed my office that there are no specific documents linking birth control authority to section 211. As proof of the Agency's contention that it has had authority to fund birth control programs under existing legislation, AID has sent me a memorandum, dated November 25, 1963, for Mr. Robert Komer at the White House from Lester E. Gordon, Acting Assistant Administrator for Program, at AID. The memo contains no data for the President on three amendments which were to be considered in the House-Senate Conference on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. Section (b) of that memo has to do with the birth control amendment. It says:

(b) Birth control amendment: A Senate amendment proposed by Senator Fulbright would authorize the use of funds for research on population growth and technical and other assistance for programs of population control. The language would confer no authority not now in the legislation. House conferees are likely to oppose the provision. The executive branch has been, and we believe should remain, neutral.

While this memo supports the contention of AID that it has had authority, it gives no clue to the central issue of when and where this authority was bestowed on the Agency.

AID also has provided me with a memorandum which attempts to explain why Members of Congress were not informed of the new action policies of the Agency, initiated by the airgram of early 1965. I include that memorandum at this point:

[Limited official use]

Drafted: January 23, 1965.
Initialed: January 23, 1965.
Action memorandum for the Administrator through Executive Secretary Dr. Hollis B. Chenery, AA/PC.
From Robert S. Smith, AA/PC.

Problem: Draft airgram on population programs.

Discussion: Attached for your approval is the airgram on population programs, which was prepared by Philip Lee and myself, following your guidance and the two executive staff meetings in December. It has been cleared by: Dr. Baumgartner, and Messrs. Hutchinson, Poats, Rogers, Macomber, Waters, Chenery, Gibbons, Farmer, and Moynihan of AID, and by Richard N. Gardner on behalf of State. A number of minor changes were suggested during the clearance process, including your own of January 18, and they have been incorporated. At Fred Simmons' suggestion, I also sent a copy for information to Francis Bator, although we assumed that you personally intend to clear the airgram with the White House before it goes out.

You will recall that during the executive staff meetings we considered the need for congressional liaison and for discussions with key religious leaders before circulating the airgram. It is Bill Gibbons' opinion that the reference to population problems in the state of the Union message—and the congressional reaction thereto—makes it unnecessary to take any further soundings now. Dr. Ben Duffy, who was of considerable help to Phil and me in drafting the airgram, is equally satisfied that there is no need for special discussions of the airgram's content with religious leaders. Bill Rogers, who had originally raised this point, accepts Dr. Duffy's opinion.

The airgram is unclassified.

Mike Moynihan's comments on the draft are attached for your information. I have told Mike that I understood it was your wish to keep this particular message in "low key" but that more detailed information will be made available over time to missions and other appropriation places. For instance, Phil Lee and I attended a meeting at the Bureau of the Budget last week to share information with other Government agencies on programs and plans in this field.

Recommendation 1: That you approve this airgram.

Approved ———.
Disapproved ———.
Date ———.

As you will observe, the message is prepared as an AID airgram. Several people in State have suggested that it would be useful to follow this up with a brief joint State-AID circular-classified, if necessary—encouraging each Ambassador to get together with his AID mission director to work out policies and procedures for dealing with governments on population program matters. If you agree, I should be glad to work this out with State.

Recommendation 2: That a separate joint State-AID message follow this one.

Approved ———.
Disapproved ———.
Date ———.

Recently I met with Mr. Bell and Mr. Gibbons to discuss this matter further.

At that meeting Mr. Bell contended that the Agency had always considered that it had the authority to support birth control abroad, and that past legal opinions from the Agency counsel had made this clear. We agreed that AID would provide me with memorandums stating this, dating back to 1962.

Subsequently, Mr. Farmer, AID's chief counsel, has contacted my office to explain that no such documents can be found. In the light of this eventuality—and the other data which I have provided, some conclusions seem clear:

First, Congress never gave the Agency for International Development any authority to use U.S. funds to support, finance, or foster in any way any kind of programs in the field of population control other than simple research.

Second, the action programs in which AID has engaged during the past few months are unauthorized and outside the scope of the congressionally-given authority of the Agency.

Third, if the Agency wishes to continue these programs then it must request authority from Congress. This most sensitive issue cannot be resolved by bureaucratic fiat. It can only be resolved in open hearings and open dabate in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the issues involved here go far beyond simply whether one is for or against birth control. They strike to the heart of our American Constitutional processes. This is clearly a case in which the executive branch is legislating in an important area which should be decided by the elected representatives of the people.

If AID wants authority to support family planning programs abroad, it should request such authority in the Foreign Assistance Act Amendments of 1966. Surely the agency should not fear the consequences of open discussion of this issue.

If the agency is allowed to operate under this highly questionable, latter-day, self-interpretation of the law, however, the Congress will have, in effect, given AID a blank check to do whatever it wishes so long as it cares to justify the actions as promoting the development of human resources.

Under such an interpretation, for example, AID conceivably could finance programs of eugenic sterilization or euthanasia—just so it could be justified in terms of economic progress.

For example, the Washington Post of Sunday, March 13, carried a news item about a scientist who proposes a search for two chemicals—the first to sterilize the entire population and a second to reverse the process and allow a couple which was given Government permission to have a baby.

The news story quoted Dr. Alan Guttmacher, president of the Planned Parenthood-World Population, as saying that he had a gloomy foreboding that such a plan might be necessary for some emerging nations which have burgeoning populations.

Clearly, U.S. support for such a program would be possible, without congressional approval, if the erroneous AID interpretation of the Foreign Assistance Act is allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that the Agency for International Development would appreciate the opportunity to legitimize its programs by bringing to Congress an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which would provide it with clear-cut authority to fund family planning abroad.

I hereby invite such an amendment to the bill.

If AID is unwilling to look for such an amendment, it will indicate two things: First, the agency feels it does not need Congress and can, by its own authority and the wisdom of its own counsels, read permissions into the foreign aid bill which Congress never intended. And second, that we in the Congress must amend the foreign aid bill to provide guidance to AID on this question. I, for one, stand ready to assist in this effort.

MOVING THE DEFENSE LANGUAGE SCHOOL, EAST COAST BRANCH, TO EL PASO, TEX., WILL SERIOUSLY IMPAIR AMERICA'S ALREADY SLENDER DEFENSE LANGUAGE CAPABILITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House a situation that I believe has grave implications for the Nation's defense posture—and that has resulted from a serious malfunction of the administrative machinery of the Defense Department.

It is a situation that cries out for urgent and immediate action. And I am hopeful that by bringing this matter to the attention of this House and to the attention of the American people we can get the relief we need more effectively than we have so far been able to get it in any other way.

Last December, Mr. Speaker, as Members will recall the Department of Defense issued its annual list of obsolete and unnecessary military bases to be shut down. Included in this list were a number of Strategic Air Command bases, those utilizing the B-47 bomber, and some of the earlier versions of the B-52. One of these was the SAC base at Biggs Air Force Base in El Paso, Tex.

Also included in this Defense real estate list, however, was another announcement. It provided that the Defense Language School, East Coast Branch, now located in Anacostia, would be moved to the Army's Fort Bliss, also located in El Paso, Tex.

It so happens that at the time this Defense Department announcement was made, Mr. Speaker, I was on the high seas as a Naval Reserve officer on annual training duty. I heard of the base closing announcement. I did not, however, hear about the proposed switch of the Defense Language School to El Paso, although, as I subsequently learned, the matter was mentioned in the Washington Post in Jerry Kluttz' column, on December 11, 1965.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the Kluttz article in the Record at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 11, 1965]

POLITICS SENSED IN SHIFT OF CAPITAL AGENCY TO TEXAS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Employees at Defense Language Institute in Anacostia have raised some interesting points as to why the agency is to be transferred to Fort Bliss, Tex. Defense Secretary McNamara announced the transfer along with numerous other base closings and cutbacks earlier this week.

Agency employees say flatly that the transfer was an afterthought; that it was ordered at the last minute, and that key Pentagon officials weren't even told of the transfer until a few hours before the McNamara directive was made public.

They also contend—with ample justification—that the transfer can't possibly be defended as an economy move as no cuts are planned in the 956 military and 319-man civilian staffs. The costs of moving the employees, their families and personal belongings along with school equipment to Fort Bliss will run up into many thousands of dollars.

These and other points have aroused suspicions that perhaps Texas politics was behind the transfer. This much is known: Air Force was ordered to close Biggs AFB, a SAC base in Texas. Biggs is in El Paso near Fort Bliss. The Army's Bliss will be expanded to include Biggs.

But Army will have no ready tenants for the Biggs facilities when Air Force vacates them, and El Paso, as to be expected, was anxious to maintain or expand the Federal payroll there. So was Representative Richard White, Democrat, of Texas, a first-term Member of Congress who voted for many of the planks in the President's Great Society legislative program.

In any event, a late decision was made to move the Language Institute and its staff from here to El Paso, along with the Army Aviation Materiel Laboratory at Fort Eustis, Va., which has 120 military and 230 civilians, and the Air Force English Language Training School at Lackland, Tex., which has 544 military and 180 civilians.

Interestingly enough, Defense doesn't propose to abolish a single military or civilian job in the three units to be transferred there. On the contrary, some of the activities may be expanded after they are settled at Bliss.

It was not until later on that I learned about this proposed change, after Congress reconvened. I was tremendously interested in the proposal because, in addition to my membership on the House Armed Services Committee, and my membership in the Naval Reserve, it so happens that I had the opportunity of serving as a Japanese language and intelligence specialist in the Navy in the Pacific for 4 years during World War II, and, for a time, also attended the Navy's Japanese Language School at the University of Colorado, in Boulder, Colo. Besides that, I was recalled to active duty in the Navy during the Korean war, first as a student and later as an instructor in the Naval Intelligence School, located across the river in Anacostia. It was this Naval Intelligence School Mr. Speaker, that administered the operations of another Navy school, also located in those temporary buildings in Anacostia, the Navy Language School—which was the forerunner of the present Defense Language School, East Coast Branch. It just got integrated within the Defense Department in those years since 1953 when I was over there.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that on the basis of my own experience in defense intelligence and language matters, I am frankly appalled at the proposed transfer of these facilities to El Paso, Tex. Let me say that in my judgment this move will seriously jeopardize the defense capabilities of the United States.

And let me say further, Mr. Speaker, that my own investigation of this matter has satisfied me that the decision for this move, with such sweeping implications for the effective operation of our Nation's defense intelligence establishment, was made by the Department of Defense purely as a real estate transaction without ever getting the prior approval of the top intelligence officials of the armed services.

Mr. Speaker, I was so concerned about this matter that I undertook at first to take it up directly with the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, during our committee's hearings on U.S. military posture. At that time, some 3 or 4 weeks ago, I asked Mr. McNamara to advise me of the reasons why locating the language school in El Paso, Tex., will contribute to the more effective discharge of the intelligence functions of the armed services. To date I have heard precisely nothing from the Secretary.

I am sure the reason he has not been able to answer me is that the shift from Anacostia to El Paso clearly does not and obviously cannot contribute to the more effective discharge of our military intelligence mission. On the contrary it is a move that will clearly impair our defense language capability, something which is even more crucial as we become more deeply involved in Asia, and thus will seriously jeopardize the defense capabilities of the United States.

The reason for this is very simple. The success of our defense language program depends, as I know from my own experience, first of all on the quality of the teaching faculty available. The faculty of our Defense Language School is almost entirely civilian in nature. They are recruited from a wide variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Obviously the Washington area is one of the best possible areas for recruiting civilian faculty of this type. People qualified in a wide variety of foreign languages and steeped in a large number of foreign cultures are available in the Washington area.

But it is perfectly obvious if we move this school to El Paso, Tex., the most westerly point of that great State, and on the Mexican border, the chances of retaining many of these people to live and work in that area will be very slight indeed. We will be gutting the heart of our vital language program.

I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, that since these language teachers are teachers, they are naturally also interested in the availability of opportunities for professional training and advancement in their particular field of learning. They may be working on their master's or doctor's degrees. They may need a great library available to them in the immediate area. Obviously all these facilities of great interest to the academic community are available in abundance in the Washington area. They are certainly not available in El Paso. The only college in the area, I am advised, is Texas Western College. There are 14 members on the faculty of this college in the department of foreign languages. All but two of these faculty members are concerned with the Spanish language. The nearest institution that could conceivably serve the academic needs and interests of the Defense Language School faculty would be the University of Texas. But that is 600 miles away from El Paso, far too far for any language instructor to travel.

Another important aspect of any successful language training program is to give to the students themselves maximum opportunity to use the language with people to whom the language is native. Of course, the best opportunity for doing this is in the country of the language itself. The next best opportunity is in a cosmopolitan area like Washington where there are people from many different countries, for which many different languages are native. Students at a Defense Language School in Washington thus have the opportunity to converse in foreign languages with military and embassy persons from a vast number of different countries. They have the chance to eat in a large number of restaurants staffed by people who are natives of a wide number of countries.

El Paso will doubtless provide such an opportunity for Spanish language students. But what about Russian? What about Chinese? What about Vietnamese, or Indonesian, or the various African dialects? In those terms El Paso would prove a desert. There would be nothing to keep the faculty in touch with their own cultures. They will be leaving in droves. The students will have no opportunity to use their language outside of class. I cannot think of a better way to gut the whole language program.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the situation is even more potentially damaging than this. At the present time I am informed that some nine languages are now being taught at Anacostia. The balance of the languages required by our military people, military assistance people, prospective attachés and intelligence experts, are now being taught in the Washington area under contract, either with civilian institutions such as the Berlitz Language School, or other Government agencies such as the Foreign Service Institute. If and when the Defense Language School is transferred to Texas, however, the school itself will then become responsible for teaching all of the languages involved itself, some 43 languages in all, so I am advised. In other words, the recruiting requirements of the school will increase for language faculty use dramatically at the very moment when the obstacles to recruiting and retaining properly qualified native teachers will become, as I have already indicated, almost insurmountable. Clearly this kind of thing just does not make sense. And no wonder the service intelligence chiefs were not asked for their opinion on the proposed move.

But the most startling fact in this whole business, as I have discovered, is that this damaging and sweeping decision to move the language school to a site that will seriously impair our language or intelligence capability was not made as a result of recommendations from our top service intelligence leaders. It was made, incredibly, by the real estate people of the Defense Department. The intelligence heads of the service were never consulted, I am informed. And they never gave their approval for the move nor were they given an opportunity to comment on the grave harm which this real estate transaction would do to one of our Nation's most important intelligence capabilities.

Briggs Air Force Base in El Paso, a Strategic Air Command installation, was closed down last fall as part of the overall action in shutting down obsolete and unnecessary installations. Apparently in an effort to ease the economic impact of this closing—a concern, I might add, which we in New York State have not seen exercised with regard to our State—the real estate people looked around for anything they could find to move into the El Paso area. The Defense Language School, with 300 to 400 military and civilian personnel assigned, is located in obsolete, temporary buildings in Anacostia. The District of Columbia has no Congressman of its own, and hence nobody would be likely to scream if some installation were moved out of Anacostia. So, although not a single job was to be cut, and though the shift itself would cost thousands of dollars, and the further costs of transporting military personnel who are about to be sent overseas back and forth between El Paso for their language training, and Washington for their intelligence training, their diplomatic briefings, their military assistance training, could prove to be staggering, they directed the switch from Anacostia to Fort Bliss in El Paso, nearby the closed Briggs Air Force Base installation, just as though the Defense Language School were a Hawk installation or an ammunition dump.

But the Nation's language capability, in a moment of grave national emergency, is not something that should be left to some real estate officer to administer.

Traditionally, we in the United States have never been very good at learning foreign languages. We have preferred to let other people around the world learn our language instead, and on the whole a lot of them have done just that. But in time of war we have found ourselves seriously deficient in penetrating the enemy's tongue. That is what happened in the war against Japan, and we had to undertake a massive, crash program to make up for our deficiency. Now we face the same problem with regard to Russian, Chinese, and the languages of southeast Asia. And I have very grave doubts whether even today we have an adequate capability and an adequate reserve in these key languages of the Orient.

Surely this is not the time for us to take any possible chances with undercutting our language capability even further. The move of the Defense Language School out of the Washington area to El Paso, Tex., must be halted as a matter of top defense security priority. Before any move is made the intelligence community must be fully consulted by the Defense Department and a decision made on the basis of language and intelligence factors, not as a simple matter of shuffling parcels of real estate.

Mr. Speaker, the relocation of the Defense Language School out of the Washington area to El Paso, Tex., is a matter of top defense security priority, and before this move is made the intelligence community must be fully consulted by the Department of Defense, and a decision ultimately made on the basis of language and intelligence factors, and not as a simple matter of shuffling parcels of real estate.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who represents the El Paso, Tex., area in this House so ably, and who was advised in advance that these remarks were going to be made here this afternoon.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for advising me in advance of these remarks, and I am happy that the gentleman from New York has given me the opportunity to extol the value of a move that will consolidate these activities.

I hope the gentleman has the opportunity to visit El Paso. I am sure that the gentleman would be surprised.

Mr. Speaker, it is one of the quirks of fate that I have this opportunity to reply to the gentleman. The gentleman spoke of his having been in the intelligence service. It is a very unusual situation that he who trained in the language facilities of World War II should be speaking at a time when I, in defense of this particular move, am a man who was trained in the Marine Corps, and served as a Japanese interpreter during World War II with the Fleet Marine Force.

Mr. STRATTON. I might say to the gentleman from Texas that I am not passing judgment upon El Paso, Tex., and I do not presume to do so. I am sure it is a very wonderful place.

The point that I am making is, first of all, I just do not think that it has the facilities that could attract the kind of faculty that we need for this kind of school, and keep the faculty. I am sure there is no place in my district probably that could really do this job, either. This is a very specialized type of situation. I believe there are very few places that could do the job any better than it is being done right here in the Washington area.

Mr. Speaker, the other point that I am trying to make is that this move, on the basis of my information, was made by real estate experts. I am sure that if the gentleman were associated with the intelligence operations in World War II, the gentleman knows enough about this to realize that these decisions are so important that they can only be made by intelligence personnel, and not by real estate experts.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. If the gentleman will allow me to address myself to some of the points which he has mentioned, I believe I might throw some light on some of the gentleman's questions.

In El Paso County we have an exceptionally fine military base, Fort Bliss, and a top-notch air base, Biggs Air Force Base. We have been, and are proud of both installations. El Paso traditionally is a military city, and our reputation is that we have the best community-military relationship in the world. We work at extending southwestern hospitality.

Mr. Speaker, we were sorrowed when the fine B-52 base was phased out by advances in technology. This base contains extensive buildings to accommodate any military mission. It would be a tragic waste of facilities to leave this well-established base idle.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me just say to the gentleman at this point that we have had a lot of fine facilities closed down in New York State too, and I share the gentleman's concern with respect to the waste of these empty bases lying around.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. This is why we were highly pleased when the Department of Defense announced that these fine facilities would be used.

Mr. Speaker, Fort Bliss, contiguous to Biggs, is now to take over the command of the air base, and the Defense Language Institute will consolidate some of its facilities and parts here. It is infrequent that two problems can be wedded into one ideal solution. The Defense Department has wanted to consolidate and expand its facilities. Now their operations are far-flung. One unit is now crowded into inadequate quarters at Anacostia Annex in Washington, D.C., and this is to be transferred, the English Training Facility.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me say to the gentleman, as I would like to try to respond to his points—and I am sure he may want to say more on his own time—but let me say when you talk about the inadequate facilities of the Defense Language School, I have indicated that they are inadequate. There is no question about that. But I can assure the gentleman that the Defense Language School exhibited no interest in this move, and was not consulted and did not support it. And, as a matter of fact, the proposed consolidation to which the gentleman from Texas refers to, if Mr. Kluttz' column in the Washington Post for December 11 is authentic, includes not only the Air Force English Language Training School at Lackland Air Force Base, as the gentleman has referred to, but also apparently to try to bring in some other personnel to the gentleman's district, the Army Aviation Materiel Laboratory at Fort Eustis, Va., which has no relation to language. It is known that the Air Force installation is a language school. But let me point out that this English Language School is a school designed to teach English. This is not a school which will have available to it the kind of people from diverse ethnological and national backgrounds who are natives in the language that has to be taught to our personnel, if they are going to have to go over to Vietnam or Indochina, or into other areas of the world and actually find out what is going on.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. As to that point, sir, let me say this.

So crowded are the present accommodations that two universities have had to train the overflow, and these will be transferred. So that by consolidation greater long-range economy and efficiency can be effected for our country. No one can deny that greater efficiency and long-range economy will result from such consolidation. These facilities that they will occupy will well accommodate all their activities and any future expansion. This cannot be said of any of their present facilities. Fort Bliss in El Paso will become the language center of the United States.

By joining the staffs and students of the Air Force English Language School with the Defense Language Institute, equipment can be shared and a greater scholarly exchange facilitated among the personnel.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman is talking about facilities in terms of buildings. This is my whole point. You have the buildings there—there is no doubt about that. You have the buildings in the Brooklyn Navy Yard too and maybe it would be better to use those buildings up there. Because, certainly, you have diverse language groups in the city of New York. But what academic facilities are there in the gentleman's area?

Mr. WHITE of Texas. If the gentleman will give me a few minutes here, I will get to that very point and show you what I am speaking of.

Mr. STRATTON. Well, as I say, I am sure the gentleman can defend his district on his own time but I want to give him a chance to respond.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. If the gentleman will give me just a few minutes, I think I can get to the very heart of what you are talking about, sir.

There are other reasons why this is an ideal choice. El Paso, Tex., is the logical site for unifying the language programs. We have been a bilingual community for many years. It is located on the border of Mexico. We are oriented internationally. Our relationships with Mexico, our familiarity with and utility of a foreign language make us particularly receptive to this type of institution. Our college and the university system have already made plans to coordinate their programs and increase their facilities for the accommodation of this language institute. Our chamber of commerce and many civic groups have already made full preparations to blend these new residents into the full community. When these new people come, they will be delighted with this wonderful Southwest climate and the charm of an established culture which is over 300 years old. Our communities were visited by people even before the landing of the

Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock on the eastern part of the country.

More than this, Fort Bliss is the missile training base for the entire free world, and soldiers of all lands and languages have trained there for years.

Mr. STRATTON. How many Russian soldiers do you have training there? I wonder if the gentleman would answer that question.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. How many Russian soldiers do they have in Washington, D.C., sir?

If the gentleman will let me continue—they have teachers.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman is suggesting because there are foreign soldiers training in the gentleman's district that, therefore, the languages that need to be taught will be available for the students to converse. The fact of the matter in the whole point is that the languages that we need are not, for example, to pick one language—Spanish—we have plenty of instruction in that language. The languages we need are in those vital areas where we cannot penetrate, for example, Russia, China, Vietnam—in areas of that kind. I am afraid we are not going to find very many Russians or Poles or Czechs, for example, to take lessons in the gentleman's district.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. You will find every foreign language of the free world freely spoken by the people at Fort Bliss.

Mr. STRATTON. But it is the other world that I think we have to be concerned with. We would not want to have our students training in a place where they could not discuss in these languages the way they can in the Washington area.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Let me give you an example. The German Air Force Surface-to-Air Missile School from Aachen, Germany, is presently located at Fort Bliss, adjoining the Biggs facilities. The school has a German-speaking staff of 280, and train approximately 1,200 German students annually.

Will the gentleman not let me illustrate.

When they visit our homes they will enjoy the warmest hospitality and the accommodations of this base program.

Many thousand foreign troops are in the United States.

I am proud to say we have made many friends. I have trained in Japanese. I was in a Japanese language school just as the gentleman was and I know you cannot learn a language unless you talk to people—you cannot just talk to the teachers.

Mr. STRATTON. That is right.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. When we captured prisoners we talk to the prisoners. I recognize that you cannot learn a language just by talking to teachers. You have to talk in the vernacular and here you have an opportunity to talk to people in the vernacular—talking to people who come from all parts of the free world and they are at Fort Bliss.

Mr. STRATTON. I think the gentleman is missing the point. I hope in the language field of our defense capabilities, we are not fighting the last war. We do not need Japanese. We do not need German very much. The languages we are short on are those not of the free world but the languages of the countries behind the Iron Curtain. Those are the languages that we have to concentrate on. Those are not the languages you are going to find in a military installation. You have to get into an area like Washington or some other cosmopolitan area where you have the people who have grown up in those areas and who know the languages, but who fortunately have chosen freedom instead of staying under Communist rule and who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. That is what you have here in the Washington area that you do not have in the area that the gentleman is talking about.

The other point, if I may say to the gentleman again, is that a college, a school, or a university, as I am sure the gentleman knows, is not bricks and mortar. It is the people who make it up, the faculty and the teachers. The point is that unless you can provide a cosmopolitan atmosphere, unless you can provide an existing university, not a small college that is going to expand from a faculty of two in non-Spanish languages to something larger, you are not going to get these people to stay. They can be employed here, in New York, or somewhere else, and we will transfer this school to Texas and then go from 9 languages to 43 at the very time that it will be almost impossible to get native teachers to sign up for duty in the gentleman's area.

I admit the fine climate there, but it is not the climate for the kind of intellectual development that we need in this school.

MAXFIELD PARRISH DIES AT 95

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I bring to the attention of the House, the death yesterday of the great American Artist Maxfield Parrish, who for 71 years, lived in Plainfield, N.H.

Mr. Parrish lived for 95 full and happy years, one of the most famous and popular artists in American history.

In tribute to the memory of this distinguished resident of my district, I offer at this point the fine obituary published by the New York Times:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 31, 1966]

MAXFIELD PARRISH, PAINTER AND ILLUSTRATOR, DIES AT 95

PLAINFIELD, N.H., March 30.—Maxfield Parrish, the painter and illustrator whose lush vistas, fairytale castles and good-humored caricatures made him one of the most popular and successful artists in the first two decades of the century, died early today in his sleep. He was 95 years old and had been ill for several weeks.

Mr. Parrish is survived by three sons, John Parrish, of Plainfield; Maxfield Parrish, Jr., of Lexington, Mass.; and Stephen Parrish 2d, of Miami; a daughter, Jean Parrish, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., and nine grandchildren.

A POPULAR CHARMER

The dawns were rose colored and the twilights silver. The girls against backdrops of imperishable rocks appeared imperishable, ethereal. The skies were a sleek dreamy blue—a "Parrish blue."

Maxfield Parrish painted scenes of vivid colors, gracefully draped figures, humorous gnomes and romantic, nostalgic settings. His book illustrations and calendars and murals charmed the public and placed him among Americans as one of the most popular painters ever born and trained in the country.

"I'm hopelessly commonplace," he told a visitor 2 years ago when, after decades of near oblivion, his painting was revived. "How can these avant garde people get any fun out of my work?"

At the same time, the small ruddy artist, with faded blue eyes and a mane of dazzling white hair, said that the sudden appreciation of his work at an exhibition in Bennington College and then at New York's Gallery of Modern Art appeared a bit "highbrow."

"I've always considered myself strictly a popular artist," he said.

And yet audiences and critics were quickly drawn once again to Mr. Parrish's work, mainly because of the pop art vogue. Lawrence Alloway (a father of pop art), who cosponsored the exhibition, said that "behind a screen of high technique, Parrish is master of the cliche, of the image of the moment."

"SUPERB TECHNICIAN"

To John Canaday, art critic of the New York Times, "Mr. Parrish (was) reestablished as a superb technician and a considerable wit as well as a first-rate storyteller, an artist of sufficient accomplishment to deserve a new showing."

His exhibition was the occasion not only for "highbrow" study but also for mass nostalgia, on the part of men and women who had either grown up on storybooks he had illustrated—"The Arabian Nights," and Kenneth Grahame's "The Golden Age," among the most popular—or who had hung his paintings.

College generations of the 1920's and into the 1930's recalled that before "Maxfield Parrish" became a synonym for conservative sentimentalism in art no dormitory room occupied by a student with any pretension to culture was complete Parrish's "The Garden of Allah," amid a maze of crew oars, fencing foils, and mooseheads.

FAMOUS "OLD KING COLE"

They also recalled Mr. Parrish's work through his advertising illustrations for such products as Fisk tires, Edison Mazda light bulbs, and Jell-O. The caption for a 1921 Jell-O said, "The king and queen might eat hereof and noblemen besides." Here Parrish's adeptness as a commercial artist and his taste for medieval themes, recurrent in his work, come together," wrote Mr. Alloway, curator of the Guggenheim Museum here.

In many of his mural decorations, too, Mr. Parrish depicted in humorous and colorful detail a never-never world, such as his 1909 painting for the Pied Piper Bar of the Sheraton Palace in San Francisco, his "Sing a Song of Sixpence" for the Hotel Sherman in Chicago and his "Lute Players" for the University of Rochester's School of Music.

But his most famous mural is the 28-foot-long "Old King Cole," which was hung in the bar of the Knickerbocker Hotel in 1920. It is now at the St. Regis.

The mural shows a bespectacled King Cole sitting on his throne in the center. Two jesters flank him, the fiddlers three are off to the left, and there is an assortment of recumbent pages. On the king's face is a smile of happy expectancy, no doubt concerning his pipe and his bowl, which is being brought in from the right. For "Old King Cole," Mr. Parrish received $50,000.

Maxfield Frederick Parrish was born on July 25, 1870, into a Philadelphia Quaker family. From his father, Stephen, a noted etcher and painter, he received early training and encouragement in art.

As a youth Mr. Parrish showed a great interest in machinery and mechanics. "A mechanic who paints," was his self-description, and his father once said, "Fred is more an artisan than an artist."

WENT TO HAVERFORD COLLEGE

From 1888 to 1891 he studied at Haverford College in Pennsylvania and for the next 3 years at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts. He also studied under Howard Pyle, who illustrated the Robin Hood stories and a series of Arthurian legends.

After his marriage in 1895 to Lydia Austin of Philadelphia, Mr. Parrish moved from Philadelphia to New Hampshire and made his permanent home there. Because of poor health, however, he lived for a time in the Adirondacks, in Arizona, and in Italy.

In April 1895, Parrish sold a cover to Harper's Weekly, and he soon attracted lucrative assignments for illustrations from Century magazine, St. Nicholas, Scribner's, Ladies Home Journal and others.

His romantic pictures of a dreamlike world brought him to the attention of children's book publishers and his illustrations became highly popular among youngsters. For Eugene Field's "Poems of Childhood," (Scribner, 1904) he created one of his most admired pictures, "The Dinkey Bird," in which a child swinging from the limb of the Amfulala tree appears to fly through space.

TO PLEASE MASS AUDIENCE

Before his stay in the Adirondacks, Mr. Parrish did most of his work with pen and ink. But the cold, dry air of Saranac, where he was at a sanitarium, froze the ink as he tried to work on the veranda. He turned to oils, and with the change came an almost immediate desire to work only in color.

Working largely on a commission basis, Mr. Parrish painted to please a mass audience. At the same time, however, he met the esthetic standards of the early 20th century and won admission to the Society of American Artists for his work "The Sandman."

Mr. Parrish's wit and good-humored caricature is seen in "The Tourist," and his taste for lush settings is apparent in such works as "The Land of Make-Believe" and "The Garden of Allah."

"He has combined the photographic vision with the pre-Raphaelite feeling," wrote Hubert von Herkomer, who was a professor of art at Oxford University. "He has a strong sense of romance. He can be modern, medieval or classic."

One observer noted that "Parrish uses only three or four basic colors, getting the different tones he wants by glazing one upon the other. This is how he gets those dreamy blues, hazy purples and sun-flecked golds. The over-all impression, when you view a Parrish picture is that you're looking into and through the painting, not just at it."

Many years later some critics found coyness, artificiality, and sentimental gushings in Mr. Parrish's work. His reputation declined in the thirties, during which he illustrated a series of highly popular calendars for the Brown & Bigelow Co. of St. Paul.

Mr. Parrish had a low regard for the abstractionists, who flurished after the war, and called their work "scribbles."

HONORED BY ARCHITECTS

Among Parrish's honors were an LL.D. degree from Haverford College, conferred in 1914, and a doctor of fine arts from the University of New Hampshire, awarded in 1954. The Architectural League of New York City gave him its gold medal in 1917.

The artist and his wife, who compiled "Slave Songs of the Georgia Sea Islands," resided for many years on a hillside estate in Plainfield that resembled in some ways a Parrish painting. The artist did much of the construction himself. Mrs. Parrish died in 1953.

In recent years, the artist rarely painted, but he still collected royalties on his popular calendars.

Two years ago, walking his visitor back to the car, he hummed tunelessly (a habit during conversational lulls) and squinted at the late afternoon sky. At the suggestion that its brilliance was reminiscent of the skies in his own paintings, a "Parrish blue," he shook his head.

"No, my skies were bluer," he said. "Too blue. I've exaggerated. Well, I'm only 93 and I'll get around to changing that some day."

STOP ALLIED AID TO RED CHINA

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was recently announced that a group of European companies, headed by a West German firm, has arranged to construct a large steel plant in Communist China. The plant will consist of hot and cold rolling mills and steel rail and tube production facilities. It is valued at $150 million.

This is not simply a private transaction. Behind it stands the Government of West Germany, which has given a credit guarantee amounting to $87 million.

This steel deal is the largest single industrial plant delivery ever made to Communist China by the West. It poses a dangerous threat to our security, in view of the fact that Red China is the most aggressive nation in the world today. This plant will significantly increase her capacity to make steel and to make war. The steel casings this plant will produce can be used to make bombs, missiles, artillery, guns, and bullets which the Communists can use in Vietnam and in the future aggressive ventures in Asia.

Press reports say that our Government was informed of this transaction several weeks ago, but made no attempt to stop it. I realize that we have had many problems in the past in trying to restrain our European allies from trading with Communist countries. But in this case, I think we could have done more because of the considerable leverage we have with West Germany. Some 225,000 American troops are stationed in West Germany today, protecting her from possible attack by the Soviet Union. In addition, West Germany wants to obtain a share of control of NATO's nuclear weapons. Any nation that depends upon our protection to this extent could be expected to respond sympathetically to strong representations by our Government in a matter of such importance.

I therefore urge that the Department of State protest this deal in the strongest possible terms, to the Government of West Germany and to the other governments whose private industries are involved in the consortium: France, Britain, Italy, and Switzerland. We should make it clear that if they expect to receive our aid, they cannot give substantial aid to the war-making power of our enemies.

If this approach fails, I believe Congress itself must enact stronger protections against trade in strategic goods by countries which receive our military and economic aid. I have in the past urged that we act to prevent our allies from trading in strategic materials with North Vietnam and the prohibition should apply to shipments to Communist China, as well. Red China is the chief supplier of weapons to the forces fighting against us in Vietnam. Our soldiers should not be jeopardized by equipment supplied by our allies.

THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR—PART III

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues part III of "All This Happened: The Story of American Labor."

This part of the series appeared in the March 18, 1966, edition of the Seafarers Log of the Seafarers International Union.

The first two parts appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, 1966, at page 7195.

ALL THIS HAPPENED: THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR—PART III

The unbridled antiunion violence of the 1870's as exemplified in the bloody suppression of the long strike in the coal fields and the great strike on the Nation's railroads, the "Molly Maguire" hangings and the "Baltimore massacre" of railroad workers, set the tone of the labor-management struggle in the United States for years to come. Powerful corporations grew increasingly callous in destroying workers' organizations, making increasing use of State and Federal Governments and troops, State and Federal courts, and the local and national press to suppress the legitimate aims of labor. Much strife still lay ahead, such as the "Haymarket Square massacre" of workers in Chicago, the bloody Homestead strike against the Carnegie Steel Corp., in Pennsylvania, and the famous Pullman strike against the Pullman Railroad Car Co.

Labor progress during this period was slow—but steady. American labor organizations faced increasingly bitter and powerful opposition. At the same time they still had many untraveled pathways to explore in the search for dignity of labor. At times these paths led to a dead end, at other times labor took what proved to be wrong turnings. Gradually, however, labor organizations grew and labor action became more and more effective. The years ahead were to see the rise of the Knights of Labor, the American Federation of Labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations—which were destined to combine into the present-day AFL–CIO.

While the giant corporations—often aided by the Government, the courts and the press—were suppressing American workers in the coalfields, the railroad industry and elsewhere, a new labor organization, first formed secretly in 1869 by Philadelphia tailors, was gaining strength and growing in membership—Knights of Labor.

The Knights incorporated a new idea into American trade unionism. It was not organized on a craft basis. Membership was open to every worker, skilled or unskilled, male or female, white or Negro. The motto of the Knights of Labor was "An injury to one is the concern of all," meaning every worker had an obigation to support every other worker in redressing his grievances. Unfortunately, however, the Knights of Labor did not stick to this ideal of militant trade unionism—turning instead to vague panaceas of social reform to improve the worker's lot. However under the banner of "An injury to one is the concern of all," and singing the militant song of the Knights:

"Storm the fort, ye knights of labor,
Battle for your cause:
Equal rights for every neighbor
Down with tyrant laws."

American workers flocked to the Knights of Labor in unprecedented numbers. By 1885 the Knights could boast several hundred thousand members. The high point of the Knights of Labor's influence came in that same year.

In 1884 another cycle of economic depression hit the United States—although not as serious or as long-lasting as previous depressions had been. American industrialists, however, as usual seized the opportunity to slash wages to the bone. Strikes broke out spontaneously among rank-and-file members to which the Knights had to give unwilling support. Surprisingly (for the times), many of these strikes ended victoriously for the workers, including a walkout against the Wabash Railroad which threatened Jay Gould's Union Pacific Railroad. These victories were to prove temporary, however, serving only to harden the resolve of American industrialists to destroy labor by any means necessary. Just 1 year after this high point the Knights of Labor was to be destroyed—another victim of the infamous Haymarket Square massacre.

Aroused by soaring business profits in which they did not share despite long and exhausting shifts in the Nation's factories, more and more American workers had begun calling for the 8-hour day. Hopes for leadership in achieving the 8-hour day led more than 600,000 workers to join the Knights of Labor. The first test of the new campaign came in 1886 in Chicago when over 60,000 workers walked off the job on May 1 to demonstrate for their cause. The city's big businessmen acted predictably—the Knights of Labor did not.

When the walkout began, Chicago's meat packer industrialists immediately called on the friendly police force to crack down hard on the 8-hour day demonstrators. The police complied with swinging nightsticks—turning peaceful parades into free-for-all riots. Outside the McCormick Harvester Works plant a workers' rally was in progress. Suddenly the plant's gates flew open and out charged armed scabs, Pinkerton finks and other assorted thugs who attacked the assembled workers. Chicago police who were on hand fired into the workers, killing 6 and wounding 20. The next night several thousands workers assembled at Haymarket Square to protest this antilabor violence. They were to be addressed by several noted anarchist speakers. It was raining and the crowd was down to about 500 listeners when suddenly there was an explosion. Someone had set off a bomb at the back of the Square. The police immediately opened fire on the assembled workers. Some armed workers returned the fire. Eleven were killed and about 200 wounded in Haymarket Square that night.

Chicago's big industralists wanted the hides of the prolabor anarchists and the police complied by arresting eight anarchist leaders—several who were on the speakers' stand when the bomb was thrown. There was no proof that they were involved with the bombing, but the jury was packed against them and local newspapers screamed daily for a guilty verdict. Five were sentenced to die on the gallows and three received life sentences. Big business followed up immediately with a violent antilabor campaign which cost labor most of the gains it had already won. The Knights of Labor, which had remained passive during these and subsequent attacks on its own members, were repudiated by American workers. Its place was taken by a new organization—the American Federation of Labor—organized in 1886 and led by Samuel Gompers.

The AFL was a return to craft unionism, limiting membership to skilled workers organized in craft unions. But within these limits, it rejected panaceas and future utopias and vowed instead to fight for immediate gains "by negotiation if possible, by direct action if necessary." "We are fighting," announced one of Gomper's aids, "only for immediate objects—objects that can be realized in a few years." A fair day's wage for a fair day's work was the goal. "We don't want pie in the sky," explained an AFL union leader.

Gompers quickly got the AFL on a sound financial footing to assure survival through a long strike or economic depression. AFL officials were full-time professionals—experts at organizing a plant, a strike or a boycott, negotiating a contract or settling disputes. The AFL preferred to win demands through negotiation but did not shun strikes—always keeping in mind that the strike was labor's ultimate weapon.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], in his effort to continue the popular school milk program during the coming and succeeding years at the same full level as in previous years by introducing H.R. 14203.

For years we have been subsidizing a milk program for our children. It is a popular program with parents, children, and farmers. It makes the perfect food available cheaply to our youngsters at the time when their growing bodies need it. At the same time, it helps the farmer by removing or reducing surplus milk.

In 1966, we authorized $103 million to be appropriated for this program. The President's budget asks only $21 million for this program, a cut of $82 million or four-fifths of the 1966 budget.

While we must eliminate every unnecessary item of cost from our budget, we must not do this at the expense of needy children. We must not deprive children from poor homes of their only source of milk. At present, these poor children depend on this program for their milk.

My bill would provide a permanent school milk program for children at the same full level as in previous years. The bill authorizes $110 million to be appropriated for next year; $115 million the following year and $120 million for each year thereafter. The gradual increase in funds takes care of the increasing number of schoolchildren.

This is a good bill and I am hopeful that it will be supported by the Congress.

COMMISSIONER ROBERT BARTLEY ACCEPTS THE SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN GOLD MEDAL IN BEHALF OF THE FAMILY OF THE LATE SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN AT BONHAM, TEXAS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my wife and I were very pleased to be present in Bonham, March 18, when the Speaker Sam Rayburn Gold Medal "for services rendered to the people of the United States" was presented to his two beloved sisters, Mrs. W. A. Thomas and Mrs. S. E. Bartley, in behalf of and in the presence of the members of the distinguished Rayburn family. Also present were faithful former employees, public officials, and many friends of the late Speaker. Attorney Buster Cole of Bonham was master of ceremonies. Rev. William Cheatham gave the invocation. The welcome address was given by City Commissioner Gene Danner. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, who sponsored the legislation, eloquently reviewed the honors paid, recognition given and accomplishments of Speaker Rayburn. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Robert A. Wallace referred to the many virtues of Speaker Rayburn and the benefits derived therefrom by the people of our Nation. The benediction was given by Rev. Jack Carson.

The impressive presentation of the medal was made by Miss Eva Adams, Director of the Mint, at the beautiful and historic Rayburn Library. The medal is only the 11th of its kind authorized by Congress for some one other than a President of the United States. The occasion was a most inspiring, meaningful, and uplifting one. I commend the reading of the remarks of Commissioner Bartley to each of you. Commissioner Bartley ably and accurately described some of the ways by which Speaker Rayburn reached the many sound decisions for which he was and is noted. His statement was particularly significant to my wife and me because of our long association with this highly respected and very remarkable man. I served in Congress with Speaker Rayburn about 19 years and was on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which he had been chairman.

Speaker Rayburn possessed an abundance of great qualities. He was honest, able, and fearless. He was patient, studious, cautious, and courteous. Never was he one to waste words. One of his great qualities was the directness with which he could approach a question or an issue. One reason he could do this no doubt was because of a faculty Commissioner Bartley referred to in his concluding sentence:

> Renowned as a great Speaker, one key to his success is that he was a great listener.

The above-mentioned remarks of Commissioner Bartley follow:

Acceptance Remarks of Robert T. Bartley, Nephew of the Late Sam Rayburn and a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, March 18, 1966

It is my happy privilege to accept this medal on behalf of the family of Sam Rayburn and to serve as the conduit to its permanent home, the Sam Rayburn Library.

I would like to emphasize one point made by Secretary Bob Wallace. You will recall he said: "Here in Bonham, Sam Rayburn continually sought opinions of people in all walks of life to help guide his thought and direct his actions."

Sam Rayburn had his own Gallup poll before anybody ever heard of Gallup. When the word got out that "Mr. Sam will be home this weekend," relatives and friends from all over the Fourth District dropped whatever other plans they had and would drop by and say "hello."

Those of us in Washington fortunate enough to be close to him could sometimes anticipate when he might simply say "Get me a reservation." We could, as he would have said "Feel a trip coming on." No one ever thought—or would have dared to ask "to where?" All knew, that if by train, it was Denison, or if by air, Love Field.

The clues to these sometimes apparent sudden trips had a familiar pattern.

As an important issue began to stir—as more and more leaders in Government or in industry and commerce just had to see Mr. Sam or the Speaker for a few minutes—as these pressures began to build and as the issues began to sharpen and the time for decision grew nearer and if one could catch a fleeting wistful look in his eyes, we would start listening for those welcome words "Get me a reservation."

I say they were welcome words because we knew that when he returned to Washington, he would return with his decision and would be ready, willing, and able to assume the leadership. And when he started to lead, the pressure let up and the people he wanted to see started showing up and things began to move.

What caused this wonderful thing that happened to him—and to the country—on these brief visits to Bonham?

In his words: "Down home they'll give it to you with the bark off." When he'd come back he'd say "My people think this is the right thing to do." He was looking for what they thought was best for our country. By the time he got off the train or plane in Washington, he had his decision. That is the wonderful thing that happened on those visits back home with his folks.

Renowned as a great Speaker, one key to his success is that he was a great listener.

NEED FOR TOTAL MANPOWER UTILIZATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in his manpower report to the Nation on March 8, 1966, President Johnson declared:

> A manpower policy must be based on belief in the value of the individual and in the promise of welcome change.
>
> A manpower policy should lead us to a society in which every person has full opportunity to develop his—or her—earning powers, where no willing worker lacks a job, and where no useful talent lacks an opportunity.

However, the President recognized how much we have failed to implement such a policy when he declared:

> Certain groups in the Nation have not fully shared in the benefits of our unprecedented economic expansion. Nonwhite workers constitute 11 percent of our labor force; 20 percent of our unemployed and nearly 25 percent of our long-term unemployed suffer the double disadvantages of lower educational attainment and lingering discrimination.
>
> The unemployment rate for Negroes was still 7 percent in February. It was down from 9 percent a year earlier and from nearly 13 percent in February 1961. But we cannot be satisfied when 1 out of every 14 Negro workers is without a job.

The need for total manpower utilization in our country is apparent. The waste of manpower which is inherent in racial discrimination in employment should be abhorrent to us all.

While the laws are being written, there are some who are of their own accord and under the free enterprise system rendering a great service to young Negro men and women all over the country. One such person is Richard V. Clarke, president of Richard Clarke Associates, Inc. Starting out with a small employment agency called Hallmark Employment Agency, in my congressional district of Harlem, Mr. Clarke achieved rapid and unusual success in the pilot placement of Negroes. Word of mouth of his efficiency and productivity quickly spread to members of the Nation's business community and he was soon acting as a consultant to most of the largest businesses in New York City, Chicago, Rochester, Atlanta, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles.

This young man has not performed his excellent service out of some do-gooding motivation, but rather has done precisely, what every other businessman in this economy has sought to do—run a good business for profit while still serving his community, his city, and his Nation. I frequently said that we need more Negroes in business. Richard Clarke is an outstanding example of the reasons why. He is an unqualified success and I am proud that as one of my constituents, he has achieved so much in such a remarkably short time.

I call your attention to two articles printed about Mr. Clarke's operation in the New York Times Sunday issue of February 6, 1966, and Advertising Age, February 7, 1966. I also am including a letter from the second vice president of one of the largest banks in America to a prospective client which demonstrates the confidence the business community has in this capable young man:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1966]

Search on for Negro Talent

The drive to recruit qualified Negro candidates for employment in business and industry has led to publication of "Opportunities for the College Grad," by Richard Clarke Associates, Inc., a New York firm specializing in the placement of members of ethnic minorities. The pamphlet contains "help wanted" advertisements by cooperating firms designed to attract qualified Negroes in June's graduating class. Over 90,000 copies have been mailed to students, colleges, and firms.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1966]

Negroes Please Apply

(By Olive Evans)

Last May, when business and industry recruiting of college seniors was at its height, some companies reported a reluctance on the part of Negro students to sign up for job interviews on campus. Albert Barlow, a vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank in New York, told the New York Times: "I don't think we've convinced the students of our sincerity. We may have to overcome their suspicion by reaching them much earlier, in the classroom."

A move to do just that is now underway. Ninety thousand copies of "Opportunities for the College Grad" have been mailed to students, colleges, and business and professional organizations all over the Nation. This brochure is designed to reach the qualified Negro college senior, early in the period of his career decisionmaking.

All of its 13 full-page ads, which will appear only in this publication, in essence bear the same message: "We are interested in considering you for employment." Short articles, in addition to the ads, brief the jobseeker on the practical matters of writing the résumé and letter of application, the technique of the interview, and "How to Use Your College Placement Office."

Through all advice runs the recurrent theme of reassurance that Negro candidates will be considered if they are qualified. Three "Profiles of Success" outline the encouraging case histories of three Negroes who achieved eminence in the career of their choice.

"Opportunities for the College Grad" can lay the groundwork for the recruiter who is coming to the campus and substitute for the one who will not get there. Conceivably the concept might broaden the scope of recruiting for all companies, campuses, and candidates.

[From Advertising Age, Feb. 7, 1966]

Thirteen Advertisers Seek Negro Employees Via Recruiting Brochure

NEW YORK, February 1.—Thirteen national advertisers have bought space in a job recruiting brochure mailed to Negro college seniors by a company specializing in minority group personnel placement.

Richard Clarke, head of Richard Clarke Associates, said the brochure is being distributed to approximately 90,000 Negro students, chiefly in Negro colleges, and is intended to convince them that things are changing and that the companies are sincere in their offers of career opportunities.

The brochure advertisers, who paid $1,500 per black and white page, are Eastern Air Lines, Xerox Corp., Air Reduction Co. (Airco), Hoffmann-LaRoche, Inc., F. W. Woolworth Co., American Oil Co., American Brake Shoe Co., Bristol-Myers, Singer Co., J. C. Penney Co., Celanese Corp. of America, Equitable Life Assurance Society, and IBM. Fifteen pages of the 44-page brochure contain résumé forms to be forwarded to the Clarke office here.

The ads, tailored to reflect the advertisers' interest in nondiscriminatory hiring, carry headlines such as: "If You're Interested in People, Places, and a Prestige Job, Eastern Is Interested in You"; "Do You Speak Our Language?" (Airco); "We've Grown Because We Discriminate (Hoffman-LaRoche). Copy in this ad explains: "We're experts at discriminating between those who perform and those who don't." The Bristol-Myers ad states that "typical openings might be for the college man or woman with a B.S. or Ph. D. in chemical engineering, B.S. or Ph. D. in pharmacology, etc."

In his foreword, Mr. Clarke writes: "Industry is no longer indifferent to the employment of Negroes. In every way they can, many firms are earnestly trying to encourage recent college graduates to apply for positions. If you begin to believe that things are changing and you act on this belief, then you need not be doomed to a lifetime of little in the land of plenty."

Mr. Clarke said the idea for the brochure came to him after he read a survey by the Harvard School of Business Administration that found Negroes do not respond to want ads in white newspapers. He wrote letters to between 1,200 and 1,400 heads of major companies, setting forth his plan and including material to indicate the probable degree of success. He said the response pleased him and added that a number of advertisers indicated they would make use of the brochure next year. "They wanted to see how it would work this year," he said. Mr. Clarke added that he plans to publish the brochure annually.

Since 1964, Mr. Clarke's organization has conducted opportunity center meetings in New York and Chicago where top corporations send recruiters to interview Negroes for management positions. The 1966 session is scheduled for June, on a date to be announced.

FEBRUARY 15, 1966.

DEAR MR. KELLOGG: The booklet to which you refer, "Opportunities for the College Grad," can be obtained from Mr. Richard Clarke, of Richard Clarke Associates, 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Clarke who is well known to the Chase Manhattan Bank, has been a pathfinder in the identification of the college educated Negro. Mr. Clarke has been a leader in convincing industry that there is a vast potential within this group. I am sure that he will agree with me that now that industry is becoming increasingly aware of the great contributions Negroes can make, the continuing job is for us to sell the Negro of our sincerity.

Sincerely,

ALBERT H. BARLOW.
Second Vice President.

THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 proposes to break new ground in various ways to assure better nutrition for our children. A case in point, and one that interests me particularly, is the pilot breakfast program. I believe there is a particular need for this kind of program in many areas—especially in rural areas and low-income urban areas. Children attending rural schools frequently travel long distances by bus or, in mountain areas with few roads, have a long walk. Even if they have had a fairly decent breakfast, it is a long time until lunch.

In downtown low-income residential areas, it is not uncommon for parents to have to leave for work an hour or more before the children go off to school. This means the children pretty much shift for themselves in terms of getting breakfast and more than a few just will not bother.

I think the importance of this type of program was well stated in a recent publication, "Education: An Answer to Poverty," issued jointly by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education. The publication states flatly:

> Hungry children are nonlearning children.

And then goes on to say:

> Scientific studies have shown conclusively that the process of learning virtually ends when a human being becomes uncomfortably hungry. When a child appears at school in the morning having had little or no breakfast, he might just as well have stayed at home. The teacher's effort is wasted. The curriculum, the long hours of professional preparation, the value of textbooks and teaching aids are lost upon him. Similarly, a child without lunch loses most of the value of a school afternoon. A hungry child not only injures himself, but his discomfort may subtly disturb the teaching of a whole class.

That is blunt language but I think few would take exception to it. In our pursuit of excellence in education we have to start with the first essential since time began—good nutrition.

COMMUNITY ANTENNA TELEVISION SYSTEMS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, for several years a dispute has existed between certain of the television broadcasters of the United States and the operators of community antenna television systems, which developed as a means of providing to the public a more satisfactory method of viewing the broadcasters' efforts. Rugged terrain, electrical interference, and long distances from transmitting stations made it necessary for homeowners to invest substantial sums of money in television antenna installations in order to receive broadcast signals, often with less than satisfactory results. Even in our cities, people who live in apartments or in areas where there are many tall buildings, experience difficulty in receiving programs from their local stations.

Community antenna systems by improving and extending reception have provided a substantial service both to the broadcasters and to the public.

In the beginning, broadcasters welcomed the CATV systems, but in recent years they have had second thoughts. The FCC, until last year denied it had jurisdiction over the CATV industry, but has now had second thoughts. Congress has come close to legislation to regulate the CATV industry, but had second thoughts.

The broadcasting and CATV were directed to iron out their differences and bring back a consensus approach to legislation. Committees worked at the task, and reached tentative agreements, but second thoughts again prevailed.

With all the second thoughts about this industry, it is distressing to me that those who have sought most avidly to regulate it have not directed some of their second thoughts to the people who benefit from the service. The public endorsement of CATV in areas it serves must be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering today what I believe to be a reasonable legislative approach to the problem of providing the greatest possible diversity of program material to the American public.

This bill will provide adequate protection for the broadcaster, and the people beyond the present service areas of CATV by requiring the CATV to make the local station available on the cable and not duplicate its programs from another source at the same time. It will provide for an equality of reception not generally available in most of the country, and it will also make it possible to provide services to the public not adaptable to or provided by broadcasting.

By providing for the continued growth and development of both broadcasting and reception services, we will be enriching the lot of the public, and not catering to the economic desires of the industries which have been unable to reach agreement. I believe this to be a true consumer bill which merits the sincere and immediate attention of this body.

For the convenience of those interested in the contents of my bill I have attached the following analysis of the bill:

ANALYSIS OF CATV BILL

This bill contains a concise definition of a community antenna television system (CATV) and confers upon the Commission specifically defined authority to regulate CATV in specified respects.

A

The first section of the bill would amend section 3 of the Communications Act by revising two definitions and adding a new definition. Section 3(h) defines the terms "common carrier" and "carrier." The bill retains the present definition and adds to it the proviso that a community antenna television system is not deemed to be a "common carrier." Section (o) defines "broadcasting." Again the bill retains the present definition and adds to it the proviso that a community antenna television system is not deemed to be engaged in "broadcasting."

Section 3(gg) is new; it defines "community antenna television system." The definition makes it clear that the act is applicable only to a CATV system which receives signals from at least one television broadcast station whose transmitter is located more than 30 miles from the main post office in which the community antenna system is located. In other words, if a CATV (1) only receives television signals from stations located within 30 miles of the system;

or (2) if it only originates its own television programs; or (3) if it only receives or originates audio programs, or any combination of these three elements, no FCC jurisdiction would exist.[1]

The reasons for the exclusions are patent. So far as program origination is concerned, there are only a few instances where CATV systems originate their own programs. Moreover, there is a serious doubt as to whether Congress can constitutionally authorize regulation of a communications medium—i.e. origination of program material—where there is no factual need for regulation based on inherent scarcity of facilities such as exists in the case of radio frequencies. Since there is no evidence of a pressing problem in program origination by CATV systems and since substantial constitutional problems are involved in a system of regulation of program origination by CATV systems, NCTA urges that the matter be left in status quo unless and until it becomes a matter of pressing urgency.

So far as audio programs are concerned, somewhat the same policy considerations obtain. While the same constitutional objection may not be present as in the case of program origination, NCTA is not aware of any problems caused by audio reception on CATV systems. Congress should not be called upon to act in a vacuum. If events at a later date seem to call for remedial action, Congress can at that time fashion an appropriate remedy.

B

Section 2 adds a new section 331 to the Communications Act. It gives the Commission authority to "issue orders, make rules and regulations, and prescribe such conditions or restrictions with respect to the technical characteristics and operation of community antenna television systems to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of the act with due regard to both the establishment and maintenance of broadcast services and the provision for multiple reception services." Under this grant of authority, the Commission can make reasonable rules and regulations regarding technical characteristics of CATV systems so as to make sure that they cause no interference to radio services. The Commission can also make reasonable rules and regulations with respect to reception of signals on CATV systems and the protection to be accorded television stations where these regulations are necessary to the maintenance of broadcast services and do not impair the essential function of CATV systems in providing a multiplicity of reception services.

The grant of authority to the Commission is specifically limited in four respects, as follows:

1. The Commission may not require any CATV system to receive on its system signals of a television broadcast station whose transmitter is located more than 30 miles from the main post office of the community in which the CATV system is located. The CATV system may choose to receive such signals; the Commission cannot compel such conduct.

2. The Commission cannot require a CATV system to receive on its system the signals of a television broadcast station which originates fewer than 10 hours per week of its own programs. This proviso is directed at stations such as translators and satellites which originate fewer than 10 hours per week of their own programs. Such stations are not true media of local self-expression. A channel on a CATV system is a valuable communications medium. It should not be wasted by a Commission requirement that it be used for a translator or satellite which has little or no programing of its own.

3. The Commission cannot compel a CATV system to receive the signals of a television broadcast station which duplicates in whole or in substantial part (i.e., more than 75 percent) the programs of another television broadcast station received by such CATV system. This proviso differs in two respects from the previous one. In the first place, this proviso is directed at a station which originates at least 10 hours per week of its own programs. Hence, the Commission under proviso 2 could require its reception if the station were within 30 miles from the CATV system. Secondly, the CATV would nevertheless be excused from receiving the programs of such a station if it were, in effect, a semisatellite—i.e., one which duplicated in substantial part (i.e., more than 75 percent) the programs of another television broadcast station; i.e., provided that the signals of the parent are actually received by such CATV system. It would obviously be a wastage of facilities to require the CATV system to receive both the parent and semisatellite.

4. The Commission cannot prohibit a CATV system from receiving any signals it desires. This judgment is left to the CATV operator and its subscribers. The Commission, however, in its role of protecting a local television broadcast station (i.e., one whose transmitter is within 30 miles of the main post office of the community in which the CATV system is located) could require that the programs of a distant television broadcast station (i.e., one whose transmitter is more than 30 miles away) may not be received on the CATV system if and when the CATV system is receiving the same program on a simultaneous basis from the local station.

COVERAGE OF MINISTERS—A NEW APPROACH

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McVicker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill which I hope will facilitate and make more equitable the coverage of ministers under social security. As you know, the coverage of ministers is unique—ministers who are really "employees" are covered as "self-employed" and must pay the higher tax which is imposed on that group.

The bill I introduce today would provide that a minister who is an "employee" may be treated as one for coverage and tax purposes. My bill would retain the wholly voluntary nature of the system with the decision as to coverage left to the individual minister and the decision as to whether he will be treated as an employee or as self-employed to be jointly decided by him and the church he serves.

If the church and the minister jointly file a certificate of coverage as an employee, the minister will pay his share of the tax and the church an equal amount for the employer share. A minister earning at the maximum that can be taxed under the old-age, survivors, and disability system—namely $6,600 a year—would pay $254.10 a year as an employee. If this same minister is covered as a self-employed individual, he would have to pay a tax of $382.80 a year. The tax rates for employees and self-employed are the same for the new hospital insurance program medicare. The minister who changes churches reverts to his previous condition as to coverage. If his new church wishes him to be covered as an employee another joint certificate is filed and employee coverage continues.

You will recall that the coverage of ministers in the 1954 amendments as self-employed originated because of congressional concern that to impose a tax on a church on a compulsory basis might constitute a violation of the separation of church and state. The establishment of this fiction—calling an individual self-employed who really is not—is not only unfair to the individual minister, who must pay 1½ times the taxes he would pay as an employee, but it has, in my judgment, inhibited some ministers in electing coverage. The time limit for ministers to elect coverage has been extended by legislation four times by Congress but still some 50,000 and, perhaps as many as 80,000, ministers are not protected by the system.

The recent Advisory Council on Social Security which reported to the Congress last year stated:

> The Council is not now recommending any change in the coverage provisions for ministers. While the Council believes there are better methods of covering ministers, the improvements it has considered tend to be offset by the problems created by a drastic change from a method which has been known and used over a number of years. The Council recommends that the Social Security Administration explore further whether it would be feasible to change to a plan under which ministers employed by churches or other nonprofit organizations would be covered as employees, and to develop methods of minimizing the transitional problems.

I know that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Committee on Ways and Means will examine this bill in the spirit of the Advisory Council report.

MR. WILLIAM C. WELCH

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Henderson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take note of the advancement to a higher position with the Veterans' Administration of our longtime VA congressional liaison director, Mr. William C. Welch. It is my understanding that he has been assigned to the Advisory Council of the Administrator, in which post, I am confident he will serve with the same efficiency and distinction he brought to his work here on the hill.

Bill, as most of us knew him, was uniquely equipped to serve in the capacity of VA congressional liaison man. In the first place, he was himself a combat veteran. That ought always to be a primary requisite for such a job. Second, having served for a number of years as a congressional staff aid before he took his job with the VA, he knew Congress, Congressmen, their staff personnel, and the congressional manner of operation as very few departmental personnel can ever know it.

---

[1] Sec. 3(gg) does not provide for a specific exemption of small-sized CATV systems. The Commission, however, in sec. 331(b) has been given the authority to exempt any CATV system in whole or in part where such action is desirable because of the size or nature of the system so exempted.

In my three terms of congressional service, I have dealt with a great number of so-called liaison officers, but none who did his job as effectively as Bill. Not only did he render effective service to the Members of Congress and their staffs, but also, he rendered a very real service to untold hundreds of deserving veterans and their dependents without once ever compromising the good name or the basic laws and regulations of the Veterans' Administration or the Administrator.

Our loss here on the Hill is the Administrator's gain and I hope that the Administrator will welcome to his Advisory Council this highly qualified young man and will give great weight to his counsel in matters relating to the Congress. I am confident that the Administrator does not have within his organization anyone capable of sounder advice on this subject.

A BILL SEEKING CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT FOR THE GREAT LAKES BASIN COMPACT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Hamilton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to give congressional consent to the Great Lakes Basin Compact.

This legislation proposes that the States of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin be given consent to form a consultative and recommendatory agency to cooperate with the Federal Government in the development, the use, and the conservation of the resources of the Great Lakes.

These States and the Canadian Provinces which border this great body of lakes have been concerned for some time over the welfare and proper development of this basin.

The Great Lakes Commission, established in 1955, has been working to carry out these aims. But the Commission now needs congressional recognition to enable it to do its job with more authority.

The Commission is, I feel, a good example of the progress that States are making in the field of interstate cooperation on problems common to geographic areas or regions. This cooperation already has proved beneficial to the member States, and will be of benefit to the entire country.

For who knows better the problems of the Great Lakes than those States which border them?

WATERSHED PLANNING AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hansen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced House Joint Resolution 1007 with the intent of indicating that Congress does not want a limitation imposed on the number of watershed planning authorizations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, as long authorizations are within the fiscal limitations of the appropriations in Public Law 89–316. This is an area of great concern to me and to the people of the Seventh Iowa District.

One of the characteristics that has made America great is the willingness of its people to cooperate with one another in solving mutual problems and taking advantage of common opportunities.

This quality is nowhere more evident than in the joining of landowners, communities, and governments to safeguard and improve our land and water resources. It is our responsibility in the Congress to make certain that the Federal contribution to these local resource efforts is strong.

I am particularly proud of the intense conservation activity in small watershed projects in my district in Iowa. Thirty-seven local communities there have requested help of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service in meeting conservation and flood prevention needs. Of these, 27 have been approved for planning help; 23 projects are now in operation, and in 3 of them all structural measures have been completed. The projects cover nearly 900,000 acres.

In addition to individual landowners and the conservation districts that they have organized, several other groups are cooperating in sponsoring these projects. In nearly every project the county board of supervisors is a cosponsor. The cities of Audubon, Hamburg, and Council Bluffs are adding their efforts to projects around them. The State highway commission is a sponsor of the Mill-Picayune project. Many other local groups are participating.

The friendly spirit of mutual cooperation by these individuals and groups is making a success of resource improvement in the watersheds in my district. Effective Federal support through the Soil Conservation Service also is a vital factor in that success. To make sure that SCS assistance effectively complements local initiative and support, I urge your consideration as Members of Congress to see that adequate funds for watershed work are provided to SCS. The appropriation levels in the fiscal 1967 budget estimates are not adequate for the job. They would serve only to increase the already sizable backlog in both planning and construction of watershed projects. Delay stifles the local initiative that is so important. I fully support the recommendations of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts that $78.5 million be provided for watershed protection and $10 million for assistance in watershed planning.

I feel that a strong watershed program is fully justified, because impressive achievements in improved land use and flood prevention are alreday making their mark on the communities involved. They are bringing added benefits in restoring natural beauty to the countryside and greatly enlarging outdoor recreation opportunities. Wildlife habitat has improved. Property values have increased because of the resource improvement.

Another benefit that is plainly in evidence is the new level of community pride wherever these projects are being installed.

I am continually impressed by the unselfish efforts and cooperative attitude of all concerned in the watershed program, and urge increased Federal participation in helping them care for our resources.

Last session, Congress appropriated $5,721,000 to help finance the planning of watershed projects under the U.S. Soil Conservation Service program during fiscal year 1966. These funds, to be matched by about $2.7 million from State and local sources, are needed to provide the technical assistance required in drafting plans for construction of watersheds at a future date.

In appropriating these funds, Congress said nothing about limiting the number of new watershed planning authorizations for fiscal year 1966. Instead, it was clearly the intent of Congress that SCS should spend these funds for the continued progress of its watershed planning program.

Nevertheless, despite the lack of any authority from Congress, the Bureau of the Budget has imposed an arbitrary, hard-and-fast limitation on SCS, restricting the number of new watershed planning authorizations in fiscal year 1966 to no more than 100. This limitation appears in the fiscal year 1967 budget under the heading "1966 estimate." In fact, however, this estimate of 100 new planning authorizations is a strict limitation and SCS has been notified of this.

If the planning limitation for fiscal year 1966 is not removed, SCS will be hamstrung in providing planning assistance for worthwhile new watershed projects. According to its latest count, SCS has approved 90 requests for planning authorization during fiscal year 1966. Thus, if the Budget Bureau limitation remains, only 10 more new watershed projects will get planning authorization between now and June 30. Without the Budget Bureau limitation, SCS would approve as many as 30 new planning authorizations before the end of fiscal year 1966.

In short, the Budget Bureau limitation threatens to keep about 20 local watershed projects from receiving planning authorization this fiscal year. If these projects do not obtain planning assistance, some of them probably will never become a reality. This would be grossly unfair to the local people who have spent, on the average, about 2 or 3 years of preliminary planning for their watershed projects.

If we continue to delay work on these watershed projects, local interest will wane and we will be hard pressed to stir up interest at some time in the distant future. At the present time we have a backlog of almost 1,200 watershed projects and about 200 more requests are received each year. If we cut the program to 35 new planning authorizations we will be fighting a losing battle.

Present surveys indicate there are 8,000 small watersheds in need of project type help to solve local problems. How can we possibly solve this whole matter of soil and water conservation if we pinch the wrong pennies.

Moreover, the Budget Bureau also has imposed even more severe project limitations, on the SCS watershed program for fiscal year 1967. These limitations, which also appear in the new budget as "estimates," would restrict SCS to providing only 50 new planning authorizations and approving construction for only 35 new watersheds during fiscal year 1967. If these limitations are not lifted, the scope of the SCS watershed program would be virtually cut in half.

I hope immediate action will be taken by this body.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE FEDERATION OF JEWISH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS OF MARYLAND

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, to serve one's fellow man is a mark of humanity. To organize in order to better serve one's community is evidence of a collective desire to help. It was in that spirit that the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland had its genesis a half century ago.

In 1916, there were many women's organizations in Baltimore, Md., composed of patriotic Americans of the Jewish faith. As a result of the foresight of Mrs. Jacob M. Moses, 29 such groups formed the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations in order to realize the mutual benefits of cooperation and exchange of viewpoints.

The basic concept of this splendid federation is that all forms of local social work are manifestations of the community obligation to care for those within ites group who may require assistance and also to lend its support to other civic and philanthropic causes. The federation's efforts were geared toward the Red Cross, USO, U.S. defense and savings bond drives, Gray Ladies, civil defense, and other worthwhile endeavors.

By the end of the first decade of existence, the federation had grown to 41 member organizations and had firmly established itself as a clearinghouse to which all Jewish women's organizations could come for interchange and focus of ideas.

With the formation of the United Nations, the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland pledged its support of the U.N.'s high purpose. The federation concerned itself with the situations in the strategically important Middle East and the maintenance of the State of Israel.

Cultural pursuits loom large on the federation's agenda. It has instituted the giving of a music award to winners of the professional auditions of the Jewish Community Center in the city of Baltimore. The federation can also take justifiable pride in the important part it played in connection with the restoration of the Lloyd Street Synagogue, the third oldest synagogue in the United States.

Today, the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland is composed of 76 constituent organizations, with a total membership of 38,000 women. The federation is dedicated to the continued awareness of this group of American women, to assist them with their problems, to aid and help others and their communities.

The present officers merit full well our sincere congratulations for guiding the affairs of the federation so successfully. They are: Mrs. Jerome S. Cardin, president; Mrs. Le Roy F. Kappelman, Mrs. Benjamin C. Glass, and Mrs. Bernard Soroka, vice presidents; Mrs. Herbert Goldman, recording secretary; Mrs. Harry Bear, and Mrs. Nathan G. Mannes, corresponding secretaries; and Mrs. Mark L. Seven, treasurer.

In the first 50 years, the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland established an outstanding record of achievement and service to its member organizations, the Jewish community, and to my city, State, and our Nation. The federation looks forward to the challenges of the future with renewed inspiration, increased strength, and dedicated hearts.

I know that my colleagues in the Congress will join me in expressing our felicitation on the occasion of the golden anniversary of the federation and wishing its members continued success in the years ahead.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER], in sponsorship of a joint resolution to designate the second week of May each year as National School Safety Patrol Week.

Certainly, the passage of this joint resolution would promote the cause of traffic safety and give due recognition to the school safety patrol programs and its members who have served in this important work over the past 40 years.

I would like, at the same time, to urge others in this body to join with me in an additional effort to promote traffic safety, not just as it relates to our schools and children but to every citizen of this Nation.

At this time committees in both Houses of the Congress are studying the problem of traffic safety and its many ramifications.

Fortunately for this Nation they are examining possible solutions to the horrible murder by motor in America which snuffs out the lives of 50,000 Americans annually.

These hearings give us a precious opportunity. And we must not let it pass. It is the opportunity for a complete and thorough research of accident causation. It is the opportunity to dissect all the evidence currently available, the opportunity to discover that which is not.

It is the opportunity to correlate that which is known concerning vehicle safety, highway engineering, enforcement regulations, other safety problems and the mystery of the relationship between the driver, the car, and the accident.

To provide this undertaking I have asked the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to establish a Presidential Study Commission. Its task would be to gather all known facts regarding the American driver, to correlate this information into a single analysis and to make recommendations on its findings.

In so doing the Commission would be directed to utilize the vast technical resources available to seek out any missing evidence which might be relevant to that tragic triangle—the driver, the vehicle, and the accident.

The Commission would be further directed to work through every source and with every institution in both the public and private sector.

It would specifically be directed to discover driver-related factors contributing to accidents.

It is not enough that highways be improved. Drivers still run off the road.

It is not enough that cars be equipped with safety features because there are too many unsafe drivers.

It is not enough that drivers are arrested for speeding and other traffic violations when too many drivers are not physically or mentally competent to use our highways.

It is not enough to require a teenager to pass an examination to secure an operator's permit and then never again require a reexamination to determine if he is still competent to operate an automobile, which too often is a missile of death on the road.

We can and do in many instances require operators to bring to standard faulty vehicles with faulty brakes, headlights, and other equipment.

But what we have not done is protect ourselves from drivers who are not up to standard themselves; drivers with faulty vision, faulty reflexes, faulty judgment, and other factors which make them not only unsafe drivers but potential roadway killers.

No, safety improvement of equipment is not enough. We must insure that the 100 million Americans who guide the 90 million vehicles on our roadways today are as safe as we can possibly demand.

We must make a meaningful move toward halting the ugly, horrible, and needless highway slaughter of thousands of Americans.

Sufficient evidence is available today to demand thorough research of driver causation of accidents.

In 1959, Dr. W. David Dunavent, of Memphis, undertook a study of 16,903 accidents. The results disclosed that more than 85 percent were attributable to "driver failure."

Complementing Dr. Dunavent's findings is the statement by Mr. Howard Pyle, president of the National Safety Council, that "vehicle failure and mechanical faults and design imperfections account for fewer than 10 percent of the Nation's accidents."

Without the driver there can be no accident.

This we know. What we do not know is to what extent the driver contributes to the accident and to what extent this contribution can be reduced and/or eliminated.

It would be the task of the Commission which I propose, to make these determinations.

The cost of this undertaking in time, talent, and money would pale in comparison to the returns in protection of life and limb for thousands of American children and adults today and in the future.

I conclude with one final observation. We are daily reminded anew of the carnage on our highways.

We are daily reminded anew of the growing toll in lives being taken on our highways.

We are daily reminded anew so often that this data and these statistics lose impact and fail to register the tragic needlessness of this murder by motor.

But it takes just one careless moment by just one careless or incompetent vehicle operator to translate these cold statistics into living horror—the realization that you or I, our loved ones, our wives and children have been struck down and that tomorrow they will be, themselves, items for the data processors tabulating the ever-mounting number of persons who have been murdered or mutilated needlessly in an automobile accident.

OUR PRESIDENT'S PLEA FOR INDIA

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President sent to the Congress a message which represents the finest qualities in the American people. It was a magnificent speech, eloquent not just in words but, most importantly, eloquent in its appeal to the noblest instincts of the people he leads. I have little doubt that those people, and the men and women who represent them in this National Legislature, will respond with equal magnanimity. In marshaling our unprecedented agricultural resources to rescue a great nation—India—from an almost unimaginable catastrophe, we have an opportunity to employ a national asset which has for too long been treated as a liability. No other nation in the world can rival the United States as an agricultural power, and this is a power more potent and majestic in a hungry world than all the nuclear bombs ever manufactured.

This morning's Washington Post carried an editorial whose sentiments I share. Among other things the editorial stated that the President "has had the courage to recommend this vast program of aid, not because the Indian people some day may be our allies, not because they may help us in Asia, not because they will subsequently reward us with friendship or assistance but simply because the people of India are hungry." Another editorial, in the New York Times, stated:

> His message to Congress—and to the world—calling for aid for India, and pledging a truly generous measure of American assistance, is in the best tradition of Johnsonian philosophy.

With this I also thoroughly agree, and I include at this point in the RECORD the full texts of both editorials:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 31, 1966]

AID FOR INDIA

President Johnson's congressional message on aid to India is a great and gratifying document. It is a great document because it asks Congress forcefully and directly to underwrite the rescue of the Indian people from the threat of starvation—at any cost. It projects the direct appropriation of 3½ million tons of wheat—in addition to 6.5 million tons already scheduled for 1966 shipment. And it calls for shipment of 200,000 tons of corn and up to 150 million pounds of vegetable oils and up to 125 million pounds of milk powder. It proposes besides the shipment of quantities of cotton and tobacco that may permit the diversion of more Indian cropland to food products. But more than this, it bluntly states that if others do not meet the remaining requirements, the United States will.

The President has dared to present the problem to Congress, it is gratifying to note, as a challenge to this country's humanity. He did not claim that the United States will derive any promised or unpromised quid pro quo. He did not assert that feeding the Indians will help contain or isolate Communist China. He did not allege that it will help balance or frustrate the Soviet Union. He has not asked the Congress to support the program for any of these reasons or for any other national or selfish reason. He has rightly assumed that the Congress of the United States and the people of this country will support action on this magnificent scale on a purely humanitarian basis.

He has had the courage to recommend this vast program of aid, not because the Indian people someday may be our allies, not because they may help us in Asia, not because they will subsequently reward us with friendship or assistance, but simply because the people of India are hungry. And that is the only attribute, the only necessity, the only condition we ought to require as a qualification for aid from the granaries and storehouses of America.

This program is being undertaken in the spirit of the great efforts of this country to feed the hungry of many nations after World War I and World War II. It is in a great American tradition. The President will not urge in vain "the strong and warmhearted and generous support of this program by the American people." He will not be disappointed in the response to an appeal to the hearts of the citizens of this country.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 31, 1966]

AID FOR INDIA

Lyndon Johnson is at his best when challenged by some staggering task of human needs. His message to Congress—and to the world—calling for aid for India, and pledging a truly generous measure of American assistance, is in the best tradition of Johnsonian philosophy. It is in no sense a detraction from his gesture to add that it is good, sound American policy to help India.

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, now in New York after her visit to Washington, obviously played a vital role in the timing and scope of the American response to India's need. The meeting in Washington was a moment of international drama. This was not just because Mrs. Gandhi is a charming woman bearing the legendary name of Jawaharlal Nehru, her father, or because Mr. Johnson was at his most ingratiating best. It was because of what each of the main figures represented. India, with 500 million people, is the second most populous nation in the world and a bulwark of democracy in threatened Asia. The United States is the most prosperous and most powerful nation on earth and is engaged in a bitter war on that same Asian mainland.

But India, as Mr. Johnson said in his message, "may stand at this moment on the threshold of a great tragedy." Two years of drought imposed on a badly conceived and managed agricultural program, with the population increasing at the rate of 11 or 12 million persons a year, add up to potential disaster on a colossal scale.

President Johnson's message tells the whole tragic story, and it should be pondered as carefully in India as in the United States. Much of India's land is fertile. With better agricultural techniques India could eventually feed herself.

Droughts are unavoidable, but the human factor is more to blame—ancient, rigid ways; caste restrictions; overly small or overly large land holdings; the selfishness of well-fed states refusing to help starving neighbors; hoarders; speculators, usurers.

The great virtues of the Indian people somehow become constricted by customs, traditions, and history in times like this. Those virtues must and can be released—and India has already done a great deal in the years of independence. Much more may now be done, thanks to the imaginative, intelligent, and generous program President Johnson announced for an Indo-American Foundation which will use $300 million in tied-up rupees for education and scientific research in India. In the long range, such a program can do wonders; but in the meantime Indians must be fed.

> An undernourished nation has no future. Neither has an unskilled one in this technological age. President Johnson is wisely moving to provide the foodstuffs and the training. Indians must do the rest.

Mr. Speaker, not many days ago this Congress approved a supplemental military appropriation bill for more than $13 billion. For less than one-tenth that amount we have an opportunity now to fight a war with weapons, as Senator McGOVERN has said, that are "corn instead of cannons, with farmers instead of marines, with tractors instead of tanks, with nitrogen used in fertilizers instead of explosives, with technology instead of battle plans, with food instead of fear and with development instead of destruction." It is a war which will cost no lives, but only save them; one which will destroy no villages, but rather preserve them; a battle of love rather than hate, and a battle in which the foe is not one's fellow man, but instead his common enemy which is human misery. Many of us have questioned the wisdom and morality of another war now being fought, but this is one whose justification is beyond doubt. Now all who have protested that other war have an opportunity to prove they can be as generous on behalf of policy representing the best in our national ideal, as they can be vigorous in opposing policy they believe transgresses that ideal. For my own part I pledge to our President and my colleagues and my constituents my total support.

In a previous decade, Mr. Speaker, the American Government and its people responded to the plight of a beleaguered city and for a total cost of $266 million we furnished Berlin over a long year's period of time with approximately 1¾ million short tons of coal, food, and other supplies. Yet this relatively inexpensive venture represents one of the most brilliant and proudest chapters in the history of American foreign policy. Now in this decade we behold the blight of a whole nation, whose existence is also menaced by lack of food. If our task is on a grander scale, so much greater will shine its grandeur.

Yet in the final analysis our actions must not be prompted by dreams of glory or gain, though these are surely to be had. Our actions must spring, rather, from that reservoir of goodness which is in man and which will not allow one nation to avert its sight from the brutal suffering of another, such as India, nor permit it to turn, as the President has said, "in indifference from her bitter need."

An American philosopher, Irwin Edman, has written:

> Not what the citizens of a commonwealth do when they are obliged to do something by necessity, but what they do when they can do anything by choice is the criterion of a people's life.

In India we have an opportunity to demonstrate that one measure of our people's life is the will to do right.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I missed a quorum call on the floor. I would like to state that at the time of the quorum call I was signing up for the new medicare program. As you know, the present deadline date to sign up for this program is at midnight tonight.

As you know, I originally sponsored this type of legislation some 20 years ago to provide for a national health insurance program, and this also played a large part in my defeat for reelection to the U.S. Senate in 1950.

More than 80 percent of the Nation's senior citizens are reported to have signed for the new medicare benefits. I have introduced legislation to extend the filing deadline to June 30, 1966, to enable the remaining 20 percent to learn about the benefits and file the necessary application.

Medicare is the cheapest possible insurance for any person 65 or over, and we cannot find a better program anywhere in the world.

THE NEED FOR TIRE SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that would require the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe regulations establishing minimum safety and performance standards and a system of grading and labeling for motor vehicle tires, with the objective of providing safe tires for the motoring public.

With the steady progress in the completion of the Interstate Highway System and State construction of other highways permitting sustained high speed, the conditions under which the modern tire is used are making it daily a far more critical component of a vehicle than it formerly was. Developments in vehicles also have contributed to the increased performance demands on tires. The technology of the tire industry has made strides toward meeting these demands. An undetermined portion, however, of tires available to the public may not only fail to meet these rigorous demands but may also pose a positive danger under far less stringent conditions than high-speed travel on the highways.

The National Safety Council estimated in 1964 that 4 percent of all accidents on turnpikes have been due to tire failure, or that tire conditions have been a contributing factor in the cause of accidents. Reviewing some other statistics, the New York Thruway ranks tire failure as a major cause of auto accidents. Officials of the Indiana and Pennsylvania Turnpikes say that tire failure ranks second to driver fatigue as an accident cause. Ohio claims that 10 percent of its turnpike accidents are due to defective tires and New Jersey attributes 9 percent to this cause.

The tire market today is characterized by confusion and deception, created by excessive variation in manufacturing which produces a lack of tire uniformity. Approximately 950 different tire names currently marketed represent the products of approximately 120 private label marketers and 14 tire manufacturers. Virtually every tire manufacturer produces and markets many lines of tires, each with differing construction standards and performance characteristics. The typical manufacturer's firstline tire conforms to the specifications of automobile manufacturers for tires supplied to them as original equipment on new automobiles. The typical tire manufacturer also sells his designated firstline tire in the replacement market, but in addition, produces a number of other lines for the replacement market. He markets one or more lines of premium tires whose standards and performance characteristics exceed those of his firstline tire. He also manufactures a second line, third line, fourth line and even a fifth line of tires whose construction standards and performance characteristics are less than for his firstline subject. In other words, the situation that the consumer is confronted with is one where tires may be designated as to quality regardless of the tire's inherent quality or safety; where the price of the tire has no discernible relation to its quality or safety level; and where many of the descriptive terms employed, such as ply rating, 100 level and other grade designations, have no real meaning or definitive value in the absence of uniform standards.

I would like to state here that Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, has performed a great public service by exposing the deception used by the tire industry and is to be commended for his unceasing efforts to obtain strong tire-safety legislation.

The problems of tire selection by the average motorist has become more complex as vehicle operating speeds have increased. The intervals of time between tire purchases has decreased due to an accelerated use of vehicles during recent years. The average motorist is in a quandary when tire purchase time is at hand. Confronted by a large baffling selection from which to choose and the deceptive price advertising and other abuses in the marketing of automobile tires, the buyer usually accepts what is offered by the salesman. The tire manufacturers as a group, however, issue little or no information with respect to construction standards or performance characteristics of tires to the independent retail dealers, a pattern, I might add parenthetically, which contrasts sharply with the practice of European tire manufacturers, where disclosure of the performance characteristics and proper use of each line of tire is the rule rather than the exception.

Thus, the tire market is one identified by confusion due to a lack of basic standards that can be easily understood and relied upon by the average car owner. Despite the uncooperative attitude displayed by the tire manufacturers, there are, however, certain questions the consumer is entitled to have answered with regard to just what he is getting when he buys a tire for his car. He needs to know—

The strength of the body of the tire.

The number of miles of service the tire tread will deliver in line with a predetermined standard.

The antiskid qualities of the tire in line with a predetermined standard.

The limitations, if any, on the maximum speed the tire will sustain.

The maximum load the tire will carry at a particular inflation pressure.

If the consumer can be given figures, he will certainly be in a much better position to decide for himself just what kind of a tire he needs. I cannot overemphasize the point that, at present, the motorist cannot make a judgment for the simple reason that he is given practically no figures on which to make a decision.

It is time for the tire manufacturers to abandon their the-public-be-damned attitude. The need for tire standards is becoming critical in view of the industry's practices in advertising, pricing, tire dimension differences, grading and the multitude of designs and claims offered to the motoring public. For this reason, tire manufacturers should be required to clearly and specifically label all tires as to grade and quality, and the terminology used should be the same and mean the same for all tires so as to afford the purchaser a guide in making a selection and to assure him of the quality of the tire.

POSTAL PAY INCREASE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, as several of my colleagues on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service have also done, I have today introduced a postal pay bill which will automatically raise all postal employees in the first four levels of pay to the level immediately above that which they now occupy.

In my opinion this is the only way to cut the Gordian knot of ersatz comparability which binds these hard working and greatly deserving people to an inadequate wage scale.

When Congress passed the Pay Reform Act of 1962 its intentions were honorable and praiseworthy. This body was confident that it had hit upon the means of providing postal and Federal employees true and living comparability with the wages of their oppposite numbers in private industry.

As we all know now, we underestimated the power of the executive branch to pervert and transform a generous proposal into a program of suppression.

In putting the principle of comparability to work, the executive branch first refused to take into consideration the years of inequity which had existed before passage of the Pay Reform Act. During the 1950's there were 8 lean years in which the postal and Federal employees received no pay raise at all and, as a result, their wages fell far behind those in private industry. The recommendations which the executive branch made for the activation of the pay reform bill paid no heed whatsoever to this situation. And we in Congress have been able to do nothing to correct this oversight.

Furthermore, the principle of comparability was established on a completely false basis. The wrong comparisons were made. For example, an artificial and arbitrary connecting point—or linkage—was made between level 4 of the postal field schedule—in which all letter carriers and postal clerks are bunched—and GS-5 in the other Federal agencies. GS-5 is a grade occupied mostly by relatively junior typists and office clerks—surely there is no comparison between these positions and the positions of letter carriers and postal clerks. Furthermore, most people who are in GS-5 are merely tarrying there on their way to better things. Because of the limited opportunities for promotion in the postal service, 95 percent of all letter carriers and clerks must remain in level 4 for the rest of their active careers. This is the level of pay at which they must feed and clothe and house their families, educate their children, care for their sick, bury their dead.

To make matters worse, the Bureau of the Budget has used the principle of comparability purely for its own purposes, changing the rules of application as it sees fit. Whenever they have come to the conclusion that any semblance of comparability would cost more money than they wanted to spend, they threw the principle away. They have also changed the ground rules whenever they felt that fair and equitable treatment of postal employees would be more expensive than they desire. Just this year, for instance, they threw into their computations a leavening of nonmetropolitan area wage levels in order to dilute the samplings and keep the so-called comparability factors low.

Comparability, unfortunately, has been considered somewhat as a sacred cow in the Congress. We passed the law in 1962 and we thought it would work. We have been inclined to avoid looking at the principle critically because it would be so much more convenient all around if it did work. But, under the present ground rules, it will not work. Postal employees will never get simple justice from their Government as long as the executive branch uses comparability as a blunt instrument to bludgeon them into economic disadvantage.

By raising all the employees in the first four levels of the postal field schedule one level we shall make a fresh start at granting justice to postal employees. We shall eliminate the mean little and the disastrous big inequities that have been written into the comparability code as it is practiced. We shall improve the postal service demonstrably by improving the morale of those who work in it—by attracting more able recruits and by enabling the Department to retain its more able employees.

This is a matter of justice, Mr. Speaker, and I think we should take action on it as swiftly as possible.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Task Force on International Educational of the House Committee on Education and Labor heard four distinguished witnesses testify today in support of H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966.

Today's witnesses were the Honorable David E. Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development; the Honorable Charles Frankel, Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State; the Honorable Leonard H. Marks, Director of the U.S. Information Agency; and the Honorable Warren W. Wiggins, Acting Director of the Peace Corps.

Under permission granted, I will insert the prepared statements of these witnesses following my remarks.

I should also like to note, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow, April 1, 1966, our task force will hear testimony on this legislation from some of the best known experts in the United States on matters affecting international education. The witnesses scheduled for tomorrow's hearings are as follows:

Robert McClory, Member of Congress, Republican, of Illinois.

Stephen K. Bailey, dean, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.

Willard W. Cochrane, dean of international programs, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Kenneth Holland, president, Institute of International Education, New York, N.Y.

Howard P. Jones, chancellor, East-West Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii.

The prepared statements of today's witnesses follow:

Statement by David E. Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development, on the International Education Act of 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to appear before you in support of H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452, the proposed International Education Act of 1966.

This bill will authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants, first, to establish graduate centers for advanced international training and research; second, to strengthen undergraduate instruction in international studies; and third, to expand language and area studies.

We in AID strongly endorse these proposals as vital steps to support the participation of our Nation in the modern world. Every element of our national life—business, transport, agriculture, education, health, communications—is becoming increasingly international in character. If we are to act intelligently and constructively in international affairs, from the smallest transactions of business or travel to the gravest matters of world peace, we must understand better the people of the world outside our borders and the ways to solve our common problems.

This bill is necessary, therefore, in our own deepest national interest, to increase the competence with which we in the United States can participate in international life.

There is another reason why we in AID support this legislation. American educational institutions are making major contributions to the foreign assistance program. We look upon them as a major resource, capable of supplying professional personnel both by direct hire and contract to man overseas programs and projects, as a source for the conduct of research, as advisers on policy, and as a training ground for foreign participants and visitors.

The authority to be granted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish centers for advanced international studies should serve to strengthen U.S. capacity to provide training for foreign students and scholars at the same time that it serves the primary purpose of making an important additional contribution to American education. The grants to be made to educational institutions should add to their capacities to conduct necessary research in the foreign field and should improve their abilities to provide useful and significant training for U.S. citizens in the field of foreign affairs.

The Department of State, USIA, AID, and other departments and agencies of the Government engaged in overseas activities will be able to draw upon the U.S. university resources. Outside of Government, voluntary relief and social service agencies depend heavily for success in their missions on an understanding of foreign cultural, economic, and political behavior.

In the future, therefore, AID, and other agencies, public and private, that conduct overseas activities, would indirectly benefit from the expanded international competence this bill will encourage in American universities. We will, however, expect to continue to finance directly with AID funds the services we will use in the foreign aid program. Thus when we seek university support for an overseas technical assistance project, we will continue to finance it through an AID contract—as, to take one illustration only, we are doing through a contract with the University of Illinois Medical School to help improve the Medical School at Chengmai, Thailand. Moreover, we expect to finance with AID funds research activities intended to yield knowledge that will speed up the development process in the low income countries. Finally, we are asking in the new foreign assistance legislation, now before the Foreign Affairs Committee, for clearer authority to finance enlarged training activities in American universities where the persons trained are expected to be needed in future foreign assistance work.

Thus we are attempting to maintain a clear and sensible distinction between activities in the foreign aid field, authorized and financed under the Foreign Assistance Act, and activities designed to enlarge and strengthen U.S. training and research facilities in international fields—not for foreign aid purposes, but to permit our country to fulfill better its normal and continuing role as a member of the world community of nations.

In view of the rapidly increasing complexity and urgency of U.S. involvement in international affairs, I regard passage of the proposed International Education Act as a matter of the greatest importance, and I strongly recommend it to this committee.

Statement of the Honorable Charles Frankel, Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of State, Before the Task Force on International Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, March 31, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for the privilege of appearing before you in behalf of the proposed International Education Act of 1966. I believe that this proposed legislation can open an important new chapter in the history of American education, and in the history of our country's relations with other nations. Not only as a member of this administration, but as one who has spent most of his life in education, and simply as a citizen, I feel particularly honored to appear before this group in connection with your consideration of this significant proposal.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has already appeared before you to discuss the International Education Act of 1966, which places special responsibilities on his Department. In my remarks I propose to focus upon the significance of this bill as it affects the Department of State and the international relations of this country. From this point of view, this proposed legislation is important for at least three reasons.

First, it offers a better chance to American citizens to acquire the education they need to cope with the facts of international life.

Second, it strengthens the American capacity for foreign affairs.

Third, it takes steps that are essential if this country, in conjunction with other countries, is to move ahead purposefully in a great effort to bring the people of the world closer together in mutual tolerance and understanding.

With your permission, I should like to say something about each of these purposes. Let me begin by addressing myself to the contribution of this proposed program to the education of Americans.

It is now a truism to which I believe everyone gives assent that the United States lives in an international environment, and that the future of our own country is intimately linked to the destinies of other nations thousands of miles away. But the full significance of this truism is often hidden, perhaps precisely because we find it so easy to agree with it.

The fact is that the international environment of the United States does not begin at the oceans edge. This international environment penetrates almost every corner of our society. It is revealed in the news we hear, the coffee we drink, the movies we see, the political decisions we debate. Indeed, we hear so much about the rest of the world that it is very easy to imagine that we know what we need to know. But this, of course, is not true. We do not know what we need to know until we can go behind the noises we hear and the signals of other peoples' existence that we receive, and get some comprehension of what really causes those noises and what those signals really mean. An education, to be valid, must give the individual the information he needs to cope with important facts in his environment.

Today, for the ordinary American including the American who never goes overseas, education must provide a capacity to deal with the facts of the international environment. An education without an international dimension is an inadequate education for Americans in this century. One of the significant points about the legislation you are considering, I venture to suggest, is that it takes account of this consideration. It adds a new dimension to the Federal Government's interest in education.

This brings me to the second reason why I hope that you will give this proposed legislation favorable consideration. In strengthening the education of Americans at home, it also strengthens the American capacity for foreign affairs. To work effectively in ventures beyond our borders, we need more people with specialized skills. But in addition to their competence as doctors, teachers, agronomists or economists, such people must also have special knowledge of the societies in which they are going to apply their skills.

They need to have a special sensitivity and sympathy—a special eye and a special ear—for the differences in outlook and feeling that mark the people with whom they must work. Such special knowledge and sensitivity are not easy to come by. A difficult educational effort is required to produce them. A nation like our own, which wishes to work collaboratively and in a spirit of equality with other nations, must take deliberate steps to insure that such an educational effort is strong and continuing. That is one of the purposes, as I understand it, of the International Educational Act of 1966.

Moreover, as I have partly suggested already, we need not only more specialists who combine technical skills and international sophistication, but we also need a citizenry that has received, as part of its general education, an exposure to the complex facts of the international scene. In the long run, as the President has observed, a nation's foreign policy can progress no faster than the curriculums of its classrooms. American schools and colleges have done much in recent years to improve the study and teaching of international affairs. But much more still needs to be done if we wish to insure, for the decades ahead, that the citizens of this country have the awareness and the resilience to generate and support enlightened policies, and to pursue long-range policies with the understanding, patience and resolution such policies require.

I come now to the third reason for suggesting that the legislation you are considering is of importance to the United States in its foreign relations. It is that education has moved front and center in this Nation's affairs and in every nation's, and that close cooperation between the educational systems of different countries is one major instrument for building the structure of peace in diversity which has been the goal of this administration and those before it.

Today, for the first time since the invention of writing 5,000 years ago, more than half of mankind is literate. Nevertheless, in an era in which the ability to read and write is increasingly necessary to an individual's or a society's well-being, 4 out of 10 of the world's population are illiterate.

Today, the desire for education has become almost universal, and in all countries a larger number of people than ever before have a chance to realize this desire. Nevertheless, equality of educational opportunity remains, in most parts of the world, only a distant ideal.

Today, ideas, techniques, information, and works of art travel between the men of different countries with unprecedented speed. This process has created new possibilities for cooperation and mutual understanding among the nations. But it has also created new sources of tension and misunderstanding. Over the long run, the educational systems of the nations have as much power as any other human agency to promote understanding any sympathy at their roots.

The legislation that is before you today proposes that we in this country set about to prepare ourselves to do our part with regard to this situation. It proposes that we make ourselves ready to join with others in finding, in the words of William James which the President quoted in his message, "a moral equivalent of war." The hope behind it is that if the teachers and students of different countries can be brought together, working purposefully on common projects, they can educate each other. Given time, they can reduce the influence, it may be hoped, of such ancient human emotions as hostility toward the stranger. That is what our schools have done at home. To be sure, they have not wholly succeeded. Provincialism and fear of the outsider are perhaps inevitable facts of human nature. But the skeptic who doubts what education can do to reduce the influence of such attitudes should study the record of what American schools have done to promote habits of mutual respect and forbearance between different kinds and groups of people. The vision that lies behind the legislation you are considering is that this is possible on the international scene.

Yet while this is the vision behind the program, the proposals before you are, I believe, measured and modest. There are certain things which these proposals do not contemplate. They do not suggest that it is America's duty to educate the world. They do not commit the American taxpayer to underwriting the goal of universal education everywhere in the world. They do not propose to accomplish miracles in a year—or ever. They are addressed, in all humility, to meeting certain specific needs in our country so that we will be better able to work with others to advance education, and particularly the process of mutual international education. They look ahead to a shared adventure with other nations in which, together, we work to produce school systems that will release children from the awful handicap of ignorance, and bring them up to look on people in other nations with understanding and respect. And this hope is joined to a sober recognition that education needs time to achieve its goals.

In sum, from the standpoint of foreign policy, I endorse this proposed legislation because it lays the foundation for an international effort that gives proper attention to the crucial role that education can play in realizing the promise of our time and offsetting its perils. The legislation you are considering gives expression to the proposition that education is a major and enduring activity of this Nation, and that educational cooperation with other nations constitutes an abiding national interest. It projects to the forefront of our national policy the conviction that the advancement of education, at home and abroad, is properly a national objective of the United States, and it offers a program that is not a crash program for an emergency but a deliberate effort to seek such long-range goals.

Not lease, it recognizes the crucial truth that American educational activity at home and American educational activity abroad comprise a single interrelated whole. They are not separate. Each grows more effective as it is reinforced by the other. This program is offered not as a one-sided American venture but as a sign of our desire to work cooperatively with others. Its object is to strengthen American education so that we can assist other countries in strengthening theirs, and so that, in this process, our education will be strengthened too. In the words of the President, "The knowledge of our citizens is a treasure which grows only when it is shared." A truly international educational endeavor cannot be the work of one country. The passage of the International Education Act of 1966 would indicate that this country is prepared to make a contribution to an international enterprise in which other nations are invited to join.

Finally, it may be of interest to you if I say just a few words about the relationship of the International Education Act of 1966 to the programs in Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange which are conducted by the Department of State. The programs envisaged in the act before you do not in any way duplicate the activities of the Department of State, but rather support and complement them. The search for people of high quality to take part in our programs takes much of our time and effort. I would hope and expect that the initiation of programs such as those contemplated in the International Education Act would make it easier to find the people we need. Moreover, the programs in the Department of State have been aimed, in the main, at individuals apart from their institutional affiliations, and have been conceived as part of our effort in other countries. The International Education Act of 1966 will focus on institutions, and on the needs of American education at home. Accordingly, from the point of view of the Department of State, the passage of the International Education Act will not obstruct or overlap our efforts. On the contrary, it will greatly aid these efforts.

I should be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Statement of Leonard H. Marks, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Before Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, March 31, 1966

I am glad to testify on behalf of H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452, the bill for the International Education Act of 1966.

Although as this task force knows, the U.S. Information Agency is concerned with programs overseas, not within the United States, this bill has significant implications for us. In our task of projecting the United States abroad—its policies, society, culture, and institutions—our most valuable resource is human talent. The men and women who represent USIA abroad must combine professional expertise in communications with a sound knowledge of both the United States and the countries in which they serve. Language skills and area knowledge are essential tools for them.

Thus from the point of view of strengthening our overseas * * * this bill can make a significant contribution. As American institutions of higher education improve their curriculums in international affairs and foreign languages, the young men and women who join the Agency's foreign service as junior officers will come to us better prepared in these fields. Equally important, the graduate centers of international studies envisaged in the bill will be excellent grounds for advanced training for our cultural officers and public affairs officers during their careers. My aim is that the Agency shall develop, more than has been possible so far, strong corps of experts in all areas of the world; to do so, the Agency must rely heavily upon the resources of American education.

I recognize that these hearings are limited to the proposed International Education Act of 1966. Since the committee is also concerned with the broader aspects of the President's message on international education, however, I should like to state briefly my support for these new initiatives and my agency's readiness to contribute to their execution. We are working closely with Assistant Secretary of State Charles Frankel in making necessary plans, and have supported the appointment of education officers in key embassies abroad to give new impetus to the U.S. effort in international education. These education officers will not supplant the work of USIA personnel abroad, and indeed I foresee heavier responsibilities for my agencies as a result of the President's initiative. I refer not only to programs that USIA now administers and will continue to direct—such as book publication, English teaching, and support to the local educational and cultural institutions known as Binational Centers—but also to the programs of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State for which USIS posts are responsible overseas.

The expanded training that I mentioned above will help us equip agency officers to carry out these responsibilities at a higher level of excellence, and thus contribute significantly to the President's program.

Statement of Warren W. Wiggins, Acting Director of the Peace Corps, Before the Task Force on International Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, March 31, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the task force, it is a pleasure to testify on behalf of the bill incorporating part of the President's new program for international education.

The Peace Corps itself is a venture in international education. About half of the 11,000 volunteers now serving overseas are engaged in classroom teaching. The other half are teaching too—by example and by action in their communities overseas. Just as they are all learning about other peoples, other countries, other continents, other cultures, millions of people around the world are learning from them about Americans and about America. And as volunteers return to this country, millions of Americans are learning more about the world.

From the beginning, Congress has placed great emphasis on this educational aspect of the Peace Corps. Two of the three purposes stated in the Peace Corps Act have to do with mutual education and international understanding.

And from the beginning, the Peace Corps has seen the importance of preparing the volunteers for this venture in education, not only in training before they begin their actual service but throughout their overseas service.

For this training and educational support, both in this country and overseas, we have turned primarily to American institutions of higher education. They have responded generously, often on short notice and under great difficulties. We are remedying the short notice because most of our programs are now continuing ones. But many of the difficulties remain. They arise primarily from the fact that few of our colleges or universities have sufficient experience or strength in the areas for which our volunteers need training. Particularly at the beginning, many of the languages the volunteers needed to learn had not been taught in this country before; there were no texts, no tapes, no teachers. There were no experts for may of the areas to which they were going, and for many of the fields of work they were to undertake.

Faced with the need to train 20,000 Peace Corps volunteers and to assist in their support overseas, and faced with other important needs for overseas expertise, American higher education has been extending itself and gaining in overseas experience and understanding. But much more must be done. And the President's program will enable it to be done.

Through this bill, colleges and universities will be able to expand their international studies and research on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. They will be able to strengthen their faculties, both with American teachers who have acquired first-hand experience and with teachers from other countries. They will be able to give their students first-rate courses and first-hand experience overseas. They will develop true centers of strength and excellence in international studies—centers with which the Peace Corps can work to improve further the training and overseas educational support of volunteers.

The strengthening of undergraduate programs in international studies should greatly increase the number of applicants for Peace Corps service who have demonstrated interest and ability in international education and who already have special skills. And the centers for advanced international studies can provide returned volunteers with an avenue through which their interests, ability and experience in international education can be effectively used.

In the first report to President Kennedy on the Peace Corps, 5 years ago, Sargent Shriver wrote: "It is time for American universities to become truly world universities. They need to expand their horizon—their research and curriculum—to the whole world. The Peace Corps will help with this transformation."

The Peace Corps has helped. College and universities, faculties and student bodies, are helping themselves. And this bill will make possible even greater progress in this transformation.

That is what the Peace Corps needs. That is what the Nation needs.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, to publish continuously for 20 years is a remarkable feat in and of itself. The Ukrainian Quarterly, which for many years has enjoyed the reputation of being an authoritative journal of east European and Asian affairs, has this further accomplishment to its credit.

For the past two decades, it has provided American and foreign readers analyses of developments and events in eastern Europe and Asia which are in many ways unique and novel. Its articles on U.S. foreign policy issues have developed dimensions of thought and perspective that are not readily found in any other American publication.

With good reason, many of the subscribers to this journal are official agencies and groups in the Red Empire. For years they have followed carefully the periodical's studies of the captive nations problem, and Moscow especially has attacked the journal persistently for disclosing facts and developing interpretations which it regards as harmful to its imperiocolonialist domination over numerous captive non-Russian nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union.

It can be truthfully maintained that no periodical in this country contains as much information and critical analysis about the captive nations in general, and the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. in particular, as does the Ukrainian Quarterly. Adding to its uniqueness, the journal consistently deals with U.S. foreign policy issues from viewpoints that have scarcely been developed or even understood by other American literary media. For example, its viewpoints concerning a sound liberation policy, the totalistic captive nations concept, Red economic strategy, Sino-Soviet imperiocolonialism, the historical Russian problem, a free world poltrade policy, American myths about the U.S.S.R. and Russia, and numerous other subjects, are virtually pioneering in contemporary American thought.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues, who have profited over the years from reading this journal, when I congratulate the Ukrainian Quarterly upon its 20th anniversary, and offer my felicitations and wishes for many more decades of productive public service and enlightenment. A perceptive insight into the highly constructive character of the journal can be gained by reading the anniversary article on "In the Mainstream of Basic Issues," written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, and published in the index of the journal's spring issue. I insert this illuminating article as part of my remarks in the RECORD.

IN THE MAINSTREAM OF BASIC ISSUES

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Within the span of a short article it isn't easy to recount all the rich and varied experiences connected with a publication in existence over 20 years. Those who are at all familiar with the tasks, burdens, and costs of regularly publishing a periodical cannot but regard this very duration of the Ukrainian Quarterly with considerable esteem and perhaps some amazement. On the American literary stage periodicals of scholarly and yet popularly written content come and go, each well attesting to the difficulties surrounding the nature of the enterprise itself. Many a college or university cannot even afford a publication of this type. It is therefore no mean feat to have been able to maintain the quarterly for over two decades, and the prospects of its expanded circulation, particularly in areas of influential thought and action, are far brighter now than they were after the first decade of its existence.

My association with this journal of East European and Asian affairs commenced back in 1946, when I was serving on the faculty of New York University. The cumulative experience of these years leads me to ascribe the following reasons to this real, successful achievement of the journal. First, the dedication to the journal as shown by its originator and first editor, Dr. Nicholas D. Chubaty, and by its subsequent editor, Dr. Walter Dushnyck, has been basic to the sterling performance and high standards of the publication. Editorial direction of this spirited and dedicated kind is the very soul of any publication, infusing it with activist purpose, balanced accomplishment, and perpetual momentum.

The second dominant reason for this genuine achievement has been the steady growth of subscribers and readers, both here and abroad. The sustained interest of the readers has been a veritable source of inspiration and encouragement for successive improvements in the journal itself. From the very beginning a determination was made to produce a scholarly and objective journal with an intellectually activist orientation. Too many scholarly publications tend to accumulate dust because of their lack of this orientation. In so many instances over the years our readers have let it be known that they disagreed with the data and ideas of the article and editorial but were nevertheless moved by the spirit of translating the overriding theme into concrete, constructive action. This, in short, is what is meant by intellectual activism.

Another impressive reason for the progress made is the editorial advisory board. This body consists of distinguished scholars who occupy professorial positions at universities and colleges on almost every continent of the world. They have substantially contributed with their articles and advice to the stable growth of the publication. Their association with the journal has been of inestimable value.

A VALUABLE MEDIUM IN THE STRUGGLE

In addition, the Quarterly has become during this period a valuable medium of knowledge, interpretation, and understanding in the truly titanic, contemporary struggle. The reader would be surprised to know the official and private subscribers to the periodical, both in the free world and the Red empire. And yet a moment of reflection would erase any cause for surprise. Without exaggeration, there is no publication in the United States that provides material on the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union as does this one. Criticisms from Moscow, Kiev, and other Red totalitarian capitals have been consistently abundant and severe, but they have also measured the effectiveness of the journal's regular output. The record is an imposing one.

Furthermore, the Quarterly is also unique in furnishing information and ideas regarding all the captive nations in the Red Empire. Doubtless, there are other publications that dwell on one or a few captive nations, but none can be compared with this periodical in terms of scope, breadth, and outlook. One of the publication's policies is drawn along the lines of Public Law 86-90, the Captive Nations Week Resolution, and in effect privately implements this Congressional resolution by offering articles, editorials, and commentaries dealing with each captive nation, be it Cuba, mainland China, Georgia or Hungary. In this respect the issues of the Quarterly have served as a vital reservoir for research and study, especially in the past 6 years.

Highly important, too, for the prominence of the periodical are the prime perspectives that almost every issue maintains and cultivates. The central idea that imperiocolonialist Moscow and no other capital or area in the Red Empire is the crucial enemy of the free world is one essential perspective. Another is the genetic development of the Soviet Russian Empire, from Moscow in 1917 to Cuba in 1960. A third is on the basic and determining distinction between Russia, the power center of the empire, and the U.S.S.R., the legalistic facade concealing from free world view the basic captivity of a dozen large captive non-Russian nations. After all, the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe is Ukraine; in Asia, it is mainland China. Happily, this fundamental perspective has gained wide acceptance in the United States. For example, speaking of the breakup of empires in this century, one outstanding American historian states, "If the Ukraine had been detached from the Soviet state immediately after the Russian Revolution, the Soviet empire today would not be such a disturber of the peace." [1]

A further, most important perspective, particularly for U.S. leadership, concentrates on the key to cold war victory and the prevention of aggression and a hot global war, namely the freedom and independence of all the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Our inability to see this and its unlimited ramifications and opportunities is one of Moscow's most formidable defenses of its empire. Protracted American ignorance about the multinational composition of the U.S.S.R. empire-state really devolves into forming Moscow's chief weapon against the free world, negative though it be. Without question, the Quarterly has been in the forefront of such constructive thought, and undoubtedly one of its chief contributions to U.S. policy and action will be this perspective over the long run.

---

[1] Anthony Harrigan, "Our War With Red China," National Review, New York, Mar. 8, 1966, p. 206.

LIVE ISSUES, LIVE WRITING

Perhaps the best aspect of the journal is its constant ideational location in the mainstream of basic issues. Addressing itself continually to live issues, the Quarterly has attained to the remarkable reputation of being an organ of live writing. Not the superficial weekly or monthly type, aggregating facts and offering shifting opinions, but rather the analytic quarterly type, sifting and dissecting facts against a stable, interpretative background of history and ideas. Pick up any issue of this journal and you will find this omnipresent truth staring at you. Indeed, there are current, basic issues and subjects which you are unaware of simply because other media either fail to recognize them or, if they do, are not competent to handle and treat them with analytic adequacy and insight. Most are even unaware of the running literary battles waged across the seas and within the United States on these fundamental subjects.

Being in the mainstream of basic issues, the Quarterly regularly covers a wide spectrum of essential material. Developments in Eastern Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, thoughts on U.S. foreign policy, cold war analyses, and a wide range of disciplines—historical, economic, political, anthropologic, etc.—consistently appear in the pages of this journal. But perhaps the best indication of the live nature and character of the periodical is its use in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is an integral part of of the Nation's recorded history. The prudent publication of Quarterly material in the RECORD has not only made much valuable analysis more readily accessible to the general public but has also contributed to legislation, congressional hearings, and studies, and informed opinion concerning the U.S.S.R. in particular.

Just to cite two examples, Public Law 86-90, the Captive Nations Week resolution, and Public Law 86-749, authorizing the Taras Shevchenko statue, are the products of thought found in the journal.

The creative public service performed by the Quarterly all these years cannot be appreciated unless one has followed this whole development closely and attentively. The evidence is a massive one, but the scope and depth of it can be gleaned from a concise review of some highlights that have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The items are a selected few, enough to indicate the variety of subject matter, the nature of the analyses, and the acute currency of the issues. Many of the issues discussed openly and in this form 10 years ago still apply today. This is why the journal has become increasingly important for research purposes as well as new discussion.

THE BREADTH AND WIDTH

As highlighted examples, then, several articles appeared in the last decade on the intriguing subject of U.S. diplomatic relations with the Ukrainian S.S.R.[2] The analyses formed a basis for congressional hearings that gained nationwide attention. The death of the resolution's sponsor and several intervening events caused a long delay on the subject, but the matter is still before the 89th Congress for consideration. It is one of those basic issues that fleeting time cannot erase. It will have to be resolved sooner or later.

Closely associated with the preceding subject is that of lands and nations in the U.S.S.R.[3] A Quarterly article on this vital matter was reprinted in the RECORD and gained considerable popular appeal. Countless Americans under the illusions of the U.S.S.R. being "a nation," "a single country," "Russia," "a monolith" and many other baseless characterizations, found the data in the article "new" and "thought provoking." In process of education, what was said accurately 10 years ago has to be repeated for every new generation. The contents of that article apply today as they did nearly 10 years ago.

Much the same can be said for the Quarterly article on "Basic Misconceptions in U.S. Military Thought on the U.S.S.R."[4] The misleading notion of assessing the enemy's military power solely in terms of arms technology is as current today as it was in 1959. The article exploded this notion and, with pertinent evidence and analysis, maintained that Moscow fears its armed forces far more than we do, but for other more determining reasons.

The subject has broad cold war implications, as do the two articles reprinted in the same year on the subjects of Russian machinations in the Middle East and traditional Russian cold war activity. "Guiding Impressions of the Middle East" still apply today as we witness Moscow's penetrations in Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, and elsewhere.[5]

Even without Khrushchev, the reprinted article on "The Russian Problem: From Ivan the Terrible to Nikita the Sanguine" applies to Brezhnev, Kosygin, and any other successor so long as the empire within an empire exists.[6]

With the U.S.S.R., indeed the entire Red Empire, in deep economic trouble today, we don't hear much about the "decisive economic race," "the economic competition" against the United States in particular and the free world in general. Yet, except for certain statistical data and dated empirical comments, the reprinted article on "Economic Vulnerabilities of the Soviet Union" enjoys an even greater application today because of both its structure and substantiation by subsequent development.[7]

Moreover, myths we have lived by are not only economic in character but of many other hues. This was clearly elucidated in a Quarterly article long before a concern about myths was shown by one of our Senators.[8] Despite some improvement in our thinking about "Russia," the nine myths still linger on.

An area which continues to elude the understanding of most Americans is political warfare. This organic subject is the most important one since by proper definition it embraces everything within an operational context. An early article on "Polwar's Strategic Concept" covered the essentials of this field.[9] A later reprinted analysis of "Dominant Russian and American Problems in the Cold War" showed the opportunities open to us for successful political warfare operations.[10] Here, too, with the slow progress of understanding in this critical field these articles will continue to enjoy current significance.

The reality of the captive nations in toto has been underscored repeatedly. This reality has served as the basis for numerous analyses. It has also justified the creation of a special congressional Committee on the Captive Nations.[11] This journal has surpassed all others on this point, so that today the subject is being carefully considered and some workable arrangement will be consummated. Interlocked with all this is, of course, the Quarterly's persistent interest in all of the captive nations and attempts made to liberate them. An article titled "China's Battleline of Freedom" exemplifies this interest vividly.[12] The dominant ideas of this article remain fresh and pertinent for any discussion bearing on Free China or Red China.

As to the now traditional Captive Nations Week and general American understanding of its meaning and intent, numerous pieces appear annually in the Quarterly. An excellent but critical background article on "Nixon and the Captive Nations Resolution" usually serves as the base for measuring the strides made in this understanding.[13] On this score, too, the Quarterly is unsurpassed. As a matter of fact, various other periodicals depend on this journal for analyses and commentaries dealing with the annual Captive Nations Week observance, reactions from the Red Empire, and projections for the future. Is it little wonder that the journal has been under constant attack by the Red totalitarians?

The Taras Shevchenko statue in our Nation's Capital is truly the second statue of liberty, dedicated to the liberation and freedom of all the captive nations. This living monument to world freedom was made possible through the analyses published originally in the Quarterly. One of the articles sets forth all the issues that were successfully controverted against a Washington daily.[14]

Not only this, the journal's articles and commentaries uniquely contained all the fire and battle sounds in 4 years of exchange with Moscow and its puppets, which constitute research data not to be found analyzed in any other American medium. An ardent advocate of the statue is revered by all freedom-conscious citizens in Washington, and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Shevchenko Memorial Committee have honored him with the Shevchenko Freedom Award. In one of its reviews the Quarterly paid fitting tribute to the beauty, inspiration, and truth of his official prayers.[15]

From all this it should be evident that this journal, enjoying the real and genuine achievement of 20 years in existence, is profoundly immersed in the critical issues of our times. Just to cite a few more examples from the angle defined earlier. East-West trade is an issue of considerable importance in the cold war. The Quarterly has examined every conceivable aspect of the issue in its articles and commentaries.[16] Its conclusion on the necessity of a poltrade policy is being widely discussed today. Another illustration is the effectiveness of its articles and commentaries on the U.S. Consular Convention with the USSR. This issue has been outstanding since the spring of 1964, and it can truthfully be said that the Quarterly's concentration on the problem has contributed heavily to the postponement of any quick and ill-advised ratification of this pact by the Senate.[17]

---

[2] "House Concurrent Resolution 58; Three of a Kind," daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 29, 1954, pp. A2384–A2386.

[3] "Lands and Nations in the U.S.S.R.," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 11, pp. 14233–14237.

[4] Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 2, 1959, pp. A5760–A5762.

[5] Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 27, 1959, A3461–A3463.

[6] Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1959, A4487–4489.

[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 9, pp. 12282–12285.

[8] "Nine Lingering Myths on 'Russia'," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 3, pp. 3521–3524.

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 9, pp. 11544–11546.

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 1, pp. 1129–1132.

[11] "Why a Special Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 7, pp. 9617–9619.

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 13, pp. 17969–17972.

[13] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 10, pp. 12788–12790.

[14] "The Shevchenko Affair," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 4, pp. 5048–5051.

[15] "Chaplain Harris' Inspiring Prayers Praised by Ukrainian Quarterly," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 13, pp. 17801–17802.

[16] "Red Totalitarian Trade—Another Cold War Instrument," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 8, pp. 10469–10472.

Finally, because of its activist literary output the Quarterly, the publication of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, is confronted by innumerable inquiries as to its policies and objectives. These are easily answered by "The Educational Policy of UCCA," an article that states clearly and distinctly the policy, aims, objectives, and convictions of all who manage the periodical.[18]

In short, derived from the general UCCA policy, that of the Ukrainian Quarterly is purely and candidly educational, but educational for action and survival. Its philosophy has been and its ideas and truths anchored in historical evidence and molding American thought and experience for excellence and success in the world crisis. Its contributions have found their mark in American scholarship and intellectual thought. And as it plunges into its third decade of existence, the Quarterly does so with a solid foundation of experience and achievement, a well justified and inspired hope of even greater successes, and a confidence in the longrun and ultimate efficacy of the power of its knowledge, ideas, and recorded convictions.

SBA BUSINESS LOAN PROGRAM SHOULD BE RESUMED

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill should be passed. There is need to resume the SBA business loan program.

The increase of $125 million in lending authority as proposed in the pending bill will allow SBA to begin accepting loan applications again on a limited basis until additional financing is worked out for next fiscal year. It would be my preference that there be a more substantial increase in the revolving fund. In this connection, I introduced a bill—H.R. 12089—last January to provide an increase of $359 million to $2.2 billion in the fund.

However, I am pleased to support S. 2729 so that SBA can get on with its job of providing loan service for small businessmen of America who are in need of capital and credit.

The SBA is beginning to realize its great potential. Last October the loan program was suspended. We must pass legislation to authorize and permit resuming of SBA's business loan services.

In fiscal year 1965 more than 13,000 loans were approved for $418 million—which is twice the number of loans approved in 1964—and 1964 was a record year.

To assure adequate funds for the small business loan program, section 2 of S. 2729 establishes two separate loan funds—one for business loans and one for disaster loan programs.

I am sure we are all familiar with the fact that the mingling of the two funds has resulted on several occasions in business loans being exhausted because of the occurrence of natural disasters.

Certainly a fund for natural disasters at times is needed. Such funds should be earmarked and separated from the business loan program.

I urge the passage of this authorizing legislation.

SPEECH PRAISED

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune has taken due note of President Johnson's reminder to the French people as to what a withdrawal from NATO could mean.

It would mean, the paper pointed out, "returning to a bilateral system which brought the downfall of France in two world wars" and it would mean "taking France out of a collective system which has brought France greater peace and prosperity than it has known in this century."

Since the analysis made by the newspaper is very timely, I offer the editorial for printing in the Record.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 24, 1966]

L.B.J. ADDRESSES THE FRENCH

If President de Gaulle is to be diverted from his NATO collision course, it must now be clear that much more than diplomatic messages, however skillfully drafted, will be necessary. The exchanges now going on between the American and French Presidents were initiated by General de Gaulle to explore a solution for a France not inside, but outside, NATO.

The system of bilaterial military pacts which De Gaulle would substitute for the collective NATA system already has been rejected by the United States and the 13 other NATO members; and if President Johnson goes to the trouble of spelling out the reasons, either in fresh letters to Paris or in a public speech, as he did yesterday, he may be doing so not because he thinks he might change President de Gaulle's mind, but because he would like to reach the minds of the French people. It may be too late for De Gaulle to change on his own volition; but it may not yet be too late for the French electorate to change his mind for him.

President de Gaulle, of course, presumes that the French will follow wherever he would lead. But the results of the last presidential election made it clear that he does not have the following he had before, and that his losses were due in no small measure to his anti-NATO position.

President Johnson has developed the implications of this position for the benefit of the French public as well as the U.S. Foreign Service officers whom he addressed yesterday. They would mean returning to a bilateral system which brought the downfall of France in two world wars; and they would mean taking France out of a collective system which has brought France greater peace and prosperity than it has known in this century.

That is a good deal to be throwing away in exchange for something, the nature of which is still not clearly known. The French may sympathize with De Gaulle in his romanticism, as may the rest of the world, but the road to romanticism could also lead to ruin if not tempered by reality.

It is to the French sense of realism that the champions of NATO must address themselves. And if this sense of realism should be expressed in the parliamentary elections to be held prior to expiration of the NATO treaty arrangements, these arrangements might yet conceivably be upheld. That would be a defeat for De Gaulle. But a victory for NATO may be more important for France, as for the rest of the Western World.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Flynt (at the request of Mr. Stephens) on account of official business.

To Mr. Rumsfeld (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through April 13, on account of official business as a member of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid and Government Information.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Multer for 1 hour, on April 25.

Mr. Zablocki, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Stratton, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Quie (at the request of Mrs. Reid of Illinois), for 1 hour, on April 5, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. Reid of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Latta.
Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Fino in two instances.
Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Stratton) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Gonzalez.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska.

---

[17] "Ten Reasons Against the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty," daily Congressional Record, Feb. 7, 8, 9, 10, 1966, pp. A567–A568, A608–A609, A668–A669, A699.

[18] Congressional Record, Jan. 25, 1966, pp. 1060–1063.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4599. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colo., and of certain chipped colored glass windows for Saint Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev.;

H.R. 6568. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6845. An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; and

H.R. 9883. An act to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 4, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2254. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on implementation of section 511(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2255. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a recommendation for an amendment to the Social Security Act which would extend from March 31 to May 31, 1966, the deadline for enrollment in the medical insurance portion of the social security health insurance program for the aged (H. Doc. 418); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

2256. A letter from the Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Fees and expenses of witnesses" for the fiscal year 1966, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2257. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the 18th annual report on the national industrial reserve, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80-883; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2258. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the act of February 11, 1929, as amended, relating to the compromise of claims of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2259. A letter from the national president, Blue Star Mothers of America, transmitting minutes of the 23d Annual National Convention of the Blue Star Mothers of America, held in Miami Beach, Fla., October 24-29, 1965; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2260. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2261. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, for the calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the acting superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: Committee on Foreign Affairs. A report entitled "The Costs of World Peacekeeping"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 14215. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12617. A bill to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 14088. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people; with amendments (Rept. No. 1408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 14176. A bill to enlarge the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 14177. A bill to enlarge the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 14178. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 14179. A bill to provide that individuals 65 years of age or older may be permitted to enroll, at any time during 1966, in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits established by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 14180. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through September 30, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the supplementary medical insurance program in the case of individuals reaching age 65 before 1966; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 14181. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 14182. A bill to provide for judgments for costs against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 14183. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 14184. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 14185. A bill to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14186. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for a Minority Economic Council; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 14187. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 14188. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 14189. A bill to prohibit insured banks from issuing negotiable interest-bearing or discounted notes, certificates of deposit, or other evidences of indebtedness; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 14190. A bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14191. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 14192. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 14193. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14194. A bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 14195. A bill to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 14196. A bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14197. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the control of alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14198. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 14199. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 14200. A bill to provide that a church and its minister may elect to have such minister treated, for social security coverage and tax purposes, as an employee of such church regardless of his coverage as a self-employed individual (or his lack of coverage) under the provisions of law otherwise governing his coverage status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 14201. A bill to amend section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 14202. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the initial phase of the east side division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 14203. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 14204. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel, and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 14205. A bill to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 14206. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 14207. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 14208. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to suspend certain provisions of law relating to women in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14209. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1957, Public Law 85-155, 71 Stat. 375, and title 10 of the United States Code, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 14210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat sintering or burning as a mining process in the case of shale, clay, and slate used or sold for use, as lightweight concrete aggregates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 14211. A bill to enlarge the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 14212. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 14213. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to require that the daily ration of members of the Army and Air Force contain at least as much butter as the daily ration prescribed for members of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 14214. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 14215. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 14216. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 14217. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 14218. A bill to provide for the lease of certain public lands for ponding and related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 14219. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 14220. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14221. A bill for the establishment of a Civilian Aviation Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 14222. A bill to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 14223. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend the disability "freeze" to cases where an individual is compelled by his disability to give up his usual occupation and takes less remunerative work or limit the extent to which he performs such occupation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 14224. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 14225. A bill to establish a Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14226. A bill to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14227. A bill to establish a consolidated Federal corrections system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.J. Res. 1002. Joint resolution on a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.J. Res. 1003. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 1004. Joint resolution on a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 1005. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.J. Res. 1006. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 8th day of September of each year as "International Literacy Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 1007. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.J. Res. 1008. Joint resolution to suspend temporarily the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve consolidations, unifications, or acquisitions of control of railroad properties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 1009. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as "National Flag Week," to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 1010. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.J. Res. 1011. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.J. Res. 1012. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.J. Res. 1013. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.J. Res. 1014. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.J. Res. 1015. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 1016. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14228. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Turriciamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 14229. A bill for the relief of Patrick Hugh McDonnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 14230. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 14231. A bill for the relief of Joao Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 14232. A bill for the relief of Irene Calderone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 14233. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Robledo Diaz Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14234. A bill for the relief of Juan deJ. Toledo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14235. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Camilo Farias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14236. A bill for the relief of Manuel M. E. Egea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 14237. A bill for the relief of Deb Kumar Das; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 14238. A bill for the relief of Shuhūru Ibrahimia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 14239. A bill for the relief of Nethaniel Eisenberg and Drora Eisenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Soybeans and the Fifth District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the 10 counties of my congressional district produce nearly one-third of the soybeans grown in my home State of Ohio.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's report on soybean production, dated August 1965, these 10 counties produced 13,059,000 bushels of soybeans on 554,800 acres during 1964. Total 1964 production for the State, according to the USDA report, was 41,850,000 bushels, grown on 1,860,000 acres.

Thus my district, Mr. Speaker, is a leading producer of a crop which has shown phenomenal growth in production in the United States—but of which still more is needed.

In the past decade, soybean acreage has almost doubled, while acreages for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, peanuts, potatoes, oats, hay, and flax have decreased. Last year U.S. farmers harvested 34.5 million acres of soybeans with a farm value of $2 billion. Ohio production, like the rest of the Nation's soybean output, increased—from 41 to 51 million bushels.

But there is currently a drive on by the National Soybean Crop Improvement Council to increase soybean acreage in 1966 by 3.5 million over the 1965 total. The Department of Agriculture is cooperating with this private industry group in accomplishing this goal. Secretary Freeman has announced that soybeans can be planted under provisions of the 1966 feed grain program.

The world demand for oil and protein is growing as populations of countries around the world explode. Soybeans can help feed the world's 1.5 billion undernourished or malnourished persons. In planting more acres of soybeans and also increasing their yields, American farmers can help fill this worldwide need for oil and protein and, at the same time, reap the rewards of the crop which has come into its own as a money crop.

Future Homemakers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Future Homemakers of America Week.

The State of Tennessee is the second largest State in the organization's membership with a total of 36,686 members.

Over 30 schools in my district have FHA chapters, and the efforts these outstanding young women are making will long be felt by their communities and State.

While congratulating all the girls in my district and State, who are members of this fine organization, I would like to single out four young ladies from my district, who are candidates for State offices in the FHA—Becky Beets of Morristown, Dorris Milligan of Jefferson City, Cathy Norris of Dandridge, and Donna Whitson of Jonesboro.

This week the 11,000 chapters of the FHA, which have 600,000 members, have spotlighted activities and projects concerned with a 4-year national program of work.

The objectives of this program of work, as detailed by the National FHA, are:

> To help each member recognize her abilities, strive for their full development, and participate actively in family, community and world improvement projects.
>
> To further these objectives the elected youth officers of FHA developed nine projects which stress individual development; emphasize mental and physical health; encourage serious consideration in choosing and training for useful careers; develop codes of ethics, morals, and manners; further understanding of people of all heritages, customs, and beliefs; promote appreciation of all family members and their abilities and problems; teach selective spending; inculcate citizenship responsibilities; and encourage using leisure time for activities beneficial to the individual and society.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my gratitude for the ambitious and essential program, which the FHA chapters have undertaken.

I want to commend all the 600,000 students, who are members of the Future Homemakers of America, and urge them to continue to be concerned with and committed to the real values of life.

Future Homemakers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the week of March 17 through April 2 has been set aside to pay tribute to an organization that is doing an outstanding job in preparing some of our young folks for the future. I refer to the Future Homemakers of America—a national youth organization of more than 600,000 high school students enrolled in home economics courses with local chapters in every State, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

In these hectic days when so much publicity is given to the minority youth groups such as the juvenile delinquents, beatniks, and draft card burners, it is a pleasure to honor some of the good guys who are seriously preparing themselves as good citizens of the future.

This national youth organization of home economics students in junior and senior high school provides opportunities for developing individual and group initiative in planning and carrying out activities related to today's complicated science of homemaking. As part of a large national organization of teenagers concerned with good home and family life each girl grows through new experiences, new views, and new friends. Its objectives are to help each member recognize her abilities, strive for their full development, and participate actively in family, community, and world improvement projects.

To further these objectives the elected youth officers of FHA developed nine projects which stress individual development; emphasize mental and physical health; encourage serious consideration in choosing and training for useful careers; develop codes of ethics, morals, and manners; further understanding of people of all heritages, customs, and beliefs; promote appreciation of all family members and their abilities and problems; teach selective spending; inculcate citizenship responsibilities; and encourage using leisure time for activities beneficial to the individual and society.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to add my voice to those who, this week, are paying tribute to this fine organization and its fine young members.

Fino Urges Minority Economic Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for a Minority Economic Council to advise the Senate and House minorities on economic policy. I would also like to suggest another way in which minority and junior Congressmen might be given adequate technical staff assistance.

The Republican minority in the House of Representatives today suffer a very real handicap in the limited technical and professional staff assistance available to them in intricate fields like taxation, banking, foreign trade and investment, housing credit, and monetary policy, and so forth. The ratio of Democratic to Republican committee staff members becomes trebly unfair when it is remembered that many Democratic efforts are backed by the work and research of the many Federal departments and agencies.

The present administration has sent up a great array of complex legislation to the Hill. Often the farthest reaching parts of these bills are the most camouflaged. The lack of Republican staff assistance has been a major factor in Great Society legislative success because often we in the minority cannot complete a careful analysis of the legislation in the short time we have to act. Nor do we have adequate staffs to prepare our own legislative programs.

Today I am introducing legislation to create a Minority Economic Council to give the minority assistance in one crucial field, but this is not enough. We must go further.

I would suggest that committees be budgeted an additional $10,000 per annum per member, which money would be used to hire assistant counsel who would work not for the committee as a whole but for a particular member. This would give a newly elected Congressman immediate access to professional staff assistance in the realm of his committee's activity. I think that this would solve not only the minority staffing problem, but the staff-help problem of junior Members in general.

I would imagine that this proposal I am making would cost about $10 million per year. The House would attract young professional people by the hundreds. Many young men and women would get their professional skills sharpened without absorbing the bureaucratic psychologies dispensed by the departments and agencies in the executive branch.

While this staffing would be a boon to the minority, because the minority are presently so badly understaffed, it would also be a boon to the Congress in general. Expertise in a given subject up before the Congress or one of its committees would not be confined to committee staffs under the thumb of a chairman presumably loyal to the administration. The type staff I am proposing would be a vigilant, alert staff which would restore much of the vanishing prerogatives of congressional supervision and control of Government. We would save any money we spent and tenfold more.

I commend this proposal to the House. It will be the vehicle of a restoration of vanishing congressional power.

The 145th Anniversary of the 1821 Revolt in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, since the House was not in session on March 25, I would like today to take note of the 145th anniversary of the 1821 revolt in Greece which culminated in her independence. Many American ideals and institutions can be traced to the Greek civilization and the Grecian achievements in art, philosophy, law, literature, and science. And I am sure that most of us are aware of the diverse and important contributions of Greek-Americans throughout our history. In my district of Texas, we are blessed with a vibrant and vital community of Greek descendants who have contributed much to the culture and prosperity of San Antonio.

The recognized American concept of individual freedom owes its birth to the Greeks. Indeed, it was the basis of much of their civilization. Herodotus, the Greek historian, quotes a Greek conversing with a Persian:

> You do not know what freedom is. If you did, you would fight for it with bare hands if you had no weapons.

The Grecian culture flourished under the city-states, but the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C. and the lack of national unity laid the groundwork for defeat by Rome near the end of the Macedonian wars in 146 B.C. Greece became a Roman province; but Athens remained a center of learning, and the Greek language and culture were widely influential. In A.D. 395 the Roman Empire crumbled, and Greece became the center of Byzantine Empire for more than one thousand years—another indication of Greek knowledge and influence.

The Ottoman Turks who conquered Constantinople in 1453 gave the Greeks a large measure of political autonomy. Greek merchants became engaged in worldwide trade, and the Greek Orthodox Church gained ascendancy in communal affairs. But the traditions of liberty and individual freedom were still smoldering in the hearts of the Greek people. It was ignited in the uprising of 1770, which was crushed by the Turks and led to severe curbs on Greek nationalism. But in 1821, under the leadership of Archbishop Patras, the Greeks on March 25 launched their war of independence against Turkish suzerainty. Greek independence was recognized by Britain, France, and Russia in the London Protocol of 1830.

The course of the Greek nation has not been smooth. She has been visited with domestic upheavals, bitter rivalries with Turkey, and, in 1944, a civil war. But Greece now participates in NATO, and is an associate member of the European Economic Community. She benefited from some American economic and military assistance beginning near the end of her civil war, and is now living up to all expectations of economic and political stability.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to salute Greek independence.

Voters in California's Sixth Congressional District Express Their Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, every year, I send a questionnaire to every registered voter household in my Sixth Congressional District. I am always gratified that so many take time to answer these questions on some of the critical issues of the day. This year, over 20,000 families replied and the results are tabulated below.

Obviously, there was some confusion where "yes" and "no" answers were given to multiple-choice questions, but even though the percentage figures on some questions do indicate duplication, the results leave little doubt as to the collective views of the respondents:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. VIETNAM			
The war in South Vietnam continues to be increasingly costly to the United States in terms of men and money. In your opinion should we—			
1. Continue the present policy of air attacks against North Vietnam and ground support for South Vietnam while pressing for negotiations?	60	25	6
2. Intensify the prosecution of the war in an all-out effort to end the fighting as quickly as possible despite the increased risks involved?	61	31	8
3. Withdraw U.S. forces on the theory that continued loss of lives cannot justify whatever may be gained from an eventual settlement?	36	58	6
B. MINIMUM WAGE			
The administration has proposed increasing the minimum wage in 3 steps, from $1.25 to $1.75 in 1968, and extending protection to 7,900,000 additional persons, including hotel, hospital, restaurant, and agricultural workers. Do you favor—			
1. Retaining the present minimum wage of $1.25 an hour?	47	47	6
2. Increasing the minimum wage for those presently covered?	52	38	10
3. Increasing the minimum wage and broadening the coverage?	74	20	6
C. REAPPORTIONMENT			
In an effort to reverse the Supreme Court's decision that both houses of the State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population, a constitutional amendment has been proposed allowing other factors such as geography and political subdivisions to enter into the apportionment of one house, if such apportionment is approved by a majority vote of the people. Do you favor—			
1. The Supreme Court's decision?	43	48	9
2. Each State being able to determine the composition of one house on factors other than population?	76	16	8
D. TAFT-HARTLEY			
This session will see continued debate on the administration's bill to repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the so-called right-to-work section. Do you favor—			
1. Repealing sec. 14(b), thus eliminating the States' jurisdiction over right-to-work laws?	38	53	9
2. Retaining 14(b) and thus continuing the jurisdiction of the States over right-to-work laws?	80	13	7
E. ANTIPOVERTY			
During the last session, Congress appropriated a total of $1,800,000,000 for the 2d year of antipoverty programs. San Francisco is to receive over $3,000,000 for such programs as part-time jobs for college students, adult basic education, day care centers, and preschool training for children from lower income families. In your opinion, these programs—			
1. Are having a positive impact on the community?	30	41	29
2. Cause little impact on the community?	53	18	28
3. Cannot be evaluated due to their relatively short existence?	77	10	13

Extending the Enrollment Deadline for Supplemental Medical Insurance for Our Older Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, although I am well aware that the Social Security Administration is making and will continue to make every possible effort to encourage our older people to timely enroll, by today's end, under the new medical insurance plan it appears reasonably certain that, through no substantial fault of their own, a great many of our older citizens will not meet this deadline.

Some of these people are waiting to try to find out what changes may occur in their present medical insurance coverage or what plans their employer may have for providing medical insurance after the new medicare program takes effect. In quite a few cases it seems employers and insurers will not have time, previous to the deadline, to properly and fully advise our older citizens on these scores.

Beyond this, there are a surprising number of people, who have difficulty in obtaining all the identification documents, et cetera, necessary for enrollment and additional difficulty in deciding whether or not they should enroll in the medical insurance plan after any changes in the private plans being offered have been announced.

As you know, the present law does have a provision permitting an individual to enroll after March 31 if he or she can show good cause for not having enrolled earlier. However, under this provision insurance protection cannot begin until 6 months after the enrollment. In other words, those who enrolled in April would not be given protection until October and if he or she enrolled in May they would not be protected until November.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this protection delay objectively appears too stern and severe a penalty to inflict upon any of our older citizens who may have been delayed from timely enrollment in this insurance program through no fault of their own.

In an effort, Mr. Speaker, to make absolutely certain that every one of our older citizens has a fair chance to make a deliberate and considered decision to become eligible under this obviously advantageous, voluntary medical insurance plan I introduced last Tuesday, March 29, a bill, H.R. 14043, to extend the enrollment deadline for supplemental medical insurance through May 31, 1966. I most earnestly hope that the esteemed Committee on Ways and Means and the House and the Senate will expedite action in the adoption of this measure, or any similar one, in the fullest consideration of the welfare and insurance protection of a great many of our elder citizens.

Fino Urges 5-Percent Tax on Betting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, in a letter to President Johnson, I recommend a 5-percent Federal tax on betting and a new Gambling Tax Unit of the Treasury Department, staffed by thousands, to enforce the tax.

In my letter, I said:

> I am writing to you about a way in which the Federal Government may tap America's illegal gambling coffers without actually participating in gambling enterprises.
>
> I urge the establishment of a 5-percent tax on betting. This would be a 5-percent tax on gambling turnover—on the Nation's overall gambling volume. It would not be the same as a tax on gambler's receipts or income.
>
> No doubt you are aware that the British Government just announced a proposed 2½-percent tax on betting. I think they have a good idea. The problem, of course, is in the enforcement. I think it is a problem we can and should overcome. Gambling today is a $50-billion-a-year business in the United States. That is a vast potential tax base.
>
> To investigate gambling enterprises and provide the backbone of gambling tax enforcement, I propose a Gambling Tax Unit in the Treasury Department which would seek out gamblers and gambling the way the

Alcoholic Tax Unit does with illegal liquor dealings.

I urge that gambling enterprises be identified and their turnover estimated. A tax of 5 percent would then be imposed on that turnover. It would then be up to the gamblers to disprove the estimate or pay up. In a situation like this, tax procedure of this sort would be warranted.

With a $50-billion-a-year taxable base to work to uncover, the potential of this tax would be great. It could reach $2½ billion a year.

This tax would cripple illegal gambling if enforced in the way I have suggested by a powerful and well-staffed Gambling Tax Unit. It would also be a great revenue raiser. In addition, I think a tax like this would help to shift public wagering into State-run gambling enterprises.

I urge you to give real consideration to this measure. I think that such a tax, linked with the enforcement I propose, would be a social and financial boon to America. This is a better tax than the telephone tax boost. This is a better tax than the suggested 5- to 7-percent corporate and personal income tax hike.

Alaska's Gold Rush Contributes to Nationwide System of Trails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pleasant experiences of man is to strap a pack on his back or climb into a saddle and head off for adventure along a primitive trail. Not only does the experience touch the senses, but it is one of the best means I know of relieving the strain of modern living and promoting good health.

The value of hiking and riding trails is well known to the hundreds of thousands that yearly make the effort to meet nature on its own terms along trails. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, of which I was a member, pointed out in its 1962 report that trails are one of the best outdoor opportunities. President Johnson stressed the need for trails available to everyone last year in his eloquent natural beauty message.

For almost a year now, Secretary Udall has spearheaded a cooperative nationwide study of trails for the purpose of developing a comprehensive, far-sighted program that will assure adequate trail opportunities for present and future generations. This study has culminated in a proposal to establish a nationwide system of trails, which the President mentioned in his recent message on preserving our natural heritage. Today Secretary Udall submitted the proposal to the Speaker, and today I have introduced that bill and urge its early consideration and enactment.

The bill that I am introducing today would substantially contribute to meet the ever-increasing outdoor recreation needs of an expanding population by establishing a nationwide system of trails serving all sections of the country and within easy reach of all segments of the population.

Several classes of the trails are recognized in the bill. National scenic trails would extend for hundreds of miles across whole regions of the country. Additional trails in scenic State and Federal forest and park areas would open new recreation opportunities for hikers and riders. Most important of all from the standpoint of the number of people to be served are trails that would be provided through green belts in and near our cities and metropolitan areas.

The bill includes provision for the imaginative development and expansion of each of these classes of trails. As the initial National Scenic Trail, the bill provides for the full establishment and perpetuation of the Appalachian Trail. This venerable trail, extending 2,000 miles from Maine to Georgia through 14 States has existed for many years. It was created by the efforts of thousands of volunteers who devoted their spare time and hard work to the task. It is now jeopardized by developments stemming from the increasing population pressures of the eastern seaboard, pressures that are greater than volunteer workers can hope to cope with.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with all of the public and private interests along the trail, including the Appalachian Trail Conference, to establish a firm route, to acquire the land, to upgrade the trail, and to regulate its use so that those who follow us will be able to enjoy the same quality experience which we now cherish.

The bill also earmarks 10 other potential national scenic trails for study by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, including an outstanding opportunity in Alaska which is associated with the gold rush era. Outstanding examples in Alaska are three gold rush trails, comprising the network of historic trails leading from southeast Alaska to the gold fields of the Yukon.

The tidewater terminus of the Dyea Trail and the White Pass Trail was the historic town of Skagway. The town of Haines was another historic gateway over the Dalton Trail. Trails in Federal and State park and forest areas would be given increased emphasis.

On Federal lands, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are directed to expand and upgrade the trail systems they administer. In State park and forest areas the States are encouraged with Federal assistance to do the same.

Trails in and near metropolitan areas are receiving increasing attention across the country. Much more needs to be done. Under existing authority, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development are directed to encourage the additional effort needed.

It has been customary down through the years to regard outdoor recreation as less of a necessity than other public responsibilities such as highways and water development projects. Through the efforts of President Johnson and of the late President Kennedy, the Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the value of natural beauty and outdoor recreation to the welfare and well-being of the people. A deliberate effort is needed to protect our places of great beauty and inspiration and to make them available.

Trails to and through these great areas whether they are near at hand or far away, will help in an important way to provide the recreation opportunities that increasing millions need. The bill that I am submitting for your consideration today goes far in assuring these opportunities.

GOP Report and Proposal on Nonproliferation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following special report is being issued to the House GOP Conference by the chairman of its Nuclear Affairs Committee under date of April 1:

SPECIAL REPORT TO HOUSE GOP CONFERENCE

From: Representative CRAIG HOSMER, chairman, Committee on Nuclear Affairs.

Subject: Treaty barring nuclear weapons proliferation—Information concerning and GOP proposals.

Soon the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will be sending to the floor a resolution giving congressional blessings to the administration's efforts to negotiate a "nonproliferation" treaty (S. Res. 179 or H. Res. 673). NBC–TV on April 17, will do a well-advertised show about it. The administration is seeking to give prominence to the subject.

This special report contains background data you may need regarding it and contains GOP initiated proposals and viewpoints which I recommend to you.

TREATY BACKGROUND

Simply stated, the burden of the proposed treaty will be (1) a promise by the nuclear powers not to aid in the spread of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear powers and (2) a promise by the latter not to "go nuclear."

The 18-Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva has negotiated on the subject intermittently for some time. Three nuclear powers are in attendance: United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. Two nuclear powers are not: France and Red China. The latter are not expected to "go along" in the near future with the treaty if it is negotiated.

U.S.–U.S.S.R. POLITICAL HANKY-PANKY

Both the United States and the U.S.S.R. have proposed their own versions of a treaty. So far the U.S.S.R. has used the negotiations mostly as a platform to shoot verbal-poisoned arrows at NATO. Most observers believe the U.S.S.R. finds nonproliferation to be in its own self-interest and expect it to commence serious negotiation when its venom is exhausted.

Some people, including myself, believe that the time will come at some appropriate point prior to the U.S. elections in November. The basis of this belief is a feeling that a certain amount of "left-handed" cooperation behind-the-scenes is going on between the current administrations of the two countries. With the Vietnam war likely to wage indefinitely, the Johnson administration will need something to go into the campaign with that can be touted as a "peace" accomplishment. Naturally, the Kosygin-Brezhnev administration will expect something in return.

NUCLEAR "HAVE-NOT" NATIONS' DEMANDS

Although the nuclear "have-not" nations presumably stand to gain as much from a pact as the nuclear "haves" in the form of a less turbulent world, they, too, are talking in terms of getting something from the "haves" for signing up. Rather than discouraging this kind of talk, the Johnson administration's position seems poised between tolerating it and encouraging it.

In return for giving up their right to go nuclear, a number of "have-nots"—some with such slight technical and industrial capabilities for atomic weapons production as to make their chatter ridiculous—are talking quid pro quo in terms of:

1. Making the "haves" get down to business on concrete disarmament steps;
2. Holding out for provisions outlawing the use of nuclear weapons, or at least prohibiting their use against nonnuclear states;
3. Demanding side agreements from nuclear powers (principally the United States) to protect them against nuclear aggression or, for that matter, against anything at all they themselves define as aggression—nuclear or otherwise.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION BUNGLING

The nuclear "have-nots" first two conditions simply are not credible holdout positions. The third has some grains of legitimacy, but administration spokesmen and the President himself have evidenced so much equivocation and ambiguity in dealing with it there is a possibility the treaty will create more trouble for the United States than it is calculated to eliminate. The administration could be making so many loose and general defense commitments to so many nonnuclear states to rush to their rescue that we could be triggered automatically into East-West confrontations seriously involving dangers of world war III. This will be discussed in detail in a separate special report to be issued soon.

"HAVE-NOTS" REALLY NEED "PLOWSHARE"

Actually, what the "have-nots" really need—and which neither they nor the Johnson administration yet have perceived—is in the plowshare area of peaceful atomic explosives.

The AEC is on the brink of producing practical and economic devices and techniques to put the atom's explosive power to work for mankind. They are sorely needed for such massive excavation jobs as creating a new canal supplemental to the congested Panama Canal. Other large-scale nuclear excavation needs soon will be felt to implement such bold proposals as the Amazon Basin project to turn into productive use vast South American swamps and jungles and NAWAPA (North American Water and Power Alliance) to regulate and divert this continent's rivers to meet burgeoning United States, Canadian, and Mexican requirements for water and hydropower. Much of southeast Asia and other portions of the globe also must depend on nuclear explosives for geographical face-lifting operations to reclaim land and provide an economic base for peaceful societies.

Underground there also are splendid economic potentials dependent on peaceful nuclear explosives. It is estimated the world's supply of natural gas can be doubled by nuclear fracturing of impervious gas formations deep beneath the surface.

These are but a few examples of the great future for peaceful nuclear explosives. The nuclear "have-nots" real loss from giving up nuclear development lies in the Plowshare area, not in weaponry.

UNITED STATES SHOULD SHARE PLOWSHARE

The United States not only should point this out, but should take the creative initiative of offering our Plowshare technology and devices on a fair-charge basis to any friendly country needing and wanting them. They also could perform tremendous service in our AID programs for global elimination of hunger and poverty.

In bilateral arrangements by which AEC officials retain physical custody and control of the nuclear devices until exploded, the strict provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 prohibiting turning them over to others can be met. By using a dual firing key arrangement whereby a U.S. custodian would first activate the firing circuit and the foreign official finally close it to initiate the actual firing, the limited test ban treaty's general prohibition against U.S. releases of radioactive material on foreign soil would be technically observed.

AMEND LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY TO UNCHAIN PLOWSHARE

However, as pointed out in my February 8 memorandum to you, the unrealistic provisions of the limited test ban treaty precluding release of any quantity of radioactivity—no matter how small or harmless—beyond any national boundary now paralyzes Plowshare use.

This restriction bears no reasonable relation to the purposes of the treaty. It even bars releases over empty ocean water beyond the 3-mile limit and thus we cannot proceed nuclearly with the second Isthmian Canal because of it. Until the bar is removed benefits to mankind from most Plowshare possibilities will be denied unreasonably.

Here, again, is a fruitful area for creative initiative being neglected by the administration and which only GOP sources presently are initiating proposals.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Father Lawrence E. Comey, S.J., Gonzaga College High School, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Let us all pray that God, in His infinite wisdom and profound peace, may inspire these self-sacrificing and dedicated men of the Senate who must determine that course of action which will be for the greatest common good and the future prosperity for all people—that God may inspire them to make sound judgments and wise decisions on so many weighty and pressing problems which will result in a deeply significant tranquillity within our own land and a lasting and universal accord throughout the entire world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 29, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

ECONOMIC AID TO INDIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 417)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

In recent months I have been watching with deep concern the emerging problem of world food supply. And I have been especially concerned with the prospect for India. During this past week I have discussed the Indian food problem with the Prime Minister of India, who has been our welcome and distinguished guest here in Washington. I am persuaded that we may stand, at this moment, on the threshold of a great tragedy. The facts are simple; their implications are grave. India faces an unprecedented drought. Unless the world responds, India faces famine.

Strong efforts by the Indian Government, and our help, have so far averted famine. But in the absence of cooperative and energetic action by the United States, by other nations, and by India herself, some millions of people will suffer needlessly before the next crop is harvested. This, in our day and age, must not happen. Can we let it be said that man, who can travel into space and explore the stars, cannot feed his own?

Because widespread famine must not and cannot be allowed to happen, I am today placing the facts fully before the Congress. I am asking the endorsement of the Congress for a program that is small neither in magnitude nor concept. I am asking the Congress, and the American people, to join with me in an appeal to the conscience of all nations that can render help.

I invite any information that the Congress can supply. Our people will welcome any judgments the Congress can provide. The executive branch, this Nation, and the world will take appropriate note and give proper attention to any contributions in counsel and advice that congressional debate may produce.

If we all rally to this task, the suffering can be limited. A sister democracy will not suffer the terrible strains which famine imposes on free government.

Nor is this all. The Indians are a proud and self-respecting people. So are their leaders. The natural disaster which they now face is not of their making. They have not asked our help needlessly; they deeply prefer to help themselves. The Indian Government has sound plans for strengthening its agricultural economy and its economic system. These steps will help India help herself. They will prevent a recurrence of this disaster. I also propose action through the World Bank and the Agency for International Development to support this strong initiative by the Government of India.

THE CRISIS

Since independence India has done much to increase her output of agricultural products. Her agriculture has not been neglected. From 1950 to 1965 she increased food production 75 percent. This is a creditable achievement. But India has had to contend with a continuing and relentless increase in population. Her people have also consumed more from a higher income. Accordingly, she has remained heavily dependent on our help. Last year we provided, under Public Law 480, more than 6 million tons of wheat, equal to more than two-fifths of our own consumption. To keep this supply moving, the equivalent of two fully loaded Liberty ships had to put in at an Indian port every day of the year.

Now India has been the victim of merciless natural disaster. Nothing is so important for the Indian farmer as the annual season of heavy rain—the monsoon. Last year, over large parts of India, the rains did not come. Crops could not be planted, or the young plants withered and died in the fields. Agricultural output, which needed to increase, was drastically reduced. Not since our own Dust Bowl years of the 1930's has there been a greater agricultural disaster.

Indian leaders have rightly turned to the world for help. Pope Paul VI has endorsed their plea. So has the World Council of Churches. So has the Secretary General of the United Nations. So has the Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization. And so, in this message does the President of the United States.

I have said that effective action will not be cheap. India's need is for at least 11 to 12 million tons of imported grain from January to December 1966.

Food in this world is no longer easy to find. But find it we must.

Here is what I propose.

THE PROGRAM

Last fiscal year we supplied 6 million tons of food grain to India. So far in this fiscal year, I have allotted 6.5 million tons of grain for shipment to India—more than the total of 6 millions tons which we had planned to provide as a continuation of past arrangements. It is even more necessary in this emergency to keep the pipelines full and flowing and to insure that there is no congestion of rail or sea transport. India, furthermore, estimates an additional 6 to 7 million tons of food grain will be necessary through next December beyond what has already been committed or expected.

I propose that the United States provide 3½ million tons of that requirement, with the remaining 3½ million tons coming from those nations which have either the food to offer or the means to buy food. I invite those nations to match the amount which we will supply. For example, I am delighted to be informed that Canada is prepared to provide a million tons of wheat and flour to India.

Every agriculturally advanced country can, by close scrutiny of its available supplies, make a substantial contribution. I ask that every government seek to supply the maximum it can spare—and then a little more. I ask those industrial countries which cannot send food to supply a generous equivalent in fertilizer, or in shipping, or in funds for the purchase of these requisites. All know the Indian balance of payments is badly overburdened. Food and other materials should be supplied against payment in rupees, which is our practice, or as a gift.

It is not our nature to drive a hard mathematical bargain where hunger is involved. Children will not know that they suffered hunger because American assistance was not matched. We will expect and press for the most energetic and compassionate action by all countries of all political faiths. But if their response is insufficient, and if we must provide more, before we stand by and watch children starve, we will do so. I, therefore, ask your endorsement for this emergency action.

I have spoken mostly of bread grains. The Prime Minister of India spoke also of other commodities which can meet part of the requirements or replace part of the need. In response to her needs, I propose that we allot up to 200,000 tons of corn, up to 150 million pounds of vegetable oils, and up to 125 million pounds of milk powder to India. The vegetable oil and milk powder are especially needed for supplementing the diets of Indian children.

In addition, India's own exchange resources can be released for food and fertilizer purchases if we make substantial shipments of cotton and tobacco. I am suggesting the allotment for this purpose of 325,000 to 700,000 bales of cotton and 2 to 4 million pounds of tobacco. Both of these commodities we have in relative abundance.

I request prompt congressional endorsement of this action.

I urge, also, the strong and warmhearted and generous support of this program by the American people.

And I urge the strong and generous response of governments and people the world around.

India is a good and deserving friend. Let it never be said that "bread should be so dear, and flesh and blood so cheap" that we turned in indifference from her bitter need.

FURTHER ACTION

The Indian people want to be self-supporting in their food supply.

Their government has adopted a far-reaching program to increase fertilizer production, improve water and soil management, provide rural credit, improve plant protection, and control food loss. These essentials must be accompanied by a strong training and education program.

I have directed the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with AID, to consult with the Indian Government to ascertain if there are ways and means by which we can strengthen this effort. We have long experience with short courses, extension training, and similar programs. If they can be used, I feel certain that American agricultural experts would respond to an appeal to serve in India as a part of an Agricultural Training Corps or through an expanded Peace Corps. Many of our younger men and women would especially welcome the opportunity.

I am determined that in our assistance to the Indian Government we not be narrowly limited by what has been done in the past. Let us not be afraid of our own enthusiasm. Let us be willing to experiment.

The Indian Government believes that there can be no effective solution of the Indian food problem that does not include population control. The choice is now between a comprehensive and humane program for limiting births and the brutal curb that is imposed by famine. As Mrs. Gandhi told me, the Indian Government is making vigorous efforts on this front.

Following long and careful planning and after discussions in recent days with Prime Minister Gandhi, I have proposed the establishment of the Indo-United States Foundation. This Foundation will be financed by rupees, surplus to our need, now on deposit in India. It will be governed by distinguished citizens of both countries. It will be a vigorous and imaginative enterprise designed to give new stimulus to education and scientific research in India. There is no field where, I hope, this stimulus will be greater than in the field of agriculture and agricultural development.

Finally, in these last days, the Prime Minister and I have talked about the prospects for the Indian economy. The threat of war with China and the unhappy conflict with Pakistan seriously interrupted India's economic progress. Steps had to be taken to protect dwindling exchange resources. These also had a strangling effect on the economy. Indian leaders are determined now to put their economy again on the upward path. Extensive discussions have been held with the World Bank, which heads the consortium of aid-giving countries.

The United States interferes neither in the internal politics nor the internal economic structure of other countries. The record of the last 15 years is a sufficient proof that we ask only for results. We are naturally concerned with results—with insuring that our aid be used in the context of strong and energetic policies calculated to produce the most rapid possible economic development.

We believe Indian plans now under discussion show high promise. We are impressed by the vigor and determination of the Indian economic leadership. As their plans are implemented, we look forward to providing economic assistance on a scale that is related to the great needs of our sister democracy.

An India free from want and deprivation will, as Mahatma Gandhi himself once predicted, "be a mighty force for the good of mankind."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 30, 1966*.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 22. An act to promote a more adequate national program of water research;

S. 254. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; and

S. 490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2729) to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H.R. 4599. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo.;

H.R. 6568. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7723. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods; and

H.R. 9883. An act to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5147. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1966, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such act; and

H.R. 14012. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 4599. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colo., and of certain chipped colored glass windows for St. Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev.;

H.R. 6568. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6845. An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; and

H.R. 9883. An act to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5147. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1966, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14012. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Thomas F. Collins to be postmaster at Linesville, Pa.; which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance:

Lester R. Uretz, of Virginia, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service); and

Fred B. Smith, of Maryland, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph Palmer II, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe the appointment of Joseph Palmer to be an Assistant Secretary of State is a most excellent appointment. His knowledge of Africa and African affairs is vast. His service there was distinguished by the highest devotion to duty. He is a man of great integrity. I am delighted that someone of his high caliber is to be appointed to this most important post. And too, I am confident that the Senate will confirm his nomination unanimously.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the Asian Development Bank.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CERTAIN RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 879, H.R. 3349.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 3349) for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "Service", to insert "including the Reserve components thereof,".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my intent to ask unanimous consent to strike the committee amendment. This request will be made on the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary and interested members of the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3349 is intended to waive the 10-year statute of limitations for the filing of claims with the General Accounting Office by certain retired officers of the military services who are veterans of both World War I and World War II. The purpose of this bill is not to affect or change the substantive law dealing with the retirement benefits of the Regular or Reserve components of the military services. Its purpose is simply to waive the statute of limitations to permit the filing of a claim for increased retirement benefits with the General Accounting Office.

It has been determined by court decision that under the existing law certain officers could include time spent on retired lists in computing special re-retirement pay adjustments. Several Reserve officers are included in the limited number affected. This act, then, is designed merely to permit these officers, both Regular and Reserve, to file the claim, but is not designed to pass on the merits of any of these claims. Further, it is designed to permit the filing of a claim with GAO only by the class of beneficiaries who meet the stated criteria of the bill, the 10-year statute of limitations notwithstanding.

This act, when it passed the House, was intended to permit all officers who fell within the stated criteria of the act; thus, those who are similarly situated, to benefit by its dispensation provision. This would naturally include Reserve as well as Regular officers who meet the criteria. The intent of the bill in waiving the statute of limitations thus applies to all officers similarly situated.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee from the Comptroller General dated December 15, 1965, concerning this bill. The Comptroller General was opposed to the legislation as it passed the House and still opposes the legislation, but particularly the Senate committee amendment. He states in the letter that his interpretation of the act is that the deletion of the committee amendment would not affect the standing of benefited Reserve officers to file their claims, providing they otherwise meet the criteria of the act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with this interpretation the Senate committee amendment is superfluous and I ask unanimous consent that it be rejected and that the bill without the amendment, and with this specific intent expressed, be passed.

EXHIBIT 1

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1965.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with a recent conversation between Mr. Lipscomb of your committee's staff and a member of our staff, we are writing this letter to express our views on H.R. 3349, 89th Congress, "An act for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force," which passed the House of Representatives May 3, 1965, was reported to the Senate by your committee, with an amendment, on October 15, 1965, and was passed over by the Senate on October 19, 1965 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 20, p. 27284).

The amendment made by your committee added the words "including the Reserve components thereof" after the words "any retired officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service." The bill as so amended (with the added words underscored) provides as follows:

"That the limitation of time prescribed by the Act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061; 31 U.S.C. 237), is hereby waived with respect to claims for increased retired pay by any retired officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, including the Reserve components thereof, if (1) he served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918; (2) he was retired under any provisions of law prior to June 1, 1942, and was subsequently called to active duty; and (3) he was returned to an inactive status on a retired list after May 31, 1942: *Provided,* That a claim for such retired pay shall be filed with the General Accounting Office by each such officer or by his designated beneficiary, within one year following the date of enactment of this Act."

Our views concerning H.R. 8937, 88th Congress, a bill with identical provisions to those in H.R. 3349 (except for your committee's amendment), were set forth in our report to you, B-145158, February 25, 1964, copy herewith. As you will see from such report, H.R. 8937 was objectionable to our Office. H.R. 3349 as it passed the House of Representatives was equally objectionable because it would tend to undermine the salutary principle of limitation of time within which claims against the United States may be filed. However, with the committee amendment the bill is considerably more objectionable than it was before such amendment.

In Senate Report No. 892, to accompany H.R. 3349, it is stated that:

"The amendment adding the language, 'including the Reserve components thereof,' is added at the request of the proponents of this proposed legislation to insure that several affected retired officers who will benefit by the provisions of the bill will be included therein."

The primary purpose of H.R. 3349 is to overcome the bar of the 10-year statute of limitations (31 U.S.C. 71a, 237) with respect to certain claims for so-called re-retirement benefits under the fourth paragraph of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, ch. 413, 56 Stat. 368 (37 U.S.C. 115, 1952 ed.). Both this Office (in decision of May 6, 1947, B-63359) and the Court of Claims (in *Abbott v. United States,* 152 Ct. Cl. 798 (1961)) have held that the fourth paragraph is applicable to members of the Regular components only and is not applicable by its own force and terms, to members of the Reserve components. It may be true that several Reserve officers who have been retired for physical disability have received re-retirement benefits under the fourth paragraph. If so, it was not because of any specific legislative recognition of the applicability of that paragraph to them but because of their assimilation to Regulars under the general assimilation provisions originally enacted as section 402(i) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, ch. 681, 63 Stat. 820, and now contained in 10 U.S.C. 1215, as follows:

"The laws and regulations that entitle any retired member of a Regular component of the Armed Forces to pay, rights, benefits, or privileges extend the same pay, rights, benefits, or privileges to any other member of the Armed Forces who is not a member of a Regular component and who is retired, or to whom retired pay is granted, because of physical disability."

We are greatly concerned that if there were a specific legislative recognition of the applicability of the fourth paragraph to Reserves (as there would be, in effect, if H.R. 3349, as amended, should be enacted) it might materially weaken the case against extending the benefits of that paragraph to all retired Reserve officers who had service prior to November 12, 1918. Legislation has been introduced in every Congress since the 84th in furtherance of the effort to overcome the decisions of the Court of Claims and the Comptroller General holding the 4th paragraph inapplicable to Reserve officers. See, for example, H.R. 5268, 89th Congress, and H.R. 7711, 88th Congress. These two bills would waive res judicata and the statute of limitations and would make it possible for U.S. district courts to hear and decide certain cases which, if the plaintiffs won, would upset the Court of Claims decision in the Abbott case. If that were done and the benefits of the fourth paragraph were extended generally to Reserve officers drawing retired pay under title III of Public Law 810, ch. 708, June 29, 1948, 62 Stat. 1087–1091, and its successor provisions, we have good reason to believe that the ultimate cost to the Government would be in excess of half a billion dollars. We believe the Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives, may have obtained more precise cost figures in connection with its consideration of H.R. 5268 and H.R. 5436, 89th Congress.

Not only would such a general extension of fourth paragraph benefits involve a huge cost but it would result in gross discrimination in favor of retired Reserve officers who happen to have had any military service, however short a period, prior to November 12, 1918. We believe that in a majority of the cases, the retired pay would be at least doubled. In some cases it would be tripled or quadrupled. Neither the 77th Congress, in enacting the 4th paragraph in 1942, nor the 80th Congress, in enacting title III of Public Law 810 in 1948, had the remotest intention that such a result should occur. This we have vigorously and consistently represented to the committees of Congress which have considered H.R. 5268 and similar bills. We enclose a copy of the report B-153104, dated March 29, 1965, on H.R. 5268 which we made to the chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives.

We, therefore, urge your committee to delete from H.R. 3349 the five words which were added to it by the committee's amendment. It is our view that such deletion would not affect in any way the rights of those reserve officers retired for disability whom the amendment was designed to benefit. In other words, insofar as this office is concerned, Reserve officers retired for disability who have received certain re-retirement benefits under the fourth paragraph of section 15, by assimilation under 10 U.S.C. 1215, would be entitled to the additional benefits authorized by H.R. 3349 (if that bill should be enacted) whether or not it contains the words "including the Reserve components thereof." It therefore appears that the committee amendment could be stricken from H.R. 3349 as being unnecessary and then if that bill should be enacted without amendment, the proponents of a general extension of the fourth paragraph to Reserve officers would not have their cause unduly assisted by the language and legislative history of the act stemming from H.R. 3349.

As stated above, even without the committee amendment H.R. 3349 is objectionable to us. We reiterate our position that if the Government's financial transactions are to be conducted with any assurance that after records have been destroyed under authorized record-disposal procedures the Government will not be faced with claims based on such records, it should be able to rely completely on the provisions of the 10-year statute of limitations where applicable. The enactment of legislation which has the effect of waiving the statute in any situation even though such action may seem equitable tends to undermine the salutary principle upon which statutes of limitations are based. Accordingly, we recommend that H.R. 3349 not be favorably considered but if this recommendation is not acceptable we urge that the committee amendment be deleted before the bill is enacted.

Sincerely yours,

Frank H. Weitzel,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I was inclined to favor the so-called Hart amendment, which included some Reserve components, but the language of the amendment was interpreted by some Members to accomplish more than is intended by the act; however, I am glad to be reassured that the deletion of the amendment will not affect the standing of benefited Reserve officers to file their claims, providing they otherwise meet the criteria of the act.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, the committee amendment is rejected.

The bill (H.R. 3349) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM"

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. It is nothing more than a statement supplied by General Hershey, which the Directors of Selective Service in the various States have found to be extremely useful and, likewise, all Senators will find extremely useful in answering mail or questions relating to the Selective Service. Hence, the resolution.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 246) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate one hundred and three thousand additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 82 of the Eighty-ninth Congress entitled "Selective Service System."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Extension of Deadline for Enrollment in Medicare Program

A communication from the President of the United States, proposing an amendment to the Social Security Act which would extend from March 31 to May 31 the deadline for enrollment in the medical insurance portion of the social security health insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Agricultural Conservation Program

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the agricultural conservation program, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agricultural and Forestry.

Reports on Reapportionment of Appropriations

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Fees and expenses of witnesses" for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for "General operating expenses," for the fiscal year 1966 had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Railroad Retirement Board for "Limitation on salaries and expenses," for the fiscal year 1966 had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Military Construction Contracts Awarded Without Formal Advertising

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on National Industrial Reserve

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Industrial Reserve, dated April 1, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Flight Pay

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on flight pay in that Department, as of January 1, 1966; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Department of Army Research and Development Contracts

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (R. & D.), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts awarded during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Legislation Relating to District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the act of February 11, 1929, as amended, relating to the compromise of claims of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the regulation in the District of Columbia of retail installment sales of consumer goods (other than motor vehicles) and services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on Proposed Gift of Certain Property To Enlarge the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed gift of certain property to enlarge the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, located at Abilene, Kans. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on practices which resulted in the invalid and other questionable use of fiscal year 1964 appropriation, U.S. Information Agency, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for improvement in the management of vehicle utilization, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the management and utilization of Capehart, Wherry, and other Government-owned family housing, Department of the Army, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of procedures for measuring national forest timber in the Pacific Northwest region (region 6), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operation of a dairy farm by the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., Department of the Navy, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination into policies for the recovery of Government expenditures incurred in the management and operation of Indian forest enterprises, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on economies from making electron tubes available to other Government users, Federal Aviation Agency, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Proposed Judgments for Costs Against the United States

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for judgments for costs against the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Contractual Actions Taken To Facilitate the National Defense

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contractual actions taken to facilitate the national defense, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report Relating to Claim of Vernon M. Nichols *v.* The United States

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendation relating to the claim of *Vernon M. Nichols* v. *The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Aliens—Withdrawal of Name

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of See Song Chew, also known as Jun Wo Chew and Edwin Chew, from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on February 1, 1965 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report Under Labor Management Relations Act of 1947

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report under the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. Monroney and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 8647. An act for the relief of the Troubadors Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn. (Rept. No. 1093).

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 11029. An act relating to the tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics (Rept. No. 1092).

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 6319. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries (Rept. No. 1091).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2999. A bill to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)) (Rept. No. 1094).

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1095)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report unfavorably the resolution (S. Res. 220) to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed, together with minority views.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 3160. A bill for the relief of Kwang Sun Yi and Edgar Lee Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3161. A bill to provide for judgments for costs against the United States; and

S. 3162. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3163. A bill for the relief of Mr. Pedro Alfonso Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3164. A bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. Scott):

S. 3165. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3166. A bill for the relief of Sullivan I. Kite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 3167. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, in order to prohibit the sale or receipt of any stolen dog or cat which has been transported in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3168. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York (for himself and Mr. Nelson):

S. 3169. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special program for the mentally retarded, mentally ill, and physically handicapped spouses and children of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy of New York when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York (for himself and Mr. Javits):

S. 3170. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States over certain classes of removed cases and to provide injunctive relief in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy of New York when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. Jackson):

S. 3171. A bill to establish a Nationwide System of Trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. Montoya):

S. 3172. A bill to provide for establishment of the Trinity National Historic Site in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 3173. A bill to amend agricultural acts to include "any vegetable crop" as commodities to be grown on diverted acreages; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio (by request):

S. 3174. A bill to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 3175. A bill to amend section 3(c) of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Kennedy of New York):

S. 3176. A bill to provide criminal penalties for the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of master keys for motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Carlson, and Mr. Metcalf):

S.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to support United States participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ellender when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of April, 1967, as "Federal Land Bank Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH:

S.J. Res. 151. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bayh when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO CLAIMS AND SUITS BROUGHT BY OR AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills concerning claims and suits brought by or against the United States.

The first of these is a bill to provide for costs in judgments against the United States.

There is a substantial inequity in the present law covering the granting of costs in litigation involving the United States. When the United States sues on a claim and wins, it may be awarded costs; when the United States sues and loses, costs may not be awarded against it. When the United States is sued and wins, it may be awarded costs; when the United States is sued and loses, costs may not be awarded against it. Only in rare cases does the law provide for costs to be assessed against the United States when it is the losing party in civil litigation.

I have been interested in this problem for some years and on several occasions have offered amendments to specific bills requiring that the Federal Government accept liability for court costs when it is the unsuccessful litigant. I am most gratified that this administration supports this principle and this bill.

The basic general statute pertaining to costs in litigation involving the United States is section 2412(a) of title 28 of the United States Code. That statute provides that the United States shall be liable for costs only when such liability is expressly provided for by act of Congress, and there are relatively few statutes in which costs against the United States have been expressly provided for.

This measure will amend section 2412 of title 28 to provide that, except as otherwise specifically provided by statute, costs as set out in section 1920 of title 28 may be awarded to the prevailing party in actions brought by or against the United States or any agency or official acting in his official capacity. The amount of costs that may be awarded shall be in accordance with the amounts established by statute or by court rule or order. The bill makes it clear that the fees and expenses of attorneys and expert witnesses may not be taxed against the United States.

The second bill is intended "to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government, and for other purposes."

The Tort Claims Act, with certain exceptions, makes the United States liable for the negligence, wrongful act, or omission, of a Government employee while he is acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances in which a private person would be liable under the law of the place where the act or omission occurred.

Presently, a person who has a substantial claim arising under the act must bring an action in a Federal district court, and he can seek administrative settlement of his claim only if the claim is for less than $2,500. Experience under the Federal Tort Claims Act has demonstrated that of all awards allowed in cases filed under the act, 80 percent are made prior to trial. Since tort claims against the Government tend to arise in a few agencies, these agencies have considerable experience in settling such claims.

This bill would institute a procedure under which all claims would be brought to the appropriate agency for consideration and possible settlement before court action is instituted. A claim would first be considered by the agency whose employee's activity allegedly caused the damage and which possesses the greatest information concerning that activity. As a result, meritorious claims would be settled more quickly, without the need for expensive and time-consuming litigation or even for filing suit.

In order to provide the agencies with sufficient authority to settle a broad range of claims, the bill would give them authority to consider and settle any claim under the Tort Claims Act, irrespective of amount. Settlement and awards in excess of $25,000 would require the prior approval of the Attorney General. Any settlement of a claim in excess of $100,000 would be brought to the attention of Congress since claims over this amount would require approval through a supplemental appropriations bill.

Finally, in order to encourage claimants and their attorneys to make use of this new administrative procedure, the attorney's fees allowable under the act would be raised from the present 10 percent of the administrative award and 20 percent of the settlement of judgment after filing suit to 20 and 25 percent, respectively.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of these bills be printed at this point in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Ervin, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3161

A bill to provide for judgments for costs against the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2412 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

Except as otherwise specifically provided by statute, a judgment for costs, as enumerated in section 1920 of this title but not including the fees and expenses of attorneys or expert witnesses, may be awarded to the prevailing party in any action brought by or against the United States or any agency or official of the United States acting in his official capacity, in any court having jurisdiction of such action. A judgment for costs when taxed against the Government shall, in an amount established by statute or court rule or order, be limited to reimbursing in whole or in part the prevailing party for the costs incurred by him in the litigation. Payment of a judgment for costs shall be as provided in section 2414 of this title for the payment of judgments against the United States.

Sec. 2. Section 2520(d) of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. These amendments shall apply only to judgments entered in actions filed subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act. These amendments shall not authorize the reopening or modification of judgments entered prior to the enactment of this Act.

S. 3162

A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (a) That the first paragraph of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The head of each Federal agency or his designee may consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, compromise, and settle any claim for money damages against the United States for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the agency while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred: *Provided,* That any award, compromise, or settlement in excess of $25,000 shall be effected only with the prior written approval of the Attorney General or his designee."

(b) The second paragraph of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Subject to the provisions of this title relating to civil actions on tort claims against the United States, any such award, compromise, settlement, or determination shall be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government, except when procured by means of fraud."

(c) The third paragraph of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Payment of any award, compromise, or settlement in an amount in excess of $2,500 made pursuant to this section or made by the Attorney General pursuant to section 2677 of this title shall be paid in a manner similar to judgments and compromises in like causes and appropriations or funds available for the payment of such judgments and compromises are hereby made available for the payment of awards, compromises, or settlements under this chapter."

Sec. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 2675 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) An action shall not be instituted upon a claim against the United States for money damages for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, unless the claimant shall have first presented the claim to the appropriate Federal agency and his claim shall have been finally denied by the agency in writing and sent by certified or registered mail. The failure of an agency to make final disposition of a claim within six months after it is filed shall, at the option of the claimant any time thereafter, be deemed a final denial of the claim for purposes of this section."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 2675 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by deleting the first sentence thereof.

Sec. 3. Section 2677 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Attorney General or his designee may arbitrate, compromise or settle any claim cognizable under Section 1346(b) of this title, after the commencement of an action thereon."

Sec. 4. The first paragraph of section 2678 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The court rendering a judgment for the plaintiff pursuant to section 1346(b) of this title, or the head of the Federal agency acting pursuant to section 2672, or the Attorney General acting pursuant to section 2677 of this title, making an award, compromise, or settlement, may, as a part of such judgment, award, compromise, or settlement, determine and allow reasonable attorney fees, which, if the recovery is $500 or more, may be up to but shall not exceed either 20 per centum of the amount recovered under section 2672 of this title or the amount contracted between the parties nor may not exceed 25 per centum of the amount recovered under section 1346(b) of this title, to be paid out of but not in addition to the amount of judgment, award, compromise, or settlement recovered, to the attorneys representing the claimant."

Sec. 5. Subsection (b) of section 2679 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The remedy against the United States provided by sections 1346(b) and 2672 of this title for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death, resulting from the operation by any employee of the Government of any motor vehicle while acting within the scope of his office or employment, shall hereafter be exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding by reason of the same subject matter against the employee or his estate whose act or omission gave rise to the claim."

Sec. 6. Section 1302 of the Act of July 27, 1956, as amended (70 Stat. 694; 75 Stat. 416; 31 U.S.C. 724a), is further amended (1) by inserting a comma and the word "awards," after the word "judgments" and before the word "and"; (2) by deleting the word "or" after the number "2414" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma; and (3) by inserting after the number "2517" the phrase ", 2672, or 2677".

Sec. 7. Subsection (b) of section 2401 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) a tort claim against the United States shall be forever barred unless it is presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within two years after such claim accrues or unless action is begun within six months after the date of mailing, by certified or registered mail, of notice of final denial of the claim by the agency to which it was presented."

Sec. 8. The first sentence of section 2671 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"As used in this chapter and sections 1346 (b) and 2401(b) of this title, the term 'Federal Agency' includes the executive departments, the military departments, independent establishments of the United States, and corporations primarily acting as instrumentalities or agencies of the United States but does not include any contractor with the United States."

Sec. 9. (a) The section heading of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"s 2672. Administrative adjustment of claims."

(b) The analysis of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 2671 of such title, is amended by deleting the item "2672. Administrative adjustment of claims of $2,500 or less," and inserting in lieu thereof: "2672. Administrative adjustment of claims."

Sec. 10. This Act shall apply to claims accruing six months or more after the date of its enactment.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, the administration's Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a memorandum entitled "Explanation of Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966" be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3164) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty, introduced by Mr. Clark, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3164

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966.

AUTHORIZATIONS AND FINANCING

Sec. 2. (a)(1) For the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C of title I of such Act), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $1,750,000,000, of which, subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made available by appropriation act shall not exceed $533,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title I of such Act, $944,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title II, $65,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title III, $5,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions referred to in the second sentence of section 407, as added by these amendments, $160,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V, $17,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and $26,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII as added by these amendments.

(2) Section 616 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting immediately before the first comma the following: ", or under any Act authorizing appropriations for any such title (other than part C of title I)".

(b)(1) Sections 131, 221, 321, 503, and 615 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are each amended by (A) striking out "three" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "five", and (B) striking out "succeeding fiscal year" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "three succeeding fiscal years".

(2) Section 407 of such Act is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "five".

(c)(1) Sections 115 and 208(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are each amended by striking out "three" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "four".

(2) The first sentence of section 216(b) of such Act is amended by (A) striking out "two" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "three", and (B) striking out "shall be" in such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "shall not exceed".

PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

Criteria for community action programs

Sec. 3. Section 202(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "Such criteria shall include requirements to assure (1) that each agency responsible for a community action program is qualified to administer such program and the funds granted to it efficiently, effectively, and in a manner fully consistent with the provisions and purposes of this part, having due regard for the size and complexity of such program and the number of persons and size of the area served; (2) that each such agency is subject to evaluation of program progress and regular or periodic audits and that the results or findings of such evaluations and audits are considered by the agency as well as by the Director in connection with proposals or applications for the renewal, expansion, or modification of any such program; (3) that each such agency maintains records and internal controls needed to achieve and document compliance with all legal requirements and that all records bearing exclusively on grants made under this part are available to the General Accounting Office; (4) that each such program is carried on in accordance with standards and policies, including rules governing the conduct of officers and employees, to preclude the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting, or resulting in an identification of such program with, any partisan political activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office; and (5) that the personnel of each such agency are selected, employed, promoted, and compensated in accordance with standards prescribed by the Director, or personnel plans approved by him, as promoting efficiency and the effective use of funds."

Community action—Personnel assistance

Sec. 4. Section 206 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "The Director is also authorized, upon request of a grantee under this section, or sections 204, 205, or 209(b), to make special assignments of personnel to the grantee to assist and advise in the performance of functions related to the purposes of this part, except that in no event shall more than 100 persons be employed for, or at any one time regularly engaged in, such assignments, nor shall any such special assignment be for a period of more than two years in the case of any grantee."

Adult basic education—State plan criteria and project grants

Sec. 5. (a) Section 212 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting", or lack of similar basic skills," immediately before the word "constitutes".

(b) Section 214(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 214. (a) The Director shall approve a State plan which sets forth a program for use, in accordance with section 213(b), of grants under this part, and which (consistent with such basic criteria as the Director may prescribe)—

"(1) contains a system of specific priorities adequate to assure the most effective use of funds, having regard to the number of persons described in section 212 in different areas of the State, the extent of their educational deficiencies, and the degree to which local programs or projects under this part will assist such persons to increase their incomes or otherwise significantly alter their prospects for employment or economic advancement in accordance with the purposes of this part;

"(2) contains specific provisions for cooperative arrangements with appropriate public or nonprofit agencies within the State concerned with problems of poverty, employment, and health related to the purposes of this section, and sets forth specific procedures for implementing such arrangements in connection with local projects and programs, as necessary or appropriate to assure that related services or assistance needed by participants will be provided and that such projects and programs will be carried on in a coordinated manner consistent with the provisions and purposes of this Act;

"(3) provides such criteria as may be necessary to assure that all projects and programs are carried on in a way responsive to the needs and abilities of adults who are educationally and economically disadvantaged and that use is made of services, facilities, staff, systems, and methods that will best contribute to this objective;

"(4) provides that projects and programs initiated or supported under the plan will be subject to adequate procedures for evaluation of their effectiveness and for the dissemination of the results of such evaluations whenever appropriate to interested agencies and persons throughout the State; and

"(5) provides for administration by the State educational agency in accordance with procedures and policies to (A) assure proper disbursement of and accounting for all funds granted under section 213, (B) enable the State agency to make such prompt reports to the Director containing such information as may be required to permit him to determine the current status of operations or actions taken under the State plan, or as may otherwise be necessary to enable him to perform his duties under this part or any applicable provision of this Act, and (C) assure that such supporting books, records, and other documentation will be maintained, and made available to the Director, as he finds reasonably necessary to verify reports or otherwise discharge his responsibilities."

(c) Section 215 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by—

(1) amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) which the Director determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this part shall be available (1) for use within such State for the purpose of grants under section 218(b); (2) for reallotment in accordance with subsection (c); and (3) for reallocation, or transfer subject to section 616, for use in connection with other programs under this Act when the Director determines that the funds cannot be effectively or efficiently reallotted or otherwise employed for purposes of this part."; and

(2) amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) Reallotment as authorized by subsection (b) may be made from time to time in such States during any fiscal year as the Director may fix. Reallotments of funds from one State shall be made to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum of (1) the amount which the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out its State plan approved under this part, and (2) any amount which the Director determines may be allowed for the purpose of grants under section 218(b) in such State; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts are not reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year which is not made available for purposes of grants under section 218(b) shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year."

(d) Section 218 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"SPECIAL PROJECTS AND TEACHER TRAINING

"SEC. 218. (a) Not to exceed 25 per centum of the funds appropriated or allocated to carry out this part for any fiscal year may be reserved for use in making special project grants and in providing teacher training as authorized in this section.

"(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to local educational agencies or other public or private nonprofit agencies for the purpose of special projects which will be carried out in furtherance of the purpose of section 212 and which—

"(1) involve the use of innovative methods, systems, materials or programs which the Director determines may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs under this part, or

"(2) involve activities in adult basic education, which the Director determines are so coupled with other Federal, federally assisted, State or local programs, as to have unusual promise in promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of low-income persons with basic educational deficiencies as described in section 212.

"The Director shall establish procedures for the making of grants under this section which shall (1) require a local or non-Federal contribution of at least 10 per centum of the project costs wherever feasible and not inconsistent with the purposes of this section, and (2) assure that in advance of any grant an opportunity for review and comment will be afforded (A) to the State educational agency of the State in which the project will be carried on and (B) to appropriate local educational agencies (either directly or through the State educational agency) in the case of any grants not proposed to be made to such agencies.

"(c) The Director is authorized to provide (directly or by contract), or to make grants to colleges and universities, State or local educational agencies, or other appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations to provide, training to persons engaged or are preparing to engage as instructors for individuals described in section 212, with such stipends and allowances, if any (including traveling and subsistence expenses), for persons undergoing such training and their dependents as the Director may by or pursuant to regulation determine."

RURAL AREAS—LOAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. Section 302(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "exceeding $2,500 in the aggregate" and inserting in lieu thereof "resulting in an aggregate indebtedness of more than $3,500 at any one time":

GRANT SUPPORT—SMALL BUSINESS

Loan program

SEC. 7. (a) Section 402 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is hereby redesignated section 402(a) and there is added at the end thereof a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) The Director is further authorized to make grants to, or contract with, public or nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay all or part of the costs necessary to enable such agencies to provide screening, counseling, management guidance, or similar assistance with respect to persons or small business concerns which receive or may be eligible for assistance under subsection (a). Financial assistance under this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of section 208 of this Act."

(b) Section 407 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by (A) striking out the heading "DURATION OF PROGRAM" and inserting in lieu thereof "AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS" and (B) adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 402(b), for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

VISTA—NEW TITLE VIII

SEC. 8. (a) The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by—

(1) striking out section 603;

(2) adding at the end of such Act a new title VIII to read as follows:

"TITLE VIII—VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

"Statement of purpose

"SEC. 801. It is the purpose of this title to enable and encourage volunteers to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty, by living and working among deprived people of all ages in urban areas, rural communities, on Indian reservations, in migrant worker camps, and Job Corps camps and centers; to stimulate, develop and coordinate programs of volunteer training and service; and, through such programs, to encourage individuals from all walks of life to make a commitment to combating poverty in their home communities, both as volunteers and as members of the helping professions.

"Authority to establish Vista program

"SEC. 802. (a) The Director is authorized to recruit, select, train, and—

"(1) upon request of State or local agencies or private nonprofit organizations, refer volunteers to perform duties in furtherance of programs combating poverty at a State or local level; and

"(2) in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local agencies involved, assign volunteers to work (A) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; (B) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in their construction or operation by Federal funds; and (C) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

"(b) The referral or assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine; but volunteers shall not be so referred or assigned to duties or work in any State, nor shall programs under section 805 be conducted in any State, without the consent of the Governor.

"Volunteer support

"SEC. 803. The Director is authorized to provide to all volunteers during training pursuant to section 802(a) and to volunteers assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) such stipend, not to exceed $50 per month (or, in the case of volunteer leaders designated in accordance with standards prescribed by the Director, not to exceed $100 per month), such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation (including travel to and from the place of training), supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, and health and dental care as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

"Application of provisions of Federal law

"SEC. 804. (a) Each volunteer under section 802 shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 104(d) of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such oath or affirmation; but, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, such volunteers shall not be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(b) All volunteers during training pursuant to section 802(a) and such volunteers as are assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 106 (b), (c), and (d) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in paragraph (2)(B) of section 106(c) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 under the Classification Act of 1949.

"Special programs and projects

"SEC. 805. The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants, contracts or other arrangements with appropriate public or private nonprofit organizations for the conduct of, special programs in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Such programs shall be designed to encourage more effective or better coordinated use of volunteer services, including services of low-income persons, or to make opportunities for volunteer experience available, under proper supervision and for appropriate periods, to qualified persons who are unable to make long-term commitments or who are engaged in or preparing to enter work where such experience may be of special value and in the public interest. Individuals who serve or receive training in such programs shall not, by virtue of such service or training, be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits; except that such individuals who receive their principal support or compensation with respect to such service or training directly from the Director or his agent for payment shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as volunteers assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) of this Act. Not to exceed 15 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 806. (a) The Director shall carry out the program provided for in this title during so much of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, as follows the date of enactment of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and during the three succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title (other than section 805) during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the Director may utilize funds appropriated or allocated for the purpose of carrying out title VI of this Act during such year without regard to the provisions of section 616. For the purpose of carrying out this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

(b) Paragraph (2)(A)(iv) of section 205 (b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "section 603" and inserting in lieu thereof "title VIII".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 9. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended as follows—

(1) Title I of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before section 110 a heading for that section to read "YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS";

(2) Title II of such Act is amended by redesignating section 219 of part C as section 219-1; and

(3) Section 213(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 214".

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965—MORATORIUM ON STUDENT LOANS TO VISTA VOLUNTEERS

SEC. 10. (a) Paragraph 2(c) of section 427(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-329, 79 Stat. 1239) is amended by (A) striking out "or" before "(iii)" and (B) inserting immediately after the phrase "Peace Corps Act," the following: "or (iv) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any loan outstanding on the effective date of this Act without the consent of the then obligee institution.

The memorandum presented by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Section 1. Short title: This section provides that the act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966."

Section 2. Authorizations and financing: (a) This subsection authorizes a fiscal year 1967 appropriation of $1,750 million for programs under the Economic Opportunity Act. This appropriation would be used for all programs under the act except the college work-study program which is administered by the Office of Education as part of the program of student assistance provided under the Higher Education Act of 1965. Also, in the case of the title IV small business loan program, the authorization would cover only funds needed for screening, counseling, and similar services provided by small business development centers. Funds for making loans and for Small Business Administration administrative costs are not included, since these would be provided through the SBA revolving fund, as authorized by section 404 of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The total sum authorized would be subject to specific title limitations, as contemplated by the Economic Opportunity Act. The authorization would be included in one brief subsection of the bill, rather than in a variety of amendments to the individual titles of the Economic Opportunity Act. This format is designed so that the authorizing legislation will present a clearer and more concise picture of the total amount authorized and the manner it is contemplated that the funds will be employed.

Specifically, the authorization provided by the bill would permit the following appropriation and program levels during the fiscal year 1967:

Five hundred and thirty-three million dollars for title I programs to permit an anticipated capacity for 45,000 youths in the Job Corps and jobs for 354,000 youths in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Nine hundred and forty-four million dollars for title II programs, to sustain community action programs in more than 900 communities, Headstart programs for 700,000 children, and adult basic education programs for 75,000 participants.

Sixty-five million dollars for title III programs. This sum will be used to support a greatly expanded program of assistance to migrant workers and their families, and provide loans to 15,000 low-income rural families and 400 local cooperative associations.

Five million dollars for title IV small business loan program. This will be used to provide screening, counseling, management guidance or similar assistance through 120 small business development centers in 70 areas.

One hundred and sixty million dollars for title V work experience programs serving 105,000 participants.

Twenty-six million dollars for VISTA (under a new title VIII which the bill would add to the Economic Opportunity Act) to support a program with 4,500 volunteers.

Seventeen million dollars for general direction and administration of the War on Poverty pursuant to title VI.

(b) This subsection extends the duration or term of the various programs under the Economic Opportunity Act until June 30, 1970. This means that each program would have a 5-year term, beginning with its first full year of operation. The change would facilitate long-range program planning. It would not, however, affect congressional control over annual program levels, since specific authorizations, as well as appropriations, would still be necessary for each fiscal year.

(c) This subsection extends for 1 year authority to provide Federal assistance to work-training, community action and adult basic education programs at a basic level of 90 percent of program costs. The act now provides for a reduction of assistance to 50 percent of program costs. This reduction would begin to affect some programs in the fiscal year 1967, since assistance granted during that year may extend to activities carried on during the following fiscal year when the reduction will become effective. It is now clear that a 50-percent level of support would be too low and would drastically impair the capacity of States, communities, and local agencies to carry on projects already initiated. A further analysis of each program is being made to determine the administrative actions and specific statutory amendments needed to assure that the required commitment of non-Federal resources will be as meaningful as possible consistent with the varying fiscal capacities and needs of different States and communities.

Section 3. Criteria for community action programs: This section would provide the Director with more specific authority to prescribe and enforce requirements for local community action programs on matters relating to fiscal procedures, evaluation and audit, preclusion of partisan political activities, and personnel standards that are basic to the success of those programs.

Section 4. Community action personnel assistance: This section expands authority to provide technical assistance by permitting special assignments of Federal personnel to local community action or State technical assistance agencies. Some communities, particularly in low-income rural areas, have a need for guidance and technical expertise that cannot be met through normal avenues of advice or brief visits of Federal or State technical assistance personnel. The amendment would permit highly qualified persons to work with some of these communities having especially difficult problems over more extended periods, while retaining their regular employment status. No more than 100 persons could be hired for this purpose or could be on special assignment at any one time, and no such assignment could be for more than 2 years.

Section 5. Adult basic education—State plan criteria and project grants: (a) This subsection amends section 212 of the Economic Opportunity Act to clarify the educational deficiencies at which adult basic education programs may be directed. At present, section 212 refers specifically only to inability to read or write the English language. The amendment would make it clear that programs may also include adult education in similar basic skills, such as simple arithmetic and speech.

(b) This subsection clarifies and strengthens the criteria for approval of State plans.

The statute now contains little in the way of qualitative or substantive criteria for these plans. If the program is to be maintained in its present basic structure, a better statutory focus is needed, with emphasis on effectiveness in serving low-income persons and coordination with related programs. These objectives are related in that programs will typically be best when the participants can see that basic education is tied to other activities or assistance, such as employment counseling or job training, which give promise of an immediate, tangible impact on their lives. The new criteria would require specific priorities governing the distribution of funds and effective procedures for assuring coordination, at State and local levels, with agencies concerned with problems of poverty, employment, and health. They would also require attention to the special problems of teaching the educationally and economically disadvantaged, and regular or periodic evaluation.

(c) This subsection makes certain amendments in the provisions relating to the reallotment of funds in order to provide somewhat increased flexibility in the use of funds not required for carrying out State plans. It would permit use of these funds in certain cases for special project grants or their reallocation or transfer for use in connection with other programs under the Economic Opportunity Act subject to applicable appropriation and authorization limitations.

(d) This subsection authorizes a limited use of adult basic education funds for special project grants. These could be made directly to local educational agencies or other public or nonprofit agencies. They are designed to encourage particularly innovative programs such as may have national significance. They are also designed to encourage and facilitate projects involving cooperative arrangements, as with agencies conducting community action, employment or training programs, which hold unusual promise in promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of low-income people with basic educational deficiencies. State educational agencies would be afforded an opportunity to review and comment upon all such grants before they are made, as would the appropriate local educational agencies in cases where grants are not proposed to be made to such agencies.

Twenty-five percent of the funds appropriated or allocated for the adult basic education program could be reserved for special project grants and for the training of adult basic education teachers or instructors. Additional funds for project grants may also be made available in some cases by virtue of the amendments in subsection (c) to provisions governing reallotments.

Section 6. Rural loans: Under this section, the individual loan limit on rural loans would be raised from $2,500 to $3,500 and small farmers and other qualified low-income rural residents would be permitted to obtain credit under the program so long as their outstanding indebtedness does not exceed this amount.

Applications for individual rural loans must now be rejected if it is obvious $2,500 will not be adequate either to finance initial operations or permit an enterprise to be established on a profitable basis. The present loan limit of $2,500 also prevents the extending of additional financing which could strengthen small enterprises in the critical first year or two of development. The amendment would be particularly helpful in enabling the individual loan program to serve more effectively the rural nonfarm poor, who make up the majority of the rural poverty population.

Section 7: Grant support, small business loan program: This section provides direct funding under title IV for public or nonprofit agencies, principally small business development centers, to enable such agencies to provide screening, counseling, management guidance or similar assistance in connection with small business loans. Funds for this purpose have been provided in the past through grants under the community action program. While the amendment will permit separate financing under title IV, coordination with community action agencies will be maintained.

Section 8. VISTA—New title VIII: This section creates a new title VIII for VISTA. At present, while VISTA is a distinct and separate program in the war on poverty, authority for it is contained in a section of the title for administration, and coordination. This amendment recognizes the status of VISTA as a separate program, and clarifies the significant role with which VISTA is charged. A new section 801 declares VISTA's purpose is to enable individuals to participate personally in the war on poverty and to stimulate, develop and coordinate programs of volunteer training and service through which persons will be encouraged to combat poverty in their home communities.

Two changes are made in the substance of the VISTA authority. The new section 803 authorizes the Director to pay a stipend not to exceed $100 a month to volunteer leaders designated in accordance with standards prescribed by the Director. At present, the maximum stipend for all volunteers is $50 a month. This increase in stipend for volunteer leaders is similar to that provided for persons in similar positions in the Peace Corps. It is designed to recognize the experience, outstanding ability, and responsibility of volunteers on whom extra burdens of leadership are placed. Normally only those persons who have completed at least 1 year's service will be eligible. These leaders are not expected to be greater in number than 1 in 25 volunteers.

The second change is contained in the new section 805, which provides for special volunteer programs in furtherance of the purposes of the title. This section would authorize or facilitate new programs of volunteer service that build upon the experience of the present VISTA program. These could include special programs for low-income persons, programs for qualified persons who cannot commit themselves to the 1-year term of service usually required for VISTA volunteers, and programs for qualified persons for whom the experience, supervision, and training available in special VISTA programs will serve as valuable preparation for further work in the field of volunteer service. Not more than 15 percent of sums appropriated or allocated to carry out the purposes of title VIII would be available to carry out special programs under this section.

Section 9. Technical amendments: This section contains several technical amendments which do not affect the substance of the existing authority.

Section 10. Higher Education Act of 1965—Moratorium on student loans to VISTA volunteers: This section extends to VISTA volunteers while they are in service the moratorium on repayment of loans under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–329, 79 Stat. 1239) which that act provides for full-time students, members of the Armed Forces of the United States and Peace Corps volunteers. A comparable moratorium on repayment of loans under the National Defense Education Act was extended to VISTA volunteers by the 1965 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

COMPENSATION TO SURVIVORS OF LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS KILLED WHILE APPREHENDING PERSONS COMMITTING FEDERAL CRIMES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the job of the local police officer is often a thankless and unrewarding one, so much so that it is difficult to convince good men to seek a career in local law enforcement. Recent television documentaries have depicted policemen as fighting a losing battle, not only against the increased incidence of crime, but often also against local public opinion.

I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, with the cosponsorship of my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], a bill dealing with this problem, to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons committing Federal crimes.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3165) to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. SCOTT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REMEDIAL LEGISLATION NEEDED TO END CRUEL TRAFFIC IN PETS—DOGS AND CATS—BY CRUEL AND UNSCRUPULOUS PERSONS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would prohibit the sale of stolen dogs or cats or other pets transported in interstate commerce. This proposal, amending 18 U.S.C. 2317, would make it a felony to knowingly sell, receive, or buy stolen dogs or cats so transported. It would subject offenders if proved guilty to a heavy penalty of a fine of up to $5,000, imprisonment for a maximum of 5 years, or both.

The proposed legislation is necessary to prevent unscrupulous operators who are greedily taking advantage of the rapidly growing demand for animals required for laboratory research and for medical experimentation.

It has been estimated that institutions in which medical research is performed—colleges, universities, hospitals, and other public and private organizations—now require almost 2 million dogs alone each year. Because of this tremendous demand the price of dogs and other animals used in research has increased rapidly. In 1965 alone, hospitals and research facilities receiving Federal money spent between $30 and $50 million to purchase dogs and cats. This, in addition to those facilities not receiving Federal assistance.

Supplying dogs and cats to research institutions has become a big business. It has become profitable for brutal, callous, inhumane operators to steal or lure pets away from their homes. It has been reliably estimated that over 65 percent of all pets reported as missing have been taken by "dognappers," so-called, who sell them to dealers. Who knows how many family pets, loved by children and adding to the happiness of families, have been taken when they strayed from their yards. Many a lost dog or cat which some child loved and which some family cherished is now probably starving to death in some animal concentration camp.

Mr. President, I am sad to say that deplorable as the stealing of pets may be, that is not the worst of it. In cutting maintenance costs to increase profits, many dealers treat these animals with indescribable brutality prior to their sale and delivery to research centers. They are literally piled on top of each other in small enclosures. The condition of their confinement leads to wholesale starvation, death, maiming, and disease. Details of atrocities perpetrated by unscrupulous dealers are too distgusting to describe.

Recently, Life magazine, in its February 4 edition, exposed in a shocking article entitled "Concentration Camps for Dogs" the horrible conditions to which dogs, cats, and other animals are condemned prior to their sale for research in experimental laboratories.

Yesterday, Mr. President, the Scripps-Howard newspapers of this Nation published an article, as follows:

WRITER TELLS OF HORRORS AT STOLEN DOG AUCTION

WASHINGTON.—Grim-faced U.S. Senators listened in revulsion to a vivid description of the horrors suffered by animals at a Mississippi dog auction.

The Senators, members of the Commerce Committee, are considering legislation to halt the interstate traffic of stolen dogs and cats and to bring about humane treatment of animals sold for medical research.

Here's part of what Miss Kay Pittman, a reporter for the Memphis Press Scimitar, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, told them she saw at a dog sale March 7 in Ripley, Miss.

"One car trunk, completely unventilated, held about 20 dogs. Some were big dogs, like Collies, and they were crammed and bent double.

"Out of such a trunk I saw a magnificent-looking Collie with a shiny coat and thoroughbred lines come out. A child walked by and patted the dog on the head. The Collie leaped to run after the child.

"That's when a rope attached to a long steel prodding bar was tightened to the strangulation point around the Collie's neck, jerking the dog upward. His tongue hung out, and the dog made gagging noises.

"Then the steel bar came down hard on the dog's nose and blood spurted from the wound. The dog was sold for $5 to a dealer.

"Cats and puppies were brought to the dealers in big burlap sacks that were tied at the top. They were dumped on the ground."

Miss Pittman told how she saw State tags taken off dogs; how nearly all the dogs had some sign of blood on them; how they were stuffed into trucks and cars to travel hundreds of miles without food or water.

R. T. Philips, director of the Denver-based American Humane Society, said dognapers move so quickly in spiriting their animals across county and then State lines, that it is almost impossible to move quickly enough to establish larceny before the dogs have been taken into another jurisdiction.

In western Pennsylvania recently, he said, authorities found an abandoned truck containing 75 dogs and cats, most probably stolen. Twenty were dead and the survivors were eating the carcasses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I am cosponsor of a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] which provides for the humane treatment of animals and the humane design of experiments. It is not an antivivisection measure. It legislates only against unnecessary cruelty in experiments for research purposes.

However, additional legislation is needed to discourage and prevent the theft of family pets—cats and dogs—for this horrible trade. Legislation is already on the books making it a crime to buy, sell, or dispose of stolen cattle in interstate commerce. My bill would expand this provision to include cats and dogs. Surely families with pets are entitled to the same protection as cattle dealers.

Mr. President, my record in support of medical research and education speaks for itself. I would not introduce or support any measure to outlaw or curtail research which is responsibly and humanely conducted.

However, needless suffering and wanton theft does nothing to advance science or human welfare, and a nation as idealistic in tradition and as great in resources as ours must not condone this cruelty and must not condone the theft of pets which is encouraged by the greatly increasing market for experimental animals.

Mr. President, the enactment of legislation to prevent the use of stolen animals for research purposes and to provide for the humane treatment for those animals legitimately used for such purposes is absolutely necessary. Such humane legislation will in no way deter the advance of medical science. To the contrary, it will eliminate needless brutality and condonation of theft in one of mankind's highest callings.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be embodied in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3167) to amend title 18, United States Code, in order to prohibit the sale or receipt of any stolen dog or cat which has been transported in interstate commerce, and for other purposes: introduced by Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3167

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2317 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or any dog or cat" immediately after "cattle".

SEC. 2. Section 2311 of such title is amended by—

(1) inserting immediately after the definition of aircraft a new paragraph as follows:

" 'Cat' means any live domestic cat (Felis catus);"; and

(2) inserting immediately after the definition of cattle a new paragraph as follows:

" 'Dog' means any live dog of the species Canis familiaris;".

SEC. 3. The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 113 of such title is amended by striking out "2317. Sale or receipt of cattle." and inserting in lieu thereof "2317. Sale or receipt of cattle, dogs, and cats.".

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health.

I realize that one of the institutes already established at the National Institutes of Health—the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness—is devoting part of its time and resources to research on diseases of the eye. However, blindness is such a scourge that it deserves an institute entirely devoted to searching out its causes and their cure. We need one great center in this country whose emphasis and scientific personnel are directed in only one channel—to the control of eye defects, eye diseases, and blindness.

Even though we consider ourselves—in these mid-1960's—as living in an era of scientific discovery and medical achievement, more than 10 million people throughout the world are totally blind. In our own Nation, more than 1 million Americans are functionally blind—which means that they cannot read a newspaper, even with the aid of the best lenses science can provide. Many others are blind in one eye, or have other serious eye defects.

I feel that we must direct a massive and unrelenting drive on blindness, and that the establishment of a National Eye Institute at the greatest research center in the world is the first step to take in this drive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3168) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXTENSION OF DEPENDENTS MEDICAL PROGRAM TO CERTAIN DEPENDENTS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize an extension of the dependents medical care program to cover the care of mentally retarded, mentally ill, and physically handicapped dependents of members of the uniformed services; and to amend the Social Security Act to require that services provided by States pursuant to the maternal and child health services and the crippled children provisions of that act not be denied on grounds of residency to children and spouses of members of the uniformed services.

The bill is designed to fill some major gaps which exist in the medical care provided for the dependents of men in the uniformed services. In my preparation of this legislation I have been particularly appreciative of the work of Margo Cohn who has put together a great deal of information on this subject.

I know that every Member of the Senate is aware of, and concerned about, the tragic effects of mental retardation and mental illness generally. I invite the Senate's attention to the particularly tragic circumstances involved when the dependent of a man on active duty with the uniformed services is so afflicted.

I have been concerned about this problem for some time. In 1964, while I was Attorney General, I received a letter from an Army colonel who explained the difficulties he had had in finding adequate care for his retarded son. The Army's medical care program did not provide for such treatment, and the colonel had at first been unable to place his son in a State institution because he was not then a resident of the State where he was stationed. He had later placed his son in a private facility, but only at burdensome expense. He would undoubtedly have been unable to afford that course had he been an enlisted man or even an officer of a lower rank.

I sent the colonel's letter to Secretary McNamara, and received a reply which showed that we had indeed touched upon a most difficult situation. A memorandum which he attached to his reply showed that retarded children of servicemen were not being cared for adequately, but that efforts were being made to remedy the problem.

The matter came to my attention again in early 1965 when I received a letter from a specialist fifth class in the U.S. Army. This specialist had 3 children at the time; a 5-year-old boy, a 3-year-old girl, and a severely retarded, nonambulatory 2-year-old girl. The youngest was hospitalized at that time in Alabama at a cost of $125 per month. A specialist fifth class makes a base pay of $318 per month. The soldier had to declare bankruptcy. He had 14 years of service in the Army, and a hardship discharge was not the answer for him. I have subsequently been in correspondence with this man, and at the present time he is on a 1-year period of compassionate reassignment from Europe to a base in the United States. But this is only a temporary solution. What will he do when his year is up and he is eligible for overseas assignment with no foreseeable solution for his retarded daughter? His desperate letter seeking assistance, as well as dozens of other letters I have received describing similar situations, prompted me to take a long, hard look at the entire problem.

I wrote to Secretary McNamara again in September 1965, to ascertain the current status of the problem and to suggest that the Department of Defense consider trying to deal with it through expansion of existing military medical facilities. The Secretary's thoughtful reply stated that the Department had concluded to seek legislation to broaden the dependents' medical care program to provide care for mentally retarded military dependents in civilian and State institutions.

On March 10, 1966, Secretary McNamara wrote to me again, enclosing the Department's proposed legislation, which is now before the House of Representatives. I am told that these proposals are an outgrowth to some extent of my correspondence with Secretary McNamara. I believe, therefore, that this correspondence is of interest to the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. The Department's proposed legislation has now been combined into an omnibus bill, H.R. 14088, to broaden the Dependents' Medical Care Act. That bill also deals with such matters as health benefits for retarded members of the uniformed services and their dependents and more adequate outpatient care for dependents of a person on active duty. I support these other aspects of H.R. 14088, but, because of my longstanding interest in the problems of the handicapped, I have singled out the portion of the legislation which deals with those problems for special study since Secretary McNamara wrote to me on March 10.

The bill I am introducing today is based on the draft which the Secretary sent me 3 weeks ago, but it differs from the Department of Defense proposals in a number of critically important respects, which I shall come back to in a few moments. First, let me describe the magnitude of the problem in somewhat greater detail.

The President's Panel on Mental Retardation estimated that there are 75,000 mentally retarded children of servicemen who present special problems and require special facilities. This number includes those who can be helped with special education classes and occasional training by therapists. But it also includes the profoundly and severely retarded—those children who are noneducable and often nontrainable. Frequently physical deformities and handicaps accompany these cases of severe retardation.

A special survey conducted by the Department of Defense in 1964 translated the figures into human terms, with hundreds of case histories of service families with severely or profoundly retarded children. For these children institutional care is the only answer, yet it is rarely possible at the present time. For the others, the children who are less severely retarded, there could be hope, but without the necessary special training and education, they will be destined to live an unhappy, dependent existence. And even this special care is rarely possible at present for the child of a serviceman.

Three cases demonstrate the magnitude of the problem.

An airman first class has a profoundly retarded girl of four. The child is deaf, born with three ribs missing; her head and face are deformed; she has been recommended for institutional care. But her family has been unable to obtain State institutionalization or afford private institutionalization, and she lives at home with the four other children of the airman.

An Army enlisted man making about $500 a month has a girl of 3½. Her IQ is unknown; she was born with a palate and growth defect; she has a defective leg and no balance; she has no speech and requires special speech training. This child cannot take care of her normal body functions and has been recommended for institutional care. But the cost of this care is beyond the means of her father, who has four other children as well.

A staff sergeant in the Army has a 7-year-old boy, profoundly retarded, IQ below 20, semiambulatory, living at home. The sergeant has investigated institutions in 36 States, but nothing is available.

And so these and hundreds more like them remain in the home. And when the father is assigned to an overseas base—in Korea, the Dominican Republic, Vietnam, where he cannot take his family—the problem is magnified even more.

Legislation has been passed by Congress to provide money to the States to help care for the mentally ill and retarded and to help retrain the handicapped. As a nation we try to insure that each individual receives the full measure of medical and psychological care and therapeutic assistance that is available today. However, in the area of service dependents, we have failed to meet and cope with the problems of retardation, mental illness, and physical handicaps.

To attempt to handle the retarded child at home, with no help by way of special training and education, stagnates what potential the child possesses and destroys any semblance of normal family life. Normal brothers and sisters may well suffer and become confused in this family situation. The physically handicapped child will only become more disabled and dependent without special rehabilitation. And lack of care for the mentally ill can bring problems in that area to a critical stage very quickly.

Unfortunately, public assistance in all of these areas is frequently not available to the dependents of our men in the uniformed services. The child or wife of the serviceman often does not qualify for the assistance offered by the city or State due to the serviceman's frequent change of domicile. And the cost of private care is prohibitively high for the serviceman, whose pay scale was never gaged to cover such medical expenses.

The Dependents Medical Care Act, Public Law 84–569, which was passed by Congress in 1956, made health care benefits available to dependents of uniformed services personnel. Most medical care for the wives and children of men in the service is provided by the military dispensaries and hospitals operated at various locations throughout the United States. These facilities provide what would be considered the normal range of medical services. In most cases they do not have psychologists or psychiatrists or special therapists trained to work with the severely handicapped. And these dispensaries and hospitals do not provide institutional care for the mentally ill or retarded who need constant attention.

Military personnel living in areas where there are no service medical facilities were authorized by the 1956 law to use private or public medical facilities and receive partial compensation by the Department of Defense, However, the costs of care for the mentally retarded or mentally ill and the physically handicapped were not included under the 1956 law. As a result, servicemen have been forced to turn at their own expense to other public and to private facilities to meet their needs.

The benefits provided under the military health legislation have remained frozen at the 1956 level. But the world has changed. Medical knowledge, special education and rehabilitation techniques have advanced since 1956. We must advance in the area of legislative action to apply this new knowledge to the dependents of our servicemen.

As a result of the gap which exists in our medical care program, all too frequently men with 10, 12, 14 years of honorable service to their country are forced to leave the Armed Forces in order to provide for their families. This is not only unfair to the men and families involved, but a great loss to the Nation as a whole.

This is as true when the wife or child of a man in uniform requires psychiatric or psychological care as it is when the problem is that of a mentally retarded child. It is particularly damaging to the individual with mental problems not to receive immediate professional care. Without this care the condition may well worsen or become permanent. The same lack of military facilities and high cost of private aid plague the family seeking treatment for a mentally ill member.

When a serviceman's wife is afflicted with mental illness, this lack of assistance may lead to the breakup of a family. In a case that recently came to my attention, a mother of five children was suffering intermittent attacks of schizophrenia that required outpatient care and occasional short periods of treatment in an institution. The cost of this care was placing a severe financial and emotional drain on the family. This occurred while the husband was fighting in Vietnam. This type of care is small thanks for his service to us.

Another area of care that has been neglected is that of aid for the physically handicapped. With proper care, children who are born with deformities can be fitted with the necessary equipment and trained in their use so that they can live relatively normal lives. Surgical correction of structural defects and of a cosmetic nature can in many cases prevent the child from withdrawing from society if performed early enough. Although some of our military hospitals provide this service, most do not. If the physically handicapped children of our servicemen are to receive the necessary medical and therapeutic attention, the Federal Government must provide it.

All of these problems are in areas which have heretofore been neglected. The measure I am introducing today is designed to meet these problems.

The first portion of my bill authorizes a program of special care for the mentally ill and retarded and physically handicapped spouses and children of the men in our uniformed services. This assistance is to be included as a part of the program of medical care provided outside of the regular dispensary and military hospital service and administered by the dependents medical care program.

Under this program, the following are authorized: diagnosis; inpatient, outpatient, and home treatment; training, rehabilitation and special education; and institutional care in private nonprofit, public, and State institutions and facilities. The member of the uniformed service would pay a portion of the expense incurred.

The second portion of my bill amends the Social Security Act to require that residency requirements for service families be removed from State plans for certain types of maternal and child health services and for care of crippled children. This amendment would require that States receiving Federal funds for these types of care not discriminate against the families of men in the uniformed services, and would reimburse the States on a 100-percent basis for the care they so provide.

As I stated earlier, the bill is based upon legislation which has been introduced by the administration in the House of Representatives. But, as I also stated, my bill differs from the Department of Defense proposals in a number of critically important respects:

First. It covers mental illness as well as mental retardation and physical handicaps. The administration's proposal does not cover mental illness. As I have explained above, I believe this coverage is a necessary part of any humane and adequate medical care program.

Second. My proposal would extend the care provided to spouses of members of the uniformed services. This coverage is, of course, more important for mental illness and physical handicaps than it is for mental retardation, but that is important enough. I believe the failure of the administration's bill to cover spouses should be remedied.

Third. My bill covers mental retardation generally, instead of only the moderately, or severely retarded. Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas Morris, testifying before the House Armed Services Committee, stated that the Defense Department proposal would cover approximately 7,000 mentally retarded children. In addition, he classified some 20,000 children with emotional disabilities and 10,000 with major learning difficulties as physically handicapped, and therefore also covered by the administration bill. These children are perhaps mentally retarded in the broad sense contemplated by my proposals, but they would still bring the total covered to only 37,000. and, as I stated, the President's Panel on Mental Retardation has estimated that there are 75,000 mentally retarded children of servicemen who need special care. My proposal would meet this need. The nature of the care and the facilities to be made available, depending on the degree of retardation, can be provided for by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare in the joint regulations which my bill contemplates.

Fourth. The bill I introduce today covers the physically handicapped generally, instead of just dependents with "serious" physical handicaps. Again, the nature of the care to be provided for, differing degrees of handicap can be decided by the joint regulations which the bill contemplates.

Fifth. My proposal specifically authorizes the providing of prosthetic appliances and devices for the physically handicapped.

Sixth. My bill broadens the dependent's medical care program to provide well-baby care for the first year after childbirth up to a total of 12 visits. The Defense Department's bill does not so provide, and this is most important for the early identification and treatment of mental retardation and physical handicaps.

Seventh. My bill provides a flat $25 per month ceiling on the amount which any member of the uniformed services would have to pay for the treatment and care authorized therein. In my judgment, the graduated scale of payments which the administration's bill provides creates undue administrative difficulties without sufficient corresponding financial benefit to the Government. Only 10 percent of the personnel who would be covered by this legislation are even officers and a relative handful receive a monthly pay which is high enough to make them subject to the full $250 monthly payment which is contemplated by the administration's bill. A flat $25 a month contribution from the serviceman will be administratively more convenient and not significantly costlier.

Eighth. My bill requires, as does the administration's bill, that public facilities are to be used if they are available. It makes clear what I believe the administration's bill implies—that private facilities can be used when public facilities are unavailable and that administrative supervision of the choice of private facilities in those circumstances will be exercised under the joint regulations to be promulgated by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare. In addition, my bill contemplates that a member of the uniformed services may choose to use private facilities even when public facilities are available, provided that in those circumstances the United States will only contribute an amount equal to the average cost of similar care in a public facility.

Ninth. My bill requires that certain programs which are federally aided under the Social Security Act be made available to military dependents without regard to residence requirements. This requirement would be applicable to the maternal and child health services and the crippled children's programs under the Social Security Act. To obviate any administrative difficulties which the requirements of service to nonresidents might cause for the States, my bill contemplates that the States will receive 100-percent reimbursement for taking care of military dependents instead of the aid on a matching basis which they receive under the rest of the programs

under sections 503 and 513 of the Social Security Act.

Tenth. My bill would become applicable on January 1, 1967, instead of July 1, 1967. I see no administrative reason why this aid cannot be made available at the earliest possible date.

It is inconceivable in a society which strives to aid the mentally retarded, and in a time when the utmost is demanded of our men in uniform, that these families can be left to their own devices in seeking a solution to such heart-rending problems. This measure, while not a total solution, is another step forward in our continuing efforts to deal effectively with the problems of mental and physical handicaps.

EXHIBIT 1

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1964.
The Honorable ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing herewith correspondence which I have received from Lt. Col. William D. Proctor, who has a noneducable retarded child. It appears that Colonel Proctor and other career servicemen encounter difficulties in establishing residence in order to obtain adequate care for these children.

If this comes within your jurisdiction, I would greatly appreciate your having someone look into the situation facing these families in an effort to find some solution or assistance for them and for the children.

Sincerely,
ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

FORT RUCKER, ALA.,
July 9, 1964.
The Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am enclosing a letter which I sent to the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I believe the letter is self-explanatory.

Your assistance in developing a program similar to that outlined in the attached letter would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM D. PROCTOR,
Lieutenant Colonel, Infantry.

FORT RUCKER, ALA.,
July 9, 1964.
The Honorable ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is written in the hope that you might take necessary action leading to the long-range solution of a most difficult problem. As a professional Army officer and the father of a noneducationable retarded child, I have been keenly aware of the problems facing personnel in my category over the past several years.

I do not have statistical data as to the number of career Armed Forces personnel who have retarded children; however, the numerous cases coming to my attention at various stations of assignment in the United States and overseas would indicate a rather large number.

In 1958 I attempted to place my son in an institution for mentally retarded children in the State of Georgia. Due to his age at the time, (6), I could not, in good conscience, pursue this course of action. I was fortunate in locating a private nursing home where, although quite expensive, I was able to place my son. He has been in this nursing home for the past 6 years.

Recognizing that I will not be in a position to continue this payment either after retirement or certainly after my death, it is essential that some long-range solution be found, not only for me but for the thousands of others in the same predicament. In my case, I reapplied for my son's admission to the Georgia institution since I am categorized as a legal resident of Georgia. The attached letter received by me indicates that admission of my son to the institution is far from assured. Even though I am a legal resident of Georgia, it is doubtful that the permanent solution to my problem is the Georgia institution.

Numerous other officers and career enlisted men find it almost impossible to obtain admission of their children to State institutions, in that establishment of legal residence in any particular State is, of course, subject to the stability of military assignment as well as the governing rules, regulations, and laws of the State concerned.

It occurred to me that a major step forward in the program to assist the mentally retarded could well involve the establishment of dispersed institutions for the care of mentally retarded children of Armed Forces personnel. This would appear feasible in that these personnel find it difficult to establish legal residence and to be accepted as bona fide residents as regards the admission of their children to State institutions. Since these children, as dependents of military personnel, are entitled to medical treatment by Armed Forces doctors and since there does exist military installations with unused land, it occurred to me that the establishment of such a program could possibly involve the creation of these institutions on existing military installations operated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The medical aspect might well be solved by utilization of military doctors and facilities. The implementation of such a program is recognized as a complicated problem; however, it appears to me that by implementing such a program, the Government would (1) assist in solving a most difficult problem for career Armed Forces personnel, and (2) demonstrate in a dramatic manner the concern of the Government for this very real and currently unsolved problem affecting thousands of the career Armed Forces personnel.

I am enclosing, in addition to the letter I received from Gracewood State School and Hospital, a letter received by a friend of mine faced with the same problem. This second letter emphatically points out the difficulty of many career soldiers in establishing State residence for the purpose of obtaining care for the mentally retarded child.

I apologize for such a rambling letter and hope that you might see fit to investigate the feasibility of establishing such a program as outlined above.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM D. PROCTOR,
Lieutenant Colonel, Infantry.

STATE OF GEORGIA, GRACEWOOD
STATE SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL,
Gracewood, Ga., May 6, 1964.
Lt. Col. WILLIAM D. PROCTOR,
Fort Rucker, Ala.

DEAR COLONEL PROCTOR: This is in reply to your letter of April 20 concerning the application for the admission of your son, David. We regret to advise that there is still some uncertainty regarding the likely opening date of the new institution planned for the Atlanta area. While it is hoped that some nonambulatory cases may be admitted in early 1967, we simply cannot advise you as yet how soon there might possibly be a vacancy for your son. We assume, however, that the waiting list situation will continue to be a problem and will necessitate priority being given to those families who are experiencing the most severe problems in managing their children at home.

You did not indicate in your letter whether you are still interested in placement for your son at Gracewood, but it is our unhappy task to advise you that our critical shortage of bedspace and long waiting list of urgent cases would make it impossible for us to plan admission for your son within the near future in any case. In the meantime, if you have any question about his degree of retardation, and there has been no recent psychological testing, we would be glad to provide this service on an outpatient basis if arrangements could conveniently be made to bring him here. Since David has doubtless grown and progressed greatly in many areas since the original application was submitted, we are enclosing a new application form which should be completed and returned to us prior to either an outpatient evaluation or active planning toward admission. If you decide to postpone both further evaluation and admission planning until 1967, we would suggest that you delay submitting the new application until late 1966 so that the information will be even more up to date. If you feel that we can be of any service to you and David on an outpatient basis in the meantime, please advise us at your convenience.

Sincerely,
JOSEPH S. HOUSTON, M.D.,
Director, Evaluation and Rehabilitation Center.
NORMAN B. PURSLEY, M.D.,
Superintendent.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF STATE INSTITUTIONS,
Gainesville, Fla., May 13, 1964.
Mrs. M. H. PARSON,
Fort Rucker, Ala.

DEAR MRS. PARSON: We have your letter of May 12, 1964, telling us that you have had favorable reports concerning our center through Mr. Gonzalez, who has a daughter with us. We appreciate, very much, the kind comments Mr. Gonzalez may have made.

To supply you with general information concerning Sunland Training Center at Gainesville, I am enclosing one of our brochures, but I shall also try to answer your specific questions.

With reference to visiting Sunland, we would be very happy to have you come anyday Monday through Friday of any week, between the hours of 9 to 11 a.m. or 2 to 4 p.m. We are not in a position to take visitors through over the weekend or on holidays.

With reference to our waiting list, we have slightly more than 400 on our list here at the present time, and the other Sunland Training Centers in the State also have rather lengthy waiting lists. Because of this there is naturally a waiting period in most every instance before an applicant can be accepted.

Legal residence in the State is a definite requirement. It is not my feeling that simply owning property in Florida qualifies one for real legal residence. We have always construed legal residence to mean having actually lived in the State of Florida for at least 12 consecutive months and also that the person interested would have the intention of continuing to make Florida his home.

I personally feel you are to be commended to continue caring for your child as long as you can, however, I feel you are wise to be thinking ahead to a day when you may need help from an institution. I believe that it would be helpful to you if you could plan to visit us here at some convenient time and I hope that you may find this possible. If there is anything further we can do to give you information you need, please let us know.

Sincerely,
R. C. PHILIPS,
Superintendent.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, August 5, 1964.
Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: This is in reply to your letter of July 20, 1964, enclosing correspondence from Lt. Col. William D. Proctor, father of a noneducable retarded child.

You may be interested in the attached memorandum, which summarizes our activities in this difficult area. If any thoughts or ideas occur to you as to how this program might be improved, I would be happy to have them. I can assure you that this is a matter in which I am personally interested.

Sincerely,

BOB.

PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Early in 1963, Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), appointed a senior staff man in his office with considerable background in this field to act as liaison between Defense Department and Dr. Warren, special assistant to the President. Dr. Warren was appointed to implement the recommendations of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation.

Since that time, continuing efforts have been made to alleviate the problem of the career military serviceman who has a retarded child. There are an estimated 75,000 such military dependent children. The vast majority of these are educable or trainable. Some success has been achieved with respect to the educable following a memorandum of agreement with Health, Education, and Welfare whereby all such children located on installations in impacted areas will now be counted along with the normal children as the basis for providing payment for education of these children. The details of this program have been promulgated to the field by all of the services. In addition, when future programs are submitted by the States for application for Federal aid, attempts will be made to add to the number of children of residents of the State the children of military personnel who are assigned to the State but who are not residents thereof.

The most difficult problem is with respect to the severely retarded children in need of custodial care. Practically all military career people have lost entitlement, by their absence, to services rendered to such children in their native State and are unable to qualify for such services in the State to which they are assigned, because they are there temporarily. In such instances, the military parent must apply as a nonresident for admission to a State institution and pay three or four times the amount required of a resident or turn to private sources where the costs may run as high as $600 to $900 a month.

There are estimated to be approximately 3,000 children of military in the severely retarded group. The following plan has been developed to meet this situation:

Thirty-eight percent of military personnel stationed in the United States are located in California and Texas on the West Coast, and South Carolina, Georgia and Florida on the East Coast. A location in each of these areas will be selected on an installation which has been declared surplus. Custodial facilities will be established on these installations. The serviceman will be obliged to pay for the care of his child the amount he would be required to pay in his native State to a State institution if he were eligible for such services.

Efforts are now being made to secure initial funds from nonappropriated fund sources. This would be in the amount determined necessary for rehabilitation of buildings and for staff. Elaborate hospital-type facilities are not required. The normal hospital or outpatient facilities should be adequate to care for the health problems that might arise. The program would be operated by a nonprofit corporation in the State of location.

When we have the assurance of adequate funding to get started at one site, we plan to canvass several foundations for assistance, particularly in the area of research. The local group will be entitled to benefits of Federal grants that may be approved for the State and the payments by the parents of children will also contribute to the continuing costs. Servicemen, particularly in the enlisted ranks, who are unable to fully meet even the charges under this plan will be assisted wherever possible by service organizations such as the Navy Relief Society.

Dr. Warren, the President's Special Assistant in this area, strongly endorses the plan. HEW has given assurance of full cooperation and the services of professional personnel who have special competence in this area.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1965.
Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY MCNAMARA: In the summer of 1964 we corresponded concerning the problem of care for mentally retarded dependents of military personnel. At that time you requested any ideas or suggestions I might have on this subject.

As you are aware, this is a serious problem affecting our military personnel, and there is very little help available to them at the present time.

Recently the services have begun individual programs in an effort to help their own personnel. These are mainly local projects located on individual bases and as such are necessarily scattered and limited in scope. These local programs provide generally only for the child who is educable—the less severely retarded.

In the spring of 1963 I am informed that you appointed Judge Stephen Jackson to implement recommendations handed down by the Dependents Medical Care Advisory Committee in this area. Subsequently a survey was conducted to determine the extent of the problem. This survey, which was incomplete, showed 1,400 severely and profoundly retarded dependents—those children who are noneducable and generally nonbrainable. Compensating for the acknowledged weaknesses in the survey, Department of Defense personnel have put the figure at between 3,000 and 6,000. The accepted figure for all retarded service dependents is 75,000.

Although pilot projects have been started in other allied areas, virtually no progress has been made in the area of help to families with severely retarded children.

I have received many letters from men with 10, 12, 14 years of service, fathers of severely retarded children who require virtually custodial care. Such care is not normally available from State institutions because the serviceman does not have the necessary residency; the high cost of private care is prohibitive; and a hardship discharge is no answer for the man who has put in 14 years of service.

Judge Jackson's approach to the problem has been an attempt to establish two small facilities, one in the southeast and one in the southwest, as custodial hospitals. This plan has been unsuccessful so far. The basic reason for the failure, I believe, is that Jackson is attempting to finance the project through private foundations rather than seek appropriated funds. Private foundation money cannot be the answer for a project that is a Government responsibility, staffed and used by Government personnel. So far foundations approached have declined to join the project.

Facilities such as the ones sought by Judge Jackson would only accommodate some 5 percent of the total children affected. If we are to secure an answer for these families it must be a more total answer.

It seems to me that perhaps the one way this program can be centrally organized, feasibly financed and more totally effective is to make it a part of the dependents medical care program. Could not sufficient money be requested and appropriated to expand existing military medical facilities, both in the United States and abroad, to handle these custodial cases?

The advantages to this plan are numerous. First, it would automatically provide for facilities located in the areas of heaviest military concentration. Second, it would allow for utilization of existing medical facilities and personnel which are essential in the many cases of accompanying physical handicaps. Third, it would assure that the serviceman who was due for reassignment could accept his transfer with some assurance that a facility for his child would exist somewhere in the area of his new assignment. Fourth, it would automatically provide for those service families stationed overseas, 30 to 35 percent of our total forces.

In addition to the advantages to the serviceman, I feel this plan carries many inherent benefits to the services and to the country. It would make more men assignable worldwide. It would allow men, otherwise qualified and eager to serve, to remain in the service rather than force them out due to the unconquerable problem of severe retardation. The program would be administered by the dependents medical care program, thus assuring an already established administration. It would help to alleviate a severe morale problem for many of our fighting men.

I wonder, even with all your other problems, if you could take a look at this and see if any plan could be developed which would solve or at least alleviate this problem which is so heart rending for so many servicemen.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, October 21, 1965.
Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I appreciate your thoughtful letter of September 10, 1965, on the subject of medical care for retarded dependents of military personnel. I have delayed replying in order to have the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) make a full review of our efforts over the past 3 years to find a solution to this problem. I share fully your concern with the necessity of finding effective means of affording adequate care to military dependents.

Our recent studies of this matter reveal that we have many related problems which arise from restrictions contained in the Dependents' Medical Care Act passed 9 years ago. The act limits such care to hospitalization, with very few exceptions. It covers very little outpatient care. It further excludes the treatment of nervous or mental disorders or chronic diseases, except in emergencies. An additional problem, which you have mentioned, is the fact that since military personnel are transients, they are not eligible for care by State institutions.

Despite these limitations, however, I agree that the dependents' medical care program is the best vehicle by which we can solve or substantially alleviate this heart-rending problem. As a result, we are now completing studies leading to the submission of proposals to liberalize and broaden the coverage afforded by this statute. We plan to have these proposals ready for consideration by the next session of Congress.

We have also concluded that it is impractical to meet total dependents' medical care requirements through the construction of additional military facilities or the augmentation of military medical staffs. While we will continue the policy of providing care on a space and staff available basis to dependents of active duty personnel, retirees and their dependents, it is not feasible to program military construction to meet these requirements, nor could we, in any event, provide enough facilities worldwide to assure care to all of our dependents. It likewise does not appear in the national interest to attempt to equip and staff our facilities for specialized care such as that needed for mentally retarded and physically handicapped children, since the major mission of our medical facilities is adult care for the active duty military population. Moreover, by so doing, we would in some instances be duplicating civilian facilities already in existence. It is much sounder, we believe, to make it possible for our military dependents to receive such care, treatment, and special schooling from civilian and State institutions. This will be the purpose of our proposed legislation.

I certainly appreciate your continuing interest in helping find a solution to these problems. We will be pleased to keep you informed of our progress.

Sincerely,

Bob.

The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1966.

Hon. Robert F. Kennedy,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob: I recall that I promised to keep you informed of developments concerning medical care for retarded children of military personnel.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter sent to the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee on March 8, together with a copy of the Defense Department's proposed bill. As you can see, its provisions greatly broaden the coverage suggested by H.R. 9271, and apply to the physically handicapped child as well as to the mentally retarded. It would establish a comprehensive program for their care, training, rehabilitation, and special education, with all such care to be obtained from civilian facilities.

I trust you will see in our proposal a sincere effort to establish a sound working program for these unfortunate children, and to take a decisive step to help alleviate some of the handicaps under which they live.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

Bob.

General Counsel of the
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1966.

Hon. L. Mendel Rivers,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Reference is made to your request for the views of the Department of Defense with respect to H.R. 9271, 89th Congress, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide resident care for mentally retarded children of members of the Armed Forces under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

The purpose of H.R. 9271 is to provide resident care for mentally retarded children of members of the Armed Forces while the latter are on active duty for a period of more than 30 days. Eligible children of members of the Armed Forces would be those determined by competent authority to be mentally retarded and in need of resident care because of that condition. The bill provides that resident care, for such children, may be provided in facilities of the Armed Forces established solely for that purpose. Charges may be imposed for the resident care provided. Uniform regulations, prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, may provide for reimbursing a public or private facility providing resident care for eligible children. The bill provides that amounts paid to a facility may be recovered from members by monthly deductions from their basic pay and from any amount due upon final settlement of their accounts.

While the Department of Defense supports the purpose of H.R. 9271, we recommend the enactment of the more comprehensive draft attached.

The purpose of the substitute draft is to provide a special program for mentally and physically handicapped children of active duty members of all seven of the uniformed services to the end that the heavy and, at times, unbearable burden of providing continuing care for such children will be lightened for the serviceman.

The Department of Defense recognizes that the basic obligation of providing for the needs of its members, in terms of acceptable living standards, must be fulfilled by the uniformed services if they are to attract and retain a competent, dedicated, and professional force. It is further recognized that payment for the care, treatment, and special education of mentally and physically handicapped children is frequently such a drain on the financial resources of an active duty member as to make it impossible for him to maintain an acceptable standard of living.

The services required by mentally or physically handicapped children of members of the uniformed services are generally not available at uniformed services facilities. Moreover, such children are often unable to receive civilian care and treatment, or special education, because of State residence requirements. The proposal is intended to make public and private nonprofit facilities readily available to children of members of the uniformed services, regardless of the assignment of the member.

The proposal would establish, effective July 1, 1967, a program for the care, training, rehabilitation, and special education of children who are moderately, severely, or profoundly retarded mentally or who have a serious physical handicap.

The care, training, and special education covered by the proposal would all be obtained from civilian institutions and facilities. This provision stems from the conclusion of the Department of Defense that it would be impractical to attempt to solve this problem through the construction of additional military facilities or the augmentation of military staffs.

Under the proposal, active duty members would be required to pay a share of the cost of the benefits provided their children. Members in the lowest enlisted pay grade would be required to pay the first $25 incurred each month. Members in the highest commissioned pay grade would similarly pay $250. The amounts to be paid by members in all other pay grades would be determined administratively, except that the amounts so determined could not be less than $25 or more than $250 per month.

In an effort to overcome the effects of the residence requirements imposed by some States in connection with their child welfare and crippled children programs, the proposal would, in effect, require such States to waive residence requirements for the children of active duty members (and for a period of 1 year following the member's retirement) in order to obtain Federal grants for their programs.

Except for adding a special new program limited to handicapped children, the proposal would not make any changes in the existing dependents' medical care program.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that enactment of this proposal will result in the following additional annual costs (in millions):

	Fiscal year				
	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Army	9.2	9.6	10.0	10.5	11.1
Navy and Marine Corps	7.1	7.4	7.8	8.1	8.6
Air Force	11.5	11.9	12.3	12.8	13.5
Coast Guard, Environmental Science Services, and Public Health Service	.4	.5	.5	.5	.6
Total	28.2	29.4	30.6	31.9	33.8

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the committee.

Sincerely,

L. Niederlehner,
Acting General Counsel.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record. I also ask that the bill remain on the table for 5 days to allow Senators who wish to join me in cosponsoring it to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 3169) to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special program for the mentally retarded, mentally ill, and physically handicapped spouses and children of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Kennedy of New York (for himself and Mr. Nelson), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3169

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The second sentence of section 1079(a) is amended by striking out "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e)".

(2) Section 1079 is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(c) In the case of a dependent spouse of a member of the uniformed services, or of a child (as defined in section 1072(2)(E) of this title) of a member of the uniformed services, who is retarded mentally, or is mentally ill, or has a physical handicap, the plans referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall, with respect to such mental retardation, mental illness, or physical handicap, include, under joint regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the following:

"(1) Diagnosis.

"(2) Inpatient, outpatient, and home treatment.

"(3) Training, rehabilitation, and special education necessitated by the spouse's or child's mental condition or physical handicap.

"(4) Institutional care in private nonprofit, public and State institutions and facilities and, when appropriate, transportation to and from such institutions and facilities.

"(5) Prosthetic appliances and devices for the physically handicapped.

"(d) Except as provided in subsection (e), members of the uniformed services shall share in the cost of any benefits provided under subsection (c) by paying the first $25 incurred each month. A member who has a spouse and a child or two or more children incurring expenses in a given month under a plan covered by subsection (c) shall not be required to pay an amount greater than $25 a month in total. The foregoing limitation on the amount to be paid by members shall apply only if members use public facilities to the extent such facilities are available and adequate as determined under joint regulations of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such regulations shall also govern the basis on which private facilities are to be selected in circumstances where public facilities are unavailable or inadequate.

"(e) Whenever private facilities are used in furnishing any medical care referred to in subsection (c) of this section and such facilities are used at the request or direction of a member of the uniformed services, the cost to be borne by the United States shall not exceed an amount equal to the average cost of furnishing the same or similar medical care in public facilities throughout the United States, as determined by the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1077 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(e) Infant care under clause (5) of subsection (a) of this section shall include, but shall not be limited to, well-baby care in the form of routine medical examinations, tests, and observations of the infant during the first year after its birth; and not less than twelve such medical examinations of the infant shall be authorized as a part of such well-baby care during such period."

(b) Clause (3) of section 1079(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Postnatal care shall include, but shall not be limited to, well-baby care in the form of routine medical examinations, tests, and observations of the infant during the first year after its birth; and not less than twelve such medical examinations of the infant shall be authorized as a part of such well-baby care during such period."

SEC. 3. Section 1079(a) of title 10, United States Code, is further amended by redesignating clause (6) as clause (7) and inserting after clause (5) a new clause (6) as follows:

"(6) Routine physical examinations and immunization when required for dependents to move into any area outside the continental United States, and the move by the dependents (A) is incident to the duty assignment of a member of the uniformed services, and (B) has been approved by the Secretary concerned."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 503(a) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (7), and (2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; and (9) provide that no individual who resides within the State shall be denied any services provided by the plan on the grounds that he fails to meet any residence requirement or that he is eligible for benefits under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, if such individual (A) is the wife or child of an active-duty member of the uniformed services, or (B) is the wife or child of a person who (i) has been retired from the uniformed services within one year prior to the time such individual applies for such services, and (ii) is covered for benefits under section 1074(b) of title 10, United States Code".

(b) Section 513(a) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (6), and (2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; and (8) provide that no child who resides within the State shall be denied any services provided by the plan on the grounds that such child fails to meet any residence requirement or that such child is eligible for benefits under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, if such child (A) is the child of an active-duty member of the uniformed services, or (B) is the child of an individual, who retired from the uniformed services within one year prior to the time such child applies for such services, and who is covered for benefits under section 1074(b) of title 10, United States Code".

SEC. 5. (a) Title V of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end of section 505 the following new section:

"SEC. 506. Additional Payments to States.

"In addition to the sums payable to the States under section 504, there shall be payable to each State which has an approved plan under this part an amount equal to 100 per centum of the expenses incurred by such State in meeting the requirements contained in section 503(a)(9). There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the preceding sentence."

(b) Title V of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end of section 516 the following new section:

"SEC. 517. Additional Payments to States.

"In addition to the sums payable to the States under section 514, there shall be payable to each State which has an approved plan under this part an amount equal to 100 per centum of the expenses incurred by such State in meeting the requirements contained in section 513(a)(8). There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the preceding sentence."

SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect on January 1, 1967.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question concerning the bill he has just introduced?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, would the bill provide for the care of the dependent retarded children of a serviceman only?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NELSON. And would it provide for the care of such a child only while the father is in the service?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The bill deals with the dependents of servicemen who are on active duty and would provide for such care for the period of 1 year after the serviceman had retired from the armed services.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with everything that the Senator has said about the problem of the mentally retarded. I wholeheartedly endorse the bill, and should like to be listed as a cosponsor of it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin may be listed as a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled the "Civil Rights Procedure Act." This bill would liberalize Federal court procedures in two areas: It would, first, liberalize the right of removal of State prosecutions to the Federal courts in civil rights cases; and, second, broaden the right to a Federal injunction against unconstitutional civil rights related State court proceedings. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

This preferred legislation was drafted, after careful study, by a distinguished special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York under the able and conscientious chairmanship of the Honorable Francis E. Rivers. The members of the panel had the expert help, in both the study and the actual drafting, of the former staff director of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. The bill is a responsible and thoughtful proposal.

This is a bill on a very limited, but nevertheless very significant subject. The bill's importance is not as a comprehensive piece of civil rights legislation, but rather as a careful effort to deal with one problem which should be covered in any comprehensive legislation which we enact this year.

That problem is the relationship between the State and Federal courts in civil rights cases. More specifically, that problem is the fact that Federal law on removal of civil rights cases to Federal courts and on Federal injunctions against unconstitutional State prosecutions is inadequate.

The bar association committee's report extensively documents these inadequacies of the existing law. Rather than repeat the contents of the report, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The basic point on removal is that because of restrictive judicial interpretation of 28 U.S.C. 1443, particularly in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the categories of State prosecutions removable to Federal court were limited to those under a statute or ordinance unconstitutional on its face. Remand orders to the State courts were not appealable until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provided a right to appeal, so the restrictive interpretation stayed in the law.

The result was that defendants in clearly unconstitutional State prosecutions were forced to wend their way through the State courts up to the U.S. Supreme Court, and sometimes further yet—to the Federal district court on petition for habeas corpus. The path to exoneration was slow and costly indeed. The bar association report mentions the Shuttlesworth case and the Jackson freedom riders cases, and there are dozens more where the road to dismissal of the charges was traversed successfully, but only at great cost in time and money.

And there are, of course, hundreds and hundreds of cases where the defendants lacked either the financial resources or the legal skills or perhaps just the inclination to travel the whole way.

The bill which I introduce today broadens the right to removal for immediate Federal consideration of the case by spelling out that State proceedings which interfere with constitutional and Federal statutory guarantees in the area of civil rights can be removed to Federal court. It does this by adding new subsections to 28 U.S.C. 1443 rather than by changing any existing language. It takes this approach because the existing language of 28 U.S.C. 1443 is now finally in litigation at the appellate level under the 1964 act's grant of the right to appeal remand orders in removal cases. That litigation, which is a tribute to the persistence and ingenuity of the private practitioners who have contributed their services to the civil rights movement in the South, has already resulted in some judicial reinterpretation of the existing provisions of 28 U.S.C. 1443 to give them a new life. That will be a salutary development if it is ultimately upheld by the Supreme Court. But the present proposals will be helpful as well in spelling out clearly a broadened right to removal.

The basic point of the bar association proposal on injunctions is complementary—to make 42 U.S.C. 1983 into an adequate tool of recourse to the Federal courts to stop clearly unconstitutional State proceedings from continuing.

Senator JAVITS and I introduce this legislation today because we believe it should be considered along with the administration's bill, which, as I understand it, will be introduced next week. I look forward to cosponsoring that legislation; but I also hope the legislation we introduce today will be carefully considered at the same time.

The questions of removal and injunction in civil rights-related cases need clarification. The bar association bill, which I introduce today, would provide that clarification. The members of the bar association committee, and particularly Judge Rivers, deserve our congratulations and our thanks for the excellent job they have done and the great contribution they have made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with the report of the committee of the Bar Association of New York be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3170) to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States over certain classes of removed cases and to provide injunctive relief in certain cases, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of New York (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3170

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Civil Rights Procedure Act."

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) The Congress has over the last century adopted legislation declaring, protecting, and granting various civil rights to citizens. It is the sense of Congress that some citizens seeking to avail themselves of these declared rights have been subjected to lengthy and expensive criminal prosecutions instituted to deter them from attempting to obtain their civil rights. It is further the sense of Congress that the proper means to correct this unlawful activity is to vest appropriate jurisdiction in the district courts of the United States.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose of this legislation to promote the general welfare by preventing reprisals against those who seek to end discrimination on account of race, color, religion or national origin prohibited by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. REMOVAL OF CAUSES.

(a) Section 1443 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of subsection (2) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(3) For any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion or national origin; or

"(4) For an exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States when committed in furtherance of any right of the nature described in subsection (3) of this section."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 1447 of title 28 of the United States Code as amended to read as follows:

"(d) An order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed is not reviewable on appeal or otherwise, except that an order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed pursuant to section 1443 of this title shall be appealable as a final decision under section 1291 and an order denying remand of a case removed pursuant to section 1443 shall be appealable as an injunction of proceedings in the State court under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 1292."

SEC. 4. INJUNCTION OF STATE PROCEEDINGS.

Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1983) is amended by inserting "(a)" at the beginning of the section and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Such redress shall include the grant of an injunction to stay a proceeding in a State court where such proceeding was instituted for:

(1) Any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion or national origin; or

(2) Any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, when committed in furtherance of any right of the nature described in subparagraph (1) of this subsection;

and where:

(i) An issue determinative of the proceeding in favor of the party seeking the injunction has been decided in favor of his contention in a final decision in another proceeding arising out of a like factual situation;

(ii) The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation or other authority for the proceeding has been declared unconstitutional in a final decision in another proceeding;

(iii) The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation or other authority for the proceeding is, on its face, an unconstitutional abridgement of the rights to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble; or

(iv) The proceeding was instituted for the purpose of discouraging the parties or others from exercising rights of freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble.

"(c) In an action seeking an injunction under subsection (b) the court shall not deny or defer relief on the ground that a defense or remedy in the State courts is available."

The report presented by Mr. KENNEDY of New York is as follows:

PROPOSAL FOR A FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS PROCEDURE ACT—SUMMARY OF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS WITH PROPOSED BILL

INTRODUCTION

In the spring and summer of 1963, members of this association, as citizens and more particularly as lawyers, were greatly disturbed by news reports out of the South. These reports told of repeated instances in many communities in which the efforts of Negroes to exercise civil rights claimed, and in many cases well established, under the Constitution and Federal laws were being frustrated by the use against them of the processes of local and State law enforcement. These processes included arrest, physical coercion by the police, denial of or onerous conditions on bail, rejection of Federal claims at trial and on appeal, and delays or harassment at various stages of the proceedings.[1] That the local and State law enforcement processes were being misused in many instances was confirmed by the decisions of the Federal courts when these or related cases finally reached a hearing in a Federal court.

It was also apparent from such decisions that the ability of these defendants to have their Federal claims passed upon by a Federal court promptly and decisively was severely restricted by the out-of-date wording of the applicable Federal remedial statutes, some of which have come down unchanged from Reconstruction legislation, and in particular by the narrowing interpretations that had been given these statutes by the Supreme Court in the last decades of the nineteenth century in civil rights and other cases. Subsequent developments in the recognition and expansion of the substantive civil rights of Negroes by the Court and the Congress, particularly in the period since the School Segregation Cases of 1954, had not been accompanied by equivalent rethinking of Federal remedial law. The problem became acute in the last several years, as Southern Negroes, aided by civil rights workers from all sections, have stepped up the pace of demands for realization of their substantive civil rights in all communities by public attempts to exercise those rights and by demonstrations and similar activities in public places to protest the denial thereof.

Accordingly, the then president of the association, Herbert Brownell, appointed this Special Committee on Civil Rights Under Law, charged with the primary duty of conducting a study of the relevant Federal remedial statutes available to protect civil rights and with recommending revisions found necessary or advisable for their modernization.[2] The work of the committee was informed by an extensive legal and factual research study made under contract by a professional staff, financed by foundation grants.[3] The detailed study (to be referred to herein as "the staff study") is presently undergoing editorial revision with a view to publication in book form.

---

[1] See "Law Enforcement—A Report on Equal Protection in the South," U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, pp. 62–83 (1965).

In view of the fact that the problem with which this study is concerned has continued to be severe, despite the further expansion given to the scope of substantive civil rights by the Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the executive committee of the association has authorized the release of the present recommendations and summary of report at this time, in order that the Congress and the public may be informed of the recommendations of the committee, including the changes in Federal legislation it proposes.

I. THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Many Americans have been arrested, jailed, tried, and convicted by local authorities only because they have tried to exercise rights granted by the Constitution and laws of the United States. In recent years the offenses charged have not generally been based upon statutes or ordinances avowedly commanding racial segregation, but upon apparently neutral enactments, such as those prohibiting disorderly conduct, resisting arrest, obstructing sidewalks, breach of the peace, and similar alleged offenses.

Ultimately, however, the facts proved in these cases have generally boiled down, as the staff study shows, to activity protected against State interference by the 14th amendment, together with the 1st amendment and Federal civil rights statutes. And ultimately many of the defendants have been vindicated on the basis of Federal law, but usually not until a hearing was secured in a Federal court. Under the existing restrictions upon the applicability of Federal remedial statutes, it may require 2 to 3 years for a State criminal case to reach a Federal hearing, either in the Supreme Court on direct review of the State conviction or in a district court on petition for habeas corpus. Meanwhile, persons who ultimately will be vindicated are incarcerated or subjected to hafsh bail restrictions, and they and others similarly situated are discouraged from asserting their legitimate substantive civil rights demands.

Constitutional history teaches that Federal rights require the backing of Federal remedies to assure their vindication in States hostile to such Federal rights. It may be hoped that in the generality of cases the State courts will recognize their concurrent responsibility for enforcement of such rights and thus make unnecessary widespread use of the Federal court remedies. However, it is clear, upon a review of the reported cases in which Federal substantive civil rights have been claimed as defenses against State criminal prosecutions for activity asserting such rights, that local and State authorities in some areas have taken unfair advantage of the delays and other difficulties of invoking the ultimate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to review such State criminal prosecutions. Hence, it became apparent to the committee early in its deliberations that remedies in the Federal courts at the local level had to be strengthened to assure justice, speed, and finality in the vindication of Federal defenses in criminal prosecutions for civil rights activity.

The focus of the staff study was upon the three classic means of Federal intervention to protect constitutional and other Federal rights against State attack, each long recognized in Federal statutes: habeas corpus, injunction of State criminal proceedings and removal of State criminal proceedings to a Federal district court. With respect to each remedy, as will be discussed below, various restrictions of statutory construction or judicial doctrine were found to limit its full effectiveness as a means of assuring the desirable justice, speed and finality in achieving the protection of substantive civil rights. The problem is essentially one of modernizing the law governing Federal remedies so as to make them effective to prevent the exercise of federally granted substantive civil rights within a State from being unlawfully frustrated by means of State action in the form of criminal prosecution. These statutory remedies, and the revisions proposed by this committee, do not relate to purely individual invasion of individual rights, but only to wrongful State action.

The committee concluded that precedents in the case law make statutory change unnecessary with respect to habeas corpus, that statutory expansion of Federal removal jurisdiction is imperative and is the most salutary approach to the problem presented, and that a narrowly limited statutory expansion of Federal injunctive jurisdiction is also essential for complete relief.

II. THE SCOPE OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

After reviewing the text, the legislative history, and the judicial interpretations of the relevant statutes, the committee determined that it was advisable to make fresh definitions of the conditions under which Federal courts should intervene in the State criminal process in this type of case. Tinkering with the imprecise 19th-century wording of the Reconstruction legislation which stands encumbered with the gloss of judicial interpretations dating from an era when the courts were not in sympathy with expansive recognition of civil rights, was recognized as unsatisfactory in principle.

Moreover, the meaning of these old enactments is the subject of pending litigation in numerous civil rights cases. The committee believed that the Congress would not want to prejudice the positions of the parties therein by changing the existing statutory wording. Thus, where the committee recommends statutory revision, the changes take the form of adding independently-defined conditions for relief to the provisions now on the statute books. (The committee's recommended changes, in the form of a bill entitled "Federal Civil Rights Procedure Act," are set out in app. A. The most relevant provisions of the existing statutes, with the recommended changes added in italic, are set out in app. B.)

The committee was concerned that its recommendations should not represent punitive or sectional legislation—but rather should be equally applicable in all sections of the Nation as and when cases of the defined types may arise in the continuing quest of minority groups for equal rights. For this reason, the committee rejected the approach of enlarging upon the local prejudice jurisdictional test of some of the Reconstruction legislation, and instead sought to define objective classes of lawful activity for which Federal jurisdiction could be invoked as a protection against 'unwarranted State criminal prosecutions. For the same reason, the recommended statutory provisions speak, as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 similarly does, in terms of denial of equal protection, not against Negroes alone, but "on account of race, color, religion, or national origin."

The committee was, of course, aware of the current controversy existing with respect to Federal court intervention in State criminal proceedings in contexts other than civil rights cases. Because the civil rights cases present a distinct and urgent claim for Federal remedies to protect the Federal rights actively being asserted in the conduct for which these defendants are prosecuted, we deemed it unnecessary and inappropriate to become involved in the quite different problem of the relation of Federal and State judicial proceedings in the context of alleged deprivations of due process (or denial of equal protection or of first amendment rights on any basis other than civil rights activity). The committee's recommended legislation therefore is limited in terms to cases within the scope of civil rights activity as commonly understood—the assertion and advocacy of equal civil rights for minority groups.[4]

III. THE EXISTING REMEDIES AND SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING THEM

A. Definition of civil rights activity

Even with the avowed intention of limiting its recommendations to the civil rights context, the committee found varying views as to the best way to define the protected civil rights activity in a remedial statute. Recognizing that one problem with the existing legislation was its use of imprecise terms such as "equal civil rights," the committee determined to couch its recommendations in objective terms by describing activities prosecution for which merited and needed Federal protection because such activities were the vital manifestations of the substantive civil rights declared by Federal law.

---

[2] Mr. Brownell's successor as president of the association, Hon. Samuel I. Rosenman, was an original member of the committee, but resigned upon becoming president. He has continued in that position to give interested and strong support to the work of the committee, as has Paul B. DeWitt, executive secretary of the association.

[3] The staff director was Berl I. Bernhard, Esq., formerly staff director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, who during the period of this study held similar positions with the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and the White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights." Ronald B. Natalie, Esq., a former member of the staff of the Commission, served as associate staff director. The present recommendations and summary of report was prepared by the committee, based upon the manuscript of the Staff Study.

The work of the committee has been financed to date principally by grants from the Ford, Field and Taconic Foundations. A supplementary grant from the New World Foundation covered the expenses of the conference with a group of Federal and State judges and prosecutors referred to in note 4, infra.

[4] In order to test out the tentatively formulated recommendations against possible attack on the ground they could be abused by defendants in State criminal cases having nothing to do with civil rights and in order to seek out informed views on the central problem of Federal remedial protection for civil rights defendants, the committee invited a distinguished group of judges and prosecutors, Federal and State, from southern as well as northern jurisdictions, to express their views.

Following an afternoon and evening conference with this group of experts in the practical administration of such remedies, the committee sharpened its recommendations. The responsibility for the final recommendations lies entirely with the committee, of course, but it wishes here to record its appreciation for the candid, thoughtful and constructive views expressed at the conference by the following persons who responded to its invitations:

Hon. Harold Tyler, Jr., U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York;

Hon. Francis L. Valente, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, First Department (now deceased);

Hon. Barefoot Sanders, assistant deputy attorney general of the United States; former U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas;

Hon. Terrell Glenn, U.S. attorney of the eastern district of South Carolina; and

Hon. Richard Uviller, chief of the appeals bureau, New York County district attorney's office.

One view was that the definition should reach all constitutionally protected activities by speaking in terms of the equal protection clause and the first amendment. This view was deemed too broad, in that it might permit unintended use of the legislation by State defendants in contexts other than civil rights cases as properly defined.

On the other hand, it was suggested that the protected activities might be described by reference solely to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the most compendious catalog of substantive civil rights in modern legislation. Although reference to the act by way of example seemed desirable, limiting the coverage of remedial provisions to its subject matter was deemed too narrow, in that the remedial statute might thus become obsolete soon after enactment. This could occur as the minority rights movement shifts emphasis to new areas of concern not mentioned in the 1964 act, but which may come to be held within the constitutional or Federal statutory protection against racial and similar discrimination.

The committee concluded, therefore, that the scope of civil rights activity to be protected should encompass State prosecutions for "any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion or national origin."

However, civil rights activity is commonly conducted not merely by bare attempts to exercise individual rights, but by demonstrations and similar public manifestations of protest at the denial of civil rights, and by advocacy for their enforcement and enlargement. These first amendment activities will typically include civil rights workers and other persons in addition to those whose individual rights are sought to be furthered by the activity. Hence the committee's definitional provision goes on to include State prosecution for "any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States when committed in furtherance of any right described in [the preceding quotation]."

As explained more fully below, the proposed legislation would make all State prosecutions for activity within either branch of this definition removable to a Federal district court. The more severe remedy of injunction of State proceedings would also be available in cases meeting the same test, but only if one of the additional stringent requirements explained below is met. The proposed definition would not affect Federal habeas corpus jurisdiction, as no statutory change is proposed there.

B. Habeas corpus

The committee believes that statutory amelioration of restrictive decisions regarding the availability of habeas corpus is unnecessary because there are now persuasive precedents in the case law which recognize that the general requirement of exhaustion of State remedies before resort to Federal habeas corpus is not applicable in circumstances found in the typical civil rights case. Moreover, adoption of the enlargement of removal jurisdiction we recommend would make resort to habeas corpus in this type of case largely unnecessary in the future.

It is fortunate that these conclusions are possible. Many members of the committee were reluctant to propose departures from the historic generalities of the rules governing the Great Writ for any particular class of cases, even in light of the urgent current problem with respect to civil rights cases. The committee was aware that general legislative expansion of the remedy of habeas corpus might arouse great State resentment, as evidenced by the reaction to the broad scope given recently to this remedy in the general criminal law context by Federal judicial decisions.[5] In habeas corpus actions, the Federal court discharges a person held by the State and, although the writ is not necessarily a bar in law to a reprosecution, it may well be one in fact depending on the grounds for its issuance.

The nub of the matter is that the remedy of habeas corpus has been used rarely in civil rights cases[6] because there has been uncertainty as to the requirement of prior exhaustion of State remedies in such cases.[7] Briefly, the exhaustion doctrine provides that the writ of habeas corpus may not be granted unless the petitioner has first exhausted his State remedies. Although the original habeas corpus statute[8] in no way conditioned habeas corpus upon such prior exhaustion, some subsequent judicial decisions read the exhaustion doctrine into the law as an exception to the general availability of the writ. First and most notable of these was the case of *Ex parte Royall*, 117 U.S. 241 (1886), which devised the exhaustion doctrine in a case involving a petition for anticipatory (pretrial) habeas corpus in a contracts clause dispute.

However, many anticipatory habeas corpus decisions subsequent to Royall, while recognizing the exhaustion doctrine, have held it inapplicable to cases involving incarceration of persons attempting to exercise specific Federal rights.[9] It is the view of the committee that, under existing case law and without any additional legislation, Federal courts can and should grant anticipatory habeas corpus in civil rights cases without requiring exhaustion of State remedies.[10]

There seems to be confusion in the cases as to the scope and effect of the exhaustion doctrine upon postconviction habeas corpus, now governed by 28 U.S.C. 2254, which explicitly requires that State remedies must, in most cases, be exhausted before habeas corpus may be obtained after judgment in a State court. The reviser's note (1948) to this provision states that "this new section is declaratory of existing law as affirmed by the Supreme Court." However, section 2254 itself provides that the exhaustion doctrine is inapplicable if there exist "circumstances rendering such [State] process ineffective to protect the rights of the prisoner." [11]

We suggest that present civil rights experience in the South, as well as recent Federal civil rights legislation, indicates clearly that such circumstances do exist and should be judicially recognized. Therefore, the committee feels that Federal district courts now have the authority, without further legislation, to hold that the exhaustion requirements of section 2254 is inapplicable after, as well as before, judgment in civil rights cases where the denial of governing Federal rights is patent.[12]

C. Removal

Federal removal jurisdiction dates from the founding of the United States. Thus, the very first Judiciary Act passed by Congress authorized removal of specified classes of cases to the Federal courts.[13] Congress from time to time thereafter has enlarged Federal removal jurisdiction to meet new situations which seemed to require special consideration.

In 1866, Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act, which was designed to give the freedmen the full and equal benefit of laws for the security of person and property.[14] The act contained procedural provisions which appeared to authorize the removal to a Federal court of all civil and criminal cases affecting persons who were denied or could not enforce in the State courts the rights granted by the act.

These provisions, as subsequently extended and codified, now appear in 28 U.S.C. 1443. The section authorizes removal of criminal prosecutions:

"(1) Against any person who is denied or cannot enforce in the courts of such State a right under any law providing for the equal civil rights of citizens of the United States, or of all persons within the jurisdiction thereof;

"(2) For any act under color of authority derived from any law providing for equal rights, or for refusing to do any act on the ground that it would be inconsistent with such law."

While this statutory grant of removal jurisdiction appears broad on its face, the staff study clearly demonstrates that the Supreme Court, in a series of decisions which culminated in 1906, construed the grant so narrowly as to render it virtually nugatory to effect removal of cases arising in the current civil rights struggle.[15] These landmark cases, and the many lower court decisions which followed them, apparently restricted the right to removal under subdivision (1) of what is now section 1443 to those limited situations where a State constitutional or statutory provision was unconstitutional on its face.[16]

---

[5] The judicial expansion of the scope of habeas corpus is best illustrated in *Fay* v. *Noia*, 372 U.S. 391 (1963).

[6] The notable exception has been *In re Shuttlesworth*, 369 U.S. 35 (1962). The history of this case prior and subsequent to the cited decision of the Supreme Court is discussed at length in the Staff Study, and a summary is set forth at pp. 22–24 herein.

[7] See, e.g., *Hillegas* v. *Sams*, 349 F. 2d 859 (5th Cir. 1965).

[8] Act of Feb. 5, 1867, ch. 28, sec. 1, 14 Stat. 385–86.

[9] See, e.g., *Cunningham* v. *Neagle*, 135 U.S. 1 (1890); *Ohio* v. *Thomas*, 173 U.S. 276 (1899); *In re Loney*, 134 U.S. 372 (1890); *In re Sam Kee*, 31 Fed. 680 (C.C.N.D. Cal. 1887); and *In re Lee Sing*, 43 Fed. 359 (C.C.N.D. Cal. 1890).

[10] Particularly with respect to rights claimed under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the cases arising under the Commerce Clause, analyzed in the Staff Study, are precedent that in prosecutions interfering with an important Federal interest, a petition may be granted before trial. See generally, Amsterdam, "Criminal Prosecutions Affecting Federally Guaranteed Civil Rights: Federal Removal and Habeas Corpus Jurisdiction To Abort State Court Trial," 113 U. Pa. L. Rev. 793, 882–908 (1965).

[11] Sec. 2254 is set forth in app. B hereto.

[12] If application for bail pending exhaustion in the State courts is denied, the Federal habeas court may deem exhaustion completed. *In re Shuttlesworth*, 369 U.S. 35 (1962). See also *Johnston* v. *Marsh*, 227 F. 2d 528 (3d Cir. 1955); *United States* v. *Hamilton*, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 17 (1795). Even appeal is not required where prisoners are held for petty offenses and numerous prosecutions are likely to be pressed in the State courts—typical civil rights situations. *Ex parte Kieffer*, 40 Fed. 399 (C.C.D. Kan. 1889); *Collins* v. *Frisbie*, 189 F. 2d 464 (6th Cir. 1951), aff'd, 342 U.S. 519 (1952).

[13] Act of Sept. 24, 1789, ch. 20, sec. 12, 1 Stat. 79–80.

[14] Act of Apr. 9, 1866, ch. 31, sec. 3, 14 Stat. 27.

[15] See, e.g., *Virginia* v. *Rives*, 100 U.S. 313 (1880); *Neal* v. *Delaware*, 103 U.S. 370 (1881); *Kentucky* v. *Powers*, 201 U.S. 1 (1906).

Thus, these precedents served in recent reported cases to deny a right to remove where a State statute or ordinance, possibly valid on its face, was unconstitutionally applied because of purposeful and discriminatory application against Negroes and civil rights workers. These decisions also inhibited removal where arrests were made pursuant to law laid down by the highest court of the State, rather than by State statute. Even the wrongful actions of State court judges were apparently not deemed grounds for removal under the statute as thus construed.[17]

These restrictive precedents were established in a totally different constitutional and legal atmosphere when, for example, a State's provision of "separate but equal" facilities for Negroes was deemed an acceptable constitutional practice.[18] And they were decided long prior to the time that Congress manifested its recent clear intent to enact into law specific statutory guarantees of substantive civil rights.[19] However, whatever the background or explanation, the committee has concluded that section 1443, as interpreted by these controlling decisions rendered some 60 or more years ago, does not speak adequately to the serious problem of the administration of justice now existing in many areas of the country. This appears clear from the fact that, until recently, a remand to the State court was ordered in virtually every reported civil rights removal case, and the right to remove to a Federal court was thus effectively and definitely frustrated.

A dramatic, but not atypical, example is found in *Baines* v. *City of Danville*, 337 F. 2d 579 (4th Cir. 1964), where a group of civil rights demonstrators were unsuccessful in removing their arrest cases to the Federal court under section 1443. The submission made by the Department of Justice to the district court showed that the State court judge had actually been in the streets attempting to disperse the demonstrators, carried a gun to court, had otherwise displayed prejudice against the defendants, and had tried to intimidate the defendants and other Negro citizens from any further exercise of their constitutional rights. Nonetheless, section 1443, as interpreted, was found not to justify a removal of this case to a Federal court.

In another landmark case described in detail in the staff study (see pp. 22–24, infra), a Negro minister prominent in the civil rights struggle was convicted of disturbing the peace on absolutely no evidence, but was required to spend more than 5 years in a massive legal battle to vindicate his rights. In the course of this struggle, he had to appear no less than 16 separate times in Federal and State courts. A right to remove this case at an early stage would clearly have effectively served the interests of justice.

In still another series of cases, the Jackson (Miss.) freedom riders were compelled to spend 4 years in the courts at great legal expense in order to overturn their convictions. This long struggle was necessary despite the fact that the Supreme Court had previously declared the statute underlying the arrests to be unconstitutional.[20] Here again a liberal removal statute would have achieved justice, speed, and finality.

There have been few opportunities in recent years to urge the Supreme Court to reverse the aforementioned long course of restrictive judicial interpretation and application of the thrust of section 1443. Until the Civil Rights Act of 1964, for many years orders of Federal courts remanding civil rights cases to the State courts were not appealable. As a result of the new appeal provisions of the 1964 act,[21] there is a glimmer of evidence that some lower courts are seeking to find some way to make section 1443 fill its original purpose.[22] The committee has concluded, however, that these piecemeal efforts to erode the line of ancient Supreme Court precedents, followed by lower court rulings for some 60 years, will be time-consuming, expensive, and may ultimately fail on the basis of application of the doctrine of stare decisis. In our judgment, continued delay in this area will only foster disrespect for law and order as an effective method to achieve equal civil rights for all.

With many removal cases pending in the courts, the committee feels, as noted earlier, that it would be inappropriate to attempt modification of the original language of subdivisions (1) and (2) of section 1443 at this time. Accordingly, the committee proposes the addition of new subdivisions to section 1443, providing that the defendants may remove to the Federal court any State criminal prosecution:

"(3) For any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured, or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion, or national origin; or

"(4) For any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States when committed in furtherance of any right of the nature described in subsection (3) of this section."

Some members of the committee initially felt that in the light of the extension in the definition of removable cases being recommended, the procedure for removal might be restricted in two respects. They suggested that removal should no longer be automatic upon filing appropriate papers, but should require an order of the district court upon an evidentiary showing. They also believed that remand orders should not be appealable as of right, as the 1964 act provided, but that a certificate of probable cause from a district or circuit judge should be required (along the lines of the procedure for appeals in forma pauperis).

The committee concluded, however, that the present removal procedure should not be restricted in either respect. Basically, the committee believes that the burden of going forward in these cases should be on the State prosecutor, particularly in light of the severe shortage of lawyers to handle civil rights cases in many areas. The establishment of the conditions warranting removal can be made upon the prosecutor's motion to remand as well as upon an original petition for removal, and the nature of the showing to be made can best be developed by case law in the course of application of the new jurisdictional standard recommended. As to appeal, the committee favors expansion, rather than contraction, of the right to appeal in these cases in order to achieve greater consistency of standards (see note 21). Moreover, even though the right to appeal a remand order is not limited, a stay of further proceedings in the State court continues to be discretionary.

In reaching its conclusion, the committee was not unmindful of the caveat expressed by some members that automatic removal might cause calendar problems by enlarging substantially the caseload of the Federal courts. But a consideration of these possibilities in the light of the goals involved shows such objections to be untenable for many reasons: (1) under the present wording of the removal statute, section 1443 (1) and (2), many removal cases have been filed in recent years; (2) with the proposed liberalized removal provision, there will be less resort to petitions for habeas corpus or for equitable relief; and (3) in any event, deprived persons should not be denied the enjoyment of federally granted rights to equal protection of the laws because of inconvenience to judges or to other litigants.[23]

---

[16] The committee's research leads it to the conclusion that these opinions limiting the thrust of the original civil rights removal statute, which were not in fact based upon the legislative history of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, may be inconsistent with the available historical record. These cases were decided long before legislative history had become accepted as an important tool in the interpretation of statutes. See Cox, "Judge Learned Hand and the Interpretation of Statutes," 60 Harv. L. Rev. 370 (1947).

[17] Subdivision (2) of sec. 1443 has rarely been construed by the courts. Accordingly, while the door may still be open to a more liberalized construction of this part of the statute, the committee thinks it possible that the thrust of the subdivision will be restricted to situations where Federal officers, or perhaps private citizens, were actually discharging a Federal duty, as distinguished from exercising a Federal right, at the time of their arrests. See discussion in *New York* v. *Galamison*, 342 F. 2d 255 (2d Cir. 1965), cert. denied, 380 U.S. 977.

[18] Compare *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896), with *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

[19] See, e.g., Civil Rights Act of 1964, 78 Stat. 241, 42 U.S.C. 2000a–2000h-b; Voting Rights Act of 1965, 79 Stat. 437.

[20] *Bailey* v. *Patterson*, 369 U.S. 31 (1962).

[21] The committee's recommendations include technical changes in the 1964 provision, to clarify the basis for appeal of remand orders (see *New York* v. *Galamison*, *supra* note 17), and to make denials of remand also appealable in civil rights cases, in the interests of fairness to the State and greater consistency of standards through appellate review. See proposed amendments to 28 U.S.C. sec. 1447(d), in apps. A and B.

[22] See, e.g., *Rachel* v. *Georgia*, 342 F. 2d 336 (5th Cir. 1965), cert. granted, 15 L. Ed. 2d 58 (indicating that removal may be effected when a State statute, valid on its face, is unequally applied in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964); *Peacock* v. *City of Greenwood*, 347 F. 2d 679 (5th Cir. 1965) cert. granted, 15 L. Ed. 2d 464 (1966) (indicating that removal may be effected where it is proved that the accused was deprived of his equal civil rights by virtue of an arrest made for reasons of racial discrimination); *Cox* v. *Louisiana*, 348 F. 2d 750 (5th Cir. 1965) (indicating that removal was justified where the State court prosecution was deliberately designed to frustrate the protective mandate of the Supreme Court); *McMeans* v. *Mayor's Court*, 247 F. Supp. 606 (M.D. Ala. 1965) (indicating that removal was justified where the police made harassment arrests of civil rights workers engaged in peaceful and lawful picketing; a local parade ordinance and State statute relating to reckless driving were held unconstitutional as applied to these defendants). For argumentation supporting a more liberal interpretation of the present civil rights removal statute, see Amsterdam, "Criminal Prosecution Affecting Federally Guaranteed Civil Rights: Federal Removal and Habeas Corpus Jurisdiction To Abort State Court Trials," 113 U. of Pa. L. Rev. 793, 851–882 (1965).

However in *Commonwealth of Virginia* v. *Wallace*, No. 9462, and *Baines* v. *City of Danville*, No. 9080, both decided January 21, 1966, by the fourth circuit, the court refused to order removal on two grounds—first, that 1st and 14th amendment rights generally are not within the protection of the present removal statute, and second, that the inability to enforce one's right in the State court must be shown with certainty. In both cases, the court held that Rives-Powers line of cases (supra note 15) are still good law and noted that when Congress made remands appealable, it did not seek to change the scope of the removal statute.

The committee's recommended enlargement of Federal removal jurisdiction is, we believe, consistent with the original purposes of the century-old section 1443, as applied to the problems of 1966. It will truly make removal in genuine civil rights cases available to those who desperately need the prompt protection of the Federal courts, and will not adversely affect the existing rights of the States to try noncivil rights cases in State courts.

D. Injunctive relief

Of all the remedies considered by the committee, that of Federal injunction of a State prosecution is the most drastic. Removal contemplates a trial in the Federal court of the State criminal charge removed. But Federal equitable relief would enjoin and thereby terminate the trial itself.

The pressures for such summary disposition are great, particularly where the prosecutions are in conflict with plain or adjudicated constitutional principles and motivated by hostility to guaranteed civil rights. In such cases the delays in obtaining justice have become notorious. The NAACP legal defense and educational fund, at the request of the committee, compiled a statistical analysis of all the State criminal prosecutions in its files arising from civil rights activities. That analysis indicated that the average time required to complete action within the State court system, from the date of arrest through the final disposition of the case by the highest court of appeals, was 20 months. It required an additional 9½ months to obtain certiorari and a decision by the Supreme Court.[24] Months and years therefore elapse before basic rights can be vindicated. During this span, many defendants have been incarcerated or released on bond at great and continuing cost as in the freedom rider cases in Jackson, Miss.[25] Federal injunction of such prosecutions, ultimately determined to be unconstitutional, would foreclose the harassing effect and purpose of these prosecutions.

At the same time the committee was cognizant that the remedy of enjoining a State criminal prosecution, and thus imposing an absolute bar to that prosecution, involves considerations impinging upon serious aspects of our Federal system. This problem of the accommodation of overlapping Federal and State judicial jurisdiction occasioned by our dual system of government has presented a perplexing problem from the beginning of our national history.[26] One of the earliest amendment to the Judiciary Act of 1789 was that contained in section 5 of the act of March 2, 1793, 1 Stat. 335, which limited the jurisdiction of the Federal courts by providing: "nor shall a writ of injunction be granted to stay the proceeding in any court of a State."

In addition to this statutory limitation upon the Federal injunctive power in the case of a pending State proceeding, the Federal courts, as a matter of comity, have frequently abstained from enjoining or interfering with prospective or anticipated State prosecutions or proceedings.[27] There is, therefore, a formidable tradition in the Federal system dictating extreme caution in the use of the Federal injunctive power vis-a-vis threatened or actual State proceedings or prosecutions.

Yet, despite this tradition of caution, the courts and Congress have from time to time found it necessary and desirable to extend Federal jurisdiction in this area. Thus, following the Civil War, numerous exceptions were engrafted by judicial decision upon the original injunctive prohibition.[28] The cases have indicated that certain acts passed since the enactment of the foregoing act of 1793 operated as implied legislative amendments to the blanket prohibition where those subsequent statutes expressly vested Federal courts with exclusive equity jurisdiction.[29] This doctrine is incorporated in the present legislative prohibition against Federal injunction of State proceedings, which appears in 28 U.S.C. 2283, as follows:

"A court of the United States may not grant an injunction to stay proceedings in a State court except as expressly authorized by act of Congress, or where necessary in aid of its jurisdiction, or to protect or effectuate its judgments."

The question arises whether the equitable remedies specified by Federal statutes for the protection of civil rights have "expressly authorized" an exception to the anti-injunction statute. It was provided in 1871, and now incorporated in 42 U.S.C. 1983, that: "every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or territory, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States, or other person within the jurisdiction thereof, to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceedings for redress." [30]

It has been held by the Court of Appeals in the Third Circuit [31] that 42 U.S.C., 1983 supplied the statutory basis for an exception to the prohibition against Federal injunction of State proceedings; however, there are decisions in the fourth,[32] sixth,[33] and seventh [34] circuits to the contrary. Recently the fifth circuit held that the injunctive remedy provided by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 constituted an express statutory exception to the anti-injunction statute.[35]

In our view, the present state of the law does not adequately define or settle the appropriate occasions for the exercise of Federal equity power where a State proceeding or prosecution is brought in those areas of civil rights which the committee deems entitled to Federal remedial protection. In undertaking to define the appropriate area for Federal equitable intervention in such cases, the committee would propose to balance the right of the State to enforce its criminal laws and the right of the accused to prompt adjudication of his Federal constitutional claims by extending the right to an injunction in certain narrow but highly significant areas in civil rights cases subject to removal on the grounds discussed at pages 8–9, supra.

There are four types of circumstances, any one of which, in the view of the committee, should be a sufficient condition precedent in such cases for the exercise of the injunctive power to stay the criminal proceeding:

1. "An issue determinative of the proceeding in favor of the party seeking the injunction has been decided in favor of his contention in a final decision in another proceeding arising out of a like factual situation."

The need for an extension of the remedy of equitable relief in this type of use is illustrated by the litigation arising out of the cases of the Jackson freedom riders, which commenced on May 24, 1961, when they entered the wrong waiting room at the bus terminal, ignored the request of police to leave it, and were arrested on charges of breach of the peace and conspiracy to breach the peace.[36] The facts in relation to each of some 300 defendants were substantially the same. There was no genuine dispute over these facts, and there was no claim that any of the riders had been disorderly in any way. Fifteen white Protestant ministers, on the basis of testimony not materially different from that available in the other 300 cases, were given a directed acquittal at a trial de novo in the Hinds County court.

In November 1963, all of the other cases had been tried in the municipal court and then tried de novo before juries in the county court; a number had been decided and affirmed by the circuit court and some of them had been briefed in the Mississippi Supreme Court.

When the 15 white Protestant ministers were found not guilty, it meant that, as regards the other civil rights defendants, a final decision had been made in another proceeding arising out of a like factual situation which constituted a holding that these facts could not amount to a violation of the State's criminal law. Under such circumstances, the Federal court should have had the power to stay State criminal proceedings against the other Jackson freedom riders.

---

[23] See further discussion in the article by Amsterdam in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review, supra note 22, at pages 832–835.

[24] It should be noted that these figures embrace several States, in some of which unusual delays in civil rights cases have been nominal or nonexistent. Moreover, these figures reflect only those cases which have been fully completed, and prosecution in large numbers on account of demonstration activity is a relatively recent phenomenon. There are over 1,100 current unclosed cases in the Fund files, and the average age of these cases, even counting those just begun, is 30.3 months.

[25] See Lusky, "Racial Discrimination and the Federal Law: A Problem in Nullification," 63 Col. L. Rev. 1163, 1179–1182 (1963).

[26] See *Toucey* v. *New York Life Ins. Co.*, 314 U.S. 118, 129–141 (1941); Warren, "Federal and State Court Interference," 43 Harv. L. Rev. 345 (1930); Taylor & Willis, "The Power of Federal Courts To Enjoin Proceedings in State Courts," 42 Yale L. J. 1169 (1933); Durfee & Sloss, "Federal Injunction Against Proceedings in State Courts: Life History of a Statute," 30 Mich. L. Rev. 1145 (1932); note, "Federal Power to Enjoin State Court Proceedings," 74 Harv. L. Rev. 726 (1961).

[27] *Douglas* v. *City of Jeannete,* 319 U.S. 157, 163 (1943); see also *Wells* v. *Hand,* 238 F. Supp. 779 (M.D. Ga., 1965), aff'd, 382 U.S. 39 (1965).

[28] See *Wells Fargo & Co.* v. *Taylor,* 254 U.S. 175, 183 (1920); *Toucey* v. *New York Life Ins. Co., supra,* n. 26, at 134–139.

[29] *French* v. *Hay,* 89 U.S. (22 Wall.) 238, 250, 253 (1875) (two cases); *Toucey* v. *New York Life Ins. Co., supra,* n. 26, at 132–134; *Bowles* v. *Willingham,* 321, U.S. 503 (1944); *Porter* v. *Dicken,* 328 U.S. 252 (1946).

[30] Act of April 20, 1871, ch. 22, sec. 1, 17 Stat. 13; R.S., sec. 1979; 42 U.S.C., sec. 1983.

[31] *Cooper* v. *Hutchinson,* 184 F. 2d 119 (3d Cir. 1950). On motions for temporary injunctions in *Tuchman* v. *Welch,* 42 Fed. 548 (C.C.D. Kan. 1890), and *M. Schandler Bottling Company* v. *Welch,* 42 Fed. 561 (C.C.D. Kan 1890), it was held that the predecessor to 42 U.S.C., sec. 1983 provided the necessary statutory authorization for Federal equity jurisdiction notwithstanding the prohibition contained in the predecessor to 28 U.S.C., sec. 2283, but on subsequent demurrers the temporary injunctions were dissolved and the bills dismissed for want of equity in *Hemsley* v. *Myers,* 45 Fed. 283 (C.C.D. Kan. 1891).

[32] *Baines* v. *City of Danville,* 337 F. 2d 579 (4th Cir. 1964), cert. denied, 381 U.S. 939 (1965).

[33] *Sexton* v. *Barry,* 233 F. 2d 220 (6th Cir. 1956), cert. denied, 352 U.S. 870.

[34] *Goss* v. *Illinois,* 312 F. 2d 257 (7th Cir. 1963).

[35] *Dilworth* v. *Riner,* 343 F. 2d 226 (5th Cir. 1965).

[36] The following are some of the citations of these various decisions: *Bailey* v. *Patterson,* 199 F. Supp. 595, 612–13 (S.D. Miss. 1961) vacated and rev'd, 369 U.S. 31 (1962); 206 F. Supp. 67 (S.D. Miss. 1962), rev'd in part, 323 F. 2d 201 (5th Cir. 1963) cert. denied sub nom. *City of Jackson* v. *Bailey,* 376 U.S. 910 (1964).

Removal would not be the most appropriate remedy here since it allows the prosecution to continue, and in these cases the prosecutions should have been terminated.

2. "The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation or other authority for the proceeding has been declared unconstitutional in a final decision in another proceeding."

Again, in the case of the freedom riders litigation, the Federal district court, acting on instructions from the Supreme Court (*Bailey* v. *Patterson*, 369 U.S. 31, 34), had held the segregation statute underlying the prosecution to be unconstitutional (see p. 13, supra). If freedom riders who were tried subsequent to this 1962 Federal court decision were being prosecuted under this same statute, it would be a prosecution under a statute which had been declared unconstitutional in a final decision in another proceeding. Such a factual situation would certainly justify a Federal court's having the power to enjoin any further steps being taken to prosecute the criminal proceeding.

3. "The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation or other authority for the proceeding is, on its face, an unconstitutional abridgement of the rights to freedom of speech, or of the press, or of the people to peaceably assemble"; or

4. "The proceeding was instituted for the purpose of discouraging the parties or others from exercising rights of freedom of speech, or of the press, or of the people to peaceably assemble."

The committee further recommends that in civil rights cases made subject to removal, the remedy of equitable relief also be made available where either of the above two criteria recently laid down by the Supreme Court in *Dombrowski* v. *Pfister*[37] are met. The Court there authorized Federal injunctive relief against a threatened prosecution by the State of Louisiana of officials of the Southern Conference Educational Fund for violation of statutes "justifiably attacked on their face as abridging free expression, or as applied for the purpose of discouraging protected activities."[38] Statutory codification of *Dombrowski* v. *Pfister* will serve to stabilize the rule of that case and to provide Federal district courts with reinforced guidelines. Accordingly the committee has proposed the two additional bases for Federal equitable relief quoted above.

In addition to urging the statutory creation of the aforementioned four categories of cases where the exercise of Federal injunctive power is appropriate, the committee further recommends the abolition of the judicially created abstention doctrine. The staff study shows that this doctrine has been frequently invoked to bar or delay the granting of prompt and effective Federal relief. Unlike the anti-injunction statute itself, the abstention doctrine was a judicial creation which has, in the past, served to lead Federal courts to defer to State courts in the adjudication of Federal rights. Abstention permits the Federal court to postpone the exercise of its jurisdiction and thus to delay the resolution of serious constitutional problems in civil rights cases.[39]

In order to assure that the grounds recommended for Federal equitable relief are not eroded by requirements of exhaustion of State remedies such as developed as part of the abstention doctrine, the proposed bill provides that, where a Federal injunction is appropriate on the grounds mentioned, the relief is not to be denied or deferred by reason of the availability of any defense or remedy in the State court. Since the purpose of expanded Federal equitable relief in the limited circumstances described by the committee is to provide expeditious Federal disposition of a pending State proceeding, it would be inappropriate to require exhaustion of remedies in that same State proceeding. This branch of the committee's recommendation is in accord with the prevailing authorities.[40]

Finally, it should be noted that the proposed instances for the remedy of Federal equitable intervention will be resorted to only infrequently if the committee's removal proposal is adopted. Every case in which we would authorize the grant of equitable relief would also be subject to removal under the proposed removal statute. However, if in addition to the grounds for removal there is also present one of the explicit conditions warranting prompt equitable relief discussed above, the State proceeding should be enjoined finally.[41]

IV. EFFECT OF PROPOSED REVISIONS ON AN ACTUAL CASE

On October 20, 1958, the Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, a Negro civil rights leader, walked to a Birmingham, Ala., bus stop with a group of Negroes. When the bus arrived, all but Shuttlesworth boarded it and took seats in the front section. There was a city ordinance, only 6 days old, which authorized the bus system to make its own seating regulations and provided that failure to comply with the regulations was a breach of the peace. The bus company immediately adopted regulations requiring segregated seating, and the Negroes acted to test this new maneuver which had the purpose of avoiding desegregation. The driver of the bus ordered the Negroes to move to the rear of the bus, which they refused to do. All of them, including Shuttlesworth, who was still on the sidewalk, were arrested on charges of breach of the peace, conspiracy to break the peace and disorderly conduct. On October 23, Shuttlesworth and the other Negroes were convicted of disorderly conduct in the recorder's court and varying sentences were given, including one of 82 days in jail at hard labor for Shuttlesworth.

That this criminal prosecution of Shuttlesworth was obviously to thwart and frustrate the exercise by him and others of civil rights was shown more than 5 years later in a decision of the Federal district court. On December 12, 1963, that court released Shuttlesworth in a habeas corpus proceeding, stating:

"The court finds no evidence whatever in the record to support the conviction of petitioners, and, under the compulsion of the authority of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Thompson* v. *The City of Louisville, supra*, has no alternative except to conclude that the convictions are void and without force and effect, since as the court there said 'just as conviction upon a charge not made would be sheer denial of due process' so is it a violation of due process to convict and punish a man without evidence of his guilt." *Shuttlesworth* v. *Moore*, 9 Race Rel. L. Rep. 107 (N.D. Ala. 1963).

Under the ancient removal precedents discussed earlier this criminal prosecution could probably not have been removed initially to the Federal court since the ordinance under which Shuttlesworth was convicted was not discriminatory on its face. However, under the Civil Rights Procedure Act recommended by the committee herewith, removal would have been authorized since the prosecution was on account of acts coming within the definition of the proposed subdivisions (3) and (4) of section 1443. Promptly after removal, the defendant might have had the case dismissed because his acts were pursuant to vested civil rights. Instead of waiting 5 years to effect protection of his civil rights, Shuttlesworth might have secured such protection within a matter of months. It is this speed which the proposed removal revision would bring to Federal process for vindicating the substantive rights granted by the Constitution and Federal statutes.

On July 20, 1960, after Shuttlesworth's conviction had been affirmed by the county court of Alabama and he had appealed to the intermediate State appellate court, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit held that the ordinance under which he was convicted was unconstitutional.[42] Under the proposed Civil Rights Procedure Act, Shuttlesworth could then have secured an order from the Federal court enjoining any further State criminal proceedings. However, under the present state of the law, because of the anti-injunction statute and decisions thereunder, Shuttlesworth could not stay further State court proceedings and continued to be involved in protracted proceedings in the State courts until December 12, 1963, when the district court finally granted habeas corpus.

A summary of the Shuttlesworth litigation, since his arrest for disorderly conduct on October 20, 1958, shows the following: He made numerous court appearances, divided as follows: Five in the State court to review his conviction directly; three in the Federal court to obtain an injunction; three in the State court seeking collateral review and bail; one in the Federal court to obtain bail; and four in the Federal court to secure release on habeas corpus. In addition to the 5 years involved with this court litigation, he served 34 days in jail, had to pay money for bail and had to be afforded legal services of a value of many thousands of dollars. This gross miscarriage of justice would have been prevented if the committee's recommendations for statutory amendments had then been in force.

V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Special Committee on Civil Rights Under Law is of the opinion that the Congress should consider and enact improvements in the Federal remedial statutes applicable to civil rights cases along the lines discussed herein. The committee's draft of a Federal Civil Rights Procedure Act, annexed in bill form as appendix A, is believed to represent a carefully limited extension of Federal jurisdiction to protect the vital Federal interest at stake in State prosecutions for civil rights activity, without unduly hampering the States in the discharge of their legitimate responsibility for enforcement of the criminal law.

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF HIKING TRAILS BILL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for myself and the distinguished Senator from Washington and chairman of the Senate Interior Committee [Mr. JACKSON], President Johnson's bill to establish a national system of hiking trails.

---

[37] 380 U.S. 479 (1965); see also *Cameron* v. *Johnson*, 244 F. Supp. 846, vacated and remanded, 381 U.S. 741 (1965).

[38] *Dombrowski* v. *Pfister, supra*, n. 37 at 380 U.S. 489–90.

[39] See discussion in Lusky, "Racial Discrimination and the Federal Law: A Problem in Nullification," 63 Col. L. Rev. 1163–1177 (1963).

[40] See *Lane* v. *Wilson*, 307 U.S. 268 (1939); *Mills* v. *Board of Education*, 30 F. Supp. 245 (D. Md. 1939); *Thompson* v. *Gibbes*, 60 F. Supp. 872 (E.D. S.C. 1945); *Stapleton* v. *Mitchell*, 60 F. Supp. 51 (D. Kan. 1945), appeal dismissed sub nom. *Mitchell* v. *McElroy*, 326 U.S. 690; see also *Hague* v. *CIO*, 307 U.S. 496 (1939).

[41] A possible correlation between the two remedies may arise in a Freedom Rider situation, where arrests are made and trials held over a period of weeks. It is conceivable that the first group arrested might remove and obtain a final adjudication of the unconstitutionality of the statute under which the arrests were made. If the State continued to press the prosecutions, an injunction would be available.

[42] *Boman* v. *Birmingham Transit Company*, 280 F. 2d 531, 535 (5th Cir. 1960).

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week for cosponsors and that the text of the bill, together with the text of the letter from Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall to the President of the Senate explaining the legislation in detail, appear in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

This legislation will be a benchmark in the history of wise outdoor recreation development in this Nation.

Hiking trails are not only delightful—providing recreation opportunities for everyone from the long-distance tripper to grandparents on a Sunday stroll—but they represent perhaps the most economical form of public investment in outdoor recreation. There ought to be a place to hike within an hour's reach of every American.

President Johnson deserves very high praise for the imaginative leadership and wisdom he has shown in conservation.

The Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture recently completed a comprehensive trail study. The bill that we have introduced today is based on the results of that study.

The Appalachian Trail—that magnificent footpath from Maine to Georgia maintained by volunteer labor for 30 years—is the great example of what can be done.

But early action to protect the Appalachian Trail and to establish vitally needed new trails is imperative if we are to have them to enjoy.

Increasing pressure to develop land for commercial and residential purposes is placing existing trails in serious jeopardy and will soon make it nearly impossible to establish new trails where they are most needed near centers of population. Unless decisive action such as this bill provides is taken soon we risk the permanent loss of several major trail opportunities and the crippling diminution of the quality of others.

It was in recognition of these great opportunities and serious dangers that I first introduced legislation to recognize and protect the Appalachian Trail in the 88th Congress and introduced a national hiking trail bill—S. 2590—as well as the Appalachian Trail bill—S. 622—in this Congress.

The nationwide system of trails bill will provide for present and future outdoor recreation needs through the upgrading and expansion of existing trail systems, and the addition of new trails. A nationwide system would be established consisting of four categories of trails: extended trails of national significance identified as "National Scenic Trails"; trails located in Federal parks, forests, and recreation areas; trails located in State parks, forests, and recreation areas; and trails convenient to metropolitan areas.

The present Appalachian Trail, extending for 2,000 miles from Maine through 14 States to Georgia, is listed in the bill for initial national scenic trail status. The bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, States and their political subdivisions, and private interests, shall select a right-of-way and mark, develop, and protect the trail in perpetuity. To advise and assist him, the Secretary would establish an advisory committee composed of Federal, State, and private interests along the trail. To protect the trail, the bill authorizes Federal agencies to acquire trail lands within the boundaries of areas they now administer. It encourages States and their political subdivisions to acquire lands or interest in lands outside of Federal areas for trail purposes, but to the extent that they fail to do so the Secretary of the Interior may acquire lands to preserve the trail. The bill specifies that the Appalachian Trail shall be managed for the protection of its natural, scenic, and historic features, and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue appropriate regulations.

In addition to providing permanent protection for the Appalachian Trail, the bill earmarks nine other trails for study and possible later establishment as National Scenic Trails in subsequent legislation. These nine potential trails are the Chisholm Trail, Continental Divide Trail, Lewis and Clark Trail, Natchez Trace, North Country Trail, Oregon Trail, Pacific Crest Trail, Potomac Heritage Trail, and Santa Fe Trail. One study trail—the Pacific Crest—already exists. Others exist only in part.

Greatly improve recreation trails in Federal parks and forests are a second major objective of this bill. The bill directs the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to improve, expand, and develop trails on the national forests, national parks, public lands, national wildlife refuges, and Indian reservations that they administer. Both Departments already have authority for trail development on these lands. However, the potential for trail purposes has been only partially realized. Much yet can be done to provide for needed public recreational trail use on Federal lands.

State park and forest trails and metropolitan area trails will be encouraged by the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and Housing and Urban Development. Again, authority exists for such encouragement, but much larger programs are needed, especially in and near metropolitan areas. Once trails have been developed by States and their political subdivisions to acceptable standards, they could then be designated and marked as part of the nationwide system with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Special emphasis will be given trails in metropolitan areas, where opportunities for hiking, cycling, and horseback riding are often severely limited. In every city our people should be able to walk directly from their homes short distances to an access point on a metropolitan trail network which will enable them to travel at a leisurely pace through natural areas, by water courses, along ridge lines, and through spots of scenic beauty.

Utility rights-of-way offer many special opportunities especially for metropolitan area trail development. The bill authorizes the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to cooperate with the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, and other Federal agencies having jurisdiction over utility rights-of-way to help realize these opportunities where practical.

The nationwide system of trails bill follows careful studies by the principal land management agencies in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. These studies were made in close cooperation with many States, localities, and private groups. The bill, in my judgment, is a reasonable approach to the problem of providing adequate trail mileage and goes a long way toward meeting the Nation's long-range needs. I commend the bill to your early consideration.

Because of my prior association with the concept of hiking trails as author of the Appalachian Trail bill introduced May 20, 1964, and a national hiking trail bill introduced October 1, 1965, the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee has graciously authorized me to sponsor this measure with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 3171) to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress finds that in order to provide for the ever-increasing outdoor recreation needs of an expanding population and to promote public access to, travel within, and enjoyment of, the National and State parks, forests, recreation areas, historic sites, and other areas, existing trails should be improved and maintained and additional trails should be established both in the remaining highly scenic and unspoiled areas and in the metropolitan areas of the Nation.

Nationwide system of trails

(b) To carry out the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section, there is hereby established a nationwide system of trails composed of (1) trails designated as "national scenic trails" in this Act or subsequent Acts of Congress; (2) park, forest, and other recreation trails on lands within areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture when designated by the appropriate Secretary; (3) park, forest, and other recreation trails on lands administered by the States when designated by the States and approved by the Secretary of the Interior; and (4) recreation trails on lands in and near metropolitan areas when designated by the administering agency and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the appropriate Federal agencies, States, local governments, private organizations, and advisory councils, shall select a uniform marker for the nationwide system of trails, and shall provide for the placement upon the uniform marker of a distinctive symbol for each national scenic trail.

DEFINITION OF NATIONAL SCENIC TRAILS

SEC. 2. (a) A national scenic trail eligible to be included in the system is an extended trail which has natural, scenic, or historic qualities that give the trail recreation use potential of national significance.

(b) The following trail is hereby designated as a "national scenic trail":

Appalachian Trail, a recreation trail of some two thousand miles, extending generally along the Appalachian Mountains from Mount Katahdin, Maine, to Springer Mountain, Georgia.

Federal, State, and local planning for additional national scenic trails

(c) The Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where lands administered by him are involved, shall make studies of the feasibility and desirability (including costs and benefits) of designating other trails as national scenic trails. Such studies shall be made in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies administering lands through which the trails would pass and in cooperation with interested interstate, State, local governmental and private agencies and organizations concerned. The two Secretaries shall submit the studies to the President, together with their recommendations resulting therefrom for the inclusion of any or all such trails in the System, and the President shall submit to the Congress such recommendations, including legislation, as he deems appropriate. The study may include, among others, all or appropriate portions of:

(1) Chisholm Trail, from San Antonio, Texas, approximately 700 miles north through Oklahoma to Abilene, Kansas.

(2) Continental Divide Trail, a 3,100-mile trail extending generally from the Mexican border in southwestern New Mexico northward along the Continental Divide to the Canadian border in Glacier National Park.

(3) Lewis and Clark Trail, from St. Louis, Missouri, approximately 4,600 miles to the Pacific Ocean in Oregon, following both the outbound and inbound routes of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

(4) Natchez Trace, from Nashville, Tennessee, approximately 600 miles to Natchez, Mississippi.

(5) North Country Trail, from the Appalachian Trail in Vermont, approximately 3,200 miles through the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, to the Lewis and Clark Trail in North Dakota.

(6) Oregon Trail, from Independence, Missouri, approximately two thousand miles to near Fort Vancouver, Washington.

(7) Pacific Crest Trail, a two thousand three hundred and fifty-mile trail extending generally from the Mexican-California border northward along the mountain ranges of the West Coast States to the Canadian-Washington border near Lake Ross.

(8) Potomac Heritage Trail, an eight hundred and twenty-five-mile trail extending generally from the mouth of the Potomac River to its sources in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, including the one hundred and seventy-mile Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Towpath.

(9) Santa Fe Trail, from Independence, Missouri, approximately eight hundred miles to Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Selection of route for the Appalachian Trail

(d) The Secretary of the Interior shall select the right-of-way for the Appalachian Trail designated as a national scenic trail by subsection (b) of this section. Such right-of-way shall be (1) of sufficient width to protect adequately the natural conditions and scenic and historic features along the trail, and to provide campsites, shelters, and related public-use facilities on adjoining lands; and (2) located to avoid, insofar as practicable, established highways, motor roads, mining areas, power transmission lines, private recreational developments, public recreational developments not related to the trail, existing commercial and industrial developments, range fences and improvements, private operations, and any other activities that would be incompatible with the protection of the trail in its natural condition and its use for outdoor recreation. The location and width of such right-of-way across Federal lands under the jurisdiction of another Federal agency shall be by agreement between the head of that agency and the Secretary. In selecting the right-of-way, the Secretary shall consult with the States, local governments, private organizations, landowners, and land users concerned and with the Advisory Council established under subsection (f) of this section. The Secretary may revise the location and width of the right-of-way from time to time with the consent of the head of any other Federal agency involved, and after consultation with the aforesaid States, local governments, private organizations, landowners, land users, and the Advisory Council.

The Secretary shall publish notice of the selection of the right-of-way in the Federal Register, together with appropriate maps and descriptions. If in his judgment changes in the right-of-way become desirable, he shall make the changes in the same manner.

Marking route of Appalachian Trail

(e) The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Federal agencies, States, local governments, private organizations concerned, and the Appalachian Trail Advisory Council, shall erect and maintain the uniform marker for the Nationwide System of Trails at appropriate points along the Appalachian Trail route, and shall select a symbol for the Appalachian Trail for placement upon the uniform marker. Where the trail route passes through Federal lands, such marker shall be erected and maintained by the Federal agency administering the lands. Where the trail route passes through non-Federal lands and is administered under cooperative agreements, the Secretary shall require the cooperating agencies to erect and maintain such marker.

Advisory Council for the Appalachian Trail

(f) The Secretary of the Interior shall establish an Advisory Council for the Appalachian Trail. The Secretary may consult with the Council from time to time with respect to any matter relating to the trail, including the selection of the right-of-way, the selection, erection, and maintenance of the markers along the trail route, and the administration of the trail. The members of the Advisory Council shall be appointed for a term not to exceed 5 years by the Secretary as follows:

(1) a member appointed to represent each Federal department or independent agency administering lands through which the trail route passes and each appointee shall be the person designated by the head of such department or agency;

(2) a member appointed to represent each State through which the trail passes and such appointments shall be made from recommendations of the Governors of such States; and

(3) one or more members appointed to represent each private organization that, in the opinion of the Secretary, has an established and recognized interest in the trail, and such appointments shall be made from recommendations of the heads of such organizations.

The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Council shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

Members of the Advisory Council shall serve without compensation, but the Secretary may pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Council in the performance of its functions upon presentation of vouchers signed by the Chairman.

Acquisition, development and administration of lands for the Appalachian Trail

(g) Within the exterior boundaries of areas under their administration that are included in the right-of-way selected for the Appalachian Trail as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the heads of Federal agencies may (1) acquire lands or interests in lands by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange; and (2) enter into cooperative agreements with the States, local governments, and private organizations concerned in order to carry out the purposes of this section.

(h) The Secretary of the Interior, in the exercise of his exchange authority, may accept title to any non-Federal property within the Appalachian Trail right-of-way, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction which is located in the States through which the trail passes and which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require. The Secretary of Agriculture, in the exercise of his exchange authority, may utilize authorities and procedures available to him in connection with exchange of national forest lands.

(i) The State or local governments involved shall be encouraged (1) to acquire, develop, and administer the lands or interests in lands within the right-of-way selected for the Appalachian Trail under subsection (d) of this section that are outside the exterior boundaries of federally administered areas, or (2) to enter into cooperative agreements with the private owners of such lands or private organizations in order to carry out the purposes of this section: *Provided*, That, if the State or local governments fail to acquire such lands and interests or fail to enter into such agreements within a reasonable time after the selection of the right-of-way, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire the private lands or interests therein outside the exterior boundaries of federally administered areas by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, and may develop and administer such lands or interests therein, or may enter into cooperative agreements with States, local governments, private owners, and private organizations in order to carry out the purposes of this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall utilize condemnation proceedings without the consent of the owner to acquire private lands or interests therein pursuant to this subsection only in cases where, in his judgment, all reasonable efforts to acquire such land by negotiation have failed, and in such cases the Secretary shall acquire the fee title only where, in his judgment, lesser interests in land (including scenic easements) are not adequate for the purposes of this section.

(j) The Secretary of the Interior shall develop and administer the Appalachian Trail designated as a national scenic trail by subsection (b) of this section, consistent with appropriate use of the authorities contained in subsections (g) and (i) of this section, except that any portion of such trail that are within areas administered by another Federal agency shall be administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the head of that agency, or as directed by the President.

The Appalachian Trail shall be administered, protected, developed, and maintained to retain its natural, scenic, and historic features; and provision may be made for campsites, shelters, and related public facilities, and appropriate public outdoor recreation activities; and other uses that will not substantially interfere with the nature and purposes of the Appalachian Trail may be permitted or authorized, as appropriate: *Provided*, That the public use of motorized vehicles shall be prohibited: *Provided further*, That the Federal laws and regulations applicable to Federal lands or areas included in the trail shall continue to apply to the extent agreed upon by the Secretary and the head of the agency having jurisdiction over the Federal lands involved, or as directed by the President.

The Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of the heads of any other Federal agencies administering lands through which the Appalachian Trail passes, and after consultation with the States, local governments, and private organizations concerned, and the Appalachian Trail Advisory Council established under subsection (f) of this section, may issue regulations, which may be revised from time to time, governing protection, management, use, development, and administration of the trail.

(k) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

FEDERAL PARK, FOREST, AND OTHER RECREATION TRAILS

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are directed to improve, expand, and develop park, forest, and other recreation trails for hiking, horseback riding, cycling, and other related uses on lands within areas administered by them: *Provided*, That the public use of motorized vehicles shall be prohibited on such trails within (a) the natural and historical areas of the national park system, (b) the national wildlife refuge system, (c) the national wilderness preservation system, and (d) other Federal lands where trails are designated as being closed to such use by the appropriate Secretary. Such trails may be designated and suitably marked as part of the nationwide system of trails by the appropriate Secretary.

STATE AND METROPOLITAN AREA TRAILS

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is directed to encourage States to consider, in their comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans and proposals for financial assistance for State and local projects submitted pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, needs and opportunities for establishing park, forest, and other recreation trails on lands owned or administered by States, and recreation trails on lands in or near urban areas. He is further directed, in accordance with the authority contained in the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Organic Act (77 Stat. 49), to encourage States, political subdivisions, and private interests, including nonprofit organizations, to establish such trails.

(b) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is directed, in administering the program of comprehensive urban planning and assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, to encourage the planning of recreation trails in connection with the recreation and transportation planning for metropolitan and other urban areas. He is further directed, in administering the urban open-space program under title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, to encourage the provision and development of such recreation trails.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture is directed, in accordance with authority vested in him, to encourage States and local agencies and private interests to establish such trails.

(d) Such trails may be designated and suitably marked as parts of the nationwide system of trails by the States, their political subdivisions, or other appropriate administering agencies with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

UTILITY RIGHTS-OF-WAY

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized, with the cooperation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and other Federal agencies having jurisdiction, control over, or information concerning the use, abandonment, or disposition of rights-of-way and similar properties that may be suitable for trail route purposes, to develop effective procedures to assure that, wherever practicable, utility rights-of-way or similar properties having value for trail route purposes may be made available for such use.

The letter presented by Mr. NELSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C. March 31, 1966.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The President, in his February 23 message on preserving our natural heritage, said "I'm submitting legislation to foster the development by Federal, State, and local agencies of a nationwide system of trails and give special emphasis to the location of trails near metropolitan areas." The proposed legislation is enclosed.

A nationwide system of trails will open to all the opportunity to develop an intimacy with the wealth and splendor of America's outdoor world for a few hours at a time, or on 1-day jaunts, overnight treks, or expeditions lasting a week or more. A system of trails carved through areas both near to, and far from, man and his works will provide many varied and memorable experiences for all who utilize the trails.

During the past 8 months, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with other public and private trail interests, jointly conducted a nationwide trail study which is nearing completion. The enclosed bill provides for the establishment of a nationwide system of trails composed of the following four general classes of trails to serve the needs of the American people:

National scenic trails: A relatively small number of lengthy trails which have natural, scenic, or historic qualities that give them recreation use potential of natural significance. Such trails will be several hundred miles long, may have overnight shelters at appropriate intervals, and may interconnect with other major trails to permit the enjoyment of such activities as hiking or horseback riding. The enclosed bill designates the Appalachian Trail as a national scenic trail for inclusion in the nationwide system, and provides that other trails may be so designated by subsequent legislation. Moneys appropriated from the land and water conservation fund would be available to Federal agencies to acquire lands for the national scenic trails and would be available to States and their political subdivisions for land acquisition and development for trail purposes. The development of national scenic trails by Federal agencies would be financed by appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury.

Federal park, forest, and other recreation trails: There will be an improvement and expansion of existing trails and the development of additional trails within areas administered by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture in order to enable the public to make use of the distinctive natural, scenic, and historic resources of the areas administered by the two Secretaries. Among such areas are the national parks, national forests, national wildlife refuges, Indian reservations, and public domain lands. However, appropriate arrangements would need to be made with the Indian tribes and individual Indians involved for rights-of-way or easements across Indian lands. No new legislation is required to authorize the construction of this class of trails. The two Secretaries will request funds for the trails as part of their regular requests for appropriations as they have in the past. The enclosed bill authorizes each Secretary to designate and mark the trails of this class under his administrative jurisdiction as part of the nationwide system of trails.

State park, forest, and other recreation trails: An expansion of trails on lands owned or administered by the States will be encouraged. Only a few States now have major trail development programs underway or planned. Almost half of the States report that they have less than 100 miles of such trails. The enclosed bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to encourage the States to consider needs and opportunities for such trails in the comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans and project proposals submitted to the Secretary under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897). Upon the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of trail projects proposed by the States for financial assistance under the Fund Act, funds would be available for the acquisition and development of the trails from the moneys allocated to the States out of the fund. The bill also directs the Secretary of the Interior, under the authority of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Organic Act (77 Stat. 49), and the Secretary of Agriculture, under authority vested in him, to encourage the establishment of such trails. The States may designate and mark this class of trails as part of the nationwide system with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Metropolitan area trails: To serve people near their homes, local governments will be encouraged to develop trails designed primarily for day use in and near urban areas. These trails will satisfy the needs of large numbers of people for limited hiking and riding experiences. Whenever possible, the trails will lead directly from urban residential areas. Where appropriate, river and canal banks, utility rights-of-way, abandoned railroad or streetcar beds, and even city streets and sidewalks will be utilized. The enclosed bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to encourage the establishment of metropolitan area trails under the existing authority and procedures of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. It also directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to encourage the planning and provision of trails in metropolitan and other urban areas through the existing urban planning assistance program and the urban open-space land program. In addition, the bill directs the Secretary of the Interior, under the authority of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Organic Act (77 Stat. 49), and the Secretary of Agriculture, under the authority vested in him, to encourage States, political subdivisions and private interests, including nonprofit organizations, to establish metropolitan area trails. This class of trails may be designated and marked as part of the system by the States or other administering agencies with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

As the initial unit of the nationwide system of trails, the enclosed bill designates the Appalachian Trail, extending 2,000 miles along the Appalachian Mountains from Maine to Georgia, as a national scenic trail.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to select a right-of-way for, and to provide appropriate marking of, the Appalachian Trail. The right-of-way for the trail will be of sufficient width to protect natural, scenic, and historic features along the trail, and to provide needed public use facilities. The right-of-way will be located to avoid established uses that are incompatible with the protection of the trail in its natural condition and its use for outdoor recreation. The location, relocation, and marking of the Appalachian Trail will be coordinated with the various Federal agencies, States, local governments, private organizations, and individuals concerned. Notice of the selection of the trail right-of-way, and changes therein will be published in the Federal Register.

The Secretary is also authorized to establish an advisory council for the Appalachian Trail. The council will assist in the selection of the right-of-way, and the marking and administration of the trail. The advisory council will include representatives of the Federal agencies that administer lands through which the trail passes, of the States involved, and of private organizations having an established and recognized interest in the trail.

The enclosed bill authorizes Federal agencies to acquire lands or interests in lands within the boundaries of areas they administer within the right-of-way for the Appalachian Trail by donations, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange. State and local governments will be encouraged to acquire the lands or interests in lands needed for the trail that are outside of federally administered areas, or to enter into cooperative agreements with the private owners of such lands to carry out the purposes of the bill, but to the extent the State and local governments fail to do so, the bill grants the Secretary of the Interior appropriate authority.

The Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the other agencies and ogranizations concerned will administer, protect, develop, and maintain the Appalachian Trail in a manner that will protect natural, scenic, and historic features and provide for appropriate public uses.

We estimate the land acquisition cost for the Appalachian Trail at approximately $4,665,000 and the development costs at approximately $2 million. These costs are programed over the first 5 years. Annual operation and maintenance costs for the Appalachian Trail are expected to be about $250,000 after the fifth year.

The $4,665,000 land acquisition cost figure would provide for the acquisition of lands or interests therein along the 866 miles of the Appalachian Trail not now in public ownership. This assumes acquisition in fee of an average of 25 acres per mile, as well as the acquisition of scenic easements, as needed, to protect trail values on adjoining lands. The 25 acre per mile acquisition in fee would permit a right-of-way averaging about 200 feet in width.

In keeping with the bill's objective of encouraging cooperation between the Federal agencies, States, local governments, and private interests concerned, we anticipate that non-Federal interests will participate actively in the acquisition, development, operation, and maintenance of the Appalachian Trail. To the extent of such participation, the need for Federal funds will be reduced.

The man-years and cost data statement (based on current assumptions and estimates) required by the act of July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 652; 5 U.S.C. 642a), when annual expenditures of appropriated funds exceed $1 million, is enclosed.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the presentation of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

TRINITY NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, N. MEX.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, not since the dawn of civilization has one single event more abruptly launched mankind into a new age than the cataclysmic explosion which occurred on a bleak and barren landscape near Alamogordo, N. Mex., July 16, 1945.

That was the detonation of the world's first nuclear device.

In that vast, earth-shaking and awe-inspiring unleashing of energy, the end of World War II became assured. Violent though it was, and weapon though it was, it meant eventual peace.

But it meant much, much more than that: today it enables us to explore the stars, that frontier which is boundless, and if we are successful in completely harnessing it for peaceful use, and controlling it as a weapon, we will herald an era of prosperity and well-being which humankind has never imagined possible.

Mr. President, in view of the monumental significance of this event, I introduce a measure for myself and my colleague [Mr. MONTOYA] to provide for the establishment of the Trinity National Historic Site in the State of New Mexico.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3172) to provide for establishment of the Trinity National Historic Site in the State of New Mexico, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MONTOYA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3(c) OF THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended.

The events which require the proposed amendment to the Export Control Act are the issuance of the two recent export bulletins by the Department of Commerce, 929 and 930.

The existing statute, Export Control Act of 1949, states certain policies which shall be effectuated through use of export controls. They are: Protection of the domestic economy from excessive drain of scarce materials and reduction of inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; secondly, furtherance of U.S. foreign policy; and, finally, protection of national security.

The proposed amendment relates only to the first of these policies and does not affect the power to use export controls in furtherance of our foreign policy or protection of our national security. It is only related to the use of export controls occasioned by domestic economic considerations.

Recent events have indicated that it is desirable and necessary to have a specific official who is in the best position to be well informed about domestic economic and supply conditions, gather up-to-date information and on this basis make a specific determination of the existence of conditions which may require the President or his delegate to use the authority of the Export Control Act.

The proposed amendment does not affect the President's or delegate's power to act in the areas of foreign policy or national security nor for that matter in the field of domestic agricultural economics when his Secretary of Agriculture has made findings of the need. It simply requires that the Secretary hold hearings, and make a finding of supplies substantially inadequate to meet domestic needs, before action is taken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3175) to amend section 3(c) of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3175

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

"(C) The authority conferred by this section for the purpose of effectuating this policy set forth in 2(1)(a) of this Act shall be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity or products processed therefrom including, but not limited to, hides, skins, and pelts and fats and oils, only after the Secretary of Agriculture has conducted a hearing of all interested parties and determined that the supply of such commodity is and will continue for an extended period of time to be substantially inadequate to meet the requirements of the domestic economy for such commodities and so certified to the President or his delegate: Any such determination of inadequate supply to meet the requirements of the domestic economy shall be reviewed by said Secretary at least every six months and, if it appears after the result of such review that the supply conditions for any such commodity have so changed that the supply thereof is no longer substantially inadequate to meet the needs of the economy, then said Secretary shall immediately so certify to the President or his delegate."

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO REDUCE AUTOMOBILE THEFTS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for myself, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide criminal penalties for the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of master keys for motor vehicles.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3176) to provide criminal penalties for the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of master keys for motor vehicles, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, during a recent hearing of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization on the subject of traffic safety, State Senator Simon J. Liebowitz, of New York, pointed out the growing menace to life and property from automobile thefts by the use of master keys. He told me that since these keys are ordered and sent through the mail there is no way a single State can effectively prohibit their purchase and receipt by one of its residents. Senator Liebowitz urged us to reconsider introducing legislation to exert Federal control over the traffic in master automobile keys.

After studying this problem, Senators JAVITS and KENNEDY, of New York, and I have concluded that there is a need for a Federal law to regulate the advertisement and sale of this type of key. We found that for less than $30 any person can buy a complete set of keys to fit all makes of cars.

Police records show that these keys are frequently used by juveniles to take cars for joyrides. Such youngsters are usually inexperienced drivers and hence are more likely to be involved in serious accidents. By forbidding juveniles to acquire these keys, we can prevent many serious injuries and deaths and reduce one of the leading categories of youth crime.

There is mounting evidence that professional automobile strippers use the keys to steal cars and remove valuable parts such as engines, radios, and bucket seats. The National Auto Theft Bureau reports that a large percentage of the recovered cars show no sign of forcible entry.

The keys are also used by criminals who steal from salesman's cars. The thief merely follows the salesman to his home and after he parks the car, the thief has ample time to try his keys until he finds the one that fits the car. The next day the thief again follows the salesman and at the first opportunity steals the samples.

Police and Theft Bureau officials believe that master keys are an important factor in the growing rate of auto thefts. In 1964 auto theft increased 16 percent over the previous year, and in 1965 it jumped another 4 percent.

Mr. President, this is a national problem which demands a national solution. The bill I introduced today with Senators JAVITS and KENNEDY will prohibit the advertisement of sale of master keys except to those with a legitimate need for them. It authorizes the Postmaster General to establish regulations for the mailing of these keys.

Mr. President, I ask unanimuose consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum on the problem of master keys prepared by the Legislative Reference Service. It contains additional information on this topic. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill as introduced be printed immediately following the memorandum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorandum presented by Mr. RIBICOFF is as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1966.

To: Senate Executive Reorganization Subcommittee; attention, Mr. Robert Wager.
From: Economics Division.
Subject: Procurement of master keys for automobiles.

In an effort to gain information on the procurement methods of master keys for automobiles, telephone calls were made to many individuals.

A spokesman for the American Automobile Association (AAA) stated that automobile dealers generally have a key cutting machine and a code book for their make of automobile. If an individual has the serial number of a lost key the dealers are able to reproduce the key through identification data contained in the code book. The AAA spokesman stated that he understood that qualified locksmiths could obtain rings of master keys for all makes of automobiles. These master key rings are not obtained from the automobile manufacturers but from independent key companies; however, he did not know the name or identity of these key companies.

Telephone calls were made to several local locksmiths. These locksmiths generally confirmed that master keys for automobiles are available. They would answer that the keys may be obtained from many key companies; they are not obtained from the auto manufacturers. However, none of the locksmiths we spoke to would name any of the companies from whom the keys may be obtained. They claimed that the keys are available to "locksmiths with shops." When queried if a locksmith had to submit some proof of his trade with his application or if the key companies made any inquiries before filling orders for master keys, the conversation was usualy terminated by an abrupt comment to the effect that "I won't say anything more," or "What the key companies do is their business, not mine."

An official of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia stated that rings of master keys for automobiles are easily obtainable. When queried as to what qualified an individual to purchase rings of master keys for autos this official replied that as far as he could determine the qualification amounted to the price of the order with the application. He went on to say that he had seen advertisements in some popular auto magazines offering master keys for sale.

The police officials stated that the ease with which individuals apparently can obtain master keys undoubtedly does contribute to the high rate of auto thefts. He said that about 92 percent of the stolen automobile cases in the District of Columbia fall into the category they term: "for the purpose of joyriding." That is, the auto is taken for the purpose of a short time usage and that the major number of violators in this group are juveniles. This official further explained that he felt the ease of procurement of master keys was a much less important contributing factor to these "joyriding" thefts than the fact that automobile locks are very simple mechanisms that can be easily manipulated.

While the locks installed on all automobiles are simple and can be manipulated by skilled individuals, the locks on General Motors cars are especially so. He said that the locks on Oldsmobiles, Pontiacs, and Chevrolets, in that order, appear to be the easiest to manipulate. He continued by stating that many juveniles obtain a basic General Motors auto key and then are able to file and sand ridges on the key so that they can use it as a master key for a specific make of auto. He said that on many occasions the police have picked up juveniles and they would boast that "my key will open any Pontiac on this street," etc. Furthermore, they are able to prove it by demonstration.

The police official added that Ford and Chrysler autos appeared to have locks more difficult for the juveniles to overcome. Further, he added that Ford on its 1965 and 1966 models has installed a new type of lock which encompasses a set of tumblers on top of the lock, a set of tumblers on the bottom of the lock, and a sliding bar in the middle of the lock; all of these mechanisms must be activated before the lock will release. To date, the new Ford lock appears to be more effective than previous ones.

The bill (S. 3176) is as follows:

S. 3176

A bill to provide criminal penalties for the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of master keys for motor vehicles, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code is amended by—

(1) adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2319. INTRODUCTION, SALE, DISTRIBUTION, OR ADVERTISEMENT FOR SALE TO THE PUBLIC OF MOTOR VEHICLE MASTER KEYS.

"Whoever knowingly introduces, or manufactures for introduction, into interstate commerce or transports or distributes in interstate commerce any motor vehicle master key shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"Whoever knowingly disseminates or knowingly causes to be disseminated by means of the United States mails, or in interstate commerce by any means, any advertisement of sale to the public of motor vehicle master keys shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"This section shall not apply to—

"(1) the introduction, manufacture for introduction, transportation, distribution, sale or possession in interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys for use in the crdinary course of business by any bona fide locksmith, common carrier, contract carrier, new or used car dealer, rental car agency, automobile club or association operating in more than one State or an affiliate thereof, or any department, agency, or instrumentality of (a) the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or (b) any political subdivision of any such entity; or

"(2) the shipment, transportation, or delivery for shipment in interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys in the ordinary course of business by any common carrier or contract carrier.

"As used in this section, 'master key' means any key adapted to fit the ignition switch of two or more motor vehicles the ignition switches of which are designed to be operated by different keys."

(2) adding at the end of the chapter analysis of such chapter the following:

"§ 2319. Introduction, Sale, Distribution, or Advertisement for Sale to the Public of Motor Vehicle Master Keys."

(b) Section 1716 of such title is amended by inserting immediately after the seventh paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"All keys adapted to fit the ignition switch of two or more motor vehicles the ignition switches of which are designed to be operated with different keys are nonmailable and shall not be deposited in or carried by the mails or delivered by any postmaster, letter carrier, or other person in the postal service. Such keys may be conveyed in the mails, under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe—

"(1) to any bona fide locksmith, new or used car dealer, officer or employee of a common carrier or contract carrier, or officer or employee of any rental car agency for use in their business;

"(2) to any officer or employee of any automobile club or association operating in more than one State or an affiliate thereof for use in connection with the activities of such club or association; and

"(3) to supply or procurement personnel of (A) any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or (B) any political subdivision of any such entity, for use in connection with the activities of such department, agency, or instrumentality.

The Postmaster General may require, as a condition of conveying any such key in the mails, that any person proposing to mail such key explain in writing to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General that the mailing of such key will not be in violation of this section."

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

INCREASED FOOD SUPPLIES FOR INDIA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on March 30, the President sent a message to the House of Representatives pertaining to proposals for increasing food supplies for India, and a joint resolution was put before the House and sent to the Agriculture Committee of the House.

This morning, this message was sent to the Senate, and pursuant to this message, I am introducing on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and such other Senators as may wish to join, a joint resolution to carry out the message submitted today by the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 149) to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that I shall try to hold hearings on this joint resolution probably on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week, and I am hopeful that the Senate will be able to enact the resolution before the Easter recess begins.

I understand that the House will take up the resolution on Monday, and in all probability we should be able to have the resolution enacted before the Easter holiday begins.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would appreciate it very much if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would permit me to cosponsor the joint resolution, as I believe it is a resolution which should be enacted into law at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution remain at the desk until Monday next, so that Senators who desire to cosponsor it may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the President on economic aid to India be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry along with the resolution which was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the committee the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF APRIL 1967 AS FEDERAL LAND BANK MONTH

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would provide for the designation of the month of April 1967 as Federal Land Bank Month.

The inauguration of the Federal land bank system in April of 1917 marked the first time in the history of the United States that it was possible for people to obtain credit through Government-sponsored programs of any kind.

The establishment of the system has consistently attacked the chronic scarcity of money for agricultural development by instituting reforms on farm-lending practices. It has provided long-term funds for farmers at reasonable costs in place of high and often extortionate interest rates and high renewal commissions every few years. From its beginning, the bank's primary mission has been to keep borrowers in business.

Many agree that agriculture—the production of food and fiber—is rapidly moving toward its greatest hour. For it is increasingly evident that the hopes of people everywhere to obtain their barest needs for food and hope for enduring peace and, indeed, the survival of man are closely linked. Recognizing this, the Federal land banks will dedicate their 1967 golden anniversary to "American Farmers: Providers of Plenty." It will provide a threshold of public interest and understanding not only of the tremendous contributions of U.S. agriculture in the past but also of its vital role in the immediate future.

Coming at this critical time in world history, this anniversary will commemorate unquestioned success of both the Federal land banks and American agriculture and develop awareness of the imperative demands which they will be called upon to meet in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, together with a letter and its enclosures from the Director of the land bank service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letter with enclosures, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 150) to provide for the designation of the month of April, 1967, as Federal Land Bank Month, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the inception of the Federal land bank system in April of 1917 marked the first time in United States history that Americans were enabled to obtain credit through a federally sponsored program of any kind; and

Whereas the Federal land bank system stands out as a unique alliance of farmers, the financial community, and the Government, deriving its loan funds from bond sales to a broad range of investors, and thus providing a mainstay for America's agricultural strength and progress through a banking system created and working "of, by, and for" its farmer-borrowers; and

Whereas the Federal land bank system has pioneered, innovated, and provided leadership for the wise and constructive use of credit by America's farmers; and

Whereas the American farmer's productive capacity over the past half century, which has made such farmer the provider of plenty for the United States and extensive areas of the free world outside the United States, represents one of the free world's indispensable assets; and

Whereas it becomes increasingly evident that the hopes of people everywhere for food, peace, and the survival of mankind are closely interrelated, and that agriculture—the production of food and fiber—is thus rapidly moving toward its greatest challenge; and

Whereas the month of April 1917, marked completion of the chartering of the twelve Federal land banks, as authorized by Act of Congress, and the first land bank loans were issued in that month; and

Whereas the month of April 1967, provides an appropriate and fitting opportunity for due recognition of the foregoing achievements, accomplishments, and deeds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of April 1967, is hereby designated as "Federal Land Bank Month" and the President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all people of the United States for the observance of such month with appropriate proceedings and ceremonies.

The letter and enclosures presented by Mr. McCLELLAN are as follows:

MARCH 14, 1966.

Mr. JOHN L. RYAN,
President, Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, New Orleans, La.

Mr. RALPH E. NOWLAN,
President, Federal Land Bank of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR JOHN AND RALPH: As you know, one of the important projects leading up to the 50th anniversary observance will be the enactment of legislation requesting a Presidential proclamation designating April 1967 as Federal Land Bank Month. If we are to be successful in this effort, it is highly important that the enclosed draft of a resolution be introduced for consideration as soon as possible.

In order to enhance the possibility of obtaining prompt approval of the resolution, we feel it is advisable to have it introduced by a group of leading Senators representing agriculture and the Judiciary Committee, perhaps headed by Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, since he is chairman of the Judiciary Committee and also a member of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee. We are suggesting that he be joined by Senators McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, DIRKSEN, of Illinois, ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and perhaps others.

It would be much appreciated if you will make contact with your Senator on this matter or arrange for other suitable contact. The enclosed background fact sheet may be useful in explaining the importance of this proposed resolution.

I will appreciate knowing the receptiveness of your Senator to the proposal, any information you may receive as to when the resolution will be introduced, and suggestions as to appropriate followup on our part. It is essential to the anniversary program that the resolution be approved during the present session of Congress.

Sincerely,

GLENN G. BROWNE,
Director, Land Bank Service.

FACTS RELATIVE TO THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FEDERAL LAND BANKS

1. In America's remarkable agricultural progress over the past half-century, a major factor has been sound farm financing and modern business methods—first made possible through long-term credit provided by the Federal land banks.

2. Inauguration of the Federal land bank system in 1917 marked the first time in U.S. history that people were enabled to obtain credit through Government-sponsored programs of any kind.

3. By use of initial capital funds supplied by the Government and emergency Government capital during the depression of the 1930's, the Federal land banks were instrumental in helping the Nation endure periods of crisis because thousands of farmers were able to maintain production of vital food and fiber supplies. Since 1947, when all capital subscribed by the Government was returned to the Treasury, the Federal land bank system has been completely farmer owned.

4. While supervised by the Farm Credit Administration and deriving its loan funds from bond sales to eminent financial institutions and a broad spectrum of investors, this banking system is "of, by and for" its farmer-borrowers. Thus it stands out as a unique alliance of farmers, the financial community, and the Government—a mainstay of America's agricultural strength.

5. Establishment of the system attacked the chronic scarcity of money for agricultural development by instituting reforms in farm-lending practices. It provided long-term funds for farmers at reasonable cost in place of high and often extortionate interest rates and high renewal commissions every few years. Unlike many other lending institutions, the Federal land banks made it possible for borrowers to amortize their loans as they earn and to repay loans without penalty. From the beginning, the banks' primary mission has been to keep borrowers in business.

6. The Congress established the Federal land banks as a permanent and dependable source of farm mortgage credit at reasonable rates of interest and on terms especially adapted to the particular needs of farmers. Today the banks have some 384,000 loans totaling $4.3 billion on farms in this country—20 percent of all mortgage credit currently used by farmers. During their 48-year existence, the banks have served more than 2 million farmers with loans totaling some $7.8 billion. Farmers and others interested in agricultural credit agree that over the years these banks have made a significant contribution not only to agriculture but to our Nation's entire economy as well.

7. The 12 land banks and more than 700 affiliated Federal land bank associations are the senior members of a nationwide farm credit system which from its inception has pioneered, innovated, and set both pace and standards for modern, business-based financing in agriculture. Thus every farmer who has used mortgage credit has benefited. In fact, not only has this system served as a model for agricultural development in the United States but it has also furnished basic principles for developing credit systems in many other countries.

8. Meaningful appraisal of the value of the land banks is expressed in comment of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of Government Agencies when it singled out the land bank system as requiring no recommendation for change or improvement, and stated: "We take this opportunity to commend the high ability, integrity, and service which the land banks have shown over the years."

9. Many agree that agriculture—the production of food and fiber—is rapidly moving toward its greatest hour. For it is increasingly evident that the hopes of people everywhere to obtain their barest needs for food and hope for enduring peace and, indeed, the survival of man are closely linked. Recognizing this, the Federal land banks will dedicate their 1967 golden anniversary to "American Farmers: Providers of Plenty." It will provide a threshold of public interest and understanding not only of the tremendous contributions of U.S. agriculture in the past but of its vital role in the immediate future. Coming at this critical time in world history, this anniversary will commemorate unquestioned success of both the Federal land banks and American agriculture and develop awareness of the imperative demands which they will be called upon to meet in the years ahead.

COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

Legislation authorizing commemorative medals has to go through the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. It can be introduced by any Member of the Senate, but it would be preferable to have it brought up by a Senator who is a member of both the Banking and Currency and the Agriculture Committees.

After introduction on the floor of the Senate, it will be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee for a hearing—probably to be held in conjunction with other matters since it alone does not warrant a special hearing. The committee will then pass on it, refer it back to the floor of the Senate, where it will then be read twice and (hopefully) passed. It is not necessary to have it introduced by a Member of the House, where it will automatically go after Senate passage; however, it might be helpful to get House Members interested in it to expedite the matter.

Since all organizations for whom these commemorative medals are struck are expected to pay for them, no appropriations legislation is necessary to accompany or follow the resolution.

COMMEMORATIVE MONTH

Legislation providing for the observance of a commemorative month to honor the 50th anniversary of the Federal Land Bank System can be introduced by any Member of the Senate, but should preferably be introduced by a member of the Judiciary Committee. After introduction on the floor of the Senate, the bill is brought to the full Judiciary Committee which will refer it to the Subcommittee on Federal Observances, etc. (Senators DIRKSEN and MCCLELLAN), who, after having held a hearing in the course of other business, will refer it back to the full committee for recommendation; after that it will go back to the floor of the Senate for passage.

As in the case of the commemorative medal, there is no basic need to introduce an identical resolution in the House; but it would be useful to interest House Members before it gets to the House hopper.

The usual commemorative period is 1 week. We are told that it will be quite difficult to have a whole month declared a commemorative month, but the resolution was drafted with the idea that a period shorter than a month could be inserted if necessary.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE MONTH OF APRIL, 1967, AS FEDERAL LAND BANK MONTH

Whereas the inception of the Federal land bank system in April of 1917 marked the first time in United States history that Americans were enabled to obtain credit through a federally sponsored program of any kind, and

Whereas the Federal land bank system stands out as a unique alliance of farmers, the financial community, and the Government, deriving its loan funds from bond sales to a broad range of investors, and thus providing a mainstay for America's agricultural strength and progress through a banking system created and working "of, by, and for" its farmer-borrowers; and

Whereas the Federal land bank system has pioneered, innovated, and provided leadership for the wise and constructive use of credit by America's farmers; and

Whereas America's agricultural progress over the past half century represents one of the free world's indispensable assets, as a result of which the farmers of this country have become providers of plenty for Americans and extensive areas of the free world; and

Whereas it becomes increasingly evident that the hopes of people everywhere for food, peace, and the survival of mankind are closely interrelated, and that agriculture—the production of food and fiber—is thus rapidly moving toward its greatest challenge; and

Whereas the month of April 1917, marked completion of the chartering of the twelve Federal land banks, as authorized by act of Congress, and that the first land banks were issued in that month; and

Whereas the month of April 1967, provides an appropriate and fitting opportunity for due recognition of the foregoing achievements, accomplishments, and deeds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of April 1967, is hereby designated as "Federal Land Bank Month" and the President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all people of the United States for the observance of such month with appropriate proceedings and ceremonies.

WATERSHED FINANCING

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution expressing the intent of Congress with respect to appropriations and project authorizations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966. The purpose of this resolution is to remove the project planning limitation recently placed on the watershed program by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1966.

During the past few years the Congress has acted wisely in creating several new programs designed to help people help themselves. In addition, there has been a resurgence of interest in the preservation and wise development of our Nation's natural resources. In reviewing this activity, however, I fear that we have neglected one of our strongest existing programs, the watershed protection program created in 1954 by Public Law 566.

Mr. President, I know of few other programs that have greater support among the people and officials at all levels of Government. Through small watershed construction we are protecting our people from floods, providing recreation facilities, increasing municipal water supplies, storing irrigation water, and enhancing fish and wildlife habitats.

Watershed projects must be initiated by local people. Those who sponsor these projects receive technical guidance from the Soil Conservation Service and operate under the jurisdiction of State law. After approval of a project plan by the Soil Conservation Service, the local sponsoring organizations must do a great deal of work and provide a substantial portion of the cost of each project.

My home State of Indiana, under the skillful guidance of the State Department of Natural Resources and the Soil Conservation Service, has developed an exceptionally progressive program. These two agencies have done an outstanding job of working with and coordinating the efforts of hundreds of people who represent 88 local watershed sponsoring organization.

State support for this program is unequivocal. At the present time, Indiana spends more money for watershed planning within its borders than does the Federal Government. In addition, eventual State and local expenditures for projects in our current program will total around $51 million, just $15 million short of equalling the Federal financial portion. With nearly 90 projects in various stages of development, the State of Indiana ranked fifth in the number of watershed applications recorded in a June 30, 1965, survey.

This program is one of the finest examples of how the power and the resources of local, State, and Federal Government, once motivated by local initiative, can work together for public betterment.

However, only two watershed projects in my State have been completed. Perhaps even more discouraging is the fact that 38 project applications have not even been serviced. This tragic situation deprives the people of the benefit of a fuller life through the proper use and full development of our natural resources. Similar problems face other States in connection with this program. Recent actions by the Bureau of the Budget threaten to further retard future development and to render useless the time and money spent by thousands of local people on these projects.

For fiscal year 1966, a total of $5,721,000 was appropriated for the use of the Soil Conservation Service for watershed planning purposes. Although the Bureau of the Budget has the power to limit the number of projects which can be planned with each appropriation, it did not do so at the time appropriations were made last year. The Soil Conservation Service, proceeding with its customary diligence, has to date secured authorization for the planning of 90 watershed projects. However, on March 9, the Bureau of the Budget notified the Department of Agriculture that it had set a planning limit of 100 projects for fiscal year 1966.

If this standard is retained it will have a disastrous effect on the watershed program. The Soil Conservation Service would be permitted to authorize the planning of only 10 more projects this fiscal year.

At the present time 28 watersheds located in 18 States are ready for planning authorization and the Soil Conservation Service has funds to initiate work on each of them. I ask unanimous consent that the names of these projects and their locations be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. In addition, 18 other watershed proposals, the names of which have not been announced, will be added to this classification within the next few weeks. Therefore, if the Bureau of the Budget regulations are followed, 46 projects would be competing for only 10 openings, with the result that 36 projects would definitely be delayed.

Of particular importance to me is the fact that 3 of these 28 projects are located in Indiana. In addition, all of these proposals are located in Indiana's Ninth Congressional District which is so ably represented by Congressman LEE H. HAMILTON. For the past year and one-half Representative HAMILTON has worked closely with the sponsoring watershed organizations for projects on the Upper Vernon Fork of the Muscatatuck River, the Lower Vernon Fork of the Muscatatuck River, and the East Fork of the White Water River.

The development of these three much-needed projects, as well as the others, will be severely retarded unless Congress acts promptly on Representative HAMILTON's resolution, House Joint Resolution 995, or the similar measure which I am introducing today.

Mr. President, I believe that the small watershed program has reached a critical point. The invaluable services of many local organizations, concerned State agencies, and the Soil Conservation Service should not be wasted. Subject only to financial limitations, there is no valid reason why the Soil Conservation Service, which has the capability to move forward, should not be allowed to plan these watershed projects.

In the past 5 years, Congress has passed 19 major conservation and natural resource development bills and nearly 50 acts creating specific parks, reclamation projects, navigation constructions and other similar projects. In view of this, it seems to me that watershed programs, which do so much for the people and resources of the United States should receive comparable treatment.

For these reasons, I am introducing this Senate joint resolution and hope that it will receive prompt and serious consideration by both Houses of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the list will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 151) expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966, introduced by Mr. BAYH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The list presented by Mr. BAYH is as follows:

WATERSHED PLANNING REQUESTS NOW ELIGIBLE FOR APPROVAL BY SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

(Watershed, State, and county)

Big Swamp Creek, Ala., Lowndes.
Swan Creek, Ala., Limestone.
Excelsior agricultural water management project, California, Kings.
Buttonwillow, Calif., Kern.
Brooker Creek, Fla., Hillsborough and Pinellas.
Tesnatee Creek, Ga., White and Lumpkin.
John's Creek, Ga., Floyd, Gordon, and Walker.
Pond Creek, Ill., Wayne and White.
Lost Creek, Ill., White and Hamilton.
East Fork of Whitewater River, Ind., Wayne, Union, Fayette, Randolph, and Franklin.
East Fork of Whitewater River, Ohio, Darke and Preble.
Lower Vernon Fork of Muscatatuck River, Ind., Jennings and Jackson.
Upper Vernon Fork of Muscatatuck River Ind., Jennings, Ripley and Decatur.
Carter Creek, Iowa, Davis and Appanoose.
Upper Walnut east sector, Kansas, Butler and Chase.
Upper Walnut west sector, Kansas, Butler.
White River east sector, Kansas, Butler, Marion, and Harvey.
White River west sector, Kansas, Butler, Sedgwick, and Harvey.
Tebo Erickson, Mich., Bay.
Williams Creek, Mo., Clay.
Mill-Long and Moore's Creek, Nebr., Washington.
Upper Tioga River, Pa., Bradford and Tioga.
Bentley Creek, Pa., Bradford.
Bentley Creek, N.Y., Chemung.
Wolf Creek, Pa., Mercer and Venango.
Sugar Creek, Tenn., Bedford.
Darr's Creek, Tex., Bell.
Wells River, Vt., Caledonia, Orange, and Washington.
Swiss Bader, Wis., Green and Dane.
Kickapoo Creek, Wis., Vernon and Monroe.

DO NOT MAKE THE FARMER THE SCAPEGOAT OF INFLATION

AMENDMENT NO. 509

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the U.S. Department of Agriculture late yesterday announced an increase in price support for manufacturing milk from $3.24 per hundredweight to $3.50 per hundredweight. At the same time, it announced an increase of more than 900,000 pounds in the amount of Cheddar cheese which may be imported into the United States in the next few months, and an adjustment of fluid milk prices in a number of milk order areas which will somewhat offset normal seasonal reductions in prices to farmers for milk to go into bottles. I appreciate the efforts of our able Secretary of Agriculture to secure a better return for dairy farmers, but this inadequate adjustment indicates that the Secretary lost most of the battle to those economic advisers who mistakenly believe that fair farm prices are inflationary.

The adjustments in milk price supports have been carefully tailored, not to assure fair returns to the farmer, but to avoid any actual increase in consumer prices. Manufacturing milk is now selling on the market for $3.79 per hundredweight. The support price until today has been 55 cents under that—$3.24 per hundredweight.

The increase in the manufacturing milk price support simply assures farmers that for the next year milk returns will not drop back 55 cents per hundred to $3.24; rather the drop will be held to 29 cents per hundred at $3.50.

Meantime, we let in some foreign cheese—for which we will have to pay hard dollars—to freeze or even roll back the $3.79 market price level.

If anyone believes that this sort of operation is going to slow down a very serious liquidation of dairy herds, and decline in dairy production, I fear that it is only because they are listening to economic advisers without experience in agriculture. It is an unfortunate fact that the Council of Economic Advisers, where anti-inflation policies and farm policies both appear to be made at the present time, does not now include an agricultural economist.

The harsh reality of life is that when dairy checks start declining, and farmers have an opportunity to improve their inadequate returns by switching to some less onerous type of production and increase their incomes—to get up at dawn and go out and feed some cattle and hogs instead of getting up at some predawn hour to get the milking done—a considerable number of them are going to take advantage of the opportunity.

Dairy herd liquidation is going to continue under this inadequate increase in the milk price support level, accompanied by a market price depressant. The danger that our volume of milk production will continue on its downward path and finally drop to levels that will bring on a real inflationary spiral—uncontrollable even with further abandonment of import restrictions—continues to exist.

The only net we are going to get out of yesterday's milk price support announcement, I fear, is a sharp rise in producer irritation over imports—a rise that is almost guaranteed by the proposal to have the Tariff Commission agitate the matter with hearings on further increasing Cheddar cheese import quotas.

It is apparently going to have to be demonstrated again that there is no real solution to the farm problem except fair returns and larger sales at home and abroad. It cannot be solved with mirrors, or with price support operations that deny the farmer a reasonable return.

I appreciate the serious inflation problem with which we are confronted. I applaud the President's desire to prevent a price spiral.

But I deplore the effort to blame that inflation on the farmer. In fact the farmer is not yet receiving his fair share of the national income.

There has been a great deal of publicity recently about the cost of living index rising about 2.8 percent in the past year, coupled with the statement that last month food prices were responsible for about one-half of 1 point of this 2.8 overall increase.

Another Government report on March prices has also come out in the past few days—the agricultural prices report. It has not been given a lot of publicity, but it should have been. It shows that the farm parity ratio dropped 1 point last month. The prices that farmers received for their products, compared to the cost of the things they have to buy, actually fell from 83 percent of parity to 82 percent of parity between February 15, 1966, and March 15, 1966. Farm prices in the overall went down 1 point during the period and the prices farmers have to pay for their living and production items went up 2 points. The net effect was a 1-percent decline in the purchasing power of farm returns during the month.

Some of my colleagues have indicated concern that food prices are 111.4 percent of the 1957–59 average. So is everything else. The whole cost-of-living index stands at 111. Unfortunately, they do not take a careful look at the 1957–59 base.

In the base period on which the cost-of-living index is founded, farmers got about 83 percent of parity for their products—82 percent in 1957, 85 percent in 1958, and 82 percent in 1959.

They were not getting parity, or equity, in the base period.

They are not getting parity, or equity, today, and anyone who says, as a news commentator did today, that a continuing decline in farm prices is a "bright spot" in the economic outlook, only proves that he is unconcerned about justice for the American farmer.

Farmers were still getting only 82 percent of parity on March 15—only 82 percent of equity on the basis of a yardstick that we have accepted for many years as fair, although it is demonstrably too low.

The only two farm commodities that were bringing parity on March 15 were hogs, which were at 106 percent of parity, and limes—not a very widely produced commodity—which were bringing 198 percent of parity.

Beef cattle were at 89 percent of parity.

Wheat was selling for 55 percent of parity in the market, but we were supplementing farm returns with domestic certificates which brought farm returns up around 72 percent of parity on a blended basis.

Corn was selling at 71 percent of parity.

Soybeans were bringing only 86 percent of parity, although not in any oversupply.

Eggs were at 86 percent of parity.

Farm prices are still lagging—as reflected by the overall 82 percent of parity ratio. The effect of that lag in overall returns can be seen in rising farm debt, declining farm numbers—closing out sales now in progress in many areas—and in the comparatively low per capita income of our farm citizens.

The statistics on these significant measures of the real status of our agriculture ought to be known and understood by everyone.

Farm debt on January 1, 1966, stood at $39.4 billion, up $3.4 billion from a year earlier. The increase was two-thirds on real estate and one-third on non-real-estate debt. Farmers still are not staying even.

The decline in number of farmers is running at the rate of about 90,000 a year. The decline in absolute numbers is down some, because the number of farms remaining to be liquidated in America is down. We have less than 3.4 million farms now. There were once twice that number, and the liquidations still continue.

The disposable personal income of the farm population in 1965 was $1,510 per capita. The disposable personal income of nonfarm citizens was $2,405 per capita, or $900 per person more for people outside agriculture.

This is not an equitable distribution of disposable income and it is not a situation to freeze with the economy with any kind of controls.

We today have a spectacle of comparatively low farm incomes, rising farm debt, declining farm numbers as a result of the cost-price squeeze, and, yet, an increasing effort to blame farm prices for inflation and even to roll back farm returns.

The administration early this year made all Commodity Credit Corporation wheat stocks available for sale for unrestricted use at the low CCC minimum resale price level to hold down the price of bread.

About March 1 nearly 100 million bushels of corn were dumped into the market to keep feed prices low, thereby to encourage hog production and bring down pork prices. One of the President's economic advisers said exactly that on a national television show.

Export restrictions have been put on cattle hides for the avowed purpose of rolling back prices and preventing a rise in shoe prices, although the cost of hides is an insignificant part of the cost of a pair of shoes.

And now we have a milk price support announcement that will not increase farm returns, coupled with a loosening of cheese import restrictions which will depress prices.

I would regret very much the necessity of imposing price and wage controls to halt inflation.

In my judgment, we could cut several billion out of our military budget without lessening the security of this Nation in the least, and do more to reduce inflationary pressures than all the inequitable farm price actions have done or will do.

I have attempted in past years to achieve such reductions in inflationary military expenditures, and I intend to continue those efforts. It would seem to me, for example, that we ought to consider whether it makes any sense for us to finance six divisions of U.S. troops in Western Europe 20 years after World War II.

I hope that those concerned with inflation will look at the real causes and stop making farmers struggling with less than equitable incomes the scapegoats in every inflationary situation.

As one step in this direction, Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment proposed to be offered to S. 2932, the commodity reserve bill.

This amendment is intended to prevent the use of the proposed national reserve of food commodities as a price depressing device. Unless restrictions are adopted, the proposed reserve could be used in two ways to effect farm prices.

When the reserve gets low and needs to be replenished, production for the reserve—production which would be over and above market requirements—could nonetheless be left in the market until it depressed market prices down to minimum price support levels. The amendment I have offered would require the Secretary of Agriculture to take such production off the market by making loans on it at 115 percent of the current price support level. The amendment would also forbid sales from the wheat reserve at less than 115 percent of the price support, so stocks could not be released into the market at prices which are inequitable to farm producers.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the long-term welfare of the American economy will be greatly enhanced by permitting farm prices to reach equitable levels.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has done an outstanding job of reducing our surpluses and strengthening farm prices and returns. We have made real progress toward a parity of income in agriculture which will permit farmers to buy the industrial products and the services they need and thereby make their proper contribution to the total economy.

Premature imposition of price and income restrictions on agriculture, and on agriculture almost alone, will only continue an imbalance in our economy which makes for instability. It ultimately hurts the whole economy.

If we need inflation control—and I agree that we do—then let us adopt means that are equitable to all segments of the economy and not take the whole cost out of those few segments where the existence of price support programs, security stockpiles, or import limitations make it possible to depress prices by releasing stocks.

As distasteful as it is, we should approach inflation control on an equitable, across-the-board basis with measures that will be equally applicable through the economy, and certainly not with measures that will further distort prices and incomes which are already at subparity levels.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 509) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

AMENDMENT TO S. 2932

At the end of the bill add the following new sections:

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 107(1)(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as effective with respect to the 1966 through 1969 crops, and section 107(3) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as effective for the 1970 and subsequent crops, are each amended by inserting before the punctuation mark at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That price support for wheat within the farm reserve allocation shall be at a level equal to 115 per centum of the level of price support for other wheat not accompanied by marketing certificates. For any marketing year the farm reserve allocation shall be the number of bushels which bears the same relation to the farm wheat marketing allocation as the national reserve allocation bears to the national wheat marketing allocation. The national reserve allocation for any marketing year shall be the projected yield of that part of the national acreage allotment which results from action taken by the Secretary under the first proviso of section 332(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or section 4 of the Commodity Reserve Act of 1966. The national reserve allocation for any marketing year shall be proclaimed at the same time that the national acreage allotment is proclaimed for the crop of wheat to be marketed in such marketing year. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the farm reserve allocation shall not exceed an amount which, when added to the farm wheat marketing allocation, would equal (i) the actual acreage of wheat planted on the farm for harvest in the calendar year in which the marketing year begins multiplied by the normal yield of wheat for the farm, plus (ii) the amount of wheat stored under section 379c(b) or to avoid or postpone a marketing quota penalty, which is released from storage during the marketing year on account of underplanting or underproduction. The farm reserve allocation shall be shared among the producers on the farm in the same proportion as wheat marketing certificates'.

"(b) Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by changing the period at the end of the third sentence to a colon and adding the following: '*Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make any sales of wheat at less than 115 per centum of the current support price for wheat, plus reasonable carrying charges.'

"SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the Commodity Reserve Act of 1966."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL—SENATE RESOLUTION 231

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 231, relating to distribution among the States of research and development funds made available by Government agencies.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1966

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations will conduct public hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966, relating to the transfer of the Water Pollution Control Administration from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Department of Interior. The hearings will be held on April 6–7, 1966, in room 1318, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m. Individuals interested in presenting their views or filing statements should contact Jerry Sonosky, room 162, Old Senate Office Building, extension 2308, by April 5, 1966.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON SENATE BILL 2855

Mr. **TYDINGS**. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, and for my distinguished colleague, Senator ERVIN, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I announce that the hearing on S. 2855 scheduled for April 5, 1966, has been postponed until further notice.

HEARINGS ON INCREASED REGULATORY POWERS TO FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD AND FEDERAL BANK SUPERVISORY AGENCIES

Mr. **ROBERTSON**. Mr. President, last Tuesday, I introduced by request a bill to give increased regulatory powers to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and to the three Federal bank supervisory agencies, and announced that hearings on the bill would commence on Monday, April 4. At the same time, I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of the bill and an explanatory memorandum in order that financial institutions might get immediate notice of what was involved, since all of them would have access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the following day.

Today, I received a complaint from a valued friend in New York who represents institutions that would be affected, claiming it was quite unfair for me to start hearings next Monday on a bill, the contents of which were not fully known to those who would be affected.

I realize, of course, that we have not proposed to give to the financial institutions affected the usual amount of time to consider a new proposal. In the first place, this is not altogether a new proposal. A very similar proposal was included in the bill I introduced late in 1964 by request of the Home Loan Bank Board, which, of course, had to go over to the next year, but the bill was introduced to give all savings and loan associations time to study the proposal.

The bill I introduced last Tuesday authorizes the supervisory authorities to issue cease and desist orders and orders which would suspend or remove bank and savings and loan officials. These provisions would, of course, be subject to procedural requirements such as hearings and would provide for appeal to the courts. The necessity for this increased power grows out of just a few cases where action of the type indicated is imperative. If not taken in time, the situations to which I refer could bring into disrepute large segments of similar institutions and perhaps stimulate a demand for more drastic legislation than that proposed.

For the first time in recent years, all four regulatory agencies have united on what should be done, which led me to believe that the proposal would be reasonably acceptable to the financial institutions of the Nation. However, should serious objections be raised to the bill and serious demands made for more time to be heard, I shall recommend to the Banking and Currency Committee that action be deferred until such testimony can be received. But in that connection, I think those who may ask for more time to be heard should know that our committee is operating on a very tight schedule. We have agreed to start hearings, following the Easter recess on April 19, on the housing program, which is an administration program and one very vital to the Nation. It is so vital in fact that I interrupted hearings on the bank holding company bill in order to give the Housing Subcommittee a chance to perfect and bring before the full committee its bill but I have definitely promised to resume hearings on the bank holding company bill on or about May 2 and to complete action on that bill as soon thereafter as practical. It necessarily follows that if we cannot complete hearings on the regulatory bill as scheduled next week, it will have to be postponed until action has been completed on the bank holding company bill and that delay, in the opinion of all of the regulatory agencies, would be unfortunate. The present plan is to allocate as much as 8 days to the hearings on this regulatory bill and we hope that the interested parties will promptly familiarize themselves with the provisions of the bill and be prepared to express to the committee their views concerning it within that time.

HEARINGS ON GOLD SCHEDULED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to announce the subcommittee will hold hearings on May 4 on the following bills introduced for the purpose of encouraging gold mining in the United States:

S. 1377, a bill I introduced a year ago to provide for compensation to gold miners for differences in costs of production in the last quarter of 1939 and current costs. The theory of this legislation is that since gold miners are completely unable to operate profitably at this time because their costs of production so far exceed the arbitrarily limited price of $35 an ounce at which they may sell their product, they have a right to be compensated for the increase in costs of production. This is the same bill as S. 2125 which was reported favorably by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the 88th Congress.

S. 2562, a bill introduced by Senator McGovern, which would compensate gold miners on a basis of stated percentage of value of gold bullion receipts produced annually. This legislation is also designed to compensate gold miners for rising costs of production in the face of a federally imposed limitation on the price of gold.

S. Res. 83, a bill introduced by my Alaskan colleague, Senator Bartlett, to establish a Select Committee of the Senate on Domestic Gold Production.

Names of witnesses who wish to testify on any or all of these bills should make their interest known to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

POPULATION HEARINGS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, earlier this week I announced that a series of hearings were planned next week on S. 1676, my bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request, at home and overseas. Unfortunately, it is necessary to cancel the hearing the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures had scheduled for Tuesday, April 5, when we were to hear from representatives of the Dade County school system in Miami, Fla. The subcommittee will hear from Superintendent Joe Hall and School Board Chairman Jane Roberts at a later date.

The other hearings next week will be held as announced on April 6, 7, and 8, beginning at 10 a.m. in room 3302 of the New Senate Office Building.

Witnesses who will testify next week are:

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6

State Senator John Bermingham, Denver, Colo., author of birth control bill which was approved by Colorado State Legislature.

Dr. Joseph Martin, Cleveland, Ohio, Medical Associates, who, with other medical doctors, is working to make birth control information available to the poor who wish to have it; participant in the 1965 White House Conference on Health.

Dr. William Vogt, New York City, ecologist, author, secretary of the conservation fund.

Mr. Arnold Maremont, Chicago, Ill., industrialist, lawyer, president of the Maremont Corp., former chairman of the Illinois Public Aid Commission.

THURSDAY, APRIL 7

Hon. John W. Gardner, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FRIDAY, APRIL 8

Hon. David E. Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement by him on the 48th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S NEW STATEMENT OF POLICIES FOR DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Commissioner of Education's new guidelines for desegregation of public schools under title 6 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act are another example of the danger of State and local dependence upon Federal money. In our federal system, State and local officials have traditionally held the responsibility of educating our young people. Viewed broadly, the Commissioner's new guidelines are another step toward the complete nationalization of our State and local school systems by Federal agencies. Even though these new guidelines may be aimed, as Commissioner Howe asserts, only at eliminating the dual school system in the South, school officials in other parts of the Nation should certainly be aware of the direction the U.S. Office of Education is taking in dictating matters to local school boards and school officials. While other parts of the Nation may not be concerned now, these new regulations point the way to Federal regulation of textbooks, lesson plans, and all other areas of traditionally State and local control.

When title 6 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was being debated in the Senate, I warned of the dangers that tyrannical law would pose to, first, State and local responsibility for education, and second, the sole power of Congress, delegated by the Constitution, to legislate. I stated then that:

> Title 6 constitutes a brazen effort to transfer to the President the lawmaking power of Congress in violation of article I, sections 1 and 8 of the Constitution.

My warnings went unheeded, and title 6 is now the law. Congress did abdicate its legislative responsibility, and the Commissioner of Education is now assuming, because of the broad powers given it under title 6, the responsibility for legislating in these areas of education. The new guidelines of the Commissioner of Education illustrate what James Madison meant in The Federalist, when he said:

> The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

I feel the potential dangers in this type of legislation will soon be realized in parts of our country other than the South when the Commissioner of Education carries out his intended plan to deal with educational practices in other areas of the country.

Commissioner Howe, in his statement on the new rules, spoke with pride about the compliance of all the school districts with the original guideline standards. He stated that all but 70 of the 2,000 school districts filed plans in accordance with the guidelines. It is interesting to note that the original guidelines used the words "fairminded school officials" and "what reasonable men would think necessary." The tone of the original guidelines which dealt respectfully with State and local school officials has now been abandoned. The tone of the new guidelines is dictatorial, and the word "must" is used a total of 92 times. They do not mention anything about the best possible education for our children and seem only designed to implement some bureaucrat's nebulous and hollow concepts of sociological progress.

School districts now are being told that their previous deliberations and good faith planning to provide the most meaningful and equitable desegregation plan in the area in which they live are not reasonable and that they did not go far enough. The new Commissioner of Education has zealously promulgated new rules and regulations which go far beyond the legislative power which Congress allocated to him and the tedious process has been started all over again. Much is said about the good faith of local school officials, but what are these school officials to think of the good faith of the Commissioner of Education? The previous good faith contracts have been broken and if the Commissioner's purpose is to cooperate with local school officials in providing the best possible education for the children while carrying out the mandates of title 6, one can only wonder if his new approach in dealing with such deep social changes will accomplish his objectives.

These new guidelines not only are examples of the dangers of Congress unconstitutionally relinquishing its legislative responsibility, but illustrates an agency greedily assuming new power and promulgating new rules which are going far beyond congressional intent and, in effect, are passing new legislation and amending old acts. For example, section 602 of the act authorizes the agency concerned to promulgate rules of "general applicability"; however, the guidelines of the Commissioner of Education are clearly designed, and this has been admitted by Commissioner Howe, to deal only with the dual school system in effect in the South. These rules do not, Commissioner Howe says, "deal with the sometime even more difficult racial problems in our large cities or other districts." Thus, the new rules do not operate, as demanded by title 6, in a general way to regulate discrimination in the entire country. Clearly, this is against the dictates of title 6 and no matter how these regulations are viewed, fairly or harshly, no one can say that the whims of the Commissioner of Education are not amending the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Other sections of this country may not be concerned presently with this desire for power which is being exhibited by the Commissioner of Education but what laws will the Office of Education and other Federal agencies be able to pass unilaterally in the future?

An example of the incongruities of the new guidelines are the demands for total desegregation of public school faculties. The new guidelines state:

> The racial composition of the professional staff of a school system, and of the schools in the system, must be considered in determining whether the students are subjected to discrimination in education programs.

In explaining these guidelines, Mr. David Barus, of the Office of Education, said in Raleigh, N.C., that:

> Race may have to be taken into account in future assignments so as to achieve an integrated balance of staff.

Therefore, the new guidelines demand that race, in some cases, be used as a prerequisite for job selection.

In addition to the alleged purpose of title 7 of the Civil Rights Act, which was to prohibit race from being used as a criterion for job selection, section 604 of the act states that nothing in title 6 shall be construed to authorize action by any Federal agency "with respect to any employment practice of any employer, except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment." Under the new guidelines, however, all Federal money to an educational institution can be cut off if local school officials do not use, in some instances, race as a criterion for job selection.

Nothing in title 6 deals with the racial composition of the professional staff of a school system and title 4 which provides for desegregation of public schools concerns only the assignment of students without regard to race or color—no mention is made of professional staff. This is simply an example of the Department of Education exceeding the authority it has under title 6. I am sure all educators would agree that the employment of their teachers should be made on the basis of their ability to perform their job and should not be based on any other criteria.

The most insidious sections of the new policies are these which attempt to overcome racial imbalance in southern schools. During the debate of the 1964 Civil Rights Act there was repeated reference by proponents on the bill that racial imbalance was not to be covered by the act. The former Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY, in Senate debate on the Civil Rights Act made it clear that the act was in no way intended to cure racial imbalance. He stated:

> I should like to make one further reference to the Gary case. This case makes it quite clear that, while the Constitution prohibits segregation, it does not require integration. The busing of children to achieve racial balance would be an act to effect the integration of schools. In fact, if the bill were to compel it, it would be a violation, because it would be handling the matter on the basis of race and would be transporting children because of race.
>
> The bill does not attempt to integrate the schools; it does attempt to eliminate segregation in the school systems. The natural factors such as density of population and the distance that students would have to travel are considered legitimate means to determine the validity of a school district, if the school districts are not gerrymandered, and in effect deliberately segregated. The fact that there is a racial imbalance per se is not something which is unconstitutional. That is why we have attempted to clarify it with the language in section 4.

Indeed, Mr. President, these suggestions were incorporated in the section 401(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which specifically provides:

> "Desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

However, the purpose of many of the new policies issued by the Commissioner of Education is clearly to overcome racial imbalance in violation of the legislative history, legislative intent, and of the specific provisions of section 401(b) of the Civil Rights Act.

For example, in subpart D of the new policies dealing with students exercising a free choice of schools, the rules are designed to attack racial imbalance. This is true because the only preference which may be given to students exercising a free choice has to be to any student whose choice is for a school at which students of his race are a minority. No other reason can possibly be given for this section except that the Commissioner of Education is trying to remove racial imbalance. Coupled with this preference is the prospect of busing students in the South under subpart D. The busing provisions of the new guidelines are in section 181.51 which provides:

> In any event, every student choosing either the formerly white or the formerly Negro school (or other school established for students of a particular race, color, or national origin) nearest his residence must be transported to the school to which he is assigned under these provisions, if that school is sufficiently distant from his home to make him eligible for transportation under generally applicable transportation rules.

This section would, of course, require the transportation of a student to a school in which a racial imbalance exists and as such it specifically violates section 407 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That section states:

> Nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance.

Subpart C of the new guidelines concerns voluntary desegregation plans based on geographic attendance zones. However, section 181.33(b) provides that these voluntary desegregation plans need not be followed if a student desires to transfer to a school within the system where students of his race are a minority. Geographic attendance zones which have been established without regard to race have been repeatedly said to be exempt from Civil Rights Acts. But even though such attendance zones have been drawn completely without regard to race, the new policies can be used to cure any racial imbalance in violation of the specific provisions of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

In determining the effectiveness of a free-choice plan, the Commissioner states in subpart D of the guidelines he will use a percentage "increase in desegregation" in determining whether the free-choice plan shall continue. Obviously the purpose of using entirely arbitrary percentages is to overcome racial imbalance rather than to eliminate desegregation as the Civil Rights Act was designed.

In his dictates on freedom-of-choice schools in subpart D, the Commissioner of Education has gone far beyond the requirements of the courts and especially the Brown decision. In construing that decision, the eminently able jurist John J. Parker said in *Briggs* v. *Elliott* (132 F. Supp. 776):

> It is important that we point out exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided in this case. It has not decided that the Federal courts are to take over or regulate the public schools of the States. It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains. This, under the decision of the Supreme Court, the State may not do directly or indirectly; but if the schools which it maintains are open to children of all races, no violation of the Constitution is involved even though children of different races voluntarily attend different schools, as they attend different churches. Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination. It does not forbid such segregation as occurs as the result of voluntary action. It merely forbids the use of governmental power to enforce segregation. The 14th amendment is a limitation upon the exercise of power by the State or State agencies, not a limitation upon the freedom of individuals.

Now the Commissioner is attempting to break down with administrative edicts the free-choice schools, without any regard for judicial pronouncements on the subject.

Mr. President, because of the great concern many of North Carolina's school officials and citizens have expressed about the desirability of the new guidelines, I have written Commissioner Howe and asked him to reconsider these new policies in light of the disruptive effect that they might have on the good-faith progress which has been made under the original rules.

At least, Mr. President, it would seem that the Department of Education should delete the sections of the guidelines dealing with racial imbalance in order to conform the new rules to congressional intent. If this is not done, I hope the Congress will reassert its constitutional authority and strike down these regulations.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHN L. McCLELLAN OF ARKANSAS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, unfortunately, because of my duties in the Senate, including the work in which the Committee on Foreign Relations has recently been engaged, I was unable to be present when the people of my State paid tribute to Arkansas' senior Senator and our colleague, John L. McClellan, at a meeting in the Robinson Auditorium in Little Rock on Friday, March 25.

Mr. President, I would belabor the Senate by speaking at any length about John McClellan's career here because there are those in this body who have served with him for almost a quarter of a century. We in the Senate know him. Anything I could tell the Senate about the contributions John McClellan has made to the welfare of this Nation certainly would be redundant and superfluous.

Those of us, however, who have served in the Senate of the United States cannot, I think, help but be touched and gratified by expressions of appreciation from those who have made it possible for us to occupy the positions of importance and trust that we hold.

The people of Arkansas made known, last week, to John McClellan the respect, the admiration, and the appreciation they have for their senior Senator. I am sure that nothing any Member of this body might say about him could mean as much to him as this expression of loyalty from his constituents.

In that vein, and so that my colleagues might pause and reflect that our labors here do not go unnoticed, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Record copies of the following telegrams from President Johnson, Governor Faubus, John M. Bailey, and Winthrop Rockefeller; copies of newspaper coverage; and three statements delivered in Senator McClellan's behalf by Fred Pickens, Jr., Bishop Paul V. Galloway, and William H. Kennedy, Jr.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 24, 1966.

Mr. William H. Kennedy,
Chairman, Friends of John McClellan Committee, National Bank of Commerce, Pine Bluff, Ark.:

I am pleased to know that the friends of John McClellan have come together in recognition and appreciation of the many years of distinguished service he has given to his State and Nation.

John was first elected to Congress in 1934. I came to Washington at just about the same time. We share many memories of the challenges of those years as an entire nation rallied to fight the worst depression in our history.

As his former colleague in the Senate, I know, too, of the dedication and integrity with which he has served during his 24 years as Senator from Arkansas.

His achievements as chairman of the Government Operations Committee have served to improve the very structure of government. Not only his constituents but all the people of our country are beneficiaries of that work.

I am truly grateful—and I believe I speak for the entire Nation—for the magnificent accomplishments of the 89th Congress. No Congress has done more for so many people of this land.

I appreciate the support which John gave to such historic legislative programs as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which already is helping so many thousands of youngsters; to the social security amendments which guarantee hospital care for our aged; and to the vital new farm program.

I wish you would convey to him my congratulations and best wishes.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

Copy of Telegram From Orval E. Faubus, Governor, State of Arkansas, That Was Read at the Appreciation Luncheon in Little Rock for Senator McClellan on March 25, 1966

Hon. John L. McClellan,
U.S. Senator, State of Arkansas,
Little Rock, Ark.:

Sincerely regret inability to be present for luncheon in your honor. This is a great tribute which you richly deserve, and I join with your many friends in extending heartiest congratulations.

Orval E. Faubus.

Telegram That Was Supposed To Have Been Delivered to the Office Yesterday

Hon. John L. McClellan,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

May I join with your many friends in paying tribute to the distinguished service you have given your State and the country for so many years. As a Congressman during the 1930's, as a Senator for more than two decades, and as the Chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, you have won the respect of your colleagues in the Senate and the Democratic Party. My congratulations and best wishes.

Sincerely,

John M. Bailey,
Chairman, Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.

Morrilton, Ark.,
March 26, 1966.

Senator John L. McClellan,
Union Life Building,
Little Rock, Ark.:

Sorry I could not be at the luncheon today. However, as one of your constituents I want to add my congratulations to the many others you received today at the testimonial. I am proud of our State and proud of the significant contribution you have made toward a better Arkansas for all of us.

Winthrop Rockefeller.

Washington, D.C.
March 28, 1966.

Bill Kennedy,
Chairman, McClellan Day Luncheon,
Robinson Auditorium,
Little Rock, Ark.

Dear Bill: I regret meetings of the Committee on Foreign Relations in Washington prevent my attendance at the luncheon honoring my colleague and our senior Senator, John McClellan. Though I cannot be with you in person, I join with John's many other friends in paying tribute to him for his many years of illustrious service to the people of Arkansas and the Nation. Having served with Senator McClellan for 21 years in the Senate of the United States, I, perhaps more than any other person, can attest to the untold benefits Arkansas has derived as a result of his many efforts. His devotion and dedication to the people of the State of Arkansas is unsurpassed, and any tribute we can pay to him has been well earned and is justly deserved.

Please convey to him my warm personal regards.

Bill Fulbright.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Mar. 26, 1966]

Twenty-five Hundred Hear McClellan Praised for "Integrity, Wisdom, Patriotism"

(By Bill Lewis)

Twenty-five hundred persons—more than could be accommodated downstairs at the auditorium—turned out Friday to dine on box lunches and hear Senator John L. McClellan lauded for his 24 years of accomplishments for the State and Nation.

Among the pile of telegrams, two of which were read, were congratulations and best wishes from President Lyndon B. Johnson and Governor Faubus, whose absence was conspicuous.

Politics hardly was mentioned—McCLELLAN has announced for renomination to his fifth term and so far has no opposition—but there were overtones, or at least attempts to read overtones, in some of the proceedings, one of which was the attendance, accompanied by the entire board of directors of Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co., of W. R. Stephens.

The huge throng of persons who came from all over the State, many in chartered buses, exhausted the supply of 2,200 box lunches of fried chicken, slaw, baked beans and cake and about 300 more crowded onto the floor and balconies of the meeting hall, filling it to capacity. Uncounted others who came simply did not remain. The sponsors, the Friends of McClellan Committee, headed by the Pine Bluff banker, William H. Kennedy, Jr., had anticipated more than 2,000.

Three speakers praised McCLELLAN for his personal qualities, his service as a developer of the Nation's resources and his stature as a statesman. McCLELLAN responded at some length, assuring his wellwishers that none of the numerous awards from some of the most distinguished organizations were more cherished than their presence.

For days, McCLELLAN said, as he thought of what to say in response, "I was hoping for, groping for words of appreciation of this eloquent expression of your confidence and trust but I haven't found those words."

Methodist Bishop Paul V. Galloway, whose acquaintance with McCLELLAN began when he first ran for Congress in 1938, praised McCLELLAN as a man of "courage, integrity, wisdom, and patriotism," whose service has been "ceaseless, devoted, untiring, and of the nonsurrender type."

Bishop Galloway and other speakers shared the hour with Mrs. McClellan, who was seated at the raised dais, out of her usual context. "We honor you, Mrs. McClellan—Miss Norma—you came into a home with children, took them in your heart. You reared them, taught them, gave them love and care. You have given loyalty to your husband. There was humble lostness at times at home to keep a place of retreat, rest, and renewed strength for one who would return home with battle fatigue. You fought some battles with him and for him, and in graciousness you have truly been a First Lady," the bishop said.

Kennedy, president of the National Bank of Commerce at Pine Bluff, recounted some of McCLELLAN's accomplishments in obtaining legislation and funds for river basin and other development in Arkansas and the Nation and attributed to him principally the momentum for the development of the Arkansas River and navigation and flood control work on the Ouachita River Basin, the White, the Red River, Cache River, and others.

Since 1944, Kennedy said, McCLELLAN's help has been instrumental in the expenditure of $1,899,010,400 on 155 flood control, rivers and harbors, navigation and multiple-purpose projects, all or part of them in Arkansas or adjoining States from which Arkansas benefits.

"It cannot be fairly said that any one man was solely responsible for this gigantic investment in our natural resources," Kennedy said. "It can be fairly said, however, that if JOHN McCLELLAN had not had the vision and the vigor and the love of his people at heart, that a great many of these most worthwhile projects would have died aborning."

He said future generations would "revere the name of JOHN L. McCLELLAN, a great developer of his State's and his Nation's resources, and a great American."

Fred M. Pickens, Jr., of Newport, reviewed McCLELLAN's long support of State's rights and constitutional government, his dedication to preservation and improvement of the best of our institutions, and his vigorous efforts to promote economy and efficiency at all governmental levels; reorganization of executive agencies and departments to increase their economy, effectiveness, and efficiency; revamping and reforming budgeting and financial procedures, and elimination of waste, profligacy, mismanagement, and actual wrongdoing in the executive branch.

Through these efforts, Pickens said, McCLELLAN has served as a member of both Hoover Commissions, helped create the General Services Administration, passed the Budget and Accounting Act of 1950, and passed legislation enabling the States to obtain surplus Federal property for education, health, and civil defense programs.

McCLELLAN, Pickens continued, in many sections of the country "is best known for his unrelenting investigation of and struggle against criminal elements and organized crime, the culmination * * * of a career which began as a prosecuting attorney of the seventh judicial district of Arkansas 40 years ago."

Pickens also cited McCLELLAN'S efforts to root out corruption in union labor leadership, his help to farmers and to Arkansas residents in tax matters.

"He has brought his brilliant intellect, his amazing energies, his high sense of honor and integrity, his concern for the Nation, his understanding of and interest in all of his constituents to every position of honor which he has held," Pickens said.

Representative WILBUR D. MILLS said he and his congressional colleagues had selected McCLELLAN as their quarterback, "not because of his seniority" but because of his interest and energy in working for the people of the State. He said McCLELLAN was recognized as a man who stands head and shoulders above other Senators in his dedication to duty.

McCLELLAN, who noted that his tenure already was second only to that of the late Senator Joe T. Robinson in length, reviewed what he considered the outstanding achievements of his legislative career to date. First, he said, stands the development of the State's resources.

"Next," McCLELLAN continued, "I take pride that I have undertaken to pursue in my philosophy and official decisions a course of economy. I am called a conservative, and I am proud of that. I make no apology for it." He said he was conservative, not to the point of being reactionary and against progress, but in conserving the Nation's resources, its integrity and its solvency.

He is proud of his fiscal policy of helping to reduce Government expenditures, McCLELLAN said, and of his efforts at combating the forces of evil, corruption and crime.

These are troubled times, McCLELLAN said, and no one knows what the future brings.

"I don't know all the answers," McCLELLAN said. "I am willing to negotiate, now, tomorrow, any time, anywhere that can give at least the prospect of moving us toward peace." But as long as Americans are fighting and dying abroad, McCLELLAN said, "I propose to give them my support either at the negotiating table or on the battlefield until victory is won."

C. Hamilton Moses, McCLELLAN's Little Rock law partner, who introduced him, presented Mrs. McClellan a bouquet of red roses and a bracelet with charms depicting some of the history of the State, he said, and of milestones in the Senator's career.

After his address, the McClellans received an engraved sterling silver platter and pitcher as mementos of the event.

The platform was shared by Rev. W. O. Vaught, Jr., pastor of Immanuel Baptist Church, who gave the invocation; Dr. Lawrence A. Davis, president of Arkansas A.M. & N. College at Pine Bluff; Pickens, Bishop Galloway, Dave Grundfest, a Little Rock businessman who presided; Representative MILLS, Mrs. McClellan, Moses, Kennedy and Msgr. William E. Galvin, rector of Catholic High School, who gave the benediction.

[From the Pine Bluff (Ark.) Commercial, Mar. 26, 1966]

THREE THOUSAND PERSONS THRONG AUDITORIUM TO HEAR TESTIMONIALS TO McCLELLAN

(By Bob Lancaster)

LITTLE ROCK.—There was a big testimonial luncheon for Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN at Robinson Auditorium yesterday, with acres of people, very much high-flown rhetoric, many "We're proud of Senator McCLELLAN" signs, and an atmosphere full of enthusiasm for McCLELLAN's fifth senatorial campaign.

The line of people waiting to get into the dinner room of the auditorium was a block long, 12 or 13 abreast, and the room was jammed full. The press had a hard time estimating the size of the crowd, but it was finally decided that there were about 3,000. More than 2,200 tickets—at $2.50 each—were sold. Many came in without tickets.

There were 13 chartered buses outside, lined up nearly all the way down to the Marion Hotel, many from faraway counties.

They came to honor McCLELLAN, to show him they were for him in his fifth campaign for a 6-year term, and they treated him regally.

The dinner—a box-lunch affair with cold fried chicken, cold beans, slaw, cold raisin muffins, and warm coffee—was sponsored by the Friends of McClellan Committee headed by W. H. Kennedy, Jr., president of Pine Bluff's National Bank of Commerce.

There was little mention of politics at the luncheon, but the political ramifications were evident: W. R. (Witt) Stephens was introduced in the audience and it was noted that he brought along his entire board of directors of the Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co.; Governor Faubus didn't show up, and his short telegram of congratulations paled besides a long, somewhat lavish, praise-filled and almost nostalgic wire from the President of the United States; Congressmen JAMES W. TRIMBLE and WILBUR MILLS were on the platform; and hundreds of lesser political figures—Secretary of State Kelly Bryant, Dale Alford, Kenneth Sulcer, Richard S. Arnold, and so forth—were spotted in the crowd.

"No tribute has ever been paid to me," McCLELLAN said, "that I shall cherish more than this."

One of the four speakers preceding McCLELLAN's short address was Fred M. Pickens, Jr., a Newport lawyer, who said: "Senator, we in Arkansas share with you the reflected esteem in which you are held throughout the land—for we have had the good judgment to return you to the Congress of the United States time after time—and we shall continue such wise voter judgment in the future."

Congressman WILBUR MILLS also spoke and said: "JOHN, I don't know whether you know it or not * * * but we on the (congressional) team long ago selected you as our quarterback." He spoke of McCLELLAN's "inspiring leadership," "magnificent energy," "inspiring dedication," and so on.

Kennedy, long a fighter for the Arkansas River navigation project, which McCLELLAN guided through Congress said: "Future generations of Arkansans and Americans will revere the name of JOHN L. McCLELLAN—a great developer of his State's and his Nation's resources, and a great American."

McCLELLAN himself had little to say. He talked about how he had been labeled a conservative and how he thought that was an honor. About the alarming crime rate in America. About how he would continue the fight for development of natural resources.

About how "our boys are again dying on foreign soil."

About Vietnam, he said: "I don't know the answers. I'm willing to have negotiations now, tomorrow, anytime, anywhere. But we are now committed, and all I can tell you is I'll give them my support whether at the negotiating tables or on the battlefields until the victory is won." This brought stormy applause.

But just when he got warmed up, speaking in that grand, impassioned style of his, he broke it off and said: "I'm going to quit talking." And he did quit after he said: "Sometimes I think I have a heart of steel. But at a moment like this, it is submerged in humility and is as tender as the heart of a babe."

After the benediction, as the people were leaving, a man in a cowboy hat said to his companions as they walked out the door: "Boy, I just love to hear that man speak. It don't matter what he says; when he says it, I'm in hog heaven."

[From the Arkansas Democrat, Mar. 26, 1966]

TWENTY-FIVE HUNDRED GATHER TO HONOR McCLELLAN

(By Bobbie Forster)

"Here I am, a farm boy from Grant County and you have permitted me to have a part in preserving our heritage," U.S. Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN told an audience of 2,500 men and women who crowded into the Robinson Auditorium exhibition room and overflowed onto the bleacher seats of its balcony Friday.

Visibly moved, McCLELLAN had heard Methodist Bishop Paul Galloway, Pine Bluff Banker William Kennedy, Jr., and Newport Attorney Fred Pickens, Jr., pay tribute to McCLELLAN as a conserver of the Nation's resources, as a man and as a statesman, and had heard words of praise for his wife.

He had heard U.S. Representative WILBUR MILLS, Congressman from Arkansas' Second District, bring congratulations from the congressional delegation in Washington which, MILLS said, "regards you, Senator, as the quarterback of our team."

"Sometimes I think I have a heart of steel, but I stand before you and in all humility with thanks so deep I cannot bring them to the level of my lips," McCLELLAN said. "The only way I can demonstrate my gratitude is if I am permitted to serve you longer with the same dedication and devotion to industry and duty that I have in the past."

McCLELLAN declared there were few offices higher than that of U.S. Senator and that it has been "an honor" won by a few.

"Since the first Congress in 1789, in a span of 177 years, out of the millions of Americans, only 1,633 have occupied this position," he continued. "During the 130 years of Arkansas statehood, only 27 of her citizens have been chosen to serve in this position. The average tenure of service by them (the Arkansans) has been 9¾ years each. Having 23 years plus of service the only citizen from Arkansas who served longer is the late beloved Joe T. Robinson for whom this temple was named."

He said he had been "privileged to serve with our congressional delegation in developing natural resources from dormant, useless force to instrumentalities of service to mankind through which is given the opportunity to people to work and earn their living, thereby carrying out the will of our Creator."

McCLELLAN noted that he had been called a conservative "and I am proud of it but I am not a conservative to the point of being a reactionary; I am a conservative to conserve the resources of our Nation and preserve the integrity and solvency of our country."

He said that in the past 10 years Congress had cut $71 billion off the budget requests of Presidents "so that the national debt is $325 billion instead of nearly $400 billion."

He said he would continue to "war against crime and criminals because society cannot withstand these assaults and we will have chaos if the trend is not reversed."

He said he was ready "today and tomorrow to support our fighting men at the negotiating table any time, anywhere that we can get the least hope for peace, and—since we are committed—to support our fighting men on the battlefields till victory is won."

Governor Faubus did not attend but a telegram of congratulations from him was read by C. Hamilton Moses, chairman of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission. Moses also read a telegram from President Johnson in which Johnson noted that he had served with McCLELLAN in the U.S. Senate. Earlier McCLELLAN said that in his service in the Senate he had been a colleague of three men who became President and of five who became Vice President of the United States.

Dave Grundfest, master of ceremonies for the box luncheon, introduced W. R. Stephens, chairman of the board and president of Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co., who attended with the board of directors of the company. Also introduced was Brig. Gen. Murray Bywater, commander of the 825th Aerospace Reconnaissance Division at Little Rock Air Force Base.

At the speakers' table, in addition to the honorees and speakers, were Dr. Lawrence Davis, president of Arkansas A.M. & N. College of Pine Bluff; Rev. W. O. Vaught, Jr., pastor of Immanuel Baptist Church, who gave the invocation; U.S. Representative J. W. TRIMBLE, of Berryville, Congressman from Arkansas' Third District, and Very Rev. Msgr. William E. Galvin, rector of Catholic High School, who gave the benediction.

Mrs. McClellan was presented with a bouquet of roses and a gold bracelet with a charm engraved with date and an outline of the State of Arkansas set with a diamond where Little Rock is located. McCLELLAN was presented with a sterling silver tray and pitcher.

The choir from McClellan High School dressed in McClellan clan tartans sang.

[From the Paragould (Ark.) Daily Press, Mar. 26–27, 1966]

ARKANSANS HONOR McCLELLAN

LITTLE ROCK.—More than 3,000 Arkansans honored Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN Friday at an appreciation luncheon that had the trappings of a campaign rally.

The State's senior Senator responded by saying that he felt the best way to show his appreciation would be to continue to serve. He is seeking a fifth 6-year term.

Bus caravans and motorcades brought McCLELLAN fans from all sections of the State for the luncheon in Robinson Auditorium.

Signs proclaiming "Magnolia Appreciates McCLELLAN," and "El Dorado Appreciates McCLELLAN" were waved like placards at a political convention.

Methodist Bishop Paul Galloway, William Kennedy of Pine Bluff, and Fred Pickens of Newport made speeches praising McCLELLAN as a developer of natural resources, a statesman and a man.

C. Hamilton Moses, chairman of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, read a telegram of praise from President Lyndon B. Johnson with whom McCLELLAN served in the Senate.

McCLELLAN, 70, said he had searched for 3 days for words to express his appreciation and could not find them.

"I have had many honors," he said, "but the one I shall cherish most is your being here today."

McCLELLAN, discussing his own career, said he was proudest of the river development programs he has sponsored, his role as a economic conservative in the Congress, and of the part he has played in the Nation's crusade against crime.

McCLELLAN said, "They call me a conservative. I'm proud of it. I don't apologize for it."

He said he and other conservatives in Congress had pared presidential budgets by $22 billion in the last 5 years. He said he will continue to keep a close eye on how public money is spent.

Touching briefly on the Vietnam war, he said he would support negotiations if there were any chance they would lead to peace.

"But a war is raging," he said. "Our boys are dying. And I'll support them either at the conference table or on the battlefield until victory is won."

Representatives J. W. TRIMBLE and WILBUR MILLS sat at the head table with McCLELLAN, Gov. Orval Faubus sent a telegram expressing regret that he could not attend.

Moses presented Mrs. McClellan with a bouquet of roses and a charm bracelet and gave the McClellans a silver tray and pitcher.

The crowd overflowed the banquet area of the auditorium and several hundred persons ate their box lunches off their knees in seats in the balcony.

McCLELLAN was elected to the Senate in 1942. He had no opponent 6 years ago. His last serious opposition came from former Gov. Sid McMath in 1954.

[From the Fort Smith (Ark.) Times Record]

McCLELLAN IS PRAISED AT LITTLE ROCK DINNER

LITTLE ROCK.—U.S. Senator JOHN McCLELLAN told more than 3,000 supporters and well-wishers Friday that he stood solidly behind America's fighting men in Vietnam, either at the conference table or on the battlefield until victory is won.

McCLELLAN, 70, seeking a fifth term in the U.S. Senate, made the remark at an appreciation luncheon in Robinson Auditorium with delegations from all counties in Arkansas represented.

In saying there were many answers he did not have, McCLELLAN declared, "A war is raging, our boys are dying in battle. I'm willing to have negotiations if there is a prospect of peace. I'll support our boys either at the conference table or on the battlefield until victory is won."

The State's senior Senator also vowed he would keep up his relentless fight against crime and his efforts to hold down waste and and overspending in Government.

"The country's crime rate cannot continue long as it is at present," McCLELLAN said, "without bringing ruin to our society. There must be a reversal."

During the last 10 years, the Senator said he had helped in some measure reduce Government spending by $30 billion. He noted also that he was known as a conservative, saying he did not deny it, that he was proud of the fact.

Much praise was heaped upon the Senator by Methodist Bishop Paul Galloway, William Kennedy, Jr., of Pine Bluff, and Fred Pickens, of Newport. They lauded him as a developer of natural resources, a statesman, and a man.

C. Hamilton Moses, chairman of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, read a telegram of praise for the Senator from President Johnson. It was noted that McCLELLAN served in the Senate with three men who became President—Johnson, President Kennedy, and former President Truman.

Representative WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas' Second District, told the gathering that the State's congressional delegation looked on McCLELLAN as "our quarterback of the team." He went on to say that McCLELLAN was liked and respected in Congress.

Congressman JAMES TRIMBLE of the Third District, was introduced at the head table, but did not speak. Gov. Orval Faubus sent a telegram with regrets that he could not attend.

Moses presented Mrs. McClellan with a bouquet of red roses and a charm bracelet which depicted some of Arkansas' history and parts of which her husband had played a part. He presented the McClellans also with a silver tray and pitcher.

Bus caravans and motorcades brought McClellan fans from throughout the State and began arriving at midmorning. Scores of State representatives and State senators, along with State and local officials attended the luncheon.

Seventy-three persons from Fort Smith attended the event, making the trip by auto, plane, and one chartered bus. The trip was sponsored by the Fort Smith Chamber of Commerce.

Included in the local delegation were State Representatives Bernice Kizer and B. G. Hendrix, City Commissioner John Rogers, and other business and civic leaders.

The crowd overflowed the banquet area of the auditorium and several hundred persons ate their box lunches by holding them on their laps in the balcony seats.

McCLELLAN has been the recipient twice of the George Washington Award, in 1959 and 1960. He also received the Hatton W. Sumners Award, the Distinguished Statesman Citation of the Westside Association of Commerce, New York City, in 1959.

His other awards include the Freedom Award, 1962; the Distinguished Service Award of the Jewel Square Club of Philadelphia, 1963; the Annual Certificate of Appreciation of the Law Enforcement Intelligence Unit, and others.

McCLELLAN, THE STATESMAN

(Remarks of Fred M. Pickens, Jr.)

We do honor today to a man—but more than that, to his works—his long and distinguished public service in many fields, and we in Arkansas share with him the reflected esteem in which he is held throughout the land—for we have had the good judgment to return him to the Congress of the United States time after time—and we shall continue such wise voter judgment in 1966.

To enumerate the accomplishments of our senior Senator, JOHN L. McCLELLAN, while serving in the Congress would require more time than is allotted to me; to adequately depict the contributions he has made to the people of this State and Nation would require a more articulate admirer than I; to fully express to Senator McCLELLAN the appreciation of the voters of Arkansas will but require the primaries and general election of 1966.

The career of JOHN L. McCLELLAN in the Congress of the United States may truly be said to fit into the description Edmund Burke gave of a statesman: "A disposition to preserve and an ability to improve, taken together."

How well the above describes our friend, JOHN L. McCLELLAN. A strong supporter of States rights and a stanch advocate of constitutional government, he has dedicated his public life to the proposition that he would seek to preserve the best of our institutions and undertake to improve upon them wherever and whenever possible.

As chairman of the Committee on Government Operations since 1949 (with the exception of the 2 years the Republicans controlled the Senate) he has been intensely interested in and has vigorously pursued efforts to—

(a) Promote economy and efficiency in the Government at all levels;

(b) Reorganize the executive agencies and departments with the objectives of attaining more economical, effective, and efficient management and use of taxpayers money;

(c) Reform and revamp budgeting and financial procedures throughout the Government, with special emphasis on the role and responsibility of the Congress, which controls the pursestrings of the Federal Government;

(d) Eliminate waste, profligacy, mismanagement, and actual wrongdoing in the executive branch.

And, my friends, what has been the results of the untiring efforts of this great statesman? As an active member of both Hoover Commissions and based upon that Commission's findings he has sponsored legislation which resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars of savings to the taxpayers. Under his sponsorship and guidance the General Services Administration was created, the Budget and Accounting Act of 1950 was passed which has been described as "the greatest advance in Government financial operations within the last 40 years." He proposed, processed, and obtained congressional approval of legislation allowing the States to obtain surplus Federal property for education, health, and civil defense purposes. There is not a person in this auditorium today whose community facilities have not benefited from this legislation.

His monumental and historical work entitled "Financial Management in the Federal Government," containing a comprehensive analysis of financial management activities of the Government is a handbook for Government officials and policymakers; his initiative and painstaking work in the area of fees for special services have already returned to the Federal Government sums expected to total in excess of $1 billion for the fiscal year 1966.

A strong advocate of the free enterprise system, Senator McCLELLAN has led (and can be counted on to continue such leadership, regardless of the administration in power) the drive to keep the Federal Government out of those activities which can be better performed by private industry, and it is primarily his concern that has given impetus to a review of research and development programs financed by the Federal Government to the end of assuring that the taxpayers receive a dollar value for a dollar paid.

In many sections of the Nation, of course, he is best known for his unrelenting investigation of and struggle against criminal elements and organized crime—the culmination of a career which began as a prosecuting attorney of the seventh judicial district of Arkansas 40 years ago; he has made the American people aware that "crime is one of the gravest domestic problems we presently face." It is he who has sought to root out and rid interstate commerce of the burden of racketeers, syndicated gamblers and hoodlums; it is he who has led the drive to eliminate the criminal elements of organized labor; he who has focused national attention on the evils of the Mafia and other entrenched crime organizations. This has been more than talk—pending before the Congress at this moment are a series of proposed bills aimed at organized crime on all levels.

As a result of his accomplishments as chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, he has been castigated, derided, yes, even threatened by the sinister shadowy figures which seek to control by evil methods, yet he has steadfastly continued.

Some ruthless labor leaders have falsely accused him of being antilabor for the reason, we surmise, that his leadership has resulted in prosecution, indictment and conviction of top-level personnel who exploited America's working men and women. May I remind the rank and file union members of Arkansas and of America that the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959, the bill of rights which reaffirmed the basic constitutional and inalienable rights of union members, restored full citizenship rights to thousands of union members whose exploitation at the hands of some unscrupulous labor bosses was both unbelievable and intolerable, was proposed and guided to successful conclusion by this man?

Though always by virtue of his position, occupied with matters of national interest and concern, he has never failed the people of his State. May I give you but two examples: The tax bill of 1948 finally contained the amendment for which Senator McCLELLAN had so persistently fought. To the people of Arkansas it meant that at long last the inequity was abolished wherein taxpayers in community property States enjoyed a tax benefit over citizens of States such as ours—today, the citizens of Arkansas and of all States are afforded the same treatment for income tax purposes irrespective of residence. For each of us, we say, thank you, Senator. More recently, in collaboration with Senator FULBRIGHT and others, he came to the well-deserved aid of the soybean farmers of this State in his insistence that the Department of Agriculture clarify by letter and regulation the use of certain timberland which had been cleared or was in the process of being cleared for the purpose of planting soybeans. It has been estimated in my county of Jackson, alone, approximately 50,000 acres would have been affected. For the farmers of Arkansas and for each of us, we say, thank you, Senator.

Each of you knows that I could continue this résumé almost ad infinitum. I have only touched upon his achievements as a statesman. He has brought his brilliant intellect, his amazing energies, his high sense of honor and integrity, his concern for the Nation, his understanding of and interest in all his constituents to every position of honor which he has held. Thank you, again, Senator McCLELLAN, on behalf of the people of Arkansas. May you continue as our senior Senator as long as God in his wisdom and providence blesses you.

JOHN L. McCLELLAN—THE MAN

(Remarks by Bishop Paul V. Galloway of the Arkansas area of the Methodist Church)

Mr. Chairman, Senator and Mrs. McCLELLAN, and friends. We gather together for various reasons in life; to ask for the Lord's blessings and to ask for your and Washington's help, but today we gather to bring you up to date on yourself. You have become so involved that you are denied a look at yourself as to how we see you and know you. We see you as developer, statesman, and man. These are positive terms; they have to do with things: Factories, roads, schools, plants, water, physical resources. Also with causes, ideas, principles, procedures, national, and world interest.

In these we constantly ask your aid and in them we see your achievements and leadership. In them Arkansas and America are foremost and are enlarged and strengthened. In these we hold you on a pedestal, but as a man we hold you as one related to us. There is a human basis and a spiritual oneness. To the first two there is praise for the things you have done. As man there is appreciation for what you are and who you are.

How do we see you? As one not only of whom we ask things, such as plants, factories, continued completion of river basins, and the great causes of the State. These cause economic growth and win votes. Our value of you as a man brings something else in the way of devotion, loyalty, genuine, and secure support.

We look to what makes man. We see you as being politically astute, but not deceitful. We like for our leaders to be smart, alert, and daring. We like to see their active leadership. We are so proud of our Arkansas men in Congress for I believe we have the greatest of any State in the Union; Senators and Congressmen—and I even thought this when I lived in Texas.

You are courageous. As a pastor in Monroe County in Clarendon, where I introduced politicians who campaigned. (I spoke for WILBUR MILLS and was booed.) I saw you come in 1938 in a Chevrolet with a public address system on top of the car and even though you were sick that summer you had courage and tenacity, and best of all, you had two boys—your sons to accompany you. That is where my friendship with JOHN started.

Four years later you came back in a campaign. Senator, you're a fourth-quarter man—you don't quit. I'm a nervous wreck over men like you and the Razorbacks. I hope you won't have to pull any more campaigns out of the fire. You have shown courage, integrity, wisdom, and patriotism. Your courage is a child of conviction and concern. Your integrity is a result of righteousness, honor, and character. Your wisdom springs from insight, knowledge, growth, bigness, and experience. Your patriotism is from appreciation of our land and expectation for its future. This is ceaseless, devoted, untiring, and of the nonsurrender type. With these you act. The whole Nation may not cross the same T's or dot the same I's—we all may want some omissions or more admissions, but it's these possessions, attributes, characteristics, to which we point and look.

And yet, these are not possessions of yours. These are things that possess you. Great causes that consume us may tend to give obsessions at times, but we thank God for men who move on principle by which, instead of throwing in the towel, they are able to march under a great banner for the glory of man, the honor of our Nation, and the righteousness of God.

Senator, friend, we've watched you get honors. First in 1959, the George Washington Award by the American Good Government Society; in 1959, the Hatton W. Sumner Award from Southwestern Legal Foundation; in 1960, the Freedom Foundation's George Washington Award at Valley Forge; in 1962, the Freedom Award from the Order of Lafayette; in 1963, the Distinguished Service Award by the 21 Jewel Square Club of Philadelphia; again in 1963, the certificate of appreciation by the Law Enforcement Intelligence Unit; once more in 1963, a certificate of achievement by the Chicago Crime Commission and in that same year the Great Living American Award by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; in 1965, the Distinguished Service Award by the Americans for Constitutional Action; and more recently the First American Legislative Award by the Association of Federal Investigators.

I read the writeup of thanks from Fort Smith for helping save for them a large plant. These are all fine, but they don't impress me as other things because I know something of the cause and source—the man and the lady.

I like the way you started out as a boy. This past Sunday I read my father's diary while he was pastor at Greenwood, Ark. From that place in 1904, you received a letter from Congressman John S. Little. The salutation was "My Dear Little Friend." As an 8-year-old boy you had told him you picked 75 pounds of cotton in 1 day. You sent him a copy of a speech which you recited before the Democratic Central Committee—I presume at Sheridan. Enclosed in the letter were these words: "And I have no doubt that in the future you will reach honor and distinction as a citizen and public man, but to do this requires industry and hard work, and an honorable, upright life."

You started early. You have had great qualities: ambition, tenacity, persistence—but you've had more. You've had help: friends, good family. We honor you, Mrs. McClellan—Mrs. Norma. You came into a home with children, took them in your heart. You reared them, taught them, gave them love, and care. You have given loyalty to your husband. There was humble lostness at times at home to keep a place of retreat, rest, and renewed strength for one who would return home with battle fatigue. You fought some battles with him and for him, and in graciousness you have truly been a First Lady.

Yes, Senator, we have seen your strength and sorrow, your love, and your commitment to carry on. While pastor at Fayetteville I had the pleasure of being with John and Mary Alice when they were students at the university. I have shared with other pastors in keeping them in concern and in my heart as much as possible under my wing as their pastor and friend. These children reflected character because they had character. I have seen your manhood in the room as we sat and talked of home and children, loneliness and sorrow. Dreams have had to be changed, but never lost.

You see, I know your sources of power and something of your aims and drives of purpose. I know something of the heart and home, and I am glad we have been able to join in prayer together. The altar furnishings and pieces at the Winfield Methodist Church were given by the Senator and myself in loving memory of John. There we have met, not only to pray for God's strength, but for others, the Nation, and the world.

I have been in Washington with this good man and know something of his desires for this Nation and its citizens, its place not only in the world but unto God. Your excellency, we want to be a part of you and your home and we want your sense of commitment and your wisdom to be a part of us to give quality and strength. We keep you in our heart and prayers. We offer you to our State and Nation as we hold you before our God for power, righteousness, and love. Amen.

JOHN L. McCLELLAN—DEVELOPER OF THE NATION'S RESOURCES

Remarks by William H. Kennedy, Jr., president, National Bank of Commerce, Pine Bluff, Ark.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator McCLELLAN, Mrs. McClellan, Governor Faubus, Congressman MILLS, other distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen.

There are many measures of a man. One of them is his vision. Another is his force and drive and vigor. The result that he attains is a third.

By any criteria that we can use, JOHN McCLELLAN stands tall in the eyes of his fellow Americans and particularly in the eyes of us Arkansans.

As all of us know, there are a great many reasons for his stature; but, today, I particularly want to discuss with you this man's vision, effort, and the fruit of that vision and effort in the development of our natural resources, particularly the rivers and waterlands of our great State and section.

Long ago, the record reflects, JOHN McCLELLAN decided that it was vital to the best interest of Arkansas and the Nation that our fertile lands be preserved from disastrous floods, that the potential inherent in our waterways be unharnessed, and that the time would come when our country, because of its burgeoning population, would have a need for every drop of water, every kilowatt of electricity, and every acre saved.

On November 9, 1943, in his first year in the Senate, Senator McCLELLAN became an active proponent of the development of navigation on the Arkansas River when he introduced Senate bill 1519. It's interesting to note that our new Senator received the following letter dated January 14, 1944:

"MY DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: I am very much interested in your bill, S. 1519, relating to the construction and operation of water control and utilization projects in the basins on the Arkansas and White Rivers. Enactment of the bill would be an important forward step in effectuation of the policy of multiple-purpose development of our great river basins and the prudent conservation of our vast public resources.

"I feel certain that the people whose homes are in the basins of the Arkansas and White Rivers and the soldiers who will want to return to the area and to work and make homes there would be deeply grateful if the Congress were to pass S. 1519. The benefits that they would derive from a well-coordinated program for the prevention and control of floods, the improvement of navigation, the disposition of low-cost electric power and the irrigation of fertile lands would be of incalculable value. I am particularly pleased that the direct and more tangible benefits from power and irrigation would be made available in accordance with the sound principles of public benefit that the Congress has previously laid down.

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

This project was authorized for construction in 1946 and the first money was appropriated for construction in fiscal year 1948 for emergency bank stabilization. The early years of the development of the Arkansas were difficult ones for the dedicated Senator and his associates, years in which they were met by one rebuff after another. Plain lack of interest, economy moves, and the Korean war combined to hinder progress in any appreciable degree until 1957, when a $4,400,000 appropriation was secured for the beginning of construction on Keystone and Eufaula Dams in Oklahoma and Dardanelle Dam in Arkansas.

Today, as all of us know, the multiple-purpose development of the Arkansas River is well on its way to completion. Of a total cost of approximately $1,201,000,000 there has already been appropriated $652,863,000 and the budget request for fiscal year 1967 is $159,570,000. A lot of money we will all agree, and we're enjoying the benefits of its expenditure right now; but, even more important, in my view, is the long-range picture this man and others like him have brought to us.

In my mind's eye I can see barges and tow boats going up and down stream bringing in the accumulated wealth of the nation and taking out from Oklahoma and Arkansas our agricultural and industrial products as well as our raw materials. I can see new recreational areas springing up to entice citizens of less fortunate areas to share the good fortune which is to be ours. I can see farm lands freed forever, or almost so, from the dangers of flood. I can see river banks stabilized so that henceforth the wealth of our area which lies in our land will not be subject to the whims of old man river and will not be lost from crumbling banks.

And then, I'm sure I can see up and down the banks of the Arkansas smoke—smoke from the stacks of chemical plants—metalworking industries, defense industries, and many others which have been placed there to take advantage of this mighty stream which the good Lord has given us together with the power to harness it to our needs.

All of this because of the man we honor here today.

We who live on the Arkansas must also be aware that others, too, have had a claim on JOHN McCLELLAN's time and effort.

In 1946, by amending the Flood Control Act of that year, Senator McCLELLAN saved millions of dollars for local interests along the St. Francis River and at the same time secured for them protection against headwater floods of that river and the Little River. This protection was continued by the placing of appropriate language in the Flood

Control Act of 1950. This project provides protection to thousands of acres of agricultural lands, numerous small towns, several major railroads, highways and utilities located in Missouri and Arkansas. Estimated total cost of this project is $127 million, of which $60,148,000 has already been expended. The budget for fiscal 1967 calls for $3,800,000 for construction.

In 1960, our good friends on the Ouachita received the benefit of his services. Inserted into the Rivers and Harbors Act of that year, largely at his behest, was authorization to increase the navigable depth of the Ouachita from 6½ to 9 feet from the mouth of the river to Camden. Four new locks and dams are to be built and the channel rectified and dredged as necessary. Construction started in June of 1965 and will upon completion cost approximately $87,400,000. To date $9,554,000 has been appropriated and the budget for fiscal year 1967 includes another $6,500,000 for construction.

Another well-known project underway in the Ouachita River Basin is DeGray Reservoir, located near Arkadelphia. This multiple-purpose reservoir which is credited with benefits derived from reduction in flood damages, generation of electrical energy, provisions of water supply and other benefits will cost $54,300,000. To date $19,105,000 of this amount has been expended. The fiscal 1967 budget includes a request for $8 million for future construction of DeGray Reservoir.

No story of Senator McClellan's efforts in the development of Arkansas rivers would be complete without mentioning the White River with its five completed reservoirs at Table Rock, Bull Shoals, Norfolk, Greers Ferry—all in Arkansas—and Clear Water in Missouri. The sixth reservoir, Beaver, in Arkansas is essentially complete. These reservoirs provide millions of acre feet of flood control storage, thousands of kilowatts of hydroelectric power and recreation for an annual visitation of approximately 11 million people. Through June 1965, Federal expenditures for these projects totaled $280,854,000.

Work continues on the White River. In 1962, Senator McClellan sponsored a resolution for a comprehensive basin study to be completed by 1968. This study is now underway.

Other areas in which work is being done are the Red River Basin where substantial sums have been expended below Denison Dam, at Garland City, at McKinney Bayou, and at Moniece Bayou to afford flood control protection for many thousands of acres of land. There is also the Bouef and Tensas River Basin and the Bayou Macon tributaries project which has protected rich farmlands in southeast Arkansas from flooding by the Arkansas and the Mississippi, $86,400,000 being the estimated total cost of this project, with $32,531,000 having been expended to date. The budget request for fiscal 1967 is $1,700,000 for this project.

Another area which has requested and is getting the Senator's devoted efforts is the Cache River-Bayou Deview project which is just beginning to move.

Dollars alone cannot provide the measure of John McClellan's worth to Arkansas, but they can provide us with a material picture of what he has meant to us. Since 1944 there has been expended on flood control, rivers and harbors, navigation and multiple purpose projects—either altogether in Arkansas, partially in Arkansas, or in adjoining States from which Arkansas benefits—$1,899,010,400 on a total of 155 projects. There remains to be spent on these projects an estimated $1,484,287,800. It is estimated that as a result of these expenditures, losses totaling $2,715,833,400 will have been prevented.

It cannot be fairly said that any one man was solely responsible for this gigantic investment in our natural resources. It can be fairly said, however, that if John McClellan had not had the vision and the vigor and the love of his people at heart that a great many of these most worthwhile projects would have died aborning.

Future generations of Arkansans and Americans will revere the name of John L. McClellan, a great developer of his State's and his Nation's resources and a great American.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall conclude by asking the Senate to allow me, by unanimous consent, to insert in the Record my own telegram paying tribute to the senior Senator from Arkansas.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Government,
March 25, 1966.

Mr. Bill Kennedy,
Chairman, McClellan Day Luncheon, Robinson Auditorium, Little Rock, Ark.

Dear Bill: I regret meetings of the Committee on Foreign Relations in Washington prevent my attendance at the luncheon honoring my colleague and our senior Senator, John McClellan. Though I cannot be with you in person, I join with John's many other friends in paying tribute to him for his many years of illustrious service to the people of Arkansas and the Nation. Having served with Senator McClellan for 21 years in the Senate of the United States, I, perhaps more than any other person, can attest to the untold benefits Arkansas has derived as a result of his many efforts. His devotion and dedication to the people of the State of Arkansas is unsurpassed, and any tribute we can pay to him has been well earned and is justly deserved. Please convey to him my warm personal regards.

Bill Fulbright,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, citizens from all areas of Arkansas gathered at Little Rock, Ark., on March 25 and gave an appreciation dinner in honor of our able and distinguished colleague, Senator John L. McClellan. Bishop Paul V. Galloway, of the Arkansas area of the Methodist Church, who is a longtime friend of our colleague, spoke at this appreciation dinner and made an eloquent and inspiring address entitled "Senator McClellan, the Man." As one who has worked closely with Senator McClellan as a member of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and the Judiciary, I have had unusual opportunities to know John McClellan. As a consequence, I share in full measure the high opinion expressed by Bishop Galloway in his address.

As a consequence, I ask unanimous consent that Bishop Galloway's address entitled "Senator McClellan, the Man," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator McClellan, the Man

(By Bishop Paul V. Galloway)

Mr. Chairman, Senator and Mrs. McClellan, and friends. We gather together for various reasons in life; to ask for the Lord's blessings and to ask for your and Washington's help, but today we gather to bring you up-to-date on yourself. You have become so involved that you are denied a look at yourself as to how we see you and know you. We see you as developer, statesman, and man. These are positive terms; they have to do with things: factories, roads, schools, plants, water, physical resources. Also with causes, ideas, principles, procedures, national, and world interest.

In these we constantly ask your aid and in them we see your achievements and leadership. In them Arkansas and America are foremost and are enlarged and strengthened. In these we hold you on a pedestal, but as a man we hold you as one related to us. There is a human basis and a spiritual oneness. To the first two there is praise for the things you have done. As man there is appreciation for what you are and who you are.

How do we see you? As one not only of whom we ask things, such as plants, factories, continued completion of river basins, and the great causes of the State. These cause economic growth and win votes. Our values of you as a man brings something else in the way of devotion, loyalty, genuine, and secure support.

We look to what makes man. We see you as being politically astute, but not deceitful. We like for our leaders to be smart, alert and daring. We like to see their active leadership. We are so proud of our Arkansas men in Congress for I believe we have the greatest of any State in the Union; Senators and Congressmen—and I even thought this when I lived in Texas.

You are courageous. As a pastor in Monroe County in Clarendon, where I introduced politicians who campaigned (I spoke for Wilbur Mills and was booed) I saw you come in 1938 in a Chevrolet with a public address system on top of the car and even though you were sick that summer, you had courage and tenacity, and, best of all, you had two boys—your sons to accompany you. That is where my friendship with John started.

Four years later you came back in a campaign. Senator, you're a fourth quarter man—you don't quit. I'm a nervous wreck over men like you and the Razorbacks. I hope you won't have to pull any more campaigns out of the fire. You have shown courage, integrity, wisdom, and patriotism. Your courage is a child of conviction and concern. Your integrity is a result of righteousness, honor and character. Your wisdom springs from insight, knowledge, growth, bigness, and experience. Your patriotism is from appreciation of our land and expectation for its future. This is ceaseless, devoted, untiring and of the nonsurrender type. With these you act. The whole Nation may not cross the same t's or dot the same i's—we all may want some omissions or more admissions, but it's these possessions—attributes, characteristics, to which we point and look.

And yet, these are not possessions of yours. These are things that possess you. Great causes that consume us may tend to give obsessions at times, but we thank God for men who move on principle by which, instead of throwing in the towel, they are able to march under a great banner for the glory of man, the honor of our Nation, and the righteousness of God.

Senator, friend, we've watched you get honors. First, in 1959, the George Washington Award by the American Good Government Society; in 1959, the Hatton W. Sumner Award from Southwestern Legal Foundation; in 1960, the Freedom Foundation's George Washington Award at Valley Forge; in 1962, the Freedom Award from the Order of Lafayette; in 1963, the Distinguished Service Award by the 21 Jewel Square Club of Philadelphia; again in 1963, the certificate of appreciation by the Law Enforcement Intelligence Unit; once more in 1963, a certificate of achievement by the Chicago Crime Commission, and in that same year the Great Living American Award by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; in 1965, the Distinguished Service Award by the Americans for Constitutional Action, and more recently the First American Legislative Award by the Association of Federal Investigators.

I read the writeup of thanks from Fort Smith for helping save for them a large plant. These are all fine, but, they don't impress me as other things because I know something of the cause and source—the man and the lady.

I like the way you started out as a boy. This past Sunday I read my father's diary while he was pastor at Greenwood, Ark. From that place in 1904, you received a letter from Congressman John S. Little. The salutation was "My Dear Little Friend." As an 8-year-old boy you had told him you picked 75 pounds of cotton in 1 day. You sent him a copy of a speech which you recited before the Democratic Central Committee—I presume at Sheridan. Enclosed in the letter were these words: "And I have no doubt that in the future you will reach honor and distinction as a citizen and public man, but to do this requires industry and hard work, and an honorable, upright life."

You started early. You have had great qualities; ambition, tenacity, persistence—but you've had more. You've had help—good friends, good family. We honor you, Mrs. McClellan—Mrs. Norma. You came into a home with children, took them in your heart. You reared them, taught them, gave them love and care. You have given loyalty to your husband. There was humble lostness at times at home to keep a place of retreat, rest, and renewed strength for one who would return home with battle fatigue. You fought some battles with him and for him, and in graciousness you have truly been a First Lady.

Yes, Senator. we have seen your strength and sorrow, your love, and your commitment to carry on. While pastor at Fayetteville, I had the pleasure of being with John and Mary Alice when they were students at the university. I have shared with other pastors in keeping them in concern and in my heart as much as possible under my wing as their pastor and friend. These children reflected character, because they had character. I have seen your manhood in the room as we sat and talked of home and children, loneliness and sorrow. Dreams have had to be changed, but never lost.

You see, I know your sources of power and something of your aims and drives of purpose. I know something of the heart and home, and I am glad we have been able to join in prayer together. The altar furnishings and pieces at the Winfield Methodist Church were given by the Senator and myself in loving memory of John. There we have met, not only to pray for God's strength but for others, the Nation, and the world.

I have been in Washington with this good man and know something of his desires for this Nation and its citizens, its place not only in the world but unto God. Your excellency, we want to be a part of you and your home, and we want your sense of commitment and your wisdom to be a part of us to give strength and quality. We keep you in our heart and prayers. We offer you to our State and Nation as we hold you before our God for power, righteousness, and love. Amen.

SHORTCOMINGS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL LAW

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the October 1965 issue of the Hastings Law Journal contained an article entitled "Shortcomings in the Administration of Criminal Law."

Since this article was written by one of America's most experienced and learned trial judges, the Honorable Alexander Holtzoff, U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, it merits the consideration of all Americans who are concerned by the rising crime rate in the Nation, and who believe that the primary purpose of the criminal law is the protection of the society.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Judge Holtzoff be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Hastings Law Journal, October 1965]

SHORTCOMINGS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL LAW

(By Alexander Holtzoff, U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia)

PURPOSE OF THE CRIMINAL LAW

Protection of the physical safety of the lives and property of the public and its individual members is the basic and primary purpose for which society was originally organized. The defense of the Nation against external aggression is the task of the Armed Forces and the diplomats. The safeguarding of the public from internal depredations by persons who disregard the rights of others is the function of the criminal law. In turn, the enforcement of the criminal law has a number of aspects. First, there are the police and other law enforcement agencies in the executive branch of Government, whose duty is to preserve the peace, prevent and suppress crime and detect and apprehend perpetrators of offenses that have been committed. The next and crucial step in the administration of criminal justice lies with the courts—the judicial branch of the Government. Providing this protection remains the fundamental purpose of government, even though, in the course of centuries, gradual complex social and economic developments have led governments to assume additional burdens in social, economic, and financial fields.

Manifestly, the criminal law is more than a branch of jurisprudence. It is the instrumentality by which the public is protected from inroads against the safety of the lives and property of its members. In dealing with malefactors, the law inflicts punishments for their misdeeds. The term "punishment" is, however, perhaps misleading in this connection. Modern criminology no longer views punishment as the imposition of a penalty, or the exaction of retribution. A sentence in a criminal case looks to the future. Its objectives are to prevent repetition of crimes by the culprit and to dissuade others from perpetrating similar offenses. These ends are sought to be attained, in part, by immobilizing the criminal for some time, thereby making it impossible for him to continue his nefarious activities during that period. Also, the example of a sentence imposed on one person is intended as a deterrent to others. The law endeavors to reform and rehabilitate the offender, either by suitable discipline and appropriate training while in prison, or by placing him on probation and giving him guidance by a probation officer. When the last-mentioned course is pursued, its purpose is not primarily to aid and assist the criminal, but to protect society by transforming him into a constructive member of the community.

The great Italian criminologist and penologist, Beccaria, observed: "The aim, then, of punishment can only be to prevent the criminal committing new crimes against his countrymen, and to keep others from doing likewise." [1]

Need for efficient administration

"The more prompt the punishment and the sooner it follows the crime, the more just it will be and the more effective." [2] Swiftness and certainty of punishment are indispensable to a successful administration of the criminal law. Undue delay between arrest and trial, or a long interval between trial and final disposition of appellate proceedings, especially if the defendant is enlarged on bail in the interim, weakens the criminal law in its effort to protect the public, detracts from its effects as a deterrent, and tends to create disrespect or contempt for law in the eyes of the underworld, as well as disdain on the part of the thinking public.

These introductory remarks may seem simple and elementary, as indeed they are. In exploring and analyzing any important topic, however, it is essential to penetrate to its underlying philosophy, even if it is so well known that to do so seems, at first blush, needless repetition. Unfortunately, all too often matters of this kind are overlooked or forgotten in the consideration of a mass of disorganized details. Fundamentals must always be borne in mind if a consideration of details is to be fruitful. One must not let the proximity of the trees obscure the view of the forest.

The administration of justice is a practical rather than a scientific matter. It must be approached in a realistic, rather than a theoretical spirit. While the law itself may be regarded as a science, its application and administration is an art. The law is not an end in itself. It is merely the tool or the instrument by which justice is attained in a practical manner. Beccaria sardonically observed in his famous essay, "Happy the nation, whose laws are not a science." [3] This is peculiarly applicable to the field of criminal law, which deals primarily with the protection of the community.

Crime is always present in human society. All that can be hoped for is to reduce it to a minimum. Unfortunately, in recent years in the United States, the number of violent crimes has increased tremendously,[4] especially in some of the larger cities.[5] Suppression of crime has become one of the most important and vital internal problems of our country.[6] The rate of crime has grown enormously and rapidly, far in excess of and out of proportion to the expansion of the population.[7] What is particularly ominous is that the ratio between young criminals and the total number of criminals has greatly increased.[8]

In this study no effort will be made to explore and analyze the ultimate causes of crime. If this can be done at all, it is the task of the sociologist and the psychologist. We shall confine our discussion to the impact of the criminal law and its administration on the crime problem.[9]

---

[1] Beccaria, of Crimes and Punishments 42 (1964).

[2] Id. at 55.

[3] Id. at 23.

[4] Hoover, Crime in the United States 2 (1965).

[5] Ibid.

[6] In recent speeches before the Maryland and New York State Bar Associations the president of the American Bar Association called attention to some shocking facts. He indicated that there has been an increase of 10 percent in serious crimes reported in 1963 over the parallel figure for 1962, and that for the first 9 months of 1964 there was a further increase of 13 percent; that more than 40 percent of all arrests involved persons 18 years of age or under; that crimes of violence continued to increase; and, finally, that since 1958, crime has been increasing five times faster than the growth of the population.

[7] Hoover, op. cit., supra note 4, at 3.

[8] Id. at 24.

[9] It is sometimes said that an ultimate cause of crime is poverty. This is a superficial and shallow view, because two or more generations ago there was much more poverty and much less crime. Moreover, many persons charged with serious crimes are found

The primary tool of the criminal law is the trial

In the last analysis, the purpose of a trial of a criminal case is to ascertain in a fair, impartial, and orderly manner whether the accused has committed the crime with which he is charged; to convict the guilty, provided guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt; and to acquit those whose guilt is not so proven. The closer the administration of criminal law approaches this end, the more successful it is. The more it deviates from this target, the more it fails to fulfill its function. Rule 2 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure summarized this aim in the following trenchant terms: "These rules are intended to provide for the just determination of every criminal proceeding. They shall be construed to secure simplicity in procedure, fairness in administration, and the elimination of unjustifiable expense and delay." Mr. Justice Cardozo enunciated this ideal in his usual inimitable phraseology: [J]ustice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true." [10]

An eminent English judge, Sir Patrick Devlin, recently stated: "When a criminal goes free, it is as much a failure of abstract justice as when an innocent man is convicted." [11]

Rights of the accused

The common law countries, such as the United States and England, take a just pride in the fact that they place stronger emphasis on the protection of rights of individual defendants than do Roman law countries, where the law directs its attention to a greater extent to the interests of the general public. Under the Anglo-American system of law the accused is clothed and surrounded with a number of potent safeguards. Their purpose is to erect a screen to prevent the erroneous conviction of an innocent person.

The first basic requirement is a public trial.[12] The purpose of a public trial is not solely to shield the defendant, but also to protect the interests of society, by allowing the public to view the administration of justice. In fact occasionally there are defendants who would prefer a secret trial in order to avoid publicity or embarrassment.

Another vital privilege accorded to the accussed both in Federal [13] and State courts [14] is the right of counsel. While originally it was construed as confined to a right to be represented by counsel retained by defendant,[15] it has been properly extended to require the appointment of counsel for defendants who are financially unable to hire a lawyer, unless the defendant knowingly and intelligently waives that right.[16] This recent advance is enlightened and wholesome. It is an important step in the right direction in the defense of personal liberty.

A further safeguard is the defendant's right to be confronted with witnesses at his trial.[17] It is of the essence of a criminal trial under Anglo-American jurisprudence that witnesses be produced in person, face the accused, and give their testimony orally. The defendant and his counsel must be in a position to hear the testimony and to cross-examine the witness. There may be no convictions on ex parte affidavits or depositions.[18]

The prosecution is required to prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and unless such proof is forthcoming, the defendant must be acquitted. Coupled with this requirement is a presumption that the defendant is innocent until his guilt is established beyond a reasonable doubt. This is not really a presumption in the technical sense. It is an emphatic restatement, in converse form, of the doctrine requiring proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Under the Anglo-American system of law, a defendant is usually entitled to a trial by a jury.[19] This mode of trial perhaps does not rise to the dignity of being an essential feature of ordered liberty, because there are other enlightened and progressive systems of law that do not always provide a trial by jury. There is a mounting admiration, which this writer shares, for trial by jury and for the caliber of justice meted out by the average jury. Historically the jury represents a cross section of the population, selected at random, and interposed between the State and the accused. The system accords to the defendant a trial by a tribunal that is not a part of or dependant on the Government. It is a fact, however, that defendants frequently waive trial by jury and elect to be tried by the court alone.[20] For instance, this practice prevails locally in the Maryland courts and is frequently followed in the Federal courts. One may wonder why a defendant would waive the apparent protection extended to him by a jury trial. Observation and experience show that this is done at times in cases involving a particularly unpopular or disgusting crime in which the evidence of the prosecution is not very strong. In such a situation, judges are likely to demand more proof than juries. Again, jury trials are occasionally waived when the facts are not seriously contested or controverted, and the matter hinges on a question of law.

Every defendant is granted the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment, as well as by most State constitutions.[21] In respect to defendants in criminal cases, it comprises not only the privilege not to be questioned at the trial, unless the defendant voluntarily chooses to take the witness stand, but even precludes an inquiry, in the presence and hearing of the jury, whether the defendant will elect to testify and desires to submit to an interrogation.[22]

This privilege has been much discussed of late years. It is a part of the warp and woof of Anglo-American jurisprudence. It is not, however, an integral part of ordered liberty, nor is it an indispensable feature of abstract justice or natural law. Mr. Justice Cardozo made the following interesting and illuminating comments on this subject:

"The right to trial by jury and the immunity from prosecution except as the result of an indictment may have value and importance. Even so, they are not of the very essence of a scheme of ordered liberty. To abolish them is not to violate a 'principle of justice so rooted in the traditions and conscience of our people as to be ranked as fundamental.' * * * Few would be so narrow or provincial as to maintain that a fair and enlightened system of justice would be impossible without them. What is true of jury trials and indictments is true also, as the cases show, of the immunity from compulsory self-incrimation * * *. This, too, might be lost, and justice still be done. Indeed, today as in the past there are students of our penal system who look upon the immunity as a mischief rather than a benefit, and who would limit its scope, or destroy it altogether. No doubt there would remain the need to give protection against torture, physical or mental.* * * Justice, however, would not perish if the accused were subject to a duty to respond to orderly inquiry." [23]

Fundamentally, it seems entirely logical and proper to interrogate the defendant, provided that this is done fairly and not oppressively, as he naturally knows best whether he committed the act with which he is charged. An American or English visitor to a French court is amazed when he observes that, after the trial commences by the reading of the indictment, there follows an inquiry by the presiding judge to the defendant: "What have you to say?" The defendant, not his counsel, answers. Under that system, innocent persons are not railroaded to prison, but it is much harder for a guilty man to escape justice. However, we must ungrudgingly accept the privilege against self-incrimination as being imbedded in our law. It is the product of centuries of history. But it need not be glorified, or extended beyond its traditional limits. It is not a lofty or exalted principle, but is merely an artificial advantage extended to the accused.[24] Perhaps it is unconsciously derived from the Anglo-Saxon idea of sportsmanship. The privilege gives to the defendant the right to remain silent and see whether the government can establish his

---

to be employed and they use this fact as a reason for applying for release on low bail, or even on personal recognizance. Cities in Western Europe have a much smaller volume of violent street crimes than many of the big cities of the United States. For example, one feels safer in walking at night the streets, including even the back streets and alleys, of Rome, Florence, and Venice, than those of some of our cities; and yet until recently Italy had much more poverty than the United States. One wonders whether the ultimate cause is not the modern attitude of parents toward the discipline and training of children, the failure of parents to require obedience, and their omission to inculcate in their offspring proper ideas of right and wrong and regard for the rights of others during the formative years of the children.

[10] *Snyder* v. *Massachusetts,* 291 U.S. 97, 122 (1934).

[11] Devlin, "The Criminal Prosecution in England 135" (1958).

[12] U.S. Constitution amendments VI and XIV, sec. 1; *In re Oliver,* 333 U.S. 257 (1948).

[13] U.S. Constitution amendment VI.

[14] *Gideon* v. *Wainwright,* 372 U.S. 335 (1963).

[15] *Betts* v. *Brady,* 316 U.S. 445 (1942).

[16] *Johnson* v. *Zerbst,* 304 U.S. 458 (1938); *Gideon* v. *Wainwright,* 372 U.S. 335 (1963).

[17] U.S. Constitution amendments VI and XIV; *Pointer* v. *Texas,* 380 U.S. 400 (1965).

[18] The right is limited to criminal trials. It does not extend to preliminary proceedings, such as grand jury hearings. See *Harper* v. *State,* 131 Ga. 771, 63 S.E. 339 (1909). *Crump* v. *Anderson* (D.C. Cir. June 15, 1965). As to the limited purpose of preliminary proceedings, see *Giordenello* v. *United States,* 357 U.S. 480, 484 (1958).

[19] U.S. Constitution amendment VI; Cal. Const. art. 1, sec. 7.

[20] In Federal courts, this may be done only with the consent of the Government counsel and the court. *Singer* v. *United States,* 380 U.S. 24 (1965). In California, a waiver of a jury must be consented to by the district attorney. Cal. Const. art. 1, sec. 7.

[21] Applied to the States by the 14th amendment. *Malloy* v. *Hogan,* 378 U.S. 1 (1964).

[22] McCormick, Evidence 277 (1954).

[23] *Palko* v. *Connecticut,* 302 U.S. 319, 325-326 (1937).

[24] No comment is permissible before the jury on the defendant's failure to testify. *Griffin* v. *California,* 380 U.S. 609 (1965). The defendant is entitled to an instruction that no adverse inference may be drawn from his failure to do so. *Bruno* v. *United States,* 308 U.S. 287 (1939). Many experienced trial lawyers often request the court not to give this instruction because actually it is likely to prove a boomerang and do the defendant more harm than good. It calls the attention of the jury to a matter that they might possibly otherwise overlook and calls upon them to perform a feat of intellectual gymnastics that is psychologically difficult, if not impossible. In England the judge may comment on the defendant's failure to take the witness stand, but counsel for the prosecution may not refer to the matter.

guilt beyond a reasonable doubt without his assistance.

The defendant is further protected by the exclusionary rules of evidence, under which certain types of evidence are deemed inadmissible. Perhaps the most important of these is the doctrine that bars the introduction of hearsay testimony. This principle constitutes an important protection to an innocent person, since hearsay testimony is easily distorted or taken out of context, and, at times, may even be fabricated. It is a salutary doctrine in the interests of justice. Facets of this rule of evidence have been frequently criticized and even condemned as being purely arbitrary and as excluding valuable information from the jury.[25] It is interesting to observe, however, that many of the critics have been neither trial judges nor trial lawyers. Those who are in constant contact with the realities of the trial courtroom realize that the hearsay rule at times shields an innocent person from an unjust conviction, and, in civil cases, may preclude the perpetration of a fraud. In this respect the common law differs from systems prevailing in Roman law countries. The latter have no law of evidence, but admit evidence of every type, provided it is relevant or germane to the issues. There, the court or jury is presumed to appraise the weight of any item of evidence in accordance with its probative value.

Thus the accused in a criminal trial under Anglo-American law is surrounded with numerous safeguards and is accorded many advantages. The fact that he may not be convicted except on proof beyond a reasonable doubt, established by competent evidence, is a mighty bulwark for the innocent against the possibility of an unjust conviction. It is necessarily inherent in this system that, in the light of these rigorous requirements, some guilty persons will escape through the meshes. This result is inevitable, even under an efficient administration of our criminal law, and must be accepted with equanimity. But it is thoughtless to say, as some do, that the unlimited resources of the prosecution enable it to wield a heavy hand against a "helpless" defendant. This idea was well expressed by Judge Learned Hand some years ago:

"Under our criminal procedure the accused has every advantage. While the prosecution is held rigidly to the charge, he need not disclose the barest outline of his defense. He is immune from question or comment on his silence; he cannot be convicted when there is the least fair doubt in the minds of any 1 of the 12. Our dangers do not lie in too little tenderness to the accused. Our procedure has been always haunted by the ghost of the innocent man convicted. It is an unreal dream. What we need to fear is the archaic formalism and the watery sentiment that obstructs, delays, and defeats the prosecution of crime." [26]

Rights of the victim

While stressing the rights of defendants, our system of law, in recent practice, seems to neglect the interests of the public and the victims of crimes. It tends to overlook Cardozo's admonition that "justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also." [27] The rights of the victims, for example, the man who was attacked and robbed at the point of a gun, the woman whose purse was snatched and who was knocked down and injured, the family of a storekeeper who was killed during the perpetration of a robbery, or the unfortunate victim of a rape, seem to be treated but cavalierly and their interests not emphasized as much as those of the perpetrators of the offenses. Yet the victims' rights not to be molested have been violated by the criminal. These are worthy at least of as much protection and consideration as those of the accused. The pendulum has swung too far to the side of the accused. It must be brought back to an even position. A plumbline must be redrawn between the criminal and his victim.

In some quarters the accused is often depicted as a poor, oppressed, cowering, frightened individual, bewildered and ignorant of his rights, who deserves sympathy, consideration and kindness. Such a picture of the average prisoner charged with a serious crime of violence is far from accurate. It is an unjustified embellishment and a fantastic idealization. Many defendants arrested on such charges have had prior conflicts with the law, and previous contacts with the police and the courts. Although not well educated, they are likely to be ruthless, entirely oblivious of the rights of others, sophisticated in an evil way, cunning, and crafty. They are often quite familiar with their legal rights and the restrictions that hamper the police and the prosecution. The latest rulings of appellate courts in the field of criminal procedure seem to travel through the grapevine of the underworld, and are sometimes even mentioned by a prisoner to the arresting officer. The defendant is often skilled, in a petty way, and ready to fence intellectually with the police, or to try to bargain with them or the prosecuting attorney.

Some sociologists and psychologists picture a criminal as being entirely the product of his environment. Naturally, every human being is influenced by his heredity and environment. But to envisage him as a helpless puppet or robot, entirely controlled by external influences, is not only fallacious, but is a complete denial of the existence of human dignity. If these assumptions were true, criminal law should be abolished, because no one should be punished for doing something from which he is unable to refrain. Free will and the ability to choose are part of the psychological makeup of every human being, except perhaps the insane or the mental defective. Only an atheist or an agnostic is in a position to deny freedom of the will, because the existence of such volition is one of the fundamental principles of all religions. If there were no freedom of the will, there would be no such concept as sin, or punishment for sin. Sin is punished only because the sinner is in a position to choose between sinning and refraining from sinning. Some fine individuals have risen from poor environments and, on the other hand, some evildoers have been surrounded by excellent living conditions.

Every human being should have compassion. But it is error to direct compassion solely toward the criminal, as is done too often nowadays, and to ignore the helpless victim of the crime. Actually, those who adhere to that attitude compose a minority, though a vociferous one. The majority of the population, inarticulate as it may be, undoubtedly condemns the criminal, extends its sympathy to the victim, and wishes and hopes for greater protection for its own safety.

Reversals on technicalities

The trial of a criminal proceeding or a civil action is a quest for justice, not a game of skill. While justice must be administered in accordance with law, one must never lose sight of this objective and become immersed in the morass of legal minutiae that sometimes degenerate into trivia. The farsighted leaders of the legal profession brought about a great reform in the field of adjective law by the introduction of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which revolutionized and simplified civil procedure in the Federal courts. This example has been followed by a large number of the States. One of the main purposes of this far-reaching advance was to eliminate, or at least reduce to a minimum, what was labeled by Wigmore many years ago as the sporting theory of justice.

The broad success and the wide acceptance of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure emboldened those interested in law reform to attempt a similar result for criminal litigation in the Federal courts. The outcome was the adoption of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure in 1946. The purpose of this measure was also to simplify legal procedure and to clear away the technicalities that had accumulated through the centuries, like barnacles that encrust the hull of an old ship. Many of them originated in a bygone era in England, when practically every serious crime was punishable by hanging, and judges who were humanely inclined, tried to devise pretexts for avoiding capital punishment in instances in which they did not think it was morally merited. These cobwebs were brushed away in the Federal courts. The window was opened to a strong breath of fresh air.

The rules were welcomed with acclaim, and for a number of years were administered in the spirit in which they were intended. It was realized that the purpose of the safeguards that surround the defendant is to protect the innocent from unjust conviction, and not to interpose obstructions to the conviction of the guilty or to create an obstacle course for the Government. It was not the objective of the Bill of Rights and cognate provisions to frustrate convictions and to turn criminals loose, unwhipped of justice merely because the Government may fail strictly to observe all procedural niceties.

The rules did away with technical forms of indictments, and with the succession of pleas in abatement and pleas in bar that were often interposed seriatim. In many other ways they streamlined and simplified procedure. The keystone of the arch is the "harmless error" rule. It reads as follows: "Harmless error. Any error, defect, irregularity or variance which does not affect substantial rights shall be disregarded." [28] This principle should be emblazoned in red letters. It is of primary importance. If the evidence against the accused is overwhelming and there is no doubt of his guilt, an error in procedure that has no bearing on the issue of his guilt or innocence should manifestly be ignored. Such was the obvious intention of the framers of the rules. Legal procedure does not prescribe a ceremonial or ritual that must be followed rigidly and inflexibly in every detail, and that requires an acquittal for a slight deviation from a prescribed meticulous formula.

In this connection it is interesting to note the attitude of the English Court of Criminal Appeal. That tribunal hears appeals in criminal cases from various courts in England. Appeals are argued within 4 to 6 weeks after the trial. In the vast majority of cases, decisions are delivered orally at the close of the argument after a brief whispered consultation on the part of the three judges on the bench in full view of the public. The extemporaneous opinion, generally couched in felicitous phraseology, becomes the opinion of the court, which may eventually appear in the reports. An examination of reported cases of that court, as well as personal observation of the court's proceedings on different occasions, lead one to the conclusion that this tribunal does not reverse convictions for error in procedure unless the error has led to an unjust result. That appellate courts in the United States should adopt this enlightened and progressive attitude is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

Unfortunately, after the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure had been in effect for but a few years and their novelty had worn off, the pendulum began its swing to the side of the defendants and the harmless error rule came to be honored more in the breach than in the observance. In fact, it seems to have reached a state of innocuous desuetude. Many judges do not even refer to it and seem not to bear it in mind. Ignoring the harmless error rule leads to many reversals and new trials in cases in which guilt is undoubted and may even be undisputed. The result is delay in the administration of justice and sometimes its complete frustration.

---

[25] See McCormick, Evidence 628–629 (1954).

[26] *United States* v. *Garsson*, 291 Fed. 646, 649 (S.D.N.Y. 1923).

[27] *Snyder* v. *Massachusetts*, 291 U.S. 97, 122 (1934).

[28] Fed. R. Crim. P. 52(a).

The granting of a new trial is not to be treated lightly. A new trial is not to be likened to an additional performance of a drama. Lapse of time may make a new trial impossible or impracticable, due to disappearance or death of witnesses, or the fading memory of those who are still available. Moreover, new trials frequently are unfair and onerous to witnesses. The ordinary witness, who may be just an innocent bystander, is unnecessarily burdened with repeated apearances in court, at times to the detriment of his own affairs. Much worse is the plight of witnesses who are victims of crimes and members of their families who are subjected to the ordeal of being compelled to testify at repeated intervals and thus relive a horrible nightmare that they have been endeavoring to forget. The victim of a rape, for example, is at times required, a year or two after the original trial, again to go through the harrowing experience of reviving the scene and relating before a curious public the pain and embarrassment to which she had been subjected. Similarly, members of the family of the victim of a murder may be asked to recall afresh the vividness of an atrocious scene which they have witnessed. Such burdens are a gross injustice to victims and other witnesses to crimes. No thought or consideration appears to be accorded to them. The ultimate consequence of reversals and new trials is that many obviously guilty persons eventually escape punishment, to the detriment of the public, leading to a lack of confidence in the administration of justice. In cases in which punishment is finally inflicted, after a protracted course of repeated proceedings, the long delay in its imposition results in a loss of its full significance and effect.

While these defects in the administration of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure naturally relate to the Federal courts, it must be noted that their influence to some extent permeates the administration of justice in the States. This tendency has become particularly marked in recent years because, under modern postconviction procedures, cases tried in the State courts are subject to review in the Federal courts. While theoretically the scope of this review is restricted to vital constitutional questions, this term has been so liberally and broadly construed that the Federal courts have conducted what amounts to practically a reexamination of the original trial.[29]

It is not the intention of this author to criticize in this essay any specific rulings on questions of law. It is urged, however, that an outstanding defect in the administration of justice today is found in treating as grounds for reversal of a conviction errors that have no bearing on the question of guilt or innocence of the defendant and thereby ignoring the "harmless error rule" which, as has been stated, should be deemed fundamental. Many times several new trials are had in succession in the same case.

Superimposed on this weakness are the delays that are prevalent in both Federal and State appellate courts. In the numerous cases in which new trials are ordered, a long time elapses between the original and the new trial. A survey made by the committee on appellate delays appointed by the Criminal Law Section of the American Bar Association in 1963, showed that in most States the period between the imposition of sentence and the final disposition of an appeal in a criminal case varies from 10 to 18 months. In very few States was the gap less than 10 months, but in no instance less than 5 months. In the Federal courts the timelag between filing a notice of appeal and its final disposition in the U.S. Court of Appeals varied from 11.8 months in the eighth circuit, to 6.3 months in the first circuit.[30] A comparison with the English courts, where the interval between trial and disposition of an appeal is only 4 to 6 weeks, appears startling.

A few specific instances will illustrate the deplorable trend that we have been discussing. The notorious Chessman case in California is so well known that to discuss it in detail would be superfluous. Suffice it to say that the commission of an atrocious crime by him was eventually not actually in dispute, and yet the case went back and forth between the State courts and the Supreme Court of the United States for a dozen years before the sentence was carried out. Mr. Justice Douglas made the following pointed remarks in dissenting from a decision by the Supreme Court in favor of Chessman in a habeas corpus proceeding:

"But the fragile grounds upon which the present decision rests jeopardize the ancient writ for use by Federal courts in State prosecutions. The present decision states in theory the ideal of due process. But the facts of this case cry out against its application here. Chessman has received due process over and again. He has had repeated reviews of every point in his case * * * Nearly 7 years later we return to precisely the same issue and not only grant certiorari but order relief by way of habeas corpus."[31]

On the evening of March 12, 1953, in Washington, D.C., one Willie Lee Stewart entered a grocery store, brandished a loaded pistol or revolver, "held up" the proprietor, and fatally shot him. The grocer's wife and adult daughter were present and witnessed the harrowing tragedy. The fact that Stewart had committed the crime was not contested. He pleaded insanity. The psychiatrists at St. Elizabeths Hospital, an outstanding Government hospital for the mentally ill to which Stewart was committed for observation and examination, reported that he was free of mental disease or defect and indicated that he was shamming insanity. Nevertheless, the case was tried five times over a period of 10 years. Each of the first three trials ended with a verdict of guilty of murder in the first degree, which carried a death sentence. There was a reversal and a grant of a new trial in each instance on points that had no bearing on the guilt or innocence of the accused.[32] When the case reached the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Clark, dissenting in his vivid, vigorous style, made the following graphic observations:

"It may be that Willie Lee Stewart 'had an intelligence level in the moronic class,' but he can laugh up his sleeve today for he has again made a laughingstock of the law. This makes the third jury verdict of guilt—each with a mandatory death penalty—that has been set aside since 1953. It was in that year that Willie walked into Henry Honikman's little grocery store here in Washington, bought a bag of potato chips and a soft drink, consumed them in the store, ordered another bottle of soda, and then pulled out a pistol and killed Honikman right before the eyes of his wife and young daughter. The verdict is now set aside because of some hypotheticals as to what the jury might have inferred from a single question asked Willie as to whether he had testified at his other trials. In my view, none of these conjectures is sufficiently persuasive to be said to cast doubt on the validity of the jury's determination."[33]

At the fourth trial the jury disagreed. At the fifth trial the jury again found the defendant guilty of murder in the first degree, without recommending life imprisonment, as it had a right to do under a recent local statute. In the absence of such a recommendation, a mandatory death sentence was again imposed. At this trial the Government had demonstrated that the defendant had been shamming insanity, by producing some requisition slips written by him in his own handwriting and signed by him from time to time, directed to the jail library and requesting permission to borrow certain volumes of the District of Columbia Code and the United States Code, invariably naming the particular volumes containing the Criminal Code. The victim's widow died several years after the first trial, but his daughter was compelled to testify at each of the five trials, and thus to revive and relive the horrible scene every couple of years for a decade.

The long and tortuous history of this case apparently led the U.S. attorney to a feeling of complete frustration and hopelessness, which is easily understood. After the fifth trial, Stewart offered to plead guilty to murder in the second degree. The U.S. attorney took the unprecedented step of moving the court to vacate the judgment and recommending that the plea be accepted. It carried a maximum sentence of imprisonment for a term of 15 years to life. The court had no alternative but to acquiesce. The plea was accepted, and sentence was imposed on June 17, 1963, more than a decade after the commission of the original crime.

On October 3, 1960, also in Washington, D.C., James W. Killough strangled his wife, put her body in the trunk of his automobile, and threw the corpse into the city dump. He was arrested shortly thereafter and admitted his guilt. The fact that he had killed his wife was not controverted. He made both oral and written confessions. Although he was indicted for murder, the jury found him guilty of manslaughter. The judgment was reversed on the ground of inadmissibility of a confession, although it was voluntary and its voluntary character was not contested.[34] He was tried and convicted again. Another reversal followed.[35] The second reversal was also based on a ground having no bearing on the question of guilt or innocence. On both occasions there were emphatic dissents. At the third trial, which took place on October 7, 1964, almost 4 years to the day after the murder, the Government found itself bereft of sufficient evidence deemed admissible in the light of the previous rulings of the court of appeals which resulted in exclusion of all the confession. The trial judge found himself constrained reluctantly to direct a judgment of acquittal for lack of sufficient evidence. He did so with a very emphatic expression of disgust and distaste, bemoaning the miscarriage of justice.

There are numerous cases arising out of the State courts in which Federal postconviction remedies have been pursued for years by the device of raising a different constitutional point on successive motions to vacate the sentence. Much could be accomplished in the direction of achieving a more expeditious administration of justice by requiring a defendant to exhaust all of his grounds in a single motion. A defendant is entitled to one trial and one appeal. Ordinarily his rights end at that point. The original purpose of postconviction remedies was a beneficent one: to provide a cure for an exceptional miscarriage of justice, not an additional routine review. But in some districts, the Federal court is flooded with applications from prisoners in State penal institutions to vacate sentences imposed on them. While the great bulk of these proceedings terminate unfavorably to defendants, each has to be examined and many have to be heard, thereby unnecessarily consuming a great deal of time of the court, to the detriment of the rights of other litigants whose cases are being delayed in the interim. Moreover, the criminal proceeding itself is prolonged, all to the demoralization of the enforcement of the criminal law.

---

[29] *Cf. Mapp* v. *Ohio,* 367 U.S. 643 (1961); *Johnson* v. *Zerbst,* 304 U.S. 458, 468 (1938) (dictum).

[30] The report of the Committee on Appellate Delay in Criminal Cases is published in 2 American Criminal L.Q. 150–58 (1964).

[31] *Chessman* v. *Teets,* 354 U.S. 156, 172 (1957).

[32] *Stewart* v. *United States,* 214 F. 2d 879 (D.C. Cir. 1954); 247 F. 2d 42 (D.C. Cir. 1957); 366 U.S. 1 (1960).

[33] *Stewart* v. *United States,* 366 U.S. 1, 22 (1960).

[34] *Killough* v. *United States,* 315 F. 2d 241 (D.C. Cir. 1962). (Confession held to be the fruit of earlier inadmissible confessions.)

[35] *Killough* v. *United States,* 336 F. 2d 929 (D.C. Cir. 1964). (Standard interview form at jail would not have been used against him if he had been informed of this right at time of interview and had so demanded.)

To multiply examples would unduly prolong this essay. Those just given clearly illustrate some of the difficulties confronting the administration of justice and the suppression of crime in the United States today.

Many members of the bench have emphatically protested against the trends that we have been discussing. Thus, Judge Wilbur K. Miller of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, in a dissenting opinion in *Killough* v. *United States*,[36] deplored "this court's tendency unduly to emphasize technicalities which protect criminals and hamper law enforcement, against which I have repeatedly protested." He added, "in our concern for criminals, we should not forget that nice people have some rights, too."

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, a tribunal that has not succumbed to the current tendency of reversing convictions on technicalities that have no bearing on the guilt or innocence of the defendant, made the following eloquent comments in a unanimous opinion in *United States* v. *Guerra*:[37]

"The day has certainly not come when courts will set a convicted criminal free for no reason other than some practice of police or prosecution—wholly unrelated to the conviction itself—did not meet with their approval. If that unhappy day should ever arrive, the often-heard criticism that law and lawyers are interested only in technicalities will have a ring of truth, and courts may rightfully be accused of exalting form above substance."[38]

Mr. Justice Clark, in a dissenting opinion in *Milanovich* v. *United States*,[39] registered emphatic protest against the tendencies to which we have referred. He said:

"My duty here is to help fashion rules which will assure that every person charged with an offense receives a fair and impartial trial. But that obligation does not require my ferreting out of the record technical grounds for reversing a particular conviction, grounds which could not possibly have affected the jury's verdict of guilt as a factual determination."

Search and seizure

We shall now pass to another aspect of the subject that likewise tends to frustrate the conviction of the guilty. We refer to recent developments and trends in the construction and application of the fourth amendment. The fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States reads as follows:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrant shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

These provisions of the Bill of Rights, together with the writ of habeas corpus, constitute a palladium of liberty. They erect a strong bulwark against even a remote possibility of a police state. They render impossible such things as the oubliette in the Bastille during the ancien regime in France an institution that was still in existence when the Founding Fathers framed the Constitution. They ban the dreaded knock on the door in the dead of night and the arrest or removal of one or more of the occupants of a home to an unknown destination, as has occurred in our own times under Communist and Fascist dictatorships. They preclude imprisonment without a trial. They prevent a series of arbitrary arrests for the purpose of discovering the identity of a perpetrator of a crime, such as a dragnet apprehension of numerous persons within a certain area in order to interrogate them and ascertain which one may have committed a particular crime. They ban visitatorial and exploratory searches of homes and places of business, solely for the purpose of determining whether any contraband is to be found on the premises—such searches as were condemned by Lord Camden in the celebrated case of *Entick* v. *Carrington*.[40] They banish the notorious writs of assistance used by the English authorities to conduct exploratory searches in the Colonies.

In recent years the classic splendors of this imposing edifice began to crumble away by a process of erosion. The philosophy underlying the fourth amendment and the farsighted purpose of its framers seem to have been distorted and deflected. These constitutional provisions have all too frequently been applied, not to guard the precious rights which are formulated by them, but in a manner that, time after time, results only in liberating criminals. The Supreme Court, in a majority opinion by Mr. Justice Jackson, sounded this warning: "We are not willing to discredit constitutional doctrines for protection of the innocent by making of them mere technical loopholes for the escape of the guilty."[41]

It was not until 1914, when the Supreme Court decided the case of *Weeks* v. *United States*,[42] that the rule was established banning, in Federal courts, evidence obtained by an unconstitutional search and seizure. Prior to that time, the admissibility of evidence was not affected by the manner in which it had been obtained.[43] Four years ago, the proscription was extended by the Supreme Court to State courts[44] on the theory that the provisions of the fourth amendment were a part of due process of law as guaranteed by the 14th amendment to the States. Whether the Founding Fathers intended to impose such a drastic sanction for a violation of the fourth amendment is immaterial because the rule of exclusion has become definitively crystallized and must be accepted. It is the law of the land.

It must be emphasized that the fourth amendment does not ban all searches and seizures. It forbids only those that are "unreasonable." A search of the place[45] where a legal arrest is made, as well as a search of the person[46] arrested incidental to the arrest, are regarded as reasonable and are permitted. There are searches and seizures of other types that may be deemed reasonable, depending on the facts of the individual case.

The fourth amendment also authorizes arrests on the basis of warrants properly issued, as well as arrests without warrants, but made on probable cause.[47] A problem arises frequently whether a seizure of the fruits of a crime or of the means by which the crime was committed, or of some other incriminating article, was legal and therefore, whether the evidence should be admitted at the trial. At times the evidence is crucial and whether a conviction can be had, or once had whether it can stand, depends on the admissibility of the article. This in turn often hinges on the question of whether the arrest of the defendant was legally made on probable cause, which directly affects the legality of the search and seizure. Unfortunately, in recent years, there have been numerous decisions of appellate courts drawing fine-spun distinctions and hairsplitting refinements between what does and what does not constitute a probable cause for an arrest, and between what constitutes a reasonable or unreasonable search and seizure. When the point is reached at which the distinction between validity and invalidity in these matters depends on minor details and minute differences, the lofty and exalted aim of the fourth amendment becomes at least partially obliterated. In fact, many a thinking layman is gradually led to an attitude of disparagement toward the law. The majesty and the grandeur of the fourth amendment become tarnished. There is a plethora of cases in which trial courts have been constrained to direct verdicts of acquittal or in which appellate courts have reversed convictions, where the guilt of the defendant was undoubted and perhaps not even contested, but the arrest or the search and seizure were found to be technically invalid.

The reports are replete with such decisions. To endeavor to discuss many of them would prolong this article beyond reasonable limits. Perhaps an extreme case might be cited, in which police officers, who had arrived at the defendant's home in order to arrest her on a charge of violating the law relating to narcotics, saw her walk out of the house and drop a small package into a garbage can that was located outdoors in the areaway. The keen-sighted officers retrieved the parcel which was found to contain narcotics. On the basis of this evidence the defendant was convicted. There was no real contest over the issue of her guilt or innocence. The conviction was reversed, however, on the ground that the action of the officers in recovering the narcotics from the garbage can, constituted an unconstitutional search and seizure.[48]

Whether a police officer has probable cause to make an arrest cannot be determined by study and reflection in an ivory tower, library, or conference room. A police officer may be confronted with a practical dilemma requiring him to make a decision on the spur of the moment. Unless a court called upon to determine such a question endeavors to visualize the momentary scene encountered by the police officer, it is not in a position to reach a realistic result. The court hears arguments of counsel, receives and examines briefs, and then, after reflection, arrives at a decision perhaps weeks or months later. In many instances the decision is reached by a divided vote on the basis of a discussion of close legal distinctions. The application of hindsight in this leisurely, careful manner, without picturing the actualities that faced the police officer and the necessity of his making an immediate decision, is not conducive to a practical resolution of the question. A police officer is not a constitutional lawyer. He sees a situation before him momentarily, often outdoors in the dead of night, and sometimes in inclement weather. He must determine instantly whether to make an arrest or run the risk of allowing a miscreant to escape. He has no opportunity to seek immediate legal advice, and even if he did, by the time it was received it might be too late to make a seizure or apprehend a criminal, who in the meantime may have fled or destroyed the evidence.

---

[36] 315 F. 2d 241, 265 (D.C. Cir. 1962).

[37] 334 F. 2d 138, 146 (2d Cir. 1964). (Emphasis added.)

[38] Perhaps Judge Kaufman, the writer of the opinion, might well have said "should" instead of "will."

[39] 365 U.S. 551, 562 (1961).

[40] 2 Wilson K. B. 275; 19 How. St. Trials 1030 (1765).

[41] *Stein* v. *New York*, 346 U.S. 156, 196–97 (1953).

[42] 232 U.S. 383 (1914).

[43] 8 Wigmore, Evidence 2183 (McNaughton rev. 1961).

[44] *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961).

[45] *United States* v. *Rabinowitz*, 339 U.S. 56 (1950).

[46] *Ker* v. *California*, 374 U.S. 23 (1963).

[47] *Draper* v. *United States*, 358 U.S. 307 (1959); *Brinegar* v. *United States*, 338 U.S. 160 (1949); *Carroll* v. *United States*, 267 U.S. 132, 160 (1925).

[48] *Work* v. *United States*, 243 F. 2d 660 (D.C. Cir. 1957).

So, too, allowance must be made for the police officer's intuition, such as is developed by practical experience in every profession. For example, an old family physician is often aided by his intuition in making a diagnosis. To a trained police officer some minor circumstance, which may seem insignificant or even may not be noticed by any one else, may appear exceedingly suspicious and may reasonably justify an arrest, even though on a prosaic recital of the facts subsequently embodied in a typewritten or printed record, a judge, no matter how learned, may be unable theoretically to find probable cause.

At times some authorities refer to arrests or searches and seizures later adjudged invalid as "misconduct" by the police. This choice of words is hardly felicitous. The police officer is not engaged in a private enterprise for his own profit. He is not bent on a frolic of his own. He is trying to do his duty, generally arduous and frequently hazardous. He has the same frailties and shortcomings as other human beings. He may make a mistake in trying to guess what a court may hold in the future. He is no prophet. Perhaps he may be charged with error, but hardly accused of misconduct, except in flagrant situations.

There is another aspect of this subject that is of considerable importance. It is invariably assumed that the validity of an arrest or of a search and seizure must be determined on the basis of the facts before the officer at the time when he apprehended the prisoner, or conducted the search and seizure. The fact that the defendant was later shown to have been guilty of the offense for which he was taken into custody, or that the search resulted in successfully locating contraband articles, may not be considered. The logic of this reasoning is invulnerable. Yet we must not overlook the well-known precept of Mr. Justice Holmes that "The life of the law has not been logic; it has been experience."[49] As a matter of commonsense and substantial justice, it does not seem reasonable to ignore the outcome of the arrest or the result of the search and seizure. It is like saying to the officer that it is true that he arrested a guilty person, or seized an article that was properly subject to seizure, but he had no business to think that his prisoner was guilty or that he was about to find contraband. The manner in which these questions are handled seems to relegate us to the artificial world of "Alice in Wonderland" or "Gulliver's Travels." It surely would seem sensible to take into consideration subsequent events and their outcome in determining the validity of an arrest, or the legality of a search and seizure, even though stern, deductive logic would preclude this course.

In many criminal trials the proof adduced by the Government of the defendant's guilt is not controverted. At times guilt is even tacitly admitted. Often the only question litigated is whether the vital evidence against the accused was procured in violation of the fourth amendment, as construed in recent decisions. The trial is transformed from a proceeding for the ascertainment of guilt or innocence of the accused into a determination of the legality of obtaining the evidence of guilt. The trial judge finds himself in effect trying the policeman on a charge of making the arrest, or of seizing contraband articles, instead of trying the defendant. For the time being, the world seems to be turned upside down. We must find a way to return to reality.

Juvenile courts

As was pointed out earlier in this article, one of the grave aspects of the crime problem in this country today is the rapid growth in the number of vicious crimes of violence committed by young people and the vast increase in the ratio between young criminals and older offenders as compared with the ratio of a generation or two ago. It is proper and fitting, therefore, that consideration should be given to a reappraisal of our method of dealing with juvenile offenders and to a need of an overhaul of the juvenile court system. Juvenile courts were inaugurated about the turn of the century.[50] Their creation was a benevolent, progressive step in the direction of humane and understanding treatment of children who came in conflict with the law. The essential purpose of these tribunals was to deal informally and sympathetically with a child who committed a minor peccadillo, such a pilfering from a fruit stand, or a child who managed to get drawn into an undesirable and unsavory gang of youngsters older than himself. It was intended that such boys and girls should be handled in a kindly manner, without giving them a criminal record that would stain their entire life.[51] As is so often true of innovations, in the course of time the original and basic admirable purpose of the reform was lost sight of, or at least became buried underneath an underbrush of weak sentimentality. In many areas the maximum age under which juveniles were within the jurisdiction of such courts was placed at 18 years.[52] Much is to be said in favor of the proposition that this limit is too high and that the age should be set at 16, as is the case in some other places.[53] If we permit a young man of 16 to drive an automobile, thereby considering him mature enough to be vested with the responsibility for a high powered piece of machinery, he should be deemed sufficiently developed to be answerable for his acts. So, too, the jurisdiction of juvenile courts is almost everywhere made dependent solely on age, giving them authority to deal with offenses of any type, other than capital, committed by anyone within a specified age group. The result is that many gunmen and robbers whose chronological age is 15, 16, or 17, but who may be steeped in crime and may have committed a vicious offense, are brought into a court intended primarily for children. To refer to such a defendant as a "child," as is sometimes done, is farcical, unless the word "child" is used in the sense that every human being is the child of his parents.

All too frequently, when a young robber or automobile thief is brought before a juvenile court, the personnel of the court, instead of trying to impress him with the gravity of his offense, lament the fact that some sort of deprivation or compulsion led him to commit his crime, and express sympathy for him. The result is that often the young man either becomes defiant, delves in self-pity, or feels that society is indebted to him. Yet the first step toward rehabilitation of a criminal, if he is to be reformed and reclaimed, must be a realization and a recognition on his part of the immorality of his offense and some feeling of remorse and contrition. It is not unusual for a criminal over 6 feet tall, and weighing over 200 pounds, but only 16 or 17 years of age, to say to a police officer when arrested that the latter can do nothing to him because he is a juvenile.

To be sure, juvenile courts are generally vested with authority to waive jurisdiction in specific cases and transfer the defendant to a criminal court.[54] Whether jurisdiction is to be relinquished in any particular case depends entirely on the discretion of the individual judge, who has no rule of law to guide him. The Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act[55] has solved this problem in a logical and desirable manner. It vests the power of final decision of the question whether a juvenile should be prosecuted under juvenile or adult procedure in the prosecuting authority, namely, the Attorney General.[56]

Paradoxically, juvenile courts often fail to accord to young offenders the constitutional rights guaranteed to every person by the Bill of Rights. For example, many juvenile court judges discourage representation of the accused by counsel, in spite of the fact that the right of counsel is basic and fundamental under the sixth amendment. Yet the Bill of Rights is not restricted to persons over a specified age; one would search in vain in the Bill of Rights for any age limit. These constitutional provisions accompany every citizen from the cradle to the grave. Another opportunity that is frequently denied to a juvenile, though not a constitutional right, is a preliminary hearing before a judge without unnecessary delay. Frequently, a juvenile is detained in custody for days or weeks before he faces a judge.

An overhaul of the machinery for dealing with juvenile offenders seems overdue. Questions may well be considered: whether the age limit for minors within the jurisdiction of juvenile courts should not be reduced to 16, wherever it is higher than that; whether the jurisdiction of a juvenile court should not depend both on age and the nature of the charge, instead of on age alone; and whether the prosecuting authorities, rather than a juvenile judge, should decide in what court a juvenile should be prosecuted. Most important, there is a crying need for a change of attitude toward the youthful offender. In serious cases he must be impressed with the enormity of his misconduct and with the fact that he alone has the power of choosing whether to become a useful citizen or to pursue a criminal career. To minimize and palliate his crime does him a disservice.

CONCLUSION

The crime problem as a whole manifestly cannot be solved by a change in legal procedure. To hope so to solve it would be an irridescent dream. There are involved many deep-seated traits of human nature. Parental control, moral training of children, perception of ethical standards, all blend together like strands that form a single piece of tapestry. They can be elevated only in the course of time, perhaps a generation or two. This is a task for clergymen, educators, and other moral leaders. The criminal law, however, plays an important part in the control of crime, and its successful operation can be improved without a long-range program. We may hope for a return to the ideals set forth in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, and their administration and enforcement in the spirit originally intended; for a strong application of the "harmless error" rule; and for an abandonment of reversals on technicalities. Following the philosophy of Cardozo, justice must be accorded to the accuser as well as the accused. As the present cycle passes, the pendulum will eventually swing back to a true balance. The basic need is not for any change in the law, but for a modification and shifting of attitudes. It is to be hoped that in the course of time, in the not too distant future, this end will be attained. Let us not take one jot or tittle from the law that protects the innocent, but let us wipe the slate clean of subtleties that serve only as a refuge for the guilty.

---

[49] Holmes, "The Common Law 5" (Howe ed. 1963).

[50] Perkins, "Criminal Law 733" (1957).

[51] *State* v. *Guerrero,* 58 Ariz. 421, 430, 120 P. 2d, 798, 802 (1942).

[52] E.g., 18 U.S.C. 5031 (1964).

[53] E.g., Alabama Code, title 13, sec. 350 (1940).

[54] E.g., California Welfare and Institutions Code, sec. 606.

[55] 18 U.S.C. 5031–5037 (1964).

[56] 18 U.S.C. 5032 (1964). Under this section, the juvenile may not be proceeded against as a juvenile delinquent without his consent, as well as that of the Attorney General.

HERBERT C. BONNER, LATE A REPRESENTATIVE FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, when my longtime friend, Representative Herbert C. Bonner of the First North Carolina District, died on November 7, 1965, his district, his State, and his country suffered an irreparable loss. Immediately after his passing a number of articles and editorials depicting his magnificent public services appeared in the press.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles and editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen and Times, Nov. 8, 1965]

NORTH CAROLINA'S FIRST DISTRICT CONGRESSMAN BONNER DIES OF CANCER AT 74

WASHINGTON.—Representative Herbert C. Bonner of North Carolina, sometimes called the father of the nuclear ship *Savannah*, died Sunday at Walter Reed Army Hospital. He was 74.

Democrat Bonner came to the Capitol 50 years ago as a congressional secretary and went on to a 25-year career as a House Member. For the past 10 years, as chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, he exerted strong influence in maritime affairs.

And he enjoyed a reputation also as a poker player's poker player.

Bonner's first Congressional District, which included 15 sparsely populated counties in North Carolina's northeast corner, is laced by sounds, streams, and coastline. A bridge joining two of the outer banks in his district was named for him last year.

Among North Carolina's 11 Congressmen, Bonner was the most consistent supporter of the policies of Democratic administrations.

He underwent surgery in North Carolina several months ago for removal of a cancerous kidney. Then he returned to Washington to vote for various Johnson administration programs. He entered Walter Reed Hospital last month soon after Congress adjourned.

Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. Tuesday in St. Peter's Episcopal Church in Washington, N.C. Burial will be in Oak Dale Cemetery.

Bonner's death leaves the House lineup at 292 Democrats and 140 Republicans, with 3 vacancies. Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ of Maryland is the second-ranking Democrat on the Maritime Committee and thus is in line for the chairmanship.

When he was 24, Bonner came to Washington as secretary to Representative Lindsay C. Warren of North Carolina. He won Warren's seat in 1940 after the Congressman resigned to become U.S. Comptroller General. Bonner was reelected to every succeeding Congress.

In 1955, the year he became chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, Bonner introduced legislation to install nuclear reactors in existing merchant ships as a means of producing a floating exhibit of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

This plan did not work out, but he subsequently led in obtaining legislation which brought the building of the *Savannah*, the world's first nuclear-powered freighter. He pioneered also with the idea of a nuclear-powered icebreaker for the Coast Guard.

Years ago, a 10-cent-limit poker game started in the Capital. It grew to a 20-cent game and a regular recreational event for some Congressmen and congressional aids. From this came Bonner's repute as "a mighty good poker player."

He is survived by his widow; three brothers, John and George Bonner of Washington, N.C., and James Bonner of Atlanta, Ga., and a sister, Mrs. W. H. Williams of Washington, D.C.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Nov. 10, 1965]

HERBERT C. BONNER BURIED ON NORTH CAROLINA COAST

WASHINGTON, N.C.—Herbert C. Bonner, who represented coastal North Carolina in Congress for a quarter of a century, was buried Tuesday near the banks of the Pamlico River.

The 74-year-old Bonner, who introduced legislation that led to the Nation's first nuclear powered merchant ship, died Sunday in Walter Reed Army Hospital. He had been ill since the removal of a cancerous kidney in July.

Final rites for the veteran Democratic Representative were held in the century-old Saint Peter's Episcopal Church.

All the seats in the small, red brick church were filled with visiting dignitaries and the family.

Inside were Gov. Dan Moore and two former North Carolina chief executives—Terry Sanford and Luther Hodges. There was a large delegation from Congress, including two of Bonner's longtime friends, Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, and WILLIAM M. COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi.

Most of North Carolina's congressional delegation was there. Scores of State officials from the executive, judiciary, and legislative branches also attended, such men as State Treasurer Edwin Gill and Joe Hunt, chairman of the State highway commission.

Military representatives from the various armed services were in attendance, including the merchant marine which Bonner had championed during his 25 years in the House of Representatives.

Outside the church more than 300 other mourners stood silently along a narrow road named Bonner.

The Congressman's bronzed metal casket was covered with a single wreath of yellow roses and was carried by the men who had served as his personal aids.

Shortly before the funeral procession arrived, a U.S. Coast Guard plane flew over the church.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Nov. 10, 1965]

FUNERAL HELD IN NORTH CAROLINA FOR REPRESENTATIVE H. C. BONNER

WASHINGTON, N.C.—Herbert C. Bonner, who represented coastal North Carolina in Congress for a quarter of a century, was buried Tuesday near the banks of the Pamlico River.

The 74-year-old Bonner, who introduced legislation that led to the Nation's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, died Sunday in Walter Reed Army Hospital. He had been ill since the removal of a cancerous kidney in July.

Final rites for the veteran Democratic Representative were held in the century old St. Peter's Episcopal Church.

All the seats in the small, red brick church were filled with visiting dignitaries and the famly.

Inside were Gov. Dan Moore and two former North Carolina chief executives—Terry Sanford and Luther Hodges. There was a large delegation from Congress, including two of Bonner's longtime friends, Representatives MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, and WILLIAM M. COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi.

Most of North Carolina's congressional delegation was there. Scores of State officials from the executive, judiciary, and legislative branches also attended, such men as State Treasurer Edwin Gill and Joe Hunt, chairman of the State highway commission.

Military representatives from the various armed services were in attendance, including the merchant marine which Bonner had championed during his 25 years in the House of Representatives.

Outside the church more than 300 other mourners stood silently along a narrow road named Bonner.

The Congressman's bronzed metal casket was covered with a single wreath of yellow roses and was carried by the men who had served as his personal aids.

Shortly before the funeral procession arrived, a U.S. Coast Guard plane flew over the church.

During the funeral hour all government, county, and city offices were closed.

Many businesses in the downtown area of Washington also were closed in memory of their native son.

Conducting the services were the Reverend John Bonner, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Chattanooga, Tenn., and a nephew of the Congressman; the Reverend Irwin Hulbert, Jr., rector of St. Peter's, and the Right Reverend Thomas H. Wright, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Eastern North Carolina.

Burial was in Oakdale Cemetery.

Bonner was born in this Washington near the great shipping lanes of the Atlantic and spent most of his life between here and the Nation's Capital City of Washington.

A former traveling salesman, then a congressional aid, Bonner was elected to the House on November 5, 1940.

He never forgot his closeness to the sea and in 1955 became chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

He sponsored the legislation that led to construction of the *Savannah*, the Nation's first nuclear merchant ship. Bonner also worked to keep both channels open on the North Carolina outer banks and pushed for the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park.

He helped modernize passenger shipping laws that allowed American ships to compete for the rich Carribbean and Mediterranean winter cruise trade.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Nov. 8, 1965]

HISTORY WILL REMEMBER BONNER, MOORE SAYS

RALEIGH.—Gov. Dan Moore said Sunday that in the death of Representative Herbert C. Bonner the State has "lost one of the outstanding men of our time."

The Governor ordered all State flags flown at half staff in honor of the veteran Congressman.

"Herbert Bonner was a Congressman of the highest order," Moore added. "He served not only the people of his First District, but all Americans as well with distinction and honor. His deeds of public service will cause him to be remembered on through history.

"His accomplishments have helped to make ours a better country. All North Carolinians mourn his loss and honor his memory," Moore concluded.

Associate Justice E. B. Denny of the State supreme court said Bonner "had an excellent record in Congress and he will be difficult to replace."

J. M. Broughton, Jr., of Raleigh, chairman of the State Democratic executive committee, said Bonner "will be sorely missed."

House speaker Pat Taylor of Wadesboro said, "He contributed many years of valuable service to his State and to his country."

Dr. Charles F. Carroll, State superintendent of public instruction, said, "I consider him one of the most solid men to have represented North Carolina in the Congress at any time."

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Nov. 9, 1965]

BONNER SERVED STATE, NATION WELL

"Herbert Bonner doesn't talk too much. So when he does talk, he challenges the attention of the House because he knows what he's talking about."

Representative Herbert C. Bonner, who died Sunday in Washington after an extended illness, has served his district and his country well. Perhaps one of the ways in which he served it best was by not talking too much and knowing what he was talking about.

The rare tribute quoted here came from Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn in 1957, when a portrait of Bonner was being placed in his committee room.

Bonner went to Washington nearly 50 years ago to serve as secretary to the Representative who preceded him, Lindsay C. Warren. When Warren resigned in 1940 to become U.S. Comptroller General, Bonner ran for the House seat and held it until his death.

In 1955, Bonner became chairman of the important Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, a committee which has considerable power over the development of this Nation's merchant ships and over the U.S. Coast Guard.

Bonner served a district in the northeastern corner of this State, one laced with sounds and rivers and one with an economy tied in part to the sea. It was inevitable that his interest should run to the Merchant Marine Committee, but it was not inevitable that his vision should stretch to the point of being largely responsible for the development of nuclear-powered cargo ships.

The mark of a Congressman is found in two areas, his service to his constituents and his service to his country, regardless of the special interests of his district.

Some Congressmen achieve long years of service with little but work for the homefolks to their credit. Others make their national marks early and live on that for years.

Herbert Bonner, from a largely rural eastern North Carolina district, served his people well. But he had the happy faculty of being able to serve well in areas far beyond the borders of his district or his State.

The final measure of a Congressman should be in how he has served in both areas. Herbert C. Bonner ranked high in both and, because of that, was a Congressman North Carolina will find it hard to replace.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer]

COURAGE AND IMAGINATION

The death of Congressman Herbert C. Bonner took from his friends and constituents an uncommon man, and a dedicated public servant who left his district, his State, and his Nation better than he found them.

The short, bald little man with the coastal Carolina brogue first went to Capitol Hill in 1925 as congressional secretary to his friend and neighbor Lindsay Warren. Bonner was elected to his own seat in 1940, and his right to represent his district was seriously challenged only twice in the ensuing 25 years.

During his time in Congress, Bonner earned a solid reputation as a man of remarkable personal and political loyalties. He was a respected political ally of such men as Sam Rayburn, John Kennedy, and Lyndon Johnson. And he was a personal friend to countless numbers of street-corner-and-iron-stove constituents back home. He was an astute student of popular moods, and reputed among both colleagues and voters to be a man who never forgot a face, a favor, or a promise.

Out of this complex of personal and political ties, Herbert Bonner managed to forge a legislative record that bears the mark of courage and imagination. He was tireless in his effort to keep in touch with his people and see to their needs. He landed major defense installations during World War II. He took a vigorous interest in farm legislation and authored some of his own. As chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee he was an outspoken advocate of conservation legislation, and was responsible for the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Bonner was no less active at the national level. He was an ardent and hardworking New Dealer during the Roosevelt administration. It was he who authored the legislation that gave the United States its first nuclear-powered ship, the *Savannah*. His unusual mixture of durable loyalty and political gumption earned him valuable friendships in high places, but often left him standing alone among North Carolina's congressional delegation. He campaigned hard for John Kennedy in 1960 and was the first State Democratic leader in 1964 to come out for the Democratic ticket—despite the very real possibility that Goldwater's racial reputation might prove dangerously popular in his eastern North Carolina district.

Herbert Bonner took his work seriously and did it well. It is a measure of his caliber that he will be genuinely missed by congressional colleagues and grassroots constituents, alike, and that he will be remembered by all of them as a man who cared.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Sun, Nov. 9, 1965]

STATE LOSES A FRIEND AND ADVOCATE

In the death of Representative Herbert C. Bonner, whose funeral was held in his hometown of Washington, N.C., today, his beloved First District and the State whose causes he championed in Congress for 25 years have lost an able spokesman and a true friend.

Congressman Bonner, who died at Walter Reed Hospital in the Nation's capital Sunday, was not addicted to dramatic preachments or colorful oratorical explosions on the floor of the House. He went about the task of espousing those things he considered best for his district, his State, and his country in a calm manner but with efficiency and determination.

Many believe that it was Bonner's seemingly calculated avoidance of the spectacular that enabled him to build quietly a tremendous amount of influence and to win the great respect of his fellow lawmakers.

He became chairman of the powerful House Merchant Marine Committee in 1955, and was head of the committee at the time of his death.

Congressman Bonner was almost as familiar with the halls of Congress as he was with the streets of his hometown long before he ascended to the seat vacated by Lindsay C. Warren in 1940. When Warren resigned to become U.S. Comptroller General, Bonner was a "natural" for the seat, for he had served as Warren's secretary for 25 years.

Leaders in the Nation's Capital and in his own State paid tribute to Bonner, the man and the Congressman, after his death.

One of the most descriptive tributes to Representative Bonner during his long career came a good many years ago, however, from the late House Speaker Sam Rayburn, who said:

"Herbert Bonner doesn't talk too much. So when he does, he challenges the attention of the House because he knows what he's talking about."

[From the Elizabeth City (N.C.) Advance]

HERBERT C. BONNER

Herbert C. Bonner for 25 years was, before he was anything else, the Representative from the First District of North Carolina. The coast was native and dear to him. He helped to establish the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, the first of the country's seashore areas to be set aside as a public playground. From military installations to duck-hunting regulations, he kept an alert eye on any legislation or policy that might affect his back-home neighbors.

Yet Mr. Bonner, who died at 74 over the weekend, was a national figure and influential internationally. As chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, he was responsible for the ideas and acts that led to the construction of the world's first nuclear-powered merchantman, the *Savannah*. He argued for an international agency to oversee safety standards of all ships.

Moreover, as a member of the Expenditures in the Executive Department Committee he supervised an investigation of postwar profiteers who bought up U.S. surplus materials in Germany and sold them back to the Government, and led a congressional subcommittee around the world in an examination of waste and inefficiency at American military installations.

His identity with the *Savannah* in a sense was symbolic. For he saw in the nuclear vessel much that was wrong with the merchant marine: maritime labor's excessive wage demands, management's unwillingness to take advantage of automation, and the Government's reluctance to broaden its aid. The strike that followed quickly the *Savannah's* launching struck him as a national disgrace and spurred his efforts to impose Federal arbitration on the maritime industry.

It was geography, not experience, that placed Mr. Bonner on the important committee that he headed for 10 years. His early years were spent not in shipping but as a farmer, a salesman, and secretary to the Congressman he succeeded, Lindsay Warren. Capacity for growth was his great asset. His accomplishments were numerous. And the work he applied to measures and propositions yet unrealized will have a bearing in Congress for sessions yet to come.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Nov. 9, 1965]

REPRESENTATIVE HERBERT C. BONNER

The death of Representative Herbert C. Bonner deprives North Carolina of a knowledgeable and serviceable Congressman. Nor is the loss confined to North Carolina. Congress and the Nation are also losers, for Representative Bonner took a leading role in the accommodation of his State and the South to changing times.

As chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, he exerted a powerful influence. Nationally his major contributions included his chairmanship of the subcommittee investigating sales of war surplus materials and his championing of the U.S. Merchant Marine.

He not only worked tirelessly for its advancement but offered and steered to enactment legislation authorizing the SS *Savannah*, the first nuclear-powered merchant ship. Endless difficulties and technical problems failed to deter Representative Bonner, who ultimately saw his dream come true. The United States had a first in the nuclear age.

Our guess is that Herbert Bonner would wish no higher compliment than to have it said that he was a worthy successor to Representative Lindsay Warren, Sr. He was "Lins" Warren's own choice when the latter was named Comptroller General by F.D.R. in 1940 after a congressional record as "watchdog of the Treasury" which brought national recognition.

It was natural that Herbert Bonner should be the same type of Congressman that his predecessor and mentor was. When Lindsay Warren was elected to Congress in 1924 he took Bonner to Washington with him and there he remained, as secretary and administrative aid—his eyes and ears in the large First District.

During that long interval "Lins" Warren became a household word throughout the district, even to the fringes of the isolated outer banks. No one was more responsible for Representative Warren's closeness to his district than Herbert Bonner. He carried on in the Warren tradition, which he himself helped create and perpetuate. With all his national responsibilities, he looked out for his district; and his district knew it.

On the record Representative Bonner was the foremost moderate among the Tar Heel delegation. He supported Roosevelt's New Deal, stuck with his party leadership through successive administrations and went contrary to his colleagues when he voted for the key Kennedy-backed measure to enlarge the Rules Committee and break the hold of the hand of the past.

The Bonner record speaks for itself. In back-bone politics he went along with Governors Scott and Sanford. Whether Bonner's philosophy, smart politics (or a combination of the two) inspired his moderate stand—he took it: that is what is important. The voters of his district, however many of them may have disagreed with his position at intervals, nevertheless trusted and respected him, and repaid his efforts in their behalf by making him invincible election after election.

Representative Herbert Bonner clearly showed, perhaps above all else, that a Congressman may serve his district's interests intensely but at the same time never lose sight of national perspectives and responsibilities. It took far more than legerdemain to keep the First District constituency and the national administration on his team; yet that's precisely what Herbert Bonner did.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Nov. 10, 1965]

SOLEMN OCCASION: HOME FOLKS, DIGNITARIES JOIN IN PAYING TRIBUTE TO BONNER

(By Roy Parker, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, N.C.—Herbert Bonner's people flocked here Tuesday to pay final tribute to the man who had served them as Congressman for 25 years.

There were dignitaries aplenty as the funeral of the 74-year-old Bonner, who died Sunday after an 8-month bout with a malignancy.

The dignitaries were led by Governor Moore, high-ranking officers of the armed services, and veteran Members of Congress.

There was solemn pomp, too, with a fly-over by a silver plane of the Coast Guard, a slow-moving procession of official automobiles, and music by a muted high school band.

But the dignitaries were often lost in the outpouring of plainer people, the constituents and neighbors who had known Bonner as leader, mentor, and friend.

They came from as far away as the isolated Outer Banks villages of Ocracoke and Rodanthe.

There were people from the small towns, the larger communities, and the farms of the sprawling eastern North Carolina district which Bonner had represented since 1940.

Delegations of as many as 30 local political friends came from such counties as Hertford and Pitt.

There were his neighbors—neighbors of this old riverside town, founded in 1771 by an ancestor, James Bonner.

Members of veterans organizations, including old buddies from World War I days, came in a body.

Schoolchildren by the hundreds lined the route from old St. Peter's Church, where the funeral services were held, to tree-crowned Oakdale Cemetery where—to the strains of "The Mariners Hymn"—Bonner was buried.

Bonner's death had ended a career that had begun in 1925, when he came to Washington as aid to newly elected Congressman Lindsay C. Warren. Bonner succeeded to Warren's seat in 1940.

Warren was among the mourners who listened as Episcopal clergy, including Bishop Thomas Wright of the diocese of east Carolina, intoned the 30-minute service.

Governor Moore, accompanied by former Governors Terry Sanford and Luther Hodges, headed the State dignitary list. They were joined by the council of State, colleagues of the North Carolina congressional delegation, State Democratic Party Chairman Melville Broughton, Jr., more than a score of State legislators, old political warhorses such as "Cousin" Wayland Spruill, of Bertie, and new figures such as former gubernatorial candidate Richardson Preyer, Jr., of Greensboro.

From Washington, congressional friends were led by Representative **ED GARMATZ**, of Maryland, who will succeed Bonner as chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and old timers Representative **MIKE KIRWAN**, of Ohio, and **WILLIAM COLMER**, of Mississippi.

Adm. James Rowland, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, headed a group of high-ranking armed service officers who represented their services. Bonner's committee handled Coast Guard legislation and the Congressman was a champion of the coastal service.

More than 300 mourners stood outside the small brick church as services were conducted by Bishop Wright, the Reverend John Bonner, a nephew of the Congressman, and the Reverend Irwin Hulbert, rector of St. Peters.

To the strains of "Onward Christian Soldiers," the bronze coffin was borne to the hearse by pallbearers who included Bonner's congressional staff and two sons of Warren, plus former staff aids.

Led in motorcade by Governor Moore, the procession moved slowly along 16 blocks of student-lined streets to the cemetery.

The weather was warm and the autumn sun was bright as the Washington High School band first rendered "My Country 'Tis of Thee" and the ministers conducted short graveside rites.

Bonner is survived by his wife, Mrs. Eva Hassell Bonner; by a brother; and by three sisters.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Nov. 8, 1965]

REPRESENTATIVE BONNER, "FATHER" OF NUCLEAR FREIGHTER, DIES—NORTH CAROLINA DEMOCRAT SERVED IN HOUSE 25 YEARS, WAS ACTIVE IN MARITIME AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON.—Representative Herbert C. Bonner of North Carolina, sometimes called the father of the nuclear ship *Savannah*, died Sunday at Walter Reed Army Hospital. He was 74.

Democrat Bonner came to the Capitol 41 years ago as a congressional secretary and went on to a 25-year career as a House Member. For the past 10 years, as chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, he exerted strong influence in maritime affairs.

He underwent surgery in North Carolina several months ago for removal of a cancerous kidney. Then he returned to Washington to vote for various Johnson administration programs. He entered the hospital last month soon after Congress adjourned.

FUNERAL TUESDAY

Funeral services will be conducted Tuesday in St. Peter's Episcopal Church here. Burial will be in Oak Dale Cemetery.

Bonner's death leaves the House lineup at 292 Democrats and 140 Republicans, with 3 vacancies. Representative **EDWARD A. GARMATZ**, of Maryland, is the second-ranking Democrat on the Maritime Committee and thus in line for the chairmanship.

When he was 24, Bonner came to Washington as secretary to Representative Lindsay C. Warren of North Carolina. He won Warren's seat in 1940 after the Congressman resigned to become U.S. Comptroller General. Bonner was reelected to every succeeding Congress.

PUSHED ATOMIC SHIPS

In 1955, the year he became chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, Bonner introduced legislation to install nuclear reactors in existing merchant ships as a means of producing a floating exhibit of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

This plan did not work out but he subsequently led in obtaining legislation which brought about the building of the *Savannah*, the world's first nuclear-powered freighter. He also pioneered the idea of a nuclear-powered icebreaker for the Coast Guard.

Bonner initiated a congressional study of the Panama Canal and its efficiency as a modern interoceanic waterway. A board of consultants, appointed at his suggestion, is carrying on a study looking to modernization of the canal and/or construction of alternate routes.

"The existence of an adequate passageway between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans is vital to our commercial and defense needs," Bonner said after his committee found that the present canal is too small for today's needs.

LED MODERNIZING

He led efforts that updated 30-year-old passenger shipping laws, which, he said, were stifling American-flag passenger shipping and permitting foreign-flag ships to increase cruise service out of American ports.

Bonner concerned himself and his committee with labor-management relations in the maritime industry which he said were at the heart of many maritime problems.

He worked for and got congressional authorization for new superliner, U.S. passenger vessels, although Congress has not appropriated money for them.

Representative Bonner is survived by his widow, three brothers, John and George Bonner of Washington, N.C., and James Bonner of Atlanta, and a sister, Mrs. W. H. Williams of Washington, D.C.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times Picayune, Mar. 8, 1965]

BONNER SUCCUMBS AT 74—CALLED FATHER OF NUCLEAR SHIP

WASHINGTON.—Representative Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, sometimes called the father of the nuclear ship *Savannah*, died Sunday at Walter Reed Army Hospital. He was 74.

Democrat Bonner came to the Capitol 41 years ago as a congressional secretary and went on to a 25-year career as a House Member. For the past 10 years, as chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, he exerted strong influence in maritime affairs.

He enjoyed a reputation also as a poker player's poker player.

He underwent surgery in North Carolina several months ago for removal of a cancerous kidney. Then he returned to Washington to vote for various Johnson administration programs. He entered the hospital last month soon after Congress adjourned.

SERVICES SET

Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m Tuesday in St. Peter's Episcopal Church in Washington, N.C. Burial will be in Oak Dale Cemetery.

Bonner's death leaves the House lineup at 292 Democrats and 140 Republicans, with three vacancies. Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland, is the second-ranking Democrat on the Maritime Committee and thus in line for the chairmanship.

When he was 24, Bonner came to Washington as secretary to Representative Lindsay C. Warren, of North Carolina. He won Warren's seat in 1940 after the Congressman resigned to become U.S. Comptroller General. Bonner was reelected to every succeeding Congress.

In 1955, the year he became chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Bonner introduced legislation to install nuclear reactors in existing merchant ships as a means of producing a floating exhibit of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

PLAN FAILS

This plan did not work out but he subsequently led in obtaining legislation which brought the building of the *Savannah*, the world's first nuclear-powered freighter. He pioneered also in the idea of a nuclear-powered icebreaker for the Coast Guard.

Years ago, a 10-cent-limit poker game started in the Capitol. It grew to a 20-cent game and a regular recreational event for some Congressmen and congressional aids. From this came Bonner's repute as "a mighty good poker player."

He is survived by his widow, three brothers, John and George Bonner of Washington, N.C., and James Bonner, of Atlanta, Ga., and a sister, Mrs. W. H. Williams, of Washington, D.C.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Nov. 8, 1965]

REPRESENTATIVE HERBERT C. BONNER IS DEAD; HEADED MARITIME COMMITTEE—SPONSOR OF NUCLEAR VESSEL—REBUKED ALL HANDS FOR SHIPPING CONFLICTS

WASHINGTON, November 7.—Representative Herbert C. Bonner, Democrat, of North Carolina, who started as a congressional secretary and went on to a 25-year career in the House, died today at Walter Reed Army Hospital. He was 74 years old. For 10 years he had been chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Representative Bonner was operated upon in North Carolina last July for removal of a cancerous kidney. He returned to Washington in time to vote for various Johnson administration programs in the closing days of this year's session of Congress. He entered the hospital soon after the session adjourned.

He is survived by his widow, three brothers, James, John, and George, all of Washington, N.C., and a sister, Mrs. W. H. Williams.

A funeral service will be conducted at 11 a.m. Tuesday in St. Peter's Episcopal Church in Washington, D.C.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS IN CONGRESS

For much of his quarter century in Congress, Mr. Bonner fought to impose some order on what he once called the "Alice in Wonderland" world of the maritime industry.

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House since his first election in 1940, and its chairman since 1955, he observed that maritime labor was demanding excessive wages, management was reluctant to cross the "frontiers" of automation, and the Government was unwilling to broaden Federal aid.

Together, he said they were "hastening the digging of our own grave."

Shortly before his death, Mr. Bonner introduced a measure that would take the Maritime Administration out of the Department of Commerce and reorganize it as an independent agency.

"Our merchant marine is too important a part of our national posture to be allowed to continue to drift in a sea of inaction as it has for the past 4 years," he said.

Ironically, it was partially due to Mr. Bonner's support that the Maritime Administration was put under Commerce in a 1961 reorganization program. He said later that he had come to regret that support.

FIRST NUCLEAR SHIP

Mr. Bonner found a symbol of everything that was wrong with the merchant marine in the problems that plagued the building and launching of the first nuclear powered commercial ship, the *Savannah*.

After years of pleadings and pressure by his committee, construction was authorized in the late 1950's. No sooner was the $50 million vessel finished in 1962 and the crew specially trained, than the men struck, demanding better accommodations, more safety precautions and increased benefits.

"The entire affair," Mr. Bonner said in 1963 after the ship had been launched and made idle again by a walkout, "is simply unbelievable. It is already a national disgrace."

This incident and others convinced him that Federal arbitration in the industry would be necessary.

He also became convinced that an international agency to oversee safety standards on all ships was necessary after the crash of the *Stockholm* and the *Andrea Doria* in 1956. His committee held an investigation of the disaster, which occurred off Nantucket Light outside American territorial waters, claiming 50 lives.

Mr. Bonner entered the Congress with no background in shipping. He was born in Washington, N.C., on May 16, 1891, and attended school in Warrenton, N.C. After graduation, he worked as a salesman and farmer.

In 1924 he became secretary to Lindsay C. Warren, a State assemblyman. When Mr. Warren was elected to Congress the next year, his secretary accompanied him to Washington.

When President Roosevelt appointed Mr. Warren U.S. Comptroller General in 1940, Mr. Bonner won the election to fill out the term—and every election since.

INVESTIGATED PROFITEERS

Over the years, Mr. Bonner served on six committees, including the Un-American Activities Committee from 1945 to 1947. As a member of the Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee he supervised an investigation of postwar profiteers who brought up U.S. surplus materials in Germany and sold them back to the Government at much higher prices.

After that inquiry, Mr. Bonner lead a group of Congressmen on a 41-day around-the-world examination of efficiency and waste at American military installations.

Among his recorded votes were ones in favor of lendlease, Taft-Hartley, rent control and the Marshall plan. He opposed the foreign aid appropriation figure in 1953, 1954 and 1955, flexible farm supports, a permanent Un-American Activities Committee, antipoll tax measures and a voluntary fair employment practices bill.

The first year that Mr. Bonner chaired the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee—1955—he was responsible for beating back amendments to the so-called 50–50 law. The law, favored by shipowners, requires half of all aid cargoes to move in U.S. vessels.

That year he was awarded the American Legion's Distinguished Service Medal for his efforts to strengthen the merchant marine.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginia-Pilot, Nov. 9, 1965]

HERBERT C. BONNER, A GREAT AMERICAN

Herbert Covington Bonner, truly a great American, has answered his last rollcall.

Here was a man who for most of his adult life had been in the public, serving fully and capably his fellow man, knowing full well that when one serves well his fellow man, he has served his God better.

Here was a man who never stopped to ask, "What is politically wise?" Rather he asked only, "What is humanly right?"

Here was a man who lived with his political future in his hands, but with his Nation, his State, and his beloved First Congressional District in his heart.

Here was a man who chose all his life to light a candle rather than to curse the darkness. Along the way he lit many candles, and in this hour of sadness the lights of love, faith, honor, truth, self-respect, and tremendous dedication glow more brightly, as the man lies in stillness, than they ever did in life.

In his days here we all knew he was a wonderful person. In death we realize now how much greatness we have lost. His strength lay in his courage, his courage in his faith, and his faith stood every test and was never found wanting.

Here was a man who spent his happiest hours here with his own "homefolks," as he so proudly and so often said. No heart was bigger; no soul more generous. His entire life was lived with genuine kindness and love for all and with bitterness and malice toward none.

Here was a man set apart in his generation, a man beloved by so many because he loved so many, a man who has so many monuments which he built and which shall stand as long as one of us remains who knew him and loved him.

Herbert Bonner, for us, cannot die. Like a ship sailing out of harbor, we lose sight of the physical being, but what he did for so many and what he meant to so many are matters which death cannot take away nor time dim. The candles he lit in his life have served not only to chase away the darkness, but in greater and more glowing terms, they have kindled the fires of hope, freedom, and progress for so many whose steps otherwise might have faltered as they groped along life's pathway. From his life, we the living, can find new faith, and from his works, we the humble, can find new inspiration.

Herbert Bonner finished his journey on Sunday. What a beautiful thought to feel that he deserved to go away on the day of rest.

Those he loved and those by whom he was beloved are one today in sadness, while at the same time we can look upon his life proudly and say, "There was a man." He does not die; he lives forever in the hearts of those he served, he was a joy to himself and an inspiration to those about him.

Yes, he was a great American because he was first a great human being.

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer, Sept. 28, 1965]

FLOOR OF HOUSE: BONNER GETS OVATION

(By Roy Parker, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Representative Herbert Bonner returned to the House floor Monday and got a standing ovation from his colleagues.

The 74-year-old First District Congressman had been sidelined since mid-March by illness. He underwent an operation for a cancerous kidney more than 2 months ago.

Bonner responded with a wave of his hand when Democratic Majority Leader CARL ALBERT interrupted debate on the District of Columbia Home Rule bill to welcome Bonner back.

ALBERT called Bonner a "great warrior * * who has been waging a courageous battle against illness."

More than 200 Members, Democrat and Republican, rose to applaud ALBERT'S announcement.

Representative ABRAHAM MULTER of New York, who was speaking for the Home Rule bill, had just given the Jewish New Year greeting when ALBERT interrupted. MULTER said the greeting especially applied to Bonner. The greeting wished "a good year, health, prosperity, and peace."

Bonner has been back in Washington for about 3 weeks, gradually breaking into office work. However, he had not gone to the House floor until Monday.

Bonner spent several hours on the floor and in the House cloakroom during his first day back in the Capitol.

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer]

MANUSCRIPTS OF BONNER AT UNC LIBRARY

Letters from five U.S. Presidents and the inventor of Mickey Mouse are among the thousands of manuscripts in the Herbert Bonner collection recently donated to the University of North Carolina Library.

Bonner, North Carolina Congressman from District 1 who died last month began contributing his collection of letters, speeches, records, and other materials pertaining to his political career early last year and left the remainder of the items in his will to the southern historical manuscript collection at UNC.

Now filling some 24 filing cabinets and 75 boxes, the Bonner collection is being classified and arranged in chronological order so that it will be accessible to anyone interested in learning more about the Congressman or related areas.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 8, 1965]

REPRESENTATIVE H. C. BONNER, OF NORTH CAROLINA, DIES; CALLED FATHER OF NUCLEAR SHIP

Representative Herbert C. Bonner, Democrat, of North Carolina, in Congress 25 years, died at Walter Reed Army Hospital yesterday after a prolonged illness. Representative Bonner, 74, had undergone surgery in July to remove a cancerous kidney.

Sometimes called the father of the nuclear ship *Savannah,* Representative Bonner had been chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee for 10 years. In 1955 he sponsored legislation that authorized construction of the *Savannah,* the world's first nuclear-powered freighter.

An ardent proponent of modernizing the U.S. merchant fleet, Representative Bonner once wrote that "the inability of domestic shipping to revive or even survive with traditional means of cargo handling and traditional ships is painfully evident."

He called on Congress to find ways to get "new ideas and new life into water transportation."

Representative Bonner's interest in maritime affairs came naturally. His district spanned Pamlico Sound and the Outer Banks in North Carolina, and in the words of a friend, he "loved the water and was quite a fisherman." He worked with pleasure-boating associations to promote water safety among small-boat owners.

Born in Washington, N.C., and educated there, Mr. Bonner served overseas as a sergeant in the Army during World War I. He worked as a farmer and a salesman before coming to Washington 50 years ago as secretary to Representative Lindsay C. Warren, Democrat, of North Carolina.

He was elected to Congress in 1940 when Warren retired to become U.S. Comptroller General, and has been reelected each succeeding term.

The second ranking member of the North Carolina delegation behind senior Representative HAROLD COOLEY, Mr. Bonner was soft spoken, retiring, and popular with his colleagues. When he returned to the House after a long convalescence following his operation last summer he was greeted by a burst of applause from his fellow lawmakers.

Mr. Bonner initiated a congressional study of the efficiency of the Panama Canal as a modern interocean waterway. A board of consultants, appointed at his suggestion, is carrying on a study looking to modernization of the canal and construction of alternate routes.

When in Washington Mr. Bonner lived at 2601 Woodley Place NW. He is survived by his wife, Eva H.; three brothers, John and George, of Washington, N.C., and James, of Atlanta, and a sister, Mrs. W. H. Williams, also of Washington, D.C.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 8, 1965]

HERBERT C. BONNER DIES; 25 YEARS IN CONGRESS

Representative Herbert C. Bonner, Democrat, of North Carolina, a Member of the House for nearly 25 years and chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, died yesterday at Walter Reed Hospital. He was 74.

Bonner had been gravely ill since Thursday. He underwent an operation last summer for the removal of a cancerous kidney, but recovered enough to be able to attend Congress regularly this past session.

A native of Washington, N.C., he had maintained a home there and at 2601 Woodley Place NW. here.

Bonner, a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee since joining Congress, and chairman the past 8 years, introduced legislation that created the first nuclear merchant ship, the *Savannah.*

INVESTIGATED SINKING

He also headed a subcommittee that investigated the sinking of the Italian liner *Andrea Doria* in 1956.

In the early 1950's Bonner headed a House expenditures subcommittee that investigated military waste for 2 years. The subcommittee contended that hundreds of millions of dollars could be saved through a better system of buying supplies used by all services.

The group's findings eventually were released in a report bearing Bonner's name.

After graduation from Graham's Academy in North Carolina, Bonner joined the George B. Helms Tobacco Co. as a salesman. From 1917 to 1918 he served overseas as a member of the Army's 322d Infantry.

About 1921, Bonner bought a tobacco and snuff company in his hometown and operated it until he came to Washington as an administrative assistant to Representative Lindsay C. Warren, Democrat, of North Carolina.

When Warren was named Comptroller General of the United States, Bonner ran for the congressional seat and was elected in 1940.

Since then, he had served on the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Accounts Committee, the Government Operations Committee, and as chairman of the Committee on the Election of Presidents, Vice Presidents, and Members of Congress.

While a member of the latter committee, whose functions have since been taken over by the Judiciary Committee, the bill permitting servicemen serving overseas to vote was passed.

Bonner was among those who led efforts to establish the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, the first of the seashore areas set aside as a public playground.

He initiated a congressional study of the Panama Canal and its efficiency as a modern interoceanic waterway. A board of consultants, appointed at his suggestion, is carrying on a study looking to modernization of the canal and/or construction of alternate routes.

He led efforts that brought up to date 30-year-old passenger-shipping laws, which, he said, were stifling American-flag passenger shipping and permitting foreign-flag ships to increase cruise service out of American ports.

Bonner concerned himself and his committee with labor-management relations in the maritime industry, which he said were at the heart of many maritime problems.

He directed two extensive investigations in this field and talked with both sides in longshoremen's strikes on the east and west coasts.

He worked for and got congressional authorization for new superliner U.S. passenger vessels, although Congress has not appropriated money for them.

GARMATZ IN LINE

Bonner's death leaves the House lineup at 292 Democrats and 140 Republicans, with 3 vacancies. Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ of Maryland is the second-ranking Democrat on the Maritime Committee and thus is in line for the chairmanship.

When Bonner's portrait was hung in his committee room, the late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, Democrat, of Texas, said:

"Herbert Bonner doesn't talk too much. So when he does, he challenges the attention of the House because he knows what he's talking about."

Bonner was a member of the Elks, the Masons, the Shriners and the Army-Navy Country Club.

He leaves his wife, Eva H. of the Woodley Place home; three brothers, George and John, both of Washington, N.C., and James, of Atlanta, Ga.; a sister, Mrs. W. H. Williams, of Washington, D.C., and two step-grandchildren.

Services and burial will take place in Washington, N.C.

DELEGATION CHOSEN

House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK today announced the names of a delegation which will represent Congress at the funeral. Included were members of the North Carolina congressional delegation and of the House Merchant Marine Committee.

Others designated were Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, and Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi, longtime friends of the Congressman, and Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland. GARMATZ, who is expected to succeed Bonner as committee chairman, is flying back from Tokyo to join the funeral delegation.

Members of Bonner's office and committee staff also will attend the funeral.

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, Nov. 8, 1965]

REPRESENTATIVE BONNER DIES AT 74

WASHINGTON.—Representative Herbert C. Bonner, Democrat, North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, died Sunday. He was 74.

Bonner died at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, where he had undergone surgery last July and returned October 26.

The Congressman was second in North Carolina seniority only to Representative HAROLD COOLEY. He was elected to the House November 5, 1940, to succeed Lindsay C. Warren, whose aid he had been for 16 years.

Warren left Congress to become U.S. Comptroller General.

The slightly built North Carolinian was a popular figure among his colleagues, and was warmly applauded near the end of congressional session after appearing on the floor following a long absence because of his illness.

Bonner was born at Washington, N.C., May 16, 1891. In private life he worked as a farmer and salesman. He served overseas during World War I as a sergeant and was married to the former Eva Hassell Hackney, also of Washington, N.C.

An aid said Mrs. Bonner had just left the hospital room when Bonner died.

Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland, is the next ranking member of the committee Bonner headed.

Bonner's death brought to three the number of House Members who have died since the beginning of the 89th Congress. The others were Representatives T. A. Thompson, Democrat, of Louisiana, and Clarence Brown, Republican, of Ohio.

Bonner had the cancerous left kidney removed at Baptist Hospital in Winston-Salem, N.C., July 21. Doctors said then the operation was "highly successful" and said it appeared the cancer was curtailed.

Bonner had been ill more than 4 months before the operation. He was ordered to "take it easy" for several months after his operation.

He was reelected to Congress 12 times after succeeding Warren.

He was the son of Herbert M. and Hannah Hare Bonner. He attended Washington public schools and Graham's Academy in Warrenton.

Bonner came to Washington in 1924 as Warren's secretary. When Warren resigned, he was named to the post.

He represented 15 counties in the coastal plain and along North Carolina's coast. He was a prime mover in the construction of the bridge over Oregon Inlet on North Carolina's Outer Banks and the bridge was named for him.

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, Nov. 8, 1965]

AREA CONGRESSMEN JOIN IN MOURNING DEATH OF BONNER

Two southeastern North Carolina Representatives—ALTON LENNON, of Wilmington, and DAVID N. HENDERSON, of Wallace—joined the State and Nation in mourning the death of Representative Herbert C. Bonner, Democrat, of North Carolina, who died at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington Sunday.

LENNON, who represents the Seventh District and is a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which Bonner headed, said:

"North Carolina has lost a very distinguished, able, and dedicated public servant who will be greatly missed by his colleagues in Congress, the people of his district, and many others throughout North Carolina and the Nation.

"I had the pleasure of knowing him for many years, of serving in Congress with him and of serving on the same committee with him for 9 years. We shall all miss him."

HENDERSON, Third District Representative, said, "I was greatly shocked to lose a good personal friend and a great American. The State of North Carolina has truly lost a distinguished public servant, and I am sure the entire congressional delegation and the people of the State are sad with his passing.

"I'd like to extend my sympathy to the people of the First District, especially the Bonner family."

HENDERSON, who has served in Congress 5 years, said that when he first went to Washington, Representative Bonner "certainly was kind and considerate of a young Member. I never could say how much he really did mean to me."

Representative and Mrs. Lennon and Representative and Mrs. Henderson plan to attend funeral services for Representative Bonner in Washington, N.C., Tuesday.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Nov. 8, 1965]

TAR HEEL LEADERS PRAISE BONNER

RALEIGH.—Gov. Dan Moore said yesterday that in the death of U.S. Representative Herbert C. Bonner the State has "lost one of the outstanding men of our time."

The Governor ordered all State flags flown at half staff in honor of the veteran Congressman.

"Herbert Bonner was a Congresman of the highest order," Moore added. "He served not only the people of his 1st District but all Americans as well with distinction and honor. His deeds of public service will cause him to be remembered on through history."

"When I visited him at the hospital in Winston-Salem a few weeks ago, I was impressed with his dedication to duty," Moore stated. "Though weakened by his long illness, he was determined to return to Washington. Congress was near adjournment and there were matters that needed his attention. In spite of his condition, he returned to work and finished the job he had begun.

"This was characteristic of Herbert Bonner," Moore said. "This was one reason his people kept him in the House of Representatives for 25 years. His abilities there earned for him the respect of his fellow representatives and of all North Carolinians. His accomplishments have helped to make ours a better country.

"All North Carolinians mourn his loss and honor his memory," Moore concluded. "Our thoughts and prayers are with Mrs. Bonner and we share her feeling of loss."

Associate Justice E. B. Denny of the State supreme court said Bonner was "an outstanding man and an outstanding Congressman. He had an excellent record in Congress and he will be difficult to replace."

State Treasurer Edwin Gill said, "I've lost a very close friend of a lifetime. I think Mr. Bonner was a fine representative of his district and of North Carolina. We've suffered a great loss in his passing."

J. M. Broughton, Jr., of Raleigh, chairman of the State Democratic executive committee, expressed "great sorrow over the passing of Congressman Bonner. He served his district, State, Nation, and party for many years and will be sorely missed."

House Speaker H. P. (Pat) Taylor, of Wadesboro, said, "I regret very much to hear of his death. He contributed many years of valuable service to his State and to his country."

Dr. Charles F. Carroll, State superintendent of public instruction, said, "It's a profound loss not only to the people of his district but to the State of North Carolina and the Nation. I consider him one of the most solid men to have represented North Carolina in the Congress at any time."

Attorney General Wade Bruton said, "We've lost a mighty good man. I thought he was a mighty fine Congressman."

James A. Graham, commissioner of agriculture, said Bonner's death was "a loss to North Carolina's agriculture, particularly to the northeastern section because he did so much for the potato farmer."

Representative RALPH J. SCOTT, of the Fifth District said from his home at Danbury that Bonner "was a personal friend of mine and I regretted very much to learn of his death."

SCOTT said he has been "very closely associated with him for the past 10 years. I have had the opportunity to observe him in his work and can sincerely say that he was one of the more valuable Members of the House.

"He had rendered to his State and country very valuable services over a long period of time," SCOTT said.

Representative HORACE KORNEGAY, of the Sixth District, reached at his home in Greensboro, said "Bonner was not only a close personal friend of mine, but one of the truly outstanding Members of the Congress.

"He served his district, State and Nation for some 41 years in Washington in one capacity or another," KORNEGAY said. "Certainly his presence will be greatly missed by all of us."

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Nov. 8, 1965]

LOYAL TO DEMOCRATS: BONNER RESPECTED IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Lloyd Preslar)

WASHINGTON.—Representative Herbert Bonner, who died yesterday at 74, was known here as a man who looked after the interests of his constituents.

Since 1941 Bonner had represented North Carolina's First District in the House. He secured many Federal projects for the district.

Bonner's loyalty to the Democratic Party was unquestioned. He supported the programs of Democratic administrations more often than any other member of the North Carolina delegation, except perhaps Representative HAROLD COOLEY of the State's Fourth District.

A White House aid, talking about Bonner recently, described him as a man who "leads his district rather than follows it."

USED JUDGMENT

Some Members of the House, the official said, "panic every time they get three or four letters from home about a piece of legislation. Herbert Bonner doesn't do that. He makes his judgment and worries about the political consequences later."

The First District includes several counties on the northeastern part of the North Carolina coast.

Bonner, the White House assistant said, "realizes that he's got an underprivileged district and that he can't let the people who own it run the show."

WAS ABSENT

Plagued by his illness since early spring, Bonner was absent from the House during most of this year's congressional session. But in earlier years he and COOLEY often could be counted on to support Democratic Presidents when other members of the State delegation were voting against them.

Bonner was able to get Federal money for his district because of his ties to his party, his craftiness as a legislator and politician, his position as chairman of a House committee and his experience and seniority in Washington.

PART OF LEADERSHIP

For 16 years before his election to the House, Bonner was administrative assistant to former Representative Lindsay Warren. When Warren resigned in 1940 to become

Comptroller General of the United States, Bonner was elected to Warren's seat.

As chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Bonner had been part of the Democratic leadership of the House. The committee is not among the most important in the House, but the committee's work is important to the First District. Bonner's sometimes gruff manner and his devotion to his party made him a vigorous partisan in political disputes. He was known for his outspoken speeches at party rallies.

But a Republican member of Bonner's committee has described him nevertheless as "a fair and decent man—a real gentleman," whether he was questioning a witness before the committee or dealing with Republican or Democratic colleagues.

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, Nov. 9, 1965]

Representative Herbert C. Bonner

The death of Representative Herbert C. Bonner is a loss to the Nation and his State of an able and dedicated man.

Ranking second in seniority in the State's 11-member delegation, he represented well the northeastern part of North Carolina and about a third of its outer shoreline. The geography of his district recommended him in the early years of his career in the House to a place on its Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Eventually he became its chairman and in fulfilling the important responsibilities and duties, he extended his service in this particular field to the Nation as a whole.

While Mr. Bonner was considered more liberal than most of his North Carolina colleagues, this did not affect his personal popularity among them. He was also respected and liked by many other Members of the House. The esteem with which he was held was evident when he was greeted with warm applause, near the end of the congressional session, after appearing on the floor following a long absence because of his illness.

His experience in Washington began in 1924 when he went there as secretary to Representative Lindsay C. Warren, of the First District. Mr. Bonner served as his aid for 16 years until Mr. Warren left Congress to become Comptroller General. Afterward, he was elected to the House 12 times, a tribute not only to his personal popularity but practical testimony to his efficiency in representing his large district.

The people of the First District, other North Carolinians and the Nation will miss Representative Bonner, a distinguished public servant.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Nov. 9, 1965]

Quiet but Effective

Herbert Bonner was a quiet, undramatic sort of Congressman. But he had strong loyalties, was firm in his convictions, and was vigilant in advancing the interests of his district. A conservative in the deeper sense, he was not afraid to embrace new ideas and support legislation designed to meet the changing times.

Mr. Bonner, from all accounts, was an effective chairman of the House Maritime and Fisheries Committee. In that role, he did much to promote the use of nuclear power in the development of our maritime fleet. His influence also helped to bring about the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park.

Former Gov. Terry Sanford once called Mr. Bonner "my Congressman." This statement probably reflects the sentiment of most North Carolina people who knew him well. Until he fell ill several months ago, he was one of our hardest working Representatives. The State and the Nation owe him much.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Nov. 9, 1966]

Bonner's Funeral Is Today

Washington, N.C.—Representative Herbert C. Bonner, who served North Carolina in the U.S. House of Representatives for 25 years, will be buried this morning in this Tar Heel town where he grew up.

The 74-year-old chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee died Sunday in Walter Reed Army Hospital. He had a cancerous kidney removed in July at Baptist Hospital, Winston-Salem.

Speaker John W. McCormack, Democrat of Massachusetts, announced yesterday the delegation to represent Congress at the funeral.

The group includes North Carolina Members of Congress and members of the House committee on which Bonner served as chairman.

LONGTIME FRIENDS

Also designated were Representative Michael J. Kirwan, Democrat of Ohio, and Representative William M. Colmer, Democrat of Mississippi, longtime friends of Bonner.

Representative Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat of Maryland, who is expected to succeed Bonner, as committee chairman, is flying back from Tokyo and expects to arrive in time to join the funeral delegation.

The members of Bonner's office and committee staffs also will be in Washington for the final rites.

The funeral will be at 11 a.m. at St. Peters Episcopal Church.

TO CONDUCT SERVICE

The Reverend John Bonner, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Chattanooga, Tenn., and a nephew of the Congressman, will assist the Reverend Irwin Hulbert, Jr., of St. Peters and the Right Reverend Thomas H. Wright, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of eastern North Carolina, in conducting the services.

Bonner will be buried in Oakland Cemetery.

Pallbearers for the services will be men who are either now or have been personal aids of the Congressman.

Flags flew at half staff in North Carolina yesterday on orders of Gov. Dan Moore.

The Governor said North Carolina has "lost one of the outstanding men of our time."

North Carolina Senator B. Everett Jordan is expected to attend the funeral.

Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., Democrat, of North Carolina, is not expected to be back in the country in time for the services. Ervin, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, is inspecting military bases in Europe.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Sentinel, Nov. 8, 1965]

Funeral for Bonner Is Tuesday

Washington, N.C.—Representative Herbert C. Bonner, Democrat, of North Carolina, was a quiet man who pushed the idea that the world's first nuclear merchant ship should fly the American flag.

Bonner, 74, chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and sometimes called the father of the nuclear ship *Savannah*, died in Walter Reed Army Hospital Sunday. He had a cancerous kidney removed in July.

The Congressman's body is being returned to this eastern North Carolina town on the banks of the Pamlico River where he grew up. The funeral will be Tuesday at 11 a.m. in St. Peter's Episcopal Church. Burial will be in Oak Dale Cemetery.

Bonner became chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee in 1955 and introduced legislation to install nuclear reactors in existing merchant ships.

This plan never materialized, but he later led the way in obtaining congressional approval of the *Savannah*. He also pioneered with the idea of a nuclear-powered Coast Guard icebreaker.

NEW LINEUP

Bonner's death leaves the House lineup at 292 Democrats and 140 Republicans, with 3 vacancies. Representative Edward A. Garmatz, of Maryland, is the second-ranking Democrat on the Merchant Marine Committee and in line for the chairmanship.

Bonner went to Washington 50 years ago as secretary to Representative Lindsay C. Warren, of North Carolina. Before that he served as an Army sergeant overseas during World War I and was a traveling salesman.

He won Warren's First District seat in 1940 when Warren resigned to become U.S. Comptroller General. Bonner was reelected to every succeeding Congress.

He was popular with Republicans and Democrats and was noted as a "poker player's poker player."

Bonner had his left kidney removed in July at North Carolina Baptist Hospital in Winston-Salem. He was released in time to return to the Capital to vote for several Johnson administration programs.

Bonner is survived by his widow, three brothers, John and George, of Washington, N.C., and James Bonner, of Atlanta, Ga., and a sister, Mrs. W. H. Williams, of Washington, D.C.

I WAS A DROPOUT AND LOOK AT ME NOW

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, sometimes the drama of the progress of our Nation is making in securing more equal opportunities is lost in the tangle of statistical reports. That is why I would like to insert in the Record the story of Mike Balzano who once was a dropout and this year will graduate from the University of Bridgeport, magna cum laude. It was written by a fine reporter, Ethel Beckwith, and published in the Connecticut Sunday Herald, February 27, 1966.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the article just referred to, by Ethel Beckwith.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Fairfield (Conn.) Sunday Herald, Feb. 27, 1966]

Mike Balzano Tells Teens: "I Was a Dropout and Look at Me Now"

(By Ethel Beckwith)

I was a dropout. I lost 5 years of my life. And look at me now.

With these words Michael Balzano could begin his autobiography—a rescue story if ever there was one.

Out of the New Haven slums will come History Professor Balzano, in a few more years. Today he is an all-A senior at the University of Bridgeport. In addition he is teaching.

As spectacular as a miracle cure is the fact that Balzano goes back these nights to his home area to lecture at the New Haven Skill Center. He is talking to kids like himself, dropouts.

"I don't know why I dropped out of Wilbur Cross High School in 1952. For that matter, I don't know why I went in.

"Life became one large blob. I couldn't make contact, didn't belong." Balzano says.

"Nothing around the neighborhood stimulated me.

"But one thing I couldn't do was depend on my parents for support. I got a job with the sanitation department in New Haven—for 2½ years I was up at 4 a.m. picking up garbage. Yes, it wasn't very elegant, but it paid."

GROUND LENSES

At 20 he became an apprentice lens grinder at American Optical in New Haven. Here he began to meet intelligent and interested people. They included Dr. Stanley Newcomb and Miss Evelyn Casey, then English professor at the University of Bridgeport. While they had their glasses fixed, it was Michael Balzano who was given the gift of light.

He went back to Wilbur Cross evenings, received his diploma, and in the same year passed the State optician exam.

By then he wanted college. Entering the University of Bridgeport, his next stroke of luck was his meeting with Philip Stern, astronomer who had built the planetarium on Park Avenue. The whole Stern family adopted him, took him on trips, enjoyed his company.

"I am becoming a somebody," Balzano realized. He had come to Bridgeport with savings of $9,000. He had his optical trade, something he learned by keeping an eye on his superiors.

GOT SCHOLARSHIP

Through Stern, astronomy lecturer on the University of Bridgeport faculty, and Dr. Al Wolff, dean of student personnel, Balzano was awarded a second year scholarship at the University of Bridgeport. Then Stern appointed him special lecturer at the planetarium, and when he was away setting up planetariums around the country or writing, he turned over his star-studded mantle to Balzano who subs in Stern's classes from 4 to 10:45 p.m.

All this Balzano loved. For another helping, he received the full tuition Dana scholarship for his senior year. If luck holds out to June, this dropout will be graduated magna cum laude.

He plans to go to Georgetown University, to be a college history professor. This Balzano tells the boys at the skill center and no one could know better than the fugitive from the Oak Street slum how to give them the message.

The Oak Street nobody actually is the first man able to hold their attention. He reminds them that while Cassius Clay says, "I roll with the punches," Balzano rolled with the barrels—a dirty, rugged job—and he tells them that only because he was peculiarly lucky did he make up for 5 lost years.

Balzano's honors include prizes in speech and Spanish. He is president of the Bridgeport chapter of the National History Honor Society, Phi Alpha Theta. This boy keeps right on rolling.

ADDITION OF VITAMIN A AND VITAMIN D TO NONFAT DRY MILK

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I have introduced a bill (S. 2200) to allow the addition of vitamin A and vitamin D to nonfat dry milk. These important vitamins are fat soluble and removed with the cream when whole milk is processed into nonfat dry milk. They cannot be restored to dry milk for domestic consumption because the standard of identity for that item, established by Congress, made no provision for vitamin additives.

The irony of the situation is that while our own American children and grownups are given vitamin-deficient dry milk, American nonfat dry milk, vitamin fortified, is going to needy children in 114 other countries.

Mr. President, this bill was reviewed by the American Medical Association. I ask unanimous consent that their letter of endorsement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., March 8, 1966.

The Honorable ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RIBICOFF: Mr. John Pompelli of our Washington staff has suggested that you would be interested in the action taken by the American Medical Association's board of trustees with respect to Senate bill 2200, 89th Congress.

S. 2200 was considered by the AMA Council on Legislative Activities which reviewed comments received from the AMA Council on Foods and Nutrition supporting the fortification of nonfat dry milk. Noting that the legislation is permissive and would still allow consumers who wish to use a nonfortified product to obtain it, the council recommended to the board of trustees that the bill be supported by the association. This position was adopted by the AMA board of trustees.

Sincerely,

F. J. L. BLASINGAME, M.D.

THE 35TH POLARIS NUCLEAR SUBMARINE—U.S.S. "JAMES K. POLK"

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from Adm. H. G. Rickover, at sea in the North Atlantic, advising of the successful completion of the first sea trials of the 35th Polaris nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *James K. Polk.*

This is another notable accomplishment in the life of a truly remarkable American. In his letter, Admiral Rickover took the time to write a most interesting historical sketch of the ship's namesake, President James K. Polk.

So clearly and vividly does this sketch capture the former President—and the reader—that I wish to share it with my colleagues by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Admiral Rickover's letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT SEA, NORTH ATLANTIC,
March 14, 1966.

The Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our 35th Polaris nuclear submarine. The U.S.S. *James K. Polk* was built by the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn. We also have in operation 22 attack type nuclear submarines, making a total of 57.

This ship is named for James K. Polk (1795–1849), ablest President between Jackson and Lincoln, and one of the few who rose from log cabin to White House. Born in North Carolina, the eldest of 10 children of a plain farmer, Polk grew to manhood in Duck River, Tenn., a rude frontier settlement on the edge of the wilderness. His ancestors were Scottish Covenanters who migrated to Ireland early in the 17th century and to America a hundred years later, settling first in Maryland and later moving westward in search of a freer and better life. The future President's family found in Tennessee the hoped-for land of promise where unremitting toil was all that was needed to attain prosperity and an honored place in the community. Young Polk worked long hours on the farm and, since there were no schools, was taught the three R's by his parents. He was good at mathematics and liked to read. When he reached 17, his father was able to grant him his wish for an education leading to a professional career.

Though never in robust health, Polk was all his life a prodigious worker. He accomplished much because he had enormous drive and great talent for systematic and sustained mental labor. It took him but 3 years of formal instruction to make up his educational deficiencies. At 20, he was admitted to the University of North Carolina with sophomore standing, graduating with first honors in mathematics and classics. He read law and, before he was 26, had become one of the leading practitioners in Columbia, Tenn., as well as a promising candidate for public office.

After one term in the State legislature, he entered the U.S. House of Representatives where he served from 1825 to 1839, the last 4 years as Speaker and leader of the Jacksonian forces. Polk would have preferred to remain in Congress but was drafted by his party to run for Governor of Tennessee, to save the State for the party. Elected in 1839, he lost in 1841 and 1843—the only setbacks in an otherwise uniformly successful career. In those days, rival candidates used to travel the country together, putting up at the same inns, often sleeping in the same bed, taking turns addressing the same meetings to which voters flocked from distant parts, as much for entertainment as for political discussion. Polk ran on his record as Governor. He had given his State an excellent administration, rescued it from near bankruptcy, and initiated significant reforms. His rival, semiliterate but shrewd, never discussed issues but took pains to amuse the audience. He won, it seems, chiefly because he was the better storyteller.

Polk was being considered for Vice President when the Texas and Oregon issues burst upon the country causing a deadlock that could be broken only by nominating Polk as a compromise candidate for President. The 1844 election was one of the most hotly contested the Nation had ever experienced. The issues between Democrats and Whigs were sharply drawn, feelings ran high, the country was almost evenly divided. Odd as it seems today, the candidates for the Presidency did not campaign actively since it was then considered unseemly to give the appearance of seeking this high office. Polk won with 170 electoral votes to 105 for Clay. Though at 49 he was the youngest President, he was committed to a more ambitious, more precisely stated administration program than any of his predecessors. All of it was carried out in the single term to which he had limited himself voluntarily when accepting the nomination of his party.

In the domestic field, Polk's achievements proved ephemeral, but his views, consistently Jacksonian, still have historic interest. He was a strict constitutionalist because he was certain this alone could preserve the Union. He opposed the protective tariff because he deemed it "unjust to tax the labor of one class of society to support and fatten another." He feared that Federal funds for internal improvements would destroy State sovereignty. It was better "to live as free men in a trackless wilderness that ride as vessels down a broad highway." He wanted Federal funds kept separate from the private banking system to prevent their being used for credit expansion and cheap money. The Federal Government, he thought, should be brought back to "what it was intended to be, a plain economical Government." In the foreign field, Polk's success was both spectacular and of enduring importance to the Nation. An ardent expansionist, as was natural given his pioneer background, Polk added more territory to the United States than any previous President except Jefferson.

He settled the 40-year-old northwest boundary dispute by skillful diplomacy and admirable nerve in face of a possible two-front war, inducing Britain to relinquish her long-standing demand for a boundary along the Columbia River, which would have cost us the State of Washington, in exchange for abandonment of our claim to what is now British Columbia. On the basis of discovery and settlement, this was the most we could justifiably ask or, for that matter, realistically hope to obtain without resorting to war. Our southwest boundary was moved to its present location as a result of Polk's able management of the Mexican War and the ensuing peace negotiations. Mexico was generously compensated for the loss of California and New Mexico though not of Texas which had been lost 10 years earlier in exactly the same way as Mexico herself had been lost to Spain—by a successful indigenous revolt. We paid Mexico considerably more per acre than Napoleon had charged us for the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. When Polk left office, the United States stretched from "sea to shining sea."

Polk stood out among leading figures of his day in his unfaltering devotion to the national interest, uninfluenced by personal or parochial considerations, yet most 19th century historians accused him of precipitating the Mexican-American War in the interest of slavery expansion. This verdict has since been reversed in consequence of the publication early in this century of relevant official documents from the archives of Texas, Mexico, and Great Britain, which made it possible to see the issue more accurately. When Polk took office, the annexation of Texas was already an accomplished fact. Having warned us she would consider this "equivalent to a declaration of war," Mexico promptly severed diplomatic relations. Both sides moved troops to the Mexican-Texas border. Unfortunately, the two countries disagreed as to whether the Rio Grande or the Nueces constituted the boundary. It was in the disputed territory between these rivers that hostilities broke out spontaneously and a war that neither country really wanted began.

That Polk was able to execute his entire domestic and foreign program is the more remarkable in that he was neither a charismatic leader identified with some great popular movement, nor a politician adept at manipulating people and events. How he was able to resolve the great issues pressing upon him can best be understood by reading the diary he kept while in office.

The President emerges from its pages an able and astute administrator who approached every problem with a logical mind and a keen sense of political realities, who gained his objectives by stating them with precision and justifying them with well-reasoned argument. One cannot but feel that he understood the issues he dealt with better than most of his experts, whether they involved war strategy, military supply, diplomatic negotiations or how to get Congressional approval for his measures when the nominally dominant Democrats were so bent by faction that every Executive request was attacked by at least one element in his party, enthusiastically supported by the Whigs.

Written for personal use, as a reminder of the official happenings crowding his overfull days, the diary gives an intimate glimpse into the Executive Office during a transitional period in our history; a time when, as a result of war, technological change, and the physical growth of the country, certain aspects of the democratic process, certain political habits had become outmoded, but the American people were not yet prepared to relinquish them. Take the fine old tradition that every citizen has access to the President. It had become an intolerable burden, for the business of the Nation was now so large it demanded all a President's time and energy. Polk found that "no President who performs his duty faithfully and conscientiously can have any leisure." He rarely took even a brief vacation and often had to toil far into the night to complete official tasks for which he found no time during the day, so besieged was he with people wanting to shake his hand or pay their respects, and with officeseekers and patronage-soliciting politicians who, as he wryly put it, seemed to feel that providing jobs was "the chief end of Government."

Or take the persistence of divisive geographic and ideological interests which, in Polk's time, tended to take precedence over the national interest. So much so that politicians in all sections of the country indulged in the mischief of threatening to break up the Union whenever national action went against their parochial interests. The well-publicized quarrels in the Senate, which were caused by intrusion of these divisive factors into every foreign policy issue, were a serious handicap to Polk when he was engaged in difficult negotiations with Britain over Oregon, or sought by diplomatic means to end the war with Mexico. The American people and their leaders had not yet accepted the maxim we now take for granted that "politics end at the water's edge."

One cannot read Polk's diary without warming to this thoughtful man of uncompromising integrity whose political philosophy, as he once said, "was not of yesterday," but "formed upon mature consideration," and adhered to whether it was expedient at the moment or not. Having achieved the objectives of his administration, he refused renomination and retired to private life. He died 3 months after leaving the White House.

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

INTERNATIONAL DEMOLAY WEEK—MARCH 13–20

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this year, International DeMolay Week was observed March 13, through March 20, 1966. Throughout the year, this well-known, character-building organization is dedicated to numerous projects that benefit both the community and its young men.

Through association with the DeMolay, many of our Nation's youth receive a guiding influence that serves to instill within them the desire for realizing greater goals and achievements. Such undertakings deserve recognition. Therefore, it is indeed a pleasure to salute them on this 47th anniversary of their founding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a more detailed statement concerning the outstanding work of the DeMolay printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"A nation's greatest asset is its youth." This is an often-coined statement that becomes truer every day when it is realized that in just a couple of years half of all the people in the United States will be under the age of 25. One of the greatest youth organizations we have in the country today is the Order of DeMolay.

DeMolay is a character-building organisation for young men 14 to 21 and during the week of March 13–20 will be celebrating its 47th anniversary. Since the organization's founding on March 18, 1919, by Frank S. Land and 9 teenage boys, the organization has initiated nearly 3 million young men and dedicated them to better citizenship.

The purpose of the organization is well stated in one of the public ceremonies of the youth movement: "We are banded together for mutual improvement, to help each other live clean, manly, upright, patriotic lives which will be a credit to our friends and parents, and which will merit the commendation of all good men."

Certainly these laudible principles of operation merit the commendation of the leaders of our government also.

The organization was named for Jacques DeMolay, the last grand master of the Knights Templars, who was burned at the stake by King Phillip of France on March 18, 1314, as a martyr to loyalty and toleration.

Today, members of DeMolay strive to carry on the fine ideals for which DeMolay gave his life—loyalty and service to God and fellow men.

Today there are more than 2,500 active DeMolay chapters in every State of the United States as well as 10 other countries around the world.

DeMolay membership is open to any boy of good character who is between the ages of 14 and 21. Although DeMolay chapters are sponsored only by Masonic bodies or individual Masons, it is not necessary that a boy be a son or a relative of a Mason to belong to DeMolay.

The youth movement is governed by an international supreme council composed of over 200 outstanding Masons located around the world. They meet in annual session to review and approve the actions of the staff and the progress of the order.

DeMolay's slogan is "Building Better Citizens." Its ritual is what sets the organization apart from other youth groups.

The ritual was written in 1919 by Frank Marshall, a prominent Mason and newspaperman in Kansas City. It has been termed ageless, and is divided into the initiatory and DeMolay degrees.

The initiatory degree is one of solemnity and consecration, during which the initiate dedicates himself to uphold the virtues of filial love, reverence, courtesy, comradeship, fidelity, cleanness, and patriotism.

The DeMolay degree is a dramatic and historic portrayal of the trials, tortures, and martyrdom of Jacques DeMolay, and teaches a lesson in fidelity and comradeship.

As the officers of a chapter, boys are taught responsibility and given the opportunity to express themselves before a group of fellow youths. Although DeMoley ritual and meetings are greatly reverent, the organization does not advocate any particular creed, but teaches only a profound faith in the one living and true God.

DeMolay has a three-way program designed to benefit the individual DeMolay, the chapter, and the community.

Various awards are given to individuals for achievement, and merit bars are awarded for distinction in civic service, athletics, music, dramatics, religion, and other fields. Special keys are given for obtaining so many new members. The degree of chevalier is the highest honor an active DeMolay can receive. It is earned by outstanding service to a chapter and to fellow DeMolays.

The top honor in DeMolay is the legion of honor. This is conferred on senior DeMolays, over 25, for outstanding service to their community and their fellowmen.

International and jurisdictional membership, ritual, efficiency, and athletic competitions are held for the chapters. Each chapter is encouraged to have a balanced program of social activities. Each social event, like all other DeMolays activities, is supervised by an adult adviser of the chapter.

Chapters and individual DeMolays are also required to observe certain obligatory days annually. These include Devotional Day, Patriots Day, DeMolay Day of Comfort, Educational Day, Parents Day, and Frank S. Land Memorial Day.

DeMolay chapters and their members participate in a variety of activities including social affairs, civil affairs, fundraising projects, athletic events, and other wholesome activities designed to mold good character and good citizens.

The participation of DeMolay chapters in community projects has been extensive and is sometimes carried out on an international basis. Teenage traffic safety programs have been especially successful. These involve campaigns aimed at making safe drivers of all teenagers. Such efforts have received high praise from the National Safety Council and local law enforcement agencies.

Other projects that have been carried on include charitable fund drives, blood donations, civil defense, antinarcotics and anti-Communist campaigns, and distribution of safe-driving pledges.

Each chapter is supervised in all of its functions by an adult advisory council. One man is designated as the official "Chapter Dad" to handle the supervision of chapter meetings and to counsel the members.

Another helping hand for most chapters is the mothers' club. These now number over 1,900. The mothers' clubs primarily help the boys to raise money for their activities, and they usually handle the purchase and repair of robes and regalia.

DeMolay does not attempt to take the place of the home or church, but rather supplement them. The organization's purpose is to offer the teenage boy of today: (1) a wholesome occupation for his spare time; (2) worthwhile associates; (3) the best of environment; and (4) an interesting and complete program of all-around youth development.

Truly it is doing an outstanding service for our country by taking the youth of today and molding them into more responsible citizens for tomorrow.

PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSE WITH "TECHNICAL NURSE"

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, recently, I received a letter from Georgia Lee Gephardt, executive director of the Arkansas State Licensed Practical Nurses' Association. Accompanying the letter was a newspaper article which was published in the Arkansas Democrat.

The article deals with proposed replacement of the licensed practical nurse whose preparation takes 1 year with the "technical nurse" who holds the 2-year associate degree. Because I consider the article worthy of the attention of each Senator, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO REDUCE RANKS: PRACTICAL NURSES HIT MOVE

The board of directors of the National Association for Practical Nurse Education and Service has denounced the proposal of the American Nurses' Association to replace the licensed practical nurse whose preparation takes 1 year with the "technical nurse" who holds the 2-year associate degree. NAPNES firmly believes that any plan which would reduce the nurse supply and thereby jeopardize our Nation's health is against the public interest, according to Mrs. Georgia Lee Gephardt, executive director, Arkansas Practical Nurses Association.

The ANA's "first position on education for nursing" would eventually remove more than 300,000 licensed practical nurses from the area of bedside nursing where the need is most critical. Licensed practical nurses today are providing 75 percent of the direct patient care to our country's ill and aged, Mrs. Gephardt said, adding:

"NAPNES hopes that the ANA will use its great resources to help meet the crucial nursing shortage by better serving the increasing members of professional nurses who become teachers, administrators and supervisors of licensed practical nurses.

"In turn, NAPNES pledges its continued efforts to help meet our national health needs by supporting, improving and expanding the indispensable and proud vocation of practical nursing."

According to an NAPNES statement this plan would create even more severe nursing shortages than now exist. With medicare to take effect soon, larger numbers of licensed practical nurses will be needed to provide competent patient care. The ANA's 2-year program would eliminate many of these skilled practitioners and seriously curtail the supply of nurses.

The NAPNES statement pledges "continued efforts to help meet our national health needs by supporting, improving and expanding" the vocation of practical nursing.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 220, a disapproval resolution of Reorganization Plan No. 1, transferring the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice, when it is reported, be made the pending business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> Senate Resolution 220, to disapprove Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1966.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is not the intention to have the Senate proceed with the consideration of the resolution until next Tuesday.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time that when the Senate completes its business today it stands in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. Tuesday next.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESS REPORTS THAT EDWIN O. REISCHAUER WILL RESIGN AS AMBASSADOR TO JAPAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reports have appeared in the press recently to the effect that Edwin O. Reischauer will resign his post as Ambassador to Japan. It is my hope that these reports are unfounded. In the event they are accurate, I would hope that Ambassador Reischauer would reconsider.

It is understandable that Mr. Reischauer might wish a rest and a return to the academic life from which he came 5 years ago. These have been intense years for him as Ambassador to Japan. They have not been the easiest years in United States-Japanese relations, although Mr. Reischauer has been a major factor in keeping these relations on an even keel. With his great knowledge of Japan and United States-Japanese history, with his basic wisdom, decency, and understanding as a fine human being, he has been an immensely effective Ambassador to the Japanese Government and people. His has been, in every respect, one of the towering ambassadorships of the last half-decade.

It is true that no man in public life is indispensable, but the fact is, however, that some are irreplaceable at certain moments in time, if there is not to be serious detriment to the public interest. The months and years ahead in United States-Japanese relations are likely to be most critical, and may I say that I use the word "critical" advisedly.

The Vietnamese war is digging under the still relatively smooth surface of United States-Japanese relations. The accumulating consequences of this process are uncertain at best. At worst, they can prove highly disruptive of the whole pattern of peace and stability in the Western Pacific. Good will visits are no answer to this situation, although they may be momentarily helpful. Certainly, it is no answer to this situation to expect to continue to live on the capital of good will which has been built into United States-Japanese relations over the years. It is no help to whistle in the dark. What is needed is to continue to have present in Japan, as the ear, eye, and voice of the President's policy, an Ambassador of the caliber of Mr. Reischauer.

To be sure, neither he nor any other Ambassador can eliminate the complications in United States-Japanese relations which have been introduced by the Vietnamese conflict. But an exceptional Ambassador can minimize the adverse consequences of these complications. That is why it is to be hoped that these reports of resignation are inaccurate. If they are not, it would be my hope that Ambassador Reischauer not resign but continue to serve this Nation in Japan at the pleasure of the President.

In the circumstances, he is clearly a most essential man in a most vital position in terms of the Far Eastern interests of the United States. Indeed, Mr. Reischauer will be needed in the months ahead as Ambassador in Japan more than at any other time in the 5 years which he has served.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT J. ANDERSON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, one of the finest public servants of the Federal Government, whom I have come to know through the years, is retiring after 26 years of service today, April 1, and I take this opportunity to pay tribute to his work and accomplishments.

I refer to Dr. Robert J. Anderson, Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and Chief of its Bureau of State Services for the past 4 years. His career offers an example of the kind of devoted public service we look for in the performance of Federal Government programs.

Dr. Anderson has appeared before me in my capacity as a member of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee for the past 4 years. He has come as the director of the Public Health Service's environmental health activities. I have been impressed with the fine job he was doing and with his unfailing attitude of cooperation, his courtesy, and his vision and imagination.

I know also that Dr. Anderson came to be, during his career with the Public Health Service, one of the Nation's leading experts on tuberculosis and respiratory disease problems in general. I am told that upon retirement from the Federal Government he will move to a top position with the medical research arm of the National Tuberculosis Association—and I certainly congratulate that organization on getting him. I also offer Dr. Anderson my sincere thanks for our association and congratulations on this occasion.

REACTION IN NORTH VIETNAM TO ANTIWAR PROTESTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in his New Year's message to the American people, carried in English over Moscow radio, Ho Chi Minh thanked the antiwar protestors in the United States for their show of solidarity for his cause. He stated:

> I warmly greet and thank the American people for demanding that the U.S. Government end the aggressive war in Vietnam.

Recently the North Vietnamese Government issued a stamp commemorating Norman Morrison, the antiwar protestor who burned himself to death in front of the Pentagon in opposition to the war.

British Correspondent James Cameron has reported that in North Vietnam demonstrations are now occurring in support of demonstrations in the United States.

Each time a protest occurs in this country, there is a concerted effort to convince the people of North Vietnam and the world that the majority of Americans really support the aggressive and expansionist efforts of communism.

Such a view simply serves to prolong the conflict, and those Americans who engage in such protests are often unwittingly providing fuel for this furnace of deception. In an excellent article in the National Observer, Wesley Pruden, Jr., discusses in some detail the fact of Communist pleasure over antiwar protests in the United States.

He quotes an article in the North Vietnamese newspaper, the Vietnam Courier, which states the following:

> What is particularly significant is that the imperialists, when launching attacks against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, have failed to foresee that the Socialist countries, first of all the Soviet Union and China, will give every necessary assistance to the Vietnamese people in countering their war of destruction * * *. Washington not only is isolated before public opinion, but also has to face the American people's movement against its aggressive war.

I wish to share with my colleagues the insights of Mr. Pruden's article, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HO—NO PRIZE POET: HOW ASIAN REDS GLOAT OVER U.S. ANTIWAR PROTESTS

HONG KONG.—Ho Chi Minh first thought of himself as a poet more than 40 years ago, when he scribbled bittersweet verses at night after working by day as a pastry cook at the old Carlton Hotel in London. He returned to the political ferment of Asia long ago, and his political fortunes in North Vietnam, anyway, have never been brighter.

But old Ho's poetry is as bad as ever. To his good fortune, the editors to whom he submits his poems can never turn him down, and Ho's poems usually are featured on the front pages of the North Vietnamese propaganda journals that grace Hong Kong's sidewalk news counters.

A reading of these journals, in addition to plowing through Ho's graceless rhymes, interests many of the China watchers in this listening-post colony because they abound in clues to the thinking in Hanoi and Peking. In recent days Peking's propaganda has referred apologetically to "twists and turns" along the "revolutionary road," an obvious reference to recent reverses suffered by Peking-style communism throughout the world. But this doesn't stop the Communist journals from stretching, even mauling, the facts and figures of the Vietnam war. The propaganda remains tough and unyielding, and the gloating over American antiwar protests is loud and boasting.

Consider this new verse from Ho Chi Minh's pen, featured (encircled in a double-line red border) in the slickly printed, English-language Vietnam Courier:

"May the South shine with new victories,
With many more Dau Tieng, Bau Bang, Plei Me, Da Nang.
May the North show enhanced heroism,
The higher the American aggressors' escalation, the heavier their defeats.
Let all our compatriots unite and be of one mind,
Whether in frontline or in the rear, let our people redouble their efforts,
Emulating in production and rushing forward in the fight
Against the U.S. aggressors, for national salvation, our victory is certain."

The Vietnam Courier, though it purports to report and interpret the news of the war in Vietnam for Vietnamese readers, is intended as a propaganda vehicle to Western eyes. The news it reports is a clever mixture of fact, a lot of it stolen from and attributed to United States and British wire services, and absurd claims of Communist Vietcong military prowess.

Samples:

"The year 1966 began with the downing of the 847th U.S. aircraft over North Vietnam (a pilotless plane) since August 5, 1964." (U.S. military sources in Saigon conceded that American aircraft losses since the raids began on February 7, 1965, to be about 160 planes.)

"November 1–7: Second stage of Plei Me battle, intercepting of a rescue party sent by the 1st U.S. Cavalry Air Mobile Division: 400 Yankees killed or wounded, 1 company routed (November 1), 2 companies almost completely wiped out (November 6).

"November 8: Annihilation of a battalion of U.S. Brigade 173 at Dat Cuoc (Bien Hoa): 500 Yankees annihilated, 4 planes shot down."

TOO HIGH FOR BELIEF

These staggering casualty figures are, of course, denied by U.S. military sources, who said at the time only that American units had suffered "moderate" casualties. The Saigon command no longer releases specific casualty figures for specific engagements, but the slaying of 900 U.S. soldiers within an 8-day period would have been impossible to keep secret.

Yet the Courier reports with little polishing the facts of the American protests against the war at home. "Washington not only is isolated before world public opinion but also has to face the American people's movement against its aggressive war," writes an anonymous reporter in an article entitled "Time Is on Our Side."

"It is an unprecedentedly broad movement, which stands not only in opposition to the military adventure of the White House and in support of the Vietnamese people's struggle (i.e., the Vietcong), but also for a change in the policy of the U.S. reactionary government and for democratic rights and in defense of the American people's peaceful life."

A CHRONOLOGY OF SUPPORT

No fewer than 25 items on U.S. protests are included in a chronology of 1965 examples of the "World Support to the Vietnamese People" in the current issue of the Vietnam Courier.

Items:

"In early January the May 2 movement in New York distributed leaflets calling on American youth not to go to fight in South Vietnam. The movement involved 100 U.S. universities.

"Four hundred and sixteen American intellectuals demand that Johnson stop the war in Vietnam.

"Thirty-eight students of Aublin University, Ohio (apparently a reference to Oberlin College) go on a hunger strike in protest against U.S. Government Vietnam policy.

"A letter from 500 scientists protesting against Johnson's policy is published by the New York Times.

"Eight hundred and seventy-five Jewish clergymen demand that Johnson stop expanding the war.

"Twenty thousand American students in Washington demonstrate to protest against the U.S. Government.

"Three thousand American intellectuals, among them Scientist Linus Pauling, call on world scientists and workers not to produce and transport weapons to Vietnam.

"Arthur Miller sends a message protesting against Johnson's aggressive policy."

AN UNBELIEVABLE BOAST

And so on. The significance of this recital is the importance Hanoi obviously attaches to the protests. All but buried in a Vietnam Courier story boasting that "Time Is on Our Side" is the claim that "by the end of December 1965 a total of nine U.S. infantry and armored battalions had been wiped out." If this were true, it would hardly matter whether time, American intellectuals, world opinion, or anyone else were on the side of the Vietcong.

The emphatic point of the Vietnam Courior story is the assertion that Washington is slowly being drawn into a noose of American grassroots design; "what is particularly significant is that the imperialists, when launching attacks against the Democratic Republic of [North] Vietnam, have failed to foresee that the Socialist countries, first of all the Soviet Union and China, will give every necessary assistance to the Vietnamese people in countering their war of destruction. * * * Washington not only is isolated before world public opinion but also has to face the American people's movement against its aggressive war."

The weekly Peking Review takes almost the same line in an issue featuring a report on "U.S. War Makers in the Dock," and "A Bleak Time for Johnson." This bleakness, the Review makes clear, is "growing dissent with United States." The President, says the Review, is one of "the great butchers" of history.

THE BAC BO INCIDENT

"The political atmosphere in Washington is quite different from 1964," the magazine's editors write confidently. "Early in August that year, the U.S. Government created the Bac Bo Gulf (the Gulf of Tonkin) incident and started its armed aggression against the Democratic Republic of [North] Vietnam. Then on August 7, the two Houses of Congress passed a joint resolution authorizing the Johnson administration to 'take all necessary steps, including the use of armed forces,' to extend U.S. aggression in Asia.

"But now, after the Yankee aggressor troops have been trounced on the Vietnam battlefield, influential Congressmen are singing a very different tune.

"[J. William] Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declared over television that he thought the U.S. 'commitment to defend' South Vietnam was 'self-generating.' He regretted his own endorsement of the August 1964 resolution and said, 'I have played a part in that that I am not at all proud of.' "

Hanoi's propagandists, like the devil, quote scripture of their own choosing, however, and if anyone is confused by what Senator Fulbright or Senator Morse really mean, helpful Chung Ho, writing in the Peking Review, is ready with the explanation.

"No doubt," he says, in prose only a little better than Ho Chi Minh's poetry, the Johnson administration "will become still more desperate. It will continue to extend the war while thinking up still further variations of the 'peace talks' swindle. But as * * * events show, with the Vietnamese people fighting heroically and more and more millions in the world supporting them, the Johnson administration is nearing the end of its tether. Nothing can save it."—Wesley Pruden, Jr.

THE 20TH ANNUAL LOS ANGELES MUSIC FESTIVAL

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, it is with special pride that I call your attention to the 20th annual Los Angeles Music Festival to be held in Los Angeles during May 1966.

Great artists from all over the world have paid tribute to the significance of the Lost Angeles Music Festival. This great event is to the everlasting credit of its sponsors. Since Federal funds are becoming available for such events at present, it is especially noteworthy that this festival has survived and, in fact, distinguished itself as one of the most important such festivals in the world without support from any Federal Government agency for 20 years.

In the fall of 1945, Mr. Franz Waxman called on Dr. Gustave O. Arlt, chairman of the committee on fine arts productions at UCLA, to propose a series of orchestral concerts for the spring of 1946, to be called the Los Angeles Music Festival. Dr. Arlt liked the idea, arranged the details and provided part of the underwriting; the balance came from private sources.

The concerts were given in the first 2 weeks of June 1946. They were so successful that arrangements were made for another series in the following year. After the second season, Dr. Arlt agreed to make the festival a resultant annual fixture. It was incorporated, a board of directors was elected, and the project was given a sound financial base. The major support, however, continued to be from Dr. Arlt's committee on fine arts productions.

To acquaint the Nation with this outstanding program, I ask unanimous consent that a preseason announcement of the forthcoming festival be printed in the Record.

Mr. President, I would urge fellow Californians to take advantage of this outstanding event and any of my colleagues who are fortunate enough to be visiting the Golden State at this time, I highly recommend the festival.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The 1966 Los Angeles Music Festival

Twentieth anniversay, Franz Waxman, founder and director.

THURSDAY, MAY 5

Gala opening concert: Igor Stravinsky conducting his melodrama, "Persephone," with the Ithaca Concert Choir and Texas Boys' Choir; also "Chronochromie," by Olivier Messiaen, conducting by Robert Craft (U.S. premiere).

SATURDAY, MAY 7

Tribute to Jose Iturbi: In honor of his 70th birthday year, Jose Iturbi piano soloist and conductor of the Festival Symphony Orchestra, performing Mozart's "Concerto in D Minor," Debussy's "Piano Fantasy," De Falla's "Nights in the Garden of Spain," and Gershwin's "Rhapsody in Blue."

SUNDAY, MAY 15

A new look at jazz: "Jazz Variations on the Mass Text," by Lalo Schiffrin; "Les the Least Straightens the Lord," by Gerald Fried (world premiere). The composers will conduct their own works.

SATURDAY, MAY 21

A salute to Franz Waxman; from the Los Angeles Orchestral Society: "Tragic Overture," by Brahms; "The Song of Terezin," a dramatic song cycle based on poems written by children in the concentration camp of Terezin, by Franz Waxman, conducted by the composer. For mixed chorus, children's choir, mezzosoprano and orchestra (west coast premiere).

All concerts are at 8:30 p.m., in Royce Hall, UCLA.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S SCHOOL MILK MEANS TEST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, over the past few weeks I have tried to indicate what sort of means tests our Nation's schoolchildren would have to pass if they were to continue to receive milk under the proposed revised version of the special milk program for schoolchildren.

The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that children receiving milk under the program would not have to pass a stringent means test. I have shown the type of procedure that is followed in Kansas City, Denver, Atlanta, and a number of other cities around the Nation to qualify children for free lunches.

Undoubtedly the same requirements would apply under the proposed revision of the milk program. And there is no question that these requirements, beyond a shadow of a doubt, constitute a means test.

Today I will take a look at the District of Columbia's system. Each child applying for free school lunches has to have his parent or guardian fill out a form requiring the following information: why the parent is unable to provide lunches; total amount of family income; amount received from salary and wages; amounts received from public assistance, unemployment compensation, social security and other sources; employer's name, address and telephone number.

Can anyone doubt that the filling out of this form constitutes a means test? If he can he should turn to the back of the form which asks for the names of agencies working with the child or family and asks the principal, who supplies this information, to make sure that the name of the family's social worker appears on the front of the form.

Finally, I would like to read into the Record at this point a certification that each applicant must make:

> I declare that the above information is entirely correct with the full knowledge that should any of these statements be found false the needy lunch for which this application is made should be suspended. I further understand that I must report all subsequent changes in family status, occupation, or salary to the school principal. Failure to report such changes may also result in suspension of this privilege. I hereby authorize any verification deemed necessary to substantiate the information submitted.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY FOUNDER'S DAY LUNCHEON

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last Friday afternoon Vice President of the United States Hubert Humphrey delivered an address of particular importance at Georgetown University's Founder's Day luncheon.

Vice President Humphrey focused on the President's proposed "Act for International Education" and gave a compelling analysis of its principal provisions. Since this address is of special interest to the Senate in our consideration of this year's education legislation, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Record at the end of my remarks.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. President, to call attention to and commend our Vice President for his energy and tireless efforts to explain our national policies in foreign lands and to advance our national purpose here at home.

Hubert Humphrey's wisdom, humanity, and zeal for our national well-being have been an inspiration to his fellow countrymen. Our Nation is fortunate, in this time of turmoil and transition, to have as its leaders men with the unparal-

leled ability and vision of Lyndon Johnson and HUBERT HUMPHREY.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, FOUNDERS' DAY LUNCHEON AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

It is a pleasure to be here in the company of so many lovers of learning—and a privilege to speak on my favorite topic: Education.

I have spent much of my life as an educator. Early in my career, I taught political science. For the past 20 years, I have practiced it.

In our American democracy, a politican must also be an educator, if he is to be effective. It is not enough to have ideas. To translate them into public policy and programs, it is essential to enlist the support of an enlightened and informed public opinion. And, as President Theodore Roosevelt observed, American public opinion is an ocean—you can't stir it with a teaspoon.

The history of this university reveals much that bears upon my theme for today: the international dimensions of education, and the proposals of President Johnson to realize them.

Your founder, Archbishop Carroll, and many of his successors were educated in Europe. Throughout the years you have drawn deeply upon the learning and talents of scholars born or educated abroad.

But you have also acted upon the Scriptural injunction that it is more blessed to give than to receive. Among your contributions to international studies, I should like to single out two in particular—the establishment of your school of foreign service in 1919 and of your institute of languages and linguistics in 1949.

In this institute you teach many languages once regarded as exotic but which we now recognize as essential to the discharge of our responsibilities in the world. You have also been teaching English as a foreign language to thousands of students from throughout the world.

Education has had an international dimension almost from its very beginning. Like many aspects of our civilization, we inherit it from the ancient Greeks. The international horizons of education in an open society have never been more nobly expressed than by Pericles. "We Athenians," he said, "throw open our city to the world and never by alien acts exclude foreigners from any opportunity of learning or observing, even though the eyes of an enemy may occasionally profit by our liberality."

For many centuries scholars enjoyed the great advantage of having, in Latin, a universal language. As it was supplanted by vernacular languages, and as the spirit of nationalism came to dominate the world, education lost for awhile some of its international perspectives. In some countries universities came to be hotbeds of chauvinism, with professors inculcating in their students the most extreme forms of narrow nationalism.

We in America—with few exceptions—have fortunately been spared these perversions of the true academic spirit. Even in times of considerable national hysteria, our great universities and colleges have maintained the essential values of free teaching, free discussion, and freedom of research.

A university embodying a Jesuit tradition—featuring individual initiative and independence of thought—is particularly well endowed to defend universal values when they may be attacked by the xenophobic passions of the moment.

These are good times for education. Today we have in science a new international language, used and understood throughout the world. We are witnessing a greatly accelerated movement of students, scholars, information, and ideas crossing national boundaries. The character of this movement has changed greatly over the past 25 years. More people are involved, and their social classes and cultural backgrounds are more diverse.

The U.S. Government has played a substantial role in this development.

Through the Fulbright program and the Smith-Mundt Act, thousands of American students and scholars have studied and taught abroad.

Of the 85,000 foreign students in this country, about 10 percent are the recipients of some assistance from our Government. Under contracts with the Agency for International Development, some 70 American universities are carrying on technical cooperation activities in 40 developing countries throughout the world. The State Department conducts exchange programs with 130 countries. More than half of the 10,000 Peace Corps volunteers overseas are engaged in classroom teaching.

These by no means exhaust the volume and variety of the Government's overseas educational programs. But all Government programs are significantly outweighed by the activities of a multitude of private organizations such as universities, corporations, religious groups, and other voluntary organizations. These institutions have not only offered their facilities but have provided thousands of scholarships to students from abroad. In training and educating many of the future leaders of countries old and new, we not only contribute to their development but also make an investment which benefits the United States.

The contribution of the Jesuit Order to international education—with its worldwide network of colleges, universities, and seminaries—is most impressive and is steadily expanding.

So we Americans have become deeply involved in international education without many of us being fully aware of it—like the character of Moliere who was startled to discover that he had been speaking prose all his life. Education has become, de facto, an increasingly important aspect of our international relations.

President Johnson began his career as a teacher and so did I. There is no question in his mind—nor in mine—that education is at the heart of national, social, economic, and political development.

For example: Today we are working with the Government of Vietnam to move forward from the old educational system which offered education to a tiny privileged minority. We are aiding in the rapid expansion of Vietnamese universities there, just as we have in dozens of universities in Chile and Colombia, Ethiopia, and Iran. To give only one figure, the enrollment in Vietnamese universities has expanded from 2,900 in 1956 to 21,000 in 1965, in large part due to these efforts.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner, and Eugene Black, the President's special adviser on southeast Asian economic and social development, have both in recent weeks worked intensively in building programs to provide broader and better education not only to South Vietnam, but to other independent nations of southeast Asia.

For education is basic investment in these nations' human resources—and in their ability to survive in an environment of hunger, poverty, and outside aggression.

Our interest in international education, however, far transcends today's problems in southeast Asia. Last fall on the occasion of the third centennial of the Smithsonian Institution, the President announced his intention to vastly expand our programs in the international education field. This would begin with a plan to reinstate the original role of the Smithsonian Institution—that of a center for international education, a meeting place of scholars from all over the world.

The next step was a message to Congress proposing an "Act for International Education." In his message the President said: "Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes. It must be at the heart of our international relations."

The proposed International Education Act of 1966 stands as an explicit commitment to that statement. It has four basic themes:

First, it identifies the promotion of international education with our basic national interests, and particularly with building of peace—"education for peace."

Second, it is a commitment to a sustained effort in this field, continuing as far into the future as we can see.

Third, it recognizes international education as a two-way process, and declares that we are as eager to learn as we are willing to teach.

Fourth, it offers educational cooperation to all nations, to friend and foe alike.

The most important new step in our proposal is the establishment within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a Center for Educational Cooperation. This will provide for the first time a general headquarters for international education.

This center will be to act as a channel of communication between our missions abroad and the American educational community. It will be supported by a Council on International Education composed of outstanding leaders from education, business, labor, the professions, and philanthropy.

The center will not, however, supplant other governmental agencies already conducting programs in this field, such as the Agency for International Development, the State Department, and the U.S. Information Agency. Instead, it will bring all these present activities, and many new ones, into a sharper focus.

The President's message and the international education bill do more than set forth general principles. They embody a program for putting them into effect. I have time here only to mention some of its salient aspects. They include:

The opening up of new avenues for supporting the colleges and universities of the Nation, so that they can make an even greater contribution to the tasks of international education.

Funds will be provided for the further strengthening of the larger universities as the Nation's leading centers of advanced training and research in international affairs. Assistance will also be given to the smaller colleges so that their students may graduate with a wider knowledge of the world in which they will live. The establishment of a corps of education officers to serve in our embassies abroad.

Recruited from the top ranks of the profession, they will function in each country as the Ambassador's "chief of staff" for all educational relationships with the host country.

The use, where appropriate, of excess foreign currencies owned by the United States (the so-called counterpart funds) to endow binational educational foundations in other countries.

The establishment of an Exchange Peace Corps, a kind of "Volunteers to America," bringing men and women here from abroad to impart to Americans a deeper knowledge of other languages and cultures.

Finally, we have proposed a kind of international adult education at the highest level—the organization of a series of seminars bringing together representatives from many nations and many disciplines to seek answers to the common problems of mankind.

All of us—in developed and developing countries, alike, and on both sides of the Iron Curtain—share the desire to make technology the servant rather than the master of mankind and its future.

All of us have to deal with the manifold difficulties of urban living, the relations of the mass media to inherited cultural traditions, the advantages and limitations of new methods of social inquiry, the impact of automation—to cite but a few examples. All of us stand to gain from discussing these problems outside the context of competing national interests of actual negotiations.

The United States has not always been as cordial a host as Pericles was in Athens 2500 years ago. It is for this reason that the President has called upon the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to explore ways of removing unnecessary hindrances in granting visas to guests invited from abroad. We are moving also to lift restrictions on American scholars and scientists traveling abroad, including to Communist China.

We propose today to give education a new and high status in our international affairs, just as we acted last year to give it a high priority in our own society. We propose opening ampler two-way channels for international cooperation in education, and offer the support and encouragement of our Federal Government to this purpose.

Nevertheless, as the Chinese say, you can only row with the oars you have.

The success of these bold and generous initiatives will depend, in the last analysis, on the vitality and creativity of our educational system, from top to bottom. It will depend not least, upon our universities, public and private, secular and church related, in all their rich and fruitful diversity.

It will depend, to come back to this time and this place, on institutions such as Georgetown University.

Through your efforts and those of other educational institutions with the understanding and support of the U.S. Government, our country and its people can become identified as a great educator of the world. The people of the world can come to regard us—not as the gendarme of the universe but the global center of light and learning. Because the enlightenment of the mind and the renewal of the spirit is so important to civilization, the educator, the clergyman, the philosopher is as important in international relations as the diplomat and the soldier.

I join with you in pride for your century and three-quarters of service to this Nation and its Capital. I join with you in the hope that the ambitious plans you have set forth for "wisdom and discovery in a dynamic world" will be realized. I believe that the character, the enthusiasm, and the dedication of the people gathered here must surely give those responsible for the administration of this great university renewed confidence that they have not set their sights too high.

WILLIAM H. SEWARD, A MAN WITH THE STRENGTH OF HIS VISIONS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, perhaps more than other States, the story of Alaska is the story of men with the courage of their visions.

In 1860, William H. Seward, Secretary of State during the administrations of President Abraham Lincoln and President Andrew Johnson, predicted that Russian settlements in Alaska would become "monuments of the civilization of the United States in the Northwest." That was 7 years before the sale of Alaska by Russia to this country was completed.

In the debate preceding the Senate vote on approving the purchase, Senator Charles Sumner predicted that the addition of Alaska would bring to the United States untold quantities of wealth in fisheries, minerals, furs, and timber.

Mr. President, as you know, there was opposition to the purchase, just as there was to admitting Alaska to the Union 91 years later, but the position of those with vision prevailed on both occasions.

Just a few days ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson called attention to the significance of the Alaska Purchase. He said:

> It is appropriate that all America should participate in this centennial celebration, because the acquisition of the territory which has become the largest State in our Union was a milestone even for our entire country.
>
> The purchase of Alaska was the largest acquisition of land since the Louisiana Purchase. It was the last great land area that the United States was to acquire. When the Stars and Stripes were unfurled over what is now Sitka, Alaska, on October 18, 1867, the destiny of the North American Continent was permanently altered.

The paragraphs are from the statement the President issued when he signed into law the bill authorizing Federal participation in next year's celebration marking the 100th anniversary of the Alaska purchase. The bill is in keeping with the Alaska tradition captured in the centennial's theme—"North to the Future." The Alaska celebration will be a centennial with a future because men of vision, recognizing the potential that is Alaska's, passed a bill requiring that Federal funds go only for projects of enduring economic value.

There are many men of vision today who believe in the future of Alaska. These include men seeking ways to extract economically natural resources from its land, men bringing in new businesses, men attacking the problems of slum conditions in native villages. All these men are investing in the future of Alaska because they believe in Alaska as did the Sewards of an earlier day.

March 30 is known as Seward's Day in Alaska. It was on that day, 99 years ago, that the Treaty of Cession of Russian America to the United States was signed. Seward's dream was approaching reality.

Today, his vision, and the visions of Senator Sumner and others, are a reality. Certainly, the thriving urban area of Anchorage, holding more than 100,000 persons, certainly the growing picturesque communities of Sitka, Ketchikan, and Juneau, certainly the great frontier city of Fairbanks are monuments of the civilization of the United States.

Certainly, the recent record timber sale in southeastern Alaska, the rapidly growing king crab industry, the expanding explorations and operations of mining firms are all proof of the validity of the visions of those who saw in Alaska a storehouse of natural resources.

I doubt that even the most visionary of these believers in Alaska, even as late as 50 years ago, would have dared predict that Alaska would be a major source of oil by 1975, but today men who know are saying that Alaska wells will be producing 200,000 barrels a day by that year.

Mr. President, Alaska has a bright future.

We honor William H. Seward for his most important role in the history of Alaska. But in honoring this man of vision, we also honor all the men who have had, and do have, and will have, the courage of their visions of Alaska.

CONGRATULATIONS TO WILLIAM C. WELCH, DIRECTOR OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON SERVICE

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, for the past 5 years, William C. Welch has done an outstanding job as Director of the Veterans' Administration Congressional Liaison Service and soon he will be moving on to new responsibilities.

The many Members of Congress and staff members who have worked with Bill will sorely miss his service, his spirit of cooperation and his eagerness to aid those who have had service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Bill was well fitted for the position of VA Liaison Chief because he had served in the U.S. Marine Corps and had worked as a staff member for several Congressmen on Capitol Hill.

I think I speak for all members of the Senate when I say I am sorry to hear that Bill Welch is leaving, but we can take comfort in the fact that he will still be engaged actively in affairs affecting veterans as a member of the VA Administrator's Advisory Council.

Congratulations to you, Bill, and may you continue to do as well for your country as you have done in the past.

FUNDS FOR THE RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, much legislation to move America forward has been enacted in recent years, legislation that had the strong support of most Members of the Senate. Congress has authorized programs to help communities rebuild blighted slum areas, give the disadvantaged a fighting chance to escape poverty, improve health services and educational opportunities, provide food for the needy, and build parks and other public facilities.

These programs are varied and complex. They are administered by many agencies. Metropolitan centers—cities that have large, well-trained, highly sophisticated staffs—can afford to station personnel in Washington to keep track of Federal aids and to follow through on their city's applications for assistance. Let me call the attention of the Senate to an article in the March 7, 1966, issue of U.S. News and World Report, which deals with the massive problems of the big cities and how they are taking advantage of available Federal assistance. The article states:

> Some cities are setting up their own embassies in Washington to look out for local interests. Those with full-time representatives include Philadelphia, San Francisco,

Oakland, San Diego, Dallas, Jacksonville, Fla., and Long Beach, Calif.

This means that programs enacted to improve the well-being of the public are being made available quickly to these cities, that their citizens receive the maximum intended benefits.

But what about the people in our small towns—in communities where the mayor is an automobile dealer 5 days of the week, and a city official on the weekend? How about the people in the small unincorporated communities and on the farms?

How do they keep track of Federal legislation and new Federal programs?

How can they effectively follow through on whatever applications they do file?

Our job is only partly done if all of the people do not have the opportunity to share in the benefits of the new programs, as well as the older established programs. The second step must be taken. We must provide the people in the rural countryside and the hamlets and small cities an effective means of keeping tab on Federal legislation and a tool to follow through on their requests for assistance.

The beginning has been made. Last year, President Johnson endorsed the establishment of the Rural Community Development Service within the Department of Agriculture. He directed that it help other Federal agencies extend their services to rural people. That is a big job for a small agency. The staff of RCDS must maintain constant liaison with practically every Department and agency, in the Federal Government, and they must arrange for administrative functions that USDA agencies can perform in the field to make these programs more readily available to rural communities and their citizens.

The 1967 Federal budget includes a modest request for less than $3.5 million to expand the RCDS staff and to enable the agency to serve all of the 50 States.

I wholeheartedly support this modest request for funds that will enable the Rural Community Development Service to function as the President intended.

SURGEONS WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, Dr. D. Ralph Millard Jr., of Miami, Fla., has made some very sound suggestions on how plastic surgeons can be of inestimable help to the United States by making their special talents available whenever they make trips to foreign lands.

As Dr. Millard points out, plastic surgeons can perform great humanitarian service in applying this kind of medical diplomacy. For in many underdeveloped countries, there is a higher percentage of physical deformity and fewer trained specialists to cope with these problems.

Using the power of surgical medicine to correct physical deformities can indeed be a very important step in better international relations.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Dr. Millard, entitled "Plastic Surgeons Without Portfolios" which has been reprinted from the December 1962 issue of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLASTIC SURGEONS WITHOUT PORTFOLIOS

It has been my fortune to peregrinate from time to time. Hitchhiking Europe from Norway to North Africa, from London to Vienna was in quest of further knowledge in plastic surgery. Probing behind the Iron Curtain to Moscow and Leningrad was an attempt to differentiate propaganda and reality not only in our specialty but in another way of life. Service in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II and the Korean conflict was responsible for many of us more than circling the globe. In recent years there has been an opportunity for plastic work in various areas throughout the Caribbean from Antigua to British Guiana. The more one sees of people the more one is conscious of the paradox, people are quite alike and yet so unalike.

"All men are created equal"—that is, conceived by sperm fertilization of egg and delivered on the end of a placental cord. A row of cribs at any baby show impresses one with the similarity of humanity. Yet at the time of conception endowment by heredity has varied and, from that moment on, environment and chance take a hand. Thus newborn cries may sound alike but not their volume or their quality, and the air inhaled will vary from the humidity of Houston to the dust of Damascus.

Man may differ in size, ability, color, creed and motivation, but each individual possesses all of these to some degree and how he chooses to use, ignore, develop or exploit them depends on him. It would seem that there is enough in common among men for understanding of one another. The difficulty lies in our tendency to demand from other men our standards, expect them to fight under our rules and to seek in life what we desire. If standards, rules, and goals vary among Americans, even among plastic surgeons, imagine the divergence throughout the world.

For instance, it is inconceivable to us that given a choice there are men who will take tyranny over freedom, war over peace. Yet the assets of freedom and peace are vague to one who is starving and without hope of relief. One has only to wander the back streets of Cairo, Calcutta or Macao and look upon the dilated veins bulging under the slack skin of emaciated bodies, the bloated bellies of marasmic babies to understand any lack of perception into the glories of freedom.

Yet most men who have known freedom will risk their lives to regain it and resent forever having had it threatened. Talk with a Dutch farmer on the German border, listen to a Russian describe the cannibalism during the Nazi 900-day siege of Leningrad, ask a Hungarian freedom fighter about the Soviet tanks in the streets of Budapest. Determination for freedom was responsible for the birth of America, and evidence of this same spark is seen today in the avalanche breaking through the Iron Curtain into West Germany, through the Bamboo Curtain into Hong Kong, through Castro's Coconut Curtain into Miami.

A majority of the world is envious of the success of our American free enterprise system. I have seen the dollar bring a glint in the eye of a merchant of Venice, a pickpocket of Paris, a peddler in the Algerian Casbah, a Bousado oasis fig picker in the Sahara Desert, even the semicomatose in an opium den of Bangkok. A Korean papasan and head of a village working in his rice paddies for a year might earn $80. An attractive girl of the same village during occupation of American troops could net an equal amount in a week. Imagine the effect of the dollar on the economy of this village, the resentment among the native men and for that matter the men in the Allied occupational forces with less dollars. Remember the average Russian laborer's earnings approximate the compensation wages of our unemployed. This alone is enough to incite Khrushchev to throw a shoe at the United Nations.

Yet envy by others is no cause for our apologies or reason for bewilderment at our lack of international popularity. Top position is a lonely role and a fair target. It takes more continued strength, skill and alertness to remain on top than was ever required initially to get there. A fat champion is soon dethroned, but a worthy and conditioned one welcomes every opportunity to stand up to both subversive and direct attack.

There is no question but that we have a happy and exciting way of life that is succeeding remarkably for us and can serve well for others. It has proved its worth in West Germany and Japan even after unconditional surrender. Compare the spirit and vitality of the people of thriving Dusseldorf or Hamburg to the man in the street of sullen old Moscow as he gazes dully across the tremendous gap that separates him from the Kremlin's spouting Niks and sputniks.

Our ultimate goal it to stimulate all men to work for peace and a standard of living that is equal to their highest potential in a free society. Where we tend to fail is in our naive method of promoting this international Utopia. To force freedom and decree progress on an unprepared people brings collapse and chaos as the only props they possess are torn from them. Progress in freedom cannot be given; it must be earned. The gifts of patronizing handouts stir resentment in many, encourage begging and blackmail from others while perpetrating a gradual blood-letting type of national suicide for us. The technique of successful production, however, can and must be taught. Far sounder it is to lend specialists to help underdeveloped countries help themselves. The cooperation of mutual achievement wins converts, maintains respect, strengthens friendships while also raising standards.

Our State Department is making an effort along this line and must necessarily promote, direct and carry out the major portion of this effort. Yet, as in all progress, individual initiative can be used to spark vitality and ingenuity, cut redtape and reduce waste in expense by increasing energy expended. American specialists whether farmers or pharmacists, doctors or engineers, bankers, brokers, or industrialists, when traveling abroad, should make the extra effort to contact the local foreign men in their specialty. There is no better way to enjoy a country for similar interests, rapidly reduce barriers, and cooperative attack on specific problems may speed solutions. When shown a way out of a dilemma, man spends his energy getting himself clear rather than envying those who are already out.

There is an added dividend. Not only does the act of teaching organize and crystallize thought so that we better understand ourselves, but those who are teachers often find themselves students. No man is so advanced he cannot learn from another. Recognition of this brings humility which serves as common ground for a free exchange of thoughts. Although the value of speaking the other man's language must never be discounted, language today for us affords less difficulty as English is becoming, if not the primary, at least the secondary language of many countries.

In this do it yourself diplomacy the plastic surgeon can be particularly effective.

Ours is a specialty which, with its hint of magic, touch of drama and more than a dab of art, is mastered by so few yet respected by so many. There is also its great humanitarian appeal. What act can bring greater rejoicing in a family and a village than the transformation of an infant cleft in lip, expression, palate, and speech to a happy sucking baby. The infinite influence of this specialty lies in its power to render the deformed and mutilated suitable to take their place in society and serve as living monuments not only to our specialty but to our way of life.

In all underdeveloped countries there is a greater precentage of deformity and less trained specialists to deal with it. This is a manifold opportunity presenting a challenge. It calls for shaking oneself out of the everyday routine into a stimulating pioneer activity against a variety of new problems.

When planning a trip write the public relations office of the U.S. Consulate and of the local foreign government for contacts in your specialty. American plastic surgeons attending medical meetings in foreign cities should make an effort to meet the local plastic surgeons or surgeons dealing with reconstructive problems and seek from them invitations to their hospitals and clinics. Once contact has been made return visits may be arranged on a personal basis or through government sponsorship. More foreign doctors should be urged to visit the United States to evaluate our approach to their problems.

In the ever increasing demand for effective American goodwill ambassadors never underestimate the potential of a plastic surgeon without portfolio—a double antidote to the "ugly American."

D. RALPH MILLARD, Jr.,
M.D., F.A.C.S.,
MIAMI, FLA.

EMERGENCY FOOD FOR INDIA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to commend President Johnson on his proposal for an emergency famine relief program for India. The United States has a humane and honorable tradition of rendering assistance to alleviate human suffering, and it is a source of satisfaction to see this tradition continue. India is a great country with an ancient and enlightened civilization. With 500 million people, it is also the world's most populous democracy. And yet today India stands, in President Johnson's words, "on the threshold of a great tragedy."

The monsoon failed last year, the rains did not come. In spite of India's determined efforts to increase food production over the last few years, there was little that could be done in the face of drought. Crops gradually withered and died. India's Government now estimates the need for an additional 7 million tons of imported grain this year over and above what has already been programed. If the need is not met, there will be mass starvation.

In order to avert such a disaster, President Johnson proposes we furnish 3½ million tons of this requirement, while at the same time encouraging other nations to match this amount. Even before he spoke, Canada announced it would make a grant of 1 million tons of wheat and flour. The President also proposes we should provide other foodstuffs, some of which will be donated under the food-for-peace program. Furthermore, he suggests we ship considerable amounts of cotton and tobacco in order to release India's limited foreign exchange resources for much-needed food and fertilizer purchases abroad.

This is a big program, but in face of the drastic nature of the emergency, we cannot fail to respond. We cannot hoard surplus food while millions starve.

The President's request is closely related to another of his recent proposals. Since most of our food shipments to India have been bought with local currency, we now possess huge deposits of Indian rupees, usable only in India. President Johnson urges the establishment of a joint Indo-American Foundation to put $300-million worth of these idle counterpart funds, to work. The foundation would specialize in agricultural education and scientific research to better farming methods and increase crop yields. This is mandatory if India is to enlarge her capacity to feed herself.

Mr. President, I support President Johnson's humanitarian initiatives wholeheartedly. In this modern era when scientific techniques have overcome so many of nature's ways, we must not allow people to starve for lack of food. The President deserves, and I am sure he will get, the warmhearted and generous support of the Congress. An editorial in yesterday's New York Times concludes with these words:

> An undernourished nation has no future. Neither has an unskilled one in this technological age. President Johnson is wisely moving to provide the foodstuffs and the training. Indians must do the rest.

DENIAL OF EQUAL RIGHTS TO SOVIET JEWS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the continuing efforts of the Soviet Government to bring about the cultural annihilation of 3 million Jews within their own borders have been of grave and growing concern to Americans of all creeds. Less than a year ago we in the Senate voted unanimously to condemn the systematic denial of equal rights to Soviet Jews by their government. But so long as that campaign continues Americans must continue to raise their voices in protest.

It is with some pride, therefore, that I call to the Senate's attention two such protests by citizens of my own State. Earlier this week Assemblyman Joseph C. Woodcock, Jr., of Bergen County introduced in the New Jersey State Assembly a resolution urging the Soviet Government to accord the same cultural, educational, and religious rights to Jews as are permitted to other ethnic groups in the Soviet Union.

The timeliness of his action is underscored by the approach of the Passover holiday. And what Passover will mean this year to those Americans who are most deeply affected by the plight of Soviet Jewry has been described in moving fashion by another distinguished citizen of New Jersey—Mrs. Adolf Robison of West Englewood. A long-time teacher and active businesswoman, Ann Robison has nevertheless found time to take a leading role in a great number of cultural and civic undertakings.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Robison's article, published in the Jewish Standard of Jersey City, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE GO

(By Ann Robison)

When Purim comes, can Passover be far behind? Pesach brings matzoh and matzoh, this year, has a special significance. After thousands of years, an extra matzoh with a new meaning will enter our Seder services. To the three matzoh traditionally set aside will be added a fourth one, the matzoh of oppression. This "lechem oni" will not be to remind us of the oppression of Jews in Egypt in Pharaoh's time, but to remind us of a modern tragedy, the plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union in Kosygin's time. Twenty-four national organizations in the United States, including religious and lay groups, men and women numbering in the millions in their combined membership, say, "Let our people survive as Jews or let our people go."

Russia answers "No" to both supplications.

The American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, which is the umbrella organization of these 24 national organizations, includes religious Jews, from the Orthodox to the Reform, and nonreligious, from those who attend the synagogue of their choice only on Yom Kippur to the agnostics and atheists (the God the agnostics aren't sure of, and the atheists don't believe in, is probably a Jewish God). For each of us a different sensibility is outraged as we learn the facts about the plight of our fellow Jews. The rabbis and congregational representatives are especially saddened as the synagogues are closed one by one. Rabbi Israel Miller, president of the Rabbinical Council of America, the chairman of the steering committee of the conference group, came back from his visit to the U.S.S.R. with an official promise that the Moscow Yeshiva (Seminary) would be reopened. But it was not, and the average age of the few remaining rabbis in Russia is 89.

A recently returned traveler told of going to visit the one remaining synagogue in Kiev, where there are 210,000 Jews. This house of worship, like all churches and mosques in Russia, is maintained by the government. The buildings of other religions are kept up in fine order. Only the synagogue is neglected miserably. The exterior and interior are in disrepair, the prayer shawls are in tatters, and the few prayerbooks are crumbling with age. When the young people finally are persuaded by grandpa to go to "shul," they are as offended by the dirt and mire of the condition of the house of the Lord of their people.

This is what Communist Russia wants: the complete de-Judaization of her Jewish population. The uniformed answer, "But Russia and communism are atheistic; this is what you would expect." If this be true, why are all the other ethnic groups, more than 100 of them including the Volga Germans, helped by the Government to build and maintain beautiful churches and seminaries? Why is even the smallest minority group given special Government-supported schools where the teaching is done in its native tongue? Why are there flourishing newspapers and magazines in all minority languages—but only a small unworthy biweekly in Yiddish and a monthly magazine, presided over by a Yiddish poet who is regarded as a party hack and an apologist for the ultimate cultural assimilation of Soviet Jewry? Why can you buy religious objects for every religion but the Jewish? Why can you go to see a play in German or in Armenian, while there is nothing left of the great, internationally famous Russian Yiddish Theater?

A recent visitor told of a Jewish concert which he attended in a large Russian city. The soloist, a singer, was an old man who returned from 10 years in a Siberian labor camp with only two fingers on his right hand. He had lost more than these two fingers, we were told; his spirit and his voice were gone too. His rendition of Yiddish songs made it not an evening of Jewish culture, but a funeral service to mourn the death of Yiddish talent and artistry.

Another story comes to us firsthand about eager, talented Jewish children being turned away from Government-run music schools. When one teacher intervened in the behalf of a gifted little violinist, the answer she got from the Government-appointed principal of the school was, "We have enough Ostraikh's."

In my work for the cause of the Soviet Jews, I come across many skeptics. Especially frustrating are those who reject my stories and my statistics. They throw in my face their stories about what they were taken to see by the lovely intourist guide, and what she or some Government Jews have told them. For these naive Americans, I now have my own book of U.S.S.R. Government statistics. Even these Soviet figures prove our case that anti-Semitism in Russia exists to the point where it is not an exaggerated indictment to accuse the Soviet Government of cultural and religious genocide against the Jewish people.

From the section dealing with university students we can figure mathematically that the percentage of Jews in the universities at the present time is smaller than at any time during the czarist regime when the numerous clausus laws were in force.

So while we can still remember that the world, including the Jews, did not do enough to save the 6 million Jews who perished in the Nazi holocaust, let us not forget that there is still time to help the 3 million Jews in Russia. Reliable reports tell us that Moscow is vulnerable and is susceptible to the pressure of world public opinion.

As we lean at our seder table with our loved ones—our son who has been barmitzvahed, our daughter who has just been accepted at Vassar, Uncle Ben who is a high Government official in Washington, Aunt Minnie who is president of the sisterhood, and Cousin Abe who has just returned from the Zionist convention in Israel—as we pick up the matzoh of oppression, let us not forget to thank God that we are Jews in the United States. And let us remember that at many a seder table in the Soviet Union nothing of the above picture could be true. Even the matzoh would probably not be available.

Let us say: "We set aside this 'lechem oni'—this matzoh of oppression—to remember the 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union. Most of them cannot have matzoh on their seder tables tonight. Conceive of Passover without matzoh—without that visible reminder of our flight from slavery.

"Think of Soviet Jews. They cannot learn of their Jewish past and hand it down to their children. They cannot learn the languages of their fathers and hand it down to their children. They cannot teach their children to be their teachers, their rabbis.

"They can only sit in silence and become invisible. We shall be their voice, and our voices shall be joined by thousands of men of conscience aroused by the injustice imposed on Soviet Jews. Then shall they know that they have been forgotten, and they that sit in darkness shall yet see a great light."

AN ON-THE-SPOT REPORT FROM VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently Earl Richert, of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, spent 4 weeks in South Vietnam. His summary of impressions, compressing his findings about the situation as it existed only a week or two ago, has some elements of grave doubt about whether our efforts even at stepped-up levels, can achieve their goals. Despite high morale among our troops and awesome firepower, he finds few signs of the enemy approaching a breaking point, and concern about both economic and political aspects of the Saigon regime.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Richert's article, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of March 24, may appear in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GI's Want To Get Another "Charlie"—Awesome U.S. Power in Vietnam Still Not Enough

(By Earl Richert)

(Note.—This is an over-all size-up of the situation confronting us in South Vietnam—some boiled-down impressions of Editor Earl Richert of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance after a 4 weeks' visit to the area.)

Honolulu.—The most dismaying aspect of a tour of South Vietnam today is the evidence that the awesome power and energy now being exerted by the United States still isn't enough.

The Vietcong keep coming, asking for more.

If the enemy is anywhere near the breaking point—as a handful of optimists contend—there are few signs of it.

FIREPOWER

The firepower aspect of the U.S. effort is something to behold. Planes loaded with bombs, napalm and sometimes small missiles fly from big aircraft carriers standing off South Vietnam with an all-out purposefulness as if it were D-Day on Normandy Beach. The same is true from the airfields in South Vietnam.

Morale among U.S. forces is high. I have heard pilots swear angrily and bemoan their luck when their mission was scrubbed. U.S. fighter and bomber pilots are now doing what they've been trained for from years back. And never will they fight in more favorable circumstances—with no enemy air opposition.

I was told of young soldiers who were no less disappointed when an operation was delayed for a day—they wanted to get after "Charlie," the GI's name for the Vietcong.

GRIMLY

Americans from top to bottom are working arduously and grimly. Commanding Gen. William C. Westmoreland, besides directing the war, rushes around the country pepping up his own and the South Vietnamese troops.

The American Embassy under Henry Cabot Lodge, with its many operations, is furiously energetic as it advises and tries to smooth out problems for the still-fledgling Saigon government.

Information from captured Vietcong prisoners is being fed back to computers in Washington. Top psychologists are at work—for example, we've noted the growing sadness in South Vietnamese songs after 20 years of warfare, and have induced their composers to come up with peppy and more cheerful themes.

INFLATION

And we're trying to help the Saigon government fight inflation by holding ready 300,000 tons of U.S.-produced rice to sway the market downward.

Our military intelligence steadily improves. I was told that we now have photographs as well as complete information on the top 36 Vietcong leaders.

But the Vietcong still are strong and doing well. As evidence of this, Marine Lt. Gen. Lewis Walt, himself a tough fighting man, says in his mountain-top headquarters outside Da Nang, that he must have even more than his present 45,000 marines. And he's speaking about an area where the South Vietnamese troops are regarded as well trained and capably led.

PRESSURE

The U.S. military policy is to keep applying more and more pressure through more firepower and more men. How much more, no one can say. And probably no one knows what it will take to force the Communists to call a halt in South Vietnam.

A diplomat from a friendly power just back from Hanoi reported absolutely no sign of change from the "we are going to win" views long held by the North Vietnamese leaders. He said the men at the top in Hanoi finally were aware that the United States is not just another France, but that did not alter their view that the United States still would get tired and pull out.

A sizeup of the situation by a top American is that the war is going well militarily and will get even better as the year goes along. The big question is whether the "revolutionary development" program (pacification) can be made a demonstrable success around the three largest cities, where effort is being concentrated. If it can, this authority said, "we should be seeing the light at the end of the tunnel by the end of 1967."

DOUBTERS

The doubters as to the future in South Vietnam are concerned about the economic and political aspects—whether the Saigon government can win a hold on the populace through performance in their behalf. These pessimists include southeast Asia's most successful anti-Communist, Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore who, among other things, declines to move closer to the U.S. position because "of the natural embarrassment of being associated with transient regimes in South Vietnam."

The optimists are the U.S. military who are convinced they can win by making life so hot the Vietcong will stop.

But, say they, more men and guns are necessary.

PROPOSED INDIA-AMERICAN EDUCATION FOUNDATION CARRIES OUT ONE OF GRUENING FOREIGN AID RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the proposal made to Prime Minister Indira Ghandi by President Johnson for the establishment of a joint India-American Education Foundation is most gratifying to me.

On October 1, 1963, after a study of U.S. foreign aid programs in 10 Middle Eastern and African countries, as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganizaion and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations, I filed a lengthy report in which I discussed the growing problems facing the United States in managing the ever increasing amounts of U.S. controlled foreign currencies.

In that report I recommended:

Consideration should be given to the establishment of a trust fund, jointly administered by the U.S. Ambassador and the country's Minister of Education, to be used for educational scholarships, fellowships, and other educational purposes. Such a device will require a minimum of administration and will avoid to the maximum extent possible U.S. interference in the economic affairs of the countries involved.

The President's action in proposing an India-American Education Foundation follows closely along the lines of my recommendation and I commend President Johnson most highly for his action. This kind of a solution is an eminently practical one to meet the growing problem which the United States will face in the years to come because of the ever-mounting amount of foreign currencies.

In my report on the Middle East I pointed out:

> It is a disturbing thought that in the year 2003 in Greece our Embassy will still be passing on loan agreements for petroleum storage facilities, service stations, appliance manufacturing facilities, and the like. Consider the wide variety of experts who will have to be attached to our Embassy to pass on the economic feasibility of loan applications in every conceivable field. Is this the kind of activity the Congress believes should be carried on in perpetuity by our Embassy in Greece? Or indeed in any other of the numerous countries with accumulated local currencies derived from our foreign aid program.

A solution along the lines of the proposed India-American Foundation for educational purposes is one way of avoiding a continuation ad infinitum of U.S. involvement in the economic affairs of nation—especially those in which we no longer maintain an economic aid program.

I would hope that the President will cause an examination to be made at the earliest possible moment of United States held or controlled foreign currencies and, in those countries where the amounts are large or will become large, give consideration to the establishment of similar educational foundations.

In view of the recognition by the Government of India of the serious problems caused by the population crisis in that country, it is hoped that the U.S. trustees of the Foundation urge that a goodly portion of the Foundation's funds be devoted to educating and training doctors, para medics and midwives in India so that birth control assistance can be made available upon request on an ever-increasing scale.

I ask unanimous consent that chapter VII entitled "Future Uses of U.S. Owned Local Currencies," as contained in my report, as referred to above, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chapter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VII. Future Uses of U.S.-Owned Local Currencies

Consideration should be given by the Congress, at the earliest opportunity, to the establishment of clear policies with respect to future uses of the very large amounts of foreign currencies accumulated in the 10 counties studied. There is no reason to believe that the same problems foreseen in these countries will not also arise in other countries receiving economic assistance from the United States.

In the past, we have made many loans to these countries repayable in local currencies. In addition, Public Law 480 products have been "sold" to these countries in exchange for local currencies. These currencies are controlled by the United States, with a major portion of them being restricted to expenditure for the economic development of the country generating the currency. Repayment of these loans will continue for many years to come. As they are repaid, the funds will again be available for further loans. Because the loans bear interest, the local currencies available for loan by the United States will be constantly increasing.

In countries currently receiving economic aid from the United States, no special administrative or organizational problems arise in administering the local currency loan program. It can be made an integral part of the total AID program.

However, where the AID program has ended in a particular country, and the AID mission has been withdrawn, it can be expected that serious administrative problems will arise as the loans continue to be repaid.

As of December 31, 1962, in the 10 countries studied, there were outstanding loans totaling approximately $1.109 billion. Of this amount, $665.1 million has been disbursed, leaving $454.5 million to be disbursed. (See exhibit VII–A.) Assuming an interest rate of 4 percent per annum on the funds already disbursed and a constant reloan rate, the local currency loan fund is increasing in these 10 countries at the rate of approximately $26.3 million per year. When the full $1.109 billion is out on loan, the fund will increase at the rate of $44.3 million a year. To this must be added the annual interest on the interest paid and reloaned.

Lebanon has no outstanding loans repayable in local currencies so that, when its outstanding obligations, repayable in dollars, have been met, there will be neither dollars nor Lebanese pounds in Lebanon for economic development of the country. Our diplomatic mission in Lebanon will revert to normal, and our Ambassador and his staff there will have to rely upon their diplomatic skills to maintain the U.S. "presence" in that country. This is as it should be.

But what of Greece and Israel, the other countries of those 10 studied where economic assistance has supposedly ended?

Our Embassy in Israel, despite the end of our economic assistance to that country and the withdrawal of our AID mission, has a potential loan fund in Israeli pounds of $247.2 million and an actual loan fund of $209.3 million.

Thus, during the next 10 years, for example, repayments on account of principal will approximate $15 million, and interest payments will approximate $10 million per year. Our Embassy in Israel will thus be responsible for the operation of a loan program in Israel of approximately $25 million per year. New loans (in Israeli pounds) which the Embassy will negotiate during that period will total a quarter of a billion dollars.

.Greece is in a similar position. Here, too, our AID program has supposedly ended.

Outstanding loans to Greece, as of December 31, 1962, totaled $136.3 million, of which $73.5 million has been disbursed. And because of interest charged, when full disbursement has been made, the total loanable fund will increase at the rate of $5.4 million a year. This fund also will continue to increase indefinitely at approximately this rate, depending on the interest charged.

The repayment rate will be approximately the same as in the case of Israel, so that our Embassy in Greece will also face the task of operating a substantial loan program.

These figures should be compared to our loan program in the past to Greece and Israel:

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year:	*Greece*	*Israel*
1946–48	111.3	-----
1949–52	-----	135.0
1953	-----	-----
1954	-----	-----
1955	14.2	30.8
1956	19.3	35.1
1957	27.9	21.9
1958	24.8	75.9
1959	-----	44.0
1960	35.1	43.6
1961	11.9	65.6
1962	18.7	75.1
Total	263.0	527.0

With the AID missions withdrawn from both Greece and Israel, are the normal staffs of our Embassies in those countries geared to administer intelligently these ever-growing loan programs?

And whoever administers them, there is an added and continuing expense to the American taxpayer.

Little attention seems to have been given to this problem or to its implications for the future.

In 1961, the gross national product of Greece was $3.2 billion, while that of Israel was $2.7 billion. Loans outstanding as of December 31, 1962, are to be finally repaid by Israel in the year 2001 and by Greece in the year 2003. At that time the loan funds, without compounding interest, will exceed $800 million in Israel and $335 million in Greece. Loan funds of this magnitude could have considerable effect upon the economies of both these countries unless properly administered.

An excellent example of the confused state of our local currency accounts was furnished by the confusion over aid to the stricken Yugoslavian city of Skoplje. The New York Times account of August 18, 1963, described how our own officials were in doubt as to just how much was in the account and the Yugoslav officials were fearful over the effect of the drawdown of such a vast sum of money upon the entire country's banking system.

It follows and makes interesting reading:

"[From the New York Times, Aug. 18, 1963]

"U.S. SKOPLJE AID CREATES PROBLEM

"Fifty-million-dollar fund is causing bookkeeping confusion

"(By David Binder)

"Special to the New York Times

"BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA.—The U.S. Government's authorization of $50 million of aid in local currency for the earthquake-stricken city of Skoplje has created some bookkeeping problems for Yugoslav and American officials.

"The grants announced last Sunday are to consist of $25 million in direct aid and $25 million in long-term loans.

"They are to be drawn from special funds accumulated from the sale to Yugoslavia of American wheat and other agricultural goods. These funds are registered as dinars, the Yugoslav currency, in the Peoples Bank.

"As explained today by U.S. Embassy officials, the grants are to come out of a dinar fund marked 'for U.S. use.' The fund represents 10 percent of the total accumulation from wheat sales since 1954.

"The remaining 90 percent of the accumulation is available for Yugoslav projects such as dams, powerplants, roads and canals following specific agreement between the two countries.

"At Washington's Disposal

"But the U.S. use fund is at the disposal of Washington for paying costs of the Embassy in Belgrade, cultural exchange programs and the purchase of goods for U.S. Armed Forces stationed in Europe. One-fifth of this fund is also earmarked for conversion into dollars for use by the U.S. Agricultural Department.

"No one in the Embassy appeared to know today just how large the dinar accumulation in the U.S. use fund had grown. Last Sunday someone picked the figure of $93 million.

"But a second look disclosed that the dinars had been acquired over a period of years in which the exchange rate had varied widely. Estimates of the dollar-dinar total now range between $63 and $97 million.

"As for the Yugoslav side, one Belgrade official said that the Skoplje aid authorization had caused some double takes in the Peoples Bank, where authorities had become accustomed to annual U.S. expenditures of $8 to $10 million worth of dinars.

"Belgrade Surprised

"He implied that while the Yugoslavs recognized the U.S. use fund as an ultimate liability, no one had expected Washington to use so much of it.

"Two officials of the Agency for International Development, Richard Knight and Edgar Zimmerman, said they were convinced that the availability of local currency would help the U.S. aid program in Skoplje.

"They noted that in countries where local currency was not available to the United States through surplus wheat sales, the Agency's programs encountered much greater financing difficulties.

"However, they suggested that the Skoplje disaster was of such magnitude that U.S. aid in hard currency would also be useful. It is understood that several proposals along this line are to be made by the U.S. Government in the near future."

Unless we are prepared to say that the Ambassador in each of these countries should "rubberstamp" applications for loans from these local currency funds, then we must face up to the fact that, unless some device is found, there will be need for ever-increasing technical staffs at the Embassies to service these ever-increasing loan funds in an intelligent manner.

Attention should also be given to the long-run effect upon the relations of the United States to each of these countries of our continued interference in a sizable segment of their economies.

The power to reject a loan application is the power to direct. Determining which projects we will or will not support is tantamount to having a hand in how their economies will develop.

It is a disturbing thought that in the year 2003 in Greece our Embassy will still be passing on loan agreements for petroleum storage facilities, service stations, appliance manufacturing facilities, and the like. Consider the wide variety of experts who will have to be attached to our Embassy to pass on the economic feasibility of loan applications in every conceivable field. Is this the kind of activity the Congress believes should be carried on in perpetuity by our Embassy in Greece? Or indeed in any other of the numerous countries with accumulated local currencies derived from our foreign aid program. If it is, then the Congress should proceed without delay to establish guidelines for the types of loans which can be made and to make plans now for the proper type and quantity of staff and the organization of such a permanent program. The fiscal implications of such a policy should also be thoroughly explored.

Some will take the position that such a state of affairs is desirable. They will say that it is good to have a strong U.S. "presence" in these countries for years into the future. It should be noted that we are not here dealing with "years into the future"—we are dealing with perpetuity.

It has been repeatedly said to me, as one reason for continuing U.S. economic aid to this country or to that country, that such aid was necessary to assure a "U.S. presence" in those countries.

Obtaining a precise definition of the term "presence" is extremely difficult.

Obviously it means more than the stationing in a country of the customary diplomatic mission. It seems to mean the stationing of additional U.S. personnel in the country to dispense technical assistance and money. Apparently mere diplomatic missions are no longer considered sufficient to express our friendly intentions to the friendly nations to which they are accredited.

It is difficult to imagine that U.S. foreign policy can be effective in a country only if it is buttressed by technical assistance and money.

We now face the danger, because of the accumulation of local currencies, of rebuilding in a different guise in our diplomatic missions an entirely new cadre of technicians who will be administering an entirely new and ever-growing AID program with U.S.-owned local currencies. It might be productive of more ill will than good will for the United States. Who wants a foreign controller permanently stationed to determine how you are to spend what you had, rightly or wrongly, come to assume was your money?

A way must be found out of this dilemma.

I put forth a few possibilities:

1. The loan agreements with Greece and Israel should be renegotiated to provide a real incentive for the repayment of some or all of these loans in dollars. I fully appreciate that in these countries, as in many others, foreign exchange—or the lack of it—is a continuously pressing problem. I am also aware of the fact that these loan agreements are binding agreements and can be changed only by mutual consent. However, in order for the United States to get off the treadmill on which it finds itself, it would be well worth our while to offer the countries involved substantial inducements to make the necessary change. We could offer substantial reductions in interest rates or in repayment rate. For example, interest at 4 percent per annum on a $10 million loan repayable in equal payments in 30 years amounts to $6 million. That is a sizable amount. I have noted that a program along these lines was in effect with respect to the early loans made to Greece and Israel giving them the option of repaying certain loans in dollars at 3 percent interest or in local currency at 4 percent interest. In addition, loans repayable in 10 years could be made repayable in 20 or 30 years.

2. Similar renegotiation talks should be undertaken with the other countries studied.

3. Consideration should be given to the establishment of a trust fund, jointly administered by the U.S. Ambassador and the country's minister of education, to be used for educational scholarships, fellowships, and other educational purposes. Such a device will require a minimum of administration and will avoid to the maximum extent possible U.S. interference in the economic affairs of the countries involved. A necessary concomitant of such a program would be orderly phasing out of new loans of local currencies so that ultimately all local currency owned by the United States will be centralized in the trust fund.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

The United States has outstanding many loans to many countries which call for their repayment in the future in local currencies. As the money is repaid, it, together with the interest it earns, is to be reloaned by the United States for projects designed to aid the economic development of the country repaying the loans. In the 10 countries studied, loans repayable in local currencies of $1,109 billion had been made as of December 31, 1962. Because of interest payments, the local currency fund in those 10 countries is increasing at the rate of $26.2 million each year.

Someone will have to administer these funds.

Our AID program in Israel is at an end and the AID mission withdrawn. However, during the next 10 years, our Embassy in Israel will be called upon to negotiate new loans in Israeli pounds in the amount of $250 million. Our total AID program to Israel in the 10 years 1953–62 was $392 million.

The problem in Greece, where our program is also ending will likewise be great. It is a disturbing thought that in the year 2003 (when the last loan already made will be repaid in local currency) our Embassy in Athens will be passing on loan applications from the Greek Government. Will not the interference of the United States in the local economic development of a nation be resented so long after the original loan has been made and when we are loaning not dollars but local currencies. This problem faces the United States in the future to an ever greater extent as its formal AID programs come to "an end." Unless Congress lays down guidelines as to how such local currencies should be spent in the future, the United States will never be able to get off the treadmill, will never be able to end its aid program in any country, and will be forced to maintain, at the expense of the U.S. taxpayers, staffs to administer these funds of local currencies which will be constantly increasing.

It is therefore recommended that—

(a) Loan agreements calling for repayment in local currencies be renegotiated, wherever possible, with great inducements for the repayment in dollars;

(b) Consideration be given to the establishment of educational trust funds, jointly administered by our Ambassador and the education minister, into which fund local currencies can be repaid as the loans are repaid.

EXHIBIT VII–A.—*U.S. loans as of Dec. 31, 1962*

[In millions of dollars]

	Total loaned repayable in local currencies	Total disbursed	Potentially available for disbursement
Turkey	365.8	136.8	229.0
Iran	20.8	10.3	10.5
Syria	29.0	2.1	26.9
Lebanon			
Jordan	2.7	2.0	.7
Israel	247.2	209.3	37.9
Libya	5.0	4.6	.4
Tunisia	62.0	19.2	42.8
Greece	136.3	73.5	62.8
Egypt	240.8	197.3	43.5
Total	1,109.6	655.1	454.5

Source: Prepared in the office of Senator Ernest Gruening.

DAVID DUBINSKY

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, on March 16 David Dubinsky surprised his ILGWU colleagues and his friends by announcing his retirement as president of the union as of April 12. With characteristic dramatic timing, he interrupted a routine executive board meeting and announced his intentions. "I don't want to die in my boots," he said. "I want to be free."

David Dubinsky's freedom will diminish the freedom of the rest of us correspondingly. For his entire life, and his more than 30 years as president of the ILGWU have been dedicated to fighting for the freedom and the human dignity of others—his members and really, all of his fellow citizens.

He has been one of the great labor leaders in our history. His name is synonymous with responsible and socially creative union action. His achievements for his workers are too extensive to recount. Let it only be said that by fighting for decent working conditions and working for better housing, he brought thousands of immigrant workers out of the slums and into the mainstream of American life.

David Dubinsky's retirement brought forth dozens of newspaper and magazine articles in praise of his life's work. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert some of these articles in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 17, 1966]

PRESIDENT FOR 34 YEARS, DUBINSKY QUITS ILGWU

NEW YORK, March 16.—With a tear in his eye, but also with a big, impish smile of relief, 74-year-old David Dubinsky this afternoon announced his retirement as president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union as of April 12, 1966.

The peppery, Polish-born immigrant, who has led the ILGWU for 34 years, made his surprise announcement before 21 top officials of the union's general executive board, which is holding its regular semiannual meeting this week at the Americana Hotel in Manhattan.

In a letter accompanying his resignation, Dubinsky said the "cares and burdens" of his office were such that he had given serious consideration to retiring in 1959. But a "politically motivated attempt by the then national Republican administration to besmirch the reputation of our union," made it his "duty" to say on until the ILGWU was "vindicated."

The man generally favored to replace him is General Secretary-Treasurer Louis Stulberg, 64, who has been a member of the union for 39 years.

Dubinsky, who will shortly leave for a vacation in Europe, said that his resignation would in no way curtail his activities in the labor movement.

Under his 34-year reign, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union made many notable gains, including the first garment-industry agreement to provide for a 35-hour workweek (1933), the first industry agreement to establish an employer-contributed, pooled fund for workers' vacations (1937), health and welfare funds (1938), retirement funds (1943), and severance pay (1950).

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1966]

PIONEER IN UNION STATESMANSHIP

In his more than three decades as president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, David Dubinsky has made his own name and that of his union synonymous with social responsibility and creativity. His retirement at the age of 74 deprives the Nation as well as organized labor of one of its most constructive voices. The loss is particularly acute for New York City, where the garment union has long played a pivotal role in the city's biggest industry.

Mr. Dubinsky preceded Walter P. Reuther and George Meaney in enunciating the concept that labor must go forward with the community and not at the expense of the community. He helped emancipate the workers of the old Jewish and Italian ghettos from the sweatshop, then turned to the still unfinished task of protecting a new generation of Negro and Puerto Rican workers from the erosive effect on union wages of competition from "runaway" employers in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the South.

A lifelong foe of union racketeers, he was a chief architect of the ethical practices codes of the AFL–CIO. When it became clear in the early scandals over maladministration of many union welfare and pension funds that labor could not do the cleanup job alone, he was principally responsible for persuading the rest of organized labor to abandon its traditional resistance to any form of government help in eradicating abuses.

He has never lost the sense that unionism is a cause, not a business. He extended that conception into the political realm in the last municipal election by throwing his energies into John V. Lindsay's fusion campaign, instead of lining up with Mr. Meany and the Central Labor Council in ritualistic adherence to the old-line Democrats.

To all his activities he has brought excitement and imagination, and these qualities will be especially missed in a movement increasingly dominated by organization men. The union's sound policies undoubtedly will continue under Louis Stulberg, its dedicated and able secretary-treasurer, who seems virtually certain to move up to the top spot; but no one will be able to duplicate the Dubinsky gusto.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 18, 1966]

DUBINSKY STEPS DOWN

The retirement of David Dubinsky from the presidency of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union is one of those landmark events by which communities date their histories more precisely than by the calendar.

Dubinsky has long been a spirited, tempestuous figure on the municipal—and national—landscape. A man of strong emotions and deep conviction, he would be the last to ask that his contributions be recited as a record of infallibility.

Nevertheless, in most of the great historic dramas of our era, he has been an influential participant: in the liberation of the sweatshop multitudes, in the struggle against Communist exploitation of labor's grievances, and in the building of the Roosevelt New Deal coalition. He never ran from a fight, and if there were a few engagements he might have more wisely avoided, he has never lost the high vision which animated his youthful rebellions.

His "retirement" we suspect, will be a figure of speech; his presence will continue to be felt in the top councils of labor, as within the union so totally identified with his name and in other areas.

Dubinsky is one of that company of memorable leaders who rejected the conventional concept of "business unionism" and visualized labor as a dynamic social force in the Nation. He brought imagination, creativity and passion to his post; we take comfort from the knowledge that he will be around. His torch is still held high and many will light their candles from it for a long time.

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press, Mar. 18, 1966]

DAVID DUBINSKY CLOSES HIS DESK

David Dubinsky's decision to retire from the presidency of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union is a notable date in the history of American labor. It could even be said to mark the end of an era, for when Mr. Dubinsky took office in 1932 the ILGWU was rent by an internal war with the Communist Party, then aiming at a general labor takeover which Mr. Dubinsky and his allies effectively thwarted.

David Dubinsky was no mere social theoretician. As he has said himself, he decided early in life that being just a do-gooder is not enough, that effective leaders must be politicians, too. So he became a politician * * * he still retains his vice chairmanship of the Liberal Party * * * and he mingled idealism with a reasoned pragmatism.

His path was not smooth. Who can agree with all the ideas that run through such a man's head? But today his union has few strikes and is also so rich that its pension fund lends money to the Rockefellers.

All anti-Communists, including many who fought Mr. Dubinsky tooth and nail on other issues, wish him well in the coming years. The man had a job to do and he knew how to do it. An entire industry is better off because of him.

[From the World Telegram, Mar. 18, 1966]

DAVID DUBINSKY RETIRES

David Dubinsky, after 34 years as president of the International Ladies Garment Workers, has retired.

Dubinsky has been an institution in his union and in the industry, and an influence to be reckoned with in organized labor generally and in New York politics.

In his aggressive, outspoken way, Dubinsky has earned his share of foes and his maneuvers naturally could be faulted from other points of view. But he took a bankrupt, puny union in an industry with the most sordid working conditions and built it to wealth and power, with probably the most complete welfare program in the United States.

He used nerve, theatrics, ingenuity, political know-how, and unsparing use of his own authority. He has been a one-man show. But his union gained respect as well as potency, and probably with the chief factor in bringing stability and decency to the garment industry—with only the rarest use of strikes.

Once a Socialist, Dubinsky organized the American Labor Party in 1936, and abandoned it in later years when Communists moved in. Thus started the Liberal Party, still often a decisive force in local elections.

In a colorful life of 74 years, Dubinsky has cut quite a figure. By his vigor and intense distaste for the corruptibles he also cut a pattern of union leadership some of the lately-come dilettantes in the union business can't even approximate.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Mar. 18, 1966]

BUT NOT GOODBY

It was, above all else, the dynamic spirit of David Dubinsky that lifted the International Ladies Garment Workers Union from a slag heap of Communist-ridden insolvency that it was in 1932 to the national showcase of responsible and constructive unionism that it is today. And in so doing, of course, Mr. Dubinsky himself achieved national stature and influence.

He has been aptly named the little giant of the garment workers. It was he, more than anyone else, who liberated the cutters, pressers, and seamstresses from the sweatshops and tuberculosis "lung blocks" of the Lower East Side. He fought labor racketeering wherever he found it. To him, unionism has been a dedication; a vocation in the true sense of that word.

Now Mr. Dubinsky has announced that, at the age of 74, he is resigning as president of the ILGWU, and news stories speak of his "retirement."

We come to a question of meaning. He is walking off stage, yes. But it is impossible to believe that he is closing the gate on the devotion of a lifetime. He remains a vice president of the AFL–CIO and a vice chairman of the Liberal Party.

That is all to the good. The little giant is headed toward the wings, but we have reason to hope his influence will continue to be felt.

WIRE TO D.D.

The fashion business may lose one of its good customers as a result of the David

Dubinsky resignation. A telegram from Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY to the union president said:

"After reading the newspapers this morning, Ethel refuses to buy any more dresses."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1966]

DUBINSKY—AN ORIGINAL: HIS RETIREMENT IS DRAMATIC REMINDER OF THE CHANGE IN UNIONS AND UNIONISTS

(By A. H. Raskin)

The retirement of David Dubinsky provides a dramatic reminder of the speed with which the great union builders of the New Deal era are vanishing from the labor scene. John L. Lewis, Philip Murray, Sidney Hillman, William Green and a dozen others whose names once appeared on the front pages almost as often as the President's have all preceded the little giant of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union into the files of history.

Labor's new men of power are a drabber lot, steeped in the intricate responsibilities of administering and conserving a movement that has become richer in funds, status, economic security and political influence than in fresh ideas for organizing the millions of workers still outside union ranks. Mr. Dubinsky was always an original, as distinctive as Seventh Avenue and the polyglot army of cutters, pressers and seamstresses he helped to climb out of the sweatshops and the steaming, tuberculosis-ridden "lung blocks" of the Lower East Side.

His surprise farewell at yesterday's meeting of the ILGWU general executive board in the Americana Hotel was straight out of the old Yiddish Art Theater, complete with tears, laughs and a hug for his wife just out of the hospital after weeks of treatment for arthritis. It was the best show of its genre since Boris Thomashefsky and Maurice Schwartz surrendered Second Avenue to off-Broadway.

I HAD A UNION LIFE

When the union's secretary-treasurer, Louis Stulberg, who is the man most likely to succeed, led his stunned colleagues in trying to persuade Mr. Dubinsky to stay on, he replied: "I didn't have a life; I had a union life. I don't want to die in my boots. I'm not waiting for a free funeral. I want to be free."

He reminded them that they had tried 5 years ago to get him to take things easier by going on a 3-day week. That lasted just 1 week. "You know my nature," he said. "If I'm president, I can't only be president from morning till night. It has to be from morning till next morning." They still wouldn't take no for an answer, but they all left knowing his decision was irrevocable.

It will be a hard change for them and for him. It was not enough for him to be author of all the union's major policies and chief negotiator in every major contract. He was also, in the words of an intimate, "our best editor, best publicity man, best architect, best ticket taker, best seat arranger, best auditor, best economist, and best dramatic actor—and he had to do it all himself."

At the triennial conventions he was proud papa to the delegates representing the union's 447,000 members. In his major speeches he would range across the mountaintops of social idealism. And a minute later, while the mood of exaltation was still strong in the hall, he would scold some unwary unionist for stirring from his seat. He injected a note of high drama into every report and every talk.

Five Presidents, from Franklin D. Roosevelt to Lyndon B. Johnson, invited him to dine at the White House. His favorite stories there were of the days he spent in a czarist jail at the age of 15 after calling a strike against his father's bakery in Poland. For example, he would put a ring of water around his bed at night to keep off the roaches.

When he became president of the ILGWU in 1922, a disastrous internal war with the Communists had left the union so broke that it had to borrow money to pay its electric bill. But in recent years the hundreds of millions of dollars in its welfare and pension funds enabled it to make loans to the Rockefellers for civic betterment projects in Puerto Rico.

The prestige that accrued to his union caused other labor leaders to turn to him for guidance in creating a better image.

One such was James C. Petrillo, the salty leader of the American Federation of Musicians, in a period when his union was under widespread attack for insisting on the employment of standby musicians. A delegation sent by Mr. Petrillo learned that Mr. Dubinsky had no high-pressure publicity organization, but merely an editor for its internal publications. When the group asked the ILGWU head for his "secret," he told them: "Live right."

He practiced his own maxim in a thousand ways. Here is one he never let the public know about: In 1950, when the union was celebrating its golden anniversary, the executive board voted to authorize a $5,000 increase in Mr. Dubinsky's salary of $17,500. When he refused to take the money, the board insisted that the union buy him a summer home as a retreat from his arduous duties.

THEN A MODEST HOUSE

Over a 7-year period union representatives sought to interest him in one luxurious home or another, and he turned them all down as too lavish. Finally, in 1957, he was entranced by a modest house on Tiana Bay in the Hamptons. The union bought it for $17,500 and put $7,500 more into remodeling it. But just as the Dubinskys were about to move in, the newspapers carried stories about the $160,000 home in Seattle that Dave Beck had acquired with funds of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

In great embarrassment the ILGWU chief informed the board that he could not accept the Long Island house, but the board unanimously rejected his declination. The impasse ended only when one vice president said: "If this will make Dubinsky unhappy, we must respect his wishes." Mr. Dubinsky then arranged to buy the house himself by paying the union the $25,000 in five annual installments.

He referred to the incident obliquely yesterday when general objection arose to his retirement. Without mentioning the house or anything else about the specific circumstances, he reminded the board that once before all the vice presidents had disagreed with a Dubinsky decision, but had decided in the end that they must respect his wishes. "I urge you now to comply with my wishes," he said simply. It was his swan song.

[From Newsweek, Mar. 28, 1966]

LABOR: HAIL AND FAREWELL

David Dubinsky's credentials for the class struggle already were impressive when he arrived in the United States as an 18-year-old immigrant in 1911: he had recently escaped from a labor camp in Siberia, where he had been sentenced as a "revolutionary conspirator" from his native Poland. Like countless other Jewish immigrants, young Dubinsky found his first job in New York City's oppressive garment industry; and a sense of injustice first aroused by czarist police was sharpened by the plight of thousands of men, women, and children laboring up to 70 hours a week (for as little as $5) in the dim light of steamy sweatshops. He quickly joined Cutter's Local 10 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU), battled his way through a succession of union jobs and, starting with his first election to the office in 1932, dedicated the next 34 years of his life to the presidency of the ILGWU.

With Dubinsky's blend of dedication and dash, energy and enterprise, the ILGWU was pretty much a one-man show. "Dubinsky is our best editor, best publicity man, best architect, best ticket taker, best seat arranger, best auditor, best economist, and best dramatic actor," an admiring subordinate once said—and, for better or for worse, the stubby, tireless president was all of those.

Internally, he beat off Communist efforts to control his union in the 1930's and 1940's. From employers in a marginal, highly fragmented industry, he won a 35-hour workweek as far back as 1933. While wages in the ladies' garment industry are still comparatively low (an average of $66.91 per week, compared with a national average for the softgoods industry of $95.28), ILGWU contracts were early pattern-setters for employer-financed vacations (1937), health and welfare funds (1938), and severance pay (1950).

GROWTH

As ILGWU grew in membership (from 40,000 in 1932 to 363,000 today) and resources (from a $2 million deficit to a $571 million surplus), Dubinsky invested union funds in such projects as cooperative apartments on New York's lower East Side ($20 million), low-cost housing in Puerto Rico (with, of all people, the Rockefellers as partners) and Unity House, the ILGWU's 850-acre resort in Pennsylvania's Pocono Mountains. Politically, he was a friend of Presidents. But his impatience with the two parties led him to help form first the American Labor Party in 1936 and then in 1944, New York's Liberal Party.

But as the years passed, Dubinsky's advancing age and around-the-clock devotion to his job frayed his temper and, perhaps, dimmed his vision. At an ILGWU banquet last year, he devoted his considerable forensic talents to an insulting harangue of a fellow officer for botching some minor dinner arrangements. To keep restive garment makers within the ILGWU's New York power base, he undercut labor's efforts to raise the State's minimum wage.

One day last week, Dave Dubinsky, now 74, called a meeting of the ILGWU's general executive board to order at New York's Americana Hotel. Then, with his keen sense of the dramatic, he allowed discussion to ramble along on the need for raising money for next fall's political campaign, before suddenly asking to speak.

FREEDOM

"In an organization or in human life, nothing is permanent or forever," he said quietly, his eyes brimming with tears. "I don't want to die in my boots. I want to be free." What he meant was that he was retiring.

Dubinsky's stunned colleagues tried to persuade him to reconsider, but he refused (the next day Secretary-Treasurer Louis Stulberg, 64, was elected to succeed him). And as the old revolutionary headed for a well-earned rest, his friend AFL–CIO President George Meany offered a grateful labor movement's valedictory. "No one, I suppose will ever completely tabulate all the good that David Dubinsky achieved in his lifetime," Meany said, "and he would be the first to say that no one should try. For it was the deed that always counted with him, not the plaudits."

[From the New Republic, Apr. 2, 1966]

D.D.

Any of many adjectives described, partially, David Dubinsky, who retires in June as president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union: "dynamic," "ebullient," "puckish," "prophetic," "cunning." At the union's convention in Miami last May, when some journalists were speculating that Dubinsky, then 73, might step down, a speaker

mocked them by noting that the chief rose earlier than the writers and worked later. "Why should he retire?" he asked. There were two major considerations. Dubinsky had taken over the presidency of the ILGWU during the great depression, when it was thinned in membership, disrupted by Communist factionalism, and virtually penniless. He was told he would be the union's undertaker. The new president walked up to his fourth-floor office, because the elevator wasn't running; the union couldn't pay its electricity bill. The next two decades, Dubinsky goaded and flailed the ILGWU to a position of affluence and extraordinary prestige. He leaves it with about $97 million in its general fund and $400 million held in trust for welfare and retirement benefits.

"We are known as Dubinsky's union," one of his vice presidents commented recently, "not because we belong to him, but because he has given so much of himself to us." Tough minded even about himself, D.D. recognized that the presidency of the ILGWU would have to be passed on to another man fairly soon—a year more or less doesn't matter—and he wanted the transition to be orderly.

Dubinsky's reasons for retiring are, however, less significant than the fact that his departure marks the closing of an era. In the thirties, when he first emerged as a national figure, some of his associates thought he ought to improve his English, which had, and still has, a distinctly Yiddish flavor. Dubinsky himself never saw the new: "I am a Jewish worker, and I am proud of it." He wanted to be accepted as he was, a product of the Jewish-Socialist tradition under whose influence he had come as an idealistic youngster in Czarist Russia, and of New York's old East Side when it was the world's foremost Jewish ghetto and a fermenting vat for radical philosophies, alien cultures and impassioned individualists. Younger staff members of the union were known to make wry comments when Dubinsky recalled, as he did periodically, his imprisonment in a czarist jail as a boy of 16 for union activity. That past has remained as vivid for him, and as relevant, as his frequent visits to the White House over 30 years.

Though he left the Socialist Party in 1936 to support Roosevelt—"It was not an easy matter for me," he said at the time—he continued to be animated by its social idealism. In this respect, he is perhaps closer to Norman Thomas than he is to George Meany. More successfully than anyone else, he has carried the dreams of the old East Side, and a consciousness of its pain, into the main currents of American labor and American society. The dreams were pruned back, sometimes savagely, but Dubinsky would argue that the important thing is to make a beginning.

One of his closest aids describes the ILGWU under Dubinsky as a "cross between a theological seminary, a school in accountancy, and a Marine boot camp with classes conducted in Biblical quotes in Hebrew, peasant witticisms in Russian, folk wisdom in Yiddish, rule-of-thumb in shop talk, fiscal responsibility in cold figures, and backbone in Mosaic anger."

Throughout, Dubinsky has been a "principal" acting from the center of his own beliefs. In 1926, long before other democratic organizations fully understood what wreckage Communist infiltration could produce, Dubinsky did battle to keep the union from Communist control. In 1934, he led an ILGWU convention out of a Chicago hotel because it had mistreated Negro delegates. He helped to establish the CIO because he believed that industrial unions offered the only hope of organizing the mass production industries; but he later led the ILGWU back into the AFL and helped engineer the reunification of the labor movement, because he thought that this was essential for labor's progress.

Once, when John L. Lewis described himself as a "lone labor man," Dubinsky replied, "We are both in the same boat." It was widely assumed last fall that he would not risk offending President Johnson, with whom he has been especially close, by putting his union and the Liberal Party, in which the ILGWU is a major influence, behind the mayoralty candidacy of John Lindsay, a Republican. Those who made that assumption did not understand Dubinsky. His regard for Roosevelt came close to reverence, but in one instance, when he thought that F.D.R. was behaving badly, he refused to accept a call from him.

Mr. Dubinsky is still the honorary president of the union; his presence will no doubt be felt in its inner councils. He remains a member of the AFL–CIO's executive committee, and, next to Mr. Meany, perhaps its most powerful member. He is first vice chairman of the Liberal Party, to which he may now give more of his time. Louis Stulberg, an able man who steps into the ILGWU presidency, remarked that his predecessor's shoes will be "almost impossible" to fill. Not "almost"; there will have to be a different pair of shoes.—THE EDITORS.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors in the 84th Congress of the Colorado River storage project, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to note that its 10th anniversary will shortly be observed.

On a spring day, April 11, 1956, President Eisenhower signed Public Law 485, of the 84th Congress, to provide for the development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, an area which has been described as the "last waterhole" of the West.

During the past 10 years men and equipment have been at work, changing the face of the West and reshaping its destiny. The project was the result of years of research and engineering, geological studies and congressional attention. It has made possible a dream that has persisted for decades—the taming of one of the longest, wildest and most savage rivers in the Nation, the Colorado River.

The Upper Colorado River Basin, covering parts of Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona, is an area of approximately 110,000 square miles between the high crests of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado and Wyoming, and the Wasatch Mountain spur in Utah. The southern portion drains a part of New Mexico and Arizona through the San Juan River.

The flow of the Colorado River is extremely erratic, varying from 4 million to 22 million acre-feet annually at Lee Ferry. There is a tendency for the high years and the low years to be grouped, thus accentuating problems of river regulation and use. Large storage reservoirs were needed to be filled when flows are high and the deep canyons of the Colorado River and its principal tributaries in the upper basin afforded ideal locations for these reservoirs. The Colorado River storage project was planned to conserve the very limited precipitation which falls principally in the form of snow in the high mountains and to utilize it for municipal, industrial and agricultural growth.

LARGEST RECLAMATION PROJECT

The sum of $760 million, the largest expenditure ever authorized for a reclamation development at one time, was authorized to carry out the purposes of the Upper Colorado River Basin Act.

It authorized construction of 4 large main-stream dams and 11 irrigation units, known as participating projects. The project was a basinwide undertaking and the various units were designed to complement one another.

Today we see our dream becoming reality. The major storage and power features are completed or nearing completion. Many of the participating projects have been finished or are well advanced in the planning and construction phase.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS WILL BE REPAID

As we pause and reflect on the progress of the Colorado River storage project on this 10th anniversary, we find that it is indeed a multipurpose development, regulating the river, creating power, preventing floods, and making water available for use on land and in cities.

Although the project was financed initially by the Federal Government, approximately 99 percent of the total costs will be repaid by people who use the water and power and two-thirds will be repaid to the Federal Treasury with full interest.

The marketing of Colorado River storage project power moved ahead firmly and rapidly in 1965 with the installation of generating capacity, completion of transmission line facilities, and willing customers—particularly with a good water year which brought reservoir levels up. Sales of Colorado River storage project power increased substantially over the past year with revenues reaching an accumulated total of more than $10 million, up $7,500,000 since the end of 1964. By 1970–71, sales of firm power will exceed 650 million watts under the contracts in force at the close of 1965. Thus, progress in Colorado River storage project power marketing and revenue buildup is very satisfactory and well within the project repayment schedule for the buildup phase while Lake Powell is filling.

DEMANDS FOR WATER AND POWER ARE GROWING

The industrial demands for water from CRSP are growing and seem certain to be of major consequence in the future. The Upper Colorado River Basin has long been known as the "Treasure Chest" of the Nation because of its vast deposits of the world's most valuable and necessary minerals. It contains 90 percent of the known uranium deposits in the United States and a third of the Nation's copper. Lead, zinc, phosphates, gold, silver, oil, natural gas, gilsonite, gypsum, tungsten, molybdenum, and vanadium are among the more than 200 different minerals that are found in this area. It has long been felt that the project would be the key to unlock this treasure chest and we are now finding concrete expression in the form of requests for purchase of stored CRSP water. The State of Utah has granted the Resources Co. a right for temporary use of 102,000 acre-feet from Lake Powell for a large thermal powerplant to use nearby coal deposits beneath the Kaiparowits Plateau. The Bureau of Reclamation is now discussing specific contract terms for supply of the water.

Few eras in history have seen such startling changes in population, science, living conditions and industrial growth as the one in which we live. The Colorado River Storage Project with its contribution of such essential items as water and power will be an integral part of the dynamic progress that lies ahead for the United States.

TRIBUTE TO ALL WHO MADE PROJECT POSSIBLE

In this 10th anniversary year, I want to pay my respects to the many dedicated persons whose diligent efforts brought the mighty Upper Colorado River project to successful fruition. Special tribute should be paid to Utah's distinguished former Gov. George Dewey Clyde, a highly skilled engineer whose water planning ability contributed greatly to the design of the Upper Colorado Basin system. Likewise, gratitude should be expressed to my colleagues from Utah who served with me in the 84th Congress and who labored so hard to obtain passage of the authorization and appropriation bills for the Colorado River storage project: Former Senator Arthur V. Watkins, and former Congressmen William A. Dawson, and Henry Aldous Dixon.

Time will not permit me to single out for thanks all of the Members of the Senate and House who voted for the Upper Colorado River project, and especially those who were members of the Interior and Insular Affairs and Appropriations Committees, but I will long remember the support and help which they gave in getting this project authorized and funded. Over the years, I have relied very heavily on advice and assistance received from water and power experts from my own State and I especially want to pay tribute to Wayne Criddle, Jay Bingham, Ival Goslin, and William Palmer.

There are many other individuals and organizations which I could single out for praise, but suffice it to say that my gratitude is boundless. In the generations ahead the mighty dams and reservoirs now sprinkled up and down the Colorado River and its tributaries will amply testify to the foresightedness of these men and the contribution which they have made in making "the desert blossom as a rose."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a status report on the project units of the Colorado River storage project which are located in Utah.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Progress Report on Upper Colorado River Projects Located in Utah

GLEN CANYON STORAGE UNIT

Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir comprises the key storage unit and is the largest of the initial four, providing about 80 percent of both the storage and generating capacity. Glen Canyon Dam rises 710 feet above bedrock and is the second highest dam in the United States. It is the only one of the authorized dams on the Colorado River proper and is located in northern Arizona, about 13 miles downstream from the Utah-Arizona State line and 16 miles upstream from Lee Ferry, the dividing point between the Lower and Upper Basins. The reservoir will have a capacity of 27 million acre-feet and will extend 186 miles upstream on the Colorado River and 71 miles up the San Juan River. The completion contractor has recently finished installation of generating unit No. 8, the last of the eight units in the Glen Canyon powerplant. Unit 8 has gone on the line and the Glen Canyon powerplant has reached its total installed capacity of 900,000 kilowatts. The first unit in the Glen Canyon powerplant went into operation September 4, 1964. This is one of the fastest completions of a large powerplant in all of reclamation history. The left and final diversion tunnel plug is well along and will be finished by this summer. The prime contract for general construction of Glen Canyon Dam was completed in October 1964, and in January 1965 the Bureau of Reclamation announced that it had made the final payment to Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp. for a total of over $134,590,000—the Bureau's largest contract of record.

Construction of a permanent center for visitors on the right abutment of the dam—a joint undertaking of the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service—was started during the summer of 1965 and is scheduled for completion in 1967.

Since the storage of water began in Lake Powell recreation use and the development of facilities have progressed rapidly. Most of the development to date has taken place at Wahweap and Lees Ferry in Arizona. Three of the seven sites scheduled for development on Utah—Halls Crossing, Bullfrog and Hite—now have boat ramps and concession facilities. A new floating marina at Rainbow Bridge offers attractive facilities for boaters. You will remember that one of the claims of the opponents of the project was that it would "wreck the Rainbow Bridge." Instead, thanks to the man-made lake—with 1,800 miles of shoreline—one can now go by boat to within 2 miles of Rainbow Bridge National Monument, which in 1965 had more visitors than in all the years it had been under the National Park Service.

FLAMING GORGE STORAGE UNIT

First of the big storage projects was the production of the first CRSP power in 1963 after the late President Kennedy activated the first generator at Flaming Gorge Dam. Commercial power has been produced there since November 11, 1963. The Flaming Gorge storage unit has two principal functions—development of water resources in the upper basin by providing long-term storage regulation of the flow of the Green River, and generation of electrical energy.

During the past year, recreation facilities on Flaming Gorge Lake were unable to accommodate the influx of visitors to that area on the major holidays. The actual number of visitors to September of 1965 was 2½ times the number forecast when planning for the area was started in 1957. The visitor center at Flaming Gorge Dam was placed in operation this year as a joint venture by the Bureau of Reclamation, National Park Service, and the U.S. Forest Service—a pioneer effort in interagency operation of a major visitor center—has been highly successful. Development of recreation facilities has been mainly at the four major recreation areas: Lucerne Valley, Antelope Flats, Dutch John Draw, and Cedar Springs, where boat ramps, picnic and campground areas, concession facilities, etc., are available for public use. Boat ramps have been constructed at four other sites at convenient intervals on the central and upper portions of the lake.

PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

Of the 16 participating projects now authorized, 2 are in Utah.

The Emery County project is nearing completion. Water is being stored in Joes Valley Reservoir, and deliveries will begin on a testing basis in the coming 1966 irrigation season. This project will provide supplemental water for 18,004 acres of land and full supply for 771 acres in Emery County in east-central Utah. Recreation facilities will be provided at the project storage sites. The other project features under construction and progressing satisfactorily are the Cottonwood Creek-Huntington Canal and Swasey Diversion Dam, the Huntington North Dam and Reservoir, and the Huntington north service canal and Huntington north reservoir feeder canal.

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

Construction is expected to begin soon on the huge $324 million Bonneville unit of the central Utah project with the award of the construction contract for Starvation Dam. Negotiation of the repayment contract for the Bonneville unit was completed last fall, and on December 14 the voters of the seven-county Central Utah Water Conservancy District, representing 60 percent of Utah's population, ratified the contract by a 13-to-1 margin. The court has approved the contract and the $3.5 million construction funds appropriated by the last Congress may now be used to initiate construction of Starvation Dam.

The central Utah project (initial phase) will provide water for irrigation, municipal and industrial use, and power generation. Benefits will also be realized in the fields of outdoor recreation, fish and wildlife conservation, flood control and area redevelopment. The initial phase consists of the Bonneville unit, which involves diversion of water from the Uinta Basin to the Bonneville Basin and associated developments in both basins, and the Vernal, Upalco, and Jensen units, which provide for local development in the Uinta Basin.

Under the Bonneville unit the potential Strawberry aqueduct will intercept flows of Uinta Mountain streams as far east as Rock Creek and convey the water to the enlarged Strawberry Reservoir. The stored water will be released through the Wasatch Mountains to the central Utah area. Through various exchanges and by the construction of new facilities, the water will be made available to an area extending from Salt Lake City, about 75 miles south to the city of Nephi. Starvation Reservoir on Strawberry River with a feeder canal from Duchesne River will develop water for use in the Uinta Basin.

The Vernal unit construction is now completed. It includes the Steinaker Reservoir, with a capacity of 38,200 acre-feet, the Fort Thornburg diversion dam, Steinaker feeder canal, and Steinaker service canal.

Plan formulation studies and foundation explorations are in progress on the Upalco unit, which would develop supplemental irrigation water for about 42,500 acres of presently irrigated lands in the Uinta Basin. The definite plan report is scheduled for completion in fiscal year 1967.

Plan formulation studies are in process for the Jensen unit of the central Utah project to ascertain possibility of developing not only irrigation supplies for some 4,000 acres, but also municipal and industrial water particularly for the processing of the vast phosphate deposits on the Upper Brush Creek and for use in the Vernal, Utah, area. The definite plan report for the Jensen unit is targeted for completion in fiscal year 1968.

Feasibility investigations consisting of land classification studies, drainage investigations, and plan formulation studies are continuing on the central Utah project (ultimate phase), Uintah unit. Completion of a feasibility report is scheduled for fiscal year 1967.

Preliminary cost estimates, water supply studies, and power production studies are well advanced on the Gray Canyon storage unit located on the Green River in east-central Utah. A reconnaissance report is scheduled for completion in fiscal year 1966.

The Bureau of Reclamation is giving early and tentative consideration to the Ute Indian unit of the central Utah project. Under the ultimate phase of the central Utah project this unit would bring water from the Flaming Gorge Reservoir by a tunnel of about 29 miles south into the Uinta Basin. The Ute Indian unit would serve the lands which the Ute Indian Tribe agreed to defer from development under the Bonneville unit. Some 365,000 acre-feet of municipal and industrial water would be developed both for the Uinta Basin and also for transport and delivery westward along the Wasatch front area of Utah.

THE NEED TO ASSIST ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this morning the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare began its hearings on four bills dealing with education, including the administration's elementary and secondary education bill, S. 3046.

One of the others under consideration is the Adult Education Act of 1966, which I introduced on March 2 and which has 17 cosponsors. This adult education bill will be the particular topic of the hearing on Tuesday next.

ADULT UNDEREDUCATION

How would the people of this country and their legislators react if they were told that a dangerous disease was mowing down not hundreds, not thousands—but millions of the adult population—and that this disease was hereditary? This is not a farfetched hypothesis. The facts show that there is such a disease. Its name is adult undereducation.

The effects of ignorance are just as dangerous as those of physical disease—against which we spend billions on research and set up elaborate quarantine systems. The symptoms of ignorance are harder to detect, but its effects are no less malicious—and may even be lethal.

In this complex and ever changing country, anyone with less than a high school education is undereducated. Yet we know also that, according to the 1960 census, there were 55 million Americans over 25 years of age who had dropped out of school before earning their high school diplomas. To use the example of one State—and to reduce the age to a more meaningful level—this means that in New York State 6½ million people over the age of 18 on April 1, 1960, did not have a high school diploma. This is twice the number of students presently enrolled in the kindergarten through 12th year program of the regular schools in New York State.

We need, therefore, to help the States meet this great need. According to Robert A. Luke, executive secretary of the National Association for Public School Adult Education:

> Millions of Americans who dropped out of high school, who now wish to return, and who are over the compulsory school age, cannot do so. In most local school districts of this country the opportunity simply does not exist for a dropout beyond the age of 21 to return to his school and complete his high school education.
>
> In some communities, individuals can secure high school credits from their local public school systems—if they can pay a tuition fee. In still other districts, individuals have been able to get their high school education as a result of having participated in some of the earlier GI Bill of Rights programs.

I might add that the recently enacted Cold War Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act also makes provision for educational opportunities to veterans wishing to complete a secondary school education.

> Home-study courses are available, of course, to those who can afford them. But, in the vast majority of the States of the Union, the opportunity for a high school dropout to return to a local public school to complete his secondary education at public expense does not exist. The reason for this is relatively simple. State and local financial resources for education are always in short supply. State and local school authorities usually decide, therefore, to reserve the funds at their disposal for programs for boys and girls already in school and not stretch them to include funds for those who, for whatever the reason, once dropped out but now want to return

For more than one reason, the public schools of this country are the logical source of educational programs for undereducated adults. The most important reason, perhaps, is the fact that the public schools are already providing elementary and secondary education for children and youth. This means that they have the trained personnel, the facilities, and equipment possessed by no other group. Because of these existing advantages, it has been estimated that one-half the total adult population of the Nation could be given sufficient educational opportunities by using just 3 percent of the total expenditures for schools today.

Second, the public schools are ubiquitous, close by and easily accessible to almost all citizens. And because the public schools are a recognized local educational resource, it is easy for them to work closely with other community agencies and interests in providing education for adults.

THE COST OF ADULT EDUCATION

What are the effects on a country of having an undereducated adult population?

One of the effects is financial. It is an established fact that the great majority of men and women who live on public welfare funds lack a high school education. The cost of public assistance and other welfare aid has zoomed to $5 billion a year, in an era of peak prosperity. In Cook County, Ill., for example, in 1962 the monthly welfare bill was $16,500,000. Undereducated adults are a luxury we cannot afford.

Another effect is the very real danger to any country of having a large proportion of its population ill informed on national and world affairs. When such a situation exists, voters with a narrow, parochial point of view can and do countermand even the wisest decisions made on the national level. Large numbers of citizens who, through lack of education, see the world through the limited and often distorted vision of their own prejudices, emotions, and needs, make it difficult for a country to pursue rational, thoughtful courses of action. It should go without saying that, in today's world, such a situation cannot be tolerated. It endangers the lives of all of us—the informed as well as the uninformed.

Another result of adult undereducation that affects us as a nation is the heredity aspect of the disease called ignorance. That aspect cannot be exaggerated. It has been said that if you know a child's family income and its family education level you can pretty well predict his success or failure in school. Ralph Young, director of Carver House settlement in St. Louis, Mo., said:

> An illiterate family has a hard time turning out literate children. Even if they are eager to have their children attend school, they seldom can give the child the necessary intellectual motivation. The child is too likely to say, "Why should I go to school? You didn't." Or you get a parent who feels, "I made a living without schooling. Why should you have it?"

The educational programs of the poverty program have brought this situation to public attention most strikingly.

The child of undereducated parents is usually doomed to failure in school, in competing for jobs, in making a happy adjustment to modern life. The chances are considerable that he will become a juvenile delinquent, a school dropout, one of society's parasites as his name appears again and again on unemployment lists, welfare rolls, criminal court dockets. The social problems of America's illiterates are thus self-perpetuating, unless an all-out drive is made to educate them.

In "Slums and Suburbs" the noted educator, Dr. Conant, states:

> It may be that only by a greatly increased expenditure of funds on adult education can the present blocks to children's educational progress be removed in the most depressed areas of the large cities.

Thus, enacting legislation to provide additional funds for general adult education may turn out to be the wisest possible investment we could make for our children.

These are the effects of adult undereducation on the Nation. The continuing education of adults is as vital to a society as the education of its children, and the effects are more immediately felt. Moreover, the benefits derived by the State are no less significant than those derived by the persons participating.

EFFECTS OF UNDEREDUCATION ON INDIVIDUALS

What are the effects of undereducation on the individuals themselves?

Ignorance is a disease that weakens the individual's ability to get and keep a job, to establish good relationships with other people, to function effectively as a family member, to live a full, rich life.

A recent study indicates that people who have dropped out of school have a more difficult time adjusting to work than do high school graduates. They receive fewer promotions, and see less chance for promotion than does the graduate. They tend to marry earlier, and their marriages are less likely to be successful.

High-school dropouts have a hard time getting jobs these days. Employers are reluctant to hire, even for training, people who have not finished high school. They feel that there is no point in starting to train a person who will not finish the training. And, of course, many dropouts—even those who have advanced as far as high school without finishing the four years—lack the basic educational skills needed to take advantage of vocational training programs. Even though many people without high-school diplomas now have jobs, their number is decreasing daily as automation makes ever greater inroads into industry.

Ignorance of the simplest rules of good health and safety makes the under-educated individual singularly prone to illness and accident. Also, studies have shown that the poor suffer most cruelly from lack of consumer protection and lack of buyer know-how. The President said recently:

> These people are plagued by consumer problems unknown to the affluent majority. They are often victimized by excessive costs of credit and merchandise. They are subjected to countless fraudulent and deceptive marketing and financing practices. I consider this the most urgent challenge in the field of consumer information and education.

The ability to budget the family income, and to make household purchases wisely is just one of the skills needed for home management and happy family life.

The need for parent education is urgent, and the high rate of juvenile delinquency testifies to that need.

Human relations skills—the ability to communicate with and relate warmly to one's family, neighbors, and fellow workers—are desperately needed by America's undereducated adults. There are about 1.5 million marriages a year in this country, and 400,000 divorces. Another indication that this country is experiencing a breakdown in human relations skills: The National Association for Mental Health reports that 1 out of every 10 persons has some form of mental or emotional illness requiring psychiatric treatment.

These serious and far-reaching problems of adult undereducation cannot be solved by local communities without strong financial help from the Federal Government. This is not to say that some communities are not making a strong effort. It is merely to point out that hundreds of communities lack the funds to run a solid, well-balanced program of adult education for their undereducated citizens. And it is important that programs for this segment of the population be tuition free. These men and women, as we have seen, are likely to have small incomes—with little ability to manage the incomes they have. If going back to school—which they may not be too anxious to do anyway—means parting with money they need for food or rent—they will not go at all.

Mr. President, these are some of the serious issues facing us in the field of education, issues which deserve the highest priority as our next forward move in the educational structure of this country. My bill calls for the kind of assistance which the hard-pressed public schools need if they are going to be encouraged to expand throughout the Nation the opportunities for adult education so sorely needed.

Briefly, there are three elements in my proposal. First is the provision of an opportunity for those who have never achieved high school completion to make up for that deficit. Funds would be allotted to the States for such a use on a matching basis, using a formula based on the number of persons over 18 in each State who have not completed high school.

The second or supplementary adult education aspect would encourage the schools similarly to offer nonacademic adult education to their communities, adult education open to all and tailored to the particular needs of adults in such fields as consumer education, parent education, and the like.

The third element of the bill is provision for a relatively small amount of funds for the training of adult education leadership.

The U.S. Office of Education, at my request, has prepared tables showing the specific amounts of money which would be allocated to the States for both the expanded adult basic education program—defined to include education through the high school level—and for the supplementary adult education program.

I ask unanimous consent that these tables may appear at the close of my remarks.

I am highly pleased—and I am sure that my 17 colleagues who are co-sponsors join me in this statement—that the Subcommittee on Education is giving consideration to the bill. This is the next great educational frontier, the neglected area of our educational structure. There is a great need, and I hope that the committee and Congress will make a start toward meeting that need by favorable action on the bill.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations for adult basic education, fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969 [1]

	Nonhigh school graduates, 18 and over, Apr. 1, 1960 [2]	Fiscal year		
		1967	1968	1969
United States and outlying areas		$90,000,000	$125,000,000	$150,000,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	64,857,087	88,200,000	122,500,000	147,000,000
Alabama	1,325,055	1,801,960	2,502,722	3,003,266
Alaska	61,403	83,503	115,976	139,171
Arizona	416,959	567,028	787,539	945,047
Arkansas	762,698	1,037,203	1,440,560	1,728,672
California	4,794,893	6,520,637	9,056,441	10,867,729
Colorado	505,299	687,163	954,393	1,145,271
Connecticut	900,411	1,224,481	1,700,668	2,040,801
Delaware	154,784	210,493	292,351	350,821
Florida	1,832,709	2,492,325	3,461,562	4,153,675
Georgia	1,577,399	2,145,126	2,979,341	3,575,209
Hawaii	191,155	259,954	361,047	433,257
Idaho	197,072	268,001	372,223	446,668
Illinois	3,766,383	5,121,953	7,113,824	8,536,589
Indiana	1,640,949	2,231,548	3,099,372	3,719,247
Iowa	891,573	1,212,462	1,683,975	2,020,770
Kansas	686,809	934,001	1,297,223	1,556,668
Kentucky	1,317,446	1,791,612	2,488,350	2,986,020
Louisiana	1,262,356	1,716,694	2,384,298	2,861,157
Maine	341,449	464,341	644,918	773,902
Maryland	1,131,672	1,538,976	2,137,466	2,564,959
Massachusetts	1,731,427	2,354,590	3,270,264	3,924,317
Michigan	2,735,552	3,720,112	5,166,823	6,200,188
Minnesota	1,111,766	1,511,905	2,099,868	2,519,842
Mississippi	864,914	$1,176,208	$1,633,622	$1,960,346
Missouri	1,714,704	2,331,848	3,238,678	3,886,414
Montana	206,389	280,671	389,821	467,785
Nebraska	445,722	606,143	841,866	1,010,239
Nevada	85,034	115,639	160,610	192,731
New Hampshire	215,192	292,642	406,448	487,737
New Jersey	2,307,982	3,138,655	4,359 243	5,231,091
New Mexico	287,583	391,088	543,178	651,813
New York	6,473,173	8,802,952	12,226,323	14,671,588
North Carolina	1,799,825	2,447,606	3,399,452	4,079,343
North Dakota	216,471	294,382	408,864	490,636
Ohio	3,437,438	4,674,616	6,492,523	7,791,028
Oklahoma	849,871	1,155,751	1,605,209	1,926,251
Oregon	559,145	760,389	1,056,095	1,267,314
Pennsylvania	4,403,159	5,987,913	8,316,546	9,979,856
Rhode Island	355,118	482,930	670,736	804,883
South Carolina	930,736	1,265,720	1,757,945	2,109,533
South Dakota	227,880	309,897	430,412	516,495
Tennessee	1,499,696	2,039,456	2,832,578	3,399,094
Texas	3,454,448	4,697,748	6,524,651	7,829,582
Utah	211,452	287,556	399,384	479,261
Vermont	133,945	182,154	252,991	303,589
Virginia	1,491,074	2,027,731	2,816,293	3,379,552
Washington	846,320	1,150,922	1,598,502	1,918,203
West Virginia	769,935	1,047,045	1,454,229	1,745,074
Wisconsin	1,368,150	1,860,565	2,584,118	3,100,942
Wyoming	94,406	128,384	178,311	213,973
District of Columbia	270,106	367,321	510,168	612,201
Outlying areas		1,800,000	2,500,000	3,000,000

---

[1] Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations for adult basic education with 2 percent reserved for the outlying areas and the balance distributed on the basis of the population age 18 and over without a high school certificate of graduation, Apr. 1, 1960.

[2] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census of the Population, vol. 1, "Characteristics of the Population," tables 101, 102, and 103; U.S. Summary, tables 168, 172, and 173.

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations for supplemental adult education, fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969 [1]

	Estimated population, July 1, 1963 [2] (thousands)	Fiscal year		
		1967	1968	1969
United States and outlying areas		$35,000,000	$50,000,000	$75,000,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	119,889	34,300,000	49,000,000	73,500,000
Alabama	2,052	587,073	838,676	1,258,014
Alaska	142	40,626	58,037	87,056
Arizona	905	258,919	369,884	554,826
Arkansas	1,195	341,887	488,410	732,615
California	11,297	3,232,049	4,617,213	6,925,818
Colorado	1,194	341,601	488,001	732,002
Connecticut	1,774	507,538	725,054	1,087,581
Delaware	298	85,257	121,796	182,694
Florida	3,618	1,035,102	1,478,718	2,218,077
Georgia	2,579	737,847	1,054,067	1,581,100
Hawaii	413	118,158	168,798	253,197
Idaho	414	118,445	169,207	253,810
Illinois	6,715	1,921,148	2,744,497	4,116,74
Indiana	2,998	857,722	1,225,317	1,837,975
Iowa	1,751	500,958	715,654	1,073,480
Kansas	1,416	405,115	578,735	868,103
Kentucky	1,950	557,891	796,987	1,195,481
Louisiana	2,021	578,204	826,006	1,239,009
Maine	625	178,811	255,445	383,167
Maryland	2,095	599,375	856,250	1,284,376
Massachusetts	3,485	997,051	1,424,359	2,136,539
Michigan	4,937	1,412,466	2,017,808	3,026,712
Minnesota	2,150	615,111	878,729	1,318,094
Mississippi	1,342	$383,943	$548,491	$822,736
Missouri	2,863	819,098	1,170,141	1,755,211
Montana	427	122,164	174,520	261,780
Nebraska	934	267,216	381,736	572,605
Nevada	248	70,952	101,360	152,041
New Hampshire	416	119,017	170,024	255,036
New Jersey	4,326	1,237,660	1,768,085	2,652,128
New Mexico	551	157,640	225,200	337,800
New York	11,884	3,399,988	4,857,126	7,285,689
North Carolina	2,946	842,845	1,204,064	1,806,096
North Dakota	389	111,292	158,989	238,483
Ohio	6,290	1,799,556	2,570,795	3,856,191
Oklahoma	1,586	453,751	648,216	972,324
Oregon	1,191	340,743	486,775	730,163
Pennsylvania	7,513	2,149,454	3,070,649	4,605,973
Rhode Island	591	169,084	241,548	362,323
South Carolina	1,476	422,281	603,258	904,887
South Dakota	431	123,308	176,155	264,232
Tennessee	2,371	678,338	969,055	1,453,582
Texas	6,285	1,798,126	2,568,751	3,853,127
Utah	553	158,212	226,017	339,026
Vermont	255	72,955	104,221	156,332
Virginia	2,690	769,604	1,099,434	1,649,150
Washington	1,880	537,864	768,377	1,152,566
West Virginia	1,141	326,438	466,340	699,510
Wisconsin	2,535	725,258	1,036,083	1,554,125
Wyoming	207	59,222	84,603	126,905
District of Columbia	544	155,637	222,339	333,508
Outlying areas		700,000	1,000,000	1,500,000

---

[1] Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations for supplemental adult education with 2 percent reserved for the outlying areas and the balance distributed on the basis of the estimated resident population 18 and over, July 1, 1963.

[2] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Population Estimates," Series P-25, No. 294, Nov. 5, 1964, table 1, p. 6.

FAA FLIGHT SPECIALISTS RECEIVE AWARDS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was present in the office of Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, on the occasion of the award of Federal Aviation Agency honors to Mr. Charles Derry and Mr. Dominick Bellotte for assistance rendered to a West Virginia businessman, Mr. George Fallon, of Westover, in landing safely in a snowstorm in January.

These two employees of the FAA were presented the awards by Gen. William McKee of that Agency, and Congressman STAGGERS' remarks during the March 30 presentation ceremony emphasized the respect for their competence displayed by his presence to bestow the honors. The incident was described, along with a report of the presentation ceremony, in the March 31 edition of the Dominion-News, Morgantown, W. Va.

I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper article be printed in the RECORD at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that the remarks by Congressman STAGGERS during the March 30 ceremony be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dominion-News, Mar. 31, 1966]

DERRY, BELLOTTE RECEIVE FAA AWARDS IN WASHINGTON—THIRD HIGHEST TO CIVILIANS

WASHINGTON.—Two flight service specialists stationed at the Federal Aviation Agency's Morgantown bureau received FAA certificates of achievement in ceremonies here Wednesday.

They were Charles Derry and Dominick Bellotte, credited with helping guide Morgantown pilot George Fallon of Suncrest to a safe landing after he became lost in inclement weather in January.

The certificates—the third highest national honor the FAA bestows on its employees—were presented by Gen. William McKee of the FAA headquarters here.

Presentation of the awards was made in Congressman HARLEY O. STAGGERS' office in the new Sam Rayburn House Office Building.

Mr. Fallon, a Westover businessman, accompanied the two flight specialists to Washington for the ceremonies.

Presentation of the awards to the two men came in recognition of their assistance to Mr. Fallon when he became lost on a flight during a snowstorm in early January.

Heading for Morgantown from a visit in Virginia, Mr. Fallon radioed the Morgantown Airport FAA station for assistance when he realized he was off course.

Further communication between the pilot and the FAA station was difficult because the aircraft's radio developed a malfunction.

Mr. Derry and Mr. Bellotte received cooperation from airport officials in Clarksburg and Elkins in pinpointing Mr. Fallon's position over rugged terrain in Tucker County by tracing the airplane's radio signals.

They ruled "talking" the partially disabled craft into Morgantown because of fast approaching darkness and a low cloud cover.

Parsons has no established landing strip, but State police and sheriff's deputies there followed the flight specialists' instructions in improvising one near the Tucker County community.

Several dozen citizens volunteered to line up their autos with headlights burning beside the landing area to guide the pilot down for a night landing.

Following advice from Mr. Derry and Mr. Bellotte, the pilot brought his light aircraft to a safe landing despite being low on fuel. He later flew the craft to Morgantown.

The two flight specialists had praise Wednesday for the cooperation they received from authorities in the Parsons area in bringing the "lost" aircraft to the ground. They also had compliments for Mr. Fallon's calmness during the experience.

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE HARLEY O. STAGGERS UPON THE OCCASION OF PRESENTATION OF FLIGHT SPECIALIST AWARDS, MARCH 30, 1966

On the sad day when Gov. Adlai Stevenson collapsed on the streets of London and died, he left a book lying on his bedroom table. The book was open at a page filled with sage comments whose age is undetermined. One part of the message reads: "The world is full of trickery. But let this not blind you to what virtue there is; many persons strive for high ideals, and everywhere life is full of courage."

That the world is full of courage is attested by this recognition meeting here today. And the meeting would not be going on here if there were lacking men of ideals. Too many acts of courage in this world go unnoticed because there is no one present to report them. And too many acts go unrewarded because there is no one who cares enough. Fortunately in this case there was a man who noticed and who was quick to see in the performance the heroism and ingenuity of the men who are the principal actors in the drama. Bill Hart is—or must I say was—a newspaperman who has always been alert for the best that is found in human life. Not his to dig in the garbage of society and expose its rottenness to sight and smell. On the contrary, it has been his chosen role in his profession to accent the positive, to envision the constructive, to use his news medium to assemble the men and the materials which would accomplish a desirable result. It may be impossible to determine just how much Bill Hart has added to his city and State. The influence of one man here and there may be the decisive factor, and the lack of that man might mean the failure of a constructive proposal. Certainly the construction and the expansion of the Morgantown airport, which serves as a setting for the exploit we honor here today, was urged and promoted by Bill Hart.

So it excites no wonder to find that Bill Hart was in the critical place at the critical time to observe a feat which might otherwise have gone unnoticed. For certainly the principal actors are too modest to boast of it. To them at the time, it seemed routine—a somewhat more perplexing and complicated situation, perhaps, but quite in the line of duty, or nearly so.

Anyway, it was an opportunity to justify their existence as qualified specialists and to perform a service which would do honor to the whole tribe of men who have taken up the wings of the morning and flown to the uttermost parts of the earth. So their deed did not seem merely routine to Bill Hart, who recorded it and publicized it. Nor did it seem a simple performance of duty to Gen. William F. McKee, FAA Administrator, nor to Mr. Stimpson and Mr. Hicks, officials of the FAA and of the airlines serving Morgantown. For all of them have taken time off from their duties, which are important and which are always pressing, to come here for a few minutes to pay their tributes to men who have brought credit and honor to every individual who has attached himself to the new and fascinating, if always demanding and dangerous, industry of air travel. We recognize the real nobility of soul that actuates all these men. The tenets of our democracy have been engraved in their lives. Though they have achieved high position in the world of business, they have been taught to honor and respect competence and adherence to duty wherever they find it. They are the kind of people for whom Adlai Stevenson must have been thankful when he read: "Many persons strive for high ideals."

Also, I must thank my colleagues, Senator RANDOLPH and Senator BYRD, for laying aside their particular perplexities for the hour, and coming here to meet with us in recognition of this occasion. They are loyal and devoted West Virginians whose interest in man has never been questioned, and they too are fiercely proud of the good deeds wrought by their countrymen.

And to this list it is desirable to add the news media, the newspaper men, the radio and TV men, who are making this occasion a memorable one for all of us.

The feat for which we honor Dominick Bellotte and Charles Derry today has been described in detail, but is well worthy of repetition: Mr. Bellotte and Mr. Derry took their posts as flight specialists in the Morgantown Airport.

The January night was full of wind and low-hanging clouds and swirling snow. The night was also full of airplanes lost in the gloom and the storm, seeking safe havens. There was swift demand for the services of the flight specialists to determine positions and direct courses. One plane in distress was an ambulance carrying a desperately ill man from Florida to Pittsburgh, George Fallon, the pilot, will not forget that flight, whether we had brought it to this day of notice or not. He was lost, but knew he was in dangerous mountain terrain. His gasoline supply was low; his radio was working only spasmodically. He wanted help. While one of the flight specialists tried to take care of the other planes asking for help, the other specialist began to hunt for ways of helping Fallon. First he determined Fallon's position. Then he speeded a rescue plane to guide him. The rescue plane could not locate the stricken plane in the storm. But the flight specialist (this was Bellotte if you wish to name him) alerted the police of a small town. Forgive me for calling it a small town. It is small only in number of residents, not in bigness of heart. The police cleared both the main street and an abandoned air strip for a forced landing. Both were lighted by flares and automobiles. In response to questions, Fallon said he could see the lights. The plane came down and precious lives were saved.

DEBATE OF PUBLIC POLICY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is well to remember, particularly during this year when the Senate has been engaged in a historic debate on our policy in Vietnam, that our country was founded on reason and principle.

Dissent to our foreign policy is in itself a manifestation of our strength, the democratic process. To follow blindly is not reason and to subjugate objection for convenience is not principle.

At an engagement in Atlantic City, N.J., Dr. John W. McDevitt, Supreme Knight of the Knights of Columbus, gave a talk relevant to the problems troubling many of us today.

In this moving address Dr. McDevitt encouraged reasoned debate of public policy. But at the same time he warned of the danger of permitting the sensational stunts of a few to frustrate the general interests of the broad community.

He suggested that a spirit of patriotism should replace dissent as the end result of reasoned debate and formulation of policy.

Believing that my colleagues will be interested in Dr. McDevitt's remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF DR. JOHN W. MCDEVITT

It is a distinct pleasure for me to join in the happy festivities of the exemplification of the fourth degree of the second and fourth New Jersey districts of the St. Isaac Jogues Province.

But it is more than a pleasure. It is a great opportunity for both you and me to examine anew the great ideal of patriotism to which the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus is especially dedicated—an ideal, I must add sorrowfully, which is neither understood nor appreciated by some vocal elements in American society.

Patriotism is defined simply in Webster's dictionary as "love of country" and "devotion to the welfare of one's country." But patriotism must have a sound religious and spiritual basis if it is to withstand the pounding currents of selfishness and misguided idealism and the eddies of popular fancies.

As fourth degree members of the Knights of Columbus, deeply committed to Christian values, we love our country because we love our God. We have respect for properly constituted authority here on earth because we have an unfailing belief in a supreme authority above. We have respect for proper law and order on earth because we strive to adhere to the law and order of the Supreme Lawgiver above.

We are willing to work, fight, suffer, and die for our American community when this Nation's vital interests are threatened because we try to imitate the noble example of the God-Man who came down from Heaven and shed His last drop of blood for each and every member of mankind.

The history of the Knights of Columbus is replete with examples of dedicated service to our country. In World War I the Knights achieved an unparalleled reputation with their huts near the front lines dispensing aid and comfort to the American doughboys.

In World War II the Knights joined with other organizations in forming the USO which provided a "home away from home" for the millions of GI's who fanned over every continent before the fighting was over. In addition there was a record of unstinting work by the Knights of Columbus for war bonds and other patriotic undertakings.

In this connection I might note that there is a huge plaque at the supreme headquarters of our order in New Haven signed by the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury commending the selfless patriotism of our society.

But our history abounds also in examples of individual heroic service to our country.

The first member of the American Expeditionary Force to give his life for our country during World War I was Lt. William T. Fitzsimmons, of the Kansas City, Mo., Council of the Knights of Columbus.

The first American fighter pilot to bring down a Nazi plane in World War II was Lt. Sam F. Junkin, of Natchez, Miss., then and now a member of our Natchez Council No. 1034. He gained this distinction in an engagement over Dieppe, France, in 1942.

The third man to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor during World War II was Lt. Willibald Bianchi, a member of St. Patrick's Council No. 1076 in New Ulm, Minn. He received this country's highest honor for outstanding heroism with a small group of American and Filipino troops who tried to hold off the onrushing Japanese hordes that swept into the Philippines in the early months of 1942.

The citation states that Brother Bianchi volunteered to lead a rifle platoon to wipe out two entrenched enemy machinegun nests. When wounded by two bullets through his left hand, he discarded his rifle and began firing a pistol. He located the machinegun nest and personally silenced it with grenades.

When wounded a second time by two bullets through his chest muscles, Brother Bianchi climbed to the top of a tank and used its antiaircraft gun to pour fire into the enemy position. He kept firing until he was hit a third time and knocked off the tank. This lionhearted warrior recovered from his many wounds to go on to fight again for his country, only to die in action in December 1944.

The only man to receive two Congressional Medals of Honor in his day was Sgt. Maj. Daniel Daly, who was a member of Loyola Council 477, of Brooklyn, until his death in 1937.

The first man to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism in Vietnam is another member of the order, Capt. Roger H. C. Donlon, of Bishop England Council No. 724, Columbia, S.C. He received this distinguished award at the White House from President Johnson within the past year.

The citation states that despite receiving multiple wounds in a battle repulsing the Vietcong, Captain Donlon braved mortar and rifle fire and bursting grenades to rescue wounded comrades, evacuate vitally needed guns and ammunition, and rally the defenders to repel the attack.

I repeat that patriotism has been a noble tradition in our society over many decades and through many generations.

But I am the first to admit that despite its simple definition in Webster's dictionary, patriotism is a complex notion.

We do not hold that patriotism means "my country, right or wrong." The shortsightedness of this notion was amply demonstrated in our own lifetime by the followers of Hitler who murdered millions of innocent victims on the feeble basis of orders from higher authorities. A crime is a crime, and no bewitching incantations of a higher authority can make it right.

This brings us to a more discerning definition of patriotism. It is devotion to the long-term interest of one's country and of all mankind. The deliberate slaughter of innocent victims at Dachau and Auschwitz never can be judged in the long-term good interests of one's country or of mankind.

In our democratic society there is good reason why crucial foreign and domestic policies should be argued and debated to see whether they are in the long-term good interests of our country and of all mankind. It is only through this general discussion that we can hope with God's help to arrive at a proper answer to our problems and reach a consensus on which to base public policy.

But once public opinion has firmed behind a particular program it is not in the public interest for an obstinate and obstreperous minority to sabotage this program. Such is not the road of democracy. It is the rut to anarchy.

The ballot box, public opinion polls and every other measurement of the public pulse today indicates that the American people feel that we should help the Republic of South Vietnam defend itself against incursions from the Communist regime to the north, even if the price is serious.

This does not oblige every member of our society to agree with this policy. It does not put a gag on his right to express disagreement. But it does impose an obligation to respect the wishes of the great majority by refraining from any deliberate sabotage of the country's collective effort.

Under the light of this concept of patriotism, the actions of some of our so-called "vietniks" show forth in their true garishness.

There can be nothing patriotic about attempts to stop troop trains. There is no patriotic heroism evident in burning draft cards. I find no love of country shining from threats to assassinate President Johnson because of his commitment of troops to Vietnam. It is difficult to discover a glow of public spirit in courses of deceit and subterfuge to dodge the draft.

I find myself compelled to ask the question: Are the train stoppers motivated by broad benevolence or by foolish fancy? Are the draft card burners in love with their country or in love with themselves? Are they seeking the national interest or notoriety? Are those threatening to assassinate our democratically elected President following the path of passionate patriotism or the trail of treacherous treason? Are the schoolers in subterfuge promoting democracy or demagoguery?

I can understand why a man would feel that he is doing violence to his conscience by bearing lethal weapons against fellow members of humanity. But I fail to see why his conscience should suffer such violence from bearing a draft card. A draft card has never inflicted harm on anyone.

I can understand the tenaciousness and sacredness of a pacifist conscience that abhors all war and violence. But I fail to understand and cannot condone the contempt for law and mockery of authority displayed by those who engage in the shameful game of a public burning of draft cards.

No one wants to force a true conscience. But society cannot safely excuse a scornful flouting of law and order.

One question that inevitably pops up in the demagoguery of Vietniks is: "Would Christ carry a draft card if He were alive today?"

I find this question particularly irritating because they are trying to cover their drossy deeds with the halo of the God-Man of whose life and spirit they show a lamentable lack of knowledge.

They forget—if they ever studied the matter—that Christ did not come to earth to lead a rebellion against authority, but a rebellion against sin. Christ told the crafty circumventers of his time that they should give to Caesar the things that belong to Caesar and to God the things that belong to God. Christ broke his silence to reply to Pilate because he recognized that the Roman governor had authority which was given to him "from above."

Christ did not preach anarchy but order. He did not call men to selfishness but to selflessness. His message breathes love and loyalty, not antipathy and treachery.

If Christ, the great Man of Peace, were to oppose bearing arms today, He certainly would not shirk service to His country. If, as a conscientious objector, He could not carry a machinegun, He wouldn't hesitate to carry a stretcher or to bind up the wounds of His bleeding countrymen.

A noble tradition has been set by our highly respected religious neighbors, the Friends. While they have a religious aversion to bearing guns, they have no reservations about bearing stretchers and giving their countrymen a heroic example of dedicated service without arms.

Our democratic society has room for those whose conscience directs them to be pacifists. Our democratic society must protect the rights of those who disagree with the will and wishes of the majority. Our democracy will gain strength and growth from open discussion of public policy.

But our democratic society cannot survive without a general spirit of patriotism. If love of country is superseded by love of individual interest, if sacrifice for country is spurned for pursuit of personal pleasure, if the general interests of the broad community are permitted to be frustrated by the stupid stunts of a few, then our democracy is in danger. Our freedoms are in danger. We are in danger. For then we can drift only into the suicidal extremes of anarchy or despotism.

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVOLUTION—PART I

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post contained a most interesting and enlightening article by Steven M. Spencer entitled "The Birth Control Revolution." As the article points out, over the last few years there has been a substantial shift in Government and private attitudes toward family planning with the result that individuals, government officials and public health personnel are now talking openly about the need to increase Government help in family planning facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include part I of this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVOLUTION

(By Steven M. Spencer)

(Barriers fell in the year just ended, and birth control became a national policy. Here is how the "pill" and the "loop" are transforming laws and love in America and offering women new freedom and new responsibilities.)

"Oh, I know I've put on a little weight since I started on the pill," said a Chicago housewife in her late twenties, "but I think it's just from contentment. I used to worry a lot about having another baby, and that kept me thinner, but I never have to worry anymore. We have three children, from 3 years to 6 months, but with two still in diapers I'd prefer to wait for the next until the youngest is at least 2 years old. And now I know I can wait." This young mother is typical of the millions of American women who today are leading a new kind of life, for they have gained what for eons was denied the daughters of Eve—a secure means of planning the birth of their children. They are the beneficiaries of one of the most dramatic sociomedical revolutions the world has ever known.

The revolutionaries are the small band of determined men and women who for more than half a century have promoted planned parenthood. Scorned and despised at first, they gradually caught up doctors and lawmakers, millionaires, and presidents in their endeavor, until their goals became socially acceptable and almost the entire Nation changed its mind.

The implements of the revolution are "the pill"—the oral contraceptive tablet the woman of 1966 takes 20 days of each month—and the increasingly popular intra-uterine device, a coil or loop of plastic or metal worn in the womb for as long as a woman wishes to avoid pregnancy. With the pill and the loop, in spite of possible side effects and rare hazards, the science of birth control has now reached a degree of effectiveness and convenience undreamed of even a decade ago.

These technical advances, combined with a growing concern about the world population crisis, brought the birth-control revolution to a historic turning point in the year just closed, for 1965 marked the fall of most of the last important barriers against general distribution of family-planning information and services.

It was the year that the U.S. Supreme Court threw out as an unconstitutional violation of privacy the 86-year-old Connecticut law that had forbidden the use of contraceptives and forced the closing of birth-control clinics.

Positive legislative steps were taken in 10 other States, including New York.

It was the year the Federal Government, taking its cue from President Johnson, became more directly involved in birth-control activities than ever before. Early in the year the President had pledged he would seek new ways "to help deal with the explosion in world population," a problem he rated second in importance only to achieving peace. In his June address to the United Nations he urged that we "act on the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth $100 invested in economic growth." Appropriately, as the year closed, the Ford Foundation announced it was granting $14.5 million for research on human reproduction and fertility control. "Only birth control on a massive scale," Gen. William Draper, Jr., national chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, said in December, the day after the Ford Foundation announcement, "coupled with rapidly increased food production in the developing countries, can prevent the greatest catastrophe of modern times."

As Draper spoke, the Ecumenical Council of the Roman Catholic Church was drafting a text on birth control. The traditional foe of all contraceptive techniques except periodic abstinence, the church during the past several years was shaken from parish to Papacy by disagreement and debate on the topic. Many Catholic couples, including the estimated 35 percent in America who use methods not approved by their church, hoped the Ecumenical Council would modify the ban, but no such change was forthcoming. According to some observers, however, including Dr. John T. Noonan, Jr., an American professor of law at Notre Dame University who is a consultant to the Pope's commission on marriage problems, the council's final document lays the groundwork for eventual change. If so, 1965 will indeed be remembered as a revolutionary turning point.

One cannot be sure that the birth control revolution will move fast enough for the nations to avert the starvation and overcrowding of runaway population growth. Hundreds of millions of human beings are already on the brink of famine. Recently a special panel for the White House Conference on International Cooperation declared that "the rate of growth of world population is so great—and its consequences so grave—that this may be the last generation which has the opportunity to cope with the problem on the basis of free choice." But although the effect of the birth control revolution upon the nations remains in doubt, there is no question that it will have an enormous impact upon marriage in America and the American family. Birth control advocates speak of a strengthening of love between husband and wife once the fear of unwanted pregnancy disappears from sexual relations; they predict an easing of family financial strain and warmer relationships between parents and children as other stresses are removed. Already many of the 5 million American women taking the pill are enjoying at least partial relief from the menstrual tensions and pains that have always been considered their inescapable lot. Scientists are perfecting an injection that not only prevents conception but suppresses menstruation for months. This and other prospective developments reported here—including a "morning-after" pill—promise the American woman, already the freest in the world, still vaster freedom.

The freedom, however, extends not only to wives but to unmarried girls, and the choices that the latter make can mean a widening of the rift between the generations. There are indications that a majority of unmarried young women still observe the standards of sexual behavior taught by their parents or their religion. But many seek in sexual activity the confirmation of their identity as free adults, and, whether by legitimate or underground routes, the pill has found its way to the college campuses and even to the high school hallways. Dr. Mary Steichen Calderone, an eminent planned parenthood expert, tells of an encounter with a girl in a New York City junior high school during a break between classes. The girl had dropped her handbag in the crowded corridor, and its contents spilled on the floor. "I stopped to help her pick the things up," Dr. Calderone said, "and was astonished to see a package of birth control pills. I asked the child, 'Do you really know about these things?' 'Oh, yes,' she replied, 'I take them every Saturday night when I go on a date.' She had gotten the pills from her married sister—apparently without benefit of instructions. If it weren't so funny, it would be tragic." In fact, it probably will be tragic. One pill alone is quite ineffective. They must be taken daily for 5 to 7 days before any protection is built up.

Many of birth control's most ardent supporters candidly admit that the new freedom provided by the better methods carries with it—as does any freedom—corresponding dangers. While for the first time in history men and women have the ability to make an absolute and free choice as to the purpose and result of their sexual actions, good choices still require intelligence. "We now have the means of separating our sexual and our reproductive lives," says Dr. Calderone, "and we have a great responsibility to make proper use of both of them."

THE 23D COMMUNIST PARTY CONGRESS AND THE PROBLEMS OF SOVIET JEWS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, this week and next, two events of significance to Jews all over the world are taking place. Tuesday marked the opening in Moscow of the 23d Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Next Monday night will be the beginning of Passover, the celebration of the liberation of the Jews from bondage in Egypt.

These two events are very much related. For the Passover holiday is symbolic of the struggle of the Jewish people against persecution in many lands over many centuries. And the 23d Congress of the Communist Party could, in my judgment, play a significant role in influencing the dimensions of that problem in the Soviet Union, in influencing the course of that nation's policy toward its Jewish citizens for the future.

Much has happened since the historic 20th Party Congress only 10 years ago. Just in the last year Premier Kosygin publicly condemned anti-Semitism, and Pravda followed this with a similar editorial. And both the Kosygin remark and the Pravda editorial were reported in the central newspapers of a number of Soviet republics. There has been other news, too—of a theater in Vilna and a monument in Kiev, and of promises regarding both Hebrew prayer books and the reopening of a Yeshivah.

These are isolated, halting, but nevertheless encouraging steps in the right direction. True recognition of the historic and religious identity of the Jewish people will have to involve much more: a thorough educational campaign by the Soviet Government to eradicate anti-Semitism; and the allowance, even the support, of an entire set of communal institutions—schools and rabbinical seminaries, Yiddish and Hebrew books and periodicals—in short, a Jewish cultural identity.

There will be difficulties involved in accomplishing these things. This is a situation which has deep historical roots, and we in the United States know only too well that even the full weight of government policy will not erase discrimination and restrictive practices overnight. But the Soviet Union has done a great deal in recent years for other minority groups within its population. It could and should do a great deal more for its Jewish citizens.

Certainly the way in which a nation treats its minority groups will be one determinant of the interest of other nations and peoples in widening contact with that nation. Individual citizens from other countries, for example, will be reluctant to travel where they believe that irrational treatment of minorities, of "outsiders," of "foreigners," occurs. More broadly, we have seen that writers and enlightened people all over the world have expressed their concern and dismay over the repressive Sinyavsky-Daniel trial. So the stifling of internal freedoms—be they of expression or religion—has a corresponding effect on the potential for more flexible relations around the world.

And nations will be more reluctant to widen contacts and engage in efforts at détente the more they have reason to believe that the internal principles of the Soviet Union cannot be reconciled with their own. Indeed, I would suggest that the expressed concern of Communists in some of the satellite countries and in the West over anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union is an indication of their inability to rationalize some of the actions which the Soviet Government has taken against its Jewish citizens.

This is a time of international gathering in Moscow. This is a time when Communists from other nations will undoubtedly be voicing their concerns to the Soviet Government about its policy in various areas. But it is more than that. This is a time when freedom-loving people all over the world can let the Soviet Government know that its policy toward its Jewish citizens is important, not just for elemental humanitarian and libertarian reasons, but also because it involves the cause of peace all over the world.

If the concern of people around the world can make some difference to the actions of the Soviet Government at this time, then this significant week will become an historic week. Then Passover in this Jewish year of 5727 will be a renewed time of liberation for the Jewish people in keeping with the freedom from bondage in Egypt which Jewish people will celebrate next week.

THE STRIKE DILEMMA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the strike by firemen of eight major railroads in the United States once again dramatizes the potentiality of a labor-management dispute virtually crippling the economy of the Nation.

The impact of a major transportation strike touches not only our war effort in Vietnam, but virtually every level of American economic life.

Once again, however, it is the general public that suffers most from a dispute to which it is not a party.

It is for this reason that I sponsored S. 2891, a bill to establish a U.S. Court of Labor-Management Relations. I think the railroad firemen's strike is but another indication of the pressing need to adopt additional legislation to prevent obsolete and discommoding strikes against the national interest.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an editorial of February 24, 1966, from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, dealing with the subject of the labor-management court.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A LABOR-MANAGEMENT COURT

The recurrent labor problems in St. Louis, which have given this city such a black eye on the national, as well as the local, scene highlight the need for a better method than strikes for handling labor disputes.

In recent weeks, we have witnessed absolutely unconscionable shutdowns of work on the two free bridges caused by union violence, not so much against the employer as against fellow union workers, where whites would not work with Negroes, and where members of one labor mob, masquerading as a union, attempted to beat up other union workers.

For more than a month, the hodcarriers have been on strike over the issue, in the last analysis, as to whether an employer should be able to hire his own employees or whether the union would take care of this detail for him.

We have had strikes in vital defense plants, at McDonnell and Olin Mathieson, which have slowed our war effort in Vietnam.

And we always have with us Local 562 of the Steamfitters, whose featherbedding and racketeering proclivities over the years, and their prejudices, now thinly veiled for political purposes, have made them among the most odorous unions in the country.

If one looks for the reasons why Missouri and St. Louis have failed to keep pace with the national growth, one need go but little further than this.

On paper, St. Louis has everything—geographical location, fine transportation systems of rail, water, highway and air, a well balanced, diversified labor force, unlimited electric power, a wide amount of cultural activities, and everything which should attract new businesses, as well as expand existing ones.

The fact of the matter is, we haven't and we won't have as long as the city is blemished by its labor record.

Something must be done, not only here where the situation perhaps is worse than in most other major communities, but throughout America.

The most hopeful proposal for an enduring solution of these ills is one by Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, of Florida, who has announced his intention to offer legislation to establish a U.S. Court of Labor-Management Relations with final jurisdiction over stalemated strikes which adversely affect the Nation "and make the general public hostages to collective-bargaining disputes."

Senator SMATHERS states this bill would cover strikes and other disputes which affect national security or which disrupt major areas of national economy.

The proposed court would be, in effect, a "supreme court for labor-management disputes; its judgment would be final and binding on both parties." Members of the court would be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

A court such as this could have an enormous value in America, if its members were men of high reputation and absolutely impartial. If, on the other hand, they were political hacks or subject to political pressures, or if they almost always sided with one group, as the NLRB has done with labor, it would have dubious value.

Certainly something has to be done to put an end to the increasing anarchy in labor's ranks. The Globe-Democrat has long believed that a court such as this would operate in the public interest and be fair to the workingman, to his employer and, most of all, to the general public.

THE COMMUNIST CONFERENCE IN HAVANA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, although many Americans have been viewing the internal conflicts within world communism as a major change in the posture of the Soviet Union, the facts relate a much different story.

None will deny that a split exists between Communist China and the current leadership in Moscow. That split, however, concerns the method of world domination, and not the intent. The Soviet Union is as dedicated to the eventual world rule of Communism as it ever was, and one need only look at the record to see that this is so.

During the first 2 weeks of January a tricontinental Communist conference took place in Havana. Officially designated as the First Conference of the Solidarity of Peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, this conference exhibited its determination to increase the pace of terror and subversion in Latin America.

In an article appearing in the current issue of The Reporter, Paul Bethel discusses this conference, and points out:

> There was not much question that Moscow was the chief planner as well as omnipresent manager of the conference.

Mr. Bethel notes that—

> One of the major Soviet aims of the Havana Conference was to give direct support to guerrilla leaders rather than to the established Communist Parties of their countries * * *. The reason why Moscow had chosen at Havana to throw its weight behind the guerrillas rather than the Communist Party was underscored by Le Monde's conclusion that the conference was clearly aimed at obtaining results "in direct action, and more precisely in armed action."

Reacting to China's charge that it had pursued a policy of appeasement concerning the United States, the Soviet Union was intent upon proving its own allegiance to the concept of wars of national liberation.

Calling for worldwide revolution, the Latin American Solidarity Organization was created on January 19, and was the first of three continental action groups to emerge from the Havana Conference.

Once again world communism has clearly declared war upon not only the United States, but upon the independence and self-determination of all peoples. Rather than disagreeing, the Russians and Chinese are competing actively for leadership in this subversive effort.

This conference has not been publicized in the United States, and at a time when many of our so-called experts are telling us that the Communists do not really mean what they say, it is helpful to observe not only their words, but the means they are developing to implement them.

For the consideration of my colleagues I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD this article by Paul Bethel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HAVANA CONFERENCE

(By Paul D. Bethel)

During the first 2 weeks of January while President Johnson was still conducting his "peace offensive," a tricontinental Communist conference was in progress in Havana whose overriding purpose was to organize worldwide subversion against the United States. With Fidel Castro as host and officially designated as the First Conference of the Solidarity of Peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the assembly brought together some 600 delegates and observers from 82 countries in the 3 continents. From January 3–15, the delegates debated, plotted, harangued, and egged each other on to even greater militancy against the United States and its "imperialist stooges." Hanoi and the Vietcong were duly represented. So were China and the Soviet Union, with large delegations whose rivalry—and eventual adjustment—provided one of the high spots of the conference. More immediately important was the high-pitched determination, repeated in scores of speeches and resolutions, to step up the pace of terror and subversion in Latin America.

Although the Havana Conference received little or no coverage in the major U.S. newspapers, it was followed closely in Europe, where Le Monde of Paris, for example, published a series of detailed articles. In Latin America it caused profound dismay and was promptly denounced by an extraordinary session of the Organization of American States. Ambassador Ilmar Penna Marinho of Brazil, chairman of the OAS Council, said of the Havana Conference that "Except for the placing of nuclear weapons in Cuba in October 1962, no event threatens more dangerously the territorial and political integrity of our continent."

Penna's alarm was echoed by most other members of the OAS Council and by the Latin American press generally. In Panama, a commentator of Radio Mia, noting the huge U.S. effort to contain communism in Vietnam, observed that "Communism exists next door to Florida, and there they do nothing * * *. It may be that they are afraid of it, or are keeping promises made to the Russians, while that insane bearded man raves daily about invading Latin America." El Universo in Ecuador underscored the importance which the Soviet leaders attach to the conference, and that "While the Russians continue to seek compromises with the United States, they are not disposed to pay any price" to this end.

THE SOVIET HAND

There was not much question that Moscow was the chief planner as well as omnipresent manager of the conference. Last December 9, a month before the delegates gathered in Havana, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko rose in the chambers of the Supreme Soviet and briefed its members on the tricontinental conference. "The Soviet Union," Tass quoted him, "in taking part in the Havana Conference * * * will do everything to help consolidate the front of struggle against imperialist aggression." On January 2, the two Soviet supreme leaders, Leonid I. Brezhnev and Alexei N. Kosygin, followed up with a message of greeting to the conference. As reported by Tass, the message read in part: "Today, Havana attracts the attention of all fighters against the forces of imperialist aggression and colonialism, and for the national and social liberation of peoples * * *. The U.S. imperialists are challenging all progressive forces."

The head of the 34-man Soviet delegation was Sharaf R. Rashidov, a candidate member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and First Secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee of Uzbekistan. Speaking before the conference in Havana on January 6, he paid lipservice to Russia's avowed "struggle for peace." But, foreshadowing one of the final resolutions of the conference, he made a sharp and significant qualification: "We believe," he said, "that relations among sovereign states with different public systems should be based on peaceful coexistence. * * * it is clear that there is not, nor can there be, any peaceful coexistence between the oppressed peoples and their oppressors."

Rashidov then told the conference what was expected of it. "The Soviet delegation," he said, according to the Tass dispatch, "came to this conference to promote in every conceivable way the unity of anti-imperialist forces of the three continents, so as to unfold on a still greater scale our common struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism, headed by the U.S. capitalists." Specifically, he pledged "fraternal solidarity with the armed struggle being waged by the Venezuelan, Peruvian, Colombian, and Guatemalan patriots for freedom against the stooges of imperialism."

The day-to-day work of the conference was carried out by numerous committees on social, political, and economic affairs, as well as a special Tricontinental Committee To Aid Vietnam. These provided the temporary machinery of the conference. What emerged by way of a permanent setup is more to the point. According to the chief of the Venezuelan delegation, Pedro Medina, "Only two organizations came out of the conference and they will rule—a General Secretariat which will receive all information concerning the three continents, make plans on the basis of the needs of each continent, and deliver its recommendations to an executive organ * * * named the Committee of Assistance and Aid for the Peoples Fighting for Their Liberation."

This committee, which emerged as the central policy and strategy body for wars of subversion, included Soviet, Chinese, and Cuban members along with representatives of nine other participating nations. As for the General Secretariat, Havana was designated its headquarters, for the next 2 years at least, and Captain Osmany Cienfuegos, the chairman of Cuba's three-man Foreign Relations Committee, was named Secretary General. The question of its permanent headquarters was scheduled to be reviewed at the Second Tricontinental Conference, to be held in 1968 in Cario at the invitation of President Nasser.

The 12-nation secretariat also has equal representation from the three continents. Asia is represented by South Vietnam (Vietcong), North Korea, Syria, and Pakistan; Africa is represented by the United Arab Republic, Guinea, one member to be chosen from the Portuguese colonies, which the delegates have decided are to be "freed," and the Leopoldville Congo; Latin America by Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, and Chile. One of the jobs of the secretariat, as laid down at Havana, is to establish in each continent an action group to carry out the resolutions of the conference. The first of these was established four days after the conference adjourned, when the Secretariat announced the creation of a Latin-American Solidarity Organization, with Havana as its permanent headquarters. It immediately began to issue calls to action.

THE NEW BREED

One of the major Soviet aims of the Havana Conference was to give direct support to guerrilla leaders rather than to the established Communist Parties of their countries. This became clear with the list of delegates, many of whom were little known or had never been heard of before. Absent was Fabricio Ojeda of Venezuela; in his place came Pedro Medina, leader of the Venezuelan National Liberation Front. Luis Corvalán, Secretary General of the Chilean Communist Party, and many other old-line Communist politicos were also missing. Senator Salvador Allende, the defeated Marxist candidate in Chile's presidential election of 1964, headed the Chilean delegation, but he played only a minor role.

"The real stars," according to the correspondent of Le Monde, "were the lean, bronzed men who had arrived, after so many detours, from the guerrilla camps of the four 'fighting' zones of the hemisphere: Guatemala, Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru." Népszabadság of Budapest also commented on the makeup of the delegations, emphasizing that the conference was not in the "hands of catastrophic politicians" but in the firm grip of Castro-type revolutionaries.

The reason why Moscow had chosen at Havana to throw its weight behind the guerrillas, rather than the Communist Parties, was underscored by Le Monde's conclusion that the conference was clearly aimed at obtaining results "in direct action, and more precisely in armed action." It observed correctly that "With the exception of those in Venezuela and Colombia, the orthodox Communist Parties in Latin America up to now have shown no great enthusiasm for guerrilla wars."

The special publicity given to guerrilla spokesmen obviously reflected Soviet determination to capture control of the conference by giving the lie to China's familiar hard-line attack against Moscow's "appeasement" of the United states and its failure to lend all-out support to militant "wars of liberation." Throughout the conference, the Chinese delegates, as reported by Radio Peking, kept up a drumfire of criticism on this well-known theme. In the end, the apparent contradiction between Russia's avowed policy of peaceful coexistence and the support it gave at Havana to the principle of "armed struggle" was resolved by typical Soviet logic.

A special resolution on "Peaceful Coexistence" which was passed at the closing session of the conference on January 15 declared: "Peaceful coexistence applies only to relations between states with different social and political systems. It cannot apply to relations between social classes, between the exploited and the exploiters within separate countries, or between the oppressed peoples and their oppressors." This simply restated the Soviet line put forward a few days earlier by Rashidov.

The final declaration of the conference fully endorsed the thesis of "armed struggle." According to Tass, it "calls for expressions of militant, active, dynamic solidarity * * * for intensifying the anti-imperialist nature of the national liberation movements." The Chinese, it would seem, had reason to be satisfied. Even Castro's public and bitter denunciation of Peking the day before the conference opened, for backing down on its sugar-for-rice deal with Cuba, did not discourage them.

On January 19, after the close of the conference, the New China News Agency reported: "The Tricontinental People's Solidarity Movement ran into various difficulties at the outset. However, in accordance with the will of the people of the three continents, the movement is sweeping forward with irresistible momentum."

To many observers, however, the most substantial success of the Chinese at Havana—and probably their major reason for being present—was to prevent the Russians and their Cuban allies from gaining exclusive control not only of the movement in Latin America but above all of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization.

This group grew out of the Bandung Conference of 1955 and the Chinese have long regarded it as their own special charge, even to the point of attempting to exclude the Soviets from membership. Although the point was left somewhat cloudy, it appeared that AAPSO, while participating fully in the new tricontinental organization, would maintain its separate identity. For example, it was announced at Havana that AAPSO will hold its own conference next year in Peking.

THE JOBS TO BE DONE

The final declaration of the Havana Conference is global indeed. The most significant of its general resolutions "proclaims the peoples' inalienable right to complete independence and the use of every form of struggle necessary, including armed battle, to win that right." It hailed the Vietnam war as "an inspiring example for the national liberation movement of the peoples of three continents."

It urged a concerted campaign directed at the "governments of all peace-loving countries to recognize, de facto and de jure, the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam as the sole genuine and legal representative of the South Vietnamese people." It urged "the most powerful support" for American Negroes and the civil-rights movement, and stated that "In the uprisings in Watts, Los Angeles and Chicago, the Afro-Americans openly declared that they were fighting against racism and U.S. imperialism in a common cause with their Vietnamese brothers."

As to Latin America, it called for maximum militancy by those "who are fighting with arms in their hands against the force of domestic oligarchy which are in the service of the United States, as in Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and Guatemala, or are being subjected to brutal persecution under military tyranny, as in Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia, and other countries."

"Latin America," the document said, "is the rear of the most powerful and barbarous imperialism in the world and the mainstay of colonialism and neocolonialism." It went on to map efforts to sabotage U.S. investments abroad: "Every blow dealt the United States and domestic oppressors by the Latin American peoples has decisive effect in weakening U.S. imperialism." There are sections that deal with the "liberation" of Puerto Rico, which it classified as "under U.S. occupation," and the Dominican Republic, which, it said, has "set a valiant example of resistance to U.S. aggression."

Puerto Rico's chief delegate, Norman Pietri, in addressing the conference on January 10, cited "the imperative need to win national independence in order to promote * * * total eradication of Yankee military installations in Puerto Rico and the threat they pose to the rest of Latin America."

Finally, the inspirational theme was summarized with a peroration: "Faced with the criminal alliance of the reactionary forces, the people of various countries in the three continents have reacted with active, vigorous, and militant solidarity, and with their readiness to reply to every act of imperialist aggression by revolutionary action, carrying on this battle until the complete liquidation of all forms of imperialist, colonial, and neocolonial oppression."

As already noted, the Latin American Solidarity Organization, created on January 19, was the first of the three continental action groups to emerge from the Havana Conference. According to Agence France-Presse, the 27 Latin American delegations met with Fidel Castro and Pedro Medina of Venezuela. Cuban President Osvaldo Dórticos, the Cuban chiefs of staff of the army, and the principal Communist leaders were also present. In the course of the meeting it was decided that the organization would be permanently established in Cuba and that it would include representatives from all the Latin American countries, as well as Puerto Rico and Trinidad-Tobago. With Medina as its secretary general, it will presumably come under the general control of Captain Cienfuegos and this tricontinental secretariat.

Its operations are already underway. On February 12, the Latin American Solidarity Organization backed a call to action by the Tricontinental Committee To Aid Vietnam, another permanent organization that emerged from the conference. This appeal urged the recently departed delegates to launch "a wave of sabotage against Yankee interests throughout the world."

It also called for "demonstrations, sitins, protests, meetings, and denunciations in front of U.S. Embassies all over the world." A call also went out from Havana to "boycott production and refuse to load ships, or to transport arms or any kind of war material bound for North American troops."

Once again Puerto Rico came in for special attention. On February 10, according to El Imparcial, Puerto Rican freedom fighters established a "Free Puerto Rico" Embassy in Havana, and on the same day signed a pact of solidarity with the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam at its Havana headquarters. The Puerto Ricans claimed that they were "recognized as the only legitimate representative of the Puerto Rican people."

Shortly thereafter, 26 Latin American Communist delegations agreed to establish National Committees of Solidarity with Free Puerto Rico in their countries.

All members of the tricontinental organization must contribute funds to the Aid Vietnam Committee. One way to raise money was described by Pedro Medina in an interview broadcast by Radio Havana. The Vietcong delegation had presented the helmet of a U.S. pilot shot down over North Vietnam to the Venezuelans. In turn, he said, "The Venezuelan NFL gave the helmet to the Tricontinental Committee to Aid Vietnam." He continued, "We will wage a campaign with it, on the island of Cuba and in Latin America, and we will carry it to every continent to give more impact and more brilliance to the week of solidarity with Vietnam which is scheduled for March on all three continents." Similar solidarity demonstrations are planned for the U.S. mainland and Puerto Rico.

THE CUBAN SPEARHEAD

Havana was a natural choice as the operational headquarters for worldwide subversion and wars of national liberation, for it is dedicatedly anti-American and pro-Soviet, and has a well-developed apparatus of subversion already active in the hemisphere. Following the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962, many of the obsolete Soviet military establishments in Cuba were converted into guerrilla training camps, and new camps have also been constructed.

The U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee listed 10 such installations as early as 1963. Today, according to some intelligence estimates, there are 43 camps equipped to train as many as 10,000 activists a year—guerrillas, terrorists, propagandists, experts in sabotage and espionage, and specialists in sophsticated radio equipment. The basic training period lasts 4 months, with longer periods for certain categories.

When the guerrilla candidate arrives in Havana by a clandestine route, he is given a questionnaire on areas and personalities vulnerable to subversion techniques. He is asked, for example, about targets for sabotage and the terrain surrounding those targets, about homosexual tendencies among members of his hometown police force, army units, and politicians, and about tax irregularities condoned by local bureaucrats. This information, checked and rechecked by contacts in the country in question, provides a starting point for campaigns of subversion.

Castro's Soviet-financed fishing fleet is especially useful in bringing guerrilla recruits to Cuba and reinfiltrating them into their homelands. According to a defecting crewmember of one of the ships, "Cuban patrol boats and fishing vessels are continually introducing arms and men into Mexican territory."

The Cuban training program is coordinated with international Communist subversion. Vietcong, Soviet, Red Chinese, and Spanish Communist instructors teach recruits from Africa as well as from Latin America. Cuban Negro instructors have been used to train African recruits in special camps established in the Provinces of Las Villas and Oriente. One, identified as Sádez Gómez Garcia, was killed while operating with guerrillas in the eastern Congolese district of Maniema. A diary found on his body indicated that he had arrived in the Congo from Cuba via Moscow, Prague, and the Tanzanian capital, Dar-es-Salaam.

Defected Castro officers state that 200 Africans have returned to Dar-es-Salaam following 8 months of "leadership training" in the Minas del Frio guerrilla camp in Cuba. On September 17, Congolese government forces patrolling Lake Tanganyika intercepted and sank a troop and supply boat, the *Ajax*, which had been running Cuban-trained Congolese guerrillas from Tanzania into the eastern Congo. Last June, 27 Senegalese were tried in Dakar and found guilty of subversion. All 27, it was brought out at the trial, also had completed 8 months of training in Cuba.

Lumumba University in Moscow, according to a broadcast from the Soviet capital, is training thousands of Latin American students. The broadcast, beamed to Latin America in the Quechua language of the Indians of Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador, said that when these students return to their homelands, "They will teach their brothers the modern techniques they have learned. But they will do more than teach. * * * They will fight alongside peasants and humble people to insure that their countries have freedom."

The collaboration between Cuba and Soviet-bloc embassies in Latin American subversion is exemplified in Ecuador, which broke relations with Cuba, Czechoslovakia, and Poland in April 1962. After an uprising launched by a youth organization that took its inspiration from Castro, the government found that the Czech legation had been handing over funds to the Ecuadorian Communist Party obtained through the sale of Skoda trucks and other Communist-bloc products. Poland was also involved. Bolivia broke with Czechoslovakia in October 1964, when the embassy in La Paz was shown to have delivered 500,000 Bolivian pesos to rebellious tin miners that were used to buy Czech weapons.

Venezuela, under almost constant attack for years from Cuban-supported guerrillas and terrorists, discovered last October that the Communists had set up an efficient underground arms factory on the outskirts of Caracas. There were "enough explosives to blow up Caracas," according to a Cabinet Minister, and the Director General of the Interior Ministry declared that "specialists from Havana, Moscow, and Peking are trying to get into Venezuela to execute terrorist operations" planned for 1966—what they called the Year of the Explosives.

Castro-trained men have also infiltrated the notorious bandit groups of Colombia that have extorted more than a million dollars' ransom from relatives of 148 Colombian ranchers kidnaped over the past few years. Kidnaping has been used to raise funds by guerrillas in Guatemala, as well as to create an atmosphere of terror to disrupt the recent elections there. And in the remote valleys and mountains of Peru, Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala, minor Government officials and pro-Government peasants are sometimes murdered, Vietcong style. Che Guevara's "Guerrilla Warfare," is the handbook for Latin American rebel leaders: it preaches the same tactics urged by the Tricontinental Conference to sow seeds of discord everywhere and keep the oligarchs busy putting out the fires.

The Soviet Union has backed up its investment in direct support for subversion by diplomatic maneuvers in the United Nations. It has striven constantly to divert OAS complaints against Cuban subversion from the OAS to the Security Council, where the Soviet veto could block any punitive measures. It has also succeeded in heading off in the world body any definition of aggression that would include wars of liberation.

At the same time, Moscow has pursued its double-track policy of peaceful coexistence, attempting to maintain friendly diplomatic relations with the very governments its agents are working to destroy. In Uruguay, on the verge of bankruptcy and beset with social problems as a result of a disastrously overextended welfare state, the Soviets found one of the hemisphere's weakest points.

The oversized Embassy in Montevideo has long been the center of a clandestine network extending throughout Latin America. In December Soviet agents were accused by the Government of having engineered a strike that paralyzed the country for days. This intervention, according to one Latin American expert in Washington, was an "act of supreme contempt" for Uruguay's weakness.

The Uruguayan Foreign Minister asked the Soviet Ambasasdor for an explanation of his Government's role at the Havana Conference and was not impressed by the answer that Sharaf Rashidov was speaking "privately." National Council President-elect Alberto Heber Usher called the reply "insulting." Heber has now vowed to muster the votes in Uruguay's ruling nine-man National Council to break relations with Moscow as a first step toward diplomatic rupture with the Communist powers.

In other Latin American countries, particularly those most exposed to subversion, the leaders did not mince words either. Peruvian Premier Daniel Becarra de la Flor said that the Soviet Union was involved in "tacit aggression," and that delegate Rashidov's statements in Havana now made Soviet activities in Peru official. Minister of the Interior Gonzalo Barrios Bustillos of Venezuela recommended the use of force to combat the subversion planned at the conference, which he told Agence France-Presse "is nothing more or less than a consequence of the blind struggle the Communists are waging against the United States, particularly in southeast Asia." In 1964, the Cuban newspaper Revolución had made more or less the same point, declaring that "Colombia and Venezuela form the embryo of a vast Latin American Vietnam."

The resolution which the OAS passed on February 2 emphatically condemned the policy of aggression and intervention adopted at Havana. Chile and Mexico abstained, saying that while they deplored intervention from whatever source, they considered the resolution exceeded the Council's powers. The U.S. alternate delegate, Ward Allen, voted in favor, but was less fiery than some of his Latin American colleagues. The resolution denounced in particular "the open participation * * * of official or officially sponsored delegations of member states of the United Nations" which on December 21 had voted in the General Assembly in favor of a nonintervention and self-determination resolution. Among those voting in favor was the Soviet Union, which a few days later sent its delegation to Havana.

The central issue was stated before the OAS by Colombian Ambassador Alfredo Vázquez Carrizosa, who said, "If there is to be war and no peace, let it as least be known who declared it."

FOOD FOR INDIA

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have read and have been impressed by the message of President Johnson on the desperate food situation in India. The President has appealed to the Congress—and the Nation—for support of his request for additional shipments of food to feed the hungry and of tobacco and cotton to release India's exchange resources for food and fertilizer purchases.

I believe that the United States is capable, in both food supplies and humanitarian spirit, of meeting the crisis in India. I join in the hope that other nations will assist in the special aid program.

It was exactly two decades ago that I participated in the massive effort of those nations with extra food to sustain those countries which war and harsh weather had left famished. Then, as now, drought had inflicted severe hardship on India.

Just as the allies had successfully combined their military direction, they combined their resources in the food relief campaign and achieved victory against starvation.

I welcome the President's strong call for action to help India and ask unanimous consent that editorials from the March 31 Washington Post and the March 31 New York Times be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 1966]

Aid for India

President Johnson's congressional message on aid to India is a great and gratifying document. It is a great document because it asks Congress forcefully and directly to underwrite the rescue of the Indian people from the threat of starvation—at any cost. It projects the direct appropriation of 3½ million tons of wheat—in addition to 6½ million tons already scheduled for 1966 shipment. And it calls for shipment of 200,000 tons of corn and up to 150 million pounds of vegetable oils and up to 125 million pounds of milk powder. It proposes besides the shipment of quantities of cotton and tobacco that may permit the diversion of more Indian cropland to food products. But more than this, it bluntly states that if others do not meet the remaining requirements the United States will.

The President has dared to present the problem to Congress, it is gratifying to note, as a challenge to this country's humanity. He did not claim that the United States will derive any promised or unpromised quid pro quo. He did not assert that feeding the Indians will help contain or isolate Communist China. He did not allege that it will help balance or frustrate the Soviet Union. He has not asked the Congress to support the program for any of these reasons or for any other national or selfish reason. He has rightly assumed that the Congress of the United States and the people of this country will support action on this magnificent scale on a purely humanitarian basis.

He has had the courage to recommend this vast program of aid, not because the Indian people some day may be our allies, not because they may help us in Asia, not because they will subsequently reward us with friendship or assistance, but simply because the people of India are hungry. And that is the only attribute, the only necessity, the only condition we ought to require as a qualification for aid from the granaries and storehouses of America.

This program is being undertaken in the spirit of the great efforts of this country to feed the hungry of many nations after World War I and World War II. It is in a great American tradition. The President will not urge in vain "the strong and warmhearted and generous support of this program by the American people." He will not be disappointed in the response to an appeal to the hearts of the citizens of this country.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 31, 1966]

Aid for India

Lyndon Johnson is at his best when challenged by some staggering task of human need. His message to Congress—and to the world—calling for aid for India, and pledging a truly generous measure of American assistance, is in the best tradition of Johnsonian philosophy. It is in no sense a detraction from his gesture to add that it is good, sound American policy to help India.

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, now in New York after her visit to Washington, obviously played a vital role in the timing and scope of the American response to India's need. The meeting in Washington was a moment of international drama. This was not just because Mrs. Gandhi is a charming woman bearing the legendary name of Jawaharlal Nehru, her father, or because Mr. Johnson was at his most ingratiating best. It was because of what each of the main figures represented. India, with 500 million people, is the second most populous nation in the world and a bulwark of democracy in threatened Asia. The United States is the most prosperous and most powerful nation on earth and is engaged in a bitter war on that same Asian mainland.

But India, as Mr. Johnson said in his message, "may stand at this moment on the threshold of a great tragedy." Two years of drought imposed on a badly conceived and managed agricultural program, with the population increasing at the rate of 11 or 12 million persons a year, add up to potential disaster on a colossal scale.

President Johnson's message tells the whole tragic story, and it should be pondered as carefully in India as in the United States. Much of India's land is fertile. With better agricultural techniques India could eventually feed herself.

Droughts are unavoidable, but the human factor is more to blame—ancient, rigid ways; caste restrictions; overly small or overly large land holdings; the selfishness of well-fed states refusing to help starving neighbors; hoarders; speculators; usurers.

The great virtues of the Indian people somehow become constricted by customs, traditions and history in times like this. Those virtues must and can be released—and India has already done a great deal in the years of independence. Much more may now be done, thanks to the imaginative, intelligent and generous program President Johnson announced for an Indo-American Foundation which will use $300 million in tied-up rupees for education and scientific research in India. In the long range, such a program can do wonders; but in the meantime Indians must be fed.

An undernourished nation has no future. Neither has an unskilled one in this technological age. President Johnson is wisely moving to provide the foodstuffs and the training. Indians must do the rest.

AID TO TORNADO AND FLOOD VICTIMS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, nearly a year has elapsed since a rash of tornadoes devastated large parts of Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Indiana on Palm Sunday, 1965. Enormous losses of life and property were suffered in this calamity. In my State of Indiana alone, which experienced the full fury of the storms, nearly 140 persons were killed, over 1,300 were injured, and more than 300 were hospitalized. In addition 1,251 homes, 1,055 farm buildings, 208 house trailers, and 154 business places were destroyed and many others suffered major damages.

This was only one of many major natural disasters which have struck our Nation in the last few years. Because of severe drought, flooding, blizzards, earthquakes, and hurricanes, the President has declared more than 40 areas of the United States eligible for major disaster relief since January 1, 1964. Even though it is not pleasant to contemplate the possibility of similar tragedies, realistically we must recognize the probability that other natural disasters of equal damaging effect will likely occur in future months and years.

Last April a group of Senators from Midwestern States which had suffered great losses from tornadoes and floods joined with me in examining the adequacy of Federal assistance authorized by law to officially declared major disaster areas. We found that, although considerable legislation had been enacted to provide relief for State, county, municipal and other public property, individuals whose homes, farms, and businesses have been destroyed or damaged could only count on a minimum amount of temporary, emergency aid.

After careful study and many conferences with those charged with the responsibility of administering disaster relief programs, I introduced on April 30, with the cosponsorship of nearly 40 other Senators, S. 1861, a bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. The Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors, of the Senate Committee on Public Works, held hearings on this bill in June. The bill was reported favorably, with amendments, by the committee on July 15, and the Senate adopted the bill by voice vote on July 22.

In the House of Representatives the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Public Works Committee conducted 2 days of hearings on the bill on October 14 and 15, just prior to adjournment of the first session of Congress. Although many of us expected and hoped that S. 1861 would receive early consideration in the House, to the present time no further action has been taken on this measure. Because of the real need for legislation to provide supplementary relief in cases of major disasters, I am taking this opportunity to renew my plea that attention be given to this whole problem by the other body as soon as it is feasible to do so.

Let me review briefly the main features of S. 1861 as adopted by the Senate on July 22, 1965. Authorization would be granted in cases of major disaster for the readjustment of loans made by the Housing and Home Finance Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and the Rural Electrification Administration. Where property has been severly damaged, the schedules for payment of principal and interest on such loans could be extended to a maximum period of 40 years at an interest rate of not less than 3 percent. Payment of the principal and interest on loans made by HHFA and VA could be suspended for an additional period not to exceed 5 years if necessary in order to avoid severe financial hardship.

Loans up to $30,000 under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 for the repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of property damaged or destroyed as a result of a major disaster could be made without regard to whether or not the required financial assistance could be provided by private sources.

Through a new cost-sharing program, homeowners and business concerns sustaining property losses because of major disasters would be eligible for

Federal and State grants to help offset those losses. To participate in this program, States would be required to develop comprehensive disaster relief plans and designate a State agency to administer assistance to disaster victims. Grants up to $250,000 could be authorized by the President for the purpose of assisting States to prepare their disaster relief plans.

If damage to property from a major disaster exceeds 5 percent of the value or at least $100, the Federal Government would share up to 50 percent and the State Government up to 25 percent of the loss, with a maximum loss limit of $30,000 for homes and $100,000 for business concerns. The owner of the property would be obligated to pay the other 25 percent of the cost. However, no such grant could be made for any loss for which private insurance is available and collectible at reasonable rates, nor for any loss in a State which does not have approved flood-plain zoning controls.

Because of the extensive losses sustained by farmers in disaster areas, the bill would establish a new grant system for their assistance. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to make grants equal to two-thirds of the cost of restoring lands to cultivation or replenishing livestock herds, with the maximum amount paid to any farmer limited to $10,000. Reasonable terms and conditions could be imposed by the Secretary in making such grants, but no payment could be made to a farmer unless the Secretary determined that the cost of preparing lands for production had been increased as a direct result of a major disaster.

If either the owners or tenants of homes which might be destroyed or made uninhabitable by a major disaster cannot provide suitable dwelling accommodations for themselves and/or their families, the President would be authorized, in order to avoid severe hardship, to acquire or lease housing which in turn could be rented to these victims for such periods as may be necessary. Rentals for this emergency shelter, including mobile homes, could be adjusted for as long as 1 year according to the financial ability of the occupants, but in no case would disaster victims be required to pay more than 25 percent of the family's monthly income for this housing.

Although the major thrust of S. 1861 is directed at providing assistance to private individuals and businesses which have suffered losses from major disasters, it also would supplement existing legislation in the public sector. Experience demonstrates that certain gaps or deficiencies exist in statutory authority relating to disaster relief for public schools, highways and other public works, priority for public housing, aid to unincorporated communities, and disaster warning systems.

The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning would be authorized to provide assistance both for the reconstruction and the operation of public elementary or secondary schools which have been destroyed or seriously damaged by a major disaster. However, to be eligible for such assistance, the Governor of the State would have to certify the need for help and give assurance that a reasonable amount of State and local governmental funds have been expended to assist the schools.

Likewise, the local school agency would have to make a reasonable tax effort and avail itself of other financial sources to replace and restore its buildings.

If State and local funds, including proceeds from insurance, are not sufficient to provide minimum necessary school facilities, Federal assistance could be made available to help replace or restore those facilities and to meet current operating expenditures. However, funds for operating expenditures would be limited to a period of 5 years at a declining rate for each year.

During the first year the amount of aid could be the full amount needed to supplement other available funds in order to insure a level of education equal to that existing before the disaster occurred, but this would be limited to 75 percent for the second, 50 percent for the third, and 25 percent for the fourth subsequent years. Additional assistance could be extended to help replace instructional supplies, equipment, and materials, including textbooks, and to help provide cafeteria facilities impaired or made unavailable by a major disaster.

The Federal share necessary to repair, restore, or reconstruct any Federal-aid highways damaged by a major disaster would be increased to as much as 100 percent of the cost necessary to perform such work. An amount not to exceed $50 million would be authorized to be appropriated from the general fund for this purpose. Furthermore, authority would be granted to appropriate the amount necessary to repair, restore, or reconstruct other non-Federal public highways, roads, streets, and bridges, with the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning vested with power to determine the Federal share up to 100 percent of the total cost.

Where other public works specifically authorized by an act of Congress, such as airports, water and sewage treatment plants, electric power installations, or navigation, irrigation, and flood control projects, have been damaged by a major disaster, either during their construction or after completion, the bill would authorize appropriation of necessary funds to aid their repair, restoration, or reconstruction without regard to any other statutory limit on the amount which could be appropriated for such project.

The need for legislation enabling the extension of Federal assistance to small rural, unincorporated communities in disaster areas was made dramatically clear by the problems facing the village of Russiaville, Ind., which was devastated by last year's series of tornadoes. More than 90 percent of the buildings in Russiaville were damaged, with 40 percent of the homes completely leveled. Despite the grievous blow suffered by this small community, its inhabitants bravely decided to restore and rebuild rather than move elsewhere, but for several months obstacles and delays blocked substantial progress.

Unfortunately, the unincorporated status of Russiaville made it difficult, if not impossible, to seek aid for public facilities which normally is available to cities in disaster areas. In order that other rural-governed places caught in the maelstrom of major disasters in the future might avoid some of the difficulties encountered by this Indiana village, S. 1861 would amend the basic disaster relief legislation to provide that unincorporated towns or villages should be included within the scope of its provisions.

Also, direct or insured Federal loans could be made to rural, non-profit corporations for the acquisition, construction, improvement, or extension of waste disposal systems, and Federal construction grants up to 50 percent of the cost could be made to rural areas for such community services as sewage disposal, water production and distribution, or other public facilities.

In major disaster areas, priority would be conferred by my bill upon applications from governmental bodies for Federal assistance to repair, construct, or extend public facilities or for public housing projects.

Because there appeared to be some question about statutory and financial authority to provide adequate warnings of impending disasters, S. 1861 would empower the Secretary of Defense to utilize the facilities of the civil defense communications system for the purpose of alerting the civilian population in areas endangered by imminent natural disasters.

Finally, the bill would make certain that there would be no duplication of benefits made available through this legislation. Departments and agencies administering any portion of the disaster relief program would be directed to determine that no person, concern, or other entity would receive assistance for any part of a sustained loss for which assistance had been provided under any other program.

Because of the delay in passage of S. 1861, and in order to supplement certain of its provisions, I introduced on January 18 of this year, a bill which is designed to bring additional relief to rural areas suffering major disasters. This measure, S. 2782, would authorize loans to the owners of farms and other real estate in rural areas whose encumbered buildings or related facilities have been damaged or destroyed by a major disaster as determined by the President or by a natural disaster for which the Secretary of Agriculture makes assistance available under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961.

Loans could be made for temporary rent, debris removal, repair and replacement of buildings, and for financing existing encumbrances to the extent necessary to bring the refinanced prior indebtedness and other loans made under this title within the applicant's repayment ability.

Another purpose of S. 2782 would be to provide standby authority to make emergency loans to eligible farmers and ranchers caused by other types of disasters not now encompassed by present statutes. Section 325 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 now permits the making of emergency loans, without area designations, to farmers who have had severe production losses as the result of a natural disaster not general to the area. This has been interpreted to include those situations where a local natural disaster affects only a small number of farmers or ranchers, but does not include damage caused by floods from the breaking of dams, wildfire—unless carried from place to place by natural causes such as wind—explosions, insurrections, or invasions.

Many farmers have incurred severe losses in disasters. Buildings destroyed or damaged in rural areas often have been heavily mortgaged, making it almost impossible for the unfortunate victims to secure needed credit to repair, rebuild, remove debris from fields, or to provide temporary living quarters. Both S. 1861 and S. 2782 would provide additional means of refinancing prior debts and obligations on the property and help farmers get back into full production as soon as possible. Moreover, the latter would bring additional aid in those unusual instances of damage caused by local natural disasters not now covered by law.

Mr. President, I reiterate my plea for prompt and serious consideration of these measures. In time of disaster it is only natural for our people to look for help, not only from their neighbors, private organizations, and their own communities, but also from their National Government.

The purpose of my bills is not to provide a Federal handout; rather, it is designed to assist helpless victims, who have been dealt cruel blows by entirely unexpected and unpredictable natural forces, recover at least some degree of their former economic status and living conditions. Those who are subjected involuntarily to the awful experience of an earthquake, tornado, flood, hurricane, or other natural disaster can never fully restore their possessions nor return untouched to their former way of life, but the American tradition of extending a helping hand to our compatriots in need is very strong.

Let us complete the job which our predecessors have begun; let us prepare now by adopting adequate legislation to minimize the devastating effects which future natural disasters will have on the daily lives and economic well-being of our citizens.

A NATIONAL NEED OF LONG STANDING

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, 17 times in the past 90 years, suggestions have come forth, most of them from the Congress, for an instrument to bring more order and organization and coordination to the Nation's farflung and complex transportation system. The Hoover Commission recommended it back in 1949. President Eisenhower suggested it in his 1961 budget message. President Johnson is the first Chief Executive to lay a formal proposal before the Congress. This is, as the Boston Morning Globe said in a recent editorial: "a national need of long standing." I urge my colleagues to support it, and ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, the Morning Globe's fine editorial on the subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Morning Globe, Mar. 3, 1966]

TRANSPORT: FOCAL POINT

In the last 90 years Congress has rejected 17 times proposals to create in the executive branch a policy-making focal point for transportation. President Johnson's message to Congress Wednesday asking for creation of a Department of Transportation will find a mixed reception.

Mr. Johnson's proposal, however, makes much sense. His new Cabinet-level department would bring together almost 100,000 employees from many agencies which spend $6 million annually in Federal funds.

Congress would quickly agree that something drastic must be done to reduce the carnage on the highways. But the President's request on the establishment of mandatory safety standards for all motor vehicles will jolt the auto and rubber industries—and, naturally, their friends in Congress.

Vehicles which failed to meet safety standards prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce would be barred from interstate commerce. A compulsory minimum standard would be set for tires.

No single State, with the possible exception of California and New York, has been able to exert enough regulatory leverage to compel the auto makers to adopt as standard equipment certain safety features. And while Detroit has done much to meet the growing demands in this area, certainly more can and should be done.

Massachusetts in recent years has been among the leaders in pressing for more highway safety, but a gigantic $700 million national safety program, including more research, would provide a welcome added thrust. We cannot afford to become blase about the increasing toll of death, injury and economic loss on the road.

Massachusetts and New England have much at stake in the coordination of various transportation modes. We have special problems and opportunities in the federally-aided high speed rail experiments in the Northeast Corridor. We need better knowledge and perspective about priorities for air, rail and highway travel.

The President wisely left the program of aid to urban mass transportation—also of great importance to Boston—in the new Housing and Urban Development Department, where it belongs.

Like its subject matter, the creation of a Department of Transportation covers a lot of ground. Even though it excludes the controversial regulatory functions about which the various carriers feel strongly, it goes a long way to meet a national need of long standing.

FINANCIAL STATUS AND HOLDINGS OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I made in writing to Hon. Emery L. Frazier, Secretary of the Senate, regarding my financial status.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
March 19, 1966.

Hon. EMERY L. FRAZIER,
Secretary of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Early in 1959 I disclosed publicly my financial holdings and status so that the citizens of Ohio would be able to judge for themselves whether or not there could be any claim of conflict of interest and whether or not any of my votes or statements on legislative proposals would ever be actuated by selfish motives.

I was the very first Member of either branch of Congress to discolse fully my financial holdings and financial status. Following my statement early in my first term, I have from time to time written the Secretary of the Senate and informed him, as I do you, that he may disclose my letter to anyone.

I am again making such report, and I am placing in your hands the following as a complete statement of my financial holdings at this time.

I own U.S. Government bonds, also Airport Parking Co. of America and W. R. Grace & Co. bonds.

I own real estate in New Smyrna Beach, Fla., in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, and 80 acres in Mississippi on which there is an oil lease, and also my Washington residence.

In addition, I own stock in the following corporations: W. R. Grace & Co., Sinclair Oil Corp., Monsanto Chemical, Atlantic Refining, General Fireproofing, Central Aguirre Sugar Co., Robbins & Myers, Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Lamb Industries, Mission Development, British Petroleum, Buckingham Corp., Martin Marietta, Delta Airlines, Inc., Airport Parking Co., United Fruit, Radio Corp. of America, Lucky Stores, Inc., Stauffer Chemical, Ashland Oil & Refining (common and preferred), South Puerto Rico Sugar (common and preferred), Phillips Petroleum Co., Northern Pacific Railway, Federal Pacific Electric (preferred), Occidental Petroleum Co., Sellon, Inc., Clevite Corp., Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway.

You will note that I am a stockholder in oil production corporation. Am frequently recipient of letters, accompanying dividends, from the presidents of these companies asking me to write my Congressman expressing opposition to any legislation to reduce the oil depletion allowance of 27½ percent. I have not disposed of these holdings and shall not do so as it is well known I have voted at every opportunity offered me against the depletion allowance of 27½ percent given to oil and gas production corporations. I have spoken out in the Senate and voted against the depletion allowance and expect to do so at every time the opportunity is offered. I consider such depletion allowance unfair to citizens generally and I will oppose it until it is either eliminated or greatly reduced.

Except for current bills I am not financially obligated to any person or corporation. I owe no person nor corporation any money whatever on any unsecured note. I do owe the Union Commerce Bank of Cleveland a substantial sum of money on my promissory note. This loan is amply secured by my deposit of collateral including bonds and stocks valued at more than twice the indebtedness.

Mr. Secretary, I attest that the foregoing is a true and correct statement of my financial situation.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN M. YOUNG.

BALLOON LOGGING

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, for some time now I have been keenly interested in various aerial logging techniques. More recently, my interest has been directed to research developments in the field of balloon logging for reasons I will explain.

First, I am interested in timber and logging techniques because the timber products industry in my home State of Alaska is currently developing in a very big way. With two major pulp mills already in operation, the St. Regis Paper Co. was recently awarded an 8.75-billion-board-foot timber contract which requires construction of a third mill by July 1, 1971.

The St. Regis plant is expected to add more than $30 million to Alaska's expanding economy and provide more than a thousand new jobs in the mill and woods combined.

Much of this timber development is taking place in southeast Alaska, and most of it there within the Tongass National Forest. Therefore, receipts from the timber harvested go into the U.S. Treasury through our agent, the Forest Service.

The topography of the Tongass National Forest is generally mountainous and rough. Logging is extremely difficult and a portion of the marketable timber is impossible to reach or at least economically unfeasible to harvest by conventional methods.

Balloon and other aerial logging systems offer excellent possibilities for economically harvesting timber from difficult access areas while protecting multiple-use values. Conventional logging methods on these areas of difficult access and steep terrain are very costly and tend to increase soil erosion, landslides, and flood damage. In addition, conventional logging and roadbuilding are not always compatible with the high demand for scenic and recreation areas, also important resources in the Alaska economy.

Developments in aerial logging to date have been accomplished by cooperative efforts between the timber and equipment industries and the U.S. Forest Service. These efforts have shown balloon logging to be feasible.

With industry-developed equipment and Forest Service systems engineering research, basic information has been obtained for laying out and operating skylines and balloon logging systems. Having demonstrated the technical feasibility of balloon logging, further research is needed to make the system economically operational. Studies are needed on balloon configurations, development of gas supply systems, means of deicing, ground handling and transport facilities, and other performance tests.

The substantial progress made to date with the limited resources available for this work is indeed a tribute to the ingenuity and dedication of both the industry and Forest Service engineers working on this vital project.

I think the time has now come for the Federal Government to make an additional contribution to the aerial research work. In my view we should step up our efforts in this area. My motives are somewhat selfish, in that the development of a commercial balloon logging system would be a great boost to the Alaska timber industry, but there is more to it than that.

It is estimated that development of balloon logging or other aerial logging systems could capture an additional 440 million board feet of annual allowable cut in Alaska on National Forests alone. None of this timber could be logged by currently used conventional methods. Over $1 million per year additional would be realized in stumpage receipts; three-quarters of that amount would go into the Federal Treasury. The remainder would be added to the income of local Alaska governments. Even more important perhaps is the fact that several thousand new jobs would result in Alaska from the harvesting and processing of this extra stumpage.

Mr. President, the promise which balloon logging holds is by no means confined to Alaska. For example, the Forest Service estimates that such a system would capture 500 million board feet annually of allowable cut lost on timberlands not now loggable in the Douglas-fir region. Timber harvesting on an additional 17 million acres of currently nonloggable lands in western United States would be possible with less road construction and better protection of water and soil resources.

In conclusion, I would like to say simply that I consider any Federal money spent on additional aerial logging research a good investment. By increasing the amount of timber harvested annually we will experience direct returns to the Treasury, at least with respect to that timber harvested on national forest lands. The additional jobs created by the harvesting of previously impossible-to-reach timber will return income to the Treasury in the form of taxes on wages and salaries. Moreover, balloon logging promises to further Alaska's economic development, a matter of considerable Federal concern.

None of this even goes to the conservation benefits that accompany aerial logging techniques. Balloon logging, for example, reduces the need for logging roads by about 50 percent. Each mile of road permanently destroys 10 acres of trees—trees which naturalists enjoy and trees which could be harvested again in the future.

I urge for an increase in Federal participation in aerial logging research at the earliest possible date.

EMPLOYMENT FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, we of the Senate Special Committee on Aging are charged with the responsibility and given the privilege of working on problems and opportunities of our Nation's elderly. One of the most important aspects of our work is employment for the Nation's senior citizens. I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate an excellent discussion of this subject which appeared in the November 1, 1965, report bulletin of "Personnel Management Policies and Practices," a service for employers published by Prentiss-Hall, Inc., of Englewood Cliffs, N.J. The article was written by Mr. Martin Nemirow, of Prentice-Hall. In my judgment, it is an interesting discussion of the false impressions which sometimes deter employers from employing older workers. Mr. Thomas E. Butler of that publishing enterprise, has given me permission to insert this copyrighted material in the Congressional Record. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the Record, as follows:

SHOULD YOU HIRE WORKERS OVER 40?

Is there anything left to outlaw? This question has been asked, only half in jest, by some employers as they survey the restrictions—many of them yet forthcoming—of the Federal law that forbids discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

The question has been answered with a humorless "yes," by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz. Age discrimination, if Wirtz has his way, will be the next target of Washington lawmakers.

Why the Government is concerned: Studies recently made of 26,000 job openings in 8 major cities showed 4 out of 10 barred applicants over 55 years old; 3 out of 10 also barred those over 45; 2 out of 10, those over 35.

The fact of the matter is that the number of older people in this country continues to grow, but the number employed keeps slumping. This is partly due to more widespread pension and retirement plans—but part of the blame has also been pinned on an invisible sign that hangs over many personnel departments: "Only young men need apply."

Business is thus likely to be burdened with yet another restriction on its hiring practices—unless employers can convince the Government that when they do turn down an older worker it is because the man or woman is unqualified—not simply because he is too old.

To help you reevaluate your policy on hiring older workers, Prentice-Hall reexamined three widely held assumptions that cause employers to turn away older workers. Disturbing conclusion: We found some doubt as to whether any of these assumptions are solid enough to warrant a rigid "hire young" policy if the Government does crack down.

As you read the following, keep in mind these questions; (1) Can you still afford—in the face of an increasingly tight skilled-labor market—to refuse to employ skilled job applicants in their forties and fifties? (2) Would it be worthwhile to loosen up age restrictions in order to forestall Federal action in this area?

Assumption 1: Higher life-insurance and pension costs make it too expensive to hire older workers.

This is one of the most brasstack answers given by employers. What is the real added cost of hiring an older man versus that of hiring a younger man? One survey of 37 public utilities shows that at retirement age, a 15-year employee (i.e., hired at age 50) would have cost the company an average of $40 a year more for life insurance and $141 a year more for pensions than a 30-year man hired at age 35. In other words, the older man costs the company a total of $181 more per year.[1]

This is certainly a weighty consideration in hiring, one that any Federal law would have a hard time glossing over. But are employers letting visible costs mask invisible savings in this area? Here are some of the savings:

---

[1] Study by Robert L. Fjerstad, in Personnel Administration, March-April 1965.

Older workers have better attendance. A study of 18,000 workers shows employees aged 55–64 were absent least. Result: An average of $51 a year saved for every older worker on the payroll.

Youngers workers leave four times as fast. A Census Bureau study shows almost 1 out of 3 employees under age 24 changes jobs—compared to 1 out of 14 employees over 45. Also, the American Management Association estimates it costs you $500 (in recruiting, training, and the like) every time an employee leaves the payroll. Putting these facts together, one expert calculates that every older workers saves the average company about $30 a year in turnover costs.

Subtract that $81 from added pension-insurance costs: The hidden savings of $81 (the sum of better attendance plus less turnover) should be subtracted from the $181 figure—leaving only $100 that an older worker adds to your benefits costs.

A hundred dollars is a hundred dollars—but many personnel directors are surprised to see such a relatively low figure—they thought it ran higher. Ask yourself this question: Is $100 a year too large an extra sum to pay for added years of skill and experience? The answer may sometimes be yes—but not always.

Assumption 2: Older workers are less productive.

Even admitting that they may have overestimated the added cost of pensions and insurance, some employers simply shrug and say "older people produce less." Not true, according the Labor Department studies:

A study of eight manufactures showed no drop in productivity until 55—even then the drop was slight.

Another study 6,000 incentive workers found older workers had steadier output week after week than other groups—and again no differences in total production.

Some employers' impressions about older workers' productivity may be based on tests they give older applicants or employees. Remember this—

Speed tests may be misleading. Tests you give older workers may not reflect accurately their real productivity. Reason: Older employees often work slower, but the slower the pace is usually offset by greater accuracy. Reevaluate the tests you're giving—do they make allowance for this fact?

Example: You may be using only one system of scoring a test for job openings in several departments—even though some departments call for high speed, others for high accuracy. What to do: In scoring the test for high-accuracy departments, give less weight to time in which the test was finished. This not only allows the hiring of older workers—it's a better test for anyone applying for a job in that department.

Assumption 3: Older workers can't adjust to new situations.

This saying has been widely bandied about. But more and more, it's being proved that older people who resist change did so when they were younger—and younger people who accept change will do so when they're older. Many companies are coming to realize this: Witness the increased ease with which out-of-work executives over 40 are finding jobs. It's in such managerial jobs, of course, that a man's ability to change is really tested. To find out why employers are hiring more older executives, Prentice-Hall talked to Col. James E. Wilson, president of the Forty-Plus Club of New York, a nonprofit organization that secures jobs for top executives over 40 (address: 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y. 10038).

Question. "Col. Wilson, an executive recruiting firm recently reported 15 percent of its top management jobs now go to men over 50, whereas 10 years ago a man that old was rarely considered. Does your experience bear this out?

Answer. "Yes. Three years ago, we placed only about 100 of our people. Last year we placed three times that number.

Question. "Is this increase simply due to a shortage of younger talented executives in their twenties and thirties? Is it this fact that causes companies to raise their chronological sights and hire experienced executives in their forties and fifties?

Answer. "That's just part of the story. Another part is that many firms are getting tired of hiring bright young men who proceed to play the leapfrog game. Here's how it works: A younger man has been working for a company several years. He's done well—in fact, he knows three times as much about his field as he did when he first started. But his salary hasn't kept pace with his value to the firm, and he knows it. So he leaves. This is happening more and more in industry.

Question. "It's generally agreed that older employees are more loyal—but isn't an older man less creative, less willing to adjust?

Answer. "This has proved to be a very misleading generality, time and time again. Here's an example. John McCarthy (let's call him that) was 50 years old. He came to us after holding highly responsible jobs in a number of companies. He's a short, red-faced fellow—not very impressive-looking, frankly. He spent three years looking for a job—kept getting turned down because he was overqualified or too heavy on experience—these are the usual euphemisms for being too old. One company bluntly admitted to him that it was looking for 'a younger man with more creative ideas.' That company ended up hiring and firing five younger men before it found someone who really was creative. Meanwhile, McCarthy got a job in which he brilliantly revamped one whole area of a company's operations. He is now vice president of a multimillion dollar division of the firm. I could give you many other examples like this one.

Question. "Should any of the employers who turned him down have been able to see that McCarthy was creative?

Answer. "A smart interviewer would have concentrated on the fact that McCarthy quit his last job because he thought his boss was unwilling to go along with him on new ideas. Problem here is that this reason for leaving a job is over-used—so it's often hard to tell when it's being used legitimately. Here it was legitimate.

As this interview shows, a number of firms often find themselves trying one younger man after another on a certain job—because so many younger men leave or do not work out. This turnover occurs in spite of the fact that most young applicants today are tested and retested to gage such things as "creativity" or "potential." Older men, in contrast, are tested far less often—simply because a man's experience of, say, 20 years is a much more reliable indicator of his ability than any test.

The danger of letting a man's age mask his ability when you interview him for a job is evident from the above example of a brilliant older executive who nevertheless had much trouble finding a job. The principle also applies for older men in lower-level jobs. There are creative and uncreative older men who are looking for jobs as foremen or accountants—much in the same way that there are creative and not-so-creative older executives.

What to do: In trying to tell if an older man has "hardened" and has become less flexible, or less creative, be careful not to confuse a man's natural resentment toward certain things—for example automation—with a real lack of ability to adjust.

Example: Ladef, aged 55, applied for a job. He was laid off at his old plant because of automation. When Ladef applied for another job, he talked bitterly to a personnel interviewer about "those damned machines." The interviewer concluded Ladef was too old and inflexible—wouldn't work out at the company's highly mechanized plant. But in a follow-up interview the shop foreman talked with Ladef and decided he had every reason to be bitter—he lost his job to a machine. What the shop foreman wanted to know in addition was whether Ladef had been given a chance to retrain—and whether he had flubbed the chance. That would show inflexibility. As it turns out, he had been given no chance to retrain. So the foreman decided to estimate Ladef's flexibility on the basis of how versatile his past work experience was. The foreman rightly concluded that neither Ladef's age nor attitude toward his former employer proved much one way or the other.

NO BLACK AND WHITE ANSWER

Clearly many of the assumptions that companies make about older men are not proven ones. This doesn't mean that an older man should always be hired. But it does mean that employers might consider trying somewhat harder to determine whether a particular older job applicant ranks high or low in areas such as "ability to adjust" and "productivity." Previously, you may have assumed older applicants would fall on the low side; so you may have dismissed them out of hand. As we've seen, such an assumption may be false, and may lose you the chance to hire a loyal, steady, and highly skilled worker.

LABOR SALUTES FARM LEADER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Monday night it was my privilege to attend a dinner honoring James Patton, who recently retired from one of his jobs, that of president of the National Farmers Union, which he effectively led for a quarter of a century.

Appropriately, for a dinner honoring James Patton, those who gathered to honor him came from a variety of organizations, professions and places. His influence has extended far beyond agricultural matters, far beyond this Nation's borders, to the benefit of humanitarian causes.

It was especially appropriate that so many labor leaders participated in this occasion. When many of them were milking cows back on the farm, Jim Patton, as a young lad, was helping his dad organize unions in Colorado mines. Jim Patton knew from the beginning that the needs and goals of working men and women are compatible, whether they work on the farm or in a city. One of his greatest contributions has been the unity that he has helped forge between farm and labor leaders.

Jim Patton is in the rich tradition of this Nation's "embattled farmers" who "stood and fired the shot heard round the world." AFL–CIO Vice President Joseph D. Keenan detailed this vital characteristic of American farm leaders in his tribute to Mr. Patton. I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Keenan's address and a list of the sponsors at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and list of names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To most Americans who follow agricultural affairs to any extent—and certainly to Members of Congress—the National Farmers Union is "that other" farm organization.

The National Farm Bureau Federation, year in and year out, in Washington and in the State capitals, thunder against every piece of social legislation designed to help the people in general, and wage earners in particular. They are as predictable as the National Association of Manufacturers—and they are almost always on the same side.

They have successfully created an image of the American farmer as a dyed-in-the-wool reactionary, concerned only with his narrow self-interest. Worse than that, a reactionary who always has his hand in the public purse, but who is a skinflint toward everyone else.

This image has been so widely accepted that many citizens, I am sure, are vaguely surprised that the National Farmers Union exists at all. For the NFU, as we all know, has just as consistently spoken out for the well-being, the continuing progress, of wage-earners as well as farmers.

But those who are surprised by a liberal, progressive farm organization don't know much about American history.

Let us remember how Emerson described the opening battle:

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
  Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
  Here once the embattled farmers stood
  And fired the shot heard round the world."

Now those farmers weren't shooting at the redcoats for the sake of high subsidies and low wages.

They had some other objectives in mind—the kind of objectives that have been exemplified over the years, by the National Farmers Union.

You may be thinking that I am oversimplifying the case, by going all the way back to 1775 for a comparison. Actually, this was just the beginning of a long tradition.

Through most of the 19th century, the movers and shakers, the idealists and the reformers, came from the farms, not from the cities. The bitterest enemies of slavery—giving full marks to the New England intellectuals—were the free and independent farmers, north and south, who measured a man, not by his color, but by his performance in the endless struggle with the forces of nature.

When wage earners were an unorganized, voiceless mass, it was the farmers who inspired and supported the Populist movement, that terrified the industrial moguls of the time—the "malefactors of great wealth," as Theodore Roosevelt would call them later.

These barons weren't afraid of their workers. With the help of the law, the courts, the official and unofficial police, they could crush any uprising of their own employees. What scared them was the farmers—the free, independent farmers, who demanded an end to the domination of American life, and the American economy, by the Morgans and the Carnegies and the Rockefellers.

Nothing has ever been said about Samuel Gompers or Philip Murray or even John L. Lewis that compares with what was said about William Jennings Bryan.

Even Eugene Debs was less of a threat. Debs could be attacked as a Socialist, a "red," a spokesman for a strange new ideology. But Bryan was the symbol, the standard bearer, of a radical reform movement that was undeniably 100 percent American. And it had its roots in the soil.

Consider that desolate period after World War I—the so-called "roaring twenties," the "jazz age" of flappers and bootleggers. If we base our judgments on the movies and the television, it was a glamorous and exciting time. It was a time when every young man had a Stutz Bearcat and a raccoon coat and a silver flask full of bathtub gin. And every girl was beautiful, confused and available.

Maybe that's the way it was in Princeton and New Haven, in Greenwich Village or Hollywood. But for workers and for farmers it was a decade of stagnation, from the "return to normalcy" to the "chicken in every pot."

Of course, hardly anybody paid any attention to workers and farmers in those days. Almost everyone was getting rich in Wall Street.

But there were a few who were paying attention. There were a few, lonely voices who pointed out that a slogan like "the business of America is business" didn't really include all of us.

These weren't labor voices alone. No, the major voices of dissent in that long, bleak decade went by such names as La Follette and Norris and Borah, Wheeler and Johnson and Nye. They were not always right on every issue, but they were the voices that kept alive the spirit of social progress when so many others had given up the fight.

And when the long political drought ended with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, where did the new President look for help? Not just to the college professors; he also called in the heirs and survivors of the Populist and Progressive movements, men like Harold Ickes and Henry Wallace—and like Harry Truman.

So I say that the National Farmers Union is not really "that other" farm organization. On the contrary, it represents the true spirit, the real principles, of the independent, self-supporting farmer, as demonstrated by almost two centuries of American history.

Now this obviously brings me to the area of practical politics; so let me say a few words on that subject.

The whole philosophy of the National Farmers Union, as I understand it—and if I am wrong, I will certainly be corrected in a very few minutes—is that what is good for America is good for farmers.

This happens to coincide with the philosophy and program of the AFL–CIO.

We say that what is good for America is good for the AFL–CIO.

Clearly, we can't be very far apart.

But at the same time, neither the National Farmers Union nor the AFL–CIO lays claim to any special sanctity. We are not asking anyone to fit us with a halo.

We are simply operating according to the principles of enlightened self-interest.

It seems simple enough to me. A farmer who is well off, who has a reasonable chance to sell his crops at a reasonable price, will be a better customer for tools and tractors, textiles, and toothpicks, than the fellow who is constantly faced with foreclosure.

In the same way, a wage earner who can meet his rent—or his mortgage payments—without strain, who can clothe his family and pay the electric bill, will also buy more meat and bread and vegetables and eggs.

Therefore—and this is so simple there must be something wrong with it—the AFL–CIO is for prosperous farmers and the NFU is for prosperous workers.

I offer this bold new concept, without charge, to the Farm Bureau.

Seriously, I think this concept needs a good deal of development; and if I may say so, the need is greater among the farm population.

I was very pleased to read that the NFU is now going to intensify its organizing efforts. That's fine. We in the labor movement can tell you that organization and education are inseparable. As you recruit you will educate, to the benefit of all.

The plain truth is that there is no conflict of interest between farmer and worker. What the farmer gets has very little relation to what the worker pays for food in the supermarket. What the worker earns an hour has almost nothing to do with the price of a harrow. The rivalry is imaginary, cleverly fomented by those who want both farmers and workers to get less.

Earlier I recalled that the most eloquent spokesmen for the liberal cause, in past years, were often farmers. I think it is fair to say that the labor movement has now taken over a large part of that role. It has fallen to us to be the people's lobby, the voice of the voiceless. We accept the obligation gladly.

Yet we would be stronger in this role, and the national interest would be furthered, if more of the farm population joined in the quest for a better America.

We look forward to the day when there will be a bigger, stronger and even more influential National Farmers Union at our side.

Our guest of honor tonight has devoted most of his life to creating the foundation. For a generation, Jim Patton has symbolized the true spirit of the American farmer—an independent spirit, but a progressive spirit as well.

I think it is highly appropriate that the National Farmers Union and Jim Patton were born in the same year—1902. Measured by the calendar they grew up together. But the real growth of the National Farmers Union, in both size and influence, began when they got together in a literal sense.

This is easy enough to understand, for as you look over his career, it almost seems as though Jim Patton spent his first 38 years preparing to lead the NFU. He started young; his father was a Populist and a follower of William Jennings Bryan, and I am sure this helped to shape his thinking during his Colorado boyhood. He had financial troubles early in life; after the death of his father he had to quit college and go to work, in order to support his mother and three younger sisters. He had hardly recovered from this setback when the depression cost him his job as a typewriter salesman.

This proves that the depression wasn't all bad. Because it was only a short time later that we find him with the Colorado Farmers Union, setting up a cooperative insurance program. That was the real beginning.

From the start of the New Deal, Jim Patton has been an adviser and a source of ideas for the Federal Government. He has not only supported the social programs adopted during the last generation; in an amazing number of cases, he thought of them first.

I won't attempt to recite the list. Let me give only one example. In August 1951, Jim Patton proposed that the United States send farmers and technicians to live abroad and teach their skills to the people of undeveloped lands. Ten years later, John F. Kennedy founded the Peace Corps.

In his ideas and in his career, Jim Patton has been an eloquent spokesman for the common interests of farmers and workers in the ultimate achievement of the American dream. As we honor him tonight, let us rededicate ourselves to that goal.

Let me conclude with just one more thought—one that I know President Meany intended to express, if he had been able to be here. It is simply this: On behalf of the AFL–CIO, and of every wage earner, we say to you, Jim Patton, "Thank you; thank you, from the bottom of our hearts."

Sponsors

George Meany and P. L. (Roy) Siemiller, Cochairman.

I. W. Abel, United Steelworkers of America.

Joseph A. Beirne, Communications Workers of America.

Joseph Curran, National Maritime Union of America.

A. J. DeAndrade, International Printing Pressmen's and Assistants' Union of North America.

David Dubinsky, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union.

John J. Grogan, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America.

Paul Hall, Seafarers International Union of North America.

Ralph Helstein, United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers.

M. A. Hutcheson, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

Paul Jennings, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers.

Joseph D. Keenan, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Herman D. Kenin, American Federation of Musicians.

Lee Minton, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada.

Paul L. Phillips, United Papermakers and Paperworkers.

Jacob S. Potofsky, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Walter P. Reuther, International Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America.

William F. Schnitzler, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Peter T. Schoemann, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

James A. Suffridge, Retail Clerks International Association.

David Sullivan, Building Service Employees International Union.

Hunter P. Wharton, International Union of Operating Engineers.

CON EDISON: THE COMPANY YOU LOVE TO HATE

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, Consolidated Edison Co. of New York is probably used to being the subject of criticism, particularly from the area of New York City which it serves with both gas and electricity. But since November 9 of last year, when New Yorkers were without power for as long as 13 hours after the massive Northeast power failure, unprecedented national attention has been focused on Con Edison.

The Federal Power Commission singled out this firm, in its report to the President on the blackout, for special and extensive discussion. A great deal of comment appeared in the press regarding the failure of Con Edison to restore service quickly. And the State Legislature of New York has several proposals before it regarding investigation of the company relative to the blackout.

It is not surprising, therefore, that there are murmurs again heard in New York City that the only way to protect the public is for the public to own and operate their electric utility.

On the other hand, it is quite surprising to find one of the Nation's leading business magazines publish a ringing indictment of Con Ed's operation, rates, and attitudes.

In its March issue, Fortune magazine extensively discussed the company, prefaced by the statement:

> Much of its plant is old, its rates are high, its profits are low, its growth is meager, its customers are furious. But at Con Edison the aging management assumes the mantle of martyrdom, and trusts that everything will turn out all right.

Mr. O'Hanlon has carefully analyzed many of the problems of Con Ed. More public discussion and public scrutiny of the operation of an electric utility which suffers 3,000 localized blackouts each year and a major failure about every 2 years is necessary. I intend to pursue this matter and will discuss it in more detail at a later date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Fortune article by Mr. Thomas O'Hanlon be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CON EDISON: THE COMPANY YOU LOVE TO HATE

(By Thomas O'Hanlon)

Much of its plant is old, its rates are high, its profits are low, its growth is meager, its customers are furious. But at Con Edison the aging management assumes the mantle of martyrdom, and trusts that everything will turn out all right.

The Consolidated Edison Co. of New York is the Nation's largest electric and gas utility, serving some 3 million customers in New York City and Westchester County, exercising tight control over electric, gas, and steam distribution, and harvesting $840 million in annual revenues. It is also the Nation's most cordially disliked utility. To Charles Emil Eble, who this month at 65 becomes the company's new chairman and chief executive, this low state of esteem reflects not the company's true performance but only its size and conspicuousness. "When you are top dog," Eble says with an air of fatalism, "everybody is gunning for you."

How right he is on one count, and how wrong on the other, for Con Edison's deficiencies are legion. Since the mid-fifties, the company has lagged so far behind other utilities in growth and earnings that investors are beginning to suspect it is a muscle-bound giant unlikely ever to start moving again. Its customers in the past 6 years have had to pay for five rate increases totaling nearly $58 million, tacked on to the highest residential-rate structure of any major utility in the Nation. Despite these higher prices, they have been subjected to a series of power failures, culminating in the prolonged agony of November's black Tuesday, which have made Con Edison an imprecation on the tongues of millions of New Yorkers. For its performance on black Tuesday, Con Edison was given a rebuke by the Federal Power Commission in its report to the President.

Faced with such internal and external crises, Con Edison, one would think, should be looking to some radical changes in its policies. But there will be few such innovations. In the fortresslike headquarters building on the East Side of Manhattan prevails an atmosphere that one executive compares to the camaraderie in a military camp toward the end of a long, exhausting battle. Most Con Edison executives have spent their lives within the protective womb of the company—an environment that they will not now, in their latter days, permit to change. Old and embattled, proud and thin-skinned, the men who lead Con Edison look upon the company as their own personal creation. Given the length of their experience at Con Ed, their attitudes are not hard to understand.

Charles Eble began his career as a $6-a-week messenger boy when Woodrow Wilson was in the White House. In 1921 and 1922, Eble took a 2-year home-study course in business at the Alexander Hamilton Institute. He moved up through Con Edison's accounting department; in 1953, after 37 years, he became a vice president. Four year later he was elected president. "With his inside knowledge of the company and the industry," says a colleague, "Eble did a great selling job with the board." Eble succeeds Harland C. Forbes, a 41-year company veteran, who retires at 68.

The new president is 64-year-old John V. Cleary, an Eble protégé who started his career back in 1925. Like Eble, he too began in the accounting department. Cleary later became an expert in rate regulation, and was elected senior vice president in 1962. One measure of the cost-plus approach to management at Con Edison is Cleary's idea that a rider should be added to the company's rate schedule so that future local tax increases would simply be tacked on to customers' bills.

The third member of top management is Executive Vice President Otto Manz, Jr., 63. Manz is a taciturn engineer who went to work for the company in the same year Cleary did—2 years before Lindberg flew the Atlantic. Except for a World War II billeting to a powerplant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., Manz has been with Con Edison ever since.

Such records of longevity are not unusual at Con Ed. The 21 top officers have been with the company an average of more than 33 years—a state of affairs that prompted one Wall Street utility analyst to remark recently: "Con Ed isn't just a corporation. It's a way of life."

When they discuss Con Edison's present woes, its officers never fail to point out the unique and burdensome physical characteristics of the Con Ed system. Indeed, the inherent limitations that the company faces are enormous. It serves only 600 square miles; by comparison, California's Pacific Gas & Electric operates in a 94,000-square-mile territory. Con Ed's customer density is 5,000 per square mile—more than 300 times the industry average, and far above the ideal saturation point. Moreover, about 75 percent of its customers live in apartments, and pay an average annual electric bill of only $83. By contrast, the owner of an all-electric home in the Northeast pays a bill of about $375. "Our customers' bills are maximum to them, but minimum to us," bemoans one executive. The use of electricity by New Yorkers, one-fifth of whom live on the verge of poverty, is less than half the national average.

"DIG WE MUST"

Yet to service its low-yield area, which encompasses slums, high-rise apartments, and towering office buildings, Con Edison must expend huge amounts of cash. By law, all transmission lines in Manhattan must be placed below the streets; they cost from 5 to 15 times as much as an overhead system. To maintain its 66,700-mile web of subterranean cables, Con Ed's labor force of 5,000 makes about 40,000 excavations every year, so that its street sign "Dig We Must" has become a bitter joke. To transmit the enormous peak power loads most efficiently, the company has been forced to construct an 80-mile-long, extra-high-voltage cable at a depth of 4 feet—a $220-million backbone that links 12 generating stations. In all, for every $1 of plant Con Edison must spend $2 for transmission and distribution—25 percent above the national average.

Nor can Con Edison look to heavy industry for growth. Heavy industry is a vital factor in the sprightly performance of such regional utilities as American Electric Power and Detroit Edison. But service industries, banking, insurance, communications, and printing predominate in New York, and their energy requirements grow only moderately each year. Since the company's largest customers are public agencies, such as the subway system, the City Housing Authority, and the Port of New York Authority, there is good reason to believe Chairman Eble's contention that Con Edison is virtually recession-proof. But, by the same token, service to such static consumers has been a serious limitation on Con Ed's growth.

To compound its problems Con Edison has relatively high production costs. In electric generation, expenses per net kilowatt-hour for the most efficient plants run under 3.5 mills. But, according to the 1964 figures filed with the FPC, only 3 of Con Edison's 12 generating stations produced power within a mill of this cost. In its 8 coal-, gas-, or oil-fired plants, costs ran from 7 to over 9 mills. Con Ed's new splashy nuclear-powered plant at Indian Point, 24 miles from the city, produced energy at 12.46 mills in 1964—making it one of the most expensive in the Nation. Con Ed's latest average cost per net kilowatt-hour works out to a high 6.4 mills. Despite the company's massive construction program, about half of its capacity is in inefficient plant, some of it half a century old, that swallows up cash simply for maintenance.

The result of all these intrinsic difficulties shows up clearly in the company's financial record. Despite capital expenditures of over $2 billion in the past decade, which increased the investment in plant by 8.5 percent annually, revenues lagged at a disappointing 4.5 percent. In 1965 the company had a net income of $112 million on $840 million of revenues—about 82 percent from electric power, 13 percent from gas, and 5 percent from steam. Rising costs, particularly local taxes that now eat up 16 percent of revenues, have reduced the benefits that should have resulted from new plant. At a scant 5.4 percent for electric operations, Con Ed's return on its rate base has run 1 to 2 percentage points behind most of the industry, a depressing record to one of the company's most important constituents, the financial community. If only to preserve the company's standing in Wall Street as a good income stock, the board of trustees has been forced to pay out 75 percent of net income after interest charges. Even so, investors have shown a lack of enthusiasm—understandable when Con Edison's performance is compared to that of another large utility; since the midfifties, per share earnings of Commonwealth Edison of Chicago have grown at an annual rate of over 8 percent, more than twice that of Con Ed.

Bad as Con Ed's performance seems, it looks even worse to a financial analyst's eye. For the company's reported earnings, like those of some other utilities, reflect the use of an accounting system that rapidly depreciates new equipment and brings the tax savings down to net income. The full complexities of the "flow through" accounting system need not be spelled out here; what matters is the effect of the system on earnings. Last year the flow-through method accounted for more than 30 percent of Con Edison's per share earnings. The practice of boosting earnings by this method of depreciation and tax deferral has been questioned by such a prestigious accounting firm as Arthur Andersen & Co., which has about a third of the U.S. public utility business.

Flow-through accounting is required by the New York State Public Service Commission; by following that practice, Con Ed is simply complying with regulatory procedures. Nevertheless, conservative members of the financial community still feel that dividends should not be paid from the extra earnings generated by an accounting procedure. They point out that if Congress should repeal the law permitting accelerated depreciation, or if the present level of expenditures for new plant should taper off, Con Ed's earnings would dip. In addition, the Investment Bankers Association has pointed out that the flow-through methods contribute to the difficulties of the average investor when he tries to form a sound judgment about the merits of individual utilities.

To Con Edison's Eble, all these arguments are academic. "I just don't see us having to pay back these deferred taxes to Uncle Sam," he says flatly, "because we are constantly expanding."

FROM OUTRAGE TO OUTRAGE

While the infinite expansion is going on, not the least of Eble's concerns will be to overcome what has become known in the company as "the problem of public acceptability." Commenting on this, Washington utilities consultant David Kosh says: "I've been in the utilities business for 34 years and

I can't think of a company that goes out of its way to alienate customers the way Con Edison does. They're so stiff-backed. I have yet to hear a Con Edison executive say, 'Maybe you have a point.' By definition, they always think they are right."

Each year there are 3,000 interruptions in Con Edison's electric-distribution system—"minor outages," according to the company's press releases, but major outrages to infuriate customers. Most often these blackouts occur because of faulty equipment, but some have been caused by company employees digging into the city streets. When searching for a gas leak in midtown Manhattan, a workman drilling on 43rd Street severed the powerline to the New York Times a few hours before that paper's deadline—and only a month after the Times had lost $100,000 of advertising revenue because of the big blackout in November. Power was restored quickly, but the incident did little to improve relations between the city's most influential newspaper and Con Edison.

Con Edison's service has been erratic many times in the past. In 1959, 500,000 people in Manhattan were struck by an 8-hour blackout that resulted from the failure of underground cables. Two years later a 5-square-mile area of mid-Manhattan was paralyzed for 4½ hours when switching equipment failed in a substation. After an investigation by the Public Service Commission, Con Edison was directed to install a second contingency system for the high-voltage substations that feed power into network areas. It complied, but city engineers protested that this installation in itself would not prevent a future blackout; the Con Edison transmission-and-distribution system was so designated, they charged, that future blackouts could not be localized. Last November, when the power failure paralyzed New York's life, their predictions came true—despite the previous insistence of Con Edison executives that maximum reliability was built into the system.

The fault that touched off the big power failure did not lie with Con Edison. But the air of unconcern that pervades the company was never more evident than at that time. New York, as former Mayor Robert Wagner put it, "lives, eats, and virtually breathes on power." When the blackout occurred, two of the metropolitan airports were closed, hospitals were without power, 600,000 passengers were trapped underground in subway trains, television and some radio stations went off the air, monumental traffic jams clogged the streets.

FOR THE WANT OF OIL

The company was taken to task by the Federal Power Commission in its report to the President. For one thing, the FPC wondered why there were neither automatic devices nor more precise guidelines to help the system operator at Con Edison's power control center, so that he could cut clear of the interconnecting ties with the stricken upstate utilities. (There was a period of 7 to 12 minutes between the initial disturbance and the final collapse of the system.) Furthermore, the agency criticized Con Ed for the 13-hour delay in restoring service; it pointed to the company's reliance on slow-starting steam generators for reserve power, and the absence of auxiliary generators that would have provided electricity to restart the huge, inert turbines. When the power failure occurred, no electricity was available from auxiliary sources to pump a protective coat of oil on the massive bearings in many of the company's generators. As a result, 50 bearings were damaged by friction when they spun to a halt; 1,500,000 kilowatts of capacity lay dormant. The company's newest and largest unit, the massive 1-million-kilowatt Ravenswood generator, was down for repairs for 2 months after the blackout.

Consolidated Edison Co. came into being in 1936, when a group of gas, steam, and electric utilities were merged with an already existing amalgam of companies that a group of New York bankers had brought together over a period of 50 years. The man who set the current patterns at Con Ed was Hudson Roy Searing, chief executive from 1953 to 1957. Searing had spent the thirties coordinating the activities of the scores of utilities that made up Consolidated Edison. Since management people were pouring into the new company from the various subsidiaries, Searing's first task was to coordinate this new mass and to dampen personal feuds. "Some people were literally hitting each other over the head," recalls one executive. "At the very least, men from the gas companies simply did not talk to people from the electrical side."

Searing's dream was to build an integrated utility that would operate as a "total energy system." To achieve it, he naturally needed the cooperation of local and State governments. But during the administration of Mayor Fiorello La Guardia, the attitude of the city toward utilities was distinctly hostile. An advocate of public power, La Guardia was constantly threatening that the city would go into competition with private power in order to force a reduction in rates. It was no empty threat: three publicly owned powerplants were then supplying power to the city subway system, and the city was one of Con Edison's largest customers.

Searing's answer was to put Con Ed deep into politics. He began a search for someone in the company who could mesh Con Ed's plans with the various departments of the city, and develop a close working relationship with city hall and other political powers. "Charlie Eble is the man for that. He knows everybody," Searing was told. Looking back today, Eble recalls, "Over the years I struck up friendships with many politicians. It was not something that I set out to do objectively at the beginning. But, as time passed, I found that many of my friends had moved into positions of authority in government. I could talk to them. It was as simple as that."

To talk to friends in authority has become an important part of Eble's job. He makes frequent trips to Washington, where he sees members of the New York congressional delegation, and to Albany, where he is on intimate terms with key politicians of both parties. Two of the utility's vice presidents, Ralph Norris and Bernard Gallagher, spend a great deal of time strenthening relations with city and State legislators. Gallagher also has forged a strong link between the company and the powerful Central Labor Council; Gallagher says that Con Ed, because of its construction projects, provides 15 to 20 percent of the jobs for building trades workers in New York City. Besides his regular responsibilities, public relations Vice President Max Ulrich handles special political assignments. "He has a sixth sense about where the centers of power lie," say a colleague. Other work is handled for Con Edison by its public relations consultant, Sydney Baron, a long-time associate of former Tammany Hall leader Carmine De Sapio.

Con Edison is also directly involved in clubhouse patronage. Under a provision of the administrative code, the company must pay the salaries of "hole inspectors," who are charged with supervising excavations in the city streets. But these inspectors, who are part-time employees, are appointed by the highway department from a list of names submitted by the mayor's office. Con Ed has no voice in the choice of the inspectors and no supervisory control over their work. All it does is pay the tab.

Company executives are a major source of funds for both political parties. Most of these contributions are made by buying tables at fund-raising dinners. Con Edison employees have quite a reputation for stolidly eating their way through innumerable rubber-chicken affairs. All this, of course, is intended to give the company a strong voice in legislative actions while they are still in the formative stage. As Eble puts it: "When I got into the political end of this business, a friend told me, 'Charlie, don't wait until you have a problem before you approach a politician. Build up your credit first.'"

THE POLITICAL PRICE OF POWER

With the election of John Lindsay, Con Edison's relations with city hall may not be quite so smooth as they have been in the past. For one thing, Lindsay is death on clubhouse politics, and has bitterly attacked partisan political patronage and the "power brokers" who, he charges, have long manipulated city government. One of his first actions—a call for the abolition of all coal burning in order to cut down air pollution—would have a direct effect on Con Edison, which burns approximately 5 million tons of coal a year in its city plants.

One of Con Ed's most furious political battles was fought and—by its management's lights, at least—won 7 years ago. The opponent was that old nemesis, public power. The three powerplants the city had owned since La Guardia's day needed to be modernized. Faced with an expenditure of $100 million, the city had either to take the plunge and possibly extend power distribution to other public agencies and authorities, or to sell the plants to Con Edison. But before the city could sell the plants it needed enabling legislation from the State capital. In Albany, Con Edison put on a display of political lobbying that professionals still recall with awe and admiration. The bill was finally passed with only a handful of dissenting votes.

But if the political generalship was masterly, the price paid for the obsolete generators was extraordinarily high. Con Ed gave the city the book value of $126 million for the three 50-year-old plants, whose real value was probably much lower. Moreover, the company since has had to spend heavily to maintain the equipment, and even that has not been enough. Former Chairman Harland Forbes admitted that the economics of the powerplants was questionable, but that it was important for Con Ed to get the city out of the power business.

It was not the first time that Con Edison paid dearly to stifle the threat of public power. In the mid-fifties, a group of powerful legislators were fighting hard in Washington to lead the Federal Government into the ownership of nuclear powerplants. To stave off this threat Con Ed made a surprising decision. The company plunged headlong into its plans for the construction of the first privately owned nuclear power station in the Nation, at Indian Point, on the Hudson River. Con Ed refused all Government assistance and subsidies, except for the $500-million Federal indemnity insurance that is mandatory under the Price-Anderson Act. It also rejected the thought that it might share the cost of a pilot plant with other public utilities, as was done by utilities in New England and the Midwest.

The first estimate for Con Ed's spectacular plant was $55 million. But it was plagued by engineering difficulties, took 4 years to build, and finally cost $127 million. A conventional plant of the same capacity would have cost about $190 per kilowatt of capacity; Indian Point cost between $450 and $500 per kilowatt. To make matters worse, the State public service commission has decided not to include the plant in the company's rate base. "There simply is not sufficient evidence," said the commission, "to reach a proper conclusion on appropriate and proper treatment of the costs of Indian Point operations, either capital costs or operational costs."

IF AT FIRST YOU DON'T SUCCEED

Despite the jolting experience with its first nuclear plant, Con Ed is determined to try again. It is convinced that in its area, where fuel costs are high, nuclear power will be competitive with energy produced from coal or oil. This summer Con Edison expects to receive a construction permit from the Atomic Energy Commission for an 873,000-kilowatt plant that will be located near Indian Point I. This time, however, having been burned when it acted as its own general contractor, Con Edison is buying a turnkey installation from Westinghouse at a cost of $125 per kilowatt. "By running Indian Point II at 80 percent of capacity," says Senior Vice President Mowton Waring, "we can deliver power at 5 mills, about as low as you can get with any conventional system."

Placing the plant 24 miles upriver from New York City is a bow to public opinion. In 1962, Con Edison applied for a license to build a nuclear plant in Queens, then had to abandon the project because of fierce public opposition. But executives like Waring are so enthusiastic about nuclear power that they plan to make another attempt to locate a generator within city limits in the 1970's. Such a plant would enable Con Edison to scrap some of its inefficient coal-burning stations. (Steam from the boilers could also be sold for heating and air conditioning.) "We're going to fight to put the next nuclear plant right in the city," says Waring. "We know it's safe, and the Atomic Energy Commission is convinced. The public has yet to be persuaded."

Another of Con Edison ambitious projects whose outcome is questionable is the proposed construction of a 2-million-kilowatt pumped-storage plant at Cornwall, 8 miles upriver from the nuclear generator. On paper, this hydroelectric scheme seems to make sense: it would, Con Edison told the Federal Power Commission, provide large blocks of power at low cost, alleviate air pollution, provide reliability of service, pave the way for use of large nuclear plants, and improve the company's bargaining position in purchasing other fuels. "I do not know of any project the company has undertaken," intoned Harland Forbes, "that offered so many benefits of such great significance to the public as the company's Cornwall pumped-storage project."

THE EVER STUBBORN CITIZENRY

But in this case also the public has yet to be persuaded. Although the FPC granted a permit for the construction of the $162-million plant, conservationists carried the case to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, which has set aside the FPC decision. The FPC must now, at the direction of the court, undertake a study of other methods of power generation, such as gas-turbine plants. Nobody at Con Edison is betting on the final decision.

Besides giving consideration to the Cornwall project, Con Edison has been negotiating with the Quebec Hydro Electric Commission for the purchase of 1,500,000 kilowatts of Canadian power. Talks have bogged down on costs ("We're about half a mill apart," says a Con Edison executive). However, in a prospectus issued last November, the company said that conditions are promising for the importation of Canadian power sometime in the 1970's.

Currently Con Edison is revamping its system to guard against another disaster like the November blackout. The company has purchased 28 diesel generator sets. They will provide an emergency source of power to insure a safe shutdown of turbine generators and help start up smaller units. Larger generators have been ordered to provide startup power for units in the newer stations. Company executives are also working out a method of providing emergency power for the city subway system. The cost of this backup service will be an estimated $10 million.

All this expansion is intended to do more than just to supply the needs of Con Edison's customers. By extending capacity and its high-voltage ties with other utilities, the company hopes to become a major regional supplier of power. It is already connected with upstate New York and New England. A new interconnection will link Con Ed with plants in Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, and New York. The benefits of such interconnections are obvious: each utility can use the most economical source of power within the pool, and large generating plants can be operated at high capacity.

In the past Con Ed attempted to acquire the neighboring Long Island Lighting Co., a more profitable utility with both the industrial and residential growth that Con Edison lacks. Both attempts were blocked, first by the regulatory agencies, and then by Long Island Lighting's directors. But with the promise of high-voltage interconnections, Eble no longer sees a need for the acquisition. "We can really get the same results under separate managements through cooperation and joint planning," he explains. "That way, you don't get into trouble politically, and you don't antagonize people."

THE PLEASANTNESS OF CHANGE

This state of affairs would be a nice change for Con Ed, many of whose customers feel a good deal of antagonism at the moment. The long series of rate increases has brought some customers, at least, to the belief that they are being penalized for management's ineptitude. Some of the largest real estate companies in the city evidently shared that view. The real estate companies, banding together in the Owners Committee on Electric Rates, Inc., have spent $320,000 over a 12-month period fighting the company's last major rate application. Although the court of appeals upheld the $27 million increase, the group considers that its tactics were well worth the cost: the delay saved the group $22,500,000. Con Ed's growth depends on future construction in the city, and this battle has probably been a deterrent to other builders.

Charles Eble takes opposition in stride. A prodigious worker, Eble has come to symbolize Con Edison to what he considers its most important constituents—Wall Street, the political power structure, and community organizations. In his spacious office on the 16th floor of Con Ed's command post, Eble puts in a 12-hour day, mainly on financial matters. Since the company must borrow constantly for its construction program, Eble juggles deftly to keep the capital structure in balance, to avoid an overload of debt, and to pave the way for an equity issue tentatively scheduled for 1967. And since all construction projects must be coordinated with other companies, Eble spends a considerable amount of time shoring up relations with other utility executives. Eble also lends his talents to a number of outside business and community organizations. Among other posts, he holds the position of chairman of the once moribund Greater New York Safety Council, designed to promote safety on the roads and in industry, and reactivated it by increasing its budget and by persuading some prominent businessmen to serve on the board.

Some of the intense pressures on Con Edison, and on its facilities, may be alleviated in a few years if the company's expansionary plans are translated into reality. But Con Ed also had a conspicuous weakness: a consistent reluctance to find within itself the reason for its consistent unpopularity. That failing is likely to endure, partly because the company has no visible second-line young managers to generate new ideas along with the generation of more power. Executive Vice President Otto Manz seemed to recognize the weakness when he said recently, "We're always the whipping boy. We just don't sit here in the tower and decide to do in the customers. We must find a way to show people that we don't have horns." In fact, the company has never proved—the way exemplary utilities such as American Electric Power and Detroit Edison have proved—that it is on the same side as the customers.

But then Chairman Eble thinks it has. "In a broad sense," he says, "the goals of Con Edison and the city are in harmony." Then in an odd twist he adds: "But you know, I'd never use Charlie Wilson's phrase, 'What's good for the company is good for the city.'"

THE POLARIS STORY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, in San Diego, Calif., the week of April 11 to 17 is Submarine Week. While our attention is directed to the war on the continent in Asia in which we are presently engaged, we should take time to note that under the surface of the world's seas cruises a powerful force of U.S. submarines. They are carrying out their missions of guarding the ramparts of freedom by offering a massive nuclear deterrent to aggression.

Mr. President, as the veterans of World War II submarine service meet to renew friendships and memories, they, as we, are interested in what has been done to keep our submarine fleet in a dominant, battle-ready state.

I would like to present here a brief history, Mr. President, of the development of the concept of the submarine-launched Polaris missile and its place in our balanced defense system of today. In view of some of the developments in our military posture, through economies and revision of concepts, our dependence on Polaris at the present time is greater than ever.

Mr. President, here is the Polaris story:

POLARIS—A GREAT WEAPON

Somewhere deep in the vast reaches of the world's oceans, an unknown number of quiet, whale-shaped ships with 16 ready-to-fire missiles each, are moving—up, down, and through the murky wet jungle of the liquid space that covers most of this planet. This dominant, dependable deterrent is ready to administer the supreme punishment for the crime of crimes. Readiness is in motion, keeping nuclear peace on the living space that covers the rest of this earth.

The ships, nuclear-powered submarines.

The missiles, Polaris.

The mission, prevent nuclear war.

The method, deterrence.

One use of national power is to deter actions by other nation-states inimical to our interests. The power available to the U.S. ranges from political and economic sanctions, through varying degrees of military force up to the ultimate—long-range nuclear weapons.

We are concerned here with the power available to the United States at the upper end of the spectrum—long-range bombardment systems with nuclear warheads—and its use as a war deterrent.

NUCLEAR DETERRENT POWER

Nuclear deterrence depends on posing a threat to use military power in its most devastating form. But, both the ability and will to use this power must be demonstrated.

Deter. It means to discourage action through fear of unpalatable and inevitable consequences.

The effectiveness of deterrent power depends on how the consequences are viewed in the mind of the deterred. If the party being deterred does not understand what actions will cause what consequences; if he does not believe that the consequences are inevitable; and if this party does not consider the consequences to be unacceptable in terms of what he hopes to gain by taking the action, then the deterrent will fail to deter.

Another complexity is the fact that today's deterrent may not work tomorrow. The deterred will search for a method of defeating or neutralizing the force which is intended to bring the consequences about. It is human nature to do so, and if the deterred thinks he can do it, then the deterrent may fail.

This raises some questions. What is our nuclear deterrent power supposed to do for us? Who will it deter, and what will it deter them from doing? If it fails, what are the consequences? How do we make the punishment so certain that the commitment of the crime never happens?

If the deterrent fails, then it is possible that large areas of the world's living space and the people in it will be annihilated. It is of such dimension. It is that important.

Basically, our nuclear deterrent power makes it possible for us to deter a rational country from taking any action which the United States might use nuclear force to counter.

What then are the Communist actions to be deterred?

Essentially, our nuclear deterrent power discourages a rational nation from launching a nuclear attack against this country or against our allies. It may do more. It may, for example, deter the Communist camp from engaging in political-military actions short of nuclear war, because such actions could escalate to nuclear war. But this is byproduct of nuclear deterrent power, not the primary purpose.

The key to this power resides in the inevitability of the consequences. If a Communist nation launches a first strike against this country, then we would destroy them as a nation and as civilization.

This is the heart of nuclear deterrent power. If the United States, in fact, has such power, we know that it does not have a universal application. The building of a wall in Berlin, French recognition of Red China, insurgency in Vietnam, are events this power could not deter. This power should not be applied where only economic, diplomatic, and conventional military power are useful.

A nation cannot long rely on a nuclear deterrent system as a bluff. Dependable deterrence demands substance. Our ready nuclear power must convince possible aggressors that they cannot possibly win a nuclear conflict. They must understand the postulate that there are no issues as vital as the survival of their homeland itself.

THE STANDARDS

Retaliation and second strike describe the operation, but how is the job to be done? What kind of weapons do we need?

A first strike by the United States is not a consideration. Even if it were, it would not lessen the importance of being able to strike back. Come what may, retaliation must be certain. Twenty-four-hour-a-day retaliation readiness is required.

The forces that make up our nuclear deterrent power must possess certain essential characteristics. Recently, Gen. Curtis LeMay defined some of the most important:

"Adequate in quantity and quality to execute its mission, accurate, capable of striking a range of targets with precision, survivable, to prevent its being destroyed in a surprise attack, flexible, capable of attacking all types of targets under varying conditions, controllable, responsive at all times to the Nation's decisionmakers."

The most significant word in General LeMay's list is "survivable." Without survivability, the retaliatory system must fail.

A survivable deterrent stymies enemy efforts to neutralize or destroy the system concurrently with the action that the system is designed to deter. But obviously the system must do more than survive a nuclear attack.

It has to survive sabotage. Floods, earthquakes, heavy weather, and other phenomena of nature cannot be allowed to interfere.

Can the system be destroyed in flight? Can the warhead be rendered harmless by countermeasures?

In order to deliver the consequences, the system must survive—prior to launch and in flight.

THE STAGE

Prior to 1949, the United States enjoyed a nuclear monopoly. But, in 1949, the Soviet Union began to catch up. They exploded an atomic weapon.

In 1950, the Communists invaded South Korea.

The follow-on period saw in the United States the buildup of bomber forces, warning systems, and air defense systems.

With sufficient warning of a bomber attack, the United States could launch its own bomber forces. With adequate air defenses, we could make a bomber attack on the United States a costly adventure that might fail.

But, on an October day in 1957, sputnik was launched, and in its wake the postsputnik Communist offensive and the word "missile gap."

The rationale underwent a sharp change.

Sputnik raised the specter that someone else had an intercontinental ballistic missile to deliver an atomic bomb.

With little or no warming time, and with no missile defense, could United

States retaliatory forces survive a surprise missile attack? If not, then how could we deter a nuclear assault on this country?

The so-called missile gap may have been a myth, but warranted or not, "sputnikosis" occurred with a few symptoms of panic. The Communists were to make the most of it.

In the foreword to his "Public Papers of 1962" the late President Kennedy wrote:

> Following * * * sputnik in 1957, the Soviet Union began to intensify its pressures against the non-Communist world. * * * The notable successes in space were taken as evidence that communism held the key to the scientific and technological future. People in many countries began to accept the notion that communism was mankind's inevitable destiny.

Sputnik was the signal to Communists everywhere. Using nuclear blackmail, Khrushchev laid down the ultimatum on Berlin. Using insurgency, subversion, aid, and trade, 1958 saw the pressure build up in Vietnam and Laos; the simultaneous crises at Matsu-Quemoy in Asia and Lebanon-Jordan in the Middle East; and before the year was out, a man named Castro took charge in Cuba.

By the spring of 1960, the Communist offensive had gained real momentum. The climax came with the shooting down of an American U-2 over Soviet territory.

American's pride and sense of purpose seemed to flow downhill in the wake of rising Communist military, scientific, and political prestige. America's stature seemed to wallow feebly in the wake of sputnik and later Soviet achievements.

THE FLAW

During the first 3 years of the postsputnik offensive attention was focused on the word "missile-gap," and it obscured the real issue. Actually, survivability of any system was at the root of the concern that centered around our nuclear deterrent power.

Retaliatory reaction to a manned bomber attack was one thing, but retaliation to a surprise missile attack, if the Soviets in fact had such a capability, was something else. It represented a different kind of a threat.

Missiles reduced the warning time to minutes, outmoding our jet interceptors. An antimissile system did not exist. Effective base hardening was a concept, not a fact.

The status of missile development in the United States vis-a-vis the Soviet Union was quite beside the point. The point was that sputnik gave the world a psychological reason to believe that the Soviets could have a missile delivery system capable of neutralizing our ability to deliver the consequences. Moreover, the actions and spirited statements coming out of the Sino-Soviet bloc added credence to the possibility that they could do so.

As the postsputnik offensive gained in momentum, the free world's confidence in our ability to deter nuclear war and our strength to resist Communist encroachments around the globe diminished. Whether this derogation of confidence was founded in fact is unimportant. The important consideration was what was going on in the minds of Communist decisionmakers. If they could, by calculation or miscalculation, conclude that devastating retaliation by the United States was not probable, then a serious flaw had developed in the creditability of our nuclear deterrent power.

The way had been paved for more vigorous probings, more serious challenges, and more dangerous threats. As the peril of escalation gained in substance, the range of alternatives open to the United States in the arena of international politics narrowed.

Except for the weapons that could be launched from aircraft carriers and Regulus submarines, this Nation was dependent on a static system to carry out its nuclear deterrent concepts. Our bomber forces stationed around the world, and later, our open, liquid-fueled missiles, represented 90 percent of our retaliatory might.

These forces were not only vulnerable to surprise missile attack—they were the primary targets. Further, it occurred to our allies that our bomber and missile forces abroad were attractive nuisances that could invite nuclear attack on them—an attack that might be precipitated by an event in which they had neither a voice nor an interest.

The United States had invested tremendous sums in a rigid strategic concept by placing 90 percent of its eggs in what was to become a faulty basket. The ability to survive and then retaliate was in doubt. This was the issue—this was the strategic flaw.

THE REPAIR

The deficiencies in our deterrent posture were recognized and several costly measures to correct them were set in motion. Under the heading of the "cocked configuration" the techniques of dispersal, field rotation, ground alert, and airborne alert were instituted.

These efforts to gain mobility were an expedient. True sustained mobility was unattainable, because the supporting bases were fixed. True sustained mobility is achieved only when the base moves with the system.

Frantic attempts to gain mobility created problems. Exposed forces must be committed, if at all, early in nuclear war. An airborne force lacks staying power. It must be expended at the outset, because the bases on which the force depends would disappear on the first attack. Released under these circumstances an airborne force cannot deliberate or choose its own timing. Indeed, it is the captive of time.

The force reacts by moving on the enemy without delay. The option of poised thought and controlled action are denied.

Base hardening was developed to improve survivability. But aside from its practical and economic limitations, hardening only helps temporarily.

Harden all you will—land locations are fixed—a latitude and longitude recorded on a Soviet target checkoff list. It is axiomatic that military installations will attract enemy warheads in a strike against this country. An enemy has no choice.

If fixed bases attract enemy bombs, then hardened bases attract more and bigger bombs. The better the hardening, the bigger the bomb that base attracts. This in turn widens the area of destruction and increases the perils of fallout.

THE CURE

The cocked configuration and hardening could repair the flaw in our deterrent posture to a limited degree—it could not effect a cure.

The defect of rigidity simplified the enemy's problem while reducing the options open to us. The cure demanded that our nuclear deterrent strength be given a large shot of versatility.

This does not suggest that our bomber forces and land-based missile systems needed to be replaced by another system. On the contrary, it was important that they be retained to avoid falling into the very error that had to be corrected. The United States had to escape from the unhappy plight of the rigid military posture, and the single weapons system on which it depends.

Not only did our nuclear eggs have to be distributed more sensibly among the baskets we had, but more and better baskets had to be developed.

In November 1955, the Navy backed by America's highly skilled industrial base, began to weave a new and better basket. By July 1960, the basket had taken on form and substance—the submarine *George Washington* successfully launched two Polaris test missiles from beneath the Atlantic. Before the year was out, two FBM submarines were deployed to station with 16 ready missiles each.

If the world sat up and took notice it was because thinking people saw in Polaris the enlargement and strengthening of America's shield. The means to gradually repair the flaw were in hand. The weight of Polaris gradually tipped the scales of nuclear deterrence in America's favor, and gradually wrested the strategic initiative from the Soviet Union. By the end of 1962 nine submarines with 144 missiles were at sea.

Survivability prior to launch, was the flaw which had undermined our deterrent posture. The world's oceans provided the sound solution.

To the Soviet Union, the United States represents a target covering less than 2 percent of the earth's surface. To us, the Soviet Union represents a target covering about 6 percent. These are the geographical facts of life. It would be sheer idiocy for the United States to engage the Soviet Union in a nuclear duel between continental-based missiles. With three times the land mass of the United States, the Soviets would start off with a 3 to 1 advantage on dispersal alone. Missiles bases on land do not move, and the Soviets know exactly where they are.

What could be more logical than to move a significant part of our nuclear deterrent forces to sea, and thereby multiply the earth's surface area available to us by 35; from 2 percent to 70 percent. This can be done without a treaty, without a concession, without a lease. It removes the attractive nuisance from our soil as well as foreign soil.

Deployed forces at sea exist in isolation and represent dispersed power instead of concentrations of power. Each unit moves continuously and at random.

Random depth, speed, and direction characterized each unit—and each unit represents a mobile base constantly changing position on the globe.

This is true sustained mobility. The quiet, unseen moving target. Imagine a Polaris submarine track superimposed on North America. Then, imagine if yesterday it left Philadelphia and moved in a direction selected at random. Today it could show up in Boston, or somewhere in North Carolina. Tomorrow it might appear in Montreal, Canada; Savannah, Ga.; or Chicago.

Polaris does not suffer the limitations of the highway, there is only the water—the boundless stretches of ocean. Somewhere within it are small, individual units. An unknown number of submarines in unknown locations, moving at random, elusive, avoiding detection, compounding the difficulty of discovery.

Even if one is found—it has to be identified as a submarine. But this submarine avoids detection at all cost and takes timely evasive action to insure it. Even if identified, the submarine must still be destroyed. The latter is not an automatic consequence of the former.

Remember, there is just the water covering an unknown number of submarines at different locations deep in the sea. To prevent retaliation, the enemy would have to find and destroy every one of them before launching a nuclear strike of their own. To attack this system, an enemy would have to go after each small, individual ship. Missiles are useless. To destroy such a system an enemy would have to seek out, classify and engage each unit—one by one. A mammouth task entirely different than that of coping with the offensive submarine that risks detection by purposely engaging other forces on the high seas.

Thus, the system as a whole is survivable. Freed from the ballistic missile threat, it cannot be destroyed by surprise attack systems.

Survivability does not depend on special measures or expensive hardening. The bull's-eye is under the sea, try and find it.

If the enemy should try to destroy our sea-based deterrent force, their efforts would not bring devastation on the United States. By not attracting missiles to this country, sea-based forces limit the damage that would be inflicted on our society. A sea-based system stands between the enemy and the United States. It stands in front of, not among the defended. This is a bonus beyond price.

In flight, Polaris is not any more or any less survivable than other missile systems. Nevertheless, it does offer advantages. Because it is launched from a point closer to the target, the inflight time is shorter. Second, the launch point cannot be monitored—the enemy has not the slightest notion of its location. These two factors taken in combination reduce the time available to neutralize or destroy the missile while it is in flight—another plus for survivability.

Other characteristics in General LeMay's list are: "accurate, flexible, controllable, responsive." This package takes on importance if the system survives, and the characteristics of readiness and reliability are implicit.

The standards in this package are tough to meet, yet, Polaris meets them rather well.

Polaris has the accuracy and range to hit any place on the face of the earth. This has been established by over 125 firings from submerged submarines.

Reliable? This is the only system that has been tested fully, right up to the nuclear warhead itself, and by the men who will be expected to do so under war conditions, and in the normal operational environment.

Submarine reliability has been demonstrated. To quote the late Admiral Ricketts, then Vice Chief of Naval Operations:

> The first Polaris submarine went to sea over 3 years ago. Since that time, no Polaris submarine has been late in deployment; no patrol has been aborted; no submarine has returned early from its patrol.

Admiral Ricketts touched on responsiveness. In over 3 years "no communications message has been missed." Operational experience has demonstrated that the system will hear the Presidential command to launch missiles—if and when.

Responsiveness involves more than hearing the command. Compliance is every bit as important. This is where flexibility and readiness enter the picture.

Polaris is not preaimed. Completely flexible, it can shift, right down to the instant of launch, and "zero in" on new targets laying in any direction.

To be responsive, a system must be ready to go. This too has been demonstrated. In over 3 years, at least 15 of the 16 missiles in each submarine have been ready to fire over 99 percent of the time, and all 16 have been ready to fire over 95 percent of the time.

Flexible, always ready—in short, responsive. Launchable within minutes without the need for a long countdown, it is neither influenced by, nor does it vary with, the state of international tensions. The sea-based system is always there, ready to function when ordered, and only then.

A controllable deterrent. It gives the decisionmakers room for maneuver. It allows mature judgment and thoughtful action. Instantly responsive? Yes, but Polaris does not depend on hair-trigger methods. It need not move on the enemy without delay, because the system will survive.

Its missiles can be held for days, weeks or months, and then squeezed off with cool deliberate aim. Some, or all, or the system can be held in check to carry out a war of systematic terror and destruction if the President so directs.

A controllable weapon, useful as a negotiating force if deterrence fails. Controlled retaliation to force the enemy to capitulate through the deliberate destruction of his whole society—bit by bit—until our terms are met.

This is a weapons system officered and manned by carefully selected, highly trained and highly skilled American sailors. Qualified submariners, thoroughly schooled in the traditions of the sea as well as in the latest that technology has to offer. These men serve their country with a sense of purpose and pride in what they are doing to safeguard America.

Even the most dedicated, highly trained, carefully selected individuals can err. To prevent a mistake or an accidental firing of any of these awesome missiles, a system of checks and balances has been designed into the organizational structure of the submarine itself. The mutually dependent coordinated action of several people is required to launch missiles. This system is as foolproof as ingenuity can make it.

The organization and the type of men entrusted with it makes it manifestly impossible for any missile to leave its silo unless the President so directs.

THE REACTION

Polaris meets the standards. In fact, it does more. It forces an involuntary reaction by the Communist powers.

The Russians have always been an inward looking, suspicious, defensive people. Locked to the Eurasion landmass, their naval power has supported a strategy of defense. Such is reflected in Russian history and explained by geography.

Communists understand the advantages of a sea-based missile system. To reach nuclear deterrent parity with the United States, they too must turn to the sea. Moreover, they must turn to the sea on a grand scale if they should try to counter Polaris at the source—the submarine.

The United States moved part of its nuclear deterrent force to sea naturally. We constructed the system that is best for us. This, too, is reflected in history and explained by geography.

The Soviets are trying to match Polaris with a similar sea-based system. But what was natural for us is unnatural for them. Whether they try to match it, or counter it at the source, Polaris forces the Communists to apply their resources in an involuntary way.

A fact that disturbs the Communist nations is that sea-based deterrent forces can ring the Eurasian land mass with retaliatory missiles. At one time, the Soviets could concentrate their defensive strength along the polar frontier. Now, missiles can penetrate from any direction—across China, over the Himalayas, no frontier is safe. With immense frontiers, difficult to protect, they must undertake the tremendous task of defending themselves everywhere around the Eurasian land mass.

The effects are twofold. The Sino-Soviet bloc must reorient their defensive strength which in turn weakens the total. Secondly, they must build more defense forces which leaves them with fewer resources for aggression and economic progress.

Soviet sensitivity to Polaris was seen in the Geneva disarmament talks. In

March 1964, Russia proposed the destruction of all U.S. submarine-borne nuclear missiles as the starting point of world disarmament. Soviet Delegate Tsarapkin called the Polaris missile "a dangerous weapon, difficult to control, antihumanistic and antidisarmament and must be done away with."

The Soviets have nothing to fear from Polaris as long as they behave. But scrap Polaris and we resurrect the post-sputnik offensive. Scrap Polaris and America moves out from under the umbrella of its dominant deterrent, no longer as free to use its other powers to protect our interests.

THE PAYOFF

A randomly dispersed arrangement of quiet, moving weapons, Polaris—the most effective deterrent to nuclear war ever devised.

If nuclear war should come, our deterrent forces will have failed their mission. Over 100 million Americans may be dead. But—

> When the strong man, fully armed, guards his courtyard, his property is undisturbed—Luke 11: 14–18.

The United States can absorb every nuclear weapon in the Soviet arsenal and still have the power to deliver the consequences.

As long as the men in the Kremlin are rational, we need not dilute our national goals, our national purpose, out of fear from a nuclear attack or a massive power play from them. We can continue to concentrate with confidence on the smaller but no less important problems of this planet and the people on it.

But continuation rests on seeking solutions in an arena free of nuclear blackmail.

Polaris, hand in hand with complementary systems and conventional forces, backed by astute diplomacy, and the will to use our national power, makes this possible.

Polaris is not the end-all, the absolute. Military history, especially the post-sputnik era, underscores the danger of a rigid strategic concept. It simplifies the enemy's problem. It reduces the risks he must take. It minimizes his opportunities for miscalculation.

The single, perfect weapons system does not, and probably never will, exist. That is why systems to complement Polaris, in fact, a mix of weapons systems is needed. But among this mix, America's sea-based system is a component of great importance.

The Prime Minister of Great Britain, Sir Alex Douglas-Home expressed it this way:

> I believe we may be over the watershed of danger with the Soviet Union, but if so, it is because the deterrent has deterred, and above all, because the Polaris submarine * * * has convinced the Soviet Union that war is too dangerous.

The fear of nuclear blackmail has faded. The problems of escalation are manageable. Polaris, by restoring our retaliatory strength, gave America the advantage over its enemies in the cold war. The fear of nuclear blackmail has faded.

The strategic initiative is in our hands.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS, AND FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY of New York obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me without losing the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate from today until 11 a.m. Tuesday next the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President and the House of Representatives, that the Vice President and the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills, and that committees be authorized to file their reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, perhaps at this time the distinguished majority leader can tell the Senate what the business will be on Tuesday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The business on next Tuesday will be Senate Resolution 220, the disapproval resolution of Reorganization Plan No. 1, transferring the Community Relations Service to Justice.

After that it is anticipated that some minor bills will be considered.

We hope that on Tuesday or Wednesday, or perhaps on Thursday, we shall be able to consider the India resolution, which was referred today to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understood there was some opposition to the reorganization proposal. I am wondering whether there will be a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As far as I am concerned, I would hope not, but any Member can ask for it, and I would assume there may well be a record vote on Tuesday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

CHARGES MADE AGAINST MR. MORTIMER CAPLIN

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I was deeply disturbed to read over the past few days that allegations were made by a former Internal Revenue Service auditor before a Senate subcommittee against Mortimer Caplin, who was formerly Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

I have known Mr. Caplin for some period of time. I also served with him in the executive branch of the Government. He was a distinguished public servant, a man of great integrity and honesty. He was recommended for the position of Internal Revenue Commissioner by the former senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. Harry F. Byrd. The testimony before the committee by this gentleman alleged, without any basis at all, that Mr. Caplin was a close friend of a San Francisco accountant who had prepared certain examination reports which had allegedly been falsified.

The fact is that Mortimer Caplin does not know this gentleman, and certainly never stayed at his home, as was alleged, and certainly did not play golf, as the former auditor claimed before the Senate committee.

It is extremely disturbing when someone who has been in public life is faced with unfounded charges, particularly when they are made before a public committee. I have known Mr. Caplin for a long time. I have talked with him since these charges were made, and he tells me that he did not know about the charges made against him before they were made.

In fact, he was unaware of the charges being made against him until the newspapers in his own State of Virginia and elsewhere published the charges. It seems to me that it would have been elementary justice to have informed Mr. Caplin of these charges that were going to be made against him, rather than have him learn of them for the first time by headlines in newspapers in the city of Washington and his own State of Virginia and across the country.

I understand the committee is going to let Mr. Caplin testify, but it seems that the damage has been done to Mr. Caplin and his reputation for integrity and honesty. As Commissioner of Internal Revenue, he conducted the operation of the Internal Revenue Service not only with honesty but with efficiency. I know that from personal experience.

I believe that all American citizens, and those who serve in the U.S. Government, and those who pay taxes in this country, owe a great debt to Mr. Caplin. I think that a disservice was done to him over the last few days by that testimony before a congressional committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would like to take this occasion to associate myself with the remarks of the junior Senator from New York.

I served as U.S. attorney for 3 years during the period of time when Mr. Caplin was the chief of the Internal Revenue Service. I think it was most unfortunate that the Senate committee conducting an investigation, ostensibly for the purpose of better legislation, had not done more thorough homework in connection with permitting charges which were completely unfounded, to be stated and then spread in the public press to hurt the reputation of a very distinguished former public servant.

It is difficult enough these days to attract highly capable men into the public service.

The purpose of congressional investigations is to frame or draft legislation to get the facts from responsible witnesses on which to base legislation; and not to blacken or muddy the reputation of a very fine public servant.

I was most distressed when I read the newspaper accounts which the Senator has mentioned. I think it is most unfortunate, and I do not think that the work of the staff of that committee was sufficient to protect the honor and integrity of people who should be protected. I would hope that in the future, before calling witnesses, they would do a little more background checking and not permit unfounded statements of this type to be made, which could seriously harm the integrity of an outstanding lawyer and an outstanding former public official.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is the Senator from Maryland aware of the fact that Mr. Caplin did not even know these allegations were to be made against him before the congressional committee until newspapermen telephoned him afterward to tell him about statements made about his integrity and honor?

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not know that. I think it is absolutely unconscionable for any committee staff or counsel to know, as they do know, when they review the case properly, when the honor and integrity of a fine public citizen and former public official is going to be besmirched, and not give him the decency of advising him beforehand so he can be there to protect himself.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I might add that prior to the time that Mr. Caplin came into Government service as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, he was a distinguished law professor at the University of Virginia. His entire career has been one of integrity and contribution to the general public.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Maryland insofar as the character of Mr. Mortimer Caplin is concerned.

I am not familiar with the case which the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from New York have mentioned, but I am very familiar with Mortimer Caplin. I have known him for 25 years. I believe him to be one of the finest men in our State. I believe that he made an outstanding record in the administration of President Kennedy. I think that he is a man in whom all of those who have had acquaintance with him, all those who have had an opportunity to know him, all of those who have been in college with him, all of those who have been associated with him as a citizen of Virginia, realize that he is a man of the highest integrity and the finest character.

I am pleased to associate myself today with the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Maryland in rising to defend Mortimer Caplin and to state that in my judgment there is no finer citizen of our Commonwealth than Mortimer Caplin.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Caplin was recommended as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by the father of the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I might say that I am well aware of that fact and I am proud of that fact.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe the Senator would be.

CIGARETTE SMOKING

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, last year Congress enacted legislation to require a warning on cigarette packages to the effect that smoking may be hazardous to health. When this legislation was before the Senate Commerce Committee, many Members of the Senate contended that the warning should be required in cigarette advertising as well. The able Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] introduced legislation to this effect. I supported that legislation.

The Commerce Committee chose to report legislation that required a warning only on packages. It provided in addition that the Federal Trade Commission's jurisdiction to require any more extensive warning would be cut off for a period of 3 years.

Senator NEUBERGER and I and others sought on the Senate floor to limit the moratorium on FTC power to 1 year. We were defeated, and the bill as finally sent to the President provided a moratorium on FTC jurisdiction until January 1, 1969, while requiring only a warning on packages until that time.

Events since have tended only to prove that the warning provided by last year's legislation is inadequate, and that if the Senate is not going to legislate more extensively, the limitation on the FTC jurisdiction is unfortunate. The newspapers this week contained two separate reports which, in my judgment, bear out the need for additional regulation of cigarette advertising.

First, Surg. Gen. William H. Stewart reported to an American Cancer Society seminar that, if anything, the Public Health Service has up to now underestimated the hazards to health involved in cigarette smoking.

A new Public Health Service survey shows that some 12 million cases of chronic illness in this country are connected with smoking—among them, 300,000 coronary conditions, 1 million cases of chronic bronchitis and emphysema and 1 million cases of peptic ulcers. These results of the survey and others were reported in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune for March 30, 1966, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these articles also be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, Chairman Henry criticized the advertising of cigarettes on radio and television, pointing out that such advertising fails to mention the adverse causal relationship between cigarette smoking and health. This, of course, is precisely the warning which would have been required had Senator NEUBERGER's bill been passed last year, or had the FTC's cigarette advertising regulations been permitted to go into effect. Chairman Henry said:

> Television viewers in particular are led to believe that cigarette smoking is the key to fun and games with the opposite sex, good times at home and abroad, social success and virility.

It takes only a few hours of watching television to confirm that Chairman Henry's description is wholly accurate. Yet last year the representatives of the cigarette industry told the Senate Commerce Committee that the industry had undertaken to police itself, particularly in regard to luring young people to begin smoking.

But cigarette advertising—especially on television—has continued to portray smoking as the smart, sophisticated thing to do. And 4,500 to 5,000 youngsters in our country still start smoking every day. Projections still show that present smoking habits projected will result in lung cancer for more than 1 million children now in school in America today. Indeed, at least 14 million people now alive will die prematurely as a result of cigarette smoking if something is not done.

Far from helping to discourage young people from starting to smoke—or even remaining neutral by explaining the dangers while enumerating the attractions of cigarette smoking, whatever they may be—the cigarette industry and the broadcasting industry are actively luring thousands of youngsters to take up a habit they may never be able to break. Indeed, the only positive steps which seem to have been taken were in two flagrant instances in response to concern expressed by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Commerce. In these serious circumstances, I ask the following:

No. 1: I ask the cigarette industry to come up with a program to regulate its advertising adequately and effectively.

No. 2: I ask the broadcasting industry, as well, to come up with a program to regulate the kind of advertising it accepts from the cigarette industry.

I call, in short, on both the cigarette industry and the broadcasting industry to provide an answer, particularly as to young people who are encouraged to smoke by the way cigarette smoking is portrayed in advertising. As to young people, the advertising is a weapon to lure them to their ultimate destruction, a tool to lead them to snuff out their own lives at an early day. Both industries, therefore, must come up with realistic programs to police themselves.

No. 3, if such programs are not forthcoming within a reasonable period of time, I would like to have the administration suggest adequate regulatory legislation. I was delighted that the administration recently proposed legislation on auto safety in analogous circumstances. But cigarette smoking is an even greater killer. If the broadcasting and cigarette industries will not regulate themselves, the Government will have to do it for them.

If the industries do not propose an acceptable program within the next few months, the administration should act. In those circumstances, I call on the administration to propose legislation before the end of the present session of Congress in time for action to be taken.

This matter can wait no longer. Thousands of young people every year are still buying premature death when they buy their first package of cigarettes. Preventive action now is therefore imperative.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I commend the Senator from New York for his observations on cigarette smoking. I should certainly like to join in endorsing his suggestion that the cigarette industry and the broadcasting industry attempt to provide an answer to this problem. If they do not, I agree with the Senator from New York that legislation on the subject ought to be forthcoming. I commend the Senator for his discussion of this highly important issue.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Mar. 30, 1966]

SMOKING IS LINKED TO 12 MILLION SICK: SURVEY INDICATES TOBACCO WIDENS CHRONIC DISEASE

(By Jane E. Brody)

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—If all Americans were nonsmokers, there would be 12 million fewer cases of chronic illness reported in this country, a new national survey indicates.

The survey, discussed here today, also showed that smoking is related to the existence of 300,000 extra coronary conditions, one million extra cases of chronic bronchitis or emphysema, nearly two million extra cases of sinusitis and more than one million extra cases of peptic ulcers than would be expected to occur if no one smoked.

Results of the survey, done by the national center for health statistics, were based on interviews in 42,000 households during the year from July 1, 1964, to July 1, 1965.

The survey results, which have not yet been published, were described in a paper by Dr. William H. Stewart, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. The paper was presented by Dr. Eugene H. Guthrie, Assistant Surgeon General, for science writers attending an American Cancer Society Seminar being held at Del Webb's Towne House in Phoenix.

Another finding of the survey, Dr. Stewart said, is that "there are three million more man-days of restricted activity" and "900,000 more days spent ill in bed" among cigarette smokers than would be the case if all were nonsmokers.

From these figures, the Surgeon General concluded that "we are paying dearly for the cigarette habit, not only in terms of lives prematurely lost but also in terms of human suffering, medical bills, and the Nation's economy."

He estimated the cost of work days lost because of smoking-related illnesses as running perhaps "into billions of dollars." For emphysema alone, he said, "the Social Security Administration pays more than $60 million a year to men disabled [by the disease]."

OTHER GUY THEORY

Dr. Stewart, however, expressed great dismay with the fact that "Americans continue to smoke, and the number of smokers continues to rise."

Despite the report of the Surgeon General's advisory committee on smoking and health, issued 2 years ago, and 1,300 studies published since then, there are still "dissenters and skeptics," Dr. Stewart said.

Dr. Guthrie commented that one of the major misconceptions about the adverse effects of smoking is the notion that "it will happen to the other guy, not to me." He pointed to another seminar speaker, Dr. Louis F. Fieser of Harvard University, as an example of one who once expounded the "other guy theory."

Dr. Fieser, an organic chemist, had been a heavy smoker for 45 years. Last September, he underwent an operation for lung cancer, which he says was brought on by his cigarette habit.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 30, 1966]

NEW OUTCRY AT CIGARETTES

(By David Hoffman)

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—The Public Health Service believes it has underestimated the danger of cigarette smoking as the result of its recent study of 42,000 American households—the broadest survey yet of the nicotine habit as a hazard to health.

Yesterday, Surgeon General William Stewart reported his grim and as yet unpublished findings. Between July 1, 1964, and July 1, 1965, PHS men talked about smoking with 42,000 families, then projected these conclusions:

That Americans 17 years of age or older reported 12 million more chronic ailments during the test year than they would have reported if they had not smoked.

That there were 300,000 extra coronary attacks, a million extra cases of bronchitis or emphysema and another million extra cases of peptic ulcers.

That Americans spent 900,000 more days sick in bed than they would have spent if the total population enjoyed the same disease rate as nonsmokers.

The report prepared by the Surgeon General was given to an American Cancer Society seminar here by Dr. Eugene Guthrie, the Assistant Surgeon General for Operations, in the absence of Dr. Stewart, who was called to testify before Congress.

PREDICTION

According to the Surgeon General, the data available on time lost from work due to cigarette smoking shows the cost "could run into billions of dollars."

Dr. Stewart's report was delivered minutes after a nationally renowned Harvard scientist, himself a victim of lung cancer, predicted that a safe and salable cigarette will never be invented. According to Dr. Louis Fieser, the chemist who synthesized vitamin K, a cigarette packed with spinach would still endanger the health of its smoker.

The reason: Spinach, like most plants, contains much cellulose, and burned cellulose breaks down into benzopyrene, which doctors believe causes lung cancer.

Although Americans are smoking more cigarettes than ever, Dr. Stewart denied that anticigarette campaigns led by his agency have been ineffective. "Not so widely known is that while total national consumption increases as population increases, the individual smoker is smoking less," he reported.

Similarly the percentage of male smokers dropped from 59 percent to 53 percent in 1964. According to Dr. Stewart, a smaller percentage of the male population now smokes cigarettes than at any time during the past 50 years. Another ray of hope is that 18 million adults, including half the physicians who once smoked, have kicked the habit, apparently for good.

The 1965 law requiring a "caution" label on cigarette packs also orders the PHS and the Federal Trade Commission to report back to Congress in July 1967, on effects of the label change. If the PHS decides this has been effective, "we might very well recommend additional legislation," Dr. Guthrie said yesterday.

Serious disappointment was expressed by the Surgeon General over Congress refusal to pass a stronger measure, which also would have forced cigarette makers to display cautionary warnings in advertisements. His remarks contained the hint the PHS may campaign again for such a law when it delivers its report to Congress.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 30, 1966]

FCC CHIEF ASSERTS CIGARETTE ADS FAIL TO MENTION PERILS

CHICAGO.—E. William Henry, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, today criticized radio and television broadcasting of advertising that ignores the smoking controversy.

But the communications boss had some compliments for the 6,000 radio and television delegates attending the National Association of Broadcasters' 44th annual convention in the Conrad Hilton Hotel.

"As one who watches and regulates you," he said to them, "I take this opportunity to congratulate you publicly and to encourage you to continue along the road to better service to all the people."

Mr. Henry said he was not proposing any new rule, policy or action of any kind by the FCC, but wanted to examine areas in which he and industry people disagree, "not to condemn or ridicule, but to stimulate your present efforts."

He said broadcasters have shown admirable restraint in refusing to advertise products considered harmful or of a nature too personal to broadcast, with one glaring exception—the advertising of cigarettes.

"From the cigarette advertising presently being carried on radio and TV stations," he said, "no one would ever know that a major public controversy is in progress as to the harmful effects of cigarette smoking on the American public. One would never guess that the great bulk of medical opinion, including a Surgeon General's report, has concluded there is an adverse causal relationship between cigarette smoking and health.

"Television viewers, in particular, are led to believe that cigarette smoking is the key to fun and games with the opposite sex, good times at home and abroad, social success, and virility."

[Last year cigarette advertisers spent more than $200 million for radio and television advertising, according to figures made available in New York by the Television Bureau of Advertising and the Radio Advertising Bureau.]

Mr. Henry went on to talk about artistic freedom and integrity, an area in which, he said, broadcasters often have shown a lack of courage. He mentioned the practice of cutting out words sometimes called "blooping" in adult entertainment fare.

"BLOOPING" AND GOOD SENSE

"Too often, I suggest, routed by shadows, you break and run before a shot is fired in anger," Mr. Henry said. "Too often you surrender to popgun complaints as if they were the crack of doom. Too often the record here shows not only a lack of courage, but a lack of commonsense."

To illustrate his argument, he quoted an excerpt from the British movie "Room at the Top," as he said he heard it in a late-night American TV showing:

"Father. 'And by the way, young man, I know your relationship with that other woman, and I'm telling you straight, get rid of that (bloop).'

"Son. 'Don't ever use the word (bloop) when you speak of her.'

"Father. 'When I have a word that fits, I believe in using it.'"

"And there," said Mr. Henry, "sits the poor audience, wondering what in the name of all that's artistically honest, the bloody word is. This bloop-blip technique may be fine for selling razor blades but is scarcely appropriate in an adult film on a controversial theme."

The FCC Chairman reminded his audience that stations operate under a Federal statute prohibiting obscene language, that good taste calls for careful exercise of judgment as licensees, and that dramatic programs suitable for late evening viewing may not be suitable for the entire family. But then he added:

"All this being true, and admitting the sensitive nature of the problem, it is still fair to say that your response to the challenge of artistic freedom often makes as much sense as did the threatened banning in Boston of 'Life With Father'."

Mr. Henry said it should be noted that he was not advocating a policy of "anything goes," but that "the blooper button is similar to the one marked 'panic' and should be used with caution."

SUGGESTED BASIC CHANGES IN FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Monday, April 4, the Foreign Relations Committee once again will begin hearings on foreign aid legislation. At the request of the Secretary of State, the first hearing will be in executive session. This will be the 18th time in the 17 years I have served on the committee that we have done this.

Over the years that I have been concerned with foreign aid, I have come to the conclusion—which I have expressed more than once—that three basic changes need to be made in the program. In no particular order of importance or priority, these are to separate military and economic assistance, to provide a long-term authorization, and to put the program more on a multinational, less on a bilateral, basis.

In years past, the Senate has voted for all of these reforms at one time or another; but, except in minor respects, we have not been able to persuade the other body or the administration. It appears, however, that the administration is now persuaded.

The administration's program this year provides for a separation of military and economic assistance; it provides for long-term authorizations; and the President's message endorsed an increasing emphasis on multilateral aid—though one would not know this from an examination of the draft legislation. But be that as it may, Mr. President, the administration gets high marks for having moved as far as it has. However, I do not think it has moved far enough; and in due course, I shall offer amendments to move it further.

This business of foreign aid, Mr. President, is at once an exercise in both economics and politics—two fields of human activity in which what is logical in one is often hopeless in the other.

Let us first consider the economics of foreign aid. Is it possible, in simple economic terms, to generate processes of self-sustaining economic growth in the world's underdeveloped countries—or at least the most important of them, the Indias and Brazils?

The answer, in simple, economic terms, is most assuredly "Yes"—provided adequate resources and management talent are devoted to the task. But nowhere near adequate resources are being devoted to the task. What we and the other rich countries of the world have been doing in foreign aid is like trying to cool a pitcher of martinis by dropping in one ice cube every 10 minutes. What you end up with, of course, is no ice and watery martinis—which are still not cold. But if we had put a whole tray of ice cubes into the pitcher at once, we would have gotten cold martinis, and the ice would not have melted.

In the more prosaic terms of the World Bank what this means is an immediate increase of at least 50 percent in the net flow of long-term capital from the Bank's rich members to its poor members. This estimate comes not from me, but from the hardheaded conservative economists of the Bank. They estimate that the current rate of this flow of long-term capital is $6 billion plus—a figure that is rather surprisingly high—and that it should immediately be increased to $9 or $10 billion a year. Furthermore, they are knowledgeable people who think this higher figure should be doubled again over the next 10 years—to, say, $18 billion. This sounds like a very great deal of money, but it is less than 1 percent of the gross national product of the rich members of the World Bank. Indeed, the total amount of aid suggested for 10 years hence is considerably less than the amount by which the GNP of the United States will increase in this single year of 1966.

Now, of course, Mr. President, there are things which need to be done besides increasing the available capital resources. The way in which these resources are used is of utmost importance. Most underdeveloped countries have traditional patterns of life and thought which are incompatible with an industrial society or with rapid economic growth. This, indeed, is one of the reasons they are underdeveloped, and these traditional patterns must be changed if they are going to enter a process of rapid development.

Even with the best will in the world, this is not an easy thing to do, as the people in my part of the United States know so well.

This is a political problem—in the broadest sense of that term—for the underdeveloped countries. Foreign aid also poses a political problem for the rich countries—much more a political than an economic problem, as a matter of fact. This problem is simply that having gone about foreign aid, except in Europe, in the wrong way, and having seen it fail to produce the hoped-for results, the developed countries are unwilling—as a political matter—to continue to support foreign aid or to devote to it the necessary economic resources.

This being the case, the programs which the developed countries do undertake are likely to fail. This failure, in turn, increases political opposition to foreign aid in the developed countries; and in the underdeveloped countries, it increases the reluctance to change the traditional patterns of life which are inhibiting the best use of such resources as are available.

The political problems in both the aid-giving and the aid-receiving nations act on, and exacerbate, each other. The aid-giving nations foolishly expect gratitude. This expectation annoys the aid-receiving nations, and the failure to receive gratitude annoys the aid-giving nations. The aid-receiving nations think that to maintain their self-respect they have to do something—almost anything—to demonstrate their independence of the aid-giving nations. This something frequently takes the form of rejecting the advice of the aid-giving nations.

Thus, in this sort of relationship and quite apart from the matter of the adequacy of the volume of aid, the objectives of the aid program are unlikely to be attained. In these circumstances, I do not propose to vote to continue to send good money after bad.

There is, however, one possible way out of this impasse. This is to change the political context of the relationships between aid-giving and aid-receiving nations. A sufficiently radical change in these political relationships might make it possible for the aid-giving nations to support, politically, a larger volume of aid, and for the aid-receiving nations to accept a larger volume of advice.

The way to bring about this change, it seems to me, is to multilateralize—and thereby to institutionalize and depersonalize—the aid relationship. For several years, I have advocated that greater use be made of the World Bank and its affiliated institutions, the International Development Association and the International Finance Corporation. The Senate has approved this view at least twice, only to see it frustrated by the Appropriations Committee of the other body.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that there are two great misconceptions about foreign aid abroad in the land. One is that foreign aid is a way to cure most of our foreign problems, and that this cure works not alone through extending aid but also through denying it. Thus, at various times the Congress in its wisdom has voted to deny aid both to the Castro regime and to any successor anti-Castro regime which has failed to pay for Castro's sins; it is forbidden to give food to living Poles, but foreign aid money is used to maintain the cemeteries of dead ones. None of this really has anything to do with economic development.

The second great misconception about foreign aid is that it is somehow more effective if it is stopped and started to achieve short-term political objectives according to the headlines in the morning paper. It is felt that foreign aid becomes less effective in achieving United States objectives to the degree that it is not controlled by the United States. My point is precisely the opposite—that foreign developmental aid is much more likely to be effective to the degree that it is multilateral in character. I say developmental aid to distinguish it from humanitarian or philanthropic assistance.

There are a great many multilateral mechanisms, some of which are efficient and some of which are not. I am thinking mainly of the World Bank and its affiliates, as well as the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank and the U.N. Special Fund. CIAP—The Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress—is another useful multilateral instrument. One can also point to ad hoc multilateral arrangements such as the Indus Basin development plan.

I am not arguing for putting all of our aid on a multilateral basis. There is, and will probably continue to be, a place for bilateral grant assistance. What I am arguing for is shifting a larger proportion of our aid from a bilateral to a multilateral framework.

An additional reason for doing this is to avoid misunderstandings, such as we have recently encountered in the Vietnam matter, as to whether or not the approval of bilateral aid constitutes a commitment for unlimited military support.

Mr. President, there has recently come to my attention a remarkable speech which was made in New York, March 17, by Mr. Escott Reid, a distinguished Canadian and former official of the World Bank. It seems to me that Mr. Reid makes an unanswerable case for increasing multilateralization of aid, and I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRENGTHENING THE PARTNERSHIP AGAINST WORLD POVERTY

(By Escott Reid)

(NOTE.—Escott Reid is principal of Glendon College, York University, Toronto. He was Canadian High Commissioner in India from 1952 to 1957; Ambassador to Germany from 1958 to 1962; and Director of the World Bank's operations in south Asia and the Middle East from 1962 to 1965. He is the author of "The Future of the World Bank," an essay published in September 1965, by the World Bank in Washington.)

I'm not going to talk about underdeveloped countries, or less-developed countries or even developing countries. I'm going to talk about poor countries. It's the poverty of these countries which is their distinguishing characteristic. That is what China, India, Brazil, have in common.

What Pericles said of Athens, the poor countries of the world can now say of themselves. Pericles said: "Poverty we think it no disgrace to acknowledge but a real degradation to make no effort to overcome."

I'm not going to talk about developed countries or industrialized countries. I'm going to talk about rich countries. It's the wealth of these countries which is their distinguishing characteristic. That is what the United States and the Soviet Union have in common.

It is also what Poland and Venezuela as well as Czechoslovakia, and East Germany, have in common for, according to the statistical experts in the World Bank, they probably have per capita incomes of $750 or more. Even when the definition of rich countries is stretched to include countries such as Poland and Venezuela, only one quarter of the population of the world has the privilege of living in countries which are rich, comparatively speaking.

Two-thirds of the population of the world live in poor countries, countries with per capita incomes of less than $250 a year.

I'm going to talk about rich countries and poor countries. I'm not going to talk about the in-between countries, countries such as Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Peru.

I'm going to talk a good deal about the World Bank and not enough about the U.N. development program or about UNCTAD. That is because I know at firsthand of the work of the Bank while there are many of you here who know much more than I do about the U.N. development program, and UNCTAD.

I assume we all agree that we have reached some kind of crisis in the relations between rich and poor countries.

In the last 15 years the yearly rate of economic growth of the poor countries has been slowing down while their rate of population growth has been speeding up and their international debt has been exploding. In the last 5 years the rich countries have got much richer but they have not shared any of their wealth with the poor countries. In many rich countries public support for, or even acquiescence in, Government aid to poor countries has been weakening.

Some leaders of public opinion in rich countries are displaying a mounting impatience with what they consider to be the ingratitude of the poor for the favors they have received, or with what they consider to be their inefficiency and corruption or the way they waste their resources on fighting and preparations for fighting. Other leaders in rich countries consider that their own expenditures on fighting and preparations for fighting are far more important than finding money to promote the economic development of poor countries. Others in rich countries seem to believe that the struggle against poverty in poor countries is virtually hopeless and that there is little use in pouring good money after bad.

It is because of all this that there exists today a widespread uneasy feeling among those concerned in rich and poor and middle-income countries with the problems of the economic development of poor countries that the world has reached some kind of crisis in the relations between rich and poor countries, an uneasy feeling that, if we cannot together resolve this crisis in a reasonably sensible way within a reasonable time, most of the poor of the world will be left without much reason to believe in the possibility of a much better life for themselves and for their children.

The consequences of this would be profound. The problem of the economic development of poor countries is one of the two great problems of the last third of the 20th century on which we are now entering. The only problem comparable in importance to it is the problem of the relations between the Western World and China.

I suggest that the first step toward a sensible resolution of the present crisis over foreign aid is to persuade doubters that the struggle against world poverty is not hopeless, that there is, indeed, more ground for hope today than there was 10 years or so ago that if we, the partnership of rich countries, poor countries, middle income countries, and international institutions, persist in our struggle against poverty in poor countries we can succeed.

The main reason why there is more ground for hope is that the development of the intrauterine device means that for the first time in the history of the world a technique of population control has been devised which is suitable for poor countries. The population explosion is no longer uncontrollable. The population explosion need no longer terrify us into paralysis.

There are other reasons why there is more ground for hope today than there was 10 years or so ago that if we persist in the struggle against world poverty we can succeed.

Many of the poor countries are far ahead of where they were 10 years ago in their ability to formulate and carry out sensible development policies. In poor countries and in rich countries, in international institutions, in universities, in institutes of economic research, there is now more knowledge and understanding of the problems of economic growth than there was 10 years ago. Economic growth is still an enigma but it is a little less enigmatic. International institutions under the devoted leadership of men like Paul Hoffman, David Owen, Philippe De Seynes, Raul Prebish, Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, and George Woods—to name only a few—have gained experience in mobilizing knowledge, wisdom, opinion, and resources.

The United Nations development program has speeded up the tempo of its technical assistance activities. It has widened and deepened its preinvestment studies which have been so helpful in facilitating investment by the World Bank, Regional Banks and private investors.

UNCTAD and its subsidiary machinery now provide exceptional opportunities for the rich and the poor countries of the world to look together at those worldwide problems which are the concern of all countries and can be resolved only by the joint endeavors of all countries. The World Bank is becoming capable of bearing heavier burdens, of taking an increasingly active role in encouraging and helping poor countries to make the best use of all their resources, in persuading rich countries to provide more aid, for better projects, aid on better terms, in administering and coordinating aid.

We know that if aid from rich countries to poor countries is to be decisive, the rich countries must pour into the poor countries a much greater flow of materials and skills. They must provide more of their aid on easy terms. They must open their markets much wider to the goods of the poor countries. They must have patience for a long pull. Patience not for a decade of development but for a generation of development. Patience not until 1970 but till 1999.

What order of magnitude of aid is required?

The net official flow of long-term capital from the rich members of the World Bank to the poor members is now about $6 billion a year or about six-tenths of 1 percent of the combined gross national products of these rich countries. I have no hesitation in saying that the flow of financial resources from these rich countries to poor countries should be increased immediately by at least 50 percent, that is from $6 billion a year to $9 or $10 billion a year. This is the minimum figure suggested by the conservative economists of the conservative, tough minded World Bank.

We must not delude ourselves that this kind of increase in aid from $6 billion a year to $9 or $10 billion will be sufficient for long. It will not. My own guess is that we should think in terms of a tripling of net aid over the next 10 years. Our target for 1976 from the rich members of the World Bank should therefore be about $18 billion a year. In 1976, $18 billion would probably be a little under 1 percent of the combined gross national products of the rich members of the World Bank. World Bank experts have estimated that their gross national products in 1963 totaled about $1,050 billion. In 1976 at a 5 percent annual growth rate this would have increased to about $1,950 billion in terms of 1963 dollars.

I am convinced that if the international war against poverty is to have a reasonable chance of success the rich nations of the world must mount this kind of massive effort over a long period.

I am equally convinced that there is not the slightest chance of the rich nations which are members of the World Bank mounting this kind of massive effort unless the poor countries and the International Aid Agencies do much more than they are now doing to help the leaders of these rich countries find a way around the obstacles to mounting this kind of effort.

In order to help the leaders of rich countries find a way around the obstacles which stand in the way of a great increase in foreign aid, the partnership against poverty must be strengthened.

We must return to the grand design of the founders of the United Nations. According to this grand design the economic and social council of the United Nations was to be the leader of a galaxy of United Nations specialized agencies. These U.N. agencies, under the leadership of the economic and social council, were to help the nations of the world undertake a worldwide, coordinated, massive, and sustained offensive against the economic and social causes of international tension and war.

It is this concept of partnership which we must emphasize today.

Each partner in the worldwide struggle against world poverty—whether it is a nation or an international agency—must make it easier for the other partners to fulfill their obligations under the partnership. The international agencies must cooperate ever more closely. The poor countries must make it easier for the rich countries to give them much more aid and aid on much more generous terms. The international agencies must sharpen their tools of economic analysis and perfect their techniques of development diplomacy so that they can give better advice to poor countries and give it in the way most likely to result in acceptance. And—a point which I shall develop later—the rich countries must make it easier for poor countries to accept much more aid and much more good advice.

Poor countries must, by an exercise of sympathetic imagination, come to realize better than they do today the practical political difficulties which face the practical politicians in rich countries who want to do more for the partnership against the poverty of the poor countries.

Poor countries must be more willing to do things sensible in themselves which would make it easier for the practical politicians in the rich countries to find a way around those political difficulties. Poor countries must make it easier for the leaders of rich countries to convince their legislatures and their peoples that the poor countries which they are aiding are not wasting the resources that are given them and that they are not wasting their own domestic resources. Poor countries must realize that the rich countries are not likely to increase greatly the quantity and the quality of their aid to poor countries unless they can feel reasonably certain that the poor countries which they are aiding are moving at a reasonable pace to improve their economic, financial, and development policies, programs, and performance.

This does not mean that poor countries, in order to make it easier for the leaders of rich countries to do more for them, should be required to submit to a whole series of inquisitions by individual national governments into their economic affairs. This would be intolerable.

There must be outside expert investigations into the domestic economic affairs of poor countries if the quantity and quality of outside aid to them is to reach the right levels. Of that I am convinced. But I am likewise convinced that the investigations must be made not by national governments but by impartial expert international agencies. These must be agencies which can win and maintain the confidence of both the givers and the receivers of aid. They must be agencies in which givers and receivers can feel that they are equal partners.

Each member of the great galaxy of United Nations agencies has its special task to perform. I want to say something about the special task which the World Bank could become capable of assuming on behalf of the two-thirds of the world outside Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and China. I do not say that the World Bank is now capable of assuming this task. I say that it could become capable of assuming this task.

It seems to me clear that if a poor country wants massive aid over a long time it must accept the political reality that its chances of getting that aid will be greatly increased if it requests the World Bank to make searching investigations into its economic policies, programs, projects, and performance and if these investigations are followed by improvements in its policies, programs, projects, and performance.

This will increase the chances of the poor country getting greatly increased aid. This will increase the chances that the aid will be well used. This will increase the chances that the whole program of economic development of the poor country will be improved, that its rate of economic growth will be speeded up.

Poor countries need wise, unpalatable advice on what they should do to speed up their economic development. They need to take this advice. The experience of the World Bank has indicated that it is easier for an international institution to give wise, unpalatable advice to poor countries on problems of economic development than for national governments to give such advice and that it is easier for poor countries to take the advice of an international agency than that of a national government.

But though it may be easier, it is not easy. The rich countries and the World Bank must constantly strive to find ways to make it less difficult for the leaders of poor countries to invite the World Bank to investigate the domestic economic affairs of their country and to give them advice, to make it less difficult for the leaders, the legislatures, and the people of poor countries to accept this advice even if it is unpalatable. This is one of the ways by which the rich countries and the World Bank can strengthen the international partnership against world poverty.

The more confidence that the poor countries have in the wisdom of the advice given them by the World Bank, the easier it will be for them to accept the advice even if it is unpalatable. In order to increase the confidence of the poor countries in the wisdom of the advice given them by the World Bank, we need better expert economic analysis by the World Bank both of the economic and development policies, programs, and performance of the poor countries and of the comparative real economic costs and benefits of alternative individual projects of development in poor countries.

In order to get better analyses we need to sharpen the present blunt tools of economic analysis. That is why I have been urging that the World Bank and its sister institution, the International Monetary Fund, should set up in Washington a great autonomous international institute for research into the problems of the economic development of poor countries.

The Institute would carry further the great work which has been done by the Society for International Development. Its task, like that of the society, would be to help to break down the barriers between the theorists of economic development in rich and poor countries and the practitioners in rich and poor countries and in international development agencies. The margins of error in the basic statistics about the poor countries would be narrowed. Economic theory would be enriched by practice. Practice would be improved by theory. Economic advice to poor countries from outside agencies would be more authoritative, more helpful.

One of the first tasks of the new Institute might well be to establish for each of the principal aid-receiving countries a provisional estimate of the opportunity cost of capital in that country for, as the London Economist has recently pointed out, "whether the opportunity cost of capital is calculated at 8 or 12 percent will often sway the bitterest technical argument on roads versus railways or conventional versus nuclear power."

The work of such an Institute would thus in time result in greater agreement than exists today on the techniques which should be followed in comparing, for example, the benefits to a certain poor country of building a $50 million nuclear powerplant or of spending that $50 million on more imports of fertilizer and on the construction of fertilizer plants as part of a crash program on agriculture which would bring fertilizer, new seeds, water, and insecticides to the farmer at prices and on credit terms advantageous to him.

Even today, however, there is sufficient agreement on the techniques of economic analysis as to warrant much greater use by aid giving and aid receiving countries of the World Bank's expertise in assessing the comparative merits of alternative projects of economic development. I therefore suggest that, before a member of the World Bank agrees with a poor country to help finance a big project of economic development in that country, the two countries should jointly ask the World Bank to make an assessment at their expense of the economic benefits of the project, using the most sophisticated techniques of analysis which are available, particularly the opportunity cost of capital.

The World Bank has in the past been reluctant, mainly because of shortage of skilled staff, to accept the responsibility of assessing projects other than ones which it itself may finance. But the World Bank is accustomed to twisting the arms of aid givers and aid receivers. It would do the World Bank no harm to have its own arms twisted occasionally by the aid givers and the aid receivers.

If, before aid givers and aid receivers were to commit themselves to a big project of economic development in a poor country, they were to secure an assessment by the World Bank of its economic benefits, they would protect themselves against pressures from special interests with special objectives: Pressures from salesmen for fertilizers, salesmen for pesticides, salesmen for nuclear powerplants, for example; pressures from single-minded enthusiasts for fertilizers, pesticides and nuclear powerplants, for example.

There would be less danger that pressures in the giving country from the exporters concerned added to pressures in the receiving country from the advocates of prestige projects would lead to a waste of the scarce resources available to poor countries for their economic development. Such waste on a large scale has taken place in the last 15 years. The experts, for example, tell me that there are at least half a dozen poor countries whose pace of economic advance has been slowed down in the past 15 years because they built steel plants instead of investing their limited resources in projects of higher economic priority.

A great Western European statesman was talking to me some years ago about the economic development program of a poor country whose President had just been visiting him. He said: "This country has a very sensible development program." He paused. "No steel plant." His simplification was the simplification of the political realist. For that country at that time to include a steel plant in its development program would have been to demonstrate that it was not serious in its efforts to raise the standards of living of its people.

Agreement by aid givers and aid receivers on going jointly to the world bank with a request for an expert assessment of a big project of economic development before they commit themselves to it would protect the tax payers of giving countries against their aid not doing as much good as it should to the economic development of poor countries. Most important of all, the precedents established in making the best use of international aid would help the leaders of the poor countries to make a wiser use of all their resources for development, whether these resources are derived from foreign aid or domestic resources, from private foreign investors, from taxes, from the profits of publicly owned enterprises, or from domestic savings. And it is only if they make a wise use of all their resources that the poor countries can lift themselves out of their poverty.

There is another and very different way by which the leaders of poor countries can be helped to make a wiser use of all their resources for development. Their task of persuading their legislatures and peoples to support policies which are likely to result in the wisest possible use of all their resources will be increased if the leaders of rich aid-giving countries and the international officials concerned with international economic aid make clear in public and in private that they comprehend the magnitude of the difference betwen the contributions required from rich countries and from poor countries if the international campaign against poverty is to succeed. They must make clear that they understand that while rich countries must, out of their wealth, give much more aid to poor countries, poor countries must, out of their poverty, make intolerable sacrifices.

This is one of the most important ways by which rich countries and international civil servants can strengthen the partnership against world poverty.

A particular responsibility rests on the political leaders of rich countries. It is essential that they make clear that they realize the weight of the tragic burden borne by the political leaders of the poor countries who know that, if their country is to lift itself out of its poverty, they must hold down increases in consumption by the poor; they must put off doing much to reduce inequalities and inequities among regions and among groups within regions; they must sacrifice today's goods for tomorrow's hopes.

Out of their poverty, out of their very scarce resources of materials and skills, the poor countries, if they are to succeed, have to squeeze out a greater proportion for economic development. They have to be willing to postpone indefinitely the prestige projects, which may be big dams, or steel plants, or nuclear powerplants, or international airlines, or new capital cities, if these yield a low real rate of economic return.

They have to concentrate on projects which have a quick and a high yield. Most of them have to concentrate on agriculture. Most of them have to curb their population growth. They have to be willing to change many of their traditional patterns of life and thought which constitute impediments to rapid economic growth. They have to be willing to participate to the full in outside expert investigations into their domestic economic affairs and to consider sympathetically the conclusions of those investigations. They have to accord to the appropriate international agency three basic rights: The right to be informed, the right to warn and the right to encourage.

This can be bitter medicine for proud poor countries and it is only proud countries which are worth helping.

As for the outside experts who participate in investigations and in dialogs on development with poor countries, much is required of them. For the giving of advice is a delicate and a hazardous occupation.

The giver of advice can usefully remind himself of four things. First, that human judgment is fallible. Second, that luck or providence or the unpredictable plays a large role in economic development. Third, that while it is a good thing for poor people to have more to eat and to wear, better places to live in, more and better nurses, doctors and teachers, and less illness, it is a better thing for them to have these goods without sacrificing those ancient values of their society which can give them a feeling of belonging to a group, a sense of dignity and the possibility of serenity.

The fourth thing which a giver of advice to a poor country can usefully remind himself of is that, even if final truth has been revealed to him, he is not Moses laying down the law from Mount Sinai. He is a partner speaking to a free and equal partner. For him, success is measured not by the wisdom of the advice he gives but by how much of his wise advice is accepted. His task is one of persuasion. When he intervenes with advice his "intervention should be in the least abrasive, the least corrosive way possible."

During the 3 years I was with the World Bank, I became deeply involved in discussions with poor countries about loans and studies and consultants and advice. During those years I found myself thinking of a statement by the great Indian poet and philosopher, Rabindranath Tagore. In one of his essays he was contending that in India in the past the use of wealth had been subject to what he called "the strong pressure of social will." "The donor," he wrote, "had to give with humility; the sanskrit saying 'sraddhaya deyang' give with reference, is significant."

Those of us in the rich countries who are called upon to give advice and money to the poor countries can usefully meditate on this saying: "Sraddhaya deyang," give with reverence, give with humility.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article entitled, "Europeans Fear Flow of Capital From Rich to Poor Nations Lags," written by Max Frankel, and published in the New York Times of Friday, April 1, 1966, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Europeans Fear Flow of Capital From Rich to Poor Nations Lags

(By Max Frankel)

London.—Although the Western alliance is preoccupied these days by its internal diplomatic and military crises, many of its most distinguished public figures are more deeply troubled by the long-term outlook for world trade and distribution of wealth.

It is commonplace in every European capital, and especially in the international economic community of Geneva, to hear about how the rich keep getting richer while the poor are getting poorer and how the world simply cannot survive half rich and half destitute.

But even more perplexing to many officials, diplomats, businessmen, and academic observers is the evidence that not nearly enough is being done or is likely to be done by the industrial world of the Atlantic to relieve itself of the certain misery and instability that present trends suggest.

LOBBY ESTABLISHED

In Geneva, this gloomy prospect is most evident because the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development has established a permanent lobby on the issue, headed by Raul Prebisch, the Latin American economist who is now secretary general of the organization established by that conference.

Mr. Prebisch has made himself unpopular in the industrial world with his tactics in sounding the alarm and rallying 77 so-called developing nations for a demanding assault upon the governments of the 20 or so developed nations of the West.

But in no capital of the Western allies is there any challenge of his complaints about insufficient action and his forecast of perilous consequences if action is not taken.

The very nature and duration of the problem are in dispute, so that many discussions of it get bogged down in statistical combat.

All experts begin with the knowledge that economic development in the poor nations depends upon the accumulation of investment capital through sales of goods to the richer nations and the receipt of moneys from them in the form of gifts and loans.

AMOUNT NEEDED IN DISPUTE

The present flow of capital from the rich to the poor by these means is between $8 billion and $9.5 billion a year, with $4 coming as a result of trade for every $1 of aid.

At this point come the arguments. Some contend that by 1970 at least $15 billion and perhaps $20 billion must flow to the poor nations to sustain an average economic growth of rate sufficient to take care of rapidly growing populations and provide enough left over for significant investment.

Others argue that $12 billion each year is about all that the poor nations can effectively use, especially since the problems and opportunities of the nations that import capital are so different from country to country and region to region.

The more pessimistic analysts say the problem will grow worse unless the larger sums are reached. The more optimistic, including most Americans, say the lesser figure would at least keep the problem manageable.

Almost all political leaders, businessmen and students of the problem agree, however, that even the smaller figure will not be achieved by the policies now pursued or contemplated by the Atlantic nations.

GAP LAMENTED IN PARIS

Discussion of this crisis is widespread throughout Europe. In Paris an official lamented not only this growing gap between the rich and the poor but what he described as the new gap that economic and technical advances are causing between the United States and all the other advanced nations.

The failure to close this new gap by greatly expanding trade opportunities, Europeans warn, can produce rivalries and restrictions among the richer nations that will condemn the poor nations to misery and violence for a century.

A variety of factors appears to be contributing to the pessimism among Western specialists. Besides the disputes over basic statistics and the inadequacy of experience with rapid nation building, they cite the preoccupation of the United States with Vietnam and with domestic economic growth and the resignation if not isolationism of the former colonial nations in Europe.

The specialists cite the intractability of relatively modest trade problems in conflicts among the Western and Communist nations to develop the degree of trade and commercial cooperation of which they are capable.

They cite the lack of coordination of national programs of foreign aid and, above all, the poor prospect of any significant increase in the amounts of foreign aid in the next few years, for both political and economic reasons.

They cite the narrow concern of the advanced nations with their balances of inflowing and outflowing funds, and efforts to keep a balance by striking first at aid and trade deficits.

And they cite the refusal of the advanced nations to think of a real international division of labor that would let relatively easy and labor-consuming industries in some agricultural fields and light manufacturing, such as in textiles, pass from the advanced nations to the poor ones.

These unsophisticated industries have been jealously held by the nations that have them, not only by protective devices but by discriminatory practices against competitors in the poor nations, officials say.

There is despair among political and economic officials about the vicious circle by which private capital is flowing only to the few politically stable areas of the underdeveloped world while the absence of that capital and of the accompanying political interests virtually assures more instability.

There is also frustration among those active in the aid and trade field about the inability thus far of the richer nations to impose necessary economic policies upon the poorer nations so that the most can be had out of every salable crop and every new industry and out of every dollar directed to that nation.

A number of specific ideas have been put forward in Europe to compensate poor nations with cash for export failures that are not due to their own failures, for buffer stocks of commodities to protect their prices on the world markets, and for specific tariff preferences to individual poor nations by individual rich nations.

There have also been a variety of proposals to stimulate and insure private investment, with only modest success so far.

Each of these measures, however, and dozens more that are in preparation in the West become the subject of bitter debate among the specialists in what is described as a context of governmental lethargy if not apathy.

"It is a crisis," said a British official, "that everyone could do something about but only a few ever talk about."

PRESS PAYS TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, in the March 27 edition of the Arizona Daily Star, one of the many fine newspapers published in my State, there appeared a noteworthy feature on one of our most beloved and respected colleagues, the senior Senator from Arizona.

Written by Arthur Edson of the Associated Press, and distributed to hundreds of AP clients throughout the Nation, this was an exceptionally well-done feature which I commend to all Members of the Senate.

I am delighted that through this article millions of Americans in other States will have the opportunity to learn about some of the many accomplishments and the distinguished service of my esteemed colleague from Arizona, who has served longer in Congress than anybody in the history of the Republic.

In order that it may have even wider distribution, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARIZONA'S SENIOR SENATOR—HAYDEN WON LONG TENURE HARD WAY

(By Arthur Edson)

WASHINGTON.—In its long and often turbulent history, the U.S. Senate has produced demagogs, dolts, flashes in the pan, nonentities, egomanics, conscientious plodders and, happily, an occasional statesman.

But it has turned out only one CARL HAYDEN, and the suspicion is that there will never be another.

This shrewd 88-year-old Democrat has been in Congress ever since Arizona became a State—a record-shattering 54 years.

And he has done this the hard way. In a temple dedicated to windbaggery, he has kept his mouth shut while astutely pushing out invisible tentacles of power.

"CARL can walk through fresh snow and never leave a track," an admiring colleague once said.

There are few other modern politicians who have done more to change the face and plot the future of America. Deserts bloom, highways span the land, foreign aid wobbles through, all because HAYDEN has known whom to prod and how and when.

That well-advertised prodder of Congress, Lyndon B. Johnson, was recognizing a fellow craftsman when he said:

"I know of no more effective servant in public life today than CARL HAYDEN."

Yet few Senators are as unknown—and what national recognition he does get is for the wrong reason.

After President John F. Kennedy was assassinated, Johnson addressed Congress, and for the first time many voters became aware of the importance of two emaciated elders perched behind the new President.

If something had happened to L.B.J., Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, then 72, would have been successor. And if MCCORMACK had also been struck down, HAYDEN, as the Senate's senior citizen, would under the law have been next in line, and the biggest job in the free world would have fallen on his tired shoulders.

To many the prospect was horrifying. Even a member of HAYDEN's staff was disturbed enough to ask the patriarch what he would do if a double calamity were suddenly to propel him into the White House.

"I'd call the Congress together, have the House elect a new Speaker, and then I'd resign and let him become President," HAYDEN said.

Typically, while others fretted, he had quietly decided.

In this self-conscious age—when politicians hire image polishers to determine how they should look and poll takers to decide what they should say—HAYDEN's attitude is as refreshing as it is hard to understand.

Take Vietnam. Hawks and doves soar and flutter and worry, aloud, of course, so their countrymen will know what high-grade worriers they are.

HAYDEN was among those whose views were sought by the President while he pondered whether bombing of North Vietnam should be resumed. The old Senator carefully wrote down his views—befitting a former sheriff, he is mildly hawkish—but he never made his stand public.

Recently he granted an interview, rare for him, and he seemed surprised when asked why he hadn't joined the multitudes in telling the President how to run the war.

"If I was on the Armed Forces Committee or the Foreign Relations Committee, I might do it," HAYDEN said, without conviction.

"But as appropriations chairman," he said, "it's my job to look over the budget and provide the money to carry on. It isn't necessary for me to make a speech. If I put my time in making speeches, I wouldn't attend to my business, that's all."

It's easier to say that a Senator has power than to explain how he got it, but it is essential to anyone interested in understanding that beguiling, maddening institution, the U.S. Senate.

HAYDEN derives his power from such diverse sources as—

His long service in Congress. He came to Washington in 1912, when Howard Taft was still President, as Arizona's first Representative. Projects often need years of careful cultivation, and HAYDEN, a patient gardener, has had time to plant and nurture the seeds from which mighty projects grow.

His long service in the Senate. HAYDEN moved over from the House in 1927, and since the Senate worships seniority, HAYDEN is its god, or, more specifically, its President pro tempore. This is mostly an honorary title, but it does carry with it a Government limousine and chauffeur, a status symbol largely wasted on HAYDEN. He rarely goes out at night, and he lives in the Methodist Building, a block from his office.

His job as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Although the Government spends $100 billion a year, each Senator dreams of more installations for his own State. How prudent it is to be nice to that nice Mr. HAYDEN. For HAYDEN helps render the final verdict in the dickering over differences in House and Senate money bills. "It's in conference that he really shines," a friend of HAYDEN's has said.

His character and his habits. Loving to compliment each other, Senators stage a wallow whenever one of them passes a birthday or similar milestone. But when HAYDEN's turn comes—he hates these admiration orgies so much that he sometimes refuses to show up for his own party—a new element can be spotted.

Among the lush adjectives are testimonials, from Democrats and Republicans, of how they arrived in the Senate bewildered and ill at ease, and of how HAYDEN sought them out to offer help.

"I do not believe he has an enemy," Lyndon Johnson once said.

This good will from all includes Barry Goldwater, panting to return to the Senate he left to run for the Presidency. Goldwater has said he will run against his old friend HAYDEN in 1968 although in 1958 he said on the Senate floor:

"As a Republican, Mr. President, I find myself in great sympathy with the people of my State who have eternal gratitude for the service of CARL HAYDEN in the Senate."

There's this summation from a man who had a chance to watch him closely for years:

"I don't think you can impress him very easily. Well, you don't impress him at all. No one does. I don't think he knows the word fear or insecurity. Even death doesn't scare him. He wants to live, but he looks upon death as a natural, inevitable thing."

Most of his contemporaries are long gone, but, fortunately, I had a rambling and delightful interview with Henry Fountain Ashurst shortly before his death in 1962 at the age of 87.

Ashurst was a Senator from Arizona for 29 years, and he and HAYDEN made a curious but effective team: HAYDEN, taciturn, dry, a quiet operator who got in his licks behind scenes; Ashurst, flamboyant, a wildly rococo orator whose voice was so powerful his intimate conversations could startle innocents a block away.

Zestfully, Ashurst recalled that glorious period when he and HAYDEN engaged in a filibuster: They believed the provisions for building Boulder Dam impinged on Arizona's rights.

"HAYDEN was the engineer," Ashurst boomed. "He knew the rainfall, the soil, the precise number of kilowatts the dams would produce. But he was making the shells, not firing them."

The old man who had fired the shells that HAYDEN made smiled at the memory. "Now I might get up and say, 'Mr. President, under Charles V—,' and so on and on. And when I finished HAYDEN would take the floor and say, 'Mr. President, let's look at the soil on which this dam is to be built.' "

They won that fight eventually, but Ashurst, the indefatigable talker, knew that talk could be costly. "I used to tell my colleagues that every speech is a deadly enemy, for it puts a powerful weapon in the hand of your opponent.

"Well, HAYDEN will never lose a vote on what he has said."

In theory, garrulity is an affliction of the aged, but perhaps in reality those who babble when they are old also babbled when they were young. Certainly HAYDEN has escaped the infection, as any interviewer soon learns.

For here's a man whose great-grandfather fought in the Revolutionary War; whose father left Independence, Mo., with an ox train in 1845; whose mother, Sally Calvert Davis, of Arkansas, was delayed on her trip west to teach school because buffaloes got on the railroad tracks; who, as the first white child born in Hayden's Ferry, now Tempe, was proclaimed by the Salt River Herald as "the prize baby of Maricopa County."

Who vividly remembers the Indian uprisings and the capture of Geronimo: "Why the name of that murderous old villain was shouted by paratroopers when they jumped is a mystery to me," he grumbled 80 years later.

Who went home for the Christmas holidays in 1902 and thus missed out on playing center for Stanford in the first Rose Bowl game (Michigan won, 49 to 0); who married Nan Downing and who lived happily with her for 53 years until her death in 1961 even though her pet name for him was "Bugs"; who as a sheriff when the West was wild once captured two tough train robbers, the Woodson brothers, and who when his wife complained of the danger explained that no one could get hurt: "I never carry a loaded gun," he said.

Who on his trip east to become Arizona's Congressman had a long talk with a fellow passenger, William Jennings Bryan; who has worked with 10 Presidents, who has voted for two World Wars and who has watched and helped nurse along a nation until it ranks at or near the top in wealth, in might, in worries and in frustrations.

What anecdotes and what insights HAYDEN has to have.

Yet true to his creed, HAYDEN's replies to questions are squeezed as dry as the budget figures he studies.

When asked to compare men he served with in Congress, HAYDEN says cautiously:

"There were able Senators then and there are able Senators now. We have lots of men of ability now."

Nor will he criticize his beloved Senate. "I like it just as it is," he says. "Our forefathers worked out a very good system. I wouldn't change it."

If HAYDEN is no longer frisky, he's still tough. He took an 18,000-mile tour between sessions—he wanted to know how much money was needed for Vietnam.

It's the nature of his profession for a politician to grasp for power; it's the nature of the seniority system that his power comes relatively late in life. And power once grasped is not easy to relinquish.

In 1962 HAYDEN won reelection even though he could be in Arizona for only 13 days, and even though he spent the last 13 days of the campaign in a hospital here.

Although HAYDEN has usually supported Democratic Presidents, he has never bragged about it and, characteristically, has never alienated anybody.

So John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson pitched in to help, and conservatives gave time and money.

"There's never been another victory like it in history," a major participant in that campaign said.

Yet the guess has to be that HAYDEN won't try again at 90. It would be too difficult, it would seem to perform a political miracle a second time, especially with a man like Goldwater running.

HAYDEN, of course, isn't talking.

And he seems content with his unique role as the silent Senator.

"You're in the paper for today, in television for today," the old man said, "then people forget it. The only way I know is to do a day's work the best way I can."

THE STATES, THE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT SAFETY COMMISSION, AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, all of us are aware of an increasing interest in Congress about what can be done to reduce the appalling rate of accidents on our highways. This attention and concern on the part of Congress as to how the Federal Government may contribute most effectively in a coordinated program of traffic safety is certainly deserving of our serious consideration.

However, as one who has been associated with this field for some years, I am also concerned that in its legitimate pursuit of protecting the public interest the Federal Government should not be panicked into hasty or ill-advised action that could create more problems than it would solve.

Specifically, we should not overlook or discard the tremendous amount of constructive work which has already been accomplished by interstate compact methods.

We already have an organized and functioning Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission formed by an interstate compact. Forty-four of the fifty States have ratified this compact and the remainder are expected to affirm it within the next year.

This Commission already has issued a tire performance regulation after extensive study, and this regulation is now in the process of being considered by the Member States. Several of the States, including California, have already adopted it.

First as a member of the Western Governors Conference, and later as chairman of the National Governors Conference Committee on Roads and Highway Safety, I was privileged to play a part in the efforts which led to formation of the compact commission.

The chairman of that commission, Mr. Louis P. Spitz, recently issued a comprehensive statement regarding its work which I commend to all members of the Senate.

Mr. Spitz, who is director of motor vehicles for the State of Nevada, offers some valuable suggestions in this statement—especially one directed at bringing the Federal Government into this interstate compact as a working partner.

In my judgment, this suggestion has a great deal of merit as a practical way to recognize the legitimate national interest in traffic safety and to harness Federal resources in the most effective manner to work with the States, where in the final analysis, the job must be done.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Mr. Spitz be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATES, THE VEHICLE EQUIPMENT SAFETY COMMISSION, AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Statement of Mr. Louis P. Spitz, Chairman, Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission, Mar. 30, 1966)

The growing interest of the Federal Government in vehicle components, vehicular equipment, and the entire field of highway safety makes it unlikely that the States can continue for very long to have a significant policymaking and administrative role in the vehicle equipment safety field, unless they find some way of coordinating their activities with those of the Federal Government. The initial problem is much more intense for the States, because the Federal Government is constitutionally able to preempt most if not all of those areas for which the States presently exercise responsibility.

However, in the final analysis, the problem is just as severe for the Federal Government, because even though Congress and the national administration may, in the belief that popular need requires it, seek to regulate the vehicle equipment safety field, only the States have the administrative machinery and experience to enforce such regulation at any level that can hope to protect the public safety.

The establishment of the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission has constituted a recognition by the States that a high degree of cooperation among them was desirable in discharging their vehicular safety responsibilities. It was the view of the States, apparently supported by Congress when it enacted the Beamer resolution, that interstate cooperation could do the job. On the other hand, if the Federal Government now intends to take a major substantive hand, it should not do so unilaterally.

The present need appears to be to fuse Federal and State activities. Since there is a good chance that the bills now before Congress, or the policies underlying them, will set the major tone of Federal-State relations in the motor vehicle field for some time to come, an examination of the possibilities against this background seems to be the best way to begin.

Since Federal action taken without reference to State policy interests and enforcement capabilities is undesirable, and State action without preference to the Federal Government may in future be politically and constitutionally impossible, the only practicable course may be joint action by the Federal and State Governments. While a good joint mechanism is being developed, the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission can still continue to adopt standards which will serve in the interim.

At the present time, committees of the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission are at work on regulations for brakes, crash helmets, safety glass, inspection, lighting, and seatbelts, and a variety of other components including aspects of the interior of the vehicle.

The Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission and the compact which brought it into being, represent a made-to-order means of securing real joint Federal-State action. It is already a joint mechanism of the States (44 of them and the District of Columbia).

The regulations which the Commission promulgates can be developed from a wide variety of available standards, from sources such as public and private research and testing bodies, the States themselves and the several agencies of the Federal Government, such as the General Services Administration and the Department of Commerce. Federal participation in the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission would not change or limit the availability of these sources, but it would provide the Federal Government with a direct means of stimulating faster action along lines which it believes to be in the national interest.

If the Federal Government were to join the compact, the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission could develop equipment safety regulations which would then have the status of both Federal and State action. Since the result would be State action as well as Federal action, the States would be justified in enforcing these regulations. At the same time, the Federal interest would be served by the Federal voice in the Commission.

Making the Federal Government eligible to join the Vehicle Equipment Safety Compact would require amendment of it. At present, the compact defines "State" as a State, territory or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Only States are presently eligible parties. However, there is nothing legally impossible about the Federal Government joining a compact. In fact, there is one example of just such a situation. In 1961, the four States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware and the Federal Government entered into the Delaware River Basin Compact which establishes an intergovernmental commission with comprehensive regulatory and administrative functions relating to water and related land resource management and development in the Delaware River Basin.

While the subject matter of vehicle equipment safety is different than the subject covered by the Delaware River Basin Compact, this Federal-interstate compact in the water resources field provides a precedent that can be used in other fields, where appropriate. The policy reasons are also analogous. In the Delaware instance, both the Federal Government and the States had interests, legal authority, and administrative needs that could best be served by joint exercise of their respective powers.

Drafting a suitable amendment to the Vehicle Equipment Safety Compact for the purpose contemplated would not be difficult. The only real question is what should be the nature of the Federal Government's participation.

The simplest form of Federal participation would be to make the Federal Government analogous to a party State. Its representative would be a member of the Commission. Whenever the Commission adopted regulations specifying standards for equipment safety, those regulations could become Federal law in the same way that they become State law.

The particular meaning of this process so far as the Federal Government is concerned would be that the Commission's equipment safety regulations could be made directly applicable as requirements for vehicles and vehicular equipment or components wherever manufactured or sold. It would also mean that the Federal Government would be making the regulations, along with the State.

It may be necessary to change the present relationship of the Commission's product to State law. It may be necessary to forego the legislative route for adoption of Commission regulations as it is now thought such procedure may not be sufficiently expeditious. If this should prove to be the case, it may be necessary to consider universal use of the administrative means of placing Commission regulations in effect in the States. This could be done by statutes in each of the States now employing the legislative route option, or by amendment of the compact, thereby denying the use of this option to any member State.

Another issue which must be considered is the voting strength to be accorded the Federal Government on the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission. At present, all parties have one vote each. This is also the pattern in the Delaware River Basin Compact. However, in that instance there are only a limited number of States.

Another possible arrangement is that contemplated for the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact. This agreement would have created a planning agency of the six New England States and the Federal Government.

While the compact itself is no longer being actively pursued (its objectives are being achieved by a somewhat different Federal-interstate mechanism), the voting arrangements of this compact are interesting. In effect, they would have given the Federal Government half the voting strength and the participating States the other half. This would seem to be an appropriate arrangement if the Federal Government were to become party to the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission.

Another point at which the extent of the federal participation requires some thought is in the area of the Commission's budget. The financial formula now in the vehicle equipment safety compact is based significantly on the proportion of registered motor vehicles in each of the party States.

Since all the vehicles concerned are registered in the United States, the proper share to be paid by the Federal Government would have to be considered separately. The compact could be amended to divide Commission budget requests into two parts: a States' share to be apportioned under the present formula, and a Federal share that could constitute a fixed percentage of the entire budget, or which could be calculated on the basis of a formula.

DECREASE IN PRICES OF FARM COMMODITIES A HARDSHIP FOR FARMERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, all too frequently the activities and policies of this administration mystify me.

On March 30, the U.S. Department of Agriculture released its index of prices received by farmers and its index of prices paid by farmers for commodities and services—including interest, taxes, and farm wages.

The report notes that the parity ratio for prices received by farmers declined to 82 in March, but was well above the parity ratio of 75 one year earlier. It might also be pointed out that in December of 1960 the parity ratio was 81, and that since February of 1961 the parity ratio for 5 years was below this figure—generally ranging from 74 to 78.

The report notes also that the prices paid by farmers index increased 2 points and was 4 percent above a year ago.

The report reveals some other interesting figures. Using a ratio based on 1957–59 as 100, it is noted that for March 1966:

First. Prices paid by farmers for wages had moved up to 127.

Second. Prices paid by farmers for taxes had moved up to 165.

Third. Prices paid by farmers for interest had moved up to 232.

Fourth. Seed costs had gone up to 110.

Fifth. Feeder livestock had moved up to 116.

Sixth. Family living items had risen to 110.

One of the big reasons for the increase in interest is that farm debt has increased so greatly. Over the past 5 years it rose by $14 billion, and the farm debt to farm asset ratio has grown steadily worse.

Balanced against these increases, the ratio of prices received by farmers, taking all farm products into consideration, had risen to 112. This average figure takes into account 81 for food grains, 107 for feed grains, 119 for oil-bearing crops such as soybeans, 130 for commercial vegetables, 140 for fresh market vegetables, 123 for meat animals, 108 for dairy products, and 110 for poultry and eggs.

It is clear that, overall, costs of farm production have gone up more since 1959 than prices for farm products. In other words, the cost-price squeeze on farmers has been growing worse. This is why, for example, more dairy farmers are going out of business, selling off their dairy herds, and milk production has been going down.

In the face of this picture, one reads with shock and amazement this morning's edition of the New York Times, which contains an article captioned: "Freeman Elated Over Price Drops," with a second caption reading: "He predicts further cuts in cost of farm products." According to the article:

> It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices.

Of course, no one likes to see the consumer price index go up, as it has been doing steadily and increasingly over the past 5 years of this administration. When this happens, it indicates that the purchasing power of the dollar is going down—that inflation is taking place. However, to try to handle this problem by holding down wages, holding down farm prices, or holding down retail prices is to work on the symptoms of inflation and not on the cause of inflation.

The root cause of inflation is more money—including credit—in circulation than available goods and services; and the foundation for this situation is laid by the action of a majority of Members of Congress voting to spend billions and billions of dollars more than the Federal Government takes in, year after year.

During the last 5 years, a majority of Members of Congress have run this country $33 billion deeper into debt, and this has been accompanied by $53 billion of inflation.

No wonder costs of farm production have gone up. They went up $4 billion in the last 5 years, almost $1 billion during 1965 alone. A good chunk of this increase is due to inflation.

And now the Secretary of Agriculture, who ought to be the first one to wish to see farmers relieved of the cost-price squeeze, says that he is pleased over declining farm prices. I believe he should be thinking more about fairer prices for farmers, just as the Secretary of Labor must be concerned that the working man receive fair wages.

I pointed out last year, in my supplemental views to the Senate Agriculture Committee's report on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 that, comparing the base period of 1946–50 to 1964, wages increased—on the average—176 percent, national net income increased 140 percent, corporate profits—before taxes—increased 88 percent, and net farm income declined 16 percent. It is evident that farmers have not been sharing fairly in the national net income in comparison with other segments of our economy.

I ask unanimous consent to have the New York Times article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEMAN ELATED OVER PRICE DROPS—HE PREDICTS FURTHER CUTS IN COST OF FARM PRODUCTS

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman expressed pleasure today with the fact that the prices of farm products had dropped recently.

It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices. Like Mr. Freeman, the officials were happy to note that consumers would benefit from lower prices by this summer.

"If the food marketing industry will respond quickly to lower farm prices over the next several months," Mr. Freeman told a news conference, "retail prices also can be lower sooner."

Not only have farm prices fallen since February 15, Mr. Freeman said, but the average prices of all farm products should be 6 to 10 percent lower in the fourth quarter of the year than they are now.

PRICE SUPPORTS RAISED

The Secretary's prediction came as he announced an increase in the Federal support prices for milk and soybeans to encourage production of these products, now in short supply. Both increases are aimed at preventing runaway prices and resulting higher costs to consumers.

He increased the support for milk used in manufacturing butter, cheese, and other dairy products 26 cents per 100 pounds to a level of $3.50 for the new marketing year starting tomorrow.

The new prop is below the current market price of about $3.79, resulting from low milk production and a surge in the demand for some dairy products, particularly cheese.

The new support level for butter will be 61.6 cents a pound compared with 59.4 cents. Mr. Freeman said butter prices already had dropped 2 cents a pound since February 15.

In addition, Mr. Freeman said he would lift the quota on the import of cheddar cheese to help overcome the imbalance in manufacturing milk supplies.

This imbalance has developed as cheese and butter manufacturers compete for existing supplies of manufacturing milk and divert milk from butter production.

Many small creameries face disaster from the cost-price squeeze resulting from the imbalance, the Department said. The increase in butter prices also threatens to hurt the market for butter and in the long run injure those dairy farmers who produce mainly for butter production, it said.

Mr. Freeman said President Johnson was directing the Tariff Commission to report on the advisability of high cheddar cheese import quotas for an extended period.

The present yearly quota of 2.78 million pounds will be raised by 926,700 pounds, one-tenth of 1 percent of the annual U.S. consumption, Mr. Freeman said. This will extend through June 30. Canada and New Zealand are the main importers presently.

Mr. Freeman gave this rundown on farm price decreases since February 15:

Mr. Freeman revoked the suspension he had announced on March 1 on fluid, or bottling milk, prices in Federal milk marketing order areas. The revocation, he said, would be effective April 10 and would tend to peg fluid milk prices about 22 cents higher per 100 pounds through June than the Federal orders would have provided.

Hogs down 4 cents a pound, followed by a 10-to-13 percent decline in the wholesale price of bacon and pork. Lambs also down 4 cents a pound. Butter down 2 cents a pound. Soybean and corn oil down more than 6 percent.

Fresh lettuce down 35 percent, cabbage, celery, and onions down more than 20 percent. Fresh oranges and grapefruit off 7 percent. Eggs down 3 cents per dozen.

He predicted the following declines by the end of the year:

Poultry and eggs, down 15 to 20 percent; vegetables, down 20 to 25 percent; potatoes, 10 percent; meat animals, 5 percent.

EXPORTS OF AMERICAN LIVESTOCK HIDES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, another mystifying action was taken by the administration on March 11, when the Commerce Department announced export quotas for cattle hides.

Few of us here can forget the controversy which swirled around falling cattle prices in 1964 and the efforts of many of us to limit beef imports to this country to a reasonable level so that fair livestock prices would be restored.

In fighting efforts to limit imports, the administration asserted that one way out of the problem would be to step up the development of beef export channels.

On May 12, 1964, President Johnson assured farm editors that the administration was planning to help in developing export markets.

On June 9, 1964, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman declared that:

> It would be a serious mistake to legislate quotas which, while serving no immediate purpose, would weaken the position of our Government in attempting to expand markets for all of American agriculture in the current GATT negotiations.

He then said that the Government would take steps to develop export markets, particularly in Western Europe.

Let me sum up the expressed intent of those two statements by the administration: Every effort will be made to expand and develop markets abroad for our agricultural commodities, including those relating to the beef industry.

Yet, in the face of these statements, the administration now has placed quotas on exports of American livestock hides.

Need I remind my colleagues that the beef industry, taking the statements by the administration at face value, has spent large sums of money to develop an export market for hides, a byproduct of the industry. Even the Department of Agriculture, through its able Foreign Agricultural Service, has spent money for this purpose.

The 1965 export trade in cattle hides was estimated at 13.3 million pieces, valued at nearly one quarter of a billion dollars—and a sizable 15 percent above that of 1964.

In 1964, the latest figures available, it was estimated that the value of Iowa exports of hides and skins was close to $9 million, only $100,000 of which went through Government channels. Indications are that the value of 1965 exports was much higher.

It is estimated that enforcement of the quota system already has cut hide prices to such a degree in Iowa that it will cost Iowa beef producers $12 million annually.

Garland Russell of Des Moines, general manager of Iowa Packing Co., estimates that the action by the administration will adversely affect our balance-of-payments problem by about $45 million.

And the Livestock Market Digest, in its edition of March 21, remarked:

> The action is difficult to understand if agricultural prosperity is actually an objective of Washington officialdom, but it is doubly so when these same officials seem so concerned with maintaining a sizable quantity of exports for dollars, or building new markets, in order to help minimize the sizable U.S. foreign payments deficit.

What is the curious thinking behind this action by the administration? Well, there is concern over the increasing Consumer Price Index. If the cost of shoes goes up, this will further increase the consumer price index. So, let us hold down the cost of hides so that the cost of shoes will not go up. And who will absorb the cost of this action? Why, the farmer, of course—the very one who is not sharing fairly in the national net income and is being forced off the farm by the worsening cost-price squeeze. The order imposing hide quotas ought to be rescinded.

In the column entitled "Capitol Stuff" published in the March 30 issue of the Washington Daily News, the perceptive columnist, Ted Lewis, reports that a secret memorandum was submitted to the President on March 17 by his Economic Council claiming that the export controls on hides would definitely hold down a rise in shoe prices; that increases in hide and leather prices would have forced an increase in shoe prices of 5 percent or more; that shoe producers gave assurances that they would "cooperate" in holding down prices. However, he points out that there were no "hard" assurances, and that fall price schedules now indicate that shoes will be up 5 percent by the time the children start back to school again.

On March 21, I pointed out that action by the Department of Agriculture in making abnormally large sales of CCC stocks of corn had been having an adverse effect on the market price of corn. I would invite my colleagues to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date for the details. Here again, we have action that is seeking to hold down the consumer price index by holding down farm income, when the action ought to be for the administration and its controlled Congress to stop its multibillion-dollar deficit spending and the inflation which is causing the consumer price index to go up.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "See $12 Million Cattle Hide Loss," from the Des Moines Sunday Register of March 20; an editorial entitled "Action on Hide Licenses Could Hurt Agriculture," from the Livestock Market Digest of March 21;

and an editorial entitled "Crisis in Cattle Hides," from the Wall Street Journal of March 23, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 20, 1966]

See $12 Million Cattle Hide Loss—13.3 Million Cattle Hides Exported to Foreign Countries in 1965

(By Ed Heins)

Quotas placed on exports of American livestock hides drew heavy opposition last week from Iowa agriculture, meat industry, and government officials.

Iowa Secretary of Agriculture Kenneth Owen said the quota system already has cut hide prices at a rate which will "cost the Iowa beef producers $12 million a year" in reduced live cattle prices.

Representative Neal Smith, Democrat, of Iowa, said the export quota order already has caused a drop of 25 cents per hundredweight in live cattle prices because of the reduction in the value of the hide.

Representative H. R. Gross, Republican, Iowa, described the action as "inexplicably contradictory."

Garland Russell, of Des Moines, general manager of Iowa Packing Co., a subsidiary of Swift & Co., said:

"This quota system will mean putting 3 million additional hides—about 12 to 15 percent of the present domestic total—on the market. I'm no economist but it's my understanding that the effect on price will be much more severe than the 12- to 15-percent boost in supply."

The object of the Iowans' ire was a U.S. Department of Commerce order setting up export quotas on the number of domestic hides which can be sold overseas.

Federal officials said the quota system was needed to protect domestic users of hides from dramatic price rises. U.S. exports of cattle hides hit a new record of 13.3 million pieces in 1965 while domestic demand strengthened.

The U.S. Department of Commerce claimed that the Nation was faced with a potential shortage of 2.7 million hides during 1966 as export trade continued to expand and the domestic utilization increased still further. The export quotas were designed to bring expected supply in line with demand, the Department said.

The heavy demand—both domestic and export—resulted in a sharp climb in hide prices, from a Chicago quote of 14½ cents a pound a year ago to a recent high of 26 cents.

U.S. shoe manufacturers have increased prices on their 1966 lines of merchandise, claiming they were forced to make the price boost because of higher hide prices.

Gail Danilson, executive secretary of the Iowa Beef Producers Association, said hide prices at 24 to 26 cents per pound aren't excessive.

"Those prices are only high when compared to the depressed prices which have faced the hide market in the last few years," he said.

After the announcement of the export quotas, the futures prices of hides in Chicago dropped dramatically. On March 3, hides for April delivery were selling for 24 cents a pound in Chicago. In March 14 about a week after the quota order was announced, the same April-delivery hides were quoted at below 19 cents on the Chicago market.

A cured cattle hide weighs about 40 to 50 pounds, according to an Iowa meatpacking company official.

Russell of Iowa Packing Co., said the Government has said repeatedly that one of the country's major problems is its adverse balance of trade.

"If you reduce exports by 3 million hides—at about $15 a hide—that's a $45 million increase in our adverse balance of payments.

"Unless there are trade increases elsewhere, that's another $45 million in our gold supply that will have to be exported to meet our overseas commitments," Russell said.

He noted that it has been the Commerce Department that has been most active in seeking to stimulate foreign trade. The Commerce Department last year opened an international trade office in Des Moines to get additional Iowa manufacturers interested in foreign markets.

Because of Iowa's high production of meat and other livestock products, much of the emphasis by the export office has been on the meat industry. One of the top export items being stressed was livestock hides.

Danilson said it was only the expansion of the foreign market that enabled farmers and meat industry officials to get a fair price for hides. He said synthetics and substitutes for leather were causing the domestic market to decline.

"I urge all people associated with the cattle industry to use their influence to get the order rescinded," Danilson said, "So that trade in hides can expand."

Iowa Agriculture Secretary Owen said the Nation's farmers are "again being called upon to make a little contribution to keep the consumer prices down."

He said cattle hides at 24 to 26 cents per pound aren't expensive. "This is merely a return to adequate pricing after many years in which hides were a drug on the market," Owen said.

Owen said Iowa agriculture officials have been pressing a statewide grub control program to improve the quality of the animal hides in order to make them more attractive to manufacturers, especially those in the export market.

"Now our own Government has taken action that has caused the Iowa farmer to lose in price for his hides," Owen said.

U.S. Representative Smith said he "immediately objected" to Commerce Department officials about the quota order. He has sent a letter to all Members of the House of Representatives asking them to support his move for a "thorough reconsideration" of the export quota order.

He said the reduction in the price of hides will mean an increase in meat prices for the consumer "unless someone is willing to take less" for the meat throughout the merchandising channels.

Iowa livestock producers are afraid that that "someone" will be them and the drop in hide prices will mean lower live cattle prices.

Smith said the idea that higher hide prices have caused the boost in shoe prices is overrated.

"The cost of the cattle hide in a pair of shoes is so small that even a sharp increase in green hide prices would raise the cost of a pair of shoes only a few pennies," he said "The shoe prices in this country increased while hide prices were going down."

One Iowa meat packing firm executive, who has also been active in the Department of Commerce's own program of increasing export trade, said:

"We all know of many items that have gone up in price over the years and the Government didn't express any concern about exports of those products.

"No one seems to be worried about how many cars we export although everyone knows you pay $4,000 for a car which cost $700 some years ago."

He said the Nation's farmers and the meat industry have spent large amounts of money seeking to develop an export market for hides.

"Now that we've found the market, our Government says we can't sell to them," he said.

Meat industry and farm groups have been pressing to expand foreign trade because many substitute products, including DuPont's highly publicized Corfam, have been chipping away at leather's share of the domestic shoe market.

One meat industry official said, "Until the export market expanded, hides were fast becoming an item which was hardly worth saving."

The 1965 export trade in cattle hides, at 13.3 million pieces, was a whopping 15 percent above the previous record set in 1964.

Japan was the best customer, taking 3.8 million hides. However, the biggest boost in 1965 over 1964 was in trade with Eastern European countries, which upped their purchases from 400,000 pieces to 1.8 million.

One of the stimulants to the big boost was extremely dry conditions in Argentina which led to a reduction in cattle production. Argentina is traditionally a big source of hides for the export market.

[From the Livestock Market Digest, Mar. 21, 1966]

Action on Hide Licenses Could Hurt Agriculture

Prices for hides have been good, export markets plentiful. But instead of letting the domestic industry take care of the demand all by itself (and suffer either the consequences or be aided by the profits), Washington officials have stepped in. An export licensing of hides was ordered into effect March 7.

The action was further evidence, where none is really needed, that at least some Washington officals cannot seem to abide a situation which finds a long-depressed segment of agriculture operating at a decent profit. The effect of the action ordered by Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor has already been to shove hide prices downward by the equivalent of $2 to $3 per head. Some in the industry, as stories in this week's Digest indicate, expect that the prices could be reduced further by $6 or $8 per head because of Connor's action.

In an industry that operates historically on a big volume and low margin, as the packers do, hide prices represent a significant factor in profit or loss. Thus, their success in selling hides reflects directly on the rest of the producer to consumer chain.

The action is difficult to understand if agricultural prosperity is actually an objective of Washington officialdom, but it is doubly so when these same officials seem so concerned with maintaining a sizable quantity of exports for dollars, or building new markets, in order to help minimize the sizable U.S. foreign payments deficit.

Hide prices, as Mr. Connor has been made aware by those in the livestock industry by now, have been depressed for a long time. They are far below the 33-cents-per-pound limit established as a price ceiling during the Korean war. The level currently is about 18 cents.

It is important to the livestock industry, and to agriculture as a whole, that the Connor ruling on exports of hides be revoked promptly.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 23, 1966]

Crisis in Cattle Hides

Though a spokesman for the Nation's shoe manufacturers says the current furor over cattle hides "just astonishes us," the uproar should have been fairly predictable. The whole affair could in fact be an unhappy portent of what's in store for the economy generally.

The crisis in cattle hides began building up a few weeks ago when shoe manufacturers blamed rising hide costs for shoe price increases. Since the administration is opposed to rising prices—that appears to be the only official definition of inflation—Federal officials decided that something had to be done.

It seems not to have occurred to anyone, however, that the hide and shoe price increases were two more arguments for curbing the Government's easy-money-high-spending expansion that is now pressing upward on prices almost everywhere. Instead, the administration reasoned that rising hide exports were reducing the supply in the United States and helping push up domestic prices; the obvious remedy, in Washington's view, was to restrict exports.

As too often happens when the Government moves to manipulate the economy, the restrictions were imposed with a minimum of dexterity. First the Commerce Department announced that hide exports would require Federal licenses. Then, less than a week later and before the industry or anyone else had a chance to see how limited controls would work, the Government clamped tight export quotas on top of the licensing system.

In the economic controllers' eagerness to go to work, they found it easy to ignore a few old policies and principles, such as America's alleged devotion to free world trade and the Government's longstanding effort to lift exports and thus aid the Nation's ailing balance of payments.

Nor are Washington officials apparently much disturbed by the confusion they have created in the industry. Licenses won't be issued under the quota setup until mid-April, nearly a month away. While the Government says some "emergency" licenses will be issued in the meantime, no one is too sure of how to go about getting them, and hide dealers contend they are "virtually under an embargo."

As usual, too, controls are raising sharp questions of equity.

At the moment, for instance, the export curbs are bringing domestic hide prices down. "Now with lower hide prices," says President John K. Minnoch of the National Hide Association, "why shouldn't shoe prices be reduced?" Whether they should be or not, it's understandable that hide merchants are piqued enough to contend the shoemakers may be "profiteering."

The long-range results of the hide hassle could go well beyond the current acrimony among businessmen and the destruction of some export markets. Controls also can cause disorders in the domestic economy.

The shoe industry, for its part, is a relatively smaller user of cattle hides than it was a few years ago. In this situation the export curb and artificially low domestic prices may lead eventually to a reduction in domestic supplies instead of a rise, as packers slow the rate of cattle slaughter. The upshot might be not only higher prices for hides but higher prices for meat as well.

Such self-defeating interventions would be discouraging enough if they were limited to a single segment of the economy; actually, they're growing progressively more pervasive. That's true even though it should be evident that wage and price "guideposts" and all the other gimmicks aren't producing the economic stability the administration so earnestly professes to seek.

What they are producing, and will continue to produce as long as the Government shuns sensible restraints on its own monetary and fiscal policies, are unhealthy distortions in the economy. It's the administration's inability or unwillingness to see those results, rather than the cattle-hide contretemps, that's really astonishing.

REMOVING CORRUPTERS FROM PUBLIC LIFE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Clark Mollenhoff, of the Cowles Publications in Washington, is acknowledged to be one of the most tireless, objective, and hard-digging reporters in the business.

He has collected an array of awards for diligence in his profession, including winning the top journalistic honor, the Pulitzer Prize.

His investigations have resulted in officials becoming more wary before they violate the ethical standards which they should follow.

As Mr. Mollenhoff sees it:

> Once the American people recognize all the corrupters—the genteel as well as the brazen, the efficient as well as the careless and slipshod—and once it becomes fully understood how the corrupters threaten our way of life, I hope they will react with vigor and remove them from public life.

Mr. Mollenhoff follows this precept closely in uncovering the corruption which too frequently occurs in high Government circles.

His role and examples of corruption are well set out in his new book, entitled "Despoilers of Democracy." I think it is a book well worth reading.

I ask unanimous consent to have selected critical reviews of the book printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First. "The Case Against Corruption," from the Saturday Review of November 20, 1965.

Second. "Personal Report: Washington," a column written by Robert E. Baskin, Chief of Bureau, Dallas Morning News, December 13, 1965.

Third. "'Despoilers of Democracy' Disturbing," from the Daily Times, Gainesville, Ga., November 23, 1965.

Fourth. "Washington's Scandals Probed by Mollenhoff," from the Indianapolis Star, December 12, 1965.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Review, Nov. 20, 1965]

THE CASE AGAINST CORRUPTION

(NOTE.—"Despoilers of Democracy," by Clark R. Mollenhoff (Doubleday, 411 pp. $5.95), demonstrates, through accounts of actual cases, how political corruption still flourishes amid a conspiracy of silence. Nat S. Finney is Washington correspondent for the Buffalo Evening News.)

(By Nat S. Finney)

This deeply distressing book is the product of a decade of exceptionally competent investigative reporting by an indefatigable Washington correspondent, whose bona fides combine professional training in both journalism and law. It is not, despite its title, a sensational report, but a factual recitation of a series of cases that have raised doubts about the probity of Federal officials—abuses in the foreign aid program, the mismanagement of a secret postwar stockpile program, the operations of Billie Sol Estes, the arbitrary award of defense contracts, a celebrated miscarriage of Civil Service procedure in the matter of Otto Otepka, and the so-called Bobby Baker case in all its ramifications. The author, Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Washington Bureau of the Des Moines Register and the Minneapolis Tribune, does not pretend to reach verdicts; he simply sets forth the evidence and invites the concerned reader to draw his own conclusions.

Two of his case studies, the opening one about Jerry M. Jackis, a foreign aid employee, and a later one about Otto Otepka, a personnel security officer at the State Department, describe the fates of civil servants who had the misfortune and temerity to "blow the whistle" on their superiors in the Federal hierarchy—a "crime" unlisted in the code but heinous nonetheless. In another such case, presented as a footnote to the Billie Sol Estes matter, N. Battle Hales, a civil servant who tried to work within the unwritten canons of civil service ethics, was punished by appointive officers who apparently could not understand the rules of the Government game. These studies, while likely to attract less interest, are exceedingly important, for good Government must be expert as well as political.

This reviewer finds it hard to take much interest in the so-called stockpile scandal, yet Clark Mollenhoff is right to include it as an illustration of the fact that if you put the banana within the monkey's reach there is going to be some grabbing.

The true centerpiece of "Despoilers of Democracy" is the TFX contract, if for no other reason than its exemplification of the warning with which President Eisenhower closed his administration: "In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist * * *. We should take nothing for granted * * *. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing."

Reporter Mollenhoff pursued the award of a nonesuch contract for these aircraft from the first signal of arbitrary action to the collapse of the inquiry after President Kennedy's assassination. Mollenhoff came out of the ordeal bristling with unallayed suspicions, but frustrated. There never was a plausible answer to the question of why Secretary of Defense McNamara handed this $6-billion contract to General Dynamics, and for all his bloodhound diligence Clark Mollenhoff doesn't produce one. But he does make a thorough case that in a government based upon consent there simply must be answers. A society that is incapable of compelling answers to questions of genuine public moment is no damned good. The answers may be impalatable and their consequences impolitic. In the TFX matter the Department of Defense may well have placed the contract with General Dynamics to rehabilitate a sick company. However hard this would have been to swallow, it would have been defensible as an action to assure the existence of industrial suppliers in time of trouble. But neither this nor any other intelligible answer whatever was offered, and that, entirely aside from any question of despoiling, is reason enough to throw the rascals out.

The Bobby Baker case still rumbles in the corridors and anterooms of power in Washington, and there is no one better qualified to trace its origin than Clark Mollenhoff. He was, in the judgment of some of his friendly and respectful colleagues, more deeply involved in the case than is professionally wise.

The spectacle of an employee of the Senate defying the inquiries of his erstwhile employers is bad enough, but the slavish condemnation of such contumely by legislators sworn to defend the public interest is worse. Hardest of all to bear is the complacence of just those people whose interest is insulted—the "knowledgeable citizenry" in which President Eisenhower reposed his confidence. Clark Mollenhoff got angry about the torpor that existed in Washington during the Baker inquiry and at the electorate's indifference to the stench. In his fury he offended enough of his associates to spark a challenge to what should have been his routine election as president of the National Press Club. He was narrowly defeated by a rump candidate in a contest that does the Washington press corps little credit.

Mollenhoff gives his readers an inside view of the Walter Jenkins case, and discloses that he had learned from Donald B. Reynolds that

President Johnson's man Friday had a morals squad record months before another arrest brought the matter into the open. It is this reviewer's suggestion that the reader let this chapter steep in his mind until all the implications are brewed out out of it. Did the silly reporter who asked President Johnson whether he knew of Jenkins' degeneracy expect a different answer from the one he got? Is the national security the private toy of the party in power? Whose captive was Jenkins?

"Despoilers of Democracy" should be must reading for anyone who still wonders what the Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., was tálking about when he described Lyndon Baines Johnson as lacking in the moral integrity a President should bring to that high office.

Yet Mollenhoff's concluding chapter is no more satisfying than President Eisenhower's invocation of an alert and knowledgeable citizenry. The book leaves it very clear that political operators can stupefy the citizenry and corruption be protected by a conspiracy of silence. The answer, if there is one, must be mechanical, not moral. The old axiom, "when in doubt, vote against the candidate with the most seniority," may provide a clue. It has been observed before that there is no tyranny like an excessive majority, and certainly the picture Clark Mollenhoff presents is of a majority run amok, the old "public be damned" attitude that invariably characterizes a regime too long in power. The public itself has become too doctrinaire about its politics, and lost sight of the prophylactic exercise of the franchise.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Dec. 13, 1965]

PERSONAL REPORT: WASHINGTON

(By Robert E. Baskin)

In Washington political and press circles, Clark R. Mollenhoff is known as a hard-digging, courageous reporter who does not fear to probe into the more suspicious activities in our Federal Government.

As a correspondent for the Cowles publications, Mollenhoff has amassed a host of prizes for investigative reporting, and he has shown no indication that he wants to rest on his laurels.

He has just produced another book, "Despoilers of Democracy" (Doubleday), that certainly will be disturbing to all who read it. It is a compilation of some of the noteworthy shenanigans that have taken place in the Federal bureaucracy in the last few years.

Mollenhoff's knowledge of these matters is intimate. Most of the stories he relates deal with events which he covered personally as a working newspaperman.

The cumulative effect of his book—which chronicles such scandals as the Billie Sol Estes and Bobby Baker cases—is enough to cause one to wonder if our democracy is, indeed, not in danger of being subverted by the "despoilers" Mollenhoff describes.

Mollenhoff is heavily critical of State Department for its handling of the Otto Otepka affair and of the Defense Department for the way it awarded the TFX contract.

While there may be room for argument over the circumstances of some of these matters, no one can question Mollenhoff's zeal or honest intentions in trying to expose to view the behind-the-scenes manipulations that occur in the Government.

Mollenhoff is frankly concerned over the growth of presidential power at the expense of the Congress. And he is particularly indignant over "the massive propaganda of recent years" which he says is intended to discredit Congress and its investigative bodies. This propaganda, Mollenhoff says, is succeeding.

"The decline in the independence of Congress has been accompanied, unsurprisingly, by a parallel decline in the independence of the American press," Mollenhoff says. "* * * When the power of Congress is emasculated, the ability of newsmen to obtain accurate information from Government suffers. * * *

"Without the congressional power to investigate behind them, the reporters in Washington could be reduced pretty much to the level of the German newsmen who gathered at the propaganda ministry in the 1930's to receive their handouts from Dr. Goebbels."

Mollenhoff makes plain his disapproval of the White House role on congressional investigations.

"Because the White House now, in the current political situation, has the votes to override the committee chairmen in their own committees as well as on the floor, it can disregard them," Mollenhoff says.

"It can stop or limit investigations in some committees.

"Though the White House objectives are sometimes laudable, they are not always so. It is a bad omen when party discipline can kill an investigation before it is started."

Mollenhoff praises the work done by such men as Senators John McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, and John Williams, Republican, of Delaware. Much of the documentation for this book are results of these two men's investigatory efforts.

But, Mollenhoff says, the public must take a great interest in clean government.

"Once the American people recognize all the corrupters—the genteel as well as the brazen, the efficient as well as the careless and slipshod—and once it becomes fully understood how the corrupters threaten our way of life, I hope they will react with vigor and remove them from public life," Mollenhoff says.

In addition to having a message, Mollenhoff's book is noteworthy for its well-written accounts of several scandals, and Texans will be particularly interested in his recapitulation of the Billie Sol Estes case.

[From the (Gainesville, Ga.) Daily Times, Nov. 23, 1965]

"DESPOILERS OF DEMOCRACY" DISTURBING

(By Sylvan Meyer)

(Note.—A review of "Despoilers of Democracy" by Clark R. Mollenhoff, Doubleday, $5.95.)

Clark Mollenhoff, a reporter in Washington for Cowles Publications, ranks as one of the Nation's top, and most respectable, muckrakers.

This book is a comprehensive wrapup, with the perspective of history, of several of the major scandals of the last decade in the Capital.

The information itself may not always be new, but Mr. Mollenhoff has gathered the truly pertinent evidence, organized it well and thus added to its impact, bringing the instances of corruption he reports into shocking focus. Readers will be more outraged as a result of his analyses than they were when they read of the incidents piecemeal over months and months of newspaper reporting.

He delves into the TFX fighter plane controversy. In this one, the Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, awarded a hefty fighter plane contract to General Dynamics of Texas despite a lower bid from Boeing and despite strong military preference to Boeing.

Mr. Mollenhoff reviews Mr. McNamara's statement to congressional committees and finds his reasons for ignoring military advice to be vague. Furthermore, the Department of Defense, according to Mr. Mollenhoff, treated the congressional group in a rather cavalier fashion and made precise information difficult to come by.

"Despoilers" points out close relationships between the Texas of Lyndon Johnson and the individuals responsible for the contract award.

The book also works over the Billy Sol Estes case; the case of Otto Otepka, a State Department security officer who was badgered and persecuted because he tried to place reports of wrongdoing before congressional committees; and the Bobby Baker case. In sum, the book wreaks heavy damage on the integrity of the executive branch and particularly on its policy of letting the public know as little as possible.

Yet, it should be made clear that Mr. Mollenhoff is a reporter and not a polemicist. This book is not at all in the hysterical, wildly accusative genre of "None Dare Call It Treason" or the other far out politically inspired summaries of alleged wrongdoings in Washington.

It is a carefully documented presentation, organized like evidence in a courtroom and balanced with plenty of material from the defense as well as from the prosecution.

There is no question of Mr. Mollenhoff's reliability or of his professional competence. Consequently, it is a disturbing book and deserves a thoughtful response from those it accuses. It needs an answer.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Dec. 12, 1965]

WASHINGTON'S SCANDALS PROBED BY MOLLENHOFF

(By Ben Cole)

Vanity and venality are the ingredients that produce the scandals in the Federal Government reported by Clark R. Mollenhoff in "Despoilers of Democracy" (Doubleday, 411 pages, $5.95.)

Mollenhoff is a Pulitzer Prize winner who has covered all the cases he discusses in the fast-moving volume.

Among the matters the author takes up are; the drumming of Jerry Jackis out of Government because he exposed multimillion-dollar shilly-shallying in foreign aid; military disobedience to build an unauthorized air strip; stockpile profiteering; the incredible case of Billie Sol Estes, and the mystifying case of Secretary Robert McNamara and the X–TFX.

Also, the punishment of State Department security officer Otto Otepka for giving testimony to Congress: the fortunes of Bobby Baker and the downfall of Walter Jenkins.

Mollenhoff makes no secret of his distaste for President Johnson, whose personal finances the author views with deep misgivings. But he also has some nonpartisan disapproval to confer upon former Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, whose dealings in stockpiled metals come into question in one chapter of the book.

Readers who yearn to understand what the TFX case was all about, what was going on in Texas with Billie Sol, and how the Bobby Baker case came about can learn all about it in Mollenhoff's absorbing book.

If the complexities of the shenanigans he recounts are at times confusing when they are not incredible, then it is because truth is often more complicated than fiction.

Mollenhoff writes with a sting of puritan righteousness which gives his work substance and direction. He is no apologist for wrongdoers.

What mystifies the ordinary citizen—and enrages Mollenhoff—is the frequency with which Uncle Sam is fleeced like a city slicker at a county fair. Most Americans are scared to death at having their tax return questioned for a couple of bucks, while bigtime shrewdies march into the Federal agencies and cart the loot out by the bale.

What's worse, perhaps, that once having made a mistake, the Government goes into the most unbecoming convulsions of denial, concealment, and obfuscation to cover up its chargeability.

Mollenhoff offers a hope that the country may not be going all the way to the dogs as a result of misdeeds in high places, but he is certain that it could.

He relies on the Congress, with its power to investigate the executive branch, for exposure of and eradication of malfeasance.

"If the public doesn't care about it Congress—or doesn't show that it cares—and if it continues to shrug its shoulders over arrogant administration and shoddy favoritism, as well as outright corruption, then 1 day the house of democracy may fall. For, in the end, the responsibility for good Government rests with the people. America will get as good a government as Americans demand," he concludes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which has just been reported, and which is Senate Resolution 220, to disapprove reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

AMENDMENT OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6319.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6319) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to temporarily laying aside the pending business and proceeding to the consideration of the bill just stated by title?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, on page 17, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Two-month extension of initial enrollment period for supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged.

(a) The first sentence of section 1837(c) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out "January 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1966", and (2) by striking out "March 31, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 31, 1966".

(b) Section 1837(d) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "January 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1966".

(c) Section 102(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by striking out "April 1, 1966" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1966".

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this bill passed the House of Representatives by unanimous vote, and it was reported unanimously by the Committee on Finance.

It provides a revised set of rules for the income tax treatment of any recovery by a corporation of losses which arose from expropriation or confiscation of its properties by a foreign government. Present law provides that the amount recovered must be included in income subject to regular rates of tax if the original deduction resulted in some saving in income tax. Present law takes no account of the fact that the prior deduction may have offset income which was not subject to full tax. For example, the deduction may have offset income which would have been taxed as a capital gain or as income eligible for Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation treatment.

This bill provides that the corporation may elect to have recoveries of foreign expropriation losses treated under the new rules. These new rules provide that upon the recovery of a loss previously deducted, the amount of tax to be paid on account of the recovery is to be measured by the amount of tax saved by deducting the loss taken in the earlier year. This rule takes into account the fact that the earlier deduction of the loss may have reduced foreign tax credits or investment credits which would otherwise have been allowable in a larger amount. Similarly, the new rules take into account the fact that the loss in the prior year may have resulted in a tax benefit only at capital gains rates. In computing tax benefit received on deducting the loss, the rates in the year of the recovery will be used rather than the rates in the year of the loss.

The bill also provides that where the bulk of a recovery of an expropriation loss is in property rather than in money, the taxpayer can have an extended period of time up to 10 years to pay the tax imposed on the recovery, but the delayed payments will bear interest at the rate of 4 percent. Should the taxpayer sell the property received back, the payment of the tax is accelerated.

The bill also provides, even though a corporation does not elect the new rules on recoveries of expropriation losses, that the restoration in value of a stock or security held by a corporation is to be treated as a recovery. As a result this value is to be included in gross income if a deduction was previously taken because the stock became worthless on account of expropriation or seizure by a foreign government of the assets of the company which issued the stock or security. This provision is comparable to a provision in present law which deals only with restorations in value of property subject to the rules governing World War II losses.

This bill is virtually identical to a bill passed by the Senate in 1964. It is acceptable to the administration.

EXTENSION OF MEDICARE ENROLLMENT

We amended this bill in committee to provide a 60-day extension of the initial enrollment period during which people can apply for voluntary medical insurance under social security.

Many Senators have sponsored bills along the lines of the committee amendment. Senators SMATHERS, DOUGLAS, RIBICOFF, BENNETT, CURTIS, MORTON, and DIRKSEN of the Finance Committee are among those Members who have introduced bills on this topic.

Subsequent to the committee adoption of this amendment on Wednesday, a request was received from the President urging this precise action. Obviously, the committee had its crystal ball in good shape in guessing that this would be the position of the President.

I think all of us recognize it is desirable to extend the deadline for enrollment so that every eligible person may be given an adequate opportunity to join the voluntary portion of the medicare program.

Many private health insurance companies—including Blue Cross and Blue Shield—have only recently announced changes in their policies for older people. Many employers are just now modifying their health insurance coverage of older workers who are also eligible for medicare. A substantial number of older people have not enrolled in part B because they have not had adequate time to study the effects of these changes in private health insurance coverage. They have not had sufficient time to compare benefits—to see how a private policy meshes or conflicts with medicare benefits.

The committee amendment will give these people ample time to study the advantages of participation in part B of medicare. More time will also be available to inform and clarify questions for those who are uncertain about aspects of the program.

The extension of time provided by the committee amendment will not change or interfere with the July 1 starting date for payment of benefits under part B. After May 31, the last day of the initial enrollment period under the amendment, Social Security would still have a full month left before benefits were payable in which to set up their records.

I am pleased to say that 86 percent of the aged people over 65 have already signed up for the voluntary portion of the medicare program. We believe that the final figure may go as high as 90 percent or more by giving those who have not thus far taken advantage of the opportunity, additional time to make application for the voluntary portion of medicare.

There was an amendment intended to be proposed by the two Senators from Ohio in an effort to resolve a problem which exists between the welfare agency of that State and the Federal Government.

I ask the Senators from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. YOUNG], that their amendment not be offered on this bill because there is some urgency in enacting this immediately; they should give us a chance to look at their amendment in committee. I wish to assure them that the committee will look at that amendment as soon as possible so that we can understand their problem and determine the views of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare so that we can give proper consideration to the problem that needs to be corrected in the State of Ohio.

I wish to assure the two Senators from Ohio that the committee will undertake to give careful and sympathetic consideration to the problem when we have had the opportunity to give it the careful attention it deserves.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We were confronted with varying estimates as to the number of people who remained unregistered under part B of the medicare program. The estimates varied from a million to 5 million people. We thought that perhaps there should be sufficient time to make sure all of them were registered.

I believe Congressman BYRNES, the minority member of the Ways and Means Committee in the House of Representatives, and ranking minority member of the committee, suggested at the time that the medicare matter was under consideration that perhaps September 1 rather than March 31 should be the deadline date. In the amendment that I suggested, and which was cosponsored by a good many Senators, we did accept the September 1 deadline.

However, I believe it was the opinion of the committee that 2 months was ample; that perhaps there would be maximum registration in 2 months.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Illinois has been very helpful in this matter. I thank him for his suggestion.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly endorse the remarks just made by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee. It has been obvious to many of us that extension of the initial enrollment period for part B of medicare was desirable and equitable. As early as last February I introduced a bill, cosponsored by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, to extend the initial enrollment period. The committee amendment accomplishes my goal; that is, to see to it that every older Floridian—every older American—has ample time and adequate opportunity to participate in this worthwhile program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his support. I know that he has been very helpful in informing the committee of the need for this legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am glad to support the committee amendment to H.R. 6319. On Tuesday of this week I introduced legislation—S. 3159—to extend the enrollment date until the end of this year. My own judgment was and still is that the 2-month extension which is before us now may not be adequate to reach the 1.5 million senior citizens who have not been heard from at all in connection with part B, and the 1 million who have turned down its coverage, many of them basing their decisions on misunderstanding of the program.

I thought it would be wise to let those who need more convincing see the program in operation after July 1 and let them decide then. But the 2-month extension is a good beginning. If it proves inadequate, we have shown that we can act expeditiously to extend the deadline. My bill and those of other Senators could be passed as well 2 months from now as now. If we need to take such action then, I know we will do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I appreciate the support of the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly on the proposal before the Senate today—to extend for 2 months, through May 31, 1966, the signup period for the supplementary medical insurance program voted by the Congress last year.

The Social Security Administration has estimated that some 19 million people 65 years of age or over are eligible for coverage beginning on July 1 of this year. While some have declined to enroll in the period which ended last night, the President yesterday estimated that 17 million people had already asked for the coverage offered under the law.

I believe it is very likely that the persons—1 million or more—who have not yet responded, or who might not have been reached by the announcements, are very likely individuals who most need the opportunity to have adequate medical insurance coverage under this health care program. I know that social security offices around the country have been working long and hard hours to enroll eligible persons, but it is very possible that an extension of the enrollment period will enable the great majority of the other eligible persons to qualify for this important program from the beginning of its services this summer.

In my own State of Kentucky, there are thousands upon thousands of people who are eligible for this program, and I would hope that all who want to participate would have the chance to do so from the first date of availability of services. For this reason, and as it has been said that an extension of the deadline would present no administrative problems, I hope the Senate will act immediately to extend for 2 months the deadline for enrollment in the supplementary medical insurance program under social security.

As one who worked and spoke and voted for the new law to provide assurance of health and hospital care under social security, I urge immediate action on extending this enrollment deadline to May 31, 1966.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has eloquently expressed the need for the committee amendment. I appreciate his support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries, and to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the initial enrollment period for supplementary medical insurance benefits."

TROUBADOURS DRUM AND BUGLE CORPS OF BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 8647.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8647) for the relief of the Troubadours Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this is a relatively minor bill that was passed by the House of Representatives unanimously.

The young people in Bridgeport, Conn., organized a band and they describe themselves as the Troubadours Drum and Bugle Corps of Connecticut. The bill involves some band uniforms which they purchased in Mexico duty free. It involves a very small amount of money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TARIFF TREATMENT OF CERTAIN WOVEN FABRICS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 11029.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11029) relating to the tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment on page 2, line 5, after the word "before," to insert "the 60th day after."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time and passed.

SECRECY IN HEARINGS ON FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the refusal of the Secretary of State to appear Monday in open session before the Committee on Foreign Relations on the foreign aid program should tell Congress, the American people, and the world a great deal about the nature of the American aid program and the purposes to which it is being put.

His insistence upon secrecy in initiating the aid debate reflects the growing furtive and stealthy character of bilateral aid as a tool and weapon of American foreign policy. There once was a time when the great bulk of aid, even military, was fully covered in open hearings with the Secretary of State, with only a few questions in sensitive areas reserved for executive session. In 1966, we have reached the stage where he will not present the foreign aid program in public session, but seeks to reverse the normal procedure by offering the possibility that he may come back later for an open hearing. Up to now, it has been customary for a leading cabinet officer to present the opening testimony on a foreign policy matter in public and leave to a future closed session the relatively few matters of a security nature. Why the change?

"Beware," I say to foreign governments; "beware of American aid that the American people are not told about by their Government. Beware of foreign aid that is discussed behind locked doors the same way the CIA budget is discussed behind locked doors, for you may never know what is being done for you and what is being done to you under such a program."

This particular foreign aid program was unveiled with considerable fanfare about its new emphasis upon education and food production. It was a hopeful sign to some of us who have believed that foreign aid was becoming little more than wallpaper over the cracks and breaks in the social and economic structure of recipient countries, countries that must develop their human and natural resources first, if ever they are to have a foundation on which to build a growing standard of living.

In the last decade, foreign aid to developing countries has conformed to an economic theory that we abandoned in this country over 30 years ago—the trickle-down theory of economic growth. We have sent American commodities abroad under the aid program on the belief that if we put enough wealth into the upper crust of the society, some would trickle down to the masses below, providind at least a modicum of improvement in their lot. But I am frankly of the opinion that Herbert Hoover economics are not going to do any more for the less developed nations than they did for a depression-ridden America.

If we assigned every cent of the $917 million programed for military aid to education instead, we would do more for the people of the world in 1 year than we will do under 20 years of the current program. Of course, many of the governments of countries we are aiding do not want that kind of assistance. The American aid program has been designed more to maintain the status quo than to bring about change, and that usually suits both sides of the aid transaction.

In fact, American economic and military aid—particularly military aid—has supported military juntas around the world. It has been used by tyrants around the world to stamp out freedom.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, let me say that the shocking record of the United States by way of military aid in South America has been a record of the stifling of freedom in many parts of Latin America, the Dominican Republic being the latest.

Oh, if the American people could only get the facts about foreign aid. If the American people could get the facts about their foreign aid, they would hold the Johnson administration to a political accounting, as it should be.

The Johnson administration now has a Secretary of State who wants to appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations in a secret session. Again, the senior Senator from Oregon forewarns the American people, as he has been doing for 21 years in this body, to watch out for government by executive supremacy and government by secrecy. The Johnson administration is galloping toward government by executive supremacy and government by secrecy, and this is its latest ride.

These are some of the issues that should be explored this year in considering this authorization. We should examine into the nature and the extent of this new emphasis upon basic resource and human development, for we should know whether it is merely a public relations device, or a real change in the emphasis of the program.

Now the Secretary of State takes position that he cannot discuss foreign aid in public in his opening presentation. That tells me almost as much as hearing what he has to say. He has already answered many of the questions I would have asked him in public about what we are really seeking to do with foreign aid.

I shall not be in attendance for his private explanation of the secretive, clandestine nature of the aid program. I will not help to dignify the concealment policy of the Secretary of State by becoming a party to it.

I can read; and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I shall, in due time, read the Secretary's secret testimony, so that when the committee reaches the point of marking up the bill, I can offer amendments this year, as I have done in the past, seeking to check this Secretary of State, who is doing such irreparable harm to the history of this Republic. But I shall not dignify his testimony by lending my ears to hear it.

Moreover, I shall have much more fruitful endeavors in the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, where we are hearing in open and public session about the education needs of present and future generations of Americans, and what we can do about them.

In fact, I was willing to postpone the hearings of the Subcommittee on Education scheduled for Monday if the Secretary of State had been willing, in a public hearing, to talk about the foreign policy that belongs to the American people, not to the Secretary of State. But in view of the fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations has mistakenly acceded to the Secretary's insistence that he appear only in executive session, I not only shall not be present, but shall proceed with the public hearings on education.

So far as the Senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, and speaking as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, there never would have been any hearings on foreign aid this year if they had to be held under the dictates of the Secretary of State in secret session. I would have let him sit in the Department of State and twiddle his thumbs. I would have given him no hearings, unless he were willing to conform to what I think is a precious guarantee in a democracy, a guarantee which the American people are entitled to have the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senate, and Congress protect.

I say to the American people from this desk today, as I have said to them in the past: "Do not forget that in a democracy there can be no substitute for a full disclosure of the public's business. Foreign policy belongs to you, not to Lyndon B. Johnson, to Dean Rusk, or to McNamara. It belongs to you, the people. The only check you have left is the check of your ballots. Start using your ballots to vote out of office those in Congress and in the executive branch of the Government who are willing to conduct foreign policy as it is now being conducted; a policy that will kill thousands upon thousands of American boys in Asia in the years immediately ahead, if this

President and his Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense are not checked."

It does not make me happy to find myself in such unalterable, irreconcilable disagreement with my President in regard to the killing operation that is taking place in South Vietnam. That killing must be stopped; and the killing will not be stopped by the kind of foreign aid bill we can be sure this administration will offer. It will not be stopped until Congress begins to exercise the check that the constitutional fathers wrote into the Constitution—the check of the purse strings.

I say to Congress that not until we make it very clear to this President that we are not going to vote the money for the escalating of the war in Vietnam and the killing, each week, of additional numbers of American boys, shall we avoid what I am satisfied will be, eventually, a war that will lead into China and will bog us down in Asia for decades to come.

Oh, I know that war hysteria is stalking the Nation.

Those who raise their voices, as I raise my voice on the floor of the Senate again this afternoon, must expect to be castigated and attacked and smeared with the statement that they will some way, somehow let down the boys in South Vietnam.

My answer is that there only happen to be a small number of us who are seeking to protect those boys in South Vietnam. By denying to the President the power to escalate this war and by denying to him the funds, we will force him to fall back on a position such as a General Gavin, General Ridgway, George Kennan, and a good many other authorities in this country are urging upon this administration.

Mr. President, this voice will not be silenced short of a declaration of war, and this Senator will not support the kind of foreign aid program, let me assure everyone, that Dean Rusk will testify for in secrecy on Monday.

I shall continue to say to the American people, "It is up to you. You now must exercise the greatest right of freedom that our constitutional fathers gave you, your right of the ballot." In my judgment, if that right is not exercised, and if we do not stop this trend toward government by secrecy and executive supremacy, then it is doubtful that we will leave a heritage of freedom to our grandchildren. Becaues if we are moving into world war III, there will be no freedom for future generations of American boys and girls.

One of my sadnesses these days is to face what I think irrefutable, that not many in the Congress of the United States, or, for that matter, not enough people in the country, are thinking in terms of the kind of a legacy we are going to leave American boys and girls 50 to 100 years from now. Let me say that we will leave them no legacy of freedom if our generation is responsible for leading the world into the third world war. And a continuation of this administration's foreign policy in Asia, in my judgment, assures a war with China, and from that we will go into world war III.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY AT 11 A.M.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next at 11 o'clock a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Tuesday, April 5, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1, 1966:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

U.S. MARSHAL

Cornelius J. McQuade, of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of West Virginia for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Donald L. Coleman, FV3140064.
Howard H. Sherman, FV3112465.
Michael D. Thier, FV3140241.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Medical)

Harold J. Versteeg, FV3143708.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Robert L. Dix, FV3142175.
Samuel B. Holder, FV3142105.
Donald E. MacIntyre, FV3165793.
Charles G. Rule, FV3141265.
Burton L. Siegel, FV3142267.
Frank J. Trachtman, FV3165279.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Bernard Marcak, FR81374.

The following distinguished military graduates of the Air Force precommission schools for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Henry R. Adams, FV3170662.
Keith D. Baer, FV3170704.
James D. Baer, FV3154213.
David H. Barthel, FV3170664.
John B. Bestic, Jr., FV3153962.
Terry L. Boyer, FV3153642.
Jack A. Brinker, FV3170667.
Henry N. Carriger, FV3183711.
John Caso, FV3183712.
Gary A. Chavez, FV3152190.
James A. Clamon, FV3170673.
Alvin J. Cole, III, FV3170674.
Kenneth L. Coleman, FV3183715.
Richard D. Conn, FV3183716.
Charles H. Cook, FV3170676.
Joseph F. Cormier, FV3170677.
Hobdy J. Edmondson, FV3153639.
Carl E. Edwards, Jr., FV3183772.
George L. Edwards, FV3183766.
Paul S. Embert, Jr., FV3183719.
Epperson, William L., FV3152475.
Fauske, James H., FV3152014.
Finley, Thomas C., FV3183720.
Gander, Leroyce J., FV3170679.
Giberson, Kenneth L, Jr., FV3183721.
Griffith, Charles R., FV3152012.
Grulikowski, Thaddeus, FV3154028.
Guinn, Jerry R., FV3183722.
Hackley, Lloyd V., FV3183723.
Hall, Robert J., FV3183725.
Haynie, Ivan, FV3170682.
Huttenlocker, Donald J., FV3183732.
Johnson, Curtis E., FV3154072.
Johnson, Philip W., FV3149247.
Jones, William R., FV3154226.
Keck, Kenneth R., FV3183735.
King, Jackie D., FV3183736.
Krone, David F., FV3154130.
Lawrence, Bruce E., FV3154185.
Lewis, Kenneth W., FV3183769.
Maples, William K., FV3154067.
Mayer, Joseph F., FV3183739.
McBride, William G., FV3183741.
McGregor, Lorne L., Jr., FV3183742.
Meacham, Jimmy D., FV3183743.
Metzger, Richard P., FV3183771.
Murphy, Norman C., FV3153617.
Nelson, Dean D., FV3193746.
Pillittere, Leonard F., Jr., FV3183750.
Powers, Thomas J., Jr., FV3153993.
Preece, Keith A., FV3170619.
Robbins, Robert R., FV3151823.
Roskell, Robert T., FV3153638.
Saulsberry, Thomas L., FV3154073.
Shaff, Dennis P., FV3183759.
Sheets, James E., FV3154118.
Shields, William F., FV3153629.
Terla, Lothar G. T., FV3154086.
Ward, Eileen C., FV3154124.
White, James J., FV3152728.
Wogan, Stephen G., FV3154238.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Abbes, Douglas C.
Abernathy, Bobby J.
Adams, Everett F.
Adams, David J.
Adams, Robert M., III
Alexander, Jon R.
Allen, John D.
Amundson, Robert C.
Anderson, Lynn R.
Andrews, Robert G.
Aoki, Jerald K.
Apple, Robert C.
Atchley, Lonnie S.
Aten, Ronald B.
Baker, Bob E.
Baldy, Paul J.
Barber, Thomas J.
Barclay, Victor W.
Barko, James S., II
Barnes, Harold C.
Bartz, Charles E.
Barnhart, Peter W. C.
Batsel, Michael L.
Batten, Arthur D.
Becker, Douglas J.
Becton, Charles L.
Begin, Carl E.
Beitzel, James S.
Bell, Frederick M.
Bell, James M.
Bell, Robert B.
Bender, Jack S., III
Bennett, Stephen L.
Benson, Howard F., Jr.
Bernhardt, James H.
Bick, Frederic A.
Bigelow, Winfield S., Jr.
Bishop, Darrell G.
Bishop, John A., Jr.
Bittner, Elvin D., III
Bittrick, Richard W.
Blair, Henry R.
Bleistine, Cyril J.
Blevins, Gordon C., Jr.
Boese, John J.
Boese, Lawrence E.
Bosse, Steven W.
Boston, Douglas M.
Boughton, Grant S.
Boyle, Marcus J.
Bradley, Richard C., III
Bramante, Bernardo D.
Braun, Richard W.
Breslin, Robert J.
Broadhurst, Edwin B., Jr.
Brown, Derek C.
Brown, Donald E.
Brown, Scott B.
Bruns, Wayne W.
Bryan, Joseph K.
Bryan, Robert E.
Bullard, Edward M.
Bullock, Gerald E.
Bunce, Allan B.

Buynak, Stephen T., Jr.
Cairney, William J.
Caldwell, Quinton M.
Call, Jeffrey L.
Calo, Jose M.
Campbell, Michael A.
Campbell, Richard D.
Cannon, Douglas R.
Capone, John T.
Carnahan, Burrus M.
Carrington, Royal P., III
Carter, Leon J., III
Carter, Stephen L.
Chambers, Michael D.
Chapman, Robert E.
Check, William D.
Chisolm, Stoney P.
Choate, John S.
Christie, William J., II
Clark, Richard J.
Clary, Ronald E.
Clay, Michael T.
Clemen, John D.
Clements, John R.
Cobb, William C.
Cohen, Barry L.
Collier, Stanton E.
Collins, Nolan
Combs, Philip L.
Combs, Steven P.
Condit, Dale O.
Cooey, Robert L., Jr.
Cook, Walter R.
Cooke, Carlton L., Jr.
Couser, Walter J., III
Cowles, Carroll W., II
Coy, Robert W.
Coyne, Cary W.
Crosby, Bradley L.
Cross, Charles K., Jr.
Crownover, John H., III
Csanadi, Steven B.
Curtis, Johnson O.
Czerner, Frederick H., Jr.
Dahl, Larry A.
Dailey, Russell T.
Daley, William K.
Daly, Kevin C.
Dana, Robert M.
Dandar, Michael J., Jr.
Dant, Robert E.
Dell, Walter L.
Dice, John C.
Dickman, Robert S.
Diefenbach, Kurt O.
Diehl, Paul E.
Diemer, Richard A.
Dietze, Gary A.
Dixon, Dennis O.
Dixon, Lewis R.
Dockery, Charles P.
Dodd, Roger H.
Drew, Walter E.
Duda, Ronald B.
Duerr, Gerald F.
Duke, Preston T.
Dulaney, Arthur A., III
Dunn, Richard L.
Durand, Arthur A.
Dutt, Frank E., Jr.
Duwel, Richard B.
Dydo, John R.
Eastler, Thomas E.
Eastman, Raymond L.
Ehrig, David L.
Eichorst, Kurt K.
Elart, Vernon A.
Elder, David P.
Emerson, Michael R.
Ertel, Peter H.
Evans, Albert L., III
Evans, David J.
Evans, Winston C.
Ewart, Robert F.
Fahrer, Robert F.
Farrell, William R.
Farris, Prescott D., Jr.
Faust, Ernest K.
Feldman, Robert M.
Finch, Charles W.
Filburn, Ralph B., III
Flood, Paul R.
Fols, John E.
Ford, David A.
Foreman, Larry R.
Foster, Thomas J.
Freimuth, Richard P.
French, Daniel P.
French, Robert T.
Fritsche, David W.
Furdek, Dennis T.
Futey, Andrew J.
Gallagher, Douglas W.
Garcia, Wilfred M., Jr.
Garrison, John H.
Gast, James C.
Gaston, Chester D., Jr.
Gaynor, Joseph E.
Geary, Sean J.
Germeraad, John O.
Gill, Richard S.
Glass, Louis E.
Glos, Alan S.
Godfrey, Paul A.
Goode, William E.
Goss, George J.
Graham, Dwight H.
Graham, James, III
Grandia, Kenneth L.
Gray, Jay A.
Green, Henry P.
Green, Lawrence M.
Grenko, Michael J.
Gritzmacher, Thomas J.
Guarre, James S.
Gunnell, Vernen P.
Haas, Lawrence H.
Hamilton, William S.
Hammack, Larry C.
Hammer, Michael S.
Harder, Robert O.
Hari, Louis
Harmon, Ronnie L.
Harrington, Donald J.
Harrington, Edwin V., Jr.
Harrington, Ellis J. Jr.
Harrington, Richard G.
Hartman, Frederick W., Jr.
Hassell, James A.
Hatten, Donald E.
Heller, Gary E.
Helmuth, John W.
Heltsley, Charles M., Jr.
Hemphill, David W.
Herndon, Frank M.
Herr, Thomas C.
Hicks, Steven W.
Hillman, Paul, Jr.
Hirsch, Joel G.
Hodnett, Samuel A., Jr.
Hohn, Roger A.
Hoppe, Allen B.
Hrubes, James W.
Hudkins, Raymond P.
Hudson, George N.
Hull, Edward A.
Hurst, Jerry L.
Husson, Matthew A., III
Hutton, Dean P.
Jacobs, Jerr A.
Jannarone, August G.
Jensen, Albert D.
Jicha, James O.
Johani, Thomas
Johnston, Terry L.
Jones, Grinnell, III
Jordan, David W., Jr.
Jumper, John P.
Jungwirth, Arthur H.
Karsch, Michael P.
Kaul, Dean C.
Kawatachi, Arthur S.
Kehl, Ted L.
Keller, John C.
Kelly, Thomas P.
Kemp, Victor M.
Kennedy, David K.
Kester, James E.
Kettler, Richard T.
Keyser, James E.
Kieling, Harry J., Jr.
Kinkade, William L.
Kirwan, Peter M.
Klayton, Alan R.
Klosterbuer, James A.
Konecni, Joseph A., Jr.
Kraeszig, John C.
Kruppenbacher, Paul H.
Krutar, Jon A.
Labarge, Stephen F.
Ladewig, Melvin E.
Landon, Clarence L.
Lanoue, Richard R.
Larson, Ralph H.
Laukhuf, Walden L. S.
Lazaro, Robert A.
Lebeau, Thomas J., Jr.
Leeper, William C.
Lehner, Louis R.
Lenhoff, Joseph R.
Lentz, Carl W.
Lentz, Paul W., Jr.
Lewis, James P.
Lewis, John A.
Link, James A.
Litzinger, Joseph A.
Lloyd, David R.
Lossmann, Wayne H.
Lovelace, Michael B.
Lowther, William R.
Lucas, William I.
Lumley, James R.
Lynk, Michael C.
Macnicoll, Donald C.
Mackey, Roy L.
Mahoney, James J.
Makar, James, Jr.
Maloney E. K., III
Mannell, Stephen C.
Mansfield, William J.
Martin, Frederick W.
Martin, William K., Jr.
Maso, Eugene C.
Masterson, John S., Jr.
Matestic, Ronald E.
Maynard, Harold W.
McCauley, Patrick H.
McCord, James E.
McIlvoy, David W.
McIntire, James L., Jr.
McKanna, John E.
McKinney, John C.
McMullen, Thomas E.
McNamee, Peter M.
McSheffrey, James J.
Michielutte, William L.
Mickelson, Thomas P.
Miller, Kenneth G.
Miller, Leo G., Jr.
Miller, Michael W.
Milligan, Thomas J.
Mills, Rix M.
Misak, Charles K.
Miskimen, James B.
Monk, Harrison G.
Moody, Howard Q.
Moon, Vorry C.
Moore, Garland F.
Moore, Thomas G.
Moorehead, James E.
Morgan, Jimmie L.
Morris, Robert D.
Morstain, Barry
Morton, Robert W.
Mosbruger, Charles D.
Moses, Marcus B.
Mosey, Edward F.
Myer, John W.
Nabours, Warren R.
Nall, Joseph M.
Nanney, Donald M.
Neidhart, James D.
Neiman, Thomas N.
Nettles, Thomas C.
Nielsen, Philip E.
Nogales, Luis G.
Novak, Theodore J.
Oberg, James E.
O'Connor, Gary E.
O'Connor, John T., Jr.
Ogle, Sherman F.
O'Halloran, Sinon K.
Olliff, David P.
Olsen, Dahl D.
Ontko, Michael S.
Padgett, Elmer M., Jr.
Parker, Walter A.
Parkerson, Warren O., II
Paulsen, Norman M.
Payet, Charles R.
Phillips, Richard J., Jr.
Pietz, Colin D.
Pinder, Robert G.
Pinkston, Kenneth N.
Plotkin, Louis J.
Poulos, James E., Jr.
Powell, Richard G.
Powell, Starr L.
Pratt, Thomas E.
Purcell, William A.
Purvis, Thomas L.
Ragan, Charles, III
Rahn, Larry B.
Rakowsky, Ronald J.
Ray, Albert L.
Ray, John C.
Reasor, Thomas W.
Reilley, Wayne P.
Reynolds, Gerald E.
Rist, Toivo E.
Ritchie, Edward A.
Ritner, Roy N., Jr.
Ritter, Robert C., Jr.
Roberts, John D.
Roberts, Laurence
Robinson, Harold R.
Robison, Joe E.
Rodrigues, Fernando N.
Rogan, John T.
Rogozinski, Robert S.
Rooney, Thomas M.
Rosenberg, Roger E.
Rosera, Eugene S.
Rosquist, Arne E., Jr.
Round, Eugene L.
Rouse, James B.
Rousseau, Kenneth P.
Rowe, Chandler W., Jr.
Rowe, Gordon D.
Russell, Robert E.
Sabo, Donald A.
Sandweg, William H., III
Schade, Carl C., III
Schappaugh, Ronald D.
Schmidt, Steven C.
Schott, John T.
Sells, James R.
Serrill, James D.
Sharkey, David J.
Sheffey, David W.
Shelton, Jack W., Jr.
Shelton, Lee M., II
Shoffner, Larry L.
Shriver, Larry L.
Sickler, Ronald E.
Sims, David K.
Singleton, James R., II
Smith, Dennis L.
Smith, Howard H., Jr.
Smith, Jack L.
Smith, James R.
Smith, James D.
Smith, Kittredge R.
Smith, Troy J.
Smith, William D.
Snakenberg, Robert M.
Snider Victor V.
Snyder, Albert J.
Snyder, Eric B.
Songer, Surain S., Jr.
Soucy, Robert B.
Spayd, Thomas F.
Spragg, Merwin E.
Stack, Edward G.
Stanley, James M.
Starr, Ronald L.
Starr, William
Stevens, Dale A.
Stevens, Joseph S.
Stockamp, Torval A.
Stone, John R.
Stone, Rodney H.
Stone, Stuart D.
Strahl, Frederick R.
Strickland, Daniel M.
Studdard, Gary L.
Subilia, Maurice H., Jr.
Suerken, John F.
Sutton, Stephen, Jr.
Sutton, William C.
Swenson, Stanley
Swope, James R.
Szczypien, John, Jr.
Taggart, Keith A.
Tasker, Peter S.
Tate, Robert W., III
Taylor, Usysses, III
Teak, James W.
Tharp, Dennis T.
Thomas, Donald J.
Thoreson, Paul T.
Thornton, Cyril W.
Tingey, Thomas J.
Tomlin, Steven L.
Tucker, Michael D.
Turner, John B.
Vairo, Joseph M.
Van de Putte, Gary G.
Vandervoort, Stephen R.
Varnadore, Henry C., III
Veve, Rafael A.
Virgin, Arthur M., III
Vissers, Walter V.
Wallace, Lee E.
Ward, Floyd E., Jr.
Warfel, Joseph R.
Warren, George C., III
Watson, Frank D.
Webb, James G.
Wells, Frank M.
Wells, Peter A.
Wendelken, Charles P.
Wendrock, Robert F., Jr.
Wernle, Charles F., II
Wetterling, Jerry D.
Wheeler, Wayne B.
Whipple, George N.
White, Edwin M.
Whitney, Christopher D.
Whiton, Roger C.
Wilde, Stephen M.
Wilke, Carl E., Jr.
Williams, Myron R.
Williams, Russell C., Jr.
Williamson, William B., Jr.
Willis, Donald E.
Willits, Daniel H.
Winterberg, Ferris L.
Winters, James J.
Wolcott, Kent E.
Wolfe, Alex V.
Wood, David G.
Wood, Jonathan S.
Woodruff, John D.
Woolace, James L.
Wooster, Larry M.
Worthen, Russell F.
Wright, George K.
Wright, James C. W.
Young, Reginald A.
Young, Samuel E., Jr.
Zeillmann, Raymond K.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 1, 1966:

TO BE POSTMASTER

The nomination sent to the Senate on February 16, 1966, of Thomas F. Collins to be postmaster at Linesville, in the State of Pennsylvania.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Joseph Palmer 2d, of Maryland a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be U.S. Governor of the Asian Development Bank.

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the Asian Development Bank.

Bernard Zagorin, of Virginia, to be U.S. Director of the Asian Development Bank.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Forty-eighth Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, March 25 marked the 48th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia and it was observed by the Byelorussian Americans in Chicago on Sunday the 27th.

March 25 is the symbol of unity, freedom, independence, and democracy for the Byelorussian people everywhere; however, only in the free world can the Byelorussian people keep these ideals alive and continue their strife for a truly independent Byelorussia. And the Byelorussian people are not alone in this strife today but have the support for their cause in every country in the world where freedom is abiding. Each year, on the anniversary of their independence day, the Byelorussians in the free world are reminded not to stop their national task and remain indifferent, but to strive in a united and true familylike tradition to achieve the independence of the Soviet Russian dominated Byelorussian nation.

It is appropriate that we rightfully take time to assure the Byelorussian people that their desire for freedom and independence has not been forgotten by those who enjoy these selfsame advantages. It is our devout hope that the day will soon come when all men will enjoy them and that the Byelorussians will at that time take their rightful place in the family of free nations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 4, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Rafael Grossman, Congregation Brothers of Israel, Long Branch, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our Fathers, author of liberty, who hath taken us out of the house of bondage and proclaimed freedom throughout the land on this historic day of the eve of Passover. In Thy guiding providence, may this sweet land of liberty, where Israel's children have found haven with the tired, the poor, the oppressed, yearning to be free, with all its privilege and power, be the keepers of the holy torch of freedom, the fathers kindled with their lives. While dark hatred still shackles men to servitude, and tyranny binds them with chains made of iron curtains, we pray that their broken hearts be bound and may liberty be proclaimed to the captives and open the eyes of those who are in bond.

Midst all the busy shuttles of world's woe and misery, as men mingle tears with tasks that seem hopeless, let us gathered in this august Chamber at the shrine of democracy face our hallowed mission to make all who bear His image free, free to live, free to choose, free to refuse, free to serve, free to love and free of hate, and on that day, He will give peace in the land as wars will cease and out of affliction now, all men shall prostrate at His altar of peace.

Spread Thy tabernacle of wisdom, strength, courage, and justice upon the President, Vice President, and men and women who gather here to represent a nation built upon Thy ordinance of man's sanctity. May their voices resound in a call to the oppressed everywhere: Let our people go. And then indeed shall they go forth with joy, and be led on with peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 31, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3349. An act for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; and

H.R. 8647. An act for the relief of the Troubadours Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6319. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries; and

H.R. 11029. An act relating to the tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 88th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 66–13.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE INFANTRY

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of my colleagues in the House to a recent message on the wire services indicating two of the regular Army brigades mentioned by our Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, as one among several important steps taken to produce readiness, still exist only on paper, it was learned today.

As one who considers the ground forces the foundation of our armed services and as one who considers that wars are customarily won or lost with ground, held or yielded by infantry troops, I think this is a most serious matter and I wish to call it to the attention of all concerned.

If, heaven forbid, we should be attacked, I hope it is Mr. McNamara, and not I, who is in the sector defended by these "Papermate" brigades.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON HIDE EXPORT CONTROLS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Commerce, in response to a number of complaints and requests from all over the United States, has just announced that he is setting public hearings on April 18 on the hide export controls which were imposed with very little notice on March 7. Those people wishing to be heard on this matter are given until April 12 to notify the Secretary of Commerce of their desire to be heard. I think this is the first step toward correcting what appears to many—and I am one of them—to be a very grave error in the order of March 7. I want to commend the Secretary of Commerce for taking this first step. I hope when he hears the evidence he will speedily rescind the order of March 7.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION REVOLVING FUND

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, when the House the other day passed unanimously Senate bill 2729 in regard to the Small Business Administration, you will recall that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] had an amendment which would set aside a sum of money in this particular bill which, at the time we were considering the bill, I said I thought would set up a separate revolving fund.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the colloquy engaged in between myself and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], he assured the House that his amendment was so drawn that it would not set up a separate revolving fund.

Mr. Speaker, I have the assurance of the staff of our committee that an amendment has gone through setting up what will actually be a separate fund.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a very unhappy development, and I hope that, together with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], we will be able to resolve this and soon accomplish what was assured the House would be the operation of this amendment.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] informed the House last Thursday that he deleted from his amendment anything that would create a second revolving fund. Therefore, the only thing he has done is to state that within the $1.4 billion there will be a ceiling of $100 million for the operation of the title IV.

I should like to bring this to the attention of the Members of the House, and to invite their cooperation in resolving this problem.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on this 17th anniversary of the NATO treaty we ought to take note of the events which we have seen in recent weeks in the unprecedented revival of interest in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. Speaker, only one other issue is of more concern to the United States and the rest of the free world today—and that is Vietnam.

At another time I shall discuss the initiative which the United States must take if we are to preserve the spirit and purpose of the alliance. Important decisions and negotiations about the Atlantic Community are taking place and it behooves us all to know and understand the full import of the current debate and actions.

TREASON UNPUNISHED IS TREASON REWARDED

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, a group of rioters ended a wild demonstration on the courthouse lawn at Cordele, Ga., by hauling down the American flag and that of the State of Georgia, and then tearing them to shreds.

To me this is the last straw in a series of treasonable acts that have torn at the very roots of what America stands for, among the nations of the world.

This despicable action by whimpering cowards, who are happy to live in protective security, while dedicated patriotic Americans are engaged in the dirtiest, nastiest, war against aggression in history, 8,000 miles from home, ought not to go unchallenged by those in authority.

Surely, the time has come for the U.S. Attorney General to crack down on the motley array of draft card burners, flag desecrators, and others who make public exhibitions of their contempt for law and order; but even more importantly their contempt for the symbols of our freedom, and our nationhood. Treason and sedition unpunished are treason and sedition rewarded.

I am sure the flag desecration in Georgia is not representative of the people in Georgia, regardless of race, just as I am certain that the draft card burnings in New York and California are abhorred by the vast majority of citizens in those States.

But, if our Federal Government is to stop these seedling sprouts of rebellion and anarchy, it is not enough merely to abhor what is happening. These acts of rebellion demand actions by Federal authorities in the Justice Department, not merely statements of concern.

Responsible dissent is one thing; but those who downgrade our country and desecrate its flag ought to be given one-way passports to sanctuaries behind the Iron Curtain—in North Vietnam, Red China, Cuba, or Russia. Let them try living for a few days in a Communist country where dissent—responsible or otherwise—is a sure ticket to the execution chamber.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

CONFIRMING STATE OF UTAH TITLE TO LANDS LYING BELOW MEANDER LINE OF THE GREAT SALT LAKE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1791) to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

RETROCEDING TO THE STATE OF KANSAS CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OVER HASKELL INSTITUTE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10476) to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell Institute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to query for the legislative record either the proponent of this bill or the members of the majority who are responsible for programing it today, as to what occurred to bring this situation to light.

I have no objection in principle to the bill. I know the Haskell Institute well. I played football against the famous Haskell Indians in my day in college. There are several questions about why this authority of the local law enforcement official was questioned after some 81 years.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman who I know is eminently qualified on all Indian affairs and with reference to this bill in particular.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, I will say to the distinguished gentleman, the purpose of this bill is to give the local authorities the right to police the grounds and so forth at athletic contests. In other words, to give the protection of police and fire and so forth to people attending these events.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman further, was there some complaint or was there some incident that brought this situation to light? I understand from the report that the Department of Justice just suddenly decided that they had complete jurisdiction not only of the university but of the grounds and so forth. I think for the legislative record we should know why the Department of Justice suddenly brought this up after 81 years.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. There was not any incident that brought this up. But the Justice Department, in reviewing the legislative and legal status of the Haskell Institute, developed that back in the 19th century when Haskell Institute was created and the grounds were put together and the buildings begun to be built, that under a provision of the Federal law, 355 Revised Statutes of the United States, which were in existence at that time but are no longer in existence today, the Kansas Legislature had been required to and did give consent to the building of Federal buildings on this land within the State of Kansas.

As the language in these early statutes of 1889 and 1891 was reviewed by the Department of Justice, it was felt that the language was too broad. The language in fact and in effect—that is in legal effect—under a broad interpretation, appeared to give the United States exclusive jurisdiction for all purposes over this area. That was not, of course, the intent and purpose of the United States—to have or claim exclusive jurisdiction.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the question by the consent objector from Missouri is, what suddenly brought this situation to light? We have had a lot of review of the law here which I think we all understand from the report. But who did actually question this authority after the some 81 years—going back to the last century? Was it the Department of Justice?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It was the Department of Justice.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for his answer.

Now was the authority of the local law enforcement officials, I will ask the gentleman from Florida or the gentleman from Kansas, questioned in connection with a violation of law on the campus, or the collection of taxes from employees residing on the campus including Indians or the Haskell Institute, students, professors, or otherwise—or was it the voting rights of employees residing on campus?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The answer to the gentleman's question is that there was none of any of these specific examples or questions that the gentleman has asked. The question was brought up in advance of any specific incident happening or seeming to happen—or even being in mind or in any prospect of happening.

So there is no specific case or matter that developed that brought this to the attention of anybody. There is no specific case or matter or problem now pending.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would continue under the reservation of objection to observe that there has seldom been a question of voting rights in the great State of Kansas. But it is well known that many post camps and installations as well as federally controlled enclaves or areas that were governed within the reversion clause of receding of lands to the Federal Government were examined about this time by the Department of Justice in connection with even the possibility of enforcing either civil rights or voting rights laws.

I will ask the gentleman once again, yes or no, was there any such incident involving our Indians in the Haskell Institute?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, the answer is there was not.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will ask for further information. What suits are pending and, if so, in what courts, questioning the authority of the local officials? It would seem that this might justly be a matter for court determination inasmuch as it has been raised by the Department of Justice prior to precipitously legislating in order to restore control and revert property.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, there are no court cases pending because there was no person or interest aggrieved.

Mr. HALL. Insofar as the gentleman knows, it is not contemplated that there will be any action taken in any Federal court?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. If the gentleman will yield further, that is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10476

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby retroceded to the State of Kansas by the United States concurrent jurisdiction over the site of Haskell Institute, at Lawrence, Kansas.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENTING TO THE ENTRY OF MASSACHUSETTS INTO A BUS TAXATION PRORATION AGREEMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13935) to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13935

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is given to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the Act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that Act and in the Act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157).

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE AND MUNICIPAL BOND WEEK

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 837) to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning April 17, 1966, as State and Municipal Bond Week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House joint resolution will be passed over without prejudice.

There was no objection.

CENTENNIAL YEAR OF PROSPECT PARK, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 597) relating to the centennial year of Prospect Park of the city of New York, Borough of Brooklyn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 597

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States recognizes on the occasion of the Centennial Year 1966 of Prospect Park of the city of New York, Borough of Brooklyn, the historic importance of this Nation's oldest urban recreation area and sends its greeting to the citizens of the city of New York in commemorating this event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MEDALS COMMEMORATING 1,000TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 139) to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the sponsor of this legislation and the four bills that follow, H.R. 10357, S. 2719, S. 2831, and S. 2835, if there is to be any gold or silver used in the striking of the medals that are authorized by the five bills?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I should like to say to the gentleman that there are no precious metals that will be used in the striking of these medals.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does my colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri, consider that gold and silver are precious metals?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes. And no gold or silver will be used.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to propound the same question to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri with reference to copper or cupro-nickel. We have heard that copper clad with silver for electromagnetic purposes has itself come into rather short supply so that the President has had to make it available from our stockpile in order to assuage the needs of industry in America.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Copper may be used for these medals if the Secretary of the Treasury so decides, as I assume he will, since copper is the main ingredient of our coinage.

Mr. HALL. Does the distinguished gentlewoman know whether that copper would come from the category of stockpiles over which the Chief Executive has control, or from the other two stockpiles over which the Congress has control?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I understand the stockpile over which the Executive has jurisdiction would be the preferable way to obtain it.

Mr. HALL. It was, of course preferable, when they recently put the 200,000 tons of copper on the market without consulting Congress for defense and other purposes, after the industrial user's shortage in copper developed. I thought perhaps it would be from the stockpile controlled by the Executive of other than critical and strategic material controlled by the U.S. Congress and its Committee on Armed Services stockpile. I wanted to get that in the record.

I have one additional question. Does the gentlewoman know if there are any costs to the taxpayers involved in the striking of these medals?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Let me answer the question this way. The copper will come from the same stockpiling source from which we get the metal for our coinage. In answer to the other question, there will be no cost at all to the taxpayers for the striking of the commemorative medals.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I should like to ask whether any silver is to be used in these medals.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. There will be no gold, and no silver.

COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS IN REFERENCE TO COMMEMORATIVE COINS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there are five similar bills on the Consent Calendar today which I hope can be passed without controversy. None of these bills for commemorative medals will cost the taxpayers a single cent. The Treasury does not make a move toward striking one of these medals until full security has been given by the sponsoring organization. We have approved a number of such bills in the past—6 of them in the past Congress, and 10 additional ones in recent years—and there has not been any difficulty of any kind about any of them.

The Secretary of the Treasury has full control over the production of these medals, once they are authorized; he must approve the size or sizes and the designs; he has full control over the kind of alloys they can be made from; he can shut off production at any time if all conditions are not met, or if the medals would interfere in any way with coinage operations.

Members should bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that prior to the development of this program for striking commemorative medals, at the request of nonprofit organizations, for important State or local or civic anniversaries or celebrations, the Congress used to be rather free in authorizing commemorative coins—usually half-dollars—for such purposes. Congressman Jack Cochrane of St. Louis, a predecessor of mine in the Congress, and a great one, pretty much put a stop to that when he was chairman of the Committee on Accounts—he filed a blistering report on the racketeering he discovered in connection with some of those commemorative 50-cent coins, which incidentally, today, bring hundreds of dollars in the coin market.

No coins are involved here. These medals have a rather limited appeal. It takes real salesmanship on the part of the sponsoring organizations to sell them to coin collectors because they have no intrinsic value. After the initial expenditure of about $3,000 for dies, and so on, the bronze medals cost only about 30 cents apiece to the sponsors, and they then try to sell them for anywhere from $1.50 to $3, using the proceeds for worthwhile public purposes.

Three years ago, we conducted full hearings on the idea of such medals, as a substitute for commemorative coins, in the subcommittee of which I am chairman, of the Banking and Currency Committee. The Treasury strongly supported a continuation of the commemorative medal program.

I might say that the authorized limitations in the bills on the number of medals to be struck in each instance are often very optimistic. Several years ago, we enacted a bill of mine to authorize 100,000 medals marking the bicentennial of St. Louis. I just checked with the mint on that and found that only 25,000 were actually made prior to the expiration of the authorization on December 31, 1965. I am going to include a list of all recent medals and show how many were authorized and how many were actually produced.

MEDALS MANUFACTURED UNDER PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I now include a listing of all of the commemorative medals manufactured by the mint in recent years under similar legislative authority—showing the number authorized in each instance and the number actually delivered by the mint by the end of the year listed as the expiration date of the authorization.

West Virginia Statehood Centennial: 770,020 authorized. Produced: 20 platinum, 6,000 silver, 20,000 bronze (1963).

Mobile 250th Anniversary: 5,000 authorized. Produced: 5,000 silver (1961).

Texas Heritage: 2,000 authorized. Produced: 2,000 bronze.

MacArthur Memorial: 500,000 authorized. Produced: 1 gold, 11,000 bronze (1964).

Nevada Silver Centennial: 1,000 authorized. Produced: 1,000 silver (1962).

Nevada Statehood Centennial: 20,000 authorized. Produced: 20,000 silver (1964).

Colorado Centennial: 10,000 authorized. Produced: 10,000 silver (1959).

Kansas Statehood Centennial: 20,000 authorized. Produced: 20,000 (1961).

Pony Express Centennial: 500,000 authorized. Produced: 1 platinum, 7 gold, 12,000 silver, 61,000 bronze (1961).

Century 21 Exposition: 500,000 authorized. Produced: 8 gold, 11,015 silver, 140,000 brass.

Padre Junipera Serra 250th Anniversary: 300,000 authorized. Produced: 25 Platinum, 5 gold, 10,000 silver, 82,000 bronze (1965).

ILGWU Health Plan Golden Anniversary: 2,000 authorized. Produced: 1 silver presented to President Johnson, 2,000 bronze (1965).

St. Louis Bicentennial: 100,000 authorized. Produced: 10,000 silver, 15,000 bronze (1965).

New York National Shrines: 765,000 authorized. Produced: 18 gold, 18,000 silver (bronze medals made by private firm using mint dies) (1965).

Indiana Statehood Sesquicentennial: 100,000 authorized. Produced: none (1966).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall strike and furnish for the Polish American Congress, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), a not-for-profit organization observing the one thousandth anniversary of the founding of the Polish nation, to which more than fifteen million Americans can trace their proud ancestry, national medals in communication of such anniversary.

Sec. 2. Such medals shall be of such sizes, materials, and designs, and shall be so inscribed, as the corporation may determine with the approval of the Secretary.

Sec. 3. Not more than one million of such medals may be produced. Production shall be in such quantities, not less than two thousand, as may be ordered by the corporation, but no work may be commenced on any order unless the Secretary has received security satisfactory to him for the payment of the cost of the production of such order. Such cost shall include labor, material, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, as determined by the Secretary. No medals may be produced pursuant to this Act after December 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Upon receipt of payment for such medals in the amount of the cost thereof as determined pursuant to section 3, the Secretary shall deliver the medals as the corporation may request.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "communication" and insert the word "commemoration".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECRET SERVICE CENTENNIAL MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10357) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Secret Service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10357

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Secret Service, the Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to strike bronze medals of a suitable size, and with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined solely by the Secretary.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall cause such medals to be struck and sold by the mint, as a list medal, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA CENTENNIAL MEDAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2719) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to verify and confirm again the question concerning whether the cost of striking this medal will come out of the $4.5 million recently allocated by House-passed action, or whether there is an additional possible cost to the American taxpayer?

Mrs. **SULLIVAN**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **HALL**. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. **SULLIVAN**. The answer is "no" to the gentleman. These medals will not cost the taxpayer anything.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2719

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia (which anniversary will be celebrated in 1967), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Alaska Centennial Commission not more than two hundred thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Alaska Centennial Commission subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the Commission in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1967. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture; including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such Commission.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCRANTON, PA., 100TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2831) to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2831

Be it enaced by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pennsylvania, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Scranton Association, Incorporated, not more than one hundred and fifty thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Scranton Association, Incorporated, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the association in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1966. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such association.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. **McDADE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McDADE**. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare privilege for me to take the floor today in behalf of legislation which will honor a great city, the city of Scranton. That city is observing the 100th anniversary of its founding, and I am proud to be the Congressman representing Scranton in this auspicious year.

At the beginning of this year, after conferring with the Banking and Currency Committee, with the Bureau of the Budget, and with the Treasury Department, I drew up legislation to authorize the minting of a commemorative medal to honor Scranton in its 100th year. I then conferred with my distinguished colleague in the other body, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator HUGH SCOTT. The distinguished Senator agreed to sponsor the legislation in the Senate, and did so. It was reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee, and was passed by that body on March 14. I was delighted at this rapid action in the Senate, as was also the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

In rapid fashion, too, the bill has been reported out of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and has been called up on the Consent Calendar. I am grateful to my colleague from Missouri for the rapid action of her subcommittee in this matter. In the interest of saving time, the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee is substituting the Senate bill, and I am indeed grateful to the distinguished chairman for this fine action.

This is indeed a bill eminently worthy of passage. Scranton is a city which might be held up to all other cities in America as an example of true American initiative and know-how. Over the course of the century of its existence, Scranton rose in prominence as a great center of the anthracite coal industry in America. For many generations, the coal industry was the dominant industry of the community, and the lives of her people centered about the coal mines, the collieries, and the breakers. But time was unkind to the coal industry, and gradually the coal mining fell off and unemployment walked among us.

But if the coal industry was falling slowly into a low place in the national industrial picture, Scranton was not willing to die because of the failure of its principal industry.

The people of Scranton set to work to build up new industries. They formed industrial development organizations which raised money from among the people of Scranton, then went out looking for industry. They were cited by Look magazine as one of the outstanding cities in America for this program which was called Operation Bootstrap.

I might remark in passing that in 1962, when I was first elected to Congress, the unemployment rate in Scranton stood at approximately 14 percent. Today that unemployment rate has been cut in half. In that same year, 1962, the men of Scranton walked the streets of the city and of nearby cities seeking any job they might find. Today the industrial growth is so significant that the companies are now out walking the streets looking for the workers to fill the factories to fill the contracts.

Scranton has begun a whole new growth, and so this centennial looks not only to the past, but even more so to the future. I do not have the crystal ball that might tell what the next hundred years might bring. But I do have one piece of knowledge that is invaluable in making such a prediction. I know the people of Scranton.

They are the salt of the earth. They are industrious. They are intelligent. They are ambitious for a better city. They are the friendliest people on earth. So I look to the future with great confidence. I do not know who will be the Congressman from that district when the second centennial rolls around. But whoever he may be, I know that he will still represent a community bursting with a desire to grow, to improve, to lead the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to lead the Nation. And I know he will still represent the salt of the earth.

I would make one note of clarification with regard to the paragraph entitled "Use of Precious Metals" on page 2 of House Report No. 1383. In advising the committee, I made the inadvertent use of the word "strategic" where I should have used the word "precious," such as gold or silver. I want to note that there may well be the use of such a metal as copper in the striking of this metal, and copper is a strategic metal. The amount of copper that might be used in these medals, however, will be so slight as to have no impact whatsoever on our national defense.

I hope my colleagues will see fit to pass this bill which I authored. It is a good bill to honor a great city.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY MEDAL OF THE AMERICAN NUMISMATIC ASSOCIATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2835) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2835

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding in 1891 of the American Numismatic Association, which now holds a perpetual Federal charter from the Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the American Numismatic Association not more than fifty thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Numismatic Association subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the association in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1967. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such various metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the American Numismatic Association.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

FEDERAL SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14122) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, my motion to suspend the rules is made with the clear understanding that it will establish no precedent for similar consideration of major Federal salary and fringe benefit legislation in the future.

The SPEAKER. With that understanding, the Chair recognizes the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 14122, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14122

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966".

TITLE I—EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Short title

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1966".

Employees subject to Classification Act of 1949

SEC. 102. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (79 Stat. 1111; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,609	$3,731	$3,853	$3,975	$4,097	$4,219	$4,341	$4,463	$4,585	$4,707
GS-2	3,925	4,058	4,191	4,324	4,457	4,590	4,723	4,856	4,989	5,122
GS-3	4,269	4,413	4,557	4,701	4,845	4,989	5,133	5,277	5,421	5,565
GS-4	4,776	4,936	5,096	5,256	5,416	5,576	5,736	5,896	6,056	6,126
GS-5	5,331	5,507	5,683	5,859	6,035	6,211	6,387	6,563	6,739	6,915
GS-6	5,867	6,065	6,263	6,461	6,659	6,857	7,055	7,253	7,451	7,649
GS-7	6,451	6,664	6,877	7,090	7,303	7,516	7,729	7,942	8,155	8,368
GS-8	7,068	7,303	7,538	7,773	8,008	8,243	8,478	8,713	8,948	9,183
GS-9	7,696	7,957	8,218	8,479	8,740	9,001	9,262	9,523	9,784	10,045
GS-10	8,421	8,709	8,997	9,285	9,573	9,861	10,149	10,437	10,725	11,013
GS-11	9,221	9,536	9,851	10,166	10,481	10,796	11,111	11,426	11,741	12,056
GS-12	10,927	11,306	11,685	12,064	12,443	12,822	13,201	13,580	13,959	14,338
GS-13	12,873	13,321	13,769	14,217	14,665	15,113	15,561	16,009	16,457	16,905
GS-14	15,106	15,269	16,152	16,675	17,198	17,721	18,244	18,767	19,290	19,813
GS-15	17,550	18,157	18,764	19,371	19,978	20,585	21,192	21,799	22,406	23,013
GS-16	20,075	20,745	21,415	22,085	22,755	23,425	24,095	24,765	25,435	----------
GS-17	22,760	23,520	24,280	25,040	25,800	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
GS-18	25,890	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------".

(b) Except as provided in section 504(d) of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (78 Stat. 412; 5 U.S.C. 1173(d)), the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b)(4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

New appointments under Classification Act of 1949

SEC. 103. Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (78 Stat. 401; 5 U.S.C. 1131), relating to new appointments, is amended by striking out "grade 13" and inserting in lieu thereof "grade 11."

Postal field service employees

SEC. 104. (a) Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

"POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

"PFS	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$4,204	$4,343	$4,482	$4,621	$4,760	$4,899	$5,038	$5,177	$5,316	$5,455	$5,594	$5,733
2	4,552	4,701	4,850	4,999	5,148	5,297	5,446	5,595	5,744	5,893	6,042	6,191
3	4,919	5,085	5,261	5,417	5,583	5,749	5,915	6,081	6,247	6,413	6,579	6,745
4	5,331	5,507	5,683	5,859	6,035	6,211	6,387	6,563	6,739	6,915	7,091	7,267
5	5,697	5,888	6,079	6,270	6,461	6,652	6,843	7,034	7,225	7,416	7,607	7,798
6	6,113	6,316	6,519	6,722	6,925	7,128	7,331	7,534	7,737	7,940	8,132	8,346
7	6,545	6,763	6,981	7,199	7,417	7,635	7,853	8,071	8,289	8,507	8,725	--------
8	7,088	7,323	7,558	7,793	8,028	8,263	8,498	8,733	8,968	9,203	--------	--------
9	7,665	7,920	8,175	8,430	8,685	8,940	9,195	9,450	9,705	9,960	--------	--------
10	8,345	8,628	8,911	9,194	9,477	9,760	10,043	10,326	10,609	10,892	--------	--------
11	9,221	9,536	9,851	10,166	10,481	10,796	11,111	11,426	11,741	12,056	--------	--------
12	10,202	10,549	10,896	11,243	11,590	11,937	12,284	12,631	12,978	13,325	--------	--------
13	11,274	11,663	12,052	12,441	12,830	13,219	13,608	13,997	14,386	14,775	--------	--------
14	12,427	12,859	13,291	13,723	14,155	14,587	15,019	15,451	15,883	16,315	--------	--------
15	13,736	14,210	14,684	15,158	15,632	16,106	16,580	17,054	17,528	18,002	--------	--------
16	15,179	15,707	16,235	16,763	17,291	17,819	18,347	18,875	19,403	19,931	--------	--------
17	16,793	17,380	17,967	18,554	19,141	19,728	20,315	20,902	21,489	22,076	--------	--------
18	18,530	19,145	19,760	20,375	20,990	21,605	22,220	22,835	23,450	24,065	--------	--------
19	20,525	21,210	21,895	22,580	23,265	23,950	24,635	25,320	--------	--------	--------	--------
20	22,760	23,520	24,280	25,040	25,800	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------".

(b) Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS'. Compensation shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with this schedule.

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

	"Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carrier in rural delivery service:												
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,391	$2,507	$2,623	$2,739	$2,855	$2,971	$3,087	$3,203	$3,319	$3,435	$3,551	$3,667
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25".

(c) Section 3544(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule, which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'FOS', for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class, which is based on the revenue units of the post office for the preceding fiscal year. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

"FOURTH CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

"Revenue units	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but fewer than 36	$4,019	$4,152	$4,285	$4,418	$4,551	$4,684	$4,817	$4,950	$5,083	$5,216	$5,349	$5,482
24 but fewer than 30	3,715	3,837	3,959	4,081	4,203	4,325	4,447	4,569	4,691	4,813	4,935	5,057
18 but fewer than 24	3,064	3,168	3,272	3,376	3,480	3,584	3,688	3,792	3,896	4,000	4,104	4,208
12 but fewer than 18	2,407	2,485	2,563	2,641	2,719	2,797	2,875	2,953	3,031	3,109	3,187	3,265
6 but fewer than 12	1,736	1,791	1,846	1,901	1,956	2,011	2,066	2,121	2,176	2,231	2,286	2,341
Fewer than 6	1,398	1,443	1,488	1,533	1,578	1,623	1,668	1,713	1,758	1,803	1,848	1,893".

(d) The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth Class Office Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration

SEC. 105. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"Section 4103 schedule

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, $25,890.

"Medical Director, $22,760 minimum to $25,800 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"Director of Chaplain Service, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"Physician and dentist schedule

"Director grade, $20,075 minimum to $25,435 maximum.

"Executive grade, $18,730 minimum to $24,355 maximum.

"Chief grade, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"Senior grade, $15,106 minimum to $19,813 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $12,873 minimum to $16,905 maximum.

"Full grade, $10,927 minimum to $14,338 maximum.

"Associate grade, $9,221 minimum to $12,056 maximum.

"Nurse schedule

"Assistant Director grade, $15,106 minimum to $19,813 maximum.

"Chief grade, $12,873 minimum to $16,905 maximum.

"Senior grade, $10,927 minimum to $14,338 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $9,221 minimum to $12,056 maximum.

"Full grade, $7,696 minimum to $10,045 maximum.

"Associate grade, $6,730 minimum to $8,749 maximum.

"Junior grade, $5,867 minimum to $7,649 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position."

Foreign Service officers; staff officers and employees

SEC. 106. (a) The fourth sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$23,935	$24,770	$25,890				
Class 2	19,504	20,181	20,858	$21,535	$22,212	$22,889	$23,566
Class 3	15,841	16,391	16,941	17,491	18,041	18,591	19,141
Class 4	12,873	13,321	13,769	14,217	14,665	15,113	15,561
Class 5	10,602	10,970	11,338	11,706	12,074	12,442	12,810
Class 6	8,843	9,147	9,451	9,755	10,059	10,363	10,667
Class 7	7,473	7,724	7,975	8,226	8,477	8,728	8,979
Class 8	6,451	6,664	6,877	7,090	7,303	7,516	7,729".

(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$15,841	$16,391	$16,941	$17,491	$18,041	$18,591	$19,141	$19,691	$20,241	$20,791
Class 2	12,873	13,321	13,769	14,217	14,665	15,113	15,561	16,009	16,457	16,905
Class 3	10,602	10,970	11,338	11,706	12,074	12,442	12,810	13,178	13,546	13,914
Class 4	8,843	9,147	9,451	9,755	10,059	10,363	10,667	10,971	11,275	11,579
Class 5	7,974	8,246	8,518	8,790	9,062	9,334	9,606	9,878	10,150	10,422
Class 6	7,201	7,441	7,681	7,921	8,161	8,401	8,641	8,881	9,121	9,361
Class 7	6,614	6,832	7,050	7,268	7,486	7,704	7,922	8,140	8,358	8,576
Class 8	5,853	6,051	6,249	6,447	6,645	6,843	7,041	7,239	7,437	7,635
Class 9	5,341	5,517	5,693	5,869	6,045	6,221	6,397	6,573	6,749	6,925
Class 10	4,776	4,936	5,096	5,256	5,416	5,576	5,736	5,896	6,056	6,216".

(c) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committee employees

SEC. 107. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102(a) of this title for corresponding rates of compensation.

Salary rates fixed by administrative action

SEC. 108. (a) The rates of basic compensation of assistant United States attorneys whose basic salaries are fixed pursuant to section 508 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased, effective on the effective date of section 102 of this title, by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102(a) of this title for corresponding rates of compensation.

(b) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this Act are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on the effective date of section 102 of this title, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this title for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be held or considered to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

(d) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority contained in any law pursuant to which rates of compensation may be fixed by administrative action.

Effective dates

SEC. 109. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and sections 101, 103, and 108 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Sections 102, 104, 105, 106, and 107 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966.

TITLE II—JUDICIAL BRANCH

Short title

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1966".

Judicial branch employees

SEC. 202. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 671 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 675, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 102 (a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding upgraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to such section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Effective dates

SEC. 203. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and section 201 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Section 202 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966.

TITLE III—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Short title

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1966".

Legislative branch employees

SEC. 302. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government, whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 2.9 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this section, shall be increased by 2.9 per centum. Notwithstanding section 303 of this title or any other provision of this section, the total annual compensation of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall be an amount which is equal to the total annual compensation of the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, respectively.

(c) The rates of compensation of employees of the House of Representatives whose compensation is fixed by the House Employees Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act (78 Stat. 1079–1084; Public Law 88–652; 2 U.S.C. 291–303), including each employee subject to such Act whose compensation is fixed at a saved rate, are hereby increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by subsection (a) of this section.

(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and following).

(e) This section shall not apply with respect to the compensation of student congressional interns authorized by House Resolution 416, Eighty-ninth Congress, and the compensation of employees whose compensation is fixed by the House Wage Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act.

Salary increase limitation

SEC. 303. No rate of compensation shall be increased, by reason of the enactment of this title, to an amount in excess of the salary rate now or hereafter in effect for level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

Effective dates

SEC. 304. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and section 301 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Sections 302 and 303 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Salary steps for certain employees transferred to Postal Field Service

SEC. 401. Section 3551 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Postmaster General may appoint or advance any Federal employee who, together with his function, is transferred, prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this subsection, to a post office or other postal installation at or to (1) the minimum rate for his position, or (2) any higher rate for his position which is less than one full step above the highest rate of compensation received by him immediately prior to such transfer.".

Postal seniority adjustments

SEC. 402. Section 3552(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Postmaster General shall advance any employee in the postal field service who—

"(1) was promoted to a higher level between July 9, 1960, and October 13, 1962; and

"(2) is senior with respect to total postal service to an employee in the same post office promoted to the same level on or after October 13, 1962, and is in a step in the same level below the step of the junior employee.

Such advancement by the Postmaster General shall be to the highest step which is held by any such junior employee. Any increase under the provisions of this subsection shall not constitute an equivalent increase and credit earned prior to adjustment under this subsection for advancement to the next step shall be retained.".

Special delivery messengers

SEC. 403. Section 3542(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "7 cents per mile or major fraction thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 cents per mile or major fraction thereof"; and

(2) by striking out "90 cents per hour" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1.25 per hour".

Overtime

SEC. 404. (a) Section 201 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 911), is amended—

(1) by inserting "or in excess of eight hours in a day" immediately following "in excess of forty hours in any administrative workweek"; and

(2) by striking out "grade GS-9", wherever occurring therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "grade GS-10".

(b) Section 202 of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 912), is amended by striking out "grade GS-9" and inserting in lieu thereof "grade GS-10".

(c) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 3573 of title 39, United States Code, are amended by striking out "level PFS-7" and "level PFS-8", wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "level PFS-10" and "level PFS-11", respectively.

(d) Subsection (a) of section 3575 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Sections 3571, 3573, and 3574 of this title do not apply to postmasters, rural carriers, and postal inspectors."

Sunday premium pay

SEC. 405. (a) The heading of title III of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—COMPENSATION FOR NIGHT, SUNDAY, AND HOLIDAY WORK"

(b) Section 302 of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 922), is redesignated as section 303 of such Act.

(c) Title III of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 921 and following), is amended by inserting immediately following section 301 thereof the following:

"Compensation for Sunday work

"SEC. 302. All work not exceeding eight hours which is not overtime work as defined in section 201 of this Act and which is performed within the period commencing at midnight Saturday and ending at midnight Sunday shall be compensated at the rate of basic compensation of the officer or employee performing such work on Sunday plus premium compensation at a rate equal to 25 per centum of his rate of basic compensation."

(d) Section 401(1) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 926(1)), is amended by inserting ", Sunday," immediately following the word "night".

(e) Section 401(2) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 926(2)), is amended by inserting ", on Sundays," immediately following the words "duty at night".

(f) The first paragraph of section 23 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1935, as amended (5 U.S.C. 673c), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *Provided further*, That employees subject to this section whose regular work schedule includes an eight-hour period of service any part of which is within the period commencing at midnight Saturday and ending at midnight Sunday shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 25 per centum of his hourly rate of basic compensation for each hour of work performed during such eight-hour period of service".

Health and insurance coverage for certain employees on leave without pay

SEC. 406. (a) Section 6 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2095), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing, an officer or employee who enters on approved leave without pay to serve as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 2 of this Act, may, within sixty days after entering on such leave without pay, elect to continue his insurance and arrange to pay currently into the fund, through his employing agency, both employee and agency contributions. If he does not so elect, his insurance will continue during nonpay status and terminate as provided in subsection (a) this section. The employing agency shall forward the premium payments to the fund established by section 5 of this Act."

(b) Section 7(b) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3006(b)), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(b)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) An employee who enters on approved leave without pay to serve as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 2 of this Act, may, within sixty days after entering on such leave without pay, file with his employing agency an election to continue his health benefits coverage and arrange to pay currently into the fund, through his employing agency, both employee and agency contributions. If he does not so elect, his coverage will terminate as specified in paragraph (1) and implementing regulations. The employing agency shall forward the enrollment charges so paid to the fund."

(c) An officer or employee who is on approved leave without pay and serving as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 2 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091), or section 2 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3001), as the case may be may, within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act, file with his employing agency an election to continue any insurance, or health benefits coverage, or both, that he has on the date of enactment of this Act, and arrange to pay currently into the employees' life insurance fund and the employees' health benefits fund, as appropriate, both employee and agency contributions. The employing agency shall forward such payments to the employees' life insurance fund and the employees' health benefits fund, as appropriate. If he does not so elect, any life insurance and health benefits coverage will continue and terminate as for other employees in nonpay status.

(d) The United States Civil Service Commission is authorized to issue regulations to carry out the purposes of this section and the amendments made by this section.

Increase in uniform allowances

SEC. 407. The Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131–2133), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 405. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, each of the respective maximum uniform allowances in effect on April 1, 1966, for the respective categories of employees to whom uniform allowances are paid under this title are hereby increased, subject to the maximum allowance authorized by this title, as follows:

"(1) If the maximum uniform allowance is $100 or more, such allowance shall be increased by 25 per centum.

"(2) If the maximum uniform allowance is $75 or more but less than $100, such allowance shall be increased by 30 per centum.

"(3) If the maximum uniform allowance is $50 or more but less than $75, such allowance shall be increased by 35 per centum.

"(4) If the maximum uniform allowance is less than $50, such allowance shall be increased by 40 per centum.

Such maximum uniform allowances, as in effect on April 1, 1966, and as increased by this section, shall not be reduced.".

Effective dates

SEC. 408. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and sections 401, 402, 406, and 407 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Sections 403, 404, and 405 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966.

TITLE V—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

Short title

SEC. 501. This title may be cited as the "Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1966".

Definitions

SEC. 502. Section 1(j) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 (j)) is amended to read as follows:

"(j) The term 'child', for purposes of section 10(d), shall mean an unmarried child, including (1) an adopted child, and (2) a stepchild or recognized natural child who lived with the employee or Member in a regular parent-child relationship, under the age of eighteen years, or such unmarried child regardless of age who because of physical or mental disability incurred before age eighteen is incapable of self-support, or such unmarried child between eighteen and twenty-two years of age who is a student regularly pursuing a full-time course of study or training in residence in a high school, trade school, technical or vocational institute, junior college, college, university, or comparable recognized educational institution. A child who is a student shall not be deemed to have ceased to be a student during any interim between school years, semesters, or terms if the interim, or other period of nonattendance, does not exceed four calendar months and if he shows to the satisfaction of the Commission that he has a bona fide intention of continuing to pursue such course during the school year, semester, or term immediately following the interim. The term 'child', for purposes of section 11, shall include an adopted child and a natural child, but shall not include a stepchild."

Retirement coverage for certain employees on leave without pay

SEC. 503. Section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2253) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k)(1) An employee who enters on approved leave without pay to serve as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 1(a) of this Act, may, within sixty days after entering on such leave without pay, file with his employing agency an election to receive full retirement credit for his periods of such leave without pay and arrange to pay currently into the fund, through his employing agency, amounts equal to the retirement deductions which would be applicable if he were in pay status. An employee who is on approved leave without pay and serving as a full-time officer or employee of such an organization on the date of enactment of this subsection may similarly elect within sixty days after such date of enactment. If the election provided by this paragraph is not made, the employee shall receive credit for such periods of leave without pay as provided in the second sentence of section 3(c) of this Act.

"(2) An employee may deposit with interest an amount equal to retirement deductions representing periods of approved leave without pay while serving, prior to the date of enactment of this subsection, as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 1(a) of this Act, and may receive full retirement credit for such periods of leave without pay. In the event of his death, a survivor as defined in section 1(o) of this Act may make such deposit. If the deposit described in this paragraph is not made, retirement credit shall be allowed in accordance with the second sentence of section 3(c) of this Act."

Immediate retirement

SEC. 504. (a) Section 6(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2256(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Any employee who attains the age of fifty-five years and completes thirty years of service shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9."

(b) Section 6(b) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2256(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any employee who attains the age of sixty years and completes twenty years of service shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9."

(c) Section 6(f) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2256(f)) is amended—

(1) by inserting in the third sentence thereof immediately following the words "Any Member" the words "or former Member"; and

(2) by adding immediately following the third sentence thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of the immediately preceding sentence, service in an office or position in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, including each corporation owned or controlled by such Government, which terminates after March 31, 1966, shall be held and considered to be Member service.".

Annuity computation

SEC. 505. (a) Section 9(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2259(c)) is amended by striking out in the second sentence thereof the words "from the service" and inserting in lieu thereof "or, if he elects to have his annuity computed or recomputed pursuant to section 13(c) of this Act following service in an appointive position which terminates after March 31, 1966, the basic salary he is receiving at the time of separation from such appointive position, whichever is the greater".

(b) Section 9(d) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2259(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The annuity as hereinbefore provided, for an employee retiring under section 6(d), shall be reduced by one-sixth of 1 per centum for each full month such employee is under the age of fifty-five years at date of separation. The annuity as hereinbefore provided, for a Member retiring under the second or third sentence of section 6(f) or the third sentence of section 8(b), shall be reduced by one-twelfth of 1 per centum for each full month not in excess of sixty, and one-sixth of 1 per centum for each full month in excess of sixty, such Member is under the age of sixty years at date of separation."

Survivor annuities

SEC. 506. (a) Section 10(a)(2) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2260(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) An annuity computed under this subsection shall commence on the day after the retired employee dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before (A) in the case of the survivor of a retired employee, the survivor's remarriage prior to attaining age sixty, or death or (B) in the case of the survivor of a Member, the survivor's death or remarriage."

(b) The last sentence of section 10(c) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2260(c)) is amended to read as follows: "The annuity of such widow or dependent widower shall commence on the day after the employee or Member dies, and an annuity under this subsection or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) the death of the widow or widower, (2) remarriage of the widow or widower of an employee prior to attaining age sixty, (3) remarriage of the widow or widower of a Member regardless of age, or (4) the widower's becoming capable of self-support."

(c) Section 10(d) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2260(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) If an employee or a Member dies after completing at least five years of civilian service, or an employee or a Member dies after having retired under any provision of this Act, and is survived by a wife or by a husband, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 40 per centum of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) $600, or (3) $1,800 divided by the number of children, subject to the provisions of section 18. If such employee or Member is not survived by a wife or husband, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 50 per centum of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) $720, or (3) $2,160 divided by the number of children, subject to the provisions of section 18. The child's annuity shall commence on the day after the employee or Member dies or the first day of the month in which the child later becomes or again becomes a student as described in section 1(j), provided the lump-sum credit, if paid, is returned to the fund. Such annuity granted under this Act or under the Act of May 29, 1930, as amended from and after February 28, 1948, or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) the child's attaining age eighteen unless he is then a student as described or incapable of self-support, (2) his becoming capable of self-support after attaining age eighteen unless he is then such a student, (3) his attaining age twenty-two if he is then such a student and not incapable of self-support, (4) his ceasing to be such a student after attaining age eighteen unless he is then incapable of self-support, (5) his marriage, or (6) his death, whichever first occurs. Upon the death of the surviving wife or husband or termination of the child's annuity, the annuity of any other child or children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife, husband, or child had not survived the employee or Member."

(d) Section 10 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2260) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(f) In the case of a surviving spouse whose annuity under this section is hereafter terminated because of remarriage before attaining age sixty, annuity at the same rate shall be restored commencing on the day such remarriage is dissolved by death, annulment, or divorce: *Provided*, That (1) said surviving spouse elects to receive such annuity in lieu of any survivor benefit to which he or she may be entitled, under this or any other retirement system established for employees of the Government, by reason of the remarriage and (2) any lump sum paid upon termination of the annuity is returned to the fund."

Recomputation of certain annuities

SEC. 507. Effective July 1, 1966, the annuity of—

(1) each retired employee who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act on or after April 1, 1948, and prior to October 11, 1962, and who elected a reduction in his or her annuity in order to provide a survivor annuity for his or her spouse,

(2) each survivor designated by an individual who retired under such Act as described in subparagraph (1) of this section, and

(3) each surviving spouse whose entitlement to annuity under such Act resulted from the death of an employee on or after February 29, 1948, and prior to October 11, 1962.

shall be recomputed and paid as if the formula enacted by section 1103 of the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 870; Public Law 87-793) had been in effect on the date of such retirement or death. No decrease shall be made, by reason of the enactment of this section, in the annuity received by any person immediately prior to July 1, 1966, or the annuity which any person may be entitled to receive immediately prior to such date. The annuity of a child shall not be affected by reason of the enactment of this section. No annuity shall be paid, by reason of the enactment of this section, for any period prior to the date of such enactment.

Effective dates

SEC. 508. (a) Except as otherwise provided, this section, section 507, section 509, and subsection 1(j), 3(k), 6(a), 6(b), 6(f), 9(c), 9(d), 10(a)(2), 10(c), 10(d), and 10(f) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as enacted or amended by this title, shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The amendments made by this title, except the amendment to section 1(j) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, shall not apply in the cases of persons retired or otherwise separated prior to these respective effective dates, and the rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if this title had not been enacted.

(c) The amendment made by this title to section 1(j) of the Civil Service Retirement Act shall become effective with respect to the children of persons retired or otherwise separated prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, except that no annuity shall be paid by reason of this amendment for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

Miscellaneous

SEC. 509. The provisions under the heading "CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85-844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' HEALTH BENEFITS

Government contributions

SEC. 601. Subsection (a) of section 7 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (73 Stat. 713; 5 U.S.C. 3006(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the biweekly Government contribution for health benefits for employees or annuitants enrolled in health benefits plans under this Act, in addition to the contributions required by paragraph (3), shall be $1.62 if the enrollment is for self alone or $3.94 if the enrollment if for self and family, commencing with the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1966.

"(2) For an employee or annuitant enrolled in a plan for which the biweekly subscription charge is less than twice the Government contribution established under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Government contribution shall be 50 per centum of the subscription charge, commencing with the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1966."

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **CORBETT**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **BOW**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 55]

Adair
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashbrook
Barrett
Bell
Blatnik
Bolling
Bray
Brock
Burleson
Cabell
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Conyers
Cramer
Daddario
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dowdy
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Farbstein
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Grider
Griffin
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Herlong
Holland
Jacobs
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, N.C.
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Long, La.
McCarthy
McDowell
MacGregor
Mackay
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Miller
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Brien
O'Neal, Ga.
Pepper
Pool
Powell
Randall
Reinecke
Resnick
Roberts
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Scheuer
Scott
Senner
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Toll
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Weltner
White, Tex.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wydler
Yates

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 333 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. **MORRISON**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 14122, is the best bill our committee could develop and remain within the President's guidepost for wages and fringe benefits for 1966.

The bill was reported by a joint meeting of our Subcommittee on Compensation and Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, by a unanimous vote. Also, the full committee reported the bill by a unanimous vote of 22 to 0.

This bill provides for a 2.85-percent increase across the board. The overtime and Sunday premium compensation provisions, and the option of retiring at age 55 with 30 years of service, as well as the other fringe benefits included in our bill will be of great importance and benefit to the Federal employees.

I personally want to commend the very fine diligence and spirit of cooperation in which all Members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee worked together to bring out a bill that we believe stays within the President's guidelines of 3.2 percent.

I particularly want to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Arizona, the Honorable MORRIS K. UDALL, and the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable DOMINICK V. DANIELS, chairmen of the two subcommittees which held extensive hearings and gave very thorough consideration to this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is based on the recommendation of the President. It was stated in his message to the Congress, and I quote:

> I propose increases in Federal compensation of $485 million per year.
>
> I am asking the Congress to enact legislation which will provide an average increase for Federal civilian employees amounting to 3.2 percent of total compensation.
>
> On the average, direct salary increases will amount to 2.85 percent. The other increases are for fringe benefits to assist the Government employee in providing for his own economic security.

Mr. Speaker, this request has been the guiding light of our committee action from the first day the hearings started until last Thursday, when our committee took final action on the bill. We adopted this policy, and have tried to adhere to it to the fullest extent possible.

Our bill also includes several fringe benefits to assist the Government employee in providing for his own economic security. Even among the experts there are considerable areas for honest differences of opinion as to whether some of these items should be included in the evaluation of the wage guidelines. In other words they are debatable.

To cite an example, the provisions requiring the granting of the uniform allowance are estimated to cost $6.6 million. However, we passed similar legislation last year which authorized the departments to grant this allowance, but they never as yet have gotten around to doing it. This year we are requiring that this additional allowance be paid to the employees.

Mr. Speaker, as I have tried to emphasize, our guiding principle has been, and will continue to be, that we are acting within the limits of the President's 3.2 wage guidelines. We have done our best to follow this principle.

I urge your favorable consideration of this bill.

Mr. **CORBETT**. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, although I am not at all enthusiastic about it.

In 1962, this Congress adopted and wrote into law the principle of comparability, under which principle the Federal employees were to be compensated as nearly as possible to individuals in private industry who are working at similar tasks.

We have never quite achieved that comparability, and probably never will so long as we are utilizing BLS figures which are outdated before they are published. Now, in this time of rather severe inflation, which threatens to get worse, the gap between what the Federal employees are making and the compensation for those who are in private industry is getting wider. This bill will not do a great deal to reduce that gap. In fact, by the time it has gone to the Senate and to the President, the gap will probably have increased as much as we are increasing compensation for Federal employees by this legislation.

However, this bill does contain something for the employees. It does contain good fringe benefits. I believe that in actual cost to the Treasury, the bill is well within the guidelines laid down by the administration.

As the gentleman from Louisiana stated, this is the administration's recommendation, with very little change. Furthermore, we recognize that last year, in the pay bill, it was cut back in the Senate quite sharply, and at that time we were assured that a new pay bill would be recommended and would come to the attention of this body.

It is here today. I might add at this point that under the existing law again the President is required each year on the basis of the findings of the Bureau of Labor Statistics to make a recommendation to the Congress for a change in the compensation of Federal employees. This he has done. We can assume, in view of what is happening in the private economy sector of this country, that a recommendation for a further pay increase will have to come next year. We can only hope that the situation will have been changed sufficiently regarding our budgetary and tax problems so that Federal employees can be given a substantial raise and the comparability gap will be substantially reduced.

Mr. Speaker, despite the shortcomings of this bill, I repeat it is of some value. It ought to be passed. The only conceivable objections I can find to it are voiced by those who think that the amount is woefully inadequate and would like to see it higher. Again we should recall that many of the fringe benefits, particularly those dealing with retired employees, will not come out of the Treasury but will come out of the retirement fund. Consequently, and since also there are a lot of estimated costs in the bill for so-called overtime work that cannot be properly estimated because given the right kind of administration, overtime can be greatly reduced from the amount that is now used and compensated for in time rather than in dollars. So we can expect that there will be a reduction in overtime and there will be increased efficiency. Therefore, the estimated cost for overtime work must necessarily be regarded as exaggerated.

So, Mr. Speaker, I close in the hope that this bill will be sent over to the Senate with the least possible opposition and that we can pass on this small pay increase and these fringe benefits to our Federal employees.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman indicates that the administration supports this bill in the form that it is presently before the House?

Mr. CORBETT. I might say to the gentleman that this is not the identical administration request, but the changes are not great. We do not anticipate any objections from the administration.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana as acting chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee if he concurs with that viewpoint, that is, that this has the support of the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. MORRISON. If the gentleman will yield, yes, that is my understanding.

Mr. LAIRD. It seems to me the committee report indicates that the total cost of this bill is $593 million. Is that correct?

Mr. MORRISON. The bill that the administration sent up was for $485 million with additional fringe benefits. That is within the 3.2-percent guidelines, and that is what our committee kept it at—3.2 percent.

Mr. LAIRD. But the budget that was submitted by the President of the United States only contains a contingency in the amount of $300 million to cover the cost of both civilian and military pay legislation for fiscal year 1967. The President sent a budget up here indicating a contingency of $300 million to cover pay costs and then comes in the back door with a favorable report on this bill and on a military pay bill which will soon follow. The day the budget was delivered in January I pointed out how wrong the estimates on expenditures for fiscal year 1967 were as set forth by the President.

Mr. MORRISON. That is only for 6 months, or half a year. This bill was supposed to be and is within the 3.2-percent guidelines. It is 2.85 percent across the board plus fringe benefits.

Mr. LAIRD. I understand, if the gentleman will yield further, that it is within the guidelines, but I was trying to find out the total overall cost as compared with the budgeted estimate for fiscal year 1967. All I seek is information.

Mr. CORBETT. I may say to the gentleman there that the administration might conceivably object to the total cost of this bill, but I reiterate what I said earlier; namely, that an important part of the cost of this bill will come out of the retirement fund. These funds do not have to be budgeted. Another important part of the cost of the bill can be greatly reduced by proper administration which would reduce the amount of overtime that would have to be paid for. So that this is a matter for the administration. They have not said in so many words that they OK this bill. We do not know what might happen in the other body, but we operated closely and cut back in most every instance. And we are very hopeful that in view of the amount which the administration recommended, and in view of the slight increase above that figure that the committee saw fit to put in the bill, it will not be opposed by the administration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CORBETT. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that this bill is being brought up under suspension of the rules. I wonder if we could have a statement from the leadership of the House—at least one of the leaders of the House—to the effect that this is not to be considered a precedent with respect to the handling of a bill entailing the expenditure of more than one-half billion dollars, without the opportunity of the House to fully work its will upon the legislation by way of amendment?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to yield further because of the press for time, but I am wondering if the majority cannot give the majority leader time in which to answer this question?

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], in order to answer the inquiry raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman is aware that when the motion to suspend the rules was made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], the gentleman from Louisiana stated specifically that it was made with the clear understanding that it would establish no precedent for the similar consideration of major Federal salary and fringe benefit legislation in the future.

The Chair in recognizing the gentleman from Louisiana to make the motion, said, with that understanding the gentleman was recognized to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The gentleman from Iowa has complete assurance, therefore, that this action will not be a precedent for further bills of this kind.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Arizona would clear up for us the matter of the cost of this bill, as compared with the $300 million contingency in the budget, and also in view of the fact that Secretary of Defense McNamara has stated before the Committee on Armed Services that if this bill passes, he will then come in and ask for a similar increase for the military personnel. What is the total impact upon the budget?

Mr. UDALL. One has to distinguish between compliance with the guidelines and the effective date which the administration requested in its proposed pay bill. The administration requested a January 1, 1967, effective date but the percentage of increase allowed by the guidelines is the same regardless of effective date. The only difference is the amount of money to be expended in the next fiscal year, but this amount has no bearing on guidelines.

The committee did not accept the January 1, 1967, effective date in light of the very small pay adjustments that were provided in the bill. We have made the effective date July 1 of this year. The impact upon the budget for the next fiscal year will be exactly twice what it would have been under the administration request. But this has nothing to do with the guideline. One point is the percentage amount of the raise, and the other point is when the raise will go into effect.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I did not want to get into a discussion of the guidelines because I believe the guidelines used in this bill are undoubtedly in keeping with the administration's recommendation. How does the administration support this bill, if it has twice the impact in expenditures upon the budget as estimated by the President in January?

The gentleman from Louisiana has stated that the administration is now supporting this bill. Yet it clearly exceeds the budget estimate.

Mr. UDALL. In all candor, let me say that we are dealing with a large number of provisions as contained in the bill. It is an omnibus bill. We are dealing with fringe benefits and pay. I do not believe it would be correct to say that the administration endorses this bill in every instance, and in every paragraph and in every line. They have not said they accept the July 1 effective date. I believe their position is that they do not want the effective date to be July 1, but rather January 1, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, there are some items contained in the bill upon which there has been controversy about whether these are or are not guideline items. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I can say, with considerable safety, that this is a bill which if it is passed with such modification as I have discussed will be signed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I would distinguish between enthusiastic approbation of this bill on the one hand, and strong and bitter opposition to it on the other. This is not a bill enthusiastically endorsed by the administration in every particular, but it is a bill the administration can, and I believe will, accept. We have discussed this bill, since it was reported, and in our opinion it may be necessary to make some adjustments with respect to specific items in dispute, as to whether they are guideline items or not. But, Mr. Speaker, I feel sure—and I pledge myself to work for a final enactment which is clearly within the guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished vice chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], has so ably explained, it certainly was the intention of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to bring out a pay and fringe benefit bill that did no violence to the wage guidepost of 3.2 percent fixed by the President. As he further indicated, however, there has never been a clear meeting of the minds between representatives of the administration and the members of our committee as to exactly what costs are and what costs are not properly to be measured against this guidepost.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee, acting in complete good faith, made its calculations of guidepost costs as shown on page 4 of the committee report, House Report No. 1410, accompanying H.R. 14122. The costs as there computed total $471.8 million. Other costs of the bill totaling $101.2 were felt to cover items none of which were to be measured against the 3.2 percent guidepost. Since the administration representatives had put a $485 million price tag as the maximum permissible under the guidepost, our committee felt that it had more than conformed with the guidepost limitation.

In all fairness, it should be pointed out that the calculations used in our committee deliberations should probably be revised in the light of information developed, after our committee voted to report the bill, in an informal conference with representatives of the White House, the Bureau of the Budget, and the U.S. Civil Service Commission. In summary, the changes in our committee calculations which now appear to be appropriate are set forth at page 5 of House Report No. 1410, which shows a difference of $33.6 million in costs which probably should have been included among our guidepost costs but were not.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation I agreed, during the conference mentioned above, to state in this debate my position with respect to this difference of $33.6 million. Seventeen million of the amount represents an underestimate, on the part of our committee, as to the first year cost of the increased Government health benefits contributions provided by section 601 of the bill. It is my expectation and hope and my recommendation that this difference of $17 million, as well as such additional amount as may be necessary to bring the bill's guidepost costs within the 3.2-percent limitation, will be the subject of appropriate adjustments when the bill is taken up in the other body.

While the difference of $33.6 million is not substantial, in relation to the total amount involved in this bill and the very desirable spread of benefits provided, since it is and always has been our committee's intention not to violate the President's wage guideposts. I am confident that our committee would be receptive to such adjustments if made in the other body. If I am a member of a conference committee I would hope to work to produce a final bill which is clearly in accordance with the views I have just expressed and in accordance with the statements made on pages 1 to 5 of the report—No. 1410—on this bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to say this: If the gentleman from Wisconsin is so worried about the impact of this bill on the budget that he vote against it and lead his forces in opposing it.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this is not a very happy day for those of us who want to see adequate Federal salaries. We faced considerable difficulty and we made, after consultation with the major employee organizations, some very tough and difficult decisions. I want to say to the credit of these major employee organizations that they have done the patriotic thing and they have done the very difficult thing in saying that they will abide by the provisions of the bill this year. They do not like it but they accept it as being better than nothing.

The bill makes a number of improvements, not just in pay, but to take care of a number of fringe and collateral benefit areas including retirement and including the Government contributions toward health insurance plans for Federal employees, and for uniform allowances, and so forth.

Some very important adjustments are made as to overtime compensation for classified employees in the bill and a number of other adjustments are made.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill and I hope it will have widespread support among the Members of the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, no record vote is contemplated on this measure—indeed, I suppose that is the purpose of calling it up under suspension—so that everyone will be able to go home and say that he did not oppose a pay raise for Government workers. All of us would like to be able to tell our friends that we had given them a pay increase.

A pay increase is always welcomed by the recipients but nothing is so certain to set off the evils of inflation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has just admitted that it is inflationary. The President has time and again pointed to the immediate danger of inflation. He has put tremendous pressure on industry to hold prices down in spite of increasing costs. He has called on consumers to forgo the purchase of long-hoped-for consumer goods. I think that all of us know that we face a real and present danger of inflation.

This bill involves an immediate increase in our Government expenditures by more than half a billion dollars per year. It is certain to be followed by an increase of at least equal magnitude for a military pay raise, and then we all know that private wages must go in the same manner. Before this round of increases has spent itself it will have increased our new spending by several billion.

I look upon this as an unwise expenditure—one which we would like to grant but cannot afford. I think inflation is dangerous. I think it can very easily take far more away from the living standards of the very recipients of the increase than it gives them, and I know that it will hurt millions of people with small fixed incomes. I shall vote against the proposal and I shall not hide behind any agreement that there will be no rollcall. I hope that the sponsors of this bill will agree to call the roll. They have challenged some of those who question the bill to vote against it. I think that is fair and I hope that we all have an opportunity to vote but whether we do or not, my people are entitled to know where I stand. I stand against inflation. I shall, therefore, vote against this inflationary bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a 7-percent salary bill, but pressure was exerted on that figure by the administration and it went by the wayside. So we have a watered-down version which amounts to 2.89 percent in salary increase.

I think this is a stinking bill if we are ever to reach comparability and give Federal workers what they desire.

But the pressure was put on by Federal agencies so there was not much we could do.

I introduced the bill after the hearings on an identical bill to the one before us today, and I will vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time the Congress wrote all pay legislation and not be strong-armed by the Federal agencies. We must assert our rights—and we did not do so in this case.

If we wrote a good bill we could take our chances on a veto, because a principle is involved here.

If the present bill, for some reason, were vetoed the Federal workers would not lose much in money but would win on principle and reestablish the Congress' right to write its own legislation and give just due to our dedicated Federal and classified workers.

When General Eisenhower—a member of my party—vetoed a pay bill, we voted to override his veto—which we did—and I voted to override it because I thought the increase was long overdue. We should do so in this case.

Mr. Speaker, I say again this is a measly raise—nevertheless I will vote for it.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there is a kind of schizophrenia pervading some of the groups on each side of the aisle. One would say that they are in favor of savings and worried about the budget. Another would say this is a stinking bill because it does not spend enough and that this is not a big enough increase. Of course, that is the kind of point of view we might find on almost any pay bill.

This is a compromise bill. It is a compromise because of all the factors that everyone has spoken about on this floor. We are doing the very best we can to get a bill that is within the guidelines that we are asking all private industry to live by, and it is a pay bill that the Federal employees are more than deserving of. I say more than deserving of because this will barely keep them in their present position with respect to the increases that are going on in the private economy. This does not begin to catch them up.

Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has brought to the floor of the House today a Federal pay bill which provides increases in salary and fringe benefits averaging 3.2 percent. This increase is designed to be both fair to the Federal employees, that is, keep them in their present position with respect to the private economy, and it is also designed to stay within the wage and price guidelines recommended by the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

The proposed pay raise is an across-the-board one of about 2.85 percent, effective this July, although the top three grades in the Federal service will receive a slightly smaller boost of 2 percent.

The liberalized fringe benefits we propose include optional retirement at age 55 with 30 years' service, or at age 60 with 20 years' service; a moderate increase in already authorized uniform allowances for those employees who are required by the Government to wear uniforms; a reasonable increase in the Government contribution to health insurance programs; time-and-a-half overtime pay for classified employees who work in excess of 8 hours a day; 25 percent premium pay for classified and wage board employees who must work on Sundays; permission for widows who remarry after age 60 to continue to receive their survivor annuities; mandatory overtime for postal workers up through level 10; protection against salary loss for employees transferred from other agencies to postal jobs; and extension of survivor benefits to children in school up to 22 years of age. All of these fringes are just barely an attempt to catch up with the private economy.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank my friend for yielding. The gentleman makes the point that this bill will not even keep the employees up with the cost-of-living increases anticipated during the next fiscal year.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. We do not use the word "cost-of-living increases." We are talking about comparability with the advances that are going on in the private sector in comparable jobs, which is something I think more than just cost of living.

Mr. LAIRD. But the cost-of-living estimated increase in this budget, based on the revenues in the 1967 budget, anticipates a cost-of-living increase of 3 percent. Many economists think it will be a much higher increase during the fiscal year 1967.

In the colloquy which I had earlier, however, I was referring to the fact that in the 1967 budget, which I think is a very unrealistic budget, the estimates made by the President for military and civilian pay increases, the contingency allowed was only $300 million. At the time the budget message was sent up here some of us pointed out that this was not a realistic estimate on the part of the President of the United States. I believe that forecast is being borne out here today.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. The proposals are certain modest ones, and the bill has been carefully worked out. It is a good bill. We are offering a reasonably decent pay raise for Federal employees and some fringe benefits that will bring them a little closer to the state of true equality for Government workers that we seek. The intent of the bill is to carry out the Congress' commitment to our Federal employees, embodied in the Federal Pay Act of 1962, that their salaries and other benefits should be comparable to those salaries and benefits earned by employees in private industry for similar types and levels of work.

I want to emphasize that throughout our hearings on the pay and fringe benefits package, our committee worked with the understanding that we would propose no benefits in excess of the Council of Economic Advisers' 3.2-percent wage-price guidelines. We have stayed within those guidelines and have met the test of a sound and responsible Federal fiscal policy.

As pointed out in our committee report, however, there have been some honest differences of opinion as to exactly what costs should be properly included within those wage guidelines.

I do not, for instance, believe the costs of the equalizing provisions for overtime and other premium pay should be included within the wage guideposts set by the President. I do not think adjustments in retirement benefits, especially with respect to adjustments in benefits of long-retired Federal employees or their survivors, belong within the wage guideposts. The special delivery mileage allowance, the costs of broadening the term "child" to extend survivor benefits, the widows' "remarriage" provision—these are not guidepost costs.

In this regard I want to emphasize that the committee's conclusions on the pay package and the costs involved were reached after giving very special attention to the guidelines as it interprets them and in all good conscience.

Our objective, of course, is a fair pay bill—one that is fair to the employees and the Government, and one which the President will approve. We want to honor our pledge to Federal employees that their salaries and benefits will be comparable to those in private industry.

We want to increase efficiency—and morale—throughout the Federal establishment. We want to encourage recruitment of more talented people of the level and competence and career potential that we need. We want to hold on to our best employees, instead of losing them to private industry. And we cannot deny Federal employees a just and needed pay raise while other groups in our society are not so restricted.

Our country is wealthy and strong and it is growing. I agree with our President that the country's continued economic expansion must be orderly. But the bill before us is not going to overheat the economy or push prices into outer space. The proposals are extremely modest ones. They are fair—and they are necessary.

The bill is an act of plain justice. I sincerely believe it deserves the support of every Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14122, the ingredients of which I earnestly believe are confined to the guidelines advocated by the President of the United States.

At the outset, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, which participated fully and faithfully in the extensive considerations of the broad area of the subjects under deliberation, it is my desire to have the record clearly show that the efforts of the individual members of the committee were intended to comply with the President's guideline requests. I believe that the members of the committee should be highly commended for their diligence in keeping the elements of this legislation within the realm of the suggested limits. I am convinced that the coat has been cut to fit the cloth provided us, and that the committee has acted responsibly in the national interest in reporting the bill before us.

Regretfully, the international situation leaves the President and the Congress with not quite enough cloth to cloak the very substantial costs of providing all that may be desirable in this measure. To the committee fell the burden of the selection in and the selection out of those worthy plans that need funds and are in the public's and employees' interest—a burden that was well shouldered by each and every member.

There were, and still are, and always will be honest and reasonable differences of opinion as to what elements rightfully lie within the framework of prescribed guideposts, as well as sincere differences in opinion as to any that are deemed to exceed them.

The across-the-board salary adjustments averaging 2.85 percent, I am sure, cannot be construed as exceeding economic guidelines. In fact, they are obviously well under such limitations.

I respectfully question, Mr. Speaker, what items in H.R. 14122 do, indeed, exceed the recommended guideposts? What items in this bill truthfully contribute to any inflationary spiral? Is it the payment of true overtime to some employees? Is it the payment of partial overtime only to other employees? I think not.

I ask, respectfully, does partial premium pay for certain Sunday work inflate the economy? Do minimal increases in uniform allowances? I think not.

Are justifiable Government increases toward the costs of health benefits in violation of the guidelines? Is the subject of recomputation of annuities to past retirees and surviving widows properly for inclusion within such guidelines? I think not, particularly when this proposed adjustment is not a budgetary item.

Mr. Speaker, should any sound arguments be presented to this Member that convince him that any provision of H.R. 14122 is inflationary, and that transcends reasonable guidelines, he will be the first to take the initiative to accept any amendments necessary to bring this legislation within justifiable limits.

As we are all well aware, the major costs and provisions of H.R. 14122 involve salary adjustments—adjustments that are quite moderate in most cases, and entirely inadequate in others. Those provisions that pertain to improved employee fringe benefits constitute but a small portion of the total costs of this package, but which are highly desirable and long overdue. Increased Government contributions provided herein to the Federal employees' health benefits program are minimal in relation to the costs borne by each employee.

Extending the coverage of student-children under the Civil Service Retirement Act, to age 22, although desirable, is a relatively minor improvement in benefits. Permitting employees to retire on full annuities at age 55 with 30 years of service, and at age 60 with 20 years of service, are long-sought improvements that are meaningful to employees while serving the interests of Government. Another relatively minor amendment to the Retirement Act will permit survivor annuitants to retain their benefits upon remarriage after reaching age 60, while another provision will permit those survivors whose annuities are terminated by remarriage prior to attaining age 60 to be restored in the event of the termination of such remarriage.

In the judgment of the committee, it is simple justice to a certain segment of retirees and surviving widows, whose rights were based upon the laws in effect from 1948 to 1962, to provide for the recomputation of their annuities so as to grant them parity with persons who have retired or died since the liberalizing amendments of October 11, 1962.

In summary, the fringe benefits provided in the bill, while desirable, are reasonably modest in scope. The Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits will schedule the consideration of additional proposals in the near future. Its paramount objective, however, will be the exploration of a means whereby the financial condition of the civil service retirement fund may be strengthened—a problem of serious concern, and a question of finance that cannot be avoided, especially where the rights and welfare of so many people are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 14122.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14122. I have always been in favor of legislation providing adequate rates of compensation for Federal employees, particularly for the low-paid employees of the Postal Field Service. I am firmly convinced that an increase of at least 7 percent is justified in order for our Federal employees to receive rates of compensation anywhere near current comparability with rates paid in private industry.

We all realize, however, that the Vietnam conflict raises problems of much greater significance than any problem of pay comparability.

There also is a further problem of major significance which demands that we stay within the President's wage price guidelines in order not to give any unnecessary impetus to inflationary trends.

The employee organizations are to be congratulated for their display of patriotism and civic responsibility in agreeing with the President's request for us to hold the line on this pay-fringe benefit proposal, and to keep it within the wage price guidelines of 3.2 percent.

It becomes abundantly clear to me that there is absolutely no justification for holding our Government employees to the 3.2 percent when wage increases in private industry already are more than 7 percent ahead of Federal rates of compensation and are continually increasing at even a greater rate. We certainly will want to make adjustments in the very near future to compensate for any such increases.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call particular attention to one provision of this bill, section 402, relating to postal seniority adjustments. The 1962 Pay Act had the effect of destroying the seniority of many postal service employees. I sponsored legislation in 1963 and have been attempting ever since to correct this problem. A partial correction was accomplished in the 1964 Pay Act, Public Law 88-426, and attempts were made last year to correct additional inequities in seniority adjustments. However, the provisions we included in the House-passed bill last year were eliminated by the Senate. I am pleased to see that these same provisions are included once again in H.R. 14122. Even though these provisions will not correct all of the inequities, I hope that the House conferees this year will insist on these provisions remaining in any bill finally enacted by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of this legislation here today.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL], for such time as he may desire.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this salary legislation. It is not all that many of us would like it to be, but it is apparent that under the circumstances it is all there is going to be.

The reason it is not all we would like it to be is that a theoretical national guidepost has been applied to this bill. It ignores many factors.

While such a guidepost might be an important tool in this time of inflation, in this case it certainly has not permitted just treatment of the question of wage comparability. It is not being applied with the same rigor in other segments of our economy. Over the long run the result can only be that there will be some extra catching up to do. The concept of wage comparability for Government employees with those in private industry has been part of the law of the land for some years. Justice requires that comparability be observed.

Nevertheless, I urge passage of this bill. It provides raises. It makes some corrections in the retirement system that are long overdue. For example, widows of employees or retired employees who remarry after age 60 are allowed to continue to receive their survivor annuities, which under present law are terminated by any remarriage.

A number of other improvements are contained in the bill. I am delighted to see that, where they are authorized, uniform allowances now are to be made mandatory, and the administrative allowances are increased. Classified employees are granted time and a half overtime pay for work in excess of 8 hours in a day. These and other features help to make this legislation worthwhile.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] who is a member of the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14122. In 1962 the Congress did adopt a policy of comparability in Federal pay legislation. We have not yet arrived at such comparability.

I wish to express appreciation to those major employee organizations who in this time of inflation and of military action in Vietnam, were willing to accept these guidelines, even though we have not yet reached comparability. I appreciate their great patriotism and hope that their leadership will be followed by others.

Also I am glad that this bill contains provisions to eliminate certain inequities in Federal retiree annuities that have long existed and which needed to be corrected. However inadequate, H.R. 14122 is a step in the right direction. I, therefore, urge its passage.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I did not have a chance to finish my statement earlier. But I repeat this is an inadequate bill.

Under President Eisenhower, who vetoed a bill that we had up here, that I thought was a good bill, I happened to be one who voted to override the veto. It took only a matter of moments for the majority party to bring up the question of overriding the veto. I simply say that this is an inadequate bill and any veto could be overridden.

A few pennies in the pocket under this bill amounts to hardly anything. It is a matter of principle involved here. I think we should have a bill today which we think is right and just. Then if it is vetoed, bring it back and let us have a chance to override the veto.

In this way we will know who gives lipservice to the employee organizations and who does not.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Arizona, I would like to pose a question or two concerning benefits to children in school. Let me give you an example: I have a young constituent who was receiving benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act while in high school. He graduated from high school on May 21, 1965. He commenced college on September 27, 1965, the first day the college opened its fall session. This lapse of 4 months and 6 days caused this young man to lose his benefits and, in fact, he is now having to repay to the Federal Government the money he received from May through September. I know that this was not the intention of Congress. It would appear that this problem is cured by section 502 of H.R. 14122 in that it refers to "4 calendar months" rather than "4 months" as in the existing law. Is this correct?

Mr. UDALL. Yes, this problem would be cured in the future with respect to the specific dates you cite. However, the bill does not contemplate retroactive payment of benefits to students whose annuities have already been terminated under the terms of existing law.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Under the terms of H.R. 14122, may my constituent commence receiving benefits again, assuming he is still in college and not over 22 years of age, once the bill is signed into law?

Mr. UDALL. Yes; section 508(c) provides for the restoration of entitlement from the date of enactment if he then meets the description of a student-child as amended in section 502 of this bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14122, the Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966.

This bill, of course, falls far short of what we should be providing our Federal employees this year in the way of salary and fringe benefits. But, recognizing the need for keeping within the 3.2-percent guideline recommended by the President and facing the realities of our firm commitments in Vietnam, I strongly support the bill and urge its prompt passage.

The modest salary adjustments will, at least for the present, prevent the comparability gap from growing wider. The optional retirement provision at age 55 with 30 years of service and the liberalizations in other retirement features and in overtime pay are all long overdue.

Yet I must say that no one who is committed, as I am, to the principle of full pay comparability for Federal employees can really be satisfied until that cherished promise is actually and entirely achieved.

In 1962, Congress promised Federal employees that they would not have to suffer economically simply because they chose a career in Government service. We promised Federal employees full pay comparability and we set up the machinery to achieve it. We have made significant strides during the last 4 years toward achieving that goal. However, we have not yet attained full comparability, and the bill under consideration is not intended as a substitute for the goal we set before us in 1962. Rather, this bill ought to be looked upon as another milestone in the continuing effort by the Congress to achieve full pay comparability for Federal employees.

I would like to make it abundantly clear that I, for one, am not fully satisfied with the application of comparability at the low income levels, but I intend to give continuing support to the principle of comparability so long as it will serve as a means of raising the standard of living of our people. While passing this bill today, we must keep in mind that our real goal is to make comparability work and to give real meaning to the promise we made to our Federal employees in 1962.

Mr. Speaker, I urge unanimous support for H.R. 14122.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, before we leave this discussion, let me comment on the remarks of my friend from Wisconsin who is concerned about expenditures over and above the President's budget for this year. I have heard noises around this Chamber and around the country about cutting $5 billion, or some similar amount, off the administration's budget for this year.

We in Congress play a role, too. We have increased in this bill the budgeted amounts, especially by reason of the July effective date. I take my share of the responsibility for going this far over the President's budget.

I have been waiting patiently for many days now to have a list of specifics about where we are going to cut the Federal budget by $5 billion or any other large amount. I would suggest to my friend from Wisconsin, if he is concerned about it, that he vote against this bill and against the military pay raise which apparently is coming before us shortly. He can save nearly $1 billion on these two bills. Or, if he is not going to do this, I suggest that he and his colleagues come forward and tell us where they plan to make these large cuts in the Federal budget.

I have been waiting for days to have specifics, and I have not seen any yet.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, we have had a very good example in the new programs approved last week—in the rent supplement program and the Teachers Corps program—and we will have many opportunities on amendments to other appropriation and authorization bills during this session as we did in the last session.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further until I make a comment.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would like to have a list, if he will yield to me I will give it to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the programs last week would have saved a grand total of about $20 million. I would like to have an idea as to where the other $4.80 billion will come from.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, we started the program last week. We have to take one item at a time. The program last week started at least a $6 billion program over a 20-year period for rent supplements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I might suggest that the gentleman get some special orders. We are on some rather special business now. I do not think we can interrupt.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to participate in a special order, at which time I could see a list of these budget cuts which are going to be made.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I will ask that the gentleman be given an hour, at which time the gentleman from Wisconsin can outline a list.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today we are asked to support a bill to increase compensation for Federal employes. The actual salary increase provided in this measure is an across-the-board 2.85 percent, except in the uppermost brackets where it is smaller. We are told the President will veto a measure outside the so-called guidelines of 3.2 percent, including fringe benefits. So this is, in effect, a take-it-or-leave-it measure.

I sponsored a measure, Mr. Speaker, which would have provided an average of 7 percent increase in compensation, and which would have recognized the facts of life we are asked to overlook today—that Federal employee salaries have once again lagged behind in the comparability those of us sorely concerned with this problem have long sought. We are asked today to allow Federal salaries to drop further behind those for comparable jobs in private industry, and to risk again the loss of skilled Federal employees because we cannot compete with industry.

Where, Mr. Speaker, were these so-called guidelines when the steelworkers demanded, and received, their latest increases? Where were they when the New York transit workers defied Federal court orders, and won enormous concessions?

One after another of our major industries bows to labor's demand far in excess of the recommendations sent from the White House. But we are asked here today to penalize loyal Federal employees just to set an example for others to follow. But who will follow?

Five weeks ago we voted a tax increase here. We restored the excise tax on telephone service and automobiles, increased the withholding rate on income tax for millions, and advanced payment of taxes by corporations. Almost all Federal employees were affected by these increases in the same way as workers in private industry.

While the tax increase was done in the name of need for increased expenses of the war in Vietnam, our real reason, as we all know, was the undeniable fact that the Great Society programs are extremely costly. And our Government must tax to spend, and we were spending at a much greater rate than we were taxing.

Those of us who advocated tightening our belts to avoid increased deficit certainly did not intend that career Federal employees should be denied basic necessities in the interest of economy, while so-called "consultants" in the war on poverty drain millions from the Federal Treasury daily for programs from which nothing but a chaotic wasteland has resulted.

The enormous cost of the Great Society is clear to all. Yet, we hear constant denials that this is the reason for the rising cost of living—escalating at approximately twice the rate we are acknowledging today if this is to be described as a cost-of-living increase.

Mr. Speaker, with great reluctance I support this paltry increase. It should be much larger. It should have included emergency relief for 677,000 retired Federal employees who are being seriously injured by the inflation the Great Society has wrought. It should have provided a guarantee that every postal supervisor and postmaster would receive a salary at least one step higher than that paid the highest salaried employee under his jurisdiction. And it should have reflected concern on the part of the Congress for the millions of Federal employees who await our pleasure for the means with which to meet the expenses we have imposed upon them.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this legislation, and then immediately begin working for a truly equitable Federal salary increase in January. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has again performed in a magnificent manner in handling a most confusing, complicated, and technical problem. It took hard work and cooperation of many people, including the leaders of the Federal employee organizations to accomplish this.

There is never a quick solution to the problems of seeking good personnel administration. In fact, it has taken us 10 to 15 years to obtain many of the obvious improvements we now take for granted. Yet a few years ago these improvements would have been considered revolutionary. I am referring to such so-called fringe benefits as life and health insurance, uniform allowances, more liberal retirement provisions, comparability with salaries in private industry, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to seek additional ways of improving Federal service. There are many ways we can do this—many proposals which may not appear necessary at this time or may even be considered revolutionary at this time. But as I said before, we must continue to keep pace with private industry and work for ways in which we can make work in the Federal Government more attractive.

There are three proposals I should like to suggest at this time for consideration in the near future. These may not necessarily be the most important items to be considered, but I feel that sooner or later we will have to face up to these particular matters and I believe that the sooner we do so the better off the Federal employees will be.

The first proposal is the provision for parking allowances for Federal employees. This is becoming an increasingly acute problem in all of our metropolitan areas. There is no easy solution and every metropolitan area is considering expensive mass transit programs, highway programs, parking lots, and so forth. But unfortunately it seems that improvements are not being made rapidly enough; therefore, the problem becomes more acute.

In any event, the expense of parking is becoming almost prohibitive, and I fear it will become more of a problem and responsibility of management throughout the country in the near future.

I have already introduced a bill directing the General Services Administration to provide additional parking facilities for Federal employees either by construction or leasing of the facilities. My proposal, however, provides for the facilities to be self-sustaining, which means that there will be a cost to the Federal employees. I feel, therefore, that a fringe benefit needs to be considered wherein an allowance is provided by the Federal Government to the Federal employee for the expense of parking. Providing such an allowance will, in my opinion, be a real step forward in improvement of employee relationship.

The second proposal is that of summertime employment for young people attending school. We have already done something about recognizing this being a problem, but the only thing we have actually done is to consider ways of dividing up what jobs were already available, and this has proven quite controversial and I personally do not believe it has been on the fairest and most equitable basis. And, secondly, we have provided for reduced salaries in the Post Office Department for temporary summertime employees. However, Mr. Speaker, the number of young people seeking summertime employment is increasing to major proportions, not only in the number of young people of college age but the higher percentage of these young people who are seeking a college education. Therefore, many more young people each year need summer employment to further their education than there are jobs available for them. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we could be a great deal more effective in directing our attention to how more summertime jobs can be made available for these young people than to spend the many billions of dollars for those who lack the drive and ambition, as well as the ability to seek higher education.

The third proposal is one we have already met halfway, and that is to provide that no supervisor would be paid less than those he is called upon to supervise. We worked this out insofar as the blue-collar workers are concerned in the Pay Act of 1962, but there are many situations in the postal field service and classified service where supervisors are not receiving a sufficient additional amount over that which those they supervise receive.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, there are many other ways in which we can improve the Federal personnel situation. I do not expect these proposals I have made to be enacted overnight, but I do think we should give serious consideration in these areas in the very near future.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the balance of the legislative week to extend their remarks on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I shall take the time to comment only briefly on the Federal employees compensation bill under consideration and to direct my remarks to one feature which was wisely incorporated in the bill.

Perhaps it would be more accurate to commend the committee for its judgment in omitting certain language. I refer to the sections of the bill which permit the voluntary retirement, with full annuities, of Federal employees who have reached age 55 with 30 years of service, and those who have reached age 60 with 20 years of service to the Government. The omitted language, which was recommended by the administration, would have permitted the Government, or more specifically, agency heads, to mandatorily retire such employees in grades GS–13 and up, if the agency head so desired.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of nothing more disastrous to the morale of our civil service system than to have handed agency heads this discretionary authority. It requires little imagination to picture the results of such arbitrary power in the hands of Government officials. It is no secret that the bill, as it comes before the House, hews the administration line, but fortunately the members of the committee imposed their own good judgment in this one area and rejected the idea of mandatory retirement.

The voluntary retirement features of the bill, as now written, will give Federal employees who have faithfully served the Government, the opportunity to retire from service with grace and dignity.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to point out one of the additional effects of the Federal pay bill we are considering today—its liberalization of voluntary retirement rules. As you know, it will allow for the immediate voluntary retirement of the employees who have attained the age of 55 and who have completed 30 years of service and those who have attained the age of 60 and who have completed 20 years of service. Earlier in this Congress, I sponsored a bill to enable any employee to qualify for full retirement regardless of age who has completed 20 years of service and who was involuntarily separated from service because of a base closing.

Today's bill, therefore, will benefit many Federal employees who are presently employed at military bases scheduled to be phased out over the next few years. An employee who faces the choice of uprooting his family and moving to a new location or seeking a new job will now be able to stay in the area and retire at full retirement if he is 55 years of age with the requisite number of years' service. Employees in this age group are the ones who are most critically affected by the base closings. It is extremely difficult for them to find good employment at their age in their home community following the base closing. It is difficult to move their families at that age as well. The provision of this bill, therefore, will permit them to retire from the Federal service, continue their residence in their home community and to continue to participate in the life of that community.

I commend the committee for including these provisions in this bill today.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962, the Federal Government—Congress and the President—undertook a solemn obligation of justice to postal and other Federal employees. Under this act, Congress and the President established by law the principle of comparability, whereby we are bound by good faith to make annual adjustments of pay rates so that postal and other Federal pay at all grades shall be comparable to salaries and wages paid for similar work in private industry.

Equal pay for equal work—this is the standard of fairness made operative by the Civil Service Commission within the Federal service. The principle of comparability should extend this standard of fairness so that postal and classified employees get pay equal to the salaries or wages paid for the same kind of work in private enterprise.

Last year Congress and the President made a salary adjustment which fell far short of achieving comparability.

The subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee headed by the gentleman from Arizona, Representative MORRIS K. UDALL, reported a bill to the full committee providing for a 4.5-percent pay raise. If the bill as it came out of the subcommittee had become law, we would today be considerably closer to our goal of pay comparability.

The House then reduced the pay raise to 4 percent.

The Senate passed a bill providing for no more than a 3.6-percent raise. It reportedly did so under pressure from the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission—these agencies advised that the President would accept no greater pay raise. The Senate sent us their own pay bill on the evening of the last day of the last session. We had no choice except that of accepting it without change or killing any pay raise at all for the session.

Last year's pay act betrayed the executive branch's disregard for the comparability principle.

And the President's recommendation of a further pay adjustment made in this session under this bill betrays the same disregard. The raise which the administration is recommending would not bring us anywhere near close enough to our goal of comparable pay rates.

Congress this year should have reclaimed its legislative authority from the White House.

It is for Congress to determine what is just compensation for postal and classified workers. And Congress has obligated itself to realize comparability of Federal pay rates. Congress should have reclaimed and exercised its legislative authority in order to do justice to those who serve our Government. More than this, I expected that the Congress would stand firm for achievement of comparability against any pressure whatever from the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I shall reluctantly support this postal and classified pay raise this year. This is far from an exorbitant increase. Our postal and classified workers are years behind their counterparts in private industry. Government workers are doing a good job for America, and America owes them a remuneration comparable to that of those who labor outside of Government. We certainly are not meeting our responsibility to our Federal workers with this inadequate pay raise.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, in his message to the Congress, President Johnson stated that America could count among its many blessings "a corps of Federal civil servants that is unequaled anywhere in the world." Characterizing these public servants as "honest, efficient, and—above all—dedicated," he went on to say that they represent "a national resource and a national asset."

Certainly the Federal corps of public servants is to be praised highly for its achievements, for the fine way in which it has answered the many demands placed upon it.

The Federal Government owes to these workers not only words of faith and praise, but also actions which congratulate and sustain them in their careers in the public service. It was in this spirit that the comparability principle was first established in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. And it is in this spirit that the Federal pay bill before the Congress at this time should be considered.

At the time the President signed the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964 into law he said:

> America's challenges cannot be met in this modern world by mediocrity at any level, public or private. All through our society we must search for brilliance, welcome genius, strive for excellence.

This statement is only more true today. But will skilled and talented persons continue to be drawn to public service when they are not offered compensation even equal to that received in private industry?

Last year, according to the 1966 annual report of the Council of Economic

Advisers, productivity in the private economy had grown by an average of 3.6 annually, but a 3.2 wage-price guidepost was continued for Federal service.

Because we cannot afford mediocrity, and because excellence is demanded by a fast moving and ever more complex world—the pay bill before the Congress offers the very minimum we could ask.

If guidelines must be issued, then it cannot be upon the shoulders of the Federal employee alone that the burden falls. If the rewards are to be shared, then the responsibility must be shared. Is it not reasonable to ask the same guidelines for the private economy, and more especially private industry under Government contract, where the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the wages or salaries for employees of prime contractors with Defense or Space contracts? A 3-percent increase for a civil service employee and a 5-percent increase for a private employee under a 100-percent Government funded contract hardly seems fair and equitable.

America's challenges must be met—and they will only be met through a concerted effort for excellence. We cannot expect those in the Federal service to meet these challenges with excellence if they are given a disadvantage to overcome in addition to the vigorous demands made upon them by the very nature of their service to the public.

Our progress as a nation depends greatly on those in the public service, and it is in the national interest as well as in the interest of the Federal employees that fairness be maintained through comparability.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14122. However, I must state that I am greatly disappointed in what we are here providing for the loyal employees of our Government. In the 87th Congress we enacted into law a bill calling for full comparability for Federal employees. We have not lived up to the promise we made, and each year we seem to get a little more behind. I believe that we have an obligation to bring the salaries of postal and classified workers into line with comparable work in private enterprise. The bill before us does not do this.

So-called guidelines have been set by the administration, and it is highly probable that only employees of the Federal Government will be forced to stay within these guidelines—employees who are already far behind.

This bill does carry with it certain changes, outside the area of salary, which we have long sought and are, I believe, a step in the right direction. One of the most outstanding features is the provision providing full retirement benefits to employees who have served the Federal Government for 30 years and have reached the age of 55.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this bill, I say let us not long postpone fulfillment of our pledge to give full comparability to our loyal employees.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent that no one is opposed to this bill. It is to give justice to 23 Federal employees who lost their annual leave as a result of the flood. Because they lost their leave, we simply wish to pass legislation to validate that leave for them.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.R. 14122, the Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966. While I have gone on record in support of a pay increase for Federal employees beyond the 2.9 percent level provided for in this bill, I nevertheless concur in the judgment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service as to the desirable level of a pay increase at this juncture in our economy. The decision of the committee to stay within the wage guideposts established by the administration is a wise one, considering the rapid expansion and careful measurement that is presently going on in the U.S. economy.

While an increase of 2.9 percent in postal and other Federal salaries is not optimum in respect of the goal of comparability between service in Government and in private industry, the bill before us holds many benefits for Federal employees. In addition to regular salary rate increases, there is provision for more liberal uniform allowances, increased Government health benefit contributions, wider coverage of overtime pay provisions for postal supervisors, increased allowances for reimbursement of special delivery messengers, salary protection for postal employees with seniority, and other important fringe benefits.

Also included in this bill are important benefits for retired Federal employees and their beneficiaries. Most important among these is a provision for recomputation of retirement benefits for persons who retired between April 1948 and October 1962 and who elected to provide surviving spouse benefits by taking reduced annuity payments. Although no retroactive increases will result from this section, many retired persons in this category will start receiving higher annuity payments as recomputed under the 1962 formula.

Mr. Speaker, I support this measure not only because of the benefits it contains for present and retired Federal employees, but also as an example to the Nation of the workability and the desirability of controlling the rate of increase in pay scales, and additionally, price scales in an effort to hold down inflationary pressures in the economy.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to join my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] in expressing the hope that this bill can be moved along practically unanimously to the other body right now.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14122.

As many as are in favor of the motion will say "aye"; those opposed "no." In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the bill is passed.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of March 30, further proceedings in connection with this bill will go over until Wednesday next.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.J. Res. 997) to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people, with committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 997

Whereas the Congress has declared it to be the policy of the United States to make maximum efficient use of this Nation's agricultural abundance in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States;

Whereas the Congress is considering legislation to govern the response of the United States to the mounting world food problem;

Whereas critical food shortages in India threatening the health if not the lives of tens of millions of people require an urgent prior response: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress endorses and supports the President's initiative in organizing substantial American participation in an urgent international effort designed to:

(a) Help meet India's pressing food shortages by making available to India under Public Law 480 agricultural commodities to meet India's normal import needs plus added quantities of agricultural commodities as the United States share in the international response to the Indian emergency.

(b) Help combat malnutrition, especially in mothers and children, via a special program;

(c) Encourage and assist those measures which the Government of India is planning to expand India's own agricultural production;

That the Congress urges the President to join India in pressing on other nations the urgency of sharing appropriately in a truly international response to India's critical need.

The Congress urges that to the extent necessary the food made available by this program be distributed in such manner that hungry people without money will be able to obtain food.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina will be allotted 20 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] 20 minutes. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, sometime last December a meeting was held here in Washington which was attended by representatives from 50 or 60 nationally known organizations. It was the organizational meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis. Since that time I understand that many other organizations have become affiliated with this newly formed committee.

On January 19 I introduced a resolution calling for a world war on hunger. I delayed hearings on the resolution until the President's message on food had been sent to Congress. On February 14 I introduced a bill recommended by the President.

We have had extensive hearings on both those bills, and I have never known a more distinguished array of witnesses to appear in our committee room than those who have testified in connection with those two bills and other bills which have been introduced dealing with the same subject.

Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting in the White House—I think last week—the President had members of both parties there for a conference to talk about the desperate situation in India. This was after the Prime Minister of India had visited Washington and had conferred with the President. Following that conference and at the request of the President, I introduced a House joint resolution, and that resolution is now before you, House Joint Resolution 997, to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

We have had hearings on this resolution. It was considered at length in the committee. Two amendments were adopted. The resolution was approved unanimously by the 35-man committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have never visited India, and I have no firsthand information concerning the desperate plight of the Indian people. But I do know that all of the hearings we have held clearly indicate that they are in desperate need. Many people of India are now starving. This is the result of a disaster that happened there because of a great drought that they had in that great country.

Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of the people of this earth are now underfed, and one-third of the people of the world are now overfed. Fortunately, our Nation has been blessed, as no other nation on this earth has been blessed. Our fields have flourished. We have harvested abundantly. We have shared that abundance in magnificent fashion through programs of great magnitude.

The most magnanimous programs ever operated by any nation in all the history of the world have been carried on by the United States of America. We have relieved hunger in 100 nations. We have relieved hunger of 100 million people in these 100 nations of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are called upon again to come to the rescue of those hundreds of millions of Indians who are in desperate need.

As I have said many times before, and I say again, there are two major words in all the languages on this earth: "food" and "raiment." Fortunately, we have an abundance of food and of fiber.

We come now merely to endorse and to approve the new action which has been taken by the President of the United States to provide relief for the people of India.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an authorization bill. It is not an appropriation bill. The resolution speaks for itself. It merely endorses and approves this humanitarian action on the part of the President. As I said in the beginning, the resolution, after hearings, was reported by a unanimous vote. I hope that it will be approved by this House by a unanimous vote today so that not only the people of India may know of our interest and their welfare and happiness, but also that the people of the entire world will know that we are perfectly willing to share our abundance with less fortunate people.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. The other morning at the White House, as the gentleman knows, this matter was discussed by the President, by the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, and by Secretary of State Rusk. The gentleman from North Carolina will recall that I posed a question to the President as to what consideration, if any, was being given to the fact that our wheat stocks were rapidly declining, and have been so declining for the last 3 years. During this period they have gone from 1.4 billion bushels down to less than 600 million bushels and we should probably soon give consideration to relaxing controls on our wheat farmers. We did not receive a definite answer from the Secretary of Agriculture or from the President at that time.

I am wondering whether or not the House Committee on Agriculture has given any consideration to relaxing some of these controls on our wheat producers, since those stocks are rapidly declining, particularly with reference to our Soft Red Winter wheat producers in Ohio, whose stocks will be down to some 7 million bushels the first of July?

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that we were assured that if this relief were provided we would have a carryover of about 600 million bushels of wheat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

In other words, that our reserves and carryover would be adequate to meet our domestic needs.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, speaking about the 600 million bushels of carryover, I believe the February report of the wheat situation shows that the carryover will be approximately 600 million bushels. However, that was before this commitment was made by the President to India.

As I size this up, this is going to be in excess of 200 million bushels if we have to also deliver wheat to India for some of the other nations. Therefore, I do not see how we can come up with a 600 million bushel carryover if we are going to give 200 million bushels to India in this one transaction.

Mr. COOLEY. It is my understanding that our deliveries will be made throughout the rest of the calendar year. Of course, we will have another harvest coming and I assume all these things were taken into consideration by those who gave us the assurance that we would have an adequate supply in our carryovers.

I am sure you will recall that the President assured us at the White House last week that he did not want to deprive our people nor did he want to have an inadequate carryover.

Mr. LATTA. I think that is a very fair and adequate statement of the President's position.

Nor will the gentleman come back to my question as to whether or not your committee has given any consideration to the relaxation of controls on our wheat producers in view of this situation?

Mr. COOLEY. I am certain that our committee would, of course, if the bill that we are now preparing, which is an amendment to Public Law 480, is adopted, and we hope to have it up right after recess. This legislation will strike out the word "surplus," thus permitting deliberate production of food for hungry people in other nations, and we can then embark upon a program of increasing production. I have looked forward always to the time that we can go forth in the spring and plant freely, and harvest abundantly, and market our produce profitably.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question concerning the intent of this bill—as to what form our wheat might be made available to India? In the committee, as the gentleman will recall, we discussed the practicality of making as much of this wheat available in the form of flour. This is because of easier loading and unloading problems and perhaps even more important, the fact that there is greater protection against the ravages of rodents in India, a problem which concerns the Indian Government as well as those of us who have been involved in sending our products overseas and having so much of it lost because of inadequate protection at the ports and warehouses. Would the gentleman care to comment on the practicability of making as much as possible of this available to them in the form of flour?

Mr. COOLEY. I think that would depend on whether or not we could expedite our efforts to relieve hunger by sending the flour to the people in India rather than sending the wheat.

I understand the people of India, or at least a lot of them, do not know anything about flour and would not even know how to handle it or to prepare it. They take the raw wheat and grind it up into some kind of mush and consume it in that form. For the sake of our own working people here at home and the people in our mills, I would prefer of course to send them the flour. But then again there comes up the question of shipping and dock facilities and unloading and transportation in the interior by means of the distribution system there which I understand in India is very poor.

I am certain that consideration will be given to that problem.

Mrs. MAY. I know there are a number of flour mills in India, and they are admittedly running on only half capacity, as the Secretary of Agriculture testified, because they need to get this wheat directly to the people without waiting to have it milled. But because of our American marketing efforts in India, we have been teaching a number of Indian people to use the wheat as flour. Certainly there is a part of the population, quite a number, that do in some areas know how to use flour as food. All I am trying to emphasize here is that we would hope that the Secretary of Agriculture would keep this in mind because this is an easy way and a safer way to transport the grain, and for those people who know how to use it, it could be distributed to them. Otherwise, of course, as you say, they would use the grain and make their chepatas out of the wheat that they grind in their own homes.

Mr. COOLEY. I join my lovely colleague in the hope that the Secretary will bear in mind just what she has said.

I would like very much to have the wheat processed here because it would provide jobs for our American workers. I would hope the Secretary of Agriculture would take all that into consideration. But by and large the one object here is to try to see if we cannot relieve hunger as quickly as possible.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is my feeling that the people of the United States wish the help unfortunate people in India. As a God-fearing nation, the United States has time and time again come to the aid of hungry people throughout the world. Since the days of the late Herbert Hoover to the present food-for-peace program established under Public Law 480, the American people have more than generously shared their wealth and abundance with millions upon millions of people overseas.

In considering this legislation today though, I think we should try to keep in proper perspective a few major points.

First of all, from a purely legal point of view, this legislation is not needed. There is no question whatsoever that the President has all the authority necessary to do exactly what this resolution prescribes. House Joint Resolution 997 actually represents a formal congressional ratification of what the President has already publicly committed our Nation to do in regard to the serious situation in India. The defeat of a resolution like this could only embarrass America in the eyes of the world.

The second point I would like to make about this $1 billion gift to India is that, as far as I can see, the United States is going to receive no tangible benefits in return.

Perhaps we will have earned a portion of Indian good will for our generosity, I do not know. But certainly there is no evidence of the Indian Government's supporting our very perilous position in South Vietnam or in the rest of Asia. I for one want to go on record at this point by repeating a conviction that I have held for many years, and that is that the mere gifts of foreign aid do not insure lasting friends throughout the world. In the international world, it seems to me, there simply has to be a "quid pro quo" for what we give away even when the gift is prompted by humanitarian instinct.

I should like to quote from an editorial which appeared in last Friday's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer:

> ### Chilly Thanks From Mrs. Gandhi
>
> The famine-stricken people of India must be fed, and the United States, concerned as always with human distress anywhere, has again come to the rescue: this time with President Johnson's prompt pledge of a $1 billion food-aid package.
>
> Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's response to this extraordinary act of generosity is a bored sniff that it is not enough. She had hardly had the President's promise of aid in her hot little hands when she felt it necessary, in between charming New Yorkers with her manners, to insult us.
>
> Grudgingly, she conceded, in a speech at an Economic Club dinner, that what she is taking back with her from Washington will help. India will be able to struggle through the latest famine "without too much suffering."
>
> But, "on a per capita basis," she complained, India has been short-changed. Compared with the aid given other countries, India is far down the list.
>
> On a per capita basis? Is Mrs. Gandhi calling the United States derelict in its responsibility because of India's unbridled population explosion? Are we to scramble to keep pace, with our aid funds, with India's 1-million-a-month population increase?
>
> What about India's own responsibility to keep abreast of its people's needs, by such obvious measures, for instance, as going after the hoarders of gold; changing anachronistic laws that permit too large or too small land holdings; getting rid of caste restrictions and other antiques that hamper progress; making the most of the country's agricultural resources?
>
> As one coming here to beg for help—and obtaining it in overflowing measure—the Prime Minister of India has displayed arrogance, ignorance and insensitivity.

Another point I would like to make in connection with this resolution is that the "self-help" concept should really be enforced by the President. We are dealing with this concept in depth now in regard to the extension and amendment of Public Law 480, but if India is ever to progress it is clear that she must enhance her agricultural productivity. With 490 million people now and the prospect of 1.2 billion people by the turn of the 21st century, India faces a massive challenge in feeding her population.

The final point I wish to make is to urge the President, as strongly as I can, to solicit and secure the cooperation of other nations in meeting the needs of India. The Communist world especially should be asked for help in this effort. If they are unwilling to help, let India and the world know it. If they are unable to help, let India and the world know that, too.

Either way it shows the bankruptcy of the Socialist camp when it comes to meeting man's most fundamental need, the need for food.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is going to pass this House today, and history will record once again the compassion and generosity of the American people for the people of India. I only hope that this will be one history lesson the world will remember.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAGUE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. I wonder if I might at this point ask my distinguished minority leader what his recollection is in committee as to the amount of the carryover of our own domestic stocks of wheat?

This subject was mentioned earlier in the colloquy between our colleague from Ohio and the chairman of the committee. I think the record should show that the Secretary of Agriculture testified that after the delivery of 3½ million tons of wheat, the carryover would then be drawn down to 600 million bushels.

However, I do think we should point out that the President has told us that India really needs 7 million tons of wheat, and he is hopeful that other countries will supply a large portion of the additional 3 million. However, he has also indicated that if the other countries do not supply it, the United States will have to give very serious consideration to making up that difference.

Therefore, I think we ought to be very aware in the House Committee on Agriculture, that if we supply another 2 or 3 million tons to India, this according to my arithmetic, could bring our carryover supply down to 400 million bushels of wheat. In this case, we would have a very low reserve carryover. It would behoove us to keep close watch over our wheat reserve carryover. Does my colleague not agree?

Mr. DAGUE. I could not agree more. I think that it what the record of our committee will show.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman, and would like to say further that I am in support of House Joint Resolution 997.

The visit of the Prime Minister of India to Washington last week and the President's message to the Congress about the difficult food conditions in that country have focused attention on this serious problem. Our committee gave unanimous support to the resolution under discussion and I am sure it has the overwhelming support of the Congress.

The President in his message asked for information and judgments of the Congress about this program which as I understand calls for the largest shipment of food grains to a foreign country in a single year. Those of us in many parts of the country and especially in the Pacific Northwest and gulf area have been having some serious problems with the boxcar shortage for handling with the port as well as domestic shipments. We also know that despite full employment in most lines of business and pressures to keep prices and wages within general guidelines, there are still many local pockets of slack employment such as flour mills.

I hope that those agencies handling this large program will give due consideration to the need for flexibility in form of food sent as well as ports of movement in order that shipments may be maximized without conflicting with domestic and other export shipments.

During the 1946-49 critical years for meeting world food needs, flexibility of movement especially from supplying countries was the key to meeting such needs. The President mentions that the Canadian commitment of one million tons involves both wheat and flour and I suggest that the United States likewise follow this procedure.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Speaker of the House [Mr. McCormack].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The distinguished Speaker is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, although the President feels under existing law, the administration has the authority to extend this aid to India, I think he used excellent judgment in asking congressional cooperation and endorsement. For this will show the unity between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government to the Government and people of India, and to the entire world in carrying out our moral obligations and in the consideration of human beings facing keen suffering and distress.

The quick action on the pending resolution also shows the effectiveness, the efficiency, and the responsibility of democratic institutions of government. It shows to the world, and in particular to the Government and the people of India, the understanding and good will of our Government and our people in this period of emergency and distress in India.

We hope that our good-neighbor example will be immediately followed by other nations in a position to help in this grave emergency confronting millions of human beings in India.

I want particularly to congratulate the chairman and all the members of the House Committee on Agriculture for their quick action in connection with this resolution. The President sent the letter to Congress on Wednesday last. The House Committee on Agriculture met the following day and unanimously reported the resolution, and the resolution is now up for consideration in the House of Representatives today—all in a matter of a few days.

This is an example of democratic institutions of government in operation, in its finest manner, and in its highest level of refinement and operation.

Again, I am very proud of the committee and I am very proud of the House of Representatives in considering this resolution that means so much as an example to the world and in particular to millions of human beings, like we are, who are facing extreme distress in our neighboring Nation of India.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the food for India program, in my judgment, is the most misunderstood program on the books. Most American people, I am sure, believe that under this program starving destitute people in the streets of Bombay and elsewhere in India will get food without cost.

The truth is that, in all probability, not one single bushel of the food provided as a result of the President's initiative as mentioned in this resolution will go to destitute people.

It is true that the committee—I think wisely—inserted language in the resolution expressing the hope that substantial amounts will go to people unable to pay, but the past record of the Indian Government does not give much comfort. There is no hint whatever that the arrangements made between the President and the Prime Minister of India will change the character of this program in that respect. It is very likely that the rats will get a lot more out of this program than the destitute people of India. Yet I am sure that most Americans, when they think about the vast food for India program they have been financing over the years, are under the impression that most of it, if not all of it, goes without charge to hungry people.

Of course, the gift to India does indeed fill a need. There can be no question about that. Whether for good reasons or not, India is short of food. But this Presidential action amounts to a grant in aid to the Government, and the Government in turn markets the food through commercial channels.

The people of India have to pay for it. That is why I say this is the most misunderstood program on the books.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, I know the distinguished gentleman, who is a fine student of agricultural legislation, does not want to give the wrong impression. I think the gentleman will agree on two things: first, that the shipment of wheat to India will relieve a very critical situation to a certain extent.

Mr. FINDLEY. There is no question about that.

Mr. ALBERT. And, secondly, that those who are in dire need and who do not have the rupees with which to make direct purchases may be able to share through the distribution systems for relief purposes under any regular food distribution programs which the Indian Government may have in operation.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman is not suggesting that the food made available under this Presidential action will be distributed in that manner, is he?

Mr. ALBERT. I am not making a suggestion that all of it will be, but those who are eligible under the regular food distribution program or other relief might be beneficiaries of a portion of this wheat.

Mr. FINDLEY. I think the gentleman is mistaken. There is no indication that any of the food provided under this program will go under either titles II or III, the donation provisions of Public Law 480. There is that possibility, but there has been no encouraging development of which I have knowledge.

Mr. ALBERT. I was merely giving my impression of what the Indian Government might do under its regular food distribution programs.

Mr. FINDLEY. At the White House I was informed the Prime Minister had given no indication that any of the food would be provided without charge to destitute people. Since 1961 the American people have virtually donated about 20 million tons of food to the Government of India. Of that amount only about 500,000 tons or approximately 5 percent has been distributed through titles II or III. The rest of it has been marketed through the so-called fair price markets operated by the Government. In those markets the people who get the food have to pay for it, and there is no way they can know the generosity of the American people made possible the presence of that food in those markets.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman will recall when the group was down to the White House the other morning, prior to the President sending his message up here, that was one of the points brought out. I think I got the impression—and I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois has, too—that we did make some impression on the President. I am inclined to believe that he is taking that into account along with some other recommendations which were made at that conference the other morning. I got the impression from his response to some of the questions which were asked there that he was impressed and possibly would direct, and he does have the authority under this resolution to do it.

Mr. FINDLEY. I hope that will be the case.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice in support of House Joint Resolution 997. There could be little doubt as to the wisdom of adopting this resolution and there should be little hesitancy in doing so. Our action here today will reemphasize to the world that the American people are a kind people, and genuinely concerned where a problem is faced by their world neighbors.

The resolution before us places no conditions on our generosity; no infringement on the internal management of the affairs of India, political or economic. We ask nothing in return for our contributions to a needy neighbor, except that the suffering of the people be stifled. The reaffirmation of this approach to world togetherness should have rewarding results in our continuing struggle against totalitarianism and communism.

I believe, however, that when we help our neighbor we should also expect him to try to help himself. In the case of India, this means a concerted effort to increase agricultural production by adopting modern methods; to develop industry, and to take steps to manage the population problem. I understand that efforts are being made on all these fronts, that there are notable advances, and there is the promise of acceleration of these gains.

The resolution before us will be approved, and the additional foodstuffs will relieve critical food shortages in India. This simple fact will smother the food riots, which are smoldering and which have erupted from time to time. There could be no question that full-scale food riots in India could have a devastating effect on the Asian problem, and could bring serious political, and possibly military results for the United States.

Mr. Speaker I am proud to support House Joint Resolution 997.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time for a question.

The second committee amendment expresses the concern of the committee that to the extent necessary the food made available pursuant to the program referred to in this resolution will be used for direct relief of the hungry people. The gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Illinois were just discussing who would get free assistance under this program. I am wondering if the committee has shown any concern or made any provision to see that this assistance from America which is rendered to these needy Indian people will be recognized as actually coming from concerned citizens of the United States. If we are going to help the least we can do is see to it that the recipients know beyond doubt where the help is coming from.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I will be glad to.

Mr. FINDLEY. I have raised that question repeatedly in the committee hearings we have had. So far as I can determine, nothing has been done up to now to give the people of India notice that the United States is indeed virtually donating the grain which is sold through these fair price markets. Of course, the price is below that paid in the black market. Perhaps they can at least inform the people of India that due to our generosity prices are lower than would be otherwise the case. But even that is not being done so far as I know.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartily join my colleagues in support of this resolution supporting the President's program to give prompt assistance in relieving the victims of hunger in India.

As many of my colleagues are aware, I have spoken out on a number of occasions on feeding the hungry of the world. I have contended first, that we must encourage the underdeveloped nations to develop their own agriculture and second, that we expand our production of food in an orderly manner as a supplement to each nation's own effort.

Both of these points are being considered by the House Committee on Agriculture in drafting food-for-freedom legislation. I am pleased, also, to see the recognition of both of these points in the resolution before us.

We must recognize, however, that in the present emergency situation, these must be more in the form of guidelines than in the form of directives. With the threat of millions of people in India facing starvation, our first concern must be to assure them that we are willing to supply large quantities of food. This the President has clearly spelled out in his special message of March 30.

A related area not mentioned in the resolution is that of family planning. The President, however, in his message has pointed out Mrs. Ghandi's indication of the vigorous effort by the Indian Government on this matter. I am pleased to see that India's leaders are cognizant of this "other side of the coin in bringing food supplies into line with population.

The President's effort is a sincere humanitarian one. It should have the unanimous support of the Members of the Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I might just take 1 minute to say that in the President's message you will find this language when he speaks about the Prime Minister of India:

> In response to her needs, I propose that we allot up to 200,000 tons of corn, and up to 150 million pounds of vegetable oils, and up to 125 million pounds of milk powder to India. The vegetable oil and milk powder are especially needed for supplementing the diets of Indian children.

Mr. Speaker, how can we advise all of the recipients in India to the effect that this relief is coming from the people of America? I do not know how it can be done. I understand they speak about 50 different languages. It would be very difficult for us to tag the wheat that goes to the ports of India, and is unloaded in bulk and distributed through their own distribution system.

Mr. Speaker, of course everyone in the House of Representatives would like for the Indian people to know that the food is coming from the taxpayers of America. I am quite certain that our representatives in our Government will do everything they possibly can to see that the recipients know about our generosity.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask a few questions of the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

What assurance do we have in terms of the resolution that this wheat will not be resold by the Indian Government? Wheat was reportedly resold from the disaster stocks made available by the United States to India some 10 or 12 years ago.

Is there any restriction upon the sale of this wheat by India elsewhere in the world?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman mean that India might take this wheat and sell it to some other country?

Mr. GROSS. Exactly.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, someone in our Government would certainly be derelict in their duties if they permitted that to happen. If they permit that to happen to us, I can assure the gentleman from Iowa that I shall vote against giving them anything else at any time.

I cannot believe that people of India would stoop that low and, further, I cannot believe that our people would permit them to stoop that low. This is an agreement. The food must be used by the people of India.

Mr. GROSS. But there is nothing contained in this resolution to assure that the wheat will not be sold.

Mr. COOLEY. No. It will be a Public Law 480 agreement that it will not be sold.

Mr. GROSS. In the matter of transportation, are American bottoms going to be used to ship this wheat, flour, corn, cotton, and tobacco to India?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; to the extent of 50 percent.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not aware of the fact that we are chartering foreign-flag ships to haul our military hardware and other supplies to Vietnam; that we have been short of American bottoms in which to transport cargoes to that vital area?

Mr. COOLEY. I am also well aware of the fact that we have a merchant marine in this country.

Mr. GROSS. I say that this merchant marine that we have is already overtaxed, and we have been chartering foreign-flag ships in which to haul materiel to Vietnam.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman ought to try to get more than 50 percent of these items shipped in American bottoms, and he will see how far he gets in that.

Mr. GROSS. I am not advocating the repeal of the 50-percent clause. I am trying to get it all shipped in American bottoms, since it is going to be given away. I do not believe it is going to be hauled in American ships, because this is a pressure deal.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield further. I am in favor of repealing the 50-percent clause.

Mr. GROSS. It is going to be slowed down in transportation to India, because the bottoms are not available today.

Mr. COOLEY. What can the gentleman from Iowa and I do about that?

Mr. GROSS. I desire only to point out the situation you are running into in this emotional and high pressure deal.

Mr. COOLEY. I am walking into it with my eyes wide open.

Mr. GROSS. And I wonder what you are starting with millions of other hungry people around the world——

Mr. COOLEY. The President has been assured that we could make these deliveries, that we have the dock facilities, the stevedores will be there to unload the ships when they arrive. We are told that he has these assurances.

Mr. GROSS. Why is tobacco being sent over to people who are starving? Are they going to put a plug of tobacco between two slices of bread, and eat it? What is the story on that?

Mr. COOLEY. In his message to the Congress on this resolution, which is printed in the committee report, the President said:

> India's own exchange resources can be released for food and fertilizer purchases if we make substantial shipments of cotton and tobacco.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has said the tobacco will ease the tension of the starving Indians and relax the nerves so that they can eat the food and assimilate it much better.

He also quotes the President as saying that India's exchange resources can be used for food and fertilizer purchases if substantial shipments of cotton and tobacco are made. This means to me that the cotton and tobacco, if not other products, will be sold by India's Government to the Indian people and perhaps others.

This is not truly a famine relief bill and no one should labor under any illusion that it is. Nor should anyone labor under the illusion that any substantial part of this huge bill of expense to American taxpayers will ever be repaid. Whatever rupees are used in exchange will never leave India and will never be converted into dollars. Any American who thinks differently should light up his pipe, cigar, or cigarette, relax and try to assimilate the shock of another $500 million to $1 billion spent, and speculate on how he is going to scratch up additional hundreds of millions of dollars to meet the worldwide demands of those who will be clamoring for similar treatment.

The **SPEAKER.** The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, we have this resolution, which is not really necessary, but it does indicate the support of the Congress for what the President is going to do to provide at least 3.5 million tons of wheat and some other farm commodities to India. What I want to point out is that this resolution gives the impression to the American people that the United States is giving the Indians food.

When at some later date we do not get the kind of appreciation we would expect from India for giving them the food, I think we ought to realize why this is. The United States is going to sell the wheat, to India. We are going to sell it for rupees. Nothing in the hearings indicated to me that we would be actually giving any wheat to India.

The bill provided that India's present food shortages would be relieved by selling them the food. But the committee crossed that out and inserted in lieu thereof "make available." So Americans will get the impression that this will not necessarily mean the selling of the food.

I believe if there are starving people, the wheat would be more readily available to them if it was sent to them in flour. We cannot sell them flour if they are going to buy wheat. They want to buy wheat—they do not want to buy flour.

I understand Canada is going to make available 1 million tons of wheat and half of that is going to be given to India. In that case they can give India flour and have indicated they are going to give a substantial amount of flour milled in Canada.

As long as we persist in selling to them when we claim to be aiding starving people and then later on giving the rupees to them, and they can use the rupees to build some plants or something else or engage in some other activity, the Indians will feel they purchased the wheat. They will purchase what they want; we cannot sell them something they do not want. If we sell it to them, they in turn will not have the feeling toward the United States that they would if we gave them food. If we give them something else for the rupees that they have accumulated in counterpart funds from the sale of wheat we might just as well have given them the wheat in the first place. So I think we have a confusing issue before us. We ought to make up our minds if we are going to make a gift of food or not. If we are going to give food, let us give it to them so that they will know they received the food as a gift from the United States.

If we are going to sell to them, let us do again as Canada has done it, on a credit sale. So that later on they can pay back the loan which we give them. This is the intent of the so-called food-for-freedom program which we are considering in the Committee on Agriculture. At the end of 5 years the bill proposes we shift from counterpart sales, which are sales for foreign currencies, to credit sales which they would eventually pay back to us. It does not seem wise now to embark upon a large sale for rupees when the policy of the Federal Government, the U.S. Government, is to shift to credit sales. We ought to give outright gifts under title II for the people who are in famine and sell for credit to the others so they can pay back and know they are going to pay it back over a period of time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSON].

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this resolution. I am in support of it the way it is drafted. I believe that it is quite proper that we use the terminology "make available." I think in fact there might be some harm if we left the impression that we were selling on terms commonly associated with that term, this wheat. All farmers might all of a sudden decide if they were selling it, they might indeed want some of the restrictions on American production released. We might be waving the flag of false hope in referring to this aid as merely selling. We do not preclude that term when we say "make available." Or we do not have to explain that it is being sold for soft currency, for rupees, that explanation might not be noted by all.

I think it is very proper that we make it available and that we make it available through the facilities of the Indian Government. I do not think any of us in this House want to go on record as being in favor of establishing a new massive welfare system in India to distribute this aid. I know those I represent want to eliminate the threat of starvation in India and agree with me that our assistance will prove that democracy cares about people. Certainly it is easy to understand that India's impending famine is a threat to her government, the world's most populous democracy. President Johnson has acted wisely in asking Congress to express our views on this additional aid to the Indian nation, a democratic nation, experiencing a crisis.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting and voting for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 997. I am supporting it because I have full faith in the leadership of the Indian Government. I have every confidence that the Government leaders of India are just as much, if not even more, concerned than we are about the starving masses in India. After all, they are their people; and I have no reason to believe that their feelings are any different from us Americans.

We must remember that India is a country which has produced not only great leaders but great thinkers and great philosophers as well—men like Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru and prior to them, of course, the Lord Buddha. If there has been any nation which has in its history been free from self-seeking, ambitious, fortune-seeking leaders in government, it is India. While we may not fully agree with many of her beliefs, religious and otherwise, and by our own standards may want to change these beliefs and practices to suit our own image, we must remember that India still represents the biggest democratic nation in Asia and that the democratic process is not the most efficient in meeting emergency situations.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some agitation for inclusion of a limiting provision which would prescribe a method of distribution to insure that the hungry without money would receive the food which we send to India.

In the consideration of this joint resolution, let us remember that we are not giving away the needed food to India but that we are selling it for their currency. If we were to reverse the situation and were ourselves purchasing food for our starving masses here in the United States and the Indian leaders attempted to dictate how we should distribute such food among our people, what would our reaction be? We have been assured by the President and by his competent Secretary of Agriculture that a satisfactory distributive system is in operation in India and that it would be best to use such distributive system for this crash program. We must express our faith in well-meaning leaders of India that they will exert every effort to see that proper distribution is made down to the poverty stricken and penniless. Adoption of this joint resolution will be an expression of this faith.

Mr. Speaker, why cannot we in approving this legislation admit to ourselves that we as a nation are philanthropic by nature and that we are going to the assistance of India not because we feel we need her friendship or we hope for some economic advantage to ourselves, but purely because of our national humanitarian outlook? Let us make it clear that we believe in lending assistance to those in need and that so long as we are blessed by the Almighty more than our neighbors, regardless of the consequences, we will continue to share those blessings? This has been the image of our great Nation whether we like it or not, and in my estimation a good image and one which we ought to strive to keep, God willing.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. Many of us have questions about distribution, about our role, and numerous other things; but I would ask the Members, what choice is there? The choice, in my opinion, is very clear in that we must, in the American tradition, help the Indian Government and the Indian people now. They need our help now and, frankly, our only answer must be immediate action on the pending resolution.

Without a doubt, many questions can be raised by all of us, and perhaps we could come up with a solution or two; but at a time when people are facing starvation, we have only one choice, and that is to act very quickly and promptly.

Last November I had the privilege of attending the Food and Agricultural Organization Conference in Rome, Italy. At that time I had the further privilege of discussing India's food problem with Dr. B. R. Sen, Director General of FAO, and previously a high official in the Indian Government for many years. A most encouraging thing about this resolution is, as the chairman pointed out earlier, the recognition on page 2, subparagraph (c), that there will be efforts made by the Indian people and by the Indian Government to improve their agricultural technology and their production.

Dr. Sen assured me last November that India must and would increase "self-help" measures. I understand he conveyed the same thought to President Johnson about 2 weeks ago. It is my understanding Mrs. Gandhi indicated to President Johnson that self-help probgrams will be instituted in India. Certainly there should be such programs not only in India, but other countries who share in our abundance.

Many of us are now discussing this as we discuss the food-for-freedom bill. Amendments will be offered to establish self-help as an integral part of any such program; in fact, I shall offer an amendment to create a Bread and Butter Corps to assist free world countries to develop, improve, and expand their agriculture technology.

No one in this House wants any person in India to starve because of a failure to act. Yes, there may be many questions that many of us have. But the immediate problem now is, What we do when 10 million people face possible starvation? The only answer is to support the resolution and then demand efficiency from those who administer the program, which should include definite self-help guidelines and self-help assistance from American experts and those who have practical know-how.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 997.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the House joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TYPOGRAPHICAL CORRECTION

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be authorized to correct the spelling of the word "measures" appearing on page 2, line 14.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to make the correction.

There was no objection.

GREAT SALT LAKE LANDS, UTAH

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1791) to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1791

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the State of Utah all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands formerly covered by the waters of Great Salt Lake which are within the meander line of said lake as determined by public land surveys heretofore made and by such additional surveys, to be made hereafter, as are necessary to close said line, or in and to such part of said lands as the State may elect. The conveyance herein directed shall be absolute and shall take effect immediately upon execution of the instrument of conveyance by the Secretary but the Secretary may, at any time thereafter, accept a relinquishment to the United States of the State's right, title, and interest in and to any or all of the lands conveyed.

SEC. 2. It shall be a condition precedent to the conveyance otherwise directed by the first section of this Act that the State of Utah, acting by or pursuant to an express act of its legislature—

(a) undertakes to pay to the United States, if it is judicially determined that the United States now has any right, title, or interest in and to any or all of the lands to be conveyed, 90 per centum of the fair market value, as of the date of conveyance, of the right, title, and interest conveyed and not thereafter relinquished, such value to be determined by agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the State or persons authorized to act on their behalf, insofar as such agreement is possible, or by the court, if and to the extent that such agreement is not possible;

(b) disclaims any right, title, or interest or claim of right, title, or interest in and to the lands held by the United States within or for use in connection with the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge and the Weber Basin Federal reclamation project;

(c) disclaims any right, title, or interest or any claim of right, title, or interest in and to lands which are not conveyed pursuant to the first section of this Act or which are relinquished in accordance therewith, whether inside or outside the meander line hereinbefore described, and which may heretofore have been covered by the waters of Great Salt Lake or may hereafter become covered by those waters: *Provided,* That this disclaimer shall not be held to extend to any lands which have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, acquired by the State or any of its political subdivisions from the United States pursuant to sections 6, 7, 8, and 12 of the Act of July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 109), or from the United States or any other party holding lawful title thereto by purchase, donation, exchange, foreclosure, or condemnation;

(d) agrees that all rights of the State under any lease, license, permit, or contract of sale by it pertaining to land which it does not elect to have conveyed to it or which it relinquishes shall pass to the United States and that it will account for all rents, royalties, and profits hereafter received by it from such leases, licenses, permits, or contracts of sale and, further, that if it is judicially determined that the United States now has right, title, or interest in and to some or all of the lands conveyed to the State, the rights of the State under any lease, license, permit, or contract of sale pertaining to oil and gas in the lands with respect to which it has been so determined shall pass to the United States and that it will account to the United States for all rents, royalties, and profits hereafter received by it from such leases, licenses, permits, and contracts of sale; and

(e) consents to and accepts all provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. The conveyance directed by the first section of this Act shall contain an express reservation to the United States of all oil and gas in the lands conveyed, together with the right to prospect for, mine, extract, and remove the same and to permit others so to do in accordance with the laws of the United States. Said reservation, however, shall cease to be of any force or effect with respect to any lands in and to which it is judicially determined, as hereinbefore provided, the United States does not have right, title, or interest. If it is judicially determined that the United States has no right, title, or interest in or to some or all of the lands in question, the rights of the United States under any lease that may theretofore have been granted under said mineral leasing laws with respect to those lands shall pass to the State of Utah and there shall be paid to said State 90 per centum of all moneys hereafter paid to the United States under such leases minus whatever portion thereof has otherwise been paid to the State in accordance with existing law. Every lease, license, or permit issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall contain provisions designed to assure as full use as possible of the lands involved by the State, its grantees, lessees, and permittees.

SEC. 4. In order to secure an expeditious judicial determination of issues in controversy which arise under sections 2 and 3 of this Act and depend upon a like determination of the controversy between the United States and the State of Utah concerning the present right, title, and interest of the United States or the State in and to the lands conveyed or to be conveyed to, and not relinquished by, the State under the first section of this Act, the Attorney General of the United States is hereby directed to institute suit against the State in such manner and before such court having jurisdiction in the premises as will serve to secure a determination of the aforesaid issues and of matters related thereto. If such suit is not commenced on or before the ninetieth day following the conveyance directed to be made by the first section of this Act, the consent of the United States to be made a party defendant in a suit brought by the State in a court of the United States having jurisdiction in the premises and designed to secure a determination of the aforesaid issues and matters related thereto is hereby given.

SEC. 5. (a) If the State of Utah elects to have conveyed to it all of the lands within the meander line described in the first section of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall complete the existing survey thereof as rapidly as possible by closing the meander line referred to in the first section of this Act following, as nearly as may be, the level of Great Salt Lake as it was in 1855. If the State elects to have conveyed to it less than all the lands within said meander line or relinquishes some of the lands conveyed to it, the Secretary shall proceed to such surveys as may be necessary in the circumstances. In either event, he is authorized to accept such donations as the State may tender in order to expedite the work involved.

(b) In order to simplify administration by the State of lands conveyed to, and not relinquished by, it and by the United States of lands retained by, or relinquished to, it under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to adjust, in accordance with the terms of such agreement with the State as he may enter into, the boundary between Utah's lands and the United States lands to conform to section, half-section, or quarter-section lines, the United States holding the whole of any section, half section, or quarter section, as the case may be, in which half or more than half the acreage would, in any event, be its and the State holding the whole of any section, half section or quarter section, as the case may be, in which more than half the acreage would otherwise be its.

(c) As full or partial payment by the State of such amounts as may be required under the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to accept a grant of interests in lands or mineral rights (including lands and mineral rights beneath the bed of Great Salt Lake) which the State owns or a relinquishment by the State of lawful land selection rights which it has not yet exercised if, in his judgment, the acceptance of such grants or relinquishments will be beneficial and useful to the United States. Each such grant or relinquishment, if accepted by the Secretary, shall be taken at not more than the fair market value of the interests conveyed or relinquished.

SEC. 6. (a) No conveyance by the United States to the State of Utah under this Act and no election by the State to have conveyed to it less than all the lands described in the first section of this Act and no relinquishment by the State of any lands which are conveyed to it under this Act shall affect or prejudice, in any way whatsoever, lawful claims or valid existing rights, titles, or interests of any third party in and to the lands affected by that conveyance, election, or relinquishment.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall honor and carry out the terms of any lease, license, permit, or contract of sale heretofore made by the State of Utah in accordance with its laws which pass to the United States under section 2, subsection (d) of this Act, and the State of Utah shall honor and carry out the terms of any lease, license, or permit of the United States granted in accordance with its laws which pass to the State under section 3 of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, a controversy has existed between the State of Utah and the United States since 1961 concerning the ownership of several hundred thousand acres of land lying along the shore of Great Salt Lake. This dispute involves land lying below the incompletely surveyed meander line, commenced in 1855, and above the present level of the lake. The lands were exposed by the gradual recession of the lake waters, which, although showing cyclic and annual fluctuations, now stand at a level considerably below the mean high water level as depicted by the surveyed meander line. At issue is the ownership of approximately 600,000 acres of land formerly covered by lake waters but now exposed.

The controversy arises out of the differing legal positions of the State and the Federal Government on the applicability to Great Salt Lake of the common law doctrine of reliction. It is the Government's position that the doctrine is applicable and that, therefore, the United States has become owner of those lands uncovered by the recession of Great Salt Lake which abut federally owned uplands. The State denies the applicability of the reliction doctrine and claims ownership of the lands uncovered by the receding lake waters on a variety of grounds among which is the contention that the beds of all inland navigable waters passed to the State on January 4, 1896, the date of statehood.

The committee heard strong arguments on both sides of this issue but it is of the opinion that this should be left to a decision by the courts. With this in mind and recognizing that uncertainty as to ownership of the lands was a strong impediment to industrial development of the lands in connection with the extraction of minerals from the lake brines, the committee considered and recommended enactment of legislation which would overcome the problems of delay but would permit an orderly and final settlement of the dispute through the courts.

H.R. 1791, as amended, essentially does two things. First, it provides for the transfer to the State of Utah of whatever interests—except those arising out of oil and gas deposits—the United States may have in the lands lying below the surveyed meander line of the Great Salt Lake and above the present water level of the lake which have been uncovered by the recession of the lake waters.

Second, it provides a means for determining what, if any, these interests are and what amount should be paid by the State to the United States for them. The transfer of the interests is to be made immediately upon agreement by the State that it will pay the amount so determined.

The committee feels that H.R. 1791, as amended, is meritorious in that it permits the immediate use of the lands for industrial development by providing for their transfer to the State of Utah upon agreement by the State that it will pay the amount so determined, but leaves to the courts the final determination of the legal issues of ownership.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 56]

Abbitt
Adair
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashley
Barrett
Bell
Blatnik
Bolling
Bray
Brock
Buchanan
Burleson
Cabell
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Conyers
Cramer
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dowdy
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Farbstein
Farnum
Feighan
Fino
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Grabowski
Grider
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Helstoski
Herlong
Holland
Jacobs
Johnson, Okla.
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Long, La.
McClory
McDowell
MacGregor
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Miller
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
Pepper
Pool
Powell
Randall
Reinecke
Roberts
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Scheuer
Scott
Senner
Smith, N.Y.
Sweeney
Tenzer
Toll
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Weltner
White, Tex.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wydler
Yates

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I did not request the preceding quorum call.

I think the chairman of the full committee has adequately described the bill that is before the House.

Mr. Speaker, when Utah was admitted to the Union, on January 4, 1896, the Federal Government yielded title to all the lands lying under the Great Salt Lake to the State. Since that time, the lake level has fluctuated greatly. It is now considerably lower than it was in 1896. Utah has always gone on the assumption that it had title to lands that were under the lake in 1896. We assumed that we were on safe ground, so to speak, because in acquiring some lands for use in a Federal waterfowl refuge, the Federal Government has on several occasions, bought from and paid the State of Utah for lands that fit within this category.

In 1961, someone in the Department of Interior decided that the doctrine of reliction applied, and so, for the past 5 years, title to these lands has been contested.

There is some urgency in trying to get this title settled, which is what this bill proposes to do, because there are several industrial concerns that are eager to locate plants and settling ponds along the shores of the lake in order to mine the minerals, mainly magnesium and lithium, that are in the lake water. This bill would enable a judicial settlement to resolve this problem, if that is necessary.

At this time I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Baring] and the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall] and my ranking member the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] for helping us to move this bill along.

It is very important to our State. I urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman advise our colleagues as to why it is necessary to permit the legal action that is involved at this time, so that the use of the land, to which you have made reference, can be had immediately?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, none of the companies are willing to invest the multimillion dollars that will be required to create these plants unless there is clear title to the land. Commonsense dictates that a big industrial complex will not be built in an area where it is not known who owns the land in the first place.

I thank the chairman for bringing this out.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. King].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, what this bill seeks to accomplish, in a word, is to partially settle the title to a vast area of land whose title at present is in a condition of complete uncertainty. The area, amounting to 650,000 acres, or more, consists of land which has been exposed by the gradual recession of the waters of the Great Salt Lake since the time of their initial survey, which was commenced over 100 years ago.

Today this land is claimed both by the United States and by the State of Utah.

Portions of it are also claimed by private individuals. The validity of the private claims is disputed in part by both the Federal Government and the State of Utah, but not to the same extent, nor for the same reasons. This bill would settle the title controversy between the Federal Government and the State of Utah, but would not settle the private claims. The latter will have to be litigated or negotiated. Such litigation or negotiation, however, would be greatly facilitated by the settlement of this dispute between the Federal and the State Governments.

There are two further reasons why immediate action on this bill is needed. The first is to facilitate the lake's industrial development. The brines of the Great Salt Lake contain valuable minerals including the well-known sodium chloride—table salt—as well as magnesium, lithium, and others. To extract these minerals, large industrial complexes, including ponding areas, must be erected on the land in question. If it is assumed that this land is in Federal ownership, it can presumably be occupied for ponding, under Federal law, on no firmer right than a mere revocable license. Such a license provides a most precarious base for such an enterprise. No sensible businessman would invest $30 million in a venture which could be destroyed at administrative whim, even if a bank would fund it, which it will not.

Even if the Federal law were favorable to this type of development, however, a serious problem would still remain by virtue of the fact that as long as both State and National Governments claim the land, no attorney can clear title thereto as a condition to industrial development.

The second reason for requesting quick action on this bill is that it is needed to prepare the way for the development of a vast tourist program. The State of Utah has recently created what is known as the Great Salt Lake Authority for the purpose of developing the scenic, recreation, and tourist potential of the lake and its environs. Until the question of title to the disputed land is settled, little significant action can be taken by the lake authority to accomplish these goals.

Let it be remembered that the land is virtually valueless in and of itself. It consists, generally, of a vast, flat shelf of mud, incapable of sustaining life, and devoid of minerals of any description.

Virtually its only value is the space it occupies: space on which extracting machinery can be erected and where, in a few areas, beach facilities might be developed. Were it not proximate to the lake, it would be virtually worthless. Inasmuch as the Federal Government is not in a position to exploit the commercial and tourist possibilities above enumerated, it is safe to say that as far as the United States is concerned, the land is, indeed, without any practical value at all.

What this bill does is to settle title to these lands in the State of Utah, specifically leaving open the question of the conflicting private claims. The aforesaid commercial and tourist development could commence immediately, however, upon the enactment of this statute, for the reason that ample land exists within the area involved upon which private parties make no claim whatever.

In considering the need for this measure, it must be remembered that the Great Salt Lake is unique in the United States, and indeed, in the world. It is one of those rare bodies of water which has no outlet, and which has therefore become heavily saturated with minerals. Unlike the Dead Sea, the Great Salt Lake lies in a vast, flat, shallow basin. To give an idea of the problem which this creates, recall that in falling 9 feet in surface level—which it has done since 1896—the lake has exposed some 550,000 acres of land.

The general rule of law is that States own—and not just control—all of the lands lying under navigable streams and lakes at the time of statehood. This principle was clearly enunciated by the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Utah*, 283 U.S. 64, in 1931, and has never been altered since then. According to this principle, the margin—or meander line—of the said navigable body of water delineates the outer extremity of State ownership. If the body of water is contiguous to Federal property, then the meander line constitutes the dividing line between the State and the said Federal property.

The "meander line" is legally equivalent to the "mean high water mark." The mean high water mark is the highest water mark—during the course of ordinary, that is, daily and seasonal, fluctuations—reached by that water during a mean year, that is, a year when the average water level is midway between the highest known flood level and the lowest known drought level. This mean high water mark can ordinarily be determined by using as evidence the vegetation line, caused by the action of the water.

It should also be pointed out that most lakes have reasonable surface-level stability, as well as area stability. The normal outflow from the lake acts as a regulator, making it impossible for the surface-level fluctuations to exceed certain restricted limits. The relative steepness of the banks limit the extent of the area fluctuations.

The mean high water mark can therefore be quite easily determined as far as most lakes are concerned.

But the Great Salt Lake is quite different, and for that reason, requires special treatment. In the first place, the marginal ground adjacent to the water's edge is quite repugnant to the growth of normal vegetation. In the second place, the fluctuations of the lake surface are so completely erratic as to defy the application of any normal rules based on a more or less predictability of the fluctuation pattern. In the third place, the surface level of the lake has been consistently receding during recent history.

Over the past 115 years the lake has dropped over 10 feet, exposing something in the neighborhood of 650,000 acres of land. The recessions have not been uniform or continuous. During at least six distinct historic periods the lake level has risen instead of dropped. From cycle to cycle, from year to year, and even from month to month, or from day to day, the level of the lake may change. The overall trend is apparently down, but frequently this trend has been interrupted by temporary upward trends. It is a fact that even a strong wind blowing continuously in one direction can move back the waters, thus exposing many hundreds, or thousands, of acres.

The difficulties which this situation creates are thus apparent. First, it is impossible to determine where the meander line is, by reference to the mean high water mark reached in the course of ordinary fluctuations. The lake has no ordinary fluctuations. The early surveyors going onto the lake's shore in 1850 were incapable of determining any mean high water mark. From what they could determine, the waters of the lake had been receding for many years, leaving little evidence of where they had been at any one particular period of time.

Second, even if a meander line were established by some arbitrary fixing of a mean high water mark, the line would become obsolete as soon as the waters further receded or advanced.

Because of these difficulties, the first surveyors established what they felt to be a reasonable mean high water mark in 1855. Admittedly it was arbitrary, because of the extreme difficulties above pointed out. It became generally accepted, however, as the official meander line, later dividing State ownership from Federal ownership.

This meander line was approved by the Surveyor General and was platted on the official records of the county recorders in the counties located contiguous to the lake. The Federal Government platted lots adjacent to the meander line of irregular shapes and odd acreages, and patented many of these lots to private individuals or organizations. Essentially, all maps prepared by the United States and the State of Utah have shown the Great Salt Lake to include the area contained within the aforesaid 1855 meander line.

Three points should be made with regard to the above meander line: First, it was established over a long period of time, but the year 1855 is used for convenience of designation. Second, the survey which established this line was never completed. There is a substantial area on the west of the lake that has never been surveyed. Third, when Utah became a State in 1896, the 1855 meander line was accepted by the Federal Government, as well as the State of Utah, as the line of demarcation between State and Federal territory. This was justified on the ground that although the 1855 meander line was somewhat higher than the 1896 meander line, the level of the lake in 1896 was cyclically low, and the 1855 meander line seemed to more nearly represent the mean high water mark for the year 1896.

It followed that from 1896 until 1961, it was assumed by all parties, Federal, State, and private, that the State of Utah owned all the lake land within the 1855 meander line.

This is demonstrated by the fact that the State of Utah has gone ahead and leased and sold some of these lands to private individuals. The State department of fish and game has spent substantial sums of money in developing a number of extensive waterfowl management areas on these exposed lands.

Moreover, the Federal Government has demonstrated its belief that these lands were State-owned by purchasing some of them from the State of Utah—in the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge area—and by providing moneys for the purchase of other shorelands based on the same belief, and by also providing funds for reimbursement to the State for development of waterfowl areas on the understanding and acknowledgment that such developments were on State-owned land.

If matters had remained as they were, the bill now before the House would have been unnecessary. But serious disagreement came about because of a ruling of the Department of the Interior, dated May 31, 1961, and affirmed by the Secretary on February 18, 1963, that the Federal Government would claim title to all of the exposed lands, and that a new survey should be made, using the mean high water mark of the lake in its present low level as the new meander line.

This ruling was based on the common law doctrine of reliction which had been recently applied by the Federal circuit court of appeals in the case of *United States* v. *State of Washington*, 294 F. 2d 830 (1961), certiorari denied, 369 U.S. 817. In my opinion, this doctrine has no application to the Great Salt Lake whatsoever. The distinctions between the two situations are numerous and apparent. I point out two or three in passing:

First. The doctrine of reliction was formulated, in the common law, so that a man who purchased property abutting a navigable body of water would not be left high and dry when the waters receded. This doctrine has no application to our situation. The Federal Government has no need for access to the waters of the Great Salt Lake, which it does not own.

Second. The application of the doctrine of reliction to this situation would be unconscionable because of the fact that for over a hundred years the Federal and State Governments have proceeded on the theory that the 1855 meander line was the line of demarcation. The application of a new doctrine now has the effect of unsettling countless legal acts which have been taken on the strength of the first position.

Third. The doctrine of reliction applies only to the natural recession of water. The lake waters in question have receded, in large part at least, because of the artificial impoundment by man of the feeder streams which supply water to the lake.

Apart from the legal principals involved, there are practical reasons why title to this land should go to the State of Utah.

First. As above pointed out, the Federal Government is not in a position to develop this land nor to encourage its development by others. Its laws are not adaptable to this type of situation. To leave title in the Federal Government might stifle industrial development for many years, perhaps for generations to come.

Second. It is not the policy of the Federal Government to acquire this type of land. The Bureau of Land Management has long been of the opinion that it should divest itself of isolated parcels and slivers of public domain because such lands are not susceptible to management by the Bureau. Some of the lands between the 1855 meander line and the water's edge are isolated and are in odd shapes and wedges. Such a situation presents to the BLM an administrative headache, with no commensurate benefits to the Government nor to the public.

The BLM has taken the position, again and again, that this thorny problem must be settled, and the sooner the better.

I submit that H.R. 1791 affords such a settlement.

Let me make it absolutely clear that H.R. 1791 does not take the position that title to the property is irrevocably confirmed in the State of Utah. This bill lays down no precedent for future cases, on the matter of where title lies. This bill takes the position that a dispute has arisen between the State of Utah and the Federal Government. Pending the resolution of that dispute, it is prudent that title be placed indisputably in the State of Utah, so that commercial development might commence. Then the parties may proceed to court to determine their respective rights. If it should be determined that the Federal Government did, indeed, have an interest in the surrendered lands, then the State of Utah will duly compensate the Federal Government, according to a compensation schedule to be determined by the parties, or, if such is impossible, then by the court.

This solution is completely fair, and gives to all parties ample opportunity to argue their claims in a court of law.

It should be mentioned that the so-called Submerged Lands Act, 43 United States Code 1301, enacted in 1953, has no applicability to the situation corrected by this bill. The problem we are here dealing with arises out of an uncertainty as to the extent of the rights vested in the State of Utah when it entered the Union in 1896. Whatever those rights may have been, they could not have been subsequently diminished by unilateral act of Congress, as far as the State of Utah is concerned, without violating the due-process clause of the Federal Constitution.

What makes this legislation appropriate is that there is no other remedy, and that the results are fair and equitable. If the parties were left to their own devices, it might be years before title could be settled once and for all. If the parties desired to settle the matter out of court, there would be serious question as to the existence of their authority to do so.

The bill as finally amended by the committee meets the objection that it constitutes a giveaway. This was the basis for the objection of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice. The present bill involves no giveaway. The State of Utah will pay for every penny of value which the courts determine is due and owing to the United States, if any. In the meantime, matters can get moving off dead center where they are now stalled. Wealth and jobs can be brought into being, and a most unfortunate controversy can be settled amicably and expeditiously. I urge the enactment of H.R. 1791.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as a matter of background and history for this case, the Mormons arrived in Utah in 1847, which was then a portion of Mexico. It became a part of the Utah Territory several years later, and around 1855, people from the Department of the Interior were in the process of making a survey of the land in that area to determine where the mean high water mark of the Great Salt Lake was located. At that time the then engineers agreed upon a mean high water mark and began a survey. Strange as it may seem, 111 years later that survey is still not completed.

In 1896, Utah was admitted to the sisterhood of States. At that time the United States relinquished to the State of Utah all of the land under the Great Salt Lake and gave them title to that land. The height of the Great Salt Lake has varied. It has been up to an elevation of 4,211½ feet in 1872, and has dropped to an alltime low in 1963 of 4,191½ feet or a difference in elevation of approximately 20 feet.

The amount of acreage between the elevation of the meander line in 1855 and the present time is approximately 600,000 acres. Both the State of Utah and the United States from the time that Utah was admitted to the Union in 1896 down until 1961 operated under the theory that the State of Utah owned all of the lands on the sea side of the meander line as established in 1855 and that the Federal Government owned the lands above that line.

However, the Supreme Court of the United States in a case involving lands in another State, applied the doctrine of reliction. That doctrine is that where the water recedes, the land belongs to the owner of the land adjacent to it. It does not follow the title of those who owned it under the water.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from 1896 until 1961, by this mutual arrangement between the Federal Government and the State of Utah, the U.S. Government bought on a number of occasions areas on the seaside of the 1855 meander line, and paid the State of Utah the appropriate value for those lands.

Since 1961 it has been impossible for the State of Utah and the United States to settle this land dispute.

The purpose of this bill pending before us today is to arrive at a means of settling this dispute. This is not the only manner in which this case could be settled, but it is a method, and I believe it is a very fair method.

Some people have stated, "Why do you not run a survey on the land where the water was in 1896?"

Well, I can only tell you that if they ran a survey on that land the best estimates are that it would cost us about $800,000.

Also, someone said "Why do you not run a survey where the water is now down at one of its alltime lows?" The figure there is about $575,000. But to complete the 1855 line will only cost about $25,000.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania advise his colleagues as to perhaps the difference in the cost of survey based upon the 1896 line, and the value of the lands today?

Mr. SAYLOR. In all probability, if the land is to be sold at $1.25 an acre, which is the usual going price for most of the land in this area, the cost of the survey of a line in 1896 would exceed the value of the land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what this bill provides is that the Federal Government will give title to this land to the State of Utah on the seaward side of the 1855 line. They will complete the survey and then allow the Federal Government to go into court to determine whether or not the State of Utah owns the land or whether or not the Federal Government owns it, and will ascertain its fair market value.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it that there is a justiciable issue between the United States of America and the State of Utah. This bill provides for settlement immediately of the land title, and leaves the question of the value and title to the land to be set by the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this bill will be enacted by the House of Representatives, and that the rules will be suspended and the House will pass this bill, and that our Members on both sides of the Capitol will accept this version.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has explained this bill with great clarity and erudition, and both on this and previous occasions the gentleman has been very helpful, and has made very substantial contributions in regard to this matter. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 1719, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 265, a similar bill to the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the State of Utah by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest of the United States in lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State, as duly surveyed heretofore or in accordance with section 4 of this Act, whether such lands now are or in the future may become uncovered by the recession of the waters of said lake: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this Act shall not affect (1) any valid existing rights or interests, if any, of any person, partnership, association, corporation, or other nongovernmental entity, in or to any of the lands within and below said meander line, or (2) any lands within the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge and the Weber Basin Federal reclamation project.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall contain an express reservation to the United States of all subsurface mineral deposits in the Federal lands below the meander line of Great Salt Lake to the waterline of the lake as of the date of enactment of this Act, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same. The minerals thus reserved shall thereupon be withdrawn from appropriation under the public land laws of the United States, including the mining laws, but said minerals, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, may be disposed of under any of the provisions of the mineral leasing laws that he deems appropriate: *Provided,* That any such lease shall not be inconsistent, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with the other uses of said lands by the State of Utah, its grantees, lessees, or permittees.

SEC. 3. As a condition of the conveyance authorized in section 1 of this Act, and in consideration thereof, (a) the State of Utah shall, upon the express authority of an Act of its legislature, convey to the United States by quitclaim deed all of its right, title, and interest in lands upland from the meander line, which lands the State may claim by reason of said lands having been, or which may hereafter become, submerged by the waters of Great Salt Lake, and (b) the State of Utah shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior an amount approximating the fair market value of the lands, or in lieu thereof may grant to the United States interests in lands, mineral rights, including those beneath the lakebed, or release land selection rights of comparable value, or a combination thereof, as determined by the Great Salt Lake Relicted Lands Commission created under section 6 of this Act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to complete that portion of the public land survey necessary to close the existing meander line of the said Great Salt Lake.

SEC. 5. Pending resolution of the amount and manner of compensation by the State of Utah to the United States as provided herein, the State of Utah is authorized upon enactment of this Act to issue permits, licenses, and leases covering such of these lands as the State deems necessary or appropriate to further the development of the water resources of the Great Salt Lake, or for other purposes, on terms and conditions acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior. The State of Utah, by an express act of its legislature, or by written assurance of the appropriately authorized official or agency, shall agree to assume the obligation to administer the lands, for the purposes set forth above, in the manner of a trustee and any proceeds so derived by the State of Utah shall be paid to the United States, until compensation for the full value of said lands as herein provided is made. Such proceeds paid to the United States shall be to the credit of the State of Utah as part of the compensation for which provision is made herein.

Sec. 6.(a) In order to resolve expeditiously the issue of appropriate consideration to be paid to the United States by the State of Utah for the lands described in section 1 of this Act, there is established a commission to to be known as the Great Salt Lake Relicted Lands Commission, hereafter referred to as "the Commission."

(b) The Commission shall consist of three members as follows:

(1) One person to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior;

(2) One person to be designated by the Governor of the State of Utah; and

(3) One person, who shall be chairman of the Commission, to be selected by the other two.

(c) Any vacancy which occurs on the Commission shall not affect its powers or functions but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Two members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(e) Members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States or the State of Utah shall serve without compensation in addition to that received as such officers or employees, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(f) A member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the United States or of the State of Utah shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

(g) The expenses of the Commission shall be met and shared equally by the United States and the State of Utah.

Sec. 7. (a) The Commission shall make a comprehensive study of the lands which are the subject of this Act, giving consideration to, among other factors it deems pertinent, (i) the present ownership of the lands conveyed by the United States pursuant to section 1 of this Act; (ii) the right of the State to approximately one-ninth of those lands as school sections, when surveyed; (iii) the present ownership of the State of the water resources of the lake and those of its bed and subsoil; and (iv) the relationship of the land area to the development of such resources. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to limit or prevent the Commission from giving consideration to any other factors it deems pertinent to an equitable resolution of the question of the proper consideration to be paid by the State of Utah to the United States for such lands.

(b) The Commission shall report its finding and recommendations to the Secretary and the Governor of the State of Utah not later than one year after the effective date of this Act. Within thirty days after receiving such report, the Secretary shall transmit copies thereof to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, together with his comments thereon. The Secretary shall, after the expiration of sixty calendar days from the date of such transmission (which sixty days, however, shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain) proceed forthwith to execute the conveyance herein authorized provided that neither House of Congress has disapproved by resolution the proposed compensation.

(c) In the event title of the subject lands does not vest in the State of Utah, then any valid permits, licenses, and leases issued by the State under authority of this Act, shall be deemed permits, licenses, and leases of the United States and shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the terms and provisions thereof.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Aspinall: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 265, and insert the provisions of H.R. 1791, as passed, as follows:

"That, subject to the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the State of Utah all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands formerly covered by the waters of Great Salt Lake which are within the meander line of said lake as determined by public land surveys heretofore made and by such additional surveys, to be made hereafter, as are necessary to close said line, or in and to such part of said lands as the State may elect. The conveyance herein directed shall be absolute and shall take effect immediately upon execution of the instrument of conveyance by the Secretary but the Secretary may, at any time thereafter, accept a relinquishment to the United States of the State's right, title, and interest in and to any or all of the lands conveyed.

"Sec. 2. It shall be a condition precedent to the conveyance otherwise directed by the first section of this Act that the State of Utah, acting by or pursuant to an express act of its legislature—

"(a) undertakes to pay to the United States, if it is judicially determined that the United States now has any right, title, or interest in and to any or all of the lands to be conveyed, 90 per centum of the fair market value, as of the date of conveyance, of the right, title, and interest conveyed and not thereafter relinquished, such value to be determined by agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the State or persons authorized to act on their behalf, insofar as such agreement is possible, or by the court, if and to the extent that such agreement is not possible;

"(b) disclaims any right, title, or interest or claim of right, title, or interest in and to the lands held by the United States within or for use in connection with the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge and the Weber Basin Federal reclamation project;

"(c) disclaims any right, title, or interest or any claim of right, title, or interest in and to lands which are not conveyed pursuant to the first section of this Act or which are relinquished in accordance therewith, whether inside or outside the meander line hereinbefore described, and which may heretofore have been covered by the waters of Great Salt Lake or may hereafter become covered by those waters: *Provided*, That this disclaimer shall not be held to extend to any lands which have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, acquired by the State or any of its political subdivisions from the United States pursuant to sections 6, 7, 8, and 12 of the Act of July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 109), or from the United States or any other party holding lawful title thereto by purchase, donation, exchange, foreclosure, or condemnation;

"(d) agrees that all rights of the State under any lease, license, permit, or contract of sale by it pertaining to land which it does not elect to have conveyed to it or which it relinquishes shall pass to the United States and that it will account for all rents, royalties, and profits hereafter received by it from such leases, licenses, permits, or contracts of sale and, further, that if it is judicially determined that the United States now has right, title, or interest in and to some or all of the lands conveyed to the State, the rights of the State under any lease, license, permit, or contract of sale pertaining to oil and gas in the lands with respect to which it has been so determined shall pass to the United States and that it will account to the United States for all rents, royalties, and profits hereafter received by it from such leases, licenses, permits, and contracts of sale; and

"(e) consents to and accepts all provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 3. The conveyance directed by the first section of this Act shall contain an express reservation to the United States of all oil and gas in the lands conveyed, together with the right to prospect for, mine, extract, and remove the same and to permit others so to do in accordance with the laws of the United States. Said reservation, however, shall cease to be of any force or effect with respect to any lands in and to which it is judicially determined, as hereinbefore provided, the United States does not have right, title, or interest. If it is judicially determined that the United States has no right, title, or interest in or to some or all of the lands in question, the rights of the United States under any lease that may theretofore have been granted under said mineral leasing laws with respect to those lands shall pass to the State of Utah and there shall be paid to said State 90 per centum of all moneys hereafter paid to the United States under such leases minus whatever portion thereof has otherwise been paid to the State in accordance with existing law. Every lease, license, or permit issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall contain provisions designed to assure as full use as possible of the lands involved by the State, its grantees, lessees, and permittees.

"Sec. 4. In order to secure an expeditious judicial determination of issues in controversy which arise under sections 2 and 3 of this Act and depend upon a like determination of the controversy between the United States and the State of Utah concerning the present right, title, and interest of the United States or the State in and to the lands conveyed or to be conveyed to, and not relinquished by, the State under the first section of this Act, the Attorney General of the United States is hereby directed to institute suit against the State in such manner and before such court having jurisdiction in the premises as will serve to secure a determination of the aforesaid issues and of matters related thereto. If such suit is not commenced on or before the ninetieth day following the conveyance directed to be made by the first section of this Act, the consent of the United States to be made a party defendant in a suit brought by the State in a court of the United States having jurisdiction in the premises and designed to secure a determination of the aforesaid issues and matters related thereto is hereby given.

"Sec. 5. (a) If the State of Utah elects to have conveyed to it all of the lands within the meander line described in the first section of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall complete the existing survey thereof as rapidly as possible by closing the meander line referred to in the first section of this Act following, as nearly as may be, the level of Great Salt Lake as it was in 1855. If the State elects to have conveyed to it less than all the lands within said meander line or relinquishes some of the lands conveyed to it, the Secretary shall proceed to such surveys as may be necessary in the circumstances. In either event, he is authorized to accept such donations as the State may tender in order to expedite the work involved.

"(b) In order to simplify administration by the State of lands conveyed to, and not relinquished by, it and by the United States of lands retained by, or relinquished to, it under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to adjust, in accordance with the terms of such agreement with the State as he may enter into, the boundary between Utah's lands and the United States lands to conform to section, half-section, or quarter-section lines, the United States holding the whole of any section, half section, or quarter section, as the case may be, in which half or more than half the acreage would, in any event, be its and the State holding the whole of any section, half section or quarter section, as the case may be, in which more than half the acreage would otherwise be its.

"(c) As full or partial payment by the State of such amounts as may be required under the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to accept a grant of interests in lands or mineral rights (including lands and mineral rights beneath the bed of Great Salt Lake) which the State owns or a relinquishment by the State of lawful land selection rights which it has not yet exercised if, in his judgment, the acceptance of such grants or relinquishments will be beneficial and useful to the United States. Each such grant or relinquishment, if accepted by the Secretary, shall be taken at not more than the fair market value of the interests conveyed or relinquished.

"SEC. 6. (a) No conveyance by the United States to the State of Utah under this Act and no election by the State to have conveyed to it less than all the lands described in the first section of this Act and no relinquishment by the State of any lands which are conveyed to it under this Act shall affect or prejudice, in any way whatsoever, lawful claims or valid existing rights, titles, or interests of any third party in and to the lands affected by that conveyance, election, or relinquishment.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall honor and carry out the terms of any lease, license, permit, or contract of sale heretofore made by the State of Utah in accordance with its laws which pass to the United States under section 2, subsection (d) of this Act, and the State of Utah shall honor and carry out the terms of any lease, license, or permit of the United States granted in accordance with its laws which pass to the State under section 3 of this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Utah of the interests of the United States in certain lands within the meander line of Great Salt Lake, for the judicial settlement of a controversy respecting the same, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 1791, was laid on the table.

INVITATION FOR THE 1972 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES TO BE HELD IN UTAH

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) to approve selecting of the U.S. Olympic Committee and to support its recommendations that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 Olympic games.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 71

Whereas Utah has been chosen by the United States Olympic Committee as the United States nominee for site of the 1972 winter Olympic games; and

Whereas broadened participation in winter Olympics by nearly all nations as well as the increasing attendance at winter Olympics by sports lovers from all over the world is serving to further international good will; and

Whereas Utah's spectacular natural and manmade winter sports facilities uniquely qualify it as the location of the winter Olympic games; and

Whereas Salt Lake City is both a national and international transportation hub; and

Whereas Salt Lake City also offers ample excellent hotel and motel accommodations only half an hour's drive on all-weather roads to several winter sports sites: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its approval of the selection of the United States Olympic Committee and supports its recommendation to the International Olympic Committee meeting in April of this year in Italy, that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill came out of our committee unanimously. To explain it I would ask the coauthor of the resolution on the House side, the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] and now yield to him such time as he may consume.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, which is now before the House under suspension of the rules, and which was substituted, with my consent, for my own House Joint Resolution 805. The aforesaid resolution was passed by the other body on March 15, 1966. The House Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements on March 23, and the full Committee on Foreign Affairs on March 31, gave unanimous support to a favorable report on the resolution.

This resolution expresses congressional approval of the action taken by the U.S. Olympics Committee in recommending that the State of Utah be selected by the International Selection Committee as the site of the 1972 Winter Olympics. Inasmuch as the latter committee meets in the last week of April in Rome, Italy, the need for immediate action is apparent. I am grateful for the consideration which has been given to us, in view of this fact.

This resolution asks for no money. It involves no Government commitment, either legal or financial. It merely makes it possible for those who represent the United States before the International Selection Committee to employ the additional argument that the Congress of the United States favors their position.

The location of the Winter Olympic Games rotates. In the past 10 years the games have been held at Cortina d'ampezzo, Italy, 1956; Squaw Valley, United States of America, 1960; and Innsbruck, Austria, 1964.

In 1968, Grenoble, France will be host to the winter Olmpiad. Tradition suggests that the 1972 games should be in North America—hopefully in the United States.

Utahans were very pleased when the Olympic Selection Committee for the United States of America, about 2 months ago, selected the State of Utah as this Nation's recommended site. This selection was made after carefully considering several other possibilities. The choice was made by a panel of the Nation's top experts who went into the matter in great detail; I feel it fair to say that the facts speak for themselves.

I cannot resist mentioning some of the reasons that make Utah a great choice, however, and to invite all my colleagues to visit our beautiful mountains to see for themselves.

Some of my colleagues who are skiers have already been to the Utah resorts and can testify to the excellence of our skiing.

Let me just briefly remind you of a few important facts about Utah that relate to this matter.

Salt Lake City, the capital of the State of Utah is located in a mountain-ringed bowl 4,266 feet above sea level. The metropolitan area has a population of nearly one-half million. The Wasatch Range of the Rocky Mountains rise east of the city, the Oquirrh Range and the famed Great Salt Lake lie west and north.

Since settlement in 1847 by the Mormon pioneers, Salt Lake City has developed as the travel and cultural "crossroads of the West."

Salt Lake's modern jet airport transcontinental railroad depots, bus terminals and interstate highway networks serve Utah's great skiing resorts during the winter months. When the snow melts, this modern transportation network brings tourists to nearby Yellowstone, Zion, Bryce, and Grand Canyon National Parks—all within a day's driving time from Salt Lake City.

Increasingly since 1930, Salt Lake has served as port of entry and entertainment center for thousands of skiers who come to Utah to enjoy the "greatest show on earth" in the nearby Wasatch Mountains.

Metropolitan Salt Lake is unique among cities in the western United States. Hotels, lodges, restaurants, shops, galleries, museums, and theaters are less than 30 minutes from all major ski slopes.

Due to its role as a winter and summer vacation center and its function as world headquarters of the Mormon Church, Salt Lake is cosmopolitan. Its residents are friendly, many are linguists; and the city has a deserved reputation as a major center for the performing arts.

The ski resorts of Alta, Brighton, Solitude, Snow Basin, and Park City, with ski slopes of championship caliber, have 24 chairlifts and gondolas, many fine lodges, chalets, and restaurant facilities built at a cost of over $21 million.

All ski areas are accessible by a network of paved highways from Salt Lake City. Just 14 air miles from the city center, the ski resorts can be reached in 30 minutes by auto or bus from the heart of Salt Lake City.

By 1970 all resorts wil be interconnected by a series of gondolas, lifts, and tramways. The first link of this system will connect Heber City, Alta, and Brighton with a jig-back tramway and two gondolas. Construction of this link is assured by a $2 million bond issue approved by the 1965 Utah State Legislature.

Mayor J. Bracken Lee, Utah Governor Calvin L. Rampton, and the three-member Salt Lake County Commission have pledged firm support of the Salt Lake City bid for the 1972 Winter Olympic Games. All members of the Utah delegation, two from each party, vigorously support this resolution.

Facilities are presently available for all of the following events: Men's and ladies' slalom, men's and ladies' giant slalom, men's and ladies' downhill races, speed skating, figure skating, cross country, and biathelon.

Additional facilities being built or to be constructed include a new $17 million civic auditorium-sports arena complex, a 70-90 meter ski jump, luge, and bobsled runs.

Privately developed ski facilities on the Wasatch front area are valued at over $50 million. Another $5 million worth will be built in the next 5 years.

There are excellent accommodations for the visiting athletes at historic Fort Douglas and at the university.

To meet housing needs of other visitors, Salt Lake City now has 97 major hotels and motels, and others are being planned. Conservative estimates are that by 1972 there will be 53,000 tourist accommodations within a 40-mile radius of the city's business district.

Furthermore, our area is very fortunate to have a good deal of experience in organizing events of this kind.

Salt Lake City has been a sports-minded community since Utah became the 45th State of the United States of America. The U.S. amateur ski jumping championships were here as early as 1936. Hundreds of ski races sanctioned by national and international bodies have been held in Salt Lake's four ski areas. The famous Bonneville speed trials are held here annually. NCAA tennis, track and field, basketball, and skiing championships have been held in Utah, to name just a few.

Each year the Mormon Church holds the world's largest basketball tournament in Salt Lake City. The M-Men basketball championships brings teams from all parts of the world to Utah.

Other national sports events are scheduled in the future. The National A.A.U. synchronized swimming meet will be held here this April. The national handball tournament will be here in 1966.

Good experience in the day-to-day handling of the winter Olympic games was acquired when many Salt Laker's worked on the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley. Salt Lake is equipped with professional people who can handle any large sports event, including the winter Olympic games of 1972.

Of course, the main items in the formula for any winter sports program are the weather and the terrain.

Here are some vital statistics about the area:

> Salt Lake City: Elevation, 4,266 feet; average temperature ranges for dates of games (February 25 to March 6), 23° to 42° F.; average temperature ranges at ski areas (elevation 8,700 feet), 8° to 32° F.; average snow depth at ski area, 81 inches.

February in Utah usually provides enough stormy days to maintain snow depth, but enough hours of sunshine to make outdoor activities very pleasant. There are over 10 hours of daylight on the average February day at our latitude with light winds—8.2 m.p.h.—and comfortable humidity—60 percent.

Let me again express the gratitude of the entire State for the courtesy you have shown us in considering this resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur and endorse everything that my colleague, the gentleman from Utah, has said about this bid.

As a skier myself, I want to tell the Members of this House that the facilities that were described by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] are wonderful. They are among the greatest in the Nation.

The thing that will be unique about the Winter Olympics in Utah is the snow. In the high mountain country we have a dry snow that makes for a wonderful powder. It is not like the snow you have in Ohio or Maryland, for example, where it is wet and heavy. It will be delightful and we certainly urge you to participate with us in 1972 when the Olympics come to Utah.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Do you suppose that you can entice the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, to spend his money in Utah instead of in the Swiss Alps if this resolution is adopted?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I would like to invite him to come back again. He has been there before and has spent a little money, and we were very glad to get it, too.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the President's insistence to the rest of the people of this country that they spend their money in the United States, I am surprised that the Secretary went over to Switzerland to the Alps to ski and spend his money there this year, further contributing to unbalancing our international accounts.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I thank the gentleman for his cunning observation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

As a member of the subcommittee which brings this joint resolution to the House floor, I am pleased that we got some assurance from the gentlemen from Utah and the sponsors who were before the subcommittee that this resolution is not going to cost the Federal Government any part of the money that was spent on the winter games at Squaw Valley a few years ago out in California.

The Californians really did well at the Federal trough. They got about $4,400,000 of the Federal taxpayers' money in one way and another, and they still have the benefit of a pavilion that was built out there. I trust that the Members from Utah are not going to do what the Californians did when their authorization was passed. I would not say they deliberately misled us, but along the line we were given the impression that the Squaw Valley deal was not going to cost the Federal taxpayers very much money.

I say again we wound up with a bill of $4,400,000.

I can say to the gentlemen from Utah who are here on behalf of this bill today that I am going to be watching when the appropriation bills come in, if I am fortunate enough to be in Congress at that time, and I hope I am not going to see a request for any substantial part of $4,400,000.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that we are most grateful for the kind words that the gentleman has spoken for this project on this and on other occasions. I assure the gentleman that the people of Utah are known for their frugality, and although this resolution calls for not a penny, if money should be spent at a later date—and that, of course, will be another hurdle that we will have to cross at that time—I can assure the gentleman that every effort will be made to see that every penny is well spent.

Mr. GROSS. I want you to have a lot of fun at the Winter Olympics out in Utah. I hope that your invitation to the Olympic Committee is accepted. I want you to have a lot of fun, but I don't want you to take the taxpayers of this country for a joy ride at the same time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] that the House suspend the rules and concur in Senate Concurrent Resolution 71.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE AND MUNICIPAL BOND WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 837) to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Bond Week."

The clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Bond Week", in recognition of the role that State and municipal bonds play in building a better community.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a nationwide public education program on the role of municipal bonds in providing for public improvements will be conducted the week of April 17 to 23, 1966, by the Investment Bankers Association of America. This week will be known as State and Municipal Bond Week, the theme of which is "Municipal Bonds—Builder of Better Communities Today and Tomorrow." The purpose of the program is to familiarize the general public as to the purpose of and the financing features of municipal bonds. The demand for new and improved community facilities, generated by the increase in population growth and the rapid rise in new communities along with the migration to the suburbs, has placed a tremendous burden on public officials across the Nation to find ways and means to obtain and finance new hospitals, schools, roads, and the myriad of other facilities that are the backbone of modern communities. Because in most instances such facilities cannot be built without the approval of the citizen, the voter, the State and Municipal Bond Week campaign is designed to inform the public as to their role in assisting State and local officials in providing the essentials that are so necessary to the health, education, and welfare of modern communities and to the advantages of financing new public facilities through municipal bond issues.

I therefore urge, Mr. Speaker, that we adopt this resolution.

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. Mr. Speaker, in rising on behalf of this resolution, I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not in opposition to it. I simply want to observe that as the municipal bond market stands today municipals are very attractive investments. With their tax immunity they are so much sought after that it is difficult, in fact sometimes even impossible, to purchase them. It seems to me that it is hardly necessary to have a proclamation along these lines to call attention to the advantages of municipal bonds. However, since it is the desire that such a proclamation be issued, I do not suppose it will do any harm. I do not know that it will do any particular good, either.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in some areas of the country there is a philosophy, a good old-fashioned philosophy, about "paying as you go." In my part of the country, in my own district, some of our counties and some of our cities actually create sinking funds and provide through taxation in advance the money with which to provide these improvements. Then, they have money in the sinking fund during the time they are raising the fund, to make investments. So, instead of having to get municipal improvements at the expense of interest, some of these municipalities in my area actually are earning interest, rather than paying interest.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON] has made some comments that are most timely. I do not understand what this is all about. I wonder if someone can tell me where I can buy a few tax-exempt bonds. I wonder why we have to have a resolution in Congress to encourage people to buy tax-exempt bonds, which sell at a premium. Incidentally, I wonder why we should be encouraging any subdivisions of Government to go into bonded debt? I believe a resolution encouraging them to pay as you go would be much more preferable.

Although I am not going to oppose this legislation, I believe a resolution urging them to pay as they go would be much more acceptable than encouraging them to go into debt. So I just do not understand the reason for this resolution. I will be glad to hear from someone who is so much interested that the time of the Congress is taken up to pass it this afternoon.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield and would like to listen for 3 or 4 minutes I will be glad to answer.

Mr. **GROSS**. Surely the gentleman can make it shorter than that.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. I cannot make it shorter than that and answer the gentleman's question.

Community indebtedness is nothing new. State and local governments have had over 2½ centuries of exposure with debt. This experience is worthy of thoughtful review by a generation which is creating such tremendous volume of debt at the State and local level to provide for needed facilities such as schools, roads, hospitals, water and sewer systems, and a myriad of other facilities vital to human habitation in modern communities.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. **GROSS**. Just a minute. How about a thoughtful review of the Federal debt? Has anyone given a really thoughtful review to that?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. As usual, the gentleman is not on the track of what we are considering here. This is something at the local level, which has nothing to do with the Federal Government.

Mr. **GROSS**. Does the gentleman mean that the Federal debt does not come down to the local level?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. It has nothing to do with the resolution.

Mr. **GROSS**. I understand that perfectly.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Then, if the gentleman understands that, he should not ask about the Federal debt, because we are dealing with the local debt.

Mr. **GROSS**. Wait a minute. With the greatest of ease, this resolution is brought before us today. How about a resolution to provide a thoughtful review, as the gentleman says, of the Federal debt?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. I have no objection. If the gentleman wants to introduce a resolution on that point, why, introduce it, and I am sure it will be sent to our committee and we will be happy to have you come in and testify.

Mr. **GROSS**. And the gentleman will be as happy to vote that resolution out to the House floor?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. It will depend on the showing you make in connection with the resolution, because we try to study these things before we report them. So you introduce the resolution, and I will do my best to schedule a hearing in your busy life around here.

Mr. **GROSS**. The gentleman has really sold me here this afternoon on the desirability of acquiring State and municipal tax-exempt bonds, but he has not yet told me how and where I can buy some of them.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. If you have any questions about where you can buy them, I will advise you, if you are looking for that kind of advice, I am sure there will be plenty of salesmen around early in the morning if you want to purchase some of them.

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. **McCULLOCH**. Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the questions raised by this resolution and some of the answers thereto, I thought perhaps it would serve a useful purpose if I said a word or two in support of the resolution.

This resolution came from the Committee on the Judiciary, and I am in favor of its adoption. I would like to say to the Members of the House that the States and many political subdivisions thereof are forced to issue bonds in substantial amounts, particularly at this time, by reason of the fact that the Federal Government is starving most States and their political subdivisions, so to speak, by the huge tax bite that the Federal Government directly takes and by reason of the creeping inflation that takes more and more of the dollars of the people of this country.

By reason of these facts, it is more difficult to sell municipal bonds at a proper price than it was 6 or 8 months ago. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, one can buy municipal bonds right now at from 3.5 to 4 percent, which means a net yield without taxes equal to 7 or 8 percent of U.S. bond interest to a person in the income tax bracket which is taxed at 50 percent. They are on the market. They are road authority bonds, municipal bonds, and the like. One of the other reasons for that rate of interest is because many of the States and their political divisions are, at least for the time being, better risks than the Federal Government. It appears to me that this administration has had neither the courage nor the desire to balance the budget. Regardless of what is said, it presently appears that we are to have both bullets and butter. I, for one, coming from a State where the municipalities and the other political subdivisions are frugal and pay their debts far better than the Federal Government, am glad to lend encouragement to "Municipal and State Bond Week." I wish those in authority in the Federal Government would come out to Ohio and see how we finance that great State, with a balanced budget, too.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, another difference that the gentleman from Ohio has not mentioned but, of which I am sure he is well aware, is that the States and the local municipalities have no president who can crank up the printing presses and turn out paper money.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Of course they do not. They cannot go into debt. The great State of Ohio is limited in its indebtedness, without a vote of the people, to $750,000.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this important matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, while we argue over the latest change in individual prices and over the latest indications of the President's position as to personal income taxes, I propose that we make a contribution to keeping all community problems in perspective, so that continuing and basic problems will not be neglected.

We can make a contribution to the sound long-term growth of our economy by directing attention to local community needs. Mid-April, income tax return time, is an appropriate time for appreciation of the financial needs of our communities. It is an opportune period for the President to direct the public's attention to municipal and State bonds. Accordingly, in House Joint Resolution 837, which I have introduced, we would request the President to proclaim the week of April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Bond Week."

State and municipal bonds are a more important part of our financial structure than their amount alone would indicate. The dollar total of such securities which the public, financial institutions, and industrial corporations hold, is less than a third as large as the national debt and not much more than one-tenth as large as corporation debt. The total is somewhat larger than the total dollar value of consumers' short-term debt, but is only about one-fifth as large as the total of consumers', farmers', and small businessmen's individual debts of short and long maturities.

But it is not the $11 billion of municipals sold last year, or the $6 or $7 billion net addition to their supply each year when retirements of outstanding issues are subtracted, that makes the municipal security deserving of recognition in a presidentially proclaimed week. These bonds deserve wider public attention because they pay for our most essential and our most productive investments, and because they are the most democratic of all the instruments by which our common needs are financed.

The bonds sold by municipalities, school districts, States, and other local jurisdictions, help to finance the elementary and secondary schools, the water and sewer facilities, public housing, other utilities, airports, recreational, and many other facilities, which make community life possible. If a community fails to provide these facilities or fails to keep improving them and expanding them as its population grows and community needs multiply, the postponement brings irreparable loss. When adequate physical capital is provided through bond issues, a community builds the essential basis for its continued growth and for attracting industry and other employing businesses. With sufficient basic facilities, a balanced and prosperous community can be built by the enterprise of the community's citizens and the businesses which it attracts.

Municipal bonds must be issued to finance many facilities. Unlike the Federal Government, local governments cannot collect enough tax revenues to treat their capital outlays as current expenses, and pay for all building in the year when the work is put in place.

The municipal bond is the most democratic of all financial instruments. The bonds are issued only after approval by voters who have considered the taxes they will have to pay or the other revenues that will have to be obtained, to meet the scheduled principal and interest payments.

The issue of these securities is democratically determined. More and more, the funds for them are raised from popular sales, not from sales only to the millionaire or the commercial bank. Municipal securities are second only to the securities of the Federal Government in safety of investment. They bring attractive rates of return to the investor. At current prices, many of them yield around 4 percent. The interest income is exempt from income taxes, and their net return is attractive even when the investor has a modest income. Investment in municipal securities provides the public benefit of financing the community's basic facilities at minimum cost, while yielding an attractive return to the investor.

I hope that the Congress will resolve to ask the President to proclaim State and Municipal Bond Week for the week beginning April 17, so that the public may be reminded of the continuing benefits to community life and employment which these securities make possible, may be reminded of their privilege to participate in municipal bond elections, and of their opportunity to manage their own investment funds well for the benefit of their communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers], that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 837.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF CHROMITE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13365) to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately eight hundred eighty-five thousand short dry tons of metallurgical grade chromite ore now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13365 is part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration and would, as introduced, authorize the disposal of approximately 2.3 million short dry tons of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile.

At the present time, we have a total inventory of this metal of 6,244,712 short dry tons, and a stockpile objective of 2,970,000 short dry tons or a total excess of 3,274,712 short dry tons.

There has been no domestic mining since 1961. However, the United States is the major processor of chromite ore. Imports of chromite from the U.S.S.R. comprise over 19 percent of the total

U.S. imports, most of which was consumed by the metallurgical industry. The Republic of South Africa, Rhodesia, and Turkey supply most of the remainder of the metallurgical chromite. In 1964, the domestic industry consumed 817,000 tons of chromite. The bulk of the inventory is in ferrochromite.

During the hearings, it became apparent that the release of the ferrochromite would be disruptive of the market.

The average acquisition cost of chromite ores and concentrates was $50.55 per short ton. The current market value is in excess of $30 per short ton.

Because of the great disparity in the acquisition cost and the current market price as well as the disruptive effect of releasing ferrochrome in the market at this time, the subcommittee amended the bill to authorize the release of 885,000 short dry tons of metallurgical grade chromite in ore form.

With this substantial reduction in the amount authorized for release, it is estimated that if the total authorized by this release were sold at today's market price, the loss to the Government would be in the neighborhood of $17,281,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 13365 and urge the adoption of this legislation.

After consideration of this bill by the subcommittee it was amended so as to authorize the release of only 885,000 dry tons of chromite ore.

This was done to prevent a complete description of the market, and the legislation before us today provides for an orderly disposal of an excess amount of this ore.

Enactment of this legislation will result in substantial returns to the Treasury as consequence of the proceeds of the sale of chromite now held in the stockpile.

I join with the distinguished Chairman of the subcommittee on urging passage of this legislation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the stockpile bills which are before the House at this time.

I agree with the necessity of enacting these bills in order to release the various amounts from the stockpile. I do, however, want to add a word of caution on the use of the stockpiled materials.

The declaration of policy of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act states that it is the purpose of the act to provide for the industrial, military, and naval needs of the country for common defense, and to reduce our dependence upon foreign nations for these materials in times of national emergency.

Furthermore, the power of the President to release materials from the stockpile is limited either to purposes of the common defense or to time of war or during a national emergency with respect to common defense proclaimed by the President.

That the use of the stockpile was to be limited to matters of national defense is further brought out by examination of the report of the Committee on Military Affairs in connection with the act. There the language states:

> Stocks so acquired to constitute a national reserve and to be used only during an emergency upon order of the President in time of war or when he shall find that a national emergency exists with respect to national defense, as a consequence of the threat of war (House Rept. 283, 76th Cong., 1st sess.).

In his memorandum of November 15, 1965, to the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Mr. Katzenbach, Attorney General, began his opinion with respect to one particular material copper, with these words:

> The language of section 5, taken together with its legislative history, indicates that materials from the strategic stockpile should be released only where there exists a clear relationship between their release and the common defense purposes for which they were acquired.
>
> The authority vested in the President to make this determination is broad and Congress did not seek to set specific standards for its exercise. The legislative history, however, suggests that the President must make a finding which relates the disposal to common defense. He cannot use this authority where he believes the release for materials merely to be in the national interest although not required for the common defense. Concern was expressed in Congress that this authority might be used for the commercial advantage of a particular industry or in such a way as to discourage "development, expansion, and long-term financing," thus having "an unhealthy and oppressive effect on our mining industry." It was further stated that the stockpilings "are for the national defense and should be used exclusively for that purpose. Any release for purposes other than national defense should be safeguarded" by section 3 of the act.

To the extent that the Attorney General ties the disposal power to the common defense, I agree with him. However, when he shifts the common defense considerations to be secondary and incidental rather than solely or exclusively, I must disagree with him. Then, when he proceeds to go on to tie strong inflationary developments in copper to defense needs but also more generally in the economy, I must disagree even more with his extension of the intended meaning of the common defense.

I have gone into this matter to this extent in order to set the record clear as to the uses to which the stockpiled materials can be put. If there is to be any other purpose involved in the release of stockpiled materials, such as price fixing, raising revenues, or dabbling in the economy, then that should be the subject of appropriate legislation. Any economic controls that might seem desirable should be the subject of direct legislation, rather than any back-door method of operation.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. The gentleman will readily concede, I am sure, that there is no question of the legality of or any question of constitutionality raised against this bill or any of the other stockpile bills that are being considered by the House today.

With due respect to the gentleman's comments on the disposal of copper, I know of course the gentleman has expressed himself along the same lines in the Committee on Armed Services, but the gentleman will readily concede that this committee has had absolutely nothing to do with that.

Mr. BATES. I agree entirely. But I must say, being a member of the Committee on Armed Services, we on the committee are concerned with the problems of national defense and we are concerned about the presence and the availability of the necessary metals that might be available to prosecute any war that might develop. It is in that context and in that sense that I made reference to the copper.

Mr. PHILBIN. I understand that, but I just want to make the record clear that there is no question of legality or constitutionality that involves any of these bills.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the President had sufficient authority, if he applied his remarks to the national defense or if he did say that there was a present emergency. But he referred to the secondary purposes, as to inflation and its impact upon prices generally to put across the release of the 200,000 tons of copper last fall.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would like to assure the gentleman that as long as I occupy the chairmanship of this committee, we will address ourselves to the stockpiles for the purpose for which they were created. Our guideline, as the gentleman understands, is that we will get into agreement with industry before any of these critical materials are released to industry. As far as the price controls are concerned, I am sure the gentleman understands we will have no part of this philosophy of using these materials in any kind of economic way to control prices or to address ourselves to that phase of our economy. This is military, pure and simple, and that is what we will bring before the committee.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield time to me?

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts and now will he yield to me?

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House and the gentleman from Massachusetts that that is the way we will conduct it.

I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts for the fine cooperation that he has given me on this and on all matters. I thank him for his wise counsel and for his great knowledge on this entire subject matter.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], for the excellent job that he has done on this whole stockpile matter. I know of nobody in the Congress or indeed in the Nation who is more knowledgeable on this entire subject matter than the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Philbin]. The gentleman has done an outstanding job and I certainly want to pay my tribute to him and to express my respect and great admiration to him for the manner in which he has conducted these matters.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks and to say that I understood the position as just stated by the gentleman from South Carolina to be the position that he entertained; and that also is the position as explained on frequent occasions of the very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Philbin].

My only purpose in rising here today was to make this a part of the Record. But it is exactly in accord, I think, with the unanimous feelings of the entire membership of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I have the honor and privilege of being chairman, has a very real and vital interest in the stockpile program. We are all interested as individual representatives of our various districts and States because of the vital role that the stockpile program has assumed in the defense and security of our country; and, as chairman of the committee charged with the responsibility for the well-being of the domestic mining industry, I am also interested because of the very close relationship between the stockpile program and the domestic mining industry. This latter relationship between the stockpile program and the domestic mining industry, is in some respect complex, but in its simplest terms the stockpile program was established to provide this country with readily accessible materials for use in times of national emergency, that could not be readily or adequately provided by the domestic industry. In some cases the domestic mining industry can supply only a portion of our emergency requirements and we must look to the stockpile to make up the deficit. In other situations this country is totally dependent on imports of certain materials and the stockpile must be the primary source of supply in times of emergency, when normal imports are interrupted. At this point I think it is sufficient to say that in my opinion, a stockpile of strategic material is absolutely vital to our defense and security. While there may be considerable disagreement as to its size and disposition, there is not disagreement as to its necessity.

I wish to make clear the responsibility of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It does not have direct or primary responsibility for stockpile legislation or stockpile disposals. That authority and responsibility lies with the House Armed Services Committee.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, however, does have responsibility for the stability and well-being of the domestic mining industry and to the extent that stockpile legislation or disposals have an impact on the domestic mining industry we, on that committee, have an interest. I think that I should also point out that either the acquisition of minerals for the stockpile or the disposal of minerals from the stockpile can, and frequently does, have a direct impact on the domestic mining industry. The buildup of a large stockpile, completely adequate for any foreseeable emergency, would relieve the domestic mining industry of the responsibility for providing needed minerals on a crash or emergency basis. The disposal or dumping of minerals found to be excess to the needs of the stockpile, unless carefully fed into domestic markets so as not to disrupt and depress prices, could be disastrous to the industry. Consequently, there is a very close relationship between the stockpile program and the domestic mining industry.

It should not be necessary to point out the absolute necessity of a strong and healthy mining industry to this country's well-being and prosperity in time of peace and to its security and safety in time of war. The experience of two world wars and the vital role mineral raw materials played in those conflicts should be remembered by all. War today is not a duel between individuals, but a massing of industrial strength and equipment produced from iron and steel, copper, lead, and zinc and a host of other mineral raw materials that all go into the manufacture of the armaments of modern warfare.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has recently held extensive hearings on the relationship and impact of disposals from the stockpile upon the domestic mining industry. These were not the first hearings of this type the committee had conducted. Previous hearings had been held in 1959, 1962, and 1964. It is unnecessary at this time to review either the recent or prior hearings, but I would like to say that many of us on the committee were not satisfied with the answers that we received from many Government agencies appearing before us.

It was most difficult to tie down agency responsibility. We found that little progress had been made in setting some stockpile objectives and that other objectives appeared to have been set at amounts that were below realistic levels. In all of these manipulations and maneuverings it was strikingly apparent to most of us on the committee that the well-being and stability of the domestic mining industry was not receiving adequate consideration.

In addition many of us on the committee are of the opinion that some of the releases of minerals from the stockpile are not in keeping with what we believe to be the intent and objective of the stockpile program. The opportunity for speculators, rather than bona fide consumers to obtain material released from the stockpile has been of concern to us. The degree to which this has happened is not now known but for at least two commodities, mercury and copper, there appears to be good indications that speculators were successful in obtaining supplies of the released material. In the case of copper in particular the opportunity for profit is enormous.

Copper is released from the stockpile at a price of 36 cents per pound. The speculative price for copper has risen to about 80 cents per pound. Speculators, if they can obtain quantities of stockpile copper, can therefore double their money overnight without turning a hand. Copper released from the stockpile and used for defense-rated orders or national defense purposes is one thing, but speculation in copper or its use for nonessential purposes is entirely a different matter.

Within the last 5 months 400,000 tons of copper have been released from the stockpile by the President under a finding of "common defense." We now have a shortage of about 360,000 tons of copper below the established stockpile objective of 775,000 tons. I am concerned, as are many members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that this Nation's national security can be endangered by continued releases of copper. Here is a situation where approximately one-half of our stockpile of a vital defense mineral has been used up with no real prospect of renewing the supply. I think it is necessary to see that this copper is channeled to essential industries and that all speculation is eliminated.

In the past when it has been shown that a specific mineral is in short supply and not available to American industry, I have supported legislation introduced to permit its disposal. This was the situation in the case of lead and zinc last year. In these circumstances I do not object to releases from the stockpile. Additionally, I am firmly of the opinion that sales and disposals from the stockpile must be made in a manner to avoid adverse effects upon the domestic mining industry.

The 13 bills before us today, providing for the disposal of minerals that have been found to be excess to the established stockpile objectives, generally appear to meet these criteria. If the subsequent disposal programs are carried out in an orderly manner domestic markets should not be disrupted. In view of this I will not offer any objection to their passage.

I wish to express my appreciation to Chairmen Rivers and Philbin of the full committee and the Subcommittee on Armed Services for their complete cooperation with us during our hearings. As in the past, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will continue to work closely with the Committee on Armed Services in seeking mutually satisfactory programs for disposal of stockpile excesses without adversely affecting the domestic mining industry.

Again my congratulations to the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to speak on this particular bill. When the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], brought up the subject of copper, I felt that there was a point to be made in accentuating what he has said and which is pertinent to all 12 of the bills pending before the House this afternoon.

There are serious questions about the last release of copper. As we all know, there is a serious shortage of copper in the industries which make finished copper products. In the release of last fall, it is known that significant quantities of copper were released to ingot makers who traditionally melt down copper and brass scrap and resell it on a speculative market.

Much of this copper found its way to the ingot maker, and there is reasonable cause to believe that since restrictions were placed upon the export of copper to all countries except Canada, that some of it could have found its way into the Canadian markets and to the Canadian speculator, who in turn might have resold it to Red China and Russia.

I make this point not to point a finger of accusation in any direction because I think it has been admitted that disposing of the copper to the ingot maker was a mistake, and I am sure that mistake will not again occur. But I think it is significant, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said, that this Congress had absolutely no control or jurisdiction over that disposal last fall. We do have control over much of the stockpile, as is exemplified by the 12 bills that are here before us this afternoon.

I think the biggest mistake that this Congress could make, which would defy the best interests of American industry and the national welfare, would be to surrender congressional control over the national stockpile.

The General Services Administration has done a magnificent job of administering these disposals. They have always received timely action from the Congress. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] has held hearings immediately upon request. There has never been any delay.

These are highly technical matters, but yet they have been thoroughly and completely considered, so much so that we come together today, as Republicans and Democrats, completely united in favor of the 12 bills that are before us.

Yet there are pressures at work which would take away the control of the stockpile which is presently vested in the Congress and would transfer it to one bureau or a single agency or one administration. I point up that mistakes can be made, as they were made evidently in the disposal of copper last fall, when too few people have control over these significant disposals. It behooves us to continue what we have been doing in the past years, doing so successfully under the magnificent leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] and to retain control of stockpile disposals where it belongs—with the people's direct representatives, namely, the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we will demand seconds on the remaining 11 bills, but I repeat that they are not controversial. We are in complete accord and we will only demand those seconds for the purpose of preserving the minority's right to speak should some Member on this side wish time, but we are 100 percent in favor of all 12 bills.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I hope that my remarks will be taken in the context in which I intended to make them, and not as critical of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] or the Chairman who is handling these bills, my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

But as Chairman ASPINALL stated, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has a great interest in the national stockpile and its objectives, and we have conducted a series of hearings under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. We have come up with reports that have shown some remarkable shortcomings; namely, the manner in which the people who are handling the stockpiles view our national objectives.

First, we have a 5-year objective, or an objective for a 5-year war. Now we have changed it to a 3-year objective. Each time that we have held hearings on this matter we have been assured by the people who have charge of the stockpile program that they will come and give us the requirements for a nuclear war as well as the postnuclear requirements. I am sorry to say that as of right now those requirements have not been satisfied. They have not even been established.

Here we are disposing of critical materiels, when we do not know what the requirements are for a nuclear war or the postnuclear requirements.

Copper has been cited as an example. The objectives for a 3-year war for copper are 775,000 tons. Within 5 months 400,000 tons have been released. This brings the National Stockpile level down to 360,000 tons, or less than one-half of the requirement for copper for a 3-year conventional war.

Testimony before Mr. EDMONDSON's subcommittee shows that only 40 percent of the first 200,000 tons released from the stockpile got into defense contracts, and this is by giving the benefit of every possible pound of copper that could go into the defense contracts. Over 60 percent of the amounts that were released from the stockpile in the first 200,000 tons did not get into defense requirements. Nobody can deny that.

The last witness we had before our committee was from the Budget Bureau, Mr. Hughes. Mr. Hughes very blandly admitted that it was one of the purposes of the administration to get money into their current accounts so that they could reduce some of the national debt. This is his statement before our committee, and nobody has challenged it.

It seems to me very, very strange that one of the most precious assets this country has, our military stockpile, is being disposed of before we have established the requirements or need. I have had nobody tell me why.

Is this to be used merely to fix the market price? It has a definite effect on the market. Some people say that certain of these items that are being released have no effect upon the domestic industry. That may be true at the present time, because there is no domestic industry, for the releases that have been made from the stockpile have forced the domestic miners out of business.

This is on record before our committee. It is available to the Armed Services Committee. We are already below the stockpile requirements that the Department of Defense has set for a 3-year conventional war. If we have war that extends beyond Vietnam, what will happen if we get into a prolonged conventional war?

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following in connection with the 13 stockpile bills which are now before us for consideration.

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has just concluded some 6 days of hearings to review the stockpile program as it relates to minerals and metals and as it affects the domestic mining industry.

I wish I could say that I am satisfied with the results of these hearings, but I am not. We encountered the same difficulties which we found on previous hearings held in 1959, 1962, and 1964. It was not possible to clearly tie down agency responsibility. We found that no progress had been made in setting nuclear objectives, although this had been promised some 4 years earlier. We found that other objectives, set for conventional warfare, were set at amounts which appeared to bear little relationship to needs, and most significant and certainly most disturbing, we found evidence that the stockpiled materials were being used for purposes never contemplated by Congress when the program was established.

Agency after agency appeared before the House Committee and testified that releases from the stockpile had not depressed the domestic mineral market. The situation on mercury speaks for itself. After releases of mercury were commenced by the General Services Administration the price of mercury dropped from about $700 per flask to $400 per flask. When questioned regarding releases of aluminum and copper, witness after witness declared the releases were not made to control prices—this, in the face of a price rollback in both minerals, and agency after agency declared that the disposals from the stockpile were not made to produce additional revenue or to help balance the budget. The last witness to appear before our committee, Mr. Philip S. Hughes, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, was, in my opinion, refreshingly frank in his statement. His testimony certainly indicates that the sale of stockpile materials to produce revenue ranks among one of the first considerations. Pertinent portions of Mr. Hughes' testimony follow:

Statement of Phillip S. Hughes, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

> Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as you are aware, the President is keenly interested in the disposal of excess strategic materials, and the 1967 budget proposes disposals of surpluses as a means of reducing annual maintenance and management costs in future years, as an important source of supply in our expanding economy, and as a source of budget receipts.
>
> Experience has proved that all of this can be accomplished while, meeting the present and future needs of our national defense; maintaining an orderly market for the continued prosperity of our industries; and reducing the cost to the taxpayer of maintaining excess, unnecessary stockpiles of strategic materials.
>
> The General Services Administration has transmitted 24 separate bills to this session of the Congress to facilitate the disposal of individual commodities from the stockpile. Still others will be forthcoming. Enactment of these bills is important to the achievement of the Administration's stockpile management and budgetary objectives. We believe the number of bills involved tends to support recommendations which the Administration has made heretofore for general legislation to dispose of commodities in excess of stockpile objectives. However, whether in the form of general legislation or specific bills, we urge the support of this committee for favorable action by the Congress.

This statement speaks for itself and contrary to what all other agency witnesses stated it clearly reveals that stockpile disposals are being considered as a source of revenue and as a means to balance the budget. While no one can object to a balanced budget, I submit that the purpose of the stockpile program is for national defense and not as a means to produce revenue.

Under a finding of common defense the President has released 400,000 tons of copper from the stockpile during the past 5 months. These releases have created a deficit of about 360,000 tons of copper in our stockpile which was set at 775,000 tons. Roughly about one-half of our total stockpile of copper has been disposed of or is earmarked for disposal. With the tight world situation on copper, it is most unlikely that the stockpile can be built back up to the established objective. Our national security is endangered in direct proportion to these releases as copper is vital to our military effort.

Testimony submitted before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs revealed two additional significant factors. Of the first release of 200,000 tons of copper made last November, only 40 percent went to defense industries, while 60 percent went into general commercial channels. Copper released from the stockpile for national defense is justifiable but when 60 percent of a release goes for nondefense purposes, I fail to see how such a release can be justified under a finding of "Common defense." This same copper was released and sold at a price of 36 cents per pound. The speculative price is 80 cents per pound. Apparently little or no precaution was taken to see that speculators did not move on what was obviously a good thing. There are good indications that speculators did obtain quantities of this copper and that it was resold for nondefense purposes at double its purchase price.

The stated objective of the administration for this fiscal year is the disposal of $1 billion worth of material from the stockpile. The same objective has been set for the following years until approximately $4 billion has been sold. As I stated previously, these disposals are being made at a time when the objectives for a nuclear war and post nuclear conflict have not even been established. From this I can only conclude that the stockpile is not being used for the purpose contemplated by Congress, but that very serious questions are raised as to its adequacy for national defense.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, apparently this bill is made necessary in part because of the situation that has developed with respect to Rhodesia. As the report states, two of the major sources of high-grade chrome ore outside of the Communist countries, are Rhodesia and Turkey.

Turkey's supply of chrome ore is contracted for 18 months. This leaves Rhodesia as a principal producer of high-grade chrome ore.

President Johnson, in one of the most outrageous actions of our time, has joined Britain in a boycott of Rhodesia, a total boycott in an attempt to break the Rhodesian Government, which is seeking its independence. That action has cut the supply of chrome to American users.

So here today we are asked to approve disbursals from the defense stockpile for the purpose of supplying American manufacturers.

Apparently we are taking a loss of about $18 million, incidentally, on the sale of this chrome, as compared to the original purchase price.

Let me point out that the British, despite the fact that they instituted their boycott of Rhodesia last November, did land, early in February of this year, a cargo of Rhodesian high-grade chrome ore in England.

In other words, they ran it right through their own boycott. While American consumers of high-grade chrome ore from Rhodesia were being denied this source of supply, the British shipped in a cargo representing a 5 to 6 months' supply in England. How reprehensible can the British get?

I would like to ask the committee a question concerning these disposals from our stockpiles. In the report accompanying the bill it is stated that:

> As indicated in the statutes cited above, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in both the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except in those instances where the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use during time of war.
>
> Since the proposed disposal of this material is not based on obsolescence, the proposed disposal requires the express approval of the Congress.

Now let me ask you this question: Does aluminum become obsolescent?

Mr. PHILBIN. I think to some extent but not too great an extent.

Mr. GROSS. Then, would the gentleman say that aluminum does not really become obsolescent?

Mr. PHILBIN. To some extent but not a great extent.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask you this question: Then how could the President of the United States, when Congress was in adjournment last year, tell the aluminum producers that if they increased the price of aluminum a half cent a pound he would go to the strategic stockpile and sell aluminum without the authority of Congress?

Mr. PHILBIN. The President has control over certain elements of the stockpile under the Defense Production Act and over the other stockpiles in times of emergency, or whenever he thinks it is in the interest of national defense he can make transfers from the stockpiles. However, I should prefer that the gentleman would propound any questions concerning the President's motives to him, because I think he is in a better position to answer that question.

Mr. GROSS. I wish somebody would tell me why this pending legislation is necessary if the President can dispose of materials from the stockpile without any authority on the part of the Congress when such materials do not become obsolescent. I wish somebody would tell me how he could threaten the aluminum producers last year with this kind of reprisal without the prior authority of Congress.

Mr. PHILBIN. As the gentleman well knows, I believe Congress should have authority to make disposals under this act just as we have been doing over a period of time. I propose to continue to do that, may I inform the gentleman, but, of course, I cannot talk for the head of the executive department.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the bills on the floor today provide further evidence of the diligence of the House Committee on Armed Services in handling legislation for disposals from the stockpile.

Surely we are witnessing a fresh demonstration of the fact that no delegation of legislative power is required, to any executive agency, to assure expeditious authorizations of releases wherever and whenever the national interest requires releases.

For my own part, Mr. Speaker, there are serious doubts as to the adequacy of present stockpile objectives on some of our strategic metals and materials. Present stockpile objectives on copper, for example, appear to be far below a reasonable level for either conventional or nuclear war. The same can be said for a number of other metals.

This comment, however, is directed at the executive agencies responsible for stockpile objectives, and not at the Committee on Armed Services.

The Nation is indebted to that great committee for many things, not the least of which is its continuing vigilance to advance American preparedness to a point at which our country is first on land, on sea, and in the air.

Our national stockpile is an integral part of American preparedness, and is also one of our primary deterrents to war.

Let us continue to safeguard that great stockpile and to maintain congressional control over its management.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 13365, with an amendment.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF ACID GRADE FLUORSPAR FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13367) to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately thirty-two thousand short dry tons of acid grade fluorspar in lump form now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13367, as sent to us by the General Services Administration, would authorize the release of 236,773 short dry tons of acid-grade fluorspar from the national stockpile.

Presently, we have in our two stockpiles and the DPA inventory a total of 1,144,090 short dry tons and a stockpile objective of 540,000 short dry tons.

Fluorspar is a mineral of calcium fluoride. Except for a very limited supply of cryolite and the very low fluorine content in phosphate rock, fluorspar is the only source of fluorine for industrial use. Most of the acid-grade fluorspar in the stockpile is a concentrate which has been finely ground.

Acid-grade fluorspar is used to make hydrofluoric acid. This acid is used to produce synthetic cryolite, freon gas, alkylate for high-octane fuel, pickling steel, etching glass, and many other minor uses. Cryolite is used in making alloys of aluminum and magnesium and in the refining of scrap of these metals.

Mexico produces approximately 25 percent of world production and the United States is the second largest free world producer. Countries which export acid-grade fluorspar to the United States are Spain, Italy, and France.

The approximate cost for a short dry ton of acid-grade fluorspar was 46.69. The present market value of fluorspar is estimated to be $45 per short dry ton.

During the fluorspar hearings, the committee became convinced that the domestic fluorspar industry was suffering a severe economic strain. Mere authorization for disposal would tend to further depress the domestic industry. There was industry consensus, however, that the release of acid-grade fluorspar in lump form would satisfy a current shortage of this type of fluorspar in the domestic market and would not upset the domestic fluorspar industry. Therefore, the committee reduced the amount for release to 32,000 short dry tons of acid-grade fluorspar in lump form

If all the fluorspar authorized by this release were sold at today's market price, the loss to the Government would be approximately $358,000.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in the colloquy with respect to H.R. 13365, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] raised certain questions about the source of the President's authority for making releases from the stockpile. I thought the gentleman might be interested in knowing that this is Public Law 520 of the 79th Congress, which was approved almost 20 years ago, July 23, 1946. Section 5 permits the President to make disposals from the stockpile, "(a) on order of the President at any time when in his judgment such release is required for purposes of the common defense."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the common defense clause of the Constitution, as well as the commerce clause and the general welfare clause, as we all know, has been expanded to the point where the President can do almost anything he wants to under those clauses.

And, Mr. Speaker, I cite this to emphasize what the gentleman from Iowa has said. He has eloquently clinched the point I was trying to make earlier; namely, that this authority really belongs in the Congress. Part of it has already been transferred to the executive branch, and the door is open.

Mr. Speaker, without saying anything about any particular administration, and that is not my intention, the President can, under the common defense clause, use these items and thereby regulate prices as he wishes, and use them to gain revenues into the Treasury, if he wishes, or for any other purpose.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I strongly feel that the authority granted to the administration—any administration—in 1946 was a mistake, and that Congress, before it considers giving away more of this authority ought to consider taking back that which it has bestowed upon the President.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. So, for all practical purposes, the exercise we go through here today with seven or eight bills—whatever the number—is in the order of a subterfuge, and a sham, because the President has the authority to dispose of materials from these stockpiles anyway, if he deems it to be in the national interest?

Mr. GUBSER. I do not say, nor do I believe, that any of these bills are in the nature of a subterfuge, because the President or the administration has come to the Congress in good faith asking for permission to make the disposals. However, it is my opinion that the gentleman is correct; that the disposition of stockpile assets justified by the common defense clause is a delegated power to the President, whomever he may be. The present President could make a disposal irrespective of the wishes of the Congress. However, to his credit, with reference to the 12 bills under consideration, he has not done this, and he has asked the Congress for concurrence.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that one of the Members of the House who has been here more than the 14 years I have been a Member, tells me it is his recollection that when this public law was passed in 1946, it definitely was not the intent of Congress that the stockpile should be used as it is being used today.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13367, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the disposal of acid fluorspar from the national stockpile."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF BISMUTH FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13368) to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13368

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Serivces is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately two hundred and twelve thousand three hundred pounds of bismuth now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704 (b)). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The **SPEAKER.** Is a second demanded?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is part of the legislative package of the General Services Administration for 1966 and would authorize the disposal of approximately 212,300 pounds of bismuth from the national and supplemental stockpiles.

Bismuth is a grayish-white, brittle, hard, easily powdered metal with a reddish tinge. It has a low melting point—270 degrees centigrade—and a low thermal conductivity. It is derived chiefly as a byproduct of lead refining.

Bismuth is used principally for low-melting—fusible—alloys and pharmaceuticals. It is also used in other alloys, principally as an additive to improve machinability of aluminum and malleable iron.

Bismuth comes from Peru, Mexico, Canada, and Yugoslavia.

The total inventories contained in the national and supplemental stockpiles are 3,812,315 pounds and the stockpile objective is 3,600,000 pounds, or an excess of 212,315 pounds.

The average acquisition cost of bismuth was $2.13 per pound. The present market value is estimated to be $4 per pound.

On the basis of the needs expressed to us at this time, it is planned to channel the entire excess of bismuth covered by H.R. 13368 to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Since this will be an intergovernmental transfer, obviously there is no profit or loss.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 13368?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF MOLYBDENUM FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13369) to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile with a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13369

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately fourteen million pounds of molybdenum now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The **SPEAKER.** Is a second demanded?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill sent to us by the General Services Administration and it authorizes the disposal of approximately 14 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile.

Between the time the bill was introduced and the date of the hearings, the stockpile objective for molybdenum had been reduced from 68 million pounds to 55 million pounds. The reason for the reduction in the stockpile objective is that a recent review disclosed two new sources of molybdenum which had not been considered previously. Therefore, at the request of the administration, we admended the bill to provide for the disposal of all excess molybdenum or a disposal of 14 million pounds.

The average acquisition cost of the molybdenum in our inventory was $1.04 per pound and the present market value is approximately $1.55 per pound. Thus, if we sold molybdenum at the current market price, there would be a total net gain to the Government of approximately $7,140,000.

Molybdenum is a hard silver-white metal obtained from molybdenite. It imparts a high-melting point, high strength, stiffness, and toughness to alloys.

Molybdenum is used as an alloying metal in iron and steel. It is also used by the electrical, chemical, and ceramic industries. Small quantities have applications as catalysts, welding rods, paints and pigments, lubricants, and a trace element in plant and animal metabolism.

The **SPEAKER.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13369 and H.R. 13774, the bills to provide for the disposal of a quantity of molybdenum and vanadium from the national stockpile and companion bills which would authorize the disposal of other materials.

I want to pay particular tribute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. PHILBIN] for his efforts on behalf of this legislation and the expeditious manner in which his subcommittee handled it.

The release of molybdenum and vanadium which are excess to the needs of the national stockpile, will be of great help to steel companies in my district.

A molybdenum shortage has seriously curtailed certain of their operations and this legislation will remedy that shortage. The release of vanadium will prevent the vanadium shortage from becoming as critical as molybdenum.

I urge the passage of this very worthwhile legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point and include a letter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13369, a bill to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile. Last year I introduced a similar bill. In fact, for the past several years, I have endeavored to bring the problem of a molybdenum shortage to the attention of responsible officials. For the past 3 years at least, this country has been suffering from such a shortage. The action in Vietnam has aggravated this shortage and many steel mills are in desperate condition.

Mr. Speaker, molybdenum is an essential raw material for the production of tool and other specialty steels. The mills in my district find that they cannot plan expansion or, for that matter, even accommodate their present orders.

I have introduced three separate and distinct bills to aid us in our molybdenum shortage. The first relates to the stockpile release. The second would provide that most forms of molybdenum be imported duty free. The third would establish a Molybdenum Export Review Board which would conduct a quarterly review of the domestic supply of and demand for molybdenum. This board would allow the export of molybdenum only when domestic supply exceeds domestic demand. Until that time, no molybdenum could be exported from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, although I believe this to be the proper approach to this problem, the basic ill falls to our trade policy. This archaic policy makes it difficult for even the President to protect U.S. industry.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching correspondence which better illustrates the problem. The first is a letter to me from Mr. E. F. Andrews, vice president, purchases, of the Allegheny Ludlum Steel

Corp. Mr. Andrews' letter points up the typical situation found by all our specialty steel producers.

The second letter is from Mr. Marcus Saxman, chairman of the board of the Latrobe Steel Co., and a leading U.S. industrialist. Mr. Saxman makes several specific points regarding a stockpile release. All should be carefully considered, but one is exceedingly important, that is, the release should be to domestic consumers only. We have had such releases in the past, and most of the material has gravitated to foreign shores. If we are going to release molybdenum from our national stockpile, we should specifically restrict its distribution to those who need it most—U.S. industry.

The correspondence follows:

ALLEGHENY LUDLUM STEEL CORP.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., January 24, 1966.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Thomas Shannon has asked me to write you concerning our observations on the molybdenum shortage and the present plans under consideration for the relief of this shortage.

One of our most serious concerns is the fact that molybdenum is being offered quite widely on what we would call a black market. Molybdenum oxide, which should normally sell for $1.75, is being offered for $3.75. Some of this material is foreign produced, but much of it is guaranteed to be U.S. domestic produced. Those who offer this material frankly tell us they are buying the material here in this country, and they are either offering it direct at black-market prices or exporting it where it can command a higher price in the world marketplace.

One of the suggestions for relief of the current short situation is an additional disposal from the Government stockpile. Our first thought here is that this country produced about 76 million pounds of molybdenum in 1965. It is my understanding that there is a proposal to release 5 million pounds from the stockpile. Therefore, this is a fairly small addition percentagewise to the available supply. It should be remembered that in 1965, we not only produced 76 million pounds; but we added to that a very late 1964 stockpile release of 3 million pounds and a February 1965, stockpile release of an additional 3 million pounds, both lots of which were consumed during the calendar year 1965. Therefore, the total available from the United States in 1965 was not 76 million pounds but 82 million pounds. Five million pounds put into this large capacity is relatively insignificant.

However, be that as it may, we do not want to take a position against the stockpile release, as we must admit that every pound helps. We would like to suggest, therefore, that careful consideration be given to the means of disposal from the stockpile. It is our feeling that much of the stockpile material from the last go around drifted out of this country in spite of the intentions of the Government to the contrary. The terms of the release specified that the material had to be consumed in the United States. Since it was molybdenum disulfide, the buyers had it roasted (converted to the ferro or oxide state) in the United States and thereby fulfilled the requirement of being consumed in the United States. They were then free to export it or do as they pleased with it. We therefore, feel that some disposal means similar to the cadmium disposal or at least the last stockpile disposal of molybdenum be insisted upon.

While on the subject of the stockpile release, we would also like to point out that the urgent need for material to relieve the shortage is now. In your bill, H.R. 10361, you provide for the release of molybdenum disulfide from the stockpile. Let us assume that it would take 60 days to get the bill passed through both Houses and signed. It would then take an additional 60 days for the GSA to make its offering, receive its bids, and deliver the goods. Another 60 days would be required for the buyer to arrange for roasting and delivery to his plant. This means that the consumers would have molybdenum in a form which they could use in about 5 to 6 months from now, provided the Government would be willing to withdraw its roasting contracts from the major roasters to make room for the roasting of this stockpile material. In the 68 million pounds presently in the stockpile, 7,500,000 pounds are already in the ferro state; 19,500,000 pounds in the oxide state; and 39 million pounds in the disulfide state. We would like to suggest that you change the wording in H.R. 10361 to provide for the release of ferro or oxide material which could be sold directly to the consumer and thus avoid the speculators getting around the technicality of consuming it when they roast it. This would also eliminate a very serious step in the timing and speed up the flow to the consumer.

We have said, we feel that the stockpile release, while helpful and needed, will be too little, too late. Therefore, it is our feeling that the Commerce Department should impose some sort of curtailment of exports at least for the first 6 months of 1966. We note that Secretary Trowbridge, in a letter to Mr. Thomas E. Morgan, indicated that the exports have, in fact, dropped from 40 percent of production in 1964 to 37½ percent in 1965 and that he anticipated they would go to 33½ percent in 1966. We have indicated in a previous letter to Mr. James Rill, of Collier, Shannon & Rill, that we take issue with these figures, and we still do. However, we admit that in the case of Bureau of Mines figures it is difficult in this instance to make sure that everyone is talking of apples and apples. Therefore, let us for the moment accept the Department of Commerce figures as Secretary Trowbridge presents them and let us admit that the export rate in 1965 was 37½ percent, of our production. There is no question but that during 1965, with an export rate of 37½ percent, there was a severe and injurious shortage of molybdenum in the United States. It is fairly well estimated, and certainly is true in our own company, that we could have used a minimum of 25 percent per month more last year over and above that which we were able to obtain. We have heard other companies advise that their shortages ran as high as 50 percent per month. Be that as it may, let us assume that we would be satisfied with the same amount which we had in 1965 when an admitted serious shortage existed.

Most major consumers have been advised by the major producer that, for the foreseeable future in 1966, we will receive 15 percent less per month than we received in 1965, so we start out the year with 15 percent less material than we had last year. Secretary Trowbridge's letter indicates that exports will be curtailed from the 37½-percent to 33½. This would mean that we would have 4 percent more material from the export areas than last year. We are still 11 percent short of 1965 figures. The only new material available to the domestic consumers during 1966 would be the Molybdenum Corp.'s New Mexico facility. This mine is rated at a capacity of 10 million pounds. The 10 million is based on their beginning to produce at rated capacity on January 1 and maintaining that rate until December 31. This, of course, has not and will not happen. If the Molybdenum Corp. can get into business and put 7 million pounds into the bloodstream during 1966, and if we are able to keep all of it in the United States in the hands of domestic consumers, this will be less than 10 percent of the material available during 1965. So, when we say we are going to get 9-percent help from Molybdenum Corp. and 4 percent from exports, we are still 2 percent short of the amount we had in 1965 when a serious shortage existed. If we release 5 million pounds from the stockpile and it gets into the bloodstream by summer, we would be adding another 3 percent to the available material. We would then be 1 percent better off than last year, provided it does not leak out of the country. It should also be noted that it is generally agreed, and history has shown that the demand in this country is increasing at the rate of 7½ percent per year. Therefore, if all of the above-mentioned help comes into existence and does not leave the country, including the stockpile release, we will end up with a 7½ percent more serious shortage than we had in 1965.

The latest figures we have on export are the Bureau of Mines statistics. One of the things that bothers us is the tremendous rate of increase of exports noted at the end of the year, particularly when it is recognized that the major producer is bringing a new plant on stream in Rotterdam. The October Bureau of Mines figures indicate that the exports to European countries in October over September were increased as follows:

	Percent
West Germany	21
Netherlands	16
Japan	14
Belgium	11
United Kingdom	9
Sweden	8
Austria	7
France	6

These countries received 92 percent of the total exports. What is even more alarming is that the October rate to the Netherlands and to Belgium was over 1,000 percent higher than the rate last year. During this same period of time in 1965, when all of these countries were receiving increased exports over the previous month, we were reduced by an additional 15 percent available to us. If we take the first 9 months of 1965, we were exporting at the rate of 24.6 million pounds per year. In October we exported at the rate of 31½ million pounds per year.

It should also be noted that the October figures of the Bureau of Mines indicate that our stocks, or inventories, at the end of October were 3½ million pounds. It is easy to see that our national inventory is approximately 2 weeks' supply. Therefore, some strong effort must be made to fill the pipelines. As anyone knows, you just cannot keep operations flowing properly with this small a quantity in the pipeline. This is why we suggest both release from the stockpile and curtailment of export to not only make more material promptly available to the consumers, but to also give the pipeline an opportunity to adjust to the demand.

Another argument which has been advanced in favor of the export of molybdenum is that it aids the balance of payments. This argument does not stand up when you realize that if we had molybdenum, we would be exporting 100 pounds of 316 stainless steel for $35 to $50 rather than 3 pounds of molybdenum for $6.

It should also be noted that the world supply of molybdenum is also going up. Canada has added about 5 million pounds last year and will add an additional 15 million pounds within the next 2 years. This material is not available to the U.S. consumers because of a prohibitive import duty on molybdenum in this country. Therefore, we support your efforts to eliminate or at least reduce this duty permanently or set it aside temporarily as we did the nickel duty.

We apologize for being so lengthy in this letter, but it is difficult to be brief and at the same time clear. Thank you for your attention and your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

E. F. ANDREWS,
Vice President, Purchases.

LATROBE STEEL CO.,
Latrobe, Pa., March 11, 1966.

Hon. JOHN G. HARLAN, Jr.,
Commissioner, Defense Materials Service,
General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. HARLAN: I am writing to you as a representative of a member company of the tool and stainless steel industry in connection with the developing shortage of vanadium and the proposed program for disposal of surplus stockpile of vanadium.

We recommend that the Government Services Administration adopt the following procedure in the release of vanadium from the stockpile in order to prevent injury and hardship to the domestic consumer of the strategic element.

1. The price should be determined by the GSA considering all market factors at the time of release and sold as a shelf item at this fixed price.

2. The material should be released to domestic producers of ferrovanadium only.

3. Restrictions on the export of this material should be imposed insuring that all material will be available for domestic consumption, whether it be in the oxide or the ferrovanadium condition.

4. This material should be released under a flexible plan over a 3-year timespan beginning as soon as possible with approximately 6 million pounds to be released in 1966, 11 million during 1967, and 8 million pounds in 1968.

We believe that if these steps are followed, they will contribute effectively to prevent the developing shortage of vanadium from becoming harmful to consumers in the United States, such as the condition which exists in the molybdenum market at this time. It will also fulfill the basic requirements of the stockpile program which are primarily to assure an adequate supply of strategic material to American consumers in time of shortage.

We do not feel that any worthwhile purpose, in terms of the objective of the stockpile program, can be serviced by permitting any of this material to escape into export channels.

Sincerely yours,

MARCUS W. SAXMAN.

CC: JOHN H. DENT.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 13369, with an amendment?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF PHLOGOPITE MICA FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13371) to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13371

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately three million seven hundred and sixty-five thousand pounds of phlogopite mica splittings and approximately two hundred and five thousand six hundred and forty pounds of phlogopite block mica now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the administration sent us a legislative proposal authorizing the disposition of 3,765,000 pounds of phlogopite mica splittings. There are approximately 225,640 pounds of phlogopite mica now held in the national stockpile.

While we have an inventory of 223,239 pounds of block phlogopite mica, we have a stockpile objective of only 17,000 pounds. Thus, we have a total of 206,239 pounds of excess block mica.

For mica splittings, we have a stockpile objective of 1,300,000 pounds and a total in our two stockpiles of 5,065,000 pounds or an excess of 3,765,000 pounds.

The principal free world producer of phlogopite mica is the Malagasy Republic.

In 1963, the U.S. imports for phlogopite mica totaled 587,496 pounds, including 313,000 pounds obtained for the Government account by barter. In 1963, consumption of this mica totaled 212,261 pounds.

The average acquisition cost of the mica for disposal was $1.36 for block and $1.06 for the splittings. The approximate current prices for Malagasy "high heat" sheet—block—mica range from $0.50 to $1.90 per pound, and there is no published price for mica splittings.

Mica, phlogopite block, differs from muscovite block, in that it withstands high temperatures with less deterioration, while less resistant to abrasion across the edge of the laminae. It may be classified as "high heat" quality if it withstands a certain high temperature for a stated period of time. This type of mica is used as insulating material in soldering irons and high temperature coils, liners in proximity fuses, transformers, and heater elements.

If all of this were sold at today's market prices, the total gain to the Government would be $1,829,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13371?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF MUSCOVITE MICA FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13373) to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13373

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately six million seven hundred and seventy-two thousand pounds of muscovite block mica, approximately five hundred and twenty-eight thousand pounds of muscovite film mica, and approximately twenty-two million six hundred and sixty-six thousand pounds of muscovite mica splittings now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill sent to us by the General Services Administration, and provides for the disposal of 6,772,000 pounds of muscovite block mica, approximately 528,000 pounds of muscovite film mica, and approximately 22,666,000 pounds of muscovite mica splittings from the national stockpile.

The stockpile objective for muscovite block mica is 6 million pounds, and we have an excess of 13,187,069 pounds in the national and supplemental stockpiles and DPA inventory.

For muscovite film mica, we have a stockpile objective of 2 million pounds, and a total inventory in the two stockpiles and DPA inventory of 2,527,786 pounds.

For muscovite mica splittings, the stockpile objective is 22,200,000 pounds, and an inventory in the national and supplemental stockpiles of 44,866,426 pounds.

We obtain block and film mica from India, Brazil, and the United States. We obtain mica splittings only from India.

The approximate acquisition cost per pound of muscovite block mica was

$2.60; the average cost per pound for film was $5.60 and $1.04 for splittings.

The present market value per pound for muscovite mica, depending upon quality and grade, are as follows: block, $2 through $9; film $1 through $12; and splittings, $1.20.

If all of this mica were sold at today's market price, the net loss to the Government would be approximately $3,837,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 13373?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF RHODIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13578) to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13578

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately six hundred and eighteen troy ounces of rhodium (Rh content) now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this is still another part of the legislative package of General Services Administration for disposal of metals from the national stockpile.

This is probably the smallest of the group. It calls for the disposal of approximately 618 troy ounces of rhodium—Rh content—now held in the national stockpile. There was never a stockpile objective for this particular metal.

The average acquisition cost of the commodity was $126.54 per troy ounce.

In 1959, Congress authorized the disposal of 2,524 troy ounces of rhodium, and the average unit recovery was $129.19 per troy ounce.

The current quoted market price for rhodium is $197 to $200 per troy ounce.

Rhodium is obtained from Canada, South Africa, the United States, and the U.S.S.R.

Rhodium is a metal of the platinum group and is intermediate between platinum and iridium with respect to hardness, toughness, and melting point. Rhodium maintains freedom from surface oxidation.

It is used to define the international temperature scale between 630.5 and 1063 degrees centigrade. Rhodium has a lower specific electrical resistance than platinum or palladium. Scientific instruments, silver and platinum jewelry, and precision instruments for the measurement of the physical properties of corrosive liquids are plated with rhodium. Electric contacts plated with rhodium are used for radio and audiofrequency circuits because of freedom from oxidation and low-contact resistance, and sliding or moving contacts are coated with rhodium to take advantage of the great hardness. Mirrors and surfaces coated with rhodium maintain brilliancy.

If all of this were sold at current market prices, the total gain to the Government would be approximately $22,000.

The bill has been unanimously recommended by the committee. If there are no questions, I would ask for a vote on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13578.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF THORIUM FROM THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13579) to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13579

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately three million five hundred thousand pounds (thorium oxide content) of thorium nitrate now held in the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b): *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize disposal of 3,500,000 pounds—thorium oxide content—of thorium nitrate now held in the supplemental stockpile.

Currently, we have 3,965,461 pounds of thorium in the stockpile and a stockpile objective of 500,000.

Thorium is obtained from India, Brazil, and South Africa.

The average acquisition cost of thorium was $4.54 per pound. The average acquisition cost of the thorium inventory was $2.08 per pound of thorium nitrate. The current market price for thorium nitrate is about $2 per pound.

Thorium is a gray powder or a heavy malleable metal changing from silvery-white to dark-gray or black in air. It is used with tungsten or nickel in electrodes in gas-discharge lamps and in conversion of fissionable uranium. It is used to make the incandescent—Welsback—type gas light mantle. Some of its compounds are used in luminous paints and in flashlight powders. It is compounded with nickel to produce a high-temperature alloy.

If all of the thorium were sold at today's market prices, the net loss to the Government would be approximately $1,320,000.

If there are no questions and no debate, I ask for a vote on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13579.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF AMOSITE ASBESTOS FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13580) to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13580

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately fifteen thousand, one hundred and seventy short tons of amosite asbestos now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the administration has submitted a proposal for disposal of 15,170 short tons of amosite asbestos now held in the national stockpile.

Currently, the stockpile objective is 40,000 short tons and the amount in inventory is 55,170 short tons.

The average acquisition cost of the commodity was $245.86 per short ton.

The current market price is approximately $240 per short ton. Thus, if the materials were sold at the current market price, the total loss to the Government would be approximately $75,850.

Amosite asbestos is obtained from South Africa.

It is a fibrous amphibole mineral, characterized by long, coarse, strong, and resilient fibers. Amosite possesses good tensile strength and is more resistant to heat than crocidolite or chrysotile. It varies in color from gray and yellow to dark brown, with fiber lengths up to 6 inches.

Amosite asbestos is used in manufacturing woven insulating felt, heat insulation—pipe covering, block and segments—and marine insulating board. The long fiber amosite is used principally in the manufacture of thermal insulation.

If there are no questions or debate, I ask for a vote on the bill.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Since this asbestos is also produced in Rhodesia and South Africa, as with chrome, can these products be liberated from our stockpile and then sold to the British? Is there anything that would stop the sale to the British?

Mr. PHILBIN. No.

Mr. GROSS. The British, I say again, claim to be boycotting Rhodesia and its products. President Johnson has joined in that outrageous boycott. I have previously stated that the British have brought highgrade chrome ore out of Rhodesia through their own boycott while it is being denied to American manufacturers. Are we going to liberate this material from the stockpiles in this country and then see somebody sell it to the British to help them through their own boycott of Rhodesia, whose only crime is that it is seeking its independence?

Mr. PHILBIN. The disposal plan for amosite asbestos of the General Services Administration does not restrict sales for domestic consumption only.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I made an inquiry with respect to the situation as it developed with regard to copper last fall when some of it did leave the United States. I was advised in the instance of these particular bills that in the disposal plans of the General Services Administration four commodities only; namely, molybdenum, metallurgical grade chromite, bismuth, and platinum will be restricted for U.S. consumption only. The other materials in the 12 bills, including amosite asbestos, may be sold for foreign consumption.

Mr. GROSS. I greatly regret to hear that my worst fears may be well founded. I trust that the House Armed Services Committee will watch carefully the disposal of these products from the defense stockpile. I will do what I can to follow the stockpile disposals that these several bills provide, and I say to the members of the committee that any sales, directly or indirectly, to foreign governments will not be in keeping with the intent of the legislation offered here this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13580.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF RUTHENIUM FROM THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13663) to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13663

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately fifteen thousand troy ounces of ruthenium now held in the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b): *Provided*, That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The **SPEAKER.** Is a second demanded?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a legislative proposal submitted by the General Services Administration.

Ruthenium is one of the platinum group metals, and there has never been a stockpile objective for this metal.

In 1959, 51 troy ounces were approved for disposal.

While the average acquisition cost of the commodity was $37.298 per troy ounce, the average return to the Government based on all sales made under the disposal, was $35.18 per troy ounce.

Currently, we have in our inventory 15,001 troy ounces. The bill provides for the disposal of approximately 15,000 troy ounces.

The current market price is $55 to $60 per troy ounce. Thus, if all the materials were sold at the lower price; namely, $55, the net gain to the Government would be approximately $120,000.

Ruthenium is obtained from Canada, South Africa, the U.S.S.R., and the United States.

Ruthenium is a gray or silverlike, brittle, nonductive metal of the platinum group. It is brittle at high temperatures. Ruthenium is insoluble in acids, but is attacked by fused alkalies.

Ruthenium is alloyed with platinum and palladium for a hard corrosion-resistant metal. The alloy is used for jewelry, contact points, and catalysts. Ruthenium alloys are not used at elevated temperatures under oxidizing conditions. Ruthenium has been used for the nibs of pens, phonograph needles, and pivots in instruments. The high melting point, hardness, and brittleness limits the satisfactory working of ruthenium mechanically.

If all the ruthenium were sold at current market prices, the total gain to the Government would be approximately $22,000.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, there is no opposition to the bill. If there are no questions or debates, I ask for a vote.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13663.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF REFRACTORY GRADE BAUXITE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1488) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1488

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, at the fair market value thereof, approximately one hundred twenty-six thousand three hundred long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite now held in the national stockpile. Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, relating to dispositions on the basis of a revised determination pursuant to section 2 of said Act, to the effect that no such dispositions shall be made until six months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committees thereof of a notice of the proposed disposition, but in such disposition the Administrator of General Services shall comply with the provisions of such section 3, which require that the plan and the date of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **CLANCY**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **PHILBIN**. Mr. Speaker, S. 1488 calls for the disposal of 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite now held in the national stockpile.

At the present time, we have in our inventory 299,279 long calcined tons.

The present stockpile objective which was established in April 1964, is for 173,000 tons.

The proposed disposal would provide authority for disposal of all excess refractory grade bauxite.

Refractory grade bauxite is a clay-like material, dull white in color, that has been calcined.

The principal use of this commodity is to produce high alumina refractories.

Refractory grade bauxite comes from British Guiana.

The average acquisition cost of this commodity is $37.92 per long calcined ton. The present market value is $42 per long calcined ton.

The consumption has increased from approximately 115,000 tons in 1963 to approximately 141,000 tons in 1964.

If all the material were sold at today's market price, the Government would stand to net $515,300.

There is no opposition to the bill. If there is no debate, I ask for a vote.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1488.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF PLATINUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. **PHILBIN**. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2642) to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes, with committee amendments as shown in the printed copy of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2642

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately three hundred sixteen thousand three hundred ounces of platinum from the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

SEC. 2. The platinum covered by this Act, materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061–2166), and materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)) the disposition of which has been or may hereafter be authorized pursuant to law, shall be available, without reimbursement for transfer at fair market value in payment of the purchase price and other expenses of acquisition (including transportation and other accessorial expenses) of palladium for the national stockpile. No acquisition of palladium shall be made pursuant to the authority of this section if, as a result of such acquisition, the aggregate quantity of palladium in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile would exceed the palladium stockpile objective established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **CLANCY**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **PHILBIN**. Mr. Speaker, S. 2642, a bill introduced by Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, was referred to our committee for consideration. An identical bill was introduced in the House by the Honorable RICHARD ICHORD, of Missouri, and the Honorable ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina.

This bill provides for disposal of 316,300 troy ounces of platinum from the national stockpile. Section 2 of the bill would permit the use of excess platinum as well as other excess stockpile materials to be used for the payment of the purchase price and other expenses of acquiring palladium for the national stockpile. In other words, we have a surplus of platinum and a deficit of palladium. Platinum may be used interchangeably with palladium for certain defense purposes. The reverse is not true.

The committee amended the bill to add a new section at the end of section 2 which would limit this barter program of metals for palladium only until such time as the stockpile objective for palladium is reached.

The stockpile objective for platinum is 450,000 troy ounces and the total in our inventory is 766,304 troy ounces. The unit acquisition cost is $79.47 per troy ounce, and from previous disposals the average unit recovery is $62.86 per troy ounce. I understand the present unit market value is $97 to $100 per troy ounce.

Platinum is a heavy grayish-white noncorroding precious metal. It is very soft, ductile, and malleable. It does not tarnish at elevated temperatures. It is inert to the common strong acids, including nitric acid, but aqua regia slowly reacts with it. Alkali-metal hydroxides, especially with oxidizing agents, attack platinum. Chlorine and fluorine react with platinum.

The platinum group metals are used separately and in alloys or combinations with each other and other metals. The electrical uses are principally contacts, electrodes, filaments, resistance thermometers, and resistors and thermocouples. In the chemical field, it is used for crucibles and other heat and corrosion resistant vessels, cathodes, spinnerettes for organic filaments as rayon and for Fiberglas, burner nozzles, and catalysts. Other sundry uses are dentistry, jewelry, purification of hydrogen, and precision instruments.

If all of the platinum authorized by this disposal were sold at today's market price, the total net gain to the Government would be approximately $6,464,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill, one of the most important bills we have had today. There is need in industry for the bill. I think there is no opposition.

Mr. **ICHORD**. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. **PHILBIN**. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. **ICHORD**. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the highly esteemed gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] for his prompt action on S. 2642 and to express full support for this measure—a bill to authorize the release of 316,300 ounces of platinum from the national stockpile. Something has got to be done—and quickly—to satisfy the growing need for platinum in many of our industries. This is a need which cannot be met in the foreseeable future by standard supply sources at a reasonable price.

Because of the fact that I have in my district a large industry which is a great user of platinum, I introduced a bill identical to S. 2642 on January 31, 1966.

S. 2642, basically, contains two sections for dealing with the problem of platinum shortages. Section 1 of the bill authorizes the Administrator of General Services to dispose of approximately 316,300 ounces of platinum from the national stockpiles established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act—50 U.S.C. 98–98h. This amount is in excess of the stockpiling objective for platinum established by the Office of Emergency Planning.

Section 2 of S. 2642 provides for the use of materials which have been authorized for disposition in the acquisition of palladium which is below the stockpile objective. Palladium is available in exchange for platinum or other materials if GSA should choose to acquire it.

In order to emphasize the need for legislation to release platinum from the national stockpile, and to outline the basis for the wide industry support that exists for S. 2642, I have developed some background information on the major industrial uses of platinum.

The regular U.S. sellers of platinum, Englehard Industries, who market the Canadian production, and Johnson-Mathey, who sell South African platinum, are currently unable to meet the demand for the platinum needed by the oil, chemical, glass and electrical industries. Russian material has to be bought, through brokers, to make up the substantial short-fall in platinum. In recent months the prices paid for Russian platinum has ranged from $135 to $175 per troy ounce, compared to $97 to $100 per ounce from regular U.S. suppliers. This added cost to industry, and the dollar outflow that results, could be corrected by the provisions of S. 2642.

The most important industrial uses for platinum are in the oil, chemical, glass and electrical industries. In the first two instances, platinum is used mainly as a catalyst. In the second two cases it has the necessary mechanical and electrical properties, respectively, that are needed to do these jobs. Replacement of platinum by other materials is very difficult and uneconomic. In many instances there is no substitute. Finally, in the first three of these four applications, the platinum is not used up at any appreciable rate, and is available for recovery and reuse.

The oil industry has become the largest user of platinum, taking an estimated 150,000 ounces in 1965. Continued increases in octane demand, in requirements for aromatics for explosives and chemical manufacture, and in the growth of a new process—hydrocracking—that is making it possible to get even more gasoline per barrel of crude oil, have led platinum use in this industry to a high level. Even more platinum will be needed in the future by our oil industry.

Our chemical industry uses platinum primarily as a catalyst in the manufacture of nitric acid from ammonia. The demand for nitric acid for fertilizer and for military explosives is at an alltime high, and the platinum requirement of the chemical industry is accordingly increased.

Our glass industry relies on platinum to line glass furnaces and similar melting and refining devices and for dies and fixtures required for glass fiber production. There is no known substitute for platinum in regard to this application. One major firm in this field is reported to be particularly troubled by their inability to obtain, at competitive costs, the platinum needed for a large new glass fiber mill. This bill will assure their ability to provide needed additions to the capacity of this industry.

Our electrical industry uses platinum for contact points and for spark plug tips. While desirable progress is being made in substituting palladium for platinum in some of these applications, the demand for special platinum tipped spark plugs for defense uses has tended to offset the effect of this substitution.

Mr. Speaker, this should explain why American industry is so short of platinum today. S. 2642 would solve this problem while in no way posing a threat to the stockpiling needs of our Nation. I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that most of the uses to which American industry will put the excess platinum will be nonconsuming uses. I am confident that the stockpile objective of 450,000 ounces is sufficient but in the event it is not, the platinum to be sold or exchanged for palladium will be available for reacquisition by the Federal Government under its police powers in the event that it should be needed because of an emergency. I believe this should be noted in the record in case that such an emergency should arise. This is a good piece of legislation. I urge its adoption to all.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2642, with amendments.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the bills relating to stockpile materials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

VALIDATION OF ACTION OF THE ACTING SUPERINTENDENT, YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK, IN EXTENDING THE 1955 LEAVE YEAR FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2573), to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2573

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, inasmuch as the administrative order issued by the Acting Superintendent of Yosemite National Park recalling to duty certain Federal employees to assist in meeting the storm and flood emergency which existed in late 1955 and early 1956 was in the public interest, his action purporting to extend to March 15, 1956, the time within which leave available for the 1955 leave year could be used is hereby validated.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2573.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on S. 2573 at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S NEW BREAKTHROUGH FOR PEACE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper column.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, last week the President conducted one of the most delicate and far-reaching negotiations in the recent history of this Nation. It is too soon fully to assess the results of his meeting with Mrs. Ghandi. But it is not too early to say the seeds of a vast and decisive success were planted. The first shoots of a new harmony are already visible. The evidence affirms that they will flower into a newly deep and vigorous partnership between the American and Indian peoples.

The ground for that was laid last week by two great leaders of two great democracies. A great reporter, William S. White, has written with his customary incisiveness of the breakthrough that President Johnson and Prime Minister Ghandi together achieved. Bill White cuts through the fog of diplomatic niceties to the core of a most significant and reassuring truth:

> The central, and surprising, reality—

He writes—

> is that American-Indian relations are now on the soundest footing in many years.

The footing is sound, I suggest, because the President has walked with infinite skill and care. These were difficult negotiations. India has been a sometimes difficult ally. She has deep and difficult problems of her own. But the President has proven once more, as he has so often and so masterfully in the past, that no difficulty is immune to reason—that no differences are so large that they cannot be healed by patience, wisdom, and genuine friendship.

Lyndon Johnson and Indira Ghandi have made a breakthrough to new understanding and respect. Democracy has made a breakthrough and aggression has received a setback. The prospect for peace in Asia—peace in the world—has been fundamentally advanced by a new accord between the cradle of democracy in the West and the bulwark of democracy in the East.

In Bill White's no nonsense terms, Mrs. Ghandi has made it clear that "the past was the past and that neutralism in its doctrinaire and extreme form in India was dead." India's great moral leadership is now realined and ranged beside us. Red China's expansionist ambitions are plain to each partner—and both are pledged to check the aggressor separately and together.

This is the great and subtle turning point we have reached. It is not captured in the formal communiques, but William S. White has caught it in his perceptive column, "L.B.J.-Mrs. Ghandi Talks Productive," appearing in the New York Journal-American. His insights are too consequential for any Member of the Congress to miss. I therefore insert this article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Journal American, Apr. 1, 1966]

L.B.J., MRS. GANDHI TALKS PRODUCTIVE

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—No previous conference of heads of state in the time of the Johnson administration has accomplished so much for so many as has the President's parley here with Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India.

The central—and surprising—reality is that American-Indian relations are now on the soundest footing in many years. This is the private estimate of the most responsible informants in the U.S. Government. There is good reason to say that equivalent Indian sources do not disagree.

After any international conference, the custom, of course, is to put the fairest possible face upon the results, with a heavy application of the rouge of diplomatic nicety where needed. Nearly always, unless the two principals have all but socked each other in the jaw, the drill is to speak of most cordial conversations, of many shared interests, of meetings of the mind, and so on.

The formal communiques don't always tell the precise truth; the inclination is to smooth over the rough spots. In this case, the extraordinary truth is the communiques have more nearly understated than overstated the success of the first mission to Washington of the first woman to hold great power over any vast reach of the earth since Queen Victoria reigned over imperial Britain. East, in Mrs. Gandhi, has faced West, in President Johnson. And, Rudyard Kipling to the contrary, the twain has truly met.

This was a conference approached most gingerly on both sides. For his part, President Johnson months ago had all but cut off American aid to India as an emergency measure to forward the West's basic design to try to force a true armistice between India and Pakistan in their old Kashmir border quarrel.

On her side, Mrs. Gandhi was known here mainly as the daughter of the late neutralist Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, the one world statesman outside the Communist bloc who consistently gave the United States a great deal of trouble. It was not easy to see that much could come from this confrontation.

It did not work out that way. Mrs. Gandhi made it clear, in all her official and unofficial contacts here, that the past was the past and that neutralism in its doctrinaire and extreme form was dead in India. It turned out, in short, that she has been and intends to remain a moderate-minded, undoctrinaire leader of India—not in our pocket, of course, but also not at our national throat.

Those who sought to draw from her even private or implied criticism of American military resistance to shooting communism in Vietnam, for illustration, got no comfort at all. And it became plain that the old high influence in India of such emotionally pro-Communist and glandular Western haters as Krishna Menon, her late father's principal adviser on foreign affairs, has no standing with this quiet, neat lady.

All this does not mean that the United States has found some new, fighting ally in giant India. Nothing like this was ever sought. But the new situation is highly satisfactory to the West, all the same. The long and short of it is that for the first time the United States is able to feel confident that in India it faces a power that at least wishes us well.

There is not the slightest doubt that Mrs. Gandhi, for all India's historic neutralism, knows well that the real threat to world peace lies just where the United States has long known it lies—within the harshly expansionist policy of Red China. India's moral force in Asia has very often in the past been automatically against us. That is true no longer.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma on the very fine statement he has just made to the House. The importance of friendly relationships between India and our country cannot be exaggerated. The gentleman has done the House a service by calling to its attention the very fine column he made mention of.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, in again sharing in the celebration of Byelorussian Independence Day, we in the United States take occasion to reiterate our belief in the right of all peoples to assert their national and political rights. That has been the keynote of our own history since the earliest days of our existence as a country. It was the keynote of the Byelorussian proclamation of independence on March 25, 1918. It is echoed in the celebration of that occasion on this 48th anniversary of that great day.

When the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was established, the rights of the people which we in America consider fundamental were enumerated in detail. The Rada or Council which drew up the new Constitution consisted of representatives of all of the people, including the national minorities such as Jews, Poles, and Russians. The Constitution guaranteed to all citizens within the boundaries of the Byelorussian Republic such political rights as freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. It guaranteed liberty of conscience, the inviolability of the person and of the home, the right of national minorities to autonomy, and the equality of all citizens before the law.

That Constitution also included such 20th century concepts as the right to form labor unions and the right to strike.

It provided for the division of large estates among the landless peasantry; for the nationalization of the mineral wealth of the country; and, in industry, for the 8-hour law.

It is ironical that this promising nation, with its sense of social justice and its recognition of the rights of all people was, unfortunately, soon to be crushed beneath the Soviet yoke. The Byelorussian Democratic Republic was shortly to become the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, independent in name only.

Nevertheless, the independence of the Byelorussian people was to continue—in spirit, in thought, in concept. It is because of the indestructibility of the concept of freedom that we are celebrating Byelorussian Independence Day. Mr. Speaker, we honor and applaud those who carry its torch.

HOUSE DELIBERATIONS ON S. 2729 MUDDLED BY MISLEADING STATEMENTS OF THE GENTLEMAN FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the House of Representatives unanimously passed S. 2729. The bill as reported to the House by the Banking and Currency Committee would have established two revolving funds. One of the revolving funds—the disaster fund—carried an unlimited authorization ceiling. The other fund, which would have included all other Small Business Administration activity lending, would have an authorization ceiling of $2 billion. An amendment by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] added a third revolving fund for loans made under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This fund would have an authorization ceiling of $100 million. The legislation prohibits interfund borrowing. For example, if the Economic Opportunity loan fund does not use all of its $100 million, the excess money must remain in the fund and cannot be channeled into the regular business loan program.

WHO WAS THE ARTIST MISLEADING THE HOUSE?

During the debate on S. 2729, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] stated that I was "basically an artist in misleading this House of Representatives." Mr. Speaker, I am not standing in this well today to suggest that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is an artist in misleading the House of Representatives, but I shall take this opportunity to point out that when the gentleman from West Virginia debated his amendment to S. 2729, he was speaking with—as the Indians say on the "late show"—a forked tongue. I do not believe this language is too strong in view of the language used by the gentleman in criticism of me.

I first became aware of the gentleman's interest in an amendment to the legislation less than 2 hours before the legislation was scheduled to be brought before this body. The notification of his intent was delivered to me in the form of a mimeographed letter which apparently was sent to all Members of the House. A portion of the gentleman's letter concerning the amendment read as follows:

> I propose an amendment which will establish a separate revolving fund for the Economic Opportunity Act's program.

AMENDMENT WOULD ESTABLISH A THIRD REVOLVING FUND

When S. 2729 was opened for amendments on the floor, the gentleman from West Virginia did, in fact, offer his amendment in the following manner—and I am quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1966, page 7324.

> Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE: Page 2, line 4, strike "and" the first time it appears.
>
> Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964".
>
> Page 2, strike the period in line 10, and insert: "; and (C) an Economic Opportunity Act loan fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions."
>
> Page, 2, line 16 strike "and".
>
> Page 2, lines 18 and 19, strike "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964".
>
> Page 2, strike the period in line 20 and insert: "; and (C) pursuant to tile IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall be paid into the Economic Opportunity Act loan fund."
>
> Page 2, line 14, strike "and",
>
> Page 3, strike the period in line 15 and insert: "; and (D) under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall not exceed $100,000,000."
>
> Page 3, lines 10 and 11, strike "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,".

Mr. MOORE's amendment does exactly what he said he intended to do in his letter. It sets up a third revolving fund with a $100 million authorization ceiling to be used exclusively for Economic Opportunity Act loans.

So that there can be no doubt as to the effects of the Moore amendment, I have asked the Small Business Administration, as well as the House of Representatives Legislative Counsel's office, to study the Moore amendment and to determine if a third revolving fund is established. Both of these offices reaffirm what I have stated earlier—the Moore amendment does establish a third revolving fund. The letters from SBA and the Legislative Counsel's office read as follows:

> SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
> *Washington, D.C., April 4, 1966.*
>
> Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
> *Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have asked that we comment on the amendment which was offered by Congressman MOORE of West Virginia and adopted by the House in passing S. 2729 to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act.
>
> The amendment as it is reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD establishes a third revolving fund for loans made under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and removes such loans from the business loan and investment revolving fund also created by this bill.
>
> In a later colloquy between Congressman HANNA of California and Congressman MOORE, the latter stated that he had deleted from his amendment "anything that would create a second revolving fund," but there is no evidence in the RECORD that this action was taken. It appears, therefore, that the bill as passed by the House provides for three revolving funds.
>
> Mr. MOORE subsequently stated: "Therefore, the only thing I have done is to state that within the $1.4 billion, there will be a ceiling of $100 million for the operation of the title IV." This could have been done very simply by an amendment in paragraph 4 of section 2 of the bill. Although we do not consider such a limitation to be necessary since this type of program can be effectively controlled as contrasted with the disaster loan program, nevertheless, we would not object to an amendment of this type.
>
> On the other hand, we believe that the creation of the third revolving fund is not only unnecessary but undesirable and will be a handicap to efficient management of our funds. Further, since only a small amount of loans have been approved to date, we would not be able to finance a separate fund of this nature by the sale of loans as contemplated under S. 2499 now being considered by your committee.
>
> We hope that it will be possible in subsequent legislative action on the bill to eliminate or modify this amendment.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> ROSS D. DAVIS,
> *Executive Administrator.*

I opposed the Moore amendment because I felt it would lock funds into the Economic Opportunity Act programs which might not be used and which could have better been used in other lending programs of the Small Business Administration. Under the Moore amendment, roughly $40 million in the first year would sit idly in a revolving fund while other revolving funds might desperately need the money for other loan purposes. Had the gentleman from West Virginia offered an amendment which would merely have established a $100 million authorization ceiling for title IV loans which would be set up in the nondisaster loan revolving fund, I would have supported his amendment. It was crystal clear to me and numerous other Members of this Chamber the effects of the Moore amendment.

EXPERTS DO NOT SUPPORT GENTLEMAN FROM WEST VIRGINIA

We have heard what the experts have had to say as to the effect of the Moore amendment, and at this time I would like to refresh the memories of my colleagues as to Mr. MOORE's description of his amendment. When the learned gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA], one of the distinguished members of the Banking and Currency Committee, engaged Mr. MOORE in a colloquy on his amendment in an attempt to learn if the Moore amendment would set up a separate revolving fund or merely establish a separate ceiling on the nondisaster loan fund, Mr. MOORE made the following reply—and I again quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31:

> Mr. MOORE. I thought I had answered that when he propounded his earlier question because originally—the letter speaks for itself—the gentleman suggested the question to me at the time I was in the well as to whether or not this was an isolation of funds which might otherwise be available for the loan program.
>
> As a result of the gentleman's suggestion I deleted from my amendment anything that would create a second revolving fund.
>
> Therefore, the only thing I have done is to state that within the $1.4 billion there will be a ceiling of $100 million for the operation of the title IV.
>
> It was basically as a result of the suggestion of the gentleman from California that I deleted the reference to the revolving fund.

Several sentences later, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] continues:

> Mr. HANNA. If we did not have this correction, we would be making the amendment as suggested in your letter, and I believe that would be a mistake.
>
> Mr. MOORE. I agree with the gentleman, because it could conceivably—because of the fact they anticipate that only $69 million will be used—isolate $31 million of funds which otherwise could be used for the business loan program which the gentleman is interested in, I understand.
>
> Mr. HANNA. I think the gentleman can understand how the House may not have been considering the point made on the basis that we are now trying to make it, unless this clarification has been brought up.
>
> Mr. MOORE. I appreciate the manner in which the gentleman has brought this up.

Earlier the gentleman from West Virginia had this to say of his amendment:

> This amendment does not set up any revolving fund. It simply sets a $100 million ceiling upon the amount of funds in the bill which can be used for poverty loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act.

NO DELETION MADE IN MOORE AMENDMENT

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from West Virginia stated in his colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] that "I have deleted from my amendment anything that would create a second revolving fund." However, the record does not bear the gentleman out. This is further brought to the fore when the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], the ranking minority member of the House Banking Committee, rose to speak on the Moore amendment. I would like to place Mr. WIDNALL's remarks in the time sequence so that the import of his statement will bear proper weight. Mr. WIDNALL rose to support the Moore amendment less than a minute after the gentleman from West Virginia had stated his amendment would not set up a separate revolving fund.

In speaking to the Moore amendment, the gentleman from New Jersey stated:

> I am in support of the poverty loan program, but I frankly do not believe that we should take the risk of having insufficient funds in the future for our regular small businessmen, by keeping both poverty loans and regular business loans in one common fund.

In short, Mr. WIDNALL was supporting what Mr. MOORE stated his amendment accomplished, but, in fact, was speaking against the actual effect of the amendment.

FURTHER EVIDENCE OF MISLEADING BY THE GENTLEMAN FROM WEST VIRGINIA

The gentleman from New Jersey was not the only Member to speak in favor of the Moore amendment as sent to the Clerk by Mr. MOORE, but against the Moore amendment as explained by the gentleman from West Virginia. Another distinguished member of the minority of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], in supporting what he understood the Moore amendment to accomplish, stated:

> I support the Moore amendment to limit the Economic Opportunity Act loan program delegated to the SBIC to a loan fund of $100 million.

The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] had this to say of the Moore amendment:

> He [Mr. Moore] proposes a third revolving fund to handle the loan programs assigned to the Small Business Administration under the Economic Opportunity Act.

I call your attention to the comments of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Kluczynski] on the Moore amendment. He stated:

> Therefore, the same set of reasons which made it necessary to establish separate funds for disaster and regular loans require the adoption of this amendment to establish separate revolving funds for the Economic Opportunity Act program.

I want the Record to show that because of the confusion surrounding the Moore amendment, I asked unanimous consent to have the amendment reread because I felt that Members supporting the Moore amendment were not in agreement as to its content with its author. It is interesting to note that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino], one of the Members who was in disagreement with the author of the amendment as to its meaning, objected to a second reading of the amendment so that we could clarify the situation.

AMENDMENT DOES NOT SUPPORT THE GENTLEMAN FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in offering his amendment Mr. Moore intended to make certain that any heavy demand for loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act would not drain funds from other SBA lending programs. I believe that he further intended his amendment to provide that if the $100 million authorized ceiling for the title IV loans was not reached, the excess funds could be channeled into other SBA lending programs. It is now clear that his amendment does not carry out his wishes. And because of the confusion surrounding his amendment, I am not certain that it carries out the wishes of this body.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks, I would also like to answer an allegation made by the gentleman from West Virginia as to the conduct of the Banking and Currency Committee. During the consideration of S. 2729 in a colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], the gentleman from West Virginia made the following remarks:

> Mr. Moore. We tried for 3 days, I say to the gentleman from Iowa, to find out when the Committee on Banking and Currency was going to consider this authorization bill. But they delayed it for 3 days. Then at some hour, only known to the chairman, they called the bill up and had the Executive Director of the SBA present, and no one else knew they were going to consider the bill.

THE GENTLEMAN FROM WEST VIRGINIA HAS AGAIN MISLED THIS BODY

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the facts. The legislation first was considered by the Subcommittee on Small Business. It was unanimously reported by that body to the full committee and subsequently unanimously reported to the floor by the full Banking and Currency Committee. At no time during the deliberations or hearings on this bill was there any objection raised to any portion of the bill, nor did any member even suggest that such an amendment to the one the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] offered be considered by our committee. The gentleman from West Virginia states that "We tried for 3 days to find out when the Committee on Banking and Currency was going to consider this authorization bill." I do not know to whom the gentleman inquired as to the date of consideration, but I will say that if he had read the Congressional Record, he would have noted that the committee was taking up the bill. Numerous newspapers also carried the information that the bill was before the committee. Had the gentleman from West Virginia requested formally or informally to appear before the committee to testify on S. 2729, or any related bills, I can assure him that the committee would have received him most graciously. Perhaps, if he had made that request, he would not have misled this body in such a flagrant manner.

U.S. House of Representatives,
Office of the Legislative Counsel,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1966.

Hon. Wright Patman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Patman: You have asked this office for asistance in connection with the changes in S. 2729 (the Small Business Act bill) which were made by the amendments offered by Mr. Moore of West Virginia, and adopted by the House on March 31.

As shown in the Congressional Record for March 31 (p. 7324), the amendments in question appear to deal with the financing of functions under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The first group of amendments involves section 4(c)(1) of the Small Business Act, which establishes revolving funds in the Treasury for the financing of SBA's functions. Section 4(c)(1) as it appeared in the reported bill read as follows (the language is quoted verbatim from the Congressional Record):

"(c)(1) There are hereby established in the Treasury the following revolving funds:

"(A) a disaster loan fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under sections 7(b)(1), 7(b)(2), 7(b)(4), and 7(c)(2) of this Act, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions; and

"(B) a business loan and investment fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under sections 7(a), 7(b)(3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, titles III and V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions."

The amendments under consideration changed section 4(c)(1) to read as follows:

"(c)(1) There are hereby established in the Treasury the following revolving funds:

"(A) a disaster loan fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under sections 7(b)(1), 7(b)(2), 7(b)(4), and 7(c)(2) of this Act, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions;

"(B) a business loan and investment fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under sections 7(a), 7(b)(3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, titles III and V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions; and

"(C) an Economic Opportunity Act loan fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions."

The second group of amendments involves section 4(c)(2) of the Small Business Act, which deals with repayments into the revolving funds established by section 4(c)(1), and appears to be conforming in nature.

The third group of amendments involves section 4(c)(4) of the act, which imposes limitations on expenditures from the revolving funds. Section 4(c)(4) as it appeared in the reported bill read as follows (quoted from the Congressional Record), with additional changes:

"(4) The total amount of loans, guarantees, and other obligations or commitments, heretofore or hereafter entered into by the administration, which are outstanding at any one time

"(A) under sections 7(a), 7(b)(3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall not exceed $1,400,000,000;

"(B) under title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed $400,000,000; and

"(C) under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed $200,000,000."

The amendments under consideration changed section 4(c)(4) to read as follows:

"(4) The total amount of loans, guarantees, and other obligations or commitments, heretofore or hereafter entered into by the administration, which are outstanding at any one time

"(A) under sections 7(a), 7(b)(3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, shall not exceed $1,400,000,000;

"(B) under title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed $400,000,000;

"(C) under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed $200,000,000; and

"(D) under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall not exceed $100,000,000."

I hope that the above will serve to indicate the changes which were made in the bill by the several amendments under consideration.

Sincerely,

Lawrence E. Filson,
Assistant Counsel.

THE PLIGHT OF THE NATURAL GAS PRODUCING INDUSTRY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, almost 2 years ago, 36 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle joined me in an important discussion on a very critical issue facing this Nation concerning the plight of the natural gas producing industry. At that time, it was pointed out that the Federal Power Commission had been attempting for 10 years to regulate natural gas producers and the price they receive for their gas at the wellhead in the gas fields.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that the same confusion and uncertainty that existed then still is with us. Today, 12 years after the U.S. Supreme Court declared "that independent producers selling natural gas in interstate commerce were subject to FPC rate and certificate jurisdiction," we find that producers do not yet know with any certainty what price they can charge for their gas sold in the field.

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out 2 years ago on this floor, the Federal Power Commission, after 6 years of futile but harassing experimentations, gave up in 1960 the course it was pursuing in its attempt to regulate gas producers; and the Commission stated:

> Producers of natural gas cannot by any stretch of the imagination be properly classified as traditional public utilities. It is clear that in regulating producers, we are faced with problems entirely different from those presented by an ordinary public utility.

In 1960 the Commission then set about on another experiment known as the area rate approach. This called for establishment of 23 geographical areas in which the Commission would set the price of the gas "based on the reasonable financial requirements of the industry." I think it is fair to say that some producers welcomed this new approach as reason to hope for a more realistic and workable regulation by the Commission even though there was not then, nor is there now, any legislative standards or guideline upon which to base this new approach.

The first proceeding under this new approach, known as the Permian Basin Area Rate Proceeding, was begun in December of 1960. In August 1965, after almost 5 years of conferences, submission of a truck load of testimony and exhibits, long drawn-out hearings, filing of briefs, oral arguments and numerous other procedures, the Commission came forth with its decision in the Permian case.

Mr. Speaker, in this decision the Commission has reached new heights in absurdity. For example, the Commission, in the Permian Basin case, established a two-price system for gas of similar quality even coming from the same gas field or gas well. The price a producer is to receive for such gas will vary according to when he contracted to sell the gas. This is just one of many arbitrary conclusions contained in this opinion.

In this decision, which is now on appeal in the Federal courts, the Commission arbitrarily reduced the contract prices arrived at by producers and buyers through arms' length negotiation in a free and competitive market. The Commission has ignored the principle of market value. It denied the effectiveness of the great competition and competitive effort existing in the natural gas producing industry and simply arbitrarily imposed its determination of the price for gas rather than the law of supply and demand upon the Permian Basin.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission action has created even greater confusion and more uncertainty in the ranks of the natural gas producing industry. The results of this case, if allowed to stand, will be much less incentive to look for new gas supplies and less assurance for the future, all of which will adversely affect the gas consumers, the very persons which the Commission so often declares that it is dedicated to serve.

Needless to say, this decision and its arbitrary and unfounded conclusions have removed all doubt as to what must be done if this Nation is to continue to have a strong and healthy natural gas producing industry. Congress must act to promptly enact legislation which recognizes that natural gas is a commodity, and that the thousands of natural gas producers are not public utilities and should not be subjected to arbitrary price controls.

If Congress does not act, and unless conditions are improved so as to enable producers to reverse the serious declining trends in exploration for new gas supplies, the outlook for future supplies of natural gas can be considered critical.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give this matter early and effective attention.

INACTIVATION OF AIRLIFT AIR GUARD UNITS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on December 8, 1965, the Secretary of Defense announced that three Air Guard airlift units would be inactivated by October 1, 1966. These units were identified as:

The 105th Air Transport Group, White Plains, N.Y.

The 171st Air Transport Group, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The 195th Air Transport Squadron, Van Nuys, Calif.

The Special Subcommittee on Military Airlift, of which I have the honor of being chairman, recently concluded an extensive review of our total military airlift capabalities and requirements. During that review, sufficient evidence was not presented that would support the elimination of in-being airlift resources at this time. Our hearings developed the fact that no approved study by either the Department of Defense or the Department of the Air Force has been completed to identify intratheater assault airlift requirements and, even though several completed studies addressed strategic airlift, there are differences of opinion on specific requirements in the various situations.

It was noted during the hearings that the three Guard units programed for inactivation have been, for some time, directing a large portion of their effort on an inactive status to support our military fighting men in foreign countries. I am advised that during January and February of 1966 they completed 45 volunteer missions to overseas theaters. Of these volunteer missions, 31 were in direct support of the war in southeast Asia to assist the Military Airlift Command in reducing the backlog of essential supplies in that area. I feel sure that the subcommittee, in its report, will conclude that it is not in the best interests of the security of our Nation to eliminate 1,823 trained personnel and amortized airlift airframes during the period when:

One. Requirements are increasing for airlift capability;

Two. An escalation of the war in Vietnam is possible; and

Three. A new crisis may occur in one of the many countries of the world which are seething with unrest.

The Air Guard heavy airlift fleet presently is composed of 7 wings, 24 groups and 25 squadrons located in 17 States. There are currently 19,359 personnel assigned, including 1,173 experienced pilots to support 209 C-97 and C-121 aircraft utilized in this mission.

During calendar year 1965, the Air National Guard airlift force flew a total of 128,695 hours, a distance of over 26 million nautical miles, and transported 99,950 passengers and 22,544 tons of cargo in support of defense requirements. Included within this amount are 2,805 missions which required 58,788 flying hours to deliver 13,935 tons and 626 passengers in direct support of the Military Airlift Command requirements to overseas destinations.

The Air National Guard expanded its airlift support of the Military Airlift Command commencing in January 1966 to provide 75 additional outbound trips per month in direct support of southeast Asia. A total of 221 flights in January and 218 flights in February were completed and transported 4,531 tons of urgently required supplies to our fighting men overseas. The level of participation by the Air National Guard airlift units in support of the active establishment has more than doubled in the past 12-month period.

Additional man-days and TDY funds were provided during calendar year 1965 to assist in this accelerated program. Since January of 1966, funds from Air National Guard resources have been used for this purpose. This accelerated program not only provides invaluable training for Air National Guard personnel, but is also a vital airlift contribution toward the overall national military effort.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the Air National Guard airlift units are making a truly significant contribution to the Department of Defense, particularly when we consider that these units are not mobilized and are acting in an inactive status. The national military interests of this Nation cannot possibly be served by allowing the programed inactivation of our Air National Guard airlift units to continue during this time of crisis in southeast Asia.

AIR GUARD PARTICIPATION IN THE AEROMEDICAL EVACUATION MISSION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, during the airlift hearings conducted by the Military Airlift Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, it was gratifying to learn that the Air National Guard was requested last summer by the Military Airlift Command to actively participate in transporting live patients to and from various destinations within the continental United States and offshore locations such as Alaska, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Canal Zone, Bermuda, Newfoundland, and Labrador. This productive mission is accomplished as part of the Guard training effort with additional man-days and traveling expenses supplied by the active force as required to support the crews. This arrangement enables the taxpayers' dollar to perform double duty and is a logical and economical method of satisfying the requirements of this program. It serves as a backup safety valve, and as pure relief from overtaxed and extended regular active duty units. It even evacuated patients from Vietnam in Globemasters.

Even though aeromedical evacuation is a secondary mission for the Guard airlift units, our records indicate that a total of 200 missions were flown during the period August 1, 1965, to March 18, 1966, 103 of which were completed to offshore locations. Two thousand six hundred fourteen flying hours were devoted to transporting 4,604 patients, 1,299 of which were carried on litters, a total distance of 28,966 nautical miles. Moreover, other Air Guard flight surgeons—physicians—medical specialists, and flight nurses are regularly supporting the active force in transporting patients from southeast Asia to the United States in active force aircraft. It appears to me that this teamwork is indicative of the high level of cooperation between the Guard and the Air Force and that this constructive use of Guard training resources is a credit to the Air Force management system. With the increased service commitments in Vietnam, it would logically follow that the activity in this mission area will increase. I would like to state for the record that you have my wholehearted support.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLEA

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and amazed this morning when I read the Evans-Novak column in the Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, this column covered a report on the businessmen's meeting at the White House. Permit me to repeat just one paragraph:

> When one of the industrial titans asked why Mr. Johnson didn't reduce Federal expenditures to take the pressure off inflation, the President's answer shot back like a boomerang: He had tried to reduce spending in several areas, including payments to school districts, containing Federal installations and the school lunch program, but what happened? Mr. Johnson answered his own question: Republicans in Congress restored the funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am still a Republican, and I am the one who supported the President and introduced the amendment to strike the impacted area funds from the bill last week.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Larry O'Brien or some other of the President's advisers will apprise the President of this fact.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman does not mind having been given some credit for restoring some worthwhile funds does he?

Mr. BOW. As far as I am concerned, I think the impact funds should have been taken out of the bill. If the gentleman thinks the funds are worthwhile, then the Republicans will benefit from the statement of the President of the United States, but the Democrats did not support the President and voted against him on this issue. In this case the rubber stamp was lost, it does not happen often.

Mr. Speaker, I did not know we had that kind of minority, that we can override the majority and restore funds of this kind.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I am happy to announce that this is the sixth anniversary of the independence of the great and proud Republic of Senegal. For the members of the African Subcommittee and all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as well as for myself, I extend warm congratulations and good wishes to President Leopold Sedan Senghor, to Ambassador Ousmane Soce Diop and to all of the men, women, and children of Senegal, and ask unanimous consent that all my colleagues who so desire may have 5 legislative days in which to join me in expression of compliment and applause.

It was my great pleasure to work in the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations with Ambassador Ousmane Soce Diop and to know firsthand of the magnificent contribution he is making in that world body representing 117 nations.

The year 1960 saw France grant independence to many of her African colonies, but few had the distinguished background or political framework which still characterizes Senegal.

Senegal's relations with France date back to 1659, and her location at the westernmost point in Africa influenced France to develop Dakar as a primary port facility in former French Africa. In addition, French merchants and seamen cooperated in developing Dakar, St. Louis, Rufisque, and Goree as four of the most active commercial centers on the entire western coast of Africa.

Since gaining independence in 1960 Senegal has embarked on a steady road in quest of domestic economic and political stability. After withdrawing from the proposed federation with Mali in 1960, Senegal has concentrated much of its energy on the task of improving its image as a practical place for foreign investment. The most industrialized country of the former French West African territories, Senegal still remains largely agriculturally oriented. Despite this, however, the annual rate of growth of internal production between 1959 and 1964 was 3.2 percent. In an attempt to strengthen her economic base, Senegal has undertaken a dramatic program of increasing and diversifying food crops. Another plan which offers bright hope for the future is the prospect of harnessing the Senegal River in cooperation with neighboring Mali, Guinea, and Mauritania.

Admist these days of upheavals and coups, it is certainly a welcome relief to extend best wishes to a country while not without its domestic problems, nevertheless is placing most of its effort in improving the life of its people. Doubtless, the Republic of Senegal is such a country.

Though Senegal's first attempt at union with a sister state failed, President Senghor and his government remain fully agreeable to the concept of African unity. Senegal has been an active member in the Organization of African Unity and in various associations of French-speaking African states. Since independence, she has followed a declared policy of nonalinement, and has maintained relations with both blocs, and has retained particularly close relations with France. Our relations with Senegal have been on a friendly basis and we have provided modest technical, economic, and military assistance. Peace Corps volunteers have been very well received by the Senegalese.

Thus, as the people of Senegal observe their sixth independence anniversary and as Dakar hosts the first World's Festival of Negro Art from April 1 to 24, I again wish them much success in their efforts at building a stable and democratic country.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues who so desire may have 5 legislative days in which to join me on the subject of the sixth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Senegal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

GRAVESITES FOR FATHER AND STEPMOTHER OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SPRINGER.** Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill providing for the designation of the gravesites of Thomas and Sarah Bush Lincoln, in Shiloh Cemetery, Coles County, Ill., as a national historic landmark.

Thomas Lincoln was the father of Abraham Lincoln. Sarah Bush Lincoln was the stepmother who encouraged young Abe Lincoln in his efforts to gain an education. Thomas Lincoln died in January 1851. His second wife, Sarah, continued to live in the little cabin on Goose Nest Prairie about 8 miles south of Charleston. There Abraham Lincoln paid a farewell visit in February 1861, shortly before he left Springfield for Washington to take command of a Nation torn asunder by civil strife. Sarah Bush Lincoln outlived her famous stepson by more than 4 years. At her death, in December 1869, she was buried beside her husband in Shiloh Cemetery.

Thomas Lincoln was born in Virginia, probably on January 6, 1778, and came to Jefferson County, Ky., with his parents, two sisters, and two brothers when he was about 5 years old. His father was killed by Indians in 1786, and he grew to manhood without the opportunity of acquiring an education. By his own labor he acquired some money and property, and on June 12, 1806, he married Nancy Hanks.

In 1816 the Lincolns, with their two children, Sarah and Abraham, moved across the Ohio River to the Little Pigeon community in the area now included in Spencer County, Ind. Within 2 years, Nancy Hanks Lincoln died and was buried not far from the cabin site.

The cabin was lonely without a wife and mother. A year and two months after Nancy's death, Thomas Lincoln returned to Kentucky where he married Sarah Bush Johnston, the widow of Daniel Johnston. She and her three children returned with him to the cabin on Pigeon Creek. It was in this reconstructed family environment in the Indiana wilderness that Abraham Lincoln grew to manhood. In 1830, the year Abe became 21, Thomas Lincoln sold the Pigeon Creek farm and moved his family to Illinois. Abe stayed with his parents during the first hard winter in Macon County on the banks of the Sangamon, west of Decatur, but struck out on his own when Thomas Lincoln's family made their final move, to Coles County in the spring of 1831.

It has been charged that Thomas Lincoln was lazy and shiftless, but the facts do not bear out this accusation. Though not afflicted with the "vaulting ambition which o'erleaps itself," he was respected in his church and his community. He was not a drunkard or a wastrel. It is a fine testimonial to him that he could return to Hardin County, where he had lived with his first wife for 10 years, and claim another in marriage.

Thomas Lincoln was a devoted husband and father. Though the Lincolns were poor by the material standards of our day, theirs was not a degrading poverty. There was food, clothing, and shelter; more important still, there was integrity and affection.

Sarah Bush Lincoln, with her talents as mother and homemaker, supplied the love and tenderness that welded the two broken families into a harmonious home. It was with the three books tucked among her furniture in the wagon from Kentucky that the young Abraham added to his reading experience. It was with her sympathy and encouragement that he continued his quest for an education.

Lincoln's own mother, Nancy Hanks Lincoln, was buried on the Pigeon Creek farm in Indiana which is part of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial administered by the National Park Service. The Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historical Site at Hodgenville, Ky., is also in the domain of the National Park Service. Abraham Lincoln's home and tomb in Springfield, Ill., are maintained by the State of Illinois but have been designated National Historic Landmarks.

The Charleston vicinity in Illinois is rich in Lincoln lore. The Goose Nest Prairie farm is now Lincoln Log Cabin State Park. Charleston itself was the site of one of the Lincoln-Douglas debates. And then there are the Lincoln graves in Shiloh Cemetery. The Charleston Chamber of Commerce, and especially its director of tourism, Mr. James L. Seed, manager of radio station WEIC, are to be commended for their efforts to gain national recognition for these shrines.

A 62-foot statue of Abraham Lincoln will be erected in Charleston this summer. Constructed of fiber glass and reinforced steel, it is believed to be the tallest statue in the world honoring the 16th President. A fund drive to finance the $20,000 project is underway. Construction also has begun of a Lincoln-Douglas Memorial Building at the Coles County Fairgrounds, where the fourth debate was held on September 18, 1858. This next month will see the opening of a museum in the Coles County Courthouse, where Lincoln tried many cases.

Abraham Lincoln rose above his environment, but he was nonetheless a product of that environment. The father and stepmother whose graves are in Shiloh Cemetery deserve credit in no small measure for the greatness of the son they raised in such humble surroundings.

In recognition of the influence of Thomas Lincoln and Sarah Bush Lincoln upon Abraham Lincoln in his formative years, this bill proposes to identify their graves and designate them as national landmarks.

IMPACTED SCHOOL AREA MONEY RESTORED

Mr. **YOUNGER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **YOUNGER.** Mr. Speaker, there will be many disappointed Democrat Congressmen when they read the column of Messrs. Evans and Novak which appeared in the Washington Post on April 4, wherein the President admits that the Republicans restored the funds which he deleted from the budget for impacted school districts as well as the money for the children's lunch and milk fund.

Members of Congress recognize the administration's inconsistent policy of providing money for the Great Society's crafty projects by taking food from the hungry stomachs of schoolchildren, from economic impacted school districts, and from land-grant colleges for instruction, research, and extension in agriculture. Fortunately Congress has a way of seeing through such devious budgetary policies as shown by the Evans-Novak columns, which I quote as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S PLEA

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Just how badly President Johnson wants to avoid an election-year tax increase was brought home by the boldness of his proposal last Wednesday night to the most powerful collection of business leaders ever to gather in the White House.

They were prepared for a sermon from Mr. Johnson urging restraint in holding down their prices. What they had not at all expected was the President's plea to change basic business decisions.

Assembling the captains of industry in the East Room after a candlelit dinner in the State Dining Room, Mr. Johnson unveiled his unprecedented proposal for a voluntary method of fighting inflation.

In so doing, he went to the very heart of private management decisions. Expansion plans are blueprinted years in advance, based on the predicted volume of business.

Even more remarkable, the industrialists seemed not at all opposed to such massive Presidential intervention. Both during the White House session and afterward, they appeared to feel that letting Uncle Sam change their business decisions was not too high a price to pay for no tax increase.

In his own thinking, the President sees a precedent for this approach in his successful reduction of the balance-of-payments deficit by getting business to accept voluntary ceilings on the export of investment dollars. If it can work abroad, he has asked assistants, why not here at home?

For all its boldness, this plan has certain possible dangers. Once started, cutbacks in investment process conceivably could get out of hand and trigger an economic recession. Once throttled back, expansion plans of big business can't suddenly be opened up again.

But today, the President is worried about inflation, not recession; thus, he went all out Wednesday night to proselytize big business with his messianic message:

The best way to avoid a tax increase is for business itself to reduce the pressure on scarce capital equipment. And the long session in the East Room left no doubt how big business regards higher taxes.

The President called out to his guests: How many of you here want me to send a tax bill to Congress?

One tentative hand went half way up. From the far end of the room, in the evening's only comic relief, Sidney Weinberg, who runs the big Wall Street investment house of Goldman Sachs & Co., called out: "What kind of a tax bill, Mr. President, a tax cut or a tax increase?" It revealed graphically what businessmen are thinking.

When one of the industrial titans asked why Mr. Johnson didn't reduce Federal expenditures to take the pressure off inflation, the President's answer shot back like a boomerang:

He had tried to reduce spending in several areas, including payments to school districts containing Federal installations and the school-lunch program, but what happened? Mr. Johnson answered his own question: Republicans in Congress restored the funds.

This scarcely tells the full budgetary story, but Mr. Johnson fielded the question so skillfully not another question on spending came from the business moguls.

As we reported several weeks ago, the sure sign that the President had recovered from his gall bladder operation would be his return to these awesome performances in the East Room. Wednesday night's show proved the point.

Flanking Mr. Johnson at one end of the East Room were the President's entire Cabinet and economic advisers. Also there was William McChesney Martin, chairman of Federal Reserve Board, and this town's most ardent advocate of a tax increase.

"I have my whole Cabinet here," said the President. "This is your Government." But when he called for questions, he fielded them all himself. The Cabinet sat silently.

The entire program was skillfully stage-managed. One Cabinet officer presided over each round table in the State Dining Room, each softening up nine businessmen for the main show in the East Room.

The first results came less than 16 hours after the President said good night to guests groggy from the Johnson treatment. W. B. Murphy of Campbell Soup, president of blue-ribbon business council, announced a cutback in his firm's expansion plans. Murphy was the first businessman invited to the Wednesday night dinner at the White House, and the invitation was not wasted.

Following also is a letter from Mr. Maurice L. Peterson, university dean of agriculture of the University of California:

BERKELEY, CALIF.

The proposed reductions and changes in President Johnson's Federal budget for 1966–67 as they relate to instruction, research, and extension in agriculture, will seriously impair the ability of the University of California Division of Agricultural Sciences to serve the vital interests of all California residents. Federal support of these State programs has fallen behind in recent years because of rising costs for maintenance of current projects. The cuts proposed will make it necessary to curtail or eliminate programs and projects in agriculture, forestry, veterinary medicine, and home economics. Further, these funds are already committed to salaries and programs in all three areas: teaching, research, and cooperative extension.

The Federal budget proposals for 1966–67 would reduce funds for instruction in agriculture, forestry, veterinary medicine, and certain other units at the University of California by $523,580. This occurs at the very time the University is anticipating an increase of 7,362 students by September 1966 on all of its campuses.

These cuts in teaching funds will seriously reduce the university's capability to train scientists and agricultural specialists in the Colleges of Agriculture at Berkeley, Davis, and Riverside, the Colleges of Engineering at Berkeley and Santa Barbara, the College of Chemistry at Berkeley, the School of Forestry at Berkeley, and the School of Veterinary Medicine at Davis.

The reduction of $8.5 million in agricultural research funds would reduce support of the University of California Agricultural Experiment Station by $267,196. This reduction will require reducing or eliminating many projects of great importance to California producers, agricultural industries, and the general consuming public. This comes at a time when the world food supply is one of the greatest problems facing mankind. It also comes at a time when agricultural exports are helping to relieve famine in friendly countries and are contributing increasingly to improve the U.S.'s balance of trade.

The Department of Agriculture increased by $2 million funds for project grants to States. This is a substitution of Federal for local control of the use of research funds. It is our firm belief that the people of California will not want to wait until Washington is convinced we have a problem before we are able to undertake work on it. In fact, a predetermination has already been made as to what some of these problems are.

Since 1914 the Agricultural Extension Service has been financed jointly by three levels of government—the county, the State, and the Federal Government—hence the term, the cooperative extension service. Presently, the State of California contributes 62 percent of the budget and the counties and Federal Government each about 18 percent. Federal funds are allocated to each State on a formula basis.

For over 50 years this system has been a model of success in extension education. One of the primary reasons is that it has permitted a locally determined program to be supported by both State and Federal resources.

The Federal administration's new budget for fiscal 1967 proposes that this system be changed in part. The Federal Government proposes that $10 million be withdrawn from payments to States for cooperative extension work in the regular way, and $10 million be made available to States on the basis of administrative determination by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Such favorable determination will be limited to programs of national policies and goals of the Federal Government—namely, low-income work with consumers and community development work.

Aside from the fact that this proposal asks county and State governments to finance, in part, programs of the Federal Government—the system must be rejected on the grounds of undermining an educational organization. The cooperative extension service is an educational organization. It cannot at the same time promote and/or administer Federal or State programs without compromising its educational objectives.

Consequently, we are extremely alarmed by this apparent effort at Federal domination over our agricultural extension and research programs. If you agree with our concern over these budget cuts and the move toward Federal control, we suggest you write, wire, telephone, or call on your Senator or Representative and request them to contact the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations urging restoration of proposed cuts and indicating their opposition to the proposed shifts in the Federal budget. Attached are the names of California's delegation to the U.S. Congress and the Senate and House Subcommittees on Agricultural Appropriations.

I will be pleased to provide you with any additional information you may feel will be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

M. L. PETERSON.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT TO PROVIDE WATER RECREATION FOR ALL THE PEOPLE

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's water problems, particularly those in the West, can no longer be solved by local projects alone. Essential now are interstate regional programs. One such highly beneficial, multipurpose development is proposed for the 7-State Colorado River Basin. Its financial keystones are Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, which will create two large and beautiful lakes.

However, "financial keystones" are the concern, properly, of the planners, the technicians and the administrators. More appealing to a burgeoning America with a travel-conscious populace increasingly eager to enjoy the country's store of scenic treasures is the promise of unlimited recreation offered by the two magnificent lakes at Bridge and Marble Canyons.

In a day when President Johnson and his First Lady are striving for a more beautiful and a healthier America, an idea has been put forth to provide a new, much-needed playland for those who would spend their leisure in Arizona's sun country. This would be for those millions of Americans who like to fish, to boat, to swim, to camp outdoors, or picnic, or sightsee or just laze in the sun.

For the first time in history all Americans—toddlers and octogenarians alike—would have the opportunity to view the centuries-old grandeur of the remote reaches of the Grand Canyon. This is a vista beheld by fewer than 1,000 white water adventurers to date.

The National Park Service estimates that 500,000 persons annually would take advantage of the lake at Bridge Canyon to view this part of the Canyon's unsurpassable beauty. No longer would these spectacular sights be reserved for the mere handful who risk life, limb and considerable expense for a long, dangerous trip down the river.

Actually, the NPS attendance estimate may be too modest in the light of current records from other western resort areas. Last year, for example, nearly 3.5 million persons visited and enjoyed the Lake Mead National Recreation Area in Nevada and more than a half a million toured Hoover Dam, which forms the famed lake.

Since 1960 the Bureau of Reclamation has established eight man-made lakes in the West and last year these attracted nearly 2.4 million vacationers. The individual records demonstrate their immense, growing popularity. Lake Powell, behind Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River, drew 688,000 visitors during 1964. And at Flaming Gorge Reservoir, on Utah's Green River, the 1964 logbook shows some 571,000 visitors.

It is lakes such as these, and those proposed at Bridge and Marble Canyons, that will give to more of us and our children a more beautiful America and a healthier America.

LOCALE OF THE LAKES

Bridge Canyon Dam would be located 2.5 miles upstream from Lake Mead and 80.8 miles below the boundary of Grand Canyon National Park. At maximum operating capacity, the reservoir will be 94 miles long and will have a surface of 16,650 acres, equal to 26 square miles.

The upper 13 miles of the lake would extend some water upstream into the remote inner gorge—the boundary between the park and monument areas—the depth dwindling to zero at the furthermost point.

Marble Canyon Dam is to be located 12.5 miles above the upstream boundary of the park. It is a notable fact that over 98 percent of the land area in the Grand Canyon National Park will remain in its natural condition and the hardy whitewater devotees will still be able to practice their skills on the 104-mile stretch of the Colorado River between the two proposed lakes.

HISTORIC FORERUNNERS

Creating a lake for public use and enjoyment in a national preserve is not a new concept. Hundreds of thousands annually throng to the manmade lakes in Grand Teton National Park, Glacier National Park, and Great Smoky National Park. Reclamation developments for the arid and semiarid western half of the Nation had their beginning with President Theodore Roosevelt, and every succeeding Chief Executive has supported them wholeheartedly.

On September 2, 1965, while signing the legislation for the Auburn-Folsom South Project in California, President Johnson said:

> I have never seen a dollar invested anywhere in this Nation in water conservation, in multiuse projects, that in a period of even a decade didn't prove that it was a good investment, and would pay very high returns on what we had spent for it.

WHERE THE WATER GOES

During the early years of the central Arizona project, it is estimated that 70 percent of the project water would help rescue the State's agricultural economy now suffering from years of drought. This area is in the region known as the Nation's "Winter Salad Bowl," where we get 95 percent of our lettuce, 70 percent of our cantaloupes, and similarly high proportions of other fruits and vegetables.

And since no new agriculture lands are to be added by the project, it will not contribute to increasing the country's present agricultural surplus.

The remaining 30 percent of the project water would sustain homes and industry in cities in the same drought area.

A DOLLAR SPENT

Construction costs of Bridge and Marble Canyon projects are estimated at $750 million. Sale of water and the hydroelectric power produced by the dams' generators would return all allocated costs, plus more than $500 million in interest for Uncle Sam. This would also take care of 88 percent of the total cost of the central Arizona project. The remaining 12 percent is for fish, wildlife, and recreational purposes—benefits included for the general public.

In addition to the proceeds from Bridge and Marble power sales, the project's bank account will be increased from other sources. Into the kitty will also go revenues from Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams once their costs have been repaid. Besides paying for construction costs, the fund will be used to finance future related projects.

CONGRESSIONAL WISDOM

Nearly 50 years ago, when legislation authorizing the Grand Canyon National Park was enacted, far-thinking lawmakers envisioned the day the fast-growing region would require reclamation developments. Consequently, they included in the law a section which stated that "whenever consistent with the primary purposes of said park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to permit the utilization of areas therein which may be necessary for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project."

That time is now.

FRANK E. CAREY RECEIVES SCIENCE REPORTING AWARD

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the James T. Grady Award of the American Chemical Association is made to recognize, encourage, and stimulate outstanding reporting directly to the public, which materially increases the public's knowledge and understanding of chemistry, chemical engineering, and related fields. It is a presentation of the American Chemical Society.

On March 28 Frank E. Carey, of the Washington office of the Associated Press, received this award during ceremonies at the society's annual meeting in Pittsburgh. This was an occasion of great satisfaction to Mr. Carey's many friends, not only in Washington and amongst the scientific fraternity of the United States, but worldwide. This, because Mr. Carey's scientific writings have known no geographical boundaries. His assignments have ranged from an International Cancer Congress in Moscow to an Antarctic Science Expedition, and from an Atomic Energy Conference in Geneva to an Astronautical Congress in Copenhagen. He has described the splashdowns of manned space capsules from the decks of recovery ships in the Atlantic. His coverage of these events and many more have reflected a deep understanding of the scientific accomplishment and its significance.

The road to international stature for Frank Carey began on August 1, 1909, in Lowell, Mass. It led through Holy Cross College where he graduated cum laude in 1930. It involved a 1-year stopover as a chemistry teacher at Lowell High School. He became a reporter for the Lowell Sun when he developed the basic journalism skills necessary for good science writing.

In 1938 Mr. Carey went to Boston as general reporter and rewrite man for the Associated Press. It was at Boston that he made his debut in science writing by doing some part-time science reporting in addition to his regular work.

In 1943 the Associated Press made Mr. Carey a full-time science writer in its Washington, D.C., bureau. Within 3 years he was garnering honors. He won the Nieman Fellowship in Journalism at Harvard University for the academic year 1946–47, the George Westinghouse American Association for the Advancement of Science Award in 1948, the Christopher Literary Award in 1952, the American Heart Association Award in 1956, and the Epilepsy Foundation Award in 1964.

At the time of the presentation of the Grady Award in Pittsburgh, Mr. Carey responded with an address recounting some of his experiences, some of his philosophy, and much of his wise observations during his career of reporting science in an era of magnificent progress and discovery. I have asked that Mr. Carey's remarks be reproduced below:

A QUARTER CENTURY OF SCIENCE REPORTING

(By Frank Carey, science writer, Associated Press)

In this day of Oscar awards for the movies and Emmy awards for television, it is customary for the gushing winners to rush to the stage and immediately disclaim any credit to themselves for winning.

They owe it all they say, to the third assistant director, the hairdresser, the electrician, and the guard at the studio gate.

And so, not to be outdone, I'd like to thank those individuals, human and otherwise, who really were responsible for my winning the Grady award.

First, there was my often times tyrannical city editor on the Lowell, Mass., Sun who every morning used to write this deathless line in the assignment book: "Shake a foot—get something off the beaten path."

I consider that advice which should be the creed of every reporter, science or otherwise.

I owe much to Shirley Temple, the child movie star, whose bad case of tonsilitis, one night in Boston in the late 1930's, was the subject of my first AP science story, such as it was. The vigil I kept on the marble stairway at the Ritz-Carleton Hotel where Shirley lay sick was to stand me in good stead years later in Washington where covering the ills of the mighty is one of the more nervous tasks of the science man.

I owe much to a dump-truck driver in Princeton, N.J., who helped me get an interview with Einstein one day in 1942 when I was a fledgling science reporter. Pressed for time to keep my hard-to-get appointment with the great man, but unable to flag a cab, I thumbed a ride from the truckdriver to Einstein's house, got the interview—and found out early in the game that the giants of science are not so rough.

I owe much to one of the janitors at the staid halls of the National Academy of Sciences in Washington who used to go out and get hamburgers and coffee for the newsmen in the early days of the space age. The rockets were fired at Cape Kennedy, but the news—good or bad—as to what happened to the satellite, came out of the Academy. During many an all-night vigil, the janitor gave solace to the newsmen as they sat around electing one another officers of the mythical "National Association of Space Writers Who Have Yet To See a Rocket Fired."

And I owe at least part of by Grady award money to "Ham," the space monkey, who blazed the trail for the Mercury astronauts by being the first living creature to ride a Mercury space capsule in suborbital flight.

I was the pool reporter representing the world's press aboard a Navy LSD craft that recovered Ham from the Caribbean. But I ran into Navy double-talk in filing my copy by radio off the ship—and my story was delayed for hours as an immovable chief warrant officer in the communications shack kept telling me: "Sorry, sir, it's electronic interference—northern lights, you know."

I felt like leaping into the ocean until, just by chance, as the ship ploughed through rough seas at night, I came across Ham.

Hours earlier, he had been piped aboard with all the honors usually reserved for high-brass admirals, as the ship's full company stood at attention in dress-whites and cheered mightily for the little monkey astronaut. But now, with what looked like tears in his eyes, he was shivering in a cage that was lashed ingloriously to the "head—toilet to landlubbers—near the skipper's cabin.

True, it was a safety measure in a badly-rolling ship—but I concluded that Ham was a lot worse off than I was.

But now, having paid all my debts, let's get to the business at hand which, according to what the program says, is "a quarter-century of science reporting."

Man, what a dull title. I'll bet when I submitted it to Roy Avery, he said to himself: "Hmm—so what else is new?"

Unless Roy and others passed out a lot of free tickets, I'm surprised, though pleased of course, that anyone showed up to hear it. I must confess that, as a science reporter, if I saw a program listing for a talk on "a quarter-century of polymer chemistry," I'd avoid it like the plague. And I'm sure glad I didn't try to compete with a talk by a Pittsburgh newsman scheduled by the division of fuel chemistry on the far more appealing topic of: "Pennsylvania's Scenic Sewers—A Multimillion Dollar Liability."

I must confess that my title was one I offered in desperation a few weeks ago when Roy wrote to me and said he'd be needing a "topic" for insertion in the program. While I had known since last June I was required to make a speech before getting my hands on the award check, naturally I hadn't done a thing about it—even though I'm always yakking about scientists who fail to have texts of their reports well in advance of a meeting I'm covering.

But I'll try to make it as painless as possible.

Perhaps a more appropriate title would have been: "From Atom-Smashers to Presidential Gallstones,"—because that's the range of activity for the science writer in Washington which has been my beat for almost 25 years.

And, without even stirring from his office in the Nation's Capital, such a science man can find himself involved in such far-away events as the explosion of a nuclear device in Red China, the launching of a flying doghouse by the Russians, the birth of quintuplets in South America.

Sometimes, the science man even winds up on the sports pages as happened recently when I wrote a story about one of the Westinghouse science-talent whiz-kids who is using an electronic computer to try to improve the strategy of big-league baseball managers. And so far, according to this kid, it looks as though the robot is smarter than the Casey Stengels and Leo Durochers of this vale of tears.

Have no fears that I intend to regale you with a review of all the major scientific developments of the quarter-century behind us because the big ones are familiar to all of you. Indeed, I daresay many of you chemists and chemical engineers participated in some of them.

But, if you're interested at all in what makes a science writer tick, and the variety of his work, consider this:

It's true that during the last 25 years we were privileged to have front seats in chronicling such events as the development of atomic energy, the virtual conquest of polio, the discovery of umpteen wondrous antibiotics, the near-cracking of the genetic code.

But you might be inclined to forget that it was during that same period that science writers were also moved to report that:

Scientists found that even the mighty dinosaurs had rheumatoid arthritis. Researchers came close to isolating the sex-lure chemical by which the female German cockroach calls her boy friend to a date. Proof was established at long last that women are broader in the derriere than men. Gout sufferers could take heart in the finding that their ailment apparently is a hallmark of genius. Wise men at a famous laboratory ran a 6-day cocktail party for mice and found that, as with men, there are social drinkers and teetotalers among them, not to mention a few real souses. Parts of Il Duce Mussolini's brain were studied and given a clean bill of health by army scientists. Dr. Paul Dudley White recorded the heartbeat of "Olga, the lonely whale of Kodiak Island, Alaska." The planet Jupiter was found to have 13 moons instead of 12—a "baker's dozen," as it were.

And finally, the period saw researchers at Beltsville, Md., develop not only the "fatherless turkey" but the "grandfatherless" one.

There have been big changes in science writing in 25 years, from various angles—even including the tools of the trade.

"Way back when," the science writer would carry only a pencil and notebook on an assignment. Today, on a major medical assignment—such as the last days of General MacArthur at Walter Reed Hospital—you'll find me lugging a small library, ranging from Merck's Manual to something called "The Human Body and How It Works."

The vocabulary has not only expanded and changed, but there are changes within the changes. The micro-microcurie of the radiation world had only a short life in the laboratories and headlines before it became the "picocurie," and now we even have the "nanocurie." And researchers seek grants, not in terms of millions of dollars, but in "megabucks."

Years ago, the science writer might occasionally have been involved in some more or less polite scientific controversy such as whether the earth is 4 billion years old, or only 3 billion.

Today, he's constantly handling—or should be if he isn't—such hot potatoes as fluoridation, Rachel Carson versus the bad guys, the surgeon general versus the tobacco warehouses, medicare, and even the atomic bomb versus the Eskimos.

The Washington science writer used to write occasionally about elephants becoming pregnant at the National Zoo, or the hippopotamus getting a tooth pulled. Now, we're writing about radioactive reindeer near the Arctic Circle.

These reindeer are the latest headliners in the long and ticklish-to-handle news story of the radioactive fallout from nuclear bomb tests—of which those stamped with the Red China brand constitute the newest headache for the science-writer. He virtually has to ride herd on the fallout clouds, in concert with pals at the weather bureau.

And it's been a story that's made particular demands on the Washington science writer—calling for a balance somewhere between the utterances of the Cassandras who find strontium-90 under every rug, and those of the Pollyannas who have insisted at times that the radiation from the skies is no worse than that given off by the radium dial of a wristwatch.

Time was when the science man's mode of travel was limited to bus, cab, subway, and, on occasion, the airplane. Today, he might sometimes be snatched from the fantail of a destroyer by a helicopter; ride scared-stiff on the swaying highline between pitching ships; go bumping in a jeep across the Nevada desert to cover a nuclear test; or chug across the Antarctic ice in a snow-cat tractor. But, as you might expect, the glamor assignments are only occasional—there's plenty of prosaic, but nonetheless important, routine.

As general news reporters, many of us used to chase fire engines. Now, we often chase Russians.

Russia's space spectaculars not only touched off the space race—which at times is as good as the World Series—but they also generated interest in how we stand vis-a-vis the Soviets in everything from prowess in cardiac surgery to the incidence of alcoholism, and from skill in corralling the subnuclear neutrino to the comparative stage of development of baby teeth between the East and West.

Press agents used to try to get me to cover some meeting having only marginal news possibilities by saying reporters from United Press International and the New York Times had already committed themselves to come—although I knew they also used the AP as a lure for the UPI and Times brethren.

Today, these same press agents, Government and otherwise, are apt to say: "Better come out, Frank—we're gonna have a couple of Russian osteopaths there."

I'm looking forward to the day when we find out whose ballerinas leap the highest—Russia's or ours.

Chasing one particular Russian marked a temporary disappointment in science news coverage. That was when I was again a pool reporter for the world's press—this time to record the first words uttered at the historic first encounter between America's John Glenn and the Russian Cosmonaut Gherman Titov at a pretty private session at the National Academy of Sciences.

My notebook was poised to record some memorable quotes as the two eagles of the rival nations met. But, sad to relate, I was only able to report to my disappointed colleagues that Glenn's first utterance was "Hello"—and that Titov countered only with "Zdravstvuite ochen rad" which is Muscovite for "very pleased to meet you."

True, they warmed up later—even had a couple of scientific arguments—but the "great moment" was something of a washout.

The working pace of the science writer—especially one who works for a wire service—has changed substantially in the last 25 years.

The blast of the A-bomb over Hiroshima, compounded by the beep-beep of the first Russian Sputnik, did more than help shift science stories in general from the Sunday-supplement section of the newspaper—or the doldrums of the classified advertisement section—to some proximity to the Olympian heights of page 1, sometimes even on it.

They did much to put the science reporter back into a telephone booth, just like he operated when he was a police reporter.

That is, when a story is good enough, you don't take a cab back to the office and write it. You dictate it, in finished (you hope) story form, just from your notes. And God help you, and the dictation girl, when you have to use terms like "myocardial infarction," and "peritoneal dialysis."

And you don't just say "myocardial." You spell it—and it goes like this in the argot of the dictating newsman: "M for Mike; Y for yesterday; O for Oscar; C for Charlie; A for Arthur; D for Dan; I for Isaac" and so on.

And this brings me to the domain of news coverage that is, for better or worse, virtually the exclusive realm of the Washington science reporter—covering the ills of the mighty in government.

I might quickly add that there are times, when such stories break, that the science man wishes he had selected an easier profession—like a lion tamer, maybe.

Meaning no lack of respect or sympathy for anyone involved, I tick them off in my nightmares sometimes:

Eisenhower's two heart attacks, his "regional ileitis" (try dictating that one fast), his cerebral stroke; the late President Kennedy's backache and the medical aspects of his assassination; Senator Robert Taft, stricken with incurable cancer, secretly checking into a New York Hospital as "Mr.

Jones" and bravely but vainly submitting to trials of a new drug; Secretary of State John Foster Dulles felled by a cancer of a type so devastating that a doctor friend not associated with the case, whom I phoned for an evaluation based only on the announced diagnosis, immediately said, "it's curtains for him."

Baby Patrick Kennedy and his fatal hyaline membrane disease * * * Richard Nixon's knee injury, complicated by a tough staph infection, which some say may have cost him the presidency in the 1960 election, since it hospitalized him for 10 days before the great television debate with Senator Kennedy, and left him wan and gaunt for the TV encounter. President Johnson's "cold that was heard 'round the world," and his recent attack of gallbladder disease.

The catalog even includes the late Senator Joe McCarthy's case of "tennis elbow."

When a president even shows up with a tiny bandage on his hand, as Johnson did not long ago for some wart-like, benign growths, it's page 1 news. When he's stricken with serious illness and enters a hospital, the newsmen, TV and radio commentators, and cameramen move in with him in a logistical maneuver almost as complex as anything on a battlefield.

And, there are effects on the homelife of science-writers, aside from the hours of work involved.

I mean only respect and concern for former President Eisenhower when I say that, thanks to him, I may never do any more housepainting—lest something happen to him.

I was painting my kitchen one Saturday afternoon in 1955—a real fancy job, with white mop-boards trimmed with black—when the office called, and the tense voice of my news editor crackled:

"Ike's had a heart attack out in Denver. Get going kid, this is a big one."

Again, last fall, I was painting my back porch when another tense call came. You guessed it: Ike had another heart attack down in Augusta, Ga.

I might add that the "Get going, kid." of the first call didn't mean get-out-to-Denver. It meant dropping the paintbrush, phoning cardiac specialists among my sources, digging quickly into a couple of handy-dandy reference books to freshen my memory on the whys-hows-and-wherefores of a coronary—and then dictating to the office what we call an interpretive "sidebar." That is, a what's-it-all-about medical story to go along with the spot story out of Denver.

Nothing illustrates the changes in science and medical reporting of the last quarter century more vividly than do stories like these.

When I covered the story of Shirley Temple's tonsilitis years ago, those million-dollar tonsils were just passed off with a word or two—the rest of the story was about how little Shirley felt.

Today, medical stories about prominent people are blow-by-blow dissertations on anatomy and surgery—with charts and diagrams by the artists yet—and for a wire-service reporter, it's literally anatomy-on-the-run.

When a President, or a great national military hero, is wheeled from the operating room and the first sparse medical bulletins are given out, the wire-service man doesn't sit down at a typewriter to compose a masterpiece.

He dictates a running story to his office for immediate transmission via telegraph and cable throughout the world—throwing in any medical interpretation needed (and there usually is) from the top of his head, so to speak.

Sometimes, the dictation is given in muffled tones through a telephone plugged into the floor near you as the medical bulletin is being repeated in the hospital auditorium temporarily made over into a news-conference room. That was the case frequently during President Johnson's gallbladder episode.

Fortunately, I didn't get the separate kidney, ureter and gallstones mixed up, but I must admit the dictation girl and I had a rough time with the dictation of parenchyma, or main body, of the kidney. Even Johnson's doctors admitted they couldn't spell it when they related that that was where the President's remaining stone is lodged.

Well, this sort of brings things up to date.

I suppose a Grady medalist should have some sort of message to convey. Frankly, I'm not much of a hand at that, but I'll offer this, beginning with a question.

Are we science writers doing any real good for the public?

It says in the ACS news release I won the Grady award for increasing the public's knowledge of chemical progress.

I hope that's true, but I must admit I thought all the science and medical writers were going to get fired when CBS came out with results of the first round of a quiz it gave TV viewers—presumably including readers of the output of our science-writing lodge—on their knowledge of health matters.

The folks, as you recall, didn't do so well on the exam. But they scored much better on the second go-around—and, in general made out pretty well as regards things like heart disease and lung cancer. The latter are subjects on which science writers turn out copy by the country mile. Maybe we've helped.

However, I don't think it's our function to try to make medical experts out of the public, any more than I think a science writer should consider himself a medical expert or a chemistry whiz just because he happens to write about such things.

I think our function, and duty, is to inform the public as to what's going on in the world of science and medicine—and make sure we cover all the major bases. This includes tackling and trying to interpret as objectively as possible all the issues involved in the big scraps such as smoking and health, fluoridation, medicare, and fallout from nuclear tests.

How much of this information the public absorbs and retains, how it acts on the big social questions in which science is increasingly involved, is up to the public itself. Our job is to make sure we lay it on the line, and don't avoid the toughies.

And what matter, for example, if we don't succeed in having the public remember how many strains of influenza virus there are as long as we succeed in having mothers take their kids down to the clinic to get flu shots?

But beyond that, I think we can do something more—and I hope we're doing it—by the way we write stories. And that's the transmission of some of the excitement, drama—yes even the beauty and wonder—of science and research to the reader.

If I could be sure that any stories I wrote over the years helped lead a few youngsters to become astronomers, or chemists, or engineers, or schoolteachers, I'd be very happy. And it's something I think we should all keep in mind when we write.

Indeed, failing that, I think a science writer can do a service if he can open up for the reader—just for wonder's sake—the wonderful world within the nucleus of a living cell. Or, give him an idea of the vastness of the universe by telling him that the light he sees on a given night from just the nearest star beyond our sun began streaming earthward before Columbus discovered America.

So, to bring this to a close, that's how life goes with a science writer—and I've found it a good one.

But, if a kind of silver anniversarian in the field can venture a few words of advice to a youngster who might want to know how to become a science writer, I'd say this: "Go out and cover a fire. Learn first to be a good reporter—and never forget you are one."

Thank you.

LACK OF UNDERSTANDING OF CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR SITUATION ON THE PART OF SECRETARY WILLARD WIRTZ

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, we recently witnessed yet another example of the amazing lack of understanding of the California farm labor situation on the part of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz. I understand the Secretary has given some indication he will consider the establishment of an incentive piece rate wage system for California agriculture along the lines of that provided for Florida citrus. The amazing thing about this is that, long before the Florida citrus industry experimented with such a system of wage payments, the California and Arizona citrus industry had already established a sound and intelligent system of piece rate wage payments. This system was developed in cooperation with the University of California.

What particularly rankles California citrus growers is the fact that the Secretary is now praising a wage system very similar to that offered a year ago by California citrus growers, but rejected by him at that time.

California citrus growers have submitted to the Department of Labor technical data concerning their piece rate systems of wage payments, not once, but on several occasions. They feel they are deserving of recognition of the job they are doing and resent the inference that they have been dragging their feet while Florida was making progress in higher wage payments to harvesters.

It has been well recognized that California is paying, and for some time has been paying, among the very highest wages in agriculture in the continental United States. For example, a University of California study, in reference to the lemon harvest in California in 1965 states that "actual average earnings rose to $1.86 per hour." This is more than 30 percent above the "adverse effect" rate, the amount of increase by which the Florida citrus incentive wage system was to exceed its minimum hourly rate and the results of which the Secretary now loudly acclaims. Average earnings by California Valencia orange harvesters last year were $2.06 per hour, still further ahead of the "minimum wage plus 30 percent" wage payment.

I may assure the Secretary that California citrus growers intend to continue with their "old" system of higher wage payments which has mysteriously become a "new" system when adopted by Florida and "discovered" there by the modern day Ponce de Leon, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN RELIEVING VICTIMS OF HUNGER IN INDIA

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we have today passed House Joint Resolution 997 to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India. It is in the finest tradition of our country to come to the aid of the people of that great nation who are facing impending disaster—and our response should be as generous and as swift as possible.

It seems highly appropriate at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, for all of us to reflect on the total picture of the growing food requirements throughout the world and to realize that widespread famine and starvation are looming on the horizon for many nations even in the absence of the type of natural disaster which has been largely the cause of this immediate crisis in India.

When we think—as we should—of the enormous capacity of U.S. agriculture, it seems to me that we can only come to one conclusion: despite whatever the problems may be and may have been in the past, there must be a way to unshackle the farmers of this country so that they can produce to their fullest in order that we assist in meeting this potential disaster head-on with all that is in our power to provide. And I do not mean just that we should raise more food to give away. There are countries all over the world, including India, who could and would be willing to buy more food if it were only available.

Why should it be so difficult to find 11 to 12 million tons of wheat which the President has said will be required to meet this current crisis in India? My own State of Kansas—operating within the restrictions of U.S. agricultural policy—produced over 7 million tons of wheat last year. And the capacity of Kansas alone is such that it could easily more than double its current wheat production. The President said in his message of March 30 that "Food in this world is no longer easy to find." That is no doubt true in present circumstances. But it would not be nearly so true if this country had a broad, overall agriculture policy designed in full recognition of the current and projected world food requirements. It is high time that we see the situation realistically and plan accordingly. Countless millions of people are suffering and dying while our lands lie fallow.

Programs must be designed—by the United States and other rich agricultural countries—to meet what is surely going to be a crisis of monumental proportions. Last year we provided 6 million tons of wheat to India. But no one would pretend that that amount even approached meeting the gap between India's own production and the enormous requirements of its expanding population. Even in the absence of natural disaster, India's requirements for food can only go up every year and the time when its own production can meet and keep up with its requirements is not in sight. And India is only one country in which this situation exists. Obviously, self-help on the part of the developing countries concerned is the only sound way to meet the long-range problem. Their efforts must be redoubled—and our assistance to those efforts must be greater and more effective. We must, along with changing our production policies, devise ways and means to export on a grand scale the immense knowledge and expertise of American agriculture. That means putting to maximum use every private and public facility at our command.

The time has come to revise totally our own agriculture policies. The time is past when our greatest concern can be disposing of surpluses accumulated under past and current policies. What is required? Not just tired additions to old policies or some expansion of present efforts. What is required is a bold and imaginative new approach, designed with full understanding of the hard and even cruel realities before us. Such a policy would put our farmers back to work full time, greatly expand and broaden our international markets, vastly increase our ability to provide food to areas of great need, and provide the fullest assistance to the self-help efforts of those nations struggling to expand their own production.

With clear understanding of the current emergency in India, I, of course, voted for the resolution which was passed today. But I wish to point out at this time that the United States must not and cannot follow a policy of meeting crises such as we know are coming on a piecemeal, one-at-a-time basis. If we do, then it will be always and increasingly true that food in this world is no longer easy to find. It need not be so—and I for one intend to do whatever I can to see that it is not so.

FREEMAN PLEASED AT DROP IN FARM PRICES

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr Speaker, for the first time in memory a Secretary of Agriculture has applauded a drop in farm commodity prices. If this surprises you, think what an impact it has on American farmers who are caught in a difficult cost-price squeeze, and whose products still—on the average—bring only 83 percent of parity.

Time was when the Department of Agriculture and its Secretary worked to improve farm prices. Under the Great Society, they use Government stockpiles to drive prices down, and rejoice at successful bludgeoning of farm market income.

Here is the headline and text of an article which appeared in the April 1 issue of the New York Times—and it was not an April fool joke.

FREEMAN ELATED BY DROP IN FARM PRODUCT PRICES

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Secretary Agriculture Orville L. Freeman expressed pleasure today with the fact that the prices of farm products had dropped recently.

It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices. Like Mr. Freeman, the officials were happy to note that consumers would benefit from lower prices by this summer.

"If the food marketing industry will respond quickly to lower farm prices over the next several months," Mr. Freeman told a news conference, "retail prices also can be lower sooner."

PRICE SUPPORTS RAISED

Not only have farm prices fallen since February 15, Mr. Freeman said, but the average prices of all farm products should be 6 to 10 percent lower in the fourth quarter of the year than they are now.

The Secretary's prediction came as he announced an increase in the Federal support prices for milk and soybeans to encourage production of these products, now in short supply. Both increases are aimed at preventing runaway prices and resulting higher costs to consumers.

He increased the support for milk used in manufacturing butter, cheese, and other dairy products 26 cents per 100 pounds to a level of $3.50 for the new marketing year starting tomorrow.

The new prop is below the current market price of about $3.79, resulting from low milk production and a surge in the demand for some dairy products, particularly cheese.

The new support level for butter will be 61.6 cents a pound compared with 59.4 cents. Mr. Freeman said butter prices already had dropped 2 cents a pound since February 15.

Mr. Freeman revoked the suspension he had announced on March 1 on fluid, or bottling milk, prices in Federal milk marketing order areas. The revocation, he said, would be effective April 10 and would tend to peg fluid milk prices about 22 cents higher per 100 pounds through June than the Federal orders would have provided.

In addition, Mr. Freeman said he would lift the quota on the import of Cheddar cheese to help overcome the imbalance in manufacturing milk supplies.

This imbalance has developed as cheese and butter manufacturers compete for existing supplies of manufacturing milk and divert milk from butter production.

Many small creameries face "disaster" from the cost-price squeeze resulting from the imbalance, the Department said. The increase in butter prices also threatens to hurt the market for butter and in the long run injure those dairy farmers who produce mainly for butter production, it said.

Mr. Freeman said President Johnson was directing the Tariff Commission to report on the advisability of high Cheddar cheese import quotas for an extended period.

The present yearly quota of 2.78 million pounds will be raised by 926,700 pounds, one-tenth of 1 percent of the annual U.S. consumption, Mr. Freeman said. This will extend through June 30. Canada and New Zealand are the main importers present.

Mr. Freeman gave this rundown on farm price decreases since February 15:

"Hogs down 4 cents a pound, followed by a 10 to 13 percent decline in the wholesale price of bacon and pork. Lambs also down 4 cents a pound. Butter down 2 cents a pound. Soybean and corn oil down more than 6 percent.

"Fresh lettuce down 35 percent, cabbage, celery, and onions down more than 20 percent. Fresh oranges and grapefruit off 7 percent. Eggs down 3 cents per dozen."

He predicted the following declines by the end of the year:

"Poultry and eggs, down 15 to 20 percent; vegetables, down 20 to 25 percent; potatoes 10 percent; meat animals, 5 percent."

A TOTAL OF 261 NEGRO ACHIEVEMENT SCHOLARS ANNOUNCED

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the National Achievement Scholarship program for outstanding Negro students announced its list of winners for the second annual year. A total of 261 outstanding Negro high school graduates from 35 States and the District of Columbia were selected for this high honor. They will receive scholarships, depending upon need, to the college of their choice within limits of $1,000—$250 per year—minimum and $6,000—$1,500 per year—maximum.

The National Achievement Scholarship program—NASP—was created by a $7 million grant of the Ford Foundation to the National Merit Scholarship Corporation—NMSC—in July 1964. Its executive director is Hugh W. Lane.

The grant covers 200 annual scholarship awards, administrative costs, token grants to the colleges attended by the winners, and research through 1969. The value of achievement scholarships granted each year exceeds a million dollars.

Last year, in its first year of operation, NASP awarded scholarships to 224 Negro students.

Thousands of Negro students in America were recommended by their teachers. All nominations were read by a selection committee of outstanding educators who chose 1,029 finalists. These finalists, in turn, took a 3-hour battery of assessment materials which included an objective test of educational development and a questionnaire which will be used for research into the background and characteristics of able Negro youth.

As chairman of the Education and Labor Committee during the last 5 years, I have watched the Federal commitment to education rise from $450 million to $3½ billion. Our committee has reached into the lives of all American citizens to assist them and their families with new forms of financial aid and imaginative programing which can transform the educational system in this country from a creaking, old-fashioned machine to an efficient, streamlined apparatus meeting the challenge of the nuclear age.

However, Federal aid alone is not the answer to many of our educational shortcomings. In the final analysis, we must rely on human beings in this educational complex—students, teachers, and administrators.

These 261 brilliant Negro students who are achievement scholars this year are the real leaders in the educational revolution now sweeping America. Because of their accomplishments, America will have sound leadership in the future.

It is a privilege for me to be able to put their names, their hometowns and the colleges of their choice in the Record. In so doing, I call attention to my colleagues to their efforts and pay tribute to them, their families, their schools, their teachers and their communities.

ALABAMA

Tyrone Davis, Beatrice, University of Cincinnati.

Herschell Johnson, Birmingham, Dartmouth College.

Herbert U. Pegues II, Birmingham, Harvard College.

Reginald Sanderson, Birmingham, Talladega College.

Eugene Smith, Birmingham, Stillman College.

Brenda D. Williams, Georgiana, Tuskegee Institute.

Carl L. Palmer, Huntsville, Yale University.

Lynda F. Porter, Huntsville, Spelman College.

James A. Grady II, Shawmut, Tuskegee Institute.

ARIZONA

Ernest E. Nedd, Jr., Phoenix, Brown University.

ARKANSAS

Ora F. Harris, Jr., Camden, University of Arkansas.

Lynn J. Bush, Little Rock, University of Denver.

Hubert O. Clemmons, Jr., Pine Bluff, Illinois Institute of Technology.

Beverly C. Gilbert, Pine Bluff, Vassar College.

Tommy L. Love, Jr., Washington, University of Arkansas.

Emily A. Jackson, West Memphis, Rosary College.

CALIFORNIA

J. Elizabeth Harris, Altadena, Antioch College.

Inman Rouce Jr., El Cerrito, University of Southern California.

Lola Pearl Coleman, Compton, Stanford University.

William Armstead, Los Angeles, Antioch College.

Joe Albert Bedford, Los Angeles, Stanford University.

Sloan Walter Blocker, Los Angeles, Pomona College.

Don Paul Edmondson, Los Angeles, Carleton College.

Timothy A. Ingram, Monterey, Stanford University.

Deon Broome, Oakland, University of California (Berkeley).

John L. Sepolen, Richmond, University of Notre Dame.

Booker Banks, Sacramento, University of California (San Diego).

Patricia Ann Kirk, Sacramento, Stanford University.

Norris P. Gregory III, San Bernardino, Harvard College.

Patricia Ann Mapps, San Pablo, Reed College.

COLORADO

Karen Yvette Cruter, Denver, Stanford University.

CONNECTICUT

Luther C. Davis, New London, Cornell University.

Elisabeth Petry, Old Saybrook, Vassar College.

DELAWARE

Leonora K. Petty, Wilmington, Mount Holyoke College.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Virginia A. Brown, Bucknell University.

Dolly L. Davis, Smith College.

Sharon M. Dennis, Radcliffe College.

Glenn T. Dixon, Brown University.

Anthony L. Jackson, Princeton University.

Michael J. Johnson, Harvard College.

Noble S. Jones, Swarthmore College.

George R. Keys, Jr., Bucknell University.

Wilhelmina A. Leigh, Cornell University.

Alan G. Martin, Boston College.

Frieda A. Murray, University of Chicago.

Allan Stinson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

FLORIDA

Gloria M. Adams, Miami, Xavier University, Louisiana.

Joyce D. Miller, Orlando, Bryn Mawr College.

GEORGIA

Janis Erwin, Atlanta, Spelman College.

Orban D. Harris, Atlanta, Harvard College.

James R. Hurley, Jr., Atlanta, Northwestern University.

Sharon Hutchinson, Atlanta, Northwestern University.

Laurence W. Johnson, Atlanta, University of Michigan.

Cynthia A. Lemon, Atlanta, Spelman College.

Marian A. Scott, Atlanta, Antioch College.

Cynthia Strozier, Atlanta, Swarthmore College.

Michael V. Yancey, Atlanta, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Bennie Ward, Augusta, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Freddie L. Welcher, Augusta, University of Georgia.

Florence M. Battle, Columbus, Coe College.

Walter Smith, Columbus, Harvard College.

Terry B. Tyson, Columbus, Georgia Institute of Technology.

Shirley Barden, Eastman, Fisk University.

Elizabeth R. Miller, Fort Valley, Bryn Mawr College.

Ruben H. Scott, Rome, University of Denver.

Robert A. De Shay, Savannah, College of the Holy Cross.

Delores Trutlin, Thomasville, Rockford College.

ILLINOIS

Mark Durham, Chicago, Harvard College.

Roscoe C. Giles III, Chicago, University of Chicago.

Pierre E. Leroy, Chicago, Yale University.

Gail C. Mays, Chicago, Carleton College.

Joseph E. Ritchie II, Chicago, Calvin College.

Warren E. Simpson, Chicago, Carleton College.

Linda Sponer, Chicago, Grinnell College.

Hugh Wilson, Chicago, Princeton University.

Wayne E. Patrick, Evanston, Rose Polytechnic Institute.

Marilyn McDonald, Joliet, University of Redlands.

INDIANA

Avery Brooks, Gary, Oberlin College.

Rebera E. Elliott, Gary, Fisk University.

Nona K. Fitts, Gary, Indiana University.

Roderick H. Morgan, Indianapolis, Wesleyan University.

Martha Partee, Indianapolis, Michigan State University.

Philip L. Whitfield, Kokomo, University of Chicago.

IOWA

Deborah Ann Gibson, Cedar Rapids, Mount Holyoke College.

KENTUCKY

Gail P. McHenry, Hopkinsville, Indiana University.

Arthur C. Dillard, Louisville, University of Michigan.

Rita M. Gilbert, Louisville, Knoxville College.

Dwayne White, Louisville, Cornell University.

Felix T. R. McElroy III, Louisville, Purdue University.

Arthur B. Buckner, Owensboro, Yale University.

LOUISIANA

Wilson J. Gordon III, Baton Rouge, Southern University.

Diaane M. Irvine, Baton Rouge, Mount Holyoke College.

Cheryl L. Manson, Baton Rouge, Michigan State University.

James M. Christian, Bunkie, Howard University.

Edgar J. Jordan, Jr., De Quincy, University of SW Louisiana.

Dale Lombard, Gretna, Tulane University.

Thomas K. Johnson, Metairie, University of Southern California.

John A. Anderson, Monroe, Howard University.

Irma J. Bland, New Iberia, Dillard University.

Wayne P. Colin, New Orleans, University of California, Los Angeles.

Calvin J. Duffaut, Jr., New Orleans, Yale University.

Marie L. Henley, New Orleans, St. Mary's College, Indiana.

Robert E. Lee, Jr., New Orleans, Harvard College.

Edgar L. Taplin, Jr., New Orleans, Yale University.

MARYLAND

Marsha N. Chalmus, Baltimore, Sarah Lawrence College.

Clifford Pugh, Baltimore, Harvard College.

Nathan T. Seely III, Baltimore, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Ruth Burley, Glen Burnie, Howard University.

Gilford W. Queen, Jr., Glen Burnie, Cornell University.

MASSACHUSETTS

Craig H. Yorke, Jr., Brighton, Harvard College.

MICHIGAN

Pearl Cleage, Detroit, Howard University.

Evans E. Pate, Jr., Detroit, Michigan State University.

Ivy L. Thomas, Flint, Wellesley College.

Vernice V. Killough, Remus, Michigan State University.

MINNESOTA

Christopher W. Gossett, Minneapolis, Harvard College.

Jan Pierre Reed, St. Paul, Stanford University.

MISSISSIPPI

Joe L. Harris, Canton, Michigan State University.

Leon Jackson, Canton, University of Notre Dame.

Albertine E. Carter, Clarksdale, Fisk University.

Daniel M. Smith Jr., Cleveland, Howard University.

Joseph P. Hudson, Handsboro, Georgetown University.

Lin Falkner, Holly Springs, Loyola University, (Illinois).

Beverly D. Knapp, Jackson, Southern Illinois University.

Edward T. Lewis Jr., Jackson, Tougaloo College.

MISSOURI

Nevada Ann Harris, Kansas City, Vassar College.

Brenda J. Gatewood, St. Louis, Grinnell College.

Carma Whitfield, University City, University of Wisconsin.

NEW JERSEY

Charlotte Burns, Montclair, Bucknell University.

Stephen S. Robinson, Newark, Reed College.

Randolph Livingston, Paterson, Rutgers, The State University.

Harry R. Gibbs, Rutherford, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Craig L. Backerville, South Orange, Harvard College.

Wallace L. Ford II, Teaneck, Princeton University.

Carl R. Jones, Trenton, Harvard College.

Annette Smith, Willingboro, Cornell University.

NEW YORK

Cicero Wilson, Jr., Amityville, Columbia University.

Valerie V. Oldwine, Binghamton, Howard University.

Nancy Austin, Brooklyn, Barnard College.

James C. Burford, Brooklyn, Harvard College.

Winston M. Carmichael, Brooklyn, Harvard College.

Beverly A. Davis, Brooklyn, Bryn Mawr College.

Don Dayson, Brooklyn, Dartmouth College.

Ronald O. Howell, Brooklyn, Yale University.

Earl C. Strayhorn, Brooklyn, Cornell University.

Bridget Van Gronigen, Brooklyn, Howard University.

Gary P. Williams, Hempstead, Swarthmore College.

Deborah Trice, Jamaica, Barnard College.

Myles V. Lynk, New York, Harvard College.

Merville C. Marshall Jr., New York, Columbia University.

Frederick Randall III, New York, Harvard College.

June E. Roberts, Queens Village, Wellesley College.

Larry R. Stephens, Roosevelt, Dartmouth College.

Denis E. Kellman, Springfield Gardens, Georgetown University.

Patricia M. Wardlaw, Springfield Gardens, Cornell University.

Yvonne M. Gilchriest, Southampton, State University of New York, Albany.

Donald L. Bert, White Plains, Harvard College.

Emily J. Rock, White Plains, Radcliffe College.

NORTH CAROLINA

James L. Frazier, Charlotte, Columbia University.

Karin E. Kirksey, Greensboro, Stanford University.

Brenda E. Armstrong, Rocky Mount, Duke University.

John L. Willis, Roper, Howard University.

Emerson U. Fullwood, Supply, North Carolina State University.

Edison Gore, Supply, University of North Carolina.

Donnell Burton, Wake Forest, North Carolina State University.

Millicent R. Brown, Wilmington, Northwestern University.

Margaret B. Balsley, Winston-Salem, University of Wisconsin.

Rodney D. Parker, Winston-Salem, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

OHIO

James Dailey, Alliance, Western Reserve University.

Barbara J. Taylor, Athens, Ohio University.

Robert W. Faithful, Jr., Bridgeport, Miami University, Ohio.

Larry Bronson, Cincinnati, Amherst College.

Terence Copeland, Cleveland, Yale University.

Bobbie Hamilton, Cleveland, Mount Holyoke College.

Benjamin Willis, Cleveland, Amherst College.

William M. Parham, III, Columbus, Harvard College.

Marshall John Garner, Dayton, Cornell University.

Luther K. Robinson, Jr., Elyria, Oberlin College.

Jacquelyn O. Wright, Germantown, Columbia Union College.

James McCaulley, Mansfield, General Motors Institute.

Kathleen D. Battle, Portsmouth, University of Cincinnati.

William A. Brower, Jr., Toledo, Antioch College.

OKLAHOMA

John A. Davis, III, Lawton, University of California, Los Angeles.

Howard T. Strassner, Jr., Tulsa, University of Chicago.

PENNSYLVANIA

Steven F. Cuspard, Carlisle, Princeton University.

Marie L. Brown, Monongahela, Mt. Holyoke College.

Michael S. Simmons, Monongahela, Harvard College.

Aremona G. Bennett, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania.

Horatio C. Miller, Philadelphia, Temple University.

Zara G. Miller, Philadelphia, Dickinson College.

Robert M. Neal, Philadelphia, Swarthmore College.

Meryl L. Nimmons, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania State University.

Carl G. Robbins, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania.

George C. Royal III, Philadelphia, Yale University.

Yvonne C. Smith, Philadelphia, University of Michigan.

Pamela J. Williams, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania.

Loretta C. Bruce, Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh.

Renee S. Taylor, Pittsburgh, University of Chicago.

William Gaymon, Westtown, Amherst College.

Howard W. Bell, Jr., Willow Grove, Princeton University.

Leon Denmark, York, University of Chicago.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rowland M. Washington, Beaufort, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Robert Godfrey, Charleston, Columbia University.

Shirley M. Tolliver, Columbia, Michigan State University.

Sandyles Pearson, Enoree, Duke University.

Violet D. Harrington, Florence, Mount Holyoke College.

Vicky E. Kerr, Orangeburg, Boston University.

James S. Bowen, Sumter, Davidson College.

TENNESSEE

Ronald E. Franklin, Chattanooga, University of Tennessee.

Freeman Sanford, Chattanooga, Morehouse College.

Thurman Northcross, Jr., Memphis, Wesleyan University.

Mary E. Robinson, Memphis, Earlham College.

Patricia A. Simpson, Memphis, Southwestern at Memphis.

George L. Whitney, Memphis, Southwestern at Memphis.

Paula R. Wooldridge, Memphis, Earlham College.

Jacqueline A. Akins, Nashville, Reed College.

William Washburn III, Nashville, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

TEXAS

Charles J. Creasy Jr., Beaumont, California Institute of Technology.

William K. Flowers, III, Dallas, Stanford University.

Harold Hardin, Dallas, Yale University.

Dolores A. West, Dallas, Western College for Women.

Theresa L. Young, Dallas, Southern Methodist University.

Adrienne V. Holmes, El Paso, Radcliffe College.

Jettie M. Burnett, Fort Worth, Bryn Mawr College.

Carolyn D. Boone, Houston, Jackson College, Massasuetts.

Sharon R. Jackson, Houston, Carleton College.

Linda F. Williams, Lovelady, Rice University.

Patrosky Thomas, Midland, University of Texas.

Janice K. Whitlock, Odessa, Howard University.

Carlotta Samples, San Antonio, University of Denver.

Bennie L. Edwards, Tyler, Lamar State College of Technology.

Columbus E. Coleman, Jr., Wharton, University of Texas.

UTAH

Sandra McIntosh, Ogden, University of Utah.

VIRGINIA

Byron N. Rimm, Chesapeake, Duke University.

Bennie Boswell, Jr., Danville, Williams College.

James T. Breedlove, Ory Fork, Princeton University.

Anita K. Henry, Hampton, Howard University.

Leslie H. Powell, La Crosse, Wesleyan University.

Irving M. Williams, Jr., Norfolk, Princeton University.

Leo V. Williams, III, Norfolk, Wesleyan University.

Davis C. Young, Norfolk, Dartmouth College.

Francis L. Griffin, Petersburg, Amherst College.

Brenda B. Wall, Portsmouth, Sarah Lawrence College.

Cheryl A. Willis, Portsmouth, Oberlin College.

William C. Hocker, Richmond, California Institute of Technology.

Cheryl P. Brothers, Virginia Beach, Radcliffe College.

Charles H. Curl, Jr., Virginia Beach, Yale University.

James P. Davis, Virginia Beach, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

WASHINGTON

Robert L. McIntosh, Renton, Harvard College.

Barbara J. Parker, Seattle, Occidental College.

WEST VIRGINIA

John H. Lawson, Beards Fork, West Virginia Institute of Technology.

WISCONSIN

Darryl Walker, Milwaukee, Dartmouth College.

END OF AN ERA: DAVID DUBINSKY RETIRES AS PRESIDENT OF INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, an era has come to an end. It is the 34-year era of David Dubinsky's presidency of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. On March 16 he not only announced his retirement as president, but also his retirement after 45 years as an ILGWU officer. This was the union that he helped to build and helped to shape, and which in turn molded him throughout his adult life.

The International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, under the leadership of David Dubinsky, was a pioneer in the establishment of medical centers for its workers, fostered good and sound social legislation, was in the forefront in the civil rights movement, and years ago began conducting seminars for the membership so that they may be informed on the great issues facing their respective States and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, one of President Dubinsky's longtime associates in the union and my good friend, John F. Albano, the ILGWU manager in the Springfield office, conducted these seminars in the western Massachusetts area, and I have addressed the union membership and participated in the panel discussions. I am sure that Mr. Albano and his membership are saddened by the departure of David Dubinsky but are pleased to know he will now receive a well deserved rest.

Under permission granted, I include with my remarks a news story on David Dubinsky's retirement from the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union newspaper, and a biographical sketch of President Dubinsky, as appearing in the March 15–April 1 edition of Justice:

END OF AN ERA: DUBINSKY RETIRES

Suddenly, early in the afternoon of March 16, an era ended. The Wednesday afternoon session of the regular meeting of the ILGWU general executive board started as usual, with the board members assembling in the Biarritz Room of the Americana Hotel in New York City shortly before 2 p.m.

The long, U-shaped table was covered with the reports and note paper the ILGWU vice presidents had used during a long discussion-filled morning session. As they took their seats around the table and were called to order by President Dubinsky serving as chairman, not one of them could know the fateful turn the meeting was about to take.

In the general office only a handful—those closest to the president and involved in the preparation of reports and statements for the board meeting—knew. Besides them, only the President of the United States and the president of the AFL–CIO knew.

The session began with the continuation of the report on education and political action that had been started before the adjournment of the morning session.

Then it began as the first guest arrived. The GEB sessions are closed meetings. Members had noticed, however, that in the rear of the meeting room sat Emil and Abe Schlesinger and Elias Lieberman, longstanding legal aids to the ILGWU and President Dubinsky.

Soon after the start of the session, three of the city's outstanding newspapermen arrived and were admitted to the meeting. By the time A. H. Raskin, of the New York Times; James Wechsler, of the New York Post; and nationally syndicated Victor Reisel, of the New York Journal American were seated, President Dubinsky told the board members, "I have invited them because I intend to take up a matter that is very important to myself and to the union. These guests are here not as newspapermen but as friends." Among those present were Irving Vogel of the Jewish Daily Forward and Herman Morgenstern of the Day-Jewish Journal.

Then, as President Dubinsky began a review of his 45 years as an ILGWU officer, a few more were admitted. Some of the board members began to shake their heads with forebodings. The ILGWU chief told of the times he had thought of leaving office; then, after referring to the time when ILGWU President Benjamin Schlesinger brought in his own written resignation, President Dubinsky, and Mrs. Emma Dubinsky sitting at his right, said: "I have come prepared with writing."

He asked that his letter to the general executive board be read.

The words came with stunning effect. Around the table, disbelief registered on the faces. Each board member listened intently. Each marked the fateful words, the historic moment with some crucial memory of what the man now saying he wished to retire had meant in his or her own life.

"I have decided to retire and I hereby submit to the general executive board my resignation as president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union."

Suddenly, the reading was finished. For one dramatic moment there was silence. Some had been fighting back tears. Others were reaching back for the remembrance of when they had first met this man, now asking to be released from the burden of a presidency he had filled with honor and accomplishment for 34 years.

Then General Secretary-Treasurer Louis Stulberg moved to the microphone. He asked First Vice President Luigi Antonini to act as chairman.

"We are not going to discuss the question of this man's retirement," Stulberg said. "I move that a committee of this board be named to make every effort—in consultation with the president—to get him to postpone his decision.

The special committee was named.

Then, others spoke.

Following them, President Dubinsky replied. He said: "In an organization, in human life, nothing is permanent, nothing is forever. Giving 45 years of my life—34 as president—you will have to concede has meant I didn't have a life—only a union life And I don't want to die in my boots.

"I have the interests of the union at heart. If I knew that what I am doing would be hurtful to the union, I wouldn't do it. But I feel it is better for me to do this thing now than to do it a year or two later. It must come to it. Dubinsky can't live forever. The union may have to live forever.

"I believe that what I am doing will be good for me; it will be good for the union; and it will be good for the man who will take over. It will give him the opportunity to strengthen his position—to become another Dubinsky or better.

"Now, we still have a lot of business to complete at this board meeting. But if you feel you want to discuss this matter with me, let us not lose time. I am ready to meet with the committee but I repeat what I said in my letter: I urge you to comply with my wish."

Then the session was adjourned. The murmur of voices rose louder. But some remained silent, in their seats, remembering.

D.D.: CZAR'S FOE, PRESIDENTS' FRIEND

President David Dubinsky's retirement marks a record of labor leadership that spans youthful exile in Czarist Russia with friendship with five Presidents of the United States.

He was born in Brest-Litovsk, Poland on February 22, 1892. At 15 he became a master baker and was elected assistant secretary of the bakers' union. At 16 he was arrested for union activity, imprisoned, sent off to Siberia, managed to escape and make his way back to Russian Poland and to set off for the United States where he landed in New York City on January 2, 1911.

During the first 5 months in his new homeland he worked as dishwasher, knee-pants operator, buttonhole maker. Then in June 1911 he joined ILGWU Cutters' Local 10. By 1918 he was a member of the governing board of the local union. He had begun his rise up the leadership ladder, becoming in turn president of the local in 1920, vice president of the ILGWU in 1922, secretary-treasurer of the ILGWU in 1929, president of ILGWU in 1932, vice president of the American Federation of Labor in 1934 and a founder of the AFL–CIO in 1955.

The half-century of his union service has been rich in incident and purpose. In the mid-twenties he led in beating back the Communist attempt to seize control of the ILGWU. In the 1930's he directed the rebirth of the garment union, rebuilding its membership from 25,000 to 200,000 in 1 year and reestablishing it on a sound financial basis. In the same decade, he championed industrial organization in the AFL, led the garment workers out of the federation, then returned in 1940 with an AFL commitment to encourage organization and to fight racketeering. For this last, he was slugged by a notorious shady character while he was attending the AFL convention in New Orleans, where he was the sole ranking officer to abstain from voting for another disreputable figure.

After World War II, as a representative of the AFL, he helped found the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, at meetings in London in 1948 and 1949, in opposition to the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions.

In the 1950's, as a member of the AFL executive council, he drove for clean unionism, for the reunification of the organized labor movement and the formulation of a code of ethical practices. He broke tradition by being the first to support legislation involving Government's power to investigate unions and to safeguard their growing welfare funds.

The long record of his activities reveals four dominating concerns: the insistence that unionism is a cause and not a business, the conviction that the welfare of workers requires political as well as economic organization and action, the concept that the objectives of unionism include social gains as well as those centered on the pay envelope and the belief that unions and the community are dependent upon each other for the achievement of social progress.

His occupation with ethics reflects his first concern. His participation in the founding of the American Labor Party in 1936 and then the Liberal Party of New York in 1944 reflect his second concern. His vision in formulating and gaining through collective bargaining the benefits of social unionism reflects the third, and the unique aid programs of the ILGWU, together with its political programs, are a reflection of the fourth.

Under his guidance, the ILGWU has made many notable gains. These include the first industry agreement to provide for a 35-hour workweek (1933), the first industry agreement to set up an employer-contributed pooled fund for workers' vacations (1937), health and welfare funds (starting in 1938), retirement funds (1943), severance pay (1960).

He launched a fleet of mobile health clinics; was the first to publish a public union financial report which won high praise from President Franklin D. Roosevelt; set up the first union engineering department; the first union political department; initiated vast housing and redevelopment programs with fund reserves; fought tirelessly for higher minimum wages.

He has symbolized and magnified the traditional practical idealism of the garment workers and for this he has received many honors. He wears the Star of Italian Solidarity of Italy, the King's Medal of Service of Great Britain. He has received an honorary degree from Temple University and is soon to be honored again by Brandeis University. When Bard College first honored him with a doctorate in 1951 he was cited as follows:

"David Dubinsky, you have brought to the land of your youthful adoption a personal knowledge and abhorrence of ancient and persistent wrongs. You have fought skillfully and implacably against exploitation in every form. As once this country opened a door to you, so you have opened to others doors of opportunity for work and education.

"Your leadership of labor has helped millions to a more equitable share in the bounty of this productive land; it has increased the political as well as economic influence of those by whose hands this bounty is produced; it has helped create a new concept of economic morality and decency in human relations. Your service to labor has been a service to the health and strength of the Nation, and a service to mankind itself."

RENT SUBSIDY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the rent subsidy program last year. This year, changes were made in the bill which represent some improvement. However, we face strong and growing inflationary pressures in the economy. I have expressed my concern about inflation several times in the RECORD, and I believe it is inopportune to pass the rent subsidy measure at this time.

SOUND AND LIGHT FOR THE NATION'S CAPITOL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation, House Joint Resolution 1027, to provide for sound and light evenings at the Capitol. Spectacles dramatizing the history of the Capitol would be presented.

The son et lumière programs would be memorable events—at once instructive and enjoyable—for the thousands of Americans who visit the Capitol each year.

Son et lumière originated by chance in the years after World War I. One night a French architect, Paul Robert-Houdin, happened to observe the chateau of Chambord during a thunderstorm. Lightning leaped about the stonework; the heavens crashed with sound. To Robert-Houdin it seemed that history had been recreated and Chambord was alive. He wrote:

> I then thought it might be possible to reproduce artificially a spectacle like the one nature had just offered me.

This he did, using banks of powerful lights synchronized with sound tracks carrying music, voices, and special effects such as cannon fire and the slam of doors. He called the new process "son et lumière."

As now developed, son et lumière brings to life a historical narration centered on a particular building or setting. It presents a tremendously impressive show simply and at low cost. Unlike traditional historical pageants, no actors and few technicians are needed for the productions. Once the sound tracks are recorded and the lights and speakers in place, one technician can operate the automated son et lumière control mechanism. Sound is heard from different parts of the building and fades away, lights go on and off and dim, all automatically.

Son et lumière has been used to produce highly popular spectacles in France and nearly a dozen other countries, including the United States. Productions have been presented in such famous and historic settings as Versailles, the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris, the Roman Forum, the Acropolis in Athens, the Tower of London, the Chateau de Tourbillon in Switzerland, the Royal Palace in Madrid, and Independence Hall in Philadelphia. A son et lumière production utilizing the battleship U.S.S. *North Carolina*, moored at Wilmington, N.C., re-creates events of the Pacific naval war.

The script for the production at Versailles was written by one of France's outstanding writers, Andre Maurois. Leading French actors and the choir of Notre Dame joined in making the sound tracks for the spectacle at Notre Dame Cathedral. The voice of Orson Welles is heard reading Shakespeare during a scene re-creating the death of Julius Caesar in the son et lumière production in the Roman Forum.

In the production at Independence Hall, which ended in June 1964, the audience faced the bell tower as the voice of Fredric March began the tale of "The American Bell." Suddenly a tree blazed with a greenish glow and out of its leaves one heard Thomas Jefferson saying:

> We have counted the cost of this contest and find nothing so dreadful as voluntary slavery.

The light died.

Gradually the Georgia facade of the Hall was bathed in many-hued light. The stage was set for a drama of the Liberty Bell. From the East Room of the Hall, one heard the builders planning for the bell. The only illumination was that which shed a soft candle-glow inside the room. The light died; the music swelled and there came the sounds of ropes and pulleys straining, eager shouts, and band music as the bell was raised to the bell tower. Lights followed its invisible progress until, with a triumphant cry from the unseen colonists, a dazzling light at the top covered the modern bell with brilliance.

In the narration, Pulitzer Prize winner Archibald MacLeish told the story of America's independence.

The production at Independence Hall was carried out under a concession approved by the National Park Service and by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Now I hope Congress will approve a similar production for the Capitol.

The Capitol is an ideal site for son et lumière. It is the building that most symbolizes our Nation. The history of the country and of all three branches of Government is closely bound up with the Capitol. It has been the home of Congress since 1800. The Supreme Court met within its walls for 134 years and handed down some of its most important decisions here. Most of our Presidents have been inaugurated at the Capitol, and it has been the scene of many of the greatest Presidential messages and acts. Nineteen Presidents served in Congress before becoming Chief Executive, and two returned to Congress afterwards.

In addition, the Capitol is one of the world's architectural achievements. It is probably the best-loved, most historic, and most visited building in America.

Son et lumière could revitalize the many dramatic events, the legislative, executive, and judicial acts, the great debates and speeches that have taken place here. Many of the events that might be re-created through son et lumière come to mind:

The convening of the first Congress in Washington and the first address to a joint session in the Capitol by President John Adams on November 22, 1800.

The drama of the Jefferson-Burr contest for the Presidency in 1801.

The strident voices of the warhawks of 1812 and the answering voice of British Rear Adm. Sir George Cockburn who reportedly stood in the Speaker's chair and asked:

> Shall this harbor of Yankee democracy be burned?

The great McCulloch against Maryland decision of 1819.

The proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823.

The tumultuous welcoming of the Marquis de Lafayette at the rebuilt Capitol in October 1824.

The eloquence and rising passion of the Clay-Calhoun-Webster debates of the 1850's.

The ominous tones of the Dred Scott decision of 1857.

Lincoln's first inaugural address.

The conversion of the Capitol into a barracks, hospital, bakery, and storehouse during the Civil War.

The 35-gun salute of the Capitol Hill battery when the head of "Freedom" was bolted into place December 2, 1863, as work on the Capitol went on to symbolize the continuance of the Union.

The noisy gaslight celebration of the news of the fall of Richmond, followed by the solemnity of Lincoln's lying in state.

The intense tones of Thad Stevens' speech of impeachment against President Andrew Johnson and the trial that followed.

The debates on civil rights, silver, and monopolies of the last decades of the 19th century.

Woodrow Wilson's declaration to Congress that the "world must be made safe for democracy."

Passage of the income tax, suffrage for women, prohibition, and the New Deal legislation—and Supreme Court invalidation of the National Industrial Recovery Act as one of its last acts before leaving its Capitol quarters.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt's message to Congress of December 7, 1941.

Congress' welcome to Winston Churchill, symbolizing the Anglo-American alliance.

From these and other events of the recent and more distant past a program to stir the blood of patriots and to delight the eye and ear could be contrived.

Son et lumière could portray also the history of the Capitol building from Dr. William Thornton's original design of 1792 to the recent extension of the East Front. The program could recall the wooden walkway that once connected the House and Senate wings, the burned-out Capitol of 1814, Bulfinch's Dome and Capitol addition of 1825–56, the Dome and wings added in 1850's and 1860's.

House Journal Resolution 1027 would provide for the appointment of a Commission composed of three members of the House of Representatives named by the Speaker and three Members of the other body appointed by the President of the Senate to carry out a son et lumière program at the Capitol. The Commission is patterned after the joint committee created to carry out the excellent reenactment of Lincoln's first inauguration.

The Commission would have the power to retain a staff for the preparation of a suitable scenario for the program, and the recording of the sound tracks. Undoubtedly many historians, artists, and writers would be anxious to contribute their talents to this production. The Commission could also call upon the bands and vocalists of the military services to provide music for the sound track.

The Commission would be authorize to purchase the necessary lights, speakers, and related devices. The Architect of the Capitol would be directed to provide staff to set up the equipment. In the production at Independence Hall, most of the equipment was removed during the day so as to avoid marring the building and setting. Eight men were required for the entire production. If equipment could be left in place—as in many of the European productions—the manpower needed would be less.

The son et lumière productions would be free. As I envision it, they would be given several times a week throughout the period when the greatest number of Americans are visiting the Capitol—from late spring to early fall. The Commission would be given control of the scheduling of the traditional military band concerts so as to avoid conflicts. The military band concerts would continue separately or as a part of son et lumière productions.

The text of the resolution follows:

H.J. Res. 1027

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is established a commission which shall conduct on the Capitol grounds, beginning in 1967, a series of programs which shall depict, by means of son et lumière, historical events which have occurred at the Capitol. The commission shall make no charge for admission to such programs. The commission shall select for its programs historical events at the Capitol which are suitable for presentation through son et lumière, prepare scripts and plans for the programs, and direct the continuing management of the programs. To the extent practicable, the commission shall attempt to obtain information on historical events, the preparation of a script and plan, the recording of actors' voices and music at no cost to the United States. For this purpose, the commission shall consult and cooperate with the National Council on the Arts and military bands, choral groups, and other public or private agencies or organizations.

(b) The Architect of the Capitol shall make available to the commission such personnel as may be needed to set up lights, loudspeakers, and other paraphernalia necessary for the programs conducted under subsection (a) and to operate the son et lumière control mechanism.

(c) The commission may purchase such loudspeakers, lights, control devices, and related equipment as are needed for the presentation of its programs.

(d) (1) Sections 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7, of the Act entitled "An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes", approved July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193b, c, e, f, g), shall be inapplicable to the conduct of the commission's programs, and (to the extent that the commission by regulation provides) to the movement and seating of spectators at such programs.

(2) The scheduling of concerts given under the authority of section 13 of such Act (40 U.S.C. 1931) shall be subject to the approval of the commission. Such concerts may be given as a part of the commission's programs under subsection (a).

Sec. 2. (a) The commission shall be composed of six members, three of whom shall be Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker, and three of whom shall be Senators appointed by the President of the Senate. A vacancy in the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(b) Each member shall be appointed for a term ending on the day preceding the beginning of the first Congress following the Congress during which he was appointed.

(c) Four members of the commission shall constitute a quorum.

(d) The chairman of the commission shall be elected by the members of the commission.

Sec. 3. The commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such consultants and other personnel as it deems advisable without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days, a number of outstanding experts in the field of international education have testified before the Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor in connection with H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966.

Scheduled to testify Tuesday morning, April 5, are the following witnesses: F. Champion Ward, deputy vice president for international programs, the Ford Foundation; John T. Caldwell, chancellor, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, N.C.; J. George Harrar, president, Rockefeller Foundation; John Kennedy, chairman, Department of Government and International Studies, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.; and Mina Rees, dean of graduate studies, the City University of New York, New York City.

The witnesses who testified before the task force on Friday, April 1, are as follows: Hon. Robert McClory; Stephen K. Bailey, dean, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, New York; Willard W. Cochrane, dean of international programs, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Kenneth Holland, president, Institute of International Education, New York; and Howard P. Jones, chancellor, East-West Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

The witnesses who testified before the task force this morning, Monday, April 4, are as follows: Edward E. Booher, president, McGraw-Hill Book Co.; Frederick H. Burkhardt, president, American Council of Learned Societies; Claude Phillips, director, Institute of International and Area Studies, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Mich.

Mr. Speaker, I include the prepared texts of these witnesses at this point in the RECORD:

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966 (H.R. 12452)

(Statement of Stephen K. Bailey, Dean, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y., representing the American Council on Education and the Association of American Colleges before the Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, April 1, 1966)

Mr. Chairman and members of the task force, I am Stephen K. Bailey, dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, and chairman of the Commission on International Education of the American Council on Education. This statement is submitted on behalf of the American Council on Education, representing 1,194 colleges and universities, 179 nonprofit educational organizations, and 52 nonmember affiliates. The council's membership includes 96 percent of all universities, 84 percent of all 4-year colleges, and 34 percent of regionally accredited junior colleges. These institutions enroll 83 percent of all students in institutions of higher education in the United States.

I am also presenting this statement in behalf of the Association of American Colleges, a constituent member of the council devoted primarily to the concerns of undergraduate colleges, in particular colleges of the liberal arts.

The American Council on Education, together with the Association of American Colleges, strongly supports the objectives of the International Education Act of 1966. We see recognition in this proposed legislation of demonstrated national interest.

Few could deny that the educational component of our public overseas objectives will increasingly depend upon academic manpower and resources. This legislation proposes to augment that manpower and strengthen those resources. In so doing, it recognizes a basic obligation of government to support the development of our institutional and intellectual resources. The literacy of our people about other nations and peoples must be increased. We must strengthen the channels of international intellectual communication as well. To do these things we must increase our college and university capacity.

Government's dependence upon higher education has become increasingly apparent in many fields since World War II: for the conduct of research to enlarge our scientific horizons and capabilities, for curricular and other internal development designed to train our people more adequately, for direct assistance in upgrading human resources abroad, particularly in the emerging nations. The past two decades have witnessed the most extensive involvement of higher education in international affairs in modern times, and the Congress has long recognized in legislation the very great public importance of scholarly and other international exchanges, and of technical assistance to societies less well developed than ours.

A broadening collaboration has emerged between government and our academic institutions, based upon the unique capacity of higher education to enhance within the areas of its special competence the goals and objectives of our international public policy. Our colleges and universities have responded willingly to government's calls upon their manpower; and they, in turn, have derived substantial educational benefit from their growing orientation.

GUIDELINES (OR CRITERIA) FOR SELECTION OF INSTITUTIONS IN IMPLEMENTING THIS ACT—WHAT COMMITMENT HAS THE INSTITUTION TO THIS PROGRAM?

It is only fair to note, however, that American institutions of higher learning have accepted these new international responsibilities at a heavy price and with considerable strain. Furthermore, the record of our success has been at best uneven. I need not chronicle at length for this committee the range of problems which American colleges and universities have faced in this whole area. The very introduction of the International Education bill is testament to your awareness. But in brief, we have been engaged in unprecedented "international responsibilities" which too often have disrupted our teaching schedules, involved us in overseas operations which have penalized rather than promoted scholarly research, and distorted educational planning. Short term Government contracts have frequently imposed burdensome indirect and nonreimbursable costs upon strained university budgets, and have forced us into short-term hiring policies which have been the enemy of rational staffing. At the very moment in time when we are plagued by a shortage of qualified teachers, classrooms, and library and laboratory facilities to meet the vast recent expansion in domestic enrollments, we are called upon by the logic of America's world position to become instruments of our national purposes abroad. We are eager and willing to play our part. But the issue becomes increasingly clear: we must anticipate unprecedented draughts upon national resources for the necessary facilities if we are to become effective instruments of national purpose in the field of international education.

We should like to stress, in this connection, that "balanced" Federal support is of the utmost importance. On this account, we regret to see that this act prohibits funding for construction purposes. We recognize that Vietnam places such strains on the budget, and indeed on the construction industry, as to compromise even the most responsible request for increased appropriations for facilities. However, we should prefer to see this prohibition stricken from the act so that, in due course, we can request of the Congress funding for facilities which will be made necessary by the other authorizations in the legislation now before you.

Desirous of strengthening this Nation's international educational commitment, American higher education cannot but welcome legislation which recognizes the necessity for long-range development of its capacity. Colleges and universities will continue to shoulder educational responsibility abroad in the public interest, and they are daily expanding their efforts to increase this Nation's literacy in the cultures of others. Their ability to move forward effectively depends in no small measure upon Government's assistance in building up the necessary academic strengths, as authorized in section 2 of this act.

I do not believe this committee requires my extended comment on the particulars of this Act. With your permission, I should prefer to notice specific provisions which strike higher education as particularly commendable.

There can be little doubt that world stability depends more and more heavily upon the mutual knowledge of its varied societies one of another. Although one of the most advanced of the Western World, this Nation has no cause to be complacent about its basic understandings of other cultures. We know a good deal less than we ought to about almost any society one can name, but we are particularly weak in our knowledge of the two-thirds of mankind comprising the non-Western World. Our colleges and universities cannot be entirely absolved of their own past parochialisms in this particular; but you can be sure that they are now amply aware of them. It is gratifying to observe that the International Education Act of 1966 recognizes this critical need, and authorizes in sections 3 and 4 Federal assistance at both the graduate and undergraduate levels to meet it.

The emphasis in section 3 upon graduate-level research and training in international studies strikes us as sound. In the field of technical assistance, Secretary John Gardner (then president of the Carnegie Corp.) astutely commented over a year ago: "We still know all too little about the processes of modernization. We need research and lots of it, basic and applied, in the field and on the home campus."[1] The proposed legislation embraces sufficiently flexible authorizations to facilitate such research. Through it, the Nation can build upon not only the established centers of academic excellence in area studies but also open up broader research opportunities in many colleges and universities throughout the land. Every dollar thus invested will have a multiplier effect in understandings we badly need to cultivate if we are to deal wisely and effectively with a world in ferment.

One of the most farsighted principles embodied in this act, however, is the provision in section 4 for grants to strengthen undergraduate programs. Two years ago, the Association of American Colleges in its report, "Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts

---

[1] "Aid and the Universities," p. 18.

College," stated: "The encouragement of non-Western studies in undergraduate colleges will not only serve to sustain and enliven the liberal arts but will also furnish help where it is likely to yield the highest returns. The quality of graduate education depends upon the quality of the undergraduate experience. This is the business of the liberal arts college."

It is becoming daily more obvious that the American commitment to education now embraces undergraduate-level training for the maximum number of our citizens. We appear to have determined as a people that a college education is nearly, if not quite, indispensable to men's work and citizenship alike. For the great majority of our educated people, therefore, the prime opportunity for promoting literacy in other cultures and societies will be during the undergraduate years.

Here it becomes material that for an indefinite period much of our undergraduate education will be provided by small and medium-sized institutions. These are the colleges and universities at present least capable financially of supporting comprehensive language, area, and research programs in international studies. As the AAC report referred to above notes: "* * * the majority of colleges are at least aware of the challenge presented by nonwestern study. A sizable minority have already responded to this challenge. Others seem anxious to do so. But, if progress is to continue, help is needed—for students, for faculty, and for libraries—and it is needed now when the critical step has been taken and the will to go forward is strong."

The authorizations included in this act will make it possible for many such institutions to undertake serious scholarships and teaching in the nonwestern cultures in particular on a scale commensurate with their public responsibilities in our time. Many of them will be able for the first time to take meaningful advantage of scholarly exchanges, and to participate in building active and permanent channels of intellectual communication with the rest of the world. They will have the resources to develop more sophisticated and effective student programs of study abroad; and they will be able to afford their faculty new opportunities to take part in vitally needed research programs.

It seems to me in keeping with the foregoing needs that the act provides in section 4(c) for equitable distribution of the grants throughout the States, so long as demonstrable institutional need and potential for development are the guiding criteria for the awards.

I am sure the committee recognizes that we in the academic community are not at present able to judge the order of magnitude of the new authorizations in this act. We assume that supporting appropriations legislation will be introduced in due course. We understand meanwhile, however, that the authorizations in this proposed legislation are intended to supplement on-going educational activities in such agencies as AID and the Department of State, and that the appropriations requested for the educational responsibilities of AID at least are substantially increased over those of the current fiscal year.

We should be less than candid, on the other hand, if we failed to voice regret that the related appropriations for the Department of State appear to have been reduced in the President's Budget for fiscal 1967. The council has testified repeatedly that the Department's cultural and educational exchange programs have long been underfinanced. Because they are, for example, it is becoming more and more difficult to induce distinguished American scholars to accept exchange awards under Government-sponsored programs; and our academic institutions find it increasingly difficult adequately to meet Government's needs across a broad spectrum of exchange and cultural enterprises. Encouraged by the farsightedness of this act, we hope that the financing required effectively to undergird it, as well as the related on-going programs authorized in the Fulbright-Hays and successive Mutual Security Acts in particular, will receive the full and favorable attention of the Congress.

This leads to a final word, Mr. Chairman, on what seems to us one of the soundest provisions in the International Education Act of 1966. Continuity of planning over an extended period of time is essential to any effective educational enterprise. The 5-year authorization proposed in this legislation (section 7) constitutes a major step forward as Government enlarges its area of partnership with universities and colleges. With this authorization, long-range strengthening of institutional capacity can be prudently planned and efficiently managed; and the intent of public policy to "stay the course" in the vital business of international education will have been certified to all.

In expressing appreciation, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear before this committee in behalf of the International Education Act of 1966, I can assure you that the academic community will cooperate with Government in every appropriate way in carrying out its intent and its provisions.

REMARKS BY KENNETH HOLLAND, PRESIDENT, INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mister Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate your invitation to testify on the International Education Act of 1966 which you have under consideration. My remarks will be brief. I warmly endorse this measure and congratulate Congressman BRADEMAS, Congressman POWELL, and Senator MORSE for sponsoring it.

This proposed legislation gives substance to President Johnson's eloquent and farsighted commitment to strengthening American education. It is essential if we are to employ effectively our educational resources as an instrument of national policy and as a means for achieving world peace and international understanding.

The belief in the importance of international education is widespread and nowhere more so than in our colleges and universities. They have taken the initiative in developing programs of international education. They have willingly responded to the Government's request for assistance and cooperation in programs designed to achieve national goals in international affairs. They have done so at considerable cost to themselves. The presence of more than 80,000 foreign students on our campuses is only one indication of the readiness of American higher education to devote its resources to international education. More than 20,000 of these students receive financial support from the colleges and universities they attend. A far greater number, indeed the majority, are the beneficiaries of special programs and services which are provided at considerable cost to our academic institutions.

For all that our academic institutions have contributed to our national objective through programs of international education, their full potential has not been realized because of a lack of funds. This measure before you will help remedy this situation. American higher education deserves and needs the support which this measure will provide.

I applaud the provision of the bill which will permit the development of graduate research and study centers. This will materially assist the creation of non-Western area study centers at American institutions, something we badly need. Our universities are all too weak in their teaching and research facilities when it comes to Asia, Africa and even Latin America. In a world grown so small as ours, where our everyday lives are affected—and indeed where our fate may be determined—by events in such once exotic places as Vietnam, Indonesia, and Ghana, we urgently need men and women with the training required to permit us to deal effectively with these lands.

For the same reason, I am pleased that this measure will permit the strengthening of international study programs at our undergraduate institutions. Many observers have pointed out the weakness of international studies at many of our liberal arts institutions. One study published some years ago estimated that not more than 10 to 15 percent of American undergraduates take courses that would provide them with some basis of knowledge of foreign countries and international affairs. These times do not permit us to leave our citizenry, no less our future leaders, so uninformed about the world in which they live.

Naturally, I am happy to see that the proposed legislation authorizes the utilization of private, nonprofit agencies. American higher education is served in many important ways in its international educational interest by these agencies.

I should like to make a few suggestions for your consideration. First, section 3B of the proposed bill authorizes funds for travel abroad to individuals undergoing training in proposed graduate centers for international studies. I believe that this should be broadened to cover not only travel but study abroad. Although the statistics on American students abroad are not satisfactory, we estimate that only about 18,000 to 20,000 Americans are actually enrolled in foreign academic institutions. Of these, less than 1,000 are sponsored by our Government. This number should be substantially increased. For students with a professional interest in a foreign area, an extended period of study abroad can be said in many cases to be essential. Needless to say, we can only induce our best students to study abroad by providing grants which are financially adequate. Many graduate students are discouraged today from accepting Government grants for study abroad because they are not competitive with other awards for study in the United States.

Second, in developing international studies, especially at smaller institutions, foreign student programs have an important role to play. On many campuses the presence of foreign students constitutes an important resource to the faculty and to the student body at large. This committee may wish to consider the advisability of assisting institutions to maintain a high quality foreign student program.

Third, it is difficult and I believe unwise, to divorce the cultural aspects of international education from the academic aspects. The arts represents natural bonds for international understanding; they can transcend barriers of both language and ideology. Programs of cultural exchange have met with great success. To provide a new dimension to this form of international education, I recommend that you consider including in this proposed legislation authorization to send young American artists of high professional competence abroad for training and study, and to bring to the United States young but mature foreign artists. These young artists would take up residence at one or more academic centers, there to practice their arts and to exchange their knowledge and understanding with their colleagues. Such an artist-in-residence program could easily be administered in cooperation with our colleges and universities.

Let me say that the promise inherent in the bill and in the President's program, as outlined in his message of February 2, can be realized only if the necessary appropriations legislation is passed. Our investment in international education has in the past been inadequate to achieve the results we seek. The Government must be prepared to provide the funds necessary to implement its intentions.

I am confident that the passage of the International Education Act, and the appropriation of necessary funds, coupled with the steps President Johnson has indicated he intends to take, will not only benefit American education but the Nation, and will contribute importantly to the goals to which we are dedicated.

STATEMENT OF WILLIARD W. COCHRANE, DEAN, OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966 (H.R. 12452)

The proposed legislation of the 2d session of the 89th Congress entitled the International Education Act of 1966 provides authorization to implement programs of decisive importance to the national welfare. As presently drafted the bill contains two crucial elements: (1) the recognition of the importance of international education to vital national goals and (2) the importance to these goals of a mutual partnership between Government and institutions of higher education. This statement will emphasize these two elements and add further comments concerning their implementation.

Explicit in section 2 of the draft bill is the first of these two elements—the recognition of the importance of international education to vital national goals. It emphasizes the importance of strong American educational resources as a base for strengthening relations with other countries, the importance of developing resources for international study and research, and the need to assist the progress of education in developing nations and the need to promote mutual understanding and cooperation among nations. To this list could be added other areas of needed emphasis including the importance of an alert and better informed public opinion about foreign policy and international relations. But extending this list would be superfluous. This is a thoroughly documented field and the evidence is clearly and unequivocably in support of the relevance of international education to vital national goals. Its recognition and implementation through this legislation is a pioneering step in educational legislation.

The second crucial element in the proposed legislation is the recognition of the important mutual partnership that exists between Government and institutions of higher education in achieving vital national goals. This is explicit in sections 3 and 4 of the act. This mutual partnership is a distinctive American innovation with a solid record of achievement and public acceptance. This record has been won largely in fields of science and technology, but the operating principles contributing to this record of achievement and public approval are equally applicable to other vital national goals including international education. These principles are so important to the International Education Act of 1966 that they are worth reviewing here. Briefly they are as follows:

1. A search for excellence and the provision of incentives to assure its growth. Since universities are the only institutions which produce more high level manpower and research than they consume (that is, they are suppliers to the Nation of trained manpower and research findings), it is essential that these supplies be of excellent quality. Thus, this principle of a search for excellence is a most important aspect of the relationship between Government and institutions of higher education.

2. A reliance on an advisory system to recommend the awarding of Federal grants and contracts. This system has involved many scientists from many different fields and it has been an essential element of the search for excellence.

3. A move from specific to general purpose support. This principle has evolved from an earlier practice which favored the support of an individual professor and his project rather than an institution. The evolved principle of institutional support is now an accepted one in fields of science. It is illustrated, for example, in the research grants of the NIH for medical schools and in the institutional grants of the NSF. This principle is an integral part of sections 3 and 4 of the International Education Act of 1966 and one of its most laudable aspects.

4. The encouragement of large scale programs in the development field. This principle encourages the creation of a "critical mass" of human energy directed toward work on the problems of developing nations. Efforts to deal with development problems often must be interdisciplinary in organization, which means that such research organizations must be relatively large scale. Such efforts are also possible under the provisions of the Education Act of 1966 and also are laudable.

5. The acceptance of the need to provide institutional grants for the support of administrative services. In a sense this is similar to the move from specific to general purpose support. But it is different in that it does not necessarily support specific research projects or specific research objectives. It is illustrated in the support of training programs, library support, fellowship programs and the development of effective administrative systems. This principle also appears to be applicable under sections 3 and 4 of the proposed legislation.

These five principles have provided a climate for success in a variety of programs involving the mutual partnership between Government and institutions of higher education. These principles are, however, silent on one important need—the need for continuous international programs and sustained financial support. Such continuity and such sustained support may be permissive under section 3 of the act, but it is not insured by the language of the present draft.

The importance of long-term sustained support cannot be overemphasized. If the vital national goals expressed in section 2 of the act are to be achieved through mutual relationships with institutions of higher education, opportunity must be provided for these institutions to make long-term commitments including the hiring of permanent faculty and development of long-range research programs. Short-term funding is often disruptive and disabling; this is true with respect to both instruction and research programs.

The principles described above point to the need for a durable relationship between government and institutions of higher education in their joint efforts to achieve national goals. Long-term support was the key element in the success of agricultural research under the Hatch Act; the technological payoff that we are now experiencing in the United States in the production of food and fiber is the result of 80 uninterrupted years of cooperation between the Federal Government and institutions of higher education in research and development in agriculture. A comparable approach in the implementation of international education under the act of 1966 must be formulated, if vital national goals in the international area are to be achieved.

Section 3 of the act has features worthy of special comment and commendation. It contains some of the most imaginative and substantial parts of the act. The scope and range of activities authorized under this section are basic to the achievement of the expressed purposes of this legislation. Centers for advanced international studies, as authorized under section 3, will produce the research results and the supply of trained manpower needed to implement other sections of the act.

Section 4 of the act is a major innovation. It provides an opportunity for smaller colleges and universities to participate fully in the resources available for strengthening international education. Without such provisions, the attempts to reach the vital national goals specified in section 2 would be thwarted. The emphasis on undergraduate instruction in international studies, exchange programs, strengthening of faculty, and other special programs to strengthen international education are all highly desirable objectives.

In summary, the International Education Act of 1966 takes an important first step in recognizing the relevance of international education to vital national goals. Its implementation through grants establishing centers for advanced international studies and grants to strengthen undergraduate programs are vital to the creation of conditions which will insure that the purposes of the legislation will be achieved. Grants provided by the legislation will also assist institutions of higher education in strengthening international studies and research.

But an important second step must be taken to support those institutions of higher learning that are already deeply committed to international studies and research. A means, or mechanism, must be found to fund on a regular and sustained basis the international activities that have been initiated by grants and contracts from private foundations and existing public agencies. We hope that such a means can be developed and included in the International Education Act of 1966, for until such a means is developed and placed into operation, international activities in institutions of higher learning will be held captive in a "hand-to-mouth" funding relationship. The full promise of the International Education Act of 1966 can only be realized with long-range educational programs funded on a sustained basis.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD P. JONES, CHANCELLOR OF THE EAST-WEST CENTER, AMBASSADOR TO INDONESIA 1958–65, BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, APRIL 1, 1966

Mr. Chairman, members of the task force, I appreciate your invitation to appear before you. I strongly support the proposed legislation, cited as the International Education Act of 1966. Before commenting on specific provisions of the bill, it may be worthwhile for me to outline briefly the framework of national purpose within which I see this legislation. This may be taken as amplification of the superb statement in section 2 of the bill to which I wholly subscribe. As you are aware, the institution I represent, the East-West Center, is a federally supported institution, operating in the forefront of an educational effort dedicated to the proposition that peace can only be achieved through basic understanding of each other on the part of the peoples of the world and that this understanding can only be obtained through education and working together.

If I may inject a personal note, my years in the diplomatic service, a majority of which were spent in Asia on dealing with Asian problems, convinced me that it was not, as a rule, the specific issues which brought nations to the point of war with each other but rather basic misunderstanding of each other's motivations. Emerson once said, "A friend is one with whom you can be sincere." Friends, that is, whether individuals or nations, can disagree and still remain friends. But real friendship without some basic understanding of each other is difficult if not impossible. I think we can all agree that wars solve no problems; they may help to prevent more serious problems, but in so doing they create new ones, frequently more complex than the old.

The peace for which America is working these days is much more than the absence of war; it is a creative peace, marshaling resources to fight starvation and disease, ignorance and prejudice.

One of the greatest threats to peace, and to well-being everywhere, is the widening gap between standards of living in developed and in less developed countries. This gap also exists, to a lesser degree, between developing countries. Those of us who have been close to the kind of intense nationalistic rivalry that can easily burgeon into battle have come to realize that peace and peaceful development are sometimes endangered by uneasy relationships within and among countries which can least afford to be distracted from their developmental activities.

The need for knowledge is enormous. Implicit in a more civilized and civilizing solution to Asia's ills than war, is the conviction that diet, health, shelter, transportation, communication, industrial and agricultural productivity, and higher living standards depend, in the end, upon a people's own innate abilities awakened, developed, extended. Such abilities cannot be awakened, developed, extended, except by education.

Education then, is at the base of everything we do. The virtue of the legislation you are presently considering is that it recognizes clearly that education is a two-way street. The peoples of other nations need education to help them solve their problems of poverty, disease and war. We need education to enable us to understand other peoples, to the end of working together to develop mutually acceptable solutions to these problems. One of the great by-products will be the enrichment of our American culture, as it has been enriched by the contributions of many nations in the past. Again, to quote Emerson who is not read much these days, "Education should be as broad as man."

Turning now to the specific provisions of the bill, I should like to comment first on section 3 which provides for Centers of Advanced International Studies. I strongly endorse this section but would like to see it broadened to encourage other countries to do likewise. Thus, my own institution, the East-West Center, would find its work greatly simplified if there were in the 26 Asian and Pacific areas with which we deal corresponding centers established by their own governments with which we might cooperate. Some nations may not yet be ready for such a step; others should be. Such a network of centers would in turn result in new and additional channels of communication for all American universities and scholars in their contacts with Asia.

In support of section 4, I should like to point out that one of the great weaknesses in our educational system has been that we have been educating about half the world. We have seen the world almost as though we had blinders on. Indonesia, where I had the privilege to serve as Ambassador for more than 7 years, is a prime example of this. How many Americans know that Indonesia is the fifth largest country in the world in population, that it is generally regarded as the third richest in natural resources and that, if we except Hawaii and Alaska, its area is larger than that of the United States? How many Americans know anything about the history of this country? I am sure, even today after it has been in the headlines for so long, few know that this nation had a glorious history of its own, that long before Harold the Saxon fought the Battle of Hastings and the small island in the stormy North Atlantic we call England began to stir itself to establish the hardly to be discerned beginnings of what would be a great nation and a vast empire, Indonesia had lived to see its own manifestation of strength and glory in an empire which included all of what is now Indonesia, as well as important parts of the Asian mainland.

The great Sriwidjaja empire of the 7th, 8th, and 9th centuries with its glittering court at Palembang in South Sumatra rubbed shoulders with China to the north. Its reach was later duplicated by the Java-based Madjapahit empire of the 14th century. Long before Columbus discovered America that is, there existed in middle and southeast Asia two great empires—the Chinese empire and the Javanese empire. The lingua franca which is spoken all the way from the southern borders of Thailand to and including West New Guinea is the Indonesia language which comprised one of the important unifying factors in Sukarno's revolution.

Few Americans also have appreciation of the rich culture of Indonesia. We are proud of our culture. They are equally proud of theirs. It may be useful to briefly draw a parallel here, as an illustration of the kind of understanding this bill should generate. Both the American and Indonesian cultures represent a blending, a borrowing, and a perfecting of the diverse cultures of older civilizations. The sources from which we have drawn our basic institutions, however, are in many instances different. The main elements of our American political and economic system: our concepts of law, our respect for the sanctity of private property, and our belief in the overriding rights of the individual citizen, have all flowed from the great mainstream of European civilization—from Greece, from Rome, from the medieval scholars of France and Italy, from the English judges and parliamentaries who compiled the great body of common law. This ideological system has been further molded by our own experiences as a nation and by our own great statesmen. This system has brought to our people such immense benefits, both material and spiritual, that we may perhaps be pardoned if we sometimes fall into the error of thinking of it as universal rather than but one of several equally rewarding cultural systems.

Indonesia's cultural, political, and social heritage flows from equally exalted but very different sources—from the age-old civilization of Java; from the India of Buddha and Asoka; from the laws of Manu; from the splendid empires of Sriwidjaja and Madjapahit; from the teachings of prophet Mohammed. A particularly striking contrast in the ideological evolution of our two countries, however, has come in the past 200 years. Since 1782, Americans have been the masters of their own destiny, free to draw on their cultural heritage in shaping their own society with virtually no real interference from the outside world. During the same 200 years, Indonesia came under the domination of what was, to the Indonesian people, a totally alien culture. Only in the brief 15 years since Indonesia's independence struggle met with success in 1949, have the Indonesian people been able to address themselves to the great task which has engaged our energies for the past 200 years—that of forging their political, ideological, and cultural heritage into a unique national identity. Moreover, the Indonesian people have had to face this task not in the remote world of the 18th and 19th centuries—when it might take half a year for a letter to travel from Djakarta to Washington—but in the full glare of the present world of instantaneous communications and all-pervasive ideological conflict.

The burning desire on the part of the Indonesian people to shape their own national identity—an identity neither American nor Russian nor Indian nor Chinese but Indonesian—is a salient factor in Indonesia's relations both with the United States and with all other countries. In the relationship between Indonesia and America, we have, in effect two nations with a proud revolutionary heritage, but one of them—ourselves—has had almost two centuries to develop and perfect the institutions born in that revolution. The other is only now engaged in that exciting and often painful process.

Indonesia is only one of the many nations which needs understanding. What I have said represents only a small window opening on one country, but it illustrates the importance of developing college and university curriculums in the United States which which give us some appreciation of other human beings with whom we share this planet. The lack of such knowledge inhibits to an extraordinary extent communications between peoples.

It might be appropriate, Mr. Chairman, for me to note at this point that the practicality of the proposals included in this bill is evidenced by the activity currently going on at the East-West Center.

The Center's function is stated in its name—cultural and technical interchange between East and West. The key word is interchange. Specifically, the Center does not exchange people in the sense that Asians are sent to the United States and Americans are sent to Asia. Rather, Asians and Americans are brought together, intermingling, sharing a common experience, pursuing consonant purposes, learning about other cultures through personal contact with a cross-section of other peoples, and examining their own cultures in the context of an international community. This occurs in an environment offering access to a university of unusual excellence in the area of Asian-American studies, and to a community whose multiracial composition provides proof that men of different creeds and cultures can live in peace.

The Center has no illusions about the effects of human interchange. Propinquity does not necessarily breed affection and respect. Understanding may not mean assent. Nationalism may be enhanced and passions heightened, rather than decreased, as adherents of differing viewponts meet face to face, airing their difference in classroom, dormitory and cafeteria. Nor are the irritations, jealousies and discord implicit in human relationships discounted or overlooked.

Indeed, these negative aspects of human interchange form an important part of the experience each participant shares, a counterweight to the excessive expectations and resultant frustrations so common in this field.

What the Center seeks, rather, is a new kind of international colleagueship, composed of men and women whose horizons have been widened, whose capacity to think has been broadened, whose compassion has been deepened, by a shared experience. It brings together scholars and students, administrators and officials, proponents of the public and private sectors, long isolated from each other. It creates an atmosphere conducive to the cross-fertilization of experiences and ideas. It induces interaction among men of different disciplines, matching the administrator with the professor, the public official with the entrepreneur, the humanist with the engineer. It crosses national frontiers, bringing together from different countries groups concerned with identical problems, exposing them to their opposite numbers in other lands. It crosses boundaries within societies, drawing together countrymen formerly separated by sectarianism, geographical distances and occupations. It generates ideas as useful to Americans as to Asians, shattering ethnocentricity, combating condescension, and ordering the traffic in ideas along a two-way street. It forms enduring professional contacts which are in themselves among the greatest stimulants of change. It confers upon thinkers and doers in every field and of every nationality a common citizenship in a society of scholarship where excellence is revered.

What I am saying here, I do not intend as special pleading for the East-West Center, but rather to illustrate the potential generation of communication which implementation of this bill should stimulate.

Education engenders a desire to know more. The establishment of courses in international affairs and the history of other peoples will bring us together in ways which cannot now be foreseen. Think, gentlemen, two-thirds of the people of the world live in Asia. How much do we know about them?

Education in these fields at the undergraduate level will lead to more research and study at the graduate level. This will in turn produce more Americans competent to work with leaders in the less developed areas in lessening the gap in living standards between us, in developing mutual understanding and respect. The fields of study are well nigh unlimited, ranging as they do from economics to linguistics, from political science to oceanography, from philosophy and history to art and music.

Four years of experience at the East-West Center has convinced us that, once language competence has been attained, concentration on a specific research problem in a foreign country constitutes a natural progression in developing channels of communication in that country. The student or faculty member has a specific job to do in a specific subject matter area. He thus has a gateway of mutual interest through which to pass on his way to getting to know the people and the country.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to underline again my own conviction that legislation such as this proposed is the best preventive of tomorrow's wars that so far has been devised.

As more than 60 leading scholars from East and West concluded at a recent international conference, "Until the processes of social, cultural, political and economic change as they are taking place—and have occurred—in Asia are more fully understood, we will continue to be handicapped in our efforts to direct the course of change in accordance with our desires."

When Americans understand the peoples of other nations and we begin to achieve a blend of the best in their cultures with the best in ours, this planet can begin to take on the characteristic of one world.

BOOKS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

(Statement by Edward E. Booher in support of H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966, on behalf of the American Book Publishers Council and the American Textbook Publishers Institute, before the Task Force on International Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, April 4, 1966)

My name is Edward E. Booher and I am president of the McGraw-Hill Book Co. I appear here today on behalf of the American Book Publishers Council and the American Textbook Publishers Institute, in which organizations I currently serve as chairman of a joint committee concerned with governmental affairs. The council, numbering 190 members, is made up of commercial firms and nonprofit organizations publishing general books, including adult, juvenile, scientific, technical and professional, book club, paperbound, and university press books. The Institute is composed of approximately 110 firms publishing elementary, secondary, and college textbooks, encyclopedias and other reference works, and educational tests and maps. Many of the major publishing firms belong to both organizations. The members of the council and the institute publish well over 95 percent of books of all types produced in the United States.

OVERSEAS ASPECTS

The book publishing industry is concerned with international education in both its major aspects—education in the United States and education abroad. It can be assumed that book publishers would be interested in education in this country since books and collections of books in libraries are primary teaching aids and the repositories of knowledge of all kinds. It does surprise many people, however, to learn how important a role American books play on the international scene and particularly in the field of education. Although book exports amount to only 8 percent of our total production, that 8 percent makes us the major book exporting country in the world, surpassing the traditional leaders—the British—by a small but growing margin. This export position is a development of the last 20 years. Before World War II we were a net book importing country with only very marginal exports, principally to Canada and the Philippines. Now the exports and sales of American books abroad are on the order of $150 million a year, or three to four times our book imports. We sell books of every kind abroad, but textbooks, dictionaries, encyclopedias, and scientific, technical and scholarly books predominate. In many countries of the world English has become the language of instruction in scientific, technical and professional training at the university level and American books are widely used as the standard university texts.

In view of this background we are naturally very interested in the external aspects of the President's program for international education as set forth in his recent special message to the Congress. We realize that the bill before you only deals with two aspects of this comprehensive program, but it seems to us that if the Congress gives its approval to the broad preamble of the bill before you, it will have signified its agreement with the general outlines of the whole program set forth by the President in his message.

We have already met with some of the leading Federal officials in the executive branch concerned with these matters in order to offer our cooperation in a variety of ways, some of which I should like to list briefly at this point:

1. We have volunteered our help in the briefing and the background training of the corps of education officers to be set up in the U.S. Foreign Service to provide information on the American publishing industry. These officers will be called on to advise on matters relating to the production and distribution of educational materials in countries to which they are accredited and we would like to make available to them information on the resources they can call upon in American book publishing firms.

2. We have offered to make available to the proposed American Education Placement Service in the Department of HEW the names of experts of various kinds from the publishing industry who might be available for foreign service on a full time or on a consultant basis.

3. We have indicated our willingness to continue to work closely with the Agency for International Development in every field in which we can be of help in their educational projects and programs. We have worked with AID over a period of years and are delighted to see that increased emphasis will be placed on education activities in this agency.

4. We are particularly pleased to see emphasis in the President's message on the teaching of English abroad. As the world's leading exporter of English language books, we have long been convinced of the fundamental importance of English as a primary language of international communication, and as a basic tool of educational and economic development. We will continue to cooperate with those Government agencies concerned with English language teaching programs abroad making use of materials produced by American publishers.

We have also suggested that it would be very useful to tie together the work of the existing Government Advisory Committee on International Book Programs—which serves the Department of State, AID, and USIA primarily but also other Government agencies—with the overall coordinating committee to be established in the field of international education, the Council on International Education. We have recommended specifically to Secretary of HEW Gardner that the Chairman of the Government Advisory Committee on International Book Programs be made an ex officio member of the Council on International Education.

We were also particularly pleased to see in the President's message mention, for the third time within the past year, of the importance of U.S. adherence to the Florence agreement, freeing educational and cultural materials from tariff duties and the related Beirut agreement which has similar provisions for audiovisual materials. The passage of the implementing legislation permitting the United States to adhere to these two multilateral conventions which have already been approved as treaties by the Senate, will not only aid our own educational community but greatly improve our stature in intellectual and educational circles abroad in the 50-odd countries which have already adhered to these agreements.

DOMESTIC ASPECTS

Now let me turn to the domestic aspects of the President's program including the specific provisions of this bill. The bill provides (1) for a grant program to American colleges and universities to establish graduate centers for research and training in international studies; (2) for a grant program to assist colleges and universities in developing comprehensive programs for improved undergraduate instruction in international studies; and (3) for strengthening title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 relating to area and language centers in educational institutions. We believe all three of these provisions of the bill to be important as a means of strengthening the understanding of international affairs in the training of college students and in building up a larger and better equipped corps of experts in a wide variety of international specialties for service to government, business, and education. Specifically, we believe that in one of these graduate centers of research and training in international studies which the bill would authorize, it would be important to consider the possibility of developing a special program for the training of specialists in the techniques of book publishing and the writing and editing of educational materials in developing countries. This is a key function in helping to create modern educational systems and the U.S. publishing industry has been working with government agencies on a consulting basis to provide expert assistance in this field in a number of countries. However, it would be desirable to have a center at which this training could be carried on in a more systematic and intensive basis both for American citizens and citizens of developing countries.

Turning to other domestic aspects of the international education program not specifically dealt with in the bill before you, we have offered our cooperation in the areas of strengthening programs of international studies in elementary and secondary schools and in participating in conferences of leaders and experts in discussions and exchanges on international understanding.

In conclusion let me repeat our strong endorsement of the provisions of H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452 and of the broad outlines of the President's expanded program for international education. We believe the bill and the program as a whole are important to the national interest. We pledge our cooperation in every aspect of the program in which the resources, training, and expertise of personnel in the book publishing industry can be helpful. We are grateful to the task force for this opportunity to present our views.

Statement of Frederick Burkhardt, President, American Council of Learned Societies, Before the Task Force on International Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the U.S. House of Representatives, Monday, April 4, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the task force, I am very pleased to have the privilege of appearing before you this morning. I am Frederick Burkhardt, president of the American Council of Learned Societies, which is a federation of 32 national scholarly organizations in the humanities. I am appearing also on behalf of the Social Science Research Council, which, like the ACLS, is a national organization devoted to the advancement of research and study in many scholarly disciplines.

The two councils have for many years worked together in the area which is the concern of the legislation you are considering: international studies. We have, for instance, been two of the four national agencies responsible for the screening and nomination of candidates under the Fulbright-Hays program for lecturers and advanced research scholars. For many years the ACLS and the SSRC have administered joint programs designed to encourage research and to build in this country a cadre of scholars and teachers who would be expert in the cultures of other peoples. At the present time we have six joint committees—on Africa, Latin America, Asia, the Near and Middle East, contemporary China, and Slavic and East European studies. The councils, with the help of these committees (which are composed of scholars in the several fields) administer grant-in-aid programs, organize research conferences, survey the needs of the disciplines and of the scholarly community, and in general do what we can with the funds at our disposal to foster advanced research, on a multidisciplinary basis, on the social, political, and cultural institutions of other countries and regions of the world.

On the predoctoral training level, the ACLS and the SSRC jointly administer the foreign area fellowship program, which was initiated in 1952 by the Ford Foundation and transferred to our auspices in 1962. In all, this program has made awards totaling more than $13,500,000 to 1,447 fellows for graduate study on the major areas of the world.

From the perspective of the work of the ACLS and the SSRC, I would say that there is ample evidence of the need for the support which would be provided by the proposed International Education Act of 1966, and I welcome the expansion of opportunity and improvement in quality it will make possible.

The two major objectives of the bill—the establishment and strengthening of graduate centers and the strengthening of undergraduate instruction in international studies—are equally necessary. The two objectives are reciprocally related: as we increase graduate training we will provide faculty for undergraduate studies in the colleges, and as the latter are improved and expanded more and better qualified students will enter the field of international studies at the graduate level.

On the graduate level it will in some areas be more important to strengthen present centers than to establish new ones, because the available specialized talent is already spread rather thin. This is likely to be especially so in the case of Near Eastern and Asian studies, because command of the necessary languages (like Arabic and Chinese) is rare, and these languages take many years to learn. To establish new centers which could be staffed only by drawing away the personnel of the existing ones would contravene the purpose of the act, yet it would be easy to bring this about by too hasty expansion in some areas.

The list of needs covered in paragraph 3(b) strikes me as comprehensive and realistic. I particularly applaud the emphasis placed on the support of travel by both staff and students at graduate centers. Travel in the field for research and study is for the area expert what a laboratory is to the scientist. It is absolutely necessary to the observation and collection of data and to the discovery of new knowledge. If he is to keep his subject alive for himself and his students, he must make periodic trips to the region of his specialty. For extended research field trips allowances should also be provided for the dependents of the scholar.

I have one further important observation to make on the graduate portion of the bill. Section 3 (a) and (b) both refer to grants being made to institutions of higher learning for centers and for individuals teaching at or being trained at such centers. I hope that a substantial number of institutions will receive grants, but I presume that many colleges and universities will have to be left out. I note that, according to the Department of State's publication "Language and Area Study Programs in American Universities" (1964), only 61 of the some 2,000 institutions of higher education in the United States possess centers for advanced study of foreign areas. However, by no means all of the expertise on foreign areas is concentrated in those institutions that possess organized area centers. The improvement of training and research in institutions beyond those directly aided by grants is important, and I believe calls for a national competitive offering of research and training opportunities for promising men and women who are at colleges and universities that do not receive grants.

The undergraduate support that will be provided if this bill becomes law is in some ways even more important than the strengthening of graduate centers, for it will strengthen the understanding of international affairs of the educated citizenry, and such understanding, as Assistant Secretary Frankel said the other day, will strengthen the foreign affairs of this Nation. As a former college president I can testify from experience that adding non-Western or other area courses to the undergraduate curriculum is neither easy nor inexpensive. It is much more complicated than adding a course here and a few credits there. It sometimes involves the reeducation of the faculty so that it makes use of new materials in present courses. Often it involves collaboration with other institutions—and for this reason I suggest that the phrase "or combinations of institutions" be included in the first sentence of section 4(a), as it is in section 3(a).

Strengthening the undergraduate programs is also important to the eventual strengthening of the graduate advanced study centers because some head start could then be made on the mastery of some of the difficult languages, which are rarely taught now on the undergraduate level.

The strengthened undergraduate programs will provide better prepared graduates and eventually will strengthen the corps of expertise needed by our universities and colleges and by Government and industry.

But it will also be, for most of those affected, a strengthening of their own liberal education and an increase in their intellectual range. Not the least educational effect of studying other cultures is the new perspectives and insights furnished into our own.

The projects and activities described in section 4(a) and the conditions set forth in 4(b) seem to me to be sound and conducive to solving the problems which small universities and undergraduate colleges now have in improving their international studies curriculum. There is, however, one need which is not specifically mentioned which I feel is so important that I would like to see it on the list in section 4(a). I refer to the building up of library resources for both teaching and research. One has only to think what books, periodicals, maps, audiovisual aids, etc., would be needed by a college that wanted to add only a single new program of, say, Asian or Slavic studies to its curriculum to see immediately what a financial burden it would be, and how futile it would be to try to hire a new faculty member in this field without library support. The international component of undergraduate education in this country has been notoriously weak—and this means that undergraduate libraries have been making few accessions in this area. A new international studies program would mean starting practically from scratch in many institutions. It is imperative therefore that the grants under the undergraduate section of the bill make possible the financing of library acquisitions needed to support the new programs.

The amendments to title VI of the National Defense Education Act included in this bill are all welcome and are based on the experience of conscientious administration of the provisions set down in 1958 when the act was passed. In view of the present realization that international understanding should become a major educational objective of the Nation's institutions of higher education, the limitation imposed by the present text must be removed. Areas whose languages are not in short supply are nevertheless important for us to study. Western Europe, for instance, might well be said to be the great neglected area in our educational system—it is the one major cultural region which is not now generally studied with the concerted multidisciplinary approach which characterizes other area studies. We have the illusion that we are familiar with Europe because the European tradition appears in so much of our liberal arts programs as part of our own heritage, but we may be living in the past—the new Europe now emerging will well repay study as a unitary cultural region, using the methods which work in other area studies.

The lifting of the matching restriction of 50 percent will make it possible for centers to be established in universities that have good intellectual potential but which cannot afford half the cost.

Finally, the provision of direct institutional grants will make for greater flexibility as well as for increased strength in programs and planning.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to three statements that have been sent to me which I attach as appendices to this statement. Two of them are from the chairmen of joint ACLS–SSRC committees: Prof. John M. Thompson, chairman of the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies, and Dr. John Pope, chairman of the Joint Committee on Asian Studies. The third is from Prof. L. A. Peter Gosling, secretary of the Association for Asian Studies, a constituent society of the ACLS. All three were written at my request to supply me with informed opinions concerning this bill and its relevance to the educational needs of particular fields of study and research. They do so in a way so succinct and authoritative that I feel they should be put into the record as they stand.

Gentlemen, I thank you for your consideration. I shall be glad to try to answer any questions that you may have.

Statement by Prof. John M. Thompson, Chairman, Joint Committee on Slavic Studies—A Committee of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies

(Attachment to statement by Frederick Burkhardt, President, American Council of Learned Societies, before the Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in support of H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966)

From modest beginnings in the period before World War II, the field of Slavic and East European studies has expanded remarkably in the two decades since 1945. Several thousand able young Americans have been trained as specialists in the languages, histories, and societies of Russia and Eastern Europe. A growing volume of thorough and objective research has greatly increased our knowledge and understanding of these countries and peoples. In this effort universities, private foundations, and the Government have cooperated fully, and together have made a substantial contribution to American education and scholarship.

While much has been accomplished, much remains to be done. To insure a continuing supply of the specialists required for teaching, research, Government work, and international service, additional fellowships are needed to attract talented young Americans into a training program which, because of the difficulty of the languages involved and because of the multidisciplinary approach required, demands a longer period of study than that called for by graduate training in more traditional fields. A small amount of fellowship support is also needed to encourage young students and promising scholars from Asia, Africa, and Latin America to undertake basic training on Russian and Eastern Europe in American graduate centers on these areas. Opportunities for fruitful exchange relationships with Russia and Eastern Europe, particularly with the latter, and for international conferences in this field also deserve assistance.

The quality of American research on the Slavic world and Eastern Europe has been remarkably high. To retain that level and to expand scholarly study of these areas, funds are required for faculty research and travel, for a coordinated and increased program of library acquisitions, particularly in the face of a rapidly growing volume of publications in and about those countries, and for more sophisticated and highly developed bibliographic guides, references, indexes, reproduction services, documentation centers, and translating services. A major challenge in research is the stimulation and encouragement of comparative Communist studies, in which the development and operation of Communist societies and of the Communist movement in different settings and cultures, including Asia and Latin America, are examined comparatively.

Much of the achievement of the postwar period has been concentrated in the study of Russia and the Soviet Union; consequently the nurturing and expansion of East European studies, both in the comparative sense noted above and in language, history, and culture, is an important task for the future.

Moreover, the greatest strides in this field have been made in graduate training and research. Although some colleges and schools now teach about the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, most students and the majority of Americans are woefully ignorant concerning this important part of the world. Much more needs to be done to encourage study of the Russian language (now an important language of science) and of the histories and systems of these Communist societies in our colleges and schools, as part of a larger effort to acquaint our students and citizens with all non-Western societies. Thus, under section 4a of the International Education Act of 1966 programs should be developed to insure that every graduate of an American college has some basic knowledge about communism and about Russia and Eastern Europe.

Finally, the proposed amendments to title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 will unquestionably strengthen the existing centers of Slavic and East European studies. Moreover, in view of the excellent record of the universities in developing outstanding centers for the study of Russia and Eastern Europe, we strongly endorse section 3 of the International Education Act of 1966, which provides for direct institutional grants to support many of the major needs of centers for advanced international studies.

Statement by Dr. John A. Pope, Chairman, Joint Committee on Asian Studies—A Committee of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies

(Attachment to statement by Frederick Burkhardt, president, American Council of Learned Societies, before the Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in support of H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966)

The ACLS–SSRC Committee on Asian Studies is in a position to review periodically the major problems and prospects of the field of Asian studies. We have been encouraged by the increase in the number of trained specialists and the quality of American scholarship on Asia. However, we have become increasingly aware that growth has not been adequate to make a substantial impact on higher education nor to supply the needs of government.

The committee has observed the wide dispersal of Asian studies away from the major training and research centers to more than 100 smaller universities and colleges. We have been concerned that the shortage of funds in these smaller institutions has prevented them from building minimum international studies programs, with the result that Asian specialists and other international faculty have been unable to teach in their area of major competence. The frustration among these isolated specialists is very great because they are not able to practice in their particular field and are not able easily to obtain opportunities to work overseas. They represent one of the greatest wasted educational assets in the Nation today.

We have also observed the difficulty in implementing the recommendations of the Gardner report to make the resources of the universities more useful to AID. Even the major centers of Asian studies have barely enough faculty to staff their professional training programs, and therefore cannot release faculty for extended periods of service with a Government agency. In the smaller centers of Asian studies the prolonged absence of a single staff member can seriously displace an effort to introduce international studies into the curriculum.

Even in those cases when the faculty member can free himself of teaching duties, there is increasing difficulty in obtaining adequate funds to support his field research. In our estimate only half of the trained specialists seeking research support are able to obtain funds, and even then it often involves financial sacrifice. It is virtually impossible for a faculty member who wishes to retrain in Asian studies to find financial support. Most of the Government funds available are so encumbered with stipulations limiting travel allowances that the average faculty member cannot afford to accept a Government grant.

The development of Asian studies in the United States over the past 20 years has been remarkable and today American scholarship on Asia is outstanding. However, demand has exceeded supply and the increasing pressure on the limited resources available has curtailed the impact of American expertise on Asia so that it is not able to make a major impact on American education at all levels, and is not able to contribute to Government substantially. The passage of the International Education Act would facilitate the rapid growth of Asian studies which is necessary to provide a significant international component to higher education and supply specialists for Government service at home and overseas.

Statement by Prof. L. A. Peter Gosling, Secretary, Association for Asian Studies

(Attachment to statement by Frederick Burkhardt, president, American Council of Learned Societies, before the Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in support of H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966)

Despite significant investment by foundations and by the U.S. Government under the National Defense Education Act, the shortage of trained personnel in the field of Asian studies is as great now as anytime over the past 15 years. Even though membership of the Association for Asian Studies has doubled in the past 5 years to more than 3,400, there are unfulfilled demands for trained specialists on all parts of Asia. I would estimate that the number of trained Asian specialists should be immediately increased by more than 100 percent to fill current needs.

The main shortages exist in Government agencies and in smaller universities and colleges. In addition there are critical shortages of trained specialists in certain disciplines even in the major university centers and specialized research agencies. Because of the lack of stress on language training in economics, sociology and psychology there is a severe shortage of specialists in these fields with serious implications for our comprehension of the most critical problems in Asia today.

The proposed International Education Act can be of substantial help in overcoming the shortage of Asian specialists. It would permit the creation of new training programs in language and international studies in institutions not able to qualify under the current National Defense Education Act title VI stipulations. It would increase the resources available for training faculty specialists, both in this country and abroad. It would facilitate the "internationalization" of the curriculum at the undergraduate level which is important not only for recruitment of some students into professional training for international service, but also for insuring that every student is acquainted with a culture different from his own as a critical part of his liberal education. A relatively small investment in adding an international component to the undergraduate curriculum can pay massive dividends in the subsequent addition of international studies in secondary education and the creation of an informed and involved public.

Increased support of the existing graduate centers for advanced international studies will help expand training programs for specialists in the critical disciplines of economics, sociology, and psychology. It would permit the graduate centers to increase staff in order to undertake more research associated with the needs of AID and other Government agencies and would permit more specialists from these centers to spend time on Government or private research assignments overseas without limiting the effectiveness of training programs. In addition, these major training centers would be able to establish effective joint programs with foreign institutions and implement effective exchange programs.

The Association for Asian Studies is vitally concerned with the proposed International Education Act and is eager to be of any help possible in providing information about Asian studies, its current problems and future potential.

Testimony in Support of H.R. 12452 by Claude S. Phillips, Ph. D., Director, Institute of International and Area Studies, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Mich., April 4, 1966

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Western Michigan University, located in Kalamazoo, was created by legislative action in 1903 as Western State Normal College. Since then it has experienced a steady growth and a succession of name changes, finally becoming Western Michigan University in 1957. It is now fourth in Michigan in number of students and diversity of academic programs. The university has more than 16,000 students registered in 6 schools: Liberal Arts and Sciences; General Studies; Applied Arts and Sciences; Education; Business; and Graduate Studies. Degrees granted include the Bachelors of Arts, Business Administration, Music, Science, and Science in Engineering; the Masters of Arts, Business Administration and Music; and the Specialist in Education (a 6-year degree). Beginning in the fall of 1966, the Ph. D. will be granted in Chemistry and Sociology, and the Ed. D. in Science Education and Educational Administration.

Student enrollment has doubled in the last 6 years, from 8,300 in 1959 to 16,100 in 1965, making Western Michigan University the fastest growing institution of higher education in Michigan and one of the fastest growing in the Nation. It has a faculty of over 800. As might be expected, the university is quite active in the preparation of public school teachers and administrators. In fact, it was fifth in the Nation in the number of certified teachers produced last year, and it has awarded one or more degrees to 20 percent of all practicing school administrators in Michigan. The university is now in the top 100 in the Nation which supplied the undergraduate training of present college and university professors.

The university has also built strength in a number of other areas, not the least of which is in international studies. In fact, on January 17, 1966, Western Michigan University won the award for distinguished service in international education sponsored by the Institute of International Education and the Reader's Digest Foundation. The citation accompanying the award mentioned specifically the university's "farsighted emphasis on student and faculty international exchange, the complexity and diversity of its academic programs in international education, and its firm commitment to expand these efforts."

THE COMMITMENT TO INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

In the mid-1950's a great many people on this campus became acutely aware of the fact that our educational program was so centered on Western civilization that our students were learning of the total world of mankind only by accident. Our offerings included dozens of courses dealing with Western Europe and the United States, but only a spotty and haphazard listing of courses that dealt with Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America, and almost nothing on the Middle East and Africa. Our so-called general studies in social science (Western civilization, man, and society) were openly western-centered. Departmental offerings which might have taken a world focus (international relations, comparative economic systems) were largely limited to the big powers, and there were no courses in anthropology at all.

The awareness that something was wrong was not entirely stimulated by a rejection of ethnocentricism. It was equally informed by the changing concept of the educated man which was stirring the intellectual community. No longer could a man be educated whose intellectual horizon was limited to a single culture. World War II, the rise of the new nationalisms, and the emergence of the third world not only demonstrated the falseness of ethnocentricism, they even raised the pragmatic question of whether any culture, including that of the West, could survive in ignorance of others. Practical as well as intellectual doubts came to challenge the existence of a formalized structure in education which automatically ignored most of mankind.

These doubts, of course, swept across many campuses, and some colleges and universities at least attempted to correct the imbalance. Western Michigan University has undoubtedly made one of the most dramatic, and drastic, efforts along this line of any middle-sized university. Perhaps more amazing, and truly indicative of the nature of the commitment, is the fact that these changes have occurred chiefly in the past 7 years.

In 1958, the vice president for academic affairs, Dr. Russell Seibert, appointed a faculty committee to evaluate the place of international studies in the total curriculum. The committee spent 9 months of intensive study and reported to Vice President Seibert in the spring of 1959 that:

1. Only a small fraction of students got any training outside of Western civilization;

2. For those students who did get some non-western training, it was largely a matter of accident; i.e., there were no planned programs to make this possible; and

3. A few courses dealing with the non-Western World were scattered among departments but no effort was made to give the breadth of training on any non-western area of the world as was given on Western Europe and the United States.

The committee concluded that this was indeed an intolerable situation for an institution whose purpose was universal knowledge. It recommended that positive steps be taken to correct the condition and suggested the following actions:

1. The creation of an interdisciplinary, general education, social science course on the nonwestern world to serve as an elective alternative to Western civilization or man and society;

2. The creation of interdisciplinary area programs to permit students to concentrate on certain areas by taking courses from numerous departments;

3. A deliberate policy, in future hirings, of seeking staff with area training on various parts of the world; and

4. The creation of a formal structure to carry out the foregoing. (This was the sensitive recommendation, for professors and administrators alike seem by nature to be distrustful of another organization. Yet on this issue hinged the nature of the real commitment.)

Vice President Seibert not only agreed with the findings, he accepted the need for, and the urgency of, the recommendations, and so reported to President Paul Sangren. In June 1959, the president formally created the Institute of Regional Studies, since renamed the Institute of International and Area Studies. This was not an arbitrary decision, however, for it was clearly supported as well by the dean of liberal arts and sciences, the heads of the six departments involved (economics, geography, history, philosophy and religion, political science, and sociology and anthropology) and probably 75 percent of the faculty from these departments. The establishment of the Institute, therefore, was a positive act with widespread support, an indication of the intellectual ferment which existed and which recognized that something must be done.

The institute began to function immediately, setting up committees to resolve specific problems, planning a number of different programs, and generally attempting to create a community of scholars able to deal with the whole world of mankind. A major impetus in these directions occurred in February 1960, when the Carnegie Corp. of New York awarded the institute $144,000 to be used in a number of ways: course planning, foreign travel and research for the faculty, the use of numerous eminent area-specialists in special faculty seminars, special student assemblies dealing with various parts of the developing world, and library improvement. The Carnegie grant was the seed money which helped to guarantee the success of the new venture. People and events on the campus, however, were the indispensable cause. The commitment made in 1959, for example, was actually strengthened in 1961 when Dr. James W. Miller became president of the university, for he has taken an unusual interest in furthering the objectives of international and area studies.

DEVELOPMENTS IN INTERNATIONAL AND AREA STUDIES: 1959–66

The following will demonstrate that the university commitment to a world perspective in education was taken with seriousness. From the moment the commitment was made, the faculty and administration have taken giant strides to implement it. The nature, extent and objectives of the Institute of International and Area Studies are indicated in the following sections.

Institute programs in general studies

In 1960 a general, interdisciplinary course entitled "Introduction to the Non-Western World" was introduced. Offered at the freshman-sophomore level, it was an elective alternative to one semester of Western civilization or man and society. Enrollment averaged about 150 per term or 300 per year until 1964, when it began to expand. By this time, a special blue ribbon committee was examining our total concept of general education. The committee's report and recommendations were accepted by the faculty senate of the university and included the following significant developments for social science education.

1. General studies courses should be offered at the junior-senior level as well as the freshman-sophomore level.

2. Students must study both Western civilization and man and society at the lower-class level.

3. All students seeking a baccalaureate degree must take at least one course devoted exclusively to the non-Western World, such course or courses to be offered at the upper level.

Since these requirements involve a student body of over 16,000, it is readily apparent that the university is now embarking on a major new venture, both in mass education and in the concept of the educated person in social science. It is our intention that no undergraduate, regardless of vocational objective, will be able to escape at least one course devoted wholly to the developing areas. The magnitude of this undertaking is revealed by the fact that we will have to enroll 5,000 juniors per year in introduction to the non-Western World or in a few selected alternatives which cover the same subject. While the commitment is present, we have not yet been able to obtain the funds to guarantee its success by the target date of 1967.

A further effort to complement studies on Western civilization was initiated in 1964 when the school of general studies introduced non-Western arts and ideas as a part of the humanities series. The course was taught by two professors for the first three terms and in the winter term of 1966 a third professor was added. China and India are now treated in the course and other areas will be added as quickly as competent staff can be obtained.

Area studies

Between 1960 and 1963 four undergraduate programs were established in the following areas: African studies, Asian studies, Latin American studies, and Slavic studies. Students majoring in traditional social sciences and humanities are encouraged to minor in area studies. Those planning to teach may now be certified in area studies as a result of specific action taken by the Michigan State Board of Education. The impact of these programs is demonstrated by the fact that during the current term alone (winter 1966) there are 1,200 students enrolled in various advanced courses in international and area studies.

The M.A. program

On February 3, 1966, the graduate council approved the master of arts program in International and area studies. This program is not designed to compete with the usual 2-year M.A. degree in area studies. Rather, it is a 1-year program designed to give a world perspective to those students who have a traditional social science background, with its focus in Western civilization. It is created primarily for those who plan to teach in high schools or community colleges and others who desire the M.A. but do not plan to take higher graduate work.

The Ph. D. program

The department of sociology and anthropology has now estabilshed a doctoral program in sociology. The three fields of specialization are social problems, the sociology of education, and comparative social organization. These concentrations may be in the tradtional mold or they may be offered in cooperation with the Institute of International and Area Studies. The curriculum of the latter is interdisciplinary, that is, the student must not only pass examinations in sociology but must also demonstrate proficiency in other social science disciplines dealing with the developing areas as well. Other departments are also planning to offer the Ph. D. and have included specialization in the developing areas in their plans. This stems from the fact that each of the social science departments has built a strong staff in international and area studies. It is only logical that this strength be capitalized on in future planning.

Other developments

Besides a steady increase in both area staff and offerings, each area has developed some new programs. Special summer seminars for both graduate and undergraduate students have been conducted in India and Japan (1963), Kenya (1965) and Yugoslavia (1965). The Kenya program was supported entirely by student fees, while the others had the support of Public Law 480 funds. The Yugoslav program will be repeated during the summer of 1966. Plans are to repeat the India-Japan program in 1967 and the Kenya program in 1967 or 1968. A grant from the National Science Foundation will permit three faculty members and six selected students to conduct research on social change in Guatemala during the summers of 1966 and 1967. A Peace Corps training program for Nigeria was conducted during the summer of 1965. Since then, a 5-year degree program for Peace Corps service has been instituted by the university and the Peace Corps whereby 1 year of academic credit may be earned by Peace Corps service and training.

Faculty travel, research, and publications of significance to international and area studies have expanded rapidly since 1960. In fact, faculty identified with the Institute probably constitute the single most productive group on campus. To stimulate further research, the university has recently established a series of research grants and has liberalized its sabbatical policy. Staff identified with the institute have benefited greatly from these innovations. The institute, furthermore, has now established a monograph series on cultural change and published its first monograph in 1965. Two more manuscripts are expected shortly and others will be published as they are ready.

While international studies has been centered in the Institute of International and Area Studies, the whole university has been caught up in the programs. In 1959 there were 21 faculty members in liberal arts involved in international and area studies; today there are 43 and in the fall term this year there will be over 50. There are almost 200 foreign students on the campus. The school of education has conducted special programs for foreign school administrators. The school of applied arts and sciences is helping to build a technical college in Ibadan, Nigeria, under contract with the Agency for International Development. Visiting foreign professionships, special foreign lecture programs, and foreign film and art programs have been established. In the fullest sense, the response on this campus has revolutionized the curriculum, changed the nature of the faculty in the social sciences and humanities, and added a wholly new dimension to educational objectives. Furthermore, these changes have come without weakening the study of our own great civilization. Indeed, the nature of western civilization has been sharpened as the whole world has become the focus of education.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966 TO WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

The developments described above do no more than lay a foundation. Except for the Carnegie Corp. grant, the costs for our programs in international and area studies have come overwhelmingly from normal operating funds. This runs to about $200,000 per year in salaries alone related strictly to the teaching of courses in international and area studies. Administrative, research, sabbatical, travel and maintenance expenses increase this sum considerably. We are now contributing to international studies at the limits of our resources. Gradual growth, of course, will continue, but we are now at a "take-off" stage which demands outside assistance.

The next stages are relatively more expensive than those completed to date but will open vast new opportunities for students at every level of college and graduate education. The proposed act would make it possible for us to take the next steps almost immediately. The fruition of our planning would complete a revolution in educational objectives on this campus which would make the whole world of man the focus of education. The proposed act, in fact, seems almost deliberately designed to permit us to capitalize on the foundations we have already laid.

Under section 3 of the proposed act, Western Michigan University could establish graduate centers which would provide "national and international resources for research and training in international studies." A considerable amount of research on transitional societies is already occurring and graduate strength is developing in the following areas: Japan-Korea, the Philippines, Yugoslavia, Central America and Tropical Africa. Numerous faculty members have conducted research in these areas, but we are hampered in capitalizing on their research.

1. We need more specialized library resources, not only to help the scholars keep abreast of current developments but in order to provide graduate students with the basic materials they need to study before carrying out their field research.

2. We need funds to permit faculty members to "write-up" their research findings after they have been abroad, and to prepare new research projects before going abroad.

3. We need funds to permit graduate faculty to maintain personal travel contact with the area of their concern more frequently than their sabbaticals will permit.

4. We need scholarships to permit graduate students in international and area studies to travel and do research in the country of their focus for their master's theses and doctoral dissertations.

5. We need language teachers to train our graduate students in the language necessary for their foreign research.

6. We need visiting scholars, foreign and domestic, on rotating professorships, not only to broaden student contacts and awareness, but to establish and maintain the professorial dialog necessary to scholarly growth.

7. We need librarians, bibliographers, and catalogers with special skills in our areas of focus.

8. We need new staff at the advanced graduate level to fill in gaps in our present offerings and to establish a staff of many specialties for each area.

We do not propose to cover the whole world in our graduate specialization, but to build on areas of strength which we have already developed. But we need the assistance referred to above even to do that. Without this sort of help, we will not be able to train graduate students as they must be trained. Without outside assistance, we can only build slowly over the next number of years. With help, however, we have the foundation for, and we are committed to, the building of graduate programs of excellence in international and area studies.

Under section 4 of the proposed act, this university would be able to add new and meaningful aspects to an undergraduate program which already has considerable strength. We would be able to give undergraduate teachers the invaluable experience of travel and study in the areas about which they teach. This would be especially appropriate for some good teachers in various courses with an international focus who are not, and do not aspire to be, research scholars. Consequently, they have found it difficult to obtain the numerous foreign grants which are usually reserved for scholarly research. Yet there is no gainsaying the added dimension, the new presence, which comes merely from travel and study in foreign areas. It seems to us that every instructor who teaches a course with international content ought to have the chance, ought in fact to be expected, to travel and study occasionally in foreign areas. Only by such travel can the rest of the world become alive and meaningful to him to the extent that he can make it live for his students.

We would be able, furthermore, to:

1. Expand our course offerings in non-Western arts and ideas;
2. Expand our foreign language offerings;
3. Add new, and needed, faculty to our social science course on the non-Western World;
4. Establish work-study-travel programs for selected outstanding students; and
5. Establish visting professorships for undergraduate courses in international and area studies.

In contrast to our graduate programs, we do plan to cover the world in our undergraduate programs. Since the undergraduate courses will involve most students in their first concentrated look at cultures outside of Western civilization, we have sensed the need of a grand sweep at this level. After all, if one is going to look for the first time at other cultures of man, there is no scientific justification for picking one and ignoring the others. The cultures of the Far East are as distinct from those of the Middle East and Tropical Africa as each is from Europe. Studies in depth are essential at the graduate level, but the grand panorama of the setting of each culture is essential at the undergraduate level. With the support envisioned under section 4 of the proposed act, this university will have an undergraduate program in international studies of the very highest quality.

CONCLUSION

Western Michigan University has joined many other universities in deliberate efforts to prepare Americans to respond to our new involvement in world affairs. We have already built a foundation in international studies which demonstrates our commitment to the congressional "Findings and Declarations" set forth in section 2 of the proposed International Education Act of 1966. We have channeled portions of our limited budget into areas of new social needs. We accept the obligation which stems from the new awareness that the educated man must know the world in which he lives. We acknowledge the fact that in a democracy only informed citizens can supply their government with the support and understanding necessary to cope with the complex and frightening world we have created. We have no difficulty in recognizing the intellectual and moral obligation of a university in the advancement of knowledge and understanding about the cultures of man.

Nevertheless, we cannot educate for tomorrow with yesterday's means, New programs have to be added to the already complex activities of the "multi-versity;" rarely can they replace old ones. This stems from the fact that the diverse functions of the university are responses to real social needs. These needs are basically local and domestic and there is no reason to expect them to yield to needs which are international. Furthermore, schools such as Western Michigan University operate overwhelmingly on funds supplied by the legislature, and State legislatures understandably have little concern for foreign affairs.

New obligations require new resources. The new obligation we face is national in scope. It is Americans we must train, not only Michiganders; it is an American society which must accommodate to the world. It does not seem to us unreasonable, therefore, for the Government of the United States to help universities fulfill their national obligations. We support the proposed International Education Act of 1966.

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution calling upon the National Science Foundation to make a study of the scientific resources which this country possesses in order that a plan may be developed by which there will be an orderly and equitable distribution of Federal research and development funds on a regional basis.

From time to time, extravagant remarks have been made which allege that the Midwest is now in the process of becoming a vast intellectual wasteland. In point of fact, the fine educational institutions of Iowa and its surrounding midwestern neighboring States have produced an exceptionally high number of research and development Ph. D.'s. Over the past years, however, a disproportionate share of Federal research and development funds have been diverted to the east and west coast and areas in the Southwest.

I have joined with a number of other midwestern Congressmen in supporting, through the formation of a midwestern resources group, an association designed to promote the scientific interest of our midwestern region. One of our first goals is to support the three midwestern sites under consideration for the BEV accelerator. These sites are located at Madison, Wis., Ann Arbor, Mich., and South Barrington, Ill.

My resolution, introduced today, proposes that a factual study be made by the National Science Foundation of the available scientific resources of this country, and from this study, the Foundation shall be authorized to present a plan to Congress for the more equitable geographic distribution of Federal research and development funds. Such orderly regional dispersion of Federal funds will, in my estimation, strengthen the scientific efforts of this Nation and contribute to a more balanced national scientific effort.

THE RIGHT RESPONSE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I note that the Christian Science Monitor is one of the many newspapers which has commented most favorably on the President's speech about the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The Monitor applauds the President because "he wisely avoided recrimination—and indeed any direct reference to French policy decisions" in his address on the importance of maintaining NATO.

> We understand the need to keep NATO abreast of the times—

The paper states, adding—

> above all, a way must be found of keeping intact the Atlantic ark built and launched in 1949. It still guarantees as nothing else the security and safety of those who first came abroad when the postwar storm was raging.

I know my colleagues will be interested in this review and analysis, and I offer it for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 25, 1966]

THE RIGHT RESPONSE

President Johnson's speech on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization struck the right note. Everybody knew that he was addressing President de Gaulle—or perhaps more accurately, the French people. Everybody knew Mr. Johnson's address was prompted by the French President's apparent determination to withdraw France at least from the integrated organization set up under the North Atlantic Treaty. Yet the President did not once mention Charles de Gaulle by name. He wisely avoided recrimination—and indeed any direct reference to French policy decisions.

Astutely, Mr. Johnson drew upon the remarks of French leaders 16 years ago to buttress the case he was making for the continued need for NATO and all that goes with it. He made it clear that neither the United States nor any of the other 13 members of NATO for whom he was speaking was going to take any initiative either to exclude France or to weaken the alliance.

There are intangibles that made this Atlantic community as natural and desirable a grouping as any in modern times. To the rest of us, France can never be left out of it.

Of course it is still not clear just how far President de Gaulle is prepared to go in his declared intent of freeing France from what he sees as the American protectorate established over Western Europe. Presumably he will stop short of the point to pass which would bring more hurt than help to France. Where that point is, depends—when it comes to decisionmaking in Paris—on the General's personal judgment. President Johnson eloquently pointed to the fallacy in the argument that NATO has done the job for which it was intended. It has freed Western Europe of the fear of armed attack or subversion from within. And therefore (some argue) it can be dismantled or simply allowed to lapse. That, in the President's view and in ours, is nonsense.

Nibbling away at NATO piecemeal cannot lead to the next great step forward in Europe, the healing of the wound that still keeps Germany divided and one part of the Continent fenced off from the other. We doubt sincerely whether General de Gaulle will be able to make a contribution to this healing by bolting from NATO ranks and seeking in isolation some kind of deal with the Kremlin when he visits Moscow in June. As President Johnson said, it is the strength of the Atlantic community—still most effectively expressed through NATO—"that offers such hope for the reconciliation of Western Europe with the people of Eastern Europe."

We understand the desire of all Western Europeans not to see their homelands treated by Americans as American protectorates. We understand the need to keep NATO abreast of the times. Both the desire and the need must be met. But above all, a way must be found of keeping intact the Atlantic ark built and launched in 1949. It still guarantees as nothing else the security and the safety of those who first came aboard when the postwar storm was raging.

BUREAU OF BUDGET PLACES ARBITRARY LIMIT ON WATERSHEDS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, many authoritative reports have been made here in the House of Representatives about our widening water shortage and mounting pollution problem.

And these ominous warnings of an imminent water crisis merit our concern and action.

The key to meeting future needs, we are told, is in the development of water management programs at the community level.

And this is what we are attempting to do in the Ninth Congressional District of Indiana—control and conserve our water resources at the local level. And it takes the effort of local, State, and Federal participants.

It is about the Federal level of responsibility that I wish to comment today.

Last session, Congress appropriated $5,721,000 to help finance the planning of small watershed projects during fiscal year 1966. These funds, matched with about $2.7 million from State and local sources, are to provide technical assistance to draft watershed projects.

Clearly, Congress intended that the Federal allocation be used in its entirety for the watershed planning program.

But the Bureau of the Budget has imposed a limit of no more than 100 watershed planning authorizations in fiscal year 1966. This restriction appears in budget for fiscal year 1967 on page 115, the agriculture separate of the Appendix to the Budget in the table entitled, "Main Workload Factors, 1966 Estimate."

If this limitation is not removed, the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, administrator of the watershed planning program, will be prevented from providing planning assistance for many worthwhile watershed projects across the country.

According to its latest count, the Soil Conservation Service has approved 90 requests for planning authorizations for fiscal year 1966. If the Budget Bureau limitation remains in force, only 10 more new projects will receive planning authorization between now and June 30, 1966.

Congress appropriation, however, appears to be adequate for as many as 130 watershed planning projects.

To complicate this critical situation even more, the Bureau of the Budget estimates for fiscal year 1967 propose to reduce the watershed planning authorizations to 50.

As a first step, I introduced on March 29, 1966, House Joint Resolution 995, expressing the intent of Congress in its watershed planning appropriation for fiscal year 1966. It is short and I would like to insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the intent of the Congress that the appropriations, in Public Law 89–316, of $5,721,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for small watershed investigations and planning (in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act) shall be expended as needed for the purposes for which the appropriation was made, and that it is the intent of the Congress that, to the extent consistent with the amount of such appropriation and with amounts available from previous fiscal years, no limitation shall be imposed on the number of watershed planning authorizations during fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

It should be noted, too, that the Soil Conservation Service now has 28 watershed planning requests which have met all requirements for authorization. These 28 projects are in 18 States and the congressional districts of 28 Members of the House of Representatives. Another 46 watershed planning projects are in various stages of development to meet the requirements for watershed planning funds.

The local planners, the persons who are demonstrating their concern over the conservation of water resources, have spent from 2 to 3 years working on these requirements.

If the Bureau of the Budget limitation remains in force, those who do not make the list of 100 will be told to wait until next year—or the next year—or the next.

Particularly if the fiscal year 1967 limitation of 50 authorizations remains in force.

I want to go on record as demanding the limitations imposed by the Bureau of the Budget, which I believe violate the intent of Congress, be removed.

I do not wish to tell the local leaders in my district that the project on which they have put in so much time and effort cannot be considered for another year or two.

Nor does any other Congressman, I am sure, who is concerned with the proper development of water conservation.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE SPACE AGE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, I was pleased to participate in a symposium on the "Implications of the Space Age," sponsored by the Michigan Federation of Business and Professional Women's Club and the Division of Continuing Education of Oakland University, Rochester, Mich. The following is an address that was given by Sister Mary Sheilia Crampton, PBVM, Presentation College, Aberdeen, S. Dak. Her comments, I feel, could be read with value by every individual, but particularly by those persons who see no wonder, joy, or beauty in the things of this world and our civilization:

SPIRITUALITY OF THINGS

There are two things for me to "what about" with you this afternoon:

1. What about things?
2. What about their spirituality?

Closely connected is man with the things surrounding him. His attitude toward things helps determine his attitude toward life and gives the tone to the kind of future he will pass on to those who come after.

Every man, no matter who he is, sets out on the three great quests: the quest for certainty, the quest for identity, the quest for the meaning of life and death; and in all these searches, man encounters persons and things. So what should be his attitude toward the things in his world?

In this age I think it is important to know things correctly—not to fear them, not to hold them in contempt, not to despise them.

Things: things like technology, computer learning and processing, TV education, programed instruction on tapes, motivational research advertising—all these things seem to reduce us today so that Gabriel Marcel says, "We live in a dehumanized society, a broken world where the supremacy of being over having has been reversed and man feels lost."

In the silence of today's nothingness, in the darkness of today's earth, into the abyss of today's emptiness, something new must stir; something must breathe out upon the waters of troubled contemporary society. Man must recapture his sense of mastery over things. Over the sullen nothingness of Nietzsche and Dr. Altizer's "God is dead"; over the dismal emptiness out of which John Paul Sartre shouts, "We are condemned to be free—our liberty is our slavery"; over the darkness of a soft world which crumbles to dust and does not come to life when breathed upon; over this ocean of bewildered human emptiness, there must breathe a new spirit of God, and I think there is.

Pope John XXIII, J. B. Phillips, Karl Rahner, Martin Marty, Teilhard Chardin, Ingmar Bergman, and somewhere, perhaps even here, a modern woman, who give back to man the honey-taste of victory, victory over things. For we who are women, to whom words like barren, bored, weary, imprisoned, unfulfilled, depersonalized, are not strangers, we must again give birth to understanding and a sense of magnitude. Here in America man has lost his sense of magnitude. The Greeks found man noble and exciting, and they viewed him as the center of the universe, but modern man does not seem able to view himself with awe; we no longer have tragedy, for tragedy in essence is the spectacle of a great man confronting his own finiteness and being punished for letting his reach exceed his grasp; and the emphasis is on the great man who has learned through suffering and who has been spiritually awakened, and part of this loss of magnitude lies in man's cringing before things, things which he himself created. And so it is up to women, it is through us that man must be born again, so to speak, in confidence and joy and triumph. This is how the material will be spiritualized. Not just sunsets, but rockets, too, are glory filled.

Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson both responded to the wonders of that powerful mechanical giant of their day—the train—but they did it in their respective ways. Walt bowed before it as to a god and addressed it with the title of, "O Great One." Emily looked at it and then whimsically, and I think a bit tenderly, wrote a poem for children about this big new toy, "I like to see it lap the miles and eat the valleys up." And therein lies the difference.

We as women have to see to it that a sense of balance is kept and that man does not grovel before the mechanical, but we have to like these great creations. It would be exciting to explore this topic further, but we do not have the time. Let me just say we need an Emily today.

In the best seller of 1965, Herzog, Saul Bellow makes the charge: Modern man is swamped with ideas, metaphysics, values, and surrounded by messy facts—all of them things. In such a world—the world of lunacy, violence, stupidity, and greed—I think the task of spirituality is to impart order, gentleness, brilliance, and graciousness and generosity to the world which needs them. If man finds his heart withered and dried up like grass, then he can breathe again only if he discovers the essential spirituality at the center of things.

Today we must all learn to live more intensely—this does not mean more anxiously—since so many things around us are impersonal. IBM cards, technological jobs, large groups, out-directed society, the playing of roles, the wearing of masks—all these and others tend to lead us away from personal relationships, so it becomes that much more imperative that personalness be restored to each. As women who do live personally, we ought to be terribly concerned about housing, wages, neighborhoods, art, community theaters, entertainment, education, and every other aspect of modern life which can be made more alive—more personal.

I sometimes think that the trouble is that women today do not feel at home in the present world. But I also know that if she is to impart realness and spirituality to this same world, she must go out from the familiar ground of her own life and penetrate into all these places where she does not really feel at home. She must discover the holiness and personality in all the mechanics and machinery and tools and things which by her nature she distrusts. Where there is no dimension of compassion—no dimension of the personal—she must implant it.

Just merely to live in the present has no immediate importance. There must be a vision, a dream, in everyday living and everyday action and this spiritual significance, vision, dream is found best when one knows and one feels—When one knows one's age and those in it * * *. Loves one's age and those in it. This is to interpenetrate the profane with the sacred so that God, the holy, the spiritual is present—present in structural steel, in computers, in the flame of a rocket, in the cruelties of guerrilla warfare, in the office of a tax consultant.

I think you should be terribly concerned if in your schools, the children whom you know are always drawing just trees and flowers and the things of nature and never being presented with the beautiful in the form of technical science and things made by man who has discovered what God knows and is telling us all about it. DNA and life in a test tube is no threat to God—it is exciting and children should be made aware of it.

In philosophy they state that being and good are convertible. Religion has nothing to add to realities except the awareness that God is there. It does not add a second story, a supernatural level; it is not the icing on the cake.

In the broadest sense, God is the ground of being—the cause of being—but the things themselves remain themselves possessing their own proper effects. All things in themselves are as scared as they are profane. The world and its concerns deserve to be celebrated simply because the world is good. We must learn to throw ourselves fearlessly into the crucible of the world for it is in the world that one meets Christ. This demands a clear vision so that our view of space and machinery and technology become impregnated with a sense of what they really are. We have to learn to care about the world, its things, and to plunge ourselves, as Chardin says, into them. We can't simply sit and say: these things are unlovely, lacking soul and beauty, for they don't. In structure, in order, in intricacy of detail and the overwhelming, almost mysterious power of operation—things can fill us with awe and let us respond feelingly to them.

Time and space today, as always, are two deep mysteries; and when we see or hear about conquering space and overcoming time, we ought to respond with triumphant joy, for we are very close to God and eternity.

Some today say, "God is dead," and I say, "God is living" and who decides which is myth and which is reality. What is it that alienates man from himself—the confession of God's presence in history or the suppression and repression of Him in our consciousness? How is it that people fall into absurdity and nonexistence—through knowledge of Him or through ignorance of Him?

We rarely learn the meaning of life by asking what is the meaning of life because usually the answer comes in the form of more questions—one thinks of Job, or of Faust, or of Yeats. We learn the meaning of life from living it with awareness and assuming a sense of responsibility for that portion of the world wherein we find ourselves. We face up to the events and the machines which are in our midst. We deal with the God we encounter in the things and the persons where we are. Machines no longer threaten us—we approach them with small but firm steps ready to wrest from them their innate sacredness.

Sacredness of things, however, is a structure of many levels so that the holiness and the thing may well be both realized and not realized.

Somehow or other modern woman must be willing to say and to mean with Wallace Stevens: the greatest poverty is not to live in a physical world. The physical put us in dialogue with our own times. Things are place-centered, and that is our delight if we are to discover their spirituality. Unless succeeding generations are to see us as moral and intellectual cowards, we must stop moaning and groaning and getting savagely angry as so many of our writers and poets and singers and artists do; and we must find a way to mean the words of Pope Paul VI, "We shall love our time, our civilization, our technical science, our art, our sport, our world." We must stop trying to squirm out of our world and take a leap, a plunge into it.

We must become makers ourselves. We must learn somehow by this plunge into to like the things around us. We have to somehow recognize, realize, know that to be human is all right—that things and discoveries are upright and good.

In the Eastern World they have a saying that everything is beautiful; but we in the Western World have made divisions into good and bad, ugly and beautiful. Maybe for a while we should change our way of thinking and come to the conclusion that the easterners are right—everything is beautiful.

We ought to try to find both mountains and billboards beautiful. As Sister Corita, IHM says, "Thank God for cityscapes; they have signs. Thank God for magazines; they have ads. Thank God for highways; they have words. Sunkist, cold clear well water, Del Monte Catsup makes meatballs sing." And so we read, and the ads and the signs and the world become infinitely rich and holy. Consider this ad, for instance—"When you're a homely little lamp, you have to have lots of personality and be very helpful * * * then people will take you home and love you." (Do your own meaning for this one.) We must, as she says, look for new wineskins.

Time, Look, Life are real and contemporary manuals of contemplation which, if common man learns to use rightly, will help him more and more see the profane as sacred.

To impart warmth and new atmosphere, to hold to a world of understanding, intuition, respect, sympathy, participation, devotion and love has always been considered woman's great contribution to the world. But today it is even more necessary that woman leave her compact world of home and fireplace and bring these qualities of warmth and tenderness to the open world of street and office. She must touch with cool, gentle fingers the machinery which surrounds her. She must hold lightly and firmly in her hand and her heart and her mind the power of technology and add to it the fineness of respect and the awe of reverence. Thus she will be true to the world entrusted to her by the men who spend a life carving it.

She must grasp the world cultivated and reformed by man and transform it with loving care and attention into a holy and sacred place. To acquire a sense of spiritual realities, a penetration of divine things, a feeling for life in Christ which endows with wonderful discernment and so makes for the full deliverance of liberty. God is near at hand to be touched, possessed, and held.

Surrounded by the realities of this world, living among things and in the society of others like herself, a woman must be active among them in thought, work, and love. It is in the world that she will find the divine—it is in the world that she will encounter the holy—in places, in things, and in persons.

This is her world and in this world she must actively engage herself in the work of transforming and humanizing a universe of things and men. She embraces everything—all things—since the temporal comes from God, goes to God and points to God. She loves them then as a way to God. Things have a meaning. They carry a call from on high. They are there to remind us of God and bring us nearer to Him.

We must love the temporal as servants. Detached and unafraid, we stand in the presence of rocket ships and IBM machines; and we have respect and a feeling of excitement and calmly we go about the task of putting these, our servants, to work.

Far from being tortured by the immensity of these things, we are elated. Small we may look beside those great communities of flame and power and strength, but we are not diminished. We view our technological society without any murmurs of lamentations, for these things stand immense and lovely. We make no meek adjustments but stand in their presence and respond not so much to their reality as to their transparency—a transparency that allows them to blaze with spirituality and the touch of God.

There is joy and splendor if we stand straight and tall and no longer feel contempt or fear. Let us be fascinated by the things of our 1966 world, and let us recognize in the secret of our hearts the great adventures of the minds which have worked on these things.

In conclusion, let me say that the true artist of the 20th century must strive toward realism; he must accept, but he must reject—the world is nothing—the world is everything—this is the contradictory and tireless cry of our century. At the very moment that one chooses to share, to enter into, to lose himself in his own time—then he asserts his own individuality and turns away from his time.

And so, if we learn to rightly value things, then we shall be free of them and no longer enslaved by them. If we learn to see them as they really are—possessing a dignity of their own—then we can accept or reject without breaking or sliding below them. Things will be things, and not the overwhelming monsters so many have found them. And when things become just things with their own identity and holiness, then man can move freely and simply and once again discover his own texture and magnitude.

If we can stand in the presence of things, no matter how powerful, full of light and not let them put us into darkness and let them make us more human and not dehuman, then the children of the next generation won't echo the words of Andy Warhol, today's top pop-op artist: "Russia wants everyone to think alike—they're doing it under communism. I want everyone to think alike. It's happening here all by itself without being under a strict government. Everybody looks alike and acts alike; we're getting more and more that way. I think everybody should be a machine. I think everybody should like everybody. Pop art is liking things. Liking things is like a machine because you do the same thing every time. You do it over and over again."

And they won't sing songs like this, the most popular song in our country for the past 3 months:

"He's a real nowhereman, sitting in his
nowhere land,
Making nowhere plans for nobody—
Doesn't have a point of view,
Knows not where he's going to."

A seeing of things as holy will not be the whole cure, but it will make a start.

PRESERVATION OF REDWOODS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hansen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as one of the persons who has been vocal in my concern for the preservation of the redwoods in California, I was particularly interested in a recent editorial in the Des Moines Register on this subject. I think it points up the concern and diminishing parochialism of the Midwest. Even though we are located 2,000 miles from these proposed national park areas, we do have a sense of historic and esthetic beauty. It is my hope that Congress will refuse to yield to the pressures of the big lumber interests and will take the necessary steps to preserve these priceless wonders.

The editorial said in part:

> When President Johnson recommended the creation of a Redwoods National Park in northern California recently, the proposal was applauded as an important victory for conservation groups that have been battling to save some of the remaining virgin stands of these magnificent trees.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The lumbering companies and some business organizations in the two California counties in which most of these redwood stands are located base their opposition strictly on economics. They contend that setting aside 90,000 acres of timberland in the area, as the conservation groups recommend, would destroy the economy of those two California counties. They argue that it would result in the loss of an annual payroll of $8 million for the area and a potential loss of nearly that much in tax revenues for the State and local governments.
>
> It is their contention that the recreation needs for the area are for facilities located near the ppoulation centers of California and not for large and relatively remote forests.
>
> We think they miss the point. The purpose is to preserve a bit of nature that is both spectacular and unique and which cannot be replaced once it is destroyed. The opposition arguments, it seems to us, are as outdated and unrealistic as they would be if they were being made against the creation of Yellowstone or Yosemite National Parks.

AMERICA'S NATURAL HERITAGE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the preservation of America's natural heritage has become a matter of vital concern to the Nation in recent years. This concern was emphasized recently by the President in a message to Congress in which he stated proposals to insure this preservation.

I recently received a creed from Troop 205 of the Boy Scouts in Silver Spring, Md., which I would like to commend to your attention. This creed contains the Boy Scout Outdoor Code. It is simple and basic, and could easily be adopted by every American:

> As an American, I will do my best to—
>
> Be clean in my outdoor manners. I will treat the outdoors as a heritage to be improved for our greater enjoyment. I will keep my trash and garbage out of America's waters, fields, woods, and roadways.
>
> Be careful with fire. I will prevent wildfire. I will build my fire in a safe place and be sure it is out before I leave.
>
> Be considerate in the outdoors. I will treat public and private property with respect. I will remember that use of the outdoors is a privilege I can lose by abuse.
>
> Be conservation minded. I will learn how to practice good conservation of soil, waters, forests, minerals, grasslands, and wildlife; and I will urge others to do the same. I will use sportsmanlike methods in all my outdoor activities.

PRESIDENT'S SKILL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Anderson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is the opinion of the Nashville Tennessean that President Johnson produced a masterpiece in his policy statement regarding NATO and the destructive tactics of President Charles de Gaulle of France.

> By stressing unity—

The newspaper points out—

> the President has done much to assure that the remaining NATO nations will draw closer together to form an effective defense unit without Mr. de Gaulle.

The paper adds:

> The President's stand undoubtedly will not be lost on the French people. Nor will his calm reaffirmation of NATO principles and his patient determination to guarantee Western Europe's defense be lost upon the rest of the free world.

I am convinced the editorial in full will be of much interest, and I insert it in the Record:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, Mar. 24, 1966]

President Shows Skill in De Gaulle Problem

For a man who has been accused of being weak in foreign relations, Mr. Johnson produced a masterpiece yesterday in his policy statement regarding NATO and the destructive tactics of French President de Gaulle.

Instead of reacting harshly and critically to Mr. de Gaulle's decision to pull France out of NATO and force American troops out of the country, President Johnson took the attitude of a scoutmaster dealing with a wayward Cub.

The other West European nations will continue to mold NATO into an effective fortress of defense, the President said. Any member may leave the fold at any time he chooses, but the door will remain open for him to return, and it was the President's hope that no member would long remain withdrawn from the mutual affairs and obligations of the alliance.

"A place of respect and responsibility will await any ally who decides to return to the common task," Mr. Johnson said.

Although handling Mr. de Gaulle gently—and not by name—the President warned that withdrawal of a member nation could erode the effectiveness of NATO to the detriment of the other nations.

"The mightiest arsenal in the world," he said, "will deter no aggressor who knows his victims are too divided to decide and too unready to respond. Collective action through NATO is the best assurance that war will be deterred in the Atlantic world."

Referring to Mr. de Gaulle's arguments that NATO has outlived its usefulness, Mr. Johnson conceded that NATO should adapt to the changing needs of the times. "But we believe just as firmly," he said, "that such change must be wrought by the member nations working with one another within the Alliance."

Mr. Johnson then hinted subtly of past disasters that have befallen Western Europe because of the failure to unite in common defense.

"Consultation, not isolation is the root to reform," said the President. "We must not forget in success and abundance the lessons we learned in danger and isolation: That whatever the issue, we share one common danger—division—and one safety—unity."

Many Americans have been greatly displeased by Mr. de Gaulle's efforts to reverse the progress that has been made during the 17 years of NATO's existence and by his apparent blindness to the lessons of history. As a result there has been sentiment favoring a reaction somewhat stronger than that which the President delivered.

Nothing could be gained by reacting in kind to Mr. de Gaulle's hostility, even though it is unlikely he will ever be led back through the open door.

By stressing unity, however, the President has done much to assure that the remaining NATO nations will draw closer together to form an effective defense unit without Mr. de Gaulle. And by keeping the door ajar, Mr. Johnson has made it easier for France to reenter the alliance after Mr. de Gaulle is gone.

The President's stand undoubtedly will not be lost on the French people. Nor will his calm reaffirmation of NATO principles and his patient determination to guarantee Western Europe's defense be lost upon the rest of the free world. Mr. Johnson clearly has crossed up the critics of his ability to deal with political affairs at the international level.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON PRACTICES WHAT HE PREACHES

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, is a realist and practical man who perhaps will go down in history as one of our greatest Presidents. Last week he displayed strong leadership and a realistic view toward Government spending by ordering Government agency heads to hold down spending in their areas. Some of our recently passed welfare programs should receive drastic cuts and others should be killed or postponed. The need for some of them has been lessened by our low employment rate and by the manpower needs in combat and supporting industry.

In face of the war in Vietnam, which will cost us between $12 and $15 billion this year, and the continued threat of more inflation, we must cut out nondefense spending until the crisis is over in southeast Asia.

I am proud of my President and I congratulate him for ordering his administration officers to reduce spending and to go slow on worthwhile, but costly, programs at this juncture in our Nation's history. I plan to vigorously join President Johnson in this endeavor. I include a news article from the April 2, 1966, edition of the Orlando Sentinel, Orlando, Fla.:

L.B.J. Pursues Drive To Reduce Spending

Washington.—President Johnson, continuing his personal campaign to reduce nonessential public and private spending as an anti-inflation measure, Friday directed the Cabinet to try to make more than $1 billion in Federal spending cuts in the next 3 months.

The President met with the Cabinet and agency heads to discuss ways of reducing Federal spending programs to check inflation and trim the rising deficit in the budget for the current fiscal year.

The fiscal 1966 budget deficit is now estimated at $6.4 billion, an increase of $1.1 billion over the figure anticipated when the budget was submitted to Congress 15 months ago. The increase is largely the result of the Vietnam war.

Robert H. Fleming, deputy White House press secretary, reported that the President urged department and agency heads to cut spending in every way possible in an effort to bring the deficit down to the original $5.3 billion by the end of this fiscal year on June 30.

Fleming said Johnson did not prescribe specific spending ceilings or amounts he wanted cut from the budget, but told the department and agency chiefs to follow the general guideline of "do what is necessary and not what is desirable."

Johnson ordered his Cabinet and independent agency administrator to bring to the meeting reports on potential spending cuts or deferments. Fleming said several officials reported to the President on possibilities for trimming their planned spending or postponing such capital outlays as construction projects.

Fleming also said the President warned department and agency heads to be extra careful to avoid the practice known as June buying. Johnson was referring to the practice of increasing spending, whether necessary or not, in June as the fiscal year is ending to get rid of unspent funds so they will not have to be turned back to the Treasury.

The President has been hinting for several days that an income tax boost might be necessary if inflation is not brought under control. He has undertaken a personal campaign to trim Federal expenditures and persuade business, labor, and consumers to join his anti-inflation drive by keeping prices and wages in line and avoiding unnecessary spending.

ANTIMISSILE AND CIVILIAN SHELTER PROGRAM NEEDED NOW FOR DEFENSE OF OUR COUNTRY AND ITS SURVIVAL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, a priority program for the defense of our Nation, a large one, which has been overlooked in recent years must now get some concrete consideration from the administration and the Congress. It is absolutely essential to our defense.

I refer to the antimissile and civilian defense shelter program. It is really a joint program, each part supporting the effectiveness of the other. Many people seem to feel that the proposed fall-out program is just a be kind to people program. In fact it is an integral part of a let our Nation survive program. This total and joint program the Joint Chiefs of Staff support and call vital.

A reason why antimissile weaponry is tied to fall-out shelters is that knocking down incoming weapons where fall-out shelters exist will, in fact, greatly prevent loss of life and enhance retaliatory measures. Its presence lets the enemy know we would in fact be able to retaliate; and we could do so effectively if the whole joint program is accepted. In the absence of the shelters our ability to retaliate would be greatly diminished.

President Johnson has made a strong move to cut nonessential spending in the Government, and now is the time to enact legislation providing for the defense of the Nation against nuclear attack. The absence of such a program endangers our country's survival. I repeat that it is not just a be kind to people program. Far from it.

The Russians are now in the process of establishing such a program, and we should not delay our efforts. I have introduced and supported legislation to establish a civilian defense shelter program for the last several years, and now my bill, H.R. 281, is pending in the House of Representatives to accomplish this important project. The Defense experts in our Government are solidly behind the shelter program and I know we need to do something about it now.

I include in the Congressional Record an editorial from the Orlando, Fla., Sentinel of April 2, 1966, calling for a real defense against a nuclear attack, including anti-missile and civilian shelter programs. In the absence of this our retaliatory power is greatly lessened. When it is accomplished we will cease to invite a sneak attack; or any attack for that matter.

United States: No Defense Against Missiles

Two Americans out of three believe the United States has a defense against nuclear missiles, according to opinion polls, and the grim fact is that the citizens of this great country are at this very moment utterly defenseless against Russia's mammoth missives of desolation which could come zooming in at 30 times the speed of sound.

The fact is, too, that this country could provide its nearly 200 million people with a fair amount of protection through an antimissile missile defense system, if the Nation were willing to pay the price of something like $30 billion,

The Joint Chiefs of Staff and defense experts in the Congress and in the armed services are urging an immediate start on production of the Nike–X antiballistic missile (ABM) system which would require 6 years or more to complete.

The Nike–X, a complete weapons system concept, makes use of the Nike-Zeus and the new lightning-fast and efficient Sprint missile developed here in Orlando by the Martin Co. These two solid propellant missiles would be backed up by powerful radar and near-instantaneous computers.

Those who would proceed at once with the construction of the Nike–X missile defense system would also start at once with construction of a giant civilian bomb-shelter program to protect our citizens from the inevitable nuclear fallout from our own defense missiles as well as from the attacking missiles which would be hit and exploded before they reach their targets.

The United States has not been asleep or negligent in developing an antimissile system. Work on the highly complex problem of intercepting incoming missiles has been going on for 10 years. And the Russians are known to be working on the problem too.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and his civilian experts believe we have one more year to work on research and development before we freeze the plans and start production. The timing is both delicate and dangerous. It could be that we will wait too long to start production, and on the other hand we could start too soon and find that our $30 billion defense system is obsolete and relatively worthless before it is completed.

Of course this country does have protection in its devastating strike-back capability, with its giant nuclear-tipped missiles securely ensconced in underground silos and standing at the ready in our nuclear submarines. The Defense Department relies heavily on our deterrent striking force for safety while pushing for the ultimate in an antimissile missile system.

But the Russians may beat us to an in-being missile defense system, and then our strike-back threat would have less deterrent value, and the Red Chinese may have a long-range missile before we get our defenses ready. Peking may not be easily deterred by our deadly missiles.

What to do and when to do it are awesome decisions which Mr. McNamara and the President must make, based on their own best information and calculations.

It is true perhaps that public opinion would force immediate construction of the Nike–X system, if the people realized fully that we now have no antimissile defense system. This could be good and it could be not so good.

THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946—A LANDMARK IN AMERICAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that a great man is rarely fully recognized or appreciated in his own time. I would not presume to judge the validity of this remark. But it is certainly true that the importance of certain events is often vague and uncertain when they occur and that their true import does not become fully realized until years later. To a considerable extent this is true of the Employment Act of 1946, the 20th anniversary of which was celebrated with many speeches and a festive dinner here in Washington in February of this year. How different when the bill was being conceived and passed.

The origins of the bill coincided, of course, with the closing months of World War II. This was a time when forward-looking statesmen, businessmen, and labor leaders were becoming very much concerned with the outlook for the Nation after the expected victory over Germany and Japan. The prospect of victory was already bright during 1944 and many in Congress and elsewhere in the Government and private life began turning their thoughts to peace and the readjustments that would be needed at that time. With few exceptions, there was great concern about potentially overwhelming, if not highly dangerous, unemployment in the immediate postwar period. The prospect of a demobilization of millions out of the armed services without engendering massive unemployment seemed incredibly remote. It was in this atmosphere that a small group of men, in and out of Congress, became convinced that it was the responsibility of the Federal Government to make sure that no such intolerable unemployment should occur. The postwar recession after World War I and above all the paralyzing unemployment of the 1930's were vivid in the memory of these men.

This view of the responsibility of the Government was already reflected in President Franklin Roosevelt's January 1944 state of the Union message to the Congress in which he outlined an economic bill of rights, the first point of which was: "the right of a useful and remunerative job in the industry, or or shops or farms of the Nation." It was amplified by Senator James Murray and then Senator Harry Truman, who in their subcommittee report to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, entitled "Legislation for Reconversion and Full Employment," wrote, on December 18, 1944:

> The right to a job is not self-enforcible. It can be translated into reality only through the joint action of the people of our country—business, labor, agriculture, and all groups—acting through the medium of their duly elected Government. In short, the so-called right to a job is a meaningless figure of speech unless our Government assumes responsibility for the expansion of our peacetime economy so that it will be capable of assuring full employment.

I do not intend here to go into the extended legislative history of this bill from 1944 till its passage and signature by President Truman on February 20, 1946. For those interested in this actually fascinating legislative process, I would commend the first-class study by Stephen K. Bailey, "Congress Makes a Law, the Story Behind the Employment Act of 1946." Suffice it to say that in the legislative process, the modifications in language, generally in terms of putting Government commitments in more general and less specific terms, made many of the original backers of the bill pessimistic as to the usefulness of the measure as finally enacted. Just taking the phrase "full employment" out of the bill seemed symptomatic of emasculation generally. On the other hand, there were those who considered even this bill as it passed a serious threat to the American people and their way of life. Thus the New York Herald Tribune on June 14, 1946, called this bill "perhaps the most serious threat to free enterprise and democracy with which the country has been confronted in the 170 years of its existence."

In general, however, it must be admitted that, at the actual time of the signing of the bill, there was remarkably little interest in it. Controversy as to the continuation or abandonment of price and wage controls occupied the attention of the Nation to a far greater degree. Editorial comment on the bill itself after it was signed was scanty. But as the machinery established by the bill, the Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, began to function, the importance of this economic Magna Carta became more and more widely recognized.

Some notice was taken of the act in 1956, its 10th anniversary, particularly in an anniversary volume issued by the National Planning Association entitled, "The Employment Act, Past and Future, a 10th Anniversary Symposium." Even more notice was taken this year as I mentioned at the outset of my remarks. It may be instructive to note a few of the comments made about the act 10 years ago, and this year, and see how the perspective of the years has brought about a change in our appreciation of this basic statute.

The 10th anniversary volume clearly demonstrates the bipartisan support of the Employment Act. At that date President Eisenhower wrote:

> It [the Employment Act of 1946] rightly establishes as the policy and responsibility of the Federal Government the promotion of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. It rightly enjoins us, furthermore, to pursue these goals by means that will foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare. That is a charter to which all Americans can wholeheartedly subscribe.

And on the same occasion, former President Truman wrote:

> There is almost no other piece of domestic legislation enacted while I was President to which I would attach equal significance. This legislation proclaimed a new responsibility of Government: namely, the promotion of conditions for employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking to work. The act was not only a milestone in the development of modern democratic government, but also it had a deep and, I believe, wholesome influence on the private economy. Businessmen, labor leaders, and consumers can now plan their activities with confidence that the Government will take action if a major downswing or inflationary pressure should develop.

A survey of leaders of business, agriculture, labor, and the professions made by the National Planning Association in 1956 showed that most of them were quite well satisfied with the act. Some felt that the Council of Economic Advisers should confer more frequently and regularly with various economic and political groups. The National Planning Association itself suggested, first, that each Economic Report of the President, called for by the Employment Act, should include long-range projections of a full employment economy, with possible alternatives; second, that the interrelationship between the budget and the Economic Report should be improved; and, third that the responsibility of the Joint Economic Committee should be broadened to include the overall examination of the budget and related Government economic programs.

What changes can we discern when we come up to the present, celebrating 20, instead of 10, years of the Employment Act? It is probably not farfetched to say that the act is more than twice as firmly entrenched in American law and in American economic thinking than it was 10 years ago. During the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, the Council of Economic Advisers has played a more vigorous and positive role than ever before. The success of the tax cuts of 1964 and 1965 in revitalizing the economy, tax cuts which were urged upon the President by the Council, even in the face of immediate budget deficits, did more than anything else, I believe, to convince the American public of the usefulness and beneficence of this law.

The latest decade, and probably especially the very most recent time, have accentuated certain problems which the President, the Congress, and their economic advisers have had to deal with within the framework of the Employment Act. One is the need to maintain a reasonable international balance of payments while pursuing the objectives of high-level employment and economic growth. A second is making sound adjustments to the rapid changes in technology, especially as related to automation, which have had a sharp impact on various kinds of employment. A third is integrating the goals of the Employment Act, "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power," with such other goals as combating poverty, improving the lot of racial minorities, clean air and water, and a healthier physical and social environment. Finally, the problem of maintaining stable prices at high levels of business activity has become perhaps the most urgent economic problem of the moment.

More than ever, these developments suggest the need for greater flexibility and speed in the policy decisions of the Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Economic Committee. As Walter Heller, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers from early 1961 to 1964, stated at the 20th anniversary symposium:

> Flexibility of mind, approach, and program are vital to the employment act's suc-

cess in a world of change and uncertainty. This requires willingness to shift or reverse gears, both in the basic direction of policy and in its fiscal-monetary, tax expenditure, consumption-investment and domestic-international emphasis. Doctrinaire adherence to consumption stimulus in the past 5 years would have poorly served our objectives of high growth, price stability, and international competitiveness. Doctrinaire adherence to investment stimulus today would poorly serve our current needs for price stability and our future needs for full employment. Flexibility of program calls for readiness to move taxes up as inflation pressures mount and down as demand ebbs, to tighten or loosen money as needed, or to shift between monetary and fiscal, general and selective measures in response to changes in the structure of our economic problem. And it calls for speed.

In closing, may I add a personal note. I was proud to be serving in the Senate of the United States when the Employment Act became law and am proud to be in the Congress now, able to testify as to its importance and effectiveness. I was glad to give my wholehearted support to the act as it was being considered in 1945 and passed in 1946. I recognized then, as I do now, that this is a vital and basic piece of legislation, a cornerstone in American political economy. I also recognize that it needs to be supplemented by such legislation as that providing for elimination of discrimination in employment because of age, sex, or race, legislation which I have vigorously sponsored during my tenure in the Congress. We must attack the problem of lack of adequate employment opportunity in whatever guise that problem presents itself. We cannot waste the most valuable of all resources, the human resource. But with vigor and foresight we can continue to do everything possible to create and maintain the employment opportunities which are necessary for a healthy and growing economy. And the Employment Act of 1946 is a fitting beacon to light our way along this course.

NATIONAL SOCIAL WORKERS MONTH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an observance, National Social Workers Month, now taking place in various ways throughout the country during March under the sponsorship of the National Association of Social Workers and its 167 chapters covering the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

This observance has particular importance this year because it is being used to bring home to the public the critical manpower shortage in social work—and the bottleneck existing in the available educational facilities for training of social workers. This is a matter of the deepest concern not only to overworked social workers but to practically every public and voluntary health and welfare agency in the country, and therefore, every citizen who wants to live in a community that is responsive to the needs of people.

The new report of the task force on social work education and manpower, just being issued, estimates that by 1970, just 4 years from now, the public agencies and services in this country for health, education, and welfare will require 100,000 new professional social workers. There are less than 50,000 in that rank today and the country's 60 accredited graduate schools of social work, at capacity load, are presently able to turn out only 3,000 more each year. The prospective famine in social work manpower promises to be equally great in impact, if not in numbers, among the voluntary agencies whose services are equally vital to the well-being of our communities.

Why does that rising famine in social work manpower exist? Partly it is because we are still a growing country with daily thousands of new heads to be counted—particularly among the old and the young—two groups heavily requiring social services. It is also because you, and I, and other members of this Congress have followed the lead of our President, and mounted from year to year new programs dictated by our awareness of the social and personal needs of our people and the devastating health and social problems which poison our society. I have particular pride in the part I could play in expanding research, facilities and services in relation to mental retardation and mental health and in the enactment of the Mental Retardation and Community Mental Health Centers Act. But we are all proud of the steps taken thus far in attacking poverty, in providing medical care for the aging under social security, in our child health programs, in strengthening our schools and colleges, in stimulating the building of new hospitals and health facilities, and all the other programs which represent our determination to achieve a better society, and hopefully the Great Society.

In enacting such measures we have usually been quite aware that they could not succeed without the skills and services of trained personnel. Therefore, we voted the higher education bill. We enacted the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act to aid the construction and rehabilitation of schools that train physicians, dentists, optometrists, pharmacists and podiatrists. We have voted to strengthen and extend the program of nursing education.

We also provided $3.5 million in grants to schools of social work last year to train some of the 21,000 child welfare workers who will be needed by 1970. We have enabled more social workers to get training through grants from the National Institute of Mental Health and the Veterans' Administration. But overall, we have not faced up to the need for expansion of social work education. To meet the social work manpower shortage, there is critical need for assistance in expanding the buildings and faculty for graduate schools. There is need for extending training for social welfare manpower down into the undergraduate level and for expansion of training programs within public agency settings.

When President Johnson returned from Honolulu, he was quoted in Time magazine as saying:

> For a President of the United States, no matter what his name, to sit down and discuss the nuts and bolts of reform, just like a social worker in Chicago, is unprecedented.

I hope this Congress will not overlook the fact that unless social work education in this country is given the assistance it needs, Chicago, and every other city, is going to be desperately lacking in social workers to bring neighborhood leaders together to reform their environment, to provide for homeless, neglected, or abused children, to work with groups of unmotivated young people, to assist retired people to work out their financial problems and a different way of living, to make up the professional team in the community mental health center, to help strengthen family life.

The proof that social workers are needed is in the demand for their skills in the wide variety of programs and services where they are now operating. In thousands of agencies the search for qualified social work personnel is at constant fever pitch and the turnover of workers, pirated from one agency to another, represents a serious waste of funds and effort.

I would urge that Members of Congress look into the social work manpower and education needs in their own States during this National Social Workers Month. You will probably find easy evidence that your agencies and training facilities are suffering. Some States, like my own, still do not possess a graduate school of social work but depend on schools in other States to supply their professional social work manpower.

We shall wait to hear what the administration recommends for legislation in view of its own task force report. Certainly, this is an area in which we can no longer elect to sit it out and hope that somehow the social workers the country needs will spring to life full grown and fully trained.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Gilbert (at the request of Mr. Rosenthal) for April 4 and 5, on account of Jewish holiday.

To Mr. Farbstein (at the request of Mr. Rosenthal), for April 4 and 5, on account of Jewish holiday.

To Mr. Multer (at the request of Mr. Rosenthal), for April 4 and 5, on account of Jewish holiday.

To Mr. Celler (at the request of Mr. Rosenthal), for April 4 and 5, on account of Jewish holiday.

To Mr. Pepper (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. Hagan of Georgia (at the request of Mr. Karsten), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. Reinecke (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. Flynt (at the request of Mr. Stephens), on account of official business.

To Mr. Wolff (at the request of Mr. Rosenthal), for April 4 and 5, on account of Jewish holiday.

To Mr. Tenzer (at the request of Mr. Rosenthal), for April 4, 5, and 6, on account of Jewish holiday.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Edmondson), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Feighan (at the request of Mr. Edmondson), for 1 hour, on April 5, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. Sullivan and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Roncalio.

Mr. Miller.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Clarence J. Brown, Jr.) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Griffin.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Edmondson) and to include extraneous matter:

Mrs. Kelly in two instances.

Mr. Powell.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1404. An act to promote the observance of a uniform system of time throughout the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3349. An act for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

H.R. 7723. An act to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods; and

H.R. 8647. An act for the relief of the Troubadours Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 5, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2262. A letter from the president, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the Annual Report of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83–272 (H. Doc. No. 419); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2263. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–10; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2264. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report on operations of the Manpower Development and Training Act, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–15; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2265. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audits of Government Services, Inc., and of its employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan for the year ended December 31, 1965; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2266. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 62 Stat. 85; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2267. A letter from the president, Communications Satellite Corp., transmitting the annual report of the corporation for the year 1965; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2268. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised, together with the names of the aliens covered, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2269. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according the beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification under the act, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2270. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2271. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)-(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2272. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Department of Labor during the year ending December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of title 28, section 2673, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2273. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 31, 1966, the following bills were reported on April 1, 1966:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7406. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes; without amendments (Rept. No. 1409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 14122. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 31, 1966, the following bill was reported on April 2, 1966:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 14025. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted April 4, 1966*]

Mr. STEED: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 14266. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.R. 14240. A bill to amend the act providing financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families in order to provide financial assistance for the education of orphans and other children lacking parental support; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 14241. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for a Minority Economic Council; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 14242. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with Proctor Reservoir, Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 14243. A bill for the establishment of a Civilian Aviation Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 14244. A bill to make further provision for the retirement of the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 14245. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing annuities for persons who participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, by extending the class to whom annuities may be paid; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 14246. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that delayed birth certificates and similar documents issued under State law shall constitute prima facie evidence of age for purposes of establishing eligibility for benefits or assistance under that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 14247. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 14248. A bill to make further provision for the retirement of the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 14249. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other governmental departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 14250. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate the credit for investment in certain depreciable property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 14252. A bill a provide a comprehensive program to combat alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14253. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14254. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 14255. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 14256. A bill to provide a supplemental payment for Arapahoe Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14257. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act to prohibit the imposition of any durational residence requirement as a condition of eligibility for aid or assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 14258. A bill to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 14259. A bill providing for the designation of the gravesites of Thomas and Sarah Bush Lincoln, the father and stepmother of Abraham Lincoln, in Shiloh Cemetery, Coles County, Ill., as a national historic landmark; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 14260. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 14261. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for direct loans to assist certain disabled veterans to acquire the specially adapted housing to which they are entitled under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 14262. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 14263. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14264. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the amount which may be paid on account of the funeral expenses of certain veterans from $250 to $300; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14265. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the application of the investment credit to property used in possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 14266. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 14267. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act with respect to the exemption of certain individuals from induction under that act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14268. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of an experiment and demonstration plant, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.J. Res. 1017. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in November of each year as "American Art Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 1018. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 1019. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.J. Res. 1020. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 1021. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.J. Res. 1022. Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 1023. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 1024. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify its provisions insofar as they relate to the making of laws permitting the free exercise of religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 1025. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.J. Res. 1026. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.J. Res. 1027. Joint resolution to establish a commission which shall conduct on the Capitol Grounds a program depicting historical events by means of son et lumière; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 1028. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.J. Res. 1029. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H. Res. 810. Resolution relating to the distribution among the States of research and development funds made available by Government agencies; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

439. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Alaska, relative to supporting an effort to improve the status of the Department of State office dealing with international fishery problems; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

440. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Maryland, relative to the national anthem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

441. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to legislation increasing the monthly payments under the Federal Social Security Act to $200; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

442. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to legislation granting a 10-percent increase to those who receive social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

443. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to the Federal school lunch program and the Federal special milk program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 14269. A bill for the relief of Milan Aleksic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 14270. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14271. A bill for the relief of Gheorghe Stan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 14272. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francesco Crocenzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 14273. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Rollin F. Allyne, Army of the United States (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 14274. A bill for the relief of Pero Cibilic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 14275. A bill for the relief of Ivana Bonso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14276. A bill for the relief of Genaro Crescenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 14277. A bill for the relief of Faith M. Lewis Kochendorfer and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 14278. A bill for the relief of Carl F. Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H. Con. Res. 624. Concurrent resolution recognizing the services to the United States of Harrison Heater; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

362. By the **SPEAKER**: Petition of Senator Glen M. Stadler, chairman, Legislative Tax Study Committee, State of Oregon, relative to Federal financial assistance for areas in Oregon affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

363. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to television advertisements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

364. Also, petition of Mrs. Margaret Vredenburg, Columbus, Ga., relative to redress of grievances for invasion of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

365. By Mr. PRICE: Petition from State of Illinois region 8 tourism council urging the renaming of the Carlyle Lake Reservoir as the Elden E. Hazlet Reservoir in honor of his tireless efforts in support of the Kaskaskia development program; to the Committee on Public Works.

366. Also, petition from the East St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, East St. Louis, Ill., urging the renaming of the Carlyle Lake Reservoir as the Eldon E. Hazlet Reservoir in honor of his tireless efforts in support of the Kaskaskia development program; to the Committee on Public Works.

367. By the **SPEAKER**: Petition of Danny Walsh and others, Norman Junior High School, Crossett, Ark., relative to the numbering of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Passover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the story of the Passover is familiar to all those who share the previous heritage of the Jewish faith, for this historical event is a central fact in the Judeo-Christian heritage.

When the Jews were held in oppression and subjection in Egypt, they were rescued and led forth by Moses, under divine guidance and protection, and Pharaoh's pursuing soldiers were swallowed up in the sea. The joy of this salvation, the joy of this justice done to the oppressor, and rescuing of the oppressed, is rightly shared with the recurrence of this festival—not only by all who share the inheritance of Israel, but by all who love freedom and hate injustice and persecution. In this historic happenings are dramatized the ideals of religious freedom, of national independence, and of the unquenchable human passion for justice. Such moral ideals are the shining glory of courage in action. The reliance upon divine providence that characterized the first Passover should be our reliance today.

At this season Americans of all faiths rejoice with American Jews in the celebration of the feast of the Passover, feeling keenly the central place of this event and its memory in the long history of human freedom. We are proud and glad that, for century after century, and down to our own time, the children of Israel still rejoices over the freeing of their nation. We think today not only of that ancient story of Egypt, but of the Nazi persecutions in Europe, and of the joyful establishment of the nation of Israel, as we join in the sone of Moses and Miriam and the children of Israel, as it is recounted in the book of Exodus:

> The Lord shall reign for ever and ever. For the horse of Pharaoh went in with his chariots and with his horsemen into the sea, and the Lord brought again the waters of the sea upon them; but the children of Israel went on dry land in the midst of the sea. And Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand; and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances. And Miriam answered them, Since ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea.

Salute to the Republic of Senegal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the people of the Republic of Senegal are observing their anniversary of national independence. On this great occasion, we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Leopold Sedar Senghor, President of Senegal; and the Senegalese Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Ousmane Soce Diop.

Of the eight states that were carved out of former French West Africa, Senegal has long been considered the best known. From the early 17th century, French shippers and merchants took advantage of the superb location of Dakar and established one of the best port facilities in Africa. In addition to Dakar, St. Louis, Rufisque, and Goree became major trading facilities. During the 19th century, the French gradually established their control over the interior of the country which was under protectorate status until 1920 when it became a colony of France.

Senegalese political experience and sophistication date back prior to 1871 when citizens of the four "communes" of Dakar, Goree, Rufisque, and St. Louis were accorded the rights of French citizenship. By 1871 they were allowed to elect a deputy to the French Parliament and, at the local levels, their own municipal officials. Among all the territories of former French West Africa, they were the only ones given such freedoms until colonial reforms took place after World War II.

Despite occasional internal difficulties since independence, Senegal has remained true to its philosophy of pursuing a form of government based on traditional African communal institutions. The Government has left considerable room for private enterprise and foreign investment.

Though still largely an agricultural country, Senegal is today the most highly industrialized state of the former French West African territories. There is a very good chance that oil and gas in worthwhile quantities might be discovered and thereby create an even sounder basis for the economy. In addition, the production of phosphates and tuna has been increasingly bright.

Another reason why I am proud to extend congratulations to Senegal is the fact that from April 1–24, 1966, Dakar will host the First World Festival of Negro Art. Participating will be representatives from 30 African, European, and North and South American countries. The idea for the festival was conceived by President Senghor of Senegal, another indication of his determination to give Negroes an increased sense of accomplishment and an awareness of their cultural heritage.

Mr. Speaker, as the people of Senegal celebrate their independence and host the festival. I take great pride in offering them my warmest congratulations and urge them to continue their work toward unifying and strengthening their country.

The 17th Anniversary of NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, today is the 17th anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty.

It was on April 4, 1949, that the Foreign Ministers of 12 countries—Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States—signed the treaty in Washington, thus giving birth to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Subsequently, 3 other countries joined the 12 original signatories: Greece and Turkey in 1952, and the Federal Republic of Germany in 1955.

During the 17 crisis-filled years that followed the signing of the treaty, NATO has proved itself one of the most durable and effective alliances of modern times. It has served as the shield which guaranteed the security of the North Atlantic Community, allowing the free nations of Europe to proceed with their economic reconstruction and, later, with the provision of technical and economic assistance to the developing countries on other continents.

In recent weeks, we have watched with apprehension the rapidly unfolding developments relating to France's role in NATO's military structure. Many of us have been deeply troubled by the direction of these events. We have not been shocked, because President de Gaulle's public expressions have foretold possible French withdrawal from NATO. Therefore, the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has, for the past 3 weeks, been holding executive session hearings on the problems involved in the removal of our bases, our storage plants, and so forth, from French soil. These hearings will be printed very soon so that the Members of Congress may have the benefit of knowing fully the problems involved in order to better consider that part of the pending foreign aid legislation relating to NATO.

I am delighted to note that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee may hold hearings on this subject. I would like to bring to the attention of the chairman of that committee that the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has already gone into this subject very thoroughly, and we will be pleased for him to have the benefit of our study when it is printed.

It is much too early to predict, and I would not venture to express any opinion on, the outcome of the processes which are today taking place within the NATO Community. I think, at the same time, it is fitting, on this anniversary, for all of us to reflect on the condition of our world, on what we have been able to achieve through the solidarity of the North Atlantic Community which has found such an effective expression in NATO, and on the need for continuing this close collaboration and unity.

Permanent Special Milk Program for Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce a bill providing for a permanent special milk program for children. This bill will benefit both schoolchildren and dairy farmers. It will benefit schoolchildren by giving them at reduced prices pure and wholesome milk so necessary to growing bodies and it will benefit dairy farmers by providing a fluid milk market for their product. Our entire Nation thereby benefits by having healthier children and a stable dairy industry.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, the special milk program for children has grown at a remarkable rate; however, the fiscal 1967 budget request is for a drastic cut in the funds for this program with the result that the entire program is in jeopardy.

In Wyoming alone funds will be cut from $129,000 in fiscal 1966 to approximately $27,000 in fiscal 1967. There is nearly an 80-percent reduction in funds for this nutrition program. This reduction will most assuredly not benefit schoolchildren since they will not be able to purchase and consume as much of nature's most perfect food.

Neither does the cut benefit dairy farmers. They will lose a substantial fluid milk market and probably have to process manufactured dairy products from this milk. This will result in a large reduction in the already low dairy farmer income, and in turn will cause the increased departure of many dairy farmers from the industry.

In 1960 milk production in Wyoming was 192 million pounds. However, in 1965 it had decreased to 175 million pounds. There has also been a large reduction in milk cows. In 1960 Wyoming had 35,000, and in 1965 it had only 27,000.

This bill, which has already generated wide support and interest, will eliminate the harm done by this proposed cutback. It will restore these funds and add some additional funds. These additional funds are necessary for three reasons: The first reason is that the present funds are not enough to reimburse the schools now in the program.

My bill will insure that the schools now in the program will be reimbursed. The second reason for some increase in the present program is that school population is growing and thus more children will need to be covered. Third is that more schools will continue to join the program. This bill insures that adequate funds will be available for schools joining the program. This bill will make this program permanent realizing the benefits given to schoolchildren, dairy farmers, and society are of true and lasting value.

By continuing this special milk program for children a rate expanding with the need, nutrition to children can be effectively promoted while drastically reduced dairy farmer income can be increased to a small degree.

Port of Oakland Dedicates Flagpole and Flag to U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Port of Oakland, Calif., dedicated a flagpole and raised a United Nations flag on it in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. This flag will fly each day as a symbol of the worldwide interest in peace and America's determination to be a part of this international endeavor.

The Port of Oakland has ships from all over the world calling at its docks each week. I know that the foreign sailors coming in on these vessels will be assured of America's determination to work for peace throughout the world when they see this symbol of such an effort flying in Jack London Square in Oakland.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article from the Oakland Tribune of March 25 giving the account of Ambassador Goldberg's remarks just prior to raising this flag. Also, I am pleased to insert the message which President Johnson sent for the ceremony.

GOLDBERG RAISES U.N. BANNER IN LONDON SQUARE

United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg raised the flag of the United Nations in Jack London Square today as several hundred onlookers applauded—and one shouted: "Don't raise that flag."

A lone opposition picket paraded in front of the lawn where the blue and white flag went up.

Taking note of opposition to raising the standard in the square, Joseph W. Chaudet, president of the Oakland Board of Port Commissioners, declared:

"The opponents of the board's decision have been loud, long and wrong.

A congratulatory telegram from President Lyndon B. Johnson was read.

Goldberg noted that Astronauts Edward White and James McDivitt carried a U.N. flag around the globe in their Gemini capsule, and quoted their later comment:

"When you go around the world in 90 minutes, you don't see any national boundaries; you see only one world."

The Ambassador added:

"We raise this flag in support, confidence and determination to carry out what every

American wants based on the principle of freedom and liberty for people everywhere."

Fremont High School provided the band and honor guard.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1966.
Mr. C. STANLEY WOOD,
Chairman, U.N. Flag Committee,
Oakland, Calif.:

I am happy to join with Ambassador Goldberg and all who participate in Oakland's flagraising ceremony in observance of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations.

In San Francisco only a few months ago, at the 20th anniversary commemorative session of the United Nations, I stated that the U.N. has taken root in human need and that it has established a shape and a purpose and a meaning of its own.

I repeat that basic principle again today. I repeat what is so obvious and so encouraging. Mankind has found a forum in the United Nations. Mankind has come together in the United Nations. Man's hopes have leaped and his fears have shrunk because of the force and influence of the United Nations.

And man will go on in hope. The United Nations will go on. It has already acted more than 50 times to keep the peace. It will continue to act, to keep faith with man's hope, until there is true and lasting peace.

You who are gathered here in Oakland honor this noble purpose. You advance this shining vision. You commemorate a vital instrument of civilization, and you are to be commended for your faith and purpose.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Futures Trading and Consumer Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, when the price of sugar began to soar in 1963, the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, assigned to the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, of which I am chairman, the responsibility for looking into the factors behind the sudden, sharp price increases in a most important consumer product.

Raw sugar prices doubled during the period from late 1962 until May 23, 1963, when we began an inquiry, and the price then subsided gradually and reluctantly—but it did come down finally. Now sugar prices, while at the normal or parity price here in the United States, because they are effectively supported by Federal programs, are deeply depressed on the world market, hovering around 2 cents a pound, which is extremely low, compared to the 6.85 cents per pound which was the spot price Friday in New York.

In May 1963, the world price reached 12.6 cents, and the spot price in New York was above 13 cents. So the sugar market has gone through a boom and bust. Much of this was the result of excessive speculation based on fear of a shortage which did not quite develop.

Out of the information the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee obtained in our study into sugar prices in 1963, and out of the investigation into coffee prices which was initiated by the Federal Trade Commission at my request as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives in 1954; I became convinced that futures trading in these two important commodities—which are significant factors in the consumer price index and in the wholesale price index—should be subject to Federal regulation to prevent excesses and abuses which lead to unnecessarily wide fluctuations and gyrating prices at retail. My bill, H.R. 8, would bring both commodities under regulation.

This morning, the House Agriculture Committee's Domestic Marketing and Consumer Relations Subcommittee, headed by Representative SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii, began 3 days of hearings into the broad subject of commodity futures regulation in connection with an administration bill, H.R. 11788, by Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act. I was privileged to appear as the first witness.

In view of the direct relationship between increases in commodity futures prices and in consumer prices in the stores, sometimes without regard to actual supply circumstances, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that my testimony this morning before the Matsunaga subcommittee may be of general interest to all Members who are concerned about consumer issues, and therefore under unanimous consent I submit it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING AND CONSUMER PRICES

(Statement by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, before House Committee on Agriculture, Monday, April 4, 1966, on legislation to amend the Commodity Exchange Act)

I know you have a heavy schedule of witnesses for the next several days on this important legislation to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, so I do not intend to take more than a few minutes of your time to share some ideas with you which I hope you will find helpful in this hearing.

As Chairman COOLEY knows, and as many of the members of the committee know, I have been introducing since 1954—for a dozen years—bills to bring trading in coffee futures under the Commodity Exchange Act. I introduced the first such bill immediately after the Federal Trade Commission completed and made public a comprehensive investigation, initiated at my instigation 6 months earlier, into the coffee shortage hoax of 1953–54 which sent prices of a pound of coffee at retail to as high as $1.50. The shortage was a fake, deliberately fabricated by certain interests speculating in coffee futures on the unregulated exchange in New York.

Last year, in reintroducing again my 1954 bill on the regulation of trading in coffee futures, I amended it, as you know, to include sugar as well. That derived from the investigation we made in the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, under my direction, into the gyrating sugar market of 1963. Our studies clearly pointed to excessive speculation in sugar futures, on an unregulated exchange—the same exchange where the 1953–54 excesses occurred in coffee futures trading a decade earlier.

In both instances—in coffee and in sugar—frantic buying and selling of futures by amateurs not connected in any way with the trade—coupled with a tremendous amount of speculation also as well as hedging by regular traders—caused chaos in the marketing of these commodities resulting in wild swings in prices which were reflected in quick order in much higher consumer prices. Both of these episodes could have been prevented, or at least sharply contained, by effective Federal regulation.

It is not my intention this morning to go into the technical aspects of futures trading, because you have experts from the Department of Agriculture and from the exchanges to talk about that. I am here primarily to urge that in amending and, I trust, improving the Commodity Exchange Act to protect the public and to assure orderly trading, that you now take the necessary steps to include two very important consumer commodities not now covered, coffee and sugar. Other important commodities, such as live cattle, beef carcasses, pork bellies, and additional ones, as trading in them becomes significant, should also be included.

INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL COMMODITIES

That can be done either by amending the act's definition of commodities, which I would prefer, or else of including the provision of the administration bill giving the Secretary the discretionary powers to add commodities when necessary to the list. I would, as I say, prefer statutory authority, particularly for coffee and sugar, as regulated commodities, rather than just leave this to the Secretary's discretion, but the fact is that it is 12 years since coffee was proposed for inclusion and this is the first time since then there has even been a legislative hearing on it. Under present procedures, the delay in including new commodities is much too long.

Turning to other aspects of commodity regulation, there are many provisions of the administration bill which are controversial, I know. I generally support the intent and direction of the lesiglation. We must place powers in the Government to prevent cheating and to punish offenders in commodity trading. But we must also give the Government the power to assure orderly trading, to have a voice in the setting of exchange rules—including those relating to the setting of margin and spot price determinations, to name two of the biggest problems which have been uncovered.

The officials of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange may claim here there is no need for any laws applying to them because my subcommittee had investigators looking over all of their sugar operations several years ago and presumably found nothing wrong. It is true that we never accused them of any wrongdoing. Our purpose was to find out how the operations of this exchange were affecting sugar prices, and we found a great deal of important information, to show that trading in sugar on this exchange should be brought under regulation. The Federal Trade Commission earlier established the need for regulation of coffee futures.

We found nothing to warrant putting anyone in jail—and we weren't looking for that kind of evidence. But we found terribly loose practices in the setting of the daily spot quotation on which vast quantities of cash sugar are bought and sold, and on which Government statistics, including the wholesale price index, are based. We found that they applied no really effective margin restrictions until after the need for them had really passed.

The 1963 sugar market was wild, and the trade itself could not effectively control it without governmental regulations of trading. The irony was that to the members of the exchange, the more trading which occurred, the more money there was to be made in commissions, even though much of it was from uninformed amateurs speculating on futures. This is not a situation which can be counted on to contribute to stability in time of market stress. Quite the opposite.

STRENGTHENING OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

Therefore I urge: First, that you amend the present law to include coffee and sugar and other major commodities now outside the law among commodities subject to regulation.

Second, that you amend the law, as proposed by the administration, to tighten Federal authority over rulemaking powers of the exchanges dealing with regulated commodities; and particularly to set margin requirements where there is reason to believe there is danger of manipulation, sudden or unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in prices, excessive speculation, etc., contributing to market disorder or to unnecessarily higher prices to consumers or a dislocation of the economy, or excessive costs to businesses using a certain commodity.

Furthermore, I ask that you provide the Act with teeth, to make possible the issuance of cease-and-desist orders against continued violations; to seek court injunctions to restrain or prevent violations; to deny registration to racketeers or other persons unfit to be turned loose as traders or commission merchant registrants; to require minimum financial requirements for registrants; to set up more severe penalties for violations; to require better recordkeeping on all transactions which affect commodity trading (including spot or cash transactions); and to do many of the other things the administration has proposed to prevent dishonest trading activities.

Many of these things are technical, but the overall concept is to try to guarantee truth and responsibility in all such trading. There is definitely a consumer interest in all of this, which is why I ask for stronger regulation and more protection for consumers and businessmen affected by futures trading.

Salute to Helen Delich Bentley, Maritime Editor of the Baltimore Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and pleasure of attending a testimonial dinner for the maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, Helen Delich Bentley, given by the Iron Shipbuilders International Marine Council of the International Boilermakers Union.

Certainly, there is no one today, in the entire Nation, connected with the press covering maritime affairs, more deserving of the tributes and honor paid her on the occasion of that dinner.

In this connection, the remarks of her own Senator, DANIEL B. BREWSTER, were especially appropriate.

Because of the fact that the House Merchant Marine Subcommittee is presently holding important hearings having to do with shipping policy, with special reference to Vietnam and, because, furthermore, many of us in Congress are greatly concerned at the present sad lack of any forward-looking constructive policy, I believe it is timely to place the Senator's testimonial remarks in the RECORD.

I urge my colleagues to read Senator BREWSTER's remarks, which, under unanimous consent, are included at this point:

SENATOR DANIEL B. BREWSTER'S REMARKS AT TESTIMONIAL FOR HELEN BENTLEY BEFORE THE IRON SHIPBUILDERS INTERNATIONAL MARINE COUNCIL, MARCH 23, 1966

Helen, members of the Iron Shipbuilders Council, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen.

It is a very great pleasure for me to be here tonight to participate in this salute to a distinguished Marylander, a distinguished journalist, and an effective advocate of those maritime policies which all of us believe are essential to the continuing strength of our economy and our defense.

Helen's television series has borne the title "The Port That Built a City and a State." All of us know that she has given unceasingly of her energy and her talent to build that port.

In this period of division and uncertainty in maritime affairs, it is good to find something about which we can all agree. On the distinctive contribution of Helen Delich Bentley to an understanding and appreciation of the meaning and importance of sea power there can be no disagreement.

Knowing Helen, as I do, I am certain that nothing we could say here tonight would be more welcome than our collective pledge to continue to fight at her side for a stronger American merchant marine; for a merchant marine built in American shipyards, manned by American seamen, carrying the bulk of American trade and ready to answer any call as a vital element of American defense.

All of you who are here this evening are familiar with the present unsatisfactory condition of the American merchant marine. All of you are familiar with the deterioration which has characterized this great industry in recent years. All of you recognize the danger to the industry, to the American economy, and to American security in construction abroad, runaway flags, slashed budgets, idle shipyards and decreasing numbers of skilled operators and skilled labor.

These are the weaknesses in the current maritime situation and in current maritime policy. These weaknesses have not developed suddenly, but they have suddenly taken on an urgency which requires that positive corrective action be undertaken immediately.

The emergency which we face in Vietnam has had at least one positive value—it has served to demonstrate and highlight for the public what we have all known for a long time—that the Government is guilty of negligence in its handling and mishandling of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and in its inattention to a vital factor in the equation of national power—seapower.

Anyone familiar with ships and the sea knows that the essential tools of seamanship are the anchors, the rudders, and the engines. A ship which has none of these is destined to drift aimlessly—to drift toward the rocks and shoals—to drift toward inevitable disaster.

In the simplest analysis, it is drift that has characterized U.S. maritime policy. We have had no anchor in policy, no seamanship at the wheel, and no propulsion to move us forward.

A few illustrations will highlight the rocks and shoals onto which we have drifted.

1. The 14-knot dry cargo carrier is supposed to be the elite of our merchant fleet. Of the 901 ships in that fleet, 80 percent are 19 years old or older. In fact, the average age of the 643 active ships is 21.8 years. The condition of the inactive ones we have been recalling to meet our needs in Vietnam is already on the record.

The time required to activate these World War II ships, their deficiencies in speed, the obsolescence of their winches, booms, and riggings, plus the repeated breakdowns have proved that our Reserve fleet is a myth—a paper tiger—a sample of our weakness, not our strength.

2. By 1970, we will have only 200 dry cargo liners under 25 years old. Such a fleet would be insufficient to support even a Vietnam-type operation.

The most shocking thing about this fact is that the leadtime required for design and construction of modern ships makes it already too late to change those figures.

3. The American shipbuilding program is now 90 ships behind and we are currently carrying only 9 percent of our own exports in American bottoms.

4. If our level of spending remains at its current trickle, our replacement program may never be completed. It could be 1980 before we finish and even then we wouldn't have made a beginning on our tramp and independent fleet which currently averages 23 to 26 years old.

5. What about competition? Lloyd's reports world shipbuilding at an alltime high. Japan ranks 1st as a builder, with Great Britain 2d, and the United States in 11th place with only 340,061 tons on order.

Soviet Russia is building ships at a rate 14 times greater than ours. She has 612 vessels on order or under construction, compared to our 44.

Not only our ships but our crews are in short supply and overage.

6. Under normal peacetime conditions we need an annual supply of about 1,000 newly licensed officers to maintain even our present fleet. This year all our maritime schools combined will graduate less than 550 men.

Today the average age of the American seaman is 50. Approximately 44 percent will be eligible for retirement in a few years.

7. Our maritime work force ashore is faced with a similar problem as I'm sure you all know. Highly skilled and qualified men are leaving the industry—some through retirement, but others because action and inaction by the Government gives little promise of a future at the shipyard.

8. The problems which afflict our maritime industry are not limited in their effect. They have serious implications—as we have discovered—for our defense posture. They have, also, a depressing effect on our balance of payments and our domestic economy.

American-flag ships must be built, repaired, and supplied in American shipyards. The cost of materials and services combined with the salaries to the American labor force constitute a major contribution to our economy.

When foreign flags are utilized, 73 cents on every freight revenue dollar is carried from our shores.

We cannot allow the current contribution of more than $1 million to our balance of payments to dwindle.

These are the cold facts of the situation as those of us concerned with the merchant marine find them.

Now what must we do about it? When the President created the Maritime Advisory Committee in June 1964, he said it was to seek long-range solutions. When he delivered his state of the Union message to the Congress in January 1965, the President promised to submit a new maritime policy. We are approaching June 1966, and still there is no policy. In fact, the recent transportation message completely omitted any suggestion of such a policy.

Normally the President proposes and the Congress disposes. But on this critical matter there may not be time to wait. Too much time has been wasted already.

The interagency task force report is in. The Maritime Advisory Committee report is in. The Defense Department is currently studying a sealift posture for 1970–80, and the comparative cost of sealift and airlift.

My colleague, Chairman GARMATZ, has been holding very important hearings on maritime problems as they relate to Vietnam.

On the 9th of May, I will commence a series of hearings on maritime matters for the Senate Commerce Committee. Our study will be particularly directed at the adequacy of our lift capacity and of U.S. construction and repair facilities as well as at the present and future training and availability of a skilled labor force to build, sail, and maintain our merchant fleet.

And so the dialog continues. I don't think that this dialog is a bad thing. It has done much to get the problems of the merchant marine before the public—to attract attention to the industry and to stimulate study and ideas.

I think that I should say here that over the course of these many months, it has been our own Helen Bentley who has given this dialog life. It is she who has made the dramatic presentation of our case to the American public. Helen is the most respected maritime reporter in the business. She is the most knowledgeable, and has the best sources. Her story is inevitably the first and the most complete. It is our great good fortune that Helen is, as well, our finest advocate.

Helen has put the cause of the merchant marine and the words of this great debate on the front page. But dialog and front page stories are not enough. What we must have is action.

The responsible public officials and government agencies must stop talking and start moving. Stories about the problems of the maritime industry and differences between recommendations for the solution of these problems should now give way to announcements of policies, decisions, and programs of implementation—programs which will guarantee a resurgence in the construction and operation of the American-flag fleet—programs which will guarantee a return to America preeminence as a maritime power.

Let me say to all of you here tonight that it is toward this end that I am consistently directing my efforts as a member of the Senate Commerce Committee.

I grew up in the port that built a city and a State. We are proud of that port and of the associated industries and skilled labor which make Baltimore a center of international trade.

I want to close with a promise. So long as I am able to speak and Helen is able to write, the needs of the maritime industry will have a hearing before the Congress and the public.

Helen, we salute you.

Activities of Representative Edna F. Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, and under cloudy skies, the second session of the 89th Congress opened. In southeast Asia, the suspension of the bombing of North Vietnam did not produce the desired results: the Communist factions showed no desire to end the conflict through peaceful negotiations. President Johnson's worldwide peace offensive, initiated shortly thereafter, as well as many other direct and indirect contacts, fell short of achieving that goal. And in the meantime, new strains began to tax the ties which—for the past two decades—bound the members of the North Atlantic alliance in our pursuit of mutual security. New problems cried out for solution in Latin America, in the Middle East, and in South Africa, as well as in the Far East.

Is the United States too deeply embroiled in these areas? That is the question. We find the United States blamed wherever there is trouble, as there appears to be little sharing of the world's burdens. The United Nations, for the time being, has only a limited capacity in helping to keep order in the world. There is an urgent need, therefore, for special review of all U.S. policies, and your Congress, in every committee, has turned to this task.

On my own activities, I talk to you briefly.

In preparation for the work which would confront your Representative in the field of national security during this session of Congress, I traveled to Europe in December 1965. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have legislative responsibility for the area which stretches from the shores of the Atlantic through the vast reaches of Soviet Russia.

I visited several capitals of Europe. I met with a number of our Ambassadors, with other foreign affairs specialists, and with the officials of foreign governments. The latter included the French Foreign Minister Couve de Murville; Italian Prime Minister Aldo Moro; the Deputy Foreign Minister of Poland Jozef Winiewicz; and the Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Sr. Pedro Cortina, of Spain.

The future of NATO, the problems of the Common Market, East-West relations, and the conflict in Vietnam, were among the key issues which we discussed during these meetings. I have been deeply concerned for some time about General de Gaulle's ominous—and increasingly antagonistic—comments about the future of French participation in NATO, which may reverse the progress toward Western European integration and result in the reemergence of Germany as a dominant power. Since March 17, your Subcommittee on Europe has been probing the prospects of the North Atlantic community, directing our immediate attention to the crisis in NATO, including President de Gaulle's call for the removal of U.S. and NATO military facilities from France and his announced intention to terminate French participation in NATO's military structure. Witnesses who have testified before the subcommittee to date have been our Ambassador to France, Charles Bohlen; Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, John Leddy; Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, John McNaughton; Supreme Allied Commander for Europe, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer; and Under Secretary of State, George Ball. It is anticipated that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara may wind up the hearings.

Equally disturbing is the continuing trade between some of our allies and adversaries, for example, the building in Red China of a steel mill by the German Government. These things place strains on our alliances. While not ignoring the issues which divide us, we were trying to find areas in which we can cooperate for our mutual well-being and security. This is a never-ending task; nothing in this world is impervious to change, and our relations with our allies must be subject to constant adjustments if open ruptures are to be avoided.

The Kelly amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1951 led to the establishment of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), and I am proud that over the years this organization has helped with the resettlement of some 1.4 million human beings, including close to 640,000 refugees. I was delighted to receive recently a report from Mr. Walter Besterman, who was formerly with Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of Brooklyn, and worked with this program since its inception—and who is now the Deputy Director of ICEM in Geneva, Switzerland— that ICEM has been instrumental in solving the unemployment problem in Italy and France, and in facilitating redistribution of labor surpluses in other countries. The success of ICEM again underlines the importance of international cooperation in solving various regional problems. It should serve as an example as we tackle some of today's difficult issues.

Your House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in its various subcommittees, has also undertaken studies relative to the apartheid issue in South Africa, our foreign buildings program, and further amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

It is understandable that our national security is the prime concern of this Congress—but hovering close in the background is the need to follow up on many domestic issues. These are most important. We have made enormous strides in enacting social legislation during the first session of the 89th Congress. I reported to you on those achievements in my Annual Report of 1965. Now we must make certain that this legislation is properly implemented.

In this regard, I have notified organizations and thousands of my constituents to seek out persons over 65 years of age and urge them to enroll and thus safeguard their rights under the medicare program. Too many persons are still unaware that substantial benefits are theirs under this program. As a result, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 14103, to extend the time for enrollment to January 1, 1967 and I have requested the President to send a message to Congress in support of this extension. Since the introduction of H.R. 14103, the President has recommended that the deadline for enrolling be extended 2 months; however, I will continue my efforts towards a longer extension.

Considering the tremendous scope of social legislation enacted last year, it is not surprising that problems arose and errors were made in its administration. In the economic opportunity program, many problems have come to our attention. These are being studied and, I am sure, will be corrected. One program under the act which has proved very successful is Project Headstart.

One further guarantee of civil rights for all our citizens would be to end discrimination in the selection of juries for Federal and State courts. This is under review by Chairman EMANUEL CELLER's House Committee on the Judiciary, and it is expected that action will be taken in this session of Congress.

Other programs which I have been reviewing within my congressional district have been the progress in much-needed housing and urban renewal, education, health care, and job training—all of which need refining.

Not only my attention, but the attention of the entire New York congressional delegation is centered on the specific issues of the Brooklyn Navy Yard and the Brooklyn Army Terminal. The creation of jobs by relocation of industry to this area and the establishment of employment opportunities for those displaced by these closings are important to the maintenance of the economy of the city of New York—particularly to the Borough of Kings County.

Last but not least are the important Immigration and Nationality Act amendments—Public Law 89-236—which deleted the national origins quota as the basic criterion for welcoming immigrants to our country. This amendment to correct the inequity in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 was initiated by me and was one of my first acts as a Member of Congress. More than 52,000 immigrant visas have been issued since the new law went into effect last December and thousands of families in my district, with my assistance, have been reunited.

The many urgent problems facing your representatives on the Federal, State, and local levels, which must receive the support of all peoples and all organizations, should transcend party lines.

The first bills enacted into law in the 2d session of the 89th Congress were supplemental authorizations and appropriations. These represented primarily requests for national defense and, second, for the implementation of laws enacted prior to last session—in other words, for the operation of domestic programs such as assistance by way of matching grants, veterans compensation, and pensions, and increased pay for military and civilian personnel. Additional obligations were met for educational programs, for health insurance for the aged, and for credits to social security trust funds.

It was with a heavy heart that I voted for a delay for 1 year in carrying out the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965. Since 1951 I have sponsored legislation to repeal this law; however, in view of the needs of national defense and at the request of President Johnson, I voted for this delay in enacting a tax reduction which I fully supported in the first session. Estate tax liability provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 were amended. The Bank Merger Act amendment clarifies the applicability of the antitrust laws to bank mergers to maintain a sound banking system. The Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act extends educational and housing benefits to veterans of active duty since January 1955. Additional circuit and district judges were created. The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act amendments were adopted to reduce casualties in coal mines. U.S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., in cooperation with the Inter-American Center Authority was authorized.

Other bills which have passed the House of Representatives this session, and are awaiting Senate action are: provisions for an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. A nationwide marketing order for cotton to be established for the purpose of administering the financing to augment cotton produce research and promotion. To amend the Railway Labor Act to provide for the establishment of a special adjustment board to eliminate the backlog of claims before the National Railroad Adjustment Board. Provisions for more efficient mail service to servicemen.

To protect the American consumer, Congress is also considering legislation in regard to the proper labeling and packaging of products, credit contracts, and provisions to close the gap in dealing with cosmetics and medical devices.

While Congress is in session, you may contact me at my Washington office which is open year round for your service.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 1966

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Joseph Sherrard Rice, D.D., minister, First Presbyterian Church, Columbia, S.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who in Thy sovereign power dost govern in the affairs of men and of nations, we thank Thee for this good land in which we have been born, or to which we have been brought by Thy providential care. Strengthen and guide us in these times of rapid change that we may measure up to the great national responsibility that has been committed to us, and prove ourselves fit to lead the world in paths of justice and of peace. May Thy blessing rest upon the Senate of the United States here assembled and may the deliberations and actions of the day be acceptable in Thy sight, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 1, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 1, 1966,

The Secretary of the Senate received a message from the House of Representatives which announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1404. An act to promote the observance of a uniform system of time throughout the United States; and

H.R. 7723. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 1, 1966,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on Monday, April 4, 1966, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 4599. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colo., and of certain chipped colored glass windows for St. Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev.;

H.R. 6568. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6845. An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; and

H.R. 9883. An act to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 1, 1966, the following reports of a committee were submitted on April 4, 1966:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 1717. A bill to provide for the registration of names assumed for the purposes of trade or business in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1096);

H.R. 959. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1097); and

H.R. 8466. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of insurance premium finance companies in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1098).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

H.R. 11664. An act to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12(g) (1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Rept. No. 1099).

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile;

S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes;

S. 2719. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia;

S. 2831. An act to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.; and

S. 2835. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) to approve selecting of the U.S. Olympic Committee and to support its recommendations that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 837) to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Bond Week," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 3349. An act for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; and

H.R. 3647. An act for the relief of the Troubadours Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 1061, S. 1717, and the measures which follow, with the exception of Calendar No. 1063, Senate Resolution 220, which is the pending business, and Calendar No. 1064, S. 2999.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGISTRATION OF TRADE NAMES

The bill (S. 1717) to require the registration of trade names in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1717

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Assumed Trade Name Act."

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District or their designated agent.

(b) "District" means the District of Columbia.

(c) "True name," in the case of an individual, means such individual's surname or family name preceded by his given name, unless such name has been legally changed by a court of competent jurisdiction in which case the name as so changed would be the true name of such individual; in the case of partnership, the surname of each partner preceded by his given name or, in the case of a corporation, the name under which the corporation is organized in the place of its incorporation.

(d) "Assumed trade name" means the name or designation under which business is conducted in the District when such name is other than the true name of the individual, or the corporation, or the true names of the partners, conducting the business or having an interest therein.

(e) "Corporation Counsel" means the attorney for the District, by whatever title such attorney may be known, designated by the Commissioners to perform the functions prescribed for the Corporation Counsel in this Act.

SEC. 3. No individual, partnership, or corporation shall conduct business in the District under an assumed trade name unless there has been filed with the Commissioners a certificate of ownership setting forth the assured trade name, the street address of the office or other place in the District where such business is conducted, and the name and residence address of such individual, or of each partner in each such partnership, or of each officer of each such corporation. Such certificate shall be open to public inspection. If the residence address of any such individual or partner or corporate officer required by this Act to be included in any such certificate shall be outside the District, the required certificate shall be accompanied by a power of attorney authorizing the Commissioners to act as the lawful attorney for each such nonresident for the service of legal process in civil actions arising from the conduct of such business in the District: *Provided,* That officers of corporations, foreign or domestic and in good standing, which continuously have and maintain a registered office and registered agent at such office for the service of process, legal notice, or demand pursuant to the provisions of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (68 Stat. 179, as amended, D.C. Code, 1961 ed., sec. 29–901, et seq.) are not required to file a power of attorney under this Act.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to promulgate such regulations as they deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, and to fix and collect such fees for rendition of services by the municipal government of the District under this Act as they may from time to time determine to be necessary to defray the approximate cost of operation.

SEC. 5. Failure to file the certificate of ownership required by this Act, or failure to keep the information current by filing with the Commissioners amendments of such certificate, or the violation of any regulation promulgated pursuant to this Act shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $300 or imprisonment for not more than ninety days, or both. All prosecutions for violations of this Act, or of the regulations made pursuant thereto, shall be conducted in the name of the District by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

SEC. 6. With the exception of the function of making regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Commissioners are authorized to delegate any of the functions vested in them by this Act.

SEC. 7. This Act shall become effective on the 1st day of March next following its approval which is at least ninety days after such approval.

AMENDMENT OF FIRE AND CASUALTY ACT WITH REGARD TO CASUALTY INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H.R. 959) to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LICENSING AND REGULATION OF INSURANCE PREMIUM FINANCE COMPANIES

The bill (H.R. 8466) to amend the Fire and Casualty Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of insurance premium finance companies in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATING DOMESTIC STOCK INSURANCE COMPANIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 11664) to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Board of Commissioners and the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate proxy solicitations and "insider trading" activities of domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12(g) (1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 which had been reported from the Committee on District of Columbia with amendments on page 2, line 4, after the word "conformity," to insert "as nearly as may be practicable,"; in line 17, after the word "hearing", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That if the Superintendent shall find upon examination that the further transaction of business by the company would be hazardous to the public or to the policyholders or creditors of the company in the District, he may suspend such authority without giving notice as herein required: *Provided further,* That in lieu of revoking or suspending the certificate of authority of any company, after hearing as herein provided the Superintendent may subject such company to a penalty of not more than $500 when, in his judgment, he finds that the public interest would be best served by the continued operation of the company. The amount of any such penalty shall be paid by the company through the office of the Superintendent to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."; on page 8, after line 4, to insert:

> (i) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section, or any rule or regulation thereunder the violation of which is made unlawful by this section or the observance of which is required under the terms of this section, or any person who willfully and knowingly makes, or causes to be made, any statement in any application, report, or document required to be filed under this section, which statement was false or misleading with respect to any material fact, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $1,000, or be imprisoned not more than thirty days, or both.

At the beginning of line 15, to strike out "(i)" and insert "(j)"; after line 16, to strike out:

> SEC. 4. Domestic stock insurance companies shall be exempt from the requirements of section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

And, at the beginning of line 20, to change the section number from "5" to "4".

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Findley Burns, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and twenty-eight postmaster nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate returned to the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4(c) OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2729, a bill to increase SBA authorization ceilings in which the House has made several amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2729) to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 3, strike out "and" where it appears the first time; on page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike out "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,"; on page 2, line 9, strike out "functions" and insert "functions; and (C) an Economic Opportunity Act loan fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions."; on page 2, line 15, strike out "and"; on page 2, lines 17 and 18, strike out "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,"; on page 2, line 19, strike out "fund." and insert "fund; and (C) pursuant to title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall be paid into the Economic Opportunity Act loan fund."; on page 3, lines 9 and 10, strike out "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,"; on page 3, line 10, strike out "$1,364,100,000" and insert "$1,400,000,000"; on page 3, line 12, strike out "$366,500,000" and insert "$400,000,000"; on page 3, line 12, strike out "and"; on page 3, line 14, strike out "$156,700,000" and insert "$200,00,000"; on page 3, line 14, after "$156,700,000" insert "; and (D) under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall not exceed $100,000,000"; on page 3, line 20, strike out all after "(1)" down through and including "appropriate" in line 22, and on page 4, line 5, after "appropriate." insert "Business-type budgets for each of the funds established by paragraph (1) shall be prepared, transmitted to the Congress, considered, and enacted in the manner prescribed by law (sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 847–849)) for wholly-owned Government corporations."

Mr. PROXMIRE. I move, on behalf of myself and Senator Tower, the ranking Republican member of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, that the Senate disagree with amendments 1 through 7 and concur with amendments 8 through 14.

Mr. President, the first seven amendments provide a separate SBA revolving fund for loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This separate fund is not necessary and, I am convinced, was not intended by the House, which only meant to put a ceiling on such loans. The acceptance of amendment 12 accomplishes the desire of the House to provide a ceiling on the loans which may be outstanding under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The acceptance of amendments 8, 9, 10, and 11 would give Senate agreement to increases made by the House on ceilings on the dollar amount which may be outstanding for—

First. SBIC financing;

Second. State and local development company loans; and

Third. Regular business loans, displaced business disaster loans, the taking of prime contracts by SBA, and title IV loans under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—these loans are included in this category and also have a special ceiling of their own as provided by amendment 12.

I recommend Senate acceptance of amendment No. 13 which would strike, from the provision of the bill relating to quarterly reports to Congress by SBA, the requirement that SBA should include in its report its projection of future needs for funds, and its recommendations for additional appropriations. SBA would still be required to report on the status of its funds and its recommendations regarding authorizations. This amendment was requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Amendment No. 14 provides that business-type budgets for each of the revolving funds established by this bill shall be prepared, submitted to Congress, and enacted as prescribed by the Government Corporation Control Act. This amendment does not change any existing procedures now being followed in the preparation and submission of SBA's budget to Congress. I understand that this amendment was placed in this bill by the House at the request of Congressman Mahon, of the House Appropriations Committee. There is no administration objection to this amendment. I recommend that the Senate accept this amendment.

I believe that the Senate should take this action. I think that these amendments will be acceptable to the House. Thus a conference on this bill will be avoided and the bill can go to the White House for the President's signature.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin is suggesting that with certain suggested changes and deletions of some amendments and acceptance of others, the Senate take final action on the bill today, or is the bill still to be in conference?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The bill would not go to conference, it would go back to the House. We have discussed the matter with Republican and Democratic members of the Banking Committee of the House. They agree to this handling of the bill, that the Senate agree to certain of the House amendments, and the House agree to withdraw certain others which the Senate rejects.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator will yield further, my own interest is that we get early action on it, because there is great need for these funds. In my own State, we have groups which have been asking for several months for funds from the Small Business Administration. So far, they have not been available. I sincerely hope that action can be completed at an early date.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas. I am glad that he underlines the fact that with the passage of the bill, which we hope will be final in a couple of days, the Small Business Administration will be in a position to begin processing loans again. They have not processed any loans since last October.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate act on Senator Tower's and my motion.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE ANSWER TO FOREIGN MINISTER GROMYKO'S "SIMPLE" SOLUTION TO THE VIETNAM IMPASSE IS TO RECONVENE THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on April 2, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Andrei Gromyko, at the 23d Communist Party Congress, stated that the solution to the conflict in Vietnam would be "simple" and could be settled if three provisos were agreed to: First, the United States to stop bombing North Vietnam; second, the United States to withdraw its troops; third, "it—the United States—must stop trampling on the Geneva agreements on Indochina."

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I made on last Saturday, the day this "simple" solution was advanced by Mr. Gromyko at the 23d Communist Party Congress, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Answer to Foreign Minister Gromyko's "Simple" Solution to the Vietnam Impasse Is To Reconvene the Geneva Conference

At the 23d Communist Party Congress Foreign Minister Gromyko said today the solution to the conflict in Vietnam would be "simple" and could be settled if three provisos were agreed to: (1) the United States to stop bombing North Vietnam; (2) the United States to withdraw its troops; and (3) "it (the United States) must stop trampling on the Geneva agreements on Indochina."

President Johnson, in seeking avenues toward the conference table and peace in that war-torn country, has stated many times that if unconditional negotiations were agreed to the bombing would stop as a step toward peace. He has also said that we would be very happy to withdraw our troops if a reasonable and honorable settlement could be reached at the negotiation table. He has also stated many times that he would agree to a conference based on the Geneva accords of 1954 and/or 1962.

It seems to me that if Mr. Gromyko means what he says—and if he represents the official Soviet attitude as I assume he does—then it appears that the appropriate step for the Soviet Union would be to join with the United Kingdom, its cochairman on the Geneva Conference, in reconvening that Conference to discuss the proposals he has laid down. In line with the statements made by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, I believe it is fair to ask his government what is preventing it assuming its responsibility under the Geneva accords to help bring peace to Vietnam and southeast Asia.

The way to the conference table, in my opinion, lies through the exercising of the joint responsibility of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom as cochairmen in reconvening the Geneva Conference which would serve as the conference table to consider, to probe, and to find solutions not only to the problem of Vietnam but to the problems of southeast Asia as a whole. This would be welcomed by the United States.

I am certain that this proposal would not only meet with the approval of the United States but would also be in accord with the efforts recently suggested by Canada, a member of the International Control Commission, an organization set up under the Geneva agreement of 1954 for the purpose of patrolling the accords reached at that time. The nations comprising the ICC—namely, India, Canada, and Poland—would, I am sure, be very much interested in reconvening the Geneva Conference at the earliest date.

EXPORT CONTROLS ON CATTLE HIDES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in recent weeks, I have received a number of protests about the new controls over the export of cattle hides. This is unfortunate because the recent increase in the export of domestic hides has been of value to the industry. These complaints come from livestock producers in my State.

The imposition of these controls by the Department of Commerce seems to be inconsistent with the stated goals of our national policy. First of all, we have been encouraging freer movement in our international trade without restrictions. Also, we have been encouraging initiative and free enterprise in the livestock industry, a position which this segment of our economy supports with great gusto. What we have done with these new regulations is to establish trade barriers and to control initiative in an industry which has found an expanding market. The export market is bringing new income to an industry which has had its ups and downs financially in recent years.

This is a matter which must be reviewed carefully. Both my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] and I have expressed sentiments to both the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture suggesting a rescinding of these export controls. We were very pleased to receive the announcement yesterday from the Secretary of Commerce indicating that he had recognized the situation. He is scheduling public hearings on April 18 here in Washington, D.C., to discuss these export policies, reconsideration of these export controls and further clarification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the press announcement dated April 4, 1966, a statement prepared by Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Collins, before the House Agriculture Committee, and a table be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the press announcement, statement, and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce announced today that he is scheduling a public hearing on the matter of control of exports of cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and leathers made therefrom.

The requirement for obtaining an export license for, and imposing a limitation upon, the export of cattle hides, calf, kip skins and leathers was put into effect on March 7 as a part of the Government's efforts to reduce inflationary pressures and after consultation with representatives of producers and users of these products.

The Secretary stated that, inasmuch as the Department has received requests for clarification and reconsideration, from those opposed to the imposition of export controls, and has received requests that various segments be given the opportunity to explain in further detail their views concerning such export controls, hearings for this purpose are being scheduled.

The hearings will begin on April 18 and the Department of Agriculture will be represented on the hearing panel. Those wishing to file written statements are requested to do so by that date and those wishing to appear and make oral statements are requested to notify the Secretary of Commerce on or before April 12 so that an orderly schedule of witnesses can be announced in advance.

Statement of the Under Secretary of Commerce LeRoy Collins Before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the House of Representatives Agriculture Committee, on Tuesday, March 22, 1966, on Export Controls of Cattle Hides and Leathers

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I am LeRoy Collins, Under Secretary of Commerce. I am accompanied by Mr. James F. Collins, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Domestic Business Policy, and others from the Department of Commerce who are knowledgeable about the matter with which you are concerned.

I welcome the opportunity to talk with you about the recent action taken by the Department of Commerce to restrict the export of cattle hides. We regret, but fully understand, that the occasion is one which is disturbing to an important sector of our economy. We appreciate your interest and I think it is fair to say that we in the Department share your concern.

On March 7, 1966, the Department of Commerce imposed validated license control over the export of cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and leathers made therefrom, destined to all countries except Canada. Following that action, on March 11, 1966, the Department supplemented that control by announcing that the exports of these materials would be restricted to specific quantities. In addition, the Department provided that these allowable exports would be equitably distributed among traditional exporters in accordance with historical country patterns.

Authority for this action is included in the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, which provides that it is the policy of the United States to use export controls to the extent necessary "to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand."

As we interpret this, in order to provide a base for any action of restraint, Commerce had to find: (1) An excessive drain of scarce materials; and (2) an inflationary impact from abnormal foreign demand. And, of course, over and beyond this, it was the Department's responsibility to exercise its authority with soundness and reason.

I think that we can show here that all of these factors were inherent in our actions.

The assessment of the Department of Commerce regarding the domestic cattle hide situation was made in collaboration with the Department of Agriculture and other Government agencies. It showed that we were faced with an acute but hopefully temporary shortage of hides caused in large part by abnormal foreign demand.

Argentine hide exports have been a key factor in this demand. In 1962, Argentine exports were 12.1 million hides, in 1963, approximately 11.1 million; in 1964, a total of 7.8 million; and in 1965, only 6.8 million.

The increase of 3.5 million hides in U.S. exports in 1964 roughly matched the 3.3 million reduction in Argentine exports that year. Furthermore, the gain in U.S. exports of 1.8 million hides in 1965 is in part a result of the additional reduction of 1 million Argentine hides entering export markets in 1965. We believe that Argentine exports in 1966 will be slightly above the low levels for 1964 and 1965, but substantial Argentine export recovery is not expected until 1967.

Reacting to the reduction in the Argentine supply, European hide imports from the United States increased substantially in 1964, and again in 1965. U.S. hide exports increased from almost 8 million in 1963, to 11.5 million in 1964, and in 1965, exports again increased to 13.3 million. Although the domestic hide supply also increased, the growing requirements of the domestic shoe industry in 1965 produced the highest demand since 1959 for cattle hide leather from the domestic tanning industry.

Actually, the U.S. cattle hide market could properly be described as chaotic, in February 1966, as pressures of foreign buying mounted.

The shortage in 1964 was met largely by a drawdown of hide inventories of packers, dealers, and tanners without a sharp upward effect on domestic hide prices. In 1965, however the shoe and leather tanning industries reported that inventories had been reduced to unusually low levels by the end of the year. Inventory data available supported this, and the surging prices after July 1965, indicated that the marketplace confirmed these judgments.

The increase in East European imports from the United States (table C) of 170 percent in 1965 over 1964, and the increase of all European imports from the United States in 1965 amounting to 40 percent over 1964, had a dramatic effect on our domestic cattle hide prices. These prices increased approximately 100 percent between February 1965, and February 1966. Domestic hide prices in the first week of March 1966, increased an additional 13 percent. Although we are frank to admit that these price increases took place on a depressed base, it should be noted that the price level during the first week of March 1966, was approximately 50 percent above the 10-year average for 1956–65.

The inflationary aspects proceed in a sequence as follows: (1) Shortage of hides; (2) increased prices of hides; (3) increased prices of leather; and (4) increased prices of shoes.

Department of Commerce analysis shows a direct relationship between hide prices and shoe prices. Between 80 and 85 percent of all cattle hide leather is consumed in shoe production. Using average annual prices, it appears that a 10-percent increase in hide prices results in a 1-percent increase in shoe prices. This price relationship would be more drastic were it not for the effect of substitution of other products for leather as hide prices go up.

In the fall of 1965, shoe prices increased an average of 5 percent. In January 1966, the shoe industry through various elements, made clear its intention to increase prices an additional 5 to 10 percent at its spring showing of fall lines. Following the imposition of the controls here in question, shoe industry representatives have expressed the belief that this action will eliminate or minimize the need for further shoe price increases this spring.

Summarizing, Mr. Chairman, in 1966 unrestricted exports would have resulted in a projected domestic shortage of 2.7 million cattle hides. This finding by the Department of Commerce was concurred in by the Department of Agriculture as was the need for export controls to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of these scarce materials. The export quota or limitation was fixed at the 1964 export level, of 11.5 million hides, the second highest level of exports in the history of the industry. The resulting estimated retention of an additional 2.5 million hides in the domestic economy in 1966, will almost balance off the anticipated shortage of 2.7 million hides. Therefore, the end result will be to provide an adequate domestic supply with a minimum degree of export restriction.

Export controls were also imposed on calfskins, kipskins, and leathers at the 1965 export level consistent with 1966 anticipated exports. These actions were taken as a means of preventing frustration of the basic controls on cattle hides.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize the burden these controls have imposed on cattle producers, cattle feeders, meatpackers, renderers, and hide exporters. We also recognize the seeming paradox between this action and our Government's efforts generally and specifically in the case of hide sales, to encourage the expansion of our exports. We did not take this action lightly. It was the view of our Department and the other Government agencies involved, that the circumstances warranted the imposition of these controls. We are confident that the criteria of the Export Control Act, as spelled out by the Congress, have been met.

We feel that the actions taken are limited to those reasonably necessary now to correct the shortage. We are hopeful that the shortage is temporary and will be eliminated by the end of the year. If the problem proves less serious than we have anticipated, we would expect to take modifying action as promptly as the facts warrant.

This concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman. I would like to express my appreciation for the opportunity to appear here today.

TABLE A.—*Cattle hide supply and demand*

[In thousands]

	Preliminary, 1965	1966 estimates	
		Without control	With control
Slaughter	34,800	34,800	34,800
Imports	300	300	100
Exports	13,300	14,000	11,500
Available supply	21,800	21,100	23,400
Consumption	23,400	23,800	23,800
Shortage	1,000	2,700	400

TABLE B.—*U.S. cattle hide production consumption, 1955–65*

[In thousands]

Year	Estimated total slaughter	Imports	Exports and reexports	Apparent supply	Cattle hide leather production [1]
1955	28,257	333	5,863	22,727	25,832
1956	29,242	340	4,934	24,648	25,908
1957	28,514	167	6,518	22,163	25,511
1958	25,880	417	5,434	20,863	23,818
1959	25,223	1,025	4,107	22,141	23,167
1960	27,590	331	6,899	21,032	21,969
1961	28,012	294	7,645	20,661	22,736
1962	28,516	413	7,121	21,808	22,523
1963	29,800	360	7,972	22,188	21,654
1964	33,262	314	11,540	22,036	22,834
Estimate, 1965	34,800	302	13,309	21,793	23,400

[1] Equivalent hides to consuming industries. Source: Tanners' Council of America, Inc.

TABLE C.—*U.S. cattle hide exports*

[In thousands]

	1965	1964	Percent increase
Western Hemisphere	1,967	1,896	+3.8
Western Europe	5,033	4,226	+19.1
Eastern Europe	1,823	676	+169.8
Total, Europe	6,856	4,902	+39.9
Asia	4,475	4,681	−4.4
Oceania and Africa	11	25	−56.0
Total exports	13,309	11,503	+15.6

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED INCREASES IN ANNUITIES PAYABLE FROM THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities under the Law Enforcement Assistance

Act of 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF LADIES OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

A letter from the District of Columbia representative, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Minneapolis, Minn., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON MANPOWER RESEARCH AND TRAINING

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on manpower research and training, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the president and national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"H.J.M. No. 15

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the sovereign State of Idaho, hereby respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the Federal budget request for vocational education for fiscal year 1967 is considerably lower than the amount authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963; and

"Whereas a reduction in Federal appropriations under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 will seriously curtail the development of public vocational education programs in the Nation, and reduce the number of youth that might otherwise benefit from such programs; and

"Whereas a vigorous and expanding program of public vocational education is essential to the domestic and military economy of this Nation; and

"Whereas the Federal-State-local relationship built up over the many years has proven itself for an effective program of vocational education: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate the full amount authorized under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the 4th day of March 1966.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the 5th day of March 1966.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest.

"DRYDEN M. HILER,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

"H.J.M. No. 14

"Joint memorial to the Honorable President of the United States, the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled and the Honorable Secretary of the Department of Agriculture

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the most important industry in the State of Idaho is agriculture, an industry that produces crops of many kinds; and

"Whereas the teaching of instructors in the field of agriculture extension work, to provide assistance to the agriculture industry, is very necessary to the industry; and

"Whereas the agriculture programs of the extension service do more than any other single program to keep our young people in the field of agriculture on the farm; and

"Whereas a program of agricultural research is vital to the agriculture industry of the State of Idaho, and is the only program that we now have in the development of new strains of seeds and the control of diseases and insects that in so many ways destroy farm crops; and

"Whereas the Federal budget for 1966–67, appropriating moneys to these programs, has drastically reduced these funds: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully request that action be taken by the President and the Congress of the United States of America, to restore these funds to the original amounts as provided in the 1965–66 budget; be it further

"Resolved, That attention be drawn that the growing population of the world will bring additional strain on the production of foods and fibers; and to curtail the development and selection of instructional personnel and deter the research in the area of agriculture is not in line with our American principles; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the 4th day of March 1966.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the Senate on the 5th day of March 1966.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"DRYDEN M. HILER,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Commerce:

"H.J.M. No. 9

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas there are now pending in Congress several bills, including S. 1058, H.R. 909, and H.R. 2982, proposing the enactment of legislation to be known as the 'National Potato Labeling Act'; and

"Whereas such proposed legislation will require that all fresh potatoes marketed in interstate commerce be labeled to show the name and address of the packer or repacker and the State in which such potatoes were grown; and

"Whereas the widespread practice by packers and repackers of mislabeling fresh potatoes has resulted in potatoes which were grown in one State being labeled, advertised and sold as having been grown in another State; and

"Whereas such false labeling has misled the consumer and in many instances has caused the consumer to buy potatoes that are wrong for the intended use; and

"Whereas the consumer has a right to protection from such deceptive practices and a right to choose from among various potatoes in the market on the basis of correct information as to their State or origin; and

"Whereas since similar legislation has been enacted to protect farmers in the purchase of seed potatoes, the consumer is entitled to the same protection in the purchase of fresh potatoes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact the proposed 'National Potato Labeling Act' as proposed in S. 1058, H.R. 909 and H.R. 2982; be it further

"Resolved, that the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Idaho, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce and to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

"Passed the house on the 28th day of February 1966.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the 2d day of March 1966.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"DRYDEN M. HILER,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"H.J.M. No. 10

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas there is now pending in Congress H.R. 8282 proposing extensive changes in the Federal laws relating to unemployment insurance; and

"Whereas the enactment of H.R. 8282 would have a profound and adverse effect on the unemployment insurance laws of the States in that it would superimpose a new Federal program on the States and would force basic changes in State laws relating to eligibility of benefit claimants, the amount and duration of payments, disqualification of claimants and the taxable wage base; and

"Whereas the passage of H.R. 8282 would result in a substantial increase in the cost of the unemployment insurance program in Idaho and other States and would do violence to the principle of primary State responsibility which has been the foundation of the unemployment insurance program since it was established more than 30 years ago; and

"Whereas for the past many years in each regular session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho has devoted considerable time and attention to the enactment of legislation effecting changes in this State's unemployment insurance laws and Idaho has thereby demonstrated its ability and willingness to improve and strengthen the unemployment insurance program of this State to meet changing conditions; and

"Whereas the State employment security administrators have proposed alternative legislation to H.R. 8282, providing for modifications in the Federal laws which will effect improvements in State unemployment insurance programs, many of which have been previously adopted by the Idaho Legislature and which would preserve in the States the primary responsibility for the development and administration of the program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session* (*the Senate and House of Representatives concurring*), That we most respectfully oppose H.R. 8282; be it further

"*Resolved*, That Congress is urged to give careful consideration to the enactment of the alternate legislation proposed by the State employment security administrators which preserves in the States the primary responsibility for the development and administration of the unemployment insurance program; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Idaho and the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

"Passed the house on the 3d day of March 1966.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Passed the senate on the 5th day of March 1966.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"DRYDEN M. HILER,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"H.J.M. No. 8

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the sovereign State of Idaho, hereby respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States will have before it, in the near future, proposed legislation affecting future management of the present Sawtooth Primitive Area and adjacent property; and

"Whereas this is a region of incomparable scenic beauty and attractiveness and should be protected for the enjoyment and use of the people for all time to come; and

"Whereas, there is a growing need and urgency to provide adequate facilities for the public for maximum use and enjoyment of the area and accordingly an urgency for a permanent plan and policy; and

"Whereas the proposed national recreation area will provide for multiple use of the area to the extent that this is practicable—for example, permitting grazing and timber management where feasible; and

"Whereas a national recreation area would permit continued management of fish and game by the Idaho Fish and Game Department; and

"Whereas this area has been ably administered by the U.S. Forect Service for the past 61 years: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho now in session* (*the Senate and House of Representatives concurring*), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact the necessary legislation to authorize the establishment of the Sawtooth Mountains National Recreation Area and Wilderness; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the 28th day of February 1966.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Passed the Senate on the 4th day of March 1966.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"DRYDEN M. HILER,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"H.J.M. No. 16

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the impact of Federal programs has long been evident in the State of Idaho, and will continue to affect this State; and

"Whereas such federally sponsored programs result in the immigration of large numbers of families, and children of these families must be educated; and

"Whereas the education of these children places great burden upon existing instructional facilities and educational resources of this State; and

"Whereas it is the heritage of our country and the right of all to receive the benefits of a good and competent educational program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session* (*the Senate and House of Representatives concurring*), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to proceed with all due speed to extend Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, as amended, authorizing the funds for educational purposes in areas burdened by the increased numbers of educable children, caused directly by the impact of Federal programs; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the 5th day of March 1966.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Passed the senate on the 5th day of March 1966.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"DRYDEN M. HILER,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"S.J. RES. 7

"Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession and inability

"Whereas both Houses of the 89th Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, in the following words, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled* (*two-thirds of each House concurring therein*), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'"ARTICLE —

"'"SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"'"SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"'"SEC. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"'"SEC. 4. Whenever the President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"' "Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office." '

"Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of delegates concurring)*, That the amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America herein set forth be, and the same is hereby, ratified and affirmed; and that certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State at Washington, to the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Agreed to by senate February 1, 1966.

"Ben D. Lacy,
"*Clerk of the Senate.*

"Agreed to by house March 8, 1966.

"George R. Rich,
"*Clerk of the House.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"S.J. Res. 81

"Joint resolution urging the restoration of funds requested for general agricultural research in Alaska

"Whereas the budget submitted to Congress by the Bureau of the Budget failed to make provision for the continuing Federal support of general agricultural research in Alaska; and

"Whereas for the current fiscal year $434,100 was appropriated for the research program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Experiment Farm at Palmer; and

"Whereas support for the continuation of this vital service in the amount of $446,000 was requested for the 1966–67 fiscal year but the item was deleted from the budget before its submission to Congress; and

"Whereas the further and beneficial development and improvement of Alaska's agrarian economy is very much dependent on the continued research at and service from the Agricultural Experiment Station at Palmer: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the President and the Congress of the United States are respectfully and urgently requested to restore the requested appropriation request for support of the U.S. Agricultural Experiment Station at Palmer, Alaska.

"Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honoraole George H. Mahon, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; the Honorable Charles L. Shultze, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"S.J. Res. 77

"Joint resolution relating to restoring Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 to the public domain

"Whereas our Nation is consuming petroleum products at a rate which far exceeds the discovery of new sources within our national boundaries; and

"Whereas the oil and gas industry is currently engaged in an active exploration program all along the arctic slope of North America; and

"Whereas there is presently established Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 containing 23 million acres which is not open to exploration and development by private enterprise; and

"Whereas private enterprise is ready, willing, and able to undertake the development of new petroleum reserves in the national interest: Be it

"*Resolved*, That Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 as established by Executive Order No. 3797–A dated February 27, 1923, as amended by Public Land Order 289 dated July 20, 1945, be abolished and terminated; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the lands encompassed in Petroleum Reserve No. 4 be restored to the public domain and that deposits of oil and gas underlying these be made subject to disposition by the Secretary of the Interior in the manner provided for by act of Congress (41 Stat. 437), as amended, or wholly by bid if so authorized by the Congress; provided that nothing shall affect the validity of any existing lease, license, permit, transfer, or agreement, including the authority of the Secretary of the Navy under Public Law 87–599 (76 Stat. 401) to develop the South Barrow gas field, and under Public Law 88–389 (78 Stat. 340) to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field.

"Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable Paul H. Nitze, Secretary of the Navy; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Commerce:

"S. Res. 69

"Resolution registering opposition to the imposition of tolls or user charges, either directly or indirectly, upon the enjoyment of our inland waterways as a free passageway for commerce

"Whereas the imposition of tolls and/or user charges on the historically free inland waterways of the United States of America may be considered during the current session of Congress; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Kentucky has been endowed with more miles of navigable rivers than any other State in the Union; and

"Whereas waterway user charges would prejudice Kentucky cities located on the inland waterway system carrying shallow draft barges which are proposed to be taxed thereby giving greatly increased economic advantage to areas served by deep draft vessels which are not proposed to be taxed; and

"Whereas the industrial development of Kentucky—past, present, and future—has been and will be due in large measure to the availability of water transportation for its bulk commodities which are essential to the development of heavy industry with the collateral development of satellite industries and services, waterway tolls or user charges would restrict and impede water transportation and thus sharply curtail the economic growth of the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas imposition of user charges on the inland waterways would constitute a breach of faith with those Kentucky industries which have made vast private investments in industrial plants dependent upon the continuance of low-cost water transport as well as investments in boats and barges and related shore installations; and

"Whereas the solution to the economic problems of the Appalachian region of Kentucky is dependent in large part upon the sound development of water resources of this area; and

"Whereas the imposition of an excise tax on water transportation, which has from the earliest days of this Nation been free of such taxes, would by increasing transportation costs inevitably increase costs to the consumer and thus increase inflationary pressures: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky*, That the imposition of tolls or user charges on the historically free inland waterways of the United States is not in the public interest and is destructive to needed acceleration of the economic development of the Commonwealth and the generation of new jobs and industry and said Senate does hereby register opposition to the imposition of tolls or user charges, either directly or indirectly, upon the enjoyment of our inland waterways as a free passageway for commerce and further that the chief clerk of the senate is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to memorialize the Congress of the United States by forwarding copies thereof to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and to the members of the committees who have responsibility with respect to waterways development, waterways commerce, and taxation."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Finance:

"S. Res. 61

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to increase the percentage depletion rate for coal from 10 percent to 15 percent of the gross income from mining

"Whereas coal mining is one of the basic and major mineral industries in the Nation and is entitled to equitable treatment in taxation; and

"Whereas most other minerals now enjoy a percentage depletion rate of at least 15 percent and coal's competitors in the energy field have an even greater rate—oil and gas 27½ percent and uranium 23 percent: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky*—

"Section 1. That the Congress of the United States is requested to pass the necessary and appropriate legislation to increase the percentage depletion rate for coal from 10 percent to 15 percent of the gross income from mining.

"Sec. 2. That the clerk of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and to the members of the Senate Finance

Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Granting to Veterans of World War I Pensions Comparable to Grants to Veterans of American Wars Prior to World War I

"Whereas the national policy of the United States has been to grant assistance to veterans of the United States by a pension, in consideration of their military services; and

"Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension to veterans of World War I comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth, and to the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Yellowstone County, Mont., Farmers Union, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide adequate funds for loans under the Rural Electrification Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the San Diego County, Calif., Federation of Republican Women's Clubs, favoring the resignation of Robert Strange McNamara as Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc., of Jamaica, N.Y., relating to the struggle for freedom by the people of Byelorussia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the State of California Recreation Commission, in Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the preservation of the California redwood trees; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the executive council of the South Dakota Bankers Association, favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the Oaae Irrigation Unit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Hawaii County, Hilo, Hawaii, relating to the hospitalization of veterans in local hospitals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Sindicato Obreros Unidos, de Puerto Rico, signed by Jose Caraballo, president, relating to the inclusion of Puerto Rico under the minimum wage law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition signed by Pedro A. de Jesus Negron, and sundry other citizens of Puerto Rico, praying for the enactment of House bill 13712, concerning amendments of the Fair Labor Standards Act and minimum wages; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Two petitions signed by Mrs. Bertha S. Fairchild, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the San Diego County, Calif., Federation of Republican Women's Clubs, relating to the repudiation of the support of the California Democratic Council, by Governor Brown, of California; ordered to lie on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of South Carolina memorializing Congress not to reduce appropriations for the Federal school lunch program and the Federal special milk program.

The South Carolina General Assembly is deeply concerned about this matter, and I share the concern of members of the legislature of our State. I request that this concurrent resolution be referred to the appropriate committee of Congress, and I join wholeheartedly in urging that these valuable programs be preserved.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

South Carolina Resolution S. 665

Whereas through no fault of their own there are many public school age children whose parents do not have economic means sufficient to provide for them an adequate and well-balanced diet; and

Whereas it is vital to the well-being of all citizens that the youth of our country grow into healthy and properly developed adults; and

Whereas an adequate Federal school lunch program and a Federal special milk program are essential in significantly improving nutrition of these economically handicapped future citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress be memorialized to not reduce the appropriations for the Federal school lunch program and the Federal special milk program as recommended by the administration's budget proposals for 1966–67; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each U.S. Senator from South Carolina, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States.

ADDITIONAL STAFF MEMBERS AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO COMMITTEE ON FINANCE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1100)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report Senate Resolution 224, to provide for six additional professional staff members and six additional clerical personnel for the Committee on Finance, with an amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the individual views of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] be printed along with the committee report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar; and without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 3177. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of community programs for patients with kidney disease and for conduct of training related to such programs, and other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 3178. A bill to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315g); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 3179. A bill for the relief of Maj. Sheril D. Huff, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 3180. A bill to amend the Act of October 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 897); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Curtis):

S. 3181. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCarthy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 3182. A bill for the relief of S. Sgt. Lloyd M. Fletcher, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Mr. Javits):

S. 3183. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prescribe criminal penalties for the illegal importation of depressant and stimulant drugs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 3184. A bill to provide an incentive for private industry to establish programs to educate and train individuals in needed skills by allowing a credit against income tax for the expenses of conducting such programs; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself and Mr. McCarthy):

S. 3185. A bill to provide for reimbursement for the city of Hastings, Minn., and Dakota County, Minn., for construction of flood protection walls along the Vermillion River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. METCALF (by request):

S. 3186. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 3187. A bill to provide for notification of buyers and owners of automobiles having defects which render the operation of such automobiles inherently dangerous to life and limb; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mondale when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3188. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brewster when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Carlson):

S.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating a "National Day of Prayer"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Simpson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Federal land bank system in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Mr. Javits):

S.J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

PREPARATION OF EDUCATIONAL FILM ON THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. HARTKE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 247) to provide for the preparation of an educational film on the U.S. Senate to be shown to visitors to the Capitol, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Hartke, which appears under a separate heading.)

KIDNEY DISEASES ACT OF 1967

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in October, my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] and I jointly introduced a legislative proposal entitled "The Kidney Act of 1966"—S. 2675. This bill proposed a broad program for patients with kidney diseases, with a strong emphasis on the provision of artificial kidney treatment for those whose kidneys had completely failed. As I pointed out in my remarks at that time, the proposed bill would have begun to meet the need for artificial kidney centers in the United States. It would have provided funds which are sorely needed to construct these facilities and it would have provided funds which are needed to equip such centers and to train the skilled physicians, nurses, and technicians that are needed to bring this treatment to the community. It would also have made funds available for other types of community programs for kidney patients, and for specialized training of medical personnel in kidney disease.

Subsequent to the introduction of that proposal, we were contacted by a number of individuals with special competence in the field of kidney disease who felt that even broader legislative authority was needed to deal with this health problem. They expressed a concern lest programs proposed in S. 2675 would be too fragmented to insure continuity of care for kidney patients from the onset of their disease to the point at which they might need treatment with the artificial kidney or a kidney transplant. These medical scientists also expressed concern lest the development of treatment programs for kidney disease patients not go hand in hand with the development of improved training programs for physicians, nurses, and technicians who must participate in the care of such patients. In view of the comments and suggestions of these people, my colleague and I have revised the bill and today I am submitting the revision to supplant S. 2675.

The essential features and the ultimate goal of this proposal—improved treatment facilities for patients with kidney disease—are unchanged. Where the first bill specified a number of types of kidney programs, this version uses the broader terminology "community prevention and treatment programs," a move which will enable a community to decide what is most needed to meet its kidney disease problems and then seek support for the development of the needed program through grants from the Public Health Service. By bringing the various types of programs for kidney patients together under one heading, this new version would permit communities to develop not only chronic dialysis treatment centers for those unfortunate individuals who cannot survive without artificial kidney treatment, but would also permit the development of related programs directed toward the prevention, early detection, and adequate treatment of those conditions which—undetected and untreated—lead to kidney failure.

I would also like to take this opportunity to point out several developments which have transpired since my remarks in October in relation to S. 2675. In November, the National Broadcasting Co. presented a 1-hour television special entitled "Who Shall Live," which dramatically presented the problem of patients who must be able to pay the $10,000 to $15,000 that such treatment costs each year if they are to survive.

Many of you, like me, received letters from your constituents following this program. These letters came from young and old, rich and poor, sick and healthy. They came from wives who watched the program sitting next to a husband who is fated to die of kidney disease within months because they could not raise the funds necessary to obtain lifesaving treatment. They came from people—without friends or relatives afflicted—who were simply outraged that the fruits of our tax-supported medical research programs should be denied those who need them for lack of financial support. And they came from those who understood the underlying message of this program—that no effort could be made to treat everyone until more trained personnel and more adequate treatment facilities were available. The bill offered today will enable the Federal Government to begin an expanded effort aimed at providing these trained personnel and providing these complex facilities which must be created before even those who can afford to pay can receive treatment.

A second factor worthy of note as we consider this legislation is the fact that the Scientific Advisory Board of the National Kidney Foundation has recently adopted a policy statement which favors expanded Federal support of community diagnostic and treatment centers for patients with kidney disease. These physicians recognize the toll taken by kidney disease in the population each year and the need for the Federal Government to take a position of leadership in demonstrating the best detection and treatment techniques to the lay and medical community.

It is worth while noting that research as such is not covered in this bill, nor was it covered in the last version. There is no question but what the National Institutes of Health have sufficient authority to conduct any research needed in the kidney disease area. Demonstration and treatment programs, on the other hand, cannot move without additional legislative authority.

Some of the most important advances in kidney disease treatment—particularly those relating to artificial kidney treatments for patients with chronic kidney failure—have taken place in the United States. Many of these advances have taken place in my own home State of Washington. It is both interesting and disturbing to note that other countries—such as Great Britain—have taken up the fruits of our federally supported research and are bringing them to their people before we have made a decision to do so. This legislation would enable us to begin to go forward on a broad front against kidney disease. It would begin to meet the needs of this country for better diagnostic and treatment facilities for kidney disease patients. And it would bring new hope to those fated to die of kidney failure because they simply cannot afford artificial kidney treatment.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk through April 19, 1966, for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The bill (S. 3177) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of community programs for patients with kidney disease and for conduct of training related to such programs, and other purposes; introduced by Mr. Jackson (for himself and Mr. Magnuson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8 OF THE TAYLOR GRAZING ACT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill I am introducing at the request of the Department of the Interior to meet the growing need for increased flexibility in exchanges of publicly owned lands and interests therein.

Specifically, the measure would amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act, which was enacted in 1934. This section is found in 43 United States Code 315g.

As the executive communication signed by the Under Secretary of the Interior points out, the bill is designed to meet a demonstrated, tangible need to make the exchange authority of the Department of the Interior more workable and useful. Enactment in advance of completion of the work of the Public Land Law Review Commission is desirable, and would not in any way interfere with the Commission's examination of the general body of land law. The Western States Land Commission Association memorialized Congress in 1964 for legislation designed to accomplish the purposes of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the executive communication transmitting the draft of proposed legislation and explaining the need for it be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3178) to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315g), introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315g)."

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The proposed bill would eliminate gaps in the Department's exchange authority under the Taylor Grazing Act, and would facilitate the consummation of such exchanges.

More specifically, the proposed bill would (1) authorize the acceptance of cash in order to equalize values; (2) authorize exchanges of interests in lands; (3) establish the same rules for both exchanges with States and exchanges with private individuals and give the Secretary more complete authority to determine whether State exchanges would be beneficial; (4) designate lands acquired through exchange as automatically a part of the withdrawn area within which they are located; and (5) make it clear that the exchange provisions apply to Alaska.

1. Equalization of values: Under existing law, exchanges with private individuals can be consummated only if the value of the offered land is not less than the value of the selected land. Often differences in value lead to extended negotiations and examinations at considerable cost to the Government. Not uncommonly, exchanges die because the exchange proponent is unable to offer additional lands to meet the value requirements.

Since January 1, 1960, a total of 258 exchange proposals failed, and in 95 percent of the cases the failure was due to the inequality of land values. In many cases the private landowner was willing to pay cash to make up the difference. All of these proposals would have benefited Federal programs by blocking up intermingled public and private lands.

Congress has recognized the need for each payments to equalize values in exchanges in recent legislation establishing new park or recreation areas (Public Law 87-126, Cape Cod; Public Law 87-657, Point Reyes; Public Law 87-711, Padre Island; Public Law 88-587, Fire Island; Public Law 88-590, Canyonlands; Public Law 88-639, Lake Mead; Public Law 89-158, Delaware Water Gap; Public Law 89-195, Assateague; Public Law 89-336, Whiskeytown).

A proposal to permit cash payments to equalize the values of exchanges within national forests was submitted to Congress by the Department of Agriculture and is now pending before the Senate Agriculture Committee (S. 2264).

It should be noted that the authority in the proposed bill to equalize values by cash payments is limited by the requirement that a cash equalization payment may not exceed one-third the value of the land, and that this limitation does not appear in the national park statutes.

The limitation is proposed for the Taylor Grazing Act because that act contains no land purchase authority, and we feel that in the absence of purchase authority the Secretary should not pay more than one-third the value of the land in an exchange transaction. If a larger payment were involved the transaction would tend to resemble a purchase and lose much of the character of an exchange.

This limitation is not needed, and is not desirable, in the national park bills because there the Secretary has both purchase and exchange authority. Consequently, it does not matter whether the transaction is viewed as a purchase or as an exchange. Regardless of the relative values of the lands exchanged, the use of Federal land not needed for program purposes in lieu of money can result in a saving of appropriated funds.

2. Exchanges of interests in lands: The present statute has been construed as not permitting the exchange of interests in lands. Our experience has indicated that some exchanges, of mutual benefit to the Government and to the exchange proponents, have been precluded by the limitation on authority. Our proposal explicitly provides for exchanges of such interests.

The phrase "interests in lands" includes all interests less than fee estates, including, inter alia, mineral interests, rights-of-way, and easements.

Under the present section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act, 48 Stat. 1272 (1934), as amended, 43 U.S.C. 315g (1958), the Secretary of the Interior may convey the full fee title in the public lands, including the mineral interest. The present law does permit either party to "make reservations of minerals, easements, or rights of use" (43 U.S.C. 315g(d)).

The mention of "interests in lands" in the bill would permit the transfer of mineral interests only, with retention by the United States of title to the surface. It would allow the Secretary of the Interior to exchange mineral interests reserved to the United States in lands previously patented. It would permit the Secretary to accept mineral interests in land in exchange for transfers of lands on an equal value basis. In addition it would permit the Secretary to dispose of the interest of the United States as lessor under a mineral lease, which is an authority not now available. (See 61 I.D. 459.)

The methods used to determine the value of these mineral interests would be the same as are presently used in exchanges and other transfers where a mineral interest is involved. We recognize that there may be instances where valuable mineral deposits are discovered subsequent to a transfer of rights to those minerals. However, this could just as readily operate in favor of the United States as against it.

For example, authorization for an exchange of interest in land would have afforded a solution to a problem which existed in connection with the Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park in California, which problem was considered in special legislation, the Act of December 19, 1963 (77 Stat. 448). The details of this situation are set out on page 296 of the hearing record on S. 1598 (Public Land Review, part 2, hearings of Subcommittee on Public Lands, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963) as follows:

"One specific case exists in California where the State has been offered as a gift the NE¼ and E½NW¼ of sec. 29, T. 20 S., R. 3 E., M.D.M., California, for use as part of Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park. The lands (240 acres) are former public domain patented under the Stock-Raising Homestead Act with reservation of all minerals to the United States together with the right to prospect for, mine, or remove the same. The attorney general of the State of California has ruled that the State cannot take title to property subject to mineral reservations 'in which the right of surface entry is not under control of the State.'

"If the State could acquire the mineral interest reserved to the United States, then it could under State law accept the gift of the land. The U.S. Geological Survey reports that these lands are considered to be nonmineral in character.

"Under S. 1598, the State could offer State lands or interests in lands in exchange for the reserved mineral interest of the United States. Such an exchange is not possible under existing law."

There are other situations where consolidation of mineral rights with the surface estate would be desirable for both the Federal Government and the non-Federal owner of the surface. Our records show that more than 59 million acres of public lands have been patented with some or all of the minerals reserved to the United States. Development of some of this land, especially for urban or suburban use, may be impeded by the existence of a mineral reservation. One example of this type was considered by the 87th Congress in connection with the bills which resulted in enactment of the act of October 5, 1962 (76 Stat. 743), dealing with lands around Tucson, Ariz. The location of mining claims on lands patented many years ago under the Stock-Raising Homestead Act was interfering with suburban use of the land by private owners, and the Congress by that law withdrew the reserved mineral estate from the operation of the public land laws.

Similarly, the act of October 5, 1962 (76 Stat. 750), withdrew 4,540.57 acres of reserved mineral interests of the United States from the operation of the public land laws, in order to permit intensive development of the privately owned surface.

The need for broader exchange authority, particularly with reference to exchanges of interests of lands, has been recognized by the 1964 Annual Conference of the Western States Land Commissioners Association at their meeting in Salt Lake City on July 21, 1964. They memorialized the Congress "* * * to review the exchange laws in their entirety with a view to liberalizing and standardizing such laws; to direct the administrative branch to apply a more liberal construction to such laws, and further that in enacting such new legislation that special consideration be given to permitting exchange of lands or interests in lands such as mining, rights-of-way, easements and leases as well as adopting uniform standards for appraisals of Federal and State lands."

3. Uniform rules for State and for private exchanges: Under existing law where a State exchange involves the selection of lands within a grazing district, the offered lands must lie within the same grazing district. The selected lands must be apart from the general orders of withdrawal and withdrawals for grazing districts, unreserved and unappropriated. The sole discretion vested in the Secretary is the determination of "* * * whether the selected lands lie in a reasonably compact body which is so located as not to interfere with the administration or value of the remaining land in such district for grazing purposes. * * *" Where the selected lands in a State exchange application are not within a grazing district and are unappropriated and unreserved, the Secretary is directed by the statute "* * * to proceed with such exchange at the earliest practicable date * * *" and he is without authority to consider the impact of the proposed exchange upon good land tenure and use, the local economy, and Federal land programs and interests. Under the proposed change he could consider those and similar factors to determine whether a State exchange truly would be beneficial.

The present statute provides that State exchanges can be made on one of two bases—equal value or equal acreage. The Secretary by regulation, 43 CFR 2244.2-2(a) (formerly 43 CFR 147.2(b)), has authorized use of the equal value concept only. Equal acreage is not a sound criterion owing to the vast differences in land values, often depending on location only. The proposed bill takes cognizance of our present practice. Equal value is also the usual concept adopted by the Congress in measures having their own exchange provisions. In the light of the current practice of approval of exchanges only on a value basis, we have not included in our bill the provision of existing law authorizing a State to exchange unsurveyed school sections, identified by protraction, on an acreage basis.

4. Status of land acquired by exchange: Under the present statute, lands acquired through exchange by the United States become a part of the grazing district within which they are situated. However, such lands do not automatically otherwise become a part of other reservations within which situated. Our proposal thus would obviate the issuance of public land orders to some extent.

5. Alaska: Section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act has not been applied to Alaska. The need for exchange authority in Alaska is similar to the need for exchange authority in other public land States. Our proposal clarifies the present law by specifying that the exchange authority applies to Alaska.

Our proposal specifically authorizes the Secretary to exchange lands acquired under section 32 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, 50 Stat. 525-6 (1937), 7 U.S.C. 1011 (1958), as amended, which have been or may be transferred to this Department for administration under the Taylor Grazing Act, as amended, supra. Millions of acres of such lands have been transferred to us by the Department of Agriculture. The bill would also clarify the status of lands received by this Department in exchange for such lands.

The proposal omits the provisions of subsection (d) of section 8 relating to publication of exchanges. Experience has demonstrated that essentially internal work procedures embodied in statutes decrease their flexibility. They can be effectively instituted through regulation.

Also omitted is the provision that no fees shall be charged for exchanges. This provision was superseded by the act of July 14, 1960 (sec. 201, 74 Stat. 506, 43 U.S.C. 1371 (Supp. V, 1964)), which states that notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may establish reasonable fees for processing applications relating to public lands under his jurisdiction.

The proposed bill is intended to meet a demonstrated, tangible need to make the Department's exchange authority more workable and more useful. The exchanges authorized are only those that will facilitate administration of federally owned lands in accordance with the statutory policies applicable to those lands.

We believe that the enactment of the proposed bill in advance of the completion of the work of the Public Land Law Review Commission is desirable. The merits of the bill can be evaluated independently of the general body of land law, and the enactment of the bill would not prejudice possible changes in that general body of law.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Carver, Jr.,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

TAX STATUS OF REIMBURSEMENTS FOR CERTAIN MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the tax status of reimbursements for certain moving expenses made to an employee by his employer.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for 1 week to give other Senators an opportunity to join as sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 3181) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, introduced by Mr. McCarthy (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to clarify a confused situation. It is intended to assure that employees who are required to move and who are reimbursed by their employer for several types of moving expenses will not be required to pay an income tax on such allowances. It covers only those taxpayers whose new principal place of work is at least 20 miles farther from his former residence that was his former principal place of work and also only those employees who have been employed by the same employer for the previous 12-month period.

In the Revenue Act of 1964 the Congress authorized tax deductions for certain moving expenses for two groups of employees: those who continued to work for the same employer, although required to move to a new place of work, and who were not reimbursed by their employer, and new employees who moved to accept a position. This action extended the benefits to all, which under previous law the Internal Revenue Service had agreed are excludable for existing employees where they are reimbursed. The categories of expense for which the 1964 act provided were transportation expenses for moving the employee and his family; for moving personal and household effects; and expenses for meals and lodging for the employee and his family while en route to their new location.

There are, of course, a number of other expenses connected with moving, and the quesion of the tax liability of an employee who was reimbursed for these additional costs was acknowledged in the Senate report on the 1964 act. It stated:

> No inference should be drawn from this, however, that moving expense exclusions under existing law are necessarily limited to these 3 categories of expenses. However, since by administrative ruling, these categories are clearly excludable in the case of existing employees who are reimbursed, it is believed that deductions for such expenses should also be made available to new employees and nonreimbursed employees as well. The question of whether the exclusion for existing employees extends beyond these 3 categories is left for judicial interpretation.

The court cases and legal aspects of this question are complicated and still not fully resolved. It appears that on the basis of one court of appeals decision, the England against United States case, the Internal Revenue Service has issued a ruling instructing employees to report as taxable income any reimbursement by employers for such expenses as temporary living allowances and out-of-pocket costs relate to sales of the taxpayer's old residence. The IRS has also informed employers that reimbursed expenses of this kind would be subject to withholding. Subsequently, on January 17 this year, the Supreme Court refused to grant the requested writ of certiorari in the England case. This action does not end litigation about deductibility of certain moving expenses; rather, it tends to prolong it. It is my view that it is desirable that Congress determine specifically by statute what reimbursements for moving expenses are not to be subject to income tax liability.

It is estimated that about 150,000 "old" employees who move annually are affected by the problem, and to some extent it also involves a number of members of the armed services. Another reason that it is desirable for Congress to act in this session to clarify this situation is the prospect that another group of citizens will very likely soon be involved. Last Wednesday the House of Representatives passed H.R. 10607, the bill to provide reimbursement of expenses and losses incurred by civil service employees who must move to a new location for the convenience of the Government. This bill provides allowances for Federal employees, in addition to those for transportation of household effects and for transportation of the employee and his family, for such items as one home-seeking trip to the new location for the taxpayer and his spouse, temporary quarters at the new location up to 30 days under some circumstances, certain expenses related to the sale of his old house and the purchase of a new home at the new location, and a number of other miscellaneous expenses.

H.R. 10607 is supported by the Civil Service Commission. It has passed the House. If the Senate approves it and it is enacted, we would end up in the curious position of reimbursing Federal employees for admitted expenses incurred in his moving at the direction of the Government, and then proceed to tax a portion of these reimbursements as though it were earned income.

The bill I am introducing today is drafted to permit reimbursements for moving expenses along similar lines to those allowances provided in H.R. 10607. It removes personal income tax liability of an existing employee for reimbursements by the employer for: one house hunting trip when the old and new job locations are both in the United States; temporary living expenses at the place of new employment for not more than 30 days except that the period shall be up to 60 days for moving to or from an overseas location; expenses incident to the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's former residence or settlement of an unexpired lease; expenses incident to the purchase of a residence in the area of the new principal place of work; and other miscellaneous items directly attributable to the transfer, subject to a limit of 2 weeks the taxpayer's regular weekly wages or $1,000, whichever is the lesser, for a taxpayer with a family and 1 week's wages or $500 for a single taxpayer. As I stated earlier, the provisions would apply only to an employee whose place of work was at least 20 miles farther and who, for the preceding year, was an employee of the employer.

I am also preparing legislation providing comparable deductions for an existing employee who is not reimbursed by his employer, and also for unemployed who move to take or seek new employment.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR BRINGING CERTAIN DANGEROUS DRUGS INTO THE UNITED STATES FOR ILLEGAL SALE OR USE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT UNITED STATES-MEXICO NARCOTIC COMMISSION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill and a joint resolution which are a continuation of the legislative program of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. Their enactment into law would help control one of the Nation's greatest social problems, narcotic and dangerous drug abuse. Senators JAVITS, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and MONTOYA are cosponsors of these measures.

I ask unanimous consent that both the joint resolution and the bill be allowed to lie on the table for 5 days, so that additional Senators who so desire may join as cosponsors; and I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the resolution and bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill and joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the subcommittee has worked closely with President Johnson and the various executive agencies charged with the responsibility of enforcing this Nation's narcotic and dangerous drug laws. As a result of this close relationship we were successful in enacting into law the 1965 Drug Control Amendments which will deal a major blow at those criminals who, annually, divert 5 billion capsules of dangerous drugs into the illegal traffic.

The current phase of this united effort by the executive and legislative branches is the "Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965." The subcommittee is presently conducting hearings on this legislation and I am certain we will report a bill that will put the Federal Government in the position of leadership in this field that it surrendered to the States many years ago.

It was during these hearings, on January 25, 1966, that California officials led by their attorney general, Thomas C. Lynch, made a plea to the Federal Government for help in stanching the flow of drugs into that State.

Mr. David Acheson, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, who, I feel, has ushered in a new concept of the function of the Treasury Department in the field of narcotic law enforcement quickly answered that plea. At my invitation Mr. Lynch and Mr. Acheson, along with members of the subcommittee staff, met in San Diego to assess the problem and plan for increased cooperation between the Customs and Narcotics Bureaus of the Federal Government and the law-enforcement agencies of the State of California.

The results of that meeting are a welcome beginning. They augur well for future enforcement activities in that part of the country, and I feel I can safely predict that the dope peddlers and pill pushers of southern California will find the going increasingly rougher in the coming months.

As a result of this meeting and the hearings to date, we have developed legislation that will round out the overall Federal efforts in controlling our nationwide dope problem.

Since I became its chairman in 1961, the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee has investigated the dope problem not only on an interstate basis, but particularly as it has developed along the international border in the southwestern part of the United States. We have for years identified a criminal element in the Republic of Mexico that has increasingly supplied the dope addicts and the "pill heads" in the United States. The problem has increased in scope and intensity until our present situation wherein a small army of petty criminals and not-so-petty criminals have unleashed a flow of dope across our border that is unequaled in history.

It is easy to prove that this preposterous condition exists. It is not as easy to explain why it exists.

Let me give an example.

The attorney general of California has turned over to the subcommittee the names of 15 fugitives from American justice who are presently operating south of the border with complete immunity. There is nothing very clandestine about the operations of these criminals.

They have been known dope peddlers for years.

They engage in this traffic with apparently little or no interference.

We know it and the Mexicans know it.

The solution to this situation, while seemingly obvious, has, as of today, defied the efforts of many honest, hardworking officials in both countries.

In revealing these facts, I do not overlook the valiant efforts that have been made by sincere men in our sister Republic to the south.

I know that arrests have been made of a few of the ubiquitous pill-pushers.

I know that many acres of marihuana have been seized or destroyed.

I know that many poppy fields, small and large, have been burned.

I know that many poverty stricken peasant farmers have been harassed by the Mexican Federal Government for producing the only crop that provides them with the money to eat and live, opium.

I know that agents from both countries have been threatened, tortured, and killed in their attempts to arrest Mexican bandits who run the dope traffic.

But the fact remains, Mr. President, that today in southern California, in the Southwest in general, and in the streets of major cities throughout America, Mexican marihuana, Mexican heroin, Mexican peyote, and Mexican pills are more plentiful than at any time in the history of our narcotics problem.

The conclusion is obvious.

The efforts of officials on both sides while impressive, have been inadequate to meet the total problem. Let me outline some comparative statistics to illustrate this point.

In 1961 there were 421,269 grams of marihuana seized by Federal and State officials. In 1965 there were 6,237,301 grams confiscated. This is a total of 7.2 tons. One seizure alone totaled 750 pounds, the largest seizure in history.

In 1961 there were 20,372 grams of heroin seized. In 1965 seizures totaled 33,275 grams.

In 1961 there were 451,425 pills seized as a result of the smuggling activities of Mexican and American criminals. In 1965 seizures of these drugs had grown to a total of 1,256,579 pills.

This is in addition to recent increases in smuggling activities in the hallucinogenic type drugs, including peyote and LSD.

These figures become all the more important when we realize that these seizures represent only a fraction of the total amount of drugs smuggled into the United States.

It is no wonder that the attorney general of the State of California has accused the Federal Government of allowing that State to become the dumping ground for Mexican dope.

And he has the names and addresses of 20,000 drug users and addicts to prove that a good percentage of that traffic stays in California.

I need not impress upon my colleagues the need for strict controls on the deadly heroin. Since 1914 the Congress has recognized the devastating effects of this traffic on our citizens.

It has only recently recognized the serious problem of the dangerous drugs which literally exploded into American life in the mid 1950's.

And today, we are receiving danger signals from the new time bomb that is ticking away on college campuses throughout the Nation, the hallucinogenic drugs which unfortunately are shrouded in a mantle of intellectual sanctions.

I have come to the Senate floor to sound a warning to my colleagues that we cannot delay the passage of the legislation I introduce today as we did with the 1965 Drug Control Amendments. We cannot allow tens of thousands of young Americans to fall into the bottomless pit of the new mind-destroying drugs as we allowed tens of thousands of them to become victims of the psychotoxic compounds.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to give intensive thought to this problem and ask that they take swift action on these two simple, but effective, measures.

As I pointed out, the 1965 Drug Control Amendments which President Johnson signed into law in July of 1965, will soon be enforced by a newly trained, highly skilled, force of Food and Drug Administration investigators. Inasmuch as these drugs are legally produced in this country, I am certain that sizable dents will be put in the illicit traffic through the efforts of law enforcement along with the cooperation of responsible leaders in the drug industry.

This means, however, that tens of thousands of drug abusers must now turn to the criminal underworld for their source of supply.

We know from recent developments that a major source of this contraband will be produced in Mexico and smuggled across our borders for distribution throughout the United States. The signs are already there. We must not wait for the developments of a full-blown organization of producers, middlemen, and sellers, as we did with the heroin problem.

The first bill I introduce today would put a serious crimp into the activities of these pill peddlers.

The intent of this bill is threefold:

It will particularize the offense of dangerous drug smuggling in the same manner as we did with heroin;

It will increase the penalties for smugglers who are apprehended at the border;

And, it will impress upon Federal enforcement agencies and judicial officials the sense of Congress which considers these drugs to be in the same category as the products of the opium poppy.

As it stands today, the penalty for smuggling these destructive items can be no more severe than the penalty applied to a tourist who smuggles perfume across the border.

The second piece of legislation has a much broader approach in that it calls for the establishment of a Commission composed of the highest officials of the Republic of Mexico and the United States to enter into negotiations for a complete overhauling of the legal and enforcement machinery between our two nations as they relate to the production, sale, distribution, and smuggling of opium and its derivatives, marihuana, peyote, LSD, the barbiturates, the amphetamines, the tranquilizers, and any of the other chemicals which tens of thousands of Americans daily gobble up much to the detriment of the communities in which they live.

Such a proposition has had many supporters in the past. It was supported by President Kennedy and it has the support of President Johnson and his White House Commission on Narcotics.

It certainly has the support of the citizens of the States which are the targets for Mexican dope.

At the meeting between David Acheson and California Attorney General Lynch which I referred to earlier, there was unanimous agreement on one vital point. The combined efforts of Federal and State agencies will be useless until the reservoirs of narcotics deep in the mountains of Mexico and in the border towns are dried up. They agreed that one of the best ways to accomplish this was through the establishment of a commission such as I propose today.

There was also unanimous support for the smuggling measure on dangerous drugs which I propose.

There was never any doubt in my mind that there would be.

They are the people who daily grapple with the problem and who are in a position to see what is developing in the twilight world of the drug addict. They were the first to know of the burgeoning nature of the criminal traffic in dangerous drugs. They supported the 1965 drug control amendments. But that legislation will only do part of the job. This bill will finish the job.

The World Health Organization in recognizing the international traffic in these drugs has called on all nations to take legislative steps to prevent the transshipment of large numbers of dangerous drugs across international boundaries. The legislation I introduce today will fulfill that request.

I am much encouraged by the results of the meeting by the officials from the Department of Treasury and the officials from our most populous State. After many frustrating years I am convinced that in 1966 we can look forward to maximum cooperative efforts by both of these groups.

I can only hope that the U.S. Congress will rise to the occasion and share its part of the responsibility by providing the legislation which will make these efforts worth while.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill and joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3183) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prescribe criminal penalties for the illegal importation of depressant and stimulant drugs, introduced by Mr. Dodd (for himself, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Mr. Javits), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3183

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after chapter 27 thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 28—DEPRESSANT OR STIMULANT DRUGS

"Sec.
"561. Definition.
"562. Illegal importation.

"§ 561. Definition

"As used in this chapter, the term 'depressant or stimulant drug' shall have the same meaning as that given to such term in subsection (v) of section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

"§ 562. Illegal importation

"Any person who knowingly imports into the United States in violation of any law of the United States any depressant or stimulant drug for the purpose of manufacturing, compounding, processing, selling, delivering, or otherwise disposing of the same in violation of the laws of the United States shall—

"(1) for the first such offense, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both; and

"(2) for the second and each subsequent such offense, be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"(b) The analysis of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after

"27 Customs.......................... 541"

the following:

"28 Depressant or stimulant drugs.... 561"

Sec. 2. (a) Chapter 203 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3061. Officer's powers involving depressant or stimulant drugs

"Any officer of the customs may arrest any person violating section 562 of this title in his presence or view, and may execute any warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of such section."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 203 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"3061. Officer's powers involving depressant or stimulant drugs."

Sec. 3. (a) Chapter 205 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3117. Search warrants for seizure of depressant or stimulant drugs

"Any officer of the customs shall have authority to execute any warrant to search for and seize any depressant or stimulant drug, as defined by subsection (v) of section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321), brought into the United States in violation of section 562 of this title. Any depressant or stimulant drug so seized shall be held by the customs officer or by the United States marshal pending disposition thereof by the court."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 205 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"3117. Search warrants for seizure of depressant or stimulant drugs."

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 154) to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose

of setting up a joint United States-Mexican commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S.J. RES. 154

> To request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico.
>
> Whereas Mexico is the primary source of supply for narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs brought into the southwestern part of the United States; and
>
> Whereas these narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs are subsequently distributed throughout the United States; and
>
> Whereas 100 per centum of the marihuana seized by the enforcement officials in the southwestern part of the United States comes from Mexico; and
>
> Whereas the smuggling of narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs into the United States poses the largest single problem for the collectors of the customs and for the Federal courts in the southwestern part of the United States; and
>
> Whereas the use of narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs by juveniles has greatly increased due to the easy accessibility of such drugs from Mexico: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the President is requested to initiate negotiations with the Government of Mexico for the purpose of setting up a joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate and to recommend appropriate solutions concerning the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between said countries.

TAX CREDIT FOR INDUSTRY TO ESTABLISH PROGRAMS FOR TRAINING EMPLOYEES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide an incentive for private industry to establish programs to educate and train individuals in needed skills by allowing a credit against income tax for the expenses of conducting those programs.

Mr. President, we are living in a booming economy. Unemployment has reached the lowest point in more than a decade. All over the Nation—and most of all, in industrial States like Connecticut, the cry is heard "We need trained workers." The manpower crisis in America has changed from surplus to scarcity in a few short years.

There is a soaring demand for trained technicians—men and women who can support the growing numbers of the most highly trained professional people our schools and universities can produce—an urgent need for men and women to help engineers, scientists, doctors, and other professional persons in the performance of their highly complex tasks.

For example, Secretary of Labor Wirtz has stated:

> Our particular need is for semiprofessional personnel who can assist engineers, scientists, and other professional workers.

A report of the National Society of Professional Engineers is similar in tone:

> One incontrovertible fact stands out with brilliant clarity: there is virtual unanimity of agreement among manpower specialists, both in and out of Government, that there is an urgent need to train impressively more numbers of 2-year technical institute graduates.

The Connecticut Department of Education recently completed a similar survey, and demonstrated a need for trained technicians in every branch of our industry. From electronics to chemicals, our Nation's industry needs technicians—needs them now—and will need even more in the future.

A nationwide survey 2 years ago indicated that the overall industry and Government ratio was 2.5 engineers to each technician, when the need was almost the opposite—three technicians to each engineer.

What can we do about this? Much has already been done. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 put the Nation on record in favor of meeting the technical manpower needs of our society. The poverty program seeks to give the poor the skills they need to get and hold jobs. It does seem to me, however, that we have not yet taken full advantage of one of our greatest resources—American industry. In our corporations, we have not only a recognized need for trained personnel, but the means with which to train them.

When men and women lose their jobs to automation, we step in through the Manpower Development and Training Act to retrain them for useful work in necessary occupations. However, we need more preventive medicine—the training to equip our workers with the skills they need to participate in our scientific revolution, not become victims of it.

Thus far we have looked primarily to our schools for that preventive medicine—the teaching of the skills necessary to contribute to today's society. When our young people have left school, the community's efforts are far too often finished. Some lucky youngsters might gain an apprenticeship—some might be fortunate enough to take part in a corporate training program.

But what of those who missed the boat and never gained a skill? Or those older workers whose talents are rapidly growing obsolete?

Manpower specialists agree that the modern world has no place for the uneducated and the untrained. The pace of our technology is such that skills become outmoded overnight. Knowledge once held precious is turned by research breakthroughs into obsolete notions—as antiquated as the ancient Aristotelian theories of our solar system.

In short, we must face up to the need for lifetime training—and in such a colossal task we must find and use every teaching and educational resource in our command.

Without question, one of those resources is the American corporation—which could in the long-term constitute something in the nature of a new kind of community technical training classroom.

This movement will not come about overnight—or through goodwill alone. People—and industries—need motivation.

It is in an industry's own interest to train and obtain the best possible people for its operations. But there is also a public interest in assuring that young people receive the training and the skills they need for the 20th century.

I propose that we make a beginning. And we should start now, when the economy is strong. The time to fix the roof is when the sun is shining. I propose that industry be given an incentive to provide that training and those skills—not only to its own employees, as any progressive company would—but to the young people of the entire community.

My bill is designed to give companies tax relief to reflect the cost of training and retraining programs open to all who can qualify, run in conjunction with the educational systems of our States and communities.

Such programs could immeasurably expand our training facilities. They would be local in nature—coordinated with the schools, with labor and with industry. Their financing would ultimately be Federal—for we face a national problem.

The bill would provide an income tax credit for the amount of education and training program expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year. Like the investment credit, there is a limitation on the amount claimed in any one year. The amount of credit is limited to the amount of tax liability, up to $25,000, plus 25 percent of any tax liability in excess of $25,000. Thus, a corporation with a tax liability of $125,000 would be limited in that year to a $50,000 credit, assuming it spent that much on a qualifying program. Excess amounts could be carried back 3 years and forward 5 years.

To qualify for the credit, the training program may be designed to afford education or training in trade, business, industrial, technological or scientific skills. However, the program must be open to all qualified applicants, with no preference given to employees. It must be a truly community program, open to all, without charge.

The education and training programs would be established under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and must be approved by him as meeting the conditions and purposes of this proposal before being eligible for the credit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 5 days for cosponsors and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 3184) to provide an incentive for private industry to establish programs to educate and train individuals in needed skills by allowing a credit against income tax for the expenses of conducting such programs, introduced by Mr. Ribicoff, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3184

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 39 as section 40, and by inserting after section 38 the following new section:

"Sec. 39. Expenses of Education and Training Programs.

"(a) General Rule.—Subject to the provisions of subpart C, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year the amount of education and training program expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year.

"(b) Regulations.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section and subpart C."

Sec. 2. Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subpart:

"Subpart C. Rules for Computing Credit for Expenses of Education and Training Programs

"Sec. 51. Limitation on amount of credit.
"Sec. 52. Definitions.
"Sec. 53. Special rules.

"Sec. 51. Limitation on Amount of Credit.

"(a) Limitation Based on Amount of Tax.—

"(1) In general.—The credit allowed by section 39 for the taxable year shall not exceed—

"(A) so much of the liability for tax for the taxable year as does not exceed $25,000, plus

"(B) 25 percent of so much of the liability for tax for the taxable year as exceeds $25,000.

"(2) Liability for tax.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the liability for tax for the taxable year shall be the tax imposed by this chapter for such year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under—

"(A) section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit),

"(B) section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest),

"(C) section 37 (relating to retirement income), and

"(D) section 38 (relating to investment in certain depreciable property).

For purposes of this paragraph, any tax imposed for the taxable year by section 531 (relating to accumulated earnings tax) or by section 541 (relating to personal holding company tax) shall not be considered tax imposed by this chapter for such year.

"(3) Married individuals.—In the case of a husband or wife who files a separate return, the amount specified under subparagraph (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall be $12,500 in lieu of $25,000. This paragraph shall not apply if the spouse of the taxpayer has no education and training program expenses for, and no unused credit carryback or carryover to, the taxable year of such spouse which ends within or with the taxpayer's taxable year.

"(4) Affiliated groups.—In the case of an affiliated group, the $25,000 amount specified under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall be reduced for each member of the group by apportioning $25,000 among the members of such group in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'affiliated group' has the meaning assigned to such term by section 1504(a), except that all corporations shall be treated as includible corporations (without any exclusion under section 1504 (b)).

"(b) Carryback and Carryover of Unused Credits.—

"(1) Allowance of credit.—If the amount of the credit determined under section 39 for any taxable year exceeds the limitation provided by subsection (a)(1) for such taxable year (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as 'unused credit year'), such excess shall be—

"(A) an education and training program credit carryback to each of the 3 taxable years preceding the unused credit year, and

"(B) an education and training program credit carryover to each of the 5 taxable years following the unused credit year,

and shall be added to the amount allowable as a credit by section 39 for such years, except that such excess may be a carryback only to a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1965. The entire amount of the unused credit for an unused credit year shall be carried to the earliest of the 8 taxable years to which (by reason of subparagraphs (A) and (B)) such credit may be carried, and then to each of the other 7 taxable years to the extent that, because of the limitation contained in paragraph (2), such unused credit may not be added for a prior taxable year to which such unused credit may be carried.

"(2) Limitation.—The amount of the unused credit which may be added under paragraph (1) for any preceding or succeeding taxable year shall not exceed the amount by which the limitation provided by subsection (a)(1) for such taxable year exceeds the sum of—

"(A) the credit allowable under section 39 for such taxable year, and

"(B) the amounts which, by reason of this subsection, are added to the amount allowable for such taxable year and attributable to taxable years preceding the unused credit year.

"(3) Effect of net operating loss carryback.—To the extent that the excess described in paragraph (1) arises by reason of a net operating loss carryback, subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall not apply.

"Sec. 52. Definitions.

"(a) Education and Training Program Expenses.—For purposes of the subpart, the term 'education and training program expense' means only an expense which, but for the provisions of section 53(a), is allowable as a deduction under this chapter and which—

"(1) is incurred by the taxpayer in providing one or more approved education and training programs, and

"(2) is directly attributable to an approved education and training program.

An expense shall not be treated as an education and training program expense if such expense would have been incurred by the taxpayer in the conduct of his trade or business without regard to any approved education and training program provided by him.

"(b) Approved Location and Training Programs.—

"(1) In general.—For purposes of this subpart, the term 'approved education and training program' means only a program which—

"(A) is designed to afford education or training, or both, in trade, business, industrial, technological, or scientific skills, and

"(B) has been approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as fulfilling the standards, requirements, and conditions prescribed by him for purposes of this subpart.

"(2) Limitations.—The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not approve any education and training program—

"(A) unless such program is made available (within the limitations of the facilities in which such program is conducted) to all qualified applicants;

"(B) if any fee or charge of any kind is required of individuals applying for or participating in the program; or

"(C) if, in selecting participants in the program, any preference of any kind is given to employees or prospective employees of the taxpayer.

"(3) Withdrawal of approval.—The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall withdraw his approval of an education and training program previously approved by him if he determines that such program—

"(A) no longer fulfills the standards, requirements, and conditions prescribed by him for purposes of this subpart, or

"(B) is being conducted contrary to any provision of paragraph (2).

"Sec. 53. Special Rules.

"(a) Denial of Deduction for Education and Training Expenses.—For purposes of the tax imposed by this chapter, no deduction shall be allowed under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) or under any other provision of this chapter for any education and training program expense.

"(b) Subchapter S Corporations.—In the case of an electing small business corporation (as defined in section 1371)—

"(1) the education and training program expenses for each taxable year shall be appropriated pro rata among the persons who are shareholders of such corporation on the last day of such taxable year, and

"(2) any person to whom any education and training program expense has been apportioned under paragraph (1) shall be treated (for purposes of this subpart) as the taxpayer with respect to such expense.

"(c) Estates and Trusts.—In the case of an estate or trust—

"(1) the education and training program expenses for any taxable year shall be apportioned between the estate or trust and the beneficiaries on the basis of the income of the estate or trust allocable to each,

"(2) any beneficiary to whom any education and training program expense has been apportioned under paragraph (1) shall be treated (for purposes of this subpart) as the taxpayer with respect to such expense, and

"(3) The $25,000 amount specified under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 51 (a)(1) applicable to such estate or trust shall be reduced to an amount which bears the same ratio to $25,000 as the amount of the education and training program expenses allocated to the estate or trust under paragraph (1) bears to the entire amount of the education and training program expenses.

"(d) Limitations With Respect to Certain Persons.—In the case of—

"(1) an organization to which section 593 applies,

"(2) a regulated investment company or a real estate investment trust subject to taxation under subchapter M (sec. 851 and following), and

"(3) a cooperative organization described in section 1381 (a),

rules similar to the rules provided in section 46(d) shall apply under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(e) Cross Reference.—

"For application of this subpart to certain acquiring corporations, see section 381(c) (24)".

Sec. 3. (a) The table of subparts for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Subpart C. Rules for computing credit for expenses of education and training programs."

(b) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out:

"Sec. 39. Overpayments of tax."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 39. Expenses of education and training programs.

"Sec. 40. Overpayments of tax."

(c) Section 381(c) of such Code (relating to items taken into account in certain corporate acquisitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(24) CREDIT UNDER SECTION 39 FOR EMPLOYEE TRAINING EXPENSES.—The acquiring corporation shall take into account (to the extent proper to carry out the purposes of this section and section 39 and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) the items required to be taken into account for purposes of section 39 in respect of the distributor or transferor corporation."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINUANCE OF WORK IN MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am today introducing, by request, the administration's bill to increase by $60 million the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

The authorization proposed would be subject to two limitations. First, it would be confined to appropriations for fiscal 1967 and fiscal 1968. Secondly, funds could not be spent to initiate construction of units that were not authorized since August 14, 1964.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the March 30, 1966, letter pertaining to this bill from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior to the President of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3186) to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior, introduced by Mr. METCALF, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. METCALF is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of bill "To increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior."

We recommend that this draft bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

The bill would increase by $60 million the appropriation authorization for the portion of the Missouri River Basin project for which the Secretary of the Interior is responsible. The authorization of $60 million is confined to appropriations for fiscal years 1967 and 1968 and is further qualified by a proscription against appropriation of any of the funds authorized by the bill to initiate construction of units of the Missouri River Basin project not authorized since August 14, 1964, or hereafter authorized by an act of Congress.

Section 9(e) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887) authorized the appropriation of $200 million for partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the initial stages of the Missouri River Basin project. Subsequent acts, the most recent of which was Public Law 88-442 of August 14, 1964, have increased the funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior for carrying out the comprehensive plan of development of the Missouri River Basin project to a total of $946 million. The proposed legislation will raise this total to $1,006 million.

Since the current appropriation authorization provided by Public Law 88-442 will expire June 30, 1966, the additional authorization will be required early in this session of Congress to support the administration's request for appropriations for fiscal year 1967.

The bill provides that "No part of the funds hereby authorized to be appropriated shall be available to initiate construction of any unit of the Missouri River Basin project whether included in said comprehensive plan or not, which has not been authorized since August 14, 1964, or is not hereafter authorized by act of Congress." This limitation affects approximately 100 units of the Missouri River Basin project the authorization for which stems from the 1944 and 1946 Flood Control Acts. A careful and continuing review of the units, the construction of which has yet commenced, indicates that the purposes to be served by the units, arrangement of engineering features, lands to be irrigated, costs, benefits, repayment ability, water supply and other related factors may differ substantially from the conditions in being in 1944, when the project was originally authorized. In the exercise of sound administration, we feel that a careful reexamination of each of these units must and will be made before any request is submitted for funds to start construction on these units.

The act of August 14, 1964, provided an authorization to appropriate $120 million for work in the Missouri River Basin. This bill, when enacted, will provide funds for work to be performed on any of the authorized projects in that basin.

Enclosed is a table showing the history of appropriation authorizations for the Missouri River Basin project and the estimated requirements for fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH HOLUM,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Bureau of Reclamation, Missouri River Basin project status of appropriations and allotments[2][4]

Amount authorized to be appropriated:	
Flood Control Act Dec. 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887)	$200,000,000
Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 641)	150,000,000
Flood Control Act, May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 170)	200,000,000
Flood Control Act, July 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 297)	200,000,000
Flood Control Act, July 14, 1960 (58 Stat. 891)	60,000,000
Act of Dec. 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 842)	16,000,000
Total authorized to be appropriated to June 30, 1964[1][2][3]	826,000,000
Less net allotments to projects as of June 30, 1964	−805,659,709
Balance available as of June 30, 1964	20,340,291
Act of Aug. 14, 1964 (78 Stat. 446), for fiscal years 1965 and 1966	120,000,000
Authorization available for fiscal years 1965 and 1966	140,340,291
Amount allotted to projects in fiscal year 1965	64,453,289
Amount allotted to projects in fiscal year 1966	40,545,619
Authorization used in fiscal years 1965 and 1966	104,998,908
Expired authorization, June 30, 1966	35,341,383
Estimated fiscal year 1967 requirement	33,658,000
Estimated fiscal year 1968 requirement	24,137,362
Additional authorization-required for fiscal years 1967 and 1968 rounded to $60,000,000	57,795,362

[1] Total, Missouri River Basin project, regions 6 and 7 and technical records.

[2] Excludes other agencies and Gray Reef Dam ($974,740) covered by special legislation.

[3] Includes $528,920 for Fort Peck project for fiscal years 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964 as this is the period that this project was integrated with the Missouri River Basin project.

[4] Excludes Garrison diversion unit authorized by separate legislation with a ceiling of $207,000,000 which is adjustable by cost index.

FAIR WARNING ACT OF 1966

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this morning's papers carried the news that General Motors Corp. had recalled certain Chevrolet model automobiles for repair of dangerous defects. Notification of the defects in certain of these models reportedly was made several months ago to 6,500 General Motors dealers, but not to members of the public at large who might own or operate such autos. I believe that such notification should have been made at that time as well to those who drive these automobiles every day—and in particular, this was necessary in my State of Minnesota. We were told in the papers that under conditions of wet, heavy snow or slush, the throttles on certain models of Chevrolet cars could stick, and the cars would continue forward even though the driver took his foot off the accelerator. These are common conditions in Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, South Dakota, and indeed throughout much of the Nation.

Since I believe that the consumer has the right to know when the automobile he drives has dangerous defects, I am introducing today the Fair Warning Act of 1966, which will provide that automobile manufacturers must notify owners, dealers, and the public of dangerous defects in the cars in which they are driving and riding.

The President's bill on traffic safety requires the promulgation of auto safety standards, but it is reasonable to assume that such standards will not become effective for at least 3 or 4 years after the bill passes. My bill would provide immediate protection to the consumer and purchaser of automobiles. And indeed, even if auto standards are adopted, it will be possible to revise them for use in the production only of new models. But the consumer has a right to know immediately, not after a year or more has elapsed. And he would be protected only if he could afford the costly venture of buying a new car.

In summary, my bill would require the manufacturer of automobiles to notify people who have cars which are defective. It places the burden of discovering the defect on the manufacturer because he has designed, produced, and inspected the automobile, and is in the best possible position to know of the defects in the automobile, and the remedies for correcting the defect.

The proposed legislation provides for criminal penalties and a presumption of negligence to aid the civil litigant. In addition, the Attorney General is authorized to receive complaints on auto defects and notify the manufacturer of such complaints. The information received by the Attorney General will be public information and available to litigants.

The bill requires the manufacturer to notify all owners of defective automobiles by registered mail, to notify its own dealers, and to make public notice in newspapers circulating in all areas in which the defective automobiles have been sold. The obligation of notification falls on the manufacturer whenever he knows or should know of the defect. Notification must be made immediately to the owners of such cars, not exceeding 30 days after the defect becomes known.

Two methods of enforcement are provided. First, the manufacturer is liable to a fine of $1,000 for each such defective automobile, or imprisonment, or both. Second, failure to comply shall constitute negligence on the part of the manufacturer in any lawsuit brought against the manufacturer for loss of life, injuries or property damage arising out of the defect.

In the past, manufacturers have asked their dealers to recall certain types of automobiles to repair dangerous defects. Recently some adjustment had to be made in the braking system of some 500 of the Buick Le Sabres built during 1965. Dealers were told to call these models in for repair. The Ford Motor Co. is reportedly completing its program of calling in some 40,000 Lincoln Continentals for repair of a dangerous defect in their braking system. Notice was not sent to each owner.

We are all familiar with the well-publicized case of the Chevrolet Corvair, which for several years had a rear end suspension system which tended to buckle under and cause the auto to roll over in turning. Dealers were offered kits to improve this defect, but no general notification was made to those who owned these models.

In 1959, the Supreme Court of Michigan considered a case in which the brake fluid of the Buick Roadmaster could be sucked into the engine, robbing the driver of any braking power. The dealers were notified of this defect, but the consumers and purchasers were not unless they happened to bring their cars in for servicing. The Michigan Supreme Court said that in their view the facts in the case imposed a duty on General Motors to take all reasonable means to convey effective warning to those who had purchased these Buicks of the very real danger which could confront them when driving the car.

In November of 1964 Chrysler Corp. sent a bulletin to dealers urging them to recall for inspection certain models of the 1965 Plymouths, Chryslers, and Dodges to determine whether a steering bracket needed welding. But no attempt was made to get in touch directly with the owners of the cars and warn them of the possibility of danger.

In 1965, Ford Motor Co. notified some 30,000 owners that a change in the rear suspension of the 1965 Ford could improve the ride, and urged them to bring these cars in to the dealers. But no mention was made of the fact that, in addition to improving the ride, the vehicle was subject to complete loss of control if the suspension arm were to break loose from the chassis.

We cannot continue to permit people to drive "time bombs" which can cause fatal or crippling accidents without warning. The owner of a car, which often carries his family and loved ones, must be able to drive knowing that he can do so with safety. Senator RIBICOFF has said that more than 500,000 Americans have been killed in motor vehicle accidents since the end of World War II—125,000 more than the Nation lost in battle in all of that war and the Korean war. In that period more than 10 million Americans were injured, compared with the 774,000 wounded in those wars. We must act now to meet this problem, and full information to the consumer is essential if the war against traffic fatalities is to be won.

The fact that most of the automobiles we drive do not have defects which can cause injury to life and limb, while a tribute to the auto industry, is perhaps the most effective argument for this legislation. The American public rightly expects that the cars they drive are safe, and must be told when they are not. If they are not, the tragic traffic accident death and injury toll will continue to mount regardless of how safely we drive. Cars are far too complicated today for the consumer to be able to determine a defect until it is too late. Fair warning immediately upon discovery is the public responsibility of the producer.

This legislation will give the consumer that fair warning. I ask that it be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3187) to provide for notification of buyers and owners of automobiles having defects which render the operation of such automobiles inherently dangerous to life and limb, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

IMPROVED EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, for almost a full generation of legislative deliberation, the Congress of the United States has considered various means of combating the abuses of management against labor within the employment structure of the Federal establishment.

As long as 15 years ago, bills were introduced in the Congress which would make management in the Federal Government legally responsible in its relationship with Federal employees who could not strike, or bargain collectively, or use any of the conventional weaponry which is available to organized labor in private industry.

For years the executive branch of the Government resisted such legislative incursions into what it considered its own private preserve of privilege. The managers of the various departments of the Government felt they had—by some divine right, no doubt—the Federal employees exactly where they wanted them, and they saw no reason to relinquish any part of the unfair hold they held upon those who depended upon them for their livelihood, their welfare, their security.

The cry from the executive branch always was: "We are all—all honorable men"—and therefore we can be trusted to treat our employees in an honorable fashion.

This turned out to be a fantasy.

The managers took advantage of every legal loophole they could with which to suppress their employees. Working conditions in the Federal Establishment fell well behind the accepted norm in even the most backward sectors of private industry. The Federal Government—instead of being a leader in the field of management-labor relations—became a disgraceful follower, sluggishly and reluctantly shadowing the efforts of private industry in every area of human engineering.

I do not want to belabor a point as obvious as this. Suffice it to say that all our beneficient Federal programs, such as workmen's compensation, retirement, sick leave—even paid holidays and vacations—came into being years after they were standard operating procedure in private industry.

I know that every Member of the Senate receives in his mail the monthly publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers, the Postal Record. Too few of us read it. I strongly suggest that you do glance regularly at a monthly column in that magazine entitled "Prologue"—a month-by-month account of labor-management relations in the postal service, dating back 75 years. This will give you some rare insights into the way in which our postal—and other Federal employees—have been treated by their managers over the years. You will be horrified and appalled by the backwardness that has taken place among Federal management and Federal employees who had no legitimate weapons with which to defend themselves against such actions.

The issue came to a head, in the Postal Service, at least, during the years 1953–60 when postal management fairly well ran herd on postal employees. The management made fair promises, but cynically failed to live up to those promises. The faults were perhaps more noticeable at the top level here in Washington, but they spread in their more pernicious and less noticeable form to the local levels. It is at these local levels that the danger is greatest because it is there that the real problems arise, exist, and persist. And this is the level that gets congressional attention only in individual cases, where an aggrieved person has the ability to get his case the attention it deserves.

When the Kennedy administration came into power in 1961, and, with it, a strongly liberal Congress sensitive to the demands and desires of each segment of our population, there was an immediate upsurge of congressional support for revival of the plan to pass a strong labor-management law for the Federal Government which would assure union recognition and which would make certain areas of negotiation available to Federal employees.

The executive branch, liberal and decent-minded as it was under the leadership of President John F. Kennedy, still resisted the idea of legislative intrusion into its own management preserves. A Presidential Commission was created to study the question. It did an outstanding job. It produced recommendations which were splendid in their idealism. The recommendations brought forth Executive Order No. 10988, which President Kennedy signed on January 17, 1962, and created union recognition, and procedures for collective bargaining in certain limited fields. This was a great step forward in the history of labor-management relations in the Federal Establishment and every fair-minded person in Government rejoiced in the new era that was coming to birth.

But, the idealists did not correctly estimate the resistive power of the entrenched bureaucracy in the Federal Establishment. They had no idea how an Executive order, no matter how idealistically planned, can be perverted, twisted, and ignored by stubborn bureaucrats who wished it to fail.

Mr. President, 4 years have passed since Executive Order No. 10988 was signed by our martyred former President. Since that time a lot of the bloom has been worn off the idealistic rose. If we view the results of that order today we find:

Some agencies of Government carry on as if it had never been signed.

Some agencies of Government give it only a passing, almost mocking obeisance.

Some agencies refuse to bargain with unions of Federal employees on any serious matter whatsoever.

Some Federal agencies still act as if organized labor were a remote and hostile force from outer space, with which the slightest contact would be degrading and mortal.

It should be stated that the Post Office Department, under the leadership of Postmaster General J. Edward Day, John A. Gronouski, and Lawrence F. O'Brien has made the most honest of all attempts to comply with the Executive order. They have set up elaborate machinery and they have conducted lengthy—almost interminable negotiations—at the national level, on writing a viable contract under which labor and management can operate in harmony and with equal respect for each other.

But, Mr. President, the trouble with an Executive order, as opposed to a legislative act, is that it has no teeth. There are no teeth in the Executive order to make the agencies of Government at the national level resolve impasses with any celerity of effectiveness. There are no teeth to make management in the field—even postal management in the field—comply with the letter and the spirit of the law.

The abuses in the field between management and labor which existed prior to the signing of Executive Order No. 10988 4 years ago in the field—that is in every State, county, and city of the United States—exist today, almost as if the order had never been signed.

Even in the Post Office—the best example of compliance in the Federal Establishment—we find almost innumerable examples of postmasters who cynically use the impasse as a weapon with which to preserve the status quo of their own feudal domains.

This leads up, Mr. President, to the announcement that I have today introduced legislation which will create—for the first time in our history—a true and viable labor-management principle in the Federal Establishment. It will activate the idealism of Executive Order No. 10988 and will give the idealism the legislative, punitive teeth which will make it a living, breathing, active force for good insofar as the social welfare of our Federal employees is concerned.

The proposed legislation—among many other things—will take the responsibility of handling grievances out of the hands of the Civil Service Commission and place it where it belongs—in the hands of the Department of Labor.

I submit, Mr. President, that the Civil Service Commission, has proved itself, particularly in recent years, and particularly in its top management, to be management-oriented to the point of prejudice, a mere subjunct to the Bureau of the Budget, and no more representative of the aims, needs, desires, and aspirations of the rank-and-file Federal employee than is the National Association of Manufacturers.

My bill, Mr. President, makes recognition of organizations which are recognized by Executive Order No. 10988 mandatory by law at the local and unit levels, as well as at the national level.

It sets out an orderly program of administrative procedures and appeals which will be conducted under the Secretary of Labor. This will supersede and surpass many mock procedures which exist in our Government today which are a disgrace to our Great Society—or to any other concept of decent-minded liberalism in 20th-century America.

My bill also provides for an orderly settlement of grievances at the local, regional, and national level which will correct glaring inequities which are being perpetrated in the Federal Establishment today, despite the idealism which permeated the creation and promulgation of Executive Order No. 10988.

And my bill does provide for appropriate penalties for those who willfully and deliberately violate the law as enacted by the President of the United States.

My bill, Mr. President, does not interfere in any way with the existing prohibitions against strike, or other collective action of a similar sort, against the Federal Government. There is not an employee leader of any Federal employee organization of the United States who wants to interfere with this sensible and necessary provision of the law—and there is no responsible rank and file employee who wants to do that, either.

But, Mr. President—the executive branch over the years—ever since the employment and maintenance of a numerous employee force within the Federal Government became necessary—has used the prohibition against strike and other similar collective action—as a brutal bludgeon with which to beat down Federal employees in the exercise of their natural rights in other areas—natural rights that are enjoyed as a matter of course by their opposite numbers in private industry.

Mr. President, there have been cynics in the past who have claimed that the best government is a benevolent despotism.

What the cynics never added is that despotism is never benevolent.

We—even under Executive Order No. 10988—are permitting petty despots to operate at will within the Federal Establishment. The legislation I have today introduced will eliminate despotism in the Federal and postal service and, I sincerely believe, deserves the support of every Member of this body.

My bill, will, in short, give Federal employees the same 20th-century human rights which workers in private industry have been enjoying for 30 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3188) to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in this year, 1966, which has been designated as the "Year of the Bible," it would be fitting that the President of the United States proclaim a National Day of Prayer.

This country is in need of prayer, as are its leaders, its fighting men, and its people. Prayer and Bible-reading are companions that complement and supplement one another.

This year, special attention is being given to the printed Word of God which can be obtained in any one of 1,232 languages and dialects. Hundreds of millions of copies of the Bible are printed each year and distributed to those seeking the truth. Truly, it is a great work, inspired by God, and sets forth the hope of the world.

I am pleased that the Senate has adopted a resolution designating 1966 as the "Year of the Bible." Every conceivable effort that our leaders can make to point our people back to the Bible and God must be made.

Prayer is communication with God. We are to praise God for His goodness to us and the many blessings He has bestowed upon us. We are to ask the Lord for wisdom and guidance, and confess our dependence upon Him. We are to come to Him in the time of need and ask for His divine assistance and protection.

Today, we see a nation founded on Christian principles, following trends of moral rot and decay. We see a nation that has been blessed and protected by the hand of God, turning away from God. We see a nation that has championed religious freedom and freedom of education and expression, echoing the chants of a few misguided souls who claim that God is dead.

Mr. President, our people need to reaffirm their conviction and belief in God. Never before have we needed divine guidance and wisdom so desperately—from the perils within as well as those on the outside. Prayer can bring that needed guidance, wisdom, strength, peace of mind, joy, confidence, and the courage to do the things we should do.

Prayer is powerful—and this country needs that power.

Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating a "National Day of Prayer."

I ask that the resolution be printed in the Record, and lie on the table for 5 days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wyoming.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 152) to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating a "National Day of Prayer," introduced by Mr. Simpson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 152

Whereas we are a religious people whose country was founded on religious principles and sustained by prayer; and

Whereas this Nation and its people have been richly blessed by God; and

Whereas the conditions of this country and the world call for a personal relationship and dependency upon God; and

Whereas nothing is stronger than the power of prayer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation (1) designating a day as a National Day of Prayer; and (2) inviting the governments of states and communities and the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities to the end that all our people find a personal relationship with God, and that our country be sustained through the power and grace of God.

AN EDUCATIONAL MOVIE ABOUT THE SENATE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I am offering a resolution which authorizes the Committee on Rules and Administration to arrange for the preparation of an educational motion picture about the operations, history, and procedures of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, there is a need for this sort of educational information. Each of us receives in his office many hundreds of visitors to the Capitol each year. They receive passes to the gallery, and they observe whatever happens to be in progress. But they may not understand the representative system. They may not understand the committee system. They may not know what the full range of duties and responsibilities of a U.S. Senator are. Consequently, despite the best efforts which we and our staffs exert, our visitors too often, I fear, leave with a distorted view—or at least without a well-rounded view—of this great institution of government.

The Senate has a great history, and the modern miracles of cinematic art can develop that history and the traditions by which we come to the work of this body. From Clay and Webster down to Wagner and Taft, great Senators have left their imprint. How they did it, and how we are attempting to carry on the traditions of the past, is a story which could be most effectively told in a motion picture for use both here and through a wider distribution if desired.

The Senate has an auditorium. It is equipped for the showing of movies. Such a film might be shown on a regularly scheduled basis so that visitors might better understand what they see.

Further, investigation has shown that it is possible to secure the cooperation of a highly skilled major Hollywood film company which would undertake such a project on the basis of their cost only. As in the case of the film made at the Second Lincoln Inaugural Reenactment, of which I was a member of the committee on arrangements, it is very likely that highly talented actors could be found who would participate without charge or for the minimum allowable by their organization. In fact, there is good indication that a film of this sort, of high professional quality, could be achieved for no more than $35,000 on such a basis. If undertaken without this kind of cooperation, as a strictly commercial venture, the cost would run up to $200,000 or more.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution may lie on the desk for 10 days and that its text may appear hereafter in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the resolution will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 247

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to make appropriate arrangements (1) to have an educational motion picture prepared depicting the history, activities, and procedures of the United States Senate, suitable for viewing by visitors to the Capitol, and (2) for regularly scheduled performances of such motion picture for such visitors.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the Committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on March 21 I introduced S. 3107, a bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource programs through a National Water Commission. In the week that this measure lay on the desk, 37 Senators of both parties from every region and section of our country joined me as cosponsors.

Today, Mr. President, I have the honor to ask unanimous consent that the names of seven more distinguished Senators be added as cosponsors at the next printing of the bill. They are Senators Robert Kennedy of New York, Prouty, Ribicoff, Douglas, Byrd of West Virginia, Ervin, and Byrd of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the addition of these Senators brings the total number of sponsors to 44. As I mentioned, every water region and major river basin of our land now is represented on this bill to establish a National Water Commission. This representation extends from Maine to Washington State, and from Mississippi to Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the entire list of sponsors of S. 3107 be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the list of cosponsors was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Jackson (for himself, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Tower, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, and Mr. Ribicoff).

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, this imposing list emphasizes the statement in the executive communication transmitting a draft of the proposed legislation that:

> Water resource problems do not end at local, county, State, or even regional lines. Their dimensions are truly national in scope. They require intelligent long-term planning and the assessment and development of a whole range of alternative solutions. They require thorough and systematic analysis to assure that the programs undertaken by the Federal Government contribute to the soundest long-range water objectives.
>
> The National Water Commission bill proposed today provides a new way to meet these urgent needs. It will do more than give us a vital instrument in our search for imaginative ideas. It will help us develop the blueprints for our long-range water resource plans and goals. It will help us assure that the dollars we spend are wisely spent. In the words of the President, the Commission will "review and advise on the entire range of water resource problems. * * * It will judge the quality of our present efforts. It will recommend long-range plans for the future. It will point the way to increased and more effective water resource measures by the Federal Government, working in close cooperation with States, local communities, and private industry."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Church be added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 81, which I introduced recently to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the establishment of the Peace Corps, and that his name be listed among the sponsors at the next printing of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill, joint resolution, and resolution:

Authority of March 17, 1966:

S. 3096. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes: Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bible, and Mr. Long of Missouri.

Authority of March 22, 1966:

S.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools: Mr. Aiken, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morton, Mr. Moss, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Talmadge, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S. Res. 237. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study and investigation of any matter pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States: Mr. Bennett, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Thurmond.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Findley Burns, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 5, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1404) to promote the observance of a uniform system of time throughout the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2642) to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 265) to authorize conveyance of certain lands to the State of Utah based upon fair market value, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 13367. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13368. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13373. An act to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13579. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 13935. An act to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157).

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 13367. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13368. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13373. An act to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 13579. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13935. An act to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. SIMPSON:

Address delivered by Senator Thurmond at the Senate prayer breakfast group on March 30, 1966.

ARE THE COURTS TOO LENIENT?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the March 1966 American Bar Association Journal published an editorial entitled "Are Our Courts Too Lenient?" The editorial refers to a recent Gallup poll in which only 2 percent of those persons interrogated in April 1965 and again in September 1965 felt that the courts were dealing too harshly with criminals, whereas 60 percent of the people contacted in September 1965 felt that the courts were not dealing harshly enough with criminals. Interestingly, the 60 percent public opinion figure constitutes an increase over the 48 percent who, in April 1965, felt that the courts were not dealing harshly enough with criminals. Accordingly, the poll shows that this trend of thinking among people across the Nation is increasing.

As the editorial states:

> That a majority of every major population group in the Nation concurred in the opinion that our courts are not severe enough with criminals should give judges, lawyers and citizens food for serious thought.

Mr. President, I have been saying this for a long time. The courts, especially the Federal courts, and with specific emphasis, the Supreme Court of the United States, have, in recent years, rendered decisions which, although perhaps not intentionally, are weighted in favor of the criminal and against the general public.

A number of court decisions have strengthened the rights of the individual and restricted the power of the police. No American wants to see any abrogation of civil liberties or abuse of constitutional privileges. Yet, there seems to be conclusive evidence that some judges, in their decisions, are today unnnecessarily fettering law enforcement, that is, putting unrealistic handcuffs on the police.

Take, for example, a Chicago judge's decision in March 1965, which acquitted two defendants in a case in which two plainclothes police officers were attacked in a street assault. One of the officers was so severely gashed, he spent 23 days in the hospital, where 28 stitches were required to close his wound. One of the assailants had a broken beer bottle. When the officers identified themselves and demanded that the suspect drop the broken bottle, he failed to do so; one officer then drew his pistol. In releasing the two defendants, charged with the offense of assault upon an officer, the judge said:

> The right to resist unlawful arrest is a phase of self-defense. What is a citizen to do when he is approached by two officers with a gun?

Seldom has a more unrealistic judicial decision been rendered. Here was a case of a defendant who had used a broken beer bottle to attack officers who had properly identified themselves, one of whom had drawn his gun in justifiable circumstances. Yet, the arresting officers were criticized. The court refused to admit evidence that the officer had drawn his gun because of a police station report that "some crazy guy is walking down the street with a broken bottle and threatening people."

The trial judge's decision was severely criticized, the Chicago Tribune commenting editorially that the decision "gave comfort to the underworld, discouraged all the policemen in Illinois, and disgusted most of the people in Cook County."

It may be difficult to document with hard data the growing and compelling belief that, as a result of court restrictions making it impossible to convict criminals because of technical violations of their rights and liberties, the criminals are being turned back on the streets to commit more crimes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia be permitted to speak for 5 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, however, it cannot be gainsaid that there do exist cogent cases in point. For example, a Federal judge in the District of Columbia felt he had to dismiss an indictment against a rape suspect because crucial prosecution evidence had been obtained through an illegal search—although he did so reluctantly and with a firm belief in the suspect's guilt. A short time later, the same man was arrested and charged with a similar offense. The judge now recalled that this was exactly what he had feared at the time of the earlier dismissal, and added:

> Many say that court decisions do not contribute to crime. If, in fact (the suspect), committed this rape, it would be most difficult to convince (his) latest victim that there is no connection between crime and court decisions. (Washington Star, Aug. 10, 1965, p. B-1.)

Never must it be forgotten that the citizens of the community also have rights. When the balance is weighted too heavily in favor of the criminal, giving him every break, and putting handcuffs unnecessarily on the police, the cause of good society is not promoted.

I fully support adequate protection of the constitutional rights of all persons accused of crime, but Supreme Court decisions recently have gone so far as to subordinate the freedom and safety of the average law-abiding citizen to the imagined rights of vicious criminals. These decisions, of course, are applauded by some people who apparently feel that one rehabilitated, live criminal is worth 20 decent, law-abiding citizens dead. As an example of Supreme Court decisions which have shifted the balance in favor of the criminal and strait-jacketed the police, I cite, as I have done many times, the case of *Mallory* v. *United States*, (354 U.S. 449). Since 1957, when the Mallory ruling was handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court, crime in the District of Columbia has risen steadily except for two relatively brief periods of level trend. From June of 1957 through the end of calendar year 1965, the number of homicides in the District of Columbia nearly doubled, the number of robberies quadrupled, the number of housebreakings tripled, and the number of auto thefts tripled. Since 1957, Washington has moved from 12th place to 3d place in the rate of serious crime as compared with other cities with populations of 500,000 to 1 million people. In February of this year, the Police Department reported that the trend of part I offenses had risen without exception for 45 consecutive months.

The only hope thus far for relief from these rising crime trends in the Nation's Capital has been the package of anticrime programs financed last summer by a special amendment to the 1966 police budget. Foremost among the programs in that package were the establishment of a tactical saturation patrol force and the provision of automobiles for a one-man-scout-program. The police department reports that these projects have had noticeable effects in recent months on the rates of robbery, housebreaking, and auto theft. These programs are not inexpensive. Recurring annual costs will total nearly $3 million—a high price to pay for a poor substitute for effective law enforcement through identification, apprehension, and conviction of criminals and their removal from the heart of society.

Have the police been unable to apprehend criminals under the Mallory ruling and companion restrictions in their investigative operations? The record is quite clear on this point.

For the fiscal year 1957, the last year before the Mallory ruling, a total of 9,155 serious felonies were reported to the police; 5,304, almost 58 percent of those crimes, were cleared by the police. Since 1957, the number of serious felonies reported has steadily risen until the total reached 23,174 for fiscal year 1965. But the clearance of these crimes has not nearly kept pace with the increase of offenses. Of the serious felonies reported in 1965, only 7,912, slightly over 34 percent, were cleared by the police. The clearance rate of these crimes has dropped from nearly two-thirds of offenses reported to slightly over one-third and clearance rates are still dropping.

With what are we dealing when we talk of the Mallory ruling and the even more restrictive decisions of the court of appeals for this circuit which led Chief Layton to testify before the Senate District Committee last year that "as little change as a return to the immediate post-Mallory doctrine which was in force in 1957 and 1958 would be viewed as beneficial to law enforcement"?

These decisions are not, as some of their advocates would like us to believe, pronouncements of constitutional principles designed by the founders of our Nation to protect us from governmental oppression. These are, instead, only applications or misapplications, of procedural requirements of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, and the preponderance of evidence is that these procedures were neither designed by their drafters, nor intended by the Congress which approved them, for the purposes to which they have been subverted to restrict the operations of the police.

The public must express a strong indignation over the growing number of restrictive court decisions which turn guilty criminals loose on trivial technicalities to walk the streets and terrorize unprotected citizens in the parks, on buses and in subways, in homes and even in churches. These court decisions produce confusion and uncertainties—uncertainties as to arrest procedures—uncertainties which make law enforcement more difficult at best and which deter arrests, investigations, and prosecutions at worst. In any event, these decisions impair the morale of the police, generate contempt and disrespect for the officers of the law and even for the law itself, and lessen the ordinary citizen's respect for, and faith in, the courts. We have reached an anomalous situation in America when courts of justice appear to be obstructing justice. Little wonder that many citizens today hesitate to go to the aid of the police or to the aid of other persons in times of danger. The criminal has the upper hand. The scales appear to be weighted in his favor. Why take a chance on getting involved?

Mr. President, crime commissions, executive messages on crime, more and more appropriations for police equipment and police positions, more and better police training—all of these are good, but they are not enough. Unless the courts begin dealing more realistically with criminals, it will become increasingly difficult to find good men who are willing to enter police work, police departments will be frustrated in their efforts to provide good law enforcement, good citizens will continue to be victimized, and the rapists, murderers, robbers, and rioters will go free.

Mr. President, as the American Bar Association Journal editorial so aptly stated:

> Courts owe a paramount duty to the public. Judges swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States. The preamble of that Constitution states that it is ordained to insure domestic tranquility—that is, order. Without order there can be no blessings of liberty. It is important that justice not only be done but that it be seen to be done. It is not seen to be done when the guilty escape and the innocent walk the streets in fear. When courts, out of mistaken sympathy or for any other reason, refuse to apply the law as courts of justice, then we are approaching the time when there will be liberty and justice for none.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the editorial from the American Bar Association Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ARE OUR COURTS TOO LENIENT?

The American Institute of Public Opinion, the Gallup poll, recently asked the question: "In general, do you think the courts in this area deal too harshly, or not harshly enough with criminals?" Replies from 180 communities throughout the United States were summarized as follows:

Courts deal with criminals

	September 1965 (percent)	*April 1965 (percent)*
Too harshly	2	2
Not harshly enough	60	48
About right	26	34
No opinion	12	16

That a majority of every major population group in the Nation concurred in the opinion that our courts are not severe enough with criminals should give judges, lawyers and citizens food for serious thought.

J. Edgar Hoover has been warning for many years that too much sentimental concern for young thugs and teen-age criminals has resulted in a steadily increasing crime rate in homicide, forcible rape, aggravated assault, larceny, burglary, robbery and auto theft. Recently in this Journal (51 A.B.A.J. 225) the Right Honorable Lord Shawcross, former Attorney General of England, commented that: "Whatever we as justices may say in sentencing those criminals who are unlucky enough to be caught, crime pays. Crime is booming. We have been faced since the war with a massive increase year by year in serious crime."

There is no doubt that in the United States the rights of accused—indeed the guilty—have been protected to a degree never seen before in history. It must be clear to anyone familiar with criminal law that many of the accused do not want fair trials at all, if those trials produce justice. What they want is mercy; or if guilty, they want a smart mouthpiece who can get them off on a legal technicality and help them to beat the rap.

Heraclitus reputedly said: "The major problem of human society is to combine that degree of liberty without which law is tyranny with that degree of law without which liberty becomes license."

The emphasis recently has been too much on license. Courts of laws are courts of justice, not courts of mercy. It is the executive, the President or the governor who by law has the power of pardon. Courts owe a paramount duty to the public. Judges swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States. The preamble of that Constitution states that it is ordained to insure domestic tranquility—that is, order. Without order there can be no blessings of liberty. It is important that justice not only be done but that it be seen to be done. It is not seen to be done when the guilty escape and the innocent walk the streets in fear. When courts, out of mistaken sympathy or for any other reason, refuse to apply the law as courts of justice, then we are approaching the time when there will be liberty and justice for none.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM XVI—A POLICY IN SEARCH OF A GOVERNMENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, nothing could more completely reveal the falsity, the farcicality, the feebleness, and the bankruptcy of the administration's policy in southeast Asia than what is happening in South Vietnam.

What is happening there can best be described as a civil war on top of a civil war or a civil war within a civil war.

Americans—allegedly called into South Vietnam by a friendly government—are ordered by our own authorities to stay off the streets of Saigon because it is not safe for them to be out, so great appears to be the hostility of the inhabitants of that city toward the United States. That is in Saigon, not Hanoi.

Premier Nguyen Cao Ky—the U.S. anointed leader of South Vietnam, whose one hero is Adolf Hitler—is now attempting to put down by force of U.S. arms the growing protests against his rule.

The press is rigidly censored—the people are not allowed to learn what is going on. Is this the freedom, the protection of which we have sent American boys to fight for and all too often to die?

Twelve years of fumbling folly—12 years of moving inexorably further into the quagmire that is South Vietnam—apparently has not taught successive administrations in the United States that political problems cannot be solved by military might.

Mr. Tom Wicker, in a thoughtful and thought-provoking article in the New York Times, April 1, 1966, entitled "Dilemma in Vietnam" analyzes the unfortunate predicament of the United States in South Vietnam in seeking to build upon the quicksand government of Premier Ky.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wicker's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DILEMMA IN VIETNAM—UNREST MAY LEAVE UNITED STATES WITH CHOICE: LET KY FALL OR BACK HIM AT ANY COST

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Continuing political unrest in South Vietnam may bring the Johnson administration face to face with a tormenting double question:

Can it afford to let the present military government fall or should it move openly to keep it in power if that becomes necessary? So far, the administration regards the situation as threatening but basically unclear. Officials are not yet convinced there will be a final clash between the military council that has held power in Saigon for 9 months and civilian elements primarily inspired by Buddhist leaders.

So far, it is believed here that the military council will weather the storm. But Washington is perplexed by the council's failure to take stronger action to sustain itself, and it is not forgotten here that it was Buddhist power in the streets that led to the downfall of the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963.

Since Roman Catholic pressures also are being brought on the Government in Saigon, and a distinctly anti-American tone is beginning to emerge from student demonstrations, the possibility that the military council might be unseated is not discounted here.

That possibility is taken seriously enough, in fact, that attention is being given to the question whether the United States could afford to let the Ky government fall. Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky is Premier and leading spokesman for the military council of 10 generals.

There are two reasons why the ouster of Marshal Ky and his military colleagues would be regarded here as far more damaging than any of the succession of government changes that occurred between the Diem overthrow in late 1963 and the capture of power by the military council last June.

The first is that President Johnson and the administration publicly embraced the Ky government at the Honolulu conference in February, proclaimed its leaders as partners in winning the war and rebuilding South Vietnam, and gave strong endorsement to its plans for pacification and other reform programs.

Thus, the Ky government's overthrow, particularly by popular demonstrations such as those going on in Hue and Da Nang rather than by a secret coup, would be something of a South Vietnamese repudiation of the United States. That could have strong repercussions on public opinion in this country, in Congress, and among other governments.

It would bolster Communist claims that the United States is the aggressor in South Vietnam, rather than a defender of a country that has asked for assistance against aggression.

The other reason is that the administration believes the reform programs of the Ky government are sound, that at least the major figures in the military council are strongly committed to them and that political stability in South Vietnam is vitally necessary if these efforts are to have any chance of success.

The administration now is committed to the idea that reforms to provide a better life for the South Vietnamese people are a necessary part of the struggle to win lasting control of the populace for the Saigon government. The Ky government is seen here as the best hope, at least for the time being, to carry out such reform.

Thus, the administration is desperately anxious for the Ky government to survive its troubles. They were set off when the Saigon military council expelled Gen. Nguyen Canh Thi, a Buddhist, who commanded in most of the five northernmost provinces, where the demonstrations are now strongest.

An informed source here likened his ouster to a snapping rubberband that had set off the sequence of events.

One source of puzzlement here is why the Ky government did not quickly get General Thi out of South Vietnam after his ouster from the military council. Instead, it allowed him to return to the area where he had commanded, and demonstrations have been going on there ever since.

Nor does Washington understand why the Ky government has tolerated such events as the temporary takeover of radio stations in northern cities by student demonstrators, who then broadcast antigovernment propaganda.

Marshal Ky has threatened to take "very, very strong measures" if the unrest continues, but has not yet done so. This also puzzles the administration, although it is remembered here that when the Diem regime responded with violence to Buddhist opposition in 1963, the effect was only to create even stronger sentiment against the government.

For much the same reason, overt American support for the Ky government would probably exacerbate the anti-Americanism already cropping up in some demonstrations—today in Da Nang, for instance—and further undermine the government's position with the South Vietnamese people.

If the situation reaches the crisis stage, however, the administration would have to answer the hard question whether to move openly to keep the Saigon government in power.

The disadvantages are obvious. The Ky government would immediately be labeled a "puppet" of the United States, any claims it might have to popular standing would be dissipated, and anti-Americanism in South Vietnam would be greatly enhanced. On the world scene, the U.S. position as the defender of an invaded country would be eroded, and congressional critics of the war would be mightily bolstered.

Thus, the administration policy now is to lend the Saigon government whatever moral and covert support and advice it can, in an effort to help Marshal Ky and his colleagues surmount the unrest.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and other Americans in Saigon are working overtime to convince dissident elements that, whatever their problems are now, they are likely to become worse if a change of government is forced at what the administration believes is a critical stage of the war.

Mr. Lodge was credited in reports from Saigon with having helped persuade Roman Catholic elements to tone down a statement of their demands for a civilian government, lest they undermine the Ky government.

The Catholics, a powerful minority, are said to have warned the government not to go too far in appeasing Buddhist demands, however. They threatened open opposition to Marshall Ky if he did not take vigorous steps against the Buddhist-inspired demonstrators.

Marshall Ky, therefore, is caught between conflicting pressures and so is the Johnson administration.

A major question that no one here yet can answer concerns the nature of any government that might succeed the military council. In all likelihood, it is believed here, such a government could be "lived with" and would prosecute the war, despite the setback to social and economic programs that might be caused by the upheaval.

There remains always, however, the possibility that a new government would seek to end the war. And no one here pretends that the downfall of the present regime would be less than a serious setback to the United States in the larger world picture.

LT. (J.G.) PHILIP OWEN ROBINSON—AMERICAN CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, within a single week last month three young men from Wyoming died in battle. One of the three was Navy Lt. (j.g.) Philip Owen Robinson, of Sheridan.

Several days ago I was in receipt of a copy of the letter that he sent to his father, Owen L. Robinson, the day before he was mortally wounded at Quang Nghi, Vietnam.

This young man's death came very much as a personal loss to Mrs. Simpson and myself. Sheridan has been more to me than just another city in Wyoming. It was there that I met, courted, and married my wife, and I spent a good part of my life in that city. I have known Phil's parents for more years than I can remember and I have watched this young man, who died for a cause in which he deeply believed, as he passed through elementary and secondary school into high school and then to the University of Wyoming. He was a student and a fellow ATO fraternity member while I was president of the university's board of trustees. I know personally the fine man that he was and the potential he held for his State and Nation. He fell in battle along with two other young Wyomingites, Army Pfc. Leonard May, of Medicine Bow, and Marine Pfc. Michael Beck, of Cheyenne. These fightingmen died less than 5 days apart and brought the death toll of Wyomingites in Vietnam to 11.

Mr. President, it is questionable that any war is worth the cost in lives, not because the objectives of the moment are not attained, but because history tells us that the peace achieved at the end of war is so short lived as to vitiate the causes for which the blood was shed. Those who study this war 20 years from now may well say of us that we could neither win the war nor keep the peace. On that we can only make supposition. But of one thing I am certain. Phil Robinson, Leonard May, Michael Beck, those of Wyoming and other States who died before them, and those who will follow, will have died in vain if communism is not driven from South Vietnam.

We are fighting a war in that southeast Asian nation which denies the political context of the endeavor. We have only to read today's newspapers to realize that there are three battlefields involved in the southeast Asian war and a loss on any one of the three can mean a defeat in totality.

The hills and swamps of the shooting war are not the only battlefields on which the war for Vietnam will be decided. There are two other fronts of equal importance—the governmental battlefield of Saigon and the political battlefield of Washington. I have no doubt that American fighting men, freed of the political hobbles which restrain them, could win the shooting war. What causes me the greatest concern is the war in Washington and the chaos in Saigon, neither of which allow us the luxury of a protracted conflict in a nation which is teetering on the thin edge of political and hence, military disaster.

Lieutenant Robinson was a junior officer uninitiated in the intrigues of Saigon or the machinations of high-level, politically oriented military strategy. But his plea that we "open up on the enemy sanctuary in North Vietnam" is being heard more and more and not only from junior officers but by those long experienced in the conduct of war.

I do not know that bombing Hanoi is the answer. Nor would I commit myself to a policy of blockading the harbor at Hanoi. I do know that by some means—perhaps mining the harbor or knocking out the railroad tracks which connect the Communist Chinese mainland to the capital of Hanoi—we must stop repeating the tragic sanctuary blunder of Korea.

I have no desire to see the war in Vietnam escalated to a degree that will trigger a major land war in Asia. But I am firmly convinced that no government has the legal or moral right to send soldiers to fight when policy has dictated in advance of their commitment that they will not be allowed to win. If we can require that our Nation's finest young men fight and die in Vietnam, we must enable them to fight and win—for their sake as well as ours.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and I would like to add a few sentences from a letter from the father, who writes from Sheridan, Wyo.

He wrote:

> Phil was a good boy and the whole city is shocked. He was stationed on a communications ship at Norfolk in charge of the code room. A year ago he called and said that he would be home the following week. I asked him what gives and he said, "Dad I've been giving it a lot of thought—thinking of my family and friends and our way of life and decided to do something about it. I think that we had better stop the Communists in Vietnam and not wait until they get to the Montana border."

In keeping with that conviction, he did go to Vietnam and there lost his life.

His father wrote further:

> He had been an adviser to the junk fleet with one or two other Americans—a lonely, risky life. He lived with the natives, ate with them, saw the atrocities of the Vietcong and was completely sold on the Vietnam and their cause. He said, "Dad, this is a young man's war—the boys under 20 are doing a terrific job. He had the greatest of praise for the chopper pilots as he rode with them. He said they know that they are sitting ducks but if there is an American to be gotten out, especially if wounded, they go in.

As I recall, he wrote his last letter to his father the day before he died. So there is not only another casualty, but there is also another hero in the cause of the country.

In line with all of this, Mr. President, the first young man from Crawford County, Ill., in the little town of Palestine, who lost his life was Thomas A. Jennings. I was struck by the fact that the casket simply contained these words:

> Thomas A. Jennings, 1945–66.

That speaks a volume, because he was born in one war, and he came to his untimely end in another war this year. That brings the war home to the country. Probably one of the tragedies also is that his father is a retired Army major and was at the services at the time.

So little towns and large towns, but particularly in the small towns, the war comes home to them when one who has lived in the bosom of the community is suddenly snatched out of this life.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his remarks. I ask unanimous consent that articles and editorials from Wyoming newspapers pertaining to Lieutenant Robinson's death and the death of Pfc. Leonard May and Pfc. Michael Beck, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"AND MAY HE NOT FAIL YOU"—LOCAL MARINE IS KILLED IN VIET

(By Wanda Banta)

"And may he not fail you, his country, nor his mother. Thank you, God."

Holding back the tears, Mrs. Weston Beck, 38, of 147 King Court, read again today the "Mother's Prayer for Her Marine."

Yesterday, Mrs. Beck and her husband, a railroad brakeman, were notified that their son, Pfc. Michael Beck, 19, was killed Tuesday on patrol near Quan Nghi, Vietnam.

Sgt. William J. Moore, Marine recruiter, brought the news to the Beck home, a pink shingled house with a decal on the front door, "We are proud to be a service family."

Only yesterday, Mrs. Beck had received two letters from her son.

One letter read, "I'm in good spirits, feel well, love you, and miss you all."

The other said, "I'm scheduled for a patrol in a day or two and am looking forward to it."

The Cheyenne marine was the second local fatality in the war and the third Wyoming serviceman to die this week.

Weston Beck, a tall, slender, soft-spoken man, said, "Even though I lost my only son, he is still my favorite subject to talk about."

"Mike was a scrapper," he said. "For years, I taught Mike * * * 'son, don't look for a fight but if you have to fight, be there first.' "

He said he felt his son died doing what he thought was right.

Mike was born February 24, 1947, and attended Cheyenne schools. He was an outstanding athlete and received letters in football, wrestling, and track at Central High School. He was a member of the Central High C Club.

The father said three or four times "We have no regrets * * * we believe the sacrifice of our son is necessary." He said, "Others have died and there will be more * * * I'll worry about every one until it's over."

The mother and father both said, "Tell every parent to write their boys * * * letters mean so much to them * * * the kids ought to be reassured."

Mike's dad is a brakeman for the Union Pacific Railroad and has lived in Cheyenne 20 years. He said the thought of Mike used to comfort him on the long passenger runs to Green River.

The boy's sister, Mary, 16, was taking her brother's death hard, the mother said.

Mrs. Beck said, "You don't realize how close you are to your children until you lose them."

The parents said again, "We'll miss him so, but we have no regrets."

Beck was attached to C Company, 1st battalion, 7th Marines, 3d Marine Division, and had been in Vietnam less than 6 weeks. He enlisted last August.

Besides his parents and sister, he is survived by a grandmother, Mrs. Alice Ray, Sutherlin, Oreg.; three uncles, Carl C. Beck, Cheyenne; Don Beck, Denver; and J. Beck in El Paso, Tex.; and an aunt, Mrs. Margaret Burt, Denver.

Mike's body will be flown home for military services.

Janis Black, Cheyenne freshman at College of Idaho, Caldwell, close friend of Mike's, said today, "I've known Mike since grade school; he was a good sport, an outgoing, fun-loving guy. * * * We'll all miss him."

Janis said that friends of Mike at the University of Wyoming had stayed up late last night in the dormitories at Laramie, talking about their friend.

Cheyenne's first casualty was Navy man Robert Guthrie, 21, son of Mr. and Mrs. Vern Guthrie, 2217 East 13th, attached to the marines, who was killed on a patrol at Da Nang.

Two other Wyoming men died last week after they were wounded in action in Vietnam.

Navy Lt. (jg.) Philip Robinson, 28, of Sheridan, died aboard a helicopter Friday after he was wounded while on patrol 5 miles east of Quang Nghi city.

Army Pfc. Leonard May, 21, son of Mr. and Mrs. Albert May of Medicine Bow, died Thursday when he was shot while on duty with the 1st Infantry Division.

Services are in charge of Wiederspahn Chapel of the Chimes.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Mar. 28, 1966]

A Time for Reassessment

In this election year of 1966, there are signs of restiveness among the American people over the way the Johnson administration is running the war in Vietnam, and over its domestic programs.

Perhaps the people have no one to blame but themselves, for it is with them that the ultimate power lies.

Perhaps, too, the American people desperately need today, as peaceniks march in the streets of our cities and chant slogans calculated to serve the purpose of our enemy, to make a reassessment of their Government and its current conduct of the war against both the North Vietnamese and against poverty; and also to make a reevaluation of their own attitudes.

This past weekend, it was announced that a young Navy lieutenant from our own State had been killed only last Friday in Vietnam. The story of Lt. Philip Robinson, who was 28 years old, is a deeply moving account of dedication to the cause of this country, and of personal sacrifice.

"A year ago in April" said his father, Owen Robinson, "he called us and told us he had asked for a year's extension in Vietnam. He said he had been thinking of his family and his friends and our way of life—and since he was single, he thought he should do something about it."

He said, Mr. Robinson recounted, "that if we were to stop communism we'd better do it there than on the Montana border."

This past weekend, too, Ronald Reagan, a movie and TV actor who is a candidate for the Republican nomination for Governor of California, told a meeting in Nebraska: "If our sons are going to be allowed to die for their country, they ought to be allowed to win."

While the story of the death of Lieutenant Robinson was being told, and Reagan was making his speech in Lincoln, Nebr., and thousands of anti-Viet war demonstrators were marching across the country, there was mounting evidence that the real professional military leaders of the United States were becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the manner in which the Johnson administration is running the war.

Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the five generals who are top servicemen in the Military Establishment, made it known through all but direct quotation that the Joint Chiefs are concerned over the prospect of an intensification of the war in Vietnam not through a more aggressive waging of that conflict by the United States, but by lack of it.

For one thing Wheeler and the Joint Chiefs have noted intelligence reports indicating a greater buildup of North Vietnamese regular forces in South Vietnam. For another, they also are worried about fuel oil storage sites in North Vietnam that they have not been allowed to bomb.

But President Johnson has subordinated the advice, based on the professional skill and training of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to a civilian industrialist, Robert S. McNamara. Furthermore, under this wholly civilian operational setup, he has subordinated a strictly military concept of the war to a political basis.

Our military analyst, Gen. Ira Eaker, one of our most capable and thoroughly professional combat leaders of World War II, decries this tendency on the part of the Johnson administration in an article printed in an adjacent column today. General Eaker points out that for the first time in the history of this country, we have placed almost total reliance on strategy as well as tactics in the hands of civilians who are amateurs. He might have said, one civilian: Mr. McNamara. This civilian with the possible assistance of the State Department has enunciated the concept that one cannot go too far in war—at least in this war—because it might bring on greater war, a specious theory which overlooks the stark fact that war once commenced must be waged with vigor because the only other alternative is defeat.

As for the American people themselves, they too must come to realize that they are in this as much as the Lt. Philip Robinsons, and the young men who already have given their lives in sacrifice in this deadly struggle, and their families.

It is not enough that these alone must bear the brunt of saving our way of life, as Lieutenant Robinson recognized as his duty. We all must bear the common burden.

In so doing, let us dispense with the belief that we can have business as usual; that we can simultaneously fight wars of poverty and wars of liberation of the oppressed; wars of economics at the same time we are fighting wars for freedom. Let us discard the notion that all we need worry about is material comforts at home while young men like Lieutenant Robinson are fighting and dying for us 8,000 miles away.

In short, let us get to the guts of the Vietnam matter, now—wholly, totally, and with singleness of purpose, through whatever may have to be done—including a sacrifice on the part of some people of seeking forever to win elections by keeping everybody happy.

[From the Cheyenne, Wyo., State Tribune, Mar. 31, 1966]

Do Not Forget

"Here dead lie we because we did not choose to live and shame the land from which we sprung."—A. E. Housman.

"The bravest battle that ever was fought;
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the map of the world you will find it not;
It was fought by the mothers of men."
—Joaquin Miller.

The returns are coming in faster than ever from Vietnam. Yesterday it was Michael Beck; 4 days earlier Philip Robinson; the day before that Leonard May.

Three Wyoming boys have yielded up their lives in a war far from their homeland, within less than a week's time. Michael Beck is the second casualty of the war from our town; the first was Robert Guthrie.

What can we say to the parents and families of these?

In our own incompetent, dumb, and uncomprehending way, we can say we are sorry; that we are saddened, and weep with them over their loss.

That is the very least we can do.

We can tell them—and especially the mothers and wives—that we share with them in a modest way, their bereavement.

It will not help very much, but it may a little.

We can tell them that these are the men who were made men far ahead of their time; and who further than that have rendered the ultimate contribution to their fellow man, and to their country.

They join a legion of Americans that stretches back to the war of 1776; to the likes of the 32-year-old physician named Dr. Charles Warren who stood in the ranks at Bunker Hill on a hot June day and yielded up his own life that there might be an America.

Or men the stripe of Davy Crockett and a rag-tag band of beardless youths and middle-aged men who perished in the Alamo in a similar battle fought 130 years ago this very month—then on a foreign field, against a despot and tyrant.

Or the 600,000 men, mostly youths, who gave their lives in the most terrible war of this Nation's history, from Bull Run through Antietam, Shiloh, Gettysburg, Stone Mountain, Appomattox.

Or the Indian Wars that covered some 30 years and ground that we presently live on, in comfort and security.

Or San Juan Hill, San Mihiel, the Argonne, Bataan, the Battle of the Bulge, Pork Chop Hill.

More than three-quarters of a million men have died for the America we know today, in battles here and far away; on our home ground, in France, Germany, Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Iwo Jima, the Philippines. In Korea and now in Vietnam.

Vietnam probably will get worse before it gets better; and there will be more dread messages.

But let us say that whatever comes we must not falter and turn away, if only for these who already have given the last ounce of their devotion to America.

They fought for an America that may not really exist except in their hearts and minds.

But if the ideal was theirs, it is for us the living to perfect that ideal.

It is now no question that they have measured up to the greatest heights of any man, be he President or average citizen. They now are tested in time.

The question before us, the living, is: Do we measure up to them?

Let us not forget that we must seek to merit their faith, every day that we live, forever more. For the Michael Becks, the Phil Robinsons, the Bob Guthries, the Leonard Mays and all the rest, of this war and those before.

Do not forget.

"God rest the dead, our honored dead,
Who died for you and me;
And bless him for his faith and love,
And for his bravery;
"The one who gave his all for us
Upon the battlefield,
Because he had convictions,
Because he would not yield.
"He is the hero in the hall
Of everlasting fame
Where no one in the realm of God
Has any greater claim.
"For he laid down his life for us,
And who can offer more
To serve his God and fellow man
On any sea or shore?"

[From the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press, Mar. 26, 1966]

Lieutenant Robinson Loses Life in Vietnam

Lt. (j.g.) Philip Owen Robinson, 28, son of Mr. and Mrs. Owen L. Robinson, 10 South Linden, died March 25 in Vietnam, and becomes the first Sheridan man to lose his life in that conflict.

Lieutenant Robinson graduated from Sheridan High School in 1956. He attended Sheridan College and later graduated from the University of Wyoming. At one time he worked for the city during the summer.

Mr. and Mrs. Robinson received word while in Cody. A U.S. Navy officer drove over 300 miles to get the word to them there, and the death was confirmed by a telegram from Vice Adm. B. J. Semmes, Jr., chief of naval personnel.

It said: "I deeply regret to confirm on behalf of the U.S. Navy that your son, Lt. (j.g.) Philip Owen Robinson, U.S. Naval Reserve, died on March 25 * * * as a result of hostile fire received while on patrol 5 miles east of Quang Ngai City, Republic of Vietnam. Your son died aboard a helicopter en route to an aid station with a Navy doctor in attendance. Your son died while serving his country. Please accept my most heartfelt sympathy in your great loss."

The Robinsons said today they had received a letter from Phil last Friday stating he would be out June 9 and wanted to stop a. Hong Kong on his way home. He also said 400 mines were being planted around his area so he felt safer.

A year ago in April, his parents revealed, he called from Norfolk and said he would be home in a week, said he had asked for a year's extension and that he had asked for Vietnam. He said he had been thinking of his family, his friends, and our way of life, and since he was single felt he should do something about it.

In all his letters, the Robinsons report, he said he liked the people and was a firm believer in their cause. He said that if communism is to be stopped it would be better to do it there than on the Montana border.

"So he died fighting for his convictions," his parents said today.

His body will be flown to San Francisco and will then come by train to Sheridan. No definite time or date for services has been set as yet, but burial will be in the Masonic circle at Sheridan Municipal Cemetery.

Lieutenant Robinson was born in Janesville, Wis., March 23, 1938.

He belonged to Masonic Lodge 43, Sheridan Scottish Rite, the Methodist Church, the Elks Club, and was a member of ATO, a university fraternity.

Surviving are his mother and father, two sisters, Anne Sidwell, Sheridan, and Lynn Gustafson, Oneonta, N.Y., and seven nieces and nephews.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, after conferring with the other member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 127 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution designating April 9 of each year as "Sir Winston Churchill Day."

Mr. DIRKSEN. The resolution probably has 35 or more sponsors. The reason for calling it up by unanimous consent, even though it has not cleared the full committee, is that on April 9, which is a few days hence, we will observe Sir Winston Churchill Day because it is the third anniversary of the date when the bill was signed which conferred upon him honorary citizenship.

I am advised that in the garden of the British Embassy a very impressive statue of Sir Winston Churchill will be dedicated.

The House of Representatives, I believe, will pass the joint resolution today also. I believe it timely and appropriate that we do likewise. In the terms of the joint resolution we ask that the President proclaim that day as Sir Winston Churchill Day.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in January I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 127, which would authorize and request the President to declare April 9 of each year as Sir Winston Churchill Day.

Forty of my distinguished colleagues joined me in cosponsoring this resolution, demonstrating quite clearly the wide and strong support for such a tribute to perhaps the most outstanding man of the 20th century.

It has been my earnest hope that this measure could be passed before next Saturday. That will mark the third anniversary of the act which made Sir Winston the first honorary citizen of the United States.

It would coincide also with the unveiling of a magnificent bronze statue of Churchill at the British Embassy.

A most notable occasion would become even more significant if the dedication of the statue could be the first anniversary of Sir Winston Churchill Day.

I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Senator Dirksen, and the distinguished Senate majority leader, Senator Mansfield, for their interest in this measure and their invaluable assistance having the resolution taken up on the floor today.

Once the Senate passes this resolution, it is very likely that it can also be approved by the House. Congressman Byron Rogers, chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee which handles such legislation, would like to see this taken up on the House floor as soon as possible before the Easter recess.

I would like to express my appreciation to Congressman Rogers and to the many persons who have expressed an interest in this legislation.

And, of course, I also want to thank the many cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 127 for their support.

The many distinguished Senators who cosponsored the resolution are Gordon Allott, Republican of Colorado; Birch Bayh, Democrat of Indiana; Alan Bible, Democrat of Nevada; Daniel Brewster, Democrat of Maryland; Quentin Burdick, Democrat of North Dakota; Harry Byrd, Jr., Democrat of Virginia; John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky; Peter Dominick, Republican of Colorado; Sam Ervin, Jr., Democrat of North Carolina; Paul J. Fannin, Republican of Arizona; Ernest Gruening, Democrat of Alaska; Fred Harris, Democrat of Oklahoma; Philip Hart, Democrat of Michigan; Vance Hartke, Democrat of Indiana; Roman Hruska, Republican of Nebraska; Daniel Inouye, Democrat of Hawaii; Len Jordan, Republican of Idaho; Robert Kennedy, Democrat of New York; Ted Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts; Jennings Randolph, Democrat of West Virginia; Thomas Kuchel, Republican of California; Edward Long, Democrat of Missouri; Warren Magnuson, Democrat of Washington; Eugene McCarthy, Democrat of Minnesota; Lee Metcalf, Democrat of Montana; Jack Miller, Republican of Iowa; Frank Moss, Democrat of Utah; George Murphy, Republican of California; Gaylord Nelson, Democrat of Wisconsin; Claiborne Pell, Democrat of Rhode Island; Winston Prouty, Republican of Vermont; Willis Robertson, Democrat of Virginia; Donald Russell, Democrat of South Carolina; Hugh Scott, Republican of Pennsylvania; Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri; Strom Thurmond, Republican of South Carolina; John Tower, Republican of Texas; Joseph Tydings, Democrat of Maryland; Stephen M. Young, Democrat of Ohio; Abraham Ribicoff, Democrat of Connecticut.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 127, and, without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. Res. 127

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 9 of each year, the anniversary of the conferring of honorary United States citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill, is hereby designated as "Sir Winston Churchill Day." The President is authorized and requested to issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to honor the memory of Sir Winston Churchill by observing such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY TO FILE REPORT BY MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, last Friday I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 149. I gave notice that I would attempt to hold hearings on the joint resolution today. I am hopeful that at 3 o'clock this afternoon I shall be successful in obtaining the number of Senators required to make a quorum of the committee. If I am successful in having the hearings completed today, it may be possible for me to report the joint resolution today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted until midnight tonight to file the report of the committee.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALIFORNIA BACKS PRESENT SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, support for a continuation of the special milk program for schoolchildren is snowballing. As we all know, the administration has proposed an 80-percent cutback in the program. Last year the program provided milk for between 24 and 26 million children. If the administration's proposal passes only 3 million children will receive milk under the program.

My bill to make the program permanent at an increased level of Federal funding has been cosponsored by two-thirds of my colleagues in the Senate. Dozens of similar bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives. Letters of support for the program keep rolling in.

I was gratified to receive two resolutions from the State of California a few days ago endorsing the present milk program as well as my bill to make the program permanent. One of these resolutions was passed by the California State Board of Education. It wisely urges a minimum appropriation for the program in fiscal 1967 of $110 million instead of the $21 million requested by the administration.

The second resolution was approved by the California State Board of Agriculture. This resolution specifically endorses the Proxmire bill.

In closing I would like to point out that Assembly Joint Resolution 2, introduced at the 1966 first extraordinary session of the Legislature of the State of California, also supports the school milk program in its present form.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two resolutions passed by the California State Boards of Agriculture and Education be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution by the California State Board of Education Relative to the Special Milk Program

Whereas, the special milk program for children was authorized by Congress in 1954 to encourage the consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States; and

Whereas, the program enables schools generally to serve a one-half pint or one-third quart of milk to a child for 5 cents; and

Whereas, the success of the program is evident by the fact that 2½ million California children benefit from the program daily; and

Whereas, during the past several years the Bureau of the Budget has limited special milk program funds to $100 million annually on a national basis, notwithstanding the fact that Congress has appropriated $103 million annually for the program; and

Whereas, the Bureau of the Budget's request for 1966–67 has reduced the present appropriation from $103 million to $21 million; and

Whereas, $110 million is needed annually to finance the steady growth of the program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Education of the State of California, That it memorializes the Congress of the United States to favorably consider increasing the proposed special milk program appropriation for 1966–67 from $21 million to $110 million; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Resolution of the California State Board of Agriculture Re Federal Special Milk and School Lunch Programs, S. 2921 (Proxmire) and H.R. 12606 (Sisk)

Whereas milk is a vital and necessary element in the daily diet of children; and

Whereas many children get no milk or very little milk at home and must look to the special milk program and the school lunch program to supply this vital food product; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Bureau of the Budget have reduced funds for the special milk program in the current fiscal year by $3 million below the total amount appropriated by the Congress; and

Whereas the proposed U.S. Department of Agriculture budget for 1966–67 reduces the special milk program by $82 million to an unrealistic low amount, and the school lunch program by $19 million; and

Whereas the Honorable William Proxmire, Senator from Wisconsin, and the Honorable B. F. Sisk, Congressman from the 16th District of California, have introduced bills in the Congress, S. 2921 and H.R. 12806 respectively, to provide for an expanded special milk program in lieu of the proposed drastically reduced program; and

Whereas Assembly Joint Resolution 2, introduced at the 1966 first extraordinary session of the Legislature of the State of California, urges the President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget to restore the $3 million cut in the present budget for the special milk program, and to increase the proposed appropriation in the 1967 budget for such programs to $103 million: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California State Board of Agriculture, meeting in Sacramento on February 21, 1966, does hereby support Assembly Joint Resolution 2, and recommend and urge that the Congress of the United States be requested to: (1) assist in obtaining the release of the full amount of budget funds for the special milk program for the 1966 fiscal year; and (2) restore the budget cuts for the special milk program and the school lunch program for 1967; and in addition, that the Congress enact S. 2921 or H.R. 12806; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California, for transmittal to the California congressional delegation.

A FAIR SHARE OF THE TAXES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Wilmington Morning News there appeared a very timely article by Henry J. Taylor entitled "Whose Fair Share Is It?"

This article emphasizes some of the many questions that can very appropriately be asked by every American taxpayer as the April 15 date approaches. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wilmington Morning News, Apr. 1, 1966]

Whose Fair Share Is It?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The Internal Revenue Service, stroking its new computers like Willie Mays strokes his bat, announces these mean "each taxpayer will be paying his fair share." Fair share, my eye.

What is our fair share of the $122 million paid fat-cat Philadelphia contractor, Matthew McCloskey, a bigwig political money raiser, for Washington's Sam Rayburn Building? It houses our Congressmen at a cost of $122,000 a head.

That's a fair enough share for the Congressmen and McCloskey. But what's ours?

What is our fair share of the bill for conflict of interest that profits Congressmen and other officials tied in with airlines, TV stations, defense suppliers and such? Or the payroll for relatives like absentee Congressman Adam Clayton Powell's $19,700-a-year absentee wife, officially named untouchable by Congress itself?

What has the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of Justice really done to Bobby Baker? He resigned under fire October 7, 1963. The stalling passed into its third year before even an indictment was sought that involved not a single Washington official. Said Senator Clifford Case: "This matter is too outrageous to let it slip into the obscurity of the files." Yet what would have happened to the ordinary taxpayer who took the fifth amendment as Bobby Baker did?

What is our fair share of the junkets, the plush $5.9 million private jets, pay increases, and the squandering (free) of our taxpayers' foreign currencies this column has dealt with at length.

What is our fair share of Sargent Shriver's $5.4 billion poverty war in New York City, Chicago, etc., where it's admittedly shot through with dishonesty, political preference, and stealing? How, precisely, would you define Shriver's alibi when he answers, "That's life"?

Somebody remarked the other day that the only way you can pay your taxes and live a middle-class life today is to be poor enough to qualify for the poverty programs.

Beyond these, what is our fair share for the politically padded relief rolls, with some favored freeloaders getting handouts into the second and third generations?

Here we are in history's biggest boom, employment officially called "menacingly tight." Businesses everywhere are crying for workers, as is obvious in any newspaper. But the relief rolls still go up and up and will boost our share in some big cities to a half-billion dollars this year.

The politicians are so busy showing their liberal credentials (at our expense) that the rest of us who are only taxpayers or soldiers get lost in their profitable game.

What is our fair share in footing the losses for a post office whose bad service is a growing scandal? Or our fair share for the Federal paperwork jungle?

A House investigating subcommittee's exposure was squelched, but it stated that big brother is requiring about a billion reports a year from us. Big brother's handling charge to us exceeded $7 billion last year.

What is our fair share where Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara finds obsolete 113 Atlas and Titan launching sites in 13 States that cost us $859.9 million? Or is this, as Falstaff said, a question not to be asked?

What is our fair share of the consequences extending from the Bay of Pigs, the backdown in Laos, the glaring failures to honor our own word before we were painted into a corner in Vietnam? The incredible billions on billions that official failures, bad judgment, and coverups have cost us are the biggest single factor in the tax load.

And the very men, elected and appointed alike, responsible for all this, are only nominally subject to the tax collector and the Government as a whole, because they are the Government.

What would they say, and what could they do, if the Nation's taxpayers all—all—just mailed the new computers a blank tax return on April 15 and let the taxers stew in their own juice for a while?

This country needs a Patrick Henry. We're being robbed deaf, dumb, and blind.

HANDLING OF CRIMINAL CASES BY THE COURTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Plea Bargaining Under Fire," from the Washington Post of March 29, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this article states that Chief Judge John Lewis Smith, Jr., of the court of general sessions has challenged that court's long-entrenched system of judicial barter in which felony criminal charges are frequently reduced to misdemeanor charges in exchange for guilty pleas. I certainly want to commend Chief Judge Smith for his stand in this matter.

This newspaper article alludes to a confidential report on that court by the Department of Justice, which report, according to the article, states that 2 dozen or more of these bargaining sessions are held each day and that half of them result in reduction of charges against the defendants, usually in return for guilty pleas to lesser offenses. According to the article, in many other cases, the charges are dropped.

Mr. President, I have long maintained that convicted criminals in the District of Columbia are not being given sentences commensurate with the gravity of the offenses they commit. I have stated this; I have steadfastly reiterated this even in the face of those who produced statistics from the U.S. district court which purported to show that those convicted of crime in the District of Columbia receive more severe sentences than in any neighboring jurisdiction.

Mr. President, it appears that, finally, the facts of criminal justice in this District are being exposed to the light of public knowledge. And a principal fact of criminal justice in this District is that the U.S. Court of the District of Columbia never hears the vast majority of felony charges in this city. It is obvious to even the casual observer that only the most serious, the most grave offenses are tried in this jurisdiction as felonies in the U.S. district court. Small wonder then that this court shows what we are told are heavy penalty patterns.

The fact is, and those of us who have taken time to study in detail the crime problem of this city know this—the fact is, and I am glad to see that the Justice Department has studied this problem and has reported on it—the fact is, and I am glad to see that the practices of the courts of this jurisdiction are finally being exposed to the light of public knowledge—the fact is that felony charges in the District of Columbia are not bringing heavy penalties in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia; the fact is that many felony charges in the District of Columbia are being tried as misdemeanors in the Court of General Sessions where the plea bargaining system will bring a sentence of 360 days, or of 120 days, or of 90 days, or even of 30 days on a misdemeanor conviction of simple assault for an offense of robbery or attempted robbery.

Mr. President, I submit to this Senate the statement of your Committe on Appropriations in its report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1966:

> It is the committee's considered judgment that additional police are not only required, but in addition a comprehensive study of criminal cases handled by the courts is desirable without delay.

EXHIBIT 1

PLEA BARGAINING UNDER FIRE—JUDGE SMITH OPENS BATTLE TO END GENERAL SESSIONS BARTER SYSTEM

(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

Chief Judge John Lewis Smith, Jr., threw his weight behind the growing movement for reform in Washington's court of general sessions yesterday by challenging the court's long-entrenched system of behind-the-scenes judicial barter.

Beginning a month-long tour of duty in the court's U.S. branch, Smith told prosecutors and defense lawyers that he will no longer allow them to take serious criminal cases back downstairs for informal hearings at the counter in the U.S. Attorney's Office.

Until now, these counter hearings have been used by both the prosecution and defense for plea bargaining: the defendant agrees to plead guilty if the prosecutor will reduce the charge against him.

A defendant first charged with assault with a deadly weapon, a felony, might agree, for example, to plead guilty to simple assault, a misdemeanor carrying a much lighter maximum sentence. Or another, charged originally with housebreaking, might wind up pleading guilty to unlawful entry.

Smith, in explaining his action to a reporter, noted that the Justice Department's confidential Subin report on the court had pointed up and criticized extensive plea bargaining at these counter hearings.

Two dozen or more of these hearings were held each day and, the Subin report showed, half of them resulted in a reduction of the charges against the defendants, usually in return for guilty pleas to lesser offenses. In many other cases, the charges were dropped.

Prosecutors explain that the hearings give them an opportunity to recheck the original charges they lodge in light of new information that the defendants or their lawyers supply.

But Judge Smith said in court yesterday that the prosecutors will now "have to prepare the charges right the first time."

The judge added later that if a defense attorney presents "a convincing argument" in court that there are "valid extenuating circumstances" in the case, he will make an exception and allow the case to go to a counter hearing.

"But when it is obvious that they want a hearing for plea bargaining purposes only," he warned, "I will turn them down."

Some court observers also believe that Smith's new policy is aimed at forcing the U.S. District Court to hear more felony cases which in the past have been reduced to misdemeanors which added to the overcrowded general sessions calendar.

Smith told a reporter that this "was not on my mind at the time," but he added, "if the criminal act committed is a felony, it should be prosecuted as a felony and not as a misdemeanor."

Prosecutors are certain that more cases will remain felonies now and be sent over to the district court, which in the past has been accused of shifting part of its caseload to general sessions.

"The question now is whether or not the grand jury there will indict that many more defendants or just turn around and send the cases back here as misdemeanors anyway," one prosecutor said. "What will Smith do then?"

The first result of Smith's new policy was easy to see yesterday; the U.S. attorney's office—usually jammed all day long with lawyers, defendants, witnesses, and policemen—was nearly empty by 11 a.m.

Smith's action was his first public move toward change of any of the court's practices and problems outlined in both the Subin report and a series of articles published in the Washington Post last month.

Smith assigned himself to the U.S. branch after Charles W. Halleck, a newer judge, spent the last 2 months there challenging several traditional practices of both the court and the U.S. attorney's office.

Last week Halleck began refusing defense attorneys' requests to take cases "downstairs" for counter hearings, a move that apparently was spurred by Smith.

"I told Tim Murphy (chief assistant U.S. attorney for general sessions) a couple of weeks ago that we intended to stop letting these cases go back there for hearings," Smith said yesterday, "and then I talked to Halleck about it."

Halleck also had refused to assign cases in the U.S. branch to several defense lawyers who had regularly practiced there in the past but who Halleck felt were not working hard enough for their clients.

Halleck never made public the list of lawyers he had barred, but several longtime U.S. branch "regulars" soon disappeared from Halleck's courtroom.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PROTECTING SHALE OIL LANDS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in recent months there has been a concentrated effort to press Secretary of the Interior Udall in making a decision which would allow the leasing of shale oil lands.

As cosponsor of Senator Douglas' bill, S. 2708, to preserve this country's valuable oil shale deposits, I cannot stress enough the importance of protecting this valuable public resource.

Our Government has a tremendous opportunity to guide the development of this rich natural resource. Seldom in our history have we had such an opportunity.

The importance of not making any hasty and unwise decisions in this matter is stressed in a series of articles and editorials appearing in recent issues of the Lamar Tri-State Daily News, Lamar, Colo., and the Farmer and Miner, Frederick, Colo.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these articles and editorials printed in the Record and included with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Lamar Tri-State Daily News, Mar. 4, 1966]

Protecting a Public Resource

The United Press International this week quotes the chairman of the board of Humble Oil & Refining Co. as advocating "an orderly and reasonable program of leasing Colorado shale oil lands for development without delay." He was speaking before the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers.

The speaker urged immediate action and suggested a competitive fixed-bid royalty basis similar to the program the Government has used for its offshore oil and gas lease sales.

Somehow we have never had the impression that the public came off too well in the offshore operation, and certainly, in view of the warning statements by at least two members of the Oil Shale Advisory Board in their report to the Secretary of the Interior in February 1965, we would be hesitant to buy the recommendation for a rapid transfer of the oil shale potential of our State to the private oil companies. Only now is the general public beginning to get some idea of the potential wealth of this last great natural resource.

In his report to the Secretary of the Interior, Dr. Kenneth Galbraith arrived at certain conclusions. While space will not permit us to print his conclusions in full, in light of the foregoing suggestion by a prominent official of one of the Nation's largest oil companies, we would like to quote a portion of Dr. Galbraith's conclusions:

"(1) We agree that it is not sound policy to lock up important resources. We gain in wealth by using our natural wealth and doubtless will continue to do so. There is good reason, accordingly, to seek the development of effective and economical processes for recovering oil from shale.

"(2) Alternative fuel supplies are, however, wholly sufficient to permit orderly and equitable development of shale oil resources. Extravagant, windfall or unknown rewards need not be paid for hurried development. There need be no irrational or helter-skelter alienation of this public resource. All who believe in conservation must resist such course.

"(3) The interest of the people of the immediate area in development is understandable. But the resource in question belongs to all the people of the United States. Their interest is paramount.

"(4) In the early deliberations of the board it was urged that development was being held up by the unavailability of public lands. On examination this contention fails to stand up and little was heard of it in our later deliberations. Development is not, in fact, now being restricted or curtailed by the fact that the larger part of the reserves are in public hands. Oil companies that are as competent as any in the country for development now own in fee simple shale resources far beyond any conceivable requirement for long-term development. They are being deterred not by Government ownership of other land, not by fear of what the Government may do with these lands, but because of the costs of development and because the further economics of production, as compared with alternative costs of crude oil, are either unclear or unattractive. We conclude that the charge that Government ownership is holding up development is based on either ignorance of the size and richness of present private oil company holdings or an effort to turn local pressure for development into pressure on the Secretary of the Interior to lease the lands."

[From the Lamar Tri-State Daily News, Mar. 7, 1966]

Bold Planning Necessary

Recently in this column we referred to an address by a representative of one of the major oil companies in the course of which he advocated the "immediate" leasing of lands in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah, said to be rich with oil shale.

Dealing with this same topic the March issue of Atlantic Monthly carries a most illuminating article by Julius Duscha, veteran Washington reporter, and author of several books dealing with affairs of Government.

Duscha traces the history of the oil shale discovery and concludes his four-page article with these words:

"While Members of Congress from the western States and lobbyists for the major oil companies continue to press for the leasing of the shale lands as if they were just another public resource to be controlled for private gain, Secretary Udall and a few other officials in Washington have recognized the unique position in which the Government finds itself. Seldom in the history of the United States has the Government had the opportunity to guide the development of a natural resource in the way it can direct the growth of a shale oil industry. The closest parallel is probably with the early days of atomic energy.

"It seems plain now that if the public interest is to be served, Udall—and President Johnson—must first make certain that no legislation is pushed through Congress forcing the Government to lease its shale lands before their true value is known and before the cost of taking the oil out of the rock is determined. But Udall and Johnson also must convince Congress that shale oil offers a special opportunity to develop an extremely valuable resource in the best interests of the people to whom it belongs.

"The Government does not, however, necessarily have to develop the shale lands itself. What is necessary is that the Government protect the public interest in this great resource, once private development of these Federal resources is permitted. A quasi-public corporation similar to Comsat, which is operating the Nation's commercial communications satellites, a Tennessee Valley Authority, or an agency modeled on the Atomic Energy Commission could be used to develop the shale fields. Studies should be undertaken to determine what kind of development corporation and plan could best serve the Nation after it becomes clear that shale oil land is needed to augment or replace liquid petroleum reserves.

* * * * *

"Fifteen percent of the shale land is not owned by the Federal Government and is available to oil companies that want to carry on research. Large tracts of land are not needed for experimental work, and if it is necessary, the Government can lease small sections of its shale lands to facilitate research.

"But above all, a Great Society must encompass bold planning for the development of natural resources as well as human resources."

[From the Farmer and Miner, Feb. 3, 1966]

Mountains of Oil

—from the February Rotarian

It would take a mountain of money to pay off the U.S. national debt, now well above the $300 billion mark. U.S. Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, in the last session of Congress introduced another idea: how about using a mountain of oil instead? More specifically, how about using the "mountains of oil" which our readers learned about in the Rotarian for December 1965?

Senator Douglas' proposal concerns those oil shale deposits in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, a virtually untapped reservoir of energy thought to contain, he points out, "twice the known recoverable reserves of petroleum in the entire world." Since 1930 the oil shale lands have been withdrawn from development and conserved as part of the public domain. Now, with prospects of a cheaper method of processing petroleum out of the shale and with private industry showing increasing interest in the deposits, the Senator asks that "the income received by the United States from the development of the oil shale will be used solely for reducing the public debt." So, here is one more element in the growing oil shale story.

[From the Farmer and Miner, Mar. 24, 1966]

The Douglas Bill

In attempting to acquaint readers with the problems and corruption behind shale oil in Colorado, we present the work of Denver's Gene Cervi:

Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, points the way by which the Federal Government can retire the national debt through royalties from the rich oil lands owned by the Federal Government itself.

Largely overlooked in the closing days of the session (1965), the Douglas proposal requires that if and when "these tremendous assets owned by the people of the United States" in the oil shale lands of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming are developed, the income to the Federal Government as landowner would be paid into a special Treasury account. This money would be used to retire the debt.

How extensive are the oil resources owned by the U.S. Government? According to Interior Department witnesses appearing before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the most conservative estimate of the high grade deposits on federally owned shale lands reveals a potential yield of 600 billion barrels of high quality oil, or, said Senator Douglas, "twice the known recoverable reserves of petroleum in the entire world."

For the past 35 years, this vast oil rich area in the public domain has remained withdrawn from development. Under an executive order issued by President Herbert Hoover on April 15, 1930, these Federal shale lands were reserved for "investigation, examination, and classification." Although that executive order still holds, Senator Douglas warns that pressures are growing to reverse it and release these lands to private companies for development.

"The principle of my bill," said Senator Douglas, "is that when the Congress and the executive branch have properly resolved many problems connected with development of these resources, then the income received by the United States from the development of the oil shale will be used solely for reducing the public debt."

Senator Douglas is determined to "warn all parties, including the executive branch and the lobbyists who are sure to become actively involved that many of us in Congress will be alert to any attempt to deprive the people of their rights to this national resource.

"Through the introduction of this bill as a means for the repayment of the national debt, I wish to illustrate again the fact that the publicly owned natural resources of this country far exceed the national debt in value," Douglas said.

MILITARY PAY BILL

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, every Member of this body and, indeed, every American is profoundly conscious of the bravery and sacrifice now being demonstrated by thousands of our men in uniform in Vietnam. We are secure in our homes and free to live our lives in peace and justice only because over the years millions of men and women in uniform have devoted their lives to duty in defense of their country. Surely the least we can do—and I have said this many times in the past—is to relieve them of economic anxiety and undue material sacrifice. The rigors of a serviceman's life are hard enough without adding the burden of personal financial hardship for his family.

Over the last 2 or 3 years, we have done more in that direction than was often the case in past years. Between 1958 and 1962, there were no changes at all in military compensation. But in the last 28 months, the Congress has passed and the President has approved pay increases for the Armed Forces amounting to $1.23 billion. That is an average increase of nearly 13 percent in the serviceman's base pay.

Last year, the Congress increased military pay sufficiently to create an equitable balance with the pay received by civilian employees of the Government. Now the President, on the advice of the Secretary of Defense, proposes that this relationship be maintained this year and in the future. I strongly support this recommendation, which is based on the annual review of military pay required by the military pay bill that we passed last year.

Last March, the President proposed a 3.2 percent increase in the average compensation of civilian employees. In keeping with the comparability principle, he now proposes a similar 3.2 percent average increase for our men and women in uniform. Both the civilian increase and the military increase are within the wage-price guidelines established by the Council of Economic Advisers. This means that we can reward our devoted public servants and our courageous soldiers, sailors, and airmen while, at the same time, continuing to set a good example for private industry and American labor.

For all these reasons, I urge that prompt action be taken on the President's pay raise proposals. There is no way that we can really repay the sacrifices which duty demands from so many of our best young man. But what we can do, we should do—and we should do it gladly and with dispatch.

A TRIBUTE TO CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the great Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Earl Warren, reached his 75th birthday last week. During his 13-year tenure on the Court, he has secured a place in history comparable to that of John Marshall. Under his leadership, the Supreme Court has been a dynamic force for social and racial justice. Bill Hall of the Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune has articulated this in an excellent editorial, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Mar. 19, 1966]

SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS FROM A SPLENDID MIND

Few men still in office, or even still alive for that matter, can be quite as certain of their place in American history as Chief Justice Earl Warren, who turns 75 today. That is because few men in our history have presided over milestones so momentous in the development of this democracy.

Too often in the life of this Nation the Supreme Court has been a collection of tired men who were blind to the changing times and intent only on protecting and preserving the stagnant status quo.

But the fabled Warren Court, as it is called with affection by its admirers and with disgust by its critics, has been an activist body, carrying its full share of the load in the never-ending task of perfecting the system. Under Warren's leadership, and with the willing assistance of most of the Associate Justices, the High Court has in the last 13 years treated the Constitution not as a barrier in time, but as the pliable instrument of a changing democratic institution.

Warren gave notice of the attitude that would prevail under his leadership when he stepped down as Governor of California in 1953 to accept President Eisenhower's appointment to the highest position in the judicial branch. In a farewell address to Californias, Warren said of the Court that, "If through the years its work is well done, the home of every American will always be his castle, every human life will have dignity, and there will forever be one law for all men."

If that was intended as a promise of things to come, he kept his word. Warren and the Warren court have been unrelenting in trying to nail down those guarantees of individual freedom that had not been extended equally to citizens of every race and economic status.

The Court's decision on the collection of evidence, the right to counsel, the selection of juries and the general conduct of trials has modernized and perfected the American judicial system.

Decisions on everything from freedom of expression to freedom of religious choice have left no question of the meaning of the first amendment nor any doubt that its guarantees must be respected.

The Nation has not yet achieved perfection in securing the promise that "every human life will have dignity" and the assurance that "there will forever be one law for all men." But we are far closer to it today than we were 13 years ago when Warren took command.

Many decrees have been handed down from that bench in those 13 years, but none was more of a milestone than the unanimous decision reached on May 17, 1954, to overturn the "separate but equal" doctrine laid down by a less courageous Court in 1896. The 1954 decision was really the starting point for the civil rights revolution that has blossomed since. Much remains to be done, but if 25 or 50 or 100 years from now the Negro achieves virtual equality in education, in economic opportunity and in social contacts, May 17, 1954, will be remembered as the day a fundamental barrier toppled, knocking over all the rest.

Likewise, the Warren court may be remembered in future times as the body that remodeled State legislatures, giving State government a backbone and millions of citizens the voting power their numbers warranted.

But the best measure of Warren and his court is not to be found so much by peering into the history books of the future as by listening to the wounded cries of those who can't say his name without clenching their teeth—the white supremacists, the ultraconservative defenders of the status quo and others who crave the dead days of another time. The incompetent or conventional mind rarely inspires such hatred or accomplishes so much.

IS HELP ON THE WAY FOR THE COMMUTER?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last year Congressman Bingham of New York and I introduced a bill, S. 2339, to permit a State to elect to use funds from the State highway trust fund for the purpose of urban mass transportation.

The purpose of S. 2339 is to permit officials at the local level to determine whether or not Federal highway subsidies, allocated for the urban areas, could be better used to build a balanced transportation system, using part of the funds for rapid transit and the balance for highway expenditures.

This bill would permit the local or State officials to make that determination rather than to have the determination predetermined by an official here in Washington behind a desk.

I believe the Federal highway program has been a great program. It has done a great job, but the purpose of the Interstate System, as I understand it, is to connect major cities across the Nation, and not to tell city officials or State officials how to build a transportation system within their own urban or metropolitan areas. S. 2339 would simply permit local and State officials to determine how best these funds could be utilized.

Hearings have been scheduled on S. 2339 on April 28 before the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Commerce Committee.

In an illuminating article on the alternatives available to cities to handle their transportation problems, the Christian Science Monitor of March 11, reported on urban transit problems and the efforts being made to solve them. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Help Is on the Way for the Commuter" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP IS ON THE WAY FOR THE COMMUTER

(By George H. Favre)

NEW YORK.—Ask John Q. Straphanger to let his imagination run riot while he describes an ideal transportation system.

His answer would likely include the following:

Cleanliness, privacy, comfort, door-to-door pickup and delivery, speed, and economy.

Some cities are already experimenting with systems that aim at these advantages.

Pittsburgh is testing the Westinghouse Skybus for its planned extensive rapid-transit system. A running prototype of the totally automated system is already in operation.

Its small, aluminum cars hold 30 people. It glides noiselessly on rubber tires over elevated concrete tracks. Cars start, stop, speed up, or slow down as their silent electric motors respond to directions from a central computer.

It is estimated that no commuter will have to wait longer than 2 minutes to board a car.

IDEAL ANSWER SOUGHT

Detroit, bastion of the internal-combustion engine, is going still further afield in search of a solution to its transit problems. The city council is negotiating with Teletrans Corp. for a 1-mile demonstration line along Woodward Avenue, on Detroit's North Side, representing a radical departure in mass transit.

The system involves individual cars that will travel in tubes, totally controlled by a computer, and electrically powered. Up to 4 people (2 adults and 2 children) will be able to sit in each car.

By depositing an IBM card in a slot they will be shot off through the tube to a station within one block of their destination.

These two transit concepts—the Skybus and Teletrans—come close to providing the ideal answer that transit experts seek. Prof. James P. Romualdi, a civil-engineering expert at the Carnegie Institute of Technology, sees in them an approach to what transportation engineers have talked about for years but are only now getting around to developing.

Dr. Romualdi, who has just been named director of the newly established Transportation Research Institute at Carnegie Tech, said the systems have exciting possibilities. While either or both concepts may have bugs in them to be ironed out, he says, "they force us to go ahead and give it a try."

AVERAGE SPEED CLOCKED

Each type of system has its particular advantages and will be useful in particular situations. Thus the middle-sized Skybus may best fill the needs of transit between a core city and its suburbs. A highly flexible and personal system, such as the Teletrans, may be better adapted to short-haul trips within the core city.

The paradox of transportation in the United States is that the ideal form has long been here. It is, of course, the automobile. But as more and more straphangers became "wheelhangers," speed gave way to the traffic jam.

And while the car is still the cheapest way to take the family on an outing, it is hard to justify using a 4,000-pound, 350-horsepower vehicle to carry one or two commuters into a traffic-jammed city.

To illustrate: New York City's central business district is inundated by 3⅓ million people coming to work each day. Of these, about 850,000 enter during the 8–9 a.m. rush hour, including 9 percent by car. The average auto speed over major arteries leading into the city during rush hour has been clocked at 13 m.p.h. Once in the city, it slows to about 8½ m.p.h.

Why not build more roads, bridges, and tunnels? The Regional Plan Association, a voluntary transport agency, recently estimated that if every highway, tunnel, and bridge leading into Manhattan were doubled in capacity, and if only cars were permitted on them, they could still accommodate only 22 percent of the worker inflow during the peak hour instead of the 9 percent they do now.

But neither the cold-molasses pace of rush-hour traffic, the high tolls for bridges and tunnels, nor the big bite for all-day parking seems to deter the motorist.

There are two reasons for this:

Door-to-door traveling using present rail transit is even slower than by car.

The rapid-transit system is outmoded, unclean, crowded, hot in the winter and even hotter in summer, generally unsavory.

New York City has one of the worst commuter problems in the Nation. But time is catching up with other major cities, too. Over the past 10 years, city populations have gone up 10 percent, while suburbs have exploded by 59 percent. The trend is expected to continue. The census bureau estimates that by the year 2000 some 50 percent of the population will be concentrated in 48 major metropolitan areas.

CRUCIAL ROLE RECOGNIZED

It is clear that the problem can no longer be looked at simply as a matter of concern to a few big cities, nor even to a few metropolitan regions.

New York's recent transit strike, which lasted 13 days, cost an estimated billion dollars in business lost. That gives some measure of what a free-flowing commuter transportation system means to the national economy.

Congress recognized the crucial role of commuter transport in 1964 when it passed the Urban Mass Transportation Act. The measure was designed to make Federal funds available to cities and States, encouraging them to build up coordinated transit systems.

In 1965, Congress appropriated $375 million for research and equipment for highspeed surface transportation. This was not strictly for commuter transit but to encourage a high-speed rail system for the "northeast corridor" between Boston and Washington.

Just this week deBiasi & Purcell Associates of Newington, Conn., unveiled a plan that would employ computers, elevated rails, and a new breed of vehicles running at speeds of up to 200 miles per hour.

The vehicles—cars, buses, and trucks—would be equipped with an "autokinetic wheel," a pneumatic tire with a metal flange on the outside to fit the elevated rails of the system.

A traveler could enter his car at home and drive to a special toll booth. Here he would drive onto a railed on-ramp after having fed his destination into a computer. The computer would take over until he was "delivered."

The wheel would be hydraulically driven by an "inside-out" engine—a turbine type in which the drive shaft would remain stationary and the rest of the engine revolve.

The Department of Commerce has asked the firm to submit a proposal for a grant toward laboratory testing of such a wheel and motor.

Solutions of this sort could help in solving regional transit problems as well.

In reference to this, President Johnson is pushing legislation to rejuvenate the entire transportation system of the Nation.

However, simply making Federal money available to study the problem of urban mass transportation is no sure-fire guarantee of a solution. Experts agree that "a solution" is technologically possible for any given transit situation. But each city is an individual social, political, economic, and cultural entity. Its transit problems are just as individual.

AUTO CONCEPT UNDER STUDY

This means that the optimum solution for each city will include the tried and true as well as the yet-undreamed-of type of transportation.

Thus, experts agree, the country will still need more highways. The population is expanding. More and more families are having two or three cars in the garage. No one foresees a decline in the number of private automobiles anywhere in the future.

This means that the basic concept of the automobile itself is under study. Chrysler, for example, has had a number of turbine-engine cars being road-tested for 2 years now. Engineers are studying ways to make cars safer. Automobiles, however reluctantly, are being forced by law to adopt new safety features, often before the public demands them.

Highways themselves are being redesigned. Traffic flow is being regulated by computerized lights. As mentioned above, engineers are thinking in terms of electronic guide strips that would take control of the car and leave the driver free to read his morning newspaper.

Thus new transit concepts are being forged and old ones updated. Stuart T. Saunders, chairman of the Pennsylvania Railroad, notes that more than $2 billion has been committed nationally to build new mass rail-transit systems or modernize present ones. His own railroad is in the forefront of these efforts.

While radically new rapid-transit forms are in the works—as in Pittsburgh and Detroit—rails still hold a high priority. For one thing, most cities have existing rail lines which, however outmoded, represent a huge capital asset. As a right-of-way, rails may be valued from $4 million or $5 million to $30 million a mile if the cost of replacing them with new surface, elevated, or subway lines is considered.

Thus the Long Island Railroad, on the verge of bankruptcy, has been bought out by the State of New York. It has begun a modernization program that will run eventually to some $300 million.

Shortly it will begin testing the world's first self-propelled, gas-turbine rail cars on a 20-mile stretch of its tracks. The $1.3 million project will use turbines similar to those that power aircraft. The cars will be lightweight stainless steel, fast, smooth riding, and with controlled heat and humidity.

Updating existing commuter rail lines can pay off. In Philadelphia, a publicity subsidized modernization program brought a 250-percent increase in riders on 1 line in less than 3 years.

But in every case where new technologies are being put to work to develop lighter, more comfortable, faster, more economic systems, the basic demands of the commuter are being honored.

As these transportation technologies are perfected, experts forecast that the motorist will be increasingly weaned from his attachment to his car.

And those who must drive their cars will be able to do so with greater speed, comfort, and safety as a result.

TESTIMONIAL FOR SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, our colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, was honored last week at a testimonial dinner at his home town of Elkins, W. Va.

I regret that a prior engagement prevented me from attending the gathering, but I was pleased to send my congratulations in a message which was read at the dinner.

A news story from the Elkins, W. Va., Inter-Mountain of April 4, 1966, carries all the excitement and the warmth of the gathering. Because I believe that other Members of Congress would be pleased to read about the dinner and the complimentary remarks made by the guests, I ask unanimous consent to have the news story printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONIAL FOR SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

"A man of great faith and vision * * * a champion of just causes for Mountaineers everywhere," said Gov. Hulett Smith.

"He is worth his weight in gold to the people of America," said Congressman HAROLD COOLEY.

"One of the giants of West Virginia political history," said W. W. Barron.

"Had it not been for him the National Air Museum would not exist," said Paul Garbor of the Smithsonian Institution.

These were among the words of praise of Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH which poured forth from leaders from the field of government, aviation, and education at the Elkins banquet saluting Senator RANDOLPH at the National Guard Armory on Saturday night. Close to 700 persons attended the banquet which was sponsored by the city of Elkins, Elkins Chamber of Commerce, and the Randolph County Court.

Governor Smith praised RANDOLPH in the following words:

"Fortunately for West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH has been a man of great faith and vision. He is not a man who is backward about looking forward.

"He wears many hats—

"A student, because he is always trying to learn new ways in which he can better serve all of us.

"An educator, for he is always extolling the attributes of a state that is now solving problems of growth, rather than problems of stagnation.

"A judge, for not a day goes by that he is not required to pass judgement on a matter of monumental importance in the marble halls of the U.S. Senate.

"A lawyer, for he is constantly trying the case of West Virginia in a court in which there are 49 other competitors.

"A businessman, for he has the momentous duty of conducting the Nation's business.

"And above all, I like to think of him as an advertiser, because in Washington, he is one of our best products. (However, I'm quick to add, he can't be bought.)

"I join Elkins and the rest of West Virginia in paying homage to this great West Virginian and champion of just causes for Mountaineers everywhere—our senior U.S. Senator, JENNINGS RANDOLPH."

High praise came from leaders in the aviation field.

Addressing her words to Senator RANDOLPH, Mrs. Blanche Noyes, chief of the air marking staff for the Federal Aviation Agency, stated: "By presenting the first bill in Congress for Federal aid to airports, you helped establish airports across the Nation. Those airports helped us win World War II." Mrs. Noyes pointed to further legislation authored by Senator RANDOLPH which helped the field of aviation including the bill which gave Federal aid to the air marking program. She recalled that 30 years ago, she was invited by Senator RANDOLPH to come to the dedication of the Elkins Airport. Mrs. Noyes, cowinner Denix Air Race in 1936, is a twin-engine pilot and has flown hundreds of hours in her air marking assignments.

Paul Garber, head curator and historian of the Smithsonian Institution, National Air Museum, directed these words to Senator RANDOLPH: "Had it not been for you, the National Air Museum would not exist. I would like to thank you on behalf of the Nation for our National Air Museum."

Garber turned to the audience as he referred to Senator RANDOLPH as "a great and distinguished West Virginian—a man who is loved by most because of his attention to duty. JENNINGS RANDOLPH occupies the top rung of all the illustrious men we have had in Washington. Elkins and Randolph County can be proud of him. He is a great American."

"He's a whole regiment of men surging ahead of his time. He has lead us in aviation greater than any other man," said L. Welch Pogue, a former chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and a former president of the National Aeronautical Association.

"Senator RANDOLPH is worth his weight in gold to the people of America," said Congressman HAROLD COOLEY of North Carolina, a 32-year veteran of the House and one of only five House Members who have served continuously since 1934. Congressman COOLEY said that "by his intelligent devotion to duty, Senator RANDOLPH has endeared himself to his Congress." Congressman COOLEY and Senator RANDOLPH served together in the House 3 decades ago. COOLEY is chairman of the House Agricultural Committee.

Congressman HARLEY O. STAGGERS joined Representative COOLEY in telling the Elkins audience of Senator RANDOLPH'S effective leadership in Congress.

That Senator RANDOLPH and his wife were touched deeply by the salute from their hometown folk was in evidence. The Senator stated: "I have appreciated the touch of every hand * * * the word of every adviser. I have never wanted to walk in front of people. I just want to walk with them."

Judge Robert E. Maxwell was toastmaster. Welcoming the group was Mrs. J. E. Martin, Jr., chairman of the planning committee for the dinner.

John Harris presented a plaque to Senator RANDOLPH from his hometown. It was of bronze and was contributed by Seneca Corp. Hugh Nestor made the base for it from Randolph County black walnut. Candlesticks of bronze which were replicas of 150-year old antiques, made by Harvey Bailey and his machine shop class at Elkins High School, were also gifts to the Senator. Other gifts included a giant birthday cake made by Wallace Bakery which was topped by the Senator's picture.

A total of 700 paper weight favors were contributed by Masketeers of Belington and Metalab plant at Beverly. The base was of hard maple furnished by Metalab and the brass tops were from Masketeers. They were valued at $3 each or $2,100.

A platter of native cherry was contributed by Hugh Nestor and Spike Moore and the vocational classes at Elkins High.

Former Gov. W. W. Barron and his wife, Opal, were on hand for the banquet. In an interview prior to the banquet. Barron had this tribute for the Senator:

"It is difficult to pay just tribute to a man such as JENNINGS RANDOLPH. His very life and works, constitute an enduring tribute and testimony far more eloquent than any words of mine. He is without dispute, one of giants of West Virginia political history."

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION FINANCING

Mr. LAUCHE. Mr. President, I have spoken on the floor of the Senate and have introduced bills seeking to curb the unrealistic and unintended expansion of the Rural Electrification Administration and to bring about some equalization of the interest rates charged by the Treasury for REA loans and the amount the Treasury pays for its borrowings. This multimillion-dollar subsidy to the REA at the expense of the taxpayers has been in effect too long and I have repeatedly pointed out that it should be brought to a halt. I have been free to admit that the REA did a good job in the early years bringing light and power to farm and rural communities that previously were without electricity. This was the intent of the Congress.

Mr. President, that is not the way of a bureaucracy. With the sweet taste of accomplishment in its mouth, so to speak, the REA has looked for new worlds to conquer, and the Congress generally has agreed to go along. Now, we have the REA building big generating plants and long transmission lines. We have the REA serving not only rural, but invading suburban territories in competition with established taxpaying electric companies. We have had REA financing lifts for ski areas where there was no snow; we have had REA enticing factories by cheap power. And all of it has been done at the expense of the taxpayer—with money borrowed by REA at 2 percent interest even though the Government itself had to pay 4 percent or more to get the funds to lend.

I have sought to end this clambake of the REA at taxpayer expense. Now, however, we have a high court slapping down the Rural Electrification Administration as if it were an unruly small boy in a district school.

I shall say no more, but merely quote for you an article by Roger W. Benedict, which appeared on the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal, of March 29, under the title "Power Play," with the provocative subtitle, "Colorado Case Shows REA Has Strayed From Original Aim."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this entire statement be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER PLAY—COLORADO CASE SHOWS REA HAS STRAYED FROM ORIGINAL AIM

(By Roger W. Benedict)

High in the Colorado Rockies, just west of the Continental Divide, a new coal-fired

150,000-kilowatt powerplant sends out a steady flow of electricity for customers as far away as Nevada.

Until a few weeks ago, this 9-month-old plant, which with its network of long-distance transmission lines represents an investment of about $30.5 million, was the pride of thousands of the area's local residents, who technically own a share of it. But now it's suddenly become the source of considerable uneasiness to farmers and townspeople across much of the western slope, and even in neighboring States.

Last month, the Colorado Supreme Court ruled that use in the project of $22,867,000 of Federal funds was illegal, and that the State's public utilities commission erred in approving its construction. Now even the plant's most ardent backers hesitate to predict what's to become of it.

"This has been quite a shock to this community," reports Ora K. Harris, a lumber dealer in nearby Craig, Colo., one of the few who opposed the plant. "Most of the people around here knew this wasn't a feasible project, but they were spooked into supporting it as a boon to the local economy," he asserts. "Now they're worried about what's going to happen."

How the steamplant at Hayden, Colo., came into being is a murky, complex tale that's been largely shrouded in Government secrecy. But the controversy surrounding it is one of interest to power users and taxpayers throughout the country.

The Federal funds involved were borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration by Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Montrose, Colo., a group of 13 rural electric cooperatives and 1 public power district, which has taken preparatory steps toward appealing the Colorado Supreme Court decision to the U.S. Supreme Court.

If the ruling is upheld, it will become the most significant in the stormy 30-year history of REA, and it could well shape the future course of the federally financed rural electrification program. But even should it be overturned, the Colorado-Ute case holds significance far beyond its legal impact—which is limited by a number of factors—as it has become the focal point of a private versus public power controversy over the aims and purposes of REA.

THE POINTS OF LAW

The points of law in question are important, to be sure. The Colorado decision "confirms that it is in the public interest for a State to prevent unnecessary duplication of utility facilities that waste the consumer's money," declares Robert T. Person, president of Public Service Co. of Colorado, in Denver, one of the utilities that brought suit against the State commission. Mr. Person also heads the Edison Electric Institute, trade group for the investor-owned segment of the power industry.

"If REA must withhold funds in any project in litigation, as this decision holds, then utilities can simply stop up the whole program of REA-financed generating plants and transmission lines through endless legal maneuvers," concedes Charles Robinson, staff engineer and general counsel for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C., trade group for 997 co-ops borrowing from REA.

Potential impact of the decision is tempered however by two factors: Utility commissions of only 16 other States, like Colorado, regulate rural electric cooperatives; Federal courts have repeatedly declined to rule on similar cases, holding that the actions of REA are accountable only to Congress.

As a result, the Colorado-Ute case may prove more important as part of a growing controversy over the marked changes that have occurred in the REA program since its inception. Both sides agree that REA is no longer what it started out to be, but they sharply disagree over what it has become.

REA was set up in 1935 as a means of encouraging, through Federal loans, the extension of power distribution lines to farms and rural areas lacking central station service. But it now makes subsidized outlays mainly to build powerplants and long-distance transmission lines that provide service primarily to nonfarmers.

In the last 5 years, REA has nearly doubled the Federal investment in rural powerplants and high voltage powerlines to $1.7 billion, which exceeds the funds Congress has appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and amounts to more than 43 percent of the total $3.9 billion REA has loaned for distribution lines over the first 30 years of the program. REA estimates its borrowers will need an additional $3.1 billion of such loans over the next 15 years.

Almost two-thirds of the 5.4 million customers served by REA borrowers are not farmers, and increasingly these borrowers are competing with conventional utilities to hook up suburban housing projects, factories, and shopping centers. At present 98.2 percent of the Nation's 3.3 million farms have central station power—about half of it supplied by REA borrowers—up from 11 percent of the 6.8 million farms when REA was launched.

REA borrowers get 35-year loans at 2-percent interest, although similar money currently costs the U.S. Treasury about 4.6 percent; over 95 percent of REA's loans have gone to cooperatives and public power agencies which are exempt from Federal income taxes; and unrecoverable costs of the REA program to the Federal Government, even after all loans are repaid, are already approaching $400 million.

Rural electric co-ops, which have received over 90 percent of REA's loans, view the program's new mission as a "socioeconomic" one not unlike the antipoverty program. They note that rural areas have over half the Nation's poverty and about two-thirds of its unemployment, and they assert that subsidized help and loans to build generating plants are necessary to their task.

"If it were not for generating and transmitting loans, the rates cooperatives pay for electricity purchased from utilities would be substantially higher than they are," asserts Mr. Robinson. "Without low wholesale rates on power," he says, "it just wouldn't be feasible to serve many rural areas." He notes that a recent survey shows co-ops average only 3.3 customers and $460 of revenues per mile of line, compared with 33.2 customers and $7,164 of revenues per mile for commercial utilities.

But utility executives charge that the new concept of REA is a far less beneficent one in which REA loans for generating plants and transmission lines have become the means of obtaining Federal financing for power projects Congress has refused to authorize for Federal power agencies. They say REA is now spending more for such projects than the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation.

CONGRESS' INTENTION

"Congress never intended that the Rural Electrification Act be used as a backdoor means of building a nationwide, federally subsidized electric system," declares Mr. Person. "The Colorado-Ute case brings into sharp focus the way in which REA officials have acted by administrative fiat to accomplish their aims in complete disregard of the law."

That such angry comments have some validity is indicated by the way the Hayden plant came into being. Prior to undertaking the project, Colorado-Ute was made up of just five small co-ops in northwestern Colorado, and was operating well in the red. Obviously too small to build a 150,000-kilowatt generating plant, it set out to build up its membership.

One new member was a subsidiary of Salt River project agricultural and power district, serving over 100,000 customers in suburban areas of booming Phoenix, Ariz., 700 miles away. Colorado-Ute agreed to sell Salt River one-third of the plant's power at less than half the price to its co-op members, in return for a one-third investment in the plant. Another was Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc., made up of three co-ops in southeastern Colorado, across the Rockies. It, too, got a special low price.

Colorado-Ute also added seven more distribution co-ops. Why did they join? "We were informed that we'd no longer be able to buy power at low prices under our co-op preference rights from the Bureau of Reclamation," reports Mr. Harris, a director of Yampa Valley Electric Association, Inc., one of the seven. "But after the power plant deal was completed, the Bureau of Reclamation said it was willing to sell us all the power we wanted at a price that's about half what the Hayden power costs us—but, of course, it was too late to do anything about it."

As a further inducement, Colorado-Ute bought Yampa Valley's power plant "which was just junk" for $250,000, Mr. Harris reports. Colorado-Ute offered $1 million for three other co-op plants. Its offer for facilities of Bridger Valley Electric Association in Wyoming, however, was rejected by the Wyoming Public Utilities Commission, which noted that Bridger Valley could buy power cheaper from the Federal dam at Flaming Gorge than from Colorado-Ute, and pointed out that Colorado-Ute's indebtedness exceeded its assets by $2.1 million.

Mr. Harris, one of two directors on Colorado-Ute's 24-man board to oppose the Hayden project, asserts that most co-op members didn't know about all this maneuvering. "The whole thing was a crash project prompted, formulated and pressured by REA officials, the Bureau of Reclamation, Salt River and the coal industry," he charges.

RECLAMATION BUREAU'S ROLE

Why would the Bureau of Reclamation be interested in promoting such a project? It, like all other Federal power agencies, got into the power business through hydroelectric projects incidental to dams purportedly built for flood control, navigation and irrigation. Congress has refused to permit any Federal agency other than TVA to build coal-fired electric plants. But hydropower is principally useful when interconnected with coal-fired plants. Utilities also note that the country has nearly run out of economically feasible hydro projects, due to advances in power technology.

"REA is being used to get coal-fired plants to firm up Federal hydro power in an all-public power network," charges Edwin Vennard, executive vice president and general manager of Edison Electric Institute. "And not one of REA's loans for generating plants can be justified on the basis of either need or economics. Utilities are selling co-ops power for a lower average price than the average cost of generating electricity in REA-financed plants, and we have ample reserve supplies to handle their future needs."

Co-ops buy 43 percent of their power from utilities, 39 percent from Federal power projects, and generate 18 percent.

The Colorado-Ute case is only the latest in a series of recent setbacks for REA. Senator HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, chairman of a Senate appropriations subcommittee, criticized REA this month for failing to follow special directives Congress placed on generating and transmitting loans in 1963. President Johnson has clamped a $270 million limit on REA loans in the current fiscal year, and recommended a cut to $220 million for fiscal 1967. And Congress has been critical of co-ops that invest or lend at higher interest rates part of the 2-percent money they get from REA.

REA could also be in more hot water in Indiana, where litigation is pending before the State supreme court on a $60 million power project that's already under construction.

"But don't underrate the durability of REA," says Mr. Vennard. Noting that fewer than 70,000 U.S. farms still lack central power, he adds, "REA's a classic example of the fact that Government agencies don't fade away when their original purpose has been accomplished—they simply find something else to do."

OMBUDSMAN AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, in August 1964, the Congress passed Public Law 88–499, which created the Administrative Conference of the United States. Unfortunately, to date it has not become operative because the best person for chairman has not yet been found. We hope he will be found soon.

The Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure is deeply interested in the Administrative Conference. Last week, the distinguished professor of law at Columbia University, Walter Gellhorn, delivered the Oliver Wendell Holmes series of lectures at the Harvard Law School Forum. Professor Gellhorn devoted his lectures to the concept of "ombudsman"—the so-called citizen's defender. This topic is also of much interest to the subcommittee, for just a few weeks ago we started our series of hearings on ombudsman by taking testimony from Mr. Alfred Bexelius, the Swedish ombudsman.

The subcommittee intends to explore all aspects of the system of ombudsman, for in my opinion it has great possibilities here in the United States. At this time, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an article by Mr. Robert J. Anglin, which appeared in the Sunday Washington Post, April 3, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEWARE OF ALL-AMERICAN MR. FIXIT

(By Robert J. Anglin)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—One of this country's leading experts on the Swedish ombudsman device for handling citizen complaints against Government said last week that we should be careful about creating an "all-American Mr. Fixit."

Columbia Law School Prof. Walter Gellhorn said, however, that the much-discussed theory of a one-man, impartial expert to act as arbiter between Government and the governed could be put to good use at the State and local level in the United States.

Gellhorn delivered the prestigious Oliver Wendell Holmes series of lectures at the Harvard Law School forum.

In three talks before law students and faculty, he explored from several aspects the Scandinavian system of the ombudsman, whose job it is to investigate and press citizens' complaints against public officials.

In Sweden, the ombudsman has proved a successful device for democratic government since it was established in 1809. Since then it has spread to other countries—to Finland, Japan, Denmark, and New Zealand.

There is a proposal before the U.S. Congress for creation of an American style ombudsman, who would be called "administrative counsel of the Congress."

His duties would be to "review the case of any person who alleges that * * * he has been subjected to any improper penalty, or that he has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled * * * or that the determination or award of any such right or benefit has been * * * unreasonably delayed as a result of any action of failure to act on the part of any employee or officer of the United States."

This review, however, would be undertaken only when a Member of Congress requested, a major change from the Scandinavia system of a grievance bureau open to all.

Introduced by Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, Wisconsin, the proposed legislation has not gotten beyond committee.

Gellhorn stated at the outset of his lecture series that he was not presenting arguments for "supplanting existing means of dealing with conflicts between wielders of governmental power and those affected by it.

"The familiar institutions do, after all, work," he said. "They fit national habits—or, perhaps, national habits have grown to fit them."

If there is any possibility for some sort of American ombudsman, Gellhorn said, he would be the chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, set up by a statute enacted in late 1964 but not yet operative.

"The Administrative Conference, in concept," Gellhorn said, "has one particularly marked advantage over the ombudsman systems now in use abroad.

"That is the administrative agencies' direct involvement in recommendations affecting some or all of them.

"Views formulated by such a body—constituting, one might also say, a specialized legislature—should carry considerable weight," he said.

On the other hand, Gellhorn said, a single, all-embracing ombudsman in the Scandinavian style "might drown in a sea of genuine or fancied grievances before he could even begin to function.

"The scope and complexity of Federal operations, the geographical dispersal and number of persons these operations affect, argue in combination against attempting to create a single, all-American Mr. Fixit.

"An ombudsman-type official with authority to examine the entire range of State or municipal administration in order to correct citizens' grievances would be 'a promising experiment,'" Gellhorn said.

He warned, however, that "one would be incautious indeed to predict that a new alchemy practiced by an external critic of administration or by a whole covey of critics could suddenly transmute bureaucratic bungling and other real or imagined governmental failings."

POLARIS SUBMARINE "GEORGE C. MARSHALL" NOW IN OPERATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last Tuesday I received another in a series of letters from Admiral Rickover informing me of the first sea trials of the U.S.S. *George C. Marshall*, the Nation's 36th Polaris submarine.

It is indeed fitting that this addition to our strong naval fleet should be named after the first military man ever to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. This should serve as a fitting reminder to friend and foe that these potential weapons of war are intended to secure the peace. Without such a goal the billions of dollars we spend on defense are a total loss. With such a goal we can wisely direct our defense efforts toward a permanent world order.

Admiral Rickover's letter spells out in eloquent detail General Marshall's magnificent career. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S.S. "GEORGE MARSHALL" (SSBN–654),
At Sea, North Atlantic, March 28, 1966.
Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our 36th Polaris nuclear submarine. The U.S.S. *George C. Marshall* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va. We also have in operation 22 attack-type nuclear submarines, making a total of 58.

This ship is named for a distinguished soldier-statesman, General of the Army George C. Marshall (1880–1959). Born and raised in Uniontown, Pa., the son of an operator of coal and coke industries who had left Kentucky after the Civil War, Marshall grew up with an unusual understanding of northern and southern viewpoints. His family, of Scotch-Irish origin, were among the earliest settlers in Virginia. Moving to Kentucky around 1780 when this was still frontier country, they became prominent in local and State politics and as planters and professional men. In his boyhood, Marshall got rather tired of hearing about his famous collateral relative, Chief Justice John Marshall, and felt it was about time someone else in the family made a name for himself. As it turned out, he took the first step in this direction when, after graduation from Virginia Military Institute, he applied for and received a commission as second lieutenant in the Army. His retirement to private life at 71 brought to an end a half century of public service which for sheer competence and devotion to duty has rarely been surpassed.

Yet outside the military he was known only during his last 12 years as a public servant. The early careers of nearly all great war commanders seem drab and in no way predictive of their wartime achievements. The reason, of course, is that a career officer normally, that is, in peacetime, does not practice his profession but remains a student, eternally preparing himself for an eventuality that he and everyone else hopes will never occur. This peculiarity of the military profession accounts for the fact that the special competence of career officers tends to be undervalued by outsiders, yet without it no war is won. This competence can only be acquired by practical experience over a long career span. No layman has it, however brilliant he may be, for intellect alone, pure ratiocination alone will not produce it, just as it will not produce the surgeon's operating skill.

It was a measure of President Roosevelt's greatness as a war leader that he fully understood this. He was very much his own Commander in Chief; he ran the war, made the broad policy decisions, but in the execution of these policies, in matters of strategy, tactics, and operations, he nearly always deferred to the professional judgment of his military top command, especially that of General Marshall.

Marshall's unusually long tenure as Army Chief of Staff contributed to his effectiveness, for able men grow abler when they see a task through from beginning to end. Heading the Military Establishment during the entire 6-year-war period, he was responsible for the rapid and orderly expansion of the Nation's military forces from 175,000 men, 13,000 officers, and some 1,000 planes to over 8 million men, 764,000 officers, and 69,000 planes. In an incredibly brief time, a peacetime army ranking 17th among the world's national armies, had become a vast, flexible, superbly equipped and trained force—"mobilized as if from nowhere," to quote Secretary of War

Stimson—with which a difficult six-front war was won. Once the initiative was ours, there were practically no serious setbacks. Marshall's timetables of the successive operations proved accurate. To an astonishing extent, the war went according to plan. His estimates of the number of combat divisions required for victory were adequate and yet not excessive. No combat division was left in this country when Germany surrendered; all were overseas in the theaters of war. It took every man the Nation had mobilized, wrote Marshall in his Final War Report, "to do our part of the job in Europe and at the same time keep the Japanese enemy under control in the Pacific."

Marshall became Army Chief of Staff on the day Germany attacked Poland—"by a favor of Providence," as President Truman was later to remark. Not the least of his achievements was completion of a good part of the military buildup during the 27 months of peace that were granted us while Europe and the Far East were embroiled in war. The Army had grown to eight times its peacetime strength when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. We were much better prepared than we had been in 1917, and this despite widespread opposition to military preparations, reflecting in its emotional intensity the passionate determination of the American people not to become involved in this war.

Marshall worked hard to dispel the popular confusion of preparedness with warmongering, to awaken the public from the dangerous illusion that our unrealized power potential would deter an aggressor, our mere wish to avoid war secure us peace. He tried to make clear to the public that much time must elapse between deciding to arm and being armed and that we could not safely count on being granted this time if war were thrust upon us. He said once in a speech that "perhaps the most important task of the Army is to plan and scheme and work to the end that this time factor will be kept to a minimum." Our past experience worked against him. We had never yet had to pay the price of defeat for failure to prepare in time for war. Although the war was manifestly moving closer, the bill extending selective service passed by but a single vote—just 4 months before we were at war. It was an election year and public opinion had made itself heard.

World War II was a coalition war of global dimensions in which 93 million men and women were mobilized. For the Allies to win, it was as essential that they prosecute the war in the closest accord, as that they exert themselves to the utmost. Never before was a coalition war fought with such unity of purpose and effort by so disparate a group of allies; never had such prodigious exertions been required of each member state. Decisive for the success of the alliance was the fact that the two members who jointly accounted for the larger part of its total military and economic strength fought the war, from the start, under a unified high command. In Stimson's judgment there were two main reasons why the United States and Great Britain were able to use their land, sea, and air forces as if they were a single military unit: Roosevelt's and Churchill's determination to wage the war as a team, and General Marshall's organizing genius and diplomatic skill. He was the dominant member of the joint command organization—the combined chiefs of staff—of whom Churchill said that "there was never a more serviceable war machinery established among allies."

Upon his retirement from active military service at the end of the war, Marshall was summoned to important civilian posts: Ambassador to China (1945-46), Secretary of State (1947-49) and Secretary of Defense (1950-51). He was the first military leader ever to hold the two highest ranking cabinet positions, the first to serve in one war as the military head of the Army and in another (Korea) as the civilian head of all our land, sea, and air forces. Momentous changes took place in American foreign policy while he was Secretary of State and in these he played an active part—rescue of Greece and Turkey from Communist conquest, rehabilitation of Europe through the Marshall plan, initiation of discussions leading to establishment of NATO. For his contributions to the generous and imaginative aid program which bears his name, Marshall received the Nobel Peace Prize (1953), the first military man ever to have been so honored.

A reticent man who shunned publicity, Marshall once remarked, "I think I prize my privacy more than anything else." This, and the fact that the story could not be told honestly and completely without hurting the feelings of many people, decided him not to write his memoirs. Marshall resisted pressures from friends and lavish offers from publishers. The closest he came to an autobiographical record was his Final War Report, covering the years 1943-45. This brief (153 pages), lucid and factual description of the buildup, the logistics, the strategy, the steps on the way to victory, was, as his biographer, Robert Payne, remarks, "a history of the war which could only be written at a time of triumph by the man most responsible for the triumph." Through it "there shines the peculiar quality of the man at his best: complex and unyielding, stripped like a runner for the race."

Those who most directly depended on Marshall are best qualified to add to our understanding of this man. When President Roosevelt could not make up his mind to appoint Marshall Chief Allied Commander in Europe—even though he was so obviously the logical choice that the appointment was taken for granted—he left the decision to the general. The war was too big for personal feelings or desires to enter such a decision, replied Marshall, whereupon the President said, "I feel now that I will not be able to sleep at night with you out of the country," and kept him by his side. Marshall knew as well as the President that field commanders rather than chiefs of staff are remembered in history, but this counted for nothing with him. As with all men who render great public service, his sense of duty always took precedence over personal concerns. Dean Acheson tells of an interview he had with him shortly after Marshall became Secretary of State. In reply to Acheson's query as to what was expected of him as chief aid, Marshall said: "First, the most unvarnished truth, particularly about myself. I have no feelings except those which I reserve for Mrs. Marshall." Churchill called him "a magnificent organizer and builder of armies—the American Carnot"; Truman wrote that "to him, as much as to any individual, the United States owes its future"; but Robert Payne came perhaps closest to the essence of Marshall in this passage: "It can be said of him, as it can be said of few others, that he lived for an idea, and the idea was America."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

ANOTHER SIDE TO THE GREAT DEBATE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a column of Arthur Hoppe's which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 23. In a lighter vein, he repeats—with a twist—an argument with which we have all become familiar.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER SIDE TO THE GREAT DEBATE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

"We have our commitments in Vietnam and we must honor them," said the hawk, slapping his palm on the table for emphasis. "It's as simple as that."

"But what about the danger of escalation?" asked the dove mildly. "Don't you worry about that?"

"It won't happen," said the hawk firmly. "They don't want to get involved in a vast land war in Asia any more than we do. All we have to do is meet every aggressive act of theirs with a measured response. And if we hold firm to our ideals and purpose, their resistance will eventually crumble."

"Maybe," said the dove doubtfully. "But it would save a lot of bloodshed if we agreed to negotiate with the opposition in South Vietnam. After all, they control a good half of the country and if we offered to let them take part in an interim government, pending elections."

"Why," cried the hawk angrily, "that would be like letting a fox in the chicken coop. Anyway, they aren't a real government. We all know who's pulling the strings. Remember the lesson of Munich."

"Oh, come now," protested the dove, "it isn't like Munich at all."

"It certainly is," said the hawk. "The appeasers sold out to the Nazis at Munich and only whetted their appetites. Are you blind to the lessons of history? Don't you realize the forces of aggression must be contained at the outset?"

"Well," conceded the dove, "there's some merit in that."

"It's the key to the whole thing," said the hawk. "Think of the nations that are now straddling the fence. If we don't honor our commitments in Vietnam, what will happen in Thailand? As South Vietnam goes, so goes Thailand. Then Laos. Do you want the forces of aggression to overrun all of southeast Asia?"

"No, of course not. But——"

"Do you want us to withdraw completely from Vietnam and leave those loyal Vietnamese who have counted on our support to the tender mercy of their enemies?"

The dove sighed. "I guess there's no easy way out. But there are so many unanswered questions."

"The easiest way out," said the hawk, with a paternal smile, "is to stop asking questions. Of course, you have a perfect right to ask them—even though questioning our Vietnam policy gives aid and comfort to the enemy. And makes him think we are divided, thus encouraging him to continue the war."

"You're right," said the dove, lifting his shoulders as though relieved of a burden. "The quickest path to peace is to fight harder. Why, I feel better already."

The hawk put down his chopsticks, took a sip of tea and beamed proudly at the dove.

"Let us never forget," he said, "that if we citizens of the People's Republic of China march forward together in unquestioning solidarity, the American aggressors can never win in Vietnam."

LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in an editorial on March 14, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch questioned the source of the heavy financial backing evident in the public relations campaign now underway in favor of the latest rotten borough amendment on State legislative apportionment.

Many Senators have raised the same question. Who is footing the rotten borough amendment publicity bill? And is all the money being collected in the name of malapportionment actually being spent to promote the Dirksen amendment?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial, entitled "Room for Clarification," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Room for Clarification

Senators Tydings, of Maryland, and Proxmire, of Wisconsin, challenge Republican Leader Dirksen to disclose the financial backing of his latest reapportionment amendment. The Illinoisan says the matter can be discussed during debate. If so, the results could be enlightening.

There is nothing wrong with raising funds for the most misguided efforts if they are within Federal law, and there is nothing wrong with hiring a big public relations firm to conduct an expensive campaign for a legislative purpose. But when this is done, the public naturally wonders who pays the bill.

Senator Dirksen tries to make his attack on popular legislatures seem to be a popular crusade. That is nonsense on its face. But many persons still think of legislative apportionment as primarily a rural versus urban issue. Is it really that simple? In Missouri, Mr. Dirksen's major avowed allies are business and farm groups which evidently feel they were protected by a malapportioned house.

Short of being entirely rural, much less popular, the real source of support for the Dirksen amendment appears to be political conservatism. If that assumption is wrong, no doubt the Senator will clarify it with an accounting in the Senate debate.

FOOD FOR INDIA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, a farmer whose barns were full of corn was accustomed to praying that the needy be supplied. But when anyone in needy circumstances asked for a little of his corn, he invariably said he had none to spare. One day, after hearing his father pray for the poor and needy, his little son said to him: "Father, I wish I had your corn."

"What would you do with it?" asked the father.

"I would answer your prayer," replied the child.

No one will say that this great and compassionate Nation of ours ever ignored the desperate prayers of our fellow men.

Today, President Johnson has sent to the Congress a special message seeking our approval of emergency shipments of grain, cotton, corn, powdered milk, and vegetable oil to our friends in India. Need for this food and fiber is desperate. India, the world's largest democracy, with a population of one-half billion human beings, is now suffering the worst drought of the 20th century. The Indian Government has estimated that even with a strict program of belt tightening throughout the nation, she will still fall short of her minimum requirement by 11 to 12 million tons of wheat alone.

This Nation, thus, is in the position of that farmer of whom I spoke earlier. We have adequate reserves of grain. We have the capacity to help see India through this crisis without endangering our own supply.

Thus, the need is clear and the responsibility is clear. I support President Johnson's call for an emergency shipment of 3½ million tons of wheat. And I echo his call to all the nations of the world to join in this great humanitarian effort. Political philosophies must be put aside in the face of human suffering. All that can help must help—and I am proud that we here in the United States are taking the lead.

SEVENTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF NATO

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, yesterday was the 17th anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty. On that occasion President Johnson issued a statement affirming the resolve of the United States to strengthen and to perfect the Atlantic alliance in a constructive spirit. The President emphasized the continuing need for the alliance, in these terms:

> NATO was created as an instrument of peace. Its objectives are to remove temptation to aggression and to provide the foundation for seeking a settlement in central Europe, based on the principle of self-determination, providing increased security for East and West alike. Every lesson of our common experience argues that these objectives should be pursued in closest concert.

Manlio Brosio, Secretary General of NATO, also chose the occasion of the 17th anniversary to issue a message to the members of NATO.

I ask unanimous consent that the two statements be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the two statements were ordered printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by President Lyndon B. Johnson, April 4, 1966

Seventeen years ago today, with the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty, the Western nations drew together in an historic undertaking to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of our peoples.

For the United States this meant rounding the last corner on the long road from self-imposed isolation to full acceptance of our responsibilities in the world. For our allies the North Atlantic Treaty signified a departure, no less historic, from traditional pursuit of national interests narrowly construed. In the Treaty we together acknowledged a common destiny and the duty to pursue it together.

We decided that if we didn't hang together, we would hang separately. Nearly two decades of time have demonstrated the wisdom of those who read the lesson for the future in two world catastrophes out of the past.

The Atlantic alliance deterred the threatened aggression which brought it into being.

Behind the military bulwark it raised from the Black Sea to the North Cape, an era of unprecedented growth and well-being began.

Within the framework of security it provided, the vision of a United Europe became a practical undertaking, now far advanced.

The Atlantic alliance has succeeded perhaps better than its founders dared hope. Yet we must never forget why it has prospered.

The unique quality of the alliance for peace lies in the joining of sovereign nations in an integrated system of collective defense. We and our partners, in painstaking effort, created the peacetime planning agencies and integrated military commands called the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These institutions afford practical assurance that aggression would be met by allies acting at once and as one. They have insured the peoples of the Atlantic community 17 years of peace.

NATO was created as an instrument of peace. Its objectives are to remove temptation to aggression and to provide the foundation for seeking a settlement in central Europe, based on the principle of self-determination, providing increased security for East and West alike. Every lesson of our common experience argues that these objectives should be pursued in closest concert.

Together with 13 other Allied nations, we have declared our resolve to carry on, to strengthen and perfect our NATO system in this constructive spirit. We shall not abandon an institution which has proved itself in the hour of peril.

We look forward to the day when unity of action in the Western family is fully reestablished and our common interests and aspirations are again expressed through institutions which command universal support among us.

NATO 17th Anniversary Message by Secretary General Manlio Brosio

Seventeen years ago 12 nations laid the cornerstone of a structure which spans the ocean and links the Old World with the New. In 1952 they were joined by Greece and Turkey and in 1954, by Germany. Had such an alliance existed before, mankind might have been spared two terrible World Wars. Since 1949, this alliance, NATO, has insured its members peace and freedom and provided an opportunity for prosperity unequaled in history.

Today NATO is, I believe, more necessary than ever for all countries concerned. Each makes its contribution according to its own capabilities. But if, as seems obvious, military strength is necessary, moral unity of purpose is even more necessary in our time in the face of a continuing threat from the East and of doubts in some quarters as to the reasons for the very existence of our alliance. My message to you then is one of faith and hope that the difficult times we are passing through will see NATO not only overcome the problems confronting it but go on to achieve new strength.

PEKING'S SELF-ISOLATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, like the man who painted himself into isolation in an exitless corner of his room floor and then blamed the paint manufacturer for his predicament on the grounds that the instructions on the paint can were insufficient; similarly, there seems to be a growing number who say that Peking's isolation is not of her own making but the fault of the manufacturer.

Let us review the facts. Mr. Roscoe Drummond in an article appearing in the March 28 issue of the Christian Science Monitor clearly points out that Peking's isolation has been self-imposed in every instance.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEKING'S SELF-ISOLATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—It is striking that so little controversy is being stirred by the mounting pleas for fuller contact between Red China and the United States.

Time was—certainly during the McCarthy period—when the merest word that the United States should exchange ambassadors with Red China or favor inviting Peking into the United Nations would have brought the instant charge of procommunism or worse.

Such emotional views, almost wholly ungrounded, shut off rational debate.

THREE REASONS

There are, I think, three reasons why a new look at U.S. policy toward Red China is emerging in a calmer and soberer climate.

For the most part, the miasmic mood of the McCarthy era has passed.

The support within the U.N. for admitting Peking shows that the U.S. stand against it is a losing cause.

But most telling of all is the Nation's anxiety lest mainland China enter the Vietnam war—and the desire to explore any good course to prevent this.

Now we are seeing a healthy public debate over what U.S. policy should be toward Red China. Nearly all the experts support our defense of Vietnam; agree that containment is necessary. But the main thrust is toward expanding all kinds of contacts with Peking. Nearly 200 of the China experts urge that the United States recognize Red China and help get her into the U.N.

In theory there is much to be said for this view. But is it attainable? That is, is there any reason to believe that Red China wants to widen its contacts with the rest of the world? Is it the West that is isolating China or is it China that is isolating itself?

CHINA ISOLATED

The United States did not isolate Red China from the Soviet Union or from Indonesia or from Cuba; they isolated each other. The United States didn't isolate Red China from Algeria, or from Yugoslavia, or from the African nations which have expelled Peking's diplomats. China isolated herself by her own actions. It isn't the United States which is blocking an exchange of American and Chinese newsmen. We have been trying to bring this about for years. Red China blocks it.

Would Peking accept an exchange of ambassadors with the United States? There is every evidence that it would not, except on its own terms. For example, Peking forced General de Gaulle to withdraw the French Ambassador from Formosa before it would accept recognition from France. Is the United States to allow Peking to decide the countries with which we are to have diplomatic relations?

UNACCEPTABLE CONDITIONS

Does Peking want to join the U.N.? We don't know and it seems to me the U.N. should find out. So far Red China has laid down wholly unacceptable conditions: Formosa must be expelled; the 1950 U.N. resolution citing Red China as an aggressor in the Korean war must be rescinded and the United States named the aggressor instead; the "imperialist nations" and their "puppets" should be removed from the U.N.

If a two-thirds majority wants Red China in, why shouldn't they make it quite clear that nobody is going to be expelled and on that premise invite Peking to take a seat? Such a course will, at least, show whether the U.N. is keeping Red China out or whether Red China is keeping itself out.

Peking's self-isolation doesn't mean that we should not try to bring it into wider contact. It does mean that it will take a long time to do it, almost certainly into the next generation of Chinese Communist leaders. Like Stalin's Russia, Red China apparently needs to picture the United States as a big enemy in order to justify the massive repressions of the Mao regime. A U.S. policy of containment and contact makes sense.

MORE BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure resumed its hearings on invasion of privacy. We took testimony on a number of problems, ranging from governmental invasions of privacy to industrial espionage in the drug industry. Apparently, our subcommittee was not the only one concerned with this serious problem. My good friend and colleague Senator RIBICOFF took testimony from Mr. Ralph Nader on the activities of General Motors. And even the State Department was involved in tracking down American citizens as they traveled abroad.

Max Lerner has written a most informative article on this subject. His opening sentence expresses my feelings, when he says: "Snoopers, snoopers, everywhere." I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, the article by Mr. Lerner which appeared in the Evening Star on Tuesday, March 29, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PATH TOWARD A DOSSIER STATE

(By Max Lerner)

Snoopers, snoopers, everywhere. Doubtless it is sheer coincidence that three major cases of snooping, in three widely different fields, should have hit the headlines at the same time. But in the America of 1966 rather than of 1984 the effect is too eerily big brotherish to be shrugged off.

All three have broken here in Washington. One was a case of industrial espionage and involved the highly artificial price structure of the drug industry. The head of a firm of industrial sleuths, working for a drug manufacturer, told a senatorial subcommittee that he had planted a spy in a wholesale drug company to discover whether he was cutting his prices to retailers.

The second was an admission by the head of General Motors, before another Senate committee, that this giant company had spied upon a young Washington lawyer who had written a book that is highly critical of cars as containers for human beings, and which attacks them as death traps.

Third was the disclosure that at the request of the FBI, the State Department had asked the embassies in Paris and Moscow to place a Harvard professor of history under surveillance.

I am sure that somewhere in each case somebody thought he was doing the right thing. I am also sure that these are not isolated cases. Industrial espionage is widespread; massive auto corporations, with a big investment in current models, are tempted to protect their investment by less than open methods; the State Department now tells us that it is a common practice, and that hundreds and even thousands of Americans have been treated with this extra attention.

Shades of Adam Smith, who saw the system of business competition as "nature's simple plan." Shades of Jefferson, who was convinced that the crucial value in the young American republic was the jealous safeguarding of the right of criticism. Shades of Justice Holmes, who spoke of the "dirty business of wiretapping" and had the old-fashioned sense of honor and openness that gave him a healthy dislike for snooping in every form. The fact that these things are done commonly and on a big scale does not make them more attractive but less.

Of the three cases I find the sleuthing of Americans by U.S. embassies abroad the most disquieting. The target was H. Stuart Hughes, a teacher and scholar of distinction, who has taken some naive political positions in the past but probably not any more so than many other American intellectuals. One doesn't have to agree with Hughes in order to believe that his political positions are no justification for shadowing him when he goes on a research assignment to Europe.

It appeared at first that the passport division of the State Department had issued the surveillance order on its own, without a request from any agency. Then it turned out that the FBI had sent through a request. Perhaps it's more consoling for the shadowed person to know (if he ever discovers it) that the surveillance of him is pursuant to a request from a Government agency, and that everything has been done in proper form. But bureaucratic order doesn't help much if the principle itself is a highly doubtful one.

While saying that it has been common practice for years to shadow Americans abroad, the State Department was unable to cite the legal authority under which it is done. I suppose the answer is that it is not a legal but a practical problem. At a time of war, whether cold or hot, there are agencies whose tasks it is to guard U.S. security. They keep a watch over certain men within U.S. jurisdiction, and when they go abroad the vigil presumably continues.

There may be no real answer to the problem. The FBI and similar agencies would feel crippled if they could not ask for surveillance of people they suspect. But the trouble is that there is no way for the rest of us—the Nation as a whole—to form any judgment of how responsibly or irresponsibly those suspicions have arisen, how and why a particular man is chosen for shadowing, by whom and on what grounds the decision to make the request is reached, and what use is made of the harvest of information that is gathered about the suspect.

Can we not, with all our vaunted intellectual resources, contrive some way by which the security of the Nation will be tolerably guarded while retaining one of the prime values of our society:

The right of a person to live his life, well or ill, without benefit of the snoopers?

INTEREST IS BUILDING IN CREATIVE FEDERALISM AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the growing interest of the Nation's press in the development of a creative federalism to help State and local governments better meet public needs is both salutary and significant. This interest, of course, is heightened by President Johnson's particular concern with modernizing our Federal system to bring State and local governments into a closer partnership with the Federal Establishment. A very well-written and thoughtful article by William Chapman appeared last Sunday in the Outlook section of the Washington Post entitled "The States as Partners."

It highlights some of the thinking of Presidential assistants, State leaders, and others on this important subject.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Chapman's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATES AS PARTNERS—L.B.J. WANTS THEM TO COOPERATE WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BUT NOT AS LITTLE BROTHERS

(By William Chapman)

In city halls and State capitols, ears are cocked apprehensively toward the White House these days for answer to a widely discussed question: "What is creative federalism all about?".

It is a common but enigmatic phrase that President Johnson has employed for nearly 2 years in speeches and messages touching on the Federal, State, and local governments. To interested visitors, the President has spoken of it in stirring terms, declaring, "It means we've got to get this country ready for the year 2000."

The guests usually go away as uncertain as when they entered.

More positive guidance is expected this spring when Mr. Johnson is to deliver a special message on the issue and appoint a study committee to spend 2 or 3 years surveying the broad fields of Federal-State relations. For the present, White House aids and independent observers offer only some clues as to what they think the President is thinking. Their description goes like this:

The Federal Government is bound to grow larger and more powerful as States, cities, and towns turn toward it for help in providing everything from sewers to jet airports.

Washington will provide money and set standards to serve these needs, but it should not attempt to control every step in the process, leaving nothing to local imagination or initiative.

Yet the States and localities are poorly organized to do their part, and the existing systems for sharing Federal revenues are unwieldy and outdated.

It is the task of creative federalism to foster new institutions at the grassroots level and develop new fiscal arrangements so that State and local governments can become true partners with the Federal Government, and not merely little brothers.

WATER POLLUTION AN EXAMPLE

One Presidential aid, aware that this explanation is a bit fuzzy, cites the administration's water pollution bill as an example of things to come. A single State cannot clean a river. A regional agency with jurisdiction along the river's entire course is necessary. Therefore, the bill withholds funds from any State whose Governor has not promised to join an interstate body having power to force compliance on those who can control sources of pollution.

"We are saying, 'You put together an organization of counties, cities, towns, and States, and we'll give you the money to clean your river,'" explains the White House assistant.

An example of new revenue-sharing ideas is found in the administration's recent proposal for rebuilding urban hospitals. Previous Federal assistance has been funneled to the States through Hill-Burton grants and loans. It has gone primarily for construction of new hospitals under a formula that guaranteed help for rural States with low per capita incomes.

But it did little for the larger cities, where most of the Nation's obsolescent hospitals are located. So early in March the President sidestepped the Hill-Burton program with a new grant-and-loan plan geared specifically for old hospitals that need new equipment or a general rebuilding. It is tailor-made for big cities and it is generous in financial terms, even by the standards of the American Hospital Association.

A TREND SYMBOLIZED

The break with tradition in aiding hospitals symbolizes a trend in several other Great Society programs proposed or enacted in the last 15 months. The drift is away from across-the-board grants-in-aid and toward programs that are directed, through Federal standards, straight to points of greatest need.

Elaborate and specific guidelines bind the antipoverty program, demonstration projects in cities, and educational funds for children of low-income families. Even the school milk and lunch programs, Mr. Johnson suggests, should go only to those children who need them, not to every child that enters a schoolhouse door.

The shift to tighter Federal restrictions means less authority for Governors. States participate in the new programs primarily in conjunction with other States through such associations as the Appalachia Commission or the proposed regional river commissions. The Governor who had wide latitude in determining where an interstate highway went in the 1950's will have no such authority in a clean river project of the 1960's.

The confusion and disagreement over trends in federalism are nowhere better revealed than in the cities demonstration program. A key figure in this plan for rebuilding central cities is the Federal coordinator, the man who would be assigned to pull together Government programs at the block level.

His role is viewed by administration designers as one of creating more initiative, dynamism, and variety in local development plans. But local officials are wary of potential czardom.

"Already, proposed coordinators of Washington's handouts to metropolitan areas are being hailed as Federal 'mayors,'" charges Michigan Gov. George Romney, who has described a "new centralism" in which power flows to Washington as Federal money comes to the localities.

Aware of this trend, such Governors as John Connally, of Texas, and William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, far apart in distance and political philosophy, have voiced identical complaints: that they are not given a loud enough voice in the development or operation of Federal programs.

Connally has traveled to Washington to keep his hand in the Camp Gary Job Corps. Scranton complained that the Federal Government keeps talking about cooperation without seriously seeking State advice.

Many share California Gov. Edmund G. Brown's lament that "while an increasing number of government services are administered under joint State and Federal auspices, the Governor is brought into the policymaking discussions * * * only infrequently, informally, and haphazardly."

NEW INSTITUTIONS NEEDED

A key element entering into any discussion of creative federalism is the need for new institutions, and White House officials speak of both public and private institutions. In the public sector, examples are obvious: the river commissions, metropolitan planning organizations encouraged by the carrot of financial aid and the rural development districts proposed to do what separate country towns cannot.

Applying creative federalism to the private sector is more difficult. Officials speak of drawing universities into cooperative research centers with the magnet of Washington money. Or they talk of semipublic corporations formed to do what private business alone cannot afford.

One test of the new approach, they say, is coming soon in the development of a prototype of the supersonic transport aircraft. Private industry alone cannot foot the bill, sometimes put at $50 billion, for an SST program running from initial research through the first generation of 200 planes.

But the Government wants to avoid a permanent subsidy of the sort that threatens to engulf it in connection with the maritime industry. Federal officials now are trying to work out an arrangement with manufacturers before entering the prototype stage next year.

"We are looking for some arrangement in which we can give them the money to get over the hump, help them with information and then get some of our money back," one official said.

Such innovations in either the private or public sector would be critically reviewed in Congress, which is normally skeptical of fundamental changes. But there is evidence of growing concern.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, citing the critical absence of coordination in Federal grants-in-aid and the local governments' shortage of skilled planners and managers, is on record in behalf of two fundamental reorganizations. He wants a National Council for Intergovernmental Affairs established in the White House and extensive Federal help in training local personnel.

What creative federalism really means is still anybody's guess. Mr. Johnson apparently is not sure himself, for in his state of the Union address he announced that "a commission of the most distinguished scholars and men of public affairs" would be created to "develop" the new concept.

There is little doubt, however, that the President expects it to be a major contribution of his years in the White House.

GROWING DISSIDENCE IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in the face of the endemic political division and deterioration in South Vietnam, I would like to bring two items which recently appeared in the New York Times to the attention of my colleagues. Last Sunday James Reston wrote on the "Myths and Realities in Saigon." He emphasized that an effective war against the Vietcong depends upon a cohesive Saigon government which does not now exist. He feels the recent demonstrations at least have exposed the reality. In an editorial the next day the Times said Prime Minister Ky's effort to smash opposition in Danang, and thereby possibly precipitate another civil war, is the application of military power to what is basically a political problem. Because of this, "a change in government in Saigon is clearly going to be necessary."

I ask unanimous consent that these items by printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1966]

WASHINGTON: MYTHS AND REALITIES IN SAIGON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—The latest political agitation in South Vietnam, with its undertones of rebellion and anti-Americanism, gives the impression of a new and particularly vicious crisis, but this is misleading.

It may be a crisis—though it can undoubtedly be handled—and it is vicious, but it is certainly not new. The demonstrations of the Buddhists and the students against the Washington and Saigon Governments are not transforming the situation but only exposing it. They are not changing the political fundamentals, but merely reminding us of what they are.

THE ANCIENT PROBLEM

The nub of the American problem from the beginning of this adventure was the fragility of the political base from which we chose to operate. The present Saigon Government is a coalition of military warloads.

The Prime Minister in Saigon, General Ky, never really had control over the South Vietnamese military commander in the 1st Corps area, General Thi, whose domain bordered on North Vietnam.

The present difficulty arose from the fact that the Prime Minister, General Ky, tried to prove that he had control over the whole country. President Johnson summoned him to a dramatic conference in Honolulu. He outlined a very sensible program of social and agrarian reform for South Vietnam with which General Ky agreed. President Johnson treated General Ky as the leader of all of South Vietnam, knowing this was not true but hoping he could make it true if he said so, but it didn't work.

It is too bad. There should be social reform and there should be a powerful central government in Saigon that could bring it about, but there isn't. General Ky tried to prove that there was. Inspired by all the publicity and flattery of Honolulu and all of the Johnson-Ky photographs, he tried to eliminate his rival in the 1st Corps area, General Thi, and the trouble started.

BUDDHISTS AND STUDENTS

The Buddhists and the students took to the streets in support of their deposed local leaders. The protests spread from Da Nang in the 1st Corps area to Saigon. The U.S. Consul in Da Nang, Samuel B. Thomsen, had to urge Americans, including the 50,000 U.S. soldiers in Da Nang, to keep off the streets, and even American officials and Congressmen were advised to cancel their proposed trips to Saigon.

All this proves is that the political situation is unchanged, and that the propaganda of Honolulu has not prevailed over the power and tradition of Saigon. There is no cohesive national spirit in that nation for the simple reason that there is no nation.

It is still a tangle of competing individuals, regions, religions, and sects, dominated by a group of military warlords, representing different regions, an army without a country, presiding over a people who have been torn apart by war and dominated and exploited by Saigon for generations.

THE AMERICAN DILEMMA

No doubt American power will be able to sustain the central government of General Ky in the present crisis, but the more power we use, the more American domination will be resented. This is the dilemma. It has been there from the beginning and the latest political struggle has merely brought the facts to the surface.

The basis of American intervention in the beginning—and even of the official American thesis now—is that we are in Saigon to support a "government" and a "nation" against external aggression, which that Government and nation must win or lose primarily by themselves, but there is no Saigon Government that can govern, and no South Vietnamese "nation" in our understanding of the word.

ENDS AND MEANS

Meanwhile, the war goes on, unaffected so far by the political turmoil, but there is a basic problem still unresolved. Washington is still counting on a cohesive Saigon Government that does not exist. It cannot count on effective political or military action by the South Vietnamese and it is not prepared to produce the political and military manpower to take their place.

In short, the administration in Washington has not adjusted to the facts. It has not brought its ends and its means into line, It has accepted the ends of the "hawks"—destruction of the enemy's forces—but not the means, and it has accepted the ends of the "doves"—a negotiated compromise—but not their means, negotiation with the Vietcong who are doing most of the enemy fighting.

So Washington is in trouble. It is relying on myths and the only consolation of the present political demonstrations is that they are at least exposing the reality.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 4, 1966]

VIETNAM: WAR WITHIN WAR

Premier Ky's threat to smash dissidence in Danang and Hue by flying in troops from Saigon raises the danger of military clashes with local forces that could precipitate a second civil war in South Vietnam. It is the application of military force to what is essentially a political problem. And the use of American planes and weapons for this purpose—despite the claim that American troops will not be requested—makes it vital that Washington call a halt to this dangerous adventure.

A change of government in Saigon is clearly going to be necessary. The question is not if, but when—and how—a representative civilian regime can be established. Although he has only been in office 7 months, Premier Ky already has overstayed by 5 months the time predicted for him by former Ambassador Maxwell Taylor.

President Johnson's Honolulu embrace who obscured the Conference's real purpose—to generate a new program of social reform—weakened rather than strengthened Premier Ky's position and made recourse to anti-Americanism a logical move for his political competitors. An attempt to perpetuate Premier Ky in his post to save face for Mr. Johnson would only tar him further as an American puppet.

A new political balance has to be struck in Saigon. What is most important is not its exact nature but that a new balance of political forces should emerge—and that it emerge in as orderly a fashion as possible. The crisis in South Vietnam is not a popular upheaval calling for panic moves; nor has the Vietcong taken over Danang and Hue. What was in progress, until this past weekend, was essentially a Cabinet crisis, accelerated by the dismissal from the military directorate of its most powerful member, the northern commander, Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi. The street demonstrations, even if somewhat infiltrated by Vietcong agents, were traditional maneuvers by organized factions seeking to influence the outcome. The first need is not to "restore" Saigon's control of South Vietnam's northern provinces—a control it has not been able to exercise for many weeks—but to come to terms with the political problems.

This, Premier Ky now promises to do by calling a national political congress of all factions to select a constituent assembly. The makeup of the constituent assembly is the critical issue between the Saigon directorate and the militant Buddhist faction led by the Hue monk, Thich Tri Quang, whose stronghold is also in the northern provinces. Tri Quang insists that the new constituent assembly be drawn entirely from local and provincial councils to which last year's elections returned predominantly Buddhist elements.

It is a mark of Premier Ky's political ineptitude that the formation of this assembly, planned last year and promised for February at Honolulu, was not completed before the dismissal of General Thi—and that General Thi then was permitted to return to Hue. The crisis illustrates again the extent to which the United States is becoming Saigon's prisoner. The American Embassy was not consulted or even informed of General Thi's dismissal until the military directorate had taken its fatal decision.

Premier Ky's decision to send troops to Danang appears also to have been taken without consultation. Before the situation gets further out of hand, the strongest influence must be exerted to resolve the Saigon struggle by political means.

YOUTHFUL PRIZE WINNERS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, each year the Farmers Union in Oklahoma sponsors a Washington trip for its members and for youth winners of an essay contest in the State. Always, the group is an interesting one and I enjoy visiting with its members.

One of the winning essays this year was by Steve Powell, of Altus, Okla., who discussed how 4-H Clubs promote community living. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD. A second essay by Kirk Castleberry, Ninnekah, Okla., stresses the benefits for farming as a good way of life provided by the Farmers Union and by rural electric cooperatives. I also ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MY ORGANIZATION PROMOTES COMMUNITY LIVING

(By Steve Powell, Altus, Okla.)

I am 15 years old and I do not know exactly what a community is. What a community means to me might be something entirely different than to you. Webster doesn't define it as to size, but says it is a group of people having common organization or interest. So, if this is true, all of Oklahoma could be considered a community, but whether it be all of Oklahoma, western Oklahoma, Jackson County, or a small community in Jackson County, my organization—the 4-H Club—it is the same in principle wherever 4-H Clubs are found. It is its purpose to first develop the person. While the person is being developed, we do like my grandmother does when she is baking a cake. We throw in a pinch of incentive, a dash of leadership, and a large helping of citizenship. Placed in the oven of community life to grow for a few years, soon we are "done" enough to take our place as responsible citizens in our communities. While we 4-H members are still cooking, we are definitely making a contribution to community living. We represent free enterprise in miniature. We voluntarily joined our community 4-H Club. No one forced me to join or dictated which club I should join. I voluntarily selected my own projects. The success of 4-H Club projects depends upon the time and energy that each member puts into them. Upon the successful completion of our projects, we usually receive some kind of award as the fruits of our labor. This is true of any community. It is no better than the people who live there and no community progresses unless much effort and leadership is put forth. The awards I receive are mine and mine alone. I do not have to share them with those who have been lazy and less diligent. With this kind of training, the community we live in will be in a position to go forward and be a better place to live as a result of my organization, the 4-H Clubs.

I am disturbed by the comments older people make, but mostly I am disturbed about uninformed people, some of them professional peddlers of gloom and doom, who shout to the housetops the American family farm and rural communities are being wiped out. I am disturbed to hear some of them describe American farming as our greatest problem. And I hear some of these same people caution us young people to stay away from, or get out of farming—that it's not a good life, that it's too risky. For years the Farmers Union has promoted and encouraged family farms. All of us will agree that a family farm today is much larger than a family farm was 20 years ago, and that our communities do not have the same boundary line they had 20 years ago, but as we 4-H members view this situation this is a sign of the times, it denotes progress and we want to be a real part of this progress of the changing time. Our 4-H Clubs have geared their programs and projects to the changing time just as the Farmers Union has had to do too. Let us further compare the objectives and goals of our two organizations. Farmers Union means many things to hundreds and thousands of men, women, and young people. But each and every activity, whether on the local or national level, has a single purpose. The single purpose of Farmers Union or the 4-H Clubs is a strong family relationship, in a strong agricultural community, in a strong America. It all comes back to the family, the most important unit in Farmers Union, also the most important to 4-H Club work.

Strength for your organization or my 4-H Club comes through knowledge. That is why your Educational Department of the Farmers Union is so important to your overall program and this is why 4-H Clubs were first started and this is why they are stronger today in every community than ever before. And every member of the family is important to your organization. Our 4-H Clubs members believe that it is not guns, missiles, and atomic power alone that keep our great country strong and free. We believe that local people and local communities that are interested in local affairs contribute more to a strong economy, a better way of life, more opportunity for us young people than any other factor. I know this is all true: for the Farmers Union of Jackson County has and still is taking a real interest in us 4-H members both with their time and money, for I have been the recipient of their efforts.

Yes; we are very much alike: Farmers Union means summer camps, National and State conventions, local action and entertaining meetings, international exchange programs. This is our program, too. So with the same program, Farmers Union and 4-H Clubs can continue to hold hands and move forward in our communities promoting a better living for all. The spirit of our 4-H Club is reflected in the prayer of the Saint from Assisi: "May I seek not so much to be served, as to serve others."

Farming Good Way of Life

(By Kirk Castleberry, Route 2, Ninnekah, Okla.)

Say, have you ever bathed in a cramped, cold sided, No. 2 wash tub? If you have, I shall have little trouble convincing you that the rural electric cooperatives promote good community living.

First, I'd like to take you on a mental visit to my grandfather's pioneer Oklahoma farm. His day began before sunrise when he rose, and built a fire in the kitchen range. When the worst chill was gone, grandmother rose, and cooked breakfast while he went to the barn, and fed the cattle and horses by the light of a kerosene lantern. After breakfast, grandfather harnessed his team and was in the field by sunrise. He came to lunch at 12 and was back in the field by 1 where he stayed until sundown.

Grandmother canned the family's food and ironed with flat irons heated on the wood range. She washed on a washboard, and made clothes on a treadle machine by the light of a flickering kerosene lamp.

Their only sources of power were their animals and their muscles.

But a great change was coming. On May 11, 1935, President Franklin Roosevelt, by Executive order, created the Rural Electric Administration.

When Congress provided funds, it hoped private utility companies would use this low-interest money for rural electric development, but they thought it wouldn't pay. Their lines served 30 to 50 customers per mile. The rural system would average three. So the farmer lived in the "dark age" from 10 to 20 years longer.

Then the Farmers' Union which had strongly supported the REA, suggested forming rural electric cooperatives. Farmers long had been looking to this organization for leadership in (1) beneficial farm legislation; (2) complete insurance coverage; (3) cooperative cotton gins, wheat elevators, creameries, and gas stations.

So, when this trusted organization suggested farmers borrow money from the REA and construct their own electric lines, they listened.

Each of these rural electric cooperatives is a local, independent enterprise whose primary purpose is to furnish dependable, low-cost electric service. Each is owned and governed by its users through an elected board of directors. These directors hire a general manager. He hires and supervises other employees. At the annual meeting the customer-owners discuss and vote upon current problems and chart courses for the coming year.

Those who accuse the REC's of being socialistically owned and supported by the Government are uninformed of their true nature.

On the farm more than 400 uses of electricity are known. It is pumping water for rural homes and stock tanks. Electrified dairy farms produce more pure milk than ever before. It irrigates fields, augers grain, runs hay elevators, and furnishes power for all farm shop tools—welders, solderers, saws, and drills.

Many farm families are enjoying all-electric kitchens including freezers, ranges, garbage disposals, and dishwashers. Clothes are washed and dried indoors; electric heat and air conditioning are being added to farm homes each month.

The REC's also provide many benefits to the local, State, and National communities. Competition is Oklahoma's greatest guarantee against unreasonable electric rates.

Seven hundred million dollars have been spent in Oklahoma towns by REC customers on appliances. Motels, restaurants, filling stations, and drive-in movies using REC electricity have added to our State's economy.

No environment can be more pleasant than the farm community. Farm families work together to understand and solve each other's problems. Farm children share the work burden, contribute to the budget, and develop an early sense of responsibility toward both.

Farm people have a strong appreciation of nature. They experience, yearly, the joys of seeding time, sprouting crops, and the fulfillment of harvesting. Farming is a good way of life made much better by cooperatives like the rural electric and Farmers Union.

And I think, beyond doubt, I've proven to you the REC does promote good community living.

COLUMNISTS UNDER INVESTIGATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the April 1, 1966, issue of the Washington Post there appeared an article by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson entitled "Columnists Under Investigation."

During the past several weeks these writers have written several articles outlining questionable transactions which allegedly involve a Member of the U.S. Senate, and that Senator has officially asked both the Justice Department and the Senate Ethics Committee to investigate all of these charges and announce their decision to the public.

In fairness to the man being charged, this investigation should be conducted thoroughly and promptly.

If the charges are false the man has a right to have his name cleared—and if they are true then the Ethics Committee should so notify the U.S. Senate.

But as this investigation proceeds, let it be remembered that the No. 1 job is to establish the accuracy or inaccuracy of the charges. After this has been done it will be time enough then should there be a question as to the manner in which the information was obtained.

I repeat, the question here is not how did Mr. Pearson get the information, but is it true or false?

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Columnists Under Investigation

(By Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson)

A funny thing happened to us the other day at the Justice Department. We were called down there by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach and were told we were under criminal investigation on a charge filed by Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, of stealing documents from his files.

This raises a very important point. If it is a crime for newsmen to seek evidence documenting charges of corruption against a U.S. Senator, then the press must give up one of its important functions and Senators will remain a sacrosanct body, able to expose others regarding deep freezes, mink coats, vicuna coats, and Bobby Baker's conflicts of interest, but immune from exposure themselves.

For it is almost impossible to prove indictable facts regarding a Senator, or for that matter any official, without using evidence obtained from the inside.

Furthermore, using inside evidence is one of the chief ways the FBI and most law enforcement agencies operate.

It would have been impossible for instance, for the FBI to secure evidence on the Ku Klux Klan in the Liuzzo murder case without having an FBI agent inside the Klan. Almost every week the FBI pays money for inside information. So does Internal Revenue. Many of the tax convictions in the United States result from inside information.

There is a law on the statute books providing remuneration to tax informers; and Congress appropriates the money for the FBI to pay for inside information.

PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

As it happens, we paid no money and stole no documents. We did talk to former members of DODD's staff who were motivated by the highest interest, namely, the public's right to know when a U.S. Senator delivers speeches and performs chores for a foreign agent; when he deposits in his personal account thousands of dollars contributed to his election; when he accepts valuables from companies he helped in regard to Government contracts; and when he charges both the taxpayers and private organizations for trips he makes around the country.

The Attorney General's investigation also raises an important point regarding senatorial "theft" or use of unauthorized documents.

We asked Mr. Katzenbach, for instance, whether he had investigated Senator John Williams, Republican, of Delaware, as to how he obtained the documents which he publicized in the Bobby Baker case. Obviously they were obtained from Government employees who believed in the public's right to know.

The Attorney General said he had not investigated Senator Williams.

We also asked whether he had investigated Senator Dodd's possession or possible theft of the Otepka papers. This was the famous case where Dodd, as vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, was personally involved with obtaining State Department files.

The State Department considered this theft. For on September 23, 1963, it charged Otto F. Otepka, Chief of the Evidence Valuation Division of the State Department's Office of Security, with violations of 13 regulations by giving confidential information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

CHAMPIONED THEFT

On November 5, Otepka was dismissed. Later that day, Senator Dodd denounced the State Department, warning that if Otepka's ouster "is permitted to stand it will become impossible or exceedingly difficult to elicit any information from employees of the executive branch that bears on * * * wrongdoing by their superiors."

Katzenbach said he had not investigated Dodd in connection with the alleged theft of the Otepka papers.

Other important Members of Congress have used documents obviously obtained from sub rosa Government sources, most of these critical of the executive branch—Senators John McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas; Ed Long, Democrat of Missouri; Strom Thurmond, Republican of South Carolina, and Representative Mike Feighan, Democrat of Ohio.

It was evident that the Attorney General had not investigated any of them for obtaining Government documents.

We also asked whether instructions to investigate alleged theft in the Dodd case came from the White House. Our question was based on the fact that the President and Tom Dodd have been extremely close. At the Atlantic City Democratic convention it was widely reported at first that Dodd, not Hubert Humphrey, would get the Johnson nod for Vice President.

Dodd had nominated Lyndon Johnson for President at the 1960 Los Angeles convention. Lyndon, in turn, had intervened to put Dodd on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ahead of Senator Joe Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania, who had seniority; and twice had gone to Connecticut to be the star attraction at Dodd's fundraising dinners.

The Attorney General denied that instructions to investigate came from the White House.

That's the funny thing that happened the other day at the Justice Department. It will be interesting to see what happens next.

B'NAI B'RITH WOMEN SUPPORT TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was very much encouraged to receive a resolution endorsing the truth-in-lending bill, S. 2275, adopted by the executive board of the B'nai B'rith Women during their session of March 20 to 22, 1966. B'nai B'rith Women represent 135,000 members throughout the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution transmitted by me by Mrs. Arthur G. Rosenbluth, president of B'nai B'rith Women, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

B'nai B'rith Women,
Washington, D.C.

Resolution Regarding Truth-in-Lending Bill, S. 2275

Whereas payments on installment and mortgage debt now account for over one-fifth of average family income in the United States; and

Whereas the consumers have the right to plain information on what they are going to have to pay when they borrow money; and

Whereas testimony before the Senate Banking Subcommittee and other groups have shown widespread concealment of high interest charges on consumer credit through misleading methods of stating financial costs; and

Whereas consumers would benefit from the passage by the Congress of the truth-in-lending bill: Therefore be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to Senator A. Willis Robertson, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee; and to Senator Paul Douglas.

JOHN W. GARDNER—A HAWAII "LOCAL BOY"

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the State of Hawaii has a small claim on Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner. This was brought to my attention recently in an editorial published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Hawaii's largest daily newspaper.

I was most pleased and proud to learn that Secretary Gardner once went to school in our beautiful State since he is now known as one of the most effective administrators in town.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Aspire to the Heights

You can't properly call John Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, a local boy. After all, he was born in California and got his college education there. But he is a graduate of Punahou and lived for a while with his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. W. D. Adams, at Kalakaua Avenue and Lewers Road when the Moana Hotel was the highest building in Waikiki.

And so, perhaps, we do have a "calabash" claim on the man who has been hailed as one of the most effective administrators in Washington.

The former Carnegie Corp. president, a Republican, was appointed HEW Chief by President Johnson last August. He has, to quote Jonathan Spivak in the Wall Street Journal, "managed a greater mastery of HEW in a few months than Secretaries Anthony Celebrezze and Abraham Ribicoff achieved in several years."

One reason for Gardner's apparent success stems from the quality of his appointments to key positions. Says Spivak: "He has assembled probably the brightest, toughest, most experienced top team in the Department's history. There is not a political dud in more than a dozen appointments."

The article goes on to say that the improved morale at HEW stems in part from Gardner's determination to promote the Department and not himself. While not overlooking possible sources of difficulty in the future (cutbacks in the "impacted areas" funds and school lunch funds already have stirred up a buzzing), the Wall Street Journal article suggests that Gardner is the kind of man who can face up to these challenges.

Gardner did not become the man he is by underselling his own abilities. What he has achieved is not beyond achievement by any number of Hawaii's intelligent young men and women if they refuse to underestimate their own potential and are willing to work toward high goals.

Horatio Alger stories of poor but honest boys who rise from rags to riches on their own merits are somewhat out of style these days, but we have all around us living examples of Alger-type heroes. None of our four members of Congress was born with a silver spoon in mouth. All got where they are on their own merits—and by not selling themselves short.

Nor should we consider aspirations achieved unworthy if they do not carry one to Congress, the Cabinet, or the Presidency.

John Gardner once said: "The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water."

The key is excellence—and enough faith in one's self to drive ahead in spite of obstacles.

Today a Punahou boy sits in the President's Cabinet. Some day a McKinley boy may sit in the White House.

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVOLUTION, PART II

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the article which I previously mentioned, that appeared in the Saturday Evening Post recently, discusses the tremendous shift which has taken place in American attitudes toward birth control. A major factor in this shift has been the scientific discovery of hormone pills which today are one of the most widely used means of family planning in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the Record, part II of the Saturday Evening Post article, "The Birth Control Revolution," by Steven M. Spencer, entitled "The Scientific Revolution."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

The Scientific Revolution

In her efforts to control the number and spacing of her children, woman down through the centuries has resorted to many recipes, often more strange than effective. She was advised in an Egyptian papyrus of 1,500 B.C. to use a concoction of acacia tips, bitter cucumber and dates, mixed with honey. Dioscorides, the famous Greek medical scientist of the first century, prescribed willow leaves in water (willow because it was thought to have no seeds) or the leaves of barrenwort finely ground and taken in wine. Other Greek medical writers offered a choice of powerful amulents, including one made of henbane seed diluted in mare's milk and carried around the neck in a piece of stag's skin.

The woman of today takes nothing more exotic than a pink pill (or a white or peach-colored one). Or she wears a small device within the womb, a hidden amulet, so to speak. Although these intrauterine devices are fast gaining acceptance in foreign countries, they are far less used than are the pills. In addition to the 5 million American women taking the pills on doctors' prescriptions, there are some 2.5 million abroad, mostly in Latin America, Europe and Australia. And the market continues to expand.

Not since the sulfa tablets emerged in the 1930's to conquer pneumonia and a host of other infections, has a little tablet exerted such far-reaching influence upon the world's people. It may, in fact, be the most popular pill since aspirin. It is certainly relieving bigger headaches—both family and global. And all at a cost of about $1.75 for a month's supply. The pill is big business, produced by seven firms, advertised in the medical journals in two- and three-page spreads with lace-and-roses borders and sold in feminine and fashionable dispensers. Some resemble powder compacts, others, telephone dials, marked off to help the woman keep track of the days she should take them.

From the very outset the pill's ability to prevent ovulation, and therefore pregnancy, has been virtually 100 percent when taken faithfully as directed. This is usually for 20 days beginning with the fifth day of menstruation. Only total abstinence or surgical sterilization can equal or surpass their record. When pregnancies have occurred, it has been because the woman was unknowingly pregnant before she started taking pills, or because she forgot them for 1 or more days.

The "mother" of the pill is Mrs. Margaret Sanger, the famous founder of the birth-control movement in America who today at 87 is living in Tucson, Ariz. Physically infirm, she is still sharp of mind and can look back on a half century of hard-won achievements and a life struggle marked by arrests, jailings, and verbal abuse. Many years ago Mrs. Sanger recognized the limitations of the principal methods offered by the birth-control clinics—diaphragms and spermicidal jellies—and she suggested to Dr. Gregory Pincus of the Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, in Massachusetts, that he try to develop something better.

"Then one day in 1951," Dr. Pincus recalls, "Mrs. Sanger approached me again. She was especially disappointed by the failure of conventional methods in India. She said, 'Gregory, can't you devise some sort of pill for this purpose?' I said I'd try." With a grant of $2,500 from Mrs. Sanger's Planned Parenthood Federation, he and his associates went to work on it.

Pincus was not starting blind. Scientists had known since 1900 the fundamental bodily chemistry that the birth-control pill exploits. They knew that chemicals called hormones, secreted by a woman's pituitary gland, cause her ovary to release a ripened egg each month—the process is called ovulation. They also knew that if the egg becomes fertilized and attaches itself to the lining of her uterus (the beginning of pregnancy), still another hormone cancels out the pituitary hormones and prevents ovulation, keeping her ovary from secreting more eggs during the 9 months that the fertilized egg is growing into an infant. It was this antiovulation hormone, identified in 1934 as progesterone, that Dr. Pincus sought to imitate in an oral birth-control tablet.

Researchers at the University of Rochester had used progesterone in 1937 to prevent ovulation in rabbits, but efforts to apply the rabbit findings to humans had been discouraging until Dr. Pincus and his associate, Dr. Min Chueh-chang, took up the problem. Dr. John Rock, then clinical professor of gynecology at Harvard independently tackled the same problem, and soon he and Pincus' group joined forces.

As director of the Reproductive Study Center in Brookline, Dr. Rock was originally trying to induce ovulation in women unable to have babies. Pincus and Chang were seeking an oral method of preventing ovulation. By a curious physiological paradox, both goals were achieved, in differing degrees, with the same hormones. When Dr. Rock gave progesterone and another sex hormone, estrogen, to 80 previously infertile women daily for 3 months, and then stopped, 13 of the women became pregnant within the next 4 months, apparently because the hormones had improved the condition of the uterus and tubes. This became known as the "Rock rebound effect." At almost the same time the Pincus-Rock team demonstrated the value of the hormones in preventing ovulation, when taken for 20 days.

But since the natural hormones had to be given in large oral doses or by painful injections, Dr. Pincus' group sought a more convenient synthetic substitute. They screened some 200 chemical relatives of progesterone and found three that looked promising. The first medical use of the synthetic hormones was in the treatment of menstrual irregularities. Then, in December 1954, Dr. Rock began administering them as a contraceptive to a group of women in Brookline. In April 1956, large-scale tests began in Puerto Rico and later in Haiti and a number of U.S. cities.

At first the Food and Drug Administration approved the pills for only 2 years of continuous use. But under careful observation by research doctors, many women continued them without harm for much longer periods. Some have taken them for as long as 10 years, and certain of the pills are now approved for 4 years of use. When women have stopped the pills to have a baby, there has been no impairment of their fertility.

Tests over the years have shown that the amount of hormone in each pill need not be as large as originally believed. On the principle that the less hormone you take the better, so long as the effect is achieved, manufacturers have steadily reduced the concentration. One company's pill, which began as a 10-milligram tablet several years ago, is now down to 2.5 milligrams, and a new 1-milligram tablet may soon be introduced to the market.

In addition to the pill's clear superiority in effectiveness, women like its neatness and its complete dissociation from the sexual act. "I simply take a pill every evening," one young suburban mother remarked, "and, my God, it's wonderful not to have to worry." Another plus for the pill is that it has brought into the birth-control clinics thousands of women who would not otherwise have come, or who, discouraged by less easy and reliable methods, would have dropped out. Dr. Richard Frank, medical director of the planned parenthood affiliate in Chicago, says that up through 1961 not more than 30 or 40 percent of the women stayed with the methods then offered—usually the diaphragm. But a recent count showed that 75 percent of those introduced to the pills were still using them after several years.

No one claims, in spite of the generally favorable experience, that the pill is perfect. There are side effects, most of which resemble the familiar symptoms of early pregnancy—nausea, some swelling and tenderness of the breasts, headache or fatigue. There is often some weight gain and occasional "spotting" during the month. But only a small minority of women experience the side effects—figures range from 2 to 15 percent, depending on the specific symptom. The problems tend to disappear after the first 2 or 3 months, especially with the newer low-concentration pills. And if one variety of pill is troublesome, the doctor may prescribe another. Although weight gain is a frequent complaint, doctors believe it may be only a physical reflection of the pill's psychological benefits—the freedom from worry that it brings to many women.

Of graver concern are the still unsettled questions about whether or not, in rare instances, the pills produce serious illnesses. Cancer, for example, has caused moments of alarm. Here a key point is the difference between causing a new cancer and stimulating the growth of an already existing one. The estrogen component of the pills is believed capable of causing the enlargement of an existing cancer of the breast or pelvic area, and if the doctor suspects such a malignancy, he will not prescribe the pills. "For this reason, it is important for women taking the pills to have periodic breast and pelvic examinations," says Dr. Robert W. Kistner, assistant professor of obstetrics and gynecology at Harvard. "I think they should be examined as often as every 6 months."

There is absolutely no evidence, however, that the oral contraceptives will initiate cancer. Early uneasiness on this point was stirred up by research on inbred strains of laboratory rats already prone to breast cancer. Careful analysis of the medical histories of thousands of women on the pills has revealed nothing to indicate the pills can produce a cancer that was not already there.

As a matter of fact, there is now well-founded opinion that the pills may actually prevent cancer of the uterus. Dr. Pincus and his associates discovered a definitely lower rate of positive "Pap smears" among women taking the pills in Haiti and Puerto Rico. And at Harvard Dr. Kistner was able to protect rats from the known cancer-inducing effect of certain chemicals by feeding them contraceptive pills. "It may well be that cancer of the uterus is a preventable disease," he says.

Another illness that some have linked to birth control pills is thrombophlebitis. This is an inflammatory and sometimes fatal clotting in the veins. A number of cases, and a few deaths, have been reported among women taking the pills, in both the United States and England. The reports have received wide publicity, but the cause-and-effect relationship has been clouded by the fact that thrombophlebitis has always been rather common among women of childbearing age, the very group now taking the pill. Among millions on the pill it would not be surprising if a few women coincidentally suffered from blood-clotting complications. The verdict at present; neither proven nor unproven. But to be safe the Food and Drug Administration requires the manufacturers to advise the doctors not to prescribe the pills for women with a history of thrombophlebitis, pulmonary embolism, stroke, or liver disease.

Just last November the FDA added one more precautionary note, a warning to watch for any blurring or loss of vision among women on the pill. Here again, the cause and effect has not been established, as the FDA points out. But a Johns Hopkins eye specialist, noting a few suspicious cases of eye trouble and other neurological complications, asked for reports from other doctors and received 73. Many of the women affected had histories of high blood pressure or other conditions that might have accounted for the eye symptoms.

For women who have medical difficulty with the pill, the answer may be the intrauterine devices, particularly the Lippes loop, named for its designer, Dr. Jack Lippes, of Buffalo, N.Y. Originally hailed mainly as a method for those who couldn't afford the pills or who were too ignorant to count the days, the intrauterine devices (IUD's) are now gaining favor among wealthy women on Park Avenue and in fashionable suburbs.

"Members of some of our most prominent families have been using IUD's for as long as 3 years," a New York obstetrician revealed, "and are very well satisfied." A Boston doctor had to install a second telephone to help handle calls from women wanting IUD's. More than 200,000 women in the United States have been fitted with them.

Family planning experts have repeatedly emphasized that the effectiveness of any method depends to a large extent on the motivation of the woman, or the couple. To have a free choice is one thing. To exercise it through deliberate decisions is another. With the pill, the need to make the decision is at least removed in time from the moments of rushing passion. But as Dr. Sheldon J. Segal of the Population Council points out, "Once a woman has the IUD successfully installed, she makes her next decision only when she wants to have a baby; then she goes to her doctor and has the device removed."

The loop, coil or bow is soft and elastic enough to be squeezed into a hollow plastic tube for insertion into the uterus, where it springs back into its original shape. To avoid infection or accidental perforation of the uterine wall (which has occurred a few times), the device must be inserted with care by a physician, preferably one with some training in gynecology. Most doctors insert the IUD for a reasonable fee—that for a regular office visit. But some have charged as high as $100, $200, or even $400, reports a New York obstetrician who has been speaking out against such exorbitant prices. Last September the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists cracked down on the high-fee practice and suggested in its newsletter that the charge be "not in excess of $25." The devices themselves, as sold to the doctors, range in price from $1 for the loop to $1.80 for the steel ring, with a small additional charge for the instruments needed for insertion and removal. In large quantities, for use in clinics, the cost is only a few cents apiece.

No one is yet certain just how the intrauterine device interferes with conception. The currently favored theory is based on meticulous research carried out at the University of California at Los Angeles. Investigators there, after artificially inducing ovulation in monkeys and then artificially inseminating them, found that the IUD causes the egg to hurry down the Fallopian tubes before it is mature enough to be fertilized.

Doctors do not usually advise IUD's for women who have never had a baby. The devices have the added disadvantage that only about 75 percent of women who do try them find them acceptable. An estimated 15 percent must have them removed because of pain, excessive bleeding or other medical reasons, and 10 percent accidentally expel them, sometimes without knowing it. But about 97 percent of those who can retain the IUD are protected against pregnancy, a lower score than the pill's but still better than that of older methods.

Even with its imperfections the IUD is regarded as one of the most practical methods of coping with the world population crisis. The Population Council, supported mainly by Rockefeller and Ford money, has sponsored extensive worldwide trials, focusing especially on India, Taiwan and Korea. India, now launched on a $400 million birth-control program, has received 1.2 million IUD's from the Population Council. And last summer it started a factory to turn out 14,000 loops a day, distributing small gold-plated loops as souvenirs of the opening day ceremonies.

In the IUD and the pill, the birth-control revolution has formidable weapons against the world population explosion. The science of birth control, however, is pushing on toward new techniques that may make birth control even easier. Several drug companies, for example, are developing an injection that will prevent ovulation for 1 to 3 months, depending on the formula. One compound produces its effect so gradually yet so powerfully that a single shot will suppress both ovulation and menstruation for 6 months to a year.

The injectables are still in the trial stage and won't be on the market until completion of tests on more than 5,000 women in several States, but preliminary reports are promising. Menstruation occurs normally with the once-a-month injection, as it does with the daily pills. But it can be suppressed by the longer acting injectables or by taking certain types of contraceptive pills through the full month, without interruption. Dr. Charles Flowers, professor of obstetrics at the University of North Carolina, finds that women suffering from painful or excessive menses, or from the irritability and "witchiness" of premenstrual tension, are delighted to be relieved of these troubles for several months at a time.

But the injection is just the beginning. Among the new advances promised for the future is a vaccine against pregnancy, now being worked on by several groups. One approach involves extracts from the egg and the sperm. Dr. Albert Tyler of the California Institute of Technology has found that a sperm extract injected into the female rabbit will coat the rabbit ova so that a live sperm from the male rabbit cannot attach itself to fertilize the egg. Anticonception vaccines suitable for human use have not yet been perfected, however. Dr. Tyler, though optimistic about the future, points out that such vaccines "must not make wives allergic to their husbands."

Such allergic tragedies would be avoided by a vaccine for the husband, which would work by suppressing his own sperm production. Dr. Kenneth Laurence, of the Population Council's research unit at the Rockefeller Institute in New York, thinks this goal may be reached in 3 or 4 years. He and his associates have been injecting male guinea pigs with extracts of guinea pig testes or sperm, and within 6 or 7 weeks the animals become sterile. Their sperm production comes to a stop. While a single injection renders the animal sterile for 4 to 11 months, his sex-hormone output is not interfered with. He retains a normal sex drive and will mate if allowed to.

When the effect of the vaccine wears off, the glands resume the manufacture of sperm, at first with minor variations in sperm size. Eventually the sperm are normal in size and number, and the guinea pigs are able to father normal offspring. They have also had normal "grandchildren." There has been one drawback, however, to the practical application of the male vaccine method of birth control. The vaccine must contain an oil ingredient (called an adjuvant) for it to work efficiently. And the adjuvant makes such a sore at the point of injection that Dr. Laurence doubts most men would want to put up with that much discomfort. "But we are now working with another adjuvant that doesn't produce a lesion," he said. "Two injections would be necessary with this material, instead of one, and we haven't yet tried it on humans, but we think we'll be ready for this in a few years."

A number of efforts are being made to produce something a woman could swallow following intercourse—the so-called "morning-after pill." Dr. M. C. Shelesnyak, of the Weizmann Institute in Rehovoth, Israel, has found that a single dose of an alkaloid known as ergocornine, given to rats within 6 days after intercourse, will prevent the implantation of the fertilized ovum on the wall of the uterus. Dr. Shelesnyak has made preliminary studies with women patients, giving them 2-milligram tablets of ergocornine. The results were encouraging, but more work is necessary, he reported, to determine whether the method will prevent pregnancy without toxic side effects.

An American pharmaceutical firm has been experimenting with another morning-after pill that appears to destroy the fertilized ovum. But on one of the first field trials, women who had taken the pill unexpectedly became photosensitive. As soon as they went out in the sun, they got a sunburn. If these difficulties can be solved, the "morning-after pill" may become the ideal contraceptive.

LADONNA HARRIS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, recently Mr. Maarten C. Bolle, distinguished foreign correspondent for Het Volk, Ghent, and Het Vrije Volk, Amsterdam, wrote an excellent article for his newspapers about one of Oklahoma's most distinguished ladies, Mrs. LaDonna Harris, the wife of Oklahoma's junior Senator, Mr. Fred Harris.

It is a fine interview with this distinguished lady—as Bolle describes her, "Daughter of the Proud Comanches."

I commend it to the Members of Congress for their attention, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Translation from Het Volk, Ghent, and Het Vrije Volk, Amsterdam]

Daughter of the Proud Comanches: LaDonna Harris—Symbol of the Resurrection of the Indians

Washington, January.—American literature is full of melancholy tales about the downfall of the red race. Novelists have told us for a century or longer of the glory of the frontier; they have, in their stories, glorified the heroism and the enterprising spirit of the pioneers and the settlers, and they have described for us the tragic ruination of the country's copperskinned natives.

The historians, too, have told us about all this. Their stories, however, paint a far less romantic picture of the frontier days and do not attempt to conceal the atrocious injustices so often dealt out to the Indians by their white conquerors.

This enormous continent is no longer the land of the Indian, but of the white man. The minority, which the Indian now represents, even pales into insignificance as compared with the size of that other national minority: the Negro. Whereas the Negroes number about 20 million, the number of Indians—even at the highest estimate—still remains far below 1 million.

Many thousands of the approximately 500,000 to 600,000 Indians still live on reservations, as wards of the Federal Government, a great many of them in dire poverty. Not all Indians by far have been absorbed by American society; many of them do not want to be assimilated; they prefer to live in their own environment and to maintain their own customs and traditions.

The problem of the American Indian is as yet far from solved. Persistent efforts are being made to elevate them. Sometimes complaints are heard that the Indians themselves do not always cooperate, that they do not sufficiently feel the need to turn their backs upon the past, when they could roam freely over the prairies and in the forests, and instead look toward the future of an America in which they could participate, through the application of all their talents and their potential, as full-fledged citizens. For the past will never come back.

FULL-BLOODED COMANCHE

Not very long ago I had the privilege and the pleasure of having a long talk with a woman who is, as only few persons are, an example of the role which the Indians can play in the life of the American Nation. This woman is LaDonna Crawford, now LaDonna Harris, by virtue of her marriage to Fred

Harris, U.S. Senator for the Midwestern State of Oklahoma.

LaDonna is a full-blooded Comanche, born and raised on a ranch in southwestern Oklahoma, a State which has, throughout the history of the United States, been known as an Indian State. There is, in Oklahoma, a city called Anadarko which is known as the Indian capital of the United States.

INDIAN CULTURE

Indian culture and Indian customs constituted important elements of the environment in which LaDonna spent her early years. Both Comanche and English are spoken in the Crawford family. The history of the Crawfords bears witness to the fact that the Comanche tribe has for centuries been heavily mixed with Spanish blood. This tribe had its tents and roamed in that southwestern part of the United States which was for many years under Spanish rule.

LaDonna's great-grandfather was the son of a Spaniard who owned a ranch in the neighborhood of El Paso, a city in what is now Texas, on the Mexican border and on the banks of the famous Rio Grande River. This boy was taken prisoner in a battle with the Comanches and raised as an Indian. He won fame as a warrior and later become a chief of the tribe.

OLD TRADITIONS

Having lost her parents at an early age, LaDonna was brought up by her grandparents. Her grandmother is still alive. She is now 86 years old and still lives in the old city of Lawton, in the southwestern part of Oklahoma, near Anadarko, where the Indians are still living in the older part of the city. Her grandfather spoke very little English; he preferred to speak Comanche, a purely spoken language since the Comanches have never known an alphabet.

LaDonna's grandparents always wore their hair in long braids, as the Comanches had done for generations, and they wore the usual full-length outer garments. At home, Comanche was spoken at all times. Her grandfather was never converted to the Christian faith, but her grandmother became, as LaDonna expressed it so characteristically, "the victim of a missionary." She did not mean this in any way derogatory, she hastily added, but yet her remark revealed unintentionally the degree in which the Comanches and the descendants of the Comanches are still attached to their old traditions and their own tribal culture, as precious possessions which the White Man could never take away from them.

QUALITIES OF LEADERSHIP

The Comanches have never lived on reservations. They were always too proud for that. They lived and live dispersed, mainly in southwestern Oklahoma. They are today just as proud of their Indian heritage as they ever were and yet they are to an ever growing degree being absorbed into American life and American activities. The process of assimilation is, insofar as the Comanches are concerned, going on incessantly.

Even her grandfather, who was every inch a Comanche, was very conscious of at the same time being an American citizen and he never missed an opportunity to vote in elections, both local and national.

"The Comanches," LaDonna told me, "display all the qualities necessary for full-fledged citizenship." However, they have evidently not—up to now—contributed a great deal to government itself. "Though they possess the qualities of leadership," LaDonna said, "no Comanche has ever, strangely enough, studied law." And that is apparently almost a "must" in order to obtain success in public life in the United States.

LaDonna met her husband in 1949. He was then still a freshman at the University of Oklahoma. When LaDonna and Fred were married in 1949 they were both 19 years of age. She worked at the University to add to the salary Fred Harris was making as a printer, so as to enable him to complete his law studies. He subsequently obtained his degree with high marks.

This Indian lady has, right from the start, played an active role in the realization of her husband's political aspirations. She worked hard in his campaign for the Oklahoma State senate and later, in his campaign for the U.S. Senate of which he is at present, at the age of 35, one of the youngest Members.

However, this is not the whole story of LaDonna's activities. She spends part of her time as a voluntary assistant in the Senator's office, in spite of the fact that she has her work cut out for her at home, with her three children, two girls and a boy. All the members of the family are officially members of the Comanche Tribe.

INDIAN WOMAN OF THE YEAR

It came as no surprise to anyone that, in 1965, LaDonna received the title of "Indian Woman of the Year," in the Indian capital of Anadarko, on the occasion of the American Indian exhibition there. Very few Indians have played such a useful role in public life, both on a State and a national level, as LaDonna has. She has made herself very useful in Oklahoma in all kinds of social work, to help the poor, the sick and the underprivileged. She is a member of the Human Relations Council in Lawton, the district of Oklahoma in which she grew up. In that capacity she has done a great deal for the betterment of the relations between the different races.

LaDonna is obviously very proud of her Comanche parentage. She worships her grandmother, who is—in turn—proud of her capable and active granddaughter. She told me in our conversation about the traditions of the Comanches, the most powerful roaming Indians of the American southwest, a race of genuine nomads and famous as the most skillful horsemen among the Indian tribes. Their language became the principal medium of communication of and between the tribes in that area; it was, for instance, used by the different Caddo tribes, if and when the sign language proved unsatisfactory in the deliberations among the chiefs of the various tribes.

MIXED BLOOD

The full-blooded Comanche is characterized by a light coppercolored complexion, an aquiline nose and thin lips. The tribe was known as hospitable and generous and was, as far as moral characteristics are concerned, generally considered to be superior to the other nomadic tribes of the region. But the Comanches were at the same time formidable warriors who neither gave nor asked for quarter. The Comanches now living, estimated at about 3,000, are mostly of mixed blood and of Spanish descent. The tradition of accepting women and children, taken prisoner in raids on Spanish settlements, into the tribe had been followed for so many years that not a single member of genuinely Indian blood remained. According to LaDonna Harris, almost all of them are, to a lesser or greater degree, of at least partial Spanish descent.

"Tsa Nuisahkite A Puneets," LaDonna said to me smilingly at the conclusion of our talk—a phonetic rendition of a phrase the Comanches use when they take leave of a friend: "I feel better for having talked with you."

As for myself, I felt much better for having been able to talk for such a long time with this vivacious, interesting, intelligent and pretty woman about the things that are so close to her heart.

THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one evident result of the Foreign Relations Committee's hearings on China, which have just been concluded, is the emergence of an apparent willingness to openly discuss a subject that has long been taboo in Washington. For the first time since the Korean war, there are increasing signs that the American public would welcome a reappraisal of our China policy.

I have here an editorial and an article which indicate the depth of public concern. They appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on March 23. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Seeing What Is There

"China out of the cupboard" was a headline in the American survey section of a recent number of the British weekly, the Economist. What prompted the headline was last month's series of meetings of China scholars in Chicago and five other midwestern cities. It could be used with even greater aptness to sum up the welcome and valuable hearings on China held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington.

Such distinguished experts on China as John Fairbank and Doak Barnett performed a national service in speaking up as unsentimentally, levelheadedly, and constructively as they did.

The phrase that has been used to sum up their proposals for policy toward China in the years ahead is "containment without isolation." Vice President Humphrey endorsed this concept in a television interview—and there is no reason to believe that in broad and general terms President Johnson does not go along with it, too. Indeed, there are indications that American public opinion as a whole is now more flexible toward China than at any time since the Korean war.

Peking's attitude is a paradoxical mixture of bitterness over past humiliations and of self-righteous superiority and virtue. As Professor Fairbank indicated in a recent article in the New York Review of Books, the best to be hoped for immediately ahead is "diplomatic wrangling and nasty competition with China" all across the board—which, as the professor implied, is surely better than a prolonged military showdown.

Speaking before the Fulbright committee, Professor Fairbank further pointed out that in the past, China had understood foreign relations only in terms of tributary relations. Until modern times, there was no other power in China's own world physically able to approach her except as a subordinate. But today neither the Soviet Union nor the United States is going to come crawling or even bowing to China in that posture. What China has to learn is the necessity of coexisting peacefully with both these great powers because all three—and many others—have to learn to live together, if the world is not to be blown eventually to smithereens.

Let us therefore not wait for the end of the war in Vietnam to find ways of engaging in the diplomatic wrangling. Probably neither the admission of Peking to the United Nations nor U.S. recognition of the mainland regime would in isolation be an "open sesame." Either or both might or should come perhaps later than sooner. Professor Fairbank's key phrase was probably "all across the board." Is it too much to hope that the Soviet Union might cooperate—at least tacitly—with the United States in this "across the board" direction once the 23d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party is over in a few weeks' time?

UNITED STATES URGED TO TALK TO PEKING

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—In the marble-columned Senate caucus room top university experts on Communist China are telling the United States the same thing that Premier Fidel Castro is telling Cuba, that Lieutenant General Suharto is telling Indonesia, and that Soviet First Secretary Leonid I. Brezhnev is telling international delegates to the great Communist rally which opens March 29.

It is that Communist China is acting in a fantastically bizarre and irrationally chauvinistic manner, alike dangerous to so-called friends and enemies.

Here is a nation of some 700 million people, comprising from one-fifth to one-fourth of the human race, which seems to regard all other nations as conspiring against it: not only its archenemy, the United States, but its former allies and client states, the Soviet Union, Indonesia, Cuba, and others.

Most of the experts on China testifying before the Senate Fulbright committee for the past 3 weeks have urged that it is to the interest of the United States to attempt to bring Communist China back into reality while not relaxing military safeguards.

The phrase "containment but not isolation" was picked up 24 hours after it was made before the Senate Foreign Relations (Fulbright) Committee by Columbia University Prof. A. Doak Barnett and adopted as a slogan by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

EXPERTS DIFFER

The Chinese experts here have differed among themselves on many points, and the leading ones have differed with Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT's desire to relax pressure in Vietnam, but they have tended to agree on certain views on Peking.

They present it as a vast, frightened, inward-looking, potentially powerful nation, whose aging leaders are certain to be soon replaced. They see it at present suffering from a gargantuan persecution complex which sees its lay religion of Maoism threatened on all sides.

Global reactions have been various:

Cuban Premier Castro, himself reaching a domestic economic impasse, has quarreled violently with Peking, which has tried to enforce its unrealistic alternatives upon him.

Indonesia is throwing out, or actually exterminating, the once-powerful Communist Party where again the ideology of the followers of Mao Tse-tung apparently ruined their friend, the once-powerful President Sukarno. The greatest blood purge in history may be occurring there.

Moscow has circulated in other Communist countries a memorandum prior to its March 29 party conference. What appears to be a complete text of this has been published in the Hamburg newspaper, Die Welt.

EFFORTS DESCRIBED

It chronologically tells the efforts of Moscow to normalize relations with Peking after the fall of Nikita S. Khrushchev in October 1964, and of the paranoidal Chinese response. The Soviet letter charges "that the Chinese leaders require a long-lasting war in Vietnam in order to maintain international tensions; in order to portray China as a 'besieged fortress.' "

As reported from Germany the Moscow statement charges that Peking is trying to "bring about a military conflict between the U.S.S.R. and the United States."

With horror that might parallel capitalistic reaction the Moscow statement reputedly repudiates statements of Chinese leaders welcoming the thought of a nuclear war.

The statement uses the words "adventurism," "militant great-power chauvinism," and "ideological error."

Here in the quiet Fulbright committee room top American academic experts weigh the China problem. One after another they dispute the most widespread official beliefs and policies toward China. The essence of their advice is: "Do not isolate Red China."

POSITION FAVORED

That is the trouble at the present time, some argue. Mr. Barnett said he favored "maximum contacts with and maximum involvement of the Chinese Communists in the international community."

The irony of taking a pariah nation into the United Nations strikes some Senators forcibly.

Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, and Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, for example, evidently fear a rush of emotionalism. Later sessions will bring hard-line experts who do not want to relax the policy of isolationism.

The Chinese scholars do not generally advocate a "soft" line in Vietnam. They recommend continuance of the "containment" policy toward Communist China.

On the other hand, they say the American trade embargo of China is an almost total failure; that the theory that the Formosa nationalist regime is the legitimate government of the mainland is a fiction. Most of them cast doubt on China's present military power.

IMPOSITION OF EXPORT CONTROLS ON CATTLE HIDES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, about 1 month ago, on March 7, the Commerce Department instituted export licenses on cattle hides. This action has helped to hold the line on inflation by safeguarding supplies of leather for shoes for the American consumer. It has also helped to assure more adequate supplies of leather for military shoes.

The mild step of licensing the export of hides is an anti-inflation measure which has been taken to meet the extraordinary increase in the export of American hides which had threatened American supplies. Total U.S. hide exports in 1965 rose 16 percent to 13 million hides, as compared to the 1964 level of 11.2 million. This was almost 40 percent of our total domestic supply. Hide exports in January 1966 were 19 percent over those for January 1965. February exports rose to a whopping 76 percent over those for February 1965. And total exports the first 2 months this year were 46 percent more than in the corresponding 1965 period.

Prices for hides responding to rapidly increasing exports rose sharply until the export limitations were announced. Hide prices increased 66.7 percent from February 1965, to February 1966, and have fallen only slightly since that time.

What was the reason for this sharp increase in exports of cattle hides? The major world producers of exportable cattle hides today are the United States and Argentina. This was not always so. In 1950 America was a net importer of hides. In 1953 our net exports were only 1,926,000. By 1963 they reached 7,610,000 although Argentina had most of the foreign market. In the early sixties, Argentina suffered a severe drought. Many cattle were killed, which reduced Argentine exports in the following years. Filling the gap, American exports jumped to 11,190,000 in 1964 and to over 13 million last year. If controls had not been imposed, our exports this year might well have reached 15 million, or 44 percent of our domestic supply. This export level would have meant a shortage of as much as 4 million hides in the United States this year. Escalation of the Vietnam conflict could, in these circumstances, lead to the imposition of priorities to protect supplies for the military, major price increases in the civilian shoes, and perhaps further controls.

This year the United States will produce an estimated 34 million hides and use 23 million. If exports are reduced to the 1964 level—11,190,000 hides—the objective of the licensing controls, domestic supplies will still remain very tight. An export total of 11,190,000 hides would be equal to 86.5 percent of the all-time high in hide exports of 1965.

The destinations to which hides are shipped also bear watching. In the full year 1964, Russia and Eastern Europe took 757,000 hides. In 1965 their imports from the United States more than doubled to 1,896,000, an increase in 1 year of 150.46 percent. In January and February of this year, exports of hides to Russia and Eastern Europe were three times the amount exported in the first 2 months of last year. And some of our hides exported to other countries find their way into Iron Curtain countries.

The question might well be asked, "Why do foreign buyers pay the present high prices for hides?" On the one hand, Russia, for example, has set a goal of increased shoe output and is desperately short of hides to produce this footwear. On the other hand, Czechoslovakia, for example, wants American dollars badly. Workshoes made in Czechoslovakia by low-paid workers sell in the United States at less than the cost of materials here. These foreign-made shoes cannot be bought by people in the country of manufacture, but their sale in the United States produces needed dollars for the Iron Curtain bloc.

The United States, a major industrial nation, is an exporter of the raw materials for manufacturing shoes abroad which are then imported here. Total footwear imports accounted for 16 percent of output in 1965, as against 1.2 percent in 1955. American consumers and American workers should not be required to pay the cost of strengthening the economies of the Iron Curtain countries.

Shoe manufacturers and retailers in America want to hold the line on shoe prices. Consumer shoe prices rose 4.5 percent from February 1965 to February of this year, almost entirely the result of higher hide costs. But whereas shoe prices rose 4.5 percent, leather prices in the same period were up 15.2 percent and hide prices up 66.7 percent. The shoe industry, manufacturing and retail, operates on an average annual profit margin of 2 percent to 3 percent of sales. Costs must be passed on. While hide prices have dropped only slightly, it is hoped export licensing will bring a measure of stability to what has been a chaotic hide market. Export licensing should enable shoe manufacturers and retailers to hold price rises this year to a moderate 2 to 5 percent, which reflect current hide and skin levels.

If exports of hides had continued to increase unchecked, the serious shortage of leather at home could have affected supplies of shoes for the Armed Forces. Overall needs for military shoes are, of course, increasing. In 1963 the Government purchased about 5,200,000 pairs of combat and noncombat shoes; in 1964, 6,500,000; in 1965, 7,690,000. In 1951, during the Korean conflict, the military bought 19 million pairs of shoes. It would have been tragic, avoidable folly to export half our production this year in the face of expected prolonged conflict in Vietnam and possible escalation of the war.

The United States produces 34 million hides a year and will use 23.8 million in 1966. We should always have a surplus for export. The trouble comes when booming civilian and military demands are pyramided by a surge in foreign buying. Last year foreign buyers took almost 40 percent of the U.S. hide production, at constantly increasing prices. The supply of hides in the United States is not expected to increase in 1966 and may be even a little tighter than in 1965. Domestic shoe production should expand from 630 million pairs in 1965 to at least 640 million in 1966. As cattle slaughter improves in Argentina over the next 2 years, however, pressures should be eased on the United States market.

The American shoe industry's prices are held to a minimum by its basic structure. No business is more competitive. The leather shoe industry is made up of over 850 companies operating 1,300 factories in 38 States. Many of these factories are small, family owned plants. At the retail level there are 25,000 shoe stores and departments, and shoes are sold in over 100,000 places in the United States. The manufacturer of shoes buys all his materials and assembles the parts. Leather accounts for 50 to 55 percent of the wholesale cost of a good pair of leather shoes. In the face of drastically increased prices of raw material, the average retail price of all shoes in February of this year was only about $7. Over 50 percent of all men's shoes sell at $10 or below and over 50 percent of all women's shoes are $6 or below.

The mild licensing plan wisely adopted by the Department of Commerce involves no price controls as such. It is merely a temporary measure which can be eliminated or eased as supplies of hides improve. Responsible exports at a reasonable level are desired by all of us. Argentine production is improving and supplies are expected to be normal within 2 years. In the meantime, judicious use of export controls will assure adequate raw material for shoes for the American people and their servicemen at reasonable prices.

INVOCATION BY LT. COL. KARL APPLBAUM AT ANNUAL BANQUET OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on February 25, 1966, at the annual banquet of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, I was deeply impressed and inspired by the invocation which was delivered by Lt. Col. Karl Applbaum, the national chaplain of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States; rabbi of the Avenue M Jewish Center, 1898 Bay Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Chaplain Applbaum is affiliated with all of the major veterans organizations in the United States. During World War II, he served as an Army chaplain.

At this annual banquet, the Reserve Officers Association presented the 1966 Minute Man Award to one of our most distinguished colleagues, Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi. This invocation sets forth with considerable eloquence the great admiration we have for Senator STENNIS.

I ask unanimous consent that this invocation of Chaplain Applbaum be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the invocation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVOCATION DELIVERED BY LT. COL. KARL APPLBAUM

(National chaplain of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States; rabbi of the Avenue M Jewish Center, 1898 Bay Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., at the Park Sheraton Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 25, 1966)

Our Heavenly Father, assembled here are the elite of this Nation, Members of Congress, members of the Armed Forces, heroes of wars; all of whom have come here to pay tribute and homage to one of the chosen few, JOHN CORNELIUS STENNIS, champion of preparedness and defender of the Reserves who has been selected by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States for the 1966 Minute Man Award. Thou hast endowed him with wisdom and understanding, with dignity and stature, with honesty and integrity, and with the power to command the respect and admiration of his peers and of all who come in contact with him. Strong as a lion in the pursuit of those goals which he considers necessary to assure the safety of our country, swift as an eagle to catch up with those who would endanger our defenses and above all a belief and trust in Thy divine guidance. Like the voice of Thy prophet of old his voice reverberates through the Halls of Congress fighting for eternal vigilance and standing erect as the Rock of Gibraltar tossing back any assaults against the defenders of our country—the citizen army and stanchly supporting the men and women who have dedicated themselves to the service of our country. Be Thou with him and his family all the days of his life.

We also thank Thee O God, creator of the universe for the life and dedication of Lt. Comdr. Hugh F. Lecky, Thy humble servant whom Thou hast blessed with bravery and courage and who has dedicated his life to the bringing of Thy teachings and precepts to the battlefield. Who has courageously faced the enemy and conquered. We are grateful to Thee for having returned him safely to us and to his beloved family. Be Thou with him all the days of his life. His fellow officers have chosen him as the Chaplain of the Year. May he always earn the respect and admiration of his countrymen.

Bless these United States of America, the land of the free and the home of the brave. May it always serve as a beacon light to a troubled humanity and a guiding post to an eternally upset world.

Bless our Commander and Chief, the President of these United States. Endow him with the wisdom of a Solomon and the faith and patience of a Joab in the service of our country and in the safeguarding of this world which Thou hast created.

May it be Thy will that when we assemble again for a midwinter conference that peace and tranquillity shall reign over the world. "Nations of the world shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree. None shall make them afraid for all the people shall walk every one in the name of God." Amen.

WE CAN STILL WIN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, former Vice President Richard Nixon has written an excellent analysis of the administration's war on poverty.

As he so correctly summarizes, the poverty program has been "first in promises, first in politics, first in press releases, and last in performance."

In his article, he articulately offers, as he has done throughout his many years in public service, constructive and realistic suggestions. Republicans, Democrats, and independents alike will certainly agree with Mr. Nixon that the time has come to adopt a new strategy in the poverty war.

Mr. Nixon has presented an excellent eight-point program including—I am pleased to note—an endorsement of my amendment placing various poverty employees under the Hatch Act's prohibitions against partisan political activity. He also recommended adoption of the Human Investment Act which I am cosponsoring.

I certainly agree with Mr. Nixon that by adopting new strategy and by reviewing and reevaluating the administration's approach to this all-important and crucial program, we can reverse the tide of defeat which has characterized the poverty war to date. We cannot waste another minute in this important effort. The one and only purpose of the antipoverty program should be to benefit the needy of this Nation. It is time that we approached this job in a more effective and proper manner.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "We Can Still Win the War on Poverty" which appeared in the Los Angeles Times Sunday, April 3, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 3, 1966]

WE CAN STILL WIN THE WAR ON POVERTY

(By Richard M. Nixon)

The Johnson administration is losing the war on poverty. The initiative has been lost;

the offensive has bogged down; there is dissatisfaction and disillusionment with the administration of the poverty program all over America.

The war on poverty has been first in promises, first in politics, first in press releases, and last in performance.

With the war mired in mismanagement and waste, the temptation is to call it off, to compromise, to settle for a policy of peaceful coexistence with poverty. But this is not the way.

The time has come to adopt a new strategy and to launch a great new offensive that will bring America victory against mankind's oldest foe.

Eighteen months have passed since the opening guns were fired in the war on poverty. So far the effort has cost Americans $2 billion—well over $100 million a month. Over the next 5 years it will cost another $15 billion.

What do we have to show for this enormous effort?

While modest advances have been recorded on some fronts, a wholesale rout is in full swing on another—the inflation front.

On this front, the greatest setbacks in the poverty war have been suffered. For Johnson inflation has been rapidly creating a new class of poor while Mr. Johnson's poverty programs have barely dented the old.

Among the new poor will be thousands of the 21 million on pensions who cannot defend themselves against an inflation that destroys the value of all they own and all they earn.

How do we regain the initiative in the war on poverty? Here is an eight-point program.

1. We must open a second front by taking the offensive against inflation.

HANDSOME PAY RAISE

Those below the poverty level suffer most from an inflation that destroys the value of what little they have. While the Johnson poverty programs have filtered a pittance down to the poor, Johnson inflation has bitten deeply into the savings and income of them all.

2. We must quit giving sergeants in the poverty war general's pay.

The percentage of officials receiving more than $19,000 per year is higher in the poverty program than in any other major department of Government.

In city after city, such as Paterson, N.J., and New Haven, Conn., the poverty director was given a higher salary than the mayor. In State after State, top poverty officials are paid more than the vast majority of elected State officials.

More than two of three of the top poverty warriors, "consultants and experts," received a handsome pay raise when they joined the program.

The time has come to put a stop to the disgraceful spectacle of politicians profiting from the poor. Now is the time to muster out the mercenaries—by following the advice of Senator HUGH SCOTT—and putting a ceiling on salaries.

3. We must take politics out of the poverty war.

Politics should end where poverty begins. But, big-city political machines have used Federal funds to fight one another rather than to fight poverty. They have used tax dollars to escalate their political wars while neglecting the poverty war.

We can put an end to politics-as-usual in the poverty war by adopting Senator GEORGE MURPHY's recommendation of putting all poverty officials under the Hatch Act—which would prohibit them from playing politics with poverty.

4. We must mobilize our natural allies to win the war on poverty. The first of these allies are the poor themselves who have the greatest stake in victory.

As Representatives ALBERT QUIE and CHARLES GOODELL have urged, only the "involvement of the poor" can "convert the poverty program into something different than another tired old welfare approach." The shockingly low percentage of turnout of the poor in poverty elections in cities around the country indicates the poverty officials have fallen short of this goal.

OTHER NATURAL ALLIES

The other natural allies who are not being used to the limit today are the thousands of private, nongovernmental agencies that have years of experience and a history of success against poverty.

5. We must concentrate our fire on areas where the chances of a breakthrough are greatest.

This means redoubling our effort in the Headstart program which has done so much to aid the children of the poor. Poor children should be put at the top of the list for liberation from poverty; here the least investment will yield the greatest return. These are the youngsters who can be rescued from a lifetime of poverty with a minimum of effort.

6. We must utilize the ultimate weapon in the poverty arsenal: the free enterprise system.

Here is the most effective engine in human history for combating poverty and it is time we wheeled it into battle. We can bring the free enterprise system into the fight by adopting two Republican proposals: The Human Investment Act and the Industry Youth Corps. Under these programs tax credits and other incentives would be given to businessmen who fight poverty by training unskilled workers for better jobs.

7. We must delegate more authority to our commanders in the field.

No war can be run wholly from Washington; many critical decisions are best made by the men at the scene. State governments, which have the greatest knowledge and experience in fighting poverty in their own sectors, should be delegated a greater measure of responsibility for action in the war on poverty.

END TO WASTE

8. We must establish a "committee on the conduct of the war." Its purpose: to expose the political profiteers, to courtmartial the incompetent commanders and to put an end to mismanagement and waste.

This is the recommendation of Representative WILLIAM AYRES. With that watchdog committee, the country should receive a continuing audit on how the poverty resources are being allocated. As an example, such a committee might uncover the reasons why a wealthy suburban community like Garden City, Long Island, which can find no poor children in its schools, expects to receive $33,000 in poverty aid to education.

By adopting these proposals, we can reverse the tide of defeat and put the Nation back on the road to victory in the one war in which all Americans agree there can be no appeasement and no surrender.

UNDERGROUND METAL MINERS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a recent report showed that of each 100 young men entering a lifetime career as an underground metal miner, no less than 7 of them can expect to die in an on-the-job accident before retirement age. I think that these rates can and should be improved. Legislation to protect the metal miners in our country is presently pending in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. To acquaint the Members of this body with the persuasive arguments for this legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the following testimony of Mr. Frank N. Hoffmann, legislative director of the United Steelworkers of America, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FRANK N. HOFFMANN

My name is Frank N. Hoffmann, legislative director of the United Steelworkers of America.

Mining—metallic, nonmetallic, and coal by underground methods—is the most hazardous of the mineral industries, because it must be carried on under adverse natural conditions, such as overhead roof or rock, explosive or harmful gases and dusts, restricted working space and illumination, proximity of electric power to workings, danger of impounded water, use of explosives, and use of mechanical underground equipment.

Mining has become, to a large extent, a mechanical industry requiring skilled workmen. The injury of such skilled workmen by accident or impairment by occupational disease is an economic waste, which if not kept to a minimum, endangers the economy and well-being of the Nation.

Preservation of life, limb, and health of the workmen in mining is paramount; without such protection, efficient production is impossible. It is, therefore, self-evident that prevention of accidents and occupational diseases represents the highest order of conservation.

The United Steelworkers of America are privileged to represent over 30,000 miners who are directly engaged in metallic and nonmetallic mining, that is, the mining of copper, lead, zinc, iron ore, uranium, gold, silver, aluminum ore, antimony ore, and miscellaneous minerals.

We have been striving for the enactment of mine safety legislation for over a decade. The impetus initially came from the president of the steelworkers, Mr. Phillip Murray. During the 2d session of the 81st Congress, Mr. Murray appealed to Senator James E. Murray, Democrat of Montana, and Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio, both members of the Senate Labor Committee, "as to the need for some degree of resolute health and safety standards for all miners throughout the Nation."

The Senate Labor Committee, with the complete support of all members, instructed the staff to ascertain whether or not conditions in the mines warranted further action by the committee.

After 6 months of on-the-spot study and review of the health, safety, and working conditions of the miners, the committee stated that some legislation was called for but that it should be confined to metallic and nonmetallic mines.

With the advice and help of the U.S. Bureau of Mines and the Chief of the Bureau, Mr. Jack Forbes, a mine safety bill was drafted and introduced in the Senate by Senator James E. Murray, and other Senators interested in mine safety.

This bill gave the Bureau of Mines the right of entry into any metallic or nonmetallic mine. It also empowered the Secretary acting through the Bureau to make annual or necessary inspections of the metallic or nonmetallic mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions in the mines.

This bill was a modest beginning. It was an approach which called for inspection coupled with gathering and reporting of all data relating to accidents, fatalities and working conditions in these mines. No enforcement powers were called for other than a penalty being levied for refusing to admit a Bureau of Mines representative into the mine.

It was thought that inasmuch as a large segment of the mining industry was already cooperating with the health and safety programs of the Bureau of Mines that industry would welcome inspection by Bureau personnel on an official basis. With no penalties involved as far as recommendations of the Bureau were concerned in regard to a particular mine, the thinking at the time was that the operators would cooperate wholeheartedly with this voluntary approach to mine safety. Unfortunately, the operators and the American Mining Congress were opposed to this bill in 1953, which did not have penalties. They are opposed to H.R. 8989 in 1966, which contains penalties for noncompliance.

Until today no hearings have been held by a Senate committee on mine safety in metallic and nonmetallic mines.

Hearings on this bill were held by various subcommittees of the House Committee on Education and Labor during the 84th, 87th, and 89th sessions of the Congress.

These hearings have had a salutary effect on the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Mines, on management and labor, and some of the States.

In 1963, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, and the Department of the Interior Bureau of Mines published a study, entitled "Silicosis in the Metal Mining Industry: A Reevaluation," in 1958–61.

The foreword to that study states:

"The present study was an outgrowth of hearings on mine health and safety, held by the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 84th Congress. The study, however, should form the basis for others which could materially assist in ultimately eliminating silicosis as a serious threat to the health of metal miners."

This report marks a step forward in that it provides a solid foundation upon which to build against this devastating disease, silicosis.

It is not our purpose to burden the record with excessive wordage or extraneous material. We have found that over the years facts are stronger than argument, more impressive than reasoning, and more dependable than opinions.

Having led the legislative struggle before the Congress in behalf of mine safety for more than a decade, and advocated the identical bill to one that has been introduced by Senator CLARK, we asked that this bill be introduced so that this subcommittee and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare can use it for reference.

Similar bills to the one introduced by Senator CLARK were introduced in the 83d and in the 84th Congresses by Representative FULTON, Representative Kelley, Representative SAYLOR, Representative McConnell, Representative METCALF, Representative O'HARA, and Representative BLATNIK.

Representative Graham A. Barden, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in the 84th Congress, in response to appeals by the United Steelworkers of America, set up a subcommittee to consider these identical bills, with the then Representative LEE METCALF, now Senator, as chairman of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee held on-the-spot hearings in Virginia, Duluth, Minn., Butte, Mont., Ouray, Colo., and in Washington, D.C. These hearings produced a wealth of factual data as to the need for metallic and nonmetallic mine safety legislation.

This subcommittee recommended that a subcommittee be appointed in the 85th Congress and that the overall subject of safety in the Nation's metallic and nonmetallic mines should be given further study.

It was during the 87th Congress that hearings held by the Select Subcommittee on Labor on the original and only bill as submitted in previous sessions, provided the basis for a study that was worked out under the guidance of Representative Herbert Zelenko, chairman of the select subcommittee, which recommended that the Secretary of the Interior conduct a study covering the causes and prevention of injuries and health hazards, as set forth in Public Law 87–300.

Public Law 87–300 was passed in the 1st session of the 87th Congress and was signed into law by the President on September 26, 1961. The law authorized the Secretary of the Interior to make or cause to be made a study covering (1) the causes of injuries and health hazards in metallic and nonmetallic mines; (2) the relative effectiveness of voluntary versus mandatory reporting of accident statistics; (3) the relative contribution to safety of inspection programs embodying (a) right-of-entry; (b) right-of-entry plus enforcement authority; (4) effectiveness of health and safety education and training; and (5) the magnitude of efforts and costs of each of these possible phases of an effective safety program for the metallic and nonmetallic mines.

The Secretary of Interior was given the right-of-entry to any metallic or nonmetallic mine, and 24 months to report back to Congress its recommendations and findings.

A Mine Safety Study Board composed of three individuals, was created.

The Board's report to the Congress revealed: (1) widespread existence of correctible hazards to life and health in mines inspected; (2) a high casualty rate suffered by miners from dangerous conditions beyond their own control; (3) the ineffectiveness of State and local efforts to reduce mine health and safety hazards. These findings were documented in a report approximating 200 pages of text and statistical tables.

This report sustained the case that had been raised over the years as to the need for mine safety legislation in the metallic and nonmetallic mines.

The Mine Safety Study Board, in its report to the Congress, sets forth the following conclusions on page 67:

"The competency of American private enterprise in the extraction of metals and minerals is recognized throughout the world. The long experience and ingenuity of these industries and their equipment suppliers has led to the development and use of production techniques that are models of efficiency. The unfortunate fact, however, is that efforts to overcome many of the hazards to health and safety have not kept pace with increased productivity. The number and severity of the injuries experienced each year by persons employed in the extractive industries should be alarming to an America that prides itself on its high standards of civilization and its concern for the welfare of its citizens.

"In the face of 10,000 lost-time injuries and more than 200 deaths in a single year, it would be difficult to ignore the need for positive action."

H.R. 6961, the mine safety bill that was introduced by Representative JAMES O'HARA, was based on the findings of the Mine Safety Study Board. This bill along with others provided the basis for the hearings and the subsequent reporting out by the Committee on Education and Labor of a "clean bill," which became H.R. 8989, the bill passed by the House and now before this subcommittee.

The United Steelworkers of America are grateful as all labor is for the passage by the House of this Mine Safety Act, H.R. 8989. It is a good bill. It came through the House with strong bipartisan support, and all who worked for its passage have rendered a real service to the cause of mine safety in metallic and nonmetallic mines.

Two sections of H.R. 8989 give this act meaning and substance. They are vital to mine safety.

Inspection is the key factor that will curtail accidents and fatalities. The Secretary is required to inspect, at least annually, each underground mine covered by this act. This requirement of annual inspections of underground mines was put into the bill by the Committee on Education and Labor because it recognized underground mining as the most dangerous of mining operations.

The place to curtail accidents is in the mine.

Ability to carry out an inspection obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions can have only one end result and that is a decrease in fatalities.

The Bureau of Mines started to collect data on metallic and nonmetallic mines in 1911. Since then reports have been collected annually. The Bureau of Mines is authorized to gather data on injuries and related employment at metallic and nonmetallic mines, but there is no Federal law that compels operators to submit such information. The information, as furnished, is on a voluntary basis. Unfortunately, it is incomplete and unsatisfactory.

The mandatory reporting provision of H.R. 8989 is a major one. Any operator of a mine subject to the act will be required to submit reports to the Secretary of the Interior of accidents, injuries, and fatalities annually.

The Secretary is required to analyze and publish, either in summary or detailed form, the data he obtains from such reports. These reports must be available for public inspection and they may be published if the Secretary so determines.

This data will enable the Secretary to analyze and study mine health and safety conditions on the basis of data which is complete.

This material if properly evaluated can lead to (1) improved health and safety, (2) which segments of the mining industry need a more concentrated effort as to the difficulties encountered.

This information will be a tremendous help to all who are interested in safety be they labor, management or Government.

The development of health and safety standards as set forth in H.R. 8989, section 6 called for the Secretary to develop standards for mines covered by the act.

The Secretary is empowered to appoint advisory committees to assist him in formulating these standards. These advisory committees shall be made up of equal numbers of representatives of labor, management and at least one representative of a State safety agency.

Those standards which deal with conditions or practices which could cause death or serious physical harm shall be designated as mandatory standards. The Secretary must consult with the advisory committees before classifying standards as mandatory standards. The operators under sections 8 and 9 of the Act must comply with these mandatory standards.

We would like to suggest that the Subcommittee consider the feasibility of making all standards promulgated by the Secretary and his advisory committees, as enforceable under section 6(b), by changing the mandatory concept, thereby making such standards applicable, pursuant to the provisions of sections 8 and 9.

The Committee on Education and Labor allowed for representation on the advisory committee of State safety officials in the belief that by being represented they could make a contribution to the advisory committee.

The wisdom of putting State safety representatives on the advisory committee is open to question, but we feel that the advantages in having them participate are readily apparent, for with the formulation of standards the States will not be able to say that they did not know what was taking place.

H.R. 8989 gives the States the responsibility for development and enforcement of health and safety standards in those mines located in the State. The Secretary of the Interior is required to approve or disapprove the State plan of operation as set forth in the various sections of H.R. 8989.

Section 13 of H.R. 8989 deals with the delegation of authority to the States. This section was amended on the floor of the House. A new subsection (d) was incorporated into the bill. This was a major amendment. It takes away from the Secretary of the Interior final authority to refuse approval to, or withdraw from a State plan. It provides the State a right of appeal to the Federal courts from an adverse decision of the Secretary with respect to the adequacy of the State plan or the manner in which it is being carried out by the State.

Section 13(d) also provides that the State may file an appeal with the appropriate U.S. circuit court of appeals no later than 60 days after notice of the Secretary's final decision. The court must accept the Secretary's findings of fact as conclusive, if these findings are supported by "substantial evidence." If "good cause" is shown, the court may remand the case to the Secretary, with the instructions that he take further evidence. Such remanding of the case may or may not lead the Secretary to make new or modified findings of fact, or perhaps to modify his previous decision. Any new or modified findings of fact, by the Secretary of the Interior, must also be accepted by the court as conclusive, if supported by substantial evidence.

The circuit court, after hearing the appeal, is given the authority to affirm the decision of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The practical effect, we feel, of a decision by the circuit court to set aside, entirely, the Secretary's action in refusing approval of a State plan submitted to him would be to leave the State plan in operation, and thereby continue to exempt mines in that State from direct Federal mine safety regulation and standards.

Both parties—i.e., the Secretary of the Interior and the State—may file an appeal with the U.S. Supreme Court against the decision of the circuit court. If the Supreme Court, however, does not decide to review the case, the judgment of the circuit court will be final.

Section 17 of H.R. 8989 was also amended on the floor to change the effective dates of certain sections of the act. The amendment postpones, until 1 year after the date of publication in the Federal Register of mandatory mine health and safety standards, the power of the Secretary to issue a notice to a mine operator requiring the abatement of a violation of such a standard or to issue an order of withdrawal and debarment of persons from a mine where the Secretary finds an imminent danger of death or serious physical harm exists. These powers of the Secretary of the Interior cannot be exercised in any State within less than 90 days after the adjournment of the next regular session of the State legislature which convenes after the date of publication of the mandatory standards in the Federal Register.

The extent to which this amendment will postpone the effective date of the Secretary's powers to issue abatement notices and orders of withdrawal and debarment will depend upon the timelag between the enactment of the act and the designation of mandatory standards, as well as upon the timing of legislative sessions in the individual States—particularly in those States whose legislatures meet only biennially.

During 1966, 26 States will hold legislative sessions. The remainder of the States do not have a regular legislative session scheduled until 1967.

To illustrate what would be presumably an extreme possibility for postponement of Federal enforcement power: Assume an 18-month lag between the date of enactment of the act and the date of publication in the Federal Register of the mandatory health and safety standards which the Secretary must develop in consultation with advisory committees. With a State legislature meeting biennially which does not convene until 18 months after the Federal Register publication date, with a session lasting 4 months, a total of 43 months, or 3 years and 7 months would elapse between the date of enactment of the act and the date at which Federal inspectors would acquire the authority to issue notices of abatement or orders to withdraw and debar persons from mines where an immediate or imminent danger of death or serious physical harm is found to exist.

The purpose of delaying the effective date until 90 days after the close of the next State legislative session is to give the State legislature the opportunity—if it decides to avail itself of the opportunity—to look at the mandatory standards designated by the Secretary, take action to pass any new legislation that may be required for establishment of a State inspection and enforcement plan to be presented for the Secretary's approval, and to appropriate the money that will be necessary in order to have the State plan carried out to the Secretary's satisfaction. An approved plan has to "provide for the development and enforcement of health and safety standards * * * which are or will be substantially as effective * * * as the mandatory standards" designated by the Secretary, it is not unreasonable to require that a substantial amount of time be given a State, after it has learned what these mandatory standards are to be, in which to decide whether it wishes to develop and finance a State plan embodying substantially as effective standards.

Safety is one field of endeavor where needless loss of time in its execution, can be disastrous.

Section 13, especially (d), will delay the effective and timely implementation of H.R. 8989. It creates a no man's land between the Secretary of Interior and the several States. Delays, and indecision would be the order of the day. Instead of expediting health and safety for the miners it will serve to hamstring this objective.

With the States having recourse to judicial review as to the actions of the Secretary, the specter of frustrating delays is all too apparent.

The record as developed over the past decade leaves little to hope for as far as bringing about some degree of effective and uniform health and safety measures on the part of the States.

We respectfully refer to page 167 of the hearings on mine safety, before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, for a detailed statement as to the failure of the States to improve their mine safety codes, if they have them, and bring some degree of safety to the miners through thorough inspections and training. Report No. 606, 89th Congress, 1st session, House of Representatives, on pages 4, 5, and 6, sets forth the many and various failures of the several States, as related to mine safety in the metallic and nonmetallic mines.

We strongly urge the subcommittee to review the hearings that were held before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, pages 34–56. These individual reports are facts that cannot be ignored and reveal the terrible inadequacies of State mine enforcement and inspection.

The record will show that many of the States are reluctant to appropriate adequate amounts of money to insure enforcement of their mining codes by their State safety agency or department.

There is no assurance that under section 13 the States will make any effort to provide these funds, preferring to let well enough alone, and let the Secretary of Interior take over all these functions.

The gap between the legislative session of the State legislatures and the one given over to appropriations would only serve to confuse and delay the putting into being the health and safety measures that are needed now—not 2 or 4 years from now.

Since its inception over 50 years ago, the Bureau of Mines has had as one of its main objectives the promotion of health and safety practices in the mining industry. This aim is being accomplished through safety education, first aid training, technical consultation, and safety inspection of mines, including specific recommendations for eliminating or minimizing hazards. The Bureau staff is ready to assist in every possible way to prevent injury in mining operations.

The responsibility for mine safety in the metallic and nonmetallic field should be given to the one agency that has experience in mining. The Bureau of Mines has that experience and knowledge.

The Bureau is carrying out the inspection and enforcement of health and safety standards in all the coal mines of the Nation, employing more than 14 miners. That responsibility was given in the 82d Congress under Public Law 552, the Neeley-McConnell Act. This subcommittee referred favorably a bill, H.R. 3584, dealing with small coal mines to the standing Committee on Labor and Education in the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

H.R. 3584 gives the Bureau responsibility for carrying out various provisions relating to health and safety.

This bill has been favorably voted on by the Senate.

The responsibility for Federal action in health and safety activities has been established in many fields. Some of the more objective examples of this are such Federal activities in atomic energy, coal mines, inspection services of the Department of Agriculture, Food and Drug Act, and the ship inspection service.

All of labor, therefore, recommends that section 13 be amended as follows:

"Sec. 13. The Secretary shall provide that the major responsibility for administering the provisions of this Act shall be vested in the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior. The Secretary acting through the Bureau shall have authority to appoint, subject to the civil service laws, such officers and employees as he may deem requisite for the administration of this Act; and to prescribe powers, duties and responsibilities of all officers and employees engaged in the administration of this Act: *Provided, however,* That to the maximum extent feasible, in the selection of persons for appointment as mine inspectors, no person shall be so selected unless he has the basic qualification of at least five years practical mining experience and in assigning mine inspectors to the inspection and investigation of individual mines, due consideration shall be given to their previous practical experience in the State, district, or region, where such inspections are to be made."

This amendment will make for a more effective and efficient mine safety law.

The opposition to this mine safety legislation comes from some of the operators. Why are the operators opposed to Federal inspection by qualified inspectors of the Bureau of

Mines? Is it because a safer operation would cost more to operate? We respectfully refer this subcommittee to pages 171 and 172 of the hearings before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, 89th Congress, as regards industries position on this attempt to secure some legislation relating to the miners in metallic and nonmetallic mines.

The American Mining Congress has stated that seven in a hundred underground metal miners can expect to be killed at work in a working lifetime.

The Bureau of Mines reports that for metals alone the period 1963–64 there was a sharp increase in fatalities in 1964 to a total of 59, 13 more than in 1963. Nonfatal disabilities also increased to 3,745 in 1964, compared with 3,465 in 1963.

In October 1965 at the American Mining Congress Convention held at Las Vegas, Nev., Mr. Sidney S. Goodwin, vice president, the New Jersey Zinc Co., stated as follows:

"You may or may not be aware of the fact that several of the States, particularly Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and New Mexico, have brought revisions either in their laws or their regulations to improve the position of local inspectors; eliminate out-of-date laws; improve State and local controls over health and safety matters in the mines. Others are already developing plans for similar action in the months ahead. These actions are fine examples of the type of steps that need to be taken in all our mining States if Federal policies are to be avoided. The task remaining in the States becomes apparent if one takes the study of the Interior Department, with respect to State laws and their adequacy, at its face value. This report would indicate that most mining States have laws today which the Federal Government considers adequate. The remaining States have no direct mineral safety laws or they are considered inadequate from the standpoint of meeting standards which the Federal Government believes should be attained.

"Under the terms of the House-passed bill, it is provided that safety control and enforcement of standards could be turned over to those States having laws which provide for inspections and enforcement and for adequate personnel to accompany this task. I would also like to point out that with or without this type of legislation the industry still feels that management should seek to strengthen the laws at the local level; to improve the effectiveness of the agencies administering them; increase emphasis on safety education and training, which is the prime weapon needed to bring about a reduction in accident frequency and severity. We do not need more Federal encroachment in safety matters in noncoal mining. What we need is an enthusiastic and deeply ingrained safety consciousness in top management; a firmly supported educational program for all employees in safe working habits; and continued and vigorous efforts to personally recognize and stimulate each employee's interest in safety through awards programs, frequent safety meetings, and by sustained instruction in accident prevention."

Mr. Goodwin admits that some States need to improve the position of local inspectors, eliminate out-of-date laws, and improve State controls over health and safety in the mines. Why for the past 20 years have many of the States lagged in this vital matter? Why is the threat of a Federal statute required to have the States do what they should have been doing all along?

The record for this period shows that more than enthusiasm on the part of management is required to bring about a reduction in accident frequency and severity. For anyone to advocate otherwise is to fly in the face of reality.

In the December 1963 issue of the Mining Congress Journal, an article by James Boyd states as follows:

"We must acknowledge that all mines do not live up to safety standards that are well recognized, and that there are no means by which the industry itself can enforce compliance; hence, some public authority with enforcement powers is necessary. We firmly believe that these powers should remain with the State or local authorities. Enlightened management recognizes that both the human and the economic considerations require strict attention to safety standards, and by far the majority of mining administrations enforce within their own operations standards which are more stringent than can be feasibly set by law. There are only a few who do not live up to these standards and whose accident rates give rise to the clamor for Federal enforcement powers."

Some operators realize that all mines do not live up to safety standards. There are no means by which the industry can enforce compliance on itself.

Many of the corporations engaged in metallic and nonmetallic mining are cooperating with the Bureau of Mines health and safety programs at this very moment.

The following statement on page 58, House hearings on mine safety, 87th Congress, reveals the following:

"Mineowners are indebted to the U.S. Bureau of Mines for its data on accidents and recommendations for their prevention. The Bureau employs competent engineers and obtains trustworthy data in rendering its service."

The attempt to augment this excellent and necessary activity with Federal inspection saw the operators retreat to State inspection and statutes as the better approach to mine safety.

If they have such great respect for the Bureau staff on an educational basis, why the resistance when an inspector is given the authority to see that all mines are made as safe as they can humanly be made?

The very nature of underground mining makes it a dangerous industry in which to operate and to work.

You cannot have too many involved in safety, be they State or Federal agencies, or private associations. The operators admit they can't enforce compliance.

The attitude of the Bituminous Coal Operators Association is in marked contrast to the metallic and nonmetallic operators of the American Mining Congress. In a paper delivered by Mr. George C. Trevorrow, safety director of the association at the American Mining Congress mining show, Las Vegas, Nev., October 11–14, 1965, stated as follows:

"Top management of most of the larger coal companies insist on a strong safety program at its mines. This attitude is reflected in every case in a low number of injuries and a low injury frequency rate. Part of this insistence is due to the increasing sensitivity to public opinion, but mainly because its representatives have learned that a safe coal mine is an efficient one and that a good safety program is just good business. In many of these companies the top management insists on getting reports of all mine inspections, reports of the investigations of injuries and those of any unusual occurrences in or about the mines. Such management obviously is kept informed of the injuries occurring at the mines. It follows with this careful scrutiny that inspections and investigations are carefully made; the supervisors are anxious to keep substandard conditions found on these inspections to a minimum; and every reasonable attempt is made to prevent recurrence of injuries."

The task at hand is such that State inspection where it is experienced benefits from contact with and the work of the Bureau of Mines inspectors, as the operations in coal have proven. This trend has not diminished, for they look to the Bureau of Mines for guidance and information.

Progress in this effort for mine safety legislation in the metallic and nonmetallic mines has been painfully slow, but there has been progress nonetheless. The fact that this act, H.R. 8989 is before the subcommittee is evidence as to that.

If the need was not there the legislative efforts to secure mine safety legislation would have faltered back in the 84th Congress and come to nothing. The need was there. The hearings of the 84th, 87th, and 89th sessions of the Congress bear out that contention. The 24-month study by the Department of the Interior as authorized by Congress made a major contribution to mine safety, when it provided the vehicle for the introduction of a mine safety bill sponsored by the administration.

The House reported out a good bill. H.R. 8989 can become a better one, if amended as has been proposed.

We hope this subcommittee will be able to report favorably on H.R. 8989 with the suggested amendment to section 13 of the act, and that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will vote its approval of this much-needed legislation in the vital field of metallic and nonmetallic mining.

I thank you for the opportunity you have given me in presenting this statement.

RULES OF U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND IN VIETNAM

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, every American who is a member of the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, is issued a very important document, entitled "Nine Rules for Personnel of U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam," immediately upon his arrival in Vietnam.

I believe this document speaks rather eloquently of our fighting men in Vietnam who are involved not only in warfare but also in the very important task of bringing about better understanding and improved relationship between our people and the Vietnamese.

I wish to share with my colleagues the nine important rules issued by our command in Vietnam to our service personnel.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this document be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the rules were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINE RULES FOR PERSONNEL OF U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND, VIETNAM

The Vietnamese have paid a heavy price in suffering for their long fight against the Communists. We military men are in Vietnam now because their Government has asked us to help its soldiers and people in winning their struggle. The Vietcong will attempt to turn the Vietnamese people against you. You can defeat them at every turn by the strength, understanding, and generosity you display with the people. Here are nine simple rules:

1. Remember we are guest here; we make no demands and seek no special treatment.
2. Join with the people. Understand their life, use phrases from their language and honor their customs and laws.
3. Treat women with politeness and respect.
4. Make personal friends among the soldiers and common people.
5. Always give the Vietnamese the right-of-way.
6. Be alert to security and ready to react with your military skill.

7. Don't attract attention by loud, rude, or unusual behavior.

8. Avoid separating yourself from the people by a display of wealth or privilege.

9. Above all else you are members of the U.S. military forces on a difficult mission, responsible for all your official and personal actions. Reflect honor upon yourself and the United States of America.

"PA AND MA AND L.B.J."

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, in times such as these, when many of us feel the tenseness of the war in South Vietnam and the pressure of domestic problems of inflation and taxation, it is helpful to sit back and see the lighter side of life.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article from the April edition of Nation's Business. The article is entitled "Pa and Ma and L.B.J." with the subtitle, "Or How To Become a Casualty in the Government's War on Poverty." It was written by Jim Comstock, editor of the West Virginia Hillbilly of Richwood, W. Va.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Pa and Ma and L.B.J.

Pa had no sooner climbed out of the truck which he'd thumbed a ride in when he hollered at Ma to get him the foreign country map and find out where Poverty was as President Johnson had just declared war on that country and expected every man to do his duty, and Pa was preparing to do his but he wanted to know where the place was and how to get there.

Fiddlin' Clyde, who sat in the parlor a-strumming his guitar, quit humming the song he had just composed called "I Left My Baby Depressed in the Mountains," or "I Want to Hold Your Handout." He allowed Ma needn't worry none about no geography because he knew where Poverty was. It was in Kentucky. He knew because he heard the Great Society social worker say if anybody wanted to find Poverty in West Virginia, they ought to have a look in Kentucky first. Fiddlin' Clyde ain't called Fiddlin' Clyde because he plays the fiddle but because he fiddles around with the guitar. And he always makes songs about what Pa is thinking about.

Pa took a swig of his sassafras julep and wiped his mouth with his sleeve and said he figured it was a fur piece wherever it was. Then he said for Ma to bring his mountain rifle that hung on the laurel pegs over the door. She brought it, and he took it in his hands, and said to Fiddlin' Clyde:

"When you hold yer gun to shoot in Johnson's war on the people from Poverty, stand thiss way sidewise so you won't be as apt to git shot." He stood sidewise in the door, tippy-toe and gallant, and I felt so prideful at his military bearing and I said to Pa that I wished I could go away and fight. Pa took a drink of sassafras and said real sad, "Son, this'n is a man's war. Yer place is home with yer Ma and Pa, while Fiddlin' Clyde goes off to fit."

Fiddlin' Clyde said, "Pa, this war on Poverty is fer the birds * * *."

And he didn't get finished, because Pa interrupted him and said, "Yes, son, hit is fer sure. Hit is fer Harry Byrd, and Robert Byrd and Lady Bird. It is a poor man's war and a rich man's fight, or is it the other way around? I allus fergit which."

Fiddlin' Clyde said he didn't give a dern which it was, he wasn't going to fight in no more wars, and Fiddlin' Clyde's wife said she seconded the emotion because Spider Webb was in the Vietnam war and his allotment wouldn't support his wife if she didn't get free commodities, doctor bills and hot lunch.

Well, I never saw Pa take nothing so hard as this. He just sat there like he was killed.

"Jest to think, here's my own flesh and blood who won't be one of Johnson's proud foot soldiers, an' my flesh and blood's own rib that should be happy to be one of Johnson's WAC's is raisin' her hand agin it. Bring up a chile the way it should go and when it gets old it will vote Republican if you ain't awful kirful," he said, and he said it so sad, it just about made me want to take a gun and shoot every danged Poverty man alive.

Then Ma said to Pa, and the way she said it I knew I was going to wish she didn't, because I saw that look in her eye and I saw Pa cringe because he saw it too. She said:

"Pa, I got news for you. This war ain't the kind of war you think it is. And Poverty ain't no country, but is what you air, or what you ain't got really, because it is poor people."

Well, Pa was hurt, and I knew he wasn't hurt at Ma, but at the President of the United States. The solemn agony on his face was something to render your soul and I turned away my head because it was the agony of one who had lost faith in his leader.

"You mean President Johnson is goin' to make war on the poor people? You mean them that don't have nothing is goin' to have it took away like the Bible says, and all of them is goin' to be killed? Tell me, woman, that you don't mean that! Re-firm my faith in my country, woman, and tell me that our hearts ain't turned to stone!"

Ma saw his deep and abiding suffering and she told him low and quiet like, "Pa, that great man Johnson has a heart. In fact he has two hearts. One is great big like a mustard seed and the other'n is a little littler like Bobby Baker's modesty. I heered all about it from the Girls Who Do, which is a branch of the West Virginia Federation of Wimmen's Clubs, the branch that don't meet at no Greenbrier every year. They was a woman there who said that Johnson was going to do somethin' for poor people who are impoverished and was goin' to rid the country of poverty." And she wiped something out of her eye with the dress of Fiddlin' Clyde's and Fiddlin' Clyde's wife's new baby, Baby Bird, which she was holding.

PA ON THE SOAPBOX

Well, that done it for Pa. It reaffirmed and updated his faith in our great President. He took another swig of the juice and he said for Ma to blow out the lamp like Johnson does in the White House, and he took off his pants because he said that was going Johnson one better because he was not only saving lamp oil but his crease, too, and it didn't matter as long as he wasn't seen. Then he jumped up on the soapbox which he always keeps for sacred times like this and he made a speech that ought to be engraved on every heart in this land and printed in the books.

"Let us all praise this great man. Let all of us fortunate people, what has everything like us, who gits our commodities free, and who gits a hot lunch fer our kids in school and a bus to take 'em there and bring 'em back, join with our great President in he'pin' the people who ain't got it so good as us. Let us, who have free doctor bills, and free tooth dentist bills, and free hospital bills and git a reasonable pay fer our votes, and git hauled to the polls, remember the impoverished people who has to work on their jobs and pay it all out in taxes and who don't get the fringe benefits of not workin' on steady jobs.

"Let us all join in and fit this war on poverty and help the depressed school teachers, and depressed office workers, and depressed and impoverished businessmen who don't git paid fer keepin' books fer the internal revenue people, and who have to pay employees who ain't still workin' fer 'em, and who have to pay half their social security fer them if they are. Let us not just fight fer the underprivileged, but fer the mentally retarded who don't know how to vote so's to git government jobs and don't know of the free things waitin' fer them in a free country like this'n."

Oh, there never was anything so solemn. And then he said something that capped it all.

"And may we be thankful that we ain't poor and depressed like them people in Washington and in the New York slums, and down in the hills of Kentucky. And, Mr. Johnson, you can count on all of us West Virginia fortunates to help you fit the war on poverty so everybody can be as well off as us in these everlasting hills."

So Pa decided to do what he could to help. That's why the Perfessor came over. He was the one who advised Pa to do it. I'll never forget his words:

"Accept it, old man, accept it. President Johnson wants a man to head this war on poverty in Commodity Ridge precinct and he knew that he needed a staunch man who had been through it all. Who would know poverty's pinch more than you, sir? If he had wanted men who could read, he would find plenty of them in Washington. Or Harvard. Or possibly in Texas. But he doesn't need the intelligentsia for this job. President Johnson isn't the Ford Foundation. He's the government. He doesn't need brains."

Then he took a drink right fast, and Pa just glowed with pride. And Fiddlin' Clyde played a little song he wrote for the occasion called "Readin' and Writin' Is Nothin' but Rot, All Anybody Needs Is an X for the Spot."

Pa snickered and likkered and told Ma the story:

"Well, our father in Washington might be turning the lights off in the White House, but he's sure turning 'em on in this turribly impoverished State in Appalachia. He come out of the sky in a plane like a great white bird with Lady Bird and he look down upon our awful squalor and wretchedness and poverty and he said I am goin' to have compassion on my people. That means he's gonna do somethin' fer us and do it quick. Because a President must have compassion fer lowly people whether they are a-starvin' er a-making a fuss when he is a-making a speech. And the President's plane come down into poverty-struck Huntington and he talked to the people and told 'em that things was pitiful but he'd fix things up, the way Roosevelt started out to do, only the Republicans didn't help and made one-fifth of the people go to bed hungry every night. But he ain't brookin' no interference from the Republicans and is liftin' 'em by the ears like they was beagles, er is it Beatles?"

Pa paused, and the Perfessor took over. "What Pa wants to say is that President Johnson has invited him to join in this war and be on the staff of Appalachian youth. But he felt that he could not serve adequately, not being a Harvard man, and he sought my advice. I am happy to tell you that I have persuaded him to accept, and have pledged my support."

That was great news for all of us, and again we was all thankful that the Perfessor would take over and help Pa do his job.

The Perfessor had come down to Commodity Ridge as one of the first explorers of the New Frontier. I recollect Pa asked him how come he got to Washington, and he laughed and said he reckoned he just turned left from Harvard Yard.

Mister Kennedy had sized him up real good and said for him to go down to those wonderful West Virginia hills and help his people. And he had found our holler, and knocked on our door and Pa said for Ma to open the door and see who it was who couldn't open it for himself, and he had come in and Pa said have some sassafras juice and he did and then he had some more and some more, and well, he just never did go back. He moved into the old Jooks house and made application and got his check every month and his Wisconsin cheese and pork and gravy and lived among us.

Once Pa even figured out how to improve the commodities.

He came home from town with an empty can in his hand and the minute he got in the door he hollered to Aggie to come quick and take a letter to Senator BYRD.

Ma asked him why was he all the time writing letters to Senator BYRD for. Why don't he ever write to that nice Mr. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who is so good to the woman folks and looks into their eyes when he shakes their hands.

Pa got ruffled up and he said because common people can't spell a long name like JENNINGS RANDOLPH. He said that BOB BYRD is a sight easier to spell because it is easier and quicker to say. And I thought that was pretty smart thinking on the part of a man who never got no head start at no school.

"Woman, a bird is a ordinary thing which you see every day and it would only be natural that it would spell ordinary," Pa said. A body has to admit that Pa can sure see right into things.

But I could see it wasn't the letter that was the important thing. It was that empty can in his hand. So I said, right curious like:

"Pa, what's the old empty can fer, and what was in it?"

That sure done it, Pa jumped up on the hickory bottom straight-back and he spoke loud: "In this can was great wealth."

"Aggie," he said, "before you start writin', I wisht you'd read what it says here on this can."

A 900-CALIBER DIET

And Sister Aggie started reading and I wish I could recollect what all she read because it was good hearing. It went something like: Drink four cans of this each day, one in place of each meal and one just before the 11 o'clock news, and maybe just a little bit in between if you feel you ain't had enough. But don't eat no food, it said, and keep on drinking water just like you always do. If you don't drink the whole can full then put it in the springhouse and keep it till you want it.

Four cans a day will give you 900 calibers or something, and you won't need nothing else to eat and if you are fat it will make you as poor as a fence rail, but if you ain't got too much fat to lose, or just a little bit, then you can just drink it in placce of breakfast and eat your dinner and your supper, or you can eat breakfast and dinner and skip supper.

Then Pa told how he learned about this wonder drink. "You know the Tubbs family. Well, you know how fat all of 'em are. Or was. They ain't fat no more. They have started drinkin' this can and they are sellin' their commodities."

But directly Pa started dictating to Sister Aggie. And then we was all quiet, even Ma, because I think all of us down deep knowed it was a sacred minute of a voter communing with his Senator. And I listened real good so I would be able to tell it to my own children someday.

"DEAR HON. SENATOR BYRD: I take my pen in hand to write you a letter to inform you that I am well and hope you air the same. I am not coming to you to ast a favor because I voted fer you. It is because I know that you are interested in your people gittin' suitable commodities, and that is why I am writin'. There is a new thing out now that you drink and you don't have to eat. I am asking you if you won't please put this in with our commodities instid of flour and meal and pork and gravy and they would be easier to carry home."

But we never got none.

Every night the Perfessor comes down and discusses politics with Pa and interrupts the news to him and gives advice.

As he encouraged Pa to join up with the poverty fighting forces, I noticed that Ma looked dubious. And Ma started talking:

"Perfessor, my heart is troubled. When our great President dropped out of the clouds like good things from the corn of copi-a and said he would help us who was heavy laden with automation, at the same time this feller, Mac Namary was a-closin' down 62 military bases which would throw people out of jobs. Mac Namary means well, and said not to worry as they and their families and their things would be transported at Government expense to new jobs. Now, Perfessor, I know you mean well, and Pa means well, and President Johnson and Mr. Mac Namary means well, but what I want to know is what jobs is they gone to be transported to. Is them jobs now open, and if they is, why hain't the people of Appalachia been transported there, and if they ain't open, does that mean that jobs is goin' to be invented fer them?"

The Perfessor has always found Ma a hard row to hoe. He always says that Harvard's library didn't have nothing to come up with her. Just things by folks like Adam Smith and Karl Marx and such like. But he had a answer. He said:

"Don't worry your head, Ma, because between us both, your husband and me, there has evolved a plan. As you know this war on poverty will ned planing and executing. Already we have the Appalachian youth organization. Now, we are going to ask President Johnson to send to Appalachia all those who have ben idled by closing down these military bases. They will become the administrative staff, the investigators, the teachers and workers. Tell her the rest of our plan, Pa."

"When all these people come here, they will be assimulated with us and their kids will wed our'n and vice versa. And they will make application and live off the fat of the land and their Government checks. You tell them the rest, Prefessor," Pa said as he filled his glass.

"Then there'll come another year that is divisible by four, which apparently is the lucky quadrennial in America, and it will be found we have more poverty than ever. Then more people, replaced by IBM and Control Data, will come to assist us in a new war on poverty, which by then will have another name. Then it will be noticed that in Appalachia, as if by miracle, all the poor people in the world will be comfortably off. Now, Pa, if you will conclude this litle dissertation, we shall get down to more serious business," the professor said as he handed Pa his empty glass.

HOW TO TAP THE TILL

"Why then all us impoverished people of poverty will j'in together and declare ourselves foreign territory and * * * and then what do we do, Perfessor?"

"We then make application for foreign aid."

"Oh, yeah," Pa said, and his eyes jumped with anticipation. "There will be no more sorrow and no more work."

The perfessor stopped him. "Pa, actually you have two places confusd. But essentially there is no great difference."

And Pa went to sleep and snord. The professor poured more sassafras julep and set back in his chair and looked through his glass to the fire in the fireplace and I heard him say the queerest thing.

"Ah, Lyndon," he said. "You are working on the wrong fifth."

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966—COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 220) to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 transmitted to the Congress by the President on February 10, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the resolution.

The Chair will state for the information of the Senate that we began consideration of Senate Resolution 220 at 11:40 a.m. Under the law—Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended—all debate of the resolution is limited to not to exceed 10 hours to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member, has recently held 2 days of hearings on S. 3010, a bill to create a new Department of Transportation. It was during the course of these hearings that I became fully aware of the complexity of the proposed legislation, and I am glad that the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has scheduled additional hearings on the bill for May 3 and 4. I commend him for his careful handling of this matter.

The bill contains several proposals which I feel warrant additional investigation and attention. For instance, I have serious questions in my mind concerning the proposals in section 7, which would, in effect, transfer to the new Secretary many of the functions now exercised by the U.S. Corps of Engineers with regard to our water transportation systems. At the present time, practically all of our inland navigation systems, which the Corps of Engineers has been responsible for designing, justifying, and constructing, have been authorized under the multiple-purpose concept. This includes navigation, recreation, flood control, water supply, and conservation. I, therefore, question the advisability of separating from the feasibility study of these projects the contribution which navigation and transportation will have on their justification, without relation to the other purposes of the projects.

Second, I have reservations about the proposal in the bill to transfer all of the powers and functions of the Federal Aviation Agency to the Secretary of the new Department. Aviation continues to be one of the fastest growing and expanding industries in our economy, and it is contributing more and more to our overall economic development. With this rapidly expanding use of the air transportation, I question the advisability of abolishing FAA, which through the years has demonstrated exceptional ability to coordinate and direct the efforts of aviation in America.

Third, I am concerned over the proposed transfer of the functions and powers of the Bureau of Public Roads to the new Secretary of Transportation. Under existing conditions, the Bureau of Public Roads has done an enviable job of directing our programs of interstate and Federal aid primary and secondary highway programs. There has been excellent Federal-State cooperation. I feel the proposed reorganization plan could curtail our progress in this area considerably and, therefore, feel that further consideration shoud be given to the possibility of transferring, if at all, the powers and functions of the Bureau of Public Roads to the new Department as it is now structured, and as a legal entity.

Mr. President, I have mentioned only a few of the more prominent questions which have come to mind in regard to S. 3010. I feel that these questions point out the great responsibility of Congress to be very cautious before approving this recommendation to create a new Department of Transportation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **McCARTHY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CASE AGAINST A TAX INCREASE

Mr. **McCARTHY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "The Case Against a Tax Increase," written by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., and published in the New Republic on April 2, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE AGAINST A TAX INCREASE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Nearly 2 years ago in this journal, at a time when men of good will were worried to the point of despair about automation, the flood of teenagers into the labor market and the supposed disappearance of jobs for the unskilled, and when unemployment was 5.5 percent, I was lucky enough to write: "My proposition * * * is that general fiscal and monetary measures of the Government to expand total demand * * * will all by themselves solve the unemployment problem. And by solve it I mean reduce unemployment, by our normal statistical definitions, to 3.5 percent or less of the labor force in 2 or 3 years." Reaction of readers was almost uniformly disbelieving.

In the intervening time, spurred by measures such as the 1964 tax cut, aggregate demand has risen by just under $50 billion a year, a rattling big increase. The war in Vietnam has helped it rise faster in the past 9 months than it would have risen otherwise, but up to now this extra effect of defense spending has been small—an annual rate of $5 billion at most, in a $700 billion economy. Presumably nearly everybody now agrees that demand is the main cure for unemployment, and among the "everybody" are Sargent Shriver and Willard Wirtz. Unemployment, at this writing, is 3.7 percent of the labor force and heading down, and the biggest growth in jobs for nearly 2 years has been among the relatively unskilled. Negroes have benefited at least as much as whites.

But now there arises a serious question. Granted that the old worries about automation and chronic unemployment are out of date for all but a tiny fraction of our working-age people, whose problems the Government is trying to tackle, there remains the issue of whether we can safely press on to drive unemployment well below 3.7 or even 3.5 percent, and by the same method as before: expansion of aggregate demand.

The question arises because that is precisely the direction in which we are heading. Can we let 'er rip some more without a damaging and dangerous inflation? If the Government does nothing to brake demand, we will move to even lower levels of unemployment. The issue is no longer whether we can get lower unemployment from expanding demand, but whether we should. The following argument that we should do so—that we should let 'er rip a while longer—is made with far less assurance than the argument of 2 years ago. But it seems to me worth making because now, once again, the conventional wisdom (even among economists this time, in contrast with the earlier period) is saying that we cannot safely do so.

Thus, this is the case against a tax increase. It is the case against braking demand and the boom itself. It is the case in favor of going for broke—for an unemployment level of 3 percent, or even possibly less. It is a gambler's case, for it has risks.

The case is in four parts.

First, we can drive the economy harder because Americans can get an astonishing amount out of bailing wire on the old machine or a day's work out of a dropout. This country can produce more, and employ more, and thereby make supply rise to meet demand.

There are, after all, still 3 million unemployed (even if most now have not been unemployed for long)—and two-thirds of them have some previous work experience. There is, granting the grave deficiencies of the statistic, about 8 percent of industrial capacity not working, on the average, though there are differences among industries. Salesmen for chemical products, books, drugs, tractors, and a host of other things are still on the road looking for orders. The admen are still trying to sell a few more Buicks and stainless-steel blades. Prices are actually going down for many manmade fibers, and there is certainly no scarcity of toasters or transistor radios, let alone cars.

In a word, this country's capacity to produce is not exhausted. To drive the economy harder means more jobs, not actual shortages of anything that matters. If rising demand brings forth more supply, inflation will not be serious. Every additional point on the industrial-production index now means several score thousand jobs. Why not see whether the alleged "hard core" unemployment is really so hard core? We got down to 2.5 percent unemployment in the Korean war because the war pushed us into an expansionary policy. Why not try again, even if the war in Vietnam ends? The fiscal and monetary tools are there, war or no war. We shall never know how hard we can push this economy without serious inflation until we try.

Second, there is the matter of "restraint"—otherwise known as guideposts. Here the real world is remarkably different from the public image, but in two contrasting ways.

It is entirely true, as critics of the Government's anti-inflationary guideposts have contended, that they have no application at all to a tremendous number of prices and wages in the economy, probably the big majority.

Ask Armour or Swift, or their dozens of smaller competitors, whether the guideposts could possibly govern meat prices. Ask a drug or supermarket chain or a bank whether guideposts influence the wages of their counter clerks. Ask a steel scrap dealer or a merchant in cattle hides whether the guideposts have anything to do with the prices they get.

LABOR AND THE GUIDEPOSTS

As George Meany huffs and puffs about the inequity of the guideposts for labor—with considerable justification, because the 3.2 percent figure for wage increases can be fair only if average consumer prices do not rise at all, and of course prices do rise—he understandably neglects to mention that organized labor does not set wage levels. Less than one-fourth of the labor force is unionized. The newspaper front pages, when they discuss union attitudes toward the guideposts, discuss something of less than earthshaking importance. Most wages in this country are in fact set in the classic marketplace, and nonunion wages are now probably rising faster than union wages.

And yet with all that said, the critics do not do the guideposts full justice. For the guideposts have changed human attitudes in some specific situations, and thus they have kept wages and prices here and there lower than they otherwise would have been.

With almost no notice, the unions of Federal Government employees have accepted a guidepost award this year. There is no doubt that last year's fairly moderate steel settlement was made possible because the guideposts gave a figure the government intervenors use. Steel, aluminum, newsprint and cigarette prices have gone up less, because of the guideposts, than they would have gone up 10 years ago. Although no one can prove the case, it is the pragmatic guess of this writer that even the construction unions, despite their words, will in fact settle for somewhat smaller gains (though still, of course, in excess of the guideposts) this year, just because of the existence of a somewhat organized public opinion.

In short, "restraint"—i.e., guideposts—will have some moderating influence where men, rather than pure economic forces, have an influence over decisions. The effect will be modest, but it will exist. To the extent it exists, it makes safer a policy of driving the economy harder.

Third, there is the issue of how much inflation we can tolerate. Dropouts will be employed, bailing wire will keep machines going, and Roger Blough of United States Steel will act the statesman. But still prices will rise if we drive the economy as we are doing. They have risen already. How much is too much?

I do not know. I suggest, however, that we can tolerate a price rise on the order of 3 percent or even 4 percent over a short period of about 1 year if that rate of price increase does not last.

Germany, France, Sweden, and Holland have done so without grave difficulty, for more than a year. All have driven unemployment well below our levels. Britain has done so too. But Britain is in trouble and the others are not. The reason, of course, is that mysterious thing called the balance of payments.

The argument here could go on forever. Briefly, my contention is that the American balance of payments, and in particular our trade surplus, is far more immune from price and even wage movements than those of European nations.

We export only 4 percent of our total output of goods and services, far less than any European country, and a moderate upward change in our price level is unlikely to have any big impact on our share of the world market (just as our recent price stability by comparison with our competitors has not increased our market share).

In Britain, a higher level of wages or prices, or both, matters a great deal to the maintenance of the value of the nation's currency vis-a-vis others; I seriously doubt that this is so in the case of the United States, within the limits we are talking about. Caterpillar Tractor machines will continue to be sold abroad because of quality, not price. Our gold loss will not increase, and the dollar will certainly not be devalued, if our price rise hits even 4 percent for a while.

Apart from the balance of payments, there is of course the argument that inflation is unjust. It is. I am simply suggesting that unemployment—even if now it is not as long term as it was and is very low among family breadwinners—is more unjust. Economists rightly talk of the "tradeoff" between so much inflation versus so much less unemployment. Fair enough. I am choosing lower unemployment and accepting somewhat more inflation, though as argued above, I doubt that the inflation will be as bad as the worriers fear.

Fourth and last, there is the problem of "overbraking." All of us are agreed on one thing: we want the expansion to continue and to avoid a recession. Those who favor applying the brakes do so, in complete good faith, on the ground that this will prolong, not shorten, the expansion. However, for better or worse, we are already using the brake of a tighter monetary policy, whose effects are likely to be powerful later this year. In addition, the normal growth of our tax revenues, plus another social security tax increase next January, will move fiscal policy in the direction of restraint early next year. Thus, a tax increase request now, allowing for the fact that it could not be in effect before June or July at the earliest, might well "bite" at just the wrong time, when the economy was ready to slow down of its own accord.

This is no more than a statement of a risk. The other side claims the greater risk to sustained prosperity is to let inflationary pressure mount, for there will be an inevitable postinflation recession. No man can say for certain which view is right. But it is worth pointing out that the boom is good for us, not bad; a hangover is not inevitable; perhaps we should hold our fire at least until we see the bloodshot in its eyes. As President Johnson has pointed out, not all the economic indicators even now are screaming "inflation."

Once again the case comes down to a gamble: Why not go for broke? Has anybody noticed that there are no riots in Cleveland or Detroit lately, or in West Virginia, or even in Newark or Harlem? Full employment does not solve everything, but it solves some things. Maybe if we let 'er rip, even people in Watts will find ways to get to work.

Nobody wants to exceed the speed limit. But slow drivers can be dangerous, too. Until we know what the speed limit is, why not test it? Other countries have achieved genuinely full employment. Why not us?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Mr. Dale specializes in economic affairs. I think it is important to make known the views of men like Mr. Dale and others who are challenging what seems to be a rather popular position now, that of advocating a tax increase, supposedly in the face of a serious threat of inflation, a threat which, in my judgment, does not exist.

A number of economists seem to have panicked on the basis of their reading of some of the indices, partly because they are seriously disturbed and partly also because there is a tendency on their part to give up that old saw in business cycles, which has been repeated for the last 40 years, that there must be a recession after a period of prosperity. This theory is so clearly imbedded in the minds of some and so clearly written into the doctrines of the various departments of economics that, although the situation does look encouraging, they are inclined to go back to the old judgments and principles and begin to worry in public when perhaps they should not be worrying.

The case made by Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., is of such importance that Members of Congress and Treasury Department officials should examine it closely. I hope that after some of the economists read the article, they might give some second thought to the matter and express themselves in public.

WAGE AND PRICE GUIDEPOSTS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Wage and Price Guideposts," writen by James Kuhn and Maurice Wilkinson, and published in the Christianity and Crisis magazine on April 4, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAGE AND PRICE GUIDEPOSTS: THEY ARE TOO ABSTRACT AND SIMPLE FOR PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION

(By James Kuhn and Maurice Wilkinson)

(NOTE.—James Kuhn and Maurice Wilkinson both teach at the Graduate School of Business of Columbia University. A member of the editorial board, Dr. Kuhn is the author of "Manpower and Nuclear Technology" (Columbia), which has just been published. Dr. Wilkinson recently completed a major study of demographic change and economic growth in Sweden.)

The Johnson administration's antidote for inflation—wage and price guideposts—is meeting with strong resistance from two groups that rarely agree. Not without reason, both businessmen and labor leaders have attacked the Government's policy in recent months.

The editors of the Wall Street Journal, reflecting the criticism of the business community, have denounced the guideposts in strong words: "Inevitably the result is to distort the working of the free market, encouraging the misallocation of the Nation's resources of materials and manpower." And again, "The guideposts are bad enough in theory. Tied to practical politics, they are in danger of guiding the Nation to a controlled economy."

The executive council of the AFL–CIO has denounced them with the same sharpness. It accuses the President's Council of Economic Advisers of helping to accelerate the shift of income from wage earners to other groups, and of adding to an "imbalance that can undermine healthy economic growth * * *. [It] views wages only as a cost of doing business and not as a source of income for people. As a result the Council is sitting on the employer's side of the bargaining table."

So contentious a policy when defended and pursued by a politically astute President deserves careful examination and consideration by the public. What are the guideposts, and how were they established? How are they supposed to defend the economy against inflation? How do they affect labor and business? And, finally, how effective are they are anti-infationary devices?

When President Kennedy's economic advisers first proposed the guideposts in 1962, they offered them simply as a "contribution to a discussion" of how the public might judge whether wage-price decisions made by large, powerful businesses and well-organized unions served the national interest. They suggested that economy-wide productivity (annual rates of growth of output per man-hour) might be a guide for appraising wage and price increases. Assuming no change in the relative shares of income of labor and business, they proposed two different guides—one for wages and one for prices.

Wage (and fringe) increases would be judged noninflationary as long as they did not exceed the trend increase of economy-wide productivity, no matter what the productivity of a particular industry. This guidepost was simple and direct: all wages could be measured against a single figure. The guide for prices was more complex. It indicated a price cut where an industry's productivity surpassed that of the economywide trend, a price rise if an industry's productivity fell below the overall rate, and stable prices if the industry productivity matched the economy's.

In the years since 1962 journalists and even administration spokesmen have largely ignored the complexity of the price formula, simplifying it to a plea for stable prices in an industry or, more usually, an acceptance of "modest" price increases. As will be shown later, such popular misinterpretations and the administration's failure to correct them have antagonized labor and called into question any claims of equity that the advocates of the guides might have made.

The Council originally was well aware of many of the difficulties and problems in using its guideposts as national policy. They recognized that there was no "meeting of minds about the appropriate methods of measuring the trend rate of increase in productivity" in industry as a whole or for individual industries. They warned that the subject was "large and complex" with "much still to be learned." They also realized that circumstances of particular workers and industries would require modifications of, and exceptions to, these standards.

THE TENTATIVE BECOMES POLICY

Despite the tentativeness of the original proposal, its admitted weaknesses and exceptions and the criticisms from business and labor, it began to evolve into a national policy. In 1963 the Council restated the guideposts with the disclaimer that "they cannot, and should not, replace the normal processes of free private decisions and negotiations." In the Council's view, however, they could enlighten "public understanding of the nature and causes of inflation" and "would be an additional force minimizing any inflationary threats in the years ahead." By 1964 the Council was offering them as much more than a mere contribution to discussion. It was now by its own admission ready to seize every "opportunity to advise and inform the public" regarding wage and price decisions.

The Council boldly claimed in 1965 that the guideposts were designed "to deal with the problem of (reconciling) noninflationary price and wage behavior under prosperous conditions * * *. [They] offer a standard for responsible business, labor and government leadership in an environment of informed public opinion." For the first time it also provided a figure for trend productivity: 3.2 percent. Against this figure all wage settlements could be measured; significantly missing from public discussion, though, were any data on industry productivity, without which price guides could hardly be established.

Though the Council had earlier admitted much was yet to be learned about productivity data, and though it never disclosed its calculations of the price standards, the administration began to enforce these standards. The President used them in judging the steel wage settlement; in last October's confrontation with the managers of the steel and aluminum industries over price increases he appealed to them; and in persuading Congress to cut its proposed pay increases for civil servants he argued that they must be respected.

Thus, the discussion of 4 years ago had become policy. The Council noted in its January economic report that the actions taken over the preceding 12 months "clearly reaffirmed the administration's strong commitment to the guideposts as an essential pillar for price stability." Through restatement, reiteration, and expansion of a tentative proposal, economic experts in the executive branch have, with Presidential approval, created a national wage and price policy.

The rationale of the policy cannot be understood unless one examines the Council's analytical framework. In its restatement of the guideposts this year, it wrote:

"Most earlier periods of high employment since World War II have been accompanied by inflation. In some of those years the cause clearly was excessive demand. In other years no general excess of demand was evident, yet prices continued to creep upward. The movement continued even during some periods in which—on any reasonable criterion—overall demand was quite inadequate. The exact diagnosis remains a matter of some disagreement among economists. But almost all agree that an important part of the explanation lies in the fact that, in many industries, unions or managements, or both, possess considerable discretionary power to set wages and prices in ways not consistent with basic supply and demand forces in the market."

The numerous antitrust suits in recent years and the frequent conviction of business managers of our largest firms for rigging prices are only one kind of evidence that price-setting responds to something other than merely the competitive market. Quite as obviously, some unions, such as the steelworkers in the fifties, secured wage gains unattainable except for their strong bargaining position.

The Council thus sees the problem as keeping business and unions from pushing the economy into an inflation through administered prices and negotiated wages. It has little faith in general fiscal and monetary policies halting this kind of inflation, however useful they may be for containing inflation due to excess demand. The inflation that the Council asserts we face is caused by price and wage increases in a few concentrated sectors of the economy. Remedies such as general tax increases, cutbacks in total Government spending, or overall tightening of credit do not directly and specifically strike at the causes; they merely slow down the whole economy without having a direct impact on the particular wages and prices in question.

In the Council's judgment, traditional monetary and fiscal tools can control administered-price inflation only at the cost of significant unemployed labor and capital. Unemployment rates in excess 5 to 8 percent may be required to prevent increases in money wages. Excess plant capacity would also be required to restrain rises in the price of goods.

QUESTIONABLE ASSUMPTIONS

The Council's point of view, however, is subject to criticism. The two basic assumptions that underlie its position are not generally acceptable to all economists. First, the assumption that the economy is so noncompetitive that inflation is likely to have its source in labor and management decisions has not been demonstrated on either a theoretical or empirical basis to the satisfaction of the majority of economists. More important, no economist has succeeded in providing a technique for identifying administered price inflation. Thus if the Council cannot differentiate the source of the inflation with any great degree of confidence, is it justified in applying a selective policy tool that is designed to combat only one possible source of inflation?

The second questionable assumption is the need to halt moderate inflations. This involves not only the analysis of the consequences of inflation for continued economic expansion but also the value system of American society. Economists are divided in their opinions regarding the effect of moderate inflations on investment and possible recessions. And our society may be just as divided over the desirability of incurring a moderate amount of inflation for the sake of a reduction in unemployment. Of course, the Council intends to eliminate the need for Americans to make the latter choice by seeking a policy that will render compatible the goals of full employment and price stability.

Nationwide compliance with the guideposts would by definition guarantee stability in the general price level. But how are the indicated wage and price changes related to the actual changes in a competitive market economy? That is, do economic theory and the past performance of the American economy (as it undertook the resource allocation function) provide any support for the guideposts?

An examination of the relationship between wages, prices, and productivity in a competitive economy suggests that in the long run they have behaved much as economic theory predicts they should. Industry prices have moved inversely to industry productivity. Prices of goods produced by industries with a productivity greater than the national average have fallen; by and large, the greater the rise of productivity, the greater the fall in prices. Industries with a smaller than average productivity gain have tended to raise their prices. Real wages generally have increased in both high and low productivity industries at the same average rate of about 2.4 percent per year. The guidepost policy is, therefore, attempting to simulate the operation of a free market economy by Government injunction.

The analysis underlying the guidepost policy, however, is far too simple to constitute a national wage and price policy. It is, first of all, merely a technical and theoretical examination of a few variables to which the economy responds. While the direction in which industry prices and wages move may match the long-run trends, the size of the change is also crucial if the market is not to be obstructed in an important function, that of allocating resources.

In the short run, wages and productivity have typically fluctuated more or less independently, and the inverse movement of prices and productivity has by no means been consistent. Wages and prices seldom respond directly and immediately to variations in productivity within a firm or an industry, let alone in the nation. Any short-term movements that coincide with changes in the national productivity trend are sheer happenstance. Wages and prices must and do respond to a variety of forces that play upon the market: the weather, enactment of new laws, Government programs, and expenditures, strikes, impact of foreign trade, new uses of labor, inventions and innovations, shifts in taste and demand, and adjustments in the quality of labor. While over-all productivity increases may ultimately influence and even set limits to fluctuations, they require no close correspondence at any one time.

INEQUITABLE ENFORCEMENT

The Council's analysis is inadequate to sustain a national policy also because it tries to reduce or escape issues of justice and equity—values—by pretending it is dealing only with technical matters through neutral techniques. It assumes that it has rendered "expert" and, therefore unbiased judgments on the most contentious, prickly and interest-laden issue in a business society. No greater constellation of powerful and vital interests can be found than those affected by the guideposts, for wage and price decisions influence jobs, investments, profits, costs and the distribution of income.

Surely only single-minded economic technicians could seriously expect a lone, abstract, technical concept such as productivity to govern such an array of interests. Further, only naive experts would assert, as the Council did in January, that "public policy is and should remain neutral with respect to wage and price decisions that attempt to change the distribution of industry's income between labor and capital."

Neutrality has hardly governed enforcement of the guideposts. The administration's economic power is a subtle influence compounded of varying measures of prestige, respect, political rewards and penalties, and the ability of officials to activate market pressures. The latter may well be the most important. Thus the opportunistic use of available power, not neutrality, determines the use of guideposts.

If the guideposts are not voluntarily followed, the Council, with small staff and limited resources, must choose carefully its attempts at enforcement. Clearly the relatively few, large firms in the steel industry and the big United Steelworkers of America present a more attractive target for regulation than the construction industry, which is fragmented into thousands of widely scattered firms and more than a dozen major unions.

Steel prices and wages, for example, have received much of the Council's and the President's attention. Last year they insisted that wage increases for the half-million workers be held to 3.2 percent (computed over the 39-month period of the agreement). More recently they forcefully interfered to restrain the industry's attempt to raise prices. After trying for an increase twice as large, the steel firms agreed to a Council suggestion that an increase of $2.75 a ton was desirable.

In contrast the construction industry, which provides jobs for over three million men (six times the number in steel), has not been touched by Government action. Though wages rose by over 4 percent in 1965, and some workers negotiated increases up to 15 percent, the Council has found no effective way to apply the guideposts. Even though the Government will spend nearly $9 billion on public-works construction this year, the projects are so decentralized and the wage and price decisions made at such a local level that enforcement of the guideposts is nearly impossible.

One can understand why the administration "guides" the steel industry but does not act in construction. To lend credibility to its policy it must seek enforcement where success is more likely. But to pretend that it chooses its targets impartially and applies its guideposts equitably fools no one, unless the Council members are fooling themselves.

The administration has enforced its policy upon other industries for reasons that appear to have little to do with their "key" position. Holding large stockpiles of aluminum, copper, and a hundred other products ranging from uranium to duckfeathers, it is in a powerful bargaining position, as Alcoa and others found when the President made use of it. Lacking any stockpile of aluminum workers, though, he notably did not try to enforce the guideposts when the union won a wage increase larger than the guideposts allowed. The threat of dumping the stockpiles to prevent price increases was effective, to be sure, but it also introduced another element of arbitrariness and capriciousness into the enforcement since the Government does not stockpile the products of all key industries. The inequities that result when some important industries are bound to the guideposts while others are not outrage the sense of justice of businessmen and unionists; they may also misallocate resources and distort the patterns of investment.

More serious than the arbitrary, opportunistic appeals to the guidepost policy has been the administration's inability or unwillingness to seek price cuts where industry productivity exceeds the national trend. Last year, according to Council statistics, labor costs per unit of production declined in manufacturing by 0.8 percent but prices did not drop. The declining unit labor costs, accompanied in some cases by rising prices, enabled many business firms to record generous profits. Average earnings for the 500 largest industrial corporations rose 16 percent in 1965, ranging from 5.9 percent for steel to 38.9 percent for airlines (only shiplines declined). General Motors alone showed profits of $2.1 billion, an increase of 23 percent. The Council in 1964 called attention to the problems that would result from a failure to cut prices. "Such profits become highly visible to the public and constitute a lure for strongly intensified wage demands."

Workers or dissident opposition groups within unions want to know why they should not enjoy more of the fruits of good times and the productivity gains accruing to stockholders. For instance, negotiators for the auto workers will surely aim for wage increases greater than 3.2 percent. Invidious comparisons will drive unions that abided by the guides to bargain for larger, matching increases. The guideposts may then become only silent markers of a dead policy.

Should the administration succeed in tying forthcoming wage increases to the guideposts despite the attractive pull of soaring profits, unions could still find ways to escape. As they have done in previous periods of wage restraints, they would negotiate productivity, piece-rate or incentive provisions that allow workers to earn bonuses for extra work. Though rates might remain firmly tied to the guideposts, earnings would be free to roam—and rise—depending upon how loosely the provisions were drawn and administered. Or, alternatively, management might find it expedient to stay formally within the wage guides but to begin to upgrade workers to higher paying classifications.

Finally, the guideposts are now essentially a selective tool in danger of becoming corrupted. The method of calculating them was changed by the Council in January 1966 because it gave the wrong answer. Retention of the old method of calculating national trend productivity (a 5-year moving average of the annual change in output per man-hour) would have resulted in a figure of 3.6 percent. The Council switched to an unidentified method without really explaining why the old one was no longer applicable. It was unwilling to admit that no economist knows how to calculate the trend level of productivity that the economy can sustain with full employment and price stability. If the guideposts were initially devised to assist the public in evaluating wage and price changes, what will the public use to judge changing guidepost calculations by the administration?

We conclude that the guideposts have considerable merit in that they recognize the need for responsible decisionmaking by those who possess economic power. Unfortunately the President's Council has not limited them to this purpose but has made them into an operating policy of government. They rest on too abstract and too simple assumptions to carry the load of practical implementation. In addition, the Council seems unaware that the guideposts are not value free, that in their actual, selective effect they inevitably play with the interests and welfare of labor and business. Small wonder, therefore, that both are united in their criticism and opposition to the policy.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, James Kuhn and Maurice Wilkinson, both of whom teach at the Graduate School of Business of Columbia University, have raised some significant questions concerning the wage and guideposts which are now in effect and some other questions in the area of economics relating to the basis upon which these guidelines or guideposts supposedly have been established and are being applied.

Their conclusion is that the guideposts have considerable merit in that they recognize the need for responsible decisionmaking by those who possess economic power. Unfortunately, the President's Council has not limited them to this purpose, but has made them into an operating policy of government, without authority from Congress. They rest on too-abstract and too-simple assumptions to carry the load of practical implementation. In addition, the Council seems unaware that the guideposts are not value free, that in their actual, selective effort they inevitably play with the interests and welfare of labor and business. Small wonder, therefore, that both are united in their criticism and opposition to the policy.

It is time for Congress to examine the manner in which the wage and guideposts are established and applied. It is my judgment that, if they are to be effective in the direction of the control of American economy, there should be legislative action on the part of Congress.

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF WATER RESEARCH

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 22) to promote a more adequate national program of water research, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 200 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 331, 42 U.S.C. 1961b) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 200. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, $6,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971, and $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1972-1976, inclusive, from which appropriations the Secretary may make grants to and finance contracts and matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations or other institutions, with private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are, in his judgment, adequate for the conduct of water research projects, and with local, State, and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior which he may deem desirable and which are not otherwise being studied.

"(b) No grant shall be made, no contract shall be executed, and no matching or other arrangement shall be entered into under subsection (a) of this section prior to sixty calendar days from the date the same is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and said sixty calendar days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die."

SEC. 2. The last paragraph of section 104 of said Act is hereby repealed and a new section 307 is added to that Act reading as follows:

"SEC. 307. The Secretary shall make a report to the President and Congress on or before March 1 of each year showing the disposition during the preceding calendar year of moneys appropriated to carry out this Act, the results expected to be accomplished through projects financed during that year under sections 101 and 200 of this Act, and the conclusions reached in or other results achieved by those projects which were completed during that year. The report shall also include an account of the work of all institutes financed under section 100 of this Act and indicate whether any portion of an allotment to any State was withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor."

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

STATE AND MUNICIPAL BOND WEEK—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 837

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 837, authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Bond Week."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 837) to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Bond Week," which was read twice by its title.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, municipal bonds must be issued to finance many facilities. Unlike the Federal Government, local governments cannot collect enough tax revenues to treat their capital outlays as current expenses and pay for all buildings in the year when the work is put in place.

The municipal bond is the most democratic of all financial instruments. The bonds are issued only after approval by voters who have considered the taxes they will have to pay, or the other revenues that will have to be obtained to meet the scheduled principal and interest payments.

I favor asking the President to proclaim "State and Municipal Bond Week" for the week beginning April 17, so that the public may be reminded of the continuing benefits to community life and employment which these securities make possible, and may be reminded of the privilege to participate in municipal bond elections and of their opportunity to manage their own investment funds well for the benefit of their communities.

Madam President, I ask for immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 837.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OUR WATER RESOURCES—BUDGET PROPOSALS TO DRASTICALLY REDUCE SMALL WATERSHED WORK IN FISCAL 1967

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, for many years in this body, and before that, in the House, I have supported in every possible way measures to develop and strengthen the water resources of this Nation.

I am proud of my advocacy of this cause, which I consider to be second to none of the needs of our time, and I am equally proud of the magnificent progress we have made, particularly in flood control and navigation in our major river basins.

The people of my State, and of her neighboring States in the South and in other major areas of this great Nation, have greatly benefited from these vast works of improvement, and although much remains to be done, we can say, at this date, that we are well along with the development of our major river basins.

There remains, however, an important and integral part of our overall water resources job that is not receiving proper emphasis and adequate support. I refer to the small watershed program, authorized by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, in 1954.

This program, which grew out of the Omnibus Flood Control Act of 1936, the Flood Control Act of 1944, and the pilot watershed program of 1953, has proved its worth in more than 700 communities in the past 10 years. The Congress has amended the original authorization several times to broaden the purposes and strengthen the program.

By any test that can be applied, this program has been highly successful. It has reduced flood and sediment damages by millions of dollars. It has supplied water to many towns and industries. It has provided for recreational benefits and fish and wildlife development. It has brought sizable economic benefits to hundreds of communities across the land. It ties in perfectly with our major works of improvement in the major river basins. It supplements these programs. It does not duplicate them, or overlap them.

The small watershed program has proved to be perhaps the most popular program of its kind in our history.

Consequently, I am disturbed to note that the budget items pertaining to this program, to be found in the estimates for the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, call for a drastic reduction in small watershed work.

It is difficult, indeed, to understand why the budget proposes to limit new watershed project starts in 1967 to a mere 35 for the entire country. This is an average of less than 1 for each State. The current rate of new starts is 80 per year, and it is hardly adequate—certainly not in the light of the demand for assistance from the responsible local organizations that initiate these projects and help pay for them, and operate and manage them.

In my own State of Arkansas, for example, the local people are ready to start 10 new watershed projects in fiscal year 1967. If the limitation of 35 for the Nation is permitted to stand, practically all these projects will be delayed. This would be a tragic mistake, not only for my State, but also for many areas in many States where the people are ready and able to go ahead with their own plans, and are ready to pay their share of the cost.

The proposed limitation is unsound. It will delay action in our total water resources program on which we are many years behind as it is.

Equally unwise is the budget proposal to limit watershed project planning authorizations to 50 in the next fiscal year. This will build up still more the sizable backlog of communities awaiting planning assistance and dishearten people who already have waited too long.

Madam President, the Senate should concern itself with this matter.

It is too important, too necessary to maintaining and strengthening our economy to be set aside for other things. These multipurpose small watershed projects are investments and not expenditures.

Have the American people ever been offered a better bargain? I doubt it.

To take full advantage of this bargain, this opportunity to invest in the welfare and prosperity of several thousand American communities—and thereby in all of America—is the challenge.

The challenge is bigger today than it has been before. For we have in motion a great program that must maintain momentum. We dare not let it slow down or stand still. Our land and water resources are the foundation blocks on which this great Nation has been built and will continue to serve as the basis for our future dynamic growth and development.

In a letter to the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies, I have expressed my concern for an adequate appropriation for the items about which I have spoken today. I am confident that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and, indeed, all Senators, as they become aware of the problem, will support my appeal for these changes in the fiscal year 1967 budget.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK TOMORROW MORNING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966—COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 220) to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 transmitted to the Congress by the President on February 10, 1966.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending measure occur at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, with the time between 11 o'clock and 12 o'clock noon to be equally divided between the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Madam President, let me say that the morning hour will come right after conclusion of the vote tomorrow, if there is a desire for one.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That the Senate proceed to vote on Senate Resolution 220, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, at 12 o'clock noon, Wednesday, April 6, 1966, and that the hour between 11 o'clock a.m. and the vote be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], respectively.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE INDIAN-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, the announcement last week that plans are well along for a foundation to advance the knowledge of science, industry, and agriculture in India is good news.

It is good news because it indicates that we have added another tool to the already extensive kit of tools that have been used in our AID program to help India increase its productivity and raise its standard of living.

It is good news, too, because the programs to be supported by this Indian version of the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations can be paid for out of Indian currencies owned by our Government without the need of draining off a single U.S. dollar. The Indian-American Foundation does not represent new aid. It will be a sensible use of the supply of Indian rupees we have accumulated by selling our surplus crops under the food-for-peace program.

India can be the key to longrun stability and economic growth in south Asia. Since 1951, India's 5-year plans have sought with considerable success to raise the standard of living of its people, and accelerate its agricultural and industrial production to achieve self-sustaining growth.

India's location, economic potential, size, accomplishments in self-help, and strategic importance to the free world have combined to make India the largest recipient of U.S. economic assistance.

India has set firm objectives, and has shown the determination to work to achieve these goals. The country now finances about 80 percent of the cost of development activities from its own scarce domestic resources.

There is much yet to be done.

India has the most extensive irrigation system in the world—but still is plagued by problems of water supply.

Eighty percent of India's people make their living from agriculture—but in many places primitive farming methods are still in use.

India has vast herds of cattle, but inferior stock raising techniques detract from their economic value.

Some fine universities and centers of learning are located in India, but only 25 percent of the people can read and write. English is the official language, but some 200 languages are spoken within her borders.

In India, transportation and communications are fully developed only around the edges. There are more than 40,000 miles of railroads, but the rails are not of uniform gage.

The culture of India is among the most ancient among nations, but until recently oncoming generations could look forward only to a poverty-stricken life of toil.

The power to overcome these problems will come from extending knowledge and breaking bottlenecks in the educational process—and this is what the Indian-American Foundation will seek to do.

I know that many able men both in and out of the Congress have brought the plans for this Foundation to fruition. They deserve the commendation and gratitude of this body for having hit upon a plan that can do so much to help India achieve self-sustaining economic growth in the framework of freedom.

Last week it was my honor and privilege, along with a number of other Senators, to be called by the President to the White House, to have him explain to us his plan for aiding India in the light of the present conditions of famine. To me, the plan urged by the President is wise and soundly conceived, and not a bit extravagant. Later we will be asked to approve food aid to India.

I recall that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] made an excellent speech on the subject of India on the floor last week. To my regret, I was not able to be present, but I have had an opportunity to read what he said. I see him present in the Chamber at this time. I commend him for the erudition and learning evidenced in that speech and his sympathetic attitude with regard to the very difficult problems of the Indian people.

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate the kind statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania about my remarks concerning the Republic of India made last Friday.

I take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania relative to the proposal which the President of the United States has made with respect to the use of the rupee accumulation which the United States has in India from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480.

I think the proposal of the President is ingenious and well thought out. It will not cost the taxpayers of the United States a single penny. It will utilize a vast resource of Indian currency, which has been lying idle and in effect losing value through inflation each year. It will utilize these funds in educational procedures and will be greatly beneficial to the Indian people and to the cause of democracy and free enterprise in India, and will add materially to the stabilization of conditions manifested by the recent disturbances in India.

I may add also that I do not think it is particularly helpful to have a great accumulation of one nation's currency by a foreign nation. Certainly, we would not like it if France or Great Britain in effect controlled one-third of the currency of the United States. I think the utilization of these funds can be made wisely and will prevent a source of friction between the two governments, and is a wise and thoughtful government policy.

I also would like to say that the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania are of great merit because of the importance of agricultural development in India. The new program of food for freedom stresses the need for development in India of her agricultural resources and potential. I think perhaps this is one of the gravest crises facing India.

I hope the Senate will act favorably on the legislation when it is reported to the Senate from the Agriculture Committee, hopefully tomorrow, or Thursday.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator believe that one of the grave problems confronting India in its efforts to raise sufficient food to take care of its many millions of people is some kind of workable system of population control?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator is absolutely right. I think the two great problems facing the Republic of India are food production and population control. I know that Prime Minister Gandhi and the responsible leadership of the Indian Government recognize this problem well.

It is interesting to note that if the size of the Indian population had remained stable from the time of India's independence from Great Britain in 1947, India today would have the highest standard of living in all Asia. She would be exporting food. She would be helping substandard countries. There would be no need for us to help her with her food shortage. India must make progress in agriculture, industrial development, and power. The population of India has exploded so rapidly since 1947 that, in effect, the country has been running on a treadmill or has been going on an escalator marked "Down," while she is trying to go up.

Previously a family in India had to have 8 or 9 children in order to make sure that one would live. Today, when the parents have 8 or 9 children, perhaps 8 or 9 of them live. The result is that the population increase which is in effect constitutes one of India's great problems. I think, happily, the Indian people recognize it. The Government recognizes it. This is a program which, with assistance, according to optimistic Indian leaders, will result in reducing India's population rate by one-third in the next 10 years.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator knows that the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, is presently holding hearings on the Foreign Aid Act for the coming fiscal year. The Senator from Maryland has introduced a bill which, if enacted, would expand substantially assistance by the United States in the area of population control. I hope the Senator from Maryland will appear and testify before the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope that the program for IDA can be expedited and moved forward with more effectiveness, with respect to the problem of population control, in all underdeveloped countries. Real economic growth is being threatened by population growth. One of the questions involved is whether the present program of aid with respect to population control, particularly the determination of devices which will render population control more effective, should not be supplied by the U.S. Government. To amplify that statement, it is one of the principal areas where I believe we should be moving more effectively in various areas in an attempt to realize this Nation's plan to achieve a balance between those nations' gross national product and population which would promote an annual rate of growth.

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, as the President said last year in his state of the Union message to Congress, $1 of assistance given to an undeveloped country in the field of population control is worth $100 of material assistance in their aid program so far as help to an individual country is concerned.

I would hope that the Congress would adopt legislation along the lines I have proposed, in which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has pioneered for so many years, which would enable our aid program, if a nation requested it, to supplement or assist that nation's own voluntary population program, with whatever technical advice, assistance, medical supplies, and devices which that country might request.

I think it is important and my legislation spelled out that it would be a voluntary program.

But I think that when a nation, such as India, Indonesia, Pakistan, or any nation to which we supply aid, requests assistance in its population program, in family responsibility programs, and efforts to enable parents of their country to raise a family responsibly, we make a tragic error when we do not fill the vacuum, when we do not give all the assistance the country requests because it is in this field that we can make the greatest strides.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to express complete agreement with the Senator from Maryland, of whose bill I am a cosponsor. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

Mr. PEARSON. Madam President, in a speech in this Chamber on March 29, 1966, I proposed that the appropriate officials of the administration be invited to appear before an appropriate congressional committee to explain the administration's current policy of indirect price and wage controls.

I argued that this was necessary for two principal reasons. First, despite the fact that the administration is engaged in an extensive price-wage fixing, the full intentions of the administration have never been fully identified and the techniques have never been adequately explained. Indeed, the administration has deliberately attempted on numerous occasions to obscure from the American public its intentions and its methods.

Second, a policy of indirect price and wage controls is very likely to result in numerous inequities and various groups in our society are likely to be forced to make sacrifices not demanded of others.

Madam President, full and open debate on this extremely important public policy which affects the vital interest of every individual in the group can no longer be delayed. Therefore, I had delivered to Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, a letter requesting that this committee initiate hearings on the administration's indirect price and wage control policy.

This is the same procedure now being followed in the House of Representatives seeking to find some definition of not only policies but the methods.

Madam President, I want to emphasize that I am not calling for imposition of mandatory controls at this time, nor am I saying that indirect controls should never be used. However, I am saying, and most emphatically, that because the decision to engage in indirect price and wage controls constitutes the making of a public policy of greatest importance, these decisions and their justifications must be subject to free and open debate. The Congress must be provided with an adequate explanation from the administration and must have the opportunity to approve, or reject, or modify the operation of this policy.

Madam President, these are the facts. The administration has been applying price and wage controls without any expressed consent of the Congress, and it is applying these controls, as far as I can determine, without any standards or rules of Government intervention and without adequate consideration of their overall and selective economic impact.

In this connection it would appear that the only rule or guideline that the administration is using is simply to apply pressure at those points where its enormous powers can be used most effectively. Thus, prices in some industries and businesses have been rolled back while other prices have advanced rapidly. For example, while there have been price rollbacks in aluminum, copper, steel and cigarettes, there have been price advances in such key areas as chemicals, plastics, TV tubes, gasoline, newsprint, and rubber tires.

Some labor contracts have resulted in wage increases that are within the 3.2 percent productivity guideline while other wages have gone beyond this 3.2 percent increase.

In my statement of March 29, 1966, I expressed the concern that the administration's undercover war on inflation was resulting in economic inequities particularly in agricultural, and I identified several areas in which the administration had acted to force down farm prices.

Farm prices are, indeed, falling but there is absolutely no assurance that this is going to have any anti-inflation effect. Thus the result of these actions may well do nothing more than reduce the farmers' already slim margin of profit.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, apparently took pleasure last week in announcing the decline in farm prices. As William M. Blair reported in the New York Times of March 31, 1966:

> It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices.

I am just as concerned about inflation as Mr. Freeman, but I see nothing that is pleasing about the decline in farm prices. It is particularly disturbing to me that as farm prices are falling, the farmers' cost of production is rising. The Department of Agriculture report which showed a turndown in the prices received by the farmer also showed an increase in prices paid out by the farmer. Thus, the parity ratio dropped from 83 in February to 82 in March. The price cost squeeze on the farmer is cutting deeper and deeper.

Madam President, the farmers' economic position has been weakened and the Administration is confidently predicting that farm prices wil continue to fall. In an article published in the Washington Post of April 3, 1966, John Schnittker, Undersecretary of Agriculture, predicted that farm prices will drop another 10 percent in the near future.

The administration can make these predictions with confidence because it has the power to force such a rollback. But Madam President, the farmers and the Congress want to know if the administration can also keep the lid on prices paid by farmers and also if lower farm prices will ever mean lower retail food prices.

I see no evidence to date that suggests that either of these will occur. Mr. Freeman has expressed the hope that lower farm prices will be reflected in lower retail prices. But the experience of past history is not at all encouraging on this score.

Last Friday the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] expressed the belief that recent administration actions in milk price supports "have been carefully tailored not to assure fair returns to the farmer but to avoid any actual increase in consumer prices."

This appears to be the case not only in regard to milk but also in regard to other agricultural products. Farm prices are frozen or rolled back while farm costs continue to rise and consumer prices continue to move upward.

In my statement of March 29, 1966, I pointed out that the rollback in cattle hide prices did not prevent a subsequent increase in shoe prices. But several days after major shoe companies had announced major price increases the Secretary of Agriculture was quoted in the Christian Science Monitor of April 1, 1966, as saying "the housewife should be able to save on a pair of shoes as a result" of the administration's drastic export limitations on skins and hides. This is exactly the type of thing that makes it vitally important that the administration's indirect price and wage control policy be brought into the open and submitted to full and searching debate. The Congress must be an active participant in this debate. It is imperative, therefore, that congressional hearings be initiated as soon as possible.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERVIEW OF SENATOR CHURCH, OF IDAHO, ON AMERICAN BROADCASTING SYSTEM PROGRAM "FROM THE CAPITAL," FEBRUARY 7, 1966

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, during the recent hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Relations, several members of the committee showed a lively interest in the proceedings. One of the most attentive and discriminating of my colleagues has been the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church]. Many of his statements are already in the Record. I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of a television interview of Senator Church on February 7, on the American Broadcasting System, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Excerpts for the American Broadcasting System program "From the Capital," Feb. 7, 1966]

Guests: Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho.

Correspondents: Keith McBee and Irv Chapman.

Mr. McBee. Senator Church, what helpful things, affecting the Vietnam war, do you think can come out of this Honolulu conference.

Senator Church. I hope that greater emphasis will be given to the economic and political side of the war in Vietnam as a result of this conference. I think that an intensification of the war, given the circumstances, is also inevitable; but I would hope that it does not take the form of broadening the war front or widening the war front in Vietnam.

Mr. McBee. Does it not take some of the senatorial heat, and accompanying press coverage off of the administration at this particular time?

Senator Church. Well, it may have that effect for the next few days because naturally and properly, the President is the principal focus of the news, and the coverage he will receive in Hawaii will be very thorough and complete, but I think the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, which are meant to continue considerably beyond that time, will get the attention that they ought to get, and I am not concerned on that score.

Mr. Chapman. Senator Church, on his arrival in Honolulu the President said as part of his remarks, "There are special pleaders who counsel retreat in Vietnam, they belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope." Do you think this is the way the President regards his critics on Capitol Hill, you among them?

Senator Church. I would not think so, because I do not know of any here on Capitol Hill who have advocated retreat in Vietnam. If there are any, they are very few and far between, and I certainly am not one. He may have been referring to some of the demonstrators who have gone very far in protesting the war. I would think that he did not have in mind responsible critics, because if it were his purpose to silence responsible criticism, this would be the stifling of freedom right here in America, and I cannot imagine that the President would have anything like that in mind.

Mr. Chapman. Well, in answering reporters' questions at the White House, after he announced on Friday he was going to Honolulu, he seemed to refer to your hearings as "a show." Do you think the criticisms being made up here are falling on deaf ears?

Senator Church. I cannot say what the President's attitude may be in that respect. I should think, however, that he would be interested in the inquiry that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is making and that this would form a part of his continuing appraisal of the situation. I should not think that he would want to isolate himself in the White House with a certain coterie of handpicked advisers, all of whom reflect his own opinion about the war; and for that reason I would hope that he would give serious attention to these proceedings in the Senate committee, and any other proceedings here on Capitol Hill that are directed toward a thorough examination of the premises that underlie the war and the objective, the ultimate objective that we have in mind out there.

Mr. Chapman. Senator Church, do you think the President is carrying out what obligation he has, to answer these basic questions that are being raised himself, as opposed to making exhortatory speeches about the war effort?

Senator Church. I think that it is a part of the evil of war, I suppose you could say, that the further a country becomes embroiled, the greater the degree of emotion. It is natural enough, we have got 200,000 boys out there now and it is becoming increasingly difficult to take a dispassionate view of the war; and the larger the American military commitment becomes, the greater the danger becomes to the country; and the longer the casualty lists grow, the more difficult it will be to remain unemotional about the war. I should think this would be perhaps the highest responsibility of the Presidency; to set the tone that will permit us to continue to be objective and rational about American policy in Vietnam.

Mr. McBee. Senator Church, do you think that the President had any recourse, from a military standpoint, but to resume bombing North Vietnam?

Senator Church. I think that from a military standpoint the resumption may have been indicated. The question of how long the suspension should have been continued was not a military one but a diplomatic one. Obviously, the bombing has failed to achieve the military objectives that were once proclaimed for it. It has not cut off the continuing supply of the Vietcong from the North. It may have harassed the supply lines, but obviously they have continued and in fact the Vietcong has grown very much stronger during the period that the bombings have been underway, so that the military objectives of the bombing have not succeeded. I think that by reinstituting them we merely want to commence again the kind of harassment that makes the supply routes more dangerous and more difficult.

Mr. McBee. Well, is it because of the danger of Red China, do you think, that heavier bombardment is not being employed and populations are not being destroyed?

Senator Church. Well I think that there are several reasons for this. In the first place, North Vietnam is a rural country. We could strike the cities, we could destroy Hanoi, and we could destroy Haiphong, their major port. But if we destroyed their cities and all their industry this amounts to less than 10 percent of the total production of their economy, and the government in Hanoi could resort once again to the countryside and the resistance would continue, so this will not, I think break the back of Hanoi. It will not force them to the negotiating table. It will not accomplish what we hope to accomplish; namely, a political settlement of the war in Vietnam. On the other hand, it could intensify their determination to persist in the war, and it could, of course, increase the danger of a Chinese decision to come down. We have to remember, our memories are not to be so short as to lead us to forget our experience in Korea when the Chinese did come down after we had reached a certain point in the extension of that war northward toward the Chinese frontiers. I think there's a plate-glass window up there somewhere—we don't know exactly where it is, but if we continue to expand the dimension of the war northward, at some point we're going to break that window, and when we do, I think we can expect the Chinese to respond as they responded in Korea, when they poured down over the Yalu River with 600,000 men.

Mr. McBee. Senator, do you ever have a feeling that the inclination among some of the U.S. military now is to take on China now, to bring them in if possible, before they have atomic delivery capabilities?

Senator Church. Well, I would hope that this is not seriously intended by the military. I cannot say whether there is any advocacy within the military itself of such a policy. But I remember about 15 years ago when there was considerable argument on behalf of a preventive war against the Soviet Union, and it was said then that we will either have to fight the Soviet Union now or later, it is better to fight her now than later. I am glad that counsel did not prevail 15 years ago, and I think that the same counsel ought not to prevail now. I cannot imagine a war that would involve a greater tragedy for the United States, that would involve a larger number of casualties, and that in the end would lead to such frustration as a war with China. No nation in history has managed to conquer China, are we now going to undertake what all other countries have tried and failed to do for centuries and centuries in the past? People who think that a war against China will merely consist of sending a few bombing planes over and destroying her nuclear plants are just deceiving themselves and the country. That is just the opening overture in such a war. Eventually, the only way that China can be conquered is for land armies to invade and occupy China. This means conquering an area larger than any other in the world, save Russia; and a population of 750 million people in a body to body confrontation. Now, I do not know anything at the present that requires us to engage in such a holocaust, and I would certainly hope that rational leadership will prevail against any counsel, if it does exist, to extend this war in Asia to the point where we find ourselves engaged against China on the opposite side of the world. I cannot believe that this is intended by the administration, I am certain that the President is endeavoring in every way possible to keep the war in Vietnam within manageable limits.

Mr. Chapman. Senator Church, if our objective in Vietnam is a political settlement, could we promote that objective by recognizing Vietcong as an agent at the bargaining table?

Senator Church. I think that the only way we are likely to get to the bargaining table is by engaging the Vietcong directly in preliminary talks that might lead to a political settlement.

Mr. Chapman. Right now?

Senator Church. I think that the sooner that this is done, the better. I know of no war that has ever been settled without engaging the combatants, and obviously the Vietcong is the largest single element in South Vietnam against which our forces are now deployed.

Mr. Chapman. But the thing that we are fighting against is the domination of South Vietnam by the Vietcong. Now shouldn't any role for the Vietcong be a concession we make during the negotiating process and not in advance of it?

Senator Church. Of course, and I think that this country would oppose, and certainly I would oppose, any settlement that delivered over South Vietnam into the control of the Vietcong. I am merely saying that the Vietcong need to be engaged in conversations with other non-Communist elements in South Vietnam, looking toward the possibility of establishing some form of interim regime which would restore order and supervise the conduct of elections that could ultimately determine the political character of the regime in South Vietnam.

Mr. Chapman. Well, Hanoi is making this as a sticking point at this time, we must recognize the National Liberation Front, the Vietcong, as the spokesman for South Vietnam. Do you feel that if we did come some way toward it that Hanoi might not point some other sticking point because of their feeling that they can't conquer South Vietnam?

Senator Church. There is no assurance that the Communists will come to the bargaining table under any circumstances. But it would seem to me it would be unrealistic for the United States to overlook the people who are principally engaged in the war in South Vietnam against the Vietnamese that we support there. I do not think that the United States as a government can open up conversations with the Vietcong. But I do think that the Vietnamese who are involved against the Vietcong should be encouraged to open up conversations to determine whether or not some basis can be found for a political settlement in South Vietnam, which would of course be consistent with the commitment that we have made to the Saigon government. I think it is unrealistic to assume that we are likely to get to the conference table by going over the heads of the people who are themselves involved in the battle and who are each day dying in large numbers, and to assume a posture that permits us to talk only to some other government, whether it be Hanoi, or whether it be Peking, or Moscow. I think that is the least likely way to reach the conference table.

Mr. McBee. Do you think, sir, the Saigon government can talk independently to the Vietcong, apart from Hanoi?

Senator Church. I think that definitely, that there are non-Communist elements in South Vietnam that should be encourged to open up conversations, preliminary conversations, in the hope that this might lead to a more formal conference at which all elements could be represented. I should think that this might permit Hanoi then to back up the Vietcong, while we backed up the non-Communist elements and would put neither side in the position of appearing to be backtracking upon pledges made. The problem that we have in South Vietnam, our determination not to backtrack on our pledges, is similar in ways, I suspect, to pledges that it has made in support of the Vietcong. Therefore, the best way to reach a conference is to engage the fighting elements in the field. Suppose during our own revolutionary war that the British had taken the position that they would deal only with the French, and not talk at all with George Washington? The French had more troops at Yorktown than Washington had continentals. Obviously, it is not realistic to expect negotiations to commence which do not involve the principal participants in the fight. And yet, up till now this has been the American posture.

Mr. McBee. Do you think, sir, during President Johnson's peace offensive there was a serious breakdown or lack of liaison with Saigon? Marshal Ky said that certain of the military might attempt to overthrow him at any moment, there was very little notice given to the Saigon regime that the President was about to conduct this worldwide peace offensive.

Senator Church. Well, that I really am not competent to say. I do not know what notice was given to Saigon, I do know that the Saigon government is dependent entirely upon the United States for its sustenance, for a long time it depended utterly upon us for our money, now it depends on us for our men. If it must depend upon us to fight its war, then I think that we ought not to be handcuffed in our efforts to reach a satisfactory peace.

Mr. McBee. On the other hand, sir, might you infuriate the Saigon regime by treating them as something of a junior partner in their own country?

Senator Church. I am sure that the President has not done this, and the very fact that he is now conferring with the chiefs of the Saigon regime in Hawaii, confirms, I think, all of the recognition and all of the prestige that the President of the United States can give to this regime.

Mr. Chapman. Senator Church, I gather that your basic point of view on the way to settle the Vietnam war is attuned to your feeling that we have exaggerated the impact of communism within the revolution that is going on there, as elsewhere, and that we have really no right and certainly no wisdom to go in after every revolution, including this one, because there are Communist elements or even a possibility of Communist domination. Is that your point of view?

Senator Church. My point of view is this: I think that the United States has an interest in doing all that it can to discourage the spread of communism in the underdeveloped world. I think, however, that American military intervention more often than not may turn out to be less of a deterrent to the spread of communism than a stimulant.

Mr. Chapman. Is that true in Vietnam?

Senator Church. I am afraid in Vietnam that our decision to convert the war, more and more, into an American war, pitting hundreds of thousands of white Western troops, imported from the opposite side of the world, against Oriental troops in the Orient makes the war appear to many Asians to be an attempt on the part of a Western nation to reassert political control over the affairs of an Asian country. Now, we know this is not our intention. But the important question is: How do the Asians see it? And I am afraid that the reason that Mao Tse-tung is so much opposed to the settlement of this war and so anxious for the war to continue is not because he thinks that the Hanoi government can defeat the United States of America, but because he feels that the continuation of the war will assist China in her larger interests in Asia and will have more effect in spreading communism elsewhere in Asia than a negotiated settlement would have. I think it is a great misfortune that we did not better appreciate Mao Tse-tung's view of this war some years ago. I think he has ensnared us in a trap which he obviously feels serves China's interest. We must remember in this part of the world that after two centuries of colonial experience, the thing that is most feared by Asian people is Western imperialism, not communism as such; and in the lands that I have visited, many of the lands in this region of the world, it is capitalism, not communism that is the ugly word. Because they haven't known our kind of capitalism, they have only known the kind that was associated with their old colonial experience. So when we move into South Vietnam with a large Western army, this permits the Communists to say that the government we support is merely a puppet of Western imperialism. It permits China to pose in the role that she most wants to be accepted in among her Asian countries. Namely, the role of champion of Asia for the Asians. And it helps to identify communism with the one nationalist aspiration that dominates the feeling of most people in Asia, it helps to identify communism with the effort to expel Western imperialism or colonialism from Asia. Now that is a losing cause, I think, and that is the reason why Mao Tse-tung is so anxious to see this war continue.

Mr. Chapman. Senator Church, in a quarter of a minute, how do we prevent Thailand from becoming another Vietnam?

Senator Church. The best way is by not permitting the Thai Government to become accusable of being another puppet of the United States.

Mr. Chapman. Thank you for being with us on "From the Capital."

EDITORIAL COMMENT BY JOHN S. KNIGHT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that four excellent editorials written by the distinguished editor and publisher, Mr. John S. Knight, be printed at this point in the Record. Mr. Knight is one of the most experienced and knowledgeable observers of the American and world scenes today. He is also one of those unusual publishers who writes editorials which give to his newspapers an unusual interest and zest.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Feb. 13, 1966]

The Editor's Notebook: Nation Sees in Viet Policy Arbitrary Display of Power

(By John S. Knight)

It is often said that Lyndon Baines Johnson is a complex and baffling individual.

This understatement was never more clearly illustrated than in the President's actions of the last 2 weeks. Prior to the recent Honolulu Conference, Mr. Johnson was wooing the doves of peace by insisting that we wanted no more than an honorable truce in Vietnam.

The President also urged that the Vietnam war be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council for discussion and possible U.N. action.

By these moves, Mr. Johnson clarified our position and won world approval as he skillfully placed responsibility for continuance of the war on Hanoi and Peking.

Yet 1 week later, the scene was shifted and the President spoke from another stage.

This time he was in Honolulu where he assured Premier Nguyen Cao Ky and Chairman Nguyen Van Thieu that the United States is irrevocably committed both to the defense of South Vietnam and a social revolution designed to solve its problems of hunger, ignorance, and disease.

Furthermore, the U.S. military buildup in Vietnam will double this year and may increase to 600,000 in 1967.

"The road ahead," said the President, "may be long and difficult. But we shall prevail."

General Ky and his entourage were greatly encouraged by these pledges, as well they might be. They had succeeded beyond their most optimistic expectations.

So there you have it, stroking the ruffled feathers of the doves one week and sharpening the claws and beaks of the hawks on the next.

As James Reston has said so succinctly: "The President has recently been giving the impression that he is not following a clear strategic policy, but that he is thrashing about, rejecting peace offensives and then trying them, stopping bombing and then starting bombing, rejecting the U.N. and then appealing to the U.N., sending Vice President HUMPHREY to brief Asian leaders on the Honolulu conference which he did not attend—all in an atmosphere of restless experimentation and self-righteous condemnation of anybody who differs with him."

My own analysis is that President Johnson—ever the strong and prideful one—is showing marked impatience over our failure to achieve significant military victories in Vietnam.

And so, unlike the Government of France which gave only limited support to their forces in 1954 and saw them fall at Dienbienphu, President Johnson is prepared to rout and defeat the enemy without regard to the size and cost of our commitment.

In a word, the President characteristically rejects any thought of failure. If and when the United States sits down at a negotiating table, it will be on Johnson's terms and because he is the victor.

No, I don't think the President is running a bluff. He will continue to talk of peace, but his implacable determination to make war unrewarding for the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese seems now to be an indisputable fact.

Where all of this rapidly escalating involvement will lead is a matter of conjecture. Entrance of the Red Chinese, as in Korea? A rift with Russia? Nuclear war? Who really knows?

What a shocking thing it is that the small involvement which began as economic assistance with a few hundred U.S. advisers in Vietnam more than 10 years ago has now proliferated into major war.

What irony it is that South Vietnam's "free and democratic society"—the very essence of authoritarian rule—is now to be transformed by our wealth and resources into a flowering paradise of democracy where no one hungers or dreads the state police.

What a tragedy it is that thousands upon thousands of American boys will die in Vietnam because of the incalculable blunders of our leadership, both past and present.

Only now and far too late are we hearing any debate on Vietnam. The handful of U.S. Senators who dare to question Government policies are treated by the President with studied contempt.

So at least it is clear that the President has assumed all responsibility for the conduct of the war. The Hubert Humphreys, McNamaras, and the Rusks are but the echoes of his desires.

The people wanted a strong President and, in this respect, he has not disappointed them.

For what we are witnessing today is the most arbitrary exercise of power within the memory of any living American.

CAPSULE COMMENT

Prime Minister Harold Wilson's valiant efforts to salvage the pound from devaluation may be thwarted by a strike of the National Union of Railwaymen unless the government yields to wage boosts which far exceeds its 3.5-percent guidelines.

(NOTE.—The United States gave Britain massive financial aid on assurances by Wilson that excessive union pay demands would not be countenanced. Yet, here at home, Lyndon Johnson's good friend, AFL–CIO President George Meany, has consistently scorned the President's anti-inflation efforts.)

Huey Long, the Louisiana kingfish, was ahead of his times.

A Presidential commission (Johnson's) now thinks a Government check should go to every American family whose income falls below $3,000 a year. This is called a negative income tax, but the idea is basically the same as Huey's which was to take the money from one man's pocket and put it into another's. The cost? Only a trifling $20 billion or so, about one-third of what we pay for national defense.

President Johnson's new foreign aid approach is to be concentrated on countries that "are not hostile to us and give solid evidence that they are determined to help themselves."

This is welcome realism, but don't count upon seeing it happen.

Contrary to general belief, Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin (retired) did not advocate the holding of enclaves in Vietnam to the exclusion of all other alternatives. It was Generals Gavin and Matthew Ridgway who persuaded General Eisenhower not to commit U.S. forces to Indochina when Vice President Nixon was urging that course in 1954.

In his memoirs, General Ridgway said this: "When the day comes for me to face my maker and account for my actions, the thing I would be most humbly proud of was the fact that I fought against, and perhaps contributed to preventing, the carrying out of some hare-brained tactical schemes which would have cost the lives of thousands of men. To that list of tragic accidents that fortunately never happened, I would add the Indochina intervention."

Yet it did happen, less than 10 years later, when there were no longer any Gavins or Ridgways with the courage to oppose the civilian "generals" in power.

A Washington newsletter reports that Federal officials are trying quietly to figure out some way of pumping more money for economic development into the "have-not" nations.

With Vietnam, negative incomes taxes and the Great Society, it takes an optimist to believe we will have any left.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Feb. 20, 1966]

PUBLISHER'S NOTEBOOK: VIETNAM DEBATE LATE BUT GRAVELY NEEDED

(By John S. Knight)

ANSWERS, AT LAST

The Senate hearings on the war in Vietnam are providing the American people with sorely needed information on the background of our involvement and the possible perils which lie ahead.

For the first time, we are getting both opinion and fact from competent authorities who have either dealt with the problem at firsthand or whose long experience in the military and diplomatic fields enables them to see a local war in a global context.

This is not to say that the revelations are new. Newspapers and magazines which are dedicated to the principle that an informed public governs best, have faithfully portrayed each and every development leading to our present position in southeast Asia.

And yet, despite millions of words, pictures, maps, interpretation, and editorial comment, the Vietnam picture has remained unclear and imprecise.

TRUTH, NOT THEORY

Thoughtful discussion is often obscured by simplistic theories which appear logical enough if not carefully examined. Thus we have the "win or get out" school of thought, the "victory" squad led by Barry Goldwater who now charges President Johnson with "groveling" before the enemy, and the "Nixonites" who favor "doing more" but stop short of advocating all-out war.

We have seen, too, the superpatriots who would deny the right of dissent and who appear to believe that any citizens who question the wisdom of our course are cowardly and lacking in patriotism.

So it was a good day for our country when Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, decided to stage a full-scale review of the Vietnam problem in an unrelenting search for truth.

SENATE WAS SILENT

The hour is late, as Senator FULBRIGHT has conceded. Even as the peril mounted, the august Senate was meekly bowing to the President's will when it should have been challenging the wisdom of his policies.

Only Senators GRUENING, of Alaska, MORSE, of Oregon, McGOVERN, of South Dakota, FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, CHURCH, of Idaho, McCARTHY, of Minnesota, MANSFIELD, of Montana, CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and GORE, of Tennessee, expressed either their reservations concerning Vietnam policy or their opposition to it.

Since no Republican member of the Senate could find his tongue there was no major debate on Vietnam in what was once called the greatest deliberative body in the world.

The information which might have been brought to the American people several years ago was tragically delayed as the administration literally smothered all opposition with optimistic and meaningless official pronouncements on how well the war was progressing.

A DEBT WE OWE

But late as it is, the Fulbright committee is now tearing away the veil of secrecy and performing a notable public service for the country.

The televised hearings have produced a needed challenge to the administration, a diversity of views from eminent authorities and a broader comprehension of the total situation.

It has been a long, long time since both the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the majority leader have been at odds with the President on major policies.

Mr. Johnson is known to be downright angry with Senator FULBRIGHT and quite disappointed in Senator MANSFIELD, a calm and persuasive man who always reasons but never rants.

Both Senators accept the President's displeasure philosophically and hold true to their convictions.

We owe them a debt of gratitude for placing the national welfare above considerations of friendship and party loyalty.

PERSONALITIES

Senator WAYNE MORSE, the most relentless critic of administration policies in Vietnam, is a former dean and professor of law who was first elected as a Republican but later switched to the Democratic Party.

He is a strong supporter of the United Nations and believes the United States is acting in violation of international law. Senator MORSE, a confirmed maverick, is a blunt and merciless questioner who often dilutes his effectiveness by resorting to extremism and overstatement.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, a Rhodes scholar and former university president, has a mind which "encompasses everything." He has been critical of U.S. intervention in both Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

An ideal presiding officer, Senator FULBRIGHT is ever courteous, a disarming interrogator, and a convincing low-key speaker.

He and President Johnson have been longtime Senate friends.

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, son of the famous or infamous Huey, has been moving up in the Democratic power structure and serves as acting majority leader in the absence of Senator MANSFIELD.

He is a stanch defender of Johnson's policies, an arm-waving orator who said last Wednesday that he "swells with pride when he sees Old Glory and prays he shall never see a white flag of surrender."

Senators KARL MUNDT and BOURKE HICKENLOOPER are conservative Midwest Republicans who have generally supported the administration on Vietnam but appear to be thinking of how the Republicans can capitalize on an unpopular war in 1966.

Senator GEORGE AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, is known as the "owl" in a mixed cote of doves and hawks. The Senator is well respected for his fairness and judicial temperament, as is Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, who was Adlai Stevenson's Vice-Presidential running mate in 1952.

General Maxwell Taylor, former chief of staff for American forces in Europe, U.S. commander in Berlin, and the 8th Army's commander in Korea, is an articulate exponent of administration strategy in Vietnam where he served as our Ambassador for 15 months.

The McNamara-Taylor reports of several years ago on the war's progress proved to be extravagantly optimistic.

George Kennan, long a career diplomat and former Ambassador to Russia, and Yugoslavia, is credited with inventing the "containment" concept of dealing with Russia.

Mr. Kennan, now with the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N.J., fears we are on a collision course with Red China, does not favor withdrawal from Vietnam but vigorously opposes escalation of the war.

Gen. James Gavin (retired) rose from private to lieutenant general, served in World War II, as paratroop commander and later as President Kennedy's Ambassador to France.

The general supports a holding concept in Vietnam and sees great peril in widening the war. He believes, as do many military experts, that Vietnam is a poor staging area for a major conflict.

PAT-ON-BACK DEPARTMENT

The National Broadcasting Co. is to be complimented for carrying live coverage of the Senate hearings when the other networks were taking care of the soap and detergent commercials.

A high-level CBS decision to suspend live coverage of the hearings produced the resignation of Fred Friendly, president of CBS News, who said the decision "made a mockery" of the network's crusade to obtain broadest access to congressional debate.

The ruckus, with its attendant adverse publicity, quickly got CBS back on the sound track, but NBC rates the laurels for public service.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Feb. 27, 1966]

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK: GREAT DEBATE OVER VIETNAM HAS SERVED THE NATION WELL

(By John S. Knight)

The great debate over Vietnam is producing some welcome results.

For the first time since our unfortunate involvement began more than 10 years ago, the American public is beginning to understand the full significance of our role in southeast Asia and the nature of our so-called commitments.

It has been the fashion to deplore teach-ins, street demonstrations against the war, and the writings of those who have differed with administration policies.

Yet these protests have served a useful purpose. For there is today a public awareness that the Vietnam problem has many facets and no simple solutions.

The Senate hearings conducted by Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT, of the Foreign Relations Committee, brought to the Nation the views of able and scholarly men with wide experience in global relations.

We can be proud that our country is served by Generals Gavin and Taylor, the broad knowledge of former Ambassador George Kennan and the lucid expositions of Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

And, with an exception or two, the Senators who conducted the interrogations posed questions which were pertinent and direct.

Whether one agrees or finds fault with individual testimony is not so important as the fact that every American citizen had the rare privilege of hearing a full exposition of the Vietnam war from all viewpoints for the first time since U.S. military participation reached major proportions.

Until the Senate hearings, the objectors to Government policies were held in contempt as being either flaky or downright unpatriotic.

But no such charges could be brought against Gen. James M. Gavin, paratroop commander in World War II and former U.S. Ambassador to France.

Nor did they apply to George Kennan, a former Ambassador to Russia and the architect of our "containment" concept in the cold war with Moscow.

Such men, along with Senator FULBRIGHT and a handful of Democratic Senators who dared to defy the all-powerful Lyndon Johnson, spoke with courage and conviction.

And yet there are some superheated patriots among us who find the Senate "disgusting" and charge the Fulbright committee with "giving aid, comfort, and information to the enemy."

One such is a Mr. Frederick J. Read, of Grand Rapids, who would bring the press, NBC, and the Fulbright committee into court to show reason why they should not be tried for treason.

The Reads and those of his persuasion forget that the purpose of the Fulbright hearings is to enable our citizenry to become better informed on Vietnam and that such a clearing away of misconceptions is vital to a healthy democracy.

The charge of traitorous conduct is unworthy of a reply other than to remind Mr. Read that the United States is not officially at war.

A free nation could not long endure in a climate of no dissent. Only dictators flourish for a time in those unhappy lands where freedom of expression is shackled by the State.

The Fulbright hearings were long overdue. For years, the August Senate sat in silence as administration spokesmen in Washington and Saigon brainwashed the American public with optimistic pronouncements which bore little or no resemblance to the truth.

One need only to recall the fatuous statements by Ambassador Lodge and the McNamara-Taylor reports to President Kennedy to understand how completely we were misled on the progress of the war.

Had it not been for the dissenters, the studied conclusions of Senate Leader MIKE MANSFIELD and the Fulbright hearings, we might still be searching in vain for the truth.

President Johnson, who bridles at opposition in any form, is reported to have watched the televised Senate hearings with avid interest. He should have been pleased since Gen. Maxwell Taylor and Secretary Dean Rusk, reflecting administration policies under merciless questioning, came off very well indeed.

It appears, however, that the President is now harkening to the voices of dissent. At least he senses the need for a clarification of administration policies.

Thus he gave the country needed reassurance in his Freedom House speech by stating that the United States was not caught in a "blind escalation of force" which might lead to a vast conflict with Communist China.

Bill D. Moyers, the White House press secretary, told reporters that the President did not intend the speech to be an answer to his critics or a denunciation of those who disagree.

But had it not been for the critics, it is an open question as to whether Mr. Johnson would have declared himself against a wider involvement with such evident emphasis.

Of course the larger question is whether a wider war can ultimately be avoided since we have ample evidence at hand that "small wars" often lead to major confrontations.

Nevertheless, the President's address provided a partial and long-sought exposition of policy.

The great debate over Vietnam has served us well.

RANDOM NOTES

The administration's reaction to Senator ROBERT KENNEDY's first statements about bringing the South Vietnamese and indigenous Vietcong into a coalition government is a good example of Potomac confusion.

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY ridiculed this idea as akin to "putting a fox in a chicken coop * * * an arsonist in the fire department." But in the Senate hearings, Secretary of State Dean Rusk insisted that the United States would stand for free elections in Vietnam and accept the result. The outcome of such elections could mean precisely such a coalition as KENNEDY originally mentioned.

President Nasser of Egypt, who once told Americans they "could drink sea water" if they didn't like his policies, is at it again. Nasser, who has received millions in American assistance, is now assailing U.S. military aid to Israel and threatens a "preventive war."

Sukarno of Indonesia is another recipient of our favors who never misses an opportunitv to blast the United States. We deserve him since the Truman administration encouraged the Netherlands to yield their sovereignty to Sukarno in 1949.

Just before the death of Fleet Adm. Chester Nimitz, he warned that Japan will remain friendly to the United States "just so long as that friendship profits Japan."

The admiral predicted that whenever the Japanese feel they can do better elsewhere, they will do it, and that "includes an alliance or trade agreements with Red China."

At some stage, Japan could become a factor in the Vietnam struggle since she is known to be unhappy over the possibility of an enlarged war.

The current agitation in Congress to force safety improvements in automobiles is commendable, but how does one cope with drunken drivers, others with weak eyes, and poor reflexes and car-happy kids who "own" the road?

You can't pad sense into people.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 13, 1966]

THE PUBLISHERS NOTEBOOK: GREAT DEBATE UNCOVERS A GRIM NEW BRINK

(By John S. Knight)

RANT VERSUS REASON

No responsible editorialist enjoys belaboring Government policies merely for the sake of controversy. Unbridled and irresponsible criticism can be as harmful to the national interest as remaining silent when it is being endangered.

The great debate over Vietnam is a case in point. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, is one of the courageous few who has consistently challenged the validity of our involvement in southeast Asia. Yet he often unhorses himself when engaging in ill-tempered bombast.

By contrast, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, is even tempered, judicial, and a model of propriety as he interrogates the witnesses who appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There are likewise journalists who rant and fume in columns of lint-picking, captious criticism. They become largely ineffective since they persuade no one, but only harden the beliefs of those who already agree.

Responsible writers of opinion do not lack conviction. But they prefer the use of facts, logic, and analysis to make their case. Not as exciting, perhaps, but decidedly more informative and trustworthy.

Being human, both the politicians and members of the press can be arbitrary, capricious, petty, and illogical. Or, they may be fair, objective, analytical and zealously devoted to the search for truth.

The Senate hearings on Vietnam have revealed both the bellicose traits of a few and the even dignity and composure of the many. In journalism, with notable exceptions, the comment has been vigorous and well reasoned.

THE ULTIMATE GOAL

As Senator Fulbright now concedes, the public debate on Vietnam came several years too late. Yet it has been productive if only because the Johnson administration is now aware of the boiling dissent and the challenge to its policies.

Senator Fulbright's committee has provided a badly needed, full-scale review of the Vietnam situation. This has been most helpful to a confused American public which seeks nothing more than clarification of our aims and ultimate objectives.

Within recent days, it has been illuminating to learn that even as we fight an undeclared war in Vietnam, the ultimate goal is the containment of Red China.

Defense Secretary McNamara and Vice President Hubert Humphrey have said as much in interviews and appearances before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

So the "little war" of a few years ago which we were told was being fought to resist aggression and protect the liberty-loving South Vietnamese is now a major exercise in power politics.

Walter Lippmann dismisses the notion that China can be contained in Vietnam as "sheer mythology." He asks, quite appropriately, how Secretary of State Dean Rusk and McNamara can believe that they are containing China despite the fact they have alternated the Soviet Union, spread doubt and division in Japan, have no support in Pakistan and India.

"In the realm of great power politics in Asia," says Lippmann, "the United States is playing a lone hand. * * * The true containment of China is possible only as and if her great Asian neighbors, the Soviet Union, Japan, India, and Pakistan, are alined together or are at least acting on parallel lines."

ENORMOUS RISKS

One does not have to be an alarmist to comprehend the enormity of this undertaking and its inherent hazards.

Yet we inch on and on through the jungles of Vietnam toward a possible confrontation with China, standing virtually alone and with no true insight into the moods of Russia's inscrutable leaders.

To those who decry the Fulbright hearings as meaningless and political, the answer can be made that except for the testimony which they have produced, the public would not today be aware that the United States is back to "brinksmanship" in a stage which would have alarmed even the late John Foster Dulles, master of bluff and bluster in Eisenhower's time.

The erudite gentleman from Arkansas—undismayed over the criticism of his colleagues and undaunted by the President's displeasure—deserves the gratitude of his fellow Americans for a magnificent public service.

Republican leaders, who couldn't find their tongues in the Vietnam debate, are counting upon the war's unpopularity to bring them sizable gains in this year's congressional elections.

Being neither hawks nor doves, they can boast of their support for the President if things go well. But should the war take an ominous turn, the GOP will blame the Democrats. They also have the appeasement issue when and if negotiations begin.

No statesmanship, this; only practical politics.

U.S. SPOTLIGHT ON CHINA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article, entitled "Now U.S. Spotlight Turns on China," written by Frederic Collins, and published in the London Sunday Times of recent date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Now U.S. Spotlight Turns on China

(By Frederic Collins)

The focus of debate now is shifting to China from the Vietnam war. Senator Fulbright begins public hearings on China on Tuesday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and will extend them over several weeks. There is every prospect that they will come to command attention as serious and intense as those he held on the war itself.

The transfer of interest is general. Official comment, public and private, is beginning to center on China, as is public discussion. The debate on the war has at least temporarily exhausted itself, leaving opinion seemingly still divided between majority support for President Johnson and an irreconcilable minority of opposition, apparently not growing at the moment.

The change in debate reflects the sense of a need to find a policy on China which can be clearly understood by the public and win its support. The curious fact that such a policy does not now exist is explained by the involvement of the China issue in the most vicious kind of ideological politics over at least two decades.

Proponents of almost any course other than uncompromising hostility toward Communist China became the objects of anti-Communist witch hunts. One effect was to drive most China experts out of the government. The administration for that very reason will be hard put to find stars to present its views in Fulbright's hearings, when their turn comes after his witnesses, drawn at first from academia, are heard.

FORBIDDEN SUBJECT

Senator Fulbright, announcing the hearings, remarked that mainland China has been something of a forbidden subject since the days of Senator McCarthy. He hopes the hearings may "give more maneuverability to the Government," induce a "feeling of freedom," and embolden "some people in the administration to change the policy."

That indeed might happen. The four most recent administrations have been hopelessly restricted by the murderous politics of the issue. Ventilation could help a lot.

The quickening discussion is already beginning to produce indications of the kind of policy which might result from full debate. The goal seems to be a formula for the containment of China without either full-scale hand-to-hand war with her or an unending task of military resistance to proxy aggression, as in Korea (including 1 million Chinese "volunteers") and in Vietnam.

Effective peaceful containment could then, under such a formula, provide a climate within which China's fears could be quieted and her aggressive impulses cured by persuasion.

Senator Fulbright might one day find common ground with the administration once more in such a policy, after their long estrangement. He believes the only course open in Asia is an understanding with China permitting neutralization of southeast Asia.

The administration, including its highest officers, scorns this, holding that Communists, or any compulsive aggressors, are not to be trusted in neutralization schemes. But Fulbright counters that if the issue of Chinese and American power is left unresolved, even a total victory in South Vietnam is unlikely to solve very much.

It seems clear, however, that the differences between him and the administration are in considerable part those of timing. The administration thinks it madness to talk now of treating with China or even hoping to. Fulbright thinks it not too early to begin talking about it.

THE FRUSTRATION OF GLOBALISM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "The Frustration of Globalism," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post of recent date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Frustration of Globalism

(By Walter Lippmann)

The edginess which has appeared recently among the President's principal advisers is a symptom of the frustration which is so pronounced in Congress and in the country. The frustration springs not from any fear that the American forces in Vietnam can be defeated on the battlefield. The frustration springs from doubt that there is any other course still open except to escalate the war without any genuine prospect of ending it. The President is supported in Congress and in the polls because there seems to be no alternative to what he is doing.

Once the President had raised the stakes by investing 200,000 American troops, it made the fight predominantly an American war. He had, as one of his supporters remarked recently, painted himself into a corner.

From the perspective of the White House the pursuit of a military decision could lead to a confrontation with China or the Soviet Union or both. On the other hand, the attempt to negotiate a truce raised unavoidably the question whether President Johnson was prepared to negotiate with his enemies in the field, of whom some 80 percent are Vietcong.

If for the time being we cannot do anything to dissolve the President's predicament, we can, at least, make an effort to understand how for 12 years we have slithered and now have slipped into such a war.

In a preceding article I argued that the containment of Red China, which is a necessary objective of our policy, is being grossly mishandled by the President's principal advisers, Messrs. Rusk and McNamara. Their way of containing China has left us without support, and in certain cases with the active opposition, of every great power in Asia. Yet if China is as expansionary as we think she is and must be contained it can be done only by a coalition of great powers concerned with Asia. In the preceding article I said, too, that the egregious result of our policy was hidden from view by a piece of well-circulated political mythology; namely, that the outcome of the fighting in South Vietnam would decide China's foreign policy and the future of the Communist revolution on this planet.

I venture to believe that the root of the Rusk-McNamara misconception of our foreign relations is the myth, propagated since the First World War by the naive and idealistic followers of Wilson, that all sovereign states, whether big or small, are not only alike in their human rights but alike also in their right to exercise influence in the world. I believe this to be a myth which falsifies the nature of things and the facts of life. It has rendered Mr. Rusk incapable of sound judgments in foreign policy.

In the Senate hearings, for example, Mr. Rusk discussed with great moral fervor the conception of spheres of influence in international politics. They were inadmissible, he said. Therefore we could not recognize that China too might claim a sphere of influence. We were too pure for such worldly old things as spheres of influence. But on what grounds we were doing what we have been doing in the past few years in Cuba, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, and Panama, Mr. Rusk was too dainty to say.

For a foreign minister to deny that we treat the territory south of us as an American sphere of influence, and that we did risk a world nuclear war to prevent the Soviet Union from entering it, and that we have suppressed revolution in the Dominican Republic on suspicion of the intrusion of foreign Communist influences—all this is so blatantly contrary to the facts that it is regarded everywhere else as extremely crude hypocrisy.

For my own part I know of no serious and educated student of international politics who attempts to deny that great powers will insist on spheres of influence which no other rival great power may enter with its military forces. This is one of the elementary facts which every competent foreign minister keeps in mind. It is a fact, just as the existence of two sexes is a fact.

While the existence of spheres of influence is undeniable, there can be great differences in how the great power exerts its influence. Historically, there was a revolutionary turning point in the evolution of the concept of spheres of influence when President Roosevelt declared that our Latin American policy would be the good neighbor policy. He did not say that we did not have a sphere of influence. He said that we intended to act within it, not as lords and masters, but as friends and partners with our neighbors. This was the progressive evolution of the classic concept of spheres of influence.

U.S. POLICIES IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of a broadcast by Eric Sevareid on the CBS evening news of March 14, 1966.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

When it comes to the President's conduct of foreign relations, the U.S. Senate has the constitutional right and duty to advise and to consent. When it consents, that's not news. In our 16 years' involvement with Vietnam that is all it has done. But when it advises, that is news. And so, in a way, the biggest story in Washington now is the story of the Senate, specifically its foreign relations committee, more specifically its chairman, Fulbright, of Arkansas.

Two or three weeks ago, administration officials were privately denouncing the Senator's public inquiry into our Far Eastern policies, conveying to the enemy and the world, they said, an image of the United States as a divided country. Mr. Fulbright made the right answer today; since the country obviously is divided, he said, what was conveyed was not an image, but a fact.

Yesterday Vice President Humphrey said Fulbright's current hearings on China are among the most fruitful procedures now going on. Nobody in power was talking about the Senator that way a while back.

What this means is that Fulbright has won his first objective—to make the administration think far more seriously and deeply about the danger of a condition in which the world's greatest power and the world's most populous power, both armed with nuclear weapons, are scarcely on speaking terms. We have nothing like the means of communication with Peking that we had with Moscow at the most critical moments in Russian-American relations.

The Vice President's remark yesterday that we should try to contain China without isolating her—in other words, do as we did with Russia—is public recognition of Fulbright's achievement. Now the real authorities on China, and there are several, buried rather deep in the layers of Government, are more likely to be listened to at the top levels. Another signal that Washington wants to get on a new footing with China is the President's decision to let American scholars travel to China—if China will let them in.

All things begin in the mind, including catastrophes. For months, many minds in Washington have been gradually drifting from the idea of war with China as a possibility toward the idea as a probability. The next stage would be expectation. This is what Fulbright has detected and wants to halt.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM—COMMENT BY THE BRITISH MAGAZINE "THE ECONOMIST"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, the January 29 issue of the widely respected British magazine, the Economist, contains a perceptive and provocative report from Saigon entitled "Ones Who Wait and See." I should like to summarize the main points in this article because I think that they raise questions that all of us should ponder. They point up to me the subtle contradictions and paradoxes of the war in Vietnam.

First af all, the Economist points out that as more American troops pour into Vietnam, especially as they approach in numbers the size of the South Vietnamese Regular Army, there is a growing risk that the South Vietnamese Army will be looked on as mercenaries. The article notes that while General Westmoreland is reportedly aware of this danger, "statistics are working against him."

The second point the article makes is that the larger the American establishment in Vietnam becomes, the more it dwarfs the Vietnamese Government and the more the suspicion grows "that Vietnam's independence and sovereignty have become a mere shadow."

The third point in the article is that as the war grows in intensity, democracy and freedom become empty words. The generals that have stepped into President Diem's shoes "are telling the people—with the Americans nodding approval—that they cannot indulge in the luxury of a democratic regime as long as the war lasts."

The fourth point is that many Vietnamese are becoming increasingly bitter and indifferent because they see, on the one hand, that if the Communists win, the country will be enslaved, while, on the other hand, the alternative of national independence and freedom "is nowhere in sight either." The article points out that this has led more and more people, including a good many in the South Vietnamese Army, to ask: "For what and for whom are we fighting?"

Finally, the Economist states that after 20 years of war:

> The Vietnamese are back where they started but this time with the Americans instead of the French by their side.

Summing up, the article concludes that so far as the Vietnamese are concerned:

> National independence and individual freedom seem to be two irreconcilable aims in a country caught in an East-West confrontation which has reached the stage of open—though indirect—military conflict.

As for the United States:

> In coming to Vietnam to defend freedom they cannot escape infringing on Vietnam's national independence.

The United States will inevitably "reap the resentment of the Vietnamese people, because, to win the war, they will have to take over the effective direction of the country."

It seems to me that the article is an unusually good analysis of the inevitable consequences of the war in South Vietnam. These consequences are persuasive arguments, as if any more were needed, for hoping that we shall soon be able to move to a negotiated settlement of the war.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the article mentioned above be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ONES WHO WAIT AND SEE

(From our Saigon correspondent)

Too few people are paying attention to something that is going to exercise increasing influence on the course of the Vietnam war. This is the resurgence of Vietnamese nationalism. To French residents of Saigon—many of them ex-members of the French expeditionary corps who have made Vietnam their home—the present political picture is strangely reminiscent of the early 1950's. Attentisme—fence-sitting—is growing among the Vietnamese.

As more American troops pour into Vietnam (they will soon outnumber the Vietnamese Regular Army) and engage the Communists directly in big battles, the Vietnamese Armed Forces risk being looked upon as supplétifs. These were the local auxiliary troops recruited, armed, and paid by the French in the earlier Indochina war, who fought under the heavy moral handicap of being looked upon by their Vietnamese Communist opponents as mercenaries. The American commander in Vietnam, General Westmoreland, is reported to be acutely aware of this danger. He is trying his best to correct the impression. But statistics are working against him.

The bigger the American establishment in Vietnam gets, the more the Vietnamese Government is dwarfed. No assertion to the contrary by Vietnam's ruling generals can wipe out the suspicion that Vietnam's independence and sovereignty have become a mere shadow.

This is one side of it. There is another. As the war grows in scale and intensity, democracy and freedom, the two slogans which were so prominent in the last years of President Diem's rule and rallied round them all the forces which were to overflow his regime, have now become empty words. The generals who tossed President Diem out in the name of democracy and freedom speak Mr. Diem's language now that they have stepped into his shoes. They are telling the people—with the Americans nodding approval—that they cannot indulge in the luxury of a democratic regime as long as the war lasts.

Many people, in particular the articulate elements who had turned a deaf ear to the same plea by Mr. Diem now say they have been deceived. Hence the growing bitterness, brooding indifference, and attentisme. The Vietnamese Government and the Americans are shocked by this attitude, just as Bao Dai and the French were in the early 1950's. But even allowing for the undoubted loss of nerve and cynicism of a number of Vietnamese, there is a real moral problem here. To many honest and courageous Vietnamese it looks well-nigh insoluble. If the Communists win, the country will be enslaved. But the alternative—national independence and freedom—is nowhere in sight either. The question now being asked by more and more people, including a good many in the Armed Forces, whose daily lot is fighting and dying, is: for what and for whom are we fighting?

After 20 years of war, suffering and waiting, the Vietnamese are back where they started, but this time with the Americans instead of the French by their side. The political problem remains unsolved. Perhaps it cannot be solved, for national independence and individual freedom seem to be two irreconcilable aims in a country caught in an East-West confrontation which has reached the stage of open—though indirect—military conflict.

To the Americans too the answer seems unfindable. Whether they like it or not, in coming to Vietnam to defend freedom they cannot escape infringing on Vietnam's national independence. Mr. Arthur Schlesinger says in "A Thousand Days" that President Kennedy was acutely aware of the dilemma but died before he could solve it. The United States will have expended a great deal of blood and money to save Vietnam only to reap the resentment of the Vietnamese people, because, to win the war, they will have to take over the effective direction of the country. They will have to find a formula that will reconcile the desire for individual liberty with the equal desire for Vietnam to be independent of any great power. Otherwise the war will be very much the "dirty war" so well known to the French—long, bloody, costly, exasperating, and indecisive.

STATEMENT ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD CHINA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement on United States China policy prepared by a number of Asian scholars who support in principle the changes recommended for U.S. policy toward China.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement on United States China Policy

We, the undersigned, submit the following statement for the consideration of the executive branch, the Congress, and members of the public.

That the formal China policy of the United States has long since been out of date is widely recognized and tacitly accepted even by officials of the American government. Changes in this policy will not solve the major political and military challenges to the United States in Asia, but they can improve the ability of the United States to deal with these problems and reduce the likelihood that a crisis could turn into a major military confrontation.

We believe that the following represent accurately factors on which United States policy on China should now be based:

1. The People's Republic of China with its capital at Peking is a reality of international politics, whose importance to the course of international affairs will grow. There is increasing danger in the isolation of the United States from China and of China's relative isolation from other nations and international institutions.

2. The People's Republic of China is now committed to a policy of hostility to the United States and has made opposition to U.S. policies a cornerstone of its foreign policy.

3. In the immediate future the United States is unlikely to persuade Peking that it is not its most implacable enemy. But the United States can hope to convince Peking that, while prepared to respond when challenged, the U.S. is at the same time interested in exploring areas of mutual interest and normalizing relations wherever possible.

4. The government of the Republic of China on Taiwan will be a member of the international community for the indefinite future, but only as the government of Taiwan, and not as a potential government for mainland China.

5. The major problems for the United States in Asia have to do with establishing stable and mutually satisfactory relations between the United States and Asian national governments, while helping to develop social and economic viability within Asia countries through technical and economic aid programs. Although the problems are intensified by the existence of an expansionist Communist force in Asia, they arise from factors independent of communism itself and must be dealt with in the context of the total situation.

In the light of these principal factors and others, we urge that the U.S. Government adopt the following policies:

1. The United States should cease to use its influence to prevent the admittance of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations and other international bodies. In the interests of international peace and the national interests of the United States, the government at Peking should be accepted into these institutions, without conditions posed by us or by Peking.

2. The U.S. Government should announce that it is prepared, while maintaining relations with Taiwan, to enter into negotiations regarding the establishment of full and formal diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China.

3. The United States should propose to the People's Republic of China an opening of a new phase of bilateral negotiations at which the following items would be discussed: (a) Exchange of diplomatic representation; (b) renunciation of force as an instrument of policy; (c) arms control including problems of the control over nuclear weapons.

4. The United States should announce that it is prepared to accept accredited newspapermen, scholars, and others from the People's Republic of China and call upon the People's Republic to reciprocate. American willingness to accept Chinese visitors should not, at least in the short run, depend on reciprocation.

5. The United States should end its total trade embargo with Communist China and permit the importation and exportation of nonstrategic materials.

We believe that the measures suggested here would only initiate what must be a long and difficult process leading, we hope, to the normalization of relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China and a reduction of hostilities between the two countries. We believe, despite the antagonism shown by the Chinese government, that it is up to the United States to try to move the Chinese to a greater acceptance of the principles of coexistence in the emerging world community.

Position Paper: Recommendations for a Change in United States-Chinese Relations and Policies

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to set forth reasons supporting certain recommended changes in U.S. policy toward China. It is hoped that the paper will contribute to a growing consensus within the United States that our China policy should be modified, that our Government should indicate willingness to undertake changes, and that these proposed changes should be debated and discussed increasingly by citizens throughout the country.

There are occasions when policymakers in government are reluctant to embark on a given policy change because they think such a change would not be supported by the public. With respect to U.S. policy toward China it appears that this factor is one of those inhibiting U.S. governmental action. Therefore, it is important through discussion and sober exchange of views, to persuade the Government that there is widespread support for a change in its policy toward China and that the United States, by changing its policy within parameters dictated by its own best interests, can contribute ultimately to an improvement in relations between the two countries.

BACKGROUND

A policy statement was drafted by a small group of scholars concerned with U.S. foreign policy. It was submitted to members of the Association for Asian Studies to learn the views of a group considered among the most knowledgeable about China, Asia, and U.S. relations with nations in that part of the world. The members of this association have varied backgrounds and possess knowledge about different facets of Chinese life or other parts of Asia. Most of them are members of university faculties; some are serving abroad in various capacities. Of about 2,700 who were sent the draft statement, over 300 (11 percent) responded, a much better than the average response to a mailed request for an answer.

The Asian specialists were asked to indicate whether they approved the statement in principle, whether they desired to recommend changes in it, or whether they did not wish to be associated with this effort. Over 85 percent (258) said they were sympathetic with the aims of the statement. Of these 198 were prepared to support it in principle and have their names so designated. (A list of these is available.) The remaining 60 said that they would sign the recommended policy changes if certain modifications in wording or concept were made. Since, in most cases this could not be done without resubmitting the statement to all those who had already signed, these names have had to be omitted. Eighteen respondents said they supported the statement but for various reasons did not wish to sign it. Only 19 stated they did not wish to be associated with the statement because they opposed the proposed changes in United States-China policy; in most cases the opposition was not to the statement in its entirety but to parts of it. Five respondents stated that they did not wish to sign the statement, but gave no explanation of their views.

The large number of signers who are experts in Asian studies is convincing evidence that the changes suggested are grounded in knowledge about China or the surrounding area as well as in recognition of U.S. interests in that part of the world. The general point of view of the Asian specialists, as revealed in comments of those who responded to the statement circulated, is reflected in the following pages. This paper is not necessarily endorsed by the signers of the statement on changes recommended.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

The United States has always been opposed to Communist expansionist and aggressive policies. In the past the Government has also refused to deal with Communist governments. We have believed communism to be an antidemocratic force, inimical to the growth of freedom and self-government, and bent on the destruction of those governments whose economic systems were based on a measure of free enterprise and capitalism. At times we assumed that Communist governments wanted to destroy any society or government that was not Communist.

Because of the above considerations the United States waited for 14 years before it established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in 1933, and then the fact of recognition in no way implied approval of its government or policies, but rather acceptance of the Soviet Union as a government in control of a large population and important territory. After World War II, while the United States never severed diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, our Government, nevertheless, felt that the Soviet Union had to be contained in what we believed were aggressive and expansionist policies. Today the Soviet Union has given indications of changes in its foreign policies and many of its internal characteristics, so much so that the United States and the Soviet Union have reached mutually satisfactory relationships on a variety of subjects. There remain many serious areas of differences and because neither country can be sufficiently certain of continued and improved peaceful relations both expend enormous amounts of funds and resources to continue to build destructive armaments aimed primarily at each other.

In addition to changes in the policy of the Soviet Union there have also occurred within the past 10 years important changes in the internal and external policies of other Communist states in Europe; some of them now receive substantial amounts of U.S. economic aid, and trade between them and the United States has been growing. The United States no longer views the Communist world as a monolithic group of states with respect to all questions.

U.S. relations with China, in contrast to U.S. relations with the Soviet Union and Communist states in Eastern Europe, have grown from bad to worse. Whereas shortly after the Communists came to power in China in 1949, the United States stated that it did not intend to take further sides in the civil war between the Communists and the Nationalists and appeared to be actively considering recognition of the Chinese Communist regime, today there is increasing hostility between the two countries. Beginning with the Korean war in 1950 it is not difficult for a U.S. citizen to construct excellent arguments as to why the deterioration of relations with China has been the fault primarily of China, but conversely it does not take a lot of imagination to construct a Chinese viewpoint to the effect that the cause of bad relations has been mainly the responsibility of the United States. If relations are to be improved, and especially if war is to be avoided, it is more important to assess the situation of the present and how it might be dealt with than to arouse increased bitterness by determining blame for past episodes.

With these remarks we can turn to a consideration of the suggested changes in policy.

Recommended policy change No. 1

The United States should cease to use its influence to prevent the admittance of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations and other international bodies. In the interests of international peace and the national security of the United States, the government at Peking should be accepted into these institutions, without conditions posed by us or by Peking.

1. The United Nations ought to be a universal organization. Its main purpose is to maintain international peace and security and its effectiveness to do this will be limited, if not drastically curtailed, as long as important nations are not members. China, the largest country in the world populationwise and one of the great powers in Asia, should be permitted to become a United Nations member and encouraged to assume all the obligations and responsibilities that membership entails.

Some argue that China does not qualify for membership because article 4 of the United Nations Charter states that:

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

China is said not to be peace loving; the United Nations named China an aggressor for her actions in the Korean war in 1950 and recent promulgated doctrines by her leaders reinforce the belief that the Chinese Government advocates violence and revolution throughout the world. Thus, it is held that China does not believe in peace and would not carry out the obligations of the United Nations Charter.

One can indulge in legalistic arguments to claim that article 4, on two counts, is not relevant to the admission of mainland China to the United Nations. First, article 4 refers to states which have not already become members by virtue of article 3 of the charter which states:

"The original members of the United Nations shall be the states which, having participated in the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco, or having previously signed the declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942, sign the present charter and ratify it in accordance with article 110."

China is one of the original members of the United Nations, having signed the declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942, and having participated in the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco. China's membership status, therefore, is defined by article 3 and not article 4 of the charter.

Secondly, the question of mainland China's membership in the United Nations is a question not of the admission of a new member, but of which government should represent the seat held by China, the government at Peking or the government at Taipei. The United Nations Charter does not delineate any procedure for dealing with this question; when one government replaces another, as is happening constantly by constitutional processes, by revolution, or otherwise by forceful or violent overthrow, the new government replaces the old in United Nations bodies without contest. If there is a contest, the decision regarding the seating of one group versus another group is left to the General Assembly upon recommendation of its Credentials Committee.

Leaving aside the legal argument, the question remains as to whether China is able and willing to abide by the obligations of the United Nations Charter as stated in article 2. These obligations include willingness to settle disputes by peaceful means, to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, to give every assistance to the United Nations in any action it takes in accordance with the present charter, and to refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

One cannot be positive to what extent the government at Peking is prepared to abide by these charter principles. China has stated it should be admitted to the United Nations because it is the legitimate government of China; but the Chinese Government has also accused the United Nations of being dominated by the United States. On occasion China has claimed the United Nations should be reorganized and should undertake reforms to rid itself of U.S. control. China, however, does not state these as conditions to its joining the United Nations. Often there is considerable difference between China's rhetoric and its activities. Its future behavior in abiding by the charter's principles, if it becomes a United Nations member, remains in doubt. Of course there are many nations that at times have not acted in accordance with the charter's principles of settling their international disputes peacefully or refraining from the threat or use of force. The charter recognizes that a member may misbehave and so article 5 provides that:

"A member of the United Nations against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored by the Security Council."

Given the importance of universality of membership in the United Nations to maximize chances of maintaining international peace and security, and given improper behavior by United Nations members on occasion toward abiding by the charter, the weight of the argument is that China should be admitted to membership. Then China's behavior can be judged, as should all nations, on the basis of how she abides by the principles of the charter once a member.

2. Peace and security in Asia will be more difficult to secure and maintain with China outside rather than inside the United Nations; thus, the security interests of the United States are better served if China becomes a United Nations member.

For some time to come Asia will be the scene of many disputes which are likely to threaten international peace. In many of these China is or will be a party or will have an influence over the outcome. But such disputes cannot be handled by the United Nations effectively so long as China is excluded from that body. India would not ask for United Nations assistance when China attacked and invaded it in 1962 because China was not a United Nations member; the United Nations could not mediate the dispute. This was due to the unwillingness of the Soviets to be put on the spot in the U.N. to support India rather than China in the dispute.

The current war in Vietnam cannot effectively be brought to the United Nations because of the exclusion of China from it. If conflict breaks out in Burma, Thailand, or other areas in Asia, and China is a party to that conflict, the United Nations again will be rendered impotent. If the restoration of peace and security in Asia is made difficult or impossible in some cases because China is denied admission to the United Nations to present its case, to negotiate there to end the dispute, or to hear the complaints of others, then the security of the United States, with its widespread commitments in Asia, is also threatened.

There are some who reject these arguments about the need to have China in the United Nations in order to maximize chances for peace and security in Asia, and argue instead that China, if it became a United Nations member, would wreck the United Nations by obstructing all of its activities. This argument has been stressed by officials of the U.S. Government. No one can prove or disprove such an argument in the abstract. Chinese statements certainly have been extremely critical of the United Nations; they are couched, however, not at the institution and its aims, per se, but rather at the institution in terms of being dominated by the United States.

If membership to the Chinese were open, the Chinese could use this fact alone to claim that the United Nations was no longer dominated by the United States, and hence, membership once again was worthwhile. Furthermore, it is doubtful that the United Nations is so weak that the activities of a single country, even a permanent member of the Security Council, can destroy it or permanently damage its effectiveness.

Whether the Chinese, once admitted to the United Nations, would do all in their power to wreck it would seem to depend on how such behavior hurt or helped its foreign policy interests. If the Chinese want to win friends among the nonalined countries of the world they would not act to alienate these countries by improper behavior in the United Nations. If the Chinese want to trade and have normal relations with countries in Western Europe and elsewhere they may not want to antagonize them by attempting to obstruct progress in various areas of international cooperation.

United States and Chinese interests in the United Nations, nevertheless, will probably clash on many issues and this would have some adverse effects on the implementation of U.S. policy in the United Nations. These difficulties must be recognized. The crucial question, however, is what is most conducive to the maintenance of international peace and security, and again the weight of the argument is that the risks of China's obstructing peace by being in the United Nations are not as great as those which exist as long as China remains outside the United Nations.

3. U.S. interests in the United Nations would be better served if the United States removes its objections to membership for China than if China is admitted over the negative vote of the United States.

Each year since 1961, the first year that the United Nations voted to debate the issue of the admission of China, the vote has moved toward admittance. In 1965 the vote was 47 for admittance and 47 against; 20 abstained. In 1965, 56 voted for the proposition that the Chinese admittance question was an important issue, and hence required a two-thirds vote, and 49 voted that the decision should be taken by simple majority; 11 countries abstained.

On both questions it would not be difficult for a few votes to shift, thus assuring a seat for China. For example, if eight countries which had voted that the question was an important one abstain in the 1966 vote, this would mean that only a majority vote would be needed to decide the issue of representation; in 1965 eight countries which voted that the issue was an important one abstained on the final vote on admittance or, in the case of the United Kingdom, voted for admittance. These countries were Chile, Iceland (Laos did not participate in the vote), Lebanon, Libya, the Netherlands, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United Kingdom. A decision on representation could also be made by a simple majority if some who abstained in 1965 voted that the question was not an important one and, therefore, did not require a two-thirds vote.

Many countries believe China should be admitted but withhold their vote out of friendship with the United States; or, they trade votes with the United States thus obtaining U.S. support on an issue of special interest to them. For example, Canada has trade relations with China but voted in the United Nations to regard the question as important and to reject a seat for China. In the absence of special pleading by the United States it is likely that Canada's vote would change. Some countries in Latin America privately believe China should be admitted. Japan is possibly another case in point.

The United States would have greater opportunity to negotiate and improve relations with China if the former removed its opposition to United Nations membership. Furthermore, U.S. relations with other United Nations members would not be subject to so much strain if the United States acquiesced in such a move. The United States pays a heavy price in good relations with some countries by its pressure on them to vote against China. U.S. interests would probably be better served if it reserved its persuasive power for more important issues.

4. The United States would have a better chance of securing a balanced settlement over the future of Taiwan if it accepted China in the United Nations.

Many countries, especially several in Latin America and Africa, refused to vote a seat for China because the wording of the proposed U.N. resolution simultaneously would have evicted the Chinese Nationalist regime on Taiwan. Had that resolution been worded differently there are some observers who feel that a majority vote in favor of Chinese admission would have occurred.

From the U.S. point of view it would be desirable to have Taiwan as a separate member of the United Nations. From China's viewpoint Taiwan should become part of China. Many of the native Taiwanese, which the Chinese Nationalists have largely excluded from the Taiwanese Government, would want an opportunity to have a say about the future of the island. Under these circumstances perhaps the best course is to have China, the Nationalists, and the United States, at the time of China's entry into the United Nations, reach an understanding that the future of Taiwan will be left to subsequent negotiation. This would enable the United States, for the time being at least, to continue to recognize Taiwan as a separate state and to work for its continued membership in the United Nations.

If the Government of the Republic of China were to change its name to Government of Taiwan and to redefine its territory as encompassing only the island of Formosa this would probably assist in maintaining Taiwan as a separate state. But apart from the native Taiwanese it is unclear whether the Chinese on Taiwan want to remain separate from China; they may prefer to negotiate for Taiwan to become a semi-autonomous region within China. Further discussion of this problem is given under recommended policy change No. 3.

Recommended policy change No. 2

The U.S. Government should announce that it is prepared, without prejudice to the maintenance of its relations with Taiwan, to enter into negotiations regarding the establishment of full and formal diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China.

By indicating that it is prepared to recognize and have diplomatic relations with the present government of China, the United States would be taking a first step toward normalizing its relations with China. China may reject the U.S. offer, but this is not an argument why it should not be made.

Many Asian experts believe that the United States and China should discuss the question of diplomatic relations before an actual exchange of Ambassadors takes place. This is desirable because of the extreme hostility that now exists between the two countries and also because there are issues the two countries should attempt to resolve or about which they should at least reach a greater degree of mutual understanding.

1. The main reason why the United States should try to have formal relations with China, through recognition of its government, is that world peace will be jeopardized more by the continued hostility and lack of contact between these two countries than by increased contact. While recognition in no way assures a steady improvement of peaceful relations, it would signify that the two countries were attempting to reduce tensions between them.

2. Recognition of China by the United States, if reciprocated by China, would mean that contacts at various levels might be made. While some U.S. citizens could be permitted to travel to China and Chinese citizens permitted to travel to the United States, this would be very limited if there were no diplomatic relations between the two governments. Contacts at various levels—scholars, government officials, journalists, scientists, artists, businessmen, and so forth—would permit renewal of exchange of information about life, conditions, and thought in the two countries.

At the present time when there is almost no contact each side tends to believe the worst about the other. There is a serious degree of ignorance in the United States about what is going on in China; the reverse also is undoubtedly true. Recognition is an almost indispensable step toward the goal of increased mutual understanding and improved relations.

3. Recognition offers a means of conducting business and settling disputes. It provides a channel by which the countries can reach formal agreements about such matters as trade, exchange of persons, and political problems. Some might argue that the United States and China have reached agreements and resolved differences before without resort to recognition; the case most often cited is the negotiation to end the Korean war. Furthermore, some officials argue that the current occasional meetings between a United States and Chinese representative at Warsaw provide a channel through which disputes can be settled.

In the first case negotiations were delayed because of lack of contact. (It is even conceivable the Korean war would not have progressed the way it did if there had been recognition because a channel would have existed to minimize miscalculations about the behavior and reactions of the governments involved. This may also be the case with respect to the Vietnam war). In the second case it should be noted that the meetings are sporadic, always conducted in secret, and without diplomatic recognition they cannot form the basis of official agreements which become valid before international law.

In other words, people outside the government have no knowledge of what issues are discussed or positions taken by the two governments. Any agreements reached in this context have no standing in terms of public support; certainly they would be viewed suspiciously by many in the Congress who object to agreements reached in secret between the United States and other governments.

Some who oppose U.S. recognition of China use the argument that such an act would hurt the security of countries in southeast Asia having a large Chinese population. The U.S. act to recognition, it is argued, would cause these Chinese to become more sympathetic to the Communist government in China, thus undermining the stability of governments in southeast Asia where a large Chinese population exists.

This argument has little validity today. The government at Peking is so obviously in control of the mainland that there are probably few Chinese who believe it can be overthrown. The act of U.S. recognition would not be likely to have any significant adverse impact on the way these overseas Chinese behaved toward the government of the land in which they resided or toward the Peking government. Recognition might even have a salutary effect in that some overseas Chinese who have been sympathetic to their mother country on grounds it is being kept out of its rightful place in world affairs may then be able to view it more objectively.

Recommended policy change No. 3

The United States should propose to the People's Republic of China an opening of a new phase of bilateral negotiations at which the following items would be discussed: (a) exchange of diplomatic representation; (b) renunciation of force as an instrument of policy; (c) arms control including problems of the control over nuclear weapons.

As stated in the previous section, it is one thing for the United States to state it is prepared to recognize the Peking government and quite another to have a formal exchange of ambassadors. Some discussion and negotiation of outstanding issues will need to precede this exchange.

Discussions on the exchange of diplomatic representatives might include such matters as how each government was prepared to treat citizens of the other traveling within its boundaries. Some issues left over from 1949, such as economic arrangements, might be usefully treated. Similar talks with generally beneficial results took place between officials of the United States and Soviet Governments prior to U.S. recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933.

A discussion of the renunciation of force as an instrument of policy is of concern to the United States in view of the implications of the Chinese policy to take Taiwan by force and to support so-called wars of liberation in the developing nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. To the United States the Chinese position suggests that the Chinese will be fomenting revolution, subversion, and violence in as many parts of the world as it can. The Chinese, for their part, try to justify such wars on the ground that the people in these countries are being oppressed, usually with the help of the imperialist United States. In the United States view the Chinese Government's sanction of force labels it as an enemy of place and it is the principal reason today for the large U.S. military presence and involvement in Asia. Before the United States could consider any significant withdrawals of its military power from Asia, it would want an understanding that Chinese policy would not encompass military aid to Communist subversive groups in other areas.

It is unlikely, however, that there is much the United States can do at this juncture to persuade China to drop its policy of supporting, in principle at least, wars of liberation. But what would be desirable is an agreement to the effect that China would not supply arms to revolutionary groups and the United States would not use military force to thwart every attempt to install a Communist government into office.

The United States and China also need to discuss the future of Taiwan. China has threatened the use of force to return Taiwan to China. The United States has interposed its 7th Fleet between China and Taiwan to prevent a forceful takeover of Taiwan. If the United States were to agree to remove the 7th Fleet from the Formosa Strait and the South China Sea as well as to dismantle its military base on Taiwan, China would need to agree to leave the future of the status of Taiwan to negotiation between China and the government and people on Taiwan. Some China experts regard such an arrangement as forming a basis for a settlement of the issue. But the arrangement would need some kind of international or third party guarantee in order to give each of the parties to it confidence it would be respected.

There could be useful discussions between China and the United States on their future relations in various parts of Asia where China has a claim of wanting friendly neighbors (not unlike the U.S. claim to have friendly neighbors in Latin America) and the United States has treaty commitments with several of the smaller Asian nations. In this connection many would argue that improvement of relations between the United States and China must await cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, but another approach might be that a settlement of Vietnam could be hastened if the United States and China could reach some degree of accommodation about the degree of their involvement in Asian affairs.

Bilateral discussions over arms control issues including the control over nuclear weapons should not be regarded in any way as a substitute for international discussions. Such bilateral discussions are thought to be advisable because they could provide an opportunity for the United States and China to exchange their views on the subject without having them subjected immediately to public reaction. Just as private exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union often assist each Government to understand better the position of the other, so such an exercise might be helpful between the United States and China.

There are several arms control issues on which it would be useful to have United States-Chinese exchange of views. One is the question of safeguards and trade in fissionable materials. If the Chinese were to join the United Nations they probably also would be interested in joining the International Atomic Energy Agency as well as the U.N. specialized agencies. This Agency has recently taken several steps to initiate a program of safeguards to assure that nuclear materials loaned or sold for peaceful purposes will not be diverted to weapons. The Chinese view of such matters would be useful to know.

The United States should also understand more about China's view of the conditions under which it would be willing to restrict its nuclear weapons program. Another subject would be arms control measures covering conventional weapons. This is important in view of the likelihood of continued conflict in Asia in which conventional arms would be used. It is unlikely that any immediate compromise solutions can result from such discussions; nevertheless, the sooner serious and nonpolemical discussions can take place the sooner arms control agreements involving the Chinese and the United States as well as other powers might be reached.

Recommended policy change No. 4

The United States should announce that it is prepared to accept accredited newspapermen, scholars, and others from the People's Republic of China and call upon the People's Republic to reciprocate. American willingness to accept Chinese visitors should not, at least in the short run, depend on reciprocation.

It has been stated earlier that the full implementation of this recommended change in U.S. policy for all practical purposes depends upon the success in negotiations over recognition and an exchange of ambassadors. Some exchanges, nevertheless, could occur while such negotiations were being undertaken or even before they were convened. The United States refused to undertake an exchange of newsmen at a time when the Chinese were receptive to such a step in the mid-1950's. When the United States decided a few years later that this might be a good step, the Chinese retracted their offer. As a result, no Chinese from China come to the United States and practically no Americans visit China.

There is evidence that limited exchanges could now take place prior to diplomatic recognition if this could be done quietly and without extensive publicity. The recent announcement by the U.S. State Department in late December 1965, that medical and other similar professionals would be free to visit China is a welcome move and it is unfortunate that the immediate Chinese response was negative. Press reports indicate the United States may take further initiatives in removing travel bans to China.

As stated earlier, the main benefit to be expected for exchanges of persons in different fields is that the degree of ignorance about the society in the two countries would be reduced. Increased contact does not always result in improved relations or understanding, but it usually succeeds in reducing misconceptions.

Recommended policy change No. 5

The United States should end its total trade embargo with Communst China and permit the importation and exportation of nonstrategic materials.

If the United States is to embark upon the long process of improving its relations with the Chinese Government and people, one of the early steps to undertake is to permit increased trade. There are many who doubt that effective distinctions can be made between strategic and nonstrategic materials, but what is intended in the recommendation is to use as guide posts distinctions developed by the United States in trade relations with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. The nonstrategic items on this list cover a wide variety of goods: food, some raw materials, some machinery, and a large number of consumer goods.

China in the past has supplied the United States with a number of materials not available in ample supply elsewhere: bristles, feathers, and tungsten, for example. China's exports to the United Kingdom include hides and skins, textile fibers, animal and vegetable materials, leather, textile yarn and related products and nonferrous metals. British exports to China include scientific instruments, machinery, textiles and manmade fibers, iron and steel, aircraft and parts.

In the past few years 10 West European countries have sent trade missions to China (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom and West Germany). Japan and Canada have also sent missions. The results have not been substantial and it is not likely that a great deal of trade can be developed immediately between the United States and China; a start, however, could be made. This would be another channel for opening up contacts. It might give the United States some leverage in negotiating other items with China since in the first instance there are more goods China would desire from us than we would want from China.

A willingness by the United States to embark upon trade relations with China would also remove a source of friction between the United States and some of its allies (in Western Europe, Canada, and Japan) and at the same time would remove a disadvantage in which U.S. businessmen and farmers have been placed with respect to competitors abroad. Increasingly non-Communist industrialized nations have been pressing to trade with China, and the United States has argued against expanded trade relations; the former no longer believe that a total trade embargo has any positive effect on Chinese policy in terms of making it more flexible and less hostile. Many argue that just the opposite has occurred, that

Chinese belligerence is fostered because of the continuance of the embargo.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The United States, because of its treaty commitments to various Asian countries and its special responsibilities in the United Nations to help maintain peace, has a strong interest in security problems in Asia. None of the recommendations cited in the statement signed by the Asian specialists envisage that the United States should or would abandon these commitments. However, an effort should be made to demonstrate that the United States, by improving its relations with Asia's most populous country, will be contributing to the stability, security, and peace of Asia as a whole, of itself, and of those countries to which the United States is committed to assist in the event they are attacked by China.

In this paper the discussion of tactics to implement the recommendations has been for the most part omitted. Some of those who responded to the statement indicated that certain questions should be left open for negotiation. This is primarily a matter for diplomats and Government officials. Citizens outside the Government are necessarily more concerned with substantive policy questions than detailed matters of tactics which often shift from day to day. The substantive policy proposals, therefore, have been set forth succinctly in the statement because these are the main changes needed. The sooner they can be adopted as official policy by the U.S. Government the sooner may a process be started along the long and difficult road toward the normalization of relations between the United States and China.—BETTY GOETZ LALL.

ASIAN SCHOLARS SUPPORTING IN PRINCIPLE THE CHANGES RECOMMENDED FOR U.S. POLICY TOWARD CHINA

ARIZONA

University of Arizona, Tucson, Earl H. Pritchard, chairman, committee on oriental studies.

CALIFORNIA

California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, D. F. Fleming, professor of international relations; Sam Stanley, associate professor of anthropology.

Claremont Graduate School & University Center, Claremont, Cyrus H. Peake, professor of East Asian history.

Los Angeles Valley College, Los Angeles, Mark Naidis, associate professor of history.

Mills College, Oakland, Edward Le Fevour.

Pomona College, Claremont, Charles Leslie.

San Bernardino Valley College, San Bernardino, William J. Moore, chairman of the political science department.

Stanford University, Stanford, Harumi Befu, department of anthropology; G. William Skinner, professor of anthropology; J. T. Wixted, department of Asian languages.

University of California, Berkeley, Gerald D. Berreman, associate professor of anthropology; James Cahill, department of art; Joseph R. Levenson, professor of history; J. M. Potter, assistant professor of anthropology.

University of Southern California, Los Angeles, George O. Totten, associate professor of political science.

A. Elgin Heinz, high school teacher, San Francisco, J. F. Richards, Berkeley; Mrs. Beryl F. Zimberoff, Los Angeles.

CONNECTICUT

Yale University, New Haven, Harry J. Benda, department of history; Kenneth Scott Latourette, professor of missions and oriental history, emeritus; Arthur F. Wright, Charles Seymour professor of history; Mary C. Wright, professor of history.

John De Francis, Madison.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

American University, School of International Service Millidge P. Walker, associate professor of southeast Asian studies.

Howard University, Irene Tinker, assistant professor of the department of government.

Barbara Rieman Alperovitz, arms control division, the Bendix Corp., John Melby, Andrew E. Rice.

FLORIDA

Mortimer Graves, Key West.

HAWAII

Institute for Student Interchange, East-West Center, Honolulu, Robert Aitken, evaluation of alumni liaison officer.

University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Willard D. Keim, department of political science; Oliver M. Lee, assistant professor of political science; Elizabeth Wittermans, Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West.

ILLINOIS

Bradley University, Peoria, George E. Stoner, Jr., instructor in geography.

Knox College, Galesburg, M. Hane.

Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, James R. Shirley, department of history.

Northwestern University, Evanston, James E. Sheridan, department of history.

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, H. B. Jacobini, professor of government.

University of Chicago, Chicago, Clifford Geertz, department of anthropology; Benson Earl Ginsburg, associate dean of the college; McKim Mariott, professor of anthropology; Manning Nash, professor of anthropology; Melford E. Spiro, department of anthropology.

Frederick M. Asher, Chicago; Douglas Wayne Johnson, Rockford; Norman J. Parmer, De Kalb.

INDIANA

Earlham College, Richmond, Jackson Bailey, associate professor of history.

Indiana School of Religion, Bloomington, Harold E. Hill, associate professor of Old Testament language and literature.

Indiana University, Blooming, Leon M. Zolbrod, assistant professor of east Asian languages and literatures.

Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College, Bloomington, Sister Mary Gregory, S.P., director of Asian studies.

IOWA

Drake University, Des Moines, C. Walter Clark, Jr., political science department.

Barbara Teters, Ames.

KENTUCKY

University of Kentucky, Lexington, Walter Langlois, associate professor of modern foreign languages.

LOUISIANA

Tulane University, New Orleans, Henry Orenstein, associate professor of anthropology.

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston University, Boston, Amiya Chakravarty, professor of comparative oriental religions and literature.

Harvard University, Cambridge, Robert N. Bellah, associate professor of sociology and regional studies; Jerome A. Cohen, professor of law; Albert Craig, department of history; Rupert Emerson, professor of government; Donald W. Klein, East Asian Research Center; Ezra F. Vogel, East Asian Research Center; Edward Wagner, associate professor of Korean studies.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, William N. Locke, director of libraries.

Tufts University, Medford, Freeland Abbot, chairman, department of history; Allan B. Cole, professor of east Asian affairs, the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.

MICHIGAN

Alma College, Alma, Edwin C. Blackburn, associate professor of history.

Oakland University, Rochester, Sheldon Appleton, associate professor of political science; David C. Potter, assistant professor of political science.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, J. H. Broomfield, assistant professor of history; Jason L. Finkle, consultant Ford Foundation, associate professor, population planning; Victor Kobayashi, assistant professor of education; Stephen S. Large, student of China and Japan; Rhoads Murphey, department of geography.

Wayne State University, Detroit, Shanti S. Tangri, associate professor of economics.

Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Chester L. Hunt.

Alton L. Becker, Ann Arbor, Mr. and Mrs. Seymour Kavesky, Madison Heights; Ronald N. Montaperto, Ann Arbor; C. P. Paul Siu, Harper Woods.

MINNESOTA

Carleton College, Northfield, Tetsuo Najita, associate professor of history; Bardwell L. Smith, associate professor of religion; Robert E. Will, department of economics.

University of Minnesota, Indianapolis, Joseph E. Schwartz, department of geography.

MISSOURI

University of Missouri at St. Louis, St. Louis, Lyman Tower Sargent, assistant professor of political science.

Washington University, St. Louis, N. J. Demerath, professor of sociology; social sciences consultant, Ford Foundation, New Delhi, India; Donald A. Gibbs, assistant professor of Chinese.

Webster College, St. Louis, Sister M. Bernard Barbato, S.L., department of history.

NEBRASKA

Robert H. Stoddard, Lincoln.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

University of New Hampshire, Durham, Allen Linden, department of history; W. Findley Guffey III, Exeter.

NEW JERSEY

Drew University, Madison, Changboh Chee, director of "Core" program in Western and non-Western studies; Charles W. Estus, instructor in sociology; Robert Friedricks, professor of sociology.

Newark State College, Union, Howard Disbury, professor of history.

Princeton University, Princeton, William W. Lockwood, professor of politics and international affairs, Woodrow Wilson School of Public & International Affairs.

Rutgers University, New Brunswick, Katharine S. Diehl, assistant professor of library science.

Charlotte Furth, Princeton; Jessie G. Lutz, East Brunswick; Lawrence H. Mandel, Parsippany.

NEW YORK

Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, Brijen K. Gupta, department of history.

Colgate University, Hamilton, Theodore Herman, chairman, department of geography.

Columbia University, New York, Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Allen, department of anthropology; William R. Bryant, graduate student; L. Carrington Goodrich, professor emeritus of Chinese; Frank Kehl, graduate student, East Asian Institute; Joan P. Mencher, research associate, department of anthropology.

Cornell University, Ithaca, Knight Biggerstaff, professor of history; Alice Cook, professor of industrial and labor relations; Claire Holt, research associate, Asian studies; Lauriston Sharp, professor of anthropology.

Dutchess Community College, Poughkeepsie, Carolyn C. Landau, associate professor of political science.

Hamilton College, Clinton, Edwin B. Lee, associate professor of history.

Long Island University, Brooklyn, Kahlil A. Nasir, associate professor of history and political science.

New York University, New York, James T. Crown, associate professor of political science.

State University College, Oswego, Johnson G. Cooper, professor of non-Western history.

State University College, Potsdam, Luther H. Gulick, Jr., chairman, department of geography.

State University College, Geneseo, Donald Innis, chairman, department of geography.

State University of New York, Albany, Dewitt C. Ellinwood, associate professor of history.

State University of New York, Stony Brook, Charles Hoffman, professor of economics.

Union Theological Seminary, New York, Herbert C. Jackson, professor.

Edward P. Gottlieb, National Chairman, War Resisters League, New York City; Thomas L. Havill, Syracuse; Chang Hsin-Hai, Great Neck, Long Island; Eileen Koppelman, Bronx; Prafulla Mukerji, Brooklyn; Richard and Elsie Orb, Keuka Park; Romesh Shah, New York.

NORTH CAROLINA

Meredith College, Raleigh, Lillian Parker Wallace.

University of North Carolina, Raleigh, W. L. Highfill, department of philosophy and religion.

Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem, Robert G. Gregory, associate professor of history.

OHIO

Denison University, Granville, Louis F. Brakeman, chairman, department of government; Maylong H. Hepp, professor of philosophy; James L. Martin, coordinator of non-Western studies.

Miami University, Oxford, John H. Badgley, department of government.

Ohio State University, Dayton, Byron S. Weng, instructor in government.

Ohio University, Athens, John F. Cody, professor of history.

Western College for Women, Oxford, T. A. Bisson, chairman, department of intercultural studies; Robert Brank Fulton, associate professor of intercultural studies.

OREGON

Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Hideo Hashimoto, professor of religion.

University of Oregon, Eugene, Kathleen G. Aberle, research associate in anthropology.

PENNSYLVANIA

Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, M. Bronfenbrenner, Graduate School of International Affairs.

Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Thomas Hopkins, assistant professor of religion.

Haverford College, Haverford, Holland Hunter, chairman of the department of economics.

Ohio Methodist Theological School, Eastern, Ernest E. Best, associate professor of theology.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Derk Bodde, professor of Chinese; F. Hilary Conroy, professor of history; Leigh Lisker, professor of linguistics; Jonathan Mirsky, oriental studies, Chinese; Donald E. Smith, associate professor of political science.

Wilson College, Chambersburg, Roswell G. Townsend, professor of economics.

Frederick Gaige, Philadelphia.

TENNESSEE

Memphis State University, Memphis, Ram Mohan Roy, department of political science.

UTAH

Brigham Young University, Provo, Paul Hyer, coordinator of Asian studies.

University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Helmut G. Callis, chairman of Asia studies, professor of history and political science.

VERMONT

University of Vermont, Burlington, Horace Briggs II, instructor, department of political science.

VIRGINIA

Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Richard C. Rowland, department of English.

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Richard J. Coughlin, professor of sociology; Maurice Meisner, assistant professor of east Asian history.

WASHINGTON

Eastern Washington State College, Cheney, Charles H. Hedtky, division of history and social science.

University of Washington, Seattle, Paul R. Brass, assistant professor of political science; Charles F. Keyes, assistant professor of anthropology.

WISCONSIN

University of Wisconsin, Madison, Eugene Boardman, professor of history; Ripley Moor, assistant professor of Indian studies.

CANADA

University of Toronto, Donald E. Willmott, associate professor of sociology.

CEYLON

University of Ceylon, Gananath Obeyesekere, lecturer in sociology.

FRANCE

T. D. Long, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, directorate for scientific affairs, Paris, France.

INDIA

Margaret L. Cormack, Director of Educational Foundation in India.

JAPAN

Tokyo University, Toshio Ueda, professor emeritus.

ADDITIONAL ASIAN SCHOLARS SUPPORTING IN PRINCIPLE THE CHANGES RECOMMENDED FOR UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD CHINA

ARIZONA

Arizona State University, Temple, Guilford A. Dudley, associate professor of history.

CALIFORNIA

California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo, Francis V. Catalina.

Stanford University, Stanford, Mark Mancall, assistant professor of Asian studies; Harold H. Fisher, professor of history and chemistry, emeritus; Hoover Institute and Library.

University of California, Berkeley, Chauncey D. Leake, University of California, San Francisco Medical Center, San Francisco.

University of California, Santa Cruz, Bruce D. Larkin, assistant professor of international relations.

University of California, Los Angeles, Michael Moreman, assistant professor of anthropology; Nikki Keddie, assistant professor of history.

Willard P. Norberg, Ackerman, Johnston, Johnston & Mathews, San Francisco.

HAWAII

University of Hawaii, Honolulu, John Singleton, associate director, international development fellowships and seminars, Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West; George H. Gadbois, Jr., associate director, exchange of persons programs, Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harvard University, Cambridge, John Fairbank, director, East Asian Research Center; Morton H. Halperin, Center for International Affairs.

Wellesley College, Wellesley, Paul A. Cohen, department of history.

MICHIGAN

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Alexander Eckstein, professor of economics.

Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Charles O. Houston, associate professor, institute of international and area studies.

MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Romeyn Taylor, department of history.

MISSOURI

University of Missouri, Columbia, James W. Hamilton, department of sociology and anthropology.

MONTANA

Montana State University, Bozeman, Richard B. Landis, assistant professor of Asian history.

NEW YORK

Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, Charlton M. Lewis, department of history.

Colgate University, Hamilton, Kenneth W. Morgan, professor of religion.

Columbia University, New York City, Wayne Wilcox, department of government.

Cornell University, Ithaca, John W. Lewis, associate professor of government.

Union College, Schenectady, Malcolm Willison, assistant professor of sociology.

PENNSYLVANIA

Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, John Roger Stemen, department of history.

Wilson College, Chambersburg, Helen-Lee Jones.

A. Gutkind Bulling, Philadelphia.

WASHINGTON

Gonzaga University, Spokane, Jack D. Salmon, assistant professor of political science.

University of Washington, Seattle, Marwyn S. Samuels, modern Chinese studies.

TAIWAN

Mark Selden, Taipei.

POLITICAL INSTABILITY AND CHAOS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, since late 1963, when President Diem of South Vietnam was deposed, the political and military situation in that country have seemed to race each other toward the brink of failure and disaster.

For 9 months, we have heard that political stability is being achieved, so the military situation can be retrieved by American military forces. But, in the last week, the political instability and chaos of South Vietnam has reached a new peak. Police, armed and trained by the United States, and apparently some army units, have taken part in demonstrations against the government of General Ky. American air transport has been furnished to Ky's forces to suppress them. If there is such a thing as a civil war within a civil war, it surely is transpiring today in South Vietnam.

A new addition to these demonstrations, and an almost inevitable one, is their tone of anti-Americanism. Visits by White House and Cabinet officials and Members of Congress have to be suspended, so as not to add to the appearance that the country is an American vassal, which unfortunately it is.

But at the same time, the jingoism whipped up by the administration to support the war has been reflected in press editorials calling for a crackdown on dissidents not only by the Government of

South Vietnam, but also by the United States if necessary. Obviously, the rationale for what we have done up to now requires that we remain whether or not there is a government in Saigon worthy of the name.

It is the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon that we will remain in South Vietnam irrespective of what happens to its government, because we have made South Vietnam an American vassal, to the shocking discredit and disgrace of our country, as our action will be recorded on the pages of history for future generations to read.

Having sold ourselves the concept that we are in Vietnam to save people from communism, there are no limits to what we can convince ourselves must be done to stay there. We never pretended that freedom and liberty for the people of the south were at stake, because they never had freedom or liberty under their various governments. It is only communism from which we mean to save them—not tyranny, not death, not misery, not destruction, not foreign rule. All these and worse are being visited upon the people of South Vietnam by the combined forces of the United States and General Ky, all as a result of the wrong that the United States has committed in South Vietnam, the wrong action of the United States in supporting an immoral and illegal war and involving itself in bloodletting in a country in which it had no right to be in the first place. It is all as a result of the policy of the United States in South Vietnam as we proceeded in 1954 to violate our treaty obligations, and, in effect, to help destroy the Geneva accords.

Madam President, that is the sad and sordid record of the United States which is being supported by the present President of the United States. As a Democrat, I want to say that the responsibility rests primarily upon my party, and my party should be held to an accounting by the American people unless my party stops its illegality in South Vietnam.

As we send increasing numbers of soldiers into Vietnam to hunt and destroy the Vietcong and send increasing numbers of aircraft to smash both south and north, we can scarcely avoid a growing animosity among its people for a foreign military power that destroys their country in the name of its own national interest.

We must expect the rationalization from the Pentagon and from the White House that what we do to help put down this insurrection or civil war within a civil war is done because we are satisfied that it is Communist dominated.

The American people will not receive any rationalization from the Johnson administration for the continuation of this butchery in South Vietnam without being told that we are doing it in order to put down communism.

I say that the American people ought to be protected against the loss of their lives from an administration that is using this false rationale in order to justify our illegality in South Vietnam.

We ought to say to the people of southeast Asia: "You are going to run your own affairs and we are not going to kill American boys to support one side in a war that has been a civil war from the beginning." This is being demonstrated so clearly now in South Vietnam for those who are willing to see that what is involved there is a civil war, and some of the characteristics of a religious war, too.

I am one Senator who will never vote to kill an American boy in a war that has any of the overtones and undertones of a religious war. I do not intend to vote to kill American boys in South Vietnam in a contest that has a scintilla of cause-to-effect relationship between Catholicism and Buddhism. This administration cannot deny the religious overtones and undertones that have been involved in this war from the beginning.

Madam President, the absence of any genuine government in South Vietnam for this country to respond to, and the failure of our alliance partners to invoke the SEATO treaty, are instinctively understood by the American people. In my opinion, they explain the widespread attitude of the American people which supports their government, but which also seeks an end to the war by negotiation, by United Nations action, or even by some elusive knockout blow that would get it over with. It has only been the most recent public opinion polls which have gotten away from the question of whether people simply support their government, for most people will say "Yes" to that, no matter what it does. But framed in terms of whether they would support a candidate for Congress who, in the words of the poll, "says he would try harder to reach a compromise peace settlement in Vietnam," 67 percent believe they would vote for him.

Another poll queried the public on their attitude toward a United Nations arbitration of the issue, and found 2 to 1 in support for that solution, provided the Communists agreed in advance to abide by it.

Pollsters are increasingly commenting on the fact that persons advocating greater use of military power in the South and in the North do so on the assumption that it will bring a quick end to the war.

It is this latter point that the President heavily distorts when he tries to create the impression that "warhawks" are pressing him against his wishes to step up the level of the war. He has even sought to lay the blame for this at the doorstep of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by saying our hearings created more warhawk sentiment in the country.

Far from creating warhawk sentiment, our hearings have convinced many people that our real task in Vietnam is to find a way to end the war; some erroneously feel that a bigger application of military power will do that.

That false impression was planted by the President's own administration when it advertised the bombing of North Vietnam as a means of forcing Hanoi to the bargaining table. Every time the Secretary of State announced that a new application of military power was needed to make someone stop what they were doing, he contributed to the seductive notion that bombs would solve our problems there, if only we use enough of them.

This talk has come primarily from the White House and from the President's Cabinet. I say to President Johnson that the real warhawks are in his own administration. It is the President himself who seeks to deride and belittle those in Congress who seek peaceful solutions in Asia. If there were the pressure he talks about from public opinion to increase the scope and level of the war against his wishes, he would do what every politician does in those circumstances, and encourage the peace wing of his own party to hold hearings, to speak up, to offer alternatives, and in general, to offset unwelcome war talk.

This the President of the United States has not done and is not doing, and I shall be surprised if he ever does it. He has not done it; he has done just the opposite. He has tried to ridicule the speeches, to offset the hearings, and to dismiss the alternatives. The White House displeasure with the peace wing has been made evident on many occasions and in many ways. But no White House displeasure or rebuke was directed, for example, at General LeMay when he suggested bombing North Vietnam into the Stone Age. No rebuke was administered to the White House adviser, General Taylor, when he urged the mining of Haiphong Harbor, without the slightest basis in international law for that war-hawk proposal. He continues to sit at the President's right hand and continues to give him bad advice, with the result that both Taylor and the President, plus Rusk, McNamara, and Lodge and the rest of the bad advisers of the President, are misguiding this country into a war that will eventually kill Americans by the hundreds of thousands.

These war-hawk views are emanating from the President's personal and official family. The organized strength of that family is brought to bear not against the war talk, but against the peace talk.

I deeply regret this, because I welcomed the Johnson platform of 1964 when he said in his campaign speeches that "we will not go north" and he would not send American boys to fight a war that Asians should fight for themselves.

I am sorry to repeat it again, but I intend to repeat it on the platforms of America from coast to coast, as long as there is any hope for us to stop this American outlawry in southeast Asia.

The American people gave President Johnson a mandate in November 1964, and it was a mandate joined in by millions of Republican voters, as well as Democratic voters. It was a mandate against the Goldwater war policy. It was a mandate for peace. It was a mandate against an escalation of the war. It was a mandate against sending increasing thousands of American boys to be slaughtered in South Vietnam.

The President of the United States has walked out on that mandate. It is his administration that beats the war drums and waves the flag to tatters. Therefore, as I have said before, it is for the people to take account of this administration, and of those running for office who support escalating the war and increasing the slaughter of American men. Those men should not have been sent there in the first place, for the reasons given by candidate Johnson in the fall of 1964. They should be given the protection advocated by General Gavin, General Ridgway, George Kennan, and other recognized authorities, who have recognized the soundness of the enclave approach, as contrasted to the Johnson approach of an expansion of this war that is going to lead to the killing of untold hundreds of Americans in a part of the world where we have no interest.

It would seem evident that the American people must make good on the indications that they would support candidates for Congress who would try harder to negotiate an end to the war, whether through the U.N. or directly with our adversaries.

Is it not interesting that in this civil war, as with any war in Vietnam these days, those Vietnamese who are opposing the tyrant, Ky, are urging arbitration or negotiation of the war through the United Nations or through reconvening of the Geneva Conference?

That is not Communist propaganda, Madam President. That sounds like people seeking to deliver their country from a war that is being conducted by a foreign power—the United States. I am not surprised at the anti-American sentiment that is characterized by the opponents of Ky.

Madam President, I repeat, it would seem evident that the American people must make good on the indications that they would support candidates for Congress who would try to negotiate an end to the war, whether through the United Nations or directly with our adversaries. I pray they will, for this administration can be checked only by a Congress willing to check it, and that must be provided by the voters.

I close, Madam President, by saying that I think it is exceedingly sad that my Government is supporting such a tyrant as General Ky, the leader of a military junta, whose first reaction to opposition seems to be, "Kill."

We have seen his brutality manifested on many occasions. Now, because he is being opposed in Da Nang by one of the most highly educated men in South Vietnam, a scholar and a brilliant doctor—who points out so clearly that Ky's talk about the Da Nang rebels being Communist controlled, which unfortunately is endorsed by American officials in Vietnam, is not supported by a scintilla of evidence—Ky's response is, "Kill him."

That is the kind of a brute we are supporting in South Vietnam. That is the kind of a tyrant American boys are dying to keep in power.

Madam President, my country cannot justify it. This administration cannot justify it. We have no moral right to send U.S. forces to South Vietnam in support of this brute who has come to control the military junta of South Vietnam.

Oh, I think the rebellion will be put down. But let me warn the American people today, when it is put down, with the use of American arms and American planes—and I suspect also with the use of American power—the headlines will say, "Ky Sustained—Ky Victorious—Stability Maintained"; and yet the sad fact is that my Government and yours, may I say to the Senate, is supporting a tyranny in South Vietnam, a brutal military junta that has not the slightest conception of the meaning of the word freedom.

That is our record.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. In the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon, will this position deter, discourage, or contain communism, or does it lower the prestige of the United States, and thereby increase the prestige of communism?

Mr. MORSE. The United States, since it started violating the Geneva accords in 1954, has been creating Communists by the hundreds of thousands in the underdeveloped areas of the world and throughout Asia. The greatest aid communism has in the world is American foreign policy.

The United States, through its military aid, through its support of military juntas, is the greatest aid communism could have. We cannot defeat communism with American bullets, as the Senator from Tennessee has heard me say so many times. We possess the greatest weapon against communism; Bread, not bullets, and the exportation of our system of economic freedom which gives to individuals dignity and self-respect and helps to develop them so that they can develop their own political freedom.

I do not have to tell the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Alaska, or the Senator from North Dakota what is going on in South America. The support my country has given military juntas in Latin America by way of military aid has increased the threat of communism in Latin American, not decreased it.

To the extent that we are being successful in some areas in Latin America, it is in those areas where a democratic form of life is desired by the masses of the people, because they understand it and we have been building it up by preparing the seedbeds of economic freedom of choice for the masses.

That is the way to defeat communism.

But, my country is out on a bloody course of assuming that it can contain communism with bombs and bullets and military power in Asia. We will be bogged down there for decades to come, until finally the American people understand—as the French people came sadly to learn and understand—that we cannot contain Asia with western military power.

Some of us have got to be willing to speak out and take the abuse that goes with it, and have all our motives challenged, including our patriotism.

I consider it the greatest patriotic challenge which has ever confronted me in my 21 years of service in the Senate.

It is my duty and my trust to do what I can to save American lives in southeast Asia. I cannot save American lives in southeast Asia by supporting Lyndon B. Johnson in continuing to escalate America's war in southeast Asia.

Madame President, I am perfectly willing to let history be the judge in my opposition to what I am sorry to say has now become Johnson's war in Asia.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, home rule for the District of Columbia is a subject that has been debated on Capitol Hill and elsewhere for many years. I am hopeful that conferees from the Senate and the House of Representatives can sit down around the conference table at a very early date.

Reasonable and responsible men with conscientious differences of opinion have traditionally worked out legislative differences by the conference route.

Six times since 1949 the Senate has passed legislation to grant self-government to the District of Columbia. With House passage late last year of a charter approach to this question, Congress has come further down the home rule road than ever before in modern history. Therefore, as an eternal optimist, I express the hope that conferees from both bodies can make real progress in this area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1118) to provide for the District of Columbia an elected mayor, city council, board of education, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Charter Act".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the intent of Congress to make available to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia such measure and form of local self-government as they themselves shall democratically establish if such self-government is consistent with the constitutional injunction that Congress retain ultimate legislative authority over the Nation's Capital. In taking this action it is further the intent of Congress to demonstrate its fundamental and enduring belief in the merits of the democratic process by exercising its retained legislative responsibility for the seat of the Federal Government only as it concerns amendments to any charter which might be established under this Act, but not as it concerns the routine municipal affairs of the District of Columbia.

SELF-GOVERNMENT REFERENDUM AND CHARTER BOARD ELECTION

SEC. 3. (a) (1) The Board of Elections shall conduct a referendum, on a day specified by it, not later than one hundred days after the date of enactment of this Act to determine if the residents of the District of Columbia want self-government for the District of Columbia. The following proposition shall be submitted to the voters in the referendum:

"The voters of the District of Columbia are being asked in this election whether they want a District of Columbia Charter Board created whose purpose would be to write a charter for the District of Columbia. The charter, if approved in accordance with the District of Columbia Charter Act, would establish local self-government for the District of Columbia. Do you approve the creation of a District of Columbia Charter Board? ------yes ------no."

(2) In order for the proposition to be approved, a majority of those voting must vote in favor of the proposition.

(b) The Board of Elections shall also conduct an election on the same day as the referendum to choose members of the Charter Board (to be established in accordance with section 4).

(c) Every qualified elector—

(1) who has registered with the Board of Elections, in accordance with section 7 of the District of Columbia election law, for the last election held in the District of Columbia prior to the date of the election and referendum authorized by this section and who the Board of Elections ascertains is still a qualified elector, or

(2) who registers with the Board of Elections in accordance with subsection (d) of this section,

shall be entitled to vote in such election and referendum.

(d) (1) The Board of Elections shall conduct a registration of electors under section 7 of the District of Columbia election law, during a period beginning as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and ending not more than thirty or less than twenty days before the date of the referendum and election.

(2) The Board of Elections may by regulation prescribe any reasonable method for ascertaining whether a person registered to vote in the last election held in the District of Columbia prior to the date of the election and referendum authorized by this section is a qualified elector. Any such person who it ascertains is a qualified elector shall be notified by mail before the beginning of the registration period established under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(e) (1) Before the beginning of the registration period the Board of Elections shall publish in each of the daily newspapers of general circulation in the District of Columbia a list of registration places and the dates and hours of registration.

(2) Not later than two weeks before the election and referendum, the Board shall publish and mail to each registered voter a voter information pamphlet which shall contain (A) a statement (not exceeding one hundred and twenty-five words in length) by each candidate for election setting forth his qualifications, (B) an argument for approval of the proposition to be submitted in referendum, and (C) if this Act is not passed in each House without opposition, an argument for disapproval of that proposition. Each argument shall not exceed five hundred words in length. The argument for approval of that proposition shall be jointly written by two Members of Congress who voted for the approval of this Act, one appointed from the House by the Speaker and one appointed from the Senate by the President pro tempore. The argument for disapproval of that proposition shall be jointly written by two Members of Congress, similarly appointed, who voted against the approval of this Act if there were Members in each House that voted against approval of this Act; otherwise such argument shall be written by one Member, who voted against approval of this Act, who shall be selected by the President pro tempore or the Speaker, as the case may be.

(f) (1) In the election of members of the Charter Board, there shall be a number of different ballot forms equal to the number of candidates. The Board of Elections shall arrange such ballot forms so that the order in which the candidates' names appear on the ballot forms is rotated from one voting precinct to the next The rotation shall be accomplished by arranging one ballot form so that the names of the candidates are listed vertically in alphabetical order and by arranging each succeeding form by placing at the bottom of the list the name which was at the top of the list on the preceding form. The forms shall be allotted to voting precincts by lot in a manner prescribed by the regulations of the Board of Elections.

(2) Ballots and voting machines shall show no party affiliation, emblem, or slogan.

(g) (1) To be a candidate for the office of member of the Charter Board a person must be nominated in accordance with this subsection, must be a registered elector of the District of Columbia, and must have been a continuous resident of the District of Columbia for at least three years prior to the day of the election. The President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and officers and employees of the District of Columbia shall be ineligible for membership on the Charter Board.

(2) To be nominated as a candidate a person must present a petition to the Board of Elections not less than forty-five days prior to the election. Such petition shall contain signatures of at least three hundred registered electors and shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable filing fee of $25. The Board of Elections shall determine the validity of the signatures contained in such petition.

(3) Members of the Charter Board shall be elected from the District of Columbia at large.

(h) (1) In the election each voter may cast one vote for each of not more than fifteen candidates. The fifteen candidates receiving the largest number of votes shall be elected.

(2) The Board of Elections shall certify the results of the election and referendum to the President, the Clerk of the House, and the Secretary of the Senate, and the Board of Elections shall issue a certificate of election to each person elected to the Charter Board.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CHARTER BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) If the proposition submitted to the referendum conducted under section 3 is approved, there shall be established an independent agency of the United States to be known as the District of Columbia Charter Board. The Charter Board shall be composed of the fifteen persons elected in the election conducted under section 3. The candidate for office of member of the Charter Board who received the highest number of votes in such election shall be chairman of the Charter Board until the Charter Board selects a chairman from among its number.

(b) Each member of the Charter Board shall be entitled to receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Charter Board, except that (1) a member who is also an officer or employee of the United States shall not be entitled to receive such per diem for any day for which he is compensated by the United States for his services as such an officer or employee, and (2) no member may receive more than $5,000 in the aggregate for his services as a member.

(c) The Charter Board shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel, as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(d) The Charter Board may procure, in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants. Individuals so employed shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Charter Board, but not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The District of Columbia government shall furnish such space and facilities in public buildings in the District as the Charter Board may reasonably request, and shall provide the Charter Board with such records, information, and other services as may be required by the Board for the carrying out of its function.

(f) The Charter Board may hold meetings, hearings, and issue subpenas within the District of Columbia. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Charter Board, or any member of the Charter Board designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member.

(g) Hearings of the Charter Board shall be open to the public and shall be held at reasonable hours and at such places as to accommodate a reasonable number of spectators.

(h) (1) There is authorized to be appropriated not more than $300,000 for the administrative expenses of the Charter Board.

(2) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Board of Elections such sums as may be necessary to conduct the election and referendums authorized by this Act.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF CHARTER BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the limitations in subsection (b), the Charter Board shall have the power to propose a District of Columbia charter, within two hundred and ten days from the day on which the election and referendum is held under section 3. Such charter shall, if approved in a referendum conducted under section 6 and if not disapproved by Congress under section 7, establish a municipal government for the District of Columbia. The Charter Board may propose a charter only by the vote of a majority of its members, and only one charter may be proposed. A copy of the proposed charter shall be transmitted to the Board of Elections.

(b) (1) The Charter Board is authorized to prepare a charter which may vest in a District of Columbia government complete legislative power over the District of Columbia with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation which are within the scope of the power of Congress in its capacity as the legislature for the District of Columbia as distinguished from its capacity as the National Legislature. The Congress reserves the right at any time after the adoption of such a charter to exercise its constitutional authority to amend in whatever fashion it chooses any charter written pursuant to this Act. Provisions of a charter may provide for subsequent amendment of the charter by the people of the District of Columbia. Such an amendment must be submitted in a referendum. However, such an amendment shall not take effect if disapproved by Congress in the manner provided by section 7(c).

(2) The President of the United States may disapprove any legislation enacted by a District of Columbia government established under a charter approved pursuant to this Act, but his positive assent is not needed for any such legislation to take effect.

(3) The Charter Board may also provide in the charter for the creation of such courts as may be necessary to assume the functions, solely relating to the affairs of the District of Columbia, of any Federal court within the District.

CHARTER REFERENDUM

Sec. 6. (a) The Board of Elections shall submit to referendum the charter proposed by the Charter Board. Such referendum shall be conducted by the Board of Elections, on a day specified by it, not later than forty-five days after the Charter Board transmits the charter proposed by it to the Board of Elections. The provisions of section 3 relating to the referendum conducted under that section shall be applicable to the referendum conducted under this section, except that (1) the registration period shall begin as soon as practicable after the transmission of the proposed charter to the Board of Elections, (2) the arguments respecting approval of the proposition shall be written by members of the Charter Board appointed by the chairman thereof, and (3) the voter information pamphlet shall contain a copy of the proposed charter.

(b) The following proposition shall be submitted to the voters in the referendum:

"The District of Columbia Charter Board has written a charter which, if approved in accordance with the District of Columbia Charter Act, would establish local self-government for the District of Columbia. Do you approve the charter?

-----------yes -----------no."

APPROVAL BY CONGRESS

Sec. 7. (a) A charter proposed by the Charter Board in accordance with section 5 and approved in referendum under section 6 shall be transmitted to the Congress. The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session.

(b)(1) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the District of Columbia Charter transmitted to Congress shall take effect upon the expiration of ninety days following the date on which such charter is transmitted to Congress, unless between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such ninety-day period there has been approved by either of the two Houses of Congress a resolution stating that that House does not favor such charter.

(2) If before the expiration of such ninety-day period the Congress shall approve a concurrent resolution stating that the Congress approves such charter, such charter shall take effect on the date of approval of such resolution.

(3) For purposes of this subsection in the computation of the ninety-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or sine die.

(c) Amendments to such charter which are approved in a referendum shall take effect in the manner provided in subsection (b) for such charter.

DISSOLUTION OF CHARTER BOARD

Sec. 8. The Charter Board shall cease to exist seven months after the approval of the proposition submitted to referendum under section 3, unless the Board proposes a charter under section 5, in which case the Board shall cease to exist on the day after the day on which a referendum is conducted under section 6.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 9. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Charter Board" means the District of Columbia Charter Board established by section 4 of this Act;

(2) the term "District of Columbia Election Law" means the Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1101 et seq.);

(3) the term "Board of Elections" means the Board of Elections for the District of Columbia; and

(4) the term "qualified elector" has the same meaning as it has in section 2(2) of the District of Columbia Election Law (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102(2)).

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act authorizing the residents of the District of Columbia to make known their preference on the question of home rule and, if they wish, to elect a board for the purpose of preparing a municipal charter for submission to the voters and to Congress, and for other purposes."

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment and ask for a conference on the bill, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Bible, Mr. Morse, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Dominick conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE RIGHT OF AMERICAN CITIZENS TO TRAVEL ABROAD

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, on March 23, it was reported in the press that the passport office of the Department of State had sent cables to certain State Department embassies abroad concerning Prof. H. Stuart Hughes of Harvard University. Professor Hughes intends to visit Europe next fall on a private trip, as a private citizen, with an accredited pasport. Nevertheless the cables, describing Professor Hughes as a man who "reportedly in the past has had strong convictions toward communism," asked the embassies to report back on any activities of his that came to the embassy's attention in the countries he was visiting.

I know Professor Hughes. He is a professor of history at Harvard University. He is a grandson of the late Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and a Republican candidate for President in 1916. Professor Hughes has strong convictions about the policies our country should pursue. They are not my convictions or those of the great majority of the people of Massachusetts. Nevertheless, he is a man of character and integrity. His views and activities have been very well publicized, and any full evaluation of his public career would satisfy a fair-minded man that he is neither a Communist nor a pro-Communist, nor are his activities in any way dangerous to the security of the United States.

But there is a deeper issue involved in this case, an issue that goes to the fundamental right of American citizens to travel abroad. Two and one-half million Americans went abroad last year. Ten million more visited Canada and Mexico. If our Government can single out Professor Hughes for special treatment, it can single out many other citizens whose views are controversial. If these citizens know their activities may be reported back, will this not inhibit what they do when abroad: and does not this inhibition restrict the right to travel, which the Supreme Court has said is "basic in our scheme of value as close to the heart of the individual as the choice of what he eats, wears, or reads."

Let me make it clear that I feel there are some individuals about whom our embassies abroad should be alerted. If a suspected smuggler, or a member of an international criminal syndicate, or a fugitive from justice, or a mentally unstable person whose condition might lead him into serious difficulty abroad—if these kinds of people travel, our investigatory authoritories legitimately can ask that our embassies report any information that comes to their attention. In fact, they could also ask the help of police officials in the foreign countries to keep watch on such people. If a known member of the Communist party goes abroad our embassies should be asked to report back on the speeches he makes, although in such a case I would think an alert embassy staff which reads the papers would do so as a matter of course. But when this practice is extended to persons who dissent from government policy, or express unpopular views, or are "controversial," we are skating dangerously near the area of thought control and the apparatus of a police state, which are the traits of our enemies and not ourselves.

It was because of my deep concern with the extent of this practice, and my feeling that it must be brought under control that I asked the Secretary of State to brief me fully on the Hughes case; on the extent of the practice in similar cases; and on the procedures followed by the Department when the forwarding of such information is requested by your investigatory agencies. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary dated March 23 be made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
March 23, 1966.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: A New York Times story of March 23, describes a State Department memorandum sent by the Deputy Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs to the Director of the Passport Office concerning the procedures to be followed in seeking information on U.S. citizens traveling abroad. The citizen involved in this instance was H. Stuart Hughes, a professor of history at Harvard University. It was further reported that the cable concerning Professor Hughes to the various U.S. Embassies described him as a man with strong pro-Communist convictions and requested information concerning his activities when abroad.

Let me state at the outset that I know Professor Hughes and am familiar with the views he has expressed. While I have had serious disagreements with him on matters of policy I have always considered Professor Hughes to be a gentleman of integrity, who has expressed his convictions in an honest and forthright fashion.

Regardless of the individual involved, however, I am dismayed to discover that once a passport is granted to a U.S. citizen to travel freely in the countries of his intention, he may still be differentiated from other citizens by prior messages to our embassies concerning his political beliefs and calling for some form of surveillance. I would have assumed that the granting of a passport carried with it for each citizen the privileges given to all citizens, and that all passport bearers would have their privacy assured and be able to travel without embarrassment. In each passport the request is made by our Government to all that the citizen be allowed to "pass without delay or hindrance." I would not like to see our embassy personnel involved in the shadowing of U.S. citizens. The embassies are considered a source of protection to the citizen abroad when needed, not a center for investigation.

I do not wish to rely on a news account of our policy in such matters. I am writing to you for a response to some questions that occur to me, and I am sure to many others, as a result of the Hughes situation, as well as some further information.

What is the relationship between the Passport Office and the investigatory agencies of Government, both in the granting of passports and in the surveillance of those who have received passports? Is every request for such surveillance from an investigatory agency automatically cabled abroad? Are all such requests initiated in the investigatory agencies, or may the Passport Office alone request this form of embassy action?

What is the basis of authority for the Passport Office to request embassies to undertake investigations of private U.S. citizens traveling abroad?

Who is assigned the responsibility in our embassies to survey the activities of American citizens abroad, and how is such information gathered?

How many U.S. citizens have traveled abroad in the past year, preceded by advisory cables of their political opinions?

Finally, Mr. Secretary, I would appreciate receiving a copy of the cable sent to our missions concerning Professor Hughes' political convictions. I feel it most important to determine who makes the judgment that a traveling citizen is pro-Communist, whether that judgment is confirmed by the Passport Office when it transmits a request for surveillance, and what further use is made of such a determination, and of any information obtained by this investigatory activity, among the various Government agencies.

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, I may say that the Secretary and his associates in Government have been extremely courteous in responding to my requests. We have conferred on a number of occasions in an effort to bring this practice under control.

As I understand the practice followed up to now, if it comes to the attention of the investigatory agencies of the Government that an individual of interest to them is preparing to travel abroad, they notify the Passport Office. This action routinely results in a cable being sent abroad on that person, embellished in many cases with language such as that found in the Hughes cable, asking the embassies to report back any information that comes to their attention. There have also been instances when the Passport Office has informed the investigatory agencies of the person's application for a passport, thus prompting the agencies to make the request for the information.

My further understanding is that the embassies abroad do not shadow or impose surveillance on these people, but merely serve as a clipping service, reporting back to the department, and through it to the investigatory agencies, on anything appearing in the press concerning that person.

It is also my understanding that this practice has been going on for many, many, years; and that within the last year not only Professor Hughes, but certain students, certain artists, persons considered controversial, and even distant relatives of persons considered controversial have been singled out for special treatment as a result of these cables.

In other words, the line that should be drawn to separate out controversial persons from people who are a threat to the security of this country has been drawn far too loosely, and by the wrong people.

There have been instances in which travelers have been preceded by cables describing their beliefs, not because of evidence of direct Communist affiliation, but because of an anonymous Passport Office employee's evaluation of the person's views. I do not believe, Madam President, that we can continue to rely on the ability of low-level governmental employees to define what is good American thought. That person does not speak for me, and is not a person readily accountable to Congress for the decisions he may make that can embarrass a citizen or ruin his reputation.

Madam President, it is high time that this practice be controlled. We operate today under an entirely different set of legal standards than we did in the days when the State Department had wide discretion to prevent American citizens from traveling abroad. I hope we have advanced from the days when low-level evaluations of loyalty and security were made the basis of action in our Government.

The new constitutional standards give the right to travel an enhanced status in our country, as it must have in a modern society. The kind of people whose rights of privacy should be respected in this area are the people who disagree with the Government—precisely the people that a Communist country would not let travel abroad. Their right not to be singled out is a part of the very fabric of freedom that we are fighting for today.

Shortly after the press reported on the Hughes case the Secretary of State said that the present practices should be changed. He said:

> I don't believe that we ourselves, or anyone else, should be transmitting broad unevaluated information which has not been subjected to a real judgment as a matter of policy here in Washington.

This statement indicated to me that the Secretary and I agreed on the basic reform needs.

I made certain recommendations to the Secretary and the Attorney General on the needed reforms, and they were evaluated by the two Departments alongside their own recommendations. As a result the Secretary has informed me today that significant changes are to be made in the internal policies of the State Department. I shall read the pertinent sections of the Secretary's letter regarding these policy changes.

> During the last week the Attorney General and I have reviewed with care the procedures of the Departments of State and Justice. We appreciate having the benefit of discussions with you on this whole matter. The following guidelines will govern henceforth the actions of our two Departments regarding requests for the transmission of information concerning American citizens traveling abroad: (1) such requests will be made by the Department of Justice only in cases where an important national interest would be served by the transmission of information that may be received; (2) as in the past, American diplomatic missions will engage in no surveillance; a mission will, on appropriate instructions from the Department of State, simply forward relevant information that may come to its attention; (3) requests for information will be initiated in the Department of Justice by a responsible officer, and the dispatch of a requesting message from the Department of State to a diplomatic mission will be handled by a responsible officer of the Department; (4) any such requesting message will be limited strictly to what is required for fulfilling the reporting function; (5) requests for information and any reports received in response will be handled on a restricted basis, both as origin and destination, with distribution closely controlled to assure appropriate protection.

Madam President, as I read that statement, and as a result of my discussions in the past week with the agencies involved, it is clear to me that the procedures that created the Hughes and similar cases will no longer be followed. It is my hope, however, that the appropriate committees of Congress will from time to time assure themselves that this is the case.

I also hope that the other agencies of Government which may possibly be involved with such investigatory activities will follow the example of the Departments of State and Justice in this area.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to include Secretary Rusk's letter in its entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 5, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I appreciate your thoughtful letter of March 23 concerning a New York Times article on that day discussing the proposed travel abroad of Prof. H. Stuart Hughes. I share your concern for the freedom of Americans to travel abroad without any surveillance on the part of American diplomatic missions. I am, of course, deeply disturbed that reports reflecting adversely on Professor Hughes came into the area of public discussion. I have caused a thorough inquiry to be made into this matter and have given a good deal of personal attention to it.

Your letter posed a series of questions which I will now undertake to answer.

You inquired first as to "the relationship between the Passport Office and the investigatory agencies of Government, both in the granting of passports and in the surveillance of those who have received passports."

First of all, I wish to emphasize most strongly that no question of surveillance or investigation by the Department of State or any American diplomatic post abroad is involved. The Department of State has traditionally been the agency of the Government to which other Departments turn for cooperation and assistance in aspects of their responsibilities relating to areas outside the United States. These have included requests for information the Department may receive concerning individuals traveling abroad. Requests of this kind have been sent routinely to the Passport Office in the Department. Also routinely, such requests have been passed on to our diplomatic missions abroad, with a request that the mission should forward to the Department any information that it may receive in normal course of business during the travel of an American citizen. The diplomatic missions have not been asked to conduct any surveillance or to engage in any investigative process. They have merely been asked to transmit certain information they may receive which, in the absence of a request from the Department, they might have no occasion to report.

The second question contained in your letter inquired as to the authority for requests to embassies to transmit information concerning private U.S. citizens traveling abroad. This authority derives fundamentally from the statutes creating the Department of State and providing for the exercise of responsibilities by the heads of executive departments. These statutes are to be found in United States Code, title 5, sections 22 and 151. There is a further provision of law dealing expressly with action by American diplomatic posts abroad to comply with requests coming from agencies of the Government other than the Department of State. That provision is contained in United States Code, title 22, section 846, which reads as follows:

"The officers and employees of the Service shall, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, perform duties and functions in behalf of any Government agency or any other establishment of the Government requiring their service, including those in the legislative and judicial branches, but the absence of such regulations shall not preclude officers and employees of the Service from acting for and on behalf of any such Government agency or establishment whenever it shall, through the Department, request their services."

The third question in your letter inquired as to "who is assigned the responsibility in our embassies to survey the activities of American citizens abroad, and how is such information gathered?" As I have emphasized earlier, no question of surveillance of Americans is involved. Nor do our diplomatic posts make special efforts to secure or ferret out information in response to requests from the Department that have been made on behalf of other Government agencies. Instead, the diplomatic post simply forwards any information it may receive from items preparing in the local press, reports that may come to the attention of the post, or other routine receipt of information.

The fourth question in your letter inquired as to the number of instances during the last year in which requests were sent to diplomatic missions for reporting on the travel of Americans abroad. The records of the Department show that there were approximately 150 such requests.

During the last week the Attorney General and I have reviewed with care the procedures of the Departments of State and Justice. We appreciate having the benefit of discussions with you on this whole matter. The following guidelines will govern henceforth the actions of our two Departments regarding requests for the transmission of information concerning American citizens travelling aboard; (1) such requests will be made by the Department of Justice only in cases where an important national interest would be served by the transmission of information that may be received; (2) as in the past, American diplomatic missions will engage in no surveillance; a mission will, on appropriate instructions from the Department of State, simply forward relevant information that may come to its attention; (3) requests for information will be initiated in the Department of Justice by a responsible officer, and the dispatch of a requesting message from the Department of State to a diplomatic mission will be handled by a responsible officer of this Department; (4) any such requesting message will be limited strictly to what is requird for fulfilling the reporting function; (5) requests for information and any reports received in response will be handled on a restricted basis both at origin and destination, with distribution closely controlled to assure appropriate protection.

I believe these are sound guidelines that will advance the objectives we have in mind, to meet the legitimate needs of the Government for information and to protect the rights of American citizens.

Sincerely yours,

Dean Rusk.

RELEASE OF PLATINUM FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a message from the House on S. 2642, "An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile," be laid before the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2642) to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes, which was, on page 2, line 14, after "stockpile." insert "No acquisition of palladium shall be made pursuant to the authority of this section if, as a result of such acquisition, the aggregate quantity of palladium in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile would exceed the palladium stockpile objective established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, the House amended S. 2642 to specify that no acquisition of "palladium" otherwise authorized to be received as payment for the disposition of the platinum be permitted if the aggregate amount of palladium would exceed the stockpile objective established by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

Madam President, I have consulted with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen], the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and with their full approval, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, may I say that this bill and the one on bauxite passed the Senate about 2 weeks ago. The House agreed to the bauxite stockpile bill without amendment. This is the second of the two stockpile bills passed at that time.

Furthermore, the House on yesterday passed 10 additional stockpile bills. It is my hope that the Armed Services Committee will be able to consider them shortly and that before too long they will be before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Murphy in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANSWER TO CRITICISM OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICIES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette of Friday, March 25, carried a story entitled "Minister Baffled—Byrd's District of Columbia Policy Chastised." According to the story, the Reverend P. R. Newell, a former Pocahontas County, W. Va., pastor, now an activist Washington minister, was in Charleston to speak at a dinner at St. Matthew's Episcopal Church, and the story was based on an interview of Mr. Newell earlier in the day.

The newspaper story was replete with insinuations, terminological inexactitudes, and vicious inaccuracies, and I shall, at the close of my remarks, ask that it be placed in the Record.

The District of Columbia coalition of conscience, mentioned in the story, and in which Mr. Newell is active, has been particularly vociferous in its criticism of me, and one of its top spokesmen last year stated, during public hearings on the District of Columbia budget, that—

> We have resolved to do all that we can to arouse the consciences of the people of the Nation, generally, and of the State of West Virginia particularly, to do something about the tragic state of public assistance in the Nation's Capital.

Apparently, Mr. Newell's recent statements to the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette staff writer constituted a step in carrying out the implied threat by the coalition spokesman to whom I have just alluded. I shall, accordingly, address my response to the inaccuracies appearing in the story.

First. The story paraphrased the District of Columbia minister as having said that "Byrd seems to be driven by an almost fanatical desire to prove that Washington Negroes are inferior and to punish them for it."

Mr. President, in reply to this inflammatory and absurd accusation, may I say that it is my belief that the inferiority, mediocrity, or superiority of an individual is best attested to by the individual himself, and is usually reflected by his ability, intellectual capacity, attitude, resourcefulness, industriousness, and drive. Just as it has been said, "one man's poison is another's meat and drink," similarly it is common knowledge that one man is born a genius, another with ordinary intellectual powers, and another comes into the world an imbecile or a moron. Each individual should advance and progress on the basis of his own capacity, desire, and efforts to advance; and it is my further belief that each individual, of whatever race, should be given the opportunity to develop to the utmost whatever inherent and positive potential he may possess, be it little or be it great.

In this regard, had the clergyman sought to be fair with me, he could have mentioned—in addition to whatever adverse criticism he wished to offer—the strong support which I have consistently given to appropriations for education programs in the District of Columbia where the student population, as a whole, is 90-percent Negro, and the elementary school population is 92-percent Negro. He also could have cited my efforts to provide teachers for severely mentally retarded children in the District of Columbia, who are uneducable in the usual sense because their IQ's range from 35 to 55. Over a period of several years there was a long waiting list of scores of such children ranging in age from 7 to 16 years, and I took steps to eliminate this waiting list and to provide teachers, together with supporting personnel for the entire group. The minister could have pointed to my having joined with the then Senator and now Vice President, HUBERT HUMPHREY, in providing sufficient moneys to replace obsolete textbooks for children in the District of Columbia. Mr. Newell could have recalled my support of increased funds for experimental programs for severely maladjusted pupils in the Nation's Capital; my support of increased funds for tuition of handicapped children in outside institutions; my support of increased appropriations for additional teachers and counselors and for construction of additional public school facilities in the District of Columbia—all of which were instances in which I, as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, fought for increased funding over the House allowances, and sometimes over the budget estimates, for programs beneficial to the school population in the Nation's Capital, a population which, as I have already stated, is overwhelmingly Negro. My efforts in support of higher appropriations for education in the Nation's Capital are conveniently overlooked by my critics, but the record speaks for itself. How could any individual who has done so much for education in the District of Columbia be accused of seeking to "punish" Washington Negroes?

Second. Mr. Newell was quoted as saying:

> He [BYRD] must spend hours and hours studying and working on investigations and bluffing witnesses at hearings.

Mr. President, I have never sought to bluff witnesses at hearings. I make every effort to be courteous to witnesses before my subcommittee, and, as I will not allow myself to be bluffed by others, I make no attempt to bluff, pillory, or badger those who appear to testify.

Third. The newspaper story—not quoting the clergyman—stated:

> BYRD has waged a vigorous campaign against "welfare cheaters" in the city and has opposed allowing Washington to participate in the Federal ADC (aid to dependent children) program.

Apparently the staff writer was unaware of the existence of an ADC program as distinguished from an AFDCUP—aid to families of dependent children of unemployed parents—program. Washington does indeed participate in the Federal ADC—aid to dependent children—program, there being 4,700 families on the ADC rolls in February of this year. This program has been in existence for years, and I have not "opposed allowing Washington to participate" therein. I have, however, opposed District of Columbia participation in the AFDCUP program, and for good reasons, but I have made possible a temporary assistance program in substitution therefor, with a ceiling on payments, for many of the identical group which otherwise would have qualified under an AFDCUP program.

Fourth. The story—again not quoting the clergyman—stated that some Negroes in Washington have suggested that I am "motivated by racial feelings." I can understand how some persons may look at the matter in this way. The ADC welfare caseload in Washington is 94-percent Negro, in terms of families, and approximately 98-percent Negro, in terms of persons, and the fact that I have attempted to eliminate ineligibles from the caseload could, conceivably convey a mistaken impression that I have been "motivated by racial feelings." However, the fact that the ADC caseload is overwhelmingly Negro is not of my making, nor is the fact that 59 percent of the recipients were ineligible, as revealed by a 1962 investigation. I would have been just as zealous in ridding the caseload of ineligibles had they been overwhelmingly white.

By the same token, the fact that I have given strong support to the Police Department in the District of Columbia and have spoken out against the laxity of the District of Columbia courts in handling criminals, might conceivably convey the mistaken impression that I am "motivated by racial feelings," especially since the Negro group comprises about 88 percent of the criminals arrested for serious crimes in the Nation's Capital. But such an unwarranted impression would overlook the fact that 84 percent of the victims of serious crimes in the District of Columbia are likewise Negroes.

Fifth. The clergyman was quoted as having stated that BYRD has a "twisted sense of morality," referring to my opposition to District of Columbia participation in the AFDCUP program while West Virginia participates. The clergyman may be a more discerning and accredited judge of what constitutes a "twisted sense of morality" than I, but I hope I do not appear to be equally presumptuous when I state that I have no "twisted sense" of my own responsibility as a Senator of the United States or as chairman of the Senate Appropriation Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the latter of which is a position I did not seek but which someone has to fill. As chairman of that subcommittee, it is my duty to review the budget requests for the District of Columbia government and to recommend to the Senate, for its approval, those items and programs which, in my judgment and after careful hearings and study, can be justified. I have never deemed it wise to institute the AFDCUP program in the Nation's Capital, for reasons too legion to mention here, but my attackers repeatedly pursue the illogical argument that because West Virginia participates, ipso facto, so should Washington—two entirely different jurisdictions, two entirely different factual situations, neither of which has any relation to, nor any bearing whatsoever upon, the other.

Sixth. The District of Columbia minister was quoted as saying:

> I'm appalled by the amount of time that BYRD spends on the District of Columbia welfare situation, and his effort isn't aimed at helping the families in trouble but, rather, exposing them and punishing them.

The clergyman, if, indeed, he said this, spoke either without full knowledge of, or with complete disregard for, the whole facts. The record will show that I have championed, among other things, higher foster-home payments for homeless children, additional and better paid social workers so as to provide help and counseling to families in trouble, and additional welfare clerical personnel so as to free social workers from clerical tasks. Admittedly, I have sought to bring integrity to, and create public respect for, the District of Columbia welfare program by ridding the rolls of ineligibles. If the clergyman implied that freeloaders should not be exposed and punished but should be permitted to continue siphoning tax moneys which could otherwise go to deserving recipients or other deserving programs, then I leave it to the public to judge whose sense of morality is "twisted."

Seventh. The clergyman was quoted as saying:

> A man in his [BYRD'S] position is supposed to be deciding national policy, and yet he spends all of his time trying to take bread out of the mouths of poor children and to punish them for the sins of their fathers.

Mr. President, a more preposterous statement could hardly have been made. The fact is that most of every Senator's time must, of necessity, nowadays be spent in fulfilling duties entirely unrelated to the duty of "deciding national policy." There are various subcommittee chairmanships which in no way lend themselves to the shaping of national policy, but someone has to shoulder the burden of serving in each instance. Then, too, as the clergyman's gospel of St. Luke instructs authoritatively, he who would have "authority over 10 cities" must first prove himself "faithful in a very little."

As to the charge that I spend "all of my time trying to take bread out of the mouths of poor children, and to punish them for the sins of their fathers," this is unworthy of comment were it not a statement by a man of the cloth. This is an intemperate, unfair, and vicious statement, thoroughly typical of those statements which have often appeared in the Washington press by individuals who have been guided more by emotions than by reason and who have obstinately insisted upon being absolutely oblivious to the facts presented in the public record. The clergyman stated his pride in being a West Virginian; yet, I wonder if there is a West Virginian anywhere who really believes this statement of the clergyman.

Eighth. According to the newspaper story, Mr. Newell, although not being directly quoted on this point averred that—

> At BYRD's instigation, 77 special investigators were hired for the sole purpose of trying to find people on the welfare rolls who weren't eligible to be.

By way of background, a sample investigation of the ADC—aid to dependent children—and GPA—general public assistance—caseloads was undertaken at my request in 1962 by the General Accounting Office of the United States working in conjunction with investigators of the District of Columbia Department of Welfare. The investigation showed that 59.7 percent of the ADC cases were ineligible. Moreover, only 9.7 percent were found to involve no infractions whatsoever. In addition, 20 percent of the eligible cases were discovered to involve overpayments.

As a result of these findings, the Comptroller General of the United States recommended that—

> A continuing field investigation should be instituted with the objective of investigating ADC cases for the purpose of determining the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance and the effectiveness of the PAD's (Public Assistance Division) prior verification of representations by the recipients.

Prior to the GAO investigation, there were 14 investigators already in the Department of Public Welfare handling location of missing persons and referrals from the social workers on case situations. In order, therefore, to implement the Comptroller General's recommendation, the investigative staff was increased by 63 investigators to a total of 77, and 22 of the 63 were assigned to handling the backlog of cases that the original 14 could not handle. Thirty-six of the seventy-seven investigators, therefore, perform the important functions of locating missing persons and investigating referrals from social workers. The balance of 41 investigators conduct audit and intake reviews.

Ninth. The Washington clergyman, in referring to District of Columbia Welfare Department investigators, was quoted as saying:

> These investigators weren't social workers. They were mostly former cops * * * deputy sheriffs from down in Virginia. * * *

The truth is that only 19 of the investigators have ever had any type of military police or civilian police experience at any time in their lives, and I am advised that none of the investigators had ever been employed as "deputy sheriffs from down in Virginia."

The clergyman went on to say:

> Their only job was to find cheaters.

This is not an accurate analysis of the work of the investigators. The purpose of the audit and intake reviews is to check the validity of the AFDC and APTD—aid to the permanently and totally disabled—caseloads, and the AFDC and GPA applications. As I have already indicated, the investigators also locate missing persons and supply information on cases referred to the investigators by social workers.

Tenth. The clergyman stated:

> There hasn't been any similar program anywhere in the United States.

Actually, the only unique part of the investigator's role in the District of Columbia is the systematic checking of the validity of the AFDC and GPA cases. Everything else that the investigators do is done by investigators in other States—who may have a different title in some cities in some States. Practically every State and many cities have investigative staffs in the public welfare program. And, moreover, there has not been the intensified effort, perhaps, anywhere else in the United States to clean up the welfare rolls as has been conducted in the District of Columbia, but this is not to say that there shouldn't be just as much diligence elsewhere. After all, when a scientifically conducted investigation shows, as it did in 1962 in the Nation's Capital, that 59.7 percent of the ADC recipients, 58.8 percent of the GPA recipients, and 39.7 percent of the APTD recipients were ineligible, and that thousands of dollars in welfare payments were being given annually to "cheaters," what is wrong with ferreting out the freeloaders and taking them off the rolls?

Eleventh. The minister referred to the investigators as "BYRD's special police force." In the first place, the investigators do not have police powers. Second, I have absolutely no authority over them. Third, they were authorized by Congress, not by me alone, and the positions were created by the Congress in attempting to implement the recommendation of the Comptroller General of the United States that a "continuing field investigation" be instituted "for the purpose of determining the eligibility of ADC recipients." My critics, such as Mr. Newell, consistently seek to avoid the ineluctable fact that the General Accounting Office of the United States has repeatedly affirmed the need for ridding the District of Columbia welfare caseload of ineligibles.

Twelfth. The story, without directly quoting the District of Columbia clergyman nevertheless attributed to him a statement that, "BYRD claims the investigators found 67 percent of the welfare recipients in Washington were ineligible," but that "other figures indicate that the national rate is only 5 percent."

I, of course, have never claimed that the investigators found 67 percent of the recipients ineligible. As I have already stated, the welfare department investigators, working with the GAO investigators, found 59 percent of the ADC recipients ineligible. Of course, the "67 percent" figure could have been an inadvertent error and may or may not have been Mr. Newell's estimate.

As to a national rate of 5 percent, this is the figure which the Department of HEW found to be ineligible in a sample investigation of the ADC caseload conducted nationwide under the direction of the Department itself. However, the GAO observed, monitored, and reported on the HEW investigation, and raised serious questions as to the reliability, in certain respects, of the methods and guidelines utilized by HEW in checking eligibility of welfare recipients.

Thirteenth. The clergyman then referred to the so-called man-in-the-house rule which, not quoting the minister but according to the story, "specifies that if a man is present, the wife and children cannot qualify for welfare help." Of course, Mr. President, this is a gross inaccuracy. The truth is that the mother and children are not disqualified by virtue of the presence of a man in the house if that man is a close relative, such as the father, grandfather, son, or brother of the recipient. Nor are they disqualified though the man in the house is the woman's husband or paramour, if he is incapacitated and thus unemployable, in which event the incapacitated male is also eligible. Mr. Newell is obviously not acquainted with the fact that, under the basic Federal law, except in the 21 States which participate in the AFDCUP program, the children cannot qualify for ADC payments if the parent is employable, though unemployed, and living in the home. The District of Columbia rule, which more precisely should be called the substitute parent rule, like that in 15 States, recognizes an employable male, who maintains a continuing relationship of husband to the wife and father to the children, as a substitute parent. I am not the architect of the rule, it having been in effect since 1955. The rule apparently was never the object of much criticism prior to the GAO investigation which found the caseload heavily encumbered with ineligibles and which resulted in a stricter enforcement of the regulations governing eligibility.

Mr. Newell, in referring to this rule, was quoted as saying:

> That merely breaks up homes. When the untrained, uneducated husband can't find work, and the family gets more and more desperate, the wife finally tells him to move out so she can get some income to support the children.

Here again, the clergyman professed to know that which he did not know. The facts show that since 1955, when the substitute parent rule went into effect, the number of ADC cases qualifying for assistance on the basis of the absent parent factor, gradually but consistently decreased from 53 percent in 1956 to 29 percent in 1965. In other words, in 1956, over half of the ADC cases in the District of Columbia resulted from parental "desertion," that is, the absence of a parent, if one wishes to term it thusly, whereas only 29 percent of the cases in 1965 resulted from this factor. This would not appear to indicate that the rule is driving parents to desert their families. As a matter of fact, in 3 years of work, over 40 percent of the approved applications investigated have been found to be ineligible for public assistance, and the reason for the highest number of cases closed was that it was found that the recipient was employed. In reality, some ADC mothers have refused to allow their husbands to return home because the ADC payments were larger than the husband's work paychecks. Additionally, not infrequently, the problem confronting the untrained, uneducated husband has been found to be not so much that he cannot find work, but, rather that he would not hit a lick at a snake, to use hill country vernacular.

Fourteenth. The story, in referring to the much-publicized Mary Etheredge case of last year, stated that:

> A Negro mother and her five children were evicted from their home after one of the investigators found a man in their house and the woman's welfare payments were stopped.

The committee hearings, the District of Columbia Welfare Department records, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clearly refute this story, the true facts being that the woman was drawing welfare payments at the time of her death on April 14, 1965.

Fifteenth. The newspaper story stated that Mrs. Etheredge died of pneumonia. Mr. President, the autopsy showed that she died of a blood clot which probably originated in the veins of her leg.

The Etheredge case was seized upon by forces which sought to stampede Congress into providing the AFDCUP program and removing the investigators. Ironically, they sought to make the public believe that I, in some way, was responsible for the death of Mrs. Etheredge, whereas I have absolutely no authority in administering the welfare program, and the woman was actually receiving welfare payments at the time of her death. Then, too, the AFDCUP program, had it been in existence in the District of Columbia, could have had no bearing on the case in view of the fact that the husband was not unemployed nor was he untrained for employment. He had no difficulty in finding employment. His work history in the District of Columbia revealed that, following his coming to the District in 1960, he was employed by at least 18 different employers, some of whom employed him more than once. He held good jobs in the District of Columbia, worked at some of the best restaurants, could get a job anytime he wanted a job, but consistently failed to retain a job because of absenteeism. According to the record, he was in and out of jail and he came home from time to time, and the poor woman was made to carry the additional burden of bearing his children following his visits, and providing for them without his support.

Sixteenth. The clergyman referred to my all-night speech against the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by saying:

> Ironically, the main theme of his talk was opposition to Federal intervention in local affairs.

Such an analysis constitutes an oversimplification. The main theme of my speech, as anyone who has read it should know, was manifold: One, the unconstitutionality of the civil rights bill; two, its destruction of property rights; three, its destructive effect upon the constitutional powers of the States and upon our Federal system of government; four, its destruction of liberties and freedoms basic to the American way of life; five, my opposition to the prostitution of normal parliamentary procedures, thus precluding the careful scrutiny to which such a controversial and far-reaching measure should have been subjected; and, finally, six, my opposition to congressional and Executive capitulation to the mobs in the streets. Of course, I stated during the debate that the Supreme Court of the United States, as presently constituted, would uphold every jot and tittle of the act, and, in tests thus far, this has come to pass. In the light of other High Court decisions in recent years, decisions which have thoroughly emasculated and tortured time-tested legal doctrines and principles, the Court's views with regard to the 1964 Civil Rights Act should come as a surprise to no one.

Seventeenth. The Washington clergyman stated:

> By common consent, he [BYRD] is one of the hardest working men in the U.S. Senate, but he spends an inordinate percentage of his time working for goals which I believe are morally wrong and socially objectionable.

The only comment that I care to make here is that Mr. Newell's concepts and my concepts of goals that are "morally wrong and socially objectionable," apparently are not exactly parallel. I just refuse to roll over and play dead in order to please those who, like Mr. Newell, disagree with me.

Eighteenth. The clergyman stated:

> In seeking to combat crime and delinquency, he wants to strengthen the police and courts, instead of getting at the root causes which are squalid living conditions and the absence of any hope of getting out.

In seeking to combat crime, I do not agree with Mr. Newell and those other highly vocal and articulate individuals and groups who daily seek to blame society for the misdeeds of criminals. Apparently, there are some individuals who today believe that 1 rehabilitated criminal is worth 20 decent, law-abiding citizens dead. I do not gainsay the fact that poverty and squalid living conditions are undoubtedly factors which may leave their influential imprint upon the attitude and outlook of some criminals; yet, the same circumstances have served to inspire many people to work all the harder to rise above such circumstances and make something out of themselves. The minister should know that we are living in an era of permissiveness, and, in the judgment of many, the disturbing increase in crime and so-called juvenile delinquency can be attributed, in considerable measure, to the deterioration of the spiritual and moral character of the Nation, much of which results from the trend toward a materialistic gospel preached today, unfortunately, by all too many clergymen from all too many pulpits.

Confessedly, I do want to "strengthen the police and courts," and I shall continue to oppose the efforts of a tiny minority of hoodlums and troublemakers who seek to destroy the effectiveness of the police by harassing them with unjustified and unwarranted charges of police brutality. This is not to say that I support and condone real police brutality when it actually occurs, as is the exceptional case according to the FBI. Nor do I hesitate to say that, in my considered judgment, some of the Federal courts, and particularly the U.S. Supreme Court, have by certain recent decisions, handcuffed the police in their efforts to apprehend criminals and enforce the law.

Nineteenth. Finally, the District of Columbia clergyman is quoted as having stated:

> You can't teach people middle-class values unless you give them a chance at middle-class jobs and middle-class homes and middle-class education.

This all sounds very well, Mr. President. However, people who are unqualified for middle-class jobs cannot expect to be given such jobs, and, while every effort should be made to provide the tools and opportunities for education, middle class or otherwise, the individual must himself acquire the education through work, study, application, and sweat. An education cannot be infused into one's system intravenously, or injected via a hypodermic needle. We have seen all too many people who want middle-class homes and who want middle-class jobs but who display little stomach for the mastery of middle-class reading, writing, and arithmetic. In other words, the old saying that "You can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink," is quite applicable here. Mr. Newell may seek to believe otherwise, but we have only to look about us to see that there are numerous individuals who will never deserve "a chance at middle-class jobs and middle-class homes" simply because they do not and will not exhibit a fitness for either because there is too much work involved in acquiring a middle-class education.

An education which will open the way to employment, to the ownership of property, and to security is certainly within the reach of every American who has the willpower, the ability, and the tenacity to go after it. Booker T. Washington acquired an education in his day—when Federal scholarship loans, Headstart programs, and Youth Opportunity Centers were unheard of—and he went on to become an educator of others. What Booker T. Washington did, others can do if they will try.

Mr. President, those of us who serve in public office understand that we are always subject to criticism. We cannot please everybody. Constructive criticism can be beneficial. However, it is one thing to constructively criticize but it is quite another thing to make vicious public statements about elected officials when those statements are unwarranted and factually insupportable. The individual who publicly criticizes me, as a U.S. Senator, has a duty to present facts, and such duty devolves upon a clergyman as much as upon anyone. As a matter of fact, it would seem to the lay person, like myself, that one who professes to that highest of all callings, the preaching of the gospel, should be most circumspect in what he says about others. The temptation to utter malignant and intemperate charges against public figures is sometimes great, perhaps, but a man of the cloth, as much as anyone, can and ought to avoid it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter to the editor of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Charleston Gazette, Mar. 28, 1966]

Senator Byrd Praised

Editor, the Gazette:

If the Reverend Philip Newell were as good a man as Senator Byrd he would be preaching the gospel instead of getting involved in political name calling. Senator Byrd is doing a splendid job for the taxpayers and we should have more good men like him in Washington. No one, black or white, should be allowed to live for years off the sweat of another, and we all know that is exactly what is going on. Senator Byrd is trying to right a terrible wrong. The clergy aren't helping anyone's cause when they spiel off such garbage as has been going out recently. People are sick and tired of hearing everything except the gospel preached.

Mrs. Cleo Blankenship.

St. Albans.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the newspaper article to which I have alluded.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Mar. 25, 1966]

Byrd's District of Columbia Policy Chastised

(By James A. Haught)

An activist Washington minister said in Charleston Thursday that Senator Robert C. Byrd, Democrat, of West Virginia, seems to be driven by an almost fanatical desire to prove that Washington Negroes are inferior and to punish them for it.

The Reverend Philip R. Newell, a leader in several social reform programs in the District of Columbia, said Byrd has a "twisted sense of morality" and actually causes some of the social evils he claims to be fighting.

Mr. Newell, a former Pocahontas County pastor, came to Charleston to speak at a dinner at St. Matthew's Episcopal Church (where his brother-in-law, the Reverend Michael Paine, is curate). In an interview earlier in the day, he expressed bewilderment over Byrd.

"People around Washington keep asking, 'What makes Byrd go? Why is he so obsessed with this one thing? Hasn't he got more important matters to consider?'

"He must spend hours and hours studying and working on investigations and bluffing witnesses at hearings * * *. He's hooked on one idea, the idea of Negroes in Washington."

Byrd, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, is one of the most powerful Members of Congress in directing the life of Washington, which is governed by Congress.

Washington is the only major city in America with a predominantly Negro population. Byrd has waged a vigorous campaign against "welfare cheaters" in the city and has opposed allowing Washington to participate in the Federal ADC (aid to dependent children) program. Some Negroes there have suggested that Byrd, a former member of the Ku Klux Klan, is motivated by racial feelings.

Mr. Newell frequently finds himself opposing Byrd in Washington because the minister is involved in numerous Negro betterment causes. He is associate pastor for neighborhood work at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church; chairman of the Presbytery of Washington's Urban Church Work Committee; on the steering committee of the Committee on the Public Welfare Crisis; is active in the District of Columbia Coalition of Conscience; and belongs to the Washington Interreligious Committee on Race Relations.

"I'm appalled by the amount of time that Byrd spends on the District of Columbia welfare situation," the minister continued. "And his effort isn't aimed at helping the families in trouble but, rather, exposing them and punishing them. * * * Why does he get so much fulfillment from this?

"A man in his position is supposed to be deciding national policy, and yet he spends all his time trying to take bread out of the mouths of poor children and to punish them for the sins of their fathers. * * *

Mr. Newell pointed out that, at Byrd's instigation, 77 special investigators were hired for the sole purpose of trying to find people on the welfare rolls who weren't eligible to be.

"These investigators weren't social workers. They were mostly former cops * * * deputy sheriffs from down in Virginia. * * * Their only job was to find 'cheaters.' There hasn't been any similar program anywhere in the United States."

He quoted a Washington Post editorial which indicated the investigators are directed primarily by Byrd. He called them Byrd's special police force.

Byrd claims the investigators found 67 percent of the welfare recipients in Washington were ineligible, the minister said, but other figures indicate the national rate is only 5 percent.

Mr. Newell referred to the "man in the house" rule which specifies that if a man is present the wife and children cannot qualify for welfare help.

"That merely breaks up homes," he said. "When the untrained, uneducated husband can't find work, and the family gets more and more desperate, the wife finally tells him to move out so she can get some income to support the children."

Mr. Newell referred to the Mary Etheredge case, in which a Negro mother and her five children were evicted from their home after one of the investigators found a man in their house and the woman's welfare payments were stopped. Later, a Catholic nun found the woman and children huddled in the rain and the woman died a few hours later of pneumonia.

Demonstrators picketed Senate buildings carrying a coffin and a sign inquiring "Is There a Man in Byrd's House?" The Senator commented that the woman's death was the fault of her husband, who drank and intermittently deserted the family.

The clergyman said Byrd has a "twisted sense of morality." He pointed out that, while West Virginia has 49,096 recipients of Federal ADC assistance (third highest number in the Nation), the West Virginia Senator opposes application of the program in Washington.

Mr. Newell pointed out that Byrd gave an all-night speech in the filibuster against the Civil Rights Act of 1964, during which he suggested that the Government should do something to curtail the high percentage of Negroes in Washington. "Ironically, the main theme of his talk was opposition to Federal intervention in local affairs.

"By common consent, he's one of the hardest working men in the U.S. Senate," he said, "but he spends an inordinate percentage of his time working for goals which I believe are morally wrong and socially objectionable.

"In seeking to combat crime and delinquency, he wants to strengthen the police and courts, instead of getting at the root causes which are squalid living conditions and the absence of any hope of getting out.

"You can't teach people middle-class values unless you give them a chance at middle-class jobs and middle-class homes and middle-class education."

He said chances for Negro betterment in Washington are being harmed by the posture of Byrd and a few Deep South Democrats on the Senate and House District of Columbia committees.

The clergyman, who was pastor of four Pocahontas County churches until he moved to Washington in 1960, said he still is a West Virginia taxpayer because he and his Charleston brother-in-law still own a 150-acre farm in Hampshire County. He added:

"I'm proud to be a West Virginian and a Democrat—and I even voted for Byrd once."

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, under today's prior order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 6, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 5, 1966:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Findley Burns, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 5, 1966:

Department of the Treasury

Fred B. Smith, of Maryland, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

Lester R. Uretz, of Virginia, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Spurgeon E. Crayton, pastor of Holy Trinity Baptist Church, Amityville, Long Island, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Psalms 133: 1: *Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.*

Let us pray:

Our Father in heaven, grant that we may now be drawn together in unity and in spirit. May these days of crisis, which try our souls and tend to harden them, create within us new resources and capacities, enabling us to follow the loftiest ideas without fear and without faltering. Grant that amidst the yearnings of our troubled world and through the storm of human indifference, we may hear the voice of our Great Captain of life's mighty ocean saying, "peace be still."

Bless our leaders and Nation in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman from Texas if this has been cleared with the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I understand it has; I might say to the distinguished minority leader.

The chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is now sitting, asked me to come over and make the request. I am sure that the gentleman has cleared it with the proper persons on your side.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is this the full committee, or a subcommittee?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, the full committee. We are now engaged in the CATV hearings, and there are many, many witnesses who desire to be heard. In order to accommodate them this procedure should be followed.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RECENT DECLINES IN FARM PRICES HAILED AS A BREAK FOR THE CONSUMER BY THE SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Secretary of Agriculture expressed his personal pleasure at recent declines in farm prices and hailed them as a break for the consumer. This is the first time any Secretary of Agriculture, even Mr. Freeman, has shown public delight at a drop in farm income. His jubilation was accompanied by the announcement of plans to break the price of dairy products, including a proposed 33-percent hike in the quota for imports of Cheddar cheese.

Everybody knows that it is not the farmer who benefits from inflated food prices. It is the middleman who makes the profit. It is a fact that the man who drives a milk-delivery truck in a large city gets more money for a 36-hour week than the average dairy farmer earns in a 400-hour month.

When farm prices rise, Secretary Freeman is overjoyed and takes credit with the farmers. When they drop he is again enraptured and takes credit with the consumers. I suggest that Mr. Freeman should go on television as a substitute ventriloquist because he has shown an ability to talk out of both sides of his mouth and out of the middle, too, all at the same time.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

OSMUNDO CABIGAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5838) for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. HALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MAJ. DONALD W. OTTAWAY, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4602) for the relief of Capt. Donald W. Ottaway, U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4602

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Captain Donald W. Ottaway, United States Air Force (64856A), of Wichita, Kansas, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $2,522.46, representing the total amount of overpayments of compensation paid to him by the United States Air Force as the result of an administrative error in determining the amount of service that should be credited to him for pay purposes. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Captain Donald W. Ottaway an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike "Captain" and insert "Major".

Page 2, line 5, strike "Captain" and insert "Mayor".

Page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Major Donald W. Ottaway, United States Air Force."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. ALAN DeYOUNG, U.S. ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10990) for the relief of Maj. Alan DeYoung, U.S. Army.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HEIRS AND DEVISEES OF FLY AND HER GROWTH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1049) to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1049

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, numbered 267, the sum of $1,289.96 for distribution to the persons entitled thereto.

SEC. 2. The heirs and devisees, immediate and remote, of Fly, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, numbered 266, are hereby relieved of all liability to reimburse the United States for any payments erroneously made to them representing revenues from the allotment of Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, numbered 267: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VIRGINIA SUAREZ TEJON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3059) for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3059

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality

Act, Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVANGELIA G. LATSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5003) for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5003

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of section 205(c)(1) of that Act shall be inapplicable in the case of Evangelia G. Latsis.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, after the words "provisions of", strike out "section 205(c)(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 204(c)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KUNIKI NAGANO ZWIEFELHOFER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5533) for the relief of Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhofer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5533

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhofer may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Chief Warrant Officer and Mrs. Robert L. Zwiefelhofer, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhofer may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Chief Warrant Officer and Mrs. Robert L. Zwiefelhofer, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FEIGHAN

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 2, strike out the words "eligible orphan" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "child".

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHO MYUNG SOON AND CHO MYUNG HEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8219) for the relief of Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8219

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee may be classified as eligible orphans within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in their behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Alexander J. Stirling, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

Section 205(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee may be classified as children within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the act, upon approval of a petition filed in their behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Alexander J. Stirling, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the act.

"Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERAFINA ANTONIETTA COREA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8833) for the relief of Serafina Antonietta Corea.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8833

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Serafina Antonietta Corea may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Stephen T. Cappadona, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Sarah Antoinette Cappadona may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Stephen T. Cappadona, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Sarah Antoinette Cappadona."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABDUL WOHABE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10220) for the relief of Abdul Wohabe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JOANNA K. GEORGOULIA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 518) for the relief of Joanna K. Georgoulia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 518

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act of Joanna K. Georgoulia may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F), and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Joanna K. Georgoulia by Mr. and Mrs. George H. Jules, citizens of the United States pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Joanna K. Georgoulia may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. George H. Jules, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

KOCK KONG FONG

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2752) for the relief of Kock Kong Fong, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "June 30, 1958," and insert "the date of the enactment of this Act,".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are all amendments to these bills germane to the bills?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes. In fact, this is one of seven House bills which were amended by the Senate. These bills passed the House in the 1st session of the 89th Congress and were pending before the Senate Committee when the new immigration legislation, Public Law 89-236, became effective.

Mr. GROSS. I am particularly concerned to have the gentleman's statement that all the amendments to all the bills he proposes to call up are germane to those bills.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, they are perfectly germane.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Each amendment is technical in nature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREZEMYSLAW NOWAKOWSKI

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2938) for the relief of Przemyslaw Nowakowski, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Przemyslaw Nowakowski may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Harry Nowakowski, a citizen and lawfully resident alien of the United States, respectively, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANOJLO VERZICH

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2939) for the relief of Manojlo Verzich, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Manojlo Verzich may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Merko Verzich, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. PANAGIOTA VASTAKIS AND SOTEROS VASTAKIS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3875), for the relief of Mrs. Panagiota Vastakis and Soteros Vastakis, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "section 205" and insert "section 204".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALPH TIGNO EDQUID

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4743), for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Ralph Tigno Edquid may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Lieutenant and Mrs. Arthur Edquid, a citizen and lawfully resident alien, respectively, of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID GLENN BARKER AND RICHARD PAUL BARKER

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6112), for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park), with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park) may be classified as children within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of that Act, upon approval of a petition filed in their behalf by Sergeant First Class and Mrs. Allen N. Barker, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in these cases."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KI SOOK JUN

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9442), for the relief of Ki Sook Jun, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:
>
> "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Charles Hood in behalf of Ki Sook Jun, and the provisions of section 204(c) of that Act relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of children defined in section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act shall not be applicable in this case."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSMUNDO CABIGAS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the "official objectors" on the Private Calendar. The rules of the House do not permit questions, explanations, or debate during the call of the Private Calendar. Nevertheless, I try to study each bill and resolution thoroughly and make my decision objectively and equitably.

Today I objected to the consideration of H.R. 5838, a bill for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas. The bill would authorize payment of $10,000 to Mr. Cabigas as a gratuity because of the accidental death of his son while on active duty at Andrews Air Force Base.

Last year, after the House Committee on the Judiciary approved this bill, the Congress approved a new group life insurance program for servicemen. It provided retroactive benefits for certain military personnel who were killed between the time national service life insurance expired and the effective date of the new insurance program. Under that law, beneficiaries were granted $5,000. Congressional policy appeared to be set by this law. Mr. Cabigas is receiving the benefit under this law and, therefore, it does not seem equitable for his case to be treated differently from many others under the general policy established by the Congress.

I commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] for his sincere concern for the interests of his constituent. In spite of his earnest and sustained efforts, I was constrained to object for the aforesaid reasons.

TO AUTHORIZE THE LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7813), to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 1, line 4, strike out all after "lend" down to and including "escort." in line 9 and insert "one destroyer and one destroyer escort from the reserve fleet to the Republic of China on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, give us a brief explanation of the bill, including the action of the other body.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I gladly yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on August 30, 1965, the House passed three bills authorizing the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries.

These bills were a continuance of a policy adopted by the Congress many years ago to place ships in the hands of our friends so as to permit them to perform functions—particularly antisubmarine warfare—that we would otherwise be required to perform ourselves.

These ships are taken from our reserve or mothball fleet and almost always are the kind of ships that are highly unlikely for return to our active naval fleet. They are serviceable and can do a job but they are not modern ships in the sense of those in our active naval fleet today.

Simply—but not cynically—stated the loan of these ships is for our own benefit and not primarily for the benefit of the friendly foreign nation. We are happy that they can protect their own shores with these ships but, in the last analysis, it is the interests of this country which are being served by these loans.

The Senate took a somewhat different view of the loans contemplated by the three House bills. The Senate agreed with us with respect to ships for Italy, Spain, Turkey, and the Philippines—and substantially agreed with us with respect to Argentina and Brazil.

The Senate, however, did eliminate Venezuela, Peru, Chile, and the Republic of China. The last of these friendly foreign nations, the Republic of China, is the subject of the Senate amendment to H.R. 7813 which is under consideration at this time.

At the conference between the Senate and the House on October 22, 1965, the House accepted the Senate version of the ship loan legislation at least in part because of the lateness in the session. Indeed, October 23, 1965, was the last day of the 1st session of this Congress.

The conference report contains the following language:

> It was agreed in conference that the Senate conferees will give serious and sympathetic consideration to the ship loan program as passed by the House early in the next session of the Congress.

H.R. 7813, as amended by the Senate, is a reflection of this conference agreement.

The House version of this bill contemplated the loan of one destroyer and two destroyer escorts to the Republic of China. The Senate has amended the ship loan to the Republic of China by striking one of the destroyer escorts.

H.R. 7813 as it is now before the House would do only one thing: permit the loan of one destroyer and one destroyer escort from our mothball fleet to the Republic of China. It does nothing else.

FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS

The costs involved in the transfer of these ships are contemplated to be on a cost-share basis with the United States providing grant aid austere reactivation and overhaul and the Republic of China defraying modernization costs. The U.S. share would amount to about $2.9 million from military assistance funds for a destroyer, and $2 million for a destroyer escort. The Republic of China share would depend on the extent of modernization the country desires and whether any or all of the work is done in U.S. shipyards. If it is determined to perform all the ship modernization in U.S. yards, costs would be about $5.7 million for the destroyer and $2.7 million for the destroyer escort with the Republic of China defraying the differences over the above-mentioned figures.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the minority side has been well advised on this bill. As usual, the Committee on Armed Services is unanimous in this effort. This is a vital and important part of the military assistance program. The ship that was in question for Venezuela, at the time the original bill passed the House, has been withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to China."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Arends
Bell
Blatnik
Bolling
Bray
Brock
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Conyers
Dowdy
Farbstein
Farnsley
Fino
Foley
Fraser
Fuqua
Gilbert
Grider
Griffin
Halpern
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Herlong
Holland
Huot
Jacobs
Randall
Johnson, Okla.
Karth
Keogh
Leggett
Long, La.
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Miller
Multer
Murray
Nix
Powell
Reinecke
Resnick
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
St Germain
Scheuer
Scott
Sweeney
Tenzer
Toll
Tupper
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Bob

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. **McVICKER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McVICKER**. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I today have the privilege of introducing a resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary, April 14, of the Union of American Republics, now known as the Organization of American States.

That organization has a noble past, a strong present and a brilliant future. As a member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have had the opportunity to see at close range the activities of that organization during the past year and a half.

The OAS is the institution that maintains the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere. It promotes economic progress and improvements in the welfare and the level of living of all peoples of the region. Most important, it helps to strengthen the principles of individual liberty, free institutions and genuine independence in the hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that we in this body are recognizing the progress of the OAS as it consolidates the gains of the past and creates dynamic and vigorous institutions to meet present and future crises.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. **DENTON**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14215), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] and myself.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14215, with Mr. Price in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton], will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. **DENTON**. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are presenting today for the consideration of the House, the 1967 appropriation bill for the Interior Department and related agencies. The activities included in this bill are extensive in scope, and if I were to fully discuss each and every item in the bill at this time, it would take considerably more than the hour allotted to me. For the Interior Department alone, there is everything from green forests to blue lakes to black coal. Then when the items under the related agencies are included, the variety becomes even more diverse.

I will not endeavor to discuss each item in the bill since I feel that the report on this bill rather fully explains the action recommended by the committee in each instance. Therefore, during the time allotted to me, I will limit my remarks to some of the highlights which I feel should be called to the attention of the House in its consideration of the bill.

Total appropriations recommended in this bill are $1,321,149,500. This amount consists of $1,169,703,500 of what we refer to as direct appropriations; $125,446,000 for the appropriation of receipts; and $26 million in borrowing authorization. The appropriation of receipts and the borrowing authorization involve a small portion of the total appropriation, and for the 1967 fiscal year, do not vary significantly from what we have provided in these bills during the past several years. Therefore, I will direct my remarks principally to the direct appropriations.

On page 1 of the report you will note that the direct appropriations recommended for 1967 in the amount of $1,169,703,500, represent an increase of $30,316,430 over the appropriations approved for the 1966 fiscal year including anticipated pay supplementals. The amount recommended by the committee is also a decrease of $34,811,000 below the budget estimate.

Naturally in an appropriation bill of this type, you are bound to have conflicting ideas of the funding which should be provided. The President had his idea, which was reflected in the budget estimate presented to the committee. This committee deemed it appropriate to make some revisions in the amounts included in the budget estimates. I am sure there are others who have even different ideas of how this bill should be funded.

I believe it would be appropriate for me to take a few minutes at this time to commend the members of this subcommittee. All of them are knowledgeable of the activities covered in this bill, each of them has what I would call special knowledge of various aspects of the bill. Attendance at subcommittee hearings by all members was very good, and the chairman was gratified at the interest each of the members displayed in all of the items heard in the hearings.

The subcommittee attempted to delve into each activity covered by this bill to adequately determine the justification of the amounts being requested. We began our hearings on February 2, 1966, and completed the hearings on March 9, 1966.

I am very pleased to state that in all of our discussions on items in this bill, a bipartisan attitude prevailed at all times. I believe I can say without exception that in each of our determinations, the decision was based solely on the merits of the case. With this very excellent cooperation by the members of the subcommittee and the diligence with which they examined each request, I believe I can truthfully say that we are presenting today a well balanced bill, one that should provide sufficient funds to carry out the necessary activities of the agencies, and one that is mindful of various budget considerations that are dictated by world conditions today, and the guidance the Congress has given us through the enactment of various legislation in past years.

I think it is most important that I bring to your attention a consideration that is frequently overlooked and not accorded adequate significance in connection with this bill. To a large extent, this bill is self-supporting through the income derived from the activities it covers. On page 34 of part 1 of the hearings is listed the receipts of the Department of the Interior activities covered under this bill. On page 14 of part 3 of the hearings are listed the receipts generated by the activities of the Forest Service. To summarize these amounts, activities covered by this bill are forecast to generate $992,300,000 in Federal revenues in fiscal year 1967 as compared to $758,800,000 in fiscal year 1966. So while appropriations for 1967 will increase by $30,316,430 in 1967, we will have an increase of $233,500,000 in receipts generated by the activities of agencies covered by this bill.

Another way one might consider this is that receipts generated by this bill lack only about $328,849,000 of totally funding the operations in this bill, and it provides approximately $321,513,000 for various services and facilities for the American Indians.

In my opinion, there are two important considerations that recommend this bill for your approval: First, to a very large extent the activities in this bill are self-supporting; and, second, funding contained in this bill is for the improvement and betterment of America, in fact I feel this appropriation can be properly categorized as "an investment in America."

MAJOR INCREASES AND DECREASES

As I have mentioned previously, this bill would provide $30,316,430 over the funding level of 1966. For the most part, these increases are brought about by new legislation enacted by the Congress and the growing demands on facilities covered by this bill.

To briefly mention a few of the items of increase, I would like to point out that an increase of $32,500,000 is included in the bill for additional education and welfare services and other assistance to the American Indian. Although appropriations for the Indians have increased materially over the past several years, the general status of the American Indian is still such that we cannot afford to brag about it. School facilities are still limited, although greatly improved over 2 or 3 years ago; and although great progress has been made in improving the general health of the Indians, we still have a severe shortage of medical facilities, and much more work needs to be done in the housing area. I would like to point our that much has been done to improve these areas in other sections of the country during the past years, and it is only fair that we provide the Indians the same benefits.

There is an additional $4,400,000 for management, protection, and maintenance costs in the national parks. As a result of legislation enacted by the Congress, we have 10 new park areas in 1967, and with our increasing population, national park visitations are increasing each year. It is estimated there will be 127.5 million park visitors in 1967.

Three million six hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for acceleration of the solid waste disposal program, and additional activity in the coal research program.

There is an increase of $9 million for various activities by the Bureau of Mines and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for restoration projects in the Appalachian region.

Seven million three hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for the acceleration of the saline water research program. A large portion of this increase is for the construction of the replacement plant near San Diego, Calif.

Six million two hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for additional requirements of the U.S. Forest Service, mainly in connection with land management practices in connection with the 186 million acres of land in the national forests and grasslands.

Five million three hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for construction of the rail rapid transit system. Legislation authorizing this activity was passed last year and plans for the construction of the system are just now getting underway.

Four million eight hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for additional operating and research costs of the Smithsonian Institution. The new building space authorized by the Congress is now ready for occupancy and of course, it will require additional funds for the staffing and maintenance of these exhibit spaces.

Offsetting these increases we also have some major items of decreases. For example, there is a decrease of about $21 million in the construction of facilities and roads. This is in consonance with the President's recent indication that to the extent possible, the construction of new projects should be held to a minimum level at the present time.

Ten million dollars of the decrease relates to nonrecurring items which were contained in the 1966 appropriation, consisting of $1,400,000 for the construction of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial, $4,500,000 for transitional grants to Alaska, and $4,100,000 for payments to the Alaska Railroad in connection with damage to its facilities by the earthquake.

Other reductions include $4 million for the rehabilitation of Guam as a result of the availability of 1966 funds previously appropriated for the urban renewal program which was not approved by the Guam Legislature. There is a $2 million reduction in subsidies for the construction of fishing vessels, and several other miscellaneous reductions.

EXTENT OF ACTIVITIES FUNDED IN THE BILL

On page 3 of the report are listed some of the major activities funded by this bill, and I will mention a few of them at this time: management, conservation, development and protection of the forest, range, mineral and water resources of 464 million acres of the Nation's public domain lands; administration of mining and mineral leasing on 780 million acres in the continental United States and over 250 million acres of submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf; provision of educational assistance, facilities, and services to 59,800 Indian children in the public schools; management, protection, maintenance, and construction of facilities, including about 18,800 miles of parkways, roads and trails in 230 national parks, and other areas comprising about 26.4 million acres with an estimated 127.5 million visitors in 1967; and the management, protection, and development of 186 million acres of land in the national forests and grasslands, including an estimated harvest of 11.6 billion board feet of timber in 1967 with a value of $146,400,000.

ITEMS OF MAJOR INTEREST IN THE BILL

Several items in this bill were of considerable interest to numerous individuals, and I will take a few minutes at this time to report the recommendation of the committee with regard to these items:

First. Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development: Under Public Law 88–309, funds are provided to finance on a cost-sharing basis, fishery research and development projects proposed by States. The program provides for financing by the Federal Government of up to 75 percent of the project cost. The objective of this program is to increase the total fishery research effort of the United States. In 1966, a total of $4,100,000 was available for distribution to the States. The 1967 budget estimate provided for the distribution of $2,600,000 to the States, a reduction of $1,500,000. The committee is recommending the restoration of the funding for this program to its 1966 level which will once again provide $4,100,000 for State projects under this program. This was probably one of the most unpopular reductions recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Numerous outside witnesses appeared before the committee recommending restoration of this reduction, and the committee received hundreds of letters urging restitution of the funds.

Second. Excess foreign currency authorization: For the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the budget estimate recommended an excess foreign currency authorization in the equivalent of about $4,900,000. This authorization would have provided for the use of foreign currency in Poland, Israel, Burma, Ceylon, and Yugolslavia. The major portion of this authorization, approximately $3,500,000, was for the construction of a stern-ramp trawler in Poland. There was great opposition to this proposal both by numerous Members of Congress and outside witnesses. The bill as recommended by the committee today contains no authorization for the construction of ships in any foreign country under this bill, and recommends deletion of the total item for excess foreign currency authorization. In the opinion of the committee, funding of operations in foreign countries by this means is not consistent with well-controlled and regulated appropriation procedures.

Third. Land and water conservation fund: Great interest was also indicated in the operation of the land and water conservation fund. This item involves the appropriation of receipts from the sale of recreation/conservation use permits, motorboat fuel tax, and the sale of surplus property. The proceeds of this fund are used for the Federal purchase of land for recreation, forest areas, and wildlife habitat.

In 1966, $125 million was appropriated for this fund, but due to the decrease in estimated revenue in the fund, $110 million is provided for 1967.

Included in the funds provided for Federal acquisition was $10 million for the acquisition of land in the Redwood National Park. The committee has deleted this item without prejudice, in view of the fact that authorizing legislation for the acquisition of this land has not yet been enacted. With a few minor revisions recommended by the committee in the use of this fund, there is a total of $76,203,000 provided for assistance to States, an increase of $11,763,000 over the amount provided in the budget estimate, and a similar decrease in the amount available for the Federal land acquisition program.

Amounts available for assistance to States are on a 50–50 matching basis.

Fourth. George Washington Memorial Parkway: Extensive consideration was given by the committee to the proposal for the acquisition of park land along the Potomac River on both the Virginia and Maryland sides of the river. Of special interest was the acquisition of parkway land from the Wilson Bridge to Fort Washington for the ultimate purpose of constructing a parkway between these points. The committee did not approve this proposal for the reason that adequate authorization does not exist to cover the acquisition of land as proposed in the budget estimate, and in the opinion of the committee, the whole matter of the construction of parkways in this area needs to be reviewed by the proper legislative committees in the House and Senate. Many doubts and questions attend the intent of the authorization on which this request was based, and in the opinion of the committee it would be most beneficial to have a current and specific statement of policy by the Congress with regard to the construction of parkways by the National Park Service, not only in this area but for the entire Nation. Until such legislation is obtained, vexing problems and doubts will continue to attend any proposal for the construction of parkways, especially in the vicinity of the Capital area.

Fifth. Arts and humanities; Public Law 89–209, approved September 29, 1965, authorized grant-in-aid programs for the arts and humanities. The initial appropriation for this activity was made in the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1966. The 1967 budget estimate proposed funding for the National Council on the Arts and the National Council on the Humanities. The committee recommended a reduction of $1 million below the budget estimate for the National Council on the Arts.

At the time of the hearings, the National Council on the Humanities had just recently been organized and had not met as a body. The budget estimate presented to the committee contained no specific indication whatsoever of a budget program for 1967 since the Council had not approved any specific activities for the budget year as of that time. For this reason, the committee passed over the budget estimate of the National Council on the Humanities without prejudice, pending determination by the Council of specific projects to be financed in fiscal year 1967.

Sixth. Rail rapid transit system: The budget estimate for the National Capital Transporation Agency was reduced by $8 million. The total budget estimate for this agency was $25,580,000; $17,055,000 to be funded under this bill and $8,525,000 to be funded under the District of Columbia bill.

Included in the estimate was $12,200,000 for tunnel liner. Although construction is not scheduled to begin until July 1967, it was testified in the hearings that because of the individualistic specifications on this liner, considerable leadtime was necessary for its procurement. In the opinion of the committee, the planning schedule submitted by this agency is quite optimistic, and it is very problematical that preliminary planning and design will have progressed to the point where it will be feasible and practical to begin the procurement of this liner in fiscal year 1967. For that reason, the committee recommends a reduction of $8 million in the Federal share of the agency's estimate related to the procurement of the tunnel liner. As stated in the report, the committee has no desire to retard or delay the construction of this system, and if it develops that the planning schedule as set forth in the budget estimate can actually be maintained, the committee will be inclined to give favorable consideration to a supplemental request for this item in 1967 or the reprograming of available funds for the initiation of procurement of the tunnel liner.

Seventh. Anadromous fish: Public Law 89–304, approved October 30, 1965, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish. This legislation authorized to be appropriated for the period ending on June 30, 1970, not to exceed $25 million to carry out the purposes of the act. There appears to be great interest in this legislation and the committee has received numerous requests regarding the funding of this program in fiscal year 1967.

This matter was discussed during the hearings and the committee was informed that because of the timing of the legislation and the necessary preliminary work that had to be done in getting the States organized since this work was to be performed through cooperative agreements with the States, no funds were included in the 1967 budget estimate for this activity. The committee understands that organizational work on this program is proceeding, and there is a good possibility that funds for the administration of this program will be requested in a supplemental request.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my general remarks on this bill. As I have stated, it has received the serious consideration of the committee; we think it is a bill with good balance, and earnestly recommend its approval.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The reason I am asking this question—and I know it is too late to get some new controversy started here and I am not asking this to start a controversy—but it came to my attention more or less accidentally that within this department there were some high-priced employees who had been given leaves of absence with full pay in order to accept fellowships to work on doctorate degrees—and presumably upon the completion of that they would come back to the department at a still further increase in salary.

What I want to ask is this. Is it the policy of this Government to pay full time when a man is on leave to do something that will benefit his own career?

Mr. DENTON. Congress passed legislation to that effect. This legislation provides that an employee of the government can take training if it improves his work, and if he agrees to stay with the Government employment for a certain length of time. That is applicable not only in the Department of Interior but in every department of the Government. There are two or three pages in the hearings on this subject.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I want to get this clear. In other words, you are recommending to this Congress that we pay a man who is a grade 12——

Mr. DENTON. We are not making any recommendations. The Congress made the recommendation. Our committee did not enact the legislation. Our committee only appropriates in accordance with the legislative acts that the Congress has enacted. If you are dissatisfied with the program, it is not because of our action but because of the provisions in the Government Employees Training Act, or its maladministration by the agencies.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Let me ask one question. Is there money in this bill to provide the salaries of people who do not do any work and who get additional compensation and sufficient money to maintain them in their schools?

Mr. DENTON. There is money in this bill for the Federal Employees Training Act to carry out the program as directed by the Congress.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I know they were hesitant about giving the names of these people or where they were. This information has to be dragged out of them. I have not made any direct inquiry to the Interior Department to get these names. But the request has been made by a responsible Member of this House and I can tell you that I am reliably informed that there are several employees of this Department who are on leave—with full pay—and their income is being further supplemented by scholarships and fellowships—and at the conclusion of their educational program they will presumably return to work at higher salaries. I have no objection to assisting an individual in getting an education but I do resent my tax dollars being spent to permit any person to draw the equivalent of two salaries when he should be willing to bear a part of the burden himself. The principle, in my opinion, is wrong. The Government Employees Training Act is permissive legislation and was not intended to give such windfalls.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. On page 656 of the hearings, part II, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri will find a breakdown of costs. The number of employees total 4,773 who participated in this training program. I might suggest to the gentleman that he might be interested in reading this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Beginning on page 662, part II, of the hearings, and running for several pages, I find there is a hiring of all kinds of consultants, and just preceding that there is a request for an additional $100,000 for the transportation of persons totaling some $287,000.

Mr. DENTON. I think the gentleman will find our extended remarks on that in the second paragraph of the report. We have looked with disfavor on contracting out so much work, and the hiring of numerous consultants. We think it would be much better for the agencies to use their own employees. We cover that at some length in the report.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GRIDER. I wish to express my approval and pleasure in relation to this item of $61,700 to strengthen the registry of national landmark programs. As the chairman has said, this is an All America bill, and I am happy to see that we are not forgetting the value to America of preserving the old landmarks and the old heritage of the days that are now past, and the mementos which are being so rapidly obliterated.

Mr. DENTON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], who is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Interior and Related Agencies, has given all of us in the committee on both sides a full and accurate account of all of the actions of our committee, and I agree with the chairman's statement that this is a nonpartisan bill. Each item has been considered on its merits.

I shall not take up your time unnecessarily in going over again the actions of the committee. Those have been adequately explained to you by our chairman. I am especially pleased with the provisions contained in the bill for the betterment of the Indian Americans in this country.

Actually, the Department of the Interior appropriation request, which exceeds last year's appropriations by some $30 million, was in the area having to do with Indian programs. Most of it is for school buildings for the education of the Indian children who are in need of classrooms to carry out that important function of our Government.

In that regard the bill attempts to provide comparable facilities that are afforded other segments of our population in regard to their well-being.

As the chairman has pointed out, the bill also contains an additional amount of $500,000 to attack trachoma. This is a most urgent item. Trachoma is a terrible eye disease, and I think I should take the time to read from the hearings. I refer to part 3, page 949:

> Trachoma is a profound personal tragedy for its victims; and it is linked to the economic plight of the people, for the visual impairment and blindness caused by the disease are an impediment to the acquisition of skills required to improve their economic lot. As a measure of this economic toll, a pilot survey on San Carlos and Sacaton Reservations Indians in fiscal year 1964 found a rate of 830 per 100,000 individuals to be industrially blind (20 per 200 or less vision in both eyes) due to trachoma sequelae. It is of interest in this connection that approximately 23 percent of the blind-aid recipients in Arizona are American Indians and that one-third of these are blind due to trachoma.

As the chairman has pointed out, this disease of the eyes was nearly wiped out back in the 1930's. For some reason or other, particularly in the Southwest among the Apaches and the Navajos, this horrible eye disease is now coming back. This item was added to the budget once the information was available to the committee with respect to the increasing growth of this disease among these peoples.

Trachoma is controllable with sulfanilamide treatments that can be taken orally. When I was a kid on the reservation I remember that they did not have this kind of treatment. The eyelid would be rolled back with a stick, and the eyelid would be scraped. You could hear the victims of this disease screaming a block away. Today the treatment is much more humane. When this appropriation is approved by this House and the other body and becomes law, it will help to start a program to eradicate this dread disease.

The greatest work of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is carried on in the field of education and welfare. We have more students than ever before who are now taking advantage of the educational opportunities provided by this bureau through the appropriations in this bill. This bill contains the funds needed to carry on this challenging work.

As the chairman of our subcommittee has pointed out, I believe it is a tight budget. When the President sent us his budget for fiscal year 1967, he told us that we could continue our domestic spending at about the same rate as in the past and even begin new programs in an orderly and responsible way, at a pace that reflects the claims of our commitments in southeast Asia and Vietnam. So I believe we can have bombs and bread and butter, and maybe a few blossoms strung along the way in these times that are trying men's souls.

The cost of the war has meant some sacrifice. Some of the bureaus and offices of the Department of Interior were asked to cut back on their requests. The members of our committee, and particularly our very able chairman, Mr. DENTON, have made a conscientious and sincere effort to bring the budget requests of the Department of Interior into focus with the realities of fiscal responsibilities.

It is not an easy task to rework budget requests. It is not an easy task to decide which programs should be cut, which should be maintained at their previous levels, and which should be increased or started.

This body has among it Members who have said, time and again, that it should have an opportunity to express its will and not be dictated to by the administration. We have seen fit to cut $34 million from the original budget requests. We have seen fit to reallocate at least $7,200,000 to certain projects that had been considered by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget and turned down.

As a consequence of hearings, during which individual citizens have come to explain the need of these projects, we have taken into consideration and included in this bill projects which amount to approximately $7,200,000. I hope this committee will give its full support to this action.

I particularly would like to call the attention of Members of the House to certain areas and programs contained in this bill which merit our special consideration. I endorse the additional funds for the National Park Service. In these times of a little more affluence in our society, our people are going out into the countryside to look for a place to get away, not only from the busy, but also sometimes humdrum, crowded city life. Our population is increasing. There is need for the additional recreation facilities that are made possible in some State or community or area near an overgrown municipality.

I also endorse the expenditure of funds in Samoa and Guam.

I visited Guam shortly after the first hurricane about 2 years ago. In December, I had the pleasure and privilege of visiting the Samoan people, who are now receiving programs that are financed through the interest of this committee, of this body, and the other body.

Progress is being made there in the field of education and health and improved well-being of our friends, the American Samoans. Is is an impressive record.

I am especially interested in the Office of Saline Water, with respect to contributions it can make to the use of brackish water and the possibility of fighting against water pollution in our streams and rivers.

I believe there is a good opportunity for the Job Corps in our park areas, and our Bureau of Land Management, public land areas, and in the reservations under the control and supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. If we have Job Corps, camps, they should be out in these open areas, where these people, who may be dropouts from school, may have an opportunity to come in contact with the nature of their country.

I believe these programs can be of mutual benefit if the programs are administered properly and there is sufficient coordination among the agencies. I was a little disturbed to find, as contained in the record of hearings, that the proportion of Job Corps supervisors to of Indian Affairs. If we have Job Corps is probably narrower than it should be.

If we are going to have these camps, I do not know of any better place to have them than in our parks, forests, and land management areas. I agree with the chairman that this bill can be referred to as an investment in America, since practically every item, if analyzed, will be found to be instrumental in making America a little better place in which to live. I believe this bill merits your approval and merits the approval of the full committee. I recommend it to you for passage without reservation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for his intelligent approach and appraisal of the wide range of problems which face this committee. It is a committee which deals with everything from funding progress in the trust territories to funding the National Capital Transportation Agency here in Washington, D.C.

The hearings were held in great depth and the chairman's fairness toward every section of this Nation and our trust territories, his fairness to all the problems ranging from hurricanes, forest fires and park policing to funding the new arts and humanities program was exceptional.

At this time I would also like to pay tribute to the ranking member of this committee who was chairman of this subcommittee when I first became a member, for his intelligent, alert interest in every American program reported here. It was through his vision and his willingness to make the original investment that the schools of Samoa are today so outstanding. His work on behalf of educational TV has opened a new program of education not only for the young people there, but to the adults. To MIKE KIRWAN I pay a sincere tribute.

No appropriations bill suits everyone in this House. There are those who would cut and those who would raise. Some 64 Members of Congress appeared before us asking for additions and increases in the budget. Many representatives of important segments of the industrial economy appeared before us urging that money be expended in research that can and will mean the future of not only regions, but the Nation. The committee tried to select very carefully those items which should be funded, war or no war, realizing, of course, that the major part of the national budget is going into defense and into winning the conflict in Vietnam.

The largest increase in this entire bill is for our Indian people and even with this increase we are going to have problems. The status of the Indian people in our Nation is a national disgrace. The poverty, the lack of job training, lack of programing for the future all show up today in the housing, inability of many, many Indians to speak our English language and the inability of these Indians to take their place in the 20th century society of these late 1960's. I join the distinguished ranking minority member in his concern.

I commend Secretary Udall of the Department of Interior for his recent statement wherein he proposes a new and more imaginative look at the entire Indian problem. This should be done without delay and is almost a century late.

In this appropriations bill there is a substantial increase in funds for Indian schools. I think some of you would be interested in knowing what we have done.

In the year 1959 the percentage of those entering high school from the elementary schools was 46.6 percent. In 1965 it was 77.4 percent. However, it is well to examine this figure a little closer.

In 1965 there were 3,098 students in the ninth grade in the high schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In the 10th grade there were 2,766; 11th grade 2,133; 12th grade 1,832. Obviously if these figures relate to potential students, there were substantial dropouts. It is also interesting to note that the number of Indian students graduating from 4-year colleges and universities rose in the year 1960 from 56 to 121.

However, when I questioned the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and asked him, "Have you any comparable percentage between the dropout rate in the Indian boarding schools and in the public schools?" he replied:

> With these figures which I have indicated earlier, the high school graduates increased for 46.6 percent to 77.9 percent so that nearly four out of five of those entering Federal boarding high school will remain to graduate.

But, he indicated on page 373 of the hearings that the dropout rate in the public schools during these same years was increasing at a rapid rate and creating a serious situation.

Some of the statistics are listed on page 373 and you will be interested in some of them now: In Arizona of 767 eighth-grade students there were only 273 high school graduates. In my own State of Washington of 189 eighth-grade graduates in the public schools, there were only 95 12th-grade graduates. In the State of New Mexico there were 591 eighth-grade graduates and yet there were only 311 high school graduates.

Therefore, our requests for education today are large in the Federal area, but more needs to be done in the public sector of education. What causes these young people who start the ninth grade in a public high school to drop out before finishing? The dropouts will be related later in their lives to problems of unemployment, crime, juvenile delinquency, and welfare.

The Commissioner testified on page 374 of the hearing record that welfare costs have been going up for several years on the reservations. He related the rising welfare costs to the era of mechanized farming and the slowdown in needs for unskilled seasonal farmworkers.

The only appreciable slowdown in relief and assistance to the unemployed Indians came during the accelerated public works program. The Commissioner stated:

> We put $21 million of direct expenditure for public works on the reservation during a 15-month period. During that period the general assistance load did not increase.

These figures and these statements clearly indicate that unless we educate, train, and provide some educational opportunity for our Indian people, they will remain on job assistance rolls. It is a far better program for their pride, their families, and for their communities and for the national good that they be trained so that they may become part of the economic future. This is the reason in this bill that you will find sums of money spent to develop industries in their own areas.

Indian reservations need better management and assistance to develop there an economy which will develop the Indians' ability economically.

Turning to another most important facet of our national resources, I would like to point out that in the field of the U.S. Forest Service we did not fund as heavily as we should have. Necessary construction in many instances has not been funded due to the Presidential request and also due to the financial limitations. However, I do want to point up some of the costs of not continuing our research or in slowing down.

For example, we are opening up an Appalachian timber economy and proposing to put it in the mainstream of the entire timber economy of this Nation. Perhaps more than any other industry this one has had its ups and downs. There are periods of tremendous depression and there is behind it one overall pressing problem which is the competitive position of lumber itself with the use of other products—aluminum, steel, glass, plastics. Now, when we are about to want to do a good job in the Appalachia region, I have raised the question, "How can we afford not to go ahead full speed on the research which retain or give the forest products a better position?"

This is directly related in the chemistry section of the Madison Forest Products Laboratory.

For forest research the Bureau of the Budget did not propose this year to construct an Animal Damage Laboratory which would serve two States.

The preservation of wild animals and at the same time the preservation of our forests is of major importance. The laboratory facility of the States of Oregon and Washington is pressing hard to develop some way of discouraging animal damage without causing damage to the animal population—this through the use of chemicals on the seeds and on the roots of small trees. In the State of Washington alone the animal damage to our forest development is $15 million annually. The Government, the States, and private industry spend small fortunes annually in planting trees and in reseeding operations, not only for forest products, but to maintain watersheds, eliminate the causes of flooding and to restrain drought. For example, reforestation in the State of Washington in 1965 cost $1,734,929.72. Yet, animal damage can destroy in a very short time the investment made by Federal and State Governments as well as the investments by those with private forests. The economy of the entire forest-producing area of the Nation is becoming more and more dependent upon research.

I deeply regret today that there are not adequate funds to construct these much needed laboratories.

In conclusion, may I say that we funded projects for which we will be criticized, undoubtedly, but there is no project in the United States of America that cannot be criticized by someone who wants to criticize. We have appropriated money today for the programing of the arts. The chairman has already explained why the humanities were omitted. And may I indicate to everybody concerned Congress does not wish to supervise the arts. I do urge all of you to read the hearings and the excellent testimony by Mr. Stevens as he appeared before our committee.

The committee has repeatedly made plain our interest and I think there can be no charge by anyone that a program of arts and humanities will be used for propaganda purposes. In fact, to make this plain the committee questioning was long and serious. May I say on behalf of this program, we annually spend millions of dollars for outdoor recreation. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife receives in this budget some $37 million. I think it would be well for us to remember that there are millions of people who will never hold a gun in their hands and who will never use a fish pole. They live in the cities of our Nation and access to the outdoors is difficult and often too expensive for many. But these are the people who can benefit from and will enjoy a program of arts. These are the people who will enjoy the ballet, plays, paintings, music and literature. All the Nation will enjoy them, but particularly to our urban dwellers, these potential programs offer a tremendous opportunity to enjoy the creative and performing arts.

This Nation spends substantial sums of money on many and a wide variety of items. I am going to list some of them for you now.

This Nation, in 1964, spent $13,600 million for liquor. In that same year, they spent $7,826 million for tobacco crops.

Let us turn to the field of juvenile delinquency and crime.

FBI figures for 1964: 41 percent of those arrested were under 25 years old. Annual cost of all crime is now estimated by the FBI according to the President's crime message, at $27 billion. The proportion of crime attributed to youth and juveniles is unknown. Assuming that juvenile delinquents and youth up to age 25 contributed to the total cost of all crime in proportion to their arrests, the figure would be $11 billion.

Per capita costs is between $3,000 and $6,000 per year per bed.

California's budget alone is $100 million for California Youth Authority. New York Youth Authority is $55 million—this gives total group under 25 years of age, rather than 16 to 25.

In this year, military assistance for nations around the world, excluding Vietnam, is proposed in total of $1,150 million which breaks down to $3,151,000 per day.

Finally, I only want to remind the Members of this Congress to look back across the centuries of history. What has survived? Art, music, literature, theater. The battles that have been won in many instances are almost forgotten; alliances and lands have changed; but Shakespeare, Brahms, Michaelangelo, Da Vinci are immortal.

America will be remembered in the centuries ahead for her ideals, and her surviving culture.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I do not have much time, but I will yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman speaks of the illiteracy of the American Indian. I am sure she is right, but how many hundreds of millions of dollars is this Government dishing out each year on the education of foreigners around the world?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would just recommend that the gentleman read last year's report of our Committee on Foreign Affairs. He can get the information there. I am discussing American Indians at this time.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDade].

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill pending before us today. However, before I begin to discuss any part of the bill and my impressions of it, first I want to extend my deep appreciation to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton] and to our ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] for the kind cooperation and assistance extended to all the members of the committee as we proceeded through these hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee has already discussed some of the technical problems contained in this bill. My distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] has discussed many of the problems that face the American Indian. Certainly there is no greater advocate of the problems that must be solved on behalf of the American Indian than my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel].

It is natural inclination for men of concern to occasionally experience moments of introspection, to ask of themselves: What have I done today to better the lot of mankind, to make this great Nation of ours a little better place in which to live? What have I done to so shape the destiny of our Nation that it shall be a richer and greener pasture for our children?

This is a question which those of us who serve in this House cannot ask often enough. For we are privileged to act in a fiduciary capacity for 190 million men, women, and children who share in the ownership of the most noble exercise in Government that mankind has ever known. Inevitably, they share the fruits of our wisdom when we have the vision to act with purpose.

In just a few short hours at the conclusion of debate, each one of us in this House will have a rare opportunity to end our day's labor, secure in the certain knowledge that we have helped to make the United States of America a richer and greener pasture for tomorrow. We can do so by supporting this appropriation bill for the Interior Department and related agencies. Without equivocation, I say to you that no legislation to come before this body does more to enrich the lives of our fellow Americans.

No legislation will do more to give to our children the same America which was given to us by our own fathers—and certainly this is the smallest heritage we owe the future.

There is in this bill a montage of America under all her magnificent aspects.

There is the continental sweep of the National Park Service. You may stand in the very heartland of America, at Grand Teton. You may look to the far shores of the Pacific, to Point Reyes, and the National Park Service is the protector of beauty there. Or you may look to Cape Cod, where once America's whaling industry plied its trade, and the National Park Service is there. Or you may go deep into the most mysterious swamp in all of our 50 States, the Everglades, where the wildlife is not only prolific but is unspeakably savage and beautiful at the same time, and your guide will probably be one of the men of the National Park Service who are trying to save this remarkable territory for other generations.

Wherever you look the National Park Service is there, and is saving the heritage of America.

And through the Forest Service, they are saving more than mere scenery. They are studying the problem of husbanding our resources in land and water, so that our children may have the land on which to grow their food, and the water that will give life to tomorrow.

If this were the only agency in this bill, it would give ample justification for its passage. But it is only one of many.

Look to the two sections of the Department of the Interior which are concerned with fishing, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries. We look at the oceans, the vast Pacific on the west and the Atlantic on the east, and the Gulf of Mexico to the south of us. To us they are gigantic bodies of rolling waters, but to the men in the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries they are repositories of the food of the future. There is a new research center in California, and another in Florida. Daily they are researching the patterns of the deeps. So new is this research, that there is a new specie discovered nearly every day.

As a matter of fact, with the new work being done in this field, we have discovered fish swimming in the deeps of the ocean which were thought to be extinct for over a million years. We have scarcely probed the shallow waters of the Grand Banks. We have not even begun to touch the unknown world of the Marianas Trench and all of the other great deeps that lie on the ocean floor. We know nothing of the chains of mountains and the volcanoes that lie hidden beneath the oceans. We are only now beginning to chart the path of the food fish that move with the winds, the tides, the temperatures, the currents.

And if it is sport you want, not commercial fishing then visit any of the 50 States of America and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries will guarantee that trout and bass will be running in the early morning when you go down to the stream to take up the mantle of Izaak Walton.

But the work of the Department of Interior is certainly not principally concerned with the oceans beyond our borders. It is concerned with the land beneath our feet.

In the Bureau of Geological Survey there are men who are working day and night to discover the still hidden natural resources which the future will demand. They have recently discovered a major silver deposit at Creede, Colo. They are working at new ways to detect petroleum deposits. They are charting the crust of the earth, which their Director, Dr. Pecora, most properly called "a veritable 3-dimensional jigsaw puzzle."

These men who work in the Office of Geological Survey are most remarkable men, who do not think of the edge of the sea as the end of the continent. For them, the land shelf reaching out under the ocean is just as much a part of our Nation as the very land on which we stand today. They are men who have a truly global sweep to their vision, and whose discoveries here are watched by every geologist across the world.

I have spoken often about the ocean. But the Office of Saline Water looks on it with different eyes. In that salt water there may lie not only the food for the future harvests, but even drink for our cities of tomorrow. There are already desalination plants in operation which, at this very moment are converting the waters of the sea into a reservoir of usable, drinkable, water.

You will all remember the magnificent gesture of our commanding officer at Guantanamo Naval Base who, when Castro announced that he was shutting off the water supply for the base, calmly went out and cut the pipe in scorn. Our desalination plant at Guantanamo not only gives our men ample drinking water and bath water; we have enough left over for the swimming pool.

And in the middle of all this natural wonder in this bill is the merest touch of the esthetic in the arts and humanities portion.

Mr. Chairman, I am one who walked in reverence past the painting called the Mona Lisa. I walked past the Pieta at the World's Fair. I have luxuriated in magnificent plays and musicals on Broadway, and in other theaters when these plays were on the road. I read fiction and nonfiction as much as the limited time permitted me allows. I am an unabashed enthusiast for the arts and humanities.

I am reminded of a story of Dr. Johnson who was once invited to dinner, and who, when asked about the meal later, remarked:

> It was a nice dinner, but not the sort of dinner you would invite a man to.

Mr. Chairman, I feel about the arts and humanities section of this bill much as Dr. Johnson felt. Without this section it would still be a fine bill, but not the sort you would invite a man to examine.

There is, finally—and I have deliberately held this portion until last—the Bureau of Mines. Mr. Chairman, this portion of the bill must be very close to my heart, because I represent the northern portion of the anthracite mining section of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I could not possibly finish my remarks without paying my personal compliments and thanks to Dr. Hibbard, the Director, and to Mr. Frank Memmott, the Deputy Director of the Bureau, for the remarkable cooperation they have extended me in my work of representing the 10th Congressional District.

You will note on page 15 of the report on this bill a reference to a "practical means of extinguishing smoldering fires in culm dumps in the State of Pennsylvania." This section refers to the culm dumps in the arthracite area of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to portray the problems we face in this area. It is really only known by those who visit the area. Where others worry about the surface of the earth and what might be done with the land on which they live, my own constituents must worry about the deep mines under the earth and the constant threat of cave-ins, of mine subsidence, with all the attendant destruction to property, and sometimes to life.

In South and North Carolina today men are fighting bravely against forest fires, and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that they may all be extinguished by nightfall, because fire is a dreadful enemy.

But in my own district, Mr. Chairman, we have mine fires that have been burning for 50 years, and we have no hope to extinguish them by nightfall. We have refuse dumps, called culm dumps in the anthracite area, which have caught fire by spontaneous combustion, and which also have been burning for 50 years. They lay a pall of smog over the area on foggy nights, a smog which eats the paint off the houses, that must surely have a serious effect on human lungs, and that hides the highways in a dangerous darkness. We need programs to solve these problems. They are vital to the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, this is the bill before us. It is a bill to keep the land green. It is a bill to keep the ground productive. It is a bill to keep the streams of America running with fish. It is a bill to keep the oceans of the world brimming with food fish. It is a bill to keep the air of America unpolluted. And it is a bill to give that final richness to America, the richness of the arts. This is the richness which has made man not just a little better than the animals, but rather just a little less than the angels.

I hope my colleagues will approve this bill in its entirety. I know what work went into the preparation of the final form of this bill. It was not pieced together frivolously. It is the product of prudence and intelligence, and a wise frugality. Let it not be said of us when this day is past that we knew the cost of everything and the value of nothing. This bill was written by men who looked deep within themselves, to learn the value of the future of America. I know of nothing more valuable on the face of this globe.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman who is now addressing us on his fine presentation and also to commend the distinguished minority member, the gentleman from South Dakota, who made such an excellent presentation here and who has worked so hard in retaining the funds for the arts and humanities, legislation I sponsored on January 11, 1965, together with many other Members here in the House.

I would like to read several telegrams that I received today, if the gentleman will allow me. The first telegram is from my great and close friend Erich Leinsdorf, conductor of the world renowned Boston Symphony. The telegram is as follows:

BOSTON, MASS.,
April 4, 1966.

Representative SILVIO O. CONTE,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been greatly disturbed during the past few days by the general trend of the interview of Mr. Roger Stevens by a congressional subcommittee. The arts can only be supported and furthered, and they can progress only when experts are entrusted with all detailed decisions of where support is needed and should be placed. For the United States and its magnitude and considering its other financial commitments, the original sum for the arts and humanities has been small enough. To cut it further will not help us financially but will ruin some of our great reputation in the world of art and science. I hope your vote will be with the arts and sciences.

Respectfully and sincerely,
ERICH LEINSDORF.

And if I may read another one from the American Association of Museums:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 4, 1966.

HON. S. O. CONTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Association of Museums, speaking for 5,000 American museums which provide annually educational and cultural programs and services for more than 300 million American children and adults, urges your support of the appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Museums across the Nation heartily endorse the arts and humanities legislation and realize fully the value to the Nation's cultural life and development of the Foundation's important efforts and programs. These valuable initial efforts of the Foundation should not be curtailed or hampered.

JOSEPH ALLEN PATTERSON,
Director.

In addition to the two telegrams I have just read to you, I have also received numerous pieces of communication from persons in all walks of life; all supporting this legislation. When this measure was originally under committee study, I received an avalanche of mail in support of the measure. The mail was so overwhelming that I had to keep one person busy full time just responding to the letters I was receiving in support of the arts and humanities bill.

The support came from the average Mr. and Mrs. America, and also from some of our noted scholars and educators. The letters came from Dr. Edwin E. Sten, dean of the School of Fine and Applied Arts at Boston College.

From Dr. J. A. Stratton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology who in his letter said:

> I do want to emphasize my own strong belief in the need for concerted support of the arts and the humanities and to endorse in principle the bills you are now considering which will make this support a reality.

In his letter to the Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Dr. Stratton said:

> Despite the magnificent generosity of private gifts in the United States to museums, orchestras, opera companies, universities, and the like in support of the humanities and arts, there is every evidence that this is insufficient. Even great established organizations, such as the Boston Symphony Orchestra, the Metropolitan, and San Francisco Opera Companies, are faced with mounting difficulties every year. Moreover, it has become practically impossible to initiate new ventures solely with private donations.

Other letters of support came from Dr. John W. Lederle, president of the University of Massachusetts; from Russ Miller, director of studies at Deerfield Academy; from Edmond S. Meany, Jr., headmaster of Northfield School. Thus you can see some of the support the arts and humanities bill had.

It is my understanding that later this afternoon an amendment will be proposed to completely delete the Arts and Humanities Foundation from fiscal 1967 funds. I shall not comment on that amendment at that time, but shall limit my remarks to the present ones. I do want each and every member, however, to know that I am completely opposed to such an amendment. The Appropriations Committee has worked long and hard on this year's appropriation measures as we do each year. The Appropriations Committee cut almost $7 million from the foundations request. To cut more would be to kill this budding giant.

Perhaps if some of my colleagues had more of an opportunity to be exposed to the fine work of groups such as the Boston Symphony they would not be attempting to cut this $7 million.

I certainly again wish to compliment the gentleman and hope we will at least get these meager sums provided for in this budget.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who preceded me in the well, made one of the finest pleas for the programs financed by the moneys authorized in this legislation that could possibly be made. I wish to congratulate him as a new Member of the Congress for his statement.

I want to take note of the fine relationships that exist between the appropriating committee, especially the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agency Appropriations, and the authorizing committee of which I am chairman. For many years we have had this fine relationship. This was true when the committee was chaired by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. It is now true as the committee is chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], and those members who serve so ably and unselfishly upon this subcommittee.

I can say to my colleagues that it is a most pleasing experience when one goes before the appropriating committee and is permitted to give his own personal opinion as to the relationship between the authorization procedures and the appropriation procedures. While this bill is not in all detail what I might have asked for if I had been on the committee or perhaps as I would like it now in every detail, nevertheless I do understand as much as anyone the great responsibility of this committee, and I want to congratulate them for the fine work that they have done, and to suggest to my colleagues that we should support this bill wholeheartedly in the form it comes to us.

I think one of the most meaningful statements in the report appears on page 2. The activities covered by the bill are forecast to generate $992,300,000 in Federal revenues for fiscal year 1967. When we look at the relationship between this amount of money and the amount of money appropriated, we can see how near this Department comes to carrying its own activities.

Then on pages 3, 4, and 5, and part of 6, we have a statement as to the extent of the activities funded in the bill. This is perhaps one of the most concise and factual statements that we have ever had brought before the Congress of the United States as to the activities that come under the jurisdiction of this particular subcommittee.

May I suggest that in this bill there are several places where some warnings are given to the Members of the Congress. It will be well for us to heed these warnings.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, last Tuesday, when we were in the Committee of the Whole House debating the second supplemental appropriation bill, I stepped over to the other side of the aisle to address the House, because I was representing the President of the United States in his attempt to keep the $41 million appropriation for impacted school aid out of the bill, which the President did not want and which was not budgeted.

Perhaps I should now step over there again today in support of the President. I would be very happy to do so, because I believe he needs our support in his effort to hold down Federal spending during the remainder of this year and throughout the fiscal year 1967.

I feel certain that all of you have read several recent press reports that indicated the President has complained that Congress is altering his budget plans to the extent that we are increasing, rather than reducing, his $112.8 billion expenditure budget for 1967.

Of course, we all know that the President and the Bureau of the Budget can control the level of a considerable amount of the Federal spending in 1967, regardless of what Congress does in the way of providing new spending authority. The control of spending has been accomplished by earlier administrations, and it can be done again simply by impounding funds that are available for expenditure on nonessential programs. The classic example of such control is the action taken by a former President, Harry Truman, during the 80th Congress, when he impounded the funds for additional air groups.

Since I was not privy to what the President did in his meeting with the Cabinet last Friday, I am obliged to rely on the report of the White House deputy press secretary, Mr. Robert H. Fleming, with respect to conclusions reached at that meeting. Based upon Mr. Fleming's briefing, I was heartened to learn that the President hopes to reduce the anticipated budget deficit for this year by as much as a billion dollars. The reduction will be accomplished by reducing planned Federal spending during the last 3 months of this year and by the fact that revenues are coming into the Treasury faster than was anticipated in the January budget.

I am elated over the fact that the President has reached the conclusion that one very desirable way to ease inflationary pressures is by cutting back on nonessential Federal spending. This is a cause that I have been espousing constantly since the budget for fiscal year 1967 was submitted to Congress on January 24.

Now, if the President's bureaucratic minions in the departments and agencies will take to heart his admonition to them to seek out and defer outlays that may be desirable but are not essential, then some real progress can be made toward controlling the inflationary pressures in our economy.

I urge Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, to give the President their unstinting support of his efforts to reduce nonessential Federal spending in this and the 1967 fiscal year as a prime means of controlling inflation.

To do what I can to support the President, I shall, at the appropriate time today, offer two amendments to the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, H.R. 14215.

The first of my amendments would reduce total appropriations in the bill by $7,293,000.

This $7,293,000 represents the sum of 41 individual increases in appropriations above the budget request. The items covered by this total increase of $7,293,000 represent projects of vital interest to Members of Congress. I want to make this absolutely clear to each of you. My amendment, if approved, does not affect a single project in this bill. The projects remain in the bill. It simply is a reduction of the total amount in the bill of $7,293,000, which the bill overbudgets. Congress in its wisdom put these items in the bill, and it would be expected, Congress having put them in the bill, that the Department of the Interior would fund them and take care of them. We are not attacking a single individual item in the bill. It is simply a reduction of that amount.

May I point out to you—and I think this is very important—there is plenty of money in this bill, which amounts to $1,170 million. There are sufficient funds in here for the Department of the Interior to find $7,293,000 in order to fund these programs which the Congress in its wisdom put into the bill. So we are not taking out projects but are simply saying to the Department of the Interior that we are staying within the budget requests; you find the money.

It has been said here there is a $34 million reduction in the budget estimates for this bill. That is right and that is good. But if you take the total amount of cut in the bill, it is about 3 percent. May I point out to you that even though there is a $34 million reduction in this bill from budget estimates, the bill is still $30 million higher than was appropriated last year. We can talk about reductions all we like, but I think we also ought to take a look at the amount of the bill and how much it is over the appropriation of last year. Again I point out that with $1,170 million and an increase of $30 million over 1966, there is no reason why the Department of the Interior cannot find $7,293,000 to fund the projects which Congress said are important to all of you. They should be funded, and the President can certainly find ways in which to do it.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Yes. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. May I remind the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, that the additional $30 million or more over and above last year results primarily from making funds available for additional school housing for Indian children. This has been in the pipeline in anticipation of the housing for these children come schooltime next year.

Mr. BOW. I say to the gentleman that the $30 million additional is still there.

Mr. REIFEL. But it is necessary for education.

Mr. BOW. I do not quarrel with you about it at all. The money will stay there. You will still have $1,170 million. If any agency is in the position of having a budget of $1,170 million and cannot find $7 million there for these projects, then you had better get rid of the agency, because we all know that there is plenty of money to take care of these individual items.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We could find and save $7 million very easily by knocking out this hearts and flowers expenditure for the so-called arts and humanities, could we not?

Mr. BOW. There is about $7 million right there.

Now, my other amendment, I will say to my colleagues, limits expenditures provided in this bill to 95 percent of the level proposed by the President for this bill in his budget for 1967. Such limitation would protect the President. I want to protect him from people who want to spend more. It would, in fact, protect him from those who want to spend more than he is proposing. This affects expenditures only and has no effect on proposed appropriations for 1967.

The second amendment would limit the President's spending to 95 percent of what he projected in the 1967 budget for items in this bill. It would prevent him from going further. I might also add that I think it would be a specious argument for anyone to advance the idea that any kind of expenditure limitation amendment would put the affected departments or agencies in a straitjacket with respect to spending. The Committee on Appropriations has already made desirable cuts in the bill where it was determined that they should be made and that action provides flexibility. Again I say to you that this limitation amendment does not affect one dime of appropriations in this bill. It says that the President shall be confined to 95 percent of the amount he projected in the 1967 budget for items in this bill. They cannot force him to go beyond that. These two amendments should be adopted. They do not affect projects in the bill, but they do give the President a little help in trying to cut down on Federal spending.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SKUBITZ. My colleague suggests what we do is take a percentage cut of 5 or 6 percent on every project across the board?

Mr. BOW. No. I am not suggesting that.

Mr. SKUBITZ. What are you suggesting?

Mr. BOW. I am suggesting we take $7,293,000 of appropriations out of the bill, which is the amount that we have gone over the budgeted separate items, and say to the Department of the Interior, "Here, you have $1.2 billion. Fund these projects which Congress put in the bill from the appropriations provided." After all, Congress has the authority to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOW. We have the authority to say to them, "These are projects which should be funded, and you can find the money to fund them. We are giving you this tremendous amount of money. You take care of these projects. They belong to the Members of Congress."

Mr. SKUBITZ. Has the gentleman from Ohio so decided that he could cut out certain projects?

Mr. BOW. No, I am not saying that we cut out certain projects. I am saying that you could fund the projects out of the money now being appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has spoken, and it is the will of Congress that these projects be given proper care. We say, indeed, take care of them out of this large amount of money we are giving you.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as the 5 or 6 percent across-the-board suggested cut is concerned, this might be a good idea on some of these projects. The President says that if we continue to go beyond his budget figures, he is going to have to ask for increased taxes.

Mr. Chairman, it is a question of whether we want to have an increase in taxes or some real fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this House of Representatives has got to stand up to this question, and if we want to really protect the taxpayers of this country against further increases in the already heavy tax burden, we are going to have to go along with these two amendments which I propose to offer. They do not affect this bill one bit with reference to any specific project contained therein, except they would cut total appropriations by $7,293,000 and would limit spending for items in this bill to 95 percent of the amount the President proposed for expenditure in 1967 for this bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to support as strongly as I can the appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, with particular reference to the $7 million recommended by our Appropriations Committee.

As you know, this amount represents a substantial cut in the appropriations recommended by the President for this new agency for the next fiscal year. It represents a cut of $6,930,000—or almost 50 percent of the funding the President recommended.

Now I recognize that $5 million of this cut applies to the national endowment for the humanities, because as the House report states, the policymaking National Council on the Humanities, which guides the work of that endowment, had not had an opportunity to meet and formulate its plans and programs prior to its chairman's appearance before the Subcommittee on Appropriations chaired by my distinguished colleague from Indiana.

My remarks are not addressed now to that portion of the cut. However, for the RECORD I would like to point out that the Humanities Council was sworn into office 2 days after the Council Chairman, Dr. Henry Allen Moe, appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

The swearing-in ceremonies took place at the White House at which time the President spoke eloquently on the very meaningful role this Council would play in the advancement of our Nation's learning and scholarship. The Council met in full session after the ceremonies at the White House, and has now framed a detailed program which may now properly be considered by the Senate, and which I feel is most deserving of strong endorsement by the Congress.

We are not debating that issue now, Mr. Chairman, though I repeat I would like the record to show my strong support for the humanities program, and my hope that the Senate will take all appropriate action to remedy an omission of funds which is attributable only to the time elements involved, and is in no way a reflection on the eagerness of the humanities leadership to proceed with their important work with all possible dispatch.

Today, however, we are concerned primarily with the appropriation for the national endowment for the arts, the equal partner with the humanities in the new Foundation, and the partner whose Council has been in being for just over a year.

I had the privilege of serving as floor manager of the bill creating the Council. It represents a group of 26 men and women who have dedicated themselves to the development of the arts in this country, who are nationally and, indeed, internationally recognized as outstanding leaders in their field of the arts, and who have worked long hours—often without any pay whatsoever—for a cause in which they and countless others deeply believe.

We are not talking about luxuries, or window dressing, or frills or furbelows, for the American scene and our way of life. We are talking about the essential quality of American life, the kind of quality that is absolutely basic to our goals for the future—basic to young people and their development as better human beings, basic to the middle aged and to our older citizens, basic to the whole fabric of our country in terms of both the present and the future.

All leading civilizations throughout history have placed great emphasis on the arts. They have done so because the arts translate into lasting, permanent form man's highest aspirations. These facts are beyond debate. For centuries the arts abroad have been supported at a state or national level. Today the taxpayers in all leading European countries support the arts. Austria, for example, spends $1.70 per person per year for the arts, including aid to arts festivals which attract thousands of visitors to that country annually.

The per capita expenditure for the arts involved in the appropriation we are considering amounts to less than 4 cents annually. Four cents per person, per year, to benefit the arts by the richest Nation on earth—it is utter nonsense to call that an extravagance. It is sheer folly, and a complete misinterpretation of values, to say that we cannot afford it.

And yet it is just this small amount of money which is so urgently needed.

It is the kind of seed money which can return itself many, many times over, which is fundamental to our recognition of what the arts can do to benefit this country, and which can provide a highly important stimulus to private giving for the arts. That private support is simply no longer adequate to meet the growing demands our people are making on arts organizations all across the Nation. The inadequacy of private support was not only described in detail during the extensive congressional hearings on this legislation, but it is manifest in the hundreds of letters which the arts endowment has been receiving since enactment of the public law. For example, during the period between February 15 and March 31, the endowment received 441 requests for grants; 136 of these were referrals from the Congress; and may I add that more than 30 percent of these—48 in all—were referred by Republican members.

It is ridiculous to suggest that governmental support will diminish private giving for the arts. Just the opposite has been true in those States which have already established programs financed in part by State funds.

And speaking of our States, at a recent conference in Chicago, sponsored by the National Council on the Arts, the Governors of every State sent representatives to that conference held to explain the new law, and how each State could benefit by its provisions which make each State eligible for a maximum of $50,000 in Federal funds. Some States sent as many as five representatives to the conference—and all at their own expense. That would seem a truly remarkable demonstration of interest for any new Federal program.

There are 55 entities designated to receive Federal funds in the act, including the District of Columbia and the territories. By cutting the total appropriation for the States, and the District and the four other areas, from an authorized and recommended $2.75 million to the $2 million before us today, that means that each State can receive only a maximum of $36,363.63—a cut of more than 30 percent. Whatever is appropriated to the States must be allotted on an equal basis.

To cut State funding for the arts by over 30 percent and the basic grants-in-aid program by 20 percent—from $5 to $4 million—would hardly seem in line with an economy drive, not matter how well motivated.

But I am not here to complicate an issue which has already been decided by our Appropriations Committee, or to debate the wisdom of the action they have taken. I am here to defend this program and this recommended appropriation against any further incursions.

The program is aimed at helping the individual artist and arts organizations on a nationwide basis, and at assisting each State to develop its own meaningful activities in the arts.

It is directed toward helping the young artist, the young musician, the young writer, painter, and sculptor, as well as the accomplished professional who now ekes out a most meager livelihood and who has been searching for years for the kind of opportunities this program can provide.

It is directed toward satisfying the needs of our people; for there is a great new audience in our country waiting to receive and enjoy excellence in the arts.

It is directed toward education in the arts—education in the classics so essential to our understanding of what is best and meaningful; education for young people in high school and for members of the adult community.

It is directed toward increasing cultural understanding between our Nation and our Latin American neighbors, while at the same time giving our own artists greater opportunities for employment.

It is directed toward increasing excellence of design as it applies to our whole national environment, especially in the fields of architecture and industrial design.

It is directed toward making the works of promising artists known to a wider audience, through museum exhibits in our smaller cities, those of less than 250,000 in population.

It is directed toward building up regional support of the arts, so that their values can be appreciated in local communities and at the grassroots level.

Are we to say that this program, which this Congress enthusiastically endorsed just a few months ago, is now unworthy of one ten-thousandth of 1 percent of our Federal budget?

The figure we are considering is less than that, in actuality.

Are we to say that the kind of civilization our men are now fighting for in Vietnam is not to be enriched here at home by this very modest support for the arts, which make the difference between a materialistic society and a truly creative one?

In this connection, may I remind my colleagues that in the darkest days of World War II, the British Government—with a budget far more limited than ours and under the gravest kind of duress—brought its Arts Council into being, to boost morale, to affirm that there is more to life than guns or butter and that the values of the human spirit and the creative mind are deserving of support, especially in times of crisis.

In view of the achievements that Council has brought to Great Britain, achievements which have been projected internationally throughout the free world—are we to call this action foolish, or misguided, or in error?

That is what we are discussing—the kind of civilization we want to make possible for the future of our own country, and the image we project beyond our own shores.

If there are those who choose to attack this program, and make this minuscule portion of the budget a special target; if there are those who wish to make this small but immensely meaningful program into a political football—let them remember the tens of thousands of people who have supported the concept of this program over the years and who have so eagerly awaited its arrival. Let them remember the leading members of the business community who serve as board directors for the many hundreds of arts organizations throughout our country, and who fully endorse this Foundation. Let them remember the strong support which labor is giving to this program—and the millions of our people it can benefit in the years to come.

And let them also remember that he who kicks a political football into the air is by no means invulnerable to receiving the final boot.

Mr. Chairman, I urge most strongly that the full amount recommended to us by the Appropriations Committee, the full amount we are considering today, be approved.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, we have a problem in the United States that is growing by leaps and bounds and which is apparently being overlooked year after year. This year the Department of the Interior finally took a good hard look at it and came up with some recommendations. But the recommendations did not come forward until the bill was being marked up in committee. I refer to the blackbird and starling problem that we now have in the United States. This problem is tremendous. According to the Department of Interior, we are suffering losses in the United States now of roughly between $50 million and $100 million a year and primarily from the blackbird and starling problem. In the State of Ohio, we are suffering losses in excess of $15 million.

I would like just briefly to go into the report of the Department of the Interior on the question of blackbird and starling problems:

II. NATURE AND EXTENT OF LOSSES AND DAMAGE

Agricultural losses: The total economic losses attributable to birds have not been accurately determined but have been estimated to be between $50 and $100 million annually. Reports recently received from field offices of this Bureau indicate total damage by birds, other than game birds, of about $58 million annually.

Losses caused by birds in New Jersey have been estimated at $2½ to $4 million annually, with corn damage being the major item. Estimated losses in New York, on the basis of incomplete reports, were comparable to those in New Jersey, with damage reported to orchards, vineyards, and corn.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in the bill there is an amount of $665,000 to eradicate blackbirds and starlings, and the Department of the Interior has said that until they find means to kill blackbirds and starlings without killing other species of birds they could not use any more money than that?

Mr. LATTA. No, I am not aware of that, and the report does not so indicate. The money to which the gentleman has referred, approximately $660,000, has been in the budget for some time for research on methods to prevent crop deprivations and other losses caused by several different species of birds. I realize that such an appropriation has been made by the Congress year after year. I was coming to that later on. I am sorry the gentleman is attempting to confuse this appropriation with what I am attempting to do here to carry out a new recommendation of the Department to deal specifically with the blackbird and starling problem.

If I may now continue, the report states further:

Arkansas' rice losses have reached nearly $1½ millon. California reports an almost $8 million annual loss from bird damage, extending over one-half million acres of crops.

In Ohio, annual losses from birds are predicted at about $1 million annually, principally in field corn. One report from Ottawa County showed a loss in corn of somewhat more than $100,000 in that county alone. Dr. Maurice L. Giltz, of the Ohio State University, recently reported that the value of corn sold for cash in that State, subject to damage by red-wing blackbirds, is estimated at $15 million annually. In addition, corn subject to damage and used as feed amounts to many additional millions. He also reported that many large sums are spent by farmers in an attempt to prevent the destruction of their crops. These efforts, in spite of the outlay, have been only partially successful. A recent survey conducted by Dr. Giltz indicates that an average of somewhat more than $5 per acre is spent to prevent destruction of the crop in those Ohio counties which experience persistent depredations. In addition to the direct damage to grain in the soft or milky stage, bird pecking is responsible for additional damage from molding, rotting, sprouting on the cob, and general failure of the grain to mature when direct damage reaches a critical degree.

Last year conventions of 15 farm bureaus passed resolutions urging assistance with bird problems. The American Farm Bureau Federation, at its national meeting in Chicago, Ill., on December 16, 1965, passed the following resolution, on which that organization is now acting:

"WILDLIFE PESTS

"Blackbirds, starlings, and similar pests are causing serious damage to crops and property in many areas. They are a hazard to aviation and a carrier of diseases to humans as well as livestock.

"This problem is increasing over a wide geographic area. Intensive research efforts at State and Federal levels and prompt use of all practical recommendations and methods to eradicate these pests are fully justified.

"We recommend an action program under authorized personnel to control wildlife pests. Adequate funds should be made available to the Department of the Interior for this program."

The Colorado Department of Agriculture conducted a starling survey in 1963. Of the 400 respondents reporting, 32 percent stated they had no problem, 45 percent had a slight problem, and 23 percent have a major problem. They also predicted that the problem would become more serious in the future.

In 1962, 580 livestock operators in the North Central States were contacted through a random selection by county agents. Sixty percent of those returning questionnaires indicated that starlings were a problem in their feeding operations during the winter months. Forty-six percent of those replying reported appreciable consumption and contamination of livestock feed by starlings.

A similar questionnaire in Missouri yielded generally similar results. From 100 responses, 55 percent reported that starlings were bothering their feeding operations during the winter months. Of those reporting starling damage, 48 percent reported an appreciable consumption and contamination of livestock feed. The information is significant because the response from the counties and feeders contacted was far greater than experienced in most surveys. It indicates much concern with the starling problem.

The October 1964 issue of the American Fruit Grower magazine states that growers in southwestern Michigan reported annual losses of about $2¼ million worth of fruit from starling damage. Blueberry and cherry growers bore the brunt of the loss. The Journal of Economic Entomology, volume 51, No. 1, in an article titled "Some Factors Influencing the Infestation in Corn in the Field by the Rice Weevil," states:

"The main predisposing factor which influenced rice weevil infestations in the field in this study was bird damage to the husk. Corn ear worm damage alone was responsible for approximately 15 percent of the total damage, whereas the birds were responsible for 63 percent. The remainder of the damage was attributed to normal inherent characteristics of the corn."

So it goes all through this report, a report put out by the Department of the Interior, dated March 1966.

Getting to the problem that the gentleman mentioned here, about control, this is a problem that needs some additional funds, and the Department recognizes it. Turning to the Department's own recommendations in this report and its conclusion, it says:

The 1966 budget of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife includes $660,000 for research on methods for preventing crop depredations and other losses caused by several different species of birds. In addition to this research effort, the Bureau is spending approximately $170,000 annually to alleviate the bird damage problem.

Get this, my colleagues: they are spending $170,000 annually to alleviate the bird damage problem which they themselves say is between $50 and $100 million annually, and in the State of Ohio alone is $15 million.

Research at the present level will eventually produce improved methods; but the scope of present needs compel that these efforts be increased to provide needed solutions. These methods must be demonstrated and otherwise properly introduced to the public. An experienced cadre with technical, demonstrational, and investigative skills and experience is needed for this work. Accomplishment of these objectives would require an additional initial expenditure of $1 million and 50 biologists (10 additional biologists in research and 40 for field programs). Of this amount, $200,000 would finance additional control methods research, and $800,000 would finance programs for dissemination and demonstration of the knowledge and techniques now available.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Is it not true that in addition to direct damage to the corn crop, there is also damage to livestock through the spread of disease by blackbirds and starlings?

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As he knows, tremendous damage has been caused in his district, and there have been stock diseases carried by these birds.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. As a matter of fact, in certain areas of my district which are noted for hog production, several farmers have found it is no longer profitable to go into hog production partly because of diseases that are spread by these birds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this a little further and ask whether, in this Chamber just yesterday, we did not hear a number of our colleagues discuss the question of the wheat that was going to be sent to India, that would be lost through consumption by monkeys and rats and the sacred cows of India, and whether it might not be a good investment for us to try to prevent that kind of damage in this country from birds?

Mr. LATTA. I could not agree with the gentleman more. I think that an investment of $1 million for research to attempt to wipe out a $58 million loss annually to our farmers would be a pretty good investment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Particularly at a time when we may face possible shortages in some of the crops that are being damaged.

Mr. LATTA. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask in conclusion, is it not true that this money would be spent to find ways to limit the predatory birds without damaging other wildlife and songbirds and other birds that we want to preserve?

Mr. LATTA. That is correct.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, the Department is well aware of this problem. As indicated in their own report, from which I have been reading, they have—

First. A stepped-up action program to reduce damage in critical areas, relying heavily on compound DRC-1339 and decoy traps.

Second. A stepped-up research program aimed at finding techniques, chemicals, and other materials useful in coping with a variety of species causing a variety of problems.

Coming to my own State of Ohio, and particularly northwestern Ohio, I might say that a great many of our farmers, who have been producing corn for years and years, have had to cease raising corn because of extensive blackbird damage. I happen to have in my hand a picture which appeared in the Fremont News Messenger on Monday, March 28, 1966, which shows the blackbirds in flight from a field. The sky is almost black. This picture shows what our farmers are subjected to.

I am glad to know that the Department of the Interior has recognized the seriousness of this problem and has finally come up with some recommendations. I am only sorry that they did not come up with these recommendations months ago, when many of my colleagues and I joined together in an appeal for relief.

The mere fact that the Department did not come forward with these recommendations until the committee was marking up the bill does not seem to me sufficient reason to delay this program for another year. I may say a number of States, according to the Department, including Ohio, now have existing programs. Through the Agricultural Extension Service and the game agency and other agencies in particular we have provided ways to reduce damage from birds. It is anticipated any extended program of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife will be closely integrated with these existing programs. The details of how this integration will be worked out cannot be spelled out here. In any event, there will be no duplication of effort or competition with present efforts. Any increase in the Bureau's resources for this program could be used to supplement and strengthen the overall effort by all concerned. In all cases the Bureau would embark on a program of a State only—and I stress this—only after receiving a formal request to do so from the Governor or from an official authorized to represent them in this matter. Also, the program would be undertaken only after consummation of an agreement with the State.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I might tell the House that Ohio is taking such a step. According to an article which appears in the newspaper to which I referred earlier, Mr. Roy Kottman, director of the Ohio Research and Development Center at Wooster, outlined plans for a crash program this summer aimed at giving better control of the blackbird. He said that eight researchers are being assigned to the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Kottman said that the eight researchers being assigned to the project will be aided by other employees. The research center last week received $12.5 million in emergency funds from the State of Ohio Controlling Board. The program is to receive the same amount in a later allocation. Mr. Kottman estimated that the blackbirds, primarily of the redwing type, destroyed about $15 million in Ohio crops last summer, which is about 6 percent, of the State's $225 million corn crop. We can no longer sit still. We have to get moving, because Ohio farmers cannot afford this kind of loss. Some farmers lose up to 15 percent of their crops as flocks of redwing blackbirds numbering in the tens of thousands invade their fields. In areas near Lake Erie, Mr. Kottman said, we have had a desperate problem during the last 10 years. The bird problem now reaches into about 50 of our 88 counties in Ohio.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. CONTE. I am certainly very sympathetic to the plea that the gentleman from Ohio is making here. I think it makes a lot of sense. But I am wondering if the gentleman was here when his colleague, the ranking Republican minority member of the Committee on Appropriations took the floor earlier today and said he is going to offer an amendment to knock out all of these projects. He was saying it to the tune of "Bye Bye Blackbird."

Mr. LATTA. I do not know whether the gentleman makes this comment in order to play down the importance of this problem or not. I hope he does not. But certainly the gentleman to whom he refers, the ranking Republican on the Committee on Appropriations, is familiar with this problem. As I understand it, he himself brought the subject up at my request when this matter was being marked up in the Appropriation Committee.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, sufficient Federal aid to our commercial fisheries is of utmost importance. For with these funds we will be enabled to continue research into methods of increasing the amount of fish in man's diet.

In discussing the appropriation for our commercial fisheries for fiscal year 1967, I first wish to thank the Appropriations Subcommittee reporting this bill and its most able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] for taking a major step forward in this Nation's efforts to meet the growing world food and vitamin shortage. As you all know, the administration's budget request was for only $3.2 million. The Appropriation Committee recommended $4.7 million, or an increase of $1.5 million for the program in 1967.

This higher level of funding will allow us to continue with important studies such as those in relation to the development of fish protein concentrate which holds such bright promise in alleviating the protein shortage in the diet of hundreds of millions of people. We must also remember that in addition to such specialized studies, these additional funds will enable the States to go forward with their full research program.

There will be some who will say, why spend the extra $1.5 million. For the answer, take a look at the population predictions. Reportedly, the world's population is expected to more than double by the year 2000. Food even in the near future is surely going to be as scarce as many anticipate. Then we must get much more food from the ocean—the greatest remaining, least exploited, reservoir.

The world's fish catch, in 1964, set a new record of 51.6 million tons. It may seem like a lot of fish, but actually it is not. The great bulk of the catch for one reason or another is not used for human food.

We here in the United States have made no progress, really in seafood consumption, in spite of important development in processing, storage, and marketing. In 1965, U.S. per capita consumption of fish, fresh, frozen, canned, and cured was only 10.6 pounds—almost exactly the same as in 1947–49 and 1957–59. We consumed more coffee per person in 1965, and also more beef, and chicken.

I mention these comparisons to indicate some of the untapped food potential which remains to be taken from the sea. Seafood and fishery consumption has lagged. The consumption lag has been due primarily because we, and others, have lagged in the attention we have given to this important matter.

I want very much to see the commercial fisheries of this country receive the attention that agriculture has received over the past several decades. In total, the investment in agriculture may be in the billions of dollars. Certainly it has paid off—no people anywhere are well fed for such a small portion of their labor time.

I think it is time that we intensified our efforts to revitalize our commercial fisheries. Back in 1964 we made an excellent start. We passed some monumental legislation for our ailing commercial fisheries. One of the acts, the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of May 20, 1964—Public Law 88-309—rightly gave rise to substantial expectations. Yet, what happened? Apparently we had slippage between authorization and full activation. We lost 1 full year of appropriation because no appropriation for aid to the States was made for fiscal year 1965. During the second year of the program the President's budget request for commercial fisheries research was for $2.6 million which the Congress raised to $4.1 million.

Mr. Chairman, these funds for research and development of our commercial fisheries represent seed dollars—dollars for research, dollars for development and dollars for marketing a woefully neglected resource on which greatly increased demands may reasonably be anticipated very soon. These dollars will not be wasted. They will be repaid many times over in increased quantities of high-quality food.

I urge my colleagues to support the appropriations for our commercial fisheries at the level permitted under existing legislation.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Gray].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton] and the members of his subcommittee for bringing out a very good bill. It is a prudent bill and below the budget estimate, and all House Members should support it. I am especially pleased that the Committee has seen fit to approve the budget items for the Shawnee National Forest and the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in southern Illinois. I want to thank the Committee for seeing the need and granting our request, to start work on the Lusk Creek Lake project in the Shawnee National Forest by including a $50,000 appropriation for this important work. The Federal Government owns more than a third of the land area of Pope County, Ill., where this project is to be located and the payment in lieu of taxes is small from the sale of timber, therefore, this project is badly needed in order to provide more revenues to these hard hit counties, supply a balanced recreational program for the southeastern part of Illinois and improve the national program of this administration to provide more outdoor recreational areas for our growing population.

I want to thank the U.S. Forest Service for their help on this project and again thank this distinguished Committee.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Secrest].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments that will be offered later by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. Chairman, these projects that were added were added because the members of the committee thought they were good and thought they were proper. It is my sincere belief that they should remain in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is foolish to think that if the budget is cut as it has been here, 3 percent, that they are going to further cut that budget in order to take care of these 41 projects that have been added. They just will not do it.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding, and I want to thank the subcommittee for the language which has been placed in the report on pages 8 and 9 with reference to a construction start on the school at Eufaula, Okla., and with reference to the agricultural extension program for the Indians in Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for a clarification from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton], a question with reference to the language which appears on page 8 of the report which states as follows:

> The committee recommends that the agriculture extension program in Oklahoma be funded at a $100,000 level in 1967, with funds reprogramed from the mutual help and low-rent housing program.

What I would like to know is this: Whether this refers to the national funds for mutual help and low-rent housing program, or to the sum provided for the State of Oklahoma alone?

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. That refers to the national fund, and not to the amount provided for the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Giaimo].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the subcommittee which has reported out this legislation. It is my opinion that they have done a fine job here, and I particularly would like to address myself to one problem which I believe is going to confront us as we discuss this legislation. That problem is with reference to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. Chairman, today as we consider the budget for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, I think it is well to keep in mind the stated purpose of this institution, "to develop and promote a broadly conceived national policy of support for the humanities and the arts in the United States."

The Subcommittee on Department of the Interior and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, has recommended an appropriation of $7 million, a reduction of $6,930,000 below the budget estimate of $13,930,000. The money that is left in the appropriation has been scrutinized even further with expressions of doubt as to the validity of certain grants to individuals and organizations. There seems to be much concern as to who should approve what projects applying for aid from the Arts and Humanities Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, to continue to cut the budget of the Arts and Humanities Foundation is to cut dangerously near the point of leaving the foundation impotent and unable to carry out its purpose. If we continue to advance the argument that the foundation is in its infancy and refuse to let it grow, then we are acting like the parent who refuses to let his child mature.

It is certainly the job of the committee to see that funds appropriated for the operation of the Foundation are not misused or used to show disregard of the programs outlined before it. But I think that prudence and an obligation to act responsibly require that the committee and this Congress permit the Foundation the opportunity to prove its worth and the value of its program.

The creation of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities is a credit to this Nation and to the men and women who have worked with dedication to bring it about. It is testimony that we can build beauty as well as bombs.

We have splendid opportunity in the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and we should give it the support and the opportunity to function.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would today resist any attempts to cut further the moneys appropriated for this Foundation.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Wyatt].

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, the Willamette Falls Fishway project at Willamette Falls in Oregon, is considered by the Fish and Wildlife Service as the most important single project dealing with the perpetuation of salmon and steelhead runs in the entire Columbia River system. It is accurately estimated that the annual benefit accruing to the various commercial fisheries, sports fisheries, along the Pacific Coast from this development would approximate $4 million annually.

In 1904 fishways were built at Willamette Falls for salmon and steelhead passage. These are now antiquated. In the intervening 62 years new fish ladder techniques have been developed, industrial usage and pollution have made the problem of fish passage more critical, and these ancient fish ladders have deteriorated to the point that they are not much help to the migrant fish population.

At the present, movement of fish over the falls through the old fishway is possible only during a very limited time when water flows are moderate. Fish are delayed on their upstream journey at the falls by high flows, and cannot find or enter the present ladder during low flows.

Last year Congress appropriated $600,000 for construction of phase A of the Willamette Falls Fishways project and the contract for construction of phase A has been awarded. It is vitally necessary now that funds for construction of phase B of the project be made available. Based upon the cost of phase A, it is now estimated that the total cost of the Willamette Falls Fishways project is $3,200,000.

Private industry is providing 16.3-percent financing for actual construction of this project, and in accordance with the Federal Power Commission's findings, industry should make available approximately $510,000 for those items for which it has been established that industry has partial responsibility.

It is absolutely essential and vital that funds which are now included in this bill be appropriated in fiscal year 1967 to provide for continued construction of the Willamette Falls Fishways project. There is absolutely no question but that the Federal Government has never had such an opportunity for such a sound business proposition. The total cost of the Willamette Falls Fishways project will be $3,200,000 but the annual benefits to be derived from this project will approximate $4 million annually.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the item contained in the pending bill to provide support for the arts endowment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. I think it is both wise and proper to approve this initial appropriation at this time so that we can begin to move forward with our program of national patronage for the performing and creative arts in America.

For a long time I have been a supporter of the concept of Federal encouragement for the arts. Last year in the first session of this current 89th Congress, I was pleased to be among the House sponsors of legislation that created the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. The reasons I advanced at the time we authorized the establishment of this body are the same I now offer in support of an appropriation.

As a cultured country, we have moved at an astonishingly slow pace to enhance our indigenous art forms. Many other nations of the world are far ahead of us in this respect and the strength and viability of their arts provide proof of the value inherent in government patronage.

While we have these world examples of what can be accomplished by public agencies lending their interest to the arts, we also have a closer-to-home demonstration of what government help can mean to educational endeavors. The National Science Foundation has strengthened science in the United States to a considerable degree. It has done so without Government control, as well.

I am well acquainted with the response received from the scientific community to the help provided by the National Science Foundation. Many of its grants go to the University of Rochester where researcher after researcher has reported to me on the new scientific vistas which are opened by this aid.

In addition to the honor I feel in representing some of the Nation's eminent scientists, I also feel a similar privilege in my representation of some of our country's greats in the field of art. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson] with whom I have worked so very closely in this legislative area kindly called my home community of Rochester, N.Y. "one of the bright spots on the cultural landscape" of this country.

As many of my colleagues know, Rochester is synonymous with the finest in music education, symphonic presentations, ballet troupes, art and sculpture exhibitions, the art of photography, and in all the allied activities of American art. Those who are close to these concerns in Rochester and its environs have discussed with me on frequent occasions the promise they feel is held out by Federal patronage.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, one of the local organizations with which I have cooperated in this regard, the Ars Antiqua Society, asked me to author an article for one of its recent newsletters on the subject of the Arts and Humanities Act. Because it expresses my feelings on this measure and by extension voices my views on the desirability of approving this appropriation before us, I ask that it be printed with my remarks in the Record.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members of this body will see fit to keep the amount appropriated for the Arts and Humanities intact, and will resist all efforts to reduce it.

The Arts and Humanities Act

(Note.—In September, amidst a ceremony in the White House rose garden, President Johnson signed into law the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. This bill was introduced and sponsored by Congressman Frank Horton. We are proud of his achievement and are pleased to print the following article.)

(Written exclusively for Ars Antiqua Society by Congressman Frank Horton, 36th District of New York)

It is my strong conviction that the arts and humanities are matters of crucial importance to our society. Those qualities which make us wiser, more humane, more understanding and more appreciative of beauty and truth are the products of a deep kinship with the arts and humanities and a flourishing cultural life. I believe that these are the qualities which must be sought in greater measure to realize national success and individual fulfillment. While the arts and humanities, through the ages, have sustained man at his most profound level of being, we are growing increasingly aware of the need for their broader and deeper influence. More and more, we recognize their values not only in terms of national prestige, utilization of leisure time, but also as a necessity for man in an age of science and technology.

As significant as a rich cultural environment may be, the evidence is quite clear that our cultural development lags far behind scientific development and that support and encouragement for the arts and humanities must be increased to satisfy requirements for expansion and excellence in these areas. Convinced that the arts and humanities have a role equal in importance to the national interest as science, I am concerned over the existing imbalance in our national life and feel that the Federal Government has a responsibility for giving limited, but constructive support and encouragement for the development of our cultural resources. Because of the magnitude of the issues and the needs, I have supported arts legislation in the past. This year I introduced legislation pertaining to the establishment of a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and have testified on its behalf and actively worked to win prompt and positive action on the measure.

The Foundation proposals have received enthusiastic support in the Congress and from the various sectors of our society. In my opinion the establishment of a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities will provide vital recognition and support for the arts and humanities while guaranteeing maximum independence and freedom from improper Federal control. Moreover, the creation of such a foundation would signify to the Nation and the world that a free society values and is capable of sustaining a rich cultural life.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman].

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and the appropriation therefor in the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1967, being H.R. 14215.

Perhaps the best example to demonstrate that governmental support and assistance serves to stimulate private funding for the arts is contained in the 4-year history of the New York State Council on the Arts.

The council began its activities with a survey of needs. During its first year—1961–62—the council operated with a budget of $450,000 over 70 percent of which was supplied by its State appropriation, the remainder coming from private sources. During 1964–65, the ratio was entirely reversed, with almost 75 percent of a larger budget—$562,000—coming from private funding and the remainder from the State. The council's appropriation in 1961–62 was $330,000; in 1964–65, this has been more than halved—to $153,000.

During the same period, the number of communities served by the council doubled, from 46 to 92; the number of performances tripled, 92 to 277; and the number of touring companies aided by the council increased almost twelvefold, from 6 to 71—from the testimony of John Hightower, executive director of the council.

A special report prepared for the U.S. Office of Education and printed in the hearings calls the New York State Council on the Arts "the most developed State council in the country," and continues:

> New York has also amply demonstrated that a State can assist and further the arts without loss of freedom—without setting up controls.

The bill is intended to encourage this type of State activity in the arts throughout the whole of the United States.

A great deal of what needs to be said in this field has been previously said by my predecessor, John V. Lindsay, now mayor of New York City. He was the coauthor of the arts council bill, and, in support of it, in this body stated on August 20, 1964, as follows:

STATEMENT BY FORMER REPRESENTATIVE JOHN V. LINDSAY, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK, ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 20, 1964

I rise in support of this bill, sometimes known as the Thompson-Lindsay arts council bill. It is an important proposal. It is the basis for national recognition of a great national good.

The background for this proposal should be reviewed and the matter put in full perspective.

The idea that the Federal Government should assume a role in the encouragement of the arts is not new; but in recent years, it has been a source of heated controversy and profound misunderstanding. Certainly, the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States are in the national interest. We are continuingly engaged in an effort to strengthen our national security. Surely it is also in the national well-being to enhance the cultural life of our civilization.

What is the basis from which I speak today? It is my great privilege to represent in Congress the area in New York which is undoubtedly the leading hub of cultural activity in the United States. Within the bounds of the district are the Metropolitan Opera, Carnegie Hall, Broadway's Great White Way, the New York City Ballet, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the New York Public Library, the Seagram Building, the Guggenheim Museum, Greenwich Village, Yorkville, Gramercy Park, Rockefeller Center, the New York Coliseum, Central Park, Cooper Union, New York University, the United Nations, Union Square—the centers of book and music publishing, the Nation's leading daily press, advertising, all major national radio and TV networks, scores of galleries, bookshops, and coffeehouses. The list could be extended indefinitely.

There is mounting evidence of increased interest in the arts in America. I am impressed and heartened by such signposts as the growth of the quality paperback, by the increase in symphony orchestras, and by the increased patronage of our Nation's art galleries. It must be pointed out, however, that while these hopeful signs are indicative of increased cultural consumption, they do not indicate that the creative climate is as healthy as it should be.

I think it is fair to state that our national leaders expressed a more profound concern with the growth and development of the fine arts in the early years of the country than they do today.

For example, George Washington in his first annual address to the Congress, January 8, 1790, declared "that there is nothing which can better deserve our patronage than the promotion of science and literature." John Quincy Adams in his first message to Congress called for the founding of a national university and for the passage of laws for the encouragement of the arts, sciences, and literature.

In 1846, the Smithsonian Institution was created to take advantage of a bequest of James Smithson to the United States. The Institution has expanded over the years and now includes no less than 10 bureaus, 4 of which are directly concerned with the arts: the U.S. National Museum, the National Collection of Fine Arts, the Freer Gallery—which operates only partly on Federal funds—and the world-renowned National Gallery of Art.

In 1910, Congress created the Commission of Fine Arts as guardian for the L'Enfant plan for the development of the District of Columbia.

The Library of Congress operates a music division which not only collects material relating to music, but also conducts a performance program.

The General Services Administration is charged, among other things, with the responsibility of design and construction of all public and administrative buildings of the Federal Government. Its annual payments to architects, muralists, sculptors, and painters are considerable.

For many years the Department of Agriculture has had a program of making and using motion pictures in its educational program.

The National Park Service has a program for the conservation of our national historic and architectural monuments.

The Office of Education has several specialists serving in areas related to the arts.

The Department of State has engaged in cultural enterprises for a number of years. Particularly since World War II under the foreign building program, the Department has brought in leading architects to design many of our new embassy buildings. Under our educational and cultural exchange program, representatives of our artistic community have traveled throughout the world, testifying to the vitality of our national life.

So it is clear that Federal participation in the arts is hardly a new development. It has gone on with a large degree of success for many years. The hostility that has been expressed to a Federal entry is justified only when one examines the problem of Government control.

Institutions of American culture are confronted with a number of difficulties, the greatest of which is financial instability. No one embarks on a career in the arts to secure a "comfortable" existence as long as there exists a scarcity of opportunities and a surplus of hopefuls seeking them.

As the House hearings on this subject held in 1961 pointed out, production costs have far outpaced reasonably available revenues, and great patrons of the arts who once gave of their personal fortunes to support cultural activities are disappearing.

How then can we as a nation help to restore these institutions to financial vitality and to give the individual artist an opportunity to do what long and arduous years of training have prepared him to do?

It seems clear that Federal subsidies to the arts are not necessarily the answer to artistic development in this country. Rather the role of an enlightened citizenry is of paramount importance. It is the responsibility of individuals in all parts of the country—the general public as well as the wealthy patrons and benefactors—to provide the principal basis of support for the artistic community. Private enterprise, and the American labor movement, too, must continue to bear a heavy share of this responsibility. There has been heartening progress in this area in recent years. Let us hope that it continues.

Further, financial support is only part of the problem. The function of the Federal Government should be to create healthy environmental conditions so that the arts can grow and flourish. Too often, Government, through such restraints as inequitable tax treatment, actually hinders artistic expression and surrounds the practice of the arts with unnecessary restrictions.

A number of State and local governments are providing increased assistance to the arts, and it is to them that we can turn to observe some of the more hopeful developments in the relationship between Government and the arts. A number of cities and States already have established executive offices whose purpose it is to give due recognition and status to the arts. New York State, under Governor Rockefeller, has developed one of the best. Many more are developing programs for the systematic improvement of the arts. It is on the local level that these programs should begin, for it is there that community resources for private participation can be best utilized.

The New York State Council on the Arts has been a great success in fostering and encouraging the arts, and in the words of Governor Rockefeller is "providing a pattern for emulation both for the Federal Government and for many of our States."

As I have stated, the Federal Government has taken an active role in support of the arts for a number of years. There is nothing new about this. However, widespread confusion exists because many people mistakenly assume that all Federal assistance to the arts must necessarily involve direct subsidies. In my opinion, subsidies are not the first order of business. The Government's best role is to make certain that the environmental conditions exist which will permit the arts to grow, advance, and flourish on their own. Recognition of the importance of the arts as a national good is important.

The step that the Federal Government should take at this time in order to give this recognition and to coordinate the existing Federal involvement in the arts is to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.

Three administrations—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—have called for the creation of such a council. I have pressed for it ever since I have been in Congress. It has always been a bipartisan proposal and has received widespread support throughout the country.

As I have pointed out many times, the proposed council would have no authority or funds to dole out subsidies. The cost for its first year of operation would be extremely modest.

The structure and membership of the Council is defined in the Thompson-Lindsay bill. There is a Chairman and 24 members. The Chairman is full time and paid. The others are not. Certainly, the Council should be composed of individuals with broad judgment and the finest credentials. The Council would have the power to study the state of cultural resources in the United States, to propose methods of increasing private initiative in the arts, to support increased cooperation among local, State, and Federal departments and agencies and to foster greater activity in the forms and practice of the arts.

The Arts Council bill is only one form of recognition. Again, what I am talking about is indirect assistance, not direct.

There are other steps that should be taken. The Federal Government should remove unnecessary restrictions upon the creation, practice, and appreciation of the arts in America. Federal tax relief is therefore essential. I have long urged that the Federal Government repeal its 10-percent admissions tax on live dramatic performances. The resultant saving would eventually be passed on to the public in the form of lower ticket prices. Indeed it would have to be passed on as there has been a sharp drop off in public attendance. It would result in the creation and production of more and better plays, musical performances, and symphony and opera for the benefit of our citizens. Just recently I testified before the Ways and Means Committee in support of my bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, pointing out the distressed condition of the New York theater, center of the Nation's cultural life. Without tax relief, the New York theater may find itself in a very serious position as it opens its new season in the fall. I had with me two show business constituents, Mr. Hal Prince, producer of such Broadway shows as "Pajama Game," "Damn Yankees," "West Side Story," and so forth, and Mr. David Merrick, producer of "Hello Dolly," "Carnival," "Oliver," who joined me in testimony of the seriousness of the financial situation of the theater.

Unfortunately, the Treasury Department persists in lumping the dramatic arts together with other failing industries. To the Treasury, the dramatic and musical arts, shooting galleries, dog races, and flea circuses are all the same. The Treasury Department retains the hidebound view that what is right for an industrial organization is right for the theater industry. Naturally, this position is conveniently overlooked when the Government, in response to Soviet competition, uses our arts as instruments of foreign policy in our cultural exchanges program. But the Treasury Department fails to recognize that without a healthy environment for the creation of new plays, new works of music, and the like, there would be little or nothing to export. If this is the view of the Government, then it is placing a strong barrier in the way of a free and healthy creative climate.

Another change in the tax law which I have sought to bring about through legislation is more equitable tax treatment to authors of literary, musical, or artistic compositions in the event that they sell the rights to their works. Under present law, tax treatment for authors of literary, musical, or artistic compositions is discriminatory. Benefit of capital gains tax treatment is given to the author of a patent in order to stimulate inventive activity. We should have a comparable means of stimulating literary, musical, and artistic creation. The bill (H.R. 2519) would repeal the exclusions which presently prohibit copyrights and literary, musical and artistic compositions from considerations as capital assets. The bill further provides that transfer of copyrights or composition rights in the hands of the creator shall be considered a sale or exchange of a capital asset. Under present law such sales are taxed as ordinary income. Persons who acquire an interest in such property from the creator prior to the substantial completion of the copyrighted work would also receive this treatment. In order to avoid difficulties which could arise in the operation of this legislation, two limitations have been written into the bill. A transfer would apply only with respect to work that has been substantially completed. Second, only one copyright or composition of a taxpayer year would be eligible for this treatment. This bill came very close to being reported out by the Ways and Means Committee in the last Congress. It was stopped by the administration, which lobbied long, diligently, and senselessly against it.

A third area which has merited remedial action is the problem of authors, composers, artists including performing artists who receive income in fluctuating amounts from year to year and whose earnings may be concentrated in a comparatively short period while the completion of the work itself may have taken several years. I introduced a bill (H.R. 2520) which would permit writers, musicians, and artists to spread the compensation that they receive from a work of art over the period in which they have worked on the project in computing the tax on this income.

I was pleased, therefore, when the tax bill in this Congress gave recognition to the problem and contained a limited "averaging out" provision. The bill did not give the relief afforded under my bill. The bill enacted does not deal with unused deductions and exemptions, and with small income variations.

Another proposal which I believe has great merit, long sponsored by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], a veteran member of the Committee on Ways and Means, would provide a charitable contribution deduction of up to 30 percent for contributions by an individual to nonprofit museums, libraries, and other facilities in support of the arts. Under present Federal income tax law, a deduction for charitable contributions by an individual is limited to 20 percent of his adjusted income in all cases except gifts to churches, schools, and colleges, and certain types of hospitals and medical research organizations where the limitation is 30 percent. The proposed legislation would permit an added 10 percent to libraries and museums of art, history, or science. John D. Rockefeller III has suggested that opera, symphony orchestra, ballet, repertory drama, and community art centers also be included. All these suggestions which have been proposed to aid the arts either through tax and tariff relief—the Tariff Act could well be liberalized with respect to the importation of works of art, the construction of physical plants (buildings, concert halls, and the like)—should receive the closest and most detailed study from an advisory council on the arts. We could all benefit from the increased understanding that would result.

In the course of these remarks, I have pointed to much that is hopeful in the artistic taste and expression of this Nation. But for all that is full of promise, there is much that is shoddy and distressing. Bad city planning has crowded out reason and justice. New construction too often destroys the good with the bad. Roads encroach upon precious solitude. Entertainment often aims at the lowest common denominator. These may afford satisfaction for the moment but how much will endure? Artistic endeavor in America must not be judged by false or ersatz criteria. When we mistake the package for the product, the shadow for the substance, quantity for quality, and consumption for creation, we do ourselves a disservice as a nation.

The great ages in the life of a civilization have been those in which the arts have flourished. The Age of Pericles in democratic Athens was as noted for its philosophers, sculptors, and playwrights as for its generals and statesmen. We should not forget this. It was hardly an accident. The quality of a society is measured as much by its culture as its political and economic attainments.

This bill, then, represents an important effort to recognize the arts in the United States as a "national good." It is designed to pull together what at present is a scattered Federal concern. It is designed to give status to the concern and care of our National Government. It is a bill that has great merit and should be supported.

In an article in the Saturday Review of March 13, 1965, entitled "A Congressman Looks at the Arts," Mayor Lindsay stated:

A CONGRESSMAN LOOKS AT THE ARTS

(By Hon. John V. Lindsay)

Increasingly, it seems to be an accepted fact that the arts, and especially the performing arts, are a "good thing" for the community and the country. Four years ago Congressman FRANK THOMPSON and I were defeated on the floor of the House of Representatives in our attempt to put through a simple National Arts Council bill—a nonmoney bill that one would have thought generally noncontroversial. We were defeated on the ground that the arts and their general condition is no business of any government. One powerful Congressman denounced the bill as the opening wedge toward subsidy of poker games.

Only 3 years later, however, in 1964, we put the National Arts Council bill through the House of Representatives by an astonishingly large majority. It must also have surprised the administration, for it took the President 6 months to appoint the Council.

The Council's main job, of course, is to make a determination of where we go from here. What is the role of government in the arts? Is it possible to create a national goal to which the country will aspire? If organized society has an obligation to do something about the health of its people, or their education, cannot the same be said of the country's cultural resources? If the arts are one of the central elements of a good society and an important part of an individual's betterment, a source of strength to him, his family, and his community, is it not true that the health of the arts should be of concern to the elected and appointed representatives of that society?

The subject is considered important today where it was not 4 years ago. Something has happened to the politicians since that first unsuccessful foray. I suspect that they have been hearing from the housewives in their constituencies, who, happily, are beginning to become as excited about the condition of the local drama society as they are about the price of butter. More than 100 bills have been introduced in this 89th Congress for the purpose of supplying small measures of Federal financial support for the arts (unheard of), on a matching basis, to States and localities.

At the recent congressional hearings on the subject all kinds of testimony was presented in support of a Federal Foundation on the Arts; even Congressmen who would have left the floor in dismay 4 years ago were now declaring themselves in favor of it. Then, too, there has been a spate of State arts councils modeled after the pioneers in the field—New York, North Carolina, and Louisiana.

I'm still wondering, however, exactly where we go from here. We are dealing with an area so highly personal and individual and unorganized (fortunately), so experimental (again fortunately) and sensitive, that one treads cautiously where Government involvement is concerned. But granted the sensitive and personal nature of creativity, there are nevertheless some nasty unsolved problems of brick and mortar and boilerplate that make creativity unnecessarily more difficult. In the performing arts especially, all kinds of problems of business and administration, taxes and real estate, wage scales and other union requirements, foreign competition and costs in general are involved. There is no reason why these problems cannot be lessened, but any progress will require a very exact knowledge of the industry.

I have discovered, in researching this subject, that knowledge is hard to come by, that the discovery of facts and full information is most difficult. That is one of the several reasons that I am excited by the new Rockefeller panel report, "The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects." This was a blue-ribbon panel, so good and so responsible that I could not mention some of its members without calamitous omission; let me only say that John D. Rockefeller III, who has given luster and strength to the performing arts in New York City, was its chairman.

Fascinating stuff in this report. Did you know, for example, that in 1963, of the $10 billion that was contributed by Americans to all charities, 78.6 percent was contributed by individuals, as opposed to 8.2 percent by foundations, 7.9 percent by wills and last testaments, and 5.3 percent by business corporations? I had begun to think that the foundations were the sources of all nongovernmental beneficence in this area. "Nothing could be further from the truth," concludes the panel. "For arts organizations to turn to foundations, large or small, in hope that their needs will be swiftly satisfied, is almost certain to lead to disappointment." Many of my constituents who have come to me for an introduction to a foundation, hoping for financial support for a worthy artistic endeavor, will sadly bear out the point.

And did you know that of the $7.8 billion in individual contributions, more than 50 percent comes from those with adjusted gross incomes below $10,000, and that those in the lower income brackets give higher proportions of their incomes than all taxpayers except those in the very high brackets? There have been some shifts in recent years that are interesting, too. For example, in the 5-year period from 1958 to 1963, individual giving to charities, increased by 39 percent, foundation giving by 62 percent, and bequests by 77 percent, while corporate contributions rose by only 2 percent, despite the fact that over the 5-year period corporate income before taxes increased by approximately one-third.

The beneficiaries of these sums are just as important to one's understanding as are the sources. In 1963 the $10 billion received from all sources, included the $7.8 billion from individuals, was distributed as follows: religion, 49 percent; education, 17 percent; welfare, 15 percent; health, 12 percent; paid into foundations, 4 percent; and all other, including civic and cultural, 3 percent.

Lest anyone still think that we are in good shape, however, one need only take a look at a few other figures. The average salary in orchestras in the United States ranges from $2,000 to $9,000. Actor's Equity estimated in a survey taken for the years 1957–58 that of nearly 7,000 members of its association employed as performers, the average actor's annual income approximated $2,000. Clearly salaries have advanced since those years, but they remain indecently low. They are, however, still ahead of salaries in the dance, where it is estimated that $3,000 to $3,500 a year is the average income for a professional dancer (and he would be fortunate if this were steady from year to year). A prima ballerina can today hope for little more than $10,000 a year. The prodigious cost of the opera is well known. The outpouring of money for 1964–65 for the New York Metropolitan Opera was over $9 million and the end is not in sight.

Cost is, of course, the continuing crisis for all of the performing arts. The theater is the only one that has survived as a commercial enterprise and has been thought capable of self-support, and yet about 75 percent of all Broadway productions fail to make money, and Broadway's output has dwindled from an average of 142 productions per year during the thirties to a mere 63 in 1963–64. No new theater has been built on Broadway since 1938.

There is, of course, the cultural explosion that one hears is going on in the small towns of America. The Rockefeller brothers panel report finds that it is real and good and healthy, but it concludes that the explosion is largely amateur. It needs professionalism and management and money if there is to be a higher appreciation and a wider understanding and enjoyment of the performing arts at their best.

The Rockefeller brothers panel makes the finding that one of the shortages has been information itself. This report supplies a good deal of information that has been lacking and for that reason alone is worthy of wide notice.

The final conclusion of the distinguished panelists is that even though so much new interest in the performing arts has been shown in America, it is surprising and shocking that the lag in the artistic excellence and the commitment of our people to its betterment remains so great. There are increasing initiatives by universities, communities, choral groups, and amateur undertakings, and there are great efforts by foundations and men and women of wonderful good will in every community who give of themselves and their resources for the construction of a local music, drama, or dance center. But still there is a colossal gap between what there is and what there should be.

What can be done about it? The panelists find that the energy must come from every direction. Most especially it must come from private sources and private initiatives. And it must come from States and municipalities, which must do much more than they have been willing to do to date. Lastly, the Federal Government has a limited but important role to play; this role will include financial giving, preferably on a matching basis, and tax relief. At all times, of course, the independence of the arts, their freedom of choice and decision, must be maintained. And there is the rub. But it can be done; it's been done elsewhere and there's no reason why it can't be done here.

With great increases in leisure time, and pressure on all sides to make room for an expanding population, it seems more important than ever to take a look at the needs of the inner man, his outward well-being having been generally accepted as a social goal.

It is almost trite to suggest that the mark of a civilization is the state of its culture, but unless the point is carefully understood there will be no advance. It seems beyond further doubt that society cannot ignore its cultural well being any more than it can the condition of its health or education. Any course of conduct to the contrary is sheer folly and will show up as such by the example of other civilizations and countries, to our ultimate shock and loss. Therefore, it is incumbent upon us to get on with the job; to beef up our municipal, State, and local art centers and advisory councils; to give proper national recognition by appropriate and additional national legislation; to strip away the tax, real estate, and other barriers that stand in the way of artistic growth; to advance our copyright laws and and other protections for creative artists and authors; to encourage our schools and colleges to begin early and complete training in the performing arts; and to encourage and make possible the widest possible enjoyment of the performing arts in every community.

Even in the best of his own campaign for mayor in the fall of 1965, Mayor Lindsay took the time to appear in this body, as reported in the Congressional Record of September 15, 1965, and to state:

Last year Congress authorized the formation of the National Arts Council to study the role of Government in the arts.

The bill before the House today goes much further. It establishes a national foundation to provide Federal financial aid to such activities as opera, dance, drama, painting, literature, and allied fields.

At the same time, it makes it quite clear that such aid will not involve any Federal control of the recipients. I plan to vote for this bill because I believe that culture in this country is in serious trouble.

Let us review the state of the arts:

On August 10, a cultural phenomena took place in New York City's Central Park: 70,000 New Yorkers trouped out to hear the New York Philharmonic play "Beethoven's Ninth Symphony." The crowd exceeded any that the Philharmonic had played before. It more than doubled the attendance at the game between the Minnesota Twins and the Yankees the same night. It topped the gathering of 55,000 teenagers which rocked to the Beatles 5 days later at Shea Stadium.

The crowd in the park was an impressive indication of the potential audience for the arts in this country.

A recent Rockefeller fund report cites some others: There are twice as many opera groups—754—in the United States as there were a decade ago; in the same period the number of theatrical enterprises has risen by 15 percent to 40,000; the number of symphony orchestras is now 1,400, double the number in 1939.

The statistics indicate that culture is doing pretty well in this country. Not so, said the report.

Almost all of the recent expansion in the arts has been amateur. Only 54 of the symphony orchestras are professional. Only one dance company in the Nation operates year round. Over the past 40 years the number of commercial theaters has dropped from nearly 600 to barely 200.

A few more figures: The average annual salary in our orchestras ranges from $2,000 to $9,000; many professional musicians earn only a few hundred dollars a year from concerts.

Professional dancers average only about $3,500 a year, and the prima ballerina can today hope for little more than $10,000.

The prodigious cost of opera is well known; the New York Metropolitan Opera required more than $9 million last season.

Cost obviously, is the continuing crisis of the performing arts.

The Broadway theater is the only one that has proved remotely capable of self-support through the box office. Yet about 75 percent of all Broadway productions lose money; fewer than half as many plays are produced on Broadway each year as there were during the 1930's. Few are serious dramas. No new theater has been built on Broadway since 1939.

Performing arts can and do earn substantial income through ticket sales. But it was the conclusion of the Rockefeller report, however, that the arts cannot be logically expected to pay their way at the box office.

Somehow the gap between expenses and income at the box office must be made up by contributions, most of them from the private sector of the economy—individuals, foundations, corporations.

States and municipalities must do more. Most States would do well to follow my own New York, which under Governor Rockefeller's leadership spends nearly $600,000 a year to bring theater, opera, and symphonies to small towns all over the State.

I have sponsored legislation to help the arts since I entered Congress in 1959.

Only a National Arts Council has been approved thus far. Now, however, I believe that more meaningful Federal participation is needed—specifically, money.

To date, Federal support of the arts has been largely ancillary. The State Department's cultural exchange program is one illustration.

The few direct Federal artistic activities, such as the National Museum, the National

Collection of Fine Arts, the Freer Gallery, are fine, but are concentrated in Washington, D.C.

Society cannot ignore its cultural well-being any more than its schools or hospitals. The arts, therefore, are the proper concern of the elected representatives of that society.

Parenthetically, I no longer hear much about that premise. But I well remember an arts council bill I cosponsored in 1959 being denounced by a powerful Congressman as the opening wedge toward subsidized poker games.

Our early Presidents were conscious of the responsibility toward the arts. John Quincy Adams, in his first annual address to Congress, called for the passage of laws for the encouragement of the arts, sciences, and literature.

It would be gratifying to President Adams that the House has been considering precisely such a law. For myself, I am gratified that the bill before us includes virtually all the proposals I have urged for the past 6 years.

Basically, the bill provides for establishing a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities which would parallel the National Science Foundation.

Under the Foundation, a national endowment for the arts will carry out a program of Federal grants to groups or individuals in the arts, enabling them to put on professional productions which, without such assistance, would have been unavailable to Americans.

A similar national endowment for the humanities will award grants and fellowships in language, literature, history, philosophy, and the other fields. During fiscal 1966 each endowment will have $5 million to award, plus an equal sum to match certain private and State contributions.

To those who are concerned that Federal aid means Federal control, I call attention to that section of the bill which expressly forbids any department, agency, or employee of the United States from exercising any supervision or control over the policies, personnel, or operation of any non-Federal group dealing with the Foundation.

No statement, it seems to me, could more definitely delineate the Government's role in this program. With this safeguard, the small sums proposed can do much to cure the malaise afflicting the arts in the United States.

A nation's culture is its soul. Its enhancement enriches us all.

Mr. Chairman, with the record thus set forth, it would be unthinkable not to continue the appropriation for the National Council on the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of full funding for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. I think it is unfortunate that the direct grants have been cut from $5 to $4 million and assistance to the States from $2.7 to $2 million under the endowment for the arts.

This means the matching funds available to the individual States will be cut from $50,000 to $36,000.

The overall amount for the encouragement of the arts and humanities is modest. This effort enjoys bipartisan support. It is a beginning program. It is a seed program. The funds for the States in particular are basic in my judgment to the encouragement of private or local initiative in the arts.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I hope that a principle will be made clear here today that is basic and of paramount importance—autonomy for the arts. The Congress must be disinterested as between particular grants. There must be a clear insulation from Federal control and from the dead hand of the Government. Congress should support the arts in my judgment, but without attempting to influence artistic judgment or direction.

The Congress must not interpose its ideas on artistic questions. This should be left entirely to the talented and public spirited men and women who serve on the National Council on the Arts and its several distinguished panels on the theater, the dance, and the visual arts.

The Congress has the right and clearly so to appropriate funds for the encouragement of the arts, but we should not deal with specific grants which, in my judgment, would be a grave error. We must, as the House of Commons has for two decades, uphold independence for the arts free from political interference.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities just as I supported the original legislation because I believe that when the history books are written on this 20th century, we are going to be judged not by how many screaming missiles or bombs we can produce. Bombs and missiles will determine, of course, whether we do survive—but we are going to be judged also on how we survived.

I think this will be dependent upon what type of scholars and what type of artists we are able to produce.

I had certain misgivings about this legislation and I certainly still have. They are the same as the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] mentioned—that it will tempt the Government to dictate to the arts.

There is some language in this report with which I disagree, and I want to disassociate myself from this language because I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. In my opinion, the words represent a veiled threat to the arts. This language is on page 36 of the report and is as follows:

> The committee would also caution that extreme care must be exercised that those responsible for the administration of this program do not unduly influence through the award of grants, the type or style of art which is to be cultivated in this country.
>
> As the committee views this program, there are many potential pitfalls that must be avoided if it is to merit the continued support of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I think the greatest pitfall in this program is the Government telling artists how they should produce and what they should produce.

Artists and scholars must be free. They must be daring and imaginative, and they must be unafraid. If they think a congressional committee is looking over their shoulders, rather than stimulating and encouraging and helping artists and scholars, we are going to be frustrating them and tying them down.

If the day ever comes when I feel that in order to get an appropriation, an artist must be pleasing to this Congress as far as his output is concerned, that is the day on which I will withdraw my support for this program because we do not want, in this country, the Government interfering with the arts. We ought to post a great big sign "Keep out," telling the politicians to stay out of the arts and the matter of awarding scholarships and leave such things to those who are best able to judge for themselves. We must not try to set ourselves up as censors.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is most appropriate that the distinguished and able gentleman from New Jersey has made these comments with reference to this proposed legislation. Of course, this is one of the reasons why the people have been fearful of bringing the Government into these programs, however necessary such aid might be.

Mr. Chairman, Congress in the years ahead, like the administrative agencies, must be careful not to attempt to influence the arts and the humanities and their developmental progress. I know of no legal restraint that we could impose to bind any Congress in the future. But the Congress is going to have to practice self-denial and not try to impose its judgment over and above the judgment of the authorities who have the responsibility for the disposition of these funds.

Once we ever start to interfere in the sense of trying to express our own likes and dislikes, it will simply mean that eventually, for the sake of freedom of the arts, Government assistance will have to be withdrawn.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman. I would remind my colleagues that in the Soviet Union, judges have just sentenced two people to jail for daring to be critical. We do not want to be put in a position of denying appropriations for any similar reasons.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes, or so much of that time as he may desire to use, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am still amazed by the number of consultants hired by the Department of the Interior. I wonder if the gentleman from Indiana could tell me how many supergrades they have in that Department, or if he could even approximate the number of supergrades in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. DENTON. I cannot give you that information. I am sympathetic with your complaint about too many supergrades. In cases where the number of employees has been limited, they have contracted agency work. The work has not been as good a quality, and it has cost more.

Mr. GROSS. There is now before a subcommittee of which I am a member a request for some 500 additional supergrades, and I have no doubt that the Interior Department wants some of those. I cannot understand why the departments and agencies, with these highly paid employees cannot do their work inhouse without hiring all these consultants.

Mr. DENTON. I could not agree with you more. We made that complaint in our report. The gentleman will find it on page 5. We will follow up on that. I agree with you.

Mr. GROSS. I trust the gentleman will do just that.

I should like to ask the gentleman about this language appearing on page 43 of the bill: "Archeological Research and Excavation." What are we spending $2,300,000 to excavate?

Mr. DENTON. That work is mostly done in foreign countries through American universities. Reference to it appears in our hearings. It is something that has gone on for years. Some of it is in Egypt, and the Near East. The Government has done this for years.

Mr. GROSS. So we can add another $2 million-plus to the arts and culture, or whatever you wish to call it.

Mr. DENTON. If you want to call it that.

Mr. GROSS. I just wanted to know where it was. It is over in Egypt.

Mr. DENTON. Part of it is in Egypt and part of it is in Guinea, India, Burma, Israel, and Tunisia, where there are ruins.

Mr. GROSS. It would not be possible for the Egyptians to take care of their own excavations, would it?

Mr. DENTON. I expect that they can take care of some of it. Other countries in the world are taking part in this excavation work, which is designed to increase the knowledge of the history of mankind.

Mr. GROSS. I want to ask about the Job Corps. Is there any money in this bill for the Job Corps?

Mr. DENTON. No, that comes under the poverty program. There are funds for supervisory work of the Job Corps which are transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. GROSS. I wondered if there have been any more experiences similar to that on the Indian Reservation in Wisconsin, where a couple of girl employees of VISTA went to teach the frug and the Watusi. While teaching the Indians these dances, they were thrown off the reservation. Evidently the chiefs did not want the girls teaching the Indians how to dance. I don't know whether this is supposed to be art, culture, humanities, or what, but the Indians were dancing before this country was discovered. At any rate, they were thrown off the reservation, and the "Great White Father" in Washington had to send somebody to Wisconsin to get the girls back on the reservation and bury the hatchet.

Mr. DENTON. That is not funded under this appropriation. That is in the Economic Opportunity program. We will go into that when that bill is considered by the committee.

Mr. GROSS. You will do what, when?

Mr. DENTON. When the House considers the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, I am sure my friend from Iowa will take it up at that time.

Mr. GROSS. Even though this bill provides for the Indian Bureau, which administers the reservation in Wisconsin where the trouble occurred, I still must go to the poverty program people to find out how and where the hatchet was used?

Mr. DENTON. They fund the program and they are responsible for its administration.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] such time as he may require.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, as we review the debate that we have had today, we will see that it has been pointed out that had any Member of the House written this bill himself, there would have been areas that he would have cut and areas in which he would have added. Certainly I find myself in that position. But I rise to recognize the work of the chairman of the subcommittee, my colleagues of the majority, the minority leader, the minority members, and the staff of this committee, for the fine job that they have done in an effort to reconcile the many areas concerned with our national needs.

For myself, I rise to point out that I support the bill. As has been mentioned, there are certain areas in the bill that some of us take exception to, and in other areas, some would have added funds.

In the subcommittee, and again in the full committee, there was a great concern for the considerations of financial responsibility which dictate that we reduce or postpone expenditures in order to maintain maximum economic strength at a time at which our forces are engaged in an active war effort in Vietnam.

On the other hand, as the hearing testimony reflected, there are increasingly pressing needs here at home with respect to the management and maximum utilization of our national resources, for an expanding population, which demand urgent consideration.

Under the circumstances, I believe the committee struck a reasonable balance, with the assistance of its fine staff, and brought to the House a bill which, while it represents a substantial reduction of the budget total, makes a reasonable effort to carry forward programs which the American people have demonstrated they want their Representatives in Congress to advance, within the limits of the economic safety of the Nation.

Mr. DENTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman a question with regard to the construction going on in Rock Creek Park and on the Memorial Bridge. This has been disgraceful. It has been going on for over a year. It is a hazard every night and every morning to motorists. I am wondering about what is being done about it.

Mr. DENTON. In the supplemental appropriation hearing that we had the other day, we went into that very thoroughly with the National Park Service. The chairman of the full committee wrote a letter to the National Park Service about this.

We have had continual difficulty with this and have taken it up with Park Service officials on numerous occasions. We intend to follow up on it.

Mr. CONTE. Is this a Job Corps operation? Are they learning how to build roads?

Mr. DENTON. This is a Park Service operation. It is an operation of the Park Service.

Mr. CONTE. The equipment out there seems to be rented equipment.

Mr. DENTON. That is right. They have quite a bit of equipment themselves, but they contract much of this work.

Mr. CONTE. I really think that the Pyramids in Egypt were built a lot faster than they are going to build the road through Rock Creek Park.

Mr. DENTON. I am sure you could not be far wrong in that.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman. Somewhere in this budget there is $10,000 for the cooperative fishery unit at the University of Massachusetts. I cannot find it. Is it in the bill?

Mr. DENTON. That is in the report under the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, on page 22.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, as one of those who sponsored the bill which created the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, I am very much interested in the section of the report and the appropriations relating to that area.

The spiritual needs of a civilized society must not be neglected while we provide the guns of warfare and the butter of nourishment. Today we should provide a full portion for the Nation's cultural life.

In the first place, I am concerned that there has been a reduction in the funds amounting to $6,930,000 from the 1967 budget requests. This includes a $1 million cutback for the endowment for the arts and the elimination of the entire $5 million requested by the endowment for the humanities. I certainly hope there will not be a further reduction this afternoon. I think the National Endowment on the Arts is entitled to our support and to receive the full funding which the subcommittee has reported. I am sorry, indeed, that the National Foundation on the Humanities has not been funded, but I hope that the matter, when it is before the Senate will be remedied.

I am concerned about the matter referred to by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] and by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper]. I think we must be very careful to insure complete freedom for the arts in this country. Congress should not attempt to exercise a role which would be tantamount to Government interference in the arts, something which has been decried time and time again. Perhaps there may be a temptation for those who review the appropriations to try to substitute their judgment for the judgment of those who are highly qualified and competent in a field of the arts. We are fortunate to have a distinguished Council on the Arts to advise in this area. I believe that we should leave questions of type or style of art to its discretion.

In addition to that point made in the report, the report also strongly recommends that awards should be made "to established foundations, organizations, and institutions, rather than to numerous individuals in the field of art." It implies that future funding will depend upon emphasising grants to such established entities rather than to individuals and little known organizations which may be more inclined to engage in experimental and adventuresome programs.

Mr. Chairman, the amounts of money may be small, but the principles are weighty. One of the objectives we had when we passed the bill was to encourage the young artist, the new person entering the field of the arts. Every effort should be made to see that awards are made to creative individuals, although not recognized or established, and to newly organized groups, which will experiment and engage in venturesome programs. This in the long run will improve the cultural life of our society.

Again these decisions should rest with the Council on the Arts. Emphasizing grants to established institutions diverts the program from fresh creatives in newer fields and threatens to diminish the role of the Advisory Council.

I disagree with the rationale for not funding the Endowment for the Humanities because the program is not spelled out in detail. Testimony before the subcommittee pointed out that the distinguished Americans on the Council can be expected to develop programs in a dynamic way in response to events during the course of the year. Let us give them a vote of confidence.

Mr. Chairman, I will vigorously appose any amendments to further reduce the appropriations, and I stress that freedom in the arts is essential for the full flowering of our creative life.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, during the reading of the bill, I intend to offer an amendment which I think will be highly beneficial to this legislation. There are no controls on the expenditure of the many millions of dollars in the arts program provided by this Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, H.R. 14215, and I believe that Congress should require, as a condition of their expenditure, that they be equitably distributed among the several States.

Last year, I believe, we appropriated more than $7 million for the National Endowment for the Arts and I do not find any breakdown of the amounts given to each State so far under this program. This information should be supplied us at this time, so we can actually see how much each State has received, as it is supplied by other Federal departments and agencies. On pages 297 and 298 of the published hearings on H.R. 14215, it is pointed out that the proposal by the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts is to give each State $50,000 for a total of $2.5 million, but this is only about one-third of the funds provided last year, and being requested this year, and it will probably take some time to parcel this out to the States on an equitable basis at the rate the National Endowment is proceeding.

Sections 5(h) and 11(c) of Public Law 89–209 authorizes the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts to establish and carry out a program of grants-in-aid to assist the States with their art programs. The intent of the Congress in this section is clear, and my amendment would simply have clarified this and help in the administration of the program.

As we all know, many of our historic buildings and sites that are rich in tradition, history, and architecture and of great cultural and artistic value are threatened by the bulldozers and wrecking balls.

Already, some 6,000 of our heritage of 12,000 most historically significant buildings have been destroyed. Time does not stand still, and progress of a kind which takes no account of history or cultural and artistic values is catching up with the landmarks which remain.

The Metropolitan Opera House is an outstanding and world-famous victim of this kind of shortsighted progress.

In December 1962 Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall declared the Metropolitan Opera House eligible for registration as a national historic landmark, but the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., opposed such registration, and the board of directors, including Roger L. Stevens and Anthony A. Bliss, has continued to press for the destruction of the historic Metropolitan Opera House.

Mayor John Lindsay, of New York City, is interested in saving the Metropolitan Opera House, as are many other well-known people including Artur Rubinstein, Isaac Stern, Leonard Bernstein, Dr. Howard Hanson, Laszlo Halasz, Leopold Stokowski, Martha Graham, Rebekah Harkness, Dr. Harold Taylor, and Phillip Langer of the Theater Guild.

My proposed amendment would simply require that, as a condition of the expenditure of the millions of dollars provided by this appropriation bill for the National Endowment for the Arts, none of these funds would be used directly or indirectly to destroy the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City at 39th Street and Broadway. The Metropolitan Opera House should be preserved and can be operated on a sound basis for the enjoyment and appreciation of generations yet to come. The Met's friends are legion, and will yet save this exceptional structure known as a landmark throughout the world.

I append pertinent material for your consideration:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1966]

Mayor Supports Saving Old Met—Aid Says Lindsay Seeks Constructive Purpose for Opera House—Demolition Scheduled, but Several Groups Hope That Razing for Offices Can Be Prevented

(By Theodore Strongin)

Woody Klein, Mayor Lindsay's press secretary, said yesterday the mayor believed that the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street "should be saved and used for some constructive purpose. He has one or two staff members working on it," Mr. Klein added.

The opera house, which was completed in 1883, is scheduled to be demolished to make way for an office building after the opera company moves out next month. In September the new Met at Lincoln Center will open.

The mayor is pleased with the efforts of various groups who are trying to save the old building, said Mr. Klein.

Among these are the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit group with headquarters in Mount Vernon; the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects, whose members will testify at a meeting of the city planning commission on March 30, and the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street, which has asked the planning commission to institute condemnation proceedings so that the city acquires title to the Met property.

The architects' group believes that by easing certain zoning restrictions and granting special permits the builders of the planned office structure can be compensated for the loss they would incur if the present auditorium is preserved.

These matters would have to be studied, the architects concede. So they will suggest at the planning commission meeting that an impartial feasibility study be made to investigate their suggestions and, maybe, find new ones.

Roy Anderson, head of the Save the Met Foundation, said that this organization was circulating petitions to be sent to Governor Rockefeller, asking him to "introduce, support, and pass New York State legislation to preserve the famous Metropolitan Opera House." Mr. Anderson also said that he had information that could lead to a rehearing of the Met case before the Landmarks Preservation Commission or to a contest of the Met's lease to the group of real estate investors who plan to erect the office building.

TURNED DOWN LAST YEAR

In December the Landmarks Preservation Commission declined to designate the opera house a landmark, which would have saved it. At that time, the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects suggested preserving the auditorium and building the office building over it. The commission found the plan economically unfeasible.

TO TAKE POSSESSION MAY 8

The group that leased the old Met site is headed by Jack D. Weiler and Irwin S. Chainin of New York. It will take possession on May 8. The Met expects to get an average of $485,000 a year in rentals.

A provision in the lease forbids the use of the site for grand opera or musical presentations. Anthony Bliss, president of the Met, said that the limiting provision was made for financial reasons only, so that the new building would produce the greatest revenue possible for the Met.

He said that many feasibility studies had been made over the years, and that the Met itself had investigated the possibility of building over the present house, but that all plans had proved to be financially unsound.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
National Park Service,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1966.

Mr. Roy Anderson,
Trustee, Save the Met Foundation, Inc.,
Mount Vernon, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Anderson: Secretary Udall has asked us to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of July 10 requesting that the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City be designated a registered national historic landmark.

In December 1962, the Secretary declared the opera house eligible for registration as a national historic landmark. Immediately following this, the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., was notified of the Secretary's action and invited to participate in the landmarks program. The association, however, declined to register the opera house because of its plans to demolish the structure. Since participation in the program is strictly voluntary, there is little more we can do.

We are in sympathy with your efforts to save the opera house and hope you will succeed in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,
Howard P. Stayer,
Assistant Director.

Statement of the New York Chapter, the American Institute of Architects, Before the Landmarks Preservation Commission, September 21, 1965, New York N.Y.

My name is Martin Cohen, architect, and I represent the New York chapter, the American Institute of Architects.

The architectural quality of a building must be judged not only by its formal design in steel or concrete, but also by how well it fulfills the functions for which it was intended.

This auditorium is unique in the United States. There is no finer example here of the Louis XIV elegance characteristic of these classic 19th century opera houses. One must travel to Paris or Vienna or Milan to find a rival. But even more important, there is hardly a more satisfying interior theater space in the world. The hall has been criticized for technical stage limitations, and some seats are better located to produce revenue than to witness opera, but the fact remains that for the sheer drama of seeing, and being seen, in the exciting atmosphere of glittering spectacle, and for superb acoustics, this hall has few peers anywhere. One can hardly imagine a happier or more successful relationship between architecture and people. It must be preserved.

If the only way this great auditorium can be saved is to preserve the entire building, then the New York chapter would have to recommend the whole building be saved. However, we recognize the functional, as well as the architectural limitations, of the exterior building shell and would recommend that consideration be given to schemes in which the auditorium itself would be preserved, possibly with reconstruction of some essential spaces ancillary to the hall, within the framework of an income producing structure. We believe this theater can continue to serve New York's millions, while returning the site to revenue producing status for its owners.

It is difficult to avoid the analogy of Carnegie Hall. Also deemed redundant, technically inadequate, and slated for destruction but a few years ago, Carnegie Hall stands as an inspiration to those who believe in New York's readiness to preserve its architectural and musical heritages, and as a warning to those who would destroy our renowned halls of proven quality while chasing endlessly after elusive secrets to achieve adequate replacements.

We strongly urge the designation of this building as a landmark.

Martin H. Cohen, A.I.A.

[From New York Times, Mar. 25, 1966]

Fans of Old Met Prepared To Fight—New Body Petitions City and Plans To Raise Money

Leonard Bernstein, Harold Clurman, Aaron Copland, Agnes de Mille, Gian Carlo Menotti, Tony Randall, Artur Rubinstein, George Szell, Jennie Tourel, and Peggy Wood are among the figures in the world of music and drama who have declared themselves in favor of saving the old Metropolitan Opera House from demolition.

They have joined the Citizens' Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street. Leonard Altman is chairman of the group, which is now being formed.

The committee has petitioned the city planning commission to start proceedings to acquire the property by condemnation and put it up for auction. Members would raise the money needed for a successful bid and for renovation of the old house.

Bronson Binger, an architect who is the group's secretary, yesterday said some money has already been raised, but he would not disclose the amount.

There would be no cost to the city or to any other governmental body, Mr. Binger added.

MET NEEDS THE MONEY

The Metropolitan Opera will open in its new house in Lincoln Center in September. It has leased the old house to a group of real estate investors headed by Jack D. Weiler and Irwin S. Chainin of New York. The Met expects to receive an average of $485,000 annually from site rental over the next 25 years.

In a statement released today, the committee recognizes that the rental money or its equivalent is indispensable to the Met in its new home. The income the Metropolitan Opera Association will receive from "prudent investment of a fair purchase price—will far exceed the income which it will realize from the lease," the statement continues.

The statement cites the old Met as a symbol to the entire world of the highest artistic achievement, and adds that neither New York nor the United States can afford to lose it.

Other members of the committee to date are Stella Adler, Mrs. Douglas Auchincloss, W. H. Auden, S. L. M. Barlow, Thomas S. Buechner, Walter D. Binger, Robert Cordier, Kenward Elmslie, Barbara Epstein, Jason Epstein, Mrs. Mario Fratti, Robert Fryer, Hugh Hardy, Mrs. Gaston de Havenon, Mrs. Vladimir Horowitz, Mrs. Howell Howard, Charles E. Hughes, James Hulse, and Alan Price Jones.

Also, John Koch, Mrs. Jacob M. Kaplan, Miles Krueger, Lucy B. Lemann, Leo Lerman, Sylvia Marlowe, Joseph Papp, Will Petschek, Perry Rathbone, Henry Hope Reed, Mrs. Artur Rodzinski, Ned Rorem, Gertrude Rosenstein, Mrs. Remi Saunder, Mrs. Thomas Schippers, George Schneider, Daniel Selznick, Leo Silber, Mrs. Dario Soria, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Strasberg, and Sherman Sullivan.

In addition, Harold Taylor, John S. Thatcher, Mrs. Lawrence Copley Thaw, Virgil Thomson, Charles Turner, Mr. and Mrs. Michael Wager, David Wallace, Mr. and Mrs. Meyer Weisgal, and Herschel Williams.

Richard Caine Striker is secretary and Nathan L. Goldstein is general counsel.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 30, 1966]

Drive To Save Met Joined by Stokowski

(By Sally Hammond)

Leopold Stokowski has enlisted in the campaign to save the old Met.

One of the music world's towering figures, the dynamic, long-maned conductor added his name to the growing list being compiled by the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, whose headquarters is at 33 East 61st Street.

Leonard Altman, who heads the new committee, is a trustee of the Carnegie Hall Corp., and a veteran of the successful campaign that saved and renovated Carnegie Hall when it faced a similar fate as the Metropolitan Opera. He looks on his new job, he says, as "my second saving."

THE NEW MEMBERS

Along with Maestro Stokowski, Altman announced the following new adherents to the cause:

Martha Graham, Virgil Thomson, Henry Lee Munson, Leonard Rose, Rebekah Harkness, Raymond S. Rubinow, Mr. and Mrs. George Atkinson Braga, Mr. and Mrs. B. Rionda Braga and Marya Mannes.

Another leading maestro, Sixten Ehrling, conductor of the Detroit Symphony, recently called the committee from Detroit asking to be put on the list, Altman said.

Altman and his committee have been concentrating, however, on drawing up a report to be presented today at a hearing of the city planning commission where several plans for saving the old opera house will be considered.

"Everyone is waiting for our report," Altman said. "It is rather an exhaustive document which we think will lend weight to our belief and prove that the opera house is very definitely useful and can be self-sustaining."

TAX RECORDS CITED

Another organization devoted to the Met's rescue, the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., has charged that income tax records show the Metropolitan Opera Association has been operating at a profit and not at a deficit as Met spokesmen have claimed in their case for demolishing the building.

Roy Anderson, editor of the magazine Choral and Organ Guide, who organized the foundation in 1961, has publicized his findings that Internal Revenue Service records here show that the Met declared surplus income of $3,573,411 for the 3-year period ending with the 1963–64 season.

In reply, Anthony Bliss, president of the Met's board of directors, called Anderson's conclusions absolutely inaccurate.

"Mr. Anderson has confused as 'surplus,' funds that have been received for advance subscriptions and for special purposes," he said.

"For example, we received in 1964 funds for the new opera house, funds for productions for future years, subscriptions for the year 1965. None of these moneys can be truly counted as money received and available."

[From the New York World-Telegram & Sun, Feb. 12, 1966]

The Old Met Must Be Saved

(By Louis Biancolli)

While there is still time, and while the subject of landmarks is in the air, let me make one last, probably hopeless, appeal to save the Metropolitan Opera House.

No argument for the demolition of the old house, and I have heard and read all of them, can shake my conviction that this most significant of all the city's landmarks should not yield to the inroads of business.

At all costs, at whatever cost, this building must be saved. Let Mayor Lindsay, Governor

Rockefeller, yes even President Johnson, step in and with their power of office safeguard this symbol.

For symbol it is, a symbol of spiritual growth. It is shameful that in all the practical and emotional commotion by good people over the preservation of this mansion and that public building, no meaningful official effort has yet been made to save the Met.

Don't get me wrong. I am thrilled over the magnificent new house at Lincoln Center, thrilled, too, at the prospect of several more years of the farsighted and daring leadership of Rudolf Bing.

I have no quarrel with institutions that like to better themselves. Like men of vision they must move on. But a house cannot move. It either remains where it is or it is torn down. But some houses are institutions too.

Such an institution is the Metropolitan. The house is of the city's very organic makeup. Removing it will leave a hole, a hole to be filled up by still one more office building. Every city in the world, large or small, has office buildings.

Only New York has a Metropolitan Opera House, a lodestone of artistic glamor for generations, a refuge for the millions hungering for great singing. After 8 decades of service the Met deserves better than to be destroyed like an old horse.

Other cities have their own opera houses, valued, cherished, preserved, even subsidized. None but New York has the Metropolitan. It belongs to the world. Among all opera houses this has a special sacredness. No other house has such memories to enshrine.

Berate its exterior for the aging warehouse that it seems. Enumerate the places in the house from which it is hard to see. Itemize the signs of physical deterioration. They amount to nothing beside the grandeur of its interior.

Our renovators, given the money and signal, could go in there and redo everything in one long summer. Given public and official interest, they could turn every office into a museum of opera. That part of the house could be a world center of mementoes.

The rest—so hospitable for singer and listener alike, so commodious, yet so friendly from seat to seat, row to row, aisle to aisle, level to level, would remain New York's guest room for the great visiting ensembles.

I am convinced that, with unbiased effort, 40 weeks of ballet and opera, from outside or inside New York, could be booked into a preserved Metropolitan. If not profitably, at least deservedly, New Yorkers deserve that break.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 31, 1966]

THE OLD MET'S FRIENDS FIGHT ON TO SAVE IT

(By Sally Hammond)

With the clock ticking closer to midnight for the old Met, a host of its would-be rescuers were given a sympathetic hearing by the city planning commission.

Commissioner Ballard stretched a point yesterday to hear all the arguments that a "constructive purpose" could be found for the historic building, to use Mayor Lindsay's hopeful expression.

Ballard put the rather tense witnesses at ease, saying: "We of the commission would certainly applaud if you can figure out any way to do it." But he added that his commission could not settle the matter.

THIRD FORCE OPERA

Among the most effective speakers was Laszlo Halasz, the distinguished conductor who 20 years ago helped found the now flourishing New York City Opera and was its first general manager.

Just returned from conducting engagements in Europe, Halasz said he was "saddened" to find plans for the Met's demolition going ahead "in spite of all efforts."

Speaking as a practical artist, Halasz insisted that the old Met could be operated with very little money with a different approach. In a statement he brushed aside the theater's so-called shortcomings and suggested smaller scale productions, stylized staging, projected scenery, and the more effective use of modern lighting.

The city is ready for a third force opera, he said, with the new Met on one hand with its name stars and $14 top and the New York City Opera on the other with its emphasis on the contemporary. The old Met could present standard opera and offer a livelihood for young American singers, 500 of whom are presently in voluntary exile in Europe.

HUROK IS QUOTED

Leonard Altman, who announced that Isaac Stern, the "savior of Carnegie Hall," had just joined his Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, submitted a 21-page statement ending with a quote by Sol Hurok: "Give me a 4,000-seat house and I'll keep it going 52 weeks a year." The committee claims that private funds are available to purchase and renovate the building and that it can be made self-sustaining.

Altman petitioned the commission to recommend to the mayor that he place the matter of preservation of this house before the proper civic authority so that proceedings leading to the city's taking title to the property at the earliest possible date can be instituted.

Martin H. Cohen, speaking for the American Institute of Architects, New York chapter, said: "To destroy the Met's auditorium would be tantamount to civic vandalism." And Mrs. Katherine Thayer Hobson, secretary of the Fine Arts Federation, said, "The amount of mail we have been getting is tremendous. If we do not save the Met we will be failing our duty to the whole country."

Roy Anderson, president of the Save the Met Foundation, charged again that the Metropolitan Opera Association was running a surplus and did not need to lease the site. Anthony Bliss, of the Met's board of directors, called his statement scurrilous. "Our books are open to all," he said.

[From the New York World-Telegram & The Sun, Feb. 9, 1966]

THE MET DOES WELL

In the "Closeup" column by Hope Johnson February 1, Mr. Bing is quoted as saying, "The Met will never make money, neither will any other opera not State subsidized."

The Save the Met Foundation would like to point out that, according to statements issued by the comptroller of the Metropolitan Opera Association, Mr. Bing had the following excesses after expenditures for 1961, 1962, and 1963:

1961	$1,423,825
1962	1,812,080
1963	337,506

This amounts to $3,573,411 balance in excess of expenditures during the past 3 years. The total income for the same 3 years was $24,873,574.

Therefore, Mr. Bing appears to be doing quite well, even without a State subsidy. If any commercial, profitmaking corporation could make a 14.3 percent profit after taxes during a 3-year period it would hold up its head in pride.

In case your readers are interested we are continuing the fight to save the historic Metropolitan Opera House from demolition, and still have high hopes for success.

ROY ANDERSON,
Save the Met Foundation.

COMPARISON

Comparison of contributions filed by Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., on 990–A filing for year ending June 30, 1964, with contributions claimed by other organizations on their 990–A fillings for same period ending June 30, 1964:

Organization	Amount of gift claimed	Amount filed by Metropolitan Opera Association
Kathryn Long Trust	$13,584.78	$20,000
Metropolitan Opera Endowment Trust	7,880.45	1,964
Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts	75,520.61	(1)
Cornelius M. Bliss Memorial Fund	4,300.00	2,600
Metropolitan Opera Guild, Inc.	261,000.00	276,100
James Foundation	100,000.00	50,000
Oaklawn Foundation	500.00	500
Cecil Blaffner Hudson Foundation	(2)	5,500
Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation	25,000.00	25,400
Gramma Fisher Foundation	(2)	71,000
Preservation Society for Newport County	(2)	5,000
Youths' Friend Association	(1)	1,000
Ford Foundation	600,000.00	(1)
Do	25,000.00	25,000

[1] None.

[2] No filing of 990–A.

In that certain of the organizations contributing to the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., have not filed 990–A forms, the above schedule is incomplete. However, there appears to be at least eight organizations whose 990–A filings contain a different amount than shown on the 990–A filing submitted by the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 31, 1966]

PLAN WOULD KEEP MET WITH NEW BUILDING OVER IT—ARCHITECT WANTS CITY BOARD TO DEFER DECISION ON A REPLACEMENT

(By Theodore Strongin)

A full exploration into ways of saving the auditorium of the present Metropolitan Opera House, by building over it rather than demolishing it, was suggested yesterday to the city planning commission.

The proposal was made by Martin Cohen, representing the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects, at a commission meeting in city hall, Mr. Cohen asked the commission to delay action for 3 months on an application for a special zoning permit, submitted by the builders of a 40-story office building planned for the site when the Met moves out on May 10. The delay would allow time for the study to be made.

The Met will open its next season in September in its new house in Lincoln Center. The opera company has leased its old site for 50 years to Keystone Associates, a group of real estate developers, who plan to demolish the old house and erect the new building after the Met moves out on May 10.

The delay was opposed by Samuel Kramer, attorney for Keystone Associates. He said it would be unfair to ask Keystone to wait longer before starting the project, in view of the valuable time, effort and money already spent in engineering and architectural studies.

Mr. Cohen suggested a number of ways in which the developers could be recompensed for the loss of money-earning floor space and for added construction costs should they decide to include the auditorium in their new building. The city could allow them to build higher, and it could waive the requirement by which buildings must be terraced back from the street at certain heights.

Besides the architects' chapter, several other groups as well as individuals made strong pleas for saving the Met. William F. R. Ballard, chairman of the commission, ruled these out of order, saying that they did not bear on the business at hand, which was specifically the special zoning permit application. For the most part Commissioner Ballard let the pleas be heard anyway.

Among those testifying were members of the Citizens' Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street, who proposed that the city acquire the building at no cost to itself, and let the committee renovate and run it as a hall for music and dance. The committee would raise the needed money.

Roy Anderson, speaking for the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., declared that the Met's lease to Keystone was invalid, and that so were many of the Met's financial statements, which it used as evidence in getting permission from the courts to make the lease.

Several others testified mostly for saving the Met but one was against.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 3, 1966]

Save the Met for Shakespeare

Shakespeare in the old Metropolitan Opera House?

Philip Langer, speaking for the Theater Guild, would very much like to see the historic Met with its capacious stage saved from demolition for just that purpose.

In a letter to City Planning Commissioner Ballard, Langer wrote:

"We urge and entreat you to make every effort to preserve the Metropolitan Opera House. There are not enough large auditoriums in New York City to handle the large number of Shakespearean and other classical spectacles that would like to come here."

ISAAC STERN AGREES

Citing the same need, Isaac Stern, the violinist whose efforts helped save Carnegie Hall, wired the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera to say, in part:

"Theaters of this large size and with (the Met's) purposefulness are much too rare and can be of enormous value to the artistic expansion of the city of New York.

"I feel that this hall could operate 40 weeks a year with absolutely no detriment or competition whatsoever to the new auditoriums now being completed."

In the Theater Guild's plea to Commissioner Ballard, Langer wrote that several times in recent years the Guild has tried to engage the Met for a season of Shakespeare. But the hall was never available, except in May, a notably poor time for legitimate presentations.

NO PLACE TO PLAY

Also, efforts to bring productions to the New York City Center found that, too, unavailable and the productions were thus unable to come to New York.

"If the Metropolitan Opera House were to be saved," Langer summed up, "we feel it is evident with a large number of opera, ballet, and theatrical producers in the city that the Metropolitan Opera House could be filled throughout the season with exciting productions that otherwise cannot come here, and have not come here through the years."

Statement of Laszlo Halasz in Favor of Saving the Metropolitan Auditorium, to New York City Planning Commission, March 30, 1966

The Metropolitan Opera House should be saved. Its historic and esthetic values should be assessed by experts in the field.

I shall limit myself to the question of the constructive purpose for which it should be preserved, a point raised by Mayor Lindsay in his endorsement of rescuing the Metropolitan from destruction.

The Met is the only theater in Greater New York which could serve as a true Stadttheater, or municipal theater, and, because of its central location and large seating capacity, which could be managed economically as well. If this auditorium were destroyed, decades might pass before another theater of its capacities could be constructed, and at a frightful cost.

The so-called shortcomings of the theater do not really furnish arguments against the preservation of the opera house. Although 600 seats allegedly have obstructed views, this does not seem to prevent their being sold for almost every performance. And if scenery and staging were designed to occupy a more central portion of the stage, the angles of visibility (even from obstructed-view seats) would be improved considerably. Moreover, the 600 seats could be used by the blind, increasing their so-limited opportunities to attend live performances. Similarly, the so-called inadequacy of backstage storage space for scenery, props, etc., is also closely connected with the requirements of large-scale productions, which emphasize the grand rather than the opera. With a different approach to production problems, drawbacks could be overcome by stylized staging, projected scenery, and the more effective use of modern lighting. (The crucial and ever-present question of costs might also be resolved by this kind of reassessment of the basic philosophy of operatic production.) Although I concede that office space is very cramped, the dedicated Met staff has functioned well within these limitations. A different operation resulting in the reduction of personnel occupying the theater could provide more elbow room. Lastly, the present lack of air-conditioning in the house is the problem most easily dealt with. Since New York is a summer festival, as we are continually reading, an air-conditioned Metropolitan would draw large audiences and quickly amortize the initial cost of the installation of equipment, incidentally adding immeasurably to the meager local summer theater facilities.

The following theater arts should comprise the saved Metropolitan-City Theater:

OPERA

Greater New York City is ready for a third force in opera. The Metropolitan is more and more becoming an organization which concentrates on the presentation of name stars in performances available to the few who can obtain tickets and afford to spend up to $14.00 apiece for them; the City Opera Co. focuses on American, contemporary, and the lesser known operatic works. The standard operas, however, which still appeal most to the operagoers of the world, including those of Greater New York City, with its large ethnic groups, offer the best chance of livelihood for the young American singers, 500 of whom are presently in voluntary exile in Europe. This standard repertoire is simply not available to the masses of New York during the main seasons.

Therefore, I visualize another opera company in addition to the Metropolitan and the City Opera, one leaning heavily on the established repertoire and devoted to presenting higher quality performances in new scenic productions by thoroughly rehearsed ensembles featuring the cream of American singers and creative artists, those in the United States and others who should be repatriated. The main consideration in the attainment of this goal is finding a suitable theater which could be used not only on the days and evenings of the performances, but also for the essential and sometimes extensive preparatory work and rehearsals.

CLASSICAL OPERETTA

The people of New York's melting-pot crave the operettas of their various national heritages. The "Viennese Operetta" from von Suppe to Lehar draws sold-out houses wherever and whenever it is performed. The French Can-canesque masterpieces a la Offenbach are not heard at all, and our steadily mounting Spanish speaking population is entitled to hear and enjoy the numerous Zarzuelas which are completely neglected in our city. A company concentrating on these musicals could fill a large part of the available season of the saved Met, and with stunning financial results.

BALLET

New York is the ballet city of the world, but outside of the New York City Ballet, no company has a home. Martha Graham's company, the Ballet Theater, the Joffre Ballet, Jose Limon's Troupe, etc., must perform in theaters and at times not of their own choosing, but to suit what is available. These companies, together with the visiting foreign ballets (Hurok attractions), could represent another large portion of the booking of the newly formed Stadt Theater.

DRAMA

There are historical plays which we do not see and hear in New York because they require mammoth stages, large casts, and commensurate seating capacities in order to equalize the cost. Robert Whitehead and Elia Kazan, both of whom have been in favor of saving the Met, could formulate plans for such a division.

To summarize, the growing population of greater New York and the cultural expansionism so evident these days require a theater which could house all of these art forms under one roof. The present Metropolitan Opera House is the only theater which can make such a project possible. Our city, our country, and our people are crying for it. With the dynamiting of the Met such a project would be demolished before it could even be discussed. Selfish interests or fear of competition (and healthy competition is after all one of the keystones of our national life) should not be permitted to interfere with progress.

[From the New York World-Telegram & the Sun, Feb. 23, 1966]

Don't Destroy the Met

As a lover of opera, a Metropolitan subscriber, and as an architect, I cannot help but contemplate with dismay the impending destruction of the present Metropolitan Opera House.

The old house has its faults but they are not acoustic, and experience with the two completed music theaters at Lincoln Center should cause the Opera Association's directors much concern. The City Opera Company's move to the New York State Theater (which will establish it as the first major company unable to sing unassisted in its own home) is but another compelling reason to save the old Met—not as an archeological artifact but as a vital and essential component of New York's life.

HERBERT KAUFMAN.

[From the New York World-Telegram & the Sun, Mar. 26, 1966]

The Met's Destruction

One of the saddest aspects of the impending destruction of the hallowed Metropolitan Opera House is the ghoulish abandon with which gala performances are scheduled to celebrate the dismal deed.

But possibly even more cynical is the public hearing of the city planning commission scheduled for March 30 at city hall, at which will be considered the granting of special exceptions to the zoning laws modifying height and setback regulations for the opera house site. Thus the developers of the proposed office building request the public's permission to make a more intensive use of this crowded site—use which the zoning resolution enacted only a few years ago was expressly designed to prevent.

Not only is the community to be bereft of this noble portion of its history and heritage, but the community's laws are to be legally violated so that the bereavement may be profitable.

Herbert Kaufman.

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, Mar. 14, 1966]

“Barbarians” Threaten the Met

A few days ago it was announced that the great golden curtain of the Metropolitan Opera House will be cut in scraps by RCA and sold as souvenirs with long-play records.

Here is another example of cultural vulgarity in keeping with the whole idea of demolishing the Met. Governor Rockefeller states that the Met (built in 1883) is antiquated and inadequate and that the real estate is far too valuable to permit the continued existence of this venerable building.

The Paris Opera House was constructed in 1864–74. Though it has an imposing exterior and marble foyers, the auditorium is ugly and insignificant. That the Paris Opera House is antiquated and inadequate cannot be doubted. Located in the center of Paris, it occupies a piece of real estate that is unquestionably one of the most valuable in the entire world.

But would the French dream of demolishing it to erect office buildings that would yield a fantastic revenue? Never. Instead they recently commissioned Marc Chagall, one of the world's greatest living artists, to paint the ceiling. The French possess cultural values that transcend francs and centimes. These values we have not yet acquired.

The demolition of the Metropolitan Opera House with its incomparably beautiful auditorium and acoustics constitutes an act of vandalism and those who sanction this sacrilege enhance our reputation as cultural barbarians.

Lucy B. Lemann.

The Home of the Diamond Horseshoe—An Analysis

(By William H. Edgerton [1])

(Architecture is the printing press of all ages, and gives a history of the society in which it was erected.—Lady Morgan)

On the 15th day of May 1880, a certificate of incorporation was recorded in the office of the secretary of state of New York. The corporation designated in this certificate was the Metropolitan Opera House Co. of New York, Ltd. As reported in Harper's New Monthly magazine of November 1883:

"In what other cause of charity would it have been found so brief and easy a manner to induce 70 men of business to subscribe $20,000 each, in order to raise the $1,400,000 which the Metropolitan Opera House was estimated to cost? Here there was not only the certainty of no pecuniary return, but the additional prospect to the stockholders of paying their admission into their own building like the undistinguished throng. One of them has computed that it will cost him $20 to lend his box for an evening. When we compare this alacrity with the struggles of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, it shows that whatever may be the nature of the hold of Italian opera upon the high-dizened, select populace, it is at least very powerful."

Apparently the number of boxes in their existing opera house, The Academy of Music, were in short supply. In fact, the demand became so great for these boxes that they "quite lost their character of unprofitable investments. Just before the project of the new opera house was undertaken, $30,000 was offered for one of them."

An abortive attempt to locate the new opera house on a 200- by 200-foot plot near Grand Central Station was made by the committee only to discover after accepting the design of architect J. Cleveland Cady that adjoining property owners held a guarantee restricting the proposed site to uses other than those of public amusement, and that unanimous waiver of this restriction could not be obtained, even in the case of Italian opera. Thus thwarted, the committee made a more enviable decision when they chose the current location, a truncated rectangle of land bounded by Broadway, 40th Street, 7th Avenue, and 39th Street, in an area now referred to as Manhattan's garment district. This site allowed 60 additional feet in depth, and allowed the architect to realize the full potential of his designs.

In their 19th century prose alternating between awe and gentle criticism, Harper's new monthly magazine justifies the design of the new opera house thusly:

"The design of an opera house is at every point a compromise between conflicting claims. Fortunately, there was no question between the two great divisions of the house, the stage and the auditorium. The auditorium is quite the largest in the world, exceeding its closest rivals, San Carlos at Naples, and La Scala at Milan, by some feet in every dimension. The stage is exceeded in area only by two, that of the Imperial Opera in St. Petersburg and that of the New Opera in Paris. But it is evident from the plan that the dependencies of the auditorium have been in some degree sacrificed to the auditorium itself. This sacrifice is not of the stairways, by any means, but simply of the corridors, which are in some places narrowed beyond what an architect would probably think desirable for the free circulation of an audience between the acts. The number of occupants in each tier of the boxes is so small, 222 being the maximum, and only the male half of these being liable to engagements between the acts, that the narrowing of the corridors does not threaten any physical inconvenience, but only some impairment of the character of dignity and spaciousness which it is desirable to give to the corridors. "The entrances and exits, indeed, are entirely ample, almost beyond example elsewhere. It has often been pointed out how far inferior modern public buildings are in means of access and departure to those of the Romans. It would not occur to anybody to call the doorways of a modern building vomitoria, even if modern notions of verbal propriety did not restrain him. Here, however, with the rare good fortune in New York of a building standing free on all four sides, it was comparatively easy to contrive ample and separate entrances to all parts of the house, at no greater inconvenience than that of an increase in the number of ticket takers. The great double staircase, which is gained from the Broadway entrance, through a vestibule 63 by 37, in two flights, each of 12 feet in width, gives access to all parts of the house except the gallery. There are also large vestibules midway down each side, that on 39th Street 70 by 33, that on 40th Street 50 by 33. To each of these entrances carriages may drive under cover of a permanent veranda of metal, and from each a winding staircase, contrived in the space between the curve of the amphitheater and the rectangle in which it is inscribed, gives access to the boxes; while from each of these side entrances a staircase rises to the balcony, and two to the gallery.

"The interior form of an opera house is distinctly established by experience as the amphitheatrical, and very few innovations upon this typical form are possible. The amphitheater in this case seems elongated beyond what is usual, and then widens at the stage end so as to give it more nearly the form of a lyre than of the glittering horseshoe's ample round, which belongs to the conventional temple of the lyric drama. There is a more important departure from the conventional opera house for the proscenium is altogether omitted. In the 14th Street Academy the proscenium boxes have been objects of desire, to achieve which there have been given whole seasons of intrigue and social politics. Inasmuch as the proscenium could not be extended so as to include the amphitheater, a widely splayed opening of a very few feet in depth, decorated with large pilasters at the reentrant angle, and still for convenience called the proscenium, is the only representative of the abolished feature.

"The purpose of making any box as desirable as any other box has by no means been attained, however, when the proscenium has been abolished; and the study of sight lines and acoustics, so as in some measure to bring this about, is one of the chief of the many problems which beset the architect of an opera house. In the present case, sight lines were drawn from every part of the house in each tier to the sides and the rear of the stage, to ascertain how much of the view of the stage would be lost from that point, and the contour of the auditorium and the pitch of each tier were modified in conformity with the results of these studies to the arrangement actually adopted. The result has been so satisfactory that it is safe to say that there is no theater in which there are fewer bad seats in proportion to its size, nor any opera house in which the difference between the best and the worst boxes is so small.

"The seating capacity of the house seems arranged with a liberality almost extravagant. The total number of seats is 3,045, divided as follows: parquette, 600; baignoir, 72, parterre, 216, first tier, 222; second tier, 222; balcony, 735; gallery, 978. And yet the New Opera in Paris, which occupies nearly if not quite as great an area, has only 2,156 seats.

"The facilities for emptying the operahouse, while they are beyond those of almost any other theater, are less needed that in almost any other theater. Their amplitude is a matter of inconvenience, not a matter of safety. The destiny of a theater almost proverbially is to die by fire, and there is scarcely a famous theater in the world which has not been rebuilt more than once. Here it has been attempted to construct not merely a slow-burning but a really fireproof theater.

"The only combustible material it contains, outside of the stage, is the wood used in the floors and their furrings, and in the fittings of the galleries. The stairways throughout are of iron in brick wells; the partitions, apart from the main walls of brick, are of fireproof material, the construction of the floors of fireproof arches turned between iron beams, the flooring of the corridors of tiles.

"The ceiling is a great sheet of metal hung from metal bars, and its dome a great saucer of the same material hung from the roof. The roof rests upon the elliptical walls of the auditorium, which are the main constructional walls of the building, and the roof construction is of iron trusses. The supports of the gallery are iron beams anchored in the walls of the auditorium. Many difficulties arose in applying this construction to the ever-varying lines and forms required in an opera house, and many interesting expedients were adopted to overcome them. In order to gain an easy descent from the corridors to the front of the boxes, for example, it was found necesary to interpolate two steps, and this necessitated a double bending of the rolled beams which were to carry the galleries. Moreover, as both the pitch and the slope were continually changing, no beams would require exactly the same bending, except the pairs opposite each other in the same tier. The contractor found it necessary to erect a mill of his own in which the beams could be bent as well as rolled. The proscenium wall is continued 25 feet above the auditorium, and required to be supported from the walls on either side of the curtain opening. A brick arch was not practicable from lack of abutment. The expedient adopted was a truss some 80 feet in length by 15 in depth, upon which the gable wall of the stage stands, and to which it is additionally secured by rods built in the brickwork. A smaller truss spans the curtain opening.

---

[1] William H. Edgerton is editor of the Dow Building Cost Calculator published by F. W. Dodge Co., a division of McGraw-Hill Inc. He is the author of the "Building Costs & Trends" section of the Appraisal Journal.

"The stage is required to be an open space from top to bottom and from side to side. The end wall of the building thus becomes an isolated piece of brickwork, unstiffened by floors, 125 feet high from the street, and 106 feet wide. It is an unbroken surface within, but on the outside is reenforced by two massive buttresses 5 feet deep. The roofing of the stage is also an interesting piece of construction, for it is not often that a roof of 106 feet clear span is required to be set upon walls 101 feet high. This is effected here by an iron truss, set upon rollers to provide for the expansion and contraction of the metal throughout so great a span.

"As the stage is the point of any theater especially vulnerable to fire, it is of prime importance to confine to the stage any fire that may originate there. This is accomplished not only by making the rest of the house incombustible, but by converting the stage itself into a flue, inclosed in the brick walls which rise above the rest of the house. A large skylight in the roof of the stage is weighted so as to fall open when its fastenings are removed, and these fastenings are arranged to give way at a comparatively low temperature, and thus open the top of the chimney of which the walls are the sides and the proscenium opening the hearth. To put out fires which may arise on the stage, reliance is placed, beyond the ordinary precautions, upon a novel automatic appliance. A network of small pipes is hung above the stage, filled with water from a tank in the roof, and pierced at frequent intervals with holes stopped with soft solder, which melts readily, and drenches the stages as from a great shower bath.

"Among the novelties the arrangement of the orchestra deserves mention. It is placed in a brick bowl sunk below the parquet, and floored at a level which will leave the musicians visible only from the upper tiers. The sonority of this reservoir is expected materially to reenforce the volume of tone.

"Another novelty is the system of supporting the stage. The supports of the stage must be readily removable, so that any point underneath may be utilized as it may be called for by the varying exigencies of the drama. Ordinarily this requirement is fulfilled by the use of a wilderness of timber supports, any section of which may be knocked away as the space it occupies is needed. This arrangement is hardly compatible with a fireproof building. Here a light iron construction has been devised, containing some 4,000 members, which has all the facility of removal and reconstruction of the carpentry. The cellar of the stage is 30 feet deep from the floor, and this depth is divided into three stories, of which any one, or any section of all three, can be made available at once.

"The exterior of the building is considerably less like the stereotyped treatment of an opera house than the interior. Costly as the building is, it is so very large as to limit the expenditure upon its external architecture. And this limitation seems to have determined the architect, together with other considerations, to seek for the effect of the great building through simplicity and expressiveness of general composition, and the utmost delicacy of such decorative detail as he must somewhat sparingly employ. The style, in deference, possibly, to the purpose of the building, is Italian, and in the Broadway entrance, which is more copiously decorated than any other part, is a correct and academic Italian Renaissance. This style has more elegance than vigor."

And today, more than 82 years later, this elegance—though much in need of a good cleaning—is a welcome relief from the monolithic verticality of New York's more recent architectural mediocrity.

COST OF AN OPERA HOUSE

The cost of a building is always of prime interest. The figures shown in table I were reported in American Architect and Building News of February 28, 1884.

The cost of the building, exclusive of land and items of personal property not reported in the above list, was $1,024,061.15. According to historical cost information maintained by the Dow Building Cost Calculator, today's replacement of the building would cost the princely sum of $45 million.

The first owners of the opera house were 70 men of business who each subscribed $20,000 to raise the then estimated $1,400,000 cost of the building and its real estate. These 70 men united themselves into the original Metropolitan Opera House Co. of New York, Ltd. Originally there were 74 opera boxes—70 for the stockholder families and 4 to be disposed of by the manager. Democracy of ownership was so strong that the heads of these families drew lots to achieve impartial allocation of the boxes. Then, on September 21, 1883, the Metropolitan Improvement Co., Ltd., was formed and held its first meeting. Ownership of this corporation was identical to the Opera House Co.; the Improvement Co. was formed "to purchase, lease, own, hold, and sell real estate, improving the same by the erection of buildings, do the management, and conduct of such buildings for the purpose of a hotel or apartments, with restaurants and other facilities connected therewith."

TABLE I.—*Original construction costs*

Amount paid for real estate	$622, 191. 44
Excavation	54, 002. 44
Masonry, plastering, tiling	401, 664. 59
Iron-work	272, 539. 70
Carpentering	80, 271. 61
Roofing	11, 382. 00
Plumbing	15, 050. 65
Gas-fitting and fixtures	21, 694. 62
Terra-cotta	16, 510. 00
Electric wiring	5, 172. 38
Stage, rigging, loft	28, 343. 84
Seating	23, 044. 75
Ventilating and heating	35, 344. 31
Decorating	14, 349. 68
Architects' fees	44, 690, 58
Total	1, 646, 252. 59

When translated into action, this resulted in the construction of 70 bachelor apartments in twin towers flanking the entrance of the building. Ownership was divided equally among the 70 families: freehold of premises on the opera boxes and bachelor apartments above.

Opening in the fall of 1883 with Gounod's "Faust," the opera house immediately became an international symbol of the cultural excellence of New York City. However, even in those early days there was an indication of the hassle of real estate and financial affairs to come.

ENTER: MISFORTUNE

The first disaster was of major import; on August 27, 1892, fire came to the opera. If a sleepy patron had been in his seat, it might have seemed to him that the closing scene of Mozart's "Don Giovanni" was suddenly and forcefully coming true. A fortnight later, the American Architect and Building News carried the following story in their issue of September 10:

"The detailed accounts of the fire show that a most extraordinary use was being made of the building at the time. Apparently, a sort of scene-painters' festival had been going on there for some time. Not only was the scenery belonging to the opera house piled about in all directions, but new scenery for two other theaters, Hoyt's and the Casino, was being painted on the stage; and immense numbers of huge, freshly painted canvases were stacked in the flies and in the wings, while others were in process of preparation on the stage floor, as rapidly as the decorators and carpenters of the other two theaters, with the help of a part of the opera house staff, could paint them and put them together.

"To make this enormous accumulation of dangerous material as dangerous as possible to the building, the iron curtain between the stage and the auditorium was pulled up to its full height, so as to expose the whole interior to fire from the stage; and this notwithstanding that, by a piece of inexcusable carelessness, a temporary wooden floor, which was built over the whole area of the auditorium, on the occasion of a ball held in the building last spring, had been left in place.

"In some unexplained way, very likely by the lighting of a pipe among the easy-going individuals in charge of the place, the fire caught among the paintpots and varnish, and spread like a flash over the fresh, oily canvases and pine wood stretchers which were stocked or piled in enormous masses on all sides, as well as overhead. As might have been expected, it did not occur to any of these vigilant guardians of the great property to lower the iron proscenium-curtain, but all hands fled, every one escaping without injury from what must have been a blaze so sudden and violent as to have been little short of an explosion, with the exception of a boy, who had been sent on an errand to the fourth story, and, terrified by the sudden burst of flames, jumped down a shaft to the first story, and was taken out with a fractured skull.

"Meanwhile, the different portions of the construction behaved just as they were intended to do. The great skylight over the stage was shivered immediately by the heat, giving bent to the flames, and, by its powerful draft, holding them away from the auditorium. If the iron curtain had been down, it is not likely that the least damage would have been done by fire to the auditorium; but, with the proscenium-arch open, in a room 90 feet deep, 100 wide, and 150 high, filled with blazing oil and canvas and pine wood, it was hardly possible that the heat should not have had some effect; and the temporary floor took fire, smoking and staining the ceiling, while the balcony railings were partly destroyed, and the ceiling itself, which is of metal suspended from the iron roof, was somewhat injured.

"At this moment the firemen came in, and wrought, with streams of water from 25 engines, the havoc which seems to be unavoidable in such cases, soaking the walls, floors, and upholstery, with what remained of the scenery, and even the books in the manager's library, and the dresses in the wardrobes. It did not take many minutes of this sort of work to complete the destruction of $200,000 worth of property, consisting mostly of scenery and dresses; the building, with the exception of the stage roof and fittings, and the decorations of the auditorium, being little injured. No doubt, the skill of the New York firemen had a good deal to do with keeping the loss within such reasonable bounds; but it is certainly highly creditable to the architect that his building should have resisted so well the fury of such a conflagration."

In the beginning, the Opera House Co. had given a mortgage for $600,000 to the Bowery Savings Bank, and when the Improvement Co. was formed to build the bachelor apartments, a mortagage of $210,000 was given to one of its directors, Adrian Iselin. To reconstruct the building after the fire, together with his desire to clear title to the property and to consolidate the mortgages, Iselin forced a sheriff's sale. A new company was formed in March 1893, to purchase the assets of the two original companies at the sheriff's sale on March 22, 1893. Its name was the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co.; its capital stock consisted of $1,050,000, being 10,500 shares each with a value of $100; and its directors included notable men of great wealth such as J. P. Morgan, William K. Vanderbilt, and William C. Whitney. Land conveyance to the new company was by referee's deed, and reconstruction of the building was commenced.

This reconstruction produced a slightly different interior arrangement; since the new corporation was formed by 35 of the original 70 owner-families, only 35 boxes were reconstructed, with title again termed freehold of premises. The new company leased the auditorium to various outside production companies for operatic productions, thus relieving the 35 owners from further financial obligation in case the productions operated at a loss. To insure absolute control over the affairs of the corporation, in their request for corporate status the directors of the real estate company included the following statement: "No transfer of stock shall be made except to a person or persons previously approved by the directors."

Then, in October 1889, when some operatic patrons wished to formalize the emerging social activities in connection with the production of opera, the Metropolitan Opera Club was formed as a membership corporation for the cultivation of vocal and instrumental music, the encouragement and support of operatic and musical performances, and the promotion of social intercourse among its members. The Opera Club has functioned throughout the years, though it now is no longer a corporate entity There are several unanswered questions regarding a possible interest in the opera real estate held by the Metropolitan Opera Club that will be developed below.

The year 1903 saw the formation of still another company, the Conried Metropolitan Opera Co., organized solely for purposes of operatic production. Its name was changed in 1908 to the Metropolitan Opera Co., with an assent to the name change given by the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co. The latter then entered into a lease with the former, for the production of opera in the building. The original lease was due to terminate May 31, 1911, but contained self-renewing 5-year options.

In 1932, the owner-families organized what is now known as the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., a membership corporation, and began production of opera in the opera house, replacing outside production companies. No doubt, one of the replaced companies was the Metropolitan Opera Co. whose lease was allowed to expire. With the advent of national radio networks, several years previously, it became quite apparent that opera productions were becoming a subject of great public support and interest and that operatic productions might well be placed on a paying basis. Thus the owner-families returned to direct operation of the auditorium.

By this time the freehold family ownership was being held, in several instances, by the heirs of the original families. Further, many of these heirs did not like opera and, in order to add to personal income, began to rent or lease their freehold to individuals who were more interested.

Because of the confusion brought about by the actions of the box owners, it was decided that the owner-family controlled Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., would buy the now-famous building from the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co. (also under the same owner-family control), but the former claimed that it was without sufficient funds to effect the purchase.

Therefore, beginning in 1938, the Real Estate Co. began threatening its sister company, the Opera Association—both controlled by the same family-owners—that it would sell or demolish the building unless funds would be found for a purchase, thereby forestalling demolition. The Opera Association made a wide and dramatic public appeal for funds on their weekly radio programs "to help save this historic building." By 1940 the Opera Association had realized more than $1 million in gifts for the purpose of buying the opera house, and an announcement was made that "the public has saved the opera house."

It would appear that the association then paid its self-controlled Real Estate Co. $1,970,000 and acquired title to the opera house subject to a demand mortgage of $470,000 (which still stands today) with the Morgan Guarantee Trust Co., as well as acquiring a warehouse used for the storage of scenery, located at 209 West 40th Street, New York. Immediately upon acquisition of the building the association gave a "purchase money" mortgage in the amount of $1 million to the Title Guarantee & Trust Co. This mortgage was, and is represented by 4-percent bonds $467,000 of which have been redeemed. At this point the Metropolitan Opera Co., the old production company, was dissolved, followed a few days later by the dissolution of the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co.

NOW, TO THE PRESENT

On February 27, 1961, the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., petitioned the New York Supreme Court, under the provisions of the membership corporations law of New York State, as follows:

"Your petitioner desires to lease the said Metropolitan Opera House site for the purpose of demolishing the present improvements thereon and replacing the same with a modern building for office and other commercial purposes, and has entered into an agreement of lease, dated February 16, 1961, for the lease of the same to Jack D. Weller and Robert H. Arnow, as tenants, for an initial term of 50 years, with two renewal terms of 25 years each, at a net fixed annual rental during the 50-year term, as follows:

"During the first 4 years: $200,000 per annum.

"During the next 6 years: $400,000 per annum.

"During the second 10 years: $450,000 per annum.

"During the third 10 years: $500,000 per annum.

"During the fourth 10 years: $550,000 per annum.

"During the fifth 10 years: $600,000 per annum.

"The net fixed annual rental during the renewal terms will be a sum equal to 6 percent of the fair market value of the land as of the commencement of such respective terms, but in no event less than $500,000 per annum."

Among the several reasons given in the petition as to how the interests of the petitioner would be promoted by the lease, were the following:

"The board of directors of your petitioner has heretofore approved the participation of your petitioner in the Lincoln Center project which involves the creation of a unique cultural center in the city of New York to house a complex of constituent institutions each serving an important area of interest in the broad field of the performing arts. A principal feature of the Lincoln Center project is the construction of a new Metropolitan Opera House for use by your petitioner. It is anticipated that the new Metropolitan Opera House will be ready for occupancy by May 1, 1964. At such time the present Metropolitan Opera House site will no longer be required by your petitioner.

"The revenue to be derived by your petitioner from the net fixed annual rental provided for in the aforesaid agreement of lease is necessary to enable your petitioner to meet its obligation in connection with the new Metropolitan Opera House to be erected in Lincoln and to otherwise carry out its objectives and activities.

"The possibility of the Metropolitan's continuing to operate the opera house building for rental to producers of musical and theatrical attractions was rejected because of the administrative burdens and expenses involved, the uncertainties and financial risks entailed in theatrical rental, and the fact that even under optimum conditions the estimated net return would not approximate the return which might be obtained from other dispositions of the property."

The lease specifically prohibited grand opera or concert hall performances.

In an appraisal of the opera real estate and improvements submitted with the above petition, made by Brown, Harris, Stevens, Inc., on December 30, 1959, a statement was included:

"The building is obsolete and adds nothing to the value of the land at this time, and that if the property were offered for sale and made available for a new improvement, a higher price could be gotten for the plot if the building had been removed."

The appraisal concluded that the value of the property was $7 million and that a fair annual net rental would be $420,000. This happens to be the 50-year annual average of the lease payments as outlined above.

Two years later, in 1963, the opera association petitioned the New York Supreme Court for permission to amend the lease requested in the first petition. The amendment was necessary for two reasons: to postpone possession of the premises by tenants due to delays in the construction of the Lincoln Center project, as well as to anticipate and allocate among the parties a condemnation award that might stem from public efforts to preserve the building. The petition stated that:

"The tenant would not be entitled to any portion of the condemnation award unless the landlord received at least $9 million as compensation for the land value and consequential damages to the landlord's fee interest."

TABLE II.—*Comparison of amounts, lease versus condemnation award*

Years:	*Lease*	*Condemnation*
1 to 4	$200,000	$450,000
5 to 10	400,000	450,000
11 to 20	450,000	450,000
21 to 30	500,000	450,000
31 to 40	550,000	450,000
41 to 50	600,000	450,000

The petition was subsequently granted. One might conclude that the opera association had appraised their building, exclusive of land, at $2 million.

QUESTIONS OF YIELD

The above petition presented a capsule history of the opera, but failed to mention that there were "freehold of premises" owned by members of the Metropolitan Opera Club within the history of the real estate transactions, such "freeholds" having been signed over to management. Therefore, it is a moot point whether or not any part of the lease payments outlined above will accrue to the owners of the opera boxes or their heirs. It is possible that income realized from the lease would go in part to the boxholders or their heirs in payment for relinquishing their possession. This gives rise to the question that if the city of New York acquires the building via a negotiated sale (as was the case when Carnegie Hall was preserved) or by condemnation proceedings, how will the proceeds be divided between the association and the club? The answer to this and other related questions would not be apparent without an examination of the books and records of the opera association. Such a search is impossible at this time.

But more important, how will the Metropolitan Opera Association benefit under the two alternatives, the lease or condemnation-negotiated sale? (To beg this question for a moment, it is necessary to observe here that the use of present value analysis to value a stream of income in the future, like the use of any other formula or tool of analysis must be applied correctly to advance one's supposition or statement.)

Robert Landry, reporting in Variety on May 5, 1965, indicated that:

"1. A condemnation award of $9 million invested at 5 percent per annum by the Metropolitan Opera Association, would yield $450,000 per year.

"2. The existing lease not yet in effect, with payments of from $200,000 to $600,000 over the 50-year term, would yield these various sums per year, since it was a net lease."

Thus, the figures shown in table II could be drawn, showing amounts per year.

Mr. Landry then concluded that only from the 21st year onward would the association lose under a condemnation award. This conclusion is logical if one is not prepared to say that moneys to be received in the future are worth less than their face value today (this being the raison d'etre of present value analysis). In fact, the present value of the leased fee is $6,381,650, and the present value of the condemnation, invested at 5 percent, is $6,892,900—over $2,500,000 more.

Therefore, because their wish is to lease the property and raze the building, one can only conclude that the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., is particularly desirous of reducing competition in the field of operatic presentation as much as is possible. And this, with over 96 percent of available seats filled throughout the season.

WHY SAVE THE OLD MET?

What are some of the practical reasons for saving the Metropolitan Opera House?

1. It has the lowest fire insurance rate for any building of its type in New York City.

2. There is more storage space in the opera house than exists in any opera house in the world.

3. It has more stage space and scenery and costume storage space than that in the plans for the Lincoln Center Opera House.

4. There are more auditorium seats and more space in the orchestra pit than in the new Lincoln Center Building.

5. As it now stands, the old Met has more rehearsal space than in all Lincoln Center buildings combined.

6. The Met's acoustics are excellent—considerably better than the acoustics of the already completed Philharmonic Hall.

7. It has complete carpentry and tailor shops.

8. The 70 apartments can provide a substantial rental income to offset costs of operation.

For several years, Mr. Roy Anderson, a music magazine publisher of Mount Vernon, N.Y., almost singlehandedly has been carrying on an attempt to save the opera house. In 1961 Mr. Anderson formed a nonprofit corporation entitled the Save the Met Foundation, Inc.

Mr. Anderson suggests that there is room in New York for standard operatic productions at popular prices, as well as a need for an auditorium to be available for ballet, repertory theatre, concerts, film premieres, and even large stockholders meetings. He suggests that if it were operated on an ownership and not a producing basis, the building could become quite financially successful; and that there are enough opera-goers in the metropolitan New York area to support a second major opera house, particularly if prices average $5.00 per seat as Mr. Anderson projects. With the recent appointing of a permanent Landmarks Preservation Commission by Mayor Wagner, the likelihood of saving the building by public means has been materially increased.

The Metropolitan Opera Association has stipulated that it may back out of the Lincoln Center opera house if possession is not obtained or if the building should prove unsuitable for the production of operatic performances.

The possibility then exists, that, should the Save The Met Foundation, Inc., actually save the building against the wishes of the Opera Association, as well as if the association should find their new building unsuitable for the production of opera, then the association would have to lease the old building from its saviors—a grossly ironic thought.

[From Save the Met Foundation, Inc., Mount Vernon, N.Y.]

Comparison of Alternatives To Indicate Incorrect Reasoning in Paragraphs 8 and 9 of the May 5, 1965, Variety Article on Save-the-Met Movement

(By William H. Edgerton)

On May 5, 1965, Mr. Robert Landry reporting in Variety, indicated that the Metropolitan ground lease to be executed in 1 year, contains the following scale of payments: $200,000 per year for 4 years; $400,000 per year, next 6 years; $450,000 per year, next decade; $500,000 per year, third decade; $550,000 per year, fourth decade; $600,000 per year, fifth decade.

Alternatively, should the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., obtain enough momentum, Mr. Landry indicated that the Metropolitan Opera Association would presumably be paid $10 million, and this sum invested at 5 percent would yield $450,000. We assume a misprint here, i.e., the interest rate should have read 4½ percent. Mr. Landry continued "and only after 20 years would the Met lose under such an exit settlement."

The following analysis will show that the Metropolitan Opera Association will benefit more from the second alternative, hereinafter called condemnation, than under the ground lease, as now written. The analysis will be conducting using the present worth or present value method of valuing a stream of equal or unequal payments to be received in the future. Present value analysis assumes that money in hand today is worth more than the same amount to be received in the future due to the fact that interest is accrued in the interim. Present value analysis is the only approved method in use today to determine the value of lease payments, and it is the only realistic method in use to determine the value of an income stream; such as would be received under the condemnation alternative.

PRESENT VALUE OF THE GROUND-LEASE ALTERNATIVE

Assumptions are as follows:

1. Lease payments to be made at the end of each year.

2. The applicable interest rate is 6 percent, basically due to the fact that the ground would be improved with a high-rise office building, thereby creating a very secure lease position. Referring to the graduated lease payments above:

Present value of $200,000 per year for 4 years, at 6 percent: Inwood factor of 3.465 times $200,000 equals $693,000.

Present value of $400,000 per year for 6 years at 6 percent: Factor for 10th year equals 7.360; less factor for 4th year equals 3.465; difference equals 3.895 times $400,000, or $1,558,000.

Present value of $450,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 20th year equals 11.469; less factor for 10th year equals 7.360; difference equals 4.109 times $450,000, or $1,849,050.

Present value of $500,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 30th year equals 13.764; less factor for 20th year equals 11.469; difference equals 2.295 times $500,000, or $1,147,500.

Present value of $550,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 40th year equals 15.046; less factor for 30th year, equals 13.764; difference equals 1.282 times $550,000, or $705,100.

Present value of $600,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 50th year equals 15.761; less factor for 40th year equals 15.046; difference equals .715 times $600,000, or $429,000.

Total present value of leased fee is $6,381,650.

These calculations indicate that an individual could invest $6,381,650 now, at 6 percent interest, to obtain the 50 years of payments as outlined. At the end of 50 years, his investment would have been returned to him, together with 6 percent interest.

PRESENT VALUE OF THE CONDEMNATION ALTERNATIVE

Under the anticipated terms of the condemnation, the Metropolitan Opera Association would presumably be paid $10 million. Invested at an interest rate of 4½ percent, annual interest would be $450,000, assuming that no investment management fee is paid or other expenses deducted. An income stream of $450,000 per year for 50 years at 4½ percent, has a present value factor of 19.762 times $450,000, or $8,892,900.

This indicates that an individual could invest $8,892,900 at 4½ percent interest to obtain repayments of $450,000 per year for 50 years. At the end of 50 years, his investment would have been returned to him, together with 4½ percent interest.

In the case of the Metropolitan Opera Association, no value has been placed on a return of the principal of $10 million for it is assumed that this sum would remain invested. Similarly, it is assumed that the ground-lease would be continued in force, perhaps with different terms.

SUMMARY

The above calculations indicate that the condemnation alternative has a present value to the Metropolitan Opera Association of $2,511,250 more than the ground-lease alternative. This is not a loss after 20 years as suggested by Mr. Landry.

Save the Met Foundation, Inc.—Financing alternatives

	At interest of—			
	3½ percent	4 percent	5 percent	6 percent
BORROWING				
1. $10,000,000 amortized over 50 years, principal and interest paid each year	$426,337	$465,550	$547,767	$634,442
2. Annual investment required, to grow to $10,000,000 in 50 years	76,337	65,552	47,767	34,442
3. Annual interest without amortization on $10,000,000	350,000	400,000	500,000	600,000
BONDING				
Assume $10,000,000 to be repaid with interest at the end of 50 years in 1 payment:				
Total repayment required	27,500,000	30,000,000	35,000,000	40,000,000
Annual investment required per year:				
At 3½ percent	210,000	229,100	267,200	305,200
At 4 percent	181,000	196,500	229,100	262,000
At 5 percent	131,400	143,200	167,100	191,000
At 6 percent	94,600	103,000	120,000	137,500

Assuming $10 million is needed to save the Met—$8 million to pay off present owners (Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc.) plus $250,000 to reimburse Weiler and Arnow their costs, there remains $1,750,000 to clean, renovate, and air condition the historic opera house. Using the opera house as collateral, the above chart indicates various financing alternatives covering a $10 million borrowing plan. A realistic income from auditorium and apartment rentals would produce $1,250,000 annual income. This amount is nearly double the amount of annual principal and interest payments—even at 6 percent interest.

Carnegie Hall operations for period of July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964

Rents collected	$812,530.10
Other income:	
Hall operation	171,801.84
Box office	23,385.00
Concessions	14,669.89
Sponsored events	15,009.86
Miscellaneous income	13,028.15
Total	237,894.74
Total gross income	1,050,424.84
Contributions received	9,410.20
Adjusted total income	1,059,835.04
Total expenses	1,000,055.10
Surplus at end of year	59,779.95
Allocation of expenses:	
Compensation of officers, etc.	45,953.97
Other salaries and wages	281,486.41
Interest	1,139.50
Taxes	16,062.59
Rent to city of New York	183,600.00
Depreciation	77,219.75
Miscellaneous expenses	394,592.98
Total	1,000,055.10
Improvements on Carnegie Hall since 1960:	
Office furniture and fixtures	23,502.79
Painting	79,027.20
Carpeting and flooring	51,411.09
Draperies	37,412.95
Building (outside)	16,160.24
Building (inside)	99,594.14
Air conditioning	343,209.21
Donated assets	66,118.59
Miscellaneous	21,962.90
Total leasehold improvements since 1960	738,399.11
Balance due on above as of June 30, 1964	738,399.11

NOTE.—Carnegie Hall Corp. has an accumulated fund balance of $368,015.41 as of July 30, 1964.

MARCH 25, 1966.

Re zoning application affecting present site of Metropolitan Opera House.

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: One learns in life to be grateful for little things and all humanity is enriched because New York is graced with the residence of Rudolph Bing.

Were he to live in Rome, he would build an urban renewal project on the site of the Colosseum.

The destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House is no less an act of vandalism, from which mankind must recoil with horror.

New Yory City needs the Metropolitan Opera House more desperately and urgently than it needs another office building. All the evidence points to a growing hunger among our people for musical performance: booming sales of classical records; the vast outpouring of humanity last summer to the Philharmonic Concerts in Central Park and in Prospect Park, the continued contributions of Carnegie Hall to the culture of our city, a contribution which would have been lost had not an aroused public saved that institution from the bulldozer 6 years ago.

Just 30 years ago, Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia had the vision and the courage to establish the City Center of Music and Drama. Certainly our city would today be a little poorer if it did not have its ballet company, its Christmas Nutcracker Suite, or the talents which blossomed and flourished at the City Center.

I dare say that nothing Mayor La Guardia accomplished in his many years of public service has so lasting a value or so enduring a quality. It is hopeful that Mayor Lindsay is prepared to move forward along the road taken by Mayor La Guardia.

It is a dismal fact that very few New Yorkers have ever seen the interior of the old Metropolitan Opera House. It is an equally dismal fact that very few will ever see the interior of the new Metropolitan Opera House. This is inevitable, so long as the Metropolitan engages in subscription series ticket sales and so long as it is obliged to maintain high price ticket schedules. But this is also immoral, so long as the tax pennies of the very poorest in our city help support and maintain the Metropolitan Opera.

What is desperately needed in the performing arts is the moral equivalent of the pocket book, to make the performing arts available to the millions in the same way that publishers have made the printed word available to the millions. We have made some progress along those lines at the City Center, at the Academy of Music in Brooklyn, at Lewisohn Stadium, which unfortunately is now departed from New York's scene.

The Metropolitan Opera House can play a decisive role in that progress. There is no question in my mind that what Joseph Papp did in New York City for William Shakespeare, an equally alert mind can do in New York City for Giuseppe Verdi.

Here in New York City where we detest those who burn books, deface statues and destroy paintings, we can conceive for the proscenium curtains of the Metropolitan Opera House a fate more gracious than that decreed by Rudolph Bing—bits and pieces of rag to promote the sale of RCA-Victor records, success or failure in the market place must depend entirely upon the integrity and excellence of their musicianship.

Early in this session of the legislature, I introduced a resolution providing for acquisition of the Metropolitan Opera House by the State and for its operation by the State council of arts. Unfortunately the legislature has not yet had an opportunity to consider that resolution. However, irrespective of the action that may be taken by the legislature, I am convinced that there is more than enough talent and imagination to infuse a new spirit of life into the Metropolitan Opera House.

I regret, indeed, that legislative duties during this final week before the Easter recess make it impossible for me to appear before you in person in the interests of a cause about which I feel so deeply.

I can only emphasize that New York City is not so endowed with cultural resources that it can offerd to destroy the Metropolitan; nor is it so destitute of economic resources that it would prove to be unable or unwilling to support and maintain the Metropolitan.

I respectfully urge this commission to do nothing which will bring us nearer to that "sad hour, selected from all years to mourn our loss." Let us resolve to preserve the Metropolitan till, in Shelley's gentle words, the "future dares forget the past," so that the Metropolitan's "fate and fame shall be an echo and a light into eternity."

Sincerely yours,
BERTRAM L. PODELL,
Member of Assembly.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to those who have already expressed the gratitude and the congratulations to this committee and its dedicated and devoted chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], for their work and for their product on this appropriation bill for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies. As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] has said, there is probably no one on this floor who would not add items and subtract items. I am no different from this mythical character conjured up by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr.

Marsh]. I would prefer, for instance, to see the appropriation with a subsidy to the arts vastly reduced or eliminated and I shall express myself further on that during the course of this debate.

On the other hand, I note that out of activities financed by this budget of $1,169 million plus, revenues to the Federal Government in excess of $992 million will be generated. These agencies are almost entirely self-supporting. This budget covers many proprietary functions of the Federal Government and one of the most important is the production of timber on which the great woods products industry of this country depends.

I and a number of my colleagues requested an additional $1 million to the Forest Service and $200,000 for the Bureau of Land Mangement to program and lay out sales of down, dead and dying timber and thinnings presently going to waste on the Federal preserves. Each such dollar invested would return to the Federal Treasury from $3 to $4. In addition, and probably equally as important, it would put on the market approximately 271 million board feet of timber in excess of one-fourth billion board feet—at a time when pressures on and the availability of timber supply have never been greater. These pressures are caused by the demand for wood products accentuated by the need for building materials in southeast Asia, together with the continuing pressures of log exports which this year totaled in excess of 900 million board feet. No relief from the export problem has become apparent except the possibility of increasing the allowable cut by this means which, far from imperiling the sustained yield capacity of our forests, makes efficient utilization of wood supply that will otherwise be wasted. I hope that these additional sums of money may be added in the Senate.

I also must express my regret at the failure of the committee to fully staff the forest research facility at Bend, Oreg. In both of these instances we have an expenditure that can be expected to return dividends not only to the Federal Treasury but to the economy as a whole.

I regret also the failure to include funds for research into balloon logging, a most promising development in logging technique which should not only cut logging expenses by reducing the need for the present expensive road system required, but should also greatly reduce soil erosion and the resultant turbidity of our streams, a major factor in stream pollution. Again, I hope and shall urge that the Senate restore these deficiencies.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa to strike the appropriation of $7 million for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. I do so with a great deal of reluctance and I do so only because $6 million of the $7 million is for expenditure under sections 5(c) and 5(h), endowment of the arts and grants to the States for the arts.

I indicated last year my support for Federal assistance to the humanities. For some time now we have had Federal assistance to the sciences and mathematics and languages under the National Defense Education Act. This has been all to the good. In my opinion, support to the humanities is long overdue and, should a case be made in the Senate and this bill returned to the House with an appropriation for the humanities, that provision will have my support.

Last year I opposed the bill authorizing the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities primarily because of what I then said was a "legislative marriage between the arts and humanities." The humanities I supported and support; the Federal assistance to the arts I opposed for, to me, art is a spontaneous and free expression of the culture of a free people. I cannot help thinking, regardless of the motives and the good intentions of those who must pick and choose, that the very fact of Federal support for some forms of artistic expression and the rejection of others will result in a dampening or an extinction of that form of artistic expression which might otherwise prosper. By the very nature of the selective process we will shape by government fiat the nature of the culture which this generation and those to follow will leave to those who follow behind us.

I feel also that the artist must be free to practice his art and the public must be free to patronize or reject those forms of which he approves or disapproves.

I also am reluctant to tax all for the artistic tastes of less than all. While to some, the opera, the ballet, and the legitimate theater are the acme of artistic expression, others have no taste for such and prefer instead folk music, Indian dancers, pop art; indeed—belly dancers and the Beatles. In my judgment, if the Government is to patronize any, it ought to patronize all.

But the Congress has spoken on this when it authorized the Foundation. I would be willing to accept the action of the Congress and vote appropriate sums of money so that the congressional will might be carried out were it not for the pressures presently existing on the American dollar. President Johnson has asked industry to forgo expansion, to reduce the inflationary pressures. President Johnson has asked his Cabinet officers to reduce spending by $1¼ billion this fiscal year to reduce inflationary pressures. I cannot understand how—in view of these requests from the President of the United States—this Congress can at this time vote funds for the inauguration of a program to subsidize the arts. We have existed as a country for almost 200 years without this. Surely we could exist until the termination of the crisis in Vietnam and the return of the economy to a somewhat more stable state of equilibrium.

I have had the same telegrams and telephone calls from my district that other Members have. I realize as well as they that this is not a popular position. I realize also that Members of Congress of good will and as devoted to the public will as I will differ with me on this vote. I have said many times, however, that economy in government is a selective process; it does not mean a "no" vote on every issue. It does, however, mean a "no" vote on those appropriations which can be denied or deferred without major consequences to the public welfare. I therefore intend to vote "aye" on this motion.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, among the many specific items of importance in this bill, I would like to call special attention to a relatively small sum which has special meaning for all who are concerned about the future of the Potomac River Basin. I refer to the appropriation of $179,400 for the National Park Service for improvements along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Monument between Seneca and Cumberland, Md.

The C. & O. Canal is a priceless historical and recreational resource. As the Potomac Basin's population grows, and as more and more residents and visitors discover the beauty and recreational opportunities of the Potomac Valley, the C. & O. Canal will become more and more valuable.

As one who has been working for many years to preserve and restore the canal, I am pleased that the Potomac Basin task forces now at work consider the canal a central strand in the proposed Potomac Valley park complex. I am pleased that the Secretary of the Interior, in his message to Congress last week proposing a nationwide trails system, urged consideration of the 825-mile Potomac Heritage Trail as a possible national scenic trail. The towpath of the C. & O. Canal of course would be incorporated as a major segment of this trail.

I am especially pleased today that the National Park Service has shown its intention not to delay improvement of the canal until comprehensive park plans have been completed or longer trails have been designated. The $179,400 in the bill before us is clear proof of the Park Service's desire to restore the canal, rebuild the towpath, develop bicycle trails, improve bridges and bridge approaches, and generally clean up and patch up the canal and keep it clean. With the cooperation of the many interested conservation and civic groups and organizations who enjoy and appreciate the canal, this relatively small Federal expenditure can bring exceptional results. As an investment in the future, this item this year has a value far above its cost.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the able chairman and members of his subcommittee have again demonstrated their responsibility to duty by reporting out an outstanding Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for the 1967 fiscal year. Through their patience and understanding during many lengthy hearings, they considered the funding of programs charged with the important responsibilities of developing, supervising, and protecting the great natural resources base of the Nation.

I am particularly pleased to note the recommended increase of $6,288,000 over 1966 for additional requirements of the U.S. Forest Service for the next fiscal year. Many interested citizens in my district appreciate the committee's approval of $28,000 planning funds for a new Forest Service Range Management Laboratory at La Grande, Oreg. The new facility will replace the temporary and inadequate quarters now occupied by the scientists carrying out important research work.

Oregon's sports fisheries resources will be greatly enhanced by the committee approval of $100,000 for further development of the new fish hatchery on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation.

I regret that the $3 million reduction in the 10-year national forestry research program was not restored to allow continuation of high-priority research. This program is vital to the States whose economies are supported extensively by the lumber industry. This activity must be supported with greater appropriations in future years.

Although not included in the President's budget, a 5-year progressive land rehabilitation project at an estimated cost of $550,000 is recommended for the Drewsey grazing unit in Harney County in my congressional district. Unfortunately, the initial appropriation of $150,000 for the first year's operation was not made available. I am hopeful the committee will give this matter serious consideration during next year's hearings.

On March 9, I presented additional testimony before the committee with proposals to alleviate the problem of log shortages which threatens the stability of the lumber industry in Oregon and Washington. The capacity of many mills to process logs into lumber, plywood, and associated products exceeds the availability of timber. Many of these industries are dependent exclusively upon national forest timber for their operations.

This problem is complicated further by the heavy export of logs to Japan, leaving an even smaller supply to support our domestic wood processing industry. In my testimony, I endorsed Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's proposal of September 17, 1965, to accelerate the offering of timber not normally included in the established annual allowable cut. These offerings were to be made from salvage operations, silvicultural thinnings, and more efficient prelogging and postlogging utilization. Such sales would be another forward step in Forest Service practices for maximum utilization of our public timber resource under sound, sustained yield management.

In region six of the U.S. Forest Service, the annual offerings could be increased 249.2 million board feet, without any additional capital investment in roads; $457,300 would be required in the next fiscal year for manpower requirements in preparation of the sales.

Forest Service officials have also identified 141.9 million board feet in areas now inaccessible for logging. Road financing needs to develop these sales would be $1.6 million next year. Sale development costs for this timber would be $266,800.

Mr. Chairman, this important lumber supply program is not funded in the bill before the House of Representatives. I consider this would have been a sound investment of Federal funds, since an additional 2,000 jobs would have been made available in the Oregon and Washington lumber industry through the proposed program, adding strength and stability to the economy of this area. If a future opportunity presents itself, I encourage my colleagues in the House to support appropriations for this important program.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend Chairman DENTON and the committee for the great work they appear to have done in bringing this bill before the House. I observe that the committee has recommended $34,811,000 under the 1967 fiscal year budget estimates of the administration.

I believe that the committee deserves further commendation for the additional funds it has recommended for improved services to the American Indian—a people that we have treated so shabbily in the past. The committee has also dealt intelligently with the rapid transit and conservation problems created by the booming population increases in this Nation. We now have close to 200 million people living in our country, and population experts estimate that this figure will swell to 325 million by the year 2000—an increase of 62 percent in only 35 years. The problems which this poses for the transportation and conservation experts will be staggering. Somehow, we must learn how to move larger numbers of people more rapidly while posing the least threat to our natural resources.

The challenge of building a quality society—one in which we manage to maintain a delicate balance between the needs of our people and the resources of our land—is as great as any facing us today. I believe that H.R. 14215 goes a long way toward meeting this challenge.

My first-hand knowledge of the good that one small section of this bill will do back in the State of Missouri is a case in point. H.R. 14215 recommends $50,000 in preplanning funds for the construction of a reservoir in the Upper Big River in the Meramec River Basin. When this project is completed, facilities for boating, water skiing, swimming, hiking, and picnicking will be available in a region badly in need of such additional recreational facilities. Residents of the St. Louis area, the rapidly developing new Lead Belt region of southeastern Missouri, and southwestern Illinois will benefit greatly from this project.

This is but one example of the tremendous needs that continue to exist in the interior of this Nation. H.R. 14214 certainly cannot provide all of the answers, but it attempts to deal with some of the more pressing problems. I am grateful to the committee for authorizing a start on this project near the town of Belgrade, Mo.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues in support of the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1967.

I would like to commend the gentleman and his distinguished committee for an outstanding job on the legislation that they have reported to the House today.

I am gratified that the committee recognized the importance to our commercial fishermen of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act. The passage of this act in 1964 was probably the most substantial boost to our fishermen in recent years.

The purpose of this 5-year program is to stimulate research and development projects by the several States in the development of our Nation's commercial fisheries on a matching fund basis with Federal funding of up to 75 percent of the cost.

The President's budget asked that only $2.6 million be appropriated for fiscal year 1967. Fortunately, the Appropriations Committee recognized the benefits to be realized from the program and increased the appropriation to $4.1 million. This will provide funding for distribution of allocations to States on the same level as prevailed in fiscal year 1966.

Research and development in the field of commercial fisheries, which is one of our most valuable natural resources, cannot be ignored any longer. We must move forward—we must accept the challenges and exploit the opportunities which abound in American waters.

Not to do so would be a tragic waste of our God-given heritage.

Mr. Chairman, I want particularly to compliment the gentleman and his distinguished committee on the decision to eliminate from the President's budget the item that would authorize the use of excess currency funds in Communist Poland for the construction of a stern-ramp trawler for our Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

In July of last year, when I first learned that the Bureau of the Budget was urging the Department of the Interior to propose use of excess foreign currency funds for the purchase of two stern-ramp trawlers to be constructed in Communist Poland—thus bypassing the admittedly hard pressed U.S. commercial shipyards—I immediately wrote to Secretary Udall and the Bureau of the Budget, opposing this plan.

Then, in August of last year, before the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Committee on Commerce, I was privileged to testify in opposition to this proposal. It was my understanding that this radical idea had been discarded.

Therefore, I was amazed to learn that the fiscal 1967 budget for the Department of the Interior included a request for authority to obtain one stern-ramp fishing trawler with these excess Polish funds.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the merit of our Government's endeavors to find means by which to utilize the foreign currencies we own, but before proceeding to utilize these funds we must thoroughly scrutinize and carefully evaluate their potential impact on our domestic enterprises and national policies.

It has long been asserted, by those in authority, that a shipbuilding capability is essential to our national welfare.

This has long been my conviction and that of many others. But, somehow, in recent days, the essentiality of that capability has suffered from a lack of coordination among the various agencies of the Federal Government.

To illustrate. The Maritime Administrator has been actively promoting the idea of building some U.S.-flag merchant vessels in foreign shipyards. The Department of Defense is, at this very moment, negotiating the procurement of certain noncombatant vessels for the U.S. Navy from British shipyards.

In turn, the Navy Department wants to place more shipwork with the Government-owned and operated naval shipyards. And, then, the Interior Department sought authority or approval to have a fishing trawler built in Communist Poland.

The net effect of this massive squeeze play, if carried to fruition, would adversely affect large and small shipyards alike.

Once the foreign construction of American ships is permitted, regardless of size or number of vessels involved, a dangerous precedent would be established which would encourage other agencies and officials to seek foreign-built ships.

Officials advocating such policies seem more interested in effecting dubious savings than they are in strengthening this Nation's shipbuilding and maritime capabilities.

Perhaps this distinguished committee, in its decisive action on this trawler issue, has provided a key for initiating the kind of leadership needed to retain America's shipbuilding and maritime capabilities. Certainly, this committee has demonstrated a more acute awareness of our national problems and needs than some Government officials and agencies.

Since such leadership has not been provided by these officials, whose responsibility it is to protect and promote industries which are essential to our national welfare, then perhaps we are looking to the wrong source for guidance.

I submit that this committee's action has served notice that—unless these same agencies and officials abandon their build-abroad policies and begin to respect and implement the policies adequately outlined in our Merchant Marine Act of 1936—they may be forced to do so through congressional action.

I earnestly hope this will be the last we ever hear of proposals to build fishing trawlers—or any other kind of American vessels—in foreign yards.

The action of this distinguished committee should kill the initiation of any such proposal in the future.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the discussion today leaves me with mixed emotions. I agree with those who argue that we must cut back on our spending that we must exercise more self-discipline. On the other hand, I do feel we should provide money for the use of the Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Perhaps what we need is a ceiling under which the Executive branch must operate. It might be well to make them responsible for the specific decisions as to where the cuts can be made with the least impact.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is self-evident that the arts scene in the United States today is one of great variety and richness. We are producing much for which we are honored and respected throughout the world. We do not lack for talent. We do not lack for creativity. We do not lack for public interest.

What is lacking, for almost every artistic enterprise we can mention—professional, semiprofessional, and amateur—is adequate financial support. From local little theater groups to the glorious symphony orchestras which rank among the greatest in the world and the incomparable Metropolitan Opera Society, all are in economic difficulty. Or as the Rockefeller Panel Report on the Future of Theater, Dance, Music in America reported last year:

> In spite of tremendous growth and exciting promise, the performing arts as we see them today are in trouble.

By way of illustrating the tremendous growth of the past 20 years, the report cites the fact that the current total of about 1,400 symphony orchestras is more than double the number existing in 1939—but only 54 are composed predominately of professional musicians.

Some 750 groups are presenting opera—almost twice the number so engaged only a decade ago. However, only 35 to 40 of these groups are fully professional, and not more than 10 perform more than 15 days a year.

The number of dance companies approaches 200. However, in the entire country only about half a dozen meet high professional standards and have any real degree of institutional stability; only one has a performance schedule approaching a year-round schedule.

Theatrical enterprises number about 40,000 and have grown by about 15 percent in the last decade. Yet the number of commercial theaters has dropped from 600 in 1927 to barely 200. And Broadway, the heart of our creative theater, has reduced its output from 140 productions a year in the thirties to 63 in 1963-64, while the number of playhouses on Broadway has diminished from 54 to 36 in that same span of years. Incidentally, I might mention that in my home community of Morristown, N.J., an ambitious program has been developed by the Morris Repertory Theater, now in its second year of operation. Its performances have been of high professional quality and community support for this worthwhile effort has been increasing.

Further, most performing artists, as the report points out, are poorly paid:

> The miserable income of the majority reflects both a shortage of jobs and the brief duration of employment * * *. In all except the small handful of our major and metropolitan orchestras, the musicians earn an average of only a few hundred dollars a year from their professional labors.

The report further suggested that $40 to $60 million of new support would be required annually to meet the normal operating expenses of a professional performing arts establishment. When the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was established, its supporters did not envisage it as a major source of funds of the magnitude which the Rockefeller panel considers basic to the healthy growth and activity of the professional arts.

Rather, proponents of this legislation envisage the Federal contribution as in the nature of seed money, designed to nurture and develop new sources of private and local support for the arts and to increase audiences for the arts throughout the Nation. Without a modest Federal contribution, the arts scene in the United States, despite all its dynamism and vitality, will continue to be in trouble. Through leadership, which the National Foundation will provide, we can hope to develop the magnitude and kind of support for the arts which will permit the development of stable, mature, and civilized activities and creations which will reflect the greatness of this Nation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I support the appropriations herein for the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities, and only regret that the timing of the bill was such that the Humanities Council was not organized in time for its programs to be outlined before the subcommittee. I am pleased that the report mentions this fact, thus opening the door for acceptance of an amendment by the other body.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Committee on Appropriations has given careful consideration to the budget requests for the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities; has made some cuts; and further cuts would be disastrous.

The creation of this foundation which is concerned with the quality of American life was one of the highmarks of the first session of this Congress. It climaxed years of effort on the part of many Members, including the present occupant of the floor.

The purpose of this legislation, with its very modest authorizations was to provide seed money. Obviously the full $5 million for the arts does not begin to meet the deficits of all of the most professional cultural activities; neither does the same small sum provide the funds necessary to finance all of the scholarly research, study, and publication needed for the humanities.

But these sums, prudently placed by wise men and women having absolutely no private nor political axes to grind, can enrich the cultural and esthetic life of America and its people.

To fulfill this function, however, the seed must be healthy.

Unless we affirm the action of our subcommittee; unless we plan to go to conference with an open mind; the seed will be dried and shrivel and will die on the vine.

Mr. Chairman, of all the programs this Congress has authorized and implemented, none is designed to be more free from the Federal bureaucratic hand than this one. This House could change all of that by requiring that one of its committees serve as the selection board for projects, place the heavy hand of legislative bureaucracy upon the program.

I, as one member of the Committee on Appropriations, do not feel that I have the competency to make such judgments.

I do feel, however, that such people as Dr. Barnaby Keeney, of Brown University, Dr. Odegaard, of University of Washington; Dr. Germaine Bree, of University of Wisconsin, and others in the humanities; as well as Isaac Stern, Paul Engle, Philip Hanes, Agnes Demille and others in the arts are all fully competent to make such judgments.

These two great councils have made excellent starts; let us give them the tools so that they may continue to get the job done.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am torn between two positions—first I would commend the committee for trying to make reductions in Federal spending, but at the same time, I feel they used very poor judgment in deciding when those cuts should be made.

They have shaved $34.8 million from the President's budget but unfortunately the reductions have been made at the expense of important, vital programs while other fringe needs were given greater appropriations by the committee.

The committee's attempt to cut spending is excellent, but economy could have been achieved by delaying the nonessential programs, thereby leaving sufficient funds to meet more pressing needs in 1967.

The recommended budget includes reducing predator control funds by $20,000, reducing Geological Survey water resources investigation funds by over $600,000, and contains no appropriations for key construction projects only partially completed by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

At the same time, however, research funds for commercial fisheries were hiked up by $1.5 million and a special Appalachian project was granted nearly $1 million. I find the committee's action most inconsistent in pulling the rug out from under half-completed projects and then pumping millions into research and special regions of the country like Appalachia which has already received two or three layers of relief and more than $1 billion in special help.

The misplaced emphasis of the committee has resulted in no appropriations for badly needed facilities and programs. Let us take predatory animal control funds as an example. Even at the current fiscal year level of spending for this program, the problem has not been solved. This year alone there was more than a $40 million in loss from predatory animals to sheepmen alone. Yet the committee has recommended slicing already inadequate funds by $20,000.

As another example, the committee has placed nothing in the budget for many uncompleted construction projects by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Near Spearfish, S. Dak., the McNenny Fish Hatchery has embarked upon new building programs which will more than double their current trout production to meet the acute needs of a four-State area. The project has started, yet the committee has budgeted no funds for continuing work there. Instead, it has arbitrarily decided that more research is needed along the Atlantic coast and has increased research funds for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries by $2.5 million.

Because of a—and I quote—"extremely low volume of sales of annual recreation permits" to cover costs of a program within the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the committee has increased appropriations to the Bureau by $450,000 while cutting out needed funds for the Geological Survey for water resources investigations. Incidentally, I think we should remember that when the House passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act it was under the assumption that this permit system would make the program self-sufficient, but now we find that funds needed elsewhere have to be sidetracked to pick up the losses of this program which occurred because of miscalculation.

Certainly it is hard to place priorities on many of these projects, and the committee must be commended for its ardent effort to come up with the most economical and yet most comprehensive budget that could be drawn up. However, the committee has misplaced these priorities. Before we embark on more research, recreation, and nonessential regional aid programs, we must complete our present construction obligations and make certain that vital programs are not curtailed at the expense of luxury for a few.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Management and investigations of resources

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such resources; promotion of education and training of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions related thereto, as authorized by law; $20,292,000, and in addition, $1,000,000 to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARMATZ

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARMATZ: On page 20, line 4, strike out "$20,292,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,312,000."

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment would be to provide $20,000 for the staffing and operation of the Baltimore Fishery Market news service office.

The Baltimore office was opened in 1958 to collect, compile, and disseminate daily wholesale fishery market data in that area. It has operated continuously since then in the most economical manner possible at a total cost of about $20,000 annually.

This has been accomplished by a small staff of two men who relay the daily data by wire to the Hampton, Va., market news office. There it is published and released to the industry the same day, along with market information collected by the Hampton staff.

The Baltimore area is an important wholesale market for fishery products. It is the main outlet for Chesapeake Bay fish and shellfish, and also handles fishery items from many other fishing ports.

The daily market information supplied by the Baltimore Market News Office has been a stabilizing factor for the Chesapeake Bay fisheries.

When combined with market news data from the other 7 market news offices throughout the Nation, another link is added to the chain of market information for U.S. fishery products.

Funds to finance the Baltimore Market News Office in fiscal year 1967 were removed from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries budget to effect savings in Government spending. In fiscal year 1966 it is being financed temporarily by diverting funds from other activities.

However, such diversions will no longer be possible, due to the overall limitation on the Bureau's budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urgently hope that the authorization will be increased to $20,312,000 for fiscal year 1967 so that the Baltimore office can continue to operate.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, we are willing to accept that amendment.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment was discussed on our side, and we are willing to accept the $20,000 item to keep a market news office open.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of fishing vessels

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), as amended by the Act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614), to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss with the chairman of the subcommittee the language appearing in the report on page 23 dealing with the migratory bird conservation account. I note on that page that there was an appropriation in 1966 of $7.5 million under the accelerated wetlands acquisition program. The estimate for 1967 and the recommended funds for 1967 were also $6 million. This is $1.5 million, according to the distinguished subcommittee, less than last year. I would point out to the chairman of the subcommittee that this program was authorized at a level basis of $107 million for 7 years, which would be an annual authorization somewhat in excess of about $15 million. Indeed, to maintain the pace that the legislative committee intended, we would have to expedite and accelerate this program rather significantly. I would point out to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who is my good friend and for whom I have great affection and respect, that what has happened here is a program which is regarded by conservationists and by those concerned with the preservation of our migratory waterfowl has been lagging so badly that only approximately 38 percent of the funds which were authorized by the legislative committee over these years have been appropriated.

I would point out that this legislation passed the House unanimously and there was neither a dissenting vote nor was there a word in opposition to the bill. I wondered what my good friend could tell me about the prospects for bringing this program in line with the level of expenditures that was envisaged by the legislative subcommittee.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the committee is very sympathetic to this program, as I believe the gentleman understands. We accepted the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget in this respect. There was no indication that this amount was not adequate, and that additional funds should be appropriated.

Mr. DINGELL. I wonder if my good friend is sympathetic with this part of this program? It appears that the Bureau of the Budget is not.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this is a program which has been carefully considered by our legislative subcommittee, of which I happen to have the honor to be chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], that it has the strong backing of the conservationists of the Department of the Interior, and indeed it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Yet we find that the program has lagged so badly that about 38 percent of the funds that should have been appropriated have not been appropriated.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the Bureau of the Budget did not recommend additional funds.

Mr. DINGELL. But would my good friend look with any kindness upon increasing the amount of money in this item, because wetlands are vanishing very rapidly in this country, and the prospects for the propagation of several types of waterfowl for the future hinge upon what is done by the Department. They have a significantly better record of land acquisition than the legislative authorization would allow. We are only proceeding at a rate less than that which the fundamental legislation would authorize.

Mr. Chairman, what I am doing is protesting what has been done here, both by the subcommittee and by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield further to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Of course, there was some difficulty on land purchases which held the program back. However, we are not bound by the action of the Bureau of the Budget, and we are not bound by the recommendations of the Department. What we did was to make this decision ourselves. However, when they make a recommendation, and there is no apparent reason to do otherwise, we are very likely to follow their recommendation.

Mr. DINGELL. If I can switch to more language in this committee report, I would like to discuss some language which appears in the middle of the page. The Appropriations Committee says that the committee expects that the Bureau of the Budget will continue in the policy of more widespread acquisition by easement instead of purchase in fee, and thus reduce the cost of the program.

I would point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, that what this language is going to do is to require that the sportsmen of this country who are footing this program buy this land time and time and time and time again at higher and higher prices, because this is what an easement-oriented program does. It does not, I say to my friend, buy the land the cheapest. It may get a lot of land in fairly short order, but the ultimate result of it is to see to it that the sportsmen who buy the duck stamps and pay this money for the land under this program, buy the land a second time and a third time, and that their children and their grandchildren, down to the 10th generation, will keep on buying this land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. This question has arisen from time to time.

Mr. DINGELL. What you are accomplishing is that you are imposing upon the children and the grandchildren of today's duck hunters the servitude of continuing to buy duck stamps with which to pay for the easements on the land that could better be bought by buying the title to this land in fee.

I understand full well—and I will tell my good friend this—I understand full well that there are circumstances where it is necessary to buy this land in fee, and there are circumstances which occasionally arise because of the smallness of the area, or for other reasons it becomes necessary to buy the land and buy the easement, and not to buy in fee.

But this is not the intent of the legislative committee, that we should emphasize easement purchases.

Mr. Chairman, I want my good friend from Indiana to know this, because this has come up before us every year.

Mr. DENTON. If the gentleman will yield further, this question has come up before the committee every year, and this committee is of the opinion that it is more economical to obtain easements than to buy the land. However, there was this additional fact, which entered into the consideration of this matter: As long as easements are obtained, the land still stays on the tax rolls, and in a great many places if you take the land off the tax rolls you deplete the source of revenue of the area.

Mr. DINGELL. I am aware of that. However, last year we passed certain legislation designed to take care of this particular problem, and it is very generously funded. The counties which happen to have refuge lands within their borders would participate. In fact, we passed specific legislation which would make payments in lieu of taxes to these areas, on a most generous basis.

What I am saying to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, is this, and this is by way of protest: I do not intend to offer any amendatory language on the floor today, but I want my friend to know that those who are aware of this problem do not like the idea of going in and buying large refuge acreage and buying easements instead of acquiring the same land in fee. It would be far more economical to acquire it in fee.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, I resent the idea that the Committee on Appropriations should give what appears to be instructions—and I say they are not instructions—to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife which are so much at variance with the intent of the legislative subcommittee, of which I happen to be the chairman.

Mr. DENTON. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I know how much he is interested in this program. I can assure the gentleman that a balance will be maintained so far as we are concerned between easements and purchases. I think both are necessary. I think we should have both, and we do have to take this into account.

Mr. DINGELL. What my good friend is saying to me is that this language in the report is not a direction to unduly accentuate the purchase of this land?

Mr. DENTON. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. Or of the easements. But my good friend will join me in setting out an attitude that there should be——

Mr. DENTON. There should be a balance.

Mr. DINGELL. But large acreage should be acquired by purchase.

Mr. DENTON. I would say, there should be a balance.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, I understand that. I recognize that but in large areas, rather in the acquisition of small potholes and things of that kind in isolated areas where they are not suitable for administration as large refuges, these lands should be acquired by easement particularly where there is opposition to the acquisition of the land by fee for the Government. But in other instances, I am sure my good friend joins me in understanding that we are setting up a large wildlife refuge that should be acquired in fee by the Federal Government; is that not so?

Mr. DENTON. Speaking generally, I would say the gentleman is right about that. But a balance has to be maintained, and there are places where the easements should be used.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to discuss one last point with my good friend. The gentleman remembers that a large number of Members appeared before his subcommittee and urged the funding of the anadromous fish program which was unanimously passed by the Congress last year. Does the gentleman have any information that he can give me as to the intention of his subcommittee in regard to this program which has such heavy support here in this body and also heavy support among sports fishermen and conservationists around the country?

Mr. DENTON. There was nothing in the budget for the program. The Bureau furnished the committee this information: Legislation for this program was enacted late in the last session of Congress. It provided for matching funds by States. The department has not received the requests of the various States, and it was not able to include a request for funds in the regular estimate. There is a strong likelihood funds will be requested in a supplemental request.

Mr. DINGELL. I happen to be aware that the States have now placed some $7 million to support this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Management and investigations of resources

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); and maintenance of the herd of longhorned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; $37,164,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LATTA: On page 23, line 14, after "Refuge;" strike out "$37,164,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$38,164,000".

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier that I would offer this amendment.

In view of what I said earlier and the recommendations submitted by the Department of the Interior on this blackbird and starling problem, I merely would point out the need for this amendment by reading the summary of the Department's recommendation as follows:

> Blackbirds and the introduced European starling probably number about one-half billion in the continental United States. Although blackbirds have always been with us, reported losses from these indigenous species have increased tremendously during recent years as they come more and more into direct conflict with our expanding population. The phenomenal increase and spread of the introduced starling is due to its reproductive capacity, general hardiness, adaptability to changes in land use, and the success which introduced animals sometimes enjoy in a new environment.
>
> Losses to agriculture from birds are extremely serious and must be approached with positive action. Since the problem is varied, and includes all States, a national approach is required. Estimates show bird damage to agriculture amounts to about $58 million annually. Damage to buildings, hazards from bird-associated diseases, and the possibility of air strikes increase this national problem.
>
> Research has developed considerable information regarding numbers, characteristics, and management techniques. Large-scale field tests indicate the value of a compound known as DRC–1339 to reduce bird losses to field lots. The decoy trap has been improved. This device works well in and around orchards and shows promise in the grain-growing areas. Repellants and scare devices have a place in bird management and can be used by the public. However, these techniques have not as yet been perfected to stop bird damage to standing crops.
>
> The answer to many of the bird problems may come through use of antifertility agents to reduce reproduction and through roost reduction techniques.
>
> Both approaches need additional investigation. Greater focus must be placed on behavioral traits and physiological processes of problem species to find weak spots in their protective armor.
>
> Known tools will not stop present losses to standing grain; however, the tools that are available will reduce damage and should be widely demonstrated to the public. It is estimated that a Federal program to do an effective job will require an additional initial expenditure of $1 million to meet the demands in this field. Of this amount $200,000 would be used in research and $800,000 for supervision and demonstration of techniques.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment merely follows the recommendation of the Department of the Interior to the dollar. When we consider that our farmers suffer a $58 million loss a year, an appropriation of $1 million seems quite small. Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish on facing up to our responsibility toward this problem.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would this fund be limited to research in bird damage to grains and other farm production?

Mr. LATTA. The amendment would merely add this amount to that already being appropriated.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Could it be transferred to other agencies, or would it be used for this type of work?

Mr. LATTA. Certainly, it would be limited to this blackbird and starling problem.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENTON. I am opposed to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio. In this bill there is an appropriation of $665,000 for the control of starlings and blackbirds. That amount is $5,000 over the appropriation for last year and it is $17,000 over the 1965 appropriation.

The difficulty is that they have not discovered the means to kill blackbirds and starlings without killing other birds. If they would kill the other birds, too, this could cause more damage to crops than the starlings and blackbirds are doing.

We pursued this matter extensively in the hearings. The agency witness testified, "We simply do not have the concrete techniques to cope with a full-scale bird control program." Until they have a program developed, they cannot effectively use any more money than the funding provided in the bill. In the committee we discussed the feasibility of increasing the appropriation for this item by $100,000. It was decided that we would not do so, that we had provided all the money that could be used. If any more funds were needed, the request should be on recommendation of the the agency and come through the Budget Bureau.

I hope the amendment will be rejected. We have a tight budget. Many want something added to the bill. If additional funding would get rid of the birds, it would be fine, but they do not have the techniques to do this. For that reason I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Is the gentleman discussing the Department's own report?

Mr. DENTON. I do not have a copy of that report. I am quoting testimony given to our committee.

Mr. LATTA. This report was submitted in March of this year. As I read just a few moments ago, research, according to them, has developed considerable information regarding these birds and how to deal with them.

Mr. DENTON. Yes.

Mr. LATTA. It seems to me that on the mere statement of the gentleman, that he recognizes the problem and that the matter was discussed in the committee shows that we should have some kind of additional research program carried on. I do not think we ought to continue to subject our farmers in this Nation to a $58-million-a-year loss, because we do not know the answer to their problem. I think we ought to appropriate some money, go after the problem, and do away with the $58-million-a-year loss.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. Until research reveals that they can use additional funds to kill these birds, more money appropriated now would be of no avail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION OF THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Salaries and expenses

> For expenses necessary to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, including functions under Public Law 88–579, to remain available until expended, $7,000,000, of which $6,000,000 shall be available for carrying out sections 5(c) and 5(h) of the Act: *Provided*, That, in addition, there is appropriated for the purposes of section 11(b) of the Act, an amount equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests and devises of money, and other property received by the Endowments, during the current fiscal year, under the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the Act, but not to exceed $2,000,000 for the Endowment for the Arts, and $3,000,000 for the Endowment for the Humanities, less the amounts respectively appropriated to such Endowments for the purposes of section 11(b) in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 41, strike all the language beginning on line 7 through line 22, and on page 42, strike out all of lines 1 and 2.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about this amendment. It simply strikes out all of the money for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Mr. Chairman, I thought that the House did very well yesterday in behalf of humanity when it voted $500 million for food and other products for India.

In this business of continuing to take care of humanity around the world, I insist we ought to save the money in this country in order to do it. Or is it proposed to load all the debt on the backs of our children?

Something has been said this afternoon about cultural programs in foreign countries. Well, bless your souls, you are also financing those programs.

There is pending before the Foreign Affairs Committee now a bill to provide for approximately another $3 billion as a handout to foreign countries. We are taking care of them.

I know of no provision in this bill that had less justification than this arts, humanities, and culture business. I want to read to you from page 290 of the hearings some of the colloquy that took place between Mr. Stevens and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton], chairman of the subcommittee.

> Mr. Denton. Mr. Stevens, if we know what the money is going to be used for, the agency is pretty successful. If you say, give us the money and we will decide how it is going to be spent later, then there is trouble.
>
> Mr. Stevens. I understand your point. We will conform, generally speaking, with this group of projects, but I think you could understand that we have a slight problem also if you understand, Mr. Chairman, and that is that these are very distinguished men that come to approve these projects, and if we gave them a fait accompli, they all would walk out on us, too. You see our problem.
>
> Mr. Denton. Mr. Stevens, this is a very distinguished committee, too, but in the last analysis we are responsible for the appropriation of your funds, and we are not about to write you a blank check.
>
> Mr. Stevens. That is right.
>
> Mr. Denton. We have to know what your specific program is for the funds you request.
>
> Mr. Stevens. But you did say, didn't you, sir, that you did not want us to appropriate money unless we had already secured an approval?
>
> Mr. Denton. Let me ask you this. You knew you were coming up here to present your 1967 budget estimate?
>
> Mr. Stevens. Right.
>
> Mr. Denton. Why didn't the Council approve this program before you came to this hearing?
>
> Mr. Stevens. Well, the program was submitted at the last Council meeting, but we didn't approve it, X, Y, Z.

Then we come to the humanities. A Mr. Henry Allen Moe appeared before the committee on this. There had been no meeting of the Humanities Council, and the colloquy goes like this:

> Mr. Moe. Now, because of what the law says in reference to the dependence of the Chairman on the advice of the Council, I could not come before you with approved programs at this time.
>
> Mr. Denton. What do you expect us to do?
>
> Mr. Moe. Sir, I don't know, but what do you expect me to do, if I may ask the question? I have submitted all that I can submit.

Parenthetically, I would say he had not submitted anything. He goes on to state as follows:

> I think there will be approved programs by the Council and I have been unable to put a price tag on any of them, I am sorry to say.
>
> Mr. Denton. What did the Bureau of the Budget do when you submitted this justification to them? What did you recommend to the Bureau of the Budget and what did they do with your recommendation?
>
> Mr. Moe. I have no information about what the Budget Bureau did, sir.
>
> Mr. Denton. Mr. Mark, what did you do about the budget recommendations for this agency? You have had experience in this work.
>
> Mr. Mark. For the humanities?
>
> Mr. Denton. Yes.
>
> Mr. Mark. They wrote it separately from ours.
>
> Mr. Collett. The Budget Bureau determined the amounts in the green sheets.
>
> Mr. Denton. The Budget Bureau prepared these?
>
> Mr. Collett. Yes.

First of all, who did justify the appropriation for the humanities? The Bureau of the Budget? Was it prepared in the Bureau of the Budget? Was there nothing submitted to this committee in behalf of the appropriation? That, apparently, is what the hearing record shows.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. I was going to say to the gentleman from Iowa—and I am not a member of this subcommittee but I am of the full committee—it is my understanding the committee did not appropriate any money for the humanities partly because of the fact that they did not make out a record justifying the appropriation.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. The $5 million request for the endowment for the humanities was not approved——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. The endowment for the humanities had a very high caliber Council appointed. This Council reviews projects and approves grants. The Council had just been appointed shortly before we heard the budget estimate for the humanities. They did not have—and they were very frank about it—their justifications prepared. So we passed over the item without prejudice, as we have done in several instances.

Mr. GROSS. The same thing is true with the arts, is it not?

Mr. DENTON. No. They were specific in their justification.

Mr. GROSS. They were what?

Mr. DENTON. Their justifications were quite specific.

Mr. GROSS. That is not what the hearing record shows, I will say to the gentleman, and I have taken the time to read from it verbatim. So on neither count do you have any real justification for this.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Is it proposed to go out with this money now—perhaps this is the reason why all of these New York Members were talking in favor of this business today—and rent lofts for artists in deserted buildings in New York? Is that what is proposed to be done with some of this money? Is it another form of rent subsidy?

Mr. DENTON. Did the gentleman ask me another question?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. DENTON. If you want to know about the housing fund, there is $100,000 in the bill for some preliminary expenses such as planning and design to enable private foundations to obtain loans under the FHA program to renovate old buildings. When FHA approval is obtained the planning funds are reimbursed. The $100,000 is in a sense a revolving fund.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I intend to support the gentleman's motion primarily because of the pressure on the American dollar and the request that the President has made to help him save money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support. It is about time we in the House started cutting down on expenditures. If we are going to spend $500 million in one day for help to India, it seems to me that somebody had better start thinking in terms of fiscal responsibility. It is about time that we cut out items of this kind that we can well dispense with.

Somehow or other we have gotten along pretty well in this country for a good many years, for a century and a half or more, without expending money from the Federal Treasury on art and the humanities.

Let us cut out this expenditure. Let us stop it right where it is at least until we can balance the budget and see daylight ahead.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from Iowa would have been more timely when Congress enacted this legislation last September.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the Committee will recall that 114 Members of the House introduced legislation to create this program. There was no vote of record on passage of the bill, but on a motion to recommit the House adopted this legislation by a vote of 2 to 1. That settled the question. The Appropriations Committee now must determine how the program will be funded.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], read the cross examination in the printed hearings—I guess one could call it that—with reference to my colloquy with Mr. Stevens. I believe Mr. Stevens gave full justification for his budget estimate, and did it with meticulous care.

Mr. Chairman, I have a list here of the actual projects to be funded. I do not know how they could have been any more specific.

The National Council on the Arts is set up to pass on these projects. The membership of the council is listed on page 281 of the record.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to read this list into the Record, but the Members of the Committee will see that it is composed of very eminent men and women.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know mucn about art. However, I enjoy it, and I respect the people who do know something about this kind of work.

However, when it comes to passing upon the justification for the expenditure of this money, we should rely on the judgment of this fine board which has been set up, composed of these very able individuals. Personally, I intend to place great reliance on their recommendations as to just what is art, and just what types of art should be funded.

Mr. Chairman, we have many comparable situations contained in this bill. For instance, there is money for research in coal, there is money for research in water. We have boards that pass upon these projects, and we give considerable credence to their recommendations.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in another subcommittee on which it is my privilege to serve, the subcommittee which handles the NIH, we have boards composed of people who submit recommendations on cancer research projects, on mental health, and heart trouble.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know for certain whether the various projects are good or bad, but I trust their judgment. Fortunately we have a very able council that has made recommendations for the arts program.

Now, some people are inclined to ridicule art. I do not. I respect the arts. As someone has pointed out, we have money in this bill for fishing. Some people like to fish. A great many other people are interested in the arts.

Mr. Chairman, as other Members of the Congress have done, I have been to Rome and I have been to Greece. In the past they were great countries. Today the most notable monuments to their great past is their art and their literature.

Mr. Chairman, America has grown up. Other countries finance such projects as this. For instance, the United Kingdom spends $38 million annually on the arts; Austria spends $12 million annually.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. In just one moment I shall.

West Germany spends $11 million annually on the arts; France, $8.5 million, and Italy $8.5 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a matter that does not merit further controversy. We have gone into this very carefully, because we knew that any action we took would be severely questioned on the floor.

I believe Mr. Stevens took very good care of himself in the hearings. They have this fine Council to review the projects, and Congress has decided that we will embark upon this program.

Mr. Chairman, we have expended a great deal of money on science. This is somewhat complementary to the sciences.

I believe this debate is superfluous, and that this appropriation has been justified. I hope the amendment is voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned the British and French Governments' contributions to art and culture. Does the gentleman have any idea how much money they owe us in terms of billions of dollars?

Mr. DENTON. I do not know. What has that got to do with this question?

Mr. GROSS. It has a lot to do with it. The fact that we have subsidized their arts and culture.

Mr. DENTON. That is not a matter for consideration in this bill. It has been said that we Americans are the craziest people in the world.

Mr. GROSS. What was that?

Mr. DENTON. There are Europeans that have said we have the better teachers than any country and they go to their country to perform. They said that we were training their performers. This would give the people in this country the same benefit of these excellent performances they have in other countries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, from my standpoint they can spare us some of the entertainment which they have sent over here.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, until last year the United States was the only large progressive nation in the Western World without a systematic art subsidy.

Of all nations of the Western World England is closest to the United States in spirit and tradition.

In England national patronage of the arts is vested in the so-called Arts Council of Great Britain.

When did Government support for the arts begin in England?

Did it begin in peacetime?

No, it began in the middle of the worst war England or the world has ever known.

In the bitter war winter of 1939 a private group called the Committee for the Encouragment of Music and the Arts was formed. The committee's initial efforts were financed by a private grant of 25,000 pounds. Within 4 months, however, the British Government agreed to match private donations pound for pound.

By the third year of the war, the private trust withdrew and the financial destiny of the Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts was left in the hands of the British Government.

On June 12, 1945, before the war was over the Chancellor of the Exchequer declared in the House of Commons that there was a permanent need—even in peacetime—for an organization entrusted with the encouragement and diffusion of the arts. The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced on that occasion that the Government had decided to incorporate the Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts into an officially sponsored organization to be known as the Arts Council of Great Britain.

Thus at a time when our English friends were fighting for their very existence, they were willing to spend to preserve and improve the very thing for which they were fighting—their civilization.

At that time, Great Britain was spending approximately 59 percent of its national income to defend its very existence. Today, our overall defense exenditures amount to 8.1 percent of our national income. Ten percent of our military force is engaged in a limited war 10,000 miles from our shores.

Today, while our soldiers are fighting in Vietnam, we can certainly afford to spend less than one ten-thousandth of our national budget to preserve and improve our civilization and the quality of life to which our soldiers will be returning.

Last year we changed this.

Last September this House by an almost 2 to 1 vote pledged to all the people that there would be support for the artists and scholars of America.

Now we are being asked to renege on that pledge.

We are being asked to return to being the only Western nation without a program for assistance to the arts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 36, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am most gratified that our colleagues have so decisively rejected the amendment by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]. The gentleman's consistent opposition to arts and humanities legislation is as well known as it is ill founded. The following articles and telegrams are representative of the opinion of an overwhelming number of this Nation's scholars and cultural experts and, indeed, of the people:

New York, N.Y.,
April 4, 1966.

The Honorable Frank Thompson,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope very much that New York City delegation will support in full amount Interior appropriation for national arts and humanities. This is extremely important in New York City as cultural center of United States.

John V. Lindsay.

Princeton, N.J.,
April 4, 1966.

The Honorable Frank Thompson,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand House Subcommittee on Appropriations is not recommending funding next year for national humanities endowment. May I urge the importance of this funding and ask you to help in having it restored at level originally recommended by the President.

Robert F. Goheen,
President, Princeton University.

Atlanta, Ga.,
April 4, 1966.

Hon. Frank Thompson,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I join with many scholars in hoping that the Congress will appropriate funds to support the national humanity foundation for the crucial next fiscal years.

Harvey Young,
Professor of History, Emory University.

Atlanta, Ga.,
April 4, 1966.

The Honorable Frank Thompson,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In behalf of the citizen arts panel of the Georgia Fourth District may I express sincere hope that adequate appropriations for the arts and humanities foundations will obtain approval of the House. Thank you for your efforts in this behalf.

George Beiswanger,
Chairman.

Atlanta, Ga.,
April 3, 1966.

Representative Frank Thompson,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My colleagues and I are deeply disturbed by difficulties facing the National Humanities Foundation's appropriation. Your continued support for this essential program will be greatly appreciated.

Chappell White,
Chairman, Department of Music,
Emory University.

Houston, Tex.,
April 5, 1966.

Congressman Frank Thompson,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Western Arts Association, which is composed of art educators from 18 States, urge that you protect the interests of the arts and humanities in the current attempt to cut appropriations.

Sincerely,

Fred V. Mills,
President, Western Arts Association.

Houston, Tex.,
April 5, 1966.

Congressman Frank Thompson,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

It is urgent that you protect the arts and humanities legislation and resist all attempts to cut appropriations.

Lucile F. Curtice,
Trenton, Mich.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 4, 1966]

TROUBLE FOR THE ARTS FOUNDATION

Already the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, created by Congress only last September, is running into congressional trouble. A House appropriations subcommittee has cut the $5 million authorized by the bill for the arts endowment to $4 million and denied the money authorized for the humanities endowment altogether. Chief among the subcommittee's complaints seems to have been that the endowments' plans for spending the money were not yet sufficiently detailed.

This complaint, however, cuts to the heart of the philosophy behind the Foundation: that Federal support for the arts and humanities should be provided, but that it should be insulated from Federal control. Critics of the bill originally protested that nothing would more stifle creativity in the arts and humanities than the dead hand of Government, and nothing would be better calculated to realize their fears than to have the endowments answerable to a congressional committee for their choices of projects.

Each endowment has been provided with a highly distinguished council of private experts, who may know little about legislating but know a great deal about the arts and humanities. The amount of money involved is relatively small. The principle at stake—support without interference—is large. The matter is expected to come before the House this week. By all means let the experiment be funded so that it can proceed in the only way that success is possible, which is to leave the decisions in the hands of the Foundation itself and its councils.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1966]

BALLET: BRILLIANT DANCING FITS HISTORIC OCCASION—FEDERAL MONEY AIDS THE ART FOR FIRST TIME

(By Clive Barnes)

The American Ballet Theater sweetly, effortlessly, and most splendidly made sweet, effortless, and splendid history at the New York State Theater last night.

It opened its month's New York season before a star-studded, indeed star-spangled audience, headed by Vice President Humphrey, and with no pain at all became the first American performing arts enterprise to appear with the help of a Federal grant. For this relief much thanks. May it be the first of many enterprises so to benefit, and may its future be at last made as secure as money can make it.

The program luckily matched the historic occasion, opening with a sensitive new production of the second act of "Swan Lake," which marks a milestone in American ballet. For this production, mounted by David Blair from Britain's Royal Ballet, is the first American thoroughgoing reconstruction of the great Russian choreography.

The Royal Ballet "Swan Lake" traces its ancestry straight back to the famous 1894 version at St. Petersburg's Maryinsky Theater, and is, more or less, an exact transcription of the Ivanov work.

This is one of the supreme masterpieces of ballet, not only because in its dance image of the doomed Swan Queen, an aloof and poignant symbol of man's aspiration, Ivanov created a choreographic metaphor that threads its way into the mind, but also because in the symphonic patterning of the ensemble, even more apparent in Ivanov's last act of "Swan Lake" created a year later, dance took one of its most decisive steps forward.

It is right and proper that an American company should assume responsibility for this great "Swan Lake" in the United States, and one is enheartened by the understanding that this production of the second act is merely the first stage in a project to mount the complete Petipa-Ivanov ballet. It is a first stage marvelously well surmounted.

Mr. Blair's careful yet subtle staging is exemplary. Apart from a strange musical insertion from the last act, he has been consistently faithful to Ivanov, permitting himself only a few grace notes (a flurry of pas de bourrees when the Swans enter; the removal of the intrusive Benno, that long-suffered Prince's Friend, from the pas de deux; the courtly manner in which the Prince enters to watch Odette's solo) that adds up to a production that is, one supposes, currently the best in the world.

Helped by Oliver Smith's most attractive lakeside setting, properly and prettily Gothic, but perhaps, to carp, a little hard in outline for misty Romanticism, and Freddy Wittop's elegant costumes, the company looked fine.

Lupe Serrano as Odette acted with passionate incisiveness, but her dancing, for all its swift, salmonlike turning movements, lacked eloquence. Royes Fernandez was the convincing Prince, grave and ardent, only disappointing in his handling of the one or two high lifts. The ensemble, wearing Swan headdresses that too-resembled powdered wigs, had vitality without a completely cohesive style. But good already, clearly it will be better later.

The program also included last season's triumphant "Les Noces" and that old Ballet Theater favorite, "Etudes." Jerome Robbins' "Les Noces" is unquestionably one of the most important ballets to be created in recent years. It is breathtaking in its imagery, in the power of its dancing, in its sense of human compassion, and in its sheer beauty of craftsmanship and imaginative grasp.

Mr. Robbins has taken Stravinsky's "Les Noces," a dance-cantata of enormous complexity, and staged it so that his dancing and Stravinsky's music come together white-hot. It is conceived, as the composer directed, in terms of nonspecific folk dance, and it becomes a sort of savagely ritualistic epithalamium.

The Bride (Erin Martin) and Bridegroom (William Glassman), literally thrown together by their parents and the matchmakers, show fear and reluctance, at last warming into physical love. The work, watched grimly by Oliver Smith's censorious Russian icons on the backcloth, has a joy of life, an asservation we had not previously noticed in Mr. Robbins since perhaps "Fancy Free" and "Interplay." It is a strange turn, but not one for the worse. And this "Les Noces" is a masterpiece.

* * * * *

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Nov. 21, 1965]

Arts Council: Cautious Daring

(By Richard L. Coe, special to the Providence Sunday Journal)

Washington.—In its unprecedented task of spending Federal funds, the National Council on the Arts is moving with what might be called cautious daring.

By recognizing the need of individual artists for cheap places in which to work and live, the Council shows that it has its feet on practical earth, an area to which dilettantism rarely descends.

By aiming to help finance acting companies for the school boards of three cities, the council shows keen awareness of the congressional bill's accent on grassroots activity. One sign of this was evident at the Council's final session of its recent 3-day meeting in Tarrytown, N.Y., in the press representation from various cities.

A half-dozen other cities have been exploring an acting company scheme through their local school boards and the U.S. Office of Education. Interest in those several cities was keen enough to have reporters on hand to flash the word. Such coverage was indicative, justifying this year's congressional action.

That the word has not yet been decided is logical enough since such a scheme would be genuinely revolutionary and still will take further probing. The plan is to offer first-rate theatrical companies performing five afternoons per week to students, unfamiliar with the world's rich dramatic literatures, and three evenings per week to the general public at "reasonable" prices.

These two schemes—housing and board of education plays—are definite innovations and came about through the self-insulation the Council has chosen for its early business sessions.

Tarrytown House is the former estate of Mary Duke Biddle and is one of several private, isolated "think factories" dotting the east coast as havens for executive seminar sessions. Removed from the distractions offered by New York, Boston and Washington, such centers provide unrelieved 16-hour days to concentrate on given problems.

The Council's members include such knowledgeable figures as the heads of the Metropolitan Opera, the museums of Toledo, Houston, and New York's modern art, the American Federation of Musicians and ANTA, such lively names as Poet Paul Engle, Choreographer Agnes de Mille, Actor Gregory Peck, Director George Stevens Sr., Designer Oliver Smith, Architects William L. Pereira and Minoru Yamasaki, composer Richard Rodgers, Violinist Isaac Stern and Washington's Dean Warner Lawson and Father Gilbert V. Hartke.

The Arts Council is actually only one half of the bill enacted this last session under the Arts and Humanities bill.

Further, as all faithful legislative followers are aware, an authorization for funds is not an appropriation. Thus, in the middle of a fiscal year, the Arts Council has at its disposal less than $3 million.

To those following how moneys are being donated to the arts in our culture conscious era, that $3 million prompts a quiet smile. Only 2 weeks ago the Ford Foundation allocated $85 million in a special program for the Nation's symphony orchestras.

Thus, both the initial actions and modest sums are admittedly tentative. As Council Chairman Roger L. Stevens remarked, "This is only a start. We are the first to admit that we've got a lot of fields to cover yet."

There are five other points on which the Council has decided to split its $2,680,000 melon. These are:

An immediate matching grant of $100,000 to the American Ballet Theater, which did not share in last year's Ford Foundation largess to dance, and an additional $250,000 matching grant to be used for a nationwide tour.

Its 25 years of dancing to audiences all across the Nation, not simply in New York, makes the ballet theater grant not merely sensible but mandatory.

An individual competition of American contemporary artists from which 35 to 50 paintings and sculptures will be selected for a national tour to cities with populations under 250,000.

Participating artists will receive rental fees of $100 per month for their work and cooperating cities must provide half the cost of the tour in their areas.

A $100,000 grant will finance a study of how writers and directors can be assimilated from academic training to practical activity in the film field. With hopes toward stimulating an American film institute, the council has allocated $500,000 to such an organization if film, academic, and other interests match that figure.

A sum of $250,000 was set aside to finance new plays by known and unknown playwrights in community and university theaters outside the New York area. This recognizes the increasing impossibility of financing serious drama in New York's commercial theater and could further the aims of the American Playwrights Theater, founded by playwrights for the same purpose.

Nor are individuals neglected. Artists, writers, musicians, composers, and choreographers will share $755,000 as grants-in-aid.

In most cases, the Council has refrained from making final choices itself. These will be left to panels of experts in the various fields, States arts councils and other appropriate bodies. And, also in most cases, the awards are contingent on organizations getting matching sums from their immediate supporters.

These two tactics, while seemingly complex, have been devised to overcome the notion that "the Government is dictating to the arts," one of the thornier matters in what is, for this country, a highly revolutionary step. Artists are free to ignore the whole affair and plunge onward as before. Nobody is dictating to anybody.

But, the fact remains, the Arts Council's think sessions have come up with a seven-point program of imagination, moderation, and awareness that the U.S. eddies beyond the Hudson and Potomac.

And that modest $100,000 set aside as pump priming for cheaper working space is especially provocative. For despite the flossy icing, the arts begin with paying the rent.

Intelligent Spending To Promote The Arts Begins

(By Frank Getlein, art critic of the Star)

There are two kinds of opposition to the National Council on the Arts and its subsidization with Federal money of American art and artists. The more vocal and less important have been the congressional jackanapes who fancy themselves as razorlike wits when they rise to talk of the "fine art of poker playing, Mr. Speaker, are we-all gonna put some money into that?"

A lot has happened to America since these clowns used to speak for a presumed majority. They can now be dismissed with pity and patience.

The more serious opposition has existed within the artistic community itself and has been voiced, thoughtfully or wildly, by artists, critics, and institutional officers. The fear is of the turning of Roger L. Stevens into a dictator of the arts. The tradition appealed to is one of considerable alienation of artists from the community at large.

GROUNDLESS FEARS

The alienation however comforting it used to be, is long over. It is time that artists of all kinds took time off from the writing of grant applications and the enjoyment of social lionization to realize that nobody hates them anymore. Everybody loves them. This condition has dangers of its own, but they are not those of the outcast of the islands.

How about Roger Stevens as artistic dictator and arbiter of culture? The fear is groundless. So is the larger fear of the Federal Government taking over the arts by spending money.

The Council had its first disbursement meeting last weekend at Tarrytown, N.Y., Washington Irving's hometown. It got through almost the whole of the $3 million given it by Congress for the first year. And it set a pattern for thoughtful discrimination as to need and prospect in the arts. In its first major action the Council demonstrated brilliantly that it will be an imaginative force for intelligent change in the art structure of this country, as well as a quick and generous support for the truly national institutions in their moments dire.

TOUR EMPHASIZED

The moment dire alleviated at Tarrytown was that of the American Ballet Theater, a distinguished company long supported by one chief patron and this year in imminent danger of financial disaster. The Council last weekend, rushed in with $100,000 at once, on a matching basis, plus a matching $250,000 for a national tour.

You will note the "matching," which is part of the Council's style, as it tends to be of the Ford Foundation's. But note also the tour, for this is just as much part of the new style. The Council clearly recognizes that art is something that happens in megalopolis, a location that includes the rim of the Great Lakes, the gulf coast, and two parts of California along with the familiar Boston to Norfolk axis.

But the Council just as clearly has decided to throw a lot of its weight toward making the arts more readily available outside of the one big city most of us live in.

The invitational art competition will produce an exhibition to tour cities under 250,000 population. Thus, the Laboratory Theater project, in collaboration with the Office of Education and local school boards, will create three acting companies for secondary school students in cities where classical theater is not readily available. Thus, too, plays of merit and interest, currently unproduced because of the venality of Broadway producers will be given productions out of New York in university and community theaters.

FILM INSTITUTE PLAN

The Council has begun what could be a real breakout for the American arts from their present status as almost wholly a set of compensations for the discomfort of having to live in New York and its extensions.

Now regard the one new apparatus the council has undertaken to create, an American Film Institute. It will, in part, be archival, conservatory and restorative, three functions the idiot industry has largely ignored through the years. But it will be chiefly devoted to the training of directors and writers for the movies. Again, the vulgarians of Hollywood have ignored this necessity despite its obvious relationship to their own welfare.

The projected institute does two very salutary things. It rebukes the avarice and stupidity of an industry which has made money hand over fist for decades and very rarely ploughed a dollar and a half back into the cultivation of its resources.

And it points out that cinema is not stars and sets, but is writing and direction, the latter term to include cutting.

The movies constitute, along with jazz, America's most important contribution to world culture. But things have reached the State where we are outclassed regularly by the Russians, the Germans, the Italians, the French, the British, the Swedes and, God help us, the Japanese. There can be no thought of "regaining" world leadership, but at least we ought to get back into the club of civilized moviemakers. The institute is of fundamental importance in that effort. Indeed, at the moment, it just about is that effort.

DETAILS DRAWN UP

Frank Lloyd Wright used to quote his master, Sullivan, that "God is in the details." Consider some details in the program drawn up at Tarrytown.

They are putting $100,000 into planning the renovation of old buildings to make them studio-residences for artists of all kinds. The actual financing will come from Government underwritten loans as already established in realty and once the first jobs are completed, the council gets back its hundred grand and can keep on doing it.

For some years now, New York artists have been moving into the lofts vacated by the light industries driven out of town by taxes and the lack of parking space. The city, in its cultural way, has persecuted the artists because they are violating residential codes.

There is an obvious chance that in John Lindsay the artists at last have someone that will know what they're talking about. Assuming such an attitude on his part, what a brilliant stroke this revolving fund is. It will calm down the artists and eventually house them within occupancy code standards. And actually the cost is nothing at all, except getting some brains together and letting them think it out. The heart of this project is the knowledgeable fusion of parts of two formerly separate worlds, art and government.

More details: the 50 artists who will get one-semester sabbaticals are teaching in colleges and universities and hence have some kind of professional achievement. This is important because so much of private foundation aid to artists concentrates on youth. If you are an unknown painter with a beard and bad manners, you find it very difficult to avoid getting a foundation grant and an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art as a young American.

GRANTS TO COMPOSERS

But if what you have is not promise but achievement, you will often find yourself whistling up the drainpipe for either cash or museum exposure. Another fully knowledgeable choice.

Again, the composers are getting grants not just as commissions but also as money specifically earmarked for copying and related costs. This attacks what amounts to a scandal in musical composition, although it really isn't anyone's fault. But the fact is that a good musical copyist much too often makes more money out of a musical commission than does the composer. The commission calls for delivery of adequate parts for all the instruments and the composer often has to pay for copying himself. Since copyists are rare and the work is tedious, they charge high prices and deserve them. But how good to have someone besides the poor composer picking up the tab.

A REVOLUTION

By now you will have noted an exemplifying strain in the grants: the council is not only doing things, it is setting an example of how these things ought to be done. Here's another: The painters and sculptors in that touring exhibition get paid rental of $100 a month for their stuff and it could be away for 3 years.

This is a real revolution. It's one that the Whitney Museum once tried to pull off, namely paying artists for the use of their works just as we pay performing artists for theirs. The fact is that the art public, including those who buy an occasional picture, is as big a bunch of freeloaders as the Washington press corps. We have made art a market commodity, pure and simple. But there ought to be, and at times there have been, other ways to set up a cash nexus between the man who creates art and the people who enjoy it.

Rembrandt Peale used to haul his monstrous painting, "The Court of Death," about the country on rollers and sell tickets to see it. Don't laugh. The first year he made eight thousand smackers and in the 1820's that was a lot of dough.

So there are other ways and people ought to be willing to pay for pleasure received in art as they regularly do in all other forms of pleasure. Again, the council has taken a very imaginative and possibly pattern-setting step.

NO FALSE MOVE

Unlike poor Peale's 8 grand, $3 million is not a lot of dough with which to confront the entire national need in all the arts. Presumably and hopefully there will be more in the future. Right now you can pick up some fantastic figures in the New York rumor mills about the size of the program in a couple of years.

But in the meantime, with a paltry $3 million, the council has made an utterly brilliant beginning. There isn't a false move. The return will be many, many times the investment. And almost every item is so beautifully constructed that it will teach the trustees, patrons, directors, and customers of the American art establishment things they should have known before.

One final, invisible blessing: a staff is beginning to come into existence working for Roger Stevens that will, within months, know just about everything that's going on in the American arts. The closest approach to this so far has been the brain of McNeil Lowry of the Ford Foundation, but Lowry is not a public official and his information is his tools. It will work that way here, too, but the nature of our Government insures that the information will also be widely available.

President Johnson, Senator PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, who was chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts and Humanities and introduced the administration's legislation, Mr. Stevens, and a cast of thousands over the years have brought in a winner.

GOVERNMENT GIVING ARTS SIGNIFICANT PUSH

(By Howard Taubman)

The Federal Government's new presence in the arts makes it almost a certainty that the mid-1960's will be a great watershed in their history in America.

Sparked by the money and energies released by the establishment of a National Arts Endowment, a host of projects are being developed.

By next fall, in time for the start of the new school year, there will be three new professional repertory companies playing Shakespeare and other classics. They probably will be centered in Providence, Milwaukee and Fort Worth.

They will be organized by the endowment and will have substantial backing from the Office of Education, working in cooperation with State and municipal authorities. Their prime function will be to serve as a living aid in the teaching of dramatic literature.

Perhaps sooner than next fall an ingenious plan to help a number of gifted writers will be in operation. About 20 who have published books that received critical acclaim will be selected.

The Arts Endowment will cooperate in buying up copies of the books. The writer will get the royalties due him, and the books will be donated to libraries that could not otherwise afford them.

The endowment also expects in the next few months to work out extensive ideas for grants to States for projects that will have local matching contributions.

All this planning reflects a salutary change in the Nation's cultural climate.

In the 1930's the Federal arts projects, which were making work for unemployed writers, painters, musicians and actors at a pitiful subsistence wage, were under frequent fire in Congress.

In the mid-1960's the Federal Government is investing directly and openly in artists and artistic institutions. Yet Congressmen today, instead of complaining, are appearing personally at the new offices of the Arts Endowment in Washington to push the claims of their constituents and communities for Federal aid.

The top men in the Government, beginning with President Johnson, have taken careful note of the Nation's upsurge in the arts. They are aware of the expanding vogue for arts councils and arts centers, of the explosion in sales of paperback books, of the wide appeal of recordings, of the new energies in regional theaters, orchestras, dance groups and museums, of massive foundation activity.

Everyone agrees that the arts are no longer the preserve of a minority or elite. It has become clear that the arts increasingly have become a necessity to many millions and that what they have to offer should be accessible to many more millions.

To modernize Hamlet's phrase, the arts are, indeed, caviar to the general public because in the Great Society the general public likes and wants caviar.

The cultural pot is simmering in Washington and across the land. The man who has done the most to get the fire going under it is Lyndon B. Johnson.

According to close friends of Johnson, the new President fixed on a three-phase strategy to move the Government formally into full support of the arts.

First, he made it clear that he would follow the Kennedy idea of appointing an arts council by Executive order.

Then in 1964 he got Congress to establish a National Arts Council.

Third, in 1965, he induced Congress, using his familiar tactics of personal persuasion by telephone, to set up national foundations in the arts and humanities backed by sizable, if not overwhelming, appropriations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL: Page 42, before the period in line 2, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the amounts appropriated under this paragraph shall be available to any organization, or entity, only on condition that not more than 12½ percent of the amount so made available be expended in any one State: *And provided further*, That no part of any amount appropriated under this paragraph shall be used to make grants to any organization, or entity, or to pay the salary of (or to cover expenses incurred by) any person who, or organization which, in his, or its, official, or unofficial capacity, participates in, cooperates with, or supports any action which could result in the destruction of any structure, or place, of local or national historic or cultural significance, including the Metropolitan

Opera House located at 39th Street and Broadway in New York City".

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, this changes existing legislation. It provides that there should be quotas among the States when the existing legislation does not contain such a provision. This is legislation that changes existing legislation.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Does the gentleman from New Jersey desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a type of amendment that has been accepted before on similar legislation. It seeks to protect the interests of the States in these grants and in the distribution of funds under this program. I think it is a very equitable amendment and should be accepted by the committee.

The **CHAIRMAN** (Mr. PRICE). The Chair is prepared to rule.

This amendment would impose new duties on the officials charged with the administration of this program in determining whether grants should be made to any person or organization which participates and cooperates with or supports any action which could result in the destruction of any structure or place of local or national historic or cultural significance.

For the reasons above stated, the amendment is obviously legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOW: On page 46, after line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 302. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of $7,293,000."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but will reserve the point of order so that the gentleman may speak to his amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Indiana reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to reduce the amount of appropriations in this bill. I spoke on it in the general debate, and I want again to say, and make it crystal clear, that I am not attacking any project in this bill. I am not trying to strike any project from this bill. The amendment would simply reduce the total amount of the bill by the amount added for 41 projects in instances in which the bill went over the budget.

The House in its wisdom, exercising its prerogative has said to the Department, "There are certain projects that we think ought to be in here, and we are appropriating $1,204 million, $30 million more than was appropriated last year."

I am convinced that the Department can and should, under this legislative mandate that these projects be funded through the amount of $7,203,000, in a budget of one billion two hundred and some million dollars find this money and they should process these projects to take care of these Members of the House. We are not taking out any projects. We are leaving them in, and we are saying to the Department, "We, the Congress, in this appropriation bill, are sending a directive to you to fund these out of funds we are giving to you."

I say to you that if there is an agency that has that kind of money, $1,200 million it ought to be able to find $7 million to work out the will of Congress. We will make legislative history today—not that we want these projects taken out, but that the Congress wants them funded with the funds we are giving them. Let them take out some of the low priority programs, if it is a question of priorities. But certainly those which the House has put into this bill above the budget should be of high priority.

I would urge you, if you sincerely want to help the President in his budget effort, if you want to be in a position so that he cannot say, "You have gone over the budget in so many instances, therefore you must raise taxes," vote for this amendment. Vote for your projects in the bill, and see that the Department complies with this directive that we have put in, that they be funded from the $1,200 million.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, there are numerous agencies covered by this appropriation bill. While the executive branch has discretion not to spend this money, the proposed amendment would force the Executive to assign priorities to the various agencies. It would place discretionary action with the President and, it is the Congress who determines how funds shall be appropriated. The amendment would take that authority from the Congress and give it to the Executive.

The **CHAIRMAN.** I understand that the gentleman from Indiana is insisting on his point of order?

Mr. DENTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment would reduce the appropriations in this bill in the amount of $7,293,000. The so-called Holman rule provides:

> Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of Congress to appropriate money and determine how much each agency shall receive. This amendment would take away that responsibility from the Congress and give it to the executive. Congress does not have to rubberstamp the recommendations of the Budget Bureau. It is our responsibility to determine the amount of and to whom funds are appropriated.

In this particular bill we have cut the appropriations $41 million. In round numbers, we have added $7 million, for a net reduction below the budget estimate of $34 million, or 3 percent.

In addition, income under this bill will be increased by $233.5 million in 1967. The bill increases appropriations $30 million. Taking that sum from the $233.5 million, it can be seen we are $203.5 million better off than we were last year. If we can do as well as that with respect to every other appropriation bill which comes before this Congress, we will have no difficulty.

This is a most unusual motion. I have never heard one like it before—to reduce the funds, but have the executive determine where the reductions will be made.

It has been said this amendment would not take anything out of the bill. Let me me cite a few items the committee added to this bill.

We added $250,000 to reduce the incidence of trachoma among the Indians. They have been victims of this infectious disease which causes blindness.

By the use of some of this money we can conquer the disease, because we will have the means to do it.

There is also a provision for dam construction involving $165,000, for the Blackfeet Indians. This will make the Indian lands irrigable, so that the lands can be cultivated. Some would tend to say we might take that out of the bill.

I could go on at length. There are a number of projects involving fish hatcheries, renovation and development, and other things, all of which have A-1 priorities. By next year these construction projects would cost 10 percent more. It would be penny wise and pound foolish to delete these items from the bill.

In this bill we make recommendations below the budget estimates and have added some items. We have redistributed the funding as presented in the budget estimate. Our committee spent much time on this appropriation bill, and I believe our committee is thoroughly cognizant of the items in this bill. I will stand back of every cut and every increase the committee recommends.

I would be willing to accept $41 million any day against the $7 million the committee has added.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am wholeheartedly in agreement with what the distinguished chairman has said. We have cut the amount requested by $34 million. As I said earlier in the debate, some Members of the House have said we should not be a rubberstamp. That has been said on our side of the aisle.

Now we have an opportunity to express our will, in opposition to what has come up from the administration.

We have cut the amount $34 million, and we have added some additional projects which we believe should be provided. Practically all of them were turned down by the Bureau of the Budget.

This, in the judgment of our committee, is merely a redistribution of some of the money.

I hope the Committee of the Whole will support our position.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I believe that the committee in this instance has done an excellent job.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] is one of the outstanding men on our committee. He knows this subject as well as, if not better than, any other man in the House.

The ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] is also a knowledgeable man in this field.

The committee has done a good job for economy, in cutting the budget request approximately $34 million.

Under the "scatter or blunderbuss" amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio some $7 million would be cut, but it would be cut by the bureaucrats downtown. If the amendment is defeated, the money appropriated under the terms of this bill will be spent the way Congress wants it spent.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that the amendment of my friend from Ohio will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 46, immediately before line 22, insert a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. 302. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana reserves a point of order.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make it very clear in the remarks that have been made here previously that I hold the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] in the highest regard. I think he is a great chairman and does a fine job in handling his bill, as do all of the members of that subcommittee, particularly the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee on this side of the aisle [Mr. REIFEL]. My effort to reduce this spending should not be taken as a reflection on any member of the committee, but simply as my prerogative and my philosophy that we have been spending too much money. I do not think you can justify a lot of these measures by saying we have cut the bill by so much. We ought to take a look at how much more the bill is this year than it was last year. We have a continuing deficit and a mounting deficit year by year. So we had better begin to make some cuts where they are effective and not just say that the Bureau of the Budget can send up a terrifically big budget to us and then we make cuts in it and make ourselves look good although we do not really cut down on our deficit spending.

When you talk about a $34 million cut, which is what the record shows it to be, let us look at the fact that the direct appropriations are $30 million higher than last year.

I see the House is not in a mood now to support the President in his efforts to cut spending or the efforts of the President to keep the budget down to a proper level. Let me say that this amendment I am now offering simply provides, in effect, that during the fiscal year 1967, the President shall not spend more than 95 percent of the aggregate net expenditure estimates for the agencies in this bill as contained in the budget for fiscal year 1967. This is a limitation on spending. This provides that just 95 percent of the expenditure estimate, if they get up that high, shall be spent. It is a very simple amendment. There is nothing more to it than a limitation on spending to 95 percent of the budget estimate.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In effect, is not this amendment what the President himself said last Thursday or Friday he was going to direct members of the Cabinet to do for fiscal 1966 and what he intimated he would ask members of the Cabinet and their respective departments to do in fiscal 1967? The President's statement last week in effect wiped away the validity of the budget that he submitted to us in January of this year. This amendment which you are offering today is a help to him in remedying the inadequacies and deficiencies of the budget which he submitted to us in January 1966.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The President intimated he is going to try to cut spending by $1 billion in order to stop inflation and in order to prevent the necessity for a tax increase. We are simply trying to help him with this, and I hope that the amendment would be adopted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order question.

Mr. Chairman, we have not had opportunity to examine this in detail, but from a quick reading it is not entirely clear to me just what this amendment would do. If the amendment has any application to funds provided in previous years which might be available for expenditure in the fiscal year 1967, then I would suggest that the amendment is out of order. Do I understand that the amendment would hold expenditures to 95 percent of the funds provided in this bill?

Mr. BOW. It says:

> The money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The moneys in this bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this is a broadax cut of 5 percent across the board. If it is not, then we are abdicating our responsibility as Members of Congress to appropriate money and we are turning it over to someone else. If this is to be a 5-percent cut across the board, you are cutting money for the education of the Indians 5 percent; you are cutting money for the health of the Indians 5 percent. The Bureau of Land Management takes in a good deal of money. They supervise the oil interests of this Government. If you cut their budget 5 percent, you would lose a great deal of money. I do not understand why these motions are made on this particular appropriation bill. This bill was cut $34 million. When you consider the income, we are 15 percent better off than we were last year in this bill. We have cut this budget 3 percent. It is the function of this Congress to determine how this money should be spent and where. This is a shotgun cut. It does not specify where the funds should be reduced. It leaves this determination to the executive branch of the Government, and in reality it is asking us to abdicate our responsibility and become rubberstamps by turning this decision over to the Bureau of the Budget. I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 46, after line 21, insert a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation in this Act may be used for the payment of any part of a salary in excess of $6,000 per year to any individual who is granted a leave of absence with pay for the purpose of accepting a scholarship, fellowship, or other similar plan under which such individual may continue his education under a subsidized program, financed either by a foundation, or a State or Federal Government."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this will not save a lot of money, but it will place a limitation—and I think cause not only this Department, but other departments, to reexamine the acts under which the employees are employed and educated under the Government Employees Training Act. That seems the basis for which they are paying the full salary to people who are given annual leaves to accept scholarships, fellowships, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, this came to my attention, more or less, by accident. However, I am going to cite this one example to the members of the committee.

There was an employee in the Interior Department—a grade 12; and I do not known what his salary is, but a grade 12 is somewhere in the neighborhood of $11,000 or $12,000 a year—who was not the type of employee that got along too well in the Department. So they shipped him from another area of the country down to Washington.

Well, he did not get along so well here. They arranged to assist him in obtaining a fellowship with which to send him off to school. They sent him across the country. The fellowship paid him enough money to the point where the average person would be delighted to have just that remuneration from this foundation, or scholarship.

But he gets his leave of absence, continues his salary of $10,000 or $11,000 a year, or whatever it is, plus the scholarship.

Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to do the man an injustice, because later from a reliable source I have learned that there are others in that Department as well as the other departments of Government who take advantage of this situation.

Mr. Chairman, the general legislation is permissive. But what I think has happened in some of the departments is that they have used that as either a directive or mandate that if a person gets a scholarship or a fellowship or some way they could go on and continue their education to better qualify themselves for a better job, a higher paying job after they get back, then they will give him this leave of absence, with pay.

Mr. Chairman, all this amendment would do is if that man makes more than $6,000 a year we would not pay him above $6,000 a year. If he is a person who is getting $10,000 a year at the present time he could take a leave of absence and draw $6,000 a year in pay from the Government, receive his scholarship or fellowship or the remuneration which he might get from some foundation that is paying for this type of education. That is all this does. It only applies to a person who gets a leave of absence, with pay. It would cut back his salary to $6,000 a year if he gets more than that. If he gets less than that it would not affect him at all. It would affect only a fellow who is paid two salaries while receiving a benefit which would help him get a better salary later on.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the Members of the House are in sympathy with wasting Government funds in that manner, and for that reason I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one bad case should not change an entire law.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENTON. No, I will not yield at this time; I will later.

Congress enacted legislation providing for training of employees to improve their job performance. This is done in every branch of the Government, not only in the Interior Department. I think you will find that private industry does this too.

Mr. Chairman, we had comment a few minutes ago with reference to cutting down expenditures. However, this amendment objects to training Government employees to accomplish this. This law has paid dividends. If it is going to be changed, it should be changed by legislation.

Certainly we should not discriminate against the Department of Interior and treat it any differently than any other agency.

I hope this amendment is defeated, because it is, in effect, legislation. It is not an appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You mention the fact that we were making out just one case. I cited one case but I know on good authority that there are other cases in this department. If the House of Representatives wants to put some restriction on this at this time, I think we should add this provision to all the bills as these other bills come along from the Committee on Appropriations and we should take care of this in order to do away with this practice. I think it is a misuse of the permissive authority given under the Government retraining program.

Mr. DENTON. If you want to do that, the way to do it is to amend the Government Employees Training Act and have the change apply to every agency and not just to the Department of the Interior. This is legislation on an appropriation bill, and this matter should be considered by the legislative committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If you wait to do that, it will never be corrected—I can tell you that. We ought to do this today while we have a chance to save some money here and now, and at the same time let all Departments know we are in favor of stopping this gravy train.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Jones of Missouri), there were—ayes 26, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. Price, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that Committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment:

"On page 46, immediately before line 22, insert a new section as follows:

" 'Sec. 302. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335).' "

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that in the opinion of the Chair the noes had it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

In accordance with the order of the House of March 30, the vote will be postponed until tomorrow.

The gentleman from Ohio withdraws the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. BOW. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM APRIL 7, 1966, TO MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 625

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND FOR THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House from April 7 to April 18, 1966, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BUSINESS ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, April 20, 1966, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CHILDREN'S SPECIAL MILK ACT OF 1966

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to put the special milk fund on a permanent basis and to assure the continuation of this program which has helped so many of our children.

The administration is asking that $82 million be slashed from the milk fund. It is my feeling that budget cuts that are meaningless in terms of savings would be false economy, at best. Such a cut in the milk fund would compel the Government to raise the support price of milk and to add to the inventory of dairy products already amassed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The result would be more expensive than continuing the special milk fund at its present level.

While the administration is recommending that Congress cut the milk fund, it is also sponsoring legislation to extend the school lunch program and special milk fund to more needy students.

It is my feeling that low-income children should be guaranteed an adequate milk diet. But how do you expand the program, or even continue it, if you cut its appropriation? If the cuts are approved, the increased cost per half-pint of milk will mean that many students simply will not be able to afford this fine nutritional supplement.

The administration's substitute plan would center about a poverty formula. This formula will be totally unlike the formula used in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Under title I of Public Law 89-10, whole school districts are eligible to receive categorical aid. But under the administration's plan for school milk, we may well be embarking on a "means test" for individual students. I do not think that Congress should sanction another onerous means test, such as we had under the Kerr-Mills medical care program. It would be reprehensible to segregate individual students on the basis of economic rather than educational need. All children should be able to enjoy fresh milk.

I strongly urge the Congress to adopt legislation that will fulfill our obligation to the nutrition of our children and that will prevent increases in the cost of Government agriculture programs.

A SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce a bill providing for a permanent special milk program for children. This bill will benefit both schoolchildren and dairy farmers. It will benefit schoolchildren by giving them at reduced prices pure and wholesome milk so necessary to growing bodies and it will benefit dairy farmers by providing a fluid milk market for their product. Our entire Nation thereby benefits by having healthier children and a stable dairy industry.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, the special milk program for children has grown at a remarkable rate; however, the fiscal 1967 budget request is for a drastic cut in the funds for this program with the result that the entire program is in jeopardy. In Wyoming alone funds will be cut from $129,000 in fiscal 1966 to approximately $27,000 in fiscal 1967. There is nearly an 80-percent reduction in funds for this nutrition program. This reduction will most assuredly not benefit schoolchildren since they will not be able to purchase and consume as much of nature's most perfect food.

Neither does the cut benefit dairy farmers. They will lose a substantial fluid milk market and probably have to process manufactured dairy products from this milk. This will result in a large reduction in the already low dairy farmer income, and in turn will cause the increased departure of many dairy farmers from the industry.

In 1960 milk production in Wyoming was 192 million pounds. However, in 1965 it had decreased to 175 million pounds. There has also been a large reduction in milk cows. In 1960 Wyoming had 35,000, and in 1965 it had only 27,000.

This bill, which has already generated wide support and interest, will eliminate the harm done by this proposed cutback. It will restore these funds and add some additional funds. These additional funds are necessary for three reasons: The first reason is that the present funds are not enough to reimburse the schools now in the program. My bill will insure that the schools now in the program will be reimbursed. The second reason for some increase in the present program is that school population is growing and thus more children will need to be covered. Third is that more schools will continue to join the program. This bill insures that adequate funds will be available for schools joining the program. This bill will make this program permanent—realizing the benefits given to schoolchildren, dairy farmers, and society are of true and lasting value.

By continuing this special milk program for children at a rate expanding with the need, nutrition to children can be effectively promoted while drastically reduced dairy farmer income can be increased to a small degree.

INQUIRY INTO SIMPLIFYING U.S. INCOME TAX FORMS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as the inevitability of the income tax deadline fast approaches, I am sure the question is arising in the minds of all of us who are preparing our tax returns, why it is that forms are so complicated, and, why do they require so much time and effort, and recordkeeping?

The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee has concerned itself with the problem of tax return simplification for some time. Members of the subcommittee are Congressmen TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Democrat, of Massachusetts; CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey; JOHN G. DOW, Democrat, of New York; DONALD RUMSFELD, Republican, of Illinois; and ROBERT DOLE, Republican, of Kansas. The Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, is chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations. The subcommittee, of which I am chairman, is charged with evaluating the efficiency and economy of various agencies of the Government, including those of the Internal Revenue Service. If some means can be devised to cut down on the time, expense, and effort required of taxpayers to fill out their income tax forms, it should likewise cut down on the Government's costs of processing the returns.

In our efforts to seek means of simplifying income tax forms under existing laws, I have communicated with most of the major associations of lawyers, accountants, and tax experts in the country, many of whom have given the subcommittee the benefit of their thinking on the subject. I have also been in touch with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Sheldon S. Cohen, and have enlisted the aid of the General Accounting Office in the subcommittee's efforts.

Also, the staff of the subcommittee has conferred with representatives of automatic data processing equipment manufacturers to see what ideas could be obtained from their experience in streamlining and speeding up business procedures.

I mention these things to show the breadth of the effort that the subcommittee has put into attempting to obtain better and more economical governmental procedures and ways of avoiding the tediousness that all taxpayers must go through in preparing Federal income tax returns.

Our efforts are directed to bringing about improvements under present laws. The subcommittee has no legislative jurisdiction in the tax field; its purpose is to see that everything possible is being done to simplify the process under existing statutes.

All taxpayers, I believe, will be interested in the practices followed by the Internal Revenue Service in making up the forms which we will have to file by April 15.

The Internal Revenue Service maintains a full-time staff within its Tax Forms and Instructions Branch of the Technical Planning Division. The chief of that branch doubles as chairman of the IRS Tax Forms Coordinating Committee, which includes part-time representatives of each of the six Assistant Commissioners, and of the Chief Counsel of IRS. The Commissioner has told the subcommittee that these, plus others, follow tax legislation step by step and maintain continuing contacts with business and professional organizations, and also review thousands of suggestions from the general public and from internal revenue offices throughout the United States in the formulation of tax procedures and forms.

In their work, IRS officials are faced with the twin challenges of technical accuracy and ease of compliance. Their principal problem lies in the complexities of the income tax laws.

According to the Commissioner, in addition to the large numbers of individuals, committees, and task forces within the Internal Revenue Service which are constantly examining various forms, procedures, regulations, mechanical equipment, and other aspects of tax administration, other studies are being made in the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, in the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and by many private and professional organizations, including the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the American Bar Association, and the Tax Executive Institute.

An interesting incident occurred with regard to the 1965 tax forms, which we are now filing. The wealth of IRS and private talent which is devoted to simplifying tax forms and procedures might seem at least adequate to deal with any form problem. Yet, in the midst of the subcommittee's study, the Washington Post, on October 19, 1965, carried a report that IRS had gone outside the Government, to a private firm and contracted for assistance in getting up its 1965 forms.

Because that meant the expenditure of taxpayers' funds—and the subcommittee was concerned with economy—as chairman of the subcommittee, I asked the Commissioner to explain the expenditure.

The Members and other taxpayers who are now filling out the revised form for 1965, on which the best minds of the Internal Revenue Service and outside experts, including private contractors, have collaborated, will be pleased to know that the Commissioner's reply disclosed full awareness of the difficulties taxpayers face in preparing their forms. The contract was made in aid of simplification—and maybe the forms are a little easier to fill out than they were last year.

Without objection, I submit the Washington Post article referred to, and the Commissioner's reply to the subcommittee:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 19, 1965]

IRS HATCHES AN EAGLE TO KEEP ITS EYE ON YOU

(By Phil Casey)

The Internal Revenue Service has a new emblem that will be printed on all the bad news it sends to people.

It's a modernistic design of an eagle, the scales of justice and an olive branch, but you probably wouldn't know this unless somebody told you.

It'll be the same old news—the IRS dunning you and reminding you and threatening you—but the old-fashioned IRS seal will be gone, replaced by the eagle, if you can make him out.

The IRS figures this emblem is better and jazzier, and it will appear on the front page of the 60 million or so income tax packages that will be sent to taxpayers about January 1.

Sheldon S. Cohen, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, says the new emblem is symbolic of the tax men. The eagle represents authority. The olive branch is for the courtesy and fairness of the IRS, and the scales represent, he said, justice and equal treatment. Yes, he's talking about the tax collectors.

Apparently the appearance of the IRS forms bugged the people almost as much as the content of the forms. There have been many complaints.

So, the IRS awarded a competitive bid contract to a New York industrial design firm to recommend format changes. A number of changes have been made in the format of the various forms, booklets and correspondence of IRS, but the eagle is the big thing, the thing that catches the eye.

It's apparently a pretty good eagle. It cost the IRS—and us—$20,000. One man to whom the eagle was shown was depressed. "For 20,000 clams," he said, "it should look like an eagle."

But this isn't everybody's opinion, particularly that of IRS men. It's their eagle, and they're going to live with it.

General Services Administration said that so far as can be determined, IRS has started no trend. There's no spate of requests by other Government agencies to get eagles on their paperwork and there's no rush to change whatever they've been putting on it. Thus far, it looks as if IRS can keep its eagle.

The design firm, Lippincott-Margulies, made other changes in the forms to help the taxpayers. For one thing, the forms will be easier to read, because of more modern type arrangement.

Another thing the new forms will do is make it easier to figure out what you owe the tax collectors. Nobody said they'd make it any pleasanter, though.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am happy to furnish you information on the contract we entered into with the firm of Lippincott & Margulies, if only to correct the impression left by local newspaper stories that the Internal Revenue Service spent $20,000 for a doohickey.

While these stories probably were well-intended I have observed that there is something about writing about tax collectors that often encourages a jocular approach. We have learned to live with this and indeed rather enjoy most of the things we read. But where the well-sanctioned game of poking fun at the tax collector includes reference to the spending of money, then we get things like the "internal revenue eagle" stories.

In my letter of May 10, 1965, to which you referred I described our continuing efforts to simplify the tax forms and outlined the problems we face in trying to achieve success. I should like to stress that the primary concern of the Tax Forms Coordinating Committee is to develop a tax form that will reflect the provisions of the law and at the same time be reasonably comprehensible to the general public. The committee does not pretend to have the design expertise of commercial concerns that specialize in these matters. Nevertheless, we have been trying for years to simplify the appearance and layout of the 1040 to make it easier to fill out and less forbidding looking. While this obviously does not rank in importance with the actual simplification of the law itself, we felt we owed it to the Nation's taxpayers.

It had been suggested to us on more than one occasion that our internal efforts were inadequate and that we ought to go outside for help. For this reason, and because we are trying to avoid complacency and the assumption that we are infallible, we decided to give commerical firms a chance to see what they could do. (We rejected out of hand as impracticable, of course, the idea of hiring our own staff of industrial designers.) We, therefore, put out invitations to bid among design firms and eventually awarded a contract to Lippincott & Margulies, a firm with an outstanding record of success in this area and whose bid fell in about the middle range of those received.

I am attaching a copy of the contract with that firm. As you can see, we asked Lippincott & Margulies to improve the format and appearance of the 1040, 1040A, and the corporation tax form, 1120. Secondarily, we also asked them to attempt to correct other deficiencies the Service presents to the public, including the appearance of our "tax package," itself, which goes to some 48 million Americans, but, which, at a glance is undistinguishable from advertising circulars. (Indeed, I have even been told that our tax packages have been thrown away by some taxpayers who took them for junk mail.)

I know the firm found this assignment one of the most difficult they had undertaken and, frankly, they did not come up with as many changes in tax forms as one might have hoped for. Like our own staff, they discovered that the need for compressing so much information on limited space militated against producing a simple form. Nevertheless, Lippincott & Margulies did make a contribution by improving the typography and general appearance of our current 1040 and its sister forms. I think you will see this yourself by comparing the enclosed 1965 1040 with its 1964 predecessor. They also made a number of suggestions that in a small but significant way will improve the appearance of our letters, pamphlets, and office signs.

As part of its work, the design firm pointed out to us that few people could tell our official seal from the many similar seals used by other Federal agencies, and they suggested that we adopt a new emblem as a method of identifying our communications. Hence, the "internal revenue eagle," a minor part of the overall project.

While these design improvements should make it easier for taxpayers to deal with us, we realize that they are, in the end, surface improvements. We do not hope, nor is it our purpose by these designs to acquire a "new image." We fully recognize that the impression people have of us depends on how well we do our work and how fair and courteously we treat taxpayers. We continue to strive for excellence in these areas, and our effort to improve the layout and appearance of our forms and instructions is one part of this overall goal.

For long years our tax forms, especially the 1040, have been criticized by Member of Congress, newspapers, and taxpayers. We are aware also of your own interest in this matter. I just do not believe that I can sit idly by wringing my hands at the perplexities of the law without at least making an attempt for improvement wherever humanly possible. I have done my best by entering into this modest contract with a firm that had dealt with and solved similar problems. I would be the first to admit that we have not scored a major breakthrough but, while I expect no praise, I would hope at least that we would be given a modicum of credit for having made the effort.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

SOIL CONSERVATION MAKES AMERICA MORE BEAUTIFUL

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of talk about beauty in the countryside. But it takes more than talk to bring it about.

Rural beauty is nothing new to the people of my congressional district in southwestern Wisconsin. They have been working at it for more than a quarter of a century.

Evidence of their work was recently published as the frontispiece in the report of the President by the White House Conference on Natural Beauty.

This illustration was the only one of natural beauty in the entire report. It is an aerial photograph showing the Monroe County, Wis., countryside in my congressional district.

This same beauty is repeated throughout the 15 counties in my constituency. What is it that makes this landscape appealing to the eye? It is the curving patchwork of stripcropped and contoured fields, the rolling green meadows, the terraces and windbreaks, the glistening ponds. This is what we have come to know as America the beautiful.

Most important is this fact: Much of this beauty is man-made—created by the farmers who voluntarily develop their land resources in cooperation with locally managed soil and water conservation districts.

Soil conservation and its resulting beauty got its start in my congressional district in 1939 when the first soil conservation district was formed in La Crosse County. In the following 10 years, the entire congressional district—almost 7 million acres—became blanketed by soil conservation districts.

The farmers take pride in their productive land. They protect it from the ugliness of erosion and damages of floods. They stand out as leaders in planning and applying conservation measures on their farms.

They have been working at it for 27 years.

Now consider just the accomplishments they made in 1965 in my congressional district: 690 farmers became new cooperators with soil conservation districts; 7,100 farmers requested and received technical help in resource development; 30,500 acres of land were contour farmed; 29,000 acres were stripcropped; 296 acres of grassed waterways were built; 167 farm ponds were constructed; 86,600 acres were treated with all planned conservation measures—all this in 1 year, and more.

Outstanding by any measuring stick are my constituents' accomplishments through small watershed projects designed to prevent damaging floods, control erosion, and provide recreation and beauty.

Of the 16 watershed projects under construction in Wisconsin, 14 are in the Third Congressional District.

Throughout the State, 13 watershed projects are being developed for recreation as well as flood prevention—12 of these are in the Third Congressional District.

When finished, these developments will create more than 1,200 acres of surface water in lakes ranging from 50 to 240 acres in size. In addition, they will provide other recreation facilities on 13,000 acres of adjacent land. An estimated half-million visitors yearly will boat, fish, camp, swim, picnic, and enjoy the wonders of nature in these new recreation areas.

The motivating force behind every one of these watershed projects has been the local soil conservation districts, their leaders, and cooperating farmers.

I consider it a privilege to salute these men for their voluntary work in preserving and developing the bounty and enhancing the beauty of America. I will do all I can to encourage it—for we all benefit by it.

A REVOLVING FUND WILL NOT BE ESTABLISHED

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, some questions were raised yesterday in this Chamber as to the intent of the Moore amendment which the House adopted to S. 2729 which the House considered last Thursday. As the membership may recall, the amendment was passed by voice vote last week, despite the severe opposition from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

I offered this amendment to preserve and to help restore the historic small business program as originally envisioned by the Congress. As is known, the small business program has been defunct for many months because of a drain on funds for that program resulting from the heavy demand for disaster funds caused by Hurricane Betsy.

It is to prevent the repetition of this shutdown of the vital small business program that we in the House and the Senate approved legislation to set up separate funds for disaster and small business loans, and in addition, the action of the House in passing the Moore amendment which further reduced the possibility of administratively curtailing the small business program.

My amendment to place a $100 million ceiling on economic opportunity loans within the $1.4 billion authorization for the small business loan program was to prevent a drain on regular small business loan funds, from economic opportunity loans, similar to the drain caused last year by the natural disaster, Hurricane Betsy.

As I assured the House last week, there was no intent on my part to set up separate revolving fund to the economic opportunity loans. Because of a certain amount of confusion generated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], an attempt on my part to reword the Moore amendment so as to make this clear, was not accomplished. After the House followed my leadership in this matter, it would have been very easy for me to have changed the texture of my remarks under permission to revise and extend the same; however, my desire to keep good faith with the membership, a matter not commonly understood by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I chose to let the remarks stand as delivered.

I wish to advise the House that I completed arrangements Monday for two distinguished Members of the other body, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TOWER], to amend the Moore amendment in the Senate in order to carry out my commitment to this body. This amendment, which is scheduled to come today in the Senate would insure that a $100 million ceiling would be placed on economic opportunity loans within the $1.4 billion authorization fund set up for the operation of small business loan program.

I wish to expressly thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], for his support and his complete understanding of what goes on in this body, and his attention to the needs of the small business community of this Nation, as well as the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] for their forceful support of the Moore amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there was never any intent on my part nor the part of those who supported my amendment to mislead the House. It may be safe to say that without the severe opposition of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that the Moore amendment would not now enjoy the general endorsement that it does. The Executive Administrator of the Small Business Administration, together with other sincere experts who speak in the interest of the small business community of this Nation support the Moore amendment or have no objection thereto.

USE OF WAR ON POVERTY FUNDS TO ESTABLISH COOPERATIVE STORES IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, a rather strange situation has arisen in the San Francisco Bay area in connection with the operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity, especially in regard to its activities called BAND which apparently has a 1-year grant of some $256,251 to conduct an experimental demonstration in consumer education and action. What they are actually doing is promoting the establishment of cooperative stores in opposition to local independent business institutions.

Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., wrote a letter to Mr. Robert Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity on this subject, to which he has received no reply. I quote from that letter:

MR. ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: Some time ago we wrote you concerning the reported usage of war-on-poverty funds to establish cooperative stores in the San Francisco Bay area, and asked if such reports were accurate.

We have received no reply from you, but under the date of February 17 did receive a letter from Mr. Herbert Kramer of your office who stated the Bay Area Neighborhood Development Foundation has received a 1-year grant of $256,251 to conduct an experimental demonstration in consumer education and action. The letter then goes on to say "the residents of these impoverished areas may decide they would like to establish a cooperative store." This is followed by a most remarkable statement, "We believe this is totally in keeping with the free enterprise spirit."

It is also interesting to note that literature given out at BAND offices in San Francisco states its articles of incorporation include these purposes:

"To conduct basic educational research in the field of urban consumer education directed toward the formation of consumer cooperatives.

"To provide specific information about the formation and operation of consumer cooperatives to individuals and groups interested in the formation of such cooperatives."

This literature further states that the members of the board of directors of Associated Cooperatives, and organization of local consumer cooperatives, are the sole voting members of BAND, and that they select the BAND board.

We have also noted with interest that in the San Francisco Examiner of March 6 it is reported that after the protests raised, Mr. Sanford Kravitz of your office flew to San Francisco to order the BAND group to stop publicizing their cooperative activities and to "stop dealing in specific solutions such as cooperatives and preach instead general concepts."

Mr. Shriver, at this point, on behalf of our more than 210,000 independent business proprietors across the Nation, we would like to ask a question.

Do you honestly believe that a leopard can change its spots? Do you believe that an organization controlled entirely by dyed-in-the-wool believers in cooperatives instead of free enterprise, with more than a quarter-of-a-million dollars of other people's money to play with, are going to quit agitating for tax exempt cooperatives to compete with private, taxpaying enterprises?

Also, do you believe that it is proper, or equitable, to collect taxes from private business and its employees, to furnish the ammunition needed for such groups to carry on antiprivate business agitation?

Mr. Shriver, how far do you intend to go in using the fruits of free enterprise to promote socialistic concepts?

We would appreciate an answer from you, because the independent business proprietors, since this disclosure was made, are asking these questions:

1. Is the poverty program antibusiness?

2. Information received indicates that in addition to the grant from you of $256,000, Associated Cooperatives are also putting up an undetermined amount. Is this to be interpreted that the funds you gave will be used to agitate for cooperative stores, while money for the actual physical setting up of such cooperative stores will come from the Associated Cooperatives?

You can appreciate that these are logical questions that are being asked. In other words, they would like to know if this quarter of a million dollars plus grant was made to these people with the purpose of helping destroy private business, or was it due to a colossal administrative error.

Sincerely yours,
C. WILSON HARDER,
President.

Mr. Speaker, another letter which was written by Mr. R. W. Howard, of the Howard Enterprises, to the National Federation of Independent Business, which has its home office in San Mateo, Calif., and I quote that letter:

HOWARD ENTERPRISES,
Oakland, Calif., March 31, 1966.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif.
(Attention Mr. Neal Heard.)

DEAR SIR: I received in today's mail 16 brochures and 1 large book on the poverty program and I was wondering if you are in possession of copies of these booklets? If not, I will gladly send them on to you there in San Mateo. Just write me. They are titled "Have You a New Neighbor?" "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as Amended." "Poverty: Quick Facts About the War on Poverty." "The War on Poverty: A Hometown Fight." "The War on Poverty: Education in Job Corps Youth Conservation Center." "Job Corps Centers for Women." "Job Corps Facts: Profile of a Job Corpsman." "Is There a Job in Your Future?" "Vista Questions and Answers." "Small Business Administration." "Neighborhood Youth Corps." "Adult Basic Education Under Title 11B, Economic Opportunity Act." "Work Study Program." And last but not least a book 9 by 12, three-eighths of an inch thick, titled "A Nation Aroused," first annual report Office of Economic Opportunity.

I have read with very much interest your March 25 release to members of the bay area, also your release to the press and frankly I can see through the entire thing from A to Z. No. 1, they want going into the cooperative business to be something to undermine little business—then another step will be communism—it is coming just as certain as taxes. I fully believe the Government is planning for it all the time to become operative within the States by directing all of our attention to Vietnam, while it is being done. If you will look back you will readily see that things that were put over on the people were done while the powers that were at the time were spending all their time and using the press to talk about just the opposite until they had gotten footing solid enough to let it be known to the public. After all just what can the little man do against government? Practically nothing.

In these so-called cooperative ventures entered into because "poor people can't read" why is Government permitting "big business interests" to put in 50 percent of the money used to start and operate them? Something is wrong somewhere.

I think that what should be done is to warn every member in plain English that it is a move of communism to take over little business and that you should warn all of your members in just so many words asking them to write and send telegrams to their various Congressmen not that it will completely stop it, but that it might stall it until such a time as you can figure out some other means of combating this scourge that is being thrust upon us again by subterfuge.

If you will tell all the membership the facts as they really are you will be more apt to get a general response rather than hint to the danger that is right here ready to take over.

Once they get one cooperative operating and the storm of the little merchants has subsided, more and more so-called can't read cooperatives will be constructed and the little man has completely left the picture.

Johnson is continually talking about more jobs, yet he is doing things that will eliminate jobs instead. How many people will be thrown out of employment when the little man has finally been eliminated from the scene?

Well I offer you a hearty good luck in your project but in the long run I am very much (after having thought quite a bit about it) afraid little business is destined for the final skids real soon—talk to them now in any section of the country and you will find that they are not satisfied with the volume of business they are getting, but the discount houses (with few exceptions) are very much satisfied.

Anyway I got it off just so you might possibly find something in my ramblings you could possibly do something with.

Yours truly,

R. W. HOWARD.

This seems to be another example of where the administration is determined to destroy the small businesses and defeat the creation of new jobs in the private sector.

A BILL TO PERMIT THIRD-CLASS MAILING OF SAMPLE BALLOTS AND OTHER ELECTION MATERIALS

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, 1965, I introduced legislation which would permit the third-class mailing of sample ballots and other election materials by registrars of voters to be handled in the mails as first-class mail. I introduced this bill because in several recent elections, despite timely handling of these materials by registrars of voters, the necessary election materials were received after the election had been held.

I was utterly amazed to receive a copy of an adverse report by the Bureau of the Budget on this legislation which was furnished me through the courtesy of the Honorable TOM MURRAY, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The Bureau of the Budget cites that the Postmaster General is recommending against the enactment of my bill, primarily because it would "discriminate against other third-class mail" and "first-class handling of election materials is unnecessary because election dates are known well in advance and the mailing of election materials can be scheduled to provide timely delivery by third-class mail."

Mr. Speaker, the ignorance of election procedures in the various States, which this statement by the Postmaster General reveals, is nothing short of shocking and appalling.

In the first place, what wrong with placing such important material in a class by itself which does discriminate against the junk mail, which most of us do not like to get in our mail boxes anyway. Actually, the material should be mailed postage free since there is nothing more important to a democracy than the mechanics of operating an election in the most efficient manner possible. I have seen millions of pieces of mail go out from the various executive branches, particularly the Office of Economic Opportunity, which have been at the taxpayers' expense. I think the timely receipt of a sample ballot is much more important than some of the propaganda with which Great Society public relations experts have recently been flooding the mails.

The statement that first-class handling is unnecessary because election dates are known well in advance shows an abysmal ignorance of election procedures. In my own State of California, we are growing so rapidly that precincts never remain constant and are changing from year to year. Unfortunately, the precinct boundaries cannot be finally established until such time as registration is complete. This creates a time interval problem which makes it impossible to mail a sample ballot to each voter until shortly before an election.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the adverse report on the part of the Post Office Department and the Budget Bureau is shortsighted and definitely adverse to the best interests of democracy.

EVERYBODY LIKES SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, just recently, the Gallup poll reported the city that most Americans want to live in. It came as no surprise to me, of course, that "the city" is San Francisco. I am delighted, however, that the Dr. George Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion confirmed what San Franciscans have long known, that our city is everybody's favorite city.

San Francisco has rightly been called the Paris of the West, the Gateway to the Orient, and by one of its distinguished citizens, Columnist Herb Caen, as a Bagdad by the Bay.

San Francisco can rival Rome for its hills; Paris for its cosmopolitan atmosphere; Hong Kong for its touch of the exotic East; and even London for its fog. It has no rival, however, for the warmth and friendliness of its citizens.

The San Francisco Chronicle ran an article, "Everybody Likes San Francisco," which follows:

EVERYBODY LIKES SAN FRANCISCO

Sexy, swinging, lovely, and a gourmet's paradise—above all, the one city Americans most want to live in—that's San Francisco, according to the Gallup poll.

The city's repute has been climbing swiftly over the past decade, and it is obviously headed for overwhelming leadership among all American metropolitan centers.

These conclusions emerged yesterday in a special survey conducted by Dr. George Gallup's prestigious American Institute of Public Opinion.

The Gallup poll queried a sampling of adults all across the country about their impressions of American cities. The climatic question was: "Which city would you most like to live in?"

Ten years ago Los Angeles was in first place, followed by New York. San Francisco ranked only third.

But this year's survey awards the top honor to San Francisco. It ranked first as America's favorite city, followed by Los Angeles in second place and New York in third.

It's obvious that San Francisco has no peer as the city with the most beautiful setting. It ranked first 10 years ago, and first again in 1966. Ten years ago Los Angeles and Miami ranked second and third; this year the second and third spots for beautiful setting are held by Los Angeles and Washington.

WOMEN

Most beautiful women? Ten years ago San Francisco didn't rate among the top six as a city of stunners; it drew only an honorable mention. Los Angeles, New York, and Dallas were the first three in this category in 1956.

But this year's poll shows San Francisco on the move: it ranked third in female pulchritude, just behind New York and Los Angeles.

The Gallup surveyors asked Americans which city has the gayest night life—and came up with something of a surprise. Despite topless North Beach and jazz all over, San Francisco ranks only fourth in the night life department.

The first three cities for "gayest night life" are New York, Las Vegas, and New Orleans.

Ten years ago San Francisco ranked fifth in its night life; New York, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Chicago were the top four.

FOOD

Most Americans consider New York as the city with the Nation's best food, but San Francisco ranks second this year. New Orleans, Chicago, and Los Angeles follow.

Ten years ago the image of San Francisco restaurants was a little lower: the city ranked only fourth in the "best food" category. At that time the leaders were New York, Chicago, and New Orleans.

The Gallup pollsters added two new categories in their city survey this year. They asked which city is the most interesting or different; and which is the healthiest.

As an interesting, different city San Francisco ranked second, just behind New York and just ahead of Los Angeles.

HEALTH

As for health, the rank order goes: Phoenix, Denver, Miami, Los Angeles, San Francisco. Apparently strangers don't realize the the salubrity of San Francisco's fog.

Here are the Gallup poll ratings in each category:

Which city would you most like to live in?

Year 1956: (1) Los Angeles, (2) New York, (3) San Francisco, (4) Miami, (5) Denver, (6) Chicago.

Year 1966: (1) San Franciso, (2) Los Angeles, (3) New York, (4) Miami, (5) Denver, (6) Phoenix.

Honorable mention, 1956: Detroit, Seattle, Washington, Boston; 1966: Chicago, San Diego, Seattle, Washington.

Which city has the most beautiful setting?

Year 1956: (1) San Francisco, (2) Los Angeles, (3) Miami, (4) New York, (5) Washington, (6) Denver.

Year 1966: (1) San Francisco, (2) Los Angeles, (3) Washington, (4) Miami, (5) Denver, (6) New York.

Honorable mention, 1956: Seattle, Chicago, Salt Lake City, New Orleans; 1966: Seattle, Salt Lake City, Chicago, Phoenix.

Which city has the best-looking women?

Year 1956; (1) Los Angeles, (2) New York, (3) Dallas, (4) Atlanta, (5) Chicago, (6) New Orleans.

Year 1966: (1) New York, (2) Los Angeles, (3) San Franciso, (4) Dallas, (5) Atlanta, (6) Chicago.

Honorable mention, 1956: San Francisco, Miami, Salt Lake City, Houston; 1966: Miami, New Orleans, Houston, Salt Lake City.

Which city has the best food?

Year 1956: (1) New York, (2) Chicago, (3) New Orleans, (4) San Francisco, (5) Los Angeles, (6) Boston.

Year 1966: (1) New York, (2) San Francisco, (3) New Orleans, (4) Chicago, (5) Los Angeles, (6) Miami.

Honorable mention, 1956: Miami, Philadelphia, Detroit, Kansas City; 1966: Atlanta, Boston, Milwaukee, Philadelphia.

Which city has the gayest night life?

Year 1956: (1) New York, (2) Los Angeles, (3) New Orleans, (4) Chicago, (5) San Francisco, (6) Miami.

Year 1966: (1) New York, (2) Las Vegas, (3) New Orleans, (4) San Francisco, (5) Los Angeles, (6) Chicago.

Honorable mention, 1956: Houston, Dallas, Pittsburgh, St. Louis; 1966: Reno, Miami, San Diego, Dallas.

Which city is the most interesting or different? (A new category this year.)

(1) New York, (2) San Francisco, (3) Los Angeles, (4) Washington, (5) New Orleans, (6) Chicago.

Honorable mention: Miami, Boston, Philadelphia, Seattle.

Which city is the healthiest? (A new category.)

(1) Phoenix, (2) Denver, (3) Miami, (4) Los Angeles (5) San Francisco, (6) New York.

Honorable mention: Tucson, Seattle, Chicago, Salt Lake City.

HORTON EMPHASIZES THE NEED FOR A CONVENTION OF NORTH ATLANTIC NATIONS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, I introduced a joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations. Today, I rise to urge support for this resolution, House Joint Resolution 999. The Government and the Congress of the United States have been preoccupied in recent months by the struggle this Nation is waging on behalf of the people of South Vietnam. While this preoccupation is understandable, we must not allow ourselves to forget that there are other areas of the world that require our attention.

For too long now, it seems to me, our Government has allowed affairs in the Atlantic world to drift. It is almost as if we took the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for granted, confident that problems in relations between Europe and the United States would take care of themselves in the long run. Our policies have been narrowly conceived to preserve what exists; they have lacked the boldness and imagination that should be displayed by the most powerful nation of the North Atlantic Alliance. Above all, we have been overcautious in defining future goals toward which the Atlantic nations could work.

One consequence of our policies has been to leave the initiative to others. Should we really be very surprised that General de Gaulle has seized the opportunity to advance his own views of how the North Atlantic Treaty Organization should be reformed? A new U.S. initiative in Atlantic affairs is overdue. It is my conviction that we must stop reacting and begin leading, lest the crisis we face today lead to the piecemeal dismantling of all that has been built up over the past 17 years.

One of the purposes of the resolution which I have introduced would be to express congressional interest in defining and working toward the goal of federal union for the nations of the Atlantic world. Neither I nor the other sponsors of this resolution believe that a federation of the Atlantic nations can be achieved in the near future. But we are all deeply convinced that this is the long-term goal toward which the 15 members of the Atlantic Alliance, and other interested nations, must work if they are to meet the challenges of the world in which we live. If we do not set this long term goal for ourselves, I am fearful that Europe and North America will gradually drift apart. Indeed, in the crisis we face today in NATO, we can see that this is not an imaginary danger.

But the drifting apart of Europe and North America must not be allowed to happen. Have we not learned through bitter experience that the fate of North America and the fate of Europe are so intertwined that 19th-century conceptions of sovereign independence are outmoded on both sides of the Atlantic? Have we not learned over the past 20 years that unity of purpose and policy is best achieved within the framework of common institutions? And who would deny that unity of purpose and policy are even more necessary today than at the birth of NATO in 1949 if the Western nations are to play a constructive role in the world we know today. Have we in the United States not also learned that boldness and imagination in foreign policy reap success?

The resolution that I am proud to sponsor in this House is at once bold in the goal it would set and modest and realistic in the steps it proposes for the present. It would direct the President and Congress to appoint an Atlantic Union delegation of eminent citizens who would be authorized to organize and participate in a convention of similar delegations from other NATO nations. The task of this convention would be exploratory. It would determine what measure of agreement exists on the goal of federal union, and what practical, interim steps could be taken toward this goal.

Four years ago, in January 1962, a similar convention of delegations from Atlantic nations met in Paris. At the conclusion of their meetings, the delegates adopted the Declaration of Paris, in which the need for an eventual Atlantic union was eloquently set forth, and some gradual steps toward this union proposed. The work of the convention was widely praised in the press of this country and of other NATO countries. And the declaration gained the support of prominent citizens and statesmen on both sides of the Atlantic.

Since that time, however, we have been standing still. Perhaps for a while we in this country became too fascinated with the movement toward European unity, and did not realize that by promoting unity only in Europe we might also be promoting division in the Atlantic world. Today, I think we are wiser. There are many people in the United States and Europe who are convinced that European unity is not enough and that Atlantic unity is a necessity. The purpose of the resolution I have introduced is to continue the work begun by the Atlantic Convention of 1962. It is imperative that we regain a sense of direction in our Atlantic policies. Now is the time for Congress to show its interest in moving forward with purpose in the Atlantic world.

ELECTED REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to believe firmly in the importance and equity of providing meaningful popular representation for the citizens of the District of Columbia. If true home rule, in the form of an elected municipal government, cannot be achieved this year, it is crucial for us to institute District representation in Congress. As long as Congress legislates for the District, the people of the District need a representative on Capitol Hill.

In the past I have sponsored bills to establish the office of nonvoting delegate to the House from the District of Columbia. On February 8 the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] and I introduced identical bills, H.R. 12690 and H.R. 12693, entitled the "District of Columbia Election Extension Act." This measure would establish the office of delegate from the District of Columbia in the House, would specify the powers and privileges of the delegate, would provide for his biennial election, and would make necessary changes and improvements in the voter registration and election laws of the District. The bill also would provide for special primary and general elections in the fall of 1966 to choose a delegate to serve in the 90th Congress.

I would like to emphasize two points. First, I consider nonvoting congressional representation for the District a first step, not a final goal. I do believe that the citizens of Washington should have voting representatives on both sides of the Capitol, and will support an appropriate constitutional amendment toward that end. I also believe, however, that a transitional period is necessary—first, because ratification of a constitutional amendment is not a rapid process; second, because the Congress has not yet

fully explored questions such as the number of Senators and Representatives appropriate for the District, and whether the District should be included in the apportionment of Representatives among the States; and finally, because the voters of the District need time to become accustomed to the processes and procedures of elections. H.R. 12690 is vital, therefore, as an interim measure which would establish the required electoral machinery in Washington, and provide a degree of representation until full voting representation can be secured.

Second, I do not consider representation in Congress for the District in any way an adequate substitute for home rule. Representation here is especially important in the absence of home rule, but the establishment of elected municipal government in Washington will make congressional representation for the District no less significant or just.

Mr. Speaker, the great majority of citizens of the District of Columbia have displayed extraordinary patience and a willingness to seek responsive government through traditional channels. It is time that the Congress acts to extend to Washington residents the democratic rights enjoyed by all other Americans.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this point a section-by-section analysis of H.R. 12690:

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION EXTENSION ACT

(Section-by-section analysis of H.R. 12690 (MATHIAS) and of H.R. 12693 (UDALL), 89th Cong., 2d sess.)

(These bills are identical and have been referred to the House Committee on the District of Columbia. For convenience, the two bills are referred to simply as "a bill," or "an act" in this memorandum.)

SECTION 1

Section 1 states the title of the act.

SECTION 2

The existing District of Columbia election laws, which establish the present 4-year cycle between election years, require that all voters in the District have to reregister anew in each quadrennial election year. The present law also requires that registration operations be shut down a full 45 days before each election.

This bill provides a number of changes in these existing election laws, including substantial changes in the provisions relating to registration of voters. These changes are contained principally in section 2 of the bill. The third section of the bill provides for the election of a delegate to Congress every 2 years, and it is because of this speed-up in the election cycle that it is practicable thus to modify and improve the registration process.

Subsection (a) of this section 2 amends the existing election law so as to establish and maintain a permanent system of registration. At the same time it requires the Board of Elections to keep the registration accurate and current, and provides for the removal of the names of registrants who have failed to vote in two successive general elections and who have not reregistered. Subsection (b) removes the present requirement that the voter reregister anew in each election year.

Subsection (c) provides for longer periods of registration than under the present law, and shortens to 30 days (from the present 45 days) the period before each election in which the registration office is closed. It also broadens slightly the Board of Elections' power to issue regulations with regard to times and places of registration, and clarifies its power to set reasonable deadlines for filing documents with the Board where deadlines are not established by the statute.

SECTION 3

This section sets up the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives, and provides the basic statutory framework for his election by the voters in the District of Columbia.

Subsection (a) of this section 3 specifically establishes the right of the people of the District of Columbia to be represented by a Delegate in the House, elected by the voters of the District. The Delegate will have a seat in the House Chamber with the right of debate but not of voting. His term would be for 2 years, along with the Members of Congress. The committees to which he would be assigned would be determined by the House under its rulemaking power. The District Delegate must be at least 25 years old and have lived in the District for at least 3 years, and must continue to live in the District during his term of office. He must remain a qualified elector under District law in order to continue in office.

Subsection (b) adds the definition of "Delegate" to the existing District of Columbia election statute. Subsection (c) adds three new provisions to the existing election laws so as to establish in general the manner in which the District Delegate will be elected. It provides that the Delegate shall be elected by the District of Columbia voters in a general election, in the usual case after first winning a primary election. The candidate for a primary election for Delegate is to be nominated by a petition containing at least 500 signatures of registered voters of the same political party as the nominee, and accompanied by a filing fee of $200. The primary election of candidates for Delegate will, as in the case of existing District of Columbia law, be by a closed primary, but the general election of the Delegate will be an open election which will permit voters to cross party lines.

Subsection (d) further amends the District election laws in a number of respects, first to assure that the timing of the primary and general elections of Delegates will coincide, in presidential election years, with the May primaries and the November general elections under existing law. The Delegate would be elected every 2 years, of course, and in nonpresidential election years the Delegate would also be chosen by a May primary (followed in some cases by a runoff election) and by general elections in November.

Subsection (d) of this section 3 also amends existing law to provide for a party runoff election, which would be required if no one candidate in a primary election for Delegate received as much as 40 percent of the total vote of his party in that primary. Generally speaking, the candidates in the party runoff would be the two top vote-getters in the preceding party primary. Under this same section the Board of Elections is given the power to set the dates for these party runoff elections and generally to prescribe terms and conditions for their conduct.

Subsections (e), (f), and (g) change the present election law, so as to provide that the polling places in all elections will be open from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. on election day (present law is from 8 to 8) and to modify the existing provisions with regard to breaking tie votes so as to make it clear that those provisions will apply only when it is necessary to break a tie in order to affect the results of an election.

Subsection (h) provides for filling vacancies in the office of Delegate, and also in the position of candidate for Delegate in the event that a candidate wins in a May primary, or later party runoff election, but dies or resigns before the general election in November. In the latter case the local political party committee selects the successor. If a vacancy occurs in the office of a Delegate who has already been elected, the Board of Elections is required to hold a special election to fill the vacancy, except toward the end of a term of Congress.

SECTION 4

This section makes a series of changes in existing statutes relating to the operation of the Congress, to put the Delegate from the District of Columbia into a position or status in the House of Representatives essentially comparable to that formerly held by the Delegates from Hawaii and Alaska, and presently held by the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. Most of these changes in law are required simply because the present laws refer to Delegates "from the territories." Since the District of Columbia is not a territory, these changes are required.

As a result of the enactment of these 10 subsections, the Delegate from the District of Columbia would receive the same annual salary as a Member of Congress or Resident Commissioner—$30,000 (subsec. (a)); and when elected to fill an unexpired term, his salary would begin with the date of his election and not with the date on which the vacancy occurred (subsec. (b)).

Similarly, the provisions of law relating to the payment of unpaid salaries in the event of the death of a Member of Congress during his term of office are made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. (c)), and the privileges of participating in the retirement benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act which are applicable to Members of Congress are made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. (d)).

In the same way, subsection (e) makes applicable to the District Delegate, and to his office, the provisions of law relating to allowances for stationery, telephones, the hiring of clerical help, and the furnishing of office equipment which now apply to Members of Congress and to the Resident Commissioner. The statutory provisions for congressional office space are also made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. (f)).

The provisions of Federal criminal law which relate to Members of Congress, to their activities, and to their elections, are also made applicable to the District Delegate. Thus, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act is made applicable to the Delegate's position (subsec. (g)), as are also the provisions of law making it a Federal crime to intimidate voters (subsec. (h)), as well as those punishing the use by Federal employees of influence or authority to interfere with elections (subsec. (i)).

Subsection (j) contains the changes required in existing law to assure that appointment of candidates to the armed services academies from the District would be made by the elected Delegate, rather than by the appointed Commissioners.

SECTION 5

This section contains the definitions which are used throughout the bill, and also a number of miscellaneous provisions which will be important in administering the law. Subsection (a) contains the definitions. Subsection (b) simply brings up to date the provisions of the existing law with respect to the current name of the former municipal court. Subsection (c) changes the deadline date for filing nominating petitions for candidates for local party elections, so as to give enough time for the operation of the new procedure for challenging nominating petitions, established by subsection (d) below.

The new subsection (d) amends the existing District of Columbia election law so as to give the Board of Elections authority to accept initially the signatures on duly filed nominating petitions, but sets up a mechanism by which the petitions can be timely challenged, and the challenges resolved by the Board of Elections, with a right of later review in court. It also provides that the order in which the names of candidates will appear on the ballot shall be determined by choosing lots.

Subsection (e) amends the existing law slightly to clarify the authority of the Elections Board to issue regulations to accept some ballots which have been cast outside the precinct in which the registrant lived—as one example, in the case of a person who was registered in one precinct but on election day is in a hospital in another precinct and is voting as a "shut-in."

Subparagraph (f) changes the existing elections law slightly so as to require that only one of the officials in the polling place will be needed to accompany an illiterate or handicapped voter into the voting booth in order to carry out the voter's directions with respect to recording his vote (present law requires the presence of two officials). The change would also provide that the voter can, if he so desires, have a second official of the Board of Elections to witness the recordation of his vote in accordance with his directions.

Subsections (g) and (h) will shorten and simplify the party "primary" ballots under the 1955 Election Act, by eliminating the election of alternates to the various party officials. The party primary ballots have been widely criticized because of their length and complexity. The elimination of the election of alternate officials will substantially shorten the ballots in a number of cases. At the same time, the alternates can, of course, be selected by the parties themselves, by caucus or other means not involving the use of the citywide primary election machinery. The party officials themselves (national committeemen and women, delegates to the presidential nominating conventions and, when designated by the parties, members and officials of the local party committees) would continue to be elected by ballot under the present election law.

Subsection (i) amends the existing election law to make it clear that if the local political party committee so desires, the party primary ballots may contain presidential preference questions to be answered by the voters. The bill requires that the local party committee furnish the potential presidential candidate with written information to the effect that it is so proposing his name to go on the ballot. At the same time the bill provides a mechanism by which the potential candidate may, if he chooses, remove his name from the ballot without the necessity of stating a reason for his decision in this respect.

The right to have these presidential preference questions on the ballot under the present law has been sharply disputed ever since the act was passed in 1955, and a 1964 court decision cast a further cloud on the authority of the board of elections to permit presidential preference questions under existing law. With this amendment, these presidential preference questions would also replace the so-called party questions. These party questions have been criticized as diluting the powers of the elected party officials to formulate party policies, and also because the questions add further to the length of the ballot.

Subsection (j) would remove an ambiguity in existing election law by establishing a clear deadline for filing the designations of the offices of local party committees to be filled by the party primary elections.

Under the existing election law each candidate on the ballot has the right to have one watcher at each polling place. Subsection (k) would change this arrangement slightly in the light of the length of the party primary ballots (in the 1964 election, for instance, there were over 250 candidates on the party ballots), to give the Board of Elections authority to issue regulations reasonably limiting the number of watchers in each voting place, and reasonably to regulate the scope of the watchers' activities, while at the same time preserving their rights to perform their important duties.

Subsection (l) would give the Board of Elections clear authority to declare that duly nominated and unopposed candidates for party office are elected without opposition. The fact that they have been so elected would appear on the party ballot, together with the names of all the candidates who are opposed and whose election is to be determined by the voters. This change will further simplify and shorten ballot forms, without in any way diminishing the effectiveness of the elections under the act.

Subsection (m) changes the method of compensation of the members of the three-man Board of Elections. They are now paid $25 per day while performing their duties. With the enactment of this act there will be two elections in every even-numbered year, with occasional special or party runoff elections to be expected from time to time, thus substantially increasing the activities of the Board of Elections. The amount of time spent by Board members in an election year is substantial, and the changeover to some modest, fixed annual compensation is desirable and appropriate under all the circumstances.

Subsection (n) amends the law so as to give the candidates a period of 30 days after each election in order to complete and file their financial reports. At present they have only 10 days in which to perform this work, a period which is insufficient and unworkable.

Subsection (o) tightens up the enforcement provisions of the present law so as to make it clear that any false statement by a registrant with respect to qualifications for voting will render him subject to penalty, whereas the present act limits the applicability of the penal provision to false statements as to the registrant's residence or voting privileges outside the district. The bill also makes the enforcement provisions of the act applicable to the restrictions on contributions and requirements for reporting expenditures.

Subsections (p) and (q) amend the title, and the first section of the existing law, so as to reflect the fact that the act provides for the election of the Delegate to the House of Representatives in addition to the other officials elected under the existing law.

SECTION 6

Enactment of the first five sections of this bill would have the effect of converting the present quadrennial election cycle in the District of Columbia to a biennial cycle—that is, there would be two elections in every even-numbered year, whereas at the present time there are two elections only in every fourth year—in presidential election years.

Enactment simply of these first five sections in an election year such as 1966 would raise some operating problems. It takes several months to get ready to run an election well, and funds have to be made available for the purpose.

In order to take care of these initial starting problems, section 6 has been added which authorizes special elections in the autumn of 1966 to elect a Delegate to the House to serve in the 90th Congress, which convenes next January. This section 6 specifically validates for purposes of these 1966 elections all the 1964 registrations (approximately 200,000 of them were made at that time) to the extent that the registrants prove that they continue to meet the qualifications required by the District of Columbia election law.

Section 6 also provides for additional registrations for these 1966 elections, and gives the Board of Elections flexibility in scheduling the dates for the 1966 primary and general elections for Delegate, and for party runoff elections also, if such additional elections prove to be necessary. The section provides a time limit in which the Board is required to complete the installation of the new permanent registration system to replace the present periodic registrations now required. The deadlines prescribed will assure that the permanent registration system will be in full operation for the 1968 elections.

Technical note: The bill has been drafted to meet the codification requirements of the District of Columbia Code and also, in sections 2(a) and 4, the codification requirements of the United States Code.

A CONSERVATION JOB TO DO AT HOME

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, across mid-America the land blooms, communities prosper, and there is great confidence in the future. We must trace this good fortune to the basic resources of the region—to the good earth, the water, and the hardworking and skilled people on the farms and ranches and in the towns.

We have done more than build—we have rebuilt. We have conserved and developed our resources and made them work for us. We are proud of this heritage. But we know that we can sustain our prosperity only by continued dedication to the principles of sound resource conservation and development.

We know, too, that all is not well with the land and the waters that flow across it. The soil still washes and blows where it should be held secure by vegetation. The streams are polluted with wastes that limit or destroy the value of this needed water.

While we have accomplished much in conserving and developing our land and water resources, we have much yet to do.

In Kansas, soil conservation districts embrace every farm and ranch, and the majority of these districts have signed modernized agreements with the Department of Agriculture to permit broader and more useful development of the rural lands and waters of the State.

Yet, only 34 percent of the needed soil and water conservation work on Kansas farms and ranches has been completed, and at the current completion rate of about 1½ percent per year the job clearly will take a long time to finish.

Of a total of 236 watersheds that need project-type action in Kansas, 40 have been authorized for planning assistance, and of these 21 have been authorized for installation of works of improvement.

These examples are a brief indication of basic soil and water conservation work that remains to be done in Kansas. A similar picture could be drawn for every

State, for every State has a great backlog of watershed protection and other conservation work waiting to be acted on. This is a challenge we cannot ignore.

We must move resolutely forward in programs to conserve and develop our soil and water and related resources—to clean our streams and curb further pollution of them; to prevent damaging floods; to save the soil from washing and blowing away; to make the best possible use of our water resources through impoundment and distribution as needed for building sound local economies; to preserve the woodlands from heedless exploitation; to enrich the lives of our people by continuing to make the countryside a more beautiful as well as a more useful place for the benefit of all Americans.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8282 which is pending on the important matter of unemployment compensation, is of a good deal of interest to all of us in the House. I have been in contact with a constituent of mine, Mr. Richard H. Barry, a well-known financial and business consultant, who has some ideas pertinent to the revision of this legislation. They are embodied in a resolution from the Fargo Chamber of Commerce, which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point for the study of those interested:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Fargo Chamber of Commerce:

1. Is strongly in favor of an equitable system for both employees and employers in administering the mechanics and financing cycles of temporary and seasonal unemployment in the permanent work force as distinguished from part time or occasional workers, and

2. Recognizes the need and advisability to up date the unemployment compensation insurance system from time to time in the light of experience and changing conditions, such as the premise in most States that the employer should pay 100 percent of the cost of unemployment insurance; and

3. Is unalterably opposed to H.R. 8282 in its present form, as it is woefully inadequate insofar as the need for an up-to-date system of unemployment insurance is concerned; and

4. Suggest that the time has come for the Congress of the United States to redefine the following:

4.1 The purpose and scope of unemployment compensation insurance; and

4.2 The respective financial responsibilities of the employer, the employee and the general public to pay the insurance premiums, first for cycles of temporary and seasonal employment of the permanent work force, and second, the much higher cost of insurance programs embracing part time and occasional workers, plus cycles in excess of 6 months; and

4.3 The duties and compensation of the State and Federal administrators of the program, plus the mechanics of how such regulators and administrators are appointed; and

5. Suggest to the Congress of the United States that legislative bills such as H.R. 8282 are frequently drawn and sponsored by civil service employees of the United States Department of Labor giving to them, through the office of the Secretary of Labor, unwarranted and excessive bureaucratic control without sufficient regard for the following:

5.1. The full context of what is in the best interests of the public; and

5.2. For the tax inequities caused the majority of employers; and

5.3. For the excessive financial burdens for the majority of small employers with stable payrolls; and

5.4. For the denial to all employers of effective recourse to the judicial branch of government to establish the intent of the law; and

6. Suggest that the foregoing preamble to the resolution summarizes the attitude of the vast majority of employers in describing their concern with the implications of H.R. 8282 to grant to a few unidentified key employees in the vast U.S. Department of Labor under the guise of authority to issue routine regulations or bring about uniformity, a wide range of excessive control over the rights of employers and in effect making such Federal administrators the sole proprietors of all knowledge; and

7. Suggest that the Federal advisory commissions appointed in the past exclusively by the U.S. Secretaries of Labor to represent labor, business and the best interests of the citizens as a whole have failed to function effectively in that capacity; and

8. Suggest that a specific instance of the failure of a recent Federal Advisory Commission to function for extended periods of time and failure to issue reports at reasonable intervals is shown by the attached letter dated August 2, 1962, from the office of the late Congressman, Hjalmer C. Nygaard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress in its evaluation of H.R. 8282 be hereby urged to take into consideration the foregoing preamble and take affirmative action to have the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate appoint a full-time bipartisan three-man Unemployment Compensation Board of Administration of which the Secretary of Labor would be an ex officio member to deal more knowingly and equitably with the employee and employer in the full context of what is in the best interest of the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the following Members of Congress for the State of North Dakota with the request that each of them evaluate these recommendations and if they are in accord with them that they write their colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives encompassing their thoughts on the substance and spirit of this resolution: Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, Congressman MARK ANDREWS, and Congressman ROLLAND REDLIN.

FARGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1962.

Mr. RICHARD BARRY,
Fargo, N. Dak.

DEAR MR. BARRY: Unfortunately I am not able to come up with the material you wanted relative to S. 3411 and H.R. 12385, copies of which are enclosed.

I am advised that the Federal Advisory Commission under the Bureau of Employment Security is not functioning at present. The terms of the past members have expired and new members have not as yet been appointed. It is expected they will be named within the next 10 days or 2 weeks at which time I will send you the names. The last report published by this Commission came out in 1954 and is now out of print. I have been put on a waiting list for any new report which may be forthcoming.

This is a rather vague and cloudy reply, but it is the best I can give you under the circumstances. Under separate cover, I am sending you a 1962 Congressional Directory. On pages 516 and 517 you will find the makeup of the Bureau of Employment Security which may give you some information that will be helpful. I am holding copies of the two bills and the information you gave me over the phone for Mr. Nygaard.

Sincerely,
IRENE MARTIN EDWARDS,
Assistant to Congressman Hjalmar C. Nygaard.

HAIPHONG, THE SANCTUARY THAT HURTS

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken so often of this matter that I feel a little redundant. However, the issue is too vital, so important to our Nation, that I feel compelled to bring the matter to the attention of the House and the public until something effective is done about it.

My reference is to the need of blockading Haiphong and other North Vietnam ports in order to keep the British and other free world ships particularly from carrying in supplies to the Vietcong. I am happy the Greek Government no longer permits Greek-flag ships to engage in this trade; so, perhaps we are making progress, even if it is slow.

It has been noted that Soviet Russian vessels are carrying the latest Mig-21's to Haiphong for unloading; one ship we have been informed, arrived just the other day. Yet the propaganda line is to paint the Russians as the "good guys" and the Red Chinese who are presently doing far less for the Vietcong as the "baddies."

While I do not pretend to be an authority on this subject, others are. By unanimous consent, I introduce an editorial from Navy, the official publication of the Navy League of the United States:

HAIPHONG, THE SANCTUARY THAT HURTS

The question of when or whether the United States should take decisive steps to shut off the flow of arms and war supplies into Haiphong, North Vietnam's biggest and busiest port, continues to gnaw at the Johnson administration.

Pressure for such action has mounted in recent weeks, as American aircraft losses and the number of North Vietnamese regular army troops infiltrating into the south increase. The principal methods advocated are these: (1) bombing from the air; (2) laying of minefields in the harbor, and (3) the establishment of a partial blockade or quarantine of the type ordered by President Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and now a Presidential adviser on Vietnam, told Congress early last month that he believed it was time to do something about Haiphong. He said he throught mining the harbor would be the simplest way to discourage shipping from entering that port.

About a week later, a raft of interpretive stories came out of the Pentagon—indicating that a background session for reporters had been held by official spokesmen—which said that the Joint Chiefs want to bomb some of Haiphong's industrial and petroleum storage areas as part of a general expansion of the air war against North Vietnam.

Several leading Republicans, including Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen and former Vice President Richard Nixon, have been advocating a blockade of the Communist port. A number of influential Democrats in Congress, Senators Russell and Symington, for example, also favor such a step.

EXPLOITING OUR FEARS

The thinking behind these recommendations for ending the de facto sanctuary status of Haiphong goes like this: It doesn't make sense to bomb North Vietnam at all if the Communists are allowed to import anti-aircraft guns and missiles and the shells and bullets which make the bombing more expensive in American lives and money and increase the casualties among our forces engaged against the enemy in the south.

The administration, however, is fearful that if we attack Haiphong, or blockade it, we might risk a serious crisis with the Soviet Union and/or Communist China. The Russians and Chinese are well aware of this fear and have exploited it. The Russians reportedly have passed the word through diplomatic channels that if we strike either Haiphong or the capital city of Hanoi (also a sanctuary) they will have to take some kind of counteraction. The Chinese have said the same thing publicly. According to a member of the Philippine Senate, who had just returned from a visit to Peking, the Chinese told her that they would feel justified in entering the Vietnamese war if the United States attacked the two big cities in the north.

State Department and Pentagon leaders have played down the heavy military aid the Soviet Union has been giving the North Vienamese aggressor, presumably on the theory that good relations with Moscow should be maintained so that it might, one day, persuade Hanoi that it should come with us to the peace table. As a consequence there has been a tendency on the part of the administration to downgrade the importance of Haiphong to the war effort against us and also to entangle it with the question of bombing Hanoi, for which there is far less pressure.

Accordingly, there must have some red faces in Washington late last month when a copy of a letter purportedly sent by the Kremlin to Communist parties around the world found its way into print in the Western World. Dealing with the Moscow-Peking split, the communication for the first time gave the American people a fairly detailed account of the kind and scope of the military aid the U.S.S.R. has been supplying our enemy. Here is what it said, in part:

"The Soviet Union delivers large amounts of weapons to the DRV (Democratic Republic of Vietnam), including rocket installations, anti-aircraft artillery, airplanes, tanks, coastal guns, warships, and other items. In 1965 alone, weapons and other war materiel worth about 500 million rubles ($550 million) were placed at the disposal of the DRV.

"The DRV is receiving support in the training of pilots, rocket personnel, tank drivers, artillerymen, and so on. Our military aid is being rendered to the extent the Vietnamese leadership itself thinks necessary."

Figures on the value of Chinese military aid to North Vietnam are not available, but it is doubtful that it would match the Soviet's half-billion dollar annual rate, a rate the Kremlin makes clear may go even higher—Hanoi only has to ask.

BULK OF IT GOES BY SEA

With China and the U.S.S.R. assailing each other so bitterly that some observers believe the two Communist giants are near a complete break, it may be assumed that the bulk of this Soviet aid reaches North Vietnam by ship, through Haiphong. Again, the Kremlin letter referred to above sheds some light. It said:

"The Chinese Communist Party leadership hindered the implementation of the agreement of the Government of the U.S.S.R. with the Government of the DRV on an immediate increase in military aid for the DRV. The CCP leaders did not permit Soviet transport planes with weapons to fly over CPR (Chinese Peoples Republic) territory.

"Then, Chinese personalities also placed obstacles in the way of the transportation of war materiel to Vietnam by rail. Thus, at their request, an additional shipment of military equipment, including anti-aircraft artillery, which is needed so urgently to protect the Vietnamese cities and villages against the United States air pirates, was recently delivered to the Vietnamese comrades. The Chinese authorities refused for a long time to relay the freight, under the pretense that the papers for its transit had not yet been filled out and that they did not know whether Vietnam needs this war materiel."

It is clear that the port of Haiphong is vitally important to the North Vietnamese war effort and that this importance will increase as Soviet and East European Communist aid expands. Militarily, it would make sense to disrupt this lifeline that helps sustain our enemy. We control the sea and the air and could do so. There are, of course, diplomatic and political factors that the President must weigh. But the American people now know, ironically from the Kremlin and not from the White House, how vast the Soviet military aid to North Vietnam is and how necessary Haiphong is to its delivery. The pressure for a new decision by the President is bound to increase further. Should he decide to allow Haiphong to remain a sanctuary, he will have to make a new case. His present one is not convincing.

DISRUPTIVE CCC CORN SALES SHOULD BE THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATED

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1966, I sent the following letter to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, calling his attention to the recent policies of the Commodity Credit Corporation which have initiated a potentially disastrous situation in the Minnesota corn market:

March 8, 1966.

Hon. Harold D. Cooley,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In the face of departmental predictions to the contrary and drastically dropping corn prices, the Commodify Credit Corporation has dumped nearly 175 million bushels of corn on the market since the first of this year. During the past 9 weeks, the Commodity Credit Corporation has disposed of about one-third of the total CCC reserve supply.

Can this be the same Government agency which predicted in December that corn requirements this year could "be met largely out of the 1965 crop, with only limited amounts of corn expected to be made available from (Government-owned) stocks"? On December 17, the USDA announced that sales in 1966 would be less than last year's total of 417 million bushels. Nevertheless, in the first 9 weeks of 1966, the Commodity Credit Corporation has sold a total which already amounts to 42 percent of the entire 1965 total. In January, the Commodity Credit Corporation dumped 62 million bushels of corn, compared to only 8.4 million bushels in December. The February total of 140.2 million bushels dumped was the highest for any month in 4 years and more than double the amount for February 1965. The Commodity Credit Corporation seems bound and determined to break their newly established record this month. Last week, they unloaded 72 million bushels of corn.

In 2 days of last week, the Commodity Credit Corporation dumped 40 million bushels of corn in Minneapolis; nearly five times the amount sold in December on all markets. These sales in Minneapolis were made at 6 to 7 cents under the level of the futures contract in Chicago for March. The closing prices of corn futures after these two days were from 6⅜ to as much as 10 cents below the February 14 level.

Most of the unloaded grain was purchased by domestic users. In February, for example, the Government sold 122.9 million bushels for domestic use and 17.3 million bushels for export. Why has this heavy emphasis on domestic sales occurred during a year when exporters say that total exports will exceed 700 million bushels if the supplies are available at ports, an increase of 130 million bushels over the 1964–65 total.

The answer, of course, is a concerted Government effort to drive the farmer's corn prices down. This effort has succeeded, as it always has. Prices on No. 2 yellow corn in Chicago have dropped since mid-February from $1.33 to $1.27. Prices on corn sold for future delivery on the Chicago Board of Trade closed last Friday at $1.23 a bushel, down 8 cents from mid-January.

It is very discouraging to farmers that, at a time when the parity price ratio shows signs of creeping upward, the heavy hand of the Commodity Credit Corporation would shatter this reviving trend with its dumping practices. It may be that as in the recent cases of actual or threatened dumping of aluminum and steel, the official excuse will be that of curbing inflation. However, someone will have to prove to me how a segment of our economy can be held responsible for our growing threat of inflation when they only receive 80-some percent return on their contribution to our economy.

A better explanation for these recent dumping practices just might be tied in with their timing. This happens to be the time of year that farmers are being asked to sign up for acreage-retirement programs. As some corn traders have suggested, "we can only suspect the corn disposal has the aim of discouraging a large corn acreage this year." This amounts to no less than economic assault being used to force farmers into programs which Congress clearly intended to remain voluntary.

I would hope that through your leadership, the House Committee on Agriculture will act quickly to halt this misinterpretation of congressional intent and insure the restitution of the grain market to the supply and demand influences of a free economy.

Sincerely yours,

Ancher Nelsen,
Member of Congress.

On March 28, I received the following reply from Chairman Cooley:

House of Representatives,
Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1966.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ancher: I forwarded to Secretary Freeman your letter of March 8, concerning Government activities in the corn market, requesting of the Department a discussion which might be useful in understanding these activities. I now have a response from Mr. John A. Schnittker, Under Secretary, a copy of which is enclosed, along with a table he supplied.

There seems to be substantial disagreement on what is being done and what is being accomplished. I'd appreciate your comments upon Mr. Schnittker's letter.

Sincerely yours,

Harold D. Cooley,
Chairman.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1966.

Hon. Harold D. Cooley,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Chairman: We appreciate this opportunity to respond to the inaccurate or misleading statements contained in Congressman Ancher Nelsen's letter to you which was forwarded to us for reply.

The Department, in the press release noted by Congressman Nelsen, stated that CCC sales in 1965-66 were expected to be considerably smaller than in the previous year, but, we further indicated that in application of the ever-normal-granary principle, CCC supplies would be offered as necessary to insure an orderly movement of supplies into domestic use and export. This principle involves acquisitions by CCC when supplies are overburdensome and releasing stocks when the market flow is inadequate. The basic objective of the ever-normal-granary and CCC sales policy is that of promoting orderly marketing over a period of years and within a given marketing year. This has been, and is presently the basis for the CCC sales and procurement policy.

As has been the case since enactment of the present type of feed grain program, the Department this season has offered its storable corn supplies for unrestricted domestic use at the market price but not less than the legal minimum, that is, the applicable loan, plus a gradually increasing monthly markup. The markup this season began with 4¼ cents per bushel for October (compared to nothing in past years) and is again being increased by 1½ cents in each succeeding month to reach a scheduled final total of 17¾ cents for July, August, and September.

Thus, the CCC minimum price has a built-in upward seasonal trend and is above the current loan redemption value for producers at all times by a gradually widening difference.

Sales of corn for restricted use, mainly for export, or of nonstorable qualities, have also been available at not less than market price.

The increase in rate of disposals beyond the levels indicated in December is accounted for by several subsequent developments. First, it became apparent by February that total utilization would be larger than initially estimated by nearly 90 million bushels, including an increase of 50 million bushels in exports. The estimate of the 1965 corn crop also was adjusted downward by 8 million bushels and from the feed value standpoint may actually be somewhat lower.

Second, an unevenness developed in the market offerings of corn after harvest accompanied by an uncharacteristic price movement considering the size of the 1965 crop (see tables 1 and 2), partly because a larger-than-usual proportion of the new crop went into storage at relatively high moisture levels, hence was taking more time to get into condition considered desirable for sale by producers. A good many producers also reacted to the somewhat unqualified discussion of growing world food needs by putting off corn sales against the possibility of a big surge later in export demand.

It became apparent by January that if the Department was to carry out its general responsibility of insuring an adequate and reasonably steady supply movement to users, it would be insufficient to limit CCC offerings, as initially anticipated, primarily to get rid of supplies unsuitable for further storage and to meet the needs of the emergency livestock feed program at concessional prices as required by law.

As more was learned about the low quality and high-moisture condition of 1965 corn in the northwest Corn Belt, particularly in Minnesota, it also became apparent that considerable quantities of dry corn from CCC stocks would be desired for blending with the new crop to improve its acceptability in the market. In this connection, it may be mentioned that up to 2 million bushels of CCC bin site corn per week are continuing on offer to local Minnesota buyers to further insure coverage of blending needs.

From now on, however, it seems likely that total CCC disposals will taper off substantially as the movement of corn from other sources normalizes.

Incidentally, the reference to CCC disposals of about 140 million bushels in February being the highest in 4 years for that month is not a very good indicator of the average overall monthly rate so far this season. At only 4.8 and 8.5 million bushels respectively, the recent October and December rates were the lowest for those months in all of the five seasons since the present type of feed grain program began. The November total of 19 million bushels was the lowest for the month in the five seasons with the exception of 1964-65 and at less than 62 million bushels the current January disposals were the smallest for the month except in 1963-64.

We hope that the foregoing deals adequately with respect to the points raised in the letter from Congressman Nelsen.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Schnittker,
Under Secretary.

Table 1.—*Corn: Receipts at primary markets, by weeks, October–March 1963–66*

Period [1]	1963–64 market receipts [2]	1964–65 market receipts [2]	1965–66 market receipts [2]
	Thousands of bushels	*Thousands of bushels*	*Thousands of bushels*
Week ended:			
Oct. 2	4,253	8,357	4,755
Oct. 9	4,489	6,339	4,766
Oct. 16	7,460	6,710	3,883
Oct. 23	14,115	12,981	4,894
Oct. 30	23,341	18,935	4,986
Nov. 6	22,860	21,926	9,690
Nov. 13	23,490	21,594	14,373
Nov. 20	24,931	17,883	17,386
Nov. 27	14,457	9,678	16,103
Dec. 4	14,909	9,084	14,438
Dec. 11	9,819	6,144	12,609
Dec. 18	6,030	4,986	9,687
Dec. 25	3,437	4,359	5,941
Jan. 1	4,030	2,803	2,912
Jan. 8	6,972	5,067	3,856
Jan. 15	8,393	8,050	6,461
Jan. 22	9,915	8,179	6,960
Jan. 29	9,706	7,676	7,890
Feb. 5	9,310	6,219	7,617
Feb. 12	8,761	7,930	7,871
Feb. 19	6,107	7,897	7,497
Feb. 26	6,034	8,971	7,970
Mar. 5	4,961	7,171	8,818
Mar. 12	4,931	6,266	7,641

Table 1.—*Corn: Receipts at primary markets, by weeks, October–March 1963–66*—Con.

Period [1]	1963–64 market receipts [2]	1964–65 market receipts [2]	1965–66 market receipts [2]
Total receipts:	*Millions of bushels*	*Millions of bushels*	*Millions of bushels*
Oct. 2–30	53.7	53.3	18.5
Nov. 27	139.6	124.3	76.1
Jan. 1	173.7	148.9	118.7
Jan. 29	212.7	180.7	146.9
Feb. 26	242.9	211.7	177.8
Mar. 12	252.7	222.1	191.7

[1] Market receipts for week ended previous Thursday.

[2] Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Duluth, St. Louis, Kansas City, Peoria, Omaha, Indianapolis, Sioux City, St. Joseph, Wichita, and Toledo.

Table 2.—*Corn, all grades: Cash sales price per bushel at 5 markets, by weeks, October–March 1963–66* [1]

[In cents per bushel]

Week ending—	1963-66
1963	
Oct. 11	124.6
Oct. 18	118.7
Oct. 25	116.6
Nov. 1	115.7
Nov. 8	117.3
Nov. 15	116.5
Nov. 22	115.1
Nov. 29	113.3
Dec. 6	116.5
Dec. 13	119.2
Dec. 20	120.9
Dec. 27	121.8
1964	
Jan. 3	118.2
Jan. 10	120.3
Jan. 17	121.4
Jan. 24	119.9
Jan. 31	120.3
Feb. 7	119.2
Feb. 14	117.8
Feb. 21	117.7
Feb. 28	119.4
Mar. 6	120.3
Mar. 13	120.2
Oct. 9	124.0
Oct. 16	122.7
Oct. 23	120.3
Oct. 30	119.2
Nov. 6	118.6
Nov. 13	119.0
Nov. 20	120.6
Nov. 27	122.7
Dec. 4	123.3
Dec. 11	124.7
Dec. 18	126.6
Dec. 25	127.3
1965	
Jan. 1	125.2
Jan. 8	126.7
Jan. 15	128.0
Jan. 22	129.4
Jan. 29	128.1
Feb. 5	127.7
Feb. 12	126.9
Feb. 19	126.5
Feb. 26	124.9
Mar. 5	125.1
Mar. 12	128.2
Oct. 8	120.2
Oct. 15	120.3
Oct. 22	120.4
Oct. 29	116.4
Nov. 5	115.6
Nov. 12	115.0
Nov. 19	113.4
Nov. 26	113.6
Dec. 3	116.5
Dec. 10	117.5
Dec. 17	119.0
Dec. 24	122.5
Dec. 31	121.7
1966	
Jan. 7	123.9
Jan. 14	127.7
Jan. 21	128.0
Jan. 28	127.9
Feb. 4	126.4
Feb. 11	126.4
Feb. 18	124.4
Feb. 25	120.5
Mar. 4	118.1
Mar. 11	121.4

The included markets are Chicago, Minneapolis, Omaha, Kansas City, and St. Louis.

In response to Chairman COOLEY's request for my comments on the letter from Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnittker, I have today sent the following reply:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1966.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the farmers, country elevator operators, and the grain trade in general in Minnesota, I take this opportunity to thank you for your interest and concern regarding the plight in which these people now find themselves due to the recent actions of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The many letters which I have received certainly indicate that there is valid cause for such concern, and I know that all of these people will sincerely appreciate any actions which you and the committee decide to take to investigate these policies of the CCC.

I was disappointed to note that in the reply from the Department which was signed by Under Secretary John A. Schnittker, it was suggested that my letter to you contained "inaccurate or misleading statements." I regret this because it would seem to indicate that whoever was responsible for the reply you received did not read my letter very carefully. As a result, the information contained in the reply was inadequate and thus, misleading.

The reply is filled with high-sounding phrases like "ever-normal granary principle * * * orderly movement * * * adequate and reasonably steady supply" and "releasing stocks when the market flow is inadequate." The reply, however, neglects to comment on the effects on the market price that the recent sales in Minnesota have had. It seems more important to me to know how much grain the market will bear in any particular year in each area rather than to try to equalize the annual volume irregardless of other circumstances. I fail to find the element of "orderly marketing" in the fact that the CCC sold only 8 million bushels of corn during October and November when the market receipts were the lowest, and then they turned around and sold 140 million bushels in February. I might mention the fact that if the Department of Agriculture didn't realize until February that Minnesota corn farmers harvested a wet crop last year, then they were the last to find out.

In spite of the high-sounding phrases, the reply is inadequate if it pretends to successfully question my figures regarding the price-depressing effects of these sales policies. I realize that this is a pretty ticklish area in view of the now-famous statement of Gardner Ackley, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers: "We're trying to hold down the price of corn." I protest strongly the increasing efforts of the entire administration to make the farmers pay for the growing threat of inflation which is clearly not their fault. Even so, these recent actions by the CCC are poorly designed if they are to carry out the directives of Mr. Ackley. They are doomed to backfire.

This entire effort is designed to lower feed costs and thus bring down the prices of pork and beef products. However, the way these corn stocks are being handled, the ultimate effect is going to be just the opposite.

The handling of the approximately 47 million bushels of corn which were sold by the CCC to terminal operators in the Minneapolis market on March 2 and 3 completely and flagrantly violates the charter which established the CCC. In the charter, Congress directed the CCC to use the "usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade" in its sales policies. Because of the violation of this provision, the cost of feed grain to the livestock raisers is going to increase, not decrease. In turn then, we will have higher, not lower meat prices.

The livestock growers have traditionally relied on their local country elevators to supply them with feed grains when needed. Now we find the CCC removing this source of supply in order to fill the orders for which they contracted in the early March Minneapolis sales. These country elevator operators would buy this grain immediately if given the chance. Instead, they were given a chance to purchase only 40 percent of the CCC stocks which they were storing. The rest will be shipped from the feed deficit areas in thousands of boxcars (which are already in short supply) to the terminal markets. If the local warehousemen are forced to buy this same grain back, they will do so at higher prices due to freight and commission expenses. These higher prices will then, of course, be charged to the livestock feeders, and ultimately to the consumers.

I have received many telephone calls and letters from distressed country elevator operators outlining these problems. I referred one such letter to Secretary Freeman and received a reply on March 30 from Mr. E. A. Jaenke, Associate Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. Mr. Jaenke admitted that the usual "ship or buy" option was not offered on the current loading orders being issued to country elevators. He then claimed that adequate stocks were available for local needs. Since this information seemed to be in direct contrast to the information I had been receiving from the country elevator operators, I contacted the local warehousemen and asked them to furnish me with details on their particular situations.

The first response I received from this request was in the form of a special bulletin published by the Northwest Country Elevator Association for its members. The bulletin points out that the latest loading orders did not include the usual "ship or buy" option. The grain must be shipped as soon as possible to the terminal markets. Thus, the CCC has replaced the country elevator as the principal supplier of the terminal markets. It was also noted that since the elevators in drought-stricken counties were not affected by the earlier loading orders which included the option to buy, the new total-supply loading orders would hit these beleaguered areas even harder.

The bulletin includes a prediction which will undoubtably upset Mr. Ackley: "Since CCC corn is no longer available in these areas, it means that these local elevators and their feeder customers are going to be faced with substantially higher corn prices, inasmuch as they will have to come to the terminal market or go to other areas where corn is available and buy it and move it into their area. This would not have needed to be done, in most instances, had the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks remained available to country elevator operators, as has been the practice in the past."

For your information I am enclosing a copy of the associations' bulletin and the letter from Mr. Jaenke.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the matter to your continued attention. The abrupt and disruptive nature of the March 2–3 sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation in direct violation of the spirit if not the letter of the corporation's charter require the immediate consideration of your committee and the Congress. Hearings in your committee could be directed to develop the spurious reasoning behind the loading orders which were so destructive to the entire grain marketing system in Minnesota and so potentially disastrous to the farm economy. I fail to understand why the farmer and the farm economy should be victimized by the use of the CCC as a price fixing agency of the Government contrary to the purpose for which it was established by the Congress.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1966.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSEN: Further reference is made to your letter dated March 16, 1966, in which you enclosed a letter from Mr. Dale Rollag, manager, Adrian Cooperative Elevator, Lismore, Minn., pertaining to the shipment of Commodity Credit Corporation-owned corn and the adequacy of corn supplies for local use by farmers and merchants.

It is true that CCC is not offering the "ship or buy" option on current loading orders being issued to country elevators. CCC needs its country elevator corn stocks to fill outstanding to-arrive sales. However, I want to assure you that there are ample supplies of corn available in private hands and CCC stocks. Farmers and others need have no concern over a shortage of corn for feeding or other purposes, even though our sales for shipment out of the area have been heavy.

An analysis recently completed on the supply requirements situation for corn in this area, especially around Minneapolis, shows us that additional quantities of corn can be made available from CCC stocks for local use. During the past 5 weeks, approximately 3.3 million bushels of corn have been offered each week in the Minnesota-South Dakota area. Approximately two-thirds of the corn offered was sold at prevailing market prices.

In order to allay fears that corn supplies will be depleted in that area we are stepping up our sales offer to 2 million bushels per week in Minnesota and 1 million bushels per week in South Dakota. These offers will be for corn at binsites. Good quality dry corn from bins will be made available in sufficient quantities through the spring months for purchase by farmers, warehousemen, or others for blending with high moisture corn still on farms in both States. Weekly offerings from binsites could be further increased later on if required.

CCC has sales of about 33 million bushels for delivery in Minneapolis, for which no loading orders had been issued. We have about 41.9 million bushels of CCC corn in binsites in Minnesota and South Dakota. In addition there are approximately 23 million bushels of 1961crop corn currently under reseal in these States. These two sources assure us of enough corn to meet both CCC's commitments and the increased offerings.

We share your concern over the need for high quality low moisture corn and assure you that CCC expects to fulfill its commitments to the farmers and to the grain and livestock industries by making available supplies of high quality dry corn to blend with high moisture corn currently moving off farms. If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

E. A. JAENKE,
Administrator.

NORTHWEST COUNTRY ELEVATOR ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 31, 1966.

SPECIAL BULLETIN

MEMBER FIRMS: Much interest has been shown in the recent CCC corn sales in this area. Our Congressmen have been receiving questions and complaints. We were asked to prepare some background information for use by a Congressman from this area. After preparing the material, it was decided that many Members might find it useful, so it is being sent to you as a special bulletin.

CCC CORN SALES—ORDERLY MARKETING?

The sale of approximately 47 million bushels of corn by CCC to terminal operators in the Minneapolis market on March 2 and 3 was a most unusual sale—of a type which the Minneapolis ASCS Branch Commodity Office had not previously made. This brought the Minneapolis branch office's sales for the year 1966 to 73 million bushels. This 73 million bushels consisted of 64 million bushels of corn sold for unrestricted use, 7 million bushels of Durum for export, 1.5 million bushels of flax for export, and 500,000 bushels of barley for export.

It is interesting to compare this 73 million bushels sold in the first two and a fraction months of 1966 with the total sales for the calendar year 1965 made by the Minneapolis Branch ASCS Office. Both figures total 73 million bushels. Of the 73 million bushels sold in 1965, only 18.9 were corn and practically all of this was sold at country elevator level and none was sold to terminal operators on the basis of the recent sales.

Early in January 1966, the Minneapolis branch office issued loading orders to Minnesota and South Dakota country elevators, storing CCC corn, for approximately 20 percent of the inventory located in those elevators. The exception was that no loading orders were issued in those counties that last year were drought counties. Of this 20 percent loading order, almost all of it was purchased by the storing warehouse. At the end of January, another 20 percent loading order was issued to these same elevators and again practically all of it was purchased by the storing elevator.

A typical situation is the Becker Grain & Lumber Co., of Northrop, Minn. Their CCC corn inventory on December 31 was 106,775 bushels. On January 7, they received a loading order for 22,671 bushels of sample grade corn. This was purchased on January 12 when the Minneapolis cash market closed at $1.28. The purchase price paid by this firm was $1.15¾, arrived at as follows: 1 cent was added to the Minneapolis price because the corn was dry and 5 cents in discounts was allowed because it was sample grade. The freight was 7.28 cents per bushel and the commission 1.28 cents for a total of 8½ cents.

On January 30, they received another loading order for 22,775 bushels, which they purchased on February 1. The Minneapolis close on February 1 was $1.22. The price paid by Becker Grain & Lumber Co. was $1.11½. This was No. 4 corn on which they were allowed a 2-cent discount and there was again 8½ cents for freight and commission. I talked to Mr. Becker on March 30 and he told me that he would gladly have purchased the balance of the corn on his inventory, as he needed it for mixing locally with the high-moisture, high-damage 1965 crop.

Of the 40 percent loading orders issued in January, only about 5 percent was actually shipped and 95 percent was purchased by the storing elevators, as it was needed for local feed use or for blending with the high-moisture 1965 crop. Much of the 1965 crop is so high in moisture it cannot be safely shipped to market unless it is blended with old, dry corn and, of course, this means it must be done at the country elevator before shipment.

When CCC made the sales of 47 million bushels on March 2 and 3, they issued loading orders for the balance of the corn stored in country elevators and advised those elevators that they could not purchase any of the corn because it all had to be moved to market to satisfy these sales. This procedure was contrary to previous practices which CCC had followed. It might be said that, in making sales of this type, CCC deviated from the intent of Congress in that they did not use the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade as provided in the CCC charter. In this instance, they usurped the position of the country elevator operator and commissionman, inasmuch as they became the suppliers of the terminal market and deviated from previous practice wherein they had disposed of their corn as near the point of production as possible.

Although all country elevators involved were hurt by this action on the part of CCC, those hurt the most, in many cases, were the elevators located in the drought counties, as they had not previously received any loading orders. Therefore, their entire inventories were ordered shipped and many needed this corn for local use and would gladly have bought it if it had been offered to them.

Another rather interesting aspect of this sale is that this corn was sold for unrestricted use at the market, inasmuch as it was deemed to be nonstorable—a rather strained interpretation of the definition of nonstorable corn. Up to this time, CCC had always considered grades Nos. 1, 2, and 3 as storable corn and only grades Nos. 4 and 5 and sample grade as nonstorable. The big sales of March 2 and 3 were made on the basis of No. 3 corn with No. 4 and No. 5 to apply at a discount. Grade No. 1 and grade No. 2 cannot apply on these contracts, inasmuch as it is considered storable and under the law would have to be sold at the feed grain formula price, which in most instances would be somewhat higher than the price at which this corn was sold.

Rightly or wrongly, country elevator operators had been accustomed to CCC's method of selling corn. This method being that, under most circumstances, the country elevator operator would have the opportunity of buying corn once it was placed on loading order. Many country elevator operators, particularly in areas that had a bad corn crop last year, depended on the CCC grain as a source of local corn. It is badly needed for feed in many areas and, if the 1965 crop is to be marketed successfully, of necessity it must be blended with dry, heavy corn. The 1965 crop was high in moisture, rather immature, and low in test weight and is basically unmarketable unless it can be blended with dry corn. The main source of dry corn and, in many cases, the only source of dry corn available were the CCC stocks located in country elevators. It is true that a substantial quantity of CCC-owned grain is located in binsites and some of this corn has been put up for sale on a bid basis in certain localities and, it is my understanding, is still being offered for sale in certain localities. A check with the Minnesota ASCS Office this week revealed that so far this month (March) they had sold about 1.1 million bushels of binsite corn, of which 282,000 bushels was nonstorable and 805,000 bushels was storable.

However, it should be kept in mind that CCC does not have binsite corn at all places and the country elevator operator, in areas where there is no binsite corn, has no other sources of supply of dry corn except the stocks of CCC grain stored in his own elevator. A good example of this is Dakota County where a dealer advised me there were no Government stocks of binsite corn and only 171,000 bushels of CCC-owned country elevator stored corn, which of course has all been ordered out even though it is badly needed locally.

At the time CCC made the big sales of March 2 and 3, they had in their inventory, in this area, approximately 15 million bushels of corn stored in country elevators in Minnesota, approximately 5 million bushels in elevators in South Dakota, and about 33 million bushels of uncommitted corn in Minnesota binsites and 18 million bushels of uncommitted corn in South Dakota binsites. This totals 71 million bushels and, since No. 1 and No. 2 cannot apply on contracts, it seems logical to expect that practically all of the CCC corn will be used to fill these big sales. It should be kept in mind that the Minneapolis Branch ASCS Office has direct control of and makes direct sales of warehouse-stored corn, whereas the State ASCS offices, acting through the county ASCS offices, have operational control of CCC corn stored in binsites and are the agents of CCC in selling the binsite corn. When binsite corn is moved on ex-bin loading orders, the county ASCS office supervises the removal of the corn from the binsites, including the securing of samples, supervision of weighing at the elevator, and payment of charges for removing and transporting grain to the warehouse.

Both Minnesota and South Dakota State ASCS offices reported that, according to their own figures, they had about 14 million bushels each of No. 1 and No. 2 corn located in their binsites. If this corn actually comes out of the binsites and grades as high as the State indicates it should, CCC will have to wait until takeover of corn starting August 1, in order to fulfill their contracts.

It is interesting to note that over half the binsite corn in both States is from the 1956 or earlier crop years. Some Minnesota binsite stocks are from the 1951 crop and some South Dakota stocks are from the 1952 crop. In fact, over 25 percent of the South Dakota binsite stocks are from the 1953 crop. Basically, this corn is in excellent condition and could probably have been stored for several more years. In fact, on the basis of a sample taken from each bin last December, South Dakota reports show that they consider over 85 percent of the 1953-crop corn would still grade No. 1 or No. 2.

As far as the CCC-owned corn, both elevator-stored and binsite-stored, is concerned there was absolutely no need to sell the corn because it was nonstorable. It had kept for years and was in no danger of spoiling. The fact that the corn was sold as "nonstorable" was a strained use of the term and had no relation to the storability of the corn.

There is no question in my mind that CCC could have sold practically all of the elevator-stored corn back to the storing elevators at a net price considerably in excess of what they sold it for on the sales of March 2 and 3, provided the sales had been spread over a 2- or 3-month period. I say this because in many instances corn was needed locally. Since CCC corn is no longer available in these areas, it means that these local elevators and their feeder customers are going to be faced with substantially higher corn prices, inasmuch as they will have to come to the terminal market or go to other areas where corn is available and buy it and move it into their area. This would not have needed to be done, in most instances, had the Commodity Credit stocks remained available to country elevator operators, as has been the practice in the past.

Another particularly distressing aspect of the big sales of March 2 and 3 by the Minneapolis branch ASCS office is that it compounds an already very serious shortage of boxcars in this area. At the time of the sales, this area had been suffering from the most serious boxcar shortage old-time grainmen could remember and it was already several months old. The terms of the sale require delivery at terminals. Most of it will come to Minneapolis. This will require the equivalent of about 25,000 boxcars. Currently, the Minneapolis branch ASCS office is completing plans to move some of this corn by truck and by using open-top hopper cars, which will be fitted with a cover. Much of this transportation would not have been needed had CCC sold the corn to the storing elevators, as it would have been used locally.

The transportation problem is further compounded by the fact that corn will have to be shipped back to many of the country elevators to satisfy local feed requirements.

In this area, CCC had never previously made the type of sale used in this case. The sale of over 47 million bushels of corn in 2 days was 2½ times the entire total sold in this area during the entire year of 1965. The sale bypassed the country elevator operator who had traditionally bought corn when it was placed on loading orders. The sale complicated and added to an already serious boxcar shortage. The sale took away supplies which were needed in local areas and, based on past CCC practices, could logically be expected to be made available locally. The sale was made when CCC stocks were lower than they had been the previous year.

In view of these facts, it seems reasonable to ask, Why?

PETE STALLCOP,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that there is now an administrationwide campaign to bring the struggling agricultural economy to its knees. As the above documents show, part of this campaign is being led by the Commodity Credit Corporation through its corn dumping activities. These actions even if isolated, are deplorable. When viewed in the proper context, which would include efforts by the Department of Commerce to force down livestock prices through the guise of hide export limitations, and the Department of Agriculture's recent actions to lower the dairy market prices by allowing imports of foreign cheese, the total effort is clearly designed to charge the inflation-causing Great Society spending bonanzas to the American farmer.

The true purpose of these strangely consistent actions has been steadfastly denied by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, although admitted by other administration spokesmen. However, the effects have now been candidly cheered by Mr. Freeman. In a ridiculous example of inconsistency, Mr. Freeman has maintained that there has been no effort to lower farm prices, and then he could hardly contain his joy when it was revealed that these efforts would do the job they were clearly intended to do.

A headline in the April 1 issue of the New York Times read as follows: "Freeman Elated Over Price Drops—He Predicts Further Cuts in Cost of Farm Products." The story was written by William M. Blair from Mr. Freeman's comments during a news conference held in Washington on March 31. Mr. Blair continued:

> It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices.

Mr. Speaker, with permission, I include the New York Times article at the conclusion of my remarks for the information of my colleagues:

FREEMAN ELATED BY DROP IN FARM PRODUCT PRICES

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman expressed pleasure today with the fact that the prices of farm products had dropped recently.

It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices. Like Mr. Freeman, the officials were happy to note that consumers would benefit from lower prices by this summer.

"If the food marketing industry will respond quickly to lower farm prices over the next several months," Mr. Freeman told a news conference, "retail prices also can be lower sooner."

PRICE SUPPORTS RAISED

Not only have farm prices fallen since February 15, Mr. Freeman said, but the average prices of all farm products should be 6 to 10 percent lower in the fourth quarter of the year than they are now.

The Secretary's prediction came as he announced an increase in the Federal support prices for milk and soybeans to encourage production of these products, now in short supply. Both increases are aimed at preventing runaway prices and resulting higher costs to consumers.

He increased the support for milk used in manufacturing butter, cheese, and other dairy products 26 cents per 100 pounds to a level of $3.50 for the new marketing year starting tomorrow.

The new prop is below the current market price of about $3.79, resulting from low milk production and a surge in the demand for some dairy products, particularly cheese.

The new support level for butter will be 61.6 cents a pound compared with 59.4 cents. Mr. Freeman said butter prices already had dropped 2 cents a pound since February 15.

Mr. Freeman revoked the suspension he had announced on March 1 on fluid, or bottling milk, prices in Federal milk marketing order areas. The revocation, he said, would be effective April 10 and would tend to peg fluid milk prices about 22 cents higher per 100 pounds through June than the Federal orders would have provided.

In addition, Mr. Freeman said he would lift the quota on the import of Cheddar cheese to help overcome the imbalance in manufacturing milk supplies.

This imbalance has developed as cheese and butter manufacturers compete for existing supplies of manufacturing milk and divert milk from butter production.

Many small creameries face "disaster" from the cost-price squeeze resulting from the imbalance, the Department said. The increase in butter prices also threatens to hurt the market for butter and in the long run injure those dairy farmers who produce mainly for butter production, it said.

Mr. Freeman said President Johnson was directing the Tariff Commission to report on the advisability of high Cheddar cheese import quotas for an extended period.

The present yearly quota of 2.78 million pounds will be raised by 926,700 pounds, one-tenth of 1 percent of the annual U.S. consumption, Mr. Freeman said. This will extend through June 30. Canada and New Zealand are the main importers present.

Mr. Freeman gave this rundown on farm price decreases since February 15:

"Hogs down 4 cents a pound, followed by a 10- to 13-percent decline in the wholesale price of bacon and pork. Lambs also down 4 cents a pound. Butter down 2 cents a pound. Soybeans and corn oil down more than 6 percent.

"Fresh lettuce down 35 percent, cabbage, celery, and onions down more than 20 percent. Fresh oranges and grapefruit off 7 percent. Eggs down 3 cents per dozen."

He predicted the following declines by the end of the year:

"Poultry and eggs, down 15 to 20 percent; vegetables, down 20 to 25 percent; potatoes 10 percent; meat animals, 5 percent."

EXTENDING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS TO DEPENDENT OR SURVIVING SISTERS

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent or surviving sisters of insured individuals who are living and who suffered disability which did not end prior to the month in which the insured became entitled to old-age or disability insurance benefits, or who have become deceased.

In order to qualify as a dependent or surviving sister the insured must have provided her with at least one-half of her support, proof of such support to be filed within 2 years subsequent to the time when the insured sustained disability or died.

The amount of money which would inure to the benefit of the dependent or surviving sister under my bill would equal 50 percent of the insured's primary fund, and where the insured has died, 82½ percent would be allowed one sister or 75 percent each for two or more sisters. A dependent or surviving sister would not receive any benefits if the insured has a wife, husband, child, widow, widower or parent entitled to benefits under existing law.

The revenues needed to support this program amount to .01 percent of the employers' payroll tax. This amount, while small in comparison to total tax subtracted from the employer and employee, is sufficient to insure security for many individuals who otherwise would, because of the death or disability of an unmarried brother or independent sister, be without support.

The Advisory Council on Social Security stated in their 1965 report that for the vast majority of Americans the social security program gives assurance that old age, total disability or death will not mean the end of a regular family income.

Prompt action on this bill would assure benefits to even a greater majority of Americans by including a group who are among those most in need of the security the act provides.

WHO'S ON FIRST, WHAT'S ON SECOND

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, once in a while the agricultural program mess sounds a little bit like the old Abbott and Costello colloquy "who's on first" and so forth. This one is encouraged to plant, the next farmer not to plant, and on and on. Winthrop French, of Wakeman, Ohio, wrote a very interesting letter to the New London, Ohio, Record. If the Members will read it, I am sure they will get the point.

The letter follows:

Dear Editor: Oh happy, happy day. We farmers are winding the Maypole, and Orville is queen of the May. Uncle Sam's going to pay us for growing flowers. Sunflowers, that is. According to a March 10 letter from the boys at the Huron County office of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee of the USDA, we can grow sunflowers on the acres that we sign up to not grown corn on. We can't grow soybeans on these diverted acres, but we can grow sunflowers on them, and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman will pay us 20 percent of the amount he would pay us to not grow corn on them.

So now instead of collecting $1,170 for not growing 30½ acres of corn and $860 for growing 30½ acres of corn, or a total of $2,030 as originally promised to me, I can collect $234 for growing 30½ acres of sunflowers where I don't grown corn, and $860 for growing 30½ acres of corn where I don't grow sunflowers, or a total of $1,094. Thus, for a sacrifice of $936 of subsidy payment which really didn't belong to me anyway, I can collect $1,094 for planting and harvesting 30½ acres of corn and 30½ acres of sunflowers, and help flood the bird seed market.

Or I can resist the bait and escape this Socialist trap—go ahead and plant corn or soybeans or oats or barley or sunflowers or cucumbers as I see fit—only to get clobbered with the club of Government control of our grain market.

The peasants of Russia's collective farms raise sunflowers because sunflowers stand the drought better than soybeans. They make their oleo from sunflower oil and whale oil, and their toilet paper from sunflower stalks. In America we make our oleo from corn oil and soybean oil, and our toilet paper from straw pulp. Sunflowers are "for the birds," and the birds will sing Orville's praises forevermore.

Sincerely,

Winthrop French.

Wakeman, Ohio.

MANDATORY OIL IMPORT PROGRAM HARMFUL TO COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the decision of this administration to once and for all end for all practical purposes the mandatory oil import program is indeed tragic for a number of families from Appalachia that live the life of coal.

The action of the Johnson administration in revising the program for controlling imports of residual fuel oil is another significant step toward liquidating the market for coal and other domestic fuels on the east coast. Regardless of how the changes in the program might be interpreted, it can mean only one thing and that is an almost unlimited supply of imported oil during the coming year.

I would like to point out that the new order removes the limitation on the amount of residual oil which can be imported. The sky is now the limit. In addition, the new order broadens significantly the number of firms which will now be eligible to import oil for the first time, and it will make consumers of oil, including Government agencies, eligible to go before the Oil Import Appeals Board and secure an allocation for importing oil directly.

In other words, this new order says in effect, "Go out and scare up the customers for imported oil. We will guarantee that you will be given the right to import the oil."

This is not an import control program. Senator Pastore, Democrat, of Rhode Island, was absolutely correct when he stated that the changes in the program "makes the retention of controls merely a fiction." He added that this being the case, all vestiges of controls should be abandoned. I say that since controls are now a fiction the administration should abandon its masquerade of protecting the domestic fuels industries and announce its real intention, which is to deliver this entire east coast fuel market into the hands of imported oil. At the very least, if the administration would adopt a position of stating frankly and publicly just what its new program will do, the coal industry, and the domestic oil industry, could prepare for what lies ahead. Not even the famous Johnson "treatment" can convince the affected domestic industries, and their workers, that the program as revised will be good for them.

However, this latest step in further diluting the control program started by President Eisenhower in 1959 as essential to national security should come as no surprise when viewed in the light of the history of the past two Democratic administrations. Under this and the preceding Democratic administration, the import control program has been completely emasculated. At the beginning of 1961, when the Democratic administration took office, imports were running at the rate of 154 million barrels a year. By 1965, they had been increased through repeated liberalization of the program and the total had reached 267 million barrels—an increase of 113 million barrels.

This means that under two Democratic administrations, which have been pledged to the economic revitalization of Appalachia, annual residual oil imports have been permitted to increase the equivalent of some 28 million tons of coal.

The production and transportation of this amount of coal, displaced from its traditional markets by increased oil imports, would have created 12,500 jobs, with an annual payroll of $75 million annually. The possibility of creating these additional jobs in West Virginia and other Appalachian States were destroyed by the oil import policies of these two Democratic administrations at a time when they were paying lipservice to the need for doing something for Appalachia.

Yet, these administrations were content to substitute job training for well-paying jobs. They were content to accelerate the export of jobs of American miners and railroad workers to Venezuela as a means of bolstering the economy of that country. The damage which increased oil imports caused to the economy of Appalachia apparently is a matter of secondary concern, the victim of our foreign policy.

This whole thing smacks of politics. The announcement was made by the Democratic speaker in the presence of Democratic Senators and Congressmen from New England. Perhaps it will be good politics in New England, but in West Virginia and other coal-producting States of Appalachia it is bad economics. The people of our area will pay the price in reduced job opportunities and lost payrolls.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE—WATERSHED AND PLANNING CONSTRUCTION AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have been very concerned at the prospect of the severe cutback in funds for the Soil Conservation Service as evidenced by the President's budget request. The concern in this respect has prompted me to appear before the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the House Appropriations Committee and request that additional sums of money be appropriated in order that this distinguished program, and particularly, the watershed and planning phases of the same could be continued.

Under unanimous consent I include in my remarks the statement that I made before the Subcommittee on Agriculture, House Appropriations Committee:

Statement of Congressman Arch A. Moore, Jr., Before Subcommittee on Agriculture, House Appropriations Committee

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about several items in the budget proposals for the Soil Conservation Service, and I appreciate this opportunity to discuss them.

One hundred percent of the land units in the State of West Virginia are in organized soil conservation districts. These conservation districts have broadened and changed their activities and assistance as new needs have been encountered by both rural and urban landowners. I feel the current budget recommendations do not adequately reflect these needs. Therefore, I make the following suggestions:

WATERSHED PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

I recommend an increase in Public Law 566 watershed planning funds to $10 million, and an increase of $12 million for watershed construction.

West Virginia now has 36 watershed projects completed, under construction, or in the planning and application stage. I'm very enthusiastic about this program because I've seen the tremendous economic impact they have on the surrounding communities.

For example, in my district, the Upper Grave Creek Watershed at Cameron was completed about a year ago. Last summer there was a violent rainstorm in the upper watershed area. Previously, the farms and community of Cameron would have suffered severe damages. But, thanks to this watershed project, the storm water was "walked down" the tributaries and there was no damage at all.

Local people and soil conservation technicians are now working on a plan for the Wheeling Creek Watershed, where considerable destruction and the loss of one life have resulted from floods in the past few years.

I feel these are the kinds of projects we should continuously try to move forward, not retard. Under the proposed budgetary limitations, new construction starts will be reduced from the current total of 80 per year to only 35 in 1967. This will hurt both the people in West Virginia and throughout the Nation.

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

I recommend an increase in the overall appropriation for conservation operations to $120 million. Part of this increase—$3.6 million—is needed to restore the proposed reduction for soil surveys. These surveys have always been a basic tool of rural conservation planning. More recently, they have proven their value for nonagricultural use by such groups as State highway departments, real estate developers, health departments and planning commissions. Wider use of surveys is growing as West Virginia grows and I am disturbed to see a cutback in an activity so essential to sound land use planning.

Further increases are needed for staffing to provide technical programing and installation services to soil conservation district cooperators—West Virginia's 14 soil conservation districts report a need for a minimum of 35 man-years of additional SCS help. Nationwide, the need is for more than 1,500 additional man-years.

I also wish to urge that the $1,028,000 proposed for assistance in land use planning related to income-producing recreation be appropriated. This is especially important in West Virginia, where we are long on scenery and somewhat short on first quality farmland.

In the past few years, soil conservation service personnel have assisted in establishing a number of income-producing recreational enterprises in West Virginia. Soil conservation districts have also completed a recreational inventory for the entire State. This leadership is helping landowners recognize opportunities for recreational use of their land and water resources to improve their income. Increased Soil Conservation Service assistance is essential to help these landowners arrive at sound decision in planning recreational developments.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

A project plan is now being developed for the Little Kanawha resource conservation and development project, which includes Calhoun County in my district. This project has tremendous local support and I heartily endorse it. In fact, I strongly believe there should be more projects like this to help local people plan for the orderly development of their resources. I recommend that the $312,000 proposed for resource conservation and development project planning be at least doubled so as not to curtail this worthwhile program.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE—VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, whose national chairman is Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, a highly respected authority on military matters, has issued a statement which ought to be read by the greatest number of citizens of this country.

In brief, General Fellers demands to know why U.S. forces, controlling the airspace over Vietnam and the seas bordering that country, continue to fight a sanguinary jungle war and on terms largely dictated by the Communist Vietcong.

The statement follows:

> By July 1945 in the war against Japan, the XXI Bomber Command had burned out 66 cities and destroyed many of Japan's greatest factories. In 9 months B–29 raids inflicted 806,000 casualties of whom 330,000 were killed. Preraid evacuations and mass migration after attacks caused a population displacement of 8,500,000 persons. In March the Emperor, watching a Tokyo bombing, had resolved to stop the war regardless of what might happen to him personally.
>
> Near the close of the war MacArthur's medium bombers showered leaflets on some of the cities, warning that before a certain date these cities would be destroyed by the Army Air Forces. The leaflets explained their purpose: to urge families to evacuate and survive, to enable the people to appeal for help so as to learn how powerless the Japanese militarists were to defend them.
>
> After the surrender, evacuees from the cities which had been destroyed were interviewed. Our leaflets had created stark panic. Cities had been immediately and completely abandoned; no lives were lost.
>
> No people were ever more thoroughly indoctrinated to resist surrender than were the Japanese. Two million firstline troops stood ready to defend their shores against landings. Yet bombing and blockade forced these tough warriors to lay down their arms without a single hostile incident. General MacArthur flew into Japan with 1,100 men.
>
> Here then is the pattern to superimpose on North Vietnam. Warn military target areas—mostly supply centers—that total destruction will soon be inevitable. Urge populations in these military target areas to evacuate to designated tropical sanctuaries. Then destroy every military target. Blockade the coastline. Deny munitions and weapons to the enemy; the end will come quickly and long before Red China could intervene. Red China intervened in Korea only when it was known that the Yalu and Manchuria would be sanctuaries. Moreover, Red China is ill-prepared for a major war and Chiang Kai-shek's invasion threat is a deterrent.
>
> Why fight a war of attrition on enemy terms in tropical jungles? Why trade American youth for Asiatic hordes? Military assistance, making full utilization of our fleet and air power, is the only prompt, humane way to end the war.

DIVERSION OF ANTIPOVERTY FUNDS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 of this year, I cited the Women's Job Corps Center in Charleston, W. Va., as an example of extravagant diversion of antipoverty funds into the pockets of Democratic politicians. Two days later, March 23, 1966, at hearings on the war on poverty, the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, challenged the accuracy of the figures put into the Congressional Record by me.

At that time he said, "Congressman Quie, the figures that were given to you and through you put into the Congressional Record were inaccurate."

On this same day, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons] addressed the House and stated that there were misstatements about the cost and expenses of the Charleston, W. Va., Women's Job Corps Center contained in my remarks on March 21, 1966.

During the past several days, our investigator, Mr. John Buckley, studied financial aspects of the Charleston, W. Va., Women's Job Corps Center, and I can report the figures I used in my presentation were correct and the figures used by the Office of Economic Opportunity were inaccurate.

As I previously stated, the lease for the hotel provides a payment of $7,900 a month or $94,800 a year, and I will be placing a copy of the lease in the Record with the amount of rent shown in article III. All taxes, insurance, utilities, and repairs are paid by the sponsor, Packard Bell Electronics Corp. In addition, the sponsor, with Federal funds, transported the Kanawha Hotel's furniture to a storage building at a cost of $2,800.25 and has contracted to pay $4,800 a year for the storage of this property. In this connection, it is noted the sponsor, again with Federal funds, has paid personal property taxes to the State of West Virginia on this stored furniture as well as personal property taxes on accounts receivable the hotel had listed in a previous business property statement.

I initially reported more than $225,000 of Federal funds had been expended to renovate the hotel building. This figure was challenged by the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity who stated the rehabilitation costs were $187,400.

The costs were actually more than $187,400. In fact, they were considerably more than the conservative figure I had used, of $225,000.

Our investigator found $290,026.60 was expended in repairs to the hotel and installation of the equipment necessary to the operation of the Women's Job Corps Center. In addition, a total of $30,586.14 is outstanding in mechanics liens against the property and $24,936.77 was spent on electric heating and plumbing items prior to January 4, 1966, under the item "Maintenance." The total of repairs, equipment installation and maintenance prior to January 4 of this year is $345,549.51. The sponsor has indicated only $187,377.31 has been charged to rehabilitation of the hotel. I submit, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what bookkeeping terms

Packard Bell Electronics Corp. and the Office of Economic Opportunity choose to follow, that nearly $350,000 in Federal funds have been obligated to put the rundown hotel in a condition suitable for a Women's Job Corps Center.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I was present at the hearings. The gentleman from Minnesota presented his facts on the total amount of money spent to rehabilitate and renovate the rundown Kanawha Hotel. Will the gentleman repeat the amount he stated in the hearings which was contradicted by Mr. Bernard Boutin, Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mr. QUIE. I had said that more than $225,000 was used to renovate the hotel.

Mr. GOODELL. The Deputy Director objected. He then flatly said that your facts were inaccurate and incorrect. The true figure was about $187,000 according to Mr. Boutin.

Mr. QUIE. One hundred eighty-seven thousand four hundred dollars.

Mr. GOODELL. The actual figure now developed by the investigator shows $345,000?

Mr. QUIE. Two hundred ninety thousand twenty-six dollars and sixty cents was spent on repairs and installation of equipment, $24,936.77 for electric, heating, and plumbing items which they call "maintenance" and $30,586.14 for outstanding mechanics liens.

Mr. GOODELL. In round numbers, $345,000, as contrasted with $187,000 that the Director of OEO said had been spent to renovate this rundown Kanawha Hotel.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Examples of some items which OEO did not include under rehabilitation were the installation of new kitchen equipment at a cost of $36,813.10, permanent installation of air conditioning equipment and ducts, and the installation of window air conditioners.

The Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity went to great lengths to show the market value of the hotel in 1965 would have been $438,000 and in 1966, $508,250. He stated they assessed at 40 percent of real value in Charleston, W. Va. On March 25, 1956, the Kanawha County tax assessor advised our investigator that the assessed valuation of property in that county is equal to 50 percent of the true and actual value. He cited chapter 18, article 7(a), section 4, of the 1965 Cumulative Supplement to the West Virginia Code of 1961, which provides that the total assessed valuation in each of the four classes of property shall not be less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent of the appraised valuation of each said class of property. This regulation is contained in West Virginia House bill 499, passed March 9, 1963, a copy of which was obtained by our investigator. I will ask later to have that included in the RECORD.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I was present at this hearing when the gentleman in the well made the statement that the assessments in West Virginia under the law were 50 percent of the appraised valuation. I was also present when the Deputy Director of the OEO said that was incorrect and that it was 40 percent of the assessed valuation. Do I understand the gentleman's statement in the well today is based upon the investigator's report and the citation of the specific law in West Virginia and that he was correct when he said 50 percent of the assessed value?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. There was a court case in West Virginia which lead to a change in the law which prohibits any assessor from assessing less than 50 percent or more than 100 percent, which is the language that I just cited. An examination of the real property connected with the Kanawha Hotel determined that the hotel building prior to occupancy by the Women's Job Corps Center was assessed at $87,000. It was subsequently raised to $115,000 as a result of extensive repairs to the building. In addition, the hotel building occupies two parcels of land assessed at $67,300 and $21,000, respectively. The total assessment of the parcels of land and building prior to the Women's Job Corps Center occupancy was $175,300. Using these figures as 50 percent of the assessed valuation, it might well be claimed the market value of the combined building and land was $350,600. However, reliable real estate brokers in Charleston, W. Va., who were contacted pointed out due to the rundown condition of the hotel they would not have offered more than $250,000 prior to the renovation. They referred to a recent sale of the Milner-Ruffner Hotel building in Charleston on February 1, 1966. They stated this building, although older than the Kanawha building, includes more ground and is located on Kanawha Boulevard, which is the main thoroughfare in Charleston. This building was sold for $200,000. It was noted by our investigator that a large tract of property located directly opposite Virginia Street from the Kanawha Hotel is currently being developed in connection with urban renewal. It was purchased by the Charleston National Bank for $10.50 per square foot within the past 2 years. At this rate per square foot, the value of the Kanawha Hotel land would be approximately $154,402. You can compare this with the $88,300 assessed valuation, half of the $176,600, that was used in the figures as the full and true assessment based on 50 percent. It was noted further in May 1965 the Hotel Kanawha Co. purchased one-twelfth of an undivided sixty-one one hundred sixtieths of an adjoining building for $950. The second floor of this building is being used as classrooms and offices for the Women's Job Corps Center. The Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Gibbons, made much of the claimed annual square foot rental cost of something less that $1 and the cost of shelter amounting to $27 per month per enrollee. I submit these figures were based on the rental cost alone, which is $94,800 a year clear profit to the Peyton Corp., while it should be noted the OEO claimed it to be only $90,000, divided by the number of square feet of 100,000 and the number of enrollees in the Job Corps center of 294.

In this regard, the Office of Economic Opportunity and Mr. Gibbons neglected to include $16,000 charged to the sponsor to settle leases of former tenants; $4,800 being paid annually for the storage of the hotel's furniture; $2,800.25 paid to transport the hotel furniture to storage; $7,450 paid annually for real and personal property taxes—including taxes on the furniture in storage and the hotel's accounts receivable—$5,740 paid annually for insurance; not to mention $314,963.37 paid to date for repairs, building maintenance and installation of equipment, and mechanics liens outstanding amounting to $30,586.14, making a total of $477,139.76 which include rent of $94,800. I submit, Mr. Speaker, these expenses should be included when figuring costs, and the figures of $1 per square foot and $27 a month per enrollee cited by the Office of Economic Opportunity were deceptive and misleading.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify the situation, am I to understand from the facts which the investigator developed, that the Kanawha Hotel, in the opinion of reputable real estate agents in Charleston, W. Va., had a value of $250,000, approximately, when the Job Corps Center went in, and that the Federal Government has since spent $345,000 on renovating the Job Corps Center at the Kanawha Hotel in Charleston, W. Va.?

The $250,000 was the value and they have spent $345,000 to renovate it?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I also recall the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] making a great point about the less than $1 per square foot cost. I take it, based upon the investigation that has been made, that the figure of less than $1 per square foot was arrived at by taking the $90,000 per year claimed by OEO to be the annual rental of the Kanawha Hotel, which is erroneous, and dividing it by the number of square feet and the number of enrollees in the camp?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. In other words, they should have started with $94,800 which is the actual rental per year. In addition, there is $4,800 that the taxpayer's money pays annually for storage of furniture. There are utilities, taxes, insurance, et cetera, which are paid for by the taxpayers on an annual basis, plus the renovation costs and the mechanics liens and other thinks which the gentleman from Minnesota has indicated as outstanding?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for purposes of comparison the lease connected with the former Hotel Governor Cabell in Huntington, W. Va., which is the site of a Women's Job Corps Center. This building is being leased at the monthly rental cost of $6,050 and the lessor is paying taxes and insurance during the period of the occupancy by the Women's Job Corps Center. In addition, the owners of the hotel were forced to sacrifice an estimated $80,000 worth of hotel furniture when the premises were vacated. Under the terms of the lease of the Kanawha Hotel, Packard Bell Electronics Corp. is obligated to pay the Hotel Kanawha Co. the sum of $70,000 as compensatory remuneration in the event the lease is terminated by the lessee for any reason either at the end of the original term of 2 years or within 90 days thereafter. The special concessions made in connection with the Kanawha Hotel in Charleston, W. Va., strongly suggest political favoritism to a company whose president is the commerce commissioner of that State and who, in 1964, was defeated in the Democratic primary for State senate. Mr. Angus Deyton lost to Mr. Paul J. Kaufman 13,274 to 19,462. I would add the present Democratic Governor of West Virginia was commerce commissioner of that State prior to his election in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a copy of the lease for the Women's Job Corps Center at Charleston, W. Va., a copy of the West Virginia House bill 499, relating to a computation of local share and appraisal and assessment of property, and a copy of insurance coverage furnished by Packard Bell Electronics Corp.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The matters referred to follow:

APRIL 9, 1965.

This indenture of lease, made as of the 20th day of March, 1965, by and between the Hotel Kanawha Co., a West Virginia corporation, party of the first part, hereinafter referred to as "lessor," and Packard-Bell Electronics Corp., a California corporation, party of the second part, hereinafter referred to as "lessee," and whenever the context so admits, the successors and assigns of each of them: Witnesseth—

ARTICLE I

Demised premises: Lessor hereby leases to lessee, and lessee does hereby take from lessor, upon and subject to the terms and provisions of this lease, the following described property, together with the improvements and appurtenances thereunto belonging, situate in the city of Charleston, County of Kanawha, State of West Virginia, to wit:

1. All that certain tract or parcel of land having a frontage of 55 feet on Summers Street and running back the same width throughout with the line of the U.S. Government property used as a post office to what is known as the Arcade Building and being the same property which was conveyed to the Hotel Kanawha Co. by F. M. Staunton and wife, by deed dated the 30th day of April, 1903, and recorded in the office of the Clerk of the County Court of Kanawha County, W. Va., in deed book No. 90, page 25.

2. That certain tract or parcel of land adjoining the above tract having a frontage of 7 feet on Summers Street and running back with even width about 115 feet to what is known as the Arcade Building and the same conveyed to Hotel Kanawha Co. by Mary E. Wagner, by deed dated May 31, 1902, of record in said clerk's office in deed book No. 88, page 403.

3. Those two certain parcels of land conveyed by Mary E. Wagner to Hotel Kanawha Co. by deed dated December 14, 1904, and of record in the clerk's office aforesaid in deed book No. 95, page 448, the first tract fronting 55 feet on Virginia Street and running back with Summers Street and in a line parallel thereto, equal width throughout, to the property above described owned by the Hotel Kanawha Co., the second tract, being all right, title and interest formerly owned by said Mary E. Wagner in and to a private alley fronting 12 feet on Summers Street and running back to the said Arcade Building; in the said deed of December 14, 1904, said Mary E. Wagner dedicates for a private alleyway a strip 5 feet wide fronting on Virginia Street adjacent to said 55-foot lot, said alley running from Virginia Street back to the line of the property of the Hotel Kanawha Co. and by said deed the Hotel Kanawha Co. likewise dedicates off of the 55-foot lot so conveyed to it a strip 5 feet wide adjoining the above described 5-foot strip for like use as a private alley, making an alleyway 10 feet wide for private use, the right and interests of said Hotel Co. in said alley are also hereby leased.

4. All right, title, and interest of the Hotel Kanawha Co. in and to the lot of land 25 feet square adjoining the 10-foot alley above mentioned and other property formerly owned by Mary E. Wagner to be used upon the terms and conditions set forth in a deed dated the 9th day of June 1906, between Mary E. Wagner and the Hotel Kanawha Co., which deed is of record in the clerk's office aforesaid in deed book No. 103, page 130.

5. All of the second floor of that certain two-story building known as the Wagner Building fronting 50 feet, more or less, on Virginia Street and extending back therefrom a distance of 70 feet, more or less, abutting on the Hotel Kanawha Building, and designated as 706½ Virginia Street, East, containing 3,500 square feet, more or less.

It is the intention to hereby lease what is generally known in the city of Charleston as the Kanawha Hotel located at the corner of Summers and Virginia Streets and on the Post Office Square in the city of Charleston, W. Va., together with all of the furniture, furnishings, dishes, silver, machinery, lighting and heating fixtures, refrigeration, and equipment of every kind and description now in, on or belonging to said premises (but not including food, other perishable inventories or linens as provided in article IX, sec. 3); and the second or top floor of the building known as the Wagner Building which is immediately adjacent to the said Kanawha Hotel.

Also, all and singular the tenements, hereditaments and appurtenances belonging or in any wise appertaining to the aforesaid premises and all thereof, together with all income, rents, issues and profits in all the aforesaid premises or property.

ARTICLE II

Term of lease

Section 1: The term of this lease shall be for a period of 2 years commencing with the "date of contract" of contract No. OEO–138 which is under negotiation between the Office of Economic Opportunity and lessee. It is mutually agreed that the commencement of this lease is wholly contingent upon the successful negotiation and execution of said contract No. OEO–138. Lessee shall send lessor written notification of the "date of contract" as soon as practicable.

Section 2: Lessee shall have the right at the expiration of the original term hereof to extend the original term for 3 successive periods of 12 months each, such extensions to be on the same terms, covenants and conditions as are herein contained, except such right to extend shall be exercised by written notice to lessor at least 2 months prior to the expiration of said original term or any extension thereof, as the case may be, upon the giving of such notice and without any further instrument, lease or agreement, this lease shall be so extended.

Section 3: In addition, lessee shall have the option at any time prior to the expiration date of the original 2-year term of this lease to extend said lease for an additional 90-day period beyond the 2-year period by so notifying lessor in writing.

Section 4: Lessee shall also have the option at any time prior to the expiration date of any additional 1-year term which is commenced in accordance with the provisions of article II, section 2, to extend said lease for an additional 90-day period beyond the expiration date of such additional 1-year period; provided that this section 4 shall only be effective if lessee notifies lessor at least 60 days prior to the expiration of such additional 1-year term that lessee desires to have this option. In the event lessee, after giving such notice, does not elect to exercise such option, lessee shall pay to lessor as additional rent hereunder a sum of money equivalent to 2 months rent. In the event lessee, during said 60-day period, and after giving such notice to lessor, shall notify lessor that lessee renounces this option, lessee shall pay to lessor instead as additional rent hereunder a sum of money equal to the difference between 2 months rent and the apportioned rental due for the balance of the additional 1-year period from the date of receipt by lessor of such notice renunciation.

ARTICLE III

Rent

Section 1: Lessee covenants and agrees to accept the aforesaid hotel building and adjacent building, and pay fixed net rent at the rate of $189,600, payable in equal monthly installments of $7,900 in advance on the first day of each and every calendar month during the original term of 2 years, and pro rata for the fraction of any month.

Section 2: In the event that lessee shall exercise its right to extend this lease under article II, section 2, lessee agrees to pay the fixed net rent at the rate of $94,800 for the first year of said extended term, payable in equal monthly installments of $7,900 in advance on the first day of each and every calendar month during the first year of the extended term, and pro rata for the fraction of any month.

Section 3: In the event the lessee shall exercise its right to further extend this lease under article II, section 2, lessee agrees to pay the fixed net rent at the rate of $94,800 for the second year of said extended term, payable in equal monthly installments of $7,900 in advance on the first day of each and every calendar month during the second year of the extended term, and pro rata for the fraction of any month.

Section 4: In the event the lessee shall exercise its right to further extend this lease under article II, section 2, lessee agrees to pay the fixed net rent at the rate of $94,800 for the third and last year of said extended term, payable in equal monthly installments of $7,900 in advance on the first day of each and every calendar month during the third year of the extended term, and pro rata for the fraction of any month.

ARTICLE IV

Taxes

Section 1: Lessee shall punctually pay and discharge, as additional rent, all real estate taxes, property taxes, special assessments, paving assessments, and other taxes and charges of any kind which, after the first day of the term of this lease, are assessed against or become a lien upon the leased premises and against any building or appurtenance now or hereafter located thereon. All such taxes which shall become payable during the first and last years of the term of this lease or any renewal term hereof shall be apportioned pro rata between lessor and lessee in accordance with the respective number of months during which each party shall be in possession of the demised premises in said respective tax years.

Section 2: Lessor agrees that that portion of the leased premises designated as the WAgner Building as described in item 5, article I hereof, shall be excluded from the lessee's obligation to pay all taxes as provided in section 1 hereof.

Section 3: Lessee shall not be required to pay any tax which may be imposed upon lessor by reason of any transfer of lessor's title to the demised premises or of any interest therein, or any income tax or gross sales tax or other tax which may be imposed upon lessor by reason of the receipt by lessor of the rent herein reserved.

ARTICLE V

Utilities

Lessee shall pay for all telephone, water, sewage, fire service, incinerator, and other service and utility charges, including electricity and gas used for lighting, cooling, heating, or for any other purposes during the term or any extended term of this lease.

ARTICLE VI

Compliance with law, etc.

Lessee covenants and agrees that it will promptly comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations of any duly constituted governmental authority or applicable insurance inspection bureau.

ARTICLE VII

Safe condition

The lessee covenants and agrees, at its own cost and expense, at all times during said term to keep and maintain said premises and appurtenances thereunto belonging, including the adjoining areas, alleys, stairways, and sidewalks, in a clean, safe, and healthy condition, and to keep the same free and clear of snow and ice and other obstructions; and to use all reasonable care to guard and keep safe all fires and other dangerous substances and forces on said premises.

The lessee further covenants and agrees that it will indemnify and save harmless the lessor and also the land and premises herein demised from any and all claims, liabilities, responsibilities, damages, and outlay of expenses that lessor may incur or any cost or expense to which it may be put by reason of any injury and/or claimed injury to person and/or property or by reason of any claim on account thereof, resulting from the condition of the present buildings and/or any addition or alteration which may be constructed or placed upon the premises, or any other building or structure thereon.

ARTICLE VIII

Alteration and waste

Section 1: The lessee covenants and agrees not to commit or suffer any waste on said premises, and not to make any structural changes in said demised buildings, without first submitting plans and specifications to lessor and obtaining the written consent of the lessor to the same, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld, together with the lessor's approval of such changes, and that having obtained such consent and approval, the lessee will, at its own cost and expense, make the same within the time, and in such manner as shall be so approved, and indemnify and save harmless the lessor, and said demised premises from and against any and all liens, claims for damages, and other charges and claims of every kind and nature incurred in or arising from the same. However, lessee is authorized to make any and all changes, repairs, additions, improvements and alterations which do not affect the building structure without lessor's consent.

Section 2: In the event lessee shall make structural changes or alterations in said demised buildings, lessee, at its sole cost, hereby covenants and agrees that within 6 months from the date of the termination of this lease it shall restore the said demised premises to its condition prior to such structural change or alterations, reasonable wear and tear excepted, if required to do so by lessor.

However, lessor shall be required to give written notice on or before 30 days of the date of termination of this lease, listing the structural changes or alterations it will require lessee to so restore, or lessee shall be relieved of its obligation under this section of the lease.

ARTICLE IX

Furnishings, fixtures, etc.

Section 1: The lessee covenants and agrees during the term of this lease to maintain and keep the furniture, fixtures, and equipment in said demised buildings in first class condition and repair, and to surrender same to lessor at the end of the lease in its present condition, reasonable wear and tear excepted.

Section 2: It is mutually agreed hereto by lessor and lessee that an inventory shall be made within 1 month from the date of the execution of this lease by representatives of lessor and lessee, of all the furnishings and fixtures on said leased premises, which shall be binding upon both parties upon the termination of this lease in regard to the obligations of lessee contained in section 1 hereof. Said inventory shall indicate the condition of the furnishings and fixtures and any other comments mutually agreed upon by the parties hereto.

Section 3: Lessor agrees to take an inventory of all food, other perishable items and linens within 1 month from the date of the execution of this lease, and lessee shall have the exclusive right to purchase any and all such items at a price to be mutually agreed upon.

It is understood between the parties hereto, however, that said items are not included in this lease, and lessee shall not be responsible for replacement, restoration, or payment of the aforesaid items at the termination of this lease.

ARTICLE X

Fire insurance

Section 1: Lessee agrees to procure at its own expense and to maintain in full force and effect through the term of this lease or any extended term or terms hereof, fire and extended coverage insurance on the building or buildings erected on said premises designated herein as the Kanawha Hotel (excluding the leased premises designated herein as the Wagner Building), including all furniture, furnishings, fixtures and equipment of lessor in or appurtenant to the leased premises, and all alterations, changes, additions and improvements in an amount which at any time will represent the fair value of the same. All policies shall be issued by responsible companies authorized to do business in the State of West Virginia selected by lessee and approved by lessor and any mortgagee, which policies shall provide that loss, if any, payable thereunto shall be payable to lessee who shall utilize said proceeds in accordance with section 5, hereof. Lessee agrees to deliver certificates of insurance or authenticated copies of such policies to lessor and mortgagee.

On or before the expiration of any policy or policies of such insurance, lessee shall pay the premiums for renewal insurance and deliver to lessor or to any mortgagee lessor may designate within said period of time, satisfactory evidence of the payment of the premiums thereon and if such premiums or any of them shall not be so paid and the policies or certificates shall not be so delivered lessor may procure and/or pay for the same, and the amount so paid by lessor, with interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date of payment, shall become due and payable by lessee as additional rent with the next or any subsequent installment or fixed rent which shall become due after such payment by lessor; it being expressly covenanted that payment by lessor of any such premium shall not be deemed to waive or release the default in the payment thereof by lessee, or the right of lessor to take such action as may be permissible hereunder as in the case of default in the payment of fixed rent.

Section 2: Lessee shall not violate or permit to be violated any of the conditions or provisions of any of said policies, and lessee shall so perform and satisfy the requirements of the companies writing such policies that at all times companies of good standing and acceptable to lessor shall be willing to write and continue such insurance.

Section 3: Lessee shall cooperate with lessor and any mortgagee in connection with the collection of any insurance moneys that may be due in the event of loss and shall execute and deliver to lessor and any mortgagee such proofs of loss and other instruments that may be required for the purpose of facilitating the recovery of any such insurance moneys.

Section 4: Such insurance may be carried under a blanket policy covering the demised premises and other premises owned or leased by lessee.

Section 5: If the demised premises shall be damaged by fire or other cause or peril covered by insurance purchased in accordance with this article X, the proceeds thereof shall be utilized solely to repair, rebuild, replace or restore any and all property damaged, unless mutually agreed upon to do otherwise by both parties in writing.

ARTICLE XI

Public liability insurance

Section 1: Lessee agrees at its sole expense, to procure, carry and maintain in full force and effect throughout the term of this lease or any extended term or terms hereof, public liability insurance in an amount not less than $100,000 for bodily injury or death to one person, and not less than $500,000 for bodily injury or death of more than one person in one accident, and not less than $50,000 for damage to property.

Section 2: Such insurance may be carried under a blanket policy covering the demised premises and other premises owned or leased by lessee.

ARTICLE XII

Damage to person or property

Lessee will indemnify and save lessor free and harmless from any and all claims for damage or otherwise, either to persons or property, arising from lessee's use or misuse of the leased premises and will also indemnify and save lessor free and harmless from any and all claims for damage done to goods or other property in the leased premises. All personal property, merchandise, machinery, goods or other things or articles in the leased premises shall be at the risk of lessee only; and if the whole or any part thereof shall be destroyed or damaged by fire or otherwise, or by leakage or bursting of water pipes, or by roof, gutter or downspout leakage, or in any other manner, no part of said loss or damage is to be charged to or borne by lessor.

ARTICLE XIII

Subordination to mortgage

Lessee shall, upon the request of lessor in writing, subordinate this lease and the lien hereof to the lien of any present or future mortgage or mortgages upon the demised premises or any property of which the demised premises are a part irrespective of the time of execution or the time of recording of any such mortgage or mortgages, provided that the holder of any such mortgage shall enter into a written agreement with lessee to the effect that in the event of foreclosure or other action taken under the mortgage by the holder thereof, this lease and the rights of lessee hereunder shall not be in any way affected but shall continue in full force and effect so long as lessee shall not be in default hereunder. The word "mortgage" as used herein includes mortgages, deeds of trust or other similar instruments, and modifications, extensions, renewals and replacements thereof, and any and all advances thereunder.

ARTICLE XIV

Surrender upon expiration of lease

Upon the expiration of the term or any renewal term hereof, or sooner termination of this lease, by the exercise of any option herein or otherwise, lessee agrees to surrender possession of the demised premises to lessor, peacefully and without notice, and in good order and condition, excepting fire, acts of God, and subject to ordinary wear and reasonable use thereof.

ARTICLE XV

Compensatory remuneration

In entering into this lease agreement it is recognized that lessor has removed itself from the hotel business to its detriment, and allowed lessee to make structural changes and alterations to the leased premises for its own use, which lessee shall have 6 months from the date of termination of the lease to restore said premises to its original condition. Therefore, in the event that this lease shall be terminated by the lessee, for any reason whatsoever, either at the end of the original term of 2 years thereof or within 90 days thereafter, lessee agrees, in order to compensate the lessor for the loss of its good will, patronage, continued un-interrupted business, and its inability to be ready for business within 6 months after termination of this lease, that it will pay the sum of $70,000 as compensatory remuneration.

ARTICLE XVI

Quiet enjoyment

If lessee shall perform all and singular the covenants herein agreed to be performed by it, lessor, its successors and assigns, shall warrant and defend lessee in the enjoyment and peaceful possession of said premises during the term of this lease, or any renewal term or terms hereof.

It is understood, however, that the entire demised premises will be vacated within 1 week after the notice to lessor of the commencement date of this lease except for those tenants listed on exhibit A hereto. With respect to such tenants, lessor hereby covenants and agrees that they will vacate the demised premises not later than the termination dates set forth in said exhibit A.

In consideration of lessor's expense in causing said tenants to vacate the demised premises, lessor shall be entitled to retain the rentals paid by such tenants prior to the termination dates listed.

For any month or part thereof during which any such tenant remains in said premises beyond said termination date, lessee shall deduct from his monthly rental payments the amount stipulated as indicated on said exhibit A.

ARTICLE XVII

Notices

Every notice or communication authorized or required hereunder shall be deemed sufficiently served when given in writing and sent by registered mail, and directed, if to lessee, to Packard-Bell Electronics Corp., 12333 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles 64, Calif.; and if to lessor, to Hotel Kanawha Co., Post Office Box 88, Charleston 21, W. Va., or to such other addresses as either party may designate in writing by registered mail to the other. However, any and all notices or communications may be served in accordance with the statutes of the State of West Virginia relating to the service of process.

ARTICLE XVIII

Entire agreement

The entire agreement between the parties hereto is set forth in this instrument. The parties shall not be bound to any agreements, understandings, conditions or modifications except as expressly set forth and stipulated in this agreement or in a subsequent written agreement signed by the parties hereto.

Any amendment or rider attached hereto and duly executed by lessor and lessee shall be deemed incorporated herein and made a part hereof. In the event that any provision contained in said amendment or rider is inconsistent with the provisions of the within instrument, the provisions contained in said amendment or rider shall supersede said provisions of this instrument.

In witness whereof, Hotel Kanawha Co., a West Virginia corporation, has caused its name to be signed hereunto by its proper officer, thereunto duly authorized, and Packard-Bell Electronics Corp., a California corporation has caused its name to be signed hereunto by its proper officer, thereunto duly authorized, all as of the day and year first above written. Executed in triplicate.

HOTEL KANAWAH CO.,
By ANGUS E. PEYTON,
President.

PACKARD-BELL ELECTRONICS CORP.,
By WENDELL B. SELL,
President.

State of West Virginia, County of Kanawha, to wit:

I, Mary Bowling Frankfort, a notary public in and for the county and State aforesaid, do certify that Angus E. Peyton, who signed the writing hereto annexed bearing date as of the 20th day of March 1965, for Hotel Kanawha Co., a West Virginia corporation, has this day, before me in my said county, acknowledged the said writing to be the act and deed of said corporation.

Given under my hand and seal this 20th day of March, 1965.

My commission expires the 24th day of May, 1972.

MARY BOWLING FRANKFORT,
Notary Public.

State of California, County of Los Angeles, to wit:

I, La Raine Collup, a notary public in and for the county and State aforesaid, do certify that Wendell B. Sell, who signed the writing hereto annexed bearing date as of the 20th day of March, 1965, for Packard-Bell Electronics Corp., a California corporation, has this day, before me in my said county, acknowledged the said writing to be the act and deed of said corporation.

Given under my hand and seal this 29th day of March, 1965.

My commission expires the 25th day of June, 1968.

LA RAINE COLLUP,
Notary Public.

EXHIBIT A

Tenant and termination date:	*Deduction amount*
Kanawha Valley Realty Co. (May 1, 1965)	$500
Barber shop (May 1, 1965)	150
Capital Investigations (May 1, 1965)	100
Hayden, Stone, Inc. (May 1, 1965)	400
Morris Harvey College (May 31, 1965)	4,000
S. S. Boggess (May 1, 1965)	100
Franklin Finance Co. (May 1, 1965)	600
West Virginia Contractors (May 1, 1965)	250
Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric, Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, Division 1493 (May 1, 1965)	300
West Virginia Society of Professional Engineers (May 1, 1965)	200

EXHIBIT A—Continued

Tenant and termination date—Con.	*Deduction amount*
West Virginia Building & Loan Association (May 1, 1965)	$350
Charleston Scientists' & Engineers' Society (May 1, 1965)	600
WCAW Radio Station (May 1, 1965)	500
Wagner Building (May 1, 1965)	800

HOUSE BILL NO. 499

An act to amend and reenact section 4, article 9(a) chapter 18 of the Code of West Virginia, 1931, as amended, relating to computation of local share and appraisal and assessment of property

Be it enacted by the Legislature of West Virginia: That section 4, article 9(a), chapter 18 of the Code of West Virginia, 1931, as amended, be amended and reenacted to read as follows:

ARTICLE (9). ALLOCATION OF STATE AID FOR SCHOOLS

Section 4. Computation of local share; appraisal and assessment of property.—On the basis of the most recent survey of property valuations in the State, completed as to all classes of property in all counties determined by the tax commissioner under present or former provisions of this article, the State board shall for each county compute by application of the levies for general current expense purposes, as defined in section 2 of this article, the amount of revenue which such levies would produce if levied upon 100 percent of the appraised value of each of the several classes of property contained in the report or revised report of such value, made to it by the tax commissioner as follows: (1) The State board shall first take 97½ percent of the amount ascertained by applying these rates to the total assessed public utility valuation in each classification of property in the county. (2) The State board shall then apply these rates to the appraised value of other property in each classification in the county as determined by the tax commissioner and shall deduct therefrom 5 percent as an allowance for the usual losses in collections due to discounts, exonerations, delinquencies and the like. Fifty percent of the amount so determined shall be added to the 97½ percent of public utility taxes computed as provided above and this total shall be the local share of the particular county.

The tax commissioner shall make or cause to be made an appraisal in the several counties of the State of all nonutility real property and of all nonutility personal property which shall be based upon true and actual value as set forth in article 3, chapter 11 of this code. In determining the value of personal property—other than all machinery, equipment, furniture and fixtures of any industrial plant, mine, quarry or installation and of any commercial, industrial, or professional establishment—the tax commissioner shall prescribe accepted methods of determining such values. The tax commissioner shall in accordance with such methods determine the value of such property.

For the purpose of appraising commercial, industrial, and professional properties the tax commissioner after consultation with the county court shall employ a competent property appraisal firm or firms which appraisals shall be under his supervision and direction.

In making or causing to be made such appraisal, the tax commissioner shall employ such assistants as available appropriations will permit and shall prescribe and use such accepted methods and procedures for checking property values and determining the amount of property in the several classes of property provided by law as are customarily employed for appraisal purposes.

Such appraisal of all said property in the several counties shall be completed prior to the first day of July, 1936. Each year after the completion of the property appraisal in a county the tax commissioner shall maintain the appraisal by making or causing to be made such surveys, examinations, audits, maps and investigations of the value of the several classes of property in each county which should be listed and taxed under the several classifications, and shall determine the appraised value thereof. On the basis of information so ascertained, the tax commissioner shall annually revise his reports to the legislature and to the State board concerning such appraisals, such reports to be made not later than the first day of January of each year.

As information from such appraisal of property in a county under the provisions of this section becomes available for a district, municipality and county, the tax commissioner shall notify the county court and the assessor of said county that such information is available and shall make available to said county court and assessor all data records, and reports or other information relating to said work, along with a list of any properties in said district, municipality, and county which are entered on the assessment rolls but for which no appraisal has been made, a list of any properties which were appraised but which cannot be found on the assessment rolls and a list of all properties carried on the assessment rolls which have not been identified on the maps. Said lists shall set forth the name of the owner and a description of the property and the reason, if known, for its failure to have been entered on the assessment rolls or to have been appraised or to have been identified on the map, as the case may be.

As such appraisal of property in a county, under this section, is completed to the extent that a total valuation for each class of property can be determined, such appraisal shall be delivered to the assessor and the county court, and in each assessment year commencing after such appraisal is so delivered and received, the county assessor and the county court, sitting as a board of equalization and review, shall use such appraised valuations as a basis for determining the true and actual value for assessment purposes of the several classes of property. The total assessed valuation in each of the four classes of property shall be not less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent of the appraised valuation of each said class of property: *Provided*, That, (1) until the completion of the appraisal herein provided for in all 55 counties of the State; and (2) upon completion of the appraisal of any county and delivery of the appraised valuations to the county by the tax commissioner; and (3) when it shall appear that the total assessed valuations of any class of property in such county are less than 50 percent of the total appraised valuations of such class of property; then in such events the tax commissioner may authorize a total assessed valuation in each such class of less than 50 percent of the total appraised valuation of such class of property; except that such authorized total assessed valuation shall be increased each year thereafter, as nearly as practicable in equal steps, so that in the third assessment year after the delivery of the appraised valuations in each class of property, as required above, the total assessed valuation of each class of property shall be not less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent of the appraised valuation of each class of property as delivered by the tax commissioner: *Provided further*, That, upon the tax commissioner's delivery of the appraised valuation to a county, such appraised valuations shall serve as the basis for the spot check appraisal in said county until all of the 55 counties of the State have been reappraised.

The determination of appraised values in those counties where the full appraisal has not been completed as defined above and delivered to the assessor and the county court prior to the first day of the assessment year shall be continued by the tax commissioner on the annual spot survey basis. Beginning with the fiscal year 1960 and for each year thereafter until the full survey is so completed and delivered in a county, the assessed value in each of the four classes of property in such county shall be not less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent of the appraised valuation of each said class of property as determined by the last previous statewide report of the tax commissioner: *Provided, however*, That in those counties where the full appraisal has not been completed and delivered, as aforesaid, to the county assessor and the county court prior to the first day of the assessment year, the requirements of this paragraph shall be satisfied if:

(1) The total tax yield from the four classes of property based upon the allowable school levy rates defined in section two of this article equals or exceeds the amount required to meet the local share as provided in this section; or

(2) For the assessment year 1961, the assessor has increased the total valuations of property in an amount not less than 33½ percent of the difference between the total assessed valuations for the assessment year 1960 and the valuations required by this section; or

(3) For the assessment year 1962, the assessor has increased the total valuations of property in an amount not less than 50 percent of the difference between the total assessed valuations of property for the assessment year 1961 and the total valuations for such class required by this section; or

(4) For the assessment year 1963, the assessor has increased the total valuation of property so that the same meet the requirements of this section.

Whenever in any year a county assessor and/or county court shall fail or refuse to comply with the provisions of this section in setting the valuations of property for assessment purposes in any class or classes of property in the county, the State tax commissioner shall review the valuations for assessment purposes made by the county assessor and the county court and shall direct the county assessor and county court to make such corrections in the valuations as may be necessary so that they shall comply with the requirements of chapter 11 and of this section and the tax commissioner shall enter the county and fix the assessments at the required ratios. Refusal of the assessor and/or county court to make such corrections shall constitute grounds for removal from office.

In any year in which the total assessed valuation of a county shall fail to meet the minimum requirements above set forth, the county court of such county shall allocate for such year to the county board of education from the tax levies allowed to the county court a sufficient portion of its levies as will, when applied to the valuations for assessment purposes of such property in the county, provide a sum of money equal to the differences between the amount of revenue which will be produced by application of the allowable school levy rates defined in section two of this article upon the valuations for assessment purposes of such property and the amount of revenue which would be yielded by the application of such levies to 50 percent of the total of appraised valuations of such property. In the event the county court shall fail or refuse to make the reallocation of levies as provided for herein, the county board of education, the tax commissioner, the State board of school finance, or any other interested party, shall have the right to enforce the same by writ of mandamus in any court of competent jurisdiction.

In conjunction with and as a result of the appraisal herein set forth the tax commissioner shall have the power and it shall be his duty, to establish a permanent records system for each county in the State, consisting of:

1. Tax maps of the entire county drawn to scale or aerial maps, which maps shall indicate all property and lot lines, set forth dimensions or areas, indicate whether the land is improved, and identify the respective parcels or lots by a system of numbers, or symbols and numbers, whereby the ownership of such parcels and lots can be ascertained by reference to the property record cards and property owner's index;
2. Property record cards arranged geographically according to the location of property on the tax maps, which cards shall set forth the location and description thereof, the acreage or dimensions, description of improvements, if any, the owner's name, address and date of acquisition, the purchase price, if any, set forth in the deed of acquisition, the amount of tax stamps, if any, on the deed, the assessed valuation, and the identifying number or symbol and number, shown on the tax map;
3. Property owner's index consisting of an alphabetical listing of all property owners, setting forth brief descriptions of each parcel or lot owned, and cross indexed with the property record cards and the tax map.

The tax commissioner is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into such contracts as may be necessary, and for which funds may be available, to establish the permanent records system herein provided for, or may through his staff and employees, prepare and complete such system.

All microfilm, photography, and original copies of tax maps created under the provisions of this section are the property of the State of West Virginia and the reproduction, copying, distribution or sale of such microfilm, photography, or tax maps or any copies thereof without the written permission of the State tax commissioner is prohibited. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this paragraph shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not less than $50 nor more than $300 or imprisoned for not less than 30 days nor more than 1 year, or both in the discretion of the court. Justices of the peace shall have concurrent jurisdiction with other courts having jurisdiction for the trial of all misdemeanors arising under this paragraph.

The tax commissioner shall by uniform regulations establish a procedure for the sale of reproduction of microfilm, photography and maps and may pay for having such reproductions made from the appropriation for "Property appraisal." Any funds received as a result of the sale of such reproductions shall be deposited to the appropriated account from which the payment for reproductions is made.

The cost of conducting the appraisal herein provided for shall be borne jointly by the State and the several counties in the following manner and terms: There shall be appropriated from the general revenue fund not less than $1,500,000 for each fiscal year until sufficient funds have been appropriated to complete the appraisal in all counties of the State. Each county shall furnish, through its county court, not more than 10 percent of the cost of such appraisal or reappraisal and permanent records system for such county. Such county costs may be paid over a period of 3 years with the approval of the tax commissioner. In those instances where the cost of the appraisal, reappraisals or permanent records system required by this section has been paid by the tax commissioner from funds appropriated for these purposes, the share of such cost allocated to each county shall, upon receipt thereof by the tax commissioner, be deposited to the appropriated account from which such payments have been made. If a county has employed a professional appraisal firm to conduct an appraisal or reappraisal of all or a part of nonutility property within the past 5 years, and such appraisal, or any other appraisal or reappraisal has been or shall have been accepted by the tax commissioner, credit shall be allowed to such county for its portion of the statewide appraisal costs and any contract with appraisal firm or firms shall not be made for appraisal or reappraisal of such property except and unless requested by such county, or shown to be necessary by the tax commissioner: *Provided,* That until the completion of the appraisal herein provided for in all of the 55 counties of the State, the local share for each county shall be determined on the basis of the annual spot survey of property valuations by the tax commissioner in this State, as heretofore provided, but in no way shall this be interpreted as affecting the assessment provisions set forth above; however, in any county having accepted and used appraised valuations developed by an appraisal made by the tax commissioner or accepted by him as a basis in determining the true and actual valuation for assessment purposes, the county board of education may annually request that the local share shall be that which was in effect under the last applicable spot survey preceding such acceptance and usage and until the full reappraisal has been completed in all counties the board of school finance shall comply with such request: *Provided, further,* That the sample pieces of property employed in making the annual spot survey shall be used by the tax commissioner for this purpose only and shall be open to none other than the legislature by its request through a resolution approved by both the senate and the house of delegates and as otherwise provided in this section; however, if on the basis of the current statewide report of the tax commissioner available the first day of January of each year, it appears that any county shall not have complied with the requirements regarding the ratio of assessed valuations, the tax commissioner shall notify the assessor and the county court of each such county and, if they file a request for review of the appraisals which they believe to be in error, he shall review the appraisal of such properties and shall correct such errors as he may discover in such individual appraisal and/or in the preparation or recording of the report by the tax commissioner. The corrected figures shall be reported to the board of school finance prior to the first day of June and shall be used in determining the allocations of State aid to the county boards of education for the subsequent fiscal year.

The county assessor and the county court shall comply with the provisions of chapter 11 of this code in determining the true and actual value of property for assessment purposes and shall not arbitrarily use a direct percentage application to the appraisal valuations (whether complete appraisal or spot survey) of any class of property or property within a class for such purpose.

The provisions of this section shall not be construed to alter or repeal in any manner the provisions of chapter 11 of this code, but shall be construed in pari materia therewith, and compliance with this section by the assessor and county court shall be considered, pro tanto, as compliance with said chapter 11.

INSURANCE COVERAGE

I

Purpose: Building and contents.
Insurer: Firemen's Fund.
Policy No. AW-1-12-92-84.
Premium: $15,318 covering period March 31, 1965 to March 31, 1968.

II

Purpose: Covers difference between replacement and depreciation of contents.
Insurer: Lloyd's of London.
Policy No. LC 103789.
Premium: $1,275 from April 6, 1965 to April 6, 1966.

III

Purpose: Boilers and machinery.
Insurer: Pacific Indemnity.
Policy No. M48751.
Premium: $209 from April 1, 1965 to June 6, 1966.
Face value: Maximum liability of $500 per accident.

IV

Purpose: Malpractice for nursing program.
Insurer: Unknown.
Policy No.: Unknown.
Premium: $2,700 per year.

V

Purpose: Fidelity policy for blanket coverage of all P.B. employees.
Insurer: Unknown.
Policy No.: Unknown.
Premium: Policy is paid through January 1, 1968. No allocation to Charleston operation at this time.

VI

Purpose: Comprehensive general liability.
Insurer: Harbour Insurance.
Policy No. 100445.
Face value: $2 million.
Premium: $218.40 for period June 9, 1965, to October 1, 1965—$700 annual premium for Charleston operation beginning October 1, 1965.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, it would appear clearly from the facts that the Kenawha Hotel Corp., whose president is a prominent Democrat in the State administration, gets a guaranteed annual profit of $94,800 on an investment of $250,000. That is poverty profits of 38 percent per year.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he notified the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] that he was going to take the floor today?

Mr. QUIE. I notified the gentleman from Florida to the effect that I was going to bring the Charleston, W. Va., story up again, and that I would be mentioning his name. We talked about it.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate that information.

Mr. QUIE. I mention him because the gentleman from Florida brought it up on the floor in a 1-minute speech after this came up in the committee on March 23.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PEACEFUL WORLD ORDER THROUGH UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish community of Greater Cleveland began a 10-day vigil last Sunday—on the eve of Passover—to preserve the human rights of some 3 million Jews living in the Soviet Union. This vigil began with a 1½-mile march from the intersection of Superior and South Taylor Roads to the Jewish Community Center on Mayfield Road where a replica of the Eternal Light in Washington was rekindled. A public rally at the Community Center, attended by Christian clergy and laity, emphasized the themes of "Matzoh of Repression" in Soviet Russia where Jews are being denied matzoh for their Seder tables and the "Empty Chair of Russian Jewry"—as a symbolic reminder of "the millions of fellow Jews in the Soviet Union who are absent tonight from the Seder: absent not of their own volition but because of the tyranny under which they live."

The Passover which began at sundown last night commemorates the delivery of the Jews from ancient Egyptian slavery. Matzoh is the symbolic bread of affliction. It is served at the Seder table with the admonition—Let all who are hungry enter and eat. The youngest of the family is privileged to ask four questions at the Seder table. Those questions serve to remind all those present of the plight of the Jews in ancient times and the manner of their deliverance from the bonds of slavery.

During this Passover the members of the Jewish community in Greater Cleveland might well be asking these questions.

First. When will the Jews of the Soviet Union be permitted to freely practice their ancient faith?

Second. When will the Jews of the Soviet Union be allowed to have their prayer books in Hebrew?

Third. When will the Jews of the Soviet Union be allowed to maintain a rabbinical seminary for the preparation of those holy men who preserve the faith from generation to generation?

Fourth. When will the Jews of the Soviet Union be permitted to enjoy their cultural heritage and to share it freely with their children?

Questions in this same vein might well be raised by Christians as we enter Holy Week and look forward to the Feast of the Resurrection. For the day-to-day lot of the practicing Christian in the Soviet Union is no less severe than that of the practicing Jews. Like the Jews, the Christians are denied the right to freely practice their ancient faith, seminaries are closed and the remaining Christian clergy are victims of systematic persecution, Christian baptisms are performed in secret to avoid harassment by the government, the teaching of religion is officially prohibited and parents pass on the faith to their children at great risk of exposure and punishment by the state.

The same conditions apply to all religious faiths within the Soviet Union. It is the official policy of the Soviet Government to encourage and support financially antireligious programs calculated to promote atheism.

As is well known, the Soviet Union is a multicultural state just as it is a multinational state. Propaganda emanating from Moscow claims that there is complete cultural freedom in the Soviet Union. But the record of practice tells us otherwise.

The leaders of the Soviet Union have been more than candid in their boasts that they are in the process of developing a Soviet man. An examination of the doctrine of Homo Sovieticus will reveal clearly the intent of Soviet official policy toward the peoples under its control. Under that doctrine the Soviet man will be "devoid of all attachment to religious beliefs, devoid of all attachment to longstanding cultural heritages, devoid of all attachment to long standing traditions and customs, devoid of a sense of national origin and the historical aspirations associated with that origin." Such a man will, in the meaning of that doctrine, lack all the human feelings held dear within the multicultural, multinational population of the Soviet Union. The developers of this new type man intend that he be denied the civilizing influence of 2,000 years of Judeo-Christian values and be reduced to the unchecked will of the masters in the Kremlin.

When the intent of this doctrine is examined in the context of the writings of Raphael Lemkin, no other opinion can be reached but that the doctrine of Homo Sovieticus is a blueprint for the crime of genocide. Lemkin spent most of his useful life in the study of techniques used by governments and states to exterminate whole groups of people and nations. He created the term genocide and developed the legal theories through which he appealed for international action to control and punish those who perpetrated such crimes against humanity.

The term "genocide" is a combination of the Greek word "genos," meaning race, nation, or tribe, and the Latin suffix "cide," meaning killing. In our lifetime we have seen this crime practiced through mass murder and deportation—crimes against humanity practiced by both Hitler and Stalin. But the same evil ends—the killing off of a race, nation, or tribe—can be accomplished by more sophisticated but equally final methods. For example, the killing of religious beliefs, cultural heritages, and national aspirations by official governmental denial of basic human rights. That is precisely what the doctrine of Homo Sovieticus is attempting to do.

When any state or nation sets upon a course of genocide as a matter of policy to attain its objectives, a dangerous threat to world peace exists. That threat was created by the Nazi regime prior to World War II and was a major factor plunging the entire world into the most devastating conflict in history.

Mankind must face up to this new threat against the establishment of a peaceful world order. The doctrine of Homo Sovieticus practiced upon the diversified peoples and nations of the Soviet Union carries with it the seeds of violence and war. The spread of that doctrine to other lands beyond the Soviet Union has already begun and unless it is checked it will plunge the world into a holocaust.

There is no established law of nations which controls in these crimes. Nor is there an international tribunal before which the human rights of its victims may be defended.

The United Nations was confronted with the issue of genocide as far back as 1946, in its embryo stages and when the hopes for a peaceful world order were at high tide. Over the years the broad issues of human rights within the Soviet Union have come before various organs of the United Nations. Beyond the importance of making a public record of charge and countercharge, little was accomplished in terms of remedy or positive results.

In these circumstances I believe it is both proper and urgent that the House of Representatives take the initiative to establish a means through which the doctrine of Homo Sovieticus may be put under a global spotlight and examined as a threat to world peace. I have, therefore, introduced today House Resolution 813 calling for the establishment of a House Select Committee on Human Rights and Peaceful World Order.

What can the proposed select committee do to meet this urgent problem?

It can get all the facts from competent witnesses and much documentary evidence can be produced by scholars and students of the problem. Those facts have not been gathered and made available to the American people.

It can seek the advice of experts on the threat thereby presented to world peace and obtain advice from other experts on what steps can be taken to remove the blocks thus presented to a peaceful world order. There is expert opinion available on these issues and it should be sought out and presented to the public.

It can examine the evidence and opinion gathered and formulate positive and practical recommendations for the consideration of our Government.

It can provide the kind of public forum these vital issues deserve.

It can develop public opinion on an international scale which even the most hardened leader in the Kremlin cannot afford to dismiss.

A scholar of Jewish affairs recently asked, "Are the Russian Jews to become a lost tribe of Israel?' It is the opinion of that same scholar that by the year 2000, 34 years from now, it is within reason to assume that there will not be a practicing Jew left in the Soviet Union. If this happens the doctrine of Homo Sovieticus will have been proven beyond question as a blueprint for genocide.

We have gone to the rescue of victims of earthquakes and other natural calamities in distant lands. We did so without expectation of reward. We did so because it was right. The salvation of the Jews in the Soviet Union may well rest with the American people. We should now move to marshal world public opinion behind their fight for survival. It is the right thing to do.

Following this course we shall be marshaling world public opinion behind the struggles of the many different peoples in the respective Soviet Republics who also fight for survival as national and cultural entities. By so doing we act to further the cause of a peaceful world order of a determined effort to stamp out the most virulent seeds of world conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks at this point, House Resolution 813, which I introduced today:

H. Res. 813

Resolution creating a select committee on basic human rights and peaceful world order, and for other purposes

Whereas the Government of the United States has consistently advocated the cause of basic human rights and freedom as a key to world peace; and

Whereas the official and organized denial of basic human rights and freedom by any government to large segments of the population under its control creates dangerous international tensions which prevent the development of a peaceful world order; and

Whereas there is mounting evidence that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has officially authorized and is now carrying out an intensified and systematic plan to eradicate all Jewish religious and cultural life within its borders; and

Whereas there is accumulated evidence that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a matter of official policy is engaged in a systematic effort to eradicate all organized religions based upon belief in a supreme being, to eliminate all non-Soviet cultural and ethnic values and traditions, and to suppress the natural development of the many nations federated by force to the Russian Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a Select Committee on Basic Human Rights and Peaceful World Order to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom shall be designated as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the official policies and practices of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with respect to religious liberty, cultural freedom, ethnic traditions, national aspirations within the respective Soviet Republics and the relationship of such policies and practices to the development of a peaceful world order.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigations and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, during the course of the House session, it will be my purpose to seek recognition to call up by unanimous consent H.R. 14224, a bill to amend part B of title 18 of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance for the aged.

The Committee on Ways and Means in executive session reported the bill this morning unanimously, after having adopted an amendment making two changes in the text of the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the language of the amendment making the changes could be put in the RECORD for this evening so that the membership will have notice of the language involved in the amendment, or really of the bill reported by the committee today?

Mr. MILLS. I would think it will be better to include the bill and the amendment approved by the committee. If there is no objection, Mr. Speaker, I do ask unanimous consent to so include the bill and the amendment at this point.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

H.R. 14224

A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 1837(c) of the Social Security Act is amended by (1) striking out "January 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1966"; and (2) striking out "March 31, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 31, 1966".

SEC. 2. Section 1837(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "January 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1966".

SEC. 3. Section 102(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by striking out "April 1, 1966" each time it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1966".

SEC. 4. In the case of an individual who first satisfies paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1836 of the Social Security Act in March 1966, and who enrolls pursuant to subsection (d) of section 1837 of such Act in May 1966, his coverage period shall, notwithstanding section 1838(a)(2)(D) of such Act, begin on July 1, 1966.

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (b) of section 1843 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof (after and below paragraph (2)) the following new sentence:

"Except as provided in subsection (g), there shall be excluded from any coverage group any individual who is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under title II or who is entitled to receive an annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937."

(b) Section 1843 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) The Secretary shall, at the request of a State made before January 1, 1968, enter into a modification of an agreement entered into with such State pursuant to subsection (a) under which the second sentence of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to such agreement.

"(2) In the case of any individual who would (but for this subsection) be excluded from the applicable coverage group described in subsection (b) by the second sentence of such subsection—

"(A) subsections (c) and (d)(2) shall be applied as if such subsections referred to the modification under this subsection (in lieu of the agreement under subsection (a)),

"(B) subsection (d)(3)(B) shall not apply so long as there is in effect a modification entered into by the State under this subsection, and

"(C) notwithstanding subsection (e), in the case of any termination described in such subsection, such individual may terminate his enrollment under this part by the filing of a notice, before the close of the third month which begins after the date of such termination, that he no longer wishes to participate in the insurance program established by this part (and in such a case, the termination of his coverage period under this part shall take effect as of the close of such third month)."

(c) Section 1840 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) In the case of an individual who is enrolled under the program established by this part as a member of a coverage group to which an agreement with a State entered into pursuant to section 1843 is applicable, subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall not apply to his monthly premium for any month in his ocverage period which is determined under section 1843(d)."

CRIME—A NO-WIN POLICY SEEN BY DON MACLEAN

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, having twice been the victim of personal assaults since coming to Washington, I was very much struck by a story told by Don Maclean in his column in last Friday's Washington News. It reports an attack by juveniles on the mother of an aid to one of our colleagues. No names are mentioned in the article but the story Mr. Maclean relays, if accurate, indeed spells out a no-win policy towards crime. I urge my colleagues to give their most thoughtful attention to this account of how a vicious assault could take place with the guilty parties going scot free and unpunished.

The story follows:

The other day I took testimony from a Congressman's aid, whose story, I think, has a message. (His name is available to any legitimate agency wishing to do further research on this subject.) His mother-in-law, who survived the bombings of Warsaw, Poland, without a scratch, was viciously beaten and robbed by three youngsters in daylight on a Washington corner. Fortunately, a passing motorist, who turned out to be a karate instructor at the YMCA, jumped from his car and sat forcefully upon one hooligan while the victim limped off to call police. Her son-in-law, the congressional aid, arrived at the precinct station as police brought in the other two purse snatchers. (The first one finked out.)

"A juvenile 'case worker,' or some such title, gave the little rats a stern lecture," the Congressman's assistant said. "He was a wonder. He understood child psychology, environmental problems, toilet training, etc. When the kids' parents showed up, he lectured them, too. After that, he said the kids were to be released.

"Well, I screamed. He said they were only juveniles, after all. And that the training schools are jammed. 'Be reasonable,' he said, 'we've scared them, they've apologized to the old lady, what more do you want?' In desperation, I said, 'Forgetting her doctor bills, how about the kids or their parents giving her back the $27 they stole?' The kids said they lost it, the parents said they didn't steal it, why should they pay it back? Everyone looked at me like I was some sort of monster. I gave up and left. I'm afraid we're pursuing a no-win policy in the so-called war on crime."

POLISH REPUBLIC-IN-EXILE PRESIDENT SPEAKS

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Government-in-exile in London persistently carried out its moral responsibility to speak on behalf of the oppressed people of Poland. At this time the task is as important as in any period since the close of World War II because the Communist government of Poland in retrogressing into a completely Stalinistic state.

On April 2, in London, the President of the Polish Republic-in-exile, His Excellency August Zaleski, addressed the latest session of the Council of the Republic of Poland which functions as a parliamentary body in exile. His remarks follow:

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT AUGUST ZALESKI OF THE POLISH REPUBLIC-IN-EXILE

News received from Poland indicates that the situation there has worsened in many respects since I last had the honor of addressing this Council.

In the economic field, the imbalance between supply and demand still persists as is usual with countries under a Communist system and with a bureaucratic economy. In Poland, this state of affairs is now aggravated by a natural increase of population for which the feebly developing industry cannot provide employment. But the economic state of the country suffers far more because Poland, as a member of Comecon, is bound with Russia—actually the autocrat of this allegedly voluntary union of so-called fraternal nations and who ruthlessly exploits her position as the principal supplier of raw materials and the chief recipient of the commodities produced by the countries she has subjected. The very low standard of life in Poland caused by this situation has dual repercussions: on the one hand, it evoked the serious dissatisfaction of the population and, on the other hand, forces a great many people to seek means of existence for themselves and their families by various illegal methods of acquiring essential sources of income.

Unable to cope with this situation, the Communist regime feels bound to restrict freedom of speech in ever greater measure by tightening the censorship and punishing not only those who strive to earn some money illegally but even those who protest against the system current in Poland.

This system was imposed upon Poland by Russia, and all that the Communist regime in Poland does is either on the orders of Russia or at least tolerated by her. Thus, an examination of Russian relations can clarify much for us.

It seems undoubted that the attitude of the Warsaw regime toward the church, so incomprehensible for many, is modeled on Soviet relations. In Russia, the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church has been mastered by the Soviet Government. The present-day Russian patriarch is just as much a faithful servant of the godless Soviet Government as the procurator general of the holy synod was in czarist times, creating the impression abroad of the existence of religious freedom in Russia. This would seem to be the ideal the Communist regime in Poland is striving to reach. It is my firm conviction that these efforts will be in vain if only because they are incompatible with the character of the Catholic Church and of the Polish nation. Nonetheless, the struggle against them will be a desperate one, and bringing it to the notice of the Western World is one of our principal tasks. The struggle must be undertaken, particularly during this year of Poland's Christian millennium as it is probable that, with the morale of the whole nation raised by this great anniversary, the Communist regime has decided to step up its antireligious activity wishing to do all in its power to obstruct the huge celebration of Poland's Christian millenary planned for May this year, when even His Holiness the Pope was expected to honor Poland by his presence at the Polish shrine of Jasna Góra in Czestochowa. At present the Communist regime in Warsaw has informed the Vatican that a visit by Pope Paul VI to Poland would be inopportune, and the official announcement a few days ago of new difficulties in obtaining visas for foreign visitors to Poland leaves no doubt that they are meant to prevent the participation in the May millennium celebrations of foreign bishops invited by the Polish Episcopate.

Finally, the vast complications which now mark international relations likewise merit our close attention. Chief amongst the root-causes of these complications is the fact that up till now no peace treaty has been signed. This is due mostly to the attitude of Russia, who wanted to exploit the state of "neither peace nor war" for her imperialistic ends. In this she has been largely successful. It afforded her the possibility of establishing Communist regimes in a large part of Europe. Now she has managed to instill within many circles on both hemispheres the hope that her intentions are pacific.

The Federal German Republic could improve this situation by recognizing the Oder-Neisse frontier line. But the Bonn government refrains from doing it in the hope that with time perhaps it will succeed in obtaining a change of this frontier, although such a policy tends to prolong the division of Germany.

All this inhibits efforts for European unity not only in Europe but also in some American circles where the conviction is arising that the danger of an armed Communist China is a factor common to the interests of the United States and of Russia, although the last American investigations prove that the rearmament of China is a matter requiring a long time to accomplish.

All these circumstances call for great vigilance and intensive effort on our part. It is still my hope that the Poles in exile will realize this and successfully unite in order to cope with the very arduous task which faces them.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep in mind that one of the tragic developments in postwar Europe following the infamous Yalta agreement has been the persistence of the State Department in subsidizing the Communist governments of Eastern Europe. We recognize that the dangers to our freedom remain great as long as the Communists maintain control of previously free people in any part of the world. Therefore, we should note the words of wisdom and strength of the President of the Polish Government-in-exile and hope that U.S. foreign policy might be properly redirected to effectively achieving a world of complete freedom and peace.

RHODESIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I venture to bring up again the subject of Rhodesia now that the British elections are over. Already it is possible to note the accelerated hue and cry calling for the downfall of Ian Smith's government as a result of Prime Minister Wilson's so-called mandate.

The word, "mandate," is becoming a much-abused word and has, apparently, taken on a new meaning. It once meant, in politics, that an overwhelming majority of the people supported, through their vote, a particular man and his philosophy. It is impossible for me to read a "mandate" into Wilson's skin-of-the-teeth vote. His vote was a scant 48 percent, which, by anybody's figuring, is less than a majority and certainly less than a mandate.

In the 5 months since Ian Smith signed Rhodesia's Declaration of Independence from Great Britain, this small nation has managed to keep its governmental head above water despite the vindictive treatment heaped upon it, principally by Great Britain and the United States.

Three generations ago, a group of resourceful white men went into the jungle of what is now Rhodesia and carved a civilized land by the sheer force of their brains and management ability. The lesson of history was crystal clear then as it is now: The natives were not capable of producing any semblance of what we call civilization. Now that the white man has lead them out of savagery, the Socialist, leftwing camp is up in arms to turn the country back to them. This is, of course, a not too subtle way of building a Socialist bridge from democracy to communism.

These advocates, who play so lightly with the truth, try to create the impression that, in Rhodesia, a handful of white men are holding the natives in bondage and worse, after having forcefully taken their land from them. Nothing could be further from the truth. Let us look at a few of the facts, as opposed to the big lie.

The impression is created that only the white man can vote; that a small white dynasty controls the nation. The fact is that all Rhodesians, black and white, are subject to exactly the same voting requirements. What could possibly be more democratic? There is even a provision made for those, black and white, who fail to meet the minimum standards. They are allowed to vote on the so-called B list which elects almost 25 percent of the governing legislature. These are the facts; not the fiction of the Socialists.

This same group would have us believe that the natives are segregated, downtrodden and living in fear of a white-supremacy police. Again, let us look at the facts, rather than the big lie.

The facts are that segregation is unknown in Rhodesia. It is forbidden by law. Public facilities, hotels, bars, buses and the like are open to one race as well as another. And as for the white-supremacy police force, this fiction is dispelled by the truth itself: Both the police force and the army are almost entirely black.

If the situation in Rhodesia were what the Socialist left would have us believe, it would be true that the natives were suppressed in their educational opportunities. The truth of the matter is that Rhodesia has a much higher proportion of African children in school than any other nation except South Africa.

In spite of all this, the leftwing wolfpack of the world continues to bay for blood; even to armed intervention to overthrow Ian Smith and hand the nation over to the Africans. If they are successful, the day will not be far off when, as they were before, the natives will revert to living in the jungles. It is the height of folly and treachery to snatch success from the Smith government on the vague theory that any head, no matter how empty, must have an equal count in the management of the nation.

The U.S. policy is apparently being shaped by U.N. Ambassador Goldberg; working, sometimes openly, sometimes under cover, to undermine Smith and bring about a black revolution. This policy is urged on us by the same extremists who brought about the rout of anti-Communist, pro-American Moise Tshombe. They are the same, violently vocal group, that instigates protests and demonstrations about our so-called meddling in Vietnam. Our anti-Communist effort in Vietnam is called meddling, but they have no difficulty facing the opposite direction and calling for our intervention in a successful pro-American government in Rhodesia to overthrow it in favor of some Socialist regime that will, at least cooperate, if not submit to the left. This about-face is completely inconsistent, but, then, consistency is never a hobgoblin to their minds.

In recent months, government after government among the emerging nations has fallen, risen, and fallen again. Military dictatorships flourish. Free speech and all forms of personal liberty have been suspended in any number of countries. Yet in no other instance has their been a word of protest from this Government. Only in the case of Rhodesia has the United States seen fit to meddle in the internal affairs of a government. Naturally, the question must be asked, why?

One principal difference separates Rhodesia from these other nations and that is that the Ian Smith government is predominantly white. There can be no denying that the U.S. policy is based, in the main, on racism in reverse and a determination that, no matter what he wants, the Negro shall have it. The fact is that Rhodesia has become the cornerstone of this nation's tenuous foothold in the entire Afro-Asian world. If we are successful in our treacherous subversion of Rhodesia, there is no possibility that Portuguese Africa and South Africa can stand. When they, too, collapse, we will have no friend on the continent.

The question must also be asked as to why we are so willing to support Great Britain in imposing every sort of economic and political sanction against Rhodesia. The answer lies again imbedded in the Socialist philosophy and in racism in reverse.

During the months we have sided with Great Britain in imposing these sanctions against Ian Smith, the British Government has refused to apply sanctions against Communist Cuba. Ship after ship flying the British flag has put into North Vietnamese ports unloading supplies for the Communist Vietcong, supplies which fortify the soldiers who are, daily, slaughtering American servicemen in South Vietnam.

Beleaguered though his government is, Ian Smith has offered the United States troops he can ill afford to spare us, to aid us in Vietnam. Who, then, is our true friend? Great Britain who supplies the Communist enemy or Rhodesia who offers us troops to fight the Vietcong?

The answer is obvious. But the Rhodesian Government has committed the mortal sin of being white and this Government cannot forgive them. We clamor for one man, one vote and threaten to topple their Government if they do not adopt this foolish ideology immediately no matter what the cost.

Again, one can only wonder where our dedication to this principle was when Cuba was taken over by the Communists and elections forbidden. Or when Hungary was overrun by Russia. Or in any other nation where voting is an abstraction, whether one man, one vote or no vote for anyone.

The United States began just as Rhodesia is beginning, by declaring its independence from Great Britain. It would be impossible to draw a parallel any closer to the founding of this land. Yet, instead of helping Rhodesia or, at the very least, leaving her alone, we have adopted the reprehensible policy of seeking its overthrow.

Our actions in Rhodesia make a mockery of freedom and democracy.

Rhodesia is at its Valley Forge. It ill behooves this Nation to play the part of the Hessian by attacking the most promising nation to emerge from the Dark Continent.

THE AMERICAN FLAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have been shocked in the past several days to learn of two incidents in which the American flag has been deliberately and publicly insulted and desecrated right here in our own country.

Many have also been surprised to learn that at the present time there is no law to deal with this crime. Perhaps this is because until recently it was not seriously considered that Americans would enter into this kind of activity.

Perhaps the average citizen, who still gets a lump in his throat when the flag goes by, never believed that it would be necessary for laws to protect the very symbol of our liberty. Yet this time has come.

We have become accustomed, unfortunately, to seeing Communist-led agitators carry on with demonstrations and riots in other countries, especially in the less developed areas of the world where it can be expected that the irresponsible, self-seeking Communists can hope to make headway in stirring up hatreds against this country. It is only barely newsworthy these days when another American Embassy overseas is stormed and the American flag is desecrated as a symbol of injustice.

But now that the unlikely has happened, and the American flag is being defiled within our borders as well as abroad, it is time that we take action to penalize this gross disrespect for decency and sense.

I am introducing a bill today that would make it a Federal crime to desecrate the American flag. The proposed law would carry a prison term and a fine for such an act.

The most recent incident of this kind which has been reported in the newspapers took place on March 31 at Cordele, Ga. What the Associated Press called a wild demonstration by a so-called civil rights group was staged on the courthouse lawn in that community. Apparently, the law-enforcement people were not able to halt the demonstration or to maintain order. They allowed the demonstrators complete freedom to register their feelings.

But then some of the demonstrators threw all sense of responsibility to the winds and tore down an American flag and a Georgia flag from the flagpole. They pulled at the American flag until holes were torn in it. If this is the civil rights movement, then a lot of do-gooders had better take a second look.

The other recent incident took place during the third week in March at a meeting of the Students for a Democratic Society at Purdue University in Indiana.

The meeting was held to protest the U.S. effort against communism in Vietnam. The people attending evidently have a very poor regard for this country in its efforts to protect innocent people against the military aggression and terrorism of despots.

To illustrate his point a participant at the meeting stood on the stage and methodically spat upon the American flag, first twice from one side, then twice from the other. He then tore the flag apart, threw it to the floor, and stepped on it.

At the conclusion of his performance many persons from the audience came to the stage and milled about, stepping on the remnants of the flag.

Mr. Speaker, we are making an extremely serious mistake if we go much further in the belief that the unrest in our land today is entirely spontaneous and idealistic. We are being foolish and naive if we underestimate the element of Communist involvement in these incidents of agitation and strife.

Last year at about this time an official of Howard University wisely said that some demonstrations are being led by people who are not interested in the civil rights of anybody.

It might be said of the Purdue University incident that the American flag was desecrated by a person who was motivated not by any kind of justice for anyone, but rather by a wish to arouse emotional hatred against the very idea of an orderly society.

This seems true because at that Purdue University meeting the object was to recruit students to march in a "peace" demonstration in Chicago. And the slogans the students were advised to use included some favoring U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam, refusal to pay taxes, protests against any kind of nationalism, some against monogamy, in favor of free love, and in favor of something called antistatism.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing in this country today a serious problem in the form of a tiny minority of subversives who are using great skill in techniques of agitation to influence events to an extent far beyond what most of us might think would be likely or possible.

We are either unwilling or unable to come to grips with this problem. We are turning our eyes from it, and are not prepared, evidently, to grasp the potential seriousness of it, just as in other countries the people turned their eyes until it was too late.

A law to assess penalties to individuals who desecrate the American flag will not solve the basic problem by itself. However, such a law at least will show where we stand on this question of respect for our flag.

It might also help to identify some of the hard core agitators who are devoting themselves wholeheartedly to the effort of breaking up U.S. communities and the Nation itself.

Mr. Speaker, the frustrating point is that the very freedom which makes it possible for these perpetrators of treasonable acts to indulge in their irresponsible behavior is the same freedom symbolized by the flag they would desecrate.

Were it not for the flag and the glorious freedom it represents these hoodlums would not be able to speak out in dissent; they would not have the right to petition their Government; they would not be allowed to hold meetings opposing the Government or the war in Vietnam, or local authority.

No, Mr. Speaker, when the flag is destroyed or defiled and is no more the effective symbol of our American heritage, then the desecrators themselves would become the slaves of the very statism which they seek to destroy.

The flag symbolizes the very law that gives them the benefit of doubt when they go into court for such illegal acts; it protects them and gives them constitutional rights; it is the guardian of each and every individual in this Nation.

In passing this proposal into law we will confirm the principles and ideas on which this Nation was founded and on which the morality of our system is based. We will express the love and the honor we feel for the American flag.

Mr. Speaker, Henry Ward Beecher said:

> A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of liberty and men rejoiced in it.

And President Woodrow Wilson said:

> This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours.

Today in Vietnam more than 200,000 of our young men are fighting for the ideas symbolized by the U.S. flag. It is not tolerable that we can allow defilement of the flag to go unpunished any longer.

I urge early consideration of the bill.

RED CHINA LOBBY AT WORK AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, once more we see the Red China lobby at work with its usual approach of soft-pedaling the vicious Communist regime's tyranny and holding out the olive branch to our enemy. It is no secret that our State Department has been waiting for a chance to push Red China into the community of respectable nations and now seems to be the time. For the past 5 years I have continually pointed out the feelers that were sent out by these professional miscalculators who champion the cause of aid to our Communist enemy, negotiation, and treaties, increased trade, and lowering of all barriers with them. The terrible record of Communist performance does not deter them a bit, they continue to advocate the same shopworn "be kind to Communists and they will treat us nice, too" theory which is out of touch with reality.

In the late forties, these same people were referring to the Red Chinese as agrarian reformers. They attacked Chiang Kai-shek and had many Americans believing that he was worse than Mao. The Institute of Pacific Relations and other pro-Communist groups were grinding out a relentless barrage of misinformation calculated to bring the American guard down. It did just this. All of a sudden, we hear the same line reminiscent of the Owen Lattimore days when, in the words of the late President Kennedy, then a Massachusetts Congressman, our diplomats and President frittered away what our soldiers had won. He was speaking of course of the loss of China to communism.

Now we see a concerted effort to put the aura of respectability over this bandit nation whose leaders murdered more than 20 million of their fellow Chinese when they came to power. This is bad enough but the method of accomplishing this change in policy is even more interesting. They sell the idea that our policy is to get Red China to shift from its position and relax the barriers it has erected against us. Note that well. The situation is exactly the opposite. We have erected the barriers, we have prevented them from becoming a member of the United Nations. We have had the barriers against them. Now we read that the State Department is working hard to get China to give in. The next step will be to talk them into accepting our foreign aid. They will hail as a diplomatic victory the Red Chinese acceptance of a seat in the United Nations and the resumption of trade with the United States.

An Associated Press news story on March 15, 1966, gives a hint of this line. It said in the lead paragraph:

> The United States is pressing Communist China through public and diplomatic channels to lower barriers between the two countries, officials said yesterday, and the next effort probably will be made tomorrow in a meeting of ambassadors at Warsaw.

Read that over again. We are pressuring Red China to lower its barriers. This is fraudulent. One of the number one foreign policy goals of the Communists for the past two decades has been to get U.S. diplomatic recognition of Red China, to open trade and to get the Reds a seat in the United Nations. This has been their goal, not ours—"ours," of course, meaning most of us excepting the State Department—and now we see our so-called foreign policy experts hunting for the "key to unlock China." Red China is an aggressor nation; it lives in disregard of the United Nations Charter and gives no evidence of being the type of nation which would live at peace in the community of nations. It is in the Communist world's interest to accomplish a reversal of present U.S. policy, not ours.

Fortunately, there are a few people around who see the China picture clearly and speak out with ringing authority. One of these is Prof. David Nelson Rowe of Yale University who testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 28, 1966. Professor Rowe is a stalwart American and spent last summer in Seoul, Korea, at the Freedom Center. I was privileged to serve with him as one of the American observers at the 11th annual Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League conference which was held last September in Manila. The following transcript of his testimony shows the China picture in its true perspective. We can only hope that the sound judgment of men like Professor Rowe will be heeded and the willful band of diplomats who have failed, miserably failed, in dealing with world communism will not succeed in this effort to whitewash Red China. I share the concern of those who would like to see a change in Communist China-United States relations. This change should be based on their change, however, and not on merely determining this is the time and place to let moral standards go out the window and acquiesce once more to communism. The United Nations has enough problems trying to be effective now. If it is turned into a reform school there will be no hope for it.

Professor Rowe's testimony follows:

THE CHINA PROBLEM TODAY IN U.S. POLICYMAKING

(Statement before the Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate, by Yale University Prof. David Nelson Rowe, March 28, 1966)

Why does this problem exist (in the United States)?

1. The Korean war proved that Communist China was willing to fight the free world in order to achieve Communist expansionist aims in Asia vis-a-vis Korea (Japan was the real objective and the most important one).

2. The formula has been repeated in:

(a) Tibet—anti-India and Nehru.

(b) Laos—250,000 Chinese Communist troops massed on the Laos frontier in 1961-62 to bring a settlement favorable to Communist China.

(c) Indian frontier—this involved an actual Sino-Indian war, with Communist Chinese troops fighting Indian troops.

(d) Communist Chinese support for North Vietnam aggression against South Vietnam. The Sino-Russian ploy: North Vietnam (the North Korea of this episode) is immune from destruction at the hands of the United States and its allies, because of its joint Sino-Soviet backing. Communist China stands behind North Vietnam's aggression militarily, to prevent such military action against North Vietnam as is necessary to the attainment of our military objectives in and for South Vietnam. Thus, Communist China achieves for North Vietnam immunity from the consequences of its aggression in South Vietnam which the previous Sino-Soviet techniques and strategies of support for North Korea failed to achieve, and this without any cost thus far in Communist Chinese manpower.

3. Thus, Sino-Soviet "indirect" aggression in South Vietnam depends upon their joint success in preventing the United States from taking military action against North Vietnam adequate to achieve the defense of South Vietnamese independence.

4. The chief Sino-Soviet weapon in this psychological warfare struggle is the threat of massive Chinese manpower intervening as "Peoples Volunteers" in the Vietnamese war.

5. How did we deal with this threat and fact in the Korean war?

(a) By making no direct attacks on the Chinese Communist home base.

(b) By application of massive firepower to Communist Chinese mass attacks in Korea, resulting in such heavy Communist Chinese casualties as to make them insupportable indefinitely. This led to truce talks of great length, so long that most U.S. casualties were incurred during the truce talk period.

6. The difference this time is that we have publicly announced that never again would there be a privileged sanctuary in Communist China in case we got into another war directly with Communist Chinese military forces under whatever guise and in whatever conditions.

Thus, the risk to the Communist Chinese regime is incalculably greater this time than in the case of Korea, albeit the current actual costs to them are negligible.

7. This pattern fits the current picture of China perfectly:

(a) Internal economic crises prevent Communist China's incurring real costs, particularly in manpower (for political reasons).

(b) Lack of logistical support to Communist China from the U.S.S.R. means poverty of Chinese Communist military means. All material from the U.S.S.R. in the Korean war was purchased by Communist China, in exchange for food and agricultural raw materials sent to the U.S.S.R.

(c) The internal crisis in Communist China demands external action, for internal mobilization, diversion of attention, and internal political and military and economic payoff with the victory that is confidently counted upon for the Communist forces in Vietnam.

8. To mitigate the risks of Communist China's southeast Asia policy today is the aim of all true friends of Communist China in the United States today. Many others aid and abet this aim for a variety of reasons.

9. Thus, almost immediately after the Johnson policy of heavy, direct U.S. military involvement in the Vietnamese war was initiated, the friends of Communist China began to emerge from the relative obscurity into which they have been forced by the Communist Chinese attack on us in Korea and to start openly supporting Communist China again and attacking the U.S. Far Eastern policy at the same time.

10. These movements, so patently anti-anti-Communist, seem to have forced the administration to speak as though communism by and large was not involved in the Vietnamese war, thus robbing us of one of the chief psychological supports and chief political bases of the war in Vietnam and the whole war against Communist aggression everywhere. This is clearly seen in President Johnson's Baltimore speech (see my analysis in the Congressional Record) [Not shown in this issue of the Record] and even more so in his recent speech at Freedom House, New York, where he uses "Red" and "Communists" just once each in the whole speech, thus playing down communism as an issue in the Vietnam war.

By contrast on January 12, 1966, the Ambassador from Vietnam to the United States, in a speech of only about one thousand words (about one-fifth as long as that of President Johnson, cited above) used the term "Communist" 9 times, for a frequency thus 22 times greater than that of President Johnson. This is a useful index of the importance of the Communist issue in the Vietnam war, to the government and people of South Vietnam.

The purpose of the anti-anti-Communists here is clear, namely to try to show that the war in Vietnam has no valid ideological basis and thus to depict it as naked U.S. aggression without any justifications. Who sold President Johnson the line of de-emphasizing communism as an issue in the Vietnamese war?

11. Paralleling these movements are the hearings in the Senate which seem to aim at two main effects:

(a) To aline selected civilian propagandists uniformly against the mainlines of U.S. foreign policy in Asia and then to bring to rebut them the main administration figures such as the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense (much of whose testimony has to be classified). This show then goes on radio and TV (highly edited toward the left). The whole effect is to depict public "experts" as at odds with the administration. This not only persuades the Communists in Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow of divisions of opinion in the United States that do not exist in fact. It also seems to drive the administration toward public positions on Communist China that contradict its public position that the war in Vietnam could soon be ended if only Communist Chinese attitudes and measures would change. It also seems to lead members of the administration to start softening its policy of resistance to Communist China by talking "containment without isolation" and to that extent undercutting its own experts such as Secretary of State Rusk and Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs William Bundy.

(b) To have a main effect of softening our resistance to Communist China. Senator Fulbright himself states that the main aim of his hearing on China is a political aim, namely to prevent a war with Communist China.

12. In fact, the prevention of a military showdown now between the United States and Communist China is the main aim of Communists everywhere. Why?

(a) If such a showdown came soon it would destroy Communist China as such and constitute the single most catastrophic setback in history to the course of the Communist world revolution. In the course of such an event, however, the U.S.S.R. would assuredly grab both Manchuria and Sinkiang, in order to have those Chinese areas available as bases to start over again the job of communizing east Asia. But the rest of China could be saved, without doubt.

(b) If such a showdown can be prevented for 5 to 10 more years, the pro-Communist-China and anti-anti-Communist elements in this country count on the development of Communist Chinese thermonuclear power to produce a standoff and make Communist China then invulnerable to U.S. destruction, by means of the retaliatory threat. They count on this stage lasting 10 to 20 years during which either one and probably both of two things would happen:

(1) The United States would prove unable to develop any effective deterrent to so-called indirect aggression and peoples war with the result that all of Asia would come under Chinese Communist domination and control and the impact on Africa and Latin America would be disastrous.

(2) Under the deterrent of terror the political and psychological pressures toward a "detente" with Communist China similar to present illusions along that line with the U.S.S.R., would engender a thorough and complete "coexistence" policy vis-a-vis the Communist Chinese.

The Communist Chinese need coexistence much worse than do the Russians. Why? The lack of massive external support and their huge and insoluble internal problems, doom them forever to weakness and mediocrity and complete totalitarianism and military adventurism. They are trying their hardest now to soften our approach to them under the blackmail of aggression and war, to gain, at no cost to them politically, what they need in outside economic and technical support from the West and particularly from the United States. This is why their friends in the United States are trying so hard to soften the U.S. approach to Communist China.

13. What are the main themes now being pushed by the pro-Communist China and anti-Communist elements along this line?

(a) (Theme). The historical causation line: The Communist Chinese foreign policies are merely a logical result of China's frustrations and suffering at the hands of the outside world for the last century or more:

Question. Why are these frustrations and hostile reactions focused on the United States, the one nation with the longest and best record of pro-Chinese aims and actions for 125 years?

Answer. Because our past pro-Chinese policy and our present anti-Chinese-Communist policies are identical. Both involve (as with our war against Japan, 1941–45) the defense of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of small and/or weak countries in Asia. The Chinese Communists today are the chief declared opponents of this policy of ours, as Japan was previously.

Question. In this framework, why should anyone react emotionally to the word "Munich" when it is used similarly to evoke a hostile reaction to any sell-out of our friends in southeast Asia. (I.e., was a surrender to fascism appeasement and surrender; a surrender to communism neither?)

Answer. Is this reaction hypocritical, merely naive, or knowingly wrongheaded?

(b). (Theme.) The "inevitable softening of the Communist Chinese": This line is pushed hard by all the pro-Communist-China and anti-anti-Communist elements. Even Fidel Castro gives them aid and comfort by blasting the current Chinese Communist leaders as "senile" and anticipating a less dangerous Communist Chinese leadership to come with the demise of Mao.

Question. Was Khrushchev better than Stalin, and is the present leadership of the U.S.S.R. better than Khrushchev?

Answer. No.

(c) (Theme.) The "two-Chinas" line. This is tantamount to saying we can play with enemies without alienating friends. Whatever the distant future holds we cannot know. But for the responsible policymaking future there can be no two-Chinas policy for the United States or anyone else. For example, the United Kingdom has tried to adopt a two-Chinas policy: recognition of Peiping and trying to do business with Taipei. Result: it has neither China. The Communist Chinese have never entered full diplomatic relations with the United Kingdom, and the United Kingdom cannot really cooperate with the Republic of China, on Taiwan, the single most rapidly advancing and developing area in Asia. By contrast, the United States without recognition of Peiping, has much higher-level diplomatic contacts with the Chinese Communists than Britain, and is the main ally and collaborator with the Republic of China on Taiwan.

Question. Should anyone believe there can be any formal United States-Communist China diplomatic relationship without U.S. abandonment of the Republic of China?

Answer. No.

Question. Can any U.S. administration advocate abandonment of the Republic of China without committing political suicide?

Answer. This is what two-Chinas policy advocates really are urging the administration toward, some knowingly and other unwittingly. I.e., the two-Chinas policy means, to start, full diplomatic and other relations with Communist China, and with a trend toward this once set in motion we can more easily abandon the Republic of China on Taiwan, particularly since it would break relations with us if we recognized Communist China.

(d) (Theme.) The "they don't mean what they say" line. Anyone who believes in drawing the lessons of history, should not object if we say the world would have been better off if more people had taken seriously such historical documents as the Marxist Manifesto, Hitler's "Mein Kampf" or the pre-World War II utterances of the Japanese imperialists. The current utterances of the Communist Chinese leadership seem just as dangerously unrealistic today as the previously cited ones did then. They are therefore hard to give credence to. They are, in fact, filled with nonsense, but then of course so too was "Mein Kampf." But this is merely to say that all madmen are dangerous, to a great extent precisely because they are mad.

For example, in the same March 19, 1966, issue of the New York Times in which witnesses before the Fulbright committee were quoted as describing Communist China as being "fundamentally weak" and "inward-looking" and "desirous of avoiding a military confrontation with the United States," the Times carried (on the last page in the upper right-hand corner) a statement by Juo Mo-jo, Vice Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National Peoples Congress, as follows:

"Listen, U.S. imperialists. The 650 million people of China are prepared. If you insist on another trial of strength, suit yourselves. Come whenever you like, alone or with others. We will not shut you out; we will wipe you out, as many as you come."

Question. When men talk madness (as the Communist Chinese do) would it not be wise to assume they mean it until and unless they prove otherwise by their acts? Yes. Are the Communist Chinese proving otherwise by their acts? No—they do just the opposite. Witness: Korea, the Taiwan Straits, the Indian frontier, Laos, and Thailand, as well as Vietnam.

(e) (Theme) The "simultaneous hard and soft" line: "containment, but not isolation." The friends of Communist China and the anti-anti-Communists are constantly describing our post-World War II policy toward the U.S.S.R. as combining these two features and advocating that we adopt such a policy toward Communist China.

What is the truth?

(1) Our immediate postwar policy toward the U.S.S.R. was not one of containment, but of surrender. Eastern Europe and Outer Mongolia were surrendered to the U.S.S.R. with the connivance of the United States and even with highest pressures being brought to bear by the United States on our allies to surrender to the U.S.S.R. land grabs, as in the case of Nationalist China and of Mongolia. This was an effort to appease Stalin and get him to accept this as his price for cooperating with us. He took the price, but did not cooperate.

(2) The containment policy was then resorted to and it has prevented further territorial takeover. However, this whole policy is now threatened by French action in re NATO, and the chief deterrent to armed action by the U.S.S.R. in Europe is now the mutual thermonuclear threat.

(3) Accordingly, we have generally not applied the policy of surrender of territory to Communist China, and in every case but one, have resisted Communist Chinese efforts to push outward. This case was Laos in 1961–62, and much of our trouble in Vietnam stems from the application to Laos of the formula of appeasement and surrender through the device we tried to use in China (1946–47) to prevent a Communist Chinese takeover pure and simple, i.e., the coalition government with Communists in it. Sino-Soviet cooperation helped bring about the surrender in Laos and thus to mark out South Vietnam and Thailand as the next Communist targets.

(4) As far as Communist China is concerned containment means isolation: The two are one and inseparable and the crux of this problem is Taiwan. The Communist Chinese price for nonisolation (which is a two-sided matter, not solely under our control) is the handing over of Taiwan to them, i.e., destruction of containment. Any U.S. administration which would even suggest any such thing would commit political suicide by producing a major catastrophe in Asian affairs.

Question. Do those who suggest the ending of Communist China's isolation in re the United States, the United Nations, etc., know what they are saying? Are they merely stupid? Or hypocritical? Or are they trying to be "smart"?

(f) (Theme.) The line "we have no support among our allies" for our southeast Asian policy. This line was, for example, advanced in re the Japanese by that great authority (?) on Japanese affairs, Mr. George Kennan. Mr. Kennan today seems to know even less about Far Eastern affairs than he did 17 years ago, when I asked him what Asia would mean in our future struggle with communism. He replied then that the struggle with communism would be settled somewhere along a line drawn between Stettin in the north and Trieste in the south. Of course, since then we have had Greece and Turkey in Europe; Korea, the Taiwan Straits, and the 17th parallel in Vietnam, not to mention Laos, and the Indian frontier, in Asia.

But today Mr. Kennan is our latest "Johnny-come-lately" on Japan. He resembles his colleague as a Soviet specialist, Ambassador "Chip" Bohlen, who in 1958 while U.S. Ambassador in the Philippines assured me personally that the United States would not support the Republic of China in its defense of the offshore islands against the then current Chinese Communist attack. I told him we would, and we did.

Mr. Kennan now says we are seriously alienating our Japanese friends by our military actions in Vietnam. He thus shows his profound ignorance of the Japanese people, who suffer as we do ourselves in this country, from the presence of a lunatic fringe of cowards, pacifists, appeasers, and just plain, simple Communists and pro-Communists. In spite of this they basically understand and respect what we are doing in Vietnam. They know their own security depends upon us, and our resolution and will to suffer and die for what we believe in. Despite their "lunatic fringe" problem, the Japanese people are sound and sensible. They understand the need of armed defense. Their own small "self-defense" forces are slowly, but steadily, growing in strength and improving. Even business firms today are sending their new employees for short periods of living and working with the armed forces before starting work, in order to bolster their morale and acquaint them again with the spirit of disciplined organization so lacking in upper-level educational institutions today both there and elsewhere. They increasingly support their defense arrangements with us, and this is because of, not in spite of, the war in Vietnam. In the past 2 years, the number of Japanese who support their alinement with the West has increased materially, and the number advocating so-called neutralism has decreased. This "new mood" is the result, I believe, of our firmness in southeast Asia, an area vital to Japan from an economic point of view.

The Japanese people will respect and honor success on our part in Vietnam. Like others, they view with apprehension any irresolution, lack of determination or willingness to pull out and surrender, on our part. This is generally true of all Asians, from Japan clear around through Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, southeast Asia and south Asia. This is one of many reasons why we cannot and must not fail in Vietnam.

Other friends and allies, including Korea, the Republic of China, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand are all helping in various ways in Vietnam, and will doubtless help still more in the future. If and when the need arises, the arrangements have no doubt already been worked out for the Republic of China, on Taiwan, to become directly involved. But, whether this will be required only time can tell.

As to allies and friends in Europe and elsewhere the vast preponderance of them approve what we are doing whether they say so or not. Secretary Rusk is right on this.

(g) (Theme.) The line "if we can get to know enough about China and the Chinese people we can promote better relationships with the Chinese Communists." This is the opposite of the truth. Actually, the more we study Chinese history and culture the more we can see that the Chinese Communists are reversionists who have chosen to reemphasize the worst that can be found in the Chinese tradition instead of the best. What are some of these things? Totalitarianism, authoritarianism and autocracy, conspiratorial politics, dogmatic subjectivity, the perversion of education into sheer indoctrination, the exaltation of political dogma and the corresponding debasement of technology, true science, and scientific expertise. They have chosen these emphases, and allied them with the religious subjectivism of Marxism, which appeals to them because it demands so little in the way of abandonment of those reprehensible features of the Chinese tradition that they have seized upon in their fanatical desperation and urgency to change China and the Chinese overnight. This latter characteristic they assert over and over again in such terms as "The Great Leap Forward," "Socialism Within 5 Years," "Do 20 Years' Work in 2," etc., etc.

Such hopeless and futile experiments at doing something with nothing as the backyard steel furnace debacle, are also illustrative of this trend, as well as of the subjectivist dogmatism of the upper level Chinese Communist leadership. No wonder the Chinese intellectuals reacted in such a hostile way to this leadership in the brief interval of the so-called hundred flowers episode when they were encouraged to express their opinions, only to be ruthlessly suppressed by Mao Tse-tung when he realized the truth; namely, that they were not for him but against him. With true subjective self-deception he had convinced himself that the intellectuals were on his side. But they were not, and are not today. In the last 2 years 160,000 intellectuals have been seized by the regime and forced into so-called reform through labor camps. This means for most of them merely slow death by overwork and starvation. This has gone virtually unnoticed in the West, at a time when even some European Communists are openly rebelling at the recent arrest, "trial," and condemnation to forced labor of only two Soviet intellectuals.

Indeed the notion that to know the Chinese Communists better will make it easier for us to tolerate them is no more true than if we were to say that to know Italy better would make it easier for us to tolerate the Mafia. The fact is we already know enough about both the Mafia and the Chinese Communists to know one thing, and that is that we do not need to know any more in order to justify our policies of opposition and hostility. Of course, we can always use more knowledge on what can be described as a tactical level, such, for example, as is being supplied by U–2 overflights from Taiwan. But we are not likely to learn much from proposals to allow our scholars and students of China to visit Communist China, and for two reasons:

(1) The Chinese Communists are not going to allow anyone to come there unless they are convinced that he is a dependable friend of communism and of Chinese com-

munism, in particular. They have been following this policy for years.

(2) Under these circumstances what knowledge is brought back is likely to be either superficial or biased along pro-Chinese-Communist lines.

Even in the U.S.S.R., as my colleague Professor Barghoorn could no doubt testify, efforts at objective fact-gathering by foreign scholars are not without their risks. The hazards to life involved in even minor contacts with the utterly incompatible, are clear from the recent death of an innocent American traveler while in the hands of the Russians. The subsequent warnings to such potential travelers by the State Department were well deserved.

14. The campaign along the lines analyzed above, is being carried out in this country at a pitch of intensity unmatched in recent propaganda history. The so-called teach-in more extensively used in the earlier phases of the anti-Vietnam-war campaign, has not been emphasized in this one. Instead, full-blown new organizations have been established on a nationwide basis, including ARFEP, or "Americans for a Review of Far Eastern Policy." This organization was started on the Yale campus by a group of students and faculty members. It has been spread across the country from there by a well-manned organization of promoters and organizers. Recently a large advertisement advancing its views appeared, for example, in a San Francisco newspaper, as emanating from the "Northern California Chapter" of ARFEP.

Certain features of this organization appear very clearly. For example, what they mean by a "review" of our Far Eastern policy usually turns out to be nothing but propaganda in favor of Communist China in the shape of support for its admission to the United Nations, United States recognition of the Red regime, full U.S. relations in trade, cultural relations, etc., well calculated to advance the aims, purposes, and interests of Communist China. This propaganda also, at times, is heavily in derogation of our ally, the Republic of China, President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek, etc.

Second, the main centers of organization and the main personnel involved are the colleges and universities. I do not know how many ARFEP centers and branches there are, or how many persons have "signed up" or are otherwise formally or informally affiliated with them. Nor can we fully know at present just what activities they engage in. The following is a no doubt incomplete list of activities: signing petitions and placing advertisements in newspapers; holding small and unadvertised "seminars" conducted by faculty members on China and China policy; sponsoring open debates on China policy questions, with both sides represented (a minor feature); conducting what amounts to a speaker's bureau to supply speakers from one campus to another.

What we do not know is the extent to which ARFEP is behind the second main feature of the current campaign, that is the current rash of conferences on various aspects of China and United States policy toward Communist China being held on college and university campuses from coast to coast.

For example, in Portland, Oreg., two such conferences, involving a number of educational institutions on a cooperating basis, are being held within a month of each other this spring. At these and other such meetings, speakers are brought in from long distances for substantial honoraria plus travel costs, necessitating very substantial budgets in the amount of thousands of dollars. Where does this money come from?

At a "National Conference on the United Nations and China" to be held next month at the University of Pennsylvania, the fee and travel cost paid to one speaker alone, will approximate $1,000. At this conference, where they hope for a maximum of 800 registrants, a $10 registration fee is being assessed toward expenses. But it is doubtful that the cost of the conference can be met in this way. Where will the balance come from?

It should be noted that at the University of Pennsylvania conference, not one single academic expert on China will be present to speak on the program in favor of the official U.S. policy toward Communist China. This defense is relegated to official representatives of the U.S. Government and of the Republic of China. This repeats the pattern so clearly seen elsewhere, of putting up as academic experts on China only those in opposition to the official policy, and balancing them with official spokesmen who can be discounted in advance as such. Thus, the false impression is created that the public, represented by the academic experts, is uniformly opposed to the policy of our Government at this time. This is false, and utterly false.

At a conference at Harvard under the auspices of the Collegiate Council for the United Nations on March 25–27, Prof. Owen Lattimore, of Institute of Pacific Relations fame, was scheduled to speak on "The Chinese Revolution: Causes and Consequences."

Also, from an organizational point of view, new and political uses are now being made of an organization that predictably would be used for pro-Chinese-Communist purposes if and when the time came to do so. This is the Association of Asian Studies. When I say its current political uses were predictable, I mean just that. I refer you to my statement on this organization made in testimony under oath before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on March 27, 1952 (pp. 4010–4013). [Not shown in RECORD.] I referred then to the Far Eastern Association, which is now the Association of Asian Studies, and I characterized it as designed at least in part, to take over the political propaganda functions of the Institute of Pacific Relations in case the latter institution came to grief, as I believe it subsequently did, over questions of the pro-Communist bias of its activities.

Well, my prophecy on this matter in 1952 has taken almost exactly 14 years to prove out, but prove out it has. We now see (on March 21, 1966) that all the signers of a pro-Chinese-Communist position paper published on that date in the New York Times, are among the about 2,700 members of the Association of Asian Studies. Of these 2,700 persons, 198, labeled (in many cases incorrectly) by the Times as "China experts," signed the statement which now places the Association of Asian Studies squarely in the policymaking arena. Of the total membership of 2,700, some 300; i.e., about one-ninth, "responded to the paper" signed eventually by 198 of them, i.e., about 7.3 percent of the total membership. To the views of this small minority of the total membership the New York Times of March 21, 1966, devoted a full column on its front page and nearly an entire inner page (p. 12). In an editorial on March 23, 1966, the Times stated that "this shows where the weight of informed American opinion lies." This is at the very least a gross distortion of the meaning of the statistics. Such are the distortions of propagandistic journalism.

The least the Times could do would be to give equal weight and coverage to the some 330 signers, as of January 1966, of the "Declaration in Opposition to Any Concessions to Communist China" sponsored by the Committee of One Million (not 2,700) Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations. I say this in view of the fact that all of these some 330 signers are Senators or Representatives in Congress, representing I do not know how many millions of American voters. But the Times would not even print a letter submitted to it in February 1966, by two U.S. Senators in opposition to a Times editorial on the subject of China and the United Nations. The two Senators wrote as members of the Steering Committee of the Committee of One Million, which no doubt accounts for the failure of the Times to print it.

What the Times will print is well exemplified by the letter in its columns for March 18, 1966, by Prof. Vera M. Dean of New York University. In this letter the lady professor while expressing her views on various policy matters, also expresses her hopes. Among these, as she puts it is that the "ghosts" as she describes them, of "Senator McCarthy and the Committee of One Million on China" should be exercised, and that former China experts who she says were driven from the State Department by McCarthyism should be sought out to advise the President and Secretary Rusk. Leaving this latter point aside, the lady professor should be informed that before she can exercise the ghost of the Committee of One Million it will have to die and produce such a ghost. Far from dying, the committee is very much alive today, and shows no signs of dying. All reports to the contrary are highly premature, to say the least. As time goes on I am sure the committee itself will do everything in its power to continue its efforts by all means at its disposal. It should see to it that Professor Dean is aware of these efforts. Or is she merely whistling to keep up her courage?

In this situation and from this background in what policy area should our best and strongest efforts be made, to counter the current attempts to support Communist China, and its program for Asia and the world? We are talking here, of course, of U.S. policy alternatives.

I do not believe the matter of possible U.S. recognition, trade and cultural relations, etc., is central. It is quite doubtful that, under current circumstances, any administration in Washington would move toward such policies. More real is the danger that we will succumb to the folly of supinely accepting the supposed inevitability theory, and submit to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. In fact, so central do I believe this whole question to be to the problem of "standing up to Communist China's grandiose demands" in world affairs, as Prof. John Fairbank puts it, that I believe here is where major emphasis should lie in respect to China policy today. Therefore, I propose to devote a considerable part of my presentation to analyzing the problem of Chinese representation in the United Nations.

Let us see why the Chinese Communists should not be admitted to the United Nations.

First, let us sketch in the background of the problem.

CHINESE REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

1. What was the origin of the United Nations?

The United Nations originated as an association of victors in World War II. It excluded the soon-to-be-defeated powers, Germany, Italy, and Japan. In its very origins it was thus exclusive, not universal. The essential feature was the wartime association of the wartime Allies, the United Nations, and the community of interests that that alliance embodied.

2. The United Nations: What for?

The United Nations was founded in the hope for peace and the search for it. The functional approach was adopted, i.e., cooperation wherever possible, in whatever measures possible. Measures were to be taken for common and mutual security. The problem of expanding the United Nations membership arose at the United Nations Conference of 1945. Exhaustive debate at San Francisco in 1945 produced the decision that the organization should not be based on universality of membership, but there should be qualifications for membership. In the Charter these are:

(a) Only peace-loving nations are eligible. It may be difficult to define and determine what is meant by a peace-loving nation, but it is not hard at any given time to determine what nations are breakers and disturbers of the peace.

(b) Only those nations are eligible for membership that are willing to assume and live up to the obligations of the Charter.

(c) Members who violate the Charter may be expelled.

This opened the way for the defeated nations in World War II to enter, if and when they qualified, and also for new states to enter. But the United Nations, unlike the League of Nations, has never expelled a member, although a member has voluntarily withdrawn.

3. The United Nations: How has it done?

(a) It has been almost swamped by the worldwide results of the breakup of the wartime alliance and the worldwide contests between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R., the free world countries (divided as they may be) and the Communist countries (divided as they may be).

(b) Its whole future has been put into the balance by a gross increase of its membership drawn largely from nations newly emerged as independent and many of which are themselves caught up in internal and international problems threatening constantly their very existence. Having (many of them) recently emerged from colonialism, they are now, willy-nilly, dragged into the worldwide contest between communism and freedom.

(c) Korea after 1945 is a perfect case in point. Emerging after the defeat of Japan from 35 years of Japanese colonialism, it was divided between the United States and the U.S.S.R. for postsurrender administration. The United Nations tried to unify it by peaceful means, but the U.S.S.R. thwarted this at every point. The U.S.S.R. tried to unify it by indirect war in 1950, but U.N. forces thwarted this. Then the U.N. tried to unify it by war, but Communist China thwarted this and was branded by the United Nations as an aggressor for its armed invasion of Korea.

This act by Communist China firmly and irrevocably established that regime as a full-time, highly activated part of the Communist side of the worldwide struggle between the free world and the Communist countries.

4. How did the United Nations representation issue on China arise, and why does it exist?

The Republic of China was a founding member of the United Nations in 1945. On the 18th of November 1949, shortly after Communist China set up a new regime on the mainland, Communist China notified the United Nations that the Republic of China's delegation to the U.N. was illegal. The United States upheld the right of the Republic of China to continue to represent China. The U.S.S.R. supported Communist China. The basis of the U.S. position was not Communist China's communism per se, but its lack of qualification. But can these be separated? On the 13th of January 1950, the Security Council voted 3 to 6 against Communist China's claim to represent China at the United Nations. Norway and the United Kingdom abstained, the United Kingdom on the basis that action should be defered until the majority of the United Nations recognized Communist China.

On March 9, 1950, Secretary General Trygvie Lie issued a memorandum on this, saying that representation and recognition should not be linked in the United Nations. He stated that representation should be based on a United Nations determination of which government is in the position to carry out the obligations of the United Nations Charter, to exercise effective authority and to employ the resources of the state.

On the 6th of November 1950, Communist China's forces invaded Korea, thus forcing the United Nations to brand Communist China "guilty of aggression in Korea" and disqualifying Communist China by Secretary Lie's criteria, for United Nations membership. Since then the China representation question has arisen frequently, but Communist China never secured approval for U.N. membership.

5. What are the main elements of the United Nations situation in regard to this issue?

(a) Growth of the functions of the General Assembly, due to multiple impasses in the Security Council. The Assembly tends to argue the case, but the Security Council authority in this matter is still present and available on the basis of the 1950 precedent.

(b) A large increase in Assembly memberships has taken place. This has produced a struggle to secure the votes of African nations, for example.

(c) The "important question" issue. Is the question of China's representation an "important question" at the United Nations? It has several times been decided to be.

6. Now, what are the issues today?

(a) Communist China's record as to aggression. This is overwhelmingly relevent to the question of its accepting the "obligations of the charter." This is not just a matter of Korea. In February 1950, 5 months after the Chinese Communists established their regime, it began its aggressive course. This was predictable: Mao says every good thing comes out of the barrel of a gun. In February 1950 the Chinese Communists issued a call to all people of southeast Asia to overthrow their governments. Was this merely a move against colonialism? No. It called for revolution against independent governments also. Then there came the Chinese Communist 1950 Korean aggression and the United Nations resolution (still outstanding) which branded Communist China an aggressor. The Chinese Communist philosophy is: "Ours is a policy of fight-fight, stop-stop, half-fight, half-stop. This is no trick, but a normal thing." This is a philosophy of alternating war and subversion. This was followed by direct Chinese Communist aggression in southeast Asia (Laos and Thailand), India, and indirect aggression in Vietnam.

(b) In view of this, in order to admit Communist China to the United Nations, the United Nations Charter would have to be changed and the relevant qualifications for membership removed. The Communist Chinese know this and themselves say the Charter must be revised as a prerequisite for their accepting a seat there.

(c) Communist China's position on this in the United Nations is as follows:

(1) "All countries should review the United Nations Charter together." All independent countries should then be admitted and all "imperialist puppet states should be driven out." It wants to expel some members even before its own admission. Clearly the Chinese Communists neither want nor plan either universality or coexistence.

(2) They openly state what kinds of changes would have to take place in the United Nations:

(a) As a prerequisite to Communist China's accepting a seat, the United Nations would have to openly declare that the United Nations resolution condemning Communist China for aggression in the Korean war was wrong, and brand the United States as the aggressor in Korea.

As Chinese Communist "Foreign Minister" Chen Yi said on September 29, 1965: "Calling China an aggressor and then asking the aggressor to join, would not the United Nations be slapping its own face?"

(b) The United Nations is nothing but a United States-Soviet medium of cooperation.

(c) Another United Nations should be set up as a rival to the United Nations now extant.

(d) Thus, there is no more argument possible about what the necessary effect of the United Nations admission for Communist China would be: it would destroy the United Nations as we know it. The United States could not any more be a member under those conditions and would have to withdraw.

(e) The current issue today is that of the war in southeast Asia.

(1) The Communist Chinese show complete obduracy here and hold to a hard line of demanding total United States-South Vietnam surrender.

(2) Can we change this by admitting Communist China to the United Nations? On September 1, 1965, the New China News Agency authorized broadcast stated: "The Vietnam questions has nothing to do with the United Nations."

(3) But we'd better believe that once Communist China was in the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council it would veto all acts by the Security Council which sought to promote peace by curbing Red Chinese aggression. Even the thus far futile efforts of U Thant to mediate the war would be impossible.

(f) The current issue today is the Taiwan issue. Communist China demands that we abandon a loyal ally, an excellent partner in economic, social, and political development, and a strategic strength closeup, by insisting that the United Nations throw the Republic of China out of that body as a prerequisite for its own entry. This would mean we would tell everyone else: "go make your settlement with Communist China; become its vassal." Is there a way out of this in the so-called two-Chinas policy? No; this policy is utterly infeasible, because both the two main parties to it, Communist China and the Republic of China, reject it totally and absolutely.

(g) The general issue today in regard to the western Pacific is: Can we have any security if the whole area falls under control of such a hostile power as Communist China? No. We tried withdrawal between 1922 and 1941, but it just led to a greater war.

(h) Can we hope for change in Communist China? It is often said that we can make the United Nations a reform school for Communist China. I would like to quote on this, Edgar Snow, in the Nation, September 12, 1953, when he said: "A Chou En-lai showing us his posterior from Peiping and uttering slanderous statements or carrying out irresponsible or warlike actions against us is not necessarily less a threat than the same infidel seated in full view of the United Nations and answerable to a body of world judgment." But, of course, the answer is that if the United Nations is made over on the Communist Chinese model, Communist China won't have to change, will it? Since we can't change that much, we will have to get out if they come in on their terms.

(i) The overriding policy question is the growing United States-Communist China confrontation in southeast Asia and what it may mean to Communist China: destruction at our hands. In view of this, it is natural that more interest in United States-China policy should develop. The possibility is clear that this time another major United States-Communist China confrontation may destroy Communist China.

(j) Finally, Pope Paul VI has been widely quoted (October 4, 1965) as urging Communist Chinese United Nations admission by saying to the United Nations that it should "study the right method of uniting to your pact of brotherhood in honor and loyalty, those who do not yet share in it." But here is what L'Osservatore Romano, the official organ of the Vatican, said on this on October 18–19, 1965. In an editorial under the title "The Church and the Universal Community of States," it takes note of the fact that there are people who have "given a precise political meaning" to these words of His Holiness. Then the editorial declared: "But true universality does not mean the arithmetic sum of nations; it presupposes the convergence of everybody on the effective recognition of and respect for natural law, which is the foundation of the United Nations." That is to say, the rule of law is primary; expanding United Nations membership is secondary.

The Pope is thus saying what we all know to be true; namely, that any form of political association must be founded on some measure of agreed-upon community of values, and that for such associations to tolerate as components thereof, those elements which deny and forcefully flaunt the agreed-upon community of values, will seriously endanger and probably eventually destroy the association. Thus, limitations upon membership and upon participation in political action are common to all political communities. The United Nations, weak as it already is, is no exception. It cannot be an exception.

To sum up, I quote in full the leading editorial in the New York Herald Tribune for November 8, 1965, as follows. It is a welcome antidote to the columns of the New York Times. It reads:

"RED CHINA OVER THE U.N.

"If the United Nations were administered by completely rational men, there would be no reason to doubt the outcome of this week's General Assembly debate on the issue of admitting Communist China as a member of the world organization. But reason does not always rule. Not infrequently it is clouded and weakened by set positions which, as in the case of Soviet Russia and India, have become so hardened as to imprison those who have assumed them; or by misleading arguments, such as the contention that Peking's effective control of the Chinese mainland automatically entitles it to China's seat; or by wishful thinking, such as the suggestion that admission to the U.N. will convert Peking overnight from a warmaking into a peaceloving country.

"Therefore it cannot be taken for granted that the United States and its allies will again succeed in turning back the attempt to seat Peking. The two sides appear to be more closely balanced than ever before. This throws a still greater burden on the handful of countries which have acquired the power to decide the issue one way or the other. How could they better discharge it than by exercising the rational process?

"On moral, legal and constitutional grounds, Peking is ineligible for admission. It is an aggressor; its leading spokesmen beginning with Mao Tse-tung, insist on their right to commit aggression so long as it advances their Communist, international, revolutionary aims. The U.N. Charter, on the other hand, clearly disqualifies an aggressor by stipulating that a candidate for membership must be a peaceloving state.

"The question must then be considered on what are called 'realistic' grounds. The main argument is that Peking, once inside the U.N. and exposed to its civilizing, restraining influence, will be less aggressive than if it remained ouside the U.N.—an unhappy and rebellious outcast.

"Those who advance this argument forget one very crucial point. If Peking were admitted to the U.N., it would become a permanent member of the Security Council. As such, it would acquire the power to veto any act by the Security Council (and, according to the Soviet view, by the General Assembly, too) which ought to promote peace by curbing Red Chinese aggression. In other words, admission of Peking, in its present frame of mind, could very well tie the hands of the United Nations and thereby advance, rather than inhibit, Red Chinese acts of aggression.

"In view of this possibility—one which has yet to be disclaimed, or even aired in the General Assembly—admission of Red China this year would be carrying irrationality dangerously close to the edge."

In the time and space available to me I cannot well deal with all the other aspects of positive policy which should be dealt with. However, I wish to call the attention of the committee, the Congress as a whole and the country at large to what I consider a very excellent presentation of these matters from an official source. I do not believe this cogent and learned statement has been given anywhere near the attention it deserves, either in the public media of communication or by the body of our citizens who are so actively concerning themselves with questions of China policy today. In order to help, I hope, in securing general circulation for it and what it says, I enter it here, as the final section of what I want to present to this honorable committee and through it, I hope, to the Senate, the Congress, and the public at large.

THE UNITED STATES AND COMMUNIST CHINA

(By William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, delivered at Pomona College, Calif., on Feb. 12, 1966)

Communist China is without doubt the most serious and perplexing problem that confronts our foreign policy today. Peking's foreign policy objectives, and the tactics it employs to achieve those objectives, sharply focus for us the issues of war and peace in Asia and the freedom and lives of millions of people, not only in Asia but throughout the world.

U.S. OBJECTIVES

The key questions we must ask at the outset are: What are our objectives in Asia and in the world as a whole? What are Communist China's objectives? and What kind of policy is best for the United States in the light of those basic assessments?

And, viewed in this light, the unfortunate fact is that the kind of world that we seek and the kind of world our Asian friends seek is totally antithetic to the kind of Asia and the kind of world that Communist China seeks. What we seek is a situation where small, as well as large nations are able to develop as free and independent countries, secure from outside aggression or subversion. We look toward their economic, political, and social development and growth; we hope their development will be in the direction of increasingly democratic institutions, but we recognize that these nations must develop as they themselves see fit, in accordance with their own traditions and customs. Their rate of progress, we believe, will vary according to individual situations, but progress will inevitably take place and toward goals which are deeply rooted in individual aspirations.

In harsh conflict with these objectives is any situation in which a single nation or combination of nations sets out to control others in the region or to exercise political domination over other nations in the area or any major part of it.

Our objectives are consistent with the spirit of the charter of the United Nations and, I believe, with the aspirations of the peoples and the governments of the area and of the nations in contiguous and other areas that share with us a concern for what happens in Asia in this and in the next generation. We believe, too, that our objectives accord with the whole tide of history at the present time. They are not abstract principles. They are the bedrock of our policy throughout the world. Governed by what the nations themselves wish to do and by practical factors, what we seek is to assist the nations that are trying to preserve their independence, trying to develop themselves, and, therefore, necessarily trying to resist forces working in the contrary direction.

CHINESE COMMUNIST OBJECTIVES

There is today in Communist China a government whose leadership is dedicated to the promotion of communism by violent revolution.

The present leaders in Peking also seek to restore China to its past position of grandeur and influence. Many of Peking's leaders today, now grown old, are proud and arrogant, convinced that they have been responsible for a resurgence of Chinese power. The China of old exercised a degree of control over Asia that waxed and waned according to the power of the ruling emperor. Under strong rulers this meant a type of overlordship, sometimes benign but frequently otherwise, over the countries around its borders. And the restoration of that image and controlling influence is certainly a part of Communist China's foreign policy today.

In the 1930's Mao Tse-tung called attention to areas controlled by China under the Manchu Empire but since removed from Chinese control: Korea, Taiwan, the Ryukyus, the Pescadores, Burma, Bhutan, Nepal, Annam, and Outer Mongolia. In more recent years, Chinese Communist leaders have added to that list parts of Soviet Central Asia and eastern Siberia. I think we can take this as valid evidence of Peking's Asian ambitions. As Prof. Oliver Edmund Clubb, in his "Twentieth Century China," says: "The urge to revolutionary empire is fortified by the feeling drilled into all Chinese since the beginning of the Republic that all territory ever included in the vast Manchu Empire rightfully belongs to China."

In addition to these historically rooted aspirations, the present leadership is inspired by a Communist ideology still in a highly militant and aggressive phase. This phase is ideologically akin to that in the Soviet Union in the 1920's or early 1930's. It coincides, however, with a situation in which the opportunities for expansion are, or appear to Peking, more akin to those available to the Soviet Union at a much later phase in its ideological development—in 1945 and the immediate postwar years. This Communist element includes the advocacy of change through revolution and violence throughout the world and particularly in China's neighboring areas—not revolution seeking the fruition of the national goals of the people of these areas, but revolution supplied or stimulated from outside and based on a preconceived pattern of historical development.

Their vision of this Communist mission extends to countries far from China—including, as we all clearly have seen, Africa and even Latin America. Peking's plans for carrying out its objectives have been delineated in a series of pronouncements issued by its leaders, one of the latest and most widely publicized having been that issued last September by Marshal Lin Piao, top military leader in Communist China, in which Lin Piao offered Chinese Communist experience in the war against Japan as a lesson to be emulated by the less developed countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in their pursuit of "revolution."

As you know, the Lin Piao article draws an elaborate analogy based upon the domestic experience of Mao and his cohorts in taking over China: the organization of the rural areas against the urban ones. It extends that analogy to the thesis that the less developed areas of the world are all in the rural category which will be mobilized in order to destroy "the cities"; that is to say, all the Western, more advanced centers—ourselves, of course, at the head.

I mention this article because it is a clear and comprehensive indication that there has not taken place any moderating, but if anything a solidifying at least at this stage, of this virulent revolutionary policy that is central to our discussion of Communist China. And, of course, we have seen it in action over and over again.

THE CHINESE THREAT IN ASIA

I shall not speak at length of the problems created by Communist Chinese policy in Africa and Latin America. The recent reaction even of Castro suggests that Latin America is reacting adversely to the heavy-handedness of these policies. In Africa, too, there is every sign that the new nations of the area, themselves carrying out nationalist revolutions of their own design, know full well what is meant when Chou En-lai, for example, referred last June to Africa being ripe for a second stage of revolution. The new leaders of Africa have shown no desire to be Kerenskys.

But it is in Asia itself that the major thrust of Communist Chinese policy is felt and must be countered by their neighbors. It is sometimes argued that the ambitions of Communist China in the areas contiguous to it do not mean outright control; and it can certainly be argued that they are tactically cautious in pursuing those ambitions. They have not wished to seek a confrontation of military power with us, and in any situation that would be likely to lead to wider conflict they are tactically cautious. But in looking at the extent of their ambitions one cannot, I think, simply take the historical picture of tributary governments that would be tolerated as long as they did roughly what China wished. That indeed was the historic pattern in many periods when powerful governments ruled in the mainland of China. It is also, perhaps, the pattern one might draw abstractly from the desire any major power might feel not to have hostile military power based in areas adjacent to it. Those two logics, historic Chinese logic and "great power" logic, might appear to point to something less than total political domination as the Chinese Communist objective around their borders.

And yet we must recognize, I think, because of the Communist element in the thinking and practice of the leaders of Peking today, that there is another factor that raises strong doubts whether their ambitions are in fact this modest. We have seen, for example, in the contrast between what the Soviets have done in Eastern Europe and the behavior of predecessor Russian regimes, that there is a Communist logic that does insist on total control, that will not tolerate anything other than the imposition of the full Communist totalitarian system. The experience of Soviet control in Eastern Europe suggests that this same kind of Communist logic does and would apply to the behavior of Communist China.

That it would is further strongly suggested by the way that the Communist Chinese regime has treated Tibet. The fact that Tibet was within the historic limits of Chinese suzerainty does not explain why Communist China has virtually obliterated the culture of Tibet in seizing control of it. One cannot rationalize this on grounds of history or of the need of a great power not to have hostile forces adjacent to it. So I suggest that we must give great weight to the probability that the ambitions of Communist China do extend, not necessarily to the degree of obliteration of the local culture that we have seen in Tibet, but at least to a fairly total form of domination and control in areas contiguous to it.

What, then, would be the consequences if Communist China were to achieve the kind of domination it seeks? Here again one is tempted to look for analogy to Eastern Europe, where there is a growing will to pursue national and independent policies and to adopt domestic policies that differ sharply from the original Communist model. Yet it has taken 20 years of virtual subjugation for the nations of Eastern Europe to move this far, and their nationalism, traditions of independence, and capabilities for independent development were in general far more highly developed than those of the smaller nations on China's borders. To accept Mainland Chinese domination in Asia would be to look forward to conditions of external domination and probably totalitarian control, not merely for 20 years but quite possibly for generations.

Moreover, the spread of Chinese domination would inevitably create its own dynamic and in the end threaten even the most securely based and largest nations within the area of that threat, such as India and Japan. One does not need to subscribe to any pat "domino" formula to know from the history of the last generation, and indeed from all history, that the spread of domination feeds on itself, kindling its own fires within the dominant country and progressively weakening the will and capability of others to resist.

PAST MISTAKES AND THEIR RELEVANCE TO PRESENT

This is what we are dealing with. We can all think, as we look back at the history of China, of errors that we as a nation have made and that other nations of the West have made—errors in justice and conduct in our relationships with China. We should search our souls on these and set our objectives and our principles to avoid repeating them over again. In Asia, at least, the colonial era is for all significant purposes at an end.

But to say that the West itself bears a measure of historical responsibility for the strength of the feelings of Communist China does not deal with the present problem any more than discussion of the inequities of Versailles dealt with the ambitions of Hitlerite Germany. Whatever the historic blame may be, we have to deal with the present fact of a Chinese Communist Government whose attitudes are very deeply rooted in China's national history and ambitions to revive its past greatness, and in an extremely virulent Communist ideology.

In the words of a recent article by Professor (John K.) Fairbanks:

"We are up against a dynamic opponent whose strident anti-Americanism will not soon die away. It comes from China's long background of feeling superior to all outsiders and expecting a supreme position in the world, which we seem to thwart."

TACTICS AND STRATEGY

I would like to emphasize that up to this point I have been speaking of the basic objectives of Peking's policy. To describe these objectives as deeply expansionist is by no means to paint the picture of another Hitler, building a vast military machine with the aim of conquest by conventional warfare on a timetable backed at some point, in the Chinese case, by a nuclear capability.

This has not been the historical Chinese way, and there is every reason to believe that it is not their present preference. Chinese are patient and think in long historical terms. Military force is important and they would like to think that their nuclear capability may at some point be useful in backing the picture of an overwhelmingly strong China whose will must be accepted. But the doctrinal statements of Lin Piao and others speak rather in terms of what they call "people's war," which plainly means the instigation and support of movements that can be represented as local movements, designed to subvert and overthrow existing governments and replace them by regimes responsive to Peking's will.

This is what we are seeing today in Thailand in the form of a so-called Thai patriotic front established and supported from mainland China. This is the direct form of Communist Chinese tactics that must be met. A variant tactic was reflected in the Communist Chinese role in support of the PKI (Communist Party of Indonesia) in Indonesia.

But equally important to Peking is its encouragement and support of the parallel efforts of the other Communist Asian regimes in North Korea and North Vietnam. What is now happening in Vietnam is basically the result of Hanoi's own ambitions and efforts. Peking might wish eventually to dominate North Vietnam or a unified Vietnam under Hanoi's initial control. But if this were resisted by the Vietnamese in the classic historical pattern of relations between the two areas Peking would still gain enormously from the success of Hanoi's effort, which would clear the way for Peking to expand and extend the kind of action it is undertaking on its own in Thailand. It takes no vivid imagination to visualize what Peking would do in Malaysia, Singapore, and Burma if Hanoi were to succeed in Vietnam and Peking itself succeeded in Thailand.

This, then, is the preferred Communist Chinese tactic and strategy. Ideas are a part of it, although Communist China's image as a successful model of social and political organization is hardly as attractive today as it may have been before the disastrous mistakes of the "great leap forward" and the uneven progress of the years since. Few Asians today think of the Communist Chinese structure as a model, although individual ideas such as land reform and attacks on "feudal" social structures are a part of Peking's tactical efforts.

But essentially we are dealing here not with the power of ideas but with the power of subversive organization—perhaps the one field in which Communist China has shown real innovation and skill. In mainland southeast Asia, as today in South Vietnam, what we could expect to see as the spearhead of the subversive effort would be terrorism, selective assassination, guerrilla action, and finally, if it were required, conventional military forces largely recruited by the tactics of the earlier phases.

These tactics might be varied if Communist China were to decide again to threaten India directly. There the element of conventional forces would play a greater part but would still be backed and reinforced by major political efforts to disrupt the cohesion and strength of India.

OUR BASIC POLICIES

I repeat, we must look at things and deal with them as they are, if we are to hope for change. Our basic policy must include, as major elements, two interrelated efforts: to assist the free nations of the area, as they may desire, to preserve their security; and to help them, again in accordance with their own wishes, to improve their political, economic, and social conditions. The latter is an effort that I am sure we would be making even if there were no security threat.

These two fundamental elements of our policy have much in common with the policies that we and our NATO allies pursued so successfully in the areas threatened by the Soviet Union after the war. And surely there is, to a very high degree, a valid parallel between the situation we continue to face vis-a-vis Communist China and that we faced with the Soviet Union after the war. We have dealt with the Soviet Union fundamentally by assisting in the restoration of the power and strength of Europe so that Soviet ambitions were successfully checked. Since 1955, although Soviet ambitions remain, we have seen a trend toward moderation in Soviet policy and a turning inward by the Soviets to their domestic problems.

There are, of course, myriad differences between the situation in Asia and that in Europe in terms of sophistication of economic and political bases, the stability of the societies, and the unity of national cultures. But basic to our policy in respect to Communist China, as in the case of our policy toward the Soviet Union, must be our determination to meet with firmness the external pressure of the Communist Chinese. Again, in Professor Fairbank's words:

"We have little alternative but to stand up to Peking's grandiose demands."

So the effort to assist in preserving security is fundamental to our policy. It is reflected in our treaty commitments—bilateral with Japan, Korea, the Republic of China, and the Philippines, multilateral (but individually binding) through the SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization), and ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-United States Security Treaty) treaties, and extending to South Vietnam through a protocol to the SEATO Treaty.

Necessarily, our security effort and commitments have a major military element, for the threat of military action is direct in relation to Korea and the Republic of China and lurks in the background of the Communist Chinese threat to southeast Asia, as it does for India. The day may come when other nations in the area can join in assuming more of this burden, but the simple fact is that today there cannot be an effective deterrent military force, and thus a balance of power, around China's frontiers without major and direct military contributions by the United States.

But even in the security area the effort is far from merely a military one. Local military forces should, wherever possible, be adequate, so that an external attack would have to take on large proportions immediately identifiable as aggression. But at least as basic to the preservation of the independence of the nations of Asia is their capacity to insure law and order and to deal with subversion, and this in turn relates to the whole nature of their political structures and to their social and economic progress. So in the end what is done under the heading of "Security" merges almost indistinguishably into what is done under the heading of "Development."

And so, at one time or another, we have had assistance relationships with all of the non-Communist countries of Asia. Today three of these—Burma, Cambodia, and Indonesia—have chosen to follow paths that involve little or no assistance from us. And there are nations such as Japan, and more recently the Republic of China, which have made such economic progress that they no longer need our direct help. Malaysia and Singapore are other special cases, which look for historical and practical reasons to Britain and the Commonwealth.

So the pattern is varied. In a very few instances we supply major assistance to conventional military forces. In others, such as Thailand, the emphasis is as great or greater on nonmilitary measures to better the lot of the people and thus to strengthen the fabric of the nation. And throughout the area, even where we are no longer giving direct economic assistance, we have joined in supporting the increasing efforts of the World Bank and private lenders to pitch in on the economic side, and more recently the profoundly important regional economic developments represented by the formation of the Asian Development Bank and the growing, though still embryonic, effort to provide an effective framework, through the United Nations, for assistance in the Mekong Basin and on a regional basis to southeast Asia.

All of these efforts are linked together. They represent the kind of activity which, as I have said, we would be supporting in large part in any case irrespective of the threat of Communist China and the other Communist nations. What they should do, over time, is to help build in Asia nations which are standing on their own feet, responding to the needs of their peoples, and capable of standing up to the kind of tactics and strategy employed by Communist China, backed where necessary and in accordance with our treaty commitments by the assurance that, if external attack in any form should take place, the United States and others would come to their help.

This is the essence of what we are trying to do. Containment, yes, but containment carried out by actions that run clear across the board. And containment in the last analysis that depends upon the performance of the Asian nations themselves. As one looks back over the short historical span of the last 15 years, one can surely see throughout the area tremendous progress where security has been maintained. Even though present difficulties are formidable, the nations of Asia have great capacity, and there is much reason for encouragement at the long-term prospect.

UNITED STATES-CHINESE COMMUNISTS RELATIONS

This brings me to the whole question of how we deal specifically with Communist China. Let me briefly review and analyze some of the things we have done or might do.

As far as contacts through diplomatic channels are concerned, we have had 128 meetings at the ambassadorial level with Peking's representatives, first in Geneva and now Warsaw. I think it is fair to say that we have had the longest and most direct dialog of any major Western nation with Communist China.

I am bound to say at the same time, however, that the dialog so far has not been very productive and founders on the fundamental issue of Peking's demand for Taiwan and by its stated conviction that the United States is by historical necessity Peking's prime antagonist on the world scene. But it is fair to say that it is more of a dialog than we could expect to have if we were ever to recognize Communist China, if the experience of Western diplomats in Peking is representative. And it is an opportunity to try directly to make them understand that we have no hostile designs on mainland China or its leaders but that we fully intend to maintain our commitments to defend our friends and allies against Communist aggression and that the United States seeks peace, freedom, and stability for the countries of Asia.

In addition to these direct contacts, we have of course been prepared to deal with Communist China in multilateral forums where its interests are directly involved. This was true of the Geneva conferences of 1954 and 1961–62, and we have made clear our willingness to participate in a Geneva-conference type of format to resolve the present Vietnam problem or to have Communist China appear at the United Nations if Hanoi or Peking were ever ready to let the United Nations deal with the Vietnam issue.

And there is the possibility that Peking may at some point be prepared to participate usefully in multilateral discussions on disarmament. We have always said that we would envisage such participation if workable arrangements appeared to be in prospect, although I am bound to add that Peking's attitude, particularly since its nuclear tests, has given no ground for supposing that she is prepared to enter disarmament discussions with any constructive position.

CHINESE REPRESENTATION AT THE U.N.

Some nations at the U.N. hope that Communist China's seating would have a moderating effect on its policies. They advance the thesis that, not being included in the U.N., Peking feels rejected and acts with considerably less restraint than if it were a member with a member's obligations.

We respect those who hold this view, but we cannot agree with it. It seems to us a rationalistic view that ignores the deep-seated historic and ideologic reasons for Peking's current attitudes. Nor does this theory—the neurosis theory if you will—explain Peking's behavior toward other Communist nations or its behavior in Afro-Asian groupings to which Communist China has been fully welcomed. I return again to Professor Fairbank's description of China's "long background of feeling superior to all outsiders and expecting a supreme position in the world." Surely this, alongside ideologic differences, lies at the root of the Sino-Soviet split, of Communist China's disruptive behavior in Afro-Asian groupings, and of the heavyhandedness of Communist China's policy from Indonesia to Burundi.

Moreover, we must consider Peking's price for entering the U.N. On September 29, 1965, Chen Yi, the Chinese Communist Premier, made the following demands:

1. The expulsion of the Republic of China from the U.N.
2. The complete reorganization of the U.N.
3. The withdrawal of the General Assembly resolution condemning Peking as an aggressor in the Korean conflict.
4. The branding of the United States as an aggressor in that conflict.

These are obviously unacceptable conditions.

The Republic of China, for example, is one of the original signatories of the United Nations Charter and has lived up to its obligations as a U.N. member in good faith. More than 13 million people live on the Island of Taiwan. This is a larger population than that of 83 members of the United Nations. The United States for many years has had close and friendly relations with the Republic of China, and since 1954 we have been bound by treaty to join with it in the defense of Taiwan. It would be unthinkable and morally wrong to expel the Government of the Republic of China from the U.N. to meet this demand of Peking's.

One must also consider the attitude of Communist China toward conflict, not only where its own interests are directly concerned but even in cases where they are not. Had Communist China been in the United Nations, could there have been a cease-fire resolution on the India-Pakistan conflict in September and could Secretary-General U Thant have received any mandate to bring that conflict to a halt? Peking's critical comment on the Tashkent proceedings is a clear answer. We are dealing with a nation that, at least as far as we can now see, will attempt as a matter of principle to put a monkey wrench into every peacemaking effort which may be made in the world.

Finally, there is the psychological factor: whether the admission to the U.N. of a nation that is dedicated to violent revolution and currently supporting North Vietnam's aggression against South Vietnam and threatening India in seeking to exacerbate and extend the Indo-Pakistan conflict would, in fact, not encourage Peking to think it is on the right track while deeply discouraging other nations which are resisting Peking's pressures and seeking to maintain their own independence.

It continues, therefore, to be U.S. policy to support the position of the Republic of China in the U.N. For our part, we will also continue to oppose the admission of Communist China.

BILATERAL CONTRACTS

Now I should like to talk briefly on the subject of unofficial contacts with Peking, stressing above all one point which has not been sufficiently emphasized.

Many people do not realize that it is Communist China which has prevented any movement toward bilateral contacts. The United States over the past several years has tried to promote a variety of contacts, but the Chinese have kept the door tightly barred.

Since 1958, for example, we have validated passports of over 80 representatives of newspapers and other media for travel to Communist China. Only two have been admitted. We have tried unsuccessfully to arrange with the Chinese either a formal or an informal exchange of newsmen and more recently we have indicated to them our willingness unilaterally and without reciprocity to see Communist Chinese newsmen enter the United States.

In addition, we have a short time ago amended our travel regulations to permit doctors and scientists in the fields of public health and medicine to travel to Communist China.[1] We shall see, but so far the response has been negative.

We have discussed with various scientific and other organizations their interests in arranging people-to-people exchanges with the Chinese. We have encouraged the exchange of publications between various universities and institutions in the United States with Peking. There is a free flow of mail to and from Communist China. All of these efforts have been consistent with our worldwide concern for a freedom of information and for the exchange of knowledge and views in humanitarian fields. Yet they have been consistently rejected by Communist China. If there were a possibility that such contacts might over time develop a broader understanding of the rest of the world in Communist China, it is they, not we, who reject this possibility.

TRADE WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

Let me now say a few words about trade.

We have not opposed the trade of other nations with Communist China except insofar as there is a strongly built-up pattern of control in the area of strategic commodities. We have expressed our concerns to other nations from time to time, recognizing that their trade policies were their own decision but raising questions of their vulnerability to possible pressures from Peking in their overinvolvement in trading patterns.

As for the possibilities of our trade, every time the subject is seriously mentioned in this country, it is shot down immediately in Peking. In 1961, for example, when food supplies in mainland China were very short, President Kennedy made it quite clear that we would take under consideration a Chinese Communist request to purchase grain. The Chinese Communist response was to denounce the President and to reject any possibility of trade, not only in grain but in other commodities with the United States.

CONCLUSION

These are samples of what we are up against. We are Peking's great enemy because our power is a crucial element in the total balance of power and in the resistance by Asian states to Chinese Communist expansionist designs in Asia. That is the really controlling fact, not sentiment, not whatever wrongs may have been done in the past, but that very simple fact and the very fundamental conflict between their aims and objectives and the kinds of aims that we have—above all, our support for the right of the nations of Asia to be free and independent and govern themselves according to their own wishes.

All of us must hope that this picture will change. Mainland China is, of course, a great power in the world historically. How it will develop economically and in other respects remains to be seen. I myself think that they will have considerable problems that will tend over time to absorb them if their external ambitions and desires are checked. There are those who argue that mainland China's great size and population, its historical and cultural links with the areas around its borders, and its economic potential make inevitable the growth of a Chinese "sphere of influence" in Asia. Those who advance this fatalistic theory discount the aspirations of the peoples in the area, their ability, and the effectiveness of U.S. aid, and they ignore the historical trends of our time.

In sum, I repeat that the problem must be considered basically in the same way we did that of the Soviet Union. We must, on the one hand, seek to curtail Peking's ambitions and build up the free nations of Asia and of contiguous areas; on the other hand, while maintaining firm resistance to their expansionist ambitions, we can, over time, open the possibility of increased contacts with Communist China, weighing very carefully any steps we take in these general areas lest we impair the essential first aim of our policy, including our clear commitments.

It is unlikely that the present leaders, who have become doctrinaire and dogmatic, can be expected to change, but they in due course will be replaced with a new generation of leaders. It is our hope that these men will see with clearer eyes and better vision that China's best interest lies in pursuing a peaceful course.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF GENERAL MacARTHUR

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago today, on April 5, 1964, our Nation lost one of the most distinguished soldiers in its history when General of the Army Douglas MacArthur died at the age of 84 in Walter Reed Medical Center after a month's illness. The indebtedness that the United States and the free world in general owes to the leadership of General MacArthur in helping to eradicate the greatest actively militant coalition of despotism at that time, the Axis powers, needs no elaboration here. Suffice it is to say, that he was one of freemen's bulwarks in a time of freedom's peril.

Today the free world faces another enemy with worldwide designs, older in time and experience and infinitely more treacherous and cunning. In 1926, years before Hitler became a matter of international concern, the Lenin University in Moscow was established for the purpose of training Communists of leadership quality from all races and nations. As long ago as 40 years ago, Lenin University could boast of a student body comprising Communists from almost every country in the world. In its first year of existence, the university began training, among many others, a small contingent of 10 students sent by the Communist Party of the United States. The following year 20 students arrived from this country with the number increasing in later years. Over a period of years many of the outstanding Communist political figures in the Balkan countries, in Italy, Greece, Czechoslovakia, France, Bulgaria, Austria, China, India, and in the South American countries, were trained in Russia's Communist academies. Since that time the number of these schools of revolution have greatly increased, with recent additions as close as Cuba, 90 miles from our southern shores.

At present the fruits of Communist patience, farsightedness, and industry are materializing. Coupled with military might, a ruthlessly atheistic ideology and control of 35 percent of the world's population and over 26 percent of its land mass, this international movement can influence, in varying degrees, the peoples, governments, and policies of every nation on the globe.

Of course Douglas MacArthur, who could spot a tyrant hemispheres away, was not fooled. In his address to the joint session of Congress in 1951 he cautioned:

> The Communist threat is a global one. Its successful advance in one sector threatens the destruction of every other sector. You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our efforts to halt its advance in Europe.

Would that the present opponents of our firm policy in Vietnam heed this admonition.

Again today, a leaderless, directionless free world faces an international menace to man's God-given rights. Voices of appeasement, reminiscent of sincere but misguided Neville Chamberlain, call for coalition governments, admission of Red China to the U.N., increased trade with Communist countries and other political follies, forgetting—or ignoring—the fact that appeasement of despots fosters new and bloodier wars. Those who called for a coalition government between the Nationalist forces and the Chinese Reds in 1949 see no connection between the subsequent downfall of free China and the killing of over 33,000 American soldiers in combat by North Korean and Chinese Communist troops in Korea a short time later. Also forgotten by some in the present Red China debate is the unbelievably inhuman treatment of both the Chinese and Tibetan people by the Chinese Reds in violation of the United Nations Charter.

On this second anniversary of the death of General MacArthur, the poignant and inspiring words of his "Duty, Honor, Country" speech are especially fitting. Given without preparation or notes on May 12, 1962, at the U.S. Military Academy, these remarks were addressed to the American soldier, but the theme and moral message vitally concerns every citizen, potential soldiers all, within their own spheres of influence.

Although his leadership in adversity and his reassuring presence are gone forever, may these words serve as his legacy and contribution to his Nation in its struggle for survival.

The inspiring speech which General MacArthur delivered on May 12, 1962, at West Point is contained at the conclusion of these remarks. The speech represents the type of message that should be repeated over and over and over.

Duty—Honor—Country

As I was leaving the hotel this morning, a doorman asked me, "Where are you headed for, General?" And when I replied, "West Point," he remarked, "Beautiful place. Have you ever been there before?"

No human being could fail to be deeply moved by such a tribute as this. Coming from a profession I have served so long, and a people I have loved so well, it fills me with an emotion I cannot express. But this award is not intended primarily to honor a personality, but to symbolize a great moral code—the code of conduct and chivalry of those who guard this beloved land of culture and ancient descent. That is the meaning of this medallion. For all eyes and for all time, it is an expression of the ethics of the American soldier. That I should be integrated in this way with so noble an ideal arouses a sense of pride and yet of humility which will be with me always.

---

[1] For background, see Bulletin of Jan. 17, 1966, p. 90.

Duty—Honor—Country. Those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying points; to build courage when courage seems to fail; to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith; to create hope when hope becomes forlorn. Unhappily, I possess neither that eloquence of diction, that poetry of imagination, nor that brilliance of metaphor to tell you all that they mean. The unbelievers will say they are but words, but a slogan, but a flamboyant phrase. Every pedant, every demagog, every cynic, every hypocrite, every troublemaker, and, I am sorry to say, some others of an entirely different character, will try to downgrade them even to the extent of mockery and ridicule.

But these are some of the things they do. They build your basic character; they mold you for your future roles as custodians of the Nation's defense; they make you strong enough to know when you are weak, and brave enough to face yourself when you are afraid. They teach you to be proud and unbending in honest failure, but humble and gentle in success, not to substitute words for actions, not to seek the path of comfort, but to face the stress and spur of difficulty and challenge; to learn to stand up in the storm but to have compassion on those who fail; to master yourself before you seek to master others; to have a heart that is clean, a goal that is high; to learn to laugh yet never forget how to weep; to reach into the future yet never neglect the past; to be serious yet never to take yourself too seriously; to be modest so that you will remember the simplicity of true greatness, the open mind of true wisdom, the meekness of true strength. They give you a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a vigor of the emotions, a freshness of the deep springs of life, a temperamental predominance of courage over timidity, an appetite for adventure over love of ease. They create in your heart the sense of wonder, the unfailing hope of what next, and the joy and inspiration of life. They teach you in this way to be an officer and a gentleman.

And what sort of soldiers are those you are to lead? Are they reliable, are they brave, are they capable of victory. Their story is known to all of you; it is the story of the American man-at-arms. My estimate of him was formed on the battlefield many years ago, and has never changed. I regarded him then as I regard him now—as one of the world's noblest figures, not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless. His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty, he gave all that mortality can give. He needs no eulogy from me or from any other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemy's breast. But when I think of his patience under adversity, of his courage under fire, and of his modesty in victory, I am filled with an emotion of admiration I cannot put into words. He belongs to history as furnishing one of the greatest examples of successful patriotism; he belongs to posterity as the instructor of future generations in the principles of liberty and freedom; he belongs to the present, to us, by his virtues and by his achievements. In 20 campaigns, on a hundred battlefields, around a thousand campfires, I have witnessed that enduring fortitude, that patriotic self-abnegation, and that invincible determination which have carved his status in the hearts of his people. From one end of the world to the other he has drained deep the chalice of courage.

As I listened to those songs of the glee club, in memory's eye I could see those staggering columns of the First World War, bending under soggy packs, on many a weary march from dripping dusk to drizzling dawn, slogging ankle deep through the mire of shell-shocked roads, to form grimly for the attack, blue-lipped, covered with sludge and mud, chilled by the wind and rain, driving home to their objective, and, for many, to the judgment seat of God. I do not know the dignity of their birth but I do know the glory of their death. They died unquestioning, uncomplaining, with faith in their hearts, and on their lips the hope that we would go on to victory. Always for them—Duty—Honor—Country; always their blood and sweat and tears as we sought the way and the light and the truth.

And 20 years after, on the other side of the globe, again the filth of murky foxholes, the stench of ghostly trenches, the slime of dripping dugouts; those broiling suns of relentless heat, those torrential rains of devastating storm, the loneliness and utter desolation of jungle trails, the bitterness of long separation from those they loved and cherished, the deadly pestilence of tropical disease, the horror of stricken areas of war; their resolute and determined defense, their swift and sure attack, their indomitable purpose, their complete and decisive victory—always victory—always through the bloody haze of their last reverberating shot, the vision of gaunt, ghastly men reverently following your password of Duty—Honor—Country.

The code which those words perpetrate embraces the highest moral laws and will stand the test of any ethics or philosophies ever promulgated for the uplift of mankind. Its requirements are for the things that are right, and its restraints are from the things that are wrong. The soldier, above all other men, is required to practice the greatest act of religious training—sacrifice. In battle and in the face of danger and death, he discloses those divine attributes which his Maker gave when He created man in His own image. No physical courage and no brute instinct can take the place of the Divine help which alone can sustain him. However horrible the incidents of war may be, the soldier who is called upon to offer and to give his life for his country is the noblest development of mankind.

You now face a new world—a world of change. The thrust into outer space of the satellites, spheres and missiles marked the beginning of another epoch in the long story of mankind—the chapter of the space age. In the five or more billions of years the scientists tell us it has taken to form the earth, in the three or more billion years of development of the human race, there has never been a greater, a more abrupt or staggering evolution. We deal now not with things of this world alone, but with the illimitable distances and as yet unfathomed mysteries of the universe. We are reaching out for a new and boundless frontier. We speak in strange terms: of harnessing the cosmic energy; of making winds and tides work for us; of creating unheard-of synthetic materials to supplement or even replace our old standard basics; of purifying sea water for our drink; of mining ocean floors for new fields of wealth and food; of disease preventives to expand life into the hundreds of years; of controlling the weather for a more equitable distribution of heat and cold, of rain and shine; of space ships to the moon; of the primary target in war, no longer limited to the armed forces of an enemy, but instead to include his civil populations; of ultimate conflict between a united human race and the sinister forces of some other planetary galaxy; of such dreams and fantasies as to make life the most exciting of all time.

And through all this welter of change and development, your mission remains fixed, determined, inviolable—it is to win our wars. Everything else in your professional career is but a corollary to this vital dedication. All other public purposes, all other public projects, all other public needs, great or small, will find others for their accomplishment; but you are the ones who are trained to fight; yours is the profession of arms—the will to win, the sure knowledge that in war there is no substitute for victory; that if you lose, the nation will be destroyed; that the very obsession of your public service must be Duty-Honor-Country. Others will debate the controversial issues, national and international, which divide man's mind; but serene, calm, aloof, you stand as the nation's war guardian, as its lifeguard from the raging tides of international conflict; as its gladiator in the arena of battle. For a century and a half, you have defended, guarded, and protected its hallowed traditions of liberty and freedom, of right and justice. Let civilian voices argue the merits or demerits of our processes of government; whether our strength is being sapped by deficit financing, indulged in too long; by Federal paternalism grown too mighty; by power groups grown too arrogant; by politics grown too corrupt; by crime grown too rampant; by morals grown too low; by taxes grown too high; by extremists grown too violent; whether our personal liberties are as thorough and complete as they should be. These great national problems are not for your professional participation or military solution. Your guidepost stands out like a tenfold beacon in the night—Duty—Honor—Country.

You are the leaven which binds together the entire fabric of our national system of defense. From your ranks come the great captains who hold the Nation's destiny in their hands the moment the war tocsin sounds. The long gray line has never failed us. Were you to do so, a million ghosts in olive drab, in brown khaki, in blue and gray, would rise from their white crosses thundering those magic words—duty, honor, country.

This does not mean that you are war mongers. On the contrary, the soldier, above all other people, prays for peace, for he must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war. But always in our ears ring the ominous words of Plato, that wisest of all philosophers, "Only the dead have seen the end of war."

The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished tone and tint; they have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears, and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday. I listen vainly, but with thirsty ear, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll. In my dreams I hear again the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange mournful mutter of the battlefield. But in the evening of my memory, always I come back to West Point. Always there echoes and re-echoes in my ears—duty, honor, country.

Today marks my final rollcall with you. But I want you to know that when I cross the river my last conscious thoughts will be of the corps—and the corps—and the corps.

I bid you farewell.

FIRST LADY DISCOVERS SAN ANTONIO FOR THE NATION

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is truly said that America is the most magnificent of countries, but the sad fact is that many of us overlook our own Nation's charms for more fabled places overseas. But Mrs. Johnson, the gracious First Lady, is rediscovering America for us, and is even now touring in her own Texas and showing its charm and history to a country that often thinks of Texas as only a cow pony and an oil well. Yesterday she was at Fort Davis, in far western Texas; the day before that she was in the Big Bend country—a land so magnificent that words cannot describe it, a land where anyone can go and see for himself country that very few living men have seen. The Big Bend is vast and unspoiled; it is a land conservationists dream of, and tourists seldom find.

Mrs. Johnson rediscovered San Antonio last week. I think that few Americans know the charms of San Antonio, but they do now, thanks to the First Lady. They now know about the San Antonio River—that tiny and meandering stream running through the very heart of a great city. The river is a place of walks, soft lights, music, dancing, and restaurants. It is a place where artists hang their paintings, and where little boats will take people from place to place.

San Antonio is more than the Alamo; it is more than the river walk; it is a place filled with history and charm. I think that my colleagues will be interested in the April 2 Washington Post account of Mrs. Johnson's visit to San Antonio. After reading this story, I know that they will want to come to San Antonio and see a city that is among the favorites of the President and his lady.

The article follows:

Mrs. L.B.J.'s San Antonio Rose on Alamo Safari

(By Winzola McLendon)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX. April 1.—Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson put the spotlight on one of America's most fascinating beautification/conservation projects tonight when she turned on the lights for this city's Fiesta de Las Luminaries (Festival of Lights).

"All over the country there is an awakening to the preservation of nature's endowment's," said the First Lady as she dedicated a newly installed esthetic lighting project along San Antonio's Paseo Del Rio. "As the lights go on tonight, I look out over the river with its grassy banks and cottonwoods, and cypress, and pecan and willow, and retama, and all I can say is "This is America the Beautiful'."

The Paseo, an exciting blend of lush tropical foliage, pleasant walks, quaint shops and sidewalk cafes, follows a unique horseshoe bend of the San Antonio River right in the heart of the city—the Indians called the crooked stream "drunken old man going home at night." Saved by a militant group of women in the 1920's when city planners decided to cover the river with pavement, the river and its banks have been turned into a setting which has become known as the Venice of America.

"I have traveled through a great many cities in recent months and found them coping with what you have overcome," she told San Antonio City leaders and a vast audience of men, women, and children sitting and standing along the river banks.

"Urban sprawl has withered away their centers and they are struggling to find a way to breathe life into centercity. Here is a great example of what can be done. It says to every city—look around and find the individual charm, the bounty of nature, the heritage of the past with which to rebuild."

The newly installed esthetic lighting dedicated by the First Lady is the workmanship of a wizard of watts, John R. Watson, 43, noted landscape illuminator, tall and lanky, and a native Texan. Watson designed the lighting in Queen Victoria Park at Niagara Falls as well as the illumination of the Texas pavilion at the New York World's Fair.

The First Lady flew to San Antonio this afternoon accompanied by Secretary of Interior and Mrs. Stewart Udall, White House staff members, Secret Service Agents, and more than 50 members of the press.

After checking into the hotel, Mrs. Johnson went out immediately on the balcony of her ninth floor suite and looked across at the steeple of St. Mark's Church where she and President Johnson had been married.

With her were Dan Quill, who had made the local arrangements for their wedding in 1934, and Mrs. John Connally, wife of the Texas Governor.

She started her evening along the Paseo at the Hemisfair headquarters where she saw a colorful model of the fair which will take place in San Antonio, just 200 yards from the Alamo in 1968.

The fair will show the diversified cultures of Pan America—the history, art, religion, and socioeconomic development of each of the nations of this hemisphere, and the significant contributions to their development from Europe, Asia, and Africa.

The next stop was La Villita, the little restored village in the shadow of San Antonio's skyscrapers. The spot was a crude Indian village until, about 1732, it became the abode dwelling place of the soldiers attached to Mission San Antonio de Valero, the Alamo. The present restoration was begun in 1939 and many skills and crafts of the early settlement are still pursued in the old adobes.

La Villita was the setting for tonight's reception, attended by more than 500 of the city's leading citizens, and it honored the First Lady.

At the reception Mrs. Johnson literally received the red carpet treatment, On hand to see that she got it was the Red Carpet Committee, a group composed of citizens who think that only a real red carpet is good enough for VIP visitors. The men, wearing red jackets and the women in red dresses spread it for Mrs. Johnson on her arrival.

The reception took place outdoors in a courtyard and, even at 8 o'clock in the evening, the summer-like weather hovered at a warm and friendly 78 to 80 degrees.

From La Villita Mayor Walter W. McAllister escorted Mrs. Johnson down to the river edge where she planted an American elm seedling. Eighteen inches high and 2 years old, the seedling was taken from the John Quincy Adams elm, the old-commemorative tree on the White House grounds.

After the lighting ceremony, the Lady Bird Johnson entourage boarded gaily decorated barges for a 90-minute cruise up the winding San Antonio River.

At the Arneson River Theater where the stream separates, the audience was seated on grassy tiers from the stage, there were songs of Spain and Mexico. A German band, authentic to the last "oompah" serenaded the First Lady as her barge moved under the Alamo Street footbridge.

IOWA'S NATURAL BEAUTY INCLUDED IN NATIONAL TRAILS BILL

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as our society becomes increasingly more complex and as our population continues to expand, it is imperative that we plan for the long-range recreation needs of the Nation. I beileve vigorous action by we of the 89th Congress, is important to the future development of our national recreation effort and to the health and well being of our citizens and the maintenance of our position of world leadership.

To help meet this expanding need for recreational facilities I am today introducing a bill to establish a National System of Trails. My bill is similar to H.R. 14222 which was introduced last week by our distinguished colleague from Alaska, the Honorable RALPH RIVERS, whose long leadership and efforts in this vital area is deserving of the highest praise. My bill calls for the inclusion of a hiking and riding trail along the scenic banks of our Nation's river, the mighty Mississippi, which borders my district for more than 100 miles. This trail which would stretch from New Orleans to the headwaters of the river in Minnesota, would pass through some of our Nation's most scenic areas. In my own district in southeast Iowa, the trail would be through wooded areas, along high bluffs overlooking the river, and in close proximity of numerous historic and geological points of interest. My proposed trail would stretch the full length of the Mississippi which has played such a vital role in the development of our great Nation and which is such an important part of our national heritage, folklore, and culture.

Secondly, I propose that the historic Mormon Trail and the Mormon Handcart Trails be included in our national trail system. These two famous trails pass through my district. Certainly, a recognition of this historic trail through incorporation in our national trail system, would contribute much to the preservation of our heritage and to the full development of our recreation resources.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this proposal which would make available trails for all citizens and would permit Americans to more readily enjoy the outdoor wonders of our great Nation. As my able colleague from Alaska pointed out, the trail system will not only provide an experience which touches the senses, but will contribute to relieving the strains and tension of modern living.

LET'S LOWER THE OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues a fine editorial which appeared in the April 7 issue of The Machinist. I believe the message presented by the editorial should receive very serious consideration by all of us in the Congress who have the sober responsibility of congressional oversight of executive actions in this vital area. Apparently there are some areas which have for the past several decades been regarded as "sacred cows" with regard to suggested guidelines for tax reform policy.

In fairness to our working people in the farms and factories of America, we should extend considerations of restraint to areas which have been hitherto untouched. As an initial step in this direction, I introduced H.R. 12993 a bill which would progressively reduce the oil depletion allowance. I call this legislation to not only the attention of Members of the House, but also to the members of the Council of Economic Advisers. Adoption of this measure would be a first step in meeting the valid and constructive criticism voiced in this perceptive editorial entitled "Green Stamps."

GREEN STAMPS

Read the financial pages of almost any newspaper on almost any day. They raise serious questions about the fairness of the administration's efforts to limit this year's wage increases.

The President's economic advisers are worried that wages will go up so fast that prices will rise faster than usual. So they have set an arbitrary guide for negotiated wage increases. They would restrict all wage increases to 3.2 percent this year, except for inequity, labor shortage, or other special cases.

To the economic advisers at the White House, wages are part of the cost of production rather than family income. They would restrict that cost like they try to restrict the cost of aluminum or steel.

So far, there is no talk at all about regulating corporation profits, stockholders' dividends or management salaries, bonuses and stock options. The economic advisers consider those as personal incentives, rather than a cost of production.

PROFITS OF 20 PERCENT

The result is a kind of lopsided unfairness that sticks out all over the financial pages. Just look for one example, look at a recent Wall Street Journal report of a financial statement by Sperry & Hutchinson Co., the firm that produces the S. & H. green stamps. Most of us think we get those stamps for free.

That company has assets of more than a quarter of a billion dollars. Last year the profits of Sperry & Hutchinson jumped almost 20 percent. The wage guideline, remember, is 3.2 percent. The year before that, S. & H. profits had increased 42 percent.

These profit increases occurred despite the fact that the trading stamp business is not expanding as fast as it used to.

SALARIES OF $200,000

The S. & H. green stamp business is owned by a family named Beinecke. Six of its eight top officers are Beineckes. Edwin Beinecke, who is 80 years old, is chairman of the board. He was paid $200,000 last year. Frederick Beinecke, who is 79, serves as chairman of the executive committee. He also received $200,000 last year. That is a wage rate of almost $100 an hour. Four other corporate officers each get $100,000 or more.

If there has been any effort by the President's economic advisers to limit corporate salaries like these, we haven't heard about it. The President's economic advisers are after the men and women who make $3, $4, or $5 an hour. Some would even apply the 3.2-percent guideline to those earning $1.25 an hour.

Economic pressure applied like this to one group of Americans is patently unfair. Especially when it increases the profits of others.

CREATIVE FEDERALISM—A NEW CONCEPT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a new phrase signaling a new concept in government has been introduced by President Johnson. It is "creative federalism." While the phrase is known to many of us in Congress, the public is only now beginning to hear and read of it.

Much of the domestic legislation passed by the 89th Congress is tied to the creative federalism concept through its emphasis on programs designed to create greater power and initiative at the local government levels.

This recent legislation is not designed to increase Federal controls but to inspire community initiatives to solve problems of education, employment, and health.

The Federal Government is to act only as a junior partner in the programs.

The concept of creative federalism has been analyzed in depth by Max Ways in the January 1966 issue of Fortune magazine. His article, entitled "Creative Federalism and the Great Society," follows:

CREATIVE FEDERALISM AND THE GREAT SOCIETY

(By Max Ways)

(NOTE.—There's much more to L.B.J.'s domestic policies than meets the eye. Government is learning from modern business that, when it comes to problem solving, power belongs out where the know-how is.)

As the huge program enacted by Congress in 1965 moves into action, U.S. history is making a major turn from the politics of issues to the politics of problems, from an emphasis on need to an emphasis on opportunity, from struggle over the redistribution of what we have to the less crude and more intricate decisions about what we might become.

Salient features of the new package include aid to education, medicare, and expanded Federal activities in the health field, urban renewal, and scores of other efforts to improve the physical environment. Since many of these topics have a long and embattled past in public discussion, some observers try to force the present programs into the mold of yesterday's debates. They see the new programs simply as another surge in the drive begun thirty years ago to expand the Federal Government's share of total power in order to right social wrongs. When the Johnson program is put into that context, liberals automatically applaud it and conservatives automatically denounce it. Both are missing the point.

They fail to recognize that a fundamental break with the welfare-state trend occurred when this society made a different assessment of its own vigor. A new confidence in opportunity began to be reflected in politics 15 years ago and was a factor in both of the Eisenhower elections. Although John F. Kennedy's 1960 campaign included appeals to the older kind of politics, his statements and policies as President seldom moved back toward the assumptions about U.S. society that characterized his party's dominance between 1933 and 1952. Lyndon Johnson even more explicitly has founded his administration on the premise that U.S. society in general is exceedingly lively, increasing its rate of innovation and expanding its range of opportunity.

Two events early in Johnson's administration indicated his commitment to this premise. One was the way he argued the case for the income tax cut that Kennedy had proposed. Both Presidents, and especially Johnson, made it clear in the tax debate that they regarded the private economy, and not the pump of Federal spending, as the main engine of economic growth. The second event was Johnson's Great Society speech at Ann Arbor in May 1964. In some quarters this address has been misread as a threat to impose upon the U.S. future a Federal Government blueprint of what the Great Society ought to be.

But this interpretation is contradicted by the speech itself and Johnson's subsequent policies and words, including his 1964 campaign speeches. At Ann Arbor he was expressing, in his capacity of national leader, a bolder view of the prospect before the Nation, the widening range of choice presented to all its people and all its institutions, public and private. Toward the end of the speech, he suggested that the Federal Government would have an important part to play in the quest for a better future. Neither then nor later, however, did he intimate that the Federal role in the decisions ahead would be dominant or that Washington could supply the superior wisdom.

Along with the new assumptions of vigor in U.S. society came a new way of organizing Federal programs. At Ann Arbor and on five public occasions since then, Johnson has used a phrase, "creative federalism," that has not received the attention it deserves. Federalism means a relation, cooperative and competitive, between a limited central power and other powers that are essentially independent of it. In the long American dialog over States rights, it has been tacitly assumed that the total amount of power was constant and, therefore, any increase in Federal power diminished the power of the States and/or "the people." Creative federalism starts from the contrary belief that total power—private and public, individual and organizational—is expanding very rapidly. As the range of conscious choice widens, it is possible to think of vast increases of Federal Government power that do not encroach upon or diminish any other power. Simultaneously, the power of States and local governments will increase; the power of private organizations, including businesses, will increase; and the power of individuals will increase.

Creative federalism as it is now developing emphasizes relationships between Washington and many other independent centers of decision in State and local government, in new public bodies, in universities, in professional organizations, and in business. This characteristic of the new programs is part of a rather belated application to government of the organizational habits developed by modern business. While everyone has been watching the influence of Government policies on the economy, the impact of the economy's strength and its mode of organization have been quietly altering the way the Government works. Tens of thousands of professional and managerial types, in and out of Government service, are shaping and executing Great Society programs. This is as it should be, for professional and managerial men are preeminently oriented toward direction choosing and problem solving within a complex framework of many centers of decision.

This new outlook in Washington is the deepest reason for the rapprochement, during the Johnson administration, between Government and business. The two still have and will always have different responsibilities and aims. But they are beginning to use the same working language, depend on the same kinds of people, and get at tasks and decisions in the same way. More than administrative style is involved in this Washington shift. The whole framework of U.S. politics is changing.

THE OLD POLITICS AND THE NEW

Many observers have noted disparagingly that the Johnson program—with the significant exception of civil rights—does not generate much public "excitement." Those observers are conditioned to expect a certain kind of political excitement that arises when classes or other broad groups in a society—each armed with principles of ethics, justice, constitutional law, or ideology—clash over whether Government power should be used to achieve or retain a group advantage. The 20th century, at home and abroad, has produced so many exciting political conflicts of this sort that they have come to be considered as the whole of politics and even, perversely, as desirable.

The Johnson program's relative lack of this sort of exciting conflict should be read as a clue to its fundamental novelty. Civil rights, the single domestic issue that today creates the familiar kind of popular excitement, points up the contrast between the old politics and the new. The drive for Negro equality invokes principles of justice and ethics in demanding that the weight of Government be employed to do for one large group what society itself has conspicuously failed to do. Government can do little for Negroes as a group without hurting (psychologically, if not materially) many whites most directly affected by such measures as school desegregation. When Government must decide how far it will go in taking cherished advantages from one group in the course of helping another group, an exciting political issue arises.

Most issues of the 1930's had this same characteristic of taking from group A to give to group B. Indeed, a class redistribution of income and power was one of the stated aims of the New Deal. Thirty years ago belief was widespread that the U.S. economy was mature, that a large and increasing proportion of all social initiative would have to be exercised through the Federal Government, that the hope of progress lay in the enlarged Federal power to take from the economic royalists and give to the underprivileged. In the struggle arising from such beliefs the political positions called radical, liberal, and conservative jelled into their present meanings.

The Johnson program does not fit any of these molds. Except for the special case of the Negro, every group is now believed capable of advancing under its own steam. Consequently, the old welfarist arguments for Government intervention lose some of their force and urgency while the newer problem-solving approach comes to the fore.

Medicare, when it was first seriously debated in the 1940's, was presented with an emphasis on what the young owed to the old and, especially, on what the fortunate owed to the unfortunate. Today the viewpoint has shifted. It is now recognized that this society as a whole has a problem of paying for the greatly enlarged medical services now available to the aged; medicare is put forward as a device to deal with the problem. Similarly, the programs to improve education, clean up rivers, beautify highways, and reduce air pollution are not struggles between broad social groups. And they are not ideological issues. They are efforts to deal with problems by a society that is becoming increasingly confident of its problem-solving ability.

Specific Federal programs derived from this new approach may be good or bad, valuable or wasteful, disruptive or constructive. Each will certainly require close public scrutiny of its conception and execution. There will be plenty of chance for criticism and opposition when we learn to look at these programs in the context of the new politics. But effective criticism and opposition will not develop from the old yammer for or against any extension of the Federal Government's scope.

WILL THE PARTNER STAY JUNIOR?

Those Washington officials now busily setting up the programs like to describe the new roles for the Federal Government with the phrase "junior partner." An easy cynicism, bred of past conditions, is quick to suspect that this junior partner means to enlarge his scope until he takes over the shop. But an examination of the new programs in detail shows this cynicism is misplaced. These programs are so designed that they will work only if the "senior partners"—i.e., elements of the society other than the Federal Government—continue to grow and innovate vigorously. If that hope is disappointed, the Federal "junior partner," instead of increasing his power, will be in trouble with the electorate.

Because the Washington junior partners are aware of this danger, "creative federalism" includes a deliberate policy of encouraging the growth of institutions that will be independent of and, in part, antagonistic to the Federal Government power. Almost every part of every new program transfers Federal funds to some outside agency. Nothing will be achieved if the recipients—universities, State and local educational authorities, hospitals, medical schools, and poverty program councils—merely become subservient arms directed by the central Federal power. Tension between Washington and other independent centers is required by the whole body of experience out of which the notion of "creative federalism" comes.

This way of doing things entered the Government by osmosis from corporate management. Big corporations have been getting bigger, but executives are increasingly and justifiably impatient of outside criticism that, using the language of 50 years ago, attacks corporations as "monolithic" concentrations of power in a few hands. From the inside of any great corporation it is obvious that top management spends a great deal of its time trying to enlarge the responsibilities and strengthen the initiative of other power centers within the corporation. Such policies are pursued in the face of certain knowledge that the multiplied and strengthened power centers will develop troublesome tensions with top management and with one another. Top management does not pursue this "polycentric'" policy out of altruism or masochism. It does so because the complexity of modern knowledge, reflected in the complexity of organized action, demands that much of the decisionmaking be decentralized.

Not only is a high degree of local autonomy required but, even more significantly, a high degree of professional autonomy. Engineering decisions have to be made by engineers. Accountants, architects, artists, and xerographers acquire similar "states' rights."

Yet it is not correct to assume that the overall trend in modern organization is toward decentralization. Complexity has two sides: while specialization decentralizes interdependence centralizes. The art of modern management consists largely in discovering what to centralize and what to decentralize, and in constructing the channels through which information and decision, generated at many levels, flow. An old-fashioned "captain of industry," an industrial absolutist of the Henry Ford type, would be driven screaming into the night by the restraints and complexities of modern corporate "federalism." But it works.

Those business executives who still see in recent Washington trends only a further expansion toward "absolute government" are as blind as those critics of big business who go on mouthing warnings against "monolithic" corporations. These business executives are doubly blind, because in the new Federal patterns they do not recognize their own children.

The new patterns first entered Washington at the point where the connection between government, advanced business, and science is most intense—the Defense Department. During World War II, teams of analysts began to apply techniques of "operations research" to military decisions. In the postwar period this approach spread to analytical comparisons of "weapon systems" by methods that worked back from battlefield value to factory costs. Secretary of Defense McNamara made the Pentagon a link in an informational and decision-making process stretching from White House policy decisions through prime contractors to thousands of subcontractors.

No one can calculate whether the vast activity we call defense is more or less centralized than it was in 1960; and the answer, if we had it, would not be very important. What matters is that the total system has a more rational and a more effective way of relating the parts to the whole. There is a conscious, unceasing effort to ensure that any given decision will be made at the most appropriate place—high or low, in Washington or out—and on the basis of the best information.

ROADS FOR THE HILLBILLIES

Many Great Society programs are marked by an emphasis, similar to that of the Defense Department, on "cost effectiveness."

Take, for example, Appalachia. The casual reader of the news may assume that the program for stimulating this backward region is just another dribble of welfarist pap from the Washington udder. The casual reader will be wrong. And he will be missing one of the most interesting of recent political innovations.

The act of Congress creating the program contains a remarkable clause: within Appalachia Federal funds are to be "concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth, and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest." This method of allocation runs counter both to the old congressional pork-barrel system and to the welfarist system that allocated funds on the basis of "need." Appalachia's "need" is such that the $1.1 billion authorized by Congress would be frittered away if it were concentrated on the neediest hollows, the deadest hamlets, and the most eroded hillsides.

By making the greatest investment potential its basic criterion, the Appalachian Act directs the program to concentrate in another way. Within Appalachia there are, right now, a number of economically vigorous towns that may be stimulated to greater growth. There are other areas where local initiative and private enterprise can make a case for a high potential return on investment. The new criterion of public spending leads the men in the Appalachian program to talk in businesslike terms about market analysis and plant-location strategy rather than in terms of social work. John L. Sweeney, Federal cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, does not try to wring the reporter's heart with statistics of beriberi and illiteracy in Appalachia. Instead, he makes his pitch like a chamber-of-commerce secretary, about how Appalachia, lying between the two great markets of the United States—the eastern seaboard and the Great Lakes complex—may have a glittering economic future.

But how will concentration on the growth counties of Appalachia help the people of the back hollows? How can it relieve them of the grim choice between continued poverty and psychologically disruptive migration to Chicago, Detroit, and other great industrial centers? In answer, Sweeney turns to a map. A large proportion of Federal funds for Appalachia will be spent to aid the construction of a road network that would allow the hill dwellers to live in the land they love and commute by bus or car to jobs in the growing centers of the region. Motorized transit offers the possibility of large labor pools without a megalopolis.

One danger of all this is that the Federal Government, in moving away from welfarist standards, will find it has let in the seven worse devils of rigid central planning. But the Appalachian program is set up in a way that minimizes this danger. The key power center is not Sweeney's office but a commission made up of the Governors of the 12 Appalachian States. States, counties, towns, colleges, and private businesses have already been stimulated to compete in presenting to the commission proposals based upon the test of "greater potential." If this local initiative continues to wax, Federal coordinating functions will be a small part of the total activity. If the local initiative subsides there won't be anything worth coordinating and the Appalachian program will be a clear-cut failure. In neither case will Washington have increased its "control" of Appalachia.

TENSION AT A HIGH LEVEL

The same organizational principles can be seen at work in the Government's relations with one of the most advanced sectors of U.S. life, higher education. John W. Gardner, the recently appointed Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare did much shrewd and unconventional thinking about this subject when he was head of the Carnegie Corp. of New York. Over a year ago in a speech to university people he took aim at the familiar charge that the flow of Federal money to universities represents a dangerous increase in Federal power and a threat to academic independence. He pointed out that there was another side to the story. "To the old-time Federal official used to a world in which Government funds were spent for purposes defined by Government and administered by hierarchically organized departments under complete Government control, the new trend looks like a grievous loss of Government power," he said. "Wherever he looks, he sees lay advisory bodies recommending how Government money shall be spent, and he sees nongovernmental organizations spending it."

A Government agency, because it is accountable to Congress and the taxpayer, wants to define quite precisely what is to be done with public money that it hands over to a university research project. The university, accustomed to the notion that science works best when it is free of externally imposed conditions, resists the definitions, restrictions, and reviews insisted upon by the agency.

Gardner has urged university people to give more sympathetic understanding to the Government view, and he has urged Government officials to see the university view. But he does not believe—and this is the important point—that the tension between them will or should disappear. "Actually, there is some advantage to the public interest in keeping a certain adversary quality in the relationship."

This thought gets close to the heart of "creative federalism." In the context of modern knowledge and work, whether we are talking about business or Government, the overall degree of centralization or decentralization is seldom an interesting or useful question. What matters is the quality of an ever evolving process of deciding which functions to centralize and which to decentralize.

TOWARD A LIVELIER SCHOOL SYSTEM

"Creative federalism" is also conspicuous in the hugely expanded federal program of aid to primary and secondary education. Some redistribution from the prosperous to the poor is involved in this program since Federal tax money, collected mainly from a graduated income tax, will be spent at a higher rate per pupil in poorer school districts. But this was not the central motive for enacting the new education program and is not the dominant idea of the administrators in Washington.

Two main motives have converged to increase Federal aid to schools. The first is the widespread belief that the next 30 years will see a rapidly increasing national need for better educated men and women. Economists believe this. Business executives, now running into skill shortages, believe it. PTA groups believe it. And it is almost certainly true. The second idea, held by many educators, is that techniques of teaching now stand on the verge of a major breakthrough into greater efficiency and improved quality. Clinical psychologists have demonstrated the lifelong importance of stimulating the learning processes of children under 6. For all age groups, radically new teaching materials—movies, closed-circuit television, programed learning, recording devices—suggest that important advances may lie around the corner. How long it will take to turn the corner will depend partly on how much research and development is done in educational methods.

The Federal Government has no solutions to educational problems—and no particular competence in finding solutions. It has no set educational philosophy or policy to sell, and does not expect to develop such a policy. Those who hope and those who fear that the Federal Government is about to "take over" the schools are both off the track. The official expectation is that a heavy infusion of Federal funds entering the educational scene will further stimulate innovation and improvement at those points—nearly all outside the Federal Government—where educational innovation can actually be made.

A very large measure of control over the spending of Federal funds will be in the hands of State departments of education and local school boards. Congress even appropriated a small but significant sum for the purpose of strengthening State departments of education, some of which are now too professionally feeble to carry out the independent functions that the spirit of the program requires of them. Many local school boards, superintendents, principals, and teachers will find, if the Federal aid program works as it is supposed to, that they will have new budgetary elbowroom to develop their own initiative. Following the 1965 act, the Office of Education has invited local school boards to submit experimental projects, the most promising of which can be supported by Federal funds.

Until a few years ago there was scandalously little professional interest among university scientists and scholars in the quality of elementary and high school teaching. Lately there has been a great ferment, of which "the new math" and the new high school physics course designed by Prof. Jerrod R. Zacharias of MIT and his associates are the best known products. The Federal research program is designed to spread and stimulate this ferment.

The U.S. Office of Education won't do any of this research and it won't be able, even if it so wished, to exercise a tight control over research. Scholars and scientists will insist that they be given a rather free hand. Moreover, when any piece of research is finished, its conclusions are not going to be put into practice unless local administrators and school boards are impressed. Some proposals will be tried out in one State, some in another. Federal aid can help create a livelier network of professional information and evaluation—a "market," that is—in which the relative merits of educational innovations can compete more actively. Markets, of course, are far from infallible; but they are fundamentally different from decisionmaking by centralized control. The marvel is that this marketlike competition for forming educational policy is the one that now appeals to the people we are accustomed to call "educational bureaucrats."

WHO WILL CART THE GARBAGE?

Research and its more costly brother, development, turn up at point after point in the wide spectrum of enlarged Federal activities enacted by the 1965 Congress. A small but interesting example is the Solid Waste Disposal Act. Hah, cry the alarmists, now the Federal Government is going into garbage collection; the last rampart of local autonomy has been stormed. But maybe not.

The technology of a nation that can put men in space may discover a more efficient manner of garbage and trash disposal than burning it, or dumping it, or hauling it by scow to the open sea—which will wash it up on the beach of some other municipality. Cities struggle along with one method or another, and few of them can afford a thoroughgoing R. & D. project to find better ways of coping with the garbage and trash explosion. New ideas for solid-waste disposal will have to be tried out in practice, and in the trying it may be desirable for Washington to make a grant to some city willing to be, if one may put it so, the guinea pig.

Similarly, we have Federal programs for research into the causes of crime and delinquency and into better methods of transmitting information on suspected criminals. These do not necessarily imply that Washington is about to take over all the police work of the Nation. We will not necessarily by forced to choose between the Keystone cops and the police state.

Health, including medicare, is the largest single category of increased Federal spending projected by the 1965 legislative program. The fact that there is now a huge and increasing population over 65 years old represents medical triumphs in saving lives at all age levels. The public has shown its appreciation of the improved quality of medical care by increasing its payments for such services from a level of 4 percent of disposable income to 6 percent. Part of this increase represents the fact that "unit costs" of medical care have been rising somewhat faster than other costs. But in the main, the increase to the present level of nearly $30 billion a year indicates that the public has decided that medical care is worth more than it used to be.

For the aged, especially, there are now many opportunities for treatment (e.g., the removal of eye pupils in cataract cases) that did not exist a generation ago. Once such treatment becomes medically feasible, this society raises its standards of what it considers essential. Lack of money, it says, must not be allowed to stand between an aged person and a chance to preserve his eyesight. Even though private health insurance, pension plans, and individual savings have expanded rapidly, they lagged behind the new standards of minimum medical service to the aged. In a problem-solving society medicare was seen as a way of closing a gap that medical progress had opened up.

Unquestionably, medicare will throw a new burden of demand on medical services that are already overloaded. Recent Federal legislation provides funds to encourage the expansion of medical and nursing schools.

THE AMA SHIFTS ITS GROUND

Meanwhile, there may be opportunities to increase further the productivity and quality of medical services. To explore some of these opportunities a Presidential commission headed by Dr. Michael E. DeBakey of Baylor University proposed Federal aid for an elaborate system of regional centers for the treatment of heart, stroke, and cancer cases. The American Medical Association did not like DeBakey's plan, but in this case the AMA avoided the all-out ideological attack that had characterized its unsuccessful opposition to medicare. Congressmen, sitting down with AMA leaders and Federal officials, greatly modified the DeBakey plan into a setup that many doctors believe will work. Federal funds will be used to strengthen the professional networks that now run between practicing doctors and the great centers of medical research. In order to take advantage of the best medical knowledge, a patient in a small town will not have to be transported to a great teaching hospital; relevant information can be brought to his bedside by closer, quicker connections between existing research centers and local hospitals.

This is not a bricks-and-mortar program; Congress authorized no funds for new buildings. The goal, improved channels of communication among the doctors of a region, obviously can be sought only with local doctors in control of the program. The Federal fund dispensers can suggest procedures and can relay information from one region to another. They can deny funds to regional projects that do not meet the very flexible requirements set up by Congress. But the weight of authority will have to lie in professional organizations. Fifteen years from now medical practice will undoubtedly be organized quite differently, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that 99 percent of the decisions shaping the changes will continue to be made at points outside the Federal Government—even if, as is also probable, Federal activity in the health field expands.

THE CITY IS A PROCESS

In 1965 the Federal Government acquired a new Cabinet-level Department—Housing and Urban Development. Over the last 20 years, as the problems of the cities have become more formidable, there has been a change in how we think about these problems. This new way of seeing the urban challenge works against the danger that the Federal Government will "take over" the cities.

A generation ago, "slum" had a simple, physical meaning. It signified a group of buildings that were overage, overpopulated, and underequipped. That simple meaning implied a remedy, which is now understood to be inadequate; "slum clearance" and "public housing" would replace bad buildings with better buildings. All that was required was money and the Federal Government had it. In a program so conceived there would be some—but not much—inherent need for local decisionmaking and local initiative. Federal housing on this model made some—but not much—improvement.

"Slum" today signifies a complex in which such elements as the quality of education and the morale of inhabitants are more important than the buildings themselves. Moreover, a slum is not thought of as an isolated "blighted area" that can be quarantined and dealt with independently of the rest of the city. We are now aware of "gray areas," which may be degenerating into slums faster than bulldozers can level old slums. From this and similar observations we have come to look upon the city as a process to be improved rather than as a product to be altered.

As any manager knows, improvement of a process requires analysis of how its parts affect one another and how they can be better coordinated to obtain the chosen objectives. It is simply unimaginable that in any given city the Federal Government can play a major role in such coordination. The problems are, city by city, so unique that local coordination and local initiative must be the determining elements. Experience bears this out. Philadelphia, New Haven, Boston, are cities where urban renewal is making huge strides because bubbling local initiative and increasing professional competence make effective the spending of Federal and other urban renewal money. By contrast, New York lags, not because it has been out of favor with Washington fund dispensers, but because it has lacked the local political and business leadership, which is more important than money from Washington. Members of Congress—relics of the old politics—who promise to "do more" in the way of increasing the flow of Federal money to such laggard cities as New York will continue to be helpless until local initiative develops.

Urban renewal, far from being an extension of the "monolithic" Federal power, has created or revived a host of local organizations, which have become centers of influence on reconstructing the process of living in cities. A Philadelphian involved in the revival of that city said: "Citizen organization is the principal phenomenon of this town." In other words, Federal housing money in Philadelphia helped to create and strengthen decision-making centers that lie outside of Federal control.

THE NEW LIMITS ARE PRACTICAL ONES

It is as true today as it ever was that a free society must be vigilant against concentration of power in a few hands. It is also true that in the 20th century many national governments, using humanitarian slogans, have tended to squash the sphere of local government and constrict the scope of private organizations and individuals. The United States has not been immune to this trend. Twenty-five years ago, State and local government in the United States was anemic, and predictions—some approving, some despairing—were widely made that the Federal political system must be transformed into a unitary national system on the British or French model. Twenty-five years ago the dispersed and competing power centers of private enterprise were being cramped by the encroaching power of Washington.

As resistance to this trend developed, the United States seemed to be in a struggle between what was politically practical and what was, by traditional interpretation, constitutional. The traditionalists lost ground steadily until it became much harder to see the tidy pigeonholes into which Americans used to separate what was private, what was governmental, what was State, what was Federal. Today the scope of Federal action cannot be specifically defined by categories (that is, defense and foreign affairs). The Federal Government may have a proper function in almost any field of action. This change raises a question: can a central government that has massive roles in business agriculture, schools, health, and even perhaps, garbage collection truly be described as a "limited" federal government?

The answer, oddly, is "Yes." The new limits on Federal power have been imposed by political practicality. Ironically, the popular hunger for progress that seemed to generate a threat to limited government has come to the rescue of limited government. An electorate that began to expect real results—and would not be fobbed off by such psychological titillations as "soaking the rich"—pressed political leaders toward more effective modes of action. These modes turned out to put a heavy practical emphasis on State and local government, on business freedom, on the market as a way of making economic decisions.

If in January 1956, anybody had forecast a Federal Government budget of $175 billion by 1976, his prediction would have been taken to mean that more and more power would be concentrating in Washington. Today we can view the same prediction against a projected background of a 1976 gross national product of over a trillion dollars and understand that Federal spending at $175 billion would take a smaller share of total national activity than the present budget does. Today we are less interested in the size of the total Federal budget than in the relative "cost effectiveness" of the programs that make up the budget. The old public sector versus private sector argument is giving ground before a rising interest in good management, both Government and private.

CONSTRUCTIVE WORK AND OUTDATED ORATORY

Lyndon Johnson as Senate majority leader in the Eisenhower years showed that he sensed the new political framework. He muted the strident ideological slogans that had dominated his party in the years 1933–52 because these class struggle slogans in a rapidly progressing country were losing their appeal. As President, his much-derided insistence on "consensus politics" is in part a shrewd recognition that "issues" are no longer central. Knowing that his new programs will be judged more by what they accomplish than by the good intentions of their authors, he has warned administrators to build these programs soundly rather than quickly. Even so, several of the new programs—notably the war on poverty—have run into serious organizational difficulties. Johnson's fundamental difficulty is that many leaders of his party are still stuck in the old framework where ideology counted more than good management.

Many Republican leaders are also stuck there, still firing irrelevant ideological guns at a target area from which the enemy is decamping. The great Republican political asset for the future is its hold on a high proportion of the managers and professional men whose skills are especially needed in the conception, execution, and criticism of the new type of governmental program. Use of this asset requires close engagement with the new programs at local, State, and National levels. Beneath the surface of the last congressional session some exceedingly important work was done in improving Great Society measures proposed by the executive branch—and Republicans made a contribution to this improvement that has been somewhat masked by the party's own outdated oratory.

All through the postwar period, partisan political debate has lagged behind the radical change, generated outside politics, that has been sweeping through U.S. society. This accelerating rate of change, which appears to be a permanent condition, posed a challenge to the fundamental American political institutions. We are now emerging—successfully—from this period of challenge. In a way that was hardly conceivable 25 years ago, U.S. democratic institutions have proved flexible and adaptable and are becoming, once again, the objects of envy and admiration by discerning men in other countries. The American political genius is moving through creative federalism toward new ways of expanding individual choice while maintaining social cohesion.

INVASION OF PRIVACY

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, during the past year, Congress has become particularly aware of problems involving the invasion of privacy. Under the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher], a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations has been analyzing some of these problems, particularly in the area of psychological testing.

As a member of that subcommittee, and a Representative from New York City, therefore, I was deeply troubled to discover that the New York City Board of Education had recently allowed 350 ninth-grade pupils to be subjects for a highly intrusive personality test under a Federal research grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. The test in question was the controversial Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory which is supposed to aid researchers in discovering personality aberrations. I say "controversial" because skepticism about the scientific validity of the test has been expressed by several experts, some before our subcommittee.

The test given to the ninth-grade boys and girls included the following questions:

True or False?

Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.

My sex life is satisfactory.

Evil spirits possess me at times.

I have never been in trouble because of my sex behavior.

I am very strongly attracted by members of my own sex.

I believe women should have as much sexual freedom as man.

I believe in a life hereafter.

I have never indulged in any unusual sex practices.

I am worried about sex matters.

Children should be taught all the main facts of sex.

I believe my sins are unpardonable.

I like to talk about sex.

I have been disappointed in love.

I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself.

I believe there is a devil and hell in afterlife.

I wish I were not bothered by thoughts about sex.

I have never been in trouble because of my sex habits.

Many of my dreams are about sex matters.

Religion gives me no worry.

I feel sure there is only one true religion.

I am attracted by members of the opposite sex.

I deserve severe punishment for my sins.

Sexual things disgust me.

I am a special agent of God.

Christ performed miracles.

When a man is with a woman he is usually thinking about things related to her sex.

I pray several times a week.

I read the Bible several times a week.

There is something wrong with my sex organs.

I never attend a sexy show if I can avoid it.

A large number of people are guilty of bad sexual conduct.

I like movie love scenes.

I believe this examination represents a clear invasion of privacy and threat to civil liberties. I consider such tests improper and offensive and, with young students as subjects, capable of causing serious confusion.

Rather than measure psychological anxiety, such tests are more likely to cause it.

I was all the more disturbed to discover that the test had been administered without prior parental consent. The entire incident thus represented a deviation from existing policy as well as from good sense.

During the course of hearings held by the Special Subcommittee on the Invasion of Privacy, we expressed our concern for prior parental consent to members of the executive branch.

We are extremely anxious to protect the right of privacy for all schoolchildren and their parents where Federal research projects were involved. To this purpose, we communicated with the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and received, from the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Philip R. Lee, the following statement:

> The principle that participation in research projects involving personality tests, inventories, and questionnaires is voluntary and, in those cases involving students below the college age, that the rights and responsibilities of the parents must be respected.

We understood this statement as constituting a commitment to prior parent consent. We understood it as a policy declaration to govern all administrative programs and executive discretion. We understood it as a rule which was not to tolerate exception or deviation. Apparently this has not been the case.

I believe, therefore, that the Congress has an obligation to close any loopholes which might allow future incidents of the sort encountered in New York City. I am, therefore, introducing today legislation which prohibits the expenditure of funds for the acquisition or use of personality inventory tests unless certain prior conditions be met.

First, steps must be taken to insure that the person to whom any such test is administered is notified that the test is voluntary and that he may refuse to take the test or any part of it without being subjected to penalty.

Second, in the case of a test administered to a person who had not attained the age of 18 years, the test will be given only with the prior informed consent of a parent or guardian. These conditions represent the principal assurance that transgressions such as that which took place in New York will not be repeated. These conditions will be made clear to all Federal departments and agencies which, in turn, shall emphasize them in all regulations.

In no way am I anxious to restrict the conduct of legitimate behavioral research. It is clear that such research can make an important contribution to higher learning and to the development of more enlightened social policy. I see no reason, however, to support such research if it means we must tolerate invasions of privacy. The right to privacy is more basic than the privilege of research. That right must be protected by the Federal Government in clear and unequivocal terms. I believe the legislation I am today submitting is a necessary step in an essential direction.

FOOD AID TO INDIA

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House approved a joint resolution supporting U.S. participation in a large program of food aid to India. I was happy to support the resolution because of India's critical food shortage caused by the unusual and extensive drought conditions last year that seriously reduced the harvest.

I am concerned, however, as I imagine many of my colleagues are, about the implementation of the program. The proposed commitment is a sizable one. India's wheat requirements for this year alone will be more than half of the U.S. total annual consumption of wheat.

With current boxcar shortages in many areas of the country and the economy almost on a wartime basis, I hope that those responsible for carrying out the program will emphasize to Indian officials the need for flexibility in making U.S. supplies available.

The situation in many ways is similar to those early post World War II years when world needs were great and the United States and a few allies were called upon to supply the bread rations that were so vital in maintaining the free world. Shipping wheat in the form of flour, as well as grain, greatly increased U.S. availability of food supplies—particularly for port loading.

This flexibility of handling food shipments provided a much broader base of supply by adding more sources from more locations and reducing pressures and difficulties caused by the concentration of bulk movement through a few selected port areas. With part of the shipments in bag form, more flexibility, both in loading in the United States and the unloading for distribution and use in India is provided.

In implementing special programs of this kind, I believe every possible consideration should also be given to the best utilization of U.S. labor. Many flour mills in our Southwest area have been operating only part time and some have been forced to close down. I understand the situation to be similar in other parts of the country. In fact, my attention has just been drawn to efforts being made by union officials and some of my colleagues in New York State to do something about the great milling center at Buffalo which has been experiencing serious difficulties recently.

If more U.S. labor can be employed in this special program—especially labor that is now only working part time—not only people, but communities all over our country become directly involved in working to send food to India.

I think it is in the best interest of both the United States and India to keep our food assistance programs as flexible as possible by utilizing flour for shipments as well as unprocessed wheat.

IT'S NO PLACE TO GET RICH

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, there is a persistent and cleverly designed political effort to discredit the antipoverty program by playing up the compensation received by those administratively involved in the program. This is like any other program in that competent people must administer it; otherwise the intended beneficiaries will not enjoy what Congress intended them to receive. So far as I am aware the salaries of those administering the Federal funds which go into this program are consistent with the salaries received by those who are handling comparable responsibilities under similar programs involving the expenditure of Federal money.

Jack Kassewitz, able chief editorial writer of the Miami News, recently did an excellent piece on salary scales in Dade County's outstanding Economic Opportunity Program, Inc. Mr. Kassewitz points out that while EOPI is responsible for an antipoverty budget of $4,470,000, with several million more dollars indirectly involved, EOPI administrative costs—including salaries—account for only 2 percent of the total budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Mr. Kassewitz' article inserted at this point in the RECORD:

IT'S NO PLACE TO GET RICH

(By Jack Kassewitz)

One thing seems certain in the war on poverty. The small band of administrators who are working to comfort perhaps one-fifth of this county's entire population will never get rich themselves at the public's expense.

Dade's Economic Opportunity Program, Inc., is fiscally responsible for projects in the community totaling $4,470,000. Indirectly, several million more dollars is involved. And yet the administration of EOPI is accomplished with the expenditure of a meager 2 (that's right, 2) percent of the sum total.

Quite a bit has been made of the fact that Mrs. Jack Gordon, wife of the controversial school board member, has been, is, and will be, earning $50 a day as a consultant for Project Headstart, designed to improve the educational lot of poor children. Now $50 a day is a large sum to one who is impoverished. But it also happens to be a fair going wage for qualified consultants in the field of education.

OTHERS BUSY

Others are earning this same salary. For example, Dr. Elizabeth Metcalf, psychologist, is currently working to train teachers for Headstart. And architect Richard Rose is designing a million-dollar day-care center program. Like Mrs. Gordon, their contracts expire February 25, but may be extended, if need be.

Richard Weatherley, director of EOPI, isn't bashful about discussing his administrative setup. The Federal allotment for his entire staff totals only $94,000, a minute portion of the overall project in Dade County.

Weatherley is paid $15,000. The director of day care, Mrs. Leslie Danforth, is paid $12,500, the same as Dr. Harold Strauss, director of the employment program. Fletcher Paschal who recently took over the community action program is paid $13,300, which equals his salary when he was assistant principal at Brownsville Junior High.

Among the other administrators, Bob Wyrick, the community relations director, is paid $8,500 and controller Harvey Keil $9,000. Mrs. Betty Lou Barbieri, director of the volunteer program, is paid $5,500, which is much closer to the average salary earned by most of EOPI's 165 staff members. (The U.S. Government says a person earning less than $3,000 is "poor.")

BOARD INFORMED

EOPI is controlled by a 28-member board of civic leaders. Weatherley said he informed them last November that Mrs. Gordon, whose husband is a board member, was being hired for Headstart. "No one objected, and no one complained about a conflict of interest," said Weatherley. "In fact, I don't think there is, either.

"If you want to draw a parallel, look at Holmes Braddock, another member of the school board. His wife is a school teacher but I didn't hear anyone complaining about a conflict of interest.

"Mrs. Gordon was recommended to us by Dean John Beery, of the University of Miami. It's much more economical to hire a person of her ability on a short-term basis. She has the professional training we needed. That's why she was hired."

MY MOST UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTER

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent Miami Beach, along with my able colleague, the gentleman from Florida, DANTE FASCELL. The whole world knows of this great center of tourism and recreation. Nowhere on earth are there to be found so many beautiful and spacious hotels and motels, such delightful accommodations located so proximate to the Gulf Stream in such a tropical climate and tropical setting as in Miami Beach. Millions of people every year come to enjoy this glamorous city so perfectly designed for the delight of the visitor. The man responsible for the vision and the beginning of Miami Beach was Carl Graham Fisher, of Indianapolis, Ind., who bought land and initiated the building of this magnificent resort with the comment that it would be the greatest resort area in the world.

Carl Fisher was as fabulous a character as he was a builder. The lovely and keenly intelligent lady who was by Carl Fisher's side in all these great days, his wife, Jane Fisher, has in the April number of Reader's Digest written of this extraordinary man under the heading, "My Most Unforgettable Character."

I believe this is a story everyone would delight to read—an exciting story about one of the exciting figures of our times, Carl Fisher. I therefore include this article by Mrs. Fisher in the body of the RECORD following my remarks:

MY MOST UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTER

(By Jane Fisher)

My favorite spot in Miami Beach is a tiny, flower-filled park where children play before a bronze bust of a smiling man wearing a floppy, broad-brimmed hat. Sometimes as I gaze at this likeness of my husband, Carl Graham Fisher, the city's gleaming skyscraper hotels dissolve into cloud castles, and I relive that day shortly before World War I when he took me to a sand dune in a steaming, alligator-infested swamp across Biscayne Bay from Miami.

"Honey," he said with his Hoosier twang, "I'm going to build a city here."

"Fisher's Folly," people called his idea. But Carl believed that "If you can dream it, you can do it." He built his dream city as he did everything else, by saying "I dare you" to himself, and moving heaven and earth to meet that dare.

LITTLE HONEY

I was going on 15 that memorable Fourth of July 1909, in Indianapolis when the starting bomb went off in a puff of white smoke, horses reared, John Philip Sousa struck up "Stars and Stripes Forever" and I got my first glimpse of my future husband. He was soaring into the sky in a white Stoddard Dayton roadster attached to an enormous yellow balloon—one of his publicity stunts.

To my elders, Carl Fisher was the flamboyant automobile racer and salesman who had built the big Prest-O-Lite plant on the edge of town. To us teenagers, he was the daredevil hero who had ridden a bicycle on a tightrope above Main Street. One night at the Canoe Club with my parents, I passed within a few feet of Carl's table and when he glanced up it seemed to me he looked into my heart. A few weeks later, when a fire broke out in our kitchen at home, the first thing I did was telephone his office: "Mr. Fisher, this is Jane Watts, the girl you saw at the Canoe Club, and my house is on fire."

"I'll be right over, Little Honey," said the deep male voice.

A neighbor had put out the fire by the time my hero drove up in his racy white roadster. His white felt hat was pushed back, buccaneer fashion; a yellow polo coat covered his broad shoulders. The handsome face was wreathed in a smile. When I explained about the fire being out, he said, "Hop in, Little Honey," and took me for my first automobile ride. We went to a field outside the city where he was building the Indianapolis Speedway.

"It's going to be the greatest automobile racetrack in the world," he told me. That, I was to discover was the Carl Fisher style—first the matter-of-fact announcement that he was going to do something nobody else thought possible, then the action. That dusty drive was the first of many with Carl that summer. One day he said, "You know, Jane, I'm going to marry you," and I said, "Yes, I know."

My stepfather took a dim view of a son-in-law almost his own age (Carl was 35), but he and mother finally consented. At 6 o'clock on our wedding morning, a German street band began playing "Ach Du Lieber Augustine" under my bedroom window in a rainstorm, and nobody could stop them. "Orders from Mr. Fisher," the bandleader said. Then came a procession of wagons bearing flowers and presents. There was hardly room for the small wedding group by the time Carl arrived with his mother and Galloway, his Negro valet.

It was Galloway who decorated our apartment in Indianapolis while we were on our honeymoon. The apartment was arranged just like Carl's bachelor quarters. The doorbell was wired to an electrical player piano that played "After the Ball," to which Carl's St. Bernard, Collie and Airedale howled in chorus. The bedroom was dominated by a huge, revolving department-store rack filled with Carl's suits. Over the head of the bed hung large prints of Carl's lifelong heroes, Lincoln and Napoleon, and a piece of sandpaper for striking matches.

SKINNING THE CAT

Carl's drive and his impatience with convention were easier to understand when I learned more about his boyhood. In Greensburg, Ind., where he grew up, he was considered a show off. He couldn't pass a fence or gate without stopping to stand on his head or "skin the cat." He practiced tightrope walking on his mother's clothesline, and he built a pair of stilts so tall he had to mount them from an upstairs window. No one guessed that Carl was showing off to conceal the fact that his vision was badly impaired. Because he stumbled and upset things, his playmates called him "crip," and his teachers considered him stupid.

He left school when he was 12. His mother ran a boardinghouse, and Carl was the mainstay of the family. He got a job as grocery-delivery boy; he peddled peanuts and magazines on the trains. Having little but his own peanuts to eat, he developed a fondness for them and always kept a huge jar of salted peanuts beside his bed. It wasn't coincidence that the man who built the capital city of leisure was a small-town boy, who had to start working early and never stopped.

At 17, Carl started a bicycle shop and promoted sales by becoming a master cyclist. Later he began selling and racing automobiles as well, hurtling around the primitive dirt tracks, unable to see much further than the hood. But Carl's poor eyesight provided the challenge that made him a millionaire. This was "Prest-O-Lite," the name Carl gave to the acetylene gas which an elderly inventor named Fred Avery had managed to compress and store in a metal tank. "It's for use on automobiles so people can see the road at night," Avery explained.

Carl, conscious of his own poor vision, was excited. He bought into the company, and Prest-O-Lite tanks became familiar on the running boards of the early cars. When Carl sold out to the Union Carbide Co. a few months after our honeymoon, his share was $10 million. Friends urged him to retire. But his life until then was only a preparation for the creation of Miami Beach.

PRETTY LITTLE TOWN NAMED MIAMI

Fate carried us there on the *Eph*, a yacht Carl ordered and named after a dog he had loved as a child. The boat was delivered by a young engineer named John Levi. Impulsively Carl invited him and some cronies to cruise down the Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico. When the *Eph* was beached by a hurricane on the west coast of Florida, Levi volunteered to sail the boat around to Jacksonville, where we would meet him. A couple of weeks later, Carl got a telegram: "Miami pretty little town; why not meet me here?"

We loved Miami at first sight, and Carl bought a house there, which we called "The Shadows." The front windows looked across Biscayne Bay to what was then a swampy, jungle-covered island. One day we were exploring in the *Eph's* dinghy when we heard a gentle voice call, "Is thee lost?" Before us stood John S. Collins, a 75-year-old Quaker horticulturist who had come to Florida 30 years earlier to pioneer the growing of avocados. Collins had gone broke trying to build a bridge to the mainland. Carl so admired Collins' courage that he lent him $50,000 to complete it. One of the main thoroughfares in Miami Beach is named Collins Avenue.

A little later Carl bought the big tract of swampland. When he told me, he had that faraway look I knew so well. I can say truly that I saw Miami Beach when it was only a gleam in Carl Fisher's eye. Then he said it, softly, "Honey, I'm going to build a city here."

A GREENHORN WILLING TO TRY

So in 1913 the dream was born. From The Shadows I watched the work gangs fight their way through centuries of swamp jungle. The palmettos, anchored with roots that twisted the steel blades of machetes, had to be pulled out by mules with chains and grappling hooks. As the swamp was cleared, it had to be filled. That meant pumping millions of cubic feet of sand and mud out of the bay. Men loved working for Carl because he believed that they could do anything. "Experts tell me why something can't be done," Carl said. "Give me the greenhorn who's willing to try anything."

Two years later there were 6 miles of glistening white sand. Trees, flowers and grass were planted. Butterflies took the place of mosquitoes. But only a few houses went up. To get things started, Carl offered choice oceanside acreage free to friends who would build homes or hotels. But they shook their heads. One night early in 1915 when we were sitting before the fire, Carl said suddenly, "By golly, I've got it." He would build his dream city himself. Risking every penny he owned, he started building hotels, shops and even office buildings. Later that year, Miami Beach was incorporated as a city—with John Levi as mayor.

One day Carl burst out, "All these yachts, and no slips to hold them."

"What yachts?" I asked.

Carl was impatient. "Everybody will bring their yachts to Miami Beach. We will have to build yacht clubs." Eventually, he built a yacht basin that could accommodate all the yachts on the eastern seaboard. It was not until 1920 that land began to sell on Miami Beach. Then the great Florida land boom started here and spread outward. Carl had opened up a new frontier. It was just as wild and raucous as the old Wild West, but with yachts instead of covered wagons, millionaires instead of cowboys and real-estate operators instead of rustlers.

Carl used his flair for showmanship to sell Miami Beach. The leading polo players of the world were invited to bring their ponies to Miami Beach at his expense. (He started work on the stables before he had a single reply.) Carl laid out the world's finest golf courses before most Americans had even heard of the game.

Our new home, "the Beach Shadows," became the center for all that went on in Miami Beach during those early years of the twenties, and life there was a continuous party attended by just about every celebrity. James Whitcomb Riley, our Hoosier poet, was a regular visitor. Will Rogers once wisecracked, "Carl Fisher is the man who took Miami Beach away from the alligators and gave it to the Indianians." In the midst of all the stir and glitter, Carl remained the unpretentious Hoosier. None of his many hotels, office buildings, or boulevards were named for him.

UNDAUNTED DREAMER

Once Carl's dream city had been caught up in the great Florida boom he helped create, he started building a new "paradise" at Montauk Point, the sandy tip of Long Island, where he envisaged a summer playground in a great transatlantic harbor. Carl was in Montauk with a thousand-man crew, building roads, power stations, and hotels for his summer paradise when the great hurricane of 1926 hit Florida. "Miami Beach total loss," his agent wired him. Carl had used his Florida holdings to guarantee the bonds for building Montauk. Within months the huge Montauk project fell apart, and Carl knew that he must lose everything.

One by one over the next few years his properties were taken away—the hotels, golf courses, finally even his house on Biscayne Bay. Carl went right on making plans for vast new projects, even when he knew that a liver ailment left him little time to live.

"Hells bells, Jane," he told me a few weeks before he died, "I always did want to explore new territory."

In his own way, Carl was a great American frontiersman. Beneath the bronze bust in the little Miami Beach park is the inscription, "Carl Graham Fisher: he carved a great city out of a jungle." For all the adventurous Americans who are pushing back new frontiers, I think he would add this post script: "If you can dream it, you can do it."

EXCHANGES HELPFUL

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Rees] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Los Angeles Times of March 23 hails the new 2-year cultural exchange agreement which has been signed by the United States and the Soviet Union. The paper points out:

> The fact that the exchange program has endured for almost a decade is proof enough that both sides find it worthwhile.
>
> The United States favors the program because it enables at least a limited number of American scholars to get an inside look at Soviet society, and offers a breath of fresh outside air to many thousands of Russians who are otherwise cut off from Western ideas.

My colleagues will find this editorial most interesting and I have asked permission to have it included in the Record, as follows:

United States-Soviet Exchanges Helpful

> A new 2-year cultural exchange agreement has been signed by the United States and the Soviet Union—but only, apparently, after President Johnson made it clear he expects the Russians to live up to this one.
>
> The pact continues through 1967 the broad range of cultural exchanges which began in 1958.
>
> As a result, American audiences will see the Bolshoi Ballet, the Moscow Philharmonic Chamber Orchestra and the Russian Festival of Arts group.
>
> Among U.S. groups which will go to the Soviet Union are the Earl Hines jazz band, the New England Conservatory Chorus, and the Boston Symphony Orchestra's chamber group.
>
> The exchanges also include scientists, technicians, scholars, motion pictures, publications, and such sports events as the United States-U.S.S.R. dual track meet to be held in Los Angeles, under sponsorship of the Times, next July 23–24.

The fact that the exchange program has endured for almost a decade is proof enough that both sides find it worth while.

For the Soviets, the advantages include the favorable image created by their touring theatrical groups and, more importantly, the opportunity to expose their scientists and technicians to American developments in their fields.

The United States favors the program because it enables at least a limited number of American scholars to get an inside look at Soviet society, and offers a breath of fresh outside air to many thousands of Russians who are otherwise cut off from Western ideas.

Unfortunately, the Soviets have not always honored the agreements.

The last violation occurred last year, when the Soviet Government refused to admit the Broadway musicale, "Hello Dolly," despite its inclusion in the pact.

Mr. Johnson is said to have emphasized, before the new signing, that any breach of the agreement, or any harassment of Americans visiting Russia under the arrangement, will invite U.S. retaliation.

This is only proper. Furthermore, the retaliation should be where the Soviets least want it—in the sphere of technological exchanges.

AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. HOUSING ACT OF 1937

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce an amendment to the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to permit the admission of single or widowed women and men, aged 50 or over, to low-rent housing projects where unoccupied units are available for them.

In Bethlehem, Pa., alone, within the past 5 years, they have had to turn away as unacceptable for public housing—due to the age limitations—some 300 persons, most of whom are women in the age 50 through 61 group. There is rarely a week that goes by that a request for application is made and they must be turned away because the law says they are ineligible. This is unfortunate in face of the vacancies that exist now, and have for several years, in this particular public housing development. Other housing authorities of comparable size have the same problem. They have the space, the men and women in the age group 50 to 61 are desperately in need of this type of housing, and they are not permitted to accept them. This amendment would not apply to the housing authorities who are filled and have no difficulty keeping their units occupied with families of the low-income bracket, which of course public housing is basically intended for.

But in many instances, because of the rising economy and tenants moving out to purchase homes, with little or no pool of applications, this presents a real threat to local authorities insofar as their operating economy and increased maintenance cost is concerned.

Many persons, particularly women, live on a small income, and decent housing is a big item in their financial picture. I have been told that women have begged and pleaded to be allowed to rent vacant units and have gone away in tears after they have been told that the law says they are ineligible because of their age. The units are available, they are decent respectable men and women—the majority being widows—in the low-income bracket, the local authority needs the income from the units to meet their expenses, but the law reads that only the disabled or physically handicapped are eligible in that particular age group.

Mr. Speaker it is a privilege to place before this House an amendment to the housing code which will be beneficial to everyone concerned. It will provide housing to that in-between group who are now denied safe, decent, and adequate housing because of their age. It will augment the local authorities finances which in turn will work for the benefit of all.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION INVESTIGATION

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, what appears to be unsound management practices have been disclosed by an investigation of Small Business Administration financing. The Committee on Banking and Currency has just concluded a series of hearings on the financing of Small Business Administration lending activities by the device of selling off loans and other evidences of indebtedness held by the Administration.

This financing approach also contemplates the sale of participations in pooled loans through the Federal National Mortgage Association as provided by legislation currently before the committee This approach is being urged upon Congress in preference to the more normal method of obtaining operating funds through the appropriations process.

Aside from the merits and demerits of these different approaches, Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House should be aware that the Small Business Administration has recently sold about $75 million of debentures acquired in the course of financing small business investment companies. The agency hopes to sell a total of about $110 million of the debentures to institutional investors at a yield of 5¾ percent. This is an unprecedented rate for an obligation carrying with it the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government. Furthermore, the manner in which these debentures were brought to market has been incredibly sloppy and unbusinesslike. No doubt the high interest rate—which is markedly higher than other agency obligations—reflects the poor management of this financing arrangement.

It seems to me that the taxpayers deserve more careful handling of their financial affairs, particularly when public spending is at an alltime high.

But even more disturbing, Mr. Speaker, is the question raised by both the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], as well as several other members. All these committee members have challenged the legal authority of SBA to dispose of these debentures. This is indeed a serious charge to make—that the legality of a $110 million sale of Government assets is under a cloud. As I have mentioned, $75 million of these debentures are already in the hands of innocent investors whose title to these certificates may be invalid.

When faced with this charge, the best SBA could do was cite an opinion by the General Accounting Office. They had not bothered to check first for an opinion of the Attorney General. Furthermore, both our committee staff and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress have prepared legal opinions sharply critical of the GAO's decision that the debentures could be legally sold.

In fact, GAO's recent concurrence with SBA represents a reversal of a previous GAO opinion rendered in 1962 that SBA's statute does not permit the sale of SBIC obligations held by SBA. Further doubt is shed on the legality of this $110 million transaction by the fact that in 1963 specific legislation was considered necessary to permit SBA to enter into participating agreements with lending institutions with respect to loans to SBIC's. Also, if SBA has such broad authority as SBA and GAO seem to think, why is SBA currently before the Congress for authority to sell participations in pooled loans?

These questions demand straight answers, Mr. Speaker, and I expect by April 19 when we resume consideration of the participation bill, S. 2499, that we will have them. I am pleased to report that the committee staff has been instructed to look fully into this matter before we reconvene.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO DEFENDS ADMINISTRATION'S COINAGE PROGRAM BEFORE COIN COLLECTORS

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a speech by one of our most able members of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] concerning our Nation's coinage problem has come to my attention. In his address before the United Coin Collectors Alliance in Chicago, the gentleman from Illinois spells out in a reasonable and logical way the problems and pitfalls which faced the Treasury Department because of the increased use of coins, the shortage of silver for the minting of coins, and Congress answer to this problem, the Coinage Act of 1965.

Too often, citizens cannot understand the reasons for Government actions, especially concerning those situations which affect them directly. When the critical shortage of coins became evident during the past few years, the public, especially the coin collectors, became very much disturbed. The Banking and Currency Committee passed the administration's Coinage Act of 1965, changing for the first time since 1790 the amount of silver in our coins. Mr. ANNUNZIO was an active member on this piece of important legislation. I commend the gentleman from Illinois' brilliant analysis of the coin shortage problem, the Coinage Act of 1965, and his own illuminating remarks on his work as an active legislator to the Members of the House.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO, DEMOCRAT, OF CHICAGO, AT MEETING OF UNITED COIN COLLECTORS ALLIANCE, LASALLE HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 2, 1966

I am certainly happy that I was able to leave Washington in time to meet with you this morning. It is most unusual for the House of Representatives to meet on a Saturday, but it can happen and it has happened, and so there is always a degree of uncertainty about scheduling appearances at meetings like this, even for weekends.

Fortunately, nothing intervened—no emergencies in the Nation's Capital to keep us in attendance on the House floor. When the House is not meeting on a weekend, I find I can accomplish much more by being here in Chicago, meeting with constituents and business groups and organizations of all kinds, than trying to find anyone who will come to the telephone in the deserted offices of the Federal Government. I am not against the 5-day week, but L.B.J. and I, and a lot of others in elective office, largely have to just imagine what a 5-day week is like from the standpoint of our working schedule.

This is work—being here with you—but, like so many of the tasks which go with my office, it is pleasant work—work which I enjoy. When you are engaged in that kind of work, the hours are never burdensome—at least not to the spirit.

Coming here today to meet with the coin collectors—amateur and professional—in the United Coin Collectors Alliance is a continuation and extension of an important part of my congressional responsibilities as a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The jurisdiction of this committee is very broad. Much of the legislation we consider and pass upon is of vital and direct concern to every American citizen, and to our role in international affairs as the preeminent industrial Nation of the world and as the greatest factor today in the maintenance of what peace the world now enjoys.

I am proud that in my first term in the Congress, I was honored by the leadership of my party in being placed on this important committee. In keeping with the responsibilities which go with that honor, I take my assignment on the banking committee most seriously, and try my best to study and become thoroughly acquainted with the complex issues we must consider, from the activities of the Federal Reserve System to the interest rates charged a serviceman on his purchase of a car.

One of the happier chores in that assignment is to work on legislation affecting the monetary system of the United States. The decision by our Founding Fathers to provide a decimal system of coinage was one of many—a great many—fortunate judgments which were made in the earliest days of this Nation for which we can always be deeply grateful. Now that Australia has gone over to the decimal system, and Great Britain is following suit, we can derive further satisfaction and pride from the foresight of the men who first helped George Washington to free our land as a Nation and then to build it into an enduring political structure—the oldest democracy under a written constitution in the world.

As everyone knows who is interested in coin collecting, this hobby provides a valuable insight into the history of mankind and of nations, and it certainly provides many fascinating echoes of the exciting history of our own Nation.

Therefore, as a Member of Congress who believes deeply in the American political system, I welcome the entry of more and more Americans into the field of coin appreciation, if that is a good term for numismatics. The idea that some people have that coin collecting is some sort of exercise in miserliness is completely false. Society has always despised the miser—a person who covets money not for the good which can be done with it, or the useful purposes to which it can be put, but as something to hide away where no one else can derive any use or enjoyment from it. I have yet to run into an honest-to-God coin collector who fits into that category. One thing I have noticed about a genuine coin collector is that he wants everyone else to share with him the pleasures of a great "find". In that respect, you are like lovers of painting or sculpture or music, who recognize greatness in a piece of art and want everyone to have the opportunity of enjoying this same pleasure.

Unfortunately for your quiet pursuit of this hobby, a lot of factors conspired in the past few years to change the environment of coin collecting. The most dominant factor, of course, was the increasing, world-wide demand for silver, for photographic purposes—which, alone, require more silver than the United States produces a year—and for electronics, and missile and submarine components. As we became more comfortable, economically, with more and more people working at better wages, the demand for silver jewelry and silverware also rose. We finally reached a point where the deficit in silver supply could be overcome only by tapping the huge reservoir of silver in the vaults of the Federal Government at West Point.

These things were happening just at the time when demand for coins in our economy was reaching fantastic dimensions. The tremendous expansion in the vending machine industry was a major factor in this hunger for more and more coins, but a lot of other factors also came into the picture. Hence, in only a relatively few years after the closing of the San Francisco Mint because we had "too much" mint capacity in the country, we found ourselves in a situation where the Federal Reserve System had to ration coins to the banks, and the Treasury Department, running the Philadelphia and Denver Mints day and night around the clock, were unable to overcome the shortage.

That's when a lot of fast buck operators, who never were legitimate coin hobbyists but were the kind of fellows who rush into any unusual business situation in order to try to make a killing, began to muscle in on our silver supply and our coins—anticipating a rise in silver prices. Where a coin collector might be interested in several specimens of each coin, and a coin dealer might be interested in reasonable inventories to sell to collectors, the speculators were interested not in bags but in tons.

I am glad to say that the Congress rose to meet this challenge. We did not pass panic legislation aimed at the coin collector. We did not make it a criminal offense to save coins, or to buy and sell them on the numismatic market. We avoided action, too, which would have had the consequence of raising substantially the costs of doing business for American businesses dependent upon supplies of silver for their products.

The steps we did take were not particularly happy ones, but they were reasonable and necessary ones.

First, the Congress relieved the intense pressure on Government silver stocks by authorizing the Federal Reserve to issue Federal Reserve notes in the $1 denomination, to replace silver certificates. Thus, it was no longer necessary to have $1 worth of scarce silver immobilized forever in the Treasury to back up every single $1 bill in existence. This released large quantities of silver for industry.

Next, and reluctantly, Congress temporarily froze the date of our coins to ease the pressure from those buying them in huge quantities for future numismatic value. This step was taken concurrently with a vast expansion in the production of coins, under a crash program which put to productive use every inch of space in our mints, and every machine which could be found and put into operation making coins. The results have been truly astounding—phenomenal.

And then, last year, after a comprehensive study into all phases of coin metallurgy by an outstanding private research institution, the Battelle Memorial Institute of Columbus, Ohio, Congress enacted the Coinage Act of 1965 which made profound changes in the composition of our subsidiary coins and gave us the new clad coins in which little or no silver is used. We now have had some experience with the new silverless 25-cent pieces and just in the last month we have begun to see some of the silverless dimes and the 40-percent silver half-dollars.

Let me say that, as between a 90-percent silver coin, such as we have used in this country for so many generations, and the new clad coins, I prefer the looks of the old coins. The new dimes and quarters take some getting used to. The new half dollars looks so much like the 90-percent silver ones that only the date reveals the difference to most people, but nevertheless, I am sure no one really prefers the new coins to the older ones. So I am not going to try to pretend that the new coins are better looking or more desirable.

But don't ever let anyone shortchange the new coins or disparage them, without giving that person a rebuttal. The new coins work, and they work well. They make possible the continued use of millions of vending machines which supply this Nation with billions of dollars worth of merchandise in a fast and efficient and effective manner. They are worth their face value—for they carry the full faith and trust of the United States of America, and you can't ask for better than that.

Furthermore, as a result of having the new clad coins, we do not now face the dangerous prospect of being without necessary supplies of silver for defense and essential civilian needs, nor do we face any curtailment of our enjoyment of photography as a hobby, or the purchase of a handsome sterling silver gift to a June bride. Had we continued making the 90-percent silver coins at the rate we need coins for commerce, our silver supplies would now be approaching exhaustion, the price of silver would inevitably rise substantially—on a worldwide black market if we had tried to impose controls—and the value of the silver in our coins would have outstripped the face value of the coins to the point where they would be going into melting pots instead of vending machines and cash registers.

The solutions which Congress and the Johnson administration devised for this serious crisis were imaginative and resourceful; and we can all be thankful for the resilience of this Nation in solving a problem which could have been disruptive of our entire economy. We can maintain, and are maintaining what amounts to an effective ceiling on silver prices so that the existing silver coins are not jeopardized, while at the same time assuring the silver mining industry sufficient incentive—through a floor on silver ore values—to expand production. Eventually, a Joint Commission on the Coinage, authorized under the Coinage Act of 1965, will recommend a policy for the future role of silver in our monetary system.

In the meantime, all of you who are interested in coins, as a hobby or professionally, can help us in the Congress by sharing your ideas with us for future legislative actions in this field. The silver dollar, for instance, is still the symbol and standard of our coinage system, but, as you know, we have minted none for 31 years and will not do so for at least another 4 years. Should we consider a nonsilver, or low-silver-content dollar coin? The degree of success of the new half-dollar will probably help give us some guidance on that idea. I have received so far no indication of any failures on the part of the new coins in doing their job as mediums of exchange, but there are still many problems to be overcome, including the construction of facilities in the new mint at Philadelphia which can handle the production of the clad strip from which the coins are stamped.

These are factors, too, in the prospects of repealing the section of the new law dealing with mint marks. Had we continued to use mint marks, the immediate demand for new coins from all three mints now in operation—even though we do not officially refer to the San Francisco operation now as mint—would have been tremendous on the part of all coin collectors. Now that we have 1965 dates again, with the prospect that we can also go to 1966 and thus assure continuity of dating in coin collections, I don't think we are unreasonable in asking for some patience at this point on mint marks. I am sure they will return—they serve a useful purpose from a practical sense as well as for the hobbyist—and if the production at the mints meets our expectations, I think the day of the return of mint marks can be brought much nearer than originally intended.

Much as I want to make you happy and give you every possible assistance in the enjoyment of a wonderful hobby, I would not promise mint marks a moment before we can achieve this goal from a practical standpoint. On the other hand, I would not be willing to delay their return any longer than necessary. I will pursue this matter with great interest, and if and when the time arrives for appropriate action, I will introduce legislation—but only when I am convinced the time has arrived. I know that Mr. Minzer and others feel that this can be accomplished fairly soon and I am perfectly willing to study the problem further.

The newly announced mint sets are a great step forward which I am sure all of you applaud. The price is high: $4 for a single set of 5 coins, compared to the $2.10 which used to be charged for genuine proof sets and the $2.40 for the 10-coin mint sets issued up to 1964. But considering the many hand operations which will go into their production, and the tremendous demand for numismatic material of this kind from all over the world at comparable prices, I would rather see a $4 set available which everyone could buy than a $2.10 set which could be produced only in limited volume and would instantly be worth far more to the lucky few who obtained them than the Treasury price. I think, once again, we should wait a bit to see how this new activity works out in operation. Mr. Minzer has advised me that he has seen the new mint set at Miss Adams' office and that both he and your president, Mr. Forman, were very much impressed by its appearance.

I was asked to discuss the fate of the 2,977,555 silver dollars now on hand in the Treasury. The chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Congressman Wright Patman, of Texas, one of the greatest men to serve in Congress, whose interests as a legislator range over a remarkably broad field as the author of the Robinson-Patman antitrust law, the originator of the House Select Committee on Small Business, the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and author of one of the most informative books ever issued on the structure and functions and operation of the U.S. Government, has brought forward a widely discussed solution for the distribution of these desirable coins through several of our great, national, non-profit organizations, the Cancer Society and the Heart Association. A majority of the numbers of the committee, including myself, have introduced identical bills to that introduced by the chairman. We have not yet held hearings on this legislation, but interest in it is very high.

I saw the recent editorial in Numismatic News suggesting that the proceeds of the sale of these rare coins go to the Smithsonian Institution for the further development of its numismatic collection. Any such suggestions, of course, are worth considering. However, I believe your primary interest is in making these silver dollars available on a fair basis to collectors, who will enjoy them as examples of a fine art, and who would be proud to add them to collections which would be shown to other collectors and to children who have never had the thrill of getting a "cartwheel" of their own.

In conclusion I would like to leave this thought with you: we in the Congress have many responsibilities to the public. Different groups in the population believe some things we do in which they are primarily interested are more important than other things we do which affect different groups. The pressures on us are many and varied. We cannot succeed in our jobs if we try to please everyone, or if we bend to pressures we believe represent bad public policy. We must use our good judgment and weigh the consequences to the entire country of every action we take. So it is not how much noise a group makes which gets results in Congress, it is how much sense it makes in its arguments for legislation.

As students of our coinage system, you want, I know, only what is best for a country you love. You couldn't be coin collectors without having a deep-seated love and respect for the distinctive features of our political system. Therefore, I know we can count on your help to do, always, what is best for the country. In that spirit, I welcome any suggestions you may make to me for future legislation. Thank you.

DECLARATION ON AMERICAN UNITY AN ANSWER TO THE TRICONTINENTAL CONFERENCE

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. Polanco-Abreu] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, the right to be free is the most cherished of all rights. It is the most basic of all rights, and yet, it is a right for which man has had to struggle and fight since the beginning of his time on earth. This struggle and this fight continues today, for without this constant struggle there would be an erosion of freedom until it was lost irretrievably.

It seems strange and incomprehensible that in today's civilization and in this age of scientific achievement and other wonders, many peoples of the world have lost their freedom—albeit the struggle to regain it persists.

With these few words, I should like to call attention to a declaration on American unity recently adopted by the Association of Cuban University Professors in Washington, D.C.:

Declaration on American Unity an Answer to the Tricontinental Conference

Men are born free and have the right to live in freedom.

The responsibility we all have to defend this liberty cannot be delegated.

Communism has canceled, at the Tricontinental Conference, its policy of specific coexistence with the developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The Soviet Union, Red China, and Castro have coincided in the support of the so-called wars of national liberation against the peoples of Latin America, and have emphatically and overtly stated their purposes and their means for the aggression and subversion which they are using for the overthrow, through violence, of the governments established in Latin America.

The appeasement, the temporized pacifism, the repetition of Communist slogans about the social and economic problems, minimizing the danger and hiding the truth from the people is a manner—conscious or unconscious—of cooperating with the enemies of liberty, of the dignity of the human race and the survival of our peoples.

There is but one communism, its menace is not diminished because of the slant adopted.

The aggression, direct or indirect, of communism against any of the peoples of the free world, is in fact, and must be recognized, as an aggression to the rest of the peoples. The people thus attacked have to have the solidarity and the support of the rest of the free peoples, as it happens with Vietnam.

The Republic of Cuba, a member of the Inter-American system and signatory of its principles and norms, has had its territory turned into one occupied by a Communist regime, through deceit and the use of terror and force.

The people of Cuba are, and of right should be, free and independent, and it is the duty of America to help the Cubans in reinstating their liberty and to guarantee their independence.

America must exercise the right of legitimate defense, be it individually or collectively, against Communist intervention which keeps a sovereign state, member of the inter-American system, submitted and enslaved, preventing it thus from exercising its self-determination, and which from there is promoting subversion in all of Latin America.

The speeches, agreements, and resolutions of the so-called Tricontinental Conference, which took place in Havana, gave form to the violations through aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of the American states, associated by international law and repudiated by the Jus Gentium.

America's hour has struck in history's clock. The American people cannot wait indefinitely for the diplomatic process, nor for the appeasement which they reject. The time for definitions has arrived; we are ready for combat; the peoples are demanding of their leaders intelligence and courage, and from their institutions, strength.

The peoples, lulled by Communist propaganda and for lack of decision, lose their fighting capability and become easy prey to deceit and subversion.

Those who today do not understand what the responsibility of America is, should step aside so the legitimate heirs of Washington and Bolivar, Marti and Sarmiento, of Juarez and San Martin, of O'Higgins and Artigas, of Morazan and Sucre may step forward and ocupy the leader's position.

We, free men of America, with but one right, our irrevocable decision to offer our lives to defend the principles and the values of the inter-American system, invoking the help of God, declare—

That the principles of communism are incompatible with the inter-American system.

That communism is not negotiable in this hemisphere.

That the continental unity and the democratic institutions of this hemisphere are at present in danger.

That the purpose of the subversive offensive launched from Cuba is the destruction of our democratic institutions and the establishment of totalitarian dictatorships at the service of extra-continental powers.

That in order to achieve their subversive purposes and to conceal their real intentions, the Communist governments and their agents exploit the legitimate needs of those sections of the population that are less fortunate and the just, national ambitions of the peoples.

With the excuse of defending the popular interests, freedom is suppressed, democratic institutions are destroyed, human rights are violated, and the individual is subjected to the materialistic way of life imposed by the dictatorship of one sole party.

That maliciously utilizing the principles of the inter-American system, they try to undermine our democratic institutions and to consolidate and protect their political infiltration and aggression. The subversive methods of the Communist governments and their agents constitute one of the most subtle and dangerous manners of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries.

That the essential constitution of each nation and of the inter-American system for the collective effort directed to protect the freedom and the security of the human being, must be, has to be, the use, in self defense, of the adequate means of repelling aggression and of sanctioning the aggressors.

That the warning of the inter-American system addressed to the Castro government contained in the fifth resolution of the Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers has been disregarded and violated by that government, that contrariwise it has persisted in its subversive and interventionist activities.

That communism is intrinsically perverse and extrinsically dangerous for liberty, security, and peace.

That any time communism attacks a people, violates its sovereignty and endangers its independence, no matter where, we must resist and repel its aggression.

Vietnam is the most recent example. For this reason, we support the struggle of the people and the Government of South Vietnam for the maintenance of their independence; we also support the policy of the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, and of the rest of the free world concerning Vietnam.

Also for the same reasons we support the Organization of American States (OAS), the body which represents the inter-American system, we proclaim—

That America is more than a geographical area. It is a spiritual and material unity based on the principles and values of the inter-American system, the stronghold of liberty, security and peace.

That the peoples of America are brethren, united by one ideal, one common destiny; therefore, there cannot be liberty, security, or peace in the whole if none of these exists in one of its parts.

That the values and principles of the inter-American system have to have full sway in all of America.

That communism is incompatible with the inter-American system, and at the same time, is also its worst enemy.

That the inter-American system is obligated, historically, judicially, and morally, to assist, with the closest solidarity, the Cubans who fight for the reinstatement of the principles and values of the same system.

That at the Tricontinental Conference which took place in Havana, Cuba, Castro and other Communist governments declared subversive war to the death and until final victory, against the established governments in Latin America. There is no alternative; we have this war before us, whether we do or do not like to recognize this reality.

It is a war—

Of liberty against slavery;

Of love against hatred;

Of God against militant atheism;

Of economic and social development, and the security and peace of America against terrorism and subversion;

Of democracy against communism.

America has the floor. Sanction must be raised against the aggressors. Cuba must be liberated and reinstated in the inter-American system. Thus, the unity of America will be integrated.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for April 4 and 5, on account of Jewish holiday.

Mr. DYAL, for April 5, 6, 7, and 11, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WAGGONNER, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.), for 30 minutes today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, April 19, 1966.

Mr. MORTON (at the request of Mr. SAYLOR), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, April 19, 1966.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BARRETT and to include a talk given by Mr. PATMAN, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. BERRY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. WRIGHT.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile;

S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes;

S. 2719. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia; and

S. 2831. An act to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4599. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colo., and of certain chipped colored glass windows for St. Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev.;

H.R. 6568. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6845. An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act;

H.R. 7723. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty and certain tropical hardwoods; and

H.R. 9883. An act to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 6, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2274. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facility project concurrently being approved under the exemption provided by statute, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1)(b), and pursuant to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2275. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315g); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9070. A bill to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 777. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1414). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 803. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or any subcommittee thereof to travel to the Republic of the Philippines and South Vietnam; without amendment (Rept. No. 1415). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 811. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7406, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1416). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 812. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7524, a bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1417). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13881. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 14224. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 14279. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of community programs for patients with kidney disease and for conduct of training related to such programs, and other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H.R. 14280. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 14281. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 14282. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 14283. A bill to provide that the value of annuities and pensions payable under the Civil Service Retirement Act or any other Federal law shall not be taken into account for State inheritance tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14284. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent or surviving sisters of certain insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 14285. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 14286. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to reduce the amount of matching funds required from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 14287. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 14288. A bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to prohibit, except in certain circumstances, the expenditure of funds by any department for the acquisition or use of personality inventory tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 14289. A bill to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 14290. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 14291. A bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 14292. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14293. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 14294. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14295. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14296. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to permit the admission of single or widowed women aged 50 or over to low-rent housing projects where unoccupied units are available for them; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 14297. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14298. A bill to amend section 175 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include lined or unlined drainage ditches, pipes, or channels as soil conservation expenditures and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 14299. A bill to provide a system for the return of Federal income tax revenues to the States to be used exclusively for educational purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 14300. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide more equitable and realistic benefits thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 14301. A bill to establish a Bread and Butter Corps for the purpose of implementing the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening the agricultural economies of friendly nations, improving agricultural skills and knowledge in such nations, promoting world peace and friendship, and combating the threat of world food shortages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 1030. Joint resolution to provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 1031. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 1032. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 1033. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 1034. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.J. Res. 1035. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 1036. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 1037. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 22d day of April of each year as Queen Isabella Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Res. 813. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Basic Human Rights and

Peaceful World Order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 814. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Basic Human Rights and Peaceful World Order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H. Res. 815. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

444. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to orderly development of public lands, including utilization of sufficient water therefor, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 14302. A bill for the relief of Ettore Perovichi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 14303. A bill for the relief of Masayoshi Arashiba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 14304. A bill for the relief of Antonina Lombardo and Angelo Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 14305. A bill for the relief of Petroula Doula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14306. A bill for the relief of Estrella Vespertina Zamora-Vega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14307. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleftheria Yannitsiadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 14308. A bill for the relief of Bruce R. Zeller; Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 14309. A bill for the relief of Hwang Duk Hwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 14310. A bill for the relief of Jose R. Cuervo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 14311. A bill for the relief of Mr. Giuseppe Sebastino Saglimbeni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Rural Landowners in Single Texas County Set Conservation Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district of one county is at least half urban in area and predominantly urban in population, but the extent of soil and water conservation work being carried on by landowners is so impressive that I wish to call attention to it.

The Dalworth Soil and Water Conservation District in Tarrant County has 1,573 cooperators. These cooperators own and manage 255,668 acres of land, all of which is covered by updated agreements with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide assistance in carrying out longtime soil and water conservation and resource use programs as outlined in the district work plan.

About 97 percent of the cooperators have basic farm conservation plans prepared on 70 percent of their land with a number of practices underway. Soil surveys have been completed on 326,000 acres, involving a portion of the urban land.

Tarrant County is in the Trinity River watershed and is included in 5 of the 52 subwatersheds of the Trinity River flood prevention project, authorized by the 1944 Flood Control Act.

Construction and land treatment in the five subwatersheds are at various stages of completion, but already rural and urban residents are beneficiaries of installed works of improvement that have reduced floodwater damages in a number of areas.

I believe this is an exemplary showing in a county where the urban area matches the rural in acreage and where urban interests and influence in many ways predominate.

It is a tribute to the rural landowners in Tarrant County and the leadership of the soil conservation district supervisors that soil and water conservation programs on the land have increased.

The Nation needs this kind of community initiative in its rural areas. Tarrant County is demonstrating that soil and water conservation work can help to provide the impetus.

Will Retired Doctors Volunteer for Vietnam Service?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine, Dr. M. G. Waldbaum, a practicing physician and surgeon, in Omaha, Nebr., has proposed a noble and humanitarian idea. It is this: He believes that there are many retired doctors who would volunteer their services for an indefinite period for the Vietnam war effort.

These men could relieve younger doctors for more responsible duties in battlefield hospitals. The retired doctors could assist the wounded on military aircraft ambulances in their flights to hospitals outside of Vietnam. These men could give routine physical examinations, provide treatment, perform surgery, and myriads of other medical tasks.

According to the American Medical Association there were 10,293 retired physicians and surgeons in the United States on March 1, 1966.

There would be a number of ways the program could be handled. Volunteers could ask for overseas, or domestic duty, and select the length of time they desire to serve.

I have always found the medical profession to be helpful in the time of need. I am hopeful that during this crisis this reservoir of skilled doctors will make another fine humanitarian contribution.

I commend this excellent idea of Dr. Waldbaum to my fellow Congressmen, and ask for your ideas and comments.

Tight Money Is Threatening the President's Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Housing Conference celebrated its 35th anniversary and was addressed by our distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. No Member of this House is better qualified and more involved in housing programs from New Deal days to the present than the gentleman from Texas.

The National Housing Conference has long been a powerful and moving force in aiding the Nation's housing and urban development programs. The combination of WRIGHT PATMAN and the National Housing Conference is a force which has been a prime mover in providing better homes for all our citizens.

As chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have had the privilege of presiding over the hearings on the President's demonstration cities program and other housing bills. Chairman PATMAN's somber warnings on the effect that the tight money situation and high interest rates have on the housing market, the individual homeowner, the Nation's economy, and the President's Great Society programs are warnings that must be heeded if our housing and urban programs are to move forward.

I commend the address of the gentleman from Texas to my colleagues and ask that it be included in the RECORD:

Remarks of Congressman Wright Patman, Democrat of Texas, National Housing Conference, March 20, 1966

I was very happy to receive this invitation to address the National Housing Conference. Since the earliest days of the New Deal, I have seen your group come before Congress in support of legislation to make our cities, communities, and countrysides decent, livable places for people.

Your consistent pursuit of this goal has made the NHC a very influential and, in my opinion, a very necessary force in moving the Nation's housing and development programs forward. You have performed a great public service by bringing together so many of the important groups and individuals interested in broad public-minded housing and development programs.

Happily through the years, we have all seen a steady evolution in the Federal Government's commitment to the concept of decent housing for all Americans. Under the leadership of President Johnson, this evolution has bordered on a revolution—a revolution based on the belief that we can achieve a life of quality and dignity for all Americans.

Today, decent housing for both rural and urban America is a basic part of the President's Great Society programs. It is inconceivable that we could have anything resembling a Great Society so long as millions live in slums, or in decaying rural towns with inadequate public facilities.

At long last, we see a recognition that decent housing, clean, well-planned communities, and adequate public facilities are essential elements of what we like to proudly call the "American way of life."

No longer do we sit back, at either the local or national level, and suggest that decent housing "just happens." No longer do we believe that we can have model communities when one-third of the population sits in filthy, poverty-ridden slums. No longer do we believe that we can combat disease and crime when we crowd eight members of a family into a rat-infested, three-room apartment or into a broken-down farm shack. No longer do we believe that we can stop juvenile delinquency when playgrounds are no more than a garbage-filled alley.

We have come a long way down the road to accepting decent housing as a national need, a national requirement, and a national right. Without sacrificing local initiative, the Federal Government has accepted a definite role in seeking these national goals.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, which we handled in the Banking and Currency Committee during the 1st session, was a landmark piece of legislation which fully faced up to the national responsibility in these areas. I am particularly proud of what this act accomplished for the low-income and the moderate income family—such things as 221(d) housing, rent supplements, housing for the elderly, and housing for badly neglected rural areas. I am also proud of the fact that we were able to bring the interest rate down to 3 percent on elderly housing, college housing, and 221(d) programs.

This year we have before us some new housing and urban development legislation. Most of this has been generally referred to as the demonstration cities legislation. This legislation is an important and needed supplement to the 1965 act, and I hope that Congress will put this into law this session.

The Demonstration Cities Act will show not just a few cities but all cities, large and small, how they can rebuild and restore their blighted neighborhoods. What we learn in the cities where the demonstrations take place will point the way to all other cities in search of solutions. The proposal offers a wide variety of new tools to attack the problem of central cities, and there will be great flexibility in the program. These demonstrations will be carried out and largely completed over a 6-year span, but long before that period ends we will be learning new techniques and new solutions from these pilot cities.

This program puts new tools and new powers in the grasp of local leadership and private initiative. Solutions will be shaped by local officials, with a minimum of Federal direction and a maximum of Federal assistance.

This program will, more than any other, call into play the creative federalism which the President first described in his Great Society address.

The major objective in the proposed Urban Development Act is to bring into physical being the needed projects planned for metropolitan areas. New grants are proposed to assist in planned metropolitan development. But this is not money for planning. It is money to help communities pay for the facilities they need—water and sewer systems, highways, mass transit, airports, parks and open space, and the like.

These grants would be made to cities that work together to plan for the orderly growth of their entire urban area.

Another section of this act would attack the problem of urban sprawl by permitting FHA to insure mortgages for privately financed land development. This program would make it feasible at long last to open up new outlying areas to well-planned large new communities in which both small and large builders could offer housing and facilities for families of all income groups.

I know that your national president, Nat Keith, has appeared before the Housing Subcommittee in recent days to testify on these bills. I am much impressed with his suggestions for strengthening and broadening some areas of this legislation.

I was particularly interested in Nat Keith's proposals for strengthening rural housing programs as part of this year's bill. I believe this will receive widespread support in the Congress. As Nat Keith pointed out so well, the percentage of substandard and broken-down housing in rural areas is even greater than in the urban blighted areas. And as this audience knows, more than half of the Nation's poverty is today in rural sections of the country.

The answer to the rural poverty and the rural housing problems is not more migration to already overcrowded cities where good housing and public facilities are in woefully short supply. No; the problems of the cities are not solved when we annually add hundreds of thousands of unskilled and semi-skilled rural poor to their teeming populations. The problem of providing decent housing and good healthy communities must be attacked as a national problem. It cannot be met by fragmenting the answers and ignoring the vast rural areas. So, we must have both urban renewal and rural renewal.

Today, more than ever before in our history, we have mobilized our resources to combat poverty, provide good housing, strong and well-planned communities. We have taken giant steps to make a reality out of the hope that all Americans can share at the table of American abundance. President Johnson has geared his entire administration in this direction.

Despite the great programs, the great hopes and the great leadership, I would be less than candid with you if I did not tell you that there are today some very black clouds hanging over the future of the Nation's housing programs. Housing and all of the programs that go with it are affected drastically by conditions in the money market. And I know it is no secret to this audience that the money market has once again been seized and manipulated for and by the large banking institutions. Operating through the Federal Reserve System, the big banks are controlling the money supply of the Nation for the benefit of the few against the interests of the many.

This is no abstract argument about the Federal Reserve System. It is simply a cold hard fact which threatens every program which your organization has worked for through the years. The Federal Reserve System, and the big banks which operate from within that System, are placing a veto on many of the Great Society programs, including housing. Through the Federal Reserve, the big banks—the last strongholds of arch-conservatism in this country—are attempting to accomplish what they could not do at the polls in 1964.

Daily, skyrocketing interest rates and a rapidly tightening money supply are moving decent housing out of the reach of low-income and moderate-income Americans. I am convinced that many of the fine programs enacted as part of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 already have been wiped out by the Federal Reserve's action in raising interest rates 37½ percent back on December 6.

It is tragic that today interest costs are the biggest single factor—the biggest single cost—in housing. Today a $20,000 home mortgage will require $20,824 in interest charges over the life of a 30-year loan. This means that the money—the interest—is worth more than all of the lumber, the glass, the plumbing, the woodwork, the craftsmanship, the land, and everything else that goes into a house.

Even the smallest increase in interest rates takes a terrific toll. Take the recent experience of the New York Public Housing Authority. On December 9, 1965—just 3 short months ago—the Housing Authority was able to sell bonds for 3.5157 percent interest. On March 9, the Housing Authority marketed another $96 million worth of bonds and found that the interest rate had jumped to 3.6959 percent.

Just that increase—small in terms of percentages—added $27.6 million to the cost of the bonds over their life. Considering that the average public housing unit in New York City costs $20,000, nearly 1,400 housing units could have been built with the $27.6 million that went to excess interest charges. Roughly calculated, that sum could have provided housing for more than 5,500 people. Instead, it went to the bankers.

So, no longer can we look the other way or take a head-in-the-sand attitude that interest rates and housing are separate subjects. No, if we are really serious about providing housing and urban development then we also must be serious about holding down interest rates.

Since 1952, the interest charges on an FHA mortgage have gone up 1¼ percent. This has added a whopping $5,472 to the cost of a $20,000 home over the life of a 30-year mortgage. Today, the median income nationally is about $4,600. So this means that millions of homeowners are being forced to contribute their total wages for more than a year just to pay the additional interest charges. I think this is a national disgrace.

The December 6 action of the Federal Reserve—taken in defiance of the President and the Congress—is putting a severe strain on housing developments in all parts of the country. Already, there is talk of interest rates of more than 7 percent on home mortgages. And with the supply tightening, money, even at that extortious rate, will be unavailable.

Unless something is done to halt these rising interest costs, we may be heading for a long period of stagnation in our efforts to provide decent housing and adequate public facilities. In recent days, the financial pages of the newspapers have reported decisions by dozens of local and State governments to postpone bond issues because of the rising cost of money. That means that sewerage plants, water plants, parks, and schools will not be built.

Even one of the members of the Federal Reserve has been very candid about the effect of the interest-rate increases on the housing programs. Federal Reserve Governor Sherman Maisel, in a speech shortly after the December 6 increase, said that residential construction drops as much as 24 percent in a period of tight money. That was back in December, and today interest rates have gone even higher and money is becoming in shorter and shorter supply.

But, even accepting Governor Maisel's figures at face value, I do not believe the country can afford a 24-percent drop in housing construction. I do not believe we can afford a 24-percent cutback in providing parks, sewerage, and a multitude of other necessary public facilities.

The higher interest rates have put a new strain on the Federal budget—thus limiting the funds available for new housing programs. That December 6 interest increase forced President Johnson to add $750 million to the fiscal 1967 budget just to pay the additional interest costs on the national debt. If we had not had that December 6 increase, the $750 million could have been applied to housing or some other badly needed program. Instead, that sum will go to the banks. So while people do without housing, we will have a Federal aid program for bankers—courtesy of the Federal Reserve Board.

The $750 million added to the interest charges brings the total annual interest cost of the public debt to $12.750 billion for the next fiscal year.

In 1952, the interest charges on the national debt stood at $5.859 billion. This means that the Federal Reserve has added $6.898 billion to the annual cost of financing the public debt.

It is tragic when you realize that the American people have been forced to pay almost $60 billion in excess interest costs because of rising interest rates since 1952. This amounts to almost 10 percent of the gross national product and more than half of the estimated Federal budget for fiscal 1967.

We could have done wonderful things in housing, urban development, and rural development if this money could have been channeled into something more productive than paying the bankers increased interest.

All of this plainly points up the fact that high interest rates are a cruel and unfair tax on the poor, on the low-income and the moderate-income family—the people least able to pay. It is not, as the Federal Reserve Board would have us believe, a means of curbing inflation.

In fact, rising interest rates add to the cost of nearly every item in our economy. So, to the extent that higher interest rates increase prices, they are inflationary. Monetary policy is a highly ineffective tool in fighting inflation. There are many other more meaningful tools at hand, including taxes, particularly taxes on excess profits during a wartime period.

But, the Federal Reserve uses inflation as an excuse for its actions. It does not tell the public the true facts about the reasons behind these constantly skyrocketing interest rates. The fact is, of course, that higher interest rates are a means of providing the financial institutions with higher profits. Most interest rate increases over the past decade can be traced simply to the desire of the larger banks for increased profits.

Under its seized and so-called independence, the Federal Reserve serves as a tool, as an agent of the banks in providing the higher interest rates necessary for the higher profits. The Federal Reserve, of course, claims independence from the President and the Congress. It does not come to the Congress for appropriations. Its books are not audited. Its members serve for 14-year terms, thus preventing a President from appointing a majority of the Board until his last year in office. As a result, there is no effective control over the Federal Reserve System and no accountability to the people or their elected representatives. The Board is controlled from within by the banks and is operated almost exclusively for their benefit.

So long as this condition exists, housing and the other programs for which you fight so brilliantly are in grave danger. Your hard-fought gains can be wiped out by a single stroke of William McChesney Martin's pen.

Today, with interest being the biggest single cost in housing, the Federal Reserve Board has more to say about the success or failure of these programs than the Department of Housing and Urban Development. I say that this is bad public policy. I say that it is policy which should be reversed without delay so we can get on with the job of building a better America.

Seventh District Missouri Opinion Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in every congressional term, I make it a practice to solicit the views of the citizens of southwest Missouri on major issues before the Nation.

This year 13,760 persons responded to the seventh district opinion poll, which included 11 questions. The results of the poll were tabulated by an independent firm, using automatic data processing.

On only two questions could the pro and con attitude of the public be considered very close. These two issues are the President's actions in Vietnam and the question of a 4-year term for Members of Congress.

I was especially gratified at the response to questions dealing with cost of living adjustments for social security recipients and the tax sharing for education proposal. I have introduced bills dealing with each of these two issues and in both instances public support is indicated by the results.

The results of the poll follow:

Results of 7th Congressional District Missouri opinion poll

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Blank
Do you favor—			
1. The President's actions in Vietnam?	49.6	45.5	4.9
2. Repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which now permits States to adopt right-to-work laws?	19.5	76.3	4.2
3. Automatic cost-of-living adjustments for social security recipients?	66.9	28.1	5.0
4. Restoring the excise taxes on autos and telephones, which were removed this January	25.8	72.3	1.9
5. Reductions in our foreign aid spending?	86.7	10.8	2.5
6. A 4-year term for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives?	50.6	47.0	2.4
7. A full-scale congressional investigation of the poverty program?	83.9	13.2	2.9
8. The President's plan to create another Cabinet agency, the Department of Transportation?	19.4	75.1	5.5
9. Increasing social security taxes to finance a compulsory medicare program for the entire population?	11.2	86.3	2.5
10. Increasing the Federal minimum wage and extending it to farm labor?	34.3	61.6	4.1
11. Allocating a portion of Federal income back to the States for educational purposes as each State sees fit?	70.6	25.6	3.8

Your Federal Government in Action—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the C. & P. Telephone Co., is continuing its excellent series of articles on the activities of Federal departments. The fourth in this series, a description of the Commerce Department by Secretary John T. Conner, appeared in the January-February issue of the C. & P. magazine, the Transmitter. I bring this article to the attention of Congress:

YOUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN ACTION—FOURTH IN A SERIES ABOUT DEPARTMENTS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

FOREWORD

(By John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce)

The following article describes the many services of the U.S. Department of Commerce which are designed to promote the economic growth of the Nation—services geared to what President Johnson calls the ceaseless change in our economic affairs.

The technological advances reshaping every aspect of American industry and commerce are creating conditions that hardly were imagined a decade ago. In addition, our growing population is challenging us to provide more goods and services each year.

The decade ahead should be one of unprecedented growth. By 1975 we expect our population to increase by nearly 35 million. If the Nation's economy continues to expand as vigorously as it has in the past 5 years, the total value of all goods and services produced in a single year—the gross national product—will soar to more than $1 trillion. This is some 55 percent greater than the Nation's total output in 1965—and it is measured in terms of today's dollars.

Over the same period we can anticipate rising demand, but also sharpening competition in the markets of the world. Nevertheless, we can look to the future with confidence, because Government and business today enjoy one of the most fruitful relationships in history. Both are aware that the harmonizing of public and private interests is the key to progress in a free and dynamic society.

This article tells how the U.S. Department of Commerce helps to keep the American economy strong and viable in the changing and increasingly competitive world economy. I am grateful that the Transmitter has provided an opportunity for the story of Commerce to be told.

COMMERCE MEANS BUSINESS

The early years of this century ushered in a new era in America. It was a period in which this Nation was swiftly advancing from a rural to an urban society.

By 1900 more Americans were working in cities than in agriculture. In Detroit a former farm boy named Henry Ford was devising assembly methods that would make it possible for every family to own a car. Alexander Graham Bell was laying the groundwork for a communications system that would link the Nation and all the continents.

To help meet the growing needs of this industrial economy, Congress created in 1903 a Department of Commerce and Labor. In 1913, when the Department became primarily concerned with commerce, America's gross national product was just under $40 billion. This $40 billion was less than the total growth in our economy in 1965—a year when our gross national product climbed from $629 to $672 billion. The Department's charter then and today is "to foster, promote, and develop foreign and domestic commerce, the manufacturing and shipping industries, and the transportation facilities of the United States."

Our population in 1913 was scarcely more than 97 million. Today, it's approaching 196 million and forging steadily upward. There were 9.5 million telephones in the country. Now there are nearly 90 million. Income per capita was around $332. Today, it's almost $2,900. Foreign trade has increased tenfold. Americans enjoyed, at the end of 1965, their 58th consecutive month of unprecedented prosperity.

Did not just happen

All this happened because the energy of free, competitive enterprise was truned loose. It happened because of the productive and marketing genius of American business and industry, the skill of managers and workers, the knowledge of scientists, and the know-how of technicians—all activated by Government policies which encourage business to expand with a growing America.

Month by month, new records have been set in production, income, employment, profits, and all the indicators of economic health. For the first time, personal income of Americans passed the half-trillion-dollar mark in 1965. More citizens were at work than ever before. Unemployment has dropped to its lowest point in 8 years.

Confidence remains high. Capital outlays are expected to total about $51 billion for 1965, a gain of nearly 13.5 percent over 1964. All signs indicate further expansion in 1966.

None of this could have been achieved without teamwork. Our physical and human resources are unequalled, but they couldn't be mobilized without genuine cooperation from each segment of society. Seldom have business, labor, and Government acted with the unity that has been manifest in the last several years.

The Department of Commerce is very active in this productive partnership. By design and practice, the Department is the business arm of the Federal Government. Its basic function is to serve and stimulate the forces of private enterprise for the benefit of the economy and the national interest.

Operates in four broad areas

Many changes have occurred in the organization of the Department since 1913—to be useful the Department must be flexible. Commerce now operates in four broad areas: economic affairs, domestic and international business, science and technology, and transportation. It also is engaged in economic redevelopment and promotion of travel in the United States.

Economic affairs can be of national, regional, or local, substance. From whatever aspect, the ultimate goal in Commerce is to further growth and progress within our system of dynamic capitalism. The Department works toward this goal through policies that create an economic climate in which business and industry can prosper.

The Department works closely with other agencies of Government also involved in economic policies and programs. It speaks for business within the councils of government, not to advocate a partisan cause but to establish conditions favorable to growth and prosperity.

Census Bureau—More than a head count

Moreover, Commerce provides assistance and information vital to the business community in reaching the course of our national economy. The Census Bureau is best known for its population counts every 10 years. But Census surveys also uncover a wealth of information on our resources and economic habits. A census of housing is made in conjunction with the census of population. Censuses also are taken at 5-year intervals of business, manufacturing, mineral industries, transportation, agriculture, and State and local governments.

The increasing urbanization of the United States has drawn 70 percent of the population to 1 percent of the land area. This alone, is one of the most significant economic and social developments of our time. The Census Bureau also reports on retail and wholesale trade, exports and imports, construction and production, and many other fields.

The Office of Business Economics provides the standard data that comprise the framework for economic policy planning by the Government. The national and regional analyses form yardsticks from which both Government and private business develop sound economic programs. For instance, gross national product—calculated by the Office of Business Economics—gages national growth.

Combating the current deficit in U.S. balance of payments, which stood at $3 billion in 1964, is a priority program of the Department of Commerce. Secretary Connor is responsible to the President for the business community's voluntary effort to increase exports, restrain capital outflows and decrease dollar outflows abroad.

Concerned with domestic and foreign markets

Both domestic and international business hold the key to economic growth. In volume of sales our domestic market absorbs all but a small percentage of total U.S. output. Ours is the most prosperous market in the world. Americans were buying goods and services last summer at an annual rate of $432 billion.

Exports, running at about $26 billion, account for only 4 percent of our gross national product. The rate is low compared with many industrialized countries. But in dollar volume, ours is the largest share of world trade.

Businessmen seeking help in exporting now benefit from the commodity knowledge of specialists in the Business and Defense Services Administration. They also can obtain leads on overseas markets from regional experts in the Bureau of International Commerce. Both offices are engaged in a new effort to encourage small and medium-sized business firms to take advantage of "piggybacking"—a process by which one company with established overseas business facilities handle sales for another company that lacks exporting outlets.

Exporting greatly stimulates domestic employment. Each $1 billion increase in American exports creates an estimated 134,000 new jobs for American workers.

Allied with the two larger divisions are the Office of Field Services and the Office of Foreign Commercial Services. The first supervises 42 field offices located in strategic business centers across the nation. The second works with commercial officers at U.S. embassies and consulates abroad.

The Business and Defense Services Administration bears an additional responsibility—emergency readiness. It administers a priorities system to avert bottlenecks in strategic materials. It reviews stockpile requirements, identifies essential industries and supply sources.

Science and technology—keys to growth

The Department of Commerce has prime responsibility for promoting science and technology as a means of economic growth. Congress affirmed this responsibility in 1962 by creating a new office for Science and Technology.

To hurry scientific knowledge from laboratory to production, Commerce administers a program to provide technological information to local industries through the States by way of universities and research institutions.

Awareness that science influences the lives of ordinary citizens, the welfare of the farmer or small businessman, and the earnings of giant corporation, guides each of the operating agencies.

The weather outlook is crucial to the builder, to air and shipping lines, miners, manufacturers, and retailers. The Weather Bureau makes forecasts and searches for new ways to measure vagaries of weather.

Charting is fundamental to movement on seas and in the air. Thirty million nautical and aeronautical charts are distributed each year by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Its sea and shoreline explorations are significant to national defense, commerce, engineering and research, and to navigators of small craft and huge liners. The Coast and Geodetic Survey also provides a system of detection to protect the public from earthquakes.

Mass production depends upon precise measurements, and new products and processes emerge from exact knowledge of the properties of various materials. The National Bureau of Standards is the Nation's laboratory for measurement. It conducts programs of research and development in physics, applied mathematics, and engineering.

The inventor has a constitutional claim to protection of the fruits of his creativity. The patent system serves as an incentive to American genius, stimulating the will to innovate and take risks in our system of private enterprise. The Patent Office administers both patent and trademark laws. It celebrated its 175th anniversary in 1965—with more than three million U.S. and seven million foreign patents now on file.

Transportation—vital artery of commerce

Transportation is the vital artery of commerce, industry, agriculture, and defense. Rapid, economic transportation is imperative to growth. Transportation affects the cost of everything we produce and everything we buy. Highway transportation accounts for one of every six jobs in the United States. It affects one of every seven businesses.

Our transportation complex will be even more effective upon completion of the interstate highway network and the development of a high-speed system of ground transportation. Our ability to move products in international commerce is increasing with updating and expansion of the U.S. merchant marine.

The interstate highway system is one of America's greatest capital assets. It already is speeding the flow of people and products more efficiently, safely, and economically than ever. Nearly 20,000 miles of the projected 41,000-mile system are open to traffic. The entire network is scheduled for completion in 1972, and plans are being made for needs beyond 1972. The Bureau of Public Roads in Commerce administer a vast program of Federal aid to the States for highways—amounting to $4 billion in the next fiscal year.

Already, we are a nation of nearly 100 million drivers and 90 million vehicles. By 1970, Americans will drive a trillion miles a year. Today's roads must be built for the loads of tomorrow. They must be safer, too. Because of built-in safety features, interstate highways will save 8,000 lives a year. Spot safety improvements on existing roads and new requirements for each state to develop a comprehensive safety program will spare additional lives.

Since other means of transportation are equally imperative, commerce is researching and developing programs in all fields of ground transport. Rail demonstration projects are being worked out for the Northeast Corridor, between Boston and Washington. New rail equipment is being designed to accent comfort while traveling at sustained speeds of 120 m.p.h. and at peaks of 150 m.p.h. The potential of vehicles that move on bearings of air, of autorail ferries, of monorails and other systems that defy the imagination is under study.

The Maritime Administration is charged with developing a modern, ready-for-service merchant marine. The Nation's merchant fleet is essential to its trade and indispensable to preparedness for emergencies.

The Administration grants subsidies for the operation and construction of ships and develops ways to improve older vessels. Maritime built the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, NS *Savannah*, and the first ocean-going hydrofoil, HS *Denison*.

That all may share in prosperity

The upswing of the national economy has accentuated a chronic failure of some local and regional economies to share the general prosperity. One of every five Americans still lives in an area of little economic opportunity. One of every four counties has serious economic problems.

The Economic Development Administration, newly established in Commerce, assists depressed areas to rebuild their economies. Besides raising the living standards of people in these regions, its objective is to promote the economic growth of the entire Nation—for poverty in one area retards progress in others.

Local initiative is prerequisite to aid from the Economic Development Administration. Help consists mainly of grants and loans for public works, industrial and commercial loans, technical assistance, and research.

Ultimately, the new agency may assist a number of regions as it now helps Appalachia. The Appalachian Regional Commission, established in 1965, is injecting new life and confidence into depressed sections of the 12 Appalachian States.

Tourism—great potential from an old enterprise

While new industries add vigor, renewed concentration on an existing industry is frequently the quickest way to open the gates to employment and income. Tourism is one of these industries. Among the country's largest, it generates $30 billion a year. It has an asset without rival—the beauty, history, traditions, culture, inventive and industrial genius of the Nation.

The U.S. Travel Service in Commerce is engaged in a new effort to increase foreign travel to the United States. Promoting 1966 as the year of "Festival U.S.A.," its current campaign features the festivals, fairs, carnivals, pageants, and other events that provide a close-up of American life.

The number of visitors from overseas (excluding Canada and Mexico) already may have set a record in excess of 1 million in 1965. Travel to the United States not only helps to corral dollars and reduce our balance-of-payments deficit; it also stimulates economic growth necessary to continuing prosperity.

The changing needs of a growing Nation

In the building of modern America, Commerce's primary task has been to help create the conditions under which private industry can meet the changing needs of a growing Nation. As Secretary Connor has phrased it: "This economy is, in the last analysis, the basis of our power and claim to leadership in the world. And I am confident that with the continued and cooperative efforts of all the important elements of our society, it will meet any test to which it may be put."

Great Prayers and Occasions of Prayer in the History of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, last week the distinguished and capable senior Senator from the State of South Carolina addressed the Senate prayer breakfast group here in the Capitol Building, and he discussed prayer and its historical role in assisting the great leaders of our Nation. Prayer has given to our leaders of the past that inspiration, wisdom, and determination to lead this country through trying times.

Senator THURMOND brought to our attention a few of the prayers offered by America's patriots, which demonstrated their dependency and belief in the Creator, our Heavenly Father.

I believe this address will be an inspiration to all who read it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND, REPUBLICAN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE THE SENATE PRAYER BREAKFAST GROUP, WASHINGTON, D.C., IN THE CAPITOL, MARCH 30, 1966

PRAYER

James Montgomery penned the immortal words:

"Prayer is the soul's sincere desire
Uttered or unexpressed;
The motion of a hidden fire
That trembles in the breast."

And, Alfred Lord Tennyson said a great deal about prayer in this simple stanza:

"More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.
Wherefore, let thy voice rise like a fountain for me night and day."

For these next few minutes, then, this morning, I would like to consider with you some of the great prayers and occasions of prayer in the history of our Nation. We are a nation singularly blessed by God, and perhaps this morning we can draw a few moments of inspiration as together we look at some of the prayers and attitudes toward prayer that have shaped our country.

First, I think that it is interesting to note that the Mayflower Compact, written in November of 1620, begins with a prayer, "In the name of God." It further goes on to state, "We * * * having undertaken, for the glory of God, and the advancement of the Christian faith * * * do by these presents solemnly and mutually in the presence of God, and of one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic." Thus our Nation began founded on prayer.

Prayer played a large part in the winning of our independence. The kneeling figure of George Washington through that bitter winter in Valley Forge is a part of America that should never be forgotten; and here is a principle expressed by Washington regarding the Nation's relationship to God:

"Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that natural morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Washington held fast to this concept in the early days of the forming of the Nation, and I think it particularly significant to listen to the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention in June of 1787.

They had been meeting for weeks and could neither agree, nor try to agree, when Benjamin Franklin rose to his feet and addressed George Washington:

"Mr. President: The small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks close attention and continual reasonings with each other * * * is a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding. We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom since we have been running all about in search of it. We have gone back to ancient history for models of government that now no longer exist. And, we have viewed modern states * * * but find none of their constitutions suitable to our circumstances.

"In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, Sir, that we have not, hitherto, once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayers in this room for divine protection.

"Our prayers, Sir, were heard; and they were generously answered. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Or, do we imagine we no longer need its assistance? I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible that an empire can rise without His aid?

"We have been assured, Sir, in the sacred writings that, 'Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; and what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing government by human wisdom, and leave it to chance, war, or conquest. I therefore beg leave to move—

"That henceforth, prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessings on our deliberations be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business."

So what is history's verdict on the American Constitution after almost a 190-year trial?

A country with only 6 percent of the world's population has: 57 percent of the world's automobiles, 51 percent of the world's telephones, 41 percent of the world's radios and 47 percent of its television sets. Russia, with about 30 million more people than we have, has only 300,000 more children in the public schools, and we have roughly 1 million more college students than they do. Our Nation has more college opportunities than any other country in the world. Our gross national product compares with other areas of the world like this: Western Europe has about $1,280 GNP per capita; the United States has approximately $3,220 per capita; Asia has about $186 in GNP per capita.

These facts, of course, are only material evidence of God's blessing on this country. Our spiritual heritage is far greater and deeper.

Great events in our Nation's history have turned in our favor in answer to prayer. When the British Army at New Orleans sent a message to Andrew Jackson that "Tomorrow morning at this time we will eat our breakfast on your campground because we have several lords with us and General Packingham." Jackson sent back the message: "Come right on for I have on my side the Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord God Almighty, and Andrew Jackson."

Samuel F. B. Morse, inventor of the telegraph, when questioned on his actions when he got to a place in inventing where he didn't know what to do next, said, "Whenever I could not see my way clearly, I knelt down and prayed for light and understanding * * *. And may I tell you that when flattering honors came to me from America and Europe on account of the invention which bears my name, I never felt I deserved them. I had made a valuable application of electricity, not because I was superior to other men, but solely because God, who meant it for mankind, must reveal it to someone, and was pleased to reveal it to me."

During those dark days of our Nation's history when brother fought against brother, President Lincoln from time to time would proclaim days of "public prayer, humiliation, and fasting." He is quoted as saying, "I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go: my own wisdom and that of all around me seemed insufficient for the day."

While on the other side of the Potomac, the Confederate general called "Old Blue Light" by his men was known in the armies as, "The Man of Prayer." The old body servant of Gen. Stonewall Jackson said that he could always tell when a battle was near at hand by seeing the general get up many times at night and pray.

A prayer that comes out of the rich spiritual heritage of the Negro goes this way, "Lord, help me to understand that You ain't goin' to let nothing come my way that You and me can't handle together."

We see that prayer is never outmoded or out of place, for here is a prayer, recorded by Astronaut Gordon Cooper while orbiting the earth:

"Father, thank You, especially for letting me fly this flight. Thank You for the privilege of being able to be in this position to be up in this wondrous place, seeing all these many startling, wonderful things that You have created.

"Help guide and direct all of us that we may shape our lives to be much better Christians, trying to help one another, and to work with one another rather than fighting and bickering.

"Help us to complete this mission successfully. Help us in our future space endeavors that we may show the world that a democracy can compete, and still be able to do things in a big way, and be able to do research development and conduct many scientific and very technical programs.

"Be with all our families. Give them guidance and encouragement, and let them know that everything will be OK.

"We ask in Thy name. Amen."

Recently I had the privilege of arranging for Scott Carpenter, another of our spacemen, to address an audience in South Carolina, and I know that these men are dedicated to the preservation of our American way of life.

In closing this morning, I would like to quote from a prayer by the Father of our country, George Washington. We can each pray for the blessings invoked on our Nation in this prayer.

"Almighty God: We make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection: that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government; to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large. And finally, that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without a humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation. Grant our supplication, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

In this day when so many families are abandoning grace before meals; when the Supreme Court has removed prayer and Bible reading from our public schools; when a spokesman for the National Council of Churches has publicly said that "the loss of the traditional Sunday would not be catastrophic and might be healthy"; when bishops are proclaiming that Jesus Christ is not divine and other theologians announce that "God is dead"; I think it is time for the people of America to awake.

We must play our part in encouraging our people to pray more; to examine our religious heritage in this country and see the benefit of seeking God's blessing. Prayer is the only way in which the finite can communicate with the infinite; in which the known can communicate with the unknown; in which the visible may be in touch with the invisible.

Unless we awaken our Nation to its dangerous trend toward materialism and away from the spiritual heritage of our forefathers, then I fear for our future. We may easily see, if we but examine the history of our Nation, that prayer and communication with God is the very cornerstone of our society. If we allow it to be abandoned now, we will be casting away the greatest asset this Nation, or any other nation, has ever known. Let us challenge our people to recall those words of Holy Writ which so aptly describe America: "Blessed is that people whose God is the Lord."

Senator Robert F. Kennedy's Speech on Community Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 2, 1966, I sponsored with New York University a Community Leadership Conference on Neighborhood Development and Preservation. I am very pleased to report that there were nearly 1,000 people there of the more than 113 community organizations participating. The conference was a nonpartisan effort designed to help develop an awareness of community problems and of the resources which are needed to resolve them. We tried also to demonstrate the interrelationship between the various levels of Government and private citizens.

The people attending heard from such distinguished officials as my colleague from New York [Mr. SCHEUER], New York Deputy Mayor Costello, New York City Police Commissioner Leary, New York City Parks Commissioner Hoving, and former New York Buildings Commissioner Gribetz, as well as leaders from nongovernmental ranks, including President Hester of New York University.

The most significant contribution made to the work of the conference was the keynote speech of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY. The Senator's speech reflected imagination and a keen perception of the need to marshal the resources of the community at the grassroots level. For this purpose, he suggested a local coordinator to make sure there is adequate utilization of Federal programs.

I commend Senator KENNEDY's speech to my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY AT THE NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION AND RENEWAL CONFERENCE, APRIL 2, 1966, UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS CAMPUS, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY

"Chance," said Louis Pasteur, "favors the mind that is prepared." Your gathering here today—under the sponsorship of Congressman BINGHAM and New York University—is a most constructive act, for it will favor the Bronx for the workings of chance—chance in the sense of the process of change here in your community.

We live in a time of change—of unparalleled, immense, dizzying change. The State of New York will grow by 12 million people—by 67 percent—by the year 2000. In that time we will have to build as many homes and hospitals and schools as we have built in the last 200 years. For us change is chance. And if we are not prepared to master change rather than be mastered by it, the result will be disaster for us—and for our children.

That is why I, for one, am so pleased that Congressman BINGHAM has led the way to the holding of today's conference.

What must we do to master change here in the Bronx?

The elements of action are not difficult to delineate. Their names are commitment and imagination, planning and perseverance, cooperation within the community and with government at all levels—city, State, and Federal.

Application of these concepts is, of course, another matter. This morning I would emphasize just one facet of your day-to-day effort at community development—your relations as a community with the Federal Government.

The first aspect of that relationship is a question of money—a question of whether you utilize adequately the Federal financial aid which is available to you. And that depends on you—on community leadership. The Federal Government can provide millions, billions, of dollars, but these funds will only be applied where local citizens think of what they could do with the money and then take the initiative to ask for it.

The challenges are as broad as the vast and sometimes bewildering array of available Federal program.

Will you as a community use nonprofit corporations to take advantage of the wide variety of Federal aid that is available to such entities? Nonprofit agencies in your community can qualify for everything from low interest rate FHA mortgages and rent supplement assistance to Public Health Service aid for community mental retardation facilities, from HEW aid for juvenile delinquency prevention projects to neighborhood youth corps projects under the auspices of the Department of Labor. Whether they do so is up to you.

Will you as a community generate sufficient plans and pressure to clean up the shores of the Harlem River and restore them to their original beauty and their original use as a playground for the people of the Bronx? There are many possibilities for aid—the open space land program and the urban beautification program of HUD, and the outdoor recreation program of the Interior Department. Whether these programs are put to use in the Bronx is in your hands.

And the challenges go on and on—in education and employment, in housing and health, in parks and poverty—in short, in all of the areas which make up the subject of neighborhood preservation and renewal about which you confer today. And in all of these areas, the question whether you receive Federal aid of any magnitude depends in the last analysis on your initiative and ingenuity.

I would put one challenge to you in more detail.

Section 703 of last year's Housing Act created a new neighborhood facilities grant program, administered by the Department of HUD. The program provides two-thirds Federal financing of neighborhood centers, particularly for low and moderate income areas. The centers can be community centers—providing a full range of social services—or centers for a particular purpose—like health or recreation. They can be for the residents of the area generally, or for youth or the old in particular.

Now you and I know there are dozens of places in the Bronx where such centers are needed—in the south Bronx in particular, perhaps in connection with the recently approved Bronx Park South urban renewal project, and elsewhere.

Whether your community generates an application for Federal financing for a neighborhood center is up to you. You would have to get a public agency to apply to Washington, and you would have to find one-third of the money somewhere. But then a nonprofit organization here in the community could contract to operate the center. The law permits that.

HUD has $12 million for this fiscal year and will have about $25 million for next year for this program. These are modest amounts. But they have not been used up as yet. And HUD has received no application under this program from New York City or any community in the metropolitan area. In fact, it has received only two applications from the entire Northeast part of the United States.

But the problem is not only one of identifying and seeking the available Federal aid. It is also one of putting it together to obtain unified neighborhood development. For every program relates to every other—no neighborhood will develop properly unless its housing is sound, its parks adequate, its schools of a high quality, its citizens employed.

If you are to know all the Federal programs and put them together properly, you will need help and guidance. Congressman BINGHAM and I can and will help you with these problems to the utmost of our ability.

But you will also need careful organization at the local level. I would suggest that the 23d District—or, perhaps more appropriately, the Bronx as a borough—choose a coordinator for its efforts at utilizing Federal programs.

Consider the fact that the Federal Government offers over 200 programs relating to education alone, over a dozen relating to mental retardation. A formalized coordinator for use of these programs is really a must for your rational development as a community.

In finding a coordinator or a coordinating committee, you have a special asset which you must utilize. Besides New York University—which has cosponsored this conference—you have four other universities in the 23rd District, and one more adjoining.

You are fortunate in having these resources. These institutions can be the focal point of your effort at identifying and making full use of all Federal programs. With their help the first aspect of your relationship as a community with the Federal Government—the question of money and whether and how it will be used—can be adequately developed.

But your relationship with the Federal Government is not just a question of money. You have a broader responsibility to complement the Government's commitment of money with a commitment of personal effort.

In education, for example, it is a responsibility to know what our schools are doing, to devote individual and political efforts to improving them, to developing new practices for the education of our children when the old ones do not work.

In housing, it is a responsibility to realize that programs for low-income housing will not accomplish all they can unless you take the leadership in site dispersal—unless you lead the community to accept the idea that low-income families should be able to live outside the ghetto, the old slum if they want to do so.

In the fight against narcotics addiction, it is a responsibility to realize that all the treatment facilities that money can buy do no good unless the addict can be convinced that there is reason for him to try and rehabilitate himself—reason for him to want to rejoin a society that he thinks has no use for him.

In large part, these responsibilities of personal effort are responsibilities to the poor.

We know our rights. We know when those rights are abridged. And we know how to redress our grievances. But the poor often do not have the tools to protect their interests in a complex world.

The poor are often cheated in the education they receive, in the housing they live in, in the job opportunities available to them.

Just look at the disparities within the Bronx itself. Here in the 23d Congressional District, in 1960, the median income was $6,400. The average adult had completed 10.4 years of school, the unemployment rate was 4.2 percent and 9 out of 10 housing units were sound. In the 22d District just next door in the South Bronx, the median income was $4,800, the average adult had completed 8.8 years of school, 7.2 percent of the labor force was unemployed, and 1 out of 4 housing units was unsound.

So if we are to succeed in the process of neighborhood development for the future, we must help to develop neighborhoods not just for ourselves, but also for those who cannot speak for themselves, who do not know what claims to present.

We must insist not only on high standards of education for our own children, but also for those who no not know how to assure their children the education they need.

We must build better housing not only for our own families, but also for those who live in the ghetto. And if those who live in the ghetto are ever to achieve full participation in our society, we must be prepared to take steps to give them a free choice of where they want to live. We must pass and enforce fair housing laws for those who can afford to live outside the ghetto. And, since the vast majority of those who live in the ghetto cannot afford to live elsewhere, we must be ready to engage in true metropolitan planning of low-rent housing, in building new towns with sections devoted to low-rent housing, in short, in a commitment to true desegregation throughout our metropolitan area.

This is the broadest aspect of your relationship with the Federal Government. For all of the programs to improve the lives of Americans will never achieve their goal without the day-to-day commitment and participation of people like yourselves.

But the very fact of your conference today—and your willingness to discuss frankly the problems and programs on which the future of the Bronx depends—shows that you do understand Pasteur's observation, that you are prepared for the workings of chance, for the challenge of the future. Chance does favor those who are prepared. I think you will be prepared.

South Dakota Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, again this year I have sought the advice and counsel of the people of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota whom it is my privilege to represent. My annual questionnaire was distributed to all postal patrons in 43 counties, totaling 100,000, and the response was most gratifying.

Many of the questionnaires were accompanied by letters elaborating on issues of special concern to the writers. I have personally read and answered each of these letters, gaining a valuable insight into the various points of view expressed by these constituents. One thing stands out in my mind, and that is how well informed these individuals are on the issues facing this Nation today.

Because I want to share with my colleagues the opinions expressed by the thousands of individuals in my district responding to my questionnaire, I include the results as follows:

Minimum Wage: The first question was this. "Do you favor increasing the minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.75 per hour and extending coverage to 7 million more workers?" 70 percent said "no," 24 percent said "yes," and 6 percent were undecided.

Unemployment Compensation: The question was, "Do you favor federalization of State program with increased cost and increased benefits?" Your answer was most decisive. 85 percent said "no," 9 percent said "yes," and 6 percent were undecided.

Reapportionment: The question was, "Do you favor an amendment permitting States to apportion one legislative branch on other than population basis?" On this the vote was fairly even, with 52 percent voting in favor of permitting one branch of the State legislature to be chosen on a basis of area rather than population, as in the U.S. Senate, while 37 percent opposed, and 11 percent were undecided.

Firearms: The question was, "Do you favor Federal control of sale and ownership of firearms?" On this the answer was decisive, with 76 percent opposed, 17 percent favoring, and 7 percent undecided.

Spending: The question was, "Do you favor reducing spending for nondefense programs in order to meet increased war costs?" This is what the press has referred to as "guns or butter." Here again the answer was decisive; 71 percent said "yes," 22 percent said "no," and 7 percent were undecided. In other words, 71 percent seem to feel that if the American youth must sacrifice to keep the Nation strong that those who remained home should likewise make some sacrifice.

Department of Transportation: The question was, "Do you favor the establishment of a new Cabinet post handling all phases of transportation?" Seventy percent opposed the establishment of the new Cabinet post, 20 percent favoring, and 10 percent undecided.

Taxes: The question was, "Do you favor increasing taxes to meet rising war costs and new spending programs?" Here again your vote was resounding; 74 percent said "no," 19 percent said "yes," and 7 percent were undecided. It would seem from the two questions on spending and taxes that a sizable majority favor reducing expenditures rather than increasing taxes.

Veterans: The question was, "Do you favor a GI bill of rights similar to World War II law for post-Korean veterans?" As was to be expected, 81 percent favored, while only 10 percent opposed, with 9 percent undecided. Actually, the question was moot, inasmuch as the bill had already become law before very many of the ballots had been returned. I, of course, cast your vote in favor of this bill because I was among those who introduced it last year and fought for its enactment.

International "Great Society": The question was, "Do you favor the President's plan for worldwide program against hunger, disease, and ignorance?" Sixty-eight percent said they were opposed to going into a program of providing world medicine, food and education at the expense of the American taxpayer inasmuch as the suggested program does not anticipate bringing other countries in to assist.

Communism: The question is, "Do you favor expanding trade with Communist countries as recommended by the administration?" Seventy-one percent said "no," 19 percent said "yes," and 10 percent were undecided. In other words, 71 percent of the people answering the questionnaire do not believe we can "fight 'em" and "feed 'em" at the same time.

Vietnam: I admit the question on Vietnam was a complicated one inasmuch as we were cramped for space and it was difficult to word the alternatives to give the voter a clearcut expression. However, the question was, "Do you favor increased ground and air action and naval blockade in stepped-up effort to bring peace through strength?" Sixty-seven percent said "yes," 21 percent said "no," and 12 percent were undecided. The alternative question was, "Or immediate negotiated withdrawal?" Twenty-one percent said "yes," 36 percent said "no," and 43 percent were undecided.

William "Fishbait" Miller: A Distinguished Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today our distinguished Doorkeeper, the Honorable William M. "Fishbait" Miller, is being honored in Jackson, Miss., by the Mississippi Economic Council, Mississippi Chamber of Commerce, as a "loyal and faithful friend" of the State of Mississippi.

"Fishbait" is a favorite son, not only of Mississippi, but of all the States of our Union. As a freshman Congressman exploring the intricacies and mysteries of Congress, no one has been more sympathetic and helpful to me than "Fishbait." Many people view our national legislative process as a mass of confusion, but most agree that somehow it works. "Fishbait" Miller of Mississippi is one of the chief reasons.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Joseph Sherrard Rice, D.D., minister, First Presbyterian Church, Columbia, S.C., offered the following prayer:

Know therefore this day, and lay it to your heart, that the Lord is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other. Therefore you shall keep His statutes and His commandments which I command you this day, that it may go well with you, and with your children, and that you may prolong your days in the land which the Lord your God gives you forever.—Deuteronomy 4: 39–40.

Almighty God, who hast planted at the heart of our Nation a great dream of dignity and freedom, not only for ourselves and our children but for all the sons of men, grant this day that, by our words and actions, we may show ourselves faithful to our heritage and good stewards of the opportunities and responsibilities that You have thrust upon us. That we may live wisely and well amidst the abounding material prosperity of our land, grant us integrity, compassion, and humility. May Thy blessing rest upon all in positions of authority and especially upon the Representatives of the people here assembled. May Thy favor, O Lord, rest upon us, and establish Thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House and a joint resolution of the following titles:

H.R. 959. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 8466. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of insurance premium finance companies in the District of Columbia; and

H.J. Res. 837. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Bond Week."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11664. An act to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 22. An act to promote a more adequate national program of water research; and

S. 2642. An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1118) entitled "An act to provide for the District of Columbia an elected mayor, city council, board of education, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes," and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendments Nos. 8 to 14 to the bill S. 2729, "An act to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to amendments Nos. 1 to 7 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1717. An act to provide for the registration of names assumed for the purposes of trade or business in the District of Columbia; and

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution designating April 9 of each year as "Sir Winston Churchill Day".

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE FOR TODAY

The SPEAKER. The next order of business is the matters that were passed over from Monday and Tuesday. However, the Chair desires to state that there is a bill out of the Committee on Ways and Means relating to the extension of time for filing for medicare. If there is no objection on the part of the House, the Chair would like to recognize the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] to submit a unanimous-consent request to bring this bill up. The Chair also understands it is the intention to have a rollcall on the bill. The Chair is trying to work this out for the benefit of the Members. Is there objection to the Chair recognizing the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], for the purpose stated by the Chair? The Chair hears none and recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 14224) to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I certainly shall not object, I should simply like to observe that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means should be commended for bringing this bill to the floor today to provide for this extension of the enrollment period for supplementary medical insurance benefits through May 31. However, I hope that in the near future the Social Security Amendments of 1965 can be amended so that there will be no deadline and all citizens 65 years of age and over will be eligible for the supplemental program without the interposition of any kind of deadline or other restriction limiting the opportunity for enrollment. The basic purpose of medicare was to cover elderly people over 65 years of age. Those most in need are also most likely for various reasons to be unaware of the legalities which set up enrollment periods and other limitations. Let us make it possible for them to have medical attention whenever it is needed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there has been a great deal of inquiry about the ability of those who have attained age 65 to prove their age.

Is there any method whereby, if this extension is granted we can prevail on the Social Security Administration to relieve the stiff requirements of either having a birth certificate, where none are available, and not be compelled to spend extra money searching census records in order to confirm what is their actual age?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there is no change made in this bill in this respect. The basic law does require that an individual prove his age to the satisfaction of the Social Security Administration. We have discussed that at different times within the Committee on Ways and Means, and I might say that I have been unable to make suggestions and recommendations to them myself for changes in their procedures on this particular matter, which serve as a better general rule.

I find, in individual cases, that I quarrel with them about the degree of proof that is needed, but we have not legislated in this respect in this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make this parliamentary inquiry only that the Members might understand what the opportunities might be for discussion. I make the parliamentary inquiry to the effect that if the request of the gentleman from Arkansas is agreed to that the bill can be considered under unanimous-consent request—do I state it correctly that there will be the opportunity for striking out the last word and having an opportunity to speak?

The SPEAKER. The bill is to be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, and motions to strike out the last word will be in order.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman make the request that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the unanimous-consent request will automatically carry that privilege.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14224

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 1837(c) of the Social Security Act is amended by (1) striking out "January 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1966"; and (2) striking out "March 31, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 31, 1966".

SEC. 2. Section 1837(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "January 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1966".

SEC. 3. Section 102(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by striking out "April 1, 1966" each time it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1966".

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. In the case of an individual who first satisfies paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1836 of the Social Security Act in March 1966, and who enrolls pursuant to subsection (d) of section 1837 of such Act in May 1966, his coverage period shall, notwithstanding section 1838(a) (2) (D) of such Act, begin on July 1, 1966.

"SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (b) of section 1843 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof (after and below paragraph (2)) the following new sentence:

" 'Except as provided in subsection (g), there shall be excluded from any coverage group any individual who is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under title II or who is entitled to receive an annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.'

"(b) Section 1843 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(g) (1) The Secretary shall, at the request of a State made before January 1, 1968, enter into a modification of an agreement entered into with such State pursuant to subsection (a) under which the second sentence of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to such agreement.

" '(2) In the case of any individual who would (but for this subsection) be excluded from the applicable coverage group described in subsection (b) by the second sentence of such subsection—

" '(A) subsections (c) and (d) (2) shall be applied as if such subsections referred to the modification under this subsection (in lieu of the agreement under subsection (a)),

" '(B) subsection (d) (3) (B) shall not apply so long as there is in effect a modification entered into by the State under this subsection, and

" '(C) notwithstanding subsection (e), in the case of any termination described in such subsection, such individual may terminate his enrollment under this part by the filing of a notice, before the close of the third month which begins after the date of such termination, that he no longer wishes to participate in the insurance program established by this part (and in such a case, the termination of his coverage period under this part shall take effect as of the close of such third month).'

"(c) Section 1840 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(i) In the case of an individual who is enrolled under the program established by this part as a member of a coverage group to which an agreement with a State entered into pursuant to section 1843 is applicable, subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall not apply to his monthly premium for any month in his coverage period which is determined under section 1843(d).' "

Mr. MILLS (during reading of amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I can explain the dual purpose of this bill that has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, in just a very brief period of time.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House will recall, under the medical care provisions of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 we established an enrollment deadline for plan B, the voluntary supplementary medical plan, of March 31, 1966, for persons who attained age 65 before January 1, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Administration has, in my opinion, done a remarkably fine job of enrolling elderly citizens in the program, since we are advised that as of the closing date, which is March 31, approximately 16.8 million individuals, or 88 percent of the total age 65 and over, had been enrolled.

However, Mr. Speaker, it was clear that there would still be some who, for one reason or another, had not enrolled in the program by the deadline of March 31 just passed. In the light of this, we were asked to extend from March 31 to May 31 the closing date for present enrollment.

Mr. Speaker, the bill would extend the deadline, as requested, to May 31, 1966, in order to give this group of elderly individuals a further opportunity to enroll and be eligible for benefits beginning July 1, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the initial enrollment period for those who attain age 65 in January and February 1966, would end on April 31, and May 31, respectively, under the regular rules governing enrollment periods. The bill amends sections 1837(c) and 1837(d) of the Social Security Act so that the special deadline—section 1837(c)—rather than the regular deadline—section 1837(d)—will apply to those attaining age 65 in January and February 1966.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the May 31 deadline will apply to everyone reaching 65 in February of 1966 or earlier. Persons attaining age 65 before April 1966, and applying before the new deadline, would have protection beginning July 1, 1966. The amendment to the bill provides that the coverage of persons attaining age 65 in March 1966, who enroll in May 1966, would begin on July 1, 1966, rather than August 1, 1966, as in present law, and in the bill as initially introduced.

Under present law, a person whose initial enrollment period ended on March 31, 1966, but who, for good cause, failed to enroll in the supplementary medical insurance plan by that deadline, may enroll at any time before October 1, 1966; however, his protection will not begin until 6 months after he so enrolls.

The bill would also make the good cause provision of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 applicable to all of those whose initial enrollment period ended on the new special deadline established by the bill; namely, May 31, 1966—but would retain the October 1, 1966, deadline and the 6-month waiting period before coverage is effective.

Mr. Speaker, the second purpose of the bill is to provide that a State which enters into an agreement under section 1843, under which public assistance recipients aged 65 and over may be enrolled in supplementary medical insurance, may, at its option, include, simultaneously or subsequently, as enrollees persons who are on the social security or railroad retirement benefit rolls, and are also receiving under the public assistance program of the State.

The present law provides that such persons may enroll only as individuals and may pay premiums only by deduction from their benefits.

The date of the enrollment of these persons under the new provision would be determined by the date of the modification of the agreement between the State and the department under which the enrollment occurred.

In the event the individual ceased to be a public assistance recipient still receiving social security or railroad retirement benefits, he would have the right to terminate his enrollment during the 3-month period after he left the public assistance rolls.

Mr. Speaker, as to the first part of the bill the committee thought that we should adjust the situation so as to eliminate a very apparent inequity in the bill as initially introduced and also contained in the amendment adopted by the Senate recently to the House-passed bill.

The other part of the bill is also meritorious. Some of those who failed to enroll are public assistance recipients. There are provisions of present law under which a State may buy into the supplementary medical insurance program for recipients who are not on the social security or railroad retirement benefit rolls. A number of States have taken advantage of this provision, and others propose to do so. However, the fact that they may not buy in for social security and railroad retirement beneficiaries—as a result of section 1843(b) of the Social Security Act—has resulted in the failure of some of these beneficiaries who are on assistance to be enrolled. Your committee's amendment would permit the States to buy in for such beneficiaries. This change would not adversely affect the actuarial status of the program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I will not take up any more time. I urge approval by the House of the committee amendments and also of the bill, as amended.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. A question was raised about the opportunity people have on reaching 65 years of age to sign up for this voluntary program. That question was raised earlier and I think it might be well for the Members to be advised of the opportunities that exist today under present law for people who become 65 years of age to enroll in the program. There is no magic date of May 31 or March 31 as far as those people are concerned. I think the gentleman might explain that.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Wisconsin raises a good point.

If I may explain, I am sure the Members will recall as I was endeavoring to state, that initially in the bill we passed, we were providing for a date of March 31 as a final date for the enrollment of those who became 65 years of age before January 1, 1966. This deadline did not apply to individuals becoming 65 years of age after the beginning of 1966; each individual in this group would have his own initial enrollment period of 7 months, beginning 3 months before the month in which he reaches 65 and ending 3 months later. Under the committee's bill, individuals becoming 65 years of age in January and February of this year are grouped with those becoming 65 years of age before this year, leaving all those who become 65 years of age in or after March of this year with the same 7-month enrollment period they have under existing law. The practical result of the committee's bill is to provide that any individual who both becomes 65 years of age and enrolls in the program before May 31 will have coverage beginning July 1. Every individual becoming 65 years of age in the future would continue to have the 7-month initial enrollment period which he has under existing law.

I appreciate the suggestion of my friend from Wisconsin that we explain that point.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first, I wish to say that the legislation before us has my full support and the full support of all minority members on the Ways and Means Committee. As the chairman pointed out, it was voted out of the committee by a unanimous vote.

I think that the bill before us is a considerable improvement over the amendment that was passed by the Senate dealing generally with this subject. In the first place, it does remove an anomaly that would have existed so far as some people who are presently 65 years of age is concerned in their treatment and in their ability to sign up.

Also it removes a very distinct problem that has been facing some of the States in conjunction with the coverage of their public assistance people under the insurance coverage of part B of the program. We have a particular problem right here in the District of Columbia. There were some news stories on it recently. The action taken by the committee will go a long way toward correcting that problem.

Most important, however, the bill extends the period for enrollment in the voluntary medical insurance program which expired on March 31.

I should point out that I think there will be other problems that will develop as a result possibly of oversight or of experience in the operation of this program. We will have to meet those problems. Other problems have come to our attention already. But the feeling is that this bill takes care of the most urgent problem, and that attention to the other problems can be postponed to be considered at a propitious time; without delaying these particular amendments.

There is one thing I would like to say about the voluntary plan in so-called part B. I want to commend the Social Security Administration for the efforts made to enroll all those who are eligible by March 31. The extension of the enrollment period should not be taken as any reflection on the effort which has been made to inform our elderly citizens of this program and to enroll them so that they would have its advantages.

There are approximately 19 million persons over age 65, who are eligible for enrollment in the voluntary medical insurance program. More than 86 percent of them had enrolled by March 31, when the enrollment period expired. This is particularly gratifying to me, because I was always convinced that a voluntary program would meet the need of our elderly people both with respect to hospitalization and with respect to medical services. The enrollment to date amply substantiates my belief.

I think the fact that more than 86 percent have signed up is an indication of two things: First, the Social Security Administration has done a commendable job in getting the message to our elderly people; secondly, this tremendous response removes any doubts as to whether a voluntary program would be acceptable to the American people. The response in this instance shows that we do not always have to act with compulsion, that we can accomplish the same result on a voluntary basis.

So I think two things have resulted from the action in the last few months with regard to the signing up of these people under the voluntary plan: First, it shows the message can be gotten to the people and information can be gotten to them; secondly it also demonstrates that when they have the facts, they will balance them against their own needs and respond accordingly.

This bill, of course, acknowledges the fact that there are some people who have not necessarily been reached. There are some people who may have been reached but have not had the time that is required for them to analyze whether this program fits their needs and whether it is something that they want to participate in. So I think the extension at this time is very desirable.

But the fundamental point I think has been proven here that we can have a voluntary approach to some of these problems rather than a compulsory approach.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I mainly want to discuss the procedure here and say that I am quite pleased that we are handling this bill in this fashion, although the procedure itself is a little unusual. If handled in the other way, the House would have been confronted with a nongermane amendment to a bill that the House sent over where this action was taken. The House would have been confronted with the situation of trying to consider this new subject matter without the Ways and Means Committee having an opportunity of going into it fully.

I am most pleased that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], has had our committee consider this matter. We had testimony. There is a written report accompanying the bill that any Member can obtain. The House is proceeding under an open rule—I have always thought that we could do so in these matters—to consider this affirmatively, based upon proper committee study and full debate on the floor of the House.

The bill itself, as it has been described, is, of course, not of lasting consequence, in the sense that it is meeting a temporary situation. It is something that needs immediate action. It demonstrates again that the Congress, when it has to move fast on matters because of a real reason to do so, can do so in the context of adequate study and adequate debate.

Finally, I would like to make one observation in regard to the substantive point that the gentleman from New York was making, as to why this is not just opened up so that anybody 65 or over can sign up at any time. That is in line, too, with an editorial I read in the Washington Post, which said the same thing. I would suggest that the gentleman from New York discuss the matter with the actuarial authorities in the Social Security Administration. This applies also to the editors of the Washington Post.

There is a problem of actuarial soundness of the system. If there is not a requirement that people make an election to come in under this program, of course, there would be no reason to pay money every month for the coverage which one receives. One would simply wait until there was an illness and then seek to be covered.

The point of the discipline here is to have people who want the coverage pay their monthly premium along with every one else, and not permit them to wait until they become ill and know that they have the benefits of the program. Such a procedure would make it so costly that the program could not possibly operate.

Anyone can examine the provisions of exercising an option to be covered and find the program is quite liberal. A person reaching 65 years of age has, in effect, 7 months in which to make up his mind as to whether to come in, the month he becomes 65 and 3 months before or 3 month after this month. Even if he declines at that time, there will be, under the permanent law, an opportunity in 2 years for an opening up, under which people who have missed the chance before may then choose to be covered.

But the reason it is not automatically opened up is so that everyone will bear his fair share of the premium cost and not just wait for an illness to occur. To do otherwise would make benefits under the program exceed the premium revenues.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri is well-advised to make this statement as to the enrollment provisions, because of the confusion that may exist. The gentleman would agree with me, would he not, that the provisions of the present law permit anyone, when he becomes 65 years of age at any time in the future—3 months before the month he becomes 65, or 3 months after—to enroll for the plan B program?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLS. He does not have to wait at all?

Mr. CURTIS. That is right. It gives him 7 months, actually. The reason for the temporary extension provided in the bill before us is that it is a new program, and it does take time to get word around. I hope the Congress will follow these recommendations. This is an excellent bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, while we are considering a measure to extend the time during which our citizens 65 and over can elect to avail themselves of the benefits provided by the supplementary medical insurance plan, it seems particularly appropriate to again emphasize that Federal employees are unfairly deprived of the benefits enjoyed by other citizens under present medical care legislation.

The situation is complex but I want to briefly outline it because I know the Congress will want to correct this unwarranted discrimination against Federal employees. The act discriminates against Federal employees in several ways:

First. The law generally provides that all citizens who are 65 or over before 1968 are automatically covered for the basic medicare plan covering hospital and related expenses, even though they have never earned any quarters of social security coverage. Federal employees were excluded from this "transitional insured coverage" unless they retired before February 15, 1965, without coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

Second. Federal employees are eligible to participate in the voluntary supplemental plan, covering doctors' services and certain incidental medical expenses, for a premium of $3 per month matched by a $3 governmental contribution from general revenues. However, since the basic supplemental plan does not cover hospitalization and related expenses, the employee will find it necessary to retain his coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Act. Since the policies issued pursuant to the

Federal Employees Health Benefit Act also encompass the type of benefits paid by the voluntary supplemental plan, and generally preclude payment of duplicate benefits, the voluntary supplemental plan will provide far fewer benefits to Federal employees than to the population in general, and Federal employees may well conclude that it is impractical for them to participate.

Third. Approximately 50 percent of the Federal employees now retiring have acquired, through defending our country in the armed services or by working in other covered employment before or after becoming a Federal employee, the requisite quarters of social security coverage to entitle them to medicare benefits on the basis of their own earnings record. Federal employees in this category can elect to participate in the voluntary supplemental which, when added to the basic medicare plan, will provide coverage approaching in scope the high option plans issued pursuant to the Federal Employees Health Benefit Act. Federal employees making such an election may well drop their coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Act, and the Federal Government will be relieved of its obligation as an employer to provide hospital benefits to its retired employee. When private industry is relieved by governmental programs from providing benefits that employees have earned through their long years of service, the general practice is for the companies concerned to increase benefits in other areas. This only recognizes the equities involved, and the adjustments that the employer, in good conscience, must make to changed circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, these three inequities exist because the Federal Government's role as an employer has been confused with its role as custodian of a governmental program of social insurance. As an employer, the Federal Government contributes to a health insurance plan on behalf of its employees. By exercising its constitutionally delegated power to impose taxes to provide for the general welfare, the Federal Government has also undertaken to provide health benefits to its citizens.

Federal employees, like the employees of private industry, are both employees and citizens. The benefits the Government provides to its citizens should not be reduced, in the case of a Federal employee, by the amount he has earned as an employee.

Despite diligent efforts on my part throughout the last year to secure legislation that would at least partially remove this discrimination against the Federal employees, the situation still exists. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 7267) that would take a step in the right direction by providing that the $3 per month that the Federal Government will pay for individuals participating in the voluntary supplemental plan, be paid toward the premiums charged Federal employees for coverage under plans issued pursuant to the Federal Employees Health Benefit Act.

Since most Federal employees will be required to retain their coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Act, the Federal Government should pay the $3 a month on their behalf not toward the voluntary supplemental plan which will merely provide duplicate coverage to the employee, but toward his plan under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Act. If this needed reform is not enacted, Federal employees will be paying taxes to support this program but will be deprived of its benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the President signed the medicare provision into law last July 30, nearly 9 months ago. One year has elapsed since I introduced my bill to provide more equitable treatment for Federal employees. Despite the gross inequity involved, the administration has not even provided the Ways and Means Committee with a report on my proposal to take this first step in removing the discrimination against the Federal employees.

The administration was responsible for these discriminatory provisions being included in the program. Although Congress is inundated with legislative recommendations, removal of discrimination against Federal employees is apparently last on the administration's list of legislative priorities. If only a portion of the time consumed in unfairly misapplying the wage-price guidelines to Federal employees had been used to report on my bill, we would have taken an important step in achieving fairness last year. While the Congress is considering extending a program providing benefits to all our citizens, I again call upon the administration and the Congress to remove the stigma of second-class citizenship that unfairly deprives our Federal employees of the benefits of this program.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the 5 minutes allotted me. I rise only to state that I am in support today of this bill before the House, H.R. 14224. I approve of the manner in which it has been brought before the House, and especially appreciate the additional matters that have been administratively taken care of in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise primarily in order to answer the question of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] in connection with the question of a declaration of time of birth. This happened during the discussion and under a reservation, as to the manner in which this bill was brought to the floor of the House today. Late in October, after we adjourned sine die the 1st session of the 89th Congress, it immediately became apparent that the Commissioner of Social Security was in fact requiring birth certificates which cost the social security registrants approximately $4. This was not only contrary to our legislative intent when we passed Public Law 89-97, but a great delay inured to the beneficiaries as a result of this. There was a delay in their being able to complete their assignment. At that time we wrote to Commissioner Ball of the Social Security Administration. The day our constructive message was received this was at first denied, but within 4 hours on the same afternoon there was a press conference held in which it was admitted by the Commissioner in person.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a valuable point of information. Otherwise I would not take the time of the House to state this.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize this is a point that affects people in the constituencies of every one of us. I think it should be listened to.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman, my colleague from Missouri. After the original notification and the denial, which is a matter of record, within 4 hours the Commissioner held a press conference and said: First, they would no longer require from the Bureau of the Census the actual birth certificate; second, they would in addition accept corroborative evidence such as family record information and such as local "vamped in" and presumptive certificates of birth in the various States that had been issued on proper proof satisfactory to our various States; third, they would go ahead and sign these people up and assume the obligation themselves in the Social Security Administration of ultimate proof; and fourth, they would do this at the expense of the Social Security Administration with the funds provided by Congress and not at the expense of the individual registrant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would be less than frank if I did not say that since this time there have been some additional complaints at the various offices signing up the social security registrants under any part of Public Law 89-97, but generally it has improved and I have been assured by Commissioner Ball of the Social Security Administration in repeated communications that this, in fact, is the policy and it has been disseminated to all of the social security district offices. I think we can now advise our people on this basis. I am happy to make this legislative record. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I repeat I am in favor of this bill pending before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on February 10 of this year, I introduced the first House bill to extend the March 31, 1966, deadline for enrollment in the supplementary medical insurance program under the medicare law. Since that time, more than two dozen Members of both the House and Senate indicated a similar interest in the extension by introducing legislation. The bill we are acting upon today is a logical conclusion to this past congressional effort to meet an obvious need. I want to extend my personal compliments to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and his colleagues on the House Ways and Means Committee for proving once again that Congress has the will and the ability to respond quickly where such action is necessary.

The extension of the enrollment date to May 31 should provide adequate time for the nearly 1 million eligibles, who have declined to join, to review the program once again, and time for the nearly 2 million eligibles who have not been contacted to receive the necessary information upon which to make an informed judgment. I would certainly hope that as many as possible would take advantage of this opportunity to gain supplementary medical insurance coverage at such little individual cost. The number still undecided or lacking in information, however, should not obscure the fact that over 16 million have applied for coverage. Since the supplementary medical insurance program is basically a minority proposal, this acceptance of the program indicates once again that the minority can and often does contribute to constructive legislation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as one who introduced a basically similar bill, H.R. 14043, I most earnestly hope that this House will unanimously agree to act, and will favorably act, on this measure before us, H.R. 14224, to amend part B of title 18 of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance for the aged and to make other and related changes in existing regulations.

Mr. Speaker, for varied and substantial reasons it is now quite obvious, as I indicated last week, such development would occur; some several millions of our older citizens have not yet enrolled under the new supplementary medical insurance plan, through no fault of their own.

Mr. Speaker, this measure before us is designed to make absolutely certain that every one of our older citizens is given a fair chance to make a calm and considered decision to become eligible under this obviously advantageous, voluntary medical insurance program and to do so without any penalty of suspended insurance protection, which they could ill afford and which violates our normal concepts of objective justice, more particularly as it concerns our older citizens.

The distinguished committee chairman has already and thoroughly explained the meaning of the provisions of this bill and I shall not subject you to unnecessary repetition.

Mr. Speaker, this is a just and humane legislative proposal on behalf of our senior citizens who have certainly contributed immeasurably to the growth and progress of this Nation and I urge my colleagues here to approve it unanimously, without further delay.

Mr. FINO. I rise in support of H.R. 14224. It is a very simple and very basic response to a very simple and basic need. It has become obvious in the last few weeks that many of our senior citizens were not going to be able to get in under the wire as regards the medicare program.

I am proud of the medicare program. I am proud of having voted for it. I want to see it do as much good as it can—I want to see it reach as many eligible persons as it can. For that reason, I am completely in favor of the extension of the medicare filing deadline, and I urge support of H.R. 14224.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 14224, the bill to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance for the aged.

Many private health insurance companies have recently announced changes in their policies for older people. Many employers are modifying their health insurance coverage of older workers who are eligible for medicare. For these reasons a number of older people have not enrolled in the voluntary medical insurance program because they have not had adequate time to study the effects of these changes in private health insurance coverage.

In my own State of Michigan, there are thousands of people who are eligible for this program, and I would hope that all who want to participate would have the chance to do so from the first date of availability of service. For this reason, I hope the House will immediately act to extend the enrollment period for 2 months.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the House today in supporting the extension of the initial enrollment period for supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged.

We have experienced an increasing awareness throughout the Nation of the problems faced by Americans as they approach or pass retirement age. And with this awareness has come a heightened sense of responsibility—a growing desire to help this group to which we are so deeply indebted for our present social and economic well-being.

Unquestionably, the most significant step in this area was the enactment of far-reaching amendments to the Social Security Act during the last session of Congress, including the comprehensive program of health and hospitalization insurance known as medicare.

Earlier this year, I held a series of senior citizens conferences in each of the 11 counties of the Second District of Iowa, which nearly 1,000 people attended. In the course of these meetings, it became apparent that an alarming amount of confusion and misinformation regarding the medicare program still existed—confusion as to eligibility, coverage, benefits, registration, and its effect on other insurance policies now held, or other forms of public assistance now being received.

This situation was particularly disturbing to me because in Iowa a larger percentage of our population—12.4 percent—is over the age of 65 than in any other State, and this includes 52,000 residents of the Second District alone.

The energetic efforts of the Social Security Administration, other Government offices, private insurance companies, and interested parties to inform eligible citizens of enrollment procedures have been most remarkable. The response to this campaign has been enormous.

However, there are still some older citizens who have not yet signed up, because they did not act quickly enough or because they were not reached with the news of this opportunity in sufficient time to meet the original March 31 deadline. It would be unfortunate if these people were unnecessarily denied benefits in the early stages of the program.

I am confident that our action today to extend the enrollment period through May 31 will permit the largest number of our older citizens to benefit from the program to the greatest possible degree, and will result in the fullest implementation of the law which we passed last year.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 14224, and that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on the subject of H.R. 14224.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 387, nays 0, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—387

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski

Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath

McMillan
McVicker
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan

Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—45

Abernethy
Adair
Blatnik
Bolling
Brock
Burleson
Cabell
Cameron
Celler
Chelf
Colmer
Dowdy
Dyal
Farbstein
Fino

Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Griffin
Hagan, Ga.
Hardy
Herlong
Jacobs
Johnson, Okla.
Keogh
Macdonald
Matthews
Miller
Murray
Nix

Patman
Powell
Purcell
Reinecke
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Scott
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Toll
Tunney
Whitten
Williams
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Teague of Texas.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Dyal.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Murray.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6319) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not do so, I take this time merely to offer the chairman an opportunity to explain these Senate amendments.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection to the request I propose, I would move to substitute for the Senate amendments dealing with the subject of extending the time for the enrollment of people under the plan B of the social security medical care program the language of the bill which has just passed the House. The Senate amendment deals in part with what was in the House passed bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. My question is on legislative intent. Where there are people who are responsible for the care of older people, in the position of children or guardians or a relative or have the interest of that person at heart or whether it is a nonprofit organization such as a church or a church society, is it possible for that organization or that person to pay for the $3 a month premium and sign up for the older person, when, for example, an older person is not able to handle these things, or simply will not sign any paper whatever, and the family, for example, does not want to have the aged declared mentally incompetent.

Can we have a legislative intent?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me at this point?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania raises a point that is not, first of all, let me say, involved in this particular subject matter pending before the House. It is, however, dealt with in the basic legislation to which these amendments apply. In the case of the individual who is having his affairs looked after by a guardian or conservator, or for that reason in either case of that sort it is possible for that individual or that person to enroll the elderly one to whom the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Suppose there is no legal guardian appointed? Then the question comes up, can someone who has legal responsibility take care of the person.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield further, there is actually no basis involved against a person enrolling the elderly citizen, even in the case where there is no legal guardianship or legal responsibility upon the latter person.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Then if the person, for example, is confused or simply will not sign any paper, can someone in this position who has the legal responsibility for them, or a friend or a ladies aid society, pay a premium and enroll the person, unless there is a specific objection filed by the person to be benefited?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield further——

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield further to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. You want to remember this: That this is a case of a voluntary election. It is not a voluntary election by someone for someone else. It has to be an election—a voluntary election—by an elderly person who is otherwise eligible to enroll. That person is required to file for this. Unless the person is mentally incapacitated, or for some other reason incapacitated, then he has to file for this. Of course, if the person is mentally incapacitated, or for some other reason is incapacitated and could not file, normally there is a legal guardian for this person looking after the person's other affairs, and such individual could file for that person.

Even if there is no legal guardian, so long as the person is incompetent to handle his own affairs, another person may enroll for him.

Where there is a question or doubt about whether a person is competent to act on his own behalf or whether he can handle his own affairs without assistance, I understand that the policy followed by the Social Security Administration is to resolve the issue on the side of allowing another person to enroll on his behalf.

Thus there is no need to have a legal guardian appointed in order to get such person enrolled. Nor is there any need to have a legal adjudication of incompetency. The Social Security Administration will look at the facts, including medical reports, and if the facts indicate that a person is not actually able to make the decision for himself, he can be enrolled by some other interested person.

If a person is physically competent and if the person is mentally able to do so, that person has to make the determination, and someone else cannot do it for them.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, after line 10, insert:

"SEC. 3. Two-Month Extension of Initial Enrollment Period for Supplementary Medical Insurance Benefits for the Aged

"(a) The first sentence of section 1837(c) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out 'January 1, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 1, 1966', and (2) by striking out 'March 31, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'May 31, 1966'.

"(b) Section 1837(d) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out 'January 1, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 1, 1966'.

"(c) Section 102(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by striking out 'April 1, 1966' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 1, 1966'."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arisng from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries, and to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the initial enrollment period for supplementary medical insurance benefits."

Mr. MILLS (during reading of Senate amendments). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer as a substitute for the Senate amendments the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk, which is the identical text of the bill, H.R. 14224, that has just passed the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLS moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Two-Month Extension of Initial Enrollment Period for Supplemental Medical Insurance Benefits for the Aged

"(a) The first sentence of section 1837(c) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out 'January 1, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 1, 1966', and (2) by striking out 'March 31, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'May 31, 1966'.

"(b) Section 1837(d) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out 'January 1, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 1, 1966'.

"(c) Section 102(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by striking out 'April 1, 1966' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 1, 1966'.

"(d) In the case of an individual who first satisfies paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1836 of the Social Security Act in March 1966, and who enrolls pursuant to subsection (d) of section 1837 of such Act in May 1966, his coverage period shall, notwithstanding section 1838(a)(2)(D) of such Act, begin on July 1, 1966.

"SEC. 4. Coverage, Under State Agreements, of Public Assistance Recipients Entitled to Social Security or Railroad Retirement Benefits

"(a) Subsection (b) of section 1843 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof (after and below paragraph (2)) the following new sentence:

" 'Except as provided in subsection (g), there shall be excluded from any coverage group any individual who is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under title II or who is entitled to receive an annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.'

"(b) Section 1843 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(g) (1) The Secretary shall, at the request of a State made before January 1, 1968, enter into a modification of an agreement entered into with such State pursuant to subsection (a) under which the second sentence of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to such agreement.

" '(2) In the case of any individual who would (but for this subsection) be excluded from the applicable coverage group described in subsection (b) by the second sentence of such subsection—

" '(A) subsections (c) and (d)(2) shall be applied as if such subsections referred to the modification under this subsection (in lieu of the agreement under subsection (a)),

" '(B) subsection (d)(3)(B) shall not apply so long as there is in effect a modification entered into by the State under this subsection, and

" '(C) notwithstanding subsection (e), in the case of any termination described in such subsection, such individual may terminate his enrollment under this part by the filing of a notice, before the close of the third month which begins after the date of such termination, that he no longer wishes to participate in the insurance program established by this part (and in such a case, the termination of his coverage period under this part shall take effect as of the close of such third month).'

"(c) Section 1840 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(i) In the case of an individual who is enrolled under the program established by this part as a member of a coverage group to which an agreement with a State entered into pursuant to section 1843 is applicable, subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall not apply to his monthly premium for any month in his coverage period which is determined under section 1843(d).' "

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment that I just sent to the desk, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLS moves to concur in the Senate amendment to the title of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. MILLS, and by unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill H.R. 14224 was passed were vacated and the bill was laid on the table.

TARIFF TREATMENT OF CERTAIN WOVEN FABRICS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11029) an act relating to the tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "before" insert "the 60th day after".

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for H.R. 14122 but only reluctantly. This 2.9-percent pay raise for Federal, postal, and civil service employees is absolutely inadequate. In 1962 the Congress passed a law committing itself to providing all Federal civilian employees with the pay and fringe benefits equal to that earned by people in comparable jobs in private industry. Four years later we have made little progress toward achieving this goal. Federal employees still receive salaries and fringe benefits far below comparability. The bill before us today does not help in any way to bridge the gap between Federal and private salaries since it only provides a pay increase for the coming fiscal year which will be just approximately equal to the pay raises forecast for those working in comparable private jobs.

I strongly supported the 7-percent pay raise bills supported by the various Federal employee groups. Even a 7-percent pay raise would only have taken us approximately halfway toward achieving comparability. Certainly, after a 4-year delay in fulfilling our promise, a 7-percent raise was the least we could do.

Every year since 1962 Congress has been told that, for one reason or another, it could not pass a Federal pay bill which would make any real progress toward achieving comparability. Again this year, many people have claimed to favor implementing the comparability principle but they say that unfortunately this is the wrong year because of the war in Vietnam and the threat of inflation. However, expert economists tell us that the specific and principal cause of the current inflation is a too rapid increase in the rate of new business investment financed by rapidly increasing corporate profits. To me, therefore, the only appropriate response to the inflationary danger is to deal with the specific cause of the problem by imposing an excess corporate profits tax, similar to the tax imposed during the Korean War and World War II, and to repeal the special 7-percent business investment tax credit.

The answer to inflation caused by the shift to a wartime economy is not to cut back on vital domestic efforts such as the antipoverty and education programs. As President Johnson pointed out last January in his state of the Union message, to reduce these programs would be to sacrifice "the hopes of the unfortunate here in a land of plenty." Nor is the answer to refuse to grant the pay raises to Federal employees—which we all agree are quite fair and justified. For that would be to ask our employees not only to be efficient and conscientious but, in effect, to subsidize Federal programs by agreeing to lower wages.

Comparability for Federal employees is long overdue. I plan to introduce a bill providing the specific increases which would finally redeem our 1962 promise to assure Federal employees of wage and fringe benefits equal to those earned by people in comparable private jobs. I realize that Federal pay rates are so far behind comparability that we could probably not catch up entirely in 1 year. But since this is the second year I am asked to vote for a Federal pay raise bill which I feel to be grossly inadequate, I want to indicate, in this way, my strong support for the fastest possible achievement to comparable wages and fringe benefits.

I know that the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, who are so expert on questions of Federal pay, certainly wanted to bring in a bill which would have made some progress toward achieving comparability. I congratulate the members of the committee, under the able and outstanding leadership of Chairman MURRAY and Congressmen MORRISON and UDALL, for presenting us with a bill that would seem to be the most generous possible, given the harsh political realities. I particularly want to compliment them for advancing the effective date of the pay raise to July 1, 1966, from January 1, 1967.

Knowing the overwhelming support of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for the principle of comparability, I look forward to a bill being presented to us next year which will be a significant step toward achieving comparability. We should finally redeem our 1962 promise of fair and just wages for Federal employees.

FEDERAL SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

The **SPEAKER**. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 14122) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 14122, as amended?

The question was taken.

Mr. **UDALL**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 393, nays 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—393

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—1

Poage

NOT VOTING—38

Abernethy
Adair
Bolling
Brock
Burleson
Cabell
Cameron
Chelf
Colmer
Dowdy
Dyal
Farbstein
Fino
Fuqua
Griffin
Hagan, Ga.
Hardy
Herlong
Jacobs
Johnson, Okla.
Keogh
Matthews
Miller
Murray
Nix
Patman
Powell
Reinecke
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Scott
Sweeney
Tenzer
Toll
Tunney
Whitten
Williams
Willis

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Dyal.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Cameron.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Fuqua.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. **ASHLEY** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The further unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] to recommit the bill, H.R. 14215, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1967.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 46. immediately before line 22, insert a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. 302. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. **BOW**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 156, nays 232, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—156

Abbitt
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
MacGregor
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Pelly
Pickle
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stephens
Stratton
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—232

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brown, Calif
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Callan
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Hollfield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—44

Abernethy
Adair
Bolling
Brock
Burleson
Cabell
Cameron
Chelf
Colmer
Dowdy
Dyal
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Fino
Fuqua
Griffin
Hardy
Hawkins
Herlong
Jacobs
Johnson, Okla.
Keogh
Matthews
Miller
Murray
Nix
Patman
Powell
Reinecke
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Scott
Sweeney
Talcott
Teague, Tex
Tenzer
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Whitten
Williams
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.
Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Miller against.
Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Patman against.
Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. Hardy against.
Mr. Reinecke for, with Mr. Sweeney against.
Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Jacobs against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Tenzer.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Farbstein.
Mr. Dyal with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Murray.

Mr. **CONTE** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **BOW**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 370, nays 16, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—370

Abbitt
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Callan
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman

Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzales
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluzynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—16

Bolton
Bow
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Hall
Laird
Michel
Minshall
Todd
Walker, Miss.
Wydler

NOT VOTING—46

Abernethy
Bolling
Brock
Burleson
Cabell
Cameron
Chelf
Colmer
Dow
Dowdy
Dyal
Farbstein
Fino
Fraser
Fuqua
Griffin
Hanna
Hardy
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Jacobs
Johnson, Okla.
Keogh
Matthews
Miller
Murray
Nix
Patman
Powell
Reinecke
Rivers, S.C.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Scott
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tunney
Whitten
Williams
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Cameron.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Dyal.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa, Mr. McCULLOCH, and Mr. COLLIER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING APRIL 9 OF EACH YEAR AS "SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL DAY"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) designating April 9 of each year as "Sir Winston Churchill Day" and consider the same.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would I be correct in assuming that this resolution will not cost the taxpayers anything?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, I have an amendment to assure that it will not cost them anything.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 127

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 9 of each year, the anniversary of the conferring of honorary United States citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill, is hereby designated as "Sir Winston Churchill Day." The President is authorized and requested to issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to honor the memory of Sir Winston Churchill by observing such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rogers of Colorado: On page 1, line 3, strike "of each year," and insert in lieu thereof", 1966,"; and on page 1, line 7, strike "each year".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear any assurance in the amendments that this is not going to cost the taxpayers any money.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I can assure the gentleman that there is no authorization for money to be appropriated in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to be sure, because Britain owes us a good many billions of dollars, and before we put out any more money in their direction, I want to be sure that I know about it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I can assure the gentleman that this is not putting out any money for the British Empire.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Designating April 9, 1966, as 'Sir Winston Churchill Day'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF VANADIUM FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 13774) to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13774

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately six thousand four hundred and fifty short tons of vanadium (V content) now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided*, That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO CONFER ADDITIONAL JURISDICTION UPON THE SUPERINTENDENT OF INSURANCE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11664) to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12 (g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "formity" insert ", as nearly as may be practicable,".

Page 2, line 16, after "hearing" where it appears the first time insert: ": *Provided*, That if the Superintendent shall find upon examination that the further transaction of business by the company would be hazardous to the public or to the policyholders or creditors of the company in the District, he may suspend such authority without giving notice as herein required: *Provided further*, That in lieu of revoking or suspending the certificate of authority of any company, after hearing as herein provided, the Superintendent may subject such company to a penalty of not more than $500 when, in his judgment, he finds that the public interest would be best served by the continued operation of the company. The amount of any such penalty shall be paid by the company through the office of the Superintendent to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia".

Page 7, after line 15, insert:

(i) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section, or any rule or regulation thereunder the violation of which is made unlawful by this section or the observance of which is required under the terms of this section, or any person who willfully and knowingly makes, or causes to be made, any statement in any application, report, or document required to be filed under this section, which statement was false or misleading with respect to any material fact, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $1,000, or be imprisoned not more than thirty days, or both."

Page 7, line 16, strike out "(i)" and insert: "(j)".

Page 7, strike out lines 18, 19, and 20.

Page 7, line 21, strike out "5" and insert: "4".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 11664, is to subject domestic stock insurance companies in the District of Columbia to local regulation in accordance with the specific criteria set forth by the Congress to assure them of the exemption provided by the Congress in the Securities Acts amendments.

The Securities Acts Amendments of 1964, Public Law 88–467 (78 Stat. 565), were enacted to extend the disclosure requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities.

The Congress, by the 1964 amendments, intended that State legislatures could enact the laws required to meet the exemption standards which it spelled out in the Securities Acts amendments.

This bill will effectively carry out the intent of the Congress expressed in the Securities Acts Amendments of 1964 and is in the sound tradition of retaining the regulation of insurance within the District of Columbia and the States, rather than delegating such regulation to an arm of the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE LESLIE L. BIFFLE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I announce to the House the passing of Leslie L. Biffle, whose service to the Congress spanned more than 50 years. He passed away in the city of Washington at 1:35 this morning. He was born in Boydsville, Clay County, Ark., on October 9, 1889, in the congressional district that I am privileged to serve.

He rose from page boy to the top rungs of the ladder as Secretary of the U.S. Senate. He came to Washington for the first time in 1908 at a tender age. He returned to Arkansas for additional schooling. In 1909 he came back to Washington as Secretary to Hon. Bruce Macon who represented that district in Congress. Afterward he worked in the folding room in the Senate for a time.

At the recommendation of Senator Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas, majority leader, he was selected as secretary to the majority in the Senate. He held this position until he was unanimously chosen Secretary of the Senate in 1945, receiving support from the Members of both parties.

He married Miss Glade Strickling, of Clarksburg, W. Va., in Washington in 1921. She survives him. He is also survived by two sisters, Mrs. Charles Clark Hillman and Mrs. Blanche Sanders, both of Miami, Fla.

"Les," as he was affectionately called, obtained some fine advice from Senator Robinson, who admonished him, "Keep your eyes and ears open and your mouth shut." Les carried out that advice full well. He could be trusted with the closest of secrets by those with whom he associated. Senators, Cabinet members, and Presidents sought his counsel. He never violated the confidence of anyone. They were aware of that. President Franklin D. Roosevelt would call Les Biffle to the White House and inquire about what was going on in Congress. He could not have gone to a better source. He was a close friend of President Harry S. Truman and Vice President Alben W. Barkley.

While Biffle was serving as president of the Arkansas State Society the group held a reception in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building. It was a cold, snowy, distasteful day which reduced the size of the crowd who attended. The surprise guest was President Harry S. Truman who came to honor his good friend Les Biffle regardless of the inclement weather.

On July 4, 1949, the traditional annual picnic was held at Piggott, Ark., honoring Leslie Biffle, whose birthplace was only a few miles from that county seat city. It was truly a Biffle Day celebration in Arkansas. Many thousands from Arkansas and the neighboring State of Missouri were present. Vice President Alben W. Barkley headed the large number of Washington officials who attended. Several departmental heads, Senators and Representatives, and close friends made the trip to Piggott on this occasion. The noted sculptor, Felix de Weldon, made a bust of Biffle which was unveiled during the ceremonies and subsequently placed in the Federal Post Office building at Piggott where it has remained since that time. A scroll upon the bust bears the names of a number of his close friends.

Thoroughness, attentiveness to duty, loyalty to friends, and hard work brought fame and distinction to Leslie L. Biffle. In January 1959 he was honored at a magnificent testimonial dinner after 50 years of outstanding public service in the Nation's Capital. More than 1,200 friends swelled the Grand Ballroom to overflowing in the Mayflower Hotel. The requests for tickets had to be shut off a few days before the banquet was held for lack of space in the five ballrooms which were thrown together for the event. The dinner featured music and songs by recognized artists, addresses by leaders from both major political parties and presentation of gifts.

Here are some of the tributes paid to Les Biffle by speakers on the program:

He's affable, courteous, and deserving of our admiration and esteem.

His personality endeared him to the hearts of all of us.

Distinguished public servant, who knew what the word "loyalty" meant.

Only man who could whisper to Senators without moving his lips.

The Senator at Large from the United States.

His counsel was sought. He was adviser to those in the highest places of responsibility.

> He never forgets a friend and never fails to reward one.
>
> Confidant of Presidents.
>
> A pinnacle few men attained.
>
> Walking encyclopedia.
>
> He makes no demands; all he asks is to do something for his friends.
>
> Never puts off until tomorrow * * * did his job to perfection.

Former President Truman said at a news conference while in office:

> They don't come any better than Les Biffle.

"The Arkansas Pollster of 1948." This label given him was due to his activities during the presidential campaign of that year in which he dressed as a chicken peddler and drove through several States in a delapidated pickup to get the tenor of the voters in rural America. He reported that the trend was to Truman.

The words of praise came with genuine fervor and earnestness. It was evident that each of those who made remarks admired and respected the soft-spoken Arkansan.

It is indeed difficult, even impossible, to find anyone who had the privilege of becoming acquainted with Biffle who was not completely devoted to him. Les Biffle had the friendship of the leaders and members of both parties.

Services will be held in the Bethlehem Chapel, Washington Cathedral, at 11 a.m., Saturday. Gawler's Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

I would like to convey sympathy to his widow and to his sisters and other members of the family.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. GATHINGS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] in the tribute he is paying to my late friend, Les Biffle.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known a more gentle, a more noble man in all of my life. Les Biffle was a real institution around the Congress and Capitol Hill for many, many years, and a great citizen with friends across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones in their sorrow.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the death of my dear friend, Les Biffle. He and I were close friends for many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, Les Biffle was one of the most dedicated men I have ever met. He gave his whole life to the Congress of the United States. While he served in the other branch in many important positions, he loved the entire Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Les Biffle wielded a powerful and constructive influence, as we know one who occupies these various positions could do, in calling to the attention of the Members matters and information of vital importance which would be not only of great interest to them, but guidance to them.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of Les Biffle takes from me a very close and valued friend, and leaves a feeling of keen regret in the minds of the countless thousands of persons, friends and others, who knew Les and who benefited from his beautiful outlook upon life.

I extend to Mrs. Biffle my deep sympathy in her great loss and sorrow.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the distinguished Speaker of the House and the gentleman from Arkansas in saying what a fine man Les Biffle was. When I first came here as a new Congressman, he was very helpful, friendly and kindly in his understanding of the problems and challenges of a new Congressman. I have known Les Biffle and his good wife through the years and have valued so much their kindness and friendship. They are the topflight kind of people who give their all for public service, and are loyal to their many friends in public and private life.

As a matter of fact, Les Biffle never chose between the House of Representatives and the Senate nor did he choose between parties in giving assistance and friendly help to the Members of the entire U.S. Congress.

It is the memory of that kind of person that Les Biffle was, with his gracious smile, and gentle humor, who was so dedicated and devoted, that we are honoring today in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I too want to pay my respects to one of the greatest men I have ever known since coming to the Congress of the United States and one of the greatest men in the history of the great State of Arkansas, Les Biffle. Les Biffle was a true patriot and dedicated to those ideals that made this country great. He was devoted to this Congress as a great institution of the people. He advised and counseled some of the greatest men in the history of Congress. Les Biffle participated in some of the most important conferences and decisions in history. He was a gentleman, scholar, and friend of man. He will be greatly missed. Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Biffle.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness that I learned this morning of the passing last evening of one of my fellow Arkansans who gave a lifetime of service as an official in the Capitol of the United States, the Honorable Leslie Biffle, late Secretary to the U.S. Senate.

Les Biffle was a friendly man, an affable and popular man, who enjoyed people and who labored long and hard in the political vineyard, giving a lifetime of service as a valuable and trusted employee and adviser on both sides of the U.S. Capitol.

A number of years ago, a prominent columnist, in reviewing Les Biffle's accomplishments, reported that Les once said of his first yearning to become a part of the machinery of government:

> In the front of my geography book, there was a beautiful picture of the U.S. Capitol. I used to sit in class and look at those steps leading up to the entrance and wonder if I would ever get a chance to walk up the Capitol myself.

Les did get that chance in the form of an opportunuity to become the secretary of Congressman Macon, of Helena, Ark., in 1908. From that time until his retirement several years ago, Les served in many different capacities as employee and adviser to Representatives, Senators, and prominent Government officials including no less than the President of the United States. At one time, he was secretary to Senator James P. Clarke, later became Superintendent of the Senate Folding Room, then secretary to the majority of the Senate and, finally Secretary of the Senate upon return from service in the Army in 1945.

His luncheons in the private dining room of the Senate were frequent and included a broad variety of officials of both high and lesser ranks, from the President of the United States to employees in the House, the Senate and the departments. A reporter once remarked that the guest book of Les Biffle's office probably contained the world's most valuable current autographs.

Les Biffle will be missed by his friends across the Nation and particularly those who had the opportunity to know him well and to benefit from his friendly personality and his sage political wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret his passing, and I know all others who knew him do and join me in extending sympathy to Mrs. Biffle.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I learned with great sadness of the death of Leslie Biffle. He was a good friend and a great public servant. As has been said, he was for years on the Senate staff—the Secretary of the Senate when the Democrats had the majority, and the minority secretary when the Republicans were in control of the Senate.

The night was never too dark nor the day too long for him to do a good deed. It was his trademark. His devotion to his work was complete. He was a splendid example of integrity and devotion throughout his life.

To his loved ones, Mrs. Trimble and I extend our deep sympathy in this, their hour of sorrow.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the life, character, and service of the late Leslie L. Biffle.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 625. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL FOOD RESERVE

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill providing for the establishment of a national food reserve. In the past our abundance of food and fiber frequently has been considered more a problem than a blessing. This has resulted in a neglect to understand fully how important our success in the production of food has been. With a growing recognition of the vital role that our agricultural production and know-how must play in building a peaceful world through the elimination of hunger and starvation, we are forced to recognize that our agricultural abundance has not been accidental. We cannot afford to leave adequate supplies of food for ourselves and for food for freedom uses to chance in the future.

This Congress has in the past established reserves of materials termed "strategic" which were not subject to the hazards that are present in the production of food. We are reminded of these hazards most vividly by the food shortages now facing India. The crisis they find themselves in this year is largely the result of the lack of rain during a single growing season.

Fortunately, our supplies of wheat are still greater than what is considered a normal carryover and we are able to offer some assistance to India. However, our food and fiber reserves are being reduced and demand is increasing, making it an absolute necessity that we establish a food reserve before we find ourselves facing another crisis at home or abroad without the food reserve to do anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, my reserve bill would call for the setting aside of reserves without the disruptive influences that have identified reserves termed "surplus" in the past. This is accomplished in my bill through Government cooperation with producers of the commodities involved by offering them assistance identical to that now offered through the Commodity Credit Corporation in return for agreement of the producers to store an essential reserve of strategic food commodities.

I urge my colleagues to join me in the establishment of a strategic food reserve. It would be a tragic experience to find ourselves suffering a shortage of food—a commodity we cannot do without—for even a little while.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH SHOULD EXERCISE SELF-DISCIPLINE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard during the last day or so that the President has told the First Lady that they must defer building two rooms on their home in Texas. This is in the interest of encouraging Americans to spend less money and in this manner to try and fight the increasing cost of living.

Since then, the General Services Administration has announced that they will defer construction of a number of multimillion-dollar Federal buildings.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Congress exercise a little of the same type of restraint in the spending of money. I suggest that we defer building the James Madison Memorial Library for which plans are now being completed. This 11-story annex to the Library of Congress, with an authorized cost of $75 million could well wait until the forces of inflation cool. Let us show that the legislative branch can exercise restraint in spending the taxpayers' money.

ADJOURNMENT FROM APRIL 7, 1966, TO MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625) establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the House concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "1966" insert: ", and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Wednesday, April 13, 1966."

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966, and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Wednesday, April 13, 1966."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. STEED. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14266) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] and myself.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14266, with Mr. Blatnik in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed], will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte], will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the subcommittee, I am very happy to be able to bring this bill before the House today. This is possible only because of the very fine cooperation of all members of the committee, who have gone along with a very strenuous work schedule that was required to get this bill together so that we could have it to consider before the Easter recess.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to these Members who have cooperated so well with me, to make it possible for me to report to the House today that this bill comes to the floor with the unanimous accord of all those who have worked so long and diligently on it.

The funds in the bill are in four titles. The funds provided in the bill, that we are recommending to the House, total $7,210,177,135. This is $540,433,135 more than the same agencies were granted in fiscal year 1966, but it is $36,542,865 less than the amounts requested in the budgets for fiscal year 1967.

Mr. Chairman, while this may seem to be only a very modest cut in a bill that provides for such a large amount of appropriations, I think the House will be interested in knowing that, in addition to the funds mentioned here, this bill also includes certain mandatory costs which bring the grand total up to some $20 billion.

The interest on the national debt and various trust funds of the Government are contained in this bill, but they are mandatory and not under the direct jurisdiction of the committee.

It is also important to note that this bill not only is one of the largest of all the appropriation bills, but also it deals with agencies which employ more than one-third of all the civilian employees of this Government, nearly 800,000.

It also provides for some of the oldest and most important service agencies of the Government, many of which perform duties that are beyond their control. The workloads they are called upon to do are matters which they cannot control, and, in a growing economy and in an expanding country such as we have, we find the substantial increases in the workload imposed upon these agencies are virtually unprecedented. We think, by and large, that the agencies have done a remarkable job of coping with the increasing demands upon their limited resources.

It is very important to keep in mind that when services are required to be performed—such as those of the Post Office, where the amount of mail it must deliver is a reflection of the general economy of the country, or by agencies such as Internal Revenue and others, on which the growing economy has a direct impact—the ability of the agencies to perform the additional services and to absorb the increasing costs they have to face is beyond their control.

It is commendable that the agencies in the coming year will be able to hold down their costs to as small an increase as $540 million, especially when more than $349 million of this additional cost can be charged directly to acts of Congress, which have imposed additional costs on the agencies which are beyond their control.

In the requests we considered, funds were asked for the purpose of adding on 24,105 additional employees. The committee has reduced this request to 19,838, of which 15,216 are for the Post Office Department, and 4,622 are for other agencies involved.

The Post Office Department is experiencing an unprecedented increase in mail volume. In the original bill for fiscal year 1966, based upon the old factors of estimating the year ahead, the allowance was made for an increase of 3 percent in volume. The volume has gone up to about 5.8 percent, and apparently the trend is going to continue.

Coming to the terms of the bill itself, there are a few points that are of some special interest, that I would like to call to the attention of the House.

In the Treasury portion of the bill, for the Bureau of Customs, there is an interesting set of figures in the workload that is being imposed upon them.

For instance, for 1965, the last year for which we have complete figures, there was a 5.7-percent increase in the number of vehicles crossing our borders, or a total of 53.8 million. There was an increase of 4 percent in the number of people crossing our borders, or 181 million people passing through customs just in that one fiscal year. These are all new high figures and give a good, clear indication of the workload imposed upon this agency. There is every indication that these increases will continue through 1967.

When you consider this and consider the fact that we have held their request for additional personnel to 142, I think this does indicate that there has been some frugality practiced here.

In addition to the number of vehicles and people crossing the borders, the cargo-type of activity that this agency performs is also at an alltime high. Therefore, I think they are doing a very good job with very limited means. We recommend that they be granted the funds contained in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I would like to finish my general statement. It will be very short, and then I will be happy to yield for any questions.

Mr. GROSS. I would appreciate it if the gentleman will yield. This bill, as I understand it, calls for some $7.240 billion.

Mr. STEED. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I have looked around the House Chamber and I am sure there are not 10 Members of the 435 Members on the floor. It must be discouraging to my friend from Oklahoma, the chairman of the subcommittee, to make his presentation on a bill of this size without more Members present. If the gentleman is discouraged by the fact that there are so few Members here, then the gentleman from Iowa would be willing to make a point of order that there is not a quorum so as to get some Members here to hear him. I think it is really discouraging, and borders on being disgraceful, that there are no more Members on the floor of the House when we are dealing with a bill in the sum of more than $7 billion.

Mr. STEED. Of course, we think this is a very, very important bill. We have done our best to bring it to the House in the most forceful way we can. I am in no position to criticize the other Members for their apparent lack of attention to it. We waited patiently a long time, and we hope we can proceed with it and expedite its consideration here today. The gentleman will have to be his own judge about that, but I am willing to proceed under these circumstances and do the best I can.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The truth of the matter is that the House has such complete confidence in the gentleman and his committee that many Members are not here to argue it.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman.

The next item I would like to discuss is the Bureau of the Mint. You know, this agency has been faced with some very unusual problems in the last 2 or 3 years which were brought on by two things. One is the unprecedented coin shortage. Two is the fact that we passed a law last year to change the metal content in subsidiary coins. We find that the Mint has done a very good job in making these adjustments and transformations. The coin shortage has eased and is getting better every day. While there has been a shortfall in their expected production, they have been able to produce enough coins to alleviate the critical shortage. We think in the production schedule they have for next year they will be able to cope with the problems now facing them. We are pleased to report that the activities on the revitalization of the mint in San Francisco have come along very well. The work on the new mint in Philadelphia is progressing. We hope the problems which have been faced with respect to the new cladded metal being produced by private industry are being licked and that the time is not far off when we will have a very steady and smooth operation in the Bureau of the Mint. We believe they will be able to cope with any other problems in the future that can be foreseen at this time.

Mr. Chairman, another matter I would like to mention briefly is the Bureau of Narcotics. In this bill we have permitted a very modest increase of five in the staff for their overseas operations. The committee is proud of the record that they have been able to pile up on the last 2 or 3 years in this part of their activities. We are happy to note the known addicts in this country have shown a slight decrease. We believe we are beginning to make some headway in coping with this problem in our country. One of the most interesting factors to note this year is the number of new known addicts under 17 years of age. The percentage has gone down from 13 percent last year to 3 percent this year.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this represents a very refreshing success, and I am sure that all Members of the House will be happy to know that we are making some progress in this very, very important field.

Mr. Chairman, the narcotics people tell us that they do have some increasing problems with reference to the use of marihuana and some of the other types of drugs, especially around some of our college areas.

But, Mr. Chairman, I believe with the fine cooperation which exists between the Bureau of Narcotics and the local law enforcement people we are going to be able to cope with this problem. The Bureau is very strongly in favor of hospitalizing confirmed addicts. They are convinced that addicts can be cured, and we feel the same way.

Mr. Chairman, we hope that this new step is taken so that we can begin to hope that someday this curse can be removed from our country.

Mr. Chairman, another important agency is the Coast Guard. We know, of course, that these are not normal times for the Coast Guard because of its increasing involvement in the situation which exists in Vietnam. We are very proud of the fact that they have been able to perform such a very effective and useful function in those operations.

Mr. Chairman, one new thing of particular importance that the Coast Guard has faced this year is the fact by agreement between the Department of the Navy and the Treasury Department, the Coast Guard assumed responsibility for all icebreaking operations.

Mr. Chairman, we have stayed within the $103 million figure recommended by the Budget for the A.C. & I. fund of the Coast Guard, although there are those who feel that this is considerably less than this program needs. I feel it is important to keep in mind that although we have had a long-range plan for ships, aircraft and shore installations, we have tried to keep on schedule in recent years. Some new material has come to hand which indicates that a further revision of this program can be made in the case of efficiency and a more effective way for them to carry out their work.

Mr. Chairman, we have allowed, because of this function, for the planning of three new type Coast Guard ships. Heretofore much of the Coast Guard equipment has been sort of a hand-me-down type of equipment. We believe that with money to plan specific type ships with which to do particular type of work, they not only can make a very sizable savings in the future needs for ships, but they can make some very substantial manpower savings. We feel that this is of the utmost importance, and we recommend that this program be given this additional amount which has great implications of success for them.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing in which this agency becomes involved, along with several others, which the committee believes ought to be given more attention, and that is in the area of oceanography. We believe that this program is scattered out in too many governmental agencies; that there is a lack of centralization and direction, and we hope that the powers that be in the administration will find a better way to bring the entire oceanography program into a centralized activity in order to cut out duplication and make more effective the work that is being done, and to make provision for additional work which we believe needs to be done.

We have made a sizable reduction in the request of the Internal Revenue Service for its compliance activities. This is done because this year will bring the entire IRS operation in automatic data processing into full flow. We have had some very cheerful and amazing reports from the ADP equipment up to this point, and we believe that when the entire national picture is revealed the compliance phase of their activities will take on an entirely new outlook.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we believe that with the 633 additional employees we have allowed in this aera, that they can cope with all emergency problems and other things that they need to do. At a later date we can begin to get into this compliance matter in a really comprehensive way. We hope that the time is not more than a year or so away. Up to this point, of course, it has not been possible to show any substantial manpower savings in this field because they are not fully mechanized. However, the committee is very hopeful that we are now near the point where some of these dividends can be realized in this agency, even though, like the others, they have a continual increase in the workload to be performed.

Mr. Chairman, we are happy to report that as a result of last year's appropriation the Secret Service has not only increased its manpower, but its mechanization and other equipment, up to the point recommended by the Warren Commission, and other expert study groups. We hope that now, though, that they are leveling off, and that this agency is now modernized and in a position to do the type of job that has been assigned to them. And this is despite the fact that additional protective duties have been imposed upon the agency since a year ago.

I might say by way of passing that there are no funds in this bill that in anywise involve an armored car. There may be some who would be interested in that little footnote.

One interesting thing before I leave the Treasury Department. Three agencies of this Department are not only asking for fewer people in 1967 than they had in 1966, but they are asking also for less money. They are the Office of the Treasurer, the Bureau of Accounts and the Public Debt management people.

Since this is one of the few if not the only instance in the entire budget where this is true, I thought the agency deserved some little tribute for the fact that these three agencies have been able to accomplish this wonderful record. This is a direct reflection of what the wise use of the automatic data processing equipment can bring about. We think they are doing a wonderful job and we want to commend them publicly for it.

Now with reference to the Post Office Department. We have made some cuts but in no area have cuts been made that have to do with work they are now performing.

We have taken into account the unprecedented increases in the workload and we think that with the funds provided here they will be able to cope with the problems facing them.

I think when it comes to the consideration of the Post Office Department, there are a few figures that might be of interest and of help to our colleagues.

For instance in 1955 the Post Office Department delivered 55,200 million pieces of mail.

In 1965, just 10 years later, the Department distributed 71,900 million pieces of mail.

Now the average increase throughout this 10-year period has been 1,700 million pieces of mail a year.

The situation we face now is that a one-half of 1 percent increase in mail volume adds up to 400 million pieces of mail. That means if the increase in volume continues to hold up at the record pace it is now going and at the rate it has been going for the last several months, they will be required to deliver somewhere between 3½ and 4½ billion pieces of mail more during the next year than they have had to deliver this year.

This is a colossal figure when you stop to think about it. At the rate of increase that we are going, this means that within the next 5 or 6 or 7 years they will be faced with the necessity of delivering about 100 billion pieces of mail a year.

In addition to this enormous increase in the volume that has been confronting them year after year, you also have to keep in mind that we are building about 1,300,000 new homes a year in this country. Every time there is a new home, or a new office, or a new business, the Post Office Department has one more place to which to deliver mail. This means, of course, that their manpower problem is constantly growing, whether they like it or not, because it is just as important for the Post Office to deliver the mail to a new home as it is to deliver the mail to an old home. They have no choice but to just meet the situation and deliver the mail as best they can.

This situation has been going on for a long time and so far as we can see it is going to continue.

In addition to these figures, I think it is important to keep in mind that we have 33,624 post offices of which 4,627 are rated as first-class offices. All these 4,627 offices combined have a total of 529,235 employees or 84.6 percent of the total working force of the Post Office Department.

The 75 largest post offices in this group have 289,241 employees—or 54.7 percent of the entire work force.

As of the end of February this year, there were over 625,000 people working in the post offices of the United States.

Now while this increase in volume has been going on and this increase in the number of homes and businesses, offices and so on to which they have to deliver mail, the mail trains in this country which have been the traditional method of moving our mail have shown an unprecedented decrease in number. We are down from about a total of 10,000 daily mail trains at the end of World War II to somewhere between 800 and 900 trains a day at this time. In other words, with more than a 50 percent increase in volume, there has been a 90-percent decrease in the traditional facility to move this mail.

This has caused many, many transportation problems for the Department, all of which are yet to be solved.

There has been a little relief gained in airlift, but until the Congress itself sees fit to change the law, there is not much more that the Department can do than they are now doing. They are presently authorized to contract for airmail. Then they can use for first-class mail space-available facilities of the airlines. But that does not really begin to do much to cope with the problem which exists. I think the time is at hand when the Congress should go into this question and work out some new authority so that the Post Office Department can use airlift in this very important matter of moving the mail. There are many complaints about the poor mail service.

Some of them can probably be charged to the management of the Post Office Department. But I think if you want to be fair about it, you will have to take into account these physical problems that have been forced upon them. It is no one's fault.

There are some additional handicaps that have been placed on the management down there by act of Congress. If Congressmen will examine some of the legislation they have been passing in the last year or so, I think they would be astonished to see the shackles placed on the Post Office management. Certainly we should not blame the Post Office Department for that. During the last fiscal year, acts of Congress have added to this Department $218,315,000 of additional cost without giving the patron any additional service.

These same acts will add $297,531,000 of additional cost during the next fiscal year without adding anything to the service of patrons. Some of that amount is in salary increases and other justifiable costs, but some of it might be subject to debate if properly analyzed.

We find, for instance, that recognition of Government employee organizations by Executive order has caused something like 25,000 of these organizations to be recognized in various agencies of our Government, and it is an interesting sidelight, I think, to note that 24,400 of the 25,000 are in the Post Office Department. We are told that with the present trend, the number might go as high as 35,000 employee organizations that will have recognition in the Post Office Department alone.

That generalizes the information in the bill which I thought might be of particular interest to the Congress.

There is one cut in the request of the Bureau of the Budget that we made. They had asked for 27 positions to open 6 regional field offices. It was the feeling of the subcommittee that we were not ready to agree to this. It may be later on this can be documented, but we are afraid that it will be more in the field of interference and duplication, and we could not see our way to go along with it, so we took that out.

There is one final word I would like to say. We had, I think, one of the most interesting presentations when the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Schultze, appeared. His remarks begin on page 554 of the Treasury hearings. He deals with the whole budget in some terms that I think are at least unique and different, and I think immensely interesting. Even though there may be a lot of material that you do not agree with, I cannot imagine any Member of Congress reading this presentation without having a very refreshing experience in regard to the whole Federal budget. I strongly recommend that this be required reading for everyone who is truly interested in having a deeper and a better grasp of the Federal budget.

I also recommend it to the public generally because I believe this presentation is worthy of a lot of attention on the part of all of those who worry about what goes into this Federal budget of ours and why many of the things that we feel necessary to do are done.

Now I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask you something about the deliveries of mail. A few minutes ago you spoke about the closing of some of the post offices that do great jobs in the summertime. The feeling has become rather strong, particularly in the State of Maine where people go for the summer, a great many of whom are official people who need their mail quickly, that if they close several of the post offices that are on the list, it will take at least 2 days, possibly 3, to get the mail through from here. That is going to be not only an inconvenience, but it might be a very dangerous situation in some areas.

Some of us feel very strongly about it. It is unfortunate that with the expenditure of all of this money, this cut, which seems particularly unnecessary, is taking place, if it is being done to save money, for it will not save a penny. The feeling about it is that the Post Office is getting itself a very bad reputation.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I might say this to the gentlewoman: We have never had this particular type problem to which she has called our attention. Since we have gotten well into the setting up of the 552 sectional centers, it is my opinion that any situation of this sort, even on a vacation basis, can be coped with if it is called to the attention of the proper people. We do know there are many vacation areas in the country where arrangements have been made to take care of the situation. I would hope that in any area of this sort, a solution might be arrived at. I know of no instance where this type of problem has not received the closest attention, if it is called to the attention of the Post Office Department.

Mrs. BOLTON. We have called it to their attention, and we have been unable to get a reply from the Postmaster General.

Mr. STEED. We will be happy to inquire into it, if the gentlewoman will give us the details.

Mrs. BOLTON. That will be fine.

Mr. STEED. They have many problems. They are getting to them as fast as they can. I know of many instances where they have done a fine job in straightening out the problems. With the new ZIP code, it is necessary to put in sectional centers and they are trying to cope with the transportation problem as well as other headaches.

I think the strength of the new concept is that it does lend itself to the solution of individual problems. I know now of no serious problem that has been called to my attention that they have not been able to solve. We will be happy to help the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. It would have helped very much if we had been able to get a reply from the Postmaster General.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I merely wanted to commend my able colleague from Oklahoma, the chairman of the subcommittee, for the outstanding detailed and complex explanation he has given. Speaking largely from notes and without a prepared text, I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma has demonstrated a complete familiarity with a tremendous piece of legislation and a mastery of the subject that is certainly indicative of the diligence with which he has been working on this matter for many, many months.

As one Member of the House, I want to express appreciation to him and to his subcommittee for a job very well done.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his very cordial remarks.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, I believe the other members of the subcommittee feel as I do. We have had the good fortune to work on the budget for some of the most interesting agencies of this Government. We enjoy the work that we do, because of the wonderful people in these agencies whom we get to know particularly well and to talk with firsthand. I think some of the oldest and finest services rendered to this Government are covered under this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If I understand the bill correctly, it is $540,433,135 above the spending of last year for the same general purposes.

Mr. STEED. That is correct. By way of emphasis, I said that $349 million of that is forced upon these agencies by several acts of Congress during this fiscal year, and that the remainder is mostly accounted for in additional workload that has been imposed upon these agencies to perform.

Mr. GROSS. I notice there is $17,331,000, or an increase of $1,209,135 for spending on the part of the Office of the President.

Only last Friday, the President called upon the Cabinet officers of the Government to reduce spending by $1.1 billion before the end of this fiscal year. I am more than a little surprised that he did not get to the committee before this bill came to the floor of the House today and ask for a reduction in his increase of $1,209,135.

Mr. STEED. I might say to the gentleman, of course, that we treat these items with some deference, because they are directly charged to the President.

Mr. GROSS. Difference or deference?

Mr. STEED. Deference, because they are directly charged to the President himself.

I would say that, for instance, the President has made very sparing use of the emergency fund, so that about $950,000 of the $1 million he had last year was allowed to lapse.

In the National Security Council, for instance, there is a reduction in people and money requested for next year. In some of the other activities there have been some increases. Some of those can be accounted for in the changes in the national or international situation, like this whole complex of Presidential committees and advisers and other activities.

Mr. GROSS. The $400,000 being spent for refurbishing the two yachts, and taking care of the personal plane down in Texas, is not involved in this bill, is it?

Mr. STEED. I think you will find it probably under the military bill. We have no direct connection with it. I might say to the gentleman in this part of the bill I think you will find the largest item of increase will be in the Bureau of the Budget itself. They asked for about $1,126,000 more for the next fiscal year than they got this year, which would add on about 49 people. In this bill we allowed an increase of $809,135 and 22 people. The type of people they use, by and large, are in the higher salary brackets. So, because of the low budget picture, they find themselves hard pressed for enough manpower to do what they consider a thorough job in trying to weed out unnecessary items in the budget before they come up here. We thought they made a good case for that and could actually use this additional manpower to save money.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STEED. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not also a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the major part of the increase under the Executive Office of the President is represented by the increase in the appropriations for the Bureau of the Budget, amounting to $940,135 above the 1966 figures. So that of the $1,209,135 in the Executive Office of the President covered in this budget, a very substantial majority of it is in the Office of the Bureau of the Budget and not in the actual White House operations. Is that not correct?

Mr. STEED. I think the answer to the gentleman's question is this: Aside from this 22-person increase allowed in the Bureau of the Budget, almost all of the remainder of this increase is composed of these automatic extra charges which these acts of Congress impose on all agencies that employ people. We gave them extra fringe benefits and pay raises. Any agency that has very many employees feels the impact in this way. I would say a large part of this $1 million-plus increase is due to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget feels it needs additional people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not a cold, hard fact that the biggest single increase in this bill is the $750 million in the interest charge on the Federal debt?

Mr. STEED. We do not carry it here since that is an automatic item, but it is true that interest has gone up and is at an all-time high. Of course, it is the largest single item in this bill and probably in any other bill I know of. It is a very large amount.

Mr. GROSS. From the lack of attendance here today apparently very few are concerned about the fact that the interest on the Federal debt is now $12.75 billion or an increase of $750 million. I realize that this committee can do very little about that and I do not charge them with the responsibility for that increase, but I would think it would begin to dawn on the Members of the House and all Members of the Congress that this cannot go on indefinitely with a $750 million increase in the interest charge on the Federal debt plus another $564,000 increase in the handling of the debt by the Bureau of Public Debt.

Mr. STEED. I may say to the gentleman when we discussed these items with the Treasury authorities, they gave us no encouragement that this sort of trend is going to ease off any in the next few years. I was led to believe that these extra costs are just going to keep on climbing, at least as long as we keep spending more than we take in.

Mr. GROSS. As long as the administration expands old programs and initiates all kinds of new ones, of course, it will go up and the deficit will increase.

Mr. STEED. I would like to point out that included in this bill are those agencies that go out and bring money into the Federal Treasury. When we look at such items you are talking about like the interest on the national debt, it makes us feel that we cannot be too severe on the people who are bringing in the money, because apparently there are plently of those who are spending it. We do not seem to be able to find a way to collect it as fast as they spend it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BOW. In an examination of this bill, looking it over, am I right in saying that there are no increases over the budget in any item?

Mr. STEED. There is no place in the bill where there is an increase over the budget. We can assure the House that while this $36 million may seem like a small cut, these are legitimate cuts. There is no fakery in it. They are actual dollar savings, and we think we justified them, and we believe the rest of the bill has been pretty well justified.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I would like to congratulate the gentleman and his committee for bringing in a bill that is in no place over the budget. I think perhaps there can be further cuts. But it is at least something to see a bill come in here in which none of the items have gone over the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I might say in answer to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that to bring the figure down to where it could be understood by the taxpayers of this country, it might be interesting to know that the interest on the public debt amounts to about $26,000 every minute—every time the sweep hand on your watch goes around for one minute—we have paid $26,000 just in interest on the Federal debt.

Mr. STEED. Even that is a most staggering figure.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one informational question?

Mr. STEED. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, on page 20 of the report under the general comparative statement of appropriations, and being estimates for 1967, there is listed under the general and special funds of the Treasury, minor coinage profits, et cetera. Then it says an increase from $1.7 million to $3.14 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am not arguing about that at all, but a general increase of $1,416,000 is shown with a plus, or an increase in the Federal debt.

My question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is this, who brings this report to the floor of the House from the Committee on Appropriations: Why do we use the word "profit," if that is the cost of minor coinage? It would look as though it should be a "minus"—and I could certainly understand it—but since it is referred to as "profit" it looks like that should be a minus item rather than a plus item.

Mr. STEED. May I say to the gentleman from Missouri that his point may be well taken. However, this is the terminology which they use in the Treasury Department, and we accepted it, because it is just another way of saying the same thing. They saw fit to call it a profit, because I suppose when they do not have to spend it they feel they have saved it. So one could take it as a minus item in one way, as well as a plus item in another.

I do not pretend to be an expert on this subject. However, there is a very interesting story in the manner in which they carry their books, because they not only deal with two very valuable precious metals, but then, of course, they have these less valuable metals with which they do a lot of the coinage program. This is merely a bookkeeping method by which they try to keep some line on their cost of production, and we believe if they make these savings and reduce the cost that calling it a profit may be just another way of saying it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, since we have come to the day when we take both platinum one day and copper the next out of the national stockpile, it does not make any difference, I suppose, whether they are minor metals, but what I want to know is why that figure of $1,416,000 that is carried as a "plus." Is that actually a savings based upon the coinage profits to the taxpayers?

Mr. STEED. That is what it amounts to, based upon the manner in which I interpret it.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee, I would like to add my remarks on this appropriation bill to those of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma and every member of the subcommittee for the fine work that they have done this year in bringing forth what we believe is a very sound bill.

Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with my prepared manuscript I would like to state that there may be an attempt here later today to cut 5 percent of the expenditures of this particular item. I might point out that the amount being appropriated here today is $7,210,177,000. If all of that money were to be expended, 5 percent of that would mean $360,508,000. The total increase for 1967 over 1966 is $540,433,000. This Congress last year voted by a vote of 370 to 7 for a pay increase for Federal employees. That pay increase for these agencies amounted to $349 million. Therefore deducting $349 million that would leave an increase in this budget over last year's budget of $191 million. In other words, a 5-percent cut or $360 million would have to go below the 1966 budget figure of about $160 million.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to go into the details here, but there has been an increase in customs work—an increase of 5.7 percent carriers entering the country, an increase of 4 percent persons arriving in the country, and a tremendous increase in IRS returns, about 1.3 million more returns of 104 million tax returns this year; 2 billion additional pieces of mail, bringing an overall volume of mail up to 74 billion pieces of mail, or an increase of 5.4 percent, let alone the fact that I have mentioned here, the mandatory increases in wages, amounting to $349 million.

MANDATORY INCREASES

For those of us sitting on the Appropriations Committee, this will probably be remembered as the fiscal year of the mandatory increases. Many of the items responsible for the increase in budget requests are cost increases due to compliance with laws enacted by this Congress last year. While we have stressed that an effort be made to absorb these increased cots, and commended those bureaus who have been able to do so even partially, we cannot argue against these added expenses.

INCREASING WORKLOAD

However, fast on the heels of these mandatory increases has come the repeated justification of bigger budgets due to increasing workloads. For example, in the Treasury Department, the Bureau of Customs has estimated an increase of more than 2 million in the number of carriers arriving at our ports of entry from foreign countries; in terms of people, it is expected that there will be an increase of more than 7 million passing through our customs facilities in fiscal year 1967 over the number in this current fiscal year.

The Internal Revenue Service expects a net increase of over 300,000 tax returns filed in fiscal year 1967 over the preceding year, bringing the total filings to 104 million and, I might add, increasing the revenue for the Federal Government by some $176 million.

The Post Office Department expects to handle more than 2 billion additional pieces of mail in the coming year than in the preceding year, making a total mail volume of more than 74 billion pieces. With the percentage increase for the current fiscal year running 5.4 percent above last year's, almost 2½ percentage points above the expected volume increase.

While it is certainly true that the workload of these Departments is largely the result of factors beyond their control, I remind you that the ability of these Departments to look ahead and develop the capabilities to work with ever-increasing workloads is absolutely within their control, given the cooperation of this subcommittee and the Congress as a whole. And, I do not recall an instance in recent years where reasonable requests for our cooperation have been denied. We have not cut them short, but have, in many instances, taken the initiative to activate their interests and direct their resources in the directions of modernization, mechanization, the implementation of systems of automatic data processing and in maintaining a constant alertness to efficiency and productivity increases.

You need look no further for evidence of this cooperation and the results which it makes possible than in this appropriation bill and the record your subcommittee has compiled during hearings on it. I direct your attention to the capability of some—though all too few—of the bureaus of these departments to meet these increasing workloads headon, with no increase in employment, but with actual decreases. There are instances, too, of absorption of large portions of the costs of the mandatory new expenses and decreases in overall budget requests.

My hat is off to these bureaus and the capable, dedicated Government employees responsible for their administration—to Commissioner Sokol and his staff at the Bureau of Accounts, with a decrease in employees of 700 since fiscal year 1961 out of a total work force in that year of 2,127; to Commissioner Merritt and the people at the Bureau of the Public Debt, where the employment roll has been reduced by 261 positions over the past 7 fiscal years; and to U.S. Treasurer Kathryn O'Hay Granahan, who, with the cooperation of her employees in the Office of the Treasurer, is doing an excellent job today with 31 fewer employees than in fiscal year 1961.

The tasks of these offices are no less demanding today than they were 7 years ago. The upward spiralling economy and growing population faces each one of these Administrators. How have they been able to achieve these results? Every one of the offices downtown would do well to seek the answer to that question, to tear a page from their recordbooks and put it to work in their own shops.

One of the most discouraging things for a member of this committee is to have agencies come to us, year after year, piling on employment, some of them by the thousands, and at the same time asking for more money for mechanization, modernization, and automation. I am losing my patience when, year after year, I must ask what affect have the sums already appropriated for these purposes had on the operations of their offices.

They always respond that if it were not for these updating programs they would have to ask for a lot more. I say if they will effectively pursue these programs with the idea that they are "instead of" rather than "in addition to" increasing personnel and administrative expenses, they will soon be able to ask for a lot less.

For the coming fiscal year, there were 24,105 additional positions proposed for the agencies funded by this bill. The breakdown on the increases called for 18,103 new employees in the Post Office Department, 5,944 for the Treasury Department, and 58 in the remaining bureaus. The subcommittee has recommended a cutback in these new positions to 19,838, with the continued necessity of increasing the salaries of these employees, bringing their compensation closer to the standards prevailing in the private sector, these additions will be a factor in future appropriations for these agencies increasing their annual costs of operations.

The subcommittee has made an attempt to awaken the awareness of these agencies to the realization of the potential of modernization and mechanization of their operations by the cutback we have made in the request for additional positions in the compliance activities of the Internal Revenue Service.

As the Service comes closer to the completion of its fully automated master file system, we have already begun to see the stimulating effect it will have on taxpayer compliance. The justification material submitted by the Service to the subcommittee indicated that taxpayer voluntary reporting of interest and dividend income increased $2.9 billion for calendar year 1963 over calendar year 1962, evidence to the fact that the master file ADP system is stimulating improved compliance in the reporting of this kind of income.

The system has also demonstrated its ability to detect individuals who failed to file income tax returns, to offset refunds claimed against delinquent payments due, and to prevent payment of duplicate refund claims. They conclude that, "even though only partly installed, the master file ADP system is already producing sizable increases in revenue and improvements in operational economy."

On the basis of this record, the subcommittee has reduced the request for an additional 1,202 positions for the compliance section of the Service by 600 positions. But, this should not have been necessary. The Service should never have asked for this number of positions for an activity that is finally beginning to feel the impact of the ADP master file system. The position of the subcommittee has been made clear and has been on the record for years. Following the lead which we have set for them, the Service should have studied this request much more closely and made the decision to cut back that had to be made by the subcommittee. And every agency coming before our subcommittee should remember to do just that in the future.

For much too long we have been like a dog chasing its tail, in responding to the ever-increasing workloads of every Federal agency. We must demand substantial improvement in this area. This committee needs your complete support in its efforts to put a stop to this Topsy-like growth of the Federal bureaucracy and the budget required to support it. Great strides are being taken daily in the fields of mechanization and data processing. The record of this subcommittee is clear. We always have and will continue to look favorably on the adaptation of existing programs to modern techniques. It is time for these departments to get in step with the progress that is being made and capitalize on its advantages, its increased efficiency and its savings to the taxpayers

ESTIMATING FUTURE WORKLOADS

While the studied consideration of the impact of increasing workload cannot always justify additional personnel and expanded budgets, the projections of what will be the increase in workload must be as accurate as possible, and the ability of the agency to meet the demand of that workload realistically appraised.

We have seen instances of miscalculations, in both instances, in the projections and forecasts for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, as you and my colleagues know, I have stongly supported efforts by the Bureau of the Mint to meet the unprecedented demands which have been made in recent years for coins. We are finally making inroads into these demands and are putting substantial quantities of coins of the new metal alloys into circulation monthly. This committee would take no action which would thwart the commendable efforts of our Director of the Mint, Miss Adams, in bringing this supply and demand for coins firmly under control. Therefore, I think it would be well to elaborate on the $5 million reduction in the Bureau's budget, attributed to slippages in coinage production in the report before you.

The estimated coin production of the mint for the current fiscal year is approximately 11 billion pieces. The budget request brought before the committee called for an increase in coin production of some 4 billion pieces at a cost of $8,332,000. There is no argument opposing the need for any particular number of coins to be minted, for we must not only meet the current demand and whatever increase in demand that may come in the months ahead, but, hopefully, begin to replenish our depleted inventories of every denomination of coin. However, the capability of the mint to meet the increased workload it had projected for itself is not borne out by present production figures.

Presently, each of our mint facilities is employed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, yielding a current monthly coin production of 700 million pieces. Taking the production figures for the first 8 months of the current fiscal year and projected at the current production rate, the mint will have produced some 8,269 million pieces during the 12-month period, or almost 3 billion pieces short of the estimated production for the current fiscal year. Therefore, the estimated additional 4 billion pieces to be minted in the coming fiscal year, will more than double the production lag behind estimated production we are now experiencing.

It may be argued that there will be some improvement in facilities and in obtaining the strip material from which the new coins are minted from our private sources. However, in order to produce the estimated 15 billion pieces in fiscal 1967, the current monthly production would have to be increased by 79 percent. The untapped capabilities are just not there nor is the need for an additional $8 million justified, when there is not an hour in the day nor a day in the week when we are presently not minting coins. The increase which will follow the completion of installation of new equipment, not all of which will even have been delivered by the start of the coming fiscal year, cannot reasonably be expected to add to the current annual production, the capacity of an entire additional mint facility which would be required to meet the estimated production.

The increase in workload being experienced by the Post Office, as compared with that which they had projected for the current fiscal year, is at the other extreme. The present percentage increase in mail volume is running at 5.4 percent, threatening to double the estimated mail volume increase of 3 percent. The Post Office Department has experienced difficulties in these projections for a number of fiscal years, but in future years accuracy should be sharpened by utilization of data processing equipment heretofore unavailable.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

This year marks the first appearance of Postmaster General O'Brien before our subcommittee. He has brought to his new job the determination and dedication which have been the hallmarks of his impressive record of service to the Federal Government. The vigorous approach to the many challenges confronting him, which he has already taken, give every indication that the Post Office Department has the potential to meet the demands made upon it by the public.

One of the first tasks undertaken by General O'Brien was a massive program to accelerate mechanization and modernization of the Nation's postal system. We had been moving cautiously in this area in the past, but, to meet the demands for continuing improval of the postal service, it is imperative that new emphasis be placed on developing and installing the most modern mail handling equipment available.

I regret the action taken by the subcommittee cutting back funds for research, development and engineering by more than $4 million, for it is from this program that the genesis of these improvements must come. This action will certainly take away the momentum of this program once again. The needs which must be met through the Office of Research and Engineering will not be met by funds in an amount equal to that appropriated for the last 4 years, if that office is to make headway in meeting the present and future needs.

The Post Office Department is the second largest civilian employer in the United States and is the recipient of the bulk of the funds appropriated under this bill. Therefore, the affect of adding more and more employees and more and more costs for the operation of this department has the most direct influence on this legislation. And, we can expect little else in future appropriations requests if the funds are not provided to find the means to stem these rising cost items.

It is enlightening to look at the percentage of the total budget of this department that has been devoted to research and engineering. We are operating this department of the Federal Government at an annual cost of $5 billion. Yet, it is estimated that only between two-tenths and three-tenths of 1 percent of that budget is devoted to research. This account falls far short of meeting the need, as shown by a comparison with the 12 percent of all Federal funds going to research in other areas, or with the 3 to 6 percent of the budget of the communications industry of this country devoted to research.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The apropriations for the Coast Guard have increased from a figure of $281 million in fiscal year 1961 to more than $493 million, requested for the coming fiscal year. The cost of operating expenses, taken alone, has been estimated to be more in the coming fiscal year than the entire budget for the Coast Guard in fiscal 1961 and the overall budget request is less than $70 million short of doubling within the past 6 years.

The subcommittee has worked closely with the Coast Guard in an attempt to keep their facilities up to date and their capability to meet increasing demands in top order within the framework of a minimum reasonable budget. The history of the appropriations for this account, however, shows that the careful efforts of the committee have not been entirely successful. Since fiscal year 1961, almost 50 percent of the cuts made in the budget requests by this body have been restored following action in the other body. As a result, the acquisition, construction, and improvement fund, has had unobligated balances for the past 2 years of $19 and $21 million.

Therefore, it is important this year, when there is an increased authorization for this fund, to look closely at the action the subcommittee has taken and to follow subsequent action. Admiral Roland, Commandant of the Coast Guard, and Secretary Fowler have supported the reduced funds in this account. The reduction is a reflection of their determination to carry out replacement programs with orderly, well-considered projects, recognizing that vessel plans approved in the past must yield to changes, both in technology and national goals. The changes that may be effected by this 1-year breather in the vessel replacement program have the potential of saving considerable sums of money in subsequent years, and should not be sacrificed in a gesture of overgenerosity.

At the present time, we are faced with a hodgepodge of groups working in the area of oceanography, including the Coast Guard. Each group goes its own way. There appears to be an almost total lack of coordination between these Government agencies. We cannot permit this situation to continue.

Testimony received by the subcommittee indicated that 225 ship-years of work are needed in order to provide the kind of information this country would like to obtain in the area of marine sciences. At the present time Russia is devoting 230 ship-years to marine sciences, while the United States is devoting only 90 ship-years to this same area.

We have a large budding giant before us. We cannot simply increase our efforts in this area, so long as we dilute the results by useless duplication of those efforts. As this country entered the space era, we did not permit each agency to fund a major space program within its own jurisdiction. We cannot allow such a situation to continue in the area of oceanography.

We need coordination for an overall national effort in order to maximize our scientific gains from the sea and at the same time to minimize our costs.

The committee approved $12,600,000 for the transfer of five icebreakers to the Coast Guard from the Department of the Navy. This will place all U.S. icebreakers under the control of the Coast Guard, certainly a step toward more efficient management. However, when the Department of the Navy comes before the Congress for its annual appropriations, I am going to be looking for a commensurate $12,600,000 reduction in their budget request for this coming fiscal year.

SALUTE TO SECRET SERVICE AND NARCOTICS BUREAU

I have been particularly impressed by the high caliber service to the public and the protection of the public interests shown by two bureaus within this budget.

The first is the Secret Service. We are all aware of the intensified efforts for the development and modernization of the Service in the past couple of years. It is commendable that the Service has not taken unfair advantage of the position in which they found themselves. Demands for bringing the protective capabilities of the Service to immediate peak form, with virtually a blank check insured, did not tempt them to cease in their efforts to hold expenditures to the lowest possible level consistent with essential objectives.

The Service has embarked on an exciting new program utilizing automatic data processing for protective intelligence purposes. Special assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, David Acheson, reported to the subcommittee that progress in this area has been very rapid. They now have solid intelligence data on the system and will be able to use the system to carry the bulk of their immediate protective intelligence collation work in the very near future. At the same time, they are studying the application of this system to other Service responsibilities and term the potential to be unlimited.

Mention should also be made of the excellence of the overseas operation of the Service. In recent months, I met with John Hanly, an agent in this operation. I found my own extremely favorable impression of his performance echoed in discussions with officials in the protective and enforcement agencies of the foreign governments, with whom he has worked. Their respect for him and the close cooperation between these offices, made possible by his expertise in his profession, were an impressive tribute to John Hanly personally, to his counterparts around the world, and to the standard of excellence in performance of the entire U.S. Secret Service.

The Bureau of Narcotics brought to the subcommittee once again an impressive record of accomplishments for the past year. Here, in particular, the importance of the foreign operations of the Bureau contribute significantly to its overall effectiveness, for in these foreign posts the surveillance and detection work is begun to trace the sources of the drugs coming into the United States which plague, damage, and destroy the lives of almost 60,000 reported addicts and untold numbers of others.

I am sure many of you will remember reading of one of the most important cases developed by the Bureau of Narcotics last year, in which 95 kilograms of heroin were seized in Columbus, Ga., and a chief warrant officer of the U.S. Army was arrested on December 20. The cooperation of our narcotic agents in France with the French Sûreté was responsible for the development of essential information in France leading to the surveillance and eventual apprehension of these suspects in the United States. That 95 kilograms of heroin, had it reached the addicts' market in New York City, could have been sold for more than $2 million with profits added to that amount by the time it reached the hands of the addict.

The record of the agents in the foreign operations of the Bureau of Narcotics is even more impressive when you realize that we have, at this time, only 19 agents and a support staff of 6 involved in these operations. This small task force rounded up approximately 180 defendants as a result of their operations during the past year.

The importance of this phase of the Bureau's activities is ample justification for the request that five additional agents be assigned to the foreign operations. In many cases, the agents we have in the foreign countries work singlehanded in very dangerous operations. The five agents who will be sent overseas will not be fresh recruits, but experienced agents, whose vacancies in the domestic operations will be filled by recruiting replacement agents.

I do not believe there can be any doubt of the need to maintain and buttress the strength and capabilities of this foreign operation. If we are to cut off the supply of drugs to the profiteers in this country, living off the weaknesses of those addicted to narcotics, we must hit that supply at its source. I have spent time with these people working in our foreign offices—men like Mike Picini, who heads up the Bureau's European and Middle Eastern office. They are out there, undermanned and working against difficult odds in operations of detection and surveillance of the individuals shuttling these drugs toward the United States. They have performed magnificently and I join in the full support of the subcommittee in giving them the assistance we can through these five agents and the funds for their replacements here.

DRUG USE ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Of direct and immediate concern to each of us, as parents and representatives of college students across the country, is the report that the Bureau has encountered drug problems on virtually every major university campus in the United States. We were told by Commissioner Giordano that this problem is "quite disturbing because we find in some cases some of the educators themselves are not frowning upon the use of marihuana and some of the other dangerous drugs, indicating that a person should have the privilege of self-expression and should be able to experiment on himself."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to include excerpts from a recent article in the Washington Post regarding our college students "kicking high" on marihuana and LSD. We have ignored this growing problem too long and it has refused to just go away. We must meet it directly now.

I also ask unanimous consent to include a portion of one of the series of nine essays presented in the Time-Life books special report entitled "The Drug Takers." Writer Tom Alexander has treated the subject of "Drugs and the Law" in a matter-of-fact fashion, providing the reader with an excellent review of the development of the law and the prospects for new laws, not merely to punish, but, more importantly, to treat the addict.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to stress the importance of this particular appropriation bill and the impact the agencies included within its provisions have on the lives of each of us and the orderly operation of the Federal Government. This bill includes the revenue producer for the Federal Government and the private individual's major media of communication. This bill keeps the coins jingling in our pockets and pays the light bill at the White House. There will always be disagreement in some quarters during the debate on any appropriation measure. For some of you we have cut these requests too sparingly and for others too drastically. I only hope that our debate today will be in the spirit of gentlemen's disagreements—where one can disagree without becoming disagreeable.

Drugs and the Law: Stiff Penalties and Strict Enforcement Have Dented the Heroin Problem, but the Pill Epidemic Spreads and the Addict Is Still the Loser

(By Tom Alexander)

In the world of the drug taker, "panic" means a shortage of heroin, its onset need not be sudden, but the fear it triggers can certainly be overpowering.

Where the heroin-addict population congregates in the large cities of the United States, the middle months of 1965 were a time of panic. In New York it was a time of suffering that lasted more than nine times as long as any heroin panic in memory. (Most last about 10 days.)

Panic—and their results—are nothing new. First, as the supply dwindles, the price of heroin soars. Last summer in New York $5 bags were going for $18. The available supply is stretched so thin that a shot seldom provides enough heroin to get high. Sick junkies sniff airplane glue, which contains intoxicating vapors, swtich to barbiturates or simply kick in the street. Drugstore robberies, muggings, and other violent crimes have been known to rise.

Desperate junkies may turn on each other. During a 1961 panic, one addict recalls, "I saw a guy get caught dealing dummies (fake heroin) in a vestibule. This other cat took a taste from the bag, and he began yelling, 'You sold me a dummy.' He took out a gun, the rest of us hit the wall like postage stamps, and he blew the dealer away."

A panic may also have some good effects, although few junkies would agree. The protracted nature of the recent shortage in New York is credited by some police and health authorities with having helped many addicts withdraw gradually from their physical dependence on heroin. Officials noted that narcotics-hospital beds, usually filled in panic times, were strangely empty. For the first time in its 3-year history, the West Side Rehabilitation Center, which treats addicts, had no waiting list for admission. New York police claim the crime rate was actually reduced by the 1965 panic. The available heroin has been so adulterated for so long, they claim, that addicts no longer have enough of a physical habit to become desperate when they are deprived. Therefore, the police reason, junkies will not use violence to obtain the "garbage" trickling through in panic times.

Whatever its relation to the well-being of addicts, a panic is a source of satisfaction to those charged with enforcing the laws against the use and sale of narcotics. The 1965 panic started with massive seizures of heroin late last year in New York and elsewhere. A 62-kilo shipment seized in Montreal in April by Canadian police cooperating with the U.S. Federal Narcotics Bureau would have supplied every addict in the United States for 3 weeks. Its loss was a major blow both to sellers and to the intended consumers, who would have paid up to $20 million for it on the street—and now could not buy it for three times that amount. It simply wasn't there.

By the sheer fact of its length, the 1965 panic was evidence, in the minds of local, State, and Federal law-enforcement agents, that their efforts were paying off. In a way, this made sense; for the history of antinarcotic laws and enforcement is one of steadily escalating effort, backed by increasingly strict and comprehensive laws.

In the late 19th century, the sale and distribution of opiates was scarcely restricted at all. Mild tax measures already on the books in the early 1900's were intended to raise revenue as much as to restrict the drug traffic. Opium could be purchased across the counter, without prescription, in most drugstores. Patent medicines (Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup, Dr. Cole's Catarrh Cure) were often mixtures containing some form of opium. The use of opiates was so widespread that in 1914—according to estimates made by the Federal Narcotics Bureau—1 in every 400 persons in the United States was an opium addict. Most of the addicts were women, although heroin use among teenagers began to increase greatly during the early 1900's, especially in the big cities.

By 1906, the Pure Food and Drug Act had eliminated patent medicines as a source of narcotics, and a law was passed in 1909 restricting opium imports. But the regulatory landmark came in 1914 with the passage of the Harrison Act. Although it was the first U.S. law to deal seriously with the problem of drug abuse, the act, as originally passed, mentioned neither addicts nor addiction. It required registration of persons manufacturing, distributing, and selling opiates, and it exempted doctors who gave opiates to patients "in the course of * * * professional practice only." It did require physicians to make records of such treatment, and levied on all handlers of drugs a nominal tax (1 percent per ounce) to make sure that they, too, kept proper records. Penalties for violation were also nominal: failure to register, keep records or pay the tax carried a maximum sentence of 5 years at the discretion of the judge.

In the 1920's and 1930's, successive Treasury Department regulations made under the act—supported by Supreme Court decisions—had the effect of denying the addict access to all legal drugs, except under strict hospital or laboratory conditions. An important side effect was to drive the traffic in narcotics into the underworld, where it remains. The Treasury regulations themselves were written from an increasingly harsh and moralistic standpoint: "The whole theory implicit in them," according to one narcotics law expert, "was that addiction is not a disease * * * but a willful indulgence meriting punishment rather than medical treatment."

With the alarming rise of the addict population after World War II (when it almost vanished under the pressure of war), narcotics became the subject of more and more public discussion. The public response to the emergence of what appeared to be a horrible "new" drug problem was the passage of the Boggs-Daniel Narcotics-Control Act in 1956.

One of the stiffest and most inflexible sets of laws ever put on the Federal books, the Boggs-Daniel Act represents the high-water mark of punitive legislation against the use, sale, and handling of drugs. It imposed severe mandatory sentences for sale or possession of narcotics—permitting in most cases neither probation nor parole. (Possession of any narcotic drugs is illegal under Federal law without one of several licenses restricted to doctors and hospitals, legal importers, manufacturers, distributors, and druggists.) A first offense of sale—of narcotic or marihuana—carried a 5- to 20-year sentence, the second offense, 10 to 40 years. Sale to a minor was punishable by from 10 years to death. The first possession offense carried 2 to 10 years, the second 5 to 20 years, and the third 10 to 40 years. The only instance where suspension of sentence or parole was possible was the first possession offense.

The States have imitated the Federal Government. In 1932, a national conference of State delegates hammered out a uniform narcotics code that clarified and reconciled various State laws. Today every State except California and Pennsylvania has adopted parts of the uniform code, and most State narcotics laws are similar. In some States, the laws are even stricter than the Federal statutes. In the District of Columbia, Michigan, California, and Illinois, it was until 1962, a crime merely to be an addict—the evidence for the crime often being the sickness of withdrawal.

Three years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down a decision that invalidated such laws. The addict, said the Court, is a sick person, and imprisonment for the crime of being ill is a "cruel and unusual punishment" in violation of the 8th and 14th amendments to the U.S. Constitution. The uniform code leaves sentencing up to the individual States. In some States, such as New York, sentencing is fairly lenient. Mere possession (25 or more marihuana cigarettes, one-eighth ounce or more of 1 percent pure heroin) carries a sentence of only 3 to 10 years. Many others (e.g., Indiana, Ohio, California, and Illinois) have stiff ranges of sentences and fines comparable to the mandatory provisions of Federal law. And three States—California, Pennsylvania, and Illinois—have restrictions on suspended sentences and paroles. In California, probation and suspensions of sentence are prohibited after the first offense of sale, possession, inducing a minor to break the narcotics laws, or forging a prescription.

In the 11th week of the 1965 New York heroin panic, City Council President Paul Screvane announced, with cautious satisfaction, "Narcotics officials have reported to me that pushers and addicts are experiencing severe difficulty in obtaining heroin."

But even as he spoke, the drug was coming back to the Bronx and Harlem. It was expensive, but it was there. "Now, all of a sudden," said one addict, "the heavens have opened up, and as long as you have the money, you can get all you want." The panic, like all previous panics, showed tentative signs of being over.

Backed by the awesomely severe laws, why can't enforcement agencies keep such a panic going—and make acute shortage the rule rather than the exception? The answer is that it takes more than arrests and seizures.

Local narcotics squads are often undermanned, ill-financed, and badly paid. (Although the vast majority of Federal and local officers are incorruptible, the danger of corruption rises with the price of heroin. Last April, Miami FNB Chief Eugene Marshall shocked his colleagues when he was arrested for accepting a bribe from a narcotics peddler.)

Working with what manpower and funds they can command, narcotics officers face two major hurdles. The first is sociological. Unlike burglary or rape, which usually come to the attention of the police because somebody complains, narcotics violations bring few direct complaints. Addicts and pushers either depend on heroin itself or make a huge profit out of selling it. There is no reason to expect a complaint from their quarter. In the case of other crimes, complaints come from solid citizens: their cars have been stolen, their houses burglarized, or their wives mugged. In the world of illegal drugs, there are few such solid citizens. Informers, usually junkies themselves, are an inadequate substitute.

The second hurdle is far more prickly. Suspects in Federal narcotic cases have long been protected by the constitutional guarantees in the Bill of Rights. In several recent and far-reaching decisions, the U.S. Supreme Court has extended these guarantees to defendants in local and State courts, who were formerly unprotected by the Bill of Rights.

Almost all law enforcement officers feel frustrated by these decisions, which seem to them to be coddling criminals and handcuffing the police. It is not hard to see why the officers feel that way.

In *Mapp* v. *Ohio* (1961), the high court ruled that evidence obtained in violation of the fourth amendment (covering unreasonable search and seizure) could not be used in State courts. For a narcotics detective, this means getting a warrant from a judge—and a possible delay that may allow a suspect to slip away before the warrant can be executed. The decision can have other effects:

In New York a detective sees a suspected heroin wholesaler, attaché case in hand, meet another man, known to be a pusher. The two enter a parked car and the detective sees the pusher hand the other man a fat manila envelope. The detective pulls open the car door, snatches the attaché case, opens it and finds a kilogram (2.2 pounds) of nearly pure heroin—worth about $410,000 on the street.

Opening the envelope as well, the detective finds it stuffed with cash. He arrests both men. Later, in court, both are freed. Basing his opinion on *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, the judge rules that the detective's knowledge of the background of the suspects and their method of operation did not justify his opening the attaché case.

Such an instance is the rule rather than the exception.

Even if the evidence in a narcotics case is carefully and legally gathered and faultlessly presented, it may seem to the police that the punishment meted out to the narcotics offender is insufficient to do what punishment is supposed to do—deter him and others from breaking the law. In big cities the courts may be so jammed with unsettled cases that judges and prosecutors often agree to reduce felony charges simply to clear the docket and avoid drawnout jury trials. Pushers may end up agreeing to plead guilty to minor charges like mere possession, thereby drawing a 6-month term instead of a 15 year maximum sentence for selling.

"Trying to solve the narcotics problem by arresting pushers and addicts," according to a Chicago police lieutenant, "is like trying to cut down a tree by tearing off the leaves." What would make the tree fall down? Seizing large amounts of heroin is an effective way of making it bend. But few lawmen would disagree that the best way of making the problem disappear would be the arrest, conviction, and incarceration—with the help of such weapons as wiretapping—of the top Mafia men in the United States who control 80 percent of the traffic. These are the affluent "businessmen of crime," whose interests include loan sharking, gambling, and prostitution as well as the importation and sale of narcotic drugs.

"The typical big guy lives on Long Island and has a private yacht. The problem is to get near him," says Robert M. Morgenthau, U.S. attorney for New York's southern district, whose office has prosecuted more big-time narcotics hoodlums than any other. Armed with the Boggs-Daniels Act, along with other laws, U.S. attorneys—principally those in Morgenthau's district of New York—have managed to jail over 150 Mafia hoodlums in the last 10 years, including many of the middle and top echelon members of the five New York Mafia "families." Many of them are serving long sentences—up to 40 years—without prospects for parole or pardon.

Some of the best-known figures in organized crime have fallen victim to this drive. Vito Genovese, former head of the New York Mafia, was convicted in 1959 of conspiracy to break the narcotics laws. He is in Leavenworth Federal penitentiary for 15 years. John Ormento, a ranking Mafia lieutenant, was sent to Lewisburg Federal penitentiary in 1963 for 40 years on similar charges. He has since been transferred to Leavenworth, a maximum-security prison. Joseph Valachi, whose sensational testimony before the McClellan committee in 1963 revealed the inner workings of the Mafia, is still being held in protective custody by Federal authorities.

Unfortunately, the list of really big names taken out of circulation is not long. The tree—minus a few twigs—still stands.

So do legal barriers against wiretapping. President Johnson, in fact, recently issued a personal order reminding all Federal employees that wiretapping is forbidden except in cases involving national security. Even in those cases, any wiretap must be approved by the U.S. Attorney General.

During the heroin panic of 1965, a New York Post reporter described a man and a woman on a West Side street corner: "Both of them buried their faces in paper bags, breathing in loud, deep sighs.

"Then the man began to fall, almost in sections, his arms and knees and back hitting the pavement. The woman sobbed once, 'Hey, get up. Get up," and she, too, collapsed. Now they were both stretched on the ground, still clutching the torn bags filled with airplane glue, still inhaling the vapor."

It would be wrong to say that most law-enforcement officers regard such a scene as edifying. On the other hand, narcotics agents and detectives—by the nature of their jobs—tend to regard anyone connected with drugs as the "bad guys." In that context, "bad guys" get—or ought to get—what they deserve, whether it is a spell of heroin sickness during a panic or a stiff jail sentence. "As a Christian and a human being," says one Federal Narcotics Bureau agent, "I feel sympathy for junkies. In my job, I just don't."

Still, enforcement officers and judges have come to realize that it doesn't do much good simply to throw an addict in jail. He will withdraw "cold turkey" while in, but once out he soon will return to drugs. Says John M. Murtagh, administrative judge of the criminal court of New York City: "As many as fourscore addicts confront a judge of the criminal court of New York City on a single day. In his heart, the judge knows that there is little hope for any of them. Yet he must go through the motions of supporting an enforcement program which, he is convinced, is creating more problems than it solves."

This realization reflects an important trend, a long and healthy step forward from the Treasury Department's old "willful indulgence" approach to the drug problem. The new trend gathered headway in the early 1960's. The Supreme Court, in its decision striking down legal provisions that make it a crime merely to be an addict, ruled that addiction is an illness and should be treated as such. A White House Conference on Narcotics in the same year (the first of its kind) declared that drug abuse "can be regarded as a disease."

California pioneered in translating the new attitude into law. A statute passed by the California Asembly in 1961 made the first legislative distinction between the addict and the seller—the victim and the profiteer. The law set up rehabilitation centers where addicts can commit themselves, be committed by their families, or—if arrested—be sent against their will by a judge. If an addict has been convicted of a crime under the narcotics law, he can serve his time under psychiatric and medical treatment at a center, with outpatient status a possibility within about 14 months. After 3 years off drugs, an addict can be discharged by a court. This kind of aftercare, the lawmakers realized, is crucial in controlling the volume of "recidivism," the return of an addict to his drugs—and the crimes he commits to obtain them.

Few of the patients at the rehabilitation center have been voluntary, but the compulsory features of California's "civil commitment" law have made it possible for the State to control its addict population—in cases where they have been arrested—more effectively and more humanely than ever before. At the same time, California passed stiff laws aimed at making sure that the major nonaddicted, nonusing wholesalers, the heroin profiteers, "shall receive punishment commensurate with the damage they cause." On a second or third offense, a drug seller can be sent to prison for life.

The only other major program of "civil commitment" on State lawbooks is New York's Metcalfe-Volker Act, passed in 1963. Under its provisions, an addict arrested for a felony may volunteer for a 36-month commitment to a hospital before trial. He can thus avoid a prison sentence and criminal record. After 90 days in one of the State's six special hospitals, he is eligible to leave the hospital. Then, for the remainder of the 3 years, he must report regularly for continued aftercare. The program is voluntary—and the addict has a choice between the commitment program and the comparatively light terms in New York—as little as 6 months for a second offense on possession charges. Under the circumstances, it is no wonder that less than one addict in four volunteers for commitment. The majority of addicts have no deep-seated desire to be rid of their heroin habits. Given the choice of a possible 6-month jail term or the 3-year annoyance of the commitment, many will pick the jail term. In any case, civil commitment is viewed by the addicts themselves as just another form of jail sentence. One prosecutor—asked the difference between conditions in a narcotics hospital and a jail—thought for a few moments before commenting wryly, "Well, the hospital beds are softer."

The cure record of New York's Metcalfe-Volker program has not been impressive. A significant percentage of those committed leave the hospitals before their time is up. Approximately 90 percent of those released from the hospital after their "cure" go back on drugs when they return to their old associates in their old environment, amid their old frustrations.

As civil commitment struggles out of its legislative infancy, five new bills have been introduced in the U.S. Congress—one by the Johnson administration and four by New York Senators JACOB JAVITS and ROBERT F. KENNEDY, whose State has the greatest problem.

These proposals would make it possible for certain addicts (including some nonprofiteering pushers) to commit themselves to a hospital before trial. The bills also would repeal some of the mandatory no-parole provisions of present Federal law. New York Representative EMANUEL CELLER wants to add a provision including addicts previously convicted of two felonies.

We could see it coming, but we never thought it would last this long. Our arrests dropped off to almost nothing. Our contacts told us nothing was on the streets. And the pills were going good. A lot of pills were being sold.

These mildly self-congratulatory remarks were made by Inspector Ira Bluth of the New York City Narcotics Bureau on July 1, 1965. As the inspector indicated, a rise in the sale of "pills"—barbiturates and amphetamines—is an excellent index of the severity of a panic—and the effectiveness of law enforcement. But he failed to mention that the sale of pills without a prescription is just as illegal in his own State—and 48 others—as the sale of heroin, or that pills present an even greater problem.

Many leading narcotics-enforcement officers have a bias against stricter laws dealing with barbiturates and amphetamines—fearing, perhaps, that their jobs would only be made difficult by a competitive or overlapping set of laws. As it is, antipill laws are generally at the State of development marked in the narcotics field by the passage of the Harrison Act.

Every State except Montana has some form of law restricting the sale of the nonnarcotic "dangerous drugs." Eight States have a food, drug, and cosmetic law similar to the basic U.S. statute passed in 1938. Nine States enforce laws affecting barbiturates but not amphetamines.

In 1960, a Uniform State Barbiturate Code was drafted, and has been adopted—at least partially—by 11 States. As written in these States, the law requires open recordkeeping and registration. It bans oral prescriptions for barbiturates and—in some cases—amphetamines. Under the Uniform Code, penalties are left up to the States, but some have adopted strict sentencing procedures.

In drafting laws to control the flow of dangerous drugs, the States have made efforts to pattern their legislation after the Federal codes. But again—as with the Harrison Act—the regulatory landmark is a new Federal law, passed last July in the form of a series of amendments to the Food and Drug Act. Known as the Harris-Dodd Act, the new statute has three important sections:

It requires everyone connected with the manufacture, sale, and distribution of "dangerous drugs" to keep records, which are subject to inspection by officers of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Until 1965 no such record had to be kept under Federal law. A manufacturer did not have to account for the name of a purchaser, whether the purchaser was legal or not.

The law forbids the refilling of "dangerous drugs" prescriptions more than five times; no such prescription may be refilled after 6 months. Until 1965, barbiturate and amphetamine prescriptions, once written by a doctor, could be refillled indefinitely, so far as Federal law was concerned.

Rather surprisingly, the law gives agents of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Food and Drug Administration) new and sweeping police powers. For the first time, FDA agents may be armed, may execute search warrants and make arrests. Up to now, the FDA investigation force—which can only devote one-tenth of its manpower to the illegal pill trade—had to call on Federal marshals to do its arresting.

Penalties under the new law, like those of the Harrison Act, are far from severe. Illegal sale of pills to a minor, for instance, carries a maximum sentence of 2 years in prison and a $5,000 fine—paltry by comparison with the heavy penalties in the Boggs-Daniel Act for selling heroin to a minor.

Perhaps, like the narcotics laws, the laws against dangerous drugs will ride a rising curve of harshness as public awareness of the pill problem grows. And the last act may be passage of laws dealing with the problem of addiction to dangerous drugs. Like the Harrison Act, the new Federal law on pills says nothing of addiction or the fate of addicts.

It is the addict—or more accurately, the abuser of drugs—who is the human product of the drug problem. Regardless of how he is looked on by law enforcers—as "willfully indulgent" or merely ill—there is no doubt that the enforcers are doing a reasonably effective job of curtailing the illegal drug traffic in which the abuser is the consumer. And perhaps the 1965 New York panic is a sign of even greater effectiveness to come. But no matter how well law enforcement works in the future, even its guardians realize that laws are only part of the solution of a huge and complex problem.

As New York's U.S. Attorney Morgenthau puts it: "If enforcement continues to be as effective over the next 6 or 7 years as it has been over the past 6 or 7, I can see a substantial lessening in the flow of drugs. But on the enforcement side, we can't abolish the reasons for the traffic's existence. That burden is on the medical or psychological side—or somewhere." For somewhere, read society—which is to say that the burden is on everybody's conscience.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 23, 1966]

A WEED IN THE GROVES OF ACADEME—ELDERS ARE BEGINNING TO FRET ABOUT STUDENTS KICKING HIGH ON MARIHUANA AND LSD

(NOTE.—The following report is based on information that 20 Washington Post-Newsweek student correspondents gathered on 27 college campuses. They spent about 215 hours interviewing nearly 300 persons, including student drug users, school officials and law enforcement officers. Their files totaled thousands of words.)

(By Robert L. Asher)

"Senses are very acute, I get hung up on all kinds of things. Sometimes I even get taste hallucinations. One time I thought water should taste like Coca-Cola and it actually did * * *."

So spoke Dianne, an Ohio State student, bubbling over with the errie details of a jag on "pot"—marihuana—the kick that has crept onto the campuses of more institutions than parents and college deans imagine.

Dianne's story is the kind once pooh-poohed by university officials but now so strangely familiar to so many of them. It is alarming Federal and State officials, who fear that the worst is yet to come.

"Pot" is but the most popular of a string of drugs now slithering through the brains and veins of America's students. Drug taking on campus has swelled to a point where Federal Narcotics Bureau officials have at least 50 campuses under surveillance and where State officials are groping for ways to attack the wave.

Every check of campuses made for this survey turned up students who had used marihuana; some just once on a lark, others regularly on a toot. And it turned up students who are bored with pot and look to LSD and other headspinners for flights into fantasy.

* * * * *

Those using drugs at Ohio State claim that there are some 300 persons in or around the university community who are taking some kind of "stuff," not counting students gobbling so-called "pep pills" or "goofballs" for all-night exam-crams.

Though they admit that an emotional dependency can develop from marihuana, LSD and amphetamines, they stress their belief that these drugs are not physically addictive.

Dr. Robert Gardier, a research professor in pharmacology at Ohio State, says this is true of those drugs, but if an individual starts taking them, "there is a good likelihood that he may become habituated to the particular response and find it so pleasurable, unique or peculiar that he wants to do it again."

"Apparently there are no withdrawal symptoms from LSD, marihuana and the amphetamines as there are with narcotics," Gardier notes. "Therefore we can't really call them addictive drugs."

Dr. Anthony F. Philip, who runs the counseling service at Columbia College, comments that "there's nothing potentially dangerous in essentially healthy students trying marihuana. But for some students, it can be quite dangerous. For one who lacks any strong commitment to some set goals, who feels lost in a very profound way, it can be bad."

But medical experts are quick to stress a difference between heavy use of marihuana and unsupervised amateur use of LSD. Though marihuana's effects are similar to those of alcohol, they say, LSD can cause permanent brain damage or serious psychological aftereffects.

John T. Bonner, Jr., executive dean for student relations at Ohio State, finds the reports of drug users a gross exaggeration.

In the 5 years he's been dean, Bonner says, there have been five reported cases of student drug use. "I don't think that 5 out of a student body of 40,000 in 5 years can really be called a problem," he said.

But only last week, a county grand jury began investigating drug traffic in the Ohio State area after police arrested 19 persons, United Press International reported. At least nine of those arrested were students or former students at Ohio State and Kent State Universities, the Associated Press reported. Police said they believed there had been big shipments of marihuana into the area from Mexico, the AP said.

But there is nothing exclusive about the Ohio State area. There have been reports recently of the arrest of more than 30 students of a dozen colleges, the AP said. These included eight students at the University of Oklahoma, six at the University of Michigan, one at Syracuse University, two at the University of Massachusetts, and one at the University of Miami.

Last month, two students from Western State College in Colorado were arrested within a block of the University of Colorado campus for investigation of possession of marihuana.

That same week, five persons—including two university students—were arrested near the campus on charges of illegal sale and possession of LSD and marihuana. Four were released later because of insufficient evidence, but the fifth, a student from the University of Washington, was held.

The Associated Press also reported that a dozen nonstudents were arrested in a narcotics raid near the University of Washington, in Seattle, and a reporter for the Seattle Times said 500 to 1,000 persons in the university area, including school dropouts, were using marihuana.

THE LEGAL POSITION

Laws covering the sale, possession, and importation of marihuana are on the Federal books, but LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs don't as yet come specifically under tight Federal control and State and local statutes are not consistently adequate.

Only last month, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare announced the appointment of a new advisory committee of medical experts to assist the Food and Drug Administration in determining which drugs should be covered under new controls to go into effect February 1.

* * * * *

EASY TO COME BY

At the University of Wisconsin, some students claim marihuana,, LSD and mescaline are all easy to come by and are used by a small but growing number of the institution's 30,000 campus students.

Dr. Seymour Halleck, director of the university's student psychiatric service, notes that "the use of pot seems to be spreading. It's being used by kids who wouldn't have tried it 3 or 4 years ago. Pot isn't confined to hippies. It seems to move a bit beyond this. Now, you hear about fraternity kids taking it, as well as other so-called 'straight people.' "

Unlike many university administrations, which have tried to sweep any unpleasantness under the rug, Wisconsin's officials have heard enough to be convinced that they must deal with the problem.

Dean of Students Joseph Kauffman sums up the university's attitude this way: "Obviously, we frown on unlawful or idiotic behavior of people who resort to drugs. We can't counsel this * * *. A student is dealt with from a counseling point of view, in terms of his own best interests."

Kauffman makes a basic distinction between those who sell drugs and those who use them. Recruiting and selling, he says, could mean suspension.

College administrators deal with known cases of drug use in a number of ways. Generally, they prefer dealing with users on an individual, medical basis and weigh disciplinary actions against student scholastic or behavioral records.

In cases where student suppliers are nabbed, legal authorities are asked to take action and the schools take their disciplinary steps after the cases are disposed of.

Students caught using drugs must be dealt with by other means, the dean feels, with the focus on "individual behavior and surrounding circumstances, in an attempt at an understanding of the student's situation."

Dr. Halleck, who has had to counsel some students who've had second thoughts or disturbing feelings about their use of LSD, says the problem with users of psychedelic drugs—ones that affect mental processes—is not one of addiction, "except in the sense that they keep trying new ones."

DEATH IN NEW YORK

At Columbia College in New York City, the death of an 18-year-old freshman last February—first termed an apparent suicide and later attributed to an apparent overdose of narcotics—brought the problem into the open.

Following intense coverage by the student newspaper, the Columbia Daily Spectator, police revealed that they had found a large supply of heroin, marihuana, and "goofballs" in the youth's room, as well as leads on several students who had obtained drugs from him.

With estimates that there are considerably more than 20,000 drug users in New York City and perhaps half of them living on Manhattan's West Side—where Columbia is located—college authorities saw the handwriting.

Though the police uncovered no major scandal, Dean David B. Truman said in the investigation's aftermath that he "would not be totally astonished" if the number of students who had experimented with some drug or another was "as high as one-third of the school."

But regular drug users among the college's 2,700 students put the number of real users at 100 to 150, with pot used the most. Marihuana normally sells for about $150 a pound in New York, is then resold at $25 an ounce or in those "nickel" and "dime" bags.

A small number of students who have moved on from pot cigarettes, called "reefers" or "joints," turn to sugar cubes or capsules loaded with LSD, at about $3 a whack for 150 micrograms; $5 for 500 microgram doses.

Perhaps more take up peyote, because it is easier to obtain and considered "less illegal" (New York State considers it illegal, but neighboring New Jersey doesn't). Some students claim that friends in New Jersey get it mailed from Texas.

The tops of the cactus plants, or the "buttons," go for about $5 a hundred, with five or six needed to "get high."

The main complaint about peyote, the students say, is that it's bitter and hard to swallow.

In what seems to be the pattern at most colleges pep pills are used more for academic deadlines than for pleasure, since students don't dig the subsequent letdown.

SOURCE OF SUPPLY

Columbia kick seekers can turn to fellow students for most of their supplies. Someone like Steve, a 19-year-old junior, can take good care of them, with a stock in trade that includes marihuana, pep pills, LSD, and even small amounts of "the Big H"—heroin.

Steve makes a "few thousand dollars a year" off his sales, he says. Unwilling to reveal his source, he says "no one in this business tells you where he gets the stuff, and you don't tell anybody where you get it."

Sometimes you meet someone downtown, he notes, sometimes it's midtown and maybe next time it'll be uptown.

Does the business bother him?

"This is the free enterprise system, you know," he remarks coolly. "As the Romans said, 'Let the buyer beware.' It's the other guy's tough luck if he gets into something he can't handle. It's not my business to cater to other people's petty neuroses."

Much the same attitude prevails among both drug users and those who wouldn't touch the stuff but don't care who else does. One periodic Columbia customer likens the situation to categories used by sociologist C. Wright Mills to describe Marxists.

"Mills wrote that there are three kinds of Marxists," the gaunt junior begins. "It's the same with pot. There are three types of students who use it: the vulgar, the sophisticated, and the plain.

"The vulgar drug users are basically all freshmen who don't really know how to enjoy the experience. The sophisticated ones are the 'potheads,' the ones who turn on all the time, the guys who usually stay in school 1 or 2 years and then drop out.

"The plain student drug users—and here's where most of your guys fit in—use pot just to get high, like drinking. I'm one of those, and I don't think there's anything wrong about it."

BROTHERS IN POT

Like Dianne, the youth fidgets—with burnt matches, with a rub of his hand on his leg or a quick tug of an ear. He tells about the pot parties at his fraternity.

"The brothers use drugs on and off, in cycles," he discloses. "It's an in group type of house, and no one else ever comes in. Anyway, we try to keep the pot above the fifth floor.'

The youth's generalizations about his customers points up what college administrators everywhere are just beginning to find out; that the stereotype of the drug-taker as an unwashed, sloppy, sex-crazed beatnik or as a leftwing agitator is pure fiction.

"People actually involved in leftwing causes or in civil-rights work don't use drugs; they don't have to," maintains Jeff Nichols, a 20-year-old senior who heads Columbia's CORE chapter.

"Drugs are a way of working out a failure to cope with society. Students in the movement are not only coping with social problems; they're leading the fight against these problems."

Nichols agrees with findings at most colleges that those who use drugs are rarely among the campus leadership set.

"You can't send a guy who's high to organize a rent strike," he observes. "The people will be frightened or disgusted by him. And you don't want a lot of potheads in a demonstration. They don't have the energy and they can't maintain the discipline."

The users of stuff, campus leaders inform you, generally hang out on the fringe of action groups, at best just to egg on demonstrators.

A Columbia student who has kicked the practice agrees with this finding, pointing out that college drug users lose sight of reality and "think that getting high is the only important thing in life."

This 24-year-old senior, son of a Columbia professor, was caught peddling pot, peyote and LSD and has weathered a 2-year suspension while undergoing rehabilitation.

"I'd buy large amounts of pot with money I had collected from other students * * * I'd give them the amount they'd paid for and take what was left over as my profit."

The drugs in this case came from the Lower East Side or Greenwich Village. "It was not a real underworld type of thing," the student recalls. "In fact, it was almost casual, I'd call up and arrange to meet someone, or drop by a coffeehouse."

At New York University, unofficial student estimates—nowhere are there very accurate counts—show that about 15 to 20 percent of the Washington Square campus crowd has tried or uses marihuana.

A number of NYU's amateur experts figure that this is a lower incidence than last year, when authorities moved in on a pot party that took place on the ninth floor of the campus undergraduate dormitory. Three student organizers of the bash were expelled from the residence hall and suspended from school for a semester. Since then, many youths report, pot-shots are becoming kind of passé.

The New York City traffic in drugs seems to be the main source for Cornell students, a small group of some 20 or 30 regular users plus 100 to 200 samplers. Most of the stuff gets there by informal student trips rather than through pushers.

THE 1963 SURGE

Cornell, where drug use was exposed early during its surge across the country in 1963, doesn't seem to have as much of a problem as it once did. The 1963 incidents resulted in the suspension in June of eight students in connection with possession of marihuana and still others in an October raid. In the spring of 1965, two more students who were arrested pleaded guilty to lesser offenses and received suspended sentences.

At Harvard, which also made the headlines in 1963, drug use among students has become old hat but is still around. There have been two cases this school year, one an LSD party that erupted into a real hair raiser.

When one junior got a little noisy, his friends whisked him off to an apartment away from "the Yard," but he kept on wailing. Eventually, the youth had to be taken to the Massachusetts Mental Health Center in a straitjacket. When released, he was put on probation (his record was good).

The other case involved four students who were getting marihuana from a friend at another college. There was a similar case in the 1964–65 school year.

THE LSD PROFS

And probably the most publicized incident involving campus drugs occurred at Harvard in 1963, when the administration dismissed Richard Alpert, assistant professor of clinical psychology and education, and Timothy Leary, his associate and lecturer, after the violation of an agreement with the university not to give consciousness-expanding drugs to students.

Since then, Alpert and Leary have been making the rounds of colleges on lecture tours, which many officials charge may be pepping up rather than cutting down the student practice. A lecture by Alpert at Cornell last year drew an audience of about 800. When he concluded, a number of students were heard comparing notes with him on their experiences with LSD.

George Gaffney, district supervisor of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, says curiosity is the underlying factor in triggering student use of drugs. Gaffney is doubtful that all the current lectures and explanations of drugs and their dangers or pleasures do anything more than spur this curiosity.

"These students are not juveniles," he notes. "They know the dangers incredibly well. They think they are sophisticated."

EASY STEP TO H

The greatest danger resulting from the use of marihuana and LSD, Gaffney says, is that "even that first cigarette is like falling off the fence. You've committed an antisocial offense, you've defied the law. And then, if it doesn't bring on the desired effect, it's an easy step when someone says, 'Forget about that stuff—try H if you really want to get high.'"

The Bureau also attributes some of the recent growth of campus drug use to the fact that more students are traveling during the summers to places where the stuff is most available—Mexico and Morocco, for example.

But in some areas of the United States, primarily in the South, drugs have not invaded the colleges to any great degree. At Tulane University in New Orleans, students noted that "even the biggest gossips could not tell one drug from another let alone know what 'pot' meant."

Dr. Paul C. Trickett, head of Tulane's Health Service, says he has never encountered a case of drug use other than the pep pill booms at exam time. Authorities note that one of the main reasons for the lack of drugs there is the stiffness of Louisiana's laws. Penalties for pushing may go as high as 15 years.

And with alcohol readily served up to the college set in New Orleans, students seem to be getting their kicks without going astray of the law. Said one administration official, "What the students lack in drugs, they more than make up for in alcohol."

At strictly women's colleges, where reports turned up little if any real drug activity, most students interviewed expressed only mild curiosity about marihuana.

Says Vassar's dean of residence Elizabeth Drouilhet, "I don't know whether we're exempt or whether we're simply ignorant."

Most college officials would prefer to think that "it can't happen here" or that "we haven't had many serious incidents." But Boston University's dean of students, Staton R. Curtis, realizes the dilemma. "It's there, we have the problem," he said. "We don't have a choice—we have to be aware of it."

The officials at BU see the use of drugs as both a medical and disciplinary problem. A student reported for a violation appears before the university judicial committee, which may decide to issue a medical release. Such a student is eligible to return to the university, but only after extensive treatment and documentation of it.

DRUGS AS A SUBSTITUTE

At California's 6 affiliated Claremont Colleges, with a total of nearly 2,000 students, Psychological Clinic Director Thomas Brigante and his 3 staff aids have talked to some 25 LSD users in the last 2 months.

Brigante notes that many of his cases reveal students with serious personality problems. He also points out that many students "have rejected organized religion, and I think some of them turn to drugs for the things religion might otherwise provide."

At Oregon's Reed College, Dean of Students Jack Dudman disseminates as much information as he can about all drugs while discouraging personal experiments with them. Discipline problems are handled by the community senate, a half-student, half-faculty group that has recently added marihuana to the list of taboos constituting violation of the college's honor principle.

At Amherst College in Massachusetts—where the Saturday night fraternity beer party is losing its attraction while students flood the lecture halls to hear drug experts—officials are acknowledging the need for controlled studies of drug effects in hopes of putting down any dabbling.

Two miles to the north, Dean William Barnard of the University of Massachusetts has started such a program.

Yet even as authorities take action, local feed merchants there report that they are selling unusual amounts of morning-glory seeds, which contain the lysergic acid found in LSD.

At Yale, the administration is reviewing its entire policy toward drugs. At NYU, an expert has been assigned to study the problem and offer recommendations.

And in Pennsylvania, State authorities have sounded the alarm and begun a vast, coordinated investigation of the campus drug problem. Deputy Attorney General Judson E. Ruch is working with the Departments of Health and Public Instruction to dig beneath what Ruch notes is "a dearth of reliable statistics" and come up with a workable preventive education program.

Though the study has just begun, officials estimate that as many as 20 institutions may be involved. Under scrutiny is a plan that might include a special center where all deans, law enforcement officials dealing with drugs and psychiatrists could air their findings in search of new solutions.

* * * * *

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Would the 5-percent cut to which the gentleman has referred have any effect upon the salaries of the postal employees?

Mr. CONTE. Let me put it this way: It would not have any effect on the salaries, because the increase is mandatory. It was passed by the Congress by a vote of 370 to 7. It would have this effect: The mandatory increase passed by this Congress by that vote amounted to $349 million for these agencies. The administration is asking $540 million over last year's budget. If you take $349 million mandatory pay raise from that amount, it leaves you a balance of $191 million increase in this budget over last year.

A 5-percent cut in this budget of $7.2 billion would mean a cut of $360 million. So you would be dipping about $160 million below last year's budget.

Mr. BELL. That would be somewhat contradictory of what we did last year, would it not?

Mr. CONTE. Not only contradictory, but you are going to have to cut something. You will have to cut the deliveries of mails. This is a tight budget. I might say here that we knocked out 6-day delivery of parcel post. That is out of this budget. We have knocked out window service on Saturday. That is out of the budget. So what will you cut out? Deliveries of mail? Shall we deliver the mail two or three times a week instead of on 5 days of the week?

In the Internal Revenue Service will you reduce the number of agents available to collect taxes to try to run the Government? Are you going to cut down on the Customs Service, in which the workload has increased about 5 percent? Are you going to cut down on them and let people come into our ports smuggling narcotics and contrabands? Where will you cut down? Are you going to cut down on the Secret Service, which has the job and the responsibility of protecting the President, also to stop counterfeiting? Are you going to cut down on the narcotic enforcement agencies, which are trying to prevent the peddling of narcotics on our streets in our large cities, such as New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Boston, and all over the United States?

Where are you going to apply this 5 percent, if you go down below what we appropriated last year by some $160 million?

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman. I wish to commend him for his statement and for his answer to the question.

Mr. CONTE. Thank you very much.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a point of information?

Mr. CONTE. I certainly yield to my good friend from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts, in connection with his very deep discussion about the Coast Guard, brought up the question of oceanography and made a very poignant remark that those dealing with the subject at this time should be coordinated, and that there should not be a diffusion of responsibility among the various interdependent agencies on this very vital study. I concur with this much of the statement.

I wonder if the gentleman had any idea in mind from the point of view of those who listened to the various people giving testimony before the Committee on Appropriations, and particularly those from the Department of the Treasury dealing with the Coast Guard; as to where the jurisdiction and surveillance—or the oversight as we use the term—of the legislative branch should be, as far as oceanography is concerned?

Mr. CONTE. Let me put it this way: We brought this matter to the attention of the Director of the Budget when he came before us and told him there was overlapping and duplication here and one agency—we did not specify which—one agency of the Government should have complete jurisdiction over this particular field. Now, I am not an expert in the field. Of course, I am partial to the Coast Guard, handling their budget, but I think the Director of the Budget and the Administration should make up their minds and come out here with some specific program where some agency and that agency alone should have complete jurisdiction.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CONTE. Certainly.

Mr. HALL. Maybe that is where we are coming to the fork in the road, so to speak. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly that there must be no overlap except in the rare instance where there must of necessity be some overlap in research. Such is not considered bad, or a loss. Believe me, there is a lot of research involved in modern day oceanography as far as measurement of depths and promontories by sonic research or radar or Loran localization of these points in concerned. I wonder if the gentleman is aware of the fact that at the present time of all of the interdependent agencies, the budget of the Navy supplies 76 percent of all the funds for oceanography including the Inter-Agency Committee on Oceanography which is chaired by the Assistant Secretary for Research and Development of the Navy?

I rise to this point as a member of the legislative Committee on Armed Services, rather than the operating Committee on Appropriations does, simply to get in the Record the fact that this is of vital interest to the Armed Forces and particularly to the Navy and the Coast Guard, which in time of war becomes a part of the Navy and is doing a magnificent job in southeast Asia at this time as well as at home as always; with further not an admonition but rather a reminder that there is a committee on the reorganization of Congress which is sitting almost full time, and has been for almost 16 months, which is vitally concerned with this particular area, first, reduction in the number of the overall committees of both bodies of Congress and, second, the jurisdiction that will occur there. I hope, knowing that we cannot legislate in an appropriation bill, that we do not give the impression that we have an intent or interest to congeal and consolidate or coalesce these committees with overlapping jurisdiction, to the point where we eliminate research and put responsibility and jurisdiction in one area, service, or committee, other than where it is most needed.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I go along with the gentleman's remarks and, in fact, I want to compliment him for the contribution he has made here in the Record today. I still believe that primary jurisdiction should be with one agency and they can then cooperate with that agency.

Mr. HALL. I agree with the gentleman and thank him.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Robison].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, once again I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed], chairman of our subcommittee, and to my genial, ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte], and to all the other members of our subcommittee for the privilege of working with them on this portion of our Federal budget.

As it was last year, this has been an interesting and challenging experience for me, for this subcommittee of ours—as an examination of the hearings will indicate—covers a rather broad share of the budgetary waterfront. We swing from day to day from such prosaic questions as those pertaining to the safety record of the mailster—a motorcycle-like vehicle used by suburban letter carriers—to such broad and seemingly unanswerable questions as what is really wrong with our postal system since nearly everybody is unhappy with it, and on through to such defense-related questions as the adequacy of the Coast Guard fleet now that some part of that fleet has been sent on duty in Vietnam, and then into generalized questions of economic policy with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and then on into the terrible human problems related to the question of control of illicit narcotics, and finally even in such politically related questions as what does the President really do with his annual $1.5 million fund for special projects which—as I discovered—is a question you just do not ask.

All told, as the chairman and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] have already told you, we are allocating for these and the many other programs and items covered by this bill the princely total of $7,210,177,135—which total is some $36.5 million below the budget requests but, at the same time, is also over $540 million more than was appropriated for the same purposes in the current fiscal year.

On the surface, anyway, it would thereof seem as if we did not do a particularly good budget-cutting job—if budget cutting was our goal. However, it is also true—and I am discovering that this is likewise true with respect to much of the 1967 budget—that the cost of many of the items contained in this particular bill was something that was virtually outside our control.

This is particularly true, for instance, of those items—or most of them—contained in the overall budgetary request of the Postal Department. Here, as you will note, rests the lion's share of the increase over our bill last year—an increase, to be specific, of nearly half a billion dollars. The greater part of this was, of course, mandatory with the rest being attributable to the volume of mail handled now increasing at a rate of over 2 billion pieces a year—an increase holding at about 5.4 percent a year, at the moment, and amounting to a veritable avalanche of mail that requires not only more and more manpower every year but, if that avalanche is to be properly and efficiently handled, a constantly greater emphasis on mechanization of postal facilities and operations, wherever that is possible, as well as a continuing emphasis on the development and utilization of such distributive systems as those embodied in the so-called ZIP code and sectional-center concept.

Now, our subcommittee has been approving, and the Congress in good faith has been accepting most of the budgetary increases called for these last few years by those in charge of our postal operation in order to carry out our part of the Federal responsibility to provide those who use the mails with a better postal service than they have been getting.

But, somehow, this never seems to quite work out—at least, it does not if my colleagues regularly get as many complaints from unhappy constituents about the mail service as I do, and I am sure this is probably the case. We now have a new Postmaster General—a fine and likeable fellow who is highly regarded here on Capitol Hill. Perhaps, somehow, he can straighten things out—though I must say I think he would have a better chance at doing so if the President would relieve him of his continuing political duties for the White House. Certainly, the job of being Postmaster General in this day and age presents enough of a challenge so that it ought to be a full-time job for any individual.

In any event, the new Postmaster General told us—at his first appearance before our subcommittee—that he has this mandate from the President:

> I have said in the past—

The President wrote him—

> and I repeat it now, that I want you to provide this country with the finest mail service it has ever known, while managing the Post Office Department efficiently and prudently. I want you to explore all the techniques available to modernize our postal service and make certain that they are being used to provide the American people with the best postal system in the world at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer.

This is quite an order, and the Postmaster General said, in referring to it:

> I am convinced that if the Congress provides us with the tools we need to do the job, our service can be of the same high caliber as (that) cited by the President.

Perhaps, this is why our subcommittee, this year—and somewhat, I may say, to the concern of both Mr. Conte and myself—determined to give the Department nearly every dollar it said it needed to improve the operation of the postal system, either through additional manpower, additional mechanization, additional facilities, or what not. I think the feeling was that this year we would—to borrow the Postmaster General's phrase—"provide the Department with the tools" it said it needed, just to see what could be done to improve the service. I think we took this action—with which I am willing to go along—because we believe the service must be improved and, though I for one doubt very much that money, alone, will do that job, because we felt that this upcoming year was a critical one for the Post Office in that it would be the year when the new systems and procedures which we have nurtured along either would or would not begin to prove that they could do the job for which they were intended.

However—speaking now only for myself—if there is not that looked-for improvement in service to which both the Postmaster General and the President have pledged themselves in this next fiscal year—or, at least, some positive signs that that improvement is coming—then I should think that this Congress, in its wisdom, should authorize a special investigation into the whole postal operation in this country to be made either by our subcommittee and its counterpart in the other body, or by the appropriate legislative committees, or even by some special study commission to be set up for such purpose, in order to determine, if we can, exactly what is wrong with our postal system and how those things that are wrong can be corrected even if it takes some drastic and affirmative action such as taking the Post Office operation out of politics, or politics out of the Post Office operation, insofar as that is still possible.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I would like to commend the gentleman on his statement. I suppose that my congressional district is not terribly dissimilar from other congressional districts. The mail I receive indicates to me that if there is one serious problem that we have had in our rapidly growing suburban area, it is that the postal facilities and the postal services have not kept pace with that growth.

Certainly, today in 1966, we have reached the point where postal service is not a luxury. It is not just something that it would be nice to have on an efficient and reliable basis—it is a necessity.

With the population growth and the increasing volume of mail, I think it is important for the Congress, as the gentleman has suggested, to undertake a study of this problem. There is no question, in my area, but that the number of complaints are increasing every day. The postal service is deteriorating and it has not been improved with the changes that have been talked about by the administration. The facilities have not kept pace with the growth in population.

I have personally introduced legislation to take politics out of the Post Office Department. I think postmasters should not be appointed on a patronage basis. I think these posts should clearly be based on merit and under the civil service. I am hopeful that your subcommittee or the appropriate legislative committee will make such a study. Certainly it is important that we in this country recognize the problem, and, with the growth in population, it is not going to get better. It is going to get worse. As I have said, the postal service should not be considered as a luxury—it is a necessity.

Mr. ROBISON. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

I think in reply it should be said in defense at least of the postal operation that they are now still in process of implementing the ZIP code. As you know, in the sectional center concept, this is an integral part of this system. The sectional centers were all activated as of July 1 last year and it is going to take time to get into full and good operation. We hope, or at least the subcommittee is hoping, that with the funds provided in this bill there will be an improvement and these new methods will improve the quality of the mail service.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The only real indication of the modernization programs and the studies I have been hearing so much about is that the Post Office Department very recently has decided in my area to stop delivering at the door and require roadside mailboxes. This is not a rural area, but an area that is a metropolitan area, and heavily populated areas. Instead of going forward, we are going backward and going back to the horse and buggy days.

Mr. ROBISON. I suggest the gentleman take that up with the Postmaster General.

Mr. RUMSFELD. If the gentleman will yield further, I might say I probably have as much contact with the Postmaster General as anyone except his personal family. I have sent dozens of complaints to the Postmaster General and to his department. I would quite agree with the gentleman that one of the first steps should be to relieve the present Postmaster General of his nonpostal duties in the executive branch. It is understandable why the postal employees in my area have to hold two jobs in order to make a decent living, because the postal pay is so low in high cost of living areas, but I do not think it is necessary for the Postmaster General to moonlight.

Mr. ROBISON. Now, you may say, why did not our subcommittee go into these questions, and it is appropriate to ask that. The answer is that we did, insofar as the pressure of time upon us permitted—and the record of the hearings will establish this fact—but it just is not possible for us to do a thorough job at this sort of inquiry in conjunction with our consideration of this annual appropriation bill.

Well, enough of that, for now I should like to skim the surface, at least, of a number of the other items being presented to you in which you may be interested.

As the chairman has said, and as the report itself points out, the appearance before us of the new Director of the Bureau of the Budget to discuss certain overall budgetary questions, and questions delving into the always-difficult problem of competitive program priorities, produced, we believe, some interesting information that had not heretofore been available and that may make our hearings useful to those interested in such questions both within and outside of the Government.

I refer, specifically, to the material beginning on page 554 of our hearings—in the volume devoted to testimony presented by the Treasury Department and related agencies—and to the charts and tables discussed at some length in connection with that material.

On page 630 of that same volume, in a colloquy I had with the Director, Mr. Schultze, I believe we also succeeded in clarifying the fact that, in the short run, at least, it is the President—through his own individual control over the rate of Federal expenditures—who can administratively hold back on spending moneys appropriated by Congress for various programs whenever retrenchment becomes necessary as a temporary anti-inflationary measure, and that the President can, of course, do this regardless of whatever Congress may or may not do with respect to any particularly unmanageable Federal budget.

A few pages further along in that same volume, you will find a discussion between Mr. Schultze and myself about the procedure the administration followed, this year, in its own attempt to sort out the priorities between the various Federal programs—both old and new—competing for budgetary consideration. As you know, Mr. Chairman, we Republicans have been urging the Congress to sort all those priorities out again, but so far without much success. However, some of you may find interest in reading about how the Budget Bureau went at it, with Mr. Schultze claiming, when they were through, that "there was an awful lot of priority blood all over the floor," even though—for my money, at least—the procedure they followed only ended up by getting a little something of everything for everybody in this record budget, which may well be the way Congress also decides to leave it.

While I am speaking about the Bureau of the Budget, let me also say that I am in full accord with the subcommittee's decision to deny the Bureau the additional staff they asked for to reestablish field offices at several points around the Nation.

Now, this would have been a small operation—to begin with, anyhow—not costing very much more, and I certainly can agree that it is vitally necessary for the administration to obtain, through the Budget Bureau or elsewhere, close liaison with all the numerous regional directors of Federal agencies in the field, and with top State and local officials, as well, in an effort to coordinate both the old and the new Federal programs in this Great Society era, and to try to prevent duplication of effort and waste of the taxpayers' money. But, I do not believe that this suggested device—of field offices—would be the best or wisest way of going about that. As the Director's prepared statement to us said, on this point—and I think this was stated rather defensively—the field staff people of the Bureau were not to become czars over the local operation of Federal programs. And, later on, the Deputy Director, Mr. Hughes—speaking for Mr. Schultze—said he would prefer to think of the projected staff people in the field as being only "the eyes and ears" of the President.

But, either way, it seems to me, we would come dangerously close to a situation where these personal representatives of the President, acting, as it were, more or less as roving ambassadors for him, would, in fact if not in theory, supersede the discretion and authority now properly vested in the other Federal representatives now attempting to administer the various Federal programs for which they are responsible at regional, or State and local levels of operations. Mr. Hughes argued that the Bureau's proposed field people would not be out there to issue orders, or to "run" Federal programs—but, considering the prestige they would automatically carry, it would hardly seem to me as though it could be otherwise.

If better coordination of Federal programs is necessary—if closer Presidential observation as to how those programs are working or not working is desirable—and if the Bureau of the Budget has an appropriate function to perform in this connection, then I do not see why it could not be performed by the sending of Bureau staff people from Washington out into the field as necessary and whenever appropriate to do so. I sincerely hope that the other body will concur with us in this conclusion.

Skipping along, now, to the Internal Revenue Service—a service which is very much on all our minds at this particular time of the year—you will note, as the chairman has pointed out, that we have not allowed the Service all the additional personnel it wanted for its so-called compliance activities. As the report indicates—and I believe we are unanimous on this—we feel that the full impact of the automatic data system to which the Service is rapidly converting, especially its effect on securing voluntary compliance, should be tested out before we go on adding all the manpower requested to enforce compliance. As the testimony brought out, for about 39 percent of all tax returns now selected for audit there is no resulting change in the taxpayer's liability. Either this indicates that returns should be more carefully selected for audit, or that the compliance section is trying too hard to make a record—although the Commissioner was careful to point out that his people in this section do not work under any sort of quota system, and are under no forced pressure to develop a record of audit collections.

The Commissioner also told us that the Service was working on a method whereby the ADP system, itself, could be used to select returns for audit—though this had not yet been developed.

In any event, the subcommittee feels—I believe—that the additional manpower we are allowing for compliance purposes will be sufficient to permit this activity to continue along at an appropriate level, which would be one whereon all taxes properly due the Treasury are collected but there would be no undue harassment of the individual taxpayer merely for the sake of selecting a certain percentage of returns to see what could be uncovered as the result of an audit.

The Commissioner also told us about the work being done to improve and simplify the various Federal tax reporting forms—something which I am sure we all feel is badly needed. To advance this work, the Service has contracted with a private, industrial design firm—at a cost of $20,000—which may have been a useful thing to do, but I should think that the Service, itself, would be capable of making this kind of study, with its own people.

One fairly good indication of the fact that our tax forms, of today, are still too complicated for the average taxpayer is shown by the Commissioner's statement that about 45 percent of all individual taxpayers obtain help in the preparation of their returns. I think this figure is much too high, and that simplified returns and more understandable instructions, despite the progress that has been made in this direction, is a goal still to be worked toward.

There are a good many more items that I should like to talk about, if time permitted, but I do not wish to intrude further on the time of the Committee or of my colleagues.

So, Mr. Chairman, permit me to close by calling attention to the fact that—as a glance at the report will show—certain other expenses of the Federal Government, notably that of paying interest on the so-called public debt, are covered by our report, though no action on our part in the normal budgetary sense is required.

As you will see, the largest of these items is that of $12,750 million to pay interest on the debt in fiscal 1967—an increase of three-quarters of a billion dollars over the current fiscal year.

Surely, this is still something for concern—even on the part of those who like to point out that the public debt represents a declining percentage of our gross national product. It ought to be of concern, for instance, just because of the fact that the amount we are paying in debt service is almost equal to what we intend to spend in 1967 on Federal assistance for health, education, and certain basic welfare and housing programs or purposes.

It is of concern, too, or ought to be, when considered in relation to our present problem with inflation. Look at it this way: We must rely on the general public, to a great extent, to hold that debt, and this is why we encourage our citizens, in various ways, to buy and hold U.S. savings bonds. There is, in fact, under the Treasury Department, a Savings Bond Division whose sole purpose is to promote the sale and retention, by the general public, of such bonds.

When that Division's representatives came before our subcommittee, we learned that, at the end of 1965, there were bonds outstanding—these are the series "E" and "H" bonds only, which are the kind held for the most part by small investors—amounting in face value to $49.2 billion.

At this time, I asked what inflation had done, during 1965, to the value of this considerable investment. The representative of the Treasury who was present at that hearing advised me that the Secretary was using the figure of 1.9 percent as the so-called "price deflator" for 1965. Applying this figure to that investment, we found that the value of those savings bonds declined—just during 1965 alone, mind you—by the sum of almost $1 billion.

Quite frankly, I hope our people keep buying savings bonds—if they do not we are in real trouble when it comes to trying to manage the public debt. But, unless we can damp down the present fires of inflation it may become increasingly more difficult for us to convince our people that this form of savings, or any form of savings for that matter, is a good investment.

This, then, points up once again the responsibility we all share for getting this particular budget under better control, if we can, and I believe we must measure our votes constantly against that responsibility.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I certainly wish to compliment my colleague from New York for a very fine presentation today and also for the great contribution he makes on our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Departments of Treasury and Post Office and Executive Office.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO].

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, again I wish to state that the work of your Subcommittee on Treasury, Post Office and related Agencies has been a pleasant experience to me. This is largely due to the work of our chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] and my other colleagues on the subcommittee, and our able staff. I should also like to commend the clear and concise presentations made by our dedicated Federal officers who have been before us representing their departments and agencies. And I commend all the dedicated men and women of these services.

The bill before us carries a cut of $36,542,865 below the estimates for fiscal year 1967 to run the Treasury Department, Post Office Department, Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies. While this is a cut from the budget estimates, the bill carries $540,433,135 more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1966. The major part of the increase is due to increases in workload in almost every agency, increases in capital expenditures to cope with the workload increases, and compliance with laws enacted by the Congress last year, such as the civilian and military pay bills.

Much of the work we do here in enacting appropriation bills has very little meaning to the average citizen as far as details go. He hears only totals and knows that his tax dollars must pay the bills. However, there are certain areas with which everyone is familiar. At this time of the year in particular, I am sure every wage-earning citizen is well aware of the Internal Revenue Service. By January 1967, the automatic data-processing system will be in nationwide operation for the handling and review of both business and individual tax returns. Certainly, our experience with this system has shown its worth—voluntary compliance has been stimulated far beyond our most optimistic estimates. We have good reason to believe that the automatic data-processing program will make it possible to cut the Internal Revenue Service's compliance activities in other areas.

Any American planning to travel outside the United States quickly becomes aware of the customs agent. With the increase in travel, it has become necessary to increase personnel at the various ports of entry for we have every reason to believe that the rapid rise in passengers entering the United States will continue. The men of this service must be complimented for in many instances they work under very adverse conditions.

Every day the American public is becoming more aware of the narcotics problem and the tragedy following in the wake of the illicit traffic in drugs. Your committee has recommended that the full budget estimate of $6,138,000 be appropriated. I realize that there are areas in the United States where there is no narcotics problem, but be assured that these areas are becoming harder to find. As a Member of Congress from the city of New York where we have a larger percentage of drug addicts than any other place in the United States, I am well aware of the tragedy in human lives that drug addiction brings. Only a few years ago a case of drug addiction in Queens was a rarity, but that certainly is not the case today—when it starts to move in on a community the spread is rapid. Anything we can do to stop the flow of drugs at the source cannot be measured in money when one thinks of the sufferings and human misery which accompany its use for other than medical purposes. The Bureau of Narcotics is making great strides in its war against the dope traffic, and I know that it will continue to do so with our support. I believe that our Committee on the Judiciary must bring out new legislation so that we may more effectively deal with this problem. I am sure that we are all in agreement that we need more effective laws to cope with the dope addiction problem and we cannot rely only on the Narcotics Bureau. We have to deal with the "sick" people who are addicted and this is not the job of the Bureau of Narcotics.

Every American knows his postman, his rural carrier, or his postmaster. The Post Office Department reaches every citizen or resident of this Nation. We hear complaints about poor postal service in some areas, but if we stop to think about the volume and the speed with which the mail goes through, I believe we all marvel at the job that is done. Certainly, there is room for improvement, but with the terrific increase in the volume of mail which we have every reason to believe will continue, the answer must lie in mechanization. This is not to say that we will have need for less men, because this could not be the case. However, we will soon reach the point where more people cannot be physically accommodated. We must have the men and mechanized equipment to move the mail. Your committee has recommended the full budget estimate for plant and equipment and urges the Department to move forward as quickly as possible with its developed plan for providing modern postal facilities and equipment for the handling of the ever-increasing volume of mail.

I know that there will be disagreement with some of the cuts recommended by your committee, but I believe that we have provided the funds necessary to serve the interests of the people in the areas covered by this bill.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my leader, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts was very kind in referring to me as his leader.

I appreciate very much his remarks about the amendments that I have been offering on the 5-percent limitation. It is not as serious as he said, but let me say this, Mr. Chairman: I have great respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts. He does an excellent job on this committee. Some of his philosophies and mine are different, but I respect him for his. I just do not agree with him on some of the things he has to say today about the limitation amendment.

To my good friend on my right, TOM STEED, and his subcommittee, I say they have done a magnificent thing in keeping this bill down under the budget. No item in here is over the budget. This is good, although the bill is too high. And I think it is about time that we begin to cut it down.

I hope my good friends on the right will continue to support their President, as I am trying to do. What happened today? They pulled out the rug from under you. They have tried to make Congress look bad. Congress appropriated funds for post offices, one in Chicago. I really do not believe that I have seen too many Republican votes from there.

I admire the President. He is not being political, apparently, in this. Mr. Daley may think otherwise, but the President cut out one post office in Chicago. Then he went to Louisville, Ky., and Evansville, Ind., and Akron, Ohio, to cut out some more. He is doing it.

Somebody said to me yesterday that I am trying to give him a pocket veto, and I am giving him an opportunity to veto projects. Well, I am not doing that. He is doing it. He has vetoed these projects. He is returning the money to the Treasury of the United States.

Now let us give him some help. I have talked about this for some time, and I worry a little sometimes that I am somewhat alone.

We are not permitted under the rules of the House to refer to the gallery, but I sometimes wonder, what they might think when, with a $7 billion appropriation bill, we have this few people on the floor of the House of Representatives to consider the $7 billion. With the tax burden that the American people are carrying today, there is no more interest in this bill, in this $7 billion, than this handful of people.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, if he wants me to, I will put in a quorum call and I will not make a speech afterward. But I think that people ought to be here, to know what is going on here today, to discuss this question on this great appropriation bill that the gentleman has worked so hard on and that his committee has done such a magnificent job on. They had days and days of hard hearings to bring in a bill of this kind.

I am just wondering whether we should put this bill over until after Easter. Maybe the Easter vacation recess is running in the veins of too many people.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday when we were in the Committee of the Whole, debating H.R. 14215, the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967, I offered an expenditure limitation amendment. Of course, you all know that amendment was rejected by the committee.

Today, on my motion to recommit to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to include the limitation amendment in the bill, the House rejected that motion.

Even though the House, in its wisdom, did not elect to approve the amendment, I still believe it is an amendment which should be adopted. It would materially assist the President in his effort to cut back on Federal spending, as a means of controlling inflation.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to complete my remarks, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am sure the gentleman is sincere in his belief that the House should adopt this amendment to the Post Office and Treasury appropriations, as we considered doing when we considered yesterday the Department of Interior appropriation.

I am a little bit concerned, because it seems to me to be a matter of prime importance that we as Members of Congress do not shirk our responsibility and that we maintain congressional prerogatives. It seems if we adopt this amendment or utilize this device through the procedure of a motion to recommit, that we are abandoning our congressional prerogatives and leaving to the executive, which we criticize day in and day out, the authority to make decisions which we as Members of Congress should make and let them spend what money they want to spend where they want to spend it rather than making those decisions ourselves. Will the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. BOW. I know exactly what the gentleman is alluding to. It is very apparent to me that I have not made myself clear or the amendment clear, because other Members have said that. I wish I could make it clear to Members exactly what this amendment does. That is what I intend to do later on in my prepared text. However, may I say to the gentleman this is not the case. Your bill will remain exactly the same as it is. It does not affect the bill, but it only goes to the expenditures. The bill remains the same. It cuts down the amount which can be expended. One Member came to me a little while ago, my good friend from California, very much concerned that if this amendment carried, this might reduce the pay of people on the payroll. He is very considerate about that. The gentleman is very interested in making sure that people receive these pay increases they have gotten. So am I. This would not affect that. It could not cut pay. What would happen is, if the President had to do it, he would reduce the number of people on the payroll. This would not affect that.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will allow me to complete my statement, perhaps I will answer some of his questions. If I have not, then I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman for further questions.

As I say, it would assist the President in his efforts to cut back on Federal spending as a means of controlling inflation without the added burden of increased taxes. That is the thing that concerns me. It would constitute a small bit of evidence that Congress wants to help in making a sincere effort to recapture its constitutional statutory authority as a co-equal of the executive and the judiciary branches in handling affairs of the Federal system. Congress has stood by and permitted other branches of the Government to usurp many of our prerogatives and obligations. I say to you that if we do not move soon and forthrightly to restore Congress to its constitutional role in the affairs of government, we shall have been foreclosed from doing so in the foreseeable future. I think this amendment does that. The President, with all of his wisdom and industry in discharging the awesome responsibilities of his high office, simply cannot alone cope with the wasteful spending plans of thousands of Federal bureaucrats who are in fact responsible for the scheduling and the administration of most Federal spending. The President needs your help. The Nation needs your help. I think you owe an obligation to the President and to the American public to do all you can do to conserve our resources, keep wages and prices at a tolerable level, encourage private initiative which made this Nation so great, and protect the security of our beloved country from enemies within and without. In time of war we cannot discharge that obligation if we persist continually in blindly going down the free spending road without some reflection, reexamination, reevaluation, and retrenchment of nonessential spending programs. I would be the last Member of this House to become a prophet of gloom and doom, but if we here do not put our shoulders to the wheel and give the President a hand in reducing Federal spending which we can and should do without, so long at least as there is a war in Vietnam, then we shall leave our heritage a mess of fiscal pottage that will take untold years to unravel and to right.

Today in connection with the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill I shall again offer the amendment which you rejected yesterday and earlier today. That amendment simply provides that the administration may spend in fiscal 1967 only 95 percent of what the President proposed in his budget to spend on the items provided in this bill—95 percent on the items provided in this bill. It has no effect on the spending of previously appropriated funds. It applies only to the budget proposed spending in 1967 on the items provided in this bill.

Thinking on the limitation amendment should be divorced from thinking with respect to the appropriations provided in this bill. It is true that the committee cut $36 million from the budget request contained in the bill, and that represents a reduction of one-half of 1 percent. We estimate if this expenditure limitation is adopted, it will provide for a greater cut in the 1967 spending for items in the bill than the $36 million cut in appropriations. While a cut of 5 percent for proposed spending may be looked upon as minimal by some, it stiffens the President's resolve wherever possible to curtail proposed spending for the balance of 1966 and 1967.

Historically, the administration's estimates of spending, as set forth in the budget, are not hard and fast. As a matter of fact, they are often revised—usually upward—almost as soon as the budget is submitted.

Thus, the limitation will serve a useful purpose insofar as spending on items contained in the bill are concerned.

Additional requests for increased appropriations may be made of the other body when the bill is over there. To the extent that such appropriations were granted, spending in fiscal 1967 would be further increased.

Mr. Chairman, I am making this effort again this afternoon for two purposes: One, to be absolutely certain that all Members understand what the amendment would accomplish, and to give the House an opportunity to exhibit its great statesmanship which should be evident in all of its proceedings.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield to my friend again, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER], and I hope I have clarified some of his questions.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I understand a little bit better what the gentleman attempts to do. But I cannot conceive, through the use of mathematics of 5 percent, how we can maintain the existing level of services in the Post Office and Treasury Departments, and all the other agencies, by attempting to reduce the level of expenditures by just 5 percent. As small as the amount would be, it seems to be factual to me that every time we have a net increase of one in population, if we maintain the existing level of services to the people, whatever the agency or department might be, the cost of doing business increases, particularly for that department—every time we have a net increase of one in the population. In other words, we are ignoring a growing population and the new needs for expanded services. We are certainly making mockery of our responsibility. The executive will become even more powerful.

Mr. BOW. If I may reply to the gentleman, I do not have the figures before me—I wish I had them, and perhaps someone on the committee has them—I would like to show the gentleman the increase in expenditures of the Post Office Department over the last 10 years. The increase, moneywise, is greatly in excess of the increase in population.

Further, I will say to my friend that the service in the Post Office Department today is the worst we have seen in years, even though we have given them all this money. It is time that they began to get down to business and began to operate on what we are giving them. I believe perhaps a reduction would be a good thing for them to have because they have had these great increases, year after year after year, and the service has become worse and worse, plus the fact that the increases have been considerably more than the increase in population.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I would agree with the gentleman that there are some areas where cuts could be made.

Mr. BOW. Before I yield further to the gentleman from Louisiana, may I say that I look forward to Larry O'Brien doing a good job down there. I have great respect for Larry, if he will just spend his time down at the Post Office Department trying to improve the service and delivery of the mail to the American people, and serve less on Capitol Hill. If that is done I believe we will have some reductions.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I would agree with the gentleman that there are some areas in the Post Office Department wherein services conceivably should be improved, but I would disagree that we have the worst mail service that we have ever had. I do not have this experience.

Mr. BOW. Well, I do not remember the pony express, and some of those methods of delivery.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I certainly appreciate the kind, thoughtful, and generous remarks of the gentleman from Ohio, which he earlier made about me.

I believe, if the gentleman would take the time to look at the record, the gentleman would find that our records are very similar. I may disagree with him here, and I do so because I feel that such an amendment would cut in on the essential service of these agencies.

Mr. Chairman, earlier I tried to make it very clear that 5 percent of $7,210 million is $360 million.

Last year this Congress—together with the gentleman in the well now—voted for a pay raise by a vote of 370 to 7. That pay raise alone cost the taxpayers and cost this budget $349 million. You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. BOW. How many people are you putting on the payroll in this bill?

Mr. CONTE. In this bill we are putting about 19,000.

Mr. BOW. In the Post Office Department?

Mr. CONTE. About 19,838 in both Post Office and Treasury.

Mr. BOW. In other words, you are putting 19,000 more people on the payroll. Let us cut down some on the payroll.

Mr. CONTE. Well, that is easy to say——

Mr. BOW. The gentleman talks about the expense of paying people. That is because we are increasing payrolls the way we are; 19,000 more people.

Mr. CONTE. They asked for 24,000, and we cut them down to 19,838.

Mr. BOW. How much did you give them last year?

Mr. YATES. Is this a Republican civil war or can a Democrat get in?

Mr. BOW. You are not going to get your post office in Chicago. The President took it away from you. So let us talk over here on this side where we do get post offices.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman is absolutely right. I can tell you if they took my post office away, I would be on this floor screaming right now.

Mr. BOW. But they are still going to build a house for the Vice President. They cannot build any post office in Chicago for my friend from Illinois, but the Vice President, of course, is going to get his house.

Mr. CONTE. Of course, they will never take that out—they had to take care of HUBERT.

But I would like to point out here that the mandatory increases amount to $349 million. Now, the total increase in this budget with these new positions—new positions to take care of the increased volume of mail which is 5.4 percent more; to take care of the increased volume in the Internal Revenue returns which are running over 1,300,000 returns this year above last year, and may run over and above that; to take care of the increased number of travelers and carriers coming to the United States from abroad at an increased rate of 4 percent—was $503,890,270, including the 19,838 new employees to take care of these increased workloads.

Now, taking this salary increase that the Congress saddled on the Post Office Department and on the Treasury Department—taking that increase of $349 million and subtracting it from the total increase of $540 million over 1966—it leaves you with a net increase over 1966 of $191 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman such time as he may require.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman may yield to me whatever time it takes him to make his point.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

As I was saying, taking that it leaves you a balance of $191 million as the increase over the 1966 budget. Therefore, it means if your amendment is adopted and if you cut 5 percent of the total, $7,210 million—or, in other words, $360 million—we would be appropriating $169 million less than we appropriated in 1966. At the same time we have all these increases in workloads—more volume in mail, an increase in the Federal internal revenue returns for income tax and increases in the customs—you would have to cut services.

I ask the gentleman, Where are you going to cut? Are you going to cut the funds of the narcotics agency? Are you going to cut the funds of the Secret Service, the Bureau of Customs, Bureau of Engraving, the Mint, Bureau of Accounts, Coast Guard, Post Office Department? Where, I ask you?

Mr. BOW. I would say to my colleague he is using that old cliche—Where are you going to cut?

Mr. CONTE. Oh, no, this is a realistic approach to this problem.

Mr. BOW. There are many places where cuts can be made other than in these areas of Secret Service and narcotics. How much is involved with reference to narcotics in this bill?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Not at this point. I am having a very interesting conversation with my friend here, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. YATES. We are all enjoying it.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman raises the question—Are we going to cut narcotics? There is only some $6 million for that in this bill and when that is considered in relation to the $7 billion total of this bill—it is a sort of ridiculous thing to raise that question.

Mr. CONTE. The heart and soul of the whole question here is the operation of the Post Office Department.

Mr. BOW. Now we are back to the Post Office Department and we are getting away from the narcotics. That is good. I would like to get away from this question of narcotics so far as the discussion of this bill is concerned.

Mr. CONTE. The heart and soul of this is right there in the Post Office Department. They have had an increase in mail volume of 5.4 percent. The mail volume has increased by 2 billion pieces, so that now they are delivering 74 billion pieces of mail a year. Who is going to deliver this mail unless we give them the money they need to do the job?

Mr. BOW. The same people will deliver it who have always been delivering it.

May I say to the gentleman in conclusion, I think when we talk about who is going to deliver the mail that in spite of all the arguments the gentleman from Massachusetts has made, we have to think about the American taxpayers who are overburdened now and who are going to have a tax increase unless we do something about reducing the budget and reducing expenditures in this bill and reducing interest on the public debt.

As I said a little while ago, every time that second hand makes one turn around the clock and records the passing of just 1 minute of time, it costs the American taxpayers $26,000. Yes, it costs the American taxpayers $26,000 every minute on the national debt. It is about time that this Congress begins to cut that national debt and to cut out the spending and to cut out increasing the budgets every year and get down to the point where people understand exactly what we are talking about.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. What the gentleman says is true. However, you must realize this, that we did make cuts and tried to make even more. You did state it originally—but you did not give me any of the credit.

Mr. BOW. I did give the gentleman credit and I do give him credit. The gentleman has done a magnificent job on this bill.

Mr. CONTE. I tried to cut it even further. I cannot say much about what happened in executive session. You must realize this is a very sensitive agency here.

Mr. BOW. I know the gentleman tried to cut it even further.

Mr. CONTE. This is a very sensitive bill here.

Mr. BOW. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CONTE. You have all of the revenue producing agencies in the U.S. Government and all of the agencies that give these services. So you have to be very, very careful where you cut this to make sure that you do not cut the services to the American people and that you do not cut the revenue service to the point where they cannot go out and collect the revenue needed to run the Government.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has done a magnificent job on this bill and I commend him for it. The gentleman from Ohio who is now in the well is just as sincere in the job that he is trying to do as I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts is sincere in what he is trying to do.

Mr. CONTE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BOW. I think we should make some reductions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES.]

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct an inquiry to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Do I understand from the colloquy that just took place on the floor between the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Ohio who proposes to offer this amendment to cut the appropriation bill did not consult with the gentleman from Massachusetts before he prepared his amendment?

Mr. CONTE. Yes, the gentleman certainly consulted with me.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman consulted with you? Did the gentleman from Massachusetts agree with the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CONTE. I think it has been evidenced here on the floor in the colloquy we had that we disagree.

Mr. YATES. You disagree? How long has the gentleman from Massachusetts been on the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CONTE. I think the record speaks for itself.

I do not think we all have to agree with each other, even though we are all on the same committee or subcommittee. I think I have made my point clear, and I think we will prevail today.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

DEDUCTION OF EXEMPTIONS FOR CHILDREN IN THE CASE OF DIVORCED PARENTS

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced legislation that should simplify the tax problems divorced, or legally separated, parents encounter in determining which one of them is entitled to the personal exemption for their dependent child.

This has proved to be a vexatious problem. These disputes actually represent the No. 1 problem in the auditing of individual income tax returns. They are the major cause of disagreement in cases involving duplicate claims of exemptions. The amount of revenue involved hardly is commensurate with the heavy administrative burden caused by these cases, and the efforts to bring them to conclusion have clogged the appeals procedure. Many of these cases even have gone to the Tax Court for resolution.

During the 6-month period that ended on June 30, 1959, claims for duplicate personal exemptions for children of divorced or separated parents were the major issue in 5 percent of the informal conferences held on more than 13,000 cases involving individual, fiduciary, and corporation income tax. Such duplicate claims also were a lesser issue in many of the other conferences. These statistics which describe only 1 percent of all the returns examined for possible deficiencies suggest that the issue was involved in more than 65,000 of the more than 1⅓ million returns examined in that 6-month period.

Clearly, some reasonable rules for simplifying the determination of which parent is entitled to the child's exemption must be placed in the Internal Revenue Code. This is the objective of the legislation I have introduced today.

This problem arises because the Internal Revenue Code presently requires that the parent who claims the personal exemption for the child shall have contributed more than half of the child's support. This seemingly simple requirement encounters difficulties because of perfectly human responses in these situations.

Frequently, the parents disagree about the exemption for the simple reason that each believes he has made the contribution of more than one-half of the child's support in order to earn the exemption. Unfortunately, the efforts to resolve the disagreement often are impeded by continuing ill will between the former spouses and a resulting lack of cooperation in determining who supplied the majority of the child's support. The difficulties are compounded by the lack of incentive to cooperate, for the gain of one former spouse is the other's loss.

The Internal Revenue Service becomes the unfortunate arbiter. For instance, it is powerless to disclose to either the former husband or wife any information submitted by the other parent to substantiate the claim for support of the child.

The bill I am presenting today is an attempt to find a solution to this problem. I am sure it is not a perfect solution but a substantial amount of effort has been devoted to finding the best answer we could to cover the many divergent situations. The bill amends the Internal Revenue Code—section 151—to provide as a general rule that the parent having custody of the child is entitled to the deduction for his personal exemption. However, it includes several exceptions under which the parent not having custody of the child would be granted the personal exemption.

The exemption will be allowed to the parent not having custody of the child, for example, if under one of two alternative conditions: First, the decree of divorce or separate maintenance provides that the exemption be allowed to the parent without custody; or, second, there is a written agreement, signed by the parent with custody, providing that the other parent be allowed the exemption and that the parent with custody will not claim the exemption. This agreement must be attached to the income tax return of the parent not having custody. For either of these exceptions to apply, however, the parent not having custody would have to contribute at least $600 to the support of the child.

The exemption also will be allowed to the parent without custody if he contributes more than $1,200 to the child's support, and the other parent does not establish clearly to the Secretary of the Treasury that he contributed more than one-half of the child's support.

The $1,200 rule applies regardless of the number of children the divorced parents may have. For example, take the case of divorced parents with two children in the mother's custody. The father would be entitled to both exemptions if he contributes over $1,200 to support of the children, unless the mother establishes that she contributed more than half of the support for either or both children. In this event, she would be entitled to one or both exemptions.

In addition, when a dispute arises in this type of case, my bill provides that both parents are to be entitled to receive an itemized statement of the expenditures on which the other parent bases his claim of support.

The $1,200 rule possesses the unique characteristic of preserving equity to the taxpayers and yet resolving without question most of the cases. A survey of tax returns showed that a requirement of $1,200 per child would result in giving the exemption to the parent with custody of the child in about 80 percent of the cases.

Finally, the parent not having custody of the child may claim the personal exemption even though he may not contribute more than half of the child's support, as long as his claim meets the requirements under existing law for a multiple-support agreement. This provision enables the parents to agree among themselves concerning who should have the exemption.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will not eliminate all the disputes between parents concerning which one may claim the personal exemption for their child, but it should succeed in substantially reducing the number of them. In addition, it furnishes the parents with opportunities to work out agreements on their own.

The Internal Revenue Service is provided with clear-cut rules that can be applied in settling many of the disputes. The bill also permits the Service to present each parent with a copy of an itemized statement upon which the other parent bases his support claim. This opportunity should simplify the reconciliation of conflicting claims for certain expenses. Under this bill, the IRS will find itself less frequently serving as a postmarital counselor on financial problems.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, the subject of the population explosion has been discussed in relation to water pollution, food distribution, and a myriad of other areas. But we are in danger from this expansion of humanity in yet another and equally serious region, postal delivery.

We have all witnessed the problems that have resulted from the $58,600,000 appropriation reduction of last year. The mails have slowed down, and research in new methods of delivery has come to a veritable standstill.

This year's appropriation has come out of committee $21,747,000 less than requested. The amount to be allocated this year is slightly higher than fiscal year 1966. Yet postal authorities anticipate a 4- to 5-percent increase in mail volume. With our increasing population, it is fast becoming impractical to use humans to handle the mail. Mechanization, a byword in every other industry, is also needed in our postal system. I ask that we give support to H.R. 1412, in anticipation that the postal authorities will use it wisely in helping to alleviate our congested mail system. Why not do it the most efficient way possible, and then we can look forward to the promised 1-day delivery?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 17:

"OPERATING EXPENSES, EXECUTIVE MANSION

"For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion, and traveling expenses, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, and official entertainment expenses of the President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate; $692,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a minute for the purpose of saying that I am surprised that nowhere in the appropriation for the Office of the President is there any reduction, in fact there is an increase of $1,209,135 to $17,014,135. Only a few days ago President Johnson called upon the housewives of the Nation to buy cheaper cuts of meat, and other cheaper products.

I assumed when this bill came on for consideration there would be some reduction in the cost of White House entertaining. I thought that the cost of keeping things going at the White House would be down in line with the call upon housewives all over the Nation.

I must say that I am disappointed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 16:

"TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 17, immediately following line 19, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 502. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment I offered yesterday to the Department of Interior bill and the same amendment that we had on the motion to recommit. I must say to the membership that it will also be offered as a motion to recommit, if it does not carry in the Committee of the Whole. I rather anticipate that it will be offered in a motion to recommit.

I am not going to take the time of the Committee to discuss it. It has been discussed fully and plainly. The plane schedules are bad tonight, and the train schedules are bad, and it is a little difficult to speak to a small group. I am glad to see more people on the floor than we had here a while ago.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. In order not to spend any time of the Committee on this, on the time of the gentleman, I would like to rise to support this amendment.

The President is reported in the press as having called the Cabinet in a few days ago and as having suggested that a billion be cut in spending during the remainder of the current fiscal year. That has only 3 months to go. If they can save $1 billion in spending in 3 months, I do not see why they cannot tighten their belts and absorb what amounts to a 5-percent spending limitation.

I think in offering this amendment the gentleman from Ohio is proving that he is a friend of the administration. I join him in supporting the President, and call on all our colleagues in the Committee today to join us in supporting the President in his effort to curtail spending in order to curb the inflationary forces that are running rampant in the country today.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I understand what the amendment proposes to do. As chairman of the committee that has worked on this bill, I have a feeling that I have some understanding of the agencies involved here and the mandates they have to carry out in providing services for this country. I could not in good conscience do otherwise than oppose the amendment, because I think that it would result in some very undesirable situations if it were applied to these particular agencies.

I remind the House that we are dealing with some of the most important agencies of this Government. Almost all of their workload is beyond their control. They are already practicing what I believe is the most effective and the most efficient work in the whole Government in trying to do well with the money we give them.

I might say that, although this bill amounts to more in dollars than the bill last year, the hearings are replete with details of the savings and the economies that these agencies have effected in their constant battle for more efficient service. They have absorbed a lot of the cost imposed on them by this unprecedented increase in their workloads and by the acts of Congress. Otherwise, we would have been forced here today to ask for a lot more money than we have.

I think we can rest assured that, as far as these agencies are concerned, they are going to continue to get value received, and, if there is any opportunity in the coming year to save money, they will do as they have done in this past year: they will save money where they can.

I urge a vote against the amendment.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I certainly have spoken at length on this matter, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the administration has within the past 2 weeks at various times denied the seriousness of inflationary pressures, urged businessmen to cut down on investment, blamed housewives for not putting on their glasses and taking a good look at prices when they shop, suggested a whopping tax increase and then backed away from this suggestion, finally talked vaguely of cutting spending by $1 billion in the present fiscal year, even as it continued to ask for supplemental appropriations.

We in the minority again call on the President to end this confusion, to face frankly the growing problem of inflation and use the most direct weapon at his disposal to counteract it by reducing the planned level of Federal spending this year and next.

We in the minority do not want another tax increase. This year the taxpayers' burden has already been increased by higher social security taxes, higher excise taxes, advanced withholding, and by general tax rises by State and local governments. All these increases already imposed are reliably estimated to run about $8 to $10 billion.

Reduced Government spending is preferable to a tax increase as an anti-inflationary measure for three reasons.

First, every dollar cut from spending is a dollar less of inflationary pressure. When Government raises taxes, on the other hand, it takes many dollars that would have been saved if they had been left with taxpayers. Every dollar of a tax increase, then, does not reduce inflationary pressures to the same degree as a dollar cut in spending.

Second, the Government cannot persuasively call for reductions in private spending when it fails to exercise restraint in its own spending. It cannot expect businessmen and consumers to follow the advice which it refuses to heed in managing its own affairs.

Third, a tax increase will encourage recklessness in Government spending. It is not likely to produce the fiscal restraint which Government should observe in the present economic situation.

In controlling inflation, the timing of governmental action is all important. Action must be taken before the fire becomes a conflagration. The longer the administration dallies, the more drastic the action that finally will be needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue reading the bill.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLATNIK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14266) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 17, immediately following line 19, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 502. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond ninety-five percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 127, nays 244, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—127

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Corbett
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
Ottinger
Pelly
Pickle
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stanton
Stratton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Younger

NAYS—244

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Callan
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kupferman
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—61

Abernethy
Adair
Baring
Belcher
Boland
Bolling
Brock
Burleson
Cabell
Cameron
Chelf
Colmer
Cunningham
Daddario
Dent
Derwinski
Dowdy
Dyal
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Fino
Fraser
Fuqua
Griffin
Hanna
Hardy
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Jacobs
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Mo.
Keogh
Kirwan
Landrum
McClory
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
Miller
Murray
Nix
Patman
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Reinecke
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Scott
Smith, Va.
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tuck
Tunney
Whitten
Williams
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Miller.

Mr. Dyal with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. Cameron with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Boland.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Burleson.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Tuck with Mr. Murray.

Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. MACDONALD changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 368, nays 2, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—368

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Curtin
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Denton
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris

Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—2

Bow
Curtis

NOT VOTING—62

Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, Glenn
Baring
Belcher
Boland
Bolling
Brock
Burleson
Cabell
Cameron
Chelf
Colmer
Cunningham
Daddario
Dent
Derwinski
Dowdy
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Fino
Fraser
Fuqua
Giaimo
Griffin
Hanna
Hardy
Hébert
Herlong
Jacobs
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Mo.
Keogh
Kirwan
Landrum
McClory
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
Miller
Murray
Nix
Patman
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Reinecke
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Scott
Smith, Va.
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tunney
Whitten
Williams
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Dyal with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Cameron.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Scott.

Mr. GROSS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order, scheduled for today, be transferred to Thursday, April 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

RIGHT APPROACH

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in its noteworthy comment on the President's speech on the importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Houston Chronicle is typical of many papers we have all seen in the last few days.

The President "defended it persuasively," the Chronicle believes, stating that his tone "was friendly, philosophical, and unmistakably firm." The paper also noted that he was conciliatory, holding out the hope "that no member of the treaty will long remain withdrawn from the mutual affairs and obligations of the Atlantic."

In the belief that others will want to see the Chronicle's editorial, I am offering it for inclusion in the Record:

United States Will Stick With NATO

President Johnson adopted the right approach in his reply to President Charles de Gaulle's handwritten letter concerning France's intention to withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In his reply and in his policy statement before the Foreign Service Institute of the State Department, Mr. Johnson's tone was friendly, philosophical, and unmistakably firm. He explained the U.S. position, which differs greatly from France's; he defended it persuasively; and held out the hope that France someday will see the light and return to the fold.

Regardless of what France does, however, Mr. Johnson made clear that the United States intends to stick with NATO and to continue our cooperation with the 13 remaining members in insuring the security of Europe. If France chooses to withdraw the United States can do nothing to stop her.

Not that the United States sees any "righteousness in standing pat" against all suggestions for updating the alliance. If an organization is alive and vital it must grow and change, Mr. Johnson said. But we reject President de Gaulle's view that the time has come for its integrated military structure to be dismantled.

The best one can say for NATO is that it has worked; it has kept the peace in Europe. While it is based on the reality that we must fight together if war comes, Mr. Johnson explained, it also "rests on the reality that war will not come at all if we act together during peace." This is where President de Gaulle disagrees. He sees NATO's military structure as no longer necessary in view of the diminishing threat from Russia. By cutting his military ties with NATO, De Gaulle hopes to gain greater freedom of action and greater prestige for France even at the cost of disrupting the prevailing unity of the Atlantic community.

The United States, on the other hand, remains steadfast in its determination to work with remaining members to preserve and increase NATO's deterrent strength. Indeed, we expect to extend that cooperation and unity of spirit wherever it will be useful.

Mr. Johnson's tone was conciliatory. His letter referred to France as "our old friend and ally," and in his speech differing with the French leader he didn't mention De Gaulle by name. Thus, Mr. Johnson has wisely attempted to minimize the impact of this fundamental disagreement. "We are hopeful," Mr. Johnson said, "that no member of the treaty will long remain withdrawn from the mutual affairs and obligations of the Atlantic."

DESECRATION OF AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, following a recent shameful incident in my district which resulted in the public and deliberate desecration of the American flag, I was shocked to learn there is no Federal law prohibiting such action unless it occurs in the District of Columbia.

I cannot see why it should be any less a Federal crime to trample or tear our beloved symbol of freedom in one of the 50 States than it is in the District of Columbia.

I am referring to the incident last Friday when several hundred demonstrators, led by professional anti-American agitators of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, stormed the Crisp County Courthouse grounds in downtown Cordele, Ga. The screaming mob pulled down the flags of the United States and the State of Georgia and made a public display of tearing them to the shock and amazement of the local citizenry, both white and Negro.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to demonstrate in a peaceful manner, but it is another matter entirely to desecrate that symbol of freedom.

Our Governor moved swiftly to restore law and order and to protect the flags of the United States and Georgia by calling out the State patrol.

I am sure that many of my colleagues will be as shocked as I was to discover that no Federal statute exists to punish such irresponsible acts or to prevent a recurrence in the future.

Each of you will recall that it took a similar public outrage, the burning of draft cards, to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act last year.

In my humble opinion it should be an equally serious offense to desecrate the American flag—a symbol we all hold dear—as it is to alter, destroy, or mutilate a draft card involving the individual.

Therefore, I am today introducing a bill to make it a criminal offense, punishable by a fine up to $10,000 or imprisonment up to 5 years, to publicly mutilate, deface, defile, defy, trample, or cast contempt upon the flag of the United States at any place.

There are some who say that in enacting the draft-card-burning law last year we merely gave these anti-Americans another opportunity to gain publicity from their disloyalty. What a sad commentary on the times.

O, Mr. Speaker, how long shall we debate patriotism? When will my colleagues and fellow Americans wake up to the determined efforts of these people to destroy America from within while operating under the ostensible guise of civil rights workers?

Mr. Speaker, I also extend my remarks at this point in the Record by including a resolution from the Cordele posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and Disabled American Veterans, and a telegram from the president of the Cordele Lions Club.

In a special joint meeting of the local posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and Disabled American Veterans held on April 1, 1966, and representing more than 500 local members, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas since the passage of the Civil Rights Act the local schools, restaurants, and motels have been integrated without serious incident, and tremendous progress has been made between the white and Negro communities in carrying out the intent of the Civil Rights Act, which we understand to be the law, without interference from outside radical organizations until recently, and

Whereas for the past week the peace, harmony, tranquillity, and progress being made between the white and Negro communities have been seriously jeopardized by the descent upon the scene of an organization who represent themselves as being under the banner of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNIC), and being locally led by a Negro preacher who has spent much of his time in a mental institution, and

Whereas contrary to the principles and purpose of peaceful demonstration this group, numbering several hundred of mostly young schoolchildren who had been enticed away from the classrooms by the incompetent leadership, with utter disregard for the truancy laws of the State of Georgia, carried banners displaying the words "No Longer Nonviolence" and taunted the citizens of this community with obscene expressions, disgraceful appearances, using dirty and abusive language to our local police and law enforcement officers, and descended upon the office of our county school superintendent and adjoining offices removing, scattering and knocking his papers and files from the desk onto the floor, and

Whereas this group not being satisfied with this outrage did also swarm upon the courthouse grounds yelling, pulled the flag of the United States and the flag of the State of Georgia from their flagstaff and tore them from their halyards, to the shock and amazement of the citizenry of this county, both white and colored: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, and it is hereby unanimously resolved, That the aforesaid servicemen in peaceful assembly do hereby utterly condemn and deplore the un-American, unpatriotic, and communistic conduct of the aforesaid individuals, particularly the mixed-color outside SNIC agitators, as being diametrically opposed to the truths and principles for which many of us fought and bled in defense of our country on foreign fields, at the same time watching many of our buddies actually die, to preserve the rights, freedoms, privileges, and opportunities characteristic of this country which the aforesaid rabble and misguided do-gooders are now openly and brazenly flaunting and trampling beneath their dirty feet under the guise of civil rights; and be it further

Resolved, That we the veterans of past wars, all peace-loving, law-abiding citizens shall not rest until those responsible for this unprovoked and dastardly act are arrested and brought to justice; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be covered into the minutes of each of the aforesaid organizations present, and a copy thereof sent by certified mail to addressee only, return receipt requested to each of the following: The President of the United States; the Attorney General of the United States; Senator Herman Talmadge; Senator Richard B. Russell; Congressman Maston O'Neal; Gov. Carl Sanders; attorney general of the State of Georgia; State commander of the American Legion; State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; State commander of the Disabled American Veterans; national commander of the American Legion; national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; national commander of the Disabled American Veterans; chairman of the city and county commissions; local and State news media; State and national heads of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNIC).

William L. Sanders Memorial
Post No. 4742,
Harrell J. Pannell, *Commander.*
American Legion Post No. 38,
J. R. Reese, *Commander.*
Disabled American Veterans,
Cordele Chapter No. 3,
C. E. Johnson, *Commander.*

Cordele, Ga.,
March 2, 1966.

Hon. Maston O'Neal,
U.S. Congressman,
Washington, D.C.:

To the present time, relations between the Negro community and white community in this county have been congenial, the local citizenry, both white and Negro having apparent understanding as to the impact of the Civil Rights Act, and both appreciate the necessity for gradualism.

Integration of our schools, our restaurants and motels has begun and progress in this field has been hoped for and expected by the responsible people of both ethnic groups.

Without any semblance of a cause, the tranquillity existing here began deteriorating on Monday when groups of Negro children were enticed away from their schoolrooms by outside SNIC agitators and a local Negro preacher who has spent much of his time in a mental institution.

They have paraded these children through the business community, destroyed property in the school board office, spit upon local law enforcement officers and yelled at them in violent, abusive dirty language.

They blocked entrance to the school board office and Crisp County power commission office in one building and blocked entrance into the other county building, and male and female lying around on the courthouse lawn together, refusing to move on when officers directed them.

These demonstrations culminated yesterday afternoon when the leaders of this group and some small Negro children who knew no better lowered and defaced the American flag and Georgia flag, screaming unintelligibly all the while.

Some of the leaders who committed this act have been identified, warrants issued and they have been placed under arrest. Others have gone into hiding. Last night a Negro was shot and the investigation up to now indicated that he was shot by one of these so-called civil rights leaders.

The desecration of our flags has stunned this community, we believe both the Negroes and the whites. The county attorney has been advised that the actions against the flags, being on county property, does not constitute a crime under any of the Federal statutes. We urge you to do everything possible in your power to remove these SNIC leaders from our community and let us get on with the job of working our salvation for both the Negro and white people in our community. It can be done if these outside influences will leave us alone.

Today the American flag is flying throughout the city of Cordele.

Aubrey E. Alford,
President, Cordele Lions Club.

REPLY IS PRAISED

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans States-Item believes the manner in which President Johnson replied to French President de Gaulle's efforts to change the character of NATO was well handled.

The paper states that the President made it plain that:

> Without close cooperation, nations which collectively possess the greatest arsenal in the world cannot stem aggression.

It notes, too:

> Several times did the President refer to the folly of isolation. It must occur to an older generation how different is this position from that of the United States of a few decades ago, before world leadership was thrust upon it.

Believing that the analysis made by the States-Item will be enjoyed by my colleagues, I herewith offer it for publication in the Record:

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Mar. 24, 1966]

United States Answers De Gaulle

Reform is not reform at all when it applies to French President Charles de Gaulle's efforts to change the character of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the world's most powerful military alliance.

President Johnson rightly speaks out against the fractious Frenchman's shortsighted plan to reduce the highly successful 15-nation defensive device to a loose-jointed affair of bilateral agreements.

It has been plain for years that Moscow respects NATO. Best of proof is that it tried without great luck to establish NATO's counterpart east of the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Johnson says pointedly that without close cooperation, nations which collectively possess the greatest arsenal in the world cannot stem aggression.

And, obviously with France in mind, he declares: "Yet a nation—not by the action of her friends but by her own decision to prepare and plan alone—could still imperil her own security by creating a situation in which response would be too late and too diluted."

Several times did the President refer to the folly of isolation. It must occur to an older generation how different is this position from that of the United States of a few decades ago, before world leadership was thrust upon it.

Mr. Johnson cannot be accused of mincing words with General de Gaulle, yet neither can he be blamed for alienating the general. President de Gaulle has taken care of that painstakingly.

He refuses to learn from World Wars I and II as well as from the object lessons of bilateral agreements in the last century. That must not be permitted to jeopardize the 14 steadfast nations of NATO.

ONE BILLION DOLLAR PROJECTS DELAYED BY UDALL

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Duke Power Co. has requested of the Congress and the Federal Power Commission permission to spend $1 billion to develop Appalachia.

This is private capital equal to the entire authorization by the Congress to develop Appalachia. The responsibility for the delay of the major portion of this development in an undeveloped area of Appalachia is with the Department of the Interior.

As incredible as it may seem, the Department of the Interior, a tax supported Department, is delaying and could destroy forever these taxpaying projects.

I recently visited the Keowee-Toxaway area of Pickens County and Oconee County, S.C., and Transylvania County, N. C., where Duke is seeking permission to spend $700 million. This area is undeveloped and is ideal for the development of private enterprise, taxpaying projects such as proposed by Duke Power Co. It is urgent that Duke Power Co. be permitted to begin its Keowee-Toxaway project now.

Duke needs to know by the end of this month, April 1966.

Duke is anxious to have the initial steps of this vast project in operation by May 1971. Duke must know now in order to commit itself for the powerplant machinery. Orders for water wheels and other necessary items must be made immediately in order to meet the completion date in early 1971 and thus supply power needs at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I am today sending the following telegram to Secretary Udall:

Hon. Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.:

More than a year ago Duke Power Co., on January 4, 1965, requested a license from the Federal Power Commission to begin power generating projects in an undeveloped area of Appalachia in my congressional district in South Carolina and in Representative Roy Taylor's district in western North Carolina involving the expenditure of more than $700 million of private capital.

Someone in the Department of the Interior has employed delaying tactics by requesting one study after another. These obstructionist tactics are strange and unexplainable. The latest request for an extension was made on January 6 by Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Kenneth Holum for a period of 90 days—until April 7. In granting this extension, the Federal Power Commission expressed the hope it would not be necessary to take all of the 90 days allowed. Apparently the Interior Department did take the full 90 days—that 90-day period expiring tomorrow, April 7. I urge that no further extensions will be requested by the Department of the Interior of the Federal Power Commission in order that this great project in Appalachia can begin now.

The Appalachian Commission has been forced to withhold a grant for vital road construction in this area until the FPC has made its decision. This road construction is absolutely necessary before the construction of this gigantic project can get underway.

Our Committee on Public Works recommended and the Congress authorized last year approximately $1 billion of Federal funds for development of the Appalachian region. Duke is proposing to spend approximately $1 billion also to develop the Appalachian region, $700 million of which would be spent on the Keowee-Toxaway project (FPC 2503).

The Duke project would generate an abundance of cheap electricity, furnish water for municipal and industrial use, for county rural water systems and recreation on a mammoth scale. Power needs in this area of South Carolina and North Carolina are estimated to be four times the present need by 1985. The Duke projects are indispensable to meet these needs. Duke's electric power rates are 20 percent below the national average.

This Duke Keowee-Toxaway project would pay into the Federal Treasury $24 million annually in taxes and $20 million into the treasuries of the local and State governments. Past experience has demonstrated that for every dollar invested in the generation of electricity by Duke Power Company $3 additional are invested in new industry and expansion of old thus providing huge additional tax revenues. Fifty-five percent of all industry locating in the Carolinas has located in the area served by Duke Power Co.

This Duke development in Appalachia would consume from $135 to $140 million worth of coal annually from the depressed coal fields of Kentucky, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and other areas of Appalachia. The vast majority of this coal would be used in the Keowee-Toxaway project. This Duke Keowee-Toxaway project is one of the greatest projects ever proposed in the history of the United States. It has the overwhelming endorsement of the people of South Carolina, its Governor, legislature and congressional delegation. It also has the support of North Carolina.

This project would provide for better schools, roads, hospitalization and job opportunity so desperately needed by the people of Appalachia.

Mr. Secretary, I respectfully urge that anyone in your Department be restrained from requesting still another study which would only delay and hinder further Federal Power Commission consideration of a license for this great project in Appalachia.

Respectfully and sincerely,
Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn,
Member of Congress, Third South Carolina District.

PULL THE STRING ON DE GAULLE

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent actions of President de Gaulle directed toward further removing France from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and raising the strong possibility that the infrastructure of NATO may have to be moved from French soil and relocated elsewhere makes one wonder why the United States does not begin to make its displeasure felt at this new example of Gallic irresponsibility.

It may not be possible for us to change the trend of events in France, but we certainly do not have to let it be thought that we like what De Gaulle is doing to us and to NATO.

It is true that the problem is a joint problem and should be treated as the problem of 14 nations, rather than that of the United States alone, but since the United States has been such a preponderant partner in terms of organization and financing, the American people cannot avoid the feeling that De Gaulle really means what he says about removing United States influence and is directing his efforts against the United States while using our atomic power as a shield.

When we remember the urgent plea of the French that NATO headquarters be located on French soil and that the council also be placed there and the acquiescence of the other members of NATO, the present intimations of withdrawal come with singularly bad grace.

And when one realizes that over the years of NATO the United States has contributed over $900 million for its share of the infrastructure alone and that its replacement could cost a major portion of $1 billion the true extent of De Gaulle's impolitesse is apparent.

Is there any reason why we should not play some of the cards which we hold in our hands with the same coolness that the general employs?

For example, he has been methodically requiring the settlement in gold of American debts to France based on normal currency transactions but far above the normal percentage of conversion. This, of course, has been done at a time when the United States is having balance-of-payment problems due to our broad commitments throughout the world, among them the support of troops who have been allocated to NATO for the defense of France.

Why could we not take a page from De Gaulle's book and start acting on the basis of strict legality?

For example, would we not have a cause of action in quasi-contract for the benefit of the infrastructure which has been conferred?

More importantly though, what about the indebtedness of the French Government to the United States? This debt which goes back to World War I originally presently amounts to $4.688 billion.

Why should this obligation not be applied against any claims that France may exert against the United States?

Or better yet, why should we not bring suit against France in the World Court or any proper tribunal to recover the amounts due and owing.

NEW YORK CITY FAILS TO MEET DEADLINE FOR HEADSTART SUMMER PROGRAM

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, New York city's Headstart program is in utter chaos and distress. In view of the crisis, I call upon Sargent Shriver to step in and bypass the New York City Economic Opportunity Committee and deal directly with the independent agencies which have applied for Headstart programs.

Unfortunately, New York City's Headstart program still appears hopelessly mired in bureaucratic redtape. So seriously endangered is the program that the cochairman of the New York City Headstart Committee has resigned. In announcing her resignation, Mrs. Elinor Guggenheimer said that delay, inefficiency, and chaos are endangering the program.

Mr. Speaker, 3 months have passed—the winter has come and gone—since this program should have been fully operating. The program was approved by the Office of Economic Opportunity last December 27 in the amount of $6.5 million for 11,843 youngsters.

On February 14, I spoke on the floor of the House, pointing out that not a single approved agency had been authorized by the city to proceed. I reported that I had called upon both the mayor of New York City and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to break the bottlenecks and make the funds available for the benefit of the children who would never regain the time lost.

After inexcusable delay, programs for the winter Headstart program have now finally been started by 21 agencies, and 7 agencies are partially operating. They involve some 1,440 children. However, 17 agencies with programs involving about 3,500 children are not operating, and the children are trapped in the middle of a bureaucratic wrangle.

The New York City Economic Opportunity Committee should have been working full force since last August to prepare for the winter Headstart program. When the Federal grant was authorized on December 27, all applications should already have been evaluated, all space locations inspected, all programs ready to go.

In many communities throughout the country antipoverty agencies were all set with their local Headstart plans in early October. In New York City, Headstart application forms were first made available by the city to the independent agencies at the very end of October, and even at that point no clear guidelines were given to Headstart applicants. By the end of November no single facility had been inspected; by the end of December there was no clear picture as to the availability of adequate spaces—and to this date, the New York City Economic Opportunity Committee has not submitted accurate estimates of the magnitude of its space and renovating problem to the Federal Government.

In order to meet local licensing requirements, many of the proposed classrooms had to be renovated. This was known to the New York City Economic Opportunity Committee last August, and all the necessary preparations should have been completed so that classes would have been started upon approval of the grant last December. Instead the city waited and did nothing.

After the Office of Economic Opportunity approved the $6.5 million grant in December 27, then the city argued that the cost of renovations should come out of the Federal OEO grant. Meanwhile all the programs were held up, including those which had no licensing problem.

On February 21 the Office of Economic Opportunity by telegram authorized the reallocation of $490,000 for renovation, with a limit of $10,000 per facility. Three days later the authorization was rescinded. A month went by. The bureaucrats wrangled. During this period, contracts were at last signed for programs which did not require renovation. The bureaucrats continued to wrangle. Then, on March 19, the Office of Economic Opportunity agreed to authorize a maximum of $2,000 per classroom. In addition, the city is to contribute $150,000 or one third of the total Federal funds expended for renovation, whichever is less, but in no event less than $100,000.

All during the winter, the Office of Economic Opportunity asked the city for renovation cost estimates and contract specifications. This information has not been supplied, and the city has yet not submitted any renovation contracts to the Office of Economic Opportunity for the required approval.

Mr. Speaker, needless to say, the children are the ones who suffer. It is time for the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to step into this situation and straighten it out. I call upon him to deal directly with the independent agencies involved and get them started individually and immediately.

Mr. Speaker, there is still another aspect to the tragic chaos that has marked the New York City Headstart program. March 31 was the deadline set by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity for the submission of applications for this summer's Headstart program. New York City has failed to meet the deadline. The Office of Economic Opportunity is prepared to fund programs for 26,000 children this summer—the same as last summer. However, the city must act and submit its applications. Otherwise, we will not only face the same chaos and delay with the summer Headstart program, but the funds will be lost completely and diverted to other cities and States.

The failure of New York City to apply by March 31 should not result in further denial for needy children. I again urge the Office of Economic Opportunity to deal directly with the proposed independent Headstart agencies, so that there will not be a repetition of what has happened this winter.

RAILWAY PROGRESS INSTITUTE ENDORSEMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a news release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read a recent policy statement by the Railway Progress Institute, the national association of the railway supply and equipment industry, endorsing the President's proposal for a Department of Transportation. This statement is indicative of the widespread support which is being given this proposal, and I ask to include it in the RECORD at this point.

STATEMENT OF RAILWAY PROGRESS INSTITUTE

The Railway Progress Institute, the national association of the railway equipment and supply industry, has endorsed, by vote of its governing board, the concept of a Federal Department of Transportation. While endorsing the concept, the institute reserves the right to offer constructive criticism on detailed aspects of the proposal as they develop in congressional testimony.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO TRAVEL TO PHILIPPINES AND SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 803 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 803

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to send not more than five members of such committee and not more than two staff assistants to the Republic of the Philippines and South Vietnam for the purpose of conducting a full and complete investigation and study into the disability compensation and pension program, the death compensation and death pension program, the dependency and indemnity compensation program, insurance, education, vocational rehabilitation, hospital and medical care and other subjects properly coming within the jurisdiction of said committee in the Republic of the Philippines and in the case of American veterans and servicemen in South Vietnam the above-mentioned subjects and the servicemen's group life insurance program as authorized by Public Law 89–214.

Notwithstanding section 1754 or title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. **SISK**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA]. Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 803 is the normal travel resolution which will affect the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and permit two staff and five committee members to travel to the Philippines or Vietnam. The resolution conforms in all ways to the normal resolution of this type.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for its adoption and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. **LATTA**. Mr. Speaker, this resolution passed the Committee on Rules unanimously after being explained by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, that members of this committee would not be going to South Vietnam at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND AFTER THE EASTER RECESS

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as to whether or not there is any further legislative business this week, and if he could tell us when he will make an announcement of the legislative program beginning Monday, April 18.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman, we have finished the legislative program for this week. I know at this time of no legislative business for tomorrow. It will be our purpose to announce the program for the week following the Easter holidays on tomorrow. We do expect to have business on Monday following the Easter recess.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

A PROTEST ON SECRETARY OF INTERIOR'S LIFTING OF CONTROLS ON IMPORTS OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

Mr. **HECHLER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HECHLER**. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the coal miners of West Virginia, many of whom will lose their jobs as a result of unregulated dumping of cheap residual oil from Venezuela. I would also like to protest against the action of the Secretary of the Interior in lifting controls on imports of residual fuel oil, which was done in recent days. I think this was a most unfortunate move, which lost jobs for West Virginians and for the railroaders in West Virginia and which resulted in economic losses for the people of my State.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is very unfortunate at a time when we are taking other steps to improve the economy of the Appalachian area.

Mr. **BURKE**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. **HECHLER**. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. **BURKE**. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members of the House that the gentleman from West Virginia is more than likely, the cause of having these restrictions carried on as long as they have been.

Mr. Speaker, these restrictions have worked a great hardship upon New England and upon the balance of the northeastern part of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my good friend from West Virginia why the gentleman does not consider the balance of the country? The gentleman is always talking about West Virginia, and he was very effective during the time these restrictions were imposed. He always seems to be working and talking for West Virginia. I think the gentleman is working too hard for West Virginia.

I feel it is about time that West Virginia thought a little bit about New England.

Mr. **HECHLER**. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Massachusetts. We appreciate New England in West Virginia, but we most vehemently must protest when you take jobs away from us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend in the RECORD an editorial from the Herald-Dispatch of Huntington, W. Va.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to follows:

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION THROWS SUNDAY PUNCH AT WEST VIRGINIA

In lifting controls on imports of residual fuel oil, the Democratic administration in Washington has thrown a Sunday punch at West Virginia's economy.

Unregulated dumping of this cheap oil from Venezuela and other oil-producing countries on the eastern coast of the United States will result in lost markets for the bituminous coal industry, lost jobs for West Virginia miners, lost jobs for railroaders in West Virginia and economic losses for the people of the State as the indirect result of damage to its leading industry.

The ruling, announced by Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, is a victory for the big-city Democratic bosses on the eastern seaboard.

Udall's contention that his order will "combat inflation by encouraging fuel and free competition in the marketplace" is a sorry joke. Individual householders' furnaces are not equipped to use this heavy stuff. It is suitable only for converted utility boilers and other large installations, many of which have been burning coal.

That the move is being made with cynical disregard for the national security is indicated by the manner in which Udall's announcement dwells on this angle of the scheme.

The Office of Emergency Planning and the Defense Department are quoted as approving the lifting of import quotas on heavy fuel oil. Both agree that "control of these imports can be relaxed without impairment to the national security."

Well, they're all on the same partisan team. Why shouldn't they agree when the captain gives the command?

But if something happens to cut off this supply of residual oil, there will be a different attitude in Washington. Then the coal miners of West Virginia will again be called upon to meet emergency needs and "dig coal for victory"—a challenge they have often heard and have always met.

The interruption need not be total war—although that is always a possibility. Almost any kind of brush war in Latin America could imperil the free movements of oil tankers or disrupt the flow of oil to coastal refineries in South America.

Or, suppose Venezuela and one or two other Latin American countries had Castro-type revolutions and went under the Communist banner. Would they continue to send us their oil? And would we continue to buy it?

There is no shortage of coal in eastern markets. There has been no escalation of coal prices on the scale of food and other commodities. Coal has had no part in the inflationary rumble.

The basic reason why West Virginia industry and West Virginia workers are being made to suffer from this unfair foreign competition is that the State is politically a captive State. With an overwhelming Democratic majority in voter registrations and only a single Republican representative in Congress, a revolt at the polls is not feared. But in the eastern cities the Johnson administration faces serious Republican competition with a party split by the issues of the Vietnam war.

The big-city Democratic bosses have been clamoring for free entry of this cheap coal-substitute. They think it will help them with the voters. Maybe it will. But heaven help the Nation if a depressed coal industry is suddenly required to fill the gap in a broken fuel supply.

IMPORT QUOTAS ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SHOULD BE REVIEWED IN TIME OF HEIGHTENED DEMAND

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 31 the President under section 22(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act announced an enlargement of the U.S. quota restricting the importation of foreign Cheddar cheeses, pending investigation and report by the Tariff Commission. The quota for the remainder of the year until June 30, 1966, was increased by 926,700 pounds. This action is in response to alleged domestic shortages and price increases.

In his request to the Tariff Commission the President asked whether the present quota of 2,780,100 pounds may be increased by 926,700 pounds; whether the existing 2,780,100-pound quota may be indefinitely enlarged to 4,005,100 pounds; whether for the quota year beginning July 1, 1966, the existing quota may be enlarged to 9,565,300 pounds, without rendering ineffective the Agricultural Department's price-support programs for milk and butterfat.

The quota on Cheddar cheese was imposed in 1953 pursuant to Tariff Commission investigation. Quotas on 11 other products were also imposed at the same time. These quotas have not been reviewed since 1953 except for the enlargement of quotas on three other types of cheese in 1960–61. Among the quotas in effect at present are quotas on butter, which is now experiencing shortness of supply accompanied by price increases.

In view of the increasing prices for many types of foodstuffs, the President might use his authority under section 22(d) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to reexamine U.S. quotas on imported foodstuffs. Section 22(d) says that:

> After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section.

Clearly the President has the authority to cause all such quotas to be reexamined by the Tariff Commission. In view of increasing prices of foods, including milk, cheese, and especially butter, some of the most important items of consumption of our people, the President should more actively use the provisions of law available to him to determine whether section 22 quotas are fixed at proper levels.

However, I think it is important for the President to realize that as he uses powers to increase imports to alleviate the pressures for domestic price increases, or uses powers to restrict exports—that is, hides—for the same purposes he is aggravating an equally dangerous situation existing in our imbalance of international payments.

He really has only one true course open to him to put the Federal Government's fiscal house in order. This can only be done through drastic expenditure reform and removing from positions of influence these economic counselors who have been advising him that there is nothing wrong with continued deficit financing.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN COMPACT RATIFIED

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would provide the consent of Congress to the Arkansas River Basin Compact which has been drafted and ratified by the States of Kansas and Oklahoma.

The compact will become binding and obligatory when this legislation is approved by the Congress and signed by the President. The compact was signed by representatives for the States of Kansas and Oklahoma on March 31, 1965, at Wichita, Kans. Robert L. Smith and Warden L. Noe were compact representatives for the State of Kansas, and George R. Benz and Frank Raab represented the State of Oklahoma. Trigg Twichell, appointed by the President, represented the United States during negotiations.

Congress gave its consent to such negotiations under Public Law 340, 84th Congress, 1st session, on August 11, 1955.

The Arkansas River Basin Compact, Kansas-Oklahoma, has several major purposes. They are:

First, to promote interstate comity between the States of Kansas and Oklahoma;

Second, to divide and apportion equitably between the States of Kansas and Oklahoma the waters of the Arkansas River Basin and to promote the orderly development thereof;

Third, to provide an agency for administering the water apportionment agreed to herein;

Fourth, to encourage the maintenance of an active pollution abatement program in each of the two States and to seek the further reduction of both natural and manmade pollution in the waters of the Arkansas River Basin.

The terms of the compact include that portion of the Arkansas River from a point immediately below the confluence of the Arkansas and Little Arkansas Rivers in the vicinity of Wichita, Kans., to a point immediately below the confluence of the Arkansas River with the Grand-Neosho River near Muskogee, Okla.

I have been advised that the Governor of Oklahoma signed ratification papers on June 2, 1965, and the Governor of Kansas signed the document on March 4, 1966. The approval of Congress and signature of the President will implement the provisions of this important compact.

ALICE IN BLUNDERLAND: BIRCHERS FRATERNITY BROTHERS AND LEFTWINGERS REPRESENTING THE POOR

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the doorbell rang on February 23 at the Sigma Phi house, in the fraternity row district east of San Jose State College, and was answered by one of the brothers, 19-year-old Garth Steen.

So began another incredible episode in the war on poverty. The caller was a poverty canvasser assigned to get the poor out for a meeting that night. Although Steen's family income was in five figures, he had heard about the poverty war and attended the meeting. Lo and behold, "Alice in Blunderland" style poverty officials had managed to interest three people to attend a meeting to select three representatives of the poor. Young Steen returned to Sigma Phi house that night a duly elected representative of the poor for a 3-year term.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, Congressman Charles S. Gubser, has informed the Congress that the Santa Clara County Economic Opportunity Commission is suffering the torments of all others who have been forced to struggle in the torture machine of the poverty administration structure.

Last December, a John Birch Society section leader, Ray Gurries, was elected a representative of the poor in Santa Clara County. According to a local investigator, the community action board "is shot through with leftwingers—people who are not run-of-the-mill liberals but hardnosed activists of every leftist cause that has come along over the past half dozen years."

The local San Jose Mercury, one of the largest newspapers of southern California, describes the poverty board in these terms:

> It is a jerry-built structure, erected on shifting political sands, to house a program which has a worthy aim. It is run like a football game with an unlimited substitution rule, and a change of rules at the end of every quarter.

Mr. Speaker, the experience of Santa Clara County is far from an isolated one. Congress has failed the sincere and dedicated people who wish to fight poverty. We have written a law without meaningful and realistic standards that would avoid community action chaos. What has happened in Santa Clara County is a distortion and perversion of the exciting concept of involving the poor in helping themselves. Many of us warned 2 years ago that this would happen if we did not rewrite the President's poverty proposal.

We owe our colleague, the distinguished and able Congressman GUBSER, a debt of gratitude for calling this matter to our attention. On March 9, Mr. GUBSER requested OEO to investigate the situation in Santa Clara County. On March 23 the Deputy Director testified to us in committee that OEO had been on the scene in Santa Clara checking for about 8 days. To date, our colleague has not even had the courtesy of an acknowledgment from OEO of his March 9 request. All of us in the Congress are getting mighty tired of the cavalier attitude of officials at OEO.

Mr. Speaker, the Quie-Goodell opportunity crusade, H.R. 13379, would avoid problems such as have occurred in Santa Clara County. OEO would be required to insist on balanced community action agencies, including true representatives of the poor as well as local officials and private social welfare agencies. The time is long overdue for Congress to launch a real opportunity crusade as a complete substitute for the confusing, controversial, and faltering war on poverty.

FINANCING OF PRIVATE INDUSTRIAL PLANTS THROUGH TAX-EXEMPT MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to neutralize insofar as possible the economic advantage extended by State and municipal authorities to private industrial corporations, through the issuance of tax-exempt obligations in order to finance industrial construction.

The exemption from Federal taxation enjoyed by State and municipal governmental authorities was intended to permit them to finance their governmental operations free from any burden of Federal taxation. It was never intended to be used as a means of borrowing "cheap money" to build plants in order to attract industry from other areas. The financing of private industrial plants through the issuance of tax-exempt municipal obligations is a flagrant abuse of the tax-exemption privilege.

With rising interest rates charged on industrial loans, this abuse of the tax-exemption privilege by local governmental authorities has spread throughout the country. It is a matter which the Congress no longer can ignore. As was pointed out in a recent article in the Wall Street Journal on April 1, 1966, more than $1 billion of these municipal industrial bond offerings were sold during 1965. Last year through the issuance of tax-exempt municipal bonds, American Can Co. and Skelly Oil Co. raised $60 million for a plastics plant in Iowa. In Alabama, Revere Copper & Brass Co. jointly raised $55 million; Hammermill Paper Corp. raised $25 million; and, Mead Corp. and Inland Container Corp. jointly raised $45 million. A Canadian paper company is planning a $75 million issue to finance a mill near Pine Hill, Ala. It is estimated that a total of $220 million will be raised in Arkansas during 1966. Other smaller issues have been marketed by municipalities in other States, including Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Missouri.

None of these funds were needed for governmental purposes. These securities were intended solely to finance the erection of the industrial facilities, and for the most part were secured by the lease of such facilities by some of our largest corporations. These coporations had ample resources to build the facilities on their own. The credit of the corporations is the real backing behind the obligation. In most cases, the municipality may not even have the borrowing capacity, within its taxing district to borrow such funds, without relying upon the credit of a large industrial corporation. Arrangements are made for the municipality to issue bonds in order to build a plant for the corporation. The plant is in turn leased to the corporation, and the lease used as security for the municipal obligation.

While I certainly do not criticize efforts made by these municipalities to attract industry, I do not think that the Federal tax-exemption enjoyed by municipal obligations should be used as the bait. It is a perversion of the tax-exempt privilege enjoyed by the municipality. It was never intended that this privilege be used as an umbrella to facilitate what amounts to private corporate borrowings at a more favorable rate of interest. This abuse jeopardizes the tax-exemption privilege for all municipal obligations.

An amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which sought to prevent the use of tax-exempt bonds to finance industrial facilities was passed by this body in the revenue bill of 1954. This amendment provided for the disallowance as a deduction of the rental paid for an industrial facility, the cost of which was financed by the issuance of tax-exempt bonds. The amendment was not included in the Senate bill, and was deleted in conference. In explanation, the statement of the managers on the part of the House contained the following:

> This amendment strikes out section 274 of the House bill which provided that no deduction should be allowed with respect to amounts paid to States or other governmental units, or to their political subdivisions, for the use of property acquired or improved out of the proceeds of industrial development revenue bonds (as defined in the House bill) authorized after February 8, 1954.
>
> While it is recognized that a serious abuse may be developing where the Federal income tax exemption granted interest on State and local governmental obligations is used for purposes of attracting new industry, the method proposed in the House bill to check this abuse would have had the unintended result of affecting adversely certain proper governmental functions, such as the operation of municipal wharf and storage facilities, municipal airports, and similar operations.
>
> It is believed that further study should be given to this problem so that the solution adopted to prevent the abuse will not prejudice those activities which properly fall within the scope of the local government units (Rept. No. 2543, 83d Cong., 2d sess. p. 33).

Similar proposals have been pending before the Congress for the past 12 years. Various alternative approaches have been suggested. After considering these, it is my opinion that the most practical approach is to treat the rental value of a facility supplied to an industry by a municipality or other governmental authority, adjusted for the actual rents paid, as taxable income to the user of the facility. In other words, if a governmental authority finances a facility in order to attract industry and leases that facility at less than a fair rental, the difference between the rent paid and the fair rental value of the facility is in reality a bonus or consideration paid to the industry for locating in the facility. That bonus should be taxed in the same manner as any other consideration would be taxed if paid for the performance of a specific act. The bill which I have introduced establishes a basis for taxing as income the advantage which is derived through the reduced rental.

In the past, one of the objections to this approach has been the difficulty of determining the fair rental value of a facility. My bill provides a formula which will, for the most part, meet that objection. The fair rental value for the facility is predicated upon its cost amortized with interest at 6 percent per annum over the term of the lease, and in no event over a period in excess of 20 years or the useful life of the facility, whichever is the lesser. This will result in attributing taxable income to the user of the facility measured by the difference between what the facility would have been rented for if financed privately and the rentals actually paid. Income attributable to the use of the facility is thus equivalent to the savings in rental which flow from the use of the tax-exempt borrowing power of the governmental authority.

The bill does not affect the tax-exempt status of any obligations issued by the municipality. It avoids the problem of tracing funds.

The bill does not inhibit any legitimate action which might be taken to attract new industry. I do not think that we should attempt to legislate against such action. The bill merely seeks to neutralize the advantage from financing the facility through tax-exempt obligations.

Where a subsidy is given to an industry in order to locate in a specific area, the amount or value of the subsidy should be treated as taxable income. It clearly constitutes a measurable economic benefit or consideration for undertaking an act. As such, it is well within the term "gross income" as defined in the Constitution and in the statutes.

The bill is drawn in such a form so as not to impede the commercial facilities in a terminal building, for the operation of public services, such as water works, transportation, and the like.

I think that the time has come for the Ways and Means Committee to stop sweeping this question under the rug. The widespread abuse of the tax exemption enjoyed by municipal obligations cannot be ignored. If this abuse is permitted to continue, the entire structure of municipal financing will be jeopardized. The tax exemption will be taken away from all municipal obligations, both good and bad. For this reason, I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will give this bill its early consideration. I am requesting that the Treasury Department do likewise.

"A TALK ABOUT THE ARMY," BY GEN. HAMILTON H. HOWZE

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the April 1966 issue of Army magazine carries one of the most interesting and highly readable articles on the Army that I have ever seen. In "35 Years" now-retired Gen. Hamilton H. Howze reflects on his military career and states, simply:

> I feel I can talk about the Army, its bad features as well as its good, because I love it.

I have had the pleasure of personally meeting General Howze, and have always had high regard for his professional competence and abilities. General Howze closes his article by saying:

> The future of the whole Army is bright. Particularly I congratulate those who call themselves professional soldiers. After all, there's nothing like a pro.

This is very true, and one reason that the future of the Army is bright, and the future of our country is secure, is the dedication and ability of professionals like General Howze.

The article is as follows:

A Talk About the Army—35 Years

This is in no sense a recital of what befell me in my years of commissioned service, for that would make dull reading. To me, of course, 35 years plus 4 at West Point are a pretty substantial number, even though surpassed by many hundreds of other people. But 35 are enough for establishing a few biases, and it is these that I shall expose in the fancy prose which follows immediately after the commercial.

I feel I can talk about the Army, its bad features as well as its good, because I love it. My father was in the Army, and my grandfather and great-grandfather; and my wife's father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. So also my uncle, brother, cousin, two brothers-in-law, and a scattering of others. In spite of anything I could or would do, I'll always be a soldier. That was the commercial. I have retired (with great gratitude for all the Army did for me) and now hold down a civilian job, to the astonishment of the whole family.

Now that I live a civilian life in a civilian community I am much impressed by the prestige of the military services. You don't feel this very plainly while still in uniform, but it is quite apparent to me now. It should be a matter of gratification, I think, to everyone on active duty. It's too bad the feeling of the civilian community, in this respect, isn't made a bit more obvious.

Ours is a good Army, good enough to make you, when you retire, forever proud that you belonged to it. But it is nonsense to claim that it is perfect, or that it is incumbent on every member to publicly maintain a totally uncritical view. Too often have I heard senior members trumpet the unblemished virtues of the Army before civilian audiences that knew better; so too do Army information brochures protest too much. Far preferable, in my opinion, is an approach which acknowledges fault, but makes plain the point that there are mighty few American organizations that do better, and practically none that try harder. This line might, hopefully, still at least some of the very derogatory opinions of the Army and its ways expressed in countless civilian-produced books and newspapers and movies and plays.

So if I am sometimes critical in what follows I hope I may be excused. My motives are, as the farmer said, as pure as the drivelling snow.

It will perhaps be a surprise that I omit mention of Vietnam. I am quite aware of what is going on there, and of the fact that the fighting there is the major preoccupation of the Army worldwide. I can only suggest that the Army's performance in Vietnam, which reports indicate is magnificent, is a reflection of basic worth built up during years of study and administration and training—and fighting—in areas other than Vietnam. So it is to these matters that I address myself, acknowledging that much more important issues are being decided, to the great credit of American arms, in the rain forests and rice paddies of southeast Asia.

UPS AND DOWNS

The Army is subjected to some stresses not usual among large civilian businesses, the greatest of which is that of repeated expansion and contraction of its structure. Business, of course, has good years and bad, but the strains of the bad years are met by capital reserves and by cutting dividends to stockholders—rarely by closing out substantial parts of the corporate structure.

But look at the Army. If the world shows even faint signs of behaving itself, down goes the military budget and out of existence go units to which millions of dollars, and enormous labor, have been devoted. Only the professional soldier knows how disheartening and damaging this is and how often it occurs, for the process is really not made apparent to anyone else. I will long remember the chagrin felt by us who had labored in it when the 2d Armored Division, a finely trained, fully equipped battle-ready outfit, was brought back from Germany in 1956 to train recruits at Fort Hood. It retained a proud title, but had neither the equipment nor the men nor the training to back it up.

The Government has stopped the practice, fortunately—that of hanging a division title on something not a division at all. It was a misleading practice, presenting to the American people—but not to a foreign intelligence service digging into the facts of the matter—a false picture of strength. But we still struggle with the problem; up to a short time ago it took the form of reduced strength, and even now some units are very weak.

Over the years, the terms "company," "battalion," and "division" have come to have meaning to professional soldiers in terms of what units of those designations can do in combat—how big a job in attack, defense, and other necessary operations. With this understanding (which can come only through experience) the Army's schools and staff system laboriously develop the composition of units of infantry, armor, artillery, aviation, and technical services as respects men and the skills they require, and as regards vehicles, weapons, and other equipment. If and when all this flesh and hardware are gathered together and trained, you have a battle-ready unit, and theoretically at least it takes all of that unit to do the mission the unit is supposed to be able to do—why else was it so structured in the table of organization? In battle the unit will suffer casualties which reduce its capabilities, of course, but a replacement system is designed to rebuild it.

Despite all the reasoning which lies behind each published table of organization, and presumably for purposes of effecting economies without openly acknowledging reduction in strength, the device of reduced strength has been used extensively. The effect of this is often compounded by establishing even lower manning levels and then by making units count among their strength men who have not yet reported to it or have long since departed the area. The result is critical; it's hard to make an absent soldier shoot at a present enemy charging up a hill. Yet for some reason we don't squawk enough about it—perhaps because through dreary experience we've gotten conditioned to understrength. In almost every division of the Army save those in Vietnam a platoon of 30 men looks big even though the proper TOE strength may be 46.

When present-for-duty strength falls below 95 percent of TOE, things go out of balance, for many—surprisingly many—jobs of a unit don't change whether its strength is at 50 or 100 percent; the whole staff, for example, and drivers and mechanics. And if an imbalance exists (and it always does) as respects skills among men who are present, battle effectiveness goes down still further.

The table which follows won't meet any scientific criteria; the fact that all the percentages come out in even 10's proves that my statistics weren't run out on a computer. I can argue pretty vehemently, however, in behalf of its approximate accuracy. My reason for including the table is to make clear the point that as you reduce a unit's strength its effectiveness goes down much more than proportionately. That's another way of saying that the taxpayer's dollar is not producing, in this case, a dollar's worth of defense. Note that figures in italic type show battle effectiveness, on which (of course) the quantity and quality of equipment present will have further influence, not shown.

Present-for-duty strength (percent)	Training status of those present according to MOS (percent)			
	100	90	80	70
100	*100*	*90*	*80*	*70*
95	*90*	*80*	*70*	*60*
90	*80*	*70*	*60*	*50*
85	*70*	*60*	*50*	*40*
80	*60*	*50*	*40*	*30*

By the foregoing I indicate my belief that an outfit of 80-percent strength present for duty, 100-percent trained, is only 60-percent effective. If it is only 70-percent trained (a far more likely state of affairs, for it is quite impossible to train an understrength unit properly because structure and manpower are out of kilter and there is inevitably a considerable imbalance in MOS skills), I would rate the unit only about 30-percent effective.

The early days of the Korean war were fought by understrength, undertrained U.S. units brought hastily from Japan. If you consult "South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu" (the Army's official history of those days) you will read a dreary record of soldiers unable to climb hills, unwilling to hold positions, ineffective with their weapons, unconditioned, untrained, unbrave. Infantry faded to the rear at threat of enemy attack, usually in vehicles to which they gravitated like chicks to a hen. In doing so they were often cut to pieces by ambusing North Koreans who knew how to walk. One artillery battery was driven completely away from its guns by a single rifleman. Were there some exceptions to this pattern? Of course, but the record at the beginning, taken as a whole, is mighty sorry, and one whose primary cause was understrength—which tears an outfit up morally as well as organically. You might say that understrength is no excuse for lack of training effort; this is certainly true, but completely effective training is not possible under those circumstances, as I have said, an incentive to train is not heightened when in the opinion of the Pentagon (made obvious to the unit's officers and noncommissioned officers by the very fact that the outfit is kept understrength) the current mission of the unit is not important.

You can get an efficient military force out of any number from 1 to 10 million, but only if the force is properly structured. It is not possible to get a battalion to do a full battalion's job—in preparation for battle or in battle itself—unless the battalion is essentially all there. A repeat of the early days of the U.S. Army's performance in Korea should be put dead last on the Army's agenda for the future, in the hope that the meeting will break up before we get around to it.

The moral to all this is that the Government and people of the United States should not without a most careful study of effect, subject military structure to alternate ballooning and collapse, save for coping with the emergency of a big war. I strongly suspect that a somewhat stronger-than-always-necessary military force would be the cheaper solution as well as the more effective. And I also suggest that when it is necessary to draw down the Army's total manpower, units which are at all likely to be committed to battle be kept at full strength, ready to go—particularly if they are overseas. When reduction is necessary whole units should be inactivated, the rest kept wholly viable. If it is essential for sake of maintaining it in the structure not to inactivate a unit altogether, then its maintenance at cadre strength (perhaps 20 percent of full TOE) should be considered. The unit should then become a sort of school-plus-equipment-maintenance outfit, and should be plainly tagged as such for purposes of identification. The Korean Army, incidentally, practices this system in its reserve units with excellent effect. Maybe we could get it to send over an advisory group to show us how.

CARE OF THE NCO

It would be a fine thing if the NCO went back to work as such. The last initial, "O," means officer, or leader. We have unwisely changed the meaning, in many instances, to that of just another working soldier with no requirement to lead anybody or anything.

The noncommissioned officer will develop and flourish only if he is given appropriate responsibility. Over the years too much of that responsibility has been withdrawn, putting the NCO often in a position of a highly paid private who is expected to exhibit little or no initiative of his own.

Officers spend too much time, not too little, in the company or battery area. Officers give too many directions, exercise too much direct supervision, and do many things that noncommissioned officers could do better. Post regulations and unit directives foolishly prescribe far too many functions that only an officer must perform, thus manifesting mighty little faith in the NCO. The noncommissioner officer, thus often underemployed (though he may be on duty 12 hours a day), untrusted, and bored, understandably loafs on the job and of course fails to develop as he should and could. It is almost habitual, as a single example, to find an officer bellowing routine commands at his company on a firing range. How absurd.

Noncommissioned officers are, in a sense, too high-ranking—the jobs they do don't match their titles. The term "sergeant" used to mean a great deal in terms of experience and prestige, but nowadays it spreads from a veteran of 30 years' service to a soldier still wet behind the ears. Much of the difficulty stems from the device employed by the Army to get adequate pay for its enlisted people, the device being that of padding the tables of organization with rank titles that are logically insupportable. For scores of years an Army squad was commanded by a corporal, as was an artillery section. In the early days of armor it was the accepted and logical solution to make the tank commander a corporal. But during the course of World War II those admittedly important positions were written into TOE as sergeants, then as staff sergeants, and now half-squad leaders and tank gunners have bloomed as "sergeants." Yet because of the restrictions on time in grade and quotas, many of the men holding down these jobs are not promotable and must therefore serve in a rank lower than the job calls for.

The whole situation was aggravated when noncommissioned officers were given automatic one-grade promotion on return from the Korean war. The effect of this was monstrous and lasted a long while: I remember that in 1962 among corps troops of the 17th Airborne Corps there were more than 200 master sergeants excess to TOE for whom we had no appropriate positions. None of them, it should be added, were parachute qualified and none were willing to volunteer for that end of the business. In the same period the two airborne divisions were very short of master sergeants.

What with all this ballooning of rank all over the Army, it was hardly surprising that NCO stripes started turning up in all sorts of places they shouldn't be. I know somebody has to do the cooking, but a noncommissioned officer shouldn't cook, anywhere, nor should he wait on table, anywhere. Neither should he be assigned as a driver, no matter how high-ranking the passenger in the right-rear seat. Neither should he be running a movie projector, nor honchoing a bowling alley, nor selling tickets, nor checking people in and out of the post exchange, nor tending a counter in a QM clothing store, nor walking post.

It is not easy to correct something of this sort, but it ought to be done anyway.

There are all sorts of effort to "increase the prestige of the noncommissioned officer"—a phrase so notable that it has acquired the same aura as motherhood. It is a very good idea, but a goal that will not be reached by building fatter and flossier NCO clubs. It will come by getting the officer out of the noncommissioned officer's job, making the noncommissioned officer do it; by returning some meaning to the various grades of noncommissioned officer; and by assigning specialists, not noncommissioned officers, to jobs inappropriate to the title.

THE STUDY KICK

In these days of great complexity and costs as regards military equipment, weapon systems and organization, there is no doubt that careful study of pertinent factors and implications is a necessary prerequisite of many important decisions. There is a concurrent danger, however, of using the process of study as a means to defer decision. I can make the statement because I have been guilty myself. And studies have a way of dragging especially capable officers, for months at a time, off jobs that also need doing, often to the overall detriment of the Army.

The moral is, simply, don't overdo it. The moral is more obvious when one realizes that on at least one occasion a study group had to be convened to study a study, in order that the higher echelons might discover its meaning.

TRAINING PHILOSOPHY

I suppose that just about everything that ought to be said about training has been said. My 35 years have been marked by great volumes of prose on the matter, from which I'll extract only a very few ideas found best by test—plenty of test.

Every trainer should examine his product for interest—a prime ingredient of good training. A bored man can't learn; his mind slides into neutral. Much Army instruction is dull as ditch water, a routine covering of the subject which gets the instructor off the hook officially but produces only marginal benefit to the unit. It is far better to teach half of the subject matter in a lively and interesting way, letting the rest go untaught, than to drag the whole kaboodle past soldiers half asleep.

I'll long remember the sight, in Italy during the war, of a tank-company commander explaining to his gunners the latest hot dope on quick adjustment of fire. He was doing a technically correct but boring job, so the gunners weren't listening. Yet they all knew they were going back into combat the very next day, and that their own lives depended on their proficiency. But the presentation was dull, and they all said to hell with it.

I managed to insert the "full strength training" concept (I never was able to think up a better name for it) in the 2d Armored Division in Germany, in the 82d Airborne Division, in XVIII Airborne Corps, and in 8th Army—including all 18 Korean divisions. The scheme is simply one in which units are paired off to allow one of the pair to do as much as possible of the other's chores while it trains in the field at full (or as full as possible) strength, after which the two units swap roles. The week is divided into halves: for the first half unit X goes out into the woods with pretty nearly everybody present while unit Y does all the guard and fatigue for both; unit Y goes out the second half. (I was not too flattered when a lady at Fort Bragg, asked where her husband was one night, answered, "Oh, he's out in the woods, X-ing and Y-ing.") The scheme lightens the training load on officers and noncommissioned officers because they are not repeatedly instructing a small percentage of the unit, which demands of them more preparatory and training hours. Moreover, while a unit is in the field, be it only a couple of days, it can do much more with the time than it can while under the distractions of garrison life; and of course night training, a neglected art, becomes easy to schedule and do. While there are also fewer hours of formal training in the week, much more training gets done. The only real problem in all this is that visiting inspectors have got to get used to seeing a troop baseball game in progress on a workday morning.

We don't do enough different exercises during the course of a particular training period. It is not usually necessary or desirable to spend a whole morning in a company attack on a small hill. A number of simple exercises, using minimum time in the preparatory phases, is preferable—maybe four attacks in a morning, on a succesion of objectives. Errors should be pointed out from time to time, but there's no need for exhaustive critique after each exercise; mistakes will tend to iron out simply by the process of repetition over different ground. And movement prevents boredom; we have earned, unfortunately, our reputation of hurry up and wait.

American soldiers are commonly believed to have great natural initiative in responding to unusual situations. This is true only if training conditions them to react to the unexpected—and war is full of the unexpected. I'll not soon forget an incident in Italy, when a battle-experienced tank company climbed a finger ridge to the top of a larger ridge along which ran a road, and at that point started to prepare itself for the night. Just as dusk fell a battery of German horse artillery trotted in close order right through the center of the company—and nobody made a move to stop it. You see, it wasn't in the book: what to do with enemy artillery inside the tank park. If you don't believe that our units can be awkward when dealing with the unexpected, try it out on one of your own: ask an artillery battery, just for fun, to set up an immediate ambush for an enemy truck column expected momentarily down a nearby road. Likely as not, the battery commander will tell you it isn't his mission.

So training should include instruction in the unusual, with emphasis on operations over unusual terrain: rivers, swamps, mountain tops. It will add much interest, and will develop a unit's ability to cope with all tactical situations, including the more normal.

The Army has developed an unfortunate habit of requiring too much preparation for training in the shape of paperwork. I even oppose the lesson plan—pure heresy, but I do. And as for tactical exercises. These are routinely preceded by such a flux of paper that the company commander can't get his outfit in the field, because he spent so much time in the office getting ready. So a reversal is necessary: let the CO figure what the company is to do perhaps in the course of a preliminary reconnaissance or, after he becomes smart enough, while the company is marching out to the training area. In conducting their tactical exercises, companies and battalions and brigades should sometimes deliberately omit publication of any written instruction. We must be capable of maneuver without written instruction, else the enemy learn that he can defeat an American outfit by blowing up its mimeograph machine.

In executing training exercises it's very desirable to add time to the stated mission: seize and secure that hill by 1500 hours. A mission thus expressed affords to the commander issuing it an additional means of imparting to his subordinate what is wanted, and will sometimes prevent the subordinate from kiting off down the wrong alley; for example, adopting a scheme of maneuver that won't produce sufficiently prompt results. And the senior commander has every right to insert the factor of time, because it is he who is responsible for the overall success of the larger command, and it is he who must dovetail the action of each segment of his command with those of the others. If hill A must be taken before hill B is assaulted, he will want hill A to fall to his control in time to take hill B before sunset, or before the enemy has time to reinforce it.

Quick reaction, the ability to accomplish tactical jobs quickly, can well be the key to local success and local survival. The ponderous, slow-to-react force will be thrown off balance and kept off balance and thereafter defeated by one lighter on its feet and faster in its processes of troop leading, granting even an approximation of strength and mobility in the opposing sides. History is laden with examples of the truth of this.

Hence we must be much concerned with the time it takes to do battle routines which must be repeatedly done: gun mounting and laying, vehicle loading and unloading, entrucking and detrucking, and of course getting quickly in and out of helicopters, and the like. Quick deployment against an enemy roadblock, quick reaction to enemy attack including air attack and ground ambush, quick shifts of formation, are of fundamental importance and thus demand the development and practice of battle drill.

Battle drill is not what many people think it is. I define it as formation practice—quick change from one formation to another, over varied terrain—plus the practice of those elements of tactical movement which will permit a commander to launch his force into the starting phase of attack or defense by command, without benefit of assembly of his subordinate commanders or of long, complicated instruction. A unit should by battle drill be made able to launch, very promptly, coordinated action against an ambushing enemy—by command. If that seems too much to ask, what's your alternative? An assembly and conference? Remember, battle drill simply gets things started—quickly; execution may be modified by subsequent instruction in the usual fashion.

And in the doing of this sort of thing we need a rebirth of the Thunderer whistle, which is a fine short-range attention-getter and would permit the simultaneous rebirth of the hand signal. Infantry platoon and squad leaders have become too dependent on the walkie-talkie and in some cases seem to slide into the function of radio operators. A loud whistle plus hand signals would tend to restore them to the function of command.

We are currently blessed with very adequate ammunition allowances. A unit can profit by using all of it, but many use much less than the quantity authorized. Not to use up allowances but to enhance shooting ability, I strongly recommend weapons competitions. It would take pages to describe these in detail, but the details are available from headquarters, 17th Airborne Corps. It is enough here to lay down the principles.

All troops of all units compete, as distinguished from a selected team. For example, in a machinegun competition, each machinegun crew of each company participates with its assigned gun; the composite scores of all the crews make up the company's score.

Competitions should be run through a division twice a year. The company or battery is the competing unit. The best company (battery) per battalion, per brigade, and in the division, is identified and rewarded. The worst is also identified, but not exactly rewarded.

Excellent competitions may be laid on for the rifle platoon, and for crews of weapons such as machineguns, mortars, recoilless rifles, and howitzers.

All scores of all companies (batteries) are posted at the range and publicized on bulletin boards and in unit newspapers.

All shooting is at field targets at unknown ranges and against time. The problems must be entirely practical and representative of the mission of the weapon.

There is no such thing as an alibi. If the gun won't shoot, the score is zero.

Rapid assembly of the weapon is included in most competitions, followed by its movement to a firing position. Gunners' exams are included for mortars and howitzers.

You will find enormous variation in shooting among units the first time around, but if the firing problems are practical no one has a squawk coming. The competitions pose the same sort of problem an enemy does: our weapons can put down effective fire or they can't, and from the point of view of effect on the enemy the reasons they can or can't are of no great importance. Once while watching an airborne rifle company's machinegun crew stumble through a competition run I told them that in my humble opinion they couldn't break up a Sunday school picnic at 500 yards. That sort of statement has wonderful effect on good paratroopers. In three cycles, companies and batteries of the 82d Airborne raised their averages by almost a hundred percent, and very little of that improvement was attributable to familiarization with the firing problem. A great deal of it was attributable to familiarization with the weapons.

We tend to oversupervise training. Certainly some guidance and some pretty direct instruction are necessary. But junior officers and noncommissioned officers need the experience of doing what they want to do as they want to do it. Hence a scheme which requires platoon leaders to take their platoons into the field once a month for 24 hours, without visitors, has a most beneficial effect.

Soldiers can learn much by doing, as against listening. To go back about three decades, the 7th Cavalry used to send each recruit squad, on the Friday of the first week's training, on a 25-mile hike to a place where the squad engaged in a live-fire exercise, spent the night in a tactical bivouac, and then rode the 25 miles back to garrison on Saturday. In command was a corporal. This substituted for long—and needless—hours of oral instruction and demonstration on the routines of the march, care of horses, saddlebag and blanket-roll packing, how to pitch shelter tents, bivouac security, and the like. And amazingly enough the squad, in those simple times, was a military unit of some effectiveness at the end of the week's instruction. At least it demonstrated that it could march, take care of itself (to some extent) in the field, obey, and shoot. If the last wasn't too good, I at least found no one willing to substitute his own body for the silhouettes the little recruities shot holes in.

THE NE'ER-DO-WELL

"Purge" has become a dirty word, ever since the Soviets, on certain auspicious occasions, began ridding their ranks of unbelievers by shooting them. In actual fact, however, purging is good or bad depending on who gets purged, and how.

But here we won't say purge but simply point out that the Army is in urgent need of a good active sump pump of suitable capacity which has easy and workable directions plainly inscribed on the brass plate bolted to the front of it. It is all very well to contend that there is already a system whereby bad officers can be removed from the Army. There is, but the machinery is so ponderous in operation and so heavily clogged with devices to protect the individual that it strangles itself and deposits muck all over the basement. So a prudent commander will often fail to turn it on.

The out-and-out drunk, the thief, the wife-beater, and the pervert can usually be detached from his commission, although we find amazing exceptions even among cases of these. The larger problem, however, is the ne'er-do-well, the bear of little brain and energy whose chief attribute is simply an ability to stay out of trouble.

This fellow is an expensive liability, not an asset. Everybody squawks because too many of our best junior officers quit the service. What will drive a good smart young man out quicker than a dumb lieutenant colonel who, from all evidence available to his juniors, is climbing up the promotion ladder along with his contemporaries? What a young man wants is guidance and inspiration, not simply plodding routine.

We have hundreds of lieutenant colonels and majors (some of whom have done well enough in junior grades) who damage the Army each day of their service in it, partly because they symbolize mediocrity themselves and therefore brand (before soldiers and civilians) the military service as mediocre, and partly because they do their assigned jobs in a way that hurts the Army directly in terms of efficiency and money.

We all know that reports of the General Accounting Office, however unfair and distasteful they may be in some respects, often find us genuinely guilty of bad performance. It has been my observation that usually the trouble results not from flagrant dereliction of duty, but rather from inertia and lack of initiative and supervision at the field-grade level.

The Army is altogether too big and too complicated to hope that a good commander and staff can make all things go well. Sloppy performance in subordinate supervisory jobs, in these days of great technical complexity, will balk any commander who ever lived. The commander can do something about this but only if he is given the necessary authority and support, and provided also that the Army's overall personnel system works steadily in eliminating the inefficient. As things now stand, a major commander who tries to get rid of these fat cats will find himself devoting an impossible part of his time to the purpose, and he will still be often unsuccessful.

A workable elimination system must depend on a proper efficiency report, and that report should have a box on it that requires the rater and the endorser to place the rated officer in the first, second, third, fourth, or last fifth among officers of his category. How can a rater be forced to put an officer into a low fifth? By requiring the rater to keep a record of his ratings, and to submit the record annually to the Department of the Army over his signature. Presumably the habitual super-high rater (we are all high raters) will reflect on his own lack of wisdom when he finds he has put each officer he rates in the top fifth of all those he rates. Our current penchant for overrating helps keep the poor officer in service.

A system to get rid of the mediocre must impinge on the school system. It is very unfortunate that Leavenworth is a sort of sheep-and-goats separator, because the goat (I assume that "goat" is the less complimentary term, but I don't find sheep very inspiring either), after having been branded a goat, is still left in the Army to serve as a second-class citizen, or goat. It is certain that the faculty at Leavenworth would rebel at the idea, but I would shorten the course and expand the classes as necessary to take care of all good eligible officers, and those not selected I'd remove from the Army altogether. The war colleges would have to be selective as they are now, but it is a very different thing to indicate to a colonel that he probably won't be a general, than to a major that he is considered second-rate.

Basically, then, the system must not simply identify the drunks and criminals and fire them, but locate the bottom 5 percent of all officers and fire them, however kind they may be to their wives and children. The Army is mostly an agglomeration of people trying to do many different jobs in a fantastically large variety of circumstances. The Army can use the average or mediocre man, but not in its corps of officers.

AN OFFICERS' SPORT

The new Army is much better than the old in a number of important aspects, but the old used to have polo, which General Patton called the best possible peacetime training of an officer's ability to react quickly under pressure and some danger. I don't intend to discuss pros and cons of officer participation, now common, on unit football and baseball teams, but neither they nor golf nor tennis nor squash (all of which merit strong support) take the place of polo as an officer's team sport, which the Army rather badly needs. Polo used to contribute much to enjoyment and morale because match games were played on Sunday afternoon with practically all officers and their families present and interested—and strongly partisan. Sometimes too strongly.

But anyway, polo was a social as well as a sporting event. Each player dressed in spotless white breeches; the fact that sweat and dirt quickly turned them brown didn't detract from the effect. And, of course, polo is spectacular to watch and more fun to play than any other sport thus far invented. Ask the man who has played it.

In its old guise, polo in the Army is undoubtedly dead. Conceivably, however, it might come back in the form of larger teams: only 4 men on the field at once but up to 12 men playing 2 chukkers each. Thus a single player would need only one horse, which he might be able to afford (and groom) himself. Something of this sort is already practiced in the British Army. Special services ought to be rich enough to pay for construction of stables and upkeep.

But under the assumption that polo is no longer practicable under any circumstances, something else, less costly and permitting more people to play, should take its place. With apology I mention field hockey—the apology being necessary because field hockey in the United States is a girls' school sport. I happened to see Pakistan play India for the world championship at the Tokyo Olympic games. The way those gentlemen (many of them sporting great black beards and little bitty hats) played it, it wouldn't pass as a game for young ladies.

The sport need not be field hockey, of course, but it may be pointed out that the United States was not represented in field hockey in Tokyo—undoubtedly because we think it's a girls' school game. Wherefore, if the U.S. Army did institute it as a sport there is every reason to believe it could field a successful team at the Mexico City Olympics in 1968.

But whatever it may be, the Army needs an officers' sport which does have a spectator appeal, emphasis on teamwork and physical conditioning, and is good fun. It should be broadly applicable at battalion level. Special services could easily afford anything less elaborate than football. And it would be fine to aim at the Olympics.

THE UNIFORM

With the possible exception of thoughts on the organization of the infantry squad (a subject I shall carefully avoid), opinion as to the Army's uniform will get you into hot water quicker than anything. Into what the Navy calls a wardroom argument, defined as a positive statement, followed by a flat denial, followed in turn by personal abuse.

I would suggest a series of changes in the way we dress. Some of these would decrease uniformity, where uniformity doesn't count for much; some would enhance it.

In my opinion the Army has been oversensitive to unit variations in uniform, in one case to the extent of requiring all soldiers in an airborne unit newly arrived in Germany to remove their parachute wings because nearby outfits didn't qualify to wear them. This, understandably, infuriated the paratroopers. The aim should be to encourage unit identity and pride, not discourage it. The lowest common denominator is a sorry goal.

So while control is necessary to prevent overenthusiastic commanders from decorating their soldiers up in fluorescent lights, I would permit unit variations which were not too costly and which, in particular, conformed to good taste. Among European armies this is old stuff, of course, but there is no reason not to copy good practice.

The hat is perhaps the best garment to consider. On the billed cap it would be easy, and inexpensive, to permit all battalions of a parent regiment to wear a distinctive strap, perhaps black, perhaps in colored design. A cloth or metal tab might be permitted on the field cap, positioned variously among units. I would not balk at berets of different colors if some units wanted them.

I'd go pretty slow on allowing unit variations on body clothing, mostly because of expense and because the Army shifts its people about so. But if an outfit was pining away for lack of authority to wear its patch on a breast pocket, the Army might be a bit lenient about it.

Within the unit, emphasis should be strong on uniformity. There is no necessity for two men of different units, passing on the street, to be dressed alike. It is important that a platoon that turns out in formation, if only to police up the area, be dressed identically. Too often a platoon shows up with as many different varieties of dress as people.

The Army green needs its quality to be assiduously protected, especially by the Quartermaster, which sells shoddy material (amazing) in its clothing stores. I'd change the officer's ugly broad black stripe to the general's double stripe for all officers. A belt in the back, like the Marines have, warrants consideration because it makes the wearer look thinner.

I have long been in favor of a leather windbreaker jacket for the Army. It should substitute for the second field jacket, a garment of acknowledged virtues in the field but (except when it is starched, as it isn't supposed to be) making the wearer look, as the saying goes, like an unmade bed. The leather jacket should be prohibited for wear in the field, wherefore it would be necessary for the Army to hold ready, for issue to certain fire brigade units such as the 82d Airborne Division, extra field jackets. In most cases, however, such an issue would have to be made only some weeks after arrival of the unit in its area of combat operations, so the problem is not a big one.

The leather jacket (which should be dark brown with no attempt to match the green) should be permitted for garrison wear only, either over the fatigue blouse or over the cotton poplin shirt worn with green trousers. The signs of wear on leather are not particularly disfiguring. While a good jacket would cost perhaps twenty bucks, cleaning bills would reduce. It would be goodlooking and comfortable as well as warm. This is the sort of thing which encourages reenlistment.

I believe the Government should pick up the tab for these changes, were they to be approved. We do a lot of worrying and spend a lot of money on the problem of retention of good people in the Army. A soldier's contentment is conditioned largely by unit pride, and pride in his own personal appearance. Therefore I believe that somewhat more substantial Government investment in uniform will pay off in dollars, as well as in morale.

For career noncommisioned officers, and for all officers, I would require that prescribed formal and semi-formal uniforms be in the possession of all. Right now a social occasion at which formal garb (for example, mess jacket) is appropriate looks as though it were attended by officers of three or four different armies. One never encounters this with the Navy or Marines; they dress alike, and look well in the process. I think we might do away altogether with the white dress uniform, but require all to own the summer mess, the winter mess, and the blue dress—never to be worn with the bow tie, incidentally, which makes the wearer look like an usher.

In these uniforms a number of simple economies can be made to reduce cost without affecting quality or appearance. For example, the blue cap should be authorized with summer mess. Why not? It is worn only for a few minutes anyway, on the way to the affair. Also, all officers should wear the general officer's version of both blue uniforms, for they look the best, and the costly change-over (on promotion or branch transfer) would be avoided. For the far-too-gaudy lapels on the mess jacket, I would substitute a branch-color cummerbund. Instead of the very costly to buy (and to change) embroidered rank insignia on mess jacket sleeves I would substitute small, good-looking metal replicas of the rank shoulder boards we now wear on blue dress. I'd make all buy a blue cape with branch-color lining, general officers not being required to change on promotion. The cape has genuine "class"—knocks the girls all silly. We need its help.

A good uniform has utility, sure enough, but appearance is terribly important. It is a factor we have partly neglected.

FIGHTERS AND HELPERS

Army staffs put in many hours of virtuous but not very well advised effort toward increasing what is generally known as the "foxhole strength" of the division. Again an easy phrase (the bigger foxhole strength the better the organization) has had a deleterious influence.

As science has increased the complexity of the land battle, new factors have emerged.

Equipment has become more complex, but on the other hand is more capable if skillfully employed. Improperly used, it is pretty worthless.

Supply procedures have become more complicated with variety and tonnages much increased.

Costs (in dollars, effort, and materiel) in putting and keeping a man on the firing line have increased enormously.

When these three facts are carefully considered, a couple of conclusions begin to take shape.

"The man on the firing line," as I have called him, must by his performance justify the very great cost in putting him there. Here some of the data developed by the Army and by such investigators as S. L. A. Marshall should be reexamined: these data show that a substantial number of men, having been placed face to face with the enemy, don't fight—because of timidity, or fatigue, or stupidity, or lack of training, or plain negligence. So here we see the possibility of modern-day soldier equipped with expensive weapons, trained for many months, shipped across thousands of miles of sea, flown from port to a staging area, heliborne to a battle position, but who, when the enemy appears, won't shoot at him. The technocratic word for this, I believe, is nonproductive.

I would be the last to attack the basic ability of the average American soldier, but I would willingly be accused of saying that the "average" is not found in the infantry squad. Why? Because the input of recruits in the Army is screened again and again, with the best-educated and most intelligent and capable shunted into the great mass of service and other technical units. And who ends up in headquarters companies and even in special service detachments? Better than the average, you may safely bet. If you're from Missouri, make your own careful comparison of the troops in a surface-to-air missile battery and those in an ordinary infantry company.

So to put the matter bluntly, too large a proportion of the less-than-average end up in the frontline squads. There are gallant and effective men mixed with them, I am the first to admit, but they are hampered by the ones who can't or won't get with it.

In my opinion this simply won't do.

And the second conclusion is that because modern weapons give a soldier not only greater capability (if he is skillful and determined) but also greater difficulty in maintaining and resupplying himself and his equipment, he needs more support than our current organization affords him. This situation is reflected everywhere: why else, in all our divisions, are headquarters and technical support units overstrength while the line units are understrength?

So I suggest study and test of these new (so far as I know) principles of organization:

The fighter should be a selected man, with appropriate differential in pay. He should not be made a member of a squad immediately on completing recruit training, but rather be put in a support position from which he can rise to the higher status of soldier of the line on the basis of demonstrated ability and willingness to put out.

Support structure within the division should be manned at sufficient strength to avoid, permanently, the current universal habit of robbing the line of strength to meet support requirements. Support itself should also be sufficient in scope, to include necessary carrying parties for ammunition and food and evacuation of dead and wounded, and to include, as appropriate, cleaning, repair, and replacement of weapons and equipment. The peacetime chores of guard and KP and fatigue should be those of support elements; the line soldier should be free to train—really train without the crippling interference which now prevails.

To make my meaning plain, but not to indicate that I have worked the organization out in detail, I would reckon a line division of, say, 15,000, as numbering not more than perhaps 6,000 of these selected soldiers of the line, including as such flight personnel and others with fighting duties. The 6,000, assuming proper selection, motivation, and training, should all be very effective fighting men, capable of the judgment and skill that modern combat demands, and worth the transportation and equipment and support provided them. Waste of materiel should decrease, and so should demands for supply and transportation. Overall efficiency should rise, appreciably.

You might contend that such a scheme would, in a large war, kill off the flower of the Nation's manhood. The ability of modern weapons to penetrate far beyond the forward battle area would tend to negate that argument, and so too would the fact that a soldier insufficient to the task of battle will be a burden, not an asset, to his comrades, and will by reason of being a burden cause more casualties among them.

In a nutshell, I propose a sharpening of the cutting edge, and a weighting of the backup to make the edge additionally effective.

MILITARY JUSTICE

It is so fashionable to bang away at the Uniform Code of Military Justice that I'm almost ashamed to join the army of its detractors. My objection to it is that it defeats, to a considerable extent, justice in the military.

Unfortunately, of course, the code is in line with current trends in civil justice to overprotect the accused. The old saw that "better 100 guilty men go free than 1 innocent man suffer punishment" is nice and easy to understand and say, and makes the man or woman who rolls it off feel pleasantly virtuous. But on examination it really doesn't make sense—at least in a military force.

Deterrence, or fear of punishment, is a decided influence in keeping order, however much that may be disputed. How else can we explain the fact that unguarded property is stolen straightaway? Why else does looting accompany every natural disaster, when the disaster disrupts the ability of the police to apprehend the thief?

When the hundred guilty men of the quotation go unpunished, deterrence fails. The hundred are free to rob or rape or murder (whatever their specialty) again, and others of similar bent are similarly encouraged. The obvious point is that overall human suffering is made significantly greater than it would be if the single innocent man were unjustly punished. And the victims of the hundred are presumably as innocent as the single wrongly accused.

The Manual for Courts-Martial, which contains the code, seems designed partly to provide the military lawyer a forum before which he can display his special talents. Most military lawyers, to their credit, do not take advantage of the opportunity. But some do, making the court sit as a captive and thoroughly miserable and disgusted audience as the lawyer demonstrates legal erudition.

Most importantly, however, the code wraps the accused in so many safeguards, and provides so many possibilities of acquittal or wrist-tapping on the grounds of extenuating circumstances, that justice is often not done at all. Particularly infuriating are instances in which a court largely forgives a really frightful crime because the accused was hopped up or drunk. Who took the dope? Who drank the booze?

Defenders of the code will contend that these things shouldn't happen under its provisions—and here we get to the crux of the matter. The code forbids the commander to correct or to criticize a court, and severely inhibits him in the publication of instructions or cautions even in general terms unrelated to any particular crime. "Command influence" is taboo, as a wicked thing. Thus has the code crippled the commander in the execution of a fundamentally important part of the function of command.

In my 2 years as Eighth Army CG, I was blessed with fine staff judge advocates who, very properly, held me to the law in spite of all my squirmings. I was thus compelled to watch helplessly a number of flagrant miscarriages of justice, unable even to ask the court (and I'd have done it politely) if it had lost its cotton-pickin' mind.

Item: A soldier comes home dead drunk, kicks over a stove, and burns down the whole ruddy barracks.

Court opinion: The soldier was too drunk to know what he was doing.

Item: A soldier severely mutilates the face of a Korean woman with a broken beer bottle.

Court opinion: It was just a tiff between boy and girl.

Item: A soldier, resentful of discipline, gets a rifle out of the arms room and kills one sergeant and wounds another.

Court opinion (buttressed by psychiatric testimony): Soldier was mentally upset, and the sergeants were presumably expendable.

Item: A soldier steals a pistol, shows off his ability at quick draw, and kills another soldier.

Court opinion: This young man didn't really mean any harm.

What could I do about those cases? Nothing. I could not even ask the court what the parents might think about a 3- or 6-month sentence for the men who killed their sons.

The code was written just after World War II against the background of the Doolittle board report and the squawks of some number of men, suddenly discharged from the military services, who believed themselves unfairly treated by courts-martial during their service. No doubt some of them were mistreated, but I venture to say it was a small percentage of the total, and one hardly justifying a code that has acted to the detriment of good order and military discipline. And we might reflect on the fact that combat imposes great strains on discipline; I for one would anticipate much difficulty in the prosecution of a general war under the greatly limited authority vested in the commander by the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

THE SONGS WE SING

Of course the Army will not stand or fall on the basis of its songs, but if we're going to have songs at all the lyrics ought to be appropriate to a professional military force and not to the local grade school. Some of the tunes we own are fine—but the words.

"The Army Goes Rolling Along" is a title which in itself is irritating to all of us old-timers because we know the tune belongs to the artillery. But it was appropriated by the superior force and redecorated. The tune, minus the words, should be returned to the redlegs, who know how to take care of it.

A good military song is one to march by or to drink by. Take "Lili Marlene," a ditty all about a dame with a liking for soldiers, providing thus a theme so appealing that the song was sung by all the armies of both sides during World War II. (Any reader interested in this lady can read her history in Army for April 1965, edition.) You could march by "Lili Marlene" and sing it without feeling like a fool, and it made your feet hurt a little less, too.

What to do? We could do a little unobtrusive research into Army songs of the past, for they were obviously of folk origin and therefore singable and appealing. "Sergeant Flynn" was a good one, and "Fiddler's Green," and "The Mountain Battery" and "Balioag South"—and many, many others.

THE FLYING MACHINE

The close integration of light aircraft into the combat and combat support operations of the Army will eventually reach complete fruition for the simple reason that it is the right way to go. The suspicious and the foot-draggers will not stop the inevitable, but unfortunately they may continue to delay it. The danger of delay lies in the fact that a general war, or another "limited" fracas additional to Vietnam, will find us insufficiently equipped and trained to do what we otherwise could do. While the practicality of light aviation in the Vietnam situation has now become pretty obvious to everybody, it is not yet generally understood that it will be at least equally applicable to a more sophisticated war, and as well to the Army's multiple contingency plans.

As Army aviation builds, the Army will become increasingly dependent on the bold and imaginative young man, for the operational possibilities are great, the field for innovation is tremendous, and the demand for quick thinking is a compelling one. The Army will profit not only by increasing its capabilities but also through attracting the best officers and men to the excitement and pleasure newly injected into troop duty.

Another hopeful aspect of the matter is the gradually growing understanding, on the part of the Air Force, of what the Army is up to. The Army has long maintained that its purpose is simply to augment its ability to win the land battle, and that that battle poses quite enough problems to dissuade the Army from inserting itself into the missions of the Air Force. Also becoming obvious to all is the fact that far from reducing the role of the Air Force fighter-bomber, the new doctrine broadens it, and at the same time raises the Army's capability to take advantage of the enormous firepower of close support aircraft.

The state of the art in flying machines is in constant process of improvement, and the third dimension afforded by the air opens the door to new possibilities in almost every aspect of military flying. The end is nowhere in sight.

THE PROS CARRY ON

Indeed, the future of the whole Army is bright. I congratulate its members for what they have done and what they are doing, and particularly I congratulate those who calls themselves professional soldiers. After all, there's nothing like a pro.

BILL TO PERMIT PATIENTS CURRENTLY USING KREBIOZEN TO PURCHASE SAME IN ANY STATE

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to permit all patients currently using the drug, Krebiozen, to purchase the same in Illinois or elsewhere for use in any State.

At the present time there are several cancer patients in my district who have used Krebiozen, are currently using Krebiozen, and who wish to continue to do so.

It seems to me that cancer patients currently using Krebiozen should not be required to undergo additional expense to travel to Illinois to purchase the drug.

I am not unaware of the doubts which a great many doctors and Government agency officials have concerning the effectiveness of the drug. Nor am I persuaded to believe that Krebiozen is an authentic cancer cure. The fact remains, however, that notwithstanding the lack of governmental approval of the drug, there has been no clear and convincing proof that the drug is in any way harmful, as long as it is not used as a substitute for necessary X-ray or surgery. Moreover, many patients earnestly believe that their health and even their lives depend on its continued use.

Research, study, and testing continue with the hope—in which we all share—that someday in the very near future a cure may be found for cancer.

Until then, or at least until there is a clear showing that the administration of Krebiozen is harmful to the patient in any way, I cannot agree that those who believe it to be beneficial and who have actually used it, should be deprived of it in the future. We cannot play at being the deity and neither can the Food and Drug Administration.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 14322

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all patients currently using the drug Krebiozen be permitted to purchase same in Illinois or elsewhere for use in any State.

IMPROVE URBAN RENEWAL PROCEDURES BY REFERENDUM

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I recently presented a statement to the Housing Subcommittee recommending improvement of urban renewal procedures through incorporation of a referendum in the project approval process as proposed by my bill, H.R. 7434.

Under unanimous consent I include my statement at this point to enable my colleagues, and other interested persons, to consider the proposal:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am grateful for the opportunity to present this statement to the Housing Subcommittee, I have introduced H.R. 7434, a rather special, but important, bill to provide that a majority of the community approve an urban renewal project before it is begun.

There are many compelling, general and special, reasons for such an amendment to the Housing Act of 1949. I intend to present only a few today.

I am not opposed to the principle of urban renewal. We need to renew our dilapidated urban areas—this is a constant task which should concern and involve every citizen and segment of the community. Blighted areas should be eradicated. Deterioration should be stemmed. One section of our environment cannot be permitted to unnecessarily spoil another. But we must also preserve functional and pleasant residential, business, and industrial areas.

These goals cannot be accomplished without cooperation and some coordination. Urban renewal can provide a vehicle otherwise unavailable—especially when the various private property owners in a substandard section cannot, or will not, get together—in a common effort for the public necessity.

But the urban renewal project must fit and suit the community. Bureaucrats in Washington, far removed from the persons involved, unknowledgeable about the local habits, attitudes, and wishes should not be making the basic decisions.

Individual persons are the most important ingredient of a community. Urban renewal must deal primarily with people—not just with slums, buildings, and property.

Urban renewal must be personal, compassionate—but, unfortunately, it has not always been.

Urban renewal should serve the needs of the whole community; but, unfortunately, it has not always done so.

Advocates of Federal urban renewal have too often flooded the news media with good intentions and platitudes.

Urban renewal now exists upon large amounts of public moneys and Government power, but too little public or individual support.

Urban renewal is expensive.

Urban renewal is not a free Federal bonanza. We pay dearly for it through Federal taxes. The local community pays heavily also. Urban renewal projects are not done cheaply. Enormous profits have been made in urban renewal, but not for the community and the taxpayer, who care about the expense.

The typical urban renewal project destroys a great many homes—at least 126,000 between 1950 and 1960; 25,000 of these were in good condition. In the 1950 decade, no more than 30,000 units were constructed in urban renewal project areas: 126,000 down, 30,000 up. Unfortunately, for the dislocated families who must find a place to live, the 30,000 put up were out of the reach of their pocketbooks. The community cares about this.

Families displaced from an urban renewal area find it practically impossible to move back into the area. Rents in the renewed area go up, but the tenant's wherewithal does not. Many of the displaced families move to less favorable homes—less space, worse conditions, but they pay higher rents for less desirable locations. Thus, the net effect of urban renewal in the field of housing has been not helpful. The community cares about its displaced persons.

At least 1 million persons have been evicted. The manner of the eviction is not always pleasant or decent. You should know about the infamous Patania case in my district. The urban renewal project is 6 years old. Mr. Patania is 72. He and his wife lived in their modest home for 42 years. It was in good condition, but in an area designated for commercial urban renewal. They were offered the "fair market value" of their home—$12,500, I think—not nearly adequate to replace their home today. They declined. They were ordered evicted. They refused to leave. The sheriff was ordered to evict them. Mrs. Patania was forcibly subdued, placed in a straitjacket, and removed via stretcher—under the gaze of nationwide television and other reporters. Mr. Patania was forcibly removed also. Then, to add to their ignominy, both were jailed until their home was bulldozed to the ground to prevent their reentry. They have also been sued for contempt of court and damages for the costs of the evictions and the special, premature demolition of their home. Urban renewal had little compassion for this old couple who could not speak English and who only wanted to keep their most valuable and precious possession (next to life itself)—their home of 42 years. Urban renewal did not have compassion. Urban renewal could not devise a better way to relocate the Patanias. Urban renewal didn't care about people; it cared only about clearing property.

Now the community should and does care about evicted people and how it is done and where they relocate. Relocation is not just a worry for the evicted family, but a concern and burden of the community which cannot be discharged simply by paying money. The community cares.

In every urban renewal project which forces people from their homes, the evicted persons suffer severe anguish. Sentimental attachments to homes, areas, and neighbors developed through years of association are not severed by pronouncement from an urban renewal agency. The public good must truly be great to justify such inhuman cruelty to fellow man.

In their exuberance to create something better, have developers and agency personnel neglected to consider some basic rights which were at one time considered fundamental to our society?

Justice C. J. Bell, of the Pennsylvania Superior Court, in his concurring opinion in the decision remanding the case of *Tony Foranda* v. *The Redevelopment Authority of Lancaster, Pennsylvania,* to the court of common pleas has very poignantly set forth the issues.

The opinion is so timely, having been filed on January 17 of this year, and so telling, that I must read it in its entirety at this point:

"I concur in the remand, but deem it desirable to express the reasons for my views.

"It is important to recognize at the very outset that the urban redevelopment law [1] and the enormous powers ostensibly granted therein must be carefully examined in the light of the Constitution of the United States and of Pennsylvania which ordain and guarantee the right of private property. Article I, section I, of the Pennsylvania constitution provides: 'All men are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent and indefeasible rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing their own happiness,'

"Nevertheless the authority contends that the act gives the sovereign power of eminent domain to these few appointed persons to condemn not only every property which they believe is dilapidated, but also every area or region which they believe contains some dilapidated properties. For these reasons as well as several others which will be discussed, the act and its claimed wide powers must be strictly construed.

"One of the most highly prized constitutional rights of every American citizen is the right to own and possess his own home. It may be large, medium, or small, it may be one or two or three stories, it may be a ranch house or a row house, or a hut; or, in the eyes of some, it may be attractive or ugly, but it is yours and if you like it or love it, why should anyone or any political body have a right to take it from you in order to make it or the area in which it is situate more economically prosperous?

"Stripped of its attractive tinsel and pretty trappings, this blighted area act, supra, as frequently interpreted by some nonelected nonsovereign redevelopment authorities, is one of the most unjust and unwise acts ever passed. This act does not cover or even pertain to the elimination of slums as in the Slum Clearance Act; i.e., housing authorities law of 1937.[2] The act is so broad that it does not limit the authority's power to condemn and take such properties as are dilapidated but, we repeat, permits the taking of a large area in which only a few properties are dilapidated. Moreover, realistically speaking, it has nothing to do with the public safety, or health, or morals.

"Its real and practical purpose and intent, although cloaked in the spurious guise of public welfare, is to make any and every community it chooses to denominate dilapidated more economically prosperous no matter what heartbreaks it brings to homeowners or losses to businessmen. For example, a husband and wife, or a widow, may love their home and like their neighborhood, but now because of the theories of well-meaning or stargazing planners, they have to move to a distant place and start life all over again among strangers. And what happens to a little neighborhood businessman who loses his home and his business and his customers? What will recompense a liquor licensee (whose business is subject to a quota system) when he cannot get a license in the new location to which, because of the Redevelopment Authority, he is compelled to move? And what about churches? Even churches and other houses of worship are not exempt from the ceaseless craving of many for material prosperity and for constantly expanding political power. Too often, the planners consider themselves 'Solomons,' with unbounded, unfettered, and limitless discretionary power to appropriate and condemn as dilapidated (1) any and every property they believe is dilapidated, and (2) as large an area as they believe can be made economically more prosperous. In their desire for greater economic prosperity, these planners do not hesitate to tear down and destroy churches in any area which they may deem blighted. See, for example, *St. Peter's Roman Catholic Church* v. *Urban Redevelopment Authority,* 394 Pa. 194, 146 A. 2d 724. In the case, the Urban Redevelopment Authortiy condemned and destroyed, in the name of 'economic convenience and progress,' St. Peter's Church in Pittsburgh, which was considered by many to be the most beautiful Catholic Church in America.

"As this court aptly said in *Schwartz* v. *Urban Redevelopment Authority,* 411 Pa. 530, 192 A. 2d 371 (p. 536):

"'This court has held that the mushrooming of authorities at all levels of government and the frequent complaints that the agencies arbitrarily or capriciously and unintentionally ignore or violate rights which are ordained or guaranteed by the Federal and State constitutions and established law, make it imperative that a check rein we kept upon them. *Keystone Raceway Corp.* v. *State Harness Racing Commission,* 405 Pa. 1, 173 A. 2d 97 (1961).'

"These are some of the reasons why this 'blighted area' act and the powers granted therein must, in the light of the constitutional guarantee of private property and the American heritage of individual freedom, be searchingly scrutinized and strictly construed. This the lower court failed to do.

"I concur in the remand."

What single step can we take to promote the socially disabled goals of urban renewal which genuinely renews decayed and decaying sections of cities, but eliminates the heart rending eviction of thousands from their homes or businesses which can be better rehabilitated through other means?

I recommend the incorporation of a community referendum in the project approval process.

The people in the community are intelligent enough, concerned enough, and wise enough to make the decisions which are best for them and their communities.

The whole community should understand, approve, and support worthy urban renewal projects—but this, unfortunately, has not always been so.

It is not inconsistent with democracy, representative government, or citizen participation to require proposed urban renewal projects to be approved by majority referendum.

A referendum would serve three essential purposes almost entirely lacking now: (1) marshal public support, (2) encourage community involvement in public affairs, and (3) put urban renewal proponents on their mettle requiring them to develop and sell a project which has merit and will serve the total public interest, rather than benefit a small coterie of speculators at public expense, and the diminution of the rights of individual persons and businesses.

If a renewal project is not well enough planned or explained to satisfy a majority of the community which will be expected to pay a heavy portion of the enormous costs and to share a portion of the burdens (as well as enjoy the benefits), then there is no justification for it in our present day community.

If a slum area needs to be renewed, and there are two competing proposals, the community should have a direct voice in the choice.

Elections are a small cost to insure free public knowledge and support. The many economic and social manifestations of any renewal project affects the whole community. The whole community should be intimately involved to insure success. A referendum is the best method for obtaining support and insuring this success.

---

[1] Act of May 24, 1945, Public Law 991, 35 P.S., sec. 1701 et seq.

[2] Act of May 28, 1937, Public Law 955, 35 P.S., sec. 1541.

Referendums have been held in a number of communities on some phases of urban renewal projects—bond issue, establishment of a local renewal authority, or project approval—over the past few years. Approvals and rejections are almost equally divided. I submit the following documenting recent referendums:

REFERENDUMS ON URBAN RENEWAL ISSUES

Philadelphia, Pa.: 195,620 for, 73,038 against, November 2, 1965, bond issues.

Smithville, Mo.: 322 for, 227 against.

Liberty, Mo.: 366 for, 291 against, October 5, 1965, authority.

Lawson, Mo.: 154 for, 109 against, September 7, 1965, authority.

Excelsior Springs, Mo.: 300 for, 130 against, authority.

Louisville, Ky.: 70,712 for, 7,819 against, November 2, 1965, bond issue.

Dedham, Mass.: 141 for, 60 against, May 17, 1965, project.

Dedham, Mass.: 1,711 for, 1,330 against, June 12, 1965, project.

Adams, Mass.: 135 for, 1 against, September 27, 1965, project.

St. Petersburg, Fla.: 12,232 for, 35,150 against, October 5, 1965, authority.

San Diego, Calif.: 37.4 percent for, 62.6 percent against, September 21, 1965, authority.

Hawthorne, Calif.: 2,164 for, 3,138 against, June 15, 1965, authority.

Santa Rosa, Calif.: 90 percent for, 10 percent against, October 5, 1965, bond issue.

Berkeley Heights, N.J.: 1 to 5 against, project.

Columbus, Ohio.: 26,000 for, 54,000 against, November 2, 1965, bond issue.

Fridley, Minn.: 1 to 3 against, November 2, 1965, project.

Little Rock, Ark.: 4 to 1 for, November 2, 1965, bond issue.

Omaha, Nebr.: 31,121 for, 64,319 against, May 11, 1965, authority.

Alton, Ill.: 4,609 for, 7,104 against, April 6, 1965, authority.

Fairfield, Conn.: 3,931 for, 8,088 against, February 16, 1965, bond issue.

Franklin, Mass.: 546 for, 595 against, March 11, 1965, project.

Miami, Fla.: 59,277 for, 48,922 against, January 28, 1964, referendum.

Los Angeles, Calif.: 6 to 9 against, January 21, 1964, authority.

Marysville, Calif.: 946 for 1,061 against.

San Antonio, Tex.: overwhelming approval.

Kansas City, Mo.: 64.7 percent approval (not enough), elderly.

St. Ignatius, Mont.: 87 for, 52 against, March 1964, authority.

Artesia, Calif.: 349 for, 1,440 against.

Roanoke, Va.: 13,712 for, 564 against, March 24, 1964, bond issue.

Madison, Wis.: 18,121 for, 18,488 against, April, 1964, authority.

Waukegan, Ill.: 4,099 for, 9,400 against.

Alameda, Calif., 2,962, for, 8,171 against, June 30, 1964, referendum.

Alameda, Calif., 2,969 for, 8,251 against, project.

Bangor, Maine, 4,044 for, 3,568 against, June 1964, project.

Benton Harbor, Mich., two-thirds for, technical raising of funds through mileage assessment.

Bethlehem, Pa., 5 to 7 against, bond issue.

Denver, Colo., 29,344 for, 34,300 against, June 30, 1964, bond issue.

Gainesville, Ga., 2 to 1 for, bond issue.

Manchester, Conn., 3,000 for, 1,219 against, bond issue.

Newport, Ky., 3,874 for, 1,240 against, bond issue.

South Milwaukee, Wis., 2,300 for, 5,300 against, authority.

Kansas City, Kans., bond issue got majority but not required 65 percent.

New York State, 1,414,174 for, 2,018,579 against, proposed changes in urban renewal and housing article of constitution.

Monroe, Mich., 709 for, 3,780 against, program.

Hazard, Ky., 1,264 for, 659 against, project.

Baltimore, Md., 83,131 for, 70,983 against, bond issue.

Baltimore County, Md., 58,988 for, 93,466 against, bond issue.

Cleveland, Ohio, 62.6 percent approval, bond issue.

Orlando, Fla., 8,027 for, 15,911 against, authority.

Rutland, Vt., 3,827 for, 4,764 against, project.

Rutland, Vt., 2,523 for, 4,706 against, bond issue.

Lexington, Ky., 4,341 for, 10,749 against, project.

Columbus, Ohio, 52 percent approval, needed 55 percent, bond issue.

Wilmington, Del., voters transferred by 8 to 1 margin responsibility for urban renewal program from housing authority to mayor.

Phila., Pa., 3 to 2 margin for, bond issue.

Sapulpa, Okla., 2 to 1 rejection.

Santa Monica, Calif., approved program of storm drain centers as support noncash grant in aid for urban renewal program.

Livonia, Ga., 250 for, 75 against, April 14, 1963, authority.

Haquiam, Wash., approved bond issue.

Mr. Chairman, support for my bill has come from many quarters. The amazing thing is that, while I have not publicized the proposal or solicited support, letters and petitions of support have come to me in unusual quantities. Approximately 300 persons have signed petitions favoring my bill, H.R. 7434. The petitioners come from Chicago, Ill.; Kalamazoo, and Battle Creek, Mich.; Minneapolis and Duluth, Minn.; Lafayette, Indianapolis, Bloomington, and Fort Wayne, Ind.

To complete the records, Mr. Chairman, I submit the text of a letter from Mr. Charles H. Goddard, Bloomington, Ind.:

MARCH 4, 1966.

DEAR MR. TALCOTT: Indiana's experience with urban renewal and redevelopment as it is called in Indiana, shows the need for those who are affected by urban renewal to have an opportunity to express themselves by referendum. Too often the municipal officials have seen urban renewal as an opportunity to get some money, and to clear away homes for some project which they think might benefit the city, without consideration for the people involved. This is not a matter of slum clearance because blighted areas are not supposed to be slums, although some slums are certainly blighted.

Indiana has the Redevelopment of Cities and Towns Act of 1953, with amendments, which describes and defines what a blighted area is. Because of these blighted conditions, as so described, an agency or commission may be set up, a declaratory statement made, and the powers of eminent domain exercised. The statute makes it clear that these powers are granted because of the existence of blighted areas, the use of which causes an increase in crime and disease, constitutes a menace to the health, safety, morals, and welfare, and which conditions necessitate excessive expenditures of public funds for crime prevention and punishment, public health and safety. Unless these conditions exist there is no jurisdiction so to act. Nevertheless, many of the municipalities have undertaken to form the public agency required under the Federal act, to receive funds, without any effort to establish that these blighted conditions exist, and in most instances they do not exist to a large extent in said area. Consequently, the acts of the cities are illegal, and is subject to injunction since these acts are without jurisdiction.

Although the Federal law provides for some community approval and participation, those who are affected by these projects have no opportunity to express themselves in an effective way. The public hearing provided under the State law has no definitive effect upon the actions of the commission and in most instances is ignored. They brush aside the protests of the homeowners, and call the bulldozer.

In Bloomington, there was no effort to obtain the sentiments of the people in the area, nor was there any attempt to establish that the area was blighted according to the act. The testimony at the public hearing showed only talk among officials, but no securing of evidence to prove that it was blighted.

In Jeffersonville, the disregard of the people's rights was even more extreme. They sent inexperienced housewives around to make a so-called survey. None of the indicia of blight were present. No attempt was made to show it was blighted. New homes and developments had been built in the midst of the so-called blighted area.

Now a second effort is being made to tear down most of Jeffersonville in the same indifferent and callous disregard for the rights of the homeowners. Similarly, no consideration is being given to the concern of the people most seriously affected.

In Batesville, Ind., we have an even more outrageous and highhanded disregard for people's property. The powers that be in Batesville decided that Batesville had not grown as fast as the rest of the State so they plan to condemn two of the best business district blocks, which show no evidence of blight, tear the building down, and invite a supermarket to come in and build, hoping it will bring in new business. The businesses which are being torn down, in many cases, will not be able to reestablish themselves in a new area, because of the inadequate prices given for the buildings and the cost of new buildings.

Of course, one of the most outrageous features of these programs is that in most cases the people are not given prices which will enable them to buy homes of comparable character elsewhere, and many of them being older persons, cannot readily obtain loans for purchase. Consequently, many of the homeowners are forced to move into inadequate homes, or to live in hole-in-the-wall places. Of course, many of these people who have lived in blighted homes, when moved into new homes, will carry the blight with them. Eradication of blight is not accomplished by moving the blighted into new homes, any more than we change people's character or habits by buying them new clothes. We only change people by changing them inside, by giving them new ideals, by giving them a belief in themselves as children of God, and so that they have a responsibility to and a need for God. All people need a belief in the loving God, and none more than the unfortunate.

In some communities such as La Porte and Logansport, urban renewal has been defeated when the voters have put pressures on the city council. However, since in some municipalities the city leaders are not as responsive to the wishes of the people, a referendum is necessary to make clear whether the people approve and authorize such activities.

We have additional evidence to support your bill if you desire it.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE H. GODDARD.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence proves the need for improved urban renewal procedures. The whole urban renewal program will be immeasurably strengthened by passage of my bill, H.R. 7434, providing for a public referendum for urban renewal projects. I urge the support of your subcommittee.

Thank you.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMODITY AGREEMENTS AND THE POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION OF WELL-ORGANIZED FUTURES MARKETS TO PRICE STABILITY

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, international agreements to stabilize markets in primary commodities which often form the base of the export earnings of developing countries have achieved considerable popularity. Such agreements are sought by developing countries largely because they promise some stability of export prices, at least in the short term. The history of such agreements has not in the least been encouraging. Usually they last only until a member country takes advantage of a high price to sell its supplies above the fixed "agreement price" ceiling, in order to reap the benefits from a shortage in international supply.

The International Coffee Agreement, formalized in 1965, is the most recent example of an international commodity agreement. Among other agreements are those of tin and rubber. For years attempts have been made to establish an international agreement covering cocoa. That such agreements have not lost their attraction is evidenced by the recent proposal of Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, Chairman of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—on March 28, 1966, at the annual meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council—IAECOSOC. He proposed additional "measures to make more effective international agreements on basic commodities such as coffee and the creation of new agreements covering their products."

Commodity agreements have serious flaws which are too often forgotten. As short-term price stabilization measures, in the long run they damage producing and consuming countries by preventing the most efficient allocation of resources, by preventing increased demand for the product through lower unit price, by perpetuating the producing countries' reliance on a single crop or mineral, and by passing the benefits of the price stabilization on a favored few entrepreneurs, rather than to the country at large.

The present U.S. administration has accepted the argument that commodity agreements are in the best interests of developing countries, and has actively encouraged the International Coffee Agreement. Our Government has forgotten that in the long run commodity agreements have failed as a mechanism and they have retarded rather than promoted real economic growth by increasing profits from production of primary commodities and making investment in other directions relatively less attractive. Therefore, they discourage diversification of productive capacity into new products.

THE WEAKNESS OF THE "TERMS OF TRADE" ARGUMENT

The need for commodity agreements is often predicated on the "diminishing terms of trade" argument. The "terms of trade" refers to the ratio of a country's export prices to the prices of its imports. Thus "diminishing terms of trade" means that average export prices have declined relative to import prices, or that each unit of exports can, in effect, purchase fewer imports than previously. Thus, underdeveloped countries argue that their imports of producer and consumer goods from the developed countries cost more while the world prices of their commodity exports become cheaper.

There are serious flaws in this argument that render it questionable as a basis for formulating U.S. foreign economic policy.

First, the terms of trade of underdeveloped nations fluctuated widely during the period between 1937 and 1960, as indicated in the attached chart I. [Not shown in RECORD.] Whether the trend has been rising or declining depends on which year is chosen as the base year. For example, if 1937 is selected as the base year and the Korean war period—1950–1952—is considered exceptional, we could conclude that there has been a generally upward trend for the terms of trade of the underdeveloped nations. On the other hand, if we were to use 1950 as the base year, the trend of prices would on the whole be downward.

Other considerations calling into question the validity of the terms of trade argument are certain deficiencies in the statistics of import and export prices used.

First, the actual compilation of import and export price indexes is subject to many deficiencies. Commodity prices generally do not reflect quality improvements in the goods traded. Such improvements have been greatest in manufactured goods, the underdeveloped countries' principal imports. For example, automobile tires now run more miles, batteries last more hours, and industrial electric motors do more work per pound or cubic foot of space. Thus, even with higher import prices, the underdeveloped countries may actually be better off.

Second, the sample of commodity prices used to compute the export and import price indexes may not be adequate, relative weights assigned to different commodities may not always be appropriate, and indexes may not cover commodities newly entering into trade. Thus import price indexes may not even include such products as television sets, antibiotics, and plastics.

I would argue that these statistical deficiencies cast serious doubt on any data used to "prove" the extent of a deterioration of the terms of trade of the underdeveloped countries. However, even if there has been a deterioration, it does not follow per se that the purchasing power of the developing nations has weakened. This is because the "terms of trade" reflects only price changes, not volume or value. Lower commodity export prices in the past have often been accompanied by larger shipments abroad by the less developed countries. What is important, then, are changes in the total value of exports, because this is the only true measure of what a country's earnings are.

What a country should strive for is not a high level of prices of exported products, but a high level of export earnings. This is what is important for a country's economic development. A corollary relationship between export performance and economic growth is roughly demonstrated by chart 2 [not shown in RECORD.] Peru experienced the largest expansion in export values, some 11.9 percent per annum, which helped raise her annual economic growth rate to over 5 percent. Other countries with export growth rates in excess of 5 percent include Nicaragua, Venezuela, Panama, and Ecuador, and each has a relatively high economic growth rate. The two countries with the lowest rates of export expansion, Bolivia and Uruguay, also rank among the lowest in terms of economic growth rates.

Another consideration should make developed countries hesitate to accept the terms-of-trade argument. If underdeveloped countries' export prices have fallen because of reduced costs of production, a deterioration in the terms of trade may be expected but because of increased volume or just a stable percent of earnings, this should have no injurious effect on the exporting country. This appears to be the case in many underdeveloped countries, where improvements in agricultural technology, feeder roads and ports have reduced the production costs of many exports. By being able to reduce costs and prices, the less-developed countries are able to hold their earnings and yet be better able to protect their export markets against the inroads of synthetic and other competing materials. Such inroads are fostered by policies to maintain export prices at artificially high levels, and they are a much greater threat to the hard currency earnings of underdeveloped countries than declines in the terms of trade.

PROBLEMS FACING THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Use of the "diminishing terms of trade" argument as a reason for special trade measures to maintain artificially high commodity prices, is, therefore, questionable. The International Coffee Agreement is already demonstrating that its attempt to do so has created difficulties.

The President's First Annual Report on the International Coffee Agreement—submitted to Congress on January 15, 1966—estimates that the cumulative surplus production by agreement year 1974 will reach 84,129,000 bags. This surplus will exceed the projected consumption for that year, and it does not take into account presently existing surpluses left over from years before the agreement. Who will pay for the storage of this coffee, and who will pay its producers? This is not an academic but a burning, practical question.

The annual report says that—

> If a comprehensive plan of production controls were adopted now, it would be possible to bring production into balance with demand in the next decade.

The history of our domestic farm policy shows that production controls combined with high price levels is an extremely costly and largely ineffective policy. It would be a tragedy if this method were now to be tried on an international scale.

The root of the problem is that the price which the Coffee Agreement tries to maintain is much too high. It is possible that at this price total production will increase even more than is projected by the President's annual report, resulting in even greater surpluses.

One of the most pressing problems now facing the coffee agreement is that of smuggled coffee. A very lucrative contraband trade in Latin American coffee is now flourishing, because this coffee is offered at a lower price than the artificially high agreement price. Such contraband coffee is routed to traditional markets through third countries, and it has occurred in such large volume that it has effectively depressed world prices for the types of coffee being smuggled. In order to counteract the smuggling the agreement has had to expand export quotas so that added supply will bring prices down to a more realistic level.

In spite of the inadequacy of commodity agreements, the need to stabilize prices, at a level dictated by basic world demand, remains. The United States can help attain this objective, but has not used imaginative enough means to do so. One way to achieve stability of world prices for coffee as well as other commodities is to create viable international futures markets.

PROPOSAL FOR MANAGED INTERNATIONAL FUTURES MARKETS IN LIEU OF COMMODITY AGREEMENTS

The main effect of existing commodity agreements has been that they fix prices at rigid and unrealistic levels. Sometimes, as in coffee, the level is clearly too high, but there are other cases, such as tin, where the level is considered too low. In itself it is hard to fix a price for any length of time at a suitable level because of the many uncertainties governing supply and demand. Any attempt to make prices rigid, therefore, is bound to lead to a breakdown of any given agreement through excessive accumulation of stocks—as in the coffee agreement—or inability to keep prices at prescribed levels. The introduction of a range within which the price can vary does provide some improvement, but unless the range is very wide and therefore useless it is unlikely to lead to an enduring solution. What is needed is a more flexible arrangement. Such an arrangement should also prevent the holding of large stocks in the hands of official or semiofficial bodies, where they are likely to be less useful than in the hands of private traders who can use them for merchandising purposes, and where the public will not bear the burden of storage.

The way to achieve these two purposes is by flexible support of futures prices. Well-organized futures markets exist for most important international commodities, including cotton, wool, coffee, sugar, cocoa, rubber, hides, copper, lead, zinc, and tin, not to mention the grains which raise somewhat different problems. The spot price of these commodities is not necessarily equal to the price for delivery several months from the present; in general the spot price will be above the futures price when inventories are small and below it when inventories are large. In this way the difference between spot and futures prices tends to encourage either the deferment of consumption to periods of more abundant supply, or the holding of inventories until the time they are needed. The futures price is therefore inherently less volatile than the spot price, and this is one reason why it is easier to stabilize.

One well-known economist, Dr. Hendrik S. Houthakker, of Harvard University, suggests that:

> Stabilization of the futures price could be achieved by having an international agency announce a buying and selling price for some futures contract, which should be between 6 and 12 months from the present. The buying and selling price should be about 15 percent apart from each other. The agency should have sufficient funds to buy all contracts that are offered at its buying price, and to take delivery on these contracts if they cannot be sold at its selling price before they mature. The buying and selling prices themselves should be based on a moving average of the spot price during the past 3 years or so. This latter feature will introduce an element of flexible response to long-term trends in supply and demand.
>
> By holding the futures price within a relatively narrow range, the agency will encourage hedging by private traders and thus indirectly the holding of inventories and the reduction of trade margins. The cost of schemes of this kind should normally be very small since traders are willing to pay for the possibility of hedging. In fact, the schemes may well be profitable to the stabilizing agency in the long run, just as stabilizing speculation by private individuals is profitable in the long run.

This is one proposal for a means of creating a lasting stability of world commodity prices without sacrificing the economic allocation of resources, and without disrupting markets for such commodities.

Properly run, futures markets provide a valuable economic function, a function which is often forgotten. They provide:

First. Price stabilization, or elimination of peaks and valleys.

Second. An indication of price trends which allows producers to plan for the future.

Third. A needed price insurance by providing for hedging.

Fourth. A great incentive toward standardization of products and quality control.

This function is as valuable in international trade as in domestic commerce. For agriculture products, minerals and other raw materials, it should be expanded to the extent possible by sound means to provide price stability for international commodities without economic dislocation. Above all the Congress needs to study the economic theories lying behind futures markets. There is entirely too little research available on this important subject. As a result we are not fully utilizing this economic mechanism nor are we perfecting it.

I have urged for several years that the Joint Economic Committee undertake such studies, without avail. Perhaps if a public dialog can be developed it may spur the Joint Economic Committee into action.

THE DOUBLE STANDARD

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the dispatches on the front page of today's Baltimore Sun carried this headline:

> Britain Gives Oil Warning to Portugal.

The subheading reads:

> U.N. Might Use Force if Rhodesia Ban Is Broken.

The news item centers around the arrival of a Greek oil tanker at the Portuguese port of Beira in Mozambique which is linked by pipeline with the Umtali refinery in Rhodesia. The British have asked the Portuguese not to allow the fuel to be piped to Rhodesia and that refusal to do so "could touch off a sequence of events leading eventually to the use of force by the United Nations against the white regime of Rhodesia, the Portuguese territories of Mozambique and Angola and even against the white-supremacist government of Premier Hendrik F. Verwoerd in South Africa."

As I pointed out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23 of this year, knowledgeable viewers of the international scene must be convulsed with laughter at the shell-game tactics the British have utilized in their relations with the United States. We have supinely fallen into line in cooperating with Britain's economic blockade of Rhodesia. Yet when President Kennedy asked the British to cease trade with Cuba during the missile crisis he was turned down. In fact, the effects of continued trade with Cuba in 1964 became so serious that the United States temporarily suspended military aid to Britain.

But this was not the first time that Britain employed the double standard in her trade relations with Uncle Sam. During the Korean war the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee found that within the first 3½ months of 1953, 162 Western-flag vessels traded with Red China, with 100 of them being British. This was the conflict, remember, in which 33,629 American soldiers died in combat, 20,617 American military personnel died noncombat deaths, 103,284 American boys suffered wounds not mortal, for a total of 157,530 American casualties. Thus while Red Chinese and North Korean soldiers were inflicting mounting casualties on American troops in Korea, British ships were busily plying their trade with Red China in a business-as-usual relationship.

As galling as this double trade standard must be to American citizens, this new threat of force has infinitely more serious implications. Not since the days of the Katanga fiasco, when the United Nations ignored Dag Hammarskjold's warning that "this is an internal political problem to which the United Nations as an organization obviously cannot be a party," does the U.N. stand to lose as much in the way of the confidence of free and fairminded men.

Before the Rhodesian situation gets out of hand, as happened in the case of the U.N. and Katanga, the American people have a right to know the full details concerning this Nation's policy regarding Rhodesia, and most importantly the use of force in this issue. I am sure our citizens will be interested to learn why we are so willing to squash Rhodesia while we will not lift a finger to put the cause of self-determination for the captive nations on the agenda of the U.N. It is indeed ironic that we have shut off trade with Rhodesia while we make overtures for increased trade with the greatest perpetrators of genocide in the history of mankind—the U.S.S.R. and some of her totalitarian satellite governments.

One thing is certain: we did not get "took" by Britain without learning something—now we have our own double standards.

I request that the above-mentioned item from the Baltimore Sun be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

BRITAIN GIVES OIL WARNING TO PORTUGAL—U.N. MIGHT USE FORCE IF RHODESIA BAN IS BROKEN

LONDON, April 5.—Britain warned Portugal today that if it breaches an international oil ban on Rhodesia the United Nations may use force against the Rhodesian white regime. Portugal indicated it would ignore the warning.

The move by Prime Minister Harold Wilson's Government quickly followed the dawn arrival of the 12,920-ton Greek tanker *Joanna V* at Beria. This port in Portuguese Mozambique is the oil terminal for land-locked Rhodesia.

By sundown conflicting accounts came from Beira about the movements of the tanker chartered by the South African firm of A. G. Morrison in Cape Town.

SHIP SEEN UNLOADING

A news dispatch from Beira quoted witnesses who said they saw *Joanna V* unloading her 12,000-ton load of crude oil into dockside tanks.

But in London a Foreign Office statement quoted the British consul, John Taylor, as reporting from Beira that the tanker still is anchored outside the port.

Taylor added that the Beira port captain "has stated categorically the *Joanna V* will stay anchored in the stream until she sails."

This was in line with the tanker master's assurance to Capt. Thomas Fanshawe of the Royal Navy that the oil cargo is destined for Djibouti in French Somaliland.

CONTROLLED BY PORTUGAL

In Lisbon and London the British demanded firmly that Portugal act to insure *Joanna V's* oil is not pumped through the 189-mile pipeline linking Beira with the Umtali refinery in Rhodesia.

Refusal to do so, the Portuguese were told, could touch off a sequence of events leading eventually to the use of force by the United Nations against the white regime of Rhodesia, the Portuguese territories of Mozambique and Angola and even against the white-supremacist government of Premier Hendrik F. Verwoerd in South Africa.

LISBON'S ATTITUDE

Both Portugal and South Africa are friendly to Prime Minister Ian Smith of Rhodesia. Determined to preserve white rule despite British pressure, Smith declared Rhodesia's independence of Britain last November.

Even before the British note was received in Lisbon, a Portuguese Foreign Ministry spokesman indicated the oil embargo imposed by Britain and the United Nations was no concern of Portugal and emphasized friendship for Rhodesia.

"Our position is well known in these matters," the spokesman added. "It is a problem between Rhodesia and England."

SUBMARINE WEEK

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the city of San Diego, Calif., the week of April 11 to 17 will be observed as Submarine Week. There will be several functions, a general get-together of the men who fought in submarines during World War II, and general commemoration of the deeds of those who have served in our submarine Navy.

Movement is the key to the success story of the submarine. In today's tactical system, the submarine is of great value because of its ability to keep moving, presenting a mobile missile platform capable of unleashing devastating firepower, then retreating to ocean depths to escape detection.

As we recall many great and courageous victories scored by our submarine fleet in World War II, we can also be proud that our planners have been moving in the interim.

Rear Adm. I. J. Galantin, Director of Special Projects, has presented a brief history of the revolution of the submarine from the torpedo to the missile, and the prospect for future modification and increase in utility of the submarine. The text of his remarks is as follows:

REMARKS ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE FBM SYSTEM

(By Rear Adm. I. J. Galantin, Director, Special Projects)

Since the first days of my association with the Polaris program in 1957, as a member of its initial study group, I have been impressed with the ready understanding by nonmilitary people of the tremendous advantages which the nuclear-powered submarine, coupled with the ballistic missile, brings to our national defense system. The resultant Polaris weapon system, which is often called our primary deterrent system, is now an accepted and essential element of our deterrent/retaliatory posture.

It was not aggressive self-interest on the part of the Navy that brought this acceptance to pass. To a considerable degree, it was public understanding of the concept and appreciation of its national importance, expressed through Congress, that caused this extraordinary weapon system to be brought so quickly to effective operational status. Certainly much credit for this public understanding and appreciation is due to our press and other news media.

It is a source of great pride to me, and I am sure, to the Navy Department, that the Special Projects Office has so quickly and successfully brought into being this weapon system which has had such profound impact on the world situation. The impressive record of achievement by the Navy-industry Polaris team should be a source of pride to all Americans. In doing this job the Special Projects Office built upon inherent naval assets which it may be well to review.

The Polaris weapon system is the latest and perhaps most spectacular manifestation of the Navy's traditional ability to adapt to its special environment, in the interest of our Nation's defense needs, the most effective weapons of the day. From its founding, almost 190 years ago, the Navy has progressively adapted and refined the best weapons of the time. After the muzzle-loading cannon came the rifled-gun, and the armor-piercing projectile. Our Navy took the airplane to sea, thereby revolutionizing naval power and adapted the air-breathing missile to shipboard application.

It was but natural that the advent of the ballistic missile would find the Navy ready and able to adapt it to the environment we know best. The ships themselves have undergone revolutionary changes as we have progressed from sail to nuclear propulsion. At the time our first fleet ballistic missile submarine, U.S.S. *George Washington*, became operational, we already had been operating submarines in our Navy for 60 years. This is an important fact which partly accounts for the speed and efficiency with which we have developed the Polaris system and for the confidence with which we have been operating it in the deep reaches of the sea since November 15, 1960. We had no need to adapt to a strange, unknown environment.

Magnificent as the Polaris system is, I am confident this same trend of naval capabilities will continue into the indefinite future. Even our existing fleet ballistic missile nuclear submarines will, in their long lifetime, be able to apply ever more advanced and effective weapons.

Under the vigorous leadership of our President, there is a new national awareness of the importance of the sea to our economic and defense posture. We are just beginning to understand the importance of "inner space" as we must to insure that it is exploited in the free world's interest. There is no doubt that the nuclear-powered submarine will play an increasingly important role in this greater utilization of the sea.

The unique ingredient which our Polaris submarines bring to our national strategic retaliatory systems is that of concealment. This, added to the Navy's inherent mobility, creates a system of such invulnerability that it is the system of greatest assurance of retaliation, hence, of greatest effect as a deterrent. Because it need not be invoked at an early moment for fear of destruction, it gives time for mature deliberation before its use. Furthermore, it need not be unleashed in one furious blast. It can be applied selectively in measured, precise fashion.

In addition, it is clearly apparent that any attacks upon our Polaris submarines hidden at sea would not result in collateral damage upon our own territory. For these reasons, I believe the Polaris system in this era of weapons of mass destruction in a world groping toward an effectively controlled disarmament, is a most stabilizing influence. Even a potential aggressor, faced by assurance of retaliation by a system that does not face imminent destruction, must be aware of America's peaceful but determined resolve.

At the present time our plans call for a total of 41 nuclear powered Polaris missile submarines. The improvements which we have introduced both in the submarine vehicle and in the Polaris missile itself make the ships we are now building vastly more efficient than those which were rushed to completion in 1960 to fill a critical need. The *Lafayette* class (SSBN 616) submarine is as large as a World War II cruiser, and will be armed with the A-3 missile that can strike targets at a range of 2,900 land miles. No target on the face of the globe will be beyond reach of the nuclear submarines armed with this missile.

The Soviets now claim to have a system like ours. There is no reason to doubt that they have or soon could have a system comparable to Polaris. This has been the inevitable pattern of all warfare. Nevertheless, our great maritime tradition, our long and predominant lead in submarine nuclear propulsion, our demonstrated capability in solid propellant missiles, our determination makes me confident that we will never yield our eminence in this essential element of our naval power, our antisubmarine warfare system, our carrier strike system, our marine combat capability, all of which are vital elements of our national defense team.

However, I do not wish to stress the destructive potential of these submarines. They are, after all, a most effective instrument for maintaining peace. In the more stable situation which they make possible, we are able to release our thinking, our energy, and resources to countering the broader threats that face us. In the wider struggle that we face, we must present more than military strength; we must face up the grim, economic, political, psychological, and scientific struggle we are in.

SALE OF ARMS TO JORDAN

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I read in the Sunday Washington Post, April 3, page 15, that the United States reached an agreement with Jordan for the purchase of what was termed a limited number of military jet aircraft.

The United States will train Jordanian pilots in this country and other countries. Although the State Department will not confirm this, the planes are believed to be F-104 supersonic fighter-bombers, sophisticated craft which undoubtedly will require a lengthy and undetermined training period.

Over the past several months, the newspapers have reported Government acknowledgments of other military deals with Middle Eastern States, all of which were prominently covered by the news media. It is rather surprising that this recent Jordan agreement evoked comparatively little mention in the daily press.

The Department of State will not specify what types of jet aircraft we intend to sell, nor their precise number. This is classified information, although we have already been told about a so-called limited number, that pilots will be trained, that the equipment is military jet aircraft, and that delivery is anticipated over a period of time. Certainly the Russians, the Arabs, the Israelis, and any other interested party can weigh the agreement and determine policy on the basis of this announcement alone, so I cannot quite understand the Department's inclination to put the stamp of secrecy on the details.

However this may be, I am extremely distressed over our Government's persistent and detailed involvement in the affairs of the Arab States. I remain convinced that no matter how selective and restricted, sales of American weapons to the various Arab countries cannot possibly effectuate any kind of balance in long-range terms. On the contrary, these arrangements can only harden irresponsible attitudes, accelerate arms procurement among the other parties, and so dampen the prospects for peace.

Our Government's insistence upon entangling itself with the fortunes of constantly shifting elements will not help toward stabilizing the situation. We cannot expect a coherent settlement of outstanding problems in the Middle East if we lean toward politicking on a short-run basis with the sensitivities of the moment.

U.S. SHOULD PROTEST POLISH VISA RESTRICTIONS

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, according to a Reuters news dispatch published in this morning's Washington Post and other newspapers, the Communist government of Poland is planning to restrict the issuance of entry visas to Americans and other foreign visitors planning to observe scheduled celebrations commemorating the one-thousandth anniversary of the establishment of Christianity in Poland, and in other ways interfere with this important occasion.

If these reports are true, the Polish Government will be extending its persecution of the church into the area of international relations and such action should be vigorously protested by our Government.

While every country has a legal right to regulate the entry of foreign visitors, prevailing international standards emphasize the freedom to travel. The reported action of the Polish Government is obviously designed to deny that freedom to large numbers of Americans, as well as Austrians, French, Belgians, Germans, and British, who wish to participate in a program of great significance to the entire Christian world.

This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, which I hope our Secretary of State will look into and take appropriate action to indicate the concern of the U.S. Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the Washington Post:

POLAND PLANS TO "JAM" CATHOLIC FESTIVITIES

WARSAW, April 5.—Polish authorities announced today that they would stage mass celebrations April 16 and 17 at the same time and place as Catholic Church festivities marking 1,000 years of Christianity in Poland.

Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Polish primate, and 68 Polish bishops plan to travel to Gniezno for a 2-day episcopal conference with masses, sermons and millennium ceremonies on April 15 and 16.

Gniezno is the oldest diocese in Poland, a nation where most people are Catholics. The church leaders plan to move 30 miles southwest to Poznan on April 17 for further solemn jubilee observances.

Today's Trybuna Ludu, the Polish Communist newspaper, said that in Gniezno and Poznan on April 16 and 17 the authorities will stage public celebrations commemorating the fording of the Oder River in 1945 against retreating German units.

Two big soccer matches were fixed for May 3, a peak moment in the religious program when thousands of Polish pilgrims converge on a shrine at Czestochowa in southwest Poland.

On that date in the nearby coal-mining center of Katowice, Hungary plays Poland in a soccer match while the British team Tottenham Hotspurs will play in Warsaw.

Between April 16 and May, national relay races will be held from north to south and along the western Polish frontier.

During the 9 weeks of religious festivities in Poland in the summer, tourist officials will restrict foreign entry. The visa curb chiefly affects applicants from Austria, the United States, France, Belgium, West Germany and Britain.

The curb is likely to keep out bishops, church groups and newsmen during peak moments of the church millenium program.

The government's decisions followed state accusations that the Catholic Church is trying to establish itself as a state within a state.

THINKING OUT LOUD ABOUT NATO

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some general comments on the recent French decision to withdraw from the integrated command structure of NATO.

Unhappily, we confront a veritable fait accompli. Certainly our own wishes as to the course of Atlantic defense have been dealt a serious blow. France is a great power. Her territorial integrity is essential to the defense of Europe under any eventuality. This is why her plan to disembark from the alliance commands is distressing and, I believe, unwarranted.

For it is a step which is not in the best military interests of France. I say this while acknowledging that it is for the people and Government of France to determine, exclusively, their own future.

The United States, regardless of the NATO disruption, should continue pressing new and realistic means whereby the Atlantic states can bring about closer cooperation. The adversity which now beclouds NATO need not deter us from initiating countless enterprises, private and public, whose potential success is based upon that crucial reservoir of good will and mutual convenience, prescribed by history, which remains intact.

My main purpose here is not to reiterate the expressions of shock and remorse. At this time we must throw off illusion and make a careful reassessment of NATO and how it can still function usefully. We must establish what is absolutely vital and determine in what fashion the multilateral defense commitment is to be preserved.

Clearly, the NATO institutions do not in and by themselves hold the alliance together. They are rather the instruments chosen to implement the mutual guarantee. This guarantee depends not upon organizational networks, but upon each state's conception of its security interest.

The security interests of the NATO partners will not be affected, one way or another, because of alterations made to the Organization. It is quite true that integration gives greater assurance of immediate involvement in the event of war. But given the range and variety of possible conflict, and the destructive impact of modern weaponry, I doubt whether any government, under any equation, would yield these decisions completely to outside organs and events.

What I am saying is that integrated commands and foreign bases are not vital to the preservation of the NATO commitment, because the reality and credibility of that commitment strikes far deeper.

It is a natural relationship which binds the people of the North Atlantic. History has made it so. Logic, self-interest, and geography lie at the heart of the NATO pledge. No amount of dickering with institutional devices can destroy this truth. As long as Europe is divided, as long as the democracies are menaced by power in the hands of an alien and suspect force, then the resultant insecurity will prescribe certain precautions.

Emotional outbursts against France will not restore the old order. It would be foolish to engage her in a war of words.

We must recognize that the NATO structure is not an end in itself. As a great power, we cannot afford the expensive liability of assuming every international contract to be a timeless cure. Diplomacy is adjustment, and if we prove incapable of dealing tactfully with ferment and change, then we are irresponsible in the use of that natural and assumptive world power which is ours.

We must learn to live with shifts of allegiance and the processes of change. These are all too apparent not only in Europe, but in the Afro-Asian world as well. I have previously lamented our obsessive preoccupation with short-term calculations. We seem to believe that our survival depends upon the tallying of a daily scorecard, carrying gains and losses in the race with the Communist devil. In truth, these developments cannot be easily categorized, and their outcome is in most instances due to circumstances beyond our reach.

A successful foreign policy in this polycentric world puts a premium on reason, realism, perspective, and subtlety in the application of power.

Alliances remain valid insofar as they furnish member states with a protection which is felt to be vital. When the fears which prompted the alliance fade, or when the member states find that the alliance hinders the fulfillment of other and more compelling goals, then it is better to redraft the arrangement than to live with the uncertainty of commitments which may never be met.

For a false alliance is a liability. It encourages popular misconception; it frustrates the policy of the progressive states which seek changes; it endangers the peace by pretending a threat which is meaningless; it renders the Communists an obvious scapegoat to excuse their own implacability and innate suspicion; it falsifies international relations.

For reasons already discussed, I do not think that the situation in Europe has reached a point where the alliance is unnecessary and, therefore, a handicap. But it would be foolhardy to maintain NATO as it now operates if the member states lack faith in its purpose and see its integrated status as an obstacle to the achievement of a more stable continental peace.

It is true that the only country which seeks to revise or withdraw from existing arrangements is France. We have known this for several years. It is most unfortunate that the United States, the prime military force, has not moved to officially study the developing differences and to offer, long before this date, realistic proposals by which this country and the Europeans could institute acceptable alternatives. This opportunity has now been lost.

But with or without an integrated command, I cannot conceive of a general European conflict without the engagement of the United States. We are aware that security in Europe is tied to our own vital interests. The Europeans are under the protection of our nuclear umbrella, and they know it. With or without the institutions, with or without the present degree of integration, the alliance might keep the prearranged defense commitments which are the substance of the NATO accord.

I raise these points because it would be dangerous to react stubbornly to the French initiative without assessing the real value of the military alliance as it now functions and without clarifying our real priorities.

To commit ourselves to an intractable defense of the status quo will not in long-range terms serve either France or the United States.

Let there be no mistaking my position: I firmly support an integrated system as the most desirable and rational approach to the mutual defense commitment. But this is not a decision which is exclusively ours, nor should we presume it to be such.

President de Gaulle has frequently stated that he believes in the Atlantic Alliance; that is to say, he believes in commitments toward multilateral defense of the European mainland, insofar as the practical application of these commitments does not infringe upon French sovereignty. He desires that France retain the ultimate decisions of peace and war, as they pertain to France; he rejects any system that could automatically trigger French response, in the same way that the United States claims certain options; he is suspicious of American motives, realizing that although this country would unhesitatingly come to the defense of central Europe in the event of aggression, we reserve an option as to how this will be done, and what means will be employed.

Unilateral and abrupt shifts in our own expressed strategic policy over the past several years have fed doubts about American purposes. Although President de Gaulle seeks nuclear capability primarily to enhance French power and prestige, he justifies his program by doubting, in effect, whether America is going to be true to its word, which may subject the Western Hemisphere to direct, atomic retaliation.

The prime target of French policy is not strictly the alliance, but the integrated defense structure which accentuates the paramount position of the United States and prejudges French decisionmaking.

The American Government should refrain from taking precipitate actions which encourage the complete disassociation of France from whatever security commitments to the alliance she may be willing to reaffirm.

The United States should now turn to its European allies and prompt them to come forward, singly or collectively, with precise plans for reconstituting the alliance Organization, in a manner which takes account of existing anxieties, of the question of German nuclear armament, and of the special position which France has opted for herself.

Two years ago, when I last addressed the House on European problems, I spoke mainly of the MLF proposal, a political gimmick which could not have answered the problem of nuclear sharing. This problem persists. The eventual redefinition of NATO which we are concerned with today must include a settlement of the NATO nuclear issues.

The United States must be prepared, now and at any time, to discuss these matters openly and comprehensively with the NATO partners.

It is Europe, not the United States, which has profited most from NATO; but it is the United States, and not Europe, which has shouldered most of the responsibilities. This imbalance must be rectified; and if the Europeans have a strong, legitimate interest in preserving the alliance, then I see no reason why these problems cannot be solved.

We should not fall into the trap of foisting new and complex arrangements upon our European friends. It must be for the Europeans to make a positive contribution in updating and reconstructing many features of this alliance. It is their security which is most keenly affected, and it is they who constitute the overwhelming numerical majority.

At the same time, the United States should assure the Allies of our willingness to consider all and any adjustments and solutions toward the achievement of a viable and mutually satisfactory formula.

Mr. Speaker, I would place primary emphasis upon Europe in this NATO situation because most of the NATO problems are rooted in decisions affecting the future course of European affairs. I would not want the United States to indulge in influencing the future course of European politics.

We should not rush into this situation and impose hastily contrived solutions. In so doing we may underline that sense of impotency, and perpetuate that suspicion and anxiety, which is essential to overcome.

The future of the Atlantic alliance will depend at least partially on how the Europeans, together with the United States, succeed in recasting their military relationship. I earnestly hope that from this reappraisal will come a new cooperative spirit, based upon frankness and mutual trust.

ATTACK ON THE TAXPAYERS' FRIEND

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **POFF.** Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office, the conscience of the Congress, the friend of the taxpayers, and the terror of the bureaucrat and those who do business with Uncle Sam, is under attack by its own parent.

The Congress created the GAO in 1921. Theretofore, the Comptroller General of the United States and the five auditors who served under him were officers of the executive branch of the Government. The 1921 act recognized the fact that auditors who audit themselves sometimes audit inaccurately or incompletely. So, the Congress created a body which was to be an arm of the Congress, an agent of the legislative branch of Government, independent of the executive establishment. Its function was to investigate all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds, and to make recommendations looking toward greater economy or efficiency in public expenditures. In addition to auditing and accounting work, GAO was to have the responsibility of debt collection, claims settlement, records management and services, and special assistance to the Congress and its committees. The head of the GAO, the Comptroller General of the United States, was to serve a term of 15 years, was to be ineligible for reappointment and was to be subject to removal only by a joint resolution of both Houses of Congress or by impeachment.

In every possible way, the 1921 act was so structured as to guarantee the maximum degree of independence and political nonpartisanship to this new investigative arm of the Congress.

GAO has performed its function and discharged its responsibilities over the years in a superior manner. During the last Congress—the 88th—GAO submitted 380 audit reports to a subcommittee of the Congress, about 200 of which concerned defense contractor problems. Only 3 were selected for specific criticism. During the 8½-year period prior to December 31, 1964, GAO submitted 237 reports to the Congress on deficiencies discovered in reviews of Government contracts. These reports pointed out excessive or erroneous payments of approximately $124 million and resulted in recaptures of about $66 million in misused taxpayers' funds. In that same period, GAO made a number of recommendations resulting in important amendments to the Armed Services Procurement Act and departmental regulations adopted under that act which will save taxpayers unpredictable millions of dollars.

In the face of such a performance record, the majority membership of the House committee has issued a report which inferentially rebukes and chastises GAO. The committee criticized statements in GAO reports that files on certain cases were being referred to the Justice Department. And the committee report objected to GAO's practice of naming names. GAO accepted the rebuke and agreed to discontinue both practices.

While I can appreciate the committee's desire to save individuals the public embarrassment of public exposure with reference to conduct which the Justice Department may never prosecute as criminal, I do not favor any action on the part of anybody anywhere which further restricts the right of the press and the public to know what Government bureaucrats and Government defense contractors are doing and who is doing it.

Neither do I approve any effort on the part of Congress to gag and sterilize its own investigative arm. Particularly at a time when the same political party controls both the executive branch of the Government and the legislative branch of the Government by such heavy-handed majorities, there should be and remain an investigative body which is absolutely and unequivocally independent and secure against abuse, misuse, and intimidation from any quarter whatever. Failing in such, the liberties of the people are not secure.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. **ASHBROOK.** Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th anniversary of a most historic occasion. On April 6, 1866, the Grand Army of the Republic was founded in Decatur, Ill. Today there is no more GAR but there is a memory, there is a proud tradition, there is an obligation unpaid. Everyone owes a debt of gratitude to the Grand Army of the Republic. Few homes do not have some family connection with this history although most homes, sadly enough, feel little sense of obligation or appreciation for the valiant sacrifices of those 19th century minutemen. Time erodes the feeling of appreciation and the sense of obligation for most people. Suffice it to say that this same apathy is now felt for the buddies of World War I who fought to make the world safe for democracy almost three decades ago.

As a person who loves history and being somewhat of a Civil War buff myself, Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion pass without some effort at expressing an appreciation for their worthwhile sacrifice. The footprints of these gallant men are still firmly imbedded in our history and heritage as Longfellow so eloquently wrote:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> We can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time.

The men of all wars since that time, yes, even now in the strange and faraway provinces of Vietnam, are tramping in those same footprints. We lament that there is no better way of preserving freedom but to sacrifice our youth and that is the sad fact of history during the past century. More lamentable, however, is the lack of a concern we have for those who went before us and fought and died for the way of life we now enjoy. Maybe this is our Achilles heel, our failure to sense history and fully appreciate our heritage. The Civil War and the Grand Army of the Republic are inextricably woven in our national history. I can attest to the fact that they are woven into my life, my heritage as an Ohioan and, yes, down to the local level in the area which I am privileged to represent in Congress.

As a boy, the Civil War veteran and his tales were very much a part of our household. My father, William A. Ashbrook, was a Congressman from the same District I now represent and was always considered as the veterans' best friend. This is probably why my keenest efforts are always directed toward the cause of the veteran and his dependents. How well I recall Frank D. French, the last surviving Civil War veteran in Licking County and a close personal friend of my father. When I was 10 years old, he was 96 so it goes without saying he was of another era. They were always placed in some honored position on the bandstand and given a thunderous applause when introduced. Old men with canes, bent and forlorn looking. Appreciation comes from understanding and in my case it was long after the last GAR veteran died that I fully comprehended what I owed to them. Once gained, however, this sense of awareness of their sacrifice will never be lost, at least in my case.

In my family there was always an appreciation of family, tradition, heritage, and those values which place importance on history and patriotism. Maybe this is why I tend to place more emphasis on our system and the challenges it faces such as apathy, moral decay, socialism, and communism. At any rate, the history of the GAR is a most meaningful thing to me. On February 28, 1902, my father's parents observed their golden wedding anniversary. In those days it was customary to have a prepared program. My father's part of the program was a dissertation on the Ashbrook family. On this he could speak since he was an avid genealogist. He said:

> In this day and age we are so much absorbed in the strife for pelf and self that little thought is given of the past and to those to whom we are indebted for the blessings we now enjoy. The past is as little thought of as the future is unsolved. It is today—the present only—that interests us most. We have fallen into the fashion of thinking that we were by chance, perhaps, dropped in some favored spot for some particular purpose and so soon do we get mixed in the affairs of today that we seldom stop to think: where did we come from and whither are we drifting. I realize this more clearly since I have been asked to prepare a biography of the family for this occasion, the golden wedding anniversary of parents whose whole lives have been that of unselfish sacrifice and devotion to their children.

Sixty-four years later it is just as appropriate. How many Americans feel as though we have been fortuitously "dropped in some favored spot" and fail to grasp the significance of what has gone before us and of the willing sacrifice of those whose only thought was to make life better for their progeny. To reflect for a few moments on the men of the Grand Army of the Republic might rekindle the spark of patriotism that, in my judgment, is so sorely needed today.

THE LAST GRAND MARCH

It was only natural that an organization such as the Grand Army of the Republic would come into existence. The comraderie, the esprit de corps and the mutual bonds which had been forged out of the devastating struggle ran deep. Feelings were running high when Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton suggested that the armies of Meade and Sherman should be formally reviewed in the Capital before their final discharge from the service of the Federal army. The Army of the Potomac, the Army of the Tennessee, and the Army of Georgia had marched to the vicinity of Washington and encamped with preparations for a gigantic parade on May 23 and 24, 1865. Lieutenant General Grant issued the orders and directed that the Army of the Ohio remain in North Carolina under the command of Maj. Gen. John M. Schofield.

Everything was in readiness. President Johnson's reviewing stand was erected near the Executive Mansion. His Cabinet, high officials, diplomats, and those popularly referred to as "war governors" were on hand. As one historian of the day put it:

> The public and private buildings of the National Capital were profusely decorated; triumphal arches and reviewing stands were erected at different points and vast crowds of people gathered from all sections to honor the returning veterans. The teachers and pupils of the public schools of Washington were assembled on the terraces and balconies of the Capitol and waved banners and sang patriotic songs as the soldiers passed. Upon a strip of canvas along the front of the Capitol was inscribed the legend: "The Only National Debt we can Never Pay is the Debt we Owe the Victorious Union Soldiers."

What a celebration. No nation ever loved its heroes so warmly or showered so much affection on them as in the post Civil War era. The first contingent to parade down Pennsylvania Avenue was the Army of the Potomac with the hero of Gettysburg, Maj. Gen. George Gordon Meade at the head of the column. Behind him rode Brevet Maj. Gen. George A. Custer, heading the 3d Division of the Cavalry. On and on they marched until the night fell.

On May 24, what was popularly called "Sherman's Army" was reviewed with Maj. Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman at the head, accompanied by Gen. O. O. Howard. The Army of the Tennessee was headed by Maj. Gen. John A. Logan and the Army of Georgia by Maj. Gen. Henry W. Slocum. The very first troops to be reviewed were the 15th Army Corps, whose 1st Division was led by Brig. Gen. Charles R. Woods followed by his brother Brig. Gen. W. B. Woods, both of the famous 76th Ohio Regiment. These men were the pride of Licking County, both living in Newark.

This then, in fact, was the first real encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic although it is more correct to say that this was the progenitor of the April 6, 1866, encampment. Surely the idea came from this heroes' review which was accorded the 150,000 men who participated in these ceremonies. Here they were, an Army of ex-citizen soldiers about to return to private life at Newark, Ohio, or in Cincinnati or in any of the other cities, towns, and rural sections of the Union. Grant was to become President, General Woods a member of the Supreme Court, General Custer would be massacred at the Little Big Horn—yet, there they were, the pride of a grateful nation which had been saved by their valor. A technicolor news film of that day would have portrayed a happy band yet a tattered and torn one. A Hollywood studio would have rejected the scene as too drab. With worn uniforms and tattered ensigns telling eloquently of the battles they had won, these men were anxious only to return to their homes.

They were soon to part, with a tearful goodby to their friends, with heavy heart as they paused to reflect on the comrades they had left behind. Yes, the Grand Army of the Republic came into existence that week for although they were returning home they would never be the same, their allegiance to no organization would be any stronger than the ties to the Grand Army of the Republic. Later years would indicate the job was undone, the admonishments of the martyred President Abraham Lincoln "to bind up the Nation's wounds" and "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan" would need the impetus of a rebirth of the zeal which forged the victorious army.

Then, too, there was the grand army of the dead which could not be forgotten. Altogether 2,778,304 served in the Federal army from 1861 to 1865 but countless thousands of others served in local militia, local civilian defense, special campaigns and so forth. There had been 67,058 killed in battle; 43,032 died of wounds and injuries; 224,586 died by the ravages of disease; and 24,852 from causes unclassified—a death roll of 359,528. Not present to muster out were heroes such as McPherson, Reynolds, Sedgwick and, yes, old Abe himself. These men, their comrades, their leaders had not lived to hear the joyful shouts of victory. No better reason could be found for a strong GAR than the reverence they had for the grand army of the dead, encamped on another field and forever enshrined in the hearts of their fellow Americans.

Even before the first grand encampment, veteran societies were blossoming and few regiments failed to make some arrangements to commemorate specific battles or important events of their own history. Even before the war ended veteran societies were meeting. The Society of the Army of the Tennessee was organized during the rebellion. Like so many other veteran societies, they performed many acts of welfare for their comrades and their kin. For example, their records shows the expenditure of $23,000 for an "appropriate memorial at the grave of Maj. Gen. James B. McPherson at Clyde, Ohio." It was during this era that many of the equestrian statutes were erected in Washington. The Society of the Army of the Cumberland, the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States and scores of other veteran groups came into existence. Most have passed out of memory except for one, the Grand Army of the Republic.

THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC (GAR) IS BORN

Like most organizations, the GAR had its genesis in the minds of men who were forward-looking dreamers. Chaplain William J. Rutledge, born of a noted Virginia family which emigrated to Illinois, was such a man. A Methodist Episcopal Church minister, he was 40 when the war broke out and promptly enlisted. He was a tentmate of Dr. Benjamin Franklin Stephenson, considered the founder of the GAR. Chaplain Rutledge suggested to Major Stephenson that the soldiers so closely allied in the fellowship of suffering would, when mustered out of the service, naturally desire some form of association that would preserve the friendships and the memories of their common trials.

This fervent desire never faded. After the close of their army service, they continually corresponded with each other until, at last, in March of 1866, they met in Springfield, Ill., and set up the ritual and format of the proposed organization. On April 6, 1866, 100 years ago today, at Decatur, Ill., Major Stephenson organized the first post of the Grand Army of the Republic. He had a sense of history as April 6 was the anniversary of the Battle of Shiloh.

The constitution of this national organization was a simple one which was adopted at their first convention on July 12, 1866, in Springfield, Ill.

CONSTITUTION OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

> Article I—Declaration of purpose: The soldiers of the volunteer Army of the United States, during the Rebellion of 1861–65, actuated by the impulses and convictions of patriotism and of eternal right, and combined in the strong bonds of fellowship and

unity by the toils, the dangers, and the victories of a long and vigorously waged war, feel themselves called upon to declare, in definite form of words and in determined cooperative action, those principles and rules which should guide the earnest patriot, the enlightened freeman, and the Christian citizen in the course of action; and to agree upon those plans and laws which should govern them in a united and systematic working method with which, in some measure, shall be effected the preservation of the grand results of the war, the fruits of their labor and toil, so as to benefit the deserving and worthy.

Section 2: The results which are designed to be accomplished by this organization are as follows:

First. The preservation of those kind and fraternal feelings which have bound together with the strong cords of love and affection, the comrades in arms of many battles, sieges, and marches.

Second. To make these ties available in works and results of kindness, of favor, and material aid to those in need of assistance.

Third. To make provision, where it is not already done, for the support, care, and education of soldiers' orphans and for the maintenance of the widows of deceased soldiers.

Fourth. For the protection and assistance of disabled soldiers, whether disabled by wounds, sickness, old age, or misfortune.

Fifth. For the establishment and defense of the late soldiery of the United States, morally, socially, and politically, with a view to inculcate a proper appreciation of their services to the country, and to a recognition of such services and claims by the American people.

With very few significant changes, this is the constitution of the organization that swept the country until at its peak in 1890 there were 7,178 posts in the various States. Several constitutional revisions are noteworthy. The national encampment in Philadelphia in 1868 added this language:

> But this association does not design to make nominations for office or use its influence as a secret organization for partisan purposes.

The Indianapolis convention added the word "sailors" where omitted in the Springfield constitutiton and also added a new section taken from the constitution of the Loyal Legion, as follows:

> Sixth. The maintenance of true allegiance to the United States of America, based upon paramount respect for, and fidelity to, the national constitution and laws, manifested by the discountenancing of whatever may tend to weaken loyalty, incite to insurrection, treason or rebellion, or in any manner impairs the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions, together with a defense of universal liberty, equal rights and justice to all men.

There was no question that this grand organization of veterans moving en masse was a potent influence in molding public opinion in favor of those who had borne the battle. Before the year was out, the first national convention or grand encampment was held. On November 20, 1886, Commander in Chief B. F. Stephenson called to order the first national encampment of the new Grand Army of the Republic at Morrison's Opera House in Indianapolis, Ind. By 1890, there were 409,489 members of local posts throughout the United States. An indication of the impact the GAR had is best indicated by our own State of Ohio. At its peak the Department of Ohio, boasted 753 posts for our State alone.

All have passed out of existence. Yet their memory remains and in many cases there are plaques, statues or markers which can be seen in county seats and cemeteries. Too often they are forgotten.

Time puts all things in proper perspective. When you realize that none of these posts exists any more and their once busy meetings have been stifled by the roll of time, it should cause one to think about the insignificance of each of us. It should also cause us to reflect on our national lack of patriotism and respect for the past. If 100 years from now our lineal descendants should care no more for us than the average American cares for the sacrifice of those who made up the rolls of the GAR—indeed those of every war since 1776—what profiteth it all? The GAR was an organization born with limited membership which could not increase. Like those who fought at San Juan Hill, at Belleau Wood or in the Battle of the Bulge or Pork Chop Hill or now in Vietnam, their ranks could only diminish. How well the historian put it who wrote:

> The Grand Army of the Republic is a unique organization. No child can be born into it. No proclamation of President, edict of King or Czar can command admission. No university or institution of learning can issue a diploma authorizing its holder entrance. No act of Parliament or Congress secures recognition. The wealth of a Vanderbilt cannot purchase the position. Its doors open only on the presentation of a bit of parchment, worn, torn, and begrimed as it may be, which certifies to an honorable discharge from the Armies or Navies of the Nation during the war against the rebellion, and, unlike any other organization, no new blood can come in. There are no growing ranks from which recruits can be drawn into the Grand Army of the Republic. With the consummation of peace through victory its ranks were closed forever; its lines are steadily growing thinner, and the ceaseless tramp of its columns is with ever lessening tread. The gaps in the picket lines grow wider every day. Details are made for the reserve summoned into the shadowy regions until by and by only a solitary sentinel will stand guard, waiting until the bugle call of the beyond shall muster out the last comrade of the Grand Army of the Republic.

To read the annual report of the membership rolls is a reminder that the Grim Reaper moves with mechanical precision. From a high point of 409,489 members in 1890, the GAR steadily had its ranks thinned to 276,612 in 1900, 103,258 in 1920, 21,080 in 1930, 1039 in 1940, and a mere 16 when the books were closed on September 1, 1949, in Indianapolis.

Yes, in the same way the gaps in the lines grow thinner for the World War I buddies and the time is running on those who fought in World War II. We can well ask ourselves "Have we cared enough?" and "Do we really deserve the heritage of these noble sacrifices?" Time ran out on the GAR. Only six of its surviving members attended the final encampment, the 83d, at Indianapolis, Ind., in 1949. How appropriate to choose Indianapolis since it was there in 1866 that the first encampment gathered. Yes, time ran out when that solitary sentinel Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., passed to his reward on August 2, 1956, the last surviving veteran of the GAR.

One who loves history can never tire of the stories of these stalwart men. Their spirit never dimmed. Marvel, for example, at the ringing words of 100-year-old Past National Commander Hiram R. Gale who addressed the final encampment and directed this thought at World War I and II vets who were in attendance:

> You boys who served in the Armed Forces of your country have a duty. * * * If you let the country get away from the Constitution there will be no great and strong and free United States—the United States we all fought to preserve and protect.

What a fitting statement to close the roll on the Grand Army of the Republic. What a significant reminder to each of those who sees security in affluence—not sacrifice—and subordinates the real values to a false set of materialistic gods in this day and age.

INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL THROUGH LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, an unusual opportunity for developing and improving our relations with the nations of the world is, I believe, presented to us through the medium of Little League baseball. The Members will recall that within the past year the Congress of the United States, recognizing the tremendous contribution made on the national and international scene by Little League baseball, granted this organization a Federal charter. It was our hope, which has definitely been justified by subsequent developments, that the Federal charter would aid in the tremendous growth already enjoyed by this outstanding organization.

The commissioner of baseball, William D. Eckert, emphasized the contribution of Little League baseball nationally when he reported that "more than 750 graduates of Little League have now joined the ranks of professional baseball players and thousands more are continuing to play our national game on high school and college teams." In describing Little League baseball, Commissioner Eckert said:

> Little League not only fosters friendships, develops coordination and good health habits in boys, but it breaks down social barriers and makes for a more closely knit community. It knows no national boundaries as it has developed leagues in 27 countries and it is played with equal enthusiasm everywhere.

Those of us who have been intimately associated with Little League baseball, whether in the relationship of father, manager, player, coach, umpire, or just spectator, recognize the monumental contribution made by Little League baseball to the youth and to the communities of our country.

However, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion some of the more dramatic benefits that could be obtained through the program's effectiveness are being lost because of problems beyond Little League's financial capabilities. I refer to the opportunities and the financial responsibilities on the international scene. It is interesting to note that every league including those outside of the United States operates under the Federal charter, and under the rules and regulations of the parent organization through the medium of a franchise granted by the officials in their Williamsport, Pa., headquarters.

Even those areas of the world which do not speak our language are governed by the rules and disciplines, and are expected to carry out the traditions the same as every other team participating here in the United States. When I urged the adoption of the legislation which would authorize the grant of a Federal charter, I pointed out to the Congress the great good that could be accomplished throughout the world by the common denominator of a simple baseball. The color of one's skin, the language that one speaks, the ancestry, the wealth, the home background, the environment, are completely forgotten in the friendship, the mutual assistance, and the common good sought to be obtained on a baseball team. This is particularly true of Little League where the prejudices that sometimes develop in the adult have not yet begun to exist in the youth.

What better medium, therefore, for improving race relations in the United States and developing better international relationships through the world, then this great sport of baseball played as it is under the ideal conditions prescribed by Little League baseball. Consider if you will, the rare opportunity of bringing forcefully to the attention of some small South American community or some village in France, or one of the industrialized cities of Germany, Poland, or even Russia, the rules of conduct, the spirit of fair play and sportsmanship, the competitive spirit and the overall goodwill of the great American game of baseball as played by their own sons in their own backyard under the American rules.

It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the conclusion is self-evident. Here is a built-in, sure-fire, guaranteed-to-succeed implement to develop our relations throughout the world. How much more important is this than some of the ill-conceived projects which have been developed and upon which huge sums have been expended for the purpose of furthering the American image and developing good will among nations? Already Little League on its own, without any Federal contribution of any kind, has developed leagues in 27 countries. Each year teams from Europe, Japan, Canada, and Mexico travel to Williamsport to participate in a World Series of Little League baseball. At its own expense, Little League has sent plans and instructions, together with experienced know-how on organizational methods, to such places as Australia, Italy, Taiwan, Saudi Arabia, Norway, Okinawa, Africa, Japan, Teheran, as well as most major countries of Europe and our contiguous neighbors, Canada and Mexico. I am told that the acceptance of Little League baseball in these countries far exceeds even that witnessed by all of us in the United States. It is my understanding that this relationship brought about by Little League baseball in these various communities and countries, applied at the family level, modest as it is, seems to engender more respect and effectiveness for the people of the country than do some of the higher level approaches. Baseball indeed speaks a common language wherever it is played and as it expresses the pride of a parent and the unlimited ambition of a youngster of Little League age, it would seem to be worth whatever encouragement it can be given. Mr. Speaker, Little League truly represents the spark of ambition that can be struck in the heart of a boy anywhere exposure is given, and it creates the same kind of family pride in Costa Rica or the impoverished areas of Naples as it does here in our economically provident society.

In this period of history, when billions of dollars are being spent to improve the lot of our fellow men throughout the world and in an attempt to bring the American dream and the American way of life to peoples throughout the world, it seems to me that the U.S. Government should play a more important role in aid of these laudable objectives and readily obtainable accomplishments of Little League baseball.

I believe, therefore, that all of us in the Congress should consider how this budding international instrumentality can be assisted and improved. Like other agencies whose importance has become more pronounced within recent years, this is truly a Little League of youth, of youthful dreams, and of hope for the future. These hopes and these dreams can and should be shared with children all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in Little League baseball and what it can accomplish in the future throughout the world and I, therefore, am convinced that we should render some financial assistance in encouraging the work which has been done, and which in my judgment should be done on a more intensified basis through other parts of the world. Federal funds, at least in some modest amount, should be made available at once to aid Little League in teaching, promoting and developing the fundamentals of Little League baseball in many needy areas of the world. Funds should also be made available by way of transportation allowances to representative teams from foreign nations to allow for visits to the United States for the purpose of meeting in competition, teams representing the various sections of our own country. What better way to develop in the heart of a young European or Asian, the knowledge of and the respect for the American, than to have him visit our land and see it as he plays the competitive sport of baseball with an American boy of his own age, and exchanging with him his ideas and ambitions?

I would urge, therefore, the Members of this House to personally evaluate the great contribution that Little League can make and then urge the proper committee of this House, and the appropriate executive department of our Government, to authorize and appropriate Federal funds to further expand, develop and improve Little League in its efforts throughout the world. This could be, in my judgment, one of the truly important investments for the future of America and the future of the world.

AMENDMENT OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 2,933,562 men and women in the U.S. armed services today. Of this number, about 888,944 serve overseas as the outer bastions of the United States and as protectors of freedom and democracy. In fact, approximately 250,000 soldiers wearing the American uniform are now fighting against aggression in Vietnam today. The burden and sacrifice on their shoulders are only outweighed by their great contribution to the United States and to the free world.

I strongly feel that a man or woman wearing the American uniform and engaged in the defense of this country should have the opportunity of immediately becoming an American citizen if that is his desire. I, therefore, join with the distinguished gentleman from New York, the Honorable John J. Rooney, by today introducing legislation to provide means for the expeditious naturalization of aliens who have lawfully been admitted to the United States as immigrants or subsequently become permanent residents and who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States during the period beginning January 1, 1963.

Before introducing this legislation I carefully considered the appropriateness of a commencing date. I note that on February 12, 1955, the first military advisory assistance group, approximately 800 members of the Special Forces, was sent to Vietnam; on December 14, 1961, our late, great President Kennedy pledged increased aid to Vietnam; on August 14, 1964, the first air strikes were levied against North Vietnam; and on March 6, 1965, ground combat elements landed in Vietnam as a part of a buildup of U.S. forces. In weighing these dates I concluded that January 1, 1963, was the most feasible in view of the designed purpose of this legislation.

Additionally, I also weighed a requirement, as a condition precedent to expeditious naturalization, that a member of the armed services had to have served in Vietnam or perhaps in another overseas post. However, since every unit, wherever stationed in the United States, may be sent overseas, I felt that the most equitable approach would be to bestow naturalization benefits on every person who entered the U.S. military forces while in the United States or its possessions.

This legislation is similar to legislation enacted on March 27, 1942, which enabled aliens serving honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II to qualify for naturalization.

On June 30, 1953, the President signed the next legislation which affected military persons and naturalization. This was an act to provide for the naturalization of persons who had served in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950, and not later than July 1, 1955, honorably, in an active duty status, for a period or periods totaling not less than 90 days and who had been physically present in the United States for a period of at least 1 year prior to entering the armed services. This legislation was designed to bestow naturalization benefits on aliens serving during the Korean conflict. The hostilities in Korea opened on June 25, 1950, and the termination date of June 30, 1955, was selected inasmuch as that was the date of the expiration of the authority for induction under the amended Selective Service Act.

There is provision in the Immigration and Nationality Act for naturalization benefits, section 328, for aliens who serve honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States for an aggregate period of 3 years following lawful admission for permanent residence. There is also provision for aliens who served honorably in World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, section 329, and who failed to seek the benefits available to them under former legislation, but no specific provision is contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act for aliens who have served or are serving honorably during the period of the Vietnam hostilities.

Many permanent resident aliens have enlisted in our Armed Forces. Many students and visitors have been inducted in accordance with our Universal Military Training and Service Act and will subsequently become permanent residents of the United States.

I respectfully submit that a person who has risked his life for the United States should be honored with an opportunity for citizenship of this country expeditiously.

This legislation which I have introduced does not waive basic requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution, and understanding of the English language. It contemplates benefits only for the alien who has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence and who has served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Those aliens who are separated from military service on account of alienage or those who are conscientious objectors who performed no military, air, or naval duty whatever, or refused to wear the uniform shall not be regarded as having served honorably or as having been separated under honorable conditions.

I trust that the committee and Congress will see fit to act upon this legislation as expeditiously as possible.

INQUIRY INTO SIMPLIFYING U.S. INCOME TAX FORMS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at his point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the income tax forms which we are now struggling to file before the 15th of the month were designed by the Internal Revenue Service after taking into account literally hundreds of suggestions from accountants, lawyers, business systems experts, and just plain ordinary taxpayers, so the Commissioner of Internal Revenue Service has advised the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Government Operations, of which I am chairman. Members of the subcommittee are Congressmen Torbert H. Macdonald, Democrat, of Massachusetts; Cornelius E. Gallagher, Democrat, of New Jersey; John G. Dow, Democrat, of New York; Donald Rumsfeld, Republican, of Illinois; and Robert Dole, Republican, of Kansas. The Honorable William L. Dawson, Democrat, of Illinois, is chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations.

The subcommittee is interested in the income tax operations of IRS from the standpoint of their efficiency and economy. Simplification of the forms and procedures presents the possibility of large savings to the Government, and at the same time easing the tasks of the taxpayers in preparing their returns.

The problem is replete with complications. Experts, both within the Internal Revenue Service and without, have toiled toward greater simplification of forms. The 1965 forms represent the best effort that IRS has been able to produce—and they may leave a lot of room for improvement.

As the Commissioner has advised the subcommittee, there is very little room for administrative action to simplify forms under existing law. The technicality and complexity of the income tax laws undoubtedly make form preparation an extremely difficult and exacting task. On the other hand, great numbers of taxpayers are not affected by many of the special requirements of the tax laws, so that every possible effort must be made to simplify their returns.

The prospect of being able to save a lot of the taxpayers' money, by having personal income tax forms in such shape that they can easily be processed on IRS automated equipment, has impelled further subcommittee study of the problem, despite its difficulties. For one thing, it has seemed that a large amount of manpower now devoted to checking the individual entries on IRS form 1040—the long form—could be devoted to other endeavors, or perhaps largely eliminated, if more taxpayers could file their returns on simple cards. As subcommittee chairman, I asked the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to advise whether many income tax returns could be reduced to simple cards.

The Commissioner advised the subcommittee that:

> It is important to understand that existing laws determine the kinds of information to be required on tax forms. These requirements do not change when we switch from manually processed to electronically processed forms. As a matter of fact, form 1040A (which is used by nearly 20 million small income taxpayers) has been on a punch card for about 10 years. Under our automatic data processing system, all tax return forms will eventually be processed electronically. This system is in full operation throughout the country for corporation, excise, and employment taxes, and in two of our seven regions for individual income taxes. The pending Treasury Department appropriation bill will largely determine how soon we can complete the remaining implementation of the system.
>
> In the meantime, we are hopeful that means will be found for improving forms and procedures not later than the time for designing forms for the 1966 tax year.

IRS form 1040A, to which the Commissioner referred, can be filed by all taxpayers having income of $10,000 or less from wages, and no more than $200 in other income.

In its broad efforts toward simplification of tax forms and procedures under existing law, the subcommittee has explored the possibility of many more persons filing on simple cards, by raising the income limitation to which form 1040A applies. In that connection it has sought the views not only of IRS, but also of numerous professional associations and automatic data processing industry representatives. It has also asked the General Accounting Office, with its large staff of auditing and accounting experts to aid the subcommittee's study. The Comptroller General of the United States, who heads the General Accounting Office, has reported to the subcommittee on the results of the GAO study.

In brief, the GAO agrees with the conclusions of an earlier IRS study on the impracticability of extending the card form of tax return beyond its present use. The IRS study had shown that about 9 million taxpayers who could have filed the card form, 1040A, under the established $10,000 income limitation, actually used the long form, 1040, and this despite the fact that IRS had tried to encourage taxpayers to make greater use of the card form, by raising the income limitation from $5,000 to $10,000.

The study also showed that if the income limitations were raised to $15,000, some 417,000 more taxpayers could use the card form; if the income limitation were entirely eliminated, an additional 43,000 taxpayers could file on the card form. However, because so many taxpayers who are presently eligible to file their returns by cards choose to file the long form, and because tax practitioners generally prefer to use the long forms, IRS had not considered it advisable to spread the use of the card forms to apply to incomes beyond the $10,000 limitation. The GAO believes that conclusion to be appropriate.

I believe the information contained in the Comptroller General's report will be of interest to each Member of the Congress, and to every taxpayer. Without objection, I submit the Comptroller General's report for the RECORD:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1966.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of July 30, 1965, requesting our office to assist your subcommittee in its consideration of possible means for simplifying income tax return forms and procedures under existing laws. Staff members of the subcommittee indicated to us that your primary interest is to aid taxpayers in filing tax returns by making the forms and procedures as simple as possible.

As specifically requested by your staff members on September 1, 1965, we explored with responsible officials in the Internal Revenue Service the possibility of increasing the dollar income limitation above the established $10,000 ceiling to ascertain whether more taxpayers could use the card form U.S. individual income tax return (form 1040A). We also reviewed the authority of the Service to prescribe tax forms and procedures and obtained various statistical data relating to individual tax returns.

On January 14, 1966, the results of our inquiry were discussed with Messrs. Matan and Rothenberg of your staff. In general, these results showed that, according to an Internal Revenue Service study conducted in 1965 of tax returns filed for 1963, the Service estimated that about 9 million taxpayers who could have filed a form 1040A card form return under the established $10,000 income limitation actually filed a U.S. individual income tax return (form 1040). The study also showed that an additional 417,000 taxpayers could file form 1040A returns if the income limitation were raised to $15,000 and that about another 43,000 taxpayers could file card form 1040A returns if the income limitation were eliminated.

On the basis of our review of the information furnished us and our discussions with cognizant officials, we believe that the conclusion reached by the Service that it is inadvisable to raise the income limitation above $10,000 appears appropriate.

Following, in more detail, are the results of our review.

PERTINENT CODE PROVISIONS

Section 6011 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 6011) provides generally that, when required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, any person made liable for a tax or the collection thereof shall make a return or statement according to the forms and regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Section 6012 sets forth the individuals required to file income tax returns.

Under authority granted in the code, the Service has provided in section 1.6012-1(a)(7)(i) of the income tax regulations (26 CFR 1.6012-1) that individuals may use the card-form tax return (form 1040A) if their income is less than $10,000 and consists entirely of wages subject to withholding tax and not more than $200 in total of dividends, interest, and other wages. Subparagraph (6) of section 1.6012-1(a) provides that a taxpayer, although entitled to use a form 1040A return for a taxable year, may choose to report his tax on a form 1040 return. The dollar limitation on those taxpayers eligible to file form 1040A returns and the option provided certain taxpayers to file either a form 1040A or a form 1040 return are administrative rules that can be changed by the Service through revisions in the Income Tax Regulations.

CHANGES IN INCOME TAX REGULATIONS WHICH MAY HAVE INCREASED THE NUMBER OF TAXPAYERS FILING CARD FORM 1040A TAX RETURNS

For tax year 1948 the Service provided for the use by certain individuals of a paper summary form tax return (form 1040A). This form replaced the wage withholding income tax receipt (form W-2) that was filed as a return by certain individuals for the years 1944 through 1947. For tax year 1954 the Service provided a card form 1040A tax return. The card form 1040A return, made available by the Service until 1956, was designed for use by taxpayers having income primarily from wages of less than $5,000 and to permit the Service to compute an individual's tax.

The Service revised the card form 1040A for the 1956 tax year to permit the taxpayer to compute his own tax. For tax year 1958, the Service again revised such form and raised the $5,000 income limitation to $10,000. Only taxpayers having an income of less than $5,000, however, could elect to have the Service compute their tax because section 6014 of the Internal Revenue Code limits the tax computation by the Service to certain wage earners having income of less than $5,000.

The raising of the income limitation from $5,000 to $10,000 for tax year 1958 appears to have contributed to a greater use by taxpayers of card form 1040A. For tax year 1956, the year of the revision to the card form 1040A which permitted the taxpayer to compute his own tax, about 60.2 million returns were filed by individuals including about 14.1 million card forms 1040A. For tax year 1958, when the income limitation was raised to $10,000, about 60 million returns were filed by individuals including about 17.2 million card forms 1040A. Thus, while the total number of individual returns filed for tax year 1958 decreased 0.2 million, compared with those filed for tax year 1956, the card forms 1040A filed for tax year 1958 increased 3.1 million, compared with those filed for tax year 1956. The total number of individual returns filed increased from about 60 million for tax year 1958 to 64.3 million for tax year 1964, and the number of card forms 1040A filed increased from about 17.2 million to 17.7 million for these same years.

NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE TAXPAYERS NOT FILING CARD FORM 1040A TAX RETURNS

According to an internal study made by the Service in 1965 of returns filed for 1963, about 9 million taxpayers eligible to file card form 1040A tax returns under the established $10,000 income limitation filed form 1040 tax returns. A summary of the Service's analysis resulting from the study is included as an appendix.

Although the Service has taken steps to encourage taxpayers to make greater use of the card form 1040A tax reurn, such as by raising the income limit to $10,000 and allowing taxpayers the option of computing their taxes or having the Service compute the taxes, there still remain a considerable number of taxpayers eligible to file card form 1040A tax returns who elect to use forms 1040.

According to the Service, one of the principal reasons for filing a form 1040 return in lieu of a card form 1040A return is the preference of tax practitioners to use form 1040. Our inquiries to Service officials disclosed that the latest information on the number of taxpayers who employ tax practitioners is based upon tax returns filed for the years 1961 and 1962. We were informed by the Director of the Service's Statistics Division that:

"Our characteristics study of form 1040 for 1961 showed that 48 percent of returns filed for that year were signed by preparer other than taxpayer. This study was based on a sample of 12,500 out of the nearly 43 million returns filed for 1961. A technical note in the study suggests that the 48 percent estimate may reflect some upward bias due to unanticipated problems met during processing. However, estimates from subsequent small-scale studies of returns for 1962 are consistent with the characteristics study figure for 1961."

We were informed by the chairman of the Service's tax forms coordinating committee that tax practitioners prefer to use the form 1040 because it facilitates the preparation of carbon copies of the return for their files and for the taxpayers. In addition, the form 1040 generally can be prepared more easily than the card form 1040A because data required to be reported is on one side of the form. The chairman believes that the relationship between the Service and the public would be harmed if the Service discontinued the option given to taxpayers to select the form that makes it easier for them to report their taxes.

NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL TAXPAYERS WHO WOULD BE ELIGIBLE TO FILE CARD FORM 1040A RETURNS IF THE INCOME CEILING IS RAISED

According to the internal study by the Service of returns filed for 1963, an additional 417,000 taxpayers could file card form 1040A returns if the income limitation were raised to $15,000 and another 43,000 taxpayers could file such returns if the income limitation were eliminated. (See appendix.) Although 460,000 additional taxpayers would become eligible if the income limitation were eliminated, these taxpayers may not necessarily file the form 1040A return. As indicated by the Service study of returns filed for 1963, an estimated 9 million taxpayers eligible to file card form 1040A returns chose to file form 1040 returns.

In addition, we were informed by the chairman of the Service's tax forms coordinating committee that the number of additional eligible taxpayers who would file the card form 1040A tax returns, if permitted to do so, would be materially reduced principally because tax practitioners prefer to use form 1040 returns rather than to use the card form 1040A returns as previously discussed. Because of the factors as set forth in this report, the Service has not considered it advisable to raise or eliminate the $10,000 limitation on the income of taxpayers permitted to use the card form 1040A tax return.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

Summary analysis of the results of a study by the Internal Revenue Service of returns filed for the 1963 tax year

[In thousands]

Taxpayers' adjusted gross income	Number of returns filed		Estimated number of taxpayers filing form 1040 eligible to file form 1040A[1]
	Form 1040A	Form 1040	
Under $5,000	14, 618	19, 159	5, 868
$5,000 (under $10,000)	2, 947	19, 101	3, 272
Total (under $10,000)	17, 565	38, 260	9, 140
			Estimated number of taxpayers eligible to file form 1040A if the $10,000 income ceiling were raised or eliminated completely[1]
$10,000 (under $15,000)	--------	5, 664	417
$15,000 (under $20,000)	--------	1, 238	40
$20,000 (under $25,000)	--------	460	3
$25,000 or more	--------	756	--------
Total ($10,000 or more)	--------	8, 118	460
Total (all returns)	17, 565	46, 378	--------

---

[1] The estimated number of taxpayers who had income from salaries and wages within the prescribed limitation for filing a form 1040A return was adjusted to eliminate returns which included such items as itemized deductions and sick pay exclusion or which were filed by a surviving spouse or other taxpayers making quarterly taxpayments in accordance with Internal Revenue Service income tax regulations.

DEDICATED TEACHERS AT WINDMILL STREET SCHOOL

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Providence Evening Bulletin of Monday, March 28, 1966, contained an article entitled "School Can Be Fun Where There's Warmth and Kindness," which I should like to include at this point in the Record.

The article touches on the excellent work that a dedicated group of women is doing with children who are deaf and hard of hearing. As a result of their activity the deaf and hard-of-hearing program at Windmill Street School has earned great reknown throughout the New England area and has become a symbol of hope for parents. It shows what can be done by capable, qualified people who possess in high degree the warmth and kindness to which the newspaper refers.

The article referred to follows:

School Can Be Fun Where There's Warmth, Kindness—Teachers of Deaf Youngsters Also Have Problems for Parents

(By Kiki Scotti)

School can really be fun—if you are taught by Miss McPhillips, Miss Murphy, or Miss Brown. These three dedicated women teach the deaf and hard of hearing at Windmill Street School, a Providence public school.

Miss M. Regina McPhillips, the most experienced of the three, has been working with the hard of hearing and deaf since 1949. She is a motherly looking woman who radiates warmth, kindness, and fun.

At Windmill Street School, she gives supplementary classes to the hard of hearing children who are integrated in the fourth, fifth and sixth grades and teaches the educables, these children who are both hard of hearing and have an IQ below 80.

Besides working with the children, Miss McPhillips conducts a parent-training program which is held once every 3 weeks. Its purpose is to teach the parents techniques and ways to help the child integrate into community affairs.

Before being admitted to the hard-of-hearing program at Windmill Street School, the children are carefully screened. Miss Helen M. MacPherson, hearing consultant at the school, meets the parents, contacts the advisory clinic (every hard of hearing or deaf child is referred to Windmill Street School by some agency), and compiles a case history.

Every child is taken on a trial basis. Before he is accepted, each must prove through the training program that he can get along in the integrated program.

"Integration is one way for the hard of hearing to learn," Miss McPhillips asserted. But it is by no means the only way or in all cases the best way, she feels.

"The children must get the most they can out of the regular classes," she continued. They know lipreading and have special seating arrangements in the classrooms.

To instruct the hard of hearing children at Windmill Street School, the TVA (tactual, visual, auditory) method is used basically but the three teachers will try anything. "If it works we use it," Miss Murphy said, speaking for her colleagues as well.

Maureen M. Murphy, who came to Windmill Street School in 1962, teaches a supplementary class to the hard of hearing and deaf children in the first, second, and third grades and also teaches the multiple handicapped. (At Windmill Street School, children with various handicaps are accepted as long as hearing is the predominant one.)

And she has all sorts of unique ways to teach. The girls learn spelling by tracing the letters in talcum powder. The boys use sand and water. Even at the age of 6 or 7, they don't want to be called sissies.

The children also have contests with soap pipes to see who can blow the biggest bubble and beat drums to stress the correct word in a sentence.

Behind these apparent antics lies a very simple concept which Miss Murphy explained simply: "Language has to be made real to them before they can understand it.

"We act out words that are difficult, like doing somersaults to explain 'head over heels,' " she continued. "With children with motor problems, if they perform the action at the same time they're learning to say it, this reenforces the language concepts."

A cerebral palsy victim herself, Miss Murphy is interested primarily in those with perceptual and motor difficulties. She feels that she can identify with them and vice versa because she too is handicapped.

A graduate of Rhode Island College of Education, Miss Murphy began to work with socially handicapped children. From there she became interested in helping children who had problems in school, and eventually decided to concentrate her efforts on those in need of speech therapy, like the deaf and hard of hearing. So, she went to Boston U.S. fellowship program to study about the deaf.

Like Miss Murphy, Jane Brown received a master's degree from Boston University in the field of the deaf. She was the first Rhode Island teacher to avail herself of the U.S. fellowship program to study about the deaf.

For the past year, the young blue-eyed blonde has been teaching a "self-contained class" at Windmill Street School for deaf and hard of hearing children from 6 to 8 years old. She tries to create a first grade atmosphere with a little deviation from the normal.

The little deviation includes making up sentences and writing them on the board as a reward. This may sound easy, but for these handicapped children it takes many repeated efforts and much encouragement.

"They leave out all connecting words," Miss Brown explained, and employ what is termed "natural language."

As soon as they are able, Miss Brown's pupils will be integrated into regular classes, but right now they enjoy singing more than anything else.

"They have a song about ducks they love—you can tell when they hear it because their eyes light up," the young teacher enthused.

Windmill Street School is the only public school in the city which has a special program for children who are deaf and hard of hearing. Surprisingly, the other children in the school accept these handicapped youngsters naturally.

Miss McPhillips still recalls a kindergarten class in which there was one deaf child. Instead of taunting the little boy because he wore a hearing aid, the other children tried to make themselves similar contraptions.

THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barrett] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and one of the most promising of our programs in the field of urban development is the Urban Mass

Transportation Act of 1964. That program is aimed at overcoming the traffic congestion which threatens to strangle so many urban areas.

The mass transit program has unusually broad support reflecting the fact that it is aimed at a critical problem. Not only is it necessary to prepare for the future population growth of our cities and suburbs but there is an urgent need to save the tremendous amounts of private capital investment which now exists. Despite the fact that millions of people rely on buses, subways, and commuter trains, many lines find it unprofitable to maintain the heavy investment necessary for this kind of transportation. Any member whose district has suffered from a curtailment of mass transit services knows well how serious this problem is.

My Subcommittee on Housing has just completed 4 weeks of hearings on housing and urban development legislation including the extension of the mass transit program. Those hearings were unusually informative and some of the best testimony concerned the mass transit program. This came from representatives of railroad companies, private bus operators, mayors, planners, and specialized experts in the field. One of the best of these statements was the endorsement of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. I particularly want to cite their statement that—

> Commuter transportation is not a luxury; it is a necessity without which central city and suburbs alike will seriously suffer.

This fact was recognized by the Congress through the passage of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. It is now necessary to extend the authorization provided in the existing law, and for the information of my colleagues, I wish to include the excellent statement from the BRT at this point in the RECORD:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Cleveland, Ohio, April 5, 1966.
Hon. WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
Chairman, Housing Subcommittee, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen wholeheartedly endorses the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, and strongly urges that additional funds be provided for this program. Your subcommittee is well aware of the plight of the Nation's commuter rail lines and the vital role they play in their communities. Commuter transportation is not a luxury; it is a necessity without which central city and suburbs alike will seriously suffer. In spite of this, the industry is confronted with a serious economic problem which makes it impossible for rail lines to make the additional investment in equipment and facilities required to serve the community and to encourage the use of commuter lines.

Because of the special economics of commuter railroads and particularly the heavy capital investment required, a line may serve thousands and thousands of commuters every day, but still far below the profitmaking level. Congress recognized this fact and the essential role mass transportation plays in meeting the needs of our towns and cities in the enactment of the Mass Transportation Act. That act provided funds for only 3 years and it is now necessary to continue the authorization and to do it in advance of actual expiration to take into account the leadtime required for properly planning these facilities.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen also believes there is an urgent need to increase the level of funding for this program. We believe that this is in keeping with the attitude of Congress when it passed the original act. The legislative history of that law, as well as the inescapable facts of the magnitude of the problem, strongly argue for acceleration of activity under this program. We endorse the purpose of H.R. 13732 introduced by Congressman WIDNALL to step up the grant authority and put the program on a permanent basis, but feel that an even greater increase is necessary.

As originally proposed by the administration in 1962 and 1963, we would now be at a $200 million a year level, and in fact, even more is needed. We hope that Congress will view the administration's original request of $200 million annually for this program as a minimum and will give serious consideration to increases above that.

Because of the special nature of the mass transit program and the urgency of the problem, we urge the committee to act on the extension of this program as soon as possible. In view of the fact that this is an existing program and is already in operation, we feel that it should not be held back during the necessarily long consideration that must be given to entirely new proposals.

It would be appreciated if this letter could be included in the printed record of your hearings.

Kindest personal regards.

Respectfully,

AL H. CHESSER,
National Legislative Representative.

SOUND JUDGMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer has editorially praised President Johnson for his sound economic judgment.

The paper states:

> In refusing to be stampeded into hasty action on another tax increase, which is being promoted in some quarters as a panacea to check inflation, President Johnson is exercising sound economic judgment.

The Inquirer declares:

> It is prudent to observe what effect the already enacted tax increases will have on the national economy before rushing into still more tax raises.

Since I believe the analysis throws light on a vital issue, I recommend that the editorial be made a part of the RECORD:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND TAXES

In refusing to be stampeded into hasty action on another tax increase, which is being promoted in some quarters as a panacea to check inflation, President Johnson is exercising sound economic judgment.

"We don't want to act prematurely," he said at his news conference. "We don't want to put on the brakes too fast, but it is something that requires study every day, and we are doing that."

While this day-to-day study goes on, we hope Mr. Johnson will give increasing attention also to the need for reductions in nonessential Federal spending for the duration of the inflationary threat and the war in Vietnam.

There are numerous nondefense programs on the administration agenda, many of which are undeniably worthwhile and have the support of this newspaper, that are not of paramount urgency and ought to be cut back or postponed—until the inflationary forces come into clearer focus and there can be a more definitive estimate of what the Vietnam situation is going to require of the American people, in both manpower and money, in the critical months ahead.

Meanwhile, it is prudent to observe what effect the already enacted tax increases will have on the national economy before rushing into still more tax raises. As President Johnson noted, the Social Security tax increase that became effective the first of this year, primarily to finance medical benefits for the aged, will siphon off an estimated $6 billion during 1966 alone. Moreover, the tax legislation signed by the President just last week, which will not be fully operational until May, will draw off an additional $6 billion of consumer and corporate spending power through increased excise taxes and accelerated collection of income taxes.

To pile another Federal tax increase on top of new revenue measures totaling $12 billion that already are in the works would, at this time, be shooting blindly in the dark.

EXPORT CONTROLS ON CATTLE HIDES

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the mounting pressures against the recent controls on export of hides have induced the Secretary of Commerce to reexamine this sudden and unannounced policy change, and I am hopeful that the evidence presented at the hearings scheduled to begin on April 18 will persuade him to rescind these untimely controls.

I have received numerous communications from the meat industry and public officials in Hawaii expressing dismay over the effect these controls will have on the economy of my State. It has been pointed out to me that, far from being inflationary, hide prices have remained at low levels ever since World War II and that these prices have just begun to climb back to the point where the sale of hides produces any profit at all.

My State has been placed in very difficult straits by imposition of export controls. Since there are no tanneries in Hawaii, meat producers must export their hides to derive any return on them, and they have come to rely on shipment to Japan as the only feasible marketing approach. The cost of shipping to the east coast, the only area where Hawaiian hides can find a domestic outlet, is exactly 100 percent higher than shipment to Japan.

To incur such an expense with the already low prices being offered for hides will virtually decimate the marketing potential for Hawaiian hides, with ruinous effects on the Hawaiian cattle industry in general.

Some of my colleagues have already pointed out on the floor the significance of hide exports in reducing our balance-of-payment deficits abroad, to the amount of a quarter of a billion dollars in 1965 alone, and indeed this may be one of the reasons that the Department of Commerce has until now pressed American meat producers to expand their overseas markets.

The sudden reversal of policy has created widespread alarm in farm States throughout the country, and causes bewilderment about the inconsistency of Government pronouncements on this subject. If the Secretary of Commerce was motivated to this precipitate action in the hope that such controls will hold down retail prices of shoes, as has been intimated, I urge him to examine the evidence for this supposition.

The price of a hide contributes only a small percentage to the cost of producing a pair of shoes, and it seems most unlikely to me that this minute saving will be passed along to consumers by shoe retailers. It appears that the imposition of these export controls will have severe effects on the American meat industry, with no beneficial results for anyone other than foreign producers of hides.

I wish at this point to insert in the RECORD a letter from the chairman of the Hawaii Board of Agriculture, Dr. Kenneth Otagaki, in which the need for export of Hawaiian hides is made explicit, and I also wish to insert the text of House Concurrent Resolution 27 of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii to illustrate the statewide concern engendered by the control of hide exports:

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 28, 1966.

Representative PATSY T. MINK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: The recent action by the Department of Commerce which clamped export quotas on cattle hides, calf and kip skins and bovine leathers has placed the Hawaiian cattle industry in another serious bind.

Hawaii's cattle industry, already squeezed by foreign and domestic beef competition, is hard pressed for economic survival. The imposition of restrictions or quotas on the foreign export of Hawaiian hides will impose a very serious economic hardship for the following reasons:

1. Hawaii has no tannery; we do not supply our own domestic leather needs.

2. The leather industry west of the Rockies uses less than 20 percent of the total hides produced in the West. Hawaii's production cannot survive in this oversupplied western market. We must, therefore, ship our hides all the way to the East.

3. Transshipment costs for leather from Hawaii to the east coast is prohibitive compared to the present cost of exporting hides to Japan. The cost differential is 100 percent—2 cents per pound to Japan as opposed to 4 cents per pound to the east coast.

4. Keeping quality of Hawaiian hides is seriously affected by our tropical climatic conditions. The lack of adequate and rapid transportation facilities to the east coast contributes to hide deterioration. Transportation schedules to Japan are regularly spaced and require less than half of the time compared to east coast shipments.

5. Hawaii's insular nature places island producers at a disadvantage compared to the mainland producers.

6. Our total export of hides only amounts to approximately $500,000 per annum—a small volume to the Nation's total.

In view of the grave injustice imposed upon the Hawaiian cattle industry by the Commerce Department's control proposals, the State Department of Agriculture disagrees with such proposals.

Your support of our views will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,
KENNETH K. OTAGAKI, Ph. D.
Chairman, Board of Agriculture.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27

Whereas the Department of Commerce is studying proposed restrictions on the export of cattle hides; and

Whereas Hawaii has no tannery and its half a million dollar export annually in cattle hides is dependent on tanneries without the State; and

Whereas the leather industry west of the Rockies having the capacity to use less than 20 percent of the hides produced imposes economic hardship to ship to domestic eastern tanneries; and

Whereas the cost of freight for the shipping of cattle hides to Japan is one-half the cost of freight to domestic eastern tanneries; and

Whereas Hawaiian cattle hides are more perishable due to climatic conditions, so that the transportation time of 2 weeks to Japan as compared with 5 weeks to certain eastern tanneries would prevent enormous quality deterioration; and

Whereas the imposition of any quota on the foreign export of Hawaiian cattle hides would be a grave injustice to the cattle industry of Hawaii, and discriminatory to Hawaii simply because of the fortuitous and isolated circumstance of Hawaii's location: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 3d Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of 1966 (the Senate concurring), That the U.S. Department of Commerce be, and hereby is, requested to withhold the imposition of any restriction or quota on the foreign quota of Hawaiian cattle hides; and be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Honorable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce, and to Hawaii's congressional delegation, Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, Senator HIRAM L. FONG, Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, and Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK.

MARCH 16, 1966.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted by the house of representatives of the 3d Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of 1966.

ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
SHIGETO KANEMOTO,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

MARCH 21, 1966.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted by the senate of the 3d Legislature of the State of Hawaii budget session of 1966.

KAZUHISA ABE,
President of the Senate.
SEICHI HIRAI,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor yesterday heard further testimony in connection with H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966.

The witnesses who testified before the task force on April 5, are as follows: J. George Harrar, president, Rockefeller Foundation; John T. Caldwell, chancellor, North Carolina State University at Raleigh; John J. Kennedy, Department of Government and International Studies, University of Notre Dame; F. Champion Ward, deputy vice president for international programs, the Ford Foundation; and Mina Rees, dean of graduate studies, the City University of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I include the prepared texts of the witnesses at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF J. GEORGE HARRAR, PRESIDENT, ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION, NEW YORK, N.Y., BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, APRIL 5, 1966

As background to my remarks concerning the International Education Act of 1966, it might be pertinent to note that the Rockefeller Foundation became concerned with international studies and research as early as 1929. Beginning with a grant of $850,000 to the newly established graduate institute of international studies in Geneva, Switzerland, which is still the leading center in Europe for international studies, the program developed into a carefully designed series of grants in support of important aspects of international affairs and area studies.

During the 15 years after 1929, the Rockefeller Foundation assisted in the establishment or reinforcement of international studies in several institutions here and abroad. Among those receiving major grants during this period were the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, Yale University, Harvard University, the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, the Cetre d'Études de Politique Etrangere in Paris, the Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft in Berlin, as well as a number of other United States academic institutions.

Following World War II, the foundation increased and expanded its international program to include support to area studies in a number of leading universities, principally in this country. Some of the major recipients of such grants were the universities of Columbia, Harvard, Pıinceton, Notre Dame, Chicago, Yale, Stanford, Johns Hopkins, Washington, and California. One of the first area studies centers in the United States—the Russian Institute at Columbia University—was established with the assistance of a Rockefeller Foundation grant in 1946. Other grantees were the Russian Research Center and the Center for Middle Eastern Studies at Harvard, the East Asian Institute at Columbia University, and the Far East Study Center at the University of Washington in Seattle. During this period, the Rockefeller Foundation's grants program in international affairs began to include increased support in linguistics and demographic studies because of the obvious importance of both of these disciplines to international understanding.

The intent of the foundation was to develop centers of excellence which would foster research, train a broad spectrum of future leaders, and disseminate the results of research to the academic community and to public and private agencies. An added goal has been to open windows to regions of the world which might otherwise have remained obscure to American citizens.

In looking back over the 35 years during which the Rockefeller Foundation has provided support to a wide variety of international and related studies in this country and to a lesser extent abroad, certain accomplishments stand out. Among these is the training of a host of individuals, who participated in the program as students, teachers, and investigators, and who later moved on to positions of major responsibility in some aspect of international affairs. Among these can be included many foreign scholars who used these centers to enrich their academic experience and to carry on research.

A second visible accomplishment has been the establishment of a number of internationally recognized research and training centers at institutions which received early assistance from the foundation. Many of these centers have now become integral parts of the parent institution with permanent and growing financial support from a variety of sources. Finally, an important outgrowth of the foundation's early interest and support to international affairs centers is the quality and quantity of the scholarly publications which continue to flow from them in the form of books, research studies, and journals.

The total investment by the Rockefeller Foundation during the period since 1929 in programs of international and area studies here and abroad is approximately $25 million. This figure includes institutional grants, direct or indirect support for United States and foreign scholars, library development, publications and numerous related activities.

From the experience of the Rockefeller Foundation in the field of international and area studies, I am firmly convinced of their obvious and growing importance. I would, therefore, fully agree with the wisdom of the Federal Government in deciding to provide grants to strengthen international studies in this country at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

With the deep and continuing involvement of the United States in the complexities of world affairs and the new international responsibilities which each year present themselves, it is crucially important for our country to have growing numbers of young men and women equipped with the knowledge and expertise necessary to an understanding of other nations and peoples. These specialists must serve us in the field of diplomacy, in the formulation of national foreign policy, in providing leadership to international programs, in carrying out critically important research, and in training new generations of students. Moreover, an informed public opinion is as essential as are trained leaders.

In a democracy, leaders cannot be too far removed from the thinking of the general public, and must be buttressed by an informed citizenry. Therefore, in principle, I would support the proposed legislation by which the Federal Government would provide funds to expand the dimensions of international studies programs.

The goal of providing effective Government assistance to international studies can be attained only when the purposes of any such Federal program are clearly defined and adhered to. It would seem that one purpose should be to improve the quality and the productivity of graduate centers which already have a proven and significant record of accomplishment. These are the pro's in the field and could be expected to increase substantially their services to the cause of international affairs by the wise use of additional funds from the Federal Government.

A second and worthwhile purpose might well be to establish a number of new centers, but only when the need for each center is clearly evident. Such evidence should include an expressed desire on the part of the recipient institution to invest its own resources in the project and the existence in sufficient numbers of a qualified staff of specialists in the international field to form a core around which a major center could be built.

Another purpose, and one which should apply to all of the graduate centers receiving assistance, should be the utilization of the center on a multiuse basis. This would mean that, in addition to conducting research, undertaking scholarly studies, and publishing the results, the training aspects should be broadly emphasized and conceived. These might range from offering professional training leading to advanced degrees in one or another fields of international or area studies, to offering short term, more specialized training to those who intend to enter careers in diplomacy, Government, international business, or foreign technical assistance.

A fourth purpose might well be to encourage students from other disciplines to elect studies within the center, as a means of broadening their understanding and of providing valuable background for their future occupations and civic responsibilities, whatever they may be.

The proposal that Federal funds be channeled to undergraduate institutions to enable them to strengthen their academic programs by broadening their curriculums in international affairs also has real merit. The plan to enrich the undergraduate experience by exposing the students to teacher-scholars who desire to share their knowledge and experience with undergraduates, is most appealing. This is being done to some degree in a number of undergraduate institutions, but reinforcement and expansion of such efforts could be expected to have a desirable and important effect. Here, the purposes of the undergraduate program should be:

1. To graduate each year students who have greater knowledge concerning international affairs and their significance to the individual, the Nation, and the world community. Such graduates would become better informed citizens, more judicious in the exercise of their voting franchise, and more understanding of the differing viewpoints which can be the basis of international dissension.

2. To encourage, by early exposure, a reasonable proportion of undergraduate students to become interested in careers in international affairs.

3. To strengthen the faculties of undergraduate institutions in the international field, enrich their libraries, and in other ways improve the quality of instruction and individual research.

An added and important dividend which might be expected to accrue from strengthening graduate and undergraduate activities in international studies would be the greater opportunity to train the foreign students who come to this country for undergraduate and graduate education and who may choose to include international or area studies within their academic programs. These individuals, many of whom will become leaders in government, education, and business after returning to their own countries, could benefit from their experiences in the classroom, the seminar, the library, and their associations with other students with similar interests, and in many cases will later contribute significantly to international understanding and cooperation.

The foregoing comments are predicated on the assumption that any aid provided by the Government for international graduate and undergraduate studies will be firmly based on existing programs of high quality and on new programs of potentially high quality. General or "formula" grants awarded indiscriminately for international studies might be evidence of good intentions without fully meeting the productive purposes of the act. It is suggested also that the role of academic institutions in the entire program is vital to its success, and that they should be brought into deliberations at an early stage.

Although the subject is not included in the proposed legislation, it might be appropriate to suggest here that the United States should consider some support to selected institutions abroad which indicate their wish to establish centers of American studies. At present, only a few universities, located mainly in Western Europe, have such programs. In the interests both of a wider dissemination of knowledge concerning the American experience and of improved international relations, it is important that students and scholars in both the industrialized and developing nations abroad be given an opportunity to learn more about American civilization.

APPENDIX

Selected list of Rockefeller Foundation grants in the field of international and area studies

[All figures approximate]

	Period	*Amount*
Council on Foreign Relations	1933–64	$1,888,700
Columbia University for International Affairs, Russian studies, and Far Eastern studies	1946–66	2,298,936
Yale University for Far Eastern studies and international studies	1946–66	405,500
Harvard University for international and area studies—Korea, Near Eastern, and Slavic	1945–66	2,000,000
Princeton University for international and Near Eastern studies	1945–66	1,300,000
University of Notre Dame for international relations studies	1949–66	523,000
Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies	1945–66	1,150,000
University of Washington for Far Eastern and Asian studies	1945–65	600,000
University of California for area, Far Eastern, and language studies	1945–66	1,700,000
Stanford University for American, Far Eastern, and Slavic studies	1945–65	622,000
Cornell University for language and south eastern Asia studies	1945–66	1,700,000
Geneva Graduate Institute of International Studies, Switzerland	1930–63	1,800,000
Royal Institute of International Affairs, London	1932–61	1,000,000
Grants to individual scholars in the field of international relations	1960–65	1,600,000
Grant to the United Nations Institute for training and research	1964	450,000

TESTIMONY ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966, H.R. 12451, H.R. 12452

(By John T. Caldwell, chancellor, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, chairman, International Affairs Committee, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, April 5, 1966)

Mr. Chairman and members of the task force on international education, my name is John T. Caldwell and I am chancellor of North Carolina State University at Raleigh, which is a campus of the consolidated University of North Carolina. I have the privilege today of presenting testimony on behalf of two national organizations of higher education with respect to the proposed International Education Act of 1966. They are the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, of whose International Affairs Committee I am chairman; and the Association of State Colleges and Universities.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges is composed of 97 State and land-grant universities located in all States and Puerto Rico. The Association of State Colleges and Universities has 194 member institutions. Together the member institutions of these 2 associations enroll about 2,600,000 students, or almost half of those enrolled in all higher education in this country and considerably more than half if degree-granting institutions alone are taken into account.

Member institutions of both associations play a major role in training of foreign students who come to this country, and in preparing American students for work in the international field.

A study by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges indicates that 41 percent of the 82,000 foreign students in this country in 1964–65 were studying at member institutions of the association; that 50 percent of the nearly 9,000 foreign scholars and faculty members on U.S. campuses were on those of member institutions of the association; and that 52 percent of the approximately 3,800 U.S. faculty members in foreign countries during that year were from member institutions of the association. Comparable data have not been included for the Association of State Colleges and Universities, but they would greatly swell the above totals.

Thus it is apparent that our institutions have been engaged in international education for a significant period of time, in some cases for nearly a century. University programs have embraced not only education in international affairs traditionally associated with cultural enrichment and our own enlightenment, but have also included extensive involvement in scientific and technical assistance. It is because of this broad range of interest in international programs that we feel especially justified in expressing support for the International Education Act of 1966. Its passage can strengthen most helpfully our institutional resources for international studies. It is indeed a constructive attempt to prepare the future leadership and citizenship of this country for responsibilities in the world of today and tomorrow. A full partnership in education for the international field is most appropriate for Government and the higher education community.

One of the limitations facing the colleges and universities in furthering their commitment to education in the international field is their general situation with respect to support of their instructional programs. International education has to take its place among many other pressing needs and is inadequately funded.

University development of international activities has been remarkable when considered in this context. Now the mounting pressures of increased student enrollment create severe competition for faculty talents, physical facilities and other resources. New funds are urgently needed for the day-to-day instructional and operational costs of all teaching programs and to keep scholars up-to-date and refreshed with firsthand contacts with colleagues and problems.

The proposal in section 3 of the International Education Act of 1966 to establish centers for advanced international studies through grants to institutions of higher education is a welcome acknowledgment of the long-felt need. Centers of excellence exist now in certain institutions, but there is some urgency for increasing the number if we are to develop the capacity required to support the needed educational endeavor.

We are also pleased to endorse the authority provided by section 4 to make grants to institutions of higher education for comprehensive programs in international studies. We feel it is extremely important to create within the mind of every student a greater awareness and appreciation of the worldwide dimensions of our contemporary national life.

As to suggested changes in the bill: specifically, Mr. Chairman, we recommend that the first sentence of section 3(a) ending in the word "studies" be continued with the following: "including the education of students in the professions for service in internationally-related activities."

Second, we recommend that section 4 be further clarified by the addition of a new subsection (a) (7) as follows:

"(7) programs under which students in any field of study, including but not limited to professional fields and disciplines such as agriculture, biological sciences, business administration, education, engineering, humanities, law, medical and health sciences, physical sciences, social sciences, and teaching, may expand their understanding of international affairs and foreign areas and may prepare for service in other countries."

Reasons for these suggested provisions are as follows. We feel that the language of the bill as written might be interpreted to limit both undergraduate and graduate programs under the Act to those concerned primarily with educating generalists or educating specialists in "international affairs" per se. On the other hand, a great deal of the involvement of our institutions in international problems is and will continue to be conducted by those specialists in professional fields, such as engineering, agriculture, law, business administration, medicine, education—to name a few—who are called on to combine their technical and professional abilities with specific knowledge of how these may relate to problems and educational development in a foreign context.

The recommendations further clarify and broaden the interpretation of "research and training in international studies." The phrases "international studies" and "international education" may have different meanings among different peoples.

Both the high state of technological advancement in our country and the educational programs on which it is based, attract visitors from abroad and cause a heavy demand from countries abroad for the assistance of persons qualified in these areas. Half of all foreign students in this country in 1964–65 were studying in the fields of engineering, the natural and physical sciences, health-related sciences, and agriculture.

A high percentage of our representatives stationed abroad have backgrounds in these fields, and the demand far exceeds the supply.

Unfortunately our present area studies and language programs, fine as they are, do comparatively little to reach people in the technical and professional fields, except as they supply qualified experts who may later fill college and university faculty positions. We feel that the bill before you should clearly provide a means of building an international component into the education of the natural scientist, the professional specialist and the schoolteacher, who inevitably must deal either at home or abroad with his discipline in its international aspects. The Department of Agriculture, for example, is currently recruiting 40 to 50 agricultural extension specialists from our institutions to work in Vietnam. They will, I am sure, get fine, dedicated people, expert in the transfer of technical knowledge to its application on the farm in this country; but it is highly unlikely that more than a handful of them will have had any substantial exposure to the background and culture of the area and the people with whom they will be working. Young men and women interested in research in the basic sciences and their applications need also to have an international component in their undergraduate and graduate education. In the long run it is only through research and teaching that we will be able to solve the problem of getting the scientific and technological revolution underway in the developing countries of the world.

May I emphasize that it is important to interpret both sections 3 and 4 of the proposed act so as to assure opportunity for full involvement of students in all disciplines of the college or university.

The student of tomorrow will have an increasing impact on world affairs and on cultural and professional development regardless of whether his major area of university study is in agriculture, education, engineering, law, or a specific discipline within the social sciences or the liberal arts. The university has a heavy responsibility to provide appropriate international education for these diverse scholars.

The research component of the many scholarly disciplines constitutes a natural bridge for international communication. We must utilize this bridge to expand our educational and cultural relationship with the nations of the world. It is important to interpret broadly the function and concept of graduate centers provided for in section 3(a).

Mr. Chairman, I would like in conclusion to refer to a statement by the President on February 2. The President expressed the idea that education must be at the heart of our international relations and that ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospect for peace. Our educational community shares his strong belief in this concept. We respectfully urge favorable consideration of the International Education Act with the modest amendments suggested in this testimony.

STATEMENT ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION BILL H.R. 12452 ON APRIL 5, 1966

(By John J. Kennedy, Department of Government and International Studies, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Task Force on International Education, my name is John Kennedy, and I am Chairman of the Department of Government and International Studies at the University of Notre Dame. I find it a distinct privilege to testify regarding this crucially important International Education Bill. Advance information came to me that my testimony would be scheduled in the same session of the Task Force hearings with a graduate dean, a university president and the president of a major foundation. This distinguished company might be expected to be somewhat dazzling to a mere professor, and to a certain extent it is.

At the same time there was also an indication that the Task Force was interested in hearing from a working member of the profession engaged in teaching international relations, and it is in this capacity that my remarks are offered.

My statement contains observations on two principal themes:

1. College and university instruction in international relations.
2. Improvements in international relations instruction that would result from the proposed legislation.

1. COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTION

The word "instruction" is deliberately emphasized in connection with the following considerations. It has become a commonplace to see American universities as a part of a set of vast ramifications that have something to do with relations between the sovereign states of the world, international organizations and international organs of adjudication. Universities offer courses in international studies, they provide expertise and technical assistance for projects in underdeveloped countries, making available the special knowledge of engineers, scientists, physicians, etc. Almost every American university counts among its students persons who come from various parts of the earth to study in the United States. Some American universities send a portion of their students abroad for study at universities in Europe, Latin America, and the Far East. All universities offer instruction in one of the basic elements of foreign affairs study, namely, languages, the tools of communication and keys to the understanding of other cultures. In short the involvement of U.S. universities in international life is a constantly expanding phenomenon. Not all of these activities, however, are at issue here. The basic consideration here is instruction and training in international relations, my special concern as a teacher.

This particular domain in itself has also been constantly expanding in the 30 years, more or less, during which I have been a close observer as student or teacher. When I was an undergraduate at the University of New Mexico, then a small institution in a sparsely populated State, the student could have some inkling of the existence of diversity in the world from the fact that certain elements of two cultures, the Anglo-American and the Hispanic American, met in that region. Systematic instruction in international relations, however, was rather scant, and this was true of many U.S. universities at the time. There was, I recall, a course in diplomatic history, and students could also take one semester of international law.

In my last year an enterprising instructor introduced a course designated simply as international relations. This combination of a bilingual environment and a few courses stimulated some of us to go on in search of more knowledge about this world and its diversity of social and political organization. What we were looking for, of course, without then being able to formulate our quest, was knowledge based on a more systematic and comprehensive approach to world affairs, and we wound up in various graduate schools. I went to Columbia University which had a distinguished faculty giving courses in international law, organization, international politics and comparative government.

I recall vividly, however, that the international relations student was occasionally warned by other graduate students in different social science disciplines that international relations really did not offer much of a future, that there were not many teaching and research jobs in the field. One could try for the Foreign Service, of course, but this too was a pretty small job market. I don't know how many other graduate students in other universities came up against similar warnings in the late 1930's, but I doubt that my experience was exceptional.

World War II brought about a complete change in this situation. The study of international relations was accorded an unprecedented importance by a people pondering the disruptive experience of the conflict itself and trying to adjust to the stress and strain of the postwar effort to introduce or reintroduce order into a world that had been torn apart.

The search for order produced an emphasis on law and organization. Reconstruction of the devastated parts of the globe gave us an appreciation of the importance of foreign political institutions; the cold war gave the United States its first large-scale experience in alliances. The United States assumed responsibilities in many quarters of the globe hitherto hardly known to anyone except a few specialists. Simultaneously with the growth of these responsibilities we began to organize area studies to expand and systematize our knowledge. In short this whole situation has made international affairs a subject of overwhelming importance for the people of the United States, and the universities have been trying to respond with their special resources and talents to the challenge this situation offers.

A useful perspective on the importance of this challenge and this response can be gained from a brief consideration of the whole sweep of United States experience in world affairs. The United States began as a very internationally minded political community. Our Founding Fathers did indeed prize the advantages which their geographical isolation from Europe brought them, but they were acutely aware of the world beyond our borders. Between George Washington and Andrew Jackson, every U.S. President had in his background either extensive diplomatic experience abroad or service as Secretary of State.

After 1830 the background factor was less common and perhaps less necessary. The United States was expanding in population, wealth, and power at a pace that made the rest of the world look ploddingly old fashioned. Before the 19th century was over a huge nation of continental dimensions had been consolidated. Even today with rapid transportation the huge size of this country cannot be overemphasized. To travel in Europe the distance corresponding to that between South Bend and Washington would involve crossing six or seven national frontiers.

A common language is spoken in a vast area the equivalent of which in European terms would embrace a dozen or more principal tongues. Small wonder that our ancestors in the past century chose to give as little attention as possible to the rest of the world. The promises and rewards of American life could attract all their talents and energies and satisfy their ambitions on a scale not possible elsewhere in the world. And it was almost incidental to this historic display of purpose and accomplishment that the United States became a world power.

In short American history is a success story, but success brings problems to nations as well as to men. For Americans one problem has come from the difficulty of understanding why the rest of the world cannot behave as we do.

The American success in creating a great nation has sometimes made us think that American solutions could be applied everywhere. Thinking along these lines reflects a faith arising out of the American experience, but unfortunately, not much knowledge of the rest of the world. In countries where foreign policy is determined by an elite, who are especially trained for their work and who know the world beyond their national borders, such general lack of knowledge among the people might not be significant. In the United States this is not the case. This is a democracy, foreign policy cannot be determined by a few individuals. As in all great matters of state the people must be consulted.

This means that quite apart from experts and specialists in public agencies and universities there must be in the citizenry a numerous body of voters who are enlightened about the world. These persons must begin to acquire a realistic picture of the world at an early age and there must be an adequate supply of teachers to present this picture. It seems to me that it is precisely here that the purpose and justification of public support for university programs in international studies emerge most clearly. For this necessary enlightenment of the citizen must rest on systematically established and systematically imparted knowledge. Casual exposure to world affairs through travel, for example, may be useful, but of itself it cannot do the comprehensive job that critical and organized study can.

If it is asked what should make up this study, the answer, I think, is not too difficult. There are four basic elements that are indispensable to the study of international relations. The first of these is international politics, the study of which permits the student to acquire a picture of the dynamics of international life. The second and third elements are international law and international organization to establish the framework within which it is possible for international relations to exist and grow. Finally, the study of comparative government provides knowledge of the operation of foreign political systems.

Needless to say the student who undertakes this program must also receive training in foreign languages and he must have an appropriate background in history, geography and the social sciences in general.

I would now like to turn to my second subject, the improvements for international relations study that could be produced by this bill.

First of all, let me say that what is proposed in section 3 is of the utmost importance to the overall development of the kind of international relations instruction that I have sketched out above. For it is out of the centers of advanced studies in graduate schools that our indispensable scholars and teachers will come. Some of our federally supported programs to date have shown how much can be accomplished with small amounts of Federal aid. I refer here to the National Defense Education Act programs, especially title IV and title VI. My own experience at two universities, University of Virginia and Notre Dame, has been largely with title IV, and I base my remarks on this experience.

Like other teachers I have seen title IV programs produce Ph. D.'s faster and more efficiently than would otherwise be the case. What we have often regretted, however, is that for the advanced international relations student the program has not provided study and research abroad which would be so advantageous for him. Many of my National Defense Education Act students have managed on their own to get some experience abroad in summer vacations, but this is rarely adequate for research purposes. So the provision to send individuals undergoing training abroad can only be regarded as a major improvement over the existing situation.

It is also important, as the bill provides, to have the means to send teaching and research staff abroad. In this field it is impossible to do a good job of teaching unless the teachers engage in research—there really is not any nice neat line dividing teaching and research, although certainly an emphasis can be given to one or the other. Research activities cannot be maintained unless the man has steady opportunity for work in the area of his concentration. This generally involves travel. Most of us do get some work abroad, but few of us get enough. Moreover, individual grants to isolated persons cannot have the same comprehensive results that could be obtained when a director of a center can plan and schedule research and travel programs for his whole staff. As I read the bill such planning would be possible under the proposed legislation. It is a very important feature.

The necessity for U.S. scholars to carry on research in foreign areas is also seriously affected by one important changing circumstance of the past decade. It was not so long ago that U.S. universities could readily acquire first-class scholars from other continents—this was especially true when other parts of the world were rejecting their scholars, as in Nazi Germany, or in the countries taken over by the Communists. These people could bring their special knowledge and insights to the universities in this country and the students could profit accordingly.

This invaluable source of teaching and research personnel, however, has just about dried up. And other foreign areas are not supplying too many teachers either. I am acutely conscious of this since I am involved with two programs at Notre Dame where we bring in visiting professors from Latin America and Western Europe. My colleagues and I spend large amounts of time on this kind of recruiting, and we welcome the opportunity for expanding resources for this purpose that are in this bill, but it must be stressed that these people are not easy to find.

To compensate for the lack of foreign teaching personnel, we will have to send more of our own people abroad and we will have to expand opportunities for research so that our own people may bring to their students the insights and special knowledge which foreign scholars could until fairly recently supply.

It goes without saying that all this activity must be complemented by an expansion of research materials and tools, library holdings, etc. It is also important to see that these research activities and acquisitions have the long-range effect of building up the intellectual capital of the university so that what public support initiates may be carried on more or less autonomously by the university according to its own traditions.

So let me endorse with great enthusiasm what section 3 provides and also the amendments to title VI of the National Defense Education Act. Higher education in the United States will be enormously improved by both.

No less important is section 4 providing for the strengthening of undergraduate programs. Almost everything I have just said about faculty work in foreign areas applies to the teacher of undergraduate courses. If he is to alert and inspire his students he must speak from a background of knowledge in depth, not just from textbook knowledge, useful and necessary though textbooks may be. Also it is obviously necessary that the undergraduate have foreign language training and a background in social sciences and humanities, as provided in subsections (3) and (4).

What I find particularly attractive in this part, however, is in the implications of subsections (1) and (5). They seem to recognize the importance of a systematic approach to international studies in that they do provide planning and development of instructional programs. As I have tried to suggest earlier instruction must be systematic or it will not impart knowledge. On the one hand, overspecialization must be avoided, especially with undergraduate teaching. On the other, the casual contacts provided by foreign travel are not effective. The planning and supervision provided in these subsections, however, could immeasurably enhance any good program of international studies.

Finally, this section, and indeed the bill itself, goes to the heart of the matter; namely, the providing of the means for the development of a broad body of enlightened citizens who understand, even though they are not experts, the general problems of international relations. For it is on the citizens that the future of our Nation depends. Universities and public authority will alike be delinquent in their responsibilities if they fail to provide for their education. In our system of government it is not only that the people must be consulted. They must also give their support, or public policy will operate in a vacuum. Our system also implies that they should not be asked to support what they cannot understand. This bill in the long run improves the opportunities for everyone to understand the many intricate problems of the contemporary world and the international responsibilities of the United States.

STATEMENT OF F. CHAMPION WARD, DEPUTY VICE-PRESIDENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS, THE FORD FOUNDATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Because of his recent association with the evolution of this bill within the Government, Mr. Bundy asked me to substitute for him today in representing the Ford Foundation. I am glad to do so, since my principal specialized activity for the foundation has been in connection with educational improvement in the "developing" parts of the world. It is impossible to engage in such activity without becoming strongly impressed by three facts:

1. that you can't help societies which you don't understand;
2. that our overseas assistance to education requires a strong resource base at home, both in the form of men and ideas and in the form of public understanding;
3. that understanding developing societies requires knowledge of their own traditions and values and also a knowledge of the Western societies which once ruled and shaped them.

If these observations are sound, then the term "international education" acquires a number of meanings which can be very useful to this country. These useful meanings include:

1. The expansion and improvement of educational systems in developing countries.
2. The expansion and improvement of U.S. resources for assisting educational development overseas.
3. Increased American knowledge of the languages, histories, economies, societies, and political systems of parts of the world previously unfamiliar to most Americans.
4. Exchanges of ideas and experience among educators in the "developed," northern part of the world.

Through its overseas development, international training and research, and international affairs programs, the Ford Foundation has attempted since 1951 to assist in educational development overseas, to strengthen the resource base at home, and to encourage a common market of educational ideas, and experience among educators in the developed world.

Given this recent history of interest and activity on the part of my foundation, I welcome heartily the bill which is now before this committee. I welcome especially the provision that our universities and colleges, including some that have not been assisted to date, will be helped to improve the national performance in what is sure to be a long, slow pull. For the indefinite future, our country seems destined to play a world role of increasing complexity. To play this role well, Americans need both academic and practical understanding of parts of the world once known only to diplomats and missionaries. It seems to me entirely proper and necessary that, in addition to the assistance to overseas educational development which our Government makes available principally through AID, our national capacity to make that help effective and well understood by the American public be expanded and improved through the provisions of the bill now before this committee.

If good men are selected to administer the program, and if they are firmly supported in their selections of ideas, men, and institutions to be assisted, our world role will be well played, to the benefit of our own future and that of the many other countries to which our national destiny is now joined.

May I add a few comments on specific aspects of the proposed legislation?

First, the proposal to support activities over a 5-year period is crucially important, especially where new attitudes and institutional habits are being shaped.

Second, although I understand the distinction between the separate roles to be played by universities and by colleges as set forth in section 3 and section 4, I would urge, also, that every opportunity be seized to encourage cooperation between a university center and surrounding colleges where this is mutually acceptable and likely to multiply the uses to which ideas and resources can be put.

Third, I hope that grants to universities will enlarge scholarly knowledge of remote parts of the world, but I hope, also, that there will be ways to link knowledge with practical understanding of the acute current problems which developing societies face. The attitude of scrutiny and the attitude of assistance are not the same. Both are necessary, but it would be a gain if they could be combined more often in the same persons.

I would be glad to try to answer any questions which the members of the committee may have.

TESTIMONY ON H.R. 12452, THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

(By Mina Rees, dean of graduate studies, the City University of New York, before the Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Apr. 5, 1966)

Mr. Chairman and members of the task force, I welcome this opportunity to comment, on behalf of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, on the proposed International Education Act of 1966.

The bill would give congressional approval and support for an important component of the coherent program in international education proposed by the President in his message last February. It would also provide a framework within which the Federal Government and the colleges and universities of the United States could cooperate in enhancing the quality and scope of undergraduate and graduate education and in enriching the opportunities for our citizens to acquire a firmer basis for international understanding.

In its conception the proposed legislation is excellent. The Congress is to be congratulated for giving prompt consideration to the proposal to lend added impetus to the efforts that have been made in this field during the past several years by many of the colleges and universities of the United States, often with the support of private foundations and organizations. Vital as the need was in earlier years, there is in the second half of the 20th century an ever greater urgency to induce in citizens of all parts of our Nation a broader, deeper, and more intelligent understanding of our international relations.

My remarks will be brief but specific. I should like first to comment on an aspect of section 2 of the bill: "Findings and Declaration." The last purpose listed in this section, "to assist the progress of education in developing nations," does reflect what I believe to be an appropriate and desirable purpose of our national policy. But it does not seem to reflect the purposes of this bill, whose focus is on the activities and potentialities of our own colleges and universities in international studies. I would suggest therefore that, beginning with line 5, the preamble be changed to read: "for the Federal Government to assist in the development within the United States of strengthened resources for international study and research, and to assist the progress of international education in the United States by fostering an informed public opinion to the end that our requirements of world leadership be met more satisfactorily."

Section 3 of the bill is the part that is of principal concern to the Council of Graduate Schools, several of whose members have already established graduate centers concerned with research and training in international studies. With the encouragement which the International Education Act of 1966 can provide, these centers can become a resource of vastly increased importance in advancing understanding of international problems, and in providing for the education and training of larger numbers of specialists for the service of our Government and of the people of our Nation.

They can also serve another purpose which has thus far benefited only minimally from their potential. I have in mind the more extensive use of the personnel and facilities of these centers to add new and worthwhile dimensions in the graduate education of teachers preparing for careers in the public schools of the Nation. Though some universities have already seized the opportunity made available by the existence on their campuses of a graduate center of international studies to introduce these new dimensions into the training of teachers of history and the social studies, in most universities the sharp separation of the School of Education from the School of Arts and Sciences has tended to minimize such a salutary development. This is one significant way in which the interest of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the total undertaking might well operate to improve the use of our resources.

Two additional features of section 3 seem to me particularly commendable. The first of these is the provision for support in the establishment of new graduate centers devoted to international studies. Higher education today is characterized, among other things, by the large number of new graduate programs that are building toward excellence. In some of these, there are impressive faculty resources in the field of international studies, and strong commitments on the part of the universities for the expansion of activities in this field. I would hope that a broader distribution of centers of specialized competence in international affairs could be achieved under the act through assistance to these universities so that, as a nation, we may achieve a distribution among many universities of strength in different fields.

If the universities are to expand their world affairs activities and also be in a position to provide specialists who will be needed by the Federal Government in support of our commitments overseas, the universities must be provided with a variety of forms of assistance that could become available if H.R. 12452 is enacted into law: provision for visiting scholars and particularly for exchange programs, allowance for travel abroad, and assured support that will permit a gradual increase in the number of faculty members with special competences in international affairs.

It should be noted particularly that, though the provision for bringing visiting scholars to a center is highly desirable and should be maintained, caution should be exercised to provide exchanges with our own scholars whenever possible so that we do not deprive the countries from which our visitors come of their key people and strip them of opportunities to build their own programs. Such exchanges are desirable not only for the foreign countries with which we are associated, but also for our own scholars and university administrators so that they may maintain their own competence to understand and deal with the foreign areas with which they are concerned.

A second most attractive feature of section 3 is the provision that the activities of graduate centers may be concentrated on particular areas of international studies or on particular issues as well as on geographical areas. (In this connection I should prefer to substitute "studies" for "affairs" in line 19.) Existing centers have, in large part, been characterized by development along conventional lines, and most of them have been oriented toward similar aspects of the social sciences. The support of the Federal Government might well encourage new and, hopefully, more imaginative approaches, providing a focus, in some cases, upon humanistic and scientific studies. Not to be forgotten also are those social problems whose understanding would not only increase our insights into other cultures but also provide additional perspectives on our own social problems.

The social implications in differing cultures of new scientific and technological advances need study; cross national studies in such fields as developmental psychology and genetics, juvenile delinquency and geriatrics, and learning processes and perception in which human beings growing up in cultures different from our own could be examined, would provide rich insights and increase our understanding of basic phenomena.

The techniques for carrying out such cross national studies must be approached cautiously. I would hope that the administration of the bill would permit and encourage cooperative studies with research institutes and universities in other countries in fields in which major advances in basic understanding can be promoted by such cooperation.

As we move on to a consideration of undergraduate education, dealt with in section 4 of the bill, I would support enthusiastically the concept that forms the background of the proposed legislation, that an adequate undergraduate education in our present world should unquestionably include an effective international component. All students should get at least some understanding of a culture different from their own. In this respect we have far to go, and the International Education Act of 1966, if enacted into law, can have a tremendous impact upon the effectiveness of our colleges and universities in giving their students, through meaningful exposure to societies and cultures different from their own, a deeper understanding of the United States itself.

The task is not an easy one. It involves the development or upgrading of faculty competence, the restructuring of undergraduate curriculums and the development of appropriate library resources. These steps are all necessary in order to assure an effective role for international studies and to furnish a new and desirable dimension in the liberal arts education of undergraduate students. I hope, too, that the need of mounting numbers of preprofessional and professionally oriented undergraduate students for exposure to international studies will not be overlooked.

The presence of increasingly large numbers of foreign students on our campuses holds out a useful resource. The features of the bill that would enable the Government to support work study programs of faculty and students in foreign countries are also excellent.

In connection with section 4, I should like to mention a program administered by the office of foreign area studies within the New York State Department of Education in which my own university participates. I believe this program to be particularly effective. I believe also that it might serve as a model for other States and might provide suggestions for cooperative arrangements between universities with a cadre of foreign area specialists and neighboring colleges and schools whose resources are not yet adequate to enable them to benefit from the provisions of this bill.

The New York State program to which I refer is aimed at assisting both the colleges and the schools of the State. Its purpose is to incorporate into their curriculums significant elements of foreign area studies. There are seminars for members of faculties of colleges, and others for high school teachers. There is support for summer institutes as well as for tutorials for more advanced students. At the City University of New York, for example, we are now running a seminar for college faculty members dealing with the international politics of Africa. This is under the direction of one of the members of our political science faculty and is designed to provide a select group of college faculty members in political science and international politics with an introduction to African politics.

Participation is limited to full-time faculty members in New York State colleges and universities, whose present or immediately prospective teaching responsibilities will enable them to make use of the materials to be covered by the seminar in their teaching.

The seminar focuses on Africa's intra- and extracontinental politics against the background of African cultures and changing political and social systems. It is not generally expected that participants in the seminar will seek to develop new courses specifically on Africa but rather that they will attempt to introduce more material drawn from this area into introductory courses in their disciplines or will strengthen whatever coverage they already give to this material.

Although the participants have little African background, they are carefully selected and experienced teachers in political science or international relations.

A second seminar on our campus is given by a specialist in Latin American affairs, and is designed for high school teachers.

Various other projects undertaken in recent years under the auspices of the New York State Education Department have made an appreciable impact upon the social studies curriculum of public and private schools in New York State. Efforts to modify the traditional elementary and high school sequences, with a view to furnishing increased opportunities for the study of foreign areas and cultures, have recently culminated in the development of a revised curriculum in the social studies. This new curriculum will be introduced throughout the State within the next few years. Many schools, moreover, have undertaken independently to modify their basic world geography and history courses on the 9th- and 10th-grade levels so as to offer coverage of lands and peoples beyond the realm of Western civilization.

I mention these programs merely to illustrate that the approaches proposed in H.R. 12452 can be effective. My concern with this feature of the bill derives not only from my general interest as a citizen and from my special interest, as an educator, in all aspects of education, but from a recognition that the increasing effectiveness of graduate education in international affairs relies heavily on an improved base in undergraduate education. In this field as in all others in which significant curriculum reform has been carried out, there is a strong coupling between the programs in the schools and colleges and the advanced studies carried on in graduate schools. One of the strengths of the proposed act is that it recognizes the whole problem.

So much for the sections of the bill that are concerned in a new and significant way with the support of graduate and undergraduate education. Of the remaining sections of the bill I would say only this. In my judgment the proposed amendments to title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 introduce a desirable flexibility into the administration of the act and should strengthen its effectiveness.

THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor today heard further testimony in connection with H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966.

The witnesses who testified before the task force this morning, Wednesday, April 6, are as follows: Hon. WESTON E. VIVIAN, Member of Congress; James A. Linen, president, Time, Inc., New York; Alvin C. Eurich, president, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, and president, Academy for Educational Development, Aspen, Colo.; Ward Morehouse, director of foreign area studies, the State Education Department, the University of the State of New York, Albany; and Lawrence Rogin, education director, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C.

I should like to announce the witnesses scheduled to testify tomorrow, Thursday, April 7, the last day of hearings on this legislation. The witnesses are as follows: Norman Auburn, president, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio; William G. Carr, executive secretary, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.; William S. Dix, librarian, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.; Franklin Murphy, M.D., chancellor, University of California at Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, I include the prepared texts of the witnesses at this point in the RECORD:

IN SUPPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

(By Hon. WESTON E. VIVIAN, of Michigan)

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and the other members of this special task force for giving me the opportunity to comment upon the significant proposal you have before you. I have long been in favor of increasing the scope of our involvement in international education. I have spoken to the necessity for and wisdom of such an increase both before and since the President broached the subject anew last September at the Smithsonian. I have stumped for the idea both within and outside my district in Michigan. Consequently, I have asked for a portion of your limited time to express formally my firm support for the proposed International Education Act of 1966 and for the larger program in international education of which it is a part.

Nearly four centuries ago, the bard wrote: "Some are born great; some achieve greatness; and some have greatness thrust upon them."

Now Shakespeare was speaking of individuals, but his words are applicable with respect to nations as well. Our Nation has, in fact, had greatness thrust upon it, and thrust upon it suddenly—largely within the past two decades. We have had the mantle of world leadership placed upon us, and we have learned quickly that that mantle carries with it duties as well as privileges, necessities as well as prerogatives.

The promotion of mutual understanding and cooperation between nations is perhaps the most onerous—and certainly the most important—of the duties to which the United States has fallen heir. In pursuing that duty, successive administrations have realized the necessity for assisting in the development of underdeveloped nations. Further, they have perceived that the rate of development in such nations cannot far exceed the progress in education shown by those nations. Consequently, we have undertaken a number of programs—the point 4 program, various USIA and AID activities, the Peace Corps—designed to upgrade education in emergent nations.

On these extant programs, I would make two general comments. First, they are not large enough. And second, they are too one sided; we have concentrated on teaching foreigners to understand Americans, which is necessary, but we have been rather slack in teaching Americans to understand foreigners, which is equally necessary. I am convinced that enactment of the proposed International Education Act and implementation of the related proposals outlined in the President's February message would represent a logical and practical move toward removing these deficiencies in scope and direction as I see them.

A close link between the Federal Government and the universities may be traced throughout the course of the U.S. commitment to assisting the rise of education in foreign countries. Since the operative agencies—USIA, AID, Peace Corps—are staffed by the products of those universities, and since a good deal of the actual fieldwork is carried out by the universities under contract, it should be quite obvious that the quality and scope of our international educational assistance program can only be reflections of the quality and scope of our academic centers of international studies.

Yet down through the years, as the Government has constantly drawn upon the resources and personnel of our colleges and universities in the international area, it has done but little to help those institutions to produce and maintain the very personnel and resources upon which it will continue to draw. Partly as a result of this lack of reciprocity, we simply do not have a sufficient pool of qualified manpower in the international education field. AID in particular, as John Gardner pointed out in his study of that Agency and the universities, has "experienced consistent difficulty in recruiting and retaining men of appropriate qualifications."

Now, as you know, the President has proposed that AID educational programs, already short of personnel, be increased by 50 percent. It is perhaps in this context that the potential worth of certain provisions of the proposed act may be seen in its truest light. The grants for graduate centers of international studies and the liberalizing amendments to the National Defense Education Act language and area centers program could dramatically boost the supply of qualified personnel for international programs. Without added manpower, and regardless of the purity of our motives, our international programs cannot bear full fruit.

But I do not view the subject legislation as entirely, or even primarily, a proposal for professional manpower training. As I have indicated, I believe the program would increase our manpower supply in a critical area, and this is much to be desired. But I believe the chief good which would stem from the proposed program is much broader, involving as it does a rise in the Nation's level of sophistication in international affairs.

The inherent goal of the proposed act is the promotion of international cooperation and mutual understanding. It is true that we need more experts in international affairs to achieve that goal. It is also true that, produce however many practicing Ph. D.'s we may, the goal will never be fully achieved until a fair knowledge of and interest in foreign peoples and nations is present among the population at large.

The United States is seeking understanding and cooperation between nations, not merely between governments or between institutions. As a nation, as a people, Americans must teach the people of foreign lands, and Americans must learn from them as well. We must reverse the advice of Polonius and be both borrowers and lenders. The nature of the world today is such that an understanding among governments alone will not suffice. The world is presently in an era of changing aims, of changing means, of changing alinements; an era of changing outlook in which the international has become the everyday. As Whitehead has said, "Any serious fundamental change in the intellectual outlook of human society must necessarily be followed by an educational revolution." The United States stands on the threshold of a revolution—a benevolent and necessary revolution—in international education. Federal assistance to undergraduate and elementary-secondary programs in international affairs, no less than to professional programs, might furnish the spark for that revolution.

And there can be little doubt that international affairs programs in many of our colleges stand in dire need of strengthening. A 1962 survey of the graduates of 200 colleges showed, for example, that only 8 percent of the graduates had taken courses with any direct bearing on international affairs. Percy W. Bidwell, who conducted the survey, concluded: "the typical undergraduate is not well informed on foreign affairs. When he emerges from college, his knowledge of foreign countries and his understanding of basic principles and the current problems of American foreign policy are inadequate for the performance of his responsibilities, either as a plain citizen or as a community leader."

In this day of frequent personal relations between ordinary Americans and nationals of other countries, Americans must know something about other countries. The college graduate who looks on Pancho Villa as on just another bandit, or who thinks Yul Brynner in "The King and I" gave a fair portrayal of King Mongkut, may unwittingly do more damage to American-Mexican or United States-Thai relationships in a moment than a team of our experts in those countries can repair in a week.

If such errors are to be avoided, we must have more colleges with strong foreign affairs departments, and we must have more international exchange of students, teachers, materials, and ideas. The undergraduate grants proposed in the International Education Act could foster the necessary increases.

I would like at this point to say a bit more on what, in my view, should be the core of any viable program in international education: the exchange of persons, and more specifically, of teachers. I believe that that single instrument—teacher exchange—can do more toward creating true international and intercultural understanding than any other single instrument at our disposal.

If an Iranian engineer studies in this country, he will learn his profession, and he will also learn a good deal about America and its people. When he returns home, he will make use of his American-taught skills, but his vital knowledge of and feelings for the people of the United States will most probably be shared with only a few close associates.

But think of the Iranian teacher who studies—or teaches—in our country. When he returns to his native land, he will probably have a better knowledge of his subject matter and of teaching methodology. He will impart to his students a new knowledge of a different culture, a different life-mode; a knowledge which cannot be drawn from books alone, but only from first-hand experience. And, of course, this pipeline goes both ways. The American teacher with experience abroad is a better teacher, and his charges in the classroom are almost certain to share the benefits of his foreign sojourn.

Now these thoughts are certainly not original with me; I do not present them as a startling new departure. I bring this matter up because, in spite of the fact that it is so patent as to be almost a truism, we have not incorporated it in our international education program on a sufficient scale. A few figures should bear out this point. During the past academic year, there were 91,000 foreign nationals at schools and colleges in the United States. Of this total, only 9,000 were teachers, and the great majority of that 9,000 was made up of scholars, professors, researchers, and other senior academic personnel. The classroom teacher—the single greatest source of true international understanding—was present only in very small number.

The flow of Americans abroad presents a similar picture. Traveling students outnumber traveling faculty by more than 4 to 1; and again, most of the American faculty members who go abroad are senior personnel rather than classroom teachers.

I am certainly not suggesting we should cut down on the number of exchange students and exchange professors; we should not. As an aside, I am quite proud that my State of Michigan boasts three universities—Michigan, Michigan State, and Wayne State—with foreign enrollments of over 800 each, and that Michigan State and Michigan University rank one and three, respectively, in number of faculty members working abroad. No, what I am suggesting, what I am pushing, is that we should greatly increase our programs of teacher exchange.

The foregoing is perhaps a bit afield, since the subject proposal does not seem to address itself in a very direct manner to the question of teacher exchange. I wish it did. Several of the related proposals put forth by the President could, however, afford vehicles for increasing teacher exchange. Among these are the proposals to encourage school-to-school partnerships; to establish an exchange Peace Corps; to set up an education placement service in HEW to coordinate the recruitment of American teachers for foreign schools; and to double the number of U.S. teachers and professors who participate in the AID summer workshops abroad. If these proposals are fully and imaginatively implemented, and if we are careful to write the legislative history of the proposed act so as to allow a liberal interpretation of the provisions regarding travel expenses of staff and foreign scholars under both grant programs and student work-study-travel under the undergraduate grant program, then we should see some significant extension in the area of teacher exchange.

One final comment, Mr. Chairman, if I may. There will, of course, be some digit-counting and budget-fussing in connection with this proposed program. Some will no doubt point to Vietnam and conclude that the present is no time for beginning new domestic programs. I must say in advance that such arguments will strike me as, at best, ill-conceived. For one specific thing, the amounts of money envisioned for this program are not large—$10 million the first year, $17.5 million the second, and $25 million the third. That is, the contemplated cost of the program over 3 years will be about equal to the cost of 6½ B-52 bombers.

Moreover, it would be extremely shortsighted of us to allow the economic aspects of the war in Asia to forestall the enactment of a program as vitally needed as this one. In fact, the war should serve to point up the urgent necessity for more activity in international education. The era in which wars were won by might alone is no longer with us. As the President has said, "ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace." The proposed International Education Act would fit tightly into that concept, and no overstrict fiscal consideration should be allowed to impair the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my support for the proposed International Education Act of 1966. I hope it will be enacted shortly and implemented speedily, and I pledge myself to work with my colleagues on this task force to those ends.

I thank you.

Statement of James A. Linen, President of Time, Inc., Before the Task Force on International Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to appear before you and testify on behalf of the proposed International Education Act of 1966.

In the United States, knowledge, rather than manual labor, is becoming the source of productivity. It is becoming the key to success. Surrounded by the wonders of space flights and electronic computers, the modern American requires an ever greater extension of his knowledge. Six hundred mile-per-hour jet airplanes and nearly instantaneous communications have opened up an endlessly varied, endlessly changing, and often very confusing world to his consciousness. For better understanding, he turns to an educational system that is not able to keep up with his almost insatiable demands.

In the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, where 70 percent of the world's population lives, the demand for education is just as intense. Here are some 65 countries freed since World War II from colonialism, struggling to establish their identity, maintain free societies, and create viable economies. Launched with few schools and a high rate of illiteracy, they devote large portions of their budgets to establishing a corps of educated citizens. For this they turn to the more developed countries, such as the United States, for help.

Although the reasons lying behind the intense struggle for education are different in various areas of the world, they are really part of one continuum. The education of the mathematics student in Ibadan and the economics student in Indianapolis are equally important.

Our own impressive economic growth can have the unintended side effect of widening the gap between us and other nations. As important to our defense as nuclear weapons is a stable world sharing in the great gains of science, health, and productivity. These nations must be economically stable to confront their opportunities, and that stability, in today's world, requires people who are literate, educated and trained.

Considerable resources, both public and private, have gone into meeting the educational requirements of the developing nations. However, much more needs to be done; by governments, by the universities, by foundations, and by business. President Johnson, in his imaginative message to Congress of February 2, 1966, called for an increase of cooperative educational efforts in these countries.

But hand in hand with these efforts overseas must come the development of our international educational capacities at home. They have been too long neglected.

H.R. 12452 aims to redress that neglect and I strongly support it. The bill calls for the establishment of centers for advanced international studies; the strengthening of undergraduate instruction in international studies; and the expansion of language and area centers.

I believe that all of these programs are needed to broaden the base of men and women in this country who are properly trained to work in the international sphere. Students with wide ranges of interest—teachers, engineers, lawyers, journalists, social workers—should come under this program. And so should future businessmen.

Some 25,000–30,000 American businessmen are living and working overseas today, and hundreds of thousands fly back and forth on business each year. Just as this country needs qualified doctors and teachers and engineers to work overseas, so it needs qualified businessmen. That means businessmen who have a thorough grounding in the social structure of the countries where they work, businessmen who know a second language, businessmen who will contribute to the Nation-building process of the countries to which they are assigned.

The bill before this committee would provide excellent training opportunities for businessmen who will work overseas.

But, perhaps more important than those men who will live and work in Paris or Tokyo, in Lagos or Caracas, are those who will work in Chicago and Los Angeles and New York. I am referring to the managers who will command the responsibility for companies with overseas interests. All too often men in such positions today have little or no grounding in the politics and economics and, indeed, the psychology of the foreign countries where their companies operate. If American business has made mistakes in the past—and it has—it has been due in part to the ignorance of foreign affairs on the part of top management. I am happy to say that that situation is changing today. But we still have a long way to go.

There is no better way to rectify this than to build into our educational system a much greater component of international affairs and language training. With special centers to take the interested and gifted student, we will be providing the basis for a business citizenry that is much better acquainted with the world and therefore much better qualified to deal with it intelligently and compassionately.

My area of particular knowledge is communications—communications via magazines, books, textbooks, radio, and television. The recommendations encompassed in this bill would have a long-term beneficial effect on the communications industry. The industry will need many more young men trained in international affairs who have a command of a second language. These men, properly trained, will produce better books, better articles, better textbooks, and better television and radio shows. They will produce them not only for American readers and viewers, but also for readers and viewers in foreign lands.

The demand for knowledge has far outstripped the supply. We have a chronic shortage of all the tools required for the education process. Because of this, American technology is now turning toward new ways of transmitting information. I have no doubt that this new technology will play an important role in the future of education, both here and abroad. It is important that the developers of this technology in the years ahead have a solid grounding in international studies. This bill will provide them with such an opportunity.

H.R. 12452 provides not for a crash program, but for the long haul. Oliver Wendell Holmes once wrote, "A child's education should begin at least 100 years before he was born." Hopefully, this bill will mark the beginning of many years of increased international scholarship.

In conclusion, I would like to add a few words about the relationship between American business and the development of education abroad. Many members of the business community realize that, in President Johnson's words, "Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes." They also realize that increased educational development is a prerequisite to economic growth and potential investment opportunity. As evidence of this realization, you will find that the American business community is already deeply engaged in educational projects overseas. These projects fall into four general categories.

1. General philanthropy: This includes contributions to universities abroad, to special educational projects, to foundations that make grants for overseas educational purposes, and to fellowships and student exchanges.

2. Philanthropy associated with investment: This includes all contributions made in a country where an American business enterprise has a substantial local operation, such as a subsidiary, a branch, or a plant.

3. In-industry training: This includes the training given to employees in local plants of American companies abroad. This training is often uniquely suited to national needs in the developing countries because it develops and upgrades skills for existing and potential industries.

4. Educational activities for profit: This includes the creation and sale of educational materials.

In his message to Congress, President Johnson called for a Center for Educational Cooperation and a Council to advise that Center. I particularly welcome these two recommendations. At the present, there is little or no coordination between the activities of business and the universities, foundations, and Government. Indeed, there is no central point of information at all on the educational activities of business abroad. One has to compile it on a company-by-company basis.

As a result, I am sure there is duplication; duplication with university and foundation programs; duplication with Government programs; and duplication with other business programs.

An effective Council on International Education could first identify what is being done. Then it could pinpoint what should be done—and would be best equipped to do it.

I have no doubt that American business, in concert with the universities, foundations, and the Government, would welcome the opportunity to take on the job.

Testimony Before the Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, 974 Mandate on H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966, by Alvin C. Eurich, President, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, President, Academy for Educational Development, Wednesday, April 6, 1966

The United States is assuming a new role in international affairs—a role unprecedented in world history. Our assumption of this role began in the late 1940's, with the Marshall plan. We had the quiet strength, then, to see that withdrawal from an imperiled world was unworthy of a nation dedicated to human freedom. "Promising ourselves the least glory, we won the most permanent honor." Thus began our new role in world affairs.

Since that time our commitments have been extended in some places, contracted in others. We have struggled with every kind of challenge—open aggression, subversion, revolution. We have learned, haltingly, how to maintain an uneasy but honorable peace in the world.

In one respect, though, we have advanced steadily in a single direction. That is on the intellectual plane. Whatever our particular international policy or posture as shaped by immediate events, we have steadily developed our use of intellectual resources in the pursuit of our goals. We have increasingly recognized that, intellectually and culturally, we must extend our awareness of other nations, and their awareness of us. We must know and understand as much as possible about the complex and rapidly changing international world in which we perforce will find our fate.

But we are not concerned about international education for ourselves alone. We expect peoples around the world to become self-governing. On that basis we have committed ourselves to defending the integrity of nations against aggression. But it has been clear for some time that the basis of viable self-government must be education. Thomas Jefferson made this point for the United States; in our time all the leaders of the emergent nations have realized the same truth about their lands. Ignorance and freedom are not compatible in the modern world. Consequently, if we are to have viable self-government in many of the nations of the world, we must have vastly strengthened educational systems in them, too.

I saw these principles at work myself in Libya in 1965, and in Ethiopia earlier this year. In both countries I had the privilege of serving as an educational planning consultant. In Ethiopia I observed Haile Selassie I University, a new institution dependent for the time being on faculty members from outside the country—from the United States, the Continent, and England. Native professors have not yet been trained in adequate numbers. Even the secondary schools are dependent on U.S. help; of some 1,100 teachers in Ethiopian secondary schools last year, 400 were Peace Corps personnel. Thus you can see the magnitude of the need, even in one of the most progressive and educationally minded of the developing nations.

In Libya the importance of education was illustrated in another way. That nation recently acquired great wealth, as you know, through the discovery of oil. The Government is spending money as fast as it can on those things on which you can spend money fast: roads, schools, hospitals, and other types of physical facilities. But they have discovered that you can't build a doctor or a lawyer that way. Education and the trained manpower resulting from it, take time. So the Libyans find themselves building schools for which no teachers are available. For example, the Government of Libya asked the United States to provide 100 teachers of English the year before last. We didn't provide any. So Libya went to Egypt, and Nasser provided 40. These Egyptians were not well trained, so far as I could observe—some of them only had a 3-week rapid course in English—but they were the best available. This shows how readily other nations will move in to fill a need if we can't or won't provide the trained manpower needed.

I believe it is in this Nation's self-interest to build as strong an international education enterprise as exists anywhere else in the world—and more. That is the clear intent of the President's program and legislation, and for that intent I commend them for your approval.

Fortunately, this Nation has developed, largely through imaginative private leadership, the basic framework on which to build the kind of international education program envisaged by President Johnson in his recent message and legislative proposals. Beginning in the 1930's, the Rockefeller Foundation led the way with funds for non-Western studies at colleges and universities. The Russian Institute at Columbia University, first of its kind in the United States, was set up with Rockefeller support in 1945.

Soon afterwards, in 1947, the Carnegie Corp. moved strongly into the field with grants to 12 universities for foreign-area training and research, and also supported the Harvard University Russian Research Center and the Social Science Research Council fellowships in foreign-area training. The leadership in this area at Carnegie was taken largely by John W. Gardner, the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The most significant private contribution in terms of amount of money came from the Ford Foundation's international training and research program during the period in which I was privileged to serve as executive director of the education program. The foundation's grants for international training and research totaled over $200 million by the end of 1965. These grants included support of the African Studies Center at Boston University, southeast Asia studies at Cornell, Russian and east European institutes at Indiana University, universitywide approaches to international studies at the University of Michigan, Columbia, and Michigan State University, and many others.

As a result of these private efforts, augmented, of course, by substantial Federal Government initiatives, considerable progress has been made during the past decade in international education. Students 15 years ago had hardly any opportunity to learn about the larger part of the world's peoples and cultures. American higher education was based almost entirely on the Western European culture brought here by the Nation's settlers. But over the past 10 years foreign-area programs dealing with the langauge and cultures of the non-Western regions of the world have more than doubled. In addition, during the past 9 years the number of foreign faculty members and scholars on American campuses increased more than tenfold.

Moreover, foreign student enrollment in this country in 1964–65 reached a high of more than 80,000 and included representatives from 159 countries and territories. And some 70 American universities conducted technical assistance projects overseas under U.S. Government contracts totaling about $170.5 million. Many other institutions trained Peace Corps volunteers for service abroad.

What have we learned from the experiences of the private foundations and the Government activity in this field over the past 10 or 15 years? Several things: first, that the hunger for learning about international affairs runs strong in our own students, in the faculty members at our colleges and universities, and in foreign visitors who seek the chance to study here. If opportunities are provided, we have seen, talented people will come forward to fill all the available spaces. Many of our best young people and many of our most able scholars recognize that international understanding is a field of vast personal satisfaction and considerable national importance. They are able and willing to do the job. But we must give them the needed resources and tools.

Second, we have learned that to recruit able students and faculty, international studies must be visible on the campus. This means that centers, institutes, or some other identifiable bodies must be set up as beacon lights to those interested in such studies.

Third, we have learned that sizable amounts of money are needed to support the staff, the library, the travel, and the scholarships entailed in running an effective international studies program. But the results have proven to be well worth the cost in virtually every case.

Now these programs of international study on the graduate and undergraduate level are no longer pilot projects. They have proved their worth to the individuals involved, to the institutions, and to the Nation as a whole. The time has come to seize on this fruitful idea, extend it rapidly and sensibly to other campuses, sharply increase the numbers of people involved, strengthen the quality of work performed, and generally move the whole enterprise on to a new plateau of effectiveness. That is the intention of the President's program and of the International Education Act of 1966. That is my intention in presenting this testimony. That should, I respectfully submit, be your dedicated intention as forward-looking legislators.

What would be the impact of the activities proposed under the proposed legislation? In my view, the benefits would be fivefold at least:

First, we would give more students a better basic understanding of the problems which confront this Nation in the modern world. Thus we would achieve one of the basic purposes of higher education: the preparation of students to grapple with the major challenges of the times.

Second, we would encourage an interest in international problems among students, and stimulate them to work toward careers in the Foreign Service. This would meet an already desperate need which the President's program will make even more urgent. For the President intends, as you know, to establish a corps of education officers to serve embassies abroad. This is a commendable endeavor: education has for too long been underrepresented among the many interests that Americans express in their foreign missions. But we must face the problems entailed: where will we find people who are qualified in both the field of education and in their understanding of international affairs and foreign cultures? I know for a fact that we do not have such people available now, and if we do not devise new means for producing them, this program could merely inject mediocrity and incompetence into our foreign embassies.

Third, we would give better training to students coming from other countries. This, too, is vitally important. The adjustment of foreign students in the United States, like the preparation of our own students to understand foreign cultures, is a stepchild of American higher education. Foreign students coming to this country often find that the price of entry is isolation. In university after university, the ghettoes have arisen—a kind of segregation partly self-imposed out of fear but also partly enforced from without by the parochialism of American students. Thus fellow human beings, here on our invitation, here to become citizens of the world, are herded into small, confining colonies bound together more by their sense of being outsiders than by their shared language and culture. At the same time, American students by and large go through their collegiate or university experience sadly lacking in direct, fruitful contact with representatives of other cultures. The result is that their education, both formal and informal, is radically deficient in the kinds of insight and understanding essential to mature citizenship.

At last count, there were almost 100,000 foreign citizens in the United States on educational assignment, more than 80,000 of them students. About 6,000 were teachers, researchers, and other scholars. And more than 7,000 were interns and residents affiliated with our hospitals. These students and teachers and doctors came from over 150 countries and territories. It is forecast that by 1970 we will have 120,000 or more foreign students in this country.

This is an impressive figure: but it is not big enough. It is, after all, a tiny fraction of the world's students. More than half the world's population is under 26 years old. Sixteen African nations have heads of state under 45; and 5 have heads of state in their thirties.

Statesmen and educators agree that we must mobilize all our resources to bring to America as many as possible of the future leaders of the world's nations. By living here, studying here, and working here—if we give them the proper opportunity—they will acquire the same kind of personal understanding of who we are and what we stand for that Peace Corps volunteers have acquired about the people they have worked among. Moreover, if we can successfully mingle foreign students and workers with Americans here at home, we can increase that "interpenetration of cultures" which holds promise for world peace. But to accomplish this will require our inventing new approaches and new kinds of institutions and programs.

The new legislation would provide funds to move toward improved education for our foreign-student visitors.

Fourth, we would encourage more students to come from other countries for training here. This is of great significance for the reasons indicated above: The world's leadership is getting younger and coming up faster than ever before. The more of these young leaders we can bring to our shores, the firmer will be their understanding of what the United States really is.

Fifth, through graduate centers and research, we would extend our understanding of other peoples and nations. This would give us a better basis for developing our foreign programs in all areas: political, economic, and cultural.

I would like to close with a plea for leadership to you members of this committee. I believe you can perform a great service for this country by your leadership in support of this bill, backing up the President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of State. The future of international education in this country is as wide as the human world itself. By your leadership in supporting this legislation you are opening a hundred thousand doors for students, both American and foreign, to share the cultural riches of the world.

Testimony of Ward Morehouse, Director, Office of Foreign Area Studies, State Education Department, University of the State of New York, Before the Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, April 6, 1966

Mr. Chairman, my name is Ward Morehouse and I reside in Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y. I am presently director of the office of foreign area studies of the New York State Education Department.

May I take this opportunity to express my thanks to the Task Force on International Education for giving me this opportunity to appear before you. For most of my professional career I have been concerned with efforts to strengthen international and comparative studies in American colleges and universities, as well as our schools. Prior to my association with the State of New York, which began in 1961, I was for 5 years the educational director of the Asia Society in New York City, and before that, executive secretary of the Conference on Asian Affairs, Inc., also in New York City. That there should be before the Congress in 1966 a bill with the objectives and provisions of the International Education Act is an indication of the progress we have made in the past decade and a half in broadening awareness of this critical deficiency in American education at all levels.

It has been my conviction that the study of other peoples and societies, particularly those outside the perimeters of Western civilization, is a major underdeveloped area in American education. A similar conclusion was reached by the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, the highest educational authority in New York, in 1960 when they concluded that "We daily bear witness to the emergence of non-Western nations * * * into modern life. The imminent redistribution of world power * * * the rising aspirations of multitudes everywhere to share in human dignity and to lessen the gap between the rich and the poor nations are sure to have an impact on education."

In 1961, public moneys for the express purpose of strengthening opportunities and resources for the study of the neglected areas of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Russia and east Europe in the schools, colleges, and universities of New York State. Since that time, an office of foreign area studies has been established as an integral part of the State education department—which is the administrative arm of the board of regents—and an extensive program has been initiated.

In addition to a number of efforts designed to enlarge competence and interest on the part of teachers for our schools—now happily augmented by Federal support under title XI of the National Defense Education Act—the State education department has undertaken a wide range of activities to strengthen international and comparative studies in higher education, both public and private, in New York State. Directed primarily toward undergraduate education, these activities have included faculty seminars and fellowships, support of special opportunities for language study and oversea experience in non-European areas by students, development of teaching materials, and assistance to libraries. We have drawn heavily upon the faculty resources at the major university centers of advanced international studies in New York State, including Columbia, Cornell, and Syracuse Universities.

This effort in New York State—supported by State, foundation, and Federal funds—is now approaching a million dollars a year. But however substantial that sum may appear in relation to what is being done elsewhere, it is hopelesly inadequate in relation to needs in higher education in New York. In order to give you some idea of the magnitude of our task, let me remind you that there are some 230 institutions of higher education in New York State—approximately 10 percent of the total number of the colleges and universities in the United States. Consequently, the need for Federal Government support on a substantially augmented scale is critical, not only in New York State, but throughout the United States.

The provisions of the bill before you will go a long way in meeting this need, and I should like to record my strongest possible endorsement of them. I should also like to propose for your consideration the extension of these provisions in two important directions which appear not to be reflected in the present language of the proposed act.

ROLE OF REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF COLLEGES AND STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

One of the most vital factors in the progress which has been made thus far in strengthening international studies in undergraduate colleges has been the role played by associations of colleges and universities in different parts of the United States—for example, the Great Lakes Colleges Association, Associated Colleges of the Midwest, Kansas City Council on Higher Education, Southern Regional Education Board, University Center in Virginia Regional Council on International Education of the University of Pittsburgh, and the University of the State of New York. (I include our efforts here because our corporate embodiment—the University of the State of New York—is a legal federation or association of colleges and universities in New York State.) These regional college associations have had significant experience in strengthening international studies in undergraduate education and should be tapped in implementing any new Federal programs in this field. Certain kinds of needs, furthermore (for example, programs to develop faculty competence), can be pursued more effectively on a cooperative basis than by individual institutions.

In addition, State educational agencies concerned with higher education (I use the word "agencies" broadly to include State universities actively interested in assisting undergraduate institutions within their State, as well as State education departments since in point of fact the New York State Education Department is the only department in the United States with longstanding concern with higher education in all its forms as well as with the schools) have played an important part, and their experience for the same reasons should be utilized. I have described to you a little of what we have been doing in New York State because it is the most substantial single effort and the one with which I am most familiar. But it is by no means the first or the only one. Indeed, your own State of Indiana, Mr. Chairman, may properly claim to be the first; Indiana University began in the mid-1950's a program to strengthen foreign area studies in undergraduate colleges throughout the State of Indiana, supported by the Ford Foundation.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACILITIES AND AGENCIES

The present language of section 3 of the proposed bill, while it includes "combinations" of institutions of higher education, speaks only of support of "graduate centers." I believe this language should be extended explicitly to include interinstitutional organizations which have played and are playing such a critical role in strengthening programs of research and training in our universities. I have in mind organizations such as the American Universities Field Staff, Human Relations Area Files, American Institute of Indian Studies, and the Inter-University Centers for Chinese and Japanese Studies, which carry on programs of instruction in Chinese and Japanese in Japan and on Taiwan. These and similar interuniversity agencies provide significant support to programs carried forward on individual campuses, although they do not necessarily offer formal graduate training.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

I should like, therefore, to propose the following amendments to the bill before you (H.R. 12452). The passages in black brackets indicate what has been added.

SECTION 3

(a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (here and after referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to arrange through grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, for the establishment, strengthening, and operation by them of graduate centers [and interinstitutional facilities] which will be national and international resources for research and/or training in international studies. Activities carried on in such centers [and facilities] may be concentrated either on specific geographical areas of the world or on particular fields or issues in international affairs which concern one or more countries or both.

SECTION 4

(a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education, [combinations of such institutions, and State educational agencies concerned with higher education] to assist them in planning, developing, and carrying out a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies.

(c) The Secretary shall allocate grants to institutions of higher education, [combinations of such institutions, and State educational agencies concerned with higher education] under this section in such manner and according to such plan as will most nearly provide an equitable distribution of the grants throughout the States while at the same time giving a preference to those institutions, [combinations of such institutions, and State educational agencies concerned with higher education] which are most in need of additional funds for programs in international studies and which show real promise of being able to use additional funds effectively.

May I respectfully urge that the language which I have suggested be incorporated in the bill now before you. Thank you very much.

Statement of Lawrence Rogin, Director, Department of Education, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Before the House Task Force on International Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, April 6, 1966

My name is Lawrence Rogin. I am director of the Department of Education of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before the House Task Force on International Education, on behalf of the AFL–CIO, to support the proposed International Education Act of 1966 (H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452) as an important measure which will strengthen our educational resources for international understanding.

The AFL–CIO support comes as a result of a deep conviction that peace and freedom throughout the world can be strengthened if Americans have an understanding of all of the nations which make it up and out of a long trade union experience in international effort in support of free trade unionism and democracy. Such activity was carried on for many years by both the AFL and the CIO prior to their merger in 1955, and it has been intensified since that time. Today about one-quarter of the income of the federation is spent in its international efforts. In addition, most of the affiliated unions, carry on international activity either directly or through cooperative effort in the international trade secretaries of which they are a part.

A great deal of the international work of the unions is closely related to the purposes of this bill. American unionists are working in other countries assisting in the development of strong democratic trade unions through the establishment of educational centers, and by assisting in the planning, and in some cases the funding, of union-supported social projects such as housing, credit unions, and cooperatives. American unions have time and again welcomed to this country thousands of trade unionists from all parts of the free world, and have developed educational programs intended to help these visitors understand our Nation, in particular the role of trade unions in American society. Such trade union sponsored institutions as the American Institute for Free Labor Development and the Afro-American Labor Center are making major contributions to strengthening the ties between the unions of this country and those in Latin America and Africa, and in the strengthening of democracy in the countries in which they conduct programs.

In addition, trade unionists have been involved in many facets of governmental foreign aid since the start of these programs in the immediate postwar period.

American unionists, therefore, have extensive experience on which we base our enthusiastic support of this bill. We know that Americans who will be working overseas, or with foreign visitors to this country, need an understanding of the languages and institutions of the groups with whom they must relate. We recognize, too, that such study will help us learn from the experience of others.

H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452 take three important steps in Federal support for necessary activity.

The graduate centers for research and training in international studies, provided by section 3 will have a major role. We are pleased to see that the bill is broad enough to permit such graduate centers to concentrate on particular fields or issues in international affairs as well as on geographic areas. We hope that some of these centers, when established, will deal with the host of social problems whose solution is essential if peace is to be made meaningful to the people of the world.

We would hope also that the resources and training facilities of these centers would be available to all segments of our society, and that they would not be restricted to the traditional graduate students and their professors. Many of the U.S. trade unionists working in other countries are not graduates of high school, much less college. Yet their practical experience has been invaluable in preparing them for their present assignments. The artificial barrier of a college degree should not stand in the way of others like them receiving training to prepare for international work. Experimental programs at American University and at the School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell have demonstrated that unionists, even those who have never been to college, can participate in and benefit from intensive academic programs. I am sure that the same would be true of representatives of other segments of our society, particularly those who have been active in the host of voluntary organizations which are so important in the United States. What I am suggesting is that flexibility be a way of life for these centers and that the Congress make clear that this is its intent.

The grants for undergraduate programs, provided in section 4, will be an important stimulus in spreading college instruction in international studies. Some colleges already have carried out effective work in this field. However, a student who is not fortunate enough to be at such a school is deprived of an opportunity for study in this field. The spread of undergraduate education in international affairs will broaden the potential resources of interested Americans who may want to specialize. It will also provide a broader base of understanding of other nations for those whose careers may be in far different fields.

Section 8 provides amendments to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which would support the other provisions of this bill, by making funds available for West European language and area studies, and by increasing the proportion of Federal support.

The AFL–CIO recognizes that the International Education Act of 1966 is only a part of the total effort which is being proposed for the expansion of U.S. activity in the whole field of international education. We are convinced that the act will be a cornerstone for many other activities. We hope that the Congress will act quickly and will provide adequate funds so that this program can be launched at the earliest possible date.

HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of safety on our highways is both insistent and immediate as deaths continue to mount.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is now considering the National Traffic Safety Act, a bill that many of our colleagues and I introduced. This bill would establish a National Traffic Safety Agency in the Department of Commerce. Its purpose is to provide national leadership to reduce death, injury, and loss of property on our highways by intensive research into the problem and vigorous application of remedies.

The President discussed this problem in his March 2 message to the Congress proposing a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation. President Johnson urges, and my bill provides, that a National Traffic Safety Center be established, that grants be made to States to develop highway safety programs, and that safety standards be established for vehicles.

While my bill, H.R. 12905, differs in details, in the main it carries out the President's recommendations.

We must all agree that the time for action is now. We have been lethargic too long at the national level in attempting to solve this problem. Fifty thousand of our people will probably die on the highways this year. We must try to stop that.

I fully agree with the President that the people of America deserve an aggressive highway safety program. My bill does just that. If adopted, it will bring a new day for our highway travelers. For the first time we will be vigorously and effectively doing something for our millions of car-owning families.

CONSERVATION DISTRICT PROGRAMS COVER RURAL AND URBAN LAND

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the oldest and youngest soil and water conservation districts in New York are located in my congressional district.

The Schoharie District, organized in 1940, celebrated a quarter century of service last year. The Ulster District, organized 1965, will begin receiving technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service this spring.

Both these districts and the other three in my congressional district, Columbia, Dutchess, and Greene, have an extremely important role to play in resource conservation.

When the Schoharie District was set up 25 years ago, its primary role was to help farmers control erosion and develop agricultural land. These early districts made an important contribution. And over the years the men who voluntarily govern them realized that the need for soil and water development was not limited to agricultural land.

As a result, today district programs stress an interest in all land whether farmed or not.

A considerable share of the workload of the Soil Conservation Service personnel assisting the districts was in water resource development even before the drought of the past few years. This included the development of water supplies for both livestock and recreation purposes.

A portion of the Catskill Mountain Range lies in my congressional district. This is some of the most beautiful country in the world. It is not highly valuable as agricultural land—but through proper planning and development of the resources there, it can become a great economic asset as a recreational area.

The Dutchess County Soil and Water Conservation District has already assisted the Herald Tribune Fresh Air Fund in planning and establishing two small lakes in the area for recreational use by New York City children.

The counties and towns in my congressional district are planning for the future as never before. Planning boards are demanding scientific interpretations of their soils for uses in zoning, construction, and agriculture matters.

This was one of the important reasons for forming the Ulster Soil Conservation District. The staff to be provided to it by the Soil Conservation Service this spring will include a soil scientist to begin mapping the soils, a soil conservationist to assist landowners and communities plan wisely, and a conservation technician to help them apply the necessary conservation measures.

I am proud of the efforts being made in New York's 28th Congressional District in planning and developing natural resources. The activities undertaken by soil conservation districts are of benefit to urban, suburban, and rural residents as well as to farmers and their families.

I salute the soil conservation districts and their leaders for the fine job they are doing.

JET TRAFFIC AT NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, for many months now I have listened to cries of protest from those who have sought to shield Friendship Airport from potential jet traffic competition at National Airport.

The city of Atlanta has the fourth busiest airport in the Nation, with over 620 daily scheduled passenger and cargo flights, and 28 daily flights into Washington. Heretofore, all jet traffic has been required to land at Dulles or Friendship, each about 40 miles away. Now, finally, convenience has prevailed over protectionism, and Atlanta-boarded passengers will this month arrive by jet at National Airport, only a few miles away. Many of my constituents will now enjoy shorter flying time, and greatly increased convenience. As one frequent air traveler, I welcome this change, and concur with Arven H. Saunders, director of the Bureau of National Capital Airports, that—

> This new service will indeed bring Atlanta and the other great cities east of the Mississippi and the Nation's Capital much closer together in terms of travel time to the benefit of all.

Mr. William A. Askew, chairman of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce Aviation Committee, has sponsored a resolution, adopted by that body, which well states the fact:

> Atlanta realizes that this service will further facilitate air travel between the Nation's Capital and our own city, the capital of the Southeast.

Reason has at last prevailed.

ALFRED H. KIRCHHOFER RETIRES AS EDITOR

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Buffalo Evening News in Buffalo, N.Y., announced the retirement of Alfred H. Kirchhofer as its editor. I brought this to the attention of my colleagues earlier this week.

On Saturday, April 2, the News paid tribute to its retiring editor in a very excellent editorial which speaks for itself. I wish to include this editorial at this point in the Record:

An Editor's "30"

> The figure "30" is the mark every newspaperman puts at the end of his story to indicate there is no more to follow. Yesterday, a great editor wrote an official "30" to a long and brilliant career, and to a good deal more besides.
>
> For the entire staff of the News, and scarcely less for the entire metropolitan community in which he has long been one of the prime movers, the retirement of Alfred H. Kirchhofer as the editor of this newspaper is in truth the end of an era. His retirement will be noted in newsrooms all over the Nation, for he has long been recognized throughout the profession as one of the top figures of American journalism.
>
> For the News, happily, his retirement as editor is no final parting. He will continue,

even more actively, as president of our sister institutions, stations WBEN and WBEN-TV. He will remain available for special consultation and his presence will continue to be very much felt as an active citizen of this city with which he has had a lifelong love affair—as his great impatience with all elements who did it wrong so often attested.

What will be missed most, with his departure from active daily command, is the unique stamp of his whole personality that he put on each day's editions—his mature perspective and savvy of the total news scene; his instant grasp of the heart of any matter; his restless surveillance over all agencies trusted with a public responsibility; his great talent for spotting the flaw in any half-baked argument or the hole in any half-reported story; his ceaseless campaigning for civic improvement and honest government; his towering sense of his newspaper's varied responsibilities to the entire community it serves; his sheer joy in the work of putting it together—and, far from least, his great sense of fairness toward all who worked for him and his deep human regard for all their personal problems.

But even with all this lost—and with it the daily outpouring of terse "blue note" memos that gushed from his desk and flowed impartially through all departments—it will be a long time yet before Mr. Kirchhofer's editorship of The News can be said to have ceased. Too many of those left have learned too much from him over too many years for The News not to continue to function in his shadow.

Nothing basic, that is, is expected to change. The News still operates under the same strong and dedicated single-family ownership. It still travels the same basic direction it did under the late Edward H. Butler's long editorship and continued under Mr. Kirchhofer's.

What will change, inevitably, are day-to-day judgments in handling the news and in appraising it and drawing editorial policy conclusions. Mr. Kirchhofer may still be looking over our shoulders now and then. But he will not be here calling the daily shots, and some of the shots that are called will doubtless make him wince or maybe even splutter. Those who call them, however, will be doing so on the basis of a long and valued tutelage under him, a world of respect and admiration for him.

The News today, as always, faces its future with pride in its past, and with confidence that this has pointed it in a sound direction. Where we go from here will be for future events and for fallible but conscientious editors—taking up the responsibility now put in their laps—to determine as best they can.

FEDERAL SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the measure under consideration to grant to employees of the Federal Government an increase in the wages they earn.

President Johnson and Presidents before him remarked on numerous occasions about the difficulty encountered in attracting the best qualified and most capable individuals into the Federal service. If our Government and citizens are to be serviced by the highest type of civil servant, the civil service system must be able to compete by offering salaries and fringe benefits comparable to those offered by private industry.

This bill will, I believe, strengthen the Federal Government's position with respect to that situation.

Even more important, this measure will give to our hardworking and conscientious civil and postal service employees a deserving and much needed cost-of-living increase in their compensation to meet the ever-rising costs of food and other necessities of life. It is not as much as some have asked, and quite possibly deserve, but I do feel it is important to observe the guideposts established by President Johnson for industry and the Federal service in order to halt any trend toward or threat of an inflated economy. This has been a wise decision on the part of the President and I am pleased to give my support to it.

FEDERAL SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting H.R. 14122, but I am doing so with a minimum of enthusiasm. The bill does not do the job it should for the Federal and postal workers who need economic help the most. It does not offer them true comparability with what workers in private industry are receiving today, but rather, what they were receiving 2 years ago.

However, those of us who want to see the postal and Federal employees get fair and equitable treatment, have no recourse but to support this bill and hope that we might make up the injustices in the near future.

Along with many other Members of the House, I introduced earlier this year a pay bill which would have given a 7-percent pay increase. I am convinced this is the minimum needed to achieve any semblance of economic comparability.

The bill is not altogether bad. It gives a 2.85-percent pay raise, effective July 1 of this year. It contains some good provisions which I had proposed in my bill. It provides some wholesome and desirable liberalization of retirement laws. It provides full retirement benefits to employees after 30 years of service at age 55, which I had proposed. It improves the Federal employee's health benefits program, and it offers an improved system of overtime compensation. I am pleased that the bill corrects some of the inequities relating to postal seniority adjustments, and that it also gives an increase in uniform allowances—both provisions which I had included in my bill.

These are positive gains and recommend themselves to our favorable attention. But, Mr. Speaker, we are going to want to make adjustments in the future—we are going to have to take a good look at the principle of comparability as we intended it and incorporated it in the Pay Reform Act of 1962, if we are to bring the salaries of Federal and postal employees in line with present-day pay levels of private industry.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation before us. But, as I have said, with a minimum of enthusiasm because it does not give a higher percentage of pay increase. We must accept this watered-down bill if we are going to extend any help to those who depend upon us for their economic welfare.

ARTS ENDOWMENT APPROPRIATION

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, when we sat here a few months ago and listened to the annual state of the Union message, we heard our President say: "We must change to master change." None can deny that the world is changing. The Congress has recognized that change—in fact, by the appropriation over the years of billions by the Congress for scientific research and development, we have stimulated and accelerated change. Last year, recognizing the rapid changes for which it has, in part, been responsible, the Congress took steps to help us master that change when it created a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

We decided that it was high time we recognized our true scholarly heritage, for this Nation was founded by scholars—humanistic scholars, if you will—men who appreciated knowledge and were not afraid of creativity, innovation, and original scholarship.

Having taken that step last year, we must implement it this year. I commend the committee for providing the arts endowment with almost all the funds it is authorized to receive. I am disappointed that the committee could not see fit to similarly endow the humanities. I understand its position. The Humanities Council was not named until last January. It was not sworn in, nor did it meet until 2 days after its spokesman appeared before the subcommittee. This is regrettable; however, I commend the committee for opening the door in the report for additions to be made in the other body. By now the Humanities Council has outlined a program. I support the appropriations for the arts and oppose any effort to make cuts beyond those made by the committee.

BILL TO PROVIDE INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING FOR DEPENDENT PARENTS AND CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HANLEY.** Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide a cost-of-living increase for dependent parents and children receiving dependency and indemnity compensation from the Veterans' Administration. This benefit is payable to parents and children of servicemen who have lost their lives in Vietnam, as well as parents and children of veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and peacetime service whose death was attributed to their military service.

My bill contains a provision to grant to dependent parents the same 10-percent exclusion previously granted recipients of non-service-connected pension benefits, thereby offsetting the recent increase a dependent parent may have received in social security or other retirement benefits. This is an important feature of the bill, inasmuch as the amount of the parent's dependency and indemnity compensation is determined by the amount of the parent's income from other sources.

My bill further provides other income exclusions, such as the proceeds of National Service Life Insurance, profits realized from the disposition of real or personal property, and others that had previously been granted to recipients of non-service-connected pensions but had not been granted to dependent parents receiving dependency and indemnity compensation.

In addition to increasing the rates, my bill also provides for an increase in the income limitation to $1,800 per year for one surviving parent and $3,000 per year if there are two surviving parents. The increase in income limitations will enable many parents who have previously been denied dependency and indemnity compensation to now receive this benefit.

Since the enactment of the dependency and indemnity compensation program in 1957, the income limitations for dependent parents have not been increased. Therefore, I feel the benefits provided by my bill are long overdue, and certainly there is no group more deserving of assistance.

In addition to dependent parents, my bill also provides a cost-of-living increase to children receiving dependency and indemnity compensation. This applies to children in cases where there is no widow receiving benefits. Because there are not too many such cases, they are inclined to be forgotten but there are a number of cases in which a veteran is survived by as many as eight or nine children.

The House of Representatives Committee on Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension, of which I am a member, has been conducting hearings on the question of increasing dependency and indemnity compensation benefits for dependent parents and children of deceased veterans, and I am confident that this subcommittee will take favorable action at an early date.

INDIAN AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Mr. **GONZALEZ.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MONAGAN.** Mr. Speaker, with the President's recent proposal to establish an Indian-American Foundation, a new dimension has been added to our efforts to promote social and economic development on an international scale. The functions of this Foundation, which will be similar to those of the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, will augment the Indian Government's efforts to resolve problems in the basic fields of education, science, and agriculture.

Since the Indian Government's efforts to deal effectively with these problems have been impaired by political, economic, and social pressures for rapid expansion, a program of this type is desperately needed to insure that these fundamental areas receive their due attention in the process of India's development.

The establishment of the Foundation will be effected by agreement between the United States and Indian Governments, and it will be organized under Indian law. An independent Board, composed of 18 outstanding individuals, half American and half Indian, will govern the Foundation, and in the initial period, the Chairman of the Board will be Indian, while the chief executive officer will be American.

The initial endowment of the Foundation will consist of an approximate $300 million equivalent in U.S.-owned excess foreign currency which originates from the food-for-peace operations under Public Law 480, and the Foundation will function primarily as a grant-making philanthropy.

The programs sponsored will emphasize improvement of agricultural education and farm technology, and they will be keyed to stimulate and encourage native Indian initiative. This feature is premised on the key concept that the permanence of any social, economic, or political gain is dependent upon the mobilization of self-help and the development of indigenous resources, and its implementation should have far-reaching effects on India's long-range development objectives.

In addition to this feature, the planned Foundation provides a constructive outlet for the use of our excess foreign currencies which have been accumulating at an advanced rate in many aid recipient countries. As of December 31, 1965, the balance of United States-use rupees in India was 576.5 million in dollar value equivalent compared with 504.3 million in dollar equivalent 6 months earlier, and substantial accumulations in such other countries as Poland, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic have developed to the point where the total worldwide amount of U.S. owned foreign currency is well over $1 billion. Since we apply only a fraction of these excess currencies to U.S. uses—approximately $40 million per year in India—the application of some of these funds in a most deserving nation will help to promote a practical solution to India's age-old problems of illiteracy, poverty, hunger, and malnutrition, and it will serve as a symbol of the good will existing between the United States and India.

The executive branch has the authority to establish and fund this Foundation under section 104(e) of Public Law 480, and it is expected that such action will be taken after consultation with the relevant congressional committees. I hope that my colleagues share my satisfaction with this program's merit, and that they will give it their support.

PRESIDENT PROVES "CORN" CAN BE "STYLE" TOO

Mr. **GONZALEZ.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FARNSLEY.** Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article by Ralph McGill that appeared in the Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky., on March 22, 1966:

PRESIDENT PROVES "CORN" CAN BE "STYLE," TOO

(By Ralph McGill)

ATLANTA.—All the liberal and progressive legislation that was logjammed for generations now is law. The Congress has implemented the voting rights, as provided in the 15th amendment. The economy is good.

But there are still the mournfully reluctant "blue-eyed liberals" who say of the President, "Yes, but he lacks style—a manner."

Does he, now? Or does the man have style all the while, as the old folk song says?

Maybe you missed the visit to the White House of Miss Layona Glenn, of De Kalb County, Ga. She spent her 100th birthday in the Nation's Capital.

For 35 years she was a missionary and teacher in the jungles of Brazil. At 100 years, she still is a peppery old lady who can put the palms of her hands on the floor without bending her knees.

Washington impressed her * * * and the fact that her President took time out to have her come into his office and sit down in the big chair in front of him and his desk was a big thing for a lady celebrating a century of life.

PRIDE AND HUMILITY

She was proud and happy there, but, as a person of manners and awareness of things, she thanked the President and apologized for taking up his valuable time. She told him she wasn't anybody to be taking the time of the President of the United States. "I'm nobody," said the little missionary and teacher. She smiled at the man across from her and said smiling, "I'm just pore white trash, Mr. President."

The President smiled at her. "Like me," he said gently. He knew what she meant. The President knew she was thinking of the little girl growing up in the country and of wanting to be a teacher and a missionary. She had done that and gone to interior Brazil to spend the half of the Biblical life span promised as a special gift from God—3 score years and 10. It didn't seem right that so unimportant an old woman should be taking up the President's time.

THE PRESIDENT SAW MORE

But the President, smiling, said softly, understandingly, "Like me." There was a kinship of background between them. The President saw in her some of the old grandmothers of his boyhood in rural Texas.

He saw in her the mothers on Western homesteads, and the sun-baked little sawed-plank houses on the plains * * *. He saw, too, some of those who would get up in the country churches and volunteer to be missionaries * * * and those who went to normal schools and got certified to teach * * *.

He remembered his own little country school and the women who taught in it. He saw, too, as he looked at the old woman before him, the small teachers' college where he got his own schooling and his own certificate to teach.

"I know," he said gently, "I know. Like mine."

So, let's talk about "style" and "a manner." What was that moment when this old lady was trying to tell the President she wasn't an important person, that she had given 35 years of her life to teaching and being a missionary and yet that was nothing to brag about?

Shall we say this was corn and laugh at it, or make a stylish, sophisticated, glib crack? Or will we see in it what it was—a style of understanding, compassion, and gentleness?

VOCATIONAL TRAINING AND BASIC EDUCATION LEGISLATION FOR CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the basic tool in the rehabilitation of criminals is education. A discharged prisoner without the knowledge and training to earn an honest living will soon be in criminal trouble again. This is a tragedy to him and very expensive to society.

With crime costing our country $27 billion annually, we must do all we can to deter lawbreaking and to train the lawbreaker to live a responsible life in society.

In recent years many studies and surveys have been done to determine the best way to equip the convicted criminal to take his place among good citizens and to live a good life. The Federal Government is cooperating with correctional institutions at all levels to build up adequate vocational and other educational training programs to assure that the 250,000 prisoners released annually can live normal, fruitful, crimeless lives.

However, not enough has been done to make the criminal who has paid his debt a productive member of his community and not a drag on his family, his associates, and his government.

It is time now for the Congress to enact a sweeping program in the field of vocational training and basic education for correctional institutions run by the Federal, State, and local governments.

The 50 percent of released Federal and State prisoners who resort to recidivism, a falling back into prior criminal habits, must be trained to lead useful lives along with the others who do find a place in normal life after serving their sentences.

To support this grave concern of mine that we must help those 400,000 inmates in our correctional institutions, I am today introducing legislation which would authorize a substantial and continuous program of vocational training and basic education instruction in Federal, State, and local correctional institutions.

I have made a study of this problem in our correctional institutions and I have consulted with professionals in this field in and out of the Government, including specialists on the local level.

The Bureau of Prisons in the Department of Justice, the Manpower Administration in the Department of Labor, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have been particularly helpful to me in drafting this legislation and presenting necessary facts in the preparation of the bill. Also, I have consulted with the American Correctional Association, the professional organization for local and State correctional officials.

In the 1964 election I campaigned on a plank to do everything I could to halt violence and terror in the streets. Several of my anticrime bills have been enacted into law or administratively adopted. This bill I am introducing today would be a forward step in the anticrime fight.

I am hopeful for favorable departmental reports and early hearings on this bill, which I feel will go a long way in helping the criminal to adjust to a normal and useful life. A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 14341

A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to provide for programs of job training and education of inmates of correctional institutions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended (1) by redesignating title III as title IV, (2) by redesignating sections 301 through 310 as sections 401 through 410, respectively, and (3) by inserting after title II the following new title:

"TITLE III—CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

"SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall carry out a program of job training and education for persons in correctional institutions who are in need of training to obtain employment upon release. Such program (1) shall be conducted by the Secretary through agreements with officials of Federal, State, and local correctional institutions, (2) shall, where practicable, include both vocational education and on-the-job training, (3) shall include special job development and placement activities, (4) shall include, where appropriate, prevocational, basic and secondary education, and counseling, and (5) shall utilize the services of other Federal departments and agencies.

"(b) When the program includes vocational education, such services shall be provided by those agencies which usually supply such services."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 241(4) of such Act is amended by striking out "301" and inserting in lieu thereof "401".

(b) The section of such Act redesignated by the first section as section 404 is amended (1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e), (2) by striking out of such subsection "title III" and inserting in lieu thereof "title IV", and (3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) For the purpose of carrying out title III, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each fiscal year thereafter such amounts as may be necessary."

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE CO-OPERATIVES UNDER THE AID

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of one of our Nation's most productive and progressive agricultural districts, I commend my colleague and coworker, HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, for calling the attention of the Members of Congress to what cooperatives have accomplished under the Agency for International Development—AID. Mr. REUSS is chairman of the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I refer to the staff report on "Technical and Economic Assistance to Cooperative Enterprises Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961," which was prepared for his committee. The report is interesting and encouraging, and I agree with my colleague that it is "both appropriate and valuable that the report be made available to all Members of Congress for their information and consideration."

I have also an immediate reason for being interested in this report. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture I actively support the President's food-for-freedom program which is now before us. I am interested in seeing that it improves both our foreign aid and the incomes of our farm families, because we cannot do the one without the other. To be reasonably certain of achieving these objectives, we must see that as much assistance as possible goes to the producers, at home and abroad, and does not trickle down, just a few drops at a time.

Many of us have felt for a long time, from both the humanitarian and practical economic points of view, that we must shape our agricultural production here at home for maximum effectiveness around the world. This requires, first of all, something more than temporary, stopgap assistance on a year-to-year basis no matter how generous it may be. Agricultural production—and assistance to increase food production in other countries—cannot be increased by quick, one-shot attempts. Every farmer understands that you cannot speed the seasons or disturb nature too much. Neither can we put every acre in this country under cultivation in an unplanned and uncontrolled race to raise more food, to produce willy-nilly rather than the specific crops that we need, unless we are willing to face the consequences of bankrupt farmers and a wrecked agricultural economy. Fortunately the food-for-freedom program gives us just the flexibility and time we need to do the careful, intelligent planning that is required for such a gigantic and bold undertaking.

I have talked to many farmers in my district and they all see the wisdom of this simple, practical, but long overdue approach that food for freedom offers as the first step in a sensible world food program. For one thing, many farmers believe that it will help put an end to the kind of thinking that for too long has looked on our American food contributions as nothing more than a dumping process to get rid of burdensome surpluses.

Now, the food-for-freedom program enables us to substitute a partnership concept, in which our farmers cooperate with those of other countries to meet the growing food needs of the world. Our farmers will be able to furnish from their abundance the immediate assistance that people in other countries need to win the war against hunger. Our farmers will be able to do their part within the broad framework of a global self-help program that will assist farmers in other countries to gradually increase the productivity of their land.

In connection with our food-for-freedom program, I am encouraged by the importance that AID is now placing on agriculture and cooperatives in its assistance planning. For fiscal year 1967, AID proposes to invest about $512 million in programs to speed agricultural growth in developing countries. That is one-third more than is being spent currently and one-half again as much as was spent in fiscal year 1965. I wish it were more, but it is a good start. It gives strong support to the President's statement, which prefaces this report on AID's cooperative activities:

> To those nations which do commit themselves to progress under freedom, help from us and others can provide that margin of difference between failure and success.

Even with such generous assistance as AID proposes to provide in the field of agriculture, however, it is not only the amount of help, but the kind of help that we give, which will determine how effective we are in reaching and helping the people in other countries. That is why this report to the Members of Congress on AID's cooperative assistance—it is the fourth annual report—is so valuable. It tells where and how and in what ways we are directly helping groups of people to help themselves. We are often enough reminded by critics of the shortcomings of our aid programs. So, it is truly refreshing to have information about the many fine cooperative accomplishments, and AID's dedicated public servants, who labor daily to carry out our country's aims. I am impressed by how succesfully this work is carried out on a people-to-people—rather than a government-to-government—basis, so that the lone villager is reached and the challenge of rural poverty is met.

The experiences of American farmers can be shared with producers in other countries. Our farmers know that in the highly competitive agricultural economy of America cooperation and cooperatives are a necessity. Cooperatives have become an essential and highly efficient part of the business of modern farming. In my district cooperatives are a vital part of private enterprise. They provide many thousands of farmers with essential services.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY recognized the value of our tremendous cooperative resources in advancing foreign aid when he was Senator. In the course of debates on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in the 87th Congress, he offered an amendment. Section 601 of that act provides in relevant part that:

> It is declared to be the policy of the United States * * * to encourage the development and use of cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations.

That provision is popularly referred to as the Humphrey amendment. It has had wide acceptance, here at home and abroad. It has brought many cooperative organizations into support of our foreign aid. It has been a stimulus to individual initiative and private enterprise. This is how the then Senator HUMPHREY described some of these achievements to fellow Senators in 1964:

> In all the discussion about foreign assistance, there is one area that has been free of criticism, and in fact has enjoyed the blessing of all Members of Congress. I refer to what AID is doing to encourage U.S. private enterprise to be more actively engaged in our foreign assistance efforts.
>
> In this field the U.S. cooperatives, savings and loan associations, and credit unions have an enviable record.
>
> What was only an idea 3 years ago is a worldwide reality today. In the cooperative idea, we are exporting one of the finest products of a democratic society.

Certainly the report that Mr. REUSS has submitted to the Members of Congress makes it clear for all to read that farmers around the world need cooperatives in marketing, in purchasing, and in credit in order to secure many of the essential services that are needed in a healthy, expanding agricultural economy. Mr. REUSS stresses the need for credit. I can add that our farmers know how important credit is to successful farming operations. It is the same story the world over. Successful farming is not based soley on frugality and hard work. It requires even more than ready markets and reasonable prices. The difference between success and failure in farming, between more and less production, is increasingly dependent on the availability and wise use of capital and credit, available at reasonable rates of interest.

Mr. REUSS makes this point of the need for available agricultural credit abundantly clear in his letter transmitting the report on cooperative assistance abroad to Chairman PATMAN and members of the Banking and Currency Committee. He states in part:

> The committee recently concluded action on the Asian Development Bank bill. In the report on that bill, the Bank was urged to establish close liaison * * * with cooperative organizations * * * to insure success of the Bank's projects. Similarly, the committee has in the exercise of its jurisdiction over enabling legislation for international financial institutions (the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Development Association, and the International Finance Corporation) given extended consideration to these and related matters.

I not only hope that this report will be given the widest possible circulation in places where it will do the most good, but that the Members of Congress will receive a continuing report from year to year on what this kind of people-to-people assistance is accomplishing. Here is documentation that AID is reaching the people. This is the kind of assistance that the food-for-freedom program can help to stepup and expand. This is our opportunity to help build sound minds as well as healthy bodies. Our abundant production of food, and our ability to show others to do the same, can help people everywhere who are willing to do things to help themselves. Our food can train teachers and technicians. Our food can help farmers organize enterprises to market and process their commodities. Our food can strengthen the people's desire for freedom. To do all of these tasks we need viable, prosperous and independent agricultural communities. Cooperatives are one of the simple and direct means to reach the people who are expected to increase their country's agricultural production. When we reach them we strengthen the very foundation on which the whole economic well being of most of the developing countries rests—an expanding and prosperous agriculture. The food-for-freedom program makes the resources of American agriculture available to AID to do this important job.

EXTENDING MEDICARE TO THE DISABLED

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 89th Congress enacted the monumental medicare law, providing health insurance through social security for persons 65 years of age and older. This legislation was sorely needed because the aged, who become ill more frequently and for longer periods than the rest of the population, could not obtain protection through private health insurance against the expenses of such illness at a price they could afford. The result of this was either grossly inadequate medical care, or in the alternative the dwindling or disappearance of lifelong savings or recourse to public assistance rolls when expensive illness struck. Now, as of July 1, these aged persons are protected against the financially crippling costs of serious long-term illness.

There is another sector of our population, however, equally if not more in need of health insurance protection than the aged, who are not fortunate enough to be included in the current medicare law. These are the disabled, under the age of 65, who were in the labor force but who cannot work now because of crippling or disabling illness. They, too, are faced with more frequent illness of long duration and they, too, are denied private health insurance protection because of their physical or mental condition.

There are nearly 1 million persons in the United States currently receiving disability annuities under the Social Security Act, who enjoy no assistance in meeting heavy and continuing medical expenses. Regardless of their ages, they are considered to be poor risks as far as private health insurance is concerned. They are incapable of continuing their previous employment and, if illness strikes, must either forego proper medical care or dissipate what small savings they may have accumulated. They can be assured of protection against such financial disaster only through a publicly sponsored program.

I am introducing today an amendment to the Social Security Amendments of 1965 which will bring disability annuitants within the purview of the health insurance provisions.

As annuitants under the social security program, they would be able to participate in the medicare program on the same basis as the aged. My amendment would not, however, cover persons who are not eligible for disability annuities under the program or dependent children of annuitants, since the great majority of these dependents are in good health and do not have the same problem as do the disabled in obtaining private health insurance coverage.

A BILL TO END THE OVERWITHHOLDING FEATURES OF THE TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the other Members of the House to a problem which exists in the withholding provisions of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. The graduated withholding system established by that act is geared to the standard deduction only. That is to say, taxpayers who use the standard deduction will find that the new schedule of withholding rates will approximately equal their tax bill for this year.

Those taxpayers who have deductions in excess of the standard 10 percent or $1,000 maximum, however, will have more tax withheld this year than is due the Government.

For example, compare the situation of a taxpayer having $12,000 annual income who claims the standard $1,000 maximum deduction and a similar taxpayer who has a mortgage on his house or for other reasons can claim itemized deductions in excess of the standard $1,000 maximum deduction. As the following table shows, the taxpayer who claims the standard deduction has approximately the exact amount of tax withheld that is due. The taxpayer with the additional itemized deductions, however, has substantially more withheld from his salary than is due.

	1 exemption	2 exemptions	3 exemptions	4 exemptions
Tax due on $12,000 income if standard $1,000 maximum deduction is used	$1, 908	$1, 776	$1, 644	$1, 512
New annual withholding rate on $12,000 income	1, 916	1, 776	1, 635	1, 496
Tax due on $12,000 income if $2,000 itemized deductions are claimed	1, 688	1, 556	1, 380	1, 266
Amount overwithheld by new annual withholding rates	220	220	264	246

The significant thing is that under existing law, this second taxpayer cannot adjust his withholding to take into account his additional deductions and therefore will have to wait until next year to file a tax return and apply for a refund.

I am introducing a bill today to correct this situation and to provide taxpayers the means to reduce their withholding in proportion to their excess itemized deductions.

As you know, the House Ways and Means Committee added a formula to the tax bill to enable taxpayers to adjust the amount withheld in cases involving itemized deductions in excess of the standard deduction, but its provisions do not go into effect until January 1, 1967. My bill would enable taxpayers to apply this formula on May 1, 1966, the date the new graduated withholding rates go into effect.

Although the May 1 effective date for the graduated withholding rates has placed some administrative burden on employers, the change proposed in my bill would not impose any further requirement on the employer, but it would enable a taxpayer who has large itemized deductions for interest, taxes or perhaps large medical bills, to voluntarily request that his withholding be reduced to approximate his actual tax liability.

The graduated withholding scale will otherwise require taxpayers with large itemized deductions to loan the Federal Government money until next year when a refund can be requested.

While I do agree in principle with the graduated withholding rates, I do not believe the overwithholding effect of the system should be allowed to stay in effect throughout the rest of this year.

I also can appreciate the argument that the overwithholding rate may have an effect on rising price pressures by limiting the money some taxpayers have available to spend. I do feel, however, that it is basically unfair to segregate out a class of taxpayers and require them to make this sacrifice when Congress has not fully evaluated either the need for or the desirability of imposing such a tax effect.

LEONARD HICKS—A GREAT LOSS TO THE FIELD OF INTERNATIONAL TOURISM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it grieves me to announce the untimely death of a friend, Leonard Hicks, Sr. A recent article on the obituary page of the Washington Post—Sunday, April 3—refers to the leadership of Mr. Hicks in the field of international tourism. Those of us who knew him felt as one with his great zest for life; and even more important, we felt as one with his desire for a better world to live in.

Mr. Hicks is a former vice president of a national hotel chain and also former president of the American Hotel & Motel Association. His son Leonard Hicks, Jr., learned about the importance of international tourism from his father, as a result, created the internationally known firm of hotel representatives which carries his name.

Mr. Hicks lived in Miami so that he could be close to the headquarters of his son's operation.

The article that appeared in the Washington Post, Sunday, April 3, follows:

> Leonard Hicks, 79, nationally known hotelman, vice president of the Albert Pick Hotel chain, president of the American Hotel & Motel Association, and past president of the Hotel Greeters of America in Miami Beach.

PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION INVITING PARTICIPATION IN INTERAMA

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House and the other body will recall that H.R. 30 providing for Federal participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, to be located in my district in Miami, authorized the President to issue invitations to the States and to free foreign countries, particularly free Latin American countries, to participate in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center known as Interama.

I am pleased to advise that on April 1 the President issued his invitation to the several States of the Union and appropriate foreign countries to take part in Interama.

The President's proclamation appeared in the Federal Register of yesterday.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this significant and meaningful invitation of the President, which will lead, I am sure, to participation in Interama of all the free Latin American Republics, as well as many other foreign countries, and I hope most of the States, appear after my remarks in the body of the Record.

This great Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center which will do so much to promote progress with freedom in the Western Hemisphere—the theme of Interama—is happily moving forward toward reality.

Interama—A Proclamation by the President of the United States of America

> The Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center (Interama), in Dade County, Fla., plans to provide a permanent international center which will serve as a meeting ground for the governments and industries of the Western Hemisphere and other areas of the world. The facilities and exhibits of Interama will be designed to further broad and continuous exchanges of ideas, persons, and products through cultural, educational, and other exchanges.
>
> The Congress, by section 2(a) of the act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89–355, 80 Stat. 5), authorized the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the United States and certain foreign countries to take part in Interama.
>
> Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do, in conformity with that act, hereby invite the several States of the Union and appropriate foreign countries to take part in Interama.
>
> In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.
>
> Done at the city of Washington this ——— day of ——— in the year of our Lord 1966, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 190th.
>
> Lyndon B. Johnson.
>
> By the President:
>
> ——— ———,
> *Secretary of State.*

EXTENSION OF MEDICARE FILING DATE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation just passed by this body and by the other body last week, which would extend for a 2-month period the initial enrollment period for the supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged. As you are aware, under existing law this initial period expired on March 31, 1966. The penalties for failure to act within this deadline are severe. In general, unless people who are 65 and over had signed up for the voluntary plan by March 31, they will have to wait 2 more years before they can sign up; and when they do sign up, they will have to pay higher premiums.

Mr. Speaker, I was the author of a bill, H.R. 13823, that would extend this deadline date. More than 115,000 of my Dade County citizens which I have the honor to represent are eligible to be enrolled for Medicare. I am happy to see that the Congress has taken such swift action on such a great and wonderful program. I commend the able chairman [Mr. Mills] of the House Ways and Means Committee for reporting this bill out today.

Under the bill an additional 2 months will be allowed for individuals to sign up. The Social Security Administration is to be congratulated for getting the close to 17 million applications which they now have. The additional period will allow them to search out those around 2 million eligible aged who have still not applied usually because they have not been reached and are unaware of their rights under this legislation. These people, however, are often the most in need of such protection.

I wish also to support the amendments added by the Committee on Ways and Means which will allow those people who reach age 65 in March to have their benefits effective on July 1. Under existing law they would have to wait until August 1. I also believe the provision allowing the States to "buy in" for all of their old-age assistance recipients, regardless of whether they also receive social security benefits, is desirable for more uniform administration and protection of the aged throughout the country. This amendment has been requested by many of the States in that it would simplify their administration of the program.

I heartily support this legislation.

UNITY STRESSED

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of unity among freedom-loving nations in stopping aggression is stressed in a recent editorial I read in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

It quotes Secretary McNamara's statement made at a NATO Ministers' meeting in Athens in 1962, and the paper adds:

> As Secretary McNamara warns, unified deterrence is essential if defense in the face of nuclear attack is to mean anything. In isolating France from the common defense, in a childish gesture of rancor at the United States. De Gaulle would isolate his country from reality—a dangerous, self-defeating move.

Since the statement of Secretary McNamara bears repeating, I suggest that this editorial be included in the Congressional Record, and I include it at this point as part of my remarks:

> [From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 1, 1966]
>
> ### A Warning to De Gaulle
>
> Here is something for Charles de Gaulle's attention.
>
> It is a statement by U.S. Secretary of Defense McNamara:
>
> There must not be competing or conflicting strategies to meet the contingency of nuclear war. We are convinced that a general nuclear war target system is indivisible and if, despite all our efforts, nuclear war should occur, our best hope lies in conducting a centrally controlled campaign against all of the enemy's vital nuclear capabilities.
>
> Unified deterrence is essential. Relatively weak nuclear forces are perilous in peace because they might invite preemptive first strikes. Limited nuclear capabilities, operating independently, are dangerous, expensive, prone to obsolescence, and lacking credibility as a deterrent.
>
> McNamara made this statement at a NATO Ministers' meeting in Athens in June 1962.
>
> It is just as valid today as it was 4 years ago, and it has immediate pertinence directed at the mad scheming of President de Gaulle for the withdrawal of France from NATO, and its go-it-alone policy in Western Europe.
>
> As Secretary McNamara warns, unified deterrence is essential if defense in the face of nuclear attack is to mean anything. In isolating France from the common defense, in a childish gesture of rancor at the United States, De Gaulle would isolate his country from reality—a dangerous, self-defeating move.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, as you and every Member of this body will remember, the debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was lengthy and in detail. Those of us who opposed passage of the bill made every effort to clarify the contents, with the foreknowledge that it was inevitable that there would be abuses and attempted abuses on the part of those charged with the administration of the bill's provisions. A number of those abuses have already come to light and I would like to touch upon several of them briefly before addressing the subject of the latest and most flagrant abuse of Federal power which should be brought to the attention of all the Members.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the subject of membership practices of sororities and fraternities and other fraternal organizations on college and university campuses was thoroughly discussed. Though there were many members of the House who advocated that the Federal Government should withhold all financial support of any sort from any college or university which allowed segregated fraternities and sororities, those of us who believe that, for the Federal Government to impose its notion of congeniality upon such private associations is the height of arrogance, were able to insert into the Record the prohibition that no such meddling was to be undertaken.

At least, we thought we had made it specifically clear.

The Commissioner of the Office of Education at that time was Mr. Francis Keppel.

It was not long after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that I received word from various places in the country that Mr. Keppel was, by word, act, and deed, threatening colleges and universities with a cutoff of Federal funds if sororities, fraternities, and other fraternal and religious groups did not let down all membership barriers immediately.

When I reminded Mr. Keppel that this highhanded abuse of power was prohibited by the very act he was citing as his authority, his blasé answer was that this prohibition applied only to the Civil Rights Commission; that it had no effect upon him or his Office.

It was then crystal clear that, if the Office of Education were permitted to distort and expand the authority of that act, which was, in the first place and of itself a distortion of Federal power, there would be no rights left to anyone.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that, when the Higher Education Act of 1965 came before us, I introduced an amendment which clearly and unequivocably stated that the Federal Government had no authority over the membership and internal practices of sororities, fraternities, private clubs, and religious organizations.

Mr. Keppel and his associates in the Office of Education pulled out all the stops in an effort to defeat the amendment, but the House passed it and so did the Senate.

I cite this particular event as being one of the first, if not the first, flagrant abuse of the authority given under the Civil Rights Act. The habit of a certain portion of the bureaucracy of bulling ahead without authority to back them up, is no new subject to the House, but another example or two of this fishing in forbidden waters comes to mind.

One which made the headlines back in October of last year, was the attempt to deny Chicago school authorities $30 million in Federal aid because a few bureaucrats here in Washington were not satisfied with the integration "progress" in that city.

There was a political uproar in Chicago, as you will remember, Mr. Speaker. For the first time, some people in the North who had heaped abuse on the South, felt the lash of the Federal whip they had thought would be laid only on the back of southerners. This, to use an expression we all know, was their ox being gored and, therefore, quite a different story.

As a result of political pressure, the story goes, the bureaucrats were called off and the $30 million started to flow again to Chicago.

A clear case of Federal officials going beyond the power granted them by legislation.

One final example, Mr. Speaker, before I go on to the latest one.

A few months ago, it came to light that there was a movement afoot within the Community Relations Service, to influence the rewriting of textbooks to, and I quote, "picture more accurately the Negro's role in history" unquote. Who in the Community Relations Service was to say what was accurate and what was not was left up in the air.

In reply to my protest, the head of the Community Relations Service assured me this was only an idea they had been kicking around and it would not be pursued. Frankly, I am not persuaded by him glib assurances. I believe, to the contrary, that the scheme is being actively pursued.

The newest and most flagrant abuse yet of the power contained in the Civil Rights Act is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare document, "Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that, though I opposed the passage of this act with all my strength, I acknowledge that it is now a law and, as such, it must be obeyed. What I am bringing to the attention of the House at this time is the open abuse of that law by Federal officials and the deliberate falsification of what it says and what it intends. This document is my case in point.

A casual reading of section 601 of the Civil Rights Act seems, at first, to give the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, official, solid ground upon which to trod. That section states:

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

In section 604, later on in this same title VI, however, there are certain areas in which the Federal Government is specifically refused the right to roam. That section reads:

> Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize action under this title by any department or agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer, employment agency, or labor organization except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

Let me repeat, if I may, the crucial words in that section: "except where a primary objective, is to provide employment."

Not by any stretch of the imagination can any program now in operation be one in which the "primary objective is to provide employment." To my knowledge, only one program possibly fits that description, the National Teacher Corps, and as you know, that program has just been funded by the Congress. Actually it does not fit.

There is nothing in the debate which took place when the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was being considered here in the House to indicate that the forced integration of faculties was the intent of the legislation.

Yet, despite this detailed prohibition, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in their document, "Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans" requires school officials to "assure," "comply," "submit," and "report" as well as "provide," "furnish," and "arrange" the desegregation of their faculties in certain prescribed ways and must demonstrate "significant progress" each year.

This, despite the specific commandment to the contrary contained in section 604. This extra-legal edict of HEW is spelled out in section 181.13 of their "Revised Statement of Policies."

In this same document appears that Department's command that integration of students must proceed according to specific percentages and school authorities are ordered to accomplish this by one means or another, including influencing parents and propagandizing their communities.

The Civil Rights Act denies any such authority or intent and the language is clear. Section 401(b) states:

> Desegregation means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but "desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

Again, Mr. Speaker, may I repeat the significant prohibition: "shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

The English language could hardly be clearer. The establishment of quotas and percentages or any other such device is explicitly prohibited.

Yet, read the "Revised Statement of Policies" and you find this paragraph:

> If a significant percentage of the students, such as 8 or 9 percent, transferred from segregated schools for the 1965–66 school year, total transfers on the order of at least twice that percentage would normally be expected.

This, Mr. Speaker, sets a quota, without any question. Yet, the Civil Rights Act transparently says this will not be done to achieve racial balance.

Even the Supreme Court, when it ordered school desegregation did not say that any racial balance, whatever that is, was required.

The late President Kennedy pointedly stated on a number of occasions that there was no intention of setting quotas, percentages, and the like.

Yet, section 181.54 of the "Revised Statement of Policies" proceeds to lay down rules and regulations as to what percentage of Negro children must be transferred each year. To lay down such rules is clearly extra legal and is an attempt to contravene the specific language to the contrary spelled out in the law.

Mr. Speaker, authority is one thing. Abuse of authority is another. When this Congress goes to great lengths to spell out prohibitions, no person, no agency, no branch of the Federal Government is entitled to fly in the face of those prohibitions. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is doing just this, not only in the case of these new policies but in the other instances I have cited. Bureaucrats, armed with only whatever authority we give them, are proceeding against school authorities with no backing at all from the law they cite.

You know and I know, Mr. Speaker, that many school systems in the United States are accepting so much so-called assistance from the Federal Government that they cannot now refuse to do anything the Federal Government tells them to do whether the authority to order them exists or not. Local schools are tied to the Federal Government with an umbilical cord made of piano wire.

It is a cliche, I know, but the Federal fiddler is demanding his pay, but in this instance and others like it, he is demanding pay for tunes he did not play.

Too many Members of this body have gone along with these fishing expeditions on the blithe assumption that they would happen only in the South and the South makes a good whipping boy. To those Members and anyone else who has had this attitude, I would say that the bell is tolling and it is tolling for every school official and every schoolhouse in the Nation.

I urge every Member to obtain from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a copy of their "Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964" and read it. You will find, as I have, that it is autocratic in spirit and tone, demanding in every detail and a pure study in the abuse of Federal power. You will find that the tone is: "You will obey. You will submit. Or else." This was not the intent of our legislation. This is not the language of it. What HEW is demanding is clearly in violation of the law as we wrote it and whatever action we have to take to set that Department straight, we should take and take at once.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McClory (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the balance of the week, on account of official business, as U.S. delegate to the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

Mr. Cunningham (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Adair (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the balance of the week, on account of official business, as U.S. delegate to the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

Mr. Pirnie (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the balance of the week, on account of official business, as U.S. delegate to the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

Mr. Derwinski (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the balance of the week, on account of official business, as U.S. delegate to the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

Mr. Grider, for April 7, on account of official duties.

Mr. Farbstein (at the request of Mr. Hanley), for Wednesday, April 6, 1966, on account of Jewish holiday.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Kornegay (at the request of Mr. Steed), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Clarence J. Brown, Jr., and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. Halpern, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Poff, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Ashbrook, for 45 minutes, today.

Mr. Pelly, for 20 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. Cahill, for 20 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gonzalez) to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Farbstein, for 10 minutes, on April 7.

Mr. McDowell, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Waggonner, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Corbett.

(The following Members (at the request of Clarence J. Brown, Jr.) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. Bray.

Mr. Morton.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gonzalez) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Kluczynski.

Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Grider.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mrs. Kelly.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1717. An act to provide for the registration of names assumed for the purposes of trade or business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 22. An act to promote a more adequate national program of water research;

S. 1049. An act to provide relief for the heirs and devises of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees;

S. 2642. An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes; and

S. 2835. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 959. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 2939. An act for the relief of Manojlo Verzich;

H.R. 3875. An act for the relief of Mrs. Panagiota Vastakis and Soteros Vastakis;

H.R. 4743. An act for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid;

H.R. 6112. An act for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park);

H.R. 7813. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to China;

H.R. 8466. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of insurance premium finance companies in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Ki Sook Jun; and

H.J. Res. 837. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Bond Week."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3349. An act for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; and

H.R. 8647. An act for the relief of the Troubadors Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 7, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2276. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to restrict further the use of customers' funds by commodity futures commission merchants, to authorize further the regulation of records of contract markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2277. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title V of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2278. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal language authorizing additional compensation for the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia for serving as General Counsel to the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2279. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to make certain technical changes, to provide for survivor benefits to children ages 18 to 21, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2280. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the seventh annual report of the Agency, covering fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2281. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 709, United States Code, so as to protect the name of the Central Intelligence Agency from exploitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1420. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 14312. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 14313. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the leasing by local governmental units of certain industrial and commercial facilities for private profit-making purposes at rentals below their fair rental value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 14314. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 14315. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the Arkansas River Basin compact, Kansas-Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 14316. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended to remove the limitation on the authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue bonds to finance its power program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 14317. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14318. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 14320. A bill to amend section 212(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 14321. A bill to provide that blind persons may not be refused admission to housing financed in any way with Federal funds by reason of their possession of seeing-eye or other guide dogs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14322. A bill to permit all patients currently using the drug Krebiozen to purchase same in Illinois or elsewhere for use in any State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 14323. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to reduce the amount of matching funds required from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 14324. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 14325. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that women who are 62 years of age or over and are eligible for cash social security (or railroad retirement) benefits shall also be eligible for hospital insurance benefits (and supplementary medical insurance benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 14326. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 14327. A bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia; to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14328. A bill to provide standards for humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States and to encourage the study and improvement of care and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of animals used for such purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14329. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 14330. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REDLIN.

H.R. 14331. A bill to provide a comprehensive program to combat alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 14332. A bill to amend the act of October 10, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes," so as to control all types of illegal transportation of cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 14333. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 14334. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant patents to certain lands under the provisions of the Color of Title Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 14335. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the Arkansas River Basin compact, Kansas-Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 14336. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 14337. A bill to provide for the appointment of postmasters by the Postmaster General on the basis of merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 14338. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 14339. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant patents to certain lands under the provisions of the Color of Title Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 14340. A bill to provide a program of pollution control and abatement in selected river basins of the United States through comprehensive planning and financial assistance, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 14341. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to provide for programs of job training and education of inmates of correctional institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 14342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the application of the investment credit to property used in possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 14343. A bill to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 14344. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax the first $5,000 of the annual income of a totally disabled veteran; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 14345. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14346. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide hull insurance for commercial fishing vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 14347. A bill to liberalize the provisions for payment to parents and children of dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 14348. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to provide temporary assistance where public school buildings are destroyed by natural causes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 14349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of an individual's wages, salary, or other income shall be exempt from levy to enforce the payment of Federal taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 14350. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 14351. A bill to establish in the U.S. Capitol an educational center whose sole purpose will be the fostering of greater knowledge, interest, understanding, and inspiration of the significance and meaning of American history that was made in the Capitol of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 14352. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 14353. A bill to provide that disabled individuals entitled to monthly cash benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act, and individuals retired for disability under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14354. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to give to employers and performers in the performing arts the same rights given by section 8(f) of such act to employers and employees in the construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 14355. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to make certain technical changes, to provide for survivor benefits to children ages 18 to 21, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 14356. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax relief for certain persons whose real property is taken from them by condemnation or who are forced to dispose of such property because of the imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 14357. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of employees of local boards and appeal boards within the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 14358. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON (by request):

H.R. 14359. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 14360. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of community programs for patients with kidney disease and for conduct of training related to such programs, and other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14361. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 14362. A bill to improve intergovernmental relations and Government operations by assisting the States to carry out on a continuing basis in-service training programs for officers and employees of State and local governments with a view to increasing efficiency and economy in the operations of State and local governments, including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States, and encouraging the highest standards of performance in the transaction of the public business; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 14363. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide rules relating to the deduction for personal exemptions with respect to the children of divorced parents and to make related amendments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 14364. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to repeal the existing limit on the grant funds which may be used thereunder in any one State, and to provide for a more effective apportionment of such funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14365. A bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia; to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14366. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14367. A bill for the establishment of a Civilian Aviation Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14368. A bill to protect consumers, homebuilders, building material suppliers, lumber manufacturers, and others against false grade marking of lumber, to promote interstate commerce in lumber, to strengthen the standards program of the lumber industry, and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14369. A bill providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14370. A bill to strengthen the financial condition of the employees' life insurance fund created by the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to provide certain adjustments in amounts of group life and group accidental death and dismemberment insurance under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14371. A bill to increase the rate of pension payable to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, their widows, and certain other dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14372. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14373. A bill to increase the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 14374. A bill to provide that the withholding allowance for itemized income tax deductions, as enacted by the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, shall take effect on May 1, 1966, the same as the graduated withholding of income tax enacted by such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 14375. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway in the State of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.J. Res. 1038. Joint resolution to require that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 1039. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.J. Res. 1040. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 1041. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 1042. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.J. Res. 1043. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.J. Res. 1044. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.J. Res. 1045. Joint resolution providing for a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.J. Res. 1046. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.J. Res. 1047. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 1048. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.J. Res. 1049. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 1050. Joint resolution making the day on which electors of President and Vice President are chosen a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.J. Res. 1051. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize Congress to limit the power of the courts of the United States to determine that statutes of the United States or of any State are repugnant to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 1052. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOW:

H.J. Res. 1053. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 1054. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.J. Res. 1055. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 1056. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.J. Res. 1057. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.J. Res. 1058. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation for the commemoration and observance of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 626. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Department of State and the Central Intelligence Agency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 627. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Congressional Standards and Ethics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 816. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Basic Human Rights and Peaceful World Order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

445. By the SPEAKER; a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the merger of the Reserve Forces of the armed services into the National Guard units of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

446. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the construction by the Federal Government of the proposed Bradley Lake hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 14376. A bill for the relief of Francisco Acosta-Duarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 14377. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 14378. A bill for the relief of Jose Maya-Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 14379. A bill for the relief of John R. McKinney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 14380. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 14381. A bill for the relief of Rolando de Aguiar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 14382. A bill for the relief of Donald James De Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14383. A bill for the relief of Dong Son Kim, his wife, Hyun So Kim, and their minor children, Jung Yul Kim, Bong Kil Kim, and Mae Young Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14384. A bill for the relief of Herman Hyman Sanderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14385. A bill for the relief of Moy Woon Man; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14386. A bill for the relief of Franca Zazzera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 14387. A bill for the relief of Zereda Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 14388. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain articles for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 1966

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 5, 1966)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Henry J. von Schlichten, B.D., Th. M., minister, Lutheran Church of Our Savior, Port Washington, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O God, the wisdom and strength of all who put their trust in Thee: grant unto these Thy servants, Members of the U.S. Senate, an abundance of understanding and courage that they may do that which is pleasing in Thy sight rather than that which is expedient in the eyes of men.

Together with our President and all others in authority, may they earnestly strive for peace and prosperity, liberty and justice for all.

Remove from among us all distrust, prejudice, and violence which would divide and weaken our Nation.

Fill the hearts of our people with a spirit of willing obedience that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in godliness and honesty.

Grant that, as Thy children, we may live and work together in peace and harmony for our own welfare, for the prosperity of our Nation, and for the betterment of the world. In Jesus' name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 5, 1966, was dispensed with.

DEATH OF LESLIE BIFFLE, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is with deep sadness and personal grief that I announce the death of one of the most distinguished and able former officials of this body.

The Honorable Leslie L. Biffle, who served the Senate so faithfully for many years in a number of responsible positions, including that of Secretary, passed away at 1:25 o'clock a.m., today at the Mar-Salle Convalescent Home in the city of Washington, following a lengthy illness which had incapacitated him for the past several months.

Mr. President, Mr. Biffle was a native of the State that I have the honor to represent. He was born in Boydsville, Ark., on October 9, 1889. He was educated at the Piggott, Ark., High School, and Keys Business Institute, Little Rock, Ark. He received an honorary LL.D. degree from Dartmouth College.

Mr. Biffle first came to Washington as secretary to Representative Bruce Macon, of Arkansas, in 1909. In 1913, the late Senator Joseph Robinson gave him a patronage job in the Senate folding room. Mr. Biffle stayed there for several years, except for a tour as a War Department auditor in France during World War I. He held various jobs in the Senate until 1933, when he became secretary for the majority. Mr. Biffle held this position until February 8, 1945, when he was unanimously elected Secretary.

In 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission, in which capacity he served until 1945.

At the 1944 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, he was elected acting sergeant at arms. When he became Secretary of the Senate, he also assumed the duties as secretary-treasurer of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, as well as sergeant at arms of the Democratic National Committee.

On January 3, 1949, Mr. Biffle was again unanimously elected Secretary of the Senate, at the beginning of the 81st Congress. He served in this capacity until he was succeeded, on January 3, 1953, by Mr. J. Mark Trice.

Mr. Biffle gained nationwide fame in 1948 when, disguised as a chicken farmer, he toured the Nation while conducting his own private poll as to political sentiments. His travels enabled him to correctly forecast the election of President Truman that year, even though every professional pollster predicted that Thomas E. Dewey would win by a large majority and, at the same time, lead the Republican Party to control of Congress.

The relationship which existed between Mr. Biffle and President Truman was extremely close. In fact, he was the first Secretary of the Senate ever to have a direct line between his office and the White House.

In 1952, while inspecting the Senate Library, which was under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Senate, he found approximately 100 historical manuscripts which had gone unnoticed for many years. The discovery included messages and other items—mostly routine matters such as nominations—signed by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Daniel Webster, John Adams, Zachary Taylor, and others. One was the nomination of John Marshall to be Secretary of War. Another was one of June 17, 1797, reporting on American tribute paid the Bey of Tripoli at a time when the Barbary Pirates were sailing from Tripoli to prey on American commerce. The tribute was extended in the hope of buying off the pirates.

While it is not uncommon for the Secretary of the Senate to preside on occasion during Senate sessions, Mr. Biffle was the first Secretary of the Senate in history to preside for a period extending 2 days. He did so at the beginning of the 80th Congress when a dispute over Senator Bilbo's taking his seat held up the election of a new President pro tempore.

After retiring as Secretary of the Senate, in January of 1953, Mr. Biffle became a public relations consultant, maintaining his offices in downtown Washington.

Besides Mr. Biffle's widow, Glade, who resides at the Westchester Apartments, 4000 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., survivors include two sisters, Mrs. Charles Clark Hillman and Mrs. Blanche Sanders, both of Miami, Fla., and a nephew, Mr. Billy B. Sanders of Miami. Mr. Biffle was a Methodist and a Mason.

I had no better friend in this Nation's Capital than Leslie Biffle.

I am and shall always be eternally grateful to him for his many kindnesses to me. I often sought his counsel. When I first came to the Senate, I asked his advice and guidance on many problems which arose and was the beneficiary of much valuable assistance which he gave me. His counsel enabled me more effectively to meet and discharge my responsibilities as a Senator.

Everyone who knew Leslie Biffle appreciated his fine qualities, his gentleness, his understanding, and his loyalty, as well as his devotion to his work, to his friends, and to his country. He was the friend of all of us. I never heard anyone, any Member on either side of the aisle, speak unkindly of him.

Everyone praised and esteemed him.

He was a dedicated servant of this body. He was a true patriot and one of America's finest citizens.

He was my dear friend. He loved and was beloved by his fellow man.

Mrs. McClellan joins me in extending to his widow, Mrs. Glade Biffle, and his other relatives, our deepest sympathy and our prayers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly wish to join my colleague in tribute to Leslie Biffle. When I first came to the Senate he was one of the most active men as secretary of the majority. He was my friend and a help to all new Senators. Some of the most pleasant memories I have of my service in the Senate are those associated with the most thoughtful and cordial assistance he extended to me during those early years.

He was a great friend of Alben Barkley. I remember so well discussions, which were very informative and educational, that we had during those early years in the Senate.

It is with deep sadness that my wife and I note the passing of Leslie Biffle. I often visited with him in Piggott, where he was the first citizen there. I know that all people who knew him personally will share our grief in Les Biffle's passing. We express our deepest sympathy to his widow.

I had prepared a short statement expressing my sorrow about Les Biffle's death before I came to the Senate floor and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

It was with a heavy heart that I learned this morning from Skeeter Johnston of the death of another former and beloved Secretary of the Senate, Leslie L. Biffle.

Les was a native of Arkansas, but, during his service to the Senate of the United States, he was known, admired, and respected by Members of this body from every State in the Union.

Les Biffle served the people of Arkansas and the Nation in a career spanning almost 44 years dating from the day he was first appointed as secretary to Representative Bruce Mason of Arkansas, in 1909.

He was elected secretary to the Democratic majority in 1933; was elected Secretary of the Senate in 1945, in 1949, in 1951, and left the Senate in 1953.

The wise counsel and guidance Les Biffle gave to many of us in the Congress in our early days was invaluable. His respect and reverence for the Senate as an institution of our Government was unmatched, and it is because of dedicated and loyal persons personified by Les Biffle that our free democratic institutions can function. We will all miss Les Biffle, but we can all take consolation in the fact that he led a full and complete life. He was called to serve and he served well and ably, and he deserves any tribute we can pay him. To the people of Piggott, Ark., his home, to his wife Mary Glade, and to the other members of his family who survive him, I extend the sympathy of my wife Betty and myself. We shall always hold Les Biffle's memory dear to our hearts.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, my day started off very sadly this morning when I was informed of the death of my good friend, Leslie Biffle.

All of us knew that Les had been very ill for quite some time, but even with this knowledge his death came as a real shock because of our close friendship with him.

Few men have served in the Halls of this building and in this Chamber with the devotion and dedication Leslie Biffle had for his Government and for his Nation.

I came to know Leslie Biffle when he was Secretary of the Senate during President Roosevelt's administration, and from my first meeting with him I came to admire and respect him until his death. He served his Nation without fear, and although he was first, last, and always a Democrat, his country came ahead of everything else. For this reason he held the respect and admiration of all those who knew him, regardless of political party affiliation.

Those of us who knew him have lost a great friend and the country has lost a great patriot.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. HILL. I want to join the distinguished Senator from Arkansas in the beautiful tribute he has paid to Leslie Biffle. It was with great sadness that I learned today of the death of Leslie Biffle. He was my dear friend through the years. He helped me in so many ways and did so much for me.

There was no sweeter, finer character than Leslie Biffle. He was always so wise, so understanding, and so effective. He did so much to promote and strengthen the services of the Senate to our country. Leslie Biffle was indeed a most able and distinguished American. No man could have served our country with greater dedication or with finer service to this body.

I join in the expression of our deep sympathy to his lovely wife, Mrs. Glade Biffle, and pay my heartfelt tribute to this noble American.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am saddened, as I know many Senators, present and former, are saddened, by the death of Leslie Biffle, who had been ill so long, following a long period of service to the Senate. I know of no one who served as Secretary for so long as he did who showed greater respect for the institution of the Senate and its traditions. He was a friend and helper of every new Member. Secretary Biffle always helped break the ice of the unknown in the Senate and helped one into full-fledged membership in this body.

Probably there was no better forecaster of what the the Senate would do than Leslie Biffle, who understood deeply the sentiments of Members in legislative matters. He understood the political sentiments of the Members in legislative matters as a result of experience and observation of many years.

He was a beloved friend not only of many who had the privilege of working with him, but he was a friend and helper of many Presidents. We extend our sympathy to Mrs. Glade Biffle in her great loss.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suppose one could go from ocean to ocean, from the Dominion of Canada to the gulf, and he would not find another who was as effective and able and at the same time as self-effacing as Leslie Biffle. He served Members on both sides of the aisle.

If I had to search for a word to characterize his entire life, I think I could find no better word than "fidelity," because he had a fidelity to his friends, a fidelity to his country and to his party and, at the same time, he never let the fear of partisanship prevent him from being helpful to every Member of the Senate, regardless of his party affiliation.

I join our colleagues in expressing sadness at his passing and extending sympathy to Mrs. Biffle in her loss.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, of the many nonsenatorial, staff positions in this body, none is more important or more difficult than that of Secretary of the Senate. To the occupant of that high office falls the task of coordinating the activities of dozens of key employees and seeing that all phases of the legislative paperwork gets done correctly and efficiently.

The Senate has been particularly fortunate over the years to have had in this important post men of the highest caliber. One of the truly outstanding Secretaries of the Senate was Leslie L. Biffle, who held the post—with one interruption—from February 1945 to January 1951. The Senate, therefore, notes with sadness the death early this morning of Les Biffle, and with it, the end of a colorful career.

Coincidentally, Les Biffle's term as Secretary ended as I was being sworn into the 83d Congress. But I had known him, and had valued his friendship, long before that time. Indeed, the entire Nation, and particularly the Democratic Party, was aware of this outstanding public servant. Starting from humble beginnings as a staff assistant in the House of Representatives in 1909, Les Biffle switched to the Senate side and moved rapidly up the ladder to secretary for the majority in 1933. While in that post, he performed a variety of services for his party and for President Roosevelt. When he became Secretary of the Senate in 1945—elected unanimously, I might add—he continued to perform important functions for the Democratic Party. In addition to being secretary-treasurer of the Democrats' senatorial campaign committee, he served as sergeant-at-arms of the Democratic National Committee.

His term as Secretary of the Senate was interrupted during the Republican-controlled 80th Congress. The interlude permitted him to undertake the now famous "chicken farmer poll" on the reelection chances of President Harry Truman. Disguised as a chicken farmer, Les Biffle toured the country sampling political opinions—and correctly predicted President Truman's subsequent victory.

After his tour of duty in 1953, he retired. Since then, he had been a business consultant here in Washington.

Mr. President, those of us who had the privilege of knowing this fine public servant are indeed sorry to learn of his passing. He performed his many tasks conscientiously and well, and he left a record as Secretary of the Senate to which his successors can aspire. Mrs. Mansfield and I extend our heartfelt sympathies to his wife in her hour of loss.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I was privileged to meet Mr. Leslie Biffle before I reached the double numbers. Mr. and Mrs. Leslie Biffle were close friends of my late father. On many occasions we visited at Oakington on the Chesapeake Bay. I would say one of his distinguishing characteristics was his gentleness and his complete warmth of friendship.

I can recall an occasion when I was a sophomore in high school. My sister was 4 years younger. My father and mother had promised to take us on a vacation to Bermuda with the Biffles. At the last minute my father and mother could not go. Mr. and Mrs. Biffle undertook to take care of both my sister and me, which was no easy job in those days, without a murmur.

I can remember later when I was in the Maryland Legislature. No matter was too trivial for Mr. Biffle to give me the benefit of his advice and counsel, even when he had great matters of importance to the world and the Nation with which to be concerned.

I can recall an instance when I, as a member of Maryland's Young Democrats, could not get into the Democratic Convention in Chicago. This was after my father had retired. I remember Mr. Biffle took the time, effort, and trouble to get jobs as assistant doorkeepers at the Democratic Convention for me and three other young Democrats.

He, indeed, was a great man because one of the characteristics of greatness, I think, is humility and a readiness to help those who perhaps one need not help, when one is in a position to help, where the ordinary person would not.

I am deeply saddened, as are my mother and family, with the tragic passing of Mr. Biffle.

I take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and other Senators who have commented on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Leslie Biffle was a friend. When I first came to the Senate, he was gracious and helpful. Often he invited me to his office to visit with him and lunch with him.

He was proud of his position as the Secretary of this body. While he was partisan, he never was so partisan as to be personal. He knew the value of the Senate as an institution. He recognized its Members as friends.

My friendship with him was one for life. I shall miss him and his pleasant, friendly smile and his graciousness. I shall always remember those qualities which he possessed.

Mr. President, we shall all consider Leslie Biffle as a member of this body of whom we were proud.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened to learn this morning of the passing of Leslie Biffle. He was one of the first persons I came to know when I first came to the Senate 21 years ago. No one was more helpful to me than he, even though I am a Republican and he a Democrat.

At times when I would be at my home in North Dakota, I would call him for information, assistance, and advice. I do not know of any servant of the Senate who was more respected than he was. He was a kind and friendly person. We shall miss him deeply. He was one of the best friends I ever had.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and his family.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Leslie Biffle was a gentle person. Leslie Biffle, in the truest sense, was a servant of the Members of the Senate. Leslie Biffle, in the highest sense, was a fine American.

It was my privilege as a Member of the House of Representatives to cherish the friendship of Leslie Biffle before I shared membership in this body. It continued here.

Mrs. Randolph and I enjoyed a personal friendship with the Biffles. His widow, Mary Glade Strickling, is a West Virginian, and we had the opportunity to be with them very often. Les also came into our hills and people liked him greatly.

The Senate, as an institution, will remember the character of his service here. He was a counselor of Senators. His help was cheerfully given as he quietly, yet effectively, carried on his duties. Members, including the Senator from West Virginia who now expresses tribute, will remember him as a good and generous aid.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join with Senators in expressing my grief at the death of Leslie Biffle and my word of appreciation for him and the tremendous service he has rendered this body during the years he served here.

Leslie Biffle was one of the most efficient, effective, and helpful persons that I ever knew. He made a very fine Secretary of the Senate, and he served in other capacities. He always did his work well. I regret his passing.

We, of course, have missed him since he has been away from the Senate and we shall miss him even more. Mrs. Sparkman and I wish to extend our sympathy to his widow.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, the news of the death of Leslie Biffle brought to me a deep sense of personal sadness.

It was my pleasure to have been associated with him from the time he served as secretary to the majority until the time he ceased his services to the Senate of the United States.

I shall always treasure many very pleasant memories of our association.

Mr. President, despite his apparent and real humility, few men have ever been as valuable servants to the Senate of the United States as Leslie Biffle. He believed in the Senate. He was dedicated to his work. He was the confidant of Senators on both sides of the aisle. He was the confidant of Presidents and high officials in the executive branch of the Government.

I doubt that any man in this present era has known more of the secrets of official Washington and has preserved them as inviolate as did Leslie L. Biffle.

Leslie Biffle had been ill for a long time. He suffered greatly. He deserved well at the hands of the people of this country that he served so well.

I shall always treasure the memories of the many kindnesses that he extended to me, and one of them in particular that was way beyond and above any call of his duty as Secretary of the Senate.

I extend my most profound sympathy to all members of his family.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to take just a moment to join with those who have heretofore paid tribute to Les Biffle. He was truly one of the great public servants of this Nation.

I first knew him in 1933, when I was fortunate enough to secure employment running an elevator on the Senate side of the Capitol. A few months thereafter, I came to know him better when working out of the Sergeant at Arm's office, at a time when he was the secretary to the majority. Our acquaintance and friendship ripened during the 32 years intervening.

Les Biffle was one of the warmest friends I ever had, and one of the most helpful. I know of the problems that he has had in the last several months, and wish to extend to his widow, on behalf of Mrs. Bible and myself, our deepest sympathy.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 5, 1966,

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported favorably, with amendments, on April 5, 1966, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 149) to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people, and submitted a report (No. 1101) thereon, which was printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, withdrawing a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1049) to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H.R. 2752. An act for the relief of Kock Kong Fong;

H.R. 2938. An act for the relief of Przemyslaw Nowakowski;

H.R. 2939. An act for the relief of Manojlo Verzich;

H.R. 3875. An act for the relief of Mrs. Panagiota Vastakis and Soteros Vastakis;

H.R. 4743. An act for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid;

H.R. 6112. An act for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park); and

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Ki Sook Jun.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7813) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 139. An act to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland;

H.R. 10357. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Secret Service;

H.R. 10476. An act to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell Institute;

H.R. 13365. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13369. An act to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13371. An act to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13578. An act to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13580. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13663. An act to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile; and

H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 597. Concurrent resolution relating to the Centennial Year of Prospect Park of the city of New York, Borough of Brooklyn; and

H. Con. Res. 625. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile;

S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes;

S. 2719. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia; and

S. 2831. An act to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 139. An act to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland; and

H.R. 10357. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Secret Service; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10476. An act to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell Institute; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13365. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13369. An act to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13371. An act to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13578. An act to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13580. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 13663. An act to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people; placed on the calendar.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 597) relating to the centennial year of Prospect Park of the city of New York, Borough of Brooklyn, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, withdrawing the nomination of Wayne A. Wray, to be postmaster at Barnes, Kans.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. RIBICOFF, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966—COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 220) to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 transmitted to the Congress by the President on February 10, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, it is ordered that the Senate proceed to vote on Senate Resolution 220, to disapprove

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, at 12 o'clock noon, Wednesday, April 6, 1966, and that the hour between 11 o'clock a.m. and the vote be equally divided, and controlled by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], respectively.

Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged equally to the two sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, without setting a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be considered as ordered on the pending resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, the situation with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 1 is rather unique, because the original intent of the Congress was very clearly to make the Community Relations Service an independent agency. Now the claim is made that the passage of time requires a change. Therefore I believe, in all fairness, that the burden is on those who assert that there should be a change, as the legislative intent is very clear.

By way of introduction, Mr. President, there are some very interesting factors involved in the proposed transfer and the pending resolution of disapproval.

For one, the civil rights groups, were originally very much opposed to the proposed transfer, but many of them—though they are by no means unanimous—now say that they are for it. Interestingly enough, a number of conferences have taken place at the White House involving these individuals and groups; and apparently this is what has brought about a change of mind.

It is also interesting to me that if Congress refuses to go along with the President, Congress will in this case be acting independently and using its own judgment, as I believe it should.

Another interesting factor is that there are joined in the objections to the proposed transfer Senators who have been strong in favor of civil rights legislation and Senators who have been equally strong in favor of civil rights legislation, and have in fact been some of its most ardent defenders on this floor. And the reason, Mr. President, is very interesting. The reason is that the Community Relations Service is an instrument which was intended to accomplish exactly that purpose. The Community Relations Service was designed for the purpose, essentially, of conciliation and mediation, and therefore was intended to enlist the interest and the support both of those who were against and those who were for the civil rights laws.

It seems to me that the most clear confirmation of the rightness of what this resolution, of which I am the author, seeks to do, is the very fact that the strong opponents of the civil rights laws, as well as the strong proponents of the civil rights laws, favor keeping the Service where it is.

Mr. President, it seems to me that, first and foremost, we should consider the administrative aspects involved.

What is wrong with keeping the Service in the Department of Commerce? Why should it go to the Department of Justice? The reason for the reorganization plan, as explained to us by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], is that the President has given Attorney General Katzenbach the authority to coordinate all civil rights matters and, therefore, in order to coordinate effectively he must have the Community Relations Service in his office.

Well, Mr. President, if that be true, then the Attorney General should have in his office every agency which he coordinates. He does coordinate the Community Relations Service now. Indeed, the testimony is that he coordinates it with great success. The Attorney General states that it has worked out fine, and so do the persons who head the Community Relations Service, notwithstanding the fact that the Community Relations Service is not in the Attorney General's department.

(At this point Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Attorney General also coordinates the activities of the Federal Government under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which deals with the cutting off of Federal funds from Federal-State programs where there is discrimination.

By that standard, then, if the Attorney General needs in his office every agency that he coordinates, then he should have every department of Government in his office, because practically every department of Government is concerned in title VI.

Accordingly, I believe that argument to be invalid. The essential aspects of it are that for all practical purposes, the Community Relations Service is in the Department of Commerce only as a matter of administrative convenience. The testimony clearly indicates that it operates independently and that the Department of Commerce does not have much more to do with it than housing it.

The Attorney General coordinates with the Service and it has worked very well, so far, in every way.

What is the reason for the change; and will the change be prejudicial?

I have pointed out that the idea of making the change because it requires closer coordination is invalid, for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. President, will the change hurt?

The main point of my argument today is that the change will affirmatively hurt. The key to that broad argument is contained in the concept of the difference between a pattern of conflict in civil rights and a case in which there is a conflict in civil rights.

In other words, where we are dealing with an effort to cope with the problems of a community in trouble, there we have a pattern that may long precede a case.

Indeed, there may be no case, but it is, nonetheless, a situation to which the Community Relations Service must address itself, in order to avoid tensions which could break out in violence, or in other ways; whereas the job of the Attorney General is the job of dealing with a case.

Mr. President, there is very strong support in the RECORD for the statement I have just made. For example, on page 63 of the hearings there will be found the letter of the Director of Federal Programs Division of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission which, incidentally, is independent and which operates that way and is not in the Department of Justice.

The letter states as follows:

> The term "conciliation" as used in the State legislation is applied to a situation somewhat different from that of interest to the Federal Community Relations Service. Conciliation in the former context is primarily a first step in the resolution of a complaint—thus, it is directed at the resolution of the problems presented in individual cases. On the other hand, seldom is Community Relations Service concerned with the investigation or the resolution of an individual case, but rather it is concerned with patterns of conflict.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that when this idea was first broached to us, which goes back to President Kennedy's proposals in the 1960's, it was broached as an independent agency. Indeed, the great point was made that it should be independent, that it should not—specifically not—be in the Department of Justice.

In that respect, I refer to the quotation which will be found on page 11 of the hearings in which President Kennedy stated, in sending us a message on civil rights, as follows:

> The problem has grown beyond the time and energies which a few otherwise burdened officials can make available—and, in some areas, the confidence of all will be greater in an intermediary whose duties are completely separated from departmental functions of investigation or litigation.

Then, just to buttress the point, he went on as follows:

> It is my intention, therefore, to establish by Executive order (until such time as it can be created by statute) an independent Community Relations Service.

My colleague, Senator KENNEDY, of New York, who was Attorney General of the United States at that time, went on to say in respect to this matter—

> The administration's efforts will continue. But they cannot adequately substitute for the work of a regularly constituted organization which could devote its full energies to mediation in seriously troubled areas.

Mr. President, the Blue Book, which was issued by the Department of Justice in February 1964, as an aid to the Senate floor managers of the 1964 civil rights bill makes this statement—and this is the Department of Justice:

> However, it is apparent that neither the Department of Justice nor any other existing Government organization can accomplish what is needed in the field of mediation.

Thus, first, it was very clear that the Community Relations Service was to be an independent agency, and no reason has been advanced to change it.

Second, there is a substantive difference between the question of dealing with patterns of conflict and the problem of dealing with individual cases, which clearly distinguishes the Community Relations Service from the work of the Department of Justice.

Third, the Department of Justice itself asserted in that memo that the Community Relations Service should not be—I emphasize not—be in the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, two final facts are, in my judgment, extremely important.

The Attorney General himself admits that this transfer will invalidate a section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; namely, section 204(d), which expressly gives the Community Relations Service conciliation authority in a case in which the Attorney General is suing.

How the Attorney General can prosecute with his left hand and conciliate with his right hand is impossible to understand.

It is very clear that he personally admits it is very unlikely that the authority given to the Community Relations Service by section 204(d) can really be used.

I should like to read his testimony.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Attorney General had intervened in such a case, the Attorney General himself stated at page 43 of the record:

> Despite separation in the Department of Justice, it (sec. 204(d)) would cause some difficulty.

Mr. President, actually, there have been very few cases in which the Community Relations Service has had this matter referred to it; but, few cases or not, the intent of Congress that it be an independent agency and that it shall function as a conciliator in public accommodations cases, under section 204(d), will have been thwarted and nullified by this transfer.

Finally, and the most crushing point, is the issue of confidentiality.

On this point, I respectfully submit that the administration's case absolutely falls to pieces.

Congress was extremely careful to provide three tests in this area. One, that the information which the Community Relations Service obtained would be confidential. The word "confidential" is not my word. It actually appears in the statute.

The second test is that it shall be held in confidence and not made public.

The third test is that no employee of the Community Relations Service should engage in any activities of prosecution.

Now, the theory is that the Community Relations Service could then go into communities and inspire confidence, to have people come and talk freely—and this is the essence of its work.

But no matter what the technical legality may be—and the Attorney General made some argument on that, and I have little doubt that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] will also do so as well—the reality of the situation will be that if it is transferred, the Community Relations Service will have lost one of its primary and necessary attributes—neutrality in the minds of the people with whom it must deal.

Mr. President, on that point, the evidence comes directly from Attorney General Katzenbach.

I refer to page 36 of the record, which shows that I asked him as follows:

> Senator JAVITS. Mr. Attorney General, if you were a business executive and a man sent his card in and said, "I am from the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice. Tell me everything you know in confidence" how would you feel about it?
>
> Attorney General KATZENBACH. I would think they had employed an idiot in that Service. I would think anybody that came in and said, "Tell me everything you know in confidence" would not be a very sensible way to approach it.

That is the whole ball game. The fact is, if one comes in from the Department of Justice, he comes in as the representative prosecuting agency in antitrust, civil rights, and tax matters. No businessman, and certainly no man who harbors prejudice himself, is going to talk as freely as he would to a conciliating agency, when he is assured that what he might say will be taken in confidence.

Whatever ambitious tautology the Attorney General may try to spin out, to wit, that there can be disclosure from the Internal Revenue Service, et cetera, the fact is that these are matters which will not be given in confidence. The Attorney General would destroy with the left hand what he receives with his right hand. I think the transfer would destroy—and I say this advisedly—the Community Relations Serivces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

And we need to continue this useful service in dealing with discrimination and prejudice and the areas covered under the Civil Rights Act.

Unparalleled efforts from high places have been made to lobby Senators to defeat this resolution. It is an indication that when a bureaucracy wants something, it will fight like a tiger to get it, whether it is right or wrong. I believe it is wrong. It would be a salutary and refreshing exercise for us to indicate to the Presidency and the bureaucracy that we look at these things independently as Congress should, that we are willing to act on our own, and do what we think is right. It seems to me that is basic to the proposition before us.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

On February 10, 1966, the President of the United States sent to Congress a reorganization plan which would transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice. This transfer was proposed as one of several measures designed to strengthen the effectiveness of our civil rights programs.

I see no compelling reason to oppose this transfer. Indeed, in the light of changing conditions there is ample justification for any step designed to simplify and clarify executive branch responsibilities in this vital area.

When Congress established the Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce under title X of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, it was widely assumed that there would be a most urgent need for conciliation efforts arising from the public accommodations title of the act. There was some logic to support the contention then that a Government agency whose principal activity would be dealing with businessmen should be located in the Department of Commerce.

We should all be grateful that the need for this kind of conciliation was largely removed because of a ground swell of voluntary compliance. Concern over compliance with the public accommodations section of the bill has now given way to an awareness that civil rights difficulties in a given community usually involve a broad range of interlocking discriminatory problems, including voter registration, fair employment practices by both private and public entities, de facto school segregation or housing discrimination, police-community relations, and inadequate law enforcement.

I find it difficult to comprehend why the Commerce Department should continue to be regarded as the logical home for conciliation activities in these varied areas. The statutory functions of the Department of Commerce are to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, the manufacturing and shipping industries, and the transportation facilities of the United States.

Never before, to my knowledge, has the Department of Commerce been called upon to extend its activities into such a subtle and vital aspect of human affairs. And why should it? Why should a Federal department which has traditionally been associated with the promotion of trade and transportation, which has housed the Census Bureau, the Patent Office, and the Bureau of Public Roads—why should such a Federal department as this be forever regarded as the natural repository of the deep problem of civil rights?

It would be encouraging to find that the deep effects of discrimination and racial inequality could be removed from this Nation with the simple issuance of a departmental bulletin. Unfortunately, the cause of true justice has been best served by the complementary forces of suasion and sanction.

This has been true in the past, and promises to be increasingly true in the future. And if we are to gain the fullest measure of benefit from this complementary relationship, then suasion and sanction should properly be brought together under the direction of the one Cabinet officer most deeply, most intimately, and most continually involved in matters relating to civil rights.

If anyone wished to argue that the Attorney General should not be given the responsibilities he now bears with respect to this vital area of our national life, then the time to make himself heard was in 1964. The Congress, in its wisdom, has chosen to require that the Attorney General seek voluntary compliance with civil rights legislation. It has gone so far as to authorize the Attorney General to use grants-in-aid to assist State and local authorities to improve their efforts in the sensitive area of police-community relations.

Why should the Congress hesitate to give the Attorney General the expert and experienced staff resources of the Community Relations Service to help him fulfill his demanding responsibilities?

We have been assured by the Director of the Community Relations Service, a man who has been actively engaged in the front-line struggle for equal rights, that this proposed transfer can only serve to enhance a de facto coalition of effort that exists, of necessity, between Justice Department and CRS workers in the field.

The working relationship which has proved successful in dozens of smaller communities in the South will increasingly be tested in other larger towns and cities across the Nation. The expanding range of CRS activities, including those in northern urban centers, inevitably demands the closest possible harmony between the Community Relations Service and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

I am speaking here of harmony in the fullest sense—not merely an absence of friction, not merely keeping out of one another's way—but a blending together of efforts to seek a compassionate resolution of problems without recourse to enforcement procedures. The Department of Justice is not simply the prosecuting arm of the Federal Government. As the Attorney General has said:

> It has always been the function of the law and the good lawyer to keep tempers down, to find satisfactory agreement and to settle cases, wherever possible, out of court.

One can argue that the Attorney General needs the Community Relations Service to provide himself with the broadest kind of conciliatory capacity. He needs it to deal with problems that cannot be met with law enforcement and yet are intimately tied up with his responsibility to further the cause of civil rights.

And the Community Relations Service needs the Attorney General. CRS is uniquely suited to serve as a catalyzing agent in bringing a broad range of Federal programs to bear on a racially troubled community. These programs fall within the jurisdiction of no single department of government. They arise from many departments, no one of which has a field organization geared to respond specifically to the special requirements of a community on the verge of racial strife.

The Community Relations Service can perform best under the jurisdictional protection, if you will, of the Cabinet officer specifically charged with responsibility for coordinating the Federal Government's response to the kind of crisis situation represented by Watts, Harlem, and Chicago's South Side.

Let us get down to brass tacks. Are we ready to go on record as favoring a business as usual response to Watts? Are we going to look the other way—or are we going to insist that the executive branch face up to the crisis of racial unrest? The President has told the Attorney General—All right. You are responsible. You are in charge. Now get the job done. Can we in Congress now deny the President the organizational structure which he feels the Attorney General needs to do the job?

The Attorney General and the Director of the Community Relations Service believe they can carry on a more effective effort by working closely together—by legalizing the reality already in effect in dozens of communities around this country where CRS conciliators and Justice Department officials were striving for a common goal.

Mr. President, I see no reason to deny them a congressional blessing.

Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I listened to the statement of my beloved colleague and friend, with great interest.

He induces in my mind a few additional facts. One, I said this is a question of whether we are going to deal with cases or patterns of discrimination.

The Community Relations Service deals with patterns of discrimination rather than individual cases. That is why the Attorney General was able to say, "I mediate and conciliate," but he does that in cases, not where whole communities and patterns of discrimination are concerned.

I would like to point out that that is what the Community Relations Service does.

At page 91 of the record, the annual report of Community Relations Service we find just what it does. It is very clear they serve communities. The report shows, for example, that during the 12-month period ending December 30, 1965, they served 178 communities. The report does not speak of cases, but of communities. It points out that the Service was still needed in 73 of the communities.

That is what we are faced with. We are not faced with cases. We are faced with patterns of discrimination in communities.

The Senator from Connecticut, asks Why leave it in the Department of Commerce, which is essentially a business agency? First, it is not our burden to prove why it should be left in Commerce. It is an administration burden to prove why it should be put in the Department of Justice.

Aside from that, the reason for placing it in the Department of Commerce is that it was a neutral agency which would inspire confidence on the part of those sought to be conciliated.

I think that good evidence was offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] in writing to the President expressing his opposition to the reorganization plan. The letter is printed at page 75 of the record.

Senator Ervin said:

> Southerners as well as all other Americans, have traditionally had excellent relations with and complete confidence in the Department of Commerce. Most of us look to this Department for impartial and expert advice and assistance. We look upon it as neutral in its approach to human problems as well as economic problems. This is exactly the same function that the Community Relations Service should perform and was intended to perform.

Again, Mr. President, I point out that the Attorney General was never dissatisfied with this arrangement. On the contrary, he makes a big thing of the great cooperation in the Bogalusa matter between the Community Relations Service and himself.

Finally, there are many agencies in the States variously called human relations agencies or commissions on civil rights or commissions against discrimination.

We have facts and figures on that and we find the idea that any conciliation activity of this kind ought to be in the prosecutor's office is invalidated by the experience of the States themselves.

I point out, for example, page 63 of the record, where we have a letter from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights which at our request surveyed State agencies.

They say:

> Data available to us show that there are 38 State agencies with programs in one or all of the following areas: employment, housing, public accommodations, police-community relations, education, or general conciliation of issues. Twenty-five of these are independent agencies. Of the remaining 13 (each of which is part of a large department) only two are located within the office of the State attorney general.

Now, Mr. President, that is State experience and I am sure it does not bear out what is to be done here.

Finally, and very importantly, no answer is made whatever to the fact, first, that this transfer will invalidate the activities or capability of action of the Community Relations Service with regard to the public accommodations section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As I pointed out before, by reason of the testimony of the Attorney General he practically admits that himself. Second, no affirmative case is made, and in my opinion none can be made, certainly not in the face of the evidence of southerners like Senator Ervin, who is representative of the people who have to be conciliated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

No effort is made to meet the challenge that when a representative of the Service goes into a community this should be strictly personal business. That is why we all liked so much the appointment of

Mr. Collins. Mr. Wilkins' appointment is fine with me. I approved it. In my judgment he was taken on with the agreement that he would go to the Department of Justice. Naturally, he is committed to the transfer. I assume he is a sincere man though I thoroughly disagree with him.

To summarize, the first point is the question of invalidating section 204(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The second is that when a representative comes in to see a person to be conciliated, the factor of suspicion, of alarm, of reserve, of concern is added, which is completely unnecessary. Third, the Attorney General is doing a fine job of coordination already. Why then, is this transfer necessary? It should not be put with the prosecutor. Why run that risk, when the agency is running well? Under these circumstances, Congress ought to reassert its independence and authority.

Finally, I am not taken aback too much by the fact that a number of civil rights agencies have telephoned to Members of Congress and sent telegrams urging them to vote in favor of this reorganization plan and against this resolution, or by the fact that there has been a large amount of high-level lobbying. Every once in a while—and this proposal is a good example of it—it is good for people to realize that Senators and Representatives have heads of their own; that we are not vote comptometers, trying to figure out which way the votes will come out; but that we use our own judgment, truly independent of the executive arm.

This is an excellent opportunity for the Senate to say that the administration has failed to make a case; that its proposal is most unwise.

I am a strong and sincere advocate of civil rights, but I am here proposing that the Senate should not agree to this reorganization proposal.

I am very glad that southern Senators, who oppose civil rights legislation, are joined with me in opposing this plan, because this is what conciliation is all about. It is supposed to have an appeal to them and an appeal to me. The joint appeal that we make and which we reflect is that this reorganization plan be rejected. I hope the Senate will do so.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I am strongly persuaded by what the distinguished senior Senator from New York says. We are working out more conciliation—whatever might be worked out—in some other parts of the city, under the same circumstances. I think that is desirable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy. It is desirable that the resolution offered by the Senator from New York prevail. My own voting record on civil rights is well enough known to preclude further explanation here. I simply feel that there is a danger in moving so much power into a given agency so as to permit the temptation to use it at times when the greatest sagacity might warrant otherwise.

Therefore, although I am sympathetic to the viewpoint of the Director of the Community Relations Service, and have considerable confidence that he will do a good job, at the same time I think it is wiser, every now and then, that Congress rise up and assert its prerogatives and advise the President that we just will agree not to every suggestion that comes to us for a reshuffling of Government agencies and functions. This is a good place to begin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I believe the Senate ought to be a separate, independent portion of the Government. Only yesterday, for example, I made some remarks in criticism of some aspects of the President's legislative proposal to establish a Department of Transportation.

But, I find it a rather weak argument to say that every now and then we ought to pick out some proposal, right or wrong, and reject it, merely to show our independence. This is not a very good argument, unless the proposal is wrong. The President is right in his proposal of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator from Oklahoma must have misunderstood my statement, if he was referring to me. I happen to believe that the Javits resolution is correct in saying that the Community Relations Service, an agency of mediation and conciliation, does not belong in the Department of Justice, a prosecutive and coercive agency. It is salutary and right for us to tell the President that, much as we love him, he is not the only person to determine the correctness of the reshuffling of Government functions.

Mr. HARRIS. I perhaps misunderstood the Senator from Pennsylvania; I believe the President's proposal is right, and for that reason I do not see any occasion at this time for us to jump up and, willy-nilly, show our independence, right or wrong.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 for the transfer of the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice is an important part of a general reorganization of the Government's operations in the civil rights field.

The general reorganization, and this plan, stem from Vice President HUMPHREY's report of September 24, 1965, to President Johnson concerning the need for reassignment of the civil rights activities being carried on by interagency committees and the Community Relations Service. On the basis of a painstaking review of those activities, the Vice President concluded that there was an undesirable diffusion of responsibility. He recommended that operating functions be concentrated in the major departments and agencies which have clearly defined civil rights responsibilities.

The President agreed with the recommendation of the Vice President and issued Executive Orders Nos. 11246 and 11247 to carry it out as far as his own authority permitted. The first order abolished the President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity and placed its programs in the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Labor. The second order abolished the President's Council on Equal Opportunity and transferred to the Attorney General its governmentwide responsibility of assisting and coordinating the activities of the departments and agencies in the enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Commerce Department to the Department of Justice, as provided for in the pending reorganization plan, is the final action proposed by the Vice President. This transfer is another step in the direction of centralizing and sharpening the efforts of the Government to make certain that all our citizens are equal in the enjoyment of their rights under the law. And, just as important, it reflects the mutual interest and concern of the Department of Justice and the Community Relations Service in the resolution of the racial problems that arise in many communities throughout the country.

The broad mission of the Service is to assist communities in reducing racial friction and taking action to promote the observance of civil rights by and for all their citizens. It seeks to educate our communities and their leaders so they will accomplish what otherwise may have to be done in the courts. The Department of Justice has the very same goal. It seeks the assurance of respect for the civil rights of all our people, preferably on a voluntary basis but by pressure of the law if necessary. There is a natural attraction between the work of the two agencies.

In its annual report to the Congress for the fiscal year 1965, the Community Relations Service pointed out that typically the cities or areas to which it provides assistance have a broad range of interlocking problems. These frequently include voter registration difficulties; discrimination in employment; school segregation; discrimination in public accommodations and publicly owned facilities; unsatisfactory police-community relationships and inadequate law enforcement techniques. Each of these is a problem of immediate concern to the Department of Justice by reason of its obligations and functions under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes. Because of their overlapping interests and responsibilities in connection with these problems, the Department of Justice and the Service of course find themselves working side by side on many occasions. The Service pointed out this fact in its annual report by remarking that the Department of Justice is the Federal agency with which it has worked most frequently and continuously. This recurring association of the two agencies, it seems to me, virtually demands that they be brought together under the leadership of the Attorney General. It is one of the main reasons why the President's reorganization plan should go into effect.

For a number of years going back to a time before the Service was established, the Department of Justice has itself put forth a great deal of effort in explanation, persuasion and negotiation intended to quiet or resolve civil rights controversies. Thus, like the Service, it has a good deal of experience in the mediation of civil rights conflicts and a good deal of knowledge concerning communities where racial friction persists. The combination of experience, information and resources of the Justice Department and the Service, put to use under a common leadership, is bound to strengthen the hand of the Government as a conciliator.

It is inevitable that the Attorney General is called upon to take action in relation to most of the important civil rights problems that arise throughout the country. It makes little difference whether or not these problems are framed in terms of legal requirements or the possibility of litigation. They come to him in any event.

The Attorney General has testified that he spends about half his time on civil rights matters of all kinds. This burden will undoubtedly continue. Its magnitude, it seems to me, compels the conclusion that he should be in a position to use the facilities of the Community Relations Service to the best advantage. The President's plan would put him in that position.

The location of the Service in the Justice Department is also bound to be helpful to the Service. It obviously will be able to obtain greater cooperation from people and organizations in and out of the Government when it is under the direction of the Cabinet officer who has the primary civil rights responsibility in the Government.

The reasons for the transfer of the Service to the Justice Department boil down to one simple proposition: the two will be able to accomplish more together under common direction than they can while apart and operating under separate direction. The work of the Government will be done better and the country will benefit.

I urge that the Congress allow the pending reorganization plan to go into effect.

Mr. President, it has been stated in argument today and also elsewhere that this transfer under Reorganzation Plan No. 1 would affirmatively hurt the Community Relations Service. I think this is purely a matter of conjecture, because no one connected with this matter in the administration feels that this would be so.

The Vice President of the United States recommended this change by memorandum to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from that memorandum on page 19 of the hearings before our subcommittee be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Community Relations Service was located in the Department of Commerce by the Congress when it enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on the assumption that the primary role of the Service would be the conciliation of disputes arising out of the public accommodations title of the act. The acceptance of the public accommodations provisions by businesses—even in those areas of the country where they constituted a reversal of generations of custom and practice—exceeded our most optimistic predictions. I believe, therefore, that the basis for the original decision to place this program in the Department of Commerce, which, while appropriate at the time, no longer exists.

With the disappearance of its primary function, the conciliation service has undertaken a number of productive efforts in the field of race relations. Many of these should be continued. But the Secretary of Commerce agrees with me that they could be more effectively and efficiently carried on within agencies which have responsibility for substantive programs which can help eliminate racial disputes and bias. Thus, disputes which involve school problems should be handled by the Commissioner of Education and his staff; disputes which involve housing should be dealt with by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; disputes which involve employment should be dealt with by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, etc.

The Department of Justice has had deep and broad experience in racial matters and possesses information on a nationwide basis. I recommend, therefore, that the Community Relations Service be transferred to the Attorney General so that when necessary he can call upon the appropriate department with expert knowledge and positive programs to conciliate disputes.

The clearinghouse and data-gathering functions which are currently being performed by the Community Relations Service should be undertaken by the Civil Rights Commission, which already has similar responsibilities.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the President of the United States concurred in that recommendation. The Secretary of Commerce has also concurred in it. The Attorney General of the United States, the man vested with most responsibility in the field of civil rights, also concurs in it. The Director of the Community Relations Service, Mr. Wilkins, testified before our subcommittee. He was very strongly in favor of this plan.

Mr. Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau of the NAACP, sent a telegram to our subcommittee approving the reorganization plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that telegram printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington, D.C.,
March 21, 1966.

Hon. John McClellan,
Government Operations Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We support President Lyndon Johnson's plan to transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice. In these times there is great need for close coordination of the activities in the area of civil rights. We have explored the issues connected with the transfer and it is our considered judgment that the President's proposal will enable the Community Relations Service to function effectively and expeditiously. It is our understanding that the Director of the Service will have the rank of Assistant Attorney General under the new arrangement. We are further advised that the administration hopes to expand the staff and duties that the Service is called upon to perform. Therefore, we respectfully urge that your committee give a favorable report on Reorganization Plan No. 1. We request that this telegram be made a part of the hearing record on the reoganization plan.

Clarence Mitchell,
Director, Washington Bureau, NAACP.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, it has been said that the Community Relations Service is involved with communities and with patterns of discrimination, rather than with cases. If that is so—and I think there is merit in that—that would still be true after this transfer, as well as before. The Community Relations Service will still have its own identity. It will still be a legal entity. It will still be headed by a Director, appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Conditions have changed with reference to the difficulties which were expected in the enforcement of the public accommodations section of the law.

It was pointed out by the Vice President in his memorandum, it is logical that this service now be transferred to the Justice Department. The Attorney General stated before our subcommittee, as shown on page 49 of the hearings, that the activities of the Department of Commerce really have very little to do with racial tensions in communities around the United States, rural and urban. The Department of Justice is the logical place for this activity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as was pointed out in response to questions by me, the Community Relations Service will actually have higher status in the Justice Department than it has in the Department of Commerce. This was the testimony of the Attorney General as shown on page 49 of the hearings. It will be in a department with primary responsibility in the civil rights field, and it will be headed by a Director with the status of an Assistant Attorney General.

We need only look at the table of organization of the Department of Commerce to see that the Community Relations Service now is indeed an orphan. It is not really in the line of command in that Department. It is not under an Assistant Secretary. It is equated in the chart with the U.S. Travel Service, with the Area Redevelopment Association, and with the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

I submit that the Community Relations Service, headed by a man who would rank, under this plan, as an Assistant Attorney General would have the proper status, position, and organization in the right department to carry forward the great aim of this country toward the elimination of all types of discrimination in our national life.

I point out that the Community Relations Service will not lose its identity because it would continue to be headed by a director who would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It would still have its independent status and conciliation role. It would still have its confidential relationship with those with whom it deals.

I submit that the plan would further the cause of the elimination of discrimination. The resolution ought to be rejected and the plan allowed to become effective.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to summarize my argument now that more Senators are present in the Chamber.

The Community Relations Service was represented to us as an independent agency. That is the reason that we dealt with it as we did and placed it within the Department of Commerce for administrative purposes. This is borne out by the testimony of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] before our subcommittee, in which testimony he stated that, as one of the Senators in charge of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, he went to the floor day after day and made the point that the agency was not to be in the Department of Justice. The representatives of the Department of Justice also said this in the blue book which was the basis of the administration's case for the 1964 act.

The Attorney General admitted that this transfer would invalidate section 204(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which gives the Community Relations Service an independent role with relation to public accommodation cases before the courts.

The confidentiality provisions of the Community Relations Service under title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, would very likely be circumvented if the agency were placed within the Department of Justice. That requirement is borne out not only by the statutory provision that such information as the Community Relations Service receives shall be held confidential, but also by the express provision that no officer or employee of the Service shall engage in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions of any agency or defendant in any litigation arising out of disputes in which he had acted on behalf of the Service. That is section 1003(b). We are trying to protect this provision by keeping the Service out of the prosecution department.

The clinching argument is that the Attorney General himself said that if a man sent a card to a fellow whom he was trying to conciliate and said, "I am from the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice. Tell me everything in confidence," a fellow would have to be an idiot to comply with such request.

I do not want to characterize us, but we would be very unwise if we were to do what the President is asking us to do.

Southern Senators who were opposed to civil rights engaged in a filibuster against such legislation. Senators such as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and myself, who are very ardent supporters of civil rights legislation, are on the same side of this issue. That proves the point. That is what conciliation is. It is intended to bring us together. The action we propose would bring us together. The Senate ought to support our position because this is the real character of Community Relations Service.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I summarize the administration's reasons for the placement of the Community Relations Service in the Department of Justice.

First. In an exchange of memorandums on September 24, 1965, the Vice President recommended and the President concurred in the transfer to prevent inefficiency, duplication, and delay.

Second. The Attorney General has primary overall responsibility in civil rights matters and in the implementation of the 1957, 1960, and 1964 Civil Rights Acts, as well as the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

Third. The Attorney General and his staff have developed broad experience in the conciliation of civil rights disputes in school, employment, and other fields.

Fourth. The Attorney General is the principal Cabinet officer to whom the President and agencies of Government look for advice and judgment on civil rights issues.

Fifth. By Executive Order No. 11247, dated September 24, 1965, the Attorney General has already been designated coordinator for the enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, relating to nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs.

Sixth. The Community Relations Service will be an integral part of the Cabinet department whose functions are paramount in the civil rights field. It will be a separate unit in the organizational structure on a par with the other divisions, bureaus, and services.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, do I understand the situation to be that if one is for the transfer of the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice, he should vote "no" on the resolution of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If one is in favor of the reorganization plan, he should vote "no." If he is opposed to the reorganization plan, he should vote "aye."

Mr. RIBICOFF. A "no" vote means that one is for reorganization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is a parliamentary inquiry in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A parliamentary inquiry is not in order.

(The VICE PRESIDENT assumed the chair at this point.)

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Georgia would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 42, as follows:

[No. 61 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Aiken
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Fannin
Fulbright
Hill
Holland
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—42

Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—26

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bennett
Case
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, La.
McGee
McNamara
Morse
Morton
Robertson
Smathers
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.

So the resolution (S. Res. 220) was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization [Mr. RIBICOFF] is to be commended for his skillful advocacy in leading the opposition to the resolution. His clear and compelling support of Reorganization Plan No. 1 served greatly to win Senate approval. We are grateful for his strong efforts in achieving this success.

Also, we thank the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] for his splendid assistance in obtaining favorable action against the resolution. For he, too, backed Reorganization Plan No. 1 with the strong and compelling reasons which assured its approval.

While the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] capably, sincerely, and articulately urged his views opposing the reorganization plan, the Senate was permitted to work its will in no small part due to his cooperation. The leadership is thankful to the Senate as a whole for their cooperation in expediting this matter.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is at the desk House Concurrent Resolution 625. I ask that it be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be stated by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625), as follows:

H. CON. RES. 625

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

In line 4, strike the period, and insert a comma and the following language: "and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966 it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Wednesday, April 13, 1966."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this concurrent resolution will permit the House to take its Easter recess from the conclusion of business tomorrow until noon April 18, 1966. Without the concurrent resolution it would be necessary for the House to meet every 3 days as prescribed in the Constitution. The amendment I have offered will permit the Senate to take its announced Easter recess from the conclusion of business tomorrow until noon Wednesday, April 13, 1966. By adopting this amendment, it will not be necessary for the Senate to have a pro forma session next Monday to meet its constitutional obligations. The amendment is one intended for the convenience of the Senate as a whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625), as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Concurrent resolution establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966, and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Wednesday, April 13, 1966."

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES; FOR VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN MEASURES; AND FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following the completion of business tomorrow and until next Wednesday, April 13, 1966, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions; and that committees be permitted to file reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, April 6, 1966, he had signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 3349. An act for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; and

H.R. 8647. An act for the relief of the Troubadours Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The Chair announces the appointment of Senators MONTOYA and SIMPSON to be congressional advisers to the Sixth World Forestry Congress to be held in Madrid, Spain, June 6 through 18, 1966.

The Chair announces the appointment of Senators KENNEDY of Massachusetts and JAVITS to be congressional advisers to the 25th session of the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, May 9 through 14, 1966.

Pursuant to Public Law 372 of the 84th Congress, the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to be a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

Pursuant to Public Law 420 of the 83d Congress, the Chair appoints the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] to be a member of the board of directors of Gallaudet College in lieu of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] resigned.

The Chair announces the appointment of Senators TYDINGS and SMITH to be congressional advisers to the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

Pursuant to Public Law 42 of the 86th Congress, the Chair appoints the following Senators to the 9th Canada-United

States Interparliamentary Group Meeting to be held in Washington, D.C.-Oak Ridge, Tenn., May 18 through 22, 1966: Mansfield, McCarthy, Muskie, Bass, Metcalf, Inouye, Aiken, Hickenlooper, Smith, Cotton, Jordan of Idaho, and Saltonstall.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "CATALOG OF FEDERAL AIDS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS—SECOND SUPPLEMENT, JANUARY 10, 1966"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 84); which under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 84

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed one hundred thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments—Second Supplement, January 10, 1966," Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, for the Senate Committee on Government Operations, of which forty-four thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and fifty-six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3189. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alonso Portuondo; and

S. 3190. A bill for the relief of Dr. Enrique Alberto Rojas-Vila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 3191. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Cost; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 3192. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain sick leave as creditable service for annuity computation under such act; and

S. 3193. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3194. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to improve the safety and reliability of drugs:

S. 3195. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the purpose of strengthening and facilitating mutual cooperation and assistance, including training of personnel, in the administration and enforcement of that act and of State and local laws relating to food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics, and for other purposes; and

S. 3196. A bill to protect children and others from accidental death or injury by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to aspirin intended for children, safety closures on drug containers, and cautionary labeling of containers of articles subject to the act where necessary to that end; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3197. A bill to amend section 416 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; and

S. 3198. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts):

S. 3199. A bill to amend section 213(a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to claims of certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 3200. A bill to provide a uniform closing time for polling places in certain Federal elections; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3201. A bill to strengthen the coordination of economic opportunity programs with the activities of the U.S. Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3202. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the opening of Chisholm Trail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3203. A bill to amend section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act to protect the rights of employees conscientiously opposed to membership in a labor organization; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remaks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York (for himself and Mr. McGee):

S. 3204. A bill to authorize a separate sleeve insignia for Merrill's Marauders, a volunteer unit of the U.S. Army that served in the China-Burma-India theater of operations during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy of New York when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "CATALOG OF FEDERAL AIDS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS—SECOND SUPPLEMENT, JANUARY 10, 1966"

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 84) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments—Second Supplement, January 10, 1966," which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Muskie, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

A BILL TO ALLOW FEDERAL EMPLOYEES CREDIT FOR UNUSED SICK LEAVE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide a formula by which civil service employees may have granted as creditable service accumulated unused sick leave in computing retirement annuities. This measure is identical to H.R. 13754 championed in the House of Representatives by the able Representative, Robert B. Duncan, of Oregon.

Under the present system Federal employees are allowed 13 days' sick leave annually. Those who have enjoyed good health throughout their careers find by retirement time they have saved up to 3,000 or more hours of unused sick leave. Currently, no form of compensation or credit is granted to loyal workers who retire with surplus sick leave.

While I am confident that the majority of Federal employees do not abuse sick leave privileges, those who do, cause an unnecessary expense to the Government and create dissension among employees. Each day of sick leave taken when not justified is a loss to the Government of that employee's pay for that day. The Government must act to curb unnecessary absences by taking positive steps to encourage employees not to use sick leave except in cases of actual illness.

Similar measures have been introduced in this Chamber which provide the employee with an option of having accrued sick leave added to the length of service in computing his annuity, or he may receive one-half of the amount of accrued sick leave at retirement to be compensated for in cash as severance pay.

I would like to point out my reasons for favoring a program which offers a more permanent form of compensation. An employee's years of accumulated sick leave should have a residual value as opposed to an immediate cash benefit. An extra boost in annuity payments has a lasting value and is a proper recognition of an employee's many years of dedicated service. A program offering a cash settlement may prove harmful to those employees who, in hopes of receiving a larger cash payment, may neglect their health by working when they should be home in bed.

Under my bill, an employee shall receive credit for his unused sick leave at the rate of one-twelfth of 1 year for each full period of 173 hours of his unused sick leave. For example, an employee with 2,100 hours of sick leave to his credit at retirement would receive an additional annuity which would be approximately 2 percent of his high 5-year average salary for each year of his life after his retirement. This is less than half what it would cost the Government if each employee used all of his sick leave during his working life.

Enactment of my bill would cut down on the incidence of sick leave abuses by providing an equitable means of compensation for employees who retire with accumulated sick leave hours, yet the estimated cost to the Federal Government would be nominal.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3192) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain sick leave as creditable service for annuity computation under such act, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

URGENT NEED FOR LIBERALIZATION IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SURVIVORSHIP

Mrs. **NEUBERGER**. Mr. President, in 1963 I sponsored legislation to alleviate a hardship in the survivorship program by permitting an annuitant retiring on a reduced annuity to designate a second spouse to receive survivor annuity benefits in the event of death or divorce of the former spouse.

Presently when a person retires with a reduced annuity under the survivorship annuity provision, the survivorship benefits cover only the spouse living at the time of retirement. If this spouse should die prior to the death of the annuitant, there is no way in which survivorship benefits, under present law, can be extended to a new husband or wife. This is cruel, and often creates extreme hardship.

I cited examples of heartrending letters from all parts of the country pointing to this hardship situation. The flow of mail continues, and the need is as urgent as ever.

The bill I am introducing today is similar to S. 1058, which I authored in the 88th Congress.

Other governmental retirement laws, such as social security and railroad retirement, provide adequately for survivorship, without the restrictions inherent in the civil service retirement system. Congress should act to correct this inequity.

The present civil service survivorship program is unduly restrictive and primarily causes grievous injury to widows who are oftentimes left destitute in old age.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3193) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 416 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 416 of the Federal Aviation Act. The need for this amendment is urgent in order to protect and promote the U.S. international air transportation system and to eliminate a built-in procedural advantage enjoyed by foreign airlines serving the United States.

The speed and flexibility of the jet airplane has brought about miraculous changes in the air commerce of the world, none of which were envisaged when the Civil Aeronautics Act was first enacted in 1938 or when it was reenacted in the Federal Aviation Act in 1958. Unfortunately, however, our statutory procedures have not kept pace with these changes and as a result our U.S.-flag carriers are often placed at a serious disadvantage in seeking to compete with foreign airlines for traffic to and from the United States.

To meet the eruption of foreign air travel brought on by the jet plane, the United States, acting through the State Department and the Civil Aeronautics Board, has granted numerous foreign countries important air routes to and through the United States in exchange for reciprocal routes for American-flag carriers. These exchanges are made through bilateral air transport agreements negotiated between the United States and foreign governments. Once an agreement is signed calling for an equitable exchange of routes, a procedural anomaly takes place. Under the present act, the foreign government is able to implement its route promptly whereas the United States, because of its own internal procedures, must often delay years before permitting an American-flag carrier to operate the reciprocal route.

In order to place in operation the route granted by a bilateral air transport agreement, a foreign airline must file with the CAB an application, under section 402 of the act, for a foreign air carrier permit. This is a simple proceeding involving only the one foreign air carrier applicant. Since the route applied for has already been included in a bilateral agreement, the hearing is pro forma and generally uncontested. The President approves the Board's recommended decision almost as a matter of course and a foreign air carrier permit issues promptly, often within a matter of 60 to 90 days after the filing of the original application. Once the permit is issued, the foreign airline is free to start operations.

No such simple or expedited procedure is presently available to permit an American-flag carrier to operate the reciprocal route. Under the present act, the President is often required to wait years, notwithstanding the important foreign relations or national defense considerations which may be involved, before the CAB is able to submit to him for approval a recommended decision covering certification of an American-flag carrier over the route in question. It is this situation to which the bill I have introduced is addressed.

Under the existing law, American-flag carriers may obtain new operating rights by one of two methods:

First. By a lengthy certificate proceeding under section 401 of the act, including notice and hearings, or

Second. By an exemption under section 416 of the act, applicable in certain very limited situations.

Under the certificate method, the Civil Aeronautics Board has adequate power to grant the necessary operating rights, but the decision in *Ashbacker* v. *F.C.C.*, 326 U.S. 327 (1945) has been held to control CAB certificate proceedings. *Delta Air Lines* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board*, 228 F. 2d 17 (D.C. Cir. 1952). This requires all applications seeking the same or similar rights to be heard in the same proceeding. As a result, the certificate proceedings involve numerous applicants and they are necessarily slow and cumbersome, normally consuming several years before completion.

Under the exemption method, the proceeding can be fast enough but the present statutory provision as interpreted by the courts severely restricts the power of the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant relief. The requirement in the statute that the Board find "an undue burden" on the air carrier applying for relief "by reason of the limited extent of the operations of such air carrier" or "by reason of unusual circumstances affecting the operations of such air carrier," is interpreted by the courts to require a showing of something more than loss of potential revenue pending completion of the certificate proceeding. *American Airlines* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board*, 235 F. 2d 845 (D.C. Cir. 1956), *Pan American World Airways* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board*, 261 F. 2d 754 (D.C. Cir. 1958). Whatever may be said for the wisdom of this result in a domestic route situation where the competition consists only of other U.S. carriers—the situation for which the provision was primarily designed—the result is clearly undesirable where the traffic is lost to foreign competition and where the development of the U.S.-flag international air transportation system is accordingly delayed. The present exemption provision gives neither the Board nor the President authority to act in cases where public interest considerations alone require temporary authorization of one or more U.S. air carriers pending the completion of certificate proceedings. As a result, the U.S. carriers are relegated to lengthy certificate proceedings as the only method of relief.

A few examples are in order. Years ago two American-flag carriers—Braniff and Panagra—applied to have their routes extended to New York so as to provide the first U.S.-flag one-carrier through-service between New York and the west coast of South America. These applications, together with those of numerous other applicants were later consolidated in the United States-Caribbean-South America case. After 4½ years this case is still at the examiner hearing stage. In the meantime, two foreign carriers—BOAC and Lufthansa—already are operating, by virtue of permits issued by the CAB and the President under section 402, the only one-carrier through-services between the United States and the west coast of South America. The two U.S. carriers are at an obvious competitive disadvantage and can obtain no relief until the United

States-Caribbean-South America case is decided some years hence.

A second example occurred some years ago when Trans Canada Airlines started operating a through-service between Cleveland and Europe via Toronto. TWA, which serves Cleveland on its domestic network, did not at that time have effective authority to operate through-service between Cleveland and Europe on its transatlantic service. An amendment of its certificate was necessary, but this could not be accomplished until the so-called Cleveland-New York nonstop case was finally decided. This case involved a large number of domestic carriers and took several years before TWA finally obtained the necessary authority to compete with Trans Canada for Cleveland-Europe passengers. The point is that, solely as a result of the CAB's and the President's lack of authority to cope with the problem expeditiously, Trans Canada obtained a several-years lead on TWA in this purely U.S. traffic market.

Another example is found in the current Transpacific Route case in which the CAB is confronted with the enormous task of passing upon the applications of 23 U.S. airline applicants for routes throughout the Pacific Basin area. The current proceeding is a continuation of a proceeding which first began in 1959 and after suspension in 1961 was reopened in 1965. It will take years for the Board to sort out these conflicting applications. Meanwhile, two foreign carriers—Qantas and BOAC—by virtue of the expeditious section 402 procedures are already providing transpacific services to and through the United States identical to those which are in issue in the Transpacific Route case. In December 1965 the United States concluded a new air transport agreement with Japan whereby a Japanese airline was granted the right to operate from Japan across the Pacific to California and across the United States to New York and beyond to Europe and around the world. JAL has now applied for a section 402 permit for this route. No American-flag carrier is permitted at present to offer such a service, although the national interest in providing it was recognized by the CAB as long ago as 1960. Nor will any be able to operate it—even on a temporary basis—until the Transpacific Route case is decided years from now. Thus, the national interest is frustrated by procedural deficiencies.

The problem presented is not a temporary one. The cases mentioned are a portent of the future. They indicate that the same type of competitive disadvantage is likely to arise when new equipment requires changes in the international route pattern, and when new international routes are exchanged by bilateral agreement between the United States and foreign governments. Under present procedures, the foreign-flag carriers will be able promptly to secure operating rights under section 402, whereas the U.S. air carriers will again be involved in lengthy and cumbersome certificate proceedings.

Obviously some revision in the controlling statute is needed. The bill which I have introduced is intended to provide this relief.

The bill broadens the exemption power of the CAB to permit it to cope with situations such as I have described. It authorizes the CAB, pending decisions on applications by U.S.-flag carriers under section 401 of the Federal Aviation Act, to exempt a carrier from enforcement of section 401—thus permitting it to operate—for a temporary period if the CAB finds that the carrier "is placed at a competitive disadvantage" with respect to foreign carriers and that the national interest is thereby "adversely affected." The Board's action is subject to approval by the President which assures that the President's constitutional prerogative in the conduct of foreign policy is fully respected.

If enacted, the present procedural inequity will be removed, the CAB and the President will be able to grant interim operating rights to U.S. air carriers in timely fashion to enable them to compete on even terms with foreign air carriers who receive rights under the expedited procedures now available to them, and the sound development of the U.S.-flag international air transportation system will be promoted.

In short, the bill will permit the CAB upon a proper showing to clear away some of the procedural underbrush which has been allowed to frustrate the national interest. The effect will be to put the CAB and the President in a position promptly to place U.S.-flag carriers in a position of competitive equality and permit them to make their full contribution to the commercial interests of the United States and the important balance-of-payments objectives which must be attained.

The bill also provides that any exemptions involving overseas or foreign air transportation and which may be granted by the CAB under the existing section 416 shall also be subject to approval by the President. This is consistent with section 801 which requires approval by the President of any certificate authority granted by section 401 involving overseas and foreign air transportation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3197) to amend section 416 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3197

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

SEC. 2. In subsection 416(b) relating to exemption of air carriers, amend paragraph 1 by adding at the end thereof the following: "In addition, if an air carrier has filed an application under section 401 to engage in overseas or foreign air transportation, the Board may exempt the carrier from the enforcement of section 401 with respect to air transportation covered by the application, for a temporary period to continue not longer than sixty days after the final decision by the Board on the application filed under section 401, if it finds that pending hearing and final decision on its application under section 401 the carrier is placed at a competitive disadvantage with respect to a foreign air carrier or carriers serving the United States pursuant to permits issued under section 402 and approved by the President under section 801, and that the development and promotion of the United States flag international air transportation system is thereby adversely affected. No exemption shall be issued under this paragraph (1) which involves overseas or foreign air transportation without the affirmative approval of the Board and the President."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 402 OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there has been much discussion in recent years, both at home and abroad, about the authority, or lack of authority, of the Civil Aeronautics Board to deal directly and appropriately with foreign air carriers when and if their governments arbitrarily restrict U.S.-flag air carriers' operations to, from, through or over their territories. Since the problem has arisen in the past, and undoubtedly will arise again in the future, any question about the Board's authority to respond in kind ought to be settled.

There are many who believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board now possesses adequate authority under section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act to condition or otherwise limit foreign air carrier operating permits where required by the public interest in such cases. But questions and debate about the extent or limitation of the present authority have depreciated its value and usefulness. In fact, the publicly expressed differences of opinion here about this authority probably have weakened our bargaining position abroad, and may even encourage the imposition of restrictions on U.S.-flag air carriers by foreign governments in their absence of concern over the objections of, or retaliation by, the U.S. Government.

This bill is introduced to stimulate the necessary discussion and review of the Board's authority in this connection. Its purpose is to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 if it is found necessary to make clear that the CAB has the authority to take action against foreign carriers when their governments arbitrarily restrict or limit U.S.-flag airline operations.

Scheduled international air service is conducted by U.S. and foreign-flag airlines largely pursuant to one of two foundations—bilateral agreements or the principle of reciprocity. In either case, the right to provide this vital communication between any two nations requires the agreement, written or tacit, of both sovereign governments. And once agreement has been reached and rights granted, such rights should be fully and faithfully recognized. This Government should have powers over foreign air carriers no less than other governments have over our carriers, both to insure adherence to the letter and spirit of the rights granted, and to permit the taking of action short of actually terminating air service.

This bill would clear the air in that area once and for all. It would spell out the power of the Board, in section 402(f) of the act, to take reciprocal action against carriers of foreign nations whose governments impair, limit, terminate, or deny the agreed-upon operating rights of U.S. airlines to fly to, from, through, or over the territory of those countries. Moreover, this bill would deal with another problem mentioned in the past by some who believe the existing statutory machinery contemplates a hearing process too long and too involved to be effective. In the face of swift, arbitrary unilateral action with little or no notice by foreign governments, they have felt our present machinery is unwieldy and ineffectual. This bill eliminates the notice and hearing requirement to permit the suspension of foreign air carrier permits for these extraordinary circumstances.

Lastly, this bill will preclude avoidance of the intent and effects of the authorized sanctions by such devices as the substitution of service by a foreign air carrier of a third country in the guise of a pooling or similar intercarrier cooperative arrangement.

Early discussion of, and settlement of, any questions of doubt about the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board over foreign air carriers would be most beneficial. Perhaps the future would then hold fewer and fewer instances of arbitrary unilateral action being taken against our airlines, and a healthier atmosphere for the continued growth of international air transport in the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill, together with the text of the bill, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3198) to amend section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3198

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (f) of section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1372 (f)) is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately atfer "(f)" and adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Whenever the Board finds that the government or aeronautical authorities of any foreign country have, over the objections of the Government of the United States, taken action which impairs, limits, terminates, or denies agreed-upon operating rights of any air carrier designated by the United States to conduct flight operations to, from, through, or over the territory of such foreign country, the Board may, without notice or hearing, suspend and, after notice and hearing, cancel or revoke the permits of foreign air carriers of such country, or alter, modify, amend, or limit operations under such permits, for the purpose of imposing sanctions of like or similar nature, if it finds such action to be in the public interest. The Board may also, without notice or hearing, to the extent it determines necessary to make the operation of this paragraph effective, restrict operations between such foreign country and the United States by any foreign air carrier of a third country notwithstanding the provisions of any permit or agreement."

The analysis presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Analysis of a Bill "To Amend Section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958"

Section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act pertains to the requirements for, and the issuance, terms and conditions, validity, modification and revocation of foreign air carrier permits. Under subsection (f), the Civil Aeronautics Board is authorized to alter, modify, amend, suspend, cancel or revoke foreign air carrier permits, after notice and hearing, whenever such action is found to be in the public interest.

The amendment would authorize the Board to suspend a foreign air carrier permit without notice and hearing and, after notice and hearing, to alter, modify, amend, cancel or revoke a foreign air carrier permit whenever it finds that the Government or aeronautical authorities of any foreign country have, over the objections of the Government of the United States, taken action which impairs, limits, terminates, or denies agreed-upon operating rights of any air carrier designated by the United States to conduct flight operations to, from, through or over the territory of such foreign country. The amendment further provides for the restriction of operations between such foreign country and the United States by any foreign air carrier of a third country in order to preclude avoidance of the intent and effects of the authorized sanctions by substitute foreign air carrier service brought about by foreign air carrier pooling or similar foreign intercarrier cooperative arrangements.

AMENDMENT TO WAR CLAIMS ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] and myself, a bill to amend the War Claims Act so as to give nonprofit social welfare, religious, charitable, and educational organizations the same payment priority now given to small business concerns. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3199) to amend section 213(a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to claims of certain nonprofit organizations, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the War Claims Act provides for the payment of claims of U.S. nationals for certain losses arising out of World War II. Awards are to be paid out of the War Claims Fund. Since the funds available may not be sufficient to discharge all claims in full, the law provides for certain priorities, and thereafter a pro rata payment distribution scheme.

Section 213(a)(1) of the act provides:

Payment in full of awards * * * to any claimant certified to the Commission by the Small Business Administration as having been on the date of loss, damage or destruction, a small business concern, within the meaning now set forth in the Small Business Act, as amended.

The purpose of this provision, as described in the Senate debates, was "to put small business ahead of big business." It was the feeling expressed in the Senate that since large corporations have in effect already "been repaid as a result of tax deductions and other businesses they operated" it would be just to now give priority to small businesses "which thus far have not had any concessions whatever in respect to the claims."

A number of American agencies organized primarily for social welfare, religious, charitable, or educational purposes have filed claims under the War Claims Act for the destruction of their properties in Europe. These include church groups, B'nai B'rith and others. It is felt that these claimants should not be put in a worse position than small business concerns.

The reasons which moved Congress to give priority to small businesses are at least equally compelling, if not more so, regarding the claims of nonprofit organizations serving the public interest. Such organizations have never been able to recoup their war losses by deductions from U.S. taxes or by offsets against other businesses abroad. Their combined claims will probably not equal the $5 million estimated as small business claims when the provision to favor small business was enacted.

Failure to grant nonprofit agencies at least the same priorities given to small business concerns which are conducted for personal profit would be inequitable. This measure seeks to correct that situation.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT TO PROVIDE FOR A "CONSCIENCE CLAUSE"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to insure that anyone whose objection to joining or paying dues to a union is based upon religious belief will not be forced to violate such religious belief.

This measure is identical to the amendment adopted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last year when we were considering H.R. 77, the bill to repeal section 14(b). And that amendment was adopted with the concurrence of the AFL–CIO, with the concurrence of the representatives of those religious groups which would be directly affected, and with substantial bipartisan support.

I recognize that there has been, and no doubt will continue to be, some controversy concerning the precise language which should be used in such a "conscience clause." My colleague, Senator Dominick, has recently introduced a bill which differs in certain respects from this measure, and there have been proposals made in the House of Representatives which differ in other respects. But the one proposal which has already been through the crucible of public hearings and extended discussion in executive sessions of the Labor Committee is this one. If it was worthy of general support as an amendment to H.R. 77, it seems clear to me that it is equally worthy of consideration on its own merits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this measure be printed in the Record, and that it be held at the desk for 1 week for cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and held at the desk for one week for cosponsors as requested.

The bill (S. 3203) to amend section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act to protect the rights of employees conscientiously opposed to membership in a labor organization, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3203

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking the semicolon at the end thereof and adding the following:

", or (C) if he has reasonable grounds for believing (i) that such employee has been issued a certificate by the National Labor Relations Board either that he is a member of a religious sect or division thereof, the established and traditional tenets or teachings of which oppose a requirement that a member of such sect or division join or financially support any labor organization, or that, even though he is not a member of such a religious sect or division thereof, he holds conscientious objections to membership in any labor organization based upon his religious training and beliefs in relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, and (ii) either that such employee has timely paid, in lieu of periodic dues and initiation fees, sums equal to such dues and initiation fees to a nonreligious charitable fund exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, designated by the labor organization, or that the labor organization has failed upon request to designate such a fund or waives such payment, or (iii) that such employee has complied with alternative arrangements mutually agreed upon by such employee and such labor organization;".

INSIGNIA FOR MERRILL'S MARAUDERS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I introduced today on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] and myself, a bill authorizing a separate sleeve insignia for the U.S. Army's unit known as Merrill's Marauders.

This volunteer unit, unofficially known as Merrill's Marauders, served with great distinction in the China-Burma-India theater during the Second World War. In recognition of its valor and accomplishments, the unit was awarded the Army's Distinguished Unit Citation on July 5, 1944.

While engaged in operations between February and May of 1944, the men of the 5307th Composite Unit won the following awards for personal valor:

Six Distinguished Service Crosses.

Forty-one Silver Stars.

Three Oak Leaf Clusters to Silver Stars.

These awards were won in 5 major and 30 minor engagements during the process of driving toward the town of Myitkyina in Japanese-held Burma, capturing Myitkyina and its important airfield.

The Marauders suffered casualties in this operation. A total of 93 men were killed in action; 8 were missing in action; and 293 were wounded in action. In addition, a total of 1,970 suffered from jungle diseases such as amoebic dysentery, typhus fever and malaria.

As a sign of their unit spirit and their pride in their accomplishments, the men of Merrill's Marauders wore a distinctive shoulder patch.

The patch consists of a blue shield with the words, "Merrill's Marauders" inscribed across the top of the shield in red. An inner shield outlined in red is divided into four parts. In the upper left section is the white star of the Republic of China on a blue background. In the lower right section is the white star of India on a blue background. A red thunderbolt runs diagonally across the upper right and lower left sections of green.

Although the men of the 5307th Composite Unit wore the shoulder patch described above, it has never been officially designated as the unit insignia. Merrill's Marauders were disbanded upon the successful completion of their long range penetration mission and the battle honors of the unit have been transferred to the 75th Infantry Regiment of the U.S. Army. The unit was never reformed and is unlikely to be reformed as an organization of the Army.

However, some veterans of the Marauders are serving with the U.S. Army or its Reserve components today. Under current Army regulations, they are not permitted to wear this shoulder insignia.

The Merrill's Marauders Association, composed of former members of the unit, have asked me to introduce legislation to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to prescribe as the approved insignia of the 5307th Composite Unit, Provisional, the shoulder sleeve insignia worn by members of this unit while serving in the China-Burma-India theater of operations during World War II.

I am pleased to introduce this legislation today.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3204) to authorize a separate sleeve insignia for Merrill's Marauders, a volunteer unit of the U.S. Army that served in the China-Burma-India theater of operations during World War II, introduced by Mr. Kennedy of New York (for himself and Mr. McGee), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966 AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 510 TO 513

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for myself and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], I submit, for appropriate reference, a series of amendments to S. 3005, the Traffic Safety Act of 1966.

MANDATORY MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS

The first amendment would make mandatory the setting of motor vehicle safety standards within 1 year after enactment of this act, and would cause those standards to become effective no sooner than 180 days nor later than 1 year from the date on which the standards were issued. The amendment also provides for annual review and appropriate revision of these standards as the Secretary deems necessary.

As presently drafted, S. 3005 leaves the setting of motor vehicle safety standards to the discretionary judgment of the administering Secretary. It provides that 2 years after enactment, the Secretary of Commerce, after making certain findings, would be authorized to set safety standards for motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment, which would become effective no sooner than 180 days and not later than 2 years after issuance of the standards.

Mr. President, the Federal Government's response to the shocking problem of traffic safety in America has been slow in coming. With each passing year, the toll of death and injuries—the fantastic economic loss—has mounted with alarming speed. We cannot speak now of discretionary authority and years of delay in setting standards for motor vehicle safety without thinking of the human price that must be paid.

Nor can we rely on the voluntary approach advanced by the industry. The question of public health and safety is not to be left to private policy makers.

If present accident rates continue we will be losing 60,000 Americans each year in traffic accidents by 1972. How many must die and be maimed before we begin to see the problem of highway safety as a major social calamity which deserves prompt and effective remedial action? We in Congress have a responsibility to make affirmative national policy in this vital area. To adopt the language of the present bill would be to see 40 or 50 million new cars roll off the assembly lines free of any safety regulation.

If we want this law to be a potent, effective, and timely instrument for the protection of the traveling public and the pedestrian we must legislate firm policy guidelines for action by the Secretary of Commerce. In the recently passed tire safety bill we did not leave the question of setting standards to the discretion of the Secretary. We directed him to issue them by a certain date. We should do the same with respect to safety standards for motor vehicles.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 510) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 3, beginning with line 20, strike out all down through line 18 on page 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 102. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary shall, within one year after the enactment of this Act, establish and issue by order, in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, Federal motor vehicle safety standards for motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment. Such standards shall be published in the Federal Register."

On page 4, line 23, strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one".

On page 5, beginning with line 13, strike out all through line 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The Secretary shall annually review and, to the extent he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, by order revise, in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Federal motor vehicle safety standards issued pursuant to this section. Such revised standards shall be published in the Federal Register and shall be effective on the date specified by the Secretary in the regulations prescribing such standards which shall be no sooner than 180 days nor later than one year from the date on which such standards are issued, unless the Secretary finds, publishing his reasons therefor, that an earlier or later date is in the public interest."

PROTOTYPE SAFE CAR PROGRAM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, my second amendment would direct the Secretary to undertake a program to construct and test a prototype safe car and authorize him to fund up to 90 percent of the cost of construction and testing of a prototype safe car produced by a State. The senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] joins in sponsoring this measure.

The current language of the bill could be interpreted to authorize such action by the Secretary. However, I view this as so essential a part of any effort to arrive at proper safety standards for motor vehicles that I believe it deserves to be spelled out.

Prototype safe cars are not engineering forays into the world of tomorrow. They are a practical and efficient means of advancing automotive technology and providing benchmarks for measuring the relative safety and safe performance of assembly line products. Without an adequate prototype safe car program, the Secretary will be handicapped in his efforts to obtain data on which to base the promulgation of standards. This amendment would provide for the construction of more than one prototype safe car in order to assure a variety of approaches and a degree of competition in the search for safety motor vehicles.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 511) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 10, between lines 15 and 16 insert the following:

"DEVELOPMENT OF PROTOTYPE SAFE MOTOR VEHICLES

"Sec. 105. (a) In order to reduce traffic accidents, and deaths, injuries and property damage resulting from traffic accidents through the development of safety designs, characteristics and features for motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment, and to assist the Secretary in prescribing Federal motor vehicle safety standards pursuant to section 102, the Secretary is authorized to carry out a program to research, develop, construct and test fully operational passenger motor vehicles in prototype quantities embodying such safety designs, characteristics and features and technical approaches as he deems necessary. Such program shall not be limited to traditional methods of automobile design, styling, testing, production or sales practices and methods.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) acquire by purchase, license, lease for a term of years or less, or donation, secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, copyright applications, patents, copyrights, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses, and other rights and licenses under patents and copyrights granted by this or any other country;

"(2) negotiate research contracts, procure trade journals and technical information, and employ experts and consultants who shall be compensated at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time, and while so employed away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently; and

"(3) consult with any individuals, public or private agencies or organizations from which sound data, recommendations and evaluations may be obtained.

"(c) In order to carry out the purposes of this section and upon application by a State, the Secretary is authorized to make a grant pursuant to the provisions of this subsection for the payment of up to 90 per centum of the cost of a program to design, develop, construct and test fully operational passenger motor vehicles in prototype quantities embodying such safety designs, characteristics and features as the Secretary, after consultation with such State, shall prescribe. Such application shall—

"(1) designate, to carry out such program, a State agency that has demonstrated competence in the design, development and construction of such passenger motor vehicles;

"(2) set forth a detailed and comprehensive analysis of such program, including a cost analysis and a feasibility study;

"(3) contain assurances that the designated agency has authority to carry out such program in conformity with this subsection and the application, and that such State will pay from non-Federal sources the remaining cost of such program;

"(4) provide such fiscal control, fund accounting, and reporting procedures as the Secretary deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States; and

"(5) contain such further information and assurances as the Secretary may by regulation require.

"The Secretary may approve any application which he determines conforms to the requirements of this subsection."

On page 8, line 6, strike out "section 113" and insert in lieu thereof "section 114".

On page 10, line 17, strike out "Sec. 105" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 107".

On page 11, line 6, strike out "Sec. 106" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 107".

On page 12, line 7, strike out "Sec. 107" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 108".

On page 12, line 19, strike out "section 11(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 112(b)".

On page 14, line 2, strike out "Sec. 108" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 109".

On page 14, lines 2 and 3, strike out "section 107" and insert in lieu thereof "section 108".

On page 14, line 5, strike out "section 107" and insert in lieu thereof "section 108".

On page 14, line 16, strike out "Sec. 109" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 110".

On page 15, line 13, strike out "Sec. 110" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 111".

On page 15, line 15, strike out "section 107" and insert in lieu thereof "section 108".

On page 18, line 19, strike out "Sec. 111" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 112".

On page 19, line 23, strike out "Sec. 112" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 113".

On page 20, line 11, strike out "Sec. 113" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 114".

On page 20, line 17, strike out "Sec. 114" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 115".

On page 20, line 22, strike out "Sec. 115" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 116".

On page 20, line 24, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$13,000,000".

PUBLIC NOTICE OF SAFETY HAZARD DEFECTS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, my third amendment would provide an essential improvement in the recordkeeping section of the Traffic Safety Act by requiring that the Secretary be furnished with copies of all notices, bulletins, and other communications sent by auto manufacturers to their dealers or customers concerning the operation or defects of any motor vehicle or piece of motor vehicle equipment. If the Secretary determines that the public safety and convenience will be served he may take appropriate action to alert the public, based on information received through these bulletins or arrived at independently by the Secretary.

Mr. President, the air of confidentiality adopted by auto manufacturers with respect to defects or deficiencies in their products constitutes what might almost be called a betrayal of public trust. Just a day or two ago, General Motors confirmed that it is recalling more than a million 1964 and 1965 cars for corrective modification of a safety hazard. One can reasonably ask why it took so long for GM to act. I am asking the four auto companies to furnish my subcommittee with a complete list of product defect warnings issued since 1960.

A national magazine recently reported that the Ford Motor Co. has called in 1965 Lincoln Continentals because it had been found that the brake fluid used in these cars would not stand up to heat. Purchasers of certain models of Chrysler Corp. cars received a letter early in February from the service manager in Detroit urging them to have the wheels on their cars inspected by their local dealer. The letter spoke of seeking to assure the customer of maximum satisfaction but made no mention of any safety hazard despite a clear implication that wheels bearing certain identification marks were deficient and should be replaced without delay.

Experience makes it all too clear that manufacturers cannot be relied upon to take aggressive steps to inform the motoring public candidly and quickly of potential defects or hazards in their products. If an unsafe condition is uncovered in a particular make or model of automobile, the public deserves to know about it immediately, not simply when it suits the convenience of the dealer or manufacturer, and in the form of an honest warning—not a product improvement flyer.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 512) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 19, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Every manufacturer of motor vehicles shall furnish to the Secretary a true copy of all notices, bulletins and other communications to the dealers of such manufacturer and purchasers of such manufacturers' products regarding the operation of any motor vehicle or any motor vehicle equipment sold or serviced by such dealer or regarding any defect in such vehicle or equipment. The Secretary shall disclose so much of the information contained in such notice or other information obtained under subsection (a) to the public as he deems will assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act, but he shall not disclose any information which contains or relates to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code unless he determines that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, my last amendment would require the Secretary to submit an annual report to Congress on the efforts of his department in promoting traffic safety. Mr. President, it is vitally important that Congress be kept thoroughly informed about how this bill is being administered and with what effect. Serious charges have been aired abroad which suggest that the Federal Government has not been adequately concerned about the safety of the traveling public on our highways—that a kind of conspiracy of silence has prevailed between the Government and certain elements of our vast highway transportation system.

We must end forever any suspicion in the public mind that economic interests have priority over highway safety. Moveover, we need to recognize that improving traffic safety is a complex matter and that there are areas where we need to gather far more information than is presently available. If the Secretary needs additional resources to conduct research or to administer this program properly, then we should learn of it promptly.

Finally, we need a detailed annual report from the Secretary to determine whether this legislation needs to be revised and strengthened. The problem of traffic safety must not be allowed to slide off into some dark corner—there to be ignored until once again the American public cries out for protection from this brutal but essential instrument of our society.

I say "cries out again" because today the public is aroused; indeed, is deeply disturbed by this problem. The highway statistics are reaching out to touch with tragedy literally millions of American families. Half of all the new cars built each year end up with blood on them—involved in some kind of injury-producing accident in the course of their inevitable trip to the junkyard.

Each year that passes brings more cars and more drivers to our overloaded highway system, increasing the chances for accident involvement. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this final amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point, and I urge my colleagues to give their support to a strengthened and amended version of the Traffic Safety Act of 1966.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 513) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 20, line 16, strike out "REGULATIONS" and insert in lieu thereof "REGULATIONS AND REPORT".

On page 20, line 17, insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 114."

On page 20, between lines 20 and 21 insert the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress in January of each year a comprehensive and detailed report on the administration of this Act during the preceding calendar year which shall contain an evaluation of the national traffic safety situation."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, we have an opportunity to adopt the most vitally needed piece of consumer protection legislation that has come before this body in many years. We have an opportunity to help protect the American citizen from a machine he has yet to learn to master and yet cannot do without.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD an article from yesterday's New York Times on this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 4, 1966]

ONE AND ONE-HALF MILLION CARS CALLED IN FOR CHEVROLET MODIFYING

(By Walter Rugaber)

DETROIT, April 4.—The General Motors Corp. said today that about 1.5 million of its Chevrolet models now on the highways would be recalled to correct a throttle that sticks under certain conditions.

The two models involved will be called in by Chevrolet dealers to have the improvement installed free, the company said. The models are:

The 1965 standard-sized Chevrolet—including the Caprice, Impala, Biscayne, and Bel Air models—with Power-Glide transmissions.

The 1964 and 1965 Chevelle—including the 300, the Malibu, and the de luxe—with Power-Glide transmission.

Chevrolets and Chevelles equipped with either a manual transmission or a Turbo-Hydra-Matic transmission will not be required to have the improvement, the company said.

A Chevrolet spokesman said that the division knew of five instances when the throttle had jammed on cars with the Powerglide feature.

This occurred, the spokesman insisted when the autos were operated at a steady, sustained speed in a heavy, wet snowstorm.

It is possible for snow to pack tightly about a linkage rod and freeze at temperatures around 32 degrees if the throttle is held steady for a time, the Chevrolet official said.

Chevrolet intends to install a shield about 6 by 10 inches in size that will fit over the carburetor-transmission linkage.

The GM division mailed out letters to its 6,500 dealers several months ago in which the improvement was ordered.

Each shield will reportedly cost the company about $2, so that the entire project would involve about $3 million. About 30,000 shields have been installed so far, it was estimated.

An official said "every effort" would be made to find the rest of the owners of cars involved and that registered letters would be sent to them if necessary.

He conceded, however, that the dealers could not be forced to continue their efforts if the initial attempts failed. The dealers are "independent businessmen," he pointed out.

The Chevrolet spokesman also said that in many areas of the country it snowed only rarely, if ever, and that elsewhere the freeze-ups occurred only under special snow conditions.

When asked why the throttle problem was not encountered during tests at the General Motors proving grounds at Milford, Mich., he said the division "didn't happen to run into that kind of snow out there."

LINKAGE ROD AFFECTED

The carburetor, which sends a mixture of fuel and air into the engine, is connected to both the accelerator pedal and the automatic transmission.

The linkage rod that is subject to freeze-up, the spokesman explained, is one that runs between the carburetor and the transmission.

With this frozen, it was said, the accelerator pedal would in turn be held immobile. In effect, the car would keep going even when the motorist took his foot off the gas pedal.

The Chevrolet spokesman said there had been no injuries in any of the five freeze-up incidents about which the division said it had learned. He said he did not know if accidents had resulted.

"Usually they (the drivers) managed to get it (the car) under control some way," the spokesman said.

Sometimes kicking the accelerator pedal would dislodge the throttle, he explained, and in other instances drivers stopped the cars by turning off the ignition.

Major manufacturers have all recalled cars to dealers for design improvements or to correct defects in the manufacturing process.

A source at General Motors said it happened there "occasionally."

In most cases the changes are made as quietly as possible. The industry's critics have cited past changes in the vehicle as obvious evidence that the cars could be improved generally.

[By United Press International]

Washington, April 4.—Ralph Nader, the auto critic, called today for Federal legislation to require automobile makers to specify how safe their cars are and recall any defective vehicles.

Mr. Nader, author of "Unsafe at Any Speed," testified before the Senate Commerce Committee at hearings on proposals by President Johnson that could lead to Federal regulation of automobile safety.

He told the committee that Chevrolet had begun to recall 1964–65 Chevelles and all 1965 Chevrolets with Power Glide transmissions for a safety alteration. He said the General Motors Corp. had acted only because of the current controversy over auto safety.

Mr. Nader, in calling for much stronger auto safety legislation than President Johnson has proposed, declared:

"Automakers will not tell the motorist such important facts as brake stopping ability."

He said they were equally silent on such points as seat strength, dash panel, and windshield cushioning ability, door latch and hinge strength, roof-collapse strength, tire blowout and skid resistance, and the rearward displacement of the steering column under crash conditions.

"If 20 years ago the public knew that the so-called safety windshield in their cars could be penetrated at an impact as low as 12 miles an hour—which was true through 1965—it might not have taken two decades for improvements to be made," Mr. Nader said.

He also said many thousands of 1961 Pontiac Tempests were defective because of a "front cross member design without a skid plate and with low road clearance."

He said that "this exposed the vehicle to hanging up on elevations in road surfaces such as railroad grade crossings."

CITES GM LAWSUITS

"Dozens of claims by injured people whose Tempest stopped in this manner while occupants kept going against windshield, dash, or steering assembly were paid by the General Motors Corp., who admitted responsibility for such mishaps," Mr. Nader testified.

Other testimony brought out that an auto safety research program costing $700,000 in Federal funds had "produced unreliable and inaccurate" conclusions.

Dr. Paul Joliet, Director of the Accident Prevention Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, made the statement after Mr. Nader had testified that Department officials had refused to say why the study, made by the Harvard Medical School, had been prematurely terminated.

The proposed bill would impose Federal standards for auto construction at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce. It would also finance Federal studies of safety needs in cars and underwrite a portion of State safety research work.

Other Cases Recalled

Detroit, April 4.—Chevrolet is not the first automaker to recall cars for adjustments.

A recent case involved some adjustments made in the rear braking system of 500 of the 14,496 Le Sabres built during the 1965 model run by GM's Buick Division. An investigation showed the difficulty was caused by a gasket that was several thousands of an inch thicker than specifications and that might cause certain nuts in the braking system to work loose after 25,000 miles or more of driving.

Buick determined 500 cars had been built with the faulty gasket and called them in for repair.

The Ford Motor Co.'s Lincoln-Mercury Division is currently winding up a program to recall 40,000 of its 1966 Lincoln Continentals.

A spokesman said disk brakes on the front wheels heated up if people "rode" the brake pedal. He said the recalled cars had their brake fluid changed for a type with a higher resistance to heat.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am glad to have the opportunity to cosponsor these four amendments to S. 3005 introduced by Senator Ribicoff today. I think that their adoption by the Senate Commerce Committee and the Senate will materially improve the traffic safety bill.

I think that the amendments to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue safety standards for motor vehicles rather than leave it to his discretionary authority is a necessary change in this bill. As I stated the other day, it would be an inappropriate delegation of Congress' authority to ask the Secretary to determine whether safety standards should be issued. The Secretary should be required to issue standards; his discretion should extend only to the question of which standards to require.

I also believe that the Federal Government has enough information on safety standards to issue requirements within 1 year, and additionally require that the automobile industry comply with these requirements within a year from that date. If safety standards are not issued until 1970, as recommended in the current version of the bill, over 40 million additional cars will be placed on the highways without the benefit of these safety standards; and each one can be expected to be on our highways for 6 to 8 years.

I am also supporting an amendment to the language in S. 3005 to require that motor vehicle manufacturers provide the Secretary of Transportation with copies of all their communications with their dealers on the operation of motor vehicles or defects in the cars that they have sold. It is particularly important that the purchaser of a car be informed of any safety hazards that might have been overlooked or that develop in the car that he buys. This provision would insure that the consumer is informed of such defects.

The amendment requiring the submission of an annual report on auto safety by the Secretary of Transportation is a necessary one. Such a document could be highly useful to both the consumer and the auto industry. It would fully describe the decisions made on safety standards during the year; the major safety problem areas confronting the industry; the ways in which research and test knowledge is being translated into applicable safety and the ways in which the information developed by the agency is made available to the public. It is highly necessary that such an agency provide full information to the consumer; this report can accomplish this.

I am also supporting an amendment to clarify the language in S. 3005 relating to the development of prototype safe motor vehicles. The original language of the bill did not make it clear that the Secretary was authorized to carry out a program of research, development, and testing on new prototype vehicles and components. It is difficult to get new safety ideas adopted by major motor vehicle manufacturers, for the cost of change is great. Testing and development of new ideas both in the form of vehicle and vehicle components can be useful in highlighting new approaches to safety problems.

I hope that the Senate Commerce Committee will have an opportunity to consider these amendments in detail. Their adoption will benefit all who drive cars.

HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 514

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit, for myself and Senator Harris, of Oklahoma, and Senator Nelson, of Wisconsin, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 3052, the "Highway Safety Act of 1966."

This amendment would authorize grants to States to help pay up to half the cost of developing, establishing or improving State programs for motor vehicle inspection and driver education and training.

I am submitting this amendment with a clear understanding that it will mean a substantial increase in Federal expenditures for traffic safety. It will, in fact, add $525 million to the cost of the administration's proposed highway safety program over a 6-year period.

There is one simple and irrefutable basis for this amendment—the administration's existing proposal is simply inadequate. A serious social problem that is costing the United States 49,000 people killed, 4.5 million injured, and $8.5 billion in economic loss cannot be overcome by distributing $70 million a year among all 50 States for a broad range of "program" grants. These limited funds would have little or no impact on the two areas of State activity that have proven effective in promoting highway safety—vehicle inspection and driver training.

I am not suggesting that the other areas cited in the administration's bill should be ignored. Better highway design and traffic control, effective accident recording systems and expanded spot-improvement programs all warrant Federal support. But we know from past experience that little can be achieved by spreading too little money over too wide an area.

An investment in driver training programs can help produce a generation of younger drivers who will carry safe driving habits with them the rest of their lives. Yet today only 45 percent of eligible students are enrolled in driver training courses in our secondary schools. To raise that figure to 100 percent, the Federal Government should be prepared to assume half the cost—or $60 million annually.

Mr. President, the average passenger automobile on the road today is 6 years old, yet only 20 States and the District of Columbia require periodic inspection of motor vehicles. To encourage the other 30 States to adopt inspection programs, and to enable those which now require inspection to expand and improve their programs, I recommend a $45 million matching grant program. After an agreed period of time, these programs would operate on a self-sustaining basis.

It is time we recognized the fact that traffic safety is expensive. There is no cheap solution to this problem which we have ignored so long that it has now become a shocking disgrace.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 514) was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

On page 1, after line 7, strike out "404. National driver register" and insert in lieu thereof:

"404. Grants for State motor vehicle inspection programs.

"405. Grants for State driver education and training programs.

"406. National driver register."

On page 4, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new sections:

"§ 404. Grants for State motor vehicle inspection programs.

"(a) From sums appropriated pursuant to the Highway Safety Act of 1966 to carry out the provisions of this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 and for the four succeeding fiscal years, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to States to pay up to 50 per centum of the cost for the development, establishment or improvement of State programs for motor vehicle inspection in accordance with the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall determine the amount of the Federal share of the cost of such programs for each fiscal year based upon the funds appropriated therefor for that fiscal year and the number of participating States.

"(b) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this section shall designate or create an appropriate State agency for the purpose of this section, and submit, through such State agency, a State plan which shall—

"(1) set forth a program for establishing, or improving (in the case of a State which already has in operation a State administered motor vehicle inspection program), State supervised motor vehicle inspection at garages or other suitable facilities certified by the State for that purpose;

"(2) agree to accept and apply such minimum standards for highway traffic safety with respect to inspection as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe;

"(3) provide that the State will pay from non-Federal sources the cost of such program in excess of amounts received under this section;

"(4) set forth provisions for the financing of such plan without Federal assistance beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973;

"(5) contain satisfactory evidence that the State agency will adequately supervise such program;

"(6) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require; and

"(7) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting of funds received under this section.

"(c) The Secretary shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (b).

"§ 405. Grants for State driver education and training programs

"(a) From sums appropriated pursuant to the Highway Safety Act of 1966 to carry out the provisions of this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 and for the four succeeding fiscal years, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to States to pay up to 50 per centum of the cost of developing, establishing, and improving programs for driver education in accordance with the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall determine the amount of the Federal share of the cost of such programs for each fiscal year based upon the funds appropriated therefor for that fiscal year and the number of participating States.

"(b) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this section shall designate or create an appropriate State agency for the purpose of this section, and submit, through such State agency, a State plan which shall—

"(1) provide for the initiation of a State program for driver education or for a significant expansion and improvement of such a program already in existence:

"(2) include provisions for the training of qualified instructors and their certification;

"(3) provide for adequate research, development, and procurement of practice driving facilities, simulators, and other similar teaching aids;

"(4) include provision for financial assistance by the State to institutions of higher education for research in driver education testing, curriculum, and methods of instruction;

"(5) provide that the State will pay from non-Federal sources the cost of such program in excess of amounts received under this section;

"(6) provide adequate State supervision and administration of such driver education; and

"(7) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting of funds received under this section.

"(c) Prior to prescribing regulations under this section the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(d) The Secretary shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (b)."

On page 4, line 17, strike out "§ 404" and substitute "§ 406".

On page 7, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new sections:

"Sec. 105. For the purpose of carrying out section 404 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the highway trust fund, the additional sum of $45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each of the succeeding four fiscal years.

"Sec. 106. For the purpose of carrying out section 405 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the highway trust fund, the additional sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each of the succeeding four fiscal years."

On page 7, line 3, strike out "Sec. 105" and substitute "Sec. 107".

On page 7, line 10, strike out "Sec. 106" and substitute "Sec. 108".

On page 7, line 17, strike out "Sec. 107" and substitute "Sec. 109".

On page 8, line 8, strike out "Sec. 108" and substitute "Sec. 110".

AMENDMENTS TO EMPLOYMENT SERVICE AND POVERTY BILLS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 515 THROUGH 518

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a continuing concern of many observers of the war on poverty is the duplication and deficiency in effective coordination among its various programs and other Federal programs, particularly in the field of manpower training. The current hearings before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am the ranking minority member, highlight the need for much more concentrated effort at coordination of training programs around the existing network of Employment Service agencies administered by the States with Federal funds.

Accordingly, I am today introducing for reference to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, parallel amendments to the pending bill to amend the Employment Service Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, S. 2974, and to the Economic Opportunity Act to achieve coordination of the Federal training programs with the Employment Service.

I am also introducing three additional amendments to the Employment Service bill:

First, establishing a program of relocation assistance to increase the mobility of unemployed individuals;

Second, broadening the provision of S. 2974 for training of Employment Service personnel to include, on a reimbursable basis, employees of private employment agencies; and

Third, increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee to include two representatives of the private employment agencies.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and bill be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill and amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments and bill will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 515) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 10, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary through the national manpower services system shall—

"(1) recruit, counsel and refer to the appropriate office or agency individuals who are in need of and eligible for training under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2571–2620), for the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, work training, work-study or work experience programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2701–2981), for vocational training under the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 11–35n), or for any other training program or combination of programs designed to improve or restore the employability of individuals financed in whole or in part with Federal funds; and

"(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the head of any other Federal agency administering a program referred to in the preceding paragraph, such employment information concerning such individuals as he determines will facilitate their placement.

In order to facilitate the furnishing of coordinated manpower services to such individuals, the Secretary shall make such arrangements as he deems practical to have local offices administering any program referred to in paragraph (1) located in close proximity (in the same building, if possible) with the relevant manpower service center."

On page 10, line 17, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)".

On page 10, line 20, strike out "subsection (a) of".

The bill (S. 3201) to strengthen the coordination of economic opportunity programs with the activities of the U.S. Employment Service, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3201

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 611 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) In order to insure the maximum coordination of programs and activities authorized by this Act with the programs and activities carried out by the United States Employment Service, the Director and the Secretary of Labor shall, by joint regulation, provide for such coordination at the local level in public employment offices throughout the country. The Director shall include, as a part of the annual report prescribed by section 608, a detailed and comprehensive description of the activities and actions taken pursuant to this subsection."

The amendment (No. 516) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 2974

On page 7, line 15, insert "(a)" immediately after the section designation.

On page 8, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) Based upon the results of the labor mobility demonstration projects conducted pursuant to section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Secretary of Labor shall carry out a program to increase the mobility of unemployed individuals by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such a program the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed. Loans or grants provided under this subsection shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, with loans subject to the following limitations:

"(1) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

"(2) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

"(3) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

"(4) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (A) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (B) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purposes; and

"(5) the loan is repayable within not more than ten years.

Of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out this Act, not more than $——— may be used in such year for the purposes of this subsection."

The amendment (No. 517) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 11, between lines 23 and 24, add the following new sentence: "The Secretary may make such training programs available to employees of private employment agencies on a reimbursable basis."

The amendment (No. 518) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 17, between lines 22 and 23 insert the following:

"(b) Section 205(a) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding after the first sentence thereof the following: 'Two additional members to serve on the National Advisory Committee when such committee carries out its function with respect to the Manpower Services Act of 1966 shall be appointed by the Secretary from persons representing private employment agencies.'"

On page 17, line 23, strike out "(b)" and substitute "(c)".

On page 18, line 4, strike out "(c)" and substitute "(d)".

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 519 THROUGH 528

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit sundry amendments which I intend to propose to the pending bill for foreign assistance, Senate bill 2859, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the Record at this point, together with explanatory statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments and the accompanying explanations will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 519) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 2, after line 2, insert the following:

"Sec. 102. Section 201(b), which relates to general authority of the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

"(a) In the second sentence, strike out 'and' the last time it appears, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and insert a comma, and add the following: '(7) the degree to which the recipient country is making progress toward respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression and of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise, and (8) whether or not the activity to be financed will contribute to making the recipient country self-sufficient.'

"(b) At the end thereof, add the following new sentence: 'Funds made available under this title, except funds made available pursuant to section 205, shall not be used to make loans in more than ten countries in any fiscal year.'"

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 519 is as follows:

This amendment makes two changes in the authority for development loans.

First, it adds two new criteria to the factors to be taken into account in making such loans. These criteria, which are spelled out in the amendment, were included in last year's Senate foreign aid bill as principles to be taken into account in shaping a new foreign aid program.

Second, the bill limits to 10 the number of countries where development loans may be made in any fiscal year except through the World Bank and its affiliates as provided in the transfer authority of section 205.

AID plans to make loans to only 10 countries in fiscal 1967 plus an undistributed amount of $18.2 million for several unspecified African countries. Loans of this latter type would be particularly appropriate for multilateral administration. In addition AID lists three other countries as "eligible for development lending."

The argument for this amendment is that it would force AID to concentrate its efforts. To the degree that AID desired to disperse its efforts, it would have to do so through multilateral channels.

The amendment (No. 520) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 2, after line 18, insert the following:

"(a) Sec. 211(a) which relates to general authority for technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

"(a) In the second sentence, strike out "and" the last time it appears, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and insert a comma, and add the following: "(7) the degree to which the recipient country is making progress toward respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression and of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise, and (8) whether or not the activity to be financed will contribute to making the recipient country self-sufficient."

"(b) At the end thereof, add the following new sentence: 'The authority of this title shall not be used to furnish assistance to more than 40 countries in any fiscal year.'"

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 520 is as follows:

This amendment makes two changes in section 211(a) which contains the general authority for technical cooperation and development grants.

First, it includes among the criteria to be considered the factors which are listed in the amendment and which are self-explanatory. These factors were in the Senate foreign aid bill last year as principles to be taken into account in formulating future foreign aid programs.

Second, the amendment limits to 40 the number of countries which may receive technical cooperation and development grants in any one year. This is also consistent with the Senate's 1965 aid bill which suggested a limit of 50 countries receiving all types of assistance. Upon reflection, it seems that a better way to impose limits is by the type of assistance furnished, and that is what has been done in this series of amendments.

The limit of 40 countries proposed by the amendment compares with 47 in which AID proposes technical cooperation or development grant programs in fiscal 1967—plus 6 regional programs. Of the 47 country programs proposed, 19 are for less than $1 million.

The amendment (No. 521) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 4, after line 17, insert the following:

"(a) Sec. 251(b), which relates to general authority for the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

"In the second sentence, strike out 'and' the last time it appears, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and insert a semicolon and the following:

" '(5) the degree to which the recipient country is making progress toward respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression and of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise; (6) whether or not the activity to be financed will contribute to making the recipient country self-sufficient; and (7) the extent to which the activity to be financed will contribute to the economic or political integration of Latin America.' "

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 521 is as follows:

This amendment writes three new criteria into the list of things to be taken into account in furnishing assistance under the Alliance for Progress.

The criteria numbered five and six in the amendment are taken from the Senate version of the foreign aid bill last year which included them among the principles to be taken into account in formulating future foreign aid programs.

The remaining point in the amendment concerning the economic or political integration of Latin America is suggested on its own merits. It is, incidentally, consistent with the resolutions of the Rio Conference of OAS Foreign Ministers last November.

The amendment (No. 522) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 4, after line 22, insert the following:

"(b) Sec. 251, which relates to general authority for the Alliance for Progress, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(h) Loans may be made under authority of this title only to support national economic plans which have been approved by the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. Whenever the President determines that the purposes of this title would be better served thereby, he may make available, in addition to any other funds available for such purposes, on such terms and conditions as he determines, not to exceed 15 per centum of the funds made available for this title to the Inter-American Development Bank, or to any of the institutions named in Sec. 205, for use pursuant to the laws governing United States participation in the said Bank or in such institutions and the governing statutes thereof and without regard to section 201 or any other requirements of this or any other Act.' "

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 522 is as follows:

This amendment would introduce two new elements into the Alliance for Progress, both designed to move it further in the direction of multilateralism.

First, it would provide that Alliance for Progress loans may be made only to support national economic plans approved by the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress (CIAP). The effect would be that before a country could participate fully in the Alliance it would have to make a national economic plan which would be approved by the Alliance's international body. CIAP would not be given the power to control American aid; it would be given only a limited veto in the sense that if it did not approve a country's plan, that country could receive no U.S. loans. CIAP, consisting of six distinguished Latin Americans and one North American, is in a better position than AID or the State Department to insist on rigorous Latin American compliance with the standards of the Alliance. (Note, however, that the amendment would not apply to grant aid; i.e., to technical assistance or to emergency assistance to meet unforeseen contingencies.)

Second, the amendment would authorize the transfer of up to 15 percent of Alliance for Progress funds to the Inter-American Development Bank or to the World Bank or its affiliates. This is analogous to the authority presently existing in Sec. 205 for the transfer of development loan funds to the World Bank or its affiliates.

The amendment (No. 523) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 9, after line 1, insert the following:

"Sec. 109. Section 401 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general authority for supporting assistance, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That not more than 10 countries may receive assistance under the authority of this chapter in any fiscal year.' "

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 523 is as follows:

This amendment would limit to 10 the number of countries receiving supporting assistance.

The administration proposes 13 countries for fiscal 1967.

The amendment (No. 524) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 10, after line 4, insert the following:

"CHAPTER 6—ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES HAVING AGRARIAN ECONOMIES

"Sec. 111. Amend chapter 6 of part I, which relates to assistance to countries having agrarian economies, as follows:

"(a) Amend the title to read, 'Assistance to Non-Industrialized Countries'.

"(b) Add the following new section:

" 'Sec. 462. Assistance for population control.—Funds made available for use under this part may be used, when so requested by the recipient country, to furnish technical and other assistance for the control of population growth.' "

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 524 is as follows:

This amendment specifically authorizes the use of economic assistance funds, on request, to furnish technical and other assistance for the control of population growth.

The law now specifically authorizes the conduct of research into the problems of population growth. By implication, it authorizes more active population control programs. The amendment would make this authority explicit.

The amendment would thereby overcome some lingering timidity on the part of AID lawyers and administrators to embark on a serious effort to solve the underdeveloped world's most crucial problem.

The amendment (No. 525) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 10, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

"(b) Section 614(c), which relates to special authorities, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The President shall promptly and fully inform the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of each use of funds under this subsection.' "

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 525 is as follows:

This amendment would require the President to report to the Speaker of the House and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on his use of the confidential funds which are now authorized in the amount of $50 million by section 614(c). Under the administration's proposal, the authority under section 614(c) would be reduced to $25 million, and similar authority for $25 million would be added in the proposed Military Assistance and Sales Act.

The law authorizes the President to use these funds "pursuant to his certification that it is inadvisable to specify the nature of the use of such funds, which certification shall be deemed to be a sufficient voucher for such amounts."

This is the only important provision of the act on which the President is not required to make some kind of report to Congress. Most of these reports, many of which are classified, are made to the Speaker of the House and to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate. In view of the sensitivity of the subject matter, the proposed amendment would require reports on the use of confidential funds only to the Speaker and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There ought to be some congressional check on these funds, and this is certainly a minimal one.

The amendment (No. 526) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 11, lines 5 through 9. Strike out subsection (a) and insert the following: "(a) Section 622(b), which relates to coordination with foreign policy, is amended by striking out '(including any civic action and sales program)' and inserting '(including civic action) or sales programs'."

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 526 is as follows:

This rather technical amendment to the administration's economic aid bill would have the effect of preserving the requirement of existing law that recommendations pertaining to military assistance be coordinated with political and economic considerations.

The administration bill makes two changes in the existing law (section 622(b)).

First, it makes a technical change designed to emphasize the concept of a separation between military assistance and military sales programs. This change is retained in the amendment here proposed to the administration bill.

Second, the administration bill would require that recommendations of the U.S. country team pertaining to military assistance and economic assistance be fully coordinated. This is to be compared to the existing law which requires military assistance recommendations to be coordinated with political and economic considerations.

Political and economic considerations should continue to be taken into account in determining military assistance programs, and this requirement should remain in the law.

The amendment (No. 527) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 10, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

"(b) Sec. 619, which relates to assistance to newly independent countries, is amended to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 619. Multilateral Organizations and Plans.—Assistance under this Act and under the Military Assistance and Sales Act shall, to the maximum extent appropriate in the circumstances of each case, be furnished through multilateral organizations or in accordance with multilateral plans, on a fair and equitable basis with due regard to self-help.' "

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 527, is as follows:

This amendment is intended to broaden the directive in existing law that economic assistance to newly independent countries be furnished on a multilateral basis.

The amendment would apply to all countries receiving assistance and would apply to military as well as to economic assistance. The amendment would retain the existing language that assistance be furnished through multilateral organizations or in accordance with multilateral plans "to the maximum extent appropriate in the circumstances of each case."

The purpose of the amendment is to take one more step toward shifting the emphasis of the program, in both its economic and military aspects, from a bilateral to a multilateral basis.

The amendment (No. 528) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 10, between lines 13 and 14 insert the following:

"(b) Section 620(k) which relates to a prohibition against furnishing assistance to certain countries, is amended to read as follows:

" '(k) Without the express approval of Congress, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise, nor shall any assistance be furnished under Chapter 2 of the Military Assistance and Sales Act to any country for carrying out any program, with respect to which the aggregate value of assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed $100,000,000. No other provision of this or any other Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.' "

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 528, is as follows:

This amendment would broaden and make permanent a temporary prohibition in existing law against the initiation of very large projects.

This prohibition, which is found in section 620(k), had its origin in 1963 in the concern of Congress over the proposed Bokaro steel mill in India. As originally enacted in 1963, the subsection reads as follows:

"Until the enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 or other general legislation, during the calendar year 1964, authorizing additional appropriations to carry out programs of assistance under this Act, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise with respect to which the aggregate value of such assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed $100,000,000. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection."

In 1964, this prohibition was extended to 1965; but it has not been again extended and has not been operative since September 6, 1965, the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of that year

The proposed amendment would require, from now on, the express approval of Congress for the initiation of these very large projects.

The amendment would also broaden the existing law to include grant military assistance programs which will amount in aggregate to more than $100,000,000. The purpose is to attempt to provide an additional safeguard against programs which begin small and grow to major commitments.

FOREIGN MILITARY ASSISTANCE—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 529 THROUGH 535

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit sundry amendments which I intend to propose to the pending bill (S. 2861) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward internal and external security. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the Record at this point, together with explanatory statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments and the accompanying explanations will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 529) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 13, after line 4, add the following:

"(3) In furnishing assistance to any economically underdeveloped nation under this Act, the President shall take into account the percentage of the recipient country's budget which is devoted to military purposes, and its capacity to meet any additional budgetary costs which might be occasioned by the assistance in question to the end that military costs do not unduly burden its economy."

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 529, is as follows:

This amendment would add a new paragraph to the subsection of the administration's military assistance bill dealing with restrictions on such assistance to economically developed countries.

The amendment, which is self-explanatory, is intended to impose some restraint on furnishing military assistance to underdeveloped countries which might better devote their limited resources to more productive purposes.

The amendment (No. 530) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 19, after line 7, insert the following:

"(k) The total number of countries receiving assistance under authority of this chapter in any fiscal year shall not exceed 45."

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 530, is as follows:

This amendment limits to 45 the number of countries to which military assistance may be furnished in any fiscal year.

The administration proposes 53 countries for fiscal 1967.

The amendment (No. 531) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 21, line 8, strike out "value of grant programs of defense articles" and insert "total value of military assistance and sales (other than training) under this Act or in accordance with section 7307 of title 10, United States Code,".

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 531 is as follows:

This amendment tightens the limitation on military assistance to Latin America.

Section 23(a) of the administration's military assistance bill reenacts section 511(a) of the existing law, which puts a limit of $55 million a year on grant military assistance (other than training) to Latin America.

The amendment would leave the limit at $55 million but would count against the limit not only grant programs but also sales and ships loaned under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 7307. Training would continue to be exempt.

The importance of applying the limitation to all kinds of assistance except training is shown by the proposed program for fiscal 1967. The total in grants is $72 million, of which only $50.4 million counts against the $55 million ceiling. In addition, sales are contemplated of $55.5 million. Finally, substantial additional amounts of military assistance are put into Latin America under 10 U.S.C. 7307 which provides, in part:

"(b) Without authority from Congress granted after March 10, 1961, no battleship, aircraft carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine that has not been stricken from the Naval Vessel Register under section 7304 of this title, nor any interest of the United States in such a vessel, may be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of under any law (Aug. 10, 1956, ch. 1041, 70A Stat. 452)."

Congress has frequently authorized these transfers, most recently in October 1965 with respect to destroyers for Brazil and Argentina.

The amendment (No. 532) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 22, line 8, strike out "value of grant programs of defense articles" and insert "total value of military assistance and sales (other than training) under this Act or in accordance with section 7307 of title 10, United States Code,".

Line 11, strike out "chapter" and insert "Act".

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 532 is as follows:

This amendment tightens the limitation on military assistance to Africa.

Section 23(b) of the administration's military assistance bill would make permanent the limitation of section 512 of existing law. This limitation is that, unless the President determines otherwise, grant military assistance may be furnished to Africa only for internal security or civic action requirements, and that in any case the value of grant programs of defense articles for Africa may not exceed $25 million in fiscal 1966.

The amendment would also make the limitation permanent. But whereas under existing law, only grants of defense articles count against the $25 million limit, under the amendment military sales would also count, as would the loan of ships under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 7307. Training would continue to be exempt.

Title 10 U.S.C. 7307(b) provides: "Without authority from Congress granted after March 10, 1951, no battleship, aircraft carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine that has not been stricken from the Naval Vessel Register under section 7304 of this title, nor any interest of the United States in such a vessel, may be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of under any law. (Aug. 10, 1956, ch. 1041, 70A Stat. 452.)" This authority has frequently been granted.

The reason for the amendment is that the United States ought to discourage the countries of Africa from spending their scarce resources for military purposes and, further, that the United States ought not to increase their military expenses by lending them ships which will be expensive to maintain and operate.

The amendment (No. 533) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 40, line 5, add the following new sentence: "The President shall promptly and fully inform the Speaker of the House and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of each use of funds under this subsection."

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 533 is as follows:

This amendment would require the President to report to the Speaker of the House and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on his use of the confidential funds which are now authorized in the amount of $50 million by section 614(a). Under the administration's proposal, the authority under section 614(a) would be reduced to $25 million, and similar authority for $25 million would be added in the proposed Military Assistance and Sales Act.

The law authorizes the President to use these funds "pursuant to his certification that it is inadvisable to specify the nature of the use of such funds, which certification shall be deemed to be a sufficient voucher for such amounts."

This is the only important provision of the act on which the President is not required to make some kind of report to Congress. Most of these reports, many of which are classified, are made to the Speaker of the House and to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate. In view of the sensitivity of the subject matter, the proposed amendment would require reports on the use of confidential funds only to the Speaker and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There ought to be some congressional check on these funds, and this is certainly a minimal one.

The amendment (No. 534) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 39, line 13, strike out the proviso.

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 534 is as follows:

Section 92(a) of the proposed Military Assistance and Sales Act would authorize the use of up to $125 million a year without regard to the provisions of that and certain other acts when the President determines that this is important to the security of the United States. Not more than $50 million may be used in any one country in any year. This authority is the same as that now contained in section 614(a).

The administration's military assistance bill, however, contains a proviso that the limitation of $50 million for any one country "shall not apply to any country which is a victim of active Communist or Communist-supported aggression."

It is this proviso which the proposed amendment would strike.

The exception made by the proviso has never been in the law, and the administration has never been hampered by the lack of this exception. Furthermore, whether or not a country is a victim of "active Communist or Communist-supported aggression" is not always susceptible to objective determination. The administration's actions in the Dominican Republic do not inspire confidence as to how it would make such a determination in other circumstances.

The amendment (No. 535) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 24, line 3, after the section heading insert "(a)".

On page 24, after line 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) This chapter shall be administered so as to encourage regional arms control and disarmament agreements and so as to discourage arms races, especially among less developed countries. In the administration of this chapter with respect to less developed countries, special account shall be taken of the capacity of the country to pay and of the record of the armed forces of such country with respect to civilian constitutional government."

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 535 is as follows:

This amendment would add a new subsection to the section on objectives of the chapter of the administration's military assistance bill dealing with sales, barter transactions, and leases.

The provisions of the amendment are self-evident. The principal reason for it is to restrain any tendency that might exist in the executive branch to push sales of military equipment in countries which really cannot, or should not, afford it.

EXCLUDE CERTAIN REIMBURSED MOVING EXPENSES FROM TAXABLE INCOME

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] introduced S. 3181, a bill which would exclude from taxable income certain reimbursed moving expenses.

As American business has grown across the country it has accepted the responsibility of moving an employee and his family when it becomes necessary to change job locations. Yet, the Federal Government has failed to do its part in that it imposes an unfair tax liability on a great part of these reimbursed expenses.

Under the present law an employee may be reimbursed without payment of any income tax only for his actual travel costs and those of his immediate family as well as the costs of moving household goods from the old to new place of employment. The line is drawn at this point in spite of the fact that the expenses I have just mentioned do not come close to meeting the total cost burden to a moving employee. S. 3181 would recognize what I believe to be a more realistic approach to what should constitute nontaxable moving expenses by adding to the expenses which already receive tax-free treatment the following reimbursements:

First, the expenses of a house-hunting trip for the employee and his or her spouse;

Second, temporary living costs at his new location while he and his immediate family await the arrival of their household effects;

Third, the fees and other costs of selling his old house;

Fourth, expenses attendant on the purchase of a new house, such as attorney fees and other closing costs; and

Fifth, the numerous items commonly considered as a lump sum or miscellaneous figure, including appliance connections, licenses, size adjustments, and other incidentals.

When it comes to reimbursement for moving, Federal employees are at a disadvantage compared to most private industry employees. The Federal employee is presently reimbursed only for the cost of moving himself and his family and the expense of moving his household goods whereas the employee of private industry is usually reimbursed for the five items mentioned above as well. Last week the House passed legislation—H.R. 10607—which would allow the Federal Government to reimburse a moving employee for these five items as well. I shall actively support this measure when it comes before the Senate.

It seems inconsistent to me that we should recognize—as the House has already done—that these five expenses should not be a burden placed upon the employee but yet continue to treat reimbursement for them as taxable income. Certainly this present tax policy imposes an impediment to economic mobility and progress. It is estimated that American industry transfers some 400,000 families from State to State each year. The benefit of reimbursement becomes seriously diminished to an employee who must treat it as ordinary income. The Supreme Court denied a review to a taxpayer who believed that he should be permitted a deduction for reimbursement, but it should be noted that the Attorney General stated in his brief that it was for the Congress and not the Court to make any such policy decision.

I propose that the Congress should make such a determination and therefore I urge my colleagues to join together in rectifying this present inequity in our Federal tax structure.

I had prepared and intended to introduce a bill along the same lines but did not do so yesterday because of the religious holidays.

I am very pleased to join in cosponsoring the measure introduced by the Senator from Minnesota which is being held at the desk for additional cosponsors, and I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] be added as a cosponsor of S. 3006, to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 so as to prohibit the use for political purposes of certain funds collected by labor organizations from their members, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON H.R. 6277 TO ESTABLISH SINGLE PERSONNEL SYSTEM FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to announce that hearings will be held April 19 and 21 by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations on H.R. 6277, a bill which would authorize the establishment of a unified foreign affairs personnel system for the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and the U.S. Information Agency. The subcommittee will also consider the nomination of 723 USIA officers who have been named for appointment as Foreign Service officers.

Administration witnesses will be heard on April 19, and public witnesses on April 21. The hearings will begin at 10 a.m. each day in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building.

The other members of the subcommittee are Senator Lausche, Senator Pell, Senator McCarthy, Senator Hickenlooper, and Senator Carlson.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 6, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile;

S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes;

S. 2719. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia; and

S. 2831. An act to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 518) for the relief of Joanna K. Georgoulia, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3059. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon;

H.R. 4602. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald W. Ottaway, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 5003. An act for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis;

H.R. 5533. An act for the relief of Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhofer;

H.R. 8219. An act for the relief of Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee; and

H.R. 8833. An act for the relief of Sarah Antoinette Cappadona.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 3059. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon;

H.R. 4602. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald W. Ottaway, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 5003. An act for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis;

H.R. 5533. An act for the relief of Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhofer;

H.R. 8219. An act for the relief of Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee; and

H.R. 8833. An act for the relief of Sarah Antoinette Cappadona.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement by him on the 100th anniversary of the opening of Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn., to educate Negroes.

EMERGENCY FOOD RELIEF FOR INDIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 149, emergency food relief for India, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. Senate Joint Resolution 149, to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India, and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "by", to strike out "selling" and insert "making available", and after line 20, to insert:

> The Congress urges that to the extent necessary the food made available by this program be distributed in such manner that hungry people without money will be able to obtain food.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Congress endorses and supports the President's initiative in organizing substantial American participation in an urgent international effort designed to:
>
> (a) Help meet India's pressing food shortages by making available to India under Public Law 480 agricultural commodities to meet India's normal import needs plus added quantities of agricultural commodities as the United States share in the international response to the Indian emergency;
>
> (b) Help combat malnutrition, especially in mothers and children, via a special program;
>
> (c) Encourage and assist those measures which the Government of India is planning to expand India's own agricultural production.
>
> That the Congress urges the President to join India in pressing on other nations the urgency of sharing appropriately in a truly international response to India's critical need.
>
> The Congress urges that to the extent necessary the food made available by this program be distributed in such manner that hungry people without money will be able to obtain food.

DE GAULLE SHOULD PAY UNITED STATES FOR CONFISCATED NATO PROPERTY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we shall shortly be compelled to withdraw our Armed Forces from French soil. The purpose in keeping our men in France in the first place was not to aggrandize ourselves, not to subordinate anyone to our domination, as President de Gaulle maintains, but to help defend France—at her request, I might add—from potential attacks from the East. But this is now beside the point. We are not welcome. De Gaulle wants us to leave and few of us would be unhappy if 30,000 less Americans had to go overseas. It certainly would take the strain off the youth of our Nation now faced with increased draft quotas.

But leaving France means more than pulling our troops out. We would leave behind a costly network of installations including barracks, private houses, headquarters units, airfields, pipelines, improved ports, and a myriad of other properties. Reliable information fixes the cost of these properties at around $2 billion—many say $2.5 billion. The French nation will naturally inherit these properties which will add to the French national wealth—already enhanced by the spending of American GI's and their families at around $150 million a year.

It is only proper that the French should compensate us for these real properties and should not be allowed to take them over without compensation. While I do not know the terms of the secret treaties under which they were constructed, I cannot believe that there was any authorization for the French to confiscate these immensely valuable possessions without compensation. I would suggest, therefore, that we file a claim with General de Gaulle's government asking the following: First, payment for these properties on the basis of present value; second, moving costs for any property not left on French soil; and, third, if this matter is not settled within 60 days after our departure, that it be referred to the International Court of Justice at The Hague for decision.

General de Gaulle would thus be brought under the universal reign of the law instead of proceeding in an anarchic fashion. And, if he should refuse to abide by the Hague Court's decision, France would be put in an unfavorable light in the public opinion of the world.

In addition, if General de Gaulle confiscates $2 to $2.5 billion of American assets in France, I believe the Treasury and State Departments should give prompt consideration to reducing any French claims for U.S. gold by the value of the property which De Gaulle and the French confiscate.

I take the liberty, therefore, of suggesting this policy to our State Department and executive branch.

HOODLUMISM IN AMERICA

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, sometimes I think that we Americans make a mistake of looking too much outwardly—of worrying about trouble in other areas of the world, thousands of miles away, so much that we fail to see what is right under our own noses right here at home in our own Nation, in our own State, in our own city or town, and even in our own community.

We worry about our boys who are killed and injured in Vietnam—and rightly so. But in that worry we tend to pay little attention to the killings and injuries in our own cities and towns. We are not sufficiently concerned about the increasing crime rate here. About the most that we do is to bemoan it and then try to lock ourselves in our homes at night and let George do the job of trying to stop crimes, arrest criminals, and prevent crimes.

It seems to be the old story of not wanting to get involved. And that is not only a physical cowardice; it is a moral cowardice. Maybe when enough of us have been hurt we will really rise up and do something about it. Maybe we will inject enough citizen firmness in our everyday life to reduce the number of young hoodlums who constitute the hard core of the alarming increase in crime.

I have experienced being a victim of crimes. Fortunately, I have not been attacked or bodily injured. But I have been the victim of a robbery and a bombing. There is even very little security in the new Senate Office Building where a couple of years ago a fairly heavy television set was stolen from my office and the thief was never apprehended. And a couple of years ago the mailbox in front of my house was bombed.

More than 50 percent of the houses in the block where I reside have been robbed—5 out of 8. But none of the thieves have been apprehended.

Yes, I have been lucky that I have not been a greater victim of crime—that I was not in my office in the Senate Office Building when my television set was stolen or I might have been injured like Representative Cleveland, of New Hampshire, was in his House Office Building office—that I was not near my mail box when it was bombed and destroyed—that my house has not been robbed.

But I wonder just how much longer my good fortune will last—and I think about the thousands of Americans who are murdered and maimed each year by the young hoodlums who are just out for kicks.

It is with this background that I am deeply impressed with a truly magnificent piece of journalism—an article in the March 28, 1966, issue of the Christian Science Monitor by the distinguished journalist Josephine Ripley, staff correspondent of the Monitor. It is entitled "Crime Apathy Scathed." I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the Record at this point, and I seriously urge every Senator and Representative not only to read it but to study it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Crime Apathy Scathed

(By Josephine Ripley)

Washington.—It was October 13, 1961.

A group of tourists had just concluded a trip through the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington. One member of the party, a woman, hestitated, then turned back to the FBI guide with a puzzled expression on her face.

"I may be completely mistaken," she said almost apologetically, "but I'd like to go back and take another look at those photographs of your 10 most wanted criminals.

"I'm not sure—but I think I recognize one of them. He looks like a man who lives in the same apartment house that I do—in St. Paul."

PUBLIC APATHY HIT

A second look confirmed her impression. She pointed to the photograph of Hugh Bion Morse, wanted for burglary, assault with intent to commit murder, and for various sex offenses.

FBI agents were quickly dispatched to St. Paul. The woman's identification was correct. The man was arrested.

This incident may make crime detection sound simple. It isn't. There are some 80,000 wanted, dangerous, or potentially dangerous, criminals walking the streets or riding the highways, undetected, at this very moment.

The average citizen is not as alert as this sharp-eyed tourist. Even if they do spot a criminal, many are afraid to speak up.

Too many are apparently resigned to regarding crime as something they have got to live with. It has become commonplace. Crime today doesn't even make headlines unless it's particularly heinous.

"In Fairfax County, Va., a daylight burglary would have created a sensation 3 years ago," said the police chief, Major William Durrer, in an interview.

DEFENSIVE RESISTANCE

"Now burglaries occur almost daily. They are no longer news. The story runs on an inside page of the paper."

Public resistance to crime, in general, consists of a new safety lock for the door, a tear-gas pen, a gun, or a watchdog. People keep off dark streets at night.

Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach has faith that citizens will soon begin to approach the crime menace more positively. But he admits that their idea now of "doing something about it" is to barricade themselves.

"I don't think that will continue to be the case," he told this newspaper.

"Take the schools. You have a poor school system if the public is indifferent to it. When people become aroused, they insist on better schools.

"When people become aroused about crime they will do something about that, too."

Public apathy is reflected, also, in the lethargic reception of repeated warnings from the FBI.

If its crime reports were transmitted in signals from the roof of the Department of Justice, their severity would send blinding red signals flashing across the Nation.

Sending out those signals is "Mr. FBI" himself, J. Edgar Hoover, its Director.

Mr. Hoover is not an optimistic fellow when it comes to crime rates. Not even though latest FBI crime statistics show a 5-percent increase in crime in 1965, compared to the 13-percent increase between 1963 and 1964.

"Isn't this somewhat encouraging?" I asked hopefully.

Mr. Hoover answers questions crisply, tersely, bluntly.

"Any decrease in serious crime would be encouraging," he replied. "But we did not have a decrease in 1965, although preliminary figures indicate a drop in the percentage of increase."

It's like this: "A 5-percent increase of crime as indicated in 1965 means 130,000 more serious crimes were committed in 1965 than in 1964, or a 1965 total of over 2,700,000. This is hardly encouraging."

Crime has been on the upswing continuously since 1958, he points out.

Population has increased, too, but the rate of crime is six times that of the population growth.

Crime today is vicious and violent. And increasingly, the face of crime is a young face—a boy's face. More and more teenagers and juveniles are involved in crime.

"Violence is on the increase," the FBI Director confirmed. "Crimes of violence have steadily risen for the last 5 or 6 years."

Much of the violence is senseless, "perhaps motivated by nothing more than a desire to rebel openly against society," comments Mr. Hoover. It is also related to "the easy accessibility of firearms."

The young criminal today often beats as well as robs his victim, and lesser crimes thus become bigger crimes, sometimes involving murder as well as robbery.

WAITING FOR ANYBODY

This happened in the case of Mixa Merson, a musician in the National Symphony Orchestra in Washington.

It was evening in early March in 1962. Mr. Merson had gone to the store for groceries. He was returning to his parked car with his packages.

Three boys were hidden behind a tree nearby. They were not waiting for Mr. Merson but just anybody.

They picked up a large tree branch as a weapon, struck the musician with such violence that he fell to the sidewalk. His groceries were scattered around.

The boys, aged 20, 17, and 14 took his wrist watch and $90. Mr. Merson was so badly injured he did not recover.

Crime is a parasite. It goes where people are. It follows the crowd. Today the surge of population is into the suburbs.

"One of the pertinent developments in today's crime trend is its increase in suburban areas," Mr. Hoover reports. "The greatest criminal increases occur in those areas which experience the most rapid population growth."

SUBURBAN CRIME SOARS

Crime in the suburbs shot up 8 percent in 1965, compared to the 4-percent rise in cities.

Fairfax County, Va., 16 miles from Washington, is an example. It is a fast-growing community. Its residents in general are upper middle class. They work in the District.

Its police department is housed in a new, modern building. Mayor Durrer is young, earnest, articulate.

He is very concerned with the rise in crime in the county. The criminals which invade it are mainly transients. They come from other areas, generally from the District.

They are steal-and-run burglars, mostly. It happens quickly and in the daytime when many homes are vacant.

The chief of police cited a case in point: "About 3 weeks ago a woman was upstairs in her sewing room on the top floor. She heard noises downstairs, looked out the window, and saw a strange car parked outside.

HIGHWAY AIDS CRIME

"She had a telephone up there, so she immediately called the police. We contacted a prowl car in the area. The officers arrived in 3 or 4 minutes.

"By then the burglars had taken the television set and the silver and vanished."

They had a surprising ally in their escape. The Capital Beltway.

The Beltway superhighway swings around the Nation's Capital in a 65-mile arc, sweeping through Fairfax and Arlington Counties in Virginia; Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland.

It affords the criminal easy access to the suburbs and a quick means of escape in committing burglaries. He can swing off the Beltway, hold up a bank in one of the suburbs, and be back in the District in 20 minutes.

SUBURBS ATTRACTIVE TARGETS

Major Durrer reports that the Beltway has greatly increased his problems.

"Now a person committing a crime in Fairfax County can hit the Beltway, swing over into Maryland in 5 minutes. And in 10 minutes he could be in southeast Washington—bypassing the bridges. Once he is back in Washington, he is in another jurisdiction," the police chief explained.

This is a common problem around the country. Mr. Hoover confirms it.

"New, high-speed highways cut through newly developed suburbs which often are particularly vulnerable to criminal activities due to the thinner lines of police protection.

"Many criminals are driving into the suburbs, committing their crimes, and fleeing back into the cities."

A useful tool of the criminal as well as police is the walkie-talkie.

CRIMINAL TOOLS LISTED

A lookout with a small walkie-talkie can be stationed outside a bank or a house that is being burgled, and quickly alert his conspirators inside by means of this gadget.

Attorney General Katzenbach, in an interview, listed more of these modern conveniences which play into the hands of the criminal.

"Credit cards, for one," he said. "They are very useful today. But credit cards have presented a new opportunity to commit a new kind of crime—stealing credit cards. It ups the crime rate."

The increase in branch banks is another, especially banks in suburban shopping areas. "There are more bank robberies now as a result."

There is talk of mobile banks. The Attorney General foresees that while this may be a convenience to the public, it invites further crime.

The age at which a person can obtain an automobile license can make a difference in crime. If the age limit were raised to 21 "it would reduce crime a lot," in the Attorney General's estimation.

CONCERN MOUNTS ON YOUTHS

Not that he is suggesting this. Nor is anyone else. "But the facts indicate that the age at which young people may obtain a license to drive a car does have a relationship to crime," he said.

The increasing involvement of youth in crime is of deep concern to the director of the FBI.

It shows up in all statistics. Adult arrests rose 1 percent during 1965. Arrests of persons under 18 increased 3 percent.

"Youthful criminals are not only becoming involved in more crimes, but also are participating in more violent and heinous depredations than before," he replied in response to a question.

This is not only today's problem, but that of tomorrow, too, as Mr. Hoover views it.

He states it bluntly and with the logic of a man who has traced the ugly pattern of crime for many years:

"The members of juvenile street gangs, the teenage yokers, and the youth assailants who attack law-enforcement officers compose the cadre and reservoir of tomorrow's crime problem."

MORAL VALUES CHANGE

What is happening that all this is so? The average citizen wonders.

Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Police Chiefs thinks that "Somehow we have lost our sense of proportion—of respect for law and humanity. It is the time and age in which we are living."

Mr. Hoover places the blame more specifically.

"Our young people are being brought up in the midst of new notions of happiness and new ideas of values. Too many children and adolescents have absorbed false attitudes and notions of law and order.

MORE POLICE NEEDED

"The important periods of childhood and adolescence have suffered greatly from the lack of sufficient character training and parental leadership, guidance, and example."

As for the often-heard charge that crime has its origins in the slums, authorities say "no." It has many causes.

There should, of course, be more police. They should be better paid. Almost everyone seems to agree on this.

There has been a population explosion and a crime explosion, but the police-force explosion is hardly more than a pop in comparison.

Nationwide, there are about 300,000 people in the police departments. This includes janitors and clerks. It boils down to 280,000 working police, charged with protecting 200 million people.

No policeman works 24 hours a day. The men work in three shifts. This means that only one-third of that number is on duty at any one time.

That is, about 90,000 on the job. "This is comparatively few police to protect this huge country," in Mr. Tamm's opinion.

PROBLEMS OF A CHIEF

On a national average, the number of policemen per thousand people is 1.9. In 1958, the average was 1.8.

The problem of local police departments is typified by the situation in pleasant and prosperous Fairfax County.

There are 400 square miles in the county to police, with 250 men for the job. It works out to 0.75 man per thousand of the population.

Major Durrer would like to have one policeman for every thousand. That, he thinks, "would do the necessary job."

But he finds recruitment difficult. Low pay is one reason. His standards of recruitment are high. He could lower them and probably get more men.

"But I would rather have one good man on the street than five I was unsure of," he said.

COURT RULINGS RESTRICTIVE

The starting pay for a policeman in Fairfax County is $5,750 a year. Major Durrer has asked for authority to raise this amount. If it is granted, he expects to be able to attract more men into police work.

Ironically, one of the reasons policemen are low paid and the forces understaffed is that citizens generally are more interested in supporting the school system than the police force.

More than 85 percent of the tax dollar in Fairfax County goes into the schools. The rest is divided among other departments.

Another break on law enforcement, in the opinion of FBI Director Hoover, results from recent court decisions.

"There can be no doubt," he stated, "that law enforcement has been hindered by some recent court decisions. Rigid legal restrictions have steadily encroached on the power of law enforcement to operate quickly and decisively.

SOCIETY AT DISADVANTAGE

"Law enforcement does not ask an advantage in its struggle with the lawless. It asks only that the scales of justice be balanced. The cause of justice is not served when hardened criminals are allowed to go free through legal technicalities.

"Some courts, I believe," said Mr. Hoover, "lean too far on the side of the accused and give no thought to the rights of society."

Mr. Tamm, the IACP head, agrees. He feels police should have sufficient time to interrogate suspects and that confessions should be admissible within reasonable time limits. He cites the "model law" recently proposed by the American Law Institute.

BRIGHT SPOTS GLOW

These are the problems, the handicaps, the burdens under which the police of the Nation operate today.

The picture is dark, but by no means hopeless. There are signs of a growing mobilization against crime and its causes, such as these:

The President, in his crime message to Congress, proposed a national strategy to combat crime, a united front "welding together the efforts of local, State, and Federal Governments."

In a three-stage approach, the Federal Government would help improve methods of crime prevention and detection; increase appropriations for grants to States and cities to provide for better police training; and, last, make law enforcement in the District of Columbia a model for the Nation.

CRIME CENTER PLANNED

The President's Crime Commission and the District of Columbia Crime Commission are investigating the causes of crime and the adequacy of law enforcement now. A report and recommendations are due by the first of next year.

The Attorney General has invited each State to form a planning committee on crime and law enforcement. Some States already have such a committee.

The FBI recently announced plans for a revolutionary new system to catch up with the criminal electronically.

It will set up a national crime information center from which information on wanted criminals and stolen property can be transmitted instantly across the Nation. Computers will store the data. All police will have to do is "ask the machine."

The center will be in operation by January, 1967. It should help vastly in cutting down the mobility advantage of the modern criminal.

SCOOTERIZED POLICE

Local law enforcement authorities are speeding up communications within their own boundaries. In Chicago, a new communications system has been fantastically successful in cutting down the time it takes to reach the scene of a crime after it has been reported.

Motor scooters are coming into use as the mode of transportation speeds up. Police cars in many cities are being repainted in vivid colors.

"The most visible police car we can get," is the way they describe the new blue and white cars in the District of Columbia.

Many cities are applying for Federal grants under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. These grants provide technical assistance and training for law-enforcement officers.

PRACTICAL TRAINING PUSHED

"Law-enforcement training is recognized as one of the real answers to the crime problem," according to one authority. "You can't give a man a badge, a gun, and a billy club and say 'go out and enforce the law.' "

There is a great push now for practical training.

Plans are underway to expand the FBI National Academy to provide for the training of 1,200 a men a year instead of 200 as at present. The academy is located on the Quantico, Va., Marine Base.

On the congressional front, the President is pressing for passage of the Dodd bill which would prohibit the sale of guns, willy-nilly, by mail order.

There is hope it will be reported out of the Senate Commerce Committee, where it has been blocked for several years, and passed by the Senate.

Last October, Congress formed a special subcommittee on criminal law and procedure. It is holding hearings on various bills to curb organized crime—the syndicates which thrive on gambling and all forms of vice.

Around the country, more and more civic organizations are joining in the campaign against crime. They are conducting effective campaigns for higher police pay, better equipment, stronger law enforcement.

The ranks are forming. The drive is on. It is making headway. But it has a long way to go.

DWIGHT GRISWOLD LECTURE IN POLITICAL SCIENCE BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL AT NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, one of the distinguished public servants from my State of Nebraska was the late Dwight Griswold. Dwight Griswold served in this body with distinction, and his career was sadly ended by his untimely death in 1954.

The widow of the late Dwight Griswold, Mrs. Erma Griswold Bomgardner, has established at Nebraska Wesleyan University the Dwight Griswold Memorial Lectures in Political Science. This year the first of those lectures was delivered.

It was my privilege to extend to one of the outstanding Members of this body an invitation to deliver that lecture and to appear before the students in a question-and-answer period that followed. The invitation went to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Senator SALTONSTALL has served continuously in public life since 1920. He is a devoted public servant. It was most fitting that he should speak to the interested student body of Nebraska Wesleyan University on the subject of political science and on the subject of public service.

It was also fitting for another reason. We were assembled that day to honor Dwight Griswold. Senator SALTONSTALL received his bachelor of arts degree from Harvard University in 1914. Former Senator Griswold was graduated from the University of Nebraska in 1914. Their lives were similar in many instances.

Senator SALTONSTALL served as a first lieutenant with the 301st Field Artillery in France during World War I.

Senator Griswold served as a first lieutenant, and later as a captain, with the 127th Field Artillery in 1917 and 1918.

Both Senator Griswold and Senator SALTONSTALL were Masons, and both were members of the American Legion. Both enjoyed golf. Both were Republicans. Both were Governors of their States. Senator SALTONSTALL was elected in 1938 and served as Governor until he was elected to the Senate in 1944.

Senator Griswold was elected Governor in 1940, 1942, and 1944. He served until January 1947.

Both served in their State house of representatives.

Senator SALTONSTALL served in the Massachusetts House from 1923 until 1937.

Senator Griswold served in the Nebraska House of Representatives in 1921, and was a member of the State senate from 1925 to 1929.

Both served in the U.S. Senate. Senator SALTONSTALL was elected to the Senate in November 1944, to fill the unexpired term of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., who had resigned his Senate seat to enter the armed services. Senator SALTONSTALL still serves as one of the most valued Members of this body.

Senator Griswold was elected to the Senate on November 4, 1952, to fill the unexpired term of the late Kenneth S. Wherry. Unfortunately, Senator Griswold died in the spring of 1954.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my introduction of Senator SALTONSTALL at Nebraska Wesleyan University on April 1, 1966.

There being no objection, the introduction was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL BY SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS AT NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, APRIL 1, 1966, UPON ESTABLISHMENT OF DWIGHT GRISWOLD MEMORIAL LECTURESHIP IN POLITICAL SCIENCE, LINCOLN, NEBR.

I can understand why introductions are sometimes too long. Today I face the temptation to make a long introduction. I shall resist that temptation, however.

We are grateful for the generous gift of Mrs. Erma Bomgardner that will make it possible to carry on these annual lectures at Nebraska Wesleyan as a memorial to Dwight Griswold.

Dwight Griswold is deserving of this memorial. Sturdy Nebraskan, man of character, man of decision, man of accomplishment, athlete, businessman, editor, soldier, State legislator, Governor, director of military government, AID Administrator and U.S. Senator—describe Dwight Griswold. He was my friend.

Here today to speak is another distinguished American. Sturdy New Englander, athlete, businessman, farmer, soldier, State legislator, Governor, U.S. Senator, man of character, man of decision, man of accomplishment, apply to our speaker. He, too, is my friend.

Because of our speaker's friendship, respect and affection for Dwight Griswold, he is here today. It is my happy privilege to present to you the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the speech delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL covered many important public issues. It also conveyed to the student body the views of one of America's finest public servants. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the lecture delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, DELIVERED AT THE FIRST ANNUAL DWIGHT GRISWOLD LECTURE IN POLITICAL SCIENCE AT NEBRASKA UNIVERSITY, LINCOLN, NEBR., APRIL 1, 1966

President Rogers, Mrs. Bomgardner, Senator CURTIS, members of the board of trustees, faculty, students, and friends of Dwight Griswold, I am pleased that my friend and colleague CARL CURTIS could be with me today. Senator CURTIS is one of the most conscientious, frank, and politically courageous Members of the Senate.

He carries successfully one of the heaviest committee loads in our body, serving on the Finance Committee where he is an acknowledged expert on social security matters, on the Space Committee, Government Operations Committee, Rules and Administration Committee, and Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. His colleague, ROMAN HRUSKA, is another hard working and highly respected Member of the Senate, and he is very helpful on the Appropriations Committee where I work with him. Another great Nebraskan, Kenneth Wherry, was a good friend, too. I served as party whip when Ken Wherry was party leader, and came to know him well and to respect him. Senator Butler was another Nebraskan with whom I worked. So this Massachusetts Yankee is here to say that you Nebraskans have been sending men of stature and ability to the U.S. Senate.

It is an honor for me to be asked here today to give the first of the Dwight Griswold lectures in political science, an area of study that has increasing impact on the lives of each of us. But this invitation has a special meaning to me because of my friendship with and respect for the man in whose name the lectureship has been established.

Dwight Griswold and I were Governors together and later we were Senators together. Mrs. Saltonstall and I had the privilege of entertaining Governor and Mrs. Griswold in Massachusetts at the first Governors' conference they attended. Afterward I visited him in your capital at Lincoln, and we drove to Omaha together to the American Legion convention. I recall, too, my visit with him in Athens, Greece, when he was administering the Marshall plan in that wartorn country.

Some years later we were Senate colleagues until his untimely death. He was a man of high ideals and principles, a thoughtful public official concerned about the role of goverment and the freedom of the individual. It is especially fitting that this testimonial to his contribution to his State and Nation should be local on this campus where he began his college education. The nature of the memorial is appropriate, too—the Dwight Griswold Lectureship in Political Science—because of his deep involvement in and commitment to both politics and education—politics as an elected official and education as a Nebraska University regent for a number of years.

Dwight Griswold served in the State legislature, then became Governor, took an important post abroad, and finally went to Washington as a Member of the Senate. I started as an alderman in my home town, then became assistant district attorney of my county, then went on to the State legislature—speaker, Governor, and Senator. So in different States, but in the same political party, our careers are much alike. Moving up the political ladder as we did equipped us better to understand the other fellow's point of view and some of the special difficulties that face officeholders at the various levels of government.

One's political career is often shaped by events he cannot anticipate. For example, Mrs. Saltonstall and I had decided to retire after my term as Governor was concluded, when one day I received a phone call from Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, now our Ambassador to Vietnam, asking me whether I could stop by to see him on an important matter. I did so and he told me of his decision to leave the Senate to go on active duty in the Army. His resignation meant that as Governor I would have to appoint a successor. I decided to ask Sinclair Weeks, who told me he would complete Senator Lodge's term but that he would not run for election the next November. Mrs. Saltonstall and I talked it over and decided that I should run for the seat, largely because of the war. So now I come today to visit with you as a U.S. Senator—22 years later.

Most of you are students. You are approaching the end of your formal education, and soon the responsibility for the progress and future of this country will be in your hands. You move closer to the center of the stage in a troubled and challenging world, but a world of opportunity. It will be your job to make our community, our country, and the world itself a better place in which to live. You are in a position not only to participate yourself, but to stimulate others to assist also. I urge you to accept the challenge—prepare yourself to serve your community and your country, and then do so. For, as Tom Paine, writing in 1777 in the midst of the Revolutionary War, said: "Those who expect to reap the blessing of liberty must undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

Gaining an understanding of our problems and opportunities in college, an awareness of the turbulent, fast moving, and difficult, yet exciting, time in which we live, is not enough. Far more important is to develop the desire to keep on learning, the desire to understand and appreciate your fellow man, and the will to contribute to the advance of our national well-being and, in fact, to that of humanity itself. The problem is to discover where your particular talents can best be put to use to carry forward that advance.

In recent years we have seen tremendous scientific and technological advances which have had important effects on our lives. Now our job is to match those advances with progress in the humanities, the arts, and in human understanding. We are living in an age where individual freedom is fundamental to our way of life—but we realize that individual freedom must be tempered by concern for others, that it must be moderated by respect for the integrity, the viewpoints, and the talents of others. We know, too, that international competition must be regulated by international understanding.

The late President Kennedy—my one-time Senate colleague and friend—once said, "One man can change the world and every man should try." This involves knowing the past and studying the present, desiring the best and doing what one can to make it come to pass. Today, far more than in the early days of Dwight Griswold and myself, we all feel the impact of government upon us. So we have an obligation to ourselves as well as our country to make our own impact felt.

If you remember but one word of what I say to you today, I hope it will be the word "participate." There are many ways, of course, to take part in government. You can become professors and teach government so that others will really come to understand it. You can become journalists, authors, or commentators in the tradition of Walter Lippmann or James Reston and write about government so that your readers will learn more about what is going on.

You can become civil servants in public health or other technical service and participate in government by working directly for it. You can participate in community activities through your church and neighborhood associations, or community fund drives, and thus gain the friendship and confidence of your neighbors and stimulate their interest in public affairs. Finally, you can run for office yourself and become elected public officials, responsible to the people you represent, as Senator CURTIS and I try to do, and as Dwight Griswold did so well.

Today government enters our homes, our business activities, and the education and bringing up of our children. It may come in the back door or the front, but it comes. Albert Einstein was once asked how he explained the fact that outstanding progress could be achieved in the complicated world of physics when there appeared to be so little progress in politics and government. He responded by saying simply, "Physics is easier." I never studied physics in school or college, but I certainly have had to try to understand the background of atomic power, the difference between atomic and nuclear physics, and how thrust is formed to push a satellite into space. These are complicated, technical matters.

To say that government is more complicated than physics is to say that government is complicated indeed, but Einstein spoke the truth. The once relatively simple functions of government—protection from external enemies, protection from internal forces, and the raising of taxes to pay for these two services, as in the early Mayflower days—have been expanded to a bewildering and complex variety of activities.

We are not a nation of numbers, statistics, and IBM computers. We are a nation of people—with goals, needs, and capacities. What we want to do is to make certain that every American has the fullest opportunity to develop, to make the maximum contribution to society, and to insure that he retains his individuality, initiative, and freedom in the process.

As a nation we must move forward. But we want to make certain when we do move forward what the direction is in which we are going. Gov. Dwight Griswold stated it well when he wrote in 1943, and I quote:

"Change is the law of our national life and although we respect tradition we have a much greater respect for our destiny as a people. We can never expect to go back precisely to where we were before.

"It does not follow, however, that all change is improvement simply because it has the shining face of something new. We must always ask ourselves some very practical questions when we consider adopting a new idea or technique of government. Does it square with our fundamental American patterns; does it broaden and lengthen the avenue of opportunity for each of us and for all of us; does it enlarge or restrict the field of private enterprise; does it add or diminish the rights of the American man; is it fundamentally fair and decent or does it seek to whip one group at the expense of another? Then we must ask ourselves one more question: Will it work?"

These were the words of your Governor in 1943; they are as applicable today as they were then.

We all want better education for our young people, better housing, better highways, cleaner air, and cleaner rivers. We all want our slums eliminated and our cities redeveloped. No thoughtful citizen objects to these goals. The great questions are: How fast are we going to accomplish those results? Who is to administer the programs? How are we going to pay for them? We have a responsibility to keep our feet on the ground, to move forward in a realistic, sensible way that will permit the individual to exercise his freedom of choice and his initiative and still keep government close to home.

We know one thing for sure—there is never going to be enough public money to do everything that everyone wants his government to do for him. Somewhere a line has to be drawn between what we'd like and what we can have. We have to have priorities. We must remember, too, that money appropriated for new programs when they are started is just a drop in the bucket compared to their eventual cost. That is not to say that new programs are not necessary. You and I know that there are many people in our towns and cities who need a boost and we want to see to it that they get it. When we are doing so much for the people of other countries we cannot ignore the needs of our fellow Americans.

What we in the United States want is not a handout but an equal opportunity to get ahead, to rise as far as our abilities can take us, to make things as comfortable as possible for ourselves and our families by our own initiative and hard work.

We all want the Great Society, if what is meant by that is a land free from want, from unemployment, from discrimination on the basis of race or color, where people have decent housing, proper educational opportunities, good food, and the health care they need.

But in getting it, we don't want to throw out the window all the attributes that have made this country great. In short, we want the Federal Government to assist, not absorb. We want it to help but not to dominate. We want our States to continue to function within their capacities for the benefit of their people.

There are too many instances in recent years of bypassing the States and concentrating more power in Washington, of enacting far-reaching programs without concern for the views of responsible State and local officials, or for the effect of Federal action on existing State and local programs. The National Government cannot possibly appreciate the widely varying local situations and headaches. Woodrow Wilson once said: "The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it." As Governor Romney put it more recently: "The big issue 100 years ago was whether the excess sovereignty of the States was going to destroy the Union and the Constitution. The big issue today is whether the excess of concentration of Federal power and sovereignty is going to destroy State, local, and individual freedom and responsibility."

I have always believed that strong local government, sparked by the initiative and cooperative interaction of large numbers of interested and dedicated citizens is an important ingredient of our success as a nation.

Changing times and needs have thrust new and important responsibilities on the National Government, but government functions best when it is closest to the people, where it can direct its efforts to local needs and ways of doing things. Activities and programs which can be handled at the local level should be handled there. When local government abdicates its proper responsibilities, of course, the National Government is going to absorb them, often without truly advancing our individual cause. What we must do is see to it that our local governments are made to toe the mark and to respond effectively to community needs.

One difficulty they have in doing so is that they lack sufficient funds. Various suggestions have been proposed to remedy that situation. Should we have a system of Federal block grants to States? Should there be a tax credit? Should certain types of Federal taxes be turned over to States? This whole subject merits our careful attention, for our localities must be in a position to meet their obligations to their citizens.

Furthering the goals of justice and insuring that every individual enjoys the rights guaranteed to him under our Constitution is the responsibility of each of us. Think how important the accomplishment of these fundamental rights is to the way in which other nations of the world look at our country and our way of life. Today our country is the leader of the free world. The world looks to us for guidance and for assistance, but it looks to us also to set an example. Certainly the goals for which we strive are the goals of most of the people of the world.

The late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said, and I quote: "Our purpose, ultimately and at all times, should be to use our great power, without abusing it or presuming upon it, to move steadily toward lasting peace, orderly freedom, and growing opportunity. Thus do we achieve our constitutional purpose to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.' " We stand for equal rights and the worth of the individual.

There is no place for partisan sniping at a President or a policy when the peace of the world, the security of our Nation, and our international prestige and standing are at stake. This does not mean we must accept uncritically every action that is taken. We move forward as a nation by improving our techniques and our policies, and we improve them by insisting constantly that they stand the test of challenge.

As you and I well know, the United States has no territorial ambitions. We don't seek to overthrow any legitimate government, and we oppose any such attempts by other countries. What we want is a world at peace where people are able to develop in their own way free from the threat of domination by others. Our policy has been to lend assistance, where our help is desired, to independent nations as they attempt to meet the tremendous economic and social problems they face, and in their efforts to maintain their own independence and security from external interference.

Sixty years ago President Theodore Roosevelt summarized our role in a nutshell. His words are as true today, and I quote:

"We have duties to others and duties to ourselves, and we can shirk neither. We wish peace, but we wish the peace of justice, the peace of righteousness. We wish it because we think it is right and not because we are afraid. No weak nation that acts manfully and justly should ever have cause to fear us, and no strong power, should ever be able to single us out as a subject for insolent aggression."

As Roosevelt pointed out, to achieve our goals of peace and justice, we must remain strong, for strength is one thing the Communists and their allies understand. As General Norstad, former head of NATO forces, said, our foreign policy is no greater than the force which exists to back it up. The Communist leader, Mao Tse-tung expressed the same view when he said, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

Of course today when we think of world trouble spots, we think first of Vietnam. The President has made it clear that our objective will remain the freedom of South Vietnam to determine its own future without external interference, and the right to work out its relations with the North by peaceful means. We seek no more than this and cannot accept less. We do not like the situation, but we cannot run from it. If we did, we would be derelict in meeting our responsibility to the people of South Vietnam. And the impact of our action on other southeast Asian nations could have serious consequences, not only for our own security but also for that of the free world. Think of the increased pressures of our adversaries if we pulled out. We intend to show the Communists that we mean business and that aggression and the slaughter in villages of innocent civilians is not the best course. We cannot safeguard our principles by abandoning them.

The road ahead in Vietnam is not easy. Nor is it likely to be short. It more probably will be long and winding, full of detours and dangers. But we must take it, ever on the alert for solutions and alternative approaches. We must take it together as a united people, mindful that sacrifices will be called for, and above all, mindful that we are right in our determination to succeed.

We hear criticism all the time of the actions President Johnson has taken or perhaps has failed to take in Vietnam. But what would you do if you were in his place? I wake up sometimes in the middle of the night and ask myself that momentous question. It is mighty hard to say what could be done that he is not already doing. We certainly cannot negotiate if our opponent won't even sit down at the conference table opposite us. We stopped the bombing for 37 days and made very clear our intentions, yet Hanoi and Peking were not interested in what we had to say or even in offering any constructive counter proposals.

Today our attention is directed toward Vietnam. For the President and his advisers, for our military commanders, and for the Congress, however, Vietnam is but one of many difficult situations around the world. One indication of this is the fact that we have members of our armed services in more than 100 countries today.

This is a restless world, a world in ferment, where developments wherever they occur must be watched closely. Dean Rusk said recently that there had been 52 coups d'etat since he became Secretary of State. Think of it. In Africa military coups have overthrown the governments of six of the new countries in the last 4 months, and many other African governments are not at all secure. Few, in fact, are firmly entrenched. Dont' forget that in just the last decade 28 European colonies were transformed into nations, and are feeling their way in their new independence.

Today we live in a world grown small by advance in communication and transportation and the exchange of information. People in one part of the world know better how people in other parts of the world are faring. The desires for increased material gains, especially in the developing countries, have led to many crises and a collective instability that may at any moment pose a threat to the security of the entire world. If we do not act to encourage political stability by giving hope to the many aspirations of people around the globe, we may well be faced with widespread wars of national liberation or a world where the future of freedom has dimmed perceptibly.

On every front there are problems as well as opportunities. We are all concerned with the situation in Rhodesia, in Indonesia, in the Dominican Republic, and in the Organization of American States, for example. The United Nations is still another headache. Apart from Vietnam, however, two main problems confront us. One is the growing threat of China; the other the crisis in NATO.

Just a few years ago, most Americans regarded Russia as the main threat to our security and that of the world. Today, it is Communist China. Suddenly we find that we do not know as much about China as we would like to. Recently statements by a number of professors that, while we must continue to contain China, we must avoid isolating her, make us think along new lines. You may be sure that our Government as well as universities is devoting more attention to the China problem. We see an apparent deep-rooted schism developing between China and Russia. This is encouraging from our point of view. We want to see to it that they remain apart.

We also see that China has been meeting with rebuffs of late. Her representatives have been thrown out of about five African countries. They were unsuccessful in aggravating the India-Pakistan dispute. Their influence in Indonesia and Malaysia has been sharply reduced. The meeting of the Organization of African Unity last month revealed that they are not going to have their way there. They see us committed in southeast Asia. They know that Japan and Russia have concluded trade agreements. Around the world, then, they are meeting with setbacks. The big question is, how will they respond?

A further question is whether China should be admitted to the United Nations. Would she join if she were invited? What would be the effect of her admission on the effectiveness of the U.N. and the Security Council? I do not think she would join if asked, but neither do I think we should ask her. The U.N. has problems enough now.

De Gaulle's actions precipitating the NATO crisis without doubt have raised immediate and serious questions for the United States and its allies in Western Europe. Can there be a defense of Western Europe without France? How far should the member nations go towards meeting President de Gaulle's demands? If the NATO bases are to be removed from France, who is to shoulder the costs? Is NATO as it was organized in 1949, and is now operating, responsive to today's needs? If not, how can it be revamped to meet them squarely? The issue is, of course, larger than NATO itself. It involves our whole relationship with Western Europe—economically, politically, and socially as well as militarily. How it is solved may be crucial to our security and standing in the world. What the eventual outcome will be is not clear at this moment, but we are hopeful that something can be worked out which will permit NATO to remain as an unified and effective arm of the free world in Europe.

Indeed there are those observers who, like Walter Lippmann, believe that the NATO crisis is really a blessing in disguise, since out of it may develop a new European alliance, a greater European community for which, in many ways, we would be a natural ally.

So our problems are complicated, they are worldwide, and they demand the attention of each of us. In a very real sense we all are political scientists, for we are all vitally concerned with government domestically and internationally. The public officials, the writers, the teachers, and the experts, the commentators, the community leaders in both public and private organizations—they and others can affect what we do as a Nation. And it is up to us to know where they are leading us, and in fact to participate in the decision-making process ourselves.

So we who are older than you have not solved all the problems. There are more than enough for you to conquer. Helping to solve them will provide you with great satisfaction, I can assure you. As you and I know, we do not need to go to the international or even the national scene to find problems which are crying out for solution. There is much to do right in your own hometown. Begin there, if you will, but maintain your interest in national and international matters, for if we are to succeed our country needs the talents and insights of people like you working at all levels. I'm confident that yours is not only a "can do" but a "will do" generation, and I wish I could be around to see you tackle the problems which we know must be solved and can only be solved when we all take part.

There is no more rewarding and satisfying experience than public service, and I know my friend Dwight Griswold would agree, were he here with us today. I commend it to you. Certainly it has its frustrations and irritations. Certainly you will be misunderstood and you will be criticized by people who don't stop to ask why you voted as you did or said what you did. Certainly you will not be able to accomplish all you set out to accomplish. The hours are long, the tenure is uncertain, the pay may be considerably less than you could command elsewhere, and there are separations for your family. But public service has its rewards, its satisfactions, its compensations. It is stimulating, challenging, varied, and meaningful. You have an opportunity to help your fellowman and to play a part, however small, in influencing the course of events.

In closing I commend to you the words of Daniel Webster which appear above the Speaker's rostrum in the House of Representatives. I hope they challenge you to accept the responsibilities and opportunities which can be yours in public service. These words are: "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there has been much newspaper comment about the occasion. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the column entitled "More or Less Personal," published in the Lincoln, Nebr., Evening Journal of March 31, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

More or Less Personal

Friday will see the initiation of the Dwight Griswold memorial lectureship in political science at Nebraska Wesleyan University and it seems particularly fitting that U.S. Senator Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, will be the first speaker.

These men were friends. Both were wartime Governors of their States, both serving three terms—Saltonstall from 1938 to 1944, Griswold from 1941 to 1948. Both were moderate Republicans in the U.S. Senate.

The tragedy for Nebraska was that it lost this moderate voice on April 14, 1954, when Senator Griswold died of a heart attack. Saltonstall, who went from the governorship of Massachusetts to the U.S. Senate in 1944, is voluntarily retiring from office this year after 22 years of constructive service to the Nation.

These two men, who were native sons of their States and gave many years to public service, grew up in States separated by nearly 2,000 miles, and further in traditions and political heritage.

Saltonstall is a part of what is sometimes called the eastern establishment which has furnished so many learned and able men in the building of the Nation. These are the men who have had the backgrounds of eastern prep schools, the big name private colleges, many of whom, with independent wealth, had the desire for public service. Presidents of both parties have called upon them repeatedly to serve their country.

Leverett Saltonstall is rich in famous forebears—two Presidents (the Adamses), eight Governors, two ambassadors to the Court of St. James's, fighting men of all wars and two speakers of the Massachusetts House of Representatives.

The Massachuetts Senator carved out his own political career. In his first campaign for Governor he took on James M. Curley in 1938. Even his close friends conceded him little chance against this Democratic pro. He won handily and continued to pile up large majorities in the Democratic stronghold of Boston.

Though Saltonstall came from the bluest blooded of the first families of Massachusetts he had a rapport with his constituents in all walks of life. He has described himself as "just a simple Yankee New Englander." He is much more, he is a great public servant. It was typical that he looked at the calendar and decided that 74 was an age to retire and that he did it without intrigue. He announced in plenty of time for all political hopefuls to plan their campaigns.

The friend he has come to honor grew up in a pioneer State. Mr. Griswold was born in a log cabin in Harrison, in the far northwest corner of the State. The family later moved to Gordon where his father founded the First National Bank.

Banking held little appeal for the late Governor and Senator. Politics was his love. He served in both houses of the bicameral legislature. He ran three times unsuccessfully for Governor before his election in 1941.

After leaving the governorship he served with the American Civil Administration in Germany and as head of the U.S. aid mission to Greece. In 1952 he was elected to the U.S. Senate and his death resulted in an incalculable loss to Nebraska. The Republican Party lost a voice of liberal moderation at a time when such a voice might have guided the party in its time of need.

These lectures—established by a gift to Wesleyan, where Mr. Griswold attended his first 2 years of college, by the former Mrs. Griswold, now Mrs. Henry I. Bomgardner, of Scottsbluff—are a fine tribute to a man who contributed much to his State and good government.

TVA AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE FOOD-FOR-FREEDOM PROGRAM

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, the food-for-freedom program—of which I am proud to be a cosponsor—now under consideration by the Senate Committee on Agriculture emphasizes the need for the full employment of all facets of American industry and agriculture, as well as the U.S. Government, in helping to assure an adequate food supply for all the peoples of the world. Nothing is more important toward achieving political stability in the underdeveloped countries. Freedom from hunger is an essential step toward achieving a stable political freedom.

In mobilizing our resources to make food a weapon for freedom, presently as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and formerly as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have long advocated that the fullest use should be made of the Tennessee Valley Authority's great experience and knowledge in the field of fertilizer. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has said that "fertilizer is as important as bullets" in the war in Vietnam. TVA's chemical division at Muscle Shoals is the world center for fertilizer research, and the fullest use should be made of its present program and its potential. Some people may believe that our success in the improvement of fertilizers is a damnation rather than a blessing in view of some agricultural surpluses. However, I believe when our commodity production is viewed in comparison to the world food needs that we will find the balance on the side of increased production.

TVA has already participated to a considerable extent in this field through work it has done for the Agency for International Development. Half a dozen teams of two to three TVA specialists in agriculture and fertilizer development have gone abroad under AID auspices to make studies in some foreign lands—Morocco, Korea, Iraq, Nigeria, Thailand, and Turkey. TVA also has recently made a survey of plans of the fertilizer industry for expanding fertilizer production to meet the needs of food-deficient areas, and this information is being used by AID and other Government agencies in determining future policies in this field. It has helped train technicians from foreign countries, an example being a 19-member fertilizer team from India which was given an 8 weeks' course at Muscle Shoals.

TVA has, however, both the technical resources and personnel to play a much wider and more significant role in meeting the crisis which population and food experts are describing with increasing alarm. For example, Dr. Raymond Ewell, of the State University of New York at Buffalo said:

> The world is on the threshold of the biggest famine in history * * * this is the greatest and most nearly unsoluble problem in the history of the world. And it is almost here.

TVA has 30 years of experience and leadership in fertilizer technology to draw upon, having been in the forefront in the fertilizer field since its establishment in 1933. From relatively simple beginnings, its activities have developed to the present National Fertilizer Development Center at Muscle Shoals which has contributed extensively to the interests of the fertilizer industry and of agriculture in this country. The facilities and staff at the Muscle Shoals Center embrace all phases of chemical fertilizer development from laboratory to plant-scale demonstrations of technology and production. They have the capability of developing fertilizers suited to different soils, climates, and crops.

Rice, of course, is the chief food for regions containing about three-fifths of the world's population. Yet, in the rice growing areas of the world the most serious threats of famine exist. TVA has done considerable work recently on a material, urea-ammonium phosphate, which holds particular promise for these areas—an improvement over the fertilizers now available for rice culture.

Urea-ammonium phosphate has several characteristics in its favor. It contains no sulfur, which is in short supply in the world. It is highly concentrated as compared with other high-nitrogen solid fertilizers. This latter is an important attribute, since the use of concentrated materials reduces freight and handling charges per unit of actual plant nutrient. This factor can be crucial in areas which of necessity must import most or all of their fertilizer materials, particularly during the initial stages of development.

Calculations have been made, for example, which indicate that the cost of transporting plant nutrients to India in the form of urea-ammonium phosphate would be $31 a ton less than for other fertilizers, while transportation across India would be $23 a ton cheaper.

Of course there are other avenues to be explored in seeking fertilizers designed specifically for the needs of developing countries.

TVA has produced urea-ammonium phosphate in pilot plant operations, and there seems to be no question but that construction and operation of a demonstration-scale plant would be relatively inexpensive and at the same time a highly important project considering the high stakes involved in making effective our aid to the underdeveloped countries.

Another aspect of TVA experience should also be mentioned. That is the development of techniques by which the people of the underdeveloped lands can be induced to use the fertilizers and taught to apply them effectively. The development and refinement of new and improved fertilizers is only one-half the process, and in TVA it has been coupled with widespread and intensive educational programs carried on in cooperation with State agricultural colleges and extension services in close touch with the people.

While on the subject of university extension services, I wish to mention an aside. There are proposals before us to reduce not only the Federal Government's support of this service, but also the agriculture experimental units connected with land grant schools. These programs offer an example of one of the oldest and most successful programs of Federal-State cooperation existing in our country. The accomplishments and innovations of these services are renown, not only in this country but, throughout the world. I strongly believe that we should look with considerable askance on any plan to cut back programs which have been such excellent examples of constructive Federal spending.

But, to return to TVA and its work with these services, without going into a detailed description, it can be pointed out that the most effective method we have found to carry the message to the farmers on the land is based on the old adage that "seeing is believing." Farm test-demonstrations, distributor demonstrations, test plots, and similar activities have proved highly effective in introducing new fertilizers to farmers in this country and in teaching the principles of scientific fertilization. Such techniques should be doubly important in lands where the populations are far less literate than our own.

TVA is fully aware of the importance of the programs now under way to help the people of large portions of the world feed themselves and avoid famine and disorder. It is prepared to employ its fertilizer experience to further these humanitarian and peaceful aims.

Mr. President, a series of articles and editorials on the subject of TVA and its work in the field of fertilizers were recently published in the Chattanooga Times. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times Mar. 15, 1966]

TVA AND AN URGENT TASK

The urgency of the world food crisis—with some authorities feeling we are on the edge of the worst famine in history—raises the logical and indeed the pressing possibility of a newly significant role for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Specialists at top scientific and general levels in TVA are now convinced that the Authority has both the resources and the personnel to play a key role in meeting this crisis. The primary method is through the perfection of fertilizers that can best increase crop yields in southeast Asia and other poorly developed areas.

TVA's recent annual report on farm and chemical development mentions the promising potential of one fertilizer in particular, urea-ammonium phosphate, for regions containing some 60 percent of the world's population, where rice is the chief food.

Urea-ammonium phosphate appears to have one quality of revolutionary import: a very high concentration of actual food nutrient—which makes its transportation $31 per ton cheaper to India, for example, than other fertilizers, and $23 per ton cheaper across the Indian subcontinent. Most of the underdeveloped lands must import their fertilizers.

In addition, urea-ammonium phosphate contains no sulfur, a common fertilizer ingredient which is in worldwide shortage.

There would seem to be no question that a test demonstration plant, probably to be located at Muscle Shoals, would be a relatively inexpensive but highly important step deserving the consideration now of the executive and legislative branches of Government.

The United States, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, private corporations, and the great foundations are all engaged, as articles in Sunday's Times pointed out, in the problem of the world food shortage.

TVA, with its global respect, its technical competence and its trained demonstration personnel, seems ideally suited for this basic complementary task.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, Mar. 13, 1966]

TVA'S KNOW-HOW IN FERTILIZERS CAN AID OTHERS—AGENCY HAS EXPERIENCE, KNOWLEDGE TO HELP THE DEVELOPING NATIONS

The Tennessee Valley Authority—for more than three decades one of the modern world's great examples of putting technology and humanitarian motives to the service of human betterment—offers to the starving people of the world an unmatched resource for expanding the food output in underdeveloped areas.

As human suffering and famine conditions blight the lives of millions of people, the old TVA concept of seeing is believing—the simple demonstration method which bridged the gulf between scientist and destitute farmer in the famous New Deal domestic experiment—is emerging in sharper focus as a kind of magician's wand to help turn fear and hunger into hope and fulfillment.

In simple terms, TVA's great reservoir of experience and knowledge in the development of chemical fertilizer, a backlog of technical information unequaled by any other organization in the world, is available in unique manner to guide the developing nations toward swift and substantial food production for their exploding populations.

HUMANITARIAN IDEALS

Moreover, it is this awareness of the TVA's unmatched competence in meeting this great hunger crisis of the world that is stirring the regional agency's scientists and technicians in promoting discussions and assessing resources along this line. For it is the feeling throughout the agency that enlistment of TVA in the world attack on hunger would be a bold and dramatic underscoring of the humanitarian ideals that spawned its creation under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

TVA experts point to the fact that President Johnson has called for an all-out effort to create a viable economy in war-torn Vietnam and provide a showcase for Asia. In this setting, the experts note that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman observed that in Vietnam the real need was fertilizer and not bullets.

The proponents of using the TVA skills in this area to tackle world hunger point out that TVA also possesses an advanced level of technology in the study and use of urea-ammonium phosphate, which appears to have qualities of an ideal rice fertilizer with distinct advantages over fertilizers now available for rice farming.

Against this backdrop, they argue, TVA has a well-equipped fertilizer development center at Muscle Shoals with an experienced scientific and engineering research organization that can develop and produce fertilizers for virtually any soil, crop, or climate in the world.

Moreover, it is noted, TVA could establish a urea-ammonium phosphate test plant tied in with all the farflung activities of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and at the same time utilize TVA's great esteem with the scientists and technicians of foreign lands who have visited TVA for many years to receive instruction in fertilizer techniques.

It is the view of some that no other leading nation in the world actually possesses the built-in grassroots good will for service abroad that this Nation has with the TVA history and experiment.

To outline the ways in which TVA could use its fertilizer facilities and technical personnel in contributing materially toward solving the world food problem, the following six items have been prepared on the basis of interagency discussions and assessments.

(The first three items underscore the cooperative areas currently involving TVA and overseas agencies, all of which can be continued and expanded. The second three items concern the new contributions the TVA fertilizer technology could make on the world hunger front.)

1. Technical assistance and planning:

TVA is in an excellent position to provide overall guidance to developing nations with regard to both shortrun and longrun planning for fertilizers. TVA has specialists in practically all fields of fertilizer technology and use from which it can assemble teams capable of making on-the-spot studies and evaluations of all phases of a nation's fertilizer situation-crop responses to fertilizers, raw materials situations, cost of alternative production processes, location of plants, development of marketing systems, etc.

TVA through AID is already participating extensively in this area. Since the summer of 1962, seven TVA teams of two to three specialists each have gone to six nations (Morocco, Korea, Iraq, Nigeria, Thailand, and Turkey) for periods ranging from 1 week to 3 months.

2. Special studies and surveys:

In order to guide the development of policies for use by AID, the United Nations, and the world fertilizer industry in planning broad programs for introducing fertilizers into developing countries, certain special studies and surveys frequently have to be made relating to world and regional fertilizer needs, production, and use. TVA personnel are especially suited for these kinds of studies because of their experience and knowledge.

A prime example of this type of activity is the recent survey made for AID on the fertilizer industry's plans for expanding production to meet needs in food-deficient areas. This survey is now being used to develop the U.S. Government's policy relative to making funds available to developing countries for fertilizer imports and plants.

3. Provide formal training in fertilizer technology:

The lack of well-trained technicians is one of the most serious deterrents to advancing fertilizer production and use in poorly developed regions. TVA can help fill this gap by providing practical training for selected groups of foreign nationals. Competence in practically all specialized areas of fertilizer science makes it possible for TVA to provide classroom-type instruction supplemented with whatever degree of practical application the situation may demand. Such things as plant operating techniques and field demonstrations can be included.

This type of activity is illustrated by the 8-week short course TVA provided last spring for a 19-member Indian fertilizer team. A similar short course—but with 60 or more participants from several nations—is scheduled this spring. TVA has offered training to a lesser extent for many years by arranging special study periods for individuals and small specialized groups from various foreign countries.

4. Special emphasis in chemical research and engineering development:

Some portion of TVA's effort in research and development of fertilizer production technology could readily be redirected to products or projects which are especially promising in their potential for use in food-deficient nations. Vigorous pursuit of process development and demonstration designed more specifically for developing countries could help a great deal in improving their food production in a short time.

Urea-ammonium phosphate is an outstanding example of such an opportunity. TVA already had done enough research with this product to know that, from a worldwide point of view, it is one of the most promising materials that has been developed.

Rice is the principal food crop in most regions of the world that face the threat of famine. Urea-ammonium phosphate appears to have the qualities of an ideal rice fertilizer, offering distinct advantages over fertilizers now available. Also, it contains the maximum concentration of plant food obtainable in high-nitrogen solid fertilizers by present technology, where transportation is difficult or much of the fertilizer must be imported during the initial stages of development.

RICE RESEARCH PROGRAM

As an example of how TVA could work through other organizations, initial testing and introduction of urea-ammonium phosphate in Asia might be done through the International Rice Research Institute at Los Banos, The Philippines. The Tropical Research Institute in Nigeria and the Colombian Agricultural Program, both sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation, could be involved in introductions in Africa and South America.

Development and testing could be coordinated with the extension-type activities of FAO's Freedom From Hunger program. It now has fertilizer demonstrations in 18 countries and is planning expanded activity in southeast Asia. This approach would have the additional benefit of aiding in acquainting industry with new products since private fertilizer companies participate in the Freedom From Hunger campaign through contributions of money and fertilizers.

Thus, by working with and through existing organizations, results of developmental work at Muscle Shoals could be carried to all parts of the world with minimum effort on TVA's part.

6. Isotope labeling of fertilizers for agronomic research:

FAO and the International Atomic Energy Agency jointly support a research program in 20 developing countries in which isotope-tagged fertilizers are employed to determine the effect of placement, time of application, fertilizer source, and various environment factors on the efficiency of nutrient uptake by rice and corn.

Previously, labeled fertilizers for this program were obtained from the U.S. Department of Agriculture fertilizer laboratory at Beltsville. Upon closing of the USDA laboratory, the program was left without a source of tagged materials.

All equipment at the USDA laboratory for tagging fertilizers has been transferred to TVA and also the man who headed the program. FAO–IAEA has requested TVA to provide labeled fertilizers starting next fiscal year. TVA currently is considering this proposal and also investigating domestic requirements.

Providing tagged fertilizers for use in the international program would permit developing countries to obtain fundamental agronomic data upon which to base a sound fertilizer program. A similar program initiated in the United States immediately following World War II proved of real value.

Demonstration of the urea-ammonium phosphate process by TVA would provide the technology for early adoption of the process by U.S. companies who are presently planning to establish facilities in developing countries or by the countries themselves. It could also provide materials for agronomic tests and demonstration in appropriate parts of the world.

RECOGNIZED LEADER

TVA is recognized as a leader in granulation technology, but the technology developed for U.S. needs cannot always be adapted to developing countries. For example, in India the immediate problem is to make granular combinations of ordinary superphosphate, urea, and ammonia, which is not practiced in the United States. In Zambia, a high-analysis sulfur-containing fertilizer of an unusual ratio is needed. The solutions to special granulations problems such as these could be readily obtained by studies in TVA pilot plants.

The world shortage of sulfur and its high price are a serious problem in planning phosphate fertilizer production. Acceleration of the development of several promising processes that require no sulfur, or less than conventional processes, would be of particular help to developing countries.

Another important contribution TVA could make is to assist in the evaluation of indigenous deposits of phosphate. TVA is by far the best qualified agency to answer questions regarding the suitability of phosphate ores through laboratory tests, mineralogical examination, and pilot-plant studies.

5. Help develop programs for testing and introducing improved fertilizers:

TVA also could help develop and coordinate small-scale tests and demonstrations of promising fertilizers to introduce them to researchers and their fertilizer industry in developing nations. Small quantities of experimental products could be furnished to initiate introduction on a worldwide basis similar to the approach used by TVA through the years.

As a result of past program activities with the universities and the fertilizer industry, TVA has a wealth of knowledge and experience on the roles these and similar organizations can play in introducing new products and practices. This experience in dealer and farmer fertilizer education programs can be made available to such organizations as AID or the Food and Agriculture Organization.

If an individual situation warranted, TVA could supply short-term help to plan and implement such programs in developing countries.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, Mar. 13, 1966]

TVA PATTERN SEEN AS GOOD PLAN FOR HALTING WORLD HUNGER CRISES

Two experts recently used these words in attempting to describe the appalling consequences of the food shortages that are creeping relentlessly upon the developing countries of the world:

Dr. Raymond Ewell, vice president for research, State University of New York at Buffalo:

"The world is on the threshold of the biggest famine in history * * * this is the greatest and most nearly unsoluble problem in the history of the world. And it is almost here."

Nyle C. Brady, former director of science and education, U.S. Department of Agriculture:

"Between the years 1960 and 2000, another world full of people will be added to these less developed regions of our inelastic earth * * * and they are falling steadily behind in their capacity to feed themselves."

Opening up new lands has great limitations. If all the land in the developing countries on which agriculture is economically feasible were placed in production, it would increase food supplies only 25 percent, at present production rates.

Food from the sea is a hopeless prospect. It now provides only 1 percent of the world's food; doubling or trebling it would be of no consequence.

Improvement in seeds and breeds is helpful only in long range.

This leaves chemical fertilizer, which increases the production on existing acres, as the one great hope for expanding food output substantially and quickly in the developing areas.

It has been demonstrated by both FAO and AID that fertilizers can increase in yield within present primitive farming methods; that is, with present varieties and crude methods of cultivation. It is estimated that a ton of plant nutrients will increase the yield of food crops by 8 to 10 tons.

Improving yields through the use of fertilizers in these countries involves much more than providing sufficient chemical fertilizer. There is a built-in caution among farmers, stemming from ignorance, fear, superstition and other factors, which must be overcome. This was true in the Tennessee Valley and the South in the early years of TVA and specialists feel that the drag will be even more pronounced in Asia, Africa, etc.

In addition, there is a lack of adequate marketing, transportation and credit facilities. Increased food production means a great transition from subsistence agriculture, where most is consumed and little sold, to commercial agriculture, with all the "middleman" problems that result.

The following is indicative of the effect of such braking influences:

The FAO in 1946 estimated that India's requirements for nitrogen in 1960 would be 1,500,000 tons; it used 323,000. It placed requirements for phosphates at 750,000 tons; India used 58,000. Potash was placed at 150,000 tons; use was only 29,500.

Put another way, if India keeps falling behind at the present rate in supplying food to its people, it will need by 1970 the equivalent of half of the present U.S. wheat crop in addition to its own production. By 1976 it would take the entire crop.

TVA's experience over the years has provided two things, basically:

An advanced level of technology in the chemistry and production of fertilizers; and with the extension services of the land-grant colleges, a background of adult education among farmers by the test-demonstration method which has successfully overcome farmer reluctance to modernize his methods.

In fertilizer technology, perhaps the most important advance has been made in increasing the plant nutrient content, permitting shipment at lower cost. Superphosphoric acid, a breakthrough of recent years, is being considered for shipment to other countries. It opens the way to the production of high analysis phosphatic material such as ammonium polyphosphates which have high plant nutrient content (over 70 percent as against the U.S. average of 35 percent) and add the nitrogen element.

On the education side, the test-demonstration "seeing is believing" method was the arch which bridged the gulf between the scientist and the farmer in the Tennessee Valley. It is largely responsible for the revolution which saw pastures replace row crops. Fertilizers produce results which are visible and thus rewarding; consequently, it has been found that they are an effective opening in getting farmers to adopt modern methods.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, Mar. 13, 1966]

NEW PHOSPHATE MAY CURB CRISIS—FERTILIZER'S QUALITIES ARE SUPERIOR FOR USAGE ON RICE CROP IN ASIA

Urea-ammonium phosphate appears to be an ideal rice fertilizer. Rice is the major food crop in the area where the world's food problem is most acute. Asian countries, which have approximately 60 percent of the world's population, depend heavily on rice.

Rice is grown on flooded soils, which means that the nitrogen must be in urea or ammonium forms rather than the nitrate form which results in losses through leaching or denitrification; urea-ammonium sulfate, now used in large quantities on rice, is proving undesirable at higher application rates because it acidifies the soil and also because it forms hydrogen sulfide which damages rice roots; urea-ammonium phosphate contains no sulfur.

Phosphorus for rice is most available if supplied in water-soluble form; all phosphorus in urea-ammonium phosphate is water soluble.

Urea-ammonium phosphate has an added advantage of being a good fertilizer for other crops. Thus, it would not be necessary for a country to import such materials as ammonium phosphates or ammoniated superphosphates, or develop plants for their production, unless it was so inclined.

Urea-ammonium phosphate takes moisture at a slower rate than most high-analysis fertilizers and is nonexplosive and noninflammable—factors which make the material easier to store and handle under adverse conditions.

The high-nutrient content of urea-ammonium phosphate is of particular importance to developing nations. Antiquated and inadequate rail systems, shortages of freight cars and poor highway systems make shipping expensive and limit the total amount of products that can be transported. This, coupled with lack of good storage, makes it difficult to move fertilizers from the point of manufacture or import to the farm in the right amounts at the right time.

In India, the average cost for transporting fertilizer is $20 per ton (compared with about $5 in the United States). Substituting urea-ammonium phosphate (25–30–0 grade) for the commonly used ammonium phosphate sulfate (16–20–0) would amount to a saving of $23 per ton of actual plant nutrient. Each bag of ammonium phosphate would contain 1.6 times more plant nutrient, greatly reducing the pressure on transportation and storage facilities.

Urea-ammonium phosphate also would permit large savings on overseas shipments of fertilizers. This is important since most developing countries initially must import part or all of the fertilizer they use. Freight costs from Houston to India amount to $27.18 per ton of fertilizer. Substituting 25–35–0 urea-ammonium phosphate for 16–20–0 would save $31 per ton of plant nutrient shipped.

DEATH OF NEWBOLD MORRIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I call the attention of the Senate to the passing of Newbold Morris, a very close friend of mine. I was his campaign chairman in 1949 when he ran for mayor of New York. He was one of the most distinguished and delightful personalities that ever graced our city.

As president of the city council in the LaGuardia administration, and as parks commissioner in the Wagner administration, Newbold Morris displayed in full measure the high qualities of character, integrity, and devotion. As the son of one of our city's first families, he directed his talents and his energies toward making New York City a better place to live for all its citizens.

Newbold Morris was one of those rare men of wealth and position who literally devoted their entire lives to public service. And it was a measure of Newbold Morris' devotion to his native city that he always concentrated his efforts on the city itself. At one time he said he would rather be "mayor of New York than President of the United States."

Newbold Morris was also one of the most prominent Republicans in New York, and was twice the candidate of my party for mayor. In short, he left a record that deserves the respect and remembrance of all New Yorkers, and he will be sorely missed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times, Herald-Tribune, and New York Post concerning Mr. Morris, and an article from the New York Times outlining his career.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1966]

NEWBOLD MORRIS

Newbold Morris always said he would rather be mayor of New York City than President of the United States. He did become the first president of the City Council, a position he held for 4 consecutive terms, and he frequently was Acting Mayor when Fiorello La Guardia was away. He twice ran for mayor in his own right, but his defeats did not kill his appetite of municipal service. As Parks Commissioner for the past 6 years he tried hard to indulge his first love, the city's betterment.

His death may well end the era of patron-politicians—men whose families have regarded public service as an obligation for centuries. New York and the Morrises have been as one. They gave their name to the Morrisania section of the Bronx, and Newbold Morris at his death lived on the same upper East Side street on which he was born.

In a city too often notable for the cynicism of its politics, his activities over the past 35 years were an unflagging force for integrity and dedication.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 1 1966]

WE LOSE A GOOD NEW YORKER

Newbold Morris was, in the first place, a New Yorker. He regarded this city with affection and concern, and devoted his energies and talents to it. With relatively few and brief exceptions, it bounded his ambitions.

From this it follows that Newbold Morris was a good New Yorker, one who worked for the city from no hope of personal gain but from a sense of civic duty and noblesse oblige. There are more men and women of this type serving New York and its various public and voluntary agencies than is generally recognized; Mr. Morris carried his devotion a step beyond board rooms and public-spirited organizations into the heat and dust of politics.

He was by no means always successful in this complex field—but often his failures stemmed from the defects of his qualities: from idealism that did not reckon with reality; from the suspicion of the professional politician for the "do-gooder." Yet he served ably and honestly in a number of important municipal offices, and he leaves a record that has won the respect and gratitude of his fellow-citizens. Newbold Morris was a man who deserves emulation; our city can never have too many of his kind.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 1, 1966]

NEWBOLD MORRIS

Newbold Morris was a spirited, dedicated man. Born to wealth and social prominence, he could have invested his life in respectable, conventional works. Instead, following in the Republican tradition of Theodore Roosevelt, he preferred the role of mugwump. He served notably in the fusion administration of Fiorello H. LaGuardia and himself sought the mayoralty in a coalition similar to the one that finally elected John Lindsay.

A man of sympathetic, decent instincts, he added dignity and sober style to the administrations he served. As parks commissioner under Mayor Wagner, he was often too inclined to imitate the leadership of his strong-minded predecessor, Robert Moses. But he protected the parks against commercial encroachments, and his decisions, if frequently traditionalist, were fair and thoughtful.

A scion of an old, established American family, he exemplified the qualities of disinterest and vision that have kept America from hardening into a caste society. He served New York well, and he will be remembered with affection.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1966]

NEWBOLD MORRIS, 64, IS DEAD OF CANCER

Newbold Morris, former president of the city council and commissioner of parks and twice a reform candidate for mayor, died of stomach cancer Wednesday night at St. Luke's Hospital. He was 64 years old.

Shortly before entering the hospital 3 weeks ago, Mr. Morris, a member of one of the city's oldest families, was the host at a gala dinner at the Tavern on the Green in Central Park.

It celebrated the opening of the opera season at the New York City Center, of which he had been board chairman since its founding. He underwent surgery 2 weeks ago.

Mayor Lindsay ordered all city flags to fly at half-staff until after Mr. Morris' funeral, which will be held at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow at St. Bartholomew's Church, Park Avenue at 50th Street. The burial will be private.

"Mrs. Lindsay and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Morris and her family," the mayor said. "I should also like to express the sorrow of all the people of the city of New York and to acknowledge the many years of devoted and constructive service that Newbold Morris gave to the city."

Governor Rockefeller said, "This gentleman was filled with the vitality and enthusiasm of the city he loved so much and did so much for. All New Yorkers will miss him."

Former Mayor Robert F. Wagner, under whom Mr. Morris, a Republican, served during his nearly 6 years as parks commissioner, said, "I have lost a personal friend of long standing, and New York City has lost one of its truly first citizens. He was a gentleman and an aristocrat in the noblest sense of that word."

A TRYING COUNCIL PRESIDENCY

In 1940 one of the popular pastimes in town was to go down to city hall to listen to the ferocious abuse heaped on Newbold Morris, president of the city council, by members of the Democratic majority.

Mr. Morris, whose amiability, liberal social philosophy and dedication to the cause of good government were legendary, was regularly called a boy scout, a goon, a hamhead, a sneak, a Simon Legree and a Scrooge.

One day, a councilman, carried away by the tide of invective, shouted at the handsome 6-foot 3-inch presiding officer, "You're a big ape. I can tell by the length of your arms and the shape of your head."

This was nothing personal. In fact, the Democrats, many of them the sons of immigrants, were generally fond of Mr. Morris, whose ancestors arrived in 1660 and once owned the section of the Bronx that is still called Morrisania.

It was just their way of expressing their dissatisfaction with the policies of the man Mr. Morris admired above all others in public life, Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia.

Mr. Morris tried to suffer these taunts in gentlemanly silence. At last, however, he could bear no more. He tried to reply in kind, but his upbringing and education had left his arsenal of rough language almost bare.

"You're a peanut politician," he finally declared.

City Controller Joseph McGoldrick said at the time that, as a politician, Mr. Morris had been born under "the insurmountable handicap of having rich but honest parents who denied him the opportunity to sell newspapers as a boy.

"A lesser man would have abandoned hope in the face of such adverse fortune," said Mr. McGoldrick.

But Mr. Morris never stopped trying to put into practice the ideals of public service and noblesse oblige that he was taught in his parents' mansion and at Groton School and Yale.

His unbending rectitude and his inability to express his thoughts in the standard political idiom amused some persons and offended others.

Perhaps the most widely circulated quip at his expense is credited to Paul Crowell, a retired political reporter of the New York Times: "Newbold was born with a silver foot in his mouth."

Nevertheless, Mr. Morris could speak plainly and forcefully when his sense of honor and fairplay was offended. Under heavy pressure, he refused to go along with the Board of Estimate when shortly after the end of World War II, it gave permission to the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. to bar Negroes from its Stuyvesant Town project.

"Huge as this project it," he declared, "it dwindles into insignificance as compared to the principle involved."

On an earlier occasion, he spoke out at a Board of Estimate meeting against a measure for the purchase of fire equipment that Mayor La Guardia was trying to rush through.

While he was still in the chamber he received a note from the mayor asking if he were a stockholder in another company that wanted the business. Mr. Morris rushed to Mr. La Guardia's office and in his presence tore the message into small pieces and dropped it on his desk.

"I don't like to get notes like that," he said later.

His final months were clouded by disappointment. As a lifetime, if somewhat irregular, Republican, he cherished the hope that Mayor Lindsay would retain him as parks commissioner.

WAS ASKED TO RESIGN

But he was asked to resign, partly because of his close association with his predecessor, Robert Moses, who, some critics said, continued to run the department.

Then, when his successor, Thomas P. F. Hoving, canceled many of his favorite projects, including the proposed Central Park cafe, and criticized what he called the neglected state of the parks, Mr. Morris was outspokenly bitter in his comments.

Mr. Morris was born on February 2, 1902, in his family's town house at 52 East 72d Street. He was christened Augustus Newbold, but he never used his first name.

Through both his father, Col. Newbold Morris, and his mother, the former Helen Schmerhorn Kingsland, Mr. Morris was descended from the city's Knickerbocker aristocracy. His ancestor Capt. Richard Morris, a veteran of Cromwell's Roundhead cavalry, staked out the manor that was to become the basis of the family fortune.

Other members of the family were Lewis Morris, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and Ambrose C. Kingsland, who, as mayor of New York in the 1850's, acquired the land for Central Park.

Mr. Morris was educated privately here and then sent to Groton. He said later that the headmaster, the Reverend Edincott Peabody, and Mr. La Guardia had been the most powerful influence in his life.

He went on to Yale, which members of his family had been attending for 200 years. Mr. Morris had rowed on the Groton varsity and he soon won a place in the university freshman boat.

In the big race with Harvard, the young oarsman, to avoid the possibility of a disastrous slip, fastened his shorts to his seat.

When the shell sprung a leak, however, he was forced, under the eyes of thousands of spectators, to abandon ship in his athletic supporter.

Mr. Morris was graduated in 1925 and went on to the university's law school, from which he received his degree 3 years later.

A NO DEAL TICKET

Returning to New York, he kept in trim by running around the Central Park reservoir. He took up figure-skating and by 1935 was the Middle Atlantic amateur champion.

Down at City Hall, Mr. La Guardia enjoyed asking him, "Still skating, Mr. Henie?" The reference was to Sonja Henie, who at the time was starring in epics of the rink.

Mr. Morris joined his father's law firm and took his seat on the Republican County Committee. By 1933 he was president of one of the party's clubs in the 17th (Silk Stocking) Congressional District on the East Side.

Of his introduction that year to Mr. La Guardia, then a Congressman making his first run for mayor as the Republican-Fusion candidate, Mr. Morris said, "He just took me over completely that first night."

The blueblood campaigned hard for the roly-poly bandmaster's son. After the victory Mr. Morris was appointed an assistant corporation counsel. A year later he won a Silk Stocking seat on the old Board of Aldermen.

As an alderman, Mr. Morris showed from time to time a puckish wit. He once made a small bet that, although he was a member of a despised minority in the Tammany Hall-controlled body, he could nevertheless get a bill passed.

Mr. Morris then introduced a measure that made St. Patrick's Day a city holiday. It was passed by acclamation but vetoed by the mayor.

One reason that the council was so hard on Mr. Morris after he became its leader was frustration. Under the charter, it had few powers aside from the naming of streets.

But there was also the feeling that Mr. Morris had set a dangerous precedent when he voluntarily cut the budget of his office from $70,000 to $40,000 a year. Furthermore, he campaigned for the abolition of hundreds of patronage jobs.

In 1936, ignoring Mr. LaGuardia's advice, he ran for the board presidency and was beaten by a 2-to-1 margin.

The next year, under charter reform, the board was replaced by the city council. There was a new election. With Mr. La Guardia at the head of the ticket, Mr. Morris won the council presidency, and he held it for 8 years.

In 1945, when the mayor decided not to seek a fourth term, Mr. Morris unsuccessfully sought the Republican nomination. When it went to Judge Jonah J. Goldstein, whom Mr. Morris called a tool of Tammany Hall, he bolted the party to run on a "No Deal" ticket.

Mr. Morris' hopes of keeping alive the La Guardia spirit of fusion and reform ended when William O'Dwyer won the election, snowing under both rivals.

After 63 stormy days, he was summarily released by Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, who, a few hours later, was dismissed by the President.

He ran once more, in 1949, this time with the endorsement of the Republican, Liberal, and City Fusion parties, but again he was badly beaten by Mr. O'Dwyer, who less than a year later was to resign under fire and become Ambassador to Mexico.

Asked if he might make yet another try to win the office, Mr. Morris replied, "When you've asked a lady twice to marry you, you don't ask her a third time."

He served from 1946 to 1948 on the city planning commission and kept busy with his law practice, which was mainly concerned with trusts and wills.

WASHINGTON NIGHTMARE

In 1952 Mr. Morris was summoned to Washington by President Harry S. Truman. Troubled by instances of corruption in his Administration, the President appointed Mr. Morris as a special assistant to the Attorney General to lead an investigation.

Nothing came out of Mr. Morris's probe. He later referred to the experience as "my Washington nightmare."

"Everything was cozy, comfortable, and cordial until Howard McGrath discovered that I meant business," he said.

While in Washington, Mr. Morris found himself under investigation by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, who declared that Mr. Morris's law firm had represented a company that purchased ships from the Government and used them for trade with Communist China during the Korean war. Nothing came of that, either.

During one of the Wisconsin Senator's question periods, the angry Mr. Morris was handed a message from the audience.

"Just a minute," he said, glancing at it, "I have a note here from my wife."

He read it and reported, "It say, 'Keep your shirt on.' "

Back in the city, Mr. Morris devoted himself to the law, to charitable work and to his favorite avocation, the guidance of the City Center of Music and Drama. He had been instrumental in saving the former Shrine auditorium on West 55th Street for cultural pursuits in 1943, when the city took over the derelict building for taxes.

In 1960, though, Mr. Morris was appointed parks commissioner by Mayor Wagner. During the nearly 6 years he held the post, the department, under the watchful eye of Mr. Moses, supervised the erection of Shea Stadium, the creation of the Perkins Garden in Riverdale, the Bronx, and the transfer of Flushing Meadow Park to the uses of the World's Fair.

The commissioner was a doughty defender of the parks, opposing the construction of parking garages under the greensward and other encroachments. He also took a dim view of the erection of sculpture by Henry Moore and Alexander Calder at Lincoln Center but was overruled by the City Arts Commission.

Studying the work of the two renowned modernists, he said regretfully, "I don't get it. I'm in love with representational art." When he was informed of the commission's action, he said, "If I were 40 years younger I'd go sit on a park bench and cry."

WED IN GRACIE MANSION

Mr. Morris is survived by his widow, the former Mrs. Constance Hand Jordan, a daughter of Learned Hand, the eminent jurist. He married her in Gracie Mansion, the mayor's official residence, in 1942. They lived at 340 East 72d Street, the street on which Mr. Morris was born.

A previous marriage, to Margaret Copley Thaw, had ended in divorce 2 years earlier.

Mr. Morris had two sons by the first wife, Peter V. C. Morris, of 1170 Fifth Avenue, and Capt. Newbold Morris of the Marine Corps, who is stationed at Camp Lejeune, N.C., and a son and a daughter of the second marriage, Lewis Morris, a doctoral candidate in history at the University of Pennsylvania, and Frances Morris, a student at Barnard College.

Two brothers, George L. K. Morris of Paris, a painter, and Stephen V. C. Morris, a retired State Department official who lives in Washington, also survive.

RETIREMENT OF ALFRED H. KIRCHHOFER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the retirement of one of New York State's most distinguished and respected editors, Alfred H. Kirchhofer, of the Buffalo Evening News.

Mr. Kirchhofer, a veteran of 56 years in news work—51 of them with the Buffalo News—will continue as president of WBEN radio and television, but will give up the duties of editor which he has performed so with such dedication and integrity since 1956.

A former president of the National Press Club while he was Washington correspondent of the News, Mr. Kirchhofer has long been active in improving standards of journalism education. He was one of the founders of the American Press Institute at Columbia University and a former president of the American Council on Education for Journalism, which accredits college and university journalism courses and programs.

His contributions to the improvement of the education of newspaper men and women in schools throughout the country are a source of pride to everyone concerned with a vigorous, impartial, free press, and I know he will continue his effective crusade for higher standards.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in last Friday's Buffalo Evening News concerning Mr. Kirchhofer and his successor, Mr. Paul E. Neville.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A. H. KIRCHHOFER RETIRES AS EDITOR OF EVENING NEWS—MRS. E. H. BUTLER NAMES PAUL NEVILLE EXECUTIVE EDITOR, MILLARD BROWNE, EDITOR OF EDITORIAL PAGE

Alfred H. Kirchhofer retired today as editor of the Buffalo Evening News but will continue as president of WBEN Inc., which operates WBEN AM–FM and WBEN–TV, the News radio and television stations.

Mrs. Edward H. Butler, president of the News, in announcing Mr. Kirchhofer's retirement, also announced appointments to two new positions on the newspaper.

Paul E. Neville, managing editor, was named executive editor responsible for the entire news operation. Millard C. Browne, chief editorial writer, becomes editor of the editorial page.

The retiring editor, whose distinguished newspaper career has been nationally recognized by many high honors and awards, joined the News in 1915.

CONTRIBUTED IMMEASURABLY

He served as a reporter and political writer, assistant city editor, Albany correspondent, and Washington correspondent, and in 1927 was named managing editor. He became editor in 1956 upon the death of Edward H. Butler, Jr.

"Mr. Kirchhofer," Mrs. Butler said in a notice to the employees, "has contributed immeasurably to the progress and development of this newspaper which has been profoundly influenced by his competence and character.

"He will undertake some future special assignments for the News and, of course, will conduct the operation of our radio and television stations which have always been conducted in close cooperation with the News."

GREATEST DAYS LIE AHEAD

In a letter to members of the news and editorial staff Mr. Kirchhofer reminisced about his 56 years in newspaper work, 51 of them with the News.

"These have been wonderful years," he wrote, "in which to report, present, and interpret the news of a fast-changing world. But the past is prolog. The greatest days of the News surely lie ahead.

"The newspaper which intelligently serves its constituency will continue to be an indispensable source of intelligence and civic leadership. There is no substitute for news honestly and intelligently reported in the printed form."

Mr. Kirchhofer has long been active in improving standards of journalism education.

HEADED NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

A former president of the American Council on Education for Journalism, which serves as an accrediting committee for college and university journalism schools, he helped organize the the accrediting program.

He is also a past president of the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., and was president when the $10 million, 12-story National Press Club Building was constructed in the heart of the Capital.

He is a former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and is a member of the prestigious Gridiron Club composed of present and former Washington newsmen.

He is founder of the American Press Institute at Columbia University and served on its board of directors.

RECEIVED HONORARY DEGREES

Presently, Mr. Kirchhofer is chairman of the Journalism Advisory Council of St. Bonaventure University. He is a former member of the Council of the University of Buffalo and was for many years a member of the General Administration Committee.

St. Bonaventure University and D'Youville College have awarded him honorary degrees.

The schools of journalism at the University of Missouri and Syracuse University in 1956 and 1958, respectively, awarded Mr. Kirchhofer their medals for distinguished service in journalism.

He was elected to membership in the National Journalism Hall of Fame at the University of Missouri in 1959 and in 1960 was the recipient of the Canisius College Board of Regents Distinguished Citizen's Achievement Award.

Mr. and Mrs. Kirchhofer left Buffalo today on a vacation and expect to return in late April.

NEVILLE WITH NEWS 9 YEARS

Mr. Neville is a cum laude graduate of the University of Notre Dame. He began his newspaper career in Massachusetts with the Worcester Post and Boston Herald.

He served in 9th Air Force public relations in the European theater during World War II after assignment as editor of the Richmond, Va., airbase newspaper.

He subsequently returned to the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune where he had been a police reporter and was in turn general reporter, political writer, sports editor, and managing editor. He joined the News in early 1957 as assistant to the editor and was made managing editor in 1958.

Mr. Neville is vice president of the New York State Society of Newspaper Editors, a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and a member of the board of directors of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association.

BROWNE A NIEMAN FELLOW

Mr. Browne was born in the State of Washington but grew up in California and is an alumnus of Stanford University. His early newspaper experience was obtained as a reporter and staff writer on the Sacramento Bee.

In the early forties Mr. Browne was designated a Nieman fellow, one of journalism's most coveted awards, providing for a year of specialized graduate study at Harvard University. He joined the editorial staff of the News in 1944.

The immediate past president of the National Conference of Editorial Writers, Mr. Browne is an active member of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalism fraternity.

He is also a member of the editorial board of the Society of Nieman Fellows which publishes the monthly Nieman Reports, a high quality and influential magazine devoted to the field of journalism.

ADDRESS OF CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN AT MEETING OF INTERNATIONAL JUDGES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on March 12, Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court addressed a meeting of international judges which was held at the Peace Through Law Center in Geneva, Switzerland. The group was gathered for the purpose of organizing a world association of judges of which Chief Justice Warren will be the chairman.

Certainly the Chief Justice's reputation for leadership in the movement of world peace through law is truly illustrious. It is a singular honor both for him and for this country that he has been chosen to head the new organization, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks on this occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address Delivered by the Honorable Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, Before Special Meeting of the World Peace Through Law Center, Geneva, Switzerland, March 12, 1966

We sincerely thank Your Excellencies and Chief Justice Haberlin for the hospitality of your wonderful country. Switzerland through the centuries has earned a unique place among nations as a land of peace. Its existence as a neutral amid the turmoil of the quarrels and wars of others has achieved this peace image in the minds of the peoples of the entire world. Switzerland's record of neutrality and its example of harmonious living among peoples of diverse language, race, religion, and custom, have set an example all peoples admire and respect. Here you have provided a place where they who would do the work of peace may meet in an atmosphere somewhat detached from the world's struggles.

I am sure also that the pulse of everyone here is quickened merely because we are in Geneva, the renowned "city of peace." It has become customary for mankind's greatest peace efforts to operate in and out of Geneva. Universally, they who would do the work of peace almost involuntarily say, "Let's meet in Geneva."

Geneva is thus a most natural place for us to meet and discuss our plans for cooperative efforts to advance the quest for peace through justice for men and nations. Here, as we seek to formulate a role for judges, we can draw inspiration from the work of the many international organizations headquartered here and the many meetings held here which have made Geneva such a symbol of man's striving for peace.

Here was born the Red Cross. Here lived the League of Nations. Here lives the International Labor Organization with its ringing motto "Poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere." Here, too, is located the European office of the United Nations. And here lives the baby of international organizations, one in whose birth so many in this room participated and for whose future we have such high hopes: the World Peace Through Law Center. And Geneva should be the headquarters of the new organization of the world's judges which we are here to create in order to further the cause of peace with justice under the rule of law for all men and all nations.

The peace conferences held in Geneva are so broad ranging and so numerous as to prevent even a partial description or listing. I must mention, however, that even as we gather, the anxious minds of the peoples of the world turn ever hopefully and prayerfully to the disarmament discussions which seek a way out of the ever-accelerating arms race. Mankind knows that every arms race in all history has, through accident or design, ended in war. And all men know that the holocaust of nuclear war could mean incineration of humanity. Never has mankind so urgently and so universally desired world peace. Never has peace been so imperative. Never has the world so urgently needed new peace machinery. It is my thesis that any such machinery that is possible, credible, and thus workable, will be composed of law.

Many of you in this audience are major contributors to man's constant efforts for survival in a peaceful world. To many of you, humankind owes a great debt for your contributions. We judges ask your help in defining a proper role for courts within the framework of man's ancient and unending search for peace. We further ask your assistance in carrying out that role in order that law may be kept synonymous with justice.

In the beginning disputes between man and man were settled by brute strength in a fistfight. Next man used stones in slings, bows and arrows, and finally guns, generally seeking decision by death. But today, in all civilized nations of the world, we have progressed to the point where decision by death is outlawed in disputes between man and man. These disputes are settled in the courts under the rule of law. Law is the indispensable base of civilization. But even today with all our claims for achieving such a high state of civilized existence, decision by death under the law of the jungle is the ultimate mechanism in disputes between nations.

With leadership and hard work, we can and we must progress to the point where law performs the same functions internationally as it does within nations. We must create such a credible system of justice under law that it will anticipate and prevent war. Our dramatic accomplishments in so many areas of human endeavor prove beyond question that we are capable of filling this the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization.

War is the most repugnant product of the human mind. To pull the world out of the present ultimate reliance upon war as a method for resolving disputes between nations we must create a credible alternative. This must encompass a plan to achieve and maintain peace which the peoples of the world will accept. Such a plan must capture and fire the imagination of peoples everywhere. To be successful, it must be a plan which all peoples can understand. It must be related, therefore, to their ordinary, everyday knowledge and experience. If this is done the peoples of the world will understand, admire, and support a law system which replaces decision by armed violence between nations with decision under law in courthouses.

As initial proof of this plan's credibility, let me remind you that in every international area where law rules are universally accepted they are effective. The law of the sea, law of diplomatic immunity, and Postal Convention are evidence of this fact. In instances where international courts have been used for peaceful decision of international disputes their decisions, with very few exceptions, have been accepted and carried out even though unpopular with those who lost. The Thailand-Cambodia and Nicaragua-Honduras border dispute decisions of the International Court of Justice are examples. The European Court of Justice has an outstanding record of decisions on many international disputes between men and nations within the Common Market.

While the pages of recorded history are in large part a chronicle of wars and warriors, and the weapons they used to kill, destroy and enslave, no one can dispute that the brightest chapters in world history are those which represent advances in law. The Code of Hammurabi, the Ten Commandments, the Law of Moses, the Code of Solon, the Twelve Tables of Rome, the Corpus Juris of Justinian, the law revisions and compilations of Charlemagne, the Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, Napoleon's Civil Code, and our own Constitution are illustrations of such chapters.

In every community, city, state, or nation, civilization has blossomed and advanced as law has replaced force as the controlling factor in relations among men. Every new high in civilization's progress has been accompanied by a new crest in use of and reliance upon the rule of law. History demonstrates that where law has prevailed, individual freedom of man has been strong and progress great. Where law is weak or nonexistent, chaos and fear lurk and thrive and human progress is destroyed or retarded.

An evaluation of the ideas, ideals, and concepts which mankind has developed since the dawn of civilization leads to the inescapable conclusion that the rule of law offers the best attainable route to peace. In a world sundered by differences of language, color, creed and belief, and by background in diverse forms of government, the rule of law is the one concept universally understood as an ideal nearly all men have in common on a worldwide basis. It, therefore, offers the best common ground which mankind possesses upon which to erect an edifice for peace.

I sincerely believe that in today's world no man can stand aside from the search for a peace formula which will command such universal support as to be both credible and workable. We must all contribute our efforts, our thinking and our leadership. We judges must seek out together a role that is appropriate to the position we occupy and the function we perform. That is why I am here. I am sure that is why each of you is here.

Ours has been called the space age, the science age, and the atomic age. But if man is to live until future ages, ours must become known as the age of peace. To pin that label on our time and make it a true label requires the most extraordinary creative effort in the history of mankind. For it requires no less than that mankind get beyond words and work together on such concrete steps that world peace will indeed be created—created out of words, but they must be words which mean something because embodied in law; law adopted by so many nations that it is universally applicable to men and nations and their international relations; law that is so extensive it will govern and guide so much of these international relations as to minimize conflict; law which will channel the inevitable conflict into a world court system where peaceful decisions can be made and violent conflict thus avoided.

I do not join the doubters who say this task is impossible because it has never been accomplished. I join that growing group of optimists who say we will do it because we must. I refuse to believe that our creative generation which has split the atom, conquered space, developed a cure for polio, set up an almost instantaneous worldwide communications system, and brought about more international cooperation on more subjects than any other generation since the world began cannot create a workable peace structure for the world community.

These great achievements were accomplished even though detractors, many of them scientists of great distinction, scoffed at the idea of splitting the atom or putting a man into space. Other great scientists were determined to succeed and did succeed. So it must be here. We men of the law must not allow detractors and scoffers to prevent the great effort without which success is impossible. The price of failure is too great. We dare not fail. Mankind's failure to realize that the answer to our problem of establishing world order is a strong world law structure and mankind's failure to concentrate cooperative international efforts on creating this law structure is the main reason such a peace structure has not yet come into existence. There has been a failure to communicate to the people, to educate the people, in the required elements of a world order which is strong enough to achieve and maintain peace.

Law development must be the heart of all international efforts to build world stability, order, and peace. And while law in many respects reflects crystallized public opinion, this task of building a law structure for the world and creating proper public realization of its worth, is primarily a job for the legal profession. Heads of state, diplomats, medical doctors, dentists, engineers, and ministers of the gospel can help but we of the law must provide the manpower and the leadership. Sure it is a long, uncharted, and tremendously difficult road. But travel it we must. And the more of us that travel the road, the sooner we will reach the great goal we seek.

We must not overlook any experience or idea. No two of us have traveled the same law road in reaching this Conference. We come from many systems of law. We each bring to this meeting our own private and personal history of hopes for the law, discoveries about the law, disappointments about the law, and then new insights and new hopes and new defeats, and perhaps fresh hopes again for a constantly improving justice for all men and nations under the rule of law. I believe in the law and its creative capacity to meet the needs of man. That is why I believe so greatly in our creative capacity to develop justice under law which will meet the imperative need of our generation for a peace structure to prevent war.

A creative program of law building and new legal institutions adapted to our ever more interdependent world is the most positive and most possible initiative for peace which we of our day can undertake. We must use our inventive genius to create these new law instruments of control which are equal to the new instruments of destruction mankind now possesses. We can and must confront and master the problems that exist in such a program. Again, I say we will succeed because we must.

I trust that others here who are not members of my profession know that we of the law are already practicing what we preach when we urge law as the best road to world peace. We have already banded together worldwide and organized ourselves effectively to do some of the work that must be done. Through the World Peace Through Law Center we have compiled summaries of international law and summaries of the national law of over 100 nations. We have used and are using this worldwide law experience to develop and carry out a work program containing ideas, proposals, and projects designed to make law a credible plan for peace.

The idea for this historic Conference to create a world organization of judges first arose in Athens in 1963. There I participated in the inauguration of the first world Conference ever held to consider how we of the law could best further the goal of world peace. Some 50 judges and more than 1,000 lawyers from 105 nations attended that Conference. These judges informally discussed the fact that the executive departments have their channels for exchange of ideas and experience through their diplomats and members of parliaments have their interparliamentary unions, but that the world's judges have not yet created any organized channels for exchange of opinions and similar material or for face-to-face discussion of common problems. When the Washington Conference on World Peace Through Law was planned the Chief Justices and other high court judges were invited to attend so we could explore this matter further. We held two special meetings of the 65 chief judges and the some 200 other judges at the Conference. But the pressure of so many other programs and events along with the attendance of over 3,000 members of the legal profession from some 115 nations prevented our finalizing plans for a world organization of judges.

The Athens Conference did adopt a work program, which was updated and expanded at the Washington Conference and which includes many things we judges are interested in, such as plans for the first volume of a world law code and a system of low-level international courts as the beginning of a world judicial system. The formal declaration of faith in world order adopted unanimously at the final session of the Washington Conference is an inspiring document setting forth the beliefs that "only under law can there be order and justice" and "whatever transient disputes there may be, a just world order under law can be achieved." It was the Athens Conference which created the World Peace Through Law Center to carry out this global work program as a cooperative effort of the more than 1 million members of the world's legal profession. And in January 1966 the Center established its Secretariat here in Geneva.

By usual standards this Conference is convening rather quickly after the Washington Conference. But these are unusual days, and an acceptable plan for world order must provide justice for men and nations. Speedy efforts to advance world order is the great necessity of our day. At the Washington Conference and since then in many communications addressed to the Center, it has been urged that the very formation of a world organization of judges will have an impact on this necessity. It is in response to these urgings that this group of distinguished judges has been invited here to complete the task of organizing the world's judges and to define what the role of this new organization should be.

So I want you who are not of my profession to understand that in the broad spectrum of the worldwide picture of ever-increasing cooperation in religion, education, science and other disciplines, those of us concerned with the law are searching for new ideas, assuming new initiatives and utilizing the advanced thinking and technology of our times. We are, for example, exploring the feeding of law into computers to make it more available nationwide and worldwide. Our great law libraries around the world have offered to provide materials upon request to judges and lawyers in nations and cities not served by adequate law libraries. These are vital steps. By making law more available it will be used and relied upon more than ever before. Thus will it grow as a factor for world peace.

This then is the record of the legal profession and its growing efforts to further world peace. It is no longer a mere spectator of world events but is deeply implicated in the destiny of mankind. We are creating programs out of law which will substitute organized peace for organized force. Law is the only device yet developed by the mind of man whereby power can be constrained.

In urging law as the best formula or path down the road to peace, I do not mean to downgrade the great contributions of diplomacy, religion, science, communications or economics. I do point out that the contributions of each other discipline sometimes gain permanence and stability only when written into law or when so universally used, accepted and respected that they become law by custom. Customary law which that great English law leader Sir Wilfred Jenks, who is here with us, records in his book the "Common Law of Mankind."

Many take the growth of the law for granted like the air we breathe and the water we drink. But this is a misreading of law's history. Every great reform or expansion in the law has come from leadership and hard work. What we need today to make law grow strong enough, and quickly enough, to achieve and maintain world peace is the type of concentrated "crash" programs which split the atom, put manned satellites into space and which may soon put men on the Moon, Venus, or Mars. If any man of responsibility had spoken of a man on the Moon a few years ago, few would have agreed. Now no one can really doubt that this will happen.

And so in the field of law where all mankind has so very much at stake we must seek and secure the support of all who desire peace as backers for our effort to mount such a concentrated "crash" program to build a peace structure for the world community.

We of the law are working for peace with an intensity, knowledge, and effectiveness never before achieved. We still have a great educational program to carry out. The public at large does not yet realize that a world ruled by law can indeed be created. But the number and strength of the law's supporters are growing constantly. The fact that more than 100 messages from heads of state were sent to the Athens and Washington Conferences urging a strengthened and expanded rule of law for the world is in itself evidence of this ever-rising tide of support.

But we need to create more public awareness of the value of the world law as the most credible road to peace. As one illustration, the major educational foundations have not provided the support for law which they have for science, medicine, and other disciplines. Many nations have great academies devoted solely to the art of war, but no existing academy or university is devoted solely to the art of peace. It is estimated that worldwide some 150 billions of dollars are being spent yearly on arms by governments. But governments spend very little on building a peace structure—a law structure—for the world.

Man desires peace and individual liberty. Equal justice for men and nations under the rule of law is the only concept that can supply both. Any system that brings and maintains peace with justice will be a law system, not an arms system. The rule of law is the only concept with a proven record of capability to control the emotions and actions of men when made strong enough in all of its elements to be effective.

Those who lack faith in the law, and thus downgrade the value and effectiveness of the law, often do so because they fail to realize the respect for, and faith in, the law which exists among the vast majority of the peoples of all nations. The people do not look upon the rule of law as representing perfection or utopia. But they do look upon it with all its imperfections as representing the best system yet devised by man to avoid conflict, or to provide a peaceful decision for those conflicts that are always going to occur in a nation or world inhabited by human beings. This faith in and respect for the rule of law by most people is the reason why we of our generation can find in the application of that rule to relations between nations the answer to our number one necessity, world peace. In the law's principles, processes and procedures we have the best tested formula for living together rather than dying together in nuclear war.

We who work for peace through law are opening the door to a brighter tomorrow. And tomorrow's world is being built by today's people. If it is to be a peaceful world, a world wherein human rights are respected, a world wherein decision by death is ended, it must be a "law-ful" world.

As man has become more civilized, and as destructive power has grown, decision by war is no longer an acceptable method for settling disputes. True it is that reliance on the war method is easy and building a peace structure is perhaps the most difficult task ever undertaken by man. So difficult the fainthearted shy from trying. But no matter how difficult the creation of a peace structure may be, we dare not fail to build it, for it constitutes humanity's only hope for survival.

Since the dawn of history man has dreamed of a world without war. That the pages of recorded history are chronicles of failure does not mean we of our day will fail if we but make the greatest effort yet assembled by mankind on a worldwide basis for our assault on the problems of a world peace structure. We of our day can, and I believe we will, create this warless world. We will do it by building a new world order under the rule of law.

Not far from here near the Peace Palace at the Hague in a quiet resting place at the side of an ancient church in Delft, Netherlands, lies the remains of Hugo Grotius. He, with other greats of the law in centuries long past, earned eternal fame for articulating the idea of a peaceful world achieved and maintained through the rule of law. That their idea has not died but has risen up and shone forth to inspire succeeding generations to strive anew to make their dream come true attests to its strength and validity. There is an old proverb that nothing is as strong as an idea. And that nothing can stop an idea whose time has come. I urge you great leaders of men in this audience that we should seek together to enlist the support of all men, women, and children throughout the whole world in a crusade for peace, a crusade which will thereby gather the support to make the time of this great idea arrive in our day. We of our generation have made more ancient dreams come true than any generation in all history. The dream of world peace can also be translated by the peoples of our generation from dream into reality. The peoples of the world have the desire, the capacity, and the power to achieve this. Up to now they have lacked the inspiration, a program, and the essential leadership. Such inspiration, program, and leadership must be developed and it is our fervent hope that it will emanate from this center for world peace through world law.

The day when leaders could become renowned through use of arms is gone. The greatest leaders of our era will be those who lead in erecting a world peace structure. The rule of law will indeed replace force as the controlling factor in the fate of humanity as the peoples of the world become convinced that this is the only credible material out of which world order can be fashioned. Mankind's ancient quest for world peace will thus end in success—success through a world ruled by law. And when this rule of law prevails, then and only then will we live in a world where any man can live anywhere on the face of the earth, or travel to the vistas of endless space, in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

REACTION TO SPEECH OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, made a speech which has caused great concern in the agricultural areas of our Nation.

He inferred that the present inflationary pressures are caused largely by increased prices for farm products.

The facts are, farmers are not presently receiving parity in the marketplace and should not be required to take a reduction in the price of their commodities. They should not be expected to pay for the cost of our war in Vietnam.

There is a great deal of resentment against the Secretary's statement in the agricultural areas, and I sincerely hope he will, at the earliest opportunity, clarify his position on agricultural prices and agricultural income.

I read into the Record a wire I received from Glenn Pickett, executive vice president of the Kansas Livestock Association:

> We deplore Secretary Freeman's expression of delight with a drop in farm commodity prices. He has again demonstrated his refusal to represent the interests of agriculture and the public. If producers are to meet world food for peace need, they deserve better. Better diets today require a new law in percentage of income. Food is relatively the cheapest in history. Farm income is relatively low. We urge you to call these facts to the attention of Federal officials. To suggest that consumers control inflation by eating inadequate diets is highly irresponsible.

TO REPEAL SECTION 6 OF THE SOUTHERN NEVADA PROJECT ACT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1064, S. 2999. I have discussed this matter with the majority and minority leaders, and this action is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2999) to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this bill was introduced by my colleague, Senator Cannon, and myself, as a result of the transmittal to Congress of a request by the Secretary of the Interior on March 1, 1966.

The reason for the request for amendment of the Southern Nevada Project Act was contained in a statement made by President Johnson when he signed S. 32, the bill to authorize the southern Nevada project.

The President's full statement is incorporated in the report.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement by the President was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by the President

I have approved S. 32, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes.

The southern Nevada water supply project which would be authorized by this bill consists of a system of distribution pipelines and related facilities to furnish water to Las Vegas, several other Nevada towns, and Nellis Air Force Base. I have supported Federal authorization of this project as the appropriate means for assisting this area to meet its growing water supply problems.

However, during the course of this legislation through the Congress a rider in the form of section 6 was added to it without consultation with any executive agency.

Section 6 provides as follows: "In all water supply contracts for the use of water in Nevada under this Act or section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) the Secretary shall recognize the intrastate priorities of water rights to the use of water existing on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as validating any right diminished or lost because of abandonment, nonuse, or lack of due diligence, nor shall anything in this Act be construed as affecting the satisfaction of present perfected rights as defined by the decree of the United States Supreme Court in Arizona against California et al. (376 U.S. 340)."

Although these provisions are couched in general terms, the scant legislative history of the bill indicates that they are intended to be applicable to one company only. While there may be some equities which would justify special consideration for this company, I am advised by the Secretary of the Interior that these provisions might well have a much broader sweep. In fact, it appears that they might affect in unforeseeable ways the water rights of a number of individuals and firms amounting to 60,000 to 70,000 additional acre-feet.

In these circumstances I have asked the Secretary of the Interior to develop legislation which would amend section 6 to limit its effect to that intended by the Congress. I am confident that those Members concerned with this legislation will agree that the uncertainties surrounding the broader than intended effect of section 6 make its amendment desirable.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Department of the Interior in transmitting this legislation to the President of the Senate under date of March 1, 1966, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department
of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1966.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of bill to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)).

We recommend that this draft bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

The Southern Nevada Project Act authorizes the Secretary to construct, operate, and maintain a project in southern Nevada for supplying water to municipalities and industrial centers within Clark County. Section 6 of that act provides:

"In all water supply contracts for the use of water in Nevada under this Act or section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) the Secretary shall recognize the intrastate priorities of water rights to the use of water existing on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as validating any right diminished or lost because of abandonment, nonuse, or lack of due diligence, nor shall anything in this Act be construed as affecting the satisfaction of present perfected rights as defined by the decree of the United States Supreme Court in *Arizona* v. *California et al.* (376 U.S. 340)."

That section was not in the original bill as submitted to the Congress and commented upon by the Department. It arose out of a statement submitted by the attorney for Basic Management, Inc., a Nevada corporation claiming certain rights to waters of the lower Colorado River. In that statement it was stressed that the rights of Basic Management, Inc., arose from a purchase contract executed with a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a U.S. corporation. On the strength of that statement, the House amended the southern Nevada bill (S. 32) and sent it back to the Senate with that amendment. The Senate accepted the amendment and the bill was passed with section 6, as drafted by the House committee.

The problem that has arisen in connection with this act stems from the fact that, although it was intended to cover the claim of one particular organization, the section was couched in general language and may possibly have application far beyond that which was intended by its drafters. The President, in a signing statement stated that:

"Although these provisions are couched in general terms, the scant legislative history of the bill indicates that they are intended to be applicable to one company only. While there may be some equities which would justify special consideration for this company, I am advised by the Secretary of the Interior that these provisions might well have a much broader sweep. In fact, it appears that they might affect in unforeseeable ways the water rights of a number of individuals and firms amounting to 60,000 to 70,000 additional acre-feet.

In these circumstances I have asked the Secretary of the Interior to develop legislation which would amend section 6 to limit its effect to that intended by the Congress. I am confident that those Members concerned with this legislation will agree that the uncertainties surrounding the broader than intended effect of section 6 make its amendment desirable."

Basic Management, Inc., the company referred to by the President, acquired certain facilities on the lower Colorado River in 1952. These facilities were built and operated by the United States during World War II as part of the Basic Magnesium project of the Defense Plant Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which had applied for and obtained two State permits for the appropriation of Lake Mead water in 1942. Proof of application for beneficial use was made in 1948 and certificates of appropriation were issued in the same year with priority dates relating back to the permit dates in 1942. One of these certificates is for milling and metallurgical uses and covers 45 cubic feet per second of water. The second certificate covers 12 cubic feet per second for municipal purposes. These asserted water rights, it must be stressed, were acquired by compliance with State water law procedures. The Defense Plant Corporation never had a contract with the Secretary of the Interior for the use of these waters. After the end of World War II the Basic Magnesium project facilities were conveyed to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada and were ultimately acquired by Basic Management, Inc., and its subsidiary corporations. Assignments of certain of these asserted water rights have been made to each of the four operating subsidiaries.

The U.S. Supreme Court held in *Arizona* v. *California* (373 U.S. 526) that persons desiring water from the Boulder Canyon project must have contracts with the Secretary of the Interior as required by the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928. Following that decree, the Department has been negotiating with water users on the lower Colorado River to establish their rights to uses of Colorado River water. Basic Management, Inc., is one of the corporations with which the Department has been negotiating and these negotiations were taking place at the time of consideration of S. 32 the southern Nevada project bill. The Department had already established a general rule that uses of claimed water existing on December 31, 1963, would be given a priority to the extent of that use over subsequent uses. Basic Management, Inc., had claimed by virtue of its water rights, acquired from the U.S. corporation, that it was entitled to confirmation of the full extent of the rights which it had purchased; that is, 57 cubic feet per second of water of the lower Colorado River. The Department had asked for documents to be submitted to it supporting the position of Basic Management, Inc. This was the situation at the time of consideration of the southern Nevada project bill and enactment of the enabling legislation.

This Department is prepared to recognize whatever water rights Basic Management, Inc., has under Nevada law, and we have so assured the company. We are now engaged in drafting a water delivery contract with the company on that basis.

Were it not for a possible ambiguity in interpretation of section 6 of the act, it would be unnecessary to consider the draft bill attached to this letter. The concern of this Department is that the broad language of section 6 might be construed to carry beyond the specific case of Basic Management, Inc. That section relates to certain "intra-state priorities existing on the date of enactment of this Act." It is not clear just what those priorities are or may be. A person wishing to make use of Nevada waters must generally first apply for a State permit for the use of those waters. There are on file with the State engineer of Nevada a number of applications for the use of Colorado River waters. The State engineer's office then considers these applications and may grant permits to the applicants confirming their right to take the additional steps necessary to put that water to beneficial use. After the water has been put to beneficial use the applicant may then obtain a certificate confirming his right to the use of that water so long as he continues to make beneficial use of it.

The rights of Basic Management, Inc., in this case fall into the third category of certificated uses. There are a few other uses with certificates purporting to entitle them to the use of lower Colorado River water; in the main these certificates are now subject to cancellation for nonuse or are so minor as not to constitute a serious problem. Additional difficulties, however, have arisen in the identification of the possible claimants to the use of waters of the Colorado River, nor is it clear whether or not the classes of applicants and permittees fall within the category of persons described by section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act. If they should fall into that category, it is entirely possible that control over 80,000 acre-feet of Nevada's 300,000 acre-foot entitlement to the waters of the lower Colorado River would be taken from the Department.

There is nothing in the legislative history of section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act to indicate that this result was intended by the Congress. To the contrary, at a time when the control of this vital resource is a matter of extreme importance to the citizens of the Southwest, it seems its proper management is a matter of great importance and of considerable concern.

The contract which is presently being negotiated will in fact comply fully with the requirements of the statute. The only explanation offered on the floor of the House for the existence of this section related specifically to the claim of Basic Management, Inc., a claim based on its acquisition of water rights obtained by the United States under Nevada State law. Once the justification for existence for the section has been removed, there can be no further justification for this section to remain in the bill.

We have prepared and present for your consideration this bill to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act. We can and do assure you that the contract which is presently being negotiated will recognize the intrastate priority to the use of Colorado River water to which Basic Management, Inc., is entitled under Nevada law. This being so, section 6 serves no further useful purpose, and we urge its prompt repeal.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter directed to Mr. Northcutt Ely, of the firm of Ely, Duncan & Bennett, under date of March 1, 1966, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1966.

Northcutt Ely, Esq.,
Ely, Duncan & Bennett,
Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Ely: This letter will confirm your conversations with members of my staff regarding recognition by this Department of intrastate priorities of the water rights of your client, Basic Management, Inc.

Under section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965, 75 Stat. 1068) this Department is required to "recognize the intrastate priorities of water rights to the use of water. * * *" As you know, the administration proposed to recommend to Congress that this section be repealed.

In order that you may have assurance that such repeal will not affect the rights given you by section 6 we assure you that, in the water supply contracts now being negotiated between the Department, the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, and Basic Management, Inc., and its assignees, we agree to the insertion of a provision which would recognize in Basic Management, Inc., and its assignees, all that they are entitled to under section 6 of the Project Act. More specifically, the Department will recognize the intrastate priorities of water rights of Basic Management, Inc., and its assignees, to the use of water, whatever it may be under State law in quantities and priorities, under certificates No. 3118, dated June 21, 1948, for 45 cubic feet per second or 32,578.5 acre-feet, and No. 3119, dated June 21, 1948, for 12 cubic feet per second or 8,687.6 acre-feet, being the certificates held by Basic Management, Inc., and its assignees.

We anticipate that actual signing of the water service contracts may be delayed an appreciable length of time, perhaps several months, because of the delays we can anticipate in negotiating a pollution-control provision. We give you this present assurance in regard to the water right provision, because the administration is proceeding immediately to make a recommendation to Congress for the repeal of section 6.

Sincerely yours,

Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is important that this legislative history be made. The letter to Mr. Ely affirms that the Secretary of the Interior is prepared by contract to take care of the problems raised by section 6.

I am sure that the testimony before our committee made it very clear that the deletion of section 6, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, and in accordance with a suggestion by the President of the United States that the section be amended, fully accords to Basic Management, Inc., all the rights they had under State water law in Nevada.

This is all set forth very fully in the report. I ask unanimous consent that the part of the report beginning on page 4 under the subheading "Committee Consideration," be printed in full at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

In testimony received by the committee from Mr. Ivan P. Head, administrator of the

Colorado River Commission of Nevada, the contracting agency for the repayment of the costs of the construction of the project it was pointed out:

"Section 6 and the subject covered by it has nothing to do with the southern Nevada water project. The feasibility studies, the operation studies, and so forth, gave proper recognition to Basic Management, Inc.'s ability to divert up to 45,000 acre-feet through its system. Then in no way is the southern Nevada water project affected economically or financially by either deletion of section 6 or its inclusion. Las Vegas Valley Water District will have its intrastate rights fully protected in its contracts with the commission for water delivery from the southern Nevada water project."

It was further pointed out at the hearing that section 6 was not considered by the committee or when the bill was originally considered on the Senate floor. The section was added in the House and was approved by that body on October 7, 1965. The Senate concurred in the amendment without further hearings and the bill was transmitted to the President where it was signed on October 22, 1965.

It is the committee's opinion that the legislative intent as expressed in the House report on S. 32 and the discussion on the House floor prior to passage has been completely implemented by the agreement of the Department of the Interior to contract with Basic Management, Inc., for the full recognition of the water right purchased by the company, and that section 6 should be deleted from the law.

The committee therefore recommends the enactment of S. 2999 without amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this legislation received the unanimous approval of the subcommittee, and likewise the unanimous approval of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

After the bill was reported to the floor, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, propounded in writing to me two questions concerning this particular legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the question propounded by Senator FANNIN and the answers by me be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator FANNIN. S. 2999 would repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Water Project Act, and, in doing so, would eliminate from the act the following words: "nor shall anything in this act be construed as affecting the satisfaction of present perfected rights as defined by the decree of the U.S. Supreme Court in Arizona against California et al. (376 U.S. 340)."

Would the enactment of S. 2999 in any way affect the interstate allocation of mainstream waters of the Colorado River under that decree?

Senator BIBLE. No. The method of apportionment of the mainstream waters of the Colorado River among Arizona, California, and Nevada is set forth in paragraph II of the decree dated March 9, 1964, in the case of Arizona against California. The enactment of S. 2999 would in no way alter or affect that apportionment.

Senator FANNIN. Paragraph II(B)(3) provides that in the event of shortage, in apportioning the mainstream water of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide "for satisfaction of present perfected rights in the order of their priority dates without regard to State lines."

Would the enactment of S. 2999 affect the Secretary's obligation to satisfy present perfected rights in the order of their priority dates without regard to State lines?

Senator BIBLE. No. It is not the purpose of S. 2999 to alter or affect the Secretary's obligation to apportion water in accordance with paragraph II (B) (3) and no such result would be achieved by this legislation. S. 2999 in no way alters or affects the rights and obligations of the Secretary and the water users under that Supreme Court decree.

Section 6 directs the Secretary to recognize intrastate priorities (Nevada), provided that such recognition shall not affect perfected rights under the Arizona-California decree.

Under the decree, rights perfected before 1929 have first priority.

The reference to the decree was therefore necessary in order to qualify the direction to recognize intrastate (Nevada) priorities.

When the direction to recognize intrastate priorities is repealed, there is no longer a need to retain the reference to the decree.

The repeal of section 6 could not possibly affect rights under the decree.

Mr. BIBLE. I have personally discussed the matter with Senator FANNIN. I discussed it with him on the floor a short time ago. He had raised questions that were very pertinent and should be answered. He states he is satisfied with the answers, and he has no objection to the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I fully concur with my colleagues in urging favorable action on S. 2999, which would repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act.

The section in question was not considered during Senate hearings last year.

It was added by the House, and has generated questions about its effect on water rights.

It is necessary to repeal section 6 of the act to eliminate possible ambiguities in its interpretation.

The bill now before the Senate will accomplish this, and its passage will enable us to move ahead on work to meet the critical water needs of southern Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2999) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (Act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)) is hereby repealed.

Mr. BIBLE. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CITIES REVOLT AGAINST THE EXPRESSWAY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is mounting evidence of a revolt against urban expressways in Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Philadelphia, Boston, New Orleans, Cleveland, Baltimore, and other cities. Citizens' groups and government officials express the fear that their city could become a mass of interchanges, elevated causeways, trenches, and ribbons of concrete. They express the view that the interests of the highway user are being placed above all other interests. This revolt indicates that we must find new and more imaginative ways to design urban highways and the necessary dollars to finance them.

In addition to building safe and economical highways, we must protect certain urban values—historical sites, neighborhoods, and scenic beauty for the enjoyment of residents and pedestrians, as well as those who travel through the area at 60 miles per hour.

The city's problem is not unique. Highways should not run through farms and national parks without careful consideration of how the damage to these areas might be minimized. We should recognize the value of protecting the best agricultural land. We should recognize the value of protecting scenic wonders and wilderness areas in our highway construction programs. There are values to be protected in our urban areas, too. Highway engineers should not try to pick the shortest distance between two points. They should try to adjust locations to do the least amount of damage. Sometimes there is an unfortunate tendency to try to minimize land acquisition costs at the expense of neighborhoods, historical sites, and urban beauty. Unlike rural areas, protecting these features of the city does not just involve selecting the least damaging locations. In many cases, any route through the city does an unconscionable amount of damage. Protecting cities from being overrun requires more expensive kinds of highway design. It involves the greater use of tunnels and covered expressways.

The reaction to expressway intrusions has been quite intense in several cities in recent weeks.

In San Francisco, the board of supervisors rejected two highways where the Federal Government was to have invested $280 million. The board did this because it felt the highways would destroy the city's character. Last July, the board asked the State of California to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway at an estimated cost of $100 million because it was an eyesore.

In Washington, D.C., consultants to the Policy Advisory Council recently recommended a moratorium on the construction of the Inter Loop, the Three Sisters Bridge, and the North Central Freeway. Again, this recommendation was based on the fear that pressing ahead with present plans may do irreparable damage to the Nation's Capital. The world famous city planner Constantinos Doxiadis has put forth plans to tunnel the Whitehurst Freeway as it passes Georgetown because the present highway destroys the historic and scenic character of the area.

In Philadelphia, the city, the State, and a wide cross-section of citizens groups have been waging a continuing fight to prevent the desecration of the historic Independence Mall-Penn's Landing area by the Delaware Expressway. As a result of the protests, the location for the highway was shifted and depressed so that it would run through a trench. The proponents of better design pressed for a covered expressway. At first, State and Federal highway engineers said it was not feasible. It could not be done. But a local citizens group hired an engineering firm that proved that a cover was feasible. This is not now in dispute. The engineers now say it is too expensive and not necessary.

This Philadelphia problem offers an excellent example of the kinds of urban values that ought to be preserved in highway development. More than half a billion dollars in public and private money is being spent in the renewal and rehabilitation of the Independence Mall-Penn's Landing area. The Delaware Expressway, which will bisect the area, is a vital part of Philadelphia's future highway network. But, the success of the renewal effort will depend in no small part on the proper design of this highway.

It will pass through one of the heaviest concentrations of historical properties in the United States. Here is the place where William Penn landed, the site of his first house, Independence Hall, and Carpenters Hall. Anything less than a covered expressway would constitute a desecration of this historic area.

This is also the site of a major public and private renewal effort to restore the downtown as a place where people want to live. An open trench will detract from that goal.

In the United States, most of our river and lake fronts in cities have been ugly. They have been lined with industrial complexes, railroads, and warehouses. They have not been places of scenic beauty. Restoration of these riverfront properties for people to enjoy should be a major goal of the beautification program. Again, such an effort is underway in Philadelphia in the Penn's Landing development. In a park-like setting, people will find walkways by the Delaware River, museums, restaurants, and a marina with historic ships. A covered expressway will augment this development. An open trench would isolate it from the rest of the city and greatly detract from the setting.

The President and the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior have expressly recognized the need to preserve scenic and historic areas in cities. The Federal Bureau of Public Roads has directed the State departments of highways to take them into account. The Bureau of Public Roads and the Department of Housing and Urban Development have entered into an agreement to work together on compatible arrangements where urban renewal areas are involved in highway locations.

Although there is evidence of a constructive attitude and a desire to develop more compatible highway locations and designs, the revolt in Washington, San Francisco, and Philadelphia, as well as the other cities, indicates that much more needs to be done to make these announced goals a reality.

Better urban highway design is a challenging governmental problem. All levels of government are involved, with the Federal Government financing a major highway development program. There are important goal conflicts within each level of government. Highway departments and the Federal Bureau of Public Roads are interested in building as many miles of road as they can with the funds available. The Department of the Interior is interested in open space and the preservation of historic sites. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is interested in good urban design. For the good of the city, all of these goals must be brought together and weighed.

Better urban highway design is also a challenging financing problem. Urban highways are always expensive. There is considerable competition for the limited funds in the Federal Highway Aid Trust Fund. There is not enough money to build all the highways we need. Nonetheless, the tendency to pinch pennies in building urban highways must be avoided. The cost is too high. The damage done may never be undone.

Governments that build highways must recognize a responsibility for good design and for maintaining values of neighborhoods, historic sites, and scenic beauty. This is part of the "cost" of the highway program, and it should not be shifted elsewhere.

At the present time, the Federal Aid Highway Trust Fund is the only realistic way to finance the greatly increased cost of building tunnels and covered expressways. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of Interstate highways. This is a very high ratio of Federal to State funds. State and local governments would find it impossible to absorb the cost of covering and tunneling proposals without assistance of this magnitude.

There are other possible sources of Federal funds to support a tunneling or covering project, where the end result will be a park on top of the expressway. The open space programs under the Housing Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund might legitimately be used, but, again, the Federal contribution is too small. Funds are already far too limited to absorb this additional burden of reducing the barbarity of the highway program.

Open space grants under the Housing Act are up to 50 percent of the cost of the project. The authorization limit for special purchase of open space in built-up areas is only $64 million for the entire United States.

To cover the Delaware Expressway in Philadelphia and create a park would cost $25 million alone.

Only $69 million is available in the 1967 fiscal year for grants to State and local governments for open space purchases under the land and water conservation fund.

A new program or, at the very least, additional funds are needed to save our cities. Until such a program can be enacted and fully implemented, the Highway Aid Trust Fund must be used to design and build the kind of highways that do not destroy the urban fabric.

One possible new approach would be to authorize the Department of the Interior to share in the cost of an expressway cover where, such as is the case in Philadelphia, an unusual historical complex is involved. The Department could be authorized to purchase the air rights for the cover or the land on top of a tunnel.

A new administrative mechanism is needed within the Federal Government to bring in other points of view to balance those of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. The Bureau is, quite naturally, most interested in building as many miles of roads, highways, and expressways as possible. This goal must be balanced with the other goals of the Federal Government—to build better and more livable cities and to preserve national historic sites, open space, and places of great scenic beauty.

Perhaps an administrative committee should be established for this purpose. It could consist of the Secretary of Commerce—or the Secretary of Transportation if that Department is created—the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. This committee could review highway plans where federally aided highways would pass through especially significant scenic or historic areas.

Such a committee would need funds to back up its findings. At present the Federal Aid Highway Trust Fund must be used. It may be desirable to create a new fund, which could be called the Urban Conservation Fund, for that would be its purpose. It would finance the additional cost of tunneling or covering proposals where national historic sites, recreation areas, or urgent needs of the city dictate that special steps be taken in highway construction.

Such a mechanism for building and financing better and less disruptive urban highways must be developed quickly. I urge the Secretaries of Commerce, Interior, and Housing and Urban Development to work together and develop the necessary administrative arrangements and financing procedures.

I will explore the need for new legislation to promote a better urban highway program.

Decisions are being made every day that will have a lasting impact on American cities. It is late, but not too late, to heed the warning that Lewis Mumford issued in 1958:

> When the American people, through their Congress, voted a little while ago (1957) for a $26 billion highway program, the most charitable thing to assume about this action is that they hadn't the faintest notion of what they were doing. Within the next 15 years they will doubtless find out; but by that time it will be too late to correct all the damage to our cities and our countryside, not least to the efficient organization of industry and transportation, that this ill-conceived and preposterously unbalanced program will have wrought.

EMERGENCY FOOD RELIEF FOR INDIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 149, to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India, and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, yesterday, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported Senate Joint Resolution 149. This resolution was amended in order to conform with the House resolution pertaining to the same subject. I understand that a similar House joint resolution is at the desk. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 997.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The House joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK**. House Joint Resolution 997, to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 997).

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, on March 30, the President of the United States requested congressional support of the action he has proposed to take to provide additional aid to India in order to meet her increased needs caused by a drought over large parts of that country last year.

In 1965, we shipped about 6 million tons of food grains to India. Under normal circumstances during this fiscal year we would have shipped 6½ million tons. However, because the natural disaster has created extreme hardship for her people, India now finds that it will need an additional 6 to 7 million tons of food grains through next December in order to avert famine.

The President has proposed that the United States supply 3½ million tons of food grains to meet this additional need. He has also proposed to provide India with up to 200,000 tons of corn, 150 million pounds of vegetable oil, and 125 million pounds of milk powder to take care of direct food requirements and from 325,000 to 700,000 bales of cotton and 2 to 4 million pounds of tobacco in order to release Indian foreign exchange for the purchase of food and fertilizer.

The President is also asking other nations of the world to contribute to India's dire needs. He has invited these other nations to match the amount of food which we will supply. He hopes that they will scrutinize closely their available supplies, their needs and under the differing circumstances make a maximum effort in this field. He has also asked the industrial countries which cannot send food to supply instead a generous equivalent in fertilizer, or in shipping, or in funds for the purchase of these requisites.

Yesterday, during the hearings on this resolution Secretary of State Rusk indicated that 113 countries have been contacted in this regard. He reported that at this time 23 countries have already made contributions totaling about $150 million. This includes the substantial contribution from Canada. It also includes funds from private citizens in countries like the Netherlands, for example, where through a radio and television campaign, they have raised over $5 million. Another 13 countries have contributions under consideration and 33 countries have not as yet responded. Still another 44 countries have indicated they did not expect to make a substantial contribution because of circumstances concerning their own wealth and food problems. Mr. Rusk reported that the Indians are also making strong representations in a great many capitals of the world. They have sent visiting teams to such capitals to present their case, indicating that they have accepted their diplomatic responsibility in this endeavor.

The President also indicated that we expect India to make an all-out effort to produce more of its own food needs. In this regard, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman said yesterday that the Indian Government is moving to improve her own position. The program they have instituted involves increased fertilizer production, both in Government-owned fertilizer plants and also those in the private sector of the economy. They are adjusting their own internal rules and regulations to encourage more production and more investment. They have almost doubled the amount of money in their budget for the next 4-year period for agricultural purposes. They have increased the amount of foreign exchange made available for the purchase of machinery, equipment, and raw materials particularly in the fertilizer area. They are engaged in a number of pilot programs to make more credit available and are reviewing irrigation and water use.

Mr. Rusk emphasized that this program involves two important elements. One is self-help, the other that India's problem is not just a U.S. problem but a worldwide problem. It is my hope that much progress will be made in the near future.

The President now has adequate authority under Public Law 480 and other legislation to provide the additional assistance that he is now proposing. However, he has asked for congressional endorsement of his action and for the support of this program by the American people. The resolution we have before us today would provide this endorsement. In the joint resolution, Congress endorses and supports the President's proposed action to help meet India's food shortages, help combat malnutrition, and encourage India to expand its own production. This congressional resolution also urges the President to seek the aid of other nations in providing assistance to India.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that in the past few years our great Nation has been very generous toward India. It has been my privilege to visit India on at least 9 or 10 occasions, and I have seen all parts of that great country. As one travels through India, he is very much impressed with the large population of that country. It is my belief that unless India takes positive action to reverse its present rate of population growth, she will soon run out of the productive land necessary in order to provide for its people.

It is my hope that the Indians will take some action in order to curb somewhat its population explosion, because unless they do so, I can see no hope for them.

Since 1946 through 1965, we have made available to India, through loans and economic assistance, $5,882,400,000. That is quite a sum of money. It would seem to me that had the administrators of our programs forced the Indians to do more to help themselves, conditions in that country would be much better today than they are.

As to the resolution the Senate is considering, it is hoped that our administrators in India will insist that she do something for herself if she is to expect further assistance from us.

Mr. President, I pointed this out on many occasions. I realize the difficulties that confront us, or any nation, in getting a country like India to change overnight.

On my visits I remarked that there was much food consumed by work buffaloes, cattle and other sacred animals in India. It meant the difference between a reasonable diet and starvation in that country. These sacred animals, of course, are revered by the Indians, and I realize it will take a long time for India to veer away from that concept.

I remember in my traveling in India, when I was not very far from New Delhi, I saw in excess of 100 peacocks in a field. The people there will not eat peacocks, or other birds. Sacred animals account for the consumption of millions of tons of food grains.

Unless India is willing to take heed now, and unless something is done about the explosive population growth, I do not believe this country could possibly manage to supply the food necessary to maintain India's increasing population.

The population of India today is increasing at the rate of over 1 million persons a month. It takes a great deal of food to accommodate that many additional mouths.

I express the hope that India will take cognizance of what we are saying to her now—that is, if she expects continued assistance not only from this country but from other peoples of the world, she will have to do something on the home front to help herself.

As I have just indicated, the aid program through fiscal year 1965 has amounted to $5,882,400,000. That figure does not include military assistance that we have furnished India in the last 4 or 5 years. I wish I could give that figure to the Senate, but it happens to be confidential, and I cannot state it.

If we add the 1966 figures to the previous amount, it adds quite a few more millions of dollars to the figure of $5,882,400,000 that we have furnished India up to now.

I also express the hope that the present Government of India will attempt to get other nations to assist her, and not depend entirely on the United States.

I was informed some time ago that the present Indian Government did not want to go out and ask other countries of the world to assist, because India did not like to be indebted to anybody. But India is looking to Uncle Sam for a full measure of assistance.

It is my belief that the food we are now providing, which amounts to about 50 percent of her present need, should be the limit of our contribution for this year. I express the hope that India will make every effort to obtain assistance from other countries that are well able to take care of such assistance.

I wish to point out that the estimated carryover of wheat for July of next year will be 610 million bushels. We have quite a large crop coming up now. I understand the estimated amount of production will be in excess of 1,300 million bushels.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Senator stated that the figure he used was the estimated carryover for next year. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I meant 1965.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. July 1?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I want to correct the RECORD. The year should be 1965.

The estimated amount of wheat for this growing crop year is in excess of 1,300 million bushels.

It is my belief that we shall have a good deal more wheat than we need for our own use.

My good friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] had suggested that an amendment be added to the resolution. I stated I saw no reason why it should not be put in, but it would simply delay passage of the joint resolution. The discussion on the Senate floor as to the intention of Congress will be in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in fact, I had prepared an amendment to provide that under no circumstances should our domestic reserve of wheat be permitted to fall below 600 million bushels. It occurs to me that under our commitment under the pending resolution we are committing all but 400 million bushels of the divisible reserve.

We are on the threshold, however, of a crop year, and I doubt that we will endanger the domestic supply of the country, but we cannot foresee at what point there may be a drought or a failure from some difficulty. For that reason, I thought there should be a cutoff on the amount of wheat that shall remain on hand. But now by legislative history we can show the intent.

We should ever be mindful of our requirements, at the same time we are being mindful of the necessity for charity and compassion when we are dealing with a country like India, and that we cannot defend ourselves if we do not look after our own needs.

I think if the chairman of the committee will emphasize that fact, it will be helpful for the future.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have no doubt that the crop which is now growing and which will be harvested this summer will result in a carryover that will be as much as or perhaps a little more than it was in 1965. I do not believe the carryover will be under 600 million bushels.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am very happy that the distinguished minority leader will not press for the adoption of his amendment. I think we should have a minimum reserve, but I think this is something that should be considered by committee action with the opportunity for various Senators and others to be heard.

It is possible the commitment could leave us with a 400 million bushel carryover by July 1, but, according to the grain trade, we will have extreme difficulty in delivering the 100 million bushels because of the shortage of boxcars.

The new crop is coming in in about 6 weeks. We will have no problem for some time to come with a shortage of wheat.

I agree with the Senator that a minimum carryover should be established. But when we do this, we are emphasizing the need for adequate price support.

Wheat is a war crop and also one with widespread demand for famine relief. It is still the staff of life. In times of emergency or when there is a shortage and the price goes up, we place limits on our exports.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite familiar with that fact. On the other hand, if the reserves are dropped to a point where it would stimulate tremendous increase in the prices of wheat, you are only going to feed the inflationary level.

I think everybody would like to see the farmers get a fair price for wheat. But if it goes through the ceiling, that becomes another matter. If there is anything at all to the law of supply and demand, and reduction in the supply market to the point of disappearance, it will do something to the demand, and at the same time to the prices. That I would like to keep in mind.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In spite of all this discussion about a possible shortage of wheat, the price of wheat dropped 12 to 15 cents a bushel in the last 2 weeks. There will be plenty of wheat left. The cash price of wheat on the market today is about a dollar a bushel less than it was 20 years ago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think there is virtue in limitation when we yield to resolutions of this kind. We had commitments of one kind or another in the form of cash when a distinguished member of the executive department went out through the world. One never knows how far they go.

After all, Congress is charged with exclusive authority over the public purse and it should exercise that responsibility by setting certain limits. If there is a danger in trying to set a limit, unless there is a fabric of testimony on which to base it, so that we are not exactly sure we should exercise caution. I would add this mainly to call to the attention of Congress that on an open-ended resolution we should exercise caution.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no question that India is in dire need of food at this time. I do not know if even under normal conditions tens of millions will die from starvation there as someone has said, but it is a fact that in any country where there is a reported food shortage there are always certain people who begin to hold back food supplies. That starts prices going up, right along with such hoarding. As prices go up and get out of reach of the poor people, there is actually famine and starvation.

When this resolution passes the Senate notifying the world, and particularly India, that a large quantity of food is on the way, any tendency toward hoarding, inflation, and famine will automatically be discouraged, because I understand this food we are selling them on very reasonable terms will be handled in such a way that the poor people of the country will be able to get it through their authorized stores.

I have participated in many conferences relative to this subject, and each time I have insisted that we should retain here in the United States enough wheat to guarantee us a year's supply. I have felt 600 million bushels was about the minimum amount which we should carry over from year to year.

However, it is a fact, as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and others have pointed out, that we probably cannot deliver too much between now and the beginning of the new harvest year. Harvesting this year's crop will start along the Rio Grande in about 2 months and by the middle of July the harvest should be in full swing in the United States.

But if it were at the other end of the season, I would say we should insist on guaranteeing a 600 million bushel carryover for the United States.

I do not know whether they will sell down to 400 million bushels or not. I do not know if there can be delivered enough to bring it down to 400 million bushels at this time, but certainly when people are in danger of starving, the United States is always on hand to see that they do not, even our enemies. We have been known to feed them and probably will do it again.

I think this resolution will have a very healthy effect.

I hope the world notices that we are sharing; that we are perhaps willing, if need be, to bring our own reserves down somewhat below our actual annual requirements.

Actually, I do not believe that will be necessary, but if it should be, it would not be too harmful at this time of the year as the new crop will soon be available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to agree with the suggestions just made on the floor to the effect that we should have a reasonable surplus to take care of our domestic needs. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont that the protective figure should be 1 year.

I think we should also emphasize that while this country has invested—and I prefer the term invested—billions of dollars in the future of India, India itself has done a remarkably fine job, all things considered, in raising its food production capabilities, and also, if I may say so after recently talking to Prime Minister Ghandi, in undertaking programs seeking to bring about some degree of population control.

These problems of food production and population control are well understood in that great nation and attempts are being made by her to cope with these problems which are, of course, the primary responsibility of the Indian people themselves.

But I look upon this resolution as one of partnership; partnership between India and the United States; partnership between the Executive and Congress; partnership between the two parties in Congress. I look upon it as a good omen. It is certainly a truly bipartisan effort because the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, moved this resolution to and through his committee as rapidly as was possible. The chairman was ably assisted in this endeavor to report out the resolution by his counterpart, the ranking minority member, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

I had discussed with the chairman of the committee, the ranking minority member, the distinguished minority leader, and others, the possibility of a rollcall vote on this measure this afternoon. But we find no one in opposition to it. So I would anticipate on the basis of this unanimous report of the committee, and the unanimous support of the Senate and the House of Representatives that it would not be too long before we could come to a final conclusion on this worthy and necessary measure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would call to the attention of my good friend from Illinois that 3 or 4 weeks ago the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on two bills: Food for freedom, S. 2933, and another bill designed to do the things now suggested; that is, fix food reserves for our protection. That is included in Senate bill 2932. It is possible before Congress recesses that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will come forward with a bill which would fix reserves.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion that the Senator from Illinois made with regard to food reserves.

I think the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, also made a pertinent comment on the fact that if there are to be ceilings they should be considered by the committee in a separate bill. This bill deals with a temporary problem. It is not a permanent problem.

Coming as I do from a wheat section of the Nation, I cannot conceive of any possibility of moving more wheat than is being moved now. The transportation channels of the Nation are filled, in the effort to get wheat to the coasts, so that it can be shipped. There are millions of bushels of wheat today that we in the Midwest are concerned about having moved before the new harvest. In fact, a grain man called me last evening and said he has had quantities of wheat ready to be delivered since January 18. He said that he was subject to fines amounting to $150,000 because he had been given 90 days in which to move the wheat.

What we in the Midwest need is something more than a temporary movement of grain. I do not believe we need to be concerned about the great additional supply of grain to be shipped to India. Our reserves are 600 million bushels, as the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER] has mentioned. I am confident that 50 million bushels more is the most that could possibly be moved. Based on present transportation facilities, that would bring the reserves down to about 550 million bushels.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois has made a suggestion which I think the distinguished chairman of the committee may wish to consider when he gets into the long-range program of food for peace.

Coming as I do from the wheat area, I think I can assure the American people that there will be plenty of wheat for this year and into 1967.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have in mind that if the wheat measure is amended, it will have to go back to the House of Representatives, and that will entail some delay. But I believe a question should be raised, and it should be raised in connection with any resolution or bill by which we expect to sell, dispose of for free distribution, or export resources or produce from our own soil to any other country.

I do not want our sense of compassion and charity to obscure the fact that there is a little fault on the side of India, and we should not let it go by without letting it be noted for the RECORD.

It must be apparent to those who study the problems of India that much of her economic segment has been preempted by government itself as against private enterprise. When India is looking for outside private capital, a number of restrictions are imposed.

First, it is necessary to call in the Indian Government and let it have 51 percent of the interest in any outside corporate entity that enters that country. We must not forget that the corporate tax in India runs as high as 70 percent. Right now in the Indian Parliament is a bill that would restrict the granting of patent rights to any other country. That has been called to my attention any number of times by persons who are vitally interested in the subject; so a case can be made.

But over and above that, there is the transcendent fact that the people of India are hungry, and that we are dealing with one of the most vital forces, with one of the most dangerous impulses, of which man is capable. It was centuries ago that Isaiah wrote:

> And it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God, and look upward.

That is the danger in a country of 550 million population, where so many are hungry. When hunger knows no bounds, then, of course, all restraints upon judgment fall by the wayside. Who shall say, then, what will happen?

So I cannot but lend my efforts to this enterprise and to make sure that we leave nothing undone, within reason and within the reasonable capacity of this country, to help those starving people. I do not speak with my tongue in my cheek. I visited India some years ago. I went out into the countryside. I was there at the same time that there were not only a cholera attack and the bubonic plague, but famine, as well. That year it was reported that several million people died. You could drive in the countryside and see families sitting along the roadway, waiting for death to overtake them.

There was still another unhappy situation, in that we sent some types of food that India could not use. The castes would not permit it. India has 2,400 or more castes, subcastes, and sub-subcastes. I am sure that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], our distinguished former Ambassador to India, who is in the Chamber this afternoon, could tell us an interesting story about that.

Those are the problems. We must take them into account, because we cannot superimpose something from the outside upon another country. But I do like to call such a country to account, a little, when I discover that it is operating in a fashion that, in fact, restricts and repels private capital and private enterprise. Only about 30 percent of the private capital that India needs today is going into that country. Yet capital ought to go into India for the construction of fertilizer plants and whatever else is necessary in order to increase India's production of foodstuffs and make her reasonably self-sufficient. When that is done, we shall be in India with something over $7 billion. That is a large amount of taxpayers' money. Our hope, of course, is that this will not be a continuing condition. We believe that, perhaps, at long last we can assume that she will become self-sufficient.

So I am more than ready to help this cause. I remind India, however, that this is to put her straight; and that while we are compassionate and are charitable and are open-hearted, and always have been, we expect to have another country show a reasonable sense of gratitude by dealing equitably with our own country, instead of putting restrictions upon us and upon our enterprising businessmen, who want to go to India to help, only to discover that they become victims of burdensome taxes and governmental restrictions with which they cannot contend.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the President has taken the initiative to help provide for the Republic of India food sufficient to help India meet its minimum needs during this calendar year. When the resolution is approved and the President proceeds with the action he has announced he will take, about 3.5 million tons of feed grains will be provided, which will make a total of 10 million tons provided this year.

That is a large amount of assistance; yet it will provide only for the minimum needs to prevent suffering and, perhaps, starvation. When I speak of minimum needs, I invite attention to the fact that the food intake in India is about 800 to 900 calories a day. So the resolution, if agreed to, will be in the humanitarian tradition of this country. It is worthy of the efforts and initiative of the President and of Congress.

I should like also to comment briefly upon the subject which the distinguished minority leader raised—and it is important. Several lessons can be drawn from this proposal, and from the action that our country will take.

First. Our attention has been drawn to the fact that our own food resources are not inexhaustible. Perhaps now the administration and Congress will take steps to establish the reserve supplies of food which are necessary for the needs of our own people, for the security of our Nation, and to continue to provide some humanitarian aid to other countries. I may say that legislative proposals are before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve, directed to this point of establishing adequate reserve supply levels of food, and I know they will receive attention.

This situation should bring also to the attention of the American people the importance of our own agriculture. It is a wonderful thing that our farmers and our country can produce the food and fiber essential not only for our own needs but also for the health of other peoples in the world.

Second, I believe this situation and those toward which the President's food-for-freedom proposal is directed should bring more forcefully to the attention of the administration and Congress that our influence should be directed toward insisting, or at least persuading and encouraging, these countries to take stronger measures to increase their own food production. It is a lamentable fact that many countries we assist have not taken the necessary steps to do this.

When I was in India 10 years ago, I urged that its food production be increased. I recommended stronger steps to our State Department, and to our foreign aid agency, at that time.

I am happy to say—and I know that I say it from solid information—that the Government of India in the last 2 or 3 years and particularly this year has placed increased emphasis upon increasing its own food production. It will be several years, in my judgment, before that country will be able to come close to satisfying its needs. But at least this change in policy and emphasis has now been made.

The Congress of the United States, in passing its aid programs and appropriations for aid, should continue to request the President of the United States to use the influence of our country to recommend, to encourage, and even to insist that food production be increased in those countries to which we extend our aid. If a country, particularly a developing country, cannot feed and clothe its own people, the chances of stability and of the success of our aid programs and the country's own development plan are minimized and perhaps lost for all time.

This situation should bring to the attention of the American people the importance of our own agriculture. It is a wonderful thing that our country and our farmers can produce food and fiber essential not only for our needs but also for the health of other peoples in the world.

I wish to speak also about what I believe is the attitude of India, and upon its value. We have provided a tremendous amount of aid to India. Through the use of these funds, and their own funds, they have made reasonably good progress. India has increased its agricultural production by 75 percent in about 10 years. It has made economic progress. It has attempted to provide for the needs of its own people, and for the raising of their living standards. It has attempted, with a large measure of success, to reach the needs of its people. That is not true of some of the other countries to which we have extended our aid.

India has nearly half a billion people. We have expended billions of dollars of aid to India. I think it can be said that it is good for India, good for that part of Asia, good for the world, and good for the United States that such a large country appreciates democratic values and maintains democratic institutions. That this is true has been a great influence for stability, and for democratic values, in that part of the world.

I hope that this program will be carried out. I hope also, as I have indicated, that our country and the Congress learns some lessons from this proposal—that we should establish reserve supplies of farm products, that we should insist in our foreign aid program that these countries establish and improve their plans so as to emphasize food production, and that we must secure better planning and coordination in the preparation of our own foreign aid program so that these plans for increased food production will be carried out.

The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is always fair and objective. He gave this proposal full consideration and brought it to the floor of the Senate quickly. He presented his views during the committee hearing, and let everyone present his views, and brought the measure to the floor of the Senate in a very short time. That is an accomplishment such as we seldom witness in the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I know that no one is better qualified to speak on this particular problem confronting India than is our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, who served for years as our Ambassador to that great nation and is personally familiar with the problem.

The Senator has stressed some of the important problems. One was the importance of our own agriculture and the fact that it not inexhaustible. We are one Nation that can furnish and is furnishing food to countries of the world despite the fact that we have 60 million acres out of production, on which acreage we pay $2 billion of taxpayers' money. The fact that we can do this and still be a great agricultural nation demonstrates the type of agriculture that we have in this country and its great possibilities.

I discussed with the distinguished chairman of the committee a few moments ago the amount of rupees that might result from the sale of this food and the use of those rupees.

The pending bill provides that the commodities we ship there will be sold for rupees. A great amount of money will be available in rupees. The Indian economy can be improved by the use of this money.

I make one suggestion with regard to housing. For several years in our committee I have stressed the importance of housing in underdeveloped countries. A number of American companies are engaged in private housing in India. They do a splendid job. As we build up additional rupees in India, we might find some way to engage in home construction. When a man has a home, he has an interest not only in his country and community, but also in being a better citizen.

There was some discussion that this should constitute a gift. Let us get these rupees. Let us use them for the benefit of people. I think that we should stress this program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we have in excess of $500 million in rupees in India at the present time reserved for our own uses. This money will soon be used to form a binational foundation for educational purposes. In addition to that, from the money we have loaned India, we now have in excess of $1,920 million that will be collected over the years. From our Public Law 480 transactions of the past, we also had for collection $1,445 million in rupees, so that we will have more rupees than we need at the present time. When this transaction is completed, it will again generate many more millions of rupees.

I am very hopeful that these rupees can be put to good use so that India will not be so dependent on us for food.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place a table in the RECORD at this point showing the total of our aid to India since 1946.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

India

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

Program	Total, 1946-65	Repayments and interest, 1946-65	Total, less repayments and interest
AID and predecessor agencies, total	2,485.6	180.4	2,305.2
Loans [1]	2,101.0	180.4	1,920.6
Grants	384.7		384.7
Social Progress Trust Fund			
Food for Peace, total	2,753.4	70.1	2,683.3
Title I (total sales agreements)	(2,854.3)		(2,854.3)
Less (planned for U.S. uses)	(357.9)		(357.9)
Title I: Planned for loans and grants	2,496.4	70.1	2,426.3
104(c): Grants for common defense			
104(e): Grants for economic development	788.2		788.2
104(e): Loans to private industry	202.6	10.4	192.2
104(g): Loans to government	1,505.6	59.7	1,445.9
Title I: Assistance from other country sales agreements	6.1		6.1
Title II: Emergency relief and economic development	21.9		21.9
Title III: Voluntary relief agencies	220.0		220.0
Title IV: Dollar credit sales			
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	406.4	71.0	335.4
Other U.S. economic programs	237.0	66.5	170.5
Total economic	5,882.4	388.0	5,494.4
Loans	4,445.7	388.0	4,057.7
Grants	1,436.8		1,436.8

[1] Excludes $20,000,000 loan in fiscal year 1958 financed by Asian Economic Development Fund. This loan is included in NESA regional data.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, much can be accomplished if India participates in the kind of self-help program the Senator from Kentucky has been talking about. This is something that I have been preaching for 15 years in the Senate. Perhaps now, it will be adopted.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the President in his message on aid to India did have a suggestion that we set aside $300 million of rupees for a foundation that was to be controlled and managed by distinguished people from the Governments of India and the United States. This provision is not contained in the pending legislation. It will be dealt with by another committee. It is a provision that I think we should give consideration to.

It is probably as good an advantage as we can get from the use of these rupees as anything we can think of.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to speak only of the foreign policy implication of this bill.

I have a certain background, I think, for speaking on this matter. I was a cosponsor in the other body in 1951 of the bill to give 2 million tons of grain to India at a time when we were faced with a similar situation.

I remember distinctly going to the port of Baltimore, as the House sponsor of the bill, to see the first grain ship loaded to begin this program.

Mr. President, I could not agree more with the observations which have been made on the floor today. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, has for years insisted on the concept of building up India's agricultural plant, her fertilizer capability, and her adoption of the agricultural practices which have distinguished our extension services and have been so helpful to us. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has spoken properly of the necessary foundations for education and research—a very noble consummation of our efforts, an effort which will generate more productivity and money for India. Food is also money; it is a form of aid enabling people in transition to do industrial jobs instead of devoting so much of their energy to food production.

Of course, India has both that problem and the problem of being hit by a drought. My friend, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who was a most distinguished ambassador to India, much liked and highly respected there, and with whom my wife and I traveled to India at the end of 1956, just before he returned to the Senate and I took my post here, is particularly qualified to speak on the problems in India. He also excels in his analyses of United States-Indian relations.

He has spoken very movingly about the terrible food situation there, how lack of food debilitates the people. He told us that the great measures of self-help require not only outside financing, but Indian volition and initiative as well.

Mr. President, I wish to speak about the significance of India.

India is not always a comfortable friend. Sometimes she has voted against us in the United Nations. Sometimes she has taken positions we thought too favorable to the Communist bloc. Indian attempts at neutrality, however, were not sufficient to avert an attack by Communist China. India has now experienced Peking aggression.

As far as we are concerned, Mr. President, India is an essential counterweight to Communist China. India must at all costs be preserved as a free nation.

A Senator said to me a moment ago, "There probably will not be too much debate on this measure, and there probably will not be a rollcall vote; there is too much money involved. We will not talk about it very much. We only talk about things that involve relatively little money."

But, Mr. President, the money is but half the point. There is a new awareness arising among the people of India. India is an enormous subcontinent. It has become keen to the values of freedom. It has learned them the hard way. I think that Indian cooperation in signing the Tashkent agreement was an extraordinary and gifted act of statesmanship. I feel very positively about the choice of Mrs. Gandhi—whom I have had the pleasure of knowing in years past—as Prime Minister of India.

India is showing a resourcefulness and toughness of spirit which is most admirable, and of the utmost importance to the freedom of mankind. For, Mr. President, without India all Asia goes under. India, as I say, has the population, the territory, and the resources to be a counterweight to Communist China. The Indian people are among our most important natural allies.

Because of our demonstrated friendship for India, because of our aid and moral support for Indian ideals and values, the people of the United States have come to view the people of India as partners in peace. This friendship results not only from common interests and ideals, but through the active participation of a friendly relationship by outstanding U.S. Ambassadors such as Mr. Bunker, Mr. Galbraith, and Mr. COOPER.

Mr. President, I rise to speak because I hope that the people of India will interpret this new grain aid not merely as famine relief, but as an investment in our partnership, an investment which does not always have to be in money, but can be in the spirit, the love for freedom, and the respect for the creativity of their own nation. There are many things that they can learn, just as there are many things that we can learn. I agree with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that a great deal of benefit and a great deal of help can come to India through the private enterprise system. There are enormous opportunities and a great private enterprise tradition in India, and there are many American and worldwide companies anxious to go to India.

Senators may remember that I am known—and very proud to be known—as the father of the so-called ADELA Investment Company which is now operating very successfully, with an endowment of about $35 million of capital, in South America—a great worldwide involvement of the banks and industrial companies of North America, Western Europe, and Japan in the industrial development of Latin America. I would like to see an Asian version of ADELA to assist India, provided there would be a congenial climate in India for private enterprise development. There is nothing inconsistent between private enterprise development and the struggle for freedom, and no inconsistency between both of these and state involvement. Witness, for example, the experience of President Frei of Chile, a country from which I have just returned, who is now seeking to operate a mixed private business and Government enterprise which will enormously increase the productivity of the copper mines, and give Chile a 50-percent participation in the result. Contracts are being made with the most outstanding private enterprise companies in the United States, which own large amounts of Chilean property. Cooperation between private enterprise and Government can be fruitful. Such cooperation, I believe, is the way for countries like India to advance economically and yet maintain the foundations of democracy.

Mr. President, this resolution is in the great humanitarian spirit of our Nation. Even if it meant privation to us, we would never let a great people starve. I remember in this Chamber, Mr. President, serious discussion about relieving famine in Communist China, if some way could be found to move the food to the people. That is the way we feel about such things.

But beyond that, and in the great spirit in which Senator Cooper spoke, I hope very much that the people of India will consider this action on its face—as an earnest desire for partnership and friendship. India and the United States are in the same great tradition of seeking world peace through democratic means. The people of the United States wish to do every thing possible to assist the Indian people in their fight against famine and for freedom.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I strongly support the President's proposals to meet the food and financial crises facing India.

I congratulate the President on his skillful and obviously successful conduct of the conversations he held with Mrs. Gandhi last week. The memorable visit to our country by this amazing woman hopefully marks the beginning of a brilliant new era of the Indo-United States relations. On every score, I felt the discussions and the joint communique struck a positive note that should guide Indo-American relations for years to come.

No other free country has the importance for us of India.

India is the world's largest democracy and second most populous country. Her fate will profoundly affect the future of all the rest of the world.

Out of the revolution of rising expectations among the two-thirds of the world's people who live in the underdeveloped world, two nations have emerged as rival models of economic and social development.

Communist China proclaims that political independence and economic development can only be achieved on the Communist model, exemplified by the industrialization of the Soviet Union. In sharp contrast, India insists that a decent standard of living and national economic self-sufficiency can be achieved in a relatively short time, without paying the price in slavery and loss of human dignity and individual freedom that economic development in Communist terms demands.

The choices the underdeveloped nations will make between the Indian and Chinese development models cannot be predicted with certainty. The average Asian, who lives at or slightly above the level of subsistence, consumed by the elemental struggle to put food in his children's mouths, is understandably less concerned with democracy than we. Nehru is reported to have observed that a nation cannot have democracy on an empty stomach.

If the Chinese should succeed in effecting the historic transition from primitive economy to industrial society within a relatively short time, even at the enormous human cost they are exacting from their enslaved people, the Chinese experience will have an incalculable impact on the more than a billion people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. All the Western preachments about elections and individual freedom and free enterprise will mean nothing if more than half of all the world's people see no practical alternative to the Chinese method of economic development.

In contrast to China stands India. India has pursued a course of development since independence which has preserved individual freedom and respected human dignity, while making substantial industrial and agricultural progress.

India demonstrates by her very existence that a backward and once oppressed nation can lift herself into the modern world without radical, totalitarian methods, without rejecting its cultural heritage, and without destroying individual freedom.

Despite the barriers of two antagonistic religious groups, 13 separate and distinct languages, mass illiteracy, and inexperience in self-government, India has forged a viable parliamentary democracy, with a written constitution and a bill of rights much like our own.

While building and strengthening its system of personal and political freedom, however, India has made tremendous progress toward modernization of its economy. Overall, industrial production in India has grown about 9 percent a year since 1950 and food grain production about 3½ percent a year.

Of the greatest significance, however, is the fact that the Indians are paying their own way toward development. Although our assistance to them has been substantial, almost 80 percent of India's total investment has been financed by internal savings.

But these formidable statistics of Indian growth tell only half the story—the happy half.

These favorable rates of growth and expansion are dwarfed by the fact of India's enormous population and the primitive point from which India began its growth in 1951.

India's 55-percent increase in total food production since 1951 has been drastically undercut by a 33-percent increase in population. With food production rising at the rate of 3 percent and population rising at a rate of more than 2 percent each year, India has to run hard just to stay even.

The economic dislocations caused by conflicts with Pakistan and China and deadly drought-induced famine now threaten all the progress which India so far has made. India's third 5-year plan, which began with the reasonable goal of expanding national income by 30 percent by 1966, is ending this month with a crisis in agriculture and serious underemployment of industrial resources.

Whether the present crisis will amount to a major and perhaps fatal setback for India, or whether it will be only a brief interruption to her otherwise rapid march to development could be decided in the coming months.

Underlying the entire Indian crisis is the weakness in Indian agriculture which struggles along under the growing specter of a birth rate which constantly threatens to outstrip the growth in agricultural production.

If India is to survive as a nation, it must feed its people. If India is to feed its people, it must make a radical improvement in the productivity of its land already under cultivation—and that improvement will require drastic changes in India's agricultural technology. The supply of new land that can be readily brought under cultivation has been virtually exhausted. India simply must improve its use of irrigation, seeds, tools, pesticides, and most important of all, fertilizers.

I welcome President Johnson's direction to the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Agency for International Development, to consult with the Indian Government in order to find ways and means to strengthen India's programs for increased fertilizer production, improved water and soil management, expanded rural credit, and enlarged and improved agricultural training and education programs.

But raising food is only one side of India's agricultural crisis. The other side is that India simply has too many mouths to feed. And every year there are almost 15 million more. The population growth every year in India exceeds the combined populations of Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, and Tennessee.

If the Indian economy seems to be running up an escalator marked "down," one answer clearly lies in the realm of population control. And so I applaud the President's support of the Indian Government's plans to tackle the population problem as a national crisis and triple its investment in family planning measures.

To help slow the population growth now outstripping agricultural and industrial growth throughout the underdeveloped world, Senators Gruening, Clark, Hartke, McGee, Moss, Neuberger, Simpson, Yarborough, and myself have introduced a bill, S. 2992, to authorize the use of foreign currency generated by our foreign aid program to finance family planning programs in nations like India. I hope the merit of this important bill in meeting the problems created by the population explosion in India and elsewhere among the emerging nations will inspire the President's support.

Agricultural underproduction and human overproduction are the twin crises facing India today.

Many reputable observers believe that India can achieve agricultural self-sufficiency by 1971, if it can get the increased agricultural assistance it needs from the United States and if it can control its birth rate. India has the will and determination to meet its twin crises. But India needs help.

I think the President's proposals will provide a substantial part of that help.

A particularly important feature of the President's message to Congress on the food crisis in India is his emphasis on international action to meet India's development needs.

We should not, and do not, have to carry the whole burden of helping to bring India to meet its food crisis and to come to economic maturity. Every free nation has a stake in India's fate. To make sure our aid is used most effectively, and to encourage other free nations to do their fair share for India, we must work to strengthen the existing international framework for planning and financing India's economic and agricultural development.

Aid to India from the advanced free world countries is presently coordinated through a consortium of non-Communist governments working with the World Bank and the International Development Association.

The consortium arrangement brings pressure on developed countries of the free world to give their proper share of aid. It provides a framework within which to coordinate all the Western aid programs to India, in order to avoid duplication of effort.

As the principal aid-giver and as free world leader, the United States dominates the consortium. We should continue to encourage vigorously every aspect of the India consortium operations.

Close observers of the India scene also welcome the President's proposal to establish a joint Indo-United States Foundation, financed by Indian currencies paid by the Indian Government to us for part of our aid program. Under the President's proposal, this Foundation would be designed to give fresh encouragement to education and scientific research in India, especially in the field of agriculture and agricultural development.

The amount of Indian currency we own, however, has been mounting rapidly and relentlessly as our aid program has continued. We now own $2.5 billion worth of Indian rupees. This is over 20 percent of all of India's money, and could very well become almost 30 percent of it within the foreseeable future. The additional accumulation of Indian currency generated by the Indian money already in U.S. accounts in India is not only useless, it is unnecessary, foolish, and dangerous.

We must ask whether we really need to own up to a third of India's money supply in order to guide its development. Can we expect the India people to resent and fear our ownership of a third of their currency less than we would resent French or British ownership of our own currency?

President Johnson has wisely moved, first through his new food for freedom program and now through the Indo-United States Foundation, to stem further accumulation of foreign currencies in our hands as a result of our aid program.

The President's wisdom about the courses open to us to meet India's crisis is especially apparent in his restraint about our goals in aiding India. President Johnson affirms in his message on India that "the United States interferes neither in the internal politics nor the internal economic structure of other countries. We ask only for results."

India is a democracy. As such, the Indian Government must adjust its plans and programs to the political forces within India, just as we do here.

The democratic process may be a limitation on India's development. Certainly the Communists think so. But that is what the epic of India's development is all about.

If we are to help India prove that democracy is not incompatible with rapid development, we have to accept the limitations of democracy along with its strengths. We must recognize that frictions and differences of opinion are bound to arise during the continuing intimate relationship that the United States and India will share as long as our aid is necessary.

But just as India must be, and is, prepared to accept what amounts to U.S. intervention in its national economic planning, we must understand India's right to determine her own course. The reforms we see as vital may seem less significant or politically impractical to an Indian politician or administrator.

We must always remember that we are talking about reforms in their nation, not ours. We must be patient with action that may seem at times to be too slow or too grudging. And we must be prepared, at times, to accept no change at all.

Nor can we expect miracles once plan changes are agreed upon. We are dealing in India with Nehrus, Shastris, and Gandhis, not with Hitlers, Mussolinis, or Stalins. India's democracy is no more automatic in its political processes than is ours.

Naturally, we should use the influence that our substantial aid gives us in helping India to guide its development, but we must exercise that influence deftly, or we will prevent our friends in India from carrying out the very policies which we endorse.

It better serves our long-range interest to have India as a strong, independent and nonalined nation than to create a "Charlie McCarthy," mouthing U.S. foreign policy, in Asia. We will, in the long run, attract more adherents to the cause of democratic self-development with the honey of respect than the vinegar of coercion. After the Chinese border incidents, the Indians have little doubt who are their real friends.

The President's message to Congress on the food crisis in India signifies an enlightened and effective approach to the development problems now facing India. Enactment of House Joint Resolution 997, the bill we have before us today, is an essential part of that program to put India on its feet as the prime example in the underdeveloped world of the compatibility of freedom with economic development.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 997 to support expanded U.S. efforts to avert famine in India. I was proud to be able to join as a cosponsor of this important resolution, and to sit on the Senate Agriculture Committee yesterday afternoon when we gave it unanimous approval. It is my hope that the Senate will join with the other body in passing this important resolution without dissent.

I visited India 3 months ago to study the effects of our food-for-peace program in that country, and the severe problem of human hunger there. What I saw was grim—the efforts of the worst drought of this century were already making themselves felt. We cannot hide from the fact that if we do not substantially increase our food shipments to India, millions of human beings will starve in the months ahead.

But what I saw in India also gives us grounds for hope. For India is moving, with impressive determination, to correct past weaknesses in agricultural policy, to give priority to the need to improve her food production. I saw, in the intensive agriculture district program, clear evidence of success already achieved in raising yields as much as 30 to 60 percent over 5 years. What is needed is to extend the successful techniques used to raise yields in these districts to much larger areas of cropland, and this is what we must help India to do.

There is impressive agreement in the administration and the Congress on the importance of greater emphasis on self-help in our food assistance program. There is also an accord on the need for other wealthy countries to bear their share of the burden of alleviating world hunger. President Johnson has been a leader in both of these directions, as his message to the Congress of food aid to India makes clear. He deserves our admiration and our support.

As many of my colleagues have undoubtedly noted, the Washington Post has editorialized that "President Johnson's congressional message on aid to India is a great and gratifying document." The Post praised the President for presenting the problem as a "challenge to this country's humanity." The editorial goes on to add:

> He has rightly assumed that the Congress of the United States and the people of this country will support action on this magnificent scale on a purely humanitarian basis.

I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that this editorial, "Aid for India," be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to make one final, very important point. Just as we call on other nations to take a greater share in food aid to India, so also we must encourage private charitable groups to continue and expand their programs to provide sustenance and nourishment to the hungry. I was particularly pleased to note, as one fine example of such private efforts, the action by Lutheran World Relief in shipping 3 million multivitamin tablets—valued at $304,000—to victims of India's famine in mid-March. This is to be the first of three such shipments.

This is a fine example of Christianity in practice, the type of good work that Lutheran World Relief and other religious and charitable agencies have been carrying on quietly and effectively for many years. I would, therefore, like to call this work to the attention of the Senate, and ask that an article from yesterday's New York Times entitled "Lutherans Send Vitamins To Combat Indian Famine" be printed also at the close of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Exhibit 1

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 1966]

Aid for India

President Johnson's congressional message on aid to India is a great and gratifying document. It is a great document because it asks Congress forcefully and directly to underwrite the rescue of the Indian people from the threat of starvation—at any cost. It projects the direct appropriation of 3½ million tons of wheat—in addition to 6.5 million tons already scheduled for 1966 shipment. And it calls for shipment of 200,000 tons of corn and up to 150 million pounds of vegetable oils and up to 125 million pounds of milk powder. It proposes besides the shipment of quantities of cotton and tobacco that may permit the diversion of more Indian crop land to food products. But more than this, it bluntly states that if others do not meet the remaining requirements the United States will.

The President has dared to present the problem to Congress, it is gratifying to note, as a challenge to this country's humanity. He did not claim that the United States will derive any promised or unpromised quid pro quo. He did not assert that feeding the Indians will help contain or isolate Communist China. He did not allege that it will help balance or frustrate the Soviet Union. He has not asked the Congress to support the program for any of these reasons or for any other national or selfish reason. He has rightly assumed that the Congress of the United States and the people of this country will support action on this magnificent scale on a purely humanitarian basis.

He has had the courage to recommend this vast program of aid, not because the Indian people some day may be our allies, not because they may help us in Asia, not because they will subsequently reward us with friendship or assistance but simply because the people of India are hungry. And that is the only attribute, the only necessity, the only condition we ought to require as a qualification for aid from the granaries and storehouses of America.

This program is being undertaken in the spirit of the great efforts of this country to feed the hungry of many nations after World War I and World War II. It is in a great American tradition. The President will not urge in vain "the strong and warmhearted and generous support of this program by the American people." He will not be disappointed in the response to an appeal to the hearts of the citizens of this country.

Exhibit 2

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1966]

Lutherans Send Vitamins To Combat Indian Famine

Three million multivitamin tablets valued at $304,000 and weighing nearly seven tons were shipped to India famine victims in mid-March by Lutheran World Relief, according to Religious News Service.

The shipment, by commercial airliner, was the first of three scheduled to go to Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta. The three shipments total about 10 million tablets.

The vitamins were received by the Lutheran material aid agency from Interchurch Medical Assistance, an interdenominational agency which solicits donations of hospital equipment, medicines, and other medical supplies for free distribution overseas.

A spokesman for Lutheran World Relief noted that space for the vitamins on the airliners was being provided without charge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Murphy in the chair). The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 997) is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resoultion.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 997) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the preamble.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 149 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to praise the Senate for its action on the India assistance measure. Its swift approval distinguishes all of the Members immensely. But, as I mentioned before, there are a number of Senators, on both sides of the aisle, who should be singled out for assuring expeditious action on this vital resolution.

First of all, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] responded capably and decisively to the President's request. Under his able and skillful chairmanship prompt action was taken by the Agriculture and Forestry Committee to bring this measure before the Senate today. Moreover, his articulate presentation on the floor assured decisive support.

And, of course, the astute ranking minority member of that committee, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is to be highly commended for his efforts in assuring successful Senate action today. His cooperation—so typical—contributed greatly to obtaining efficient committee action and to winning the Senate's overwhelming approval of this most important resolution.

Indeed, our thanks go to all of the Agriculture Committee members. Their combined efforts made action today possible. Their combined support made unanimous Senate approval a certainty.

Additionally, we are grateful to those Senators who rose to discuss and to support the measure. I am referring to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] whose compelling support of the President's request assured unanimous Senate endorsement. The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], Kansas [Mr. Carlson], and New York [Mr. Javits] are likewise to be singled out for their enlightening remarks which helped immeasurably to obtain this great success.

Again, to the Senate as a whole I personally am deeply grateful for this great cooperative achievement. For we all hope that in the end it will be a victory in the continuing battle against hunger.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, with the action just taken today with regard to the Indian resolution, we have completed a full cycle in the past 23 years. I well remember the terrible Calcutta famine of 1943. If I may be spared a few moments to speak of a personal reminiscence, I was in India during the year 1944. I talked to many people who had seen the terrible problem which existed in 1943. It was a pretty rough experience for the entire country.

Despite the massive assistance which has been given by this Nation and others in the intervening years, this year India is again facing a major famine affecting an estimated 10 million of its citizens. We are moved with great compassion to do what we can to help our friends in India to lessen the catastrophe facing them in the months ahead. But, Mr. President, the situation in India should awaken us to the fact that we need to take another searching look at our programs which we have been pursuing in the hope of helping the hungry nations of the world. It is obvious that they have not been as successful as we had hoped and we must look for new and additional ways to meet a crisis which is drawing ever closer.

With India as a prime example, we should be painfully aware that the world food gap is growing instead of lessening. In the past 30 short years the number of grain-exporting regions has shrunk from six down to two. Because of the exploding world population, many nations which formerly met their needs for food now are falling behind, and the North American Continent has had to increasingly become the breadbasket for the entire world—for friend and enemy alike.

We must face cold, hard facts. Our bounty is not endless. No matter how great our compassion for less fortunate countries, we cannot indefinitely undertake the burden of feeding the world. Other nations which lack the know-how must be taught to help themselves. And while we are undertaking to impart our technological know-how to less developed nations, other fully developed nations of the world must share our burden of helping the food-hungry nations of the world.

We cannot go it alone. West Germany, France, and England and our other allies in Western Europe must join in sharing their bounty and their knowledge with these less fortunate nations in meeting the approaching world crisis.

In the immediate future, the whole question of world peace may depend upon how well we of the developed nations can impart our technical know-how in food production to the food-short, underdeveloped nations of the world. We cannot—we must not—fail, or we shall sooner or later be faced with the Solomonic decision to determine who shall be allowed to live. It is that serious.

Mr. President, I support the action we are taking today to help the starving people of India, and I urge that we move ahead with deliberate speed to provide the means to answer the world food crisis.

While the world food crisis grows, we are faced with a paradox in American agriculture today. Our farmers are saddled with oppressive restrictions limiting their ability to produce. I believe we must act immediately to unharness our farmers if we are to succeed in coping with the coming food crisis.

I wish to state parenthetically at this point that under the present administration program there has been a reduction in agricultural labor, which has lead to a shortage in certain agricultural products. Our efforts to increase production by having persons available to work in agriculture have been either ignored or played down by the present administration.

Time is needed for our farmers to increase their production—our food supply cannot be instantly turned on or off like a water faucet. And we need more leadtime for a program to teach food production know-how to the less developed nations of the world.

I cannot estimate how much time this might take, but it took this country literally decades to develop technical innovations to bring about our present agricultural production. We cannot possibly be able to get the other underdeveloped nations to stimulate their agriculture through technological advances unless there is a long leadtime. It would take at least 10 or 15 years before they could go forward.

In addition, we need to gear our assistance to these nations more on their own demonstrated willingness to help themselves. Our knowledge is of little value to them if they are not willing to put it to immediate use. We cannot afford to waste the lessons we have learned in India.

I had an opportunity to be a delegate in a recent senatorial group that went to Japan, India, Pakistan, and on into Afghanistan and Israel. I had the opportunity of talking firsthand with many officers and very important and leading congressional people in India, including the present Prime Minister.

One of the things we had hoped was that we would find a better atmosphere in the country of India toward its ability to produce its own food.

But it is an interesting thing, Mr. President, that although we have been trying for some 3, 4, or 5 years to increase fertilizer production in India, which is so desperately needed, the Minister of Finance in India had refused to permit any foreign development in the private sector to come into India to produce fertilizer.

I hope that in the implementation of this resolution and in the discussions with the Indian Government, we can make as a condition of our particular loan the opportunity for the creation of a fertilizer industry in India so that we can find the means and the technology to help them to help themselves in their food production.

Unless we do this, their rate of productive capacity is going to continue to go down, and we are going to be called on more and more to meet the food needs of the Indian nation. This is only one nation. Before we are through we are going to be asked to help in Africa and Asia.

From the point of view of timing, the hour is late and I believe we must move ahead immediately to forge and put into effect a program of food, fertilizer, and family planning throughout the world.

Unless we do this, population will increase and food production will decrease, in both quality and quantity.

Consequently, although I support this humanitarian resolution, it seems to me that we must take this opportunity to stimulate discussion of our overall programs and objectives in assisting underdeveloped nations with food and food production.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Colorado for commenting on the aid to India program.

In addition, I wish to stress the fact that while we have a great agricultural operation in this great Nation, it is not inexhaustible. It is time that we begin to look at the future, based on a longtime program for the strengthening of our agriculture, to be certain that our people will not only have sufficient quantities of food, but that we will be able to help other countries, as we have in the past.

I wish to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator that we have 60 million acres out of production for which we pay $2 billion in taxpayers' money to take it out of production.

We should give serious consideration, and I hope the Secretary of Agriculture will give serious consideration, to putting at least 10 to 20 percent of our present allotment of acreage back into production so that we may be able to assure future supplies for our people and for others.

Mr. DOMINICK. I know how experienced and able the Senator from Kansas is in this field. He has been one of the leaders in this field, and I very much appreciate the comments that he has made.

I might say at this point that I am often reminded of what I call the "upside down world," of our agricultural production and our agricultural programs.

As the Senator has said, we take all of this acreage out of production and we pay farmers for taking it out of production. At the same time, we pass bills, which I have voted for time and again, partially to increase the water supply of the West so that more crops can be grown on the land in these areas. At the same time we go through a research program, as the distinguished Senator is well aware, showing farmers how to drain their wet lands so they can get more land into production.

Each program conflicts with another, and we do not have an overall policy in this area. We are presenting to the farmer all the time the absolutely impossible task of his trying to be a chemist, surveyor, Government analyst and in a sense, Government regulator. He is in a hopeless position because of all the technical know-how he must have to produce and keep his family alive on a private enterprise system.

I have tremendous admiration for any farmer who can make any money on the system we have now.

I am happy to have the comments of the Senator from Kansas. I appreciate his support on these comments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6319) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by government of foreign countries, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Senate convenes tomorrow, I may be recognized for an address on a nongermane subject for 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY LAUDS "AGE OF OPPORTUNITY" IN SPEECH BEFORE AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as one who has long been actively interested in, and associated with, the efforts of the

Congress to enhance the educational opportunities for our Nation's youth, I was encouraged and delighted to read the speech presented to the American Personnel and Guidance Association on April 4, 1966, by our Vice President, Hubert H. Humphrey.

The keynote of the Vice President's remarks was both challenging and stimulating, as he said:

> We are entering an exciting new age: the age of opportunity.

Those of us who have been intimately involved with the passage of the vast body of educational legislation, which is now a part of this Nation's law, are determined that the opportunities offered by the programs we have created shall be made available as fully as practicable to our children. We do not intend to renege on the promises inherent in these programs; we intend to bring the age of opportunity to the stage of realization for the youth, and for the needy, of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech on this subject, delivered by the Vice President, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C., April 4, 1966

My message today is this: We are entering an exciting new age: The age of opportunity.

And those who do not understand this fact do not understand the most important fact today of American life.

The age of opportunity is already upon us—in the corridors of our schools, on the campuses of our universities and colleges, in the personnel offices of our corporations.

Old barriers are being torn down. Old struggles are being won.

The day is near when the future will lie open ahead—open to every American child who will make the most of it.

A 30-year fight for a program of health insurance has been concluded.

A hundred-year struggle to obtain Federal assistance for elementary and secondary schools has been won.

A century-long struggle to implement the words of the Emancipation Proclamation is being won.

Root causes of poverty are being attacked.

A new immigration policy has been established to make the words on the Statue of Liberty honest words.

Tremendous breakthroughs in medical science mean that most of us will live longer, in better health, than any people at any other time.

A host of programs to improve the quality of our physical and cultural environment have been enacted.

Our quest into outer space has brought us new knowledge, new technology, and a great adventure into the future.

And the whole sum of our progress—the whole fact of our stronger and better America—gives hope to the two-thirds of mankind living in hunger and darkness that there may be a share of something better ahead for them, too.

I, for one, am determined that the hopes of mankind shall not be in vain—that their faith in the strength and goodness of America shall not be misplaced.

The good old days were never that good, believe me. The good days are today. And better days are coming tomorrow.

As I travel around America, I see a people on the move full of enthusiasm and idealism, and wanting to participate fully in this new age of opportunity.

Sometimes I wonder whether we fully grasp the changes which have taken place in America in the past few years—changes for the better.

I am privileged to serve as a member of the Advisory Council of Plans for Progress—the voluntary organization of major business corporations pledged to promote equal opportunity in employment.

In my meetings with these leaders of American business, I am told that competition among companies is fierce to hire competent Negroes and other minority group members. Where just a few years ago most Negro college graduates could only look forward realistically to careers as teachers or preachers, the picture now has changed dramatically and the doors of opportunity in the business world are swinging open.

Many of America's finest colleges are now searching for qualified minority group members to enroll as freshmen each year.

These institutions learned it was not sufficient merely to sit back and wait for Negroes and other minorities to apply. Years of discrimination and exclusion dictated that initiative had to be exercised by the colleges and universities.

Each summer program Upward Bound, sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity, seeks to expose talented young people from deprived areas to the challenge and excitement of educational excellence so that they will be motivated to enter college after high school.

Under the recent reorganization of civil rights responsibilities of the Federal Government, the Civil Service Commission has developed a comprehensive new program to attract minority talent into the Federal service and to make sure that every effort is made to promote and advance persons who are now Federal employees. President Johnson recently met with the principal personnel officers of every Federal agency to emphasize the Federal Government's commitment in this regard.

In occupation after occupation, on American street and farm, the story is the same: We are entering the age of opportunity.

How will we meet this age?

First, we must make sure our young people understand that new opportunities are, in fact, opening up every day. We must crack through generations of cynicism and despair so that our boys and girls will seek the right education and training to fill the jobs of the future.

Second, we must be prepared to offer our young people the education and training they need—as the President has said, "all the education they can take."

The challenge of providing quality education—education of and for excellence—is a massive and difficult job.

Quality education is not being provided in many school systems.

But it must be provided lest we cheat both our young people and our Nation of the chance for full productivity.

We know the need to continue eliminating obsolete and outmoded teaching methods and curriculums—methods and curriculums which stunt the development of creative thinking and understanding.

We have begun to emphasize the importance of understanding the basic structures of mathematics, languages, and the physical and biological sciences.

And we know our young people have astounding capacity for learning when they are truly challenged and excited by the process of education.

We must, of course, recognize one overwhelming task among the great challenges facing education: What about education for the poor and deprived?

Despite the recent efforts to improve the lives of those persons consigned to live in the slums and ghettoes of our cities, we must recognize that little has changed in their daily lives.

We still find the poorest schools there—not the best. In those areas where young people are usually denied broad exposure to culture, the arts and society generally, we find schools that often do little to compensate for it.

And in those areas where children come from a home environment which provides this exposure, we usually find schools which also offer a wide variety of special courses, exciting cultural programs, and the latest teaching techniques and equipment.

It is time to see that educational excellence exists everywhere—but especially in those areas where it is needed most urgently.

We must espouse what Franklin Roosevelt called "that broader definition of liberty" under which the fortunate make an extra effort on behalf of those lacking good fortune so that, in the longer run, all may benefit.

A few months' experience with Project Headstart is enough to excite our imagination to the possibilities for lifting young minds in families and communities left far behind the rest of us. And this opportunity must extend throughout the elementary and secondary years—not come to an abrupt halt as youngsters enter first grade.

As we concern ourselves with the problem of school dropouts, let us remember that many of these youngsters are, in fact, pushouts—persons whose unique talents are never developed or recognized by the schools—persons to whom education has been a deadening and defeating experience.

We surely have a job to do here. It is estimated that if the rate of school dropouts continues at its preesnt pace, we will have some 32 million adults in the labor force without a high school diploma by 1975.

During this past year we faced the prospect of 750,000 dropouts. Although this estimate has been reduced by the intensive efforts of many persons in this room—including my own—we still have not succeeded in halting this tragic waste of human resources.

But today we have the tools to accomplish this objective—especially if local school systems and the States make full and imaginative use of new resources at their disposal.

Last year the Congress enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the Teaching Professions Act, and amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, the Vocational Education Act, and the Manpower Development and Training Act. Just last week, the House of Representatives voted funds to launch the National Teachers Corps.

We have the resources. What we must concentrate upon now is using these resources in creative and innovative ways. This is primarily a job for the States and localities.

This summer the national youth opportunity campaign—under the chairmanship of the Vice President—will again seek to provide our young people with meaningful and exciting job experiences. As many of you know, last year the private and public sectors provided more than 1 million additional summer jobs for youngsters between 16 and 21. Besides providing money, these jobs were vitally important in introducing many boys and girls to the world of work—and helped them see the need to complete their education and training before seeking a permanent job.

We hope the youth opportunity campaign for 1966 will be even more successful. We have again established the goal of 1 million jobs—with emphasis placed upon hiring young people whose lack of skill or experience insulates them from the normal forces of the job market. We are especially counting upon your cooperation and support in helping deprived youngsters experience a rewarding and challenging summer. But this will not happen naturally—each of us will have to make a special effort to see that it does.

Perhaps more than any other profession, the members of the American Personnel and Guidance Association hold the keys which can unlock the door of opportunity for our young people this summer—and for the rest of their lives. You stand at the threshold of this new age of opportunity. And so your response to these challenges is critically important.

You can touch the lives of our young people at that critical moment when they decide whether or not to leave school.

You can help them pursue courses of study to develop their individual potential to the fullest—thereby making the process of education an exciting and joyous experience.

You can direct them toward jobs to challenge and develop further their particular aptitude and skills—thereby continuing the development of their unique capacities.

At so many crucial periods in our young people's lives you provide the crucial link between the individual and society—between his preparation as a citizen and his entrance and participation in the processes of democracy.

Let us, then, heed the words of John Stuart Mill: "The unwise are those who bring nothing constructive to the process, and who greatly imperil the future of mankind, by leaving great questions to be fought out between ignorant change on one hand, and ignorant opposition to change, on the other."

Today all of us have the chance to be constructive. We have the chance to make change a force for good and enlightenment—to include everyone in this new age of opportunity.

Let us recognize that the true source of national power is our power of intellect, of our wealth, our wealth of ideas, of our resources, our resources of human skill and energy.

Let us accept the challenge of our time.

Let us fulfill the promise of a people blessed as none have ever been blessed before.

Let us fulfill what the author Thomas Wolfe—in the despair of the 1930's—called the promise of America:

"To every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this * * * is the promise of America."

I ask you to join in making that promise come true.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is always good to see tribute paid to someone who deserves it. An article in yesterday's New York Times pays tribute to such a woman: Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer.

I have worked with Elly Guggenheimer in many good causes—notably in trying to provide more and better day-care facilities in this country. Dedicated, hard working, and well informed, she is a fine example of the sort of talented woman to whom our Nation owes so much progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the article just referred to, from the New York Times of April 5, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fighter for Children: Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer

Since the early 1930's when, as a young mother herself, she became interested in the care of children of working mothers, Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer has been speaking out in defense of children.

"Conditions then were terrible," she reflected yesterday in her office at 114 East 32d Street "Children were being abused and neglected. There was no licensing, nothing." Since then she has visited day care centers all over the world, including England, France, Italy, Sweden, Japan, Switzerland, and Germany. And she is still far from satisfied.

"Our affluent society is behind almost every country in the world in providing care for the children of mothers who, for one reason or another, can't provide care for them during the day," she said.

"We like to pretend that Mom's still in the kitchen, but the fact of the matter is, she hasn't been in the kitchen for years."

As part of her continuing fight for a better life for young children, Mrs. Guggenheimer resigned as cochairman of the city antipoverty program's Headstart Committee yesterday. She did so in protest over conflicts in the running of the preschool enrichment program.

A SIZE 10 GRANDMOTHER

At 53 (she will be 54 next Monday), Elinor Guggenheimer is trim (size 10) and forthright, with a fine sense of the ridiculous.

She and her husband, Randolph, a partner in the law firm of Guggenheimer & Untermyer, live in a cooperative apartment at 1095 Park Avenue. They are the parents of two sons, Charles, 32, and Randolph, 30, and the grandparents of two boys and a girl, all under 6.

"Actually, you'd better say young Randolph is 6 because he can read now and he always says he's almost 6," Mrs. Guggenheimer explained. "I wouldn't want to hurt his feelings."

In addition to her children and grandchildren, Mrs. Guggenheimer is proud of her indomitable mother-in-law, Mrs. Charles S. Guggenheimer, known to thousands of music lovers as Minnie. Mrs. Charles S. Guggenheimer is credited with almost single-handedly having founded the summer concerts at Lewisohn Stadium.

The younger Mrs. Guggenheimer's duties as a member of the New York City Planning Commission take up so much of her time that she does not have enough left over to pursue her hobbies as much as she pretends that she might like to.

"As the result of my famous mother-in-law, I am conversant with music," she said, "and in my spare time, I do needlepoint." To illustrate, she produced a piece of pettipoint from her handbag and ran off a few stitches.

"I also play atrocious golf and cook divinely," she said. "Honesty compels me to tell you that when I get finished, however, the kitchen is a mess."

She gives a course on park and recreation planning at the New School for Social Research each fall, paints, collects Chinese porcelain, and writes skits.

BARNARD GRADUATE

Mrs. Guggenheimer is a native New Yorker, the only child of the late Nathan Coleman, a commercial banker, and Mrs. Lillian Coleman.

She was educated at Horace Mann, a private school which at that time accepted girls; Vassar and Barnard College, from which she graduated. Later, she took courses at Columbia University's Teacher's College and Pratt Institute in early childhood education and city planning, respectively.

A woman who takes her work seriously, she has been rumored to be informally soliciting support for the Manhattan Borough presidency to replace Mrs. Constance Baker Motley.

Although Mrs. Guggenheimer becomes incensed at the lag in day-care facilities in this country, she nevertheless sees some hope ahead.

"If Operation Headstart can be developed to relate to day-care centers, this would be a step forward," she said. "There is hope in the small amount of Federal funds that have served to stimulate licensing laws for the protection of children in group programs."

Governor Rockefeller's program to appropriate funds for day care is also a positive move, she feels.

"I don't want to stir things up to make trouble," she said seriously. "I want to be able to speak freely to end trouble and bring peace. There's a difference."

SENATOR FULBRIGHT SPEAKS OUT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the views of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] deserves special attention. Senator Fulbright has not hesitated to make his opinions about our involvement in Vietnam known, and many of his statements are already in the Record. A recent and very timely article has been brought to my attention, however, and I feel it merits the special scrutiny of my colleagues. In the April 9 issue of the Saturday Evening Post he has written a column entitled "We Must Negotiate Peace in Vietnam." Besides calling for American acceptance and understanding of the realities of the situation in Vietnam, he feels that the United States, as the most powerful Nation in the world, can afford to be magnanimous.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We Must Negotiate Peace in Vietnam

(By Senator J. W. Fulbright)

America is a Great Society and it is becoming greater. Our people enjoy greater material abundance, with greater personal opportunity and human dignity, than any people have ever known in the history of the human race. There is, to be sure, much unfinished business in our society, but the fact remains that we are a great and fundamentally decent Nation; we know it—or ought to—and the world knows it.

At times, however, we act as though we did not believe in our own greatness, as though our prestige were constantly in jeopardy, requiring unending exertions to prove to the world that we are indeed a great and powerful Nation. We are told, for example, that we must beat the Russians to the moon, that we must build the world's fastest airplane, that we must maintain our pressures against Castro, that we must faithfully discharge dubious commitments, not primarily because these actions are considered essential in themselves but more because it is believed that if we did not do these things, our prestige, which is to say, our reputation for greatness, would be hopelessly compromised.

In the case of Vietnam, our honor and prestige are indeed involved, but they are involved principally because we laid them on the line and did so in a legally uncertain and politically casual way. Legally, under a reasonable interpretation of the SEATO treaty, we have agreed to act against external Communist attack in accordance with our constitutional processes but are obligated only to consult with our allies in the event of subversion from outside. We have neither the obligation nor the right to intervene in a civil war. If, prior to American intervention, the war in South Vietnam was essentially a civil war, as I believe to be the case, then the legal basis of American involvement is dubious. Practically and politically, whatever the legalities, the all-out commitment to South Vietnam was made almost casually, by a series of minor escalations of the American involvement, many of which were accompanied by statements that the war was not our war and would have to be won or lost by the South Vietnamese themselves. Only when they were about to lose the war did the United States take it over.

The Executive and the Congress must share responsibility for the casual way in which the United States committed its honor and prestige to an unstable and intransigent regime which refuses to negotiate with its enemies and may yet drag the United States into an all-out war with China. The Executive tended to explain each increase in the American involvement in Vietnam as a tactical step rather than a change of policy, while the Congress failed to meet its general responsibility of holding the Executive to account and the Senate failed to assert its constitutional powers of "advice and consent" in the field of foreign policy.

It is my hope that the hearings on Vietnam recently held before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and future proceedings now under consideration will help to correct past omissions on the part of the Congress. There is some evidence, for example, that we are now expanding our commitment to Thailand in the same disorderly way that we became so deeply involved in Vietnam. There is still time, however, for the Senate to insist that any new commitment to Thailand be contracted in full accord with our constitutional procedures, including full and frank debate.

We have committed our prestige to an unwise degree in Vietnam, and we have suffered accordingly some loss of prestige, but I do not think that America's greatness is questioned in the world, and I certainly do not think that strident behavior is the best way for a nation to prove its greatness or salve its damaged pride. Indeed, in nations as in individuals, bellicosity is a mark of weakness and self-doubt rather than strength and self-assurance. There is something appropriate and admirable about a small or weak country standing up defiantly to a big and powerful country; such behavior confers upon the small country an assurance which it needs to nourish its dignity and self-respect. The same behavior on the part of a big nation is grotesque, marking it as a bully. The true mark of greatness is not assertiveness but magnanimity. "Magnanimity in politics," said Edmund Burke, "is not seldom the truest wisdom; and a great empire and little minds go ill together."

It is precisely because of America's great strength and prestige that we can afford to be—that indeed it is in our interest to be—magnanimous in Vietnam. If the Vietcong or North Vietnam were to take the initiative in offering substantive concessions, they could plausibly be regarded as having been intimidated by American power. If we were to take the lead in suggesting peace terms involving a compromise with the Vietcong, many people would suppose that the American people had grown doubtful about the war—which is probably true—but no one could seriously believe that the United States had been frightened or intimidated into submission by a small and poor country in southeast Asia.

What then should we do, what can we offer, to try to end the war in Vietnam? The first step which I recommend is that we state explicitly and forthrightly that we recognize the Vietcong as a belligerent, with whom we are prepared to negotiate peace, and further, that we will use our considerable powers of persuasion in Saigon to induce the South Vietnamese Government, which has said that it will not negotiate with the Vietcong, to change its mind and indicate its willingness to do so.

It has been said that the Vietcong is entitled to no special negotiating position because it is, after all, only one of many factions in South Vietnam. It is, however, a rather special faction inasmuch as it is the one with which we are at war. The British did not regard George Washington and his fellow revolutionaries as the only faction in the Thirteen Colonies, much less a "legitimate" or legal one; they made peace with them because, assisted by the French, they were the ones who were fighting them in the field.

Moreover, and more important, however much we may regret it, the Vietcong is something more than an organized group of terrorists. It is, I think, a genuinely nationalist as well as a Communist movement, as evidenced by its impressive military performance over a long period against heavy odds.

Nationalism is the strongest single political force in the world today. In most of the emerging countries the nationalist movements have been non-Communist, with the result that Communist efforts at subversion have for the most part been unsuccessful. It is a tragic fact, but nonetheless a fact, that in Vietnam the effective nationalist movement is controlled by Communists. For this reason above all others I recommend that we state plainly and directly what President Johnson and Ambassador Harriman have hinted: that we acknowledge the Vietcong as a belligerent and invite it to participate, along with the governments of South Vietnam and North Vietnam, in formal peace negotiations.

My second recommendation is that we state forthrightly and explicitly, in advance of negotiations, that we are prepared to conclude a peace agreement providing for an internationally supervised election to determine the future of South Vietnam and, further, that we are prepared to accept the outcome of such an election, whatever that outcome might be. The latter assurance is important because, among the many violations of the Geneva agreements of 1954 committed by both sides, the most significant was the refusal of President Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam to allow the election provided for at Geneva to take place, and America's complicity in that refusal.

I suggest further, in this connection, that we use all available channels to persuade the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong that, whatever the future political complexion of Vietnam, Communist or non-Communist, united or divided, it can enjoy a secure and independent existence and normal relations with the United States as long as it respects the independence of its neighbors and as long as it upholds its own independence of China.

Such a settlement would not constitute a victory in the traditional sense; but neither would it represent a decision, as has been suggested, to "scuttle and run." It would, quite simply, represent a compromise, including, as any compromise must, concessions by the United States. A concession, however, is not a humiliation and may indeed be turned to one's own advantage, as General de Gaulle demonstrated by giving freedom to Algeria and as Khrushchev demonstrated by proclaiming himself a peacemaker while yielding to the American ultimatum in the Cuban missile crisis. The concessions we must make are necessary as an act of commonsense in a tragic situation; as Walter Lippmann has written, "a display of commonsense by a proud and imperious nation would be a good moral investment for the future." And as George Kennan said in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in February: "I would submit there is more respect to be won in the opinion of the world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than in the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or unpromising objectives."

It may be difficult indeed to persuade the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to enter a negotiation along the lines indicated. They have little reason to trust the Western nations, having been betrayed by the French in 1946, who recognized Vietnam as a "free state" and promised a referendum on its unity but then tried to reassert their colonial authority, and by Diem and his American sponsors in 1955 when we encouraged him in his refusal to hold the elections provided for by the Geneva agreements. It will be necessary to show our good faith as well as to insist on the good faith of the other side. It may be that at first we will be rebuffed and, if so, we can do no better than to restate our assurances, patiently and repeatedly, conducting ourselves in a manner befitting a great and mature nation.

There is an unacknowledged presence in all that we think and say and do in connection with Vietnam; it is the presence of China. We wage war against the Vietcong and North Vietnam, but we regard them as instruments of China, and it is China that we consider to be the real threat to the security of southeast Asia. If it were not for our concern with China and what she might do, it would probably be an easier matter to come to terms with our enemies in Vietnam. Our prospects in Vietnam cannot therefore be separated from our attitude toward China and China's attitude toward us.

United Nations Secretary General U Thant recently described China as a country "obsessed with fear and suspicion," a country undergoing a kind of "nervous breakdown." U Thant's words suggest the need for Americans to make a critical choice in their attitude toward China. On the one hand, we can treat her as persons with "nervous breakdowns" were treated in centuries past; we can throw her into the figurative snakepit of world politics, treating her as an insane and predatory creature, an outlaw with whom there can be no accommodation. On the other hand, we can treat China by the more civilized standards deriving from our modern understanding of human behavior; while resisting any aggressive act she commits, we can at the same time treat China as a respected member of the world community now going through a period of dangerous chauvinism and warranting our best efforts to rehabilitate her to the world community.

I hope that America will make the second choice. I hope that in its attitude toward China, America will act with the magnanimity that befits a great nation by following the advice of Pope Paul who said in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly: "Your vocation is to make brothers not only of some, but of all peoples, a difficult undertaking, indeed; but this it is, your most noble undertaking. * * * We will go further, and say: strive to bring back among you any who have separated themselves and study the right method of uniting to your pact of brotherhood, in honor and loyalty, those who do not yet share in it."

The hatred of the Chinese Communists for America is something more than the normal political hostility of one nation toward another whose policies thwart the realization of its ambitions. America is hated as the leading Nation of the West, as the center and purveyor of a civilization which has had a devastating effect on China and subjected it to such humiliations as few great nations in history have undergone. I am inclined to the view that China's irrational and hostile behavior has a great deal to do with ancient grievances and that the Chinese regard their quarrel with America not only as an ideological struggle but also as an ultimate historical reckoning for China's humiliations during the past century at the hands of Western nations.

It is impossible in a few words to describe the deep and bitter humiliation inflicted upon the Chinese, a great and civilized people, by imperialist nations, including Russia and, to a degree, America. Something of its flavor, however, can be gotten from a young Chinese engineer's account of his return from Europe to China in 1913 with his Belgian wife and son. Referring to his arrival in Shanghai, where Western interests owned the hotels, restaurants, and other public facilities, he wrote:

"In Shanghai it was agony, for there it was only too plain that in my own country I was nothing but an inferior, despised being. There were parks and restaurants and hotels I could not enter, although she could. I had no rights on the soil of a Chinese city which did not belong to the Chinese; she had rights by reason of something called skin.

"We boarded the English steamer from Shanghai to Hankow; the first class was for Europeans only, and there was no other steamer. Marguerite leaned her arms on the railings and stared at the river. She was in first class, with our son. I went second class. I had insisted it should be so. 'It is too hot for you here below.'"

Today China stands isolated, mistrustful and hostile toward the outside world. Her illustrious history of 4,000 years has contributed to the view of herself as a superior civilization set upon by hostile barbarians. In the wake of so tragic and unique a national experience, one can hardly be sanguine about immediate prospects for drawing China into the community of nations as a trustworthy and responsible partner. A great deal is at stake, however, and it would be tragic folly if we did not do what little we can to rehabilitate China to the world community. The West, to be sure, must defend itself against irrational and aggressive Chinese behavior, but in the long run we can only hope to be safe in the world with a powerful and dynamic China by drawing her out of isolation. Treated with friendliness and respect, China may be brought in time to see that the "barbarians" of the West are in fact less barbaric than they seem.

As Secretary General U Thant pointed out, China is going through a difficult period; it befits us as a great nation to act upon this fact with understanding and magnanimity. If we can bring ourselves to do so, we will be on the way to a solution of the great problems that beset us in eastern Asia. The prospects for an honorable and lasting peace in Vietnam have everything to do with China and its relations with the outside world, because China is the greatest nation of Asia. It is not within our power to make it otherwise, but it is within our power to repair some of the damage done by the arrogance and condescension of the past.

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this country has been plagued with a serious boxcar shortage for several years. This problem is now reaching crisis proportions.

The crisis is most severe in the great grain producing areas of the Midwest and the lumber producing regions of the Northwest. However, the shortage has become so pressing that all sections of the country are beginning to suffer.

There is now a current daily shortage of around 14,000 plain boxcars. And, Mr. President, we have not yet entered the heavy demand period which begins with the commencement of the wheat harvest in June and extends through the corn harvest this fall.

I have had letters and telegrams from flour millers and grain elevator operators in Kansas telling of the hardships these shortages are causing. Several flour mills in Kansas are already being forced to periodically close down operations because of the unavailability of boxcars.

In the past 2 or 3 months there have been numerous reports of lumber mills in the Northwest being forced to close down for the same reason, causing great economic loss and total unemployment to their personnel.

The boxcar shortage has been a long-term problem but it is now being dramatically accentuated by the fact that this country is expected to ship more and more grain to such countries as India where food deficits are reaching famine proportions, and by the stepped up Government purchases and shipping related to the Vietnam conflict.

Mr. President, another thing which has been placing additional strain on this already overburdened transport system has been the ill-considered and unjustified action by the Commodity Credit Corporation in dumping millions of bushels of Government-owned corn on the open market.

The administration has been dumping corn in an effort to force farmers into the feed grain control program and to roll back the price of corn so that meat prices will be lowered through the increase in the production of hogs. This massive dumping has been unjustified and unwarranted. Moreover, in regards to its impact on the boxcar situation, it has simply served to make a bad situation worse.

Mr. President, another alarming aspect of the boxcar shortage is the fact that it is creating new and significant inflationary pressures. The impact on the key product of lumber is a case in point. The Wall Street Journal of April 1 reports that the boxcar shortage has been a primary factor in recent sharp rises in lumber prices. The price of green Douglas 2 by 4's has risen $12 since the end of February. At $80 a thousand board feet the price of this key product is near the record high of $85 reached during the Korean war. Prices on other products such as plywood have also increased sharply. These sharp price increases will have ramifications throughout the economy. For example, a major producer of prefabricated houses states that he will have to increase the price of his homes by 5 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article I have referred to be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this emergency situation demands emergency action. During the past month or two several Midwestern and Northwestern Senators and myself have been urging that the Interstate Commerce Commission take appropriate measures within existing laws in an effort to alleviate this situation.

I note that several such measures have recently been taken by the ICC. However, to assure that all possible steps are taken to alleviate this emergency I have written to Mr. John Bush, ICC Chairman, asking him to determine if there is any future action that can be taken by the ICC within existing authorization. I have also asked that he outline possible new emergency legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 6, 1966.

Mr. JOHN W. BUSH,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission,
12th Street and Constitution Avenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I note that during the past few weeks the Interstate Commerce Commission has issued a series of new directives designed to alleviate the boxcar shortage situation. Because of the increasing demands for shipments of U.S. grain to foreign countries and because of stepped up Government purchasing related to the Vietnam conflict and in view of the fact that the harvest season will soon be upon us, the boxcar situation has reached crisis proportions which may well have disastrous results.

In view of this fact, I would like to have you determine whether or not there are any further steps that can be taken by the ICC within existing authority to deal with this most urgent problem.

I would also like to have your assessment as to what new emergency legislation beyond S. 3091, which is now before the Committee on Commerce, might be useful in dealing with this problem in the immediate months ahead.

Very truly yours,
JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the boxcar shortage cannot, of course, be cured by administrative fiat. Although the problem is now at a crisis stage, its causes are long term in nature and the ultimate solution of the problem requires enactment of basic remedial legislation.

There are two bills before the Congress which strike at the causes of this long term problem. I refer to S. 1098 which was passed by the Senate last year and S. 3091 which was introduced last month and which has been referred to the Committee on Commerce. I am privileged to be a cosponsor of both of these bills.

Mr. President, the present crisis and possible impending disaster make it imperative that these bills be passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President at the earliest possible date.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 1, 1966]

LOGJAM: LUMBER PRODUCERS REEL FROM BOXCAR SHORTAGE, DEFENSE, HEDGE BUYING—THEY HAVE PLENTY OF CAPACITY, BUT CANNOT DELIVER GOODS—PRICES NEAR RECORD HIGHS—BAD NEWS FOR HOMEBUILDERS

(By W. Stewart Pinkerton, Jr.)

PORTLAND, OREG.—If only Paul Bunyan would show up.

He and Babe the Blue Ox probably could help out their successors in the lumbering business. But it wouldn't be easy even for them. Here's the situation: Uncut lumber is scarce, heavy war-buying by the Government is causing a shortage of cut wood, industrial buyers are trying to get extra supplies as a hedge against a possible strike by lumberjacks this summer and severe rail-car shortage is limiting shipments of what lumber is available and is causing temporary close-downs of mills.

As a result of all this, users aren't getting as much lumber as they had planned on, and what they are getting is costing a lot more than they had expected, adding to the woes of homebuilders who already are beset by a decline in housing starts and a tightening of credit. And further price rises are likely.

"I expect to have to add 5 percent ($650) to the price of my homes," says an Indiana producer of prefabricated units that sell for around $13,000. In New York, a Long Island homebuilder says, "Business is only fair, and I certainly don't want to raise my prices—but I have no choice." In San Francisco, a builder of apartment houses says he has delayed work on one project to renegotiate his financing; he needs more money to buy lumber.

IF NOT ONE THING, IT'S ANOTHER

The industry probably could handle with ease any of the several problems individually. But the combination is proving too much. For instance, lumber mills—especially plywood producers—have plenty of capacity to handle some increased demands. By adding a third work turn, lumbermen figure, plywood output could be boosted 20 to 30 percent on top of the 10-percent climb to 13.7 billion square feet already expected in 1966. But the boxcar shortage and the lack of logs rule out the addition of a third shift.

Similarly, the strike-hedge orders normally wouldn't be too tough to cope with—but the Government's buying of wood for use in Vietnam is causing a scarcity. The Government purchases are no minor factor. Defense buying from mills is expected to hit $50 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, double the level of fiscal 1965, and much of the increase is being squeezed into the final 4 months of the fiscal year. Just last week mills were asked to bid on 680,000 sheets of plywood for Vietnam, an amount equal to a third of an average plant's yearly production. The buying is expected to continue heavy for 2 more years.

The strike-hedge buying accounts for as much as 30 percent of current orders, some mills say. The industry is readying for negotiations with an array of unions, the biggest round since 1963 when a contract was reached only after an 8-week strike. Current contracts expire in June. Until last week, industry sources said there was a 75 percent chance of a strike, but a March 21 settlement with one union has lessened considerably the possibility of a strike, these sources now say.

LOG AND BOXCAR SHORTAGES

The shortage of uncut logs is being caused by rising exports, which would be a blessing to the industry in normal times. Exports of logs from the Northwest totaled 901 million board feet last year, up from 835 million in 1964 and only 311 million in 1962. The 1966 pace is up still further, industry officials says.

Probably the biggest problem at the moment, however, is the shortage of boxcars. Big west coast mills say car supplies are about 25 percent below requirements, and they don't see much relief from a recent Interstate Commerce Commission order requiring roads to return empty cars to the West more promptly.

Last month, the car shortage forced 12 sawmills in Montana to close for a week. "Our shipping rate is 10 to 15 percent below what it should be for this time of year, due to the boxcar shortage," says Gus R. Hubbard, traffic director for Simpson Timber Co. in Seattle. Many companies are seeking other means of transport, but find that they often are uneconomic.

Forest products executives complain that in general railroads haven't been replacing the boxcars fast enough. For instance, Southern Pacific Co. has cut its entire boxcar fleet by about 5.5 percent since 1962—and this is taking into account an order last week for $21 million of new cars.

THE LONG WAIT

If the mills are unhappy about the boxcar shortage, so, too, are the lumber buyers. "We've had to wait up to 40 days for some shipments" of items usually available in 10 days, say a big west coast wholesaler who has been besieged by unhappy customers. Adds a Cleveland lumber dealer: "Ordinarily, we'd be buying up for the summer, but we're ordering what we need right now, because we can't expect delivery for any more than that."

While most users may not be strapped for immediate needs, many are feeling the impact of the tight supply in another way. And they are feeling it hard. Big eastern buyers now are paying about $80 a thousand board feet for green Douglas 2 by 4's, a key product. That's up $2 in just the past 2 weeks. All told, the price has risen about $12 since the end of February; it currently is near the record $85 hit during the Korean war, and is up from less than $65 a year ago.

The price of one-quarter-inch sanded interior-grade plywood has shot up to $84 a thousand square feet, up $2 in the past week and $12 since the end of February. This price, too, was less than $65 a year ago.

Forest products executives generally contend the prices will go a little higher before leveling off. "This market hasn't peaked yet; the pipeline is still being filled," asserts one plywood official. Says an Oregon lumberman: "Prices will go higher, then back off some, but probably will stabilize at a relatively high level."

WISCONSIN AND PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS OBJECT TO PROPOSED SCHOOL MILK CUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the letters protesting the administration's plans to cut the school milk program by 80 percent keep pouring in. This morning I would like to refer to letters I have received from the administrator of the Lancaster, Wis., community schools, Mr. Philip E. Myott and the director of cafeterias for the Abington Township, Pa., schools system, Mrs. Margaretta S. Plewes.

Mr. Myott writes that his district "goes in the red over $1,000 each month for food services." We are all aware of the tremendous financial burden school districts across the United States have to face. By further cutting funds for the school milk program, the administration is simply increasing the debt of schools like Mr. Myott's, who will have to take up the slack. Some schools simply will be unable to pay the increased costs. In these schools the school milk program will be virtually eliminated.

Mr. Myott goes on to say:

> The school lunch and milk programs are so much a part of our school operation that they cannot be reduced or eliminated. Besides providing needed nutrition for many pupils, these programs are a continuing experience in proper diet, good manners, and social living.

It seems to me that Mr. Myott has raised a very significant point. The social living experience he refers to is most important insofar as the culturally deprived children from our Nation's slums are concerned. If the proposed milk slash goes into effect, these very children will be singled out as charity cases.

This point is effectively made by Mrs. Plewes when she states:

> Although many details of the President's proposed Child Nutrition Act of 1966 have not been clarified, it appears that this act, if passed, may change the school lunch program into some form of child welfare program, which would be extremely difficult to administer on the local school level. It would remove much of our present support for the school lunch program.

Of course these remarks can and should also be applied to the school milk program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two letters I have referred to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Joint Economic Committee,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: We sincerely appreciate your stand on the Children's Special Milk Act and hope that Senate 2921 will pass.

We would like to call your attention to the fact that there is also a danger that the President's program will severely mutilate the present school lunch program, which involves, as you know, support for a school lunch which includes milk.

It is our conviction that this lunch program has been an extremely effective program for the improvement of the nutrition of children. Although many details of the President's proposed Child Nutrition Act of 1966 have not been clarified, it appears that this act, if passed, may change the school lunch program into some form of child welfare program, which would be extremely difficult to administer on the local school level. It would remove much of our present support for the school lunch program and would have a serious effect on the lives of the children of this district, driving the cost of the school lunch higher than many could afford.

We urge your strong support of measures to continue the school lunch appropriations, at, or near, the level presently established. If they must be reduced we hope you will support a gradual reduction to be spread over the years rather than an abrupt deduction, such as is proposed by the President's message.

The school lunch program of this district alone involves over 500,000 dollars of childrens' money per year and we have operated without profit or loss. Any major change in the Federal aid would upset our entire lunch program.

Sincerely yours,
MARGARETTA S. PLEWES,
Director of Cafeterias.

LANCASTER COMMUNITY SCHOOLS,
Lancaster, Wis., March 25, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator from Wisconsin, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PROXMIRE: We have been informed that the administration's budget calls for a drastic reduction in appropriations for the school lunch and milk programs for the next school year.

We would urge that you support a budget that would increase such Federal aids instead of reducing them. Our district goes "in the red" over $1,000 each month for food services and we all realize that prices continue to rise.

The school lunch and milk programs are so much a part of our school operation that they cannot be reduced or eliminated. Besides providing needed nutrition for many pupils, these programs are a continuing experience in proper diet, good manners and social living.

We think it ridiculous that the administration try to save such a relatively small amount of money in this manner while it extends other aid programs in many directions.

Please do all you are able to see that food service aids are continued at existing levels. Better yet, an increase in these aids appears to be in order.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
PHILIP E. MYOTT, *Administrator.*

JET SERVICE AT NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the Federal Aviation Agency and Gen. William F. McKee, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, should be commended for granting permission on April 24 to operate short- and medium-range jet aircrafts to and from Washington, D.C., and my home State of North Dakota.

The reduction in time between Minneapolis-St. Paul, Seattle-Tacoma brought about by this new service will be substantial. For example, a Northwest Orient Airlines fan jet will leave Washington National Airport at 6:55 p.m. and arrive in the Twin Cities at 8:24 p.m., a nonstop flight flying time of 2 hours and 29 minutes. This compares to the present fastest flying time on Northwest Airlines of 3 hours and 13 minutes, a saving of 44 minutes. This same flight departing Washington National Airport at 6:55 p.m. will continue on to Seattle, arriving at 10:15 p.m., and Portland, arriving at 11:32 p.m. The elapsed time to Seattle from National Airport will be 6 hours and 20 minutes, a saving of 2 hours from the previous fastest schedule from Washington National Airport, and 10 minutes faster than previous jet service from Baltimore Friendship Airport.

The Federal Aviation Agency in making this move assures the public the benefit of jet service from Washington's close-in airport a distance from downtown of only 4½ miles.

Last year, 7 million people used Washington National Airport, and it is expected that as more jet service becomes available, the airport will serve 8.7 million passengers in 1970.

I salute the progress made possible by the Federal Aviation Agency.

INDIA AND THE CONTAINMENT OF CHINA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of our most pressing problems today is the formulation of potentially effective foreign policy alternatives in Asia. Whatever course we eventually decide upon, it must be coordinated with the policies of our allies. Joseph Kraft is an able and thoughtful correspondent, and in this morning's Washington Post he has a very stimulating column on Indian views toward the containment of China. Since India is one of the most stable democracies in Asia, and since it is the only major Asian nation directly embroiled with China, I feel our interests are similar and their views may have considerable relevance to our own. I strongly recommend Mr. Kraft's column.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTAINING CHINA

(By Joseph Kraft)

NEW DELHI.—For better or worse, the effort to contain China through a network of midget dictatorships backed by the 7th Fleet is crumbling. What new security system for Asia can take its place?

India affords a good measure of the possibilities. She is, after China, the second largest and most populous state in the world. She is the only major Asian nation directly embroiled with Peking. A security system that does not enlist the cooperation of India is a security system unlikely to work.

The first element of a system that can elicit Indian cooperation is that the military component be rather small. This is not because India is still mesmerized by the Gandhi-Nehru doctrines of nonviolence. On the contrary, the army is extremely popular here; there is a growing defense industry and, considering the past, a surprisingly active discussion of security problems. Right now, India would like more weapons for defense against China.

But India would prefer not to have the additional weapons if the price were more arms for Pakistan. For the basic Indian strategy—the strategy used successfully in the past against Pakistan and planned for the future against an enemy—is to get him hopelessly bogged down in the trackless Indian countryside.

India's most successful commander, Gen. J. N. Chaudhuri, chief of the army general staff, is a soldier in the mold of Fabius Cunctator, the famous Roman practitioner of gradual attrition tactics who gave Fabian socialism its name. General Chaudhuri believes that, even if the Chinese penetrated hundreds of miles through the northeast frontier and Assam, "we would eventually break their heads."

For him, in other words, space is more important than military weapons. Indeed, because of the space problem he does not really believe that the Chinese have ever attempted or are likely to attempt the conquest of India. "Nobody can capture India," he says. "It is too darned big."

Along with deemphasis on the purely military, there goes an emphasis on entente with foreign powers. As main security against China, India looks quite openly to parallel action by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Indians expect that Washington and Moscow would apply strong pressures against Peking if the Chinese put new military pressure on India. They expect that American and Soviet nuclear power would be cast in the balance against Chinese nuclear power—which is one reason there is little pressure here for India to build or acquire her own nuclear weapons. As General Chaudhuri has repeatedly put it: "Nonalignment is a good policy provided that in a pinch you have strong allies."

A third element in the Indian strategic outlook is a play-it-by-ear approach to the problems of China's tiny neighbors. Given the internal weaknesses of Burma and Nepal, for example, India goes along with their efforts to fend off China by making concessions. Given the internal cohesion of Thailand, Delhi also approves Bangkok's moves to take arms against subversion supported by the Chinese.

With respect to Vietnam, I have yet to meet an Indian who believes that anything decisive is going to happen there. Both in political and military circles, the prevailing view is that Asian security would best be served by a local political agreement guaranteed by the great powers.

A period of extreme tension is a period of transition. Indians think that changes in Chinese leadership will probably bring a toning down of the Chinese militancy. While even then they see problems with China, the belief is that, with a more conciliatory stance in Peking, an Asian balance could eventually be struck. To that end the Indians are slowly beginning to knit up relations with other large Asian countries—notably Japan and Australia.

The views that I have been describing are, of course, Indian views. They are not necessarily right. They are necessarily colored by India's interests. Even allowing for the bias, however, they have for me a wider significance. They represent the seeds of a general strategy, the pieces from which, with help in Washington, there can be constructed a new model Asian security system.

CONTAINMENT NOT ISOLATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, those persons privileged to hear Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY's lucid and constructive discussion of our Vietnam involvement on the "Meet the Press" television program on March 13 found his exposition of U.S. policy toward Red China greatly impressive.

Believing that his remarks on the American presence in southeast Asia are deserving of the widest possible circulation, I have secured a copy of that televised press conference.

I ask unanimous consent that this document be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET THE PRESS

Mr. SPIVAK. Our guest today on this 1-hour special edition of "Meet the Press" is the Vice President of the United States, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Interviewing the Vice President are eight of the leading publishers and editors from across the country.

John S. Knight, publisher and editor of the Knight Newspapers.

Otis Chandler, publisher of the Los Angeles Times.

Turner Catledge, executive editor of the New York Times.

John Cowles, Jr., editor of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune.

Robert Lasch, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Post Dispatch.

J. R. Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post.

Barry Bingham, publisher and editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times.

James A. Linen, president of Time, Inc.

We will begin the questioning now with John Knight of the Knight Newspapers.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Vice President, despite all of the millions of words about Vietnam, the editorial opinion, background, interpretation and even the Fulbright hearings, the

American public is still divided and confused as to our ultimate aims and objectives.

Could you tell us what our national purpose is?

Vice President Humphrey. Mr. Knight, I am not at all convinced that the American public is confused, but if there is some confusion, then it is, I think, the privilege and the duty of all of us to try to clarify it and to clean away the confusion.

Our purpose is to prevent the success of aggression against South Vietnam from the North. Our political objective is to help secure, with the Vietnamese, their freedom and their independence, so that they may exercise the right of self-determination.

Along with that objective is the helping of the people of South Vietnam to build a new social order, a viable economy with stable governmental institutions.

Of course, in order to achieve these goals and objectives, it is essential that there be peace, so the highest purpose of our national effort in Vietnam is to obtain peace, at least the conditions of peace that make possible the achievement of self-determination, social progress and a better society for those people.

Mr. Knight. By peace and since you rule out dealing with the Vietcong, are you saying in effect that what the purpose is is total victory?

Vice President Humphrey. Mr. Knight, the word victory is often used—and if by victory you mean to thwart or prevent the success of aggression against the South—yes, we mean that kind of victory, but we do not mean to conquer or to dominate any other state or to destroy any other regime. We do not seek to invade North Vietnam nor do we seek to have confrontation or war with any other powers.

What we are seeking, sir, is a conference, negotiation that can lead to the conditions that can produce peace. This necessitates—one of the conditions, I would hope, would be a cease-fire.

I am sure that if we can get any response at all from Hanoi that indicates a desire for peace that this Government is prepared as of this hour to sit down and to negotiate the conditions that make possible peace.

May I add one final word about the Vietcong. It has never been ruled out that the views of, or the words of, or the representation of the Vietcong would not be at that conference table. It has been said by the President of the United States that this was not an insurmountable obstacle. It is not a difficulty that cannot be handled, if we ever get the opportunity for negotiation.

Mr. Chandler. Mr. Vice President, you said Friday, and I believe the administration has stated this on several occasions, that we will abide by the results of a free election in South Vietnam. If the Communists were to win such an election, would this not mean that we have lost many American lives for nothing?

Vice President Humphrey. Mr. Chandler, we are all students of history, and I must rely upon the lessons of history and the facts of history. The Communists have never won a free election, and I have no reason to believe, nor do I think you have any reason to believe, that the Communists would win a genuinely free election in South Vietnam. This is a risk, but let me tell you, if you never have to take a bigger risk in your life than this, Mr. Chandler, you are going to have a life of happiness, tranquillity, and security.

Mr. Chandler. Mr. Vice President, assuming you are correct in this supposition, how effective now is Premier Ky's government in winning a political war in South Vietnam in terms of influencing the peasants and the farmers toward Prime Minister Ky's point of view and against the Communist point of view?

Vice President Humphrey. I am very pleased, Mr. Chandler, that you emphasized the political struggle, because this is a two-front struggle and war in Vietnam. One is the struggle on the military front to provide security and to prevent the success of aggression. And an equally important and maybe even more important ultimately, struggle or war is the one against social misery, the struggle to build a better society. This is what Prime Minister Ky referred to when he talked about the social revolution that was needed for his country.

He said to me—and I think you would be interested in his words, because I put pretty much the same question to him that you put to me. I had a long visit with him from Honolulu to Saigon, and that takes a few hours even by jet, and he said to me, "Mr. Vice President, I know we are 12 years late in getting underway with these reforms, but we are not too late." And I believe that the Government of South Vietnam is really exerting itself now to gain the allegiance and the support of the peasantry, to create conditions that will improve the life of the peasant and the farmer in the rural areas.

This is essentially a rural economy, as you have well noted. And there are training programs underway for the political cadre that must go back into these countryside areas. I will add one final word on it: Since 1958, Mr. Chandler, it is estimated that the Vietcong has assassinated or kidnaped some 61,000 village leaders and governmental representatives. It is against this kind of background, may I say, that the struggle goes on in Vietnam today, to build a viable economy, to find a new way of life, and if this program permits us the time, I think I can show you that many things are underway that are very, very encouraging. And I only hope that this Government will continue in its stability so that we can continue with these efforts of reform.

Mr. Catledge. Mr. Vice President, to what extent do you think China is involved in the present struggle in Vietnam?

Vice President Humphrey. Mr. Catledge, I think it is quite well recognized that China today is the main source of supply for the munitions, the small arms, the tube artillery, the shells, and so forth that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese use. China surely is an ideological source of irritation. She prods on Hanoi. I was informed in several capitals of Asia that as of this time it appears that Peking, China, the Communist regime, has the major influence in Hanoi. I am not at all sure that the Vietnamese, north or south, are always too happy about the presence of China in any area of Vietnam. They were ruled by the Chinese for about a thousand years, and the Chinese are not the most popular type of ruler. But there isn't any doubt that Communist China has a significant influence, at least behind the scenes and in the ideological struggle that is maintained.

Mr. Catledge. Accepting your assessment of the situation insofar as it refers to China, do you think the struggle can be settled in Vietnam, north or south, just between us and Vietnam?

Vice President Humphrey. Yes.

Mr. Catledge. Or must we confer also eventually with Peiping?

Vice President Humphrey. As to conference, sir, we have said that we are prepared, as you know, to enter into a Geneva Conference again, a Geneva-type conference which as I recollect, did include Peking, China, and the Soviet Union. Major powers are obviously involved in this struggle in Vietnam. Some indirectly, some directly.

We have said that we would go through the United Nations and that has been rejected. We have said that we would accept the offer of the 17 nonalined nations. Hanoi rejected that. We have said that we would accept the good offices of the Holy Father, the Pope. Hanoi has rejected that. We have said that we would accept the good offices of the President of India, President Radhakrishnan. Hanoi has rejected that. We have said we will go to a Geneva-type conference. The Soviets have rejected that and so has China. But we are prepared to sit down with anybody that wants to sit down and try to find a peaceful solution to the struggle that is under way in Vietnam.

Mr. Cowles. Mr. Vice President, at our current level of operations in South Vietnam, we are losing about 100 to 200 American lives per month, plus several hundred more wounded each week.

Are you concerned about the American people's willingness to continue tolerating this kind of casualty rate or possibly an even higher casualty rate for the next 6 months or 12 months or 18 months?

Vice President Humphrey. Mr. Cowles when anybody hears about fatalities or casualties, it makes you very sad. But the American people recognize that this Nation has a great responsibility in this world and that with responsibilities come sacrifices. I have never believed that a position of leadership gave you any privilege or any luxuries. Actually it imposes heavy demands and duties.

Our rate of casualties is, of course, always of concern, but I am happy to be able to tell you, sir, that, out of every 100 wounded, 99 live. This is the highest rate of survival of the wounded ever in the history of warfare. This is eight times better than in World War I, four times better than in World War II, twice as good as in the Korean war. What is more important, more men do get into the hospitals, and they get there within 35 to 40 minutes to an hour which is a remarkable feat, may I say, of rescue, and the military service to our soldiers, to our defense forces is excellent.

We do feel that the rate of casualties upon the enemy is something that they ought to be concerned about, because that rate is running five to one, approximately five to one over that of the allies, fatalities and casualties. And may I say with casualties to the enemy, from what information we get, most of their wounded, severely wounded, die.

Mr. Cowles. To what extent do you think a continuation of our present policies in southeast Asia will influence next fall's congressional elections, and conversely, to what extent do you think the prospect of congressional elections next fall may influence the administration's own policies in southeast Asia?

Vice President Humphrey. Let me say first that this administration and any administration that is entrusted with the security of this Nation cannot let the political eye govern the decisions that must be made in reference to our national interest and our national security.

One of the prices that you pay in public office as an elected official is the risk of making decisions at times that are rather unpopular.

I happen to believe, that the American people understand what this struggle is about. They understand that we are not fighting just for a piece of geography. They understand that we are fighting for a principle: namely, that aggression cannot go unchecked.

We have learned some lessons in the last 25 and 30 years about aggressors, and we do not believe that the principle of aggression should be embodied into international conduct as a way and a means of gaining political power or national political objectives.

I have a lot of faith in the American people. They are a mature people, and they are an understanding people, and the forces that we have in Vietnam today manifest that. They reveal that. These are the finest fighting men that we have ever put into the field. They do their job. They are brave, they are courageous, they are able, they are efficient, and they understand what they are there for.

I think that is a reflection of the American body politic.

Mr. LASCH. Mr. Vice President, I would like to get back to the subject of negotiations. You have had a good deal to say about what Hanoi has rejected. This week the Secretary General of the United Nations said that if we are going to have any movement toward negotiations, three things must happen:

1. The cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam;

2. A substantial reduction by all parties of all military activities in South Vietnam; and

3. The participation of the National Liberation Front in any peaceful settlement.

I don't know how Hanoi feels about any of these propositions, but I would like very much to know in detail how our Government feels about it.

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Lasch, our Government has said that the four points of Hanoi, the 14 points of the United States in terms of peaceful negotiations, the 5 of South Vietnam, and 25 or 30 of anybody else, all of these can be placed on the table. Everything is negotiable, but before you can talk negotiations, Mr. Lasch, you have to have somebody to negotiate with.

Everybody seems to be telling us the kind of concessions that we ought to make to Hanoi in order to get to the conference table. Has anybody said anything to Hanoi about the kind of concessions they ought to make, since they are the aggressor?

What we have said is, we are prepared to come to the conference table with no preconditions: unconditional negotiations, sir.

We are prepared at this moment to accept a cease fire. We are prepared at this moment, if the North Vietnamese will quit bombing the South, we are prepared to quit bombing the North, but you cannot, my good friend, place upon the South Vietnamese and the Americans the onus of something that is not of their making. We didn't start this struggle. We did not aggress against North Vietnam. We did not send our bombers against North Vietnam until full regiments of the North Vietnamese forces were in the South, until it was recognized in every chancellery and every embassy around the world that the North Vietnamese had committed an act of aggression.

Any time that the North Vietnamese wish to come to a conference table, Mr. Lasch—and if anybody knows how they can get them there; we have tried every way we know—we are prepared to talk about every single subject that can be conceived by the mind of man.

Mr. LASCH. What I had in mind, Mr. Vice President, was this: In our resolution which Ambassador Goldberg presented, which is now, of course, I presume a dead letter, but in any case the resolution he asked the Security Council to adopt called upon U Thant, the Secretary General, to offer his assistance as far as possible in bringing about negotiations. He has now made an offer of assistance, as it seems to him, of how to bring them about, and I don't believe our—do we simply flatly reject these proposals of his?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Lasch, we had 37 days of no bombing, total pause, deescalation of the war during that 37 days. During those 37 days the North Vietnamese proceeded to move more troops into Laos—which is a fact—proceeded to move more troops into South Vietnam, proceeded to repair the roads and the rails so that they could continue to move additional supplies into South Vietnam.

We already have accommodated point No. 1, and we didn't even get a feeler from Hanoi. I thought possibly that Hanoi, during those 37 days, might, as we put it, try to confuse the situation by indicating through some third party or directly that maybe they would like to negotiate—which obviously would have kept the bombing pause going. Instead of that, we got an arrogant defiance, and Mr. Lasch, in all kindness and goodness, may I just say that I think it is about time that leaders in the world tried to bring a little pressure to bear upon Hanoi as to what Hanoi is willing to do.

I remember my visit with Mr. Kosygin in New Delhi, and I have had the privilege of talking now with the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union.

We have gone to the Soviet Union and asked them to help us. We have been to India. We have been in contact with the Vietcong. We are in contact with Hanoi—if not directly, through third parties—and directly, may I add. And what did Mr. Kosygin tell me about the possibilities of peace in South Vietnam?

He never mentioned the National Liberation Front. He never mentioned the Vietcong.

I don't believe that he really ever thought they amounted to anything. He said, "You will have to negotiate this with Hanoi."

Hanoi—all of the talk about the NLF, and the Vietcong seems to have a particular American tinge to it. When you get into the councils of other nations, they talk about Hanoi. I think they are a little bit more realistic than we are.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Vice President, if we ever do have any negotiations or truce, what sort of interim arrangements do you think would be acceptable to us, pending preparations for a free election?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Wiggins, I think the one great disservice that the Vice President of the United States could do would be to try to describe what might come as an interim government or an interim solution.

I will say this, that we are prepared to sit down and discuss that formulation of such an interim government, but we are going to do it with South Vietnam being represented there. It is their country. The war is being fought in their country, and I would admonish my fellow Americans not to make this an American war. We are an ally. We are not in charge of South Vietnam. The South Vietnamese have a government. They have been there a long time. This is a very fine people, and I do believe that we ought constantly to keep in mind their wishes, as well as our own.

Needless to say, if we go to the conference table, we will speak up—and we want peace. We want it with all of our heart, but we do not want peace, Mr. Wiggins, at the price of appeasement and at the price of a loss of principle. We have learned that lesson, and I hope that no generation of Americans will ever again have to learn it once again.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Vice President, you have spoken personally and for the Government very strongly about reconstruction and social change and political improvement, but can we carry out a very large program of development and social improvement and economic reorganization with the sort of military tactics we are now pursuing? Aren't we going to be required, instead of striking and withdrawing from villages and rural areas, to take and hold areas so that we can provide the people with safety and security behind our own lines?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Wiggins, when I returned from my trip to the Far East, I said I had reasons to feel encouraged about the situation—the military situation—in South Vietnam, and one of the reasons was because we have a plan of action.

We are, in a sense, moving on a premeditated, preconceived plan, week by week and month by month. We are on the offensive, and that plan includes not merely military successes, it includes, if you please, the holding of the areas that have been cleaned of the Vietcong. At the same time, it includes working with the South Vietnamese, and through the South Vietnamese, the rebuilding of the countryside.

This is going to be a slow process, at least for the immediate future, but we are not just going in and having a battle over a village and then retreating. We had to do some of that last year in order to contact the Vietcong, but the Vietcong is on the defensive today, and the villagers are beginning to cooperate much more with the forces of South Vietnam. They are not so frightened. The impact of terror and fear from the Vietcong is less meaningful today.

I think the most encouraging sign in South Vietnam right now is the fact that we are getting information from the villagers, that the villagers are cooperating with the allied forces and that the representatives of the government of Saigon are also receiving cooperation.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Vice President, when you were in Asia recently, did you hear any discussion or did you find any enthusiasm for the development of the Mekong River valley along the lines of the TVA development?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Bingham, this is the hope and the dream of the people of that entire area. I am very pleased you have asked about it, because most of the time when we talk about southeast Asia, we are talking about killing and fighting and war. When I was there the one thing I tried to stress was that I didn't come there as a military expert, but I did come there to try to effectuate, at least in the beginning stages, some of the dreams and the plans of the Mekong River development, the valley, the Mekong valley regional development and the Honolulu declaration.

I said, "I come here to speak to you about the President's commitment under the Baltimore speech," where we pledged not only aid to the South but to the North in the development of the Mekong. I said, "I come to you to talk about the new social development, the social revolution that Prime Minister Ky and President Johnson pledged themselves to at Honolulu."

I went into the Mekong Valley, by the way. I made it my business to do so. I went to see some of the projects under way, and I can only say this, that if the Pathet Lao in Laos can occupy the banks of the Mekong backed up by the North Vietnamese forces—Pathet Lao being the Communist forces there—and if the Thais lose out in Northeast Thailand, there will be no Mekong River development.

One of the real important objectives in this struggle in South Vietnam is to permit the social-economic development along TVA lines of the Mekong River. It will do wonders for the people, but it can't come unless there is peace.

Mr. BINGHAM. Sir, you were the originator of the Peace Corps idea. I wonder if you foresee in the future some usefulness for that type of American operation in Vietnam?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Yes, at another date. I think it would be not advisable right now to put the Peace Corps into South Vietnam because of the terrible political disturbances and military disturbances there, but the International Voluntary Service is there; the IVS is doing a remarkable job. I visited with the International Voluntary Service. Mr. Gardner, our former AID Director, is the head man there, an American doing a fine job. Some graduates of the Peace Corps are there working with them. And another thing, Mr. Bingham, over 5,000 young students of the universities in Vietnam last summer went to the villages in the Vietnamese's own Peace Corps program. We don't hear much about this. They went on what they call their summer work project, and it worked out so well, sir, that it is now a national program, and I witnessed it at work. I saw it in district 8 in the slums and suburbs of Saigon, and they are doing fine work.

Mr. LINEN. Mr. Vice President, you visited several other capitals on this recent trip of yours, and it is often said in Asia that the arguments going on in the United States tend to confuse Asians about our intent. Did you find that to be true?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Yes, in some instances I did, Mr. Linen. Asians do not always fully understand our mores, our culture, our governmental procedures, our constitutional procedures, just as we, I might say, fail to undertsand many things that they believe in as a part of their pattern of life.

But I do believe that in the main the leaders of government now know that we have the will, that we have the determination, that we have the resources to stick it out, as we say. There is a great deal of emphasis given, of course, by Communist propaganda to the dissent that takes place in our country.

But let me make it quite clear, I told the leaders in two or three nations that one of the reasons we were in South Vietnam was to afford the people of South Vietnam the right of dissent, the right of freedom of choice. Dissent is a part of our way of life. I am not advocating that everybody should dissent, but if you have a different point of view, you ought to be able to state it.

Mr. LINEN. Mr. Vice President, seemingly the Chinese Communist's foreign policy has been suffering several setbacks. Did you hear anything in the neighboring capitals about the situation in Indonesia?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Of course I heard, Mr. Linen, about matters in Indonesia. Everyone in Asia was interested. Everyone was wondering what the developments would be. I was very circumspect in my remarks. In Indonesia there is a genuine local struggle for power going on. There isn't an outside force of aggression as such, even though the Chinese Communists' political apparatus had been at work in Indonesia for some time. But this is a struggle within the country, as compared, may I say, or as contrasted to what you see in Vietnam, where you have open aggression from another country moving into South Vietnam trying to overthrow a regime and to change a way of life.

I would only say that we are watching very carefully what happens in Indonesia.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Vice President, am I to understand from what you said a little while ago that the United States and South Vietnam would be ready to stop shooting in Vietnam, with or without negotiations, with or without agreements, if the enemy also stopped?

Vice President HUMPHREY. I think it is fair to say if the North Vietnamese and their agents, the National Liberation Front, the Vietcong, would cease its military operations—in other words cease-fire and come to the conference table—that this would be a proposition that would meet with genuine acceptance in the United States.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Vice President, in discussing aims and objectives of Vietnam you did not discuss one point. The United Press reported the other day that you told Senator CLIFFORD CASE that our real objective was the containment of Red China. If this report is accurate, could you say whether this is really our objective, and how could this be brought about?

Vice President HUMPHREY. It is my view that Communist China today is the militant aggressive force in large areas of Asia and that she is using some of this militancy through her agent in North Vietnam into South Vietnam.

I do believe that containment of aggressive militancy of China is a worthy objective, but containment without necessarily isolation. Containment of its militancy, of its military power, just as we had to do in the postwar years in Europe, relating to the Soviet Union. But at the same time not trying to isolate from the family of mankind.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Vice President, my question was, was it accurate for the United Press to say that you felt the containment of Red China was our real objective and, secondly, since the Defense Secretary says they already have nuclear capacity within a range of 500 to 700 miles and it will be much longer as years go on, how do you contain a power like that without getting into direct conflict?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Knight, first of all, our immediate objective, as I indicated to you, is to prevent the success of aggression on South Vietnam.

It is our view that North Vietnam is acting with the support and the assistance of China, that China has shown—that is, Communist China—aggressive militancy against India, against Tibet, and surely against—in South Vietnam.

Therefore, it is in the interests of international paece that China be brought to understand that aggression is not a policy that can be pursued, that it is a dangerous policy in this nuclear age.

We have, of course, exercised a policy of containment and restraint on the Soviet Union in the past, and she had nuclear capacity far beyond anything that China has today. The Soviet Union is a powerful nation, and I am happy to say that that program of responsible containment, the building of collective security in the West, but at the same time a probing and trying to find ways of communication has been relatively successful, and I think it is in our interest and in the interest of humanity that the same kind of approach be exercised in Asia where Communist China today shows not only militancy against the West and against her neighbors, but also against the Soviet Union, sir.

Mr. KNIGHT. Then you are saying, in effect, sir, that the United States is prepared for this kind of a confrontation with Red China if required?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Every decision that this Nation has had to make in recent years has been one that carried with it terrible risks. When we faced up to the Russians in Berlin, there was always the risk that it might explode into a terrible war, When we faced up to the Russians in Iran immediately after World War II and asked them to get their forces out, there was a risk. When we aided the Greeks in the Greek civil war, there was a risk of a confrontation, once again, with the Soviet Union.

And surely in the Cuban missile crisis we were right, mighty close to terribly, terribly destructive war.

Unless the Communist leaders believe that we mean what we say—I think the worst thing this Nation could do for humanity would be to leave any uncertainty as to our will, our purpose, and our capacity to carry out our purpose.

This is why I believe that you resist little aggressions before they break out into massive confrontations. We seek no confrontation with China or with Russia.

Mr. KNIGHT. But you would accept it?

Vice President HUMPHREY. These are not choices that we make. They are sometimes forced upon us. Pray God that the choice never has to be made.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Vice President, last Saturday, one of our top military leaders, U.S. Combat Brig. Gen. Ellis Williamson, reported to President Johnson at the L.B.J. ranch that we can win the war.

Now, this, to me, would apparently mean that he feels that we can push the forces from the north back across their border and that we can occupy almost the whole of South Vietnam and hold it until the end of hostilities take place.

Are we prepared to make that commitment now, which would seem to be a very long-term commitment, and if we are prepared to make it, how long in your opinion will this take?

Vice President HUMPHREY. I had the privilege of visiting with General Williamson. He was with the President yesterday when the President and members of the Cabinet—Secretary Rusk, Secretary McNamara, myself and others—General Taylor—met with the Governors, and General Williamson gave a full report. I was so pleased to hear what he had to say, because I had never talked to General Williamson on my visit to Vietnam, but I came back with the same conclusions. His conclusions or his observations were namely these, that things were better militarily; that we did have a plan of operation which we were following, as I said a moment ago; that the villagers were now cooperating with the Government forces, that is, with Saigon and with the allied forces; that the rate of defection among the Vietcong was running at over 2,000 a month; that we were being able to break into the strongholds, the military strongholds of the Vietcong; we were defeating their main units, and what he is simply saying is, if we stick with it, sir, we will have to do less of what some people think we might have to do because we have it coming with us now. But we are prepared to do what is necessary, Mr. Chandler, to prevent the success of aggression. I think the American people must know that, and I think they do.

Mr. CHANDLER. Turning to another question again, Mr. Vice President, regarding the criticism in this country of the administration's conduct of the war and the impact of that in Asia, specifically, is this criticism of the administration's conduct of the war hurting our efforts to hold the Ky regime intact?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Not as long as the Government of the United States continues to express its faith and confidence, I would say. Let me add one other thing, Mr. Chandler. I traveled in nine Asian countries on my recent journey. Several of them had some differences of view as to whether we were pursuing the tactical, the right tactical course. But I didn't find one single country that felt that we ought to be out of South Vietnam or that really contested our purpose in Vietnam. And I found every one of them knew that the blame for failure to achieve peace was on Hanoi and Peking.

Mr. CATLEDGE. Mr. Vice President, one of the spillovers out of the discussion of the situation that we are involved in in southeast Asia involves considerable speculation as to the political future of some people whom the American people might want to call to higher duty sometime, including yourself.

A basis for this speculation, some of it, is in an unhappiness felt by some of your present or former—especially former—spiritual kinfolk, that you had left the family circle and had gone off after some sort of political security.

I wonder how you feel about that, if there is any basis, or how do you feel that this speculation originates, and is there any basis for it?

Vice President HUMPHREY. My good friend—I am not at all sure, Mr. Catledge, who has left any family circle. I feel very "family" and very much a family man, but let me make it quite clear that on matters of national security there is no room for basic partisanship. That is No. 1. We need to think as Americans. We may have different points of view, but we ought not to think as partisans, and I don't believe we do. I think it is very encouraging to see the tremendous support that comes from the Republican Party for the President, and may I say from the Democratic Party, too.

I am of the opinion that much of the noise of criticism is limited to a few articulate voices.

The quantity is not always fully described by the velocity or by the vehemence of the outcry.

As far as my political future is concerned, I have never really been able to plan it very well, Mr. Catledge, and I am not going to spend much time doing it. Not at the expense, may I say, of national security; not at the expense of the life of our people or the honor or integrity of our country and its commitments. I haven't the slightest idea whether what I am doing is helpful to me or not, but I think that what I am doing is the right thing to do, and I have been brought up to believe that when you are in a position of responsibility, you had better do what is right. I have sat in on the councils of this government; I have studied long and hard the situation in southeast Asia, and I believe we are following the right course.

I was one who thought we ought to have international responsibility in Europe. I believe in collective security. I believe that we need to learn how to have the free nations of the world stand together to prevent totalitarian power from consuming other nations, large and small, and if the principle of collective security is good for Europe, Mr. Catledge, it is good for Asia, for the brown and the yellow people of Asia and not just the white people of Europe, and I think it is just about time we said so.

Mr. Catledge. Back to the matter of the job you are doing, which some people say is more than being a good soldier, I have seen it expressed that you are a recruiting sergeant. In your recruitment of support over the world let me ask you this question very frankly: Did you find in any government anywhere a great enthusiasm for the American policy in southeast Asia?

Vice President Humphrey. I found in every government everywhere a deep concern lest we withdraw.

Mr. Catledge. My question was "enthusiasm."

Vice President Humphrey. May I say that other governments have their own problems. but I can assure you that those allies that are with us there understand that we are there for the right purposes, and I didn't find a single government that was critical of our presence there, and when you talk privately to government officers, Mr. Catledge, they will tell you very candidly, very frankly, that there is a danger of aggression in Asia and that that aggression needs to be checked.

Some of them feel that the aggression comes from other sources. When I am in Pakistan, for example, our friends in Pakistan were concerned about the matter of the power of India.

And, when you are in India, they are concerned about the power of two or three countries, including Communist China. But I didn't find anybody in Asia that thought we ought not to be doing what we are doing in southeast Asia.

Mr. Cowles. Mr. Vice President, I'd like to ask about China and the United Nations. There seems to me to be a perhaps new or revitalized line of thought growing, which is that our firm position in southeast Asia may for the first time make it possible for the administration and any U.S. administration, both in terms of domestic politics and in terms of its effect on the overseas Chinese and other countries in Asia—for the United States to begin to reduce, if not eliminate, its opposition to the admission of China to the United Nations.

A few moments ago you referred to the isolation of China as being very undesirable, from the world. Would you care to comment on this matter of admitting China to the UN?

Vice President Humphrey. One of the most fruitful procedures underway in this government are the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Asia and China. I think that the American people know far too little about Asia and the countries of Asia. They are all very different, and we need to know much more about them. We are a European-oriented society, and so is our educational structure. We need much more going on in our universities and institutes on China and on Asia.

Our problem with China is not of our own making. We have had over 120 meetings with representatives of Communist China. One is taking place next week again in Warsaw, and those meetings start out just this way, whenever we seek to have any broader contacts or discuss any matter of mutual concern, the first thing that the Chinese representatives says is, "You must yield"—what he says is Formosa, and what we call the Republic of China—"You must give us that, and if you are not willing to give over the 10 or 11 million people who are in the Republic of China to the Communists,"—if we are not willing to do that, they won't talk.

I think Dr. Fairbank made it quite clear before the Foreign Relations Committee that China has a position of isolating itself. We have only recently—the President has said scholars should travel there, journalists can travel there, doctors can travel there. We have tried upon several occasions to break into China for the purpose of the visitation with people—people-to-people. This is the beginning. It could be the beginning of a much better relationship. I am afraid that we are going to have to wait until the men of the Long March, of the Mao generation, are out of positions of leadership. But in the meantime we ought to maintain as best we can a spirit of friendship toward the Chinese people, but recognizing what the regime is and making that regime understand they can not achieve their purposes by military power.

Mr. Cowles. I am not trying to lead you into unwise speculation, sir, but can you imagine circumstances wherein Red China may be admitted to the—might be admitted to the United Nations within the next 3, 4, 5 years?

Vice President Humphrey. That is very difficult for me to conjecture about. China today still stands branded as the aggressor by the United Nations in Korea. China has never asked to be admitted to the United Nations. She has suggested several revisions of the U.N. Charter. So maybe we ought to get the picture of China in proper perspective. We are always worrying about that she is not in; she doesn't worry about it at all. I have a feeling that she has some things she'd like to do before she comes into the family of responsible nations, and she is busily engaged in doing some of those things. She as yet has not made formal application, and even when some others have applied for her, she has rebuked them.

Mr. Lasch. Mr. Vice President, I'd like to ask about something you have had a good deal to say about lately, some rather hard words about the possibility of a coalition government as one element in an ultimate settlement.

Isn't this substantially what we have done and are doing in the Dominican Republic? We had a civil struggle, we have an interim government which is supposed to represent and be tolerable to both sides, while preparations are made for an internationally supervised election. What is the objection in principle to doing in southeast Asia what it seems to me we are doing in our own backyard?

Vice President Humphrey. There is a great deal of difference, Mr. Lasch. I doubt that anyone in this country would have any objection to a government in South Vietnam that included the Buddhists and the Catholics and the trade union leaders and the peasants and so forth. Just as in the Dominican Republic you have many elements in that government, but not the Communists.

When you are talking about a coalition government, we have a coalition government in Italy between the Christian Democrats and the Social Democrats. But not between the Christian Democrats and the Communists. And we are talking about whether or not—the discussion was whether or not the Vietcong, sir, the Communists, should be a part of a coalition government, at our insistence, I just—in all due respect, sir, I can't imagine that we would insist that we fasten upon the people of South Vietnam the enemy which has been the terror of the countryside.

Mr. Wiggins. Mr. Vice President, I wonder if you could say anything about our outlook in Thailand?

Vice President Humphrey. The Thais are deeply concerned. They feel themselves also, now, the victims of subversion, infiltration, and there have been regular units, by the way, of the North Vietnamese forces who have gone into northeast Thailand. I think, however, the Thais are aware of it, and they are taking preventive action. They are doing a job, may I say, on their accelerated agricultural development. I believe the situation can be managed in Thailand.

Mr. Bingham. Sir, in view of our heavy financial commitments in Asia, do you see any hope of real progress in some of the wars we are carrying on here in our own country, such as the war on urban blight?

Vice President Humphrey. Mr. Bingham, I noted yesterday in a discussion that we had, that the percentage of our gross national product that is now dedicated to defense, including the war in South Vietnam, is 7.6. That is the same as it was a year ago, and it is just one-tenth of 1 percent more than it was 2 years ago.

Our gross national product continues to go up, and we have put in more money, may I say, into the programs of the Great Society.

We are hopeful that there can be some deescalation of this struggle. We are hopeful that we can get peace in Vietnam and if we can, we are prepared to make the budgetary adjustments that will advance what I think both you and I are very much concerned in, the war on poverty, our programs in education, health, and our urban blight—programs to eliminate urban blight.

Mr. Linen. Mr. Vice President, you are one of the few statesmen of the world who has seen General de Gaulle lately. Would you care to comment on his current attitude toward NATO?

Vice President Humphrey. This attitude expressed by General de Gaulle, I think, is one surely within his general expression of attitude over the many years. He believes in an independent France; he believes in an independent course of action for France.

He wants total protection without total involvement. Actually I regret this, because I think we have learned that collective security is absolutely essential if we are going to bargain with the nations of the Soviet bloc and if we are going to make a better world out of this, and to prevent aggression.

General de Gaulle seeks to go back to what I call the period of 1914, the kind of bilateral arrangements that led us through this unbelievable period of turmoil and tension and, ultimately, destruction from 1914 up through World War II.

I don't think we ought to return to that, sir, and I don't think we will.

The argument that is going on today is not between De Gaulle and the United States, it is between General de Gaulle and the other 14 members of NATO. We are all partners in this, and I think we ought to keep that in mind. Let's not make this a personal argument.

Mr. Spivak. Mr. Vice President, I'd like to come back to Vietnam and ask you a question about the Saigon government. As you know, there have been many reports that the government in Saigon is dead set against peacetalks and any negotiations. Can you tell us what their position is on negotiations today? You have just come back from there.

Vice President Humphrey. Their position on negotiations is the same as the one expressed by the President of the United States. Prime Minister Ky, Chairman Thieu of the National Unity Council have agreed with our President that they are prepared to sit down at the conference table without any preconditions for unconditional negotiations.

Mr. Lasch. You mentioned the Cuban missile crisis and how important it was that we stood up there, and I agree with you that it was very important that we should and I am glad—I think we had to, and we did.

That brings up the question of the double standard of international conduct. That was a case where the Russians, after being contained by us for many years, decided to try a little containment on us, and we wouldn't stand for it, very rightly.

Aren't we applying a different standard of conduct to the Russians and the Chinese in their part of the world, to the one that we claim for ourselves in our part of the world?

Vice President Humphrey. Mr. Lasch, I didn't think that we needed any containment. We are not an aggressor. This Nation has given away hundreds of billions of dollars since World War II. We have had 167,000 casualties in the defense of other people's freedom. We have aggressed against no one.

There is a great deal of difference, I might add. What Mr. Khrushchev sought to do was to penetrate with the powerful new nuclear weapons system the Western Hemisphere, and we said no.

The only reason we are in Europe, Mr. Lasch, is because Europe was a target for Soviet ideological and military penetration some years back. I am happy to say that our relationships with the Soviet Union are much more stable and steady now, but I don't think we ought to kid ourselves for a single moment that the Soviet Union is anything but a Communist power.

Mr. Spivak. Gentlemen, we have less than 3 minutes.

Mr. Wiggins. Mr. Vice President, do you think a reasonable application of the Keynesian economic theories under which we have been operating now requires us to raise taxes?

Vice President Humphrey. If the costs of defense go up as the President has said, if the demands on our public revenues are larger, then we will have to raise those revenues. We have no immediate plans of doing so. We keep a very close eye on the economy, not only in terms of revenues, but fiscal policies as a way and means of being able to curb inflationary pressures as well.

Mr. Bingham. Do you think, sir, that a frank discussion of foreign policy differences among the American people is of potential usefulness to the enemy?

Vice President Humphrey. Limited, if any. I think, Mr. Bingham, that we ought to just face up to the fact that we are a strong, mature nation. We have differences of view. As long as those differences are expressed responsibly and in the national interest.

I think there are times that certain more abrasive comments could be subdued, but all of us that have been in public life have been a little guilty upon occasion of being anything but sweet and charitable, and I suppose I stand guilty, myself.

Mr. Linen. Mr. Vice President, is the Democratic Party in the fall congressional elections in trouble because of the war in South Vietnam?

Vice President Humphrey. I think not, not if the Democratic Party understands that the people of the United States are a strong people, that they are a patriotic people, they understand their international responsibilities. If some Democrats get themselves in trouble, it will be individual. I don't think it will be partywise——

Mr. Knight. Mr. Vice President, as a longtime liberal with 100 percent ADA voting record, you have in recent years said some very kind things about business. Does this represent a change in your attitude?

Vice President Humphrey. Not at all. My father was a businessman. I grew up in a business family. I had business support when I was in Minneapolis as the mayor of the city. I believe in the free enterprise system. It works better than any other. As a matter of fact, I have never found anything quite equal to it.

Mr. Chandler. Mr. Vice President, when you were in Vietnam recently, were you satisfied with the lines of communication that have developed between our Government here in Washington and our military and civilian personnel?

Vice President Humphrey. Yes, sir. Much improved. Much, much better. I think that we are doing much better.

Mr. Spivak. I think, Mr. Vice President, that we have come pretty close to the end of our time. We wouldn't have time for another question and certainly not for another answer. I am sorry to interrupt, but our time is up.

Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for being with us today on "Meet the Press."

Our thanks also to our special panel of publishers and editors.

PERSECUTION OF SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Jews throughout the world are celebrating the festival of Passover. It is traditionally a joyous holiday—a holiday that marks the deliverance of the Jewish people from oppression.

At this season, however, our joy is marred. For we know that our happiness is not shared by the 3 million Jews of Russia who continue to live in a state of religious and cultural deprivation.

We have long realized that Soviet Jews are not allowed to live out their lives freely as Jews. They are forbidden schools and other institutions of Jewish learning and research.

They are forbidden the right to have a nationwide federation of congregation or of clergy, despite the fact that religious Jews earnestly long for contact with Jews elsewhere in the world.

They are forbidden the right to join their families in the United States, Israel and other countries.

And they are forbidden many other rights accorded to other minority groups in the Soviet Union.

As I have said on many occasions, the policy of the Soviet Government reduces Jews to second-class citizenship in the Soviet Union. It attempts to shatter and gradually eliminate Jewish historical consciousness and Jewish identity.

We are happy to learn of even the smallest improvements in the lives of Soviet Jews. A few more Yiddish books and a few public statements against anti-Semitism are welcome signs, indeed.

We must be hopeful. But we know that hope is no substitute for substantial concrete progress. Therefore, we will continue to protest Soviet policy, so long as injustices against Soviet Jews persist.

THE ROLE OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE IN WORLD TRADE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CARLSON, OF KANSAS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the most able and respected Members of the Senate—Senator Frank Carlson—on March 24 made a speech before the Grain & Feed Dealers National Association in Chicago which I think will be of special interest to the Members of the Senate.

Through his long years of service as Governor, Congressman, and a Member of the Senate serving on such key committees as Foreign Relations and Finance, Senator Carlson is an outstanding authority on such issues of the day as the war in Vietnam and international trade. With his background in agriculture, he is also a great authority on Public Law 480 and the effect that our present modern agriculture is having on both domestic and world problems.

This speech is thought provoking and full of good commonsense. It is an outstanding presentation of the role of American agriculture in world trade and the work being done to expand our trade in farm products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this speech by my friend from Kansas, Senator Frank Carlson, inserted in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by Senator Frank Carlson Before the Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, Chicago, Ill., March 24, 1966

Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct honor and privilege to meet with the officers and members of the National Association of Grain and Feed Dealers at its 70th annual convention.

Your organization has for 70 years been devoted to expanding and improving the marketing of farm products, with a goal of building a better and stronger agricultural industry.

American farmers and ranchers—together with those who deal with them—are the most efficient producers in the world. They have developed a facility to put research findings and technological improvements into practice on a sound basis. Their chief problem is markets and an opportunity to adjust their productive enterprise to the ever-changing market opportunities.

Agriculture's performance since World War II is most impressive. In the past 10 years the average annual increase in output per man-hour on the farm was three times the ratio of increase in nonfarm activities.

Today—and for the foreseeable future—our American family farm will be able to feed our people at home and make available increasing amounts of food and fiber for trade and aid and economic development around the world.

The most challenging crisis for the rest of this century will be the accelerating race between food and people. We are faced with the specter of widespread hunger and starvation on a scale the world has never before known unless we begin today to plan for tomorrow's food needs.

The nations of the earth must do more than they are now doing to meet future food demands or major starvation will be the most painful fact of life on this planet within 10 years.

The production of food and fiber, their distribution and their marketing are immediate problems confronting our Nation in this period of confusion and uncertainty.

We are faced with what seems to be almost insurmountable problems—both domestic and international.

In Congress, we are wrestling with such domestic problems as taxes, deficit financing, balance of payments, inflation, international trade, civil rights, the Great Society, minimum wage, and reapportionment.

We also face international pressures and problems on every continent on the globe—Vietnam, Red China, India, Pakistan, the Congo, Rhodesia, Korea, NATO, the Alliance for Progress, Cuba, and Santo Domingo.

When you add to these the coming election, I can assure you the American people will not want for concern and action during 1966.

The issues in the campaign will be discussed with great fervor by both Republicans and Democrats. I think a statement made by the great American statesman, Chauncey Depew, illustrated what we may expect. During a political campaign, he told a Democrat colleague that if the Democrats would agree not to tell lies about the Republicans, the Republicans would agree not to tell the truth about the Democrats.

FOREIGN POLICY

Our foreign policy seems to be on dead center as to policy and, meanwhile events in most parts of the world have gone from bad to worse.

I contend we must stand first of all for a foreign policy that will serve the national interest. It might seems almost incredible that this should have to be repeated over and over again—and even defended against attack. For obviously, if any foreign policy does not serve our national interests, it must serve the interests of our enemies.

Secondly, and just as important, a successful foreign policy can only be a firm foreign policy. Never in the history of the world has any nation profited from weakness in its dealings with other nations. Never have wavering and uncertainty been of any benefit. Never have delay and refusing to face up to hard choices put off forever the day of reckoning.

Standing firm is the only foreign policy that works. It is the only foreign policy that can protect our interests, keep the peace, and give us any hope for ultimate triumph over the Communist empire. It is the only policy that the Communists understand.

While our immediate concern is our war in Vietnam, we cannot overlook or underestimate the conflict between India and Pakistan, the revolution in Indonesia, the Congo and Rhodesia in Africa, the general deterioration of NATO in Europe, unrest in Latin America, and, closer home, the festering sores in Cuba and Santo Domingo.

It cannot be said too often that the business of being a great world power is not easy. Great power involves greater responsibility and sometimes greater risks. This is especially true in an atomic age.

It is quite true that Americans want an end to the war. It is quite true that most of their friends around the world want it ended too—but it is not true that Americans and their friends could accept peace terms which would humiliate the United States and destroy South Vietnamese hopes for freedom.

In no modern war have Americans so heartily wished themselves out—but surrender is too high a price.

AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION

Our Nation is witnessing a revolution, the agricultural revolution, and it is having a great impact on our people. It is sweeping—with a quickening pace—throughout rural America.

This revolution has been going on during the past 50 or 75 years. It has paralleled the industrial revolution in its effectiveness. Nowhere else in the world is food production such an efficient process.

Were it not for this agricultural revolution, our phenomenal industrial progress of the 20th century would have been impossible.

We often regard the steel industry, the automobile industry, transportation, and public utilities as the largest employers of labor in our Nation's economy.

Farming employs 6 million workers—more than the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, the steel industry, and the automobile industry.

Agriculture's assets total $230 billion—equal to about two-thirds of the value of current assets of all corporations in the United States—or about half the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

The value of agriculture's production assets represents over $27,000 for each farm employee.

Modern agriculture is a creator of employment. Three out of every ten jobs in private employment are related to agriculture. Six million people have jobs providing the supplies farmers use for production and family living. Eight to ten million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture.

I would like to discuss one crisis which I feel is kindred to the heart of every member of the National Association of Grain and Feed Dealers. It is the impending world crisis of mass starvation—a crisis which is coming about at such an amazing pace that our national attitude and agricultural policies which for 30 years have centered upon ways to deal with crop surpluses, must be abruptly and unmistakably changed.

Abundant evidence, supported by cold facts, undeniably points to a world calamity, the true impact and effects of which are terrifying to consider.

Much has been said and written criticizing crop surpluses, stored foods, and of the expenses involved, but today these stored farm foods are diminishing at a significant rate.

What is very realistic is that the wheat stocks of 1.4 billion bushels that we had at the beginning of this decade, have been curtailed to 800 million bushels today, and by June 30 could be as low as 550 million bushels.

Corn—as well as other feed grains—is barely adequate for 6 months' consumption in the United States alone.

Currently, we are paying farmers directly around $2 billion a year to produce less. Through various programs, we have idled some 50 million acres of land. Most of it could rapidly become croplands again if we stopped planning to produce less and gear toward producing more.

The United States must give immediate consideration to the release of several million acres for the production of food and fiber that are now held out of production through allotment acreage programs.

The diminished surpluses over the past 10 years—through the combined effects of land retirements, Government subsidies, and increasing agricultural exports—make more concentrated use of our farmland most imperative. Those big surpluses we have been hearing about for many years simply do not exist today.

I am fully aware of the possibility of increasing our surpluses to unmanageable proportions—but on the other hand we cannot take chances with our food reserve during present world conditions.

There are two international trade programs that are of vital importance to agriculture and to the members of the National Association of Grain and Feed Dealers—the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, universally known as Public Law 480, and the Kennedy round in our dealings with the European Economic Community.

It will be necessary for Congress to consider the renewal of Public Law 480 this year, as it will expire at the end of 1966.

Public Law 480 was enacted by Congress in 1954 and since that time has been used as a weapon to strengthen the free world and to advance the underdeveloped nations of the world along the path of economic and social betterment.

The benefits of Public Law 480 go far beyond the initial aims of surplus disposal and humanitarian feeding of the world's underprivileged. From a practical standpoint, it has played an important role in U.S. balance of payments by using the funds generated from the agricultural sales to offset the need for dollar expenditures in many fields of endeavor.

Public Law 480 can continue to play an increasingly vital role in U.S. foreign policy and further offset dollar expenditures.

It is estimated that this year we will export between 750 and 850 million bushels of wheat.

This program has also played an important role in developing many of our new commercial markets for grain.

If we should take away the export market that goes under special programs of Public Law 480, we would still be concerned about surpluses and decreasing acreage allotments.

The immensity of the Public Law 480 program can be realized when we observe that under this program, we have generated foreign currency equivalent to $9,403,200,000 as of June 30, 1964.

Of this amount $7,290,700,000 has been transferred to various governmental agencies for their use.

These funds are used in foreign countries for programs dealing with economic, market, educational and scientific development—payment of U.S. obligations, common defense, U.S. Government buildings, international fairs and exhibits, binational centers, and vocational rehabilitation.

Eleven different agencies of the U.S. Government have used Public Law 480 funds to carry out various programs which benefit both the United States and the free world.

Public Law 480 is now 11 years old and has demonstrated how American agricultural abundance can be used to feed the hungry while mobilizing resources within developing countries, in an effort to move these countries along the paths of freedom.

KENNEDY ROUND

In 1962 Congress passed what was known as the Trade Expansion Act, and the ministers of the countries belonging to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), met in May 1963 to launch the Kennedy round and decided that grains negotiations should be carried out by a special group aimed at negotiating a world grains arrangement.

This group comprises the principal countries—both importers and exporters—concerned with international trade in cereals. It has had a number of meetings. In May 1965 members exchanged their offers and ideas as to the shape the world grains arrangement should take.

Under the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962, two Members of the U.S. Senate and two Members of the House of Representatives participate in these negotiations. Senator RIBICOFF of Connecticut and I have been appointed by the U.S. Senate to participate in these meetings.

Congressman Cecil King of California and Congressman Tom Curtis of Missouri represent the House. We attended earlier meetings at Geneva and expect to return this spring.

The Trade Expansion Act expires on June 30, 1967, and therefore, it is essential that every effort be made to complete these agreements between the European Economic Community and our Nation before that date.

This is a very tight schedule, however a workable one. It has particularly set a test of will for the European Economic Community itself. The six Common Market countries have a very short period in which to resolve their internal problems if they are to return to the negotiations at a meeting of the Kennedy round this spring.

Speaking at the National Convention of Wheat Growers at Lincoln, Nebr., on December 15, 1965, Irwin R. Hedges, agricultural trade specialist, stated:

"To summarize, a world grains arrangement must hinge on three principles realistically related to the world situation:

"(a) The need for meaningful assurance of access to the major commercial markets of the world and equal opportunity for all to compete.

"(b) the need for all participants in a WGA to accept part of the burden and to share the responsibility for adjusting production and managing the supplies moving into commercial markets.

"(c) the need for all participants in a WGA to share the responsibility for feeding the hungry of the world.

"These principles form the three pillars of our proposal. Other provisions, such as the level of international prices and the minimum price, would reflect the supply/demand balance created by the provisions of the arrangement relating to the above principles."

When the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962 was passed, Congress stipulated that no final agreements would be arrived at and no trade agreements consummated unless and until agricultural products were given their full protection and assurance of benefits in the Kennedy round.

The momentum of trends now in existence insures that the gap between food production and food needs in the less-developed world will widen further. Some countries will likely face acute food shortages between now and the time when these trends are reversed. We must be prepared to respond.

The National Association of Grain and Feed Dealers will play an important part in the expansion of food and fiber distribution to undernourished and underdeveloped countries. Our ability to produce and distribute food to people of undernourished countries could well mean the difference between peace and war.

SENATE SHOULD FOLLOW HOUSE IN APPROVING RECOMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES FOR SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on January 12, 1965, I introduced legislation to extend to Federal employees who retired before October 1962, and who elected a reduction in their annuities to provide survivorship benefits, the same liberalized benefits currently enjoyed by annuitants who retired after that date.

The House this week incorporated in the Federal salary and benefit proposal a provision similar to my bill, S. 548. The move eliminates a complicated and inequitable pattern of annuity reductions which occurred in the law between April 1, 1948, and October 10, 1962.

During these years since 1948, both salaries and annuities have increased many times but the increases in salaries have been much greater than the increases in annuities. As a result, the average annuities of persons retiring today are much higher than the average of present annuities of persons retired some years ago.

Though changes were made to liberalize the survivor provisions of the law in 1949, 1956, and 1962, they were not made retroactive to persons previously retired. Thus, the 1948 retiree pays four times as much as the 1963 retiree and receives less survivor annuity. The persons receiving the least annuities have to pay the most for survivor protection, and their survivors must suffer a lower percentage formula. The pre-1962 retiree is penalized simply because he had the misfortune of retiring at an earlier date.

Adoption of this important measure would provide a uniform basis for figuring survivorship benefits for all retirees who have elected such benefits. Under my bill, the benefits would be identical to Public Law 87-973, for those who retired on October 11, 1962, or after. This provides a simplified and uniform procedure in figuring all costs of survivorship benefits.

I urge the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to give serious consideration to the merits of this proposal when deliberating the Federal salary and benefit bill.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE INVESTIGATION—CHARGES OF ARCHIE P. SHERAR

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record certain correspondence between the Commissioner of Internal Revenue Service and myself with respect to a hearing of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure last week.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. Edward V. Long,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I have just received the results of my inspection staff's complete and thorough investigation of the charges made by one of our former employees, Mr. Archie P. Sherar, before your subcommittee on March 30, 1966. Under the circumstances, I feel it is appropriate that I share these findings with you.

Before getting into the substance of the investigation, I want to emphasize that inspection reports directly to me and is completely independent of Internal Revenue's field management. I call attention to this fact to stress that the investigation was carried out in an openminded and objective manner.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION

The investigation turned up no evidence that would support Mr. Sherar's charge of a "fix" in a tax case. Here is a summary of our findings:

1. It is not true that Mr. Sherar was fired because he refused to remain silent about a "fix." He was removed from the Service because he refused to cooperate and furnish records for the audit of his own tax returns.

2. There was no "fix." The tax cases in question have been carefully reviewed and we found no evidence that any were handled improperly. The only impropriety we discovered was the poor judgment Mr. Sherar used in conducting the audit and in dealing with taxpayers and their representatives.

3. There is no foundation to the allegation of a personal relationship between former Commissioner Mortimer M. Caplin and Mr. Nathan Friedman, the accountant who represented the taxpayers on these cases.

What our investigation does not reveal is why Mr. Sherar made these charges. I can only surmise that this young man, disgruntled by the loss of his job, chose this way to get even with IRS for discharging him.

Now I would like to set forth some of the factual detail underlying the results of our investigation.

DETAILED FINDINGS

This, as I understand it, is the substance of Sherar's charges: that in 1962 he was forced to "fix" some tax cases by limiting the scope of an audit and by falsifying reports; that he was ordered to do so by his group supervisor because "word has come down to limit it;" that word from above to limit the audit was attributable to an alleged personal relationship between Commissioner Caplin and the taxpayers' representative, Mr. Friedman; and that Sherar was removed from the Service in 1966 for refusing to keep quiet about the "fix." A brief review of the facts should lay these unfounded charges to rest.

To place this matter in context, Sherar was first assigned the key 1957 and 1958 returns in question in 1959. When conducting an audit a revenue agent may under certain circumstances requisition related returns, if in the judgment of the agent substantial tax adjustments would likely result. An agent's judgment in such matters is, of course, subject to the review and concurrence of his group supervisor.

In this case, the few returns originally assigned to Sherar soon grew into a wide-ranging audit involving 5 partnership and 34 individual returns. It was at this point, in 1960, that Sherar first came into contact (and conflict) with Friedman, accountant for the five partnerships. (It is interesting to note that in 1960 Mr. Caplin was a law professor at the University of Virginia and not Commissioner of Internal Revenue.)

In the fall of 1960, after the scope of the audit grew, Friedman complained to Sherar's group supervisor, at that time Mr. David Rossi, about Sherar's conduct of the audit. (It is not uncommon for a tax practitioner to complain to a group supervisor about the way a revenue agent is handling an audit.) By this time, the audit had grown to about 60 tax returns. In view of Friedman's complaint and since the principal issue was an engineering problem, Rossi decided to bring an IRS evaluation engineer into the case.

Sherar was instructed that the engineer was to handle this issue and that he was not to have anything else to do with it nor to contact Friedman or any of his clients on this aspect of the case. Rossi told Sherar, however, that he was free to continue his audit on any other significant issues involved. During the time Sherar was under Rossi's supervision, Rossi does not recall Sherar ever raising any other significant issues in the group of cases. The engineering issue appeared to be Sherar's main concern, and he was disappointed to have an engineer brought into the case.

Through a routine administrative realinement Sherar was transferred to Group Supervisor Thomas Haywood's group in August 1961, and took his inventory of cases with him. Meanwhile, Sherar's audit had grown to over 100 returns involving several partnerships and about 30 different individuals.

Shortly before March 1962, the engineer finished his examination of the principal issue. Although he recommended significant tax adjustments, the net tax result was more favorable to the taxpayer than that originally proposed by Sherar. Sherar did not agree with the engineer's treatment of the issue but made no formal dissent or written protest.

In March 1962, Friedman again complained about Sherar's handling of the audit, this time to District Director Joseph Cullen who referred Friedman to Group Supervisor Haywood. Friedman felt that the tax assessed to date in the group of cases was substantially correct and that after 2 years on the audit Sherar was just looking for "nickel-and-dime" adjustments.

Again, I believe it is important to place this matter in its proper context. One of the major management problems facing the Service is to carefully manage our workload to achieve the most effective use of our limited manpower. To help attain this objective, it is Service policy to keep our workload as current as possible, i.e., to emphasize disposing of old returns in inventory so more recently filed returns can be audited. If we are to keep our work current it is obvious that we cannot allow our agents to conduct open-end examinations and audit every case ad infinitum. We instruct them to audit a return until they are reasonably sure they have arrived at the substantially correct tax, then dispose of the case, and move on to other work. It is important to note that in 1962 some of the returns involved in Sherar's audit were 5 years old.

After Friedman complained, Haywood discovered that another taxpayer's representative, a law firm, had also recently complained about Sherar's conduct as a revenue agent. At this point, Haywood contacted Rossi, Sherar's former group supervisor, and both supervisors held a meeting with Sherar to view his handling of the cases. Haywood then personally reviewed all aspects of the audit, found no additional significant tax, and directed Sherar to complete his audit and prepare final reports which were to include any significant issues Sherar had developed up to that time.

Haywood states that he definitely did not tell Sherar to confine his audit reports to the adjustments based on the engineer's findings. Haywood also emphatically denies that he was under any pressure from any of his superiors to limit the examination. He states that he directed Sherar to wind up the audit because in his judgment it was the right thing to do based solely on the facts. He said Sherar was hopelessly bogged down, the cases were old, and many other cases had been closed in the same way.

The investigation supports the statements made by Mr. Haywood. All other San Francisco officials directly involved in this matter state that at no time was there any kind of pressure from anyone in IRS brought to bear on them to limit the examination. Further, Sherar was not, in fact, limited to the principal returns in the case. The record shows that he made adjustments on at least four other returns and assessed several thousands of dollars in additional tax against the taxpayers. These adjutments were made subsequent to the time Haywood told Sherar to wind up the audit.

The investigation also shows there is no substance to Sherar's allegation that one of the cases involved fraud. None of the supervisors involved can recall Sherar ever mentioning the possibility of fraud in any of the cases. Our review of the case files reveals no indication of fraud.

Sherar testified before your subcommittee that he wrote a memorandum on March 15, 1962, requesting that an investigation be made of this whole matter. If he believed there were irregularities in the handling of these cases, the proper thing to have done, and every revenue agent knows this, would have been to bring this to the attention of Inspection. This he failed to do until 4 years later when he was being removed from the Service. Sherar did write a memorandum on March 15, 1962, to the Chief of the Audit Division, but it did not contain a request for an Inspection investigation nor was there any indication in the memorandum that he felt he was being forced to "fix" a tax case.

Concerning the alleged falsification of reports, it seems to me that this boils down to Sherar not being allowed to conduct the audit in the way he wanted. The judgment of the agent conflicted with that of his supervisor, and the result was that the agent was directed to do something he did not want to do—wind up the project, write his reports, and get on with more important work.

This, of course, is precisely why we have supervisors and delegate authority to them. We depend on the mature judgment of our supervisors to provide guidance to our younger, less-experienced personnel. One of the most important functions of an Audit group supervisor is to protect taxpayers from overzealous agents. This, in my opinion, is one of the real strengths of our tax system.

I would like to turn now to the alleged personal relationship between Messrs. Caplin and Friedman. I do not presume to speak for these gentlemen, but I can tell you that we have interviewed them and both deny knowing each other. I have never met Mr. Friedman, but I am well acquainted with Mr. Caplin and know him to be a man of integrity.

Sherar's statements in testifying before your subcommittee perhaps most effectively discredit this charge.

When asked if he knew for a fact that there was a personal friendship between Messrs. Caplin and Friedman, Sherar said: "No. This was just a rumor." Again, in his own words, when asked by you if he had any specific evidence that the alleged friendship was the reason he was not allowed to conduct the audit as he wished, Sherar replied: "Well, Senator, nobody told me that this was the case. Anything that I would say would be an assumption on my part." And finally, in his testimony before your subcommittee he indicated that he is not really sure in his own mind why he thought he was being pressured to limit the audit. The record shows that he cited four other possible reasons why he felt this way, in addition to the alleged friendship between Messrs. Caplin and Friedman. Again, in Sherar's own words: "Now, the District Director may have, because of his own friendship or he may have wanted to avoid any embarrassment with the Commissioner, or avoid any complaint going to the Commissioner or for what reasons, or perhaps this was just administratively expedient."

Then, directly after this statement, the record of Sherar's testimony shows he admitted that he did not even know for sure if his District Director knew of the alleged friendship between Messrs. Caplin and Friedman. The more this charge is exposed to the light of reason, the more absurd it becomes.

Finally, Mr. Sherar was discharged from Internal Revenue solely because he refused to cooperate and furnish his records to substantiate deductions claimed on his own tax returns. Every employee of Internal Revenue knows full well that his own tax affairs must be completely above board. He also knows he must cooperate fully with other IRS personnel when his returns are being audited. The confidence of the American people in the equity and integrity of our tax system demands that every IRS employee be scrupulously correct in his own tax affairs.

Mr. Sherar was directed numerous times, both orally and in writing, over a period of approximately 6 months to make his records available and to cooperate with the agent examining his returns. He repeatedly refused to do so. The district director was faced with no alternative but to take disciplinary action. When informed of possible adverse action, Mr. Sherar chose not to answer the charge. Consequently, he was removed from the Service.

CONCLUSION

In sum, I believe this whole matter can be attributed to the poor judgment of a rather immature individual. I am sure you are well aware of Mr. Sherar's erratic behavior. In his testimony before your subcommittee, he admitted his unauthorized use of electronic equipment in routine audit cases to make surreptitious recordings of his conversations with taxpayers. Of the incidents of misuse of such equipment uncovered in IRS to date, this is the only instance where a revenue agent working a regular audit case has been involved.

In the light of Inspection's investigation and the conclusive results reported to you in this letter, I feel it would serve no useful purpose for Mr. Haywood and other San Francisco officials to appear before your subcommittee on this matter. However, if you still feel it is necessary, I will, of course, be glad to make them available.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

[Pursuant to S. Res. 190, 89th Cong.]

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE,

April 5, 1966.

Commissioner SHELDON S. COHEN,
Internal Revenue Service,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: Thank you for your letter of April 5, 1966, with respect to the charges made by Mr. Archie P. Sherar.

It would be inappropriate for me to pass on the merits of this issue as none of the documents in the case have been made available.

Needless to say, we would not have permitted Mr. Sherar to make such charges without a prior investigation if we had had any inkling that such charges would be made.

Mr. Sherar was questioned twice by staff lawyers. The first time the questioning was by Bernard Fensterwald, chief counsel of the subcommittee, in San Francisco on October 29, 1965. Mr. Robert Shaeffer of the IRS regional counsel's office was present. Mr. Sherar revealed that he used clandestine electronic listening devices on ordinary taxpayers, but gave no hint of the situation with Mr. Friedman. Mr. Sherar was reinterviewed by Mr. Gordon Homme, assistant counsel of the subcommittee, on March 30, 1966, in Washington before he took the stand as a witness. On both occasions, he was asked whether he had anything to say in addition to his revelation about electronic eavesdropping. Both times he answered in the negative. Thus, despite these two interviews, we never had any hint of the existence of the situation to which he testified. However, we were interested in his information on the use of electronic listening devices on ordinary taxpayers.

Kind regards,

Sincerely,

EDWARD V. LONG,
Chairman.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1966.

HON. EDWARD V. LONG,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter relating to Mr. Sherar's testimony on March 30, 1966.

Our records confirm that, when Mr. Sherar was interviewed by staff on October 29, 1965, he said nothing which would have necessarily alerted you to the possibility that he would testify as he did with respect to the 1962 audit. His discharge from employment by the Internal Revenue Service on March 25, 1966 would appear to have affected his attitude toward what had occurred some 4 years earlier.

We share your regrets regarding the publicity which attached to his unexpected testimony and trust that you will continue your efforts to set the record straight.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on April 4, the people of the Republic of Senegal celebrated their sixth anniversary of independence from French colonial rule. Under the able leadership of President Leopold Senghor, one of the most astute politicians and intellectuals in Africa, the Senegalese have demonstrated a consistent trend in overcoming the difficulties which characterize most new states.

While still largely an agricultural country, Senegal has rapidly expanded its industrial capacity. For example, its industries process such commodities as peanuts, phosphates, oil, and tobacco, for domestic and foreign consumption. Even more diversification of the economy is expected from expansion of the tuna fishing market. A modest petroleum refinery, and a fish cannery are now being constructed. Most of Senegal's economic assistance is derived from France, though American private capital and economic assistance have received generous welcome. Peace Corps volunteers have played and continue to play a significant role in Senegal's efforts to become a truly strong and modern republic. Senegal is also cooperating with United Nations and multination efforts to develop the Senegal River Basin. A successful undertaking there will be of monumental benefit to the nations taking part therein.

Even prior to achieving independence, President Senghor and other African leaders called for a union of the various components of former French West Africa on a Federal basis. Senegal's participation in the African and Malagasy Union—UAM—and the Organization of African Unity—OAU—clearly demonstrate her commitment to active intra-African cooperation.

Before closing, I should like to pay tribute to an event for which Dakar, Senegal's beautiful capital, is host. That is the First World Festival of Negro Art which is scheduled for April 1–24.

I am sure that Congress and the American people join me in wishing the people of Senegal best wishes as they celebrate their sixth anniversary and as they host this festival which will play a significant role in increasing international understanding.

May Senegal's prosperity and progress ever continue.

TRIBUTE TO MR. JAMES DOLAN OF BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article honoring Mr. Jim Dolan, president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, printed in the RECORD. This article, published in the Civil Service Leader of February 22, 1966, pays tribute to Mr. Jim Dolan's work in fighting to save the Brooklyn Navy Yard and his subsequent work in helping to relocate employees of the yard losing their jobs.

As president of Carpenters Local Union 2031, and unpaid president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, Mr. Dolan has demonstrated his able leadership in helping employees at the Navy yard to adjust to this major social change.

I join the workers of the Brooklyn Navy Yard in paying tribute to the able job done by Mr. Jim Dolan and commend him to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES DOLAN; DEDICATED TO FAIR AND DECENT TREATMENT OF BROOKLYN NAVY YARD AIDS

"It has a great past, but it has no future." With these words, it was reported, did Robert McNamara dismiss the subject of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, shortly after he announced its scheduled closing. The order to close the shipyard was made public on November 19, 1964, and is slated to be effective on June 30, 1966, a few short months from now.

Many events have taken place between the announcement date and the present time. The *Sandoval, Intreprid, Ogden,* and *Duluth,* all fighting ships of a fighting Navy, have been completed and sent to their places on the seas in the defense of this country. With unseemly haste much of the fine facilities of the Brooklyn Navy Yard have been ordered moved or destroyed. The Hammerhead Crane, the largest weight-handling structure in the port of New York, with a replacement value of over $2 million was sold for $6,000 and demolished for the junk value. The navy yard with a record of 165 years of achievement was left to the control of individuals who seemed to step out of the pages of "The Caine Mutiny" or "Mr. Roberts."

But what has happened to the almost 10,000 men and women workers during this time? We can answer this question best by looking to James J. Dolan, president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, president of Carpenters Local Union 2031, and now general representative of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. Jim Dolan, as president of the council represents all the workers at the shipyard. For the past 2½ years he led the fight to save the navy yard and later to obtain the maximum in fair and decent treatment for the workers. This was a task that required, in many instances, 16 hours a day, innumerable meetings, frequent trips to Washington, and a dedication to his fellow workers that borders on the unbelievable. It might well be thought that the salary of president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council must be quite high. The reverse is true; the position does not carry a salary. As Jim said when asked, "My satisfaction is being able to help the devoted, hard-working people of the Brooklyn Navy Yard in any way possible, especially at this time when most of their fair-weather political friends are not to be found."

What has this 38-year-old father of six been able to accomplish during his time as representative of the yard workers? Prior to November 1964, he spearheaded a drive to keep the yard open that will long be remembered. The assistance of chambers of commerce, labor unions, fraternal, and business groups was obtained. Petitions numbering almost half a million were collected and forwarded to the President of the United States; street rallies attended by prominent political figures were held; a letter campaign was started; proposed legislation was submitted to our lawmakers; Madison Square Garden was packed with New Yorkers protesting the threat to the navy yard; and a comprehensive program of public education was undertaken.

The President of the United States publicly acknowledged, at Albee Square in Brooklyn, having had the Brooklyn Navy Yard future repeatedly brought to his attention. Despite these efforts of Jim Dolan, and the many who joined him in the fight, the Secretary of Defense, Robert Strange McNamara, announced the intention of closing the yard that had served the Nation so well and so long.

On November 19, 1964, the civilian work force at the navy yard totaled 9,625. The average worker's age was 46 with 18 years of service at the yard. To this group, whose only mistake was that of choosing a career with the Federal civil service, the closure announcement was a thunderclap of doom. With their shipbuilding skills not required in the New York area and with family ties that in many cases prevented moving, they felt they were destined for the industrial scrap heap. However, at no point in the ensuing months did their dedication to duty falter. They continued to perform their work on ships in the same high-quality manner that had long ago earned the "can do" name for the shipyard. Commendation after commendation was received by the yard for top-notch work, performed on time.

TOP WORKMANSHIP

While the shipyard commander freely predicted an inability to produce work, the faithful men and women continued to turn out top quality workmanship. All this, while they were "working on their own coffin." When this work was finished, their jobs were through. Many believe that this sterling performance was in no small part due to the leadership of Jim Dolan and the fact that the workers knew that he was there to help them. During this time an out-placement program was established and Dolan was successful in tempering certain aspects of it that would have worked extreme hardship on the workers. He was also able to have layoffs delayed until they were required by lack of work. He continued meeting with legislators and assisted directly and indirectly in obtaining the passage of laws that provided for improvement of both retirement benefits and severance pay.

On September 16, 1965, at a testimonial dinner, Borough President Abe Stark, of Brooklyn presented a citation to Jim Dolan in recognition of his efforts "not only in behalf of the 10,000 men and women at the shipyard, but also in behalf of the people of the Borough of Brooklyn." The testimonial dinner was attended by numerous prominent labor representatives, chamber of commerce officials and most important to Jim, many of the workers whose interests he has so well represented.

Since that date many of the workers have moved on to other jobs, some in other sections of the country, others have retired, and one of his worker friends gave his life while working on the U.S.S. *Intrepid* at the navy yard. With the last ship, the U.S.S.

Duluth, gone from the once-proud Brooklyn Navy Yard the remaining workers are engaged in dismantling or packing machinery and equipment for shipping to other locations or scrapping. The former admiral in charge of the yard has been removed, a new admiral assigned and it is hoped a final phase of decent treatment for the remaining workers has commenced.

Thus the curtain slowly falls on the Brooklyn Navy Yard; the yard that has built and repaired the finest fighting ships of the U.S. Navy. The shipbuilding tradition that extended back to the time of Washington, Jefferson, and Adams is now to be broken. Dolan has said hopefully, "May the time never come when American lives are lost because of the navy yard that no longer exists but whose ships are vitally needed."

As for Jim Dolan, he will continue to represent and fight for fairness for his workers until the last man leaves and the gates are slowly swung shut.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the House today is acting upon the appropriation bill for fiscal 1967 for the Department of Interior and related agencies, with a $7 million provision for the newly created National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

As chairman of the special Senate subcommittee which handled the authorizing legislation for this new program, I have a very special interest in this program and I therefore want to take special note of the House action at this time.

The $7 million allowed by the House represents a cut of $6,930,000—or almost 50 percent—from the administration's request of $13,930,000 for fiscal 1967.

Most of the $6.9 million cut is accounted for by the failure of the House Appropriations Committee to take any action at all on a $5 million request for the National Endowment for the Humanities because the program for that endowment had not been clearly formulated at the time the House committee considered the bill. The reason was simply that the National Council on the Humanities, which is establishing the policies and guidelines for the foundation, was not sworn into office until 2 days after Dr. Henry Allen Moe, the interim chairman of the Council, was called to testify before the House committee.

I was, therefore, most pleased to note that the House committee in no way closed the door to Senate action on the request for the Humanities Foundation but simply indicated that the decision had to be deferred until the program of the Humanities Council became more clear. The pertinent passage of the House report states:

> The committee has passed over this item of the request without prejudice with the understanding that it may be taken up at a later date by the Senate.

The purpose of my statement today is to state that I shall lend my efforts to Senate consideration and approval of the amount needed for the National Endowment on the Humanities, and also for the restoration of the funds requested for the National Endowment for the Arts and for administrative funds.

Mr. President, I shall at the appropriate time make a detailed defense of these programs and state what I believe are the compelling reasons why these amounts should be restored, and I hope that other Senators with an interest in this area will see fit to join me at that time. For the present, I want only to have the Record show the effect of the cuts as they have come from the House, and in this connection I ask unanimous consent that various articles and editorials from the Washington Post, the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, and the Washington Star be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 6, 1966]

HOUSE WINDS UP DEBATE ON APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Robert L. Asher)

A couple of GOP jabs at the arts and at spending in general fizzled under bipartisan rebuttal yesterday as the House wound up debate on a $1.2 billion appropriation bill with only minor changes from committee recommendations made last week.

With a final vote postponed until today because of the Passover holiday, the House backed Appropriations Committee cuts and spending proposals for the arts and humanities program, Washington's subway and the Interior Department's fiscal 1967 projects.

Representative Winfield K. Denton, Democrat, of Indiana, chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior, shepherded the measure through the minor skirmishes, which included one move to scuttle the entire arts and humanities request.

DETAILED PROPOSALS

That amendment was offered by Representative H. R. Gross, Republican, of Iowa, who branded the program to underwrite cultural projects a "hearts-and-flowers deal."

But more Republicans than not backed the proposal, which would provide $7 million out of a $13.9 million request.

Of the $6.9 million cut, $5 million had been sought for the humanities endowment. The request was knocked out by the committee last week pending more detailed spending proposals from the new Council on Humanities which was sworn into office after the subcommittee's hearings last month.

Among GOP members urging support of the program were Representatives Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts; Joseph M. McDade, of Pennsylvania; Frank J. Horton, of New York; Theodore R. Kupferman, of New York; and Ogden R. Reid, of New York.

Denton said the $7 million appropriation had been justified to his complete satisfaction, adding, "I don't know a thing about art, but I admire and I respect the people who do."

NEITHER SIDE SATISFIED

Referring to concern about his group's cut in the program, Denton said "Neither side is satisfied * * * so we might have made a pretty good figure."

Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, floor manager of last year's bill creating the program, pointed out that the $5 million cut can be remedied in the Senate and said he merely was asking that the recommendations "not be cut any deeper."

Urging approval of the Committee recommendation, Thompson said, "We are not talking about luxuries, or window dressing or hearts and flowers. We are talking about the essential quality of American life."

He noted that the per capita expense in the bill amounts to less than 4 cents annually for the arts. "It is utter nonsense to call that an extravagance," he declared.

MUST NOT INTERFERE

Several Congressmen, including Reid, and Representatives Charles S. Joelson, Democrat, of New Jersey; Robert N. Giaimo, Democrat, of Connecticut and Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida, warned that Congress must not try to interfere with the cultural programs to be administered by the councils.

Spending proposals for Washington's subway—minus $8 million deleted by the Committee with a provision that it could be sought in a supplemental bill if needed—drew no discussion.

Also unchallenged was a $6.1 million committee cut in the National Capital Planning Commission's request that had been sought to preserve parkland along the shores of the Potomac.

Representative Frank T. Bow, Republican, of Ohio, led two unsuccessful Republican attempts to make across-the-board cuts in the bill, and will try again when the measure comes up for final passage.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 4, 1966]

TROUBLE FOR THE ARTS FOUNDATION

Already the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, created by Congress only last September, is running into congressional trouble. A House appropriations subcommittee has cut the $5 million authorized by the bill for the Arts Endowment to $4 million and denied the money authorized for the Humanities Endowment altogether. Chief among the subcommittee's complaints seems to have been that the endowments' plans for spending the money were not yet sufficiently detailed.

This complaint, however, cuts to the heart of the philosophy behind the Foundation: that Federal support for the arts and humanities should be provided, but that it should be insulated from Federal control. Critics of the bill originally protested that nothing would more stifle creativity in the arts and humanities than the "dead hand" of Government, and nothing would be better calculated to realize their fears than to have the endowments answerable to a Congressional committee for their choices of projects.

Each endowment has been provided with a highly distinguished council of private experts, who may know little about legislating but know a great deal about the arts and humanities. The amount of money involved is relatively small. The principle at stake—support without interference—is large. The matter is expected to come before the House this week. By all means let the experiment be funded so that it can proceed in the only way that success is possible, which is to leave the decisions in the hands of the Foundation itself and its councils.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1966]

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE ARTS

The House Appropriations Committee has recommended a cut of $1 million in the already miniscule $5 million sought for direct grants in the coming fiscal year by the National Arts Endowment. Compared to annual public grants to the arts in other major countries, the American appropriation—even if the full $5 million should be provided—would be disproportionately small.

But far more serious than the proposed cut is the way in which the House committee has undertaken to interpose its ideas on artistic issues for which it has no basis of judgment. For Congress to attempt to pass on details of the program would be a grave error, bound to lead to charges of political interference in delicate areas where Congress lacks expertise.

The law adopted last year set up a National Arts Council, and the President has appointed to it a civic minded, experienced, sensitive group of men and women. Their advice should be followed. In Great Britain, where the Arts Council decides how to spend the money appropriated by the Parliament for the arts, the program has worked impressively for more than two decades. Washington would be wise to learn from the British experience.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 5, 1966]

Funding Culture

Although Congress overwhelmingly approved the creation of a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities last year, the Federal Government's cultural program already is endangered. The issue is money and the arena is the House of Representatives.

Using the guns versus butter argument, Republicans are expected to attempt on the House floor to emasculate the $7 million appropriation that came out of committee. The amount is small, far less than one-one-hundreth of 1 percent of the 1967 budget, but the principle is of great importance. The foundation was established with the support and encouragement of the artistic and academic communities, partly to help right the unfavorable balance created by lavish Government spending in the sciences and partly to provide seed money to nourish growth in the arts and humanities throughout the United States.

To grant the Foundation only token funds in its second year would be to dash the hopes of persons who feel that there can be a creative partnership with Government in these fields and to insult the distinguished Americans who have accepted positions on the National Arts and National Humanities councils.

A further problem for the infant program was revealed in subcommittee hearings when it was suggested that Congress might want a voice in directing the grants given out by the Foundation. While rendering judgments as to the amount of money that should be budgeted for the arts and the humanities each year, Congress ought to show the same disinterest toward individual grants and programs as it does in the sciences. To do otherwise would be to disrupt the program by alienating the advisory councils or to make it another pork barrel.

Friends of the Foundation in the Congress should muster their forces, for if their creation is to grow, prosper and retain a necessary independence, its case must be made now.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 4, 1966]

Penny Foolish

The House Appropriations Committee has cut almost in half the request for funds for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. The request was for just under $14 million for 1967. The committee has recommended $7 million.

This is a great mistake on the face of it. Last year was the first time the Government feebly ventured into the field of assistance to the arts, although it has long been underwriting large areas of scientific endeavor. The first year's program, announced last November by Chairman Roger L. Stevens, showed courage, imagination, and much expert thought. There is no reason to believe those qualities will diminish. There is no reason to believe the need for financial help will diminish.

The existence of the National Foundation and its Endowments and Councils in the Arts and the Humanities has been one of the most encouraging signs of these times. It has meant national concern for the higher reaches and the higher rewards of the human spirit, a concern very long overdue. The penny-pinching spirit evinced by the committee is a discouraging reminder of the days when Congress could laugh at the very idea of the arts and humanities.

The sums involved are trifling compared to the overall budget and compared to the very real needs in those fields of culture and learning. But they are enormous in relation to the past and as omens for the future.

When the matter comes to the floor of the House this week, that body should restore the cuts.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 5, 1966]

"Know Nothings" Come Alive Again

(By Doris Fleeson)

The "Know Nothings" are coming to life again in Congress under cover of President Johnson's call for domestic economies. Their immediate target is the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities, whose request for $14 million for 1967 has been cut to $7 million by the House Appropriations Committee.

Washington has only just been getting accustomed to some slight deference by Congress to the fact that man does not live by bread alone. It has ventured to hope that the days when the late Senator Robert S. Kerr set the cultural tone of the legislative branch with ridicule of esthetics were gone forever.

Public debate this week will reveal House sentiment toward crippling the program put together with idealism and intelligence by Foundation Chairman Roger L. Stevens. If the cuts are restored and maintained by the Senate, the discouraging glimpses of what went on behind the scenes may be forgotten.

Yet they should not be. They show that the trend set in motion by President and Mrs. Kennedy and carried forward by President and Mrs. Johnson could be reversed if its adherents and defenders do not work hard to sustain it.

The attackers are not at all confined to the old conservative coalition or Goldwater Republicans. House Republican leaders say they will not oppose the program as a party matter, that in fact there has been no minority discussion of it.

This is an intelligent political decision. Republicans have too long been alienated from the intellectual community, and it is a major problem in their effort to restore ideas and tone to their political dialog. For Kennedy the intellectuals had a natural affinity but they have been alienated from Johnson on the Vietnam issue and in matters of form.

The arts and humanities program is so minor in contrast to vast Federal appropriations no one Congressman will be much affected by his vote for it. But opposition will be construed by the intellectuals as hostility.

The fact is that the opposition in private sessions was set off my Members identified with the Johnson party. Other Democrats professed themselves nonplussed by this circumstance. The same old sequence occurred that is sadly familiar here. Is the President really for the bill? When others were being urged to fight for it why were not his friends called? The questions are multiplying and the rollcall will be watched with unusual care.

Some of the private debate was useful and friendly even though it revealed doubts. The House group is clearly unsure what its role ought to be in a Federal cultural program and how much control it should attempt to exercise. Stevens remained cool and tactful under questions that showed the gap between his point of view and the questioner's.

Those who believe in the new effort argue that it is only fair to give the dedicated Stevens a chance, and enough money to give the program at least an even chance of survival.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 5, 1966]

Capital Opera House

For years every city in Europe has had its own opera house while the Capital of the United States has had none. Not only have such famous cities as Paris, Vienna, and Milan long enjoyed beautiful government-owned opera houses, but even an obscure city like Socchi in southern Russia has its own attractive opera house.

Almost every European country also has its government-sponsored art and cultural centers. Recently the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have secured small appropriations from Congress to promote arts and culture in the United States of America, though this year, because of the Vietnam war, the amount has been whittled down to $6 million.

Today, however, Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee, led by Frank Bow, of Ohio, and Glen Lipscomb, of California, are lying in wait for the arts and culture money ready to meat ax it altogether.

Chief Republican champions of culture are Ben Reifel, of South Dakota, only American Indian in Congress, and Silvio Conte, from Massachusetts.

STREAMLINING OF APPOINTMENTS OF CONSULAR OFFICERS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, some time ago—in fact, almost 2 years ago—the Committee on Foreign Relations began exploring with the Department of State the feasibility of streamlining the so-called routine Foreign Service lists with a view toward eliminating unnecessary confirmations.

I am very pleased that the Department of State has now announced a simplified procedure for the appointment and assignment of Foreign Service personnel who perform consular functions.

The handling of these nominations in the past has, to be sure, not been an excessive burden on the Senate or on the committee. The principal beneficiary of this change is the Department itself by the elimination of unnecessary paperwork, and I commend the Department for taking this step.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Department of State Newsletter of March 1966, entitled "The New Procedures for Appointment and Assignment of Consular Officers" be printed in the Record at this point together with the correspondence leading up to the announced change.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Department of State Newsletter, March 1966]

The New Procedures for Appointment and Assignment of Consular Officers

A new procedure for the appointment and assignment of Foreign Service personnel who perform consular functions was announced this month.

The new procedure will eliminate considerable paperwork, and also enable the Department to tailor consular titles to assignments.

As outlined in Foreign Affairs Manual Circular No. 389 of March 11, officers in the Foreign Service who are to perform consular functions will be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as consular officers of the United States of America—instead of as vice consuls, consuls, or consuls general.

Thus, once appointed as a consular officer, an individual will receive—as the needs of the Service require—an assignment commission as vice counsul, consul, or consul general for a specific consular district.

(Assignment commissions are issued by the President upon the recommendation of the Secretary and do not require Senate action.)

Effective immediately, Foreign Service commissioned appointments will be handled as follows:

An individual entering the Foreign Service Officer Corps will be nominated by the President to be (1) a Foreign Service officer of the United States of America of a specified class and (2) a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America. Following Senate confirmation and attestation by the President, two Presidential appointment commissions will normally be issued: one as a Foreign Service officer of the United States of America, of a specified class, and one as a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

A Foreign Service officer already holding a Presidential appointment as vice consul or consul will be appointed a consular officer incident to his promotion to a higher class or when the needs of the Service require the use of a different consular title. No further appointment action will be taken in the case of a Foreign Service officer of class 1, 2, or 3 who has already been appointed consul general.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer will be nominated by the President to be a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service in cases where he is required to serve in a diplomatic or consular capacity. Following Senate confirmation and attestation by the President, one Presidential appointment commission will be issued, as a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer already holding an appointment as vice consul will be appointed a consular officer when the needs of the Service require—and his Foreign Service Reserve class permits—the use of a different consular title.

A Foreign Service Staff officer or employee will be nominated to be a consular officer when he is required to serve in a consular capacity. Following Senate confirmation and attestation by the President, one Presidential appointment commission will be issued, as a consular officer of the United States of America.

The Secretary of State will no longer appoint Foreign Service Staff officers or employees to be vice consuls. Such personnel now serving under secretarial appointments will, however, complete their present assignments. If they are again required to serve in a consular capacity, they will be appointed consular officers, as described above.

The circular pointed out that none of the new procedures affect the present procedures followed in the appointment of consular agents by the Secretary.

The consular title specified in an officer's assignment commission will normally equate with his grade, as in the past. Under the new procedure, however, consular titles no longer depend upon Senate action, and consequently may be tailored to the requirements of the assignment.

There may be occasions when an officer will receive a title higher or lower than that to which he would otherwise be entitled by virtue of his grade.

The conferral of a higher consular title will not signify reward nor will that of a lower title reflect discredit upon an officer.

As a matter of policy, the Department will not lower an officer's consular title during the course of an assignment.

Consistent with the needs of the Service, consular titles will equate with grade as follows:

CONSUL GENERAL

Foreign Service officers of class 1.

Foreign Service officers of classes 2 and 3 when assigned as principal officers of a consulate general, when assigned as chief of the consular section at a large diplomatic mission, or when such title is required by the nature of the assignment.

CONSUL

Foreign Service officers of classes 2 through 5.

Foreign Service Reserve officers classes 1 through 5.

Foreign Service Staff officers of classes 1 through 4.

Foreign Service officers or Foreign Service Reserve officers of class 6 when assigned as principal officer at a consular post.

VICE CONSUL

Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service Reserve officers of classes 6 through 8.

Foreign Service Staff officers and employees of classes 5 through 8.

The circular explained that a Foreign Service officer who resigns his Presidential appointment as such, in order to join the Foreign Service Reserve Corps or the Foreign Service Staff Corps, should make clear in his written resignation that he is not also resigning his appointment as secretary in the diplomatic service and consular officer. This will make reappointment unnecessary if the officer is subsequently again required to serve in a diplomatic or consular capacity.

JANUARY 11, 1966.

Hon. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACARTHUR: This is in reply to your letter of December 10, 1965, with reference to the appointment of consular officers.

The procedure you outlined would seem to be a considerable improvement over the present system and I am pleased that the Department is taking this action to streamline the appointment process. The gradual course for implementing the new system appears to be the most desirable one and it is agreeable with me for the Department to proceed as soon as feasible.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., December 10, 1965.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer to your letter of September 18, 1964, my reply of April 19, 1965, and, also, your letter of October 8, 1965 regarding nominations of Foreign Service personnel.

The President and the Secretary of State have now approved a proposal, which if agreeable to your committee, will substantially simplify the procedure for processing consular appointments of Foreign Service personnel. Therefore, if you concur and starting at a time convenient to you, all nominations for consular appointments, including Reserve and Staff officers, will be for confirmation as a "consular officer" rather than as a vice consul, consul, or consul general, as is the practice now. Once confirmed as a consular officer, the officer will be designated—administratively by the Secretary as a vice consul, a consul, or a consul general as subsequent assignments are made.

Under this procedure, the appointment of consular officers will be similar to the present practice of appointing an officer as a secretary in the diplomatic service. Once an officer is commissioned as a consular officer, his name will not be resubmitted for further confirmation in this general category.

There are basically two ways we could initiate this new system. One would be to resubmit all of the names of Foreign Service personnel now holding consular commissions so that they could be reappointed as consular officers in one massive operation. The second course of action would be to appoint each officer as a consular officer as he is promoted or newly transferred to a consular assignment. The second course would mean a gradual decrease, over a period of years, in the number of consular nominations submitted to the Senate. We believe the first course would be burdensome and expensive in view of the fact that a nomination list and new commissions would have to be prepared for approximately 5,000 officers. Therefore, if agreeable to you, we propose to follow the second, gradual course.

We believe that this new system will help reduce—both for your committee and for the Department—the workload of the nominations that must be confirmed by the Senate. Further to your letter of October 8, we will soon be forwarding to you our comments on H.R. 6277.

Sincerely,
DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

OCTOBER 8, 1965.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: H.R. 6277, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for consideration.

As you know, this bill has far-reaching implications for the Foreign Service and the conduct of the Nation's foreign policy generally. The committee will want to study the proposal very carefully and would appreciate a detailed report from you on it. As a part of the report, the committee would like to have your comments on the objections which were raised to the measure in the House of Representatives.

It is not expected that the committee will have an opportunity to begin consideration of the measure until early in the next session and, in view of this, a report is not required in the immediate future. This will give the Department ample time to prepare detailed comments on the bill.

I might add that the Committee in working on this bill will probably wish to consider the commissioning system for the Foreign Service along the lines of my letter to the Department of September 18, 1964, and the Department's reply of April 19, 1965.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

APRIL 19, 1965.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Reference is made to your letter of September 18, 1964, addressed to Mr. J. Edward Lyerly, deputy legal adviser for administration, and to ensuing conversations between members of your staff and representatives of the Department relative to the possible elimination of Senate consideration of Foreign Service personnel who, already being confirmed in their class, are sent up for further confirmation as vice consuls, consuls, or consuls general.

Proposals for simplification of existing procedures are currently under active consideration by appropriate officials of the executive branch.

As soon as this matter is resolved, I will communicate with you again.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas MacArthur II.

September 18, 1964.

Mr. J. Edward Lyerly,
Deputy Legal Adviser, for Administration, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Lyerly: This is with reference to the request of the committee staff for the Department of State's suggestions on means of eliminating the necessity for Senate confirmation of Foreign Service officers or Reserve officers who are already confirmed in their class but are being designated "to be also" consul generals, consuls, vice consuls, or secretaries in the diplomatic service.

Although, since May 1964 when this request was made by telephone, the committee has approved three lists containing such designations, this is to inform you of the continued committee interest in finding ways to simplify these procedures.

I hope very much that before a list containing such designations is submitted to the 89th Congress, the committee could have the benefit of your ideas.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman.

SHERMAN D. PARSONS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE—OLDEST LIVING MASON IN THE WORLD

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, those of us who were fortunate enough, as I was, to be born and raised in New Hampshire are conscious of the fact that, all things being equal, we may anticipate a long and fruitful life. Even this expectancy was exceeded, however, on March 17, when Mr. Sherman D. Parsons, of Wolfeboro, became at the grand old age of 104 the oldest living Mason in the world. Active in citizenship and fraternal service for many decades and actually not in retirement yet, Mr. Parsons enjoys the esteem and respect of all New Hampshire, and I am proud to extend my personal tribute.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a short news item referring to Mr. Parsons, which was published in the March 31 issue of the Littleton, N.H., Courier.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Many north country people know of Sherman D. Parsons, one of the most remarkable men you will ever meet. On January 13 of this year he observed his 104th birthday. On March 17 he became the oldest living Mason in the world. A resident of Wolfeboro, Mr. Parsons has been living at the Masonic Home in Manchester for the past 2 years. Writes Herbert E. Kimball, grand master of Masons in New Hampshire: "New Hampshire is proud to salute this distinguished Mason for his more than 80 years of Masonic membership and service. His is a record that will probably never be equaled again in our lifetime. Every one of New Hampshire's 17,000 Masons extends most sincere congratulations and the wish that Brother Parsons may long enjoy his proud honor (he is still active in Masonry and is serving the Grand Lodge as a grand steward—an office he has held continuously since 1944)."

We add our non-Masonic best wishes to an outstanding citizen who belies his age by at least 35 years.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE TO UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, ALUMNI LAW DAY, APRIL 2, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on the evening of April 2, I had the opportunity to hear the address of our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] at the dinner arranged by the students of the College of Law of the University of Kentucky, as part of the university's annual alumni Law Day ceremonies.

Senator Morse's speech on international law paid particular attention to its application to the situation in Vietnam. The audience of 800, made up of students of the college of law, members of the faculty of the university, alumni, and lawyers of my State listened to Senator Morse's speech with the greatest of interest and attention and, at its close, rose and applauded him.

I ask unanimous consent to have his speech printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE AT THE ALUMNI LAW DAY, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, LEXINGTON, KY., APRIL 2, 1966

There is an American folk tale, often related by Carl Sandburg, which tells of a group of Americans who met in Paris in 1898 to celebrate the Fourth of July. The first speaker arose and raised his glass in the traditional American toast: "Here's to the United States; bounded on the north by Canada; on the south by Mexico; on the east by the Atlantic Ocean; and on the west, by the Pacific Ocean."

But the next speaker arose, and said that while this was a time-honored toast, it did not take into account the new ventures into overseas expansion, into imperialism that was carrying the United States into Cuba, and across the Pacific into the Philippines. So he proposed a new toast: "Here's to the United States; bounded on the north by the North Pole; on the south by the South Pole; on the east by the rising sun; and on the west by the setting sun."

The third speaker said it pleased him that the second toast had improved on the first. But in light of the changed streams of history, in view of the immensity of the responsibilities the United States had taken onto itself, he felt he did not go far enough in expressing the new dimensions of the country. So he raised his glass: "Here's to the United States; bounded on the north by the aurora borealis; on the south by the precession of the equinoxes; on the east by primeval chaos; and on the west, by the Day of Judgment."

I do not suppose there has been a time when it could more appropriately be said that today American foreign policy is bounded on the east by primeval chaos, and on the west by the day of judgment. In Asia, we are fighting virtually alone in a war that our State Department says must be fought if confidence in us among our 42 treaty partners is to be maintained, while in Europe our strongest alliance is being dissolved on the ground—or at least one of the grounds—that the American involvement in Asia robs NATO of American interest and protection and the others must now go their own way.

It is commonplace for commentators to say today that the postwar era of cold war blocs has ended, and the changing conditions of the world are causing the military alliance system of the 1940's and 1950's to break down into irrelevancy.

Yet there is every indication that our foreign policy, like so many military policies of history, is designed to cope with past problems more than with current or future ones. This, for example, has been the response of the American Government to the withdrawal from NATO of French forces and the order by France that NATO forces withdraw from France. The American President appeals to NATO nations to remember the lesson of World War II, and maintain the unified military force that was developed first to fight Germany, and subsequently to forestall any Russian military move across Europe.

In the opinion of President de Gaulle of France, the necessity for the treaty force has been totally undermined by events. Of course, the text of the treaty itself provided that it was a 20-year treaty, to be renewed or revised in 1969 upon the wishes of the members. It was not perpetual, in other words. We knew in 1949 that the conditions that made NATO desirable could change or disappear in 20 years.

France has concluded that some of them have, and that the essential task for Europe is no longer one of amalgamating American military forces into a defense against the Soviet Union, but amalgamating the Soviet bloc into a peaceful coexistence and cooperation with Western Europe. It is the French view that the massive American presence in NATO makes this European task more difficult.

The extent to which this Gaullist view may or may not be accurate, and the extent to which it poses excruciating problems for Germany, have not been met by the United States. Instead, we have tried to pretend that it is only De Gaulle who is out of step and who fails to recognize the lessons of the past. We have assailed the breaking up of the unified NATO military force. But we have done it on the basis of its past success, rather than on the basis of whether it is wise or needed for the future, and indeed, whether its existence obstructs more desirable events than it prevents undesirable events.

The American Department of Defense, and the American State Department have for nearly 20 years grounded their defense policies upon the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We have counted on NATO countries, NATO territory, and NATO forces almost as part of our own. We have become quite accustomed to stationing some 300,000 to 400,000 men in Europe as part of the NATO defensive force, and the vast and farflung military bases across Western Europe are counted upon almost as much as those on American soil.

Now, the whole fabric is threatened; the most basic assumptions and practices of the American military stance are on the verge of dissolution. There is every evidence that it is this threat to traditional military planning that is uppermost in the American objections to the Gaullist plan.

I say this because the American arguments against De Gaulle partake of military ossification more than of political realities in Europe. In 1952, Stalin offered Adenauer the reunification of Germany provided it was entirely neutralized. But John Foster Dulles became Secretary of State in time to prevail upon Adenauer to reject the offer with the seductive counter-offer that if West Germany joined NATO, it could soon demand reunification on its own terms, including full German alliance with the West.

But the military strength of NATO, including that of a rearmed West Germany, never was strong enough to reunify Germany short of war, and the hope and expectation of the Germans that it could has long since gone glimmering.

This one-time political objective has not been achieved, and there is a growing realization in Germany and throughout Europe that if Germany is ever to be united, and a major cause of East-West friction removed, it will have to come about through deescalation of military confrontations and not through their escalation. This is one attraction of the Gaullist theory to many Europeans. It is an attraction that the American insistence upon continuation of the military organization of NATO has no means of countering.

The opportunities of improved trade and cultural relations with eastern Europe are another attraction of Gaullism. As the monolith of communism breaks up in Eastern Europe, the fear of military aggression from it recedes in Western Europe. The issue that the United States does not face is whether this European view is right in feeling that the path to eased tensions and better relations is through "building bridges" rather than building armies.

The failure of the Secretary of Defense's appeal to NATO ministers to join us in the war in Vietnam reflects a decided European attitude that to become involved in the war in Asia can only get in the way of improved relations within Europe itself. To Americans preoccupation with Vietnam forces us to dredge up old battle cries about "Munich" and to warn Europe that if the so-called yellow peril is not stopped in Vietnam it will overrun not only the whole of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and North America, but Europe, too.

This "yellow peril" argument of the Secretary of Defense was coolly received in Europe by our NATO friends. Whether or not they think it useful for the Americans to fight communism in Asia, they seem convinced that it is not their war and that they have more urgent and useful endeavors on their own continent.

The American appeal for continuing NATO without France as though nothing had happened, and waiting for De Gaulle to pass from the scene, implies that nothing has really changed since 1949. At least it implies that we are seeking to perpetrate the solution of 1949 without asking whether the problem is the same.

We all know that NATO was created in 1949 to defend against what was feared to be a Soviet army poised to sweep across a defenseless Western Europe. The unified military force that was organized to act as one in case of attack was the keystone of NATO.

Twenty years later, the iron grip of Russia upon its satellites has greatly eased. All are in varying degrees of finding their own methods of organizing their economies, often with assistance from the west. Trade with Western Europe has increased, and even trade with the United States has increased. The Soviet Union itself shows no signs of planning or expecting any kind of armed attack upon anyone, much less a sweep across Europe.

To American eyes, this only means that Russia does not attack so long as NATO is in full battle array. To many others in the alliance, it means that Russia is not interested in armed conquest, if in fact, she ever was.

As one who participated in the Senate debate and ratification of the treaty, I am increasingly of the opinion that this is an issue that our European partners must decide, and not an issue on which an American decision can or should be forced on them. If Germany, Britain, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, and the other treaty partners want to continue the treaty organization, and pick up their share of the military and financial load being put down by France, then I think the United States should pick up its share, too.

But this can happen only if Europeans are themselves convinced that the military organization serves a more useful purpose than it frustrates. So far, we have not offered any convincing argument that it does. We have only depicted De Gaulle as going back to the pre-World War I system of alliances without unified forces, while we urge the system of only 20 years ago when a multinational military force helped to conquer Germany.

Both sides accuse the other of being tied to the past, and both claim to be applying the lessons of history. But are any of these analogies valid, or do they serve only to relieve both of the burden of making a case?

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has written a new chapter in postwar history by opening to public discussion the previously closed subject of our China policy, and the war in Vietnam. Without necessarily dropping that subject entirely, I am hopeful that the committee can also open the subject of the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the closely related issue of acquisition of nuclear weapons by nonnuclear powers, especially Germany, for it is said that Germany will seek her own nuclear force if she does not share in a NATO nuclear force. I hope we will hold open, public hearings on the future of NATO; if we do not, we are likely to continue to hear an American case based primarily upon the convenience of the Defense Department, and not one that considers the political objectives of the West and how they can best be pursued.

U.S. POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

The war in Asia does not, for reasons I have mentioned, seem to have the impact upon our NATO partners that our Secretary of State advertises to the American people. Another reason it has not strengthened European confidence in us is the way we have used the collective defense treaty in southeast Asia without regard for the wishes or actions of our treaty partners.

Despite the name of the treaty—Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty—it is not being used for that purpose. For several years, the American "commitment" in South Vietnam was described as stemming from a letter written by President Eisenhower to President Diem in 1954. But on August 17 of last year, President Eisenhower repudiated that interpretation of his letter, saying that it never referred to anything more than economic assistance. Since then, the administration has shifted to the SEATO treaty as the basis for our action in South Vietnam. It relies upon paragraph 2 of article 4, which permits us to consult with other members in case of some subversion or revolution within the treaty area.

But the weakness of this intervention is emphasized by the fact that we are under no obligation whatever to act under this provision. In fact, Secretary Dulles also nailed down that situation in the hearings of November 1954 on ratification of the treaty. In a colloquy with Senator Green of Rhode Island, he said:

"Senator GREEN. Is there not some provision in the treaty—I thought I saw it as I glanced through it—that we join in putting down insurrections in these countries?

"Secretary DULLES. No, sir. There is provision that if there is a subversion, threatened subversion, of the political independence of any country, then we will consult together what to do about it.

"Senator GREEN. That is subversion then.

"Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir.

"Senator GREEN. Well, isn't that another word for insurrection?

"Secretary DULLES. I would think insurrection is a form of subversion, yes.

"Senator GREEN. Then we are obliged to help put down a revolutionary movement.

"Secretary DULLES. No. If there is a revolutionary movement in Vietnam or in Thailand, we would consult together as to what to do about it because if that were a subversive movement that was in fact propagated by communism, it would be a very grave threat to us. But we have no undertaking to put it down; all we have is an undertaking to consult together as to what to do about it."

PARTIES' OBLIGATIONS ARE EQUAL IN A COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY

The administration, as of last month or so, is now relying instead upon paragraph 1 of that article. That paragraph states:

"Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations."

Yet there is no establishment that an aggression by means of armed attack has occurred insofar as the treaty members are concerned. Where is the finding of the SEATO foreign ministers council that an armed attack upon South Vietnam from North Vietnam has occurred? The only such finding has been made by the United States. As Senator FULBRIGHT has pointed out so often in the recent hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee, the reason we have no substantial help from other countries in Vietnam is that no one has considered the war there to be an armed aggression of the kind that would threaten the peace and security of themselves. When Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, Cambodia, Japan, and India, all non-SEATO members, made no such finding, that is bad enough, but neither have our other major SEATO partners—Pakistan, France, and Britain.

Surely the evidence of even our own Defense Department is skimpy in this respect. Its latest figures, dated February 14, 1966, indicate that 11,100 North Vietnamese troops are in the south. When 11,000 troops enter to buttress a local force of an estimated 73,000 regulars and another 100,000 militia, while 200,000 American troops enter to buttress 700,000 South Vietnamese forces, it is no wonder that the world is skeptical of our allegation that an armed aggression from the north has occurred.

But the administration sees it, even if the other powers with much more at stake than we do not see it. It is, again unilaterally so far as other treaty powers are concerned, invoking paragraph 1 of article IV of SEATO to combat it.

Reciprocity is one of the most basic principles of international law.

If one partner refuses or is unable to perform his treaty obligations, the other parties are relieved of any obligation to perform. The general principle was stated in a thorough article as follows:

"However widely the various meanings of the word 'reciprocity' may differ, one idea underlies them all—that of the interrelation of action and counteraction, or, to put it more exactly, that of one side's action, whether consummated or expected, providing the motivation for that of the other side." (Lenhoff, "Reciprocity: The Legal Aspect of a Perennial Idea," 49 Northwestern University Law Review 627).

Applying this principle to Vietnam we find that the obligation under SEATO becomes a self-imposed one, apparently, without any reciprocal obligation by our treaty partners. We have 300,000 men involved in this conflict, counting those serving in the 7th Fleet. According to the Department of Defense, our 7 SEATO treaty partners had a total of some

1,600 men in Vietnam as of January 15, 1966. Australia had 1,400; New Zealand had 150; Thailand had 17; the United Kingdom had 12; the Philippines had 70; France and Pakistan had none and will never have any because they do not support our policy. Arthur and Don Larson have stated the question of reciprocity under the SEATO treaty this way:

"It must be remembered that our obligation under this treaty does not run to South Vietnam. South Vietnam is not a party, and indeed has on its part agreed to nothing. The commitment of the treaty runs to the other signers. As long as the other signers acknowledge no obligation to us to send troops in the present circumstances we have no such obligation to them."

We are using SEATO not as a collective commitment among interested and affected parties, but as an American hunting license to do what we choose to do in Vietnam. We are using it as a license to bomb whom we choose, to fight whom we choose, to send American military forces where we choose, without any regard whatever for the fact that the other treaty partners have not made any finding of an armed aggression from the North that for them, would bring paragraph 1 of article IV into operation.

Even Secretary Rusk will not go so far as to say that we have a legally binding obligation under SEATO. Prior to his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations on January 28, he had never stated that we were in Vietnam because of a SEATO obligation. On two specific instances in the last few years the Secretary has told the committee in executive session that we were not acting in Vietnam under SEATO. One was during his testimony on the southeast Asia resolution.

Therefore, I am unable to reconcile his statements to us in executive session and his statement to the committee on February 18 that "It is this fundamental SEATO obligation that has from the outset guided our actions in South Vietnam." The Secretary tells us one thing privately and another publicly.

In sum, we have not asked for SEATO action in Vietnam.

We have not called the SEATO Foreign Ministers together and asked that they invoke paragraph 1 of article IV.

We have not sought a collective finding of an armed aggression within the treaty area.

We have heard the American Secretary of State Rusk declare it. When did the hostilities in Vietnam cease being a subversion and become an armed attack? Even Mr. Rusk has not said. Presumably it was a few days before his testimony of January 29, 1966; otherwise, the United States would have been guilty of violating the requirement of paragraph 1 that all actions taken under it be reported to the Security Council.

In April of 1964, the previous rule whereby SEATO members had agreed to act only by unanimous vote was altered to permit a majority to take collective action if there were no negative vote. Abstentions would not count as negatives.

Why has not the United States sought a majority decision that armed aggression has occurred? Do we fear that even a majority of the other seven treaty partners would not share our finding? Or do we fear that France or Pakistan or others would cast a negative vote?

Since SEATO is clearly not acting as a collective defense body, have the members which do have troops in Vietnam reported their action to the Security Council as the treaty requires? Or were we acting as a self-appointed agent for the handful of soldiers that Australia and New Zealand have sent when we made our long delayed report to the Security Council some weeks ago?

There are too many loose ends lying around for a case to be made for justifying our action in Vietnam as a formal response under this treaty. To dragoon the American people into a war on so casual an invocation of a treaty is to call into question all our mutual and collective defense agreements, for the administration is laying down the principle now that only the United States has duties under these treaties and that we seek and expect no reciprocal duties and contributions from any of these so-called partners. Apparently we do not seek even a common understanding with them of the existence of a "common danger" in the treaty area.

WAR AUTHORITY RESIDES IN CONGRESS

With respect to our American constitutional practices, this audience will be interested in some discussion of the war power under these two treaties. In NATO, the terms of the treaty itself make clear that no further constitutional processes are necessary in case of an attack upon one of the treaty partners. Such an attack brings upon a state of war, insofar as the United States is concerned.

But this is not the case under SEATO. It specifically provides in article IV that an armed aggression shall be met in accord with the constitutional processes of each country.

Under our Constitution, this means the power of Congress to declare war.

During the Constitutional Convention, the business of declaring war was always treated as a legislative function. In none of the drafts was there any question of where this power should reside. Earlier drafts gave the Congress the power of "making war." The change in this phrasing to "declare" brought the only debate on the war power during the Convention. This debate demonstrates quite clearly the constitutional drafters' intentions. The noted constitutional authority, James Grafton Rogers, relates the incident in this way:

"Pinckney objected to the assignment of 'making war' to the legislative. Congress would be too slow, he said. The Senate would be a better designation. Butler suggests the President should be given the authority. Mr. Madison and Mr. Gerry moved to insert 'declare' striking out 'make war,' leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks. Sherman, Gerry, Ellsworth, and Mason all protested against leaving war altogether to the Executive. On a vote of eight States to one 'declare' was chosen with some explanation that this word left the 'conduct' of the war to the Executive while the Congress only could declare it."

In the Federalist, Hamilton wrote: "The President is to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. In this respect his authority will be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It will amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the Confederacy, while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the Legislature." That is Hamilton.

Some people say declarations of war are outdated, that events move too quickly and world affairs are too complex for adhering to the letter of the Constitution. This misses the point the Founding Fathers tried to drive home—the people must be brought into this decisionmaking process. James Grafton Rogers stated the underlying rationale of the Founding Fathers this way:

"War must be 'declared,' because it reaches many people. A declaration is in part a summons to citizens. It also gives notice that many legal rights are changed. Treaties are canceled. Trading and even correspondence with enemies is no longer proper. Enemy persons and property are restrained. Contracts and debts suspended. Our ships at sea and our own property and citizens abroad have only the protection force can provide. Vast and autocratic control of people by the Government is released by a declaration of war—the right to control prices, ration food and clothing, even to seize factories and to arrest our own people without the right to demand the charges against them or secure public trial.

"The Constitution says, therefore, in effect, 'Our country shall not be committed formally to a trial of force with another nation, our people generally summoned to the effort and all the legal consequences to people, rights and property incurred until the House, Senate and the President agree.' "

Our economic problems resulting from the war are being dealt with through evangelistic pleas from the President that housewives pass up the higher-priced items on the grocery shelves, and that businessmen forego making use of the investment tax credit to expand their enterprises. But the domestic ramifications of a war cannot long be dealt with by personal appeals for voluntary efforts any more than the military ramifications can be dealt with by appeals for voluntary action by the armed services.

This is the reason why the authority to declare war was vested in the Congress in the first place.

Nor was this war power delegated to the President by the resolution of August 1964. When the Tonkin Bay resolution was passed by the Senate in August of 1964, there were 16,000 American servicemen in South Vietnam. They were there in an advisory capacity. The object in asking Congress to pass that resolution was said to be that of warning North Vietnam of our intentions and thus avoiding war.

But the past history of these congressional resolutions has been that they have resulted in wars as well as avoided them. The Mexican war and the Spanish-American war were preceded by congressional resolutions endorsing an executive action that was designed to warn off a hostile power. They did not succeed then, and the Tonkin Bay resolution did not succeed in its purpose, either.

Just 2 days after signing the resolution, the President said: "Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys must do."

Today we have not 16,000 men in South Vietnam, but 230,000. One hundred thousand more are in Thailand and in the 7th Fleet offshore. Our men are no longer advisers but are carrying the brunt of the fighting. This fiscal year alone we will spend on the Vietnam war almost as much as we spent for the entire cost of the Korean war. Neither the resolution nor the rising level of American forces has caused the Vietcong to cease its efforts to take over the Government of South Vietnam. Nor has it had the desired effect upon North Vietnam, which was to warn it to stop supporting the Vietcong.

The real challenge to us in South Vietnam is to find a way to stop the fighting, to bring factions together who can stabilize the country. We could try to do that by inviting the noncombatant countries at the United Nations to lay down terms and conditions of a cease-fire. We could try to do it by pledging that the United States would accept and abide by any cease-fire the United Nations might order.

The noncombatant members of the U.N. themselves have an obligation to the terms of the charter to undertake to arrange a cease-fire, and to enforce it. Beyond that, we should be seeking to reconcile the conflicting political forces in South Vietnam if we hope ever to see a stable, indigenous government there.

Events in Europe are disproving, rather than proving the administration thesis that

American dependability in every alliance will come into question if we do not make good in South Vietnam. What is coming into question in NATO is the desirability of a mutual defense alliance with a United States that so totally disregards the mutuality of a treaty and seeks to transform it into a legal shield for pursuit of its national interests.

What is coming into question in this country is the desirability of these mutual defense alliances where no one but the United States seems to act.

In 1966, the United States is trying to create around China the same unified military force that we built around the Soviet Union in the 1950's. But we are getting little help from the large countries of Asia; and the further we pursue that objective, the more our on-going defense force in Europe seems to fall apart. These facts suggest to me that a policy that succeeded once, under certain conditions, can outgrow its usefulness; and it may not work elsewhere at all where conditions are as different as they are in southeast Asia.

We, too, can become prisoners of past slogans. We, no less than De Gaulle, can become mesmerized by a historic past when American power was complete and unchallenged. We, too, can make the mistake of thinking those conditions will again prevail if only we will do the same things now we did then.

To the east and to the west we see the world in flux. To sort out the useful elements in American policy that are still relevant and to devise new policies for those no longer relevant is the challenge to Americans today.

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVOLUTION—PART III

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the article entitled "The Birth Control Revolution" which was recently published in the Saturday Evening Post provides a clear and poignant discussion of current thinking on the moral aspects of birth control and birth control pills, particularly among teenagers or unmarried persons.

The moral problems associated with birth control are indeed serious and deserve the consideration of all who are concerned with the increase of illegitimacy and other social dangers in our society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, part III of this article entitled "The Moral Issue."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVOLUTION—PART III

THE MORAL ISSUE

As the scientific revolution in birth control continues, solving human problems of many sorts, it also creates problems in morality. The new techniques eliminate fears that formerly deterred men and women from sex outside of marriage. With the deterrents reduced or gone, many people believe that the foundations of contemporary sexual morality may be threatened, especially the morals of the young. Newspaper headlines and book titles have cited "the new promiscuity" facilitated by the pill. "Sex on the campus" has been a popular topic on television discussion programs, and college health officers have shocked parents across the country by publicly reporting that coeds come to them for prescriptions for pills. One said that when a girl at a midwestern college recently made such a request, she was asked, "How old are you?"

"Twenty-one," the girl replied.

"You have a particular man in mind?"

"Well, yes, I do."

"Have you ever stopped to think that you might someday want to marry a man who holds virginity in high regard?" The doctor then asked.

"Yes," she said, candidly. "But I'm not at all sure I want to marry a man like that."

Indisputably, the revolution is making an impact on the lives and sex standards of the young, from teen-agers on up. Some authorities hope that the pill, prescribed for "the girl in trouble," the youngster whose sex impulses cannot be controlled, will at least prevent the tragedy of the illegitimate, unwanted child. Dr. Edward Tyler, president of the American Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians, says his clinic in Los Angeles follows the principle of giving birth-control help to girls who have had a baby or who are brought in by mothers saying they are afraid the daughters will become pregnant. In New York the Planned Parenthood clinics follow a similar rule, and if parents or guardians are not available, the girls are accepted for help on referral by a social or health agency, a clergyman or a physician.

As for the controversial issue of sex on the college campus, some college officials doubt the pill is really encouraging freer sex activity there. Though ministers and moralists are highly vocal about "the rapid breakdown of sexual moral standards" among the young, many administrators insist that the situation today is no different from what it has always been.

"We have about 5 percent whom I would call sexually active," observes Dr. Richard Moy, young head of the student health service at the University of Chicago. "But that's the same 5 percent we've always had. As for the pills, many girls have them when they come to school. Their family doctors at home have prescribed them. Or they borrow from each other or use the prescription of a married sister. Or they put on an engagement ring and get them as part of preparation for marriage. It's not a very formidable task to obtain the pills." A doctor on the west coast says, "I'm sure many are sold in the drugstores without prescriptions, and there is certainly a lot of pill swapping, like sugar or eggs."

Some investigators and many students insist that promiscuity is no more acceptable today than it was 40 years ago. Nevitt Sanford, professor of education and psychology at Stanford University, reports in the National Education Association Journal that on the basis of 12 years of studies at three schools—an eastern women's college, a western State university and a private college in the west, "there has been no revolutionary change in the status of premarital intercourse since the 1920's." He finds that between 20 and 30 percent of the women in his samples were not virgins at the time of graduation, and he thinks this is about the same percentage that existed in the 1920's.

A number of college girls interviewed on these questions believe there has been an increase in premarital intercourse, but not in the direction of promiscuity. "There is a more sensible assessment of the problem than our parents used to make," one girl explained. "I don't think that promiscuity is condoned any more today than it ever was. But sex between people in love, people who hope or expect their relationship to grow into marriage, is much more common." Nor do the girls think the rise in premarital sex is due to the pill.

Mrs. Mary-jane Snyder, of the Chicago Planned Parenthood staff, had a discussion on several topics with girls from a half-dozen colleges. On the subject of the pills, one of them said, "A lot of girls who were using other precautions have changed to the pills, I think—in fact, I know. But that's just like changing from the horse and buggy to the automobile—it's progress." Another agreed. "No, I don't think the pill has changed campus morals. The change was there. The pills just make it easier." A third girl remarked, "Just think what the automobile did to increase sex activity. Don't forget, though, there are still a lot of girls left with strong old moral fiber."

"I wish it didn't seem so old-fashioned to have high moral values," one coed commented. "So many girls would just love to be able to say out loud that they think too much is being made of the importance of sex. The silly thing is that it's sort of embarrassing to admit that you disapprove. It's 'the thing' to sound modern and blasé even if you aren't. For this reason, one can get a false impression of the percentage of girls who indulge."

A faculty member at a big eastern university also doubts the pill has been a factor in changing campus morals, although he notes that "a great many girls are taking the pills, girls whose mothers send them to school all informed and ready."

"It seems to me that the changed circumstances between the sexes is the crucial factor," observes John Munro, dean of Harvard University. "The independence of women, for example. Going steady—the steady companionship of individual couples—is another aspect. Boys and girls are so much more companionable than ever before. Girls can do so much more, too. Families will send a couple of girls to Europe unchaperoned, for example. Or boys and girls start off together on some idealistic mission. But the young people, depending much on each other, become sexually entangled. Then one of them gets tired of the situation and the other suffers emotionally, and what you have is divorce before marriage, which can be pretty hard on these people." But one girl asks: "So long as we have no child—thanks to the pill—our relationship affects only ourselves. Why is this so wrong, when no one else gets hurt?"

A controversy over birth-control pills recently flared on the campus of Pembroke College, the women's division of Brown University, in Providence, R.I. A 19-year-old reporter for the Pembroke Record, a campus paper, called on Dr. Roswell D. Johnson, the Pembroke College health director, without identifying herself as a reporter, and asked for a prescription for the pills. In her article she wrote that she had "obtained a tentative prescription," though she went on to say she was "refused a prescription for the time being on the grounds that she was under age." Her story claimed Dr. Johnson did not mention any need for parental permission.

Dr. Johnson flatly contradicted the reporter on this point, saying he couldn't even begin to talk to her about prescribing pills for her because she was under 21. "I also told her the only way she could get them was for her parents to write and request me to prescribe them," he said, "and when I added, 'I assume you're not in the mood to write to them?' she replied, 'Oh-h-h, no-o-o.'

"Anyone over 21, however, is a free agent," Dr. Johnson remarked, although he said he had actually prescribed the pills for only two unmarried students, and both of them were planning to be married. He added that if a girl asked him for a pill prescription he wanted to know why she wanted it. "I want to feel I'm contributing to a good solid relationship and not to promiscuity," he said.

Mrs. Annabelle Cooper, executive director of the Washtenaw County League for Planned Parenthood, in Ann Arbor, Mich., finds no perceptible increase in the number of unmarried college girls under 21 applying to the clinic for contraceptives. "Those who want contraceptives can get them so easily at the corner drugstore," she says, "that they usually don't come to us. The pills aren't available there without prescription, of course, nor the intrauterine devices nor the diaphragms. But foams and condoms are."

The Washtenaw clinic's policy statement on services to unmarried women is clear and decisive:

Contraceptive services are given to all women 21 years or older, all married women under 21, and all unmarried mothers 21 or under "upon consideration." "All women under 21 who are definitely engaged are given contraceptive service prior to marriage," the statement continues. "All others are counseled, but given contraceptive service only with their parents' permission."

The premarital counseling and examination will be given as long as 3 months before marriage. "We have trained social workers who try to determine if a young girl is really going to be married," Mrs. Cooper explained. "Occasionally we see a girl who is 'premarital' for a long as 2 years."

Among young couples who have premarital intercourse, many actually refuse to use contraceptives. In addition to those who observe a religious prohibition, there are couples who believe that the use of any contraceptive is "too premeditated," or is "not sincere." "Some felt 'planned intercourse' was not romantic, and was too great a transgression of standards," says Dr. Joseph Katz, of Stanford. "I believe this is one of the biggest factors in unwanted pregnancies."

Occasionally one finds a lonely, unloved girl who wants to become pregnant, even though she has no hope of marrying the baby's father. And there is always the girl who tries to snare a boy by this means. In contrast with these girls is the one whose story a university official said he had every reason to believe. Even though she was not having intercourse, she still was taking the pills, she told him, because when she turned down a man she wanted it to be a matter of her own free choice and not because she was scared.

With her bewildering reasoning, the girl had touched upon what may be the only inarguable conclusion that can be drawn about the impact of the birth-control revolution on sex behavior: In cases where fear of pregnancy was the sole deterrent, the reliability of the new contraceptives has removed that fear.

MORMON CHURCH NOT INVOLVED IN POLITICAL ALINEMENTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial published in the Church News of March 26, 1966, entitled "Politics and Religion," printed in the RECORD.

The Church News is a section that appears weekly in the Deseret News, a daily newspaper that has been published in Salt Lake City since 1850. This newspaper is wholly owned, and is published by, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The Church News section is devoted to matters that are of interest to the members of the Mormon Church.

Recent activities of some of the members of the Mormon Church have brought charges that the church is favorably disposed toward the John Birch Society. The church has now officially spoken directly on this subject, and the editorial carries the message.

I should point out that this is not the first time that the presidency of the church has spoken and made it abundantly clear that the church was not involved in political alinements. Those who have charged the church of affiliation with, or sympathy for, or even any interest in, the John Birch Society, would do well to read this editorial.

It is devoutly to be hoped that this ringing editorial, disassociating the church from Communists, racists, and Birchers, will lay at rest for all time charges that have been made concerning the Mormon Church and the John Birch Society.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND RELIGION

The United States has a divinely appointed mission in the world. It was set up as a free Nation in the last days by act of God. This was predicted by the Savior when He ministered among the Nephites and was shown also to Nephi in his vision of the future.

The mission of the United States was plainly portrayed by the Savior when He said: "It is wisdom in the Father that they (the Gentiles) should be established in this land and be set up as a free people by the power of the Father that these things (true Gospel teachings) might come forth from them unto a remnant of your seed that the covenant of the Father may be fulfilled which He hath covenanted with His people, O house of Israel." (3 Nephi 21:4).

In a miraculous manner "these things" were restored in the latter days in the only land on earth which was free enough to permit it.

Under the sheltering power of this great government, the Lord's work has spread from border to border, and from here has been taken to all other free nations.

American passports are a protection to the missionaries as they traverse the world. Embassies have assured fair treatment to these ambassadors of Christ as citizens, and under the American flag our servicemen have introduced the Gospel where no missionaries had ventured. This, of course, was during wartime.

The Savior's prediction thus far has seen a great fulfillment. But, it is not yet complete. The destiny of America will continue on into the future, as will also the work of the church.

At times, America's position has been challenged, both from within and without. Our Constitution, divinely given, has been called into question; our flag has been desecrated, our citizens outraged. Mistakes in administration have disturbed the course of the ship of state, but Providence has continued with us.

Groups have formed both to protect and to undermine our way of life. Riots have been fomented by misguided and, at times, vicious leaders. Anarchy has been invited.

Pressure groups have taken sides against each other, often also against the best interests of the Nation. Unwise and sometimes evil persons have been elected to public office and their sacred trust occasionally has been abused for unrighteous purposes.

Good citizens wonder what may be done to steady the ship of state. Should they join any of the special groups pulling one way or another? And if so, which one? How can they tell which is good or bad? The names of some organizations are frighteningly misleading, in fact deliberately deceptive. Some which have a patriotic appearance in reality are the opposite.

What can Latter-day Saints do? In which direction should they turn?

There is one safe path for members of the church. That is found in righteously living the Gospel and following the precedent of the church in obeying both the laws of the land and the laws of God.

We have been taught to avoid extremes and extremists, whether in the word of wisdom, in politics or in any other area of thought. The Lord's work is not accomplished by immoderate measures and radical groups.

At the beginning of this dispensation in one of the revelations to the Prophet Joseph Smith the Lord said: "No one can assist in this work except he shall be humble and full of love, having faith, hope, and charity, being temperate in all things." (D. & C. 12: 8)

At another time He said: "Be patient, be sober, be temperate; have patience, faith, hope and charity." (D. & C. 6: 19)

The Lord justifies us in defending our Constitution and this land for which it was written. But He does not justify radicalism in doing so. Anyone who reads His pronouncement on war may see how really temperate and patient He is. (D. & C. 98: 23–48)

The great men of our Nation have never been extremists. Washington certainly was not. Lincoln was patience and kindness personified. He felt that the strength of the Nation rested in the masses of the common people, not in pressure groups. "* * * of the people, by the people and for the people."

Some have accused the church of being communistic because it once taught the United Order. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Communism is anti-Christ. The church is the church of Jesus Christ, established by Him and for His purposes.

Some others have wondered if the church is involved in such groups as the John Birch Society, but it is no more a part of that group than of any other political aggregation.

The church has nothing to do with Communists, nothing to do with racists, nothing to do with Birchers, nothing to do with any slanted group. But it does have everything to do with the eternal salvation of human souls.

Furthermore, let it be remembered that it is a church, not a political organization. It takes no sides politically. It does stand for moral issues. Its members have free agency as citizens. Knowing that a one-party system means a dictatorship, it favors a two- or multiple-party system. It stands for free elections and law-abiding practices.

It teaches that the best way to safeguard America is through righteous Gospel living so that we may earn the divine protection which is promised if the citizenry will but serve the God of the land.

WASHINGTON AIRPORT MESS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, yesterday, the Wall Street Journal published a front page story discussing the Washington airport mess.

The article written by Burt Schorr is an objective presentation of the many problems facing Dulles International Airport. It points out how these problems will be compounded if jet passenger service is inaugurated at Washington National Airport.

As Mr. Schorr points out, Dulles is costing the taxpayers $7.3 million annually. An economic feasibility study prepared by Operations Research, Inc. for the Federal Aviation Agency shows that opening National to two- and three-engine jets will cost the Federal Government an additional $85 million in lost revenue between now and 1980.

If one adds to those amounts the possible expenditure of $150 million for new terminal facilities at National Airport, he is suddenly faced with the realization that the public will end up being taken for a ride by the FAA at a total cost of approximately $300 million by 1980.

By my standards, Mr. President, that is a lot of money. Furthermore, it is a wasteful expenditure at a time when we must economize and eliminate unnecessary expenditures.

Last weekend, WTOP radio broadcast an interview with former FAA Administrator Najeeb E. Halaby, now a senior vice president of Pan American World Airways.

Mr. Halaby pointed out that Washington National Airport was built for the DC-3 and is most ill-equipped to handle modern jet traffic. He further stated that National Airport is already the most congested airport in the Nation. The accuracy of Mr. Halaby's remarks can be attested to by anyone who uses National Airport.

Congress has established that the FAA should not operate Dulles and National Airports at a profit—but by the same token, however, Congress did not intend for those airports to be a continuing drain on the U.S. Treasury. No airport authority in the entire country loses money on its airports like the FAA—they could not afford it.

I submit, Mr. President, that it is time for Congress to make crystal clear it will not continue to underwrite the losses now incurred at these two airports. We should call upon the FAA's Administrator, William McKee, to prepare a sound management plan within the next 6 months which will place the airports' finances on an even keel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Schorr's article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Airport of Tomorrow," Washington's Dulles, Has Problems Aplenty—Distant Field Operates at Some 20 Percent of Capacity; Jets' Debut at National Is New Threat

(By Burt Schorr)

Chantilly, Va.—The Federal Aviation Agency's "fact book" about Government-owned Dulles International Airport promises visitors a 250-room hotel and two office buildings near the soaring glass-walled terminal. But the sites are still vacant.

Inside the echoing terminal itself, the men's apparel shop and the duty-free liquor store have folded. Other concessionaires are being allowed to pay less than the minimum rent. Four local-service airlines whose dates for starting Dulles operations were "to be announced," according to the June 1963 fact book, still haven't shown up.

Clearly, the Washington area's "airport of tomorrow" is finding that tomorrow is a long time in arriving; certainly longer than the Government expected. When Dulles opened in November 1962, the FAA predicted it would be handling 2,600,000 passengers annually by 1965. Instead, fewer than 1,000,000 used Dulles last year, and the FAA estimates the airport is operating at only about 20 percent of present capacity.

The agency insists that aviation growth and technological advances such as the supersonic transport will justify the Government's $109 million investment in Dulles by the mid-1970's. "Dulles benefited from the lesson of aviation history that airports usually require rebuilding 5 years after completion," asserts one FAA official.

HALABY AND HINDSIGHT

But, reluctantly, the man who was FAA administrator when the airport was opened expresses a contrary view, "Hindsight may indicate that Dulles was opened too soon and too far from the city center," concedes Najeeb E. Halaby, now a senior vice president of Pan American World Airways.

The troubles besetting the 10,000-acre airport 27 miles west of the capital's center likely will be compounded when, starting April 24, small and medium-size jet planes will be allowed to operate regularly at the only other Government-owned civil field, Washington National Airport, along the Potomac only 4 miles south of the city.

The FAA long resisted pressure from carriers and communities to open 67-acre National Airport to jets. "Every pound (of cargo) and every passenger that lands at Washington National in a jet is a passenger and a pound that does not land at Dulles International," Mr. Halaby, then FAA Administrator, told a House committee last year. Republican Representative Joel Broyhill, whose Virginia congressional district includes part of Dulles as well as National, wishes jets would remain banned from National for 2 more years; he says one reason for building Dulles was the "dangerous congestion" at National, which handled nearly 7 million passengers last year. He has support in the Maryland congressional delegation, whose members see any curbs at National as a benefit to Baltimore's city-owned Friendship International Airport, 32 miles north of Washington.

While most Congressmen, frequent airline users, would be loath to see National's convenience restricted, some on Capitol Hill believe Dulles' financial plight might at least bring on a formal inquiry into the big airport's future. Dulles' net book loss, counting interest and depreciation, is running at a rate of $7.3 million a year. The FAA, which initially assured Congress that the airport would repay its assigned capital costs over 30 years, now figures the payback at 35 years, and a former FAA official who played a leading role in the Dulles planning says that, under present conditions, it might take 45 years.

The biggest handicap for Dulles is its remote location. The 40-minute ride to Washington, much of it through beautiful rolling countryside, compares favorably with the time required to reach the city from such urban airports as Chicago's O'Hare International and New York's Kennedy International. What those airports don't face, however, is a major competitor like National only 15 minutes from downtown. Also, the limousine ride from Dulles costs $2.50, versus $1.35 from National, and the cab fare is a stiff $13.

"Naturally the businessman with an appointment at a Government office prefers being routed to National," says the vice president in charge of airport planning for a major trunkline.

"We're in the business of selling time savings," says Edwin L. Colodny, Allegheny Airlines senior vice president for legal affairs and economic research. Allegheny, which serves National but not Dulles, carries its average passenger only 198 miles, Mr. Colodny says, "and if we take him to an airport that's 30 minutes farther away from Washington we've lost him 50 percent of his time savings."

The trunklines have agreed informally with the FAA to maintain 89 of the present 103 daily arrivals and departures at Dulles after National opens to jets (Braniff International Airways intends to transfer from Dulles its 14 daily arrivals and departures of twin-jet BAC-111's). What's uncertain, however, is how many Dulles passengers might be lured to National by the shorter flying times there.

A jet flight from National Airport to Chicago, say, could connect with a nonstop flight on to Los Angeles, competing directly with present Los Angeles flights from Dulles. Also, jets at National will mean more seats and improved schedules. Delta Air Lines, for one, now serves National with three daily DC-7 flights totaling 231 seats. After April 24 it will replace two of these propeller flights with three DC-9 jets, making four flights and 272 seats. The anticipated addition of one or more stretched DC-9's carrying up to 90 passengers could improve Delta's service at National still more.

Dulles boasts two costly innovations that have yet to prove their value—its own 14½-mile limited-access highway to help link it with the city, and 21 mobile lounges to carry passengers between terminal and aircraft parked as much as a mile away.

The approach ramps to the $19.3 million four-lane highway deliberately prevent westbound motorists from getting off except at the airport and prevent Washington-bound drivers from getting on anyplace but there. The intention is to avoid congestion—but so far there's been little danger of that.

The mobile lounges, 90-passenger buses built by Chrysler Corp., cost a total of $6.5 million including development expenses. They represent a radical departure from conventional airport traffic-flow techniques; significantly, no other American airport uses them or intends to.

"An unproved experiment," is how Joseph A. Foster, Houston's director of aviation, describes them. Houston investigated the Dulles design in great depth before settling on its own $150 million design for Houston International Airport, due to open in June 1967. "We simply couldn't afford to take the same risk as the Federal Government."

The purpose of the mobile lounge is to reduce walking distance for passengers. But the 21 lounges at Dulles require a driver-supervisor force of 44 men. And the terminal was built big enough to house gates for 24 lounges; less than half that many are needed to accommodate current traffic. A less costly alternative would have been to construct a terminal to which loading fingers could be added as needed. Houston's technique for shortening walking distances will be to set its terminal buildings and parking lots in a row between two loading aprons, with access provided by a vehicular tunnel.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PAT McNAMARA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, no one can regret the announced retirement of Senator Pat McNamara of Michigan more than I. Since 1958, I have served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with this distinguished gentleman, and we have formed a relationship of more than respect; that of good personal friends. Pat McNamara is one of my best friends in this body. It is with sadness that I see him retire. His sense of honor called him to retirement, because of his ill health.

When Pat McNamara says that he believes he might not be able to give full justice to his Senate responsibilities, that means far more than it would for any normal man, for Senator McNamara has set high standards for himself. In general, he has achieved his goals.

Senator McNamara has been a supporter of the cold war GI bill every year since it was first introduced in 1959. He has given his total support to seeing that five million cold war veterans received educational opportunities and a fair chance in life.

Senator McNamara has without a doubt been one of the most valuable and influential members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in history, supporting all progressive, remedial, beneficial legislation to strengthen the health, education, and welfare opportunities of the people of this country.

As chairman of the Public Works Committee, Pat McNamara demonstrated that his interest ran to every area in this great country, and that his vision was broad and enough to encompass every facet of our economy.

The absence of this great man, who has done so much for this Nation and for his home State of Michigan, will be dearly felt in the Senate, just as the beneficial results of the many programs he has fostered will be felt for years to come throughout the United States. We will miss him most of all in the committees where he was such a faithful worker for progress. We will miss him everywhere in Washington.

THE INDIVIDUAL CASUALTY IN VIETNAM—A RADIO BROADCAST FROM SAIGON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think we all have a tendency to become hardened by press reports of dozens of battles involving thousands of men. Arthur Koestler observed once that "Statistics do not bleed." Amidst the tumult and the shouting we frequently lose sight of the individual casualty—and of the tragic cost of war.

A recent radio broadcast from Saigon movingly elaborated on the meaning of this cost. The radio correspondent is a constituent of mine, Clyde Edwin Pettit, who traveled around the world on assignment of Station KBBA in Benton, Ark., and did some most incisive reporting on the war in Vietnam.

The station to which I refer is owned by David McDonald, Winston Riddle, and Mel Spann of my State. It is a small station, without the budget or the staff or the facilities of the large networks or the weekly news magazines. But like many other small stations and periodicals throughout our country, they try to do a good job of honest and accurate reporting. I believe that stations like this are to be commended on their high level of public service programing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of one of Mr. Pettit's series of broadcasts be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Broadcast From Saigon

For KBBA news, this is Ed Pettit reporting from Saigon.

This is the last of our letters from Vietnam.

In these broadcasts we could have been talking about battalions and regiments, about casualties and statistics, about tactics and strategy. But instead we've been talking about people, about GI's and Vietnamese. For it takes people to fight a war. And when wars end, as all wars must someday end, men may look back on days gone by, may reminisce of the pleasures of conquest, or of comradeship, or of common fears once fleetingly known.

But those who have seen the face of war are never nostalgic about war itself. For no man can honestly glorify nor glamorize war. That is, no one who has really been there.

For war is the men in the camps, and the women who follow the camps, and it is also disease as well as death or destruction. And it is drudgery—plain hard work and the monotony of being "support troops"—the totally important men without which there could be no war. Many would like to be in combat, but they are support troops, knowing that for the rest of their lives they will be asked, "Were you ever in combat?" They will hesitate and answer, but they now know they will never be able to explain that simply being here in Vietnam can be dangerous, and that any man is in combat the instant somebody tries to kill him.

War is the infinite beauty of a verdant jungle anguished by a piercing animal shriek of one man bayoneting another. And his last breath is the final, pitiable groan of one you didn't even know, could hardly hate, and of whom you might have been a friend under other circumstances.

For war is taking, and war is giving, and war is the sharing of common hopes and dreams.

War is walking warily in the steps of the man in front of you, and the funny feeling of knowing that if your friend steps on a land mine he will be the one to get it. Only the first man knows how it feels to walk in front.

War is the tension of being a target, and, for some, of being hit by your own men because somebody made a mistake.

If you're a civilian here, war is the chance to make a quick killing in the black market. Or, perhaps, to quick killing, period, if you are paid well enough. Or, for some civilians, the chance to see your house burned to the ground by a bomb. Or to see your father's head cut off before your eyes.

War is the warm, rich blood of a man washing away and mixing with the black mud of the Mekong River, each cell of his blood stamped by his heredity with the uniqueness that made him, once, an individual.

So war is the wicked waste and destruction of the wonder of life itself.

Perhaps the worst thing about war is that it changes the laughter of those who love life into the weeping of new wives and young widows. War is hardest on the living, on those who must carry on, tortured by poignant memories of the past, racked with the bitter reality of the irrevocable, destined always to wonder, pointlessly, what might have been.

War is death, and death is an indiscriminate harlot who chooses capriciously with whom she will lie in fatal embrace—the coward today, the brave man tomorrow.

And war is something that puts the really important things in their proper perspective: things like survival and health.

War is the triumphantly happy smile on the face of a kid who has just been told by a doctor that only a few more operations and he may be able to see again.

In war there is the joy of simple things: of tasting a chocolate milk shake, or a cold beer, or of getting to see a Hollywood movie out in the field at night even if the mosquitoes are biting you. And perhaps the greatest pleasure of all: the joy of a shower once a week, if you're lucky.

War is a bunch of guys having a last game of touch football before going out on a patrol from which some may never return.

War is the wandering mind of a young man on guard duty, thinking wistfully of a fireplace in Vermont, or a girl in Tennessee, or a hotrod in California.

War is a bangalore mine blowing the guts out of a guy from Grand Rapids.

War is the form of what once was a man, covered by flies, in a half-forgotten foreign field.

This might have been a doctor or a druggist from Des Moines or a farmer in Florida or a crop-dusting pilot from Pine Bluff, or he might have been a happy failure.

But now he is a statistic: only one of the casualties termed "moderate" in the press reports and by the politicians.

Of course, a nation must never fear to fight aggression and tyranny. But it would be a disservice to the dead not to pause and, out of respect, consider the cost.

For the cost of war is in the millions: the millions of homes that will never be built, the millions who will die from diseases that would have been conquered by medical research were it not for the cost of war.

The cost of war is in the billions: the billions of days that will never be lived.

CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO.'S HUGE EXPORTS HELP OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, recently I read an editorial published in the Peoria, Ill., Journal Star on the subject of the Caterpillar Tractor Co.'s huge volume of exports.

This matter assumes national significance when we consider its beneficial effect on our balance-of-payments position. In 1965, Caterpillar sold to customers outside the United States $461 million worth of products built in the United States by American workmen. If only a few more U.S. firms could show a record like this, we might possibly have no balance-of-payments problem at all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Caterpillar Shows the Way on Exports," published in the Tuesday, February 8, edition of the Peoria Journal Star, printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Caterpillar Shows the Way on Exports

A couple of years ago it was fashionable among those whose prejudices automatically expect perfidy and doubletalk from "management" to suspect and expect the worst from Caterpillar overseas expansion.

Today, the actual performance and experience demonstrates that, in fact, Caterpillar management's explanations, projections, and pronouncements on their future operations were accurate and wise.

The latest annual report to the stockholders reveals that exports have so increased as to jump already high figures by 20 percent in the income from overseas sales. This increase they have reported in the context of the balance of payments and of how (responding to the crying need the President has sounded) they have contributed $461 million to a more favorable balance. The previous year it had climbed to $373 million.

This is of key benefit to the entire financial position of the United States with its delicate situation on gold in foreign trade, but the direct nature of the benefit lies in the fact that it is of goods manufactured in our plants and sold overseas.

The 25 percent of overseas sales that is actually manufactured overseas has "opened doors" whereby the 75 percent overseas sales being made of products made here exceeds all previous sales put together.

Net gain is spectacular, and is precisely what Caterpillar predicted, and the gainers are not just Government with its eye on foreign trade balance but the tens of thousands of workers engaged in making the equipment here that is thus being sold abroad.

The increase once again emphasizes the plain fact that Caterpillar's success, its employment level, and its ability to meet cost levels depend on the ability of the company to make sales in other countries.

As a leader in this complex field, Caterpillar has also passed on some of its knowledge and techniques to others, and assisted Governor Kerner in his efforts to stimulate overseas sales for Illinois firms.

It is no accident that the Manufacturers News, in announcing the 1966 directory of Illinois manufacturer's, calls attention proudly to the fact that "Illinois industry is developing new international muscle."

More than 5,000 Illinois firms now sell goods and services throughout the world. Almost 20 percent of the manufacturing and processing firms in this Midwestern State now do business overseas.

Meanwhile some 1,500 firms moved into Illinois locations during 1965 and only 3 moved out to locations elsewhere.

There is a connection.

The Governor deserves due credit for recognizing that the grassroots base for resolving economic problems, for having a base to support governmental efforts in solving social problems, and for maintaining key services lies in increased industry.

He deserves credit for working effectively in that direction, and for recognizing the key importance of export sales to it.

Caterpillar deserves credit for pioneering in this field and for giving every expert assistance to the Governor's program and to other firms interested in doing business in foreign lands.

Everyone is better off for it, just as we would all find ourselves worse off if this State had stood still in this field of activity.

Caterpillar has thus also demonstrated, with dramatic results, the honesty, integrity, and accuracy of its announcements on future plans of this kind, and its effective concern for the United States, this State, this community, and the security of its own work force.

Talk is talk, and facts are facts.

We have again been shown that the two go together at Caterpillar, and this, too, is a matter of great importance to this community.

HANKSVILLE TELEPHONE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is very hard to believe that in the year 1966, when we see daily feats of electronic gadgetry, that some areas of this great Nation are just barely catching up with some of our most commonplace achievements.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Congressional Record, following my remarks, a feature article written by William F. Smiley, the education editor for the Salt Lake Tribune.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Mr. Smiley's article tells how a small school at Hanksville, Wayne County, Utah, has just had its first private telephone installed. Through a Ford Foundation grant, the school was able to have a telephone installed along with a complex amplifying system so that each of the 37 students in the 2 classrooms can participate in telephone discussions with a caller.

It is also particularly interesting to note that the telephone is the only private line in the community of Hanksville. There are three other phones in the town, all of them pay stations at commercial establishments.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Arthur H. Lee, the Wayne County school superintendent and Mrs. Elayne Schwartz, a teacher at the school, for taking the initiative and securing Ford assistance for this project. As Mrs. Schwartz says in the article:

> Education should teach children to live as well as how to work in the world about them.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Exhibit 1

[From the Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune, Mar. 31, 1966]

When Telephone Rings, Hanksville Hails World

(By William F. Smiley)

When the telephone rings in the Hanksville schoolroom sometime next month—

Wait a minute. Telephone? In the Hanksville schoolroom?

Why there are only three telephones in Hanksville, all pay stations and operated on a magneto (hand crank) system. There's no telephone in the school.

Or in the homes of the schoolchildren.

That's why Mrs. Elayne C. Schwartz, one of two teachers at the school, got the support of the Wayne County Board of Education, Supt. Arthur H. Lee and the Ford Foundation to put a telephone in the school, complete with amplifier so that the 20 children in her class and the 17 in George L. Morrell's room can roll back the dividing wall and talk from their desks and hear the person on the other end of the telephone without leaving their desks.

LOCATION: CENTRAL NOWHERE

Hanksville, located in the central nowhere of Wayne County, is 55 miles from any other town, its television reception is poor, it has those three toll stations, and it has had electricity for only 6 years.

So, when the telephone rings in the Hanksville schoolroom sometime next month, everything will come to a halt while Mrs. Schwartz flips a switch and brings "The world to us."

That is the name of the Ford Foundation project.

OUT OF ISOLATION

"Education should teach children to live as well as how to work in the world about them," Mrs. Schwartz said. "These children know about such a small part of the world because of their geographic isolation. It is difficult for them to imagine that there is anything beyond the shale mounds to the west, the undulating washes to the north and south, and the mighty crevice of the Dirty Devil River to the east."

OPERATING THE AMPLIFIER

The Hanksville telephones are operated from the Price exchange of the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., and Philip B. Horsley, manager, said the school installation will be made "as soon as our engineers solve a method of operating the amplifier on a magneto basis."

It will require designing of a special circuit to make the amplifier work, he said.

THE MANY FACES OF CRIME

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have here an address on crime by my distinguished college from Massachusetts, Senator Edward Kennedy.

The address, delivered to the Boston University Symposium on Crime, April 1, 1966, is a carefully thought out comment on this Nation's crime problem, and it reflects a rare insight of the basic issues confronting not only law enforcement, but the courts and the public if the current threat to law and order is to be justly resolved.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Many Faces of Crime

(Address by Senator Edward M. Kennedy before the Boston University Symposium on Crime, Boston, Mass., April 1, 1966)

I am delighted to be here tonight to participate with you in this weekend symposium. I congratulate Boston University's Student Congress for planning this program—which seems an extremely constructive approach to an urgent social problem concerning us all.

The fact of crime is as old as civilization itself—only the definition has changed. In 1639 our Pilgrim Fathers considered unusual dress a crime and churches were urged to prosecute those who "followed new fashion and fell to excessive costliness in attire."

Twenty years later in Massachusetts, the alleged crime of witchcraft sent people to the stake and a few years later the crime of selling liquor to the Indians sent liquor dealers to the whipping block.

These so-called crimes are no longer on our statute books. But the fact of crime continues to affect us all, and far more significantly than it affected the lives of our Pilgrim Fathers.

No human need is more elemental than personal security. No freedom is more basic than freedom from fear. Yet if we cannot feel safe and secure in our homes and on our streets, we are not fully free. The first duty of government, as Thomas Hobbes observed centuries ago, is to provide that protection and that security.

But our personal security is now being threatened by the high rate of crime—and the threat is growing.

The crime rate in this country has doubled since 1940; the dollar costs of crime run to tens of billions of dollars annually; and the human costs of crime, both physical and psychological, are so staggering they cannot really be computed.

Some say this growth in crime is due to a weakening of our country's moral fiber, a growing disrespect for the law encouraged by the civil rights demonstrations of recent years. Others seek to place the blame on recent court decisions expanding the constitutional safeguards we afford individuals accused of crimes.

I think judgments such as these are both misguided and dangerous. They are misguided because they precede rather than follow a careful and rational analysis of the problem involved.

And they are dangerous because, by seeking solace for fears rather than knowledge for solutions, these judgments tend to divert attention from the real causes of crime and to pose a threat to our courts and our Constitution—historically the strongest bulwarks of our democratic society.

We must not blame the crime rate on criminal coddling or bleeding-heart judges. Nor must we choose between the rights our Constitution affords every citizen—including the right to peacefully demonstrate—and the right of each citizen to public safety and protection.

The protection of our constitutional rights requires vigilance. There is a natural tendency, as the crime rate rises, to relax the safeguards we afford all people in order to obtain more convictions of the guilty. We must guard against this tendency. We must work toward a system of criminal justice which both provides safety and protection for all members of society and at the same time guarantees to every American those essential safeguards contained in our Bill of Rights.

The firm observance of these constitutional rights may allow some of the guilty to avoid conviction. This is the conscious choice we make, for example, when we insist upon the right of the indigent to be represented by counsel. But it is also the price a free society must pay for the values it places on individual rights and personal dignity. I think we are strong enough to afford that price.

Our expanding effort to protect the right of the individual is not a satisfactory explanation for the crime problem. What, then, is the explanation, and what is the solution?

There is no single or simple answer to our crime problem. Indeed, there is a great deal about the phenomena of criminal behavior about which we know very little. But some basic things we do know.

We know that crime is a national problem. We know that it must be attacked at all levels of government, that we all have a responsibility to combat it. And—because crime has so many faces—we know that we must seek not pat answers which reinforce our prejudices, but mature and sophisticated explanations which enable us to match our national concern over crime with a blueprint for action—a strategy for tomorrow upon which we can agree as a nation.

Let me offer you a few examples of the many faces of crime.

A drug addict breaks into a New York apartment in search of something of value to finance his next purchase of narcotics. This is crime.

A police officer is murdered by a man attempting to rob a bank—a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison, but who prison failed to rehabilitate. This is crime.

Then there are those for whom crime is a business—those who feed off the weaknesses and ills of others, who support and profit from the traffic in narcotics, prostitution, and illegal gambling. They are the true leeches of our society. This most assuredly is crime.

And finally, a petty quarrel in Watts explodes into violent riot, arson, looting, and murder. This, too, is crime.

Each of these examples represents a different kind of social problem. Each requires special study, special attention, and the application of special skills. Each represents one of the many faces of crime. I could enumerate many others. I have chosen these few examples, because in each instance I have named, it seems to me that our Nation, through ignorance and public indifference, shares the blame for the criminal activity.

Consider first the problem of drug addiction, a spawning ground for all types of crime.

For far too long, this country has treated drug addicts as if they were ordinary criminals, rather than the victims of a serious disease. Because of our ignorance and indifference, we have failed both the addicts and ourselves.

As a result, drug addiction has increased at such a rate that there are today some 60,000 to 100,000 addicts in the United States. They consume some $350 million worth of heroin a year, and their habits—financed by petty crime—are exploited by organized crime feeding on the spread of this disease.

If we are to arrest this malignancy—if we are to fight the different faces of crime which flow from drug addiction—we need a new direction. Some of us in Congress are working now on legislation which would offer to addicts, under Federal jurisdiction, some hope of rehabilitation, by providing for civil commitment rather than imprisonment, for those addicts charged with or convicted of a Federal offense, who can benefit from medical treatment.

Under the proposed law, selected addicts would be placed in medical facilities under the supervision of the Attorney General and the Surgeon General. After it was determined that the addict had responded to treatment, he would be returned to his community under a carefully supervised community after-care program.

There is good reason to believe that this approach will return many more addicts to a normal life. California, which pioneered this kind of program in 1961, has had remarkable success with it. About half of those committed under the California program have returned to their communities and have not gone back to narcotics.

This kind of plan is not what the layman thinks of when he considers crime and punishment. But it is the kind of plan which I believe can make a significant contribution to our national fight against crime. I hope my own State of Massachusetts, following the lead of States such as California and New York will seriously consider adopting a similar approach.

Narcotics addiction is a personal aspect of the crime problem. Another aspect is an institutional one, flowing from the very nature of our federal system.

Crime detection and law enforcement have been traditionally a matter for State and local authorities. Yet in some areas the interstate nature of criminal activity makes effective regulation by local officials impossible without Federal support. This is the case with organized crime. And this is why Congress has taken concrete steps in recent years to enlarge the power of the Federal Government in the investigation and prosecution of professional racketeers, and why it is presently considering further action in this area, including measures to increase the protection our Government can provide its witnesses, both from physical violence and from further prosecution.

But new legislation is needed not only to control interstate criminal activity—but also to control the weapons which are used in the commission of crime.

There is no question that the rise in violent crimes in this country can be attributed to a significant degree to the ease with which any person—a criminal, a juvenile, a lunatic—can obtain dangerous and lethal firearms. In 1963 alone, some 1 million weapons were sold by mail order. Over a 3-year period in Chicago, for example, about 4,000 persons bought weapons from just two mail-order dealers. One fourth of these persons had criminal records. Every 2 minutes somebody in the United States is killed, maimed, beaten or robbed with a gun, and the indiscriminate sale of firearms without control or regulation makes this grim statistic possible.

Only last week members of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, of which I am a member, reported out a firearms control bill providing some basic minimum controls over mail-order interstate traffic in firearms and the importation of firearms into this country. This bill is only a first step. Our State governments will also have to take legislative action if there is to be effective control over this senseless traffic in dangerous weapons, because the Federal bill does not attempt to regulate the traffic in firearms within a State.

But Federal action is clearly a necessary step. For unless the Federal Government regulates gun traffic between States even the strongest State gun control laws will continue to be easily circumvented. Massachusetts, for example, has stringent gun regulations. But, as Commissioner Caples of the Massachusetts Department of Public Safety pointed out before our Senate committee, the Massachusetts law has not been fully effective because of the ease with which guns can be obtained elsewhere. In fact, 87 percent of the concealable firearms used in Massachusetts crimes came from out-of-State purchases. Massachusetts is helpless to deal with this problem, but the Federal Government is not. I believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to act on this, and without further delay.

There is strong opposition to such legislation from the National Rifle Association and other influential groups. And this opposition is both well organized and well financed.

The legislative budget of the National Rifle Association has gone up more than 30 percent a year since Federal gun legislation was first introduced. One mailing alone to the membership of the NRA urging opposition to the bill cost some $70,000—over half the annual budget of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. And that letter, by the very admission of NRA officials, contained errors and exaggerations about the provisions of the bill. The effect of this letter was to mislead the membership and to cause a veritable torrent of mail to Senators and Congressmen in opposition to the bill.

This opposition has taken a variety of forms. For example, car stickers which read "Register Communists, Not Firearms" have appeared on thousands of cars all across the country. And monthly gun magazines have carried numerous articles on how to influence legislation in Congress.

I have no quarrel with campaigns designed to affect the outcome of legislative voting—when they are honestly and fairly conducted, they are in the best tradition of our political process. But if the ordinary citizen is some day to be able to walk without fear in the streets of our society, I feel the opposition to this legislation must be overcome.

I will try my best to see that it is. I intend to work hard for the passage of effective firearms control legislation. And if the American people can become sufficiently concerned and informed about the need for effective gun control, and if they will join in the fight for enactment, this bill will become law.

Passage of gun control legislation would meet head on the problem of crime in the streets. Another aspect of the fight against crime—and one too often overlooked—takes place behind prison walls.

We need to pay more attention and to assign a higher priority to our State systems of correctional rehabilitation. Too often our correctional systems are looked upon solely as places where criminals are sent to be isolated from society. But criminal correction should instead be a process—beginning as soon as the lawbreaker is apprehended—whereby the individual criminal is treated as an individual, is taught the skills of a trade and the duties of good citizenship, and is assisted materially in finding a job and returning to his community. We have not done these things to any significant degree, and as a result our penal systems have not been successful in rehabilitating lawbreakers.

There are, of course, some notable exceptions where efforts are being made to apply the new techniques of rehabilitation to State penal systems. In New England, both Vermont and the Federal prison at Danbury, Conn., have instituted outstanding new programs of work release. Here in Boston General Decker, who will address you later, has initiated court clinics which provide legal, medical, and psychological assistance to offenders. Wisconsin and North Carolina have pioneered new types of rehabilitation and release techniques, and California has underway a unique demonstration project on parole which gives special, extended attention to youthful offenders. But overall, the fact is that unless some dramatic changes are made, more than 50 percent of our country's present prisoner population will go on to commit further crimes. This is an appalling statistic.

Fortunately, the spirit of change is in the air. I believe a revolution is beginning in the field of correctional rehabilitation—a revolution which seems to me quite similar to the revolution in mental health care which we experienced in the 1950's.

I have tried to make a start on this revolution right here in New England. I am seeking a Federal grant for a study of all of New England's correctional systems, in a cooperative venture involving all the New England States. The study will rely on the most advanced computer techniques available—the same techniques which have proved so successful in evaluating our Defense Department programs. Hopefully the results of the study would indicate what needs to be done, and what money must be allotted if New England correctional systems are to perform their rehabilitation functions in the most effective and economical manner possible.

I think this detailed study will show that the correctional systems of many of our States are anachronisms—obsolete and ill-equipped to accomplish the objectives of rehabilitation we now set for them. If this is true, I will press for Federal assistance for States which have developed plans for revamping their penal systems but lack the funds to translate these plans into action. The money involved would seem a small price to pay for a system which would rescue those individuals who, once they are embarked on the road of crime, can find no exit to a normal life.

I hope such a study will serve another purpose. It should show dramatically the vital role that modern science and technology can play in attacking problems of law enforcement and crime prevention. We have not yet capitalized on the contributions our great scientific advances can make to the field of criminal justice. For example:

A computer can help to determine police deployment, or identify fingerprints, or manage the calendar and dockets of our courts.

Advanced communication systems can bring quick and effective police protection to the individual citizen.

Electronic aids can improve alarm and surveillance systems.

These are but a few of many scientific benefits available to us, and we cannot afford to ignore them.

I have worked as an assistant district attorney in Boston, and I know the difficulties our local law enforcement officials encounter every day of the year in working against crime. These are dedicated and able men deeply deserving our appreciation and our support. They should not be denied any resource which can aid them in their public service.

I have been discussing some of the specific faces of crime and the measures we must take to deal with them. But we must not be content to deal only with fragments of the problem—we must plan a broad and coordinated program for the future.

With this idea in mind, President Johnson recently appointed a national crime commission, composed of distinguished citizens, judges, and other experts, to study all aspects of the process of criminal justice. This is the first official body ever to make a systematic nationwide study of the entire spectrum of crime—from its causes to its cures.

Over the next 12 months this distinguished group will be preparing a blueprint for the future—a strategy for our national attack on crime and delinquency. This blueprint should also contain specific recommendations on how we can give to those who work in the criminal justice field the recognition, respect, and financial rewards they deserve. For a criminal justice system, no matter how wisely programed, can be no better than the people who man it.

To help insure the development of well-trained professionals in all areas of criminal justice, I have introduced a bill to establish a National Criminal Justice Academy. The idea of this academy was the brainchild of the very eminent criminologist, Prof. Sheldon Glueck, and it is, in my judgment, an excellent idea.

Such an Academy could help fill the desperate need which exists for well-trained middle management personnel. It could generate new prestige and supply new talent for all the important occupations related to criminal justice. And it could take its place with, and hopefully produce the same caliber of public servants as, West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy.

But beyond this Academy, and beyond all the specifics of criminal justice which I have discussed, lies the larger challenge—the social and economic programs which attack the roots of crime by improving the quality of our lives.

I believe there is a lesson to be learned in this regard from the riots of Watts and Harlem. What is most significant to me about those riots is not the fact of racial antagonism. It is the fact that the slum areas which bred these riots are Negro ghettoes—where the Negro lives in isolation, unable to communicate or participate with his fellow white Americans; where unemployment is two or three times higher than that of the white community; and where the school dropout rate of Negroes is twice as high.

Most of those who joined in the crime and violence in Watts and Harlem were young people, like ourselves. But unlike us, they had little education, no jobs, no hopes for the future. Their behavior is surely to be condemned—but no more so than our failure as a nation to provide that equality of opportunity and sense of participation which is the birthright of every American.

Watts and Harlem are perfect examples of crime which has its roots in social injustice. It may be true that not all criminal behavior is a consequence of social injustice. But it certainly is true that we cannot hope to mount a telling attack on crime without fighting at the same time for social justice and equal rights and opportunities for all Americans.

The problems of crime and punishment cut through the entire fabric of our society. Indeed, they provide the supreme test of our society. For America cannot be great if her people are not safe—both from the ravages of crime and from the encroachments of arbitrary government action. Our challenge is to maintain a free society which is at the same time a safe society.

To meet this challenge we must come to grips with the broad philosophical questions surrounding the individual and his relationship to the state. And we must also find the answers to concrete questions of social engineering and acquire the expert knowledge which will enable us to detect and correct antisocial conduct.

Each of us here tonight has a role to play in meeting that challenge—in helping to build a society that realizes the American dream. For those of you still in school, the true test of your concern and determination lies ahead. But the preparation for that test has already begun. The activities here this weekend are a part of that preparation. They should give you a better insight into the many facets of crime.

I congratulate each of you for the sense of civic responsibility and concern that brought you here. Your presence is a sign that you are committed to participation in the larger concerns of community and Nation.

This is as it should be. For, as Dostoevski knew so well, the problems of "crime and punishment" raise all the basic questions about the human predicament and about life itself.

DAVID DUBINSKY RETIRES AS PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the retirement of David Dubinsky as president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union marks the end of an era headed by one of the great champions of American labor.

Throughout 45 years of his life, Dave Dubinsky devoted his entire talents and energy to the betterment of his fellow man—34 of those years as president of the ILGWU.

Although mere words cannot possibly give an accounting of the good deeds of this great man, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles from the March 18, 1966, issue of Justice—the newspaper of the ILGWU—be printed in the RECORD: "End of an Era: Dubinsky Retires," on page 2; "Many More Years of Great Service," on page 2; the text of a letter from President Lyndon B. Johnson on page 7 and the text of a release from the AFL-CIO which includes a statement from AFL-CIO president George Meany on page 7; and the text of President Dubinsky's retirement letter printed on page 16.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END OF AN ERA: DUBINSKY RETIRES

Suddenly, early in the afternoon of March 16, an era ended.

The Wednesday afternoon session of the regular meeting of the ILGWU General Executive Board started as usual, with the board members assembling in the Biarritz Room of the Americana Hotel in New York City shortly before 2 p.m.

The long, U-shaped table was covered with the reports and note paper the ILGWU vice presidents had used during a long, discussion filled morning session. As they took their seats around the table and were called to order by President Dubinsky serving as chairman, not one of them could know the fateful turn the meeting was about to take.

In the general office only a handful—those closest to the president and involved in the preparation of reports and statements for the board meeting—knew. Besides them, only the President of the United States and the president of the AFL-CIO knew.

The session began with the continuation of the report on education and political action that had been started before the adjournment of the morning session.

Then it began as the first guest arrived. The GEB sessions are closed meetings. Members had noticed, however, that in the rear of the meeting room sat Emil and Abe Schlesinger and Elias Lieberman, longstanding legal aids to the ILGWU and President Dubinsky.

Soon after the start of the session, three of the city's outstanding newspapermen arrived and were admitted to the meeting. By the time A. H. Raskin of the New York Times, James Wechsler of the New York Post, and nationally syndicated Victor Riesel of the New York Journal-American were seated, President Dubinsky told the board members, "I have invited them because I intend to take up a matter that is very important to myself and to the union. These guests are here not as newspapermen but as friends." Among those present were Irving Vogel, of the Jewish Daily Forward, and Herman Morgenstern, of the Day-Jewish Journal.

Then, as President Dubinsky began a review of his 45 years as an ILGWU officer, a few more were admitted. Some of the board members began to shake their heads with forebodings. The ILGWU chief told of the times he had thought of leaving office; then, after referring to the time when ILGWU Pres. Benjamin Schlesinger brought in his own written resignation, President Dubinsky, with Mrs. Emma Dubinsky sitting at his right, said: "I have come prepared with writing."

He asked that his letter to the general executive board be read. (The full text of the letter is on the back page of this issue of Justice.)

The words came with stunning effect. Around the table, disbelief registered on the faces. Each board member listened intently. Each marked the fateful words, the historic moment with some crucial memory of what the man now saying he wished to retire had meant in his or her own life.

"I have decided to retire and I hereby submit to the general executive board my resignation as president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union."

Suddenly, the reading was finished. For one dramatic moment there was silence, Some had been fighting back tears. Others were reaching back for the remembrance of when they had first met this man, now asking to be released from the burden of a presidency he had filled with honor and accomplishment for 34 years.

Then General Secretary-Treasurer Louis Stulberg moved to the microphone. He asked First Vice President Luigi Antonini to act as chairman.

"We are not going to discuss the question of this man's retirement," Stulberg said, "I move that a committee of this board be named to make every effort—in consultation with the president—to get him to postpone his decision."

The special committee was named.

Then, others spoke.

Following them, President Dubinsky replied. He said: "In an organization, in human life, nothing is permanent, nothing is forever. Giving 45 years of my life—34 as president—you will have to concede has meant I didn't have a life—only a union life. And I don't want to die in my boots.

"I have the interests of the union at heart. If I knew that what I am doing would be hurtful to the union—I wouldn't do it. But I feel it is better for me to do this thing now than to do it a year or two later. It must come to it. Dubinsky can't live forever. The union may have to live forever.

"I believe that what I am doing will be good for me; it will be good for the union; and it will be good for the man who will take over. It will give him the opportunity to strengthen his position—to become another Dubinsky or better.

"Now, we still have a lot of business to complete at this board meeting. But if you feel you want to discuss this matter with me, let us not lose time. I am ready to meet with the committee but I repeat what I said in my letter: I urge you to comply with my wish."

Then the session was adjourned. The murmur of voices rose louder. But some remained silent, in their seats, remembering.

HUMPHREY: "MANY MORE YEARS OF GREAT SERVICE"

Upon learning of ILGWU President David Dubinsky's decision to retire, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY paid special tribute to the head of the Garment Workers' Union in both a personal letter and a general statement.

In his letter, which opened with the greeting "Dear Dave," HUMPHREY said:

"Well, David, I simply had to call you on the phone and wish you well. I read about your retirement, and I could see how deeply moved you were by the expressions of affection and admiration that came from your membership and officers.

"To me, David Dubinsky will never be retired. It's just that you're changing your way of living a little bit. There's only one David Dubinsky, and I am the luckiest man in the world to have him as my friend.

"God bless you."

The Vice President's statement praised David Dubinsky as "one of the great champions of American labor. A champ may retire, but his heart will always be with the people for whom he has fought so long and so well. David is still young in spirit. He has many more years of great service still ahead for innumerable good causes.

"He is a dear personal friend, whose warmth, whose kindness, whose wisdom I cherish. His name is synonymous with trade-union integrity, trade-union pioneering, trade-unionism statesmanship.

"American labor, government and industry can, I know, continue to count on Dave for continued leadership. I wish him all the best. He deserves the best. He is the best."

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 17, 1966.

Mr. DAVID DUBINSKY,
President, ILGWU, AFL–CIO,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DAVE: The papers carried sad news today. The exit of David Dubinsky from the leadership of the Ladies Garment Workers Union is akin to detaching this country from its traditions.

Yet, there must be in your heart a warm and enduring satisfaction that comes only to a man who has built hugely and enduringly and who, almost singlehandedly, made life happier and more hopeful for hundreds of thousands of people.

I wish you long life, my old friend, for no one has worked longer or harder in the service of his fellow man than you.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

NEWS FROM THE AFL–CIO

AFL–CIO President George Meany today issued the following statement:

"David Dubinsky has been my warm and good friend throughout nearly all my life in the trade union movement. Those are the words—warm, good, friend—that I think best describe this unusual man.

"All his life has been devoted to helping people and he has approached every opportunity with an eagerness to do good that has been contagious.

"No one, I suppose, will ever completely tabulate all the good that David Dubinsky achieved in his lifetime and he would be the first to say no one should try. For it was the deed that always counted with him, not the plaudits.

"I am positive that David Dubinsky will never retire from the field he chose in his youth—the trade union movement, the brotherhood of workers dedicated to helping themselves by helping each other. David Dubinsky does not need the title of president of the ILGWU to make his impression on the trade union movement and on America. Even without it, there will be a 'D.D.' stamp on the future of American labor."

"I HAVE DECIDED TO RETIRE"

(NOTE.—Text of President David Dubinsky's March 16 letter to general executive board declaring intention to resign his ILGWU office while continuing activities in the labor movement, Liberal Party, and AFL–CIO.)

MY DEAR COLLEAGUES: As you probably know, since the age of 15 my life has been spent in the labor movement. From this movement I got my moral and spiritual nourishment. It has provided the guide for my life, giving it direction and purpose in helping workers to achieve a better life.

The principal arena of my life has been our union which I joined in June 1911 at the age of 19. Although I had participated in other sections of the movement here and abroad, it was in 1916 that I became active in the union. I served in many capacities in our union before I was entrusted with the presidency in 1932. Up until this very moment, my life has been wrapped up in the problems and the growth of our union.

To me, as to many other leaders of our union, serving the ILGWU has not been a career; it has been our life's work. Beyond all of my struggles through the years—the many complex problems, fighting off the enemies, suffering setbacks and pushing forward on new frontiers—I have always had the vision of a great union—great not only in numbers and resources, in contributions to the community and labor movement but great also—and especially—in the enrichment of the spiritual as well as the material life of the individual worker.

Having devoted my life to our union and the labor movement since my early youth, I came to feel, prior to the 1959 convention, that it was time to give up the cares and burdens and the heavy responsibilities of my office—and I gave serious thought to retiring. Frankly, I wanted more time for my family and for myself in the remaining years of my life.

However, as you will recall, we came to that convention confronted by a number of new, developing problems.

Local 25 had been made the target of an antitrust indictment. The strong antilabor bias of the charges was further emphasized by their being linked with unfounded allegations of racketeering. Basic protective provisions of our agreements were alleged to be monopolistic unfair trade practices.

Actually, these provisions were first formulated in the midtwenties by a special commission appointed by New York's Gov. Al Smith. The commission included such distinguished public-spirited citizens as Herbert H. Lehman, Prof. Lindsay Rodgers, George Gordon Battle, Bernard L. Sheintag, and Arthur D. Wolf. Their recommendations have withstood many challenges, even a case before the Federal Trade Commission shortly before the local 25 indictment.

This was a politically motivated attempt by the then national Republican administration to besmirch the reputation of our union. It would have seriously undermined the basic structure of our collective arrangements upon which the livelihood and the security of workers depended not only in our industry but also in the other needle trades. I considered it my duty, irrespective of my personal needs and wishes, to see to it that our union was vindicated, that the unwarranted attack was exposed and our vital interests were protected.

We had also begun to make real progress toward the merging of our 41 retirement funds. This was a big task, seriously affecting our members. I was determined to complete this task but at the time I didn't think it would take 6 years.

Another problem of deep concern was created by the union-within-the-union. I considered this a direct challenge to a vital trade union principle. It also created a potentially serious threat to the internal unity of our union, similar to the bitter experience we had with the Communists in the twenties.

It was followed by the politically motivated congressional (Powell-Zelenko) investigation. This was an attempt to smear our union's outstanding record in civil rights and racial equality. Unjustified and wholly unfounded charges were made that our union had discriminated against Negro and Puerto Rican workers.

As you know, these extraordinary and crucial problems have been resolved.

First, the indictment against local 25 was thrown out of court. Our union was completely vindicated. The structure of our collective relationships was preserved. We defeated this trumped-up charge just as we defeated similar frameup attempts earlier in our union's history.

Second, the false charge of racial discrimination leveled against us by the so-called congressional investigation collapsed under the crushing weight of our union's long record of dedication to the cause of civil and human rights. In fact, the Powell-Zelenko committee never even filed a report with the Congress.

Third, we finally succeeded in bringing about the creation of the ILGWU national retirement fund—a major landmark in the welfare program of our union.

Finally, only last September, a decision by the circuit court of appeals had the effect of liquidating the problem of the union-within-the union (four) thus ending this effort to divide and disrupt our organization.

While we were dealing with these problems, new challenges arose in our industry. Giant firms with diversified production began to spread. We became concerned with their effect on old firms and established standards. We studied these new developments and at our 1965 convention we took long-range action to deal with them.

We established a master agreements department to deal with these giant firms that cut across traditional industrial and organizational lines.

We adopted guidelines for future collective bargaining. While these are not a cure-all for all of our complex industrial problems, they have already shown their beneficial effect in recent negotiations.

We strengthened job security for our members by developing the idea of levels of employment. This insures that growing and expanding firms share their increased production equitably between their old workers and their new ones.

These achievements—like all the other achievements in the 34 years I have been president of our ILGWU—are the result of the good fortune I have had in enjoying the confidence, the respect, and cooperation of my colleagues on the general executive board as well as of all other officers and members. This has been the major factor in our success in overcoming threats to our union whether by Communists seeking to infiltrate our ranks or by other political enemies.

In the recent mayoralty election in New York, elements hostile to our union and envious of its achievements—inside and outside the labor movement—tried to exploit differences of opinion among our top leadership. But we disappointed them by proving that we were right in our policy and by emerging from the experience solidly united.

Now, with no major problems of an emergency nature confronting our union, I feel justified in turning again to personal consideration. I have decided to retire and I hereby submit to the general executive board my resignation as president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

In handing back to you the reins of my office, I wish to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to the members of the general executive board, to the managers of the locals, to our officers and members for their never-failing faith in me and in our union and for their understanding help through the years.

It is mainly because of this cooperation, this unity, that together we have been able to achieve higher standards and a better life for our members and the prestige and high standing of our union in the labor movement, in local communities, in the Nation, and even abroad.

For their loyalty and cooperation, I express my appreciation to the many members of the staff who have been imbued with the spirit of our union and have made their contributions to its progress.

On other occasions I have said—and I repeat it here—I am what I am because of the union. I shall always be grateful for the opportunity given me to be of service to others.

I leave the presidency of our union with the conviction that it is strong, stable, influential, and widely respected, that it is firmly rooted in the ideals and principles of the pioneers who preceded me, who founded it and fought and struggled to build and preserve it. It is a union that is demonstrating its ability to adjust to changing conditions.

I am confident that you will extend to my successor the same measure of cooperation that you have always extended to me. With a united organization, he will continue the work of my predecessors and myself in upholding the traditions of our union and in leading it to new successes for the benefit of our members and the greater prestige of our union.

I want to assure him of my wholehearted support and my readiness at all times to assist in any possible way.

Since I am aware that for you this decision comes unexpectedly, I know how you feel. Nevertheless, I urge you to respect my wishes. I am planning to go on vacation and I will leave for Europe within a month. Therefore, I request that you accept my resignation and that my retirement take effect April 12, 1966 [modified by committee to June 15].

I suggest that you proceed immediately to elect my successor. After you have elected him, and before the adjournment of this meeting, it would be a great privilege if you would permit me to install the next president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union.

Fraternally yours,

DAVID DUBINSKY,
President.

PROPHETIC LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently, my administrative assistant, Lee Williams, and I received a rather remarkable letter from a constituent of mine who was in Vietnam. The letter is dated last January 13 and was mailed from Bangkok. Since late developments in Vietnam indicate further deterioration of the situation I think this letter takes on a prophetic light.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter to which I have referred be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANGKOK, THAILAND,
January 13, 1966.

DEAR LEE AND SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This is a strange sort of salutation, I know, but although it is a bit cliche to mention it, I have never ever written a letter expressing my views to a newspaper, an editor, or a public official, and I have no intention of starting now; it always struck me as a bit presumptuous. So please let it take the form of what it is, a personal letter to you, Lee, and if you care to show it to the Senator or feel that it deserves his attention, do so.

Please permit me to be egomanical enough to comment on my observations in Vietnam. The old Wilsonian gambit of 14 points seems to be fashionable again, so here are an arbitrary 14 impressions received in Saigon where I talked intensively to over 200 people from colonels to privates, journalists and businessmen, Vietnamese, and English and French colonials. Here is what I found:

1. The war is not only not going well, the situation is worse than is reported in the press and worse, I believe, that is indicated in intelligence reports; I have had intelligence officers admit as much to me privately.

2. The kill ratio is, to be sure, in our favor, but the nature of the war is such that it would be most difficult to ascertain objectively what it is. And the formula used to arrive at casualty figures on either side are so esoteric as to resemble Italian bridge bidding conventions or Mr. Gallup's strange techniques of adjusting his polling results to be congruent with earlier assumed hypotheses. So "moderate" and "heavy" casualties are not only meaningless; so are the weekly totals of k.i.a. I would rather explain privately why this is so.

3. The kill ratio is irrelevant anyway. Were it 20 to 1, which it is not, the American military posture would not be, necessarily, substantially enhanced.

4. In one aspect, the number of U.S. military personnel is irrelevant. Since most are literally confined in closely guarded compounds, protected by moat-like defenses of concertina-wire and incessant barrages of U.S. artillery and 85- and 105-millimeter mortar fire, there is no necessary relationship; per se, between the bigness of these bastions in personnel and their security.

5. Although there is, to be sure, much to be said for the tactical advantages of a U.S. buildup if necessary, one obvious disadvantage is that we have beyond doubt greatly increased the number of possible targets for the enemy to strike at. Not only by airstrike, should events lead to that tragic eventuality, but by ground attack as well. So it is quite conceivable that we have created a certain potential vulnerability to sudden heavy losses via the sudden raid, the hidden plastic bomb, etc.

6. There is a general, although not universal, "gung ho" spirit among enlisted personnel, NCO's, and lower and middle-ranking officers, particularly in combat areas, morale is unbelievably high and sincere. There is something about combat that produces this—a messianic attitude of anger. This is not an unmixed blessing. It can lead to dangerous complacency and overconfidence. In addition to which it impairs the effectiveness of the avowed policy of the "pacification" of the South Vietnamese people, which is now most difficult at best. It is strange to talk to these men in the field who are against any cease-fire, any even temporary cessation of hostilities, and who talk blithely of remaining for 10 years and wanting to die there if necessary (sic)—and then to talk to colonels in Saigon who know the fields as well and who are infinitely more pessimistic, more cynical, and more realistic. One colonel who is most erudite (there is such a breed of officer, believe it or not) told me, "If there is a God, and he is very kind to us, and given a million men and given years and a miracle in making the South Vietnamese people like us, we stand an outside chance of a stalemate." These are harsh and bitter words, and I prefer to regard his remark as hyperbole, but there is considerable evidence that he may be stating the situation realistically.

7. There has never been an adequate picture painted of the tragic fruits of generations of French misrule. Vietnam is dotted with magnificent old French colonial mansions which serve as reminders of a dispensation which did nothing but suppress, which provided no education beyond the primary grades, which insulted a national dignity in countless ways. These mansions are inhabited by American officers now; I have been in several, and it's a nice life, indeed. But make no mistake about it: deservedly or not, we are now the inheritors of the

French mantle. We are Westerners, the outsider, the alien. To the leftists, we are villains; to the rightists we are fools (even if, out of temporary self-interest, we are allies). Left or right, there are very few South Vietnamese indeed who do not hate the shadows that remain of the Navarres and the Salans and who do not inwardly cheer at the memory of Dienbienphu.

8. So, as a consequence, any fancied similarities between Vietnam today and the problems of pacification of the Japanese people during the occupation are absurd. Too, any analogy between Vietnam and Korea is equally absurd. There we have a relatively conventional war; here we have none. There we had a battle line most of the time; here we have none. There we had a relatively defensible terrain; here we have none, there we had a people who had some faith, however misplaced, in the prospects for an eventual American victory; here we lack even that.

9. There is little understanding in the United States of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Vietcong tax collection methods throughout South Vietnam. They need money badly and they get it. They get it from individuals and they get it from businesses. They get it from the Vietnamese, from the French, and they get it on occasion from the Americans. Take a prominent hotel. It is French-owned, and common knowledge that they pay "rent" or what in the Capone era we called "protection money" to the VC. They are not fools. They want to avoid the fate of the Metropole Hotel. Officers and journalists of all nations like to drink on its comfortable terrace. As a U.S. intelligence colonel put it to me over a martini there, "You know, it's damned nice to be able to drink with impunity." It is no secret, and you have seen it in the press, that on more than one occasion Standard Oil has had to pay tolls to the VC to get U.S. gasoline through to our own forces. The VC has felt that money would do them more good than our gasoline would do them harm, and they are probably right.

10. This whole problem of blackmail to buy off terrorists leads us to the point of terrorism itself as a modus vivendi of modern insurgency. It is effective; it is cheap in cost; it is demoralizing. It has convinced hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese who would otherwise (for selfish, not ideological, reasons) be for us of the prudence of "playing both sides." And an extremely high proportion do "play both sides." The VC has a new trick in Saigon: a hand grenade with the detonating lever (spring loaded) taped down with ordinary Scotch tape; the pin is pulled; the grenade is gently dropped in the gas tank of a truck; in a matter of time, depending on how much tape is wrapped around the lever, the gas dissolves the adhesive on the tape; the bomb explodes with far greater effectiveness because of the gasoline. The weapon is cheap, simple, imaginative, and effective. Best of all, it can be inconspicuously deposited in a gasoline tank at night by any teenager. (The bomb that almost got us was tossed by a 15-year-old boy.)

11. The sad fact is that the ARVN's (Army of the Republic of Vietnam) are pretty generally ineffective. True, they die, sometimes with heroism, and I do not mean to denigrate the quality of their sacrifice when it is made. But wars have a way of being won by the living, not by the dead. Corruption and inefficiency have beeen complicating factors. A greater problem is the fact that most lieutenants and captains of experience have been killed off. The Ky regime has a tendency to look for new cadre and combat officers from the ranks of an educated class; they are loathe to promote a country boy of demonstrated leadership ability under combat conditions. Having an elite class of educated officers is all very well, but lieutenants have a notoriously high attrition rate in combat, as we discovered in Korea, and it is getting increasingly difficult to find South Vietnamese officers who have been schooled in Switzerland.

12. Many old hands in Saigon, who know far more about it than I, are convinced that the VC could step up systematic terrorism tenfold if they should so desire. A multiplicity of factors reluctantly impel me to the same conclusion. There has been a suspicious restraint about not bombing some targets which are more than inviting to them, surely. One reason, of course, is public opinion. But there is more to it than that. There is more than a little evidence that some of this restraint has been out of a conviction that some obvious targets will be needed as soon as they are captured. At any rate, we just literally could be sitting on a bomb so far as increased terrorism is concerned.

13. May I mention for a moment our consistent failure to use psychological warfare to an advantage. As you know, I believe passionately in the power of words, and I am more than aware of the human tendency to overrate those things in which we are most interested. But I believe that words and ideas are very substantial and tangible things indeed. The effectiveness of the VC soldier, frequently clothed in a loincloth, barefoot, hungry with but little stale rice, demonstrates to what lengths a man will fight with great dedication on a diet of words. Ho Chi Minh has traveled very far on a road paved with words like "freedom" and "liberty." Yet an American colonel I know, a good leader whose men have had a frightful casualty rate (up to 40 percent in some units), had to fight to get one old loudspeaker to use to speak to the VC at night when they surround his camp and come up close. He also uses a hand-held transistorized megaphone. This program has been instituted at his own initiative, with no cooperation from officialdom. Yet it has netted a couple of dozen defections recently. I think this is an enterprising officer. More has been done recently, but still little. Forgive me for overemphasizing this, but it is one symptom of our singular obsession with the use of force. I question both our original involvement and the deepening of our commitment. But so long as we are there it would seem vitally incumbent that we speak and speak with sincerity to these people; and not in terms of defending them against communism, either, which, rightly or wrongly, strikes most of them as a bit silly.

To those of us who believe that America has a message to proclaim or, if you will, a "product" to "sell," the failure to do so seems hard to explain.

To countless millions America has stood as a shining example of a nation that is basically revolutionary. This has been true for generations, and, thankfully, is still true today to our admirers, and we have many. We have been revolutionary not only because we were cast from the cauldron of revolt, we have been revolutionary politically, ideologically, technologically. Paine and Jefferson and Lincoln (the latter is a big name in Asia, by the way, even among people who dislike us) were but the first in a long line of iconoclasts to which some would add the name FULBRIGHT. The mass-production of Whitney and later Ford have had a more profound effect upon the masses of agrarian societies than have most Marxists. From vaccination to the vacuum tube, from Singer's sewing machine to the self-starter, from telegraphy to the transistor, from movies to mechanized farming, and from the Founding Fathers to Fulbright scholarships, America has been the great destroyer of the outmoded old and the great builder of the bountiful new. To most of the underdeveloped nations of the world, Edison will still outsell Lenin any day of the week if the product is properly packaged. If not, then Lenin may fill the void. At any rate, America has always stood, thank God, not for slow mutation, but for sudden and violent change, and for anything but the status quo. How infinitely sad it is that when many nations cried out for sudden emergence, we chose to issue pallid policy statements from State on stability. It is fundamental in the affairs of men that when you see the imminent and inevitable death of an ancient regime, that you go to the funeral, but you are amiable to the heirs and do not sit forever holding hands with the corpse in necrophilial devotion.

Sorry to dwell on this point.

14. Finally, this is something that is distasteful and impolitic to write, but it needs saying. Before I do let me reassure you that I am for victory if possible and have always, of course, wanted to prevent the spread of communism to any area because of its monolithic nature and denial of the right to the pluralistic society that I hope will be the universal destiny of all mankind. Having said that, here is the sad truth: Father Ho is a great leader who I happen to believe with considerable evidence is more admired in the south than any other Vietnamese. Were a plebiscite to be held today, he would still win resoundingly over Bao Dai, or the late Ngo Dinh Diem—or, yes, even Premier Ky. Ho, the former cook at the Carlton in London is so strong with the peasant that ever were he to be killed, his posthumous influence as a living legend would sharply imperil our interests. Numerous very loyal American commanders have admitted as much to me privately. Expressed as a simple syllogism, it comes out like this: (1) It is fundamental and I believe generally conceded that we cannot win the war without the Vietnamese people; (2) in view of the force and magnitude of Ho's appeal and of the limited and diffuse nature of our own appeal as liberators, it is highly questionable whether we can ever get more than token support, and that largely the result of our money; (3) ergo, it is highly questionable whether we can ever have victory.

Conclusions: As to solutions, I have none, and do not pretend to. But having just returned from there, I am very frightened. I could talk about bright spots; there are many. I do not think they override the stark, terrifying realities of a stalemate, at best, purchased at inconceivable cost and coupled with humiliating setbacks and losses. Then always, and I do not say this lightly, there is the unlikely but ever-present possibility of catastrophe. The road from Valley Forge to Vietnam has been a long one, and the analogy is more than alliterative: there are some similarities, only this time we are the British and they are barefoot. Too long have we taken our invincibility for granted.

Ho Chi Minh is not only the translator (into Vietnamese) of the tactics of Mao Tse-tung; he has gone beyond Maoist tactics and usual concepts of insurgency. His classic metaphor should be taken seriously: that the people are the sea, and the Vietcong are the fish that swim within the sea, omnipresent, clandestine, invisible.

I once again know of no easy solutions and were I gifted with such apocalyptic inspirations I would not presume to advise others. But if I had the responsibility to make the decision—and I am thankful I do not—I believe I would take a couple of drinks and then agree, covertly probably, to direct negotiations with the Vietcong (which we have not yet agreed to) and possibly consider major concessions with regard to Hanoi's third point.

By the time you read this, the world will probably know the answer as to the success or failure of the President's peace offensive, which has been theatrically impressive to most of the world's press (including the Asian). But in view of the deteriorating

American situation I have just seen there, I cannot view with optimism the likelihood of immediate peace without further compromises.

In short, I would rather America err on the side of being overly generous than on the side of military miscalculation of inconceivable cost.

For what, the world might well ask should we win the gamble, have we won?

Glad to be able to say hello and talk about all the things that I cannot broadcast about to someone who is openminded enough to understand the difficulty of our position and that it is not necessarily un-American to ask questions about what is wisdom or have doubts about destiny or wonder about the world.

Warm regards,

PUBLIUS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., ADDS A MAJOR LEAGUE HOCKEY TEAM TO ITS BIG LEAGUE SPORTS GALAXY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, St. Louis, Mo., is proud of its Cardinals baseball and football teams and its Hawks basketball team.

To this big league sports galaxy has now been added what I am sure will be bright new star; namely, a major league hockey team.

The new team is named for a song synonymous with Missouri's largest city, the St. Louis Blues. Its home will be the Arena, scene of many ice extravaganzas.

St. Louis and the National Hockey League are both fortunate that the Missouri city was the final selection in a six-team expansion of the league which also added Philadelphia, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and Pittsburgh to the league.

Mr. William Jennings, president of the New York Rangers hockey team and chairman of the league's expansion committee, announced that selection of St. Louis was unanimously approved by the league.

In welcoming St. Louis into major league hockey, he also stated that he felt the St. Louis group which was awarded the franchise is outstanding.

Knowing these men personally, I certainly agree with Mr. Jennings' assessment of them, and I am sure that my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] who could not be present today because of official duties as a representative of the Senate at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, and who is on a study visit to the NATO countries, would also agree.

President of the St. Louis Blues is Mr. Sidney Salomon, Jr., president of Sidney Salomon, Jr. & Associates. Board members are Mr. Robert Wolfson, chairman of the board of GEM International; Mr. Sidney Salomon III, of Sidney Salomon, Jr. & Associates and a member of the Missouri State Athletic Commission; Mr. James R. James, Jr., chairman of the board of the Clayton Bank; Mr. Preston Estep, chairman of the board of the Bank of St. Louis; Mr. Elliott Stein, president of Scherck, Stein & Franc; Mr. John Soult, president of Fruin-Colnon Construction Co.; Mr. Stanley H. Rosensweig, chairman of the board of Electronic Wholesalers, Inc., and Mr. Louis Menk, president of the Burlington Railroad Co.

The addition of major league hockey should contribute substantially to the sports boom in St. Louis which is keyed to the huge new Busch Memorial Stadium which opens this year on the riverfront.

It rounds out a major league sports program for a major league town which is observing its 200th anniversary.

AID FOR DROUGHT-STRICKEN INDIA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I was pleased and proud as an American to hear President Johnson's response to Mrs. Gandhi's worldwide appeal for help for her drought-stricken nation.

The President has responded in the humanitarian traditions of this Nation, and I feel privileged to pledge him my support of this far-reaching program to assist our sister democracy.

It is tragic and ironic that a nation which has done so much to help itself must now be halted in its truly impressive economic progress by a natural disaster.

We are told that the drought which has struck India is the worst the world has seen since our own water-starved years of the early thirties.

India's appeal to the world for aid to survive this disaster is a justified appeal, and I was pleased to hear the President couple his pledge of generous aid from this country with an appeal to other nations of the world to contribute the maximum they can in food, in fertilizers, in shipping, or in funds in order to buy these requisites.

The food needs of a drought-stricken nation as large and as populous as India are such that other nations of the world must help us to help her. The President's report that Canada is now prepared to provide a million tons of wheat and flour to India is encouraging, indeed.

INCREASE IN SUPPORT LEVEL FOR MILK MANUFACTURE TO BENEFIT BOTH CONSUMER AND FARMER

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, in announcing an increase in the support level for manufacturing milk today, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman took action that will benefit both consumers and the Nation's dairy farmers during the coming year.

The new support level of $3.50 per hundredweight will help bring higher production of milk, butter, cheese, and other dairy products. These additional supplies will mean lower retail prices for consumers next fall and winter than they otherwise would have been. If the support level had been increased by only the minimum required by the Agricultural Act of 1949—$3.34 per hundredweight—production during the coming year would have been smaller and retail prices likely would have been pushed higher. The new support level, however, is well under current market prices. The price of manufacturing milk in February averaged $3.65 per hundredweight.

Dairymen will benefit from the new support level because it lessens the risks of seasonal price decline, and provides a more realistic basis on which to carry out production increases.

Larger production of milk and dairy products during the coming year also will mean larger supplies for both domestic and foreign programs. Distribution to needy families and the school lunch program can be larger. Supplies of nonfat dry milk to aid in strengthening the economies of developing nations can be more plentiful.

PROPER ENFORCEMENT OF HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, last year the Congress enacted Public Law 89–285, the Highway Beautification Act. As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I supported the bill both in the subcommittee and later in the full committee. Members of the committee labored diligently to produce legislation to achieve highway beautification, but at the same time properly to consider the legitimate interest of those in the advertising industry and other people who were affected by the bill.

To the committee's credit, every line of every page was carefully gone over and as a result, the committee was able to recommend a good bill.

Mr. President, along with other Members of the Congress, I continue to be concerned with the proposed draft standards which were published by the Department of Commerce in the January 28 Federal Register. Publication of these standards prompted the distinguished Senators RANDOLPH, MUSKIE, Moss, and others to take the Senate floor and express their feelings that the standards contravened the intent of Congress when it enacted the highway beautification bill.

I concur in and support the earlier remarks of the Senators. These standards are now the basis for hearings throughout the country. Beginning in March, the hearings have been held, or will be held, in all the 50 States. It is my understanding that the hearings for the State of California will be held on April 12 at the State Resources Building in Sacramento.

Although I am cognizant that the Department of Commerce says that the draft standards were "intended solely as guidelines for consideration and discussion purposes at the public hearings and do not represent any conclusions or even tentative conclusions on the part of the Secretary of Commerce," my correspondence indicates that the Commerce Department's assurances have not alleviated the fears that the so-called draft standards will, in fact, become the rules and regulations under which the Department of Commerce will administer the act.

I for one hope that this is not the case, and if so, the Department will be acting contrary to the will and intent of the Congress.

That the draft standards are in violation of the intent of the Congress is made clear by a review of the legislative history.

As introduced by the administration, the bill proposed no controls for billboards in zoned commercial and industrial areas. On the other hand, unzoned areas of commercial or industrial use would be determined "in accordance with the national standards to be established by the Secretary."

Mr. President, much of the time of the Senate Public Works Committee was spent in examining this provision. Members were concerned that the provision would place too much power in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce. As a result of the committee's concern, an amendment was offered and adopted giving to the State legislatures the right to define unzoned industrial and commercial areas rather than the Secretary of Commerce. I now read from the Senate Public Works Committee report regarding the amendment:

> The committee has given long and deliberate consideration to this subsection, and particularly to the question of unzoned industrial and commercial areas. The basic postulate of this provision is that outdoor advertising is an integral part of the business and marketing function and an established segment of the national economy; as a legitimate business, it should therefore be allowed to operate where other industrial and commercial activities are conducted.
>
> This principle was recognized in the draft legislation proposed to the Congress by excluding industrially and commercially zoned areas from control. However, the legislation as originally proposed recommended that unzoned areas used predominantly for industrial and commercial activities be "determined in accordance with national standards to be established by the Secretary."
>
> It is the committee's opinion that this is primarily an issue of land use which should not be left to an administrative decision. It is an extension of the concept of zoning and therefore more appropriately belongs to the same authority—i.e., the legislatures of the States. The committee believes that the State legislatures, because of their more detailed knowledge of the topography and land use patterns of the States, are in a better position to define an industrial and commercial area for their respective States than is the Secretary of Commerce.

To the surprise of the members of the Public Works Committee, the administration at the last minute objected to the committee amendment and Senator RANDOLPH, at the request of the administration, on September 15 offered an administration substitute for the committee amendment. The administration amendment also gave the State legislatures the right to define unzoned commercial and industrial areas, but unlike the committee bill, it made the decision by the State legislatures subject to the approval of the Secretary.

The administration amendment interjected for the first time in the legislation the matter of billboard control criteria. Signs permitted in zoned and unzoned commercial and industrial areas were to conform to "criteria determined by the States subject to concurrence by the Secretary concerning the lighting, size, and number of signs and other requirements as may be appropriate."

When Senator RANDOLPH offered the administration amendment, a heated and prolonged debate occurred on the Senate floor. As a result, Senator RANDOLPH wisely withdrew the administration amendment. The opposition to the amendment, of course, was based on the fact that the administration amendment was contrary to the careful deliberation and recommendation of the Senate Public Works Committee in giving the States the power to make the zoning determinations.

The following day, Senator RANDOLPH offered a modified amendment making this determination of an unzoned commercial and industrial area by agreement between the several States and the secretary. The same was true as to the control standards regarding size, lighting, and space of billboards within such areas.

It should also be pointed out, Mr. President, that the catchall phrase "and such other requirements as may be appropriate" was eliminated and the control criteria in the modified amendment was limited only to "size, lighting, and space."

With this background, Mr. President, it seems quite clear that the Senate did not desire to give the Secretary of Commerce the authority to eliminate advertising in industrial and commercial areas zoned or unzoned. To the contrary, both in committee and on the Senate floor, everyone was concerned with the possibility of arbitrary and capricious action on the part of the Department that might jeopardize the outdoor advertising industry which the committee in its report recognized as an "integral part of the public and marketing function and an established segment of the national economy; as a legitimate business it should therefore be allowed to operate where other industrial and commercial activities are conducted."

Further, in reading the letter to Congressman KLUCZYNSKI, chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, from Secretary Connor, it seemed clear that the Department desired no such authority and that the substitute amendment offered by Senator RANDOLPH would not be so construed by the Secretary. Thereafter, this modified substitute amendment passed by a narrow margin of 44 to 40.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1965.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads, Public Works Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for an explanation of the criteria to be used in determining approval of State actions defining unzoned commercial or industrial areas for purposes of the President's highway beautification bill and the criteria to be used in the regulation of billboards in those areas as well as those areas actually zoned under State law as commercial or industrial.

It should be kept in mind that under the administration bill the States have full authority under their own zoning laws to zone areas for commercial or industrial purposes, and the action of the States in this regard will, of course, be accepted for the purposes of this act.

The purpose of the administration language is to make sure that "unzoned" commercial or industrial areas along our interstate and primary highways will be defined on the same basis as those which are actually zoned. The administration feels that in order to avoid an obvious inequity, those areas which are actually used for commercial or industrial purposes should be treated as if they were zoned for such purposes. In reviewing the actions of the States in defining unzoned areas for the purposes of this act, the Bureau of Public Roads would look at the standards followed by the particular State concerned in zoning an area commercial or industrial. It is believed there will be few, if any, instances where the Bureau would not be able to give full approval to the definitions made by the States on unzoned commercial or industrial areas.

The policy of the Bureau in reviewing State determinations of unzoned commercial or industrial areas would be developed only after full consultation with the States as well as with interested private business, and every effort would be made to achieve equitable treatment.

The criteria to be followed in setting the standards for billboards in both zoned and unzoned areas, designated as commercial or industrial, would be designed to assist the advertising industry to achieve an orderly development of this important and legitimate business enterprise.

In order to prevent an unchecked proliferation which not only results in a public eyesore but undoubtedly impedes the effectiveness of billboard advertising, reasonable standards pertaining to size, spacing, and number of billboards would be developed. Our great new highways are opening up vast areas of inestimable value for commercial and industrial activities. The standards for outdoor advertising would be aimed at assuring a pattern of reasonable development as the advertising industry reaches new dimensions.

It is expected that, in the interests of effectiveness of billboards, to say nothing of the esthetic results, there should be some regulation on the size of billboards or signs, and their spacing. It is obvious that lighting arrangements which clearly pose a highway safety problem should be curtailed. It is not possible to spell out in detail exactly what kind of reasonable regulation this will be, since we will continue to have new and ingenious types of signs and devices brought forth in the future which may or may not present a hazard. In regard to spacing, obviously some regulation is desirable to prevent a conglomeration of highway signs in the vicinity of an intersection or interchange which might involve a traffic hazard.

In any event, regulations will not be adopted without thorough consultation with the States, with reasonable provisions for public hearings and with full opportunity for private businesses to express their views and have them taken into account. It is the intention of the administration that the regulations, insofar as they are consistent with the purposes of this act, shall be helpful to the advertising industry and that, for instance, standards of size which may be adopted would be insofar as possible consistent with standard size billboards in customary use.

Under the administration bill there would be ample time for full consultation with the States, with the industry, and with other interested persons before any final determinations are made in this respect, and it would be expected that the refinement of these standards would be a continuing process for the benefit of both the traveling public and private business concerns serving the motorists.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MURPHY. Also, Mr. President, the committee, in eliminating the "other requirement" phrase from the control standards pertaining to size, lighting, and spacing of billboards within zoned or unzoned commercial and industrial areas, meant just that.

Further light on the sentiments of the Congress in this regard may be seen by examining the action by the House. Not only did the House amend the Senate bill requiring the Secretary of Commerce to hold hearings in all the States, as is now being done, but it also further limited the powers of the Secretary by the adoption of the Tuten amendment, requiring that size, lighting, and spacing standards for signs be "consistent with customary use." Senator RANDOLPH, when the conference report was before the Senate, explained the House amendment as follows:

> The words "consistent with customary use" were not contained in the Senate version of S. 2084. The sponsor of this amendment explained during the course of the House debate on S. 2084 that it was his purpose to write into the statute the interpretation stated in the letter from the Secretary of Commerce. Certainly, it seems to me that any regulations which the Secretary adopts in agreement with the States should, consistent with the purposes of this act, be helpful to the advertising industry. Any regulations or criteria with respect to size, spacing, and lighting of outdoor advertising signs should, insofar as possible, be consistent with customary use in the industry. Therefore, I cannot perceive any valid objection to this particular language in the House approved bill.

Yet, Mr. President, the draft standards as published on January 28 in the Federal Register are not confined to size, lighting, and spacing. They include such matters as height, setback, and animation. It is my understanding that acceptance of the draft standards would be disastrous to the advertising industry in my State, so I am naturally concerned with these standards and it would be well to have inserted at this point the remarks of Senator RANDOLPH regarding the draft standards:

> Mr. President, the draft standards published in the Federal Register are at variance with that statement and with the intent of Congress as evidenced in the committee action in both bodies and in the floor debates on the measure. Furthermore, these proposals are a departure from the declared intent of the Secretary of Commerce, as expressed in his letter to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads. They are not in accord with our oral understanding when the administration amendments were pending in the Senate. Finally they are in violation of the language of the act itself, as amended by the House of Representatives and finally enacted by the Congress.

As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I, for one, and I know my feelings are shared by many other committee members, intend to thoroughly examine the transcript of the hearings and will also study carefully the final standards that are issued by the Commerce Department to make certain that the Highway Beautification Act is administered according to the will of the Congress. I hope the final standards, Mr. President, will reflect the intent of the Congress, and I share the sentiments of the floor manager of the bill, Senator RANDOLPH, when he stated he hoped "that these proposals are not an augury of how the Highway Beautification Act will be administered."

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, with the annual attempt to repeal fair representation in State legislatures almost upon us, it is worth while to note the dramatic shift toward equal representation in our State legislatures which has taken place in the last few years.

The Christian Science Monitor of March 26, 1966, in a summary of reapportionment activity, commented on the rapid progress being made toward eliminating the rotten borough system of State legislative apportionment which has paralyzed State action for decades.

The Monitor notes:

> Next year, for the first time in history, lawmakers from cities and populous suburban areas will outnumber those from small towns in many State capitals.

This is true even though the urban population has outnumbered the rural population for nearly half a century.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Christian Science Monitor articles entitled, "Now Your Vote May Count for More," and "How It Used To Be," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 26, 1966]

NOW YOUR VOTE MAY COUNT FOR MORE

(By George B. Merry)

BOSTON.—Rural Americans are fast losing their once-firm grip on the reins of State governments.

Next year, for the first time in history, lawmakers from cities and populous suburban areas will outnumber those from small towns in many State capitals.

In a few States the change in legislative control already has taken place. And this trend seems sure to continue.

After decades of looking the other way, Federal and State courts are insisting that legislatures be revamped to meet one-man, one-vote standards.

The big reapportionment push began 4 years ago today when the Supreme Court of the United States entered the picture.

In its ruling the Court said that the so-called equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution entitles citizens to certain protections with respect to the apportionment of legislatures. Federal courts, it decreed, have the power to enforce them.

But the Supreme Court justices in their 6-to-2 decision did not spell out what action district courts might take to assure fairer apportionments. Nor were any standards set for determining whether a districting pattern is unconstitutional.

SINGLE BASIS FOR ALLOTMENT

In June 1964, however, the Supreme Court went an important step further. In a series of related verdicts it ruled that population should be the only basis for allocating seats and in both branches of a State legislature.

This one-man, one-vote directive has proven to be even more far reaching than the decree handed down in *Baker* v. *Carr*, the Tennessee taxpayers' suit, March 26, 1962.

Few court decisions have touched off more political and judicial fireworks.

Now before Congress is a constitutional-amendment proposal that would permit a State to apportion one branch of its legislature on some other basis than population. It failed to pass last year, but a new try is being made this year.

Major developments over the past few years include—

One or more lawsuits in all but two States—Maine and South Dakota—challenging the allotment of legislative seats.

Eighty-five legislative branches in 45 States reapportioned.

Efforts now underway to redistrict five senates or houses in three States.

Redistricting involving another five legislative bodies in three States also may be tackled during the next few months.

The remaining four (49 States have two-house legislatures, Nebraska only has a senate) legislative branches—the Massachusetts Senate, the Oregon Senate and House, and the South Carolina House—were revamped prior to the *Baker* v. *Carr* ruling but appear to meet court standards.

In a number of instances State constitutions have been changed to conform districting standards to the one-man, one-vote principle. Geographical considerations, long a factor in more than two-thirds of the States, have been brushed aside.

Because of the obvious political quicksands involved, most legislators—especially those from overrepresented rural areas—were reluctant to redistrict.

Yet they had little real alternative, as many found over the past few years.

While some legislatures beat the courts to the punch and voluntarily put their houses in order, many ignored their malapportionment problems until faced with a court order.

Few of them made it on the first try. Florida lawmakers, for example, have recently completed their fourth reapportionment plan since mid-1962. The three earlier ones were tossed out by a Federal court panel.

PANELS UNDERTAKE TASK

In several States, where legislators appeared hopelessly bogged down, courts have stepped in and done the job.

The first judicial redistricting involved the Oklahoma Senate and House in 1964. Since then court panels have revamped 16 other legislative branches in 9 States. The latest action of this type took place within the past 2 months in Arizona, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Some States have taken apportionment out of the hands of the legislatures and given it to a special commission. In Illinois a 10-member bipartisan commission, appointed by the Governor, redistricted the house after the legislature had tried and failed.

For some 20 years the Missouri Senate has been revamped from time to time in this way. And on February 13, Missouri voters approved a constitutional amendment providing for a similar method for reapportioning the house. And the special commission has just completed its assignment.

Michigan's new State constitution, adopted in April 1963, also took apportionment controls away from the legislature and provided for a bipartisan commission to do the job.

But this approach, too, has produced problems: Democratic and Republican members of the new special agency could not agree on a districting revamp.

Finally, in June 1964, the Michigan Supreme Court ordered the commission to adopt a reapportionment plan for both the senate and house which had been drafted by two of the commissioners.

A special board appointed for the purpose handled Alaska's redistricting job. Panels comprising top State officials did the reapportionment in Arkansas and Ohio.

The courts rejected earlier redistricting efforts in Ohio.

REDISTRICTING HAMMERED OUT

With reapportionment orders still ringing in their ears and anxious jurists looking over their shoulders, lawmakers in at least six States have hammered out redistricting plans in recent weeks. Besides both branches in Florida, these involve the Idaho Senate and House, the Kansas House, the New Mexico Senate, the North Carolina Senate and House, and the South Carolina Senate.

At the same time Maine legislators, meeting in special session, approved a constitutional amendment, which if accepted by the State's voters at the November election, will pave the way for a more equitable districting of the senate.

In Rhode Island a legislative commission is trying to work out an acceptable reapportionment plan. New Jersey has a constitutional convention in session tackling a similar assignment.

The court of appeals in New York has just approved a redistricting plan drafted by a five-member bipartisan commission. The task force was appointed by the court after Empire State lawmakers failed to agree on a new apportionment earlier this year.

In trying to comply with the one-man, one-vote dictum, many States have been forced to overlook provisions in their constitutions guaranteeing representation to each county or town.

Vermont, for example, used to allot every city or town, no matter how large or small, one and only one seat in the State's house of representatives. Under this system tiny Stratton, with only 38 residents, had a voice equal to Burlington, with 35,531, more than 920 times its size. Less than 12 percent of the total Vermont population lived in those towns which could elect a majority of the house members.

The new setup chopped the number of house seats from 246 to 150 and grouped smaller towns for the first time into districts. Also, cities got additional representation according to population.

ADJUSTMENTS MADE

At least 15 other States made adjustments in the size of one or both of their legislative bodies.

Connecticut abolished its town-by-town representation in its house and reduced house membership from 294 to 177.

In Nevada, every county used to have one senator, and 8 percent of the State's population elected a majority of the 17 senators. The revamp increases the senate membership to 20 and ups the size of the house from 35 to 40.

The latest Florida reapportionment expands the senate from 38 to 48 and increases the house from 95 to 117. Dade County (Miami) picks up seven more senators and four more representatives. Duval County (Jacksonville), Hillsborough County (Tampa), and Pinellas County (St. Petersburg) add three senators apiece.

House reapportionment in Kansas, completed earlier this month, was the State's first full-scale redistricting in 100 years, although adjustments had been made from time to time. When the new legislature is elected this fall, each county will no longer have at least one house seat.

POLITICAL IMPACT

Besides shifting the balance of power away from rural areas to cities and suburban sections, legislative reapportionment has, in some instances, altered the political structure and given new or increased representation to various racial and ethnic groups.

In Georgia eight Negroes won seats last year in the redistricted house. They are the first of their race to serve in that body since 1907. (One of the eight, Julian Bond, was barred from taking his seat after he criticized American policy in Vietnam.) At the same time Republicans boosted their strength from 7 to 22 in the still heavily Democratic chamber.

Reapportionment has spelled gains for the Democrats, too. The 1964 districting change in Michigan is believed to have helped the Democratic Party gain control of both Houses of the legislature for the first time in 26 years.

New districting patterns in several Northern States, including Indiana, Wisconsin, and Ohio, are expected to result in more Democrats in the legislatures chosen this November.

Despite the bustle of activity now under way in a few States and that just completed, the reapportionment pace appears to be slowing down.

The big year was 1965. During its 12 months both branches of the legislatures in 23 States—Alabama, Arkansas, Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, and Washington—were reapportioned.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION

Redistricting also was carried out in one legislative body in five other States—Georgia House, Missouri Senate, Nebraska Senate, New Mexico House, and Wyoming Senate.

The 1965 Florida and Idaho plans were later tossed out by the courts and done over again this year.

While it is too early to gage what the long-term impact might be from the reapportionment revolution, results so far seem to indicate more emphasis on so-called social legislation.

In Michigan the reapportioned, now Democratic-controlled, legislature liberalized the State's workmen's compensation program to the point where it is believed to be the most generous in the Nation.

More attention has been focused on urban problems. But farm legislation has not been overlooked as had been feared by some observers. A statewide meat-inspection law was passed and a milk-pricing bill almost made it.

The reapportioned general assembly in Delaware has a number of new lawmakers, including several from organized labor. Measures approved last year included the granting of tax-exempt status to a union-sponsored housing development for the elderly in Wilmington.

Since redistricting, the new legislature in Iowa increased municipal home rule and passed several liberal, labor-backed bills but refused to repeal the State's so-called right-to-work law.

While some reapportioned legislative bodies were elected in 1964 or 1965, most States will give their revamped districting its first test in elections later this year. At least 32 States, and possibly several more, are involved. These revamped legislatures will go to work next January.

Many of the legislative branches redistricted over the past 4 years had not been altered substantially for decades, in some instances more than 50 years—and this despite major population shifts within the States.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 26, 1966]

HOW IT USED TO BE

When the Supreme Court handed down its one-man, one-vote criterion for voter representation in State legislatures, it was saying in effect to the States:

"A majority of your legislators must be elected by a majority of the voters."

This had not been the case for decades in most States. In many cases the total of legislators from sparsely populated elective districts outnumbered those from urban districts. Rural voters outranked city voters.

The table below shows how far out of representational whack some legislatures were:

Each figure shows the percentage of the State's population living in the least-populous elective districts from which a majority of legislators was chosen as of March 26, 1962, date of the Court's original landmark ruling.

Under the Court's subsequent one-man, one-vote criterion, the ideal percentage would be slightly over 50 percent—a majority of voters electing a majority of legislators. Most of the reapportioning in the past 4 years has come close to, if not within, acceptable bounds.

Alabama	25.1	27.2
Alaska	35.0	48.9
Arizona	12.8	45.8
Arkansas	43.8	33.3
California	10.7	44.7
Colorado	29.8	32.1
Connecticut	33.4	12.0
Delaware	22.0	18.5
Florida	12.3	15.1
Georgia	21.4	22.5
Hawaii	[1] 25.9	[1] 44.6
Idaho	16.6	32.7
Illinois	28.7	39.9
Indiana	40.4	34.8
Iowa	35.2	26.9
Kansas	26.8	18.5
Kentucky	42.0	34.1
Louisiana	[1] 33.0	34.1
Maine	[1] 46.9	39.7
Maryland	14.0	31.7
Massachusetts	[1] 44.6	43.6
Michigan	29.0	44.1
Minnesota	[1] 40.1	[1] 34.5
Mississippi	34.6	29.1
Missouri	47.7	20.3
Montana	16.1	36.6
Nebraska	36.6	----
Nevada	8.0	35.0
New Hampshire	45.3	43.9
New Jersey	19.0	46.5
New Mexico	14.0	27.0
New York	36.9	38.2
North Carolina	36.9	27.1
North Dakota	31.9	40.2
Ohio	41.0	30.3
Oklahoma	24.5	29.5
Oregon	[1] 47.8	[1] 48.1
Pennsylvania	33.1	37.7
Rhode Island	[1] 18.1	[1] 46.5
South Carolina	26.6	[1] 46.7
South Dakota	38.3	38.5
Tennessee	26.9	28.7
Texas	30.1	38.6
Utah	21.3	33.3
Vermont	45.1	11.6
Virginia	37.7	36.8
Washington	33.9	35.3
West Virginia	46.7	40.0
Wisconsin	45.0	40.0
Wyoming	26.9	35.8

[1] Branch has not been reapportioned since the Court's ruling. Nebraska has no house.

MRS. GANDHI'S VISIT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun hailed the meeting here between President Johnson and Prime Minister Gandhi of India, stating it "could be of lasting importance to both countries."

Declaring that the American people have shown in many ways their respect for the Indian Government's example in democracy, the Sun declared:

> Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. Johnson should benefit in their talks from the area of common understanding which has been developing among the people of India and America.

Knowing that many Senators will wish to read this timely editorial on the recent meetings, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIME MINISTER GANDHI

Mrs. Gandhi's talks with President Johnson, beginning today in Washington, promise to be useful. Mrs. Gandhi has come here as the new Prime Minister of a great country which is struggling with the task of meeting its complex social and political problems within the framework of a free, democratic system of government, and with the task of meeting its urgent economic problems by a wider and more intensive application of today's equipment and techniques. Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. Johnson should benefit in their talks from the area of common understanding which has been developing among the people of India and America. The American people have shown in many ways their desire to help India to help herself, and their respect for the Indian Government's example in democracy.

As a kind of senatorial prelude to the Prime Minister's visit, Senator TYDINGS spoke in the Senate last Friday of his own observations in India and of his belief that the United States should substantially increase its economic aid to India. The Maryland Senator made the point, among others, that the United States should keep the war in Vietnam in perspective, and should not permit the war to overshadow the larger issues in Asia which center on the extent and degree to which Communist China will be able to expand its influence and control. India knows the pressure of Chinese expansion and is resisting it, even though its attitude toward the war in Vietnam differs from ours.

President Johnson has been trying to find a firmer basis for American economic relations with India, in the light of the emphasis on self-help (in increasing food production, for example) he has given to our foreign aid program. The Tashkent declaration, which has not settled the Kashmir issue with Pakistan but was clearly a useful step, made it possible for the United States to give immediate help to meet India's urgent and immediate food shortage. Now it will be possible for the President and Mrs. Gandhi to look further ahead, too. This is a meeting which could be of lasting importance to both countries.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR BRINGING CERTAIN DANGEROUS DRUGS INTO THE UNITED STATES FOR ILLEGAL SALE OR USE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT UNITED STATES-MEXICO NARCOTIC COMMISSION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted into the record a telegram which I received late yesterday, April 5, from the U.S. Bureau of Customs concerning the seizure of millions of pep pills being smuggled into this country from Mexico.

The seizure of this vast quantity of drugs in a single action has direct bearing on a bill I introduced on Tuesday that would particularize the smuggling of these drugs into the United States and provide stiffer penalities for those convicted of its violation. The bill will be on the table for several more days for those of my colleagues who would like to join in its sponsorship.

I commend the Federal, State, and local officials along with the Mexican authorities who participated in the investigation which led to the recent conviction of the conspirator who masterminded the smuggling of these pep pills on such a grand scale.

The smuggling of pep pills, goof balls, marihuana, heroin, and other drugs across the 1,200-mile common border between Mexico and this country has caused severe law enforcement problems for the authorities in the Southwest and for those in California in particular.

California bears a disproportionate share of the cost of, both in dollars and cents and broken bodies, this drug smuggling which by its international nature is a Federal rather than a State problem. I have been told repeatedly that these pills are so widely abused by our young people that we may well be rearing a generation of pill heads.

These contraband chemicals were just recently brought under strict control here in the United States by the Drug Control Amendments of 1965 which will seriously curtail the domestic supply available to illicit users. For law enforcement at all levels to effectively cooperate in crushing this traffic we must give them the tools. My bill now before the Senate, would be one important tool. It would close off a pipeline of supply to American drug peddlers.

I ask my colleagues to give serious thought to this matter, join in sponsoring this legislation and come to the aid of hard-pressed law enforcement officials.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 5, 1966.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD,
Chairman, Juvenile Delinquent Subcommittee, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

In December 1965, customs agents learned that large shipments of amphetamines, apparently made in Mexico, were being sent by air from Mexico City to Tijuana. Subsequent investigations disclosed that these were finding their way into the hands of one Henry Brulay, an American who was operating an income tax service in San Ysidro. Indications were that these shipments of amphetamines had amounted to at least 5 tons.

Meanwhile, Congress had passed the drug abuse control amendments of 1965, approved on July 15, which gave additional regulative and enforcement power to the Food and Drug Administration. Its officers had been actively engaged in making buys from several distributors in Los Angeles and other cities, having on one occasion purchased a keg of 50,000 pills. When it became apparent that this contraband was coming from Brulay, the investigation was unified with participation of customs agents, Food and Drug officers, the Los Angeles sheriff, and State narcotics officers.

Apparently Brulay somehow became aware of this interest in him, and was about to move a large quantity of amphetamines which he had accumulated in Tijuana for introduction into the United States. Arrangements were accordingly made to have him arrested in Mexico on January 28, with the result that amphetamines weighing 118 kilos were found in his car, and another 890 kilos in his home in Tijuana. This is equivalent to about 2,500,000 pills, with a street value of some under $250,000. Under interrogation he made a number of incriminating admissions.

In lieu of prosecution in Mexico, Brulay was, on February 3, deported as an undesirable alien, and arrested in the United States for violation of 18 U.S.C. 371, conspiracy to smuggle amphetamines. To American officers he made no admissions whatever; but when he came to trial on March 25, the Mexican authorities provided witnesses and investigative reports, plus written and taped records of his statements made to them. At the conclusion of a 3-day trial a jury found him guilty after deliberating only 30 minutes. He is to be sentenced on April 25.

The investigation has yielded a great mass of evidentiary material, with the names of many people, apparently including the supplier, middlemen, and distributors, as well as aliases used by Brulay himself. Some of these individuals, including Brulay's son, have been arrested, and many more arrests are expected when the evidence in hand has been sorted out and organized.

LAWRENCE FLEISHMAN,
Assistant Commissioner,
Bureau of Customs.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND TO CALIFORNIA GRAPE & TREE FRUIT LEAGUE, SAN FRANCISCO, MARCH 26, 1966

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, recently, my State of California was honored by a visit from our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida, and Mrs. Holland. Senator HOLLAND had graciously agreed to deliver the principal address before the annual meeting of the California Grape & Tree Fruit League in San Francisco on March 26, 1966.

I know that all of Senator HOLLAND'S friends in the Senate and certainly also those attending the convention in San Francisco were saddened by the family illness which cut short his visit and prevented him from delivering his address in person. The speech was delivered by an assistant to the Senator, and I have had many favorable comments concerning the thought-provoking remarks of this devoted public servant and experienced friend of our Nation's agriculture industry.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address by Senator HOLLAND printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA GRAPE & TREE FRUIT LEAGUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., MARCH 26, 1966

Ladies and gentlemen of the California Grape & Tree Fruit League, I am delighted at the opportunity to visit with you and to speak again to this fine organization. It was a high honor when you asked me to visit you some years ago, but to be invited back a second time after you have heard me once is indeed a rare distinction. My wife, Mary, is also most happy to be your guest and we both want you to know of our deep appreciation of your kindness.

As a Senator from Florida and the "third Senator from California," an honorary title bestowed upon me by some of you which pleases me greatly, I speak to you today on what I know are issues of common interest to your league, to our two States, and to all agricultural groups in the Nation.

As second ranking member of the legislative Senate Agriculture Committee, and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture, it is my pleasant duty to deal day after day with agricultural problems. I know that the problems of agriculture are increasing in number and difficulty, partly because the number of people in agriculture is diminishing in proportion to the rest of the Nation, and partly because of the vast number of complexities attendant upon agricultural production and marketing. I bring Florida greetings and some Florida sunshine to the golden State of California. I am sure our mutual interest in agriculture and in improving our posture in this important field is even stronger than our traditional interest in expounding to each other the climatic attractions of our two great States. It has been my fixed opinion for many years that without the two good States of California and Florida, the bouquet of States of this great Nation would lose a very great deal of its color and fragrance.

May I first mention the great record which your junior Senator, GEORGE MURPHY, is already making in the U.S. Senate where, among other things, he has performed yeoman's service to the agricultural interests of California and the Nation. He has aided immeasurably in bringing the problems of agriculture to the Senate floor and to the attention of the Nation. He has already appeared as the principal speaker at the annual meeting of a great Florida agricultural organization—the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association—where he was warmly welcomed as a devoted friend of all agriculture. It has been a joy to me to stand with GEORGE MURPHY on the floor of the Senate and to see him fighting there every minute for the interests of agricultural producers.

I have great admiration, too, for your senior Senator, THOMAS KUCHEL, the minority whip of the Senate. He has stood side by side with us in fighting for agriculture, though his duties as a minority leader have not permitted him to spend so much time in this field as he would have liked.

May I mention, also, another agricultural activity in which your State has contributed much. I speak of the National Fruit Export Council formerly headed by your president, Mr. Marion Newton, which is continuously making efforts to recapture the foreign agricultural markets which we had before World War II, and to enlarge those outlets for our products. The Fruit Export Council has performed an outstanding job in close cooperation with the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and with agriculturally minded Members of Congress. We have not yet reached the level of exports for which we are striving, but I am confident that under the council's leadership we will continue to increase our exports of fresh, canned, concentrated, and dried fruits and fruit juices.

Cooperation, as exemplified in the Export Council, and in the working together of our two States in the Congress and elsewhere with many other States has been responsible for much of the progress which has been made, not only as to exports, but in every other field affecting the production and marketing of agricultural products and the welfare of agricultural producers. There has never been a time when such cooperation was more important than it is today. I need not remind you that there are no commodities in the field of fruits and vegetables which are big enough in themselves to command much influence in the Congress. But by the joint efforts of all of those who are interested in any of these many products in which our Nation is so rich we can assemble sufficient strength in both Houses of Congress to protect ourselves against unfair attack and to accomplish the passage of legislation or appropriations which are necessary to our well-being.

So, I shall speak to you on several points which I believe are so important to all of agriculture as to require our full, continuing cooperation.

My first point relates to the so-called Dirksen resolution, proposing a constitutional amendment by which the people of each State would be allowed to decide for themselves whether they want to have one house of their State legislature apportioned on a basis other than strict population. Since the beginning of the Republic over 175 years ago and up until June 1964 the people had, as a matter of right, the power to determine for themselves the composition of their State legislatures. But now, as the result of the decision of the Supreme Court on this subject, and despite the warning of Justice Felix Frankfurter against the Court's entering this "political thicket" as he called it, State after State is embroiled in the predicament of reapportioning one or both houses of its legislature.

Chaos is evident everywhere and guidelines and deadlines for reapportionment vary widely and inconsistently. The so-called one-man, one-vote edict of the Supreme Court calls for an immediate change in the structure of legislative representation within most of the States. The Dirksen amendment provides the necessary instrument through which all interests, large or small, agriculture, forestry, manufacturing or labor, may continue, in the sole discretion of the people of each State, to have a direct voice in fixing the membership of one house of the legislature.

The immense progress which our States have made and which the Nation has made under the same system, as existing in Congress, should show clearly the value of this kind of representation which includes not only representatives of the great masses of people in the cities, but also representatives and neighbors of the people in the thinly populated geographical areas and of those people concerned with special economic undertakings. Big city interest should not and must not be permitted to decide the future of all interests. Vital questions call for proper and full debate in which direct representation of all areas shall have a part. I support the Dirksen amendment, since it offers the way by which States can preserve balanced legislative representation, balanced in keeping with each State's individual and peculiar needs which its own people can decide for themselves.

I bring this matter before you since I believe that agriculture, always primarily a rural industry, has a major stake in the course of action to be taken to determine whether its future will be dominated by big city bosses and labor unions.

Consider the case of your neighbor State of Nevada. More than half of its people are in the counties where Reno and Las Vegas are located, yet much of the State is relatively undeveloped even though it has had statehood since 1864. Or look at Arizona, where more than half of the people are in Maricopa County. Hawaii, with over four-fifths of its people on one island, in one county, presents an even more extreme case. Alaska, with more than twice the area of Texas, and more than half of its people in two counties, with communications very difficult, presents an interesting case. Is there any reason why the people of each of these States should not have the right, in their discretion, to allow their citizens living in remote areas to have direct representation by neighbors whom they know and with whom they can discuss their problems? As to your own great State I am sure that your agricultural interests strongly desire active representation by people from their own communities in one house of the California Legislature. I believe that the people of your great cities would help them attain this fair objective.

My second point: One of the gravest hazards that now confronts agriculture is the proposal to amend the Wage and Hour Act so as to include agricultural workers under the coverage of the minimum wage provisions. We all know how hurtful this would be. We have had a full demonstration this last year of the tremendous difference between the efficiency and productiveness of workers who want to work, know how to work, and take some pride in their production—contrasted with the output of other workers recruited from the ranks of the unemployed in the cities, many of whom are mere time servers, caring little about the amount or the quality of their work.

When we read the statements of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Senator Hugo Black—the originators of the Wage and Hours Act—in which they carefully confined the philosophy of the act to cover only workers in manufacturing, we wonder what has happened to the thinking of our so-called ultraliberals of this day.

Agriculture is still subject to the weather, to the changing and uncertain demands of the market, to the necessity to move perishable crops when they mature, to the competition of producers of similar crops, to the perils of infestation by insects and diseases, in short, to many unpredictable uncertainties which do not prevail in the field of manufacturing.

Traditionally, and always successfully up to this time, agriculture has been united in fighting off the inclusion of its work force under the provisions of the Wage and Hour Act. I hope that we may take that same position again unanimously and successfully. It will be an evil day for agriculture, and for the consumers of the Nation as well, if we do not succeed again in defeating this ill-conceived effort.

I hardly think it necessary after your recent hearings in California to point out the kind of control to which farm labor would be subject, not only by its radical leadership in many labor organizations, but also by the extremely partisan attitude of Government agencies which administer labor laws.

It would be unthinkable to me that in this great State producing agricultural values of about $3½ billion a year, your agricultural interests could possibly take any other position than to fight aggressively and unceasingly against a step which not only neglects all of the essential differences between agricultural production and other types of work, but also would give encouragement to those who would seek to bring agricultural labor into labor organizations and under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board.

It is my strong hope that this league, along with all of the other groups in California agriculture, will work closely with other agricultural producers in our Nation in insisting that agricultural labor be again exempted from the coverage of that act. I cannot think of anything which would be more harmful to agriculture than to take this step so long urged by the more radical labor leaders and now supported, I regret to say, by the official efforts of national labor officials, including the Secretary of Labor himself.

A third matter which I know is of compelling concern to all of you, is the arbitrary action of the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Willard Wirtz, concerning supplemental foreign labor. At the beginning of 1965 we were shocked to find that many of the radical liberals misinterpreted the refusal of Congress to extend Public Law 78, the Bracero Act, beyond 1964, as a mandate against the continued use of foreign labor and that some of the officials of the Department of Labor expressed this same feeling. So Senator MURPHY and I, and others, took the floor last year on five or more occasions to point out the great harm being done by decisions of Mr.

Wirtz in this field and to document the losses and frustrations of agriculture due to inability to obtain timely and adequate labor. In particular, we documented the clear intent of Congress to continue to use Public Law 414, the General Immigration Act, for the importation of needed supplemental farm labor after Public Law 78 expired. We quoted statements made on the floor of the Senate by leading opponents of Public Law 78 to the effect that Public Law 414 would continue in force and could be used after the expiration of the Bracero Act to bring in needed labor.

Notwithstanding this fact, the Secretary of Labor imposed so many hardships on agriculture, particularly in California and Florida, that I offered an amendment to the farm bill of 1965 to place the determination as to the use of foreign labor in the Secretary of Agriculture.

This amendment was adopted in committee and debated on the Senate floor on September 13. While the amendment was defeated, it required the vote of the Vice President to break a Senate tie vote of 45–45. From that moment, this placed the responsibility squarely upon the national administration itself with regard to the foreign labor problem, and I hope that such fact may produce this year a more reasonable attitude on the part of Secretary Wirtz and his associates.

It is interesting to note that while this subject was not before the conference of the House and Senate on the farm bill of 1965, the conferees nevertheless adopted a strong statement which I offered on foreign labor.

This statement indicated strong dissatisfaction on the part of members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees in the way the foreign labor problem was being handled by Mr. Wirtz and strong insistence that the Secretary of Agriculture was the proper person to handle problems of farm labor and that his advice should be sought and followed in the determinations made by the Commissioner of Immigration on the admission of supplemental foreign workers.

Secretary Wirtz is a kindly gentleman, but his handling of the farm labor problem has been highly impractical and has shown little understanding of critical farm problems. Unless much more adequate handling of this problem is shown within the next few weeks or months, the producers of perishable crops throughout the Nation must renew their battle in this matter on an even stronger basis than last year.

I shall not enumerate here all the difficulties of last year. Some of them were the actual plowing under of mature crops, the reduced plantings of other crops, the removal of plantings from our country to Mexico and the Bahamas, the removal of processors from this country, the reduction in the work force of American labor employed in the processing and transportation of farm crops and the virtual destruction of the most meaningful mutual aid program which we had with our neighboring nations.

I do want to call attention, however, to the fact that the original drive for total elimination of supplemental farm labor has apparently been blunted. To cut our sugarcane crop in Florida for 1965–66, we have been allowed to bring in 8,468 workers from the British West Indies. When we had a freeze which seemed to offer great damage to our midseason orange crop, Secretary Wirtz immediately certified 1,000 British West Indies workers as fruit pickers, though only 665 were actually brought in.

The admission of Basque sheep herders for the sheep ranchers of the West has continued and there were 1,455 of these in the country on January 31 of this year. The employment of woodcutters for the New England States and New York authorized from January 1 to March 11 totalled 3,179. The total number of workers to help the maple producers of Maine admitted in this year was 800. In the fall of 1965, Secretary Wirtz certified 4,500 Canadian workers for the potato industry in Maine besides 2,430 Canadian and British West Indies workers for the apple growers of New England, New York, Virginia, and West Virginia.

I understand that some Japanese workers have already been certified for your date industry this year. It is clear that Secretary Wirtz is gaining a better understanding of the imperative needs of agriculture for supplemental farmworkers from abroad.

You know the California situation much better than I, but I have secured from the U.S. Commissioner of Immigration a report that 17,653 so-called green card Mexicans were engaged in agricultural work in the Southwest in January of this year and that the number of illegal "wetbacks" increased so greatly last year that the burden of excluding them was greatly increased; 22,314 wetbacks were deported in 1965 as contrasted with 11,429 in 1964.

In other words, there are some favorable indications in this picture now. It is clear to me that the cooperation of all agricultural groups in the Nation must be sought and their united efforts placed behind the adequate recognition of the need for supplemental alien farmworkers, particularly at this time when the number of unemployed in this Nation is so small and when many industries are crying for additional qualified, domestic workers. At this same time the President is calling for an enlarged food-for-freedom program, under which we are asked to produce greatly increased amounts of food to feed the hungry people of the world.

The undeniable facts are with the producers of perishable food crops—and the time is favorable. I urge you to join in an insistent effort with all other producers in your State—with those in my State and all the producing States in the Nation—in pressing your rights under Public Law 414 to have supplemental foreign workers in this year when you will need them badly. I believe that success will surely crown our efforts.

The administration which has assumed full responsibility in this matter by defeating my amendment by the single vote of the Vice President, will surely listen carefully and sympathetically in this election year. Aggressive action and complete unity will get the desired result to which I say again, you are clearly entitled under Public Law 414.

It has been a great pleasure to be with you—I close by assuring you that I shall continue to fight the battle of agriculture in the Senate—believing that its economy is of vast importance to our Nation and its productive power the greatest asset that our Nation has in its international dealings during these perilous days.

APPRECIATION DINNER HELD FOR JAMES G. PATTON, RETIRING PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION; SPEECHES OF TONY DECHANT AND JOSEPH D. KEENAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday, March 28, 1966, an appreciation dinner was given here in Washington, D.C., for James G. Patton, retiring president of the National Farmers Union.

James Patton has been president of the Farmers Union for 26 years—since 1940—and during that time he has distinguished himself as one of the outstanding leaders of this Nation. He pioneered rural electrification and rural housing programs and has long fought the battle to preserve the family farmer.

James Patton has been more than a president of the National Farmers Union, he has been the vision and inspiration of an entire movement dedicated to the betterment of life in rural areas and justice for the American farmer.

I am proud that James Patton is my personal friend.

As a tribute to this great American, I ask unanimous consent that the program from that dinner, along with the remarks of Tony T. Dechant, new president of the National Farmers Union, and Joseph D. Keenan, international secretary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In Appreciation James G. Patton—Program

Presiding: P. L. (Roy) Siemiller, international president, International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.

Invocation: Rev. Shirley E. Greene, Commission on Church and Economic Life, National Council of Churches of Christ, U.S.A.

Music: Morgan Baer.

Introductions.

Addresses: Tony T. Dechant, national president, National Farmers Union; George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Presentation.

Response: James G. Patton.

SPONSOR

George Meany and P. L. (Roy) Siemiller, cochairmen; I. W. Abel, United Steelworkers of America; Joseph A. Beirne, Communications Workers of America; Joseph Curran, National Maritime Union of America; A. J. DeAndrade, International Printing Pressmen's and Assistants' Union of North America; David Dubinsky, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union; John J. Grogan, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America.

Paul Hall, Seafarers International Union of North America; Ralph Helstein, United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers; M. A. Hutcheson, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; Paul Jennings, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers; Joseph D. Keenan, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Herman D. Kenin, American Federation of Musicians; Lee Milton, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada; Paul L. Phillips, United Papermakers and Paperworkers.

Jacob S. Potofsky, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Walter P. Reuther, International Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, William F. Schnitzler, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; Peter T. Schoemann, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada; James A. Suffridge, Retail Clerks International Association; David Sullivan, Building Service Employees International Union; Hunter P. Wharton, International Union of Operating Engineers.

Introduction—Patton Testimonial Speech

(Remarks of Joseph D. Keenan, International Secretary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers)

It is a real privilege for me to be here to pinch-hit for the great leader of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations to pay tribute to another forward-looking organization, the

National Farmers Union, and to honor its leader for so many years, Jim Patton. He and the organization he has served so well have stood side by side with American labor in fighting for the welfare of American workers, both on the farms and in the cities.

To most Americans who follow agricultural affairs to any extent—and certainly to Members of Congress—the National Farmers Union is "that other" farm organization.

The National Farm Bureau Federation, year in and year out, in Washington and in the State capitals, thunders against every piece of social legislation designed to help the people in general, and wage-earners in particular. They are as predictable as the National Association of Manufacturers—and they are almost always on the same side.

They have successfully created an image of the American farmer as a dyed-in-the-wool reactionary, concerned only with his narrow self-interest. Worse than that, a reactionary who always has his hand in the public purse, but who is a skinflint toward everyone else.

This image has been so widely accepted that many citizens, I am sure, are vaguely surprised that the National Farmers Union exists at all. For the NFU, as we all know, has just as consistently spoken out for the well-being, the continuing progress, of wage-earners as well as farmers.

But those who are surprised by a liberal, progressive farm organization don't know much about American history.

Let us remember how Emerson described the opening battle:

> "By the rule bridge that arched the flood,
>   Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
> Here once the embattled farmers stood
>   And fired the shot heard round the world."

Now those farmers weren't shooting at the redcoats for the sake of high subsidies and low wages.

They had some other objectives in mind—the kind of objectives that have been exemplified, over the years, by the National Farmers Union.

You may be thinking that I am oversimplifying the case, by going all the way back to 1775 for a comparison. Actually, this was just the beginning of a long tradition.

Through most of the 19th century, the movers and shakers, the idealists and the reformers, came from the farms, not from the cities. The bitterest enemies of slavery—giving full marks to the New England intellectuals—were the free and independent farmers, North and South, who measured a man, not by his color, but by his performance in the endless struggle with the forces of nature.

When wage earners were an unorganized, voiceless mass, it was the farmers who inspired and supported the Populist movement, that terrified the industrial moguls of the time—the malefactors of great wealth," as Theodore Roosevelt would call them later.

These barons weren't afraid of their workers. With the help of the law, the courts, the official and unofficial police, they could crush any uprising of their own employees. What scared them was the farmers—the free, independent farmers, who demanded an end to the domination of American life, and the American economy, by the Morgans and the Carnegies and the Rockefellers.

Nothing has ever been said about Samuel Gompers or Philip Murray or even John L. Lewis that compares with what was said about William Jennings Bryan.

Even Eugene Debs was less of a threat. Debs could be attacked as a socialist, a "Red," a spokesman for a strange new ideology. But Bryan was the symbol, the standard bearer, of a radical reform movement that was undeniably 100 percent American. And it had its roots in the soil.

Consider that desolate period after World War I—the so-called roaring twenties, the jazz age of flappers and bootleggers. If we base our judgments on the movies and the television, it was a glamourous and exciting time. It was a time when every young man had a Stutz Bearcat and a raccoon coat and a silver flask full of bathtub gin. And every girl was beautiful, confused, and available.

Maybe that's the way it was in Princeton and New Haven, in Greenwich Village, or Hollywood. But for workers and for farmers it was a decade of stagnation, from the "return to normalcy" to the "chicken in every pot."

Of course, hardly anybody paid any attention to workers and farmers in those days. Almost everyone was getting rich in Wall Street.

But there were a few who were paying attention. There were a few, lonely voices who pointed out that a slogan like "the business of America is business" didn't really include all of us.

These weren't labor voices alone. No, the major voices of dissent in that long, bleak decade went by such names as La Follette and Norris and Borah, Wheeler, and Johnson, and Nye. They were not always right on every issue, but they were the voices that kept alive the spirit of social progress when so many others had given up the fight.

And when the long political drought ended with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, where did the new President look for help? Not just to the college professors; he also called in the heirs and survivors of the Populist and Progressive movements, men like Harold Ickes and Henry Wallace—and like Harry Truman.

So I say that the National Farmers Union is not really "that other" farm organization. On the contrary, it represents the true spirit, the real principles, of the independent, self-supporting farmer, as demonstrated by almost two centuries of American history.

Now this obviously brings me to the area of practical politics; so let me say a few words on that subject.

The whole philosophy of the National Farmers Union, as I understand it—and if I am wrong, I will certainly be corrected in a very few minutes—is that what is good for America is good for farmers.

This happens to coincide with the philosophy and program of the AFL–CIO.

We say that what is good for America is good for the AFL–CIO.

Clearly we can't be very far apart.

But at the same time, neither the National Farmers Union nor the AFL–CIO lays claim to any special sanctity. We are not asking anyone to fit us with a halo.

We are simply operating according to the principles of enlightened self-interest.

It seems simple enough to me. A farmer who is well off, who has a reasonable chance to sell his crops at a reasonable price, will be a better customer for tools and tractors, textiles and toothpicks, than the fellow who is constantly faced with foreclosure.

In the same way, a wage earner who can meet his rent—or his mortgage payments—without strain, who can clothe his family and pay the electric bill, will also buy more meat and bread and vegetables and eggs.

Therefore—and this is so simple there must be something wrong with it—the AFL–CIO is for prosperous farmers and the NFU is for prosperous workers.

I offer this bold new concept, without charge, to the Farm Bureau.

Seriously, I think this concept needs a good deal of development; and if I may say so, the need is greater among the farm population.

I was very pleased to read that the NFU is now going to intensify its organizing efforts. That's fine. We in the labor movement can tell you that organization and education are inseparable. As you recruit you will educate, to the benefit of all.

The plain truth is that there is no conflict of interest between farmer and worker. What the farmer gets has very little relation to what the worker pays for food in the supermarket. What the worker earns an hour has almost nothing to do with the price of a harrow. The rivalry is imaginary, cleverly fomented by those who want both farmers and workers to get less.

Earlier I recalled that the most eloquent spokesmen for the liberal cause, in past years, were often farmers. I think it is fair to say that the labor movement has now taken over a large part of that role. It has fallen to us to be the people's lobby, the voice of the voiceless. We accept the obligation gladly.

Yet we would be stronger in this role, and the national interest would be furthered, if more of the farm population joined in the quest for a better America.

We look forward to the day when there will be a bigger, stronger and even more influential National Farmers Union at our side.

Our guest of honor tonight has devoted most of his life to creating the foundation. For a generation, Jim Patton has symbolized the true spirit of the American farmer—an independent spirit, but a progressive spirit as well.

I think it is highly appropriate that the National Farmers Union and Jim Patton were born in the same year—1902. Measured by the calendar, they grew up together. But the real growth of the National Farmers Union, in both size and influence, began when they got together in a literal sense.

This is easy enough to understand, for as you look over his career, it almost seems as though Jim Patton spent his first 38 years preparing to lead the NFU. He started young; his father was a Populist and a follower of William Jennings Bryan, and I am sure this helped to shape his thinking during his Colorado boyhood.

He had financial troubles early in life; after the death of his father he had to quit college and go to work, in order to support his mother and three younger sisters. He had hardly recovered from this setback when the depression cost him his job as a typewriter salesman.

This proves that the depression wasn't all bad. Because it was only a short time later that we find him with the Colorado Farmers Union, setting up a cooperative insurance program. That was the real beginning.

From the start of the New Deal, Jim Patton has been an adviser and a source of ideas for the Federal Government. He has not only supported the social programs adopted during the last generation, in an amazing number of cases, he thought of them first.

I won't attempt to recite the list. Let me give only one example. In August 1951, Jim Patton proposed that the United States send farmers and technicians to live abroad and teach their skills to the peoples of undeveloped lands. Ten years later, John F. Kennedy founded the Peace Corps.

In his ideas and in his career, Jim Patton has been an eloquent spokesman for the common interests of farmers and workers in the ultimate achievement of the American dream. As we honor him tonight, let us rededicate ourselves to that goal.

Let me conclude with just one more thought—one that I know President Meany intended to express, if he had been able to be here. It is simply this: On behalf of the AFL–CIO, and of every wage earner, we say to you, Jim Patton, "Thank you; thank you, from the bottom of our hearts."

REMARKS OF TONY T. DECHANT, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, TO JAMES G. PATTON APPRECIATION DINNER, MARCH 28, 1966

I am deeply grateful and highly honored to be asked to say a few words to this distinguished gathering.

We are assembled here this evening to do homage to a great American—a truly great citizen of this world.

The entire membership of the National Farmers Union is deeply honored that you here this evening, and those you represent, are honoring Jim Patton.

Our Jim Patton is revered wherever there is a dedication to the fight for human decency, freedom, and progress.

He has left the Farmers Union a truly great heritage. Indeed, he has left me, as his successor, a mighty big pair of shoes to fill.

In the few minutes I have this evening may I make the record vividly clear as to the path ahead which will be occupied by the Farmers Union under my direction, as assisted by our able vice president, Ed Christianson, our executive committee, board of directors, and membership.

In my acceptance speech less than 2 weeks ago, I pledged my enthusiastic acceptance of our democratically formulated policies and rededicated my every effort to their implementation.

This includes, first, a major campaign to increase the income of our Nation's family farmers to bring them at least equal to that of other citizens. In this regard, we welcome your continued and most capable support.

The Farmers Union will not decrease its efforts to bring about a true and effective recapitalization of rural America. Advanced programs of housing, rural electrification, credit, conservation, cooperative development—all geared to the complete elimination of poverty—are of the highest priority, since 48 percent of our poverty is found in rural America.

We will not cease in our efforts to develop the best possible food-for-peace program—geared to assist the developing nations of a troubled world—but not saddling the costs of the program on the backs of our farmers.

The Farmers Union, pioneer in the development of our school milk and school lunch programs, is opposed to any ill-conceived reduction and this afternoon I testified for funds to strengthen these programs—not reduce them.

We will rededicate our efforts in behalf of all our people. We support the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. We want the Congress to pass truth-in-packaging, truth-in-lending, strong antipollution measures. We will join with you in labor to bring about improved medical care at lower costs, to beautify our great Nation, to make our highways a safe place to travel and our cars more safety styled.

We will work with you in efforts to expand educational programs, control the monopolizers, and develop a full-employment economy.

And we will ask your support as we strive to enact a "Wagner Act for farmers" designed to strengthen the bargaining position of farmers through Government-supervised agricultural marketing authorities which should regulate production and represent farmers in their price dealings with buyers.

Farmers Union has been proud to have been allied for many years with the efforts of the labor movement in behalf of many of the measures I have mentioned above.

We have been proud, also, to have supported measures geared to increase the minimum wage to an adequate level and expand its coverage to all employees, including agricultural workers, to improve unemployment compensation laws, and to support enactment of legislation to protect the rights of all of those who work for employers to organize, bargain collectively and protect their organization.

Legislative provisions should be strengthened regarding wage rates, health, safety, and housing conditions for domestic migratory farm labor and for the education of the children of migrant families.

The Farmers Union wants a progressive America. That is why we vigorously opposed the candidacy of Barry Goldwater in 1964 and actively oppose the John Birch Society and other rightwing extremists today and tomorrow.

We do not endorse political parties, but certainly grade the duly elected representatives and support, when possible, those who back the programs we back.

With the AFL-CIO operating on the high plane of issues in the cities and the Farmers Union operating on similar high ground in the countryside we can win the struggle for economic and social survival.

I thank God for Jim Patton. I thank Jim Patton for the broad base upon which to build. I pledge to you the continued cooperation of the National Farmers Union.

Thank you.

PRIORITIES AND PRUDENCE ARE REQUISITES IN SPENDING, BUT WATER AND LAND PROJECTS MUST NOT BE NEGLECTED; PRESIDENT'S LEADERSHIP IS COMMENDED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in addressing a conference of Mid-Atlantic States soil conservation committees at Cacapon State Park, W. Va., earlier this week, I described what I construed to be the "realistic picture of trends in the national economy and in Federal programing." I pointed out the exceptionally active and able leadership President Johnson is providing in the efforts to offset inflationary influences.

After noting that the President had summed the situation which prevails by stating that "our economic policy must be to balance the gains of prosperity against the dangers of overheating," I cautioned that we must plan and build within the framework of the conditions which prevail. And I said that in doing so, we must realize that all of our favorite programs cannot be and will not be carried on at the levels to which we have been accustomed—but we must not despair or surrender.

Even though the shaving of a billion dollars from expenditures scheduled for this year has been a challenge issued by the President to Federal departments and agencies, and even though such reductions should occur, the central fact remains that priorities must be set and prudence must be practiced in the selection of categories of public spending, and in appropriations.

For my part, I said then, and I reiterate today, water and land are so basic that they must not be neglected. Hence, my voice will be strong among the advocates of maintaining the best pace possible in our soil stabilization and water resource plans and actions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of my April 4, 1966, remarks to the Mid-Atlantic States Conference of Soil Conservation Committees.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, at Mid-Atlantic States Soil Conservation Committees Conference, Cacapon Lodge, Cacapon State Park, W. Va., April 4, 1966

Problems—especially as they were placed in perspective over the weekend—give cause for all of us to make reassessments. Here are the reasons:

Last Tuesday, following the announcement by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of a major jump in the cost of living, President Johnson appeared for a question-and-answer session with a group of White House fellowship award recipients. It was then that the President spoke of specific contingency plans for a tax rise.

He mentioned three ways in which the prevailing inflationary spiral could be curbed. One, he said, would be to impose wage and price controls—another, to pare down Government spending—and the other, to increase taxes.

The President seemed almost immediately, however, to rule out rigid controls on the economy. Then he remarked that although an attempt is being made to reduce Federal spending, he questions whether the possible cuts would be enough to stem the tide of inflationary pressures. Thus, it appeared that the President was surely laying a foundation for an almost immediate tax increase. In fact, he asserted that if prices continue to move up for another 30 to 90 days, a tax hike would be needed to remove some of the heat from the economic factors behind the price increases and upward spiral of the cost of living.

Last Wednesday, the stock market reacted sharply downward. The President again reacted, too. A series of followup statements came from the White House emphasizing that a final decision definitely had not been made to raise taxes. Every possible means of stemming inflation would be made before the President would ask Congress to increase taxes, White House spokesmen assured Wall Street and the country. The stock market reacted more favorably at the close of the week.

Meanwhile, it came to light that the President also had been engaged the early part of last week in close discussions with industrial and business leaders, asking them in the interest of national welfare to reexamine their plans for business expansion. His suggestion for a voluntary curb on big business spending for expansion was repeated to the Business Council last Wednesday night.

President Johnson followed the next day—Thursday—by carrying his plea for fiscal self-restraints directly to the American public through an address to the mayors and others attending a legislative conference of the National League of Cities.

The President seemed to be addressing all segments of the population—business and labor, congressmen, public officials at all levels, and the housewives—asking all to join in the fight against inflation. He even suggested that buyers and consumers be selective and not patronize items that seem to climb steadily in price.

On Friday, President Johnson asked his Cabinet to join the fight by cutting a billion dollars out of their spending plans this year—not next year, but this year. (Next year will be even more stringent, perhaps.)

The Secretary of the Treasury explained at the end of the week that the President and his administration had devoted the week to fiscal discussions and warnings for two principal reasons; namely, these—

First, there is some chance that by creating an acute public awareness of the problem of inflation—by, in effect, creating a selective buyers' strike against items with inflated price tags—a substantial anti-inflation counterpressure can be created.

Second, if—as appears likely—the President finds it absolutely necessary to turn to Congress for a tax increase of approximately $5 billion—the American people will not have been taken by surprise.

So, that is the picture as March 1966 gave way to April 1966—and it is better that we look at the situation realistically.

We are in military action in southeast Asia at a time when the domestic economy is booming—and extra spending for the Defense Establishment always adds heat to the boiling pot of inflationary ingredients.

When spending already is high, both in the private and the public sectors, price and cost distortions grow like unwanted weeds among the fresh spring flowers. The President has advised wisely in suggesting selective buyers' and consumers' strikes against price-inflated items which generate increases in the cost of living.

Likewise, one cannot fault the President for urging the Departments and Agencies of the executive establishment to pare spending by a billion dollars while, at the same time, he is asking industry and business to cut back on capital expenditures for expansion.

The fact is, of course, that these are "delicate times"—for we are in a period in which there must be superb national and international leadership, and an era when there must be cooperation between nations and teamwork between the constitutionally independent branches of government of our own Republic. Perhaps it is too much to hope for, but there is equal need for patriotism to supplant partisan politics—even in this election year.

With De Gaulle's France threatening the NATO Alliance, and with our efforts to halt communistic aggression in southeast Asia through the actions in Vietnam involving us in expensive problems, diplomatic strictures, and divisiveness in domestic debate, our President and our Government cannot devote total attention to domestic economics. Yet, the problems of the domestic economy are so acute as to require almost full time attention.

It was my experience to have entered the Congress in 1933 when the Great Depression developed conditions which required correction through use of the uplifting influence of so-called massive spending. The New Deal administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt was responsive to the needs of the times. I developed a real appreciation for the value of public works to make permanent improvements while, at the same time, building props under a sagging economy until the private sector would be capable of expanding and becoming healthy.

The seniors among us know what World War II did to overstimulate the economy and bring on price controls, as well as the need for us to make massive injections of foreign aid to physically and economically rehabilitate countries abroad.

We were not overly successful in the immediate post-World War II years in managing the inflation which was further heated by the costs of the Korean affair, so there developed in the mid-1950's and late 1950's a condition which was described as "recession." I returned to the Congress as a Member of the Senate at a time when the need to reheat a cooled-off economy was a priority requirement.

The Kennedy and Johnson administrations did, indeed, achieve 5 years of steady progress and it is understandable that President Johnson does not wish to see those years of progress give way to either inflation or recession. His efforts, understandably, are centered on flattening out the boom and prolonging prosperity without the intrusion of inflation.

The President has summed the situation with the comment that "our economic policy must be to balance the gains of prosperity against the dangers of overheating."

The President knows, and we must all realize, that we are in a war on two fronts—a struggle to contain communism in Vietnam and a continuous battle against discrimination, despair, poverty, disease, and illiteracy in our society at home.

We must all do our part to help achieve success on both fronts.

So we must plan and build within the framework of the conditions which prevail. In doing so, we must realize that all of our favorite programs cannot be and will not be carried on at the levels to which we have been accustomed—but we must not despair or surrender.

Even though the shaving of a billion dollars from expenditures scheduled for this year should occur, and even though budgets for the next fiscal year undoubtedly will be tighter, the central fact remains that priorities must be set and prudence must be practiced in the selection of categories of public spending, and in appropriations.

For my part, water and land are so basic that they must not be neglected. Hence, my voice will be strong among the advocates of maintaining the best pace possible in our soil stabilization and water resource plans and actions. This means, simple stated, that I favor high priorities for flood control and watershed projects. We dare not permit our soils and our precious waters to be swept away to the oceans because of neglect or flooding which might otherwise be controlled. Even now, time is not on our side because we have done too little about soil erosion and have been too conservative in our actions to conserve and improve the quality of our water supply in this country.

As the population explosion persists, we must see that the land and the water necessary to serve the population is not dissipated by erosion, over-stripping for minerals, or carried off to the oceans by floods.

But I must point out that this same population explosion creates other vast problems—the need for more classrooms for education, the requirement that the highway expansion program keep pace with the increased utilization of roads and bridges by many, many more automobiles, and the essentiality of keeping our professional and health services and facilities from lagging farther behind the rate necessary to keep pace with utilization by more and more people.

I have noted that my distinguished Senate colleague, Senator Robert C. Byrd, a member of our Committee on Appropriations, has set a goal to achieve an increase in the amount of $26 million nationwide for flood control and soil conservation purposes under the programs of the Soil Conservation Service. Not only do I commend my dedicated colleague for setting his sights on that goal—I give assurance that I will support all efforts and all ways and means available to achieve it.

There are no more satisfying experiences in my official life than those of breaking ground for or dedicating new water supply facilities under the program of the Farmers Home Administration—new watershed facilities under the Soil Conservation Service activities—new river locks and dams and reservoirs under the Army Corps of Engineers flood control and navigation assistance programs—new educational facilities under the recently liberalized aid-to-education programs of the Federal Government—new highways under the Federal-aid highway program—or new institutions to improve public health and to provide better medical and institutional care for our citizens.

Those are the services and facilities which are basic to the good life in these United States. We must not permit them to be sold short, even in time of war on communism, in war on inflation, or in war on recession. Our water, soil, traffic arteries, educational and health services and facilites should have the prime attention of our Government at all times. I certainly will be among those insisting that authorizations and appropriations by the Congress reflect their priority positions.

EXTENSION OF HATCH ACT TO EMPLOYEES OF VISTA AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I continue to receive favorable comments and enthusiastic support both from constituents and editorials throughout the country regarding S. 2908, which I offered on February 8, along with 24 other Senators, to extend the Hatch Act to employees of VISTA and the community action programs, who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal funds. I feel strongly that this amendment should be accepted this session. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the various editorials that I received be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Glendale (Calif.) News-Press, Feb. 19, 1966]

Murphy Amendment: Politics and Poverty Program

Senator George Murphy, Republican, of California, has taken a commendable step toward keeping politics out of the poverty program.

He has introduced an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which would place executives who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal poverty funds under the Hatch Act. This act is supposed to prevent politicking by Federal employees.

The "Murphy amendment" needs to stick this time. He introduced a similar proposal last year. It was accepted unanimously by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and passed the Senate without a dissenting vote. But this much needed protection was cut out in conference.

The need for keeping politics out of the poverty program is plain to see. As Murphy said in a letter to his colleagues soliciting their support:

"The war on poverty is in danger of becoming bogged down by bickering and partisan political activities. This, of course, is most regrettable, and I am convinced that unless steps are taken to keep the program free from politics, the poor will benefit little, if any, from the program."

The extra year of experience since Congress eliminated Murphy's amendment last year should provide ample grounds for keeping it intact this time.

[From the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook, Feb. 24, 1966]

Down the "Hatch" With Them

It sometimes appears that the only way the Federal Government can win the war against poverty is for Sargent Shriver to order his program executives to beat "need" to death with their salary-swollen wallets. But maybe there is another way—Senator George Murphy's way.

Senator Murphy, our junior Senator from California, has announced that he will introduce legislation requiring that executives of the poverty program who are paid more than one-half of their salaries from antipoverty funds be placed under the Hatch Act.

If Senator Murphy is successful in amending the Economic Opportunity Act, all poverty war administrators, coordinators and expediters who draw the bulk of their pay from funds intended to relieve the poor will be prohibited from political activity.

This, of course, would be a grievous blow to the patronage dispensers who now divert antipoverty funds to a motley crew of wardheelers, nepotists and professional hangers-on who buzz around the battlefields of the poor like bees in a flower garden.

Deprived of their political reasons for existence the poverty "fighters" might have no choice left except to go to work in behalf of the poor. They would, in fact, be forced to safeguard the intent of Congress in establishing the antipoverty program.

Senator MURPHY is a realist and undoubtedly has no illusions about the chances for his reform amendment. He remembers the last session of Congress when administration pressure killed similar legislation he sponsored. When the poor are pawns of an administration bent on perpetuating itself and its ordained successors in power, the public interest be damned, or so the last Congress demonstrated.

But Senator MURPHY will try again, confident that he has the strong support of the people who underwrite the billions now being wasted—the taxpayers.

Only if legislators like Senator MURPHY prevail will the antipoverty program be saved from political prostitution.

[From the Burbank (Calif.) Review, Feb. 10, 1966]

POLITICS BAR SOUGHT IN POVERTY WAR

WASHINGTON.—Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Republican, of California, has reintroduced legislation to bar local officials of the antipoverty war from partisan politics.

MURPHY's proposal was adopted last year by the Senate but later dropped by a House-Senate conference from a package of amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

The measure would place workers in the Community Action and VISTA programs under the Hatch Act, the Federal law restricting political activity by U.S. workers.

All executives of the two programs who receive most of their salaries from Federal poverty funds could be covered.

MURPHY tried to drum up support for the amendment in letters Wednesday to all his Senate colleagues.

"I am convinced that unless steps are taken to keep the $2 billion poverty program free from politics the poor will benefit little—if any—from the program," he said.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News, Feb. 23, 1966]

GOOD IDEA

Senator GEORGE MURPHY of California has come up with an idea that could cut down on the politics in the antipoverty program.

Senator MURPHY has introduced a bill (S. 2908) which extends the Hatch Act to cover employees of the community action program and the VISTA volunteers who receive the principal part of their salaries from the Federal Government.

The Hatch Act, in force since 1939, bars Federal employees from using their offices to influence voters or taking an active part in politics or political campaigns.

During the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, the law has been openly flaunted. Washington bureaucrats twist the arms of their employees for donations to the Democratic Party, and for party support at the polls. Postal clerks and employees thumb their noses at the law and politic openly.

Nevertheless, it is the law, and violators can be brought into court—if any politician has the intestinal fortitude to do it.

The antipoverty program has turned into a huge Federal patronage service, a political pork barrel, and those in the program have openly used poverty funds for political purposes. Extending the Hatch Act to cover them, would, at least, make what they are doing clearly illegal and would give communities a weapon in case poverty politicians attempted to exert pressure on local governing bodies and officials.

As the Washington Star said this week in endorsing the Murphy proposal, it may be a remedy although probably not a cure. To people who have no respect for law, laws mean nothing unless enforced.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) News, Feb. 15, 1966]

POLITICS AND POVERTY

Poverty program personnel would be barred from political activity under a proposal offered by Senator GEORGE MURPHY.

The Senator would amend the Economic Opportunity Act to provide that community action agency employees who receive more than half their salaries from Federal poverty funds, and employees of the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program would be placed under the Hatch Act.

The Johnson administration has indicated a desire to divorce the program from politics. If that is indeed the case it should have no objection to barring those who operate the program from political activity.

The Job Corps, which operates under the Hatch Act, has largely avoided getting bogged down in politics.

The war on poverty is too important to be jeopardized by political finagling.

Putting poverty workers under the Hatch Act will not solve all the problems of the program, but it should have a beneficial effect.

Adoption of the Murphy amendment would serve notice on poverty program personnel that they are there to help the poor, not the politicians.—Los Angeles Times

---

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Press, Feb. 11, 1966]

"HATCH" THEM

Since the outset, some phases of President Johnson's war on poverty have been complicated, if not disrupted, by squabbling and grabbiness among local politicians.

Senator GEORGE MURPHY, of California, thinks he have a remedy, although probably not a cure.

He said he will introduce a bill to apply the Hatch Act to all administrators in the so-called community action and VISTA aspects of the program. These are the places where the most trouble has turned up.

The Hatch Act, on the books since 1939, bars Federal employees from using their offices to influence voters or taking an active part in politics or political campaigns.

Senator MURPHY doubts his proposal would solve all the problems, but he hopes it would make them pay more attention to the needs of the poor, and less to politics.

There isn't any sound reason at all why Congress shouldn't apply the same limitations to antipoverty employees as to other Government people. In fact, in the case of the antipoverty employees, the restrictions are especially needed.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Post & Times-Star, Feb. 11, 1966]

HATCH ACT AND POVERTY

Since the outset, some phases of President Johnson's war on poverty have been complicated, if not disrupted, by squabbling and grabbiness among local politicians.

Senator GEORGE MURPHY, of California, thinks he may have a remedy. He said he will introduce a bill to apply the Hatch Act to all administrators in the so-called community action and VISTA aspects of the program. These are the places where the most trouble has turned up.

The Hatch Act, on the books since 1939, bars Federal employees from using their offices to influence voters or taking an active part in politics or political campaigns.

Senator MURPHY doubts his proposal would solve all the problems, but he hopes it would make them pay more attention to the needs of the poor, and less to politics.

In Cincinnati, one group in the Cincinnati Action Commission, responsible for the War on Poverty program, has fought desperately against a proposed local Hatch Act. Their strange argument has been that it would deprive the director and his aids of their citizenship rights.

We fail to see why employees of this contractual agency should be exempt from the rules which govern Government employees who spend Federal money and operate Federal programs.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION ON MAIL ORDER GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD some supplementary information on the mail order gun legislation now pending before the Senate. It is an article appearing in the April 3, 1966, issue of This Week magazine, a Sunday supplement which is distributed in a number of newspapers across the Nation.

Entitled "Murder in the Mail," and authored by Jerome Wilson, the article deftly outlines for the public how the availability of firearms to virtually anyone who can sign his name and spend a few dollars contributes to the criminal use of firearms in a Nation already plagued by a growing crime problem.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The author speaks of the implements of war and death: pistols, rifles, sniper equipment, bazookas, cannons, tanks, riot guns, derringers, artillery pieces and so forth which are being sold across this country much the same as a housewife buys a pound of butter.

During the 5 years we have been investigating this trafficking in firearms we have been constantly harassed by a hard-core minority of the populace spending fortunes in time and money to confuse the public, distort the issues and divert attention from the main issue. And the issue is a simple one. It is the administration's proposal to place reasonable, rational controls over the indiscriminate sale of firearms to felons, addicts, the mentally ill, and others who should not be armed. It in no way infringes the rights of others.

However, the free flow of arms to others who do misuse them, who can be expected to misuse them, and to those who may not know the difference between right and wrong infringes on the rights of the law abiding.

In testimony to the fact that this does happen, all too frequently, I ask unanimous consent that a short series of news articles concerning the misuse of firearms, easily procurred, also be included in the RECORD.

And I add that these news items represent only a small part of the mayhem wreaked on our law-abiding populace during a 1-week period from March 3 through March 29, 1966.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Apr. 3, 1966]

MURDER IN THE MAIL

(By Jerome Wilson)

Anyone (even a kid, if he tells enough lies) can buy a deer rifle or an antitank gun right out of a catalog.

Last October a Brinks armored car company's vault in Syracuse, N.Y., was blasted open with an antitank cannon by thieves who stole $400,000.

In December 1964, a high-powered bazooka shell exploded in the East River in New York City just short of the United Nations building, at which it had, fortunately, been carelessly aimed.

On January 30, 1964, a mentally disturbed mother in Wheaton, Md., killed her three teenage children and herself with a .38 revolver, and on January 29, 1965, a 15-year-old boy in Baltimore used a .38-caliber foreign revolver to murder his mother, father and younger sister.

These shocking, bizarre and dissimilar acts of violence had one thing in common: the deadly weapons involved were purchased from dealers in surplus military goods, who peddle their merchandise as cheerfully as used-car salesmen, and at lower prices. The bazooka cost $35, the antitank gun $99.50, the foreign revolver only $16.95.

No one asked the buyers what use they intended to make of their purchases, and no one found the sellers guilty of any wrongdoing.

The 15-year-old boy was not told that he was too young to buy a gun, because he ordered it by mail and gave a false name and a post office box number—just as Lee Harvey Oswald did when he bought an old Italian army carbine for $19.95 and used it to kill the President of the United States.

HOW DO THEY GET WEAPONS?

How does it happen that children, criminals and psychotic assassins are able so easily to acquire the weapons they use to build up our annual toll of murders, suicides, and accidents? It happens, first, because there are no effective laws in the United States to control the traffic in arms and, second, because the sale of firearms has become a well-organized, money-making business.

Much of the evidence that the interstate trade in arms is a serious national problem was gathered by a U.S. Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, headed by Senator Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut. The committee began hearings in Washington in early 1963. After the assassination of President Kennedy on November 22, 1963, firearms-control bills were introduced in both Houses of Congress but died in committee.

There was strong support for the legislation from influential Senators and Representatives, but there was also vocal and successful opposition from organized sporting interests, gun collectors, and businessmen worried about their profits—this in the face of official figures that show more than 2,000 fatal firearms accidents every year in the United States—FBI reports on almost 5,000 gun murders a year (70 percent committed with concealable handguns)—and evidence that half our suicides and 56 percent of our murders are committed with firearms.

ONE ANSWER TO THE PROBLEM

At this time Senator Dodd is readying a new bill. It would limit the interstate mail-order sale of firearms to licensed dealers, prohibit the sale of handguns to anyone under 21 and forbid a dealer to sell handguns to out-of-State customers. The importation of military surplus and the sale of bazookas, antitank guns, grenades, bombs, and other weapons not suitable for sporting purposes would be curbed. Effective State laws and local enforcement will still be necessary even if the bill is passed. But law officers will no longer face some of the odd and dangerous situations they do today in keeping the peace.

Last October, for example, a man in Tucson, Ariz., called the police to report that he had seen two young men carrying what appeared to be a large machinegun into a roominghouse near the University of Arizona campus. Armed with a search warrant, the police entered the room of an engineering student and found a heavy Finnish antitank gun of the type used in the Finnish-Russian war. The student produced a receipt from a local store for $156 for the gun and 25 rounds of 20-millimeter ammunition.

Police had to let him keep it—they could find nothing in Federal, State or local statutes forbidding the possession of a semiautomatic tank killer and armor-piercing ammunition.

It was this same type of gun that destroyed the Brinks vault in Syracuse. In this case, the weapon was bought by two criminals who walked in and paid cash at a gun store in Alexandria, Va. Although the store owner became suspicious and notified the FBI, the weapon was shipped to Plattsburgh, N.Y., and stolen from the express office there. The arms dealer in Alexandria defended his role in the transaction by pointing out, correctly, that selling a large-bore rifle is no different in the eyes of the law then selling a deer gun.

Tracing the source of the Finnish weapon and other foreign arms led investigators to a businessman named Samuel Cummings, president of International Armaments Corp. A U.S. citizen and a resident of Monte Carlo, Mr. Cummings has nine warehouses on the Potomac, a mile from Washington, which are stocked with some 400,000 rifles and pistols.

Mr. Cummings told the Dodd committee that he has other warehouses and offices in England, Finland, and Switzerland, and that during the last 10 years he has imported 125,000 weapons annually into the United States and sold them to 6,000 dealers in 50 States. He testified that this military surplus included 4,500 mortars, bazookas, antitank rifles and artillery pieces.

When asked about the Finnish tank destroyers, Mr. Cummings said that he had imported 1,000 and that "those are, generally, used by collectors and long-range shooters for their own private recreation and experimental purposes."

HIGH-POWERED SALES PITCH

Some of the catalogs and advertisements of army-navy stores and mail-order sporting goods houses make stimulating—though not necessarily authoritative—reading. A dealer in New Jersey offers "the original bazooka used by German troops to smash American-British forces all over Europe," an automatic rifle "used by fanatic SS snipers during the Battle of the Bulge in 1944," a pistol of the type used by Russian secret police "to terrify and kill enemies of the state," an "almost new" German cannon, for $400, which will "stop any vehicle or light tank within a mile," and is "ideal for use as a home protection weapon."

A single issue of Shotgun News, national trade paper of the weapons business, advertises purse-size tear-gas guns, Nazi and Luftwaffe automatic rifles, throwing knives and bayonets, police-type billy clubs, riot guns, derringers, daggers, blowguns, and pellet guns. A blueprint and parts list for building your own .45 target pistol is $2.

Unless his State or local laws require a permit, a mail-order purchaser simply signs a statement that he is over 21, of sound mind, and not a convicted felon. In 1962 Dodd subcommittee investigators checked the names of District residents who filled out such forms and ordered pistols by mail. Twenty-five percent had criminal records, and two had been committed as mental cases.

Millions of Americans live with the comforting misapprehension that they are protected by State and Federal laws governing the purchase and possession of weapons. New Yorkers think so, for example, because theirs is the only State where an annual license is required to own a pistol. But every day last year the police investigated four or five complaints of assault with a gun.

Many of the owners of these weapons acquired them on shopping trips to other States or by filling out a mail-order coupon. The records of one large gunshop in Chillum, Md., revealed that in 1964 and part of 1965, 58 percent of its handgun sales were to residents of the District. Of these, a further check showed that 40 percent of the purchasers had criminal records.

GUN LAWS GO BACK TO THIRTIES

Today's Federal weapons laws date back to the 1930's and were drawn mainly to discourage the sale of submachineguns to gangsters. One piece of almost 28-year-old legislation allows anyone other than a felon to acquire a Federal dealer's license in firearms—for $1. It is held by thousands of individuals who have never sold a gun but who like to order them at wholesale prices without filling out bothersome forms. The Dodd bill would raise the dealer licensing fee and restrict licenses to those who have a legitimate place of business.

According to Thomas C. Lynch, Attorney General of California, Federal dealers' licenses are particularly popular in his State with members of such groups as the Minutemen and the Christian Defense League, which claim to be preparing to defend this Nation from communism. How they collect their arsenals—automatic rifles, machineguns, mortars, land mines, booby traps, powder and ammunition by the case—was illustrated last year when police and Federal officers arrested a pair of men who had arrived in Los Angeles from Delaware in two 5-ton trucks loaded with arms and more than 950,000 rounds of ammunition for an antitank cannon.

Another group that finds it easy to stockpile arms and ammunition is the Ku Klux Klan. The Dodd committee discovered that last year one federally licensed dealer who was involved with the Klan in Mississippi bought 18 Russian Tokarev rifles and 10,000 rounds of ammunition by mail from a retail outlet in Alexandria, Va.

On January 28, 1966, a former Klan member from Greenville, N.C., testified before a House Un-American Activities subcommittee that members of his Klavern were instructed to arm themselves for defense and pick up guns wherever they could be bought without a permit. On one occasion, he said, about $300 was collected to order surplus Army rifles from a dealer in Norfolk, Va.

It should not be forgotten that the Dodd subcommittee was created for the purpose of investigating juvenile delinquency. The ready availability of lethal weapons plays an important part in the rising youth crime rate, and the weapons of delinquency have become increasingly sophisticated. A Los Angeles police lieutenant describes brass knuckles, knives, and clubs as passé. "It is guns they are after," he told the committee. A New York City official reports that the homemade zip gun has declined sharply in popularity among youth gang members because it is easier to buy a cheap six-shot starter pistol.

The most popular juvenile weapon today is a starter pistol designed to fire harmless blank cartridges but easily convertible to shoot .22 bullets. In 1963 and 1964, 127,000 of these pistols were imported from abroad; one Los Angeles importer brought in more than 80,000 of them, ordering at the same time the steel barrels which would convert them to serviceable handguns.

In 1962 New York City detectives arrested a man, handy with tools, who bought the starter pistols from an out-of-State sporting goods store for $5.80 each, then bored out the barrels and enlarged the cylinder chambers to take .22 cartridges. His salesmen peddled them on street corners for $20, and he had disposed of about 100 when apprehended.

"THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS"

Opponents of stricter firearms laws often quote the second amendment to the U.S.

Constitution, which says: "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Usually they forget the first clause referring to "a well-regulated militia" and remember only the second part of the sentence. Prohibition of the sale of pistols to minors, or the control of firearms in interstate trade, or the requirement that a licensed dealer know to whom he is selling a weapon, will scarcely weaken the security of the State.

Other critics claim that no matter how many laws are passed, criminals will still find ways to get guns and only the law-abiding citizen will be disarmed. They say "it is not guns that kill people; people kill people."

True enough. But licensing automobile drivers has not eliminated highway accidents, and no one proposes that children and incompetents should be encouraged to drive.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Mar. 23, 1966]

Blank Cartridge Fired in Face of Clergyman

The Reverend Canon Alfred Vail, of the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania, was shot at yesterday as he stood on the corner of 19th and Walnut Streets.

Canon Vail told police at central detectives, that he and a friend, John Houston, 48, of 332 Lindsey Drive, Berwyn, were on the corner at 2:30 p.m. when a car drove up, a man leaned out and fired pointblank into his face. He said he felt a sting on his face, but was uninjured.

Police said it was apparently a blank cartridge.

Canon Vail, who is 46 and lives at 245 West Highland Avenue, and Houston got into Houston's car and followed the car with the assailant to 19th and Lombard Streets where they lost him.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 24, 1966]

Alert Students Help Police in Gun Battle

Metropolitan Police captured four housebreaking suspects yesterday in a chase that erupted into a gun battle and kept the area around 50th and C Streets SE. in an uproar much of the morning.

Pupils watching the spectacle from Nalle Elementary School spotted one of the suspects darting into a house and alerted police.

Principal Phyllis W. Ford ordered the school doors locked when the action began so the children wouldn't get out and in the way of the whizzing bullets, running policemen, snarling K–9 Corps dogs and police cruisers with loudspeakers warning residents to stay indoors.

But dozens of adults who weren't locked in charged out of houses for a firsthand view.

A lot of them laughed when Bronson H. Lewis 25, was brought out of 4916 B Street, SE. at gunpoint, hollering: "Police brutality. Ask them if they have a warrant."

What neither the grownups nor the students noticed was the beginning of the whole thing at 10:40 a.m. According to 14th Precinct Capt. Vernon H. Culpepper, it happened like this:

Detectives Henry A. McElvane and Robert D. Arscott were leaving 4915 Ayres Place, SE. after investigating a housebreaking in which $137 was stolen. Standing on a corner right up the street were four young men who resembled descriptions of a housebreaking gang police had been seeking.

As McElvane and Arscott approached them, the four bolted. After stopping at their car to radio for reinforcements, the detectives ran after them.

Arscott had almost caught up with two of them when one turned and stopped. The detective no sooner started frisking him than he pulled a .45-caliber pistol, backed up a few steps, and fired, the detective said.

The shot missed, as did the four Arscott fired from his .38-caliber service revolver as the man weaved and darted and escaped into the B Street house, where nobody was at home.

By this time, about 25 police with an assortment of dogs and cruisers were surrounding the area and even the teachers at Nalle had forgotten about lessons.

Detective Lt. Marvin J. Sears, accompanied by Culpepper, acted on the tip from the school and searched the house, finding Lewis hiding in a bedroom between a mattress and box springs.

A K–9 dog, meanwhile, was flushing a 16-year-old out of the basement at 4914 B Street SE., biting him in the process.

At the same time McElvane was apprehending a 15-year-old and a 14-year-old and another officer was collecting as evidence the .45-caliber pistol Arscott said Lewis dropped after shooting at him.

By the time things settled down, the police had charged Lewis, who gave his address as 1332 L Street SE., with assault with intent to kill, housebreaking, and carrying a dangerous weapon. General Sessions Court Judge Charles Halleck set bond at $10,000 and ordered him held for the grand jury.

Police also had listened to the juveniles' story that they never saw Lewis before and that the reason they ran when the detectives approached was because they didn't want to get caught playing hookey. Police released them to their parents' custody but promised to continue the investigation.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 24, 1966]

One Hundred Lawmen Converge in Hunt for Four—Two Captured After $15,000 Robbery at Lord & Taylor

(By Alfred E. Lewis and Richard Severo)

A Metropolitan policeman was killed last night during a hunt for four robbery suspects that threw the 400 block of Hamilton Street NW., in a state of siege for nearly 2 hours.

The bandit who fatally shot Pvt. Marvin Lee Stocker, 23, then stabbed himself to death in a house he invaded for refuge.

Stocker, a 12th precinct officer who was on the assignment by chance, was killed by a convicted robber, John Wansley, who had piled up a three-page arrest record in the last 6 of his 24 years, police reported.

The two deaths and the wounding of a middle-aged couple, William and Beulah P. Lax, occurred shortly after Wansley (alias John Melvin Eldridge) and three companions held up Lord & Taylor, 5255 Western Avenue NW., and escaped with $15,000 to $30,000.

ONE HUNDRED POLICEMEN IN HUNT

About 100 policemen surrounded the normally quiet block in which the Laxes have lived for 12 years at 435 Hamilton and bombarded their home with tear gas in an attempt to drive out the man who killed Stocker.

Their sirens and the half-dozen floodlights they used to illuminate the neighborhood as they sought to corner the other suspects attracted more than 400 onlookers.

Captured on the street without a struggle were Jimmie Lee Scuggs, 20, who gave his address as 2675 Douglace Place SE., and Clarence Lee Blair, 22, listed at 1323 Rittenhouse Street NW.

CHARGED WITH HOMICIDE

Scuggs was charged with homicide and Blair with homicide and robbery. They will be arraigned at 10 a.m. today before U.S. Commissioner Sam Wertleb.

Police were searching early today for the fourth suspect, a 5-foot-10 heavy-set Negro with a medium complexion in his early twenties.

Police said the suspects told them they had planned to rob the Virginia branch of Lord & Taylor but decided yesterday at the last moment to try the Washington store instead.

They and Wansley, who was listed at 705 Irving Street NW., and the fourth man drove into the store's parking lot about 6 p.m. in a stolen red 1965 Thunderbird, detectives were told.

Police gave this version of the events that ensued:

Assistant store manager, Lionel R. Stewart, of Chevy Chase, left the store about 6 p.m. shortly after it closed and got into his car.

Stewart saw two other Lord & Taylor employees—a department manager, Gerald Vaizey of Bethesda, and an engineer, Allen H. Nordgren of Falls Church—come out of a side entrance and be pushed against the wall by three men.

As Stewart started over to see what the trouble was, a fourth man stuck a gun through his car window and ordered him to take the bandits and Vaizey and Nordgren to the store's office.

In the office the gunmen forced Stewart to open the safe. Then they made the three employees lie on the floor and bound them with adhesive tape. After looting the safe of green metal cashboxes and stuffing the money in a shabby black overnight bag and a flowered pillowcase, the bandits ran out.

It took the employees about 5 minutes to loosen their bonds and call police.

DETECTIVES SPOT CAR

Two Sixth Precinct detectives, Frederick L. Callan and Melvin L. Humphries, spotted the Thunderbird at 6:20 p.m. as they were cruising near 14th Street and Missouri Avenue NW. They radioed headquarters for reinforcements and chased the car, which the suspects abandoned at Fifth and Hamilton.

The four men scattered on the street. Among the first policemen to chase them were Stocker and Robbery Squad Detectives George R. Wilson and Robert P. King.

They saw one suspect bolt into the Laxes' two-story, red brick rowhouse.

"We decided we'd go in and try to rescue the hostages," King said. "We didn't know what was happening and we didn't feel we could wait for reinforcements."

BANDIT BOLTS UP STAIRS

What was happening, police later learned from the Laxes, was that they were on the second floor with their brown-and-white collie, Skippy, when a stranger bolted up the stairs and introduced them to the most terrifying evening of their lives.

Lax, about 50, a chef at Crown's Restaurant, struggled with the intruder and fired several shots at him from Lax's snubnosed .38-caliber revolver. The bullets inflicted only superficial wounds.

"I begged and begged," recounted Mrs. Lax, 41, a practical nurse at St. Elizabeths Hospital. "He said, 'I'm not going to hurt you,' but I was afraid he was going to turn on me."

She ran downstairs but couldn't get the door open before he caught her and started to choke her. Later he struck her on the side of the head, perhaps with his pistol, and shot her husband in the side.

"DIED IN MY ARMS"

The intruder first ran to the basement, just as Stocker, in uniform and flanked by Wilson and King in business suits, started up the Laxes' lawn. The man aimed a gun through the green latticework under the porch and fired a bullet that hit Stocker in the chest just after Stocker shot and missed.

The rookie policeman who joined the force last July, turned around, clutched his chest and said, "Man, I'm hit."

Wilson and King threw themselves to the ground and dragged Stocker two house lengths down the street as the bandit fired at them repeatedly.

"I don't ever want to go through this again," King said later. "A young kid died in my arms."

Inside the house, the gunman was running back to the second floor, forcing Mrs. Lax to accompany him to the bathroom, where he began slashing himself with the 12-inch blade of a knife he had taken from her kitchen.

SLASHES THROAT AND WRISTS

As she screamed, he knifed himself in the throat and chest, on both wrists and on the legs, according to Dr. Linwood S. Rayford, acting District Coroner. As he slashed, he went from the bathroom to one of the three bedrooms, where he lay on the bed and then rolled onto the floor after nearly decapitating himself.

By this time, the block was filling with officers and ambulances. "Everbody was running everywhere," said Eugene Harper of 5316 Second Street NW., who was in the neighborhood when he thought he heard a backfire "and then all hell broke loose."

Many of the people who gathered to see what was happening were teenagers in a holiday mood. Some laughed when the bandit's body was carried out in a blue denim sack.

Police bundled the Laxes into an ambulance for transport to Washington Hospital Center, were Stocker was pronounced dead at 7:12 p.m.

The young officer, a graduate of Coolidge High School, lived at 5708 16th Avenue, Hyattsville, with his wife, Donna, and 16-month-old daughter.

Stocker probably would not have been on Hamilton Street last night had he not happened to be at the 12th precinct stationhouse when a cruiser returned from another assignment. One of the officers left the cruiser to make a report and, when word of the chase of the Thunderbird flashed over the radio, Stocker hopped in to take his place.

AMOUNT OF $14,282 RECOVERED

As Civil Disturbance Unit officers fired two tear gas shells into the Lax house, other policemen searched the neighborhood and found the money-stuffed pillowcase and the cashboxes in and around the Thunderbird.

When District firemen later blew the gas from the house with ventilators, police found the black bag the intruder had been carrying when he barged in. In all, they recovered $14,282.81.

Wansley, whose body was identified through fingerprints, was facing a 3-to-12-year sentence for robbery. He was free on an appeal bond when he undertook yesterday's escapade. He had been arrested repeatedly on charges of robbery, housebreaking, and assault with a dangerous weapon.

NEPHEW HEARS GUNFIRE

The excitement was just dying down when Mrs. Lax's brother, Warren Payne, of 5504 Fourth Street NW., arrived on the scene.

Payne's son, Fred, 19, had been shopping at a nearby store when he heard gunfire and wandered over to Hamilton Street to see what was going on. Finding his aunt's home surrounded and beseiged, he ran home to tell his mother.

She telephoned Payne at his job at Freedmen's Hospital and he hurried over to find an empty, gas-filled house and a few lingering teenagers who were being told by an officer:

"Come on, come on, let's shove off, let's go. There's nothing here for you now."

[From the Evening Star, Mar 25, 1966]

Murder of a Policeman

Marvin Lee Stocker, 23, a rookie policeman, was shot to death Wednesday evening by a man who should have been in jail. The story of this murder and the events leading up to it is, to put it mildly, a remarkable one.

Private Stocker was killed by John M. Wansley, 24, who then committed suicide.

Wansley was a participant in the Wednesday robbery of the Chevy Chase branch of Lord & Taylor. But he was no stranger to crime. His arrest record is a long one, and he had been convicted twice of serious offenses.

In December 1960, he was sent to jail under the Youth Correction Act for an assault with a knife, and was paroled in August 1963. In February 1964, he was charged with robbery and assault with a gun. Three months later he was found guilty and sentenced to serve 3 to 12 years. He never served time on that conviction, however, since he was released, pending appeal, after posting $5,000 bond.

The Court of Appeals upheld the conviction on May 20, 1965, but Wansley remained on bond while his attorney appealed to the Supreme Court, which refused to review the case on January 17, 1966. A petition for a rehearing was denied by the High Court on February 28, 1966, and at that point, at the very least, Wansley should have been picked up to begin his sentence. But it seems that the U.S. Attorney's office was not notified, and no one tried to pick up the criminal.

The story now turns back a few days. On February 21, of this year, Wansley was ordered to appear in District Court. When he didn't show up a bench warrant was issued for his arrest and his bond declared forfeited. Meanwhile, however, another District Court judge, presumably on the strength of representations concerning the petition to the Supreme Court for a rehearing (denied February 28) reinstated Wansley's bond on February 24, and he remained free. By March 1 the snarl should have been straightened out. But there was a snafu in communications and Wansley remained at large. On March 23 he murdered the policeman.

Consideration for the criminal? Plenty of it in this case. But very little protection for the public for nearly 2 years. And none for Private Stocker.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Mar. 25, 1966]

Eight Hours With a "Nice" Gunman

Springfield, Oreg., March 24.—A slim ex-convict sipped sherry in the modest home of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fawbush yesterday and evaluated his chances against the small army of officers waiting outside.

"I have three choices," Harry Acree told United Press International by telephone.

"I can take them [the Fawbushes] out as hostages."

"I can shoot my way out, although I know I will get shot.

Or I can throw the gun out the window."

But the 33-year-old gunman picked a fourth choice to end his 12-year life of crime.

After 8 hours, amid swirling clouds of tear gas, Acree sat down in the shower stall in the Fawbush bathroom and shot himself in the mouth with a .22-caliber pistol.

He died a short time later at a hospital.

His flight began just before dawn when he and two companions were stopped by two patrolmen on a routine traffic check.

Officers Terrence Wilson, 24, noticed a shotgun in the car. Acree's companions were taken into custody. But Acree opened fire and wounded Wilson.

About 40 minutes later, Acree appeared at the Fawbush home. Police immediately surrounded the house.

Fawbush, 46, who also talked to UPI on the phone, said he was just getting ready to go to his job as a truck driver.

"I went to the front door and opened it. And there was this guy with a gun," Fawbush said. "He came in and he's been real nice to us."

Mrs. Fawbush said she cooked breakfast for Acree and later played cards with the fugitive.

Acree's sister and a brother were brought to the house. The sister went inside and pleaded with Acree to give himself up.

Acree seemed on the verge of doing so, but then his mood changed.

Officers fired tear gas grenades through the windows. Bystanders thought they heard a muffled shot.

Officers donned gas masks and dashed into the house. They found the dying gunman slumped in the shower stall.

[From New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 27, 1966]

Prominent Arizona Attorney Shot to Death; His Wife Held

Apache Junction, Ariz.—John E. Madden, a prominent Arizona water attorney, was shot to death Friday night and his former wife was jailed on an open charge of murder.

Mr. Madden, 44, was a former law partner of Denison Kitchel, who managed Barry Goldwater's campaign for President in 1964.

His wife, Becky, 41, was awarded a divorce Monday.

Officials said Mr. Madden was hit in the lower chest with a single blast from a 20-gage shotgun in the couple's trailer home.

Mrs. Madden had been awarded custody of the couple's child, Michael, 10.

Mr. Madden, a graduate of Harvard Law School, was a special counsel for the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission and was to have left Tuesday for Washington, D.C., for work in connection with the lower Colorado River project legislation.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 28, 1966]

Gunmen Rob Restraurant in Cheverly

Four masked gunmen held up the manager of a Howard Johnson's restaurant in Prince Georges County early yesterday morning and escaped with $303, police reported.

Orvel Robbins, the manager of the restaurant at 5820 Landover Road in Cheverly, told police he was leaving at closing time, about 1:30 a.m., when a man approached and thrust a pistol against his back.

The gunman was joined by three others, Roberts said, one of whom was armed with a sawed-off shotgun. They forced the manager to return to the restaurant and open the safe, then bound him and two other employees with tape.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 28, 1966]

Armed Bandit Robs Truckdriver of $1,500

A vending company route man was robbed of $1,500 yesterday and locked in his truck for 15 minutes in the Macke Co. parking lot at 1111 First Street NE.

Alvin C. Doak, 24, told police, a gunman pushed a revolver toward his face as he was stepping out of his truck at about 5 p.m. The bandit picked up three canvas cash bags from the floor of the truck, locked Doak in the back and fled. Doak was freed by another route man who saw him beating on the truck window.

Police broadcast a lookout for a Negro in his late twenties, 5 feet 9 inches, 150 pounds and wearing a white sleeveless sweater, light-colored trousers and a brown dress hat.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 28, 1966]

Bandit With Shotgun Robs Diner of $80

A bandit wielding a sawed-off shotgun fled with $80 last night from a Little Tavern diner at 1326 New York Avenue NW.

The holdup occurred at 8:45 p.m., police said. The gunman fled out a back door and down an alley.

Police broadcast a lookout for a Negro, about 30, 5 feet 8 inches, with a mustache and dressed in a dark coat.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 28, 1966]

Banker Father Gets 24-Hour Ultimatum—Florida Boy, 17, Is Seized for $25,000 Ransom

Surfside, Fla., March 28.—A stocky gunman abducted the teenage son of a leading banker from his waterfront home early today. warning that "you'll never see your son alive again" unless the parents delivered $25,000 ransom within 24 hours.

Tomorrow's deadline is the 18th birthday of the boy, Daniel Jesse Goldman.

Dade County police said the kidnaper, described as middleaged and bespectacled, took young Goldman from his home at gunpoint at about 5:35 a.m. He was wearing a poplin zipper jacket and green pants that might have been his pajamas.

RAMBLER

He left the stunned parents, banker-contractor Aaron Goldman and his wife, bound and gagged and fled in a white 1962 Rambler, apparently the boy's.

A bulletin describing the getaway car, the boy and the kidnaper instructed police, "do not molest vehicle if spotted."

The FBI was acting as "liaison" until it should be established a Federal crime was involved.

Surfside police said the kidnaper entered the Goldman home by some as yet unexplained means, took the boy off at gunpoint after tying the parents and telling them they must have the money by 6 a.m. tomorrow, "or you will never see your son alive again."

Neighbors said the Goldmans are "a nice quiet family, not ostentatious." They said Daniel was a high school senior planning to attend college close to home.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 1966]

Two Suspects Wounded in Gunfight

(By Bart Barnes)

Armed with submachine guns, pistols and shotguns, Takoma Park police waged a wild shootout with three robbery suspects Sunday night and left two of the suspects wounded, one critically.

The gunfight, which broke out when 18 officers surprised the suspects after staking out the intended robbery victim's home, also left the intended victim with a minor head wound and at least 35 bullets in the bandits' getaway car, police said.

One of the suspects was captured at the scene after a shotgun blast hit him in the abdomen, police said, but the other two got away and were arrested yesterday.

In a dragnet immediately after the gun battle, one officer, Cpl. Ray D. Williams, was pushed through a window by a police dog and cut an artery in his arm, Williams was following a trail of bloodstains left by a wounded suspect.

Charged with armed robbery were James L. Killgore, 29, of 7611 Maple Avenue, Takoma Park, Jack L. Jett, Jr., 25, of Landover Hills, and Gary L. Grove, 18, of Huntington, Pa.

Grove was arrested at the scene and was in critical condition at Washington Sanitarium yesterday with the stomach wound. Jett was taken into custody at noon yesterday when he showed up at Prince Georges Hospital seeking treatment for shotgun wounds in both legs.

Killgore was seized yesterday morning near his home.

The gun battle occurred at the home of Prentice Savage, 42, at 7715 Carroll Avenue. Police said both Savage's home and his grocery store, the Savage Market at 712 Erie Avenue, had been staked out for a week after it appeared that he was the target of a bizarre robbery plot.

For several weeks, police said, Savage had been receiving mysterious telephone calls from persons who would hang up as soon as he answered. He also noticed that his home and his store were being watched, police said.

In the stakeout Sunday, officers saw the same car drive by Savage's Market 10 or 15 times. When he closed for the night and left with the day's receipts, the auto followed him.

The police followed the auto and saw two men get out, stick a gun in Savage's back, and saw Savage give them the money.

Detectives stationed in the house closed in just as the men were tying Savage up, and the gunfight started. Although wounded, Jett escaped on foot, police said. They said Killgore sped away in the car, which was found a few blocks away on the campus of Columbia Union College.

STABILIZATION OF MILK PRICES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced last Thursday two important actions that will help keep prices of milk and dairy products at reasonable levels for both consumers and dairymen.

The first action increases the support level for manufacturing milk to $3.50 per hundredweight for the 12 months beginning April 1. The support level has been $3.24 per hundredweight, but actual market prices for manufacturing milk have been well above this. In February prices averaged $3.65 per hundredweight.

The second action provides for seasonal declines in the price for milk received by dairy farmers supplying fluid milk in most of the 45 major metropolitan areas in the United States operating under the Federal milk order program. The effective date of the lower prices was postponed on March 1 pending hearings on the fluid milk situation. Prices usually decline in these markets during the spring month of flush production, but the announcement by Secretary Freeman provides that the seasonal decline would be smaller than in other recent years.

American housewives stand to gain from both of these actions, which will insure larger supplies of milk and dairy products, and will help hold down retail prices, particularly next fall and winter.

Dairymen, too, will gain. Those producing manufacturing milk are assured of price protection at a higher level. Those supplying fluid markets will generally have a smaller-than-usual decline in prices of milk used for fluid consumption.

Both gain from stabilization of price which will neither swing up nor down steeply.

VIEWS OF THE GOVERNORS ON FEDERAL TAX PROPOSALS FOR CONTROL OF AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on March 16 the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations filed a report entitled "Views of the Governors on Tax Incentives and Effluent Charges"—Water Pollution Control and Abatement. To ascertain the Governors' views on the desirability and advisability of Federal tax incentives to encourage industry in establishing pollution controls, the subcommittee asked the Governors of the 50 States the following questions: First, Should the Federal Government provide tax relief or other incentives to industry in addition to, or instead of, the State incentives to accelerate water pollution control? Second, If such incentives were provided, what should be their nature and amounts, and how should they be distributed or administered?

From the replies, the subcommittee found that the State Governors favored Federal tax incentives for this purpose and saw no conflict between a Federal tax incentive program and any similar State programs. The responses received by the committee indicate:

First. Thirty Governors favor Federal tax incentives to encourage industry in accelerating water pollution control, including seven States which mentioned various qualifications.

Second. Four Governors urge more study.

Third. Eight Governors oppose this idea.

In its report the subcommittee summarizes these replies from the Governors. I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the subcommittee, under chairmanship of Congressman Robert E. Jones, has performed a most useful task and has provided the Congress with information helpful to the Congress in better understanding the viewpoint of the States in consideration of any Federal program dealing with air and water pollution.

When the Water Quality Act was being considered by the Senate in 1963, I wrote the Governors of each State to solicit their opinions and comments on this bill, for it was my view that their comments should be given very close attention by the Congress in legislation of this nature. I was surprised to learn that in many cases the Governors had not been consulted and in those cases in which they were consulted, they had expressed views in direct opposition to many of the main provisions of the bill. As a result the House approved several important amendments to the Water Quality Act of 1965 which incorporated the views of the Governors. The House subcommittee has performed a valuable service to the Congress by obtaining the Governors' viewpoints on particular methods of dealing with pollution and bringing them to the attention of the Congress.

On February 1, I introduced on behalf of myself and Senator Randolph a bill, S. 2857, which is designed to provide an incentive for industry to purchase and install equipment needed to combat air and water pollution, with the following cosponsors: Senators Allott, Javits, Kuchel, Lausche, Long of Missouri, Pearson, Saltonstall, and Scott. My bill increases the present investment credit from 7 to 14 percent with respect to the costs of such equipment. In the

88th Congress, this bill was offered as an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1964 by Senator RIBICOFF, who has taken great interest in the subject and has proposed economic incentives to industry so as to provide effective methods for controlling and eliminating pollution. The Senate voted to accept the amendment, but the amendment was dropped in the ensuing conference with the House. On April 1 of last year, Senator RIBICOFF introduced a bill, S. 1670, which would encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting companies to depreciate for income tax purposes the cost of this equipment over a period of 36 months.

The House subcommittee in its report has also included a most useful summary of the bills introduced in past Congresses through the 1st session of the 89th providing tax incentives for the construction of air and water pollution facilities. I ask unanimous consent that this summary be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am encouraged by the attitude expressed in the House subcommittee report that a majority of the Governors favor a tax incentive to industry. Although the trend in legislation seems to look solely to the Federal Government to initiate a program for pollution controls through increased financial grants, I believe that we should encourage industry to play a greater role. For I believe it is only proper that where industries purchase expensive equipment and facilities to reduce pollution—which facilities bring no financial return on their capital investment to industry, but are devoted to the greater public purpose and benefit—that a portion of that cost should be borne by the public through the tax mechanism.

EXHIBIT 1

* * * * *

4. Governors generally approve the principle that the Federal Government should provide tax incentives to help industry abate water pollution.

To ascertain the Governors' views on Federal tax incentives to encourage industry to abate pollution, the committee asked:

(d) Should the Federal Government provide tax relief or other incentives to industry in addition to, or instead of, the State incentives to accelerate water pollution control? If such incentives were provided, what should be their nature and amounts, and how should they be distributed or administered?

In general, the State Governors favored Federal tax incentives for this purpose, and saw no conflict between a Federal tax incentives program and any similar State programs.

The responses received by the committee indicate:

(a) Thirty Governors favor Federal tax incentives to encourage industry in accelerating water pollution control, including seven States which mentioned various qualifications.

(b) Four Governors urge more study.

(c) Eight Governors oppose this idea.

The Governors' responses to the above question are set forth in appendix D. Illustrative comments are set forth below.

Gov. Calvin L. Rampton of Utah stated:

"If a tax or other relief system is to be considered as an incentive to industry to attain adequate pollution abatement, it should be at the Federal level—that is, applicable to all States.

"It should be recognized that incentives applied unequally across the Nation could be a deciding factor in location of new industries. In the past some local governments in Utah have used a similar device to attract industry by offering to allow sewer connections without charge. Heavy waste loads imposed on treatment plants by this means have proved to be unreasonably burdensome, making this approach unsatisfactory."

Gov. Roger D. Branigin of Indiana suggested:

"I believe that the Federal Government should provide tax relief or incentives. These should be in addition to State incentives. Tax relief should be provided for the total cost of nonproductive facilities constructed for the control of water pollution. The owner should verify the cost of such facilities to the agency responsible for administering the tax laws."

Gov. Charles L. Terry, Jr., of Delaware stressed the granting of tax incentives for small plants: "* * * The Federal Government should provide tax relief, especially for small and marginal industries. This relief should take into account byproduct recovery methods when applied as a pollution control measure. For most small marginal industries the capital outlay for waste treatment installations is nonproductive."

Gov. Samuel P. Goddard of Arizona indicated federally provided incentives might give the States a new tool: "* * * It is conceivable that such tax relief provided at the Federal level might be of real assistance to us in convincing certain industries of the need for treatment facilities. It is our opinion that most value would accrue from a system which would make the cost, or a portion of the cost, of such facilities directly deductible."

It may be significant that the four Governors who provided the subcommittee with detailed data concerning the costs of their respective State incentive programs (Governors Faubus of Arkansas; King, of New Hampshire; Evans of Washington; and Knowles of Wisconsin) expressed the view that additional tax incentives at the Federal level would be useful.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown of California called for limits to such tax relief: "* * * Any federally financed program for this purpose should be limited to older existing industries where compliance with necessary, modern standards would cause serious financial problems."

Gov. Frank B. Morrison of Nebraska suggested: "* * * that Public Law 660 [the Federal Water Pollution Control Act] should be amended to give industry the same construction grants as municipalities are now given."

Gov. Daniel J. Evans of Washington suggested a three-point program including (1) grants, (2) increased investment tax credit for programs in compliance with State programs, and (3) increased tax writeoff for capital costs.

Gov. Tim Babcock of Montana cited this reason for opposing tax relief: "In Montana our industries have already provided waste treatment facilities and the majority of these industries, particularly where the wastes are large in volume and could be damaging to our streams, have provided high degrees of treatment. To offer tax relief as an incentive at this time would penalize those that have done as they should and reward those that have been reluctant or noncooperative."

In opposing Federal tax incentives to industry, Governor Bellmon of Oklahoma said that no one has the right to pollute a natural resource belonging to all, and Governor Hughes of New Jersey said it is "difficult to justify paying industry to do what is required by law in the interest of protecting the public health and the economic environment of the State."

APPENDIX D—TEXT OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION ON FEDERAL TAX INCENTIVES

QUESTION

Should the Federal Government provide tax relief or other incentives to industry in addition to, or instead of, the State incentives to accelerate water pollution control? If such incentives were provided, what should be their nature and amounts, and how should they be distributed or administered?

RESPONSES

D–1. Alabama

As you know, we in Governor Wallace's administration do not believe in any more Federal control of business and State affairs than is absolutely necessary; however, I can see no objection to the Federal Government providing a tax incentive to accelerate water pollution control, such as special treatment on the Federal income tax of any amounts expended by industry to construct antipollution facilities.

I, of course, would not be in a position to state the exact nature and amount of such income tax incentives. I am sure that this would require careful study by tax experts and engineers.

D–2. Alaska

Continuation of the comparative study of the effluent charge system and tax incentives appears advisable to evaluate these divergent approaches to the control of water pollution.

D–3. Arizona

It is conceivable that such tax relief provided at the Federal level might be of real assistance to us in convincing certain industries of the need for treatment facilities. It is our opinion that most value would accrue from a system which would make the cost, or a portion of the cost, of such facilities directly deductible.

D–4. Arkansas

Based on the experience with the severance tax credit legislation, it appears quite feasible to provide incentive or tax relief to accelerate the abatement of gross pollution in those cases where abatement costs exceed the financial ability of those responsible because of volume, concentration, or technical limitations of conventional treatment methods. On the Ouachita River alone, this program has resulted in a 1963 salt content that was 2,350,000 pounds less than the 1958 content; the stream is now usable the year round for water supply. Should some categories of industrial operations pose a similar problem at the national level, a similar approach by the Federal Government would appear reasonable. It is somewhat difficult to extend this conclusion to all industrial operations in view of the conflict between the two opposing philosophies that (1) waste treatment is a legitimate part of manufacturing or processing operation and should be treated as all other parts; or (2) waste treatment is a nonproductive part of an industrial operation and should be exempt from taxation or allowed an accelerated depreciation on the necessary capital expenditures for treatment.

The outstanding success of the Public Law 660 grant program in accelerating the construction of municipal sewage treatment facilities proves the potential of incentive techniques. Here, however, purely public funds are involved at the local and Federal levels. Certainly, any Federal incentive offered to industry for a solution of a national problem should be additive to any State incentives which are utilized for the solution of State level problems.

D–5. California

I fully recognize and sympathize with the vastly different problem of older industry in the East. Without doubt, the cost of modern treatment facilities for old plants on "sensitive" water courses would simply force many of them out of the competitive market. Because of the importance of these older industrial plants to local communities, some financial incentives may be clearly in the public interest. I do not, however, believe that public funds should be used as an inducement to new industry to incorporate the most modern available treatment facilities necessary to attain appropriate water quality standards. This simply must be one of the costs of doing business in our increasingly complex environment.

In summary, a State program of tax relief or other financial inducements for industrial pollution control does not appear warranted in California at the present time. Any Federally financed program for this purpose should be limited to older, existing industries where compliance with necessary, modern standards would cause serious financial problems.

D–6. Colorado

Yes, both Federal and State governments should provide incentives to industry through tax relief.

D–7. Connecticut

I believe that incentives should be provided to industries and also to municipalities to encourage the installation of pollution control equipment.

I would prefer to await the report of our clean-water task force before forming opinions as to the specific form of incentive and how it should be financed.

In attacking a problem as broad as pollution, I tend to favor the cooperative municipal-State-Federal approach, each level of government contributing a share.

D–8. Delaware

Yes. The Federal Government should provide tax relief, especially for small and marginal industries. This relief should take into account byproduct recovery methods when applied as a pollution control measure. For most small marginal industries the capital outlay for waste treatment installations is nonproductive.

* * * * *

In our view there is no doubt that the Government should offer aid to encourage industry to establish pollution control facilities voluntarily. Such aids should be sponsored by the Federal Government. It is our feeling that a type of incentive such as that enacted in the Revenue Act of 1962 would be most acceptable to industry and would achieve the best results. The amount of the credit must, of course, be determined by Congress but we feel that the subject is of so much importance that a credit at least equal to the 7-percent investment incentive credit would be well justified. While we have not determined the matter on an exhaustive basis, a credit against Federal income taxes would, in our opinion, be preferable to any rapid amortization deduction which could be offered.

The condition for allowance of credit should not be so cumbersome as to discourage industries from obtaining it. We think that a properly drawn law would permit the Internal Revenue Service to determine whether or not a facility would constitute a pollution control facility for purposes of allowing the credit.

D–9. Florida

I can only say as Governor that I believe the pollution of State waters is essentially a State problem and should be left to the States to solve, with the exception that some Federal regulations may be necessary for rivers and bodies of water that embrace more than a single State. Without having made a full study of the question, I would be inclined to support some provision for Federal tax relief or some other incentive to industry to accelerate water pollution control.

D–10. Georgia

We have advocated that incentives be provided to industry from State and Federal Governments. We believe this should be some form of tax exemption or low-interest-rate loans for installation of waste treatment facilities.

D–11. Hawaii

Hawaii, however, is unique among the States in that we have no river or lake systems that are in any sense comparable to the mainland situation where many States may be affected by pollution of a single river.

Our domestic water requirements are almost entirely served from artesian sources; not from rivers or lakes.

We do have some pollution problems resulting from the discharge of sugar plantation waste material into some of our streams, and into the ocean, with the result that the material in many areas covers the beaches with cane waste and sediment. But this is a local problem which can be handled at the State level.

I offer the foregoing information merely to indicate that our experience in this State does not appear to be applicable to the problems under consideration by your committee. That is why we did not comment on proposed incentives or effluent charges in response to questions (d) and (h).

Despite Hawaii's fortunate conditions which relieve our State from involvement in this problem area, I recognize the national and interstate importance of this matter and certainly commend the thorough measures which you and your committee are taking to develop adequate and pertinent information.

D–12. Idaho

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—The Governor's letter did not answer this question.]

D–13. Illinois

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—The Governor's letter did not answer this question.]

D–14. Indiana

I believe that the Federal Government should provide tax relief or incentives. These should be in addition to State incentives. Tax relief should be provided for the total cost of nonproductive facilities constructed for the control of water pollution. The owner should verify the cost of such facilities to the agency responsible for administering the tax laws.

D–15. Iowa

In regard to paragraph (d) concerning tax relief or other incentives to industry to accelerate water pollution control, you may recall a letter to you dated January 13, 1964, from Mr. Paul J. Houser, director of our State department of health engineering division, in which he states, "* * * we have consistently been strong advocates of aid to the smaller industries such as creameries and cheese factories, for financing waste treatment or other pollution control facilities, particularly when such industries are not connected to municipal sewers. In some cases, the cost of providing such facilities is almost prohibitive. Furthermore, those industries connected to a municipal sewer receive indirect benefits from a construction grant to the municipality under provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Thus, the industry with separate waste disposal is handicapped to some extent competitively. Over a period of years, there have been several bills in Congress providing for an early tax writeoff on waste treatment facilities. Whether this is the answer, we are not qualified to say. However, some financial assistance should be provided, and since the Federal Government is already in the business of providing aid to municipalities and the industries therein, it would appear that the aid to the other industries should come from the same source." This letter was in answer to your request for information concerning the water pollution control program in Iowa. Later at your committee hearing in Kansas City, Mo., May 22–23, 1964, Mr. Houser expressed this same opinion in his statement.

D–16. Kansas

It appears that any proposal to provide tax relief or other tax incentives on the Federal level to encourage the acceleration of industrial pollution control should be carefully studied. Any such measure should be weighed in terms of its effect on present State pollution abatement programs as well as being considered in the context of the present Federal-State tax structure. Attention should be given to a study of the present tax status of industrial research which is directed toward improvement of pollution abatement as well as to the tax status of industrial capital improvements which are wholly, or in part, aimed at decreasing the amount of pollutants contributed by a given industry. Joint Federal, State, and private consideration should be given to the possible effects of any proposed tax measures.

D–17. Kentucky

It is impossible to give a "Yes" or "No" answer to a question such as this. There is some question as to whether the incentives should be given in order to meet the basic minimum requirements of a water pollution act. If this is to encourage degree of treatment beyond basic minimum standards, then it should be considered in light of such requirement. The nature and amounts would depend entirely on the stringency of the requirements beyond the minimum.

D–18. Louisiana

In response to this item, I quote from correspondence from the Louisiana Department of Commerce and Industry, Louisiana's Industrial Development Board, "I do not think the Federal Government should provide tax relief or any other incentives to industry to accelerate water pollution control."

D–19. Maine

The Federal Government could, of course, provide tax relief in the form of quick write-offs and for some time the industries of this area leaned toward this solution exclusively. However, during the past year or two there appears to be a shift to favoring some more direct form of aid. It would be in some ways difficult to justify direct aid to a manufacturing company whose waste is contaminating a stream, but at the same time there is little difference from assistance to communities. Wet industry in Maine's larger categories appears to be able to finance recovery processes more readily than destructive processes even though the cost may be many times higher. We are of the opinion that from the standpoint of financing and of operation as well the eventual good of the pollution abatement program it would be better to encourage municipal systems to accommodate the wastes of their industries in every practicable case, perhaps modifying or extending present statute to do so.

D–20. Maryland

We would consider a system of "tax relief or other incentives to industry * * * to accelerate water pollution control," granted by the Federal Government, to be highly desirable and very helpful in achieving improved water pollution abatement in Maryland. These incentives should be in addition to any incentives provided by the State in accelerating water pollution control.

One possible procedure for such Federal incentives would be permission granted to industry to depreciate, more rapidly than permitted at present, buildings, facilities and equipment purchased, constructed and installed to control water pollution—provided that the purpose of such equipment and structures was so certified by the State water pollution control agency.

D–21. Massachusetts

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—Subcommittee did not receive an answer to its letter of November 17, 1965, and its followup letter of January 10, 1966, at time of printing.]

D–22. Michigan

I am increasingly persuaded that tax relief is reasonable and desirable and I expect that legislation to provide such relief may be introduced in the 1966 session of the legislature. I would think that Federal tax relief would also be appropriate.

I am aware that there are certain inherent problems in tax exemptions of this nature where some facilities may serve other purposes as well as waste treatment. However, I believe these problems can be adequately coped with by the administrative agency.

D–23. Minnesota

This is a matter of policy which can be resolved only after careful study. I believe that any proposal which has the potential for accelerated water pollution control including tax relief and other incentives to industry, should be given serious and careful consideration. I would caution, however, that unless any penalties that might be imposed on industry exceed the cost of pollution control, imposition of such penalties might have the effect of delaying control measures where industry elects to pay the penalties rather than install the necessary control facilities. I would also caution that in establishing any incentives or tax relief, care must be taken to insure that pollution control remains the primary responsibility of the industry involved and the incentives should not become a device for merely transferring an industry's responsibility to the taxpayers.

D–24. Mississippi

It would be well for the Federal Government to permit industry a rapid depreciation charge over a period of years at the option of the industry.

D–25. Missouri

Industry in this State has not voiced to us an opinion concerning tax incentives; accordingly we have no information on which to base an answer to your question.

D–26. Montana

In Montana our industries have already provided waste treatment facilities and the majority of these industries, particularly where the wastes are large in volume and could be damaging to our streams, have provided high degrees of treatment. To offer tax relief as an incentive at this time would penalize those that have done as they should, and reward those that have been reluctant or noncooperative.

D–27. Nebraska

It is our opinion that tax relief should be provided to industry as an incentive to provide both air and water pollution control measures and that Public Law 660 should be amended to give industry the same construction grants as municipalities are now given.

D–28. Nevada

The State tax sources are sales and use tax, and a property tax, probably not amenable to an incentive tax of this kind. If a tax were applied, it could only be effected after appropriate legislation, possibly a penalty type charge acting as an irritant to the polluter. In the few instances we have where there is inadequate waste treatment, it is a community which is already so financially pressed that such a tax would, on a State level, be difficult to apply. The tax might be a penalty providing funds to make the connections necessary, but this could better be accomplished by creating an improvement district and financing the connection with revenue bonds.

D–29. New Hampshire

While we consider that industrial waste treatment needs in general should be satisfied in the municipal system, we also realize that occasions arise where inplant treatment must be provided before discharging to the municipal collection facilities. If the cost of inplant treatment is minor, there is no real problem, but, if major, it may well develop that small industries cannot afford to absorb the total cost of such facilities. In these situations it would seem that the most equitable means of relief is through an accelerated depreciation schedule, under the Internal Revenue Code. To meet varying circumstances, industry should be allowed to elect the period over which the depreciation will be spread, perhaps anywhere from 1 to 5 years would be a reasonable approach.

D–30. New Jersey

To date, however, there has not been sufficient sentiment in favor of such proposals to effect any legislative enactments along these lines.

There appears to be considerable room for debate on this issue. One form of opposition is to the effect that it is difficult to justify paying industry to do what is required by law in the interest of protecting the public health and the economic environment of the State. On the other hand there is considerable sentiment to the effect that some incentive (tax relief or otherwise) might be well worth the investment in order to accelerate water pollution control. The problem in a State such as New Jersey is complicated by the fact that many millions of dollars have been invested by industry for water pollution control projects during the past 25 years or so. Some of the waste-water treatment facilities constructed during this period for industrial waste treatment and disposal remain in operation and continue to be effective. Others have become outmoded and ineffective and must be replaced or expanded or otherwise modified. There is a further factor which apparently would apply throughout the country, not merely in the highly industrialized States such as New Jersey. I refer to the local significance of the discharge of polluting materials. To illustrate, the discharge of a million gallons of a waste of a certain concentration into a very small stream would be of much more significance than the discharge of the same waste into a very large stream. Obviously, the investment required to effect the desirable and necessary degree of treatment in the former situation could be many times greater than in the latter case. Inherent, therefore, is a tremendous advantage or disadvantage to competitive industries depending upon their location in relation to the volume of receiving waters available for effluent dilution. This problem is further complicated by the use to which the receiving waters are expected to be put downstream from points of discharge of effluents. This factor is subject to change so that it is beyond the control of industry. Industry, of course, has a choice of locations before becoming established, but once established, it has little or no control over factors of environment such as I relate.

D–31. New Mexico

It may be desirable for the Federal Government to provide tax relief or other incentives to industry to accelerate water pollution control. As New Mexico income tax laws are based on Federal income tax laws and regulations, any deduction provided by Federal income tax laws would result in proportionate reductions in State income tax liability.

D–32. New York

I have repeatedly suggested that the Federal Government provide tax incentives in addition to and similar to those enacted by the State under the State corporate franchise tax as part of the pure waters program. Such a Federal tax incentive should take the form of a 1-year depreciation writeoff for new industrial waste treatment facilities under the Federal corporate income tax.

D–33. North Carolina

We believe the provisions of chapter 1100 have proven beneficial to the North Carolina water pollution control program as well as to the industries which have been required to provide costly waste treatment works. It is also believed that Federal legislation of a similar nature would prove beneficial and would recognize the problems of industry in this area of activity. The State has in the past and will continue to support the passage of similar legislation by the Congress.

D–34. North Dakota

This department believes it far better to provide tax relief or other incentives to industry for construction and operation of adequate water pollution control treatment works than to tax water polluters. It is conceivable that some industry might prefer to pay tax for discharge of wastes than construct a treatment plant. This might be especially true in certain wastes that are very difficult to treat (such as wastes from food processing, sugarbeet plants, and cheese plants).

D–35. Ohio

I regret that it is not appropriate for the Governor to make the specific comments you request at this time as their subject matter lies in the area with respect to which he has asked for advice from the Ohio Water Commission. To do as you request would in effect nullify the assignment given to the Ohio Water Commission.

D–36. Oklahoma

We feel that neither the State or Federal Government should provide incentives to industry to clean up or prevent pollution. Our position is that no individual or corporation has a legal right to impair or destroy a natural resource in the conduct of his activities.

D–37. Oregon

We have vigorously resisted efforts to "legalize" such pollution, either through establishment of so-called "effluent charges" or tax incentives.

D–38. Pennsylvania

The sanitary water board has always favored tax relief for industrial waste facilities. Some consideration might also be given to Federal incentives or regional pollutional abatement efforts, such as are being carried out in the German Genossenschaften.

D–39. Rhode Island

The question of imposing such controls or giving such incentives can be complex, but I believe that industries, especially those isolated from public sewer systems, should be given tax relief as an incentive for the construction of water pollution control facilities. Under the present system of Federal grants to municipalities, industries, discharging their waste into a municipal system enjoy indirectly the benefits of the grant program, where those isolated from public sewer systems do not.

* * * * *

I think it best that any move along these lines come from the Federal Government. Because of the limited and diverse effect on State taxes, tax relief must be granted on a much broader base than the States can offer. I also think that it will be difficult politically for a State which may be in competition with other States for industry to enact and enforce laws that may be effective. Finally, it seems to me it would be easier for the Federal Government if it were serious about the problem, to institute controls against States and municipalities and other governmental instrumentalities which ought to be included that were polluting public waters.

D–40. South Carolina

If further Federal tax relief were given industry, it should act as an incentive to speed construction of waste treatment facilities.

D–41. South Dakota

At the present time it is our thinking that tax relief or other incentives should not be provided to industry to accelerate water pollution control. South Dakota is primarily an agricultural State and, while we have several water-using industries with pollution control problems, we have many other industries such as feed lots, agricultural operations, such as fertilization, pest and weed control spraying, and similar activities, pollution from which (1) is a factor of runoff from rain and snow, (2) is almost impossible to pinpoint by location or cause, (3) does not lend itself to tax relief incentives as control efforts. We feel that all industries, agricultural and otherwise, should be treated essentially alike. We are not particularly agreeable to the general idea of tax relief or similar incentive for pollution control because (1) the followup policing action is impractical, (2) tax relief qualifications and definitions for all industry, agricultural and otherwise, would be almost impossible of administration, (3) equity among all industries cannot be envisioned and any tax relief incentives on other than an all-industry coverage would be discriminatory, and (4) kinds, sources, and intensity of pollution, effects upon water users generally, and public interests vary greatly.

* * * * *

The question of who is to receive tax relief (pay effluent charges) in what amount for what service to be rendered by the pollutor from (to) what administrative organization seems to be impractically complex.

It seems better, in our viewpoint, to invest equivalent net dollars (tax relief or effluent charge collections, or both, less administration costs: or vice versa) in present pollution control efforts.

D–42. Tennessee

Tennessee is in favor of Federal income tax relief as an incentive to industry to control water pollution. This relief could go so far as to permit industry, for corporate income tax purposes, to charge the cost of nonproductive waste treatment facilities as expenses. This suggestion was a specific proposal of the National Technical Task Committee on Industrial Waste in 1962. However, as you know, bills providing rapid amortization of industrial waste treatment facilities for tax purposes have been proposed many times in Congress without success.

D–43. Texas

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—Subcommittee did not receive an answer to its letter of November 17, 1965, and its followup letter of January 10, 1966, at time of printing.]

D–44. Utah

The question of incentives to industry for acceleration of water pollution controls is a difficult one to answer. Adding costs of neccessary pollution control to cost of product manufacture would appear to be a sound philosophy, but if it fails to achieve necessary protection of water resources, something else obviously must be done. Our experience in Utah is too limited to date to provide us with a definite answer.

If a tax or other relief system is to be considered as an incentive to industry to attain adequate pollution abatement, it should be at the Federal level—that is—applicable to all States.

It should be recognized that incentives applied unequally across the Nation could be a deciding factor in location of new industries. In the past some local governments in Utah have used a similar device to attract industry by offering to allow sewer connections without charge. Heavy waste loads imposed on treatment plants by this means have proved to be unreasonably burdensome, making this approach unsatisfactory.

D–45. Vermont

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—Subcommittee did not receive an answer to its letter of November 17, 1965, and its followup letter of January 10, 1966, at time of printing.]

D–46. Virginia

The Virginia Water Control Board has generally opposed grants for construction of municipal waste treatment facilities. However, since this program has been in effect since 1956, it appears that some consideration may be given to providing incentives or tax relief for industries, existing and new, that have to or desire to construct waste treatment facilities. This tax relief might be on a par with the 30-percent grant for municipalities, and administered similarly to the Federal water pollution control grant program, with the Virginia State Water Control Board recommending the industry or industries before any tax relief is allowed by the Federal Government.

D–47. Washington

Suggested incentives include—

1. The establishment of a Federal construction grant matching fund program administered jointly by the Federal and State water pollution control authorities with grants to be approved by the State agencies when proposed projects are in compliance with State programs and priorities for pollution control.

2. Increased investment tax credits with programs to be in compliance with State programs and priorities for pollution control.

3. Increased tax writeoff rates for capital costs of pollution control projects incurred in order to comply with State programs and priorities.

Accurate cost estimates for construction of new pollution control facilities by industry are not presently available but these could amount to more than $20 million in the State of Washington during the next 10 years.

D–48. West Virginia

We would favor a Federal tax relief for treatment facilities which are meeting State, interstate, and Federal requirements. The relief should be subject to withdrawal upon failure to maintain compliance with the standards or requirements. Relief should be available on existing treatment plants as well as those to be constructed in the future.

D–49. Wisconsin

Tax relief in the form of rapid amortization at the Federal level would provide a substantially greater incentive than does the same at the State level. Furthermore, the shorter the amortization period the greater the incentive due to greater immediate tax savings for industry.

D–50. Wyoming

If such incentives are to be provided, they should be provided by the States in preference to the Federal Government.

D–51. Guam

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—The Governor's letter did not answer this question.]

D–52. Puerto Rico

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—The Governor's letter did not answer this question.]

D–53. Samoa

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—Subcommittee did not receive an answer to its letter of Nov. 17, 1965, at time of printing.]

D–54. Virgin Islands

The Federal Government should provide tax relief to industry for water pollution control instead of the State. This should be in the form of a "tax writeoff" within 5 years. The amount should not be less than 30 percent nor greater than 50 percent of the cost of the waste treatment facilities. The State health department should certify the adequacy of the treatment facilities.

EXHIBIT 2

* * * * *

APPENDIX G—BILLS INTRODUCED IN CONGRESS TO PROVIDE TAX INCENTIVES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF AIR AND WATER POLLUTION FACILITIES, 77TH CONGRESS TO 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION (1945–MARCH 1, 1966)

SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

None found.

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

None found.

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

S. 1536: Mr. Kilgore; November 1, 1945 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). In order to encourage the prevention of stream pollution, amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste may be deducted in computing net income. Effective from December 31, 1945, to January 1, 1952.

H.R. 3972: Mr. Bailey; September 10, 1945 (referred to House Ways and Means Committee). See digest of S. 1536, 79th Congress.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

S. 244: Mr. Kilgore; January 15, 1947 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). In order to encourage the prevention of stream pollution, amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste may be deducted in computing net income. Effective from December 31, 1947, to January 1, 1954.

H.R. 1047: Mr. Kee; January 16, 1947 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 244, 80th Congress.

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

S. 1118: Mr. Wiley; February 28, 1949 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). In order to encourage the prevention of stream pollution, amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste may be deducted in computing net income. Effective from December 31, 1948, to January 1, 1955.

H.R. 1343: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; January 13, 1949 (Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1118, 81st Congress.

H.R. 5089: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; June 9, 1949 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Allows amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes to encourage prevention of water pollution. Authorizes an amortization deduction at the election of the taxpayer for a period of 60 months.

H.R. 5091: Mr. Chatham; June 9, 1949 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 5089, 81st Congress.

H.R. 6434: Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania; October 14, 1949 (referred to the Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 5089, 81st Congress.

H.R. 6677: Mr. Tollefson; January 9, 1950 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 5089, 81st Congress.

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

S. 1472: Mr. Kefauver; May 14, 1951 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance).

Allows amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes to encourage prevention of water pollution. Authorizes an amortization deduction at the election of the taxpayer, for a period of 60 months.

H.R. 1555: Mr. Tollefson; January 15, 1951 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Allows amounts paid for any facility, equipment, etc., for disposal of sewage or industrial waste to be amortized at an accelerated rate (60 months) for income tax purposes, in order to encourage the prevention of water pollution.

H.R. 2752: Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania; February 19, 1951 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1472, 82d Congress.

H.R. 5474: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, September 25, 1951 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1472, 82d Congress.

H.R. 5742: Mr. ABBITT; October 16, 1951 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1472, 82d Congress.

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

S. 3115: Mr. KUCHEL; March 11, 1954 (referred to the Senate Committee on Finance). Permits accelerated depreciation to be taken for all devices, buildings, machinery, or equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants based on a period of 60 months. Prorates the deductions over the allowable period. The taxpayer may make an election to take this deduction and at any time terminate his election. The adjusted basis for depreciation shall be only that part of the construction properly attributable to the purpose named after June 30, 1953, as certified by a State, territorial, or local agency charged with the enforcement of laws relating to abatement of hazards.

H.R. 234: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; January 3, 1953 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Allows amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes to encourage prevention of water pollution.

H.R. 606: Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania; January 3, 1953 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Allows amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes to encourage prevention of water pollution. Authorizes an amortization deduction at the election of the taxpayer, for a period of 60 months.

H.R. 2535: Mr. Elliott; February 3, 1953 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 606, 83d Congress.

H.R. 2720: Mr. Hinshaw; February 6, 1953 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 3115, 83d Congress.

H.R. 2743: Mr. Paulson; February 6, 1953 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 3115, 83d Congress.

H.R. 7170: Mr. Bailey, January 14, 1954 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits amortization of industrial waste treatment facilities, the construction, reconstruction, of erection of which is completed after June 30, 1954, and before January 1, 1958, over a 60-month period provided such facilities have been certified by the Surgeon General as contributing to the abatement of the pollution of interstate waters and by the appropriate State of interstate water pollution agency as being in accord with its stream pollution abatement program. Equates the amortization, with respect to each month of the amortization, with respect to each month of the amortization period within the taxable year, to the adjusted basis of the facility at the end of such month, divided by the number of months remaining in the 60-month period.

H.R. 7703: Mr. LIPSCOMB; February 3, 1954 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 3115, 83d Congress.

H.R. 8361: Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin; March 11, 1954 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 7170, 83d Congress.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

S. 917: Mr. Martin of Pennsylvania and others; February 4, 1955 (referred to the Senate Committee on Finance). Encourages the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes. Specifically permits such amortization at an accelerated rate of 60 months. Provides for controls which would permit only those facilities which are installed on the basis of demand from a local governmental body to qualify for certification. Further provides that in order to qualify, a facility must be a part of an overall program aimed at elimination of the present-day scourges of air and stream pollution.

H.R. 523: Mr. Hinshaw; January 5, 1955 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits accelerated depreciation to be taken for all devices, buildings, machinery, or equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants based on a period of 60 months. Prorates the deductions over the allowable period. The taxpayer may make an election to take this deduction, and at any time terminate his election. The adjusted basis for depreciation shall be only that part of the construction properly attributable to the purpose named, as certified by a State, territorial, or local agency charged with the enforcement of laws relating to abatement of hazards.

H.R. 1558: Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania; January 6, 1955 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 523, 84th Congress.

H.R. 2016: Mr. LIPSCOMB; January 11, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 523, 84th Congress.

H.R. 2417: Mr. McDonough; January 17, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 533, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3547: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3548: Mr. ABBITT; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3549: Mr. Bentley; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3550: Mr. FORD; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3551: Mr. Hinshaw; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3552: Mr. Jackson; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3553: Mr. LIPSCOMB; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3554: Mr. Pillion; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3555: Mr. Ray; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3556: Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3662: Mr. Dondero; February 7, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3778: Mr. Hinshaw; February 8, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 523, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3906: Mr. LAIRD; February 10, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 4313: Mr. Miller of New York; February 23, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 4711: Mr. Nelson; March 8, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

S. 1627: Mr. KUCHEL; March 18, 1957 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). Encourages the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes. Specifically permits such amortization at an accelerated rate of 60 months. Provides for controls which would permit only those facilities which are installed on the basis of demand from local governmental body to qualify for certification. Further provides that in order to qualify, a facility must be a part of an overall program aimed at elimination of the present-day scourges of air and stream pollution.

H.R. 1082: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; January 3, 1957 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1627, 85th Congress.

H.R. 1174: Mr. McDonough; January 3, 1957 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits accelerated depreciation to be taken for all devices, buildings, machinery, or equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants based on a period of 60 months. Prorates the deductions over the allowable period. The taxpayer may make an election to take this deduction and at any time terminate his election. The adjusted bases for depreciation shall be only that part of the construction properly attributable to the purposes named, as certified by a State, territorial, or local agency charged with the enforcement of laws relating to abatement of hazards.

H.R. 2463: Mr. LIPSCOMB; January 10, 1957 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 1082, 85th Congress.

H.R. 4134: Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania; January 30, 1957 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1627, 85th Congress.

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

H.R. 332: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; January 7, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Encourages the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes. Specifically permits such amortization at an accelerated rate of 60 months. Provides for controls which would permit only those facilities which are installed on the basis of demand from a local governmental body to qualify for certification. Further provides that in order to qualify, a faculty must be a part of an overall program aimed at eliminating the present-day scourges of air and stream pollution.

H.R. 1277: Mr. McDonough; January 7, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits accelerated depreciation to be taken for all devices, buildings, machinery, or equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants based on a period of 60 months. Prorates the deductions over the allowable period. The taxpayer may make an election to take this deduction, and at any time terminate his election. The adjusted basis for depreciation shall be only that part of the construction properly attributable to the purpose named, as certified by a State, territorial, or local agency charged with the enforcement of laws relating to abatement of hazards.

H.R. 2409: Mr. Lipscomb; January 15, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 332, 86th Congress.

H.R. 3611: Mr. Blatnik; January 29, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 332, 86th Congress.

H.R. 4248: Mr. Ashley; February 9, 1959 (referred to the House Ways and Means Committee). See digest of H.R. 332, 86th Congress.

H.R. 7566: Mr. George P. Miller; June 4, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Provides a tax reduction for the amortization of air pollution control facilities at the election of the taxpayer over a 60-month period.

H.R. 7654: Mr. Oliver; June 10, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 332, 86th Congress.

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

H.R. 730: Mr. McDonough; January 3, 1961 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits accelerated depreciation on all devices, buildings, machinery, or equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants based on a period of 60 months. Prorates the deductions over the allowable period. Permits taxpayers to elect commencement and termination of such deduction. Provides that the adjusted basis for depreciation shall be only that part of the construction properly attributable to the purpose named, as certified by a State, territorial, or local agency charged with the enforcement of laws relating to abatement of hazards.

H.R. 924: Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin; January 3, 1961 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Encourages the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes. Permits such amortization over a 5-year period. Provides for controls to permit only those facilities which are installed on the basis of demand from a local governmental body to qualify for such amortization. Requires a facility to be a part of an overall program aimed at eliminating the present-day scourges of air and stream pollution.

H.R. 2398: Mr. Ashley; January 13, 1961 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 924, 87th Congress.

H.R. 2493: Mr. Lipscomb; January 12, 1961 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 924, 87th Congress.

H.R. 6370: Mr. George P. Miller; April 17, 1961 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction based on an accelerated period of 60 months for certain facilities for the control of air pollution. Permits taxpayers to elect commencement and termination of such deduction. Provides that the adjusted basis shall only include that part of the construction begun on or after the enactment of this bill.

H.R. 7320: Mr. Vanik; May 24, 1961 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 924, 87th Congress.

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

S. 736: Mr. Ribicoff and others; February 7, 1963 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). Permits deduction from Federal income tax of expenditures for the construction or acquisition of treatment works to control water and air pollution.

H.R. 5167: Mr. Blatnik; March 28, 1963 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits every taxpayer to take at his election, a deduction from taxable income for expenditures for construction of waste treatment work to control water pollution.

H.R. 5849: Mr. Giaimo; April 24, 1963 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 5167, 88th Congress.

H.R. 8884: Mr. Lesinski; October 22, 1963 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Allows an income tax deduction with respect to the amortization of any waste treatment works used to control water pollution and any air purification facility used to control atmospheric pollution over a period of 60 months.

H.R. 11021: Mr. St. Onge; April 23, 1964 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works.

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

S. 1670: Mr. Ribicoff and others; April 1, 1965 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). Amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1964 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

H.R. 4223: Mr. Clark; February 3, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction or erection, installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water or air pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 4787: Mr. Monagan; February 10, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits deduction from Federal income tax expenditures for the construction or acquisition of treatment works to control water and air pollution.

Permits such deductions to be deferred and treated as having been incurred during any of the taxable years after made.

H.R. 5317: Mr. Smith of New York; February 23, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits the cost of water pollution control facilities to be amortized for income tax purposes over a life of 5 years.

H.R. 5681: Mr. St. Onge; March 2, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works.

H.R. 7065: Mr. Lindsay; April 1, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce). Provides for research programs relative to controlling air pollution resulting from gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles and establishes a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory to carry out such programs. Provides for the appointment of a technical committee to encourage the development of the low-cost techniques to reduce offensive byproducts of sulfur combustion.

Requires all new gasoline-powered vehicles to be equipped with blowby systems to keep hydrocarbon emissions down to certain percentages. Prohibits the importation of any gasoline vehicles not meeting the standards herein. Authorizes the Surgeon General to conduct a study to determine the effect of air pollutants on human health. Provides that such study be submitted to Congress.

Gives taxpayer a deduction for expenditures and an increased investment credit for the acquisition, construction, or installation of water and air pollution control devices.

H.R. 7394: Mr. McVicker; April 13, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce). See digest of H.R. 7065, 89th Congress.

H.R. 7418: Mr. Sweeney; April 13, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

H.R. 7656: Mr. Ottinger; April 27, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

H.R. 9659: Mr. Helstoski; July 7, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction or erection installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water or air pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 10029: Mr. Giaimo; July 22, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

H.R. 10605: Mr. King of New York; September 1, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

H.R. 11866: Mrs. Bolton; January 10, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works.

H.R. 12455: Mr. Conte; February 2, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 12478: Mr. Horton, February 2, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 12481: Mr. Mathias: February 2, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction, erection, installation or acquisition of treatment works to control water pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 12486; Mr. MORSE; February 2, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 12499: Mr. STAFFORD; February 2, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 12839: Mr. HARSHA; February 16, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I cannot predict which method the Congress may prefer in providing industry with some assistance in establishing pollution controls: that is, investment credit, accelerated depreciation, a combination of these two methods, or some other method. But I do believe that some form of incentive should be provided private industry and I urge the Finance Committee to give this matter their close consideration and I am hopeful that hearings may be held on these proposals in the near future.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the Senate that the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works has announced a 10-day hearing schedule on water pollution commencing April 19 and continuing through to May 5. I note that among the industry representatives scheduled to appear are the following: National Association of Manufacturers, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Manufacturing Chemists, the soap, and detergent industry, the iron, and steel industry, and the paper industry. I would hope that these industry representatives in discussing various methods for controlling and abating pollution would also include a discussion of their views on the use of tax incentives as a method of accomplishing this purpose.

In this connection, Mr. C. H. Gebhardt, manager of the tax department of the Mead Corp., has prepared a useful chart analyzing current tax proposals relative to water and air pollution controls so as to determine the measure of financial assistance that would actually be given to business if a particular proposal should be adopted. For each $100 outlay for pollution control facilities, Mr. Gebhardt concludes that the bill I introduced with Senator RANDOLPH would provide an incentive equal to 6.7 percent of the cost of pollution control facilities. Other methods provide for incentives of 1.1 percent, 6.1 percent, 7.8 percent, and 14.5 percent of the cost of these facilities. I ask unanimous consent that this table be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of various approaches to water and air pollution control incentives via changes in the Federal income tax law (using a $100 outlay for pollution control facilities as an example)

	Alternative approaches to incentives					
	Existing tax treatment [1] (for comparison purposes)	1-year writeoff and 7-percent investment credit	1-year writeoff and 14-percent investment credit	3-year writeoff and 7-percent investment credit	Existing [1] writeoff and 14-percent investment credit	1-year writeoff and no investment credit [2]
Cost of facility	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00
Tax benefits:						
48 percent (present top rate on corporations)	48.00	48.00	48.00	48.00	48.00	48.00
7-percent investment credit [3]	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	None
Additional 7-percent investment credit proposed [3]			7.00		7.00	
Total tax benefits	55.00	55.00	62.00	55.00	62.00	48.00
(a) Net cost of facility before considering the time value of money	45.00	45.00	38.00	45.00	38.00	52.00
(b) Net cost of facility considering the time value of money [4]	54.90	47.10	40.40	48.80	48.20	53.80
(c) Advantage of each alternative compared to existing tax treatment		7.80	14.50	6.10	6.70	1.10
(d) Amount of incentive as a percent of the cost of the facility [5]		7.8	14.5	6.1	6.7	1.1

[1] Depreciation writeoff over 16 years using 1 of the accelerated methods permitted for tax purposes (sum-of-years-digits) has been used.

[2] A 1-year writeoff with no investment credit is shown only for comparative purposes. It illustrates the importance of full investment credit, otherwise a quick writeoff, whether in 1, 3, or 5 years is ineffective if this results in a loss of the investment credit.

[3] Investment credit has been applied to the total outlay although under present law it applies only to equipment; not to land and buildings. It is hoped that any incentive legislation would extend the credit to all outlays, if it is to be an effective, even though modest, incentive.

[4] It is obvious from line (a) above that there is no difference in net cost of a facility, after tax benefits, under the various alternatives other than for those which obviously allow an additional 7-percent investment credit. The timing of a company's recovery of tax benefits is most important, however, and this is reflected in lines (b), (c), and (d) where the dollars involved have all been stated in terms of present worth (i.e., their value today). (A 4-percent after-tax discount rate, with tax benefits realized commencing 1 year after the date of investment is the technique used.)

[5] These incentives should be compared with the 30-percent Federal grants available (with certain qualifications) to municipalities for construction of facilities. There have also been a number of recommendations to increase such grants as the full environmental improvement program is implemented. Note that in appropriate situations industrial plants will (and do) utilize such public facilities, thus deriving some benefit from Federal grants. The incentives outlined above would serve, in some degree, to treat equitably those industrial plants which for technical and other reasons must install and pay for their own facilities.

EDUCATION TAX CREDIT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a matter that has been of great interest to me and many Members of the Senate for a long period of time, has been the proposed tax cut for higher education. I am happy to see the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in the Chamber. We had quite a discussion on this matter when we voted on the tax credit some time ago. I have assured him, and others, who were in opposition to this program, that I have no intention of giving up the fight. It may be that I will bring the tax credit up again this year. If the Senator from Connecticut does not wish to join me, I may do it on my own.

I am absolutely convinced that the American system of education needs some assistance and freedom of choice in granting that assistance. In my opinion, the tax credit approach, is the best way to accomplish this.

There has been some implication from time to time that perhaps the American people are not familiar with the tax credit approach and do not support this concept.

Mr. President, last night CBS conducted another of its popular national testing programs. The purpose of these shows has been to discover the thoughts, feelings, and habits of the American people. The way that the program works is to first test a representative group of people. Then television viewers throughout the Nation take the test and compare their own thoughts with the results of the national poll. These programs have previously covered many subjects. Last night, questions were asked on the subject of taxation.

One of the questions asked was.

> Should a tax credit or deduction be given to help meet the costs of a college education?

I am gratified to know that 70 percent replied "yes—they do favor such relief." only 17 percent were opposed, while 13 percent had no opinion.

Last month, when we were considering the Tax Adjustment Act, I told my colleagues in the Senate that there was widespread support for an education tax credit. I indicated, at that time, that educational expenses constituted a staggering burden to millions of American families who were trying to educate their sons and daughters. This CBS poll is further proof that our American people want a tax credit. I might note that 83 percent of those favoring the education tax credit were in the middle income classification with annual incomes ranging from $5,000 to $7,000 a year. These are the people who have to pay the rising costs of education. These are the ones who have to pay the bills. And these are the ones who overwhelmingly support the tax credit.

Senators may remember that in the progress of the debate on this subject it was stated that a poll had been taken of the presidents and trustees of the colleges in this country, and the percentage of those favoring it, among those who responded to the poll, was in excess of 86 percent.

Last month, I also stated to the Senate that strong support for such a measure is shared by parents and students. So if the educators, the parents, the students, and now the general public favor the proposal, it seems and understatement to say that an overwhelming group of people in this country would like to see progress made in this field.

However, the wishes of the public have been ignored. The administration has been opposed to the tuition tax-credit bill. It has gone to great lengths to make certain that it is not passed. I, for one, do not intend to let the people down. I plan to continue the fight which I have begun and to do my best to assure the people that their opinions will not be swept aside by the opinion of one man who happens to reside in the White House.

I hope that all Senators will join in the struggle to make our Government responsive to the wishes of the people in this highly important field, a field which is an investment in American opportunity and American education.

UNIFORM CLOSING TIME OF POLLING PLACES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have today introduced a bill designed to solve a problem that has developed in connection with our national election process.

It is common knowledge that people like to be on the winning side in any contest. Even though they may not fully agree with a candidate for public office, they like to be able to say they voted for him when he wins. This psychology is important in elections, and candidates on both sides usually try to cultivate the feeling publicly in advance of an election that they will win.

With this in mind, I have become concerned at the mass effect of the early reporting of election returns from large sections of the United States.

The fact that the polls close in some parts of the country at an earlier time than they do in other parts could very well decide the outcome of a presidential election.

This is especially true because of the technological advances enabling the mass communications media, through the use of computers, to project election returns for the Nation as a whole from returns in a few States.

I want to make it clear that I am not objecting to the dissemination of information about the outcome of an election as soon as the votes are in and counted.

I have no objection to the reporting of partial returns as the ballots are counted or after the polls are closed.

I do not object in any way to the manner in which the various newspapers, wire services, and radio and television networks cover the news about the outcome of elections, because I think they do a good job of informing people of the results.

I do not feel the communications media should withhold information.

I do feel that we can make our presidential election process more fair for both political parties and all candidates by establishing a uniform closing time for all polling places.

If the advance reporting of results convinces great numbers of people that the outcome is a foregone conclusion, it influences citizens who have not voted.

There are some who would not vote because they are faced with considerable difficulty getting to the polls, and they think their vote would not make any difference.

They might be factory workers who are tired after a long day on the job, housewives who would have to go to the expense of hiring a babysitter so they could go vote or farmers who would have to drive some distance to the polls.

People who plan to work for a candidate as long as the polls are open tend to let up when they are told their candidate already has lost, or does not have a chance.

Then there are great numbers of people who respect the opinion of the majority. They conclude that if the majority decides a certain way, the majority probably is right and therefore they will cast their vote with the majority.

Thus, when people are told the election is decided before the polls are closed, and become convinced of it, there is interference with the right of people to vote freely and independently. In short, it amounts to unfair campaigning.

My proposed legislation would require all polls in the United States to close at the same time for the election of electors for President and Vice President and for the election of U.S. Senators and Representatives.

It would take effect with the election of 1968 and would apply to every presidential election after that.

The closing time would be 9 p.m. in the eastern standard zone, 8 p.m. in the central standard zone, 7 p.m. in the mountain standard zone, 6 p.m. in the Pacific standard zone, 5 p.m. in the Yukon standard zone, 4 p.m. in the Alaska-Hawaii standard zone and 3 p.m. in the Bering standard zone.

I am not unaware that this calls for a rather early closing in Alaska and Hawaii. I believe, however, that we are faced with a serious national problem and that the national interest must prevail. The fact that the bill would not become effective until 1968 would not only give the State legislatures an opportunity to act next year, but it would give a long time to advertise this change.

It must also be borne in mind that a good portion of the important business of the country is transacted during limited hours, such as banking and business at a post office window and paying taxes. And, of course, there is no Federal law proposed as to how early the polls could be opened.

The voters who reside where Pacific standard time prevails or in the Yukon time zone, or in Alaska or Hawaii or in the Bering time zone, have a right to cast their vote without the problem that arises when voters feel that the election is over and their vote will be of no avail.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on H.R. 6319.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Murphy in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6319) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries, which was read, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. Two-Month Extension of Initial Enrollment Period for Supplementary Medical Insurance Benefits for the Aged

"(a) The first sentence of section 1837(c) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out 'January 1, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 1, 1966', and (2) by striking out 'March 31, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'May 31, 1966'.

"(b) Section 1837(d) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out 'January 1, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 1, 1966'.

"(c) Section 102(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by striking out 'April 1, 1966' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 1, 1966'.

"(d) In the case of an individual who first satisfies paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1836 of the Social Security Act in March 1966, and who enrolls pursuant to subsection (d) of section 1837 of such Act in May 1966, his coverage period shall, notwithstanding section 1838(a)(2)(D) of such Act, begin on July 1, 1966.

"Sec. 4. Coverage, Under State Agreements, of Public Assistance Recipients Entitled to Social Security or Railroad Retirement Benefits.

"(a) Subsection (b) of section 1843 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof (after and below paragraph (2)) the following new sentence:

" 'Except as provided in subsection (g), there shall be excluded from any coverage group any individual who is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under title II or who is entitled to receive an annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirment Act of 1937.'

"(b) Section 1843 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) (1) The Secretary shall, at the request of a State made before January 1, 1968, enter into a modification of an agreement entered into which such State pursuant to subsection (a) under which the second sentence of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to such agreement.

"'(2) In the case of any individual who would (but for this subsection) be excluded from the applicable coverage group described in subsection (b) by the second sentence of such subsection—

"'(A) subsections (c) and (d)(2) shall be applied as if such subsections referred to the modification under this subsection (in lieu of the agreement under subsection (a)),

"'(B) subsection (d)(3)(B) shall not apply so long as there is in effect a modification entered into by the State under this subsection, and

"'(C) notwithstanding subsection (e), in the case of any termination described in such subsection, such individual may terminate his enrollment under this part by the filing of a notice, before the close of the third month which begins after the date of such termination, that he no longer wishes to participate in the insurance program established by this part (and in such a case, the termination of his coverage period under this part shall take effect as of the close of such third month).'

"(c) Section 1840 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(i) In the case of an individual who is enrolled under the program established by this part as a member of a coverage group to which an agreement with a State entered into pursuant to section 1843 is applicable, subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall not apply to his monthly premium for any month in his coverage period which is determined under section 1843(d).'"

That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the title of aforesaid bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, both the House and the Senate have agreed to the principal features of the bill. They relate to the tax treatment of expropriation loss recoveries. The chairman of the Committee on Finance, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], explained these provisions in considerable detail when the bill was before the Senate on April 1. There is no reason to repeat the explanation of the tax features at this time.

In addition, no change has been made in the basic part of the bill as it passed the Senate at that time or in the bill as it passed the House.

An amendment added to the bill by the Senate extends the period for enrolling under part B of medicare for 2 months—from March 31 until May 31.

The House has agreed to the Senate amendment with technical modifications designed to facilitate medical insurance coverage of elderly persons who are receiving both social security benefits and public assistance. We have examined the House amendment and believe it is in keeping with the Senate provision. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has indicated that it, too, approves the House amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
April 6, 1966.

Hon. RUSSELL LONG,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for a report on the amendments to the Social Security Act reported out by the House Committee on Ways and Means, which are to be considered as amendments to H.R. 6319. The Department supports the amendments recommended by the House committee.

We trust that the Senate will be able to act on this legislation as promptly as possible. We strongly urge the adoption of this legislation as amended.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House and that the bill as agreed to be immediately sent to the White House, so that elderly persons who were unable to file for medical coverage by the March 31 deadline will have a further opportunity to file.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, a member of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Florida has just mentioned, the 60-day extension was recommended by the Committee on Finance. The House accepted that amendment, as I understand, but with an amendment that should a State desire to make contributions to take care of persons who are on social security, or who are receiving public assistance and are not able financially to pay for it, the State, of its own volition, may make those payments.

Mr. SMATHERS. The understanding of the Senator from Kansas is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Personally, I think that is a good amendment. I heartily approve it. I hope it will be unanimously approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

VIETNAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD, OF CONNECTICUT, AT AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., MARCH 30, 1966

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a week ago today the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] delivered what I believe is a very important speech before the Air Force Academy, in Colorado Springs. His speech is entitled, "The Meaning of Vietnam." With his usual flare for forthrightness, forcefulness, and accuracy, the Senator from Connecticut analyzed what the United States is doing in Vietnam and what the problems are, including the problems that arise from the dissension we see in our own country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this well thought through speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEANING OF VIETNAM

(Remarks of Senator THOMAS J. DODD at the Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo., Wednesday, March 30, 1966)

Your invitation to address this assembly of the Air Force Academy is an honor which means very much to me.

We are today involved in a worldwide battle with an enemy ever whit as evil and every whit as ruthless as the Nazis. How long this struggle will endure no prudent man can today predict. But it is clear that the very survival of freedom depends on the outcome of the critical battles which are today being fought and which are bound to be fought on many fronts over the years to come.

In these battles, you, as graduates of the Air Force Academy will play a role of signal importance.

Ever since the Battle of Britain, the men who fly have made contributions and suffered sacrifices that are out of all proportion to their actual number.

The future years, I am afraid, are pregnant with heavy responsibilities for all of you. I know that you will not shrink from these responsibilities. I am certain that you will accept them gladly, in the spirit of those who have gone before you.

After all the nonsense that has been spoken by the critics of our Vietnam policy, it is a most refreshing experience to be here with you today.

Here there are no faint hearts, no divided counsels, no tortured self-doubting, no appeasement masquerading as something noble and humanitarian.

You understand that Vietnam is a testing ground and that the outcome of the battle now being fought there may determine for centuries to come the fate of our country and of all mankind.

You understand—as the critics of our Vietnam policy fail to understand—that peace can never be assured by timidity or appeasement or retreat, and that freedom cannot survive unless we who enjoy its blessings are prepared to stand up to Communist aggression, and to match the Communists in dedication and ardor and sacrifice.

You understand that if we fail to hold the line against Communist aggression in Vietnam, we will be faced on the morrow by a dozen Vietnam crises in various parts of the world.

You understand, in short, that, in the complex world in which we live, freedom is indivisible and that our unrivaled strength as a nation imposes on us the responsibility of assisting every nation, great and small, that seeks to maintain its independence in the face of Communist aggression.

Although I know I do not have to convince you of all these things, I want to address my remarks today to a few of the many arguments that have been advanced against our Vietnam policy.

1. THE PACIFISTS

First of all, there are the pacifists, who oppose our intervention in Vietnam because they hold that it is wrong to kill under any circumstances. While the ideal of pacifism may be an admirable thing when regarded abstractly, I frankly fail to understand how any intelligent man can seek to apply this abstract ideal to the world of politics.

To be truly consistent, a pacifist would have to abjure violence of all kinds, not merely in the relations between nations, but in his personal relations with his fellow man. And this kind of truly consistent pacifism, in my opinion, is virtually nonexistent.

How many pacifists for example would consider it their duty to stand idly by if some maniac embarked on a berserk orgy of killing in the streets? And how many pacifists, in their devotion to nonviolence, would limit themselves to simple remonstration if they saw some criminal assault their wives?

The harsh fact is that, as much as we may abhor violence and love peace, there are situations in the relations between nations, just as there are situations in our everyday lives, when the employment of violence becomes a moral imperative in the defense of life and liberty.

It was so when the free world mobilized its resources to meet the threat of Nazi aggression. It was so in the Korean war. And it is so in Vietnam again today.

2. THE FRAUDULENT PACIFISTS

But even more numerous and more confused than the pacifists are those fraudulent pacifists who supported the war against Hitler, but who now lecture us on the wickedness of resorting to force in Vietnam. As Prof. John Roche, former president of Americans for Democratic Action, has pointed out, the true pacifist is precluded by his beliefs from having any favorite wars.

3. THE FRIENDS OF THE VIETCONG

Then there are those critics of our Vietnam policy who are so bemused by the word "revolution" that they tend to sympathize, openly or covertly, with the Vietcong, regarding them as bearers of social and political progress who truly reflect the aspirations of the Vietnamese people.

I can understand a Communist sympathizing with the Vietcong, because this is the attitude to which his perverted philosophy inevitably leads him. But I find it exceedingly difficult to understand the attitude of those non-Communists who, on the one hand, damn the Saigon government as reactionary and, on the other hand concede the banner of progress to the Vietcong.

If progress means anything, it should mean the betterment of the human lot, the progressive expansion of freedom and justice, and the rejection of force as an instrument of national policy.

Accepting these criteria of progress, the Communist regimes in every country would have to be put down as among the most reactionary in history.

Wherever they have come to power they have obliterated every vestige of human freedom, regimented every aspect of the lives of the people, and massacred hundreds of thousands of opponents and imprisoned many more.

On top of this, the incentive desert which characterizes Communist rule has everywhere resulted in reduced food production and in a lowered standard of living.

And, finally, communism is the total antithesis of progress because of its commitment to subversion and aggression.

But just as there were many people who once assured us that the Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers, there are those who today insist on regarding the Vietcong as progressives, or as true revolutionaries.

4. THOSE WHO SAY WE CANNOT WIN

Then there are those who have no illusions about the nature of the Vietcong, but who hold that we cannot possibly police the world. They tell us that we are already overextended and overcommitted; that southeast Asia is too remote to be of immediate concern to us; that the security of the United States does not stand or fall with Vietnam or southeast Asia; and that the Vietnam war, in any case, is one we cannot possibly win.

I have always replied to these critics, by first of all getting them to agree—as they invariably will do—that it is necessary to draw a line somehow, somewhere, against the further advance of Communist imperialism.

I then remind them that, as remote as southeast Asia may appear to be, Iwo Jima and Guadalcanal and the Solomon Islands were equally remote.

And finally, I ask them where they propose to draw the line if Vietnam should fall.

For let there be no mistake about it: If we fail in Vietnam, through our own weakness or through the weakness of our Vietnamese allies, it will be exceedingly difficult to draw an effective line against the advance of communism anywhere in the Far East.

As for the argument that this is a war we cannot fight and cannot win, I say that we are fighting this war exceedingly well, that we have succeeded in seizing the initiative and holding it, and that we have already begun to win.

The American soldiers have shown an amazing ability to adapt themselves to guerrilla warfare.

The concept of air cavalry, which had never before been tried in battle, has given us a mobility that constantly confounds the enemy. It has enabled us to confine the insurgency with a manpower advantage of less than 3 to 1, compared with the figure of 10 and 15 to 1 which had heretofore been considered essential in dealing with guerrilla uprisings.

Our air arm has devised new tactics to deal with every type of contingency, and these tactics are constantly being refined.

Our commanding officers have succeeded in coordinating land, sea, and air power in a manner never before achieved in this kind of warfare—and the indications are that the Vietcong are still groping for a way to deal with this awesome orchestration of military power.

The morale of our forces is high. Indeed, from all accounts I have heard, I do not think it has ever been higher in any war. They know why they are in Vietnam. They are genuinely fond of the Vietnamese people. And their proficiency in antiguerrilla operations improves with each passing month.

On the other side, the difficulties of the Vietcong have grown by leaps and bounds.

Because they are scraping the bottom of the manpower barrel in the areas under their control, they have been obliged to accept massive support from regular North Vietnamese army units, which have been crossing into South Vietnam at the rate of 4,000 to 5,000 a month.

This accretion of northern manpower has serious disadvantages as well as advantages for the Vietcong.

The South Vietnamese have always disliked and resented the North Vietnamese. The large-scale entrance of regular units of the North Vietnamese army into the battle for South Vietnam, has alienated many of the peasants and has produced serious friction between the North Vietnamese regulars and the South Vietnamese guerrillas. It has also greatly increased the logistical problems of the enemy, so that our airmen more frequently discover enemy convoys and our armed forces more frequently uncover Vietcong stores of food and ammunition.

There are many evidences of deteriorating Vietcong morale.

The rate of defection from the Vietcong has now risen to almost 2,000 per month. And whereas intelligence was previously difficult to come by, there is now a massive and increasing flow of intelligence from areas under Vietcong control.

So, while the road ahead may still be long and difficult, there is every reason to believe that the situation in Vietnam will continue to improve, until ultimately the Communists will be obliged to abandon their aggression—as the Greek Communists were once compelled to abandon their insurgency and as the Huk guerrillas at a later date were obliged to do in the Philippines.

So much for the argument that we are overextended and that we cannot possibly win the war in Vietnam.

5. THE APPEASERS

Then there are the appeasers, who urge us to be reasonable with the Communists and to be prepared to compromise with them, just as the appeasers of pre-Munich days insisted that peace could only be preserved if we were prepared to compromise with the Nazis.

I know that they resent being called appeasers—but then, if my memory serves me, Neville Chamberlain and the Clivdon set in Britain regarded themselves as exceedingly virtuous human beings and repudiated with equal vehemence the charge that they were appeasers.

The essence of modern appeasement is the attempt to purchase peace with aggressive dictatorial regimes by making concessions to them at the expense of other peoples. And in this sense, I see absolutely no moral or political difference between those who in 1939 urged that we placate Hitler by giving him part of Czechoslovakia, and those who today urge that we seek to placate the Vietcong by making significant concessions to them.

As Gen. Maxwell Taylor said in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "How does one compromise the freedom of 15 million people?

6. THE QUESTION OF A COALITION GOVERNMENT

The most common form of appeasement at this juncture in our national Vietnam debate is the proposal that we enter into negotiations with the Vietcong for the purpose of establishing a coalition government with their participation.

I find it difficult to believe that those who have made this proposal have studied the record of coalition governments between Communists and no-Communists, or have given adequate thought to the implications of their proposal or to its potential consequences.

First of all, I would like to answer the argument that our refusal to envisage this kind of solution places us in the position of demanding unconditional surrender from the Communists.

All we have ever asked of the Communists is that they call off their aggression against the people of South Vietnam.

We demand no reparations, nor does the Government of South Vietnam.

We seek no territory.

We ask no political conditions.

We have not even asked that North Vietnam permit the holding of free elections in its territory, in return for the holding of free elections in South Vietnam.

And while we demand nothing, we offer much.

I am certain, for example, that the South Vietnamese Government would be prepared to consent to a general amnesty covering all those who have participated in the Vietcong insurrection.

I say that I am certain of this because such an amnesty would simply represent an extension of the Chieu Hoi program, under which all Vietcong who come over to the government side are automatically granted amnesty.

The combination of a general amnesty and the promise of a free election at an early date would enable members of the Vietcong movement to test their true degree of popular support by competing for elected office.

Beyond this, we have on our own side publicly committed ourselves to bring North Vietnam into the Mekong River development plan so that she may benefit from the tremendous potentialities that will be unleashed through the harnessing of the Mekong River.

If words have any meaning at all, I do not see how these terms could, by any stretch of the imagination, be described as "unconditional surrender." On the contrary, I can recall no war in which terms as generous as this have been offered to those guilty of aggression—and this in advance of any negotiations.

Those who say that anything less than an offer of a coalition government constitutes a demand for unconditional surrender are, whether they realize this or not, demanding a settlement that is tantamount to surrender by our side.

Even if we could talk our South Vietnamese allies into accepting a coalition government with the Communists, there is little reason for believing that such a solution would put an end to the fighting in South Vietnam—and there is much reason for fearing that it would turn South Vietnam over to complete communist control in very short order.

I recall that we used our influence in the postwar period to persuade our friends in the central European countries to enter into coalitions with the Communists. In every instance, the outcome was disastrous.

Let there be no mistake about it: If we endeavor to overrule the instincts and wishes of our South Vietnamese allies by forcing a "coalition government" solution down their throats, we will not receive the cooperation of a single self-respecting Vietnamese leader.

If, despite this, we were to persist in this folly, we would wind up with a so-called coalition government which, apart from the Vietcong, would include only a handful of second- and third-rate opportunists, of whom the Communists would make short shrift.

Such a coalition government would turn out to be a Vietcong government virtually from the word "go."

I implore those sincere Americans who are advocating a coalition government in Vietnam to rethink the implications of their proposal.

I implore them also to give some thought to the fact that all this talk of recognizing the Vietcong and of forcing a coalition government on Vietnam encourages the Vietcong to persist, while it strikes dismay into the hearts of our Vietnamese allies.

I implore them to consider what the verdict of history will be if their recommendations should prevail and if the Communists should then take over, as they have done in so many other countries where we have played the perilous game of coalition government.

There are certain issues on which we can compromise and certain issues on which we cannot compromise.

We cannot compromise on the principle that aggression must never be rewarded. Because I take this stand, I repudiate with all my strength the suggestion that we should seek peace in South Vietnam by offering the Communists half the country or half control over its government.

On a moral level I consider this proposal tantamount to suggesting that we purchase peace with the American underworld by permitting them to legally retain a portion of the loot they have obtained by criminal means, or by giving them representation in our Government.

As there can be no compromise with crime, there can be no compromise with aggression.

As much as I may disagree with them, I believe that the critics of our Vietnam policy have performed a public service by raising the question of a coalition government at this time. They have helped to clear the air of rumors that such a solution was being given sympathetic consideration by the administration.

The ringing declarations of Vice President Humphrey, of Under Secretary Ball, of Mr. McGeorge Bundy, and of other key members of the administration team, have established beyond the possibility of doubt that the Johnson administration has understood the bitter lesson to be drawn from the experience with coalition governments in the postwar period.

The administration has made it clear to friend and foe alike that it will not abandon its commitment to the people of South Vietnam, that it will not buy peace through any dishonest or equivocal formula which compromises the position of our allies, and that it will not yield to the clamor of the tiny misguided minority who demand that we pull out of Vietnam.

If the Communists think otherwise, then they have gravely misread both the history and the present temper of the American people.

I wish to close with a quotation from Winston Churchill which I never tire of repeating.

During the dark days of the Battle of Britain, Churchill took time off from his duties to address the boys of his old school, Harrow. This was his message to them:

"Never give in. Never, never, never, never. Never yield to force and the apparently overwhelming might of the enemy. Never yield in any way, great or small, large or petty, except to convictions of honor and good sense."

The American people, and especially our Vietnam critics, would do well to take this advice to heart today.

FUNERAL SERVICES FOR HON. LESLIE BIFFLE, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the funeral services for Hon. Leslie Biffle, former Secretary of the Senate, will be at 11 o'clock a.m. on Saturday, April 9, 1966, in the Bethlehem Chapel of the National Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul. Burial will be private at Fort Lincoln Cemetery.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1022, Senate Joint Resolution 103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, debate on the proposed constitutional amendment will not start until the Senate returns from its Easter recess, which will be 1 week from today.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 7, 1966, at 9 o'clock a.m.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 6 (legislative day of April 5), 1966:

The nomination sent to the Senate on February 16, 1966, of Wayne A. Wray to be postmaster at Barnes, in the State of Kansas.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 6 (legislative day of April 5), 1966:

Postmasters

ALABAMA

Otis H. Moore, Jr., Sterrett.
Bessie J. Bragg, Ward.

ALASKA

Maudrey J. Sommer, Tanana.

CALIFORNIA

William R. Lackey, Bass Lake.
Paul J. Lay, Beaumont.
Shirley E. Ames, Bodega Bay.
Earl O. Good, Jr., Fullerton.
Irma L. Wyly, Jacumba.
Dorothy E. Birkhead, Morro Bay.
Carl L. Backlund, Torrance.
Betty J. Raper, Westend.

COLORADO

Rallin R. Gibson, Collbran.
Harry N. Pearson, Ignacio.

CONNECTICUT

Julia A. Wharton, Colebrook.
Edward W. Gray, Riverton.
Manuel W. Vetti, Stamford.

FLORIDA

James F. Myers, Casselberry.
James F. Bridges, Jr., Fort Pierce.
Francis A. Wynn, Homestead.
Franklin C. Smith, Interlachen.
John A. Norden, Lake Mary.
Maxwell E. Scott, Marco.
John O. Hampton, Melbourne.
Shearod W. Williams, Niceville.

GEORGIA

Mary B. Goolsby, Carlton.
Wilma G. Lawrence, McCaysville.
William B. Price, McIntyre.

ILLINOIS

James C. Stanley, Fairfield.
Norman A. Rutter, St. Libory.
Charles H. Gunier, Sheridan.

INDIANA

Earl F. Ley, Clay City.
Charles L. Powell, Denver.
Larry D. Garrison, Kingsford Heights.
Richard P. Gerhard, Kokomo.
N. Artelle Lassiter, Windfall.

IOWA

William H. Merkle, Fayette.
Clarita F. Witham, Truesdale.

KANSAS

Durward E. Smith, Admire.
Florence W. Kelley, Chanute.
Orval M. Siefers, Dorrance.
Louise L. Atwell, Kismet.
Effie M. Dunn, Meriden.

Evelyn M. Caldwell, Preston.
Earl K. Pennington, Rantoul.

KENTUCKY

Victor D. Headrick, Tompkinsville.

LOUISIANA

John W. Vining, Amite.
Doland Vincent, Kaplan.
Jesse P. LeBlanc, Lockport.
Gerald J. Marquette, Napoleonville.
Nita S. Dabadie, Ventress.

MAINE

Frank L. Reynolds, Brooks.

MASSACHUSETTS

Nelson T. Cotter, Hanover.
Patrick J. Windward, Jr., Sterling Junction.
James F. Alley, West Tisbury.

MICHIGAN

Wallace J. Reed, Flushing.
Vern W. Bemus, Hazel Park.
Elmer A. Behrend, Powers.

MINNESOTA

James M. Pederson, Echo.
Thelma A. Reynolds, Holloway.
R. Vron Muir, Jackson.

MISSOURI

Walter J. Stuesse, Beaufort.
Archie L. Williams, Carl Junction.
Edward L. Rogers, Jr., Robertsville.
Winifred M. Puchta, Rockaway Beach.
Victor F. Mudd, Silex.
J. Walter Jones, Sweet Springs.

MONTANA

Fred W. Schepens, Glendive.

NEBRASKA

Howard D. Clements, Hay Springs.
Theodore R. Gaedke, Wellfleet.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

John T. Richardson, East Barrington.
Walter P. Kretowicz, Keene.

NEW JERSEY

Louis J. Rossi, Avenel.
Joseph M. Gondola, Clifton.
Thomas F. Flynn, Emerson.

NEW MEXICO

Jenkins A. McRae, Jr., Alamogordo.
Alberto Romero, Mora.

NORTH CAROLINA

Boyce W. Cloninger, Catawba.
William P. Hudgins, Sunbury.

NORTH DAKOTA

Vernon L. Hansen, Kenmare.

OHIO

David F. Tootle, Frankfort.
Howard R. Van Scholk, Hilliard.
Joseph D. Buchanan, Norwich.
Matthew J. Dowling, Perrysburg.
Robert L. Booth, Tiffin.
Charles H. McGovney, West Union.

OKLAHOMA

James A. Maddux, Cheyenne.

PENNSYLVANIA

Steve A. Gavorchik, Fairchance.
Michael A. Hrehocik, Glassport.
Mary K. Hertzog, Lyon Station.
Harry W. Stark, Manchester.
J. Richard Hartman, Roaring Spring.
Louella J. Hanna, Spring Church.
Ralph J. Brooking, Starrucca.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John H. Atkinson, Jr., Myrtle Beach.

SOUTH DAKOTA

James W. Cheatham, Aurora.
Thomas R. Lyons, Brookings.
Stanley K. Baird, Frankfort.
Robert S. Kuni, Huron.

TENNESSEE

Florence A. West, Collegedale.
Edith T. Webb, Orlinda.

TEXAS

Charlie L. Carter, Jr., Bon Wier.
Calvin H. Davis, Brownfield.
Douglas R. McGraw, Del Rio.
Jewel L. Newbrough, Hargill.
Frank N. Simpson, McLean.
Delbert F. Arndt, New Ulm.
Bernie M. Smith, Pantex.
Irene A. Yarbrough, Princeton.
Ward V. Hollingshead, San Angelo.
Elmon J. Jacobs, Spearman.
Jack P. Meredith, Teague.
Margaret L. Cooke, Waskom.
Mary K. Herring, Whitharral.
Erna L. Boggus, Yancey.

VERMONT

Donald A. Frail, Hartland.

VIRGINIA

Randall J. Wilmarth, Danville.
Edna A. Josey, Disputanta.
Charlie M. Jeffries, Warrenton.
Carol B. Miller, Washington.

WASHINGTON

Irma S. Nordquist, Lakebay.
Lenard A. Smith, Leavenworth.
Gordon G. Johnson, Olympia.
David L. Gray, Reardan.
Robert A. Leadon, Yakima.

WEST VIRGINIA

Roy K. Hatton, Huntington.
John W. Almond, MacArthur.
Ivan N. Hunter, Nirto.

WYOMING

Verne S. Parman, Sinclair.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Conservation Districts and Rural Fringe Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, not long ago most people looked upon soil and water conservation as something for the farmers to worry about. But not today.

As cities spread out, many rural areas in their path face the need for guidance in land-use decisions.

In Illinois, we face the problems of rapid development in the areas stretching out from Chicago—and I am glad to say that we are facing them head on.

The Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission is charged with the responsibility of developing a broad framework plan. The plan will be a guide to the orderly and intelligent development of land and water resources in the six northeastern counties of Illinois. In carrying out this responsibility the commission calls on other groups to assist in their various technical fields.

Included in this all-out effort is help under a cooperative agreement the commission has entered into with the five soil and water conservation districts in the area and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service.

Through these organizations, the commission will receive technical assistance in connection with a land resource study that will become part of a comprehensive development plan for the area.

Soil Conservation Service assistance includes interpretations of soil surveys made by them which will be used as a basis for land-use planning.

Farmers for many years have relied on soil survey information to determine proper use and treatment of their land. Today, with somewhat different interpretations, the soil survey information is invaluable to the urban planner, builder, or engineer. It is used to determine the best sites for not only housing, industry, and parks, but for recreation areas, roads, utility lines, and sewerage systems.

The soil facts help avoid wrong land-use decisions that lead to deterioration of streets and highways, overtaxed water-disposal systems, silted reservoirs and streams, sediment-clogged sewers, cracked walls and inoperative septic tanks, and a host of other problems.

These problems are faced by mounting numbers of people—not only in northeastern Illinois but everywhere that rural land is shifting from agricultural uses. They are costly problems. But they can be avoided by advance planning more cheaply than they can be corrected—if, indeed, they can be corrected.

I am extremely gratified with the cooperation that these organizations are showing in providing the guidance that will not only avoid costly mistakes but lead to a much more satisfactory environment for human living and enjoyment.

I hope there will be no delay, either because of slow administrative action or because of our failure to provide adequate funds, in completing up-to-date soil surveys for all areas where they have not been done in recent years.

Mr. David Russ of Kingsport, Tenn., Winner of National Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD FULTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend congratulations to a young Tennessean who has recently distinguished himself by speaking in behalf of the democratic principals upon which this Nation was founded and rests.

He is Mr. David Russ, a senior at Dobyns-Bennett High School, in Kingsport, Tenn., who is the 1966 national winner in the annual voice-of-democracy competition sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Russ' speech, which appeared in the RECORD on February 24, 1966, was a moving and forceful declaration.

I would also like to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars who make this annual competition possible. It is programs such as this which give millions of young Americans the opportunity to think fully upon the meaning of our democracy, its beginnings, its history, its future and the obligation of each generation to keep it alive by participation in its institutions.

One who has been most active in this program has been Mr. Ollie T. Frith, of Nashville. Mr. Frith is currently State commander of Tennessee for the American Legion and for the past 8 years has been chairman of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy program. He served his country during both the Korean war and World War II and has been continually active in business and civic affairs in our community of Nashville and across Tennessee.

Time does not permit the listing of all Mr. Frith's civic activities but suffice it to say that they are broad and demanding. Nonetheless, he takes time from his demanding schedule to work with young people in the voice-of-democracy program. He does this because he firmly believes, as do the millions of other Americans who have served their country in uniform, that democracy cannot survive unless it is given active participation by those who live under it. The voice-of-democracy competition promotes this participation. Thus, not only are the young Americans who participate in this competition to be commended but also the members of the VFW for providing this means of encouragement for contemplation and articulation of the meaning of democracy.

Little League Builds Big Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the men and women who make Little League baseball a success all across the country and the young Americans who participate in it have always commanded my profound respect. In fact, if time would permit, I would like nothing better than to personally be a part of Little League baseball.

As you know, Little League was federally chartered by Public Law 378 of the 88th Congress. Since this very proper recognition by the Congress, the great work of character building which Little League has done for many years has gone forward with renewed vigor.

The purpose of Little League is to provide a beneficial program of baseball for boys. It helps a million boys each year to greater fulfillment in their formative years and offers a challenge to parents and adults who participate. Little League is an action program which encourages the competitive spirit and the desire for self-improvement. A boy must earn the right to be on the team. His attitudes and his desire to excel and improve his skills determine whether or not he makes the team. He must adapt to teamwork, take directions, learn to win and also lose. Such training is a true builder of character. Little League builds big men.

This week I was privileged to visit with Mr. W. A. Moran, president of the highly successful Sunnyvale Southern Little League, in my congressional district, and I was inspired anew as I learned of the plans of this league for the future.

The Southern Little League of Sunnyvale, Calif., began humbly 10 years ago with only about 180 to 200 participating boys between the ages of 9 and 12. It has grown to the point where more than 600 boys between the ages of 8 and 15 will participate this year. Parents and interested citizens have of course given increasingly of their time, effort, and personal resources to make this program possible. There has been some assistance from civic groups, school officials, and local government.

The progress of Little League baseball in Sunnyvale is a success story which could be told in hundreds of cities across this Nation—and always the success is the direct result of public-spirited private citizens who devotedly and unselfishly give of their time and energies.

Now, with the extension of Little League participation to youngsters from age 8 through 15, there will be many additional responsibilities that must be assumed by these hard-working volunteers. Local government agencies can aid them in waging our national fight against delinquency by providing facilities and required financial and administrative assistance. School authorities can insure the cooperation of their physical education departments and the use of school facilities. In this way, local government and unselfish individuals can join together in an investment in the future of American manhood which will pay great dividends.

In this difficult age and this time of change, where adjustment problems in our youth can easily arise, there is need to do even more than has been done in the past. Additional facilities will be needed in Sunnyvale and across the Nation. I devoutly hope that the increased contribution of time and energies by Little League volunteers will be matched by increased and improved facilities such as grounds, grandstands, and backstops furnished by local authorities and civic groups. Such a partnership of effort will be required in developing the clean, wholesome, sportsmanlike, vigorous, and competitive spirit in the young boys who will be tomorrow's men. There is no finer investment.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I think it might be interesting to hear the credo of the Little League volunteer. When he enters into Little League work, he pledges as follows:

> I will—
>
> Hold Little League to be a proud asset to our Nation and through my example will help to endow it with the highest possible standards.
>
> Respect the boy as an individual and keep in mind his capabilities, limitations, and the problems of growing up.
>
> Be active in the growing movement of Little League, ready to improve the estate of youngsters whenever possible, hoping to find honest enjoyment in the creative service the program affords.
>
> Recognize the responsibilities of training boys in lessons of fair play, discipline and teamwork.
>
> Keep myself informed through basic understanding of the objectives of the program.
>
> Cooperate in careful observance of the rules and regulations which are the strength of Little League.
>
> Encourage support of parents, educators, and all agencies devoted to the welfare of youth.
>
> Protect the Little League name and emblem against exploitation and Little League players against commercialization.

All of us in government, from local school boards, through city councils, county boards, statehouses, and here in Washington, could serve this Nation by joining in such a pledge.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay this small tribute to the men and women volunteers of Little League and to the boys who participate. They deserve increasing support because "Little League builds big men."

Agriculture Pamphlets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, following is a letter I recently sent to my constituents informing them of a valuable service available by my office:

> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
> CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR FRIEND: It is a pleasure to write you personally, now that spring is really here, and many people are asking for booklets, to help on their homes, economy meals for families, and helpful advice on their lawns, trees, and gardens.
>
> I have now obtained allotments of current Government books and pamphlets for our Congressional District, and I am always surprised how well written and popular they are. While each Congressman gets only 10,000, several of my friends—Congressmen who are not running for reelection this year—are helping, but they do not go far in our big district of 430,000 people.
>
> As you are on my personal list, I am enclosing an outline of booklets to check five choices only, and also am sending a sample. I will be glad to see these are sent to you without any cost or charge, as an extra service of my office.

I believe these booklets will really help you to keep down food costs as I have been concerned, and opposed the Agriculture bloc moves, to raise the prices of foods and meats.

Just print your name and address on back of list, and mail to me in Washington, D.C., House Office Building.

Cordially,

JIM FULTON.

Publications available for distribution by Members of Congress to homemakers and residents of cities and towns

[Items in stock as of February 1966 are listed. Unforeseen demands or subject-matter changes may exhaust supplies; hence an occasional item may be out of stock when your order is received]

FARMERS' BULLETINS

☐ F 1889 Fireplaces and chimneys.
☐ F 1972 Poison-ivy, poison-oak, and poison-sumac.
☐ F 2018 Control of nonsubterranean termites.
☐ F 2075 An American-type cheese—how to make it for home use.
☐ F 2105 Ornamental hedges for the Northern Great Plains.
☐ F 2131 Raising rabbits.
☐ F 2151 The Japanese beetle—how to control it.
☐ F 2202 Simple plumbing repairs for the home and farmstead.

LEAFLETS

☐ L 56 Preventing cracks in new wood floors.
☐ L 184 The elm leaf beetle.
☐ L 185 Elm bark beetles.
☐ L 250 Hamster raising.
☐ L 268 Eat a good breakfast . . . to start a good day.
☐ L 278 Tomatoes on your table.
☐ L 293 Sweetpotato recipes.
☐ L 307 How much fertilizer shall I use?
☐ L 321 What to do when your home freezer stops.
☐ L 324 Soil treatment—an aid in termite control.
☐ L 359 Kieffer pears for home use.
☐ L 364 Chinch bugs—how to control them.
☐ L 390 The house fly . . . how to control it.
☐ L 403 Chiggers—how to fight them.
☐ L 408 Facts about pasteurization of milk.
☐ L 415 Tapeworms of poultry . . . how to control them.
☐ L 424 Food for fitness—a daily food guide.
☐ L 428 Trichinosis.
☐ L 439 Spring-flowering bulbs.
☐ L 443 Clover mites—how to control them around the home.
☐ L 444 The narcissus bulb fly—how to prevent its damage in home gardens.
☐ L 445 Electric heating of hotbeds.
☐ L 453 How to control bedbugs.
☐ L 463 Beltsville energy-saving kitchen, design No. 2.
☐ L 466 Raising guinea pigs.
☐ L 497 The home chicken flock.
☐ L 501 The old house borer.
☐ L 508 Bridge grafting and inarching damaged fruit trees.

HOME AND GARDEN BULLETINS

☐ G 1 Family fare—food management and recipes.
☐ G 5 Food for the family with young children.
☐ G 8 Home canning fo fruits and vegetables.
☐ G 10 Home freezing of fruits and vegetables.
☐ G 11 Fitting coats and suits.
☐ G 13 Food for families with school children.
☐ G 14 A step-saving U-kitchen.
☐ G 17 Food guide for older folks.
☐ G 20 How to tailor a woman's suit.
☐ G 25 Roses for the home.
☐ G 28 Ants in the home and garden . . . how to control them.
☐ G 32 Washing machines—selection and use.
☐ G 36 Peanut and peanut butter recipes.
☐ G 37 Honey—some ways to use it.
☐ G 38 Buying your home sewing machine.
☐ G 40 Freezing combination main dishes.
☐ G 41 Green vegetables for good eating.
☐ G 44 Cabbage insects . . . how to control them in the home garden.
☐ G 48 Home freezers . . . their selection and use.
☐ G 49 Detergents for home laundering.
☐ G 51 Better lawns.
☐ G 52 Wood siding—how to install it, paint it, care for it.
☐ G 53 Lawn insects—how to control them.
☐ G 55 Potatoes in popular ways.
☐ G 56 How to make jellies, jams, and preserves at home.
☐ G 57 Getting enough milk.
☐ G 58 Shopper's guide to U.S. grades for food.
☐ G 59 Simplified clothing construction.
☐ G 60 The Beltsville kitchen-workroom with energy-saving features.
☐ G 61 Lawn diseases . . . how to control them.
☐ G 62 Removing stains from fabrics—home methods.
☐ G 63 Hand sprayers and dusters.
☐ G 64 Subterranean termites—their prevention and control in buildings.
☐ G 65 Growing chrysanthemums.
☐ G 66 Growing iris in the home garden.
☐ G 67 Insects and related pests of house plants—how to control them.
☐ G 68 How to prevent and remove mildew—home methods.
☐ G 69 Home care of purchased frozen foods.
☐ G 70 Home freezing of poultry.
☐ G 72 Nutritive value of foods.
☐ G 73 Wood decay in houses—how to prevent and control it.
☐ G 74 Food and your weight.
☐ G 76 Growing ornamental bamboo.
☐ G 77 Family food stockpile for survival.
☐ G 78 Storing perishable foods in the home.
☐ G 79 Controlling lawn weeds with herbicides.
☐ G 80 Home propagation of ornamental trees and shrubs.
☐ G 81 Maple diseases and their control—a guide for homeowners.
☐ G 82 Selecting and growing house plants.
☐ G 83 Pruning shade trees and repairing their injuries.
☐ G 84 Controlling mosquitoes in your home and on your premises.
☐ G 85 Food for the young couple.
☐ G 86 Growing camellias.
☐ G 88 Growing the flowering dogwood.
☐ G 89 Selecting fertilizers for lawns and gardens.
☐ G 90 Conserving the nutritive value in foods.
☐ G 91 Growing flowering annuals.
☐ G 92 Making pickles and relishes at home.
☐ G 93 Freezing meat and fish in the home.
☐ G 94 Family food budgeting . . . for good meals and good nutrition.
☐ G 95 Reducing salt injury to ornamental shrubs in the West.
☐ G 96 Controlling household pests.
☐ G 97 Sanitation in home laundering.
☐ G 98 A guide to budgeting for the young couple.
☐ G 99 Planning bathrooms for today's homes.
☐ G 100 Equipment for cooling your home.
☐ G 101 Home laundering . . . the equipment and the job.
☐ G 102 Iron deficiency in plants . . . how to control it in yards and gardens.
☐ G 103 Eggs in family meals . . . a guide for consumers.
☐ G 104 Protecting shade trees during home construction.
☐ G 105 Vegetables in family meals . . . a guide for consumers.
☐ G 107 Clothing repairs.
☐ G 108 A guide to budgeting for the family.
☐ GS 1 Nutrition, up-to-date, up to you.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

☐ M 930 Rural recreation . . . new opportunities on private land.
☐ M 948 Fallout shelter for six people.
☐ AH 38 First aid for flooded homes and farms.
☐ MB 1 How to buy poultry by USDA grades.
☐ MB 12 Know your butter grades.
☐ MB 13 Tips on selecting fruits and vegetables.
☐ MB 15 U.S. grades for beef.
☐ MB 17 Cheese buying guide for consumers.
☐ PA 578 Your family survival plan.
☐ PA 589 Safe use of pesticides . . . in the home . . . in the garden.

The 50th Anniversary of the Rising of Easter Week, 1916

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on this Easter week I greet the Irish people of America, and of the Irish homeland itself, and rejoice in celebrating what is, in effect, the 50th birthday of the Republic of Ireland. For though the people of Ireland never, through the centuries of foreign rule, entirely submitted or relinquished their aspirations for national independence, and though both sporadic national rebellions, and determined resistance by groups and individuals, took place through those centuries, Easter week marks the opening of a steady, resistless campaign for national independence.

Step by step, through treaties and compromises, from home rule, to Irish Free State, to fully independent Republic, Ireland has followed the path charted for her by the heroic dead whose memory we honor on this anniversary. We pay tribute today to the noble hearts that brought forth, and to the loyal hearts that have lived by, the aspirations they laid down for the nation:

> The Irish Republic is entitled to, and hereby claims, the allegiance of every Irishman and Irishwoman. The Republic guarantees religious and civil liberty, equal rights and equal opportunities to all its citizens, and declares its resolve to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and of all its parts, cherishing all the children of the nation equally, and oblivious of the differences carefully fostered by an alien government, which have divided a minority from the majority in the past.

Ireland, like America, claims as the foundation stone of its national existence the twin principles of liberty and equality: liberty both religious and civil, and equality both of rights and of opportunities. That the Easter week rising did not end with its forcible putting-down, and with the execution, imprisonment, and exile of its various leaders, is, I think, chiefly due to the large-souled generosity of the Proclamation of the Irish Republic, as well as to the steadfast courage of those who signed it and of their lieutenants.

The principles here proclaimed appeal to the best in man's nature, and contrast strikingly with the spiteful pettiness of the alien government, which had sought to rule Ireland by dividing her people against themselves, and by enabling one part of her population to profit by the misery and degradation of the other. Rightly the proclamation enshrines, and rightly the Republic of Ireland has carried out in action, the high ideal of national unity and equal treatment for all.

Members of Catholic, Protestant, Jewish faiths, even atheists, can be assured of full liberty of speech and action in Ireland; and the land is ruled as much for the benefit of inhabitants of Saxon or other foreign ancestry as for the indigenous Irish.

The Irish people, and the Irish Government, are alike committed to the high resolve expressed in the conclusion of Pardaic Pearse's statement from Kilmainham Prison:

> If you strike us down now we shall rise again and renew the fight, you cannot conquer Ireland, you cannot extinguish the Irish passion for freedom; if our deed has not been sufficient to win freedom then our children will win it by a better deed.

Hoosiers Answer Loud and Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr Speaker, during the past several weeks I have conducted an opinion poll among Indiana voters. I would like to submit the results of the sampling at this time.

STRONGER ACTION IN VIETNAM BACKED

One overwhelming conclusion drawn from this sample is that the voters will support stronger military action in Vietnam, to bring the war to a successful conclusion, as it was often expressed.

Sixty-six percent of the replies indicated a willingness to see the United States "intensify military action" in Vietnam. Nineteen percent favor maintaining the present level of involvement.

Only 8 percent would support withdrawal of our Armed Forces in Vietnam prior to a successful conclusion of the war and 4 percent favor the suspension of our bombing raids into North Vietnam.

There is still considerable confusion about our exact role in South Vietnam, reflected not only by the 3 percent who declined to answer this question but even more by the comments people added to their cards and letters. Without a doubt the war is very much on people's minds and they are greatly concerned about our position.

There are misgivings about our getting involved in the first place, but the predominant belief is that we now have to see it through. Many persons who returned the questionnaire card wrote, in addition to their answers, "Win or get out."

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the responses to this questionnaire came before the recent internal battles in South Vietnam. If a radical change in the Government of South Vietnam occurs, public opinion here may change as well.

INFLATION FEAR WIDESPREAD

The question was put to the voters, "Do you believe there currently is a threat of serious inflation?" The answer was a resounding "Yes."

Altogether, 88 percent of the replies were "Yes." Only 10 percent said "No" and 2 percent had no opinion.

An even stronger sentiment was expressed in opposition to the rent supplement program enacted last year and for which funds were appropriated recently. Ninety-three percent voiced their disapproval of this program; 6 percent approved it and only 1 percent refused to express their views.

Skepticism concerning the war on poverty was also quite evident: 91 percent said they did not approve of this year's request for $1.6 billion for the war on poverty; 8 percent did approve and 1 percent did not respond.

LONGER HOUSE TERMS NOT FAVORED

The proposal to extend the term of the Members of the House of Representatives to 4 years was disapproved by 59 percent of those replying; 38 percent said they would support this change and 3 percent had no opinion.

Tax credits for deductions to parents for the college expenses of their children was supported by 54 percent of those who replied; 44 percent said "No" and 2 percent did not say what they think about it.

POLL PROVIDES VALUABLE INSIGHT

Polls of this nature can be very helpful in understanding the opinions of our constituents. Of course, not everyone replied and in some cases there may be important information which is not known to the average voter.

Still, these samples supplement the many other contacts that I have with my constituents and I believe they are very valuable.

It is also true that such samplings stimulate thinking about some of the important issues we face. I believe the views expressed are worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

Public Opinion Poll in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed another poll of public opinion in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. This district includes all of north suburban Pittsburgh. The district is residential and industrial, with a small number of farms. The permanently registered voters in the district show a slight majority in favor of the Democrats.

The response to our questionnaire is sufficient to constitute a referendum of opinion on the issues raised. The tabulated results with some brief comments are included below. I hope that the reader will find them of interest and value:

TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL CONDUCTED MARCH 1966

1. Is the United States doing the right thing in fighting to preserve the independence of South Vietnam? Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent.

A similar question last June resulted in a 67 percent yes vote, 33 percent no. These results clearly show that the prevailing opinion in our district is favorable to pursuing the war in Vietnam and that support of the war policy is growing.

2. Are you in accord with President Johnson's decision to resume bombing in North Vietnam? Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

The fact that 7 percent more of the respondents favored the resumption of bombing than favored the war itself suggests that a considerable number of those who opposed the war want the United States to win through to peace in the fastest way possible.

3. Should the United States withhold foreign aid from nations that do not generally support our foreign policies? Yes, 85 percent; no, 15 percent.

The heavy yes vote here reflects the growing discontent of our costly foreign aid program. The taxpayers are getting sick of aiding people who in turn insult us or are openly hostile. Our policymakers should take heed in being more selective to whom they extend our aid.

4. Do you believe that we can afford to fight both the war in South Vietnam and the war on poverty? Yes, 31 percent; no, 69 percent.

Obviously a large majority of our people do not believe that our economy can stand the strain of ever-mounting budgets and deficits. The attitude is that with a war going on we are trying to do too much too fast.

5. Are you afraid that we are headed for serious (about 10 percent) inflation in the next 2 years? Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent.

We are suffering from considerable inflation right now. And the people know it. Last June 73 percent of those answering our poll then thought a serious inflation was coming. Obviously more fear it today. Inflation is the cruelest tax of all. It falls on those with limited or fixed incomes, and bears the seeds of recession for working people. Mr. President, our people say we need a war on inflation.

6. Should the Congress continue to refuse funds for the rent subsidy program? Yes, 91 percent; no, 9 percent.

Last spring 84 percent of those polled in our congressional district opposed rent subsidies. The increased opposition of 7 percent shows that the people are genuinely concerned about growing inflation, taxes, and debts, as reflected in the above two questions.

7. Would you vote to restore the excise taxes on automobile sales and telephone use which are about to expire? Yes, 41 percent; no, 59 percent.

Excise taxes are always unpopular, but the adverse vote here is a bit unexpected, since in question No. 13 a majority (57 percent) voted for increased taxes in preference to continued deficits. These renewed taxes have now been voted, and the experts think an increased income tax is inevitable.

8. Do you feel that the draft regulations exempt too many young men on physical, mental, and educational grounds? Yes, 79 percent; no, 21 percent.

There is a widespread feeling that our draft regulations result in many injustices. Too many fine athletes escape even noncombat duty and perhaps too many students whose parents can afford to keep them in college avoid service.

9. Columnist James Reston contends that "the American President now exercises personal powers in the field of foreign affairs unequaled by any other political leader in the world." Do you agree? Yes, 71 percent; no, 29 percent.

This question was included primarily to determine if the people know how powerful our President has become in the field of foreign affairs. They do know. Most of the no answers probably came from people thinking of the powers of certain dictators throughout the world. They would be right, unless we consider the tremendous military might of the United States.

10. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to permit Bible reading in public schools? Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent.

Almost everybody has an opinion, either pro or con about Bible reading. Only 2.4 percent of the people who participated in the poll failed to answer this question. There is such great sustained interest in this issue that the responsible congressional leadership in both the House and Senate should bring the amendment to the floor for a vote.

11. Are you seriously alarmed by our balance-of-payments deficits and the drain on our gold reserves? Yes, 80 percent; no, 20 percent.

The unchecked imbalance of our foreign trade payments increases in gravity because our gold stock is already pledged beyond our ability to pay. We could be seriously hurt economically if the administration does not take prompt steps to correct the situation.

12. Do you support the President's policies of publicly pressuring industry and labor leaders to hold prices and wages within "administration guidelines?" Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent.

Many people objected to the President's rather harsh action in striking out so vigorously against price increases while seemingly shrugging off pay hikes. On the other hand, fear of sharp inflation probably resulted in the affirmative majority.

13. Would you rather have increased taxes than continued deficits? Yes, 57 percent; No, 43 percent.

This question could be properly criticized because it did not provide a third alternative: reduced expenditures, rather than increased taxes or continued deficits. I agree. But the awful fact is that we are going into the red under the current Federal budget, no matter how strongly we dislike it, unless we raise taxes. A sizable cut in spending is not in the cards with an administration and congressional majorities that want both guns and butter (or gravy).

14. How would you rate President Johnson's performance in office to date? (a) good, 22 percent; (b) fair, 54 percent; (c) bad, 24 percent.

In an identical question last June the President received 28 percent A votes, 58 percent B votes, and 14 percent C votes. Thus, while his "good" and "fair" votes combined leave him in a comfortable position, it is obvious that his popularity has speedily declined and should be a cause of alarm to him and an indication that all is not well in his government by consensus.

The 100th Anniversary of the Opening of Fisk University To Educate Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, April 20 will mark the 100th anniversary of the opening of Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn., to educate Negroes.

Fisk University is located in Nashville, the capital city of Tennessee. The city, known as the "Athens of the South," is a nationally recognized center of learning and culture, for it is the home of several of the South's distinguished colleges and universities. These institutions have student populations which extend far into the thousands, and they are staffed by scores of notable scholars, teachers, writers, and artists, who have made Nashville their permanent places of residence. Fisk University, the oldest of the institutions of higher learning, is an integral part of the city and has contributed liberally to its educational and cultural development.

Nashville is rapidly taking its place among other leading American college cities as a center for liberal education. Steady advances are being made in the area of human relations, with members of the Fisk University community playing a significant role. Through its museums, its libraries, its churches, and its concert halls, the city provides unique opportunities for rich cultural experiences to supplement those gained on the university campus. In this respect, Nashville serves as a laboratory, which bridges the traditional gap between college education and community living.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FISK UNIVERSITY

The founding of Fisk University was launched in 1865, when John Ogden, Erastus Milo Cravath, and E. P. Smith, agents of the American Missionary Association of New York, in collaboration with the Freedmen's Aid Commission of Cincinnati, devised plans to establish at Nashville a school for "The education and training of young men and women irrespective of color." They were assisted in this endeavor by Gen. Clinton B. Fisk of the Freedmen's Bureau of Tennessee, who was instrumental in securing quarters for the school. The new institution, opened for instruction on January 9, 1866, was called Fisk School, in honor of the general. John Ogden became its first principal. When the charter was signed on August 12, 1867, the idea of a university was conceived and the name of the institution was changed from Fisk School to Fisk University. It was established under the auspices of the American Missionary Association.

In 1870, Adam K. Spence succeeded John Ogden as principal of the university. Plans were then formulated for the development of a strong educational program and for the removal of the institution from its original site to its present location in north Nashville. Jubilee Hall, the university's first permanent building, was erected on the new campus in 1876. This historic achievement was made possible through the efforts of the famous original Jubilee Singers, students of the university who were trained and directed by Prof. George F. White, a member of the faculty.

During the years extending from 1871 to 1878, the Jubilee Singers traveled through northern and eastern sections of the United States and through parts of Europe giving concerts, in order to raise money for the support of the university. Their efforts met with notable success. Not only were they able to create historic Jubilee Hall, but they created for Fisk a great tradition in musical excellence, which has persisted through the years. It was the genius of the Fisk Jubilee Singers that introduced the Negro spiritual to the world and established it as a distinctive American contribution to musical literature and art.

In 1875, the Reverend Erastus Milo Cravath became the first president of Fisk University with Adam K. Spence as his executive assistant. The Reverend Mr. Cravath and his associate placed great emphasis upon ideals and high standards; and under this administration, lasting 25 years, the character of the university as a strong liberal arts school was shaped. President Cravath's successors were James Merrill—1901–8—George Augustus Gates—1909–12—Fayette Avery McKenzie—1915–25—and Thomas Elsa Jones—1926–46. Under President Jones the university raised its academic standards considerably, increased its facilities greatly through the erection of the university library and the chemistry building, and made substantial strides in raising an endowment fund. Charles Spurgeon Johnson became the sixth president of the university in the summer of 1947. Dr. Johnson had been actively associated with Fisk since 1928, as director of the department of social sciences. Through his many scholarly activities including the great volume of significant research prosecuted under his direction, he had earned for that department a nationwide reputation. Fisk expanded considerably in prestige and in influence under President Johnson's administration and noteworthy additions were made to the facilities. Dr. Stephen Junius Wright faculty and to the physical plant and was elected the seventh president of Fisk in the spring of 1957. During President Wright's administration, there have been substantial improvements in the university's physical plant and facilities, including the successful completion of DuBois Hall, a dormitory for men students, and the Adam K. Spence Student Union Building and the Cecile B. Jefferson dining room.

Founded primarily for the purpose of providing for the new citizens of the South the advantages of a Christian education, Fisk has attracted, during every period of its history, students from all sections of the Nation and from many foreign countries. Although the original charter of incorporation specified "The education and training of young men and women irrespective of color," subsequent State legislation made it mandatory for the institution to limit its student body to members of the Negro race. With the exception of the faculty, which has always been appointed regardless of race or color, and a limited number of special students, the spirit of the original charter was never fully realized until recently. Fisk, like an increasing number of institutions in the region, now extends its educational resources, as originally conceived, to students of all races, colors, and creeds, either as exchange students or as regularly enrolled students on both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Fisk came into being at a turning point in American history, and from the outset the institution has enjoyed consistent growth and development in keeping with the ideals basic to its founding. It has passed successively through the stages of grade school, high school, and normal school to college and university rank. After the achievement of regional and national accreditation, the institution discontinued all instruction in those units below the college level. In achieving its present rank, Fisk was greatly assisted by other educational and philanthropic agencies, in addition to substantial support from the American Missionary Association, with which it still maintains affiliation.

Today, Fisk has a national reputation as a liberal arts institution of high standing. In addition to early recognition by the New York State Board of Regents, it was the first Negro institution to become fully approved by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Association of American Universities, and the American Association of University Women. In the fall of 1952, Fisk was granted a charter for the establishment of a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa. Recognition by these regional and national agencies has assured Fisk a ranking position among foremost American colleges and universities.

The present value of the university campus property and equipment is approximately $4,208,203. Gifts to the university over a period of years have provided an endowment fund of $6,993,708. The annual income from this fund is a major factor in meeting university expenses, but there is still a serious need for gifts which will enable the university to maintain its high standards of teaching and provide greater opportunities for its students.

It is certainly appropriate that we express our heartfelt gratitude to this fine university for its many years of splendid service in providing higher education to the youth of our land, along with a hopeful view toward its future contributions to a changing society.

Humphrey Clarifies Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Vice President came to Memphis and spelled out for community leaders some of the problems we are facing in Vietnam and throughout the world. He proved himself an eloquent spokesman as he clarified many issues that worry us all.

One of the questions thrown at him was what to do about the movement of supplies through the port of Haiphong. I include his reply at this point in the Record, as well as an editorial that appeared Sunday in the Commercial Appeal:

From a Question Period Conducted by Vice President Humphrey at a Luncheon of Future Memphis, Inc., Holiday-Inn-Rivermont, April 1, 1966

Question. Why have we continued to have our allies, for example the British, to ship supplies to Haiphong, and why haven't we put up a blockade there?

Mr. Humphrey. This is a much overexaggerated case. The British are now shipping very little, if any, into the harbor of Haiphong. There are free-world ships that are under so-called charter—Panamanian, Greek, the maritime nations. We are using our best efforts to get these ships stopped and we have stopped a large amount of them by sheer persuasion.

But the commercial instinct of maritime nations is a strong one. It is a question that bothers us a great deal. It is a question of more conversation in the National Security Council than at most any other. If we mine the harbor or if we bomb the harbor or blockade the harbor we have to face up to what happens when the Soviet Union sends a ship down there. We are trying to keep this conflict within limits. We are trying to stop the struggle. We are trying to permit South Vietnam to have its own Government, its own elections. We are not even trying to conquer North Vietnam.

But we are trying to stop its participation in this conflict and defeat their participation.

Because most people say, if you really mean to, why don't you just go over after them. And the reason you just don't go after them, you might have several million Chinese, who don't have a lot of ammunition but a lot of bodies. And I am not sure what the Soviet Union would do with its treaty of alliances which goes until 1980 with China. It is my feeling they would respect it despite the cleavage that is going on between China and Russia. And this we hope to avoid. That is why we can make a pretty good case against the stopping of shipping into the port of Haiphong. This is not an industrial nation. Only 5 percent of the people live in the cities.

In North Vietnam there is only one major industry, a plant of any size. The maximum amount of tonnage that goes to their troops a day is 150. We are not fighting massed armies. If we could get a division or two to come across the line we could really take care of them. Our problem is ambush, guerrilla warfare. * * * But to go back to your question, we have used our good offices and, frankly, our pressure upon our allies to stop their shipments. Secondly, we do not feel that the amount of goods that is coming in seriously affects the military strength or seriously affects our power in the south. We unload more in 1 hour in the ports of South Vietnam than they unload in Haiphong in a week. So if it is a matter of supplies, my dear friend, there is no comparison. We have new port facilities there that will permit as much as 1 million tons a month. That is a lot of shipping.

[From the Commercial Appeal, Apr. 3, 1966]

Humphrey Clarifies Issues

As one reporter observed, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey spoke enough words while in Memphis Friday to fill a small book.

A good editor, of course, would have been able to trim the words down to the length of a magazine article by eliminating repetition and rhetoric.

Nevertheless, Mr. Humphrey did uphold his reputation as an articulate spokesman for current Johnson administration policy, foreign as well as domestic. The repetition served to emphasize the fact that his statements were in harmony with thinking in the White House, the State Department and the Defense Department—not just off-the-cuff ramblings.

Anyone who heard Vice President Humphrey's comments on the southeast Asian situation came away with a clearer understanding of the problems and the American responses.

On the controversial question of whether Haiphong Harbor in North Vietnam should be blockaded or mined, the Vice President's answer was precise and helpful. Such a decision might have to be made in the future, he said, but the chances are that it would escalate the war. Shipments reaching Ho Chi Minh's military establishment through Haiphong do aid the Red buildup, but the amount is insignificant compared to supplies arriving by land. The risk, therefore, is not worth the cost—for the present, at least. Finally, Mr. Humphrey noted that the United States was a strong advocate of freedom of the seas, that America retaliated after the Tonkin Gulf incident in 1964 for the very reason that freedom of the seas had been violated by the Communists, and that to halt or damage ships of the Soviet Union and other countries destined for Haiphong would be to renege on our policy.

In reply to a question of deep concern to Americans—the doubt that the present military directory governing South Vietnam can survive rising civilian opposition—Mr. Humphrey was equally frank. The government of Premier Ky, which has been quite vocally supported by President Johnson, is indeed unstable, said the Vice President. But some of the military leaders now heading the directory are attempting to make themselves identified with the potential civilian government which would come into being after framing of a new South Vietnamese constitution and the holding of elections. As Mr. Humphrey said, any new government in Saigon would require the support of the military. So while he expressed a shade of pessimism he held out hope.

As a reflection of top-level thinking in Washington, the Vice President's words in Memphis carried weight. He underscored the fact that any decisive outcome in Vietnam is distant, and that in both the war and the explosive political situation the United States is going to have to play things by ear.

Should the time come when there is a break, when negotiations appear feasible, Mr. Humphrey reminded his listeners that 129 separate meetings between American and Peking diplomats have been held in Warsaw, Poland, in recent years, and that door remains open.

Memphis did as well as a host to the Vice President as he did as a guest. This city can be proud that there were no protest marches, no jeers, no incidents to blemish the visit.

As for Mr. Humphrey, he proved a charming visitor—and no doubt charmed a few conservatives with his disarming way.

Appointment Condemned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Statement by Congressmen Augustus F. Hawkins, and Joseph Y. Resnick, Condemning the Appointment of Former Police Chief of Indianola, Miss., To Head OEO-Financed Poverty Program in Sunflower County, Miss.

We were appalled to learn over the weekend that the police chief of Indianola, Miss. Bryce Alexander, has just been named director of Sunflower County Progress, Inc. This organization is the antipoverty agency of Sunflower County, Miss., and last month received a grant of over $27,000 from the Office of Economic Opportunity for program development.

Chief Alexander took an indefinite leave of absence from the Indianola police force, which he has headed since October 1, 1963. During this period, Negro citizens of that town have endured a continuing experience of terrorism, beatings, harassment, bombings, and interference with their civil rights. The police department has not only been ineffective in combating these crimes, but has even participated in some of them.

Indianola, a small municipality of 6,714 inhabitants, 56.1 percent of them Negroes, is the seat of the county government and is the largest settlement in Sunflower County, Miss.

We refer you to "Papers Omitted in Printing Pursuant to Provisions of the Statutes Involving the Five Congressional Districts in the State of Mississippi, 89th Congress, Part I, Printed for Information of the Committee on House Administration." Even a quick reading of the deposition of Chief of Police Alexander in this document relating to the contested Mississippi elections (pp. 853 to 860 shows a picture of a man accustomed to using his badge to intimidate and oppress the Negro citizenry.

In fact, by the police chief's own admissions under oath, he and his men broke up voter registration meetings on private property and arrested participants in Indianola. Chief Alexander describes quite clearly how he took a number of Negro citizens into custody for picketing the segregated white library. In his own words, "* * * they were not under arrest, they were brought in for questioning." The chief also gives the details of one of his deputies beating a Negro woman at a voter registration meeting and her subsequent arrest for "assault and battery on a police officer." We understand that Chief Alexander's record is replete with other acts against Negroes, and by his own admission, extensive arrests of civil rights workers.

A striking example of the police department's attitude toward terrorism, under Chief Alexander, occurred on the night of May 1, 1965. At 2:49 a.m. three private homes, housing civil rights workers, and one freedom house were blown up and destroyed by fire. According to an eyewitness a policeman was on duty 25 feet from the freedom house and saw two men running from the building shortly before the explosion. They were not detained. The eyewitness stated that he saw the two men and could recognize them. However, no arrests were made. Police later arrested civil rights workers who attempted to rescue records and belongings from the burning building.

Last June Sunflower County Progress, Inc., applied to the Office of Economic Opportunity for a program development grant of $58,000. The application and the key members of the board were reviewed. On February 7, 1966, a grant of $27,700 was made. Evidently, up to that point the Office of Economic Opportunity did not find racists on the board of directors. However, now, 1 month afer the grant, Police Chief Alexander is named as director—the man who will actually set up and operate the program. We charge Sunflower County with cynicism and bad faith, and of attempting to hoodwink the Office of Economic Opportunity.

It is inconceivable that such persons like Alexander, who has been directly responsible for so much of the oppression of the Negro citizens of this area, could be placed in charge of a program almost totally financed by the U.S. Government to benefit these very same poverty-stricken citizens. Such actions as this appointment demonstrates precisely the basis for the objections that are being raised against the pending transfer of the Greenville Air Force Base to the State and local Mississippi governmental agencies.

We believe that the Federal antipoverty programs will be used by the Mississippi governmental authorities to further suppress the Negro population by preventing them from obtaining the very benefits that the antipoverty program was established to give them. Moreover, this scandalous action in the Mississippi Delta underscores the tragic error begin made by the Office of Economic Opportunity in utilizing as a general policy local governmental agencies to operate these programs, as the Office of Economic Opportunity is even now doing in the Watts area of Los Angeles.

Be it Watts or the Mississippi Delta, the time has come for the Office of Economic Opportunity to stop financing antipoverty programs of local governments that continue to oppress poverty-stricken American citizens, an overly large percentage of whom are Negro.

Only a few days ago the Greenville, Miss., incidents gave rise to charges of oppression of the Negro population by some of the State and local governmental officials of Mississippi. The five Congressmen from Mississippi protested in apparent outrage. We ask them now how they can explain Chief of Police Alexander's appointment to head the Sunflower County poverty program.

Last month, Mississippi's U.S. Senators were delivering speeches on the Senate floor condemning the Office of Economic Opportunity for giving any funds at all to the Child Development Group of Mississippi (Headstart), a private organization not controlled by any official Mississippi State or local agency. Chief Alexander's appointment demonstrates to us exactly what can be expected to happen when Mississippi's officials are given responsibilities of implementing programs under the Poverty Act, instead of putting them into the hands of private agencies which will administer them fairly for the benefit of all the people, including the Negro citizens.

We demand an immediate investigation by the Office of Economic Opportunity of Chief Alexander's appointment and of the extent of the involvement in Federal programs of racist officials and individuals in all of that agency's Mississippi programs. Furthermore, it is clear to us that no longer can the Office of Economic Opportunity continue to allow prejudiced local governments to corrupt and block the implementation of the Nation's war on poverty.

We have sent the following telegrams to the President and to Mr. Shriver, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity:

"Urge immediate investigation of appointment of Indianola, Miss., Police Chief Bryce Alexander, to head Sunflower County, Miss., official poverty program. Alexander's record of racist terror against Negroes makes his appointment absolutely monstrous and unthinkable. Suggest that complete inquiry into all Mississippi OEO programs administered by official Mississippi agencies is imperative now."

(NOTE.—In a historic decision on Saturday (March 12) the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, ordered that new municipal elections must be held in Sunflower County because Negroes had been denied the opportunity to vote. Sunflower County has a population of 45,750, 67.4 percent Negro (1960 census).)

Golden Passport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Assateague Island National Seashore, which was authorized in the first session of this Congress, is located in my district. Undoubtedly, this will be an area where literally millions of people will be able to enjoy the beauties of nature and the broad white sand beaches of our Atlantic coastline.

A major portion of the funds for the purchase and development of the seashore will result from moneys gathered in the land and water conservation fund. The $7 golden passport is a good buy in anyone's book. I am pleased to have purchased mine recently, and certainly encourage all other Members of this body to participate.

The golden passport will provide you with entry privileges to some 7,000 Federal recreation areas.

For $7 you can buy a golden passport. It will provide you with entry privileges to some 7,000 Federal recreation areas.

The golden passport is offered in 1966 as a part of Operation Golden Eagle, a program designed to attract grassroot support of a nationwide effort to promote wise conservation practices.

The 1966 permit is valid for an entire year—from April 1 to March 31, 1967.

The golden passport will admit you and all the people traveling with you in a private vehicle an unlimited number of times to all the Federal recreation areas commonly entered by automobile.

The golden passport also will admit you alone, regardless of how you travel, to all Federal recreation areas that charge entrance fees. This means that you personally can use the golden passport to enter Federal recreation areas as many times as you wish, whether you walk in, travel by commercial bus, or go by some other means.

That is an outstanding outdoor recreation bargain. It fits very well with the theme of Operation Golden Eagle: "Use, enjoy, and help expand, your great American outdoor land."

The golden passport is for sale at the offices of Federal land managing agencies, at entry points to Federal recreation areas, at offices of the American Automobile Association, and by mail from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Where else can you gain entrance to hundreds of millions of acres of recreation land across the Nation—boasting some of our finest scenery, hiking trails, campgrounds, and other attractions—for such a modest price?

But that is only part of the bargain.

In addition to being a permit for you to use and enjoy, the golden passport is your personal commitment to help preserve our outdoor heritage.

The $7 you spend for a golden permit goes into the land and water conservation fund. Secretary of the Interior Udall has called on Americans to help endow the Nation's future outdoor recreation areas through purchase of the $7 golden permit.

By participating as partners in conservation, Secretary Udall explained, we buy a share of a particular recreation area, park, or forest, or perhaps a quiet green spot near a great city where children can play.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund not only provides the muscle we need to help retain our national heritage. It is a symbol of our determination to save and create outdoor beauty in wilderness areas or near our homes.

All the States have signified a need for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Through the fund, States are able to plan, acquire, and develop needed outdoor recreation areas with a constant source of matching grants to assist them.

Money from the sale of the $7 permit is a major source of revenue to the fund. When you buy a permit, you show that you desire to provide outdoor recreation opportunities to meet demands in your State and your community.

You make a tangible contribution toward meeting tomorrow's outdoor recreation needs.

You also join the increasing army of public spirited citizens who are marshaling their resources to improve the Nation's outdoor recreation facilities—State, local, and Federal.

This reflects a new national awareness of the need for preservation and enhancement of our open space. This new awareness has gained impetus from many sources—from the President, the Congress, the State and localities, conservation organizations, and interested private citizens.

The President has reflected genuine concern for the physical appearance of the Nation as well as the challenges faced in providing adequate public recreation opportunities for everyone.

What are some of the reasons behind the new feeling regarding conservation? There are many, but I will cite only three of them.

These three reasons can be abbreviated by three letters—P-U-T.

P stands for population, which is growing rapidly. By the year 2000, some 350 million Americans will use our resources. The amount of new leisure will burden our outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Power and water consumption will increase dramatically. Land values will rise sharply.

U means urbanization. In the next 35 years our cities and metropolitan areas will expand increasingly. Before the end of the present century, more than 75 percent of our people will live in cities and environs.

Crowding people into metropolitan areas often denies them access to beauty and ancient outdoor values long cherished by American tradition. Open space must be set aside to meet future metropolitan needs.

T is for technology, where tremendous advances are being made. Progress has its waste products—junked automobiles, air and water pollutants, and the poison of some chemicals, to mention a few. As one writer succinctly stated: "Our effluents tend to exceed our affluence."

Your purchase of the $7 gold-colored permit will put financial strength where it is most needed to help solve some of our most pressing conservation problems.

Many new and improved outdoor recreation opportunities are needed by the State, their cities and counties, and at Federal areas. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act created a source from which Congress may appropriate money to provide urgently needed public outdoor recreation areas and facilities.

States and certain Federal agencies are eligible to receive money from the land and water conservation fund. States may allocate portions of the money they receive from the fund to their cities, counties, and other non-Federal public agencies. The program will continue under present law through 1989.

During the 1965–66 fiscal years Congress appropriated $141 million from the fund for State and Federal purposes. Of this amount, nearly $95 million will go to the States and their political subdivisions and $46 million to Federal agencies.

Two-fifths of the amount apportioned to the States is divided equally among all the States, and three-fifths is apportioned on the basis of population, out-of-State visitor use, and Federal recreation resources and programs in the States. Matching grants from the fund made by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation already are producing improvements in State and local recreation opportunities.

Fund grants have been used to assist a number of the States in preparing their initial statewide outdoor recreation plans. Most of the States have received some matching money to acquire or develop outdoor recreation areas and facilities. By the end of 1966, it is expected that all the States will have received money from the fund.

The fund derives revenue from the sale of the annual permit and other Federal recreation admission and user fees; the sale of surplus Federal real property; and the Federal motorboat fuels tax.

Fees from the sale of the entrance permits and user charges provide substantial revenues to the land and water conservation fund. In 1965, the first year of the annual Federal permit, approximately $7 million accrued to the fund through sales of entrance permits and user fees.

By purchasing an annual permit, you register your support of an effort that reaches your own neighborhood. For the first time, a Federal channel exists through which State and local governments can receive the assistance they have needed for some years. That is one of the significant features of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

Another important feature is that the Act helps put the Nation's public outdoor recreation program on a pay-as-you-go basis. Congress will not appropriate any more money from the fund than total receipts permit. When you and I buy annual Federal permits, we put our cash down to help acquire and develop urgently needed public recreation areas. The more recreation permits are sold, the more money will be available for State, local, and Federal purposes.

Thomas Jefferson once said:

> The care of human life and happiness * * * is the first and only legitimate object of good Government.

There are few purposes more closely related to human life and happiness than those that can be accomplished by the States, their political subdivisions, and the Federal Government under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

President Lyndon B. Johnson stated in his natural beauty message to Congress:

> A growing population is swallowing up areas of natural beauty with its demand for living space, and is placing increased demand on overburdened areas of recreation and pleasure.
>
> We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities. Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare, but the dignity of man's spirit.

It would be difficult to espouse higher objectives than those voiced by President Jefferson and President Johnson.

With the full participation of everyone, our Nation can reach those objectives. Your participation is important. Your support of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act through a purchase of a golden passport is most welcome.

Thank you.

Cheers for U.S.S. "George C. Marshall" and Admiral Rickover on Successful Completion of First Sea Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

APRIL 4, 1966.

Adm. H. G. RICKOVER,
Fleet Post Office,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR ADMIRAL RICKOVER: Thank you so much for your good letter from U.S.S. *George C. Marshall,* dated March 28, 1966. Hearty congratulations on the successful completion of the first sea trials of the 36th Polaris nuclear submarine U.S.S. *George C. Marshall.* We Americans are certainly proud of your wonderful record of service and success—keep it up.

As I believe your letter is historic, I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With my personal regards and best wishes as usual,

Congressman JIM FULTON.

U.S.S. "GEORGE C. MARSHALL,"
At Sea, North Atlantic, March 28, 1966.

DEAR MR. FULTON: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our 36th Polaris nuclear submarine. The U.S.S. *George C. Marshall* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va. We also have in operation 22 attack-type nuclear submarines, making a total of 58.

This ship is named for a distinguished soldier-statesman, General of the Army George C. Marshall (1880–1959). Born and reared in Uniontown, Pa., the son of an operator of coal and coke industries who had left Kentucky after the Civil War, Marshall grew up with an unusual understanding of northern and southern viewpoints. His family, of Scotch-Irish origin, were among the earliest settlers in Virginia. Moving to Kentucky around 1780 when this was still frontier country, they became prominent in local and State politics and as planters and professional men.

In his boyhood, Marshall got rather tired of hearing about his famous collateral relative, Chief Justice John Marshall, and felt it was about time someone else in the family made a name for himself. As it turned out, he took the first step in this direction when, after graduation from Virginia Military Institute, he applied for and received a commission as second lieutenant in the Army. His retirement to private life at 71 brought to an end a half century of public service which for sheer competence and devotion to duty has rarely been surpassed.

Yet outside the military he was known only during his last 12 years as a public servant. The early careers of nearly all great war commanders seem drab and in no way predictive of their wartime achievements. The reason, of course, is that a career officer normally, that is in peacetime, does not practice his profession but remains a student, eternally preparing himself for an eventuality that he and everyone else hopes will never occur. This peculiarity of the military profession accounts for the fact that the special competence of career officers tends to be undervalued by outsiders, yet without it no war is won. This competence can only be acquired by practical experience over a long career span. No layman has it, however brilliant he may be, for intellect alone, pure ratiocination alone will not produce it, just as it will not produce the surgeon's operating skill.

It was a measure of President Roosevelt's greatness as a war leader that he fully understood this. He was very much his own Commander in Chief, he ran the war, made the broad policy decisions, but in the execution of these policies, in matters of strategy, tactics and operations, he nearly always deferred to the professional judgment of his military top command, especially that of General Marshall.

Marshall's unusually long tenure as Army Chief of Staff contributed to his effectiveness, for able men grow abler when they see a task through from beginning to end. Heading the Military Establishment during the entire 6-year war period, he was responsible for the rapid and orderly expansion of the Nation's military forces from 175,000 men, 13,000 officers, and some 1,000 planes to over 8 million men, 764,000 officers and 69,000 planes. In an incredibly brief time, a peacetime army ranking 17th among the world's national armies, had become a vast, flexible, superbly equipped and trained force—"mobilized as if from nowhere," to quote Secretary of War Stimson—with which a difficult six-front war was won. Once the initiative was ours, there were "practically no serious setbacks." Marshall's "timetables of the successive operations" proved accurate.

To an astonishing extent, the war went "according to plan." His estimates of the number of combat divisions required for victory were "adequate and yet not excessive." No combat division was left in this country when Germany surrendered; all were overseas in the theaters of war. It took every man the Nation had mobilized, wrote Marshall in his Final War Report, "to do our part of the job in Europe and at the same time keep the Japanese enemy under control in the Pacifiic."

Marshall became Army Chief of Staff on the day Germany attacked Poland—"by a favor of Providence," as President Truman was later to remark. Not the least of his achievements was completion of a good part of the military buildup during the 27 months of peace that were granted us while Europe and the Far East were embroiled in war. The Army had grown to eight times its peacetime strength when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. We were much better prepared than we had been in 1917, and this despite widespread opposition to military preparations, reflecting in its emotional intensity the passionate determination of the American people not to become involved in this war.

Marshall worked hard to dispel the popular confusion of preparedness with warmongering, to awaken the public from the dangerous illusion that our unrealized power potential would deter an aggressor, our mere wish to avoid war secure us peace. He tried to make clear to the public that much time must elapse between deciding to arm and being armed and that we could not safely count on being granted this time if war were thrust upon us. He said once in a speech that "perhaps the most important task of the Army is to plan and scheme and work to the end that this time factor will be kept to a minimum." Our past experience worked against him. We had never yet had to pay the price of defeat for failure to prepare in time for war. Although the war was manifestly moving closer, the bill extending selective service passed by but a single vote—just 4 months before we were at war. It was an election year and public opinion had made itself heard.

World War II was a coalition war of global dimensions in which 93 million men and women were mobilized. For the Allies to win, it was as essential that they prosecute the war in the closest accord, as that they exert themselves to the utmost. Never before was a coalition war fought with such unity of purpose and effort by so disparate a group of allies; never had such prodigious exertions been required of each member state. Decisive for the success of the alliance was the fact that the two members who jointly accounted for the larger part of its total military and economic strength fought the war, from the start, under a unified high command. In Stimson's judgment there were two main reasons why the United States and Great Britain were able to use their land, sea, and air forces as if they were a single military unit: Roosevelt's and Churchill's determination to wage the war as a team, and General Marshall's organizing genius and diplomatic skill. He was the dominant member of the joint command organization—the combined chiefs of staff—of whom Churchill said that "there was never a more serviceable war machinery established among allies."

Upon his retirement from active military service at the end of the war, Marshall was summoned to important civilian posts: Ambassador to China (1945–46), Secretary of State (1947–49), and Secretary of Defense (1950–51). He was the first military leader ever to hold the two highest ranking Cabinet positions, the first to serve in one war as the military head of the Army and in another (Korea) as the civilian head of all our land, sea, and air forces. Momentous changes took place in American foreign policy while he was Secretary of State and in these he played an active part—rescue of Greece and Turkey from Communist conquest, rehabilitation of Europe through the Marshall Plan, initiation of discussions leading to establishment of NATO. For his contributions to the generous and imaginative aid program which bears his name, Marshall received the Nobel Peace Prize (1953), the first military man ever to have been so honored.

A reticent man who shunned publicity, Marshall once remarked, "I think I prize my privacy more than anything else." This, and the fact that the story could not be told honestly and completely without hurting the feelings of many people, decided him not to write his memoirs. Marshall resisted pressures from friends and lavish offers from publishers. The closest he came to an autobiographical record was his final war report, covering the years 1943–45.

This brief (153 pages), lucid and factual description of the buildup, the logistics, the strategy, the steps on the way to victory, was, as his biographer Robert Payne remarks, "a history of the war which could only be written at a time of triumph by the man most responsible for the triumph." Through it "there shines the peculiar quality of the man at his best: complex and unyielding, stripped like a runner for the race."

Those who most directly depended on Marshall are best qualified to add to our understanding of this man. When President Roosevelt could not make up his mind to appoint Marshall Chief Allied Commander in Europe—even though he was so obviously the logical choice that the appointment was taken for granted—he left the decision to the general.

The war was too big for personal feelings or desires to enter such a decision, replied Marshall, whereupon the President said, "I feel now that I will not be able to sleep at night with you out of the country," and kept him by his side. Marshall knew as well as the President that field commanders rather than chiefs of staff are remembered in history, but this counted for nothing with him.

As with all men who render great public service, his sense of duty always took precedence over personal concerns. Dean Acheson tells of an interview he had with him shortly after Marshall became Secretary of State.

In reply to Acheson's query as to what was expected of him as chief aide, Marshall said: "First, the most unvarnished truth, particularly about myself. I have no feelings except those which I reserve for Mrs. Marshall." Churchill called him "a magnificent organizer and builder of armies—the American Carnot"; Truman wrote that "to him, as much as to any individual, the United States owes its future"; but Robert Payne came perhaps closest to the essence of Marshall in this passage: "It can be said of him, as it can be said of few others, that he lived for an idea, and the idea was America."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1966

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, minister, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God of our land and keeper of our destiny, we feel the strength of our Judeo-Christian teachings during these holy days. Many of our citizens remember the teachings of the Passover as a memorial of their deliverance. Christians today receive Holy Communion in remembrance of the love and salvation found in our Lord Jesus Christ. These religious sacraments give us foundations, O God, on which to stand.

May fresh winds of Thy power blow through every area of our national life. Direct the minds of the President, his associates and these lawmakers that this Nation will be taught the art of peace, service, and human brotherhood. Incline our people to do Thy will that this land may be a blessing to all mankind.

Give eternal life to those who die on battlefields of man's senseless wars. Bring healing and comfort to the wounded and strength with direction to those in conflict. We pray in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 6, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) designating April 9 of each year as "Sir Winston Churchill Day," with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11029) relating to the tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11664) to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625) establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 22. An act to promote a more adequate national program of water research;

S. 1049. An act to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees;

S. 2642. An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes;

S. 2835. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association;

H.R. 959. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 2939. An act for the relief of Manojlo Verzich;

H.R. 3875. An act for the relief of Mrs. Panagiota Vastakis and Soteros Vastakis;

H.R. 4743. An act for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid;

H.R. 6112. An act for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park);

H.R. 7813. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to China;

H.R. 8466. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of insurance premium finance companies in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Ki Sook Jun; and

H.J. Res. 837. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Bond Week."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after discussing the matter with the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and with his full approval, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business, and that at its conclusion, the Senator from New York be immediately recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the House of Representatives on S. 944 be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 944) to provide for expanded research and development in the marine environment of the United States, to establish a National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and a Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, and for other purposes, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1965."

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSES

Sec. 2. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to develop, encourage, and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national program in marine science for the benefit of mankind to assist in protection of health and property, enhancement of commerce, transportation, and national security, rehabilitation of our commercial fisheries, and increased utilization of these and other resources.

(b) The marine science activities of the United States should be conducted so as to contribute to the following objectives:

(1) The accelerated development of the resources of the marine environment.

(2) The expansion of human knowledge of the marine environment.

(3) The encouragement of private investment enterprise in exploration, technological development, marine commerce, and economic utilization of the resources of the marine environment.

(4) The preservation of the role of the United States as a leader in marine science and resource development.

(5) The advancement of education and training in marine science.

(6) The development and improvement of the capabilities, performance, use, and efficiency of vehicles, equipment, and instruments for use in exploration, research, surveys, the recovery of resources, and the transmission of energy in the marine environment.

(7) The effective utilization of the scientific and engineering resources of the Nation, with close cooperation among all interested agencies, public and private, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, facilities, and equipment, or waste.

(8) The cooperation by the United States with other nations and groups of nations and international organizations in marine science activities when such cooperation is in the national interest.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Sec. 3. (a) In conformity with the provisions of section 2 of this Act, it shall be the duty of the President to—

(1) survey all significant marine science activities, including the policies, plans, programs, and accomplishments of all departments and agencies of the United States engaged in such activities;

(2) develop a comprehensive program of marine science activities, including, but not limited to, exploration, description and prediction of the marine envronment, exploitation and conservation of the resources of the marine environment, marine engineering, studies of air-sea interaction, transmission of energy, and communications, to be conducted by departments and agencies of the United States, independently or in cooperation with such non-Federal organizations as States, institutions and industry;

(3) designate and fix responsibility for the conduct of the foregoing marine science activities by departments and agencies of the United States;

(4) insure cooperation and resolve differences arising among departments and agencies of the United States with respect to marine science activities under this Act, including differences as to whether a particular project is a marine science activity.

(5) undertake a comprehensive study, by contract or otherwise, of the legal problems arising out of the management, use, development, recovery, and control of the resources of the marine environment;

(6) establish long-range studies of the potential benefits to the United States economy, security, health, and welfare to be gained from marine resources, engineering, and science, and the cost involved in obtaining such benefits; and

(7) issue a statement of national goals with respect to marine science.

(b) In the planning and conduct of a coordinated Federal program the President shall utilize such staff, interagency, and non-Government advisory arrangements as he may find necessary and appropriate and shall consult with departments and agencies concerned with marine science activities and solicit the views of non-Federal organizations and individuals with capabilities in marine science.

COMMISSION ON MARINE SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND RESOURCES

Sec. 4. (a) The President shall establish a Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources (in this Act referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the President, including individuals drawn from Federal and State Governments, industry, universities, laboratories and other institutions engaged in marine scientific or technological pursuits. The President shall select a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among the members. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the latter's absence.

(b) The Commission shall make a comprehensive investigation and study of all aspects of marine science in order to recommend an overall plan for an adequate national oceanographic program that will meet the present and future national needs. The Commission shall undertake a review of existing and planned marine science activities of the United States in order to assess their adequacy in meeting the objectives set forth under section 2(b), including the following:

(1) Review the known and contemplated needs for natural resources from the oceans to maintain our expanding national economy.

(2) Review the surveys, applied research programs, and ocean engineering projects required to obtain the needed resources from the ocean.

(3) Review the existing national research programs to insure realistic and adequate support for basic oceanographic research that will enhance human welfare and scientific knowledge.

(4) Review the existing Government and industrial oceanographic and ocean engi-

neering programs, including education and technical training to determine which programs are required to advance our national oceanographic competence and stature and which are not now adequately supported.

(5) Analyze the findings of the above reviews, including the economic factors involved, and recommend an adequate national marine science program that will meet the present and future national needs without unnecessary duplication of effort.

(6) Recommend a governmental organizational plan with estimated cost.

(c) Members of the Commission appointed from outside the Government shall each receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties of the Commission and reimbursement of travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized in section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons employed intermittently. Members of the Commission appointed from within the Government shall serve without additional compensation to that received for their services to the Government but shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized in the Act of June 9, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 835–842).

(d) The Commission shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. In addition, the Commission may secure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 810) but at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals.

(e) The Chairman of the Commission shall be responsible for (1) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel and their continuing supervision, and (2) the use and expenditures of funds available to the Commission. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the Chairman shall be governed by the general policies of the Commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof.

(f) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) may be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services: *Provided,* That the regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46d) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: *And provided further,* That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

(g) The Commission is authorised to secure directly from any executive department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized to cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman.

(h) The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress not later than eighteen months after the establishment of the Commission as provided in subsection (a) of this section, a final report of its findings and recommendations. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after it has submitted its final report.

REPORTS

SEC. 5. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report, which shall include (1) a comprehensive description of the activities and the accomplishments of all agencies and departments of the United States in the field of marine science activities during the proceding year, and (2) an evaluation of such activities and accomplishments in terms of the objectives set forth pursuant to this Act.

(b) Reports made under this section shall contain such recommendations for legislation as the President may consider necessary or desirable for the attainment of the objectives of this Act, and shall contain an estimate of funding requirements of each agency and department of the United States for marine science activities during the succeeding fiscal year.

(c) No information which has been classified for reasons of national security shall be included in any report made under this section, except pursuant to authorization given by the President.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this Act the term "marine science" shall be deemed to apply to oceanographic and scientific endeavors and disciplines, engineering and technology in and with relation to the marine environment; and the term "marine environment" shall be deemed to include (a) the oceans, (b) the Continental Shelf of the United States, (c) the Great Lakes, (d) seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to the coasts of the United States to the depth of two hundred meters, or beyond that limit, to where the depths of the superjacent waters admit of the exploitation of the natural resources of such area, (e) the seabed and subsoil of similar submarine areas adjacent to the coasts of islands which comprise United States territory, and (f) the resources thereof.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act, but sums appropriated for any one fiscal year shall not exceed $1.5 million.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in marine science, to establish a Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree with the amendments of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Senators MAGNUSON, PASTORE, BARTLETT, BREWSTER, COTTON, and MORTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 127, the Sir Winston Churchill Day resolution, be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution from the Senate (S.J. Res. 127) designating April 9 of each year as "Sir Winston Churchill Day," which were, on page 1, line 3, strike out "of each year," and insert ", 1966,"; on page 1, line 7, strike out "each year".

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution designating April 9, 1966, as 'Sir Winston Churchill Day'."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON EXTENDS INVITATION TO GENERAL NE WIN FOR STATE VISIT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I noted with great interest in today's press reports that President Johnson has extended an invitation to General Ne Win, Chief of State of Burma and chairman of the Revolutionary Council of Burma, to make a state visit to this country next fall.

I am delighted that this invitation has been extended to General Ne Win and Mrs. Ne Win, both of whom I have had the honor to meet on a number of occasions over the past several years, most recently last November during the course of a study mission in Europe and Asia.

General Ne Win is the chief of state of a country with many internal problems, which he is trying to solve. It is a country which is potentially rich, but a country which needs to be developed, and will be, under the Burmese system and as the Burmese desire.

Burma, under General Ne Win and his predecessors, has tried to achieve a degree of neutrality, which in effect has on occasion almost amounted to isolation. That is the way the Burmese want it, because they wish to develop Burma as best they can for the interests of the Burmese people, and they wish to do it to the best of their ability on the basis of their own efforts.

We must keep in mind also that perhaps the neutrality and isolation of Burma in part is due to the fact that she has, I believe, except for the Soviet Union, the longest land frontier with China. It is interesting to note, though, that while there are still differences between India and China relative to their common frontier, the demarcation line between China and Burma, has been satisfactorily adjusted.

The Burmese are a proud people, trying to make their own way under great difficulties, and I am hopeful that when General Ne Win and Mrs. Ne Win, his charming wife, come to this country next fall, they will be able to sit down with the President and Mrs. Johnson to discuss matters of mutual interest, and to bring about a better understanding between our two nations.

Again, Mr. President, may I state that I am very happy that this invitation has been extended to the Chief of State of Burma and Mrs. Ne Win. We are delighted that they have accepted.

AMENDMENT OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT OF 1949

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF CITY OF TOLEDO, OHIO

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Council of the City of Toledo, Ohio, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

RESOLUTION 100-66—DECLARING COUNCIL'S SUPPORT OF THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES ACT; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Whereas there is presently before the Congress of the United States H.R. 12341, Demonstration Cities Act and H.R. 12946, Urban Development Act, both proposals having to do with the physical reconstruction and rehabilitation of American cities by focusing all of the talents and techniques of our society upon the problems of the American city; and

Whereas a massive demonstration cities program would provide cities of all sizes with grants to plan, administer, and assist in defraying the local share of the cost to provide for the renewal and reconstruction of our cities; and

Whereas it is the sense of this council that these two programs are of the utmost importance in our present society; and

Whereas it is the desire of this council to urge all of the Representatives in the Congress to act favorably upon this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Toledo:

SECTION 1. That the Council of the City of Toledo does hereby express its complete and total approval of the Demonstration Cities Act and the Urban Renewal Act as provided in H.R. 12341 and H.R. 12946, and does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to give its approval to said acts at the earliest possible time.

SEC. 2. That this resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and shall take effect and be in force from and after its adoption. The reason for the emergency lies in the fact that this resolution is necessary for the preservation of the public interest and welfare.

Vote on emergency clause: Yeas 8, nays 0.

Adopted: April 4, 1966, as an emergency measure: Yeas 8, nays 0.

Attest:

C. T. DIEFENBACH,
Clerk of Council.
JOHN W. POTTER,
Mayor.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 2822) to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes, reported it favorably, with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 1102) thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the bill to be placed on the calendar.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated March 25, 1966, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 3205. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to strengthen the work-study program for vocational education students; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONDALE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 3206. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, so as to prevent the loss of veteran pension benefits as the result of increases in social security benefits authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCGOVERN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

STRENGTHENING OF WORK-STUDY PROGRAM UNDER VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen the work-study program under Public Law 88-210, the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Although this program has been in operation but a short time, directors of area vocational technical schools in Minnesota have been unanimous in their praise of what it has accomplished. Through providing work opportunities to full-time students at vocational schools, it has made it possible for many students to stay in school who otherwise would have been forced to drop out for financial reasons. And it has provided valuable work experience, often in the vocation the student is planning to enter after graduation.

In the United States, during the present year, an estimated 85,100 students from age 15 through 20 are earning $25 million in jobs provided under this work-study program. In Minnesota approximately 825 students are earning $447,000.

My proposal would strengthen this program in three ways. It would eliminate the requirement that, as of July 1, local educational agencies pay 25 percent of the cost of student compensation. It would remove certain unreasonable restrictions on monthly and annual earnings. And it would increase the amount of money available to State and local authorities for administering the program.

As the law is presently written, 100-percent Federal financing is provided for the first 2 years, but beginning in fiscal year 1967 State and local authorities would have to supply 25 percent of the funds for student compensation. Many are unable to do so, because of the growing squeeze on State and local revenues. In my State, the onset of 75-25 matching would mean that local school boards would have to pay this 25 percent out of their limited resources. And since about three-quarters of the students at Minnesota vocational schools are not residents of the school district where they attend, it is likely that some school boards would not feel justified in themselves providing the 25 percent required. I, therefore, urge that 100-percent Federal financing be maintained, and my bill would accomplish this objective.

Second, my bill would remove present limits on the amount a student may earn in a month or a school year. There are no such limits for the in-school program under the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is similar in its other provisions and general purpose. Moreover, the present limits hamper the operation of the program. A student is allowed to work 15 hours a week while school is in session, but he is limited to earnings of $45 a month if he attends school within reasonable commuting distance of his home. This means that, if he is earning $1 an hour, he can only work 3 full weeks out of the month. Eliminating the earnings limitation, while retaining the limit on hours, will eliminate this undesirable consequence of present regulations, and my bill would so provide.

Finally, my bill would provide a modest increase in the amount of work-study funds available for administration at the State and local level. At present State departments of education are allowed 1 percent of their allocation to administer a State plan, whereas the department in Minnesota could effectively use up to 5 percent to strengthen the State program. Similarly, local authorities need some money for administration, particularly when carrying on the program during summer months when regular school officials are not automatically available to supervise.

My proposal would provide a total of up to 10 percent of allotted funds for administration. It is the intention of this bill that this money be used at both the State and the local level.

Mr. President, a large number of directors of area vocational-technical schools in Minnesota, and other important officials in this program, have written to me in support of the changes which the bill I am introducing today would provide. I therefore ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3205) to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to strengthen the work-study program for vocational education students, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letters presented by Mr. Mondale are as follows:

Hibbing Area Technical Institute,
Hibbing Public Schools,
Hibbing, Minn., January 3, 1965.
Hon. Walter F. Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: At this institute, we have been operating under the work-study provisions of Public Law 88-210. We note that there are a number of discriminatory provisions in the act when one compares it to the economic opportunity work-study program.

I am enclosing an information sheet which contains a number of the changes we would like to see made. Of particular import is the limitation on student compensation while school is not in session. This should be indicated by the term "vacation," since many schools operate under different vacation time schedules then as written in the law, from July 1 to October 1.

We feel, further, that it is discriminatory to allow earnings of only $45 per month or a maximum of $350 per academic year since the limitation is 15 hours per week. The school district pays the minimum wage scale of $1.25 per hour. A student under the above provision would not be able to work the maximum of 15 hours per week during the academic year.

Since we feel that this program affords the opportunity of earning while learning, it should be a continued program. We are justifiably concerned that after the fiscal year ending June 1967, when each school district would have to expend 25 percent of this cost to carry on with the work-study program, that many school districts, including our own, could not absorb the financial burden.

There are other items in the information data enclosed which bear consideration for changes. I would appreciate it if you would use your influence to encourage Congress to revise this portion of Public Law 88-210 in accord with the information attached.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
William E. Magajna,
Director.

Southwest Minnesota
Vocational School,
Jackson, Minn., January 13, 1966.
Hon. Walter F. Mondale,
433 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: This letter is being written to you concerning the work-study program which began operations last year. In my estimation it is the finest program that ever could have been inaugurated for schools such as ours. Certainly it seems vastly superior to the OEO programs which are in existence. I would like to submit the following amendments to the bill which I believe would be beneficial and in order when compared to the other OEO programs.

1. I would request that 10 to 15 percent of the total budget be allowed for supervision of the program. That is, if the total budget would amount to $20,000, I would like the supervisor to be paid from $2,000 to $3,000 per year, and this be reimbursed to us.

2. As it now stands nonlocal school residents can earn a maximum of $500 during a fiscal year, while local residents can earn up to $350. It seems to me that this is quite inadequate to meet the needs of many of the students at our school, and I would request that this ceiling be removed or raised to some more satisfactory amount.

3. Students today can only work during summer vacations and expect to get paid for 8 hours a day. I would like to have all school holidays included so that the bill would read "vacations" rather than "summer vacations."

4. The 1 percent supervision allowance at the State level is totally inadequate to meet the needs of supervisors, and it would seem much more realistic to raise this to 5 percent.

Lastly, because we do feel quite strongly that this is an excellent program, we would wish that it remain at 100 percent reimbursement rather than the 75 percent reimbursement that has been written into the bill for 1967.

Any consideration which you may be able to engender in this regard will be greatly appreciated. If I can be of further help by supplying more information, I would be most happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,
Delbert C. Schweiger,
Director.

Granite Falls Area Technical
Institute,
Granite Falls, Minn., January 14, 1966.
Re Suggestions for amending section 13 of Public Law 88-210 work study program for vocational education students.
Hon. Walter F. Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Mondale: We, in the area technical schools of Minnesota feel that one of the most important pieces of legislation now in effect is the work study program for students attending vocational schools. The act provides for financial assistance to students who may not otherwise be able to attend post high training facilities without some aid. We employ these students at various nonprofit agencies and pay them for their services.

At the present time, the law has some unfavorable limitations which I believe should be amended as follows:

Section 13(c)(3) should not have a limitation as to an amount in an academic year. The limitation as to 15 hours per week is fine. This would enable a student to work for a full 9 months instead of only 7 months.

Section 13(b)(2) Take out 1 percent and insert 5 percent. To effectively administer the program, sufficient funds must be made available.

Section 13(e)(2) Take out the sentence concerning State matching.

I also believe that approximately 10 percent of the total funds for the program should be allocated for local supervision.

I hope you will give these suggestions careful consideration and I urge you to end the discrimination against vocational students in work study programs. The work study program is a fine piece of legislation and is really effective. The program is efficient, and the aid gets right down to the person who can really benefit from the aid so that he or she may receive post high school training.

Sincerely,
Elroy Burgeson,
Coordinator.

Willmar Area Vocational
Technical School,
Willmar, Minn., February 1, 1966.
Subject: Section 13 of Public Law 88-210—work-study programs for vocational education.
Hon. Walter Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The present work-study program has provided a tremendous opportunity for Minnesota youth to earn and learn while developing their individual talents to the fullest.

The Minnesota area vocational technical schools are providing excellent educational experiences in the classroom and laboratory in training youth to contribute effectively in our world of work. The work-study program enables these youth to further develop their talents by providing actual work experience with a governmental employer.

The present law does restrict employment of students under the work-study program as it allows for noncommuting students a maximum of $45 per month with a maximum limit of $350 per year. A student from outside the city of Willmar with a room and board problem can earn no more than $60 per month with a yearly limit of $500 per academic school year. The law restricts vocational students in that it limits their work under the work-study program to about 7 months even though the student may be enrolled in a 9-month, 10-month, 11-month, or 12-month course.

Section 13(b) of Public Law 89-210 limits administrative funds for this work-study program. This limitation of $10,000 is unrealistic because administration and supervision of the program statewide cannot effectively be done at this figure. Adequate supervision is necessary in order for the program to be an outstanding success.

Section 13(e) of Public Law 88-210 stipulates that the Federal Government contribute 75 percent of the total cost of the work-study program. One hundred percent payment from Federal funds would enable the State of Minnesota to offer an effective continuous opportunity for our vocational students that is not contingent on State legislation.

May I count on you to take the necessary steps to improve the educational opportunities of Minnesota youth through a better work-study program?

Sincerely yours,
Robert W. Jacobson,
Assistant Director,
Vocational-Technical Education.

Brainerd Area Vocational
Technical School,
Brainerd, Minn., February 7, 1966.
Hon. Walter F. Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Mondale: During the past year, we at the Brainerd Area Vocational Technical School have been operating under the work-study provisions of Public Law 88-210. We feel this is a fine program and has done much to aid students in their educational pursuit. However when one compares our work-study program to the economic opportunity work-study program, many discriminatory provisions become evident.

A needy student electing to take a vocational program is discriminated against in relation to other programs for needy students that have no limitations on monthly or yearly earnings. Under our program:

(a) A resident student living at home and commuting can earn no more than $45 a month and a maximum of $350 per academic year.

(b) A nonresident student not commuting can earn no more than $60 a month and a maximum of $500 per academic year.

The result is that the vocational student is able to work only a little more than 8 months during the school year regardless of whether he is taking a 9-, 10-, 11-, or 12-month course.

Further, the work-study program under which we operate supposedly allows students to work a maximum of 15 hours a week during the academic year. The school district pays the minimum wage scale of $1.25 an hour. Therefore, when the $45 and $60 a month restrictions are considered, it is mathematically impossible for our students to work the allowable 15 hours each week.

In view of the above obvious discriminations, we feel that the limits of $45 a month and $350 an academic year for resident commuting students, and $60 a month and $500 an academic year for nonresident, noncommuting students, be eliminated from the wording of the work-study provisions, Public Law 88–210.

We do feel that the provisions limiting students to 15 hours of work a week while school is in session is a good provision. However, we believe this provision should be waived during vacation periods (during Christmas and Easter vacations for example). For this waiver to be effective it again is necessary that the restrictions (a and b above) on allowable earnings be removed.

Also of concern to us is the provision to the effect that after the fiscal year ending June 1967, each school district would have to expend 25 percent of the cost necessary to carry on the work-study program. Many school districts, including our own, could not absorb the financial burden. The opportunity for "earning while learning" would no longer be available to our students.

I am enclosing an information sheet which explains in more detail the hoped-for revisions outlined above, and discusses two additional provisions needed to aid in the efficient administration and supervision of the work-study program.

Sincerely yours,
Harry Nysather,
Director,
Area Vocational Technical School.

Alexandria Area Vocational-
Technical School,
Alexandria, Minn., February 8, 1966.

Hon. Walter Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: The Alexandria Area Technical School has been operating under the work-study provisions of Public Law 88–210. It has come to our attention that area schools are being discriminated against where the $350 and $500 limitations are placed on a student's earnings. A majority of our courses run for 11 and 12 months. Thus, a student ceases to earn any money for the last 3 to 4 months of his school year. We believe this to be a very worthwhile program and if a few of these inequities could be taken care of, it would be even better.

We have heard that President Johnson plans a reduction in the work-study allocations for next year. If this is true, I believe it would be a serious mistake. Many of our students that have been accepted for training next fall would have to drop out of school. This would come at a time when our country desperately needs technically trained people. Your support regarding the continuation and possible expansion, rather than reduction, of the work-study program would be appreciated.

I want to thank you personally for the kind attention you gave my son, Jim, when he visited your office as a delegate to Boys' Nation. His selection as the outstanding boy at Boys' State made Mrs. Ahlfors and me very proud.

We all want to thank you for the excellent job you are doing as a Senator from Minnesota.

Yours sincerely,
Raymond A. Ahlfors,
Assistant Director.

Canby Area,
Vocational-Technical School,
Canby, Minn., February 10, 1966.

Re work study program, section 13, Public Law 88–210.

Hon. Walter Mondale,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: We at the Canby Area Vocational-Technical School are grateful for the work study program under Public Law 88–210. It gives low-income family students an opportunity to make some needed income.

I would have some suggestion for amendments:

1. Section 13(c)(3), strike out everything after the first comma and place a period in its place, so it would read as follows: "provide that no students shall be employed under such work study program for more than 15 hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in season."

The above would be easier to administer and also give the student a break.

2. Section 13(e)(2), strike out the following "from a States allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the next succeeding fiscal year, such payment shall equal 75 percent of the amount so expended."

We hope that this program will continue at 100 percent for an effective program. I'm sure the Canby School District would drop the program if they had to help pay nonresident students for going to this school.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Dewain L. Englund,
Director.

Staples Public Schools,
Staples, Minn., February 15, 1966.

Hon. Walter F. Mondale,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Mondale: The Staples Area Vocational School at the present time is serving 407 students from all areas in the State, and is also operating a work-study program for 100 of these students who are experiencing financial difficulty in continuing their vocational training. This work-study program is under Public Law 88–210 and there are some limitations and discriminations that exist in 88–210 that do not exist in other similar programs (economic opportunity work-study program for example) and these should be eliminated.

We have made several surveys to determine whether a work-study program is needed and what local area people think about such a training program. Almost 100 percent of the people felt that the program should be expanded, liberalized and above all continued. This is one program that is directly pointed at helping our youth to continue their education and eliminate pockets of unemployed and underemployed people. The work-study program survey has also helped us discover where past and present problems of poverty exist and now that we have discovered these people and their needs, there is a big job to be done.

Many of our school districts have expanded their facilities to the limits of their financial abilities, also, have furnished the work-study program with supplies, tools, and supervision, and would not be able to take on additional financial burdens as indicated in Public Law 88–210.

Enclosed you will find suggestions and justifications for amending section 13 (work-study programs for vocational education students) of Public Law 88–210.

I can think of no one better qualified to tackle this important problem, and I know you will assist in this matter. Whenever I can be of assistance in any way you will find me most willing to cooperate.

Sincerely yours,
Michael J. Matanich,
Director, Area Voc-Tech School.

Area Vocational-Technical School,
Duluth, Minn., February 15, 1966.

Hon. Walter Mondale,
U.S. Senate, Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: As a counselor in an area technical institute, I feel that the work study program is very important to our students. This legislation provides for financial assistance to students who may not otherwise be able to attend post high school training facilities without aid. We employ these students in related work at various public agencies and pay them for their services.

The present law has some unfavorable limitations which I believe should be amended as follows:

Section B(c)(3): The limits on monthly and yearly compensation should be deleted. The weekly limitation of 15 hours work when school is in session would alone be a most effective limitation. This change would allow a student to meet minimum financial needs for a full school year.

Section B(b)(2): To effectively administer the program, additional funds must be made available.

Section 13(3)(2): Delete the sentence concerning State matching of funds.

Funds should also be allocated by Federal legislation.

I hope you will give these suggestions careful consideration as they will end the discrimination against vocational students as compared to the work study program for college students.

The work study program is an excellent, efficient piece of legislation. It gives aid to the students who must have it in order to receive post high school training and become employable in our society.

Sincerely,
George Larson,
Vocational Counselor.

Eveleth Area
Vocational-Technical School,
Eveleth, Minn., February 25, 1966.

Hon. Walter S. Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: The Eveleth Area Vocational-Technical School has been participating in the work-study program, re section 13, Public Law 88–210, since September 1965. This program has certainly been a great help to the students that are taking part in it. It is my opinion that to make a more workable program, some changes should be made in the law. These changes are as follows:

1. Section 13(c)(3): I feel that when classes are in session there should be a limitation as to the number of hours a student should work as is stated in this section, but limitation of compensation to the student should be dropped as they could conceivably reach the maximum in less than 8 months. There should also not be any limitation on student compensation while school is not in session (vacation periods).

2. Section 13(b)(2): Strike out 1 percent and insert 5 percent. One percent is just not enough to administer this program in Minnesota effectively.

3. Section 13(e)(2): Discussing the section with school board members and local leaders, it is a consensus of opinion that the board would be in no position to pick up the 25 percent required by law for this program after June 1967, in light of the local tax situation and the additional burden upon the local taxpayers. This is true especially in Eveleth because approximately 70 percent of our students are nonresidents to the local school district. Therefore, I feel it imperative that the Federal Government continue this program on a 100-percent basis.

In this section, thought should also be given to provide funds for local supervision. I would suggest that approximately 10 percent of the expenditures be allotted for supervision.

Except for the above changes, the work-study program has been very effective in Eveleth. Many of the students in the Eveleth

Area Vocational-Technical School have been given a first experience in being employed and holding a job. The experience that they receive will develop in them sound concepts of work as well as form good work habits and the ability to be responsible.

I hope that I can depend upon you for your support on these changes which will make the program more effective. Any steps that you might take to remedy the situation will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD F. RUSS,
Director.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
St. Paul, Minn., March 9, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The area vocational-technical school work-study program got off to a very late start even though it was enacted December 1963. Moneys for the summer program were not funded until July 1, 1965. Even then, we were able to start a summer work-study program with 8 schools and 144 students participating.

In the fiscal year of 1965–66, as of January 1, 1966, we have 470 students participating in the work-study program and by the end of the school year will have over 500 students participating in the program. There are at present over 70 percent of the students in this program doing work directly related to the subjects they are taking. These students soon will be on the tax rolls instead of the relief rolls. If money is avaiable, we will have well over 500 students who wish to participate in the 1966–67 summer program.

This fall we will have four new area vocational-technical schools operating in this State. This means that we will have over 600 students who will wish to and need to participate in this program during the regular school year.

We receive no moneys for supervision at the local level and we feel that at least 10 percent of expenditures should be provided for this very necessary work. During the summer, when most classes are not in session and instructors are on vacation, no moneys are provided for supervision of summer work-study programs at the local level.

At the State level we are allowed 1 percent of money expended for the work-study program or $10,000, whichever is the greater. To be able to conduct the program it is the opinion of most that it should be increased from 1 percent to 5 percent.

The $350 and $500 limits that are imposed on the area vocational-technical school work-study program should be removed. The OEO programs, in contrast to the area vocational-technical school work-study programs, have no limits a participant may earn per year. The OEO also has much more liberal supervisory allowances.

Both the school directors and the needy students should know in advance how much money is available for this program. If they know this, both can plan ahead and make satisfactory arrangements.

Section 13(e)(2): Discussing this section with school board members and local leaders, it is a consensus of opinion that the school boards would be in no position to pick up the 25 percent required by law for this program after June 30, 1966, in light of the local tax situation and the additional burden upon the local taxpayers. This is especially true because approximately 75 percent of the students are nonresidents of the local school district. Therefore, I feel it imperative that the Federal Government continue this program on a 100-percent basis.

President Johnson has recommended in his budget that the area vocational-technical school work-study program be cut from $25 million to $10 million and at the same time asked for a budget increase of more than $320 million for Job Corps.

You will note that the budget calls for $177,500,000 for fiscal 1967 rather than the $225 million as authorized under section 4, Public Law 88–210. You will also observe that the work-study program was reduced from $25 million to $10 million. The budget justification for this decrease reads as follows: "1967 estimates reflect reduction in work-study assistance as the Neighborhood Youth Corps program assumes responsibility."

The Neighborhood Youth Corps programs have not as yet successfully reached the smaller communities where 22 of the 25 area vocational schools operating and planned are located and where area vocational schools have work-study programs.

I am certain that a study of the vocational work-study programs being conducted in our State will disclose that these programs have been entirely successful whereas the Neighborhood Youth Corps cannot make this claim. We all recognize that something needs to be done for these youth. Why not, then, aid those students who have found themselves and who wish to further their training?

It is very evident that there should be an increase instead of a decrease in the amounts of money allotted for the administration of the area vocational-technical school work-study programs.

Enclosed please find information which bears consideration for changes. I would appreciate it if you would use your influence to encourage the Congress to revise this portion of Public Law 88–210 in accord with the information enclosed.

CECIL STENSRUD,
State Supervisor,
Work-Study Program.

CANBY AREA VOCATIONAL-
TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
Canby, Minn., March 29, 1966.

Re work-study program, section 13, Public Law 88–210.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: I understand that students under the summer work-study program will be paid 75 percent by Federal funds and 25 percent by local funds. Our board of education will not accept the 25-percent tab in view that 80 percent of our students come from outside of the school district. Our board feels that we should not use local tax funds to pay for nonresident students. We hope Congress can restore the 100 percent reimbursement figure.

We have also lost our supervisor in charge of work-study because there are no funds available to administer this program. This places the whole supervision of the work study program on my shoulders and I don't have enough time to fully care for my own program now. We hope Congress can see fit to provide funds to pay this supervision. I would appreciate your checking into this problem for me.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DEWAIN L. ENGLUND,
Director.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT TO REMEDY INJUSTICE TO VETERANS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I continue to be deeply disturbed by an injustice which has been done to many of our Nation's veterans as a result of the 7-percent increase in social security benefits authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

Because of the increased social security payments approved by the Congress last year, approximately 30,000 veterans have been penalized by having their Veterans' Administration pension checks reduced. Moreover, these men and women who have given so much to their country are losing more from their veterans pensions than they are gaining from increased social security payments. Worst of all, they were given no choice to accept or decline the social security increase.

Mr. President, I believe this is an intolerable situation which ought to be corrected immediately by the Congress.

I should like to quote from just some of the many letters I have received from South Dakotans protesting this inequity.

A constituent from Custer, S. Dak., wrote to me last August:

> I am now past 70 and a few months ago applied for my social security and veterans pension. My pension amounted to $75 per month and social security to $107 a month. I was allowed both of these. I can manage to get by on this.
>
> But now with the increase in the social security I automatically go in another bracket and the VA tells me that they will have to cut me to $40 a month because I'll be getting a few dollars over $1,200 per year.
>
> Can you see any justice in this? I can't.
>
> I don't know if this was the intent of the law.
>
> You get a raise of $7 on social security and get cut $35 by the VA.
>
> You really have to skimp to get by on $200 per month now.
>
> Please check into this and maybe something can be done. I hope.

Or, in the words of a constituent of mine from Huron, S. Dak.:

> The new social security bill which allows for a 7-percent increase in social security benefits, will be bad news for some of our war veterans and veterans widows who, because of poverty and disability, are pensioned by the Veterans' Administration. The increase in social security payments will cost them more in lost VA pensions than they will gain in social security increases. The small increases will take many into an income bracket which, while still within the Government definition of "poverty," will automatically cut back or eliminate their VA pension eligibility, the loss in pension being greater than the increase.
>
> An example being thus: an individual here presently receives $47 per month social security and $100 per month VA pension. The new 7-percent increase will raise the social security to $51 per month, an increase of $4. However, the increase raises the total nonpension income to the next higher step in the VA scale of permissible income for pension and will therefore cut the VA pension from $100 to $75 per month resulting in a $25 per month cut on the VA pension and an overall loss of $19 per month.
>
> Needless to say, this new benefit will hurt like a kick in the teeth.
>
> I realize that the original bill had an amendment added in the Senate to the effect that no pensioned veteran should suffer a loss in benefits as a result of the new increases, but in the final joint House-Senate conference it was knocked out.
>
> I cannot understand why this amendment was knocked out, why the Veterans' Administration would oppose such an amendment

or why anyone could approve of such an injustice to our senior citizens.

It is my sincere wish and hope that someway, somehow this situation can be corrected.

A woman in Rapid City, S. Dak., wrote me describing the effects of the social security increase on her father-in-law:

> My father-in-law * * * is retired. His only income is from social security ($91.50 per month) and his veterans pension ($110 per month). This amounts to $201.50 a month from which he must support a wife and put a son through college, a living that is by no means extravagant.
>
> They received word that the bill had been passed in Congress providing a 7 percent raise in his social security benefits meaning an increase of $6.40 a month or a total of $76.80 per year for his family. Although this was not a large amount, it did mean a lot to them. Shortly after receiving this wonderful news a letter arrived from the Veterans' Administration informing them that his pension had been cut down to $80 a month because the 7-percent raise in his social security benefits makes his income exceed $1,000 a year. He has lost $30 a month or a total of $360 a year due to the $76.80 raise that he has absolutely no choice in accepting or refusing because it is a social security raise. This is an injustice.

A South Dakota veterans' service officer described for me the case of six other veterans:

> Without exception all of the six would have continued in their up to now VA pension benefits had they been paid the 7 percent which was the basic raise in the new social security law. However, they are the victims of the added provision for a $4 per month minimum raise. Just to quote two examples—one of the veterans will be $4.80 over the allowable VA limitation which will cost him $300 in VA benefit payments. The widow mentioned will pay $16 per month for a $4 a month social security raise.
>
> It is impossible for me to express the strength of my feeling in this matter. I speak from only one community in our country. The number of people who will be affected nationwide would be large—large enough to warrant immediate action by the Congress to correct this miscarriage of justice and equity.

Or finally, as a veteran from Dell Rapids, S. Dak., put it:

> I am a World War I veteran getting a pension of $105 per month—also get social security $93.10. I was getting $87 a month—with the 7-percent raise amounted to $6.10, so I was cut back to $80 per month on vet pension—net loss of $18.90. What are they trying to do—rob Peter to pay Paul?

Mr. President, I believe these letters indicate the need for affirmative congressional action to remedy this injustice.

Therefore, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prevent the loss of veteran pension benefits as the result of increases in social security benefits authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3206) to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, so as to prevent the loss of veteran pension benefits as the result of increases in social security benefits authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965, introduced by Mr. McGovern, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3206

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" after "503", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, in the case of any individual—

"(1) who, for the month in which the Social Security Amendments of 1965 was enacted, was entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, and

"(2) who, for such month, was entitled to pension under the provisions of this chapter, or under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959,

there shall not be counted, in determining the annual income of such individual, any increase in benefits under such sections of the Social Security Act which resulted from the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965."

AMENDMENT TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT—INCREASING POVERTY LEVEL TO $3,000

AMENDMENT NO. 536

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit for myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966 (S. 3046). This amendment would bring under the benefits of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for the next fiscal year those children from families having annual incomes of less than $3,000 plus those children from families above that income level who are receiving funds from the aid to dependent children—AFDC—program, utilizing the latest available figures.

Under present law, only children from the $2,000 income level and AFDC children are included. The administration does not wish to have this raised to the $3,000 level until fiscal year 1968; this amendment looks to increasing the level to $3,000 for the next fiscal year instead of waiting an additional year. Witnesses from the school districts have indicated that there would be no difficulties in local planning if this were done now instead of waiting.

Under the present $2,000 level, some 5.5 million children, about 11 percent of the 41.7 million elementary and secondary schoolchildren in the Nation are covered. Under the amendment, 8.3 million children would be covered, an increase of some 50 percent.

As presently written in S. 3046, the total maximum authorization for title I is $1,306,084,777. The Office of Education estimates that the total maximum authorization under this amendment would be $1,935,028,398. However, with respect to cost it should be noted that the administration bill has eliminated the incentive grant provision originally enacted last year in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, thus cutting more than $400 million from the cost of this legislation for fiscal year 1967 as originally contemplated. The net cost is, therefore, about $200 million.

Maintaining the income level at $2,000 presents us with the anomaly of a youngster being at the poverty level under present Federal programs during his preschool and college years if he comes from a $3,000 annual income family; but being considered at the poverty level during his elementary and secondary school years only where his family earned $2,000 or less. The Office of Economic Opportunity employs the $3,000 income as a poverty level in connection with its Project Headstart programs for preschool children. The $3,000 annual income level is also employed as a standard with respect to the granting of educational opportunity grants to college students under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This amendment would bring some consistency to our education aid programs now—instead of waiting until fiscal year 1968 as the administration asks us to do.

It should be noted that the witnesses appearing before the Education Subcommittee have favored this proposal unanimously—with the exception only of administration witnesses. If the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is to achieve maximum effect next year, this amendment is needed. I hope that the administration will reconsider its position.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, together with a chart prepared by the Office of Education indicating how much each State would receive under this amendment be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment and chart will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 536) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 8, beginning with line 6, strike out all through line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"RAISING THE LOW-INCOME FACTOR TO $3,000 AFTER JUNE 30, 1966

"Sec. 105. Section 203(c) is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) For the purposes of this section, the "Federal percentage" shall be 50 per centum and the "low-income factor" shall be $2,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and they shall be 50 per centum and $3,000, respectively for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.'"

On page 8, line 16, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

On page 8, line 18, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

The chart presented by Mr. Javits is as follows.

TABLE 4.—*Estimated State maximum authorizations for title I, Public Law 89-10 if the Elementary and Secondary Amendments o 1966 (S. 3046) were amended to $3,000 per annum and 1965 AFDC data, fiscal year 1967*

	Total estimated maximum authorizations	Estimated amounts for 5 to 17 population in low-income families [1]	Tentative estimated amounts for handicapped children [2]	Estimated amounts for migratory children of migratory workers [3]
United States and outlying areas	$1, 935, 028, 398	$1, 882, 851, 665	$11, 163, 454	$41, 013, 279
50 States and the District of Columbia	1, 876, 977, 546	1, 826, 366, 115	10, 828, 550	39, 782, 881
Alabama	50, 983, 186	50, 766, 114	137, 206	79, 866
Alaska	2, 828, 896	2, 828, 896		
Arizona	16, 406, 849	15, 480, 269	165, 388	761, 192
Arkansas	38, 306, 839	37, 767, 384	171, 184	368, 271
California	138, 985, 559	129, 504, 347	370, 326	9, 110, 886
Colorado	16, 455, 722	15, 141, 816	356, 500	957, 406
Connecticut	13, 410, 886	12, 877, 977	425, 681	107, 228
Delaware	3, 720, 176	3, 445, 606	73, 672	200, 898
Florida	54, 812, 341	52, 103, 620	437, 470	2, 271, 251
Georgia	62, 662, 555	62, 545, 230	110, 177	7, 148
Hawaii	3, 849, 086	3, 733, 256	115, 830	
Idaho	5, 272, 422	4, 304, 640	24, 426	943, 356
Illinois	83, 657, 315	82, 863, 248	217, 750	576, 317
Indiana	35, 599, 991	33, 955, 290	1, 191, 141	453, 560
Iowa	31, 152, 714	30, 675, 470	399, 350	77, 894
Kansas	20, 779, 332	19, 713, 526	238, 798	827, 008
Kentucky	46, 133, 776	45, 957, 035	97, 861	78, 880
Louisiana	60, 312, 671	60, 043, 000		269, 671
Maine	7, 656, 511	7, 569, 677	80, 918	5, 916
Maryland	25, 860, 588	25, 464, 216		396, 372
Massachusetts	27, 252, 199	27, 228, 042		24, 157
Michigan	58, 996, 537	55, 234, 081	625, 744	3, 136, 712
Minnesota	41, 567, 213	41, 167, 046	108, 804	291, 363
Mississippi	$45, 888, 424	$45, 745, 206	$64, 092	$79, 126
Missouri	48, 744, 155	48, 515, 045	126, 566	102, 544
Montana	8, 254, 637	7, 508, 278	166, 098	580, 261
Nebraska	13, 727, 588	13, 216, 196	146, 818	364, 574
Nevada	1, 670, 630	1, 597, 420		73, 210
New Hampshire	2, 730, 258	2, 721, 384		8, 874
New Jersey	37, 468, 566	36, 922, 583	210, 743	335, 240
New Mexico	15, 590, 932	15, 270. 616	190, 004	129, 412
New York	186, 057, 172	183, 259, 058	757, 834	2, 010, 280
North Carolina	83, 209, 534	81, 685, 562	301, 332	1, 222, 640
North Dakota	9, 763, 807	8, 685, 670	293, 774	784, 363
Ohio	58, 714, 269	57, 738, 750	293, 700	681, 819
Oklahoma	28, 313, 997	26, 796, 231	61, 690	1, 456, 076
Oregon	14, 595, 163	12, 839, 810	327, 132	1, 428, 221
Pennsylvania	80, 649, 284	79, 804, 340	480, 370	364, 574
Rhode Island	6, 318, 100	6, 199, 912	118, 188	
South Carolina	41, 415, 278	41, 073, 006	116, 478	225, 794
South Dakota	11, 681, 232	11, 553, 499	108, 506	19, 227
Tennessee	50, 642, 077	50, 522, 939	90, 298	28, 840
Texas	134, 774, 783	128, 434, 661	473, 422	5, 866, 700
Utah	4, 922, 238	4, 643, 840	77, 254	201, 144
Vermont	4, 320, 635	4, 226, 202	84, 820	9, 613
Virginia	52, 545, 304	51, 718, 012	138, 818	688, 474
Washington	19, 242, 952	17, 510, 394	319, 866	1, 412, 692
West Virginia	25, 488, 138	25, 404, 308	83, 830	
Wisconsin	33, 178, 396	32, 323, 149	278, 190	577, 057
Wyoming	2, 861, 986	2, 633, 358	71, 854	156, 774
District of Columbia	7, 544, 647	7, 446, 900	97, 747	
Outlying areas	58, 050, 852	56, 485, 550	334, 904	1, 230, 398

[1] Estimated maximum amounts based on the estimated 5 to 17 population in families with incomes of less than $3,000 per annum (1959), the estimated 5 to 17 population in families receiving more than $3,000 per annum from AFDC payments (1965), and 50 percent of the State adjusted estimated current expenditure per child in average daily attendance, 1964-65 (OE estimate Mar. 2, 1966). 3 percent of total estimated amounts reserved for the outlying areas.

[2] Estimated maximum amounts based on the tentative total of 1964-65 ADA of eligible handicapped children in State-operated and State-supported schools and 50 percent of the State adjusted estimated CE per ADA, 1964-65. Estimated amounts are based on preliminary data from 45 States. 3 percent of total estimated amount reserved for the outlying areas.

[3] Estimated maximum amounts based on estimated number of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers (1961) and 50 percent of the national average adjusted estimated CE per ADA, 1964-65 (OE estimate Mar. 2, 1966). 3 percent of total estimated amount reserved for the outlying areas.

NOTE.—Low-income factor, $3,000 per annum; AFDC data, 1965; 50 percent State adjusted estimated CE per ADA 1964-65, except for migratory children.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3169) to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special program for the mentally retarded, mentally ill, and physically handicapped spouses and children of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2911) to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 130) to provide for the designation of the week of May 8 to May 14, 1966, as "National School Safety Patrol Week."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS TO GOVERN RECOVERY OF FUGITIVE BAILEES BY BAIL BONDSMEN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, and for my distinguished colleague, Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, who is chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, I wish to announce that the two subcommittees will hold a joint hearing on S. 2855, a bill to govern the recovery of fugitive bailees by bail bondsmen. The hearing is scheduled for Wednesday, May 18, 1966, at 9:30 a.m. in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who desires to testify on S. 2855 should contact immediately the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6308, New Senate Office Building, or the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, room 102B, Senate Office Building.

HEARINGS ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, H.R. 14266, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, passed the House yesterday. In connection with this bill I wish to announce as chairman of the Senate Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee that we plan to commence Senate hearings on H.R. 14266 on Tuesday, April 19, and run through Thursday, April 21, on which day the subcommittee expects to complete the hearings.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

George E. O'Brien, of California, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of California, term of 4 years, reappointment.

Alexander Greenfeld, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney, district of Delaware, term of 4 years, reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, April 14, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Speech by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, "Rehabilitation and Trends for Tomorrow," at conference of region III, National Rehabilitation Association, Cedar Lake, Ripley, W. Va., April 5, 1966.

NEW YORK TIMES ANALYZES L.B.J.'S REMARKABLE FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, several times in the past few weeks, I have invited the attention of the Senate to the fight by the administration against rising prices.

In general, the Nation's press has done such a poor job of reporting this battle that I again and again encounter people who ask me: What is the President doing to stop inflation? The answer is: Plenty.

Now, at last, the New York Times has come up with a story—not a front page feature—but a solid, documented report written by its White House reporter John D. Pomfret, setting forth in part the nature of the battle the administration is putting up in order to hold prices down.

In the course of the New York Times article, Mr. Pomfret writes:

> The President is using a typically Johnsonian combination of personal persuasion and Government action to cool off the booming economy, hold down prices, and forestall the necessity for a tax increase.
>
> Although other Presidents have waged campaigns against inflation, economists in and out of the Government say that they can recall no parallel in the history of the modern Presidency for the energy and range of Mr. Johnson's current effort.

I have often invited attention to the President's adroit and highly effective use of wage price guideposts, his organization of the executive department to stop price increases, his use of tax policy, and his increasing stress on holding down Government spending.

The New York Times documents a whole series of actions taken by various departments to keep prices down.

But Mr. Pomfret wisely emphasizes the immense impact of the President's use of the office itself, as Pomfret puts it:

> Mr. Johnson confided that Presidents make their biggest mistakes when they fail to realize that their greatest power lies in the office itself, that people simply do not like to say no to a President.
>
> That's the secret of what he is trying to do in his anti-inflation campaign.

The New York Times relates the many telephone calls the President has made to top business executives asking them to postpone present zooming plans for investment in plants, and equipment. It points to the luncheon for 150 top executives of the Nation's largest corporations who heard the President's personal and direct plea to keep that most inflationary of present factors, business spending, down.

Mr. President this is such a rare and competent report that I ask unanimous consent to have the article written by John Pomfret in yesterday's New York Times printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON STRIVING TO COOL OFF BOOM—MIXES PERSUASION AND ACTION IN AN ENERGETIC CAMPAIGN

(By John D. Pomfret)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—President Johnson received today a bit of statistical reassurance that his energetic campaign to prevent the economy from soaring into inflationary orbit is having an impact.

It came in an announcement by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that the unemployment rate remained virtually stable last month.

Administration economists are understandably reluctant to read much into a single statistic for a single month or to attribute solely to Mr. Johnson's anti-inflation campaign too much credit for influencing the vast and complex American economy. Nevertheless, there was a feeling of cautious optimism here.

"Certainly the President's efforts have made some contribution to stabilization," one top administration economic adviser said. "I'm convinced that we have had some impact."

THE JOHNSON METHOD

The President is using a typically Johnsonian combination of personal persuasion and Government action to cool off the booming economy, hold down prices and forestall the necessity for a tax increase.

Although other Presidents have waged campaigns against inflation, economists in and out of the Government say that they can recall no parallel in the history of the modern Presidency for the energy and range of Mr. Johnson's current effort.

It is perilous to try to read Mr. Johnson's mind, but some knowledgeable administration sources now feel that his present policy is working well enough that he will not ask Congress for a tax increase before June or July, if he does at all.

Mr. Johnson has on several occasions demonstrated his preference for dealing with difficult situations by using the power inherent in his office rather than by asking Congress for action or added grants of authority.

POWER OF OFFICE NOTED

Just last week, he was chatting with an acquaintance about the Government's wide-ranging campaign to avoid inflation.

Mr. Johnson confided that Presidents make their biggest mistakes when they fail to realize that their greatest power lies in the office itself, that people simply do not like to say no to a President.

"That's the secret of what he is trying to do" in his anti-inflation campaign, an aid explained.

The President has stimulated the executive agencies of the Government to take a series of wide-ranging actions from prodding railroads to unload boxcars faster to raising support prices on soybeans and milk; from releasing more and more stockpiled metal to turning Army dietitians into price-conscious shoppers.

He has mobilized the top officials of his administration for the battle. It has got so that it is nearly impossible for a businessman or labor leader to get through a conversation on any subject with Commerce Secretary John T. Connor, Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz or Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, without a reminder of the administration's desire to hold down prices and wages.

These men and other participants in the campaign meet regularly with the President, usually on Friday afternoon or Saturday morning, to talk about the economy and the campaign to thwart inflation.

On these occasions, the President bluntly tells them that he means business. "You might say that he put gas in our tanks," one participant said.

Just today, Mr. Fowler carried the gospel to Phoenix, Ariz., where, at a meeting of the Association of Reserve City Bankers, he asked bankers to turn down loans that might lead to inflationary spending.

In addition to the activities of his aids, Mr. Johnson has added his own typical touch—personal telephone calls to dozens of the Nation's top corporation executives urging restraint in plant expansion, appeals to union officials to hold down wage demands, orders to Federal officials to reduce spending, and exhortation to Governors, mayors—even housewives—to do the same.

A HINT DROPPED GENTLY

For some time the President has been urging labor and management to observe voluntary wage and price restraint. Last week, however, he stepped up the emotional intensity of his appeal and added a new dimension to it by asking businessmen to defer capital goods expenditures where they could.

He began placing telephone calls to business executives, one of them an influential investment banker in New York. The President asked the banker, a friend of 15 years, how he felt about the economy—was it overheating, and should there be a tax increase?

As the two men chatted amiably, Mr. Johnson suggested that it would be helpful if business investment could be restrained somewhat.

The call completed, Mr. Johnson rang up other executives around the country. Each conversation followed a similar pattern. The President sought information about what the executive and his friends thought about the economy. And, each time, Mr. Johnson gently dropped into the conversation the hope that business investment could be restrained.

EMPHASIS ON INVESTMENT

Then, on Wednesday night, the President invited about 150 leading businessmen to the White House for a review of the economy.

One guest described it later as a "virtuoso performance."

After dinner, the President, with his Cabinet ranked behind him, paced up and down for more than an hour before the businessmen in the white and gold East Room, describing the Nation's economic problems.

He concentrated particularly on investment in new plant and equipment, a sector of the economy that shows distinct signs of overheating. The latest Government survey of businessmen's intentions indicate that they plan to invest 16 percent more in plant and equipment this year than last, a total of $60.2 billion.

Mr. Johnson asked the businessmen to reexamine their investment plans and to hold off where they could.

He and Mrs. Johnson had planned an addition to their ranch home in Texas, he said, but had decided to defer it. Would not, the President asked, the businessmen look at their own investment plans? It is no time, he said, to "pour gasoline on the fire."

PRESTIGE IS STILL HIGH

There appeared to be every indication at the meeting that the President's prestige among businessmen was still very high despite the tough line taken by the administration in rolling back price increases by the aluminum and other industries.

One of the ironies of the present situation is that Mr. Johnson has so far got much more cooperation from the business community, with its traditionally Republican cast, than from organized labor, which is closely allied with the President's party.

One participant in the businessmen's meeting—not a Government man—sought to explain it this way:

"During the Kennedy administration businessmen felt they had been cut out socially at the White House. President Kennedy's parties didn't include many businessmen. With President Johnson, the businessmen feel they are back on top socially again, which is where they feel they belong."

It is not the President's wish to bring about a drastic curtailment of business investment but rather to take the cream off the top.

Administration economists feel that there are cases where the business decision to invest is a close one, as for example, when there is some doubt about the profitability of a new plant. In such cases, the President, as one administration source put it, is "one more vote at the board of directors meeting." And his vote is for restraint.

One group that has thus far spurned Mr. Johnson's pleas is organized labor. Union officials have been outspoken in their opposition to the wage guideposts of the Council of Economic Advisers. The guideposts ask that wage increases, with some exceptions, be voluntarily restricted to the long-term rate of productivity gain, which the Government puts at about 3.2 percent a year.

The unions are pointing to the fact that corporate profits after taxes in the last quarter of 1965 rose to a record of almost $46 billion at a seasonably adjusted annual rate. But the latest figures show that factory workers' earnings have not gone up at all in the last year, after deducting increased "Social security taxes and adjusting the earnings to take price increases into account.

PLANS TALK WITH LABOR

The President, however, does not intend to leave matters as they are. He is planning to hold a White House session for the unionmen later this month in an effort to persuade them to cooperate.

Persuasion has not been the only arrow in the President's quiver.

In October, the Government threatened to dump a vast quantity of aluminum in the market after the industry raised its prices. The threat worked and the price increase was rescinded.

Since then there have been these actions, among others:

Metals in short supply have been released from Government stockpiles to relieve scarcities that were creating price pressures. These include aluminum, copper, tungsten, magnesium, and columbium.

Suspension of the import limitation on sugar in the first quarter drove the price of sugar back down.

Import restrictions on residual oil have been suspended to increase subsidies and curb price increases.

The Army and Air Force have substituted oleomargarine for butter on their menus.

The Defense Department is buying textiles, shoes, and other items at times calculated not to put upward pressure on their prices and has cut back sharply in military construction not related to the war in Vietnam.

The Agriculture Department has taken a number of actions to curb rising food costs.

In sum, Mr. Johnson has deliberately turned the enormous economic power of the Government into deflationary channels.

Whether his efforts to restrain inflation will be successful in the long run depends in considerable measure on other forces affecting the economy. But the President is expected to keep up his campaign and does not feel that he has exhausted his power of persuading.

SECRETARY OF TREASURY FOWLER'S SPEECHES SHOW HOW ADMINISTRATION MAY BE WINNING WAR AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday, before the Commonwealth Club of California in San Francisco, the Secretary of the Treasury delivered an excellent speech on the brilliant performance of this economy of ours.

The speech is a tonic for those who read the newspaper columnists, listen to congressional speeches and get the impression that the Nation is on its way to economic damnation.

Of course, we have economic problems—and big ones. Secretary Fowler identifies some of them. But his speech is welcome because it points out the massive strength and power of the economy, the solid accomplishments in human terms, and the vast increase in the American standard of living built on what was already the greatest standard of living in history.

As Secretary Fowler put it:

> No great and free nation in the history of mankind has ever come so close to achieving both full employment and rapid economic growth in a context of reasonable price stability and international payments equilibrium.

Secretary Fowler discusses some of the measures that have helped this Nation achieve its remarkable growth in the past few years.

I am proud and happy to say that he also picks up an analysis that this Senator made on the floor of the Senate recently of the impact of wage-price guideposts.

At that time, I showed how the voluntary restraint on wages and prices by our free enterprise economy, in response to strong Presidential leadership, has helped give us far better real wages, a vast improvement in profits, as well as price stability until very recently.

At a time when so many economic soothsayers are in full cry for a big tax increase or other drastic action, Secretary Fowler, speaking for a strong administration that understands power and knows how to use it, hit the theme this administration has chosen to follow when he said:

> The right principle seems to be to apply policies of either stimulus or restraint in moderation or in stages, except in direst emergency. We were not for pressing the accelerator down to the floor in the expansionary period of the first 5 years of this decade, thereby risking an unsustainable boom. Neither will we now slam on the brakes so suddenly as to skid into a recession or cause our economic motor to stall.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Tuesday, at the annual meeting of Reserve City Bankers at Phoenix, Ariz., Secretary Fowler made another noteworthy speech. His Phoenix speech exemplifies precisely why the administration is beginning to have some real success in holding down prices, not with a bludgeon that could crush the economy, stunt economic growth, or set off a recession and create unemployment, but with a paring knife approach at precisely those sectors of the economy where inflationary pressures are most likely to push up prices.

Secretary Fowler is calling on the banking industry in this case to act on its own volition using its own private individual judgment. This is the way responsible free enterprise can and should work.

Secretary Fowler further stated:

> It is important, however, that such moderation as is needed, particularly of bank credit growth, be accomplished without the skyrocketing of interest rates. Raising the price of money should not, and need not, be the only means of determining which applicants get the loans.
>
> When the bigger banks rely on higher rates as the means for allocating credit among a few large borrowers, this tends to put up the cost of money for everyone.
>
> The better course, in dealing with a credit growth that threatens inflation, is to turn down or scale back the less deserving loan applications.

Secretary Fowler then cited the suggestions of a vice chairman of the National City Bank of New York to the American Bankers Association for some voluntary lending guidelines for bankers to follow in curbing loans that would contribute to "inflationary credit excesses."

He also cited the suggestions of the president of the American Bankers Association to weed out less productive and speculative loans.

Mr. President, here is a perfect example of how the administration is working, in concert with private businessmen, to fight inflation without the painful burdens of even sharper interest rate increases, heavy tax hikes, or rigid controls of wages, profits, and prices.

Of course, no one can tell whether this approach will work, but if it does work, if prices do stabilize, what a triumph for the moderate, voluntary way, and what an achievement for economic leadership in a free society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the speeches by Treasury Secretary Fowler in San Francisco and Phoenix, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE A COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA LUNCHEON AT THE SHERATON PALACE HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., APRIL 4, 1966

In this city of such cosmopolitan concerns, of such views and vistas to dazzle and delight the eye, the mind's eye, also, takes on new and broader perspectives and ranges beyond the immediate landscape to farther horizons.

Therefore, I do not come here today to dwell upon the more immediate features of the current economic scene, or to discuss the one economic question uppermost in the minds of the majority of Americans—whether and when we will need or have national tax increases. The various views on that question, and on the current condition of our economy, have been fully aired in recent weeks.

And the President has repeatedly made his position most clear. As he remarked less than 3 weeks ago, when he signed the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966—and I quote:

"I can make no prediction here today on the need for additional taxes later this year. No one can make that prediction, because no one knows what the future holds. But you may be assured that this administration stands ready to act when action is needed—if it is needed. I am certain that the Congress stands ready to respond in the same manner.

"In the meantime, there is work and duty ahead for all of us—to discipline ourselves and our actions—to be prudent, to be as wise as we can—so that what we have worked so hard to build will last and prosper."

So today, in this city of such broad interests and great vistas, I would like to take the current economic discussion out of the narrow confines in which it is commonly circumscribed and to place it in a broader perspective. Indeed, I am convinced that our success in answering the questions immediately before us will directly depend upon how we answer some far more comprehensive questions—questions concerning our economic and social and political goals here at home as well as our goals in the world at large.

To begin with, I am convinced that any decision on how best to safeguard and sustain our current expansion must rest upon our clear understanding of how it began and how it grew.

The current expansion, as you know, had its beginnings in early 1961, when the economy was emerging from our fourth post-war recession. Unemployment was intolerably high. Business investment had for years failed to maintain anything like adequate levels of growth—and remained far less than we needed to generate more vigorous economic growth and a stronger competitive position in world markets, including our own home market which was becoming increasingly open to import competition. At the same time, a series of balance-of-payments deficits—averaging more than $3½ billion a year for 3 years—rendered the dollar vulnerable and threatened the international monetary system which it supported.

To be sure, prices had remained relatively stable since 1958—but this stability was a part and a product, not of a pattern of positive and productive growth, but of a pattern of anemic and inadequate growth that had shown itself exceedingly susceptible to recession. It was, in short, a price stability purchased at the expense of our goals of full employment and adequate economic growth—and associated with severe deficits in our international balance of payments.

Our effort and our aim was to preserve that price stability, while at the same time pursuing our other major economic goals of strong and sustainable economic growth, of full employment and of relative equilibrium in our international balance of payments. We sought to fashion and follow a mix of economic policies that would enable us to move ahead simultaneously toward each of these four goals.

Our view then, and our view now, is that our economic policy mix must be both flexible in method and firm in purpose—that it must enable us to pursue simultaneously our four major economic goals through changing economic circumstances. We rejected then, and reject now, the view that these goals are inherently incompatible and that to secure one or two of them requires that we sacrifice the others.

We recognized then, as we do now, that conflicts between these goals can arise—that inevitably there comes a point where it is difficult to pursue full employment and price stability at one and at the same time, when success on the one front seems to involve falling back or slowing down on the other.

And that is precisely why, at the beginning of this expansion, our first fiscal measures—the 7 percent investment credit and the depreciation reform of 1962—centered upon encouraging productive new business investment—the kind of investment that would mean not only more jobs and greater economic growth, but the greater productivity and lower costs so essential to continued price stability and to progress in our balance of payments.

We accompanied these measures with pioneering new efforts to train and retrain unskilled and semi-skilled workers—thus helping to make them more employable and more productive. For we were, from the very beginning, fully aware that we would reach a point when growing demand alone could not continue to make inroads upon unemployment without undermining our productive efficiency or exerting a strain upon our prices. And as a result of our programs over the past 5 years—beginning with the landmark Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962—we now have underway the most massive effort ever undertaken to attack the problem of structural unemployment.

At the same time that we employed these dual measures—aimed specifically at insuring both greater growth and greater productivity in both business investment and employment—we adopted a dual approach on the overall economic level as well. Through massive and across-the-board income tax reductions we sought to increase the general level of demand in the private economy—while through the wage-price guideposts of the President's Council of Economic Advisers we sought, within the context of our free enterprise system, to encourage voluntary wage-price restraint, so that measures for growing productivity and for growing aggregate demand would result in both rapid and real economic growth.

And today, when there are those who would have us abandon the wage-price guideposts, I think we ought to have no misunderstanding of how well we have done under those guideposts.

During the 5 years from 1961 to 1965—nearly all of which were covered by the guideposts—corporate profits after taxes rose more than 65 percent from $27.2 billion to $44.5 billion. In the previous 5-year period—1956–60—when we had no guideposts, corporate profits after taxes fell by 2 percent from $27.2 billion to $26.7 billion.

In the 5 years before the guideposts, employee compensation rose from $243 billion to $294 billion, or about 20 percent—while during the 5-year guidepost period the rise was from $303 billion to $392 billion, or about 30 percent.

What is most remarkable is the behavior of prices. During the 5 years before the guideposts—years when unemployment and unused plant capacity were generally growing—the consumer price index rose by about 9 percent, while during the 5 years of the guideposts—years when the level of unemployment and unused capacity was falling—prices rose by only about three-fifths as much, or by 5½ percent.

As a result, price rises canceled out almost half of the rise in employee compensation in the 1956–60 period—9 percent of the 21-percent rise—so that, in real terms, employee compensation went up by only about 11 percent. In the 1961–65 period on the other hand, the rise in employee compensation greatly exceeded the consumer price rise so that in real terms employee compensation rose by more than 20 percent.

In the past 5 years, therefore, when we have had the guideposts, real employee compensation has grown twice as much as it did during the previous 5 years when we had no guideposts.

What these comparisons make vividly clear is the fact that the wage-price guideposts—or something like them—must occupy an important place in any successful effort to secure real growth in the economic abundance in which we all share.

And so, over the past 5 years, we have followed what I have outlined as a dual approach, on dual dimensions to move us ahead simultaneously toward multiple economic goals—complemented by a similarly dual approach in monetary policy aimed at insuring an adequate availability of money and credit for domestic needs while helping our balance-of-payments efforts by maintaining short-term interest rates at levels comparable to those abroad.

As a result of these efforts, in 1965 we were closer than at any time in our history to the simultaneous achievement of our four paramount goals: strong and stable economic growth, full employment, reasonable price stability and equilibrium in our international balance of payments.

Indeed, I think we sometimes fail to grasp exactly how immense our achievement has been—and what a great and exciting challenge we face—a challenge that ought to call forth our most determined and confident response instead of awakening, as it often seems to, a host of self-doubts and uncertainties and fears.

No great and free nation in the history of mankind has ever come so close to achieving both full employment and rapid economic growth in a context of reasonable price stability and international payments equilibrium.

The question before us is how shall we seek to accomplish what no other free nation has succeeded in doing—but what all have dreamed of doing? Shall we build upon the policies that have brought us so close to our goals?—or shall we revert to policies of the more distant past that would have us achieve one or two of our economic goals at the expense of the others—that would, for example, have us accept a higher rate of unemployment and a lower rate of economic growth for the sake of price stability and balance in our international payments, or that would have us forgo our efforts for price stability and balance-of-payments equilibrium for the sake of full employment and greater economic growth?

To ask these questions is to answer them—not only in the perspective of our own past experience, but in the even broader and more revealing perspective of our experience in relation to that of the other major countries of the free world.

In the concluding half decade of the fifties, our economy grew at a real annual rate of only 2.3 percent—far lower than that of virtually all other major countries. In the half decade just ended, our real growth rate rose to 4.5 percent—an immense improvement. And last year our real national output grew by 5.5 percent—and as a result we surged ahead of every other major country in the world, except Canada.

That surge in real output reflected one of our most impressive achievements over the last half decade—a record of price stability unequaled by any other major country in the world—a record surpassed by no other industrial nation and by only three other small countries—Guatemala, El Salvador, and Venezuela.

Let me cite one particularly instructive comparison, with France which has had some success in reducing the rate of increase in its consumer price level. In the last half decade of the fifties the cost of living in France rose at a compound annual rate of more than 6 percent, and in the first half decade of the sixties, at an annual rate verging upon 4 percent—about three times our rate in both cases. Last year, however, France reduced that rate to a little under 2½ percent, while ours rose slightly to near 2 percent—still substantially below that of France. But France achieved that reduction in prices from nearly 4 percent to a little under 2½ percent only by cutting almost in half its real annual growth rate—its growth rate corrected for price increases—compared to its record over the 1960–64 period.

That is the bargain that we have refused to make over the past 5 years and that we refuse to make now—the bargain that would have us trade away jobs and growth for the sake of a price stability that without jobs and growth is an empty accomplishment.

Our task today, therefore, is the same as it has been for the past 5 years: to sustain our progress toward our four major economic goals. But today, as you know, that task has been made both more difficult and more delicate by the added demands of the Vietnam conflict upon an economy closer to full employment and full utilization of productive capacity than at any time in recent years.

The entrance of Vietnam into our economic picture—while its real economic impact has been exaggerated and confused with the entirely different Korean war situation—nonetheless has both introduced a large element of uncertainty and increased the danger that in sustaining our rapid rate of growth and further reducing our unemployment rate we will sacrifice some measure, at least, of price stability and hinder our progress toward balance-of-payments equilibrium.

We are fully aware of this danger—but we are also fully convinced that we can better avert it, without damage to our economic objectives other than price stability, if all of us exercise our clear responsibilities for restraint, for moderation and for calmness.

We fully recognize that both monetary and fiscal policy exercised by public authority have important roles to play in containing an economy that threatens to become excessively exuberant. And both fiscal and monetary policy have been shifted from a direction of steady stimulus to aggregate economic demand to one of moderate restraint.

But in shifting from a policy of stimulus to one of restraint we must remain equally aware of the opposite danger—that the cumulative total of monetary and fiscal restraints and their timing must be designed to avoid an economic overkill that risks a loss of momentum.

The right principle seems to be to apply policies of either stimulus or restraint in moderation or in stages, except in direst emergency. We were not for pressing the accelerator down to the floor in the expansionary period of the first 5 years of this decade, thereby risking an unsustainable boom. Neither will we now slam on the brakes so suddenly as to skid into a recession or cause our economic motor to stall.

Our fiscal program—as outlined in President Johnson's budget and economic report presented earlier this year—took into account and served as a complement to the restraining influence of the earlier Federal Reserve Board action in December, and the enactment last year of additional social security and medicare taxes which took effect this January and will reduce private purchasing power at the rate of $6 billion per year.

And, as I have indicated earlier, while this combination is having its full total effect for the first time this spring, we are standing ready to take additional fiscal action if it proves necessary.

The current outlook is for a fiscal 1967 budget that, despite a projected increase of $10.5 billion of special Vietnam expenditures over and above those in the 1965 budget, will show a surplus on a cash basis and closely approach balance on a national income accounts and regular or administrative basis. This will be a meaningful, if moderate, shift from the larger deficits in fiscal 1966.

We are taking all the fiscal dividends flowing from our rapid economic growth—the higher revenues that a growing economy would automatically produce under existing tax rates—and using them to meet the increased requirements of the Vietnam struggle. We estimate that these dividends will amount to $7½ billion in fiscal 1967—and, had it not been for the increased requirements of Vietnam, these dividends would have enabled us to balance the budget in fiscal 1967 and still afford some increases in civilian expenditures or some additional tax reduction or some retirement of the national debt.

And a few weeks ago, President Johnson signed the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966—a measure that will raise some $6 billion in Federal revenues over the next 14 months, and withdraw a total of $2.7 billion from the private spending stream during calendar 1966.

But fiscal and monetary policy alone simply cannot bear the whole burden. Indeed, they will fail unless our businesses and our unions carry their full burden of responsibility for avoiding inflationary wage and price rises.

The urgent need for responsible restraint in the private sector if public policies designed to achieve both a dynamic economy and price stability are to succeed has rarely been put more clearly or cogently than in the following statement by President Eisenhower in his 1957 Economic Report to the Congress: "the events of the year showed, however, that when production and employment are high, wage and price increases in important industries can create upward pressures on costs and prices generally, and that the monetary and fiscal policies of Government must be supported by appropriate private policies to assure both a high level of economic activity and stable prices."

That observation could scarcely be more timely—indeed, few experiences bear more timely recollection than the way in which in 1957 our last major lengthy expansion turned into recession—and interrupted our progress toward our economic goals—as we tried to fight inflation by fiscal and monetary policies while inflation fed upon the failure of labor and management to exercise responsible restraint in determining wages and prices.

Let those who reject the wage-price guideposts—let those who seem to suggest that the private sector bears no responsibility for exercising restraint in wages and prices—let those who have ecclesiastical or perhaps, political objections to the guideposts—let them reflect upon the experience of 1957—let them explain it, let them defend it, let them try to assure us it cannot happen again, or let them propose a better means of assuring both price stability, full employment, and a high and profitable rate of utilization of capacity in the context of a free enterprise economy.

These, then, in broad outline, are some of the perspectives within which we must seek the answer over the next few months to some of the pressing economic questions immediately before us.

But these are not the only perspectives. For today, as in all the years since the beginning of World War II, all that we do here at home must reflect the heavy responsibilities we bear for leadership in the free world.

None of us underestimates the gravity of those responsibilities, for each of us understands that the way in which the United States exercises its international leadership will do much to determine the future for the world and for succeeding generations of Americans.

The challenges confronting that leadership are many, but these surely are three of the most basic:

First, the challenge posed by the Communist commitment to world conquest—and in particular by the Communist effort to impose their will and extend their influence by outright aggression and by subversion backed by the threat of aggression.

Second, the challenge posed by the collapse of colonialism and the emergence of new nations—thus far more than 50 in number—coupled with the growing demands of underprivileged peoples everywhere for full and immediate deliverance from the hunger and the disease and the illiteracy and the grinding poverty that had ruled their lives for centuries.

Third, the challenge posed by the spreading outbreak of excessive nationalism—most noticeable and understandable in some of the less developed countries, but highly visible as well in some of the world's more developed nations—that considerably complicates the efforts of nations to work together on a multilateral basis to attack common problems and to achieve common objectives.

To continue to meet these challenges—with their opportunities as well as their dangers—will require of ourselves and our allies in the free world the highest qualities of leadership on two major fronts:

First, leadership in standing firm and united against Communist aggression and subversion with sufficient force and power to deter such efforts and to demonstrate beyond any doubt that they are far too unrewarding and dangerous to be worth the risk.

Second, leadership in assisting on a multilateral basis the new nations in their struggle to achieve both essential stability and sufficient progress toward meeting the rising needs and demands of their people.

On both of these fronts—over a period of two decades and under the leadership of four Presidents—ours is a record of the most unrelenting effort and the most enduring accomplishment toward the preservation of peace, the protection of freedom, and the promotion of human rights and human welfare.

Indeed, in meeting the great challenges of our times, we have not been found wanting. Never in the memory of man has any nation done so much and at such great cost, not to gain dominion over the lives or the resources or the territory of others, but to help others gain full and free dominion over their own destinies.

We look back over the past two decades and ask—is it all worth the cost? Is it worth it to devote a portion of our human and material resources to the military effort required for the promotion and preservation of peace and freedom and a world in which tyranny cannot be imposed by aggression from without or subversion from within? Is it worth it to devote a share of our resources to help shape a world that will day by day witness nations, new and old, beat back the tides of hunger and disease and illiteracy in a climate of economic and social progress and of political freedom and order?

To ask these questions today is to answer them—as we have for two long decades under four great Presidents—in the clear and unqualified affirmative, for that is the only answer a truly great nation can give that bears the burden of free world leadership in an interdependent world.

We must, therefore, continue to yield to no nation in the patient pursuit of peace and the works of peace—and continue to demonstrate, as we do in Vietnam, that we have the will and the weapons to wage war, if wage war we must to defend our own freedom and the freedom of our fellowman.

We must be willing to bear the burdens and accept the uncertainties that come with such a war as we fight in Vietnam. For

Vietnam is a war of wills as well as a war of weapons. It is a test of our willingness to survive—to surmount—the strain of constant, continual conflict whose end is never clearly in sight.

And we must continue—together with other developed nations of the free world—to carry our share of the burden of leadership in the common task of helping the developing nations of the world to realize their destiny and enrich the lives of their people in dignity and freedom.

In all these ways, and more, we must continue in company with other like-minded nations to lead the way in helping better the world we share with all.

But in so doing we must recognize that, in the final analysis, our ability to discharge our responsibilities of free world leadership will depend on how we act at home—in maintaining a strong and dynamic economy—in pursuing vigilantly our national economic goals of full employment, a healthy rate of growth, reasonable price stability, and a balance in our international payments—in extending always for our own citizens the boundaries of economic opportunity and social justice.

Today, therefore—both in our affairs at home and in the world at large—we as a nation and as individual citizens have a great many responsibilities to bear—responsibilities that we bear with pride and with confidence.

Whether it be by following the path of responsible restraint laid out for our businesses and unions in the wage-price guideposts—or by moderating our private spending and borrowing demands and supporting the savings bonds program—or by postponing wherever possible travel abroad and substituting travel in this country instead—whether it be in these or in countless other ways, we all have a very great part to play in keeping America sound and strong at home and abroad.

And how well we all accept our responsibilities will have a great deal to do with how successful we are in meeting the great challenges before us, at home and abroad, in the months ahead.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESERVE CITY BANKERS AT THE BILTMORE HOTEL, PHOENIX, ARIZ., TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 1966

In reviewing economic trends and prospects with you today, I would like to start on the international side, which has come into increasing prominence among the areas that most concern economic policy. To start with, the United States experienced a substantial improvement in its balance of payments last year.

Thanks in good measure to the outstanding cooperation of banks and other financial institutions, the deficit was reduced by $1.5 billion, and totaled, for 1965 as a whole, $1.3 billion on an overall or liquidity, accounting basis. This was the smallest balance-of-payments deficit since 1957—less than half the $3 billion average deficit, on the same accounting basis, for the 7 preceding years, 1958 through 1964.

Banks made a major contribution to the improvement in our balance of payments last year—by holding their net expansion of foreign credit to $155 million.

Further evidence of this continued cooperation came last week when the Federal Reserve Board reported that banks, in the first 2 months of 1966, reduced their outstanding foreign loans and investments by $385 million.

We do not yet have before us any new estimate of the balance-of-payments outlook for this year. The assessment we made in November and again in mid-February of the prospects for reaching our goal of equilibrium remains, by and large, our assessment today.

Late last year and again in February, I noted the particular difficulties this year in assessing the balance-of-payments prospects, because of the uncertainties regarding the cost of our commitments in southeast Asia, both in the sense of our direct spending and the indirect effects on our trade balance by reason of its impact on our domestic economy.

The burgeoning of the U.S. economy, beyond our expectations of last November, may mean enlarged imports and less allocation of effort to increasing our exports. And the American tourist seems to be winging to Western Europe in ever greater numbers, magnifying a net travel deficit that in 1965 was 133 percent of the total deficit as compared to 33 percent in 1960.

But plus factors are the hoped for absence of some of the factors which in 1965 pulled down our trade surplus from previous years.

These factors which contributed to a reduction of our 1965 trade surplus included:

Economic expansion was at a reduced rate last year in Western Europe and Japan. This was probably the main factor in holding our exports for the year to an increase of less than 4 percent, compared to increases in the previous 4 years averaging about 7 percent. During the year, business conditions improved abroad, and our sales abroad rose in the third and the fourth quarters. A continuation of this trend would improve our trade picture in 1966.

Traders anticipating a dockworkers strike that did indeed occur in early 1965 pushed out about $160 million of exports late in 1964 that normally would have gone out in the first quarter of 1965, while they similarly hastened imports by some $60 million.

Steel users, anticipating a steel strike that did not come to pass, made exceptional steel imports in 1965 estimated at some $300 million.

Agricultural exports were at the low annual rate of $5.9 billion in the first half of 1965, but recovered during the last half, reaching an annual rate of $6.75 billion in the last quarter of 1965.

In assessing future prospects for our balance of payments we should ever be mindful of President Johnson's statement at the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank last October:

"The United States has taken firm action to arrest the dollar drain. Should further action be necessary in the future, such action will be taken."

Looking ahead, I would like to be able to suggest some magic date for the termination of the voluntary balance-of-payments restraints. But I cannot do so. We are not likely to be able to terminate this program so long as hostilities in South Vietnam on the present scale persist.

When that is over, there can be a thoroughgoing reexamination of all of the factors that throw light on the prospects that the voluntary restraints program could be modified or abandoned without bringing back major deficits in our balance of payments.

Meanwhile, we are moving forward to improve the international monetary situation by arranging for new sources of liquidity to finance growing international trade in the absence of dollar deficits.

Last July, I suggested that the time had come to move ahead from technical study to the negotiating table. This was becoming increasingly evident as our own balance of payments improved and reduced the supply of dollars which had been augmenting the reserves of foreign countries for a number of years.

Between 1958 and 1964, deficits in the U.S. balance of payments were the source of about three-quarters of the new reserves accumulated by the rest of the world.

If the growth of monetary reserves of the free world were to depend solely on additions to monetary gold, which recently have run no more than $500 million yearly, then annual reserve increments would not even reach 1 percent. It is clearly time to begin planning the means to supplement gold with the deliberate, careful creation of additional reserves as needed.

Since last July, we have been moving ahead. In September, following a series of bilateral talks I had with financial officials of a number of other countries, the new negotiating machinery was established in Washington at the time of the annual meeting of the IMF. The finance minister of the Group of Ten leading industrial countries who have been working together on monetary problems since 1962 met in Washington at that time.

As the first phase of contingency planning, they instructed their deputies to seek a basis of agreement on the improvements needed in the international monetary system, including arrangements for the future creation of reserve assets. It was further provided that once a basis for agreement on essential points was reached, it would be necessary to proceed from this first phase to a second phase, involving a much larger group of countries. This was to permit broad consideration of the questions that affect the world economy as a whole.

At the same time, the Managing Director of the IMF, who participates in the ministerial meetings of the Group of Ten, indicated that the Fund would pursue its own investigation of the ways and means of creating international reserves.

Since then, negotiations have been pursued actively. The deputies are proceeding to draft their report to the ministers, which we hope and expect will show considerable progress toward a consensus on the essential features of an international system for creating reserves.

Broadly speaking, there are three main approaches to reserve creation.

The first would modify and adapt the present system of drawing rights in the IMF, extending, within prescribed limits, virtually automatic drawing rights to be treated as reserves.

The second major approach is built on a composite reserve unit, directly transferable among participating countries. Such a unit would be well suited for holding of reserves by relatively advanced countries and would be attractive to them. Supplementary arrangements could be made to provide equivalent resources to other countries. Reserve units, being clearly recognizable as a new element in the monetary system, might be more effective than drawing rights in demonstrating that the world is no longer exclusively dependent upon gold and reserve currencies.

The third broad approach is simply a combination of these two—drawing rights and reserve units. Through drawing rights the monetary system would retain the benefits of familiarity, Fund supervision, and adaptability to use by all qualifying members of the Fund. At the same time, incorporation of reserve units would lay the foundation for more far-reaching innovation. The tentative U.S. proposals, presented recently in the Group of Ten negotiations, fall into the third, or dual, approach.

With any of these approaches, there are a number of important questions.

One important question is the "link to gold" and alternative means for insuring acceptability of a new reserve unit. Clearly, the status of any reserve asset depends upon its acceptability. The "link to gold" refers to proposals that would permit reserve units to be transferred in international settlement only when accompanied by some specific amount of gold. In effect, the reserve unit would not be usable on its own as an independent reserve asset.

The purpose of such a link is psychological, appealing to the point of view which stresses gold rather than other forms of reserves. The link to gold might also reinforce the tendency to hold newly created reserves rather than spend them.

At the same time, reserve creation aims to supplement future new gold supplies, and to dampen excessive preoccupation with gold on the part of private hoarders or even monetary authorities. Many doubts have been raised as to whether the link to gold would further these objectives. If such a link encouraged larger reserve holdings of gold, this would have the doubly bad effect of shrinking world liquidity and promoting an inefficient and destabilizing outflow of gold from the reserve centers.

In our view a new reserve asset should supplement and not displace existing reserves. While existing amounts of official holdings of reserve currencies are not necessarily ideal, the use of new reserve assets merely to replace existing reserves would make no positive contribution and would risk disturbing international financial markets.

A meeting of minds must also be found on the process for deciding how fast reserves should grow. Countries well supplied with reserves may take a more cautious view than others who see their long-run objective as one of building up reserves.

I have sketched only two of the challenging questions on which our negotiators are searching for common ground in this new area. For it should be stressed that the deliberate creation of new reserve assets is a significant development in monetary history. Reserves have developed in the past not by conscious design, but through central bank accumulation of high quality financial assets, with assured liquidity and broad international acceptance. Countries have earned their reserves either by producing gold or by surpluses in their balance of payments.

The present negotiations to agree on planned reserve creation attest to the imagination, patience, and sense of responsibility of the nations concerned. This stage has been made possible by the past years of monetary cooperation through the IMF, the Group of Ten and the Bank for International Settlements. It is not surprising that countries approach this subject with utmost care and deliberation, for they are shaping the principles and procedures that may guide international financial developments for many years to come.

We expect the Group of Ten Deputies to complete the report on their areas of agreement that can be made available to the Ministers and Governors of the Group of Ten countries before the summer of this year. Once sufficient agreement is reached on major points, it will be productive to move on to the next stage of reaching agreement among the broader group of countries. This work must progress if world trade and world economic development are not to be impeded for want of adequate monetary machinery.

In striving to reach balance in our international payments and in seeking with other nations to strengthen the international payments machinery, we recognize that maintaining a balance in our own economy here at home is fundamental.

Indeed, this is true of all the other challenging areas of international initiative, in addition to international monetary affairs, in which our leadership and participation is vital.

And we are taking the initiative this year, as last, to seek assiduously in both quiet and public diplomacy to enlist the cooperation of like-minded nations in bold new efforts.

These efforts encompass the promotion of freer trade by both achieving a significant reduction of duties on a reciprocal basis and removing nontariff barriers. These efforts include new initiatives to make available to needy peoples elsewhere in the world the opportunity, means and incentive for conquering hunger and disease, for living under the liberating light of education, and for developing their own resources.

Last week President Johnson and Prime Minister Gandhi of India set in motion joint government programs in which we hope other nations, private foundations and private industry will share. This multilateral effort is of crucial importance to the viability and progress of a great nation of 500 million people—the second most populous in the world—and a bulwark of democracy in threatened Asia.

The tragedy of mass starvation must be averted as better agricultural techniques and organizations for production and distribution are set in motion. The Indo-American Foundation for Education and Scientific Research is a fitting complement. An undernourished nation or one lacking in adequate skills in this technological age cannot play the role destiny has shaped for it in Asia and the free world.

Of particular interest to bankers, and with meaningful support from organizations such as the American Bankers Association, the United States is joining 31 other nations—including 12 nations outside Asia—in creating this year the Asian Development Bank. This institution is to be chartered and managed on the sound banking principles developed and applied by the World Bank and similar institutions. It seeks to extend to the people of Asia the opportunity to share in the economic abundance and social progress that so many of us in the rest of the world take for granted.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-six is a year in which we hope international financial cooperation will succeed in reducing the inadequacies and obstacles existing in private capital markets in Western Europe. We are hopeful that the slowly progressing studies under the aegis of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development will come to fruition this year in some positive programs. We hope these multilateral programs will attack at last major impediments to larger private capital formation and a freer flow of funds and capital at reasonable costs and interest rates.

We hope for the enactment in our own Congress this year of the Foreign Investors Tax Act designed to remove tax discrimination against foreign investment in the United States. It should promote the flow of foreign capital into our own markets and help, over the long pull, to relieve the burden on our balance of payments that results from an inadequate two-way flow.

But, by all odds, the most challenging area of our international activity in 1966 centers in Vietnam.

It is a crucial test. And we cannot afford to fail. If we do, we shall fail ourselves as well as the people of South Vietnam. If we do, we shall have undermined the faith of all whose freedom depends on us. We shall have undermined the web of alliances on which world peace and security depend and we shall have undermined our own faith in ourselves.

We must live up to our commitment to the defense of freedom. At the same time, we must strive to enlarge and explore every avenue for unified action with our allies in the common defense—for, indeed, to the extent that the allies of freedom cannot unite in its defense, the lesser the chances for peaceful accommodation with those who are so fiercely united against it.

For these reasons neither in Vietnam nor in Paris will we allow foes or friends pursuing nationalist aspirations to push us back in fear or pique to a lack of concern with peace and freedom beyond the two oceans which wash our shores.

All this brings us back to the realization that our ability to discharge our responsibilities for free world leadership will depend on how we act at home in maintaining a strong and dynamic economy; in sustaining a healthy rate of growth with reasonably full employment and relative price stability; and in extending for our own citizens—all races, all creeds, and all age groups—the boundaries of economic opportunity and social justice.

The situation in our economy, as you know, is this: The demands of Vietnam added on to an economy closer to full employment and full utilization of productive capacity than at any time in recent years have increased the dangers of inflation and the need for responsible restraint in both the public and private sectors.

The administration has shifted from a fiscal policy of steady stimulus to private economic demand to a policy of moderate restraint. We are striving for a fiscal 1967 budget that, despite a projected increase of $10.5 billion of special Vietnam expenditures over and above those in the 1966 budget, will show a surplus on the cash basis and closely approach balance on a national income accounts and the regular or administrative basis.

On the revenue side of the President's budget the shift from a policy of stimulus to one of moderate fiscal restraint has already been reflected by the prompt and commendable action of the Congress in enacting the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966—a measure that will raise some $6 billion in Federal revenues over the next 15 months, and will withdraw a total of $2.7 billion from the private spending stream during calendar 1966.

We expect this measure to serve as a growing force for economic restraint over the coming months—together with other restraining influences already beginning to take hold, such as the Federal Reserve action a few months ago and the increase in social security and medicare taxes of $6 billion at annual rates which began to take effect last January.

All of these things have contributed to a significant change in the economic mix.

I did not come here today to discuss whether and when we will need additional tax increases. The arguments on that question have been thoroughly aired in recent weeks, and the President has made his position most clear: The time for decision is not yet at hand, but if it comes he will not hesitate—election year notwithstanding—to ask for tax increases if required.

Evidence of the threat of inflationary pressures is disturbing enough to require that we keep the closest watch on economic and financial developments, exercise all the responsible restraint in both the public and private sectors for which the President has pleaded in the months past, and make ready the way for prompt and prudent action if that is required.

We in the Treasury are continuing our contingency planning in the field of taxation—not only in terms of possible tax increases to pay for additional public expenditures that may be required beyond those already planned or to forestall inflation, but also in terms of possible tax reductions when and if a relaxation of hostilities in Vietnam will mean a reduction in defense expenditures, or the danger of overheating the economy is no longer present.

In the meantime, now that I have received a great deal of advice, private and public, from many of you in this room and your bank economists who, through their excellent bank letters and public addresses, keep me informed as to your and their views, it seems fair play for me to turn the tables and indulge in a few comments concerning your business. Just as you have a proper concern and give advice on the area in which I operate, I have a very real interest in your business.

For it is important that we understand each other on certain points.

First, I recognize that bank borrowing and lending practices are determined by the banks themselves and the monetary and bank supervisory authorities who receive their powers directly from the Congress and not through the President and, hence, are not subject to policy direction by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Second, as previously described actions have indicated, I believe that fiscal policy should play an active role in both stimulating the economy when it is stagnant or lagging and restraining the economy when it is excessively exuberant. There is always room for differences on when these conditions exist to the degree that public action should be undertaken, what type of fiscal action is the most compatible with the national interest, and the pace or extent to which the economy should either be stimulated or restrained by fiscal action. All of my instincts are that either stimulus or restraint should be applied in moderation or in stages except in the direst emergencies. I was not one for pressing the accelerator down to the floor in the expansionary period of the first 5 years of this decade. And, as you well know, since the national decision to enlarge our military activities in Vietnam, I have been urging moderate and responsible restraint in both the public and private sector—preferring to touch the brakes lightly without risking a skid into a recession because I do not believe drastic action is necessary or appropriate.

Third, I have no objection of any kind to using monetary policy as a part of the total economic stabilization arsenal. I have said so repeatedly in responding to inquiries at Congressional hearings.

Fourth, I believe that fiscal and monetary restraints to deal with threats of inflation should work in a coordinated fashion, just as fiscal and monetary policies directed toward expansion have worked together in the past five years.

My objection to the December action of the Federal Reserve System had to do with the fact that I would have preferred to have had that decision delayed until January, until the Administration knew and the Board could know what the budgetary outlook was for the remainder of fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967, so that we could have decided together what combination of fiscal and monetary restraints were appropriate, if there were room for agreement.

I trust that the coordination which had previously existed between our monetary and our fiscal policies has again been reestablished and that instances of disagreement over procedures and timing will in the future be less important. Certainly, the Administration's acceptance of the Federal Reserve's action in December as a fact of life and its incorporation into our budget planning symbolizes that desire for coordination.

As the subsequent shift of fiscal policy in the President's January budget from stimulus to moderate restraint signified, some shift in monetary policy in the nature of a moderation of credit growth was appropriate.

It is important, however, that such moderation as is needed, particularly of bank credit growth, be accomplished without the skyrocketing of interest rates. Raising the price of money should not—and need not—be the only means of determining which applicants get the loans.

When the bigger banks rely only on higher rates as the means for allocating credit among a few large borrowers, this tends to put up the cost of money for everyone.

The better course, in dealing with a credit growth that threatens inflation, is to turn down or scale back the less deserving loan applications.

In this connection, I read with considerable interest, the recent remarks by J. Howard Laeri, vice chairman, First National City Bank of New York, at an American Bankers Association meeting in Chicago. He suggested some voluntary lending guidelines for bankers to follow in curbing loans that would contribute to what he termed "current inflationary credit excesses." He called them "today's six deadly sins of lending." Make up your own list if you don't like Mr. Laeri's.

Mr. Archie K. Davis, chairman of the Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., Winston-Salem, N.C., and the president of the American Bankers Association, also has suggested that it is essential for bankers to weed out less productive and speculative loans.

Banking industry leaders are showing an increasing awareness of the need for making monetary policy effective through their bank lending policies, and are to be commended for moving in this direction.

I would hope, also, that there will be an accompanying disengagement from unreasoning competition for time and savings deposits that ignores the need for caution and the harm that kind of competition can do to our banking and financial system.

Federal debt management also has a role to play in achieving the broad economic objectives which are our mutual concern. This is why, this past February, we took the opportunity while refunding the mid-February maturities, to offer the holders of April, May and August 1966 issues an exchange into a new 4¾-year, 5-percent note.

This move achieved some useful debt extension and lightened significantly the refunding tasks that await us now in May and August.

In taking a broad view of the Treasury debt structure and its economic impact, it may be of some interest to note that while the total Treasury debt today is some $3 billion greater than a year ago, our last reading showed that Treasury debt in the hands of the public was actually down by $1.5 billion over the year. And for those who sometimes look to Government financial policies as the source of undue monetary expansion, I would remind you that commercial bank holdings of Treasury debt are down by $3 billion in the past year. No doubt this decline in bank holdings has made our financing task a mite more difficult and costly, but it has also provided rather striking evidence that our deficit has been financed with genuine savings accumulations.

In rounding out this picture of debt management, I should say a few words also about Federal agency sales of financial assets.

This type of activity is designed to channel more private investment funds into the Federal credit programs, and avoid locking up scarce budgetary resources in a rising aggregate of direct Federal loans. It carries forward a program that received its first strong impetus in the mid-1950's under the Eisenhower administration. The principle of substituting private for public credit, and helping thereby to cut new channels of money-flows in the credit markets, was warmly endorsed subsequently by the Commission on Money and Credit, and by President Kennedy's Committee on Federal Credit Programs, which was chaired by my able predecessor, Douglas Dillon.

In seeking to expand this useful area of partnership between private and public enterprise we are well aware that it would be pointless to attempt to press more on the market than it can readily absorb. That is why we are interested in further developing the techniques for amassing pools of direct loans held by Federal agencies and selling participations in those pools to private investors. This provides an effective, economical means for tapping the resources of the private market to serve broad public purposes.

In making these asset sales programs the success they should be, the Government needs your help and I am here today to ask for it.

After taking account of net sales of federally owned financial assets and direct Federal agency issues, and balancing this against the decline in holdings of Treasury obligations in the hands of the public, we would estimate that the Federal sector will make only a modest net demand for credit on the private economy for this fiscal year—perhaps on the order of $2 or $3 billion. More impressive still, according to current plans, we would expect the Federal sector to make little or no net credit demand on the rest of the economy in fiscal 1967.

While we recognize that monetary and fiscal policies exercised by public authority have important roles to play in containing a buoyant economy, these alone are not enough. There also must be responsible restraint in the private sector, in the many day-to-day decisions affecting prices and wages.

We sometimes hear of particular periods of price increase described as "cost-push" or "demand-pull," with particular remedies supposedly appropriate to one situation or the other. We all know, of course, that, in an economy as complex as ours, both "cost-push" and "demand-pull" forces may be at work, and interacting, at the same time. This means that we need both monetary and fiscal restraints and, alongside them, appropriate wage-price guidelines to serve as yardsticks for keeping wage and price decisions within noninflationary bounds.

Those who would discard the guidelines might do well to consider the alternatives—in terms of price behavior, economic growth, gold outflow, and maintenance of basic economic freedom.

Incidentally, as an aside to some outspoken bank and academic economists, advice on using monetary and fiscal restraint to contain inflation would carry more conviction in certain quarters if it were accompanied by equally vocal support of wage-price guideposts.

In closing, I want to emphasize a very important part of any anti-inflationary effort—our Savings Bond program which is moving forward now with new impetus.

Already the higher rate of 4.15 percent, recently announced by President Johnson, is making its impact on the payroll savings plan throughout industry.

Specifically, top management officials of more companies are actively committed to the plan; many more employees are being introduced to its values; increased allotments are being reported by those already participating in the plan.

And, incidentally, President Johnson has launched a Government-wide payroll savings bond drive that promises to break by a wide margin all previous records of Federal employee participation since World War II.

While it will take some few months yet to determine the effect of the higher interest rate on payroll savings totals—since the Government campaign and many of the corporate campaigns are just getting under way—early indications are that substantial results will be registered.

The bankers of America are our long-time, dedicated allies in the successful promotion of the savings bond program.

I commend bankers everywhere for their support of our program in the past and I solicit their encouragement and cooperation for the need and the effort that lie ahead.

In the Savings Bond program, and in every other part of our national effort to maintain steady balanced growth while meeting vital commitments, we must all—in Government, in banking and finance, in industry and commerce—bear an extra burden of responsibility in the days and months ahead.

WHAT SCHOOL MILK CUTBACK WOULD MEAN TO CALIFORNIA TOWN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on March 1 the administration sent to Congress the so-called Child Nutrition Act of 1966. This legislation would cut the funds presently available for the financing of the special milk program for schoolchildren by 80 percent. The number of children receiving milk under the program would drop from about 25 million to 3 million if the proposal were passed.

I think it is significant that to this date the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 has not been introduced in the Senate. On the other hand legislation I have introduced to expand the present school milk program has been cosponsored by 67 of my Senate colleagues.

An article which appeared in the Vallejo, Calif., News Chronicle shows why Senate support for the present school milk program is overwhelming while support for the administration's proposed cutback is virtually nonexistent. The article is headed "School Cafeterias Face Major Crisis With Funds Slashed."

The piece goes on to say that "spokesmen for the Vallejo Unified School District and the Fairfield School District have indicated that a proposed reduction of Federal aid is threatening the very existence of the cafeteria service." Mr. President, this story will be multiplied across the country a thousandfold if the administration's proposed $82 million cut in the milk program is approved by Congress.

The net result of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 will be a lower rather than a higher nutrition standard for our Nation's schoolchildren. As the News Chronicle article points out, school districts now provide "lunches and milk to all students at low, subsidized prices and cooperate with welfare agencies in giving needy children lunches—and milk—for free or for token payments the family can afford." By trying to redirect the lunch and milk programs to the needy only, through a "means" test, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 may well kill the programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the News Chronicle story be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL CAFETERIAS FACE MAJOR CRISIS WITH FUNDS SLASHED

School cafeterias in Vallejo, Fairfield, and across the Nation are facing a major crisis.

Spokesmen for the Vallejo Unified School District and the Fairfield School District have indicated a proposed reduction of Federal aid is threatening the very existence of the cafeteria service.

President Lyndon B. Johnson has called for a $70 million reduction in the school milk and lunch appropriations this year in addition to the reduction of a 1 cent cash subsidy for lunches and a 10-percent decrease in the milk fund subsidy already in effect.

CUT TOKEN FOODS

Also cut is a program whereby the systems receive donated foods at a token cost.

Mrs. Catherine Harriman, director of school lunches for the VUSD, said the cutback in donated foods has seriously affected her budget. As an example, she noted the district received 90 cases, or 2,700 pounds, of cheese last year at a cost of $1 per case for handling.

She recently placed an order for only 40 cases which will cost the district over $700.

Mrs. Harriman said the district provides lunches and milk to all students at low, subsidized prices and cooperate with welfare agencies in giving needy children lunches for free or for token payments the family can afford.

NONNEEDY HURT

The Federal proposal is to drop subsidies to the nonneedy student and increase assistance to the needy under the poverty program.

Mrs. Harriman and Charles L. Sullivan, superintendent of the Fairfield School District, said the reductions pose a serious threat to cafeteria service and without Federal support the districts cannot continue to provide present service at low cost. All students will be affected by the cut.

The spokesmen suggest parents write their representatives in Washington protesting the proposed cut in cafeteria assistance.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to thank and pay tribute to the Senator from New York for so graciously permitting me to proceed at this time.

WALKING THE RAZOR'S EDGE—A REPORT ON LATIN AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Latin America is on the threshold of a development breakthrough which it can cross—or stumble over—in the next 5 years. The Alliance for Progress—midway in its 10-year lifespan—is within sight of success, yet it could be also within sight of failure.

The future of Latin America is balanced on a razor's edge; that was the lesson brought home to me during my 2-week tour through four key Latin American nations which ended last Sunday.

As a member of the U.S. delegation to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting in Buenos Aires, March 25 to April 1, and as a result of visits before and after the meeting, I was privileged to confer with the Presidents of Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Brazil as well as national government figures, business and labor leaders, students, and educators in each of these countries.

As a result of these conversations and of the discussions at the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting, I should like to report the following observations to the Senate:

First. Whether or not Latin America can successfully walk the razor's edge across the development threshold depends in large part on whether or not civilian, democratically elected governments there can give enough satisfaction in time to the people's demands for economic, social, and political justice to avoid Communist takeovers or the substitution of the military for the civilian authority.

I conclude that they can do so, but that this will require a shift of emphasis to greater measures of self-help and mutual cooperation in multinational projects among the Latin American members of the Alliance, as well as continued and perhaps even more effective support of the Alliance by the United States.

Second. The Castro Communist movement has met with utter failure on the South American Continent. This is not to say that there is not a Communist threat or continuing Castro-sponsored efforts at subversion, because there are. But Castro is no longer a hero and his personality no longer is capable of being a charismatic vehicle for communism.

I feel that Castro's attempt to subvert the governments of Latin America has failed primarily because of the growing strength of the democratic process and because of Castro's own abject failures at home. Although Castro still poses a threat of subversion, he has found that his greatest obstacle is true democracy under law. The strong and prompt reaction throughout the hemisphere against the insolent resolutions of Castro's recent Tri-Continental Conference in Havanna was striking evidence of his bungling arrogance and of the failure of his Cuban model of a Communist state to persuade others that it is the promised land they wish to emulate.

Third. While U.S. involvement in the Dominican Republic did not seem at this time to be a cause of great concern in the capitals I visited, it is a barrier to greater progress in strengthening the OAS as a peacekeeping agency for the Americas. However, I feel that there is now greater awareness among Latin American leaders that only in strengthening the effectiveness and ability of the OAS to act in crises will we be able to prevent a repetition of this kind of occurrence.

Fourth. There is genuine and widespread concern among many elements of the Latin American community over U.S. involvement in Vietnam. This concern, in my judgment, is based on two points: First, that Vietnam involvement might reduce our support of and interest in the Alliance for Progress; and, second, that inflation, induced by Vietnam expenditures, could limit our capability to support our part of the Alliance agreements. I endeavored to give reassurances on that score, speaking, of course, only as one Senator interpreting what I sensed to be U.S. opinion. I said that, in my judgment, most Americans consider the hemisphere to be the home front and that Vietnam has made us even more alert to the importance of the security and progress of Latin America.

On the subject of inflation, I pointed out that, in my judgment, there was a very strong opinion in the United States in favor of a modest tax increase if necessary to head off inflation, and that this demonstrated our determination on that subject.

Fifth. While the economic and social efforts of democratic regimes were encouraging, the fact that a number of Latin American countries still lack constitutional, democratic governments is a cause of real concern. Nine military coups have occurred in Latin America since early 1962, although none in the last 2 years—a fact for which I feel the Alliance deserves some credit. It may be argued convincingly that not every one of these takeovers was necessarily undesirable. This grave question had been raised in Brazil where there was a widespread feeling that a military takeover had been necessary to thwart an imminent threat of seizure of dictatorial power with the connivance and in the interests of international communism. On my trip, I could not see in any country of Latin America a similar threat today of successful subversion by externally orientated forces.

But, whatever the emergency and however transitional may be the entry of the military into the political affairs of some Latin American countries, in their totality such coups are generally a manifestation of continued political instability, and political instability has become increasingly damaging to Latin American economic and social development and to prospects for increased private investment.

I stated in Latin America, and I state now that as a permanent policy, I believe that collective consultation among the members of the Organization of American States should determine whether to defer the establishment of diplomatic relations with, and deny military and economic aid to, any regime brought into power in a member state by the overthrow of a duly elected, constitutional, democratic government. Certainly, such collective action—say, by a two-thirds or even a three-fourths vote—can bring about the earliest commitment for the restoration of constitutional government, for the holding of free elections and for the reapplication of human and civil rights and liberties, within a reasonable time.

We shall have this opportunity to put some such system into effect at the third Special Inter-American Conference which will meet in Buenos Aires in July, to consummate what happened in the Inter-American Economic and Social Council last week, and what happened in Panama with respect to the revision of the OAS Charter. I regret to say that Canada is not participating in those negotiations, because I think Canada ought to be in the Organization of American States as a major trading and political factor in the hemisphere.

My sixth conclusion refers to the private enterprise system, of which I know something about, both as a lawyer and as one deeply interested in business.

Sixth. The private enterprise system dominates the economy of Latin America, and it is, of course, very much in the interests of freedom that this should be the successful economic order there.

It is the salient developing area in the world where private enterprise has an opportunity to make a success in the development of its society. I speak with feeling for that reason, because I think we can do so much there, more than anywhere else in the developing areas of the world, which includes Africa, the Middle East, and Asia.

I have seen, however, disquieting evidence—albeit with some notable exceptions—that a considerable segment of private enterprise in Latin America has not learned the lessons that U.S. private enterprise has learned in the last 35 years.

The primary lesson is that business, to be successful and socially viable must be conducted "in the public interest" and should, as far as practical, be the subject of the broadest practical, mutual ownership through shareholding.

In too many cases in Latin America, I found a lack of understanding of the relationship between reasonable prices and living wages as the base for social stability and increased consumption; and a lack of appreciation of the effect on production and prices of increased competition and the rationalization of production which could come through a common market. I found, too, a lack of awareness that business had a responsibility in respect of housing, education, and health. I found certain built-in opposition to land reform without the offering of responsible alternatives. I found, too, some reluctance to adopt new and necessary techniques, as, for example, in the legislation for mixed business-government accelerated development of Chile's copper resources which has had a hard time being enacted, a fact which has cost Chile at least a year in getting started on this great historic project.

I feel that American business leadership can be of tremendous importance in helping to revise these attitudes of private business in Latin America where they exist, and in helping Latin American business to move toward the essential reforms so urgently required there. This leadership can be manifested through the great business associations which are represented in the Americas and by the leadership and example of the many American firms which have branches, agencies, and affiliates throughout Latin America.

One of the most heartening developments in my judgment, on the Latin American scene is the growth of the Adela Investment Co., which I had the honor to initiate. It is already becoming a potent force in the private sector toward the attainment of the goals of Latin American economic integration. It is making a great contribution to strengthening private enterprise in Latin America and its capability of serving the people. In operation little over 1 year, Adela has already approved $22 million in equity investments in 27 companies in 13 Latin American countries. This investment is estimated to have generated $100 million in new investment for needed production and employment. I hope to assist Adela in expanding its resources and in strengthening its role as an enlightened progressive force in the Latin American business community.

U.S. business could well be inspired by the job which is being done by the AFL-CIO in the training of trade union leadership through the American Institute for Free Labor Development—AIFLD—program.

Some of the most inspiring moments I had on this trip were spent with training classes in Buenos Aires and São Paulo where national trade union leaders were studying. Similarly, I also had inspiring moments with the progressive business leaders who are represented among the private business communities in each of the countries which I visited.

Seventh. The Alliance for Progress, in the first half of its life, has been successful in defusing many explosive situations in many Latin American nations. In this way, it must certainly be regarded as a success. These gains, however, do not represent yet the breakthrough necessary to satisfy the growing and just demands of the peoples of the Americas; they do not yet represent the breakthrough now possible in terms of the resources, technology, and techniques available in the Western World.

It is understandable that during the first 5 years of the Alliance, political problems and the problems of getting started should have placed greater emphasis on external aid by us. This phase is now properly at an end. I am confident that U.S. aid will continue on the same order of magnitude as heretofore. But self-help should be the keynote of the second 5 years. I gave my audiences my interpretation of the feeling of the people of the United States on this matter. I said that I personally was convinced that the American people will determine the extent of their support of the Alliance by the success of self-help efforts in Latin America.

A group of students in São Paulo questioned me closely on this topic and I said that the United States has no desire to pay the bills for social welfare programs which should be supported through the governments, by the propertied and business people of Latin America. Of course, we cannot tell—nor do we have any desire to tell—any nation what form its government should take, so long as it is free. But we do have the right to expect that governments with which we propose to be associated or which we propose to help, should secure social and economic justice, free expression, and self-determination for their own people. In short, we have a right to say "Let us hope that you're going to do the maximum to help yourself as we have tried to help you."

The multinational approach to self-help has been a subject of discussion and statements at inter-American conferences for many years without substantial results. I would therefore urge that before the end of this year a summit conference of Latin American presidents be convened not only for the purpose of considering these problems, but to make basic decisions in several fields which I consider to be essential to meaningful progress in accelerated Latin American development. Indeed, I am glad to say, at the Buenos Aires meeting, Argentina already offered just such a proposal. Among the key subjects that should be discussed are the following:

First. The formation of an inter-American communications system utilizing communications satellites. Such a system would represent a dramatic breakthrough not only in the field of telephone and telex communication between North and South America and among participating South American countries, but also in the field of television. There is already widespread interest in the establishment of such a system among leaders of the countries I have visited, particularly as a means to improve two-way contact between the peoples of the United States and Latin America through the televising of educational sports, cultural and political events in our respective countries, and as a means to tap the enormous resources of colleges and universities for aiding economic and social development.

The establishment of such a satellite communication system is technically within our grasp. By the fall of this year, NASA will put into orbit a communications satellite in support of the Apollo program which will have the capability of television transmission between North and South America. By the end of next year the Communications Satellite Corp. will have so-called global satellites which will have capability for simultaneous telephone, telex, and television transmission not only between North and South America but over Europe and Japan.

The decision must now be made at the highest level to establish this inter-American communications system at the earliest opportunity with the close cooperation and support of the private sector in Latin America and the United States.

Second. The development of hydroelectric power through multinational projects including reclamation, flood control, and irrigation. This multinational effort is particularly applicable to the interior of South America—the most underdeveloped area—touching Brazil, Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay, Colombia, and Venezuela. I found great interest on the part of President Belaunde of Peru, President Frei of Chile, and President Astello Branco of Brazil, in such projects.

A beginning has already been made in this area. Let me cite some examples:

Paraguay, Brazil, and Argentina are involved in a small joint hydroelectric power venture—the Acaray project; construction has already started on this project and which upon completion will generate 40,000 kilowatts of electricity. Yet it will double the power available in Paraguay and will provide much needed electrical power in a neighboring region of Argentina. The project costs $25 million and is being financed from loans from the Inter-American Bank and European private sources.

Brazil and Paraguay have under serious consideration a 10 million kilowatt hydroelectric project on the Parana River, which forms a border between the two countries. If constructed, this would be the largest hydroelectric project of the world, costing in excess of $1 billion. Another project with great potential benefit for Peru and surrounding countries is the Pampas de Olmos project. This project has great importance to Peru as a means to irrigate large tracts of agricultural land and to produce 120,000 kilowatts of electricity. The estimated cost of this project is $180 million. Feasibility studies financed by the United Nations Special Fund and the Peruvian Government are scheduled for completion by the end of this month.

In addition to a communication system through satellites and multinational power projects, there are still a number of things which can be done, which a Latin American Presidents' Conference should consider.

Third. The development of transportation with multinational impact. The Inter-American Bank has recently approved a $25.5 million loan to construct a road between Asuncion, Paraguay, and the Port of Paranagua in Brazil, and to improve the port itself. The Inter-American Bank has also under consideration a loan application for construction of a road through the Andes to improve a major artery between Valparaiso, Chile, and Buenos Aires.

These are but examples of projects that could be handled multinationally—which should be handled multinationally—to give Latin American economic integration real meaning.

Fourth. The expansion of an inter-American fund for feasibility studies of multinational projects. The President of the Inter-American Bank, the Chairman of CIAP—the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress—and the Secretary-General of the OAS, have already made proposals along these lines. It is my understanding that this will be on the agenda of the forthcoming meeting of the Board of Governors of the Inter-American Bank between April 25 to 29 in Mexico City.

President Johnson last August, and again in his foreign aid message last January, indicated U.S. support of such a fund, and Assistant Secretary Lincoln Gordon underscored U.S. support for this fund at the IA-ECOSOC Conference last week. It is my understanding that between $40 and $50 million will be needed initially. The money will be contributed by the Bank, by the United States, and hopefully, by European sources. In view of the critical importance of this fund in furthering the progress of economic integration, I believe that the United States and other developed countries should provide whatever assistance is necessary to make this project for multinational planning for multinational projects in Latin America effective.

The fifth and final conclusion relates to the transformation of the 10-country Latin American Free Trade Association into a Latin American Common Market. The idea of such a market is a logical and necessary sequel to these multinational projects, which I have described.

It is becoming more evident each day that the resolution of Latin America's economic problems can best be effected within the framework of a genuine Latin American Common Market, within which goods, persons, and capital can move more freely. With the emergence of a common external tariff, and a phased, across-the-board reduction of tariffs on intraregional trade, there would emerge in such an arrangement a mass market of 220 million people with a combined annual gross national product of between $70 and $80 billion, $18 billion in annual foreign trade, and $2.5 billion in gold and foreign exchange reserves.

While a Latin American Common Market was endorsed by the Rio Conference of Foreign Ministers last November, there is little indication that either the governments or the business community in Latin America is prepared to make the necessary decisions that would bring about the creation of such a market in the foreseeable future. The decision, therefore, must be made at the highest political level. That is why I refer to it as an urgent matter for inclusion on the agenda of a summit meeting of the presidents of the countries of Latin America.

In this connection, a major question that I met with on this trip was why the United States does not give tariff preferences to Latin American commodities like the EEC does to the former African territories of its members. I pointed out that the United States is fighting for more liberal and not more restrictive world trade and that it was much better for Latin America to free the markets of Europe than to restrict the markets of the United States. I also pointed out that the creation of a Latin American Common Market could form the basis for a hemispheric free trade area for at least raw materials from Latin America which would fit into the framework of liberalized world trade and the rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Both the Panama Conference and the Inter-American Economic and Social Council session in Buenos Aires have now been concluded with disappointing results. It is essential that we do not slacken our efforts to find a new basis for reaching agreement with our neighbors to the South and that we do not lose sight of the fact that we need each other. What I have endeavored to do in this report is to state—on the basis of my personal observations—what needs to be done.

Mr. President, I repeat what I said at the very outset: Latin America is the "home front" for the United States and offers enormous opportunities. It can be the first underdeveloped region of the world to break through to development.

Mexico's example demonstrates that such a breakthrough can be achieved. To do it will take heroic effort and hard decisions by the Latin American nations themselves, especially by the business community of Latin America in cooperation with the continued efforts, interest, good will, resources, and friendship of the United States and of the business community here.

I have uttered these words in the hope that they will have been uttered in time to bring about these most desirable results. Of course, I shall not stop here but shall, as I have been continuously, be working on projects with great specificity in an effort to forward the objectives of our Nation in respect to the whole Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three of the speeches I made on this trip as well as several articles and an editorial relating to last week's Panama Conference and the meetings of the Inter-American Economic and Social

Council in Buenos Aires be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DRAMATIC PROGRESS NOW POSSIBLE IN LATIN AMERICA

(Note.—The following are the remarks of Senator Jacob K. Javits, prepared for delivery at a luncheon of the Conaprope (Comite Norteamericano Pro Peru), Lima, Peru, Mar. 22, 1966.)

The forthcoming conference of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council in Buenos Aires could be one of the most important in recent experience. It will demonstrate whether or not you in Latin America or we in the United States have the will and the foresight and the imagination to use the tools, the resources, and the scientific knowledge now available to solve a number of extremely difficult economic and social probems facing the Americas today.

The new status given to the IA-ECOSOC—the Second Special Inter-American Council in Rio proposed that it be given rank equal to that of the OAS Council—symbolizes the recognition by the American States that the economic problems of the Americas must be dealt with on an urgent and high priority basis. The many gains made by Latin American countries in social and economic reforms—through the Latin American Free Trade Association and the Central American Common Market, through the Inter-American Bank, CIAP, and the Alliance for Progress—is proof that we feel this sense of urgency.

In my judgment, however, these gains do not represent the breakthrough necessary to satisfy the growing and just demands of the peoples of the Americas; they do not represent the breakthrough now possible in terms of the resources, technology and techniques available in the Western World.

What we need is dramatic and measurable progress in the fields of economic integration, food production, housing, population control, private sector development, and debt servicing.

These are great and basic problems, as you know only too well. I do not claim that solutions are easily found. I do insist, however, that these problems must and can be met and in the near term.

Accordingly, I would like to suggest a few practical steps that could be taken currently:

1. ECONOMIC INTEGRATION

Progress toward effective economic integration of Latin America remains disheartening. Even though intra-LAFTA trade has grown roughly 85 percent, it represented only 13.5 percent of member trade in 1965. While trade among members of the Central American Common Market has risen sharply in the last 5 years, it still totals only 16 percent of the region's total trade. Both LAFTA and the Central American Common Market have built-in limitations which, in my judgment, can only be overcome by the creation of a common market embracing all Latin American nations. Only such a common market would have the necessary size and organizational mechanisms to deal with the hemisphere's economic problems effectively.

I have proposed the formation of an action committee, modeled after Jean Monnet's Action Committee for the United States of Europe, as a means to rally strong political support behind the formation of a Latin American Common Market. I would like to renew that proposal as I believe the present situation would make such a committee even more effective.

A Latin American Common Market is not in existence today because the idea has not received widespread political support at the highest levels or among the people.

I believe that an action committee composed of leaders of democratic inter-American private and public institutions, capable of mobilizing public opinion and agreed on the necessity of a Latin American Common Market, should now be formed to agree on an immediate plan of action. I urge that a meeting of such a committee be held this year, possibly at the same time as the Third Special Inter-American Conference.

Such a committee should include the Secretary General of the OAS, the Secretary General of the Economic Commission for Latin America, the Chairman of CIAP, the President of the Inter-American Bank, the chief executive officers of LAFTA and the Central American Common Market, the president of CICYP, the president of the Inter-American Press Association, the Inter-American Radio Broadcasting Association and leading labor leaders of the Americas. And, very importantly, it should include, among others, such Latin American personalities as Lleras Camargo, Galo Plaza, Romulo Betancourt, Jorge Alessandri, and the Secretary General of the Latin American Parliament.

2. FOOD PRODUCTION

Latin America will face a major crisis within a decade, for while food production rose 16 percent in the last 5 years, it barely kept pace with population growth. As a result, Latin American countries have to spend millions of dollars on food imports each year in addition to millions of dollars worth of food provided by the United States under Food for Peace. In comparison to what is needed the $112 million in loans and grants extended through U.S. aid for food and agricultural development in fiscal year 1965, the $111 million spent by the IADB and the funds devoted by Latin American governments to speed agricultural development are, of course welcome, but not adequate. This suggests the need (a) to give top priority to agricultural development in the Alliance for Progress; (b) for the early implementation of President Johnson's proposal for a "common market" for the production and marketing of fertilizers, pesticides, and other products required to increase agricultural production; and (c) for Latin American governments to take the internal steps—in such areas as infrastructure investment, reforms, credit—that will create a rate of food production that will fully satisfy Latin America's consumption needs.

3. HOUSING

According to the estimates of the Inter-American Development Bank, the total housing deficit in Latin America today is between 15 and 19 million housing units, and 1.5 million units at a cost of $4.5 billion must be built each year just to meet the needs of new families. In contrast not more than 400,000 to 500,000 new housing units are now being built. The total investment in housing, by Latin American governments and by the Alianza since 1961 has been about $1 billion.

The $900 million now available to the Fund for Special Operation to finance social development projects by the IADB should, in part, be made available to develop new institutions such as cooperatives and savings and loan associations to finance additional housing of all types. U.S. private investment should now take full advantage of the broadening of our Latin American housing guarantee program which makes possible $400 million in new investment in housing and in credit institutions that finance housing. New housing legislation enacted in 1965 will also enable savings and loan associations in the United States to invest up to 1 percent of their assets—as much as $1.2 billion—in housing for Latin America, over and above the housing financed by 122 savings and loan associations already established in Latin America.

I would also like to see the Congress of the United States establish an International Home Loan Bank, a private institution, to channel additional "seed capital" from the U.S. savings and loan associations to similar institutions in Latin America and other developing nations as yet another way to help Latin America in its effort to create adequate housing for its people.

4. POPULATION CONTROL

The population of Latin America will increase from the present 220 million to 600 million by the year 2000 at the current rate, and this alone could wipe out all other economic and social gains.

The principal effort in this area must be made only by the Latin American Governments themselves. There must be a decision, and soon, that the best knowledge available anywhere will be brought to bear on this problem if the gains made in the past 5 years are to be preserved and pressed forward in a meaningful way. I readily admit that the support provided by my own country in this area has been very limited—$800,000 in the last fiscal year (1965). This year it may rise to $2 million. As indicated in President Johnson's recent message to Congress on international health earlier this year, we are prepared to do more.

5. PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT

While much progress has been made, many more businessmen in Latin America must assume the social and economic obligations now widely accepted in the industrialized world, and many more governments must create the climate and the incentives that will mobilize capital resources and human skills to attain the goals of society.

The Latin American nations must find means for improving the climate for private enterprise and initiative while at the same time providing for social justice. These ends are completely compatible. It can be achieved by governments accepting private enterprise as a full partner—sharing the responsibilities as well as the benefits of progress—and by private enterprise cooperating with governments in achieving their common goals.

The private sector should utilize its very considerable influence to support steps leading toward the establishment of a Latin American Common Market. It should be receptive to domestic as well as foreign private investment and willing to face competition while supporting progressive public and private economic policies.

Through the ADELA Investment Company and the Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production (CICYP), the private sector of the Americas is assuming great responsibilities toward the attainment of these goals. Through its investments, ADELA—which I helped to originate—has already attained one of its goals; to increase the confidence of foreign and Latin American investors in the future of Latin American private enterprise. ADELA has approved $22 million investments in 18 new companies and 9 existing ones in 13 Latin American countries. It will continue to exert useful influence by improving the investment climate in Latin America, by attracting ever-increasing amounts of foreign capital to Latin America and by acting as a catalyst for creating new and productive Latin American enterprises.

CICYP is focusing business attention on the key problems facing Latin America and is becoming the voice of modern business in inter-American councils. CICYP only recently set up an Action Committee to speed Latin American economic integration, which is now developing a program. It has also set up a special committee on relations with inter-American agencies and to represent CICYP at inter-American and international conferences. CICYP has made impressive progress and it must continue to do so to become an effective spokesman for progressive business in the Americas.

6. DEBT SERVICING

Even though foreign aid commitments—public and private—from all industrialized nations to Latin America increased from a level of $600 million in 1960 to $2 billion in 1965, Latin American nations paid out more than $1.5 billion last year alone to service their foreign debt—almost four times higher than 10 years ago.

In addition to refinancing this debt and lengthening the maturities of loans granted to Latin America, the industrialized nations should forge substantial new means to provide foreign exchange to developing nations. They should, for example, act on a plan drafted by the World Bank last December which would call for an annual fund of $300 million for supplementary financing of development plans for countries hit by unexpected drops in export earnings.

Industrialized nations should also provide new sources of foreign exchange by taking account of the needs of developing nations in revising the international monetary system. According to an estimate made by the London Economist last September, if the foreign exchange receipts of Latin American countries were increased by between 3 and 5 percent of their gross national products—by between $2 to $3 billion a year—in addition to current aid, through the various plans now being proposed, Latin American countries could reach Mexico's level of development in the foreseeable future.

I have stressed the problems which we must face together. Some of them might be a decade away from solution. But the decisions must be made now to deal with them as the resources, the necessary techniques and the technology, are within our grasp now.

But in my view, the most important thing to realize is that the Americas are now so closely linked so as to have a common destiny. I hope you will accept everything I have said here today in the spirit of a call to realize that common destiny to secure the peace and freedom and to establish a state of well-being for the peoples of all the Americas.

HEMISPHERIC PEACE AND SECURITY: A COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY

(NOTE.—The following are the remarks of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS prepared for delivery at a dinner meeting of the Inter-American Council for Commerce and Production (CI CYP), Santigo, Chile, March 25, 1966 and released in Santiago and Washington.)

The course of interhemisphere relations never runs as smoothly as we would like. The goals and aims of the inter-American system are clear, but we still have not found the way to guarantee the achievement of collective responsibility and collective action for the accelerated development of the hemisphere in a progressive democratic framework, in peace and free of the dangers of subversion.

The Second Special Inter-American Conference in Rio last November demonstrated that the Organization of American States is aware of the fact that despite this mutuality of interest, the problems of political and military stability in the hemisphere have not yet been resolved satisfactorily. "The Act of Rio De Janerio" specifically calls for strengthening the structure of the Organization of American States to attain fully the firm guarantees of peace and security. For while great strides have been made already toward the economic and social development of Latin America—and with renewed dedication we can anticipate greater gains—the military and political aspects of Latin American life have not kept pace with the social and economic prospects.

A special committee, composed of the representatives of each of the member nations, has been entrusted with the vital task of preparing amendments to the Charter of the OAS which will "forge a new dimension for the inter-American system * * * avoid duplication of efforts and conflicts of jurisdiction in order to facilitate cooperation and obtain a more rational utilization of the resources of the OAS." This committee is meeting in Panama and will refer its recommendations to the member nations for consideration at a Third Special Inter-American Conference in Buenos Aires next July. These amendments will also include additional standards for hemispheric cooperation in economic, social, and cultural affairs.

What is accomplished in Buenos Aires next July will determine the future course of hemispheric relations. For that reason I shall speak frankly and candidly on what must be done to improve the authority and capability of the inter-American system to accelerate the social and economic development of Latin America and to preserve and strengthen free democratic institutions. Moreover, the OAS must be empowered to maintain a common defense against aggression and subversion, within the Americas, including efforts to subvert free institutions by infiltration and other forms of interference in the internal affairs of any nation in the Americas.

Agreement on the methods and procedures of collective action for hemispheric security against subversion will not be easy to achieve. But unless the drafters in Panama accept basic truths, agreement will be impossible. These truths are just as valid to your country as they are to mine:

1. If we are to be equal partners, there must be equal participation in the great decisions of the hemisphere—political, economic, social, and military. This means that what happened in Santo Domingo should not happen again. The justification of the unilateral action by the United States will be argued for sometime, but what is important for the future of this partnership is the understanding of why the United States, however reluctantly, came to believe that immediate action was imperative. The fact is that the United States felt it acted to fill a power vacuum into which the OAS was not prepared to move—in time. Rather than debate the issues, it is now more constructive to find means to deal with such situations which could occur in the future. Collective responsibility and collective action for the security of the hemisphere is the real alternative to unilateral action.

2. Another basic and unfortunate truth in hemispheric relations is the tendency for "differences" to degenerate into "conflicts." In this regard, the United States has, at times made the mistake of equating change with upheaval. On the other hand, Latin American countries have often been overly fearful of making necessary or desirable adjustments to the United States on the grounds that any adjustment will appear as concessions to "Yankee imperialism." Domestic politics are used thereby as an excuse not to negotiate. The early stages in the United States-Panamanian negotiations concerning the Canal Zone are an example of both dynamics; the later solid results show what is the true situation.

The result of this tendency is a refusal to face problems; a refusal to come to grips with real issues. Instead, whipping boys are substituted for action. Latin American political parties compete with one another in the vehemence of anti-American slogans. The United States, in turn, makes the mistake of confusing opposition and assertions of independence with Communist influence. In order to make genuinely cooperative progress in this hemisphere, all the nations of the hemisphere must stop lighting ideological bonfires. Mature and responsible relations require at least the cessation of namecalling.

3. Another truth is the number of Latin American countries that still lack constitutional, democratic governments. Nine military coups have occurred in Latin America since early 1962. It may be argued very convincingly that not all of these takeovers were necessarily undesirable. But it may be argued with equal persuasiveness that however transitional may be the entry of the military into the political affairs of some Latin countries, in their totality these coups are a manifestation of continued political instability which has become increasingly damaging to Latin America's development and should therefore cause great hemispheric concern.

The question is what can be done—a question which, incidentally, has taxed some of the best minds of the hemisphere for decades. Again, collective consultation must determine the policy whether to defer the establishment of diplomatic relations with, and deny military and economic aid to, any regime brought into power in a member state by the unconstitutional overthrow of a duly-elected, constitutional, democratic government. Such collective action can bring about a commitment for the restoration of constitutional government, for the holding of free elections, and for the reapplication of human and civil rights and liberties, within a reasonable time. Although the OAS is constituted so as to be able to take such action, its methods are often cumbersome and slow. It does not provide a sure procedure whereby the members of the OAS, through the mechanism of coordinated opposition, could protect democratic government from overhasty, unconstitutional takeover and assist in the restoration of democratic government where it has been toppled.

4. The economic development of Latin America continues to be a major concern to the nations of the hemisphere. We have witnessed during the past 4 years significant forward movement, progress, and change. Nevertheless, progress toward true economic integration and the harmonization of economic policies has not been satisfactory. Moreover, there is a real danger that if the momentum is not increased—or if it is permitted to run down—these initial gains may well be dissipated with the most damaging consequences to the future of freedom and well-being in Latin America. The Special Committee meeting in Panama would be well advised to consider the effects of this in terms of the political security of the region.

This would be the time for all American nations to reaffirm their opposition to both Communist and ultra-rightist subversion or efforts to seize power, to reaffirm their support of democratic and progressive governments and finally to reaffirm their confidence in the Alliance for Progress as the framework for nonviolent, but accelerated social and economic development. This reaffirmation, on the eve of a revision of the charter, will be the first step toward perfecting and strengthening the inter-American system. I also urge that additional steps be taken:

First. The representatives to the Council of the Organization of American States in Washington should be vested with authority equal to that held by ambassadors to the United Nations. This would allow the representatives to the Council to act with greater authority and dispatch without being forced into inaction while they seek instructions from their respective capitals;

Second. Improved procedures for prompt OAS handling of emergencies should be established;

Third. A representative of the OAS should be posted as an observer in each of the capitals of the American states;

Fourth. Serious efforts should be made to bring Canada into the inter-American system, to give completeness to hemispheric action and to provide an added measure of confidence in the system. In trade, national power, and world responsibility, Canada belongs in the inter-American system, which is not complete without it.

It should be clear that I am a strong supporter of multilateral action in the economic, social, military, and political aspects of our inter-American system. Collective action in all of these areas will be more than the sum of the parts—success in one area will affect other areas; but unanimity is not a necessary precondition; a majority or a two-thirds vote can do what is needed. But collective action will create a sense of collective responsibility and lead to collective decision. This is the only sensible course for the Americas. Only in this way can we move onto a new and ever more satisfying level of cooperation and alliance for dignity, self-determination, friendship, true progress, and peace.

We shall await the proposed amendments to the charter which will be drawn up by the Special Committee in Panama. If they truly strengthen the inter-American system, I am confident they will have the support of every member nation in the words of the Act of Rio de Janeiro:

"As the most expressive manifestation of the will of the American states in that which relates to firm guarantees of peace and security in the hemisphere, to the rule of the principles of law, both internally and in their foreign relations, and to the economic and social development of the people of the hemisphere."

CLOSING THE COMMUNICATION GAP

(NOTE.—The following are the remarks of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, prepared for delivery before a luncheon meeting of the American Chamber of Commerce in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and released in Buenos Aires and Washington, March 28, 1966.)

There is much truth to the claim of Latin Americans that they are "not really understood" by their neighbors in the north. And there is just as much truth to the claim of my countrymen that they are "not really understood" by their neighbors to the south.

It seems incongruous in this age of space miracles, laser beams and instantaneous, transoceanic conversations that this sort of communications gap exists between the people of North and South America. But it does.

Closing this gap—this barrier to meaningful understanding—is one of the most urgent tasks we have in strengthening the inter-American system. In my opinion, modern technology has given us the means to accomplish this. It is up to the leaders of both continents to see to it that it is accomplished.

For, even though there has been an increase in press coverage of vital developments in the Americas in recent years, the North American public certainly does not have access to the steady flow of information concerning the nations of South America, their leaders, and their outstanding cultural achievements. It is especially evident that most of my countrymen are not aware of the tremendous industrial progress that has been made in certain Latin American countries.

And this same situation seems to exist in Latin America, where there appears to be a grave lack of understanding of life and attitudes in the United States, of the current trends in our social and economic life and particularly of U.S. policies and attitudes toward Latin America.

Consequently, there is a tendency in hemispheric relations for "differences" to degenerate into "conflicts." In this regard, the United States has, at times, made the mistake of equating change with upheaval. On the other hand, Latin American countries have often been overly fearful of making necessary or desirable adjustments to the United States on the grounds that any adjustment will appear as a concession to "Yankee imperialism." The early stages in United States-Panamanian negotiations concerning the Canal Zone are an example of both dynamics; the later solid results show what is the true situation.

In my judgment there is a way—now readily available—to help give Latin America a much more accurate picture of North American life than it now receives through old Hollywood movies and television westerns. There is a way to help give my countrymen a more accurate picture of our neighbors to the south than is now presented in old films or television commercials.

As a major contribution to a solution to this problem, I suggest the establishment of an inter-American television system, making use of the present television facilities in both the United States and Latin America, but utilizing communications satellites for transmission between the continents.

I would be the first to admit that establishment of such a system would be difficult and expensive, but it would be worth the effort, and most importantly, it is now technologically feasible.

The launching of the Telstar satellite in July 1962, announced the beginning of television's space age. Since then, we have seen the wonders of Telstar, Relay, and Syncom take hold. Millions of viewers in Europe witnessed the agony of the people of the United States in November 1963 as they mourned the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Later, millions of my countrymen witnessed the funeral of Sir Winston Churchill. And in this same period, millions on both sides of the Atlantic had a front-row seat at the Olympic Games in Tokyo and Innsbruck and watched as Pope Paul VI made his historic visit to New York and the United Nations.

These events, seen simultaneously by peoples in many parts of the world, certainly aided international understanding. It is my belief that a similar satellite communications setup would also increase understanding among the peoples of North and South America.

Television is available in most of Latin America's major cities, much of it is in the private sector, some of it is owned jointly by governments and private business, and some by government alone. Last year there were over 211 TV transmitters in operation in Latin America, and close to 9 million receivers were in use, with an estimated audience of almost 40 million.

The Early Bird satellite now in operation is usable only for directional transmission between North America and Europe. However, in September or October of this year, two more satellites will be launched by the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, mainly as a communications support vehicle for the Apollo program. However, these satellites will cover communication between North and South America. They can be made available for television although, until the next generation of satellites are launched at the end of 1967, TV transmission must be shared with telephone transmission. However, even this situation will be improved by the end of 1967, when the so-called "global satellites" are to be launched. Then simultaneous television and telephone transmission will be possible, meaning that by the fall of 1967, the U.S. Communications Satellite Corporation will have in operation a satellite system that would make such an inter-American television system technically feasible.

As you know, two international agreements were signed in August 1964 among 48 nations including the United States and Canada and five Latin American nations: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela. These agreements joined Comsat and the communications entities in other nations in a venture for a single global satellite system.

But more importantly, under these agreements, each participating country shares in financing and owning the space segments in the future global system. Of course it also includes the current Early Bird satellite. These so-called segments consist mainly of the satellites themselves, tracking, control and related facilities, but not the ground stations that are needed to receive communication through the satellite. In turn, participating countries benefit from revenues derived from their ownership or investment quota. The formal name of the partnership established through these agreements is the International Telecommunications Satellite consortium or Intelsat. It is important to note that the global system will be available to any country which desires to use it, regardless of whether or not it is a signatory to the agreements, by paying a fee for the use of circuits on the satellites.

My reason for mentioning the international arrangements is to indicate that the incentive to utilize this truly advanced means of communication is right there. By owning portions of the system through Intelsat, the five Latin American countries which are already members can within a brief period establish TV connection with each other and with the United States.

In all this, there is a built-in guarantee that each recipient nation will have the option to decide how and by whom its television facilities are to be owned and operated.

The critical element in establishing an inter-American TV system would be the construction of the ground stations necessary to receive signals transmitted by satellites. I am told that within the next 2 years, Brazil, Colombia, Argentina, Chile and Venezuela will definitely build such ground stations. I understand that these countries are vitally interested in using the satellite system, not only for telephone communications, but also for television.

The cost of each of these ground stations is between $4.5 and $6 million. But I believe that once the significance of such a satellite system is clearly grasped, financing of such ground stations would not be difficult to obtain. I think it is well to note that the Inter-American Development Bank is already doing a survey of existing communications facilities in Latin America, assessing the feasibility of ground stations within the capabilities and requirements of various countries. It should be completed in 6 months.

Let me give you some idea of what it would cost to set up such a system. Let me use as an example the five countries that already have expressed serious interest in building ground stations. The cost of constructing these stations would run about $25 million. It would cost another $8.5 million for the satellite and to launch the missile to put it into orbit.

The cost of developing a basic program, including cultural, educational, sports and entertainment programing, would cost an additional $20 million. In other words, it would be possible with an investment of no more than $54 million to begin an inter-American television system. The cost could very easily be shared between the private sector and the Government in the United States, and similar interests in Latin America.

Of course, all the modern technology and all the money in the world will not be able to close the North and South American communications gap 1 inch without the best in programing. I urge the establishment of a committee of representatives from the five Latin American countries already involved and Comsat in the United States to begin now to develop the necessary program. Other Latin American countries would also be invited to join.

Of course, such instantaneous satellite transmission will be a boon to TV news organizations on both continents. But there is much more that could be done in covering sporting, cultural, and political events, for example. And why should Latin American statesmen be excluded from the television "Town Meetings of the World" that have recently come into vogue, using political figures of Europe and North America? They should not, of course, and I'm sure they will not when the inter-American television system is established.

And I hope that the Committee I have suggested would not forget to find a place for the more specialized uses of satellite television that could be of the greatest assistance in breaking the communications barrier. I mean, of course, education, medicine and conferences of political, scientific and business leaders of the two continents.

I regret to say that the U.S. aid program, because of competing priorities, has not placed major emphasis in Latin America on the development of this communications media, which, in addition to its value as a tool to increase understanding among our peoples, is an excellent means to reduce adult illiteracy, spread new knowledge among farmers, and to become a major educational tool. I understand that we are supporting the development of educational TV in several countries, including Colombia, Peru, and Jamaica through AID and the Peace Corps, but only to a limited degree.

I would urge both governments and private TV interests on both continents to join this effort to establish an inter-American television system.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1965]

Action Plan Is Set by Latin Alliance—23 Technical Points Listed To Implement Programs

(By Juan de Onis)

Buenos Aires.—The Inter-American Economic and Social Council, the policymaking body for the Alliance for Progress, adopted today an "immediate action program" of 23 points to make the project more effective.

The program is designed to overcome weak spots in execution discovered over the last 5 years.

The Alliance for Progress, an inter-American effort to accelerate economic and social development of Latin America, was proposed by President Kennedy in 1961. It calls for a mobilization of local and foreign capital and basic technical assistance to give this area self-sustained economic growth. The United States pledged $20 billion in foreign capital for the first decade of the cooperative effort.

COVERS BROAD AREAS

The adopted action program is essentially technical. It covers measures from increasing local taxes and savings to agrarian reform, export promotion, regional integration, vocational training, and improved health services.

During the 1-week conference reviewing the Alliance for Progress at the midpoint in its first decade, the United States and Latin American positions have been at odds on trade cooperation and the forms taken by aid provided by the United States and international agencies.

The action program reflected the standoff reached on these issues. The United States agreed only to work for international commodity price-stabilizing agreements, without preferences for Latin America, and no mention was made of Latin American appeals that the United States relax requirements that dollar aid be used to buy U.S. goods and services, a measure designed to relieve balance-of-payments problems.

The agreement provides for the first time a detailed checklist of measures that each participating country should adopt, in the opinion of the development experts here, to satisfy Alliance for Progress standards of economic and social growth.

The list is to be used by the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress in its annual review of country performances under the alliance. This serves as the basis for obtaining foreign financing for national development programs.

AGRARIAN REFORM BACKED

The United States gave strong political support today to Latin American governments trying to push through agrarian reform programs against the opposition of conservative landowners.

Lincoln Gordon, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, voted for a resolution supporting expropriation of large, unproductive estates, with the land to be distributed to small farmers and the former owners to get deferred payment. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

The resolution called on each country requiring agrarian reform to assign greater resources to the program and urged international financing institutions to cooperate with "more agility" in technical studies and financing of agrarian reform.

The United States also succeeded in an economy move to pare the costs of the expensive central bureaucracy of the Alliance for Progress program.

By the minimum margin of 11 votes, the delegates eliminated 4 members of the so-called 9 wise men, or panel of experts the members, each of whom receives an annual tax-free salary of $30,000, evaluate national development programs presented for financing to the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress.

The annual budget for the panel has been running at close to $1 million a year. It has evaluated nine national plans in the last 2 years, in addition to doing other studies.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 2, 1966]

OAS Talks End; Aid Issue Snagged—Extent of U.S. Contractual Obligation Unresolved

(By Henry Giniger)

Panama.—A conference called to draft changes in the Charter of the Organization of American States ended today with the major question unresolved.

The question was how far the United States had in effect a contractual obligation to help Latin America economically. Nineteen Latin American countries pushed through a sweeping 21-article document setting forth economic and social norms that they said ought to govern relations in the Western Hemisphere.

Surprised by the united Latin American effort to tie the United States down by treaty to specific forms of help in such fields as trade and credits, Washington belatedly produced a shorter and much more general document.

Both documents will go to the permanent Council of the OAS in Washington and then to the governments for negotiation. An effort at reconciling the two positions will have to be made before the final drafting session in Buenos Aires in July.

UNITED STATES WAS HANDICAPPED

The Latin American document is recorded as having been unanimously approved, the United States never having had a chance to vote formally against it or to abstain.

The U.S. delegation was further handicapped by the tentative nature of the U.S. paper, which, because it was not Washington's final position, had to be presented as a working document rather than as a formal counterproposal.

However, it was generally recognized that Latin America would have to do some compromising inasmuch as no program of economic cooperation can be effective without the support of the United States. The latter has almost all the available aid resources and constitutes the major market for Latin America's exports of primary products.

One Latin American delegate acknowledged that you can't play Hamlet without Hamlet.

But in the view of participants in the conference, a fundamental question was raised involving the obligations of richer nations toward poorer ones.

Although the United States has come to recognize a moral obligation to help, there was fear among some U.S. officials that the Latin American attempt to make such an obligation contractual—in the form of a treaty—might have a reverse effect.

In this view, making U.S. legislators and other officials concentrate their thinking on treaty obligations could lead them to cut back aid that they might otherwise desire to give as a voluntary, moral gesture.

ACTION ON MEMBERS' DISPUTES

The resolution of another important issue here was also tentative. The conference approved nine additional articles to the charter giving the permanent Council and a special peace committee some responsibility to help resolve disputes between member states. But some delegations, including that of the United States thought the step was rather timid.

According to the compromise document that finally emerged, parties to a dispute may ask the Council to use its good offices but the Council cannot perform such a function unless all the parties involved agree. Further discussion was expected.

Recommendations on structural changes in the Organization of American States designed to make it a more effective and active instrument are expected to go through with little trouble.

Under these recommendations the Inter-American Conference, which has been meeting every 5 years up to now, would henceforth meet every year as a General Assembly.

The Inter-American Economic and Social Council and the Inter-American Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Council would also meet yearly at both expert and ministerial levels. A juridical council would be downgraded to a consulting committee.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 6, 1966]

Hemispheric Stalemate

It was not inappropriate that the Panama Conference called to propose changes in the Charter of the Organization of American States came to a close on April Fool's Day. The Inter-American Economic and Social Conference in Buenos Aires, where the first 5 years of the Alliance for Progress were reviewed and proposals were made for the future, had ended the day before the Panama meeting—with equally futile results.

Both conferences brought into the open differences that alined the Latin American nations against the United States. Perhaps the trouble was in the timing of the meetings. With the United States so heavily involved in Vietnam this was, indeed, a bad time for the Latin Americans to be asking financial, trade, and tariff concessions from the United States.

Congress is in no mood to make concessions at a time when it is cutting down on foreign aid and when American industry is being asked to reduce expenditures abroad and to work for a cut in the balance-of-payments deficit. Politically, too, it was a bad time for the United States to seek to strengthen the OAS Council's powers.

The OAS Charter is a treaty, and any amendments would need congressional ratification. The United States was ready to discuss proposals to revise the charter when the hemispheric Foreign Ministers held another conference in Buenos Aires next July, but it certainly did not want to be pinned down in advance to commitments on trade, tariffs, and credits. The Latin Americans, for their part, had no intention of agreeing to peacemaking and anti-Communist proposals that would give extended powers to an OAS Council and Secretary General working out of Washington. It is too soon after the American intervention in the Dominican Republic for that.

The results were stalemate—an "Act of Panama" that embodies the contrasting views and hence cancels itself out, and a failure to agree on Alliance for Progress policies in the conference in Buenos Aires.

Unless the gap between the United States and the Latin American countries is narrowed quickly, it would be better to postpone the Foreign Ministers meeting scheduled for July.

U.S. TRADE CURBS FRUSTRATE LATINS—DELEGATES AT ALLIANCE TALKS COMPLAIN ABOUT TARIFFS

(By Juan de Onis)

BUENOS AIRES.—A United States-Latin American stalemate over trade policy has introduced a note of frustration here into a meeting reviewing the Alliance for Progress on its fifth anniversary.

"We have doubts about the vigor with which the Johnson administration will carry forward the Alliance for Progress program," said the delegate of an important Latin American country, expressing privately a widespread mood.

Lincoln Gordon, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, told the ministers of economy or planning of 19 Latin American countries that United States balance-of-payments problems, aggravated by the Vietnamese war, prevented more liberal foreign aid policies.

Latin American delegates said their national development programs were being seriously hampered by the United States, the major financier of the Alliance. It has promised to increase the flow of funds to Latin America for development, but this "gives way to the interest of Colorado beet sugar producers or Texas cotton planters when it comes down to trade cases," said a trade expert.

COMPLAINTS AGAINST EUROPE

Latin Americans direct the same complaints against protectionism by Britain and the European Common Market, with the aggravation that these countries maintain preferential trade policies for the purchase of tropical products from their former colonies.

But these countries are not members of the Alliance for Progress, the inter-American program to speed up Latin American economic and social development. The United States has guaranteed the Latin American countries that $20 billion in foreign, public, and private capital will be available for development during the first decade of this program, but not preferences in trade.

Marking the fifth anniversary earlier this month, President Johnson predicted growing prosperity and unity in the Americas in the next 5 years.

The United States has kept pace with its pledge in public loans, which have risen to an annual rate of $1 billion compared with one-third that level in the 1955–60 period. The flow of direct aid disbursements is now running at $250 million a year, with an equivalent amount from the U.S.-financed Inter-American Development Bank.

PROSPECTS ARE CLOUDED

But Latin-American delegates, quoting figures that show a relative decline in exports to the United States compared with sales to the U.S. market from other areas, say the prospects of the Alliance for Progress are clouded for the next 5 years by a threat of declining foreign-exchange income.

They say Latin America as a whole is paying out nearly as much in foreign-debt service and interest as it is receiving in foreign aid and that "a vigorous increase in exports" is the best level for sustained development.

Likewise, some countries complain that they have introduced politically difficult tax, administrative and budgetary reforms as the basis for comprehensive development programs without receiving the aid they expected.

The delegates tried today to specify priority areas of investment during the next year. Proposals for expanded programs in education and health investment are among the proposed areas.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I commend the Senator from New York for doing his usual thorough, imaginative, detailed job. It is not often that someone who returns from abroad makes such a report to Congress and offers such specific suggestions for our consideration. I congratulate the Senator on the suggestion he has made and upon the obvious amount of study he has devoted to it.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF UTAH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 265.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 265) to authorize conveyance of certain lands to the State of Utah based upon fair market value, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subject to the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the State of Utah all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands formerly covered by the waters of Great Salt Lake which are within the meander line of said lake as determined by public land surveys heretofore made and by such additional surveys, to be made hereafter, as are necessary to close said line, or in and to such part of said lands as the State may elect. The conveyance herein directed shall be absolute and shall take effect immediately upon execution of the instrument of conveyance by the Secretary but the Secretary may, at any time thereafter, accept a relinquishment to the United States of the State's right, title, and interest in and to any or all of the land conveyed.

SEC. 2. It shall be a condition precedent to the conveyance otherwise directed by the first section of this Act that the State of Utah, acting by or pursuant to an express Act of its legislature—

(a) undertakes to pay to the United States, if it is judicially determined that the United States now has any right, title, or interest in and to any or all of the lands to be conveyed, 90 per centum of the fair market value, as of the date of conveyance, of the right, title, and interest conveyed and not thereafter relinquished, such value to be determined by agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the State or persons authorized to act on their behalf, insofar as such agreement is possible, or by the court, if and to the extent that such agreement is not possible;

(b) disclaims any right, title, or interest or claim of right, title, or interest in and to the lands held by the United States within or for use in connection with the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge and the Weber Basin Federal reclamation project;

(c) disclaims any right, title, or interest or any claim of right, title, or interest in and to lands which are not conveyed pursuant to the first section of this Act or which are relinquished in accordance therewith, whether inside or outside the meander line hereinbefore described, and which may heretofore have been covered by the waters of Great Salt Lake or may hereafter become covered by those waters: *Provided*, That this disclaimer shall not be held to extend to any lands which have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, acquired by the State or any of its political subdivisions from the United States pursuant to sections 6, 7, 8, and 12 of the Act of July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 109), or from the United States or any other party holding lawful title thereto by purchase, donation, exchange, foreclosure, or condemnation;

(d) agrees that all rights of the State under any lease, license, permit, or contract of sale by it pertaining to land which it does not elect to have conveyed to it or which it relinquishes shall pass to the United States and that it will account for all rents, royalties, and profits hereafter received by it from such leases, licenses, permits, or contracts of sale and, further, that if it is judicially determined that the United States now has right, title, or interest in and to some or all of the lands conveyed to the State, the rights of the State under any lease, license, permit, or contract of sale pertaining to oil and gas in the lands with respect to which it has been so determined shall pass to the United States and that it will account to the United States for all rents, royalties, and profits hereafter received by it from such leases, licenses, permits, and contracts of sale; and

(e) consents to and accepts all provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. The conveyance directed by the first section of this Act shall contain an express reservation to the United States of all oil and gas in the lands conveyed, together with the right to prospect for, mine, extract, and remove the same and to permit others so to do in accordance with the laws of the United States. Said reservation, however, shall cease to be of any force or effect with respect to any lands in and to which it is judicially determined, as hereinbefore provided, the United States does not have right, title, or interest. If it is judicially determined that the United States has no right, title, or interest in or to some or all of the lands in question, the rights of the United States under any lease that may theretofore have been granted under said mineral leasing laws with respect to those lands shall pass to the State of Utah and there shall be paid to said State 90 per centum of all moneys hereafter paid to the United States under such leases minus whatever portion thereof has otherwise been paid to the State in accordance with existing law. Every lease, license, or permit issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall contain provisions designed to assure as full use as possible of the lands involved by the State, its grantees, lessees, and permittees.

SEC. 4. In order to secure an expeditious judicial determination of issues in controversy which arise under sections 2 and 3 of this Act and depend upon a like determination of the controversy between the United States and the State of Utah concerning the present right, title, and interest of the United States or the State in and to the lands conveyed or to be conveyed to, and not relinquished by, the State under the first section of this Act, the Attorney General of the United States is hereby directed to institute suit against the State in such manner and before such court having jurisdiction in the premises as will serve to secure a determination of the aforesaid issues and of matters related thereto. If such suit is not commenced on or before the ninetieth day following the conveyance directed to be made by the first section of this Act, the consent of the United States to be made a party defendant in a suit brought by the State in a court of the United States having jurisdiction in the premises and designed to secure a determination of the aforesaid issues and matters related thereto is hereby given.

Sec. 5. (a) If the State of Utah elects to have conveyed to it all of the lands within the meander line described in the first section of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall complete the existing survey thereof as rapidly as possible by closing the meander line referred to in the first section of this Act following, as nearly as may be, the level of Great Salt Lake as it was in 1855. If the State elects to have conveyed to it less than all the lands within said meander line or relinquishes some of the lands conveyed to it, the Secretary shall proceed to such surveys as may be necessary in the circumstances. In either event, he is authorized to accept such donations as the State may tender in order to expedite the work involved.

(b) In order to simplify administration by the State of lands conveyed to, and not relinquished by it, and by the United States of lands retained by, or relinquished to, it under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to adjust, in accordance with the terms of such agreement with the State as he may enter into, the boundary between Utah's lands and the United States lands to conform to section, half-section, or quarter-section lines, the United States holding the whole of any section, half section, or quarter section, as the case may be, in which half or more than half the acreage would, in any event, be its and the State holding the whole of any section, half section or quarter section, as the case may be, in which more than half the acreage would otherwise be its.

(c) As full or partial payment by the State of such amounts as may be required under the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to accept a grant of interests in lands or mineral rights (including lands and mineral rights beneath the bed of Great Salt Lake) which the State owns or a relinquishment by the State of lawful land selection rights which it has not yet exercised if, in his judgment, the acceptance of such grants or relinquishments will be beneficial and useful to the United States. Each such grant or relinquishment, if accepted by the Secretary, shall be taken at not more than the fair market value of the interests conveyed or relinquished.

Sec. 6. (a) No conveyance by the United States to the State of Utah under this Act and no election by the State to have conveyed to it less than all the lands described in the first section of this Act and no relinquishment by the State of any lands which are conveyed to it under this Act shall affect or prejudice, in any way whatsoever, lawful claims or valid existing rights, titles, or interests of any third party in and to the lands affected by that conveyance, election, or relinquishment.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall honor and carry out the terms of any lease, license, permit, or contract of sale heretofore made by the State of Utah in accordance with its laws which pass to the United States under section 2, subsection (d) of this Act, and the State of Utah shall honor and carry out the terms of any lease, license, or permit of the United States granted in accordance with its laws which pass to the State under section 3 of this Act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Utah of the interests of the United States in certain lands within the meander line of Great Salt Lake, for the judicial settlement of a controversy respecting the same, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. Jackson, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Church, Mr. Moss, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Allott conferees on the part of the Senate.

A PROPER BALANCE BETWEEN PUBLIC SERVICE NEWS COVERAGE AND ENTERTAINMENT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the Senate Space Committee, I have a very deep interest in our space program and I follow it very closely. In that interest I am concerned for the safety of the astronauts on every manned flight.

Over a decade ago it was my personal privilege to be associated with the late Edward R. Murrow and Fred Friendly in several of their programs of their distinguished "See It Now" series as they filmed several of the interviews I had with leaders of various nations throughout the world. Their "See It Now" series has never been equaled as a public service program.

Consequently, I vigorously applauded Fred Friendly's protest resignation and his eloquent plea for a greater sense of public service on the part of the networks and less subservience to commercialism.

Now, I am no devotee or fan of "The Batman"—but I do think that the networks can reach a point of overcoverage of news events and can carry the crusade of public service over entertainment to an extreme that is neither sensible nor justified nor serving a really constructive purpose.

Such was the case, in my opinion, in the overcoverage of the Gemini 8 recovery. Admitted that we should be concerned about the safety of the astronauts in the crisis that developed, nevertheless the networks went too far in their overcoverage. The networks wisely and easily, and with propriety and proper concern, could have given the viewing audience constant reports through the white subliminal bulletin tapes at the bottom of the screen, such as they have used in giving election returns without cutting into the regular programs. They could have done this and when the safety—or forbid, tragedy—had been established, they could have broken into the program and still provided just as much conscientious and concerned news service as they did in the uninterrupted, endless drone that their overcoverage did produce.

I had no desire to see "Batman" and I admire and find most interesting the distinguished news teams of the networks, but enough is enough whether it is a politician talking too long on television—or elsewhere—or a distinguished news analyst being placed in the extremely embarrassing position of having run out of something interesting to say, having run out of interesting material, and having to resort to what was nothing less than a TV filibuster.

Not only is this an imposition on the viewers. It is no less an imposition on the analyst-commentators.

It is time for the networks to grow up on this subject of the proper balance between public service news coverage and entertainment—to avoid the extremes of overdoing either crass commercialism or public service news that loses its purpose and interest after a certain point.

Nor is the overcoverage of the Gemini 8 spectacular easily justified by a condemnation of the "Batman" TV fans and the characterization of low mentality assigned to them. Frankly, I do not admire their choice—but they are entitled to their preference without being condemned and used as whipping boys to justify such overcoverage.

With his usual delightful sense of humor, columnist Don Maclean excellently evaluated this matter in his April 4, 1966, column in the Washington Daily News. I call it to the attention of the Members of this body and ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> (By Don Maclean)
>
> After "Batman" TV fans complained to the network and the Federal Communications Commission when the show was interrupted for coverage of the Gemini 8 recovery, some folks said these were shallow-minded citizens who would rather watch fantasy than "real-life" drama. Maybe. But there's no denying that TV newsmen, unlike other performers, lack instinct about how to "get off" when they have nothing to say. For instance, during a 30-minute wait for word from the recovery area, NBC's Frank McGee and David Brinkley filled in with a gripping discussion about the model planes being used to demonstrate the rescue.
>
> "Gee, Frank, is a C–54 a high-wing plane?" "I don't know, David, maybe we're using the wrong models." It went on and on. Meanwhile, some of us could have been watching the Bob Hope Show, as originally scheduled. While not high drama, it certainly cuts model airplane news. The live coverage could have gone off when there was nothing to report and returned when there was. Altho they tried that when LBJ had a cold. All night the networks interrupted shows in this manner: "Stand by, please, for this bulletin from our newsroom * * * there is nothing new to report at this time * * * now, back to our regularly scheduled program." * * *

VIETCONG FORMULA

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, it is the opinion of the Washington Daily News that:

> In no war has there been such a cold and calculated campaign of murdering civilian officials as that of the Communist Vietcong in South Vietnam.

The paper points out:

In the last 2 years the Vietcong have murdered between 650 and 700 local officials and kidnaped another 1,500. More than 3,000 other civilians—many of them members of families of officials—also have been killed.

It adds:

The Vietcong formula is simple—kill those in important public jobs.

This editorial furnishes more information on the nature of the enemy, and I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETCONG FORMULA—MURDER

There have been many atrocities in every war.

But in no war has there been such a cold and calculated campaign of murdering civilian officials as that of the Communist Vietcong in South Vietnam.

An atrocity just reported from Saigon by Scripps-Howard's Wal Friedenberg is typical.

In February Vice President HUMPHREY visited a "model village" on the outskirts of Saigon. The village—named Tan Phu, which means "New Prosperity"—is an example of what South Vietnam and the United States are trying to do to rebuild and unify the country.

But Vietcong terrorists have now come in and murdered the village finance officer and the chief of one of the five hamlets that make up the village.

In the last 2 years the Vietcong have murdered between 650 and 700 local officials and kidnaped another 1,500. More than 3,000 other civilians—many of them members of families of officials—also have been killed.

These have not been murders of passion—even of revenge. They have been committed deliberately to keep South Vietnam from achieving the stability that can come only on a foundation of local government. The Vietcong formula is simple—kill those in important public jobs.

Those who would have us pull out of the country on the grounds that the Saigon government can't organize the country and get the support of its own people should consider why this is so difficult.

And those who bleed over burning or using chemicals to destroy rice crops to keep them from falling into Vietcong hands should weigh that "atrocity" against the hundreds of cold-blooded murders of civilian officials.

TRIBUTE TO LESLIE L. BIFFLE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, published in the Washington Post, in tribute to the late Leslie L. Biffle, former Secretary of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE

During his 44 years of service as an employee of the U.S. Senate, ending with his tenure as Secretary of the Senate in 1952, Leslie L. Biffle was the very ideal of a legislative functionary. His infinite attention to all the details of the legislative process freed successive senatorial "employers" from duties and responsibilities that otherwise would have impinged upon their responsibility for policy. He was the sort of indefatigable, tireless, self-effacing detail man that every official searches for and that few find.

Politics was his life. The son of an officeholder, he was brought up to understand public affairs and to enjoy them from early youth. He was always the faithful adjutant, but he was not without political instinct and purposes of his own. His relationships with Senator Joseph Robinson were close and his rapport with President Truman was complete.

The business of Congress could not go forward without such public servants. They are often relatively unknown to most citizens, but the mark of their personality nevertheless is on countless pieces of legislation that never would come to pass without their largely anonymous contributions to congressional deliberation. Leslie L. Biffle, on his own merit and as the personification of loyal legislative servants like him, deserves the tribute of his countrymen.

THE KETTLE BOILS IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a major obstacle to bringing about an armistice and a cease-fire is and has been the refusal of warlike officials high in the Johnson administration such as Secretary of State Dean Rusk to agree to negotiate directly with the National Liberation Front, which is and has been for years the political arm of the Vietcong. In fact, the Vietnamese fighting for the liberation of their native land were first called the Viet Minh, and the National Liberation Front was the political arm of the forces of Ho Chi Minh fighting against French colonialism.

The National Liberation Front, which is headed by a Saigon lawyer who is not a Communist, presently controls probably three-fourths of the land area of South Vietnam. This despite the fact that American Armed Forces who have succeeded the French in trying to maintain a militarist regime in that part of Vietnam south of the 17th parallel are the finest soldiers in the world, and with devastating air power capability have engaged in the most destructive bombing the world has ever known. The Vietcong forces are the major adversary against which our forces are fighting. Of course, Vietcong delegates must participate in any conference if peace is to be restored to Vietnam.

How can Secretary Dean Rusk defend a viewpoint that we will not negotiate directly with the National Liberation Front or Vietcong? He has made the amazing statement that the Hanoi government represents the Vietcong, and he talks glibly about aggression from the north. He ignores the historical fact that there is no North and South Vietnam. The Geneva accords recognized this. It is clearly stated in that agreement which the United States through John Foster Dulles approved:

> The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

At the present time and for some months past our CIA and State Department officials have been carrying on secret negotiations with the leaders of the National Liberation Front. The purpose is to secure the release of Gustav C. Hertz, an American civilian official in Vietnam and a Vietcong prisoner. Their offer is to return a captured Vietcong terrorist for the release of Gustav C. Hertz. It is noteworthy that State Department and CIA officials did not seek the release of Hertz by approaching the Hanoi government directly through an intermediary such as Algeria. They went direct to the National Liberation Front itself. This gives a lie to the claim repeatedly made that the National Liberation Front is simply a puppet of Hanoi. It reveals that CIA and State Department officials do in fact admit what officials in Asiatic nations have been saying all along—that the National Liberation Front is essentially independent of Hanoi.

The noted French historian, Philippe Devillers, a director of the National Political Science Foundation of Paris, has stated repeatedly that the Vietcong are waging a civil revolt against what they regard as an oppressive landowners' regime and militarists' dictatorship from Saigon. Professor Devillers was a former correspondent in French Indochina for Le Monde. He is the author of a history of Vietnam—"North Vietnam Today." He states that unfortunately American leaders pretend to regard North Vietnam and South Vietnam as two separate nations when, in fact, the people of North and South Vietnam are one people. Very definitely he repeatedly states the fact that the conflict in South Vietnam is a civil war. It is not an aggression from North Vietnam or China. Furthermore, the facts are that there is no evidence whatever that China has even one military advisor with the Vietcong forces anywhere in South Vietnam. Professor Devillers has stated repeatedly that Secretary Rusk's statements as to military aid coming into the southern part of Vietnam from Hanoi is much less than claimed.

The Washington Post published an editorial, "The Kettle Boils in Vietnam," which I ask by unanimous consent be made a part of my remarks and inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KETTLE BOILS IN VIETNAM

The threat of civil war within a civil war in Vietnam has been averted, but only for the present. Hope for a peaceful solution of the internal crisis now lies in the summoning as soon as possible of a convention, or "assembly of leaders" who can agree on a more representative regime.

Marshal Ky had to back down at Da Nang, and he has lost face. There is nothing more damaging in an oriental country. It probably means that his days as a premier are numbered. The problem is to make the transition peacefully and to end up with a government that will have popular support.

The United States appears to be in process of extricating itself from the commitment that President Johnson rashly made to Premier Ky at Honolulu in February. There is no need for the United States to sink or swim with any particular government leader or group in Saigon.

The United States has invested such huge stakes in the Vietnam war that it must operate as much as possible apart from internal Vietnamese politics and squabbles. In the present crisis, Marshal Ky came close to dragging the Americans into his factional conflict. His troops were flown to Da Nang in U.S. Air Force transport planes. The anti-American manifestations of recent days have taken on an ominous tone.

However, the war cannot be fought in a political vacuum. There is no time to lose. If South Vietnam is to have a government acceptable to Buddhist, Catholic, student, military, and civilian elements from all over the country, the "assembly of leaders" must be called quickly. Popular emotions either must get a peacful political outlet or they will be expressed in violence.

POETRY OF EDITH BANNISTER DOWLING

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, South Carolina is blessed with many talented people, but none more so than Mrs. Edith Bannister Dowling. Her poetry has given pleasure and inspiration to a great number of people, and for the enjoyment and uplifting of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that six poems and a sonnet written by Mrs. Dowling be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the poems were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lincoln Memorial

He knew his Bible, and his Shakespeare, well;
Surveyed raw plains, kept store, directed mail;
Rode horseback on the Illinois trail,
A long, lank, prairie lawyer; cast a spell:
"Four score and 7 years ago," said he,
"Our fathers brought forth on this continent
A new nation"—and "new" is what he meant—
Fair-founded, and "conceived in liberty."
Simple his cabin birth, sudden his end:
"Now he belongs," said Stanton, "to the ages."
Wars of today, though fought on wider stages,
Freedom still wins. Here Lincoln, freedom's friend,
Memoried is, our 16th President:
Folks of all faiths still up these steps are bent.

—Edith Bannister Dowling.

Astronaut

The capsule soars. The man inside
Works on his own, with our world's hope
Upon him. Far below that ride
This world is very small in scope.
In outer space, each hue, each sight
Is thin and strange as upper air.
What keeps him, through swift days, and night?
He told us, with a prayer.

—Edith Bannister Dowling.

Jamestown

Three hundred and fifty years ago,
From England over the sea
On the long high wave sailed a company brave
In three ships, the *Delivery*,
The *Constant*, and the small trim *Goodspeed*.
After great voyaging
They reached river land on a virgin strand;
And they named their port for the King.

Three hundred and fifty years ago,
In the Old Dominion new,
Jamestown was made, in the kind trees' shade,
And a strong colony grew:
Church and fort were built and maintained—
For God, praise; for men, laws;
And through trial and strife they established a life
Independent, yet true to the Cause.

Cavaliers of Virginia, loyal to their King:
Smith, Newport, Gates, and Dale,
And Berkeley and more, through fires and war
Working for right to prevail.
The Starving Time passed, and the Indians settled,
And the Maids fetched across the foam,
They raised their corn, and the babes there born,
And began to forget their home.

Three hundred and fifty years later,
On that island, now consecrate,
Where the old church hallows the river shallows,
Men still revere the great;
The great Founders, and great Preservers,
Through sunny years and gray,
Of the first story in our South's glory—
Of Jamestown, U.S.A.

—Edith Bannister Dowling.

For a Live-Oak Planting in Beaufort, S.C., Arbor Day (1965)

"A green thought in a green shade,"
A long-ago poet wrote down,
And Marvell's "green thought" again is made
A fact, in this island town:
Today we are adding one more green tree
To our bounty—an ever-green,
With shadowed grace, over land and sea,
And a haven for birds who preen
In its moss-boughs, gray in sun, green in rain;
By the Inland Waterway
It shall grow in glory with might and main,
This tree, from this Arbor Day.

—Edith Bannister Dowling.

Unto the Hills

I would not yet grow old.
I would not be stiff cold
With the new buds uncurled.
Oh endless hills,
Your agelessness I crave.
Let not the severing grave
Clay down the heart that thrills
To the sweet sights of living,
The sounds of song, and storm,
And the feel, final, warm,
Of love's taking and giving.
Oh lovely world I see
Around me, green and gold,
Trees, sky, and earth—I hold
My heritage from thee
In humble fealty.

—Edith Bannister Dowling.

Song for Music

The year is hard
And countries fall.
Each man's future
A stone wall.
The flesh of love
Is blown away,
Cinders, not flowers,
Every day.
The year is hard.
The watchwords change.
The only progress
The bombers' range.
But sometimes yet,
Where men stay free,
The air may shiver
With harmony.
Tremble of flute;
Strings new-born;
Challenge of trumpet;
Whoop of horn.
While under the wars
A sleepless guard
Hums a tune remembered—
The year is hard.

—Edith Bannister Dowling.

To a Colorado Mountain

Oh Crested Butte, from far across this country
I crave your immobility of stone—
Capture, and lose you, having left; stern-yielding
You stand, immobile-changeable, alone
Majestic and self-living, shades amassing
Of every hue of heaven, from dawns to eves;
Rock-crowned, above your timberline, breath-taking;
Male as your crags, female as aspen leaves.
Rigid, and quivering, guarding the green valley
Which awed the first white man here, long ago—
Oh Crested Butte, from far across this country
I yearn for you, in flower, and in your snow.
Miles high, in summer's shining, stirring hours,
I found, beyond the trees, such lone delight:
Peeping among your pebbles, wild English flowers,
Far-Western miniatures, in the thin sunlight;
Harebell, and heather; bugle, and shepherd's purse;
Across the ocean and the miles, the same.
Once England, now this mountain, is the nurse,
Kindly and strong of bosom, whom I claim,
And now, far off again, remember sadly,
Glad to have known, sad to have left: for there,
On Crested Butte, I saw that double rainbow,
Life's grief, and hope; and answer to my prayer.

—Edith Bannister Dowling.

THE INDIVIDUAL CASUALTY IN VIETNAM—A RADIO BROADCAST FROM SAIGON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think we all have a tendency to become hardened by press reports of dozens of battles involving thousands of men. Arthur Koestler observed once that "statistics do not bleed." Amidst the tumult and the shouting we frequently lose sight of the individual casualty—and of the tragic cost of war.

A recent radio broadcast from Saigon movingly elaborated on the meaning of this cost. The radio correspondent is a constituent of mine, Clyde Edwin Pettit, who traveled around the world on assignment of Station KBBA in Benton, Ark., and did some most incisive reporting on the war in Vietnam.

The station to which I refer is owned by David McDonald, Winston Riddle, and Mel Spann of my State. It is a small station, without the budget or the staff or the facilities of the large networks or the weekly news magazines. But like many other small stations and periodicals throughout our country, they try to do a good job of honest and accurate reporting. I believe that stations like this are to be commended on their high level of public service programing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of one of Mr. Pettit's series of broadcasts be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Broadcast From Saigon

For KBBA news, this is Ed Pettit reporting from Saigon.

This is the last of our letters from Vietnam.

In these broadcasts we could have been talking about battalions and regiments, about casualties and statistics, about tactics and strategy. But instead we've been talking about people, about GI's and Vietnamese.

For it takes people to fight a war. And when wars end, as all wars must someday end, men may look back on days gone by, may reminisce of the pleasures of conquest, or of comradeship, or of common fears once fleetingly known.

But those who have seen the face of war are never nostalgic about war itself. For no man can honestly glorify nor glamorize war. That is, no one who has really been there.

For war is the men in the camps, and the women who follow the camps, and it is also disease as well as death or destruction. And it is drudgery—plain hard work and the monotony of being "support troops"—the totally important men without which there could be no war. Many would like to be in combat, but they are support troops, knowing that for the rest of their lives they will be asked, "Were you ever in combat?" They will hesitate and answer, but they now know they will never be able to explain that simply being here in Vietnam can be dangerous, and that any man is in combat the instant somebody tries to kill him.

War is the infinite beauty of a verdant jungle anguished by a piercing animal shriek of one man bayoneting another. And his last breath is the final, pitiable groan of one you didn't even know, could hardly hate, and of whom you might have been a friend under other circumstances.

For war is taking, and war is giving, and war is the sharing of common hopes and dreams.

War is walking warily in the steps of the man in front of you, and the funny feeling of knowing that if your friend steps on a land mine he will be the one to get it. Only the first man knows how it feels to walk in front.

War is the tension of being a target, and, for some, of being hit by your own men because somebody made a mistake.

If you're a civilian here, war is the chance to make a quick killing in the black market. Or, perhaps, to quick killing, period, if you are paid well enough. Or, for some civilians, the chance to see your house burned to the ground by a bomb. Or to see your father's head cut off before your eyes.

War is the warm, rich blood of a man washing away and mixing with the black mud of the Mekong River, each cell of his blood stamped by his heredity with the uniqueness that made him, once, an individual.

So war is the wicked waste and destruction of the wonder of life itself.

Perhaps the worst thing about war is that it changes the laughter of those who love life into the weeping of new wives and young widows. War is hardest on the living, on those who must carry on, tortured by poignant memories of the past, racked with the bitter reality of the irrevocable, destined always to wonder, pointlessly, what might have been.

War is death, and death is an indicriminate harlot who chooses capriciously with whom she will lie in fatal embrace—the coward today, the brave man tomorrow.

And war is something that puts the really important things in their proper perspective: things like survival and health.

War is the triumphantly happy smile on the face of a kid who has just been told by a doctor that only a few more operations and he may be able to see again.

In war there is the joy of simple things: of tasting a chocolate milk shake, or a cold beer, or of getting to see a Hollywood movie out in the field at night even if the mosquitoes are biting you. And perhaps the greatest pleasure of all: the joy of a shower once a week, if you're lucky.

War is a bunch of guys having a last game of touch football before going out on a patrol from which some may never return.

War is the wandering mind of a young man on guard duty, thinking wistfully of a fireplace in Vermont, or a girl in Tennessee, or a hotrod in California.

War is a bangalore mine blowing the guts out of a guy from Grand Rapids.

War is the form of what once was a man, covered by flies, in a half-forgotten foreign field.

This might have been a doctor—
Or a druggist from Des Moines—
Or a farmer in Florida—
Or a crop-dusting pilot from Pine Bluff.
Or he might have been a happy failure.

But now he is a statistic: only one of the casualties termed "moderate" in the press reports and by the politicians.

Of course, a nation must never fear to fight aggression and tyranny. But it would be a disservice to the dead not to pause and, out of respect, consider the cost.

For the cost of war is in the millions: the millions of homes that will never be built, the millions who will die from diseases that would have been conquered by medical research were it not for the cost of war.

The cost of war is in the billions: the billions of days that will never be lived.

The cost of war is the cost of a kid from Kansas who will never see a wheat harvest again.

It is a boy from Boston who will never see his own son grow up to skin his knee on a city sidewalk.

It is a lad from Louisiana who will never live to fall in love, and laugh with a girl in the rain.

All these things are war, and many more things, too.

But fortunately for most war is coming home.

And later—much later—when a summer storm comes to a dark Midwestern sky, you hear thunder, and for a moment you think of gunfire, once long ago, and so very far away.

And you laugh, because you made it back.

Then you stop smiling, as you think of friends: of Chuck and Joe and Fred—who didn't make it back.

This is Ed Pettit reporting from Saigon for KBBA News.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE—THE GREATEST SUCCESS STORY

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, in a world where a great imbalance in the supply of food and fiber is causing grave concern on the part of all thinking men, American agriculture stands out as our greatest success story. Perhaps there is a tendency to overlook this fact in our booming industrial economy. Yet American farms have outpaced industrial productivity in our Nation by a factor of approximately 3 to 1. At the same time, our farm population has not shared the full benefits of this bountiful yield, either in income or other material rewards of our affluent society. If 43 percent of our farm families have annual incomes of $3,000 or less, we need to rededicate our domestic efforts on their behalf, and spend less on foreign aid.

I need not remind my colleagues that America is the best fed and best clothed Nation in the world; that our surpluses have worked as effectively for peace as our weapons, and that in our present declaration of world war on hunger, the American farmer is once more the backbone of this effort.

But despite our tremendous successes, we cannot feed and clothe the world. I believe the challenge is more in sharing our farm technology than our products or yield. The whole direction of our foreign aid should be that of helping all nations become more self-sufficient, so as to reduce the mounting financial burdens on the American people. Industrially, our efforts are fruitful—West Germany is a glowing example. But so long as hunger is rampant throughout the world, the American conscience will constantly prod us into action.

Let me pause here and provide a few significant figures for the RECORD. According to the latest budget summary, our national debt has grown from $270 billion in 1946 to $318 billion in 1965. This increase of approximately $50 billion is more than twice offset by our total investment in foreign aid and assistance, including food for peace, which by 1965 totaled $116 billion. Without this $116 billion expenditure, our national debt might have been significantly reduced following World War II. America, however, has been quite willing to mortgage the future of her children in order to bring relief to friend and foe alike. Our charity would seem to exceed the demands of the Good Book itself, which should influence the relations of all mankind.

I was pleased recently to note that administration officials are stressing agriculture and self-help in the new $3.3 billion foreign assistance program, which over a 5-year stretch might cost the taxpayer another $16 billion. How long can our wealth and resources stand this drain? For this reason, I have advocated a diminishing scale of foreign aid over the next 5 years, so as to impress foreign nations with the absolute necessity of becoming more self-sufficient.

There are many pros and cons in the matter of foreign aid. I, for one, could not give thought to this program of worldwide relief without the assurance that it was temporary, and designed to help other nations rebuild their resources and become self-sufficient. As I recall, the initial budget for the Marshall plan was $5 billion under a 5-year authorization totaling about $17 billion. This was most certainly a modest beginning, compared with the fact that we have now exceeded this estimate by $100 billion. This demonstrates the danger of letting the wily camel get his nose under the tent. But that was almost 20 years ago, and $100 billion less. It cannot and must not become the permanent dole, as its history would indicate.

There is a recent development that should give us hope in this respect. I speak of the willingness of our agricultural press—magazines and newspapers alike, to share the techniques of scientific farm production with foreign nations. I believe the inexpensive dissemination of scientific knowledge from the laboratory to the land in America is vital. For truly, our press has made a vast contribution in the science of agriculture.

In a recent exchange of letters between the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, and the president of the Agricultural Publishers Association, James Milholland, Jr., Cleveland, Ohio, Secretary Freeman recognized this program when he wrote:

> I was particularly interested in your comment that people of other nations have con-

tacted your association and its members in an effort to learn more about the methods used to provide American farmers with a constant flow of vital information. This is a highly encouraging development. On my travels abroad it has been very plain that one of the biggest agricultural problems facing the world in its efforts to combat hunger and improve nutrition is how to close the gap which exists between technical data in the laboratory and the applications of these data on the land. Whatever contributions you and your associates can make to help improve the diffusion of agricultural knowledge, especially in economically emerging nations, will be a truly great service.

Here is the very essence of a program to stimulate self-help. I am informed a study group of weekly and small daily newspaper publishers is planning a trip to Japan and east Asia this year. James Milholland, Jr., is also planning a trip abroad this summer. In western Europe, he will confer with government leaders and farm editors on the use of technical information by the people on the land. Furthermore, the Agricultural Publishers Association will shortly embark on a program of making available American farm magazines to governments of foreign nations. Finally, American farm editors will meet with their counterparts when the European International Association of Farm Editors meets in Montreal, Canada, in 1967. No Federal subsidy is involved in these efforts.

I commend our agricultural publishers and editors for these valiant efforts. If they have made American farming the most bountiful in the world, think then of the significance of their willingness to share their techniques with foreign nations. Think then of the great potential in such efforts to increase the yields in foreign lands. This kind of help can and will serve to reduce the burden of foreign aid on the American taxpayer, while at the same time encouraging other nations to defeat their food and fiber shortages by American know-how. Their pride in this kind of self-help will build more goodwill than our billions of dollars.

Finally, the wisdom of our forefathers in developing an inexpensive method of disseminating agricultural knowledge will once more prove its vital efficacy.

UNITED STATES ALARMED BY VIET INFLATION, RACKETEERING

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on March 29, 1966, there appeared in the Plain Dealer, a great newspaper in my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, an excellent news article entitled, "United States Alarmed by Viet Inflation, Racketeering," written by John P. Leacacos, Washington correspondent for the Plain Dealer and one of the outstanding newsmen in the Nation.

This article again reveals the ability to report a news item clearly, concisely and authoritatively of Jack Leacacos who is acknowledged to be a fine, objective reporter. He has performed a real public service in pointing out how the Vietnam war has greatly added to our balance-of-payments deficit and to the outflow of gold from our country. He further reveals the alarming economic disorder prevalent in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I have known Jack Leacacos for many years, not only in his capacity as a reporter but also as foreign correspondent for the Plain Dealer and, incidentally, as a comrade in arms of mine in World War II. We served together in North Africa and Italy in 1943 to the armistice in 1945, throughout World War II.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ALARMED BY VIET INFLATION, RACKETEERING

(By John P. Leacacos)

WASHINGTON.—The Vietnam war will add at least a half billion dollars to the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments this year, high administrative sources predicted yesterday.

More than $1 million a month in U.S. currency is being shipped via black-market channels from Vietnam to Laos, to be exchanged for gold, which is imported from Britain, U.S. Embassy officials reported to the State Department.

One American has been arrested, one expelled from the country, and 30 other American civilians are under investigation as alleged expediters for Saigon black-marketeers in the dollar-gold racket, reliable sources added.

The administration, as a consequence, is suddenly showing urgent concern over inflation and economic disorder in Vietnam as immediate causes of political discontent and morale erosion there.

The danger of inflation wiping out fruits of U.S. military investment and efforts in Vietnam will be a major subject of inquiry by Robert Komer, special assistant to the President for nonmilitary matters in Vietnam, and Bill D. Moyers, the President's No. 1 aid.

The two will leave for Vietnam in early April to join Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus R. Vance, who left last night.

A five-man congressional team, led by Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, also will go to Vietnam Saturday to look into allegations that U.S. aid in both dollars and supplies is ending up in the hands of the Vietcong.

Along the same line, two well-known New York currency and trade analysts yesterday asserted to the Plain Dealer that a large amount of the U.S. dollars in Vietnam wind up in Hong Kong, en route to Communist China, through Vietcong financial manipulations and clandestine domination of the bar and brothel business in Saigon.

The two specialists are Franz Pick and Stephen J. Rundt.

Approximately $400 million has been pumped into Vietnam in the last year for troop pay and for wages (after conversion into piasters) for the 25,000 Vietnamese civilians employed on U.S. construction projects.

Administration alarm over the Vietnam economic situation was sharpened by recollection of what happened 20 years ago in mainland China during the war between the Nationalists and the Communists. Inflationary chaos finally eroded the last vestiges of popular support for Chiang Kai-shek.

Authoritative sources pointed out that the Vietnam economic crisis was not close to such desperate straits as yet.

U.S. financial sources pointed out that imports of gold into Laos had tripled last year to $38 million as a result of the demand for gold from first, Vietnam, and second, Thailand.

The new drain on the U.S. balance of payments arises from two factors, Treasury sources said.

The United States spent approximately $9 billion for the war last year, much of it in unexpected foreign exchange costs in South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Okinawa, Formosa, and Thailand.

At the same time, U.S. bank loans to foreigners have continued high ($300 to $400 million); the normal trade surplus shows a slippage of perhaps $1 billion, while prospects for repatriation of U.S. firms' profits abroad are uncertain.

The currency situation in Saigon reflects the economic noose imposed on city markets by the Vietcong stoppage or heavy taxing of goods moving into and from Saigon. The shipping pileup at Saigon port gave added impact to Vietcong tactics.

Various rates for the Vietnamese piaster to the dollar provide illegal manipulators their chance to make profits at U.S. taxpayers' expense.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL GALLERY IS MILESTONE IN COUNTRY'S COMING OF AGE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on March 17 the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., observed its 25th anniversary with a day of ceremony.

In the East Room of the White House, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson presented 25 special anniversary medals to those who, in the words of Gallery Director John Walker, were "outstanding individuals from every section of the country who, by dedication and unusual abilities to inspire, have awakened in others a sense of our visual heritage."

Those who attended the evening's events at the gallery were greeted in the rotunda by the music of the Marine Band. The crimson jackets of the players provided a vivid accent to the black and white shapes of the columns and corridors of what is said to be the world's largest marble building. Banks of white azaleas ringed the central fountain and bronze of Mercury.

Later, the National Gallery orchestra, which has for the past 23 years been under the direction of Richard Bales, performed a concert in the West Garden Court.

These sights, sounds, and scents provided the backdrop for what must have been one of the most spectacular exhibits of French impressionistic art to be seen by the public anywhere.

The presence of the First Lady and the Vice President indicated the official recognition of what was taking place. Mrs. Johnson wrote in the gallery's guestbook—"a never to be forgotten evening."

It is significant, however, that among the 12,000 persons invited to share this occasion, there were not only national and international leaders in government, diplomacy, and the arts, but the citizenry of Washington. It is noteworthy, also, that among those receiving the awards was Prof. James A. Porter, chairman of the art department at Howard University.

The National Gallery was established by joint resolution of the Congress, approved March 2, 1937; and opened on March 17, 1941. Its brief but eventful history traces Nation's growing cultural maturity.

A private citizen, Andrew E. Mellon, donated $15 million for the structure and another $5 million to support its endowment. He also gave his paintings and sculpture, including works of many of the greatest masters of the past 700 years. It was his hope that this would form the nucleus of a truly national institution—in spirit and in fact.

Mr. Walker, who was appointed first chief curator in 1939, and became Director in 1956, has observed that the gallery was created "just in time. It became a magnet for those last great American collections not already given or promised elsewhere."

Following Secretary Mellon, other great American collectors donated their private collections of painting, sculpture, and drawings to the National Gallery: Peter and Joseph E. Widener, Samuel and Rush Kress, Lessing J. Rosenwald, and most recently Chester Dale.

As a result, the young gallery has already achieved the reputation of being the finest in this hemisphere.

The 25th anniversary exhibit was loaned to the gallery by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon and Mrs. Mellon Bruce. Mr. Mellon and Mrs. Bruce are son and daughter of the gallery's founder. Included were 248 works, most of which were seen by the public for the first time.

Of all the public buildings in the United States, the National Gallery is perhaps the showcase of our national consciousness and accomplishment in the visual arts.

The silver anniversary of the gallery will, indeed, live in memory as a day of grace and meaning, worthy of any nation at any time in history; and thus as a milestone in our country's quest for a great society.

I ask unanimous consent that current articles describing various phases of the gallery's anniversary and development, together with the biographies of two of its principals, be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 18, 1966]

Art Gallery Opens Costly, Lovely Show—25th Anniversary

(By Frank Getlein)

Before an audience of thousands including Mrs. Johnson, Government and diplomatic leaders, and many representatives of the national and international art worlds, the National Gallery opened its 25th anniversary show last night.

The show is open to the public today through May 1.

Across those crowded rooms the visitors saw one of the loveliest and costliest exhibitions ever hung. For the anniversary the gallery borrowed just about the entire collections of impressionist paintings owned by its president, Paul Mellon, and Mrs. Mellon, and his sister, Mrs. Mellon Bruce.

Impressionism is just about everybody's favorite kind of art, and the 248 pictures at the gallery make it easy to see why. More than any manner of painting before or since, impressionism combines in usually equal proportions the intensity and gusto of the painter at work with his vision of the scene before him.

Since the scene before him was usually nature at its nicest—sunlit fields, sparkling waters, rosy girls and lovely ladies, flowers and fruit and high blue skies—what's not to like?

For the crass in the crowd, there was the comforting reflection that the art on the walls had to cost more than a few million dollars, assembled as it has been in the last 20 years, a period of very steeply rising prices in French art of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

By way of baseline, the Cezanne "Boy in the Red Vest" was purchased for $650,000 in the late 1950's, the same painter's "House in Provence" for $800,000 last October. And that's only two.

For the higher crassness, the show offers a most unusual number of large groups of works by single masters. Thus: there are 9 Manets, a dozen works by Seurat, who died young and painted very slowly, 12 by Monet, the greatest of the impressionists, 16 by Boudin, master of calm seas, crinoline skirts and bathing machines, the same number of Bonnards, 13 Pissarros, and 23 by Vuillard.

On wall after wall of the dozen rooms devoted to the show, it is possible for the visitor to immerse himself in the world of one artist, catching different aspects of the same vision, different moods of the same sensibility.

This works also with artists less extravagantly represented. Mary Cassatt, for instance, is seen in only four pictures. Two of them are a vignette of children playing on a beach, round and rosy and everything we think of too facilely in regard to Cassatt. Almost facing that work is "Little Girl in a Blue Armchair," a view askew of a deep room with massive blue chairs centered on the child and a masterwork of color, light, and space composition.

VAN GOGHS

The seven Van Goghs take us from a quiet, rather melancholy view of tulip beds in Holland, to a boat on the Seine at Paris, to still lifes and scenes of complete maturity at Arles, to a passionately painted storm of green and blue in the fields of Auvers within days of his death.

The range of the two collections goes considerably beyond Impressionism properly so called. It begins with Corot and Courbet, both of whom were fully mature artists well before either the name or the manner were born. It ends in the beginnings of the 20th century School of Paris—Picasso in his 20's, Matisse in his 30's, the Paris and its environs of Utrillo.

Stimulating juxtapositions abound in the hanging. Lautrec's cheerfully dopey "Absinthe Drinker" is close by another lady in a similar cafe, Manet's daydreaming, abstracted dessert eater of "The Plum."

The most exciting such bringing together of natural partners is the hanging, on either side of a doorway, of two of Monet's views of Waterloo Bridge. Both were painted—or noted for future development—late on a London day. The same bridge from the same angle of view is on one side glowing with the gold and fire of the setting sun, on the other already blue and shadowy, about to vanish in evening as the lights of carriages appear and the night begins its quieter magic.

SMALL SURPRISES

There are small surprises throughout. The Forain view of his wife fishing in a placid stream is more in tune with the general Impressionist enterprise than you expect of him. Alfred Sisley appears to great advantage with the much better known men who are seen in the show as his separate but equal peers.

Monet and Pissarro dominate the chronological heart of the show, the golden years of impressionism. Each in his own way developed to perfection the sense of joyous nature as a pulse beating in things, echoed in brush strokes, but coming, essentially, from the light of heaven that so preoccupied them.

Pissarro traces the rhythm of that pulse from spring orchards at Louveciennes to his own garden at Eragny to the Place du Carrousel in Paris, which city, in his view of trees and sky, seems a garden itself, full of light, and bloom.

Monet makes a stair in his garden, with two small children and one woman, and it seems a happy explosion of color in 1880. A half decade earlier, despite the parasol and the fussy frock of the 70's, Mme. Monet on a hilltop seems a goddess of the fields, a monumental figure placed within and made herself of the elements of sunny growth. By 1900 a corner of the famous garden at Giverny is all but dissolved in a flux of floral brilliance.

Two other artists share the dominance of Monet and Pissarro, one earlier, one later. The former is Boudin, a forerunner and teacher to the school. Bathing machines and the spectacle of men and women dressed as if for city promenades but strolling and sitting on the beach seem strange to us today. But Boudin raises these odd materials out of their time into the eternity of pearly skies and seas that stretch beyond seeing.

LEAST DOMINEERING

The other artists who dominates a large part of the exhibition is Pierre Bonnard, strangely when you think of it, for his art is the least domineering imaginable, consisting of quiet, thoughtful reflections of bits and corners of domestic life. Yet his "Dining Room Table" is a riot of luscious, juicy color, his "Stairs in the Artist's Garden" a glowing homage to nature in full summer. The half-glimpsed figure of a nude seen through a doorway is cool and blue and personal.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 18, 1966]

National Gallery Makes 25 Awards—First Lady Presents Medals to Scholars and Teachers

Washington, March 17.—Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson bestowed the first National Gallery of Arts Awards today on 25 art scholars and teachers picked from across the Nation.

The ceremony in the East Room of the White House also commemorated the 25th anniversary of the dedication of the gallery.

The President's wife went there tonight to open a special 12-room anniversary exhibition of impressionist and post-impressionist paintings lent by Paul Mellon and Mrs. Alsa Mellon Bruce, of New York. They are the children of Andrew Mellon, who founded the museum.

The National Gallery Awards went to winners from 19 States and the District of Columbia. Each received a medal and $500. They were selected after a nationwide search by art experts and include teachers in colleges, high schools and elementary schools, and museum officials.

John Walker, Director of the National Gallery, said that those honored were "outstanding individuals from every section of the country who, by dedication and unusual abilities to inspire, have awakened in others a sense of our visual inheritance."

A list of the winners of the first annual awards follows:

James S. Ackerman, chairman, Fine Arts Department, Harvard University.

Helen Aupperle, high school art teacher, Idaho Falls.

Emma L. Bippus, senior lecturer, education department, Toledo Museum of Act.

Sibyl Browne, of San Antonio, Tex., retired professor of art education, University of Georgia.

Martha Christensen, art supervisor, Louisville (Ky.) schools.

Howard Conant, chairman, department of art education, New York University.

Victor D'Amico, director, department of education, Museum of Modern Art, New York.

Charles M. Dorn, executive secretary, National Art Education Assocation.

J. Eugene Grigsby, Jr., art department head, Phoenix (Ariz.) Union High School.

Robert Inglehart, chairman, department of art, University of Michigan.

Marie L. Larkin, supervisor of art, St. Louis public schools, and professor of art, Missouri University at St. Louis.

Frederick M. Logan, professor of art and art education, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Doris W. Lough, specialist art teacher at Pacific Pre-Vocational School, Seattle.

Edward Matill, head of art education department, Pennsylvania State University.

Mary Adeline McKibbin, retired director of art, Pittsburgh public schools; art teacher, University of Pittsburgh.

Erwin Panofsky, professor emeritus, institute of advanced study, Princeton, N.J.

James A. Porter, art department head, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Olga M. Schubkegel, director of art education, Hammond (Ind.) school system.

Julia B. Schwartz, professor, department of art education and design, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Grace S. Smith, director of art education, Houston Independent School District.

John and Aurelia Socha (joint award), art teachers in the Minneapolis public schools.

Wilber Moore Stilwell, art department chairman, University of South Dakota, Vermillion.

Ruth J. Stolle, artist and retired rural art teacher, Tripoli, Wis.

Frederick S. Wight, chairman, department of art, University of California at Los Angeles.

Edwin Ziegfeld, head of fine and industrial arts, Teachers College, Columbia University.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sunday Sun, Mar. 6, 1966]

A MAGNET FOR GREAT ART

(By Miles A. Smith)

Among the world's great public art galleries, the National Gallery of Art has been the fastest growing youngster in history. Now it is about to celebrate a birthday—only the 25th.

Despite its youth, it has gathered in treasures worthy of kings, nobles, and conquerors—and every candle on its cake contributes to the patina of lore and legend about the nonroyal collectors who have contributed those treasures.

The quality is so consistently high that even rival museums would hesitate to challenge the proposition that here are the best paintings in the hemisphere.

The gallery's quick rise to importance has been due to the simple fact that several great American private collections moved—lock, stock, and stretcher—into its halls in the twilight of the search for classical art.

GIANT AMERICAN COLLECTORS

About 80 percent of the gallery's paintings and sculptures bear the names of giant American collectors—Mellon, Widener, Kress, and Dale. In prints and drawings, the contributions of Lessing J. Rosenwald dominate.

When the gallery was opened March 17, 1941, its founder was not present.

For Andrew E. Mellon had died in 1937. Through a foundation he had put up $15 million for the structure—the world's largest marble building—another $5 million as an operating endowment, and had given his superb collection of old masters to the Nation. Guesses as to its value, even then, ran from $30 million to more than $50 million or even $80 million.

The white-haired, taciturn banker from Pittsburgh had been collecting since the 1870's—long before he came to Washington to become Secretary of the Treasury under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.

Among the 115 old masters he presented—there also was a group of American portraits—were 21 that Mellon had acquired in 1930 and 1931 after some secret cloak-and-dagger negotiations with the Russian Government. At that point the Kremlin was hard up for cold cash, but at the Hermitage in Leningrad it had a great cache of art collected by czars and nobles.

VAULT FULL OF CANVASES

For less than $7 million, Mellon got a vault full of canvases by Raphael, Botticelli, Titian, Rembrandt. Hals, Van Eyck, and others.

His collection also included more than 3 dozen masterpieces acquired in what probably was the greatest single transaction in the history of collecting.

The celebrated New York dealer, Joseph Duveen, whose main customer had become Mellon, managed early in 1936 to lease a Washington apartment directly under Mellon's. He filled it with every important painting he had acquired in Europe, gave Mellon the key and went back to New York.

The great collector kept slipping down to the lower floor for meditative visits, and gradually came to feel these fine works were his own. Finally the deal was closed, for $21 million.

When the 25th anniversary is reached March 17 the gallery will open a special exhibition from the collections of the next generations of Mellons—Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon and Ailsa Mellon Bruce.

It will be a stunning array of French art, containing some of the most important and costliest works of the modern masters.

FORMED "JUST IN TIME"

"The National Gallery was formed just in time," says John Walker, its 59-year-old Director, who in 1939 was appointed its first Chief Curator. "It became a magnet for those last great American collections not already given or promised elsewhere."

Because it was so late on the scene, says Walker, "it might have failed to attain its present eminence even if Congress had appropriated billions of dollars * * *. It needed the five great donations it received."

Mellon had hoped other collectors would follow his lead. With some 5½ acres of galleries, there was plenty of space to fill. It was largely through the persuasiveness of David Finley, the gallery's first Director, who retired in 1956, that other huge gifts came in.

The first was from Samuel H. Kress, the variety store tycoon from Allentown, Pa., who had formed an important collection of Italian pictures.

The old masters collection of Peter A. B. Widener and his son, Joseph, of Philadelphia, formed mainly before 1920, was one of the most famous in America. In the 1930's Mellon had been discussing the National Gallery with Joseph Widener, without getting any commitment.

FINLEY WINS OVER WIDENER

After Mellon's death, Finley followed through and ultimately won over Widener, but several conditions were attached.

One was that there should be no tax—creating a problem with the State of Pennsylvania. President Roosevelt sent a special message to Congress, asking that it pay the State tax, whatever the amount might be. A bill was passed and, as Walker says, it "may well represent the only blank check ever written by Congress." (The tax proved to be $357,050.)

Chester Dale was a New York financier who was drawn into collecting by his first wife, Maud, a painter and art critic. His main contribution was a magnificent and comprehensive survey of French painting of the last 150 years.

Many of the Dale pictures were acquired in the 1920's, before prices had soared. New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art had been wooing the Dales. But one legend has it that the Metropolitan slipped out of the running when the jurors of a special George Bellows Exhibit neglected to include that artist's portrait of Mrs. Dale.

ON GALLERY'S MAIN FLOOR

Aside from whole collections, the gallery has benefited from more than 100 other donations, ranging from a single rare painting to a collection of 215 American primitives given by Col. and Mrs. Edgar W. Garbisch.

Without crowding, the gallery's main floor eventually will hold between 1,200 and 1,300 pictures. It has reached roughly three-fourths of that amount.

Walker hopes American collectors will fill the gaps. The institution's upkeep is by congressional appropriation and it has purchased relatively few pictures, waiting 5 years to buy the first.

Walker speaks of "our national constituency" in estimating that people from out of town represent about 80 percent of the gallery's annual attendance of around 1,200,000.

Awesome as the gallery's treasures undoubtedly are, youngsters accept them with fresh imagination and without self-consciousness. One little boy, standing before the fragile color-magic of Fragonard's "The Swing," a sophisticated evocation of the 18th century French aristocracy's frivolity, had his own reaction.

"It makes me think of Mary Poppins," he said.

DEATH OF AMBASSADOR ENGEN

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wanted America's good friend Ambassador Hans Kristian Engen, of Norway, to be aboard that first Scandinavian Airlines System jet when it leaves Seattle next July providing a direct link between the Pacific Northwest and the great Scandinavian nations.

Now it will not be possible for him to do so.

We lost Ambassador Engen yesterday.

President Johnson has expressed his condolences, as has Vice President HUMPHREY and Secretary of State Rusk.

Their messages to the Engen family and the Norwegian Nation indicate the warmth and affection felt for one who stood high in the family of nations represented on our shores.

While the Ambassador and I had been friends over the years, it was the negotiations which resulted in the expanded SAS service to the Pacific Northwest which provided our latest, and probably our closest contact.

Not only was Ambassador Engen an outstanding representative of his own country here, but he also has been an important spokesman for the United States in Norway. In fact, he had intensive sessions with his Government to present U.S. views on major world problems, including 2 hours with Prime Minister Borten, prior to leaving for Oslo for Gudbrandsdal where he died in a mountain hytte.

He died in one of the places where he most wished to be.

In addition to being chairman of the Scandinavian delegation during the recent negotiations on the SAS request for landing rights in Seattle, I know first hand of the travel he has done to all parts of the United States, including our western United States, with Crown Prince Harald and on other occasions in connection with his work with the Norwegian-American community in the United States.

Universally well liked as a person and highly respected as a diplomat and negotiator, Ambassador Engen had a great interest in art and was well known for his warm hospitality.

I know how hard he worked and how successfully he broadened those bridges of travel and understanding between our nations. We shall miss him greatly.

Hans Engen had a keen interest in and concern for the newly independent and emerging national states, and understood the importance of the role which the United States must play in assuring proper timing in settling the differences between these new countries and the old colonialist powers. He had an active role in planning the Norwegian program for aid to underdeveloped countries.

Born on August 22, 1912, in Ringebu, Norway, Engen studied languages and history at the University of Olso and in Sweden and Germany, receiving a degree in philology in 1942. During World War II he did outstanding work in the communications service between the Norwegian home front and the government in exile in London, and later with the Norwegian Government Information Service in Sweden and in London. Shortly after his return to Norway in 1945, Engen became foreign editor of Verdens Gang, a small independent Oslo daily influential in intellectual circles. He was his newspaper's correspondent at international conferences, including the Paris Peace Conference in 1946, the Foreign Ministers Conference in London in 1947, and the United Nations General Assembly in Paris in 1948. At the same time he was a foreign commentator with the Norwegian State Broadcasting Service. During these years, Engen developed into one of the most able and well-informed commentators on foreign affairs in Norway.

Engen left Verdens Gang in 1949 to become press attaché with the Permanent U.N. Mission, and held this position until 1951 when he was promoted to Deputy Permanent Representative to the U.N. He was appointed Permanent Representative in 1952.

Engen served with distinction in a number of U.N. positions. He was unanimously elected president of ECOSOC in April 1956; was a member of the U.N. Disarmament Commission in 1958; and on several occasions served as an adviser to the late Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjöld, on Middle Eastern and Asian developments. For a brief period in 1960 he was the acting head of the Norwegian NATO and OEEC delegations in Paris.

A man of medium build, Hans Engen presented a pleasant, studious, reserved and quiet, appearance. He sometimes gave the impression of shyness. He had a fine sense of humor. He was married to an American, the former Erna Walmsley.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the messages from the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and an article from the Washington Post of April 7, 1966; also remarks made in a radio-television appearance from Oslo, Norway, by former Secretary of State Halvard Lange, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

YOUR MAJESTY: We have all been deeply saddened to hear of the death of Ambassador Engen. He was a fine diplomat, a good and able man and will be sorely missed in Washington and throughout America.

Hans Engen was a true friend of the United States. His presence on our shores, first at the United Nations and later as your Ambassador here, contributed greatly to the friendship, warmth, and admiration that the American people have for your great country.

On behalf of Mrs. Johnson, myself, and the American people I want to extend my most heartfelt sympathy and condolences.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

MESSAGE FROM THE VICE PRESIDENT

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: Please accept my sincere condolences on the loss we all share in the sudden death of Ambassador Engen. His life and work on behalf of the nation he so greatly loved and so eminently and faithfully represented provides a legacy of timeless value for generations yet to come.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

MESSAGE FROM SECRETARY RUSK

DEAR MR. MINISTER: I was deeply distressed to learn of the sudden death of Ambassador Engen. He was a valued colleague and a worthy representative of the nation he so dearly loved. Hans Engen's fine qualities contributed greatly to the strengthening of the close ties between our countries. On this sad occasion please accept my personal condolences and those of my colleagues in the Department of State.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 7, 1966]

NORWEGIAN ENVOY HANS ENGEN DIES DURING VACATION AT HOME

Hans Engen, Norwegian Ambassador to the United States since 1963, died yesterday of a cerebral hemorrhage while on a skiing vacation in Lillehammer, Norway. He was 53.

The Ambassador's lifelong career as a civil servant brought him international recognition in the pursuit of world peace. Before coming to Washington he was a member of his country's delegation to the United Nations for 9 years, and was instrumental in resolving the Suez crisis of 1956.

Ambassador Engen was born in Ringebu, Norway, and received degrees from the University of Oslo in German language in 1935, and in world history in 1938. During the Nazi occupation of 1941 through 1945 he served as a liaison officer between the home front and the Norwegian Government in exile.

After serving 3 years as foreign editor of the Oslo newspaper, Verdens Gang, Ambassador Engen came to New York in 1949 as press attaché of the Norwegian delegation to the United Nations. In 1951 he became counselor of the delegation, and the next year was appointed Norwegian Ambassador to the U.N.

During his years at the U.N., the Ambassador served on many committees there. In 1949, he was chairman of the U.N. Committee for Former Italian Colonies, and in 1953 he was rapporteur for the Committee for Admission of New Members.

In 1955 the Ambassador served as chairman of the U.N. budgetary committee, and the next year was elected president of the Economic and Social Council. When the Suez crisis flared in the Middle East in 1956, he was appointed to the General Assembly's advisory committee for U.N. Forces, and for his services received the Honorary Medal of the U.N. Emergency Forces. His was one of three such awards granted for service during that crisis.

In 1958 the Ambassador returned to Norway to serve as Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs, and in 1963 he became Ambassador to the United States.

The Ambassador was a commander of the Royal Order of St. Olav. One of the most important Norwegian orders, it is comparable to a British knighthood. He was appointed for his work as a Norwegian civil servant by King Olav V in 1964.

REMARKS MADE IN A RADIO-TELEVISION APPEARANCE FROM OSLO, NORWAY BY FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE HALVARD LANGE

Hans Engen, Norwegian Ambassador to the United States since 1963, died April 6 at the age of 53. He suffered a cerebral hemorrhage while on a sking vacation at Lillehammer, Norway. Foreign Minister John Lyng stated that the late Ambassador had for many years been one of the foremost spokesmen for Norwegian foreign policy and for Norwegian interests abroad. Through his work in a number of important posts, Hans Engen rendered invaluable services for his country. Former Foreign Minister Halvard Lange paid warm tribute to Mr. Engen in a memorial program on Norwegian radio and television.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in a telegram to King Olav, declared in part: "We have all been deeply saddened to hear of the death of Ambassador Engen. He was a fine diplomat and a splendid person and will be sorely missed by his many friends in Washington and throughout America. Hans Engen was a true friend of the United States. His presence on our shores, first at the United Nations and later as your Ambassador here, contributed greatly to the love, friendship and admiration that the American people have for your great country."

Premier Per Borten received "sincere condolences" from Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. He said about Ambassador Engen: "His life and work on behalf of the nation he so greatly loved and so eminently and faithfully represented provides a legacy of timeless value for generations to come."

U.N. Secretary General U Thant expressed his "deep sympathy" to Foreign Minister Lyng. So did U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Ambassador Engen in Mr. Rusk's words, "was a valued colleague and a worthy representative of the nation he so dearly loved. Hans Engen's fine qualities contributed greatly to the strengthening of the close ties between our countries."

Former Foreign Minister Halvard Lange, in his radio-TV tribute, said the Norwegian foreign service had suffered "a painful loss" by the sudden death of Hans Engen. "Our country has lost one of its most outstanding diplomatic representatives," Outlining some of the highlights in the late Ambassador's brilliant career, Mr. Lange observed:

"Hans Engen entered the foreign service from his work in the press. By education he was a philologist, with history as his major field of interest. Shortly after the German invasion in April 1940 he became associated with the circle of patriots around Supreme Court Justice Paal Berg who, often under heavy personal danger, maintained liaison between leaders of the civilian home front resistance and the Norwegian Government in London. As secret courier between Oslo and Stockholm, he demonstrated great personal courage, stamina and resourcefulness. With his interest in international affairs, coupled with his gift for clear and graphic description, he found his natural place in journalism. From shortly after the liberation in 1949, he was foreign editor of Verdens Gang.

"After Norway's first election to membership on the U.N. Security Council, he joined the Norwegian Permanent Delegation in New York as press attaché. He soon became a valued political counselor to Arne Sunde, then Norway's permanent representative. At the age of 40, Hans Engen succeeded Sunde as chief of the Norwegian delegation and soon won a strong position in the international milieu at U.N. headquarters. He became one of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld's few intimate friends and advisers. The solid position he thus created for himself and the trust he enjoyed in all quarters, made it possible for Hans Engen to play an active role during the Suez crisis in the summer and fall of 1956. Together with Hammarskjöld and Lester Pearson, he helped to lay the political foundation for liquidating the French-British action against Egypt and for establishment of the U.N. emergency forces.

"After 9 years at the Norwegian delegation to U.N., Hans Engen returned home to become Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. In this capacity, he made a great contribution as leader of the preparations for negotiations on Norwegian membership in the European Economic Community. In the summer of 1963, Hans Engen was appointed Ambassador to the United States, a post which he filled in an outstanding manner until his unexpected death."

Halvard Lange ended his eulogy with these words: "Hans Engen had a natural talent for diplomacy. With his ability to listen and to grasp the thinking of others, he won the confidence of all he had contact with. Solid knowledge of international politics, clear appreciation of what is politically feasible, made him an excellent negotiator. Hospitable and friendly, Hans Engen was respected and recognized as a capable representative of his country, both with regard to protecting Norwegian interests and to win understanding for Norwegian views on international issues. All who knew and worked with Hans Engen are left bereaved by his death."

AID TO INDIA

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, President Johnson's proposed program to aid drought-stricken India has my wholehearted support.

It is humane. It is compassionate. And it is wise. The society of free, democratic nations has an obligation to help its members whenever and however they are threatened.

India is now suffering from a disaster not of her making, and is asking the entire world for help.

The President has responded with a pledge of generous assistance from our country and has combined that pledge with an earnest appeal for help from all nations.

The aid we have already given our sister democracy must be continued, for her plight remains desperate. I was pleased to hear the President propose that the United States supply half of India's additional food needs through the remainder of this year, and pleased to hear him ask other nations to supply the remainder.

NAVAL ACADEMY PROBLEMS HAVE SPECIAL MEANING TO SENATORS BECAUSE OF THEIR NOMINATIONS, CONFIRMATION, APPROPRIATIONS, FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES — WASHINGTON POST PERFORMS SERVICE IN REVEALING CONDITIONS AT NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Washington Post performed a public service in its April 2, 3, 5, and 6, 1966, issues by publishing a series of significant and revealing articles indicating that all might not be shipshape at the U.S. Naval Academy.

I do not enjoy calling attention to the problems which seem to be coming to light at Annapolis. Actually, I am saddened. But I must point out that for more than a year I have been endeavoring to bring interest to bear on the situation at the Naval Academy. I suspect that perhaps I did stimulate a Navy Inspector General's investigation of plebe indoctrination at Annapolis. But it was an in-house inquiry.

No substantial good appears to have resulted. Navy seems to resist the need for change in the Academy's basic nonacademic system and makes questionable academic adjustments. Consequently, because of Washington Post revelations, Department of the Navy and Academy authorities must suffer tarnishment in public while many young men of the Brigade of Midshipmen are accused—whether falsely or accurately—of being academic malingerers.

Mr. President, in consecutive plebe classes—the one which entered in July 1964 and the current fourth class which entered in July 1965—2 out of 3 of my nominees accepted for entrance experienced inordinate difficulties or disillusionment which prompted me to take an active interest in their cases and to learn more about midshipman affairs. I will not engage in detailed discussion of either case at this time, but I have much information for the record of any Senate committee or other official investigating group.

The data available to me, and the recent Washington Post disclosures, are sufficient to convince me that I was on solid ground in having imparted to the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel last December 21 my views, in part, as follows:

> As is understandable, resignation and other separation interviews at the academies seem not to be sufficiently relaxed to adduce all pertinent facts for the record while the plebe still is in uniform or under academy control.
>
> In the case of (the young man of the 1965–66 fourth class appointed under my quota, who tendered his resignation on October 7, 1965), the roots of his reasons for not continuing at the Naval Academy are much deeper than are set forth in his letter of resignation. * * * This young man is concerned—as I am—that there is misplaced emphasis at the Naval Academy. He feels—as I do—that there is excessive subordination of academics to so-called plebe indoctrination (which really is plebe harassment). Plebes are acquiring foundation experience in the traditions of the brigade, but in too many cases it is to the detriment of academic foundations.
>
> The young man informed me that no particular incident of plebe indoctrination upset him but he was disillusioned by the inequities and uneven distribution of educational opportunities and the unevenness of so-called indoctrination. In his case, he said, three-fifths of his unscheduled and study time was required by first, second, and third classmen (the latter contrary to regulations) to be devoted to so-called professional questions, and come-arounds, including humiliating types of physical activities of various descriptions inside Bancroft Hall. (The worst offenses, the resigned plebe said, were time-consuming and nonregulation personal services required by his squad leader.)
>
> I experienced an awakening earlier this year through the conditions and the Navy mishandling of the (case of my 1964 nominee), and I am acquiring a broader understanding of the plebe indoctrination system as a consequence of the more recent (case of my 1965 nominee), neither of whom felt he was able to achieve adequate academic foundation under the plebe indoctrination conditions to which subjected. Problems such as these in consecutive plebe classes, with numerous elements of similarity, are discouraging and disconcerting. Frankly, my reservations concerning the nature and the impact of plebe indoctrination at the Naval Academy have reached the proportions of disapproval which I shall express in Senate remarks and possibly in legislative proposals.

Mr. President, this is the occasion in the proceedings of the Senate when I reiterate my disapproval of the Naval Academy plebe indoctrination system. If there are not substantial changes and improvements made in the system within the next year, I will, indeed, have legislative proposals to offer—extensive remedies for altering an abused and outmoded system which is inhibiting academic achievement by depriving plebes of opportunities to acquire adequate academic foundations. Too many of them suffer foundation losses in the first year which compound into unpreparedness and academic deficiencies in subsequent years.

Mr. President, I believe the RECORD will be the better for an inclusion of excerpts from a letter I received from the plebe appointed on my quota following his October 7, 1965, resignation from the Naval Academy. He wrote to me on January 3, 1966, from his home after having had an opportunity to read a sworn statement filed by his predecessor on my quota. I quote from the letter:

> DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: This gratefully acknowledges your correspondence of November and December 1965, regarding (my predecessor under your quota) and myself in connection with our regrettable Naval Academy situations.
>
> This is not only a matter of personal grief, but one of growing distress for citizens of the United States. Military strength is vital and superior officers a must. Now that I have been exposed to some of the judgment, logic, and ethics of some of our future naval leaders, I will admit I am concerned. Richard's statement helps epitomize the undesirable situation which plagues Bancroft Hall.
>
> My opinions will be considered biased, immature and devoid of sufficient experimental knowldege, but I still fail to see why some purely chance circumstance should carry

> enough adverse gravity to result in a complete turnabout of a person's career objective, particularly if it is avoidable. Most upperclassmen are fine fellows and are genuinely desirous of helping plebes to acclimate themselves, but there always seems to be a few who possess cruel tendencies as indicated in Richard's statement. To be assigned to and directly supervised by this type of midshipman, solely the result of a random consequence, leaves something to be desired as far as administration of the plebe system is concerned. Practically all boys can gear themselves to accept hazing, but there should be some means provided, perhaps through increased sharing of plebe management by the Academy's handpicked officers, to deal with atrocities, indignities, and inhuman infringements. It seems doubtful that this is a true test of one's abilities to recognize authority, exercise responsibility, and render correct decisions under stress.

Mr. President, there is on file in the Department of the Navy a sworn statement by a young man I nominated in 1964, who was appointed by the Secretary of the Navy under my quota, but who prompted his separation from the Naval Academy at the end of a harassing semester there.

His statement has never been officially acknowledged by the Secretary of the Navy—to whom it was addressd—nor by any of the Secretary's subordinates, nor by any uniformed officer of the Navy—but it is there, and it contains some severe indictments of the plebe indoctrination system and of some midshipmen charged with unusual nonregulation acts.

I shall not burden the Record now with more than excerpts from the four closing paragraphs of the young man's statement addressed to and filed with the Secretary of the Navy under date of July 29, 1965:

> Mr. Secretary, there was a severe breakdown of the Naval Academy plebe indoctrination monitoring system which I was led to believe * * * was totally effective. I had an academic year virtually destroyed by this breakdown, and now I find myself in the enlisted Naval Reserve with no more training or preparation for service than the slight amount received during plebe summer.
>
> Mr. Secretary, I hope that when you issue certificates of appointment to new midshipmen there will be assurances on your part and performance on the part of the uniformed Navy to make sure that each midshipman appointed will receive equal opportunities with his classmates and that each will receive fair treatment.
>
> No matter how marginal the new midshipman may be scholastically or physically when he is accepted for entrance, the fact remains that he qualified for the appointment he received; he should be made immune from attack by upperclassmen on the validity of his appointment. Certainly he should not be the target of threats by upperclassmen to run him out of the Academy. * * * I know from personal experience, Mr. Secretary, that upperclassmen have it within their power to harass plebes into academic deficiency and to destroy their motivation. I hope that there will be stronger safeguards and that the plebe monitoring system will be made effective for the present new class and all new midshipmen in the future.

Mr. President, I have the feeling that millions of dollars are not being expended with prudence and effectiveness for officer education and training at the Naval Academy—and possibly at other service academies. The administration of the Naval Academy, according to the Washington Post series, admits there is undeniable evidence of coasting by midshipmen who know that they will not be graded solely on scholastic competence. Yes, there are other elements in addition to academics on the agenda of the midshipman at the Naval Academy, but why deliberately shortchange academics and encourage scholastic malingering? Is too much time being devoted to hazing of plebes in the guise of leadership training?

More than a year ago, I urged in communications addressed to the White House and the Defense Establishment that there be a thorough study of service academy affairs participated in jointly by the executive and the legislative branches. The response was that the whole range of education in the armed services is under study and that the academies are supervised by Boards of Visitors which include Members of Congress. Obviously, something more is needed.

The Washington Post articles indicate that educational accreditation investigations and enterprising journalists are uncovering service academy deficiencies—at least at the Naval Academy—which demand attention and correction now. Grave questions are raised as to the quality of education and the products of that education; namely, the officers being graduated and being presented to the Senate en bloc each year for rubber stamp confirmation. Most graduates undoubtedly are worthy—some brilliant—but the question is this: How many unfit are getting by—coasting through?

I am concerned and I believe every Senator should be concerned because Senators have a special responsibility as a consequence of the nomination and confirmation duties reposing in us. And we appropriate very substantial investments in each service academy cadet and midshipman—possibly too much under existing administration.

It is my opinion that there should be a complete Senate investigation, beginning with the Naval Academy. In the interim, I recommend that there be a curtailment of appropriations for additions to the educational plant at Annapolis until a careful study disapproves the allegations set forth in the Post articles or until thorough-going changes have been made in the basic system there—changes which will afford a better balance between the academic side and the nonacademic phases.

Mr. President, I commend Washington Post staff writer Leroy F. Aarons and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record following these remarks the articles he wrote for the Post of April 2, 1966, under the headline, "Improve Studies, Report Urges Naval Academy"; April 3, 1966, under the headline "Son of VIP Passed With 16 Percent on Final: Ousted Assistant Professor Asserts He Resisted Academy Grade Fixing"; April 5, 1966, under the headline "Naval Academy Admits Limit on Failures"; and April 6, 1966, under the headline "Naval Academy May End Limit on Number of F's."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Apr. 2, 1966]

Improve Studies, Report Urges Naval Academy

(By Leroy F. Aarons)

A blue-ribbon accrediting team that studied the U.S. Naval Academy for 5 days last month will recommend that the school deemphasize military and athletic activities in favor of academic studies, it was learned yesterday.

It was also learned that the Academy has an official policy limiting the number of students permitted to fail their courses, regardless of grades.

A. Bernard Drought, the academic dean, acknowledged that the policy exists and said he initiated it shortly after he came to the Academy in 1963. He said his action was prompted by an increase in failures when the institution started using letters instead of numerals in grading.

The accrediting team, a committee of the Middle Atlantic Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, found that midshipmen were not performing to academic capacity because of the demands of the extensive military and athletic programs imposed by the Academy.

As one source put it: "All that malarkey stands in the way of a vastly improved academic program."

The committee will suggest a deemphasis of athletics and a shaving of the military program so that it involves less of the student's time without losing its effectiveness.

DEAN IS PRAISED

The committee praised Dean Drought for bringing about a dramatic improvement in the academic program, including a large increase in the civilian faculty, but said the Academy "still has some things to do before it reaches the goal of excellence."

The source said the committee's report to the association's commission on higher education will be critical, but he did not anticipate that the Academy's accreditation will be endangered.

The source said he could not comment on the question of grade fixing, but said, "If they're doing that, you can be sure we have the evidence."

The Academy's limited-flunk grading policy, a source of controversy among the faculty, works this way:

Student marks are gathered from the sections into which courses are divided and plotted on a curve. If the number of D's and F's exceeds a certain percentage, the curve is raised so that fewer students fall into those categories.

Drought did not have exact percentages, but said the number of D's and F's ranges from about 12 percent for first-year men to about 7 percent for seniors.

He said the system became necessary when the school switched from a 0 to 4 marking system to an A, B, C, D, F system. Under the old method, a student could graduate with a 2.5 average. With the converted system, a D is considered passing but must be offset by a sufficient number of higher grades in order for the student to graduate.

SYSTEM EXPLAINED

"Students who were working just as hard were not getting enough credits to graduate," Drought said. "In order to keep our attrition rate at the steady 35 percent it has been for the past 10 years, we instituted the cutoff system."

Drought admitted that neither he nor the faculty was happy with the system, and that it is now under study with an eye to phasing it out.

A number of civilian faculty members interviewed said they felt the policy undermines their authority and encourages some students to coast.

"Our standards are all the way down," one of them said. "Grades are being controlled to the point where we have no stick. We used to get more work out of the students; now they know their grades are getting jockeyed so they don't work hard."

The faculty member added that limiting the number of failures was a practice long before Drought arrived, but that it has gradually been getting worse.

Another said: "First of all, these boys are sent here by Congressmen, and you have to have a certain number of graduates. If you don't, you start getting questions asked."

WON'T GIVE NAMES

None of the professors interviewed would allow his name to be used for fear of reprisal. One said, "They would push my face in the mud" if officials found out he had spoken to the press.

Civilian faculty members, who make up more than 50 percent of the teaching personnel, also complained of low morale and lack of communication with the Academy's administration.

A professor with long tenure said the faculty "has no way to protest, no way to make our wants or opinions known on academic questions. You can get to see the dean and department heads, but what we don't have is a unified voice.

"Morale here is not desperate, but it is bad. This place has a chance to be a really great college, but the Navy has not yet thought through how to run a university within a garrison."

A group of instructors recently formed a chapter of the American Association of University Professors, and is now pressing for formation of an academic senate with advisory powers.

Dean Drought said he is receptive to the idea of a faculty advisory body, but that a senate, in the accepted university sense with policymaking powers, would "only meet with frustration in a military environment."

Asked about the accreditation study, he said he did not feel that the multiple demands on the midshipmen's time was a serious problem.

"It is a matter of adjustment of the individual to his own time schedule," he said. "For example, maybe a person who has gone out for athletics and is tired would be better off if he slept a couple of hours before beginning to study."

The Academy's Brigade commander, Midshipman Michael J. Sweeney, disagreed. He told a reporter that he felt the pressures on the Academy student often force him to do a mediocre job in one or more areas.

Sweeney, who discussed the problem with the accrediting team when it was at the Academy, said he proposed a revision of academic schedules rather than a downgrading of the military and athletic functions.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 3, 1966]

SON OF VIP PASSED WITH 16 PERCENT ON FINAL—OUSTED ASSISTANT PROFESSOR ASSERTS HE RESISTED ACADEMY GRADE FIXING

(By Leroy F. Aarons)

ANNAPOLIS, April 2.—An assistant professor of Spanish at the U.S. Naval Academy said today that his teaching contract is not being renewed after he refused to participate in grade-fixing practices.

Kent Ponder, 34, told the Washington Post that a midshipman whose father is a high-ranking Navy officer was allowed to pass first-year Spanish even though the youth scored only 16 percent on a final written examination.

Favoritism is not limited to midshipmen with VIP fathers, Ponder added. Official Academy policy requires that only a certain percentage of students may receive D's (passing, but noncredit grades) and E's (failing), regardless of their classroom and examination performances.

The head of the Academy's foreign languages department, Capt. Robert S. Hayes, denied that there is any connection between the decision to let Ponder's 1-year contract run out and the question of grade adjustments.

As early as September, Hayes said, his civilian faculty aides had "begun to question the caliber of Ponder's performances."

Ponder, who holds two degrees in Spanish and is working on his doctorate at Georgetown University, countered during his first weeks at Annapolis last semester he was complimented by some faculty officials for his classroom teaching and his general performance.

The trouble began around midsemester, he said, when he had a conference with Hayes, who expressed concern about the number of D's and F's Ponder was giving students in the five sections he teaches.

"He began to mention the quota of total D's and F's—10 percent for plebes, 7 percent for sophomores," Ponder said.

"This was the first time he actually told me that such a thing as grade quotas was going to operate. I told him I would not permit that in my classes.

"He then told me that I would not have to raise the marks, that someone else would. I answered that I would not allow him or anyone else to raise grades in an accredited course."

Hayes said such a discussion did not take place. He said that if grade control is practiced anywhere, it is only in the freshman year and that he can remember only one special case in his department.

Academic Dean A. Bernard Drought acknowledged, however, that he initiated the policy in 1963 because of an increase in failures when the Academy started using letters instead of numerical grading.

PERFORMANCE QUESTIONED

Ponder said that a day after his talk with Hayes, he was called into a high-level evaluation session and told that his overall performance had been questioned. Three weeks later, on January 7, Hayes notified him that his contract would not be renewed, he added.

Meanwhile, the Academy Superintendent, Rear Adm. D. L. Kauffman, called Ponder to his office to discuss the midshipman who was failing Spanish last semester, Ponder said. The youth failed his first year at Annapolis and is repeating as a plebe.

In an hour-long discussion, Ponder said, Kauffman asked whether the professor could help the youth with his studies so he could get through the course, which he was taking for the first time. Ponder said he replied that he was giving the midshipman extra instruction but that his chances for passing were slim.

Kauffman emphasized, the professor added, that he was not speaking in his official capacity but as a friend of the youth's father.

The midshipman's score of 16 percent on the final examination was the lowest made by 213 students taking first-year Spanish, Ponder said.

LISTED AS PASSING

The midshipman was given a reexamination 5 days later—a standing practice for certain failing students—and was listed as passing the course although his score was 56 percent. Ponder said he was not allowed to participate in the second test.

Hayes contended at first that the midshipman was treated like any of his colleagues. He then conceded that Ponder had been summoned to a discussion with Kauffman about the midshipman.

Efforts to reach Kauffman today were fruitless. Capt. Emil Saroch, a senior aide, said the Admiral did not wish to discuss Academy policies while the school is under study by a team from the Middle Atlantic Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Kauffman told Associated Press today that he "would be absolutely stunned" if the team recommends, as reported Saturday by the Washington Post, that Annapolis needs to deemphasize military and athletic activities and put greater emphasis on the academic program.

The view that students are not working to academic capacity also is expected to be supported by the accreditation committee. The group, it was learned, has concluded that midshipmen are not achieving what their counterparts in civilian colleges are.

SLEEP IN CLASS

In a letter written March 19 to Drought, Ponder said that students sleep in class, often must be commanded to take notes and come to class unprepared.

All the midshipmen have learned of the quota system for failures, he wrote, "and they know that if they lag as a group, they will not suffer low grades because of it.

"They know it is possible to do F work all semester and receive a C as a final grade because they see many instances of it. * * * Many of the better students * * * feel that they are being cheated, that the Government is being cheated, and that the academic education they are receiving is seriously defective."

Ponder, from New Mexico, received his bachelor's degree with honors from Brigham Young University. He obtained his master's from the Madrid extension school of Middlebury College of Vermont. An Air Force veteran, he taught at Keystone College in Pennsylvania for a year before starting work on his doctorate.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 5, 1966]

NAVAL ACADEMY ADMITS LIMIT ON FAILURES

(By Leroy F. Aarons)

"Undeniable evidence" of coasting by midshipmen who know that they will not be graded solely on scholastic competence is cited in a self-evaluation study prepared by U.S. Naval Academy personnel and signed by the Superintendent.

The study, dated February 1, states that:

"It is a matter of great concern to many of the faculty that the practical necessity of graduating reasonable numbers of naval officers each year makes it difficult, if not impossible to base grade distribution solely on scholastic competence."

"There is undeniable evidence of 'coasting' on the part of significant numbers of middle C, average midshipmen who have learned to make the minimum effort to pass successfully," the report continues.

"This is particularly evident during the senior year, when the financial investment in the education and pay of each midshipman is well recognized as deterrent to their dismissal except for serious doubt as to their future potential as naval officers."

COVERS EVERY ASPECT

The 288-page study, which covers every aspect of academic life at the Academy, was prepared for use of a committee of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The committee is now preparing a report on the Academy after a 5-day examination of the school last month.

It has been learned that the committee will recommend de-emphasis of the athletics and military activities in favor of the academic program.

Faculty members interviewed over the last several days have told the Washington Post that one reason for coasting by students is an official system of grade controls that limits the number of failures to a certain percentage of the student body.

The self-evaluation study acknowledges that assignment of grades is partly administrative and attributes it to the special problems at the Naval Academy of large student attrition for other than academic reasons.

Since 1956, voluntary resignations of midshipmen have risen from 11.6 percent to 15.1 percent in 1965. At the same time, academic discharges have declined from 15.9 percent to 11.4 percent.

The report says that faculty members frequently do not realize the impact of the special concern of the Naval Academy and the Bureau of Naval Personnel over nonacademic attrition and class rank based upon grades. As a result, they look upon grading as purely academic in nature and a prerogative of the teacher.

The report goes on to say that the faculty is in general agreement with grading policies.

Many faculty members, however, especially among the newer civilian instructors and professors, take the view that administrative control of grades undermines their authority in the classroom and demonstrates a lack of faith in their ability to judge their students.

The problem was acknowledged yesterday by Adm. Draper L. Kauffman, Academy Superintendent who said in a statement following revelations of grade fixing in the Washington Post that it is important to "phase out" the "interim ceiling" on D's and F's.

REPLIES TO CHARGES

Kauffman said the ceiling was imposed during a transition period from one marking system to another. But faculty members with tenure have said that unofficial grade-fixing has existed for many years at the Academy.

Kauffman also replied to charges in the Washington Post by Kent Ponder, an assistant Spanish professor, that he had been dropped from next year's faculty after taking a stand against grade fixing.

Kauffman told a reporter for an Annapolis paper yesterday that Ponder's dismissal stemmed from a conflict with the senior professor in the language department, and not from the grade adjustment issue.

The notification letter to Ponder from Capt. Robert Hayes, chairman of the department, makes no reference to such a conflict, but says that Ponder's performance had been satisfactory. The reason given for nonrenewal was personnel requirements of the department.

Kauffman also acknowledged an assertion by Ponder that he had taken an interest in the case of a midshipman who was failing his courses last semester. He said he had discussed the case of the student—son of a high-ranking naval officer and a personal friend of Kauffman's—with each of the student's instructors.

GIVEN PASSING GRADE

The admiral said he asked the instructors to suggest specific areas of study the student should be working on during the Christmas vacation.

The midshipman, who is repeating his plebe year, failed Ponder's freshman Spanish course, but was given a passing mark later on a reexamination in which Ponder did not participate.

Kauffman said that current problems at the Academy are the result of a true academic revolution over the last 5 years that saw major changes to curriculum, faculty, and administration.

"As might be expected, this marked and rapid increase in educational caliber brought along a few problems which have to be solved," he said, "knotty and important problems. But they can and will be solved."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 6, 1966]

Naval Academy May End Limit on Number of F's

(By Leroy F. Aarons)

Annapolis, April 5.—Limits on the number of D's and F's that U.S. Naval Academy professors are allowed to give midshipmen may be dropped by the start of the next semester.

Rear Adm. Draper L. Kauffman, Academy Superintendent, said today he is "hopeful that all ceilings will be eliminated as of September 1."

He said he is confident that his newly reactivated academic council will concur with his plans. At present, no more than 13 percent of the plebes and 4 percent of the seniors can be given D's and F's.

Kauffman, who was critical of recent stories in the Washington Post about the grade-fixing professors are required to do, said the Academy administration has exercised absolutely no control over the number of A's, B's and C's given midshipmen since he became Superintendent last September.

However, academic Dean A. Bernard Drought acknowledged that last spring he instituted an experiment controlling the higher grades for plebes, as well as the barely passing and failing D's and F's.

In one department, for example, the faculty was instructed to give 15 percent of the plebes A's and 35 percent of them B's.

Drought said the experiment failed because of coordination problems and that he has discontinued it.

Kauffman, who denied that the Bureau of Naval Personnel requires the Academy to graduate a certain number of junior officers each year, stressed that the ceilings were put into effect in 1963 only to keep dropouts from increasing during the Academy's transition from a numerical to a letter-grading system.

The number of failing students started to increase during the transition, Drought said, which is why he imposed the quotas on D's and F's. As midshipmen in the class of 1966 are the last to be graded under both systems, the ceiling now can be eliminated, he added.

Student attrition for all reasons, ranging from voluntary resignations to academic or bad conduct discharges, runs about 30 to 35 percent, Kauffman said. While the rate has been going up over the last decade, he stressed there was a sharp decline last year.

The grade ceilings were brought to light in a story in the Washington Post last week. The next day an assistant professor of Spanish, Kent Ponder, asserted that his 1-year contarct was not renewed when he refused to give higher grades to students whose performance he assessed at D and F levels.

Five assistant professors in the Academy's Mathematics Department praised Ponder in a letter today for having "the fortitude to tell Congress and the public (about) practices here in the Yard."

"We wish to express our solidarity with you," wrote Harold M. Kaplan, James D. McPherson, Alan M. Norris, James P. Yizze and D. L. Muench, who claimed that "the practice of raising grades dates from long before Dean Drought's arrival.

"What you describe, we have ourselves seen and heard and done. You deserve the support of all faculty members here in the Academy and at other colleges."

"Foreign languages and chemistry are subjects in which the Academy has the most problems with failing students," Kauffman said.

Faculty members interviewed by the Washington Post have charged that morale among professors is low not only because of the grade control practices, but also because of their difficulties in getting their views made known to administration officials and the lack of a unified voice in their own areas of professional competence.

They have suggested elimination of the rule that no midshipman who gets an F in any required course can graduate and the appointment of qualified civilians as heads of departments.

The faculty is slightly more than 50-percent civilian. All department heads are Naval officers; all senior professors are civilians.

Some junior faculty members would like to see a faculty advisory forum established to improve communication between the men who teach the midshipmen and the men who administer the Academy.

Kauffman said he has considered putting civilians in charge of departments but has yet to make up his mind. He said the suggestion that students with just one failing grade is an interesting one, but noted that a greater problem was having midshipmen sustain C averages throughout their Academy careers.

Drought conceded that a faculty-administration communication problem exists, but said the Academy is no different in this respect from other institutions.

"In a theoretical sense there is no better line of communications than in a military organization," he said. "But most faculty members present their ideas orally rather than in written form and they die on the vine."

Kauffman said the revived academic council might help reduce faculty discontent. It consists of administration officials, the senior professors, and the heads of departments. Kauffman said he is considering adding junior faculty members in the future.

Asked whether such a council would duplicate the functions of the advisory forum sought by some faculty members, Kauffman said it was too early to tell.

The council will give continuing advice on academic policy. One of its immediate jobs will be to suggest ways of implementing recommendations of an accrediting team from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, which made a 5-day examination of the Academy last month.

Kauffman said he has received a preliminary copy of the team's report and found it "amusing" to compare with what the Washington Post said would be in it. He refused to say what was in the report.

A source on the accrediting team said that, among other things, it would recommend deemphasizing athletic and military functions.

Kauffman complained that recent articles about the Academy in this newspaper were "lethal" and aimed at showing only the bad side of the school. He stressed that the Academy curriculum has undergone a dramatic change since 1959, midshipmen were allowed for the first time to choose minors and electives and to validate credits from other schools.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMPENSATION SYSTEM

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, several administration bills have been introduced in the House and Senate which would greatly alter the present unemployment insurance compensation system. The bills were introduced in compliance with the President's message to Congress on May 18, 1965, when he asked for a revised system.

The bills are complicated, contain many major provisions, and have far-reaching implications. It seems to me that these proposals should be seriously considered and debated. I would like to speak now about some of the more questionable provisions of these bills. I should state, first, that these bills are at present being considered in the other body and have not yet had hearings in the Senate.

One of the first things that comes to mind is that the bills would, in effect, take away from the States the right to establish their own provisions for disqualifying a claimant. It would, in effect, create new uniform regulations which are exceedingly loose and extraordinarily tempting. New uniform rules would prohibit the cancellation of benefits for any reason at all. Disqualification for fraud could not exceed 36 months. A claimant convicted of a work-connected crime could be disqualified for no longer than 52 weeks. States could, surprisingly enough, still disqualify a claimant who was unemployed because of a labor dispute. But, except for these situations, a State could not disqualify any claimant for more than 6 weeks. Even if the claimant's unemployment were due to his own actions—if he were dismissed for misconduct or if he voluntarily quit his job for any reason—a State would have to give him compensation after approximately 6 weeks.

The States would also be effectively required to extend benefits for a potential period of 26 weeks. But the bill goes still further and informs the States that, in qualifying claimants for these benefits, they cannot require more than 20 weeks of employment or its equivalent in a 1-year base period.

At first glance, this seems fairly harmless. But, the interesting part comes in the phrase "or the equivalent." For the bill goes on to define "the equivalent" as "total base period wages equal to 5 times the statewide average weekly wage, and either one and a half times the individual's high quarterly earnings or 40 times his weekly benefit amount whichever is appropriate under State law."

So, except in the few States using weekly wage records, the important factor here is not 20 weeks of employment but just earnings amounting to five times the average wage.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have as much time as he desires.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the average wage ranges from $75 in Arkansas to $127 in Michigan. The national average is $106. This standard would require the payment of benefits for half a year to people with very little previous employment and who are really not within the labor market.

The administration bills would also effectively kill the practice of experience rating which is presently followed in many of the States. The Federal Unemployment Tax Act gives employers a credit of up to 2.7 percent of their payrolls for taxes paid the States for the same purpose. But it also allows them an additional credit and permits an employer to take his 2.7 percent credit against the Federal tax even though the amount he pays his State is less than 2.7 percent. However, this can be done only if this State tax reduction is based upon his favorable employment experiences. This has induced the various States to pass experience rating laws under which employers were taxed according to their past records. These laws, in turn, have had the effect of inducing employers to watch their record to keep unemployment down. This program has worked very well and helped to strengthen the incentive-assistance type of State unemployment programs.

But, now the administration comes along and proposes, in effect, to take away this restriction on the additional credit so that any State would be permitted to reduce the State payroll tax rates of all of its employers on a flat rate regardless of their employment experience. The inevitable result is that this would soon lead to the general abandonment of experience rating by the States, and the present system would be greatly weakened.

Those who are pushing for this change have quite frequently voiced the argument that this would reduce Federal control and restore a right to the various States. The amazing thing is that they offer this argument with a straight face, while proposing new, incredible Federal regulations that would greatly change the present State programs. When I hear these people coming up with this argument, I am reminded of Virgil's saying:

> I fear the Greeks, even when bringing gifts.

I doubt the sincerity of these new States Righters who would generously offer the States a gift of doing away with an enlightened Federal incentive, while bringing forth new, burdensome Federal regulations. I suspect that they are not so interested in aiding the States as they are in promoting a looser and more relaxed unemployment program.

Mr. President, I feel sure that everyone in the Congress favors an enlightened unemployment compensation program, such as we have now. Such a program assists those who, through no fault of their own, are out of a job and would like to work, but are unable to find jobs because of a particular weakness of the labor market. The present program is not welfare, but rather an aid program which spurs on the unemployed to seek employment and assists them when they are genuinely unable to do so. This is as it should be.

However, the proposed bills would turn the present incentive-assistance program into a welfare program, handing out doles to those who are not especially eager to work and who find it very easy and comfortable to collect unemployment checks. Now, the question I raise is this: What is this going to do to the present system?

We all know that a great many people oppose the present unemployment compensation programs. They oppose it not because they oppose helping those who cannot find work, but because they have deep-rooted suspicions that claimants receiving unemployment benefits are all loafers who just do not care to work. As a matter of fact, a recent Gallup poll reveals that 75 percent of Americans think that many people collect unemployment benefits even though they could find work. Sixty-nine percent favored making the unemployment compensation benefits laws more strict. These feelings of suspicion toward the unemployment compensation program were shared by all Americans, regardless of education, political party, occupation, age, or level of income.

Now if these people feel this way toward the present system, I wonder what they are going to think if we tell the various States that they cannot disqualify a claimant for longer than approximately 6 weeks, even if his unemployment is his own fault? What will they think if we require the States to pay up to 25 weeks of benefits to people who have had only sporadic employment and who are actually only on the fringes of the labor market, or if we remove the employer incentive to check abuses in the program? I wonder if their present frustrations are not going to increase so rapidly that a great many of them are going to be tempted to get rid of the whole program. I would hope not, but I do not think this is a particularly unrealistic speculation.

I would hope that this bill will be studied carefully and that the proposals which I have inumerated will be removed.

HARDSHIPS INCURRED AS A RESULT OF ACCELERATED TAX WITHHOLDING

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this great body recently considered and passed a $4.1 billion tax bill despite the vocal opposition of a handful of Senators, including myself.

In a colloquy with the majority whip, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I pointed out that the major portion of the revenue expected to be derived from the bill came from excise taxes on the telephone service and the increased and accelerated withholding of income tax.

I pointed out that the first part of the bill placed taxes on necessities and the second part raised revenues by hidden means which is known in my State, where it was also tried, as "golden gimmick No. 1." It proved to be an outmoded and inequitable method of taxation, which obviously and inevitably will lead to much higher taxation at a later date.

I recently received a very thoughtful letter from a constituent of mine bearing on the details of the latter portion of this plan; namely, the accelerated withholding.

My constituent foresees what will happen to him. I direct this to the attention of the Senate because I have the basic feeling that most people will not have the foresight to analyze their own situation with respect to the income tax withholding and the acceleration of payment.

I believe it will be of some interest to the membership if, for emphasis, I quote a few paragraphs of his letter and then have the entire letter printed in the Record.

This is what he said:

I have just finished recomputing my take-home pay using the paycheck I received on the 16th of this month.

That was the month of March 1966. He continues:

My takehome pay will be reduced about 21 percent, returning me to an income level of about 6 years ago. I will have a 1960 income in a 1966 economy inflated some 18 percent or more in the interval.

Like most Americans, my economy is based on the liberal use of credit. However, I have been careful to limit my indebtedness to an amount compatible with my income. Therefore in order to accommodate this reduction in my immediate income, a number of large changes in my spending must follow. Tomorrow, I will have to cancel a planned $2,500 remodeling program for my home, because I will not be able to accept the additional monthly payments to retire the loan. The loan itself will have to be halted. I had planned to replace both my automobiles (one 12 years old, one 4 years old) this year, but I imagine they will have to do another year. Also, I will need to cancel the monthly payroll deduction for savings at least for a few months in order to cope with present debts.

I have some understanding of the national economy and recognize the need for action to halt inflation. This should be more than adequate. Recognizing that this withholding rate increase is graduated and its effect will be less on some, it still seems evident that when the shock of this reaches the collective pocket of the taxpayer, snowballing as it will, our economy will incur a tremendous setback.

I quote an additional paragraph for emphasis, because I think this is important also. It reads:

If all this were not enough, it is obvious that the public is being prepared (brainwashed is a better term), to accept a sizable income tax increase. If this money is required to fight a war, then let's fight the war and have it done with. This idea that we may fight the war so long as we are careful not to offend or hurt the enemy is sheer lunacy.

Mr. President, Senators will recall that during the debate on this particular bill, it was pointed out that there was absolutely nothing in the bill which said that the money was to be used to pay for the war in Vietnam, but that in fact the money was being used to increase revenues so that we could go forward with the so-called Great Society programs.

At a time when we are in a struggle—and a vicious struggle—in southeast Asia, the idea of going forward, willy-nilly, with increased expenditures on the domestic level, for new programs, and increased appropriations for old ones, seems to me to be pretty farfetched.

I very distinctly remember one of the recent press interviews of the President, in which, statement after statement after statement he was urging business to cut back, urging the housewife not to buy fresh vegetables but to take substitutes, urging all kinds of cutbacks for everyone but the Government; but there was not one sentence about the Government's cutting back on anything. Government spending, of course, is the major inflationary influence we have in the country today.

Mr. President, because I think this letter outlines so sharply the problems that we as Members of Congress are faced with here I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Denver, Colo.,
March 20, 1966.

Hon. Peter H. Dominick,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Dominick: In today's local newspaper, I read an article explaining in some detail, the application of the increased withholding rates which are effective May 1. In order to see its effect on me, I have just finished recomputing my take-home pay, using the paycheck I received on the 16th of this month.

My take-home pay will be reduced about 21 percent, returning me to an income level of about 6 years ago. I will have a 1960 income in a 1966 economy inflated some 18 percent or more in the interval.

Like most Americans, my economy is based on the liberal use of credit. However, I have been careful to limit my indebtedness to an amount compatible with my income. Therefore, in order to accommodate this reduction in my immediate income, a number of large changes in my spending must follow. Tomorrow, I will have to cancel a planned $2,500 remodeling program for my home, because I will not be able to accept the additional monthly payments to retire the loan. The loan itself will have to be halted. I had planned to replace both my automobiles (one 12 years old, one 4 years old) this year, but I imagine they will have to do another year. Also, I will need to cancel the monthly payroll deduction for savings at least for a few months in order to cope with present debts.

I have some understanding of the national economy and recognize the need for action to halt inflation. This should be more than adequate. Recognizing that this withholding rate increase is graduated and its effect will be less on some, it still seems evident that when the shock of this reaches the collective pocket of the taxpayer, snowballing as it will, our economy will incur a tremendous setback.

Of course I am aware that no increase in taxes is involved, yet. My income tax return for 1965 has just been prepared and it will be necessary for me to write a large check to pay taxes not withheld. But human nature being what it is, most of us will spend as we receive and worry about the additional tax due another day. The fact that next year I may not have to make an additional payment does not have much effect on my current spending.

In computing the effect of this withholding increase on me, I noted that, based on estimated income for 1966, sufficient moneys will be withheld from May 1 to December 31 to cover the entire year's income tax, so that I will receive a refund equal to all the tax withheld for the first 4 months of the year. If this rate is continued through 1967, I will receive a refund for that year equal to about 50 percent of the total income tax paid. This is absolutely ridiculous.

If all this were not enough, it is obvious that the public is being prepared (brainwashed is a better term) to accept a sizable income tax increase. If this money is required to fight a war, then lets fight the war and have done with it. This idea that we may fight the war so long as we are careful not to offend or hurt the enemy is sheer lunacy.

Thank you for your kind attention to my sad tale, late though it may be. I'd like you to know that you have had and will continue to have my full support. Thank you again.

Very truly yours,
Alonzo C. McFarling.

Denver, Colo.

ASSOCIATED STUDENT GOVERNMENTS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, we have read recently in the daily papers about many student riots in other countries, as well as problems with students here within our own country. Because of the widespread publicity, the general impression is given that most of our college and graduate students have lost their sense of values.

The facts, of course, reveal that only a small number of our students are so involved. The majority are busily engaged in obtaining an intellectual and socially responsible education.

Recently I was visited by the leaders of one of the latter groups, the Associated Student Governments. They furnished me with a description of their purpose and the history of their organization.

This organization is designed to foster better communication between colleges and student organizations and to try to work out programs which will benefit each college, so that students may expect to obtain better coordination of their individual programs with the ideals within the college, and be able to move forward under responsible student leadership.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the statement of the objectives and a brief outline of the history of this fine organization, which is so ably led by its president, Mr. Dan Miller.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Associated Student Governments

The Associated Student Governments was founded as a service organization to disseminate information among member schools concerning successful student programs. In this way, the fruits of one school's harvest may be spread over a wide area and duplication of effort may be avoided. The ultimate goal of the Associated Student Governments is the advancement of student governing across the Nation through an effective sharing of ideas and projects. This organization, however, does not wish to become involved in affairs foreign to its above mentioned purpose. Such activity would not facilitate the persuance of the Associated Student Governments goals and would not be consistent with its constitution.

Early in 1964, representatives of six schools took positive steps to turn a vague idea into a reality. Meetings in New Orleans, Vanderbilt University, and St. Louis culminated in the first annual convention in November of 1964 at the University of Oklahoma. Two hundred delegates left that meeting convinced that the Associated Student Governments would indeed be a benefit to student governments across the Nation.

The Associated Student Governments has assumed the role of a service organization with no political association whatsoever.

Several programs have been initiated to fulfill this goal:

(a) Student government reference manual: This one project characterizes our entire efforts. A complete file is kept of all noteworthy student government projects successfully undertaken by member schools. A copy of this file is sent to each school as are supplements that are prepared periodically as the master file is updated.

(b) Newsletter (ASG–NUS): By means of a monthly newsletter, each school is kept abreast of developments of local interest as well as national happenings, reported by a presidential state of affairs column.

(c) National convention: an annual convention is held in a centrally located position where personal contacts can be made. Far more can be accomplished in a short intimate conversation than by pages of written communication. Augmenting this aspect are seminars in every area of student government with addresses by college administrators and educators. These seminars are detailed discussions of various topics and include the presentation of many specific programs.

(d) Regional conventions: This aspect of Associated Student Governments' work would offer benefits similar to those of a national convention to schools who could not attend the national conference. Once again, mutual problems could be discussed on a personal basis.

(e) Lending library and consulting team: Association Student Governments is also developing these two services for use by member schools. Helpful publications on various subjects issued by individual schools that could not be duplicated on a large scale would be available for perusal from the national office. For further and more direct assistance, a consulting team can be arranged from another member school proficient in any desired area.

In summary, the Associated Student Governments was founded to serve and advance student governments by acting as a neutral clearinghouse for information. By coordinating the successes of many schools, student governments across the Nation will better be able to fulfill their function of serving the future leaders of America.

Various Statements Concerning Associated Student Governments

1. History: Bill Featheringill, of Vanderbilt University, provided the initiative and leadership which organized two preliminary conferences prior to the St. Louis convention in April 1964. These conferences, at Tulane and Vanderbilt, drew the nucleus of the present organization together to explore the idea of a new national student government association and to inform the colleges and universities of the Nation of their intent and purpose. Sixty-two schools attended the St. Louis convention and after considerable discussion, approved an interim constitution and elected an executive council, headed by Larry Blankenship, of Oklahoma, to plan for the first national convention. This convention, modeled on a workshop or seminar basis, was held at the Center for Continuing Education of the University of Oklahoma in November 1964. There they adopted a permanent constitution and elected a new executive board, headed by Tom Johnson, of Purdue. This group is now planning for its third national convention to be held in the fall of 1966.

2. The purpose of this organization is to open channels for communication and cooperation among student governments of American colleges and universities. It is directed at the individual student in the hopes of making his student government more satisfactory and beneficial to him during his years at college. The organization has no political intent or purpose; our main concern is to share ideas about programing and projects, not to provide a national sounding board for the political opinions of students—statement of purpose made at preliminary meeting at Vanderbilt University, March 1964.

3. More concisely stated it is the belief that sufficiently well-informed student body leaders can work to solve their campus problems with a maturity of decision and an economy of action never before imagined. That these problems differ from campus to campus is acknowledged by the organization's reticence to make dogmatic pronouncements on issues of a political nature, preferring to leave these decisions to local procedure.

4. Associated Student Governments goes about doing this job by acting primarily as a clearinghouse for planning and programing ideas. Here, at last, is student government's solution to the knowledge explosion as it applies to the more efficient utilization of its time and resources. On campuses across the country new student freedoms are providing a serious challenge to the competency of student government leadership. Where this leadership fails as an intermediary for students with faculty and administration, situations such as those at Berkeley arise. Where this challenge is met successfully, students gain an extremely valuable role in shaping their own collegiate destinies. Associated Student Governments attempts to help student governments to meet the challenge by making available to them carefully prepared reports on solutions to similar planning or programing problems submitted by other schools. These reports are distributed to member schools in the form of the Student Government Reference Manual (SG-RM). The SGRM and its supplements form a year-round source of constructive, potentially helpful resumes of student government activities. These may save much wasted effort or suggest other ways that an idea may be implemented to action.

5. The wide range of projects, programs, and ideas for improving student governments which Associated Student Governments embraces, makes any school—regardless of size, location or political position—eligible to receive the benefits of its members, Associated Student Governments offers services of a continuous and progressive nature. Annual three to five day workshop-seminar type conventions, complemented by a detailed, comprehensive publications series, are the primary tools of Associated Student Governments. Through these the organization can effectively help student governments organize and promote projects and activities on their individual campuses. As a forum for the Nation's student governments Associated Student Governments can utilize the ideas of every member school in aiding in the improvement of effectiveness of student governments. Through such aid every student government can better provide the students of its school with the opportunity of intellectual and personal development. Thus Associated Student Governments can help its members meet the rise of enrollment and the consequent need for better organization to benefit the individual student, the student government, the school and the educational system as a whole.

6. "The college student of today is being cast in a very unfavorable light due to the questionable activities of a few. Yet the vast majority of today's youth, who handle their problems in an intelligent, mature and diplomatic fashion, are not being noticed. One of our avowed goals is to improve upon this image by projecting the true situation in regards to America's campuses," David Banmiller, president, Associated Student Governments (1965–66).

7. "The youth of today comes to college to be educated, not only academically, but socially and spiritually, so that he may be better prepared to accept the challenges and responsibilities which the future holds in store for him. It is the primary responsibility of today's student leader to mold and shape our present educational system for the betterment of tomorrow's society. This can only be accomplished through the dedication and devotion of our young Americans," David Banmiller, president, Associated Student Governments (1965–66).

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SENATE SCORE SO FAR AND THE OUTLOOK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the past 3 months—to be exact since January 10 when the Congress reconvened for the 2d session of the 89th Congress—our deliberations have been largely concerned with and frequently dominated by the war in Vietnam. On January 12 when the President delivered his state of the Union message, in speaking of the Vietnam conflict, he stated in clear and concise terms that it was not his intention to abandon Asia to conquest. Soon thereafter, he sent to Congress his request for approval of U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank to help Asia develop her human and natural resources and thus lift the burden of poverty that has been her lot since ancient times. This bill has been enacted into law by a unanimous vote of the Senate.

The President then requested a supplemental appropriation of approximately $13.1 billion for military and economic assistance primarily in support of our operations in southeast Asia. This request carried with it the necessity to authorize $4.8 billion in military aid and $415 million in economic assistance. These two authorizations passed the Senate by an almost unanimous vote with only two dissents on each measure. This was done after due deliberation and much discussion of our policies in Vietnam. The supplemental itself, which is now law, passed the Senate with only two dissenting votes.

The Congress has also enacted into law, with only nine dissenting votes in the Senate, a Tax Adjustment Act increasing revenues in 1966 and 1967 by approximately $6 billion to help finance the conflict in Vietnam over the next 15 months. And as stated by the President when he signed this act into law, this new tax law has three major objectives:

> To provide additional funds needed to support U.S. troops in Vietnam;
>
> To provide a careful measure of fiscal restraint to balance economic expansion with reasonable price stability; and
>
> To carry out desirable and timely improvements in tax collection procedures.

In addition to taking care of our responsibilities in Vietnam, this measure also provided for the payment of social security benefits to some 370,000 persons, age 72 and over, who are not now insured under the social security program. Thus, although Vietnam has been one of our major concerns, the needy citizens of our country are receiving their share of consideration.

As requested by the President, the Congress has enacted emergency assistance to India to help her meet pressing food shortages by making available under Public Law 480 certain agricultural commodities including food grain, corn, vegetable oils, milk powder, cotton, and tobacco; extended to May 31 the deadline for enrollment in the medical insurance portion of the social security health insurance program for the aged; extended the so-called GI benefits program providing educational and other assistance to those veterans who have served on active duty for more than 180 days since January 31, 1955; extended the mandatory safety provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to mines regularly employing less than 15 men underground and strengthened other provisions of the act to increase the protection of lives and property in all underground coal mines; authorized $126 million for fiscal 1967 for the Coast Guard to procure vessels, aircraft, and to construct shore and offshore establishments; authorized $3,200,000 to establish the Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina which is the seventh national seashore to be created and tends to support the contention of many that this is a conservation Congress; approved Reorganization Plan No. 1 transferring the Community Relations Service to Justice from the Department of Commerce; enlarged the scope of the 1964 Water Resources Research Act by authorizing $85 million over a 10-year period for special research in water resources problems.

The Senate has acted favorably on the President's request to substitute private credit for public credit in funding the Small Business Administration's leading programs by authorizing the SBA to sell participation certificates in its loan pools directly to the public or through the Federal National Mortgage Association; established safety standards for automobile tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce by a unanimous vote of 79 to 0; and established a national wild rivers system by designating 7 rivers to be preserved in their natural condition and providing for study and possible inclusion later of segments of 17 other rivers.

Thus, despite the fact that much of our energies have been devoted to the conflict in Vietnam, the Senate has turned out a creditable amount of legislation in this 3-month period. On our return from a brief Easter recess, we will again consider the matter of the reapportionment of our State legislatures; the Traffic Safety Act of 1966; fair labeling legislation; a new Food for Freedom Act retaining the best provisions of Public Law 480, which will make self-help an integral part of our food aid program, emphasize the development of markets for American farm programs and establish a food and fiber reserve policy that will protect the American people from unstable supplies of food and fiber; the second supplemental which will carry funds for the National Teachers Corps and the rent subsidy program; extension and improvement of our present foreign aid program; annual authorizations for military procurement and construction; housing and urban development legislation including a cities demonstration program to rehabilitate and aid the cities; improvements in our water and air pollution programs; improvements and extension of our health and education programs including new authority for international programs in both of these fields; a continuation and acceleration of our war on poverty including a rural poverty program; a Drug Safety Act; a $4.9 billion authorization for our Federal-aid highway program; the annual space and atomic energy authorizations; civil rights legislation; an expansion and increase in our minimum wage coverage; and numerous other proposals including our annual appropriation bills.

I am happy to report that most of the major Presidential recommendations on which draft legislation has been submitted have either passed one or the other House, is the subject of hearings or scheduled hearings, is under executive consideration, or ready for reporting to the calendars for floor consideration. Though much remains to be done, I believe, after reviewing the progress of the committees, we should be able to look forward to an earlier adjournment this year.

To summarize the Senate's activities so far, I ask unanimous consent that the following report be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY THROUGH APRIL 7, 1966

Days in session	51
Hours in session	248:36
Total measures passed	172
Confirmations	26,001
Public laws	34

Following is a brief summary of all major general bills upon which the Senate has acted this session, with presidential recommendations listed first and followed by other legislation categorized by subject. If there is no rollcall vote breakdown, Senate action has been by voice vote.

PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Asian Development Bank: Authorizes the President to accept membership on behalf of the United States in the Asian Development Bank and authorizes an appropriation of $200 million. Public Law 89–369.

Vietnam supplemental economic aid: Authorizes for the current fiscal year additional economic aid in the amount of $290 million for southeast Asia and $25 million for the Dominican Republic; plus an additional $100 million for the worldwide contingency fund. Public Law 89–371.

Vote: Senate passage 82 (55 Democrats, 27 Republicans)—2 (2 Democrats).

Vietnam supplemental military authorizations: Authorizes a total of $4.8 billion additional for fiscal 1966 for military activities in Vietnam. Public Law 89–367.

Vote: Senate passage 93 (61 Democrats, 32 Republicans)—2 (2 Democrats).

Vietnam supplemental appropriation: Authorizes an additional $13.1 billion for fiscal 1966. $415 million of this amount is for economic assistance. Public Law 89–374.

Vote: Senate passage 87 (58 Democrats, 29 Republicans)—2 (2 Democrats).

Tax Adjustment Act: Increases revenues in 1966 and 1967 by approximately $6 billion to help finance the war in Vietnam; extends social security coverage ($35 minimum) to all who are or reach 72 by 1968 and are not receiving railroad retirement, Federal, State or local pensions; increases excise tax on automobiles to 7 percent and telephone service to 10 percent through March 31, 1968; increases withholding and accelerates corporate tax payments. Public Law 89–368.

Vote: Senate passage 79 (55 Democrats, 24 Republicans)—9 (5 Democrats, 4 Republicans). Conference report 72 (49 Democrats, 23 Republicans)—5 (1 Democrat, 4 Republicans).

Emergency aid to India: To help India meet her pressing food shortages, this act makes available under Public Law 480 certain agricultural commodities including food grain, corn, vegetable oils, milk powder, cotton and tobacco. House Joint Resolution 997. Public Law 89– .

GI benefits: Provides educational assistance for veterans who have served on active duty for more than 180 days since January 31, 1955. Public Law 89–358.

Vote: Senate adopted House amendments 99 (67 Democrats, 32 Republicans)—0.

Medicare: Extends from March to May 31, 1966 the deadline for enrollment in the medical insurance portion of the social security health insurance program for the aged. H.R. 6319. Public Law 89– .

Reorganization plan No. 1.: Approved the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice and the transfer of all its functions from the Secretary of Commerce to the Attorney General. Plan effective April 11, 1966.

Vote: Senate rejected disapproval resolution: Yeas, 32 (11 Democrats, 21 Republicans); nays, 42 (42 Democrats).

Coal mine safety: Extends the mandatory safety provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to mines regularly employing less than 15 men underground, and strengthens other provisions of the act to increase the protection of lives and property in all underground coal mines. Public Law 89–376.

Coast Guard authorization: Authorizes $126 million for fiscal 1967 for the Coast Guard to procure vessels, aircraft, and to construct shore and offshore establishments. Public Law 89–381.

Sale of participations in SBA loan pools: Substitutes private credit for public credit in funding the Small Business Administration's lending programs by authorizing SBA to sell participation certificates in its loan pools directly to the public or through FNMA. S. 2499. Passed Senate March 15.

District of Columbia home rule: Provides for an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia. S. 1118. Senate requested conference April 1.

Vote: Senate's passage 63 (47 Democrats, 16 Republicans)—29 (15 Democrats, 14 Republicans).

District of Columbia minimum wage: Creates a wage floor of $1.25 an hour within 6 months of enactment for an estimated 300,000 men, women, and minors not now covered by the Federal statute. H.R. 8126. In conference.

Vote: Senate passage 60 (41 Democrats, 19 Republicans)—10 (6 Democrats, 4 Republicans).

Tire safety: Establishes safety standards for automobile tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce. S. 2669. Passed Senate March 29.

Vote: Senate passage 79 (54 Democrats, 25 Republicans)—0.

Cape Lookout: Authorizes $3,200,000 for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina. Public 89-366.

Water Resources Research Act amendments: Enlarges the scope of the 1964 Water Resources Research Act by authorizing $85 million over a 10-year period in grant, matching and contract funds for assistance to educational institutions in addition to State land-grant colleges, to competent private organizations and individuals, and to local, State, and Federal agencies in undertaking special research in water resource problems. S. 22. Public Law 89- .

Wild Rivers: Establishes a National Wild Rivers System and designates seven rivers to be preserved in their natural condition and provides for study and possible inclusion later of segments of 17 other rivers. Estimated cost is $16,067,000 for the 5-year program. S. 1446 passed Senate January 19.

Vote: Senate passage 71 (45 Democrats, 26 Republicans)—1 (1 Republican).

Southern Nevada project amendment: Repeals section 6 of Public Law 89-292 authorizing $81,003,000 for the Federal construction of the southern Nevada water project. Section 6, because of being couched in general language, requires the Department of Interior to recognize the intrastate priorities of water rights to the use of water. S. 2999 passed Senate April 6.

OTHER LEGISLATION BY SUBJECT

District of Columbia

Capital stock requirements: Amends the District of Columbia Fire and Casualty Act to require that all domestic stock insurance companies authorized to do a fidelity or surety business in the District of Columbia maintain a paid up capital stock of not less than $500,000 and a surplus of not less than $250,000. H.R. 959. Public Law 89- .

Insurance premium finance companies: Provides a requirement for licensing and a means for regulating the activities of premium finance companies in the District of Columbia. H.R. 8466. Public Law 89- .

Registration of trade names: Protects the general public and legitimate businesses in the District of Columbia by requiring registration of assumed trade names, disclosure of principals and agents conducting business under such names, and requiring such principals and agents residing outside of the District to constitute the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners as their attorney for service of process. S. 1717 passed Senate April 5.

Regulating domestic stock insurance companies: Provides the District of Columbia with regulatory authority over domestic stock insurance companies to enable those companies, by coming under the regulatory jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Insurance for the District, to be exempt from regulation by the SEC. H.R. 11664. Public Law 89- .

Education

Salary increase for overseas teachers: Provides for approximately a 10-percent increase for teachers in the overseas dependent school system. H.R. 6845. Public Law 89- .

Federal employees

Back pay: Consolidates and liberalizes existing law on the restoration of an employee to this position after an adverse action against him has been found by appellate authority to have been erroneous or unjustified. Public Law 89-380.

Civil service retirement: Permits the natural child of a deceased Federal employee who dies without survivors eligible to receive a survivor annuity from the civil service retirement and disability fund to share in the distribution of any money on deposit in the fund which belongs to the deceased employee. H.R. 1746 passed Senate amended March 17.

Government employees: Preserves the retirement, group life, and health benefits for congressional employees receiving fellowships from the American Political Science Association. Public Law 89-379.

Interior employees medical expenses: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to use appropriated funds for the payment of medical care of temporary and seasonal employees and employees located in isolated areas who become disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work. S. 2153 passed Senate March 4.

Life insurance: Removes the ceiling limitation and changes the payment ratio. H.R. 6926 passed Senate amended March 17.

Finance

Bank mergers: Establishes new and uniform standards for bank merger approvals by regulatory agencies; requires antitrust action be filed within 30 days; permits mergers on basis of community need and public interest if these factors predominate; exempts mergers completed prior to June 17, 1963. Public Law 89-356.

Bankruptcy Act amendments: Amends chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act to give the court supervisory power over all fees paid from whatever source. S. 1923 passed Senate March 4.

Bankruptcy referees: Amends the Bankruptcy Act to prohibit referees or part-time referees from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act. S. 1924 passed Senate September 17, 1965; passed House amended February 21, 1966.

Use of foreign currencies: Provides permanent authority for Federal agencies to use authorized foreign currencies held by the United States for other than specified programs but requires a reimbursement to the Treasury by the agency using the funds. S. 801 passed Senate March 22.

SBA amendments: Increases by $125 million the ceiling on loans and outstanding commitments for the regular business loan program, the disaster loan program, and title IV loans under the Economic Opportunity Act; also increases by $125 million the total amount which may be appropriated to the present revolving fund; establishes two revolving funds, one for disaster loans without an authorization ceiling and a second fund to finance other SBA lending programs. S. 2729 passed House, amended March 31; Senate agreed to House amendments Nos. 8–14 and disagreed to Nos. 1–7.

General government

Postal savings: Discontinues U.S. Postal Savings System 30 days after enactment. Public Law 89-377.

Uniform time: Provides for uniform daylight saving time throughout the United States beginning in 1967 unless a State votes to remain on standard time. Requires any State or subdivision using DST in 1966 to commence it on the last Sunday in April and end it on the last Sunday in October. S. 1404. Public Law 89- .

Utah land: Confirms in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake. S. 265 passed House amended April 4.

Housing

Vice President's residence: Authorizes an appropriation of $750,000 for the construction and furnishing of an official residence for the Vice President to be located on the grounds of the U.S. Naval Observatory. S. 2394. Public Law 89- .

Import duties

Copra: Makes permanent the duty-free treatment or lower rates of duty temporarily applicable to copra, palm nuts, and palm nut kernels, their oils, and specified fatty acids, salts, and other chemical products derived from the oils. H.R. 6568. Public Law 89- .

Tropical hardwoods: Suspends the duty on tropical hardwoods until January 1, 1968. H.R. 7723. Public Law 89- .

International

China—loan of naval vessels: Authorizes lending one destroyer and one destroyer escort to the Republic of China. H.R. 7813; Public Law 89- .

Interama: Authorizes the President to provide for U.S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, known as Interama, in Miami, Fla., a permanent international fair to serve as a meeting ground for the governments and industries of the Western Hemisphere and other areas of the world. Public Law 89-355.

Vote: Senate passage 56 (43 Democrats, 13 Republicans)—18 (6 Democrats, 12 Republicans).

International Organizations Immunities Act: Provides for tax and customs exemption of the European Space Research Organization and for tax exemption of their foreign employees. Public Law 89-353.

International Petroleum Exposition: Authorizes the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held in Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966. Senate Joint Resolution 63, passed Senate February 10.

United States-Mexico flood control: Authorizes conclusion of an agreement for joint construction by United States and Mexico of flood control project for the Tijuana River. S. 2540, passed Senate March 8.

The 1972 winter Olympics: Approves selection of U.S. Olympic Committee and supports its recommendation that Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 Winter Olympic Games. Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, passed Senate March 14, passed House April 4, 1966.

World Health Assembly: Authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $500,000 to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969. Public Law 89-357.

Judicial

Federal judgeships: Creates 45 new Federal judgeships, 10 circuit court and 35 district court. Public Law 89-372.

Memorials

Boy Scouts: Pays tribute to the Boy Scouts on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of their charter, and expresses recognition for their public service. Senate Concurrent Resolution 68 passed Senate February 10; passed House amended February 21.

Sir Winston Churchill: Designated April 9, 1966, as "Sir Winston Churchill Day," the third anniversary of the date U.S. citizenship was conferred on Sir Winston. Senate Joint Resolution 127. Public Law 89- .

Resource buildup

Manson irrigation unit, Washington: Authorizes the Department of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Cheland division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington. The estimated cost of $13,344,000 will be repaid within 50 years by the water and power users, with the exception of $150,000 to be used for fish and wildlife purposes. S. 490 passed House amended March 30.

Marine resources and engineering development: This bill furthers ocean engineering and exploration, expands marine science and technology, and intensifies development and utilization of ocean, Continental Shelf, and Great Lakes resources. S. 944. In conference.

Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon: Authorizes up to $23 million for the Federal construction of the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, in Washington County, Oreg. S. 254 passed House, amended March 30.

Taxes

Armed Forces—Tax treatment: Provides retired servicemen are to be taxed only on the amount they actually receive as retired pay. The amount of any reduction to provide survivor annuities would be excluded. Estate and gift tax exclusions are also provided. Public Law 89–365.

Estate tax deficiencies: Amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that if any part of a deficiency with respect to estate tax liability is due to fraud with intent to evade tax, the penalty to be imposed is 50 percent of the total amount of the deficiency rather than 50 percent of the total tax liability. Public Law 89–359.

Expropriation recoveries: Provides a new set of rules for the tax treatment to be accorded recoveries of foreign expropriation losses. Generally, the new rules limit the tax on the recovery previously received in deducting the loss. H.R. 6319. Public Law 89– .

Tax court: Liberalizes the computation of benefits for retired judges of the tax court by basing their pension on the salary of the "office" rather than actual salary at the time of retirement, thereby permitting pay raises to be passed on to retired judges. Public Law 89–354.

Tax exempt savings institutions: Provides income tax exemption for certain nonprofit organizations operated to provide reserve funds for savings and loan associations, and subjects them to unrelated business income tax. Public Law 89–352.

Undistributed taxable income: Provides that undistributed taxable income made within 2½ months after close of taxable year to shareholders of certain small business corporations shall be considered to have been made before the close of the taxable year. H.R. 988. Public Law 88–

Veterans

Veteran allowances: Extends the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability. Public Law 89–360.

Veterans' hospitalization: Restricts the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care. Public Law 89–362.

EASTER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as we conclude this session and adjourn over the Passion weekend, I pray that we may let our thoughts go back to that period of time—the darkest period of the world's history.

If Good Friday was the blackest day for the followers of Christ, Easter Sunday was the brightest day. For they learned that the cross was not the end, only the beginning.

On Easter morn the promise that man would live again was fulfilled in the resurrection of Christ. Hope replaced despair, joy overcame sorrow, faith ended fear. For man, life had a more glorious meaning—a meaning which would sustain him to the end of time.

As our hearts repose with the beauty and joy of Easter, let us more and more come to know the living Lord who promised to them that believe that because He lived they would also live.

As we strengthen our faith in the spirit of Calvary we will overthrow evil and righteousness and truth will prevail.

The spiritual splendor of our heritage cannot be handed down, it must constantly be rewon by eternal vigilance and with every generation it must be reborn, reformed and reinterpreted in the living garden of freedom.

It was on Easter morn that the life and truth in Him was set free to live and work among men in the power of the spirit.

Tomb, thou shalt not hold Him longer;
Death is strong, but life is stronger;
Stronger than the dark, the light;
Stronger than the wrong, the right;
Faith and hope triumphant say,
"Christ will rise on Easter Day."
And while sunrise smites the mountains,
Pouring light from heavenly fountains,
Then the earth blooms out to greet
Once again the blessed feat;
And her countless voices say:
"Christ has risen on Easter Day."

—PHILLIPS BROOKS.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 625, as amended, and agreed to yesterday I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday, April 13, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, April 13, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

* * *

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Joseph F. Thorning, St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Author of life and of love, let the light of Thy countenance shine brightly upon the Speaker of this House and upon all the Members of the Congress of the United States of America.

Grant a special blessing to our President and to all who counsel him.

Vouchsafe to Thy sons and daughters in all the American Republics, including their executive, legislative, and judicial public servants, the vision and valor to develop socioeconomic programs that may bring freedom, food, homes, sound education, and good health to all groups in the population.

Assembled in the Capitol on this 22d official congressional celebration of Pan-American Day, we implore Thee, Almighty God, to bestow upon the peoples of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Panama, El Salvador, and the other countries of the Western Hemisphere, including Canada, the divine graces necessary to continue progress in measures that will insure orderly, representative government.

May we, Thy children in North America, under noble, enlightened leadership in the White House and in the Congress, prove to be magnanimous in our policies of brotherly love and spare no sacrifice important to the well-being of our brothers and sisters of every race and creed.

We ask these favors in the name of our most holy Redeemer, the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2999. An act to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (Act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)).

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution designating April 9 of each year as "Sir Winston Churchill Day."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 265) entitled "An act to authorize conveyance of certain lands to the State of Utah based upon fair market value," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 944) entitled "An act to provide for expanded research and development in the marine environment of the United States, to establish a National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and a Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MORTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6319) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries."

The message also announced that Senate Resolution 220, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, transmitted to Congress by the President on February 10, 1966, failed in passage.

The message also announced that the Vice President had made sundry appointments as follows:

The Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 372, 84th Congress, appointed Mr. SALTONSTALL to be a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

The Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 420, 83d Congress, appointed Mr. BREWSTER to be a member of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College in lieu of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, resigned.

The Vice president, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86–42, appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BASS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be members of the United States group of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group at a meeting to be held in Washington, D.C.-Oak Ridge, Tenn., May 18 through 22, 1966.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, which, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on April 1, 1966, considered and unanimously approved the Elko, Nev., watershed work plans, transmitted to you by executive communication No. 1603, 89th Congress, and referred to this committee.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

DRUNKEN DRIVING SUSPECTS SHOULD SUBMIT TO CHEMICAL TESTS OR LOSE LICENSES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the debate now raging before Congress over legislation to curb the rising toll of deaths on our highways has focused mainly on the car itself.

It has been worthwhile.

But it has not focused on the prime cause of traffic fatalities—the drunken driver.

Recent studies in California, Florida, Michigan, and other States show conclusively that between one-half and two-thirds of all highway deaths are caused by drivers who are intoxicated.

The following figures support this:

First. An 8-year study in Dade County, Fla., revealed that 47 percent of all traffic victims tested for alcohol had been drinking. Among drivers killed in single vehicle accidents, 68 percent had been drinking.

Second. A continuing analysis of victims of motor vehicle accidents in California shows that among drivers responsible for accidents, two-thirds had been drinking.

Third. An official of the American Association of State Highway Officials recently told Congress:

> One State highway department, which he declined to name because of the confidential nature of the investigation and the report, indicated that 68 percent of the drivers killed in traffic accidents had sufficient alcohol in their blood to have been intoxicated.

Fourth. A 4-year, on-the-spot study of fatal auto accidents in the Ann Arbor, Mich., area conducted by two University of Michigan scientists showed that more than half of 139 drivers judged to be at fault had been drinking.

Of even greater significance was the Dade County finding that 44 percent of the innocents, those not at fault, were killed in accidents with drinking drivers.

To my mind any truly meaningful traffic safety legislation must include a stiff crackdown on drunken driving.

So I am preparing legislation that will require States to enact implied consent laws like the one we have in New York or lose 10 percent of their Federal-aid highway funds.

Implied consent laws require a motorist suspected of drunken driving to submit to chemical tests or lose his license.

SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP TO EXPRESS APPRECIATION TO SERVICEMEN

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, I introduced legislation providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp to express the appreciation of the American people for the sacrifices of our servicemen throughout the world. The original suggestion for such a stamp was provided by several young students at North Junior High School in Sioux City, Iowa. A few months ago, under the leadership of a member of their faculty, Mr. Robert M. Shockley, these students began working to turn their idea into reality. In the light of a continuing flow of publicity concerning draft card burners and war protesters, these students felt the time had come for an expression of national appreciation for the efforts of American servicemen. They proposed the creation of a stamp depicting the flag of the United States with a superimposed phrase: "American servicemen, we appreciate you" on one selected stripe.

Within a few days, these students had gained the support of their fellow students, at all levels, throughout the city. During the following weeks, thousands of Sioux Citians—representing nearly every community organization—began working on what was termed "Operation VIP." In a short time, approximately 50,000 individuals—over half of the city's entire population—signed petitions in support of the stamp proposal. In February, as these petitions were presented to the Postmaster General and six members of Iowa's congressional delegation, support was being received from not only the Midwest but the entire Nation. As my colleagues no doubt know, postage stamps are generally issued through the Post Office Department based upon recommendations made by a Stamp Advisory Board. However, this procedure is primarily followed for the issuance of commemorative stamps. Just last week, for example, a postage stamp was issued honoring the American circus. The stamp which I propose will neither commemorate an anniversary or salute an invention. Hopefully, it will not find its most common use in the albums of stamp collectors or in the showcases of particular industries or interest groups. This will be a national stamp for general distribution, and it will find a place on millions of envelopes mailed to American servicemen stationed throughout the world. Its purpose will be singular, its meaning clear: To express time and time again the appreciation of the American people for those who sacrifice their all in defense of this Nation and freedom throughout the world.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE LESLIE L. BIFFLE

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues who yesterday paid tribute to the memory of Leslie Biffle. I had the honor of being a young employee under his wing in the U.S. Senate Library for 1 year in 1941.

This morning the Washington Post carried an editorial of great tribute to a man who I think exemplified dedicated public service, and I ask that it be made a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

LESLIE L. BIFFLE

During his 44 years of service as an employee of the U.S. Senate, ending with his tenure as Secretary of the Senate in 1952, Leslie L. Biffle was the very ideal of a legislative functionary. His infinite attention to all the details of the legislative process freed successive senatorial "employers" from duties and responsibilities that otherwise would have impinged upon their responsibility for policy. He was the sort of indefatigable, tireless, self-effacing detail man that every official searches for and that few find.

Politics was his life. The son of an officeholder, he was brought up to understand public affairs and to enjoy them from early youth. He was always the faithful adjutant, but he was not without political instinct and purposes of his own. His relationships with Senator Joseph Robinson were close and his rapport with President Truman was complete.

The business of Congress could not go forward without such public servants. They are often relatively unknown to most citizens, but the mark of their personality nevertheless is on countless pieces of legislation that never would come to pass without their largely anonymous contributions to congressional deliberation. Leslie L. Biffle, on his own merit and as the personification of loyal legislative servants like him, deserves the tribute of his countrymen.

TRIBUTE TO YOUNG AMERICA

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor and privilege to speak to tens of thousands of young men and women of America in high schools since last October. Only last Friday it was my honor to speak to the Jefferson Society at the University of Virginia.

Based on the rough and tumble of campus debates and thousands of questions from the audience, it is my conviction that no greater generation of young Americans has ever existed. The overwhelming majority of the youth of our country are patriotic and genuinely concerned about the future of America and are opposed to the insidious, diabolical Communist conspiracy to subvert and conquer the world.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial of WSPA, Spartanburg, S.C., is a great tribute to young America and to Pvt. Hiram D. "Butch" Strickland who gave his life in action in South Vietnam:

> With bearded beatniks, draft card burners, and pacifists parading over the country complaining about the war in Vietnam, it is encouraging to know that in reality they do not represent the youth of America. If they did, this Government would not long endure.
>
> WSPA believes that the real spirit of young America was expressed by a 20-year-old artillery man from North Carolina who was killed February 1 by a gunshot wound by enemy fire. Pfc. Hiram D. (Butch) Strickland of Route 2, Graham, prepared a letter to be delivered to his folks in case he was killed in action. What this young American had to say was touching. WSPA feels that it should be broadcast far and wide.
>
> "I am writing this letter as my last one," Private First Class Strickland said. "You've probably already received word that I'm dead and that the Government wishes to express its deep regret. Believe me, I didn't want to die, but I knew it was part of my job. I want my country to live for billions and billions of years to come."
>
> Continuing the letter, he wrote:
>
> "I want it [his death] to stand as a light to all people oppressed, and guide them to the same freedom we know. If we can stand and fight for freedom, then I think we have done the job God sent down for us. It's up to every American to fight for the freedom we hold so dear. If we don't, the smells of fresh air could become dark and damp as in a prison cell."
>
> Then Private First Class Strickland recalled what a teacher said while he was a freshman: "The coward dies a thousand times, the brave die but once."
>
> He then ended with this note to his mother:
>
> "Don't mourn me, Mother, for I'm happy I died fighting my country's enemies, and I will live forever in peoples' minds. I've done what I've always dreamed of. Don't mourn me, for I died a soldier of the United States of America."
>
> That is the kind of stuff that established freedom on these shores and gave this Nation the greatest Government ever fashioned by the minds of men. It is that kind of stuff which will keep America free and keep this Nation strong.
>
> What Private First Class Strickland wrote should not only be the answer to beatniks, bearded and unbearded, and to the racists who say draft card burners and those who are hiding behind cloaks of religion and otherwise to escape service, but it should be inscribed on the minds of those in power in Washington that they not bargain away what these young Americans are fighting and dying for in Vietnam.
>
> WSPA salutes the memory of Private First Class Strickland and extends to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Donald A. Strickland, our deepest sympathy. His commanding officer said their "great sense of loss should be more than equalled by a deep sense of pride."

DELAY OF OPERATION HEADSTART IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, New York City's Headstart program is in chaos and distress. It is a casualty of bureaucratic bungling with the victims—3,500 children—who should have been attending classes this winter under an Office of Economic Opportunity grant of $6.5 million approved last December. They have been deprived of the benefits of this worthwhile program. In addition, New York City has failed to meet the deadline of March 31 set by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the submission of applications for the summer Headstart program. Because of the emergency, I have called upon Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, to step in and deal directly with the independent agencies which have applied for Headstart programs.

One of the causes for the delay has been a dispute between New York City and the Office of Economic Opportunity over the source of funds to pay the cost of renovations for facilities and classrooms. I described this situation yesterday and reported the fact that the Office of Economic Opportunity has now authorized allocating part of its grant for renovations.

However, New York City is not taking advantage of an available Federal program—the neighborhood facilities program of the Urban Renewal Administration—which might be a promising source of funds for Headstart facilities. Neither city officials nor OEO officials here have pursued this approach with the requisite vigor or determination.

Under the Housing Act of 1965, $12 million was appropriated for the purpose of providing grants to communities to construct neighborhood facilities. The grants are on a two-thirds, one-third basis with the Federal Government paying the lion's share. Under this program, priority is given to projects that are designed primarily to benefit low-income families or to further the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

To date New York City has not submitted a single application under this program.

While no specific projects have been approved yet, several applications from other cities are very close to being executed. Among the projects now actively under consideration are those that would provide space and facilities for a variety of uses, such as for recreation, health programs, library services and Headstart classes.

The neighborhood facilities administrators have been reviewing only multipurpose facilities; although the law by no means restricts grants only to such projects.

Also the law does not restrict the neighborhood facilities grants only to new structures. Among the projects now in the final stages of review are a number that are essentially rehabilitation or renovation schemes using existing buildings.

It is my belief that renovating buildings for Headstart use exclusively would be a perfectly valid use of neighborhood facilities funds.

I call on New York City officials to formally apply for such funds to help break the deadlock that has gripped Headstart in New York. Although New York City officials have talked informally with Federal officials about the possibility of securing neighborhood facilities funds for building renovations that would clear the way for use of existing structures for Operation Headstart, a proven success in the war on poverty, no formal application has been submitted.

The neighborhood facilities program is a brandnew concept, as is Headstart. Cooperation between the two programs could result in a happy marriage that might have relevance for cities other than New York which face real problems in finding adequate space to operate Headstart during the academic year when all school buildings are crowded to overflowing with the normal student enrollment.

I urge New York City officials immediately to take the first step and submit a formal application. The cost of further delays is the long-term effects on 3,500 youngsters who fall further behind their contemporaries simply because of official wrangling and redtape.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM ON THE RECONVENING FOLLOWING THE EASTER RECESS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as to the schedule for the House on the reconvening following the Easter recess.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will my good friend yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of April 18, 1966, is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day. There are no suspensions.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

Also on Tuesday there will be considered—

H.R. 7524, the Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill, under an open rule, with 2 hours of general debate, waiving points of order.

H.R. 7406, for the third powerplant, Grand Coulee Dam, under an open rule, with 2 hours of general debate, waiving points of order.

For Wednesday and the remainder of the week there are—

House Resolution 756, the disapproval resolution of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; and House Resolution 777, a travel resolution for the Committee on the Judiciary.

This announcement, Mr. Speaker, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

I thank the gentleman.

RUSSIAN FISHING SHIPS CLOSE TO THE COAST OF OREGON

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, we have an outrageous situation repeating itself which I would like at this time to point out to the House. At this very moment there are four Russian fishing ships dragging for bottom fish very close to the coast of Oregon. It has been estimated that this fishing fleet is taking one-half a million pounds of fish each day.

Last year the Russians fished very close to the Oregon coast but not with the same sized equipment or as many fishing vessels. This Russian fishing fleet has the potential of depleting this great bottom fishery resource.

Our draggers in the Pacific Northwest have had many difficulties not the least of which is the current threat. The weather, the condition of the resource, and marketing problems have made this a struggling industry. Now the threat from the Russians which is again repeated this year in much greater magnitude is nearly the last straw for them.

I have appealed to the Secretary of State again this year to protest to the Russian Government the presence of this fleet. Our State Department frankly has not shown sufficient concern for our fisheries resource. A step in the right direction was taken a few years ago with the establishment of the Office of the Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife to the Under Secretary. Efforts are now underway to upgrade the status of this Office and thereby increase its influence and effectiveness.

I join with those who seek this end. The present intolerable situation points up the absolute necessity of the United States taking the lead in an effort to resolve the fisheries problem in the Northwest and in Alaska, involving this country and the Governments of Russia, Japan, and Canada.

Urgent action is needed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, during the previous 2 days while the House was deliberating the Interior and related agencies appropriation for 1967, I made every rollcall and participated actively in the debate. However, urgent district business caused me to miss the vote for final passage of the bill. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

HISTORY OF THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SECOND SESSION UP TO DATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a list of important bills acted on in the current session.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives can rightly go home during the recess with great pride in the work of the second session and with the knowledge that much has been accomplished since we convened January 10. Sixteen important legislative measures have been signed into law or are ready for the President's signature as a result of action taken by the Congress during the current session.

The international situation has demanded decisive action and the House of Representatives has responded by giving the President strong support in his handling of the war in Vietnam. The House, by the first of March, had passed and sent to the Senate two major authorization bills providing for an increased American effort in southeast Asia. Before the end of that month, the House provided the President the funds he had requested to enable this country to fulfill its commitment to the Vietnamese people.

Nor did the House delay when called upon to fulfill this Nation's pledge to aid in the economic development of other areas of the world. We acted quickly to approve U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank and by an overwhelming vote earlier this week, resoundingly endorsed President Johnson's decision to send more aid to the desperate and destitute people of India.

Recognizing that the maintenance of economic strength and stability is inextricably a part of the pattern of victory, we adopted the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. Continuing to recognize the needs of our country, Congress moved with equal speed to enact the cold war GI bill.

It is already evident that this session of Congress will be a great conservation Congress. Ready for signature is the act expanding the national program for water research, a major administration bill. The House has passed several reclamation and conservation measures, including the Tualatin project, the Chief Joseph Dam project, the Wind River Indian irrigation project, and the Cape Lookout National Seashore bill, and we are scheduling for action the week of our return the Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill and the third powerplant for the Grand Coulee Dam. The latter bill will provide much needed additional electric power for the further development of the great Pacific Northwest.

The House has passed and sent to the Senate three appropriation bills, the Federal employees pay bill and a bill authorizing a cotton research and promotion program, as well as several other measures.

Reported from committee and likely to be scheduled soon after we return from the recess, are the minimum wage bill, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act—FEPC—the International Health Act, the Child Development Specialist Act, and the health services for military dependents bill. Also ready for scheduling is the situs picketing bill.

However, the story of bills enacted, or even of bills reported, gives only a part of the picture. This is probably the hardest working session of Congress in many years. There is no doubt that the committees have been harder at work than ever before in our time. Mr. Lanham Connor, the senior committee reporter, advises me that on Friday, March 25, 33 committees and subcommittees held hearings. This is the largest number of committee meetings in a single day within the memory of anyone now serving on the staff of reporters, and that goes back more than 20 years.

Since March 25, there have been 2 days on which 29 committees and subcommittees were meeting and 1 day on which 30 such meetings were scheduled. This is remarkable when we realize that the greatest number of committees and subcommittees to meet on any one day during any previous session in the past 20 years was 26.

We are now averaging about 20 such meetings per day compared with an average of about 15 meetings per day during other sessions. It is interesting, and more than a little significant, that yesterday, just 4 days before Easter and the day before the recess was to commence, 17 committees and subcommittees were meeting.

It is in the committees that a large part of the legislative work is really being done, which means that the House can expect an ever-increasing number of bills on the floor after we return from the Easter holiday. We will have important legislation every week from then until the end of the session.

Before the end of May we will have considered and passed, in addition to those already disposed of, appropriation bills for the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, HEW, State, Justice, Commerce, and Defense, as well as for the District of Columbia, the judiciary and the independent offices.

Within a very few weeks after our return on April 18, we expect to act upon the NASA authorization, the elementary and secondary school bill, the poverty amendments, food for freedom, the International Education Act, the school lunch bill, possibly the higher education bill, and several important bills from the Judiciary Committee. By the end of May we should have military procurement out of the way, as well as a major part of the President's program for rebuilding and renewing our urban areas, the transportation department bill, the Manpower Act amendments, the highway safety bill, and possibly unemployment compensation.

This list is not exclusive or exhaustive, but it exemplifies how hard all the committees have been working.

The legislation which has been, and which is being, hammered out in Congress day by day is the result of the labors of all Members on both sides of the aisle. It is because the volume and significance of the measures considered are so great, the detail work so grueling, that often there is a tendency to lose sight of the overall achievement.

The 89th Congress, in its 2d session, has lived up to the reputation it set in the 1st session. In this era of ferment, revolution, and change in the world, the 89th Congress is facing up courageously to its momentous problems. It is my firm conviction that when the final record of this Congress is written, it will reveal that we have served the cause of ultimate peace around the world, and prosperity and justice at home.

The following important bills have this year passed both Houses of the Congress:

First. Asian Development Bank.

Second. Cape Lookout National Seashore.

Third. Coal Mine Safety Act.

Fourth. Coast Guard authorization.

Fifth. Tax Adjustment Act.

Sixth. Veterans' GI bill.

Seventh. Vietnam economic supplemental aid authorization.

Eighth. Vietnam military supplemental aid authorization.

Ninth. Vietnam supplemental appropriations.

Tenth. Water Research Act expansion.

Eleventh. Food for India joint resolution.

Twelfth. Medicare deadline extension.

Thirteenth. Refractory bauxite stockpile bill.

Fourteenth. Platinum stockpile bill.

Fifteenth. SBA authorization.

Sixteenth. Judgeship bill.

The following additional important bills have passed the House of Representatives this year:

First. Supplemental appropriations including Teacher Corps and rent supplements.

Second. Civilian pay bill.

Third. Eleven stockpile bills.

Fourth. Interior appropriations bill including appropriations for the arts.

Fifth. Treasury and Post Office appropriations bill.

The following important bills have been reported so far by House Committees:

First. Minimum wage.

Second. Third power plant at Grand Coulee.

Third. Foreign investments bill.

Fourth. Oregon Dunes bill.

Fifth. International health bill.

Sixth. Community service relations reorganization.

Seventh. NASA authorization.

Eighth. Situs picketing bill.

House hearings have been completed on the following important bills:

First. Atomic Energy Commission authorization.

Second. Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act.

Third. Demonstration cities.

Fourth. Narcotic addict rehabilitation.

Fifth. Urban Development Act.

Sixth. Unemployment insurance.

Seventh. Bail legislation.

ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF PAN AMERICAN UNION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 754, this day has been designated as Pan American Day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 785 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 785

Whereas April 14, 1966, marks the seventy-sixth anniversary of the Union of American Republics now known as the Organization of American States; and

Whereas Congress has recognized that the historic, economic, political, and geographic relationships among the American Republics are unique and of special significance; and

Whereas the Organization of American States serves as an institution for maintaining the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere, for promoting economic progress and improvements in the welfare and level of living of all the peoples of the region, and for strengthening principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in the hemisphere; and

Whereas achievement of the goals expressed in the Charter of the Organization of American States through inter-American cooperation affords the most meaningful barrier to threats to individual liberties and national independence emanating from forces inimical to the principles and concepts held by the American Republics; and

Whereas the American Republics are currently engaged in seeking ways to fortify the inter-American system of cooperation in order to consolidate the gains of the past and to create dynamic and vigorous institutions to meet present and future exigencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in honor of the founding of the Pan American Union, the House of Representatives of the United States extends to the other Republics of the Western Hemisphere and to the citizens of those Republics its most cordial greetings and its fervent hope that the deliberations going forward during this year will strengthen the inter-American system for the years ahead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, April 14 marks the 76th anniversary of the establishment of the first concrete step in the formation of an inter-American system of solidarity and cooperation, now known as the Organization of American States.

It has become customary for the House of Representatives to commemorate the anniversary of that most enduring of international organizations. I have always believed that this annual tribute should be more than mere ritual. Rather, it should be a time for stocktaking—a time to examine the imperfections of the Organization of American States as well as its successes; a time to assess the ability of the OAS to cope with foreseeable challenges; a time to evaluate our hemisphere commitments in an atmosphere unharried by crisis.

Recently events in Vietnam have commanded our attention, all but obscuring some significant activities on the inter-American scene. I should like to call to your attention three of these hemisphere developments which have received little or no coverage in the major news media but with which the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, of which I am chairman, has sought to keep current.

First is the on-going to update the OAS Charter. For some time members of the OAS have felt that the charter, written in Bogotá in 1948, was no longer responsive to today's requirements. Consequently, a special Inter-American Conference met in Rio de Janerio in November and December 1965 as a first step in revising the charter. The Rio Conference was to establish general guidelines, after which an ad hoc committee, meeting in Panama, would draft specific amendments for consideration at a new special conference to be held next July in Buenos Aires.

At the Rio Conference, which I was privileged to attend as one of four congressional observers, progress was made in two areas, while a third vital consideration was buried. A clear consensus was found for holding annual meetings of Foreign Ministers in the future, instead of the current system of conferring only to deal with sudden crises. Annual meetings, it was felt, would provide a continual forum for the interchange of views on extracontinental as well as hemisphere matters and for consideration of long-range policy.

There also developed a consensus for upgrading the importance of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council. When the Charter of the OAS was written in Bogotá in 1948, political affairs took overwhelming precedence over economic affairs. Creation of the Alliance for Progress and adoption of the Charter of Punta del Este have boosted the priority of economic and social matters, and the proposed charter amendments reflect this altered emphasis.

Disappointingly, but not unexpectedly, the Conference made no headway with respect to the problem of nonintervention versus mutual security. The Rio Treaty and the OAS Charter, the principal hemisphere agreements concerning the rights and duties of the American Republics in the event of a threat to the security of the region, were conceived prior to the emergence of Communist subversion and paramilitary tactics as aggressive forces in the hemisphere. Although subsequent Inter-American Conference and meetings of consultation have interpreted Communist subversion as coming within the purview of inter-American agreements, some Governments in the American Republics have been reluctant to depart from a narrow interpretation of what constitutes aggression. Hence timely concerted mutual defense is exceedingly difficult. The Dominican situation revealed the discordance and misapprehension within the OAS with respect to taking collective measures.

The recent Rio Conference sidestepped the entire issue. Thus, the inter-American system will continue to be plagued by ambiguities in the crucial matter of defense against modern aggressive tactics. It is imperative that we understand that the Organization of American States remains a questionable instrument for mutual defense in the event of aggression by nonconventional means.

This vulnerability in the hemisphere system has not gone unperceived by our adversaries. Indeed, the Communists have seized upon existing confusion within the OAS to further their designs for conquest. Nor are they being coy about their plans. This leads me to the second major Latin American development in recent months—the First Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin American, or "Tricontinental Conference" as it is called. The meeting, held in Havana in January 1966, was attended by delegations from 82 countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Speeches at the Tricontinental Conference left no doubt that the participants intend to subvert Latin American governments and accelerate guerrilla warfare in this hemisphere. The speech delivered by Fidel Castro at the closing session of the conference on January 15 is especially revealing. Listen to the following excerpts:

> In many other nations of America there are ample conditions for armed revolutionary struggle. This struggle has been underway, for some time now, in Venezuela [applause], in Peru [applause], in Colombia [applause], and in Guatemala [applause].
>
> In Latin America there should not be just one, or two, or three people struggling alone against imperialism. The correlation of forces of the imperialists on this continent, the proximity of its metropolitan territory, the zeal with which they will try to defend their dominions in this part of the world, require a common strategy on this continent, more than anywhere else; a common and simultaneous struggle. [Applause.] If the imperialists have to face not just the Dominican people alone, or the Guatemalan people alone, or the Venezuelan people alone, or the Colombian people alone, or the Peruvian people alone; if they must also fight—at the same time as in each of these countries—against other oppressed peoples, such as those of Brazil, Bolivia, Paraguay, Ecuador, Argentine [applause], and other peoples of Central America; if the struggle is carried out on a broad scale, if each one of these peoples, if each one of the revolutionaries of this continent fulfills his duty—and the duty of every revolutionary, as stated in the Declaration of Havana, is to carry out the revolution [applause and shouts] but to carry it out not with words but with deeds [applause] to be a revolutionary not only in theory, but in practice [applause and shouts]—if revolutionaries devote less of their energy and time to theorizing and more to practical work, and if they don't emit so many agreements, alternatives and dilemmas, and finally understand that sooner or later all, or nearly all, of the peoples will have to fight, arms in hand, for their liberation [applause and shouts], then the hour of liberation of this continent will be nearer.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We believe that on this continent, in all or almost all countries, the struggle will assume more violent forms. And when one is aware of this, the only correct thing to do is to prepare for the time when that struggle arrives: Prepare. [Applause.]

What about the much-vaunted Sino-Soviet split? Did the Russian Soviets try to tone down the plan for violent revolution and urge "peaceful coexistence"? Far from it. The head of the Soviet delegation, Sharaf R. Rashidov, a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, speaking before the Havana Conference on January 6, declared:

> The Soviet delegation came to this conference to promote in every conceivable way the unity of anti-imperialist forces of the three continents, so as to unfold on a still greater scale our common struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism headed by U.S. capitalists.

He pledged "fraternal solidarity with the armed struggle being waged by Venezuelan, Peruvian, Colombian, and Guatemalan patriots for freedom against the stooges of imperialism."

The Tricontinental Conference set up a Solidarity Organization, with headquarters in Havana, the objective of which is, and I quote:

> To unite, coordinate, and promote the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, and to render militant support to the movement for national liberation on the three continents, with all the means at its disposal.

We cannot say, then, that we have not been warned. Yet, the Organization of American States continues to duck the issue of how to cope, on the basis of mutual defense, with so-called wars of national liberation, relying almost exclusively upon the Alliance for Progress to combat the provocative acts of the Communist conspiracy.

I have supported the Alliance since its inception, believing that economic and social progress through inter-American cooperation is the best means for eradicating those conditions in which communism and other exotic doctrines can find fertile ground. Nevertheless, I have also argued that the Alliance for Progress is a long-range policy that will take time for its effects to be felt. In the interim, the inter-American system must be prepared to meet Communist machinations.

This brings me to the third important event of recent months, the fourth annual meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council held in Buenos Aires in March 1966 to review the operation of the Alliance for Progress.

At its halfway mark, the Alliance for Progress is proving the wisdom of those of us who realized at the outset that it was not a quick panacea for all the evils in Latin America, hence not an immediate answer to Communist subversion. This element of realism which has entered into the operations of the Alliance is, I believe, a healthy development.

In the past 5 years we have learned a good deal about what steps the Latin Americans themselves must take to utilize effectively external assistance; about the importance of building domestic institutions within each country if modernization is to proceed. Above all, Latin American leaders themselves are coming to the realization that economic growth and social progress will not flow automatically from an injection of funds.

Especially encouraging has been the role of CIAP, the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress, in the educational process. For instance, through CIAP's efforts there has been increasing understanding and accompanying policy changes with respect to the problem of inflation—the concept that orderly and rational development requires fiscal and financial discipline is spreading. CIAP's emphasis on the importance of modernizing rural life in Latin America is becoming influential in the budgeting of increasing public funds toward the rural sector. CIAP's stress on the dangers of excessive dependence on short-term financing is having impact on both recipient countries and their creditors. CIAP's recognition of the importance of manpower development through rational educational plans hopefully will speed efforts within Latin America to improve the quality as well as the quantity of education. CIAP's recognition that improved planning and project preparations are necessary for fruitful absorption of foreign assistance is especially helpful in dispelling the self-defeating attitude that all Latin America needs for progress is massive infusions of capital.

President Johnson's statement last November that the United States is prepared to extend mutual commitments beyond the decade foreseen in the Charter of Punta del Este reflects the growing realism within the Alliance for Progress. Modernization of societies which are frozen in the attitudes and procedures of other epochs will take time and more knowledge than we presently possess.

But while we search and experiment, with patience and conviction, the enemies of democratic progress will be exerting every effort to undermine our labors. I therefore urge a recognition that the long-term goals of the Alliance for Progress can only be achieved if the Organization of American States is prepared to meet the unremitting hostilities emanating from communism's Cuban base.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts

[Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 76th anniversary of the inter-American system. As Speaker of the House of Representatives I should like to take this opportunity to extend greetings to the legislatures of the other American Republics. Thanks to the dedication of men of many nationalities the Western Hemisphere has become increasingly unified since 1890.

On this occasion we and our sister republics to the south have much to celebrate. The Pan American Union was founded for the limited purpose of promoting trade among the nations of the hemisphere. Today the fabric of common interest is so extensive that the Organization of American States, through the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—is helping member governments to carry out economic and social reforms which would have been considered politically impossible as recently as 10 years ago.

The progress of the inter-American cause has been especially remarkable in the last few months. In November 1965, the members of the Organization of American States held a Second Special Inter-American Conference to discuss revision of the OAS Charter. Although many issues are still being discussed, the guidelines which emerged from that conference have served to promote the common interest of the hemisphere in helping the OAS to become an even more effective international organization.

The resolutions approved by the member states cover a wide area of inter-American concern. The most crucial conference resolution, called the Act of Rio de Janeiro, establishes a special committee to prepare a draft of proposed amendments to the charter. The guidelines which the committee will follow in drafting its proposal include the annual convening of the inter-American conference to approve the OAS program and budget, and the creation of both an economic and a cultural council equivalent to the existing political council of the OAS. The Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—would thus be upgraded to act as the executive committee for the proposed economic council. A second resolution calls for the holding of an annual meeting of foreign ministers as a means of strengthening the inter-American system until charter revision is approved. A third resolution discourages the forceful overthrow of democratically elected governments by proposing that the members of the OAS consult in each individual case. Finally, the conference called for the convocation of a Third Special Inter-American Conference to implement the resolutions. It will be held in July of this year in the city of Buenos Aires.

Inter-American solidarity against Communist subversion has also been strengthened in the last few months. In February the Council of the OAS adopted a resolution complaining to the United States that the recent Tricontinental Conference in Havana was a "threat to the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere." The resolution declared that the Havana meeting violated the principles of the OAS. The complaint was the first ever voted by the OAS to be filed with the United Nations.

I firmly believe that in the coming years the Organization of American States will become an even more effective instrument for furthering the peace, prosperity and freedom of the Western Hemisphere. But in order to accomplish these momentous tasks it needs the help of all of us. I suggest that we in the United States join with our neighbors to the south in reaffirming our dedication to hemispheric solidarity and in strengthening our determination to assure the continued progress of the inter-American system.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I think there is not any doubt that the salient points on the commemoration of this day have very well been covered by that eminent American theologian and that great inter-American scholar, Father Thorning, in his opening prayer to the House of Representatives today and by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden].

The high purposes which they enunciated for the free people in the Western Hemisphere I endorse heartly and associate myself with those purposes.

Once again the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has quickly and concisely put his thumb on the pulse of the problem in the Western Hemisphere. He has demonstrated the continuing leadership which he gives to inter-American affairs at the congressional level.

The distinguished gentleman from Alabama, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, has been in the forefront in dealing with the problems that confront the relationship of the Americas on all levels—but with particular emphasis on the constant and continuing problem of Communist infiltration and subversion in the Western Hemisphere.

I would like to emphasize particularly again the point which the gentleman from Alabama has made so strongly here today and which needs emphasis, in my judgment. That point is this: We must face up to the problem of Communist subversive activity in the Western Hemisphere, and we must not only face up to it but we must have the proper answer to it, because the analysis of this issue shows that it is symptomatic of the problem which the United States and the free world has all over the world with increased Communist guerrilla activities and so-called wars of national liberation, whether they occur in Vietnam, South America, or elsewhere.

There is no question in my mind, based upon what studies we have made and all the best evidence which we can obtain, that this is the current test as far as the free world versus the Communist world is concerned—that is the success or the failure of the so-called wars of national liberation; the use of violence to subvert political, economic, and social institutions toward Communist ends.

We in the United States and the free world, have resorted to normal kinds of responses; namely, military and economic.

All of us recognize that we have to have sufficient military strength to meet whatever overt act or covert act which may take place which has as its purpose the subversion of political, economic, social, free, and democratic institutions. And we are prepared to meet that act with military force, if necessary. We are demonstrating that today in Vietnam.

In addition to our military response, we have our economic program, an important part of which is the Alliance for Progress. I am more convinced than ever that these programs are absolutely essential to the objectives of the free world, notwithstanding the fact that they are under constant attack both in this body, at home with public opinion, and abroad. Long-term economic development is essential to the objectives of the free world. It is also vital assistance for the free peoples, to help themselves economically, socially, and politically, and to combat communism wherever it exists.

An important point of this discussion, perhaps the principal point, as we observe Pan American Day here today is that the United States does not yet have the right answer to the short-term problem of Communist aggression, as evidenced by so-called wars of national liberation or political, economic, or social subversion, accompanied by violence or without it.

This is the major problem confronting not only the United States, the Western Hemisphere, the Atlantic Alliance, but the entire free world. This is where we must put our best efforts, our best brains, our best capability.

I am convinced now, as I stand here today discussing this matter, that the great effort must be made in the ideological field; in the motivation of the individuals in other lands on an individual basis and on a collective basis. We must motivate these people properly in some way to do those things which lean toward the establishment of democratic and free institutions and which will lead toward the pursuit and the accomplishment of the objectives of the free world. Without that motivation coming from the people themselves—military effort, long-term economic effort—short-term economic contributions will be of little or no avail to the accomplishments of the purposes which we have joined our sister republics in the Organization of American States.

It is in this third area, of international politics and diplomacy, where the United States must exercise its greatest initiative.

I urge once again that the United States and the free world engage in the actions necessary in the ideological struggle to motivate individuals to accomplish our mutual purposes.

I am proud to join here today, as a cosponsor of the resolution introduced by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, in the commemoration of the Pan American Day, on this 76th anniversary of the oldest regional institution in the world for the cooperative effort of peoples and nations to share in the blessings of freedom.

While some might say that a resolution is of little meaning, I respectfully submit that the concerted action of this body in commemorating Pan American Day and extending our congratulations and best wishes to the free peoples, governments and institutions of this hemisphere gives them encouragement, and assures them that we the American people of the United States through their representatives are wholeheartedly in the struggle with them.

In my judgment, this is very important. I commend the distinguished gentleman for taking the time and making it available to this body to give this expression on this significant occasion.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, a very distinguished and able member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, who has always seen very clearly the problems that we face in this hemisphere.

I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

As the distinguished gentleman [Mr. FASCELL] who has just spoken said, we are very proud of the chairman of this subcommittee and very grateful to him for giving us this opportunity, to express something of our thinking about the whole area in the Western Hemisphere.

My memories of South America go back for many years. My father had a little company which used to ship twist drills to the various countries of South America. His company did a much better business than some other firms, who had not adopted the German way of packing their materials as the South Americans wanted them to be packed. Other firms were still insisting that there was only one way to do it. Our American big packageway, and the poor little donkeys could not get over the Andes with them.

But we did adopt a different way, and we sent our packages over the Andes.

South America for my family has had, apparently, a great pull for a number of years. My oldest grandson was in the Lima University and has fallen in love with it all and with South America and Spanish. He has not yet tackled Portuguese, but I think he will be doing so, if he can just get a job down there somewhere.

But the fact that we have failed to cross the valley of mutual ignorance that lies between us and the people of this other Western continent is distressing, to say the least. We seem to have shut a door that must be opened.

It means so much, Mr. Speaker, that this area be opened up by these meetings and by the work of this subcommittee. We are beginning to learn something about what the Latin Americans think and feel about themselves and about us. I think it is a most salutary thing for us and for all Americans.

I wish them all so well and hope that in a very short time we may find ourselves, all of us, together in our great effort to stop the movement that is spreading across the world so rapidly and so dangerously. I invite all of us to go down there as much as we can, and invite all of them to come up here as much as they can. That is the only way that we will understand each other, which will be of advantage for us all and for peace.

My congratulations to all for their accomplishments.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio, who is the able ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise in support of this resolution, which marks the 76th anniversary of the Union of American Republics, and to state my support of the efforts of the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

I am privileged to serve as a member of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. I am intimately aware of the efforts that he has made not only in the field of hemisphere security to which the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has eloquently referred—and that is an important field—but also in the area of creating better relationhips between our country and the countries of Latin America.

I should like to call particular attention to the second paragraph in this resolution, which points out that we as Americans recognize the historic, economic, political, and geographic relationships that exist between our country and the countries to the south. Too often we are the victims of an isolationism of the mind. Nowhere has that been more true, tragically enough, than in our relations with the countries of Latin America. We fail to recognize their diversity. We fail to understand their motivations. We fail to remember that some of these countries have histories that are as diverse and as noteworthy as our own or any other country throughout the world.

If nothing else, it would be a great accomplishment if this observance were to call these factors to the hearts and minds of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one other point. I agree fully with the points made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] but I think we would err if we did not recall here today first of all the economic progress that has been made in the various countries of Latin America in recent years. This is not unconnected, by any means, with the Alliance for Progress but it is also due to increasing maturity and fiscal responsibility. We should also point out the growing unity that has made itself evident among the countries of the Americas. To me the most noteworthy example of this growing and existing unity was the action that was taken by the Organization of American States in connection with the Havana Conference when, by a vote of 18 to 0, there was a shoulder-to-shoulder repudiation of the so-called Communist liberation movement and its meeting in Havana. This action made it abundantly clear that there is a meeting of the minds between the United States and the sister republics of Latin America and we will not sit idly by in the face of clear external threats to the security of the Americas.

Mr. Speaker, this day, April 7, 1966, which we commemorate as Pan American Day, marks the 76th anniversary of the First International Conference of American States. Our observance of this historic day on past occasions has been highlighted by consideration of the decisive and constructive action taken by the Organization of American States in the furtherance of its chartered objectives.

These objectives, chiefly the defense of the Western Hemisphere from outside aggression, the settling of inter-American disputes by peaceful means, and the promotion of political security and social and economic development, have assumed vital importance with the acceleration of the Communist threat to Latin America, and a review of the OAS efforts to repel this threat provides encouraging evidence of the value of hemispheric solidarity in coping with Communist aggression.

On numerous occasions the OAS has presented a solid front against Communist expansion in this hemisphere. The salient examples of OAS concerted action during the Cuban missile crisis and the Panama situation have been underlined with scores of equally important, though less sensational resolutions to guarantee the peace, security, and economic development of the hemisphere.

Within the 12 months immediately following our last observance of Pan American Day the cohesive posture of the American states against external aggression was strongly and most significantly shown by the OAS resolution of February 2, 1966, which condemned the infamous Havana Conference by a vote of 18 to 0. This virtually unanimous repudiation—there were two abstentions—of the so-called Communist liberation movement has made it abundantly clear to the Communists that neither the United States nor its sister republics of Latin America can be expected to sit idly by in the face of external threats to the security of the Americas.

In addition to this demonstration of its vitality in confronting threats of aggression, the OAS displayed its dynamism in pursuit of its related internal objectives through the convening of the Rio Conference in 1965. Among the numerous resolutions concerning the elevation of inter-American economic and social standards which were adopted at this conference, several notable chapters of the Final Act of the Rio Conference stand out as representative expressions of Pan American goals and their means of achievement. Chapters XXII through XXIV of this act announce a recognition of the essential necessity of coordinating efforts to protect and preserve the observance of fundamental human rights among the member states of the OAS, and these chapters resolve that member states take steps to strengthen and expand the functions of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

The underlying rationale of this resolution denotes a realization among OAS members that the roots of all resistance to external aggression lie in the provision of internal social justice and economic opportunity. This realization has formed the basis of the Alliance for Progress and through this organization, the principles of solidarity continue to inspire activities of inter-American cooperation that will enable the peoples of the American Republics to attain social and economic development as well as political security.

The Alliance for Progress has had an impact upon the living standards of the American States, and some headway—although not as much as desirable—has been made in the Pan American war on poverty. Encouraging indications of the Latin American nations' willingness to exert internal initiative in the institution of agrarian reform and taxation reform policies have been complemented with substantial examples of financial self-help. With the mobilization of large quantities of Latin American capital, the Alliance for Progress has provided several hundred thousand new homes, over 30,000 new schools and classrooms, and over 1,250 hospitals and health facilities in Latin America. In addition to this construction growth, the Alliance provides basic food commodities such as milk and eggs to over 22 million Latin Americans on a daily basis.

In view of this substantial progress, the Members of this House can take great pleasure and satisfaction in joining with the other legislative bodies of the Western Hemisphere in celebrating "Pan American Day." However, the true meaning of our observance of this historic event lies not in our exhilaration over what has been done, but in our rededication to the ideals which inspired President Kennedy's promise "to convert our good words into good deeds—to assist freemen and governments in casting off the chains of poverty." Today this promise is only partially fulfilled. Unfortunately, population increases and popular movements tend to cancel out existing gains and many of the Latin American Republics are still plagued with inflation, inadequate housing, and deficiencies in health facilities. As we adopt this resolution designating this day as "Pan American Day" we are not only commending our sister republics for their mutual cooperation, but we are reaffirming our determination to join in their efforts to develop and preserve a prosperous and democratic way of life throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut, who is also a very able member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with today's celebration of Pan-American Day, and in particular, in view of our longstanding effort to strengthen the inter-American system, I think it would be well to note that Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., who gave the prayer in the House of Representatives today, was one of the first leaders in North America to emphasize the value of inter-American friendship and cooperation.

Indeed, all his years in the priesthood have been devoted to this noble cause.

This is the reason why, for 22 consecutive years, our friend, Father Thorning, has been invited to deliver the invocation on Pan American Day. This priest-scholar was on hand on April 14, 1944, for this service. And all those who know about his efforts for international understanding and amity will pray that he can be with us on this anniversary for many years to come.

I am happy to add that, only last Friday, in the main auditorium of the State Department, Father Thorning invoked the blessing of God upon the distinguished member of the Inter-American Defense Board as they celebrated the 24th anniversary of the foundation of this vital group charged with the responsibility for the security of the Western Hemisphere.

Presiding on this occasion was the able Chairman of the Defense Board, Vice Admiral B. L. Austin, U.S. Navy, who delivered a noteworthy address.

The guest speaker was His Excellency Ilmar Penna Marinho, Ambassador of Brazil to the Council of the Organization of American States, and Chairman of the Council of the OAS. The benediction was given by Chaplain Lt. Col. Wayne E. Soliday, and the musical program was provided by the U.S. Navy Band.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks with a brief review of the record of Dr. Thorning in the domain of inter-American relations.

"The Padre of the Americas," as he has been described in the U.S. Congress, has served, at various times, as special correspondent of the Religious News Service of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

By a unanimous vote, he was elected in 1940 to succeed Prof. Percy Alvin Martin of Leland Stanford University as the one U.S. honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil.

In the same year, Dr. Thorning was appointed the director of the first inter-American seminar in the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru.

In 1941, he served in the same capacity for the first inter-American seminars in the University of Havana and the National University of Mexico.

Prior to these appointments, Father Thorning acted as dean of the Graduate School of Georgetown Universtiy, European correspondent of America, and Far Eastern correspondent of the NCWC News Service.

At present, Father Thorning is an associate editor of world affairs, and honorary professor of the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution.

One of his books, "Miranda: World Citizen," is a best seller of the University of Florida Press. This biography of Francisco de Miranda was cited, twice, by the New York Times as "one of the outstanding books of the year."

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, and I join with him in welcoming again to the House of Representatives Father Joseph Thorning.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to take part with my colleagues in the House in cosponsoring this resolution which has been offered by our distinguished and scholarly friend from Alabama, who serves so capably as the chairman of the Inter-American Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think those of us whose work takes us into day-to-day contact with our neighbors in Latin America are convinced that the relationships among the American Republics are perhaps the most important in the entire world for the future peace and stability of this earth is concerned. We see every day the threats to the stability of the Western Hemisphere enunciated by communism.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the pretenses of the Tri-Continental Congress, and their stated objective to subvert political institutions of the free countries of this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, one must always be aware of the forces pushing always behind this effort outside the hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I frequently have been asked what the U.S. goals in Latin America are, and I reply to my Latin American friends that we want simply to help create an atmosphere in which the people of Latin America can achieve their very highest spiritual, social, cultural, and economic aspirations.

Mr. Speaker, in order that this may be fully effected, I believe we must always, as the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has indicated, seek to widen in each of the American Republics the participation of the people in the processes of government and the processes of development.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is one of the most noble and majestic goals to be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, massive efforts should be made to help in the developmental process. These efforts will be required in the years ahead, both in the public sector and in the private sector.

I am happy to join in extending felicitations and best wishes to the citizens of the member states of the Organization of American States on the happy occasion of the 76th anniversary of that insoluble union.

Over this period we can all point with pride to the economic, political, and social achievements which have been attained. As one example, in the economic field so vital to the well-being of the peoples of these countries, economic growth for the last 3 years in a row has been at the rate of nearly 3 percent per capita. Likewise, measurable results of this common undertaking in both Americas toward the ambitious goals which have been established are clearly evident.

We cannot, however, rest on our laurels. There cannot be full progress unless the abundance of consumer goods and technical resources establish a climate favorable to all types of cultural manifestation; where the chance to enjoy the benefits of economic progress are reserved for a privileged minority; where the roles of letters, of the sciences, and of the arts are not fully recognized; where the means of intellectual improvement is not equally available to all who have the capability of using them; where men and women are limited in any way in the development of their cultural needs.

The ideals which the proponents of the Alliance strive for are basically to achieve man's overall progress. It is my earnest hope that in the decade ahead even greater strides will be made to bring about a closer relationship between modern development and the concern proper to culture.

Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence, because of the leadership of such an able man such as the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] and because of the increasing awareness of the Republics of Latin America, throughout all Latin America, that this will be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] an able member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my extremely able chairman of the subcommittee, of which I am a member, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] for giving me an opportunity to participate in this Pan American Day.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the very eloquent and articulate gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] for his statement. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is our outstanding chairman. He certainly most eloquently expresses everything I feel on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a minute to reemphasize the points that are being made in an effort to point up the meaningful facts underlying what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] has said.

Mr. Speaker, I remember a homily made some years ago, and widely quoted since, that finding a moral equivalent to war is one of the most difficult things that man has faced.

Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out here, the Tri-Continental Congress held in Havana in January, has been given a great deal of public attention and press because of the fact that the countries of the Americas responded with one voice. This challenge to their solidarity and their aspirations evoked a very key signal response. But underneath such items that receive press notice is an even more important happening. I believe the fact, as the gentleman from Alabama has brought out so eloquently, and as finely expressed by our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and other Members of the House, is this: One begins to see and hope for a resurgence of what Simon Bolivar had in mind—a coming together of the countries themselves toward unity in areas, economically, militarily, socially. This is happening not just to present a united front in the face of Communist aggression important as that is, but because they see in this movement a newly emphasized opportunity toward the unity and organization of the alliance, as exemplified in the Common Market of the Central American countries, or in a federation of the South American countries, looking toward a Common Market status.

Mr. Speaker, they see the fact that there should be equal opportunity for all of the people of Latin America.

We in the United States so often forget when we eat our fine meals and wear our fine clothes and drive our comfortable cars on our broad highways that we are a singularly fortunate people—and an elite people by the accident of birth that made us Americans here in the year 1966.

Our neighbors to the south have the same potential but they do not all have these opportunities. But they can have them—they can have them in our lifetime. This, above all, is worth any man's interest, any man's devoting his life to.

I think the leadership that comes out of the subcommittee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, while it does not reach the front pages, is the kind of leadership that works toward such goals.

The observance that we are taking part in here today will assist in this work. It is a real honor and a pleasure for me to take part.

I appreciate the opportunity to join with my chairman and my colleagues on this observance of Pan American Day.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his very kind remarks.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I should like, as a Member who does not serve on this committee, to compliment the chairman and the members of this committee for bringing this matter to the House today.

I think we do not realize how easily the people of South America and our North American neighbors can come to the conclusion that American policy toward their country is an on-again, off-again Finnegan kind of attitude.

I think it can be demonstrated by the chairman of the subcommittee the concern that you have given to this section of the world probably outstrip any time, energy, and attention that you have given to any other section of the globe. I think it is important to the people who share these problems with us to know this to be a fact. I also think the work of this committee should have made several points clear to the Members of the Congress, and I hope ultimately to the people of the United States. That is, there are several important points to be considered in measuring what we have to do in these countries and what we are trying to do.

One of the first considerations that I think is very often overlooked is the fact that we are looking at a section of the world that carries the blight of 300 years of Spanish reign. I challenge anyone, and I am sure the members of the committee know this to be a fact, to go any place in the world and to see a great burden placed on any land or people than the blight that exists from the reign of the Spanish absolute government that has been over these peoples. This despotic reign destroyed for 300 years one of the necessary elements that is needed for a country to become an active part of free world activity and that is this business of human motivation: Because under the Spanish reign it did not pay for anyone to try to do more than he had to because he would not receive the fruits of his labor anyway. This is a practical, realistic fact and has to be appreciated.

I think we can and must appreciate the reality of heritage.

This fact lead us to the second consideration. No matter what we are trying to do it cannot be accomplished by fine motives held in the Congress when we pass legislation, or when we make available money. It can only be truly effective if the administration of our programs is in the hands of really capable people. We then must support these capable and dedicated people with our own expressions of encouragement and appreciation for what they are doing.

It has been my observation that the operation of the AID program under David Bell has reached a level of very high acclaim which is justly given it by all of us. I hope whatever happens to that great administrator that that office continues to be filled by a man of his stature and that we will give support and recognition to this work that needs to be followed up by our Government's program.

I think our chairman will agree with me that this is very important. So I say I am delighted to be a part of this day by making these comments, and I hope they will get home to the people in the countries that we are hoping to get as our partners knowing that we understand that partnership means they have to be involved in the solutions of their problems with us and that we are not going there and saying—"Put your problem into an American machine and we will give you an American answer." Let us rather, on the other hand, say to them—"We encourage your nationalism, but we hope it is not a short-term ill-directed nationalism that will destroy the hopes of the future, but rather a self-enlightened nationalism that would spread opportunities for opening a very vigorous, productive, and progressive partner in the movement of the free world."

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman from California for his very fine remarks.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I also as a nonmember of the committee would like to commend very highly the chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for the wonderful leadership he has given in regard to inter-American affairs.

I, like the gentleman who preceded me, want to most heartily congratulate the gentleman for the attitude he has taken in relation to the other countries of the Western Hemisphere in working for and encouraging the full right of partnership and at the same time insisting that if they are full and equal partners, they must share in their own right the responsibility of such equal partnership.

I think that perhaps this is the greatest secret to any understanding between people and especially in this Western Hemisphere. If we have all been created by God with the dignity of the individual, then we must share in all the responsibilities as individuals and as a country. I think the gentleman from Alabama has expressed that point, and I am happy that he did so in behalf of this legislative body. We recognize all Latin American countries as our equals. We recognize them as our partners. We extend to them our hand when needed. But we request of them equal participation, because if you do not participate as equals, then one will fail or one will surpass the other. I would wish that the chairman continue his leadership in this respect, and I would hope that every Member of this body would be as enlightened in the affairs of the Americas as is the chairman of the subcommittee, and I most warmly again commend him for his leadership.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his very kind remarks and for his very sage observations.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, April 14, 1966, commemorates the 76th anniversary of the Pan American Union and the Organization of American States. The relatively simple purpose for which the Pan American Union was first established—to foster greater trade with the Americas—no longer suffices nor dominates our hemispheric concerns.

Since April 14, 1890, the concept of cooperation in the American Continent has been many times strengthened with positive and meaningful acts; however, our concern for events in Latin America grows constantly. Our constant vigilance is called for. As we see an escalation of events in North Vietnam, with Communist expansion attempted in that area, we cannot forget that Communist tyranny still does exist in Cuba and that something must be done about it. We must also remember and be sure that we do not push into the background a solution of the problem of Cuba because we are devoting so much time and energy to the solution of the problems in North and South Vietnam.

All the elements for international difficulty are present in this hemisphere: differences in language, customs, ideologies, race, and economies, and great disparities in power could produce unsurmountable strains on the functioning of the system. Yet the principal ends for which the Organization of American States stands—the preservation of peace, social, and economic development, human rights, and continental security—must take over any temporary dissension.

Our Nation has assumed vast responsibility in the leadership of the Americas. We here in Congress, and Americans everywhere should reflect the meaning of Pan American Day, and rededicate ourselves to the success of the cooperative endeavors of the future—only in this way can the inter-American system be successful in the years to come.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we are honored to have with us today for the 22d time, Rev. Joseph F. Thorning, who together with our distinguished speakers was one of our primary movers 22 years ago in achieving the observation of this great anniversary. Father Thorning has long been a successful advocate of a good neighbor policy between the United States and our sister Republics to the south, and surely his contributions toward better relations between the two sections of the hemisphere can be exceeded by few Americans.

At the time of this celebration in 1962 the Milwaukee Journal carried a story concerning Father Thorning which might well be reproduced today. Only some of the mathematical facts are different, and I include the article herewith:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Apr. 28, 1962]

PRIEST PLAYS HIS USUAL BIG PAN-AMERICAN DAY ROLE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A Milwaukee-born priest, Father Joseph F. Thorning, played his customary prominent role last week in the observance of Pan American Day.

For the 18th consecutive year, Father Thorning gave the opening prayer at a Pan-American Day ceremony in the House of Representatives.

As usual, he was on top of the news as he asked "the Christ of the Andes to vouchsafe to our good neighbors in the other American Republics the willingness to embrace sacrifices and changes to make the Alliance for Progress work, whether they be property owners, managers, or workers."

IS WIDELY KNOWN

The "Padre of the Americas," so named by Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD, of Montana, had Cuba particularly in mind when he asked God to "bestow upon freedom fighters everywhere the vision, bravery, and perseverance to maintain their crusade for the liberation of captive nations."

The spry priest, who was 66 Wednesday, has become widely known to Washington hostesses, Government officials, and along Embassy row as he works unceasingly in behalf of the good neighbor policy.

His lecturing, writing, and socializing on the subject closest to his heart are all in addition to his regular work as pastor of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, a big rural parish near Frederick, Md.

His Congressman, Representative MATHIAS, Republican, of Maryland, paid tribute to him in the House by calling attention to the extracurricular activities that gave him an international reputation.

MATHIAS noted that only the other day the Baltimore Women's Committee for Cuban Freedom had made Father Thorning its honorary chaplain because of his longstanding leadership in upholding freedom and decency.

Representative PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, told the House that Father Thorning's commentary on current events in Latin America carried great weight and enjoyed authoritative standing, not only in academic circles, but among governmental and diplomatic experts and contemporary leaders.

The State Department would do well to pay increasingly careful attention to the priest's views, PHILBIN told his colleagues.

GETS HIGHEST AWARDS

Father Thorning, who was graduated from Marquette Academy in 1914, was recently given the Order of the Quetzal, Guatemala's highest decoration.

Guatemalan Ambassador Carlos Alejos said he was honored because of "his vision and courage, in the early 1950's, in upholding freedom and decency against the Soviet-dominated regime of Col. Jacobo Arbenz Guzman, which was overthrown by Guatemalan freedom fighters in June 1954."

Father Thorning also has received the highest awards of Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Haiti, Panama, Portugal, Spain, and Venezuela. He is the only honorary fellow of the historical and geographic institute of Brazil and is an honorary professor of the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution. He is a professor of Latin American history at Marymount College, Arlington, Va.

The priest has two sisters in Milwaukee County—Mrs. M. Paul Reilly, 2200 East Stratford Court, Shorewood, and Mrs. C. R. Reilly, 1908 North 73d Street, Wauwatosa.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, as we observe Pan American Day, it is especially fitting that the opening prayer in the House was offered by the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning. Father Thorning is the pastor of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton-Manor, a historic church in my own Sixth Congressional District of Maryland. But Father Thorning's congregation extends far beyond the borders of this district, this State, and this Nation. Through his humanitarian work and experience throughout this hemisphere, he has truly earned the title, "Padre of the Americas."

In this difficult decade, all of us throughout the Western Hemisphere must work together to attack our common problems and to shape our common future. Although we represent diverse societies, speak different languages, and pledge allegiance to more than 20 different flags, we have mutual hopes, and mutual concerns. Through insight and understanding, we can become more than good neighbors—we can become true partners, as nations and as fellow citizens of the Americas.

Father Thorning, through his unstinting dedication and generosity, has helped to bring closer the day when this dynamic partnership can be achieved. It is appropriate that he is with us today, as we rededicate our efforts toward this goal.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, April 14 will mark the 76th anniversary of the inter-American system. I am sure that I speak for the other Members of this body in extending greetings and congratulations to the officials of the Organization of American States. It is also a propitious time to salute the accomplishments of the legislatures of the other American Republics and to send our best wishes to the peoples of the hemisphere.

Seventy-six years ago the first Pan-American Conference established a Commercial Bureau, the first permanent agency to stress cooperation on a hemispheric basis. The creation of the Commercial Bureau was a modest beginning, but it was founded upon an ideal which has continued to guide and inspire the nations of the new world. That ideal was brilliantly articulated by Simon Bolivar when he urged that the newly independent American nations create "the most extraordinary and strongest—league—which has ever appeared on earth."

Although Bolivar's dream has not yet been fully realized, the American nations have made remarkable strides since 1889. Perhaps the most significant organizational accomplishment has been the growing strength and effectiveness of the Council of the OAS.

The Council is the only body of the OAS representing all member states which is continually in session. Its modest origins are suggested by the name it bore until 1948: the Governing Board of the Pan American Union. Although it was originally placed under the authority of the Secretary of State of thet United States it gradually acquired an international character through successive reorganizations. But its main function continued to be the supervision of the juridical, cultural, and commercial work of the Pan American Union.

The Good Neighbor Policy and the exigencies for wartime cooperation led to a general realization in the hemisphere that the old organizational arrangements had become inadequate. At the Chapultepec Conference, held in Mexico City in 1945, the American Government recommended that the Governing Board should "take action, within the limitations imposed upon it by the International Conference of American States or pursuant to the specific direction of the meetings of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, on every matter that affects the effective functioning of the Inter-American System and the solidarity and general welfare of the American Republics."

The Rio Treaty, adopted in 1947, provides that the Governing Board—soon to become the Council—can act provisionally as an "organ of consultation" and can exercise all the powers which that organ is granted by the treaty.

Despite the steps toward the creation of a stronger executive organ taken in 1945 and 1947, traditional opinion was strong at the Bogotá Conference of 1948. However, under the new Charter of the OAS, the basic power to act provisionally as Organ of Consultation was left intact. The Governing Board was renamed the Council.

Today the Council has three main responsibilities. The Council has acquired important political powers, not all of which stem from the Rio Treaty of 1947. Second, the Council is charged with preparing for inter-American conferences, arranging for meetings of Foreign Ministers and carrying out other duties assigned to it by these organs. Finally, it acts as the central administrative organ of the Pan American Union. The Pan American Union can best be considered the secretariat of the OAS.

The Council has been able to take decisive political action in many situations threatening the peace of the Americas by acting provisionally as Organ of Consultation. Although it must go through the formality of calling a meeting of foreign ministers, no exact date or location is set for the meeting. The Council can then proceed to deal with the issue. In 1955, for example, the Council acted in a fairly typical way in settling a conflict between Costa Rica and Nicaragua. An investigating committee accompanied by military advisers was dispatched to the scene after the application of the Rio Treaty. In most cases the very presence of the committee has been sufficient to pacify the situation, but in this case the Council recommended the sale of military aircraft to Costa Rica in order to settle the dispute.

The responsibility of preparing for meetings of foreign ministers and inter-American conferences involves more than a few innocuous administrative decisions. The drafting of the rules for a conference includes the decision of what will constitute a voting majority. The preparation of agendas involves many important political decisions.

But most important is the fact that the increasing number of major issues which confront the OAS can no longer be handled exclusively by organs not in continuous session. The Council has been given an increasing number of delegated responsibilities.

As a supervisory body the Council has not been given real power on substantive issues. For example, the Ad Hoc Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—has more power than the Council in supervising the economic and social activities of the Organization of American States within the Alliance for Progress. One of the principal proposals which emerged from the Second Special Inter-American Conference on charter revision held at Rio de Janeiro in November was that two new Councils in the economic and cultural fields be set up to act as supervisory organs with real substantive powers. CIAP would then serve as the executive organ for the new economic council.

The growing importance of the Council is symbolic of the generally pragmatic response of the Organization of American States and its members to changing conditions in the hemisphere. But as North, South, and Central Americans, we must do more to help the inter-American system become a powerful force for peace, freedom, and prosperity in the new world.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks concerning Pan American Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEATH OF FRED AANDAHL

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to inform the House of the passing this morning of Fred Aandahl, former Governor of our State and a former Member of this body as well as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for 8 years. Fred was a great man. In his simplicity, honesty, and straightforwardness, he spoke ably and well for the people of our State and the people of the Nation. He was always willing to contribute his sound judgment to the task of building a better society.

His family, of course, has a great personal sorrow today, but it is shared by those of us who knew him and worked with him. Our hearts are with them in this moment of sorrow.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have known and served with Mr. Aandahl may extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A GRAVE INJUSTICE IN GUILFORD COUNTY, N.C.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call the attention of my colleagues to a great and grave injustice that has been done to my home county of Guilford in the State of North Carolina. While I would like to call particular attention to my home county, at the same time I will say that there are other counties in the State of North Carolina, and in other areas of the country, in which this same injustice has been or will be committed.

I speak of this injustice to my people, which comes as the result of and pursuant to the provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

This act, which was debated and passed by the Congress last year, passed during a state of high emotion. This ill-conceived piece of legislation, with its weird 50-percent formula, has now begun to operate on the innocent people of our Nation.

I was advised last week by the Director of the Census Bureau that as a result of a special census held in Guilford County, N.C., only 49.5 percent of those persons estimated to be of voting age during the presidential election of 1964, voted in that election.

I also note that other counties in the State of North Carolina which enjoy, along with my home county, a wonderful reputation for justice, for honor, and being free from any type of racial discrimination in voting practices were placed under the coverage of the act.

Let me call to the attention of the House one of the facts about this so-called census that was held in Guilford County, and the results of it. In 1960 Guilford County had a population of 144,000 people of voting age, according to the decennial census.

In a special census held last December and January of this year, the Census Bureau came up with a figure of 152,741 people of voting age—that is, 21 years or older—living in the county. Through their various gyrations and interpolations, they now say that, based on that figure, less than 50 percent voted in the presidential election of 1964, which under the terms of the Voting Rights Act brings Guilford County under its provisions and built-in stigma.

But here is the funny thing. There were 75,604 people who actually voted for one of the two candidates for the President of the United States. The mechanical counters, the tabulators on the voting booths, the mechanical voting booths of the county, show that 77,160 people went to the polls on that day in that presidential election and voted.

If you take the last figure, the number of people who actually went to the polls and voted, we would be above the 50-percent mark. If you take the figure of 75,604, the number of people who actually voted for one of the candidates for President, we come out with a figure of 49.5 percent.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORNEGAY. I will be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for addressing himself to this subject. As the gentleman knows, I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in that committee and on the floor of the House I have tried to point out that this so-called formula, as set forth in section 4, subsection (b), Public Law 89-110, the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965, is as phony as a $3 bill. The Census Bureau, in the tests or in the special censuses that have been made in North Carolina, has verified the phoniness of that formula. I am not criticizing the Census Bureau, because they had no choice in this matter. It was a crown of thorns placed upon the Census Bureau by the Congress and by the Justice Department and by the administration. It is a crown of thorns that should not have been placed upon that organization.

At the same time, it is an insult to the good Americans whom we know to be North Carolinians to have it heralded over the Nation that, because of this phony formula, the people from the home county of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] and the people from my home County of Gaston, and the people of Cleveland County in my district are engaging in some sort of discrimination with respect to voting.

The gentleman has pointed out the situation in his home county. If I may mention the capital county of our State, Wake County, we see an even more ridiculous result. According to the Charlotte Observer of March 30, 1966, Wake County falls under this phony formula, because the Census Bureau says that in the election of 1964, Wake County was shy 1,219 voters of meeting the 50-percent mark. Its total under the census was 48.9 percent.

But, in taking this census, the Census Bureau did not take into account that there are more than 4,400 people in Wake County who were counted, who are prisoners in the central prison and in the women's prison, and who are inmates of the State Hospital for the Insane—nor did the Census Bureau take into account that in Wake County there are many thousands of college students, who were counted as residents of Wake County, who attended the Southeastern Theological Seminary at Wake Forest, North Carolina State University—and I believe there are some 10,000 or 11,000 students there—Meredith College, Shaw University, St. Mary's College, and St. Augustine College.

So Wake County is a very good example of just how phony this whole business is.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a story from the Charlotte Observer of March 30, 1966.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PRISONERS: UNUSUAL TWIST PUTS RALEIGH IN VOTE NET

RALEIGH.—Wake County, home of the State capital, was brought under the 1965 U.S. Voting Rights Act under unusual circumstances.

Wake was one of 10 Tar Heel counties which will have to abolish the State literacy tests for prospective voters, according to a count made by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Under the Federal act, a county must give up the literacy test if fewer than 50 percent of the county's voting-age residents cast ballots in the 1964 presidential election.

In that election in 1964, Wake was shy 1,219 people of meeting that 50 percent mark. Its total was 48.9 percent.

But more than 4,400 of the Wake "residents" counted are inmates at Central Prison and Women's Prison, or are mental patients at Dorothea Dix Hospital.

Most of the prisoners and the patients aren't from Wake County. A vast majority of them live in other sections of the State,

Furthermore, a sizable number of the prisoners are felons who cannot vote, in Wake or anywhere else.

If the 4,400 hadn't been counted, Wake would have been well over the 50-percent cutoff point.

To top it all, Wake cannot appeal its classification on the grounds criminals and crazy folks were counted in its total. The voting act specifies an appeal cannot be made on procedural grounds.

Appeals must be based on evidence that a local election board didn't engage in discriminatory practices.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would point out that in my home county of Gaston, where the Negro leaders, when the census was announced, came out in the public press and said that there was no basis for such a census because there was no evidence of voter discrimination in Gaston County, that nevertheless thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money was wasted in taking this census. Now, how do they explain some of these results? They say that Gaston County only voted 48.7 percent of its eligible voters in 1964. Well, who are these eligible voters? They did not take into account that many people under 21 years of age have become more than 21 since the 1964 election. They did not take into account the fact that quite a number of those people moved into Gaston County after 1964, because the Bureau of the Census reports that Gaston County has experienced a 6.9-percent growth since the 1960 census.

Another interesting thing about Gaston County that they did not discuss or they did not point out was the fact that in 1960 in the presidential election in Gaston County, N.C., 41,354 persons cast a ballot. In 1964 only 37,326 persons cast a presidential ballot, notwithstanding an approximate, I would estimate, 5-percent growth in population from 1960 to 1964, if we had a 6.9-percent growth between 1960 and 1965.

So I suppose that under this phony formula the fact that approximately 4,000 people who voted in 1960 in Gaston County decided that they would not vote in the presidential election in 1964 is, in the minds of some of these warped individuals, evidence of discrimination in registration.

There are other situations that might well be mentioned. In Cleveland County, N.C., they recently had a new registration. That was since 1960. According to the board of elections in Cleveland County, 19,882 white persons sought to register. In the process this very minimal literacy test which we observe in North Carolina prevented 55 of those white persons from registering—19,827 of them were registered—2,377 Negroes sought the same privilege and were administered the same literacy test. Only 24 of those failed. So you see that there were 2,349 colored folks registered. So, as the Cleveland County Board of Elections well pointed out, there is no basis for contending that there is discrimination in voting registration in that county.

Mr. Speaker, I could impose on the gentleman further, but I will not do so except to say this: As far as the people of my congressional district are concerned, they are not apprehensive that any person in the Federal Government will be so utterly stupid as to spend more of the taxpayers' money to send Federal registrars into our area. They can investigate it from now until doomsday and they will not find any discrimination. So I hardly think it is anything to be concerned about with respect to Federal registrars of the Federal Government coming in. But, as the gentleman has well pointed out, it is a reflection upon good people, and it is a reflection which they should not have to endure. For this phony formula to be used to prevent the exercise of a reasonable literacy test is, in my judgment, inconsistent with what we in this democratic society of ours believe in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman for his remarks and for his having brought this to the attention of the House. I say to him that I hope in some way the light will shine through and this Congress can do something to get away from this phony formula, because I note in the last two elections the State of Alaska cast less than 50 percent of its vote and some 10 States have been with Alaska in that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Shelby Daily Star of March 30, 1966, an editorial from the Charlotte News of March 30, 1966, an editorial from the Charlotte Observer of March 30, 1966, and an editorial from the Gastonia Gazette of March 31, 1966, be made a part of the Record at this point and a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

[From the Shelby (N.C.) Daily Star, Mar. 30, 1966]

VICTIM OF AN INJUSTICE

A great wrong has been perpetrated upon the people of Cleveland County under the guise of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Because of a mathematical absurdity inserted in that measure, elections officials no longer may administer even the most elementary of literacy tests to persons seeking to register as voters.

The Justice Department, furthermore, may—should it now desire to do so—replace local elections officials with Federal voting registrars.

All this for no other reason than that fewer than 50 percent of the age-eligible population in the country actually voted for President in the 1964 general election.

That arbitrary and unrealistic trigger level is the grossest of absurdities. Invoking it proves absolutely nothing pro or con about the presence or absence of discrimination.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act ostensibly was introduced and enacted as a means of eradicating discriminatory practices at the voter registration table. There is no doubt but that corrective pressure of some sort was needed in some sections of the United States.

But it was not needed in Cleveland County. There is not a shred of evidence to substantiate a charge that Cleveland County officials have in any way discriminated in the voter registration either of white or Negro citizens.

To the contrary, there is substantial evidence to indicate that any and all, black and white literate enough to scrawl out his or her name have been duly registered without argument, without fanfare, without discrimination.

A perfect case in point is the county reregistration carried out here in 1964. During that reregistration period a total of 19,832 whites sought registration and, in the process, were administered the literacy test such as it is.

Fifty-five failed. The other 19,827 were registered.

Two thousand three hundred and seventy-seven Negroes sought the same privilege and were administered the same literacy test. Only 24 failed.

Any discrimination found there merely is a figment of someone's bureaucratic imagination.

Additional absurdities are connected with the placing—along with Cleveland—under provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 of such Tar Heel counties as Guilford and Wake.

Guilford was hooked because only 49.5 percent of its age-eligible population voted for President in 1964.

But in the case of both Guilford and Wake, the percentages would have been well over the 50 percent trigger had the Census Bureau and the Justice Department taken into consideration the total number of people voting rather than the total number of people voting specifically for president.

A total of 77,160 Guilford citizens actually cast ballots in November 1964. But only 75,604 of them felt compelled to vote for Lyndon Johnson or Barry Goldwater. In Wake County, a total of 56,294 persons went to the polls, with 54,195 voting for a presidential candidate.

But ridiculously enough the voting act states specifically that the presidential vote figure must be used in calculating when and when not to trigger provisions of the act.

Congressman Horace Kornegay said Tuesday that, "This situation now proves what an absurd piece of legislation was passed last year * * * in the Congress. The law does not get to the root of the problem at all because of its inequity and absurdity of application."

The law as written is unwarranted and unfair primarily because it seeks to stamp out one form of radical prejudice with the all-encompassing prejudices of passion-blinded social reformers.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, Mar. 30, 1966]

GUILTY BY A HAIR

Sometimes Washington's capacity for arrogance and insensibility on the civil rights issue seems to have no limit, as the citizens of Guilford County can surely attest today.

Guilford is among the 10 more North Carolina counties just added to the list of those affected by the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Because the county voted only 49.5 percent of its eligible population in the last national election, it is presumed to be discriminating at the ballot box and is forbidden to apply literacy tests to prospective voters. Had the voter participation level been one-half of 1 percent higher, the act would not have applied. Guilford may regain Federal favor only by a process described in the following fashion in our handy Civil Rights Commission brochure on the Voting Rights Act of 1965:

"A State or political subdivision may be removed from coverage by filing a suit in a three-judge district court for the District of Columbia. The State or political subdivision must convince the court that no test or device has been used for the purpose or with the effect of denying the right to vote because of race or color during the 5 years preceding the filing of the suit."

Government by statistic is doubly offensive when it interferes with the routine workings of progressive local government in a progressive region of a progressive State—and Guilford County easily qualifies on all three counts. It's difficult to know whether Guilford ought to suffer quietly under the dead weight of Congress collected wisdom, or submit to the ignominy of trying to disprove guilt that has never been demonstrated.

The situation uncomfortably resembles some grim governmental version of the old have-you-stopped-beating-your-wife dilemma, and it adds one more county to the long list of governmental subdivisions with cause to wish the 89th Congress had tempered its zeal with just a touch of judgment.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Mar. 30, 1966]

VOTING ACT NAILS INNOCENT, TOO

The impending suspension of literacy tests in 10 additional North Carolina counties points up inequities in the Voting Rights Act.

Although the Supreme Court has ruled the law constitutional, this does not mean that it is good in every respect. The act equates voter turnout with discrimination through an arbitrary and illogical test.

Forty counties are now subject to the provisions of the act in North Carolina. Among those added to the list after a special census are Gaston, Guilford and Wake, which embraces three of the State's major cities.

A county is barred under the act from administering literacy tests if less than 50 percent of the voting age population voted for a presidential candidate in 1964. Guilford and Wake Counties provide good examples of how this test can misfire.

The special census revealed Guilford had a percentage of 49.5 voting in the presidential election. Yet some 1,500 voters, faced with a choice between Lyndon Johnson and Barry Goldwater, cast no presidential ballot. Had they done so, said Representative Horace Kornegay, Guilford would not have come under the voting act. The same would hold for Wake.

Alex Brock, executive secretary of the North Carolina election board, raised an even more telling objection. Census takers failed to ask persons how long they had been residents of the county. If they weren't residents in time to vote there in 1964, they should not have been counted. Guilford's growth rate, paced by Greensboro, has been 9.3 percent since 1960, according to a special census. This points up the steady influx of newcomers.

The 50-percent formula for discrimination gets the States and counties Attorney General Katzenbach designed it for. But it is getting the innocent with the guilty. Although voter discrimination undoubtedly has been practiced in some counties, there is no evidence before the courts to this effect. Now the nonoffending counties must either drop their literacy tests or go to considerable expense to prove their innocence in Federal courts.

There is ample evidence of voter apathy in North Carolina, but that cannot be cured by a sure-fire formula.

Despite the Supreme Court ruling, the Voting Rights Act can and should be amended. The test based on mathematics should be replaced by a test based on evidence of discrimination.

Meanwhile, the act itself provides a living example of one cost of voter apathy—bad and inequitable laws.

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Mar. 31, 1966]

VOTER DISCRIMINATION HERE? SIMPLY ABSURD

Within the next few weeks, Gaston County will know first-hand how swift and certain the specter of Federal intervention can come to a local people.

It seems that the schools are just before feeling the heel of the Washington boot.

And just last Monday, we were warned that local citizens had not voted enough in the last presidential election. We will have to do better.

The great snowball of Federal control gathers momentum. Possibly legitimate at first, it now threatens to get completely out of hand.

Leaving the school question to another day, let us look specifically at what has happened to Gaston County where registration and voting is concerned.

A provision of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 instructed the Census Bureau to select certain counties for instant surveys. The purpose was to determine how many people now live in those counties and to compare the total with the number who voted in the last election.

If a country's total vote fell below 50 percent of the population, that county would be subject to the Voting Rights Act and could find itself with Federal registrars in the future.

Now, Gaston County hears that only 48.7 percent of the eligible voters actually voted in 1964.

We question the term "eligible voters." Who are the "eligible voters?" How many of the recent census who have moved into Gaston County since the election—yet who were tabulated in the totals—would be listed as "eligible voters?"

Also, how many other young men and women have moved into the voting-age bracket during the past 2 years? Since half of the population is under 25, wouldn't it be fair to assume that not a few reached the age of 21 during that interim? Certainly, some people on the other end, age-wise, died; but their number, comparatively, would be small.

How can these new names be held in consideration when the percentage of "eligible voters" is calculated?

We have little argument against abolishing the literacy test. We do think that there are things to be said both for it and against it. On the positive side, consider the fact that the more enlightened are a government's people then the more enlightened that government. It is true, however, that the test has been used in many counties to keep certain segments of the population from voting.

The arguments for and against the test cancel each other out, possibly. Its abolishment would be neither good nor bad.

The people in the Justice Department in Washington say that Gaston County should have had more people voting in 1965. Would they be so bold as to tell us why there were less people voting in 1964 than in 1960?

Could it be, possibly, that the race between Richard Nixon and John Kennedy was much more interesting, much more volatile, much more incentive for people to go to the polls and vote for the man of their choice than was the race between Lyndon Johnson and Barry Goldwater?

We think that is exactly the case.

The very fact that less than 100,000 votes separated the total of Dick Nixon's votes and those of John Kennedy is an indication of the intensity of that election. On the other hand, Lyndon Johnson's vote was a walkaway. He won by the biggest majority ever. Could this not, then, indicate that there might have been some people who stayed home because they figured the outcome was already decided?

We don't think we need Federal registrars here. We know we don't need them here. Congressman BASIL WHITENER has ably pointed out that there is no voter discrimination in Gaston County.

We would dare anyone—anyone—to try to prove that there has been.

In Washington, you don't have to have facts, however. All you need is for someone to surmise that just because some people in another part of the country add 2 and 2 and get 5 that the same sum is also arrived at elsewhere.

We've got news for Washington.

In Gaston County, we can count.

We can also vote. And one of these days, we'll get about enough of this thou-shalt-do-this sort of thing and throw the whole bunch out.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for that very valuable contribution to this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] has been a Member of the U.S. Congress since 1957, and prior to that he served for many years as a district prosecuting attorney, and has been engaged in public affairs since, I believe, he was 21 years of age, when he went to the State legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I want to pose to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Does the gentleman of his own knowledge and background, with reference to the subject of voting and registering in North Carolina, have any knowledge at all of any discrimination that has been practiced by our State in recent years?

Mr. WHITENER. Certainly, I would have to say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] that if I did I would feel it were my responsibility to not only say something with respect thereto, but to try to do something about it. However, I would point out to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] that in the city in which I live, with a colored population of 12 percent or less, for at least 16 years in all of the major elections the people of my city have elected a member of the Negro race, three different gentlemen, to the city council, and there has been no evidence of discrimination.

I might further point out to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] that in the Gastonia, N.C., area, the board of education just last year elected a very fine Negro attorney, one of my dear friends, as a member of our board of education in the last election in the city. This is not only true with reference to Gastonia, but in connection with other areas, and I believe, perhaps, the hometown of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY], of Greensboro.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Exactly.

Mr. WHITENER. Also I believe that is true of Fayetteville, N.C., and perhaps Winston-Salem, and many other of our communities.

It is not that you and I are here today—at least, I am not—trying to defend discrimination in the registration of voters, but it is just that I want to join with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] in protesting that some in the Congress and people in the administration would urge the Congress to have done what we have done in having this phony formula placed in the Voting Rights Act which brings into being a reflection upon the finest, most law-abiding, most nondiscriminating people you will find in America, and that is the people in the State of which I am privileged to represent a congressional district thereof.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman has rendered a great service to the great State of North Carolina.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORNEGAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Based upon what I have heard, I have the impression that it is not the formula that is at fault, but the application of the formula. Accepting, as I am, because the gentlemen from North Carolina have told me so, the fact that there is no discrimination in the State of North Carolina, there must be discrimination in some areas of the country, because we have seen demonstrations of it.

So I am wondering if there is not some suggestion that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] and his colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], might make and which might be used as, perhaps, the one originally suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] which provided, I believe, if there were complaints of 25 people in an election then the Attorney General might investigate it.

However, I would like to hear from the gentleman as to how we might approach the matter in other areas of the country where there may be discrimination.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield to me in order that I may respond to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KORNEGAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to inject myself into this, but I will say to my newly arrived colleague, the gentlemen from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN], that if he will read the Constitution of the United States, the formula set forth there clearly states, in the 17th amendment, that the qualifications of electors shall be the same as that which the law prescribes for the State legislature. So the formula is that the States under the Constitution ought to be able to make that determination.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not know of any arbitrary formula to remedy the situation. My idea and my approach is that there should not be any discrimination. The gentleman talks in terms of the complaints of 25 people. I do not feel that the very first person should be denied the right to vote because of race, religion, or national origin. I do not think we are going to arrive at a fair and equitable and satisfactory system until one looks at that individual, not at a county and not at a State. With reference to areas outside my State, I cannot speak. My remarks are based upon my knowledge of my State.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORNEGAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman has suggested that perhaps the formula ought to be applied in some other way than the gentleman from New York has suggested. If you applied this voting rights formula—this phony thing in the voting rights act—to the State of North Carolina as a whole, according to the World Almanac statistics on voting, in North Carolina in the last two presidential elections we would not fall within the formula if it were applied statewide. It is only when you go to this political subdivision thing.

But yet if you applied that formula to the State of Alaska, and I have not heard anybody complain about discrimination against Negroes or Eskimos or Indians or anyone else in Alaska—in Alaska in both of the last two presidential elections, they cast less than 50 percent of the vote of the adult population.

So I do not know how you can find any formula that would work except that which the Constitution lays down and has operated for all these years until some eager beavers got to meddling in it and got this mess created and that has now brought about these rather untoward results.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Besides Alaska, I might also point out there are four counties in Arizona, one in Hawaii, one in Idaho, and two in California.

Mr. WHITENER. I think you might find the same situation in New York if you had the figures on all of the States.

Mr. KORNEGAY. That is probably true.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORNEGAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. I want to commend and congratulate my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY], for again bringing to the attention of the House this matter that many of us predicted and indeed projected, would take place when they attempted to apply what I think has been aptly, fairly, and accurately described as a phony formula to determine the eligibility of a certain political subdivision.

You may recall during the debate last year on the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965, I went to the well of this House and called to the attention of the authors of that legislation just what we predicted would happen under this formula.

I called their attention to the fact that we have three counties in North Carolina which fell automatically—that is to say were automatically triggered under the act on the basis of the philosophy that neither 50 percent of those 21 years of age and over neither registered on November 1, 1964, nor participated in the presidential election itself, voting either for the electors for Mr. Johnson or Mr. Goldwater.

I went on to say during that rather lengthy and emotional debate that I had one county in my congressional district, Cumberland County, to be exact, where there never had been any suggestion much less a charge of discrimination. I might say for the benefit of the gentleman from New York that is true of all the counties in North Carolina.

There has been no suggestion, much less any charge of discrimination, racial or otherwise, in our State. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, under this formula they said to us that Cumberland County was included because it had one of the largest military reservations in the United States and that on that military reservation there were some 56,000 men in uniform and their dependents. They were not registered in Cumberland County and neither did they vote in Cumberland County. But their legal residence was somewhere else. Nevertheless the fact that they were there triggered that county and made that particular county the subject of this so-called phony formula.

In that connection, I might say just for the record, when this proposal was made as to this formula in connection with the Voting Rights Act, I wrote the chairman of the board of elections and propounded to him a series of questions about that county:

First. How long have you been chairman of the board of elections of Cumberland County?

He answered that question by saying that he was chairman of the board of elections of Cumberland County for 14 years.

I said, In the 14 years how many individuals have been refused the right to register on the basis of our minimal literacy test in that period of 14 years?

It is interesting to note—and it was verified, because I had it verified and put into the form of an affidavit—that of the total of 24 individuals who in the course of 14 years had been refused the right to register because of the minimal literacy test that we have in the State of North Carolina, significantly enough, out of that 24 individuals there were 12 white and 12 nonwhite persons involved.

I asked the chairman of the board of elections to send me illustrations of the literacy test, which was only a test requiring that an individual be able to copy, if you please, two or more sentences from the State constitution. He sent me photostatic copies of at least 100 that had been approved.

It would take a magnifying glass to interpret them. But that is the way we operate in North Carolina.

I did not anticipate, even when I made my protests then, that we would come to the point that the capital county and the capital city of North Carolina would be so allegedly triggered under this formula. Why? Because they are counting the 4,000 residents of the Central Prison, if you please. How ludicrous and ridiculous can you get? They are counting the inmates of the two largest mental institutions in North Carolina in order to determine this criteria with respect to whether or not 50 percent of the residents 21 years and older did not participate in the presidential election.

Gentlemen, it is a phony formula. The people of North Carolina rightfully resent the fact that the finger of suspicion is being pointed at them when all the people of America know that no State in our Union has been more fair in its efforts to see that all of our people are treated fairly. We have. Since I have been in public office I confess that I have driven through the colored sections and the other sections of the cities of my district, and in the rural areas, with a microphone and an amplifier, calling on all races and urging the people to come and register in order that they might share the responsibility for public affairs at the municipal, county, State and national levels.

We have done that.

I do not know, I will say to the gentleman from New York, how we can arrive at a solution to this situation. But the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] has made it crystal clear that a State has the right to require a literacy test as long as there is no evidence—not a scintilla of evidence—that that literacy test has been used to deprive an individual of any right, regardless of his race, creed, color, or point of origin.

I commend the gentleman from Gastonia. I know of the long and courageous stand that he has taken. I remember visiting in his county several years ago before I came to the House, in response to his invitation to speak. We met with our colored friends. We visited in their lodge down there, because we wanted them to know that we were interested in them, and we wanted them to help us in what we were trying to do for North Carolina. He has been a leader in good racial relationships during his solicitorial service, and since he has been a Member of the Congress. Again I commend both of you gentlemen for bringing this matter to the attention of the House, and I hope that the House will soon take some action on it.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman for a very fine contribution.

I recognize the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from the State of North Carolina, the Honorable HORACE KORNEGAY, for going into the depths of this problem and bringing it to the attention of this body in the hope that something can be done to rectify this unfair and unrealistic approach to a nonexistent problem in the State of North Carolina. Regardless of what this Congress might do or what the Department of Justice might do, there is nothing that would force a man to exercise his franchise on election day unless he so desires. I therefore contend that the unrealistic formula under which we are living can do nothing more that it has done—cause confusion, discontent, and, may I say, undue criticism of a great State which has been fair in its relationships to all of its citizens, regardless of race, creed or color, so unjustly and without cause. If we are to carry to its finality this formula, inasmuch as they had been counted by the census, it would be incumbent on the Governor of North Carolina on election day to release every inmate of the State prison and every patient in the mental hospitals and allow them to go home and vote.

Also, it is a matter of record that in numerous elections with respect to bond issues pledging the faith and credit of the State of North Carolina and in various municipalities in our State, considerably less than 50 percent of the eligible voters have participated. Yet, there has been no complaint of this.

With you, sir, and my colleagues, I join a vigorous protest in behalf of the good name of the State of North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina, who is one of the new Members of the House. I believe that was his maiden speech on the floor. I wish to congratulate him on the splendid statement that he made and say that I know of no worthier cause at the moment than this matter that we are taking up, and that is to try to remove the presumption of guilt against the innocent.

Mr. Speaker, I have just a few more remarks to make and I shall not be long about them. But I do wish to point out to the House that in my home county of Guilford there are eight colleges and universities. It is my information that the students over the age of 21 were counted in this so-called census, regardless of whether they lived in Guilford County, N.C., or somewhere else in the United States, for there are many in the school there from other areas of the country.

What would have been the result had they not counted the people who are not eligible to vote under any criteria in our State? I say that, had that been the case, my county of Guilford would not have suffered this stigma that has now been cast upon it.

My friend from Gastonia says that there is no worry about Federal registrars coming in. I like to think that myself, because I know they can find no evidence that the election officials and the citizens of Guilford County have been guilty of any discrimination in voting practices.

This stigma—an unfair, an unjust, an unreasonable stigma—has been attached to a fine and a proud people. I am today calling the attention of the House to this stigma in order that something may be done about it.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for just one further statement?

Mr. KORNEGAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman said points out something I am hoping: that representatives of the Justice Department will have this matter brought to their attention through the colloquy that has transpired here today.

Certainly the Justice Department should exercise some degree of discretion before they just arbitrarily call on the Census Bureau to spend thousands of dollars to go into a county and make a special census.

I know that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] will join with me in saying that we hope that the Justice Department will not embarrass the Census Bureau or the people of any area of our Nation with this type of conduct in the future, but rather, if they have some credible evidence that there may be discrimination within a political subdivision, they will then ask for the special census, but not in this rather blunderbuss manner in which they have gone about it recently.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is exactly right. It is my information that in order to take the census in 14 counties in North Carolina—so far as I know, there was no evidence of any discrimination in any of them, as far as voting rights are concerned—the cost to the taxpayers, not just of Guilford County, but to the entire country, was $800,000, more than enough to have built the Vice President a new home.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that is just in this one State. That is taxpayers' money that has been wasted.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the Director of the Census Bureau the other day, propounding to him certain questions which I believe will shed a great deal of light on the authenticity of this census taken in Guilford County, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

APRIL 5, 1966.

Hon. A. ROSS ECKLER,
Director, Bureau of the Census,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKLER: Recently, I was notified by your office that, as a result of a special census conducted in Guilford County, N.C., it has been determined that less than 50 percent of the voting-age population voted in the 1964 presidential election.

This determination, as related to the Voting Rights Act of 1965, raises several questions.

(Please note copy of a letter I have received from a resident of Guilford County, who poses several questions concerning the special census. Also, for your information, I am attaching copies of newspaper comments in Guilford County concerning the determination announced by your office.)

Although official records, which can easily be documented, will show that more than 50 percent of the people of voting age in Guilford County, N.C., voted in the 1964 general election, I will not attempt to debate those facts with you, for I realize that from your interpretation of the act, you are governed by the language contained in Public Law 89–110 and must be guided only by the total number of those who voted in the presidential election of 1964.

However, I would point out that—by your own computation—well above 50 percent of those of voting age cast ballots in the 1964 election in Guilford County. Your special census revealed that there were 152,741 of voting age in the county in 1964.

The mechanical "public counters" on voting machines in Guilford County showed that 77,160 persons went to the polls in November 1964, and cast their ballots. This, I respectfully submit, is more than 50 percent. I must admit, however, that only 75,604 cast a vote for one of the two candidates on the presidential ballot. And, since your interpretation of the law is that you must determine the percentage of votes cast in the "presidential election," Guilford County is credited with 1,556 fewer votes than the actual number of those who voted.

Ostensibly, the Voting Rights Act is aimed at prohibiting discrimination of voting registration or voting. In addition to the facts outlined above, another incontroverted fact is that Guilford County is without any hint of discrimination in the voting process.

Realizing full well that it is not your duty nor obligation to render a judgment in this matter, except in regard to statistical information, I would like to gain further information regarding the special census conducted in Guilford County. In this regard, I have several questions:

1. What criteria were used as the basis for determining that Guilford County had 152,741 persons of voting age in 1964?

(The special census revealed that Guilford County had a total of 269,513 persons in 1966, a 9.3-percent increase, or an influx of 22,993 persons, above the 246,520 enumerated in 1960.)

2. Were those tallied asked if they resided in Guilford County in 1964, when the presidential election was held?

3. Were they asked if they were of voting age—21 years or above—in November 1964?

4. Were they asked if they resided in Guilford County in November 1963, if they moved to Guilford from another State? (In order to be eligible to register to vote in North Carolina, one must have one year's residence in the State.)

5. Were they asked if they resided in Guilford County for 1 month prior to November 1964? (One must have 30 days residence in a precinct in order to be able to vote in North Carolina.)

6. Were felons (who forfeit their rights of citizenship and the voting privilege in North Carolina) enumerated in the special census?

7. Were the thousands of college students in Guilford County (who reside in Guilford County only temporarily and without the legal right to register and vote) counted in the special census?

8. What was the total cost of the special census in Guilford County?

9. What was the total cost of the special census in North Carolina?

10. Could you logically explain, for the purpose of determining the number of those persons of voting age, why the special census included a question concerning a basement in the home?

I would deeply appreciate your consideration of the questions outlined above and a reply at your early convenience.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
HORACE R. KORNEGAY.

Hon. HORACE R. KORNEGAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter concerns a recent census undertaken in Guilford County. It has been established that our registrars have not discriminated against our citizens in this matter of voter registration. Therefore, I will not dwell upon that aspect of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

As a citizen of the Sixth Congressional District, I would like to state that I strongly object to the recent census taken in Guilford County and to the ridiculous results.

I was asked the following questions by the censustaker:

1. Do you have a basement?
2. Do you own your own home?
3. How many children do you have and their ages?
4. Are there any other adults living in your home?

The first and second questions have no connection with a census for this purpose. Nothing was asked to establish whether or not I was an eligible voter in 1964. How many citizens counted were not even 21 years of age in 1964? How many persons were ineligible to vote, because of prior conviction of a felony?

I must conclude from what I have read that there does not seem to be any basis for undertaking this census. There is no accurate way to establish the number of citizens of voting age in 1964. Arriving at a figure by statistical estimate is unsatisfactory.

I would like to direct the following questions to you, in the hope that if you are unable to answer them, you will refer them to the proper individual for a prompt reply:

1. What section of the law enables an individual in the Census Bureau or Justice Department to order a census in Guilford County?
2. What is the name of the individual who gave the order for a census in our county?
3. Who is this individual's direct superior?
4. May I, as a citizen, request a census be undertaken in a given area of the United States where the voting population seems questionable?
5. Since there has been no discrimination and this census was undertaken without justification, what recourse does a county or a citizen have to void the whole procedure?
6. How may a county or a citizen be assured of full financial restitution to his government for this gross misuse of our money?
7. It appears that the law has been misinterpreted or misused. What recourse does our community have? Do we calmly take this abuse and ask, "what's the use?" Or will some concrete answers result from this letter?

Sincerely,

Mrs. Paul Gardiner.

Greensboro, N.C.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here two very fine and well-written editorials from the Greensboro Daily News, which is published in the county seat of Guilford County. I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Mar. 30, 1966]

Guilford and Bureaucratic Dogmatism

Placing Guilford County under the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which means that the "literacy test" must be suspended and that the Justice Department can order Federal registrars into the county, will have little or no practical effect. But it is an unwarranted reflection upon the county and its longstanding good name as a protector of the exercise of suffrage and fair administrator of the election laws.

The outwardly unsavory position in which Guilford finds itself stems from that section of the act which provides the treatment it is receiving for counties in which less than half the residents of voting age voted in 1964.

And from there on out confusion, unfairness, and bureaucratic dogmatism take over.

In the first place, Guilford has no literacy test; and we seriously doubt that there is a county in the State whose voters have a higher average intelligence. As Z. Hampton Howerton, chairman of the Guilford County Board of Elections, explained, a person seeking to register is required to swear that he supports the Constitutions of North Carolina and the United States, that he is so many years old, has been a resident of the State for 1 year and of his precinct for 30 days, and is not registered in any other precinct. The only semblance of what might be construed as a test of sorts is ability to read this oath.

Those who have observed Guilford registration and elections for years say they know of no instance of discrimination or unfair barring of voters. This county and its registration procedures have been a model which has received widespread praise from all sides. Many outsiders have come here to inspect and emulate it.

But that is only the beginning of criticism aimed at the admixture of Census Bureau estimates and Justice Department interpretation and application of the law.

Washington dispatches say that the Census Bureau, on the basis of its special enumeration and studies, "estimates" that 152,741 persons of voting age lived in Guilford at the time of the 1964 elections, which compares with a total population of 264,513 this year. It likewise finds that 75,604 persons participated in the presidential election of 1964, which leave Guilford, 0.5 percent below the fewer-than-half-voting formula and thus brings the Voting Rights Act into play.

Guilford has every reason to be ashamed of the apathy of its citizens and the disturbingly low percentage of voters who had sufficient interest to go to the poll. A fairer test, obviously, would have been the difference between the number of persons who registered and the total who voted. For years every effort has been made to encourage registration in Guilford, to arouse the voters and to get them to the polls. Political organizations, community leaders, civic groups and the mass media have joined in the effort. Indefensible apathy there has been; but failure to register or to vote, especially the latter, cannot be attributed to discrimination of any sort.

We are at loss to determine how the Census Bureau arrived at its "estimates." What was the voting age population as of the date of the 1964 elections and what have been the changes since? The census figures and the inexplicable entanglements of the law are again intertwined in the former's total of 75,604 voters. That is the total, says the Census Bureau, who voted for President. But the counters in the county's voting machines showed that 77,160 persons actually went to the polls in Guilford in 1964; and that total would not have brought the voting act provisions into operation.

Enter again the bureaucratic nit-pickers. The law, they say, stipuates that the votes cast for President constitute the test. The larger 77,160 total who went to the polls participated in a presidential election; but 1,500 of them did not see fit to vote for a presidential candidate while casting their ballots for other candidates on the ticket. The logical conjecture, however indicting of civic responsibility, is that they did not want either Johnson or Goldwater. And for that the country is penalized and besmirched.

The whole thing makes no sense. The assumption, of course, is that the county is guilty of discrimination based on extremely tenuous grounds—statistical "estimates" of the vaguest sort.

Guilford is zealous of its good name. Its citizens dislike bureaucratic dogmatism, and what has happened can be labeled nothing else.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Mar. 31, 1966]

Bureaucratic Dogmatic (II)

Ironies keep popping up in the U.S. census department's rigid administration of the 1965 Civil Rights Voting Act.

Guilford County qualified for abolition of the literacy test by the narrow margin of one-half of 1 percent—49.5 instead of 50 percent of its registered voters allegedly voted for President in the 1964 general election.

But down in Wake County the dividing line was 49.9 or one-tenth of 1 percent.

On top of that Wake County has more than 4,400 "residents" who can't vote. They are inmates of Central Prison and Women's Prison and mental patients at Dorothea Dix Hospital. Most of these people are not even "residents" of Wake in the full sense of the word, since their homes are in other parts of the State. Also, some are felons, and couldn't vote if they were at home.

If these 4,400 citizens hadn't been counted, Wake would have been relieved of the onus of racial discrimination—including national publicity.

Congressmen Cooley and Kornegay, not to mention Senators Ervin and Jordan, should keep up the pressure on the Census Bureau and the U.S. Attorney General's Office to rescind this preposterous example of bureaucratic dogmatism. It makes the law a laughing stock.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I have another fine editorial, Mr. Speaker, from the Durham Morning Herald, which is in my district, in a neighboring fine town, occupied by fine people, and I ask unanimous consent that this be inserted in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Mar. 31, 1966]

Pettifogging Use of Voting Act

Bringing such North Carolina counties as Wake and Guilford under restrictions of the 1965 Voting Rights Act does nothing so much as make the act look foolish.

If there had been any serious charge of voter discrimination in these counties (which there hasn't), there would still be a doubtful case for applying the law. As things stand, the case is absurd.

Both Wake and Guilford actually had a voter turnout in excess of 50 percent of their adult populations for the 1964 general elections. But because a couple of thousand voters chose not to mark ballots in the presidential race the total vote in that one contest falls below 50 percent of the adult population calculated by the Census Bureau this year. Thus the counties stand guilty of discrimination until proved innocent.

As Representative Horace Kornegay insists ignoring the number of voters who didn't vote for either presidential candidate (although they did vote) is technical nonsense. But that isn't the only nonsense in the new calculation. For as election officials in Wake County have pointed out, the figure the Census Bureau got in 1966 as the adult population for that county wasn't necessarily the total for that growing county in 1964. The census takers didn't ask Wake residents if they were in fact Wake residents in 1964. They simply counted heads and applied the figure ex post facto to the 1964 election.

Applying provisions of the Voting Rights Act to Wake and Guliford Counties—which is to say, knocking out the very perfunctory literacy test—won't have a noticeable effect on elections there. It isn't the literacy test that discourages potential voters in Wake or Guliford or any other North Carolina county. The absence of such a test won't produce a recognizable increase in registration or vote totals.

But the implication that counties, which honor and promote the ideal of the free ballot, are statistically guilty of discriminatory dirty work is galling, indeed. We recognize that the Voting Rights Act came about in response to genuine discrimination against qualified potential Negro voters in some sections of the South. We recognize, too, that Federal legislation to cope with such genuine abuse was difficult to draw.

Still, strained administrative application of this law to no point or purpose in counties like Wake and Guilford is not just an unavoidable side effect. It amounts to stupid pettifogging which can't help but discredit application of the 1965 Voting Rights Act even in communities where its application was and is all to justified.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I have two newspaper clippings from the

Greensboro Record, and I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Record, Apr. 16, 1966]

Guilford's Voting Problem: Apathy, Not Discrimination—As Civil Rights Act Impends

(By Wilson Davis)

Apathy—not discrimination—places Guilford near the borderline of counties which would be affected by the new civil rights voting legislation pending before the Congress.

Under provisions now being debated, the Federal Government could send its own registrars into States or counties where fewer than 50 percent of those old enough to vote were registered or went to the polls last November.

No charges of discrimination against Negro voters have arisen here but the voting turnout is such that the county stands just above the prescribed percentage.

Of 144,040 persons "21 years or older (according to the 1960 census) only 77,160 voted in the election last November—a dismal 53.1 percent. Those registered to vote totaled 102,485.

"Apathy, not discrimination, is the voter problem in Guilford," said one elections board official. "There is no discrimination here."

George Simkins, president of the local NAACP chapter, concurred.

"We've had 100 percent cooperation with the Guilford County Board of Elections," he said. "There has been no discrimination whatsoever."

Persons who wish to register with the Guilford Board of Elections are asked to read a nine-line, general oath. If they fail at that, they are asked to read and write a simple section from the State constitution.

In the 1964 calendar year, "less than 10 persons" failed the literacy test in Guilford, according to Mrs. Margaret Schecter, executive secretary to the election board.

"Basically, this is a literate county," Mrs. Schecter commented. "And what's necessary in order to register is pretty well known. The ones who can't meet the requirements just don't come in to any degree."

Those who failed the literacy test here numbered fewer than 1 out of every 1,771. Total new registrations in 1964 amounted to 17,712, including 11,254 white and 3,718 Negro.

In populous Mecklenburg County, there were 18,592 new registrations in 1964—and a total of 20 persons who failed the voter literacy test.

The number of registered voters in Guilford, as of November 1964, was 102,485, including 85,689 white voters and 16,796 Negro voters. Of the 144,040 possible voters in the county (according to the 1960 census) 116,748 were white, and 27,292 were Negro.

The local elections board ordinarily does not compile figures on literacy test failures or the level of Negro registration. But a recent form letter from the State board of elections asked for information "concerning the literacy test as applied in various counties of the State."

The State board also requested copies of written instructions given local registrars with respect to the administration of the literacy test.

William Joslin, chairman of the State board of elections, secured the information for several North Carolina Congressmen, because he "thought it might be useful in the (Federal voting rights bill) debate now going on in Washington."

Under a revision recently proposed by U.S. Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach and Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen, the bill also would allow Federal courts, on suit by the Attorney General, to void literacy tests, polls taxes, or other devices, which had been used to discriminate.

The suggested revision also included a provision that the bill would not apply to States or counties with a nonwhite population of less than 20 percent.

Another provision, which has some support in the House of Representatives, would allow Federal action on the receipt of a complaint from 25 or more residents of a political unit.

The State board of elections last fall recommended that local boards consider going to a written literacy test because of a clause in the 1964 civil rights bill which states that in any State where a literacy test is required it must be reduced to writing.

The Guilford literacy test is ultimately reduced to writing, but only if the prospective voter fails to read the general oath.

Z. H. Howerton, Jr., chairman of the Guilford Elections Board, says there are no plans to change from the present registration system.

"We haven't had any complaints," he added.

Howerton Thinks Census Is Wrong—"Discriminates"

Z. Hampton Howerton, chairman of the Guilford County Board of Elections, said here Monday that action of the Bureau of the Census "discriminates against us" in making the county liable to provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

"I don't think they're right," he said. "They are using figures that were not in effect in 1964: We feel like we are over percentage."

Howerton continued, "I would interpret people who voted in the presidential election as being eligible to be counted whether they voted for President or not.

"But there's just no formula for handling voter apathy. That's the big problem."

Howerton said the State board of elections had called a meeting of local boards for next Monday and Tuesday at the Barringer Hotel in Charlotte. "We should get some insight into this thing at that time," he said.

He was asked, "What will a person have to do now in order to register to vote in Guilford County?"

"We don't know," Howerton replied. "We've had no instructions as to new requirements. I am not even sure if we can ask a person if he was raised in this county. I would assume that if a person walks in, gives his name, age and address, we'll have to register him.

"But until we hear from Raleigh (the State board of elections) we will continue to operate under the old rules."

What are the old rules?

Howerton explained that a person is required to swear that he supports the Constitutions of North Carolina and the United States, that he is so many years old, has been a resident of this State for 1 year, living in his precinct for 30 days, and is not registered in any other precinct.

What about a literacy test? "We don't even have one," said Howerton.

In Raleigh, State Elections Board Executive Secretary Alex Brock was critical of census takers for failing to ask how long a person had been a resident of a county.

"This has been one of the most frustrating things we have faced," Brock said. "We feel it has a vital bearing to the census and should have been one of the questions asked."

(Gov. Dan Moore's office said he would have no comment on the report, but referred newsmen to a March 7 statement when the chief executive said, "North Carolina will abide by the law.")

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize my strong feelings about the application of this Voting Rights Act. I cannot believe that Members of Congress intended to punish the innocent with the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Yet, that is precisely what is happening.

I believe anyone who examines the case with respect to Guilford County, N.C., will agree that the application of the act there does indeed, and in fact, penalize and stigmatize the guiltless.

One of the newspaper articles, Mr. Speaker, which I have inserted in the Record quotes the leading civil rights leader of that county as saying that he had gotten 100 percent cooperation from the Guilford County Board of Elections and that there was no discrimination in voting whatsoever in Guilford County.

There has not been a single complaint of discrimination, either formally or informally, voiced in Guilford County with respect to the voting process.

In the year 1964, which is the time element specified in the triggering provision of the Voting Rights Act, a literacy test was administered to all who wanted to register. It is a simple procedure. It requires simply that a person read a 9-line oath, which simply proclaims that the registrant will uphold the Constitutions of the United States and of the State of North Carolina. In 1964, a total of 7 persons failed to qualify because of their inability to read this simple declaration.

Of the seven, only three were nonwhite and four were white. This is not discriminatory, Mr. Speaker, yet under the provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, this is a device which discriminates and no longer can it be used.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to be a just nation with equal justice for all, this Congress should repeal the Voting Rights Act of 1965. This Congress, minus the high emotions that were rampant during the debate on this legislation last year, could, I feel, write a voting rights law which would apply broadly and indiscriminately. We have been punished for the purported sins of others. Surely this Congress did not intend that. Now I am asking you, my colleagues, to look at the applications of this act from the standpoint of simple justice. If you do, I am sure that you will come to the same conclusion, that is, this is an inequitable law and certainly should be repealed or amended.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Henderson], may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, last year when the voting rights bill was under consideration by the House Judiciary Committee, I appeared before Subcommittee No. 5 which considered the measure and pointed out that only three counties in the Third Congressional District of North Carolina came under the automatic triggering provision of the bill.

These three were Craven, Onslow, and Wayne. All three had major military installations located within their boundaries, and a sizable number of persons counted in the 1960 census and reflected as residents of those counties of voting age, but who did not vote for President in 1964, were military personnel and their voting age dependents who could not vote in the three counties because they did not meet the legal residence requirements there.

Chairman CELLER and the members of Subcommittee No. 5 will recall that I offered an amendment to the committee which would have omitted from the census figures certified to the Justice Department active duty military personnel and their voting age dependents who though physically residing in a county could not vote there in 1964 because they did not meet the residence requirement.

Many members of the subcommittee expressed a willingness to go along with my position and agreed that it was completely reasonable but in the end it was voted down because a representative of the Bureau of the Census stated that the census could not accurately or authoritatively report on these military personnel because they could certify information only from their existing records and their existing records did not contain this information.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Census, the Justice Department, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the House of Representatives and the House itself took the position in opposing my amendment that the Bureau of the Census, in order to keep a county from being stigmatized with a presumption of discrimination against voters because of race, should not be required to seek out and obtain information that it did not already possess.

Now, however, we find that the Justice Department and the Census Bureau are perfectly willing to go out and spend thousands of dollars seeking information which they do not have in order to bring additional counties under the bill which could not be brought under it with information at hand.

Special censuses were taken in five counties of the Third District: Duplin, Pender, Jones, Harnett, and Lee. The special census affirmed that in Duplin, Pender, and Jones over half of the voting age population voted for President in 1964, but in Harnett and Lee the finding was that slightly under 50 percent of the voting age population voted for President in 1964 and consequently these two counties were brought under the Voting Rights Act and election officials in these counties were notified to suspend the use of literacy tests.

First, let me say that I have always insisted that Negro citizens should be permitted to vote on exactly the same basis as white citizens and to the extent that this has not been the practice in the past, positive and even drastic remedies are justified.

As we all know, however, the Voting Rights Act of 1964 fires a shotgun at North Carolina instead of a rifle and creates a presumption of wrongdoing in many, many counties where no complaint, either formal or informal, of voter discrimination has ever been raised.

This is bad enough, but when the agencies charged with the responsibility of administering and enforcing the law, specifically the Department of Justice and the Census Bureau, express to the Judiciary Committee a complete unwillingness to seek out additional statistical evidence which would clear a particular county, but spend thousands of dollars and man-hours seeking evidence to bring additional counties under the coverage of the bill, it reflects extreme discrimination by these agencies in my judgment.

I remember the old radio and TV show of years gone by called "Mr. District Attorney" in which at the beginning of each program a voice solemnly intoned:

> And it shall be my duty as district attorney not only to prosecute to the limit of the law all persons accused of crime perpetrated within this county, but to defend with equal vigor the rights and privileges of all its citizens.

Would that our U.S. Department of Justice and our Bureau of Census might display the same zeal in seeking out evidence to prove election officials innocent that they exercise in their efforts to bring into being presumptions of guilt.

A TRIBUTE TO A GREAT NONSUBSIDIZED STEAMSHIP COMPANY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, since long before the days of the Alaska Gold Rush, the city of Seattle has enjoyed the title of Gateway to Alaska.

As a matter of fact, back as far as 1882, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce was organized for the very purpose of supporting a mail service contract from Puget Sound to Alaska. Furthermore, ever since then, under a policy of what is good for Alaska is good for Seattle, the business community of the port of Seattle has made it a rule to support all worthy projects, promotions and programs that were of benefit to the once Territory, and—of recent years—the State of Alaska.

The relations between the people of the communities of Alaska and Puget Sound were ever cordial and the more so because of their mutual interests. There was one exception, however; when ERNEST HENRY GRUENING became Governor of Alaska, he deliberately set out to blame the economic problems and difficulties of the people of this vast territory for which he was responsible on their neighbors to the south. Seattle became his whipping boy and, especially, he blamed the Alaska Steamship Co., with its headquarters in Seattle, for exploiting their neighbors to the north.

Mr. Speaker, I mention this unhappy situation with the deepest reluctance. Governor ERNEST HENRY GRUENING was a most able salesman and successful politician. He was able to lay most of the woes of a struggling wilderness people on others and, since the people of Alaska admittedly were most important customers of the Seattle business community, it was possible to charge that Seattle business houses and even hotels made it a practice to overcharge their friends to the north. But, since transportation was a substantial part of the cost of doing business in Alaska, the Alaska Steamship Co., became the chief target of this political attack.

Never once, as far as I know, was credit given to the Alaska Steamship Co. for its contribution to the economy of the Northland. Nor was there thanks for service rendered—often at a substantial loss.

I have heard that, last year, this loss was in excess of half a million dollars. All of which gives credence to the current rumor that, finally, the Alaska Steamship Co. intends to discontinue service to southeastern Alaska.

If this is true, it will be a bitter blow to the 49th State and likewise to Seattle. But in any event, I, for one, say thank you and pay tribute to a great, nonsubsidized shipping company. No organization has ever done so much for so few, as far as the cities and towns of Alaska are concerned.

One would hope that after so many years' exposure to, without experience in, the difficulties of water transportation to and from the State of Alaska, that, just for once, this professional enemy of both Seattle and the Alaska Steamship Co. would raise his voice at the cause, rather than the effect.

For example, right now, the Alaska Steamship Co. has filed for a 15-percent rate increase in southeastern Alaska and the increase is requested because the principal item of expense—labor cost, 77 percent—has increased substantially during the past 6 years since the last rate increase. During the course of these same 6 years, while wage increases were obtained by the various maritime unions whose members are employed by Alaska Steamship Co., not one word of protest was heard from former Governor GRUENING. Now that the shipping public, who are the recipients of the service, are asked to pay a part of the increase, a silent junior Senator from Alaska has turned to his customary bellicose tirade, as appears in a recent issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If a person in an elected position must, for political reasons, complain about the increased cost of service by a regulated common carrier, that carrier has the right to expect that the same person will be consistent and voice equal objection to the primary cause of the increase; that is, increased wages and fringe benefits.

The State of Alaska four-vessel ferry fleet system, after but 2 full years of operation, has just announced an increase of 10 percent, brought about solely by increased wage and fringe benefits. Such an increase will hardly dent its operating deficit, but it was an increase the State of Alaska decreed should be paid by the user and not the taxpayer. Here the junior Senator has been silent not only on the cause but the effect—namely, the 10-percent increase.

The American merchant marine is in the midst of great problems and, while this is true for subsidized carriers, the difficulties of the nonsubsidized ones, like Alaska Steamship Co., are even greater. The administration evidences this concern because hearings are shortly to be held on a new Cabinet-level Department for Transportation, under the provisions of S. 3010.

The matter of a rate increase, in the final analysis, is one which will be determined by the Federal Maritime Commission, and it behooves those in positions of responsibility to speak and act accordingly, in order that the Commission's deliberations may not be conducted in an atmosphere of extraneous pressure.

On behalf of the people of the home port of the Alaska Steamship Co., I express the pride and appreciation due to this company that has served us and Alaska away beyond the call of duty and requirements of profits.

Meanwhile, I express regret that the owners of this company have been subjected so long to such a continuing attack.

Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no diminishing or discontinuance of the level of service, but I must say, if such is the case, the blame—and the loss to Alaska—should be placed squarely where it belongs.

REPORT OF A 5-YEAR PROGRAM IN BEHALF OF THE ANNA SILVER PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 20 BROUGHT TO A COMPLETION BY ITS ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place on record the interesting story of a 5-year plan completed on behalf of a public school which is a constituent of mine in New York City. It would indeed serve as a demonstration of the American heritage, our American way of life and an object lesson of brotherhood and Americanism to other communities of the Nation.

Recently, the then mayor of New York City, Robert F. Wagner, proclaimed November 30 as the Anna Silver Public School No. 20 Hall of Fame Day, very likely the only elementary school in the Nation to have a hall of fame. This school which was erected in 1897 continued until 1942 when it passed out of existence as the Air Force took it over as a training school.

It was an old time school teacher, Nathaniel Phillips, also a lawyer who had early shown an interest in the diverse composition of the population of his school, all children of immigrant parents who had heeded the call of Emma Lazarus whose words read:

> Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.

They came to these shores and a great number settled in the area a few miles away from the port of entry. Phillips organized the League of Foreign Born Citizens primarily to benefit the elders and help them to citizenship. In 1957 he gathered around him several of his old pupils and founded an alumni association to carry on the wonderful school tradition which had brought forth men who had achieved national and international reputations, all of them children of immigrant parents.

The alumni petitioned the mayor in 1960 to restore the school. Addressing the board of education they requested that the new school, in the naming be dedicated to an ideal—the East Side immigrant mother who sacrificed much and labored so intensely to bring her children to achievement. The mother of the then president of the board of education, alumnus Charles H. Silver, was proposed as the symbol of all the mothers, and the school was named the Anna Silver School.

Maintaining a broad interfaith liaison, the school was dedicated on St. Valentine's Day, February 14, 1963, in the presence of His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Rev. Gerald Vander Hart of the De Witt Reformed Church, Rabbi Dr. William Berkowitz of Temple B'nai Jeshurun, and the two Donovans, Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, present superintendent of the board of education, and James Donovan, the negotiator for the release of the Bay of Pigs prisoners, and a board of education president.

A unique event took place at the dedication exercises when two boys who never got their elementary school diplomas received them 60 years later when special diplomas were created for Smith and Dale, two theater greats who met there but who never had a chance to finish an elementary school.

Under the leadership of Aaron Fishman acting as the chairman of the Dedications Committee, the alumni were determined to make a show case of this school restored, and an object lesson of the original school where they had learned brotherhood and democracy. They commissioned the American artist Lumen Martin Winter to design a large mosaic mural which would tell the story of their immigrant forebears who began a wonderful era of rearing famous Americans. The marble walls were adorned with the legends of great Americans and uncannily on one wall there were joined Abraham Lincoln and John F. Kennedy, even before the time when they would forever be coupled in history. The two legends read:

> "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us dare to do our duty as we understand it."—Abraham Lincoln.

And—

> "And so, my fellow Americans ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."—John F. Kennedy.

Coupled for the children to absorb daily. Exhibit cases show the achievements of such students as Benjamin and Jacob Javits, Harry Golden, Paul Muni, Edward G. Robinson, Irving Caesar, Ira and George Gershwin, Judge Samuel Liebowitz, the champion of the Scottsboro case.

The exhibit cases also contain a parchment bearing a dedicatory statement which any university would be proud of. Alumnus Harry Golden of "Only In America" fame and the biographer of Carl Sandburg had obtained it from him. Its text is a tribute to our youth today and reads:

> The restless and venturing human spirit of youth may perform tomorrow with exploits today called visionary and impossible. What the young people want and dream across the next hundred years will shape history more than any other motivation to be named. The walls of this school might be saying, "Youth when lighted and alive and given a sporting chance is strong for struggle and not afraid of any toils or punishments or dangers or deaths."—Carl Sandburg.

As an expression of esteem for retiring teachers who had given a lifetime of service to the boys and girls they had guided, the alumni created the "Our Teacher" medallion which they presented at a banquet. So that others could learn of the idea they communicated with alumnus Senator Jacob K. Javits who introduced a joint resolution whereby the President of the United States was requested to proclaim the fourth Wednesday in April as National Teachers Recognition Day.

An awards program was instituted under the format of "Time for Another Diploma" whereby at an annual reunion banquet a certificate of appreciation was presented to each of the members of each 50th anniversary class who were in attendance at the reunion. Few, if any, still had the original document.

Open house and an annual luncheon for the teachers of this day on Dedication Day broadened community interest and included a plaque award to community workers.

The alumni have acquired a treasury which provides scholarship aid on the referral of neighborhood settlement houses, bus trips to historic places, visits to the World's Fair, visits to the circus, theater and cinemas, student achievement prizes, and clothing needs.

Under the direction of principal Benjamin Falon and his aide Stanley Goldstein who is the alumni association president there has been established a buddy school relationship with the Fox Meadow School in Scarsdale for visits and reciprocal entertainments. At the neighborhood branch of the Bankers Trust Co., where alumnus Philip Greene is a vice president an international art show has been put on showing the art work of this school's children and that of the Ecole des Garcons, of Charenton, Paris, with whom a pen pal project has been developed. A naval cadet unit has been invited into the after-school program. With what pride they wear their uniforms. How proudly they bear the colors.

It was an impressive tradition that had been developed at the old school under the direction of the principals who had been appointed between 1897 and 1942; namely, H. William Smith, Dr. I. Edwin Goldwasser, William Kramper, Cornelius D. Fleming, James J. O'Reagan, George S. Kurke, Frank Reh, John J.

Garvey. It was most adequately symbolized by its slogan "Per Aspera ad Astra"—despite adversity towards the stars. The alumni recall with great respect the hardworking immigrant boys from the Middle East who immediately after school hours went to the neighborhood nickelodeons where they worked till midnight as candy butchers. They made it despite adversity and became successful merchants. The school's anthem "Ecce Quam Bonum" was the Latin translation of the psalm which said:

> How good and how pleasing it is when brethren dwell together in unity.

Joseph Remey, of Polish extraction, and William T. Ryan, of Irish descent, were two graduating class teachers so beloved that many referred to Public School No. 20 as the Remey-Ryan Schoolhouse.

The old school had for many years implemented the Davis School State named for a school superintendent. It taught live civics when the children elected a governor, and judges, mayors, and district attorneys for the upper grades and held court after school hours to try actual offenders and to acquaint the children with government in action.

The school sent a championship basketball team to the St. Louis Exposition in 1904. The student body produced a full-length opera "Van der Hum." In the traffic island of a nearby parkway the younger children were inspired by the principal D. I. Edwin Goldwasser to plant gardens. The university settlement across the street from the school was a cherished affiliate whose recreation facilities made it a vital part of school life as did Herman Brown's after school recreation and summer roof-garden programs in the school itself.

The climax of the alumni program has now been reached in the installation of the Hall of Fame plaque which reads:

> This tablet, honoring those who have succeeded in their vocations and have served the community, is intended as an inspiration to future generations in knowing that they share a tradition with these alumni.

Listed in 17 categories are the following: In the judiciary are Samuel S. Liebowitz and Samuel J. Silverman of the New York State Supreme Court, Simon Silver of the criminal court, Max M. Meltzer, Philip Simon and Peter J. Abeles of the municipal court, and Robert Kleiner of the city court of Long Beach.

A miscellany of distinction is represented by engineer William Ginsberg, Col. Lewis Landes, architect Morris B. Adler, Rabbi William F. Rosenblum, accountant Irving Frankle, banker Philip Greene. Realtors who have done much to improve the appearance of New York are William Kaufman and Irving Maidman.

Among authors are Harry Golden, Simon Gould who was the oft repeated U.S. presidential nominee of the Vegetarian Party, and Aben Kandel. Social service is represented by the names of Dr. Louis A. Leventen and Irving Metz. Outstanding in various branches of government and listed under public service are U.S. Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, William B. Fischberg, Alfred Grey, Irving W. Halpern, William A. Lesansky, George Levy, Spanish-American war veteran, sheriff and oldest living alumnus; Joseph Maged, Hyman A. Mintzer, Harris Perlis, Dewey Rothkrug, Joseph Schecter, Jacob L. Simberg, Joseph V. Spagna.

The law lists Aaron Fishman, M. Jason Gould, Irving H. Greenfield, Louis J. Merrell, Abraham Moscowitz, Anthony Romano, B. Leonard Slade, and Benjamin A. Javits who endowed the halls of law of Fordham University. Among the educators we have Charles H. Silver, a president of the board of education, Stanley Goldstein, Joseph Jablonower, L. Peter J. Massaro, Mordecai Soltes, Jack Zeppinick, Dr. Henry Semat, and Dr. Elias Lieberman whose poem "I Am An American" inspired the creation of such a day celebrated every year in New York City.

Theater has on its list actor-producer Irving Jacobson, producer Ely A. Landau, actors Paul Muni and Edward G. Robinson. Music shows publisher Ben Bloom, lyricist Irving Caesar and his brother Arthur, concert pianist Herman Behrens, and George and Ira Gershwin.

Two business listings in particular represent boys who never forgot their East Side origin. Charles Guttman, president of the Paddington Corp. endowed an additional building for the Henry Street Settlement and Israel Cummings, president of Shamokin Mills, endowed summer camps for the Educational Alliance. Other noteworthy businessmen are Charles Banks, Charles Blackman, Ralph D. Cole, James N. Feldman, Henry Firestone, Bernard W. Goldenberg, Louis Graff, David Hirsch, Jack Kamlet, William Lustgarten, Sanders A. Margulies, Abraham I. Meltzer, Charles Ornstein, Morris Rochman, Leon J. Rubenstein, Joseph H. Scharf, Irvine J. Schubert.

Medicine, dentistry, and research yields the greatest number of candidates in Drs. Benjamin Apfelberg, Louis Finger, Osias L. Friedman, Herman I. Frosch, John Frosch, Abner M. Fuchs, Leon M. Gecker, Irwin Mason, Maxwell L. Gelfand, Benjamin Jablons, Henry Keil, Hyman Kosofsky, Charles Lerner, M. Murray Peshkin, Irving I. Reissman, Samuel M. Rothberg, Isidore M. Samuels, Nathan Savitsky, Abraham J. Schechter, Benjamin E. Scheiner, Nathan A. Shore, Alton A. Smahl, entomologist Charles Pomerantz and hospital administrator Abraham Jahler.

Loyalty and nostalgia have gone hand in hand. The old school had been a shrine, an Eton among East Side schools. It is a mark of distinction to have been a "twenty boy." It is worthy of mention that long after they moved away from their East Side neighborhood they retained an interest in the community although it had changed substantially. Once predominantly Jewish and Italian, it is now Spanish speaking, Albanian, Yugoslav, Chinese, and Negro for the greatest part.

An editorial entitled "A Clue to Decency" that appeared in the New York Journal-American said:

> They grew up in a neighborhood of immigrant parents huddled in tenements, and they rose above their environment. Perhaps the reason was summed up best by Charles H. Silver, former president of the board of education, an alumnus, when he said, "Maybe we do not know all the answers to the problems of delinquency * * * but we know that the regard we had for our teachers and the love we had for our parents made a great difference in our lives." We believe that a new generation can find inspiration in these words.

This is a great human interest story of a tradition that shaped lives importantly. It merits communication and the alumni of the Anna Silver Public School No. 20 are ready to put their ideas at the disposition of other schools of the Nation and invite communication.

VIETNAM UNREST FOMENTED BY COMMUNIST BUDDHIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, I have tried to read every news dispatch available to me on the civil unrest in Vietnam. I am sure most Members share my concern over the situation there. My particular attention has been focused for the appearance of the name, Thich Tri Quang because there has been no doubt in my mind even at a distance of 8,000 miles that the disturbance there has been fomented by him.

Though, as I say, I have tried to read every dispatch from Vietnam, it is only in the last day or two that casual, almost chance mentions of his name have begun to appear.

It is not particularly newsworthy that the Saigon press corps shows little favor for the U.S. policy in Vietnam. As Pulitzer Prize winning reporter and bureau chief Marguerite Higgins once reportedly said:

> Reporters here [in Saigon] would like to see us lose the war to prove they're right.

This same group of newsmen, you will notice, seldom mention in their dispatches that the riots in the streets of Hue, Da Nang, and Saigon are made up almost entirely of children, ranging in age from 6 years to early teens.

At the time in 1963 when world attention was riveted on the horrifying scene of Buddhists setting fire to themselves in the streets in protest against the Diem regime, the Saigon press corps brainwashed the American people and the administration in Washington with the story that Buddhists made up the overwhelming majority of the South Vietnamese people.

The truth slowly rose to the surface only after Diem was overthrown and assassinated; the truth that Buddhists make up less than a third of the population. No searching investigation was made to identify the motives of the man who dominated the General Buddhist Association, the extremist rabble-rouser, Thich Tri Quang.

When we in the United States think of a Buddhist monk, I am sure we all conjure up the picture of a godly man robed in sackcloth going his way among the people to teach religious principles and dedication. And, of course, this is a true image. What, however, is the truth about Thich? Is he this kind of man? Or is he, instead, something entirely different? A diligent search of the record puts this man in clear focus and, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that it be done.

In Joseph Alson's recent column "Ugly Business," there appeared this description of him and the unrest he has created in Vietnam:

> One other set of facts to bear in mind concerns the root cause of the present troubles. In brief, the same American voices who are now most stridently bewailing these troubles were major contributors to this root cause. They played a larger role, indeed, than the intriguing, self-intoxicated Buddhist monk, Thich Tri Quang, with his highly probable links to the Vietcong.
>
> These American voices, it must be recalled, gladly, indeed proudly, assumed the peculiar role of chief propagandists for the opposition to the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem. It will come as a surprise to most of the owners of these voices, for most of them have little Asian experience.

The Alsop column continued with this observation:

> At the end, poor Diem was past rescuing, because of the mounting pressures of the general situation, and also because of those pressures' unfortunate effects on the President's all-powerful brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu. But an appropriate commentary on the fall of Diem was nonetheless supplied by the veteran Communist observer, Wilfred Burchett, who called Diem the "one strong nationalist leader" in Vietnam."

To those who still remember the violent overthrow and assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem when he headed the Government in South Vietnam, Thich's name will be familiar. He is the pseudo-Buddhist who organized the revot which resulted in the coup. When asked about his part in the affair, he made no pretense that the campaign was without political motivations and he is quoted as saying:

> Don't you think it will help our cause if some of us are killed?

This was the callous retort of the man who urged other monks to immolate themselves in a fiery death as a political protest. The question needs to be answered, Mr. Speaker, whether this is the attitude of a true Buddhist or a political demagog. In my mind, his political activity to undermine the pro-American governments of South Vietnam cannot be squared with the five moral rules of conduct laid down by Buddha: let no one kill any living thing; take not anything that is not given to you; speak not falsely; do not drink intoxicating beverages; be chaste.

Let us look at Thich's record and determine if he is a man of God or, in fact, a conscious agent of the Vietcong.

According to the records of the French colonial office, Thich Tri Quang was twice arrested for his dealings with Ho Chi Minh. He has admitted himself that he served after 1945 with Communist front groups working with Ho's Vietcong army.

Our own Embassy in Saigon has had this to say about him:

> Tri Quang himself has said that he acceded to Viet Minh invitations to collaborate with them in the 1940's and that in response to their demands he served as chairman of the United Vietnamese Association which was controlled by the Viet Minh and was located near his home village in Quang Binh province.

Thich Tri Quang also for a time led a Communist-front Buddhist organization collaborating with Ho Chi Minh.

According to the French, who still have representatives at Hanoi, Thich's brother is currently working for Ho Chi Minh in the Communist Vietnam's Ministry of the Interior. It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that the duties of Thich's brother include the direction of subversion in South Vietnam.

Thich is a disciple of Thich Tri Do who is now in Communist North Vietnam as leader of the Buddhist puppet organization there. And on at least one occasion, Thich has made the statement that, in his opinion, communism is entirely compatible with Buddhism.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the man who is, at the moment, busily stirring up unrest in Saigon, Da Nang and Hue against the American presence there. I reiterate the question: Is he acting as a man of God or an agent of the Communist Vietcong? The record is crystal clear in my mind. His presence in South Vietnam is not as a Buddhist monk but as a subversive agent.

But, his record continues. There is more.

There has been a consistent report that Thich is, in fact, a lawyer, trained in the Communist north and a practicing attorney there. There are also persistent reports that he went north to Communist Hanoi after the 1954 Geneva partition of Vietnam, thus joining the very few who voluntarily chose to live under the rule of Ho Chi Minh. His movements between 1954 and 1958 are virtually unknown.

No less a personage than former Vietnamese Prime Minister Tran Van Huong stated that documentary evidence exists to prove that Thich Tri Quang worked to stir up insurrections against the Government in 1964 which would have put the Communists in power in Saigon. Maj. Gen. Do Cao Tri, commander of the 1st Vietnamese Division at Hue, claims to have captured Vietcong documents naming Thich as an agent. The general also states that an agent of the CIA exerted pressure to suppress the documents because they would have proved embarrassing to our Government.

The record should contain also, Mr. Speaker, another quotation from Thich, himself; one he made in the Saigon Post:

> With the Americans, it is not so interesting any more. They are too easy to outwit * * * some of them persist in thinking they can "reform" me into agreeing with them. * * * It is useful to smile sometimes and let them think so. * * * We will use the Americans to help us get rid of Americans.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we reach the very root of the dissent we hear from the Socialist-left, the extremists here at home and abroad, who attempt to subvert our policy in Vietnam and urge collaboration, coexistence, and compromise with the Communists. These are the Americans Thich spoke of when he said:

> We will use the Americans to help us get rid of Americans.

I bring all this to the attention of the House for a single reason, Mr. Speaker.

What this man has done in the past is water over the dam. He should have been identified and quarantined years ago as an agent of the Vietcong, but we did not do it for reasons that are entirely beyond my understanding. Instead, we have aided and abetted him and given him sanctuary in our Embassy there. But, the past is past and there is no gain in digging up our mistakes in Vietnam and belaboring them.

What is important, however, is that this man is continuing his subversion on this very day. The recent strife in the streets of Da Nang, Hue, and Saigon are his handiwork; his contribution to the toppling of the Ky government. This man must be identified for what he is and brought under some sort of control. If the Ky government is subverted and toppled as the Diem regime was, we will have one man to thank for it, Thich Tri Quang, and we will have allowed him to do it.

I intend to make available a copy of these remarks to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense as soon as I have finished and I intend to ask them for a report on Thich's activities as they view them. I believe the information I have given here is true in every detail and unless the Department of State and the Department of Defense can refute it, line by line, it will be incumbent upon the two Secretaries to explain to the American people why Thich Tri Quang is permitted to continue his subversion in Vietnam.

When I have had their replies, I will make them available to the Members.

FEDERAL EXAMINERS SHOULD BE ASSIGNED TO SUNFLOWER COUNTY, MISS., BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Speaker, on April 4 six Members of Congress joined in a letter to the Attorney General asking him to send Federal examiners to Sunflower County, Miss. So far he has refused. I include the text of the letter at this point in the RECORD:

Hon. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL: We look forward to meeting with you on April 6 to discuss, among other topics, the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. We are very much concerned with the need for Federal examiners to register voters in Mississippi's Sunflower County.

According to the Department of Justice, 14 percent of the eligible Negro population of Sunflower County is currently registered as compared with 93 percent of the eligible white population.

At the present registration rate, it would require more than 8 years to register all of the eligible Negroes in Sunflower County—and more than 7 years to bring the percentage of registered Negroes up to the present percentage of registered whites.

Municipal elections in Sunflower County having been voided by the Fifth Circuit

> Court of Appeals because 306 newly registered Negroes were prevented from voting (*Hamer* v. *Campbell,* decided on Mar. 11, 1966) new municipal elections will be held in Sunflower County in the near future.
>
> In *United States* v. *Campbell,* N.D. Miss., No. GC 633, April 8, 1965, the court held that Sunflower County had deliberately prevented Negroes from participating in the electoral process. It is clear that the Voting Rights Act is not having a significant effect on voter registration in Sunflower County.
>
> As a result of the Hamer case, there will shortly be new elections in the county. It is imperative that the Department of Justice employ the full force of the Voting Rights Act, including Federal registrars immediately so that as many Negroes as possible are registered by the time those elections take place.
>
> According to residents of Sunflower County, the presence of Federal registrars would immeasurably aid registration. Negroes are still afraid to register. Unprotected they must go to a registration machinery controlled by local white officials. The psychological impact of Federal presence and observation in the county would be enormous. Moreover, mobile door-to-door registration as discussed by Chairman Macy in the Voting Rights Act hearings (pp. 316–317) might enable Southern States to meet the requirements of the 15th amendment once and for all.
>
> The voting rolls in Sunflower County remain dramatically segregated. Unless the Federal Government intervenes and assigns voting registrars, they seem likely to remain segregated for many years.
>
> We urge you to take this action now.
>
> With kindest regards,
>
> Charles C. Diggs, Jr.,
> Don Edwards,
> Donald M. Fraser,
> Robert W. Kastenmeier,
> Benjamin S. Rosenthal,
> William F. Ryan.

Mr. Speaker, the need for Federal examiners in hard-core southern rural counties is acute. It should not require more deaths and more violence for the U.S. Government to act.

Therefore, today on the floor of the House, I call for the Attorney General of the United States to send Federal examiners to Sunflower County, Miss.

The case for Federal registrars is irrefutable. Federal examiners have made great progress in the counties to which they have been assigned. Nowhere are they needed more urgently than in Sunflower County. And the Attorney General's power to send them there is absolutely clear.

I will be more specific.

FEDERAL EXAMINERS ARE EFFECTIVE

Mr. Speaker, Federal examiners are effective in the counties to which they have been assigned. The overall statistics for Mississippi are striking. At the end of December there were examiners in 18 counties in Mississippi. Presumably these counties were the hard core of resistance and voter intimidation. Yet by the end of December 43 percent of the Negroes in those 18 counties were registered. By contrast, only 15 percent of the Negroes in counties without Federal examiners were registered. It is even more revealing to compare the percentage increase of registered Negroes in counties with Federal examiners, with those which have none. Since the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Negro registration in counties with Federal examiners climbed by 38 percent, while registration in other Mississippi counties climbed by only 10 percent.

It is no coincidence that counties with Federal examiners have had success. In its October report on the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Civil Rights Commission noted that one strong deterrent to registration is "fear of physical violence and loss of employment because of registration activity." This fear has been built up for generations. Southern Negroes are not easily convinced that there is no longer any reason for them to be frightened. One important indication that the Federal Government will not let the State continue its past abuses is the presence of Federal examiners. Thus, Federal examiners have an extremely important psychological effect.

Federal examiners also make it much easier for Negroes to register. Often they work longer hours and more days than the local registrar. In addition, there are more of them, and often they are dispersed around a county so they are more accessible. In Birmingham alone there are some 20 examiners working at 8 locations.

FEDERAL EXAMINERS ARE NECESSARY IN SUNFLOWER COUNTY

Mr. Speaker, the need for Federal examiners in Sunflower County is especially acute. On April 8, 1965, in United States against Campbell, N.D. Miss., No. GC 633, the Federal District Court found, in the words of the Fifth Circuit in the later case of Hamer against Campbell, "that the registrar of Sunflower County, Miss., for many, many years had deprived Negro citizens of their right to register to vote." That was 1 year ago. Today, according to Justice Department figures, less than 15 percent of the eligible Negroes in Sunflower County are registered to vote—despite the court order and the Voting Rights Act. By contrast, about 83 percent of the eligible whites in Sunflower County are registered. At the current rate of registration, the percentage of registered Negroes will not equal the percentage of registered whites for 7 years.

Yet Sunflower County will be holding important elections in a few months. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals voided the municipal elections held in the county last June 8, in the case of Hamer against Campbell, handed down on March 11, 1966. The court ordered that a date be set for new elections. Those elections will be the only local elections held in Mississippi this year. Moreover, as a result of the Hamer case, as well as the historical role of Sunflower County as the birthplace of the White Citizens Council, this county has taken on symbolic importance throughout the South and throughout the country.

On Friday, March 18, the New York Herald-Tribune editorial said that the Hamer case "merits as much attention as the recent Supreme Court decision upholding the Voting Rights Act itself." The editorial continued:

> The Fifth Circuit ordered new elections because Negroes had been denied the vote through discrimination for "many, many years," in the county where the white citizens councils were born. Thus it tells the arch segregationists that political segregation is, to borrow a phrase from the criminal courts, dead-dead-dead.

There are additional reasons why Federal examiners are needed in Sunflower County. To vote in the municipal elections, citizens must be registered in the municipality as well as the county. Thus there is a double registration process required. According to civil rights groups in Sunflower County, some of the municipal registrars continue to harass Negro applicants.

Furthermore, one of the important innovations of the Voting Rights Act is its provision for Federal pollwatchers. Such officials would be most important in an arch-segregation county like Sunflower. However, under section 8 of the act, pollwatchers are only sent to "political subdivisions" where "an examiner is serving under this act." Thus, to take advantage of Federal pollwatchers, a county must have Federal examiners.

The Attorney General has the power to certify for the appointment of examiners. Under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 the Attorney General is given very broad discretionary power. In any jurisdiction to which the act applies under section 6, he can certify a political subdivision to the Civil Service Commission if "in his judgment the appointment of examiners is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment." One consideration under section 6 is the degree of compliance of the local registrar. Another is "whether the ratio of nonwhite persons to white persons registered to vote within such subdivision appears to him to be reasonably attributable to violations of the 15th amendment."

In Sunflower County it is clear that the disparity in registration is "attributable to violations of the 15th amendment." That was the Court's finding last April in United States against Campbell. It is also evident that the registrar in Sunflower is not exercising the maximum possible compliance. His office is not open evenings. He does not spend days traveling the circuit, or sitting in the other towns of the county.

Recent statements by the Attorney General have made it clear that he does not think that compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 may be satisfied by nondiscriminatory registration practices. The act also calls for measures to overcome the effect of past abuses. In a letter to Mississippi registrars on January 8, 1966, the Attorney General wrote:

> Compliance with the 15th amendment means not only that local officials may not practice distinctions based upon race, but that they are under a duty to take affirmative steps to correct the effects of past discrimination.

He went on to describe some possible affirmative steps:

> In conducting registration, if it makes good sense to be open during longer hours, or during some evenings, or on Saturday; or to employ extra clerks, or to hold registration in the precincts, then I believe you should do so.

The registrar in Sunflower County has not taken all of these steps.

On February 28, 1966, in a speech to the Southern Regional Council in Atlanta, the Attorney General described the case of Birmingham, Ala., with justifiable pride:

> The vote, after all, is not a privilege, to be stingily dispensed. It is a right, to be made available freely. Where local officials do not thus take steps to make registration and voting accessible, it is my duty to do so.
>
> A major case in point is Birmingham—Jefferson County, Ala. Registration officials there were not discriminating against individual applicants. They dropped the literacy test. But they responded only grudgingly to the fact that 90,000 Negroes were not registered and under the act should have been free to do so.
>
> After discussions with the Department of Justice beginning early in December, they took some steps to increase registration capacity, but even these fell far short. More than half the unregistered Negroes in the county still would not have had even an opportunity to apply for registration before the deadline for the May 3 Alabama primary.
>
> Nonetheless, the local officials would take no further steps to increase access—steps they have taken in the past to meet heavy white registration demand.
>
> The result, 5 weeks ago, was the appointment of Federal examiners. As many as 20 examiners have been working in Jefferson County, first in 3 locations, and now in 8.
>
> The result of accelerated local registration coupled now with examiners has been striking. When President Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act last August 6, there were 26,255 Negroes registered in Jefferson County—22.6 percent of the voting-age Negro population.
>
> On January 17, the day I designated Jefferson County for examiners, there were 41,930 Negroes registered—36.1 percent. Today, the figure exceeds 58,000 and the percentage exceeds 50 percent.

The Attorney General's action in Birmingham should serve as a model for his actions throughout the South. It is a particularly good indication of what the Justice Department should do in Sunflower County.

Yet it is worth noting that there is still another step—beyond what has been done in Birmingham—which the Justice Department can and often should take. Under section 7(a) of the Voting Rights Act, the Civil Service Commission is given power to put examiners wherever it likes within a designated political subdivision. Many residents of Mississippi have asked that Federal examiners be assigned to go door to door. They point out that many Negroes in rural areas—and particularly those on plantations—have no means of transportation. They have been warned not to leave the plantation. During chopping and picking seasons, they work from sunup to sundown. Furthermore, they still think that voting is just for white folks. All of these obstacles will only be fully overcome when Federal examiners are sent door to door.

In his testimony to the House Judiciary Committee on March 19, 1965, Chairman John M. Macy, Jr., of the U.S. Civil Service Commission stated that he thought door-to-door registration was authorized by the act. On pages 316–317 of the voting rights hearings the following dialog occurs:

> Mr. Kastenmeier. In other words, you would be free to set a number of places of registration and this could take place during the evening, for example?
>
> Mr. Macy. That is my interpretation, yes, sir.
>
> Mr. Kastenmeier. Even in some communities you might authorize examiners to go door to door?
>
> Mr. Macy. That had not occurred to me but if it is necessary it is probably possible to do it.
>
> Mr. Kastenmeier. If it is I hope you will do it.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has the power and the duty to send Federal examiners into counties where they are needed to achieve the goals of the Voting Rights Act. Examiners are needed in Sunflower County. They are needed elsewhere as well. They should be sent at once. And once there, they should be instructed to take all possible steps to achieve full registration—including, if need be, door-to-door registration. Negro citizens of Mississippi have been kept out of the mainstream of American political life for too long. We intended the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to insure the right to vote. We intended the Attorney General to enforce it. Let him do so.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income that an individual may earn while receiving benefits under the Social Security Act.

Under the present standard a person cannot earn more than $2,700 per year and still receive his share of benefits under the program. And if a beneficiary exceeds $1,500 per year but earns less than $2,700, his benefits will be cut in half. The inequities created by this arbitrary plateau have a detrimental effect not only on the specific individual receiving the benefits, but it also hampers our society's productive output.

According to a 1963 survey published in the June 1964 Social Security Bulletin, the total wages earned by persons aged 65 and over amounted to at least $10 billion. The survey specifically points out the self-evident fact that these earnings are important both to the aged themselves and to the total economy. The report proceeds to analyze the trend in employment of people aged 65 and over and reaches the conclusion that—

> If the present trends toward less work and less earnings among the aged were to continue, by the end of this century there would be virtually no earnings or work experience of the aged left to analyze.

The motivating force behind these current trends can be attributed to the current retirement test.

In fact, the Advisory Council on Social Security in their 1965 report stated that they recognize—

> The present test does discourage some people who are retired from their regular jobs from earning as much as they could, or would like to, in part-time or irregular employment.

The retention of this retirement test will continue to keep many older persons from working, with a resultant loss to the country of valuable skills and productivity.

When the social security system was first inaugurated, there was good reason for the limitation on outside earnings. We were in a depression, jobs were scarce, and it was desirable to remove from the labor rolls those receiving social security benefits.

As economic conditions in our country changed, the retirement test became less necessary. Today's high employment economy does not need such restrictive measures. Realization of the need to do away with the retirement test is not new to this body. It has been manifested by the fact that Congress has changed the age at which the retirement test applies so that it no longer applies to those over 72.

In a 1965 survey conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business, the Nation's independent business proprietors voted by a majority of 65 percent in favor of removing all restrictions on the earnings an aged person may receive without being penalized on social security benefits. The federation defined the significance of their survey by the sentence, "There should be no penalty on honest sweat." C. Wilson Harder, federation president, commented:

> There are many aged millionaires now receiving the full social security benefits. However, those who must eke out the benefits by toil are penalized. It is high time there be a complete exposure of the inequities involved in many aspects of the social security system.

The bill I have introduced today will remove the inequities which have become a byproduct of the retirement test. In light of our present economy with the cost of living steadily increasing, we must eliminate this barrier for the aged members of our society who may not have investments and savings to supplement their social security benefits.

My bill will insure access to the means needed to provide these people with the ordinary decent needs of living characterized by our American society.

DOES THE ADMINISTRATION PLAN TO ELIMINATE THE INDEPENDENT BUSINESSMAN?

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed by reports that the administration is planning to place the Small Business Administration under the domain of the Department of Commerce.

Since its beginning in 1953, under President Eisenhower and a Republican Congress, the Small Business Administration has been a respected voice and an effective advocate in Washington of the small businessman. It was realized from that time that the agency could not be effective unless it were independent.

But in the past few years we have seen the slow erosion of the SBA and the muffling of the voice of the small shopkeeper and independent businessman in Government. Now we know what we have suspected for some time: that this agency has been deliberately downgraded to pave the way for its destruction.

Mr. Speaker, let me give just a few examples: There has been no Administrator since August of 1965. The business loan program, which had proven itself highly successful, has been cut off. Applications have not even been accepted since last October.

Appointments to responsible positions within the Small Business Administration have been, since 1960, based more on political considerations than background for the job. None of the seven area directors appointed since that time has had prior SBA experience and only 1 of the 30 regional directors appointed since 1960 had been with the Small Business Administration before. In addition, the last Administrator devoted a major portion of his time to political business rather than small business.

Procurement assistance, under which SBA worked with agencies to help small business get a share of Government contracts, has been severely cut and the representatives in the Department of Defense and GSA have been eliminated.

Over the strong opposition of the Republicans, the disaster assistance and business loan funds have been combined and disaster relief has been broadened to absorb much of the dollars available for loans. There has been, as a result, little money left for small business loans.

Small business development centers have been established across the Nation under the Office of Economic Opportunity to create a web of redtape through which the applicant must struggle before getting to the SBA.

Funds which Congress intended to be used for loans to deserving independent businessmen have been diverted without congressional approval to an assortment of loan experiments. This use has severely limited the extent to which the agency can carry out its real function.

Although the SBA has indicated that their loan fund is depleted and that they are unable even to accept applications from, let alone grant loans to, the thousands of highly deserving small businesses across the Nation, the administration has not included in its budget requests appropriations to supplement the fund.

Lest we overlook the importance of the small businessman, let us remember that there are 4.7 million small businesses operating in America employing 30 million workers. This is no small interest group. Its importance to our economy and national way of life is difficult to estimate, since small business concerns are involved in nearly every phase of our industrial and economical output.

It is from small businesses employing only a few people that some of our mightiest and most important companies have grown. Small business remains one of the finest assurances that America is still the land of opportunity where a lot of initiative and a lot of hard work can turn a very small investment into a profitable business.

It is obviously time for Congress to step in and pick up the reins that the administration has dropped. We must act to insure the continued effectiveness of the Small Business Administration and to protect its independent status.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point three letters. The first, which I received from C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, outlines very clearly, I think, the importance of having an independent Small Business Administration.

The second letter is one Mr. Harder wrote on February 7, to the President, asking for information on this matter. The final letter is the reply from the administration to Mr. Harder.

The letters follow:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., March 3, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD GURNEY,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GURNEY: Knowing of your consistent support for the cause of small business, and speaking for our more than 208,000 members, all small and independent businessmen, we ask and urge that you oppose any move to merge the Small Business Administration with the Department of Commerce.

Small business is no small interest group. It numbers 4.7 million units, and employs more than 30 million of our people. It requires and deserves services and recognition on the same basis as other important segments of our economy.

At the Federal level of government, the Small Business Administration is the only strong and effective spokesman for the small businessmen. That it remain an independent spokesman is a vital necessity if small business is to continue to expand and prosper.

You are probably aware of the recent statement on the Small Business Administration released by the House Republican Policy Committee. On February 23, 1966, Ross D. Davis, executive administrator of SBA, made a formal reply to this statement. In his letter to Congressman GERALD FORD, Mr. Davis states that all the major programs of the agency are operating at record levels, and claims that under President Johnson's leadership and guidance, the agency has achieved unprecedented highs. Mr. Davis' letter goes on to describe in detail how much more effective the agency is today than in the past. If one is to take Mr. Davis at his word, one would then have to admit that the agency has performed admirably as an independent unit. Should this be the case, it simply does not follow that it should lose its independence and be subjugated to a major government department which has long been considered to be "big business oriented."

In the past, you and your colleagues have received copies of our continuing surveys on the status of small business. During the past year, we received 70,000 responses to our last survey. Studies of these survey responses show that the Nation's small businessmen have been contributing greatly toward one of our prime national goals, the production of new job openings and reduction of unemployment. A projection of our representative expansion rates on the entire small business community indicates that as many as 1½ million smaller businesses expanded, creating in the process over 3 million job openings.

A prime factor in these business expansions is the fact that many of the firms have been able to turn to the Small Business Administration for the guidance, counselling and financial help needed for their expansions. We fear that once the agency is subordinated to the Department of Commerce, or to any other Federal department whose primary reason for being is not devoted solely to small business interests, these needy independents may no longer get the top level considerations they must have.

Congressman GURNEY, we ask that you, and your colleagues who have long supported the cause of small business, oppose in any and every way possible any transfer of the Small Business Administration, and fight for an independent agency capable of fully carrying out the intent of the Congress in helping small business.

Sincerely,

C. WILSON HARDER,
President.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., Februray 7, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: We have more than 207,000 individual members in smaller, independent business and the professions throughout all 50 States, all of who are intensely interested in the sound functioning of the Small Business Administration.

As you may recall from your days as Senate majority leader, in line with directives received from these members we urged that Congress not only continue its support of this agency, but that they advance it to permanent and independent status. The record shows that on July 1, 1958, the Senate, while you were the leader, voted 55–26 to make the agency permanent. The record also shows that since that time the agency has performed with increasing efficiency in serving the interests of the country through service to the country's now 4,700,000 smaller firms, in the areas of financing, contract assistance, management counseling, etc.

This same record shows, however, that from the very beginning there have been efforts by the Commerce Department to take this agency over. These efforts have been resisted by succeeding Congresses and succeeding administrations on grounds, we have reason to believe, that they would impair the effectiveness of the agency. Our small business members are in full agreement with this position.

Due to persistent rumors in the press, an increasing number of our members are asking us if it is in fact true that you are about to propose merging the SBA into the Department of Commerce. Such a proposal seems to us incredible since the Congress, based on careful study of the agency's first 5 years of performance, in 1958 decided to make SBA a permanent independent agency. You will recall that this decision was right in line with the position taken by you as on SBA as senior Senator from Texas.

Under these circumstances, and in view of a long held concern that if transferred to Commerce the agency would be weakened, the conclusion is that to recommend merger would amount to turning your back to small business. May we have your early reply, as we would like to be able to answer questions being asked us by our members. With all best wishes,

Sincerely,

C. W. HARDER,
President.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. C. WILSON HARDER,
President, National Federation of Independent Business, San Mateo, Calif.

DEAR MR. HARDER: Each year a Government reorganization program is developed for the President's consideration. The program includes numerous reorganization proposals suggested by executive branch agencies and other interested parties. Among the many suggestions received, a number have been concerned with the Small Business Administration.

No decisions have been reached on ones related to the SBA. Before any motion is taken, you can be sure that your views will be fully considered.

Sincerely

CHARLES J. ZWICK,
Assistant Director.

I heartily endorse the action of my colleagues of the minority on the Small Business Committee who have sponsored resolutions calling upon the administration to continue the SBA as an independent agency.

Mr. Speaker, it is obviously time for us to act. If the administration is allowed to succeed in destroying the SBA, the small shopkeeper as we know him could become as faint a memory as the "surrey with the fringe on top."

CITY OF SCRANTON

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week this distinguished body passed a bill authorizing the striking of a medal in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton. It is, indeed, a year to remember in Scranton. But there is another 100th anniversary which is celebrated this year, and which is also tied to the city of Scranton. This is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Francis Hodur, the founder of the Polish National Catholic Church.

Francis Hodur was born in the small village of Zarki, in the county of Chrzanow, near the ancient capital of Poland, Cracow. He was schooled in that small village, and lived in Poland until 1890, when, like so many others of the Continent of Europe, he emigrated to America.

It was in America that Francis Hodur heard the call to the service of the Lord. He had studied deeply in Poland. Now he entered the seminary, and on August 19, 1893, he was ordained to the holy priesthood by Bishop O'Hara in Scranton, Pa.

On the second Sunday of March 1897, Father Hodur formally accepted the pastorate of St. Stanislaus Church, and on March 20, 1897, celebrated the first holy mass in the church which was still under construction.

The first synod of the Polish National Catholic Church met on September 7, 8, and 9, 1904, in the parish auditorium of St. Stanislaus Polish Church in Scranton. Duly elected delegates, both lay and clerical, voted to formulate a constitution to govern the Polish National Catholic Church. Delegates came from parishes in Scranton, Dickson City, Jessup, Wilkes-Barre, Plymouth, Edwardsville, Duryea, Austin Heights, Shamokin, Nanticoke—all in the State of Pennsylvania—from Bayonne, Jersey City, Passaic, and Perth Amboy—all in the State of New Jersey—from Fall River, Lowell, and Webster in Massachusetts; from West Seneca, N.Y., and from Chicago, Ill.

The delegates voted to use the Polish language for all church services. By unanimous vote, they established two feast days; the Feast of Poor Shepherds—Swieto Ubogich Pasterzy—and the Feast of Brotherly Love—Swieto Milosci Bratniej.

Plans were made to establish a theological seminary in Scranton, Pa. The highlight of the meeting was the selection of a bishop. Unanimously, the Reverend Francis Hodur was elected bishop at the meeting in 1904.

On September 29, 1907, Father Francis Hodur was consecrated bishop in St. Gertrude's Cathedral at Utrecht, Holland. The consecrators were the most Reverend Gerard Gull, archbishop of Utrecht and head of the old Catholic churches of Europe; the Right Reverend John Van Thiel, bishop of Haarlem; and the Right Reverend Michael Bartholomew Spit, bishop of Deventer.

Upon his return to America, Bishop Hodur founded many new parishes. In 1908 the Polish National Union of America was founded under the leadership of Bishop Hodur. This fraternal insurance organization has been increasing to the present day. In 1920, Bishop Hodur made the first of many trips to his native country of Poland to preach there. In 1923, a paper founded by Father Hodur in 1897, Straz, became the official newspaper of the Polish National Union, and Rola Boza was founded and edited by Bishop Hodur as the official newspaper of the church. A gifted writer and poet, Bishop Hodur wrote the church anthem, "Tyle Lat."

Under the leadership of Bishop Hodur, the Polish National Union established a home for the aged at Waymart, Pa., in 1929. A children's retreat camp was founded in 1933, also near Waymart.

In the year 1953, this remarkable man died in Scranton. He has left an enormous legacy behind him, and certainly must be reckoned as one of the truly significant ecclesiastical figures in the history of America.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert finally an editorial published in Straz on March 31, 1966:

BISHOP HODUR WILL CONTINUE TO LIVE ON AS INSPIRATION

(By the Right Reverend Thaddeus Zielinski)

It was on the second Sunday of March in the year 1897 that a young and daring priest accepted the charge of a newly formed Polish Catholic parish in the city of Scranton, Pa., celebrated their first holy mass and thus laid the foundations for a newly reformed Catholic Church. Father Francis Hodur was his name, who at the age of 30 became the inspiring leader of the National Catholic Church movement. From a handful of determined, faithful Christians in one small community, the church has grown in magnitude to include hundreds of thousands of adherents on two continents of the world. Father Hodur based his mandate on the command of Christ: "Go teach all nations," and thus he became as St. Cyril and Methodius, the apostle of the Polish people.

Father Hodur, because of his dynamic personality and great attribute of leadership, was chosen by the popular demand of the people at the church's first synod, to become the first bishop and shepherd of this new church. Upon receiving consideration, the apostolic succession from the old Catholic Church of Holland, our denomination became affiliated with historical Christianity of the old Catholic movement. Today, the united strength of the independent National Catholic Churches throughout the world, including the old Catholic, the Anglican, the Philippine Independent Catholic Church and other National Catholic Churches totals over 50 million members. An impressionable number considering the harassment, persecution and sufferings that the faithful of these Catholic communions had to endure.

Bishop Hodur himself was publicly excommunicated from Rome in the year 1898 for his willingness to help the poor and persecuted masses of Polish people. For speaking in their behalf, for fighting their cause, he was branded for life as a heretic, lunatic, revolutionist, and radical. He suffered economical pressures, mental strain, and physical exhaustion from overwork and beatings. One such beating had contributed to his later loss of sight—yet this did not discourage this saintly priest, for he remained persevering in spirit and will to do what Christ had commanded.

Bishop Hodur in maintaining that the church is a living institution of God and must therefore meet the needs of the people—did not stereotype the Polish National Catholic Church according to Rome, but reverted to the original concepts of apostolic Christianity. He therefore entrusted the government of the church into the hands of the people, the laity, while reserving the spiritual administration to its clergy. He abandoned the dead language of Latin in liturgical celebrations and reintroduced the vernacular, the peoples native language, in conducting divine worship services. He forsook the overbearing emphasis of God's terrible wrath and awful judgment and presented the long neglected attributes of God's fatherly love, forgiveness and mercy. He upset the theory of privileged classes in which discrimination and injustice prevailed, and taught the equal rights and social responsibilities of all—regardless of race, color and creed. He summarized his entire theological school of thought in two great and immortal documents—"The Confession of Faith," and the "Eleven Great Principles of the Polish National Catholic Church."

Bishop Hodur's teachings and ideals—once considered as heretical and thus condemned, are now the bases of reform in polity, liturgy, and doctrine in the very church that had once banished his soul to hell for proclaiming these reforms. Yes, his very critics and adversaries of the past are today the disciples of his reforms.

This therefore is a year of rejoicing and jubilee, for on the 1st day of April, we will commemorate the centennial of Bishop Hodur's birth. Thirteen years ago he had been called as the good and faithful servant to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; his passing away was most grievously mourned by the entire church. Now, however, the time of mourning is over, for our beloved bishop is not dead—but living in the Communion of the Saints and Apostles in Heaven, and his greatest treasure, his greatest gift, the Polish National Catholic Church continues to flourish and increase in number, prestige, and leadership among the historical denominations of Christianity. Bishop Hodur will continue to live on as the inspiration of all who dedicate their lives to the service of the church, be they clergymen or laymen alike.

UNITED PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, information has come to my attention which indicates that the Washington, D.C., poverty-war agency—United Planning Organization—which is financed with Federal tax dollars by the Office of Economic Opportunity—is riddled with employees with long records of serious crime.

Hardened habitual criminals—apparently hired without even a superficial police record check—have been employed to work with young people and civic groups in impoverished neighborhoods. The long records of serious offenses committed by these individuals range from narcotics violations and sex crimes to armed robbery.

I am not charging that most UPO employees fall into this category, but even one such person training our young people is one too many. Any proper screening would eliminate criminals, and the children of the poor are entitled to just as much protection as other children. The loose and reckless employment practices of the local antipoverty agency shows an utter disregard for vulnerable poor young people.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that this shocking situation is a national pattern. No check has been made of the complete UPO employee roster, nor of the 20,000 Community Action program employees, paid from Federal funds, who are scattered through hundreds of American communities.

This situation cannot be whitewashed with the lame excuse that criminals are being rehabilitated; if there is a place in the war on poverty for rehabilitating criminals, that place is not on the playground or in the community center. This is a case of wildly irresponsible management. I cite three flagrant examples for the record.

EXAMPLE 1

Mr. A—employed by UPO in January of 1965 as a $6,000 per year community program worker in a Youth Employment Counseling Center, working with juveniles. He was promoted in June of 1965 to counselor in the Neighborhood Youth Corps with a salary of $8,000. Mr. A's criminal record dates back to 1952 with 11 entries on charges of larceny, false pretenses, and passing worthless checks. In October of 1965, while still on the UPO payroll as a youth counselor, A was again charged with passing a worthless check.

EXAMPLE 2

Mr. B—employed by UPO in January of 1965 as a $3,900 per year community program worker; now employed by UPO at $8,650; work has included counseling juveniles. Mr. B deserted from the Army in 1944, and his police record since then includes soliciting for prostitution, grand larceny, false pretenses, forgery, and being a fugitive from justice.

EXAMPLE 3

Mr. C—employed by UPO in July of 1965 as a $4,140 per year neighborhood worker in a neighborhood development program. Mr. C's long criminal record began with juvenile delinquency in 1949 and progressed through a sex crime, larceny, housebreaking, and bail violation.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you will agree with me that these are not examples of the kind of persons we want to have counseling our young people or helping to develop our neighborhoods. These are but three examples, but I must add that there are numerous similar cases on file.

I know from my own experience in hiring ex-convicts in my own private business that they can be good employees. Rehabilitated criminals need the help of society, but habitual criminals should not be turned loose on our children through sheer negligence, and that is the case here. The administrators of antipoverty programs have an obligation to find out who they are hiring to work with young people and others in need of help. This responsibility is being ignored by UPO here in Washington, and probably by similar agencies all over America.

All responsible officials, from President Johnson down, recognize that disadvantaged young people need the best teachers and the best counselors we can provide. It is disgraceful and grossly negligent for antipoverty officials to subject poor young people to counselors who are habitual criminals and sex perverts. A simple check of police records would prevent most of this; the most elementary screening of employees by poverty war officials would offer protection. Certainly this sort of thing could never occur if these people were civil service employees.

Mr. Speaker, this flagrant disregard for elemental precautions in the Washington UPO administration is not just a local problem. It is a serious national problem. These conditions call for a thorough, bipartisan investigation and correction by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I again call for swift action on my resolution, House Resolution 670, introduced by me on January 19 of this year, to establish a select committee of the House to investigate the conduct of the war on poverty. We have reached the point where the poor need protection against the excesses of the war on poverty.

With people of the caliber I have described employed in responsible positions in the war on poverty, is it any wonder that the poor have lost confidence in the program? There is still time for us to act to save the entire effort from being completely discredited. Approval of House Resolution 670 is the necessary first step.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENTS OPEN BACK DOOR TO PRICE FIXING

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing and Consumer Relations of the House Committee on Agriculture has just concluded hearings on H.R. 11788, a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act. With permission, I insert in the RECORD my statement for the subcommittee and the statements presented by Mr. Erwin A. Olson, chairman of the board of the Archer Daniels Midland Co. of Minneapolis, Minn., and Mr. L. W. Andreas, chairman of the board of directors of the National Soybean Processors Association.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ANCHER NELSEN BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC MARKETING AND CONSUMER RELATIONS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE IN REGARD TO H.R. 11788, A BILL TO AMEND THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to you and the subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to present my views on the proposed amendments to the Commodity Exchange Act.

I have great confidence in the commodity futures markets as they provide a workable system of organized and supervised open trading. They serve as clearinghouses between buyers and sellers, and they are instrumental in establishing high-quality standards of commodities for delivery. They allow the trade to carry large inventories at low costs, to merchandise continuously at stable prices and to distribute their stocks economically. The futures market system is highly competitive and thus highly successful.

However, even the participants of this system have suggested possible improvements to prevent abuses by individual interests. Also the Comptroller General has suggested the need for more frequent and extensive investigation of the system by the Commodity Exchange Authority. I would agree that certain changes should be made. The act should be extended to cover individuals who might assist in violations of the act. Coverage could perhaps be extended to include certain livestock markets. All terminology of the act should be clearly defined. The authority should be granted sufficient funds in order to obtain adequate personnel and money to carry out its responsibilities. More severe penalties should be instituted and fairly enforced to serve as strong deterrents to violations.

I do not believe that H.R. 11788 meets these needs. Indeed, it doesn't seem that the bill was even designed to meet these needs. A careful reading of the bill indicates that the true purpose is to shift the source of market decisions from the market itself to the Secretary of Agriculture.

In the first place, H.R. 11788 would transfer the responsibilities of the CEA which are now jointly held by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General to the Secretary of Agriculture exclusively. Even on the face of it this action does not make sense as extension of the powers of the CEA to other commodities suggests that some nonagricultural commodities would be included.

In addition to this, the Secretary would be granted more powers over the market system than have ever been granted any one man in our history. We have already seen how the present Secretary manipulates prices in the recent case of the Commodity Credit Corporation sales of corn. Under this bill, the Secretary would be given the authority to prescribe contract market rules governing conditions of sale. These rules are now prescribed by the directors of the contract markets who, as participants in the market, have greater competence than the Secretary in these affairs. The act itself is the set of rules for these markets. If changes are needed, the act should be amended to reflect the changes.

This bill would also give the Secretary the authority to prosecute any trader for any activity which the Secretary deems to have the effect of "restraining trade." Where are the legal protections from these vague terms?

The bill gives the Secretary the power to set minimum margin requirements whenever he "has reason to believe that there is danger of manipulation, sudden or unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in the price of any commodity, or excessive speculation in any commodity or any other activity reasonably expected to restrain trade."

It has not been proved that margin requirements have any important effect on possible manipulations in trading activity or that "excessive speculation" is a pressing problem. More important, it is a matter of conjecture as to whether the present or any Secretary or anyone else has the ability to foresee unreasonable or unwarranted changes in the price of any commodity, or that the Secretary can adequately define "excessive speculation."

This bill would give massive price-setting powers to one man. It is said that these powers would only be used in case of a national emergency. As I understand it, we have already established procedures for price controls during national emergencies, and those procedures clearly do not delegate the authority to declare such an emergency to the Secretary of Agriculture. I see no legitimate reason to change now.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to include a letter I have received from the Archer Daniels Midland Co., Minneapolis, Minn., at the conclusion of my statement. Thank you again for giving me this opportunity to express my views on this bill.

ARCHER DANIELS MIDLAND CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 4, 1966.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is requested that this statement be considered in connection with hearings on H.R. 11788 and incorporated in the record of the hearings thereon.

Archer Daniels Midland Co. with headquarters in Minneapolis, Minn., operates grain elevators, flour mills, soybean processing plants, and other agricultural enterprises throughout the United States. As grain storers and merchandisers and as flour millers and soybean processors, we make extensive use of the hedging arrangements available through futures trading on the Chicago Board of Trade, the Kansas City Board of Trade, and the Minneapolis Grain Exchange, on which we hold memberships. We are also members of the National Grain Trade Council, the Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, the Millers National Federation, and the National Soybean Processors Association. We support and endorse the statements being submitted to your committee by each of the above-named organizations.

We particularly wish to stress our concern with respect to three provisions of H.R. 11788. These are: The proposed definition of "manipulate," the proposed grant of authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe and enforce minimum margins, and the proposed grant of authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe and enforce bylaws, rules, regulations, and resolutions relating to margin requirements and the form and manner of execution of purchases and sales of any commodity in interstate commerce or for future delivery.

We believe "manipulate" should be defined but the proposed definition is too broad and if enacted in its present form would put every large user of futures markets in jeopardy. We believe the Congress should incorporate in the definition the element of intent and findings of various courts of law dealing with this subject.

We believe that margins on futures trading in contract markets have had, and should continue to have, but one purpose; namely, to insure the carrying out of the contracts entered into. For this purpose, the governing boards of the several commodity contract markets have performed reasonably and responsibly. They should continue to have complete responsibility and jurisdiction.

We do not believe that changing minimum margins is an appropriate or an effective tool for controlling prices for commodities or preventing manipulation or excessive speculation in a commodity. Furthermore, we do not believe that the Secretary of Agriculture can at an incipient stage properly foresee and take action against dangers of manipulation, sudden or unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in the price of any commodity or excessive speculation in any commodity.

We strongly urge the deletion of section 13 of H.R. 11788.

We likewise urge the deletion of section 16(b) of H.R. 11788 which would grant to the Secretary of Agriculture power to prescribe and enforce such bylaws, rules, regulations, and resolutions relating to margin requirements and the form and manner of execution of purchases and sales of any commodity in interstate commerce or for future delivery. Under existing law the Secretary can prevent the adoption of any rule relating to futures trading that he finds objectionable. We believe the rulemaking powers of the governing bodies and memberships of the several contract markets are being exercised prudently, and that they should retain their present jurisdiction and responsibility in the promulgation of rules.

There are other provisions of H.R. 11788 which we consider unnecessary or undesirable but which we will not recount here since attention is called to them in the statements being presented by the above-named organizations.

Sincerely,

ERWIN A. OLSON,
Chairman of the Board, Archer Daniels Midland Co.

STATEMENT FOR THE NATIONAL SOYBEAN PROCESSORS ASSOCIATION ON H.R. 11278

(By L. W. Andreas)

Mr. Chairman, I am chairman of the board of directors of the National Soybean Processors Association, which represents 95 percent of the soybean processors in the United States, and also president of the Honeymead Products Co., division of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, a regional grain and oilseed processor cooperative headquartered in Minnesota.

There are some aspects of this bill that are salutary and that will work for better functioning of the various commodity exchanges. Among these are the elements of reports, floor broker activities, consolidation of controlled accounts, bank depositories, and financial standards of clearing members. However, there are some aspects that we feel will have serious adverse effects on the marketing system.

We, as processors, buy soybeans at a fixed price from the farmers. Since we cannot sell every day the same equivalent volume of soybean oil and meal as we buy soybeans, we sell (hedge) soybeans in the Chicago Board of Trade for future delivery. This, then, eliminates the risk of market change between that day and the day we can sell our products. When we sell our products we buy back our futures sales in Chicago. Thereby, we can determine our soybean cost at the same time that we determine our product recovery price. There are, of course, many combinations to this hedging process, but all of them are executed in order to protect ourselves from market risks. Hedging is simply a method of buying insurance against market risks.

The soybean processing industry is heavily dependent on this hedging operation. Without liquid and free trading markets in the commodity exchanges our operations would take on a wholly new concept.

One more point needs making about the liquidity of the markets for hedgers. Without the speculator we would have no hedging market. If the speculator is not there to take the heavy surge trades of the market, it is the farmer who suffers. Someone must absorb the market risks. If the speculator does not, the processor must reduce his price for soybeans to the point where he can absorb the price valleys of the market. Therefore, for the sake of the farmer, the speculator must be courted, and the operations of the commodity exchanges must be so conducted.

Liquid hedging facilities (that is, markets with a large volume of speculative and hedge trading) have served to greatly narrow the spread between the farm price of soybeans and the consumer price of our products. Without the hedging medium, we would be forced to widen that spread in order to protect ourselves from sharp market fluctuations.

There are three principal proposals in the C.E.A. bill, H.R. 11278, which we are convinced will seriously hamper the liquidity and function of the hedging facilities:

1. The definition of "Manipulation" as presented in the bill fits every trade. There is never a time when a trade does not move the price to a level different than that which would otherwise prevail.

Therefore, we would have to seriously consider whether we dare trade in any commodity exchange. Current verbal indication by the Department of Agriculture of its "intent" on enforcement is hardly consolidation. Administrations and administrators change. This bill gives the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to place criminal charges against any trader at any time for any trade.

2. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to set margin requirements for many reasons, including his determination of "unwarranted changes in the price of any commodity." This is, in our opinion, an improper use of margin requirements and has the effect of giving the Secretary of Agriculture power to try to decree prices. It means that we as hedgers must, in advance of a hedge, judge what the risk is of the Secretary of Agriculture, by arbitrary action, converting a hedge into a speculation. This is a risk that the industry cannot afford to take.

As a matter of fact, no one individual, even the Secretary of Agriculture, has all the facts to determine in advance, whether a price change is "unwarranted."

3. The replacement of the Commission (Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Agriculture and Attorney General) with only the Secretary of Agriculture eliminates one of the cardinal features of our form of government. Checks and balances on judgments of

Federal employees, whether elected or appointed, is a basic part of our system. The industry cannot rely on a hedge that may be subject to the judgments of one man.

In general, we are in favor of legislation that preserves and advances fair, efficient, and liquid marketing through the commodity exchanges. We are opposed to legislation that inhibits fair, efficient and liquid marketing through the commodity exchanges.

COMMERCE SECRETARY SCHEDULES OVERDUE PUBLIC HEARINGS ON HIDES EXPORT CONTROLS

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to learn that the Secretary of Commerce has responded to the Congress request that the need for controls on exports of hides and certain skins be examined in public hearings. Export controls on hides and skins were imposed under the Export Control Act of 1949, which is under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. The hearings will be held on April 18, at the Department of Commerce.

The need for such hearings is manifest. In testimony before the House Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains I said that even the procedures provided by the Export Control Act's section 4 (a) and (b) for consultation both with the affected industries and with other Government agencies had been ignored when the controls were imposed.

The public hearings scheduled for April 18 should have been held before the imposition of the export controls on March 7. I would hope that in the future the procedures provided in the Export Control Act will be observed by the Commerce Department's Office of Export Control. But I would also hope, and recommend, that new procedures to safeguard the public against ill-considered use of the law be contemplated by my colleagues.

First, I would suggest that the Export Control Act's exemption from the Administrative Procedures Act be removed, so that the procedural safeguards in the Administrative Procedures Act would apply to the Export Control Act.

Second, I would suggest that the Export Control Act be amended to provide for more thorough consultative procedures, perhaps through advisory committees established to consult with business and the public, and with other governmental agencies, when export controls are under consideration.

Those of us who have been interested in the problems posed by the hasty imposition of export controls on hides and by the similar imposition of controls on copper and on U.S. exports to Southern Rhodesia, will follow the coming hearings with interest.

THE CONGRESS SHOULD BE ABOVE BOARD ON THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST BASIN ACCOUNT ISSUE

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, soon after the House of Representatives returns from the Easter recess we will be asked to consider and approve what originally was a relatively simple bill to authorize construction of the third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam in the State of Washington. But let me assure my friends in this body that the bill, H.R. 7406, if amendments of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee are approved, will not be simple any longer.

Three somewhat innocent looking and ambiguously worded amendments will be offered by the committee for the avowed purpose of clarifying some of the confusion which presently exists in the accounting procedures for power projects in the Bonneville Power Administration area. The full implications and ramifications of these amendments cannot be fully appreciated until one reads carefully the committee report—House Report 1409—on the bill with its equally ambiguous explanation of what the amendments are intended to accomplish.

Some of the people in the Pacific Northwest do not seem to appreciate what their so-called friends in the Congress are trying to do for them—or maybe I should say, trying to do to them. For example, the Spokesman-Review of Spokane, Wash., carried an editorial on March 20, 1966, warning that the "Foley power bill needs close check." So that each of my friends in this body may have an opportunity to read the words of wisdom of the Spokesman-Review, I am inserting the editorial at this point in my remarks:

Foley Power Bill Needs Close Check

A strange thing happened in the National Capital last week.

Washington's Fifth District Congressman Thomas S. Foley, walked into an executive session of the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. He carried with him a simply worded bill that would authorize the construction of a third powerhouse at Grand Coulee Dam.

The bill had previously been passed by the Senate last year—with wide Northwest support and no major objection—and was finally receiving initial hearing and consideration by the appropriate House committee.

When the session was over, Mr. Foley and other members of the committee found themselves carrying back to the office a heavy package of proposed legislation.

In the package was the Foley powerhouse bill. But attached to it were hitherto unexplored and unexplained provisions which would establish a "basin account" for the Pacific Northwest and would create a whole new set of Federal ground rules affecting the financing and payout of all Federal dam projects throughout the entire region.

The basin-account concept has had sporadic attention in this area for several years and it involves chiefly the subsidization of new irrigation projects from the sale of Federal hydroelectric power.

In simple form that concept is now used under existing law in the development of the Columbia Basin irrigation project. But that arrangement is unique in this area.

Any extension of that principle to other Federal dams and for other uses of the money should have thorough exploration and public understanding before being authorized—preferably by separate legislation in Congress.

The House subcommittee has acted swiftly and quite unfairly in adopting specific legislative requirements for a basin account—in a secret session which was supposed to be devoted to the bill to authorize a third powerhouse at Grand Coulee Dam.

Mr. Foley's power bill, which originally was sponsored by Senator Henry M. Jackson, and cleared through the Senate, will now require the closest kind of checking and appraisal.

The public should know far more about this proposed basin account and what effect it would have upon irrigation development, power rates and the general fiscal integrity of far-reaching Federal programs, both current and proposed, throughout the Pacific Northwest.

It is understood here that the bill was amended at the direction of Representative Wayne Aspinall of Colorado, chairman of the House Interior Committee, who is known to have a prime interest in the water problems of the Colorado River Basin.

It is quite possible that the proposed third powerhouse for Grand Coulee Dam, the still undisclosed terms for a Pacific Northwest "basin account" and the still unauthorized plans for study and possible diversion of Columbia waters to the Pacific Southwest are now more intertwined and involved than ever before.

Representative Foley and other members of the Northwest delegation in Congress have a big job ahead in untangling the complexities of these proposals and in securing effective protection for Northwest interests which have a big economic stake in the orderly development of our water and land resources.

Mr. Speaker, the questions of clarifying the amortization requirement on Federal power projects in the Pacific Northwest, of creating a basin account in that area, of uniformly applying interests, and other matters of national policy are far too important to slip in the cellar door of otherwise acceptable legislation. These issues should be considered by the Congress in an honest and above board manner with full hearing being given to all points of view.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time during House consideration of H.R. 7406 I will urge opposition to the committee amendments suggesting instead that the original bill be approved, granting authorization for constructing the third powerplant at Grand Coulee, but referring the basic policy issue contained in the suggested committee amendments back to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for further study. It is my sincere hope that the House of Representatives will join me in this effort.

A UNIFORM NATIONAL POLICY ON FEDERAL ELECTRIC POWER PROJECT REPAYMENT CAN AND MUST BE ESTABLISHED

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the requirement that the cost of constructing Federal electric power projects be repaid to the people of the United States is in shambles. This condition has resulted in confusion, inequity, discrimination, and wholesale losses for most of the Federal power projects. This situation does not have to continue. It can be corrected; and, in all fairness to the Federal Government and to the taxpayers who must foot the bill for necessary Government programs and national defense in times of rising costs, it must be corrected.

Last fall I introduced a bill—H.R. 10724—which would go a long way toward correcting this serious national problem. The distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has requested agency and department comment on the bill preparatory to its full consideration. I realize fully that the 2d session of the 89th Congress is well underway, but because of the vitally important nature of the problem which would be solved by enactment of H.R. 10724, it is my hope that hearings will be held in the not too distant future.

To assist all Members of Congress in getting a better appreciation of this problem, I have prepared a brief analysis of the bill, its need, and the background of the issue. I respectfully recommend its reading to each of my colleagues.

FEDERAL ELECTRIC POWER PROJECT REPAYMENT ACT OF 1966 (H.R. 10724)

H.R. 10724 is a bill which would establish a uniform Federal policy for repayment of costs of Federal electric projects and * * * provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority to carry out this policy. The bill is presently pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10724, if enacted, would establish the uniform policy of the United States requiring all Federal electric power projects to be self-liquidating through amortization with interest of the total cost thereof within 50 years after the project is first used for power production. The amount to be repaid with interest would include all construction costs allocated to electric power, plus interest during construction. The interest rate to be used for computing interest during construction and on the unpaid balance of the Federal costs would be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of computed average yields of outstanding marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a redemption date of 15 years or more from the date of issue.

H.R. 10724 places responsibility for administering the act upon the Secretary of the Interior.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

There is no uniform requirement in Federal law at the present time that costs allocated to Federal hydroelectric power development be repaid in any specific number of years with the result that there is confusion and inequity in the application of repayment criteria.

Section 2 of H.R. 10724 points out this fact by stating in part: "Existing laws contain a variety of formulas and requirements for repayment of the Federal costs of electric power facilities. Some contain no specific provisions. Electric power from existing Federal projects is being sold at rates which do not cover its costs to the Government."

While provisions for repayment in a given number of years have been written into the authorizing statutes of several different power projects or systems, no law applies uniformly to all such projects.

DISCUSSION OF PROBLEM

There are two significant salable products of Federal water resource developments—water and electric power. The theoretical requirements for repayment of the Federal costs in water are clearly set forth in basic law. The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 provides that costs allocated to irrigation shall be returned to the Federal Government within 40 years plus a 10-year development period. Actually, however, a large portion of the reclamation projects cannot meet these repayment requirements. Such projects are authorized specifically by separate statutes which set forth definite but more liberal repayment requirements. The Water Supply Act of 1958 provides the basic standard for repayment of costs of Federal projects allocated to municipal and industrial water supplies. That act requires the entire amount of construction costs allocated to water supply, including interest during construction, shall be repaid within the life of the project but in no event shall this exceed 50 years.

But as far as hydroelectric power is concerned, there are several unresolved problems:

1. There are diverse legal provisions covering the rates to be charged for power from Federal projects. These fail to provide the period of amortization for such facilities and they do not fix the rate of interest to be charged on the unamortized balance.

2. Provisions for the review of power rates are nonexistent or inadequate.

3. After power investment in some projects has been repaid, power revenues are being used without specific authority to amortize power facilities in other projects.

4. In numerous instances, power rates are inadequate to amortize power investment even according to announced standards.

Inadequate standards

Almost all existing laws relative to Federal power projects do not contain specific requirements that the power investment must be repaid in a definite period with interest at a determinable rate. In some instances, they do not provide that the rates must be adequate to amortize the power investment with interest. In others, amortization is required but the period is not specified, and there is not always a clear statutory mandate that interest be paid on the unamortized balance. There are two major exceptions to this general statement, however.

In the case of Hoover Dam, the statutory requirements are clearly laid down in the authorizing legislation, the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928, amended. The legislation provides, in effect, that before any appropriation could be made for the construction of Hoover Dam, the Secretary of the Interior shall have made contracts for the sale of power to be produced at rates sufficient to cover all costs of producing power and the amortization of the power investment in 50 years with interest at 3 percent.

The basic legislation is specific also for the Colorado River storage project authorized in 1956. This has the indirect effect of providing that power produced at this project should be sold at rates sufficient to provide for the amortization of the power facilities in 50 years with interest. Concerning the rate of interest to be earned on the unamortized balance, the law states that it is to be based on the average rate of interest on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity of 15 years or more.

The statutory requirements applicable to these two projects are exceptional, and the following reveals that the law applicable to most other projects is not nearly as precise.

Very different statutory requirements exist for the rates for power generated at projects constructed under reclamation law. Congress, in section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, provided:

"Any sale of electric power or lease of power privileges, made by the Secretary in connection with the operation of any project or division of a project, shall be for such periods, not to exceed forty years, and at such rates as in his judgment will produce power revenues at least sufficient to cover an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, interest on an appropriate share of the construction investment at not less than 3 per centum per annum, and such other fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper."

Several things should be noted about this language. The 40 years mentioned relates to the maximum duration of any power sales contract and not to amortization. The interest at not less than 3 percent on an appropriate share of the construction investment would go on and on without limit as there is nothing in the law providing that it would be applicable only to the unamortized investments. The language does state that power revenues shall be "at least sufficient to cover" a share of the annual operating and maintenance costs and interest, and the implication from this is that such revenues might be larger than would be required merely to cover such minimum costs. Thus, for power facilities built under reclamation law, there is no statutory requirement for their amortization.

The Bureau of Reclamation, in its publication, "Power Systems, Average Rate and Repayment Studies, 1964" (pp. ii–iii), however, states that the rates for firm commercial energy are determined "as that necessary to provide sufficient revenue to repay all costs to be borne by power." These costs, according to this study, include amortization in not more than 50 years with interest at 3 percent on the unamortized balance.

The Bonneville Project Act of 1937, establishing the Bonneville Power Administration to market power from the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River, was not explicit as to amortization and interest on power facilities. This provided that rate schedules for the sale of power should be drawn by the Administrator "having regard to the recovery * * * of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital over a reasonable period of years." Such rate schedules shall "become effective upon confirmation and approval thereof by the Federal Power Commission."

This law does not prescribe the maximum period of amortization for the power facilities nor does it require that interest be charged on the unamortized balance. In practice, rates have been drawn supposedly to provide for the amortization of power facilities in not more than 50 years. Although the statute does not expressly require that the rates be sufficiently high to cover interest on the unamortized investment, such interest charges have been considered as a cost in setting power rates. For many years, interest was computed at 2.5 percent. On some of the more recent facilities, a different rate has been used. For new works, the rate is based on the average rate of interest of interest-bearing marketable Government obligations with a maturity of 15 or more years.

The Congress, in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, made the Secretary of the Interior the marketing agent for practically all multiple-purpose power projects of the Corps of Engineers. Like the Bonneville Act of 1937, this provides that rate schedules for power from such projects should be drawn by the Secretary having regard to the recovery of the cost of producing and transmitting the power, including the amortization of the power investment over a reasonable period of years.

Such schedules are to become operative and effective upon approval by the Federal Power Commission. Here again, although the law is not specific, rates are set supposedly to recover the power investment in not more than 50 years with interest at 2.5 percent.

Lack of adequate review

With only a few exceptions, power rates for reclamation projects are set by the Department of the Interior without any outside review by an agency such as the Federal Power Commission. Where the law (as section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944), provides that only after approval by the Federal Power Commission are such rates to become operative and effective, numerous problems are raised but not resolved by the statute.

First, it does not provide a method to compel the Secretary to file the rates for a project in the first instance should he not wish to do so. For example, the Secretary of the Interior has always refused to file the rates for the Missouri Basin project.

Second, should the Commission disapprove of a rate there is no way to compel the Secretary to submit a new rate schedule that might prove to be more satisfactory. For example, in 1958 the Commission disapproved of the rates set for projects on the Cumberland River. The Commission opposed his use of the incremental method of allocating joint costs and opposed his use of 2 percent as the rate of interest (19 F.P.C. 774). Although the Comptroller General complained to Congress about the Secretary's failure to file a new rate, he did not do so until December 1963. The Commission approved this new schedule, although it met only partly the Commission's objections raised in 1958 (32 F.P.C. 1523).

Third, except in a few instances, the law imposing on the FPC the responsibility for approving rates does not specify who is to determine what portion of the joint costs should be allocated to power. Such allocation might possibly be made by the constructing agency (the corps), the power marketing agency (Interior), or by the Commission. On several occasions, the FPC and the Commission have differed as to how such costs were to be allocated.

Fourth, the Commission has taken a restricted view of its role in reviewing rate schedules submitted by the Department of the Interior. Thus, the FPC in approving a rate increase for the BPA in December 1965, said that "Congress obviously did not mean that we were to supplant the Secretary's responsibility for initiating appropriate rates, nor were we to make a de novo determination. The statutory standard leaves the Secretary a measure of discretion.

It follows, therefore, that we need not necessarily reach the same conclusion as the Secretary. Our role is to review the Secretary's proposal and confirm and approve it if we conclude, on the basis of our independent judgment, that it comports with the dual statutory standard of providing consumers with the benefits of power at the lowest possible price consistent with good business practices as well as protecting the interests of the United States in amortizing its investment in the projects within a reasonable period."

Rollings amortization

Although in setting power rates it is assumed generally that power facilities will be amortized in not more than 50 years, this does not mean necessarily that the facilities will be amortized in such a period solely from the revenues resulting from their own power production. A number of power marketing agencies follow the practice of using revenues from a fully amortized installation to amortize more costly facilities, even though Congress has not authorized this by law.

The agencies contend that all facilities are to be amortized in 50 years, but in effect, this is accomplished only by using power revenues from some projects for much more than 50 years. The BPA explains in its 1963 annual report how this works: "Thus, when Bonneville Dam, the first in our system, is paid out in 1994, its revenues beyond that date will be used to help pay out the newer dams in the system.

"Fifty years after the last dam on the system is completed, it will be paid out from its own revenues and those of the older dams which were paid out earlier. In this manner, the power investment in each dam still will be repaid within 50 years after its completion." In a decision rendered on December 14, 1965, the FPC approved of this practice as employed by the BPA. The Southwestern Power Administration and the Southeastern Power Administration (33 F.P.C. 217, 222; 1965 and 32 F.P.C. 47; 1964) also use rolling amortization.

Many power projects have been charging inadequate rates

The power rates charged for power produced at a number of Federal projects have not been sufficient in recent years to meet all of the costs of its production, including interest and amortization. A case in point is the Southwestern Power Administration which markets 1,067,000 kilowatts of power generated at Corps of Engineers dams in that area. In February 1965, the Federal Power Commission found:

"SWPA's revenues have fallen far short of meeting repayment requirements. From its inception through fiscal year 1964, net revenues have failed by some $34 million of paying interest charges on the Federal investment in generating and transmission facilities. In fiscal year 1964 gross revenues totaled $17.7 million. Operating expenses totaled $15.6 million, so only $2.1 million of net revenues were available to pay interest charges on the investment and to amortize investment costs. Since interest charges amounted to about $6.8 million, the investment to be repaid actually increased $4.7 million during the year. The operating expenses of $15.6 million comprise the following: $1.9 million for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs at system hydroelectric projects; $6.8 million for power purchased by SWPA; $5.2 million for transmission and service charges paid to Associated Electric Cooperative and Western Farmers Electric Cooperative; and $1.7 million for operation and maintenance of SWPA's transmission facilities and for costs of administration" (33 F.P.C. 217, 222–223).

Another example is the Falcon Dam of the Bureau of Reclamation on the Rio Grande. This 31,500-kilowatt project has very little dependable power. Since it was completed in 1955 it has never earned the $444,000 required annually to cover all of its costs including interest and amortization during a period of 50 years because no one would buy the power at rates designed to yield such revenue. As a result, in 1963, the Bureau of Reclamation sought approval from the FPC for a period of 5 years of a rate schedule that could yield annually only $320,000 of revenue. The Commission, in approving this proposal, stated:

"The sale of this amount of energy under the currently proposed rates would produce an annual revenue of $320,000. Annual power costs, exclusive of amortization charges are estimated to average about $345,000. Of this estimated annual cost, approximately $180,500 is attributable to interest on the investment. It would therefore appear that, although the power revenue to be provided by the project falls short of its total costs, it does exceed the out-of-pocket costs and provides for a substantial portion for the interest on the investment" (F.P.C. 457, 459).

According to the Bureau of Reclamation, this project from 1955 through 1964 lost a total of $1,702,000 after the payment of interest but before the payment of any amortization. Although gross revenues in 1964 were only $141,019, the payout schedule anticipates revenues of $444,000 (which would be needed to cover all costs) in 1968 as soon as the present contract expires.

The Rio Grande project has 24,300 kilowatts of installed generating capacity in Elephant Butte Dam. Since this power installation was completed in 1940 the project has lost $1,391,606 after the payment of interest but before amortization. Although every year after 1950 the project failed to earn enough to cover all charges including interest, but excluding amortization, the Department of the Interior expects that in 1970 it will begin to earn some amortization and that it will be amortized fully in 2012, 73 years after completion.

The giant Missouri Basin project with numerous generating units and a total installed generating capacity of 2,942,700 kilowatts has been losing money every year beginning with 1954. During the period from 1954 through 1964, it lost a total of $57,649,187 after the payment of interest, but before making provision for amortization.

Although the Bonneville Power Administration (which markets power for numerous projects in the Columbia Basin) has lost money every year beginning with 1958, not until late in 1965 did the Department of the Interior propose a rate increase.

During this period, BPA lost $25,994,000, according to the Bonneville Power Administration and the Comptroller General. Despite this, the Department of the Interior requested and obtained FPC approval of a rate increase of only 3 percent that will produce but $4 million of added gross revenues annually.

CONCLUSION

The Congress has made progress in recent years in establishing uniform policies applicable to several facets of water resource development standards such as irrigation, municipal and industrial water, and recreation facilities; but there has been no uniformity written into the law relative to repayment of power costs. The time has come for the Congress to correct this problem, and enactment of H.R. 10724 will accomplish this end.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1. This section of the bill is the enacting clause and short title—"Federal Electric Power Project Act of 1965."

Section 2. A declaration of policy and purposes of the legislation are included in this section. It states that it is the declared policy of the United States that Federal electric power projects should be self-liquidating through amortization with interest in not to exceed 50 years from when the project is first used for power production. The purposes of the legislation are to establish: (1) power rates set to produce sufficient revenues to at least repay the capital cost of power facilities as well as maintenance, operation, and replacement costs; (2) standards to insure annual payments sufficient to liquidate, with interest, the power costs; (3) authority for the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the stated policy; and (4) "a schedule for complete effectuation of this policy."

Section 3. The requirements for repayment of Federal costs in not over 50 years are spelled out in section 3. The rate of interest applicable to Federal power projects are to be set by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the computed average yield on outstanding public debt obligations with a maturity of 15 years or more as of the beginning of the year in which construction of the "power facilities" was initiated.

Section 4. The Secretary of the Interior is given responsibility for having marketing agencies carry out this act and for setting rate schedules under this act. If power in a project cannot be sold in 3 years at a price that conforms to this act, then it is to be sold at the highest marketable price and the Secretary is to report to the Congress on the reasons why an exception to the policy is necessary.

Section 5. This section provides that power revenues may not be earmarked or encumbered after the 50-year repayment period "without specific authorization by the Congress."

Section 6. This legislation is to be applicable to all Federal power projects except those of TVA "and any research and development project" of the AEC.

Section 7. The General Accounting Office is required to maintain a continuous review of the repayment status of all Federal power projects and report annually to Congress regarding compliance with the law.

Section 8. "All earlier provisions of law in conflict therewith" shall be superseded.

Section 9. This is the usual separability provision.

Section 10. The legislation takes effect when enacted.

RED CHINA'S AGGRESSIVENESS AIDED BY SALE OF STEEL MILL

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, even under ordinary circumstances, selling a vital industrial facility such as a steel mill to an arch foe of freedom such as Red China would be a serious mistake. The seriousness is compounded when American men are dying in Vietnam at the hands of Communist aggressors who receive heavy support from the Red Chinese.

There is little doubt that the sale of the $150 million steel manufacturing complex will contribute significantly to the Communist Chinese economic base and its military potential and that such a transaction is not in the best interests of the United States.

According to the report, the steel complex would be sold to Red China by a European consortium headed by a West German firm. French, British, Italian, and Swiss companies, it is reported, will also take part in the deal. The facility would add 2 million tons annually to Red China's production of steel.

It is generally agreed that one of the restraints on Communist China's aggressive designs is their low ranking industrial capacity. We could only assume, therefore, that by increasing that industrial capacity, particularly in such a vital area as steel, China's capability to undertake military ventures would be enhanced. Should the war in Vietnam continue, we could expect that American fighting men and those of our allies would be facing cold, hard steel produced by this steel complex in the form of bullets and other armaments.

I believe the United States should have registered strenuous objection about the sale right from the beginning instead of adopting the attitude that we have no control over the situation and can do nothing. The United States was advised of the impending sale several weeks before it was announced but the State Department, it is reported, made no attempt to discourage the transaction.

The Secretary of State has since spoken out more sharply about the deal. However, since what amounted to tacit approval had already been given to the proposed sale, I hope this was not primarily for consumption of the American public.

And important as a steel mill is, this involves more than the fact that a 2-million-ton-a-year steelmaking facility would be going to Peking.

If we in effect give tacit approval to this proposed sale, certainly these nations and others will take this as a cue that we are relaxing our firm position against trade with the Red Chinese.

This is another milestone in the continuing weakening and breaking down of the system of free world controls on sales of commodities to the Communist bloc in general. The United States actually has done little to keep alive and effective the free world machinery to prevent the flow of vital goods to the Communist bloc. Yet as long as we have cold war conditions, it is important that these controls remain strong and firm. To do otherwise amounts really to arming the enemy. This has never made sense in the past and it makes no sense now.

The American people can rightly feel deep concern about the way this matter was handled and what it portends for the future.

All of this emphasizes anew the importance and the great urgency on the part of the House to reestablish the the Select Committee on Export Control. We must be able to maintain a continuous study in depth of all activities and developments in this area. I introduced a resolution to recreate the select committee at the beginning of this Congress and respectfully solicit the support of the House of Representatives for the resolution.

POVERTY WAR PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recently concluded hearings of the ad hoc subcommittee on the poverty war program of the House Committee on Education and Labor have revealed an existing need for greater and more effective coordination of the various job training programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 with the actual placement of individuals in productive, lasting jobs.

According to testimony before the subcommittee, nearly 350,000 individuals have been placed in jobs through the efforts of the antipoverty program. However, of this number only 85,000 are in the private sector of the economy—more than 250,000 individuals occupy jobs in the Federal Government.

In my judgment, we must do more than merely provide make-work for those who participate in this program. The time, effort, and money expended in training these men and women will not fulfill the purposes of the act unless these individuals can make a meaningful contribution to our society and participate productively in our free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which will mandate the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to coordinate the activities and programs administered under this act with those of the U.S. Employment Service.

This amendment is a beginning. If we are to truly break the vicious cycle of poverty, we must have maximum coordination of all Federal programs from the time the individual is initially interviewed through the various stages of training and retraining to final placement in a lasting job.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AND INDEPENDENCE BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution to establish the American Revolution and Independence Bicentennial Commission. The purpose of the Commission is to develop a nationwide program leading toward the 200th anniversary of our Revolution and Declaration of Independence in 1976.

The 200th anniversary of the U.S. Declaration of Independence should very properly have worldwide repercussions since our Nation uniquely symbolizes independence, self-determination, individual liberty, representative government, and the attainment of equal and inalienable rights.

Whereas we are striving to maintain our liberties and free enterprise economic system, many nations of the world are drifting toward totalitarianism, and the Communist governments are continuing to deprive their subjects of the principle of self-determination on which our Nation was founded.

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the present situation in Southern Rhodesia, the circumstances leading up to the recent rupture in its relations with Britain, and the basis for American support of the British response is clearly articulated and ably set forth by G. Mennen Williams at a speech before the International Relations Council.

Governor Williams, as we all know, served as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs from January 1961, until his recent retirement. He was intimately concerned with the developments in Rhodesia and with the shaping of U.S. policy toward that country, both before and after the Smith regime's unilateral declaration of independence.

I am sure my colleagues will share my view that this speech of Governor Williams' is as forthright an exposition as any of us have seen of the Rhodesian problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent of Governor Williams' speech, delivered January 28, 1966, before the International Reclamation Council at South Bend, Ind., be printed at this point in the Record.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AFRICAN AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COUNCIL

The present Southern Rhodesian crisis is an important last chapter in the historic process of British decolonization. This has been an honorable and commendable history which has won respect and friendship from the former subject populations, not only for Britain but for the West. The American who hopes to gain cheap popularity by denigrating the British—in India or in many parts of Africa—quickly finds that, once Britain has shed the embarrassments of colonialism, former subjects, and many of their friends hold the Crown, Britishers, and English traditions in genuine esteem. Thus, Britain, as it comes toward the end of decolonization, has at stake both a proud tradition and practical assets of considerable value to her and to the Western World.

What is involved in Southern Rhodesia is the opposition by a few white supremacists to Britain's efforts to develop orderly and measured transition to majority rule for a country of 220,000 whites and 4 million blacks.

What is further involved is the position of Britain and the West in all of the rest of Africa north of the Zambezi and the continuation of the Commonwealth as a democratic force in the world.

Originally, under the Welensky umbrella of the now defunct Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland and the Whitehead government of Southern Rhodesia (1953–63), a program of interracial partnership made some progress toward racial harmony. In 1962, however, reaction set in with the election of Prime Minister Winston Field. When he failed to move fast enough toward white dominated independence, however, his party, the rightwing Rhodesian front, ousted him and put Ian Smith in power in April 1964. On November 11, 1965, Smith led Southern Rhodesia into rebellion against the British and toward the establishment of a white supremacy regime.

Since that time, we have supported the British Government in its efforts to depose the breakaway regime and return the colony to the path of constitutional progress toward eventual majority rule. We have done so because we believe the British sincerely are seeking the only just and sensible solution to this uniquely difficult problem. The British want to set in motion a peaceful and orderly transition toward self-determination, on a basis acceptable to the Southern Rhodesian people as a whole. Our support for this British goal remains firm.

The British policy was enunciated clearly and frequently to Mr. Smith—and to the world—by Prime Minister Wilson before the Smith regime broke off negotiations with the British on November 11 and seized power illegally. That policy can be summed up in five principles which, in effect, establish the conditions under which Britain will be willing to agree to independence for Southern Rhodesia. They are:

1. There must be unimpeded progress toward majority rule—This does not require one man, one vote tomorrow but it does mean just and reasonable progress in that direction.

2. There must be firm provisions against any retrogression by the Southern Rhodesia Government on constitutional guarantees for majority rule.

3. There must be immediate constitutional advance for black Africans.

4. There must be progress in reducing racial discrimination, including repeal of the Land Apportionment Act (the basis for both the inequitable distribution of land, as well as the cornerstone of the Southern Rhodesian system of racial segregation).

5. And there must be satisfactory evidence that the majority of the Southern Rhodesian population—not merely a majority of the whites or a majority of the government-salaried chiefs—accepts the 1961 constitution as basis for independence.

Last Tuesday, January 25, Prime Minister Wilson in Parliament added a sixth principle: "The need to ensure that, regardless of race, there is no oppression of majority by minority or of minority by majority."

It is hard to see at this point in the 20th century what policy could be more just, more practical or more democratic than this.

Let me also mention the constitutional and legal considerations in the British-Southern Rhodesian relationship at this stage. First of all, no nation in the world has recognized the Smith regime, and it remains a British colony. Britain reacted to the rebellion by having the Governor dismiss the entire Smith cabinet and by a parliamentary declaration invalidating any act passed by the Southern Rhodesian parliament after November 10. Thus, as far as the rest of the world is concerned, Southern Rhodesia remains under British sovereignty. The British Parliament, therefore, is the only body which may now legally legislate for Southern Rhodesia. Acting for Southern Rhodesia, the British have enacted a series of Orders-in-Council banning the import of oil into Southern Rhodesia, banning the export of chrome from Southern Rhodesia, dismissing the board of the Southern Rhodesian Reserve Bank and creating a new board in London under which control of Southern Rhodesian foreign exchange reserves is placed. These Orders-in-Council at this point have the force and effect of the law of the land for all those affected by them.

With the cooperation of almost all nations in the world, these controls have proved to be remarkably effective.

Forty percent of the country's gross national product is dependent upon exports, such as tobacco, chrome, asbestos, lithium, pig iron and other minerals. In a normal year, Southern Rhodesia earns 26 percent (about $87 million) of its foreign exchange from the United Kingdom and another 26 percent from Zambia.

Measures taken by the British and other major trading partners of Southern Rhodesia have cut the country's foreign exchange earning capacity by about 50 percent already. There is every indication that the screws will be further tightened.

American reaction to the illegal seizure of power by the Smith regime was immediate and positive. In the weeks that have elapsed since November 11, we have given many concrete evidences of our support of the British program of economic, political, and psychological countermeasures. We are encouraged by and pleased to acknowledge the widespread support our actions have received in the U.S. press, in American business circles, and from the general public.

At the present time, the United States is enforcing an arms embargo, announced in the U.N. Security Council last November 12, against the Southern Rhodesian regime. Under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, we have put anything in the munitions line under government license to prohibit the export of arms and ammunition to the rebel regime.

Under the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, we have prohibited the export from the United States of all petroleum and petroleum products to aid the British oil embargo. As far as foreign oil operations of American companies are concerned, they are voluntarily respecting the British embargo, although export control regulations do not apply. Although we are not a major supplier of petroleum products to Southern Rhodesia, we did supply that country with about 15 to 20 percent of its heavy lubricants, and those can now be cut off. Under this act, we also are in a position to stay in step with the British as their sanctions against exports to Southern Rhodesia become tighter and tighter.

Although controls over U.S. exports to Southern Rhodesia are provided for by existing legislation, there are no comparable controls over imports from Southern Rhodesia. The President has, however, employed powers given him under the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965 to suspend Southern Rhodesia's sugar quotas for 1965 and 1966. In fact, the entire Southern Rhodesian sugar quota for 1965 was turned back at sea in early December. But for the most part, the United States has had to rely upon the voluntary cooperation of American industry and for their recognition of British Orders-in-Council that apply to their operations in Southern Rhodesia. Such cooperation has been forthcoming in commendable fashion from American importers of Southern Rhodesian commodities.

We have managed to cut our imports from Southern Rhodesia almost in half through the elimination of sugar imports and by obtaining the voluntary agreements of U.S. importers of lithium and asbestos to find other sources of these materials. Last week, the British Government issued an Order-in-Council banning exports of chrome from their Southern Rhodesian colony. If such exports are cut off, it would be another blow to the Smith regime's remaining foreign exchange earnings. This would go a long way in tightening the economic noose around the Southern Rhodesian regime.

Let me express here our regard for the oil companies who were partners in the consortium that operated the Southern Rhodesian oil refinery at Untali. Those companies responded cooperatively to the British Order-in-Council banning the import of oil into Southern Rhodesia.

Now, having mentioned some of the measures being taken against the rebel regime in Southern Rhodesia, let me turn to some of their effects.

First of all, the oil embargo has proved to be almost completely successful, as far as we can ascertain. It will not be long before Southern Rhodesians should have pumped their last tank dry unless they succeed in their efforts to find alternate sources of supply. No crude oil has been pumped through the pipeline from the Indian Ocean at Beira, Mozambique, to Southern Rhodesia since December 31, and, as a consequence, the Untali refinery has been forced to shut down.

The Smith regime obviously miscalculated British determination to end the rebellion. Smith's planning was very poor in this regard—and, indeed, in many other regards.

For example, he counted on support from other nations, but such support, as he admitted publicly on a television program last week, has not been forthcoming.

Seizing power when it did, the Smith regime was caught with only 2 to 3 months of its normal supply of petroleum products inside the country. Smith waited a critical 6 weeks after the rebellion started before initiating gasoline rationing, and he has since twice reduced the very small amounts of gasoline people in the country are being allotted.

The British series of fiscal measures has resulted in the seizure or freezing of all official Southern Rhodesian foreign exchange reserves abroad. This has resulted in a drastic cut in the economy's available foreign exchange.

The Rhodesian pound, which has lost sterling backing, has fallen to nearly half its value in the free market.

By the end of January, nearly all major international airlines serving Southern Rhodesia will discontinue their service to Salisbury.

Imports, upon which the high standard of living of white Southern Rhodesians was based, have been reduced to about one-third of the former total and will have to be reduced even further. Taxes have been increased on many commodities.

While the Smith regime allowed the general public to have a good Christmas, within 3 days after Christmas many retail dealers began laying off their staffs and shortages of goods were noticeable in most shops with no replenishments in sight.

The only tire manufacturer in Southern Rhodesia has laid off 60 percent of its work force, and other large businesses and mining firms are similarly laying off their staffs.

Unemployment in the white community already is believed to be reaching 10 percent and there is perhaps an even higher percentage of unemployment among the black African work force. The regime is already talking of a public works program to give work to the unemployed of both races.

There are some indications of white Southern Rhodesians looking around for job opportunities in other countries. The black Africans have been hit proportionately harder by sanctions than whites, but their scale of living already was low and they can get subsistence living in their home villages. On the other hand, white living standards are going down sharply, and they face relatively greater hardship.

There will be a whole series of corporate and individual bankruptcies over the next few months unless the Smith regime steps in and meets notes for the following year.

All this is happening at a time of the worst drought in southern Africa in this century. It has become questionable whether Southern Rhodesia will be able to produce enough corn, which is the staple African diet, to feed its people this year. Cattle are reported dying by the thousands per week. The tobacco crop, which normally accounts for nearly 50 percent of Southern Rhodesia's foreign exchange earnings will be less than two-thirds its normal size this year. It also is hard to see how any of it can be marketed abroad, as the United Kingdom and most other major importers of Southern Rhodesia tobacco have banned its import for the duration of the emergency.

Thousands of people have showed their loyalty to the Crown and to the beleaguered Governor, Sir Humphrey Gibbs, by signing his visitors' book.

As far as we can determine, the judiciary has all remained loyal to the Crown.

The various church groups have courageously stood up and announced their opposition to the rebel regime. A pastoral letter was signed by all six Catholic bishops in Southern Rhodesia. The Anglican Bishop of Mashonaland was the first churchman to take a public position against the regime from the pulpit.

There are indications that some anti-Smith groups within the country are beginning to make efforts to coalesce.

African efforts to organize strikes have had to be put down by Smith's police, tear gas and guns. On November 11 there were about 2,000 African nationalists held in detention—most of them without trial—for essentially political reasons. There have been hundreds of additional such arrests since that time.

Another indication of popular reaction is found in the regime's attempt to make all Government employees sign a loyalty oath. The regime started its effort with postal workers, the great bulk of whom are black Africans. When resistance was encountered, however, the whole project was dropped.

The stringent censorship the regime is enforcing has prevented people inside the country from learning about the full extent of the economic strictures being brought to bear on them, but the British are making an effort to enlighten Southern Rhodesian opinion by building a BBC relay transmitter in neighboring Bechuanaland. That station is now in operation.

Thus, the sum total of all these measures is that only a little more than 2 months has brought a drastic reduction in standards of living among whites in the country—and they have only seen the beginning. The British have promised to invoke an even wider range of sanctions and are expected to announce the next round shortly.

There is no question in our minds about the determination of the British to see this program through. I might point out that at the Lagos Conference of January 11–12, the British appear to have convinced all other Commonwealth members who attended that there were sufficient reasons to believe that these sanctions can be successful. This led to a decision to wait until July before the Commonwealth will reexamine the effectiveness of this attempt to bring down the Smith regime. We are sure that the British will use that time to good advantage.

Before and after the illegal rebellion, the British position has been that they would not use force in the Southern Rhodesia rebellion, except to restore law and order. Shortly after the rebellion took place, the British gave an indication that they were willing to send troops into neighboring Zambia, although agreement could not be reached with Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda on a mandate for such troops. In the meantime, when the possibility that the Smith regime would cut off Zambia's power from the Kariba Dam became a specter on the horizon, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson publicly stated that the United Kingdom could not stand idly by and allow that to happen. Zambia's entire copper-based economy depends on Kariba power. Late last week, too, a British military mission arrived in Zambia for talks with the Zambian Government.

The United States and the United Kingdom are united in their determination that Zambia shall not be made to bear the brunt of the Southern Rhodesia crisis. As a result of their common colonial past, the economies of Southern Rhodesia and Zambia are rather intricately intertwined. All of Zambia's oil, for example, has been received from the refinery at Umtali. Thus, the announcement of the British oil embargo caught Zambia with less than 2 weeks' supply of petroleum products, although measures were already underway to meet Zambia's petroleum requirements by alternate overland methods. These, of course, take time to function fully.

The help given to Zambia by its African neighbors has been vital to the success of the supply operation. Kenya and Tanzania have cooperated magnificently in making available their port, railroad, and airport facilities for the British segment of the airlift. Tanzania has greatly facilitated the overland flow of petroleum by helping to organize truck convoys. The Congo has met every request of the United States and Canadian Governments to make a success of the airlift we have mounted from Leopoldville.

Two great American overseas airlines, Pan American Airways and Trans World Airlines, deserve a hearty "well done" for their assistance with this airlift. Together, they are carrying a minimum of 180 tons of diesel fuel a day to Zambia. By the first of March, the petroleum situation within Zambia should be sufficiently normal again for that aspect of the airlift to be discontinued, but we are prepared to continue the airlift for other vitally needed supplies. President Mobutu made a large gift of oil from his Government's own stocks to help tide Zambia over the most critical period of the oil shortage. The Portuguese authorities in Mozambique and Angola and the South African Government have shown a correct attitude. They have respected the British oil embargo and show every sign of continuing to practice their neutrality in what they see as a domestic British problem.

Let me close with a comment on the claim of the Smith regime that it is a bulwark against communism in Africa. We disagree. We believe the regime's policies and actions are designed to perpetuate minority rule. If those are left unchallenged and unchecked, they would create exactly the kind of situation in which the Communists could greatly extend their influence in Southern Rhodesia and which would encourage the Communists to renew their efforts elsewhere in Africa.

We have had some experience in helping responsible African governments resist Communist encroachments—far more experience, I might add, than the Southern Rhodesian regime. We believe the policies of governments in other African countries—policies looking toward social advancement, responsible majority rule and political stability—are far more effective weapons against communism than any of the methods the Smith regime might devise.

We know of no Communist threat to Southern Rhodesia at present, but we fear one may well develop if the colony continues on its present course. We do not consider our support of British efforts to return Southern Rhodesia to legal, constitutional government inconsistent with our policy of resisting the Communist threat to genuine independence in Africa. On the contrary, we look on our opposition to the rebel regime as additional evidence of our determination to resist that threat.

COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great delight that I joined my colleagues in unanimously passing the cold war GI bill during this session of the 89th Congress.

Under this bill, 18,000 veterans in the State of Rhode Island will be eligible to receive benefits—benefits that are well deserved and will no doubt prove to be a great investment in the future of our great Nation.

This permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces subsequent to the Korean war—January 31, 1955—provides assistance in obtaining college-level, including graduate and postgraduate, and below-college-level education, and education in trade, vocational, and technical schools, and education through correspondence courses.

Full-time medical, dental, and osteopathic internships and residencies are considered as an education program—when pursued in a hospital accredited by the Council of Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association, the Council on Dental Education of the American Dental Association, or the American Osteopathic Association—and eligible veterans pursuing such an educational program are entitled to receive educational allowances at the full-time rate. In determining whether or not such a course is pursued full time, the criteria of the professional certifying organizations are used.

Avocational or recreational courses are not permitted, nor is flight training unless for credit toward a college degree. A program of education may not be pursued at an educational institution which is not located in a State, unless the program is pursued at an approved educational institution of higher learning. Part-time education is permitted.

Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month of full-time education for each month, or part thereof, of active duty, not to exceed 36 months. The eligibility period is prorated when the veteran is pursuing his education on less than a full-time basis. For example, a veteran on a half-time basis would use 1 month of his eligibility period for every 2 months of half-time education.

Active duty for training does not establish entitlement to educational assistance. Unless discharged for service-connected disability, more than 180 days of active duty is required, exclusive of periods assigned full time to a civilian institution for a course of education substantially the same as courses offered civilians, or periods of service as a cadet or midshipman in a service academy.

The educational assistance allowances provided are as follows:

Type of program	No dependents	1 dependent [1]	2 or more dependents [1]
Institutional:			
Full time	$100	$125	$150
Three-quarter time	75	95	115
Half time	50	65	75
Cooperative [2]	80	100	120

[1] Dependent means a child, wife, or dependent parent.

[2] Full-time institutional program, with training in business or industrial establishment supplemental thereto.

Where education is pursued less than half time, educational allowances are computed at the rate of charges for tuition and fees of the educational institution. Education must be completed within 8 years from last date of discharge or from June 1, 1966, whichever is later.

Educational assistance is also provided for members of the Armed Forces on active duty who have served continuously for at least 2 years. These active-duty members may receive allowances based on fees and tuition, or $100 a month for a full-time course, whichever is less.

Administrative provisions similar to those in effect under the GI bill for veterans of the Korean conflict and the war orphans' educational assistance program are applicable to this program. Schools will be approved by State approval agencies, and these agencies will be responsible for extending supervision to approved schools.

An undergraduate course offered by a college or university on a quarter or semester-hour basis for credit toward a standard college degree is considered full time when a minimum of 14 semester hours is required. An institutional trade or vocational course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level, involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, is considered full time when a minimum of 30 hours per week of attendance is required. An institutional course offered on a clock-hour basis below college level, in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates, is considered full time when a minimum of 25 hours per week instruction is required.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall define part-time education in the case of the types of courses referred to previously in this paragraph, and shall define full-time and part-time education in the case of all other types of courses pursued.

Where an individual served both on "active duty" and "active duty for training," even though both types of service occurred after January 31, 1955, only the "active duty" period of service is counted, either for the 181-day qualifying period or for computing the period of entitlement. For example, a reservist who served for 6 months on "active duty for training," was released, was later called to "active duty" because of the Berlin crisis and then served on "active duty" for 10½ months, is eligible for 11 months of educational assistance based on this "active duty" period of service, if he was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable.

World War II and Korean conflict veterans, who also served on active duty after January 31, 1955, for more than 180 days, are eligible for educational assistance under this program, but the period of entitlement to receive an educational allowance is based on the period of service after January 31, 1955, only, and they are entitled to no more than 36 months of education under the combined programs.

There is no provision for retroactive payments to veterans for training which they may have undertaken at their own expense prior to June 1, 1966.

GUARANTEED AND DIRECT HOME LOANS

Benefits of both the guaranteed and the direct home loan programs, as well as the farm loan program, are extended to veterans discharged or released from active duty after January 31, 1955, for a service-connected disability, or who served on active duty for more than 180 days, with any part of such service after that date, and discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. The discharge or release requirement is waived for active duty members of the Armed Forces who have been on active duty for 2 years, until there is a break in service.

The guarantee of a loan by a private lender in the amount of $7,500 is extended to those individuals described above and, in areas established as direct loan areas where guaranteed financing has not generally been available, a maximum direct loan of $17,500 is authorized. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to regulate interest rates, under the ceiling established for Department of Housing and Urban Development.

A fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses under this program, by requiring the veteran or eligible active duty member to pay a fee of no more than one-half of 1 percent of his loan at closing. Entitlement to this benefit will expire 10 years from last active duty period, any part of which occurred after January 31, 1955, plus 1 year for each 3 months of active duty after that date, but entitlement is not continued beyond 20 years after date of last discharge, regardless of length of service. Those with service-connected disabilities have 20 years from date of the disability discharge or release. Direct loans are not authorized to be made after January 31, 1975.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED MEDICAL CARE

Prior to enactment of this law, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, were eligible for medical care in Veterans' Administration facilities only if they had service-connected disabilities. Veterans discharged or released from active duty after January 31, 1955, are made eligible under the provisions of this law for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as war veterans. Eligibility for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities is dependent on availability of a bed and the signing of a statement of inability to pay for treatment elsewhere, as is required of veterans of periods of war.

PREFERENCE IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to the group of veterans discharged or released after January 31, 1955. This benefit is not extended to those on active duty for training, and more than 180 days active duty is required, with honorable discharge.

PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE-CONNECTION OF CHRONIC AND TROPICAL DISEASES

The presumption of service-connection of numerous chronic and tropical diseases, as listed in sections 301 and

312, title 38, United States Code, previously applicable to war veterans, is extended to those veterans with active duty after January 31, 1955.

BURIAL FLAGS

Veterans' Administration is required to furnish a flag for draping the casket of deceased veterans of service after January 31, 1955, as in the case of war veterans.

JOB COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE

Places veterans discharged or released after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as veterans of periods of war for assistance through the Department of Labor in job placement and counseling.

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF

Amends the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act to enlarge the coverage of rental premises with respect to which protection under that act is given individuals called to active duty, from premises having a monthly rental rate of $80 to premises having a monthly rental rate of $150.

EFFECTIVE DATES

Provisions of this act take effect on March 3, 1966, the date of enactment; however, educational assistance allowances are not payable until June 1, 1966, and no such allowance may be paid for the month of June, unless (a) the eligible veteran commenced the course on or after June 1, 1966, or (b) the course continues through June 30, 1966.

ALCOHOLISM

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call all of our attention today to the devastation caused by alcoholism, which ranks along with cancer, mental illness, and heart disease as a major threat to the Nation's health.

In his recent message to the Congress on health and education, President Johnson stated:

> The alcoholic suffers from a disease which will eventually yield to scientific research and adequate treatment. Even with the present limited state of our knowledge, much can be done to reduce the untold suffering and uncounted waste caused by this infliction.

The President's forceful statement reflects the growing concern over the country at the plight of those afflicted with alcoholism.

Some 80 million people in this country drink alcoholic beverages. Although drinking poses no problem to the vast majority of these, there are an estimated 6.5 million to whom drinking has become an unbreakable habit.

It is a habit that has become enough of a problem to adversely affect their families, careers, and usefulness to the community. These are alcoholics.

It is also estimated that some 250,000 persons join their ranks each year.

Nevertheless, the number of treatment and rehabilitation facilities for alcoholics are vastly inadequate in proportion to the problem.

I firmly believe that the time has now come where Federal action is necessary to give impetus to the mounting recognition of alcoholism throughout the country and to reinforce State action which will reach down into the local communities where alcoholics can be treated effectively. To me, this is the best path to recovery.

I am therefore cosponsoring a bill with my honorable colleague, Elliott Hagan, calling for Federal action to implement States' programs on alcoholism. A similar bill was introduced by the Honorable Frank Moss, of Utah, in the Senate.

Forty of the States have programs on alcoholism today, but they need implementation by Federal action. The bill that I have cosponsored calls for such implementation through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by the establishment of an alcoholism control administration.

Through the creation of this administration, staffed by the most knowledgeable persons in the field of alcoholism, we will be able to implement the development of sound programs already initiated in the various States.

The economic cost of alcoholism is staggering. Business and industry alone figure that losses from absenteeism, inefficiency, lowered production, and accidents due to alcoholism run close to $2 billion a year.

The total cost to the Nation, above all, in the human loss to individuals, families, and communities is incalculable.

The bill aims at overcoming these problems by helping the alcoholics on the road to recovery so that they can once again lead meaningful and rewarding lives. Not only will their homelife improve, but the communities in which they live will benefit from their regained usefulness.

JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, our old friend, Jim Farley, was recently selected for an outstanding honor by the Ancient Order of Hibernians. He is to be the first recipient of the President John F. Kennedy Memorial Award and the presentation will be made at the 73d biennial national convention in Chicago, Ill., in August of this year.

This gold medal, which is the official commemoration, is the highest award that can be presented by the Ancient Order of Hibernians. A more deserving recipient or one who has done more for this Catholic lay organization simply does not exist. Jim Farley has lived a life, both personal and official, of such integrity and probity as to make all Irish Catholics proud of their association with him. In designating him as the country's outstanding Catholic of Irish descent, the Hibernians bring added distinction to their organization. I know that Jim's many friends here in the Congress extend to him their sincere congratulations on his selection for this great award.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a news item on the award from the Providence Visitor of March 18, 1966:

JIM FARLEY, FIRST RECIPIENT OF ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS KENNEDY MEDAL

The Ancient Order of Hibernians in America announced that Hon. James A. Farley of New York City has been selected as the recipient of the order's first President John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Medal.

Former Postmaster General Farley is a member of Division 29, Ancient Order of Hibernians, in New York City. The announcement of the award was made by William J. McEnery of Providence, national Ancient Order of Hibernians president.

Mr. Farley will be officially presented with the gold medal award at the 73d Biennial National Convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians the first week in August in Chicago.

The President John F. Kennedy Memorial Award consists of a gold medallion especially designed for the Ancient Order of Hibernians. President Kennedy was an Ancient Order of Hibernians member from 1946 until his assassination.

Starting with Mr. Farley the medal will be awarded annually to a Catholic of Irish birth or descent, outstanding in his or her field. The medal, which is the official commemoration of President Kennedy, is the highest award that can be presented by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the oldest Catholic lay organization in America.

Mr. Farley is serving as chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. He served as Postmaster General under President Franklin D. Roosevelt from 1933 to 1940. He also served as Democratic National Chairman.

Mr. Farley leaped into national prominence as preconvention manager for Roosevelt in 1932, and then was director of Roosevelt's campaign for the Presidency.

In addition to politics and business Mr. Farley was chairman of the New York Athletic Commission from 1925 to 1933. In 1940 he belonged to a syndicate that sought to buy the New York Yankees baseball club.

MRS. CAROLINE HARRINGTON

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, with so much depressing news in the papers each day, it was a change of pace and a distinct pleasure to read recently of a person who refused to accept handicap as being debilitating but rather forged an interesting and satisfactory life for herself despite severe affliction.

Mrs. Caroline Harrington of Riverside, R.I., unable to walk from childhood at the time, started to write morale boosting letters to our Armed Forces during World War II. Over the years since that time she has continued her correspondence until now she has become what might be called an international pen pal.

An interesting account of Mrs. Harrington's activity has been written by Laurence Hyman in the Providence Evening Bulletin of March 28, 1966. If there is no objection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the article at this point in the RECORD:

ALL BUT TWO ANSWERED HER FRIENDLY LETTERS

(By Laurence J. Hyman)

Despite an illness which has kept her confined to her home for most of her life, Mrs. Caroline Harrington, of 65 Beach Point Drive, Riverside, has friends all over the world.

An avid letterwriter, she spends all her spare time corresponding with dozens of pen pals whom she has never met. She also writes, and receives answers from presidents, kings, queens, and other dignitaries.

Mrs. Harrington's hobby began more than 20 years ago when she was still unable to walk from childhood because of a severe leg illness. At the suggestion of her mother, she began writing morale-boosting letters to American soldiers fighting World War II in Europe.

Her letters met such success and pleased her so much that she gradually began writing to casual acquaintances and friends of people she knew. She continues to correspond with many of them.

"I get a weekly newsletter from a woman I met years ago on the street," she said. "I have met many other people in markets, stores, post offices, banks and hospitals who have become regular pen pals. I don't know how it happens. I just strike up conversations with people, and we exchange addresses."

One day a few years ago she wrote to Senator JOHN PASTORE, partly out of admiration and partly "to see if somebody like that would answer me." She received a reply, and has continued to correspond.

Since then she has continued to write letters "whenever inspired," and has corresponded with among others, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, President and Mrs. Johnson, Princess Grace of Monaco, John Glenn, Governor Chafee, and Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY.

She has also received replies from Winston Churchill, former President Herbert Hoover, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the Queen Mother and Queen Elizabeth of England, Pope Paul, former President Dwight Eisenhower, the King and Queen of Greece, Astronauts Cooper and Conrad, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, Mrs. Sargent Shriver, Joseph Kennedy and a number of celebrities.

The only two letters she sent without receiving answers, she said with a smile, were to Nikita Khrushchev and Harry Truman.

Mrs. Harrington also keeps a stamp collection to which she receives additions from many of her foreign correspondents and Rhode Island postmasters—with whom she also corresponds.

"Writing and receiving letters has been very inspiring for me," Mrs. Harrington said. "It kept me occupied during all the years I was confined to a wheelchair, and still gives me a lot of pleasure."

Never formally educated, Mrs. Harrington writes at least one and receives several letters a day. "My mother taught me to read and to write—there was not much else I could do in a wheelchair," she said.

Mrs. Harrington, better known to some of her pen pals by her maiden name, Connie Chapman, has lived in Rumford all her life except for a 10-year residence in Bristol. She is the wife of Henry P. Harrington.

In recent years she taught herself to walk with the help of a cane, and now does all her housework, shopping, and can drive a car.

She is not about to abandon her hobby, however, and expands her list of correspondents daily.

"I have spent so much time in hospitals during my life that whenever I hear somebody is sick, whether I know him or not, I write" she said. "It is always cheering to get a letter."

MEDICAL TRAINING IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, last October the Veterans' Administration was requested to compile a series of statistics on the number of medical and paramedical personnel which had been trained in Veterans' Administration facilities beginning in 1946 and continuing through fiscal year 1965. I have just received an impressive list indicating the number of residents, interns, medical students, nurses, and other skills and disciplines connected with the operation of the great hospital and medical system which is operated by the Veterans' Administration today.

Earlier in this Congress the House passed unanimously H.R. 11631, which seeks to give new emphasis and standing to this educational operation of the Veterans' Administration. It is identical to my bill, H.R. 11668. I hope that it may be speedily enacted into law.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include statistics prepared by the Veterans' Administration on the training of various hospital and medical personnel:

VA medical residents

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally
1946	(1)	(1)
1947	(1)	(1)
1948	1,941	(1)
1949	2,200	(1)
1950	2,418	14
1951	2,127	15
1952	2,047	13
1953	2,035	12
1954	2,255	12
1955	2,314	11
1956	2,315	11
1957	2,542	11
1958	2,515	10
1959	2,669	10
1960	2,994	11
1961	3,100	11
1962	3,119	11
1963	3,001	13
1964	3,023	10
1965	3,199	10

[1] Data not available. The number in VA training for each fiscal year is a point-in-time figure.

VA medical interns

Fiscal year	Number in VA training [1]	Percent of total number trained nationally
1949		
1950		
1951		
1952		
1953	80	1
1954	101	1
1955	102	1
1956	77	1
1957	89	1
1958	83	1
1959	90	1
1960	95	1
1961	110	1
1962	116	1
1963	131	1
1964	162	2
1965	172	2

[1] Number in VA training 1949 through 1952 not available. The number in VA training for each fiscal year is a point-in-time figure.

Medical school students receiving VA training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training [1]	Percent of 3d and 4th year classes in all medical schools
1946		
1947		
1948		
1949		
1950		
1951		
1952		
1953		
1954		
1955		
1956		
1957	5,000	27
1958	6,022	35
1959	6,000	34
1960	7,500	44
1961	7,700	45
1962	7,872	44
1963	8,500	46
1964	8,470	44
1965	8,880	45

[1] Total number in VA training not available 1946 through 1956.

VA dental residents and interns [1]

Fiscal year	Residents		Interns		Total residents and interns	
	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally
1952	12	(2)			12	(2)
1953	13	(2)	1	(2)	14	(2)
1954	17	18	2	0.7	19	5
1955	18	13	7	2.0	25	5
1956	20	(2)	7	(2)	27	(2)
1957	37	(2)	12	(2)	49	10
1958	29	(2)	24	(2)	53	10
1959	36	(2)	30	(2)	66	11
1960	44	(2)	38	(2)	82	13
1961	39	(2)	38	(2)	77	12
1962	31	(2)	42	(2)	73	10
1963	43	(2)	47	(2)	90	12
1964	37	(2)	58	(2)	95	12
1965	50	17	57	11	107	13

[1] For most years the American Dental Association could not provide the number of residents and interns in training by individual category, but could furnish a combined total in training for both categories. Therefore, this table has been set up to provide whatever data are available for the individual categories plus significant data for the combined categories. The number in VA training for each fiscal year is a point-in-time figure.

[2] Data not available.

Dental school students receiving VA training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of 4th year class in all dental schools
1965	365	11

VA basic nursing students

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1950	1,057	4
1951	1,786	6
1952	2,275	8
1953	2,213	8
1954	2,219	8
1955	2,457	8
1956	2,666	9
1957	2,578	9
1958	2,953	10
1959	3,094	10
1960	2,942	10
1961	3,010	10
1962	3,176	10
1963	3,441	10
1964	4,010	11
1965	4,270	12

[1] This is the percent of the total number of graduates from schools of basic nursing.

VA graduate nursing students

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1960	258	7
1961	229	7
1962	181	5
1963	284	8
1964	347	[2]
1965	314	[2]

[1] This is the percent of the total number of graduate nurses granted degrees.

[2] Data not available.

VA audiology and speech pathology training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1957	6	1
1958	8	1
1959	10	2
1960	22	3
1961	28	4
1962	35	4
1963	70	7
1964	100	9
1965	86	9

[1] Percentage computed from information furnished by American Speech & Hearing Association.

VA corrective therapy training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1955	73	
1956	16	
1957	45	
1958	36	
1959	25	
1960	101	
1961	134	
1962	135	
1963	108	
1964	127	
1965	129	

[1] Data not available. Persons entering this field are majors in physical education, who decide to become therapists. Therefore, college students in this therapy are not clearly identifiable. However, the VA is the major resource for field training for those planning employment in this therapy in hospitals.

VA dental assistant training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally
1964	25	3
1965	43	4

VA dental hygienist training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1964	60	5
1965	72	5

[1] Percent of graduating dental hygienists.

VA dietetics training

Fiscal year	Dietetic interns		Dietetic residents	
	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1946	52	7		
1947	46	7		
1948	18	10		
1949	72	10		
1950	80	12		
1951	88	14		
1952	94	15		
1953	87	13		
1954	96	15	1	
1955	90	14	1	
1956	87	14	2	
1957	94	15	1	
1958	73	12	1	
1959	83	16		
1960	91	16	2	
1961	97	16	1	
1962	116	21	1	
1963	116	19	3	
1964	130	21		
1965	125	21	3	

[1] Information on total number of dietetic interns trained nationally from American Dietetic Association; comparable information on dietetic residents not available.

VA educational therapy training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1955	10	
1956	2	
1957	11	
1958	14	
1959	6	
1960	5	
1961	7	
1962	15	
1963	16	
1964	10	
1965	7	

[1] Data not available. Persons entering this field are majors in various types of education such as academic, commercial, fine arts, etc., who decide to become therapists. Therefore, college students in this therapy are not clearly identifiable. However, the VA is the major resource for field training for those planning employment in this therapy in hospitals.

VA hospital administration residents

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1951	4	
1952	1	
1953	1	
1954	6	
1955	5	
1956	7	
1957	4	
1958	7	
1959	6	
1960	5	
1961	6	
1962	7	
1963	7	
1964	6	
1965	7	

See footnote at end of table.

[1] Information on total trained nationally each year not available. The Association of University Programs on Hospital Administration advises that 3,107 were enrolled for the master's degree in hospital administration during this period. Therefore, the VA trained 2.5 percent during these years.

VA hospital librarian training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1960	5	0.3
1961	5	.3
1962	5	.2
1963	5	.2
1964	13	.5
1965	15	[2]

[1] These percentages relate to the total number of graduating librarians each year. However, the number interested in becoming hospital librarians is unknown, and as far as can be determined the VA has the only training program in hospital librarianship in the country.

[2] Not available yet for 1965.

VA hospital recreation training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1957	5	
1958	13	
1959	32	
1960	18	
1961	13	
1962	20	
1963	31	
1964	40	
1965	20	

[1] Data not available. Persons entering this field are majors in such subjects as arts, crafts, sports, dramatics, etc., who decide to become hospital recreation workers. Therefore, college students in this field are not clearly identifiable. However, the VA is the major resource for field training in this activity in hospitals.

VA inhalation therapist training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally
1965	2	4

VA manual arts therapy training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1955	8	
1956	8	
1957	4	
1958	22	
1959	40	
1960	68	
1961	54	
1962	70	
1963	54	
1964	64	
1965	56	

[1] Data not available. Persons entering this field are majors in industrial arts, teacher education, agriculture, etc., who decide to become therapists. Therefore, college students in this therapy are not clearly identifiable. However, the VA is the major resource for field training for those planning employment in this therapy in hospitals.

VA medical technology training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1961	10	0.4
1962	43	1.0
1963	34	1.0
1964	57	2.0
1965	60	2.0

[1] Percent of graduating medical technologists.

VA nurse anesthetist training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally
1964	15	2
1965	23	2

VA occupational therapy training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1955	240	44
1956	232	49
1957	279	48
1958	284	56
1959	280	48
1960	270	73
1961	289	75
1962	280	73
1963	247	82
1964	276	76
1965	354	75

[1] Percent of graduating occupational therapists.

VA orientation and mobility specialist, and home teacher for the blind training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally
1961	8	100
1962	18	100
1963	28	100
1964	32	91
1965	33	92

VA pharmacy training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1952	4	33
1953	4	33
1954	4	33
1955	4	33
1956	8	32
1957	8	26
1958	9	26
1959	8	20
1960	15	33
1961	15	30
1962	22	44
1963	26	43
1964	23	31
1965	29	29

[1] Trained in hospital pharmacy.

VA physical therapy training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1954	307	50
1955	325	46
1956	472	67
1957	485	65
1958	430	55
1959	427	66
1960	402	59
1961	466	60
1962	453	60
1963	488	71
1964	473	60
1965	524	59

[1] Percent of graduating physical therapists.

VA psychology training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1947	200	
1948	425	
1949	600	
1950	650	
1951	700	
1952	700	
1953	755	
1954	710	
1955	765	
1956	771	
1957	775	
1958	775	
1959	775	
1960	775	
1961	675	
1962	700	
1963	700	
1964	700	
1965	802	

[1] Valid figures regarding the number of psychologists in doctoral training programs from 1947 to the present unavailable from American Psychological Association.

VA social work training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally [1]
1947	72	
1948	185	
1949	232	
1950	318	
1951	237	
1952	250	
1953	325	
1954	306	
1955	312	
1956	315	
1957	328	
1958	327	
1959	347	
1960	410	25
1961	414	25
1962	439	25
1963	483	25
1964	498	23
1965	482	19

[1] Information on total number trained nationally not available by individual years for 1946–59. However, from cumulative figures supplied by the Council on Social Work Education, the VA provided training to 19 percent of all social work graduates during the period 1947–61.

VA X-ray technician training

Fiscal year	Number in VA training	Percent of total number trained nationally
1961	5	([1])
1962	5	0.1
1963	5	.2
1964	5	.2
1965	14	.5

[1] Not available.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Committee on Government Operations, I have joined with Chairman DAWSON in introducing legislation to amend certain sections of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 relating to retirement benefits of the Comptroller General of the United States. These bill have been designated H.R. 14244 and H.R. 14248. The purpose of this legislation is to remove certain inequities which could arise and to continue civil service retirement rights for an incumbent of the Comptroller General's office who has previously been under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

The Congress has provided, as we all know, generous retirement provisions for our Comptrollers General, who hold office for 15 years, who are not subject to reappointment, and who may be removed from office only by the Congress and only for cause. The office of Comptroller General dates back to the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 which created the General Accounting Office, and because of the long term of office provided, only a few persons have held that post.

In 1953, when a former Member of this House, the Honorable Lindsay Warren, was Comptroller General, the Congress enacted an amendment to the 1921 act which provided that any Comptroller General who completes his 15-year term, or has served at least 10 years in office and is retired for age—70 years—shall receive an annuity during the remainder of his life equal to his salary in office at the time of retirement. In case a Comptroller General becomes disabled, he may retire and receive an annuity for the remainder of his life equal to his salary at time of retirement provided he has served at least 10 years—if disablement occurs before 10 years, the annuity is one-half the salary. It was under this latter provision that Comptroller General Joseph Campbell retired last year after more than 10 years of service. He is entitled to receive $30,000 a year for the remainder of his life.

Prior to 1953, the Comptroller General was under the civil service retirement system. This act would in effect provide an election to follow either the practice followed prior to 1953 or the one enacted in 1953.

The appointment of the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, former Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as Comptroller General, illustrates the need for the change. Mr. Staats has been in Government service for many years and he has earned civil service retirement rights by making payments into the civil service retirement fund. The special provisions of law providing for retirement of the Comptroller General have no connection with civil service retirement. Unless the particular time requirements for service in office are met, the retirement provisions for the Comptroller General do not apply. Consequently, if Mr. Staats were compelled to withdraw from his office for any reason other than disability without serving the full tenure of the office, he would have no retirement protection beyond that formerly earned under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

What the bills introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] and myself propose is to take account of the circumstances in which the Office of the Comptroller General is filled by a person previously employed by the Government and subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act. The bill would continue in force the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act but allow the Comptroller General to elect whether he will continue under that coverage or avail himself of the retirement provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 as amended. Such election could be made at any time, but not later than 60 days after the first 10 years of service as Comptroller General have expired, and the decision would be irrevocable. Before or until an election were made, the Comptroller General would continue to pay into the retirement fund under the Civil Service Retirement Act in the same manner as other employees subject to that act.

In the event the Comptroller General elected to shift from the civil service retirement protection to the special provision of the act relating to the Comptroller General, then he would be entitled to a refund of the lump-sum credit to his account in the civil service ret'rement and disability fund, but he would receive no benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act. Thus the bill confers no special or additional benefits under either retirement system, but merely grants the Comptroller General the right to select the system of his choice.

This bill is meritorious and I hope it will be speedily acted upon by our committee and the Congress. Mr. Staats, whom I have known for many years and whom I regard as one of our outstanding public servants, is deserving of this legislative enactment to prevent possible inequity and to assure him, or successors in the same situation, of the full measure of protection intended by the Congress for its civil servants and the Comptroller General.

L. L. HENDERSON, CORNING, IOWA

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. L. L. Henderson, of Corning, Iowa, and a resident of the Seventh Iowa District was named a recipient of an honor certificate from the Freedoms Foundation. His award came as the result of a letter he had written to the Des Moines Register, the Dallas News, and the Denver Post.

Because I feel that my colleagues would appreciate his comments I am placing them in the RECORD:

> If communism and socialism took over the whole world, what need would there then be for all the spies and infiltrators that now work round the clock? Would these Communist-Socialist nations then start infiltrating and plundering each other?
>
> That would indeed be a new switch, for in the past they have confined their predatory tactics to the capitalist nations and the emerging underdeveloped area.
>
> Communism and socialism thrive only on the spoils of conquered nations. They have yet to prove that they can even provide adequately the bare necessities of life for the common—the workers to whom they always promise so much and give so little. Consequently, to date no one has ever heard of one Communist nation plundering another Communist nation. A bare cupboard does not excite jealousy or envy.
>
> Communism would fall flat on its deceitful face if there were no free enterprise nations to plunder. All the wealth of the capitalist nations, if evenly distributed throughout the world, wouldn't raise the world's living standard by one-half of 1 percent for a period of 60 days.
>
> In a Communist world, every worker would have an equal share of nothing which could be considered worth while by freemen.

PORK PRICES GOING DOWN

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the wire services today carried a story from the stockyards in Chicago which should be good news to America's beleaguered housewives.

The story reports that increased hog marketing and the Pentagon's operation "pork cut" are bringing the prices on pork down.

The Department of Defense has disclosed that it has ordered a 50-percent reduction in pork purchases for consumption by the Armed Forces stationed in the continental United States. This, as well as the uptrend in hog marketings in the last few weeks, has brought hog prices down from $31 a hundred pounds at the Chicago Stockyards in December to $25 a hundred pounds this week.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that while 2 months ago sliced bacon was selling at $1.20 a pound in retail stores in the Chicago area, today Mrs. Consumer can find some top quality sliced bacon at $0.79 a pound. There are retail stores which continue to tag bacon at $1.10 a pound generally.

I am quoting these figures because we have said right along that the biggest increase in the cost of living has been recorded in the rapidly rising food prices during the past 6 months. Secretary Freeman has predicted that as production catches up with demand, the wholesale prices will recede, and it is my hope that these reductions will be passed on to the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I placed in the RECORD figures which indicate that there is no inflation on durables including home appliances and television sets.

I believe that today's wire dispatches showing there is a reduction in pork prices are of great significance because they emphasize again the fact that the big trouble spots in our current inflation are prices on food.

I believe that it is most important for all of us Americans to concern ourselves with this entire subject of inflation. But I think it is eqally important that we do not push the panic button to the extent that we are going to impose severe brakes on our present economy.

We are in the sixth year of unbroken and unprecedented prosperity. The gross national product already has hit $700 billion this year and will reach $735 billion before year's end.

Those who want to make inflation a political issue, in my judgment, are endangering the normal economic growth of America.

I have stated before that I support President Johnson's effort to reduce Federal expenditures by a billion dollars in the next 90 days. But I believe that this entire discussion of inflation requires extreme caution.

There are those who without identifying any specific areas where our problem exists could do great harm to our economy with their gunshot approach. I, for one, believe that we should encourage Americans to continue buying those things that they really need. But the concern of fear and alarm about inflation could have a very adverse effect on consumer habits in America and could lead to a general downtrend in economy.

I believe Secretary McNamara is to be commended for recognizing those areas where inflation is a serious threat; namely, in the food sector.

The American housewives can indeed make a significant contribution toward bringing down the high cost of food by temporarily avoiding the luxury items.

This is the way that I believe we can bring the prices down without throwing the entire Nation into a state of complete panic and pushing a vast segment of the American community out of the consumer market.

With the prolonged prosperity and economic growth that we have experienced, it is expected that there would be some creeping up of the price index. But I refuse to believe that we Americans do not know how to conduct ourselves in a period of sustained prosperity.

Some of our critics would urge Americans to stop buying everything, and they would urge the Government to shut down shop completely. It is quite apparent that if we follow such a rigid suggestion it would plunge this country from a unprecedented prosperity to a disastrous depression.

I am confident, however, that the American people can be counted on to use reason in this whole struggle against inflation, and I am even more confident that they will bitterly reject any effort to play politics with the Nation's economic future.

"ON IMPROVING COMMUNICATION AMONG SCIENTISTS"

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in continuing my effort to establish a national dialog on the need for a national information retrieval system to help scientists significant contributions to the discus- and scholars obtain information more readily, I have from time to time placed sion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am taking the privilege today to call the attention of my colleagues to a truly outstanding paper on this entire subject prepared and delivered by Dean Don R. Swanson of the University of Chicago, Graduate Library School at the Columbia Engineering Centennial Symposium in New York.

Dean Swanson is today considered one of your Nation's outstanding authorities on this entire question of information retrieval and I consider his paper entitled "On Improving Communication Among Scientists" one of the most noteworthy contributions to this discussion in recent years.

Dean Swanson's paper follows:

ON IMPROVING COMMUNICATION AMONG SCIENTISTS*

(By Don R. Swanson, University of Chicago)

Libraries and information services of the 21st century almost certainly will be the beneficiary, or perhaps the victim, of enormous technological change. High speed search by computers, microrecording techniques, remote interrogation consoles and great communication networks will some day place the world's knowledge at our fingertips. It is inferred by many that, through such a metamorphosis, we shall cure the information ills of our age, bring order out of chaos, and somehow contain the information explosion or at least reduce it to a small conflagration.

This prophecy seems well calculated to capture one's imagination, but whether the proposed cure takes into account the nature of the illness is I think questionable. For example, the simple observation that recorded knowledge accumulates through the years, while the rate at which it can be read (by any one person) remains constant, has profound implications. It must mean first of all that scientists of each succeeding generation will have available a decreasing fraction of the total printed record. The implied prospect of ever-increasing specialization and fragmentation of scientific knowledge clearly involves communication problems of extraordinary dimensions. Among other things, we might ask what we would do with the world's knowledge if it were at our fingertips. What part of it should we read? Mechanization itself can be considered an answer only if one doesn't understand the question. In the hope of seeing more clearly the shape of things to come, we might look toward increased organization of human activity rather than to a facile extrapolation of technological progress; this I shall try to do here.

It seems plausible to assume that large scale activities, including scientific communication practices, are driven somehow toward desirable goals, even when such goals are unstated or unrecognized. This postulate suggests that we look about us for evidence of progress, even in the midst of disorder, and however erratic. Let us examine therefore those aspects of present information services that seem to accommodate themselves best to the needs of scientists and scholars for recorded information, and then propose a means of causing the best to grow at the expense of the rest.

This growth probably will have to take place within the framework of at least two constraints. The first involves the rate of input and output of information to the human brain, and, in particular, the rate at which we can read and write. This rate I assume will not change significantly over any period of interest here. The assumption is arbitrary, I grant. (Others, e.g., W. T. Knox,[1] have also noted the importance of taking into account "individual channel capacity" in the design of information systems.) The second constraint arises from a characteristic inertia in human nature. This characteristic is exemplified if we ask whether scientists in general take adequate initiative to exploit present libraries and information services. It is my suspicion that they do not; they tend to ignore such services, except as a last resort. Possibly as much as 85 percent of useful scientific information is exchanged informally and verbally before the usual bibliographic tools are consulted to ascertain whether or not published information is available. It may be unrealistic to hope that any very large number of scientists can be educated to appreciate what they have, and to make more intensive use of present information services. The goal is worthwhile to be sure, but it seems to me prudent not to count on its attainment. We should instead assume that scientists are incurably apathetic toward present services, and get on with the job of trying to change the services not its customers. It is tempting to propose a kind of principle of least action: "The design of any future information service should be predicated on the assumption (whether true or untrue) that its customers will exert minimal effort in order to receive its benefits. Furthermore, they won't bother at all if the necessary minimum is higher than some fairly low threshold."

As a focus for both a prognosis and a proposal for improved science information services, let us consider certain existing communication practices which have been invented and initiated by scientists themselves, and which therefore have survived the foregoing least action principle. The practices I have in mind include citations in the journal literature, the writing of reviews and summaries, the mailing to selected recipients of preprints, reprints and reports, and finally informal verbal communication. The obvious fact that these activities are of extreme significance in the total scientific communication process has been gratifyingly confirmed by a number of studies. My purpose here is to suggest that at least certain of these and other informal and haphazard information activities be aided and amplified, and that the potential advantage of organization and planning be brought to bear on the matter. The objective is improved communication, and whether we then need new "centers" or bigger and better machines become subordinate (though still important) issues.

THE SMALL AUDIENCE PHENOMENON

It is remarkable, but quite apparent, that the kind of communication just described takes place for the most part within relatively small groups of individuals. Let us briefly consider the evidence, and its possible implications so far as future information services are concerned.

Some numerical facts of life on scientific publication reveal that journal articles on the average have an actual reading audience much smaller than the circulation of the journal. This audience is evidently on the order of a few dozen to a few hundred scientists. It seems likely that such groups are closely related to the groups of similar size within which informal information exchange takes place—such as the mailing of reprints. The notion that a journal article is a method of scientific broadcasting is, at least on the average, a fallacy.

The evidence for the small audience phenomenon is persuasive. In a review of studies of the flow of information among scientists, Menzel[2] summarizes a number of interesting results. One of these results indicates that, on the basis of information on chemists reading time and on the number of articles abstracted in chemical abstracts per year, one concludes that only one-half of 1 percent of the articles published in chemistry are read by any one chemist. It may be inferred that, on the average, any one article is read by only one-half of 1 percent of the chemists. Assuming that chemists number a few tens of thousands, the average per article readership would be a few hundred. A large and very valuable study carried out by the American Psychological Association yielded similar results. Over half of the articles appearing in "core" journals are read by 200 or fewer psychologists.[3] [4] In connection with one (unpublished) study of cancer information services, it was estimated that the number of relevant biomedical journal articles published per year is approximately 50,000 to 100,000, and that these probably have an audience of 5,000 to 10,000 cancer research specialists. If each man were to read 6 articles per week (possibly a generous assumption), the average readership per article would fall in the range of only 15 to 60.

Curtis Benjamin's[5] apt description of "twigging" seems not unrelated to this issue, though he is speaking of books, not journals: "The 'twigging' phenomenon occurs in the endless fractionation of interest and knowledge in technical fields, a continuing fractionation that has held markets for specialized books to the same size they were 15 or 20 years ago—this is spite of the fact that the total corpus of technical knowledge is at least five times larger than it was 20 years ago and there are at least three times as many professional scientists and engineers, or customers, in the United States. (Thus the tree is much larger, but the twigs are the same size.)"

---

* This paper is based on an address given at the Columbia Engineering Centennial Symposium, New York, May 5, 1965.

[1] Knox, W. T., "Guidelines for a Technical Information Service," Research Management, vol. VII, No. 4, 1964, p. 287.

[2] Menzel, H., "Review of Studies in the Flow of Information Among Scientists," Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, January 1960 (sponsored by National Science Foundation).

[3] Garvey, William D. and Belver C. Griffith, "Scientific Information Exchange in Psychology," Science, 146, Dec. 25, 1964, p. 1655.

[4] Extended treatments of the results of reference 2 appear as vol. 1, "Reports of the American Psychological Association's Project on Scientific Information Exchange in Psychology" (December 1963). (Sponsored by National Science Foundation.)

[5] Benjamin, Curtis G., "Everything Is Not Coming Up Roses" an address presented at the 56th Annual Convention of the Special Libraries Association, Philadelphia, June 9, 1965.

It is reasonable to think that the small audience phenomenon is neither accidental nor peculiar in any way to chemistry, psychology, and biomedicine; in all likelihood it is directly and indissolubly linked to the rate of production and consumption of recorded knowledge. Given the rate at which scientific journal articles are produced, the total number of scientists available to read them, and an estimated reading rate per scientist, one can calculate the average number of readers per article. The result in general seems to be a remarkably small number. It is not possible to state with any certainty whether the average readership for scientific articles is a dozen or several hundred, but in any event it is not thousands or tens of thousands. I have been speaking of course of averages, and the fact that distributions are no doubt highly skewed cannot be dismissed; some journals have large circulation and some articles receive wide attention. The APA studies do in fact give some very informative data on such distributions.

The importance of the notion of small clusters of scientists who read and cite each other's papers and who communicate through informal channels has been emphasized by a number of others. Science historian Derek Price, for example, has referred to clusters of this kind as the "New Invisible Colleges."[6] J. D. Bernal[7] has contributed an early (1958) and perceptive paper related to this subject. The implications of the existence of such groups seem however to be ignored in most visions of future libraries, information centers, and information services. In some areas, information exchange groups exist in a more formal sense; we may note with interest the emerging of at least a few informal newsletters which circulate among small groups of scientists and which serve as a rapid, highly responsive form of disseminating scientific information. These have not come about as a result of much real planning but have arisen somewhat out of desperation to fill a critical need. It is to be expected that the lifetime of any one newsletter will be relatively short, and that new ones will keep springing up. As a whole, they are likely to exhibit what might appear at first to be even more disorganized behavior than does the journal literature, which itself has a rather astonishingly high birth and death rate. This apparent chaos is a good deal more fascinating than it is deplorable. It can probably be attributed to shifting patterns of interest and shifting associations among scientists as subject fields progress into new areas, overlap with other subject fields, give rise to new ones, and die off for lack of promise.

IDENTIFY THE INVISIBLE GROUPS

Wherever newsletters have arisen, the information-exchanging groups have, in effect, identified themselves and so are accessible to new information services. For most groups, though, newsletters as such do not exist and the membership is in essence invisible. It need not remain so of course and with some some effort, can and should be brought at least to a state of translucence. This can be done through interviews (i.e., ask scientists with whom they communicate), through a study of citation patterns in the literature, and through studies of scientists' reactions to disseminated journal articles or reports. (This latter technique has been employed in an experimental project conceived by M. M. Flood, M. Kochen, and E. Wong and being carried out at the University of California. Flood and Kochen have also suggested a news service for professional cliques.[8]) The end result of the identification effort might be a sort of who talks to whom directly, published perhaps annually to reflect change.

The identified groups are likely to be evanescent as well as translucent, and it would be of especial interest and importance to follow their changing patterns of overlap with other groups. Any one scientist may of course belong to several groups—the groups are by no means exclusive and exhaustive—and so of course there will be a degree of overlap, a degree of confusion, and the continual presence of apparently random phenomena.

Once identified, much more can be learned about the role the groups play in the communication of scientific information, and just what might be done to foster such communication. For example, the publication and circulation of limited audience newsletters for the vast majority of groups that have taken thus far no action to do so themselves, the sponsoring of select conferences of a few dozen people, and even the subsidization of telephone calls could be considered as candidates for future information services. In short, communication among scientists might best be improved through a systematic and large-scale amplification of information activities already found to be useful by scientists themselves.

THE SUMMARY AND REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

Notwithstanding the many advantages of information flow within small groups, it should be noted that there might also be some harmful side effects to highly selective communication, and that certain countermeasures are in order. As scientific knowledge accumulates, it must necessarily divide and subdivide into increasingly narrow specialties; at some point a severe onset of the law of diminishing returns may be expected. Whatever constructive purpose fragmentation of the scientific community into small groups may serve, even though the groups overlap, it does not serve to unify the sciences. It is the digestion, the summary, and the packing down of scientific knowledge that permits us to progress without foundering in the backlog of published information. W. F. Libby[9] remarked similarly in a recent article: "The way out of the maze is a simple one: True understanding of a subject makes its statement, its description, its definition, and its discussion more possible, not less possible. As we come to fuller understandings of the various aspects of nature which branches of science treat, we will be able to dispense with the bulk of the substantiating material which led to the discoveries."

We can discern within present communication practices in science, forces that indeed are at work to promote the unity of science in addition to those that seem to move toward increasing fragmentation of recorded knowledge. Scientists do write books, summaries, and review articles, many of which permit the creation of 1 page where 10 grew before. Through critiques, citations, editorial sanctions, and reviews, the scientific community furthermore manages a supervision of its own literature, and at least a partial separation of important scientific papers from the unimportant. This phenomenon, if it could be amplified, might have a remarkable impact on the character of future information activities.

The implication that we somehow identify important literature and treat it differently from the unimportant—(and perhaps even suppress the latter altogether)—understandably evokes an anguished cry from those who see in it the threat of censorship. Yet the kind of censorship that I imply already plays a vital role in the communication of knowledge. The editor of a journal who accepts poorly written, inaccurate, or unnecessary articles, is generally considered derelict in his duty. Without infringing on any one's legal right to publish and distribute whatever he wishes, I see no reason for the scientific community to dismiss any reasonable measures for better information quality control, or quality identification at least. Future information services in my opinion should reinforce, amplify and provide logistic support to the efforts of the scientific community to sit in judgment on its own information products, and to synthesize, review, and summarize its literature. (A similar requirement is cited in what has become known as the Weinberg report.[10])

The aforementioned information exchange groups might become excellent instrumentalities for effecting these tasks of summary and synthesis. For it may be after all just the subject of interest of any one information exchange group that stands in need of periodic digestion. It should be one of the functions of scientists within each group somehow to produce the required condensed, higher level, material, for the consumption of other groups and broader audiences.

In an ataxic way, this function is now performed. I suspect that the efficiency of so doing falls far short of what it could be if the phenomenon were recognized and systematically taken into account in the planning of information services. Of course it is the prerogative of scientists to decide what subjects stand in need of a review article, and to decide when the time is ripe. The characteristic time interval between decision and action being what it is (infinite, occasionally), it is not unreasonable to think that a generous measure of overall planning, accompanied by appropriate prodding, remuneration, and literature combing assistance to individual scientists could have a substantial and beneficial impact. A simple statistical monitoring of the amount of information accumulating in any one subject area should be a valuable supplement to human judgment as to when a review should be written.

Beyond synthesis itself, other activities serving similar ends can be envisioned. There is even something like a marketing function[11] to insure the proper breadth of distribution of a summary work. The small information exchange groups could assist in this by identifying overlapping groups, and other potentially interested groups as distribution targets.

SELECTIVE NOTIFICATION

Present libraries and information systems are passive; they wait to be used.

---

[6] Price, Derek J. DeSolla, "The Scientific Foundations of Science Policy," Nature, vol. 26, No. 4981, Apr. 17, 1965, p. 233.

[7] Bernal, J. D., "The Transmission of Scientific Information: A User's Analysis, pp. 77–95 of proceedings of the International Conference on Scientific Information, Washington, D.C., Nov. 16–21, 1958. See esp. pp. 80, 92.

[8] Kochen, Manfred, "Some Problems in Information Science." The Scarecrow Press, 1965 (see pp. 271–288).

[9] Libby, W. F., "Man's Place in the Physical Universe," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, September 1965 (see esp. p. 16).

[10] "Science, Government, and Information." A report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, Jan. 10, 1963.

[11] Knox, William T., "Marketing-Oriented Information Services." Mar. 15, 1965, talk at joint dinner meeting of the American Documentation Institute, American Medical Writers, Association, Society of Technical Writers and Publishers, and Special Libraries Association, International Inn, Washington, D.C.

A future information system, however, should seek out its customers. Its activity must of course be directed, purposeful, and must have continuous feedback of the consequences of its own actions. We infer that future systems must provide decentralized service points, and selective, direct, and continuous dissemination of information to customers. Service in response to standing requests should be maximized, so that customer initiative can be minimized.

I suggest selective dissemination, or selective notification, as essential to an active mode of operation, but I wish to make it clear that I am not necessarily speaking of present projects, practices, or techniques of automatic dissemination. The importance of selective dissemination as a basic requirement transcends the question of specific means of implementation. The concept must incorporate a set of standing requirements generated in some way, and capable of changing in time. It must result in small numbers of highly pertinent journal articles being disseminated directly to individual scientists, and it should collect, from those scientists, their reactions and their opinions as to which of their colleagues should see the same article. This feedback and "reverberation" is as important as the initial dissemination, and served to check on it. Clearly the information exchange groups would be invaluable in providing a basis for dissemination criteria, and as an instrument for feedback and second-level dissemination.

Ultraselectivity will be necessary, and this alone may become almost a science. Certainly careful systems planning and operational research studies are needed first. It is difficult to say with certainty that the rewards will justify the investment, but it is my expectation that they will, and that it is plausible to count the notion of selective dissemination as one of the driving forces that will change the character of future information systems. The question of initial dissemination of recorded knowledge is too important to be left to random or chance encounters with the literature, which largely characterizes the present state of affairs.

The process of retrieving information, or finding literature relevant to some topic, may be more a matter of interpersonal communication than of indexing and classification. The first step is often to find someone likely to know the answer, rather than to consult an information service. In this connection, better visibility of the aforementioned information exchange groups would clearly be of value. Furthermore, good initial dissemination will make subsequent retrieval easier, for it will increase the quantity and pertinence of the literature with which the requester is already familiar, and such literature is in principle much easier for him to retrieve than that which he has never seen. The system itself (and it is reasonable to assume here that it might be highly mechanized) should retain in its memory a complete record of who has received what (within whatever limits of right of privacy one wishes to establish), whether on initial dissemination or subsequent search and retrieval. Information systems can and should exploit the experience of past users for the sake of its future users, and the who talks to whom groups, should be a good vehicle for so doing.

The association of scientific subspecialties with relatively small information exchange groups suggests that the very organization of information within journals might now be having a substantial influence (for better or worse) on the directions of scientific research and on the development of new scientific specialties. The intriguing possibility that the course of science might be beneficially altered through intelligent modification of the information dissemination pattern seems worthy of study.

Evidence and intuitive impressions suggest that much useful contact nowadays between scientists and literature is accidental. It would be one aim of the proposed new services to make benevolent accidents happen on purpose.

A NEW PATTERN FOR INFORMATION CENTERS

We might thus envision for the future a new kind of information center, or more likely a number of centers, that could serve the numerous requirements discussed here which are not met by today's systems. A prerequisite step is to discover and identify the information exchange groups. Then, corresponding to each group within the scientific community, let us imagine that there is a small headquarters somewhere staffed by one or several people to keep track of who's who in the group, publish, print, and circulate its newsletters, study citations in the literature, and follow the changing character of the groups in the course of time, including the nature of their overlaps with other groups. They would administer, promote, sell, organize, and perhaps act as a switching center for information inquiries. In the large, an activity of this kind might monitor and improve a broad pattern of dissemination of scientific information, and stimulate production of adequate reviews, summaries, and digests of scientific literature.

Considered within the framework of the "national information center" proposals of the past few years, a center to perform the functions outlined here would be unique. Neither a repository, distribution center, abstracting service, nor a nucleus of organizational authority over other systems and services, possibly its closest counterparts in concept might be the Science Information Exchange (operated by the Smithsonian Institute), or the National Referral Center for Science and Technology in the Library of Congress (both under NSF sponsorship). Yet those two, while addressed to the who does what problem, nevertheless embrace only a small part of the function proposed here.

A collection of centers performing all functions and services implied in this discussion would be far from modest in scope and manpower, though reliable quantitative estimates would be difficult to make at this point. It would first be necessary to identify the size of population to be served, and to determine how much of technology to include with science. The total number of scientists and engineers is in the hundreds of thousands, but it is not really clear that the potential value of the suggested services applies universally; our state of knowledge of the information exchange groups is still embryonic, but if what is now known can be extended broadly, it is not inconceivable that the total required level of effort to provide these new communication services would correspond to several thousand people, perhaps a third of whom would have to be scientists or engineers themselves.

I suggest then a pattern for a new class of information centers.

THE GROWING DIALOG ON INFORMATION RETRIEVAL IN AMERICA

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years I have devoted a great deal of my time and effort toward arousing interest in the United States in the entire subject of scientific data processing and information retrieval.

My subcommittee has held extensive hearings on this subject and is continuing these hearings with the view toward ultimately establishing in the United States an information retrieval system which will make available to all of our information resources a network for quick transmittal of their information to researchers all over the country.

This entire subject is very complex and offers no easy solution.

During the past 3 years that I have dealt with this subject I have learned to appreciate the vast number of questions and problems still unanswered. But it is a continuing source of encouragement to me to see the growing dialog on this entire subject.

Last month International Science and Technology magazine carried an excellent article titled "Information Transfer" by a Mr. Evan Herbert, its associate editor.

This excellent article describes the new phase of manipulating data which can give instant access to networks of files. The article, however, quite properly points out that retrieval of information still hinges on the transfer of meaning.

Because I believe it is important that this entire subject receive the widest attention, I am including in the Record today Mr. Herbert's entire article as it appeared in the International Science and Technology magazine.

The article follows:

Information Transfer

(By Evan Herbert, associate editor)

New ways of manipulating data can give instant access to networks of files but retrieval of information still hinges on the transfer of meaning.

(In brief: In information retrieval, the process of asking questions, examining answers for relevance, has been speeded by refinements in data storage and communication so that direct dialogs with remote files are now technically feasible. Activity of a file and speed of access are the criteria for justifying mechanization. Document images stored on microfiche are becoming standard for information dissemination. While pressure is mounting for networks of specialized information centers, intellectual access to them via indexes and other representations of content hinges on how effectively meaning can be transferred when data is manipulated. Natural language information processing and associative memory techniques, holding promise of better approaches to classifying relevance, are being tested in models of research libraries of the future. Generalized service programs for data management via computer will be needed for information networks.—E. H.)

The difficult problem in information storage and retrieval will always be the intellectual job of matching the information that is known and stored with the information that is wanted at a particular moment. No universal solution exists for this problem because each of us has a unique set of needs for information. Often the very process of trying to answer a question changes our needs. In a search through categories of references and through possibly relevant data, we discover unforeseen aspects that change our concepts of what we seek. Reference data that so modify the course of our search also become information.

This feedback process is both the difficulty and the strength of good information retrieval, and it becomes more effective whenever we can speed the processes of gaining access to information—of retrieving and manipulating the references by which we coordinate a search, or of retrieving a document or fact from its actual storage place.

In the past few years, there have been significant refinements in the techniques and technology of transferring information, thus coupling the user of an information system more closely to searching facilities and to large collections of documents and facts. Search and retrieval processes can be so compressed in time that they become more truly a dialog between a man and the files that may hold the information he seeks.

These refinements have taken three forms:

First, storage of document images or encoded data is more compact. Larger collections and deeper indexes to them can be kept close at hand, more accessible physically and intellectually.

Second, new data-communication techniques offer better ways of getting at remotely stored indexes and data collections.

Third, the intellectual interaction between man and these files holds promise of greater speed and selectivity by improvements in the ability of machines to respond to natural language commands and to search, manipulate, and transform the content of natural language files.

The net effect is that a larger universe of data can be explored for nuggets of information; the scope of a search can be wider, at the same time that it may be conducted with greater speed and selectivity. And once the question is narrowed and the information is found, it can be transferred more easily and more rapidly, becoming available where it is needed in a form in which it can be used.

Let me caution you that this is the present state of the information storage and retrieval art and that only fragments of the newly available techniques and technology now appear in practice. As a result, there is a wide variation in the effectiveness of presently available information and documentation services. However, the pressures are mounting in the U.S. Government for the evolution of such services, including nongovernmental activities, into an integrated national network of information and document-handling systems in science and technology.

More than 20 different proposals have been made for similar networks on a smaller scale by such organizations as the American Library Association, Engineers Joint Council, and the Library of Congress. While they vary in detail, in essence they embody the concept of specialized information centers linked by telecommunications and switching facilities that eventually would make it possible for you to query all these centers through your own local information center. The first questions and answers, a dialog with the local center via telephone, input-output typewriter, or cathode-ray screen, would serve to sharpen the specification for the information you seek. If it is not available locally, you would be referred to, and your communication terminal switched to the appropriately specialized information center elsewhere on the network.

I shall examine the developments in information storage and retrieval which give better local access to limited universes of data and I shall explore the ways they may fit into the larger information system universe that could evolve. My concern throughout this article will be with the transfer of information—how effectively meaning can be transferred by the intellectual and physical links between an information system user and files of source data.

WHAT'S IN A FILE?

Files are orderly ways of storing data. Indeed, the order itself provides reference information to help narrow a search. Take a look at the top of your desk. If you're like some people, chances are that you are using the pile system for your working files. As long as the collection isn't too large, you're willing to search through a pile of data.

A book is the smallest pile we know, and still you must search its pages for the data you seek—helped by the table of contents and index for that book. Sometimes there are pages of data you want to note for further reference, so you jot down the page numbers (storage addresses) and a descriptive term or two for each (descriptors) to jog your memory, thus augmenting the index to the file with your own viewpoint of its content.

When the piles become too big to manipulate, you find it handier to number your documents and keep your notes about their content on a few pieces of paper that can be scanned more readily. The first step in your search can be a rapid dialog with this more easily manipulated reference file.

You might keep all the references describing one document on one card. Then to find all the documents that fit a given descriptor, you'd search every document record card to see if it carried that descriptor; references organized this way are a document system. You could, of course, keep track of the aspects of your collection by heading a card with a single descriptor, then listing all the documents that fit that descriptor; this is called an aspect system.

When you search for information, you usually use several terms to describe what you are after, just as several terms were used to characterize the document when it was originally indexed. Suppose, to shorten the dialog leading to retrieval, you could see at a glance all the document numbers that fit the terms you are asking for. This is the concept of peek-a-boo systems, or optical-matrix aspect systems which enable you to search a collection simultaneously rather than sequentially. A card which can carry a grid—perhaps as simple as a punchcard—is labeled with a single descriptor, while each grid intersection is assigned to a particular document. If a document fits the descriptor, a hole appears at the corresponding intersection. To search a collection by several descriptors at once, you superimpose the grids and look for the common holes—the documents that fit all these descriptors.

Let me recapitulate such file activity in terms of concepts of file handling. When a data collection becomes too large to spend time searching it physically, you look through each index of references for the contents of each document. If you consolidate all the reference indexes into a document system or aspect system, you can do logical manipulation—"and/or not" searches of lists or unit records—to find all terms fitting a document or all documents fitting a term.

But our needs for information are constantly changing, which means that the collections of references and documents must also be updated to match current needs more closely. How often a file must be updated, how often a file is referred to, are questions crucial to the justification of mechanizing file manipulation.

Consider the updating of simple facts like telephone numbers. Each day in the United States there are 75,000 changes or additions to listed numbers. Each day there are 10 million inquiries to information operators; each question and answer now consumes an average of 12 seconds. It's obvious that updating the files and speeding up referrals to it can justify a considerable amount of hardware, even if what is retrieved is a tiny block of data—a fact.

So the question of mechanizing reference retrieval comes down to how often you search a file and how much time you can afford to use to manipulate and scan the references by which you coordinate your search. The question of mechanizing retrieval of original source data, from tiny blocks to large documents, depends on how much time you can afford to get the data from its actual storage place and how often these data are used. So the activity of a file—not necessarily its size—is the real key to economic justification of information storage and retrieval hardware.

THE CREAMED FILE

Typically the most active files are ones which contain records of key facts like parts lists, bank and charge account numbers, rate tables, inventory lists, etc. Although these records can be documents or books or card catalogs full of data, all that is needed is one block of data at a time: the answer to a question.

When one seeks to mechanize or automate access to a file, an analysis of which blocks of data are most often referred to usually reveals that only a small percentage of a file's content is highly active. Often it is possible to skim off this data subset—the cream of the information—onto another, much smaller summary record which has fewer items to search through and which is more easily manipulated. It contains the most meaningful, and therefore most active part of the file—and files with high activity justify automation (margin).

The difficulty of preparing summary records of the most active parts of files is both statistical and intellectual. Summary records are representations of a more complete content. And when that content contains theories and ideas—not just straight facts like the melting point of a particular metal—there still is no certainty that statistical methods of analyzing document content will provide the one set of classifications, descriptive terms, or abstracts which is best for a summary record. Nor can one best set be selected by the most intelligent human indexer or abstractor, though he does exercise more judgment than a computer. He still cannot anticipate what will be relevant in the future to some requester with a different background and a viewpoint that changes in the process of negotiating the question.

So there is no certainty that all meaning is transferred in the representations of information that constitute a relatively small active file. On this hinges the question of how to divide the continuum of information into portions that can be manipulated and transferred.

THE DECENTRALIZATION DEBATE

A great debate is in progress in the information-retrieval field: Shall all knowledge be stored in a single, centralized file, or shall a series of active files containing smaller universes of knowledge be linked in a network?

The central storehouse concept is proposed to the U.S. Congress by Representative PUCINSKI of Illinois in his bill H.R. 664 to provide a single point of access for all users of the many Government agency information systems. It still wouldn't include non-Government data sources.

Another approach to the central store concept has been advocated by Alvin M. Weinberg of Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Dr. Weinberg proposes a centralized depository for manuscripts, thus making their content retrievable from one place even before they are published.

The Weinberg Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee had recommended that "each Federal agency concerned with science and technology accept its responsibility for information activity in relevant fields * * *." Aside from the matter of accepting responsibilities, there remains the problem of whether there would be wasteful overlap among agencies or whether relevancy can be subsumed.

This knotty question leads to other schemes to assign the responsibility for operating an information storage and retrieval center for given fields, like physics or mathematics, to particular Government agencies. The trouble is that such delegation also ignores the continuum of information. How could you assign math to NASA and physics to the AEC?

The third approach is the network system linking discrete groups presumably best qualified to collect and index the data in its own special area of scientific and technical activity.

A very large-scale version of this approach has just been recommended by the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information (COSATI) of the Federal Council for Science and Technology. It embraces significant worldwide scientific and technical literature and recognizes that a national information system must integrate important portions of existing Government and non-Government information activities like indexing and abstracting activities, research libraries, and publishers.

Networks of information and document centers are already being established by some Government agencies like NASA and the Department of Defense for their own needs. On a smaller scale, the Engineers Joint Council has proposed a national engineering information network of the open technical literature.

Let me immediately reveal my own strong biases in this debate about centralized files versus decentralized more active files, for I spend my working life as an active searcher for information in science and technology. Like most people, I keep a microcosm of information on my desk—I'm a "pile" man. Each of my editorial colleagues maintains extremely active files on the overlapping disciplines and subjects we watch individually and write about for this magazine.

Each of us knows best the content of his own subject files because we use them the most. When an editor wants information about an area outside the scope of his own collection, he asks the appropriate colleague. In this dialog, conducted in real-time, he negotiates the question directly with a person who has a deeper index to a specialized body of knowledge; he sees some likely documents and can determine whether their contents and his questions are approaching a meaningful match; or he evolves a better way to query a recommended source elsewhere. In short, he gets a verbal answer (fact retrieval), or some reports out of a file (document retrieval), or a recommendation on where to find the answer (reference retrieval).

Essentially I have described the concept of specialized information centers and the most advantageous features of organizing them into integrated information retrieval networks. The collections of each specialized information center, while relatively narrow in the total spectrum of knowledge, are a part of a continuum. It is more obvious to the user of very active files just how his data relate to other parts of the continuum. And while each field, each discipline, has its own terminology and its own information structure, there are associative threads that can be followed if you can enter that structure with a meaningful expression of the information you seek.

NEGOTIATING THE QUESTION

While much attention has been given to the characterization of the information content of a document more research is needed into the language in which to ask for information and into the form of the answer desired.

Most people do not get a chance to examine documents closely to decide whether they satisfy the question. Furthermore, the time elapsed between asking a question and getting back documents to examine for form and content is often days to weeks under present systems of access to specialized information centers. A user often is physically too far from both the document collection and from the people who know its files well enough to negotiate the question. He is reduced to the equivalent of seeking information from the closed stacks of a library on the best librarian's day off. Instead, he negotiates the question by mail or telex with lists of documents showing subject, title, and author, and sometimes technical abstracts. Or he frames his question in a language of standardized descriptors chosen from a thesaurus and lets an information center choose documents that fit.

Since descriptors are words which characterize the information content of a document, ideally the documents should be called for by the same labels used at the time they were stored. So a thesaurus of these labels is the bond between the indexer of the information in the document and the seeker of that information. A thesaurus is a dictionary of standardized synonyms containing the words that describe, according to a previously established classification system, the universe of data in the collection. Some thesauri add role indicators to the word to describe how it is used and thus to remove ambiguity from a word.

So a thesaurus should be a way of entering a data structure with a concept of what you want from it and acquiring the words that express what you need from the files of the information center based on its structure.

Nevertheless, even with a thesaurus, the words used by an indexer to characterize the information content of a document may be different from those of the searcher because their points of view are different. For example, "on-line" in its strict definition means "controlled by the central processor of a computer." In the language universe of the computer community, this word is used interchangeably with "real-time" which means "in the same time scale in which an event occurs." If a thesaurus tells you what a word means, but does not also lead you to the words that express the concept you are after, it cannot help you to search an unfamiliar world.

And even if you had the same background and experience as the indexer of this microcosm, points of view about information—about what are meaningful data—can change between the time data are characterized and filed, and the time they are sought. Thesauri are living documents and need frequent updating in fields which change and grow.

Significantly, the very comprehensive thesaurus which is the basis for the Defense Documentation Center (formerly ASTIA) is now undergoing revision and broadening by a 14-man task force in an 18-month activity known as Project LEX. Unfortunately, it will cease at the end of the 1½ years. But a thesaurus should be open ended and under continual revision. Similarly the present Thesaurus of Engineering Terms, which has been cited as one basis for the proposed Engineers Joint Council (EJC) network of specialized engineering information centers, will need considerable revision to relate technical concepts that can serve users in all disciplines.

The time dimension affects both the characterizing of information and the practicality of intellectual links by which information is transferred to negotiate a question from afar.

But I have mentioned that there are physical communication links—to be described shortly in another section—that could shrink the time it takes to interact with a distant file. These can so shorten the time between a series of questions and answers that a rapid virtually real-time dialog can take place between user and references, between user and actual documents uncovered by the references. Since there is latent information in every document—it depends on your point of view—if you could test each answer for form and relevance of data, then refine each subsequent question, you could follow an associative thread linking progressively more meaningful data.

THE THREAD OF RELEVANCE

Ideally, you should be able to get an answer to your initial search questions in the form of a list of references showing documents in the order of their relevance. Then you might expand or contract your search strategy with questions built around those answers that seem to lead toward greater relevancy.

Studies of how to establish degrees of associativity of a document's information content are being performed at Lehigh University under Robert S. Taylor and at Cornell under Gerard Salton. Essentially the method is to determine the absolute frequency of usage of the descriptive terms in a given document collection and the frequency with which these terms occur in association with another term. A computer is particularly important in mapping such associations, for the skein of threads between terms becomes very complex.

Associative techniques can also help with browsing in search of materials of possible relevance to one's work. The "see also" on a library catalog is the simplest form of this, but this list of related categories of documents often needs expanding on each appropriate card as new material, of relevance unforeseen in the original classification scheme, is added to the collection. Updating reference files like these is a formidable task. At best, you are led by a "see also" to another general classification in the catalog.

How much better if you could explore associative notions more directly by browsing through specific references to currently relevant documents connected in a chain or on a branching tree of associated information. This browsing capability is one goal in the development of associative memories for computers.

For example, the associative memory developed by Noah Prywes at the Moore School, University of Pennsylvania, contains information records, lists, and trees in ascending order of complexity. An excerpt from a computer record of a recent browse through this experimental memory is shown on these pages. [Not printed in RECORD.]

Each record is linked by lists of all the relevant "see also" records. As you move out from the main chain of information, lists may branch, forming a tree or network of associative notions. In the model being tested by Prywes, the records are references to specific documents, each shown with a list of keys to all the other notions associated with it, to which you might also add your own viewpoint.

The full power of a computer-manipulated associative memory is that the system accumulates knowledge, as records come in, by continually reclassifying the changing organization of all the information in the system, just the way people seem to store and reassociate past experience. Conventional storage and retrieval systems usually label documents according to a preconceived classification scheme and the fullest meaning of their content is rarely transferred to a reference file because the viewpoint of the indexer is simply a static snapshot of its relevancy in the past. The thesaurus in an associative memory is open ended and is frequently updated to respecify the changing relationships among information in the records.

Another form of associative memory is a precoordination index developed by John Dere of Washington, D.C., which shows, on an inventorylike table, all major descriptors that can be linked directly—or indirectly—to common documents. You can see how this works in the page from the Pacific Aerospace Index shown opposite [not printed in

RECORD]. The index is issued quarterly, with the aid of a computer, by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. The best way to understand the associative aspects of this index is to stop here for a moment and map the relationships yourself with a colored pencil, following from the words of your search concept to a document, then following the notions associated with it to other documents or to new search concepts.

Linguists are still struggling with the problem of how humans express attributes and associations. The problem is even more complex when meaning must be encoded for a computing machine. Only since 1959 has there been any research into answering natural language questions by computer.

Nevertheless, researchers are now studying semantics as well as syntax—meaning as well as relationship of words in a structure. For example, Gerald Salton of Cornell has found that the root forms of words lead to better "see also" for information retrieval than do suggested synonyms. Linguistic researchers at System Development Corp. have received a contract from the National Science Foundation to measure the effectiveness of transferring meaning via different kinds and forms of document surrogates—the index terms, lists, titles, abstracts, and digests used as references for the retrieval of information.

THE FORM OF AN ANSWER

Furthermore, there is the possibility that the language of a search question holds clues to the form in which the answer is desirable. It is significant that the needs of information-system users are now beginning to receive deeper study. Lehigh University's Center for the Information Sciences will try to analyze the actual language by which people negotiate questions. Another study, made by Auerbach Corp. for the Department of Defense, started with the information actually used in various specific technical projects in DOD or its contracting organizations. It traced back through where and how he got the information to what kind of information an engineer said he needed to do his work.

This particular survey—one of several to be made—dealt with specific engineering assignments, so you might expect the forms of the answers desired to be engineering data. Yet, while more than half the information needs turned out to be in this form, a quarter of these engineers needed scientific information like state-of-the-art information and concepts, ideas rather than unambiguous facts.

So, the intellectual aspects of information storage and retrieval—indexing of documents or facts and characterizing them for recall—still are slowed by language problems.

Relevance and meaning are highly subjective matters. Since there is latent information in every document, every block of data, why not let an information system user examine more directly the potentiality of original sources?

We shall examine next the developments in physical access to coded data and to documents, then discuss how remote access to the information carriers through machines, switching centers, and networks of humans and machines bring us face to face once more with problems in the transfer of meaning.

CODED DATA

There is a developing trend to create a character-coded form of the text in the process of publishing newly generated books and other documents. This can be done as a byproduct of using special typewriters for the final manuscripts, or from typesetting machinery operating on coded signals from tape.

While new data can be entered into a machine-readable store via such coded byproducts, the cost of converting printed data already in libraries is still prohibitive. Practical conversion must await more economical character-reading machines and similar devices for encoding drawings.

If only certain portions of coded text are desired for retrieval, these can be displayed on cathode-ray screens, or typed into hard copy by high-speed printers. However, line-at-a-time reproduction is still too slow for multiple pages of text; hence the advantage of storing images of entire pages.

Images can be recorded photographically or as the electromagnetic record of a video scan. Coded symbolic descriptions of each image can also be recorded with it so that the search for the image can be manipulated by machine. Most document retrieval really isn't very efficient when you must manipulate the image carrier—strip or chip of film or tape—to search coded descriptions of the recorded data. So many storage and retrieval systems now manipulate only the reference to the data, then send the physical address of the desired image to the machinery that manipulates the carriers of the desired records.

Thus, logic manipulation—the "and/or not" that refines your specification of which images you want retrieved—can be at electronic speeds rather than slower speeds at which a physical carrier must be shuffled or unreeled.

We have discussed information retrieval in terms of the logical and storage address keys to a collection—finding and getting access to relevant data and document records. The nature of the records themselves is important to our ability to manipulate them manually or by machine and to see and reproduce their content. We shall be concerned with analog rather than encoded data—with image records.

IMAGE ANALOGS

Very small images of documents—microforms—have a number of advantages: Storage space is small, the image carriers can be manipulated rapidly and automatically, and the images can be reproduced while keeping a collection complete. With the proper kind of viewer, microforms are even good for reading. Though it may sound like heresy, a book as an information storage device, as a duplication master, or as a medium for rapid manipulation and rearrangement of data, has none of these attributes except that it is good for reading.

There are many forms of microphotography. Conventional microfilm is a roll of images reduced about 24:1 and arranged in a serial string. For example, in Recordak's Microfilm Information Retrieval Access CODE system (MICRACODE), each image storage address is indexed by adjacent clear and opaque rectangles which are arranged in binary codes of descriptors of an arbitrary number—like a project number. There are 2,000 images per microfilm magazine. Each reel is searched serially to retrieve the images.

However, few documents are 2,000 pages long. To use efficiently all the record space on a strip of film, you'd have to string together a series of documents. But then there would be no room for updating individual documents by adding pages.

By going to an image carrier whose capacity more nearly matches the size of the data to be recorded as a unit, you can manipulate a record, or update a file by purging or replacing records, without affecting other records. Furthermore, random access to a file lets you go right to the record you want without shuffling all the other records. Ideally, the data on a unit record ought to be just enough to be the answer to a question, making the packet of information an optimum size for random access.

TINY PICTURES

In the past few years, NASA, the Department of Defense, and a number of other agencies of the U.S. Government, as well as large and small businesses, have begun to standardize on the microfiche, a transparent film card first popularized in France. Microfiche is a 4-by-6 piece of film that carries several rows of microimages. This size fits the hand well, just the way punchcards were made dollar-bill size because they fit the hand and handle easily.

There is space at the top of a microfiche for labels that can be read by humans without further magnification. Because most of these film cards are meant to be viewed in enlarged form, rather than to serve as reproduction masters, they are made as positives rather than negatives so that halftone images can be seen more easily. The coded index for machine selection of each card can appear on the individual holders by which a card is gripped with a slide storage module. For example, the Houston Fearless Compact Automatic Retrieval Display (CARD) system has 750 microfiche mounted in slide holders. Pushbuttons on this film card reader set a selector bar pattern that matches the binary code pattern of notches in the desired holder, retrieving a microfiche and positioning a selected page on the screen in less than 4 seconds.

Aperture cards, which are essentially film chips of microimages inserted in standard punchcards, have the advantage of being readily sortable by standard punchcard machinery, but the images on the film chips are smaller and either have less capacity or require greater magnification.

On the surface, it appears that standardization on an image carrier like microfiche solves the problems of storing information in unit records. The 12-by-5 format of 60 image frames reduced 20:1 was first adopted by NASA predicated on a study of document lengths most often encountered by that Government agency. Generally, these documents ran to about fifty to sixty 8½- by 11-inch pages, so for NASA a unit of data matches the image carrier format.

But other kinds of organizations may have documents longer than 60 pages, so a series of microfiche film cards would be needed for a record. Or a greater reduction in image sizes, like 24:1, could put 98 frames on one microfiche. On the other hand, 90 percent of the patent documents run less than 10 pages, so a 60-frame carrier would be inefficiently used.

Many documents, especially technical reports in Europe, appear on legal-size paper, taking more area per frame. These differences in format and reduction ratio within the 4 by 6 size complicate the problem of designing inexpensive viewing devices. Despite the problem, the 4 by 6 size for up to 100 image frames is the least cost solution for the amount of film used in Government publishing activities.

Another aspect of the trade-offs involved in making image carriers more closely approximate unit records of information appears in the cost of publishing in microfiche. A higher image density would lower the per-page cost of publishing—the per-print cost of a microfiche is the same for first or last copy, but you get more pages. If printing press techniques are developed for mass reproduction of microfiche, long production runs would lower the copy cost.

There is always the tendency to reap economic benefits of filling up the microfiche if a document is shorter than the capacity of the image carrier. So, if you could get 4,000 pages on higher density image film chips, say 10 books of 400 pages, for $1, there is still a question of whether you want them all, or you are forced to buy nine books of data you don't want, which really raises the cost of the information you did want.

For this reason, Alfred Tauber of Houston Fearless Corp. foresees standard microfiche photocopying in the library as a major publishing activity. Libraries would circulate viewers and lend or sell 100-page microfiches duplicated from its master file.

Good deskviewers now on the market cost between $125 and $200, but these costs would come down to less than $50 if viewers were made in high production volumes. Simple handviewers—apparently intended for impoverished students with 20/20 eyes—are on the market now in the United States and Europe for about $2.50 to $10.

When the cost of circulation control gets greater than the cost of printing a microfiche copy, libraries would simply rent or lend viewers and gives copies away. The National Library of Medicine has found that the bookkeeping cost of billing for a $2 reproduction of a journal article from microfilm archives already exceeds the revenue.

I have dwelt on microfiche because the effects of publishing with this standardized medium will have significant effects on information storage and retrieval. When Government prime contractors are required to produce reports and part lists on this medium, the subcontractors are bound to be affected. Microfiche report dissemination or publishing may reduce the need for remote physical access to central files simply because you literally can store a small library in your desk. Your own index to its content can be more effective than somebody else's index to remote files; you attach your own viewpoint to content. And because you may be maintaining much larger microfiche collections of your own, computer services bureaus may find a thriving business in periodically updating or converting large personal indexes into associative lists or precoordinate indexes like the ones shown in this article. [Not printed in the RECORD.]

ELECTRONIC IMAGES

Most photographic techniques of storage require processing time, after which the image is fixed so that it cannot be moved around or its content altered. However, images can be stored instantly by linear scanning, with the scan trace signals stored on magnetic tape. Today many television programs are stored this way, and the technique has now been refined for storage and retrieval of document images.

A single page occupies about ⅓-inch on 2-inch wide tape and can be retrieved for viewing on a TV-type monitor or can be electrostatically reproduced in hard copy. The signals that form a document image can be transmitted by the same techniques as all TV signals, making high-resolution remote access dependent only on the bandwidth of the transmission medium. A file of images can be altered and juggled simply by erasing or recopying. Details of a Videofile storage and retrieval system for 750,000 documents, like the ones to be built by Ampex Corp. for 15 NASA centers, are shown in the photograph. [Not printed in the RECORD.]

REMOTE ACCESS TO TEXT

Several trends toward the linking of decentralized files are beginning to appear. I have said that the most active files are the ones used for fact retrieval and these can most easily justify automation. With inexpensive data-communication facilities, you might query an information center from your desk.

Stockbrokers now dial coded numbers, via telephone and Dataphone terminal equipment, to receive individual up-to-the-minute stock quotations from the memory of a central computer at the New York Stock Exchange. An unusual aspect of this particular system is that the query is answered by voice—words are selected by the computer from an audio record. (An inexpensive audio output device, the telephone, is available everywhere.)

A remote display screen or output typewriter can be operated through more expensive terminal equipment by a computer which can rapidly divide its operating time among several hundred querying stations.

Because a computer can retrieve and manipulate coded data bit by bit, it can be programed to find and assemble relevant parts of a number of encoded documents, rather than the complete documents. In effect you would be getting a new document, assembled from, say, a review section of one document, data tables and their explanations in another document, some pages of theory from another. This leads to the possibility of a true journal kept by a computer. As a subject field changes, data would be added or subtracted from the memory files. It would be a base of current data from which state-of-the-art documents could be printed.

Coded data, of course, are already in a form that can be readily communicated from one point to another via radio transmission, teletype, or ordinary telephone lines. The transfer of images via electronic techniques is more costly because bandwidths are needed unless you are willing to sacrifice either transmission speed or image resolution. At present, microform images are too small to be scanned with sufficient resolution for transmission. They must be enlarged, though microform scanning appears to be within the state of the optical art.

The practical cost of terminal equipment depends on how often you have to get access to remote files. The cost of data-communication links depends on the kind of transmission and the nature of the terminal equipment. You could justify mechanizing access to infrequently used files if all you needed were your telephone and an office copier.

Elements of such equipment are about to appear. Long distance xerography, called LDX, is already available from Xerox Corp. for remote reproduction on a page every 7 seconds. While it uses broadband transmission lines or microwave radio, a Magnavox-developed system is about to be marketed by Xerox for remote facsimile reproduction via acoustic coupling to ordinary telephones. You place your telephone receiver in a cradle next to this Magnafax machine; it operates on audible beeps at a reproduction rate on 6-min. page.

No matter what the data communication technique, it puts an information center in the business of generating signals for control of a remote printing plant. It is obvious that there are legal implications in the transfer and reproduction of copyrighted information from information retrieval systems, most of which tend toward storing only a single record of any block of data and reproducing it locally or remotely by various means.

While I have ranged widely over the State of the art of physical and intellectual approaches, one cannot fit them neatly into a conceptual framework—much less into an engineering design—for a network of information systems. We need to see how well they perform on a large scale in a working environment of real users. We haven't yet been able to measure how well they work in a laboratory.

THE LIBRARY OF THE FUTURE

For such experimentation, the university library seems a readymade pilot plant as well as a customer obviously in need of academic-plant modernization.

Last summer, MIT called a planning conference for Project Intrex (Information Transfer Experiment), to develop a coordinated program of experiments which would lead to a design for the evolutionary development of a large university library into an information transfer system exploiting the state of the art in the next 5 years. The university library of the future is visualized as the central resource of an information-transfer network encompassing the university's total information sources—not only published works, but departmental and laboratory files, conference papers, notes and correspondence, and even the individual members of the university's intellectual community.

The automated library project proposed at the University of Pennsylvania acknowledges that it would be impractical to duplicate the enormous indexing effort which has taken place for almost a century. One of the features of its system will be the automatic translation of the terms of one classification system into the closest corresponding terms in other classification systems. This partly paves the way for integration of a variety of reference catalogs into a network of information centers.

As a collection grows, or as lines of inquiry cross many files, and as many such collections are gathered into a network, it becomes obvious that some kind of generalized program of data management is needed to act as an agent between the data and the programs by which a user gains access to it. The user should be able to say: "This is what I am looking for. You worry about how and where to get it for me."

In a much simpler sense, this is what you now do when you ask a long-distance operator to find and to connect you with a person in a distant city. Now that you can dial directly, even to numbers within exchanges using different file formats and structures, your dialing language is still the same, but a service program in the computer-like telephone network acts in your behalf, as did the skilled long-distance operator.

THE ECONOMICS OF INFORMATION

The kind of information-system technology we have discussed can be justified only by widely dispersed technical communities of considerable size and only when total file activity among them is relatively high.

But there are hidden costs in national networks. Organizations which operate with information which is controlled for proprietary or security reasons will find it enormously expensive to install systems compatible with a national network of open literature.

Recently, Walter Carlson, who as director of technical information for the Department of Defense is pioneering research into the way technical information is used, made a personal guess at how much engineering information is transferred today by various channels (margin). Note, only 10 percent of the useful engineering information for a general audience (not mission- or project-oriented) in the United States seems to be handled by a national center.

The national engineering information system proposed recently by Engineers' Joint Council has estimated development costs of $10–20 million over a 5-year period. Its operating costs are expected to be $5–10 million per year, including the cost of links to other information centers. Are costs of this magnitude justifiable for only 10 percent of the information needs of engineers?

Perhaps so, says Carlson, who thinks that further study of the data cataloging activities of countless companies and institutions would reveal identical operations that might be reduced in cost by 75 percent if they were performed only once in a national center. Carlson also sees an orderly and comprehensive national system as an opportunity to relegate much searching for actual data to technicians and clerical personnel. A 1 percent decrease in average salaries to aid engineering work in the United States is equivalent to $100 million a year.

A PROPOSAL FOR A NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIME PREVENTION

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, our Federal Government spends more money fighting tooth decay than it spends fighting the moral decay represented by the Nation's crime rate. Our national crime rate is a national disgrace. When people are afraid to go out at night for fear of attack, in a very real sense, they have lost the valued democratic right of freedom of movement.

I am introducing today a bill to establish a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Crime Prevention. This Institute, comparable to the specialized Institutes set by the National Institutes of Health to do research in the cause and cure of various bodily diseases of man, would assist State and local law enforcement agencies by undertaking research and training programs, and collecting and disseminating information vital to the effective prevention and detection of crimes; crime on the street, in our parks, in our homes, and shops. One hundred million dollars would be authorized to assist States and localities in mounting a major assault on one of the key social ills plaguing our affluent society.

Every survey I have made of my own congressional district in the south Bronx shows that neighborhood security is the most common concern of the people who live there. I am sure that this anxiety is not unique. People in our major cities across the country as well as the rural folk who, acquainted with the gruesome murders reported currently in Truman Capote's book "In Cold Blood," live in fear that they may become the targets of unrestrained criminal activity.

Police chiefs throughout the country, in response to my recent inquiry, stated that adequate research funds is a universal deficiency. Most of our police are fighting 20th century crime with 19th century methods.

From the policeman on the beat to the scientist researching the most advanced techniques of the space age, our Nation's resources for fighting crime must be strengthened. The possible application of science to police work seems boundless. Yet the application of science and technology to police work is one of the most neglected aspects of current public safety programs.

The recent appointment of a National Crime Commission and the establishment of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance in the Justice Department is a start in the right direction. But it is only a start, for the resources currently available, both in terms of money and manpower, are extremely limited, and demonstrably inadequate to the need.

My bill would supplement rather than supersede these agencies by giving them the basic research tools, funds, and manpower to speed their work and implement their findings. Communities across the country are desperately looking to the Federal Government for help in attacking a national problem which, singly, they cannot effectively attack without major Federal resources and strong Federal leadership.

FACT SHEET ON FARM LABOR ISSUES

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a letter which I received from an outstanding citizen of California.

Seniel Ostrow is the president of the Sealy Mattress Co., which has plants and offices across the Nation.

He is, more importantly, a man of wisdom and understanding whose social conscience prompts him to seek justice for his fellow man.

I am pleased to share his letter and views with my colleagues:

SEALY MATTRESS CO.,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 14, 1966.

Re bill H.R. 10518.
Hon. PHILLIP BURTON,
House Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was appalled when I read some of the facts regarding this bill. I am enclosing a copy of these facts which I am sure you are familiar with.

As a substantial taxpayer, I feel I have the right and privilege to urge you to see that this bill is passed. If we fail to do something now for these underprivileged people, we can blame no one but ourselves if we continue to have riots such as the one in Watts recently.

If these people do not get relief, I can visualize each one as a prime prospect for communism.

Respectfully,
SENIEL OSTROW,
President.

[From the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, 112 East 19th Street, New York, N.Y.]

FACT SHEET ON FARM LABOR ISSUES

MINIMUM WAGE

Do farmworkers need a minimum wage? Yes. In 1963, the Department of Agriculture's survey showed that while the average wage for farmworkers is $1.17 an hour, almost half of all agricultural workers earned less than 75 cents an hour. Farmworkers' average annual wage last year was $1,312, which includes earnings from nonfarm as well as farmwork. Of all industries presently covered by minimum wage legislation, the retail trades have the lowest average wages; yet their average hourly wage is nearly double that of farmworkers.

Will higher labor costs put an unfair burden on the smaller farmer? No. The bill (H.R. 10518) if passed, will only cover farms that employ more than 300 man-days of labor in any one quarter. Such farms are only about 2 percent of the total number of farms in the United States. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, less than 9 percent of all farmers own 40 percent of all farmland, account for nearly 50 percent of all farm sales, and pay almost 70 percent of all farm wage bills. These 9 percent of all farmers are, in effect, the corporate giants of American agriculture. The farms which would be covered are as financially capable of paying higher wages as any industrial giant. The family farmer will benefit by no longer having to compete with cheap farm labor.

Will higher wages cause significantly higher retail food prices? No. The cost of field labor is a very small part of the retail price of most farm products. Even if the wages of all field laborers were doubled, the cost of fruits and vegetables would rise no more than a penny or two per item.

What will be the effect of the bill on our economy? Minimum wage coverage for farmworkers will give a boost to the whole economy. Presently, the underpaid farm laborer's consuming power is limited by his low income. His poverty represents millions of pounds of meat that were not bought; millions of pairs of shoes that were not purchased. The increased demand for goods and services represented by these purchases will benefit the whole economy.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Will administration of an unemployment compensation law be difficult because of the migratory nature of farmwork? No. Studies made in 1960 by the employment security agencies of Arizona, Connecticut, Nebraska, and New York revealed that, regardless of size, farm operators do keep accurate records. Like other businessmen, these farmers must keep records for income tax purposes, social security deductions, and for payments to their employees. In the four States studied, for example, 89 percent of the hired farmworkers were paid by check. It should be noted that for the past 6 years Hawaii has successfully administered an unemployment compensation program covering agricultural workers.

Won't the cost of extending unemployment benefits be prohibitive? No. While estimates of unemployment compensation costs for agricultural workers are slightly higher than the overall average, they are in no way prohibitive. In fact, in three of the four States mentioned above, the cost ratio was actually lower than that of nonagricultural workers. In comparison with other seasonal industries which are already covered—construction, garment trades, food processing—again the cost ratio would be lower for farmworkers.

A SALUTE TO PAN AMERICAN DAY

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add my voice to those of my colleagues in commemoration of Pan American Day. It is my earnest hope that the bonds of friendship and mutual cooperation which bind our peoples today will be wisely nurtured and become more meaningful and vigorous. The recognition of the need for closer relations between the Americas has not been limited to North

Americans, but the Latin American Republics themselves have long been aware of the need for such programs. Through the Organization of American States and the Pan American Union the people of both North and South America have banded together in an attempt to overcome the many difficulties, both domestic and foreign, which still plague millions of Latin America's citizens. It is unfortunate that in this country a few groups and individuals have lost their enthusiasm for the inter-American program. They have become impatient because progress has sometimes been slow and solutions often difficult. But they fail to realize the extreme depth of some of the problems which confront the governments of those member countries of the inter-American community. Just as in the case of many of our own domestic problems, there are simply no easy or pat solutions to difficulties which have beset Latin America for decades.

However, it would be foolish for us to resign ourselves to a condition of defeatism or pessimism. For despite some of the difficulties encountered by the OAS, it has most certainly proved itself to be a practical tool in tackling numerous threats to the stability of many of the Latin American Republics. We would do well to remember that even the path to eventual hemispheric unity was sometimes a tortuous and painstaking one.

It was Simon Bolivar, the great South American patriot, who forecast as early as 1826 a union of Western Hemisphere states. At that time the integrity, indeed, the very existence of the newly independent Latin American states was being menaced by the Austrian, Prussian, and Russian Holy Alliance. Bolivar was convinced that through mutual cooperation and uniting, the young states could better protect their countries from European aggrandizement. Thus, Simon Bolivar, a man of extreme vision and foresight, issued the call for a conference to be held in Panama in 1826.

Despite his personal stature and the practicality of the proposed union, Bolivar's Panama Conference was a failure. Only Mexico, Central America, Colombia, and Peru were represented. Argentina and Paraguay refused to send delegates. Due to various opposing points of view in our Congress, there was too much unnecessary delay in designating the American delegates. Once they were named, death claimed one and the other arrived in Panama after the conference had concluded. Thus, the first attempt at launching a union of American states fell short of expectations.

Numerous other efforts were undertaken to initiate a plan of union. In one instance, a meeting in Peru in 1847 was convened, but its tone was directed primarily at the United States and its war with Mexico. But unfortunately all other efforts at securing some kind of union for international cooperation were unsuccessful.

In 1899 representatives from 18 of the then 19 American Republics met in Washington, D.C. None of them were aware of the historic action in which they were about to engage. Not even the United States, which issued the invitation, expected discussions on other than commercial matters. Earlier experiences with alliances and cooperative leagues had left a bitter taste in the mouths of many of the Latin Republics. Also, some of the states were experiencing difficulties along their common borders with sister Republics. It is understandable therefore that the smaller states which distrusted the larger and more powerful ones, were in no hurry to risk their national sovereignty with an international body which might endanger their well-being.

The first Pan American conference to which we owe so much went only as far as setting up a small bureau of commerce, with power to distribute trade information. That was a first step along a winding and uphill path. But during the early part of the 20th century, Pan American unity became an even more difficult goal. That was the era during which this country assumed the role of Caribbean policeman. Time has given us the opportunity to understand the circumstances which caused President Theodore Roosevelt to formulate his policy of preventive intervention, which later became known as the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. Stated in a nutshell, the President was confronted with a genuine dilemma. On the one hand, instability and political unrest in Latin America had given European powers various excuses to intervene into the domestic affairs of some of the Latin Republics. On the other hand, American policy was hostile to European encroachment in Latin America. President Roosevelt decided that if the United States would not permit other states to intervene, the United States itself must undertake to guarantee the integrity of the Republics and enhance their political stability. Thus we undertook after 1905 to shore up such states as the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Guatemala. Each of us is aware of the resentment and bitterness which that policy engendered. That antagonism burst forth in 1928 at the Pan American Conference in Cuba. Frequent and scathing attacks were made on our interventionist policies. It became only too clear that no meaningful degree of cooperation could evolve out of such apprehension and hostility.

But at the 1933 conference at Montevideo, Uruguay, the United States took an historic step when it renounced the policy of unilateral intervention. The adoption of a "good neighbor" policy cleared the way for achieving the unity of purpose which men like Bolivar had sought since 1826.

Now I realize that I have dwelt at some length on the historical background of inter-American relations, but I did so only in an attempt to indicate some of the upheavals and difficulties from which our present apparatus has emerged. We have passed many milestones in the quest for inter-American cooperation including the Alliance for Progress. A more recent accomplishment was passage by the Congress on February 19, 1966, of Public Law 89-355 which established the Interama facilities in Miami, Fla. That program marks another positive step taken in the interest of better understanding and closer cooperation between the two areas. It is my sincere desire that the Latin American Republics and the United States will take full advantage of the facilities which Interama will provide. I am convinced that through the full utilization of the cultural and trade center apparatus available there, a more solid and lasting bond of friendship will be established. The creation of Interama is, to me, a dream come true, but the dream must not end there. As we mark another anniversary of Pan American Day observances, I am ever hopeful that the dreams of cooperation and understanding held by other men and women of good will may come to fruition.

LESLIE L. BIFFLE

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday evening one of the noblest men ever to adorn Capitol Hill in any capacity and one of the greatest of Americans passed to his reward—Leslie L. Biffle.

Leslie Biffle, the son of Billie B. and Ella Turner Biffle, was born at Boydsville, Ark., October 9, 1889. He was educated at the Piggott, Ark., High School, the Keys Institute at Little Rock, Ark., and held the doctor of laws degree from Dartmouth College.

Mr. Biffle first came to Washington as secretary to Representative Bruce Macon, of Arkansas, in 1909. In 1913 the late Senator Joseph Robinson gave him a patronage job in the Senate folding room. Mr. Biffle stayed there for several years, except for a tour as a War Department auditor in France during World War I. He held various jobs in the Senate until, in 1933, he became secretary for the majority. Mr. Biffle held this position until February 8, 1945, when he was unanimously elected as Secretary of the Senate to succeed Col. Edwin Halsey. With Colonel Halsey's death, Leslie L. Biffle became the 15th Secretary of the Senate.

In 1941, President Roosevelt appointed him as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission where he served until 1945. At the 1944 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, he was elected acting sergeant at arms in Colonel Halsey's absence. When he became Secretary of the Senate, he also assumed the duties as secretary-treasurer of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee, as well as sergeant at arms of the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Biffle still holds these two offices.

On January 4, 1947, at the beginning of the 80th Congress, Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, replaced Mr. Biffle as Secretary of the Senate. Mr. Biffle became executive director of the Democratic policy committee in the Senate and continued to serve as sergeant at arms of the Democratic National Committee as well as secretary-treasurer of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee. He was again unanimously elected Secretary of the Senate on January 3, 1949, at the beginning of the 81st Congress. He served in this capacity until he was succeeded on January 3, 1953, by Mr. J. Mark Trice.

Mr. Biffle gained nationwide fame in 1948 when he, disguised as a chicken farmer, toured the Nation while conducting his own private poll as to political sentiments. His travels enabled him to correctly forecast the political outcome of the elections, even though every professional pollster predicted that Thomas E. Dewey would win by a large majority, and at the same time, lead the Republican Party to control of Congress.

The relationship that existed between Mr. Biffle and President Truman was extremely close, in fact, he was the first Secretary of the Senate ever to have a direct line between his office and the White House.

In 1952, while inspecting the Senate Library, which was under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Senate, he found about 100 historical manuscripts which had gone unnoticed for many years. The discovery included messages and other items—mostly on routine matters such as nominations—signed by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Daniel Webster, John Adams, Zachary Taylor, and others. One was the nomination of John Marshall as Secretary of War. Another was one of June 17, 1797, reporting on American tribute paid by bay of Tripoli. At one time, the barbary pirates sallied forth from Tripoli to prey on American commerce, and the tribute was extended in the hope of buying them off.

While it is not uncommon for the Secretary of the Senate to, on occasion, preside during Senate sessions, Mr. Biffle was the first Secretary of the Senate in history to preside over a period as long as 2 days. He did so at the beginning of the 80th Congress when the dispute over Senator Bilbo's taking his seat held up the election of a new President pro tem. This was during the period that the United States was without a Vice President.

Leslie Biffle was a man who was never satisfied just to fill his job. He made every job he held bigger by the competent and devoted service he rendered in the performance of his duty. Few men other than the Presidents of the United States have had more influence upon the legislation of our country and the course of Congress than Leslie Biffle during the many years that he served the Senate and the country. Few men had more influence upon the Democratic Party in the shaping of its platforms and its national conventions, in the election of its Members to the Congress and in the drafting, consideration, and enactment of legislation in the Congress than Leslie Biffle. He was the trusted confidante, wise counselor, and ever-ready assistant of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman over the tumultuous years of the depression, the prewar period, World War II, the aftermath thereof and the Korean war; and even after he left the service of the Senate, two Presidents, Kennedy and Johnson.

No one other than the President knew what was going on in Washington better than Leslie Biffle. People all over America consulted him and sought his counsel as well as Presidents, Cabinet members, heads of state and Members of Congress, and leaders of the Democratic Party.

Leslie Biffle was the personification of the dedicated, unassuming, ever-diligent and faithful public servant. All who knew him respected him; innumerable friends admired him and loved him.

From the time Mrs. Pepper and I came to Washington in late 1936, Leslie Biffle and his lovely, gracious wife, Glade, became our devoted friends and through the intervening years they have been two of the most cherished of our friends. We have also been happy in the friendship of Leslie's two sisters: Mrs. Charles Clark Hillman and Mrs. Blanche Sanders, who live in Miami, and a fine nephew, Billy B. Sanders of Miami. A faithful secretary, a gracious and competent lady dedicated to Leslie has immeasurably helped him in the performance of his notable public service over a period of 30 years, Mrs. Jack—Betty—Darling. Her friendship with that of her husband we, too, have been fortunate to enjoy.

The world is vastly poorer that this quiet, warmhearted, able, dedicated man is no longer among us.

But Leslie Biffle will live on into the infinite future of this America he helped to make better in the legend he left of the ideal public servant to be emulated by countless young Americans in the years ahead; in the friendships he left behind to be cherished by innumerable friends and in the memory which will remain of him by all who were fortunate enough to have been associated with him, as the kind, gentle, warmhearted, charming, gracious, and great gentleman.

Truly we shall not see his like again.

As I know do all the Members of this House, who knew Leslie Biffle, Mrs. Pepper and I, to his dear and gracious wife, Glade, to his sisters, Beatrice and Blanche, and his nephew Billy, extend our heartfelt sympathy.

It is our hope, Mr. Speaker, that through the cooperation of his devoted and bereaved friends there may somewhere be created a suitable memorial to the memory of this rare, special, great, and good man, Leslie L. Biffle.

Mr. Speaker, a very fitting and merited tribute to Mr. Biffle appeared in the Washington Post of today. I include this editorial in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE

During his 44 years of service as an employee of the U.S. Senate, ending with his tenure as Secretary of the Senate in 1952, Leslie L. Biffle was the very ideal of a legislative functionary. His infinite attention to all the details of the legislative process freed successive senatorial "employers" from duties and responsibilities that otherwise would have impinged upon their responsibility for policy. He was the sort of indefatigable, tireless, self-effacing detail man that every official searches for and that few find.

Politics was his life. The son of an officeholder, he was brought up to understand public affairs and to enjoy them from early youth. He was always the faithful adjutant, but he was not without political instinct and purposes of his own. His relationships with Senator Joseph Robinson were close and his rapport with President Truman was complete.

The business of Congress could not go forward without such public servants. They are often relatively unknown to most citizens, but the mark of their personality nevertheless is on countless pieces of legislation that never would come to pass without their largely anonymous contributions to congressional deliberation. Leslie L. Biffle, on his own merit and as the personification of loyal legislative servants like him, deserves the tribute of his countrymen.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in the morning Washington Post there was a splendid article about Leslie Biffle written by an old friend, Edward T. Folliard. I include that article in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

LESLIE BIFFLE, FORMER SECRETARY OF U.S. SENATE, IS DEAD AT 76

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Leslie L. Biffle, former Secretary of the U.S. Senate, who bucked the pollsters and predicted President Harry S. Truman's great upset victory in the 1948 election, died of pneumonia yesterday in the Mar-Salle Convalescent Home here. He was 76.

Mr. Biffle, an ardent Democrat from Piggott, Ark., put in 44 years of service on Capitol Hill. That in itself was not extraordinary, but his immense popularity was, for he was liked, admired, and trusted by Republicans as well as Democrats.

This was reflected in the Senate Chamber yesterday when Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, announced Mr. Biffle's death.

"I had no better friend in this Nation's Capital than Leslie Biffle," MCCLELLAN said, "He was a true patriot and one of America's finest citizens."

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, expressed "great sadness."

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the Republican leader, gave voice to his grief, and so did others on the GOP side of the aisle who had known the courtly little man from Piggott.

HONORED BY PRESS

Mr. Biffle was one of those fortunate men who had a chance to smell the flowers long before his death. Late in 1952, on the occasion of his retirement as Secretary of the Senate, 300 members of the Washington press corps turned out to honor him at the National Press Club. Their spokesman hailed him as "the beau ideal of a public servant." President Truman added his bouquet in the form of a letter expressing his "warm friendship" for Biffle.

On January 22, 1959, more than a thousand friends of "Biff" assembled in the grand ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel to celebrate the 50th anniversary of his entry into Government service. Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, Republican dean of the Senate, passed up a White House dinner to be on hand, Lyndon B. Johnson, then the Democratic leader of the Senate, attended the White House dinner but then dashed to the Biffle party in white tie and tails.

Mr. Biffle was so moved by it all that he gave way to tears.

The friendship between former President Truman and Mr. Biffle began when the Missourian arrived on Capitol Hill as a freshman Senator in 1935. Mr. Biffle helped Senator Truman get the chairmanship of the War Investigating Committee that brought him fame.

SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. Biffle was sergeant at arms of the Democratic National Convention of 1944 at Chicago, and here he worked to win for Senator Truman the vice-presidential nomination. Four years later, at the party's national convention in Philadelphia, he was influential in making Senator Alben Barkley, of Kentucky, the vice-presidential nominee.

After that convention, Mr. Biffle decided to conduct a one-man poll to see how the Truman-Barkley ticket stacked up against the Republican ticket of Dewey-Warren.

He changed from his Capitol Hill clothes to a faded green shirt, a pair of soiled tan slacks and a battered straw hat, and then rented a 1942 Ford truck to tour the country as an itinerant chicken buyer.

CAME HERE IN 1909

He drove through the Ohio and Mississippi valleys, buying chickens and talking to farmers, merchants and store loafers. And when he came back to Washington, he said that Gallup and other pollsters were wrong—that the Truman-Barkley ticket would win. He was a very lonely man until the votes were counted.

Mr. Biffle was born at Boydsville, Ark., October 9, 1889, and attended high school at Piggott and the Keys Institute at Little Rock. He first came to Washington as secretary to Representative Bruce Macon, of Arkansas, in 1909. In 1913 Senator Joseph Robinson, Democrat, of Arkansas, got him a patronage job in the Senate folding room. He held various jobs on the Senate side of the Capitol (except for a tour of France in World War I as a War Department auditor) and in 1933 became secretary for the Senate majority.

Mr. Biffle was holding this office when, on February 8, 1945, he was unanimously elected as Secretary of the Senate to succeed Col. Edwin Halsey. He was so popular with the Republicans that they didn't bother to go through the ritual of running a candidate of their own. Mr. Biffle was replaced as Secretary when the Republicans took over the 80th Congress, but again took over the post on January 3, 1949, at the beginning of the 81st Congress. He served in it until January 3, 1953.

Mr. Biffle, who had been ill for more than a year, is survived by his wife, Glade, who lives at the Westchester, 4000 Cathedral Avenue, NW., and two sisters, Mrs. Charles Clark Hillman and Blanche Sanders, both of Miami.

Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. Saturday in the Bethlehem Chapel of the Washington Cathedral, with private burial in Fort Lincoln Cemetery.

REV. JOSEPH F. THORNING, A GREAT CHAMPION FOR PAN AMERICAN UNITY

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, this House has been honored today as it has on so many other occasions when we commemorated Pan American Day, in having the morning invocation delivered by "The Padre of the Americas" Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning.

For many years it has been my wife's and my privilege to enjoy the friendship of this great contributor to the cause of Pan American unity and progress. No man understands the Americas, has a nobler vista of their future and a higher concept of their destiny than he. This cause has been close to Dr. Thorning's heart and the subject of his eminent scholarship and indefatigable efforts for many years. In the area of the inter-American life he speaks as did the Master: "As one with authority."

I wish to commend to my colleagues a very interesting article about the Reverend Thorning which appears in Joe Eisenhauer's notebook in the Frederick, Md., News Post on November 1, 1965, and I insert the article in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

"THE PADRE OF THE AMERICAS" HERE IN THE HEART OF MARYLAND

An announcement has just been made by Dr. Lewis F. Haines, director of the University of Florida Press, which may serve as an index to the work of the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, author of the best-selling biography of Francisco de Miranda, of Venezuela. The book, which was written in "the heart of Maryland," Frederick County, according to the officials of the University of Florida, is to go into its fourth printing, because of its perennial appeal.

When "Miranda: World Citizen" was first published in 1952, it was described, three times, by the editors of the New York Times Book Review as "one of the outstanding books of the year." The need for a new edition indicates how popular the biography of the precursor of Latin American independence continues to be.

Introduction to this study of Miranda, one of the most romantic figures of the Western Hemisphere, was written by Galo Plaza, at the time President of Ecuador. The preface was the work of Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, the only preface the latter ever produced except for one of his own books. Mr. Welles, among other things, wrote as follows "I regard this biography of Francisco de Miranda, by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, as an immensely valuable contribution to the cause of inter-American understanding." Scholars in South and Central America, in their reviews, published in Spanish, Portuguese, and French, paid similar tributes to Dr. Thorning's work.

"Miranda: World Citizen," it may be noted, was often praised and quoted in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. This often took place on Pan American Day, April 14, when Father Thorning, at the invitation of leaders of both parties, has offered the invocation in the Congress.

Another interesting development about the book prepared in Frederick County is that it is being translated into French by Madame Georges Heisbourg wife of the Luxembourg Ambassador now accredited to the Netherlands. It is expected that the French edition will be brought out in Paris.

At the same time, "Miranda: World Citizen" is being translated into Portuguese by Miss Vera de Faro, member of a prominent family of Sao Paulo, Brazil, presently serving as cultural attaché in the Brazilian Embassy, Washington. The Portuguese version is to be published in Rio de Janeiro.

Dr. Thorning, it has often been remarked in a number of world capitals, including Lisbon and Madrid, "not only writes history", but also "makes history". It was the Maryland educator, author and diplomat who persuaded the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1939 to keep the embargo on arms to the Iberian Peninsula. This insured the victory of the Nationalists in the Spanish Civil War. During the contest itself, he had served as a Special Correspondent of the National Catholic Welfare News Service and wrote several feature articles on the same subject, at the invitation of another Marylander, Dr. Felix Morley, a Rhodes scholar and the then editor of the Washington Post. These pieces in the religious press throughout the globe and in the Washington Post elicited wide, favorable attention. One result was the 17 to 1 vote in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and an equally decisive vote in the U.S. House Foreign Affairs Committee not to permit the shipping of bombing planes and machineguns to the Leftist forces in Spain. The latter surrendered on March 31, 1939. As a token of appreciation, the Spanish Government awarded to Dr. Thorning its highest honor, "The Grand Cross of the Order of Isabella the Catholic."

More history was made by "The Padre of the Americas," as he was affectionately termed by Democratic Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, when he led the movement, after World War II and the attempted ostracism of Spain, which culminated in the reestablishment of full diplomatic relations between the Spanish Government and the overwhelming majority of free Nations. This paved the way for the two-thirds vote which brought Spain an invitation to join the United Nations, UNESCO and other important U.N. agencies. Again, the Spanish people and the Spanish Government showed their gratitude by awarding to Dr. Thorning their highest accolade for cultural achievement, "The Grand Cross of Alfonso the Wise." This greatly-coveted decoration was founded to honor the memory of King Alfonso, who gathered together in his court the most gifted Jewish, Christian and Moslem physicians, poets, theologians historians, astronomers, mathematicians, chemists, physicists, philosophers, engineers, novelists and musicians. It was for this reason that Alfonso X, is known as "Alfonso the Wise".

Almost all the other American Republics followed the example of Spain by awarding their highest honors to the Maryland priest-scholar. Moreover Portugal inducted Father Thorning into the famous "Military Order of Christ", one of the most ancient orders of chivalry in Europe.

Dr. Thorning will also be remembered in the history of the Free State as the first priest ever to be appointed by the White House and the State Department to serve on special diplomatic missions to South America, Central America, and the Caribbean. He also acted as special adviser, with diplomatic status to the U.S. senatorial delegation to the 10th Pan American Conference in Caracas, Venezuela, in March 1954.

One effect of this gathering was a resolution which brought about the liberation of the people of Guatemala where the military dictators of the Soviet empire had been able to establish a beachhead. Freedom was restored to Guatemala in June 1954, 3 months after the Caracas conference.

Since the death of Prof. Percy Alvin Martin of Leland Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif., Dr. Thorning has been elected and reelected the one U.S. honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil. He is also honorary professor of international relations of the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution. For the past 20 years, he has been an associate editor of the magazine, World Affairs, Washington, D.C.

Recently, the Reverend Dr. Joseph E. O'Neill, S.J., editor in chief of Thought, Fordham University, has asked Dr. Thorning to review the more important books about Spain. At the moment, he is examining a new volume, "Spain: The Gentle Anarchy" by Benjamin Welles, sons of Dr. Thorning's friend, Sumner Welles. Benjamin Welles served in Spain for 5 years as special correspondent of the New York Times. He, too, is one of the Maryland author's numerous friends.

During the past summer, Dr. Thorning was the guest of Mrs. Morris Cafritz, celebrated Washington hostess, in Denmark, Sweden, Spain, and Portugal. Although Mrs. Cafritz herself summered in Monte Carlo, as is her custom, she provided the European trip for the Maryland diplomat as a mark of her interest in Father Thorning's 50 years in the service of God. He continues to serve God and the children of God at historic St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor. Some day, he hopes to find time to publish his memoirs. The rectory is overflowing with documents.

HOUSE LEADER LAUDS JOHNSON

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the distinguished vice chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] made some forceful comments on recent attacks on the President's pay and fringe benefits bill. The gentleman from Louisiana reminded those who have been critical of the administration proposal that Mr. Johnson is one of the greatest friends Federal and postal employees have ever had in the White House. Mr. MORRISON's remarks were reported by Joseph Young in the March 20, Sunday, Washington Star, and I commend them to my colleagues' attention:

HOUSE LEADER LAUDS JOHNSON, RAPS UNION CARPING AT PAY BILL

(By Joseph Young)

The vice chairman of the House Civil Service Committee has sharply criticized leaders of the unaffiliated Government employees unions for failing to support President Johnson's 3.2 percent pay-fringe proposal for Federal and postal workers.

Representative JAMES MORRISON, Democrat, of Louisiana, author of most of the Government pay raise laws that have been enacted in the last 15 years, said he resented inferences that President Johnson was less liberal in his attitude toward Government workers than was former President Eisenhower.

MORRISON referred to testimony by Nathan Wolkomir, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees, and other leaders of unaffiliated organizations who strongly attacked the administration's proposal as being far too inadequate.

In contrast, the big three Government employee unions (all affiliated with the AFL–CIO)—the National Association of Letter Carriers, the United Federation of Postal Clerks, and the American Federation of Government Employees—have reluctantly endorsed the President's 3.2-percent plan.

MORRISON said that under the circumstances of the Vietnam war and the serious threat of inflation, Johnson's proposal was the best that could be expected and that Government employees should be grateful to him for making any pay proposal this year.

He said Government pay raises in the last 5 years under the Kennedy-Johnson administrations have averaged about 5 percent a year compared to 3.2 percent during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration.

MORRISON said Johnson is one of the greatest friends Federal and postal employees have ever had in the White House.

The Louisianan said Johnson's 3.2-percent plan is the best that could be obtained this year and he predicted its passage by Congress.

Comparison: In a voice filled with emotion, MORRISON declared during the House unit's pay hearings:

"I would like to point out that during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration there were three vetoes of Federal employees' salary bills. Two of the vetoed bills never passed, while the third was enacted by the Congress over President Eisenhower's veto. The aggregate of pay raises during those 8 years was 26.1 percent, or an average of approximately 3.2 percent a year.

"Now, the salary increases for Federal employees during the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, including the 3.2-percent package recommended by President Johnson which is now before us, amounts to 24.1 percent, which would be slightly less than an average of 5 percent per year for 5 years."

MORRISON noted Johnson's direct intervention in the pay raise situation in 1963 after the measure had been defeated in the House. He noted that it was Johnson who resurrected the bill and was primarily responsible for getting it enacted into law.

"He [Johnson] could just as well have taken the position that the Congress had acted, and that all parties concerned would have to wait until the next session of Congress and come up with another recommendation," MORRISON said. "But he did act, and I think he was motivated primarily, in taking the calculated risk to his prestige had he not been successful, by his conviction as to the needs and responsibilities of Federal employees and the personal feeling of real warmth he holds for them."

MORRISON, who is regarded as the strongest friend Government workers have in the House, said that when the time is right, he will lead the move to obtain true comparability in Government salaries. But he emphasized that this is not the time.

"Certainly, no President could ignore, in his approach to Federal salary legislation, the urgent demands of the war in Vietnam, the needs of our fighting men there, and the threat of inflation which, if unchecked, could imperil the successful conclusion of that conflict," MORRISON said.

"It is relatively easy and simple to sit here, either in committee or as a witness or in writing a press column, and utter harsh words," he continued. "In the final analysis, actions speak much louder than words. The actions over the years which I have summarized can well speak for themselves."

LAW AND ORDER

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our communities have recently been afflicted with a strange malady—indifference and at times even antipathy, of its citizens to the efforts of our peace officers in the enforcement of our laws and maintenance of peace, as well as lethargy, in the face of criminal attacks upon the members of the community.

We remember the incident that took place on the streets of Queens in New York City in the early hours of the morning when a killer attacked a helpless young lady who was returning to her home from work while some 20 people, who either heard her screams or saw the assault, failed to lift a finger to assist her or even to call the police as she was being murdered in cold blood in what purports to be a civilized community.

Has life become so cheap that we care not what happens to it? Are we so craven that we crouch in fear while criminals murder our people? I cannot believe that this is so.

It is, therefore, refreshing to me and reaffirms my faith in man and his social responsibility, when a group of our citizens voluntarily recognizes their responsibility for law and order in the community and pledges itself to supply leadership and energy to that end.

We must make it fashionable again for our good people to ban together to fight and defeat the lawless element which terrorizes and destroys our people and our institutions.

The National Association of Insurance Agents, consisting of 170,000 members, has expressed its firm and unanimous stand in a resolution adopted by it to aid peace officers perform their duties, to report any instance of crime, to aid peace officers in distress, to encourage other citizens to do likewise and to single out and publicly commend citizens and groups who perform outstanding deeds in the maintenance of law and order.

I congratulate them on their spirit of unselfish public service and commend their actions to our fellow Americans. I am pleased to join them in their cause.

Their letter to me outlining the reasons which prompt them to embark upon this effort and the resolution pledging their support to the cause of law and order follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE
AGENTS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 29, 1966.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
13th District, Brooklyn, N.Y.

MY DEAR MR. MULTER: We are pleased to put into your hands a resolution opposing lawlessness and supporting the activities of law enforcement officers, adopted by more than 170,000 businessmen—community leaders from all over the United States. This firm and unanimous stand was expressed recently by the board of directors of the National Association of Insurance Agents, on behalf of its 170,000 members.

It is the NAIA's belief that at no time in the history of our country has the American citizen been less secure. Many Americans are trying to understand what has brought their society to the brink of savagery and jungle law, as represented, for instance, in the Watts riots and other civil disobedience.

The resolution notes the apathy of many citizens toward law and order; the failure of many others to respect law and cooperate with law enforcement officials; the fear of personal involvement or disinterest of too many citizens, which prevents timely police action; and the coddling and protection of criminals and hoodlums.

Therefore, the resolution pledges leadership in encouraging citizens to do their duty in combating the criminal elements. The agents also vowed to acknowledge and discharge their obligations as citizens by reporting to the nearest law enforcement officer any evidence of crime; to aid officers in distress at their request and direction; and to solicit the assistance and cooperation of all civic, service, business, trade, and other groups, locally, statewide, and nationally.

Respectfully yours,

ALAN S. JEFFREY,
Executive Secretary.

LAW AND ORDER RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE AGENTS, INC., NEW YORK, N.Y.

Whereas the apathy of many citizens toward law and order has reached an alltime high; and

Whereas the failure of many citizens to observe and respect law and to cooperate with law enforcement officials has become more noticeable daily; and

Whereas the fear of personal involvement or disinterest of too many citizens, which prevents timely police action and speedy apprehension of criminals; and

Whereas the coddling and protection of criminals and hoodlums in some instances has produced a staggering increase in crime, as well as in the number of criminals who prey on our families and our property, with immunity: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the National Association of Insurance Agents, That we agree to sponsor and furnish the necessary leadership for a positive program to encourage citizens to do their duty in combating the criminal element and to:

(a) Acknowledge and discharge our obligations as good citizens by observing the laws, and to encourage others so to do, and

(b) To report to the nearest law enforcement officers any evidence of a crime being committed, or having been committed, and

(c) To aid officers in distress at their request and direction, and

(d) To solicit the assistance and cooperation of all civic, service, business, trade, and other groups locally, statewide and nationally, and

(e) To single out and publicly commend citizens and groups who perform outstanding deeds in the maintenance of law and order, and

(f) To establish as paramount the right of every person to be protected from crimes against his person and property.

A PROTEST AGAINST TURKISH ATTACKS ON THE EASTERN ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATE

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give voice to the growing concern of the American Hellenic community for an embattled fortress of religious faith. I speak of the Eastern Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople, or Istanbul, which is experiencing intensified harassment at the hands of the Turkish Government.

The Patriarchate in Istanbul has for 16 centuries been the "first See of Orthodoxy." Its central figure, His Holiness Patriarch Athenagoras, is the primate of approximately 200 million Eastern Orthodox Christians. His See in Istanbul is the center of Orthodoxy, much as Rome is the center of Roman Catholicism.

The difficulty the Patriarchate is encountering today was demonstrated recently by an incident involving a visit to Istanbul made early in February by His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos, of New York, primate of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America and the official representative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in this hemisphere. Archbishop Iakovos is an American citizen, I should here note.

Immediately upon his arrival and during his entire stay, the Archbishop reported, he was followed by members of the security police of the Turkish Government. The surveillance continued even during a 26-hour visit made by the Archbishop and Patriarch Athenagoras to the island of Halki, site of the Orthodox Theological School.

Mr. Speaker, the archbishop had been scheduled to celebrate the Divine Liturgy Sunday morning, February 6, in the Church of St. George on the Patriarchate grounds. That Sunday was the Feast Day of St. Photios, patron saint of the Theological School of Halki, and was coincidentally the 11th anniversary of the consecration of Archbishop Iakovos as a bishop of the church. But on Saturday of that week, the governor of Istanbul telephoned Patriarch Athenagoras and informed him that according to a provision of an old law prohibiting a non-Turkish citizen from serving the Divine Liturgy in Istanbul, Archbishop Iakovos would not be permitted to perform the ceremony as planned the next morning.

Because of this sudden and arbitrary restriction, Archbishop Iakovos left Istanbul without celebrating the Liturgy. The Greek Orthodox constituency in the Americas has properly construed this event as a humiliation of its spiritual leader and has taken it as a personal affront and insult to the Greek Orthodox church in America.

PROTEST BY NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this was not just an isolated event worthy of notice only by a small group of people. It was part of a pattern of harassment which commands the concern of all who care for the unfettered practice of religion and the freedom of religious institutions. This broad concern is properly reflected in the reaction of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States, whose policymaking board expressed "a deep sense of shock." Under unanimous consent I incorporate in the RECORD an article in the New York Times reporting on the Statement of the National Council of Churches.

CURBS ON CHURCH BY TURKS DECRIED—COUNCIL CITES OPPRESSION OF THE GREEK PATRIARCHATE

(By George Dugan)

The National Council of Churches voiced a "deep sense of shock" this week over what it described as Turkish harassment and oppression of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Istanbul.

Pressures on the "first See of Orthodoxy" have increased rather than lessened, according to a statement approved unanimously by the council's policymaking general board. The council is a federation of most of the major Protestant and Eastern Orthodox churches in this country.

Of the patriarchate in Istanbul, the council said:

"Its gradual isolation from the world religious community, confiscation of its church properties by a spurious 'Turkish Orthodox Church' with governmental approval, shutting down of the patriarchal orphanage and press, systematic expulsion of its faithful—all point to a program of intimidation calculated to render this historic center ineffectual."

RECENT INCIDENT CITED

The council singled out for special censure an incident that occurred earlier this month. On February 6, Archbishop Iakovos, head of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America, was prevented by the Turkish authorities from conducting services in the Patriarchal Church of St. George, within the compound of the ancient see.

"Though only an incident," the statement said, "we cannot view it as an incident in isolation, but are compelled to read it as a page in a lengthy narrative of harassment and oppression that grows daily more disquieting, raising the prospect of a tragic conclusion.

"Though we deplore the unwarranted personal affront to a loved and respected colleague, we view it in reality as an affront to the whole religious community, raising the question whether fundamental religious liberty is equally fundamental to the political philosophy of the Turkish Government."

The statement, noting that "Constantinople (Istanbul), symbol of our common creed of faith, is the source of much of our common Christian inheritance," added:

"The present grave threat to its integrity and safety justifies the most earnest and forceful expression of our concern, and of our hope that the Ecumenical Patriarchate will be permitted to live and function in peace.

"Seen in the long view of history, these actions represent a radical deviation from traditional Moslem toleration of and respect for the great Christian traditions. Seen in the perspective of the patriarchate's future, these actions—and indeed the published remarks of certain Turkish leaders—imply a continuing and growing threat to its survival in Turkey, where its life has been inviolate since the beginnings of the Christian era."

RELIGIOUS FAITH AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that these events in Turkey are unfolding at the same time that in the Soviet Union, where we have come to expect suppression of religious faith and religious institutions, there is evidence of an adjustment toward greater freedom. A recent account in the New York Times related the surprising news:

> The Soviet Communist Party is in the process of reappraising its campaign against the Russian Orthodox Church. Official antireligious agitators are bewildered by the resistance of the provincial remnants of the Russian Orthodox Church. They are disturbed by what seems to be the growth of an underground church among the peasants and villagers who, deprived of regular churches and priests, are practicing religious rites in secret.

Soviet officials appear to be coming to a realization that, as described by one Communist writer, "closing a parish does not make atheists of believers. On the contrary, it strengthens the attraction of religion for people and it embitters their hearts besides."

This report gives us reason to hope that some of the police, judicial and administrative repressions of the church in Russia may begin to lighten. At the same time, it makes all the more distasteful the intensified restriction of the freedom of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to observe that diminution in the prestige and effectiveness of the Patriarchate serves the ends of the enemies of freedom in a broad sense. We should remember that Patriarch Alexei and Archbishop Nicodemus of the Soviet Union are the candidates of Soviet communism for primacy in world orthodoxy. Repression of the Patriarchate in Istanbul serves only to enhance the challenge of these candidates.

The troubles of the Patriarchate can be traced from the time the conflict erupted between the Greeks and the Turks on the island of Cyprus. Yet this form of retaliation by the Turkish Government makes little sense. The Patriarchate is not a party to the Cyprus dispute. Methods such as those being employed by the Turks will do nothing more than further complicate the Cyprus dispute and diminish the possibility of effective negotiations.

Mr Speaker, let us hope that the leaders of Turkey understand that the status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate is not merely a question of a religious minority culturally allied with another state. Nor is it only a question of modern Turkey's reputation as a democratic country determined to maintain religious freedom. It is a question of the preservation of free institutions in the world at large.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record an eloquent address on this same subject by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable William Ford, of Michigan.

Congressman Ford was a guest speaker on March 27, 1966, at ceremonies marking the proclamation of "Religious Freedom Day" in Detroit. Present on this occasion were representatives of major religious faiths, including the Round Table of Catholics and Jews, the Detroit Archdiocese of the Roman Catholic Church, and the Michigan State Council of Churches as well as representatives of the Russian Greek, Russian and Serbian Orthodox Churches.

The text of Congressman Ford's address follows:

Freedom of Religion, the Turkish Government, and Orthodoxy

The Turkish Government in Ankara has, over several past years, impeded and harassed the Greek Orthodox Church within the borders of Turkey. This has been caused partly by Turkish nationalism and hostility to Greeks, partly by the fact that more than 90 percent of the population is committed to Islam, and that the government reflects a certain hostility in the population toward Greek Orthodox Catholicity. Hostile feelings on the part of the populace, and hostile and oppressive acts on the part of the authorities, also stem in part from the violent conflicts between Turks and Greeks on the island of Cyprus. We can understand that the Turkish people would be angered, both by the violence and destruction of the civil war on Cyprus. We can understand, I say, but to understand is not to condone or to justify. Athenagoras is not Makarios; Greek nationals, Turkish nationals of Greek descent, and Greek Orthodox priests and bishops in Istanbul and elsewhere in Turkey are in no respect to be held responsible for the difficulties in Cyprus. The authorities in Ankara seem to be responding in an immature, irresponsible, and unjust manner to the emotional turmoil of their people. They are violating the Lausanne Treaty of 1923, which guaranteed religious freedom to the Ecumenical Church on condition that it refrain from political activity; they are breaking both their covenants with other nations and their pledge of religious freedom made to their own people.

The actions against the Ecumenical Patriarchate have taken the forms of direct action, of open threat, and of more insidious, less resistible measures designed to impede and intimidate the operations of the Orthodox Church in Turkey. Among direct actions to be laid at the door of the Ankara regime are the suppressions, in the spring of 1964, of both the patriarchal publications, the monthly Orthodoxia, and the weekly Apostolos Andreas, and the expulsion from Turkey of members of the 12-man synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, despite their Turkish citizenship. The flight of Greek natives from Turkey, though it cannot be called a direct action of the government, is a plain indication of Turkish popular and official hostility. During the period of tension, nearly 13,000 Greek citizens have left the country, 9,000 of them during 1964, and, by an estimate made in June 1965, only about 4,000 actual Greeks remain in Turkey. For these people to leave their homes, their jobs, their independent businesses or professional offices, is a major step; and such a mass exodus can only reflect an attitude of discrimination and oppression, directed at them both as Greeks and as Christians. Nearly 35,000 Turkish citizens of Greek descent remain in Turkey, subject to the threat of repressive action, and to the unhealthy constraint of a hostile environment.

The Ecumenical Patriarch, Athenagoras, seems ideally suited for Turkish use as a hostage and scapegoat for their wrath. Though a Turkish citizen, he stands before them as a visible symbol of the continuity of the Greek cultural and religious tradition in Istanbul, or Constantinople, which was a center of the Christian faith before Turkey arose out of the barbarian wilderness, and before Mohammed, founder and prophet of Islam, was born. Last April and May, the Turkish Government launched a series of coordinated actions and threats, directed both against the entire population of the Greek subjects still living in Turkey, and against the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate. As the outcome of a cabinet meeting dedicated to the discussion of the situation in Cyprus, it was announced that the Greek citizens in Turkey might be deported, that the books of the Ecumenical Patriarchate were to be audited by the Department of Taxation, with a view to "closer control" of its affairs, and that the Ecumenical Patriarchate might itself be ousted from Turkish territory. In past years, the Patriarchate has been harassed by such apparently unrelated threats as the proposal to demolish its establishment for "city planning and renewal," and the severe reduction of the number of foreign students allowed in the patriarchal college-seminary of Halki. An incidental move, minor but significant, is the prohibition of clerical garb on the streets to anyone but the Patriarch himself.

Just this past month, on February 6, our fellow American, Archbishop Iakovos, Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America, was prevented from conducting services in the Patriarchal Church of St. George, in Istanbul. The official Turkish explanation for this, as published in a letter to the New York Times by Ali Ustun, Second Secretary, Permanent mission of Turkey to the United Nations, is that Archbishop Iakovos is not a citizen of Turkey, and that Turkish law requires that "religious men, to be able to conduct services, should possess the citizenship of Turkey." The letter concludes with the statement that "visiting dignitaries should exercise the courtesy of respecting the laws of the land which they visit." Let us take the trouble to look back of this statement. Is it right, in the first place, for a nation to restrict the performance of religious services within its borders to its own nationals? We of the United States have no such law, nor have we ever had. Wherever, in any of the colonies that later became our United States, we had any law restricting the religious activities of priests or ministers, of whatever denomination, we rooted out and destroyed these discriminatory laws. I do not say that this freedom of religious worship is right because it is American, but I do say that America has adopted this principle and practice, and embodied it in the first amendment to our Constitution because it is right. The first law of civilization, taught among Moslems and Christians through the ages, is the law of hospitality. Both the Turkish law, and its enforcement in this case, are to be viewed in the light of the Old Testament injunction, Leviticus, XIX, 33–34: "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shall love him as thyself * * *." Surely hospitality is seriously violated when an individual is prevented from worshipping God according to the rites of his faith, and still more so when that individual is the honored and venerated religious leader of a church.

Both Archbishop Iakovos and Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras have been handicapped and frustrated in their attempts to perform their religious duties, and in their efforts to bring the peoples of the world together in peace. Archibishop Iakovos, when he was hampered by official Turkish action, was paying a visit of ecclesiastical propriety, as well as of personal friendship, to the recognized leader of world Orthodoxy; and he was on his way to attend a meeting of the World Council of Churches. Patriarch Athenagoras, in the past, has met with official foot dragging in such matters as his application for permission to attend the thousand-year celebrations of the Great Lavra on Mount Athos, in the summer of 1963; and in January 1964, when he received, only at the last moment, his permission to go to Jerusalem for his historic meeting with Pope Paul.

Our objections to these hampering and oppressive actions are not merely the protest of Greek Orthodox, of Catholics, of all concerned Christians in a matter of the mistreatment of fellow-Christians. We take a broader, less partisan and less vulnerable stand, upon the basis of the universal principle of freedom of religion. It seems to me that the most glorious aspect of the history of our America is that, through the years since its founding, it has been a haven for the religiously oppressed, in which they could find freedom to preach, to pray, and to worship, unhampered by official restrictions.

The importance of the Patriarchate is a spiritual force and is a magnet for the loyalty of the Orthodox everywhere. Americans are concerned about the Patriarchate not only because of its religious preeminence and our attachment to religious liberty, but also because diminution in the prestige and effectiveness of the Ecumenical Patriarchate serves the ends of the enemies of freedom in the broader sense. The Patriarch Alexei and the Archbishop Nicodemus are the candidates of Soviet communism for primacy in world Orthodoxy. The semblance of greater religious freedom in the post-Stalin era may have made Moscow's challenge to world Orthodoxy—the faith that early Hellenic missionaries spread from Russia to Ethiopia, from Serbia to Central Asia—more dangerous to the ideals of freedom born in classical Athens than it was in Stalin's day.

It is to be hoped that all concerned in this country understand the facts. It is also to be hoped that the leaders of Turkey understand that the question of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Hellenic community in Istanbul is not merely a question of a minority culturally allied with another state, nor merely a question of modern Turkey's reputation as a democratic country determined to keep religion and politics apart, but also a question of the preservation of free institutions generally.

Year 333: Roman Emperor Constantine I establishes the city of Constantinople, "the second Rome."

Fourth and fifth centuries: Greek priests convert the Slavs to Christianity.

Fifth to fifteen centuries: Growing estrangement between the Eastern and Roman Churches.

Fifth century: Church of Cyprus becomes autocephalous.

Year 998: Russia is converted to Orthodox Christianity by Greek missionaries.

Year 1054: "Great Schism" becomes final. Pope Leo IX and Michael Cerularius impose excommunication upon one another.

Year 1453: Conquest of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks. Under the Ottoman "millet" (nationality system the Patriarch of Constantinople, also titled Ecumenical Patriarch, and first among equals among the Patriarchs of the Eastern Church, becomes the recognized head (ethnarchy) of the Greek community in the Ottoman Empire.

Year 1589: The leader of the Russian Church assumes the rank of Patriarch. Since the fall of Constantinople, the Russian Church, as the most populous of all the Eastern Churches, regarded itself as possessing the hegemony of Orthodoxy, aspiring to a third Rome.

Year 1721: Peter the Great abolishes the Russian patriarchate and reorganizes the church.

Year 1833: Establishment of the Church of Greece.

Year 1850: Greek Church recognized as autocephalous (independent) by the ecumenical patriarchate.

Years 1917-39: Eclipse of the Russian Church under communism.

Year 1923: Lausanne Treaty provided for exchange of populations, leaving Greeks only in Constantinople; stripped the patriarchate of all but the strictly ecclesiastical functions; but allowed it to remain in Constantinople. The Greek community dwindled to 300,000.

Year 1931: Treaty of Establishment signed by Venizelos and Ataturk provides automatic rights of residence in each other's territory for nationals of the two countries.

Year 1939: New religious policy in Russia. Church rehabilitated.

Year 1943: A new Russian Patriarch, Sergei, chosen with the consent of Stalin.

Year 1945: After Sergei's death Alexei becomes Russian Patriarch.

Year 1947: Greek community was down to 100,000, but the Ecumenical Patriarchate maintained its preeminence.

Year 1955: Cyprus becomes an issue causing friction in Greek-Turkish relations. Riots in Istanbul and Izmir against minorities.

Year 1960: Cyprus issue temporarily settled with the signing of the Zurich-London Agreements among Greece, Turkey, and Great Britain.

December 1963: Status quo collapses with the outbreak of fighting between Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

March 1964: Turkish Government abrogates Treaty of Establishment by giving 6 months notice as provided by the treaty. Expulsion of Greek nationals for various reasons of Turkish law. Patriarchate suffers harassment under various legal cloaks.

Year 1965: Mutual excommunication lifted by Roman and Orthodox primates.

Year 1965: Hellenic population in Turkey approximately 40,000: 1,500 Greek nationals and 38,500 Turkish nationals.

February 1966: Iakovos, archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America, travels to Istanbul (Constantinople?) for consultation with the Patriarch. The Governor of Istanbul informed the patriarch that special permission is required for a foreigner to say mass in Turkey.

THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today, April 7, the task force on international education of the House Committee on Education and Labor completed hearings on H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966.

Witnesses who testified on the final day of hearings were: Norman P. Auburn, president, the University of Akron, Akron, Ohio; Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles; William S. Dix, librarian, Princeton University, representing the Association of Research Libraries; and William G. Carr, executive secretary, National Education Association.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to note that during the next 2 weeks the task force will be pleased to receive other statements for inclusion in the hearings. Any statements should be filed with the Task Force on International Education, 1523 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., by April 21, 1966.

Under unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD the prepared statements of today's witnesses:

STATEMENT OF NORMAN P. AUBURN, PRESIDENT, THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON, AKRON, OHIO, AND SPECIAL ASSISTANT ON UNIVERSITY RELATIONS FOR DAVID E. BELL, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, FEBRUARY 1, 1965, TO JANUARY 31, 1966, BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 7, 1966

Mr. Chairman, and members of the task force, I am Norman P. Auburn, president of the University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, in which post I have served since 1951. I address you today in support of H.R. 12452 in my capacity as the president of a medium-sized, complex urban university which is greatly interested in strengthening its capacity in international studies.

Although I address you as a private citizen, I will draw upon the experience I gained last year while working with Mr. David E. Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development, as his special assistant for university relations, while on leave from the University of Akron.

Having had experience in both camps, academic and governmental, I believe I am in a rather unique position to evaluate the provisions of H.R. 12452.

My role in my AID assignment was to serve in a liaison capacity between the academic community and the Federal Government. Specifically, I was charged with implementing the provisions of the Gardner report, "AID and the Universities." This report, authored by Secretary John W. Gardner when he was serving as president of the Carnegie Corp., calls for an improvement of relations between the user organization, AID, and the academic institutions with which it contracts to carry on technical assistance and educational research operations in developing countries overseas.

It is crystal clear to all of us concerned with helping developing nations help themselves that education is the key which opens most doors in the development process. The most efficacious way we can help these nations is by aiding them develop and upgrade their human resources. As more of their people become literate and skilled these nations will be able to use their natural resources intelligently and efficiently, thereby improving their economic well-being and gaining political stability.

In this process of helping the emerging nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America develop their human resources, our Government must rely heavily on American colleges and universities. Their faculty members must carry the burden of setting up appropriate educational systems in the developing nations, in advising ministries of education, in conducting research and evaluating studies, in interesting the host countries' teachers in the most effective methods of teaching their people.

The President's message on international education calls for greater emphasis in assisting the progress of education in developing nations. H.R. 12452 provides in sections 3 and 4 for the financial undergirding of America's capacity to carry on what we now accept as one of the requirements of world leadership.

Mr. Chairman, your bill gets to the heart of this matter. For all too long Congress has looked upon American colleges and universities as educational reservoirs which can be tapped at will, by the lure of Federal money in the form of contracts for academic and research services.

Every good teacher knows that he cannot continually tap his barrel of knowledge; he must refill it regularly through his own efforts in scholarly research and investigation. The American public generally fails to appreciate the need for replenishment. They usually think of the university function as a one-way street—sending forth knowledge to students through the teaching process. They fail to realize the threefold purpose of higher education: the advancement of knowledge, the transmission of knowledge, and the application of knowledge. Stated more briefly: research, teaching, and public service.

Your bill recognizes the academic tripod upon which collegiate institutions stand and the mission they try to accomplish. The incentive grants provided for graduate and undergraduate programs in international studies will enable selected institutions to build up their capacity and thus advance human knowledge and understanding. In turn they will be enabled to disseminate the knowledge here at home through the teaching process and also to render the public service expected of them overseas in the emerging nations.

The bill is most timely. At the very time the Federal Government calls upon America's colleges and universities to accept overseas assignments, they are overwhelmed with handling their campus teaching and research obligations. Meanwhile, qualified teaching and research talent is in short supply. Aware as they are, desirous as they are of augmenting their programs in international studies, most public and private colleges and universities will not be able to respond effectively unless they are given incentive grants.

One of the most attractive features of H.R. 12452 is section 7 which provides for 5-year incentive grants. I applaud you for this provision which builds in the assurance of reasonable continuity.

I have emphasized how H.R. 13452 will encourage American colleges and universities to gear up for public service in developing nations. There are many additional advantages to be derived from the authorization which I am sure others have mentioned here previously.

In making my final point in urging your support of H.R. 12452, I ask you to forgive a personal reference. While it represents my own thinking I believe it may be typical of situations on other campuses.

When I attended college in the late 1920's my fellow undergraduates and I had our heads buried in western sands. We learned, and properly so, about the glories and achievements of Western civilization. Had it not been that I was interested in economic geography and thus took a number of regional courses, my knowledge of the Eastern world would have been very meager.

When I went to my present university as president, I found in being an excellent general education program required of all students, whether they were enrolled in liberal arts and sciences, in engineering, in education or business administration, or whether they were involved in prelegal, premedical, or predental programs. But the entire general studies curriculum was Western-oriented. One of my first efforts was to encourage the faculty to adopt a required course in Eastern civilizations for all students. We now have a flourishing course, but it was a slow process getting it started. (As you may have heard, the two most difficult things to move are a cemetery and a college curriculum.) What slowed us up for several years was (1) lack of funds, and (2) shortage of teaching talent.

We now desire to change the required course in Eastern civilizations from 3 hours to 6 credit hours, to match a similar required course in Western cultural traditions. And we want to introduce similar courses in African and Latin American studies.

If section 3 had been in existence 10 years ago, we would not have had so much difficulty in finding teaching talent. If section 4 had been on the statute books, we might have qualified for a grant which would have taken our students' heads out of western sands some years earlier.

In expressing appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear before your task force, I can testify to my belief that America's colleges and universities will be eager to do their full part in cooperating with the Government in the worthy purpose contemplated in your bill.

Statement by Franklin D. Murphy, M.D., Chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles

In the past 20 years the two traditional fields of activity within which our foreign relations have been carried out (that is, the diplomatic and the military) have been supplemented by two new approaches—economic and educational. These newer aspects of international affairs, while not supplanting the more firmly established modes of operation, have come to play an increasingly larger role in this crucial area of human endeavor. It is, however, unfortunate, although perhaps not difficult to understand, that this increasing reliance on economic and educational programs has not been accompanied by a more formal recognition of the role they play or the establishment of long-term goals by which success can be measured.

All too often our international economic programs have been viewed as short run and only supportive of specific and immediate foreign policy goals. So too, our international educational activities have been, too often, appendages of other programs, in this instance, largely tacked on to economic assistance rather than pursued as a co-equal partner in the conduct of international relations.

The several parts of President Johnson's program for international education, and, specifically, the International Education Act of 1966, give great promise of changing this state of affairs. The keynote of this change was sounded in the President's Smithsonian address in his declaration that "learning respects no geographic boundaries." The new approach to the new role for education was set forth unequivocally in his message to the Congress on international education. The principle cannot be stated more simply or forcefully than in one passage of that message: "Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes. It must be at the heart of international relations."

This new attitude would be incorporated into the law of the land with the passage of the International Education Act. In the section that has perhaps the greatest long-term significance of this important piece of legislation, the Congress would declare "that a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research and to assist the progress of education in developing nations in order to meet the requirements of world leadership."

If the proposed legislation did no more than institutionalize this ringing declaration, it would be worthy of the solid support of those seeking to establish the conditions under which a peaceful family of nations can be established. However, the International Education Act goes beyond this important declaration and proposes steps to implement this new approach.

In this regard the act would strengthen our ability to contribute in international education in three ways:

1. By making provision for the establishment of centers of advanced international studies.

2. By providing grants to strengthen undergraduate programs in international studies.

3. By providing for a more flexible operation of title 6 of the National Defense Education Act.

Each of these proposals provides specific recognition of the interrelationship between the development of domestic competence in our knowledge of the world in which we live and our ability to act effectively in our relationships with the rest of the world. The first of these programs, the centers for advanced international studies, is, in my mind, of special significance. It would not only enhance our ability to provide the kind of graduate educational programs required in our major universities, but would also make it possible for American universities to bring together a pool of trained and interested faculty members who would be able to flow freely between international programs abroad and the teaching and research function of the centers. This development may do more to improve our ability to operate effectively in the area of international education than any other single step which could be taken.

While it would be unwise to tie the grants authorized under section 3 to specific overseas educational development programs, usually under the aegis of AID, I believe there should be coordination between the provision of these grants and the overseas development program of AID to the end that the centers will be further strengthened through the interplay between these mutually supportive aspects of the educational process.

I have been able to see firsthand positive impact of such a notion in several programs involving universities with which I have been associated. The most recent and, potentially, the most important of these programs is the University of Chile-University of California exchange program supported by a broad and flexible grant from the Ford Foundation, and designed primarily to assist the University of Chile in its desire to modernize and become more effective in serving the needs of that country today. Yet, the availability of a strong and vital center for Latin American studies at UCLA has permitted us to escalate the effectiveness of the program in Chile, and, in turn, our center has been invigorated by the development of research opportunities for our own scholars in developing their competence concerning Latin America.

As we move into what is clearly a new epoch in educational involvement with the rest of the world, note should be taken of the great importance of the creation within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a Center for Educational Cooperation. This Center must be given sufficient authority and prestige to enable it to serve as a focal point, joining in appropriate fashion the American universities with the several governmental agencies responsible for the various aspects of international development. It must serve to facilitate the development of direct mutually beneficial relationships between the American universities and their counterparts abroad.

This requires that it be given long-term financial support without which significant programs of sufficient depth and breadth cannot be created. The Center should also be served by an advisory mechanism of Americans chosen not primarily on a representational basis, but rather by virtue of experience, commitment, and competence in the area of international educational activities. I strongly urge its creation and the full support by the Congress of its activities.

It is also extremely important that AID be given authority to provide support for research and educational activities germane to the interests of American scholars in connection with overseas educational programs undertaken by American universities.

This change will not only strengthen our ability to improve and expand international education in American universities, but will improve the likelihood of success of the educational development program by making it possible for the best of our American educators to become directly and integrally involved in this activity.

It is clear from what I have said that I fully support the legislation which is now before you. It is a first and crucial step in following through on the program outlined by the President. I hope you will recommend its prompt passage so that the program it contains can be implemented as soon as possible. In addition, however, I earnestly hope that you and your colleagues in both Houses of Congress will accept completely the declaration contained in the act to which I have referred above, and, acting upon that declaration, do all within your power to assure the complete implementation of this and the other programs implied by it. I know of nothing more important to the long-range economic development and political stability of the world than these programs.

Statement by William S. Dix, Librarian, Princeton University, Representing the Association of Research Libraries on H.R. 12452, International Education Act of 1966, Before Task Force on International Education, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, April 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the Task Force on International Education, I am William S. Dix, librarian of Princeton University, and former chairman of the Association of Research Libraries, the organization which I represent today.

The Association of Research Libraries, established in 1932, comprises 73 institutional members. They are the larger academic, public, and special libraries which collect comprehensively in support of research. A list of the membership has been given to the committee. A quick reference to this list will reveal that among our 64 academic members are the universities which have been most active in developing area studies programs and other special projects concerning foreign countries, especially the so-called developing nations of the world. These universities award approximately 81 percent of the doctoral degrees granted each year in all fields of study.

I

It would be both presumptuous and unnecessary for me to attempt to describe to the distinguished members of this committee the history of the increasing involvement of the United States since World War II with the whole world, the necessity of education to the life and economy of each of the developing countries and to our own understanding of their cultures, and the response of American colleges and universities to this new need. Much has already been done; much more remains to be done. I do want to say quite simply that the academic community found both excitement and challenge in President Johnson's address at the Smithsonian Institution last September 16, and in his February 2 message to the Congress on international education. Teachers and scholars who had been struggling to solve the countless problems of international cultural relations through scores of uncoordinated instruments and agencies, public and private, effective and fumbling, found in his words for the first time the prospect of a serious and organized attempt at the highest governmental level to develop an effective U.S. program in international education.

The Association of Research Libraries, therefore, Mr. Chairman, enthusiastically endorses that program and, specifically, H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966, as an instrument for setting in motion an essential part of the total program.

II

Others have already and with greater authority testified to the need for university centers for advanced international studies and for strengthened undergraduate programs in international studies. I shall therefore, with your approval, limit my remarks to the implications of these programs for books and libraries.

One can learn about a foreign country by firsthand experience, by living there and using one's eyes and ears. But not all students and scholars can have extended firsthand experience of this sort, and even those who can must supplement this experience by the experience of other observers, by breaking through the surface to go back into history, to accumulate and compare statistical data, and to study in depth the recorded culture of the entire civilization.

Not to belabor the obvious further, I simply point out that the written and printed word is the basic medium through which information and knowledge from other shores reaches our own in a form suitable for extended intellectual discourse, and that the collection, organization, and distribution of the written word in books, manuscripts, journals, newspapers, government documents, and other forms is the basic business of libraries. No serious international studies can be carried on without substantial library resources, for the books which are required, often in difficult languages and obtained only after arduous pursuit, are not exactly of the sort available at the corner bookstore.

In the Second World War military and intelligence requirements brought to light dramatically the woeful gaps in our collections. I remember hearing of the excitement with which a particular set of Japanese maps, apparently the only one in the country to meet a particular military need, was discovered almost by accident and bundled off to Washington by special messenger from my own library. In 1948 libraries responded as well as they could to build strong collections for the future by devising and operating with their limited funds the Farmington plan, a cooperative scheme for attempting to bring into the country one copy of each book of potential scholarly interest published anywhere in the world.

Books are coming in today from some 150 countries and territories to about 50 libraries which have volunteered to assume specific subject and area assignments, to catalog the books, and to make them available to the country through the National Union Catalog at the Library of Congress. The plan has worked remarkably well, but coverage is far from complete, and a single copy for the whole country is considerably less than adequate.

The great foundations have sometimes in recent years helped with funds for library acquisitions in support of area study programs which they have backed. But even with their resources they have been unable to do enough.

Several programs of the Federal Government have helped. Under section 104(n) of Public Law 480, an amendment for which we are indebted to Congressman DINGELL, of Michigan, about 12 to 16 library centers with strength in a particular country are receiving through the Library of Congress rather full coverage of current publishing in 5 countries where there is surplus U.S.-owned local currency. It is hoped that the Congress will make appropriations for fiscal year 1967 to extend the program to several more countries, but the number will still be woefully small.

The National Defense Education Act offers some library assistance to those universities designated as centers for particular language and area study, but the number of these centers is limited.

Finally, title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965, when fully funded, will be of broad, general assistance in direct grants for library acquisitions and of particular help by increasing the amount of cataloging being done centrally by the Library of Congress. This legislation will provide much needed support for all college and university libraries.

It remains a fact, however, that any university which establishes and operates at either the graduate or the undergraduate level a program of any excellence in international affairs must find, somehow, the means for a substantial increase in its library resources to meet adequately the specific new needs created by the program. Building and organizing collections of this sort presents quite special problems.

While an examination of doctoral dissertations 30 years ago reveals almost total concern with the United States and Western Europe, a current perusal would show work in such areas as studies of Arabic linguistics, Brazilian foreign exchange policy, Chilean land tenure, Chinese history, Colombian government, the cost of Russian education, Greek economics, Indian agriculture, Vietnamese politics, and the sociology of tribes in the Congo. Library support for these new programs requires collecting and organizing tens of thousands of volumes from countries which have no adequate book trade or listing of publications. These materials, often in esoteric languages and dialects, consist of government reports, statistics, maps, parliamentary debates, newspapers, local books and journals, as well as the publications of the learned societies and academies in the Western World.

One local example may serve as an illustration. To support Princeton's expanding programs in East Asian, Near Eastern, and Slavic studies, the Princeton University Library last year spent approximately $80,000 for the purchase of materials. In 1954–55, we spent about $6,500 for the same purposes. Yet the members of our faculty still feel that we are not getting enough material. The staff costs of acquiring and cataloging the material are even greater. We have found it necessary to add to the library staff, full-time scholarly bibliographers for two of these areas and will add the third when we can find the money and the man.

These are expensive programs, requiring more than normal library support. College and university budgets are already overburdened by other demands, never having caught up with the general pressures caused by expanding enrollments, broadened curricular programs, the increase in research, and the rising cost of both materials and services. Therefore, it seems to us both proper and essential that the legislation designed to strengthen American educational resources for international studies and research include provision for supplying the library resources which are necessary to support the proposed programs.

III

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I presume to make three brief points about the specific language of the bill:

1. Centers for advanced international studies will particularly require strong library support. The language of section 3(b), which says that grants may be made to cover part or all of the cost "of teaching and research materials and resources" presumably includes library costs. If this intention is not completely clear, I respectfully suggest that any possible doubt could be eliminated by the insertion after this phrase on page 2, line 24, of the words, "including the cost of library materials and staff." It seems to us particularly important that staff costs be included, for as I have indicated, the staff costs of acquiring and cataloging a book from many parts of the world are likely to be considerably more than the purchase price of the book.

2. While undergraduate programs in international studies obviously require less library support, I can testify from considerable experience with them that they also make demands of the university library which go beyond regular library resources. Thus, section 4 of the bill should, in our opinion, make provision for library support. The present language does not seem to give this authorization. It could be added by adding a new item to section 4(a) as follows at page 4, line 7: "(7) development of library collections and staff."

3. Certain kinds of library projects in support of programs of international studies can be carried out more efficiently and more economically through a central agency. For example, various governmental archives in foreign countries are indispensable sources for certain kinds of research and can be microfilmed as they are opened for use. The effective way to make this material available to the half dozen or dozen libraries which need it is for some central agency to make a negative microfilm and then distribute positive prints. The logical central agency to develop and manage such a project may often be a scholarly association; such as, the Social Science Research Council, or one of the specialized scholarly organizations; such as, the Association for Asian Studies or the American Oriental Society.

Therefore, we respectfully suggest that eligibility for grants be extended not only to "institutions of higher education or combinations of such institutions," as specified in section 3(a), but also to nonprofit scholarly associations. This objective could be accomplished by adding the following sentence at the end of section 3(a): "The Secretary is authorized also to make grants to nonprofit scholarly associations or organizations for studies or projects of value to such centers."

These minor changes seem to us in no way to complicate this commendably simple and straightforward legislation. On the contrary, we believe that they will enable it to accomplish more effectively its admirable objective. We believe that when an institution or organization is given a task to do, it should also be provided with the tools with which to do that task. Thus, the National Science Foundation is authorized to make grants for equipment necessary to support the research which it is funding. Library resources are essential tools for teaching and research in international affairs.

On behalf of the Association of Research Libraries I respectfully recommend these minor changes and heartily endorse H.R. 12452. Please accept my warm thanks for the privilege of expressing the views of the research library community to this distinguished task force.

Statement of William G. Carr, Executive Secretary, National Education Association, Before the House Task Force on International Education, of the House Committee on Education and Labor, April 7, 1966

I am William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association of the United States. The association has 980,000 members; the combined membership of its 8,000 State and local affiliates is approximately 90 percent of the men and women who teach and administer in the schools of the Nation, and a substantial percentage of those who work in colleges and universities.

I am also Secretary-General of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession, an international, nongovernmental organization which, through their national teachers organizations, includes approximately 4 million teachers in 90 countries.

I am testifying in support of the identical bills H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452. As a consultant in the U.S. delegation to the 1945 Conference in San Francisco, I successfully advocated leadership by the United States in providing educational cooperation as part of the United Nations Charter. The charter contains nine references to educational cooperation and this is one of the significant differences between the United Nations Charter and the Covenant of the League of Nations.

A few months later, I was asked by the State Department to serve as Deputy Secretary-General for the Conference in London which created the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. I have had some contacts with UNESCO ever since. More recently, I was honored by an appointment as Chairman of the Citizens' Committee on Education and Training of the White House Conference on International Cooperation. In these and other ways, I have participated in international education relations for many years.

Let us note at the outset that the legislation before us will, if enacted, constitute only a small, although significant, part of the total program of international cooperation in education which is currently being conducted by the people, the schools and colleges, and the Government of the United States. The President's special message on international education, February 2, 1966, outlines a series of other activities to be developed by the U.S. Government, and by the schools and colleges. The proposals include—

Continued, vigorous support for UNESCO and similar international agencies;

Establishment of a Center for Educational Cooperation in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to link U.S. missions abroad with the educational community of the United States, to administer international programs assigned to the Department, and to assist private and public agencies operating in this area;

An Advisory Citizen's Council on International Education;

Education officers in the major U.S. Embassies abroad who would report directly to the U.S. Ambassadors. In the light of experience in visiting many U.S. missions overseas, I would like to stress this particular recommendation. I have often found consulates and embassies where overworked personnel had no significant contact with the educational program of the countries to which they were assigned. Further, arranging that education officers will report to the Ambassador instead of reporting to a public information officer, as cultural officers usually do at present, is a very great improvement;

Earmarking part of the funds provided by Public Law 89–10 for international studies in the elementary and secondary schools;

One thousand school-to-school partnerships administered by AID and the Peace Corps; establishment of an Exchange Peace Corps with other countries who wish to send their citizens to serve in the United States; a service for international recruitment and placement of American teachers who wish to serve abroad, an extremely valuable operation which has long been needed;

Expanding the education component of the AID program, including such matters as textbooks, teacher education, and the teaching of English as a foreign language;

Research on the technical aspects of methods to reduce illiteracy;

Doubling the U.S. Summer Teaching Corps. This work is already underway, building on efforts pioneered by the National Education Association;

Implementation of the Florence and Beirut agreements on the international movement of educational materials;

Added support for U.S. colleges and schools abroad.

The preceding outline is by no means complete, but is intended to place the important legislation before us in a wider perspective. We should not expect this legislation to solve all problems in international education. It is, instead, a specific program directed at a few attainable goals. If we set this program in a still wider setting, it would take much more time than I shall have before this committee. It would be necessary to include such activities of the U.S. Government, as the Peace Corps, the U.S. Information Agency, and the State Department's Bureau of Cultural Affairs, as well as the activities of private, nongovernmental organizations, both national and international.

With this background, let us give more detailed consideration to a few points in the pending legislation.

The representative assembly of the National Education Association, which sets the policy for the organization, met in New York City last summer, with the general theme of "Education for World Responsibility." The association's resolutions call upon members to recognize the reality of U.S. involvement in international relations, and to accept their responsibility at all school levels, and in all subject areas, to prepare American students for their world responsibility.

The President's message highlighted the need to enrich the curriculum relating to world affairs in the elementary and secondary schools. This is a familiar and appealing theme. In his analysis of the 1966 activities of international education, the President of Education and World Affairs, Dr. William Marvel, points out that "while higher education has received the lion's share of money and attention in all aspects of world affairs, the same concerns have been almost totally neglected at the school level." I agree that they have been neglected, although "almost totally neglected" may be too severe. However, the need persists to give attention to the education of the rank and file of American citizens, as well as to the small although fortunately increasing, percent of Americans who find their way into and sometimes through colleges and graduate schools.

In his testimony, Secretary Gardner said that the pending legislation would expose all students to international education. This interpretation of the bill, I heartily endorse. I hope it will be a guideline for the Department in its administration. I will accept second place to no one in recognizing the need of Government and business agencies for experts and scholars in international studies. Each of the representatives of the Government who have appeared before this Committee have stressed that their agency, whether it be the U.S. Information Agency, the Peace Corps, or some other group, needs more people from the colleges and universities who are trained in international relations and area studies.

I suggest that it be made clear in the legislation and, subsequently, in the administrative direction of the program that a major purpose of the added support for graduate and undergraduate education is better preparation of teachers for the elementary and secondary schools. These schools complete formal education for the major part of the American electorate. If we wish enlightened public interest and responsible public participation in the formation of foreign policy, we must give attention to those places where most of the people are educated. Highly trained scholarly leadership in international studies should be made available more abundantly to the education of those teachers who serve in the elementary and secondary schools. Of the 54 million students enrolled in elementary, secondary, and collegiate institutions this year, almost 90 percent are in the elementary and secondary schools.

The preparation and in-service education of teachers in the elementary and secondary schools should be one of the major purposes of the graduate and undergraduate programs financed by this legislation.

There is some recent tendency to polarize congressional action in education either on the academically talented or on those who are severely deprived culturally and economically. Adequate educational opportunity must also aim to develop that informed citizenship which has been a national necessity in the past and which is all the more crucial today in the light of the new responsibilities of world leadership which have fallen upon this Nation.

Among the knowledgeable and powerful individuals who have testified before you, and with whom it is an honor for me to be associated, was Assistant Secretary of State, Charles Frankel. He said, "An education without an international dimension is an inadequate education for Americans in this century." He said, "We need a citizenry that has received as part of its general education an exposure to international problems." Representative McCLORY pointed out that training of teachers on a large scale is essential to the success of a comprehensive educational effort. I urge that it be made very clear in the legislation that the personnel and facilities of the undergraduate and graduate centers should serve not only international scholarship but also the education of teachers who are preparing for careers in the elementary and secondary schools. Some of the testimony that has been presented, notably not Dean Rees, has shown how the instruction in the schools can be improved by the graduate centers proposed in the legislation, partly by better preparation of teachers and partly by assistance to State and local school systems in devising the elementary and secondary school curriculum.

As Secretary Gardner pointed out, the United States must have "a body of citizens prepared to handle our world responsibilities." In his testimony Secretary Gardner also spoke of the use of the graduate centers to develop a capacity for international work in the professional schools. He gave a series of examples; namely, engineering law, business, social work, and journalism.

These were, of course, examples but not a comprehensive list. I hope that it is clear in the minds of the Congress and the administration that teaching and medicine, to give two other examples, should also be included. and indeed given a very high priority, in a program of legislation proposed by a Presidential message on international education and a statute which is called the International Education Act of 1966. This attention to the education of teachers should include both the graduate centers and the undergraduate programs which are to receive Federal support. In his testimony, Secretary Gardner referred to the importance of improving undergraduate training from the international point of view in foreign languages, social sciences, humanities. Much of undergraduate training is concerned with preparing young people to become teachers.

I feel sure that Secretary Gardner would agree that teachers, like other segments of society, and perhaps more than most, should also have attention because of their influence on the great majority of America's students who are to be found in the elementary and secondary schools.

This emphasis which I am endeavoring to place on the elementary and secondary schools is heightened when we consider that academic excellence by itself can be remarkably ineffective in modifying conduct. Our international hopes and efforts have been thwarted on occasion not alone by a lack of scholarship but also by a limited popular understanding of the culture and attitudes of other people.

I believe that the graduate centers to be aided by this legislation should have as one of their major functions the development of research on methods of teaching attitudes and concepts necessary for international understanding. If such methods could be developed by appropriate experimentation and demonstration we might then hope to reach all students, those who go on to higher education and the great majority who will not do so. Thus, we might hope in time to develop a citizenry with more profound understanding of other peoples; for it is very difficult to modify attitudes learned in childhood and early youth. Furthermore, the staff members of institutions which prepare teachers and school administrators should be involved not only in the development of the undergraduate programs in international studies but pursuing also advanced studies themselves.

The efforts of this act will be wholesome. Its power to make a real difference in the way people behave, the way they think, and how they act on foreign policy issues, will be multiplied if we can make it clear that improved qualifications of elementary and secondary school teachers, in terms of international information and attitudes, is a very important purpose of the entire effort.

DR. ROBERT J. ANDERSON

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during the many years I have served both as member and chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which deals with the annual budget of the Public Health Service, I have come to know many officials who can be truly described as dedicated, devoted, and unselfish public servants.

One of those officials is Dr. Robert J. Anderson, an Assistant Surgeon General and for the past 4 years chief of the Bureau of State Services. Last week Dr. Anderson retired after 26 years of duty with the Public Health Service, and I would like to take this occasion to express my admiration for him and his work, my gratitude for myself and many others who cannot take this method of expressing thanks, and my best wishes for his future.

Dr. Anderson appeared before my subcommittee for many years, long before he became an assistant surgeon general, and I came to know him well during our many meetings and other dealings. I can say that his honesty and frankness, his courtesy, his consideration for the opinions of others, and his perceptiveness were never failing.

I want to emphasize, however, the debt that we as a Nation owe to Dr. Anderson, as well as other public servants like him who have given their lives to the furtherance of the health and welfare of all of us.

The terms "public servant" and "public service" are often overworked. And we as frequently hear them referred to as "bureaucrats" and other such titles. But the fact remains that Dr. Anderson, and people like him, have dedicated their lifetime efforts to the public good. And usually our gratitude can be expressed only by means such as this.

I might add that it seems to me there is a special note of thanks due those public servants like Dr. Anderson, who have risen to the top of their organizations, thus, demonstrating ability that might well have made them wealthy or even more prominent in private life.

Again, I extend to Dr. Robert Anderson my own personal best wishes for his new career, and I am sure that I can speak, in the same vein, for many of his friends on Capitol Hill. The National Tuberculosis Association, where I am told he is going as director of research, is fortunate indeed, and I hope that this organization will make full use of his knowledge and experience in protecting the health of the public.

THE NEED FOR INCREASED AUTO SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, over 50,000 Americans will die this year in automobile accidents. Several million will be injured. Although numerous programs have been initiated in an effort to curb these automobile mishaps, the accident rate keeps increasing. We, in Congress, can no longer afford to sit idly by while the slaughter on our highways continues to grow. We have spoken out in favor of driver education programs, safer highways and stricter law enforcement, but, in view of the fatality statistics, this obviously is not good enough. We are, however, attempting to take stronger action. The Senate recently passed a tire safety bill. As an author of a tire safety bill, I hope that the House will act swiftly in this matter. Furthermore, the time has come for us to realize that the Federal Government can no longer avoid having a major responsibility to assure our citizens that motor vehicles sold and used in interstate commerce should be designed, manufactured, and equipped so as to provide the maximum amount of safety.

In an effort to achieve the construction of a safer automobile, I am introducing today two measures. One will authorize the Federal Government to spend up to $5 million to research, design, develop, construct, and test fully operational motor vehicles in prototype quantities. The State of New York has already had plans drawn up for a prototype car which, it is claimed, could save at least 160,000 lives in the next 10 years. My second bill will require the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe mandatory standards for safety devices so that all new cars will be equipped with such features as an impact-absorbing steering wheel and column, a passenger harness, a padded dash and visor, safety door latches and hinges, safety glass, glare reduction surfaces, a dual braking system, standard bumper heights, and several other safety features.

Mr. Speaker, in every 13 minutes that goes by, some man, woman, or child is killed in a traffic accident. Last year over 49,000 persons were killed in this manner. By 1975, this figure will grow to an estimated 60,000. Auto accidents are the first cause of death in age groups from 1 to 35 years, and the fourth cause of death across the board. Traffic accidents alone kill more young men from age 15 to 24 than any disease. Over 3½ million persons are injured in traffic accidents. Every 18 seconds, somebody is injured seriously enough to be disabled beyond the day of the accident. An estimated 1½ million persons are impaired as a result of these accidents. Accident victims occupy more general hospital beds than heart disease and cancer patients combined. The cost of these accidents is staggering. Measured only in insurance payments for death, injury, and damage, in days lost from work, in congestion in the courts and in the hospitals, the cost amounted to $8 billion.

As if these statistics are not bad enough, the shameful fact is that many of these fatalities and injuries could have been avoided. Let us be honest and admit that regardless of how much emphasis we may put on driver education, stronger law enforcement, and the building of safer roads, accidents are still going to occur. We cannot eliminate accidents. What we can do, however, is to minimize the number of deaths and injuries that happen in what is called the second crash, that is to say, the impact of the individual within the motor vehicle against the steering wheel, dashboard, or windshield.

The U.S. Public Health Service's accident prevention bureau, using an Indianapolis police study, estimated that 43 percent of the motor vehicle occupants who were fatalities in auto accidents die under what is called survivable conditions. That is to say, if proper safety equipment had been installed in those autos, there would have been a tremendous savings in lives. One direct effect of the publicizing of this report was the acceptance by the public of seatbelts in their cars.

In 1964 Congress passed legislation authorizing the drafting of minimum safety standards for federally purchased automobiles. Under its authority, the General Services Administration established a comprehensive program for the development of specifications and standards to insure that the Federal Government obtains passenger-carrying motor vehicles, as well as other types of vehicles which possess characteristics suited to Government needs.

GSA has announced that it will require 17 safety features on its 1967 models. As a result of these requirements, most of the major automobile manufacturers have incorporated many of these features in their 1966 models. Furthermore, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare only recently published standards limiting the amount of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons that emerge from the exhaust of new cars. The standards will first take effect on the 1968 model cars and light trucks that will go on sale late next year.

While these are encouraging steps, there is still substantial work left to be done. As the President's Committee for Traffic Safety has stated:

> Today's vehicle is fundamentally much safer than those of earlier years, but still more progress can be made—in design and in maintenance—to reduce accidents and their severity.

The American Automobile Association favors legislation which would establish minimum standards for safety equipment in motor vehicles. Furthermore, the AAA has called automobile manufacturers to give increasing attention to design which will help prevent accidents and also to controls and door handles, padding for safety-shaped dashboards, improved safety-latch door catches, improved impact-absorbing bumpers and steering wheels.

In addition, the AAA urged car manufacturers to adopt as standard equipment a dual braking system wherein adequate braking power continues in case of loss of fluid from the hydraulic brake system.

The National Safety Council, in its 18 point traffic safety program, asked for higher standards for safety devices on vehicles purchased by legislation to require that new cars incorporate new safety features. The Consumer Advisory Council adopted a resolution urging legislation to require that new cars incorporate new safety features.

The automobile industry maintains research and testing divisions to improve their automobiles. They also contribute to nonprofit organizations which are interested in highway safety. The sums spent on research have, at times, been inadequate. All too often, the money which the auto industry spends on safety research is just wasted when decisions are reached to allow styling trends to take precedence over safety considerations.

Cars, after all, are designed to sell and safety provisions do not have the same type of appeal as "they are here and even hotter" or "has the terrific thrust of a 227 blazing horsepower engine."

Too often, Detroit has been basically indifferent to safety and overly fascinated with speed and horsepower. Furthermore, the auto industry is extremely sensitive to any criticism directed against its products and only under pressure is it forced to admit that some of its cars may be defective.

General Motors Corp. is now recalling 1½ million 1964–65 Chevelles and 1965 Chevrolets to repair the cause of a sticky throttle. Also, GM's Pontiac Division attempted to repair 80,000 cars that have a tendency to hang up on hilly railroad crossings.

In the recent Senate hearings, representatives of the automotive industry tried to give assurances that Detroit should be given a chance to prove its determination to build safe cars without Government regulation. John S. Bugas, a Ford vice president and chairman of the Automobile Manufacturers Association's Safety Administrative Committee said:

> If we hadn't gotten the message before on the importance of safety we have got it now.

Is this supposed to excuse the failure of the auto manufacturers in the past to give adequate attention to safety in designing and building cars?

Due to increasing horsepower, the motor vehicle has become an increasingly lethal instrument of death and destruction. According to the Detroit thesis, however, the chief cause of accidents is blamed upon careless driving or, occasionally, on poor highways but seldom, if ever, is any blame laid upon the automobile itself. Yet, studies have shown that the design of the automobile is such, that at times, because of its construction, it has been the direct cause of an accident. Many drivers have been unable to handle the tremendous horsepower and the steering mechanism and brakes have been known to fail in a moment of crisis.

There are several institutions engaged in the automotive field of research and accident prevention. The Cornell aeronautical laboratory automobile crash injury research program emphasized the need for the waist safety belt. The University of Wisconsin is currently developing plans for a highway safety test center. The plans include an 800-acre tract site with a 3.3-mile test track capable of handling vehicles at speeds up to 100 miles per hour, a crash-test pad, skid-test areas, a multiple-vehicle driver-education course, and many other features.

This will be the first test center of its kind in the United States other than the test tracks owned by the auto manufacturers and holds the promise of a concerted attack upon the cause of automobile accidents.

The automotive industry, however, has been traditionally loath to accept Government responsibility and authority in establishing basic safety regulations and slow to accept and adopt many of the recommendations arising from the research of the safety groups. The auto companies become interested about safety only after the public expresses concern and legislation is threatened. Our other methods of transportation—bus, plane, train, and ship—have strong safety regulations. The automobile industry should be no exception. We must establish whatever safety rules and regulations are necessary to protect the public. The bills which I have introduced today will do much to achieve that purpose.

SLAUGHTER ON THE HIGHWAYS

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, last June 2, in a speech on the floor, I called attention to the slaughter occurring at an ever-increasing rate on our highways. In that speech, I suggested two things: First, that Congress consider an auto safety bill and conduct a thorough review of all matters affecting auto safety; second, that, pending such an investigation and the enactment of such as the Congress would find proper, the automobile industry use some of the savings resulting from the reduction in the automobile excise tax to install as standard equipment safety devices such as seat belts.

I am gratified on both counts: A comprehensive auto safety investigation is now underway in the Senate and is about to be undertaken by the House; seat belts and other minimal safety equipment have been installed as standard equipment by the major automobile manufacturers. Progress is being made. Cars are safer than they were. We in the Congress are now attempting to assume our proper responsibility toward the issue of auto safety.

When I recommended these steps almost a year ago, all the information we now have was not available. But because of the tremendous number of deaths on our highways—I call them the silent murders—I felt then that some action would be wiser than no action. Now it appears that we must take still more action.

For the slaughter is continuing and getting worse. Since I spoke last June, an estimated 35,000 more Americans were killed on the highways. Almost 4 million were injured. Around $6.5 billion worth of damage was done. In the age group of 5 through 29, the automobile continues to be the No. 1 killer—greater than any disease.

This loss of lives compares in magnitude with that caused by a major war. In 1 year, twice as many are killed on our highways as were killed in the Korean war. At present rates, in 4 years we will lose more lives on our highways than were lost in all of World War II. Just as we should concern ourselves with the lives of our soldiers, we must concern ourselves with the lives of our drivers.

Last June, when I spoke to this body and introduced an early bill on auto safety, I did not know precisely the thinking of the people in the Third District of Michigan on this subject. Because of its overriding importance, I included it in a series of questions in a congressional questionnaire I sent out early this year. Although no final tabulation has been made of the answers because many questionnaires are still being returned, the results appear conclusive. They are a direct mandate to support further investigation and proper action in this field.

The questions and preliminary tabulations of the answers on auto safety are:

1. Do you think cars should be made safer by adding as standard equipment certain safety devices such as padded dashboards and sun visors, collapsible steering wheel columns, etc?

	Percent
Yes	68
No	20
Undecided	12

2. Do you favor a bill setting minimum safety equipment standards for automobiles?

	Percent
Yes	66
No	22
Undecided	12

3. Do you favor a bill setting minimum safety and performance standards for automobile tires?

	Percent
Yes	74
No	15
Undecided	11

4. Do you favor a thorough investigation of possible safety shortcomings and potential improvements in automobile manufacture and design?

	Percent
Yes	61
No	29
Undecided	10

An investigation of auto safety has been going on since Congress reconvened this year. Not until 2 days ago did General Motors announce that it was recalling about 1.5 million 1- and 2-year-old vehicles to correct a safety defect. Yet, on the same day, a representative of the automobile industry advised the Senate committee that the industry was alert to safety needs and that no legislation setting safety standards was necessary.

Can we believe this? Within the past month, General Motors first denied and then confirmed that one of its corporate officers had authorized an investigation into the personal life of a witness who criticized present automobile safety engineering in testimony before the Senate committee. Indeed, in the course of this investigation, it appears that on two occasions women of the street were hired in an attempt to seduce, compromise, or blackmail this witness.

I believe the automobile industry faces a crisis of credibility. Their Madison Avenue ad men should now turn their attention to selling cars by promoting safety instead of by associating cars with horsepower and sex appeal. They need not fear such a change in emphasis will hurt car sales; it will help them, because the nearly 50,000 people who die each year on the highway are lost customers.

Many people who answered my questionnaire took the time and trouble to comment in writing on the auto safety questions. Their comments were extraordinarily thoughtful and to the point.

Many said that careless or poorly trained drivers are an important cause of accidents. Many urged mandatory driver training courses, and an equal number supported compulsory vehicle inspection. A great number pointed out that drivers who have had something to drink are the greatest cause of accidents, and they urged tightening drunk driving laws or stiffer sentencing. Some suggested that licensing procedures should be improved, and others urged periodic review of license holders.

The bulk of these suggestions concern local or State laws. I hope that local and State governments will promptly investigate the adequacy of their laws in this area, just as I hope they will take corrective action where necessary, since I have grave reservations about the propriety of the Federal Government getting involved in setting traffic laws.

Although driver error may cause most accidents, all the evidence points to the ability of our automobile manufacturers to engineer very much safer cars. According to an estimate made by Elmer Paul of the U.S. Public Health Service Accident Prevention Bureau, 43 percent of the people who die in auto accidents die under survivable conditions. That is, if their cars had been safer, they might have lived. A summary of a report on traffic safety just released by the University of Michigan appeared in Tuesday's Washington Post. It suggested that 12,000 lives could be saved each year if seat belts had been used in cars. It added that a comparable number of additional lives would have been saved if shoulder harnesses plus seat belts had been used.

I believe we can all take satisfaction that several thousand lives may have been saved this year because seat belts were installed as standard equipment in cars last fall. But we cannot take satisfaction in the likelihood that many more thousands might have lived if harnesses had been also installed. May we expect harnesses to become standard equipment next fall? Or at least may we expect the automobile companies to advertise the probable lifesaving features of harnesses, so that the customer may judge for himself whether to buy them?

One figure in my congressional questionnaire is particularly interesting. Seventy-four percent of the respondents approved of legislation to set minimum tire safety standards. I have received many letters complaining of the same blowout experiences I have had—with very new tires. People have complained to me that even under light load conditions, the two-ply tires sometimes furnished on cars have failed entirely. One constituent wrote, complaining that he knows of cars leaving the factory equipped with tires whose load capacity is already exceeded by the curb weight of the vehicle.

Recently, the Federal Trade Commission held a series of hearings on automobile tire safety at which experts from all fields testified on the problem. The results of these hearings were shocking.

The tire sizes stamped on tires do not accurately tell the actual size, and there is some doubt whether they were ever intended to do so. Ply-rating labels have no clear meaning within the tire industry. Many new cars are sent to the showrooms equipped with tires which are inadequate even for normal use. Six-passenger cars are tested for tire purposes holding only three passengers and no luggage.

As Senator NELSON of Wisconsin has said:

> The automobile and tire industries say that choosing the right tire is up to the motorist. Yet there is no way the motorist can make this choice.

The evidence seems clear, Mr. Speaker. We must study legislation setting uniform grading requirements and minimum safety standards for tires. In the near future, I intend to introduce such legislation for consideration.

We are at the point where the wisdom of action in the automobile safety area is necessary. While some lives are being saved through the use of seat belts, and while the automobile industry appears to be more aware of the importance of the problem than it has in the past, we cannot sit idly by while people are being unnecessarily killed, and safety engineering may save them. We must act.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON BASIC HUMAN RIGHTS AND PEACEFUL WORLD ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a house resolution to create a select committee on basic human rights and peaceful world order which is identical to House Resolution 813 introduced by Congressman FEIGHAN on April 5 of this year.

It is a tragic distortion of the word "peace" to even hint that any semblance of peaceful world order exists in a world in which millions of human beings have been deprived of their God-endowed rights. Responsibility for this most brutal transgression in all of recorded history must lie, of course, primarily with the Soviet Union. Senator THOMAS DODD, when introducing a series of reports on the persecution of religion in Communist countries in November 1964, cut through to the heart of the matter in these words:

> It is appropriate that the first study should deal with the status of religion in the Soviet Union because the structure established by the Soviet regime has set the pattern, with minor variations, for the many Communist regimes since established in various parts of the world.

Not only in the area of religious freedom, but in all areas in which human rights under Communist regimes are presently being denied, the Soviet Union has set the pattern. With the Soviet's brutal subjugation of the captive nations for all the world to see, and in view of their stated purpose of throwing a similar Red blanket of Communist domination over the remaining countries of the globe, is it any wonder that free nations prepare to defend themselves with the most refined weapons of warfare that they can muster? Or is it any wonder that the prospect of a peaceful world order seems as far away today as when Hitler's mechanized divisions rolled across Europe? Plainly then, the first logical step to be taken in the quest for true world peace with justice is in addressing ourselves to the root of the malady—the denial of basic human rights in the Soviet Union.

One of the functions of the proposed select committee would be to utilize the advice of experts in formulating positive and practical recommendations for our Government in its search for world peace. The basis for such recommendations would be provided by a full investigation and study of the "official policies and practices of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with respect to religious liberty, cultural freedom, ethnic traditions, national aspirations within the respective Soviet Republics and the relationship of such policies and practices to the development of a peaceful world order."

Nor are the effects on international public opinion to be ignored. The case of one House select committee in the 1950's is an excellent case in point. The Select Committee on Communist Aggression, of which Senator DODD and Congressman FEIGHAN were members, was established by the House of Representatives in 1953 to inquire into the ways and means by which the international Communist conspiracy fastened its hold on once free nations and to find out what happened to people living under Red rule. Over a period of a year, 50 public hearings were held in the United States and Europe in which 335 persons testified, most of whom were eye-witnesses to Communist aggression against the enslaved nations and peoples of Central and Eastern Europe. More than 1,500 individual depositions, exhibits, documents, and other authoritative evidence were also received by the committee during this period.

Issues investigated and publicized by the committee included Soviet colonization and imperialism, terror as an instrument of Communist policy, famine and hunger, deportation, the status of labor, the right to vote, religion, and the persecution of the Jews, among others.

Dissemination of the findings of the committee was aided by the USIA's Voice of America program which recorded the hearings for rebroadcast to the enslaved nations and for use in educational programs carried on in countries of the free world. The interim reports of the committee were made a part of the many libraries maintained by USIA in various countries of the world. The Committee for a Free Europe—Radio Free Europe—recorded much of the testimony for rebroadcast over Radio Free Europe. The last of the committee's many reports was published in early 1955, thus concluding one of the most comprehensive and widely publicized indictments of communism's unbelievable record to destroy civilization as we know it. One of the many findings of the committee stated:

> There is no limit to the terror, oppressive tactics, barbarity, perfidy and inhuman corruption which the Soviet Union will employ to enforce or secure its demands and desires in a victim state.

It was a little over a year later, on February 25, 1956, that Khrushchev gave his famous speech to the 20th Party Congress of the Soviet Communist Party condemning Stalin and his tyrannical methods, thus ostensibly ridding himself of any responsibility for the many abuses committed during Stalin's reign of terror. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in its study, "The Soviet Empire—A Study in Discrimination and Abuse of Power," supplied still another motive for Khrushchev's relaxation of oppressive measures in the Soviet society after the downgrading of Stalin:

> All of these changes have been carried forth under the officially sponsored drive to de-Stalinize the Soviet Union and restore a measure of domestic tranquillity to its much distracted people. One of the apparent motivations underlying this effort was to prove the viability of the Communist system in an era of peaceful coexistence with world capitalism. This could not be done in an atmosphere of unmitigated terror.

While one cannot present a cause-and-effect argument to prove that the international publicity given to the efforts of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression directly caused the radical change in Soviet policy, I believe it is safe to assume that the hearings held in eight large U.S. cities and in London, Munich, and West Berlin played a part in Khrushchev's exceedingly drastic decision to desecrate Stalin, one of the Kremlin's foremost idols, and to make Soviet tyranny a little more palatable.

In case one is tempted to believe that the basic freedoms of the people in the Soviet Union have been restored, a cursory look at recent findings by congressional sources concerning the free exercise of religion in that country should dispel such unreality.

In November 1964, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate issued the first report of a series entitled, "The Church and State Under Communism," which was prepared for the subcommittee by area experts of the Law Library of the Library of Congress. Two reports of the series dealt with the status of religion in the U.S.S.R., while subsequent studies covered the plight of religious freedom in Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Yugoslavia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Cuba, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the German Democratic Republic. Additional reports are still being compiled and should be ready for release in the near future.

These studies, as was to be expected, amply proved that the pattern established by the Soviet Union over the years has been repeated, in varying degrees, by the satellite governments of the above-mentioned countries. The obliteration of all religious influences in the Communist society is still a primary goal of all Communist governments.

In May 1965, the House Foreign Affairs Committee held 3 days of hearings on "Antireligious Activities in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe." Here again the theme of total liquidation of all vestiges of religion was repeated over and over by witnesses before the committee.

On July 12, 1965, the House joined the Senate in passing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Soviet Union and the Eastern countries should be urged to permit the free exercise of religion.

In October 1965, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee released the study mentioned above, "The Soviet Empire—A Study in Discrimination and Abuse of Power." Under the section dealing with religious discrimination, after detailing at length Soviet abuse of Christians, Jews, and Moslems in the U.S.S.R., the summation concludes:

> Thus in this manner does the CPSU and the Soviet Government move toward the goal established in the party's third program of reeducating the Soviet population—Christian, Jew, and Moslem—"in the spirit of the scientific-materialistic world view," "overcoming of religious prejudices," and establishing a state and society "completely atheistic."

One facet of religious persecution which is peculiar to the U.S.S.R. is the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union. The report issued by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, based on its hearings concerning antireligious activities in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe, found:

> Of all the Communist countries, the Soviet Union stands alone by virtue of its policy of persecution of its Jewish citizens. That policy originates with the Communist Party, the center of power in the Soviet Union, and is energetically carried out by all governmental and party organs. It is directed to the obliteration of the Jewish religion and ethnic traditions from the face of the Soviet society.

The same committee further found:

> In addition to being denied the means and the opportunity to practice their religion, and to pursue their cultural traditions, the Jews of the Soviet Union are the object of a rampant campaign, bitterly anti-Semitic, which is being spread through the Soviet press, radio, and other mass media. Soviet Jews and Judaism in all its aspects and values are vilified and made the scapegoat of the failures of the Communist system. The intense persecution of Jews for alleged economic crimes, and the subjecting of some of the alleged offenders to death penalty, serve as instance in point.

Another possible salutary effect of a select committee on basic human rights and peaceful world order concerns those outside the sphere of direct Communist control, the newly established nations of Africa, for example. Because of informational facilities less adequate than our own, the truth about Communist treachery and deceit is harder to come by, and the young African students, whose allegiance is coveted by the Soviet Union, are more vulnerable to the Soviet party line. In 1960 between 6,000 to 8,000 African students accepted scholarships in Communist countries, with the number increasing in more recent years. The aforementioned report, "The Soviet Empire—A Study in Discrimination and Abuse of Power," reports the bitter disillusionment of African students who had to learn the hard way—by traveling to Moscow—the truth about Soviet comradeship:

> It cannot be said that African students in the Soviet Union have any illusions about the Soviet capacity for discrimination against other races and peoples. In December 1963, the increasing bitterness of Africans in the Soviet Union against what one writer described as a "widespread racial bias and discrimination against Negroes prevailing in the Soviet Union erupted violently when 500 to 700 African students staged a protest march in Red Square."

The account concludes thus:

> Recent reports from African students reflect the same spirit of frustration, disillusionment, and bitterness. "We are humiliated as Negroes," one African reported. "Russians are strongly prejudiced racially and discriminate against us in nasty ways. They ask us if we eat people for breakfast and they go out of their way to avoid us."
>
> Another African student in Moscow said: "When I hear nonsense every day about the Soviet people being the first whites really to love us because the economic base for it was established in 1917 (the Communist revolution), I hate this place so much that I want to contribute to the American defense budget." "To tell the truth," another student observed, "colonialism allowed more freedom than this Soviet system. Think of the poor Russians. They've got to live with this pressure all their lives."

The foregoing observations are, I believe, cogent reasons why the establishment of a House Select Committee on Human Rights and Peaceful World Order would be an invaluable aid in our Nation's quest for a true world peace through the international observance and respect for the human rights bestowed by an all just God on all men.

MEDICAL CARE SERVICES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **FOGARTY**. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill which will serve to fill an unfortunate gap in the medical care services now provided to dependents of members of the uniformed services.

The bill authorizes an extension of the Dependents Medical Care Act of 1956 to provide medical, rehabilitative, and institutional care to such dependents who are mentally retarded, mentally ill, or physically handicapped.

The bill would also amend the Social Security Act to require that services provided by the States under the maternal, child health, and crippled children provisions of the act not be denied on grounds of residency to children and spouses of servicemen. A companion bill to this, now under consideration by the Senate, has been introduced by Senator ROBERT KENNEDY.

I am sure that most Members of the House share my deep concern with the plight of the mentally retarded and mentally ill of this Nation. Yet, although the Congress has given major attention to the problems of mental illness for three and a half decades, we have only recently become fully aware of the tragic proportions of the problems of mental retardation.

Although I have been personally involved with health matters during my 25 years in Congress, even I was not aware of the magnitude of the problem until one evening in 1954 when I attended a meeting of parents of retarded children in my home State of Rhode Island. I came away from that meeting with a profound sense of the hopelessness of the situation which faced those parents, yet I was inspired by their courage and their conviction that something could and must be done.

At that time, not a single Federal dollar was being spent for research in mental retardation—an affliction which is today the number one health problem among children.

I am proud of the role I played 12 years ago in securing the first Federal funds to support research in mental retardation. I am proud of my colleagues in both Houses who on their own—and later with the encouragement of President Kennedy—have since acted to build the sizable investment we have today in research in the field of mental retardation. This investment has already paid gratifying dividends.

This and the previous Congress has also to its credit a fine record of legislation designed to apply basic advances in the field of mental retardation to the benefit of those who so desperately need them.

The Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963 provides for the training of teachers of retarded and other handicapped children. The Mental Retardation and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendments of 1965 extended these training provisions for 3 more years and authorized research and demonstration projects related to special education of mentally retarded and handicapped children.

The Social Security Amendments of 1965 authorize the training of professionals to care for handicapped children, including the retarded, and authorizes project grants to the States to provide medical benefits to children of low-income families.

It is now time we take a hard look at the grave situation facing many of our service families. The President's Panel on Mental Retardation has estimated that there are 75,000 mentally retarded children of servicemen who present special problems and require special facilities. Some of these children can be helped by special education. But many are profoundly and severely retarded and cannot be helped. Frequently, physical deformities and handicaps further complicate their situation.

For such children, institutional care is presently the only answer. But public institutions are frequently not available to service families because they are not able to meet residency requirements. The cost of private care is prohibitive to all but top-ranking officers.

The Dependents Medical Care Act which was passed by Congress in 1956 is a landmark law which made health care benefits available for the first time to dependents of uniformed service personnel. Most medical care now provided under its provisions is administered at military hospitals and dispensaries which offer the normal range of medical services. However, in most cases these facilities do not have psychologists, psychiatrists, or special therapists to work with the mentally retarded and mentally ill. And they do not provide institutional care for the mentally ill or retarded who require constant attention.

Military personnel who live in areas where no service medical facilities are available are authorized by the 1956 law to use civilian public or private facilities and receive partial compensation. However, costs of care for the mentally retarded or mentally ill and the physically handicapped were not included.

The benefits provided to service dependents have remained unchanged since 1956. As I have mentioned, it was not until 1954 that mental retardation began to be recognized as a health problem serious enough to warrant even a modest research effort. It is understandable, therefore, how the problems of service families with mentally retarded children were overlooked in the 1956 law. But in light of today's knowledge of the scope of the problem, in light of new medical techniques and methods of special education and rehabilitation, the continuance of such an oversight is inexcusable.

Today, across this Nation much is being done to prevent, diagnose, and treat mental retardation. Routine mass screening tests for phenylketonuria—PKU—an inborn error of metabolism which leads to severe mental retardation, are now required by 32 of our States. If diagnosed soon after birth, the condition can be corrected by a special diet.

Studies of cultural and environmental factors in mental retardation have given teachers and therapists new and effective tools for educating and rehabilitating many retarded children.

Much research is now underway aimed at identifying the causes of other forms of mental retardation. The immediate future holds much promise for other advances as important as the easy test for PKU.

Today's capabilities for treating mental retardation and the promised achievements of tomorrow must no longer be denied to the families of our men in uniform. The incomes of most service families—even those with good health—are but poor compensation for the sacrifices required of them in these troubled times. They must not also be expected to support the added burden of costly long-term medical care associated with the treatment of mental illness, mental retardation, and physical handicap.

The administration has recognized this problem and has included provisions for treatment and long-term care for mentally retarded and physically handicapped dependents in an omnibus House bill to extend the service dependents medical care program.

My bill is based on these provisions, but calls for a much broader, and I believe, much more satisfactory program for dealing with the long neglected problems of service families afflicted with mental retardation, mental illness, and physical handicap.

The first portion of my bill authorizes a program of special care for the mentally ill and retarded and physically handicapped spouses and children of the men in our uniformed services. This assistance is to be included as a part of the program of medical care provided outside of the regular dispensary and military hospital service administered by the dependents medical care program.

Under this program, the following are authorized: diagnosis; inpatient, outpatient, and home treatment; training, rehabilitation, and special education; and institutional care in private nonprofit, public, and State institutions and facilities. The member of the uniformed service would pay a portion of the expense incurred.

The second portion of my bill amends the Social Security Act to require that residency requirements for service families be removed from State plans for certain types of maternal and child health services and for care of crippled children. This amendment would require that States receiving Federal funds for these types of care not discriminate against the families of men in the uniformed services and would reimburse those States on a 100-percent basis for the care they so provide.

My bill differs from the administration proposals in a number of important respects.

First. It covers mental illness as well as mental retardation and physical handicaps. The administration's bill does not cover mental illness. The same lack of military facilities and the high cost of private aid plague the family seeking treatment for mental illness as for the one trying to help a mentally retarded child.

Second. My bill would extend the care provided to spouses of service personnel. They are not covered in the administration's bill.

Third. My proposal covers mental retardation generally, instead of only the moderate or severe degrees of retardation. This would make eligible for care all the 75,000 mentally retarded children of service families estimated by the President's Panel on Mental Retardation rather than limit coverage to half this number as under the administration's proposal.

Fourth The bill I introduce today covers the physically handicapped generally, instead of just dependents with "serious" handicaps.

Fifth. My proposal specially authorizes the providing of prosthetic appliances and devices for the physically handicapped.

Sixth. My bill broadens the program to provide well-baby care for the first year after childbirth up to a total of 12 visits. The administration bill does not so provide, and this is most important for the early identification and treatment of mental retardation and physical handicap.

Seventh. My bill provides a flat $25 per month ceiling on the amount which any member of the uniformed service would have to pay for treatment and care under these provisions. Only a handful of top ranking officers receive a monthly pay which is high enough to enable them to meet the full $250 monthly payment contemplated by the administration's bill.

Eighth. My bill states that private nonprofit facilities can be used when public facilities are unavailable. In addition, nonprofit private facilities may be used even when public facilities are available but reimbursement by the Government will be equal in amount only to the average cost of similar care in a public facility.

Ninth. My bill would amend the Social Security Act as I have outlined.

Tenth. My proposal would become applicable on January 1, 1967 instead of July 1, 1967. I see no reason why this vitally needed aid cannot be made available at the earliest possible date.

I am confident that this proposal will best serve to meet the needs of the thousands of servicemen who presently have nowhere to turn for assistance for mentally retarded, mentally ill, and physically handicapped dependents.

In this time of world crisis, when we must ask our men in uniform to leave their families—when we must ask them to suffer—when we must ask them to die—it is little enough for us to do all we can to lighten the burden of these men by assuring their families truly comprehensive quality medical care.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Waggonner, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Ryan, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. May (at the request of Mr. Smith of New York), for 1 hour, on April 27; to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Smith of New York), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Kupferman (at the request of Mr. Smith of New York), for 60 minutes, on April 21; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. McVicker), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pucinski, for 1 hour, on May 3.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Tenzer.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Smith of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Griffin in three instances.

Mr. McDade.

Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Smith of New York.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McVicker) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dulski.

Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. McVicker.

Mr. Addabbo.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2999. An act to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (Act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1966, as "Sir Winston Churchill Day."

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2752. An act for the relief of Kock Kong Fong;

H.R. 2938. An act for the relief of Przemyslaw Nowakowski;

H.R. 6319. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries, and to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the initial enrollment period for supplementary medical insurance benefits;

H.R. 11029. An act relating to the tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics;

H.R. 11664. An act to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; and

H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 625, the House stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon, Monday, April 18, 1966.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 625, the House adjourned until Monday, April 18, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2282. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Program, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a report on the programing and obligation of contingency funds covering the second quarter (Oct. 1 through Dec. 31, 1965) of fiscal year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 451(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2283. A letter from the national quartermaster-adjutant, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting a copy of the audit of financial transactions, and the recruiting folder of Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–530; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2284. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prevent excessive forced attrition among women officers of the naval service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2285. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2286. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2287. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 8th semiannual report on the activities of the U.S. Travel Service, pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the International Travel Act of 1961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2288. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army on whose behalf erroneous payments were made for storage of household goods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2289. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on activities under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–197; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 763. Joint Resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as National Flag Week; without amendment (Rept. No. 1421). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 18. Joint Resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1422). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1256. A bill for the relief of Victor O. McNabb; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2270. A bill for the relief of the Moapa Valley Water Co., of Logandale, Nev.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3692. A bill for the relief of William F. Kuhlman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4075. A bill for the relief of John F. Reagan, Jr.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole-House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6305. A bill for the relief of lessees of a certain tract of land in Logtown, Miss.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8793. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Bennett; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9213. A bill for the relief of William A. Buzbee; with amendments (Rept. No. 1429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9217. A bill for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10133. A bill for the relief of Fritz A. Frerichs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10846. A bill for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff, and others; with amendments (Rept. No. 1432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10838. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Post Office Department at Eau Gallie, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11035. A bill for the relief of Eleanore W. Ward; with amendments (Rept. No. 1434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11036. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edna A. Bettendorf; with amendments (Rept. No. 1435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12237. A bill for the relief of Tri-States Construction Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11251. A bill for the relief of Hubert J. Kupper; with amendments (Rept. No. 1437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12396. A bill for the relief of Elton P. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 14389. A bill to amend titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in school health and physicial education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 14390. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 14391. A bill to create a new division for the western district of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14392. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 14393. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special program for the mentally retarded, mentally ill, and physically handicapped spouses and children of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $3,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for amounts expended by State policemen for meals which they are required to eat while on duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 14396. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the postage rate for books and other educational materials to looseleaf pages and binders consisting of ordinances of municipalities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 14397. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide that a tenant of a low-rent housing project whose income increases beyond the applicable limits shall be permitted to continue to occupy the project and pay economic rent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14398. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to authorize the sale of all or part of low-rent housing projects to a private nonprofit housing sponsor for use as low-rent housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14399. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 relating to the payment of annual contributions under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14400. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 14401. A bill to amend title I of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to the method of computing payments thereunder; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 14402. A bill to establish a consolidated Federal corrections system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14403. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 14404. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of community programs for patients with kidney disease and for conduct of training related to such programs, and other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 14405. A bill to provide for research, design, development, and construction of fully operational passenger motor vehicles in prototype quantities embodying certain safety features; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14406. A bill to prescribe certain safety features for all motor vehicles manufactured for, sold, or shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 14407. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14408. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 14409. A bill to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 14410. A bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 14411. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the 12th World Jamboree and Conference of Boy Scouts to be held in the United States of America in 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 14412. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to modify the regulatory requirement that the son or daughter of an employee of a Federal agency may not be appointed to part-time, seasonal, intermittent, or other temporary employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 14413. A bill to strengthen the coordination of economic opportunity programs with the activities of the U.S. Employment Service; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 14414. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to make it applicable to the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and to permittees and licensees of such Commissions; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14415. A bill to provide a comprehensive program to combat alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 14416. A bill to establish a National Institute for Crime Prevention and Detection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 14417. A bill providing for fuller disclosure of corporate equity ownership of securities under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14418. A bill to amend "Title XIII: War Risk Insurance," of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 14419. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the payment of additional pensions to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and to widows of such veterans, to raise the income limits with respect to the payment of such pensions, to increase by 10 percent the pension payable to such veterans who served overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 14420. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 14421. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of community programs for patients with kidney disease and for conduct of training related to such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 14422. A bill to prohibit insured banks from accepting time deposits in amounts less than $15,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 1059. Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution and Independence Bicentennial Commission—the 1966–76 Commission—and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 1060. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 1061. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.J. Res. 1062. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 1063. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Res. 817. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Basic Human Rights and Peaceful World Order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 818. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

447. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the State of Alaska, relative to a housing program for Alaskan natives; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

448. Also, memorial of the senate of the State of Kentucky, relative to legislation to increase the percentage depletion rate for coal from 10 to 15 percent of the gross income from mining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

449. Also memorial of the senate of the State of Kentucky, relative to the imposition of tolls or user charges on the historically free inland waterways of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 14423. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of the Algonac Manufacturing Co. and John A. Maxwell against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 14424. A bill for the relief of Maristella Finotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 14425. A bill for the relief of Dr. Romeo L. Savellano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 14426. A bill for the relief of Shao-er Ong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 14427. A bill for the relief of Maria Victoria Yee Foldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14428. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mitsuko Kiuchi Kawai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14429. A bill for the relief of Maria Adelaide Soares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14430. A bill for the relief of Abel R. Sousa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14431. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Constantinos Ioanides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

368. By Mr. REUSS: Petition supporting H.R. 51, the Indiana Dunes National Lake Shore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

369. By the SPEAKER: Petition of George S. Gaines, St. Germain, Wis., and others, relative to a pension for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Joseph A. Corgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, too often the distinguished careers of our fine civil servants pass unnoticed, and they come to mind only when we need help or advice. Occasionally, however, a man may be so distinguished in his work that time is taken to applaud his excellence, and to give him the recognition which he so richly deserves.

Yesterday, in the Department of the Interior, Joseph A. Corgan, the head of the Anthracite Division was so honored. Here is a fine man, the father of a wonderful family, who has worked 26 long years in the Bureau of Mines. He has become a friend of mine since my coming to the Congress. He has shown a profound understanding of the problems of my people in the anthracite area, and has done his best to expedite programs to help them in their need. To see him honored by receiving a gold medal and a citation for distinguished service was indeed one of the great pleasures of my life. With your permission, I will append here the citation accorded Mr. Corgan in recognition of outstanding service in conserving and developing the Nation's resources:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington.

CITATION FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE: JOSEPH A. CORGAN

In recognition of outstanding service in conserving and developing the Nation's resources.

Mr. Corgan's career with the Bureau of Mines started in 1940 in Washington, D.C. Today, as Chief of the Division of Anthracite, he has displayed remarkable ability in carrying out responsibilities brought to the Department by passage of the Federal Mine Water Control Act, which brought responsibility for administration of mine drainage, mine subsidence, and other resource and public health and safety projects. Administration of the program and direction of research on anthracite called for great tact and resourcefulness owing to the fact that interests of citizens groups, county and municipal authorities, industrial representatives, Federal legislators, and departmental officials were often conflicting. Mr. Corgan displayed the utmost objectivity in resolving the many pressing problems brought to him by his Bureau responsibilities and his eminent and dedicated service may be measured by considering that he has directed to completion 27 drainage projects with no adverse criticism. These projects have prevented 3 billion gallons of water annually from entering mines which would have later been discharged into streams in an acid state. Currently, public health and safety projects are in progress and when completed will preserve schools, churches, utilities, and human lives from mine subsidence. Mr. Corgan has responded to the Nation's needs by conserving its resources through service of the highest degree and in recognition of this, the Department of the Interior bestows its Distinguished Service Award.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Rollcalls During Leave of Absence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1966, by unanimous consent of my colleagues in the House, I was granted a leave of absence for April 4, 5, and 6, 1966, for observance of the Jewish holiday of Passover—Festival of Freedom.

Accordingly, I was unable to be present during the vote on the Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966, on Wednesday, April 6, 1966. Had I been present, I would have voted yea, and I was pleased that the act was passed by the House by the overwhelming vote of 393 to 1.

I have supported efforts during both the 1st and 2d sessions of the 89th Congress, to achieve comparability in wages for Federal employees and while this principle still has not been achieved, it is my hope that Congress will be able to take greater strides in this direction during the remainder of this session and in the next Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to record my views on the other items of legislation approved by the House on April 6, 1966. By a vote of 387 to 0, the House extended through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged. More than 86 percent of our senior citizens have signed up for the medicare program which acknowledges that only by getting the necessary facts to the people can we achieve a response such as this. The bill as passed will give the Social Security Administration 2 additional months to reach the remaining 14 percent of the elderly who have not yet signed up. Some because they have not been reached and others because they have been given incorrect information about medicare. It would have provided me a great pleasure to have voted "yea" with my colleagues on rollcall 58, had I been present.

The other items passed by the House on April 6, 1966, were H.R. 14215, relating to appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies, and H.R. 14266, relating to appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. I would have voted "yea" on both appropriation measures; however, I would have supported the motions to recommit these measures with instructions to insert a provision that expenditure shall be limited to 95 percent of the total net expenditures estimated in the budget for these purposes in 1967.

I would have voted "yea" on the motions to recommit because I believe that it would not be unreasonable to ask these departments and agencies to cut their budgets by 5 percent. The areas where the cuts would be made would have been left to be decided by the departments and agencies involved. In the event that circumstances rendered it impossible for the agency to meet the mandate of the Congress, it is always possible for the agency to return with a request for a supplemental appropriation.

The present economic situation justifies such action and I believe Congress should scrutinize appropriations measures as closely as possible so that we can channel Government expenditures into those areas which require the highest priority. This can be done without abandoning any of our commitments abroad and our obligations at home. Five percent is a small percentage—a good, hard look at our expenditures—running a "tight ship" while we initiate programs which are designed to benefit all the people—could produce the desired results.

I firmly believe that our President is as much against waste and mismanagement as any Member of Congress and any citizen of these United States. He has asked agency heads and Government departments to cut costs. The Congress could have helped carry this forward.

Bataan Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, Bataan and Corregidor are names which will live forever in American history. April 9 marks the 24th anniversary of the fall of Bataan and Corregidor—a day to pay tribute to the valiant performance of duty by American and Philippine soldiers who fought on for months after the outbreak of World War II in the Pacific, thus giving the United States badly needed time for the rebuilding of its Pacific defenses.

The island fortress of Corregidor is being converted into a national shrine to remind us of the sacrifices made in our behalf by the men who died there, or on the Bataan death march. Nearly $4 million have been allocated by the United States and the Philippines to build this memorial that will consist of a museum, an auditorium, and a battlefield park. Completion of the memorial is scheduled for next year.

The fall of Bataan and Corregidor must be remembered forever as one of the great occasions in our history of the display of valor. The death march which followed is part of one of the most tragic episodes in the history of human warfare.

Bataan Day should have meaning for all of us. It should have meaning for all Americans for all time.

Visa to All Outdoors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in its report on the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, the House Committee on Appropriations stipulated that it expects the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to be more aggressive in encouraging the general public to support the recreational programs established under the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I fully subscribe to this recommendation, but I also feel that Members of Congress themselves have an obligation to utilize the facilities of their own offices in giving attention to these projects. In doing so, we will not only open new vistas to families and individuals who are not aware of the excellent recreation spots already available on Government lands, but also make possible the development of new areas as a consequence of the increased interest on the part of our people.

Specifically, the committee wants to step up by manifold the sale and use of Federal recreation area entrance permits. While day use and temporary permits may be obtained by infrequent users of public sites, there are maximum advantages for everyone who purchases the annual permit at $7 per car, or per person for those 16 years of age and over. Designated "Operation Golden Eagle," it has been described by American Forests magazine as the "visa to all outdoors." These cards, which will serve as passkeys to more than 7,000 Government recreation areas for an unlimited number of times between April 1, 1966, and March 31, 1967, may be purchased through the American Automobile Association, at the entry point of Federal recreation installations, or by mail at the Bureau of Recreation, box 7763, Washington, D.C., 20024.

The outstanding feature of this program is that receipts are earmarked for the recreation facilities so badly needed in this growing country. Sixty percent of the total income goes for improving recreational areas in the States, and the remainder is used to expand Federal recreation programs. So far as I am concerned, no more efficient and effective pay-as-you-go method of operation has ever been devised.

The Committee on Appropriations also directed the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and other agencies to work out arrangements between the Land and Water Conservation Fund program and others enacted by Congress to provide financial assistance for recreation. In referring expressly to the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the committee points up a cooperative effort which can be of monumental value in helping to enhance the year-around recreational advantages of Pennsylvania. The natural resources and human resources of our State were largely instrumental in expediting the transformation of a young nation into the world's greatest agricultural and industrial power, and now we offer the facilities needed for physical, mental, and moral relaxation and stimulation.

The golden eagle permit is a guide to healthful living, and all Americans should go all out for this ticket to all outdoors.

Verrazzano Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I take particular pleasure in joining with my Italian-American friends in paying tribute to Giovanni da Verrazzano whose discoveries played an important part in our American history.

On or about April 17, 1524, this daring and adventurous Florentine navigator sailed his ship into New York Harbor and sent a small boat through the narrows to explore upper New York Bay.

The widespread public interest in Verrazzano and appreciation of his important contribution to the development of our country motivated the issuance of a commemorative stamp to honor his name in 1964. Also, in 1964, a suspension bridge across the narrows of New York Harbor was completed, appropriately bearing the name of Verrazzano.

When we honor Verrazzano for his great deeds, we also think of the hundreds of other great men of Italian birth or descent who have done so much for America. There is no more difficult decision men can make than to leave their homeland, and their family ties, to begin a new life in another land. Our Nation's strength has been built by many groups from many lands. No group has contributed more—few so much—as the sons and daughters of Italy.

New York's 40th District Citizens Respond to Representative Smith's 1966 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, I sent my 1966 questionnaire to each of the more than 133,000 families in the 40th Congressional District of New York.

As in the past, 40th district residents responded enthusiastically to this request for views and opinions on some of the most critical domestic and international issues of the day.

To date, I have received more than 16,000 completed questionnaires.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues in the House will be extremely interested in the results of my 1966 questionnaire. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, the final tabulated results of my questionnaire:

		Percent		
		Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor the President's proposal to establish Federal unemployment insurance standards for all States?		45.4	49.8	4.8
2. Do you favor the pending bill to increase the minimum wage to $1.75?		43.8	54.0	2.2
3. Should Federal spending be lowered? If so, would you reduce spending in any of the following areas?		74.6	7.5	17.9
	Percent			
(a) Military	9.7			
(b) Space	29.0			
(c) Foreign aid	79.8			
(d) Agriculture	41.8			
(e) Poverty program	38.4			
4. Do you favor the proposed Human Investment Act which would allow tax credits for businesses for the cost of any programs they might offer to train the unemployed and the underskilled?		67.9	27.8	4.2
5. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to allow the people of a State to decide that 1 house of its legislature may be apportioned on a basis other than population?		40.5	50.0	9.4
6. Do you favor the construction of a new sealevel canal to replace the Panama Canal?		58.2	32.6	9.2
7. Do you approve of teach-ins, sit-ins, and demonstrations against our policies in Vietnam?		10.4	86.4	3.2
8. Do you believe that U.S. policies in Vietnam will:				
(a) Bring total victory to the United States and South Vietnam?		16.1	41.7	42.2
(b) End in a Korean-type armistice?		60.5	17.8	21.7
(c) Lead to eventual U.S. withdrawal and Communist takeover?		9.8	37.8	52.4

Watershed Planning Funds Should Be Released

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Congress acted wisely 12 years ago in creating the watershed protection program to preserve and develop this Nation's natural resources.

In my opinion, however, the entire watershed program has been seriously jeopardized by recent action of the Bureau of the Budget in limiting to 100 the number of projects to be funded with the $5.7 million approved last year for this purpose by Congress.

I therefore am introducing today a resolution requiring the Budget Bureau to fulfill the intent of Congress by releasing all funds allocated for watershed project planning this fiscal year, ending June 30.

Since its establishment in 1954, the watershed protection program has relied upon local initiative to stimulate cooperative local, State and Federal planning and financing.

My home State of Indiana has been particularly diligent in this respect. As a matter of fact, eventual local and State money devoted to watershed projects in Indiana will total about $51 million. This figure is just $15 million short of equalling the Federal Government's share.

The accomplishments of these programs are widely known, but bear repeating.

Watershed programs help save lives and property that otherwise would be destroyed by floods.

They provide much needed recreational facilities for a constantly increasing population and help develop fish and wildlife habitats.

They serve to enlarge municipal water supplies.

They store irrigation water and thereby make significant contributions to our agricultural economy.

Now, however, these valuable and beneficial achievements are being threatened with severe curtailment by the Budget Bureau.

At the present time, 28 watershed projects in 18 States are ready for planning authorization. Another 18 projects will be ready in the next few weeks.

Of these 46 projects, 3 are located in Indiana, all of them in the Ninth Congressional District which is being so ably served by my distinguished colleague, LEE HAMILTON.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] knows firsthand how vital these watershed projects are to the people of his district, my State and our Nation.

I share his dismay at action by the Budget Bureau which would mean that only 10 of 46 watershed projects will be authorized to proceed with planning funds.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] recently introduced a joint resolution which would remove the planning limitation imposed by the Bureau of the Budget. It would permit those programs ready for planning authorization to move ahead.

I agree this limitation should be lifted and am today introducing an identical resolution in hopes that Congress will see fit to insure that its intent with respect to watershed programs is honored.

Caught in the Middle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I have great sympathy and compassion for the cancer patients who have used the drug krebiozen and they honestly believe that it has helped them and is necessary for their very survival. I shall not argue the merits of the case, but I believe that they are "caught in the middle." I should like to associate myself with the statement of a number of Members of the other body which reads as follows:

> We recognize that the long and bitter controversy over krebiozen has hardened the position of both sides to the dispute. If the doubt in the minds of many, including some Members of Congress, over this matter is ever to be resolved, we feel both sides have to make a fresh start.
>
> The charges and countercharges should be forgotten so a new start can be made in an atmosphere of good faith and unbiased interest.
>
> We urge the supporters of krebiozen to file with the Food and Drug Administration a new application for an investigational program in connection with the drug.
>
> We feel it is the responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration to cooperate with responsible persons who file a proper application for an investigational program for krebiozen and we will use all proper influence as Members of Congress to see that this is done.
>
> Under existing law, submission of such an application is a necessary first step in any test program of krebiozen.
>
> A chemical analysis of a new sample of krebiozen is necessary as a prelude to acceptance by the Food and Drug Administration of any new application for investigational use of krebiozen. We are certain that the Administration will agree to examine objectively any such analysis.
>
> As laymen, we are unable to judge the efficacy of krebiozen but we certainly sympathize with those who have been using it, who feel it has helped them and who believe it is vital to their survival and well-being.
>
> We urge that any program for a clinical testing of krebiozen should include provisions to make the drug available to those who have been using it and have been advised by their physicians that other forms of treatment will be of no avail to them, if these persons volunteer to be subjects for the test.
>
> It is our understanding that the National Institutes of Health, with Food and Drug approval, clinically tests at least 100 products a year on cancer patients. We feel krebiozen deserves a similar test. Why should either side be afraid of the truth?

Cleveland Red Cross Chapter Offers Free "Service Star" Decals to Families of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Greater Cleveland Red Cross chapter last month began distributing Service Star decals to families of men in service. These Service Stars are to be displayed in windows of homes to show that a person from that family is serving his country. You will recall that during World War II Service Stars were a familiar sight on every street in our Nation.

The idea for bringing back the Service Star resulted from a letter to the editor of the Cleveland Press by Nunzio R. Calvo, commissioner of the Soldiers Relief Commission of Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio, which was published on December 30, 1965. Mr. Calvo wrote as follows:

> We live in an age of symbolism—everything has a meaning. What better way could we demonstrate ourselves than to revive the custom of displaying a Star in the windows of our homes for sons or daughters who are away serving their country? Even places of business used to do this to signify that their employees had left to serve.
>
> The number of men in Vietnam increases daily. This Star should be seen again as the symbol of hope, faith, and trust we place in our country and in the men who are serving it.

The project was launched on March 16, 1966, with a luncheon at which time the Greater Cleveland Red Cross chapter presented Mr. Calvo with a frame that included the first Service Star decal off the press, his original letter to the editor, and the following inscription:

> To N. R. Calvo, commissioner of Soldiers Relief, Cuyahoga County, for his thought-provoking letter to the editor which Red Cross officials acted on by making Service Stars available to families without charge.

Because the Cleveland Red Cross chapter is the first in the country to sponsor such a program, many eyes will be watching the success of the project. Perhaps other cities will follow-up on the idea, and once again the Service Star will be shown proudly in homes across the country. This is a wonderful way to display a symbol of support and confidence in our American servicemen away from home, and to share with these men and women our pride in the job they are doing for our country.

Albert Einstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 14, 1966, at ceremonies in Princeton, N.J., a commemorative stamp was issued in honor of Albert Einstein.

One of the speakers at this ceremony was my good friend and colleague, the Honorable Frank Thompson, Jr., Fourth District, New Jersey. When I came to Congress in 1959, Congressman Thompson was most kind and considerate in every way. I greatly appreciate his guidance and cherish his friendship.

I commend his excellent remarks, which follow, to the attention of my colleagues.

Remarks of Honorable Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, at Ceremony at Princeton University To Commemorate Issuance of the Stamp To Honor Albert Einstein, Monday, March 14, 1966

I am not going ot talk to you this morning about Einstein the physicist: I am no more able to add to what Professor Oppenheimer has said on that subject than any of the thousands who waited for 4 hours for the SS *Rotterdam* on the day 45 years ago when he first arrived in New York, and who lined Second Avenue for 2 miles just to see him and cheer.

I am not going to talk to you about him as a man I knew: I only met him once, nearly 20 years ago, while a few of you here today were his friends, and many of you remember him during the years at Princeton, sailing on Carnegie Lake or walking from Mercer Street to Fuld Hall.

I only want to say one thing this morning about the uniqueness of Einstein, and it is not a personal thing: it's not about what he meant to his fellow scientists or what he meant to the friends and disciples who loved him: it's about what he meant to those who didn't understand his work and who didn't know him, but to whom his name was as familiar as an 8-cent stamp—because that is the most important reason for commemorating him in this way—to try to keep alive a little of the inspiration that the idea of Einstein was to the rest of us.

The idea of Einstein that was born in the public imagination in the years after the experiment at Principe, delivered by the enthusiastic midwifery of the uninhibited press of the 1920's, was not originally the idea of Einstein the Zionist, although his importance to the movement as a symbol of the best in Jewish culture contributed to his public following: It was not originally the idea of Einstein the German speaking out against militarism and dictatorship, although this element grew during the years when he was a prime target of Nazi invective, and was evident, too, in the years after the First War when his first visits to London and Paris took place in an atmosphere of tension which was invariably dissolved by his presence: It was not originally the idea of Einstein the apostle of peace and the league, although this image grew stronger as he spoke out with increasing urgency against the tragedy of the nuclear arms race. All these causes drew strength from his name, but the power of his name and of the idea of Einstein had more mysterious origins than any of these.

I spent some time one afternoon last week trying to recapture that idea—an effort of imagination and retrospection, because today there is nothing comparable to that phenomenon of sudden, worldwide notoriety being won by the father of an idea not only incomprehensible to all but a few but without even any foreseeable practical consequences. As I thought about this paradox, I sent for the New York Times for April 1921, and read through the accounts of Einstein's first tour here with Chaim Weizmann. As I read the paradox seemed to be confirmed: It was precisely the incomprehensibility of Einstein that captured the imagination; everywhere during those public appearances he was badgered by reporters and by eager questioners in packed lay audiences for a statement of his theory, and everywhere the more delphic his replies, the more delighted were his listeners.

The spectacle of Einstein as one of the earliest crazes of the 1920's has its ludicrous side: There was no one to whom it seemed more ludicrous than to Einstein himself. Although with his perfect gentleness, he played the part of the mystic on these occasions with an indulgent gusto, especially when the act brought contributions to his beloved Weizmann and the Palestine Foundation Fund. But I prefer to think of the phenomenon in a different way: for millions of people whose minds were virgin in terms of abstract thought—unawakened—the idea of Einstein was the most vivid intimation in their lives of the scope and power of the human mind: for millions of people whose acceptance of the world around them was amorphous and unquestioning, the idea of Einstein was an intimation of an order and a vaster reality of which they could otherwise have had no glimpse. The innocent incomprehension of those millions as they listened to him and read about him and talked about him was neither ludicrous nor vulgar: it was as though an audience hopelesly blind from birth listened to one who could see, describing the beauty of the world. Not even knowing what it was to see the sort of reality that Einstein saw, people were nevertheless given hope and pride in humanity by the idea of him.

This is the paradox of Einstein the public figure: his memory will not fade among his fellow scientists—he has left them memorials enough: but his public memory will fade, and with it his unique inspiration: we welcome this fittingly beautiful stamp because it will contribute to keeping alive that memory and inspiration. That disquieting inspiration is well conveyed in the closing lines of a poem Archibald MacLeish wrote on Einstein in 1927: I should like to close with those lines this morning.

"Like a foam
His flesh is withered and his shriveling
And ashy bones are shattered on the dark.
But still the dark denies him. Still withstands
The dust his penetration and flings back
Himself to answer him.
Which seems to keep something inviolate.
A living something."

Croatia: Salute to Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, Croatian nationalist groups and other friends in America will observe the 25th anniversary of the realization of Croatia's centuries-old dream—freedom and independence. It was in April 1941 that the people of that ancient and culturally endowed land were finally able to assert once more their right to pursue their own destiny. Caught up in the tragedy of World War II, nevertheless, the Croatians made good on their determination to become an independent state.

Their determination and courage in facing numerous obstacles and odds was truly a remarkable and commendable feat. The Croatians' ancient experiences as a powerful kingdom and center of influence served to inculcate in them the stamina necessary to accomplish their long-sought goal.

However, the end of World War II saw the demise of Croatian independence and now she is an integral part of Communist Yugoslavia. But to those patriots who lived through that period of Croatian resurgence, their freedom was an experience they shall never forget. It is tragic that the people of such an ancient and historically rich entity are unable to express their own will and choice so as to enjoy the blessings of freedom.

I extend best wishes to the people of Croatia as they solemnly recall that April 1941 when their fellow countrymen were successful in proclaiming an independent Croatia. To Croatia's friends in America I also extend best wishes as they observe another April and recount the glory of those few years of Croatian independence.

Rehabilitation and Trends for Tomorrow Discussed by Senior Senator From West Virginia at Regional NRA Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, our able colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], a dedicated supporter and activist in programs of vocational rehabilitation, delivered an informative and enlightening speech on "Rehabilitation and Trends for Tomorrow," when he was the speaker for the conference banquet of region III of the National Rehabilitation Association on April 5, 1966, at Cedar Lake, Ripley, W. Va.

Senator Randolph was introduced by Dr. F. Ray Power, veteran director of the West Virginia Division of Vocational Rehabilitation who has teamed with the senior Senator from West Virginia in many successful rehabilitation program innovations and advances in that State, which annually ranks among the leaders of the Nation in rehabilitation achievements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record, Director Power's statement of introduction in his role as toastmaster, and Senator Randolph's message to the regional conference of the National Rehabilitation Association.

There being no objection, the statement and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Remarks of F. Ray Power, Director of Vocational Rehabilitation for State of West Virginia, Introducing Senator Jennings Randolph

Senator RANDOLPH is one of vocational rehabilitation's tested and true friends. He began helping the handicapped early in his legislative career and has kept at it. The Randolph-Sheppard Act of 1936 which provides employment for the blind through the establishment and operation of vending stands in Federal and other buildings, is an example of his pioneer work in behalf of the handicapped. This program now gives employment to nearly 3,000 blind individuals each year and does an annual gross business of $60 million. It has also brought dignity and independence to many thousands of blind people since it was enacted. I know of no instance during his legislative career where the interest of the handicapped has been involved that the Senator has not been on the right side working effectively to promote the cause.

The most recent major contribution of Senator RANDOLPH to the improvement of vocational rehabilitation in West Virginia, and in most of the States and jurisdictions in this region, was the role he performed in the enactment of the 1965 amendments of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 89–333).

Senate bill 1525 was introduced in the Senate and House bill 8310 in the House. The House deleted from its bill the provision which gave added consideration in the allocation of funds to low-income States such as West Virginia, and sent the measure to the Senate for approval. This was in August of last year when adjournment fever was high in Congress.

Word was sent out from our legislative representatives in Washington to urge the Senate to accept the House bill which had the unfavorable allocation of funds for West Virginia and other low-income States without amendments as our only choice. Instead of responding to this argument, Governor Smith and I called Senator RANDOLPH'S attention to the fact that West Virginia would lose $608,676 if the variable grant provision was not restored.

Senator RANDOLPH went to bat for the restoration of the provision to give low-income States additional funds. It was a long, hard fight and took many weeks. However, he won, and the variable grant provision was restored and West Virginia received $608,676 of additional funds as a result.

If I were running for office, I would not think of a better achievement than this. I am extremely proud to have worked with the Senator and to have shared in this achievement. It is no small task to add $608,676 to the annual basic allocation of rehabilitation funds which our State will continue to receive until the law is changed. I am sure this statute is good for 10 years and that means an additional Federal investment in helping our handicapped in West Virginia during this period of at least $6,086,760 without any increase in Federal appropriation. As Federal appropriations increase, our State allocations will proportionally increase in accordance with the favorable allocation in the new law.

Rehabilitation and Trends for Tomorrow

(Remarks by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, Region III National Rehabilitation Association Conference, Cedar Lake, W. Va., Apr. 5, 1966)

Our Nation's accomplishments in the field of rehabilitation, especially over the past 10 years, are both gratifying and significant. Last year, as you know, we surpassed the 135,000 mark in individuals rehabilitated in 1 year.

This figure represents twice the annual number of people returned to jobs just 10 years ago, and exceeds the total performance of such programs during their first 20 years. In 1951, only 51 of every 100,000 Americans completed rehabilitation. By 1965 that number had increased nearly 40 percent. More than half of the people rehabilitated had formerly depended on family or friends as their primary means of support. Approximately half had dependents. In 1965 nearly 11,000 people were removed from the welfare rolls completely as a result of the help and training received through rehabilitation

But, although the list of past accomplishments in rehabilitation is impressive, a much larger number of people must be served—by more and improved services. The usual estimate of the annual increment of handicapped people needing rehabilitation is between 200,000 and 300,000, but E. B. Whitten, executive director of the National Rehabilitation Association, has expressed the view that the annual figure lies closer to 1 million. Mary Switzer, Commissioner of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, has written recently on a backlog of unhelped disabled in excess of 2 million. It is estimated that 32 million Americans have either neurological or orthopedic handicaps. And this figure does not include persons who are severely disabled with cardiac complications, or arthritis, or pulmonary conditions.

Last year, just as the impact of the 1954 Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments had reached a plateau, Congress responded by passing new amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. With a new emphasis on all handicapped people, not just the physically handicapped, these amendments will make possible both expansion and pioneering. They will mean an improvement in diagnosing and counseling service for the disabled. In many States, they will make services available regardless of financial need. The construction of new rehabilitation centers and workshops will be undertaken with new Federal aid. Workshops will be improved with the help of money for renovation and technical assistance, and more up-to-date training will be offered to rehabilitants. All of these improvements—and others—will be better coordinated than earlier. State planning is strengthened in the new amendments by 100 percent Federal grants up to $100,000 per year for the purpose of statewide planning. Innovation in vocational rehabilitation is encouraged by special grants for such purposes. More money has been authorized for wider research in the field. To coordinate and disseminate the information which is learned or known, the new amendments provide for the establishment of a nationwide data system in rehabilitation.

It is not necessary for me to list the highlights of last year's vocational rehabilitation amendments while speaking to this audience. You are knowledgeable on the improvements. And you are concentrating your efforts on implementing them. This new legislation not only allows but encourages the use of our imagination in the task of implementation. It gives us reason to look ahead and to plan our next moves in the field of vocational rehabilitation. I am sure that you, as experts in the field, already have many ideas. That's why you are here at this conference—to voice them and share them and explore the possibilities of working toward their realization. Mine is a sympathetic voice in the U.S. Senate. In the remainder of my time on this occasion, I will discuss what I see as some of the future dreams and goals in rehabilitation.

Already the concept of the term "rehabilitation" is broadening. It will continue to do so, as the meaning of the word "handicapped" also become broader. I feel that Americans in general are becoming more aware of the fact that handicaps are not limited to obvious physical deformities, but also include such disabilities as mental illness, and mental retardation. A person is handicapped if he had always lived in a culturally and economically poor environment, or if he has a criminal record. A person is often handicapped because he is elderly. Partial handicaps, more often than not, become barriers to complete personal fulfillment, stumbling blocks in the road to obtaining the help needed so that a handicapped person can learn to achieve his potentials. Consider, for example, the skilled worker who becomes disabled and must accept a job that requires comparatively little skill and brings much lower pay.

Just as Americans are beginning to redefine in broader terms the word "handicapped," we are beginning to change our attitudes toward the handicapped. The handicapped are less and less frequently thought of as being those who lack talent to succeed. We are becoming aware of the large numbers of people among us who until now have not had an equal or an adjusted chance to share in the bounties of our Nation. We are beginning to realize that individuals suffering from disabilities are unnecessarily unhappy. We are beginning to realize that the handicapped can take useful positions in our society and can, through gaining self-respect, lead happy lives.

The field of vocational rehabilitation must capitalize on these changing attitudes in the general public. In the future, rehabilitation must expand its horizon and include all of these groups I have just mentioned—the educationally and environmentally handicapped, the mentally handicapped, those with criminal backgrounds, the aged, and the partially handicapped. It should also begin to serve the needs of more disabled people whose employability is questionable, or who have no need to be gainfully employed, such as homemakers.

Rehabilitation must begin to reach those groups whose needs in general have been overlooked. Rehabilitation should also be expanded to include all of the normally handicapped. No longer should Americans be content to know that public rehabilitation services are available only to a selected number of those whose needs require such services.

In addition, the intensity and quality of services available need to be increased. Hopefully this will be assured through increased research and increased funds. More trained professions in the field of rehabilitation are needed—as are innovations in methods. New counseling approaches ought to be developed and introduced. Nonvocational and prevocational training, both academic and nonacademic, should receive added attention.

Preventive rehabilitation should be given strong emphasis in an effort to prevent the conditions which make rehabilitation necessary. The value of expansion in preventive rehabilitation becomes clear in light of the high incidence of premature births in our country. One out of ten babies born each year is premature, and half of them are handicapped in some way.

Expansion in rehabilitation should not be limited to an in-group activity. Your programs, it seems to me, could benefit through closer coordination with the service agencies and institutions which do work related to yours. There properly is emphasis on a total approch to many different problems which face society. I feel that rehabilitation would profit by this approach also. Public education, health, welfare, and employment agencies are your natural allies.

I favor the suggestion, for instance, that the public health service agencies be contracted to perform more of the followup activities in rehabilitation and to serve more of the chronically ill and disabled. Some State rehabilitation agencies are already working with State education and labor authorities to bring vocational rehabilitation under the umbrella of aid available to the handicapped through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act, among others. Private and voluntary organizations and institutions serving the handicapped or the deprived would surely make effective teammates. Closer coordination with universities and colleges—particularly in conducting research and experimental projects—would benefit the handicapped. The advice and help of employers should be sought with the assistance of the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped. Labor unions have shown an active interest in taking a larger part in rehabilitation activities. Various groups would be receptive, I am sure, to an effort to undertake a more intensive information campaign. The general public needs to be better informed concerning the goals and services in rehabilitation.

Medical doctors also need to be kept better informed about the latest devices and methods in rehabilitation. In sum, I believe that if the efforts of those public and private organizations involved in rehabilitation were combined and coordinated to a higher degree, their impact would be substantially increased.

These projections for the future of rehabilitation are not just dreams. They are trends for which the seeds are already being sown. I feel confident that they will grow and that before another decade has passed, new innovations will have been introduced.

But progress is not automatic. Active leadership and the force of your combined imaginations, resources, and energies are necessary. I am gratified to be a U.S. Senator from West Virginia, the State which is providing real leadership in the progress of rehabilitation.

Last year was the sixth consecutive year in which West Virginia was the leading State in the Nation in per capita rehabilitations. Its average is 216 persons rehabilitated for every 100,000 in the State, compared to the national average of 70. Last year, one or more rehabilitative services were performed for 16,934 individuals in our State.

Along with serving a large number of people, West Virginia remains a leader in innovation. Through much of the past 5-year period, the State program has included more operative projects than any other State. No less than 14 research and development projects were active in 1964. Many of these projects have been only in the areas of expansion which I discussed—for mentally retarded, for persons over 55 years old, and for that one-third who have been rejected by the selective service. Also, there have been projects to develop a data collection system, to build community-based rehabilitation centers, and to intensify training and research. West Virginia is instituting rehabilitation special education programs for the State's 10,000 mentally retarded public school children, in an attempt to prevent their dropping out of school. Also, there is planning for increased services for the chronically ill and for inmates at penal institutions.

Praise for West Virginia's programs cannot be offered without mention of the pioneering work in rehabilitation which has been accomplished by the United Mine Workers.

As a West Virginian, it is understandable that I enjoy recounting our State's accomplishments. It is also heartening to know that it is not the only State in this regional group which is leading in the field of rehabilitation. While West Virginia ranks 1st in the Nation in the rate per capita rehabilitated, the District of Columbia is 2d, North Carolina is 3d, Kentucky is 8th, and Virginia and the Virgin Islands are 14th and 16th, respectively. And all of the members of this region rank in the top half of the Nation in persons rehabilitated per 100,000 population. You have an impressive number of workshops in operation, and have undertaken special research and experimental projects. The future record of rehabilitation in this region will surely be even more impressive than that of the past.

I believe that, in the next decade, two new trends will be emphasized in the field of rehabilitation—first, expansion of activities, including numbers, kinds, and quality of services rendered—and, second, greater coordination of public and private organizations in the profession to provide a "total approach" to rehabilitation. It has been said that "rehabilitation is, essentially, an individualized approach to helping a handicapped individual solve his problems." Let us hope that, in the years to come, the broadening concepts of "rehabilitation" and "handicapped" and the progress that is made in the field will make this individualized approach to rehabilitation possible more completely for more people.

A Simple Cup of Tea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, Ben Ferguson lived in my State of Colorado for 40 years and worked as a farmer, teacher, rancher, and businessman.

Now he is living in East Pakistan, where 60 million people crowd the land. Few can read or write. Landholdings are small, and farmers are hesitant to risk new methods when failure could mean starvation. Ben Ferguson is helping to change this in his role as an agricultural adviser to the Agency for International Development.

His simple story is told in a 30-minute film entitled "A Simple Cup of Tea."

This film will be shown at 9 a.m. Wednesday, April 27, in room 2200 of the Rayburn Building at the State Department briefing for Members of the House. The meeting, as usual, is for Members only. Bill Macomber, head of the Near East-South Asia region of AID, will be present to answer questions.

The Secretary of State personally has seen the film and thought it was so good that it should be shown at the briefing. I urge every Member to see it.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

The Reverend Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God of all nations, by whose providence we are citizens of a land of hope and glory, we rejoice in our heritage of faith and freedom.

We give Thee thanks for the joy we have found through the many benefits that have come to us through the fidelity of men and women who have kept faith with their ideals. Help us to prove our gratitude by good service this day and by passing on the will for the right to those who follow.

Grant Thy blessing upon the President, his advisers, and the Congress during these testing days. Give wisdom and guidance in helping them to use wisely their authority to advance the welfare of all men.

We offer this prayer and dedication in the name and spirit of Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HARRIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 7, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 6, 1966, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 13, 1966, received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 13774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 14122. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14215. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14266. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 13774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14122. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14215. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14266. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 6, 1966,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on April 7, 1966, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 22. An act to promote a more adequate national program of water research;

S. 1049. An act to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees;

S. 2642. An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes;

S. 2835. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association;

H.R. 959. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 2752. An act for the relief of Kock Kong Fong;

H.R. 2938. An act for the relief of Przemyslaw Nowakowski;

H.R. 2939. An act for the relief of Manojlo Verzich;

H.R. 3875. An act for the relief of Mrs. Panagiota Vastakis and Soteros Vastakis;

H.R. 4743. An act for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid;

H.R. 6112. An act for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park);

H.R. 6319. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries, and to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the initial enrollment period for supplementary medical insurance benefits;

H.R. 7813. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to China;

H.R. 8466. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of insurance premium finance companies in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Ki Sook Jun;

H.R. 11029. An act relating to the tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics;

H.R. 11664. An act to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1966, as "Sir Winston Churchill Day";

H.J. Res. 837. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Bond Week"; and

H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 6, 1966,

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported favorably the nomination of Robert LaFollette Bennett, of Alaska, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 1) thereon, which report was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 9, 1966, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 2394. An act authorizing the planning, design, construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States; and

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1966, as "Sir Winston Churchill Day."

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. HARRIS, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert LaFollette Bennett, of Alaska, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the confirmation of the nomination of Robert LaFollette Bennett as the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs is the high point in the career of a man who has devoted 29 years as a career civil servant and a man who is most knowledgeable and informed on the problems of the American Indian. Mr. Bennett was born on the Oneida Indian Reservation in Wisconsin. Most recently he was area director in Juneau, Alaska.

The nomination of Robert Bennett as Commissioner of Indian Affairs is another step forward in the Federal Government's effort to improve conditions on the Indian reservations and among the Nation's "First Citizens." The new program began with the appointment of Philleo Nash, also of Wisconsin, in the Kennedy administration. Under the Nash administration the Bureau of Indian Affairs began to move again, becoming much more aware of the modern day problems of the Indian. Philleo Nash, if for no other reason, should be commended for his effort in restoring Indian confidence in the Federal Government. He excelled in his personal relationship with the Indians.

Conditions on the Montana Indian reservations have improved considerably in the past several years. The accelerated public works program was of great help to many of the reservations in resource development. Welfare services, industrial development, housing, education, and other economic services have become much more effective. All of this has been in an effort to help the Indians help themselves. Insofar as the reservations of Montana are concerned, and there are seven of them, they have benefited considerably since 1961. Conditions are still not the best; there is need for many more improvements. A crash program is not going to solve the problems of these people overnight. The plight of the American Indian, much to the disgrace of our Nation, has been with us for many, many years. Large grants of money, termination or get-rich-quick schemes are not going to help the Indians help themselves.

Admittedly, there is not one reservation in Montana which could not use more Federal assistance for this and that. But it will not do any good to just give them the money. They need other kinds of assistance and guidance to develop leadership, talents, and know-how in utilizing the funds for the benefit of all concerned. A new fully equipped house is of little value to an Indian family if they are not equipped to take care of it and knowledgeable of basic home economics. When there is a new house, there should also be some guidance and training.

Relocation and termination are satisfactory when the Indian people involved are ready for it and by their own consent. To force them to do this compounds an already difficult situation. Industrial development on the reservation can contribute to the economic development and stability of many of our reservations, but only if done with proper consultation with the Indians. The Bureau of Indian Affairs must be ever on guard against exploitation in the field of industrial development.

The new Commissioner of Indian Affairs is inheriting a most difficult task, one which he is well prepared to meet. With improved attitudes within the Bureau and the cooperation of other Federal agencies this task can be realized. This goal cannot be realized overnight and it is one to which I hope the Congress will devote some attention in the immediate future.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. Harris, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Amendment to the Budget, 1967, for Department of the Interior (S. Doc. No. 86)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations for the fiscal year 1967, in the amount of $10,300,000, for the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Report on 1965 Soil Bank Conservation Reserve Program

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the 1965 soil bank conservation reserve program, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Rural Electrification Act of 1936, To Provide Additional Sources of Financing for the Rural Electrification and Rural Telephone Programs

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide additional sources of financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Commodity Exchange Act

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to restrict further the use of customers' funds by commodity futures commission merchants, to authorize further the regulation of records of contract markets, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Relief for Certain Members and Former Members of the Army

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army on whose behalf erroneous payments were made for storage of household goods (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Prevention of Excessive Forces Attrition Among Women Officers of the Naval Service

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prevent excessive forced attrition among women officers of the naval service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Construction of Army National Guard Armory, Keokuk, Iowa

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of an Army National Guard Armory, at Keokuk. Iowa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Property Acquisitions of Emergency Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended March 31, 1966; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on U.S. Travel Service

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the U.S. Travel Service, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Legislation Relating to District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal language authorizing additional compensation for the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia for serving as general counsel to the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title V of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of Part B of Title XVIII of Social Security Act

A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for improvement in multiple award contracting policy, General Services Administration, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings attainable through revisions of construction standards to avoid excess seating capacity in school dining facilities, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on opportunities for savings through greater use of available military aircraft parts, Federal Aviation Agency, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of long-term medical research on aging of aviation personnel, Federal Aviation Agency, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of royalties charged to the U.S. Government for use by Government contractors of chemical milling inventions, Department of the Air Force, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of safety conditions in certain storage areas primarily in the South Building of the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, dated April 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audits of Government Services, Inc., and of its employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan, for the year ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Activities of, Expenditures by, and Donations to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines, Grand Forks, N. Dak.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Charles H. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Establishment of a Nationwide System of Trails

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Increase of Authorization for Appropriation for Continuing Work in Missouri River Basin

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315g) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Activities Under Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, dated April 1, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Act Relating to Participation of the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to the participation of the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Department of Labor

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during the year ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Section 709, Title 18, United States Code

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 709 of title 18, United States Code, so as to protect the name of the Central Intelligence Agency from exploitation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Granting of Third and Sixth Preference Classification to Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions according third preference and sixth preference classification to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Audit Report of Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

A letter from the National Quartermaster-Adjutant, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that organization, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1965 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Administration of Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, covering the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report of Advisory Council on State Departments of Education

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Amendment of Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and Railroad Retirement Tax Act

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to make certain technical changes, to provide for survivor benefits to children ages 18 to 21 inclusive, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Construction of Buildings for Postal Purposes

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to construct buildings for postal purposes, to acquire title to real property therefor, to repair, alter, preserve, renovate, improve, extend, and equip such buildings (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Resolution 150

"Resolution registering opposition to the imposition of tolls or user charges, either directly or indirectly, upon the enjoyment of our inland waterways as a free passageway for commerce

"Whereas the imposition of tolls and/or user charges on the historically free inland waterways of the United States of America may be considered during the current session of Congress; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Kentucky has been endowed with more miles of navigable rivers than any other State in the Union; and

"Whereas waterway user charges would prejudice Kentucky cities located on the inland waterway system carrying shallow draft barges which are proposed to be taxed thereby giving greatly increased economic advantage to areas served by deep draft vessels which are not proposed to be taxed; and

"Whereas the industrial development of Kentucky—past, present, and future—has been and will be due in large measure to the availability of water transportation for its bulk commodities which are essential to the development of heavy industry with the collateral development of satellite industries and services, waterway tolls or user charges would restrict and impede water transportation and thus sharply curtail the economic growth potential of the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas imposition of user charges on the inland waterways would constitute a breach of faith with those Kentucky industries which have made vast private investments in industrial plants dependent upon the continuance of low-cost water transport as well as investments in boats and barges and related shore installations; and

"Whereas the solution to the economic problems of the Appalachian region of Kentucky is dependent in large part upon the sound development of water resources of that area; and

"Whereas the imposition of an excise tax on water transportation, which has from the earliest days of this Nation been free of such taxes, would by increasing transportation costs inevitably increase costs to the consumer and thus increase inflationary pressures: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky*, That the imposition of tolls or user charges on the historically free inland waterways of the United States is not in the public interest and is destructive to needed acceleration of the economic development of the Commonwealth and the generation of new jobs and industry and said house of representatives does hereby register opposition to the imposition of tolls or user charges, either directly or indirectly, upon the enjoyment of our inland waterways as a free passageway for commerce and further that the chief clerk of the house of representatives is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to memorialize the Congress of the United States by forwarding copies thereof to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and to the members of the committees who have responsibility with respect to waterways development, waterways commerce, and taxation.

"Attest:

"Addie Stalley,
"*Assistant Clerk of House of Representatives.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolution 121

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact proposed legislation H.R. 12663 and H.R. 12862 which would result in making the port of Buffalo an export point for more foreign aid grain and flour shipments

"Whereas for many, many years Buffalo's importance as the milling center of the world depended upon the great volume of feed grains that were shipped here and stored here and thereby necessitated the construction of large grain warehouses in Buffalo; and

"Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation, a branch of the Federal Department of Agriculture, has for the past number of years reduced its overall storage costs, has drastically cut the rate it paid for storage of surplus grain, and thus has caused our commercial elevators to suffer great losses; and

"Whereas this arbitrary action by a Federal agency has seen Buffalo's position as a flourishing grain center gradually dwindle to its present unstable position forcing the closing of local grain elevators, with the resultant loss of employment; and

"Whereas with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway much of the export grain business which used to be channeled through Buffalo has now been lost to us; and

"Whereas it should be the concern of the Federal Government to compensate the communities for such drastic losses, especially when it has within its powers and resources to do so; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States two bills, H.R. 12663 and H.R. 12862, which would remedy this situation and would result in making the port of Buffalo an export point for more foreign aid and flour shipments: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact with all convenient speed H.R. 12663 and H.R. 12862 which would accomplish the purposes of this resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

"By order of the senate,

"Albert J. Abrams,
"*Secretary.*

"Concurred in without amendment, March 31, 1966, by order of assembly.

"John T. McKennan,
"*Clerk.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Concurrent Resolution 665

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to not reduce the appropriations for the Federal school lunch program and the Federal special milk program as recommended by the administration's budget proposals for 1966–67

"Whereas through no fault of their own there are many public school age children whose parents do not have economic means sufficient to provide for them an adequate and well-balanced diet; and

"Whereas it is vital to the well-being of all citizens that the youth of our country grow into healthy and properly developed adults; and

"Whereas an adequate Federal school lunch program and a Federal special milk program are essential in significantly improving the nutrition of these economically handicapped future citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, that Congress be memorialized to not reduce the appropriations for the Federal school lunch program and the Federal special milk program as recommended by the administration's budget proposals for 1966–67; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each U.S. Senator from South Carolina, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States, and the House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 97

"Joint resolution relating to the construction by the Federal Government of the proposed Bradley Lake hydroelectric project

"Whereas the growth and development of Alaska depends upon continued planning and construction of hydroelectric projects assuring adequate power at reasonable costs to the consumer; and

"Whereas the official 1960 U.S. census report reported a total population of 8,866 people residing on the Kenai Peninsula and the population has rapidly expanded since that census; and

"Whereas the development of agriculture and industry on the Kenai Peninsula requires substantial amounts of low-cost electrical power; and

"Whereas a number of public hearings sponsored by existing utilities and studies made by engineers in the power field during the past years indicate that the Kenai Peninsula and the Cook Inlet area will face a power shortage within the next few years unless new sources are immediately developed; and

"Whereas several years ago the U.S. Corps of Engineers completed the study of the proposed Bradley Lake hydroelectric project located on the Kenai Peninsula and this study was examined and approved by the interested Federal agencies; and

"Whereas this study showed that the proposed Bradley Lake project would develop 64,000 kilowatts of energy at a cost of seven mills per kilowatt-hour; a cost comparable with the cost of energy produced from other possible projects of like size; and

"Whereas new construction techniques may make the cost of the Bradley Lake project lower than originally projected; and

"Whereas it is in the national interest that water power be utilized as much as possible for the generation of electric power rather than petrochemicals which are not replenishable resources: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Alaska respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to appropriate the necessary funds for and to expedite in every possible way the construction of the Bradley Lake hydroelectric project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House; the Honorable Wilbur D. Mills, chairman, House Ways and Means Committee; the Honorable Charles L. Schultze, Director, Bureau of the Budget; the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget; the Honorable Russell B. Long, chairman, Senate Finance Committee; and to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate, March 4, 1966.

"Robert J. McNealy,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Passed by the house, March 29, 1966.

"Mike Gravel,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"Nadine Williams,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*
"William A. Egan,
"*Governor of Alaska.*"

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution by General Court of Massachusetts

"Resolution memorializing the Secretary of Defense and Members of the Congress of the United States to prevent the proposed merger of the Reserve Forces of the Armed Forces into the National Guard units of the several States

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts urgently requests the Secretary of Defense to rescind the order relative to the merger of the Reserve Forces of the armed services into the National Guard units of the United States, and urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to prevent such proposed merger; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, March 28, 1966.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk.*

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, March 30, 1966.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

Two resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution by General Court of Massachusetts

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the monthly payments under the Federal Social Security Act to $200

"Whereas the cost of the necessities of life in this country has risen to an alltime high; and

"Whereas a substantial portion of the people of this Nation depend to a large extent if not entirely upon the monthly payments received by them under the social security program; and

"Whereas the current monthly payments under said program have now become grossly inadequate for their needs; and

"Whereas an increase of such maximum payments to $200 per month would tend to relieve such conditions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the maximum monthly payments to persons under the Federal Social Security Act to $200; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, March 18, 1966.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk.*

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, March 22, 1966.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

Resolution of General Court of Massachusetts

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a 10-percent increase to those who receive social security benefits

"Whereas there has been a sharp increase in the cost of living: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a 10-percent increase to those persons who receive social security benefits; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, March 18, 1966.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk.*

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, March 22, 1966.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Resolution 15

"Resolution expressing support for the Alaska delegation appearing before Congress on Alaska native housing legislation

"Whereas the Congress now has before it S. 1915, a bill authorizing a housing program for Alaska natives sponsored by the

Honorable E. L. Bartlett, senior U.S. Senator from Alaska; and

"Whereas S. 1915 would establish a loan and grant housing program specifically designed for Alaska's remote villages and thus fulfill a desperate need for village housing without parallel in the Nation; and

"Whereas a delegation of Alaskans will be in Washington, D.C., to testify in support of this vital legislation before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Alaska expresses its full support for the delegation of Alaskans appearing before Congress on behalf of S. 1915, a bill authorizing a desperately needed housing program for Alaskan natives, and urges that S. 1915 receive the expeditious approval of Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable John Sparkman, chairman, Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 14

"Resolution supporting an effort to improve the status of the Department of State office dealing with international fishery problems

"Whereas there is an increasing need to strengthen the U.S. position in the field of international fisheries; and

"Whereas the U.S. fishery problems on the high seas are becoming more numerous as our coastal and distant waters fisheries develop and expand; and

"Whereas the present status of the Office of the Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State is not adequate to meet the international fishery problems of the future; and

"Whereas a meeting has been called by U.S. Senators E. L. Bartlett and Warren G. Magnuson between the Secretary of State and congressional and industry representatives interested in the U.S. fisheries, to review the problem: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Alaska expresses support for strengthening the Office of the Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State and wishes every success for the congressional meeting with the Secretary of State and industry representatives to resolve the problem; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, U.S. Senator from Alaska."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Joint memorial to the Honorable President of the United States, the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, and the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, assembled in the third extraordinary session of the 38th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the State of Idaho has an abundance of fertile virgin land which, with the application of water that is available can be called upon to help feed the growing population and the hungry people of the world; and

"Whereas the State of Idaho and committees of the Congress of the United States have recognized these facts and are presently working on legislation to create what is known as the Southwest Idaho water development project; and

"Whereas we wholeheartedly endorse and commend the concept of said proposed project; and

"Whereas we also believe the State of Idaho should enlarge the concept of comprehensive development of the Snake River and its tributaries as set forth in the proposed draft of the Southwest Idaho water development project legislation to include an emphatic declaration that the proper development of all water projects must recognize fully the utilization of upstream projects to beneficially apply the water to projects upstream, and the return flow of those waters applied for re-use in projects downstream throughout the State of Idaho; and that any legislation must include ironclad guarantees that no waters shall be removed from the basin of its origin for any purpose at any other place unless such waters are surplus to any and all present and future uses within the basin, including domestic, agricultural, mining and industrial uses: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate, State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we request that the Congress of the United States immediately engage in a study to prepare and complete feasibility reports fund, and/or take whatever action is appropriate, and authorize as a unit project the development of the entire Snake River and its tributaries, under the concept of full utilization of upstream development in projects like Lower Teton, Lynn Crandall Dam, Ririe Flood Control Dam, Blackfoot Dam raising and refacing, American Falls replacement, Jackson Lake replacement (five smaller dams in the State of Wyoming), Snake River plains recharge, Salmon Falls project, Raft River-Oakley diversion and the recharge of the downstream by return flow from such projects for downstream development of those projects specified in the Southwest Idaho water development project and others that may be feasible for the complete development of the Snake River and its tributaries; we further urge the immediate funding and construction of the Lower Teton Dam; that the foregoing shall be done without obstructing or delaying the Southwest Idaho water development project legislation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the individual Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in the U.S. Congress, the Secretary of the Department of Interior, and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture."

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial to the Honorable President of the United States, the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior and to the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture

"We your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the natural resources of the State of Idaho include land peculiarly adapted to agricultural development, and abundant sources of water which are not being put to beneficial uses; and

"Whereas the ever-expanding population of the Nation and the world demand that such lands and waters be utilized in the production of foodstuffs; and

'Whereas modern methods of developing agricultural lands require tremendous capital expenditures for irrigation systems, thus requiring large acreages for economic feasibility, and the combination or pooling of small desert entry tracts is essential to the development of presently unproductive lands: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring)*, That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to take appropriate action to permit the orderly development, through private enterprise, of our public lands for agricultural purposes on a realistic basis, including the utilization of sufficient water therefor; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That all desert entry applications now pending before the Department of Interior be reviewed in the light of this resolution and a decision rendered; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That all applications for patents now pending before the Department of Interior for desert entry be likewise acted upon; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Department of Interior be required to permit the combination of individual desert entries, under appropriate rules and regulations, to carry out the purpose of this resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the individual Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress, the Secretary of the Department of Interior, and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 42

"Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to legalize as the national anthem the words and music of the 'Star Spangled Banner' as composed by Francis Scott Key and arranged by Thomas Carr

"Whereas in the name of patriotism, and with traditional regard for honoring and protecting the historical customs and heritage of this country, we hereby propose that the 'Star Spangled Banner' be legalized as the national anthem in the form in which the poem was written by Francis Scott Key and the music was adapted by Thomas Carr. The United States is about to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the writing and publication of our national anthem, and it would be eminently fitting and timely to have this great song legalized as the national anthem in the form in which it first was written and arranged; and

"Whereas following the writing of the poem which we now know as the national anthem, Francis Scott Key took his verses to Mr. Thomas Carr and requested Mr. Carr to set them to music. It is recorded that several arrangements were tried before concluding that the one we know of today was the best possibility; and

"Whereas at that time, Thomas Carr and his father, Joseph Carr, were in the music publishing business. Their work consisted of teaching music, composing music, adapting and arranging it and also the directing of choral music. Their place of business in 1814 was at 36 Baltimore Street in the city of Baltimore. When Francis Scott Key took his verses to Mr. Thomas Carr, the verses had no title and, of course, no musical arrangement. It was Mr. Carr who gave a title to these verses, arranged the music, and then published the new song. When it was first published, the sheet music from it carried the notation: 'Adapt. & Arrd. by T.C.'; and

"Whereas the verses of Francis Scott Key did not become a patriotic song or an anthem until they were set to music. The honor for the musical arrangement as well as the occasion for writing the verses belongs to the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland, as well as to the families of Mr. Key and Mr. Carr; and

"Whereas it is said that there now are several hundred arrangements and versions of the words and music of the 'Star Spangled Banner.' Clearly, as the national anthem, Congress should specify the words as composed by Francis Scott Key and the music as adapted and arranged by Thomas Carr; and

"Whereas these words and music now are wedded in the bond of time. In respect to the great history and traditions of the United States, it is eminently fitting and proper that as our national anthem we should legally adopt the words and music of the 'Star Spangled Banner' as originally composed by Francis Scott Key and as arranged and adapted by Thomas Carr; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to legalize and adopt as the national anthem the words as first composed by Francis Scott Key and the music as first arranged by Thomas Carr; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution are sent to the Presiding Officer of each House of the Congress of the United States and also to Senators BREWSTER and TYDINGS, and Representatives FALLON, FRIEDEL, GARMATZ, LONG, MACHEN, MATHIAS, MORTON, and SICKLES.

"Read and adopted by the senate, March 9, 1966.

"WILLIAM S. JAMES,
"President of the Senate.
"J. WATERS PARRISH,
"Secretary."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 5

"Joint resolution relative to the Ventura Marina

"Whereas organized for the purpose of constructing and operating a small craft facility, the Ventura port district has been operating the Ventura Marina to provide recreational facilities for the people of Ventura County and the State of California; and

"Whereas the use and successful operation of the Ventura Marina has been drastically impaired by two related phenomena: excessive buildup and settling of littoral sand in the entrance channel, and extremely heavy wave action at or near the entrance channel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to take such steps as may be necessary to investigate and assist in correcting the intolerable conditions which exist at or near the entrance to the Ventura Marina; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers."

A certified copy of senate bill No. 446, chapter 859, California Statutes of 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE BILL 446—CHAPTER 859

"An act to add chapter 3.5, commencing with section 175, to division 1, title 1, of the Government Code, relating to the common boundary between the States of Arizona and California, and ratifying an interstate compact between Arizona and California

"SECTION 1. Chapter 3.5 (commencing with section 175) is added to division 1 of title 1 of the Government Code, to read:

" 'CHAPTER 3.5. COLORADO RIVER BOUNDARY COMPACT

" '175. The interstate compact executed between the States of Arizona and California, as set forth in section 176 of this chapter, fixing the location of the boundary line between the two States from the southern boundary of the State of Nevada to the point on the international boundary which is common to the boundaries of Arizona and California, and the United Mexican States, is hereby ratified and approved.

" '176. The provisions of the interstate compact between the States of Arizona and California referred to in section 175 are as follows:

" ' "INTERSTATE COMPACT DEFINING THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE STATES OF ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA

" ' "Article I. Purpose

" ' "The boundary between the States of Arizona and California on the Colorado River has become indefinite and uncertain because of meanderings in the main channel of the Colorado River with the result that a state of confusion exists as to the true and correct location of the boundary, and the enforcement and administration of the laws of the two States and of the United States have been rendered difficult.

" ' "The purpose of this compact is to fix by reference to stations of longitude and latitude the location of the boundary line between Arizona and California on the Colorado River from the southern boundary of the State of Nevada to the point on the international boundary which is common to the boundaries of Arizona and California and the United Mexican States.

" ' "Article II. Description

" ' "The boundary between the States of Arizona and California on the Colorado River from the point where the oblique boundary between California and Nevada intersects the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude, said point being common to the boundaries of the States of Arizona, California and Nevada, to the point on the international boundary which is common to the boundaries of Arizona, California and the United Mexican States, shall be in accordance with the following description in general terms of 34 points on the boundary:

" ' "General Description of Boundary Between Arizona and California

" ' "Point No. 1. The intersection of the boundary line common to California and Nevada and the centerline of the channel of the Colorado River as constructed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, said point being common to the boundaries of Arizona, California, and Nevada, where the 35th degree of north latitude intersects the centerline of said channel; thence downstream along and with the centerline of said channel to the southerly end of said construction to

" ' "Point No. 2, which is located in the center of the channel of the Colorado River approximately one-half mile northerly from the A.T.&S.F. Railway Bridge at Topock; thence downstream on a straight line to

" ' "Point No. 3, which lies in the Colorado River vertically below the centerline of the A.T.&S.F. Railway tracks at a point midway face-to-face of abutments of the A.T.&S.F. Railway Bridge at Topock, Arizona; thence on a straight line downstream to

" ' "Point No. 4, which lies in the Colorado River vertically below the centerline of U.S. Highway 66 at a point where said centerline intersects the center of the center pier of the highway bridge; thence on a straight line to

" ' "Point No. 5, which lies in the Colorado River vertically below the center of the span of the gas line bridge owned by the El Paso Natural Gas Co. and the Pacific Gas and Electric Co., crossing the Colorado River at Topock, Arizona; thence downstream in a southerly direction through Havasu Lake along a line midway between the right and left shore lines of said lake as they exist at mean operating level (elevation 448.00 above Mean Sea Level), as controlled at Parker Dam to

" ' "Point No. 6, which is the center of the overflow section of Parker Dam across the Colorado River; thence downstream midway between the shore lines on the right and left banks of the Colorado River to

" ' "Point No. 7, which lies in the center of the Colorado River approximately 2,050 feet upstream from the earthfill of Headgate Rock Dam; thence on a straight line to

" ' "Point No. 8, which is the center of the earthfill of Headgate Rock Dam; thence on a straight line to

" ' "Point No. 9, which lies on the centerline of the river approximately 3,625 feet westerly from Point No. 8; thence on a straight line to

" ' "Point No. 10, which lies in the center of the Colorado River at a point where the parallel of 34° 10′ north latitude intersects said centerline; thence on a straight line to

" ' "Point No. 11, which lies in the Colorado River vertically below the centerline of Arizona Highway No. 72 midway between the abutments of the highway bridge; then down the Colorado River midway between the right and left shorelines across islands which may exist between those waterlines to

" ' "Point No. 12, which is at the center of the earthfill section of the Palo Verde Diversion Dam; thence down the Colorado River midway between the shorelines on the right and left banks to

" ' "Point No. 13, which is vertically below the center of the center span of the highway bridge across the Colorado River at Ehrenberg, Ariz. (U.S. Highway 60–70); thence down the Colorado River midway between the shorelines on the right and left banks to

" ' "Point No. 14, which is the center of the Cibola Bridge midway between abutments; thence down the Colorado River midway between the shorelines on the right and left banks, ignoring future channelization by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to

" ' "Point No. 15, which lies on the centerline of the Colorado River approximately 8,400 feet northward of the center of the overflow section of Imperial Dam; thence on a straight line to

" ' "Point No. 16, which is the center of the overflow section of Imperial Dam; thence on a straight line normal to the longitudinal axis of Imperial Dam to

" ' "Point No. 17, which lies at the intersection of the last described line with a line extending northeasterly from the center of the overflow section of Laguna Dam and normal to the longitudinal axis of the said Laguna Dam; thence southeasterly on a straight line to

" ' "Point No. 18, which is at the center of the overflow section of Laguna Dam; thence on a straight line to

" ' "Point No. 19, which lies on the centerline of the Colorado River approximately 5,800 feet southwesterly of Point 18; thence down the Colorado River midway between the shorelines on the right and left banks, around a curve to the eastward to

"'"Point No. 20, which lies on the centerline of the Colorado River where said centerline intersects the section line between Sections 4 and 9, Township 8 South, Range 22 West, Gila and Salt River Meridian; thence departing from the river on a westerly course along the extension of the abovementioned section line about 0.65 mile to

"'"Point No. 21, which will be the northwest corner of the northeast quarter of Section 8, Township 8 South, Range 22 West, Gila and Salt River Meridian, which shall be resurveyed in establishing this boundary; thence southerly along the centerline of said Section 8 about one-half mile to

"'"Point No. 22, which is the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of Section 8, Township 8 South, Range 22 West, Gila and Salt River Meridian; thence westerly about one and one-half miles to

"'"Point No. 23, which is the west quarter corner of Section 7, Township 8 South, Range 22 West, Gila and Salt River Meridian; thence southerly about one-half mile to

"'"Point No. 24, which is the southwest corner of Section 7, Township 8 South, Range 22 West, Gila and Salt River Meridian; thence westerly about one mile to

"'"Point No. 25, which is the southwest corner of Section 12, Township 8 South, Range 23 West, Gila and Salt River Meridian; thence southerly about one-half mile to

"'"Point No. 26, which is the west quarter corner of Section 13, Township 8 South, Range 23 West, Gila and Salt River Meridian; thence westerly about 1.93 miles to

"'"Point No. 27, which lies on the east shoulder of the north-south road through the Indian School approximately 370 feet due east of the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 25, Township 16 South, Range 22 East, San Bernardino Meridian; thence southerly along and with the easterly shoulder line of the said north-south road approximately 700 feet to

"'"Point No. 28, which lies on the easterly shoulder line of said north-south road due east of the northeast corner of the stone retaining wall around the Indian School Hospital; thence due west to

"'"Point No. 29, which is the base of the northeast corner of said retaining wall; thence southerly along and with the westerly shoulder of said north-south road to

"'"Point No. 30, which lies on the westerly shoulder line of said north-south road 330 feet south of and approximately 110 feet east of the northeast corner of Section 35; Township 16 South, Range 22 East, San Bernardino Meridian; thence due west approximately 110 feet to

"'"Point No. 31, which lies on the east line of Section 35, Township 16 South, Range 22 East, San Bernardino Meridian, exactly 330 feet south of the northeast corner of said Section 35, thence southerly along the east line of said Section 35 to

"'"Point No. 32, which lies at the center of the Colorado River, i.e., midway between the north and south shore lines just downstream from the centerline of the old U.S. Highway 80 Bridge across the Colorado River; thence down the centerline of the Colorado River midway between the shore lines on the right and left banks to

"'"Point No. 33, which is a point in the Colorado River vertically below the center of the new U.S. Highway 80 Bridge; thence down the centerline of the Colorado River midway between the shore lines on the right and left banks to

"'"Point No. 34, which is the intersection of the centerline of the Colorado River and the International Boundary Line between California and the United Mexican States, which point is common to the boundaries of Arizona, the United Mexican States, and California.

"'"These points will be marked on existing bridges and dams and where appropriate will be monumented. Between each of these points will be a number of subpoints not monumented. The total number of points and subpoints will approximate 234. The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey will locate the above-mentioned 34 points on the boundary by precise geodetic surveys. The Coast and Geodetic Survey will locate the remaining approximately 200 unmonumented subpoints by precise photogrammetric methods and will provide a list of the geographic positions and state coordinate positions (transverse Mercator system for Arizona and Lambert system for California) of each of the 234 points on the boundary. The approximately 200 unmonumented subpoints will be identified on copies of the aerial photographs by the State of Arizona and California to define the boundary; the Coast and Geodetic Survey will then locate the points so identified by analytic aerotriangulation (photogrammetric methods).

"'"When the survey and boundary description has been completed by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Boundary Commissions of Arizona and California have each certified that it is in conformity with the General Description of Boundary between Arizona and California set forth herein, it shall be attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A" and made a part hereof as though fully incorporated herein as the permanent description of the boundary between the states of Arizona and California.

"'"Article III. Ratification and effective date

"'"This compact shall become operative when it has been ratified and approved by the legislatures of the states of Arizona and California, and approved by the Congress of the United States.

"'"Executed in duplicate this 12th day of March 1963, A.D. at Sacramento, California.

"'"For the State of Arizona:

"'"Wayne M. Akin,

"'"Chairman of the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission, Chairman.

"'"Robert W. Pickrell,

"'"Attorney General, Member.

"'"Obed M. Lassen,

"'"State Land Commissioner, Member.

"'"Attested:

"'"Howard F. Thompson,

"'"Executive Secretary, Colorado River Boundary Commission of Arizona.

"'"For the State of California:

"'"F. J. Hortig,

"'"Executive Officer, State Lands Commissioner, Chairman.

"'"Stanley Mosk,

"'"Attorney General, Member.

"'"William E. Warne,

"'"Director, Department of Water Resources, Member.

"'"Attested:

"'"Berrien E. Moore,

"'"Executive Secretary, Colorado River Boundary Commission of California".'

"Sec. 2. Proclamation by Governor.—The Secretary of State of the State of California shall transmit a duly certified copy of this act to the Governor of the State of Arizona. The Governor of this State, whenever officially advised that the State of Arizona has ratified and approved the compact set forth in Section 1 and whenever the Congress of the United States has approved the compact, shall make proclamation of that fact. A copy of such proclamation shall be published one time in one newspaper of general circulation in the county seat of Imperial, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.

"Sec. 3. Petition to Congress.—The Congress of the United States, as soon as the State of Arizona has ratified and approved the compact set forth in Section 1 and when Exhibit "A" has been attached thereto as provided for in the compact, is petitioned pursuant to Article I, Section 10, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, to give its consent to the compact between the States of Arizona and California, as set forth in section 1. The Secretary of State of the State of California, in concurrence with the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona, shall transmit duly certified copies of this act to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Senators and Representatives from the States of Arizona and California to the Congress of the United States, who are petitioned to take such action as they deem proper to procure the consent of the Congress of the United States to this compact between the States of Arizona and California.

"Sec. 4. Preservation of rights.—Nothing contained in the provisions of this act, or any operation thereof, shall prejudice the titles, rights or claims of any person, public or private, natural or artificial, to any of the lands herein involved, whether such titles, rights or claims arise or exist upon the basis that the lands affected by the designation of boundary as set forth in the compact and in this act were previously a part of the State of Arizona and have now become a part of the State of California, or were previously a part of the State of California and have now become a part of the State of Arizona, or otherwise; and no person shall be prejudiced in the water rights which he now has by reason of anything contained in this act.

"Sec. 5. Recordation of documents.—Upon approval by the Congress of the United States of the compact set forth in section 1 of this act, the Secretary of State shall cause to be recorded in each of the offices of the County Recorders of Imperial, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties a certified copy of this act. As to lands theretofore considered a part of the State of Arizona which, under the terms of said compact, are within the boundaries of the State of California, from and after the date of such recording, certified copies of patents, deeds, and other instruments affecting the title to the lands which shall have been recorded in the office of the county recorder of the county in Arizona in which the lands were so considered to be located shall be accepted and recorded by the county recorder of the county in California in which the lands are located under the terms of the compact, without charge therefor. Recordings made under the provisions of this section shall have retroactive effect as constructive notice to the date of their original recording in the State of Arizona.

"A true and complete copy of the compact with exhibit A attached thereto shall be filed for a permanent public record in the office of the California secretary of state by the Colorado River Boundary Commission of California, and certified copies thereof shall be filed in the office of the California State Lands Commission, and thereupon the Executive Officer of the State Lands Commission shall cause to be recorded in Imperial, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties true copies thereof certified by him. Upon recordation thereof, such certified copy shall be notice to all persons of the particulars of the compact and survey and boundary description."

A resolution adopted by the Oregon Legislative Tax Study Committee; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"We, the members of the Oregon Legislative Tax Study Committee, established pursuant to chapter 581, Oregon Laws, 1965, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas certain school districts in the State of Oregon have been beneficiaries of the provisions of chapter 13, title 20, United States Code Annotated, entitled "Financial Assistance for Areas Affected by Federal Activities"; and

"Whereas this committee has been informed and advised that measures have been submitted to the Congress seeking to repeal or abridge the provisions of said chapter; and

"Whereas testimony has been submitted to this committee that the enlargement of school populations caused by the proximity of tax-exempt Federal installations and facilities has resulted in a substantial increase in the costs of providing elementary and secondary education which would result in an excessive property tax burden to local taxpayers if it were not for payments from the Federal Government to the affected school districts in lieu of taxes pursuant to chapter 13, title 20, United States Code Annotated; and

"Whereas it appears just, reasonable, and necessary that school expenses caused by distortions in school populations imposed by Federal activities in the vicinity be reimbursed by the Federal Government to the local school district or other municipality so long as the distortions exist: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the legislative tax study committee*, That the Congress of the United States be requested to retain the provisions for financial assistance for areas in Oregon affected by Federal activities, without diminution thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"GLEN M. STADLER,
"*Chairman*."

A letter, in the nature of a petition, signed by the principal and cafeteria manager of the Southwestern Elementary School, Chesapeake, Va., favoring the continuance of the school milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Maple Heights, Ohio, Board of Education favoring the continuation of the school milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the mayor and City Council, City of Vallejo, Calif., relating to the encouragement of travel within the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution, in the nature of a petition, adopted by the House of Man, Tallahassee, Fla., signed by sundry citizens of the United States, relating to the convening of the Charter Review Conference within the 21st year of the United Nations at New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Council of Veterans Organizations of Greater Dallas, Tex., condemning those who burn draft cards and desecrate the flag; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Outing Club of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C., relating to the protection of the wilderness of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., at Miami, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation making it a Federal offense to take part in any activities designed to promote communism in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., commending the President and his policies; ordered to lie on the table.

INTERIM REPORT ENTITLED "INVESTIGATION INTO FEDERALLY INSURED BANKS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1103)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, on behalf of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I submit an interim report of its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, entitled "Investigation Into Federally Insured Banks." This report covers a series of hearings conducted during 1965 into the failure of a number of banks that were insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The subcommittee has not yet closed its investigation of banks and other financial institutions that are funded or insured by Federal agencies, and it is likely that we will hold additional hearings and file at a later date a final report on matters now under inquiry.

Testimony we heard last year clearly demonstrated that many abuses and improper banking practices had occurred in a number of banks. We learned that certain corrupt and dishonest persons committed abuses and engaged in such practices only to obtain control of banks so that they could loot them of their assets.

Our examination of bank failures also disclosed that existing Federal laws are obviously inadequate to prevent the acquisition of control of banks and other financial institutions by persons of questionable character and integrity, who lack banking experience and financial responsibility.

We found that proper oversight of changes in bank control was not provided by Federal supervisory authorities, who failed to give effective supervision and make necessary examination of banking activities under their jurisdictions. Our hearings also disclosed that these agencies, particularly the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, failed to maintain high levels of interagency coordination and liaison.

The report gives particular attention to the chartering policy for national banks that was followed by Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon since he assumed office in 1961, which resulted in an unprecedented increase in the number of national banks. One of the subcommittee's findings is that Mr. Saxon's attempt to "change the closed image of the banking business" has burdened the industry with increased elements of risk.

Two of the most flagrant examples of the inadequacy of the supervision exercised by the Comptroller's Office, as described in this report, relate to the disintegration and collapse of the San Francisco National Bank and of the Brighton National Bank of Brighton, Colo.

Evidence clearly showed that Comptroller Saxon had available in June of 1964, 7 months before the San Francisco National Bank was placed in receivership, information that there were many violations of law in the operation of the bank. One of his national bank examiners attempted to report these criminal activities to the Department of Justice on June 22, 1964, but Comptroller Saxon did not forward the letter to the Attorney General until February 26, 1965, 8 months later. This was about a month after the bank had been closed and more than a month after the subcommittee had started its investigation. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, compelled by law to insure the bank's deposits, was never informed that the bank was, in Mr. Saxon's own words, "so murked down in just plain rot and corruption that there was no hope."

Madam President, that was his testimony before the committee. He permitted the bank to operate for 7 to 8 months after he had detailed information regarding the criminal activities which were being engaged in on the operation of the bank. After making its investigation, the FDIC closed the bank. The FDIC's ultimate liability, as a consequence of this bank's failure, may reach as much as $25 million.

A thorough investigation by the Comptroller's Office of the charter application for the Brighton National Bank would have revealed the false statements made by the applicants and by the proposed officials of the bank.

Madam President, there has been a flagrant dereliction of duty with respect to making the proper and adequate investigations before issuing some of these bank charges. Such an investigation would also have disclosed the secret agreement by which the organizers of the bank were in fact acting as front men for the person seeking to gain the controlling interest. A proper investigation was never made. From its opening on May 1, 1963, until its failure on January 22, 1965, the affairs of the Brighton National Bank were marked by fraud, forgery, corruption, and almost every kind of abuse and impropriety imaginable.

Madam President, it would be satisfying to report that, as a result of our hearings, the Federal banking agencies have taken appropriate action to remedy the deplorable conditions that were exposed. We would be gratified and most happy to state that the American banking industry is now receiving the efficient supervision and excellent administration that is so obviously needed. Regrettably, thus far, however, the deficiencies that we found have not been corrected, although more than a year has passed since they were disclosed by our investigation. The Department of Justice has taken action on some of the criminal activities; seven persons who were involved with banks we investigated have been indicted, and two of them have been tried, convicted, and sentenced to long prison terms. The others are awaiting trial.

The exposure and publicity afforded by our hearings have removed some undesirable persons from the banking industry. The banking field is basically sound and of high integrity, but the subcommittee believes that legislative action is needed to prevent its infiltration by confidence men, bank pirates, and other corrupt individuals. We must correct the inadequacies of existing laws that permit these abuses, and we must require the Federal agencies to exert maximum effort toward efficient administration and supervision, and to exercise effective interagency coordination and liaison.

Accordingly, the report of the subcommittee contains a number of recommendations. In partial summary, the subcommittee asks the Congress to consider legislation that will:

First. Require mandatory public hearings for new bank charters;

Second. Provide thorough investigations of applications for new national bank charters, to assure that the Comptroller of the Currency has checked the background and character of the applicants, has determined the sources of their capital and its encumbrances, and has ascertained that there are no secret agreements to provide front men for true beneficial owners;

Third. Require the Comptroller of the Currency to obtain the views of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Reserve System on proposed charters;

Fourth. Provide the same kind of investigation for the conversion of State banks to National banks or for proposed changes of controlling interests in other federally insured banks;

Fifth. Require cooperation and liaison among all Federal banking agencies, with full interchange of information, promptly and without charge;

Sixth. Prohibit improper solicitation of deposits through abuses of certificates of deposit, provide for registration of money brokers who deal in such certificates, and require regular periodic reports on the use of these financial instruments;

Seventh. Require independent audits for banks covered by Federal insurance;

Eighth. Exclude felons from management or policy control of federally insured banks;

Ninth. Limit the borrowing of money for the purchase of bank stocks;

Tenth. Prohibit false statements on loans and credit applications;

Eleventh. Provide for a comprehensive study by the executive branch of the functions and regulations of the banking agencies and of the laws that govern them, in order to determine whether reorganization and centralization of their functions is needed.

The subcommittee also recommends that the Federal banking agencies cooperate in efforts to improve the scope and effectiveness of their bank examination procedures, and that all of the examining agencies work together in exchanging and assessing examination reports and other information about improprieties disclosed during examinations. It is essential that all abuses and violations of law be referred swiftly by the agency which finds them to the other agencies that may be concerned, particularly those charged with Federal law enforcement, and the subcommittee strongly urges that this be done.

Madam President, most of the recommendations made by the subcommittee in this interim report lend themselves to legislation, and they are included in a bill which I introduced during the past session of Congress. The measure, S. 2575, was cosponsored by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, and we believe that its provisions, if enacted into law, would deter and prevent the inefficiency corruption, and dishonesty which we found in the banks that we investigated. The bill would also increase the effectiveness of administration and strengthen the supervision that must be provided by the Federal banking agencies.

Earlier this year, the President also recognized the need for corrective legislation in this area in his Economic Report to Congress. As a consequence of his concern, another banking bill, S. 3158, to strengthen and protect our financial institutions, has been introduced and is currently being considered by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. On April 4, I testified before the Financial Institutions Subcommittee in its hearings on that bill. I supported the principal objectives of S. 3158, which would authorize certain remedial actions by the Federal banking agencies against unsafe and unsound practices whenever they are disclosed in the banking industry.

Madam President, the legislation which is recommended in this report, and is incorporated in S. 2575, in no way conflicts with the provisions of S. 3158. In fact, these measures supplement and complement each other. It is my hope that Congress, after due examination of these proposals, will enact their principal features into law and thus take a long step toward remedying the unsafe and unsatisfactory conditions exposed by our investigation and analyzed in this report.

Madam President, for the RECORD, I should like to emphasize that this report was signed and agreed to by all nine members of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. It is not a partisan report. It is a bipartisan report in the sense that it is unanimous. I believe we are all in agreement that remedial legislation is needed and that conditions in Federal supervisory agencies, especially in the Comptroller General's office, must be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The report will be received and printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3207. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 3208. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Bethard; and

S. 3209. A bill for the relief of Zopia Zych; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 3210. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Illinois-Indiana air pollution control compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BAYH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3211. A bill to make certain expenditures of the city of Huntsville, Ala., eligible as local grants-in-aid for the purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

S. 3212. A bill to make certain expenditures of the city of Birmingham, Ala., eligible as local grants-in-aid for the purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949;

S. 3213. A bill to make certain expenditures made by the city of Mobile, Ala., eligible as local grants-in-aid for the purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949;

S. 3214. A bill to make certain expenditures by the University of Alabama eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; and

S. 3215. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide mortgage insurance, and authorize direct loans by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine or dentistry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3216. A bill to amend title II of the Act of September 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 960), as amended, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 3217. A bill to amend title VI (relating to cropland adjustment) of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 so as to permit a change from the installment method of payment under any agreement entered into under such title to the lump sum advance payment method whenever such change is requested by the producer; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

CONGRATULATION OF ASTRONAUTS NEIL ARMSTRONG AND DAVID R. SCOTT

Mr. HARRIS (for Mr. LAUSCHE) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 85) congratulating Astronauts Neil Armstrong and David R. Scott, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HARRIS, which appears under a separate heading.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILL MAKING IT A FEDERAL OFFENSE TO DESECRATE THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, the bill I introduce would make it a Federal offense to desecrate the American flag.

It is rather singular that in various sections of the country our flag has been hauled down, despoiled, spat upon, desecrated, and trampled in the mud, yet there is no Federal statute to deal with such offenses.

As I recall, nearly every State in the Union has a statute of one kind or another and prescribes a rather heavy penalty for its violation. It is high time there be incorporated in the Criminal Code of the United States something along the same line as the States require, together with a heavy penalty.

That is the purpose of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3207) to prohibit desecration of the flag, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ILLINOIS-INDIANA AIR POLLUTION COMPACT

Mr. BAYH. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to grant the consent and approval of Congress to the Illinois-Indiana Air Pollution Control Compact. This agreement, which has been negotiated by the authorities of these two States and has been adopted by their respective legislatures, is fully in accord with and would enable these governments to implement national policy and goals in this vital area.

Problems caused by polluted air have been recorded for centuries. Patricians of ancient Rome complained of smoke smudges on their togas. King Edward I of England executed a man because he burned pollution-producing coal instead of wood. During Queen Elizabeth's reign the brewers of Westminster offered to burn wood because of the Queen's celebrated allergy to coal smoke.

As inconsequential as these events may appear to be now, we realize that they were mere preludes to modern disaster. Extensive urbanization and massive industrialization have resulted in several air pollution tragedies in recent years. In 1931, 60 people died in the Meuse Valley in Belgium when atmospheric conditions stagnated deadly sulphur dioxide and particulate matter in the air. Twenty fatalities were recorded in Donora, Pa., in 1948, when similar conditions were present.

Killer smog plagued London, England, for a week in 1952. When the air cleared, London counted 4,000 deaths directly attributable to poisonous air. Similar events within the last 5 years in England and New York have taken the lives of an additional 1,200 people.

Modern science has discovered that air pollution is not only deadly and harmful to human beings but to plant and animal life, agricultural products, building materials, and textiles. Estimates placed on dollar loss from atmospheric pollution total $11 billion annually in the United States.

Increasing awareness of this disturbing situation has resulted in congressional action designed to combat air pollution. The Clean Air Act, as amended, provides the Nation with tools with which we can begin to purify our atmosphere. A key provision of this law encourages the creation of agreements between States for air pollution abatement purposes. Such compacts are important weapons in our antipollution arsenal because much of our Nation's population is located in rapidly expanding metropolitan areas whose pollutants frequently cross boundary lines of local jurisdiction and often may extend into two or more States.

Such a distressing situation exists in the Indiana-Illinois region. Beginning in the northern suburbs of Chicago, swinging in an arc through that great metropolis and around the southern tip of Lake Michigan, and encompassing the cities of Hammond, East Chicago, Gary, and other incorporated municipalities of Indiana, is one of the most densely populated and highly industrialized areas of the world. Any person familiar with this complex grouping of communities realizes that it would be futile to attempt to combat air pollution in any one of them without taking similar action in adjacent cities and counties.

The States of Illinois and Indiana have declared that air pollution is a potential hazard to human, animal, and plant life. Laws have been enacted by both States creating an Interstate Air Pollution Control Commission to prevent pollution originating in one from injuriously affecting life and property in the other. Let me summarize briefly the major features of this agreement.

Article I proclaims that, because air pollution is a potential hazard, the two States will cooperate in its control and abatement. The stated purpose of the agreement is to prevent pollution originating in one State from injuriously affecting life and property in the other State.

Article II defines air pollution as the presence of matter in sufficient quantity in the air to be injurious to human, plant, or animal life, to property, or to cause human discomfort.

Article III describes the organization of the Interstate Air Pollution Control Commission. Seven members shall be appointed by each State Governor. The State health agency and the State air pollution control agency, as well as industry, labor, and local government, will each be represented by one commissioner and two will come from the general public. All commissioners, except the State government representatives, will have 4-year terms. The State government members, who are ex officio, will serve on the commission as long as they hold office. The commission will annually choose from their members both a chairman and a vice chairman. A majority of each State's delegation will constitute a quorum, and no action taken by the commission will be binding unless approved by at least four commissioners from each State. The commission is vested with powers to conduct its business and to employ necessary personnel, and it has the responsibility of reporting to the States once a year.

Article IV empowers the commission to conduct studies and reports on air pollution problems and to recommend corrective action. If its recommendations for prevention or abatement have not been implemented within 6 months, the commission is authorized to hold hearings on the subject and can issue orders to correct the nuisance. Compliance with the orders of the commission is made the duty of the party against whom charges are made in case of dispute and enforcement may be secured by the commission through an action commenced in any court of competent jurisdiction.

Article V outlines hearing procedures and provides for the right of judicial review of commission orders.

Article VI gives the commission and its duly designated officers the right to enter, at reasonable times, either public or private property, for the purpose of inspecting sources of air pollution.

Article VII grants the power to establish advisory and technical committees which would further the work of the commission.

Article VIII states that the compact authorization does not alter or abolish the power of the party States to individually enact and enforce air pollution laws which are not inconsistent with the compact.

Article IX provides for the financing of commission activities and requires the keeping of accurate accounts.

Article X would continue the compact in force until it is expressly repealed by either party, but no repeal act could be effective until 1 year after its adoption.

Article XI is the traditional severability clause, stating that in the event any one part of the compact should be declared invalid or should be repealed, the remainder of the agreement shall still be in force.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Illinois-Indiana compact be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

This agreement is in direct response to the intent and spirit of section 2 of the Clean Air Act. It seems to me that the States of Illinois and Indiana should be commended for taking this action and that it should be approved by Congress forthwith. A similar measure, H.R. 9582, has been introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable CHARLES M. PRICE, of Illinois.

Madam President, I believe that this agreement will help the people of Illinois and Indiana avoid future tragedies like these which have struck the Meuse Valley, Donora, Pa., London, and New York. For this reason I am introducing this ratification legislation and hope that it will receive prompt and serious consideration by both Houses of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3210) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Illinois-Indiana air pollution control compact, introduced by Mr. BAYH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3210

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to the Illinois-Indiana air pollution control compact between the States of Illinois and Indiana. Such compact reads as follows:

"ILLINOIS-INDIANA AIR POLLUTION CONTROL COMPACT

"Article I. Findings and purposes

"(a) The party states find that there are potential hazards to the health, welfare, property and comfort of the people resulting from pollutants discharged into the atmosphere and which move from one party state to the other. It is the purpose of the party states to recognize and provide for the control of such interstate movement of air pollutants through the establishment of an agency of the party states with powers, in the absence of sufficient individual local or state action, to prevent, abate and control such interestate air pollution conditions.

"(b) Each of the party states pledges to the other faithful cooperation in the control of future air pollution and in the abatement of existing air pollution which originates in one state and detrimentally affects the normal health, the general welfare, the property, and the comfortable enjoyment of life (comfort and well-being) of the people in the other state, and in order to effect such object agrees to enact and enforce any necessary legislation to enable each State to place and maintain the air resources in the outdoor atmosphere of each state in such condition as will be consistent with the protection of the normal health, the general welfare, the property, and the comfortable enjoyment of life of the people, maximum employment and full industrial development. Each state shall seek the accomplishment of these objectives through the prevention, abatement, and control of air pollution by all practicable and economically feasible methods.

"(c) It is recognized by the party states that no single standard for outdoor atmosphere is applicable to all areas within the two-party states due to such variables as population densities, topographic and climatic characteristics, and existing or projected land use and economic development. The guiding principle of this compact shall be that air pollution originating within a party state shall not injuriously affect humans, plants, animal life, or property, or unreasonably interfere with the enjoyment of life and property in the other party state.

"Article II. Air pollution defined

"As used in this compact 'air pollution' means the presence in the outdoor atmosphere of particulate matter, dust, fumes, gas, mist, smoke, or vapor, or any combination thereof in sufficient quantities and of such characteristics and duration as to be injurious to human, plant, or animal life, or to property, or which unreasonably interferes with the comfortable enjoyment of life and property.

"Article III. The Commission

"(a) The party states hereby create the Illinois-Indiana Interstate Air Pollution Control Commission, hereinafter called 'the Commission', with the powers and duties set forth herein, and such additional powers as may be conferred upon it by subsequent action of the respective legislatures of the party states.

"(b) The Commission shall consist of seven commissioners from each party state, each of whom shall be a citizen of the state he represents. The seven commissioners from each party state shall be chosen by the Governor of such state, in accordance with the laws of such state, as follows: one commissioner to be the head of the state health agency; one commissioner to be the technical secretary of the state air pollution control agency; one commissioner to be representative of industry; one commissioner to be representative of labor; one commissioner to be representative of local government; and two commissioners to be representative of the general public. Except for the heads of the state health agencies and the technical secretaries of the state air pollution control agencies, who shall be commissioners during their continuance in the aforementioned positions in the respective state health and air pollution control agencies, the term of each commissioner shall be four years." However, the terms of those commissioners initially appointed as representatives of industry, labor, local government, and the general public shall, in the case of the commissioners from each party state be as follows; two for two years; one for three years; and two for four years. Vacancies on the Commission shall be filled for the unexpired term in the same manner as appointments to full terms.

"(c) The Commissioners of the party states shall each be entitled to one vote in the Commission. No action of the Commission shall be binding unless taken at a meeting in which a majority of the members from each party state are present and unless at least four commissioners from each state vote in favor thereof.

"(d) The Commission may sue and be sued, and shall have a seal.

"(e) The Commission shall elect annually, from among its members, a chairman and vice-chairman. The Commission shall appoint an executive director who shall act as secretary, and who, together with such other Commission personnel as the Commission may determine, shall be bonded in such amount or amounts as the Commission may require.

"(f) Irrespective of the civil service, personnel or other merit systems laws of any of the party states, the Commission shall appoint, remove or discharge, and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the Commission's functions. To the extent practicable terms and conditions of employment for members of the staff of the Commission shall be similar to those pertaining to comparable employees of the individual party states.

"(g) The Commission may establish and maintain, independently or in conjunction with any one or more of the party states, a suitable retirement system for its employees. Employees of the Commission shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect to old-age and survivors insurance, provided that the Commission takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to federal law to participate in such program of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The Commission may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate to afford employees of the Commission terms and conditions of employment similar to those enjoyed by employees of the party states generally.

"(h) The Commission may borrow, accept, or contract for the services of personnel and other services or materials from any state, the United States or any subdivision or agency of either, from any interestate agency, or from any institution, person, firm, or corporation.

"(i) The Commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact any and all donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services conditional or otherwise, from the United States, or any agency thereof, from any state or any subdivision or agency thereof, or interstate agency, or from any institution, person, firm or corporation, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same. The identity of any donor, the amount and character of any assistance, and the conditions, if any, attached thereto shall be set forth in the annual report of the Commission.

"(j) The Commission may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The Commission may acquire, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

"(k) The Commission may adopt, amend, and rescind bylaws and procedural rules for the conduct of its business.

"(l) The Commission annually shall make to the Governor and legislature of each party state a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the Commission. The Commission may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable. These reports shall be available for public examination.

"(m) The Commission shall have the authority to collect and disseminate information.

"Article IV. Functions

"(a) The Commission may make studies of interstate air pollution problems and whenever it finds conditions of such character and duration as to be injurious to human, plant, or animal life, or to property, or which unreasonably interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life and property in the party state where the air pollution does not originate, the Commission shall make a report recommending measures for the prevention, abatement, or control of any such conditions, and shall furnish copies of such report to all state and local air pollution control agencies with jurisdiction over the source or sources of air pollution identified in such report as causing or contributing to such pollution. In preparing any such report, the Commission may confer with any appropriate national, regional, or local planning body, and any governmental agency authorized to deal with matters relating to air pollution problems and conduct such hearings and investigations as it may deem appropriate. The Commission may consult with and advise the States, communities, municipalities, corporations, persons, or other entities with regard to the adoption of programs and the installation of equipment and works for the prevention, abatement, or control of air pollution. For the enforcement of this compact the Commission may also establish standards consistent with the provisions of this compact and any such standards which may be adopted by the party states.

"(b) Before the Commission adopts any report which specifically identifies a particular industrial or other installation, structure or facility as a source of air pollution, an opportunity shall be afforded the owner or operator of the structure, installation or facility, to discuss the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the proposed report.

"(c) No formal study shall be undertaken and no report pursuant to paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Article shall be adopted by the Commission, except on the affirmative vote of at least four commissioners from each of the party states.

"(d) No less than six months after the Commission furnishes a report to the appropriate state and local air pollution control agencies pursuant to paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Article and, if the recommendations made in such report for the prevention, abatement or control of air pollution from a specific source or sources have not been implemented, or if the appropriate state or local air pollution control agencies have not taken sufficient action to prevent, abate or control the air pollution, the Commission may after a duly conducted and constituted hearing on due notice issue an order or orders upon any municipality, corporation, person, or other entity causing or contributing to air pollution in a state other than that in which the air pollution originates. At any such hearing evidence may be received and a finding made on whether, in fact, interstate air pollution exists and the sources of such pollution. Any such order or orders may prescribe a timetable for the abatement or control of the air pollution involved.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the municipality, corporation, person or other entity to comply with any such order issued against it or him by the Commission. Any court of competent jurisdiction shall entertain and determine any action or proceeding brought by the Commission to enforce any such order against any municipality, corporation, person or other entity domiciled or located within such state or whose discharge of air pollution takes place within or adjoining such state, or against any employee, department or subdivision of such municipality, corporation, person or other entity: *Provided, however*, Such court may review the order and affirm, or reverse or modify the same, if such order is found to be deficient or unlawful on any of the grounds alleged pursuant to Article V(c) of this compact.

"Article V. Hearing and review procedures

"(a) All hearings held by the Commission shall be open to the public. At any hearing held pursuant to Article IV(b) or Article IV (d) of this compact the party states, any agencies thereof, and any affected person, corporation, municipality or other entity shall be entitled to appear in person or by representative, with or without counsel, and may make oral or written argument, offer testimony, or take any combination of such actions. All testimony taken before the Commission shall be under oath and recorded in a written transcript. The transcript so recorded shall be made available to any member of the public or to any participant in such hearing upon payment of reasonable charges therefor as fixed by the Commission. No information relating to secret processes or methods of manufacture or production shall be disclosed at any public hearing or otherwise and all such information shall be kept confidential.

"(b) All hearings shall be had before one or more members of the Commission, or before an officer or employee of the Commission expressly designated thereby to act as a hearing officer.

"(c) Any party state or person aggrieved by any order made by the Commission shall be entitled to a judicial review thereof. Such review may be had by filing with any court of competent jurisdiction a verified petition setting out such order and alleging specifically wherein said order is:

"1. Arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion or otherwise not in accordance with law.

"2. Contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege or immunity.

"3. In excess of authority or jurisdiction conferred by this compact or statutes in implementation hereof.

"4. Without observance of procedure required by law.

"5. Not within the purposes and guiding principles set forth in Article I of this compact.

"6. Unsupported by substantial evidence.

"(d) The petition for review shall be filed within thirty-five days after receipt of written notice that such order has been issued. Written notice of the filing of such verified petition for review and a copy of said petition shall be personally served upon the Commission. Any party or person so filing such verified petition for review with such court shall within fifteen days thereafter secure from the Commission a certified copy of the transcript of any hearing or hearings held in connection with the issuance of the order, review of which is sought and file the same with the clerk of such court in which such action or proceeding for review is pending. An extension of time in which to file such transcript shall be granted by said court in which such action or proceeding for review is pending for good cause shown. Inability to obtain such transcript within the specified time shall be good cause. Failure to file such transcript within the period of fifteen days, or to secure an extension of time therefor, shall be cause for the dismissal of such petition for review by the court or on petition of any party of record to the original action or proceeding. Where more than one person may be aggrieved by the order only one proceeding for review may be had and the Court in which a petition for review is first properly filed shall have jurisdiction.

"(e) No review of a Commission order shall be had except in accordance with the provisions of this compact.

"Article VI. Right of entry

"The Commission, acting by any duly designated officer, employee or agent thereof, shall have the right, to enter at all reasonable times in or upon any private or public property except private residences for the purpose of inspecting and investigating any condition which the Board shall have reasonable cause to believe to be an air pollution source.

"Article VII. Advisory and technical committees

"The Commission may establish one or more advisory and technical committees composed of such as the following: private citizens, expert and lay personnel, representatives of industry, labor, commerce, agriculture, civic associations, and officials of local, state and federal government as it may determine, and may cooperate with and use the services of any such committee and the organizations which they represent in furthering any of its activities under this compact.

"Article VIII. Compact not limiting

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to:

"1. Limit or otherwise affect the powers of either party state or any of their subdivisions to enact and enforce laws or ordinances for the prevention, abatement or control of air pollution, provided that such laws, ordinances, or enforcement activities are not inconsistent with the provisions of this compact.

"2. Prevent or restrict either party state or any subdivision thereof in requiring or prescribing measures of air pollution prevention, abatement or control in addition to those which may be required by either party state or the Commission acting pursuant to this compact.

"Article IX. Finance

"(a) The Commission shall submit to the Governor or designated officer or officers of each party state a budget of its estimated expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that state for presentation to the legislature thereof.

"(b) Each of the Commission's budgets of estimated expenditures shall contain specific recommendations of the amount or amounts to be appropriated by each of the party states. Aside from such support as may be available to the Commission pursuant to Article III(i) the cost of operating and maintaining the Commission shall be borne equally by the party states.

"(c) The Commission may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under Article III(i) of this compact, provided that the Commission takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in this manner. Except where the Commission makes use of funds available to it under Article III(i) hereof, the Commission shall not incur any obligations prior to the allotment of funds by the party states adequate to meet the same.

"(d) The expenses and any other costs for each member of the Commission shall be met by the Commission in accordance with such standards and procedures as it may establish under its bylaws.

"(e) The Commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the Commission shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its bylaws. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited yearly by a certified or licensed public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

"(f) The accounts of the Commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by duly constituted officers of the party states and by any persons authorized by the Commission.

"(g) Nothing contained herein shall be construed to prevent Commission compliance with laws relating to audit or inspection of accounts by or on behalf of any government contributing to the support of the Commission.

"Article X. Entry into force and withdrawal

"(a) This compact shall enter into force and effect when enacted into law by the states of Illinois and Indiana. The compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each party state until expressly repealed by either party state, but no such repeal shall take effect until one year after the enactment of the statute repealing this compact.

"(b) Any order of the Commission issued prior to the termination of this compact shall be enforceable thereafter by either party state in the same manner as though this compact were still in force except that any appropriate office or agency of the enforcing party state may act in the place and stead of the Commission.

"Article XI. Construction and severability

"It is the legislative intent that the provisions of this compact be reasonably and liberally construed. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of either state or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby."

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

CLARIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INDUSTRIAL SAFETY BOARD

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Code, in order to clarify the responsibilities of the District of Columbia Industrial Safety Board.

Some questions have arisen in recent years regarding the scope of the Board's responsibility toward providing for safe working conditions for employees in the District of Columbia.

Congress established the Industrial Safety Board in 1941 and declared its purpose to be "to foster, promote, and develop the safety of wage earners of the District of Columbia in relation to their working conditions."

For many years, the Industrial Safety Board assumed that the scope of its responsibilities included the safety of all kinds of non-Government employees in the District of Columbia.

However, beginning about 2 years ago, through a series of opinions by the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel, the scope of the Board's jurisdiction was reduced drastically—from a field of coverage of more than 280,000 employees in the District of Columbia to a field of coverage estimated at less than 50,000 employees.

It is not my purpose to dispute the accuracy of this series of opinions.

It is my purpose to point out that, as a result of these opinions, no District of Columbia governmental agency is directly charged with looking out for, and proposing regulations to secure, the safety of the vast majority of non-Government employees in the District of Columbia.

Regardless of what Congress may have intended 25 year ago, when the Industrial Safety Board was created, I am confident Congress will now act to lodge in one responsible agency of the District of Columbia government the duty of looking after the on-the-job safety of non-Government employees in the District of Columbia and of formulating and proposing regulations to secure their safety.

Nothing in the bill I propose would change the existing relationship between the District of Columbia Commissioners and the Industrial Safety Board. The Commissioners will retain their full present authority to approve and promulgate the regulations the Industrial Safety Board proposes. The Safety Board will have no authority to promulgate its own regulations.

But the Board will have the authority and responsibility for examining the safety of the working conditions of every non-Government employee in the District of Columbia, and for proposing for the approval of the District Commissioners whatever regulations the Board deems necessary to secure employee safety.

In drafting this bill I have consulted the District of Columbia government, its Corporation Counsel, the Industrial Safety Board itself, and representatives of the affected employees. The safety bill I introduce today contains what I consider to be the best suggestions for this legislation from each of the people I have consulted. The bill does not contain everything I believe the Senate would be willing to enact, but it does provide a clear, reasonable, simple, and rational governmental apparatus for securing employee safety in the District of Columbia.

The bill continues the traditional responsibilities of the Industrial Safety Board toward proposing regulations to secure the safety of every employee, but it also continues the District Commissioners' authority to approve those regulations and to insure their harmony with other kinds of business regulation in the District of Columbia. I am confident that this is a legislative proposal which the District Commissioners, the affected business interests of the District, the Industrial Safety Board, and the employee representatives here in the District can support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3216) to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 960), as amended, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Tydings, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 148) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Madam President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2919) to extend for 2 years Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolutions:

Authority of March 29, 1966:

S. 3153. A bill to make it an unfair labor practice to require a person who conscientiously objects to membership in a labor organization to be a member of such an organization as a condition of employment: Mr. Bennett, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Thurmond.

Authority of April 1, 1966:

S. 3169. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special program for the mentally retarded, mentally ill, and physically handicapped spouses and children of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes: Mr. Bass, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hill, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McGee, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, Mr. Stennis, and Mr. Yarborough.

S. 3171. A bill to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes: Mr. Brewster, Mr. Church, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, and Mr. Ribicoff.

Authority of April 5, 1966:

S. 3181. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954: Mr. Bible, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Hart, Mr. Holland, Mr. Javits, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Russell of South Carolina, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S. 3183. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prescribe criminal penalties for the illegal importation of depressant and stimulant drugs: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Montoya, and Mr. Murphy.

S. 3184. A bill to provide an incentive for private industry to establish programs to educate and train individuals in needed skills by allowing a credit against income tax for the expenses of conducting such programs: Mr. Long of Missouri and Mr. Randolph.

S.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating a national day of prayer: Mr. Allott.

S.J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Montoya, and Mr. Murphy.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NATO

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations will begin public hearings on problems of the Atlantic Alliance on April 26, 1966. These hearings will take a fresh and frank look at the Atlantic Alliance in relation to the achievement of American and allied aims.

The North Atlantic area is still the decisive area and its problems—including the challenge of President de Gaulle—deserve high priority on the agenda of the executive branch and Congress.

The first witness will be Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State and presently consultant to President Johnson. He will testify on Tuesday morning, April 26, 1966, at 10 a.m. Perhaps more than any other living American, Dean Acheson is "Mr. NATO." As Secretary of State he helped draft the North Atlantic Treaty and signed it on behalf of the United States on April 4, 1949.

Further hearings will be scheduled during the session. The list of witnesses will include top-level policymakers, military commanders and experts from outside Government.

Authorized by resolutions of the Senate in 1965 and 1966, our subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, has been reviewing the conduct of national security policy, with special reference to the Atlantic Alliance. Its approach is nonpartisan and professional. During the first session of the 89th Congress, the subcommittee held hearings which laid the foundation for the present phase of the inquiry. In February this year, the subcommittee issued a study entitled "The Atlantic Alliance: Basic Issues," which discusses problems to be explored in the forthcoming hearings.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 3046, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I wish to announce to interested Senators that further hearings on S. 3046, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, have been set for April 19, 26, and 27.

On April 26 it is the intention of the subcommittee to take testimony from individuals and representatives of groups who have expressed concern over proposed amendments to impacted areas legislation, Public Laws 815 and 874.

With these three hearing dates, and one more at a date not yet determined, it is our hope that testimony will have been taken either in person or by statement from all those who desire to be heard.

I want to say, for the benefit of the majority leader [Mr. Mansfield], and the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen], both of whom are on the floor, and who have raised questions with me on the progress we are making on education legislation, that after the hearings on the elementary and secondary education amendments, there will follow a series of hearings on other bills. The elementary and secondary education bill will be ready for consideration by the full committee within the next 4 to 6 weeks.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 7, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 22. An act to promote a more adequate national program of water research;

S. 1049. An act to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees;

S. 2642. An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes;

S. 2835. An act for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association; and

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1966, as "Sir Winston Churchill Day."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 85—CONGRATULATING ASTRONAUTS ARMSTRONG AND SCOTT

Mr. HARRIS. Madam President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and at his request, I submit Senate Concurrent Resolution 85, and I ask for its immediate consideration. The Senator from Ohio is unavoidably absent today because he is participating in ceremonies in Ohio honoring Astronauts Neil Armstrong and David Scott. This concurrent resolution will extend the congratulations of Congress to the astronauts simultaneously with the ceremonies now going on in Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent that the brief remarks of the Senator from Ohio be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Statement by Senator Lausche

On March 15, 1966, Astronauts Neil Armstrong and David R. Scott participated in a substantially successful and epic-making orbital flight.

Astronaut Neil Armstrong was born in Wapakoneta, Ohio, and Astronaut David R. Scott was born in San Antonio, Tex.

The civic leaders and citizens of Wapakoneta, Ohio, and the surrounding territory on this day, April 13, are paying tribute to Neil Armstrong, their native son, through appropriate and extensive ceremonies.

In view of the distinguished services to the people of the United States and the personal achievements of Astronauts Armstrong and Scott, I herewith set forth brief biographical sketches of their respective lives.

NEIL A. ARMSTRONG, ASTRONAUT

Neil A. Armstrong was born on August 5, 1930, in Wapakoneta, Ohio. He was graduated from Purdue University in 1955 with a bachelor of science degree in aeronautical engineering, and has performed graduate work at the University of Southern California.

Armstrong was a naval aviator from 1949 until 1952 and during the last 2 years of that service flew 78 combat missions in the Korean action.

After his graduation from Purdue he worked for NACA's Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory prior to going to work at Edwards, Calif., as an aeronautical research pilot for NACA and later NASA. Armstrong has flown 2,600 hours, including 1,100 in jet aircraft.

Armstrong has participated in flight test work on the F-100, F-104, B-47, F-102, and the X-15. He is a senior member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, and a member of the Experimental Test Pilots Association. He was the recipient of the 1962 Institute of Aerospace Sciences Octave Chanute Award.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Armstrong, of Wapakoneta, he has blond hair and blue eyes, is 5 feet 11 inches tall, and weighs 165 pounds. He is married to the former Janet Elizabeth Shearon, of Evanston, Ill., and they have one son, Eric.

DAVID R. SCOTT, ASTRONAUT

Maj. David R. Scott (USAF), 107 16th Street, Edwards, Calif., was born in San Antonio, Tex., June 6, 1932. His parents, Brig. Gen. and Mrs. Tom W. Scott (USAF retired), now live at 8438 Paseo Del Ocaso, La Jolla, Calif.

He attended the University of Michigan for 1 year, then entered the U.S. Military Academy and received a bachelor of science degree in 1954. At West Point, he finished fifth in a class of 633, and chose an Air Force career.

He attended Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1960 to 1962 and earned both a master of science degree in aeronautics and astronautics and an engineer of aeronautics and astronautics degree while there. His thesis concerned interplanetary navigation. At the time of his selection for the astronaut program, he was a student at the Air Force Aerospace Research Pilot School at Edwards AFB, Calif.

Scott is 6 feet tall, weighs 190 pounds, and has blond hair and blue eyes. He is married to the former Ann Lurton Ott, daughter of Brig. Gen. and Mrs. Isaac W. Ott (USAF retired), who live at 115 Lagos Avenue, San Antonio, Tex. The Scotts have two children: a daughter, Tracy Lee, 2; and a son, William Douglas, born this year.

He has logged more than 2,300 hours flying time, including nearly 2,100 hours in jet aircraft. Scott is a member of Tau Beta Pi, national engineering society; Sigma Xi, national science research society; Sigma Gamma Tau, and Sigma Chi.

Congressman William McCulloch, the Representative of the district in which Wapakoneta is situated, and myself, as Senator from Ohio, are convinced that these distinguished Americans are worthy of being recognized by the Congress of the United States, and, therefore, concluded that a concurrent resolution to that effect should be adopted by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 85) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, on behalf of the people of the United States, hereby extends its congratulations and warm good wishes to Astronauts Neil Armstrong of Wapakoneta, Ohio, and Maj. David R. Scott of San Antonio, Tex., and commends them for their personal courage, skill, and dedication in the cause of scientific achievement in their substantially successful and epoch-making orbital flight on March 15, 1966.

RIOT AT GLEN ECHO

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, on Monday of this week, a riot occurred at the Glen Echo Amusement Park in nearby Montgomery County, Md. After the rioters had been ejected from the amusement park, they left a trail of damage and terrorized homeowners in their wake as they rode buses or walked back to their Washington homes. They stoned homes and automobiles, damaged police cars and ambulances, and destroyed property in some of the most expensive neighborhoods in Northwest Washington. They invaded stores, and threw catsup, chocolate milk, baby food, and soft drinks everywhere, requiring hours of "hard work to clean up the mess." Windows of service stations were broken by rock-throwers. Firemen, rescue squadsmen, and newspapermen were pelted with thrown objects. Buses were used to remove the rioters from the area, but during the bus riding "every one of the buses was damaged."

The Washington Star of April 12, stated, with respect to the buses:

> Those which weren't ripped up by passengers were pelted with rocks by the walking crowd.

One of the bus drivers stated that he "only was able to collect fares from about 50 out of the 115" persons aboard. He went on to say that, "The girls were raising just as much hell as the boys," and, "I knew I had to go along with what they wanted to do or else."

The busdriver, a 7-year veteran with the bus company, said:

> They yelled four-letter words at each other and at me. They tore up the seats. All the way into the District along Massachusetts Avenue, some of the kids threw parts of the seats and things out of the windows.

He went on to say:

> One driver picked up a load out there and had to drive them all right into the old streetcar barn on Wisconsin Avenue because they robbed him on the way in.

Mr. President, how can Washington become a model city when it is not a safe city and is becoming less and less so? Moreover, how can any thinking person suggest that home rule be granted to the Nation's Capital where so many of its people increasingly, by their conduct, reveal themselves as being incapable and undeserving of self-government?

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Star article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 12, 1966]

Glen Echo Rioters Leave Trail of Damage Into District of Columbia—Youths Toss Rocks at Homes, Cars

(By Walter Gold)

Hundreds of Negro teenagers and youngsters rioted at the Glen Echo Amusement Park last night, and then left a trail of damage and terrified homeowners in their wake as they rode and walked back to their Washington homes.

After being ejected from the amusement park in nearby Montgomery County shortly after dark, rock-throwing, jeering youths cut a swath through some of the most expensive neighborhoods in Southwest Bethesda and Northwest Washington, causing widespread damage.

Dozens of persons were injured, none seriously, during the 4-hour disturbance. Property damage was estimated in the thousands, mainly to the amusement park. Homes and automobiles were stoned along both the county and city sections of Massachusetts Avenue and MacArthur Boulevard, and along Goldsboro Road near Glen Echo.

TURN ON POLICE

Nearly 200 policemen from several jurisdictions combined forces to restore order. The rioters, turning on the officers, smashed windows of at least a dozen police cars and damaged two ambulances which were carrying injured persons.

It was by far the worst and most widespread outbreak of violence in the Washington area within recent years. Police said the disturbance involved no specific interracial conflict.

A disturbance at Glen Echo had been rumored around Washington for at least a week, it was learned.

A capacity crowd estimated at 6,000 persons was at Glen Echo just after 6 p.m. when the first disorders were reported. Individual acts of misconduct and vandalism quickly grew into mob action, causing amusement operators to shut down the park some 6 hours before its normal midnight closing.

DOZEN BUSES DAMAGED

According to many of those involved, this angered the crowd. The majority of the Easter Monday celebrants made their way out of the park without incident, but hundreds of teenagers showed their displeasure by damaging park property, looting some of the concession stands, and throwing rocks.

It was this same body of several hundred youths that continued their vandalism while either walking home or riding D.C. Transit buses back into the District. At least a dozen buses were damaged with broken windows, ripped-up seats, and slashed interiors, transit spokesmen said.

Less than a dozen of the rioters were apprehended by police as officials concentrated on dispersing the crowd rather than arresting individuals.

Bethesda police reported the arrest of four persons. Three juveniles later were released to the custody of their parents.

It was the second time in less than a year that youths rioted at a Washington amusement area. In August 1965, nearly 100 persons including nine District policemen, were injured during a carnival riot involving an unruly, rock-throwing crowd at First and K Streets NE.

Yesterday's incident was foreshadowed early in the afternoon when groups became disorderly on several buses in the downtown Washington area. District police quickly calmed the Glen Echo-bound riders, then broadcast a warning to officers in the Northwest section of the city to "give special attention" to the outward-bound Massachusetts Avenue NW., busline.

TAKE OVER RIDE

By 6 p.m., the park was nearly filled to capacity. A normal holiday detail of special policemen was on duty at the park but quickly realized that the situation was getting out of hand, several said.

According to some of those involved, the first real trouble began at a ski-jump-type amusement, where groups of teenage boys "took over the ride." Almost simultaneously, others started milling around in the nearby Jungleland ride area. Still others roamed through the park, "breaking and taking everything they could get their hands on," one Glen Echo employee said.

By the time the first call for Montgomery County police help went in at 6:20 p.m., nearly 1,000 were involved in "one sort of disorder or another," one official estimated.

Within minutes, additional policemen were called to the amusement park, including officers from the Maryland State Police, Aqueduct (Federal) Police, Montgomery County Sheriff's Department, and the adjoining township of Glen Echo.

At 6:50 p.m., volunteer firemen from Glen Echo and Cabin John were called to the scene by police, who feared that they would have to turn hoses on the rioters. However, firemen did not use the high-pressure water lines and confined their efforts to assisting in dispersing the crowd.

When several of the battling youths fell injured, the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Rescue Squad sent several ambulances and a searchlight truck to the amusement park. Ambulances from Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Glen Echo were damaged by rock throwers as the first aiders removed the injured.

At the height of the melee, someone set fire to some shrubs in front of the 16-acre amusement park. The blaze was quickly extinguished.

Meanwhile, police blocked off the entire Glen Echo area to automobile traffic. The park, which is situated along the Potomac River bluffs about 10 miles northwest of the White House, is accessible by only three major routes, MacArthur Boulevard, Goldsboro Road, which connects with Massachusetts Avenue extended, and the Maryland portion of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Hundreds of late homeward-bound rush-hour motorists who live in the area were prohibited from using any of the routes except the George Washington Parkway during the disturbance. Outbound commuters were rerouted from the District over River Road and adjoining feeder streets.

When Glen Echo officials finally shut down all their facilities about 7 p.m. and closed the park, thousands poured out the front entrance onto MacArthur Boulevard. There were reports that several busdrivers left at the sight of the rowdy crowd and drove away in near-empty buses.

WALK TOWARD DISTRICT

This, coupled with a reported announcement over the park's public address system that "you (the crowd) are on your own," added to the confusion.

Unable to find public transportation at the park entrance, many started walking back to Washington. Police did their best to keep the crowd in an orderly file but many of the youngsters "went their own ways," officials said.

It was during this homeward bound march along Goldsboro Road, Massachusetts Avenue and MacArthur Boulevard that most of the rocks and debris were thrown at the few passing vehicles and at nearby houses. Many homeowners, who said they were terrified by the developments, reported that they turned out their house lights and barricaded themselves, some with pistols, in the upper floors of their homes.

Montgomery County Police Chief Col. James McAuliffe today revised his estimates of the crowd and said there were at least 1,500 to 2,000 milling along Massachusetts Avenue.

Capt. Paul Alexander of the Bethesda station estimated the crowd at the park between 7,500 and 10,000, which he described as "pretty much normal on Easter Monday."

OVER 70 INCIDENTS

Alexander said there were four arrests, three of them unruly juveniles. In addition, a man was charged with discharging a gun near the District of Columbia line and MacArthur Boulevard. Alexander said the man, a resident of the neighborhood, apparently became alarmed and fired a shot into the air when a group from the park began striking his car.

Alexander said more than 70 "incidents were reported with damage totaling several thousand dollars."

McAuliffe said he "didn't expect any trouble today," and that there would be "no more policemen than we ordinarily provide."

Rocks sailed through picture windows of $30,000-and-up homes. Cadillacs and Fords alike suffered damage at the hands of the rock throwers. Residents of the area were still discovering damage to their property and cars today.

At the height of the movement down Massachusetts Avenue, a 10-pound rock was hurled through the picture window of the home of Mr. and Mrs. Cecil E. Byers, 6202 Massachusetts Avenue.

RESIDENT'S DESCRIPTION

Mrs. Byers described it this way:

"Earlier in the day, I saw droves of children walking and crowded automobiles heading toward Glen Echo and wondered how the amusement park could hold all of them.

"During dinner, we saw them returning, and heard them hurling stones and shouting. They behaved very well whenever the Montgomery County police drove by, but as soon as the police were out of sight, they became unruly.

"Luckily, my husband and I were standing back from the window, watching the children, and were not directly in front of the window when this tremendous rock, taken from my own rock garden, came hurtling through."

Mrs. Byers said their 1965 Cadillac also was vandalized.

OTHER HOMES DAMAGED

Several other homes in the neighborhood also were hit by flying rocks, but the damage was less than at the Byers' home.

"Those children walked all over our yard and came to the door asking to use the telephone," Mrs. Byers added.

"The police did a wonderful job, but it was impossible to control such a large number."

Another area resident, Guy H. Birdsall, said he was sitting in his home at 6130 Massachusetts Avenue NW., near a picture window, when two rocks hurtled through the window and passed within inches of his head.

Meanwhile, back at the amusement park, hundreds of youths were forced off Glen Echo parking lots and across MacArthur Boulevard to an area near the small Glen Echo Shopping Center to await transportation. Some of the youths invaded a High's dairy store in the shopping center.

THROW FOOD IN STORE

"You wouldn't believe it," Mrs. Mildred E. Murray, one of three employees on duty at the store, said this morning.

"The place was so full of teenagers that nobody else could have gotten in. They threw ketchup, baby food, chocolate milk, and soft drinks all over the store. You couldn't even tell what color the floor was; it took five people 2 hours of hard work to clean up the mess."

Several windows at an adjoining Esso station were broken by bus-waiting rock throwers. Bottles flew through the air. Firemen, rescue squadsmen, and newsmen also were pelted with thrown objects.

Realizing their worsening position, police quickly rounded up four D.C. Transit buses from the Westmoreland Circle area and escorted them to the shopping center. About half the waiting crowd filled the buses, so several additional coaches were called for.

In all, nearly a dozen buses were used to remove the remaining youngsters from the area and take them to bus transfer points in

Washington. During the 30-minute ride, every one of the buses was damaged. Those which weren't ripped up inside by passengers were pelted with rocks by the walking crowd.

DRIVER TELLS OF RIDE

One D.C. Transit driver, James O. Breeden, 49, of Kensington, gave this account of what he saw:

"I was one of the first buses outside the Glen Echo gates when the park closed. We had been told more than a week ago by the kids themselves that they were going to tear up the park Easter Monday, but we had no idea that they would succeed."

Breeden, a 7-year veteran with the bus company, said he took about 110 to 115 youngsters on his 72-person-capacity bus "because they just pushed and shoved past me and even came in through the windows.

"I only was able to collect fares from about 50 out of the 115," Breeden said.

"The girls were raising just as much hell as the boys," the driver said. "I knew I had to go along with what they wanted to do, or else.

"They yelled four-letter words at each other and at me * * * they tore up the seats.

"All the way into the District along Massachusetts Avenue, some of the kids threw parts of the seats and things out the windows.

"Thank God most of the troublemakers got off at 14th and K Streets NW. and left me alone and unharmed."

MAKES THREE MORE TRIPS

Breeden, an ex-serviceman, said he made at least three more trips out to Glen Echo to pick up stragglers.

"Most of the other drivers wouldn't go out there when they heard what was going on," he said. "One driver picked up a load out there and had to drive them all right into the old streetcar barn on Wisconsin Avenue because they robbed him on the way in."

Washington police used all available cars and motorcycles to monitor the marchers as they entered the District. At least four District police cars were slightly damaged by rocks thrown by the youths, officials said.

There was only one report of damage to downtown property. A youth threw a rock through a large plate glass window of the Bank of Commerce at 17th and K Streets NW. There were no injuries or arrests, police said.

PARK WINDOWS BROKEN

Reporters who were admitted to the amusement park before noon found damage confined to broken window panes.

A man, who identified himself as being in charge of construction but not an official of the amusement park, said he came out as soon as he heard there was trouble at Glen Echo last night.

"There probably were more people in Glen Echo than had ever been here at one time before, and the rides were crowded. By the time the kids were ready to go home late in the afternoon, there were not enough buses to handle them because of the need for coping with the rush-hour traffic downtown. This made the kids angry, and they started hoofing it for the District line, several thousand strong. That's when the real trouble broke out," he said.

The builder, who declined to identify himself, said there was no reason why the amusement park couldn't open as usual today, but that rain and cool weather probably would keep visitors away anyway.

The park was closed down, to remove the accumulation of trash and paper, and there were few visible signs of yesterday's trouble.

Park officials said that persons who still hold tickets they had purchased yesterday can use them later.

PARK LICENSE PERILED

The possibility that Glen Echo's amusement park license might be lifted was raised today at a meeting of the Montgomery County Council.

Referring to the riot, Councilman John Henry Hiser said a resident of the Massachusetts Avenue area called him to demand the closing of the park, which he said is "a menace to the surrounding area." Hiser asked County Manager Mason Butcher to comment.

Butcher told the council that recommendations should await a full report on what happened at Glen Echo. He said the amusement park's license is up for renewal May 1.

Although the application has cleared the fire marshal's office, it has yet to be approved by the Department of Environmental Health, Butcher said.

HOSPITALS TREAT TEN

Sibley Hospital's emergency room treated two persons struck by rocks: James Shoemaker, 19, of 13113 Superior Street in the Rockville-Wheaton, Md., area, who suffered bruised ribs, and Timothy Terrell, 23, of 3947 Persimmon Drive, Fairfax, Va., whose face was cut.

Bethesda Naval Hospital treated Air Force Sgt. Grant Yates and Army Col. E. M. Pedrick, both for minor cuts.

Suburban Hospital's emergency room treated six: Ulysses Jones, 9, of 406 Fifth Street SE., for glass in his right eye; Susan Briggs, 6, 6800 Winterbury Lane, Bethesda, for a cut on her forehead; Torrence Fleet, 15, of 125 11th Street NE., for a cut on his left leg; Jacqueline Murray, 12, listed at 1709 Ninth Street, for an abrasion on her chin; Jerome Sommers, 16, of 921 Ninth Street NE., for a cut finger, and Frederick Scoville, 27, of 13424 Justice Road, Rockville, for a cut on his forehead.

THE VIETNAM DILEMMA

Mr. **YOUNG** of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **YOUNG** of Ohio. Madam President, Congress has been kept off balance by our preoccupation with the dilemma of the Vietnam conflict. How can we solve our predicament in South Vietnam? How can we disengage from fighting in a grim civil war to which we should never have been committed in the first instance? Before the birth of our Savior, Sallust, the great historian, wrote:

> It is always easy to begin a war but very difficult to stop one, since its beginning and end are not under the control of the same man.

This is precisely the situation with which we are now confronted.

Our distinguished colleague, Chairman RICHARD RUSSELL, of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, has said:

> Vietnam is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States and we should never have committed troops to combat there, but now that we have done that we must see it through to gain an honorable settlement.

In seeing it through we would do well to follow the best advice of the wisest generals and of our most knowledgeable civilian leaders against bombing North Vietnam, particularly the principal port, Haiphong, and densely populated Hanoi. The facts are that nearly $1 billion worth or possibly more, of our best aircraft have already been destroyed in bombing runs over North Vietnam. In addition, precious lives of many of our pilots and airmen have been snuffed out. One reason for the bombing pause ordered by our President was the view that the destructive effects of our bombing did not justify the huge cost in money and in lives of very fine young Americans.

Were we to bomb Haiphong we would be placed in the same despicable category as the French colonialists who for years oppressed the people of Indochina. In their final effort to save their vast Indochina empire in late 1953, the French admiral commanding the fleet off Haiphong harbor saw thousands of people on the main highway leaving the city for the interior. He ordered a cannonade from his warships, hurling shells along the highway, killing 7,000 civilians—men, women, and children—and not killing or wounding any soldiers. Asiatics have not forgotten this, nor have they forgotten that the United States did not use the atom bomb against the Germans but used it against the yellow race.

Recent demonstrations and rioting against the military regime of General Ky indicate a vicious anti-American revolt in addition to a coalition against the military warlords in power in Saigon, in power because our CIA and Armed Forces uphold this puppet regime. In fact, there is an insurrection waging within a civil war. Prime Minister Ky, installed by the military last June, never proposed any program of social and agrarian reform until President Johnson at Honolulu treated him as a leader of all South Vietnam. Inspired by publicity and flattery, and those President Johnson-Ky photographs, Ky started to prove that he had control over the whole country. President Johnson knew Ky controlled only a small part of the area of South Vietnam outside Saigon. When Ky, flattered by the President Johnson treatment, tried to eliminate General Thi, commandant of the I Corps area, he fell on his face. Even though we furnished American planes to transport Ky's soldiers to Da Nang, they were pinned down in the airbase and then returned to Saigon.

Fifty thousand U.S. soldiers in Da Nang were directed to keep off the streets and American lives and property were endangered there and in the rioting at Saigon. The Saigon government may be overthrown. If Ky is overthrown by civilians in revolt and the new prime minister of the Saigon government demands, "Americans go home," that leaves Secretary of State Dean Rusk high and dry. He claims we are in Saigon to support a government and a nation against external aggression, knowing such claim is false and knowing also that Ky's Saigon government does not govern.

The Geneva agreement of 1954 specifically stated that separating Vietnam at the 17th parallel was a temporary line of demarcation until the elections prescribed in the agreement took place. Then, later, the proposed election was called off, not by leaders in Hanoi, but by our puppet leader in Saigon, Diem. Historically, there is no North and no South Vietnam. There is no aggression from any foreign government bordering on Vietnam. There has been infiltration from north of the 17th parallel. Such Communist infiltration naturally increases as the numbers of American GI's committed to combat in South Vietnam increases. Our escalation brings out Vietnamese escalation from the north. Each is self-defeating.

Secretary Rusk and other administration officials say we are defending freedom in Vietnam. But the fact is that there has never been a democratically elected government in Saigon and Ky himself was installed as Prime Minister by a group of 10 generals who overthrew the civilian government last June. Also, the fact is that if the Hanoi regime were anything but Communist it could be fully as dictatorial as it is and fully as ruthless in pursuit of its present goals and we would never have dreamt of intervening in internal Vietnamese politics.

We have seen a succession of South Vietnamese leaders—the latest being Ky—all ruthlessly dictatorial and having no wide support from the people of South Vietnam.

In spite of this, our involvement has continued to grow—more men, more money, and more weapons. All this is given in the cause of preserving democracy in Vietnam and resisting aggressors from the north.

Even now, experts on Vietnamese affairs maintain that if popular elections were held that they would heavily favor the Communists.

As a matter of fact, former President Eisenhower stated that had elections been held in 1956 as stipulated in the Geneva accords, Ho Chi Minh would have received 80 percent of the vote of the Vietnamese people living to the south and north of the 17th parallel demarcation line.

The tragedy of Vietnam lies in our massive involvement—virtually without allies. What began as a little war is now a major conflict.

For several years we have listened to fatuous predictions from Defense Secretary McNamara, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge.

In 1963 President Kennedy was told by McNamara and Taylor that "the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965."

And in June of 1964, Cabot Lodge asserted:

> I don't see the need for more troops in Vietnam.

In March 1965, Secretary McNamara told the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives:

> I think it is also clear that we cannot substitute U.S. troops for Vietnamese troops to carry out counterguerrilla operations against subversion directed against the people of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

In 1964 he testified before the House Armed Services Committee:

> I don't believe that pouring in hundreds of thousands of troops is the solution to the problem in Vietnam.

In October 1963, the White House issued the following statement based on the predictions of Secretary McNamara and General Taylor:

> Major U.S. assistance in support of this military effort is needed only until the insurgency has been suppressed or until the national security forces of the Government of South Vietnam are capable of suppressing it. Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel. They reported that by the end of that year—1964—the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point where 1,000 military personnel assigned to South Vietnam can be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Certainly, these statements indicate that many administration leaders have consistently underestimated the strength and staying power of the Vietnamese who consider they are fighting for national liberation, and have time and time again been wrong regarding our involvement in the Vietnam war.

A major obstacle to bringing about an armistice and ceasefire has been the refusal of some shortsighted, stubborn administration officials and unduly influential military leaders to express willingness to negotiate directly with the National Liberation Front which is and has been for years the political arm of the Vietcong.

The Vietcong forces are the major adversary against which our forces are fighting. Of course, Vietcong delegates must participate in any conference if a ceasefire and peace is to be restored to Vietnam.

Vietnam is one country, artificially divided at the demarcation line fixed at Geneva. There is no south Vietnamese nation in our understanding of the word. If the Saigon military junta is overthrown, and the new regime says "Americans go home," there is no alternative. Otherwise, it would be evident before the world that our Armed Forces have supplanted the French colonial power as aggressors. The claim of Rusk, McNamara, and others that we are there on invitation of the government would be rejected. We should then get out on their invitation. There would be no alternative for a self-respecting nation regardless of whether it is or is not the most powerful nation that has ever been known under the bending sky of God, and that is the United States of America.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF FREDERICK COUNTY FRUIT GROWERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, the senior Senator from Virginia, Senator ROBERTSON, addressed the Frederick County Fruit Growers' Association at its annual meeting on April 8, 1966, at Winchester, Va. I read his statement with a great deal of interest. He discussed the offshore labor problem, the pending proposal to bring practically all farm labor under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the pending proposal to federalize the unemployment compensation laws of the several States.

Madam President, I concur entirely with the statement of my good friend and able colleague from Virginia who has had nearly 45 years of public life. He served first in the State senate, then as chairman of the Game and Inland Fisheries Commission of Virginia. Later he was elected to the Congress as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1939 where he served until he was elected to the U.S. Senate in November 1946, to serve out the unexpired term of the late Senator Carter Glass. He is now completing his 20th year as a U.S. Senator.

Madam President, in reviewing the many accomplishments of Senator ROBERTSON, I find that throughout his career he has championed the cause of agriculture, not only in the Old Dominion Commonwealth of Virginia but throughout the Nation.

Certainly, agricultural interests in my State of Florida, which I have the honor to represent in part, owe him much for his invaluable assistance. While a Member of the other body, he championed the cause of the REA, insurance of small deposits in banks so vital for small rural banks, reciprocal trade agreements to promote the export of surplus farm products, Farm Land Banks and numerous conservation measures, including the Pittman-Robertson Act, under which the States have received more than $150 million for the development of upland game.

Since coming to the Senate he has continued to enthusiastically support many, many measures vital to agricultural interests and to the continued progress of our country, such as REA, soil conservation, support price for basic farm crops, Federal aid for highways, Federal aid for rural housing, increased insurance for bank deposits and many other important measures that affect the economy of our Nation.

Madam President, the position taken by my good friend and distinguished colleague in respect to some of the proposals the Congress is being asked to consider and, which if enacted into law, would create untold hardship in the agricultural industry and, particularly on the small farmer, is commended to each Senator as worthwhile reading. I ask unanimous consent to have Senator ROBERTSON's statement, in which I say again, I concur wholeheartedly, inserted in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON AT ANNUAL MEETING OF FREDERICK COUNTY FRUIT GROWERS' ASSOCIATION AT WINCHESTER, VA., APRIL 8, 1966

It is a coveted privilege to visit this historic area, identified with the early achievements of our greatest American, George Washington; with General Morgan of the Long Rifles, and known to historians as the battleground of the Confederacy. I cherish the fact that I was privileged to start my public career in the State senate as a deskmate of Winchester's most famous citizen, Harry Byrd, Sr., and to work with him in the State senate; in his cabinet when he was Governor, and later for 30-odd years in the Congress in promoting progress within the framework of a sound fiscal policy.

I, of course, did not know Harry Byrd, when in the summer of 1915, I announced my candidacy for the State senate on a platform of better roads and better schools for the Old Dominion. I soon found that I had a warm friend and able ally in both of those programs because my new Senate deskmate was the president of a turnpike company which operated the only improved stretch of paved road in the entire State. We joined in sponsoring a State highway system for Virginia; were on the commission that laid it out, and were cosponsors of the bill that put it into operation. In 1920, I sponsored what was called the Robertson Road Act, under which the first State highways were built and in 1924 my Senate colleague led the fight to build our State highway system on the sound principle of pay as you go. That highway system, of course, was designed not only to improve the economic wealth of our State, and especially of those who lived in rural areas, but to enable us to have better rural schools and rural churches. We now have one of the Nation's best highway systems on which we do not owe 1 red cent. When Senator Byrd and I reached the Congress in the spring of 1933, we promptly extended our road activities to Federal aid for State highways and later to the wonderful System of Interstate Highways.

The session of the Congress that commenced in March 1933 was a special session and only 93 bills were enacted into law (we passed 349 last year). And, one of those 93 bills in 1933 was my bill to provide for inspection at the port of debarkation of Virginia apples to protect our growers from the frequent false claim of commission merchants in Liverpool and elsewhere that we had shipped imperfect fruit. Therefore, when I come to Winchester tonight to talk about some of the measures affecting the applegrowers of this area, I come back to friends with whom I have worked and with whom I have played for half a century.

In the words of Kipling:

"I have eaten your bread and salt;
I have drunk your water and wine;
The deaths you have died, I have watched beside
And the lives you have lived, have been mine."

Throughout my service in the Congress, you have been kind and generous to me.

There are many things that I would like to discuss tonight such as the war in Vietnam, the inflationary fiscal policies of a Government which abandoned the economy platform written by Carter Glass and on which I was elected from this district in 1932, and a so-called Great Society which is as much dedicated to material things as the great society of ancient Rome that crumbled into dust. But, within the limitation of the time allotted to me, I plan to discuss briefly just three pending issues which I believe are of interest to Virginia fruit growers and all other farmers:

1. Offshore labor to harvest this fall what I hope will be a large and fair-priced apple crop.

2. A proposal to bring practically all farm labor under the provisions of an expensive wage and hour bill. I can't support it.

3. A proposal to federalize what has heretofore been the unemployment compensation laws of separate and sovereign States. I can't support that either.

Many of you know, of course, of the effort I made last year to convince Secretary of Labor Wirtz that apple picking is not the simple operation that any unskilled laborer or school dropout could perform. He finally recognized the inadequacy of makeshift crews from urban areas by admitting about 760 harvesters from the offshore islands to pick Virginia apples.

Into the four States of Virginia, West Virginia, New York, and Vermont, the Labor Department admitted 1,340 workers from the British West Indies and Canada compared with 2,000 used in those States in 1964.

I share the desire of our Government to give every American a job before turning to imported labor. But the farmer suffers financial loss if he is not able to get his crop harvested at the proper time, or when he is forced to accept workers who have neither the training nor the desire to do farmwork.

In securing offshore apple pickers next fall, we may face the same argument with Labor officials as we did last year. In a report made public recently, the Secretary of Labor predicted that "in general, however, the period of any large-scale use of foreign labor is ended."

The Secretary reported that no use of braceros is contemplated this year in California and Michigan.

He may allow limited use of foreign labor to cut sugarcane in Florida and dig potatoes in Maine, and the situation, so far as our apples are concerned, he says, "has to be carefully watched." Needless to say, I intend to keep the Secretary fully apprised of our need for an adequate force of trained workers.

As to the minimum wage bill, no one knows what will be in it when it finally reaches the Senate floor for action. The bill reported by the House committee last August was so unsatisfactory that it was sent back to the Labor Committee which has just reported what appears to be a more reasonable one with respect to farm labor. It provides, for example, that farmers who pay harvest hands on a piece-rate basis may continue to do so, if the worker commutes daily to the farm, and has been employed for fewer than 13 weeks during the year.

The House committee made another change in its original bill by making the yardstick 500 instead of 300 man-days for determining application to permanent farmhands.

No one would welcome more than I higher rates of pay for farm labor but there is nothing in any pending bill to help farmers pay more for farm labor. The average Virginia farm is 90 acres. To fully equip that farm with laborsaving devices would cost $35,000—far beyond the reach of the small farmer. John L. Lewis once boasted that he had secured for his United Mine Workers the highest pay scale in industry. That is true but only the mines that could afford to install laborsaving devices costing $35,000 to $40,000 per man could afford to pay it. The result: some 300,000 coal miners lost their jobs and have created serious relief problems ever since.

Industry can usually finance increased wages in two ways—by increasing per man production and by controlling total output. There is little in either of those programs that is available to our farmers. No orchardist can control the size of his crop. "Paul may plant and Apollo water, but God giveth the increase." Our farmers' biggest handicap, however, is that they buy on a controlled market and sell on an open market. They pay parity for what they buy, but even with recent price increases were getting last month only 82 percent of parity for what they sold and that was 7 percent above last year. I favor higher wages for farmworkers but not until we have a practical plan by which farmers can pay them. Public relief in our proud State is a sorry substitute for a job.

I don't know the amount by which the minimum rate of industrial workers will be increased by the bill finally enacted into law, but any increase of that rate will be placing a powerful jack under the entire rate structure of the Nation.

As to federalizing unemployment, there may be changes before final action, but the pending bill would bring into that system about 700,000 farmworkers. The bill would apply to all farms which use at least 300 man-days of hired farm labor in any quarter.

This would mean that a farmer who employed four workers for 75 days in the quarter would be affected.

An additional 200,000 workers now classified as agricultural would be covered by adopting a new definition under which workers performing jobs which are essentially industrial in nature are no longer regarded as agricultural. These include jobs such as processing of maple sap into maple syrup, operating and maintaining, on a profit basis, ditches for supplying water for farming, box assembling, clerical work connected with billing, and grader and conveyor tenders.

In addition to these 900,000 agricultural workers, the bill would extend unemployment compensation coverage to about 3.7 million others, largely through a new definition applying it to every employer of one or more persons.

It would drastically raise the taxes which employers would have to pay to insure their workers against unemployment. At the present time, the rate is 3.1 percent, based on the first $3,000 of annual wages. Of this amount, the Federal Government keeps 0.4 percent for administration of the system leaving 2.7 percent to be applied to the employer's tax liability under State law.

All employers do not pay exactly the same rate of tax, because they are given credit under State laws when they show a good record for maintaining full employment.

But, they all pay the Federal share of the tax, which under this bill goes up to 0.55 percent, out of a total tax of 3.25 percent. Furthermore, the bill broadens the wage base on which the tax would be collected from $3,000 to $5,600 for calendar years 1967 through 1970, and to $6,600 thereafter.

This would add many milions to the tax burden of the covered employers. As the Reader's Digest observed in an article in its February issue: "Nobody really knows how much the whole works would add, but guesses range up to $2 billion—on top of the billions we are already spending on unemployment compensation."

Recently, I heard a sermon in which the preacher said that a kind and gracious providence has blessed us far beyond our just deserts. I humbly acknowledge how He has blessed me, not with great wealth, but with enough to pay my bills. My chief blessing has been my good health through the years. I ask that you pray that that same blessing may be mine for another 6 years because I am now at the peak of my ability to efficiently and effectively serve the State I love, and the job that I want to do for the orchardists of Virginia, for the farmers of Virginia, and for the unborn children of Virginians, with respect to the preservation of a system of private enterprise within the framework of constitutional liberty has not been finished. My fond hope, of course, is that on July 12, the Democrats of Virginia will say unto me: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, the introductory remarks made at Winchester by a grower, Mr. Joseph Dorsey, give light to the value and high esteem the agricultural interests in the valley of Virginia have for Senator ROBERTSON. I ask unanimous consent to have these remarks inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON AT ANNUAL MEETING OF FREDERICK COUNTY FRUIT GROWERS ANNUAL MEETING BY JOSEPH DORSEY, GROWER, WINCHESTER, VA., APRIL 8, 1966

In 1949 there appeared an article in Reader's Digest magazine entitled "What Are We Being Spent Into?" That article was about our speaker for this evening and the basic political philosophy of our speaker was made clear when he was quoted in this article as follows:

"There is probably not a single item in the whole list of Federal spending projects where the test of necessity, if honestly applied, would not produce confidence-inspiring savings.

"Two facts vitally affect the income, the savings, and the future of every American. The first is the increasing rate of speed at which Government spends what we make. And the second is the Government's plans to spend not less than we make, but vastly more."

Certainly the truth of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON's statement in 1949 is more valid today than when published by Reader's Digest. We are most fortunate that a man who has steadfastly adhered to this sound belief is the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and a member of the Appropriations Committee of the U.S. Senate. The name of A. WILLIS ROBERTSON has become synonymous with sound banking laws. He has patroned many bills that have been signed into law for the protection of the American's savings in financial institutions. Our banker hosts tonight can elaborate at great length upon the accomplishments of Senator ROBERTSON in this most important field of fiscal soundness and responsibility.

It would be an enjoyable but endless task for me to list the many and varied achievements of Senator ROBERTSON during his history as a legislator. If I should give you such a list, the time would slip by and Senator ROBERTSON might reach the conclusion that fruit growers sometimes get sleepy in the evenings. I will pick a few items of special interest to us, however.

As a State senator in Richmond, he was patron of the bill creating the State highway department. He sponsored the bill creating the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries and subsequently became the first chairman of this department.

His interest in the beauties and bounties of nature carried from Virginia to Washington where as a Member of the House of Representatives, he coauthored the Pittman-Robertson Act which provided some $180 million from Federal taxes on sporting arms and ammunition to return to the States for game restoration and conservation. He was appointed as chairman of the committee to study and coordinate agencies dealing with wildlife resources—the only freshman Congressman to be appointed a committee chairman.

As the successor to Carter Glass, he went to the U.S. Senate and immediately established a reputation as a close scrutinizer of all spending proposals on the Appropriations Committee.

In 1949 Senator ROBERTSON was designated by the Banking and Currency Committee to conduct an investigation of the monopolistic practices by labor organizations, especially as applied to the coal industry. The results of his study were submitted to the Labor Committee which handles legislation on that subject, but that committee refused to report the bill he introduced. You can immediately gather that Senator ROBERTSON has a keen awareness of our problems with labor legislation and our frustrations with the arbitrary rulings of the Secretary of Labor.

Gentlemen, seldom does a member of the Frederick County Fruit Growers' Association have the high honor and privilege which is mine this evening. Seldom does our association have the proper atmosphere and opportunity, as a group, to pay our respects and to express our sincere gratitude to a great statesman who has worked long and hard in resisting and retarding the obstacles placed in the path of our business success by the arbitrary rulings of the executive branch of the Federal Government. Seldom can any man stand before his fellow growers and make the statement which I now make. I state to you—without reservation—that our success in obtaining off-shore picking labor, in sufficient quantity and in sufficient time, to pick the 1965 apple crop in this area was due in the largest measure to the efforts in our behalf exerted by our distinguished speaker tonight. His constant conferences with the Secretary of Labor and the White House and his key votes on the Appropriations Committee were most directly responsible for overcoming a seemingly impossible situation last season. Senator ROBERTSON has already been to the White House in preparation for next season's problems.

I am most pleased and privileged to present to you a man who still holds the record for the hammer-throw in Virginia as a student and track star at Richmond College and a man who enjoys considerable reputation for throwing the wrench into the machinery that the Federal Government would like to have strip away our businesses, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, illustrious son of Virginia.

CUTBACK IN CATTLE HIDE EXPORTS UNJUSTIFIED

Mr. HARRIS. Madam President, the U.S. Department of Commerce recently announced action cutting back American cattle hide exports. Such action, in my judgment was unjustified, unnecessary, and unwise.

In this morning's Washington Post, there appeared an excellent editorial, entitled "Those Hide Export Quotas," the last paragraph of which states:

> Rather than waste more time and money—to say nothing about the violation of liberal principles in international trade—the export quotas on hides should be quietly abandoned.

I could not agree more, and, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE HIDE EXPORT QUOTAS

Early in March the administration, disturbed by gathering signs of inflation, imposed quotas on the export of cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and the leather made therefrom. The purpose of the action, for which the authority of Export Control Act of 1949 was invoked, is to prevent a shortage of hides that would result in sequential increases in the prices of leather and shoes. But it is already apparent that this hasty intervention by the Government will not yield the desired results.

About 3 weeks after the quotas were imposed by the Commerce Department, it was announced that the shoe industry had promised the Council of Economic Advisers to exercise restraints in pricing so long as the domestic prices of hides and leather are held down by export controls. Two days later, however, the manufacturers participating in the National Shoe Fair announced increases that will add an estimated $1 to $2 a pair to the retail prices of men's and women's shoes.

And while shoe prices advance, the burden of a large domestic supply of hides falls squarely on the cattle growers. As might have been anticipated, hide prices fell sharply in the domestic markets and rose in the foreign markets that rely upon American exports.

Surely the manufacturers are profiting by the administration's ad hoc attempt to control the price of shoes. But is anyone else? The income of the cattle growers is lower than it otherwise might be. Our foreign trading partners are now compelled to pay higher prices for hides and leather, especially that of lower quality which is not consumed in this country. And U.S. exports are being reduced at a time when a deterioration of the trade balance is feared.

After much protest in Congress, the Department of Commerce has announced a public hearing on April 18 in which all interested parties are invited to submit their views on the export controls. This is indeed a strangely inverted procedure. First the Government interferes with the operation of a highly competitive market. Then it inquires into the effects of intervention, effects that it could have predicted by careful economic analysis. Rather than waste more time and money—to say nothing about the violation of liberal principles in international trade—the export quotas on hides should be quietly abandoned.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam President, after the original announcement by the Department of Commerce, I wrote to the Secretary of Commerce protesting the action and asking that it be reconsidered. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter dated March 16, 1966, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HARRIS. On March 23, 1966, I again wrote to the Secretary of Commerce and also the Secretary of Agriculture asking for a joint meeting with them and a group of Senators from cattle-producing States to discuss this action which seemed unwarranted to us. I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, that copies of those letters to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of Commerce be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 2 and 3.)

Mr. HARRIS. On March 25, 1966, joined by Senators HICKENLOOPER, MILLER, YARBOROUGH, MCCARTHY, MUNDT, MONDALE, CURTIS, PEARSON, MANSFIELD, MCGOVERN, METCALF, MONRONEY, KUCHEL, MURPHY, TOWER, and NELSON, I again expressed our concern over the cattle hide exports restriction and asked for a meeting to discuss it. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. HARRIS. On March 31, 1966, I received a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture in which he stated that he would be glad to meet with the group of Senators to discuss the hide export controls. But, in the meantime, the Secretary of Commerce telephoned me to state that joint hearings by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture will be held in Washington on April 18 and 19 to go into this whole matter. I was very pleased to learn of this action by the Secretary of Commerce, and, accordingly, wrote the Secretary of Agriculture asking that our meetings be postponed for the time being. I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, that a copy of the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture dated March 31 and my answer to him dated April 8, 1966, be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 5 and 6.)

Mr. **HARRIS**. Madam President, the original statement by officials of the Department of Commerce that hide export controls were justified on the basis that they would "eliminate or minimize the need for further shoe price increases" has proved to be incorrect as pointed up by the recent announcement of shoemakers of fall increases in shoe prices from 3 to 8 percent. I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on March 28, 1966, entitled "Shoemakers To Lift Fall Prices 3 to 8 Percent, Despite Hide Export Limit by White House" be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 7.)

Mr. **HARRIS**. OPS ceilings in 1951 for hide prices during the Korean war were pegged at 33 cents. On March 1, 1966, during the time when the tanners and manufacturers and the Department of Commerce were saying that hide prices had become exorbitantly high, they were only two-thirds of what the Government said was a fair price in 1951.

Furthermore, according to a USDA study in 1965, the average $10 price of a pair of shoes includes only 68 cents worth of cured hide, and, the study of prices from 1947 to 1965 shows graphically that in spite of the fact that hide prices have been considerably depressed, shoe prices have continued to increase.

In truth, Madam President, there is no shortage of cattle hides. Last year we killed in excess of 32 million head of cattle in the United States, and we will have approximately the same killed in 1965.

All this is of great importance to the American cattle industry because the 3 to 5 cents per pound by which hide prices have dropped since the export controls became effective is reflected in about a $3 per head less value for the live animal.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that certain studies and charts furnished to me by Mr. C. W. McMillen, executive vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, substantiating the statements I have made, be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 8.)

Mr. **HARRIS**. The truth is, therefore, Madam President, that export controls on cattle hides are unnecessary, unjustified, and unwise. They should be "quietly abandoned," as recommended in today's editorial in the Washington Post. They're not justified on the grounds advanced by the Department of Commerce. Such controls are inconsistent with our policies for expansion of American exports, and, therefore, exacerbate our balance-of-payments difficulties. Such controls, as pointed out by the Washington Post, are a "violation of liberal principles in international trade," which have previously guided this administration.

Lastly, and most tragic, Madam President, is that once again, agriculture has been singled out to absorb alone the sanctions aimed at halting inflation and, if this action is to stand, will remain in a static or depressed price position, alone among those involved in the leather and leather products industry to receive the full effect of inflationary trends.

EXHIBIT 1

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
March 16, 1966.

Hon. JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce,
Commerce Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have noted with a great deal of concern the recent establishment of export controls on cattle hides by the Department of Commerce for 1966–67. This action is very disturbing to me inasmuch as we have been urging U.S. industries to develop foreign markets for their products. It seems most inconsistent with that policy to impose export regulations on an industry such as the cattle hide industry which has demonstrated a great deal of success in the development of foreign markets.

I would appreciate your providing me with a full report on the circumstances which have influenced this decision of the Department of Commerce. Also, I urge you to carefully restudy and reconsider this matter so that we will not hamper the continued growth and development the cattle industry has experienced in recent years.

Your consideration will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senator.

EXHIBIT 2

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
March 23, 1966.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A group of Senators from cattle-producing States are very much disturbed by the recent action of the U.S. Department of Commerce, imposing export controls on cattle hides. I am informed that as a result of this action, the price of hides dropped $2 per hundredweight in 24 hours and $4 within 10 days, and this naturally created a reaction in live cattle prices.

In view of the administration policies in regard to expanding exports and our balance-of-payments deficit, this action seems unwarranted. It has had especially harsh effect, not only on cattle producers, but also on hide dealers, recently encouraged by the Department of Commerce to go into the export market. May I respectfully suggest that you and the Secretary of Commerce meet with a group of us informally and privately to discuss this matter as soon as possible and at your convenience? My legislative assistant, Mr. Gary Dage, will be calling your office to work out details.

Sincerely yours,

FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senator.

EXHIBIT 3

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
March 23, 1966.

Hon. JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce,
Commerce Building,
Washingon, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A group of Senators from cattle-producing States are very much disturbed by the recent action of the U.S. Department of Commerce, imposing export controls on cattle hides. I am informed that as a result of this action, the price of hides dropped $2 per hundredweight in 24 hours and $4 within 10 days, and this naturally created a reaction in live cattle prices.

In view of the administration policies in regard to expanding exports and our balance-of-payments deficit, this action seems unwarranted. It has had especially harsh effect, not only on cattle producers, but also on hide dealers, recently encouraged by the Department of Commerce to go into the export market. May I respectfully suggest that you and the Secretary of Agriculture meet with a group of us informally and privately to discuss this matter as soon as possible and at your convenience? My legislative assistant, Mr. Gary Dage, will be calling your office to work out details.

Sincerely yours,

FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senator.

EXHIBIT 4

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
March 25, 1966.

Hon. JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce,
Commerce Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In regards to my letter of March 23, suggesting the need to meet with you to discuss the recent announcement of export controls on cattle hides, I have contacted a number of my colleagues, and we are now jointly requesting a meeting with you at your earliest possible convenience.

We feel that this is a matter of great concern to those of us who are representing large cattle producing States, and, therefore, are vitally interested in meeting with you to discuss the matter in more detail.

Sincerely yours,

FRED R. HARRIS, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, JACK MILLER, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, KARL E. MUNDT, WALTER F. MONDALE, CARL T. CURTIS, JAMES B. PEARSON, MIKE MANSFIELD, GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, LEE METCALF, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, GEORGE MURPHY, JOHN G. TOWER, GAYLORD NELSON, U.S. Senators.

The same letter went to the Secretary of Agriculture.

EXHIBIT 5

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1966.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: We are glad to have your letter of March 23 regarding the limitations imposed by the Department of Commerce on exports of cattle hides and leather.

I will be glad to meet with the group you suggest for a discussion of this action and we will await a call from Mr. Dage to work out details for this meeting.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

EXHIBIT 6

APRIL 8, 1966.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of the Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I appreciate your letter of March 31 in reply to the joint letter of my colleagues and me requesting an informal meeting with you and the Secretary of Commerce to discuss the recently imposed export controls on cattle hides.

I am sure you are aware of Secretary Connor's decision to hold formal hearings on the subject on April 18 and 19. In view of this decision, my colleagues and I would like to set aside our informal session with you in hopes that the public hearings will bring about favorable results.

Again, let me thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate.

EXHIBIT 7

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 28, 1966]

SHOEMAKERS TO LIFT FALL PRICES 3 PERCENT TO 8 PERCENT DESPITE HIDE-EXPORT LIMIT BY WHITE HOUSE

The Johnson administration's recently imposed controls on hide exports apparently weren't enough to prevent a price increase by the Nation's shoemakers.

As they had indicated earlier they would do, manufacturers are raising prices 3 percent to 8 percent on their fall lines of shoes. The increase could average out above the 5 percent boost posted last September on spring models.

The latest increase will add an estimated $1 to $2 a pair to the retail cost of men's and women's shoes planned for introduction this fall and to be shown this week at the National Shoe Fair in New York. Most of the new price lists will be distributed to retailers and suppliers during or after the semiannual conclave of the shoe industry.

In Washington, administration economists didn't have any specific comment on the shoe price increases, but they expressed a belief the increases would have been larger if it weren't for the Government's decision to limit hide exports. In response to industry pleas, and to "provide adequate supplies for domestic needs," the Commerce Department on March 11 established quotas for the export of hides. The quotas, which will cut 1966 exports of cattle hides by about the size of last year's increase in imports, were regarded as an attempt to reduce hide costs and thus forestall a shoe price increase.

SECOND BOOST IN 6 MONTHS

Only last Tuesday, Under Secretary of Commerce Leroy Collins told the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains that the hide controls "will eliminate or minimize the need for further shoe price increases this spring."

Nonetheless, shoemakers are sticking to their previously indicated intention of raising prices for the second time in 6 months. Of the major manufacturers, only Genesco, Inc., has already announced an increase, boosting its prices 5 to 7 percent. But Interco, Inc., the Nation's largest shoe manufacturer in terms of shoes produced, probably will post increases ranging from 4½ to 8 percent, according to M. R. Chambers, president. Several other concerns said privately they will raise some or all of their prices, with the increases ranging upward from 3 percent.

Following the Government's export-control action, hide prices backed off about 3 cents a pound to near 18½ cents a pound for heavy native steers. This was about the same as the prevailing price last August and September when manufacturers announced their 5-percent price increase. But this time, higher hide prices aren't receiving as big a share of the blame as they did in the earlier round of shoe price boosts.

HIGHER COSTS A FACTOR

Increased operating and labor costs have played a major role in determining the latest increases, industry sources say. "The hide market can go down to even lower levels and the price of shoes is still going to go up," said an official of one big company. "Regardless of the cost of hides, the price of shoes must go up to maintain already low industry profit margins," he contended.

But many industry executives agree with Government economists that the hide controls did ease some of the pressure for price increases. George Langstaff, director of footwear distribution for Genesco, said the quotas didn't delay the increases, but probably did have a "dampening effect" on them.

Industry officials appeared to be only slightly concerned about the administration's reaction to the higher prices. At a March 7 meeting between major manufacturers and the President's Council of Economic Advisers, one shoe executive confided, "We didn't accomplish a darn thing." He added: "They were only interested in leather prices, and not in problems we share with other industries."

During those discussions, Washington sources say, the shoe manufacturers indicated their pricing actions would be substantially influenced by anything the Government would do to increase the availability of hides, and thus reduce the price of their chief raw material. But one Government official said the manufacturers didn't make any specific price pledges, and the administration didn't seek any.

RETAILERS JUST GO ALONG

Last Friday, the council's staff held a similar "informal, factfinding" meeting with a delegation representing 10 major shoe retailers. But as one shoe producer noted, "There isn't too much the retailers can do about it" if manufacturers raise their prices.

The council's chairman Gardner Ackley, commented in a television interview over the weekend on the general price outlook, without mentioning the shoe situation. While food and farm product prices have caused about two-thirds of the overall price increase in the past year, he said, he is "fairly confident" they won't continue to spearhead the advance. Much of the change is due to the prospect of larger pork output, he remarked, noting that the short "pig crop" last year pushed up prices of all protein products.

Increases in various prices in recent months, however, will make it difficult for the Government to achieve its forecast that prices generally won't rise any more this year than last year's increase of about 2 percent, Mr. Ackley said on NBC's "Meet the Press." Asked if increases of 3.5 to 4 percent would require direct price controls, Mr. Ackley reaffirmed this position that controls still would be "unnecessary and inappropriate." It would be "poor management," he said, for the Government to "stumble" into price controls.

EXHIBIT 8

EXPORT CONTROLS ON CATTLE HIDES

HOW "SHORT" ARE HIDE SUPPLIES?

The March 11 press release announcing export quotas for cattle hides argues that the United States is facing a domestic shortage of 2.7 million hides in 1966. This is a strange assumption, considering the fact that commercial cattle slaughter (and therefore hide production) this year will total close to 32 million head, which will be only slightly below 1965's record volume and well above that of the preceding 3 years. In fact, compared with 1962 domestic production of cattle hides will be up between 5 and 6 million hides, while the use of hides for domestic leader production is expected to be no more than 1 million above the 1962 usage—even with export restrictions in effect.

As the data in the accompanying tables show, U.S. exports of cattle hides have increased substantially during the past 3 years. Much of this increase can be credited to the effective efforts of industry and Government to stimulate foreign markets for hides. Obviously, without these sales abroad, supplies would have been burdensome, and domestic hide prices would have been even more depressed than they have been. As these data show, exports since 1962 have about kept pace with the expansion in hide production due to increasing cattle slaughter.

Less than 2 years ago Government officials were urging industry to step up its efforts to export beef in order to strengthen the market for cattle. While export markets for beef have not materialized, hide sales abroad have expanded. Hides are the second most important product obtained from cattle, and it is difficult to see why hide exports are not as welcome as beef.

EXPORT QUOTAS—PRICE CONTROLS

Since the first rumors of impending export regulations reached the hide trade on March 2, sales have come to a standstill, and prices have sagged 3 to 4 cents per pound. The futures market for hides has dropped about 7 cents. Thus, the export licensing and quota program has had the effect of rolling back hide prices by a yet undetermined amount. In fact, the action poses several problems which may prove to be more disruptive than the mere fact that hide prices had recovered somewhat from previously depressed levels. For instance—

1. It is reported that foreign markets for hides have advanced on the news that supplies from the United States would be restricted. Thus, it is possible that a kind of two-price system for hides may emerge with prices for exported hides being above domestic prices.

2. This would be especially true if the estimated needs (23.6 million) proved to be overly optimistic, or if actual slaughter turned out to be larger than current projections.

Granting that there is concern regarding the mounting "fires of inflation," it appears most inappropriate that hides would be singled out as a scapegoat, simply because they are a commodity on which machinery happened to be available for imposing a regulation that would depress prices. Actually, cattle hides represent only 0.07 percent in the total wholesale price index weighting.

HIDE PRICES VERSUS SHOE PRICES

It has been suggested that the reason for the Department of Commerce action with respect to hide exports is the desire to checkmate an advance in shoe prices. According to a 1965 study by the USDA, on the average a $10 pair of shoes included only 68 cents worth of cured hides. This is another reason why the rollback of hide prices makes relatively little sense as a break on inflation.

HOW HIGH IS HIGH FOR HIDE PRICES?

In February, 1964 the Chicago price of heavy native steer hides declined to the lowest figure (7.5 cents per pound, monthly average) since 1933. While hide prices have improved significantly since then, the rise appears great only because the uptrend has been from such a low level. Actually, the recent peak reached in early March of 21 cents for heavy native steer hides is still below the June 1959 average of 24.5 cents, and the January 1951 average of about 37.5 cents.

Another yardstick which might be used in evaluating current hide prices is the ceiling prices for hides which were established under OPA and OPS. As shown by the following tabulation, the recent peak (which in effect has been rolled back) was lower than the OPS ceilings by about 35 percent. When adjusted for the advancing price level, recent prices were not only well below the OPS ceilings but the OPA ceilings, as well.

	Heavy native steer hides (cents per pound)	Wholesale price index (1947-49=100)	Deflated hide price (cents per pound)
		Percent	
OPA ceilings (1942-45)	15.5	67.0	23.1
OPS ceilings (1951)	33.0	114.8	28.7
Mar. 1, 1966	21.0	124.6	16.9

Still another measure of hide prices is their historical relationship to the price of live steers. This relationship is shown in the accompanying chart from which it can be seen that hide prices would have to advance to 28.7 cents per pound to equal 100 percent of the live steer price, which is still a relatively depressed level for this important commodity.

U.S. cattle hide supply and disappearance

[In millions of hides]

Item	1962	1963	1964	1965 preliminary	1966	
					No quotas	With quotas
Appearance from:						
Commercial cattle slaughter	26.1	27.2	30.8	32.3	31.8	
Other domestic sources [1]	3.1	2.2	3.3	3.8	3.1	
Imports	.4	.3	.2	.2	.2	
Total	29.6	20.7	34.3	36.3	35.1	
Disappearance:						
Exports of cattle hides	7.1	8.0	11.5	13.3	14.0	11.5
Cattle hide leather produced	22.5	21.7	22.8	23.0	21.1	23.6
Total	29.6	29.7	34.3	36.3	35.1	35.1

[1] Includes hides from farm slaughter, fallen animals, and heavy calves, plus net change in inventories at all levels. Note 1966 estimates based on Department of Commerce press release dated Mar. 11, 1966, announcing export quotas for hides.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce and the Tanners' Council.

U.S. cattle hide exports, by destination

[In thousands of hides]

Destination	1965	1964	1962
Western Hemisphere	1,967	1,895	1,170
West Germany	1,235	1,271	571
Netherlands	1,705	1,543	963
United Kingdom	606	316	37
Spain	363	263	51
France	126	146	47
Italy	624	414	63
Scandinavia	78	89	14
Other Western Europe	333	214	42
Russia and Eastern Europe	1,823	676	875
Japan	3,777	3,811	3,008
Turkey	351	469	100
Other	321	396	177
Total	13,309	11,503	7,118

Source: Compiled from U.S. Department of Commerce by the Tanners' Council.

Year	Heavy native steer hides [1]	Average price, all steer [2]	Percent H/S
1910-14	$17.19	$7.57	227
1915-19	30.55	11.93	256
1920-24	18.90	9.76	194
1925-29	18.03	11.67	154
1930-34	9.71	7.58	128
1935-39	13.49	9.94	136
1940-44	14.70	13.26	111
1945-49	22.32	23.57	95
1950-54	19.88	29.06	68
1955-59	13.27	24.54	54
1960	13.72	25.93	53
1961	14.91	24.46	61
1962	15.19	27.20	56
1963	11.23	23.79	47
1964	10.32	22.86	45
1965	14.08	25.81	55
Mar. 3, 1966	21.00	28.70	73

[1] Compiled from Pratt's Daily Hide and Leather Bulletin.

[2] Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Hide prices, specified periods

Item	Cents per pound				
	Mar. 15, 1966	Mar. 1, 1966	Feb. 14, 1964	Apr. 15, 1959	Apr. 16, 1951 [1]
Extra-light native steer (river)	25n	25¼	12¾	36n	39
Light native steer (river)	24n	24¼	11¾	33n	36½
Heavy native steer (river)	17	21	7¾	24⅛n	33
Butt-branded steer	15¾	19¾	6½	21½n	30
Colorado steer	15¼	18¼n	6	20½n	29½
Heavy Texas steer	16	19n	6¼n	21½n	30
Heavy native cow (river)	18n	22	9⅛	26¾	34
Light native cow (north)	21n	25n			
Light native cow (river)	23n	26n	11⅛	32¼n	36½
Branded cow (river)	17	21	7¼	26½n	33
Native bull	13n	13n	6n	19¾n	24

[1] OPS ceiling prices.

Source: The National Provisioner.

Wholesale price index, 1947-49=100

Item	Annual averages					January 1966
	1965 [1]	1964	1959	1954	1951	
Hides and skins	75.4	59.3	90.7	55.3	119.0	94.9
Cattle hides	55.0	39.8	79.9	46.2	124.6	70.3
Calfskins	80.2	59.9	103.2	59.7	96.4	95.2
Kipskins	81.0	75.5	118.0	60.3	116.8	99.7
Leather	106.0	100.9	111.8	85.2	124.7	114.3
Cattle hide leather	103.0	98.5	111.7	80.9	130.4	111.2
Calf leather	107.0	101.5	116.7	85.2	101.7	110.1
Kid leather	109.4	105.0	108.4	94.5	111.2	114.4
Footwear	137.6	134.8	129.6	111.8	121.5	142.3
Men's and boy's	141.9	137.9	131.5	110.6	128.6	147.0
Women's and misses'	136.7	134.9	129.9	113.3	120.9	141.1
Children's and infant's	124.2	121.2	118.8	106.3	115.9	130.4
Other leather products	107.7	104.7	100.0	97.0	112.3	111.8

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

METAMORPHOSIS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, the illuminating interview by Mr. Saul Pett with Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey was reported in the April 10 edition of the Sunday Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va.

I ask unanimous consent that this document be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the newspaper article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Metamorphosis—Bubble, Drive Are Still There, but Hubert Tempered by Office

(Note.—Happy Hubert Humphrey, the bubbly, blue-eyed evangelist, is more than just talk and smiles. He's worked hard, because "the country needs a stand-in," and the boss appreciates his accomplishments. Others talk of the future, but the Vice President wants only to have pride in his present.)

(By Saul Pett)

Washington.—Lyndon Johnson, while vice president, is said to have observed once that President Franklin Roosevelt, a man he much admired, "never let his vice presidents put their heads above water."

As President, however, Johnson has begun to allow his Vice President to surface, and the blessings have been mixed for Hubert Humphrey. As a result of White House dispensations, the Humphrey head is not only above water, where he can breathe, but high enough to be hit with rocks from the shore. Some hurt.

But Humphrey isn't complaining, although he has been known to exhibit his wounds privately. With his old zeal, his bubbly, blue-eyed evangelism, his effusive joie de vivre in the business of government and politics, Humphrey has fairly leaped into the growing role given him by the President. He would much rather be wounded but active than safe but inactive.

Being a realist, he knows, too, that what the President giveth the President can removeth. It is a constitutional fact of life that any moment he chooses, for Humphrey's protection or his own, and not necessarily in that order of priority, the President can submerge his Vice President beyond the reach of sonar.

This was recently symbolized at the Gridiron dinner in Washington. The President had said he would not attend. Thus, resplendent in white tie and tails, with a dandy little speech warming his inside pocket, HUMPHREY occupied the dais seat reserved for the senior officer of Government present.

But at the last moment Johnson showed up, in a business suit. Even in a white tie, a Vice President is no match for a President in a business suit. So HUMPHREY moved a few seats down the dais, the President delivered the Government's response and the Vice President's speech cooled in his pocket while he looked on, just another well-dressed spectator.

One might expect real damage to an oratorical rocket such as HUMPHREY when, all loxed up with all systems go, he suddenly is stopped cold on the launching pad. But HUMPHREY took the incident good naturedly. The next day, showing up at a television panel, he grinned. "I hope I get to say more than I did last night."

Publicly or privately, the Vice President has never been heard to complain about any Presidential treatment, whether it is a sudden shadow that cuts off his own light, or a sudden summons to a new assignment, or a staggering variety of phone calls from the White House that have reached him at home and abroad, in planes, behind speakers platforms, at airports, hotels, in cars and, in fact, once in the middle of a motorcade over the Brooklyn Bridge.

Nor has he ever complained about sudden Presidential decisions that scarcely leave him time to pack. Last year, he learned at 8 p.m. one night that he would be leaving at 2 a.m. to accompany a pair of astronauts to the Paris air show. This year, he was informed on a Saturday that he would be leaving the next Tuesday on a delicate mission abroad, to explain the results of the Lyndon B. Johnson-Premier Ky meeting at Honolulu and to confer with Asian leaders of nine nations.

This was HUMPHREY's most important assignment to date and his handling of it, in a blaze of impassioned speeches and a whirl of hard-nosed conferences, brought him more attention than anything since he became Vice President. It was also the catalyst that apparently crystallized the criticism by his fellow liberals. Largely, they oppose administration policy in Vietnam and now, in their mind, HUMPHREY has become the loudest spokesman of that policy. For 16 years in the Senate, he was a darling of the liberals. Now, he is a target.

What he may have lost in liberal support, HUMPHREY has gained in warmth at the White House. On his return from the Far East in February, he was greeted personally by the President, with a big hug, which in this administration is apparently the ultimate in well dones.

"Each time the President has given him a throttle, he has pulled it all the way back," says Bill Moyers, White House press secretary. "He's a doer and a great salesman * * * the Vietnam trip was his first serious conspicuous assignment, and the President thought he did a tremendous job.

"HUBERT takes pleasure in responsibility and work. He is more at peace with himself now and feels he finally has found a place in the administration. He was not just a message bearer on that trip. It was because of HUBERT, his verve and talent, that the trip became important, not because of the message he carried."

To observe the new and expanding HUMPHREY, the writer followed him one day recently. It began in his suite in the executive offices building, just a short holler from the White House.

HUMPHREY began the morning with a closed-door meeting with his staff, in which he talked 40 minutes, had them laughing frequently but left them with the very serious reminder that the office of Vice President can reflect on the office of President, that anything they do, in letters or cocktail party chatter, must never embarrass the President.

After separate conferences with Robert Weaver, secretary of housing and urban development and Gov. Roberto Sanchez Villela of Puerto Rico, HUMPHREY whipped off in his official limousine to make a "few informal remarks at the New Senate Offices Building. Here, with no notes, he spoke to the visiting Democratic State central committee from Indiana for 40 minutes, which seems to be his most comfortable cruising range.

He spoke only a little slower than the rate Barry Goldwater once clocked at "275 words a minute with gusts up to 340." He made several good jokes, mostly at his own expense, spoke of the joy he has just being in the Nation's Capital, noted that "every time I see the Capitol dome, I get goose pimples," quoted from Truman, Johnson, Churchill, Lincoln and Confucius, described his trip to the Far East and made the general point that the "brown and yellow people of Asia are as entitled to the protection of liberty as the white people of Europe."

To report a HUMPHREY speech, to quote from it, is difficult. In translation, he sounds corny. In person, he is moving. He sweeps his audience up with his momentum, he inspires them with his morning vision of the Capitol dome, he infects them with his excitement in just being at the heart of the Nation's business. Emotionally, he seems to be the Peter Pan of politics, who appears never to grow old or tired in it.

Later in the Senate dining room, he shook hands with several Senators and their visiting constituents, signed a few autographs and sat down to lunch while studying an upcoming farm speech and answering questions about his differences with Senator ROBERT KENNEDY of New York.

It was KENNEDY who suggested that a coalition government might have to be formed in South Vietnam, including the Vietcong. It was HUMPHREY who fired back the sharpest shot, all the way from Asia. To include the Vietcong, he said, would be like putting a "fox in the chicken coop" or an "arsonist in the fire department."

The long-distance argument enhanced the notion that HUMPHREY and KENNEDY are already on a collision course, fated to meet in a grand smashup in 1972 over the Democratic presidential nomination.

At lunch, the Vice President said that this kind of speculation does a disservice to both men, that neither uses foreign affairs for personal politics, that both agree far more than they disagree, and that "this town has far more fight promoters than peacemakers."

"All this fight talk tends to cloud and color the work of both of us," said HUMPHREY. "Senator KENNEDY is a man of great ability who represents a great State. He has much important work to do and so do I. And neither of us, by your actions, should be suspected of trying to upstage the other politically."

Several hours later, after presiding briefly over the Senate, after three private conferences in his Senate office, and a long session of posing under hot lights with Democratic Congressmen for campaign pictures, the Vice President dashed off to another speech. Only a few minutes late, he arrived on the stage of the State Department auditorium, where he was to make a few informal remarks at a ceremony involving graduates of the Job Corps.

Had this been the President waiting to go on, the arrangers most probably would have reshuffled the program to get to the main speaker faster. But in this case the Vice President, also a very busy man, was forced to wait more than a half hour through a series of limp speeches and even a musicale.

But when his turn finally came, HUMPHREY strode forth with eyes sparkling, face beaming. "I don't know when I had a better time," he began, and again he was utterly believable. Then he spoke for about 40 minutes, still full of good humor and zest. And for still another 20 minutes, he posed with the Job Corps boys and didn't seem to mind at all that some of the amateur photographers had to reshoot because of failing flash bulbs.

Finally, the long day was almost over. HUBERT HUMPHREY was now back in his semideserted office near the White House. On the phone, he apologized sorrowfully to his wife for missing a family function. Then he removed his jacket and tie, ordered a whisky highball and we talked.

We joked about the Vice-Presidential seal on the wall and the differences between it and the President's. The Presidential seal shows the American eagle with wings pointed upward heroically, with a cluster of olive branches in one talon and a cluster of arrows in the other. The Vice President's eagle has his wings down, clutching a single arrow and a single olive branch.

"I suppose," said HUMPHREY, "this means the Vice President has as much peace in his heart but not as much authority." It was late in the day and it wasn't much of a joke. HUMPHREY turned quickly serious.

"I have one desire, to make this office as meaningful as possible * * *. I told my staff this morning, 'You work for the Vice President, not HUBERT HUMPHREY.' In many ways, this is an awkward office, being part legislative, part executive, and having very little authority.

" 'If tragedy befell the President,' I told them, 'you would be the staff called upon immediately for important work.' Most of the time a Vice President is kind of a burden, a strain, to the President because his remarks might be interpreted as the feelings of the President. I pledged, when I took this job, I never knowingly would bring him any embarrassment.

" 'So you're working for the President, too,' I said. 'I don't want to hear one word from you at cocktail parties or anywhere or hear about one letter you've written which, if somehow a columnist got it, would reflect on this office of the President's.' "

Is there a "new" HUMPHREY?

"Not at all. I hope I'm wiser and more tolerant. I'm lucky; I've been here in Washington in the midst of things since 1948. Some people (his liberal critics) think I'm closer to business now. But I've always been close to business. I'm a free enterpriser. I believe in it.

"I am also a liberal. I've been in all the fights—for civil rights, for medicare, for many other things when they were unpopular. I believed and I bled. I got the reputation of being a firebrand liberal. But I was never against the establishment. Senators, I believe, should be independent, to probe, to inquire, to propose.

"But now I'm Vice President and I have new responsibilities. The President has given me a chance to be a man in my own right, not just a reserve on the bench. He's tested me. Sometimes he has found me wanting but he's called on me and I'm grateful."

Has HUMPHREY lost the support of liberals?

"Politics is unpredictable—there are even seasonal fluctuations. I've never left the liberals even though some are disappointed in me. Liberals have a great emotional commitment. They're volatile. If you do something to displease them, their respect becomes cynical."

The Vice President was pacing the room, gesturing broadly. There was now a sense of rising anger and frustration.

"I want to be tolerant but I can't see the difference between containment of communism in Europe and in Asia. * * * When the Communists infiltrated Henry Wallace's Progressive Party in 1948, we fought them. They opposed the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine, and we fought them. We organized the Americans for Democratic

Action to provide a wholesome, anti- and non-Communist home for Progressives.

"The Communists in North Vietnam organized the National Liberation Front. If America is willing to commit its resources to the defense of West Berlin and Western Europe against Communist aggression, why not recognize Communist aggression in Vietnam and Asia for what it is?"

HUMPHREY stopped and stared hard at his interviewer.

"I have my own views. I have my own conscience. I wear no man's collar. President Johnson's foreign policy is one I've been involved in as one of his advisers. When I disagreed, I expressed my differences. He accepted some of them.

"Some say that HUMPHREY is trying to be more for the President's program than the President. I happen to think it's a good program and that he is right. What is most unfair is not what they say about me but the idea that the President makes his decisions precipitously.

"This is nonsense. He has been a restraining influence on some who want him to be more militant. He's shown great patience and understanding. I've seen him encourage a devil's advocate to get all points of view. I've watched him make decisions painfully. He does not seek to escalate the war.

"But things are so complex * * * you don't prove yourself a liberal or a conservative by ignoring the facts of life, one of which is that Chinese communism is a militant, aggressive force. It has been more cautious in deed than word. We must insure that caution by not letting their aggressive techniques succeed. Every time communism has had to face the strength of free people communism became more prudent and cautious."

The Vice President subsided in his chair, like a boxer returning to his corner. What, I asked, are the difficulties of being Vice President?

"It's an unnatural role for an active politician," he said more quietly. "As a Senator, I was a creative man. Now I get satisfaction in letting my thoughts become part of and amalgam, and administration * * * the country needs a stand-in.

"Nobody knows what a man may be like if he had the awesome problems of leadership until he's tested in the ball game. But the people are entitled to know that I've learned the plays and the formations. To the best of my ability I have tried to prepare for leadership if need be."

Having seen and been awed by the decisions of the Presidency, does a man begin to think twice about wanting to be President?

"He does. I suppose any man in public life has the feeling he could be or ought to be President. But what I've seen lately would give anybody pause. My wife and I have talked about this many times.

"I've come much further than I ever dreamed possible. I don't know what the future will bring or what I'll be doing in 1968 or 1972. But I am very proud to be Vice President in 1966."

Is it possible that HUBERT HUMPHREY may not seek the Presidency in 1972?

"It is entirely possible and probable," he said, on his feet again, "that HUBERT HUMPHREY may not want to be President despite what some people think. But one thing I know. I want to be sure that my granddaughter will be able to read in her history books that between 1965 and 1969, the office of Vice President was not degraded and was perhaps enhanced."

The Vice President had stopped. There were tears in his eyes. He walked to his desk, shaded his eyes with his hand and said, quietly, "So, I'll go back to work now and sign some mail, thank you."

The interview was over.

The next day I talked with one of HUMPHREY's closest friends. I told him of the emotionalism the night before. He said he had seen the same thing in his friend, especially when they talked about the criticism of liberals. I asked about the statement that the Vice President might decide not to go after the big prize.

"I don't doubt at all," said the friend, after a pause, "that HUBERT meant and felt what he said as of the moment. But I wouldn't count on it."

By noon that day, HUBERT HUMPHREY was fully recovered. Beginning a major speech at the National Press Club, he recalled a reporter's questions the night before about the difference in seals, about the fact that wings of the President's eagle are up and the Vice President's are down.

"I didn't know the meaning of the difference," HUMPHREY told his laughing audience. "So I plunged right in and told him with great authority that the Vice President's eagle has to have its wings down to always be ready for a soft landing."

MEDICARE AND THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

Mr. HART. Madam President, in January of this year I sent an inquiry to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the requirement that applicants for hospital insurance benefits under the medicare program answer a question as to whether they are, or have been during the past 12 months, members of organizations required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950.

On February 9, 1966, Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, replied to my inquiry, as he did to a number of other Senators and Congressmen. I was pleased to learn from him that the Social Security Administration believes that the exclusion from the hospital insurance program of persons belonging to such organizations, and the related provision of the Social Security Act enacted in 1956, should be repealed, and that a legislative recommendation for repeal of these provisions would be sent to the Congress. I would point out that no such recommendation has been received as yet.

However, Mr. Ball went on to say that as long as these restrictions remain in the law and since there is no independent source from which they can identify persons rendered ineligible, they must continue to seek membership information from the applicant himself and must rely on provisions penalizing willful misrepresentation in connection with an application for benefits.

It has now come to my attention that since I received Mr. Ball's letter the Social Security Administration has, in fact, changed its position on this matter.

On March 8, Jack S. Futterman, Assistant Commissioner for Administration of the Social Security Administration, in the case of *Evans* v. *Gardner*, D.C.D.C. 463–66, District of Columbia, filed an affidavit in which he stated as follows:

> (8) Question 15, like all of the other questions in form SSA–18, is informational or evidentiary and failure to answer question 15 is not dispositive of the statutory condition of eligibility contained in section 103(b) (1) of Public Law 89–97.
>
> (9) Under the practices and procedures of the Social Security Administration, an application for hospital insurance benefits filed by an individual who has failed to answer question 15 is adjudicated by the Social Security Administration. Failure to answer all of the questions does not, in and of itself, render the application invalid. An incomplete application is adjudicated and, where available, information obtainable from outside sources is used in adjudicating the application. If a check of available outside sources should yield negative results with respect to question 15, the individual is considered not to be a member of any of the organizations in question and his application is approved, provided all of the other statutory requirements are met. Applications so executed by applicants are presently in the process of adjudication pursuant to such practices and procedures. As of the date of this affidavit slightly over one million completed applications have been filed pursuant to section 103 of Public Law 89–97.

This means that applicants may file an application for hospital insurance benefits, leave unanswered question 15 which many people find offensive, and not prejudice their eligibility for benefits.

It is also interesting to note that the application form was amended in January, eliminating from question 15 the phrase "or have you been during the last 12 months."

In light of the current campaign to get all individuals to sign up for hospital insurance and the extension of the filing deadline to May 31, I believe the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Social Security Administration should take appropriate steps to insure that the public is aware of the fact that applicants need not answer question 15. The Department's press release of February 9, quoting from the letter written to Congressmen and Senators, has left the opposite impression.

I urge that appropriate steps be taken at the earliest possible time to inform the public of the policy set forth in Mr. Futterman's affidavit.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks my exchange of correspondence with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the affidavit by Mr. Futterman to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the correspondence and affidavit were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 17, 1966.

HON. JOHN W. GARDNER,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Undoubtedly many persons have written you in adverse reaction to the inclusion in the application for hospitalization insurance of a non-Communist-membership affirmation.

The enclosed letter dated January 4 from Mr. Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union, voices this concern, a concern I share.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

WASHINGTON OFFICE, AMERICAN
CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR HART: Undoubtedly you have read in the press that the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is requiring an estimated 2 million elderly persons to answer a complex non-Communist question before they qualify for benefits under the recently passed medicare bill (Public Law 89-97).

Form SSA-18, entitled "Application for Hospital Insurance Entitlement" contains the following question:

"Are you now, or have you been during the last 12 months, a member of any organization which is required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950 as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization?"

Under the medicare law, 19 million Americans, aged 65 and over, will be eligible for payments covering a substantial portion of hospital costs beginning July 1, 1966. Most of them are now covered under social security, railroad retirement, or civil service programs. Benefits for approximately 2 million, presently uninsured, will be financed from General Treasury funds and it is this group which has to file this form.

HEW officials are quoted in the press as claiming they have no choice but to obey the mandate of Congress. However, that is simply not true. HEW, by a simple administrative decision, could eliminate the question, since it is not specifically required in the law as passed by Congress. This is the latest error by HEW in what can only be described as a comedy of errors by that Department with regard to this section of the medicare bill.

The alleged basis for the HEW requirement is section 103, under the title "Transitional Provision on Eligibility of Presently Uninsured Individuals for Hospital Insurance Benefits." Its subsection (a) sets forth those who are eligible for hospital benefits who are presently uninsured.

Section 103(b), however, disqualifies any individual "who is, at the beginning of the first month in which he meets the requirements of subsection (a), a member of any organization referred to in section 210(a) (17) of the Social Security Act."

That section in the Social Security Act is found in title 42, United States Code, section 410(a)(17) containing definitions relating to employment. It holds that employment for social security benefits shall not include "service in the employ of any organization which is performed (a) in any quarter during any part of which such organization is registered or there is in effect a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring such organizations to register, under the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization and (b) after June 30, 1956."

It should be noted that the responsibility for the disqualification section in the medicare bill was initially HEW's. That Department, in drafting the original medicare bill included section 103(b), because "it supposed that Congress" wanted it. It now seeks to justify its non-Communist question on the application on the same basis. However, HEW is wrong for the following reasons:

1. Congress did not specifically require this question to be asked, although there is a disqualification in the law for membership in such organizations. Congress did not specify that any individual, before he could quality for medicare, had to answer such a question. The asking of this question was wholly an administrative decision by HEW.

In contrast, the Congress, recently, in amending the National Defense Education Act (Public Law 87-835), eliminating such a disclaimer and substituted for it a provision making it a criminal offense for any member of a Communist organization to apply for, or attempt to use, any payment or loan under the National Defense Education Act. This substitution we find also offensive, but it was clearly the intent of Congress, in passing the National Defense Education Act amendment, not to permit asking the question of whether individuals were members of such organizations. In fact, the major purpose of the amendment was specifically to eliminate the disclaimer that was considered such an affront to the academic community.

2. There is nothing in the law, as passed by Congress, that refers to the last 12 months. This, again, was an administrative decision by HEW. The disqualification set forth in the law refers solely to membership at the beginning of the first month in which the individual meets the requirements of applying for medicare.

3. Although HEW has contended in a number of newspaper stories that it was required to place this provision in the application, it is interesting to note that queries of other disqualifications in the law are not asked of applicants. For example, individuals who have been convicted of offenses under chapter 37 (relating to espionage and censorship), chapter 105 (relating to sabotage), chapter 115 (relating to treason, sedition, and subversive activities under title 18 of the United States Code), or section 412 or 413 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, are barred under section 104 of the law, but no inquiry concerning these offenses is made.

Nowhere on the application is there any indication as to what organizations are required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950. It is difficult for an individual to find out which organizations fall within this category. There is no indication, for example, that there is not now a final order made by the Subversive Activities Control Board for any organization to register as Communist-infiltrated, and that the only one against whom an order has been made to register as a Communist-action organization is the Communist Party, U.S.A., and that the only orders against so-called Communist-front organizations are against organizations which haven't been in existence for years. As to the number of such organizations, we can only point to the confusion exposed in a recent article in the Reporter magazine:

"It is a measure of the difficulty applicants for medicare benefits may have in truthfully answering the question that the Times, going on the basis of orders of the SACB, figured membership in about 20 organizations, other than the Communist Party, to be relevant. The Social Security Administration told us the figure, excluding the party, was seven. And an official of the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice pointed out that only five of these seven in fact had final orders against them—adding that, in any event, all seven were now defunct."

Needless to say, the form has been presented to applicants with no list attached. People should not have to guess about what they are signing.

So far I have only discussed why HEW has not only the power and authority to eliminate the non-Communist question from SSA-18 but, indeed, should not have included it in the first place.

However, isn't it about time that the irrelevant, discriminatory and punitive sections of the Social Security Act be eliminated? Are we as a nation, so frightened, so lacking in humanity, that we must deprive some elderly persons of retirement and medical benefits available to all citizens, because they have been convicted for certain crimes, or belong to, or work for certain verboten organizations—even the Communist Party itself?

The effect of such provisions is to put on notice millions of elderly people that their receiving much-needed Government aid is conditioned on their giving up their right of freedom of association under the first amendment. This is bound to deter them from joining not only the proscribed organizations but other kinds of controversial political groups. We also note that the law and the HEW form concern themselves solely with various kinds of designated Communist organizations. Does this mean that persons belonging to other groups generally regarded as antidemocratic, such as the Ku Klux Klan or the American Nazi Party are free of any sanctions? We do not here pass on the merits of any particular political group, but merely point out the discriminatory nature of the law and the HEW form by singling out one particular kind of political association.

In recent years such manifestations of McCarthyism (no other word seems quite as descriptive) as loyalty oaths, disclaimer affidavits, and disqualifications based on organizational membership or advocacy have been decreasing. Indeed, just in this past session, Congress eliminated similar disclaimers as requirements for Job Corps enrollees and VISTA volunteers under the antipoverty program (Public Law 89-253).

Senator Jacob Javits has also recently contrasted the treatment of other groups who receive Federal funds:

"No farmer is asked to sign a loyalty oath to get a crop loan; no small businessman is asked to sign a loyalty oath when he seeks financial help from the Government. And certainly the officers of no ship line are asked to sign such an oath when they seek and get a big ship subsidy."

We write you now to urge you to contact HEW to drop its offensive and unnecessary question. At the same time, we believe that there is no reason why it must substitute a notice of the disqualification which may be equally as offensive. Other disqualifications in the medicare law are not prominently paraded or even mentioned on the application.

But, that is only part of the problem. In addition we urge you to consider introducing or backing legislation in the next session of Congress to repeal not only the disqualifications in sections 103 and 104, but also the other unnecessary (and, we believe, unconstitutional) sections in the Social Security Act (such as sec. 210(a)(17)) which demean this country by denying social security and medicare benefits for the old and infirm for no other reason than penalization.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence Speiser,
Director, Washington Office.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Baltimore, Md., February 9, 1966.

Refer to OI:I.

Hon. Philip A. Hart,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hart: Under Secretary Cohen has asked me to reply further to your letter of recent date with reference to a letter from Mr. Lawrence Speiser, Director of the Washington Office of the American Civil Liberties Union concerning the provision in the Social Security Amendments of 1965 that prohibits the payment of hospital insurance benefits to persons who are not eligible for cash benefits under the social security program or the railroad retirement program, and who are members of organizations required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950.

We believe that this exclusion is undesirable and that the related provision enacted in 1956, excluding employment by these organizations from the coverage of the Social Security Act is also undesirable. It is quite anomalous to require just about every employed person in the country to contribute toward his own protection under social security but to relieve employees of these organizations from this responsibility since when they are in need they will generally be eligible for public assistance supported by general taxation. We are therefore recommending to the Congress that both of these provisions be repealed.

While its basic concern is with the repeal of the provision, the American Civil Liberties Union argues further that administration of the law as it now stands does not call for asking people about their membership in the organizations in question. We are unable to agree with this position. Since with respect to this provision there is no independent source from which we can identify persons rendered ineligible, we believe that in the interest of careful administration we must seek the membership information from the applicant himself. The Social Security Act simply makes members of these organizations ineligible for benefits and in enforcement we must rely on provisions penalizing willful misrepresentation in connection with an application for benefits.

The reason that the form asks for membership information for the last 12 months is that the effective date of an application can be as much as 12 months earlier than the date the application is filed.

All district offices of the Social Security Administration have been furnished with the names of the few organizations involved so that the list will be readily available to applicants.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. BALL,
Commissioner of Social Security.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ALICE C. EVANS, ON BEHALF OF HERSELF AND OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED, PLAINTIFF, *v.* JOHN W. GARDNER, AS SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, DEFENDANT, CIVIL ACTION No. 463–'66

AFFIDAVIT OF JACK S. FUTTERMAN

CITY OF BALTIMORE,
State of Maryland, ss:

I. Jack S. Futterman, being first duly sworn, depose and say as follows:

"(1) I am Assistant Commissioner of Administration for the Social Security Administration and under a delegation of authority from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (title 42 United States Code section 405), I am the officer responsible for overall management and administration of the Social Security Administration and of the programs of social insurance benefits in titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act and I have personal knowledge of the practices and procedures of the Administration.

"(2) The Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89–97, 79 Stat. 286, 42 U.S.C. 1395(a) et sec.), amend the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) to provide for hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of the act and supplementary medical insurance benefits under part B of title XVIII of the act. Hospital insurance benefits are available to all persons over age 65 who are entitled to monthly social security benefits or to a railroad retirement pension or annuity.

"(3) Section 103(a) of Public Law 89–97, provides that an individual who is not otherwise eligible for monthly insurance benefits under the Social Security Act or the Railroad Retirement Act may nonetheless be eligible for hospital insurance benefits provided that he meets certain requirements with respect to age, residence, and provided further that the individual has filed an application for hospital insurance benefits. Further, any such individual who is deemed eligible for hospital insurance benefits upon compliance with the requirements of section 103(a) is not required to make any payment of contributions toward the cost of such benefits. The cost of benefits attributable to this group of beneficiaries is borne by the general revenues rather than by payroll taxes. Thus, section 103(c) of Public Law 89–97 provides for an annual appropriation on account of payments made from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund with respect to individuals who are entitled to hospital insurance benefits solely by reason of section 103(a).

"(4) Section 103(b) of Public Law 89–97 states that the provisions of section 103(a) shall not apply to any such individual who—'(1) is, at the beginning of the first month in which he meets the requirements of subsection (a), a member of any organization referred to in section 210(a)(17) of the Social Security Act.'

"(5) Section 210(a)(17) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 410(a)(17)) refers to an organization which '* * * is registered, or there is in effect a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring such organization to register, under the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization,* * *'

"(6) Section 103(b) of Public Law 89–97 is a condition of eligibility for presently uninsured individuals with respect to hospital insurance benefits provided under part A of the act and is no way related to eligibility with respect to medical insurance benefits under part B of the act.

"(7) Department of Health, Education, and Welfare form SSA–18 (copy attached) entitled 'Application for Hospital Insurance Entitlement' requests certain information with respect to age, citizenship, residence, marital status, etc., in order to determine eligibility of the individual for hospital insurance benefits under the Social Security Act. Question 15 of form SSA–18, which is based upon the conditions of eligibility prescribed in section 103(b)(1) of Public Law 89–97, asks the applicant to answer 'yes' or 'no' to the following question:

" 'Are you now a member of any organization which is required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950 as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization?'

"(8) Question 15, like all of the other questions in form SSA–18, is informational or evidentiary and failure to answer question 15 is not dispositive of the statutory condition of eligibility contained in section 103(b)(1) of Public Law 89–97.

"(9) Under the practices and procedures of the Social Security Administration, an application for hospital insurance benefits filed by an individual who has failed to answer question 15 is adjudicated by the Social Security Administration. Failure to answer all of the questions does not, in and of itself, render the application invalid. An incomplete application is adjudicated and, where available, information obtainable from outside sources is used in adjudicating the application. If a check of available outside sources should yield negative results with respect to question 15, the individual is considered not to be a member of any of the organizations in question and his application is approved, provided all of the other statutory requirements are met. Applications so executed by applicants are presently in the process of adjudication pursuant to such practices and procedures. As of the date of this affidavit slightly over 1 million completed applications have been filed pursuant to section 103 of Public Law 89–97.

"(10) If an application should be denied because of failure to meet one or more conditions of eligibility established in the law, there is a statutory procedure for the hearings of appeals with respect to determinations as to eligibility. Section 1869 of the Social Security Act, which relates to determinations and appeals with respect to entitlement under both parts A and B of the Health Insurance for the Aged Act, provides in part:

" 'SEC. 1869. (a) The determination of whether an individual is entitled to benefits under part A or part B, and the determination of the amount of benefits under part A, shall be made by the Secretary in accordance with regulations prescribed by him.

" '(b) Any individual dissatisfied with any determination under subsection (a) as to entitlement under part A or part B, * * * shall be entitled to a hearing thereon by the Secretary to the same extent as is provided in section 205(b), and * * * to judicial review of the Secretary's final decision after such hearing as is provided in section 205(g).'

"(11) Section 205(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(g)) provides in part, as follows:

" '(g) Any individual, after any final decision of the Secretary made after a hearing to which he was a party, * * * may obtain a review of such decision by a civil action commenced within sixty days after the mailing to him of notice of such decision or within such further time as the Secretary may allow. Such action shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the plaintiff resides, or has his principal place of business, or, if he does not reside or have his principal place of business within any such judicial district, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. * * *'

"(12) Subpart J of regulations No. 4 (20 C.F.R. 404.901 et seq.) issued under the authority of section 205(g) of the Social Security Act provides, in sections 404.901 through section 404.981, the administrative procedures with respect to determinations, reconsiderations and hearings, time and place of filing, request for reconsideration, evidence, witnesses, oral argument, the right to be represented by counsel, the right to review by the Appeals Council and, in specific detail, the administrative remedies that are available to any party who is dissatisfied with a determination by the Social Security Administration with respect to the individual's eligibility for benefits.

"(13) Plaintiff, herein, has not availed herself of any of the administrative remedies provided in the law and the regulations and, to the knowledge of the affiant, plaintiff has not even submitted an application for benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act. Absent such an application there is no claim that can be acted upon by the Social Security Administration.

"(14) In paragraph 11 of plaintiff's complaint it is stated:

" '11. Applications for part A benefits must be filed by March 31, 1966, with benefits payable as early as July 1, 1966. If the plaintiff cannot file her application to obtain part A benefits by March 31, 1966, then she cannot file until October 1967 and will not be able to receive benefits until July 1968.'

"Affiant affirms that the statements in paragraph 11 of the complaint are factually and legally incorrect. The March 31, 1966, deadline is not applicable to part A hospital insurance benefits, but is only applicable to part B medical insurance benefits. The affiant further states with respect to the establishment of eligibility for benefits under part B of said title XVIII that if an individual applies for part B benefits before March 31, 1966, he is entitled to medical insurance benefits on July 1, 1966, provided that he meets the age, citizenship, and residence requirements of section 1836 of the Social Security Act. This is so regardless of whether or not such individual is a member of one of the organizations referred to in section 103(b) of Public Law 89–97, because section 103(b) is not a condition of eligibility for part B benefits. Accordingly, section 103(b) of Public Law 89–97 and question 15 of form SSA–18 are completely unrelated to the March 31, 1966, deadline for filing for medical insurance benefits under part B.

"Furthermore, the March 31, 1966, deadline for filing under part B is unrelated to hospital insurance benefits under part A, because there is no statutory deadline for filing for part A benefits. Section 103(a) of Public Law 89–97 provides for as much as 12 months retroactive entitlement from the date of filing. Said section 103(a) provides, in part, as follows:

"'* * * An individual who would have met the preceding requirements of this subsection in any month had he filed application under paragraph (5) hereof before the end of such month shall be deemed to have met such requirements in such month if he files such application before the end of the twelfth month following such month. * * *'

"(15) Plaintiff has not, to the knowledge of the affiant, filed an application for benefits under either part A or part B of the Health Insurance for the Aged Act and has not stated a cause for the granting of injunctive relief.

"JACK S. FUTTERMAN,
"Assistant Commissioner for Administration, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of March 1966.

——— ———,
Notary Public.

My commission expires ———.

THE FUTURE OF THE NEW WORLD

Mr. BAYH. Madam President, recently there came to my attention a very thoughtful and stimulating analysis on Latin America made by Richard N. Goodwin, formerly a special assistant to the President and now a member of the staff at the Center for Advanced Studies of Wesleyan University. Because of Mr. Goodwin's extensive experience in and personal acquaintance with our neighbors to the south, his comments are worthy of special attention.

One of the most important yet revolutionary ideas which Mr. Goodwin propounds is his proposal that consideration be given to "subcontracting our entire agricultural development program in a specific country to a single state or group of states." During my tour of four South American nations last fall, I witnessed personally the great needs for improved techniques and skills in farming methods. At the same time I observed the real progress which has been accomplished in a few years by U.S. sponsored specialized training and educational projects, such as that administered by Purdue University in Brazil and the Partners of the Alliance program.

Although this unique proposal may not be the best approach to securing our long-range goals, it seems to me that Congress must constantly study and evaluate all serious suggestions for improving our aid program. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Goodwin's address, which is entitled "The Future of the New World," be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE OF THE NEW WORLD

(Remarks of Richard N. Goodwin to the Women's National Democratic Club)

I came here to discuss Latin America, a continent and a half of peril and limitless opportunity, a crucible of expectations for 200 million people, and a central concern of the foreign policy of the United States.

It will be a prejudiced discussion. I begin with enormous admiration and affection for Latin America. Here was the home of great civilizations finally ravaged and obliterated in their first innocent confrontation with the emissaries of Old World culture. Here are people who have clung to Western beliefs in human freedom and individual dignity, and to the Christian religion, despite misery and ruthless oppressions which would have destroyed a lesser faith. Here are nations which, although they occasionally make war, kill and oppress, have contributed, even in proportion to their power, far less to the world's sum of devastation, death, and hate liberated by sanctioned cruelty, than the advanced nations of the West. Here are societies which, despite our neglect and invasions and exploitation, have retained a sympathetic warmth for the United States and, in the main, stood beside us in moments of maximum danger from World War II to the Cuban missile crisis. And here are men and women whose personal vitality and warmth are a joy to the visitor, and an instruction to those who find all of life encompassed in stern pursuit.

So I like Latin America. I wish them well. And I am glad their desires coincide with our necessities at this moment in history.

There are common strands which bind this entire continent, and also mark it off from the rest of the developing world. Unlike Africa and Asia it is Western and Catholic, sharing the culture and convictions, the values and ambitions of our common civilization. Its nations are not new nations, and over a century and a half of independence powerful institutions have taken root which are both a source of stability and a frequent obstacle to development. And they all move under the shadow of the United States of America, the lone great power of the new world, whose influence, for good or ill, accepted or resented, is inescapable.

This common heritage underlines an immense diversity of land, people and traditions. There are countries with large Indian populations, and countries whose people are almost all of European descent. There are countries rich in natural resources, and impoverished lands. There are nations with armies under civilian control, like Chile, or with no army at all, like Costa Rica; or where the army dominates political life, as in Argentina.

Traveling through Latin America is not merely to visit different countries, but to enter different centuries. The 14th century is on the altiplano of Peru, where we met with men working a field, bent over a piece of blunt iron bound to a wooden staff, compelled to work 3 days each week for their overlord without pay, who had never heard of President Kennedy or President Johnson, their entire world enclosed by the surrounding hills. The 18th century inhabits the suburbs of Lima or Chile, where a generous host served brandy in a house stocked with servants, and walked us through a garden stocked with deer to show us rooms stocked with a priceless collection of gold and silver, the fruits of land he hardly ever saw. The 20th century, our own century, is São Paulo, with its skyscrapers, sprawling suburbs, industry, traffic jams, and its men rushing to work, plan, invest, and build. And in Brasilia, a science-fiction city on a desert plain, ribbed steel and concrete structures seemingly detached from human concern, can be found, perhaps, the century that is coming to all of us.

Seeing this illuminates a principal obstacle to progress and helps explain why Latin America has so largely eluded the grasp of radical revolution. You must live in the modern age to create modern progress or to make modern revolutions. If your agricultural system belongs to the Middle Ages, and your industry prospers behind 19th century barriers despite inefficiency and tiny markets, then the door to development is closed. If you live with unbearable toil, passive and resigned either to your fate or to the decrees of providence, then the essential condition of progress—the belief that man can master his own environment—is gone. Hopeless men do not make either modern nations or revolutions.

This is the central issue between the forces of democracy and the sponsors of radical despotism. They claim only violent revolution, guided by Marxist belief, can sweep away ancient institutions and ways of thought to clear the path for the future. Our conviction, born of our necessities, is that democratic leaders, guided by Western experience and equipped with a pragmatic temper, can do the job. History and circumstance has given us the first chance to prove our case. If we fail, that chance will not come again, nor will we deserve it.

In shaping our policy we can examine Latin America from the perspective of their interests or of ours.

From the south we see that the goals of the people of Latin America are the common aspirations of the 20th century. They are economic progress and social justice. Economic progress, for them as for us, is food and shelter, industry and power: an economy steadily growing in abundance. Social justice, for them as for us, is that the fruits of national progress—food and work and money—should be open to all and not a privileged few. Each person has a right to a stake in his own society—developing his talents able to own the land he works, spurred by the knowledge that rich as well as poor must bear their fair share of the costs of development. Those who ask whether social reform is economically important ask the wrong question. I believe it is. But justice is its own reason. Men will often fight for it more fiercely than they will for bread. And it is also true that only those secure in knowledge they are equal partners in their own society will also be equal to the enormous sacrifices and labor which development requires.

Beyond this, in Latin America, is the implacable desire for liberty—to be a freeman, in a democratic country equal in dignity to all others in the American community. Men imprisoned by hunger and poverty often have concerns which outweigh liberty. But it would be a mistake not to realize how deep the forces of freedom run. It erupts most fiercely among those whose income or education allows them to divert energies from the struggle to survive; but it is part of the heritage of all the people of this hemisphere, and part of their intentions.

This is the view from the south. What is the view from the north? Coldly and realistically, even harshly, what are our interests in those who share this hemisphere?

We want to keep the Communists out of Latin America, and avoid the serious swing in the balance of world power their presence would bring.

We want healthy and independent nations, capable of resisting subversion and revolution on their own, relieving us of the burden and necessity of rebuffing direct foreign control and hostile political movements.

We look toward a continent whose steady growth will stimulate our own prosperity, providing goods and markets for the American economy. If others develop they will not drain off a share of a limited world abundance, rather they will increase the abundance of all. To paraphrase a favorite expression of President Kennedy, in Latin America—as in Europe and in our country—the rising tide will lift all the boats.

And, because it shares both history and geography with us, we hope to admit Latin

America—as it grows in the capacity to accept larger burdens—to the Atlantic Community of Nations; not as neutrals or as nonalined, but as equal partners with Europe and America in the dangers and decisions of the Western World. Latin America, the United States and Europe, more than half a billion people spread across three continents, growing in skill and force, drawing conviction from a common spring of culture and value, can be an immense and immovable bulwark of our hopes and our civilization.

These are interests vital and grand enough to command the highest wisdom and skill of the United States. But as it would be unrealistic to deny these interests, it would be equaly unrealistic to neglect the powerful moral feelings which invade our relationships. There is belief in the common destiny of the New World. We want our fellow Americans to be fed when they are hungry; to educate their young, shelter their families, and anticipate a more abundant future for their children. We want them to live as freemen in a democratic society. We want this because the commands of our history and conscience tell us it is right. It is easy to pass over such moralizing as empty, if necessary, political rhetoric. But I have known two Presidents. I have known hundreds of men who worked for and supported, and voted for, programs to help Latin America. They never forgot the interest of their own country. But they also wanted to help because they believed it was just. Any man who looks for the moving forces of American policy, and neglects this, tells the story falsely.

These views, from north and south, reveal different hopes. But most profoundly, those hopes cross and largely overlap. We make most of our mistakes not when we put our interests ahead of those of Latin America, but when, as a result of shortsightedness or political pressure, we place what seems to be our immediate concern ahead of our true long-range interest and theirs. We are crippled not by lack of patriotism or pragmatic skills, but by the dimness of our vision. We have seen this in the past, for example, when all the force of economic and even military coercion has been placed in the service of a private American corporation which is of little real importance to our own economy; thus jeopardizing relationships, often damaging the domestic position of a friendly government, and giving substance to the accusations of our enemies.

It was the central achievement of the Alliance for Progress that it fused these two sets of interests. It recognized that meeting the goals of the people of Latin America was not only compatible with our own national interest, but essential.

And it came just in time.

With the death of Roosevelt and the end of World War II, the good neighbor policy fell into decline. A devastated Europe under the hungry gaze of the Soviet Union absorbed all the energies of government. Latin America was almost forgotten, although it had been an area of principal concern almost since the earliest days of the Republic. Billions of dollars went to Europe, and other areas, while a slim trickle of help went to Latin America. We recognized, even encouraged, the decisive need for public investment and public direction of development in Europe, and parts of Asia, and in our own country. But in Latin America we preached that unrestrained private enterprise—of a nature we ourselves had not accepted for decades—and especially American private enterprise, could lift their countries from poverty if only left alone. We gave medals to dictators, supported reactionary political forces, and encouraged the self-important illusions of generals. Most of all we showered favors upon almost any leader who would follow us obediently in foreign affairs, while not rocking the boat in his own country.

That policy was a disaster.

It brought Castro. It helped strengthen the forces of communism across the continent. It helped unleash forces of revolution in every land. And toward the United States, where there was once respect it brought fear, where there was admiration it brought hatred, where there was trust it brought despair.

In the late fifties the Vice President of the United States, lucklessly knocked the cover of ignorance off the tumultuous cauldron of discontent. Shouts and hatred, jeering mobs and violence, finally spoke what many sensitive and informed men had been trying vainly to say: We were on the edge of an abyss.

Finally, something was done. Under the brilliant leadership of Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon—and because of that leadership—the United States signed the Act of Bogotá, committing itself in a mild way to social progress; and created the Inter-American Bank with a pledge of $500 million. These were fragmentary steps. They were too small and left too many problems untouched. But they recognized that something was wrong and moved uncertainly toward some correction.

President Kennedy picked up these few and scattered threads and wove them into the Alianza para el Progreso. It was not a policy imposed by the North on the South or an act of charity by the strong toward the weak; but an alliance freely contracted, its principles and burdens a common responsibility, a recognition of the mutual interests of all the American nations.

The Alliance is not simply an aid program or an anti-Communist program. It is an ideology of development combined with concrete instruments to transform ideas into action and action into results. It not only praised social justice—land reform and tax reform and spreading education—but it demanded social justice, providing funds for the job, and reserving special support for those who want to do it. It set an ambitious target of steady economic growth; recognizing that development would require national planning, new economic institutions, large investments by the countries of Latin America, and large contributions by the United States; pledging us to at least $1 billion of economic assistance each year. It swept across the board of economic concern—from stabilization of commodity prices to the need for responsible private enterprise. And it promised full support and enthusiasm only to those countries dedicated to political democracy, the liberty of man, and the freedom of each nation to chart its own course.

It said in short that freedom, justice, and progress, were the pillars on which the American hemisphere of the future would rest.

These principles were not ours alone. They were the common declaration and the common pledge of all the American nations—except for Cuba.

Of course we knew this Alliance must be tempered, and occasionally distorted, by the pragmatic pressure of events and realities. The representatives of democracies and dictatorships alike walked forward to the central table in the hotel ballroom at Punta del Este and signed the glowing declaration with an equal appearance of enthusiasm. Only Che Guevara refused to sign, because—with his quick intelligence and unyielding dedication to revolutionary communism he realized the words of the declaration were a new and powerful enemy. We all knew that democracy or social justice or development would not come in a day; or perhaps for many, not within a decade. The United States knew it might have to associate itself with governments who would not, or even could not, obey the declaration they had signed. But this would be the necessary direction of movement.

There were those who said, as some still say, that the Alianza was a fine statement of faith, but as a policy it was unrealistic idealism run wild, the blunder of a novice administration blinded by its own moral fervor or, less creditably, by its own campaign rhetoric.

But they were wrong then: and they are wrong still.

The oligarchies and the old line generals, the ranks of reaction and the keepers of the status quo had shown, beyond redemption, that they had neither the strength nor the staying power to forever hold the forces of chaos or hostility in check. The only long-run alternative to communism or, more likely, to an angry neutralism, was progressive democracy. This was a judgment based, not on wishful thinking, but a careful, hard-headed assessment of the political forces at work across the continent. The Alliance was a policy carefully shaped to enforce that judgment. Any other course, however reasonable it might appear in the present, ultimately was illusion promising disaster.

For 5 years two Presidents of the United States have believed in and supported this policy.

How has it worked?

It has worked better than we think and not as well as we would like.

Four of the five countries we just visited have made progress since 1961.

In Peru, for the first time, a moderate progressive government, elected by the people, painfully labors to reform land tenure, colonize new areas, and give life to ambitious programs of development.

In Chile, the liberal Christian Democratic Party, propelled to power by popular enthusiasm works to reshape antique social structures and develop the economy, working with a vitality and intelligence reminiscent of our own New Deal.

In Brazil, where years of tumult and economic disaster caused when a popularly chosen President resigned in a fit of insanity, a moderate military government is sincerely working to restore both the economy and the conditions for constitutional democracy.

In Venezuela, in 1961, it seemed a continuing miracle that the hemisphere's leader of democracy, Romulo Betancourt, could survive even another week under constant attack, and threatened revolt, from both right and left. He served his term. A peaceful transition followed election. The threats, though present and difficult, have receded: and the national economy is making progress.

Of course these gains, and those in other countries, might be swept away by tomorrow's headlines. But as the mist clears, ever so slightly, the Alliance still stands and is gaining.

The greatest progress has been political. In some countries there has been no movement. In others it is far too slow. But across the hemisphere leaders and parties dedicated to democracy and progress gain in force and vigor. Elections are now fought over the principles of the Alliance. Every leader must take his stand on the great questions of development, even if only to pay them lipservice. There have been military coups, but the old style military dictatorships have not been restored. Even generals have often felt pressed to restore civilian government, and, while they stay a compulsion to adopt at least a few progressive policies. Perhaps the greatest achievement of the last 5 years has been to change the basic political dialog of the hemisphere, and strengthen progressive men and movements. This accomplishment is the foundation of all the rest. For countries will not go where their leaders will not take them.

Social justice, too, is nearer than before. Almost every nation has new programs of land reform, fairer tax laws and enforcement, and national development plans directed at reaching the most urgent needs of all the people. Some of these laws are full of import, almost revolutionary. Others are halfhearted or a mask for inaction. Some are enforced and others are ignored. But there is real movement, and it is in the right direction.

Economic development itself is far too slow. Many countries struggle desperately to keep pace with population growth or a decline in the prices they receive for their goods on the world market. There has, however, been some overall increase in the growth rate. And our trip showed what statistics cannot fully reveal: In almost every village men and women are being fed by American food. Hundreds of new schools bring learning to the young. There are housing projects and clean water and sewage systems, where there was squalor and poison. In human terms, a million lives have been touched and brightened by the Alianza.

In the countries we visited the influence of Castro and Cuba has faded. We talked with students and labors leaders, politicians, and professors; those by whom vague popular discontents are sharpened to keen, and often passionate, concern. Two years ago Cuba would have dominated every such discussion. Yet in more than three weeks Cuba was mentioned only once and Castro not at all. For many reasons, Castro has lost his standing as a symbol and model for the revolutionary left. It is a lesson to policymakers, to remember a burning issue which diminished while we ignored it.

Let us not take too much comfort in the decline of a familiar enemy. Communuism is still strong and hopeful. Among students and intellectuals especially there is a threatening leftward drift toward Peking, or a kind of violent, nationalistic Marxism. With these important groups the old line Communists, their hopes centered on Moscow, have paradoxically become the conservatives of the extreme.

A large reservoir of affection toward America can be found among men and women in both cities and countryside. In Mendoza, Argentina hundreds of schoolchildren worked late into the night making crude American flags out of red, white, and blue fragments of paper to celebrate our arrival. But there is also, especially among the educated and the young, and among many who oppose communism, a deep and violent anti-Americanism. It is not what it was in 1961. But it is there. It is strong. And it is fertile ground for those who seek to destroy the Alliance. In Chile we watched a large group of students shout anti-American slogans. The words themselves were not important. But burned into my memory is the fierce and violent hatred which glowed from a hundred young faces—hatred of you and me and of our country—hatred largely born of frustration to injustice. And I hope we might enlist such passion for our own cause.

No one can say with certainty how much of the progress we have made flows directly from the Alliance. It goes under many different names: Christian Democracy, Democratic Action, Revolution in Liberty. Some clearly results from the Alliance for Progress. Much would not have happened without the Alliance. But the only important thing is to advance. And to the extent progress proceeds on its own, it serves to vindicate our judgment that this is the wave of the future.

The road ahead is not an easy road. It is littered with the debris of outworn habits and structures, crossed by barriers higher and more resistant than we imagined.

Underdevelopment in Latin America, just as in many lands, is not simply being poor. It is a crippling and subtle virus spread over large areas of entire nations.

Progress demands institutions, from banks to cooperatives, shaped to stimulate the growth of a modern economy. Yet the institutions of Latin America rest on a narrow and precarious base—allowing only a few to contribute and a few to consume. In countries which depend on agriculture, as our own did while it developed, production is low and, for most, income is too small to sustain life. Thus the nation is deprived of necessary food, the farmer of little more than a miserable survival and industry of the large numbers of consumers essential for growth. All this tempts, and then drives, the rural population toward the miserable and dangerous city slums. Marketing of goods is ineffective, distribution and transportation are primitive or nonexistent, credit institutions are inadequate. The tropical climate, in many places, drains the energy of those who have no realistic hopes to drive them on. Each year millions of new lives clamor for their share of scarcity. And the Latin temper often yields slowly to the pragmatic demands of modern materialism; though once shaped it has proven itself from France to São Paulo, capable of heroic and successful action.

Everywhere there are dozens of intersecting and shifting circles of poverty springing from poverty and maintaining it. And they must all be broken.

Progress demands educated people. No country has ever developed without a rapid accumulation of skills and intelligence. Education, therefore, is a most important key to progress. Yet millions cannot read or write. Millions more lack the most basic skills. Few possess the advanced training needed to manage and direct development. Schools and universities are too small, too few, and too poor to meet the need.

Progress is not possible without intelligent political leadership and enduring political stability. Even postwar France, with all its resources and abilities required stability before full progress could come. Only people with confidence in the future will build and plan and invest. Yet, in many countries, the constant threat of violent revolution drains off human energy and vital resources in a struggle to keep the nation alive or a government in power. When this threat flows from subversion we must help to fight it. When it comes from the right, from the military, we must also help to fight it, knowing, however friendly the generals may be, each time they act they rip apart the fabric of tradition, economic confidence and obedience to a constitution which longrun achievement demands.

Progress demands that groups with great power be restrained to use that power within the framework of national goals. Yet Latin America is riddled with powerful special interests—landowning oligarchies, power-hungry or messianic generals, and even, though more rarely, large corporations—deeply entrenched, blindly standing in the way of progress, and constantly menacing the order and stability which a modern nation demands.

Progress also requires money. And most of the Latin American countries simply lack the capital to finance programs which can bring rapid and broadly based development.

And there are also other, and more disturbing currents, in the sea of underdevelopment which envelops a continent. For a nation to develop in the last half of the 20th century, it must be a nation. But the sense and reality of nationhood is often absent in Latin American States. Often the central government has merely presided over a scattered array of independent sovereignties—landowners or local leaders or military commanders—each with some latitude to ignore or defy direction from the capitol. Under such crippling conditions neither democracy nor national growth is possible; just as modern Europe would not have been possible without the great unifying movements of Cavour or Bismarck or the 18th-century rulers of France. Nor can nations be shaped when masses of people, the large oppressed Indian remnants of past greatness, are shut out from the economy and the society alike; citizens in name only. And large stretches of the colored patches on our maps which seem to show a nation, are really huge, unpopulated, and irrelevant wilderness, their potential untapped and ignored.

All of this is changing. Local power is being broken down and tentative, inadequate, groping efforts are being made to absorb the Indian and colonize the wilderness. But there is a long way to go.

These are formidable barriers. And any optimism must also be tempered by the knowledge that in the postwar world no underdeveloped country has yet joined the ranks of the modern industrial states.

Yet if conditions are favorable anywhere, they are favorable in Latin America. There is land and natural wealth in abundance. Growing numbers turn their energies and determination to the real issues of progress. In the United States, Latin America has a powerful partner which has finally seen the light. Some of its countries, such as Venezuela with its oil, or Mexico, are on the edge of uninterrupted growth. Others, such as Argentina with its rich plains and skilled people, or Brazil, a land blessed by nature, have all the weapons of progress within their grasp if they can break off the hampering shackles of political turbulence; and tear down the resistant national structures which protect and nurture unproductive enterprise, crowd half a nation into the small arid northeast of Brazil, and separate people from their fair expectations. Most importantly, in almost every country the spirit of the Alliance has taken hold. Much of a continent is beginning to move, slowly, but in the right direction.

This movement comes not merely from what has been done, but what has been said. There were many who complained that the Alianza stimulated hope and expectation beyond possibility. Yet nations and whole people are not stirred to act and work and sacrifice by the careful studies of engineers or the predictions of cautious economists. Only those who hold forth a large vision, a noble goal, a bright, if distant, expectation of a better day, can carry a standard which others will follow. Promises must be grounded in reality. But hope must reach to the bounds of possibility if there is to be any hope at all.

I cannot offer a single irresistible solvent for our difficulties. I do not believe one exists. A survey in the London Economist says more foreign exchange will resolve all problems. More is clearly needed. Yet after the war the treasuries of many Latin countries bulged with earnings from wartime trade. Yet it did not do the job; and it will not do it alone now. There is also brilliant wisdom in Mr. Walter Lippmann's insight that settlement of the interior is the key to the future of Latin America—not just economic wisdom, but profound psychological and political wisdom as well. But for reasons much too lengthy for this discussion, I do not believe it is enough, nor is it possible unless other problems are solved. There are reasons men have not settled the heartland of the Latin continent as we settled our own; and many of those reasons are still there.

We all know that the Latin American nation must carry the bending burdens of progress. We will help. But their willingness to endure sacrifice and make painful decisions will largely shape the future.

However, the experience of the past 5 years has also begun to illuminate more clearly the future lines of U.S. policy. President Johnson, like President Kennedy before him, has believed in and supported the Alliance for Progress to the limit of political possibility.

We must continue what we are doing, and I believe that commitment is clear. But the needs of the future require us to look in fresh, and more bold, directions. And I, of course, am no longer so strictly limited by political possibilities.

First, we must do more in the years to come—work more and spend more. As any businessman can testify, an investment that is too small is often wasted. I cannot prophesy exactly, but it will ultimately cost us two or three times today's effort. Such an increase will reward us manyfold—not only by increased welfare and security, but in the hard cash terms of economic opportunity.

Increasing aid will require increasing imagination and flexibility. It is necessary to make sure money is wisely spent. It is not necessary to clog and cripple the machinery of cooperation with endless duties, regulations whose complexity defies obedience, and standards whose rigor reflects not economic necessity, but the futile apprehension that each negotiating table sits the ghostly presence of the most hostile Member of Congress. We should at least be willing to take the same chances that almost any progressive bank or business in America accepts every day. There will be losses, but the rewards will make them up and more. We might still be working on the Erie Canal if that project had to run the gauntlet of some of the rules and people who administer our assistance programs. I have the greatest admiration for the intelligence and dedication of many who work in AID; but they are often the prisoner of a system, largely not of their own making, which transforms trust and expectation into frustration and suspicions.

Beyond this we look toward the day, when, in many countries we will not need to tie aid to specific projects. If a Latin American nation has a sound plan of development and the skill and resources to implement it, we should, as we did in Europe, simply turn over our portion of the necessary foreign exchange.

Second, we might well try to mobilize the enormous abilities of the American people for the Alliance for Progress. Across this Nation are millions of institutions and organizations and individuals rich in skills and know-how and the desire to help their country. It is they who built America, and they are building it still. Yet almost our entire AID program is conducted from a few buildings in Washington linked to officials missions in every country of the hemisphere.

Let me make a suggestion.

Most of Latin America is rural, and agriculture its most important challenge. Yet it is the most difficult to solve. For someone must reach every individual farmer with fresh skills and techniques, with credit or machinery or fertilizer. Cooperatives must be formed, new systems of marketing must be organized, irrigation and power must be planned and supplied. No nation has achieved these varied tasks more brilliantly or abundantly than the United States. Yet the sources of our success are not primarily in Washington. They are out among the States of the United States—in State departments of agriculture, universities, growers associations, and all the rest. We have some few programs to enlist these skills, notably the activities of California in Chile, in whose origin I was involved. But isolated and fragmentary programs only skim the surface of an enormous and powerful wellspring of energy and talent.

We might well consider subcontracting our entire agricultural development program in a specific country to a single State or group of States. They would supply the managers and the experts to administer our AID funds. Not only could they do a better job but soon schools and universities would be offering scholarships, professional groups sending technical help, and entire communities enlisting money and interest—in a hundred unpredictable ways—for their sister communities in other lands. Such a program would increase the amount and value of our help. It would help educate Americans to the problems of others. By transforming foreign aid from an abstraction in Washington, to a human reality at home, it could build a solid political base for the long-term effort that is ahead. And, perhaps most importantly, it would give millions of Americans a chance to share in the great overseas enterprise of the American Nation. I not only think, I am sure, they want that chance, and they will rise to it with an energy and devotion beyond expectation.

Third, we must always be true to the political and moral foundation of the Alliance for Progress. We are not merely helping to build factories or schools or even entire economies. We are helping to build nations. For our interests, truly and spaciously conceived, require countries able to stand on their own feet, secure in their independence, contributing to the defense and growth and culture of the West. Such independence comes, not by decree, but by experience. Therefore we must be unwavering in support of the right of each country to select its leaders, structure its economy, and shape its institutions. We must remember even the casual touch of American pressure may descend with terrifying weight on weak and unstable governments. We may see mistakes being made, injustices committed, dangers nourished. But except under the most overwhelming circumstances we must stand aside, painful and troubling as that course may often be.

Fourth, we must continue to give our fullest support and enthusiasm to those governments dedicated to social justice and political democracy. The United States is too powerful a force, too heavy a weight, too much the central object of both hope and fear, ever to be neutral in Latin America. If we are not for social justice, we are against it. If we are not for democracy, we are against it. If we are not for progress, we are against it. Of course, we may have to work with backward or despotic regimes, or with moderate military governments. But it all depends how it is done. It must be with reluctance, slowly, making clear there is no choice, and with unremitting pressure on such leadership to move toward freedom and the needs of their people. To do otherwise would be to cut out the moral and ideological heart of the Alianza, leaving a doomed and crumbling shell. No shortrun difficulty can be allowed to obscure our basic consistency of act and belief. For this is the foundation on which trust and partnership rest. Pragmatism is a useful tool to carry you forward. It can remove obstacles and solve problems. But it does not tell you where to go. Beliefs tell you. Values tell you. Common goals tell you. For a great nation to lead, to command the respect and trust of others, it must not only do something, but it must stand for something. It must represent in word and act the ideals of its society and its civilization. It is not realistic to solve problems and invest money and use power unguided by ultimate aims and values. It is thoughtless folly. For it ignores the realities of human faith and passion and desire; forces ultimately more powerful than all the calculations of economists and generals.

For many decades in Latin America danger will follow danger, and each hill we climb will reveal only another rise beyond. But if we match the fullness of our efforts with fidelity to principle we can help build a free and growing continent; a source of strength and inspiration and wisdom to our own country and to all who share our faith. Independence and freedom are not abstractions. Our own people have sacrificed and even died for them. But we do not pursue them in Latin America because we wish to impose our own belief on others; rather it is because they are deeply and passionately gripped in the hearts and spirits of our fellow citizens of the New World. If we do not help them build in this way, if we dissipate our moral force under the pressures of immediate events, then we may empty our treasuries and pour forth all the wonders of our science, but we will build for others. It is easy to be tough, when toughness means coercing the weak or rewarding the strong; and when men of power and influence at home stand ready to applaud. It is far harder to hold to principle, allowing others to make mistakes or to do injury, supporting forces temporarily repressed, standing firm for ideals which others seem unable to support themselves. But it is the true path of courage. It is the only path of wisdom. And it is the sure path of effective service to the United States of America.

This is our necessity and our interest. But how fortunate we are to live at a time when this necessity and interest merge with the deep and most ancient beliefs and hopes of the American people.

THE RETIREMENT CENTER FOR SENIOR CITIZENS SPONSORED BY THE IMPROVED BENEVOLENT PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS OF THE WORLD

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I would like to take note of a project with national significance that has been initiated in the State of California. It represents the first major open occupancy development for senior citizens in our history, and is being constructed as a nonprofit retirement center by private industry with the support of a sizable FHA commitment. This teamwork, that will enable many of our previously deprived senior citizens to participate in the comfort and pleasure of such facilities, deserves recognition and commendation. The retirement center for all members of our senior citizens community is being sponsored by the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of Elks of the World, the predominantly Negro fraternal organization, but which will be shared by all races, religions, and creeds. Called Golden Valley, it is located in Mira Loma, Calif., just outside of Los Angeles. Eventually, it will house 16,000 people in its 6,000 modern rental units. Many of these 16,000 senior citizens will be from minority groups that have nothing to look back upon but degradation and despair. It is only fitting that they share in our great effort to give all Americans the opportunity to live like human beings, and that they spend the latter years of their lives enjoying some of the advances that will finally present their sons and daughters with the full fruits of American democracy. I would like to commend Grand Exalted Ruler Hobson R. Reynolds of the Improved Order of Elks for his dedication and leadership; Senator KUCHEL for his support of the project; Senator ROBERT KENNEDY for his interest in "Golden Valley," which has been prompted by the participation of Manufacturers Hanover Bank in New York as the financing institution; and the Heftler Construction Co., for their leadership in pursuing the "Golden Valley" effort. It is this type of National and State Government cooperation with private industry that will allow us to reach our goals in adequate housing for all people.

TRIBUTE TO C. D. BAKER, OF LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] had intended to make today, and a news article, which the Senator from Nevada wished to insert in the Record as a part of his statement.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Bible

One of Nevada's most valued political and business leaders is retiring this month. He is C. D. Baker, a close personal friend whose active and colorful career is one to which I would like to invite the Senate's attention.

Starting as a city engineer and then county surveyor in southern Nevada, C. D. Baker's 44-year public career included service as a State assemblyman, State senator and mayor of Las Vegas.

His work, both in public life and in private business, has played a major part in molding the progress and development of Nevada. Although he is retiring, I know he will continue to have an important influence over his State's destiny.

[From the Las Vegas (Nev.) Review-Journal, Mar. 2, 1966]

C. D. Baker, Las Vegas Leader, Will End Career Soon

(By Tom Wilson)

A 44-year-long blue chip career in politics, engineering, real estate and civic leadership will soon roll to an end for the much venerated and equally controversial C. D. Baker.

Baker plans to shut down his real estate office April 1, attend a real estate conference in Japan, visit Hawaii and return to Las Vegas to wind up his business in June.

Democratic Party leader, assemblyman, State senator, Las Vegas mayor and one of Nevada's leading real estate men and landowners, Baker remains today the same gravel-voiced, candid and driving personality that won him a niche in the history of southern Nevada.

"I'll be turning 65 soon," Baker growled. "I guess I'll have to apply for my social security."

Persons close to Baker speculate, however, that only the stern orders of his doctor are keeping him from his role of kingmaker in Clark County Democrat politics.

Baker kicked off his Nevada career by serving as Clark County surveyor then moving over to Las Vegas city engineer where he built most streets in the heart of the city.

Baker's first formal entry into politics in 1940 was cut short by World War II. Elected as an assemblyman, he soon found himself called to active duty as a Reserve captain in the Army Corps of Engineers.

After spending 5 years constructing ammunition depots, airfields, bunkers, and other facilities in the Pacific theater, he returned to Las Vegas to be elected State senator.

* * * * *

In 1950, Baker was elected Las Vegas mayor.

In 1956, Baker was reelected by a narrow margin. His opponents hammered away with charges he was responsible for "tearing up the streets." Baker contended the street rebuilding was "progress."

During Baker's terms as mayor, Las Vegas went through a tremendous boom period, followed by a recession and then the start of a new boom.

Political allies cite Baker's chief tactic for retaining support of his city commission: he never issued a public statement in his own name. It was always, "The Las Vegas City Commission announced * * *."

As a realtor, Baker and his partner, H. E. "Hap" Hazard prospered in the growing Las Vegas area. Their names dot landownership maps of the valley.

As county and State Democratic Party chairman, Baker played a key role in the voter registration drives that gave his party a 3-to-1 edge in southern Nevada.

Although Baker has drifted away from his usual powerhouse role in politics, his love of the game remains. But Baker has become disenchanted with the modern party activity in Clark County.

"They all want the glory but won't do the work," he said.

In between politics, real estate, and public offices Baker served as State president of the State realty board, Clark County's board, State Elks' president, president of the City of Hope, exalted ruler of the Las Vegas Elks Lodge, district commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce president.

THE FEAST OF PASSOVER

Mr. HART. Madam President, by constitutional requirement and independent conviction, ours is a nation which assures every citizen freedom in the practice of religion. Protected and encouraged by this constitutional guarantee, there are many faiths and denominations in our land, and even the least numerous is to be given understanding respect. But it is chiefly from the Jewish and Christian faiths that our Nation derives its religious traditions.

In a weekly publication Witness, issued for use in Catholic secondary schools at Easter, I read a story on the Passover, written by that remarkable North Carolinian, Harry Golden, which bears importantly on that tradition. In the direct style which has put many of his books on the best seller lists, Harry Golden tells a story which I would hope many can read at this Easter season. It is a story which should strengthen our personal religious conviction—Jewish or Christian—at the same time increasing our understanding and respect for the tradition of our neighbor. To this end, I ask unanimous consent that the article I have cited, "Passover Again," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Passover Again

(By Harry Golden)

The feast of Passover is probably the only religious holiday which is as old as recorded history itself. Some scholars believe it began as a festival in which the people performed rituals to keep their houses free of disease, sickness and hunger. When the Hebrews left Egypt, Passover became an agricultural festival and a celebration by the Jews of their freedom.

"And they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not leavened; because they were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any victual" (Exodus 12: 39).

Unleavened bread was used regularly in the sacrificial ritual of the Temple at Jerusalem. This ritual took place in the spring, the time of the year when life is young and everyone wants to begin afresh, just as the Hebrews began afresh when they escaped from Pharaoh. Thus, St. Paul says, "Clean out the old yeast, that you may be fresh dough" (epistle of Easter).

I remember how careful my mother was in "cleaning out the old yeast," as indeed were all the Jewish mothers of orthodox homes. My sisters helped. They worked around the clock preparing for the Passover holiday.

There was always some fun. The father would plant a few crumbs on a windowsill or in the corner of a room, and lead the younger children on the search. If a little sister was 4 years old, she was not too young to help—she picked up crumbs or crusts of bread in the corners of the house, indeed in the pockets of all the garments in the household, and everybody kissed the little girl and held her up proudly when she found a few bread crumbs where no one else would have ever looked. You heard the little sister shout in ecstasy, "Here is some," and congratulations all around—and a reward. A young boy's job was to take the pile of hometz—every last bit of "evidence" of the preholiday daily life—into the street and burn it.

The well-to-do had complete sets of pots and pans and tableware used only on Passover. The poor cleaned and scoured everything, boiling each pot and plate and utensil to remove every trace of what had gone before—and to prepare for the unleavened bread of the "new grains" (matzoth) and the symbolic eating of the paschal lamb and the bitter herbs.

In the old days, the Jews ate a lamb which had been sacrificed to God. Today a roasted shankbone rests symbolically on the center plate during the Passover meal, the Seder. Christianity used this idea when the disciples called Jesus the paschal lamb of the world. For this reason the first three Gospels called the Last Supper the Passover meal.

Every ritual at the Passover Seder is symbolic of the history of our people. Next to the plate with the shankbone is the dish of salt water; beside it are a few sprigs of parsley. Each of us dips the parsley into the salt water and tastes of it. The parsley, fresh and green, suggests the new and happier life; the salt water is our tears; together they recall our freedom out of slavery.

Halfway through the meal, the youngest son opens the door and we say, "All who are hungry let them come in and eat." In the industrial-urban complex of the 20th century, this is merely symbolic. There were times, however, when the travelers, the strangers, and the poor did indeed take up places at the doors of Jewish homes to accept the invitation. In modern times, the traveling man, away from home, usually goes to the nearest synagogue or temple on Passover eve and he will be certain to receive the invitation.

For the Jews, of course, Passover means the escape from bondage and slavery and the beginning of their history as a people. What is even more important is that Passover is a family holiday celebrated in the home. That is why Jews love it the best of all their festivals. On Passover night, 1966, as a Jew, I will know that in every nook and corner of this world, in battle, in camps, in the desert, on land and on sea, fellow Jews sit just as I—at a Passover meal. It is hard to tell Gentiles what this sense of belonging means to Jews, a people who despite persecution have survived for thousands of years. And at the Seder the Jews will read the Exodus story in a book called the Haggadah which asks that, "In every generation let each man look on himself as if he came forth out of Egypt."

This undiminished vitality the Jews have lent not only to Christianity but to all of Western civilization itself. The Plymouth Bay Colony expressly drew up its constitution on the same principles of Nehemiah after the Jews' return from the Babylonian exile. The Massachusetts Bay Colony also followed Moses in framing its laws.

And on the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia is the Passover prayer from Leviticus 25: 10: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof."

MORE ABUNDANT SUPPLIES OF MILK

Mr. CANNON. Madam President, the Secretary of Agriculture recently acted wisely to encourage more abundant supplies of milk.

I have been concerned, as I know many other people are, by the decline in milk production in recent months. The Nation's dairy farmers are producing nearly 6 percent less milk today than a year ago, and the decline has become more pronounced as time goes along.

The action to provide higher support prices—even though the support level is below actual market prices—will help stabilize the milk supply situation and lead to more abundant supplies later in the year. The temporary action to provide higher minimum prices to producers of drinking milk will insure adequate fluid milk supplies for urban consumers.

I do not want to see in milk the same kind of situation which has developed in beef and pork over the last year. Beef and pork prices are high today because 2 years ago they were so low that many farmers decided to cut down on production or get out of the business entirely. We can see that happening now in dairying where many farmers are reducing herd sizes or are selling off their milk cows entirely.

If this trend were to persist, the cost of milk and dairy products could increase sharply later on this year.

The moderate actions to encourage greater milk supplies will help to strengthen the income of the dairy farmer, and will protect the consumer from sharply higher retail prices in the months ahead.

A DREAM TUNNEL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, all of us have dreams which we hope some day to see realized. My good friend, Mr. Monroe Worthington, industry editor of the Wheeling News Register, Wheeling, W. Va., has dreamed of canalizing the James River, in Virginia, from the Atlantic Ocean to Natural Bridge Station—near Lynchburg. He would also canalize the Great Kanawha River, in West Virginia, from its mouth to Deepwater or about Charlton Heights, W. Va.; and he then wishes to connect the deepened rivers by a tunnel 96 miles long.

Mr. William C. Blizzard, in reporting Mr. Worthington's dream in the April 10 issue of the Sunday Gazette-Mail State Magazine, Charleston, W. Va., called the tunnel "A Tunnel of Love," because of Mr. Worthington's devoted efforts in pursuit of his dream which, if realized in the manner envisioned, would bring great economic benefits to the peoples of the areas involved.

I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newspaper article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONROE WORTHINGTON'S TUNNEL OF LOVE

(By William C. Blizzard)

If you look in "Who's Who in the East," you will discover several things about Monroe Worthington. You will discover that he is industry editor of the Wheeling News Register and has worked on newspapers for most of his life. He is also a member of the Society of Friends and is a Mason.

But the most important discovery you will make about Monroe Worthington's career—at least to Monroe Worthington himself—is that he is the originator of the Midland Transcontinental Canal.

In a way, it is a strange sort of fame and a strange sort of pride. For the Midland Transcontinental Canal has never been built. It has never even been started. It exists only in the mind of Monroe Worthington.

It is not, in itself, either bad or unusual that a project may be said to exist only in the mind of its creator. At one time, it might have been truly said of projects so diverse as Michaelangelo's "Pieta" and the Wright brothers' flying machine.

Perhaps one day Monroe Worthington's Midland Transcontinental Canal will be a thing of concrete and stone and electricity, a waterbearing conduit for countless tons of merchandise borne by ocean-going vessels across the heart of the United States. Monroe Worthington thinks so.

But at present the newspaper editor, just turned 62, is not emphasizing the "transcontinental" aspects of his canal, a waterway which would follow the James, the Kanawha, the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Flathead, the Clark Fork, the Pen Oreille and the Columbia Rivers from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Such a grandiose plan, he admits, might frighten the general public.

Just now, Worthington is content to explain the first "leg" of his project, a midland canal which, if actually built, would have a most revolutionary impact upon the economy of West Virginia. His idea, although ambitious, is simple.

He would canalize the James River, in Virginia, from the Atlantic Ocean to Natural Bridge Station (near Lynchburg). He would also canalize the Great Kanawha River, in West Virginia, from its mouth to deep water, or about Charlton Heights. Between Lynchburg and Charlton Heights is a straight-line distance of about 96 miles, 96 miles obstructed by some of the most rugged mountains in the East.

Worthington would connect the deepened James River near Lynchburg with the deepened Great Kanawha near Charlton Heights by a tunnel 96 miles long. This tunnel would burrow beneath the interceding mountains. At its least-deep point along this line, the tunnel would bore 1,100 feet beneath the Greenbrier River.

By the use of the James and Great Kanawha Rivers, provided with adequate locks, and this underground tunnel measuring 135 feet from top to bottom and 125 feet wide, oceangoing ships could steam from the Atlantic directly into Charleston, W. Va., and all points along the Kanawha. At a later date the canal might be extended, as envisioned by Worthington, the rest of the way across the United States.

You may be gasping, by this time, at the magnitude and daring of Worthington's conception. But Worthington estimates that the West Virginia-Virginia canal and tunnel could be completed in 6 years, using a work force of 25,000 men.

The idea of such a large-scale tunnel leaves many people popeyed. Worthington's tentative estimates are that the tunnel would contain 50 feet of water, and would be in the form of a Gothic arch (like a flatiron set on its large end), with a distance of 80 feet from the apex of the arch to water level.

"Digging the tunnel," Worthington said when I visited him in Wheeling, "would require the removal of 2 million cubic yards of earth and stone per mile. Total cost of the whole canal should be between $2 and $3 billion."

Worthington is quick to point out that tunnels almost as large have been constructed. "The longest in the world," he said, "is the Delaware Aqueduct which furnishes water to New York City. It's 85 miles long. And the Fish River Tunnel in South Africa, the second longest, is 51 miles long and cuts under a 3,000-foot mountain range."

The fact that these tunnels merely convey water, not men, ships and merchandise, did not seem to bother Worthington. He thinks his idea is workable, and has thought so for almost a score of years.

Army engineers don't agree. At least one engineer told me the whole scheme is fantastic. Worthington is aware of this official attitude and is undaunted.

"The engineers," he said, "are against me publicly. But in private I've heard them say different."

There can be no denying that Monroe Worthington has thought out his Midland Canal in great detail. Over the past decade, the project has become almost a monomania. The Wheeling editor has written and telephoned Governors, Senators, Representatives, engineers, other editors, and anyone else who might possibly help to make his canal a reality.

By virtue of this activity, Worthington has got himself called a "nut," at least when it comes to canals. But it may be pointed out that no personal gain would accrue to him, or to his close friends, if such a canal were built.

The cost of the Midland Canal, of course, is the first thing, after the first gasp of wonder, that most people bring up. Even in these days of astronomical Federal budgets, where would the money come from?

Worthington has what he believes to be an answer to that question. The canal, he says, can be built from the proceeds of revenue bonds, retired by tolls. After this great toll waterway is paid for, he estimates that Virginia and West Virginia could split an annual toll revenue of $200 million.

Further, he says that a great engineering organization has made a preliminary survey of his canal, and is presumably the source of many of his estimates. And he says he knows of a finance company interested in heading a syndicate to sell the canal revenue bonds.

What sort of man, personally, is Monroe Worthington? He is a big man who stammers a little when excited, a family man who, with his wife, Lena, is sending two sons through college, a man who has built his extremely comfortable and attractive home with his own hands.

Educated in the public schools of Kansas and Texas as he accompanied a somewhat peripatetic family, Worthington was graduated from Beaver High School in Raleigh County. Had his family been able to send him to college, it is probable that his engineering skills would have taken him outside West Virginia.

Had this occurred, the idea of a sea-connected midland canal might never have been born, for, as will be explained later, it had its origins in the West Virginia Constitution.

Monroe Worthington has been a newspaperman since his teens. Beginning as a printer in Bluefield, he became a reporter and editor for several southern West Virginia papers before taking his present job with the Wheeling News Register more than 8 years ago.

Although Worthington has been a deskman most of his life, my impression was that he is a frustrated engineer. He was a building contractor in the Beckley area for a time, and built his own home there. His present home in Wheeling attests to his sense of design, architecture, and attention to engineering detail.

His concept of a midland canal is the guiding intellectual interest of his life. How did he get the idea?

"As I look back," Worthington said, "it began a little when I was a 3-year-old in Kansas. It was a panic year, and we burned our wheat for fuel instead of coal, because it wasn't worth the price to haul the wheat 25 miles to the railroad.

"Later, I came to West Virginia and saw coal miners and their kids in need of bread. It struck me that what was needed was transportation, a way to distribute that wheat from where it was grown to where it was needed. And that's what a canal is. But it was a lot of years after that, about 20 years ago, when I was reading the West Virginia constitution, that the canal idea got hold of me."

The portion of the constitution that so impressed Worthington was article XI, section 1. It reads as follows:

"The legislature shall provide for the organization of all corporations hereafter to be created, by general laws, uniform as to the class to which they relate; but no corporation shall be created by special law; *Provided,* That nothing in this section contained, shall prevent the legislature from providing by special laws for the connection, by canal, of the waters of the Chesapeake with the Ohio River by the line of the James River, Greenbrier, New River, and Great Kanawha."

"The canal idea struck me," said Worthington, "and it actually frightened me. I didn't say anything to anybody about it for 5 years. Then I subscribed to the Engineering News Record 15 years ago, and have every issue I've received since. I have personally visited every canal and lock in the United States, or have materials about them."

During the past 15 years, Worthington has conducted a ceaseless campaign to bring his Midland Canal to official attention. But rebuffs have been frequent, and even newspaper mention has been slight. Why does he continue agitation so apparently profitless?

"Well," said Worthington, "you've heard of Don Quixote?" He grinned. "I guess now it's just a case of plain obstinacy. Back in 1961, Edward Pastilong introduced a resolution in the house of delegates for a study of the canal, but it was defeated on a motion to reconsider."

The reference to the canal in the West Virginia constitution seems to have been inserted in connection with the James River Co., of which George Washington was president before he became the Father of the Country. The James River Co. was formed to build just such a canal as Worthington has in mind, but on a smaller, primitive scale.

This early canal project failed because of the mountains and prohibitive cost, although the James River and Kanawha Turnpike along much of the same route was built and completed to the Ohio River in 1800 by the same company, and was called the Midland Trail.

For 15 years Monroe Worthington has worked on his Midland Canal project as a labor of love. It may or may not have merit, but his Tunnel of Love should not, out of hand, be kissed off.

The idea is daring, and the ride could be exciting. A lot depends upon the price tag and where the money is coming from.

VEST POCKET PARKS

Mr. BAYH. Madam President, practical new ideas in the urban development field which can be put to use swiftly and at small cost are rare indeed. Even more uncommon are suggestions which would promote decentralization of the urban improvement process so that local citizens could more easily join with government in developing neighborhoods into pleasant, livable communities.

In an article entitled, "Think Big About Small Parks," which appeared in the New York Times magazine on April 10, 1966, Thomas Hoving, who was recently appointed New York City Commissioner of Parks, describes how small parcels of city land, now filled with junk, debris, and garbage heaps, could be devoted to diverse community needs throughout different neighborhoods of the city. Such "vest pocket" park spaces, acquired at a modest cost either by public or private funds for permanent or even temporary use, designed for a specific neighborhood, constructed according to local citizens' particular resources and interests, might help meet urgent social goals and alleviate urban ugliness.

Although Commissioner Hoving's article is directed toward the experience of New York City, the urban situation he describes can be found in other major cities throughout the country, whether they be in California, Florida, New Jersey, or Indiana. It would seem to me that this "vest pocket" park approach should be studied carefully as a partial answer to the living space and self-development problems confronting citizens in urban areas.

I ask unanimous consent that this worthwhile article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Think Big About Small Parks

(By Thomas P. F. Hoving)

More than a century ago the park movement of the United States was born in New York City. Like many progressive movements of the 19th century, it was a blend of moral vision and businesslike foresight. Without a carefully planned profusion of parks and open spaces, warned Frederick Law Olmsted, creator of Central and Prospect Parks, a city "would be devoured by its own ugliness and rapidly experience economic decline."

Five years after Central Park was inaugurated, land values in the vicinity had more than quadrupled. Land values are rising still—along with ugliness. Essentially, we're a noncaring, littering people, monumentally unconcerned with our environment. But despite the dizzying pace of change nowadays—in art, politics, culture—the nature of our parks has remained the same, lifelessly suspended in time like the pyramid of Cheops.

With the vanishing of large open spaces in the heart of the city the time is long overdue for a redefinition of our concept of a park and the role of the parks department.

Parks today must serve more diverse community needs because our community is more diverse. They must be used not only as naturalistic havens of repose and relief from urban congestion—"lungs," Olmsted called them—but to advance the urgent social goals of our own day. That means the parks department cannot sit back on its haunches with faceless serenity, parrying questions and complaints with form letters while the needs of the public are ignored.

A great deal of New York's available open land now consists of small parcels, many of them junk piles, garbage heaps, and slum backyards. Nothing helps destroy a community like a stinking lot. Yet thousands of these plots, owned by the city or privately held, are in middle class and slum areas where the need is crucial for new parks and recreation facilities. These garbage-filled useless spaces can be cleared, bought or rented for temporary use. Then, reclaimed as joint ventures by local community groups—block associations, religious and social organizations—and the parks department, the vacant lots can be filled with purpose; to put the parks where the people are.

The apparently impressive statistics on New York's park land are misleading. According to the figures more than 17 percent of the city's area—some 37,000 acres—is set aside for parks and recreation space. But 9,000 of these acres are under water (6,000 consist of polluted Jamaica Bay). Only 14,500 acres—roughly 7 percent of the city—is park land located in the immediate environment—much less than in San Francisco (14 percent) or Los Angeles (11 percent) and slightly less than in Chicago and Philadelphia.

More than half our recreation space is peripheral, underutilized, and relatively inaccessible (East River Park, stretching from 15th Street almost to the Battery, is a beautiful place to see from the highway, but it is hard to reach without a local guide). And the rest is unfairly distributed. A study by the Community Council of Greater New York in 1963 divided the city into 74 defined communities; it showed that only 9 of the 74 areas contained over 53 percent of the total recreation acreage. Furthermore, the number of playgrounds in an area had little relationship to the local population. Riverdale and Tremont in the Bronx, for example, each have 12 playgrounds. But Tremont has approximately 25,000 youngsters, three times as many as Riverdale. Outrageous.

Vest-pocket parks, carefully spotted in an overall plan, can help correct such inequities. Easily accessible in the heart of congested neighborhoods, they can be as large as a block or as small as a lot. Equipped with facilities that meet the community's needs and desires, they can be places for kids to play or the elderly to relax. And as a spur toward the creation of active community groups on which the success of the antipoverty program depends, the small parks program can help speed the broader social and economic reforms that the war against poverty is all about.

I know of nine residential vest-pocket parks that have been built or are underway now under a variety of sponsors: one in the Bronx, three in East Harlem, three in West Harlem, one in Brooklyn, and another at 29th Street and Second Avenue. This last was to be a temporary parking lot on land the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority hopes to use as part of a mid-Manhattan expressway. Now, through the generosity of Robert Moses and the New York Community Trust, it's going to be a temporary park, at least for 5 years. In addition, William Paley of CBS is demolishing the old Stork Club on 53d Street off Fifth Avenue for a generous $1 million gift of an elegant plaza that will perpetuate the memory of his father. And in lower Manhattan, at Broadway and Howard Street, the Franklin National Bank is planning a branch office in a landscaped setting, giving office workers and shoppers a better place to rest than the fenders of parked cars.

Beginning this summer, I hope we can start 20 more neighborhood vest-pocket parks in a year-long pilot project to determine the best way to go ahead with a more extensive program. We'll probably make mistakes, but we're going to be flexible, so we'll learn. Assuming all goes well, we plan to step up the pace of building small parks during the next 4 years. And not one of them will be the mirror-image of another. We've had enough of the "swing, slide and sandbox" stereotype, the black-topped, link-fenced asphalt prison, the standardized architecture that has made the WPA style the longest lingering art style of the 20th century.

During the period from the thirties to the sixties, Robert Moses was a marvel at acquiring land for parks and developing hundreds of new facilities. Most of the city's park land we owe to him and Mayor Fiorello La Guardia. But Moses and his successor, Newbold Morris, were slow to react to new trends and novel designs and wary of the small-park concept. Curiously, it was Jacob Riis, in 1897, who originated the notion of vest-pocket parks as secretary of a city committee on small parks. "Any unused corner, triangle, or vacant lot kept off the market by litigation or otherwise may serve this purpose well," the committee declared. "There are such corners and lots to be found around the city, the property sometimes of the municipal corporation, and these could be used to advantage and without expense."

Now it is true, of course, that the revival of the vest-pocket idea was a European postwar phenomenon. Bombed-out building sites in London and Amsterdam, for example, were imaginatively converted into small neighborhood parks. In this country, Karl Linn, now a professor of landscape architecture at Long Island University, originated several vest-pocket parks in Baltimore, Washington, D.C., and Philadelphia. Linn, then at the University of Pennsylvania, persuaded Philadelphia city officials to turn over municipally owned tax-delinquent land for the creation of what he called "neighborhood commons." Adults and teenagers helped build the playgrounds, using stone, wood and other salvage material from old building sites. The telephone company donated some old poles and huge cable spools.

Some of these experimental projects failed. Organizing a neighborhood, especially one that has been neglected and has neglected itself, is a very tough proposition. But where vest-pocket parks have proved successful, they belie the scorn of those critics who condemn the idea with such words as: Parks under 1 acre in size will be ridiculous undertakings. They are difficult to design, unfeasible to supervise, impossible to maintain. In short, nothing more than a passing fancy.

Dropped as blockbusters, statements like these land like duds. For though it would be foolish to ignore the obstacles to vest-pocket parks, it is even sillier to exaggerate them.

At the risk of candor (always somewhat perilous for a public official), allow me to raise some realistic problems about small parks and suggest some realistic replies.

ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

One thousand vest-pocket parks—a utopian projection—would add only 140 acres to the city's present park acreage, an increase of 0.4 percent. Two hundred small parks would cover only 28 acres. In relative terms the cost seems astronomical for a few more green specks on the map. In fact, however, the cost of acquiring and developing 200 parks would be about $7.5 million spread out over the next 4 years. And measured against the capital budget of the parks department—$25 million this year and a total of some $100 million over 4 years—the outlay would be less than 10 percent of the entire capital-budget package. Moreover, these estimates do not include financial aid from the Federal and State governments and private philanthropy, which might be expected to total $2 million or $3 million.

The cost of urban land is normally staggering; a plot of 10,000 square feet can cost $1 million or more. But the parcels we seek in residential areas may have limited commercial value, because of their size or location. We figure we can buy and develop vest-pocket park land at a cost to the city of about $3.50 a square foot. And, of course, the city now owns thousands of plots that can be converted to usefulness for considerably less, since the cost of acquisition would be eliminated. At last count, the department of real estate had 24,455 pieces of unimproved property under its supervision and control. Many parcels consist of land taken over for nonpayment of taxes, or buildings condemned as uninhabitable. Some parcels are being held for possible inclusion into larger plots for a future school or other municipal building. On 119th Street between Park and Lexington Avenues, for example, a large city-owned plot on which seven buildings once stood has remained fenced in and vacant for 25 years while the city considers whether to build a new police station on the site. And for 25 years the community has been fenced out of a possible park.

Construction costs would be held down in two ways. Where feasible, the program will use available community labor (exceptional skills are not essential) hired through local antipoverty agencies, thus providing on-the-job training as a bonus. Construction union labor could be enlisted as supervisors. Second, since design standards and specifications have not significantly changed in the parks department for 30 years, the use of new materials and modern building methods ought to provide whopping savings—to say nothing about the joys of anticipating some creative architecture.

Small parks on prime land in the heart of Manhattan is another story, of course. Shoppers and strollers can bow in humble gratitude to William Paley and Franklin National's bank in the park, but frankly, more oases like these are a matter of potluck. Hopefully, other generous enterprises like these will share a slice of their profits with the rest of us by endowing parklets; private foundations, too, have an opportunity to "go public" in a bountiful way. For the immediate future, though, more plazas in price commercial areas is a matter of gentle persuasion, not hard-nosed planning—except in special cases. The 34th Street Armory, for example, is due for demolition, leaving a half-block site. The land cost is $2.3 million and the city should make every effort to spend it and create a park. The opportunity is too rare to pass up.

MAINTENANCE

Preserving vest-pocket parks in decent condition once they are built will be the most serious problem we face. And it will take lots of money—about $2 million a year, with small prospect of outside contributions from government or foundations for this unglamorous purpose. But the need for funds to maintain the small parks—preferably by unemployed members of the neighborhood—are as great as the need for the parks themselves. This will mean that our budget will have to be increased. Considering the extent and value of parks department holdings in this town, it is ridiculous that our departmental expense budget is less than 1 percent of the entire city's expense budget.

The attitude of our city fathers has traditionally been: "Build it, forget it." Building parks gets great press notices, but 3 months later the parks are a mess. As a result we're light-years behind in adequate maintenance and staffing; we have 400 vacancies right now, but no money to fill them. Unless the situation improves, I'm afraid we're going to consider closing down some parks and putting up signs that say: "Sorry, No Staff."

Though the basic need is money, better designed parks will help, too. So will curb cuts on the streets, enabling parks department trucks to clean the playgrounds mechanically, and a few mobile, giant vacuum cleaners such as they have in Washington, D.C. To use our available manpower more efficiently, we're trying a new system of maintenance crews who travel as a group from park to park, doing all the repairs at one time instead of piecemeal over a period of months. Sort of a blitzkrieg in reverse.

Ultimately, of course, the maintenance of the vest-pocket parks will only be as good as the community that wanted the park in the first place. We don't intend to stick a playground where nobody asked for it. But we are hopeful we'll get the cooperation born of enlightened self-interest.

SECURITY

Up to a point, more recreational facilities help reduce crime. But dozens of scattered small parks, even hundreds of them, are no panacea for social ills. Crime is a horror in the city. Does that mean we should not develop our remaining open space? Looking at it that way, we'd have to shut down Bryant Park, a favorite playground for drunks and degenerates. No one has seriously suggested that alternative, as no one has suggested closing a school because kids are shaken down in the bathrooms.

For the umpteenth time, let it be said: we need more police, better lighting, additional scooter patrols. On the other hand, an active block association will help patrol its own turf. A pleasant park will attract people, and there is safety in numbers. And proper supervision will prevent the place from becoming a hangout for toughs and hopheads who prey on passers-by.

RECREATION SUPERVISORS

Another major new money item. Cost? About $1.5 million a year for some 250 additional people, organized in teams, since the small size of the parks would make a single stationary supervisor impractical. Federal antipoverty funds and foundation grants might help offset the cost, but the city's contribution is overdue anyway. The parks now have about 450 recreation supervisors, roughly the same number they had 20 years ago. This is a thoroughly disgraceful situation.

REDTAPE

One of the biggest stumbling blocks to the creation of vest-pocket parks—quite apart from policy objections—has been the frustrating complexity in getting them started. City-owned land cannot be released and used under the existing bureaucracy without the approval of five agencies: buildings, city planning, fire, the corporation counsel, and gas, water supply and electricity. Those aren't all. The budget bureau will not approve spending funds without assurance that the life of the park will be longer than 5 years (though many "temporary" sites, such as 29th Street and Second Avenue, are often in neighborhoods desperately in need of playground space). And actually to obtain the money, the department of parks must hand in a complete set of plans and specifications in order to let the job out for bids, a needlessly time-consuming procedure that holds up the acquisition and clearing of land.

A newly created bureau of vest-pocket parks in the parks department will concentrate on cutting through this snarl of redtape. In addition, it will coordinate all efforts, public and private, to set up vest-pocket parks, working closely with the city planning commission to make sure that neglected neighborhoods get their fair share of park land and are not passed over just because they don't know how to wave a big political stick. It will also help private groups with the insurance problems raised by the use of volunteer workers on city-owned land, which has been serious enough in the past (with premiums costing anywhere up to $1,000 a year) to scare off some private groups from building vest-pocket parks. If necessary, the parks department may have to pay the premiums directly out of its own capital budget if the cost means the difference between having a park and not having one, or between shoring up a community or letting it decay.

Early this year I helped open a vest-pocket park in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn. Since it was the first such experiment in this congested, rundown area of more than 400,000 people, and one of the first new small parks in the entire city, its short, happy history makes a revealing case study of what can be accomplished.

Bedford-Stuyvesant has 378 vacant lots, many of them city owned, so filled with decaying refuse and junk that they are no small hazard to health and safety. There are also 346 abandoned buildings, extremely dangerous but very tempting to children, who use them as indoor playgrounds for lack of real recreation space. Add to this depressing inventory more than 60 burned-out tenements that kids also play in.

Having drawn up this catalog, the Central Brooklyn Coordinating Council—an affiliation of 84 community groups in Bedford-Stuyvesant—decided to do something about it. In November 1964, more than 500 community representatives attended a conference out of which there came a recommendation to begin a demonstration project showing how vacant lots in residential areas could be converted into sitting areas and "tot-lot" playgrounds.

The city leased three back-to-back vacant lots connecting Quincy Street and Lexington Avenue, between Lewis and Stuyvesant Avenues. With the help of the planning department of Pratt Institute, the project received $10,000 from three philanthropies: the Avalon and New York Foundations and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. M. Paul Friedberg, a well-known landscape architect, designed the park free. Most of the work was done by neighborhood residents. Five landscape workers, out of work with the end of the normal planting season, cleared the land and helped build the equipment. Neighborhood kids joined in, too, sweeping up, carting off junk and painting part of two colorful abstract murals on facing brick walls that border two sides of the park. Supervising the job were students from Pratt's community education program, headed by Ron Shiffman.

Five weeks after they started, the 10,000 square feet vest-pocket park was finished. A pair of tree houses sprouted on the tops of two sawed-off, sick oak trees. The kids reach the tree houses by pole or ladder. For swings there are rubber tires, suspended by chains from leftover lengths of pipe. Foot-square timbers, planted in the ground at different heights, make wonderful stepping stones. Instead of the usual slide and ladder, the slide was built into the side of a platform in the shape of a pyramid with steps; it is safer than a ladder, and a comfortable place for the children to watch, squat, and talk. The benches are movable, large slabs of wood on a base, and when adults aren't sitting on them, they become part of the play equipment.

Perhaps because children of the community were involved in the Quincy Street playground from beginning to end, there has been almost no vandalism. The rails on the tree houses have been broken, but that may be because they weren't sturdy enough.

Maintenance has been the biggest problem, as we expected, but nothing at all on the scale that pessimists anticipated. There is no carpet of broken glass, no beer cans or fractured furniture. It's not spotless either—middleclass cleanliness people might object—but what are some scraps of wind-whipped newspapers compared to the filth that preceded the playground?

Quincy Street is not only a success as a vest-pocket park; as a pedestrian walkway connecting two streets it is a link in what is planned as a series of connecting, mid-block open spaces that will make Bedford-Stuyvesant a little more livable at the modest price of $1 a square foot.

Last month Mayor John Lindsay turned the earth for the city's latest vest-pocket park, on 123d Street between Lexington and Third Avenues, another example of cooperation between an active community group and the parks department that I hope will be widely imitated. The project was proposed by the East Harlem Tenants Council. The city demolished several rotting, condemned buildings, cleared the 3,000-square-foot plot, and will rent the park to the Tenants Council for $1 a month. Matching Federal and city antipoverty funds will finance most of the $34,650 needed for construction, staffing, insurance premiums and architectural fees. And the community itself is raising $500 for games and other equipment by asking $2 from each family in the immediate area.

Scheduled to be finished in 10 weeks, the park will be a two-level, open-air community center. The first level will include a clubhouse, complete with kitchenette for light cooking and baking, tables for dominoes and checkers, a tot-lot with a fountain, a mothers' "gossip corner" and a quiet area for the elderly. Active games will be separated from the more passive activities by putting a ball court on a 25- by 40-foot balcony. It's an ingenious and fresh design idea by the firm of Silverman & Cika, blissfully different from the cookie-cutter designs the parks department used to turn out by the dozen.

Like pebbles tossed in a pond, vest-pocket parks dropped in the middle of a neighborhood can create wider ripples of reform. Yet for all that a successful small parks program can mean for the city, it is still a compromise—a workable start toward a solution of our ugly urban environment but far from an ideal solution.

Utopia would mean a park or playground—some large, some small—every four or five blocks. For every two communities there ought to be an indoor recreation facility. Our waterfront offers miles of untapped recreation space: parks on unused piers, marinas, even floating swimming pools anchored in the river, as they have in Paris. A nationwide competition could transform post-Fair Flushing Meadow into the 20th century's Prospect Park, still the most beautiful park in the Nation and 100 years old this summer.

Safety? Prospect, Central, and the other large parks are not as dangerous as most people believe, but they are not exactly snug harbors for nature lovers either. They could be made safer and more useful—well lit for nighttime tennis players, strollers, bike riders. And if people want to spend a hot summer night sleeping on the grass, why not?

We are, I think, approaching a new awareness of parks and their purpose. It will mean less emphasis on acquiring more acreage and greater effort toward serving more people. Everything cannot be sacrificed for the vest-pocket park program—large projects such as Marine Park (accurately nicknamed "The Dump"), Breezy Point and the Green Belt on Staten Island must be kept open for future generations. But after a generation of neglect of local neighborhood needs, the attempt to catch up must be started. As far as the city's available park land is concerned, it means that to think big we must also think small.

SUPPORT FOR CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a resolution approved by the executive board of B'nai B'rith Women, representing 135,000 members in session March 20–22, 1966, in Washington, D.C.

I greatly appreciate their support and cherish their guidance and sentiments.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Civil Rights Protection Act, 1966

Whereas constitutional rights which cannot be exercised without fear are in effect no rights, and

Whereas legislation is necessary to secure equal justice for those exercising their constitutional rights, and

Whereas such a proposal is contained in the Douglas-Case bill which seeks to do the following:

1. Bar discrimination in the selection of jurors in both Federal and State courts.
2. Provide, where a system of segregated justice prevails in the State courts, for removal of litigation to the Federal courts for protection of persons charged with committing violence against those engaged in civil rights in violation of State criminal laws.
3. Enable civil rights workers to transfer their cases to the Federal court, when they are defendants in certain cases, where a discriminatory system of justice in the State courts would prevent them from receiving a fair trial.
4. Amend existing Federal civil rights laws so that certain denials of civil rights become Federal offenses and to increase the penalties for violations.
5. Permit, under title III, the Attorney General and individuals to bring suits for injunctions to prevent violations of civil rights.
6. Set up an administrative hearing procedure and provide compensation by the Federal Government to persons who have been injured because of race or color while engaged in or attempting to engage in lawful civil rights activities. Where State or local officials are responsible for the injury, the Federal Government could sue the State or local government for reimbursement.
7. Make the equal employment opportunities provision of the 1964 Civil Rights Act applicable to State and local employment.

Therefore, we urge support for the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966, S. 2923 (Douglas-Case bill).

TRUTH IN PACKAGING AND TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. HART. Madam President, it is a pleasure to add the name of the respected newspaper, Newsday, to the growing list of supporters for the truth in packaging and truth in lending bills.

Surely no one could agree more than I with the concluding sentence of the Newsday March 21, 1966, editorial: "It is time for action to protect the consumer."

Indeed, I am hopeful that Congress this session will head that plea.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the Newsday editorial at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Consumer Protection

Although there has been a good deal of fanfare and some discussion in congressional committees, legislation dealing with consumer protection is making little headway in Congress.

Ideas for truth-in-packaging and truth-in-lending laws attract a fair amount of interest from the consuming public when they are first raised. But in the process of transforming the idea into a bill and the bill into an act, that first flush of public interest wanes. One problem is that the special interests, those who would have to revise their business practices should the legislation pass, do not permit their opposition to flag. Consumers, however, are generally unorganized.

Although the truth-in-packaging bill is accorded a fair chance of passage, the opposition hasn't given up. The opponents, largely manufacturers, retailers, and packagers, insist the suggested regulations would produce higher prices, impose drabness on packaging and bring the industry under stifling bureaucratic control. They also say new regulations are not necessary because present regulations to protect the public are sufficient. The average supermarket has about 8,000 different items on display. The bill, which is sponsored by Senator Philip A. Hart, Democrat of Michigan, attempts to aid the shopper to make some rational comparisons among brands. It would require that weight and ingredients be prominently displayed on the package. Among its many provisions would be the application of a Federal definition to the word "serving," a term that is now almost meaningless.

The measure would apply not only to food but also to drugs and cosmetics. It has many strong supporters. These include the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and such nationwide organizations as the AFCIO and the National Farmers Union. Their support will help.

The truth-in-lending bill is accorded far less chance of passage. It is in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which has traditionally opposed it. It was first introduced by Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat of Illinois, in 1960 and hasn't made much progress since. The bill would simply require that there be a full and easily understood disclosure of all interest and service charges in loan and credit transactions. It would help protect less sophisticated, low-income consumers who are most vulnerable to deceptive credit practices.

President Johnson has endorsed both the packaging and the lending bills. But these bills and others, including measures that would set safety standards for tires and for motor vehicles, are presently bogged down in Congress. It is time for action to protect the consumer.

JOHN M. HEJL AND ELMER E. JONES, SPECIAL MERIT AWARD RECIPIENTS FOR OUTSTANDING COST REDUCTION ACHIEVEMENT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, I am happy to announce that two fellow Marylanders are recipients of the Special Merit Awards for Outstanding Cost Reduction Achievement in the Department of Agriculture. The two men are John M. Hejl of Hyattsville and Elmer E. Jones of College Park and I extend my congratulations to them both.

Madam President, at the award ceremonies, which were held for the merit winners, President Johnson briefly spoke and paid tribute to the capable and imaginative way in which Orville Freeman has administered the Department of Agriculture. As an admirer of Secretary Freeman, I ask that President Johnson's speech be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of the President at the Special Merit Award Program for Outstanding Cost Reduction Achievement in the Patio at the Department of Agriculture

Secretary Freeman, Chairman Cooley, Congressman Michel, distinguished award winners and my friends in the Department of Agriculture:

First of all, I want to thank the Secretary for asking me to come here and share this pleasure with you this morning. I want to thank each of you for the high honor that you have achieved, the success that has attended your efforts, the results that have come your way, and those that are still in the offing.

I want to personally and publicly express my deep satisfaction and pleasure to the House of Representatives. As I said to the distinguished Speaker and majority leader yesterday, I am very proud of Chairman Cooley and Congressman Michel and the other members of the great Committee on Agriculture for their constructive and prompt action in connection with our food for India resolution which we submitted, it just seems, a few hours ago. They have already considered it, had their hearings, reported it, and passed it without a roll call. That is the way I like to see them handle legislation in the House of Representatives.

The farmers of America, because of their ingenuity, because of their diligence, their hard work, their stick-to-it-iveness, their desire to give a value received, have given us an abundance that we can now, as good friends of all the peoples of the world, help to supply our neighbors in need.

There is no greater satisfaction that can come to any human being than the one that came to us the other day when we learned of the possibility of some millions of people dying of famine in India this year when we could open our warehouses to them and take the fruits of our bounty and the products of our labor over the years that we had stored, and share part of it with them and still have sufficient reserves on hand to take care of our own people.

I am very proud of the way Secretary Freeman has administered the Department of Agriculture. He has shown imagination and he has shown diligence. He has shown a prudence and a thrift that makes him one of the greatest administrators that this Government has ever known. He has always looked after the interests of the farmer, but he has not been unaware of the interests of all Americans.

I just asked him a few minutes ago, when they were talking about saving $15 million in storage rates, "How much do you spend in the Department of Agriculture just storing surpluses?" The man that answered me said, "When Mr. Freeman came in, the taxpayers were spending $400 million a year on storage costs. We are spending $200 million a year now."

That means that we have disposed of some of the stuff that we had in storage. That means we have improved on the storage, we have improved on the rates. The net result is that the taxpayer is spending just half as much now as he did when the Secretary took office.

In all of these economies and all of these good management practices, each employee of the Department of Agriculture can justly take pride. As public servants, we know, or at least we ought to know, that the habits that we are most in need of reforming are our own, although Mark Twain used to say that nothing so needs reforming as the other people's habits.

Our Government is very complex and times change. It keeps us busy trying to keep up with the needs of the moment and of the hour. Old ways quickly become inefficient ways, and inefficiency leads to waste. We have a war on waste and we are trying to prove to the people who work in Government that we just cannot afford the waste that we have been enjoying in the years past.

I believe that waste is a crime. I believe that waste is against our freedom. I believe that waste is against our progress. Thus, I believe that waste is against the American people. So I have said that controlling waste is like bailing a boat; you have to keep at it. There is no time to rest. All of our great dreams, all of our visions, and all of our plans will come to nothing if we do not press forward with our reforms.

We are a rich and expanding Nation. We are the wealthiest nation in the world, the healthiest nation in the world, the best educated nation, and the one that I think has the most really to be thankful for. We are educating our young, we are caring for our sick, we are providing opportunities for our poor, we are rebuilding our cities, we are beautifying our country, we are exploring the heavens, and Mrs. Johnson is exploring the Rio Grande, I see from the morning paper.

But nevertheless, in doing all of these things we have to sometimes drag some of our most respected and our best intentioned colleagues and get them by the neck and drag them every step of the way. These efforts are vital to our future and the future of the world, but they have a price tag attached because progress never comes cheaply. Our citizens should be willing to pay that price because they have shown their willingness time and time again to do that.

Some of our people feared the socialism of social security. That is when I came to town. I remember the horrors that some Congressmen expressed before we passed the first social security bill, although really less than a dozen of them voted against it when we called the roll back in 1935. But some feared the socialism of social security. A good many, I remember, spoke for a number of years about the Fair Deal of medicare. But they are here, both of them. Thank God the status quo did not prevail.

Now I see here this morning that the status quo is not prevailing. You are reforming, you are improving. A year ago last November, at the first Cabinet meeting following my election to the Presidency, I said, "As a Nation, we cannot afford to waste a single dollar out of our resources on old programs which once may have been essential, but which time and events have overtaken."

So, I have come here this morning because a great Cabinet officer and his entire Department have taken that directive to heart. Under Orville Freeman's leadership, with the help of Jane, this Department became one of the great leaders of all the civilian agencies, and she made more than her 50-percent contribution, too.

I am glad to honor these special award merit winners today because you show that you have a determination to build a great record here. I have noted, for example, that your new packaging methods for dried milk will save $125,000 a year. None of these cost-cutting ideas was in practice when we first declared the war on waste. These ideas came from Federal employees. They came from people who work for their Government who have ingenuity and imagination.

The record of the Department of Agriculture shows that effective and efficient Government is responsive, warm, and concerned with our people. That is why I wanted to come by this morning, to say thanks to each of you for what you have done, and to tell you that I will be watching in the days ahead for any improvements that you can make. I wanted to let you know that all the people in this land are grateful to you for not being satisfied with that old, worn-out phrase "Well, we have always done it this way." You are looking up, not down. You are moving ahead, not backward. That truly is the real strength of our Government.

I think every person in this room, and every person in this country, should be grateful for the great production record that the farmers of this Nation have made. They have given us food when we needed it, quality that has never been excelled; they have given us abundance that not only will take care of all of our needs, but will make it possible for us to help the other starving millions of people of the world.

I was talking to the Prime Minister of India. When I left her and returned to the mansion I realized that except for the great work that the farmers of America had done, and the great work that the Department of Agriculture had done in counseling them, guiding them, and helping them, more people would starve in India this year than live in both North Vietnam and South Vietnam. So that is a record that you can be proud of.

I see that your committee in the House, as I just observed, is equally as efficient. It believes in cost consciousness. It believes in saving money. Otherwise, it could have taken 2 or 3 weeks. Here was the India bill the other day. They reported it out promptly. I hope the Senate committee will follow your example, Mr. COOLEY, by saving money and acting on this measure before the Easter holiday.

There is one little thought I want to leave with you before I get away. One of my assistants just reminded me that this morning the last employee in the White House signed up to buy savings bonds. That gives us a 100-percent record. Just a few days ago we were under the Department of Agriculture. Forty-two percent of your people had bought bonds and we had 41. We started doing something about it.

Of course, we don't have as many people over at the White House as you have in the Department of Agriculture. Maybe I was a little more persuasive with them than I can be with you.

I know the problems that all of us have in this day of rising costs, when we are trying to meet all the needs of our families, but we have men out in Vietnam who have made great sacrifices and are making great sacrifices for us. At this particular time we have launched a savings bond program. We want it to go well in the country, and I just hope the Government can set a good example.

I have raised the interest rates so that you can get a fair return on your investment. I think that if you can possibly spare the money, it would be a good thing for you to do for yourself and for your family. I know it will be a good thing to do for your country. So I hope that I may be able to come back here in the not too distant future and have the Secretary tell me that that 42-percent record of yours may not have been improved as much as our few employees improved mine over at the White House, but at least improved it enough to justify my coming back and thanking you.

FLORENCE, S.C., ALL AMERICA CITY

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, it was with the greatest pleasure that I recently learned of the selection of Florence, S.C., as an All America City. Last year another South Carolina municipality, our capital city of Columbia, was similarly honored by the National Municipal League. Now Florence, in the Pee Dee area of our State, is the recipient of this award.

In all, 13 cities in the United States were so honored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine; and, I would like to add my "well done" to the other comments and congratulations that are being showered upon Florence.

For many years, Florence has been one of the most progressive communities in the midlands of South Carolina and I am most happy to see this signal recognition come. It is richly deserved.

The forward looking municipal and civic leaders of Florence have not only benefited their own city, but have set a lofty example for the emulation of city fathers everywhere.

THE LIVING LORD

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, Dr. Duard H. Estep, Sr., pastor of the First Baptist Church in Elkins, W. Va., prepared an Easter sermonette on "The Living Lord." This sermonette was published in the April 9 edition of the Elkins, W. Va., Inter-Mountain newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESURRECTION IS NO SHAM

(By Dr. Duard H. Estep)

There is a story about Martin Luther. Often he fell into fits of deep despondency and melancholy when the fortunes of the Lutherans at times reached low levels in their struggles. On one such occasion his wife appeared at breakfast in mourning, and when Luther inquired who had died, she replied, "God." Shocked, he protested that she must be fooling. But his wife insisted that his deep depression indicated this must be his belief, so she had decided to go into mourning for God. Luther quickly took the hint and ceased to act as though God were dead.

With too many Christians today the same lesson seems very much needed. They spend so much time bewailing the decline of morals, rise of unbelief, the successes of communism, and so forth; that an inhabitant from another planet landing here might well think that Christianity, knowing of nothing but disaster has for its motto, "Brethren, let us weep."

The great trouble is that, like Peter when he walked on the water, Christians see the difficulties and problems, the waves and the winds, all too clearly. As a result their hearts and minds cannot but fail them for fear. Dismal and despondent, too many lost heart and became cold and indifferent to the church. The real trouble, however lies within themselves; they have forgotten the sovereign God. They failed to remember that the Resurrected Christ is still Lord of life. There needs to be a renewal of faith; a return to the Scriptures to hear the Word of God: "I am the Lord and there is none else beside me."

Like Peter, too many begin to sink under the waves because they fear to act, or even to attempt anything. If one has reached the position where he feels that the forces of unbelief and evil completely dominate the universe in which he lives, he soon resigns himself to the belief that he can do nothing. And he does nothing.

Christians who believe in Christ as their living Saviour and Lord should show themselves not pessimists and mourners but rather optimists living in true joy; for has not Christ stated that despite sorrows and troubles which appear to overcome His people, He has conquered the world (John 16: 33). For the same reason Paul could assure the Romans that all things worked together for good to those who are Christ's people (Romans 8: 28). Therefore, in spite of all the apparent difficulties they should, by the indwelling Spirit, rise above trouble and disbelief; trusting in Him who is their Saviour.

Is God dead? If He is, we may well despair for behind everything lies chance and uncertainty. What is more, we might give up trying and content ourselves with awaiting death, the end. If God is dead all we can do is concentrate upon the things of this life and know that though we gain as much from it as possible; become wealthy, famous, and powerful, nothing lies beyond. All effort is pointless other than helping us try to live for today.

But God is not dead and now is Christ risen from the dead. The God-man, Christ Jesus died, but He has also come from the tomb victorious, as a host of witnesses including both Biblical and secular historians testify. Moreover, He reigns over sin and death. Therefore, let us not wallow in our misery, nor clothe ourselves in sackcloth and ashes. Let us rather in joy and gladness abound in the work of the Lord and know that our work is not in vain for He has already won the victory. (I Corinthians 15: 58).

Are you going to God's funeral? If you are, garb yourself in mourning clothes and draw near to His coffin in tears for all is over. But if you are truly a Christian, born from above by the Spirit, cease from mourning and remember that Christ is risen and is head over all things. "God raised Him up, having loosed the pangs of death, because it was not possible for Him to be held by it." (Acts 2: 34). We believe in and worship a living prophet, an immortal Messiah, the Saviour, the living Lord.

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVOLUTION, PART IV

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, for many years there was considerable religious controversy surrounding the words "birth control" and the use of any methods regulating human fertility. Today, a historic debate on the subject of birth control is going on within the Catholic Church.

A papal commission has had the entire question under study for over a year and there has been considerable discussion and soul searching throughout the church. Part IV of the article by Steven M. Spencer entitled "The Birth Control Revolution" discusses the religious controversy surrounding birth control today.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the RECORD, part IV of this article entitled "The Religious Controversy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY, PART IV

Nearly all religious denominations opposed birth control until a few decades ago, when one after another began to modify their positions. The Roman Catholic Church, almost alone, remained firm in its opposition. What the church is now involved in is a struggle to extricate itself—without confusing the faithful—from a thick doctrinal web spun around the subject of marriage and sex in the early centuries of the Christian era.

Neither the Old Testament nor the New specifically forbade contraception. The web of prohibition was purely an interpretation, woven by popes and bishops and strengthened by the authoritarian tradition of the church.

A penetrating study of this process—"Contraception: A History of Its Treatment by the Catholic Theologians and Canonists"—has been written by John T. Noonan, Jr., of Notre Dame. Professor Noonan notes that contraception had been permitted by the Greek, Roman, and early Jewish cultures and that the Christian teaching against was mainly a reaction to the excesses of the Romans, who added to their licentiousness not only contraception but abortion. The Christian doctrine also reflected a new emphasis on the sanctity of all human life, including the seeds of life to be.

But there was a peculiar ambivalence toward sex in marriage, even in the Old Testament, and this, says Professor Noonan, is basic to an understanding of the development of the Christian ethic. On the one hand is the familiar glorification of procreation: "* * * and God said unto them, be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." Yet over against this are such strange verses as that in the Psalms, in which David, though the child of a lawful marriage, cries: "In guilt was I born and in sin my mother conceived me." This and other passages, says Noonan, "furnish support to one stand of Christian thought, mistrustful of sex."

Puritanical hostility to pleasure in sex, and to contraception, reached its peak with Augustine, in the fourth century. A former believer in Manichaeanism, he bitterly attacked the sex practices of that group, including its use of the sterile period. Ironically this was the original rhythm method, the only one now approved by the Catholic Church. As Noonan observes, "History has made doctrine take a topsy-turvy course."

The pill was, of course, the catalyst that started the ferment of rethinking in the Catholic Church, for it was obviously less "artificial" than jellies, foams and mechanical contraceptives. And in mimicking the action of nature's hormones, the pill could be said to "regularize" the cycle and thus make the rhythm method more acceptable.

One of the first Catholic scholars to argue that the pill was licit on the basis that it did simulate normal physiology was the Reverend Louis Janssens, of the University of Louvain, Belgium. But within 3 months after his article appeared, in 1958, the late Pope Pius XII rejected this view. While Pius condemned the use of the pills to prevent conception, he nevertheless approved them when used for therapeutic purposes, even if "temporary sterility" was an indirect result.

This opened the door to more debate, a torrent of spoken and written words from priests and laymen alike, representing all shades of opinion and discussing female physiology and marital love with amazing frankness. Seldom in the history of the church, which now claims a world membership of about half a billion, has an issue produced such sharp and vocal division among its leaders.

At the heart of most of the liberal argument was a pastoral concern for the dilemma of married parishioners. The Belgian cardinal, Leon Joseph Suenens, was moved to declare before the Ecumenical Council in Rome: "We are faced with the problem, not because the Christian faithful are attempting to satisfy their passions and their egoism, but because the best among them are attempting with anguish to live a double loyalty, to the church's doctrines and to the needs of conjugal and parental love."

The cleavage among the priests left millions of Catholic couple confused. Many made their own decisions and chose the pills, with or without a twinge of conscience or a confession. Others had a tougher struggle. There was the girl of 18 who knocked one evening on the door of the Chicago Planned Parenthood headquarters. Mrs. Snyder, a warm and understanding staff member, let her in. "The poor girl was in tears," Mrs. Snyder recalls. "She told me she and her fiance were to be married during his 3-week leave from the Navy, and since both were Catholics she had asked her parish priest for a dispensation to permit them to use a contraceptive. She had a job and didn't want to become pregnant until her husband came home again in a year. But her priest had refused, although, as she said, a friend's priest in the next parish would have given the dispensation.

"This girl said she didn't mind if they had 12 children, once her husband was home to stay, but right now she didn't want to take a chance because it was so necessary for her to keep her job. I really felt sorry for her. I was in tears myself before she left. But I didn't want to advise her to go against her priest when she so plainly thought it would be the wrong thing to do."

For another midwestern woman, an accountant's wife with three children under 3 years of age, there was a different outcome. Mrs. Jarvis, as we shall call her, had met her husband at a Catholic college, they had been married in the church and were "the best Catholics you ever saw until our babies began to come along so close together. Then we felt we had to do something.

"Our house has five bedrooms, but my husband said he didn't want me to fill them up right away," she said. "And when I'm pregnant, I'm in a bad mood most of the time. However, he didn't think we could receive communion if we used ordinary contraceptives, because we'd have to confess each time as a sin." Mrs. Jarvis, a young woman with delicate, sensitive features, leaned forward in her chair. "But for a thing to be a sin," she said, "there are three things about it: First, you must think it's a sin; second, it must be a grievous thing against God; and third, you must have done it voluntarily. Well, we don't think the pills are a sin, and our young priest said he saw nothing wrong with them either. So we don't confess them, and we can go to church and take communion. We didn't learn about this until just a few weeks ago when the young priest told us. Young priests seem to be more understanding.

"The best time to be a Catholic," Mrs. Jarvis concluded, "is when you're very young or very old. In between is this problem. They say the Catholic Church is hard to live in and easy to die in, and it's true. But the pills, which so many in the church are beginning to approve, will be a great help."

Hopes for liberalization of the church's position appeared to suffer a setback last October, when Pope Paul spoke to the United Nations in New York. Three quarters of the way through his eloquent plea for world peace, he sounded what to many seemed a discordant and disappointing note. "You must strive to multiply bread so that it suffices for the tables of mankind," he said, "and not rather favor an artificial control of birth, which would be irrational, in order to diminish the number of guests at the banquet of life."

The pontiff's remark was open to instant and differing interpretations, as papal utterances often are. Some observers said its import hinged on the Pope's own definition of "artificial." Others thought he simply wanted to discourage an international campaign for contraception.

One of the official bodies studying the problem is a special papal commission on problems of marriage set up by Pope John XXIII. Pope Paul enlarged the commission to 56 members, including clergymen, scientists, doctors, and a few married couples. The commission failed to agree on a recommendation during the ecumenical council, but the council's final declaration on marriage, which reflected intervention by the Pope, indicated that he had asked the commission to continue its study of the birth control question.

The pertinent passages in the council's report on "The Church in the Modern World" were ambiguous, however. They said the faithful "may not undertake methods of birth control which are found blameworthy by the teaching authority of the church in its unfolding of the divine law." At present this rules out all but abstinence and rhythm. At the same time they made a significant change by placing conjugal love for its own sake on an equal plane with procreation. Some observers think this opens the way to eventual approval of many forms of birth control.

WHAT PATRIOTISM MEANS TO ONE SOUTH DAKOTA GIRL

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, earlier this spring, the South Dakota Jaycees sponsored an essay contest in which students were encouraged to express their thoughts on what Americanism means to them.

One such essay was written by an eighth grade student in Sully County, S. Dak, Diane Huse. This essay by Diane Huse was selected over more than 1,000 entries as the winner among those submitted by youngsters in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades of South Dakota schools.

I have read Diane's essay and believe it is of such note that it deserves to be brought to further public attention by being placed in the Congressional Record.

She has outlined for all Americans the true values which have become the strength of our system and which have provided the foundation stones as well for the development of the individual characters that serves to stoke the fires of freedom.

In this day and age, when there are those who look lightly upon their responsibilities to our Nation, or those who gain more public attention than they deserve through their disparagement of the patriotic values which have served to inspire our country in its hours of peril, Diane Huse's essay comes as a welcome message—a heartfelt expression that we do, indeed, have something of which we can be very proud and which is worth preserving, the United States of America.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Diane Huse's essay as carried in a recent edition of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What My American Patriotism Means to Me

(By Diane Huse)

The word patriotism has a different meaning for different people. A dictionary meaning says that patriotism is the love you have for your country. This is what I think patriotism means, the admiration, the attachments, and the devotion you feel for your country. If you truly love your country you will also love its people, you will try to make your community and State a better place in which to live and you will stand by your country in whatever it undertakes. These are the traits of a good patriot and love for your country prompts these traits. This is the true meaning of patriotism in my mind.

LOVE IS DEFINED

Patriotism is the love you have for your country. But why do I love my country? What has she done for me? There are so many reasons why I love my country that I couldn't name them all, but I think the first reason I love her is because she believes in freedom and democracy. That is what the colonists fought and died for. They wanted a land where they had freedom of religion and the right to govern themselves. This is our heritage and we are to help preserve it. We in America have many rights and privileges that other countries don't enjoy. We have the right to make our laws, the right to assemble, the right to worship God as we please and the right to speak what we want. We enjoy the right to own land, the right to operate a business, the right to vote as we please and the right to print what we want. These are rights which we really don't appreciate the way we should. These rights enable us to live a life of freedom and happiness. We don't worry about being overrun by enemies, because our Government will protect us. I am proud of my country because she is a world power. She fought and worked hard to obtain this honored position and we must continue working if we want to keep it. These are just a few of the many reasons why I love my country and wish to serve her in every way possible.

PATRIOTS NEEDED

Every country needs good patriots. Good patriots are almost always very good citizens because out of love for their country, they do what is right and serve their country. They obey the laws, pay their taxes, help enforce the laws, and vote at all elections. These are ways in which a citizen can serve his country. A person who has no love for his country won't act as a good citizen. He will disobey laws, cheat the Government, and always be getting into trouble. So you see, if you cultivate in your children and friends a love for their country, chances are good that they will grow up to be decent, respectable, honest men and women.

Loving your country isn't all that a good patriot must do. He must show that he loves his country by serving her. A patriot serving his country reflects his love for his country onto other people and encourages other people to serve with him. A good patriot will offer his services when his country is in danger. All of the American soldiers who have died for our country are in a sense just as patriotic as George Washington or Abraham Lincoln. Of course they will never be recognized as Lincoln was, but that does not mean that they are not as patriotic as he was, because they are. They gave their lives that America might remain a free and independent nation. They were true patriots.

LOYALTY VITAL

Patrotism also means loyalty. Patriots must stand up for their country and back it up in whatever it undertakes. You should speak well of your country, especially when visiting in a foreign land, as even you can help create friendly relations between America and other countries. A good patriot will act as an ambassador for his country by telling others of his country and by standing up for it.

You can sum up what my American patriotism means to me in the one word love. This includes: my love of America, which has been so good to me and which protects me, my love of freedom, a gift so precious that we fight and die for it even now, and my love of God, who has blessed me by allowing me to live in America and blessed America with good leaders, freedom, and people who love America. This is what my American patriotism means to me.

AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION CRITICIZES PROPOSED CUT IN SCHOOL MILK APPROPRIATION FOR FISCAL 1967

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, last Thursday the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee's Agricultural Subcommittee heard a number of excellent statements from public witnesses in support of the school lunch and special milk programs. As a member of the subcommittee and a strong supporter of the special milk program for schoolchildren I was delighted in the unanimity of support these witnesses gave to the program.

I hope over the next few days to comment on the remarks of several of these witnesses and the organizations they represent. Today I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to a statement made by Mr. Gordon Gunderson, chairman of the Legislative Committee of the American School Food Service Association and school food program administrator for my State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Gunderson points out that if the proposed Child Nutrition Act of 1966 were passed by Congress "the special milk program as it has operated since 1955 would be virtually dead." He then goes on to refer to studies made by the Department of Agriculture showing that when the price of milk to schoolchildren goes down the consumption goes up. He states that as milk prices to students increase, as they most surely will if the Child Nutrition Act is passed:

> The consumption by pupils required to pay the full cost of the milk will be insignificant.

Mr. Gunderson declares that the administration's proposal to concentrate the benefits of the program on schools which have no lunch program will not change the present low consumption of milk in these schools. This is a point that I have not made heretofore, but it bears repeating. Mr. Gunderson says:

> These schools have had ample opportunity over the past several years to participate in the milk program and to be reimbursed for the milk served. Section 215.7(f) of the Secretary's regulations governing the operation of the special milk program authorizes reimbursement to needy schools for milk served without charge to needy children at a rate equal to the cost of the milk to the schools. It is not required that the needy school participate in the lunch program in order to qualify for such special rate of reimbursement. Therefore we can see no reason for anticipating any significant expansion of the program to needy children in schools not participating by denying reimbursement to schools having a food service.

Finally I want to read out loud and clear the opinion of this organization of school administrators as to the feasibility of that portion of the Child Nutrition Act which would limit the program to the needy only. In the words of the American School Food Service Association:

> Subsidizing only the milk served to the needy in schools would, in our opinion, be administratively unacceptable and discriminatory as far as the children would be concerned.

In my estimation there is no better testimony to the weakness of the administration's new proposal than this statement by the very organization whose members would administer the program.

REFUGEE AND MIGRATION ACTIVITIES OF AMERICAN VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

Mr. HART. Madam President, during my tenure as the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, I came to know intimately the American voluntary agencies working in the field of refugee and migration activities. I found their programs of great benefit to this country and I developed a profound admiration for their dedicated leaders.

I was delighted to learn that a few days ago my good friend, William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, was host to this group at a luncheon in their honor at the State Department. The importance of this meeting is attested to by the fact that President Lyndon Johnson sent a personal message to the meeting.

I am grateful not only for the President's recognition and endorsement of the work of these fine agencies, but for the excellent manner in which Bill Crockett outlined the State Department's plans and policies relative to refugees and migrants. The information contained in his message to this group is of significant value to all Americans who unfortunately have been subjected to considerable misinformation regarding recent administrative reorganization plans being initiated by the Department through Mr. Crockett's office. Certainly, he is to be commended on the sincere and forthright manner in which he explained the Department's position in an unfortunately misunderstood situation.

Therefore I ask, Madam President, for the privilege of inserting in the Record the President's letter and Mr. Crockett's statement to these able leaders of America's voluntary agencies.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The White House,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1966.

Hon. William J. Crockett,
Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I am glad to learn that you are meeting today with the leaders of the voluntary agencies who have done and are doing so much for refugees and migrants. I want you to extend to them my personal best wishes and my congratulations for the remarkable job they have done over the years to alleviate the suffering of the world's stateless and homeless peoples. Without their dedicated support of our governmental programs to help these victims of war and more recently of Communist aggression, thousands who now enjoy the blessings of freedom would have perished.

I want you to assure them that we shall accept every effort to see that the friendly and humane policies related to migration and refugee matters initiated by our beloved President Truman will continue in the same full force as they have been during my administration.

I look forward to an era of renewed Government cooperation and full partnership with these great humanitarian organizations.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

Address by William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Before the Principal Representatives of American Voluntary Agencies Engaged in Refugee and Migration Activities, Department of State, Washington, D.C., March 22, 1966

I am most pleased to have this opportunity to meet with the representatives of the voluntary agencies which are concerned with solving migration and refugee problems around the world and to discuss the activities which are the mutual concern of you and the Department.

I should like to begin by saying that the proposed elimination of the superstructure of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs will have no policy or organization effects on the Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs. It will not change in any way the great humanitarian policies on refugees and displaced persons as first enunciated by President Truman in 1946 and which are today fully embraced by President Johnson and his administration.

Policy in this government of ours is not the property of one man.

Policy in this government of ours is not dependent for its continuation and fulfillment upon the personality of any one of us. We are but the instruments of the President in the fulfillment of his administration's policies.

And I repeat, the great humanitarian policies laid down by President Johnson at the foot of the Statue of Liberty will not be changed by any of us.

Over the past several years, the Department has planned and put into effect several organizational changes designed to reduce the layers of supervision between the people who operate the program and do the actual work and the top level policy and executive positions in the Department. One such change was that which eliminated the Bureau of Administration headed by an Assistant Secretary for Administration. This change was accomplished smoothly and the individual programs involved have continued to work as effectively or more so than under the old arrangement. Similar changes are being made in our regional bureaus which are the heart of the work of the Department which we believe will result in a much stronger and hard-hitting conduct of our foreign affairs.

We have every reason to feel that the changes proposed for the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, by removing one level of supervision, will place the offices comprising the Bureau in closer contact with top level officials of the Department thereby elevating them and making them more effective. I want to give you the Department's assurances that the changes envisaged will in no way mean any modification or deviation of our humane policies concerning joint interest which the U.S. Government and the voluntary agencies share in our mutual efforts to help the unfortunate through the refugee and migration programs. Further, I want to assure you of our continued determination to implement our immigration laws in complete conformity with the President's policy and his own stated objectives.

The Department is fully aware of and has the greatest admiration for the devoted and inspiring work which the American voluntary agencies have carried out over so many years in providing care and assistance to refugees and helping them to become reestablished as independent, self-sufficient persons. Through all these years you have worked closely with the Department and other agencies of our Government which are concerned with refugee matters. You have given President Johnson warm and enthusiastic support in obtaining the enactment of his immigration legislative program. For these reasons you have an understandable concern in what happens in the Government which might affect the refugee program. We plan, of course, to continue the present Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs along with its experienced personnel. Under our general plan of reorganization, the Office will be considered fully responsible for carrying out its own programs and functions and will be given my personal attention and sympathetic support, along with that of other senior officers in the Department.

You and your associates are more aware than other Americans that we in the Department do not and never have taken the significance of refugee situations around the world lightly. It may surprise even you to know that since the end of World War II the U.S. Government has spent almost $2 billion on migration and refugee activities. This is more than the United States has contributed to the United Nations and its constituent organizations for all nonrefugee purposes.

At this tense period in world affairs, I can assure you tht we are not about to relax our interest in refugee matters. We are continuing our full support for the programs which are the functional responsibilities of the Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs and tomorrow will begin hearings before the Congress on our requested appropriations for fiscal year 1967. These will include our contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, as well as for the work of the U.S. escapee program in Europe, the Far East refugee program in Hong Kong and Macau, assistance to Tibetan refugees in India and Nepal, and the movement of refugees from Cuba to the United States.

You have been kept currently informed as to the basis for the State Department having steadily reduced its appropriation requests for these programs over the past 5 years, and we have done so again in 1967. These reductions do not reflect any lessening interest in the refugee programs. Rather they show first, reductions in the size of refugee problems through the successful solution of the cases of many refugees which is a great tribute to the work of your voluntary agencies; secondly, most countries of asylum are becoming increasingly prosperous and it is no longer necessary to provide the same measure of assistance to individual refugees; thirdly, the United States has worked consistently to increase the contributions of other governments to refugee problems, particularly by their support of international organizations; and finally, we are always on the alert to find better and cheaper ways in carrying out our operations.

This latter point is important in view of the necessity for reducing the cost of all Government operations wherever possible in order to finance our commitments in Vietnam and to improve the level of our society at home. Our appropriation request of $6 million for migration and refugee assistance should be viewed in the context of the comments I have just made and of the very large contributions which the United States is making toward refugees through other appropriations. As you know, over $40 million is being spent annually for Cuban refugees in the United States, the refugee program in South Vietnam is currently at a level of $20 million; and we are still contributing approximately $23 million toward the Palestine refugee problem each year.

In addition to all this, large amounts of Public Law 480 surplus food are being distributed to refugees; this and other AID assistance is our main contribution to the numerous African refugee situations. It is therefore clear that the United States is not reducing its interest in refugee and migration problems but rather is devoting the necessary resources to these problems on a priority basis. We are also prepared to meet new refugee emergencies as they may occur. As you know, the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1966 provides authority for the President, when he deems it necessary in the interest of the United States, to utilize up to $10 million of AID funds to meet unexpected refugee needs.

The President will not hesitate to use this authority as is indicated by his prompt approval of the funds for the movement of Cubans to the United States which began a few months ago. At the time he outlined his proposed plan for aiding Cubans at the signing of the immigration bill at Liberty Island, the President made clear in his statement "that from this day forth those wishing to emigrate to America shall be admitted on the basis of their skills and their close relationship to those already here." The President set forth the additional policy that "those who can contribute most to this country—to its growth, to its strength, to its spirit, will be the first that are admitted to this land."

In this connection we in the Department of State shall continue our efforts to insure continuation of the President's sympathetic and humane policy for the admission of refugees into the United States. We realize that there is still much to be done to achieve all that is required in the application of the new law, but we are steadily working to improve the situation.

I want the remainder of time to provide an opportunity for me to hear your views and questions. At this particular meeting I should think it would be more productive for all of us if we could address ourselves to the broad area of refugee and migration policies and programs and their place within the Department of State and leave detailed technical questions to a later working meeting when our technical experts can wrestle with them. I want to tell you again how much we appreciate and admire the accomplishments of the voluntary agencies in the refugee field. I want you to know we will do everything we can to continue and strengthen our long cooperative relationship and to seek your advice and guidance on problems of mutual interest in this field.

Representatives of Voluntary Agencies Who Attended Luncheon at the Department of State, Washington, D.C., March 22, 1966

Mr. Donald E. Anderson, director, Lutheran Immigration Service, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Helen Armanas, United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Mr. Paul Bernick, executive director, American ORT Federation, New York, N.Y.

Mr. David Brody, director of Washington office, Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Paul R. Cherney, general director, International Social Service, American Branch, New York, N.Y.

Miss Etta Deutsch, assistant executive director, migration and refugees, American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Mr. Fred W. Devine, deputy executive director, CARE, New York, N.Y.

Rev. Caesar Donanzan, executive secretary, American Committee on Italian Migration, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Walter Gallan, president, United Ukrainian American Relief Committee, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. B. A. Garside, executive vice chairman, American Emergency Committee for Tibetan Refugees, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Samuel L. Haber, assistant executive vice chairman, American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, New York, N.Y.

Mr. John E. McCarthy, director, Department of Immigration, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Michael F. Markel, Lutheran World Relief, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Mike Masaoka, Washington representative, Japanese American Citizens League, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Ignace Morawski, vice president, Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Mrs. Ruth Z. Murphy, executive vice president, American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, New York, N.Y.

Mr. James Norris, assistant director, Catholic Relief Services, NCWC, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Aram Panossian, American National Committee To Aid Homeless Armenians, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Jan Papanek, president, American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, New York, N.Y.

Mr. W. E. Phillips, president, Seventh-Day Adventist Welfare Service, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Felix Poplawski, treasurer, Polish-American Immigration and Relief Committee, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Mr. James P. Rice, executive director, United HIAS Service, New York, N.Y.

Rev. John Schauer, chairman, Committee on Migration and Refugee Programs, American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., and director of immigration, Church World Service, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Richard F. Smith, director of immigration program, American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Charles Sternberg, International Rescue Committee, New York, N.Y.

Miss Alexandra Tolstoy, president, Tolstoy Foundation, New York, N.Y.

Mr. R. Norris Wilson, executive vice president, U.S. Committee for Refugees, New York, N.Y.

STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS WHO ATTENDED LUNCHEON, MARCH 22, 1966

William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration.

Philip B. Heyman, Acting Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

Michel Cieplinski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administrative Affairs.

Ambassador Wilson Flake.

Richard R. Brown, Consultant to Mr. Crockett.

George Warren, Sr., Adviser to Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

Elmer M. Falk, Director, Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs.

Clement Sobotka, Deputy Director, Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs.

J. Raymond Ylitalo, Director of Visa Office.

Gerson Lush, Public Information Officer.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. HARRIS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, it has been the desire of the majority leader to bring to the floor of the Senate for disposition the joint resolution dealing with legislative reapportionment that has been pending for some time. We thought it meet and proper that it be made the unfinished business when the Easter recess began, and that it ought to be taken up for consideration and remain the business of the Senate until finally disposed. It may well be that intermediate business of another kind will intrude itself; and if so, I should have no objection. We have been trying to set a target date for a vote, and at the moment—and this, of course, is only tentative—we thought perhaps we could bring the joint resolution to a vote sometime on Wednesday of next week, which, if I correctly recall, is the 20th of April.

I mention this at the outset, so that Senators will be on notice. The time for the vote may have to be deferred a little longer, depending somewhat on circumstances quite beyond our control. A delegation of Senators is at present in Australia. I believe they are due back on the 17th or 18th of April. I understand another delegation of Senators has gone to Europe. Several Senators were in the hospital. It was our desire to have as nearly complete a vote, with all Senators present as possible. I earnestly and prayerfully hope that that may still be consummated.

But I think I can speak for the majority leader when I say that it is hoped that by Wednesday of next week, other things being equal, and all Senators having returned, or nearly so, we can agree upon an hour certain when the vote on the joint resolution can take place.

Madam President, 35 years ago I encountered a book written by a man named William Bolitho. It has been into many printings. It is a rather fascinating book. Its title is "Twelve Against the Gods." In his book, the author undertakes a delineation of the achievements of Alexander the Great; the fight made by Woodrow Wilson for the League of Nations; the life and times of Mohammed; the works of Napoleon III; the expeditions of Christopher Columbus; the excursions of Charles XII of Sweden, who was a great military leader; and others.

I chanced to thumb through the book the other day, and I began to think a little that in some quarters, if one could believe the articles and cartoons, I am considered as having set myself up as one against nine—meaning the Supreme Court of the United States. Frankly, Madam President, I have done no such thing. If I were to be accurate, I would have to say one against six, because in the case of Reynolds against Sims the Supreme Court was divided. Out of that case came the decision commonly known as the one-man, one-vote decision. I arrogate to myself no such place, and I would undertake no position of that kind.

I have some estimate of my convictions. I have some idea about what is taking place structurally to our Government. I regard that decision as something of a crisis. I think it should be, and ultimately it must be, undone or modified. If per chance there are those who snidely, and sometimes unkindly by caricaturing my words, try to put me in a position of being a man against the Court, I must refute it, because I am not against the Court. Frankly, I disagree with the Court; and that is quite a different thing.

A very humble man came from my State a long time ago. He came, after the finger of destiny had touched him, to be the Chief Magistrate of this Nation. You will find, Madam President, that he did not agree with the Court either. He did not agree with Chief Justice Taney and the Associate Justices in the Dred Scott decision. He said as much wherever he went. As a law-abiding person, he accepted the decision. But accepting it because it comes from on high judicially is one thing; to agree to a decision is quite another. It remained for a lot of blood and for the 13th amendment finally to sponge out the decision of that Court in the Dred Scott case.

That was not the only time when the people undertook to express themselves with respect to the findings of the Court. If the date is correct, it must have been in 1896 when one of the great lawyers of all time in this country, Joseph Choate, stood before the Court and denounced what Congress was trying to do by enacting, as it actually enacted, a law to impose a Federal income tax. I think that was the first time that I ever encountered in American jurisprudence the word "communism," because Joseph Choate stood before that learned group of lawyers, of Justices, and there spoke as if the imposition of income tax in the Federal structure had completed the march of communism in this country. That was the first time that the word "communism" ever came to my attention. But that opposition did not last very long, because there is a higher power than the Court, and that higher power is the people. The Constitution is the work of the people. If it is not, they ought to strike out the Preamble, which begins with the words:

> We the people * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Having ordained it by their will and by their ratification, there was created in that Constitution one Court—and that is our only constitutional Court as such—the Supreme Court of the United States. The judicial article of the Constitution also provides that there shall be created such inferior courts as may be necessary. Today in the 50 States of the Union there is a variety of courts: The U.S. District Courts, the Circuit Courts of Appeals, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the Tax Court, and others. But all of them are in being only because the people ordained the authority in the Constitution. So we place no court above the people. The people stand supreme and above all the courts of the land.

When Congress was challenged with respect to the Federal income tax, only a few years were required before the whole concept was sold to the people. We find in the Constitution today an article of amendment which gives clear authority for the imposition of an income tax.

There are many who do not like the income tax. I sent in my tax return this morning. I was not only astounded, but also distressed, to think of how much money Uncle Sam takes away from me.

I like to intrude this, because there are people in this country who think that Senators and Representatives do not pay an income tax. Well, let me say for their special benefit that we are like the man who carries a dinner bucket into a factory. Our tax is withheld from our paychecks. Let us make that crystal clear. When not enough is withheld, Uncle Sam is there on or before the 15th of April, and we had better lob the rest of it into the Treasury with the income tax form, because otherwise we shall be subject to the penalties of the Internal Revenue Code no less than the humblest citizen of the United States.

The people undertook to see that a Federal income tax was finally incorporated in the Constitution. There was a time when even the Constitution itself was challenged, because on the floor of this very Senate, Robert Marion La Follette, of Wisconsin, inveighed against the idea of having the State legislatures choose the Members who grace this body. Until that system was changed by amendment of the Constitution, Senators were chosen by the State legislatures. But back in 1897, there was Robert Marion La Follette talking to the student body and saying, "Back to first principles."

He carried on the fight until he finally succeeded. There were Members of this body, when he was a Member, who sneered at him when he was on his feet and who walked out into the cloakrooms, to display their contempt for him. But he did not care. He said:

> The seats that are temporarily vacant will become permanently empty at some time.

And they were. So today we grace this body by the suffrage of the people, because the Constitution in its pristine form, as it came down from the Founding Fathers, was changed, and changed very materially.

I do not agree with the Supreme Court of the United States in its one-man, one-vote decision, and there are others who share that view. I daresay there are millions who do not share that view, but believe that this view constitutes a change in our form of government and that this is a constitutional crisis.

That was the reason that I undertook in the first session of this Congress to substitute Senate Joint Resolution 103, which at that time bore a different number, for a resolution that was on the Senate Calendar. That resolution failed because it did not get the necessary two-thirds vote. That is quite a hurdle, and I am not insensible of the fact that it takes some doing to get two-thirds of the Members of the Senate to follow a viewpoint.

It occurs to me that probably one of the most important things that can be done in the course of this discussion is not to merely have printed in the Congressional Record the dissenting opinion of John Marshall Harlan, but to read it into the Record and to place some emphasis where the emphasis belongs.

In my judgment, Associate Justice Harlan is a great legal scholar. He came through the Latin school in Chicago long years ago. He is a classical student and a great lawyer. His dissent is a classic, and incidentally, it is the greatest castigation of the Supreme Court that I have ever seen delivered by a member of that Court. I think I ought to read some of that decision into the Record.

In his dissenting opinion, Associate Justice Harlan said:

> In these cases the Court holds that seats in the legislatures of six States are apportioned in ways that violate the Federal Constitution. Under the Court's ruling it is bound to follow that the legislatures in all but a few of the other 44 States will meet the same fate. These decisions, with *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, involving congressional districting by the States, and *Gray* v. *Sanders*, 372 U.S. 368, relating to elections for statewide office, have the effect of placing basic aspects of State political systems under the pervasive overlordship of the Federal judiciary. Once again, I must register my protest.
>
> ### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT
>
> Today's holding is that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment requires every State to structure its legislation so that all the members of each house represent substantially the same number of people; other factors may be given play only to the extent that they do not significantly encroach on this basic population principle. Whatever may be thought of this holding as a piece of political ideology—and even on that score the political history and practices of this country from its earliest beginnings leave wide room for debate (see the dissenting opinion of Frankfurter, J., in *Baker* v. *Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 266, 301–323)—I think it demonstrable that the 14th amendment does not impose this political tenet on the States or authorize this Court to do so.
>
> The Court's constitutional discussion, found in its opinion in the Alabama cases (Nos. 23, 27, 41, ante, p. —) and more particularly at pages 26–33 thereof, is remarkable (as, indeed, is that found in the separate opinions of my Brothers Stewart and Clark, ante, pp. —, —) for its failure to address itself at all to the 14th amendment as a whole or to the legislative history of the amendment pertinent to the matter at hand. Stripped of aphorisms, the Court's argument boils down to the assertion that petitioners' right to vote has been invidiously "debased" or "diluted" by systems of apportionment which entitle them to vote for fewer legislators than other voters, an assertion which is tied to the equal protection clause only by the constitutionally frail tautology that "equal" means "equal."
>
> Had the Court paused to probe more deeply into the matter, it would have found that the equal protection clause was never intended to inhibit the States in choosing any democratic method they pleased for the apportionment of their legislatures. This is shown by the language of the 14th amendment taken as a whole, by the understanding of those who proposed and ratified it, and by the political practices of the States at the time the amendment was adopted. It is confirmed by numerous State and congressional actions since the adoption of the 14th amendment, and by the common understanding of the amendment as evidenced by subsequent constitutional amendments and decisions of this Court before *Baker* v. *Carr*, supra, made an abrupt break with the past in 1962.
>
> The failure of the Court to consider any of these matters cannot be excused or explained by any concept of "developing" constitutionalism. It is meaningless to speak of constitutional "development" when both the language and history of the controlling provisions of the Constitution are wholly ignored. Since it can, I think, be shown beyond doubt that State legislative apportionments, as such, are wholly free of constitutional limitations, save such as may be imposed by the republican form of government clause (Const., art. IV, sec. 4), the Court's action now bringing them within the purview of the 14th amendment amounts to nothing less than an exercise of the amending power by this Court.
>
> So far as the Federal Constitution is concerned, the complaints in these cases should all have been dismissed below for failure to state a cause of action, because what has been alleged or proved shows no violation of any constitutional right.

Madam President, I emphasize the fact that Associate Justice Harlan says, "It amounts in fact to an amending power of the Constitution by the Supreme Court," and the Court has no such power.

I proceed to read from Associate Justice Harlan's opinion:

> Before proceeding to my argument it should be observed that nothing done in *Baker* v. *Carr*, supra, or in the two cases that followed in its wake, *Gray* v. *Sanders* and *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, supra, from which the Court quotes at some length, forecloses the conclusion which I reach.
>
> Baker decided only that claims such as those made here are within the competence of the Federal courts to adjudicate. Although the Court stated as its conclusion that the allegations of a denial of equal protection presented "a justiciable constitutional cause of action," 369 U.S. at 237, it is evident from the Court's opinion that it was concerned all but exclusively with justiciability and gave no serious attention to the question whether the equal protection clause touches State legislative apportionments. Neither the opinion of the Court nor any of the concurring opinions considered the relevant text of the 14th amendment or any of the historical materials bearing on that question. None of the materials was briefed or otherwise brought to the Court's attention.

Madam President, I emphasize at that point what an Associate Justice of that Court said:

> Neither the opinion of the Court nor any of the concurring opinions considered the relevant text of the 14th amendment or any of the historical materials bearing on that question.

What an amazing situation that is, that the highest tribunal in the land took no account of the historical background on the relevant text of the 14th amendment and then proceeded to hand down a 6 to 3 decision which has and will bring structural changes in our Government.

I continue to read from Justice Harlan's decision:

> In the Gray case the Court expressly laid aside the applicability to State legislative apportionments of the "one person, one vote" theory there found to require the striking down of the Georgia County unit system. See 372 U.S. 376, and the concurring opinion of Stewart, J., joined by Clark, J., id., at 381–382.
>
> In Wesberry, involving congressional districting, the decision rested on article I, section 2, of the Constitution. The Court expressly did not reach the arguments put forward concerning the equal protection clause. See 376 U.S. 8, note 10.
>
> Thus it seems abundantly clear that the Court is entirely free to deal with the cases presently before it in the light of materials now called to its attention for the first time. To these I now turn.
>
> ### I
>
> #### *A. The language of the 14th amendment*
>
> The Court relies exclusively on that portion of section 1 of the 14th amendment

which provides that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws," and disregards entirely the significance of section 2, which reads:

"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State."

The amendment is a single text. It was introduced and discussed as such in the Reconstruction Committee, which reported it to the Congress. It was discussed as a unit in Congress and proposed as a unit to the States, which ratified it as a unit. A proposal to split up the amendment and submit each section to the States as a separate amendment was rejected by the Senate. Whatever one might take to be the application to these cases of the equal protection clause if it stood alone, I am unable to understand the Court's utter disregard of the second section which expressly recognizes the States' power to deny "or in any way" abridge the right of their inhabitants to vote for "the members of the [State] legislature," and its express provision of a remedy for such denial or abridgment.

Madam President, that is a rather amazing comment by an Associate Justice to his colleagues on the Court. He says:

I am unable to understand the Court's utter disregard of the second section.

Frankly, Madam President, I am also unable to understand it, and anyone who pursues the matter closely will come to the same conclusion.

Now, to continue with Justice Harlan:

The comprehensive scope of the second section and its particular reference to the State legislatures precludes the suggestion that the first section was intended to have the result reached by the Court today. If indeed the words of the 14th amendment speak for themselves, as the majority's disregard of history seems to imply, they speak as clearly as may be against the construction which the majority puts on them. But we are not limited to the language of the amendment itself.

B. Proposal and ratification of the amendment

The history of the adoption of the 14th amendment provides conclusive evidence that neither those who proposed nor those who ratified the amendment believed that the equal protection clause limited the power of the States to apportion their legislatures as they saw fit. Moreover, the history demonstrates that the intention to leave this power undisturbed was deliberate and was widely believed to be essential to the adoption of the amendment.

(1) Proposal of the amendment in Congress: A resolution proposing what became the 14th amendment was reported to both Houses of Congress by the Reconstruction Committee of 15 on April 30, 1866. The first two sections of the proposed amendment read:

"Sec. 1. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

"Sec. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But whenever, in any State, the elective franchise shall be denied to any portion of its male citizens not less than twenty-one years of age, or in any way abridged except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation in such State shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens not less than twenty-one years of age."

In the House, Thaddeus Stevens introduced debate on the resolution on May 8. In his opening remarks, Stevens explained why he supported the resolution although it fell "far short" of his wishes:

"I believe it is all that can be obtained in the present state of public opinion. Not only Congress but the several States are to be consulted. Upon a careful survey of the whole ground, we did not believe that 19 of the loyal States could be induced to ratify any proposition more stringent than this."

In explanation of this belief, he asked the House to remember "that 3 months since, and more, the committee reported and the House adopted a proposed amendment fixing the basis of representation in such way as would surely have secured the enfranchisement of every citizen at no distant period," but that proposal had been rejected by the Senate.

He then explained the impact of the first section of the proposed amendment, particularly the equal protection clause.

"This amendment * * * allows Congress to correct the unjust legislation of the States, so far that the law which operates upon one man shall operate equally upon all. Whatever law punishes a white man for a crime shall punish the black man precisely in the same way and to the same degree. Whatever law protects the white man shall afford equal protection to the black man. Whatever means of redress is afforded to one shall be afforded to all. Whatever law allows the white man to testify in court shall allow the man of color to do the same. These are great advantages over their present codes. Now different degrees of punishment are inflicted, not on account of the magnitude of the crime, but according to the color of the skin. Now color disqualifies a man from testifying in courts, or being tried in the same way as white men. I need not enumerate these partial and oppressive laws. Unless the Constitution should restrain them those States will all, I fear, keep up this discrimination, and crush to death the hated freedmen."

He turned next to the second section, which he said he considered "the most important in the article." Its effect, he said, was to fix "the basis of representation in Congress." In unmistakable terms, he recognized the power of a State to withhold the right to vote:

"If any State shall exclude any of her adult male citizens from the elective franchise, or abridge that right, she shall forfeit her right to representation in the same proportion. The effect of this provision will be either to compel the States to grant universal suffrage or so to shear them of their power as to keep them forever in a homeless minority in the National Government, both legislative and executive."

Closing his discussion of the second section, he noted his dislike for the fact that it allowed "the States to discriminate [with respect to the right to vote] among the same class, and receive proportionate credit in representation."

Toward the end of the debate 3 days later, Mr. Bingham, the author of the first section in the Reconstruction Committee and it leading proponent, concluded his discussion of it with the following:

"Allow me, Mr. Speaker, in passing, to say that this amendment takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it. No State ever had the right, under the forms of law or otherwise, to deny to any freeman the equal protection of the laws or to abridge the privileges or immunities of any citizen of the Republic, although many of them have assumed and exercised the power, and that without remedy. The amendment does not give, as the second section shows, the power to Congress of regulating suffrage in the several States."

He immediately continued:

"The second section excludes the conclusion that by the first section suffrage is subjected to congressional law; save, indeed, with this exception, that as the right in the people of each State to a republican government and to choose their Representatives in Congress is of the guarantees of the Constitution, by this amendment a remedy might be given directly for a case supposed by Madison, where treason might change a State government from a republican to a despotic government, and thereby deny suffrage to the people."

He stated at another point in his remarks: "To be sure we all agree, and the great body of the people of this country agree; and the committee thus far in reporting measures of reconstruction agree, that the exercise of the elective franchise, though it be one of the privileges of a citizen of the Republic, is exclusively under the control of the States."

In the 3 days of debate which separate the opening and closing remarks, both made by members of the Reconstruction Committee, every speaker on the resolution, with a single doubtful exception, assumed without question that as Mr. Bingham said, supra, "the second section excludes the conclusion that by the first section suffrage is subjected to congressional law." The assumption was neither inadvertent nor silent. Much of the debate concerned the change in the basis of representation effected by the second section, and the speakers stated repeatedly, in express terms or by unmistakable implication, that the States retained the power to regulate suffrage within their borders. Attached as appendix A hereto are some of those statements. The resolution was adopted by the House without change on May 10.

Debate in the Senate began on May 23, and followed the same pattern. Speaking for the Senate chairman of the Reconstruction Committee, who was ill, Senator Howard, also a member of the committee, explained the meaning of the equal protection clause as follows:

"The last two clauses of the first section of the amendment disable a State from depriving not merely a citizen of the United States, but any person, whoever he may be, of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or from denying to him the equal protection of the laws of the State. This abolishes all class legislation in the States and does away with the injustice of subjecting one caste of persons to a code not applicable to another. It prohibits the hanging of a black man for a crime for which the white man is not to be hanged. It protects the black man in his fundamental rights as a citizen with the same shield which it throws over the white man. Is it not time, Mr. President, that we extend to the black man, I had almost called it the poor privilege of the equal protection of the law?

"But, sir, the first section of the proposed amendment does not give to either of these classes the right of voting. The right of suffrage is not, in law, one of the privileges or immunities thus secured by the Constitution. It is merely the creature of law. It has always been regarded in this country as the result of positive local law, not regarded as one of those fundamental rights lying at the basis of all society and without which a people cannot exist except as slaves, subject to a depotism [sic]."

Discussing the second section, he expressed his regret that it did "not recognize the authority of the United States over the question of suffrage in the several States at all." He justified the limited purpose of the amendment in this regard as follows:

"But, sir, it is not the question here what will we do; it is not the question what you, or I, or half a dozen other Members of the Senate may prefer in respect to colored suffrage; it is not entirely the question what measure we can pass through the two Houses; but the question really is, What will the legislatures of the various States to whom these amendments are to be submitted do in the premises; what is it likely will meet the general approbation of the people who are to elect the legislatures, three-fourths of whom must ratify our propositions before they have the force of constitutional provisions?

* * * * *

"The committee were of opinion that the States are not yet prepared to sanction so fundamental a change as would be the concession of the right of suffrage to the colored race. We may as well state it plainly and fairly, so that there shall be no misunderstanding on the subject. It was our opinion that three-fourths of the States of this Union could not be induced to vote to grant the right of suffrage, even in any degree or under any restriction, to the colored race.

"The second section leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States, and does not meddle with that right."

There was not in the Senate, as there had been in the House, a closing speech in explanation of the amendment. But because the Senate considered, and finally adopted, several changes in the first and second sections, even more attention was given to the problem of voting rights there than had been given in the House. In the Senate, it was fully understood by everyone that neither the first nor the second section interfered with the right of the States to regulate the elective franchise. Attached as Appendix B hereto are representative statements from the debates to that effect. After having changed the proposed amendment to the form in which it was adopted, the Senate passed the resolution on June 8, 1866. As changed, it passed in the House on June 13.

(ii) Ratification by the "loyal" States: Reports of the debates in the State legislatures on the ratification of the 14th amendment are not generally available. There is, however, compelling indirect evidence. Of the 23 loyal States which ratified the amendment before 1870, 5 had constitutional provisions for apportionment of at least one house of their respective legislatures which wholly disregarded the spread of population. Ten more had constitutional provisions which gave primary emphasis to population, but which applied also other principles, such as partial ratios and recognition of political subdivisions, which were intended to favor sparsely settled areas. Can it be seriously contended that the legislatures of these States, almost two-thirds of those concerned, would have ratified an amendment which might render their own States' constitutions unconstitutional?

Nor were these State constitutional provisions merely theoretical. In New Jersey, for example, Cape May County, with a population of 8,349, and Ocean County, with a population of 13,628, each elected one State senator, as did Essex and Hudson Counties, with populations of 143,839 and 129,067, respectively. In the house, each county was entitled to one representative, which left 39 seats to be apportioned according to population. Since there were 12 counties besides the 2 already mentioned which had populations over 30,000, it is evident that there were serious disproportions in the house also. In New York, each of the 60 counties except Hamilton County was entitled to one of the 128 seats in the assembly. This left 69 seats to be distributed among counties the populations of which ranged from 15,420 to 942,292. With 7 more counties having populations over 100,000 and 13 others having populations over 50,000, the disproportion in the assembly was necessarily large.

* * * * *

In at least one instance, the problem of State legislative apportionment was expressly called to the attention of Congress. Objecting to the inclusion of Florida in the act of June 25, 1868, Mr. Farnsworth stated on the floor of the House:

"I might refer to the apportionment of representatives. By this constitution representatives in the Legislature of Florida are apportioned in such a manner as to give to the sparsely populated portions of the State the control of the legislature. The sparsely populated parts of the State are those where there are very few Negroes, the parts inhabited by the white rebels, the men who, coming in from Georgia, Alabama, and other States, control the fortunes of their several counties. By this constitution every county in that State is entitled to a representative. There are in that State counties that have not 30 registered voters; yet, under this constitution, every one of those counties is entitled to a representative in the legislature; while the populous counties are entitled to only 1 representative each, with an additional representative for every thousand inhabitants."

The response of Mr. Butler is particularly illuminating:

"All these arguments, all these statements, all the provisions of this constitution have been submitted to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and they have found the constitution republican and proper. This constitution has been submitted to the Senate, and they have found it republican and proper. It has been submitted to your own Committee on Reconstruction, and they have found it republican and proper, and have reported it to this House."

The constitutions of 6 of the 10 States contained provisions departing substantially from the method of apportionment now held to be required by the amendment. And, as in the North, the departures were as real in fact as in theory. In North Carolina, 90 of the 120 representatives were apportioned among the counties without regard to population, leaving 30 seats to be distributed by numbers. Since there were 7 counties with populations under 5,000 and 26 counties with populations over 15,000, the disproportions must have been widespread and substantial. In South Carolina, Charleston, with a population of 88,863, elected 2 senators; each of the other counties, with populations ranging from 10,269 to 42,486 elected 1 senator. In Florida, each of the 39 counties was entitled to elect 1 Representative; no county was entitled to more than 4. These principles applied to Dade County with a population of 85 and to Alachua County and Leon County, with populations of 17,328 and 15,236, respectively.

It is incredible that Congress would have exacted ratification of the 14th amendment as the price of readmission, would have studied the State constitutions for compliance with the amendment, and would then have disregarded violations of it.

The facts recited above show beyond any possible doubt:

1. That Congress, with full awareness of and attention to the possibility that the States would not afford full equality in voting rights to all their citizens, nevertheless deliberately chose not to interfere with the States plenary power in this regard when it proposed the 14th amendment;

2. That Congress did not include in the 14th amendment restrictions on the States power to control voting rights because it believed that, if such restrictions were included, the amendment would not be adopted.

3. That at least a substantial majority, if not all, of the States which ratified the 14th amendment did not consider that, in so doing, they were accepting limitations on their freedom, never before questioned, to regulate voting rights as they chose.

Even if one were to accept the majority's belief that it is proper entirely to disregard the unmistakable implications of the second section of the amendment in construing the first section, one is confounded by its disregard of all this history.

That is pretty tough talk, Madam President, when an Associate Justice sitting on that Court says:

> One is confounded by its disregard of all this history.

I must confess that I have been a little confounded, too, and maybe that is one reason why we have to be just a little more careful than we have been in the past looking at the implications of some of these decisions.

But Justice Harlan continues:

> There is here none of the difficulty which may attend the application of basic principles to situations not contemplated or understood when the principles were framed. The problems which concern the Court now were problems when the amendment was adopted. By the deliberate choice of those responsible for the amendment, it left those problems untouched.

Madam President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the remainder of the dissenting opinion of the decision by Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan because I will not bother to read the rest of it. But to me it is amazing how in this decision an Associate Justice castigates his own body and speaks of one being confounded by its disregard of all this history.

There being no objection, the remainder of the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C. After 1868

The years following 1868, far from indicating a developing awareness of the applicability of the 14th amendment to problems of apportionment, demonstrate precisely the reverse: that the States retained and exercised the power independently to apportion their legislatures. In its constitutions of 1875 and 1901, Alabama carried forward earlier provisions guaranteeing each county at least one representative and fixing an upper limit to the number of seats in the house. Florida's constitution of 1885 continued the guarantee of one representative for each county and reduced the maximum number of representatives per county from four to three. Georgia, in 1877, continued to favor the smaller counties. Louisiana, in 1879, guaranteed each parish at least one representative in the house. In 1890, Mississippi guaranteed each county one representative, established a maximum number of representatives, and provided that specified groups of counties should each have approximately one-third of the seats in the house, whatever the spread of population. Missouri's constitution of 1875 gave each county one representative and otherwise favored less populous areas. Montana's original constitution of 1889 apportioned the State senate by counties. In 1877, New Hampshire amended its constitution's provisions for apportionment, but continued to favor sparsely settled areas in the house and to apportion seats in the senate according to direct taxes paid; the same was true of New Hampshire's constitution of 1902.

In 1894, New York adopted a constitution the peculiar apportionment provisions of which were obviously intended to prevent representation according to population: No county was allowed to have more than one-third of all the senators, no two counties which were adjoining or "separated only by public waters" could have more than one-half of all the senators, and whenever any county became entitled to more than three senators, the total number of senators was increased, thus preserving to the small counties their original number of seats. In addition, each county except Hamilton was guaranteed a seat in the assembly. The North Carolina constitution of 1876 gave each county at least one representative and fixed a maximum number of representatives for the whole house. Oklahoma's constitution at the time of admission to the Union (1907) favored small counties by the use of partial ratios and a maximum number of seats in the house; in addition, no county was permitted to "take part" in the election of more than seven representatives. Pennsylvania, in 1873, continued to guarantee each county one representative in the house. The same was true of South Carolina's constitution of 1895, which provided also that each county should elect one and only one senator. Utah's original constitution of 1895 assured each county of one representative in the house. Wyoming, when it entered the Union in 1889, guaranteed each county at least one senator and one representative.

D. Today

Since the Court now invalidates the legislative apportionments in six States, and has so far upheld the apportionment in none, it is scarcely necessary to comment on the situation in the States today, which is, of course, as fully contrary to the Court's decision as is the record of every prior period in this Nation's history. As of 1961, the constitutions of all but 11 States, roughly 20 percent of the total, recognized bases of apportionment other than geographic spread of population, and to some extent favored sparsely populated areas by a variety of devices, ranging from straight area representation or guaranteed minimum area representation to complicated schemes of the kind exemplified by the provisions of New York's Constitution of 1894, still in effect until struck down by the Court today in No. 20 (post, p. —). Since Tennessee, which was the subject of *Baker* v. *Carr,* and Virginia, scrutinized and disapproved today in No. 69 (post, p. —), are among the 11 States whose own constitutions are sound from the standpoint of the Federal Constitution as construed today, it is evident that the actual practice of the States is even more uniformly than their theory opposed to the Court's view of what is constitutionally permissible.

E. Other factors

In this summary of what the majority ignores, note should be taken of the 15th and 19th amendments. The former prohibited the States from denying or abridging the right to vote "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." The latter, certified as part of the Constitution in 1920, added sex to the prohibited classifications. In *Minor* v. *Happersett,* 21 Wall. 162, this Court considered the claim that the right of women to vote was protected by the privileges and immunities clause of the 14th amendment. The Court's discussion there of the significance of the 15th amendment is fully applicable here with respect to the 19th amendment as well.

"And still again, after the adoption of the 14th amendment, it was deemed necessary to adopt a 15th, as follows: 'The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.' The 14th amendment had already provided that no State should make or enforce any law which should abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. If suffrage was one of these privileges or immunities, why amend the Constitution to prevent its being denied on account of race, etc.? Nothing is more evident than that the greater must include the less, and if all were already protected why go through with the form of amending the Constitution to protect a part?" Idem, at 175.

In the present case, we can go still further. If constitutional amendment was the only means by which all men and, later, women, could be guaranteed the right to vote at all, even for Federal officers, how can it be that the far less obvious right to a particular kind of apportionment of State legislatures—a right to which is opposed a far more plausible conflicting interest of the State than the interest which opposes the general right to vote—can be conferred by judicial construction of the 14th amendment? Yet, unless one takes the highly implausible view that the 14th amendment controls methods of apportionment but leaves the right to vote itself unprotected, the conclusion is inescapable that the Court has, for purposes of these cases, relegated the 15th and 19th amendments to the same limbo of constitutional anachronisms to which the second section of the 14th amendment has been assigned.

Mention should be made finally of the decisions of this Court which are disregarded or, more accurately, silently overruled today. *Minor* v. *Happersett, supra,* in which the Court held that the 14th amendment did not confer the right to vote on anyone, has already been noted. Other cases are more directly in point. In *Colegrove* v. *Barrett,* 330 U.S. 804, this Court dismissed "for want of a substantial Federal question" an appeal from the dismissal of a complaint alleging that the Illinois legislative apportionment resulted in "gross inequality in voting power" and "gross and arbitrary and atrocious discrimination in voting" which denied the plaintiffs equal protection of the laws. In *Remmey* v. *Smith,* 102 F. Supp. 708 (D.C.E.D. Pa.), a three-judge district court dismissed a complaint alleging that the apportionment of the Pennsylvania Legislature deprived the plaintiffs of "constitutional rights guaranteed to them by the 14th amendment." (Id., at 709.) The district court stated that it was aware that the plaintiffs' allegations were "notoriously true" and that "the practical disenfranchisement of qualified electors in certain of the election districts in Philadelphia County is a matter of common knowledge." (Id. at 710.) This Court dismissed the appeal "for the want of a substantial Federal question" (342 U.S. 916).

In *Kidd* v. *McCanless,* 292 S.W. 2d 40, the Supreme Court of Tennessee dismissed an action for a declaratory judgment that the Tennessee Apportionment Act of 1901 was unconstitutional. The complaint alleged that "a minority of approximately 37 percent of the voting population of the State now elects and controls 20 of the 33 members of the senate; that a minority of 40 percent of the voting population of the State now controls 63 of the 99 members of the house of representatives." Idem at 42. Without dissent, this Court granted the motion to dismiss the appeal. 352 U.S. 920. In *Radford* v. *Gary,* 145 F. Supp. 541 (D.C.W.D. Okla.), a three-judge district court was convened to consider "the complaint of the plaintiff to the effect that the existing apportionment statutes of the State of Oklahoma violate the plain mandate of the Oklahoma Constitution and operate to deprive him of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States." Idem at 542. The plaintiff alleged that he was a resident and voter in the most populous county of the State, which had about 15 percent of the total population of the State but only about 2 percent of the seats in the State senate and less than 4 percent of the seats in the house. The complaint recited the unwillingness or inability of the branches of the State government to provide relief and alleged that there was no State remedy available. The district court granted a motion to dismiss. This Court affirmed without dissent (352 U.S. 991).

Each of these recent cases is distinguished on some ground or other in *Baker* v. *Carr.* See 369 U.S. 235–236. Their summary dispositions prevent consideration whether these after-the-fact distinctions are real or imaginary. The fact remains, however, that between 1947 and 1957, four cases raising issues precisely the same as those decided today were presented to the Court. Three were dismissed because the issues presented were thought insubstantial and in the fourth the lower court's dismissal was affirmed.

I have tried to make the catalog complete, yet to keep it within the manageable limits of a judicial opinion. In my judgment, today's decisions are refuted by the language of the Amendment which they construe and by the inference fairly to be drawn from subsequently enacted Amendments. They are unequivocally refuted by history and by consistent theory and practice from the time of the adoption of the 14th amendment until today.

II

The Court's elaboration of its new "constitutional" doctrine indicates how far—and how unwisely—it has strayed from the appropriate bounds of its authority. The consequence of today's decision is that in all but the handful of States which may already satisfy the new requirements the local district court or, it may be, the State courts, are given blanket authority and the constitutional duty to supervise apportionment of the State legislatures. It is difficult to imagine a more intolerable and inappropriate interference by the judiciary with the independent legislatures of the States.

In the *Alabama* cases (Nos. 23, 27, 41), the district court held invalid not only existing provisions of the State constitution—which this Court lightly dismisses with a wave of the supremacy clause and the remark that "it makes no difference whether a State's apportionment scheme is embodied in its constitution or in statutory provision" ante, p. 49)—but also a proposed amendment to the Alabama constitution which had never been submitted to the voters of Alabama for ratification, and "standby" legislation which was not to become effective unless the amendment was rejected (or declared unconstitutional) and in no event before 1966, *Sims* v. *Frink,* 208 F. Supp. 431. See ante, pp. 8–16. Both of these measures had been adopted only 9 days before, at an extraordinary session of the Alabama Legislature, convened pursuant to what was very nearly a directive of the district court, see *Sims* v. *Frink* (205 F. Supp. 245, 248). The district court formulated its own plan for the apportionment of the Alabama Legislature, by picking and choosing among the provisions of the legislative measures (208 F. Supp., at 441–442, see ante, p. 17). Beyond that, the court warned the legislature that there would be still further judicial reapportionment unless the legislature, like it or not, undertook the task for itself (208 F. Supp. at 442). This Court now states that the district court acted in "a most proper and commendable manner" (ante, p. 51), and approves the district court's avowed intention of taking "some further action" unless the State legislature acts by 1966 (ante, p. 52).

In the Maryland case (No. 29, post, p.—), the State legislature was called into special session and enacted a temporary reapportionment of the house of delegates, under pressure from the State courts. Thereafter, the Maryland Court of Appeals held that the Maryland Senate was constitutionally apportioned. *Maryland Committee for Fair Representation* v. *Tawes,* 329 Md. 406. This Court now holds that neither branch of the State legislature meets constitutional requirements, Post, p. 17. The Court presumes that since "the Maryland constitutional provisions relating to legislative apportionment [are] hereby held unconstitutional, the Maryland Legislature * * * has the inherent power to enact at least temporary reapportionment legislation pending adoption of State constitutional provisions" which satisfy the Federal Constitution, id., at 18. On this premise, the Court concludes that the Maryland courts need not "feel obliged to take further affirmative action" now, but that "under no circumstances should the 1966 election of members of the Maryland Legislature be permitted to be conducted pursuant to the existing or any other unconstitutional plan." Idem., at 19.

In the *Virginia* case (No. 69, post, p. —), the State legislature in 1962 complied with the State constitutional requirement of regular reapportionment. Two days later, a complaint was filed in the district court. Eight months later, the legislative reapportionment was declared unconstitutional. *Mann.* v. *Davis,* 213 F. Supp. 577. The district court gave the State legislature 2 months within which to reapportion itself in special session, under penalty of being reapportioned by the court. Only a stay granted by a member of this Court slowed the process; it is plain that no stay will be forthcoming in the future. The Virginia Legislature is to be given "an adequate opportunity to enact a valid plan"; but if it fails "to act promptly in remedying the constitutional defects in the State's legislative apportionment plan," the district court is to "take further action" (post, p. 14).

In *Delaware* (No. 307, post, p. —), the district court entered an order on July 25, 1962, which stayed proceedings until August 7, 1962, "in the hope and expectation" that the general assembly would take "some appropriate action" in the intervening 13 days. *Sincock* v. *Terry,* 207 F. Supp. 205, 207. By way of prodding, presumably, the court noted that if no legislative action were taken and the court sustained the plaintiffs' claim, "the present general assembly and any subsequent general assembly, the members of which were elected pursuant to section 2 of article 2 [the challenged provisions of the Delaware constitution], might be held not to be a de jure legislature and its legislative acts might be held invalid and unconstitutional" (id., at 205–206). Five days later, on July 30, 1962, the general assembly approved a proposed amendment to the State constitution. On August 7, 1962, the district court entered an order denying the defendants' motion to dismiss. The court said that it did not wish to substitute its judgment "for the collective wisdom of the General Assembly of Delaware," but that "in the light of all the circumstances," it had to proceed promptly (210 F. Supp. 395, 396). On October 16, 1962, the court declined to enjoin the conduct of elections in November (210 F. Supp. 396). The court went on to express its regret that the general assembly had not adopted the court's suggestion, see 207 F. Supp., at 206–207, that the Delaware constitution be amended to make apportionment a statutory rather than a constitutional matter, so as to facilitate further changes in apportionment which might be required (210 F. Supp. 401). In January 1963, the general assembly again approved the proposed amendment of the apportionment provisions of the Delaware constitution, which thereby became effective on January 17, 1963. Three months later, on April 17, 1963, the district court reached "the reluctant conclusion" that article 2, section 2, of the Delaware constitution was unconstitutional, with or without the 1963 amendment. *Sincock* v. *Duffy,* 215 F. Supp. 169, 189. Observing that "the State of Delaware, the general assembly, and this court all seem to be trapped in a kind of box of time," id., at 191, the court gave the general assembly until October 1, 1963, to adopt acceptable provisions for apportionment. On May 20, 1963, the district court enjoined the defendants from conducting any elections, including the general election scheduled for November 1964, pursuant to the old or the new constitutional provisions. This Court now approves all these proceedings, noting particularly that in allowing the 1962 elections to go forward, "the district court acted in a wise and temperate manner" (post, p. 14).

Records such as these in the cases decided today are sure to be duplicated in most of the other States if they have not already. They present a jarring picture of courts threatening to take action in an area which they have no business entering, inevitably on the basis of political judgments which they are incompetent to make. They show legislatures of the States meeting in haste and deliberating and deciding in haste to avoid the threat of judicial interference. So far as I can tell, the Court's only response to this unseemly state of affairs is ponderous insistence that "a denial of constitutionally protected rights demands judicial protection" (ante, p. 31). By thus refusing to recognize the bearing which a potential for conflict of this kind may have on the question whether the claimed rights are in fact constitutionally entitled to judicial protection, the Court assumes, rather than supports, its conclusion.

It should by now be obvious that these cases do not mark the end of reapportionment problems in the courts. Predictions once made that the courts would never have to face the problem of actually working out an apportionment have proved false. This Court, however, continues to avoid the consequences of its decisions, simply assuring us that the lower courts "can and * * * will work out more concrete and specific standards" (ante, p. 43). Deeming it "expedient" not to spell out "precise constitutional tests," the Court contents itself with stating "only a few rather general considerations." Ibidem.

Generalities cannot obscure the cold truth that cases of this type are not amenable to the development of judicial standards. No set of standards can guide a court which has to decide how many legislative districts a State shall have, or what the shape of the districts shall be, or where to draw a particular district line. No judicially manageable standard can determine whether a State should have single-member districts or multimember districts or some combination of both. No such standard can control the balance between keeping up with population shifts and having stable districts. In all these respects, the courts will be called upon to make particular decisions with respect to which a principle of equally populated districts will be of no assistance whatsoever. Quite obviously, there are limitless possibilities for districting consistent with such a principle. Nor can these problems be avoided by judicial reliance on legislative judgments so far as possible. Reshaping or combining one or two districts, or modifying just a few district lines, is no less a matter of choosing among many possible solutions, with varying political consequences, than reapportionment broadside.

The Court ignores all this, saying only that "what is marginally permissible in one State may be unsatisfactory in another, depending on the particular circumstances of the case" (ante, p. 43). It is well to remember that the product of today's decisions will not be readjustment of a few districts in a few States which most glaringly depart from the principle of equally populated districts. It will be a redetermination, extensive in many cases, of legislative districts in all but a few States.

Although the Court—necessarily, as I believe—provides only generalities in elaboration of its main thesis, its opinion nevertheless fully demonstrates how far removed these problems are from fields of judicial competence. Recognizing that "indiscriminate districting" is an invitation to "partisan gerrymandering" (ante, pp. 43–44), the Court nevertheless excludes virtually every basis for the formation of electoral districts other than "indiscriminate districting." In one or another of today's opinions, the Court declares it unconstitutional for a State to give effective consideration to any of the following in establishing legislative districts:

1. History;
2. "Economic or other sorts of group interests";
3. Area;
4. Geographical considerations;
5. A desire "to insure effective representation for sparsely settled areas";
6. "Availability of access of citizens to their representatives";
7. Theories of bicameralism (except those approved by the Court);
8. Occupation;
9. An attempt to balance urban and rural power.
10. The preference of a majority of voters in the State.

So far as presently appears, the only factor which a State may consider, apart from numbers, is political subdivisions. But even "a clearly rational State policy" recognizing this factor is unconstitutional if "population is submerged as the controlling consideration."

I know of no principle of logic or practical or theoretical politics, still less any constitutional principle, which establishes all or any of these exclusions. Certain it is that the Court's opinion does not establish them. So far as the Court says anything at all on this score, it says only that "legislators represent people, not trees or acres," ante, p. 27; that "citizens, not history or economic interests, cast votes," ante, p. 45; that "people, not land or trees or pastures, vote," ibid. All this may be conceded. But it is surely equally obvious, and, in the context of elections, more meaningful to note that people are not ciphers and that legislators can represent their electors only by speaking for their interests—economic, social, political—many of which do reflect the place where the electors live. The Court does not establish, or indeed even attempt to make a case for the proposition that conflicting interests within a State can only be adjusted by disregarding them when voters are grouped for purposes of representation.

CONCLUSION

With these cases the Court approaches the end of the third round set in motion by the complaint filed in *Baker* v. *Carr.* What is done today deepens my conviction that judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill advised and constitutionally impermissible. As I have said before, *Wesberry* v. *Sanders, supra,* at 48, I believe that the vitality of our political system, on which in the last analysis all else depends, is weakened by reliance on the judiciary for political reform; in time a complacent body politic may result.

These decisions also cut deeply into the fabric of our federalism. What must follow from them may eventually appear to be the product of State legislatures. Nevertheless, no thinking person can fail to recognize that the aftermath of these cases, however desirable it may be thought in itself, will have been achieved at the cost of a radical alteration in the relationship between the States and the Federal Government, more particularly the Federal judiciary. Only one who has an overbearing impatience with the Federal system and its political processes will believe that that cost was not too high or was inevitable.

Finally, these decisions give support to a current mistaken view of the Constitution and the constitutional function of this Court. This view, in a nutshell, is that every major social ill in this country can find its cure in some constitutional "principle," and that this Court should "take the lead" in promoting reform when other branches of Government fail to act. The Constitution is not a panacea for every blot upon the public welfare, nor should this Court, ordained as a judicial body, be thought of as a general haven for reform movements. The Constitution is an instrument of government, fundamental to which is the premise that in a diffusion of governmental authority lies the greatest promise that this Nation will realize liberty for all its citizens. This Court, limited in function in accordance with that premise, does not serve its high purpose when it exceeds its authority, even to satisfy justified impatience with the slow workings of the political process. For when, in the name of constitutional interpretation, the Court adds something to the Constitution that was deliberately excluded from it, the Court in reality substitutes its view of what should be so for the amending process.

I dissent in each of these cases, believing that in none of them have the plaintiffs stated a cause of action. To the extent that *Baker* v. *Carr,* expressly or by implication, went beyond a discussion of jurisdictional doctrines independent of the substantive issues involved here, it should be limited to what it in fact was: an experiment in venturesome constitutionalism. I would reverse the judgments of the district court in Nos. 23, 27, and 41 (Alabama), No. 69 (Virginia), and No. 307 (Delaware), and remand with directions to dismiss the complaints. I would affirm the judgments of the district court in No. 20 (New York), and No. 508 (Colorado), and of the Court of Appeals of Maryland in No. 29.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have heard it rumored that maybe there are some persons in high judicial places who would be only too anxious to have this reapportionment matter resolved. Perhaps this is like the handwriting on the wall. Maybe it is like Banquo's ghost. Maybe they want to push it aside. But they have gone too far to brush it aside and it is for the Congress to deal with these matters.

Now, Madam President, I turn to an article by Holman Harvey and Kenneth O. Gilmore in the Reader's Digest under the caption, "Reapportionment: Shall the Court or the People Decide?" When all is said and done that is the issue before the Senate.

I read from the article:

Lightning struck last June 15 when the Supreme Court handed down its one-man, one-vote reapportionment decision. This decree requires both branches of every State legislature to be strictly based on population only. It represents the most far-reaching change in American political structure since our Constitution was written 178 years ago.

Few issues in recent times have stirred more controversy or created more confusion. Nearly every State in the Nation—from Montana to Maryland, from Alaska to Florida—is struggling to satisfy the Federal judiciary's order. A dozen States have already remapped their legislative districts.

Madam President, before the year is out, perhaps at least 38 States will have reapportioned their legislatures in conformity with judicial decrees.

Others are desperately trying to meet court-imposed deadlines or to devise delaying tactics. In the meantime, proposals for a constitutional amendment reversing the Court's action are being seriously debated in Congress and in the States.

Make no mistake, we are at a crossroads: our form of government is in a major crisis. What then are the stakes?

REPRESENT THE PEOPLE

"The basic issue," says Robert G. Dixon, Jr., professor of law at George Washington University, "is not simply one man, one vote. It is fair representation, a concept which philosophers and politicians have been arguing about for ages."

Since the beginning of democracy in the Greek city-states, man has groped for the best ways to govern himself and to achieve a true representation of the people's will. As far back as the 11th century, England began to move painfully toward more representative government; kings formed various councils consisting of lords, clerics, and powerful landowners. Later, townships, boroughs, and counties were called into councils, originally to be consulted on property taxes.

In America at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787, this was the essential question: How could a balanced, genuinely representative form of government be achieved, one that would reflect the majority will while protecting the minority and preventing mob rule? A solution was hammered out by our forefathers. So that the large States could not be controlled by the small or the small steamrollered by the large, a two-house plan was born, with a house of representatives based on population and a senate based on geography.

Thomas Jefferson is reputed to have asked George Washington why he favored the system. Washington asked Jefferson why he poured his coffee from cup to saucer. "To cool it," was the response.

"Even so," Washington said, "we pour legislation into the senatorial saucer to cool it."

As America matured into the world's first successful example of modern constitutional democracy, States adopted the Federal two-house system. By 1961, all but 11 States had constitutions that took into account interests other than population—geographic factors, mainly—so as to achieve fair representation. Missouri's "Little Federal" system furnishes an example. One house is apportioned on the basis of districts of fairly equal population in both city and rural areas, with districts adjusted every 10 years. In the other chamber each of the 114 counties has at least 1 member. Under these provisions, cooperation between city and rural areas is a valued tradition.

THE CHICKEN VOTE

But—and this is where the rub came—as America's cities grew, some States neglected to reapportion their lower houses. The result was, in many States, unjust rural domination of legislatures. Delaware's house districts had not changed since 1897. So unbalanced was Connecticut's house of representatives that 1 vote in a rural town was worth 429 votes in Hartford. In New Hampshire's lower house, one district had 1,000 times more residents than another.

One remiss State was Tennessee, with no revisions since 1901. A group went to court to force reapportionment of the assembly, with Memphis resident Charles W. Baker suing the secretary of state, Joe C. Carr.

That is where the case of Baker against Carr gets its name.

"The pigs and chickens in our smaller counties have better representation in the Tennessee Legislature than the people of Nashville" declared that city's mayor.

The case reached the Supreme Court. Contrary to all previous decisions—and to Justice Felix Frankfurter's warning that the judiciary "ought not to enter this political thicket"—the Court ruled in 1962 that State legislative districts are subject to its judicial scrutiny.

The Baker against Carr decision was a bombshell. It spawned similar reapportionment suits in 34 States. So varied were the court interpretations that cases from six States—Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia—were appealed to the High Tribunal.

Then on June 15, 1964, the nine black-robed men filed into the marbled chambers and handed down their shattering decision. In four cases the voting was 8 to 1; in the other two, 6 to 3. In all cases, the long established "Little Federal" system was knocked out. Chief Justice Earl Warren justified the decision on the provision of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution which requires that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

I interpose at this point to say that in 1948, when the present Chief Justice was Governor of California, he entertained a diametrically opposite view with respect to his State; but in the intervening period of 16 years he completely changed his mind.

He wrote: "Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests."

QUESTION THE WISDOM

There were vigorous dissents to the decision. Justice Potter Stewart noted: "The Court's draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, or in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union."

"It is difficult to imagine a more intolerable and inappropriate interference by the judiciary with the independent legislatures of the States," said Justice John M. Harlan. "People are not ciphers. Legislators can represent their electors only by speaking for their interests—economic, social, political—many of which do reflect where the electors live."

Aroused critics from both political parties questioned the wisdom of the Court's fiat. The Wall Street Journal summed up the feelings of many when it said, "The Court had a chance to bolster our traditions by requiring one house truly on population, and permitting the other on a geographical or other basis to reflect common interests. Instead of stopping with that, its fiat threw out institutions painfully wrought by experience and tried to substitute abstract theory."

The House of Representatives was so incensed that it rammed through a bill stripping all Federal courts of the power to hear or review State legislative apportionment cases. The Senate passed a "sense of Congress" with the purpose of asking the courts to go slow in forcing State legislatures to fall into line until the whole matter could be reviewed.

Madam President, the bill referred to was the Tuck bill, a bill introduced by the distinguished former Governor of Virginia, Governor TUCK, and the reference to the Senate is a reference to an amendment that the distinguished majority leader and the minority leader cosponsored to the Foreign Aid Act at that time.

I continue to read from the article:

> Today, as this momentous issue is debated across the land, every citizen should ponder these points:
>
> (1) The court's decree threatens to spark a chain reaction that may go all the way down to the school-board level.

The authors of that article were not kidding. There is a suit filed in Kent County, Mich., right now questioning the legality of the board of supervisors. There is a suit pending in the Federal court in northern Illinois challenging the composition of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois. Strangely enough, that suit has been filed by a law professor from De Paul University.

In Illinois, they challenge the composition of our supreme court. In Michigan, they challenge the composition of the board of supervisors. Just give them a little time and they will challenge the composition of the park board and school boards and sanitary district boards and any other kind of board that may come along. These authors were not speaking with tongue in cheek when they were speaking of what is going to happen when they said:

> The court's decree threatens to spark a chain reaction that may go all the way down to the school-board level.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I appreciate the fine speech that the distinguished Senator is making. Does the Senator think that even the Federal courts will be in agreement as to what constitutes a redistricting or reapportionment of the State legislatures in accord with the basic decision of the U.S. Supreme Court?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not; because they never have agreed in most of the circuits and districts. We shall have that disagreement all the time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, as the Senator knows, in the State of Florida, which I have the honor to represent in part, there have been two good-faith efforts to redistribute or reapportion the membership in the Florida Legislature. These efforts have met with the approval of a very distinguished three-judge Federal court, only to be disapproved by the U.S. Supreme Court later.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. That situation is almost as difficult as the one which took place in Colorado and in some other States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator think that the terrific instability which will result necessarily because of the difference in the thinking and philosophy of the members of the Federal judiciary in both the lower Federal courts and the Supreme Court itself—as shown by the different viewpoints of the members of the Supreme Court in the various decisions on cases which have come before the Court—is something that will rise to plague our country as long as this decision remains the controlling law of the land?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. One may emphasize the fact, as Justice Frankfurter pointed out, that this was a judicial thicket into which the Court should make no venture.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I read those words of the late distinguished Justice Frankfurter, and I thought that he not only spoke the truth, but that the majority of the members of the Court since that time have failed or refused to see that truth.

Is it not true, considering the fact that we have a Federal census every 10 years and that every State in the Union is anything but static in its growth and population, that this problem plaguing us already will continue to plague us as a result of these continuing censuses just as long as this Nation lasts if this decision is permitted to remain the controlling law of the land?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely; and we have taken that into account so that nobody can charge us with trying to freeze a situation for all time we propose to take a look at the matter after each decennial census.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I particularly appreciate that part of the amendment sponsored by the distinguished minority leader, of which I have the honor to be one of the cosponsors—recognizing that this country is not static.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed not.

Mr. HOLLAND. Our country has never been static. No State in our Nation is static. The people of each State under the amendment sponsored by the distinguished Senator would have the right every 10th year, after a census, to again examine their own situation and decide for themselves what they think is the fair method of distribution of members in one house of their legislature.

I congratulate the Senator upon his long and determined effort. I am glad to be counted with him because he has in mind not only a stable and sound government, but also a government which recognizes that if any one thing has marked this country through all of its existence, it is the fact that it is constantly on the move, that its people are constantly on the move, that the population of the States is constantly changing, and that the population within each State, one county as against another county and one community as against another community, is constantly changing.

I commend the distinguished Senator upon the long and scholarly effort which he has made to produce an amendment which is in consonance with the basic philosophy that underlies our American system.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rest of the article which I have been reading be made a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The remainder of the article, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

> There are 3,072 counties in the United States, and 91,185 local governments. How long will it be before the Federal courts poke into each of these units of representative democracy to take head counts and draw boundary lines? A Michigan court recently told Kent County's board of supervisors that it must be reapportioned on a population-only basis. Other suits have been filed in New York, and California. Where, exactly, will it end?
>
> "Carry the Court's decision to its logical conclusion," says William S. White, Pulitzer Prize-winning biographer and journalist, "and even the historic and deliberate population imbalance in the U.S. Senate could not in any logic longer prevail." After all, Nevada's 285,000 citizens elect as many U.S. Senators as do New York's 17 million.
>
> (2) The decision will swing the pendulum from legislatures with outdated apportionment and too much rural weight, to legislatures under the raw control of metropolitan vote-getting machines. In 25 States, more than half the population resides in metropolitan areas. In 14 States, three populous counties or fewer will elect more than 50 percent of the legislators.[1] America's sprawling urban areas will call the shots, up and down the land. Chicago will hold sway over Illinois, Detroit over Michigan, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh over Pennsylvania, Phoenix over Arizona, and Las Vegas over Nevada.
>
> The specter of raids on State treasuries by metropolitan-dominated legislatures concerns many. They see pressures mounting for more State funds for urban renewal, relief cases and public housing—with many of the funds being matched by U.S. tax dollars. These spending programs in turn will garner more votes for the city machines. Mayors in some States may soon be far more influential than the Governors.
>
> New York is perhaps the most vivid case. Here 38 percent of the population has been able to elect a majority in the senate, thus protecting certain underpopulated counties of this large State with all its diverse interests. But, under the court's rule, it is only a matter of time before the New York City metropolitan area, with 63 percent of the State's population, will be completely dominant.
>
> (3) Some groups of voters can be wiped out, under a "winner-take-all" numerical system. The Court's decision, notes The Christian Science Monitor, "will tend to weaken the complex American system for diffusing power and protecting minorities." For example, under a purely numerical system of redistricting, South Dakota's 30,000 Indians, who live in huge reservations covering entire counties, will lose two State senators who now watch out for their interests.
>
> Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH of Ohio says: "People have ever-changing problems that sometimes fail to yield to computer logic. Some may be lumbermen, miners, fishermen, or farmers. Some may be of one religion or national origin peculiar in need or consideration. Some may direct their needs toward secondary roads or superhighways, while others are more concerned about the rapid-transit system. Certainly the majority must have effective rule, but the minority, too, is entitled to effective representation, lest important segments of our people be completely subect to the tyranny of a temporary majority."
>
> Chief Justice Warren himself declared, in 1948, when he was Governor of California: "Many California counties are far more im-

---

[1] Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington.

portant in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the (State) senate to a strictly population basis."

(4) The Court's decree is a dangerous intrusion by the Federal judiciary into the political affairs of the States. Hardly was the "one-man, one-vote" decision announced before lower courts showed how fast and how far they were willing to muscle in on the deliberations of State governments. Just 2 days after the June 15 decision, a U.S. district court directed the Michigan Apportionment Commission to come up with a districting plan in 46 hours. In a Vermont case appealed to the Supreme Court, it was ruled in January that the legislature must decide upon a plan and then disband—even though this defies the State constitution.

In Oklahoma a three-man Federal district court ignored the machinery set up by the State for reapportionment and autocratically undertook to rearrange the State's legislative districts itself. It set up a master plan that was a nightmare of free-floating voting zones and mistakes. Angrily, Oklahoma's Senator MIKE MONRONEY said: "Hasty and ill-advised redistricting formulas promulgated by the courts can result in confusion and inequities. Good local self-government cannot be imposed from above. It must be generated by the people themselves."

(5) The Court's edict means that the citizens of a State can no longer decide upon their own form of representative government. One of the six States involved in the Court's June 15 ruling was Colorado. Few States have so diligently attempted to work out a method of representation tailored to their own unique characteristics. Since it became a State in 1876, its legislature has been reapportioned five times. In the spring of 1962, citizens' groups gathered to work out a reapportionment amendment that would keep pace with the State's increasing urban growth. They split into two camps. One wanted both houses of the general assembly based on population alone; the other supported a "Federal Plan," keeping geographic representation in the senate.

Each side took its case to the public. They fought up and down the State with countless speeches, debates, newspaper ads, billboard posters, radio and TV spots. This referendum overshadowed all other election issues in Colorado that year. And the outcome was stunningly clear. The "Federal Plan" won by 305,700 to 172,725. It carried every county in the State.

The amendment was challenged; it was upheld by a Federal district court. And then on June 15, the Supreme Court threw out Colorado's plan. In an amazing statement, Chief Justice Warren said that, because the plan adopted was contrary to the Court's new ruling, Colorado's referendum vote was "without Federal constitutional significance."

There were stinging dissents. Said Justice Tom C. Clark: "Colorado, by an overwhelming vote, has written the organization of its legislative body into its constitution. In striking down Colorado's plan of apportionment, the Court is invading the valid functioning of the procedures of the States, and thereby commits a grievous error which will do irreparable damage to our Federal-State relationship."

Today Colorado's senate has been redrawn to satisfy the Court. But the issue is still being debated. Meanwhile, the voters wonder what, if anything, their ballot is worth, or their State constitution.

WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Only one recourse is left to American citizens who wish to restore our representative system to its original integrity: an amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Today in Congress, and in the States, forces are gathering behind proposals that would:

1. Guarantee the citizens of every State the right to decide for themselves, by one-man, one-vote ballot, the apportionment of their own legislature.
2. Guarantee that this power will not be curtailed or reviewed by any Federal court.
3. Guarantee that one house of each legislature can reflect factors other than population if such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people.

This in essence would be the 25th amendment to the Constitution. Whether it is passed in Congress and ratified by the States will depend upon the support it receives from the American people. The stakes are high—as high as the preservation of our Republic.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there are one or two points I want to make before I close. If the Supreme Court decision stands, if there is no amendment, it becomes in the nature of a perpetual war, and someday, notwithstanding the fact that all State legislatures have been reapportioned under judicial fiat, they may find themselves exceedingly unhappy. There will be exactly nothing that they can do about it.

On this point it is rather interesting to note an observation by Associate Justice Douglas a few weeks ago when he said:

> Sometimes the decisions of this Court are not approved in the long run. And constitutional amendments are made. For example, our Court held that the graduated income tax was unconstitutional. And we got the 16th amendment—we changed that. Our Court held that a State could lay a poll tax as a condition of voting, and that was changed with respect to Federal elections. Our Court held that a State could keep women from voting and that was changed by the 19th amendment. This is part of the process. People can have such constitutions—such provisions—as they want. It is the duty of the Court to construe the constitution as it exists to the best of their knowledge.

That is so completely in point, Mr. President, and it needs no further embellishment on my part.

It has been stated that I set myself up as a sort of "one-man court," which is too whimsical for any response from me. I am afraid that some writers of editorials have awfully short memories. Therefore, it is time to jog them, because here is the platform of my party for 1964.

I read first the caption from page 19 and then the appropriation section from page 20.

We say:

> In furtherance of our faith in limited, frugal and efficient government we also pledge: * * * support of a constitutional amendment, as well as legislation, enabling States having bicameral legislatures to apportion one house on bases of their choosing, including factors other than population.

Thus, Mr. President, this is merely giving expression and affirmation to a pledge which we made to the people of the United States. As a member of that party, I feel duty bound to carry it out as best I can.

I presume, before debate on this subject ends next Wednesday, that there will be an opportunity to make one or two more observations, but let me make the point that it does not make any difference whether all of the State legislatures have been reapportioned. The residual issue still remains, and that is: Shall there be fair representation? Shall the people have something to say about the composition of at least one branch of their State legislature? Shall it still remain a government of, for, and by the people?

I never cease to be astounded by the fact that there are Members of this body who are unwilling to let the people of their respective States have something to say about the composition of their legislatures in the light of the historical development of the 14th amendment and the equal protection clause.

That is a paradox of the first order but I believe that the two authors of that article published in Reader's Digest, and the professor of constitutional history at Georgetown University, are correct when they say that this is a constitutional crisis of the greatest magnitude and the time has come to resolve it.

I earnestly hope that when the roll is intoned on Wednesday next—and I have talked with the majority leader about setting an appropriate hour on that day for the vote—the Senate, in its wisdom, will send this proposed amendment to the House for further consideration, and that it can then go to the people of the country, because that is where the power resides, that is still the fountainhead of all power in this country. When that principle and that concept fail then, of course, I do not know what will be said about the ultimate destiny of this Republic.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On the final point which the Senator from Illinois makes. The Senator from Illinois says, Why not let the people decide?

Indeed, why not let the people decide any issue; why not let the people decide whether we will pass any foreign aid legislation; why not let the people decide whether there will be any civil rights legislation? Such a procedure passes the buck. It would——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President——

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would seem to me that if this proposed amendment is good and is appropriate, then we should pass it. If not, we should defeat it. That is what we are elected for, is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Surely, my friend from Wisconsin cannot mean what he is saying.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are dealing here with an interpretation of a clause in the 14th amendment to the Constitution. We are trying to remedy that interpretation. This is not a piece of legislation. This is a joint resolution for a constitutional amendment. What the Senator from Wisconsin is talking about, when he talks about foreign aid, is legislation in the form of an ultimate statute. I know something about that, so let him offer a resolution to interdict Congress, from now on, to deal in that field and to vote any money out of the public Treasury for any such thing as, say, foreign aid, and then he will be on good ground.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is overlooking the fact that we have had more than a score of amendments to the Constitution. How many times, and how many of those amendments did we require the people of each State to decide whether the amendment should be put into effect in their particular States? The answer is "None."

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have required all of them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have required all of the State legislatures to act, but not the people in a referendum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the Senator from Illinois is basing his argument not on whether the State legislatures acted, because we have agreed that they have—or at least I believe that we have agreed—but what he is saying is that not only State legislatures and Congress act, but he has said that we should rely on a referendum. I believe that there are a great many arguments we could make against the wisdom of the referendum process.

I have served in a State legislature—perhaps the Senator from Illinois also has—and he knows that it is very easy for a State legislature which has a vested interest in the matter to compose a referendum in such a way that it would get the answer it would prefer. It is no trick to rig the question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Coming from a flaming liberal——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh no—no——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am absolutely surprised, because if he means what he says about liberalism, then of course he should be the first to want to go to the people instead of stopping with legislatures.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, I am shocked that the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate disbelieves, apparently, in the Republican-Democratic principle that we are elected to decide these questions and that State legislatures are elected, too. We do not refer them to the people and pass the buck to the people. They elected us to use our best judgment in these matters.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The people still have to pass on amendments to the Constitution. The Senator from Wisconsin continues to confuse the issue——

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Between legislation and a constitutional amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Three-quarters of the State legislatures have——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the referendum would be the only real basis for the version which the Senator from Illinois has suggested.

The Senator from Illinois has three stages to his proposal; first, Congress acts, as in all constitutional amendments, with a two-thirds vote. Then the State legislatures act with a three-quarters vote; and if the States are going to put the amendment into effect a referendum would be required. He bases his whole argument on the ground that this amendment cannot be so bad, although it destroys the principle of the one man, one vote, because the people themselves, not only the State legislatures, not only Congress, but also the people themselves, in this case, will have a vote. I say that is not much of an argument because this is something Congress should decide. That is what the State legislatures are elected to do also.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask the Senator from Wisconsin, is he afraid of the people?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He acts like it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am saying that I am not afraid of making a decision myself. I do not want to pass the buck or refer it to a referendum because we have a potato too hot to handle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will handle any kind of potato, but we are trying to deal here with a court. I was going to say a court which has been imperious—but perhaps I had better withdraw that word—perhaps I should say it has been narrowing or closing the door upon the right of the people in the States to apportion at least one branch of their own legislature.

That is the issue.

No argument, no red herring, no nothing is going to obscure that issue, because that is the issue which is going to the people.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The issue is very clear: Whether every citizen in America should have an equal vote, whether black or white, rich or poor, rural or city, whether they should have an equal vote in determining their own legislatures. That is the issue, whether the people should have an equal vote or not, 1 man, 1 vote, or 1 man, 10 votes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is not the issue. The issue is one of fair representation——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; it is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has been so for the last 175 years. Now suddenly comes the Court to throw all precedent to the winds, throwing all our experience out the window, and taking it upon themselves to change all that.

Strangely enough, the Chief Justice of that Court, when he was chief magistrate in California, had a completely other idea no later than 16 years ago.

FBI'S WAR ON ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the April 18 issue of the U.S. News & World Report has published an article written by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, entitled, "The FBI's War on Organized Crime." Mr. Hoover is qualified by his long years of law enforcement and study of crime in the United States to discuss this grave problem that now confronts us.

In reporting the progress that has been made, Mr. Hoover sounds again the ominous warning that this Nation must do more to halt the crime menace. There is need for greater public support, for law enforcement officers, and there must be new legislation, essential to the effective waging of this war on organized crime.

I am confident that the efforts which we, as Members of this body, are now making will result in the enactment of additional laws that are urgently needed.

I recommend the reading of this article by every Member of Congress and all other citizens who are concerned about the gravity of the crime menace in this country, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FBI'S WAR ON ORGANIZED CRIME

("The crime menace to our society has become critical * * * of grave concern to all of us." Those are the recent words of Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate's Subcommittee on Investigations.

(Is the menace being brought under control? How is the fight on organized crime progressing?

(It has taken a new turn since the Federal Bureau of Investigation, armed with new laws, moved into a campaign against the underworld.

(By infiltration and other means, G-men traced the network of organized crime. On these pages, the FBI's Director sets out the record of successes against the big crime syndicates.)

(By John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

Four and a half years ago, in September 1961, the FBI was empowered to launch a concerted drive against the organized underworld. Some of us in law enforcement knew, of course, that syndicated gambling and other vices had been organized for a number of years. But there had been no effective Federal laws under which the FBI could proceed against these evils.

When the FBI was charged with investigative jurisdiction of the three interstate gambling and racketeering laws passed in 1961, it moved with deliberate speed to determine who was behind these nationwide underworld operations. Infiltration, the same technique which had proven so successful in the FBI's drive against fascism, communism, the Ku Klux Klan and other enemies of freedom, was brought to bear on the underworld.

The success of this operation is very apparent. Over 260 convictions have been recorded since 1961, when the laws regarding interstate transmission of wagering information, interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia, and interstate travel in aid of racketeering became effective. Another 200 individuals have been charged with violations and are awaiting trial or grand jury action.

Of perhaps greater importance is the fact that operations under these laws enable a further FBI penetration of La Cosa Nostra and its cooperating mobs—there are several underworld groups comprising the overall crime cartel, with La Cosa Nostra being the dominant one. This penetration has brought to light evidence which has made possible the prosecution of a number of members of the organized underworld under various Federal statutes as well as many local and State laws.

Some of the big men of the organized underworld were brought to bay by the FBI within the last year. Unquestionably, the biggest catch was Sam Giancana, reputed head of the underworld in Chicago and one of nine members of La Cosa Nostra's ruling commission, the "board of directors" of organized crime. Giancana was sent to jail on June 1, 1965, for civil contempt. Brought before a Federal grand jury which was armed with extensive information collected by the FBI, Giancana was granted immunity from prosecution and ordered to answer questions. He refused and was sent to jail. The Supreme Court on December 13, 1965, denied a writ of certiorari filed in his behalf. Giancana can be held in jail until the grand jury expires on May 31, 1966.

Federal grand juries, supplied with data gathered by the FBI, also have been active in New York City where there are five La Cosa Nostra "families" (gangs). All but one of these are represented on the commission.

Two of these families are the subjects of grand-jury investigations. One of them, headed by Thomas Luchese, saw its leader "collapse" when he faced the same choice as Giancana—talk or go to jail. He reportedly remains in serious condition, virtually impotent, and thus of little use to the organization. One of his close associates was indicted by the grand jury on five counts of perjury. Four members of the family were convicted for contempt, three being sentenced to prison for 2 years, one receiving a 1-year term.

The other New York grand-jury probe concerns the family formerly headed by Joseph Bonanno—he allegedly was kidnaped at gunpoint from a New York City street early on the morning of October 21, 1964. Bonanno was scheduled to appear before the grand jury the day he disappeared. His son, Salvatore Vincent (Bill) Bonanno, was held in jail for civil contempt from March 2 until June 4, 1965, for refusing to answer questions after being granted immunity. He was released after answering some questions.

An attempt was made to kill young Bonanno and some of his associates on the night of January 28, 1966, in a wild gun battle on the streets of Brooklyn, N.Y. Gaspare DiGregorio has been named boss of the old Bonanno family, but some members remain loyal to their former boss and his son, thus setting the stage for gang warfare.

Felix ("Milwaukee Phil") Alderisio, one of Giancana's closest underworld associates in Chicago, was convicted in Federal court in Denver, Colo., in May 1965, on an extortion charge. He and two others, Ruby Kolod, an official of the Desert Inn Hotel in Las Vegas, Nev., and Israel ("Ice Pick Willie") Alderman, a Nevada gambler, were sentenced to prison and ordered to pay fines. Appeals were filed.

Murray "the Camel" Humphreys, reputed underworld fixer and one of Chicago's most notorious racketeers, was arrested twice by the FBI in 1965. He was first picked up in Norman, Okla., where he had fled to avoid a grand jury subpena. Following his appearance before the grand jury, he was indicted for perjury and FBI agents again were sent to arrest him. He refused to open the door of his apartment, and the agents were forced to kick it open and then to dissuade him from an apparent intention to shoot it out with them. Freed on bond, Humphreys died a short time later.

Historically, gambling has been the foundation of organized crime. It produces tremendous wealth—cash which can be used to underwrite other criminal operations requiring considerable capital, such as loan sharking. It also has been at the root of much of the corruption of public officials—corruption which has enabled the underworld to gain virtual control of some communities. Realizing this, the FBI has concentrated much of its attack against the underworld on its gambling operations. The so-called sports-news services, the organizations which supply bookies throughout the country with the essential betting line—the point spread on football, basketball, and other such games and the odds on horse races and other types of sporting events—have been particular targets. Operators of four of the leading services of this type in the Nation fell prey to the FBI in 1965.

Angelo "Monge" Rossetti, operator of "Sportsday Weekly," a major race-wire service, was convicted in Federal court in Boston, Mass., in June 1965, on charges of interstate transmission of wagering information and interstate transportation in aid of racketeering. He was sentenced to 2 years.

Operators of major "sports services" for bookies in Missouri, Texas, and Florida are awaiting trial on charges resulting from FBI investigations. One of these men had boasted before his arrest by FBI agents that his service was one of the four largest in the country. The destruction of these "sports services" has its effect throughout much of the gambling operations. Many bookies, deprived of the professionally established point spread and odds on sporting events, were forced to curtail operations or run the risk of extensive losses through the use of unreliable line information.

Underworld gamblers have insatiable greed. They are not even satisfied with the regular run of odds which favor them—they stoop to deceit and crooked devices whenever possible. Operators of the various types of numbers rackets will take action whenever possible to insure that a heavily bet number does not "hit." Crooked gambling devices frequently have been found by FBI agents when they raided underworld establishments. One plush casino catering to the tourist trade in West Virginia was found by raiding agents to have its dice tables wired so the operator could control the roll of the dice.

Early this year, FBI agents smashed 2 extensive gambling operations with a series of raids in 17 separate cities. A total of 25 persons were arrested, and many others may be charged after Federal grand juries consider the large volume of evidence seized. The first of the raids occurred on January 9, 1966, with some of the South's leading layoff bookies as the main targets. The second series of raids came on February 2, 1966, involving a gambling operation headquartered in Philadelphia, Pa.

Acting under a new Federal law regarding sports bribery, FBI agents struck another blow at organized gambling in 1965. Leo Enrico Casale and Joseph Frank Polito, two Chicago gamblers, were sentenced to Federal prison for bribing two University of Seattle basketball players to "shave points" in a basketball game with the University of Idaho on January 22, 1965.

The FBI has made some notable achievements in combating one of the underworld's newest schemes—planned bankruptcy, or, in underworld parlance, "scam." One of the biggest cases of this type involved the Murray Packing Co., Inc., a New York City wholesale meat and poultry firm. This company fell to underworld control through a loanshark operation in December 1960. The next month the man who had arranged the usurious loan became president of the company, and in a matter of weeks it was bankrupt with more than $2 million being owed to over 100 creditors. Six persons were convicted for this crime and were sentenced to Federal prison in February 1965. The two main subjects in this case were Peter Castellana and Joseph Pagano, members of two of the New York La Cosa Nostra families. They were sentenced to 5 years in prison and fined $45,000 each. The other four received lesser sentences.

In Detroit, an FBI investigation led last year to the conviction of three of that area's hoodlums for violating the National Bankruptcy Act in connection with the bankrupt estate of the Grosse Point Jewelry Store. Two of them were sentenced to prison and one was placed on probation. Appeals were filed.

Members of the organized underworld will involve themselves in virtually any activity which holds the promise of quick and substantial profit. Some have been attracted by stocks, both fraudulent and stolen. An FBI investigation led last fall to an 11-count indictment against an important New York hoodlum for the interstate transportation of fraudulent securities. Six other New Yorkers, one the brother of the notorious Carmine Lombardozzi, were convicted in Federal court on November 10, 1965, for the interstate transportation of stolen securities—over $1 million worth of blue-chip stock certificates stolen from a New York City brokerage house. The FBI investigation of this crime also resulted in the recovery of some $400,000 of the stolen securities. Appeals were filed.

HOW CRIMINALS WIDEN THEIR FIELD

FBI penetration of the organized underworld and the exhaustive investigation of the activities of its members have resulted in some leading racketeers being caught in what might be considered unusual violations. Actually, they merely demonstrate that hoodlums have no scruples. Following are some examples of the unusual crimes:

Peter Victor Cavataio, who has been named in testimony before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations as a "lieutenant" in the Detroit Mafia, was caught by the FBI for raising the amount on retail dealers' food-stamp forms under the Government's welfare program. He was fined $10,000 after pleading guilty.

Another man described in testimony before the Senate subcommittee as one of the "administrators and heirs apparent" of the Detroit Mafia, has been charged with fraud against the Government in connection with alleged false statements in a financial report to the Small Business Administration.

Other unusual crimes included violation of the Federal Housing Administration statute, harboring a Federal fugitive, failure to register as a convicted narcotics felon when leaving the country, and violation of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act by illegally using strike funds.

The FBI daily develops from its sources within the underworld and from its investigations considerable information which does not relate to a violation within its jurisdiction. This is promptly passed on to the proper law-enforcement agency, either Federal, State or local. Often the information is furnished in the form of sworn affidavits which provide the basis for arrest warrants and enable other agencies to move promptly.

Last year the FBI passed on some 180,000 items of criminal information to other law-enforcement agencies. In New York City alone this information led to more than 400 arrests and the disruption of several major gambling operations, one policy bank doing an estimated $1.5 million worth of business. In the Chicago area, information developed by the FBI and furnished to other agencies has led to over 940 arrests involving gambling operations in less than 3 years.

Often FBI agents will assist local authorities by providing testimony before grand juries probing criminal operations. A Kings County, New York, grand jury currently investigating hoodlum influence in the operation of Brooklyn hotels, motels, restaurants, and bars, benefited last year from testimony by FBI agents. This testimony led to six members of La Cosa Nostra, including Joseph Colombo, boss of one of the New York families, being sentenced to jail for 30 days and fined $250 for contempt of court.

Following are some other examples of the outstanding achievements resulting in whole or in part from information the FBI developed and passed on to other agencies in the past year:

The arrest of 31 persons by Denver, Colo., police in November and December in connection with gambling activities.

The arrest of 68 persons by the West Virginia State Police in a December raid on the Paddock Club in Chester, W. Va.

The conviction in Federal courts in Ohio of nine individuals for various Federal tax violations.

The conviction of 20 persons, including 1 identified in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations as a "lieutenant" in the Detroit Mafia, who were arrested in an October 1963 Michigan State Police raid on the Steren Assembly Club of

Madison Heights, Mich. All were convicted for violating State gambling laws.

The arrest of 34 persons and confiscation of close to $5,000 in a gambling raid by St. Paul, Minn., police in July.

The arrest in May by Columbus, Ohio, police of 34 pimps, prostitutes, and gamblers in a series of raids.

The arrest in May of 24 persons and confiscation of about $5,000 in a gambling raid in West New York, N.J., and the arrest of 67 men in April in a gambling raid in East Newark, N.J., both raids being conducted by the New Jersey State Police.

The arrest of 14 bolita operators by the Internal Revenue Service in the Tampa, Fla., area in April.

The arrest by St. Louis, Mo., police of 24 persons in 2 gambling raids in April.

The conviction in March of 60 gamblers in Nashville, Tenn., municipal court.

The arrest of 15 gamblers by Dade County, Fla., sheriff's officers, and the arrest of 11 persons by Philadelphia, Pa., police, both in March.

The FBI also passed on considerable information to law enforcement agencies in other countries, especially Italy and Canada, during 1965. Several arrests made in these two countries during the year were based in part on information supplied by the FBI.

THE ENEMY IS ON THE DEFENSIVE

The war on organized crime has not been won, but the enemy has been engaged and is on the defensive. Many law enforcement agencies are cooperating closely to destroy the evil of organized crime.

To acomplish this, however, law enforcement must have greater public support.

Laws relating to gambling, loan sharking, business frauds, and other vices need to be revised and updated in some areas. Organized gambling is not going to be stopped with token fines which really amount to nothing more than a license.

The public should be alert to the need for legislation essential to the war on organized crime and insist on its passage. But the greatest contribution the citizens can make is to refuse to deal with the gambler, the loan shark, and other salesmen of the underworld and to report what they know about illegal activities.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly on the situation in South Vietnam—the confrontation of the Buddhists and the regime of General Ky—although its outlines are not clear.

It may well be, as some in the administration have said, that the struggle between factions in South Vietnam is a healthy sign representing the desire of the people to secure a more representative and democratic government. But these riots and demonstrations pose serious military and political problems for the United States. It is obvious that, if they are not composed, the struggle will withdraw South Vietnamese forces from the battle and will obstruct and endanger the efforts of the U.S. forces.

The attack on the air base at Saigon—which I have visited twice in the last 4 months, and which is susceptible to other attacks—may well be the forerunner of continuing attacks on Saigon. Obviously, the U.S. forces will protect themselves. But it is difficult to see how they can prosecute the war under such circumstances.

It is an obvious political fact that if the people of South Vietnam are not willing to defend their country, the United States cannot do so for them.

I note that one of the Buddhist leaders has suggested that a constituent assembly be elected from that area of South Vietnam which is not under the control of the Vietcong, and where, presumably, a free vote could be had; and that, when elected, the constituent assembly express the will of the people who would elect them on two questions:

First, whether South Vietnam wishes to continue the war; and, second, whether they wish U.S. participation in the struggle.

I see nothing wrong in this proposal. In fact, I think it is a very good proposal, for if the people in areas in South Vietnam who are free from control of the Vietcong do not want to continue the war, do not want the United States to participate in the war and assist them, it is also obvious that the people of the entire area of South Vietnam do not want us to be there.

Our country has acted honorably in Vietnam, as I see it, over a period of 10 to 15 years. It has kept its promises and commitments, whether one considers them express or implied. No men have ever fought more bravely and with greater sacrifice than American forces in Vietnam.

I have felt sympathy for the President of the United States because, in great measure, he inherited this situation. Looking back upon this situation, it seems to me the decisive time of escalation of the war was when in 1962, the United States committed 6,000 troops, under the advice of General Taylor to meet the increased attacks of the Vietcong and from North Vietnam.

Now we have a situation where the United States must reach new decisions if South Vietnam cannot settle its political problems.

If the people of South Vietnam do not want to continue the struggle, it is obvious that the United States should not continue it for them.

We have acted honorably, but we cannot defend people who are not willing to defend themselves. And a government which cannot gain the support and confidence of the people cannot act for the people.

RESTRICTED EXPORTS OF HIDES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the recent action by the Department of Commerce to restrict exports of cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leathers has resulted in loss to everyone but the shoe manufacturers.

A cattle hide from a 1,200-pound steer weighs about 78 pounds and the effect of the order will cost the cattleman about $3 or $4 per head. The consumer, based on recently announced shoe prices, will be paying $2 or $3 more per pair.

I have a letter from a constituent who has been paying $30 a pair for a special shoe for some time. The new price is $34.

The Federal Government will lose dollar sales of hides for export, which will further reduce our balance of payments.

Hides are the most important byproduct of cattle slaughter. The last figures I have available are for the year 1963, at which time shipment of hides from cattle processing plants was valued at $150 million.

Less than 2 years ago Government officials were urging industry to step up its efforts to export beef in order to strengthen the market for cattle. While export markets for fresh beef have not materialized, hide sales abroad have expanded. In view of their importance, it is difficult to see why hide exports are not as welcome as beef.

Granting that there is concern regarding the mounting fires of inflation, it appears most inappropriate that hides would be singled out as a scapegoat, simply because they are a commodity on which machinery happened to be available for imposing a regulation that would depress prices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two tables published by the U.S. Department of Commerce in regard to the U.S. cattle hide supply and disappearance and U.S. cattle hide exports.

I also ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Those Hide Export Quotas," which was published in the Washington Post of April 13, 1966.

There being no objection, the tables and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. cattle hide supply and disappearance

[In millions of hides]

Item	1962	1963	1964	1965 preliminary	1966	
					No quotas	With quotas
Appearance from:						
Commercial cattle slaughter	26.1	27.2	30.8	32.3	31.8	
Other domestic sources [1]	3.1	2.2	3.3	3.8	3.1	
Imports	.4	.3	.2	.2	.2	
Total	29.6	29.7	34.3	36.3	35.1	
Disappearance:						
Exports of cattle hides	7.1	8.0	11.5	13.3	14.0	11.5
Cattle hide leather produced	22.5	21.7	22.8	23.0	21.1	23.6
Total	29.6	29.7	34.3	36.3	35.1	35.1

[1] Includes hides from farm slaughter, fallen animals, and heavy calves, plus net change in inventories at all levels. Note 1966 estimates based on Department of Commerce press release dated Mar. 11, 1966, announcing export quotas for hides.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce and the Tanners' Council.

U.S. cattle hide exports, by destination

[In thousands of hides]

Destination	1965	1964	1962
Western Hemisphere	1,967	1,895	1,170
West Germany	1,235	1,271	571
Netherlands	1,705	1,543	963
United Kingdom	606	316	37
Spain	363	263	51
France	126	146	47
Italy	624	414	63
Scandinavia	78	89	14
Other Western Europe	333	214	42
Russia and Eastern Europe	1,823	676	875
Japan	3,777	3,811	3,008
Turkey	351	469	100
Other	321	396	177
Total	13,309	11,503	7,118

Source: Compiled from U.S. Department of Commerce by the Tanners' Council.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1966]

THOSE HIDE EXPORT QUOTAS

Early in March the administration, disturbed by gathering signs of inflation, imposed quotas on the export of cattle hides, calf and kip skins and the leather made therefrom. The purpose of the action, for which the authority of Export Control Act of 1949 was invoked, is to prevent a shortage of hides that would result in sequential increases in the prices of leather and shoes. But it is already apparent that this hasty intervention by the Government will not yield the desired results.

About 3 weeks after the quotas were imposed by the Commerce Department, it was announced that the shoe industry had promised the Council of Economic Advisers to exercise restraints in pricing so long as the domestic prices of hides and leather are held down by export controls. Two days later, however, the manufacturers participating in the National Shoe Fair announced increases that will add an estimated $1 to $2 a pair to the retail prices of men's and women's shoes.

And while shoe prices advance, the burden of a larger domestic supply of hides falls squarely on the cattle growers. As might have been anticipated, hide prices fell sharply in the domestic markets and rose in the foreign markets that rely upon American exports.

Surely the manufacturers are profiting by the administration's ad hoc attempt to control the price of shoes. But is anyone else? The income of the cattle growers is lower than it otherwise might be. Our foreign trading partners are now compelled to pay higher prices for hides and leather, especially that of lower quality which is not consumed in this country. And U.S. exports are being reduced at a time when a deterioration of the trade balance is feared.

After much protest in Congress, the Department of Commerce has announced a public hearing on April 18 in which all interested parties are invited to submit their views on the export controls. This is indeed a strangely inverted procedure. First the Government interferes with the operation of a highly competitive market. Then it inquires into the effects of intervention, effects that it could have predicted by careful economic analysis. Rather than waste more time and money—to say nothing about the violation of liberal principles in international trade—the export quotas on hides should be quietly abandoned.

THE SCHOOL MILK AND SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appeared on Monday, March 7, in the Minneapolis Tribune, a very interesting editorial entitled, "How To Feed the Schoolchildren." It raises a point which I would hope all of us could consider with care when the Child Nutrition Act is debated. As is the office of every Senator, I am sure, my office has been receiving much correspondence protesting the cutback in the school milk and school lunch programs which are contained in the administration proposals in the Child Nutrition Act.

It is very regrettable, in my judgment, that what could be a most worthwhile addendum to our present authorities should be linked to a retrenchment program directed against operations in our school systems of the excellent school lunch and school milk programs which command such widespread community support.

In fact, last year in my subcommittee there was a consensus of opinion that we ought to proceed also with a school breakfast program, for there are thousands of little boys and girls across this land who go to school every morning without a crumb of breakfast. In fact, our investigation in the District of Columbia showed that there are scores and scores of such children here.

It may be recalled that last year I made a report on the floor of the Senate on the need for a breakfast program. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was questioned as to what could be done under the existing authorizations to provide breakfasts where needed.

I was delighted some weeks ago to read the statement by the President of the United States in support of a school breakfast program. However, I do regret that his request under Child Nutrition Act was coupled with a proposal by the President to cut back the school milk program as well as the lunch program.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I shall press, not for the contraction of the program, but the expansion of the program.

I have been heard to say before, and repeat, that I have always been in favor of food for hungry children in other lands. I shall continue to support it. But I am not going to support a program that will not provide the same food for little boys and girls in the United States who need it just as much as do children in foreign nations. I shall be heard to say more on the subject when we consider the nefarious Foreign Aid bill, which the administration has already sent to Congress.

We need more domestic aid programs, and our money must be used for them instead of for the foreign aid program, where hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money are being squandered. We must divert that waste into good programs in the United States until the foreign aid program is cleaned up. I use the words "cleaned up" advisedly.

I have been moved to make these comments as a result of the editorial which I shall ask to be included in the RECORD relating to the problem of cutting back the milk program for American schoolchildren.

As chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I, of course, have a deep interest in legislation designed to help our schools perform their educational task even though the legislation is considered before other Senate committees. It would be my hope that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as it works upon this proposal, could so change the Child Nutrition Act as introduced as to retain the new and worthwhile concepts while discarding concepts which have their roots in the budgetary rather than the child benefit doctrines.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Mar. 7, 1966]

HOW TO FEED THE SCHOOLCHILDREN

Through the confusion of widespread protest against President Johnson's proposals to cut back Federal support of school lunch programs and the special milk program, it is important to take a clear look at his additional, positive recommendations.

In his child nutrition bill, the President is asking Congress to appropriate funds for feeding schoolchildren who do not get adequate food at home and cannot afford the low-cost, subsidized school lunches and extra milk now served in many of the Nation's schools. His new plan would offer school breakfasts in pilot programs and very inexpensive or free lunches for 1.5 million children. The total new child nourishment program, for which he is asking about $56 million, would include grants for school kitchen and lunchroom facilities in low-income areas, experimental feeding at summer playgrounds, and aid to State education departments for related work.

Children who do not get an adequate breakfast or lunch at home, and who cannot pay the usual school-lunch charge, obviously should have food provided for them. Supplementing their present meager diets will increase their capacity for education as well as their level of health.

But the whole school-lunch subject is complicated and sensitive. How extensive should the food systems be? How should the costs be divided—among parents, local schools, State and Federal Government? If children in low-income, diet-deficient families are to be offered free meals, how are they to be identified and served, along with the paying customers?

Much more useful than complaints at this stage would be calm analysis by officials of separate school districts and State education departments of exactly what is needed today and how it might be achieved. With this kind of information, Congress might be able to redesign the administration bills to suit the circumstances.

FORT VANNOY JOB CORPS INSTALLATION IN GRANTS PASS, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I received two fine letters from Grants Pass, Oreg., expressing praise for the successful operation of the Fort Vannoy Job Corps installation located in that city.

I ask unanimous consent that these letters of commendation, signed by Josephine County Commissioner Donald G. McGregor, together with certain attachments, and by Sister Rita, S.A., Superior, Franciscan Sisters of the Atonement, Grants Pass, be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OREG.,
Grants Pass, Oreg., February 23, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We believe you would be interested in the enclosed letter which we have written to Mr. Charles Stoddard, Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

For the most part, it sums up our feelings concerning the Fort Vannoy Job Corp in its first 6 months of operation. At the time of the decision to place the camp in Grants Pass, there was a great deal of opposition. The letter tries to bring things up to date as to the views now held within the community.

Yours very truly,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
DONALD G. MCGREGOR,
Commissioner.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
JOSEPHINE COUNTY OREG.,
Grants Pass, Oreg., February 23, 1966.

CHARLES STODDARD,
Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STODDARD: The Josephine County Board of Commissioners wish to give you their judgment as to the operation and acceptance of the Fort Vannoy Job Corps by the community in the first 6 months of its life.

1. Following its opening, the vocal opposition to the Job Corps has, for the most part, subsided. Fears as to possible disturbances in the area because of the boys have been allayed. There have been a few minor incidents but no great ones. Kindly note the enclosed recent editorial regarding one potential rumble. We believe people have come to realize that there are both good and bad youngsters in our own community and comparative cross sections of the Job Corps boys and local youths would show about the same proportions of these qualities in each group.

2. We have noted that probably the same proportion of boys in the camp attend the church of their choice as does the general community.

3. The sports program involves contests with various service clubs and other groups and is well received.

4. Some businessmen who at first did not particularly welcome the boys' trade, now are interested in getting their share of it.

5. People are realizing that the camp has the same effect as adding a new industry to the town in the creation of a payroll.

6. The young men are accomplishing their conservation objectives in doing stream clearance, trail building and other projects.

7. Citizens who have taken the time to observe the educational program have been impressed.

8. Racial prejudice has not been manifested to any extent. The acceptance by the community of other races was one of concern to many at the beginning.

9. The need for a gymnasium, we understand, is being met shortly.

10. We feel that Mr. Stoop and his staff have met the problems of the boys with compassion, discipline and understanding. We believe these are the key factors in making the camp successful.

11. Our feeling in the beginning was that the program was being crowded too hard before adequate guidelines and policies were formulated. As the shakedown period has ended and experience has been accumulated, many of the rough spots can now be wiped out.

12. Vigilance in screening the boys adequately will always be a high priority item. The idealism of the original concept of the Job Corps and the view that this is one way of meeting today's problems of our youth will be completely lost if this vigilance is not constant. We cannot afford to let this program deteriorate into a "boondoggle," a reform school, or detention camp.

Inasmuch as you have had an interest in and much to do with this program, we thought you might like to have our comments concerning the Fort Vannoy camp.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD G. MCGREGOR,
County Commissioner.

[From the Daily Courier (Grants Pass, Oreg.) Feb. 1, 1966]

TEEN RECREATION CENTER: IS ONE REALLY NEEDED?

At a meeting last week of the Josephine County Juvenile Advisory Council, a group of high school students pondered several problems facing them in Grants Pass and offered a few conclusions.

They hit on smoking and drinking and asked for stiff penalties for those who violate the laws.

But possibly of more importance—since it might help to deal with the other two topics—was their answer to the plaintive moan, "We have nothing to do with our time." They suggested the formation of some sort of student recreation center.

The idea is not new to Grants Pass. In years past residents have made several attempts at trying to fill the need. For various reasons, they failed. So, at present, there is no such center, nor is there any particular effort now to provide one. And yet such a facility, if properly run and established "for the kids," not just as an adult operation to which youngsters can come, possibly could solve, or at least reduce, the incidence of other problems facing our teenagers and resulting from their lack of supervised activity.

With this thought in mind, we posed a question to a number of business and civic leaders: Do we really need a youth center? With virtual unanimity, the answer was "Yes."

Some saw it as a panacea, a cure-all for the youthful ills of our community. But most realistically recognized such a development for just what it would be:

It would be a place that would benefit probably a third to a half of our teenagers.

One group, about a third, is too busy and too active now to need any further organized activity. Another group, from a fourth to a third, is too interested in chasing about in cars, drinking, being irresponsible, to be helped by the facility, or at least not immediately.

The remaining group—the one in the middle, so to speak—could use the added recreation and definitely would come out ahead in moral and physical development if it was to be provided.

It would be for such a latter group that the center should be built. And in an area where outdoor recreation—parks, woods, and trails—get such heavy emphasis, an all-weather, indoor recreation center would be a natural and healthy related operation. It also logically follows that it should not be a volunteer operation—one subject to the whims of volunteer interest—but should be a city-county, full-time center, with a full-time director whose sole interest would be the proper care and maintenance of the facility.

Would such a center be used? Certainly it would at first, probably by members of all three of the groups mentioned before. But the too-busy group soon would find it didn't need the building or its activities, while the delinquent, or near-delinquent, group would soon abandon it for a new kind of "kicks," without the "be good or else" rules it would be sure to have.

That would leave the center for the use of those who most need it. And if properly handled, they'd continue to come. To be sure, to guarantee such regular participation, the center could not be governed wholly by adults, for that soon would become a "drag" on the youngsters. If established, it should have its own student government, with rules and regulations drawn up by them, and punishments established by them for violators. And if previous evidence is any guide, this sort of thing usually means pretty strict control, for the kids who write the rules tend to be very protective of what they have.

Of course there are arguments against such a plan. And the latest has been that when the city and county entertained a plea not long ago to alter the old Safeway building to youth recreation operations, interest in the project was insufficient to indicate a clear need.

History also points to previous attempts, and failures, of youth centers, but it also provides the answer to "Why?" For instance, one center that operated in the building where the Hong Kong restaurant now is located, was just what the youths wanted, a place to drop in for a friendly game of pool, ping-pong or dancing. It was a successful failure. It failed because it was operated on too slim a margin, and it went broke.

The building now called the Community Building, at 10th and L Streets, was originated through volunteer impetus, a Hi-Teen Club, and for some time was a roaring success. But the volunteers faded away and the city took over its operation, on something less than a full-time basis. It still exists and is in regular use, but the nature and location make it better suited to adult activities.

Others maintain that school buildings with their gymnasiums and many rooms, could serve the need, but increasing after-school activities, sports, and the natural tendency of many youngsters to avoid school when not in class, work to make that idea impractical.

Recreation is indeed not a cure-all for juvenile delinquency, but history also shows that cities with good juvenile recreation programs have lower delinquency levels. This means, of course, that for a center to be beneficial to the long-range picture, rather than just another place for teens to go, it should be made available for preteens, too, so that the habit can be established. A center may seem to be only a "hang out," but this, too, can be beneficial, for in a good center can be developed proper habits for socializing and in developing many skills.

Virtually everyone we approached on the subject who had real knowledge of centers, not just opinions, pointed out that strong leadership is the key to success. In fact, we might interject, that strong leadership was evidenced recently in our community, and showed how lacking our own children are in this commodity.

We refer to the near riot between local boys and Job Corps youths. The local boys, every sign says, were the instigators of the trouble. They went to the place where the corpsmen were enjoying themselves with the sole purpose of causing trouble. And had the corpsmen not had strong leadership and a firm hand from their leaders, they might have quickly offered back the trouble in kind. But no, they did not. They tried, officers who investigated the mess reported, to avoid all the trouble they could. And they do have good leadership beyond a doubt, for these boys are the very types who could be expected to be problems, since they come from underprivileged circumstances.

In years past, such a center, even if properly operated, might have died a slow death, for the need was not so great. But with Grants Pass and Josephine County expanding as it is, there is every indication today that such a center could be a success.

The officialdom of this region should begin to give some clear and forceful thinking to this project, the need exists; will it be met?

[From the Grants Pass Courier, Feb. 17, 1966]

Shorty's Saga—He Stands Tall in the Job Corps

(By George Curtis)

"Just call me 'Shorty' the stocky young man with the coal black hair said with an infectious grin.

"Well, where are you from?"

"Oh, I'm a short Texan" was the reply.

That was last summer, when Domingo Garza, Jr., of Bay City, Tex., arrived at the Fort Vannoy Job Corps Conservation Center.

But the camp officials and Shorty's fellow corpsmen were to learn that the friendly grin was typical, that Shorty is naturally even tempered and good natured.

At the time, the man welcoming the new recruit gave up on completing the formal two-way introduction, knowing it wasn't really necessary. Now everyone in camp knows Shorty Garza, although some of them prefer to call him by his given name, Domingo. No one has any more friends.

"He's one of the most popular boys in camp," says Jim Stoop, the camp director, pointing out that Shorty, who lives in the "Red Devils" dormitory, represents it on the camp's student council. It's an elective position.

Like most of the corpsmen, Shorty was a high school dropout, and, like all of them, he's here because he was short on opportunity as well as inches. (He stands 4-feet-2).

But Shorty stands high in the affections of his fellows. It may not happen often, but occasionally he loans money to the other boys.

While the Courier reporter was looking at Shorty's collection of rocks, a boy came in to repay $5 he had borrowed. There was no mention of interest.

Shorty's people live on a small farm outside Bay City. His father is a construction worker for a well-known southwestern oil company, raises chickens and turkeys on the side, and keeps a cow for family use.

His father, mother, brother, and two sisters are all taller, Shorty says. Give him a chance and he'll show you pictures of a very pretty sister and cute little nieces and nephews.

"I had a Shetland pony; but I was coming here, so we sold it," Shorty says with regret, going on to explain that "it was too much work for my mother to do, to take care of the pony when I'm not there."

Now one of his hobbies is rock hunting and one of his most prized possessions is a slab of Brazilian agate.

Shorty had found an interesting rock and traded with the man who had the sawed-out piece of agate.

"He let me have the best of the deal," Shorty explains. "I guess he liked me."

The piece of agate, five-eighths of an inch thick and 5 or 6 inches across, is polished on only one side. Shorty plans to polish the other side, then send it home to give his family some idea of the hobbies the boys work on here.

Enthusiasm shines from Shorty's dark eyes when he talks about his rock work, his fishing, and his occasional exploring in the back country.

But life is never all recreation and enjoying hobbies for a Job Corpsman. There is always work, and study.

Shorty works in the camp sign shop, but "pulls KP" as well as anyone when his week for that comes around.

One of Shorty's stanch friends is Andrew (Slim) Smith, 6 feet 6½ inches, from Jacksonville, N.C.

Smith and one other corpsman assist the "CQ," the night security officer "in charge of quarters."

They patrol the camp making bed checks, looking for the occasional sick boy, and making sure that emergency messages, such as night telephone calls from home, reach the boys for whom they are intended.

Some day Domingo Garza, Jr., will go back to Texas. He will certainly have a new outlook on life, and Bay City may seem drab. Yet home ties mean a lot to this young man, and chances are he'll stay among the home folks.

Franciscan Sisters of the Atonement,
Grants Pass, Oreg., March 3, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: In regard to our local Job Corps Center here in Grants Pass, I would like to express my opinion of it. As we have taken a special interest in the boys here, I feel we have learned much about their attitudes and what the Job Corps Center is doing for them. I believe it is a wonderful opportunity for these boys to be better educated and skilled in a trade so that they can go back to their communities and better themselves. Many of the boys have matured in every way. A tremendous program is offered them at the Job Corps Center here. I feel sure that most of the boys appreciate the opportunity they have and will benefit a great deal by it. This is indeed a very worthwhile program for these young boys and it is opening a future for them. They will be better able to help their own communities and in turn, better loyal citizens for this opportunity they now have.

Through a little weekly program we have for the boys at our parish hall, we have come to know many of the boys. We have shown an interest in each individual boy. Some of the boys who have gone on to urban centers have written back to us thanking us for the help we gave them. I think this shows they do appreciate what is being done for them. We can honestly say for our local Fort Vannoy Job Corps Center, they are doing a tremendous job with these boys.

Sincerely,

Sister Rita, S.A.,
Superior, Franciscan Sisters of the Atonement (Social Service and Catechetical Sisters).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when the original Youth Corps legislation was before the Congress in 1959, and Mr. Charles H. Stoddard, now Director of the Bureau of Land Management, was in private life, he was a strong supporter of the Youth Corps program. In fact, he is one of the people who labored long and earnestly to bring about a program that strikes at the roots of poverty. The Fort Vannoy Job Corps project is under the direction of the Bureau of Land Management. Mr. Stoddard, as well as those who operate the Fort Vannoy project, are deserving of high commendation for this admirable facility.

When the disastrous floods of 1964–65 occurred in Oregon, Mr. Stoddard was a moving force behind the successful effort to use Job Corps enrollees to assist in disaster relief. Under his direction, the Bureau of Land Management and the Job Corps did an outstanding job. These boys, by their remarkable performance, sold the program to the people of Oregon.

When the announcement was made that the Fort Vannoy Job Corps camp was to be established, many people in the area expressed their deep concern and urged that the camp be established elsewhere. Those who criticized the Job Corps program, and the Fort Vannoy camp program in particular, should recognize that Director Stoddard and his staff have given dedicated service to advance this valuable program.

The Job Corps program is one that has fine objectives and deserves support from all segments of our society. Of course, there may be honest differences of opinion as to how the program should be conducted. There are problems that must be resolved, but I am confident that they will be resolved.

No program that seeks to meet the needs of those who have not had the advantage of opportunities for training and education is one that can be operated easily.

In fairness, we should apply the test of looking at the overall record of these projects. I am satisfied that the record of Fort Vannoy is excellent. As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I express the hope that the Office of Economic Opportunity and the agencies associated in the Job Corps program will make needed improvements as the facts require. In my view, there is a need to make sure that every young man who can benefit from the program is given a chance to be considered for it. It is of equal importance that the screening process bring to the Job Corps camps and Job Corps centers young men who are constructively motivated.

One aspect of this program that was widely discussed when the Job Corps legislation was considered was whether or not young men who had run afoul of the law should be admitted to the program. Clearly, they were not to be excluded, but the charge Congress gave the Office of Economic Opportunity was that of using prudence and good judgment to give opportunity to those who are deserving and who can benefit from this opportunity. If this course is followed the goals of the Job Corps program will be realized and the Nation will benefit tremendously.

My sincere congratulations go to Director Stoddard and all of the Federal officials and employees whose teamwork has brought success in the operation of the Fort Vannoy Job Corps installation.

OREGON STATE LAND SELECTIONS AND PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND CLASSIFICATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the act of Congress admitting Oregon to the Union, like the acts admitting the other States provided for grants of lands to the State for schools.

Under the Admission Act, Oregon is entitled to 2 sections in each township of 36 sections. However, for various reasons the two sections were not always available for the State to select. Thus, the Congress wisely provided for selections in lieu of those originally intended.

These selections are made from the public domain lands—the lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management. They are not made from public domain in national forests or parks or other areas such as the revested Oregon and California grant lands. In fact, one of the reasons for the existence of in lieu selections was the earlier creation of national forests and parks as well as the homesteading of lands located in section 16 or 36, the sections granted to the State upon admission.

Oregon still has about 8,000 acres of outstanding selections due her to complete her grant.

In the period up through 1962, progress was made in granting these selections. In that year the Oregon Division of the Bureau of Land Management declined to act further on pending selections.

The Governor of Oregon, Mr. Hatfield, stated the situation succinctly at a public meeting in Portland on May 14, 1965, where he was criticizing the Department of the Interior for even thinking about making exchanges of Oregon timberlands in aid of a Point Reyes, Calif., park.

The Governor said that the State's selection applications were vetoed by the State Bureau of Land Management Director on the basis that the lands selected by Oregon for such an exchange had been permanently withdrawn for sustained yield purposes. The Governor also said:

> We somewhat begrudgingly accepted this philosophy in the interest of sustained yield policy.

I initiated a request on the status of these selections when, last summer and fall, reports appeared in the Oregon press that the State's selection applications might now be granted.

On April 28, 1965, when protesting a possible Point Reyes exchange, Governor Hatfield wrote Secretary Udall that there were then "no operative regulations" to carry out an act the Congress passed in 1964, known as the Classification and Multiple Use Act. The Governor urged that "the overall question of classification of these lands in western Oregon should be aired in public meetings after the regulations under this act have been promulgated."

I was, therefore, pleased to be informed by a letter dated March 23, 1966, that the Bureau of Land Management intends to go forward with public meetings under its Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964.

One meeting is to be held at Newport on April 25, another at Tillamook on April 26, and another at Reedsport on April 27. I shall include this letter in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

As I mentioned earlier, because of my concern that actions taken on selections be fully understood by the people of Oregon, and in view of the confusion existing, on November 16, 1965, I asked the Bureau of Land Management to supply me with a history of past and pending State selections. At that time I also urged broad public discussions prior to taking action on pending selections.

Now that the applicable regulations are operative, I believe the April 25, 26, and 27 discussions should deal specifically with the best long-term use for the 250,000 acres of public domain land in western Oregon.

Recently, a suggestion was made to my Oregon office manager, Mr. Brooks, that I urge the Department of the Interior not to hold these hearings contemplated under the 1964 law and regulations as they relate to State selections.

The public interest is never served by restricting or short circuiting the public's right to knowledge of the public's business.

Therefore I was pleased to be assured that Secretary Udall continues to be in agreement on the wisdom of the fullest use of public notice and hearing procedure provided for by the Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964 and the regulations implementing this act. The application of these procedures to the western Oregon public domain will, in the long run, be beneficial to Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the following pertinent material:

First. A letter dated October 11, 1962, from Governor Hatfield to BLM State Director Getty.

Second. Proposed decision of the Oregon Bureau of Land Management regarding State selections.

Third. A letter dated February 11, 1965, from the office of the Director of BLM to the State Director in Oregon returning the proposed decision of the State Director for reconsideration.

Fourth. My letter dated November 16, 1965, to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

Fifth. Responses dated December 29, 1965, and February 14, 1966, with enclosures, from the Bureau of Land Management.

Sixth. Pertinent material from the Federal Register of October 9, 1965, title 43—Public Lands: Programs and Objectives; Sales and Exchanges; Land Classification.

Seventh. Letter of March 23, 1966, to Senator Morse from BLM State Director Getty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 through 7.)

Mr. MORSE. These materials are made available in the public interest. They are designed to help the people of Oregon consider the question of State selections as a part of the broader issue; namely, the best classification of all of these public domain lands.

Of particular note in the BLM letter dated February 14, 1966, are numbered items 2 and 5. These show that under Oregon Revised Statutes section 273.620 a number of requests were made in 1957 and 1958 for a total of 880 acres in Coos and Douglas Counties. These selections were granted in 1959 and 1962.

On these lands the State passed the title to private individuals at the price provided by State law—$2.50 per acre—or at a total of about $2,200. These lands, according to the BLM, contained 27 million board feet of timber valued at $847,000. Their disposal reduced BLM's allowable cut by 1,100,000 board feet of timber a year and at current timber value, reduced annual income alone by possibly $35,000 to $40,000.

There are pending two additional applications of this same type totaling 713 acres. One for about 78 acres was filed on August 14, 1962, for lands in Curry County and the other, which is for 635 acres, was filed April 23, 1965, and lies in Coos and Curry Counties. These filings were made by the State Land Board of Oregon. If granted, the 713 acres will be transferred to the State. What the State plans to do with this acreage, if acquired, is not known to me, but in my opinion the Oregon hearings should make it clear, beyond the shadow of a doubt, as to whether these lands might be transferred by the State to private applicants at a price of about $1,800.

The BLM says that the allowable cut will be affected by a reduction of 400,000 board feet per annum. If these applications are approved, the State of Oregon will take 37 million board feet of timber valued at $1,357,000. We are entitled to know whether, under the pending application, this timber land could be granted to individuals for $1,800.

Numbered items 3 and 6 in the February 14, 1966, letter set forth the land values on granted and pending selections still held by the State of Oregon.

The 17 approved selections involved 10,100 acres—47.7 million board feet of timber valued at $12 million. These selections reduced BLM's allowable cut by 11,300,000 board feet a year.

The 13 pending selections involve 7,993 acres and 24.3 million board feet valued at $9,390,000. If granted, the BLM allowable cut would be reduced by 6.2 million board feet annually.

It is my hope that this material will be carefully considered by the people in western Oregon so that the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Oregon will receive appropriate comments from interested individuals. The planned public meetings on the overall classification of public lands for disposal or retention should lay all of the facts on the table. The State of Oregon, of course, will have to consider whether it wants to continue to press to receive the 713 acres it seeks if the outcome would be that for $1,800 it could divest itself of almost $1½ million in timber values.

I want the people of Oregon to know that it is my understanding of the law that the State's right to seek these indemnity lands is clear. I also want the people of Oregon to know that the Secretary of the Interior, however, does have discretion as to particular tracts he will agree to transfer to the State.

Finally, it is pertinent that Governor Hatfield stated in his October 11, 1962, letter to the Oregon BLM that the lands to be selected were "determined and designated through the cooperation of your office." As far as I know there were no public hearings then. Therefore, public hearings and review as provided in the 1964 act should be of considerable assistance in determining whether these tentative private agreements were proper. These agreements were apparently privately reached by the State of Oregon and the Oregon BLM in 1961–62, then rescinded by the Oregon BLM—all without public hearings. Now the entire subject will be open to public review.

I am proud that the record shows that the senior Senator from Oregon was insistent in calling for these public hearings, for in my many years in the Senate I have insisted that there be full public disclosure of the public's business. One of the reasons why we are living through some of the most critical hours in the history of this Republic is that too much of the public's business is being concealed from the public, not only in the field of domestic issues, but of foreign issues, as well.

Large questions of public policy are at stake. The State of Oregon is entitled to its remaining selections. The burden, however, is on the State and especially the Governor, who is chairman of the State land board, to inform the people of the stewardship he proposes over the $10 million worth of Federal timberland he seeks.

Exhibit 1

(Letter from Governor Hatfield to BLM State Director Getty)

State of Oregon,
Office of the State Land Board,
Salem, Oreg., October 11, 1962.

Mr. Russell E. Getty,
Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Portland, Oreg.

Dear Mr. Getty: By letter dated September 20, 1962, you advised us of the notice of proposed withdrawal and reservation of lands set forth in the Federal Register on September 7, 1962. We note that you request comments, suggestions, or objections to this proposed withdrawal.

As you know, we filed our lieu land selections Oregon 011382 to 011394, inclusive, with your department on March 9, 1961. Your office has taken no action with regard thereto even though the lands encompassed were determined and designated through the cooperation of your office and our State forester. Some 5 days after filing our selection, the Secretary of the Interior instructed the Director, Bureau of Land Management, to reexamine the public domain forest lands "to determine which should be set aside permanently in the interest of forest management." You advised that on June 30, 1961, a policy decision was arrived at "which committed the commercial public domain lands in western Oregon to combined management with O. & C. and CBWR lands."

The selections were made pursuant to the act of February 14, 1859, (11 Stat. 383, sec. 4) admitting Oregon into the Union. It is our interpretation of this act and the provisions of 43 USCA 851 and 852 that there is an obligation owing by the United States to the State of Oregon which can only be fulfilled by allowing our selections of March 9, 1961. (*United States* v. *Morrison,* 240 US 192, 60 L Ed 599, 36, S Ct. 326.)

It is also our position that the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847; 43 USC 141) as amended and Executive Order No. 10355 of May 26, 1952, do not confer authority to avoid this obligation of the United States to the State of Oregon.

The State of Oregon, by and through its State land board, hereby objects to the withdrawal for the above reasons. To pursue this course of withdrawal is to seriously impede and to even prevent the United States from honoring its solemn compact to the State of Oregon under the Admissions Act of 1859, which compact was duly ratified by both parties. A compact between a State and the Union is within the constitutional prohibition against impairment of obligations arising by contract.

It is hoped that this impasse can be resolved without further delay and inconvenience to all.

Sincerely yours,

Mark O. Hatfield,
Governor and Land Commissioner.

Exhibit 2

(Proposed decision of Oregon Bureau of Land Management regarding State selections)

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, D.C.

Re Oregon 012753, Oregon 011382 to 011394, inclusive, (6.0) 100.7m.

State of Oregon,
State Land Board,
Capitol Building,
Salem, Oreg.

Gentlemen: The above identified State indemnity selection applications filed in the Portland Land Office under the acts of February 14, 1859 (11 Stat. 383) and August 27, 1958 as amended (72 Stat. 928; 43 U.S.C. 851, 852) embrace approximately 8,200 acres. The selected lands are forested public domain intermingled with O. & C. lands, and are within sustained yield timber management areas in Clatsop, Tillamook, Lincoln, Marion, Coos, and Curry Counties.

Application Oregon 011390 is rejected as to the NE¼SW¼ sec. 27, T. 1 N., R. 9 W., W.M., and Oregon 011391 is rejected as to the NW¼SW¼ sec. 27, T. 1 N.. R. 9 W., W.M., for the reason that these lands are patented.[1]

All of the applications are rejected in their entirety for the reason that it is not in the public interest to classify the lands as proper for indemnity selections. They are required for established forest management programs to which the Bureau of Land Management is committed. Removal of these lands from Federal ownership would have an adverse effect on the combined O. & C. and public domain program.

By Executive Order 6910, November 26, 1934, the lands sought were withdrawn and reserved for classification, and pending determination of the most useful purpose to which such land may be put in consideration of the provisions of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), and for conservation and development of the natural resources. Section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act, as amended (43 U.S.C., 1952 ed., sec. 315f), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to examine and classify lands so withdrawn. In exercising the discretionary authority vested in him, the Secretary or his delegate may properly consider and weigh all factors which have a bearing on the suitability of the lands for the use sought as well as other uses for which the lands are suited. Cf. *Nelson A. Gerttula,* 64 I.D. 225 (1957).

An application or a petition for classification of the public lands secures no right for the applicant other than the right to have his application duly considered. John R. Ross et al, A–27259 (Mar. 12, 1956). The selection right under the acts invoked is no exception. See State of California, A–27752 (Jan. 7, 1959). Although the Department recognizes the right of the State to select vacant public lands, the selection right carries with it no right to a particular tract of land. Refusal to classify and open lands as requested in a particular selection is neither to repudiate nor to destroy the selection right. It continues unimpaired and will be permitted to be satisfied when exercised with reference to lands which meet the statutory conditions.

The selected lands are valuable timber lands distributed throughout four public land management areas and are for the most part intermingled with or adjacent to O. & C. lands. On July 1, 1961, the vacant public lands within these management areas were combined with the O. & C. lands for the purpose of optimum intensive management and timber production. This permits management of the public domain lands to the same high degree of intensity as are the O. & C. lands. They can properly be used as a means of assuring the future timber production and thereby promote the stability of the forest industry and dependent communities as prescribed by the O. & C. Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874). Under these circumstances it is reasonable and in accord with general congressional policy not to classify these lands as proper for indemnity selections.

The situation is similar to that in State of California, A–26933 (Aug. 10, 1954), in which a State application was rejected and the rejection upheld by the Secretary because the selected lands were timbered and within an area of other timbered lands which the Bureau proposed to manage under a sustained yield program. That decision was based on a proposed timber management plan, not one already in effect and to which the Bureau of Land Management is committed as is the case with these lands in western Oregon. Disposal of the selected lands involved in the subject applications would have a serious adverse overall impact upon the existing management programs. It is imperative that all of the forested public domain lands in western Oregon be retained in support of these management plans.

This decision constitutes a final administrative determination in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,
Director.

Approved: (date).
Secretary of the Interior.
Enclosures: Circs. 2024, 2059, 2085

Exhibit 3

(Letter from office of Director of BLM to the State Director in Oregon returning the proposed decision of the State Director for reconsideration)

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1965.

Memorandum.
To: SD Oregon.
From: Director.
Subject: State Selections, Oregon 012753, 011382 to 011394, inclusive.

We have reviewed your proposed decision relative to the above applications for selection. Please reconsider these cases in view of the following:

---

[1] The following curable defects are also noted. All of these applications omit the statement required by 43 CFR 270.3(c)(4). In addition, application Oregon 012753 fails to cite the act of August 27, 1953, as required by 43 CFR 270.3(c)(1). Further, Oregon 011387 requires additional base to replace 40 acres defective base for the SE¼SE¼ sec. 34, T. 11 S., R. 8 W., and Oregon 011388 requires replacement of 18.85 acres defective base for the SE¼SE¼ sec. 6, T. 12 S., R. 8 W., and the SW¼SE¼ sec. 23, T. 1 N. R. 10 W., W.M. Oregon.

1. About 4,800 acres of the lands have been identified as being in transition areas by your initial analysis (three-way designation). The remainder are fringe tracts within the better blocked areas.

2. The position paper used in the December 1964 discussions of the Director with the Oregon State director and his lands and mineral chief, particularly paragraph 3.

3. Unsatisfied State grants are outstanding obligations. The sooner we can satisfy them, the sooner we can eliminate them as a pressing management problem.

The case records are returned.

IRVING SENZEL,
(For the Director).

EXHIBIT 4

(Letter of November 16, 1965 addressed to BLM Director Stoddard by Senator MORSE)

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., November 16, 1965.

Mr. CHARLES STODDARD,
Director, Bureau of Land Management,
Department of Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STODDARD: Will you please furnish my office with the following information for the years 1953 to the latest period available in 1965:

(1) A list of lands patented to the State of Oregon under either State selections or State indemnity selections, including date of application.

(2) A statement for each such tract showing county, acreage, type of land, approximate value, and if timbered, (a) the approximate volume, (b) whether timbered by old growth or second growth, (c) the date title vested in the State, (d) whether or not the tract had been managed by the BLM for sustained yield and multiple use either as a policy or practice, by regulation or by law, and (c) the "approximate allowable cut" the tract had or would have had under BLM management.

In addition, I understand that there are now pending a number of selections by the State of Oregon. Will you supply comparable data for all these lands whether formally under such application or under discussion.

It is my suggestion that action to approve a selection be taken only after there has been a full disclosure of information setting forth:

(1) The tracts, their location and the kind of land.

(2) The volume and value of the timber and other resources and the allowable cut.

(3) Written statements from authorized State officials as to whether or not the granting of a selection will or will not provide for the sustained yield multiple use management of the lands requested, if the land is timbered.

(4) A statement of the meetings that have been held between the BLM and the State or with other interested groups.

(5) Other pertinent information deemed essential to the public's being properly informed.

As a part of this disclosure, I suggest that the Bureau of Land Management give a 30-day public notice, and notice to the Oregon congressional delegation of the time and place designated for a public hearing.

In view of the concern that has been expressed to me on this and other related matters, I feel it necessary to make this request. In so doing, I wish to point out that if the Department of the Interior had agreed to extend to Oregon the field hearings, I requested earlier on the Multiple Use Act, I think that there would be today a much clearer understanding on many problems in this specific field.

A response by December 15 will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

EXHIBIT 5(a)

(December 29, 1965, letter addressed to Senator MORSE by BLM Director Stoddard)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D.C. December 29, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Regarding your request of November 16, 1965, for information on lands and resources in Oregon for the years 1953 to the latest period available in 1965, our State director has advised that due to a delay in obtaining certain records from storage, all the data requested is not yet available. This statistical data will be furnished as soon as possible.

As to other matters in your letter, we wholeheartedly agree with your procedural suggestions for the processing of applications for State selections. In fact, our regulations and procedures issued to implement the Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964 and otherwise to improve our land classification operations call for "participation of the public and consultation with local government * * *." See, for example, section 1725.2b of the enclosed regulations.

In connection with pending State applications for selection, on October 12 we requested our State director for Oregon to institute our public-participation land-transfer procedures on a county-by-county basis. A copy of our memorandum is enclosed, as well as copies of our procedural instruction memorandums. We believe that these cover substantially the objectives of your specific recommendations. They provide for full disclosure of all information that might be of interest to the public.

Our regulations and procedures are designed to give adequate notice to all interested parties of all proposed classifications. Publication in the Federal Register and in a local newspaper is required for all proposals involving more than 2,560 acres, whether or not the lands are in one or more separate parcels. Public hearings are required in all proposals involving more than 25,000 acres or, if the area is not that large, where sufficient public interest exists. Notice of all public meetings scheduled under our land classification program has to be sent to the chairmen of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees and the Public Land Law Review Commission. We agree with you that it would be sound policy to send it to all members of a congressional delegation. Thirty-day advance notice appears entirely reasonable.

We will incorporate your suggestion in our next revision of the present instructions. We have notified the State director for Oregon of your suggestion and of our approval.

As soon as the material needed to answer your three questions has been assembled it will be transmitted to you. We are in complete agreement that public understanding of the effect the granting of this or other large applications will have on public programs is essential. No decision has been reached by me on whether the States' application should be agreed to or rejected either in whole or in part. In reaching a decision we will do so utilizing the five criteria you suggest. Your continued interest in sound land use policy is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O. CROW
(For Charles H. Stoddard, *Director*).

EXHIBIT 5(b)

(Letter dated February 14 addressed to Senator MORSE by BLM Director Stoddard, together with two tabulations designated as app. I and app. II on Oregon State selections)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in further response to your letter of November 16, 1965, concerning Oregon State selections. The enclosed tabulations were prepared by our Oregon State office. Data on applications for selection were secured from the case records. Timber volumes were estimated from inventory records. The value of the timber was based on the quarterly average of Bureau of Land Management timber sales in the district in which the timber was located. Land values were computed uniformly at $30 per acre.

Included as enclosures are: Two tabulations; five maps; two letters from the clerk of the office of the State land board, Oregon, relating to the management of State forested lands; and copies of ORS 530.450–530.520, the State's school land management law, and of ORS 273.620, its law dealing with disposal of certain indemnity lands.

Appendix No. I is a tabulation of lands deeded to the State of Oregon pursuant to State land grants during the period 1953 through 1965. The tabulation gives the serial number of the applications for selection, the date of such applications, the date the land was conveyed, the county in which they are located, their acreage, whether the timber thereon on the date of conveyance was old growth or second growth, the approximate volume of such timber, the estimated annual allowable cut represented by the conveyed timber, and the estimated value of the lands and timber.

Appendix No. II is a tabulation giving similar information for lands at present under application for selection by the State. The State director has not reported any lands as being under discussion. This and the preceding tabulation do not contain the answer to your question whether each "transaction has been managed by the BLM for sustained yield and multiple use, either as a policy or practice, by regulation or law." A management program for forested public domain lands was started in the 1940's. Authorizations and appropriations have been modest in amount and acceleration.

Gradually the quality of forest management, particularly in western Oregon, has been vastly improved. June 30, 1961, the western Oregon public domain was combined with the revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands and the reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands for the purposes of forest management on a sustained-yield, multiple-use basis, subject to the multitude of public land laws and regulations. In that sense, and with those limitations, the answer to your question is affirmative for each tract.

The tabulations, in summary, show:

1. Twenty applications for selection were approved during the period in question. Three of these were applied for in 1957 and 1958 pursuant to ORS 273.260. The remaining 17 were applied for in 1954 by the State under ORS 530.450 et seq.

2. The three ORS 273.260 selections involved 880 acres, 27 million board feet (1.1 million board feet annual allowable cut), valued at $847,000.

3. The remaining 17 approved selections involved 10,100 acres, 47.7 million board feet (11.3 million board feet annual allowable cut), valued at $12 million.

4. Fifteen applications for selection are pending. Two of these were applied for pursuant to ORS 273.260—one in 1962 and one in 1965. The remaining 13 were applied for in 1961 by the State under ORS 530.450 et seq.

5. The two ORS 273.260 selections involve 713 acres, 37 million board feet 400,000 board feet annual allowable cut), valued at $1,357,000.

6. The remaining 13 pending selections involve 7,993 acres, 243 million board feet (6.2 million board feet annual allowable cut), valued at $9,390,000.

The five maps show the location of the tracts listed in the two tabulations. Also shown on the maps are lands administered by the BLM, and forest lands reported as being held by the State of Oregon near the lands for which it applied.

If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. STODDARD,
Director.

APPENDIX I

Oregon State lieu selections—Approved

Serial No.	Date of application	Date title vested	Township and range	Section	Subdivision	County	Acreage	Timber growth	Timber volume (thousand board feet)	Allowable cut (thousand board feet)	Total land and timber value
03294	Apr. 28, 1954	Apr. 24, 1961	24 S., 10 W	6	Lot 4	Coos	17.36	Old	1,120	15	$28,520
			24 S., 11 W	20	Lots 2, 4, 5, 6	do	179.33	do	11,567	150	294,555
						Total	196.69		12,687	165	323,075
03295	do	Nov. 26, 1956	4 N., 8 W	6	N½SE¼, SE¼SE¼	Clatsop	120.00	2d	4,480	114	133,520
				18	W½NE¼, NE¼NW¼	do	120.00	do	180	114	8,820
			4 N., 9 W	2	Lot 2, NW¼SE¼	do	80.01	Old	3,960	76	117,240
			4 N., 10 W	15	SE¼	do	160.00	do	7,920	151	234,480
			5 N., 8 W	10	NE¼NE¼	do	40.00	do	1,980	38	58,620
				31	NW¼NE¼	do	40.00	2d	60	38	2,940
			7N., 7W	13	E½NE¼	do	80.00	do	0	76	2,400
						Total	640.01		18,580	607	558,020
03296	do	Nov. 19, 1959	1 N., 6 W	10	E½SW¼, SW¼SW¼, W½SE¼	Tillamook	200.00	2d		190	6,000
			2 N., 9 W	29	SW¼NE¼, NW¼NW¼	do	80.00	Old	3,960	76	125,160
				30	NE¼NE¼	do	40.00	do	1,980	38	62,580
			3 N., 9 W	10	NW¼NE¼	do	40.00	do	1,980	38	62,580
			4 N., 8 W	17	Lots 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11	Clatsop	235.52	2d	8,714	223	277,134
			9 S., 4 E	26	NE¼SW¼	Marion	40.00	do		20	1,200
						Total	635.52		16,634	585	534,654
03297	do	do	2 N., 5 W	4	SE¼NW¼	Washington	40.00	2d		38	1,200
				34	NW¼SW¼	do	40.00	Old	1,980	38	62,580
			3 N., 4 W	2	N½SW¼, SE¼SW¼	do	120.00	2d	4,440	114	141,240
			3 N., 5 W	24	NW¼SW¼	do	40.00	do	1,480	38	47,080
			4 N., 4 W	27	NE¼SW¼	Columbia	40.00	do	60	38	3,060
			5 N., 4 W	8	NW¼NE¼	do	40.00	Old	1,980	38	62,580
			5 N., 5 W	6	Lot 2-3	do	80.21	2d	120	76	6,120
			9 S., 4 E	27	NW¼NE¼, N½NW¼, NW¼SE¼	Marion	160.00	do		80	4,800
			9 S., 4 E	28	NE¼NE¼	do	40.00	do		20	1,200
						Total	600.21		10,060	480	329,860
03298	do	May 23, 1961	23 S; 12 W	1	Lots 1, 2, 3, 4	Coos	157.99	Old	5,160	135	133,740
				2	Lots 1, 2, 3	do	119.25	do	7,692	100	196,880
				11	NE¼SE¼	do	40.00	do	2,580	35	65,700
				12	W½SE¼, SE¼SE¼	do	120.00	do	7,740	100	197,100
				25	E½SE¼	do	80.00	do	5,160	70	131,400
				27	SE¼SE¼	do	40.00	do	2,580	35	65,700
			24 S; 11 W	29	Lots 3, 4	do	82.59	do	5,327	70	135,655
						Total	63,983		36,239	545	925,175
03299	do	do	23 S; 12 W	13	NE¼, E½NW¼	Coos	240.00	Old	15,480	210	394,200
				24	E½SW¼, N½SE¼	do	160.00	do	10,320	140	262,800
				30	SE¼SW¼	do	40.00	do	2,580	35	65,700
				34	E½NE¼, S½SW¼, NE¼SE¼	do	200.00	do	12,900	175	328,500
						Total	640.00		41,280	560	1,051,200
03300	do	Feb. 10, 1960	23 S., 12 W	34	S½SE¼	Coos	80.00	Old	5,160	70	188,160
				35	NW¼NW¼, S½NW¼, N½SW¼, N½SE¼.	do	280.00	do	180,60	245	658,560
			24 S., 10 W	6	Lots 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11	do	273.45	do	17,638	230	643,168
						Total	633.45		40,858	545	1,489,888
03301	do	Apr. 10, 1961	24 S., 11 W	15	W½SW¼	Coos	80.00	Old	5,160	70	131,400
				21	NE¼NW¼	do	40.00	do	2,580	35	65,700
			24 S., 12 W	1	Lots 5, 6, SW¼NE¼, SE¼NW¼	do	171.28	do	1,104	145	32,740
				2	Lots 2, 3, 4, 7, SE¼SW¼	do	205.50	do	13,255	175	337,545
				3	SE¼SE¼	do	40.00	do	2,580	35	65,700
				9	SE¼SE¼	do	40.00	do	2,580	35	65,700
				10	Lots 1, 2	do	62.07	2d	2,234	88	57,750
						Total	638.85		29,493	583	756,535
03302	do	Aug. 12, 1957	24 S., 12 W	10	Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, SW¼NE¼, N½SW¼, NW¼SE¼.	Coos	329.00	Old	21,221	275	582,837
				15	Lots 1, 4, SE¼SE¼	do	106.40	do	6,863	90	188,491
				22	NW¼NE¼	do	40.00	2d	304	8	9,408
				26	NW¼NW¼	do	40.00	Old	2,580	35	70,860
				27	Lot 1	do	36.37	do	2,346	35	64,432
						Total	551.77		33,314	443	916,028
03303	do	Apr. 24, 1961	24 S., 12 W	11	Lot 1, NE¼, NE¼NW¼, S½NW¼, S½.	Coos	639.27	do	41,283	535	1,050,005
03304	do	May 5, 1961	24 S., 12 W	12	Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, W½E½, W½	do	636.80	do	41,074	535	1,045,950

APPENDIX I—Continued

Oregon State lieu selections—Approved—Continued

Serial No.	Date of application	Date title vested	Township and range	Section	Subdivision	County	Acreage	Timber growth	Timber volume (thousand board feet)	Allowable cut (thousand board feet)	Total land and timber value
03305	Apr. 28, 1954	May 5, 1961	24 S., 12 W.	13	Lot S1, 2, 3, 4, 5, SW¼NE¼, S½NW¼, S½.	Coos	617.14	Old	398.06	520	$1,013,650
03306	do	June 22, 1961	24 S., 12 W.	14	NE¼, S½NW¼, N½SE¼, SE¼SE¼	do	360.00	2d	2,736	77	79,200
				15	S½NE¼, NE¼NW¼, SE¼SW¼, N½SE¼, SW¼SE¼.	do	280.00	Old	18,060	245	459,900
						Total	640.00		20,796	322	539,100
03307	do	June 24, 1957	4 N., 9 W.	13	W½NE¼, E½NW¼	Clatsop	160.00	2d	5,920	76	152,800
			4 N., 10 W.	22	NE¼	do	160.00	Old	7,920	151	202,800
				23	NW¼	do	160.00	do	7.920	151	202,800
			5 N., 7 W.	25	SW¼SW¼	do	40.00	2d	1,480	38	38,200
			5 N., 8 W.	32	SE¼NE¼, E½NW¼	do	120.00	do	60	38	5,100
						Total	640.00		23,300	454	601,700
03308	do	May 17, 1961	2S., 10W.	11	NW¼SW¼	Tillamook	40.00	Old	1,980	38	52,680
			3S., 10W.	24	W½NW¼	do	80.00	do	2,960	76	79,360
				25	SE¼NE¼, NE¼SE¼	do	80.00	2d	120	76	5,520
			4 N., 8W.	7	Lot 1, NE¼NE¼, NE¼NW¼	Clatsop	88.21	do		84	2,650
				8	Lot S 13, 14	do	78.52	do	2,942	75	78,842
			7 N., 6W.	27	SE¼SW¼, S½SE¼	do	120.00	do		114	3,600
						Total	486.73		8,002	463	222,652
03309	do	Feb. 9, 1962	25 S., 12 W.	14	S½NE¼, NE¼SW¼, N½SE¼	Coos	200.00	Old	12,900	2,800	354,300
				24	SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼, SW¼SW¼, SE¼.	do	320.00	do	20,640	280	566,880
				25	NE¼NE¼, E½SE¼	do	120.00	2d	4,320	171	116,640
						Total	640.00		37,860	3,251	120,240
03310	do	Apr. 24, 1961	10 S., 3 E.	10	NE¼SE¼	Linn	40.00	2d	1,200	20	32,400
			24 S., 11 W.	21	SW¼NW¼	Coos	40.00	do	0	0	1,200
				30	N½NE¼	do	80.00	do	2,880	114	74,400
			25 S., 11 W.	3	Lot 2	do	37.87	do	288	8	8,340
				18	SE¼SW¼, SW¼SE¼	do	80.00	do	2,880	114	74,400
				19	Lot S 3, 4, E½SW¼, NE¼NW¼	do					
					NW¼SE¼	do	240.20	2d	8,647	342	224,822
				30	Lot S3, 6	do	78.64	do	2,831	112	73,606
						Total	596.71		18,726	710	489,168
[1] 05957	Dec. 20, 1957	Jan. 16, 1962	30 S., 13 W.	21	SW¼SE¼	Coos	40.00	2d	1,440	57	40,080
				22	NW¼NE¼	do	40.00	Old	2,580	35	70,860
						Total	80.00		40,020	92	110,940
[1] 06455	Sept. 5, 1958	July 6, 1957	26 S., 8 W.	26	NW¼	Douglas	160.00	2d	4,592	200	147,152
				28	SE¼SW¼, SW¼SE¼	do	80.00	do	2,296	100	73,576
						Total	240.00		6,888	300	220,728
[1] 06456	do	do	26 S., 8 W.	28	N½ N½S½, SW¼SW¼, SE¼SE¼	Douglas	560.00	2d	16,072	700	515,032
						Grand total	10,952.98		504,170	12,395	12,813,600

[1] ORS 273.260.

APPENDIX II

Pending Oregon State lieu selections

Serial No.	Date of application	Township and range	Section	Subdivision	County	Acreage	Timber growth	Timber volume (thousand board feet)	Allowable cut (thousand board feet)	Total land and timber value
011383	Mar. 9, 1961	22 S., 12 N.	24	Lots 2, 3, 4	Douglas	120.37	Old	7,764	174	$284,304
		24 S., 11 W.	16	E½SW¼	Coos	80.00	do	2,580	6	96,080
			20	NE¼SE¼	do	40.00	2d	848	11	32,128
			30	Lot 1	do	60.57	Old	2,580	6	95,280
		4 N., 8 W.	14	Lot S5, 6	Clatsop	78.76	2d		77	3,150
		5 N., 9 W.	27	NW¼NE¼	do	40.00	do	1,180	39	42,900
			34	NE¼NE¼	do	40.00	do	1,180	39	42,900
		9 S., 8 W.	30	NE¼SW¼	Polk	40.00	do	615	38	23,125
			33	N½NE¼	do	80.00	Old	3,334	43	119,890
					Total	579.70		20,081	433	739,757
011384	do	9 S., 8 W.	28	S½S½	Polk	160.00	Old	9,929	128	353,880
		10 S., 7 W.	6	S½NE¼	do	80.00	do	5,928	76	210,680
			8	SE¼	Benton	160.00	2d		121	6,400
			18	NE¼SW¼, SE¼SE¼	do	80.00	Old	4,583	66	163,605
					Total	480.00		20,440	341	734,565
011385	do	10 S., 7 W.	6	Lot 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼, SE¼	Polk	608.22	Old	22,352	551	784,750
011386	do	10 S., 8 W.	2	SE¼NE¼	do	40.00	2d	1,750	33	62,850
				4 lots 2, 3, 4, SW¼NE¼, S½NW¼, NW¼SW¼, SE¼SE¼.	do	338.52	Old	10,401	300	377,575
			8	E½NE¼	do	80.00	do	2,617	77	97,995
			14	E½NE¼	Lincoln	80.00				
			28	N½NW¼	do	80.00	2d	2,010	87	73,550
					Total	618.52		16,778	497	611,970

APPENDIX II—Continued

Pending Oregon State lieu selections—Continued

Serial No.	Date of application	Township and range	Section	Subdivision	County	Acreage	Timber growth	Timber volume (thousand board feet)	Allowable cut (thousand board feet)	Total land and timber value
011387	Mar. 9, 1961	11 S., 8 W	14	SW¼SW¼	Lincoln	40.00	2d	429	39	$16,615
			26	NW¼SW¼, S½SW¼	do	120.00	Old	2,133	92	79,455
			30	Lot 1, NE¼NW¼, NE¼	do	245.12	2d	4,298	235	160,230
			34	SE¼NE¼, S½S½	do	200.00	Old	8,693	223	312,255
					Total	605.12		15,553	589	568,555
011388	do	1N., 10 W	23	S½SE¼	Tillamook	80.00	2d	2,421	77	87,935
			25	SE¼	do	160.00	Old	4,557	43	1,658,95
		2 S., 8 W	30	Lots 3, 4, E½SW¼	do	183.20	do	6,224	155	225,170
		12 S., 8 W	4	Lots 3, 4	Lincoln	83.40	do	2,710	81	98,180
			6	SE¼NE¼, E½SE¼	do	120.00	2d	1,527	147	58,245
					Total	626.60		17,439	503	635,425
011389	do	1N., 9W	20	NW¼NE¼, S½NE¼, W½, SE¼	Tillamook	600.00	Old	22,312	500	804,920
			21	NW¼SW¼	do	40.00	do	1,715	34	61,625
					Total	640.00		24,027	534	866,545
011390	do	1 N., 9 W	21	S½, SW¼	do	80.00	Old	3,265	70	117,475
			22	SW¼, S½SE¼	do	240.00	do	2,646	60	102,210
			27	N½NE¼, SW¼NE¼, NW¼, NE¼SW¼	do	320.00	do	5,000	119	187,800
					Total	640.00		10,911	249	407,485
011391	do	1 N., 9 W	27	NW¼SW¼	Tillamook	40.00	Old	2,000	25	71,600
			28	W½	do	320.00	do	6,095	139	226,125
			29	NE¼	do	160.00	do	6,900	143	247,900
			32	N½NE¼, NE¼NW¼	do	120.00	do	450	38	20,550
					Total	640.00		15,445	345	566,175
011392	do	1 N., 9 W	29	S½	Tillamook	320.00	Old	5,635	145	210,025
			30	E½	do	320.00	do	12,250	256	441,550
					Total	640.00		17,885	401	651,575
011393	do	1 N., 9 W	19	E½SW¼, E½SE¼, lots 3, 4	Tillamook	239.29	Old	9,604	193	345,710
			30	Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½W½	do	317.67	do	6,155	155	228,125
			33	N½NW¼	do	80.00	2d	198	38	10,130
					Total	636.96		15,957	386	583,965
011394	do	2 S., 8 W	30	S½SE¼	Tillamook	80.00	Old	2,902	77	104,770
		7 S., 2E	34	SW¼, W½SE¼	Marion	240.00	2d	5,274	131	194,190
		7S., 3E	28	NW¼	do	160.00	Old	6,268	105	225,780
		9 S., 3 E	24	E½SE¼	do	80.00	do	3,312	46	119,120
		11 S., 8 W	32	E½NE¼	Lincoln	80.00	2d	2,433	96	88,355
					Total	640.00		20,189	455	732,215
011382	do	22 S., 12 W	24	SW¼NE¼, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼, W½SE¼	Douglas	240.00	Old	15,480	349	566,880
			25	Lot 4, S½NW¼, S½SW¼, SW¼SE¼	do	238.02	do	15,352	349	562,192
			26	N½SE¼, SE¼SE¼	do	120.00	do	7,740	174	283,440
			35	NE¼NE¼	do	40.00	do	2,580	6	94,480
					Total	638.02		41,152	878	1,506,992
[1]016447	Apr. 23, 1965	29 S., 13 W	27	N½SW¼	Coos	80.00	2d	2,880	108	106,880
		31 S., 13 W	4	Lot 4	Curry	39.27	do	1,414	52	52,504
			5	NE¼SE¼	do	40.00	do	1,440	55	53,440
			6	NE¼NW¼	do	40.00	do	1,440	56	53,440
			9	SE¼NW¼	do	40.00	2d	1,440	56	53,440
		32 S., 13 W	17	NE¼NE¼	do	40.00	do	304	8	12,544
		32 S., 15 W	24	SE¼SE¼	do	40.00	Old	2,580	6	94,480
			25	SE¼NW¼, NW¼SW¼	do	80.00	do	5,160	11	188,960
			26	SE¼NE¼, NE¼SE¼	do	80.00	do	5,160	11	188,960
		33 S., 15W	12	SW¼SE¼	do	40.00	do	2,580	6	94,480
		35 S., 13 W	6	Lot 2, SW¼SE¼	do	76.41	do	4,928	11	180,458
			7	NW¼NE¼	do	40.00	do	2,580	6	94,480
					Total	635.68		31,906	386	1,174,066
[1]012753	Aug. 14, 1962	35 S., 13 W	6	Lot 7, SE¼SW¼	Curry	77.32	Old	4,987	11	182,622
					Grand total	8706.14		280,334	6,609	10,746,662

[1] ORS 273.260.

EXHIBIT 5(c)

LETTER DATED DECEMBER 8 ADDRESSED BY DALE MALLICOAT TO BLM STATE DIRECTOR GETTY, TOGETHER WITH EXTRACTS FROM PERTINENT OREGON LAWS

STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE STATE LAND BOARD,
Salem, December 8, 1965.

Re 100.5a:2222 Oregon.
Mr. RUSSELL E. GETTY,
State Director,
Bureau of Land Management,
State Office,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. GETTY: There can be no doubt that any pending indemnity selections under the terms of Oregon's 185 Admission Act will be immediately incorporated into the State's permanent, sustained-yield management program. Our law dealing with common school forest lands is explicit in its requirements that all such land received be certified to the State board of forestry for management in such a way "so as to secure the greatest permanent value * * * to the whole people of the State." All of the land is specifically withdrawn from sale, and not a single acre can be sold.

To expand on these points, I have enclosed a copy of our State law in which the pertinent passages have been underlined. You will note that nontimber uses such as grazing, mining, recreation, and other multiple uses are clearly authorized by the statute.

Should you want additional information of any kind that will help convey the positive legal and management position of these lands, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

DALE MALLICOAT,
Clerk of the Board.

ELLIOTT STATE FOREST; COMMON SCHOOL FOREST LANDS

530.410 [Amended by 1955 c.121 § 1; repealed by 1957 c.240 § 10]

530.420 [Repealed by 1957 c.240 § 10]

530.430 [Amended by 1953 c.76 § 2fil 1955 c.121 § 2; repealed by 1957 c. 240 § 10]

530.440 [1955 c.121 § 3; repealed by 1957 c.240 § 10]

530.450 Withdrawal from sale of Elliott State Forest. Any lands in the national forests on February 25, 1913, selected by, and patented to, the State of Oregon, for the purpose of establishing a state forest, hereby are withdrawn from sale except as provided in ORS 530.510. The state forest shall be known as the Elliott State Forest.

[1957 c.240 § 1]

530.460 Certain state lands which are primarily suited for growing forest products to be designated Common School Forest Lands and withdrawn from sale. (1) The State Land Board and the State Board of Forestry shall designate and set aside those lands presently owned by the State of Oregon, or that may later be acquired by the State of Oregon, which are primarily suited for the growing of timber and other forest products, and which are within, but not limited to, the following land classifications:

(a) Lands defined by ORS 273.010 as indemnity lands, school lands, and farm lands.

(b) Lands which have escheated or may escheat to the State of Oregon.

(2) The state-owned lands shall be designated and set aside pursuant to ORS 530.470 and 530.480, and when so designated and set aside, shall be known as the Common School Forest Lands and hereby are dedicated for the primary purposes stated in subsection (1) of this section and shall be withdrawn from sale except as provided in ORS 530.450 to 530.520.

[1957 c.240 § 2]

530.470 Determination of lands to be designated Common School Forest Lands. Immediately after July 1, 1957, and periodically thereafter as is necessary, the State Land Board and the State Board of Forestry shall proceed to designate and set aside Common School Forest Lands as rapidly as forestry data and information are obtained from field examinations of the lands eligible for dedication under ORS 530.450 to 530.520.

[1957 c.240 § 3]

530.480 Legal descriptions of lands; resolutions of State Land Board and State Board of Forestry. As the Common School Forest Lands are determined as required by ORS 530.450 to 530.520, such lands shall be described by legal subdivision, and the State Land Board and the State Board of Forestry, respectively in their regular meetings, shall by separate board resolutions designate and set aside such lands as a part of the Common School Forest Lands; lands in the Elliott State Forest, as determined by ORS 530.450, shall be similarly described and reserved. A certified copy of each board resolution, together with the description of the lands involved, shall be filed with the Secretary of State, who shall keep such copies and descriptions in conjunction with the auditing records of the State Board of Forestry Account.

[1957 c.240 § 4]

530.490 Management, control and protection of Common School Forest Lands and Elliott State Forest; easements. (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, or authority granted thereunder, after the board resolutions and legal descriptions are filed with the Secretary of State as required by ORS 530.480, the State Forester hereby shall be authorized, under the supervision of the State Board of Forestry and the regulations of said board, to manage, control and protect the Common School Forest Lands. Also, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, or authority granted thereunder, the State Forester hereby is authorized, under the supervision of the State Board of Forestry and the regulations of said board, to manage, control and protect the Elliott State Forest lands. In each instance the State Forester shall manage, control and protect such forests and forest lands so as to secure the greatest permanent value of the lands to the whole people of the State of Oregon, particularly for the dedicated purposes of the lands and the common schools to which the resources of the lands are devoted.

(2) Easements on, over and across the Common School Forest Lands and the Elliott State Forest lands may be granted as follows:

(a) Permanent easements determined by the State Forester and State Board of Forestry as necessary to accomplish the dedicated purposes of such lands may be granted by the State Land Board.

(b) Easements other than permanent may be granted by the State Forester under joint rules of the State Board of Forestry and State Land Board.

(3) The authority granted the State Forester in this section shall not supersede the authority of the State Land Board to grant easements on or leases for the Common School Forest Lands and Elliott State Forest lands for grazing purposes or for the exploration and development of minerals, oil or gas and any consideration received by the State Land Board therefor shall be excepted from the provisions of ORS 530.520; provided, however, the State Land Board shall cooperate with the forestry program of the State Forester in granting such easements and leases and make provisions therein for continuing the primary purposes for which such land has been dedicated.

[1957 c.240 § 5]

530.000. Authority of State Forester in management, protection, utilization and conservation of lands. In order to accomplish the purposes of ORS 530.490, the State Forester hereby is authorized to:

(1) Protect the lands from fire, disease and insect pests, cooperate with the counties and with persons owning lands within the state in such protection and enter into all agreements necessary or convenient therefor.

(2) Sell forest products from the lands and execute contracts thereby required.

(3) Permit the use of the lands for recreation or other purposes when such use is not detrimental to the purposes for which such lands are dedicated.

(4) Grant permits and licenses on, over and across the lands.

(5) Reforest the lands and cooperate with persons owning timberlands within the state in such reforestation, and make all agreements necessary or convenient therefor.

(6) Do all things and make all rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, necessary or convenient for the management, protection, utilization and conservation of the lands.

(7) Require such undertakings as in his opinion are necessary or convenient to secure performance of any agreement authorized in ORS 530.450 to 530.520.

[1957 c.240 § 6; 1959 c.141 § 2]

530.510 Exchanges of land. The State Forester hereby is authorized to propose and initiate any exchange of land of the Elliott State Forest or Common School Forest Lands, or propose and initiate any exchange of timber on such lands, for land of approximately equal aggregate value, when any such exchange is in the furtherance of the purposes of ORS 530.450 to 530.520; provided, however, that any exchange of land of the Elliott State Forest shall be for the consolidation of said forest; and provided further, that the State Land Board and the State Board of Forestry shall, each separately, approve such exchanges by resolutions of the respective boards, and provided, further, that the county court or board of county commissioners of the county, or counties, in which such land is situated, shall approve such exchange, and after such approval the exchanges shall be consummated by legal conveyance from the State Land Board. No exchange shall be made until title to the lands to be received has been approved by the Attorney General. All lands received in exchange shall have the same status and be subject to the same provisions of law as the lands given in exchange therefor.

[1957 c.240 §9; 1959 c.141 §5]

530.520 Disposition of receipts; manner of paying administrative expenses. (1) Excepting receipts from the easements and leases designated in subsection (3) of ORS 530.490, all receipts from the Elliott State Forest and the Common School Forest Lands, after deducting the administrative expenses, shall be paid into the Common School Fund in the manner provided in subsections (2) and (3) of this section.

(2) As used in this section, "administrative expenses" means the expenses incurred by the State Forester, under the supervision of the State Board of Forestry, in the management, control and protection of the Elliott State Forest and the Common School Forest Lands, and the expenses incurred in processing the sale of forest products and the disposal of privileges under ORS 530.500.

(3) It is the intention of the legislature that the administrative expenses shall be paid from the moneys received under subsection (1) of this section, and that the net receipts, after the payment of the administrative expenses, shall be credited to the Common School Fund. In order to carry out this intention, all moneys in the Forest Revenue Account created by section 3, chapter 121, Oregon Laws 1955, and all moneys received under subsection (1) of this section, shall be paid into the State Treasury and credited to the State Board of Forestry Account and hereby are appropriated continuously for and shall be used by the State Forester, under the supervision and direction of the State Board of Forestry, only for payment of such administrative expenses and thereafter the remainder shall be transferred to Common School Fund for the purposes of Article VIII of the Constitution of Oregon. To accomplish the crediting of the net receipts under subsection (1) of this section to the Common School Fund, the Secretary of State shall, on the last day of March, June, September and December of each year, cause such moneys in excess of $50,000 to be transferred from the State Board of Forestry Account to the Common School Fund.

[1957 c.240 § 7]

CERTIFICATE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Pursuant to ORS 173.170, I, Sam R. Haley, Legislative Counsel, do hereby certify that I have compared each section printed in this chapter with the original section in the enrolled bill, and that the sections in this chapter are correct copies of the enrolled sections, with the exception of the changes in form permitted by ORS 173.160 and other changes specifically authorized by law.

SAM R. HALEY,
Legislative Counsel.

Done at Salem, Oregon, on December 1, 1963.

CHAPTER 531

[Reserved for expansion]

EXHIBIT 5(d)

LETTER DATED DECEMBER 22, TOGETHER WITH ATTACHED MEMORANDUM, ADDRESSED BY DALE MALLICOAT TO BLM STATE DIRECTOR GETTY

STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE STATE LAND BOARD,
Salem, December 22, 1965.

Re 100.5a:2222 Oregon.

MR. RUSSELL E. GETTY,
State Director,
Bureau of Land Management,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. GETTY: In further discussions concerning the above request, we have noted that my reply to you of December 8 should be amended in a minor way. While three tracts clearly listed to us are not now in State ownership, technically we haven't sold them but rather have fulfilled the State's legal obligation incurred in sales made prior to 1916. This comes about by the operation of ORS 273.620 which makes the application and conveyance mandatory.

A copy of a staff memorandum detailing the three tracts and their disposition is enclosed.

Sincerely,

DALE MALLICOAT,
Clerk of the Board.

MEMORANDUM

DECEMBER 22, 1965.

A further analysis of our records concerning the disposition of indemnity land received by the State of Oregon from the Federal Government since 1953 reveals that the 880 acres received by clear lists 73 and 85, and described as follows:

CLEAR LIST NO. 73 DATED JULY 6, 1959

SE ¼ SW ¼, SW ¼ SE ¼ of section 28, Township 26 South, Range 8 West, Willamette Meridian, 80 acres; NW ¼ of section 26, Township 26 South, Range 8 West, Willamette Meridian, 160 acres, total 240 acres, and N ½, N ½ SW ¼, SW ¼ SW ¼, N ½ SE ¼, SE ¼ Se ¼ of Section 28, Township 26 South, Range 8 West, Willamette Meridian, 560 acres.

CLEAR LIST NO. 85 DATED JANUARY 16, 1962

SW ¼ SE ¼, section 21, Township 30 South, Range 13 West, Willamette Meridian, 40 acres; NW ¼ NE ¼, section 22, Township 30 South, Range 13 West, Willamette Meridian, 40 acres were caused to be selected for the benefit of persons named hereinbelow, pursuant to ORS 273.620 in order to indemnify said persons being the then present owners of record of School Lands erroneously sold by the State Land Board prior to 1916.

APPLICANTS UNDER ORS 273.620

George Dutch et ux, 240 acres in CL–73.

Roy V. Leonard et ux and Nathan Bradely et ux, 560 acres in CL–73.

Goos County, 80 acres in CL–85.

Consequently, the acreage figures stated in your letter to Mr. Straub, dated December 8, 1965, as remaining in the State will be reduced accordingly.

EXHIBIT 6

[From the Federal Register, vol. 30, No. 196, Oct. 9, 1965, pt. II]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT—PROGRAMS AND OBJECTIVES; SALES AND EXCHANGES; LAND CLASSIFICATION

PART 1720—PROGRAMS AND OBJECTIVES

Rules and regulations

Subpart 1725—Program Policy

§ 1725.1 Current administration.

Pending classification authorized by the Classification and Multiple Use Act (78 Stat. 986, 43 U.S.C. 1411–18) or other available authority, all lands administered by the Secretary through the Bureau of Land Management will continue to be administered for multiple use and sustained yield of the several products and services obtainable therefrom.

§ 1725.2 Disposal policy.

Public lands will be transferred out of Federal ownership in the most efficient manner possible. This will be accomplished, where practicable, by the following procedures.

(a) Encouragement and assistance will be extended to State, County, and local governments in master planning and zoning. They will be encouraged to utilize the best modern techniques for quality land utilization, including preservation of natural beauty and of open-space values.

(b) Participation of the public and consultation with local government will be invited in the formulation of plans for transfers of public lands.

(c) Timely and orderly identification and disposition of lands needed for urban or suburban purposes, or chiefly valuable for residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, or public purposes will be made.

(d) Practices and procedures will be utilized which will achieve appropriate dispositions with minimum administrative costs.

(e) Priorities will be established based upon availability of funds, urgency of needs for public lands, and resulting economies or effectiveness of Government operations.

* * * * *

PART 2410—LAND CLASSIFICATION

Subpart 2410—Land Classification; General

§ 2410.0–2 Objectives.

The statutes cited in § 2410.0–3 authorize the Secretary of the Interior to classify or otherwise take appropriate steps looking to the disposition of public lands, and on an interim basis, to classify public lands for retention and management, subject to requirements of the applicable statutes. In addition to any requirements of law, it is the policy of the Secretary (a) to specify those criteria which will be considered in the exercise of his authority and (b) to establish procedures which will permit the prompt and efficient exercise of his authority with, as far as is practicable, the knowledge and participation of the interested parties, including the general public. Nothing in these regulations is meant to affect applicable State laws governing the appropriation and use of water, regulation of hunting and fishing or exercise of any police power of the State.

§ 2410.0–3 Authority.

(a) All vacant public lands, except those in Alaska, have been, with certain exceptions, withdrawn from entry, selection, and location under the nonmineral land laws by Executive Order 6910, of November 26, 1934, and Executive Order 6964 of February 5, 1935, and amendments thereto, and by the establishment of grazing districts under section 1 of the Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended (43 U.S.C. 315). Section 7 of the Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1272), as amended (43 U.S.C. 315f), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior in his discretion to examine and classify and open to entry, selection, or location under applicable law any lands withdrawn or reserved by Executive Order 6910 of November 26, 1934, or Executive Order 6964 of February 5, 1935, and amendments thereto, or within a grazing district established under that act which he finds are more valuable or suitable for the production of agricultural crops than for the production of native grasses and forage plants, or more valuable or suitable for any other use than for the use provided for under said act, or proper for acquisition in satisfaction of any outstanding lieu, exchange, or scrip rights or land grant. Classification under section 7 is a prerequisite to the approval of all entries, selections, or locations under the following subparts of this chapter, except as they apply to Alaska and with certain other exceptions: Original, Additional, Second, and Adjoining Farm Homesteads—Subpart 2211; Enlarged Homestead—Subpart 2211; Indian Allotments—Subpart 2212; Desert Land Entries—Subpart 2226; Recreation and Public Purposes Act—Subpart 2232; State Grants for Educational, Institutional, and Park Purposes—Subpart 2222; Scrip Selections—Subpart 2221, and Exchanges for the Consolidation or Extension of National Forests, Indian Reservations or Indian Holdings—Subpart 2244.

(b) Section 8(b) of the Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1272), as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, when public interests will be benefited thereby, to accept on behalf of the United States title to any privately owned lands within or without the boundaries of a grazing district established under that act and in exchange therefor to issue patent for not to exceed an equal value of surveyed grazing district land or of unreserved surveyed public land in the same State or within a distance of not more than 50 miles within the adjoining State nearest the base lands. The regulations governing such exchanges are contained in Subpart 2244 of this chapter.

(c) Section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior in his discretion to order into market and sell at public auction isolated or disconnected tracts of public land not exceeding 1,520 acres, and tracts not exceeding 760 acres the greater part of which are mountainous or too rough for cultivation. The regulations governing such sales are contained in Subpart 2243 of this chapter.

(d) Section 3 of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875, 43 U.S.C. 1181c), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to classify, either on application or otherwise, and restore to homestead entry, or purchase under the provisions of section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, any of the revested Oregon and California Railroad or reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant land which, in his judgment, is more suitable for agricultural use than for afforestation, reforestation, stream-flow protection, recreation, or other public purposes. The regulations governing disposal under this act are contained in Subpart 2243 of this chapter.

(e) The Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended (43 U.S.C. 682 a–e), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to lease or sell certain classes of public lands which he classifies as chiefly valuable for residence, recreation, business or community site purposes. The regulations governing leases and sales under this act are contained in Subpart 2233 of this chapter.

(f) The Recreation and Public Purposes Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended (43 U.S.C. 869–869–4), requires the Secretary of the Interior, in the exercise of his discretion to make a determination that land is to be used for an established or definitely proposed project, and in the case of Alaska authorizes him to classify certain classes of public lands for lease or sale for recreation or other public purposes. The regulations governing lease and sale of land under this act are contained in Subpart 2232 of this chapter.

(g) The Act of July 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 1144), authorizes and empowers the Secretary of the Interior, in the administration of the Act of August 28, 1937 (supra), in his discretion, to exchange any land formerly granted to the Oregon & California Railroad Co., title to which was revested in the United States pursuant to the provisions of the Act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), and any land granted to the State of Oregon, title to which was reconveyed to the United States by the Southern Oregon Co. pursuant to the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1179), for lands of approximately equal aggregate value held in private, State, or county ownership, either within or contiguous to the former limits of such grants, when by such action the Secretary of the Interior will be enabled to consolidate advantageously the holdings of lands of the United States. The regulations governing exchanges under this act are contained in Subpart 2244 of this chapter.

(h) The Alaska Public Sales Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679), as amended (48 U.S.C. 364a–f), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior in his discretion to classify certain classes of public lands in Alaska for public sale for industrial or commercial purposes. The regulations governing sales of land under this act are contained in Subparts 2241 and 2245 of this chapter.

(i) The Public Land Sale Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 988, 43 U.S.C. 1421–27), authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to sell public lands in tracts not exceeding 5,120 acres, that have been classified for sale in accordance with a determination that (1) the lands are required for the orderly growth and development of a community or (2) the lands are chiefly valuable for residential, commercial, agricultural (which does not include lands chiefly valuable for grazing or raising forage crops), industrial, or public uses or development. The regulations governing such sales are contained in Subpart 2243 of this chapter.

(j) The Classification and Multiple Use Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 986, 43 U.S.C. 1411–18), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to determine which of the public lands (and other Federal lands), including those situated in the State of Alaska exclusively administered by him through the Bureau of Land Management shall be (1) sold because they are (i) required for the orderly growth and development of a community or (ii) are chiefly valuable for residential, commercial, agricultural (which does not include lands chiefly valuable for gràzing or raising forage crops), industrial, or public uses or development or (2) retained at least for the time being, in Federal ownership and managed for (i) domestic livestock grazing, (ii) fish and wildlife development and utilization, (iii) industrial development, (iv) mineral production, (v) occupancy, (vi) outdoor recreation, (vii) timber production, (viii) watershed protection, (ix) wilderness preservation, or (x) preservation of public values that would be lost if the land passed from Federal ownership.

§ 2410.0–4 Responsibilities.

Except where specified to the contrary in this part, the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to classify lands and make other determinations in accordance with the regulations of this part has been delegated to persons authorized to act in his name; to the Director, Bureau of Land Management and persons authorized to act in his name; to State Directors of the Bureau of Land Management and to any person authorized to act in the name of a State Director.

* * * * *

§ 2410.1 Criteria.

§ 2410.1–1 General criteria for all land classification.

(a) All classifications under the regulations of this part will give due consideration to ecology, priorities of use, and the relative values of the various resources in particular areas. They must be consistent with all the following criteria:

(1) The lands must be physically suitable or adaptable to the uses or purposes for which they are classified. In addition, they must have such physical and other characteristics as the law may require them to have to qualify for a particular classification.

(2) All present and potential uses and users of the lands will be taken into consideration. All other things being equal, land classifications will attempt to achieve maximum future uses and minimum disturbance to or dislocation of existing users.

(3) All land classifications must be consistent with State and local government programs, plans, zoning, and regulations applicable to the area in which the lands to be classified are located, to the extent such State and local programs, plans, zoning, and regulations are not inconsistent with Federal programs, policies, and uses, and will not lead to inequities among private individuals.

(4) All land classifications must be consistent with Federal programs and policies, to the extent that those programs and policies affect the use or disposal of the public lands.

(b) When, under the criteria of this part, a tract of land has potential for either retention for multiple use management or for some form of disposal, or for more than one form of disposal, the relative scarcity of the values involved and the availability of alternative means and sites for realization of those values will be considered. Long-term public benefits will be weighed against more immediate or local benefits. The tract will then be classified in a manner which will best promote the public interests.

* * * * *

§ 2410.1–3 Disposal classification criteria.

* * * * *

(c) Additional criteria for classification of lands valuable for public purposes. (1) To be valuable for public purposes, lands must be suitable for use by a State or local governmental entity or agency for some noncommercial and nonindustrial governmental program or suitable for transfer to a non-Federal interest in a transaction which will benefit a Federal, State, or local governmental program.

(2) Lands found to be valuable for public purposes may be classified for sale pursuant to the Public Land Sale Act as chiefly valuable for public uses or development or for transfer in satisfaction of a State land grant, or for transfer to a State or local governmental agency in exchange for other property, or for transfer to a governmental agency under any applicable act of Congress other than the Recreation and Public Purposes Act (44 Stat. 741), as amended (43 U.S.C. 869–869–4), if (i) the proposed use includes profit activities or if the interested, qualified governmental agency and the authorized officer agree that there is no need for the perpetual dedication of the lands to public uses required by the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, and (ii) in the case of sales under the Public Land Sale Act, adequate zoning regulations exist in the area in which the lands are located.

(3) Lands found to be valuable for public purposes will ordinarily be classified for sale or lease under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act (see Subpart 2232 of this chapter) is the proposed use involves nonprofit activities and if it is determined by the authorized officer that the provisions of that Act are required to insure the continued dedication of the lands to such uses, or otherwise to carry out the purposes of the Act.

(4) Lands may be classified for exchange under appropriate authority where they are found to be chiefly valuable for public purposes because they have special values, arising from the interest of exchange proponents, for exchange for other lands which are needed for the support of a Federal program.

* * * * *

§ 2410.1–4—Criteria for segregation.

The following criteria will govern the determination of the extent to which classifications and proposed classifications will segregate the affected lands from settlement, location, sale, selection, entry, lease, or other forms of disposal under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws. The segregative effect of each classification or proposed classification will be governed by applicable laws and regulations, and will be stated in the classification notice or decision.

(a) General criterion. The public lands classified or proposed to be classified under the regulations of this part will be kept open to (i.e., not segregated from) as many forms of disposal as possible consistent with the purposes of the classification and the resource values of the lands.

(b) Specific criteria for segregation effect or classification for retention. (1) Public lands classified or proposed to be classified for retention for multiple use management will be segregated from those forms of disposal which, if the lands remained open thereto, could:

(i) Interfere significantly with the management of the lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield, or

(ii) Impair or prevent, to an appreciable extent, realization of public values in the lands, or

(iii) Impair or prevent, to an appreciable extent, realization of the objectives of retention and management set forth in Part 2410, or

(iv) Lead to unnecessary expenditures of public or private funds arising out of individual efforts to acquire public lands under laws, which are in fact not applicable, because of the nature of the resources of the lands.

(2) In applying the criteria in subparagraph (1) of this paragraph, land shall not be closed to mining location unless the nonmineral uses would be inconsistent with and of greater importance to the public interest than the continued search for a deposit of valuable minerals.

(c) Specific criteria for segregative effect of classification for disposal. Public lands classified or proposed to be classified for disposal will be segregated from those forms of disposal which, if the lands remained open thereto, could interfere with the orderly disposal of the lands pursuant to appropriate law. Public lands classified or proposed to be classified for sale under the Public Land Sale Act (78 Stat. 988, 43 U.S.C. 1411–18) will be segregated from all forms of disposal under the mining and mineral leasing laws.

* * * * *

§ 2411.1–2 Special procedures where proposed disposal classification exceeds 2,560 acres.

(a) Authority. Section 2 of the Classification and Multiple Use Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 986, 43 U.S.C. 1412), requires the Secretary of the Interior to take certain actions when he proposes the classification for sale or other disposal under any statute of a tract of land in excess of 2,560 acres.

(b) Publication of notice of, and public hearings on, proposed classification. The authorized officer shall publish a notice of his proposed classification in the Federal Register and an announcement in a newspaper having general circulation in the area or areas in the vicinity of the affected land. The notice shall include the legal description of the affected land, the law or laws under which the lands would be disposed of together with such other information as the authorized officer deems pertinent. Copies of the notice will be sent to the head of the governing body of the political subdivision of the State, if any, having jurisdiction over zoning in the geographic area within which the affected lands are located, the governor of that State and the BLM multiple use advisory board in that State, the land-use planning officer and land-use planning committees, if any, of the county, in which the affected lands are located, the authorized user or users of the lands or their selected representatives, all petitioner-applicants involved, and any other party the authorized officer determines to have an interest in the proper use of the lands. The authorized officer will hold a public hearing on the proposal if (1) the proposed classification will affect more than 25,000 acres or (2) he determines that sufficient public interest exists to warrant the time and expense of a hearing.

(c) Publication of notice of classification. After having considered the comments received as the result of publication, the authorized officer may classify the lands any time after the expiration of sixty days following the publication of the proposed classification in the Federal Register. The authorized officer shall publicize the classification in the same manner as the proposed classification was publicized, indicating in the notice the differences, if any, between the proposed classification and the classification.

(d) Administrative review. For a period of 30 days after publication in the Federal Register of a notice of classification for disposal pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section, the classification shall be subject to the exercise of supervisory authority by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of administrative review. If, 30 days from date of publication, the Secretary has neither on his own motion, on motion of any protestant or the State Director, exercised supervisory authority for review, the classification shall become the final order of the Secretary. The exercise of supervisory authority by the Secretary shall automatically vacate the classification and reinstate the proposed classification together with its segregative effect. In this event the final departmental decision shall be issued by the Secretary and published in the Federal Register.

(e) Segregative effect of publication. (1) Publication in the Federal Register of a notice of proposed classification pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section or of a notice of classification pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section will segregate the affected land from all forms of disposal under the public land laws, including the mining laws except the form or forms of disposal for which it is proposed to classify the lands. However, publication will not alter the applicability of the public land laws governing the use of the lands under lease, license, or permit, or governing the disposal of their mineral and vegetative resources, other than under the mining laws.

(2) The segregative effect of a proposed classification will terminate in one of the following ways:

(i) Classification of the lands within two years of publication of the notice of proposed classification in the Federal Register;

(ii) Publication in the Federal Register of a notice of termination of the proposed classification;

(iii) An act of Congress;

(iv) Expiration of a 2-year period from the date of publication of the notice of proposed classification without continuance as prescribed by the Classification and Multiple Use Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 986, 43 U.S.C. 1411–18), or expiration of an additional period, not exceeding 2 years, if the required notice of proposed continuance is given.

(3) The segregative effect of a classification for sale or other disposal will terminate in one of the following ways:

(i) Disposal of the lands;

(ii) Publication in the Federal Register of a notice of termination of the classification;

(iii) An Act of Congress;

(iv) Expiration of 2 years from the date of publication of the proposed classification without disposal of the land and without the notice of proposed continuance as prescribed by the Classification and Multiple Use Act; or

(v) Expiration of an additional period, not exceeding 2 years, if the required notice of proposed continuance is given.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

OCTOBER 5, 1965.

EXHIBIT 7

(March 23, 1966, letter from BLM State Director Getty announcing Oregon hearings on Oregon "lieu" selections)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Portland, Oreg., March 23, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You probably have both a personal interest and a community interest in what happens to lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management in Oregon. That is why we are inviting you to take part in planning the use to be made of these lands.

Public meetings are being scheduled to discuss in detail some tentative proposals for use of certain lands now managed by BLM in western Oregon. An initial analysis of the characteristics of these lands and the laws that govern their administration led to the tentative proposals which are to be discussed with representatives of various groups and with the general public. This procedure is prescribed by the Classification and Multiple Use Act (Public Law 88–607) which was enacted on September 19, 1964. The law calls for the classification of public domain lands either for retention and multiple-use management or for transfer to other use if that is appropriate.

The current series of meetings concerns BLM-administered lands in Clatsop, Douglas, Coos, Polk, Benton, Lincoln, Tillamook, and Marion Counties. These lands are located within BLM's Salem and Coos Bay Districts. The major recommendation to be considered at the public meetings is the continued multiple-use management of most of the public domain lands in those counties. (Present laws prescribe the permanent, sustained-yield, multiple-use management of revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands and the reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands by the Bureau of Land Management.) Incidental to the proposal to classify most public domain lands for multiple-use management by BLM on a permanent basis will be consideration of applications filed by the State of Oregon for 8,000 acres of public domain lands in western Oregon.

The applications were filed to acquire lands in lieu of "school sections" previously intended for the State but which actually became parts of national forests upon their creation at the turn of the century. BLM and the State of Oregon are cooperating to satisfy all lieu selection rights.

The lands included in the State's "lieu" selections have been noted on maps and may be inspected at the office of the county courts in Corvallis, Newport, Dallas, and Tillamook and in BLM offices at Portland and Salem. Lands involved are generally located in the Kilchis, Yaquina, and Siletz River drainages.

The first meeting is being sponsored by the Lincoln County court and will be held in the courthouse conference room in Newport at 1:30 p.m. on Monday, April 25. Another meeting is being sponsored by the Tillamook County court and will be held in the courthouse in Tillamook at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 26. A third meeting, concerning lands in Coos and Douglas Counties, will be held in the council chambers at the Reedsport Community Building at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 27.

You are encouraged to attend one of these meetings and offer your comments, either orally or in writing. If you are unable to attend the meetings but wish to make written comments you may send them to the BLM district managers in Salem or Coos Bay or to the State director, 729 Northeast Oregon Street, Portland, Oreg.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. GETTY,
State Director.

RUSSIAN FISHING TRAWLERS OFF THE PACIFIC COAST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the moment I now speak, a large number of Russian fishing trawlers have come into high-sea waters 10 to 30 miles off the coast of Oregon to carry on an extensive fishing expedition. The information that I shall place in the RECORD before I close my speech indicates that they are catching more than 500,000 pounds of ocean perch a day. The fishery executives and officials in my State who have communicated with me point out that because of the fishing equipment and the fishing devices that are used, the Russian trawlers will do irreparable damage to our fishery beds.

I am not a fishery expert, but I have a responsibility as legislative counsel in the Senate for the people of the State of Oregon to try to inform myself as best I can about the factual matters involved and to advise with regard to the legislative and legal rights that those concerned with this "invasion" of the waters of this part of the globe are confronted with at the hands of the Russians.

I have been in touch with the counsel of the Subcommittee on Fisheries of the Committee on Commerce. I have been advised of the great work that the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and his very able colleague [Mr. JACKSON] have done in past programs, in which I have joined them, concerning similar difficulties that have developed with Russian fishing trawlers in the waters off Alaska, Canada, and the State of Washington.

It is obvious from the record that this armada of Russian fishing trawlers is moving down the Pacific coast and, as I have told my constituents, and say to the Senate today, because I never raise false hopes, nor do I make claims unless I believe they can be substantiated as a matter of law, that on the basis of the study of the situation that I have made to date, I recognize that we are confronted with some highly complex, difficult principles of international law; that, after all, fish in the high seas can, in one sense, be said to belong to the world: they are world fish.

But there is a long history of fishing conventions that have been entered into between friendly nations, conventions that seek to lay down some of the rules of the game, so to speak, for sound fishing practices and for a fish conservation program that will think ahead in regard to future generations and their economic rights and interests that ought to be protected by our generation, so that there will not be followed anywhere a program of destroying a highly valuable food resource that ought to be conserved, or, to use a forestry term that is so well understood in my State, a program that ought to be maintained on a sustained-yield basis. The senior Senator from Oregon believes it is just as important to have a sustained-yield program in connection with the supply of fish in the world, for fish constitute one of the major human food supplies, as it is to have a sustained-yield program for guaranteeing to future generations of Americans an adequate lumber supply.

It is not for me to pass judgment this afternoon, and I do not intend to do so, because all the facts are not available. But I think that what we really are in, as I have said to my constituents in Oregon, is a stage of exploration with the Government of Russia and its people, for on the high seas I know of no existing international rule of law that will prevent fishermen from any country, in the absence of a convention entered into that seeks to regulate and set out reasonable rules for fishing in a given area, from fishing to their hearts' content.

In 1958, there was a fishery convention negotiated by some countries, including the United States, which, had it been signed by Russia, might be helpful in the situation in regard to which I am receiving many protests from Oregon. The fishery convention of 1958, I wish to make perfectly clear for the RECORD, because some of my constituents make this very important legal point, is a convention that is regulatory only in respect to conservation practices. It is regulatory by agreement on the part of the signatories thereto, concerning methods of fishing, equipment used in fishing, the period of fishing, and reasonable limitations on the catch.

Mr. President, our difficulty in this particular controversy is that Russia did not sign the fishery convention. Russia is not bound by it. What do we do in such a situation?

As I have explained to my constituents, who are demanding immediate action, but who failed to tell their Senator what action he ought to take to stop the exploitation, I am no magician, I am not Houdini.

I am going to continue to pursue my investigation as to what possible procedures might be available, to see if I can find anyone in the Government, executive or legislative branch, who can say, "Senator MORSE, what we need to do is this. If we do this, we can stop it within the next 24 hours."

I do not know of such an easy solution. Would that there were one.

When the facts were presented to me, I had an obligation to proceed to do what I could in the province of my office. I have already said for the RECORD that I got in touch with the legislative committee that has immediate jurisdiction over the subject matter of fishery, the Commerce Committee of the Senate. I have reviewed the existing conventions on fishing. The existing conventions do not offer us any remedy for this exploitation—and I am satisfied that it is exploitation—of the fishing beds off the coasts of Oregon by the Russian trawlers.

We have had a historic record of similar problems with Russian trawlers in other waters. If the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] were here, he could bear witness to the observation I have just made.

We have had problems with other countries. We have had problems with Japan. We have had very difficult problems with Japan that have at times created serious misunderstandings between the United States and Japan.

I want to say to the everlasting credit of the Government of Japan that there has always been a willingness to sit down and talk. There has always been a willingness to take a look at the equitable rights of all parties involved. Japan has been willing to negotiate on a diplomatic basis the various fishing conventions which have been entered into by the two governments. It was not so long ago—last year, I think—that we approved a fishing convention that involved the reaching of some understanding with Japan in regard to fishing practices.

I think that there is no question that our Government should proceed with great haste to make representations to the Soviet Government that we would like ot proceed with diplomatic negotiations forthwith in an endeavor to see if some understanding can be reached with the Soviet Government in respect to its regulating the fishing practices of its fleet of Russian fishing trawlers on a give-and-take basis.

The professional staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee supplied this list of conventions that are now in force between our country and other nations:

1. International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. Parties: Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and the United States. Citation: United States Treaties 477 (hereafter referred to as "UST").

1a. Protocol (amendment) to above; parties same (10 UST 59).

1b. Declaration (interpretation) to above, parties same (14 UST 924).

2. Convention for Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. Parties: Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, and the United States (citation 1 UST 230).

3. International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean. Parties: Canada, Japan, and the United States (citation 4 UST 380).

3a. Amendment to the above; same parties (14 UST 953).

4. Convention on the High Seas. Thirty-five parties including the United States and U.S.S.R. (citation 13 UST 2312).

5. Convention on the Continental Shelf. Thirty parties, including the United States and U.S.S.R. (citation 15 UST 471).

6. Convention on Territorial Seas and Contiguous Zone. Twenty-seven parties, including the United States and U.S.S.R. (citation 15 UST 1606).

7. International Convention on Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals. Parties: Canada, Japan, U.S.S.R., and the United States (citation 8 UST 2283).

7a. Protocol (amendment) on above, same parties (citation 15 UST 316).

8. Convention of Conservation of Shrimp. Parties: The United States and Cuba (citation 10 UST 1703).

Mr. President, when we enter into fishery conventions such as I allude to, they are mutual, and, of course, our history is not one that is free of criticism from some of our neighbors to the south of us in regard to disputes that have arisen between the United States and some of our Latin American allies. I shall not dwell on them at any length, other than to make note of them in passing.

We have protested various unilateral actions on the part of some of our Latin American allies when they have extended their boundaries far beyond the 3-mile limit, which is the boundary that the United States has recognized as a matter of historic practice.

I remember one instance when a Latin American country sought to extend its boundary out 200 miles, which, of course, would have encompassed all known fishing beds in that area of the ocean.

We have been able to enter into agreements with our Latin American friends in some instances that amount to a convention of a treaty status regulating on a mutuality basis the fishing practices of our country and the given country.

Mr. President, on April 11, after I collected the facts on this matter, I sent a telegram to the President of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that this telegram be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 11, 1966.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President, White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Have received numerous complaints from fishery executives and public officials of Oregon advising of economic threat from presence of Russian fishing trawlers few miles off coast of Oregon. One fishery executive informed me four Russian ships have been taking estimated 500,000 pounds per day of small ocean perch 25 miles off Newport, Oreg. Fishery interests feel that removal of one-half million pounds of fish per day will deplete Oregon's coastal fishing grounds with possible destruction of this fishery resource.

Urge that diplomatic conference be scheduled immediately with Russian Government in endeavor to work out acceptance by Russian Government of 1958 International Fishery Convention to end that binding conservation practices be undertaken to protect our west coast fishery. In my opinion our Government has clear duty to press for diplomatic agreement with Russia.

Respectfully,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence I said in the telegram:

> Urge that diplomatic conference be scheduled immediately with Russian Government in endeavor to work out acceptance by Russian Government of 1958 International Fishery Convention to end that binding conservation practices be undertaken to protect our west coast fishery. In my opinion our Government has clear duty to press for diplomatic agreement with Russia.

Mr. President, I sent a similar telegram to the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I also sent a telegram setting forth my position, as I have generally stated in my preceding remarks, to Mr. Jim Southwell, of the Oregonian, a Portland newspaper. Mr. Southwell called me long distance to discuss the seriousness of this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that my telegram to Mr. Southwell be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 11, 1966.

Mr. JIM SOUTHWELL,
The Oregonian,
Portland, Oreg.

After talking to you on telephone few minutes ago, I checked my office record and found that on April 5, I received wires from executives of three Oregon fishing companies advising me of economic threat from Russian fishing trawlers few miles off Oregon coast. My administrative assistant contacted State Department immediately on my behalf providing the wires and asking for full report. Since talking with you on telephone I have met with counsel of Merchant Marine Subcommittee of Senate Commerce Committee. He advises that Oregon problem is identical with problem that has confronted fishing interests in Alaska, Canada, Washington State for past several months. He reports difficulty is that foreign ships stay beyond 3-mile limit. In absence of Russia's signing 1958 International Fishery Convention, there is little if anything United States can do under existing law. I have wired President and Secretary of State this afternoon setting forth facts which you and previously received wires from Oregon fishing executives have given me and urging that our Government request immediate diplomatic conference with Russian Government in endeavoring to work out acceptance by Russian Government of 1958 International Fishery Convention.

It should be understood that under this convention, we could not stop Russia from fishing on the high seas off our coast, but convention does provide for negotiating of conservation practices that would be binding upon all signatories to convention. To date, Russia has refused to negotiate any such agreement.

I think our Government has clear duty to press for diplomatic agreement with Russia and I shall continue to urge it and to do anything else I can to help.

Please keep me advised as to any additional facts which will be helpful to me.

Regards,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also received many other telegrams from Oregon on this topic. I ask unanimous consent that these several illustrative telegrams be printed at this point in the RECORD. They were addressed to me by executives of the various fishing firms in my State.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REEDSPORT, OREG.,
April 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need help. Four Russian ships taking an estimated 500,000 pounds per day of small ocean perch 25 miles off Newport, Oreg. With this volume we expect more ships. Our fishing grounds can't take this harvest.

WINCHESTER BAY SEAFOODS,
NEIL SPENCER.

NEWPORT, OREG.,
April 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are very much concerned for the future of our fishing grounds off the Oregon coast and feel this should be brought to your immediate attention. Our boats the trawlers *Pacific Queen* and *Miss Connie* sighted and fished alongside three Russian trawlers of size to work approximately 400,000 pounds of fish per day. This type of fishing will deplete our grounds very fast leaving us with very little future to look forward to.

NEW ENGLAND FISH CO.

WARRENTON, OREG.,
April 4, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Local fishing vessels report four large Russian trawlers dragging on bottom fish stocks off of Oregon coastal area. Fishermen estimate that approximately a half million pounds being taken aboard daily. The Oregon bottom fish industry is greatly alarmed over possible drastic depletion of the resource. Need action now.

SEAFOOD DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
HAROLD GRAMSON, *President.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by saying that I also called upon the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am a member, to go into this matter carefully. I think the Committee on Foreign Relations has a responsibility in respect to such problems.

I shall help all I can in the time available to see if there is any basis for us to get this kind of a matter before an appropriate subagency of the United Nations for investigation, with the thought in mind of having it eventually, in the not too distant future, raised diplomatically in the United Nations.

I think that Ambassador Goldberg's attention needs to be called to it, once we can supply him with a brief setting forth our case. He is, in effect, our legislative counsel up there, just as we in the Senate are legislative counsel to our constituents.

As soon as I get the material prepared and have it in form so that it can be released to the Senate, I shall release it to my colleagues, as well as to the executive branch of the Government, because we are in the same boat, so to speak, whether we come from Illinois or Minnesota or Maine or Oregon.

We all have a mutual interest in protecting the ocean food supply, to see to it that it is not exploited by any foreign country, including Russia. Some of the leaders of Russia have been heard to say in recent months that they want to coexist with us, but that the United States makes it difficult for Russia to coexist.

I say to Russia this afternoon: "We give you an opportunity to demonstrate your desire to coexist in good faith with us. We call upon you to proceed on the diplomatic level to cooperate with our Government in working out a fishery convention that will reasonably regulate your fishing trawlers, as well as those belonging to our country."

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, let us be thankful that the debate over how State legislatures should be apportioned is raging anew throughout the land, and that there will be an opportunity for a formal, intelligent, and immediate vote on the subject in the U.S. Senate.

The vote will come, as we all know, on the proposed amendment to the Constitution—Senate Joint Resolution 103 by the minority leader and others—an amendment which will permit the people of any State to determine whether one house of their legislature shall be apportioned on the basis of geography as well as population.

The urgency of such a vote has its roots in the fundamental question of whether we are to prevent the freezing into our way of life a new concept of representation at the State legislative level—a concept that denies voters everywhere an opportunity for enlightened and progressive effort to improve and balance their system of legislative representation.

The courts have decreed that under existing law both branches of every State legislature shall be apportioned on a substantially equal population basis. The momentous question now before this body and before our country is whether this interpretation is to forever stand or whether our Constitution shall be amended to permit the voters in each State to have the right to participate in such apportionment determinations.

As the issue is revealed today the pendulum in national thinking is in motion. Under court direction it is swinging away from the concept of legislative representation under which our Federal Government as well as most State governments have historically progressed. Geographical areas, it has been ruled, can no longer be considered an apportionment factor. Big cities we find are, by law being handed control of State legislatures.

Obviously such a far-reaching change will embody far-reaching consequences. Most of us are already sharply aware that not since our Constitution was written has there been such an upheaval in the American political structure. Never has there been such a sudden and unrestrained shift of political power within our respective States.

The longer this debate continues, I am convinced, the more obvious it will become that the bosses of the several big city political machines in the country are actually afraid to let the people vote on the issue. Through court decisions they have been given what can well be described as an extravagant windfall, and they know it. They have gotten hold of a new source of power. Because, in the rough and tough world in which they operate, they know that power begets power and they are not about to volunteer to accept those restraints which the majority of the voters may consider necessary. With high emotion they flout the age-old American belief that the granting of minority expression on any subject is sound and fair procedure. In lieu thereof they offer and defend a form of representation which callously entrusts the welfare of all the people in every State to the whims and vagaries of the big city bosses who for the particular moment have control of 50 percent or more of a State's vote.

We find such opponents of the Dirksen amendment utilizing a catch phrase, "one man, one vote." They proclaim that anyone who is for balanced representation is seeking to undermine not only the courts of the land, but to destroy each of the great institutions that form of government has fostered. They assert and we are supposed to believe that balanced representation is special interest representation, and therefore evil. They blandly ignore the realism that big city political machines are in themselves a combination of self-serving special interests. Instead, they cynically protest that granting minorities or geographical areas representation is a dangerous accentuation of differences. They even refuse to concede that many States have made great social and economic progress under a legislative system in which cities control one house and geographical areas, as well as people, are represented in the other.

Obviously, the standards advocated by opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 103 do not square with our traditional American concept of government, the concept that recognizes people and their special interests and strives to see that all are represented.

Sponsors of the Dirksen amendment, and let me say they are completely nonpartisan in this matter, have used as their text a paragraph contained in an opinion by Mr. Justice Clark and Mr. Justice Stewart which provides an extremely illuminating definition of representative government. It reads:

> Representative government is a process of accommodating group interests through democratic institutional arrangements. Its function is to channel the numerous opinions, interests, and abilities of the people of a State into the making of the State's public policy. Appropriate legislative apportionment, therefore, should ideally be designed to insure effective representation in the State's legislature, in cooperation with other organs of political power, of the various groups and interests making up the electorate. In practice, of course, this ideal is approximated in the particular apportionment system of any State by a realistic accommodation of the diverse and often conflicting political forces operating within the State.

It is to preserve this fundamental concept of legislative representation that the Dirksen amendment is offered. Many Members of the Senate have long since made known their belief that if this concept of balanced legislative representation is to be preserved and made to continue as a vital force in our way of life, a constitutional amendment is necessary. We have consistently taken the position that only through a constitutional amendment can the voters regain what was formerly considered their fundamental right—the right to participate in State reapportionment decisions.

Our distinguished colleague from Illinois has well said that representation is the key to this entire controversy. He has properly declared, and I quote:

> The people under our form of government must be represented—this means all of the people, not just the majority.

In its language the Dirksen amendment is an effort to guarantee an opportunity for the voters of this country to provide themselves with fair and balanced representation. This objective conforms with the normal give and take that is encouraged by our form of government and that best finds its fulfillment in minority as well as majority recognition. No one in this Senate, I am sure, will be seriously trying to prove this has not historically been an extremely workable concept. We know better today than ever before, however, that it will continue to work well only so long as we emphatically insist that all of the people, not just the majority, be fairly and effectively represented in each of our legislative bodies.

In introducing Senate Joint Resolution 103 on August 10, 1965, the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, declared:

> Every effort has been made to insure that the will of the majority of the people of a State will govern not only the ratification of such an amendment, but also the form and content of any plans of apportionment submitted to the people by a bicameral legislature. I have tried to provide language which would give fair consideration to the representation problems within each State. This language also provides the standard against which such plans of apportionment will be tested by the courts or by the representatives of a majority of the people in the case of the submission of a plan by a bicameral legislature. I have also provided as a minimum requirement of the Federal Constitution that State legislatures must be apportioned at least every 10 years on the basis of the most recent census.

And, I further quote the distinguished minority leader:

> We have hewn in the forest and we have fashioned on the work-bench an instrument of government which will insure the protections which our forefathers sought to achieve when they came to this country—the right to participate in their Government whether they be weak or strong, small or great in numbers.

Those of us, and I could mention Members from both sides of the aisle, who have worked with the distinguished minority leader on this extremely important matter are confident that if given the opportunity the people of this country will want and demand this kind of an amendment. Our confidence, let me say, stems from the fact that the subject has already been thoroughly debated here in the Senate and answers have been found for all pertinent questions. We have long since established that 60 percent of the Senators want affirmative action. Thirty-two State legislatures have formally asked the Congress to act on the subject, 28 of those legislatures want a constitutional convention called if Congress fails to act. Majority support is apparent everywhere, not only within State legislatures, but within county commissions and boards of supervisors, and within city councils. But a two-thirds vote is required for approval here in the Congress. This is why intense national discussion is now underway.

In view of all the distortions and misrepresentations engaged in by opponents of the Dirksen amendment, it may be well if I list here some of the things the Dirksen amendment does not do: In no way does it undermine any of the new strengths achieved in the area of civil rights. Actually it increases the opportunity for minority groups to participate in government.

In no way does it disturb the guarantees of the 14th and 15th amendments or any other provisions of the Constitution.

In no way does it remove apportionment questions from the jurisdiction of Federal courts.

The Dirksen amendment does not reverse the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote rule on legislative apportionment. It merely gives the people of each State the option of modifying that rule if the voters so desire. Only when a State clearly prefers a checks-and-balances approach to the problem of representation can the amendment be utilized. Always in one house of the legislature the big cities will have control and the power of veto.

One of the most deceptive distortions practiced by our opponents will be found in the manner in which a few dogmatists have sought to mislead through self-serving attempts at interpretation of Supreme Court intent. We all know it is requiring many hours of argument in lower courts and many attempts at appeal, to refine this issue. These misrepresentations happily are gradually being exposed for what they are by new court opinions and as the atmosphere clarifies many headline-producing statements against the Dirksen amendment have been revealed to be completely without legal foundation.

Mr. President, I think it has already been clearly shown that this issue is not one of small States versus large States or urban areas versus rural areas. Actually it is an internal matter within States. Debate here in the Senate has sharply reflected a composite of special concerns of a statewide nature. It has been developed that no two States, if left to their own devices, would provide exactly the same answers to the question of fair representation, but this we also know and can well repeat: In State after State when the issue was refined to a clear choice between big city bossism or balanced representation, the boss system has been consistently and conscientiously disapproved. Californians, for example, have expressed their thoughts on this point in five elections. Colorado voters have turned down big-city control in an overwhelming manner. Nebraska and other States have taken the same position.

The Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, has said and I agree:

> We cannot honestly and we should not constitutionally deny to members of minorities the opportunity to select and send to the legislative halls persons to represent their viewpoint. Yet, this is what could happen if population only is the sole standard for legislative apportionment for State legislatures—10 percent, 20 percent, or even 49 percent of the people of a State could be denied any representation in the State legislature.

Mr. President, I think it can well be said that many political judgments are required to deal with a situation such as this. Proper representation is not a simple matter such as introducing a set of figures into a computer and abiding by the mathematical results. Decisions on what criteria should be used in a particular redistricting are local political judgments and vary from State to State. The computer approach gives maximum emphasis to population equality and compactness and ignores most political and social factors.

As all of us know, the Supreme Court has not yet detailed the limits of population equality or exactly what criteria may be considered. We are also aware there are those who contend that any given criteria are valid unless ruled unconstitutional. This, in itself, in my opinion, gives needed emphasis to a safer and more orderly approach to the problem, an approach which I again repeat lets the people of each State make decisions in accordance with ground rules that are spelled out in the Constitution.

For my part I take the position of Robert G. Dixon, Jr., professor of law at George Washington University when he says:

> To consider only equal population, contiguity, which is an accident of geography and compactness, which means little in a mobile society, is not only unsophisticated but may be irrelevant to the true goal of fair representation.

Dixon raises such questions as whether we should make a conscious effort to create "safe" Negro districts, thus enlarging minority group representation, or whether we should mix suburbs with the central city. He declares:

> Every line drawn on a map, even by a blindfolded neutral draftsman, inevitably makes one or more political choices, whether recognized or not.

Advocates of mechanical redistricting contend that 50 years from now computer conclusions will be routinely accepted. My hope is that it will be the people in their home States who are programing and offering the criteria to those computers.

The Dirksen amendment which I believe has the support of the majority of the Members of this Senate is based on the popular belief that fundamental to our way of life is the concept that majority rule must be accepted while minority rights are being preserved and respected. This is to me a compelling argument for immediate action by Congress and ratification by the several State legislatures. Without such action nothing will remain but a popular uprising to prevent a bare majority from denying legislative representation to all others. There is enough lack of law observance in the country today without encouraging more in this manner.

I strongly support the concept of majority rule but just as strongly I support the right of all minority groups and interests to be represented. The right to an equal vote is precious, but let us not forget that the right of a minority to have a voice and a vote in legislative determinations is equally precious.

I belong to that school of thought that contends that it should always be our legislative ambition to make our decisions after all viewpoints have been presented. I pray we never find ourselves in the position in this Senate of giving way to the contention that our Government has grown so large and so unwieldy that we no longer have the time or the patience for full scale and open debate on any vital subject. I know we have grown big as a nation and that in consequence groups and individuals must speak through representatives, but let us pray we never reach the point where it can be said the only voice we have time for or that is worth heeding is the voice of the temporary majority in power.

I have all along been confident the American people, when possessed of the facts and made aware of the dangerous trend that has been started, will insist upon the restoration of the right to effective representation of the interests of each region wtihin our States and that they will want a reasonable balancing of political power rather than a mechanically imposed rule of equal population districts.

I concur with Justice Clark who in a dissenting opinion in the Colorado case wrote:

> It is important to make clear at the outset what these (reapportionment) cases are not about. They have nothing to do with the denial or impairment of any person's right to vote. Nobody's right to vote has been denied. Nobody's right to vote has been restricted. Nobody has been deprived of the right to have his vote counted. * * * Secondly, these cases have nothing to do with the weighting or diluting of votes cast within any electoral unit.
>
> The question involved in these cases is quite a different one. Simply stated, the question is to what degree, if at all, the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment limits each sovereign State's freedom to establish appropriate electoral constituencies from which representatives to the State's bicameral legislative assembly are to be chosen.

Mr. President, I am certain that during the next few days there will be presented to this body many illustrations of the extremes to which we can be pushed as a Nation if we insist on strict adherence to the one-man, one-vote principle, as sloganized by our opponents. We know what such blind adherence could do to the Senate's membership, but let me carry the thought to another level that also tests their sincerity.

Most of the opponents who rally to the slogan of "rotten boroughs" in discussing State legislative apportionment are, I believe, ardent supporters of the United Nations. It makes one ask why, if this small group is so opposed to letting the people of each State vote on the composition of their State legislatures and is really sincere in its devotion to the one-man, one-vote dogma—why is it not spearheading a movement to withdraw the United States from membership in the United Nations.

One of the principal governing bodies of the United Nations is the General Assembly. It has great powers, including the duty to approve the United Nations budget and apportion expenses among member nations. If the U.N. Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercize its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression, the General Assembly may consider it and recommend collective measures, including, in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression, the use of armed forces.

As of December 1, 1964, there were 115 member nations of the United Nations, each entitled to 5 representatives and 5 alternates to the General Assembly, but each nation is entitled to only 1 vote.

In other words, one man, one vote is not the governing principle in the United Nations, but one nation, one vote, or if you please, one district, one vote. Are these nations, or districts, truly representative by population standards—or do they, if we accept the epithet so freely used by opponents of the Dirksen amendment—constitute "rotten boroughs?"

Mr. President, I should like to specifically mention the populations of a few nations, but I ask unanimous consent that the entire list of the member nations of the United Nations and their most recent population estimates be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Member nations of the United Nations, and their most recent population estimates

Afghanistan	13, 800, 000
Albania	1, 711, 000
Algeria	10, 784, 000
Argentina	21, 762, 000
Australia	10, 965, 000
Austria	7, 171, 000
Belgium	9, 221, 000
Bolivia	3, 596, 000
Brazil	77, 521, 000
Bulgaria	8, 078, 000
Burma	23, 664, 000
Burundi	2, 600, 000
Byelorussia (included with Soviet Union)	----------
Cambodia	5, 749, 000
Cameroon	4, 560, 000
Canada	19, 102, 000
Central African Republic	1, 250, 000
Ceylon	10, 625, 000
Chad	3, 000, 000
Chile	8, 190, 000
China (Formosa)	11, 884, 000
Colombia	15, 098, 000
Congo (Brazzaville)	900, 000
Congo (Leopoldville)	15, 007, 000
Costa Rica	1, 338, 000
Cuba	7, 203, 000
Cypress	589, 000
Czechoslovakia	13, 951, 000
Dahomey	2, 200, 000
Denmark	4, 750, 000
Dominican Republic	3, 334, 000
Equador	4, 726, 000
El Salvador	2, 721, 000
Ethiopia	22, 000, 000
Finland	4, 563, 000
France	48, 133, 000
Gabon	453, 000
Ghana	7, 340, 000
Greece	8, 451, 000
Guatemala	4, 095, 000
Guinea	3, 357, 000
Haiti	4, 448, 000
Honduras	2, 008, 000
Hungary	10, 087, 000
Iceland	182, 000
India	449, 381, 000
Indonesia	97, 765, 000
Iran	22, 138, 000
Iraq	6, 732, 000
Ireland	2, 841, 000
Israel	2, 400, 000
Italy	51, 507, 000
Ivory Coast	3, 500, 000
Jamaica	1, 684, 000
Japan	96, 160, 000
Jordan	1, 727, 000
Kenya	8, 847, 000
Kuwait	322, 000
Laos	1, 882, 000
Lebanon	1, 822, 000
Liberia	2, 500, 000
Libya	1, 270, 000
Luxembourg	321, 000
Madagascar	5, 863, 000
Malawi	2, 950, 000
Malaysia	10, 406, 000
Mali	4, 305, 000
Malta	329, 000

Member nations of the United Nations, and their most recent population estimates—Continued

Mauritania	770,000
Mexico	38,416,000
Mongolia	1,019,000
Morocco	12,360,000
Nepal	9,388,000
Netherlands	12,041,000
New Zealand	2,575,000
Nicaragua	1,529,000
Niger	3,128,000
Nigeria	55,654,000
Norway	3,667,000
Pakistan	98,612,000
Panama	1,177,000
Paraguay	1,903,000
Peru	10,420,000
Philippines	30,331,000
Poland	30,691,000
Portugal	9,639,000
Rumania	18,813,000
Rwanda	2,665,000
Saudi Arabia	8,000,000
Senegal	3,280,000
Sierra Leone	2,183,000
Somalia	4,500,000
South Africa	17,075,000
Soviet Union	226,253,000
Spain	31,077,000
Sudan	12,831,000
Sweden	7,621,000
Syrian Arab Republic	5,067,000
Tanzia	10,046,000
Thailand	28,835,000
Togo	1,559,000
Trinidad and Tobago	890,000
Tunisia	4,290,000
Turkey	30,256,000
Uganda	7,016,000
Ukraine (included with Soviet Union)	----------
United Arab Republic	27,303,000
United Kingdom	53,501,000
United States	192,072,000
Upper Volta	4,500,000
Uruguay	2,556,000
Venezuela	8,255,000
Yemen	5,000,000
Yugoslavia	19,097,000
Zambia	3,500,000

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, let us consider the populations of a few of the nations and compare them with the representation per capita.

Brazil has a population of 77,521,000; Burundi has a population of 2,600,000. Both countries have the same representation.

The population of Canada is 19,102,000; the population of the Central African Republic is 1,250,000. Yet both countries have the same representation.

Colombia has a population of 15,098,000; the Congo—Brazzaville—has a population of 900,000; the Congo—Léopoldville—has a population of 15,007,000. But all three countries have the same representation.

That illustrates my comparison of what is being advocated and what has happened in the United Nations, an organization supported by many of the advocates of the one-man, one-vote system of representation.

Take another example: The population of France is 48,133,000; the population of Iceland is 182,000. Both have one vote.

A classic example is India, with a population of 449,381,000; as against Ireland with 2,841,000. Each has one vote.

Italy's population is 51,507,000; the population of Jamaica is 1,684,000.

Japan has a population of 96,160,000; Kuwait's population is 322,000.

Malaysia has a population of 10,406,000; Malta, 329,000.

The population of our neighbor to the South, Mexico, is 38,416,000, while that of Mongolia is 1,019,000.

The population of The Netherlands is 12,041,000; of Nicaragua, 1,529,000.

Another example is Nigeria, which has a population of 55,654,000, while the population of Panama is 1,177,000.

I could cite many other illustrations, but these are illustrative of my point.

Let us consider the United States, which has a population of 192,072,000. The population of Uruguay is 2,556,000. No one can fail to be struck by the enormous variation in population among the members of the United Nations, each of which is entitled to only one vote.

To illustrate further, the largest nation in terms of population is India. Her population is 449,381,000. The smallest nation in terms of population is Iceland, 182,000. That means that the voice of each Icelander is 2,469 times as powerful as the vote of each resident of India.

In terms of population, the United States is the third largest nation—192,072,000. The population of tiny Luxembourg is 321,000. If we follow the logic of the one-man, one-vote group, how do we justify the fact that each resident of Luxembourg has 598 times as much representation in the United Nations General Assembly as each American?

Consider Japan, with a population of 96,160,000. The citizens of the land of the Rising Sun are underrepresented 292 to 1 by the people of Malta, a land of 329,000 people.

Russia, the second largest member of the United Nations in terms of population, has 226,352,000. But it is a special case. Russia has three votes, because its provinces of Byelorussia and the Ukraine are included as separate nations for voting purposes.

In addition, the Soviet satellites of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania, none of which has an independent foreign policy, are listed as United Nations members. So, in effect, Russia has eight votes in the General Assembly and eight times as much representation as the United States.

If the smallest country, Iceland, is entitled to one vote in the General Assembly, then, according to the numbers game held so sacred by the Dirksen amendment opponents, the United States should have 1,056 votes.

Put another way, based on the ratio its population bears to the total population of all U.N. members—2,280,180,000—the United States should have a representation in the General Assembly equivalent to 8.4 percent of the total vote, whereas actually we have less than nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total vote.

Is our country's participation in the United Nations an abomination in the eyes of the one-man, one-vote group? Will they demand our withdrawal from this international governing body. Can they continue to urge support for the U.N. and approve our country's financial contributions to a body so undemocratically constituted, viewed from the narrow dimensions of democracy they have so assiduously laid down for themselves?

Strangely, they have voiced no anguished protests over the "rotten boroughs" of the U.N. General Assembly. The lack of faith in true democracy is as evident as their inconsistency—for in the final analysis they are unwilling to let the people decide this issue for themselves, as they—the people—see fit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The agreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That beginning on Tuesday, April 19, 1966, debate on any amendment to the pending resolution (S.J. Res. 103, proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the reapportionment of State legislatures) shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the author of the amendment and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], or whomever he may designate.

Ordered further, That the Senate proceed to vote on final passage of the resolution at 2 p.m. on Wednesday, April 20, 1966; *Provided,* The pending question (the pending joint resolution) at that time is in its present form; and *Provided further,* That the 2 hours of debate on Wednesday preceding the final vote on the pending resolution be equally divided and controlled by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], or whomever they may designate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the provisions of rule XII, clause 3, relative to a quorum call before proposing such a unanimous-consent agreement be waived.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair now to put the question on my proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement submitted by the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and it is not my present intention to object, I should like to inquire as to the meaning of the phrase "in its present form."

Mr. MANSFIELD. The meaning of that phrase is that, if any amendment is adopted to Senate Joint Resolution 103 in the form presently before us, the agreement to vote at 2 p.m. Wednesday will be nullified.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It means that if Senate Joint Resolution 103 has not been modified we will vote on it on Wednesday, but that if there is any modification, the unanimous-consent agreement to vote on final passage will be null and void.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The language used is, "in its present form."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Exactly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that even minor amendments if adopted would negate the agreement to vote on Wednesday next.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A vote on any amendment would have to be taken before 2 p.m. Wednesday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. We hope any amendment would be offered prior to the close of business on Tuesday next.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have consulted with my very able colleagues, and I see no reason that we should object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the business of the Senate on tomorrow, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DIRKSEN AMENDMENT SHOULD BE DEFEATED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the pending motion to pass the Dirksen rotten-borough amendment brings the Senate to still another chapter in one of the strangest campaigns in American constitutional history.

WOULD TAKE AWAY A BASIC RIGHT OF CITIZENS

First the effort to push through the amendment represents the first time there has been a sustained national effort to actually take away from American citizens a basic, unalienable human and constitutional right. That unalienable right, proclaimed by our Declaration of Independence and firmly embodied in moral law and our Constitution, is equality of citizenship. In our representative government maintained under law, equality of citizenship means two things above all: equality before the courts which enforce the laws and also equality before the legislatures which make the laws.

Yet the amendment before us, and its many predecessors advanced in the last 20 months, specifically seeks to abridge the right of equality of citizenship before the legislatures of the States. Its basic provision—at least in the form that it is now before us—is that in the apportionment of a bicameral legislature—

> The members of one house shall be apportioned among the people on the basis of their numbers and the members of the other house may be apportioned among the people on the basis of population, geography, and political subdivisions in order to insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate.

Or in other words, when one peers behind the high sounding facade of this language, in their representation in one house of the State legislatures, some people shall have a vote worth 10, 20, 50, or 100 times the vote of some other people of the State. Presumably, such radical distinctions in citizenship shall be determined by whatever combinations of power may be assembled in the legislature and in the electorate, and shall be justified on the basis of geography and political subdivisions. The accident of residence is to dictate whether a person is one-half a citizen, one-fiftieth a citizen, or one-hundredth a citizen.

We have already seen that in the past, before the reapportionment decisions of the Supreme Court, 1 citizen in a little hamlet in Vermont had as much voice as 1,000 citizens in the major city in Vermont, and that 1 citizen in the Sierra senatorial district had as much voice as did 475 citizens in the county of Los Angeles.

Apparently we need not wait as long as "1984" to reach the Orwellian age. The Dirksen amendment may be accurately called the "Some are more equal than others" amendment, if I may refer in the same breath to two works by George Orwell.

It is anomalous, and indeed ominous, that this proposal to reduce the rights of citizenship is being pushed at the very time that Congress is acting to defend the rights of citizenship previously denied to Negroes. The Senate is asked to withdraw from Americans one-half of their basic right to equality in citizenship, just when the people have overwhelmingly endorsed the protection of the Negro's right to vote and his equality of citizenship in education, employment, and administration of justice. In effect the Senate is asked to protect these rights of citizenship with one hand, while quietly striking out of the Constitution with the other hand the foundation for the enjoyment of these rights under our State governments.

Fortunately, the juxtaposition of the amendment and the Voting Rights Act of last year helped to point out that the amendment really seeks to make a sham of democracy. If we had approved the Dirksen amendment last year—and the vote by which we defeated it took place on the very day, August 4, when the Senate approved the conference report on the Voting Rights Act and sent it to the President for signature—we would have been saying that only the appearances of democracy count. On August 4, 1965, the Senate said that every citizen must be protected in his right to vote, but it rejected the foreign and totalitarian view that as long as every citizen can cast a ballot, we have democratic government, even if the ballot is meaningless and the weight of one citizen's ballot is greater than that of another.

That is what the Dirksen amendment appears to mean: Only the appearances of democracy count, not the substance. If it were passed, it would make a sham of democracy and of equality of citizenship under representative government.

Another aspect of this attack on individual rights is that some elements in our society may view this amendment as a means of disciplining the Supreme Court for its defense of such rights and liberties. This amendment seeks to repeal the decisions of the Supreme Court in the reapportionment cases.

I think those decisions were basic, fundamental, correct, constitutional, and in conformity with the moral law. But beyond that, this amendment appears to have the same heritage as the 1958 campaign to repeal through specific legislation a number of the Court's civil liberties decisions, which legislation was defeated on the floor of the Senate in 1958 by only one vote by the work of a devoted group of Senators led by former Senator Carroll of Colorado—it appears also to be a part of the continuous attacks on the Warren court which we have had following the Brown decision on school desegregation in 1954, and it directly descends from the campaign directed by the Council of State Governments and others to secure proposal and ratification of three constitutional amendments—namely, establishment of a "super supreme court" composed of the States chief justices which could overrule the Supreme Court; the amendment of the amending article of the Constitution to permit the States themselves to propose and ratify amendments, thus bypassing the Congress; and the denial of jurisdiction to the Federal courts in State legislative apportionment cases.

This Dirksen rotten-borough amendment is part of that attempt to denigrate and degrade the Supreme Court of the United States presided over by that great American, Earl Warren.

This attack upon the Court comes at the very time that the powers of the State and Federal governments over the people have been increasing. In the main the Court's attempt is to protect the individual in respect to the States, but this amendment and its predecessors seek to halt this defense of the individual and to strike a blow at the prestige and independence of the Court at the same time.

EXTRAORDINARY AND IRREGULAR PROCEDURES USED

Mr. President, a certainly strange second element in the campaign for this amendment is the fact that the amendment has twice been brought to the floor of the Senate by a series of procedures so irregular and extraordinary as to cause future historians to wonder whether the Senate realized the gravity of amending the Constitution. The inherent quality and wisdom of a proposal is often characterized by the procedures resorted to in order to advance it. If that rule may be applied in the present instance, some at least will conclude that this proposal has its ridiculous as well as its ominous side.

Of course, the first thrust of this battle took the form of a rider, proposed out of order to an unrelated piece of legislation—a foreign aid bill—to unconstitutionally declare by legislation a moratorium on carrying out the lawful orders of the Federal courts.

It was not a constitutional amendment in those days, it was a piece of legislation designed to overrule the Supreme Court, attached as a rider to a totally different bill.

The Senate defeated that extraordinary move, on a motion for cloture made by my colleague [Mr. DIRKSEN], which would have required a two-thirds affirmative vote, in order to establish cloture. The vote against cloture was overwhelmingly two-thirds against.

The next move was to attempt to push through an earlier form of the Dirksen amendment. When its proponents could not secure a favorable vote in the Committee on the Judiciary—even after exhaustive manipulations in the language—my colleague on the floor of the Senate proposed a further modified version as an amendment to a resolution authorizing, what?—authorizing a national American Legion Baseball Week. The Senate then defeated the "baseball week" resolution version of the amendment by 7 votes, with 57 yeas to 39 nays, two-thirds being required under the Constitution to propose a constitutional amendment.

Never was there a more frivolous mood on so grave a matter disguised in a minor and unimportant alias than this. My colleague then introduced a further revised version, Senate Joint Resolution 103, which is now before the Senate, although there is talk in the cloakrooms that a further revision is being projected in the effort to win over a few votes and get something through which will cripple the decisions of the Supreme Court.

By this time, of course, the new version bore very little resemblance to the resolution on which the Bayh subcommittee had taken testimony. Despite the fact that no hearings had been held on this proposed constitutional amendment, my colleague, Mr. DIRKSEN, insisted that it must be immediately reported by the Judiciary Committee, thus flouting all the rules of parliamentary procedure. With great flair, he proceeded to the expected favorable vote. But—despite his hopes—the resolution still could not muster such a vote in the Committee on the Judiciary. But having resorted to foreign aid riders and to baseball week resolutions, the minority leader analyzed the situation with customary aplomb. He simply threatened to block committee action on the immigration bill, which a wide majority of the Judiciary Committee supported, unless an opponent of his resolution changed his vote to permit his amendment to be reported. One Senator felt obliged to so change his vote, but he made it very clear that this did not indicate his support for the resolution.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that while Senate Joint Resolution 103 was reported to the calendar, it was released from committee without recommendation. It did not receive a majority vote in committee. Eight members, one-half of the committee membership, have signed individual views in the committee report stating:

> We believe the Senate should reject Senate Joint Resolution 103.

What additional surprises may await us in the procedures to be followed in this debate, we do not know. This accounts for the caution with which any agreement to the unanimous-consent request has been phrased.

But those extraordinary and irregular procedures we have experienced so far characterize very well the proposition before us. It has not been subjected to analysis in hearings. It was forced out of committee without a favorable vote. Surely, such a procedure is both unjustified and unjustifiable, particularly when it is a very drastic amendment to the Constitution which we are considering.

MADISON AVENUE PUBLIC RELATIONS CAMPAIGN

A third extraordinary aspect of the pending business is that this is probably the first constitutional amendment to be promoted by a Madison Avenue type of so-called public relations campaign quite openly conducted by a well-known public relations firm. This firm, Whittaker & Baxter, reportedly has established a well-staffed office in Washington and in many of the States to stir up letters and citizen committees in support of the amendment. But we are not told the source of the funds for this well-heeled campaign. This information is not supplied. It is interesting to note that, in the main, it is believed to come from the private utilities and the big corporations in this country who believe that they can deal more effectively with malapportioned State legislatures than with State legislatures in which all citizens would have an equal voice.

But we are being well supplied with slogans, gimmicks, and misrepresentations in the worst tradition of advertising techniques which are contemptuous of the intelligence of the people. Whittaker & Baxter—the "front men" for this amendment—claim widespread support for their "Committee for Government of the People"—a contemptuous title by itself since, of course, all governments are governments of the people; it is the distinguishing characteristic of American Government that as Abraham Lincoln pointed out at Gettysburg it is not merely a government of the people, but also by the people and for the people. This the Whittaker & Baxter firm do not emphasize but, indeed, omit.

One wonders how well the claimed supporters understand the issue. One revealing exchange has come to light. A "consultant" to Whittaker & Baxter in this matter, a prominent national party official, apparently solicited support from party leaders throughout the Nation in a letter describing the Dirksen amendment in the following fashion:

> It is not a partisan issue * * *. It is not an urban versus rural issue * * *. It is not an attempt to abandon the one-man, one-vote principle.

Well, Mr. President, at least one national committeeman was taken in by this misrepresentation and agreed to have his name used as a sponsor of Whittaker & Baxter's State committee. This committeeman, as Senators PROXMIRE and TYDINGS have pointed out, soon was apprised of the facts and immediately withdrew his alleged sponsorship. We can well wonder how many others have similarly been taken in by this worst kind of Madison Avenue campaign.

AMENDMENT IS AMBIGUOUS, ITS MEANING CLOUDED

Perhaps an even more extraordinary circumstance in this debate, particularly when it is a constitutional amendment before us, is the uncertainty of the meaning of the amendment. We will discuss this at length in the later debates, but the Senate should be aware that the impartial Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has published an analysis of the amendment which for 40 pages describes the "ambiguities," "problems," and "dilemmas" presented by the amendment. And on such an ambiguous, problem-ridden and dilemma-presenting constitutional amendment we have not even had committee hearings.

To cite only the most obvious uncertainty, what, in, fact, does the requirement mean that a house may be apportioned on the basis of geography and political subdivisions in order to insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate?

Mr. President, I ask: What groups and interests? Which are more important? Must every one have a representative?

Mr. President, it is people who are represented in the apportionment of a legislature, at least in the United States and Great Britain. Not groups and interests. Do we expect legislatures to represent businessmen in one district, veterans in another, white-collar workers in another, farmers in another? Of course not. We are not electing a Soviet based on occupational representation. American legislatures represent people, of whom all should stand equal before the legislature in order to obtain the equal protection of the laws.

As I pointed out last fall, the underlying theory of the amendment appears to be that of the corporate State, the principle advanced by the syndicalists and whose chief practitioner was one Benito Mussolini.

I do not accept the theory that democratic government is some combination of economic interests. Such a proposal is most alarming.

The amendment also contains constitutional, procedural, and theoretical problems almost without end. I do not believe these matters can be clarified on the Senate floor, and I strongly believe that this is not the place to write a constitutional amendment. We do not know what may emerge further from the Pandora's box which my friend and colleague [Mr. DIRKSEN] may spring upon us at any moment. But, nevertheless, I shall listen to the defenses of its sponsors and I think I can confidently predict that many of my colleagues will assist in calling these difficulties to the attention of the Senate as the debate progresses.

AMENDMENT WILL WEAKEN POWER OF STATES IN THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

Finally, Mr. President, this proposal is extraordinary because it is designed to prevent the States from taking back much of the power and functions they have lost to the Federal Government. And, it is proposed just as the State governments are moving to take advantage of the opportunity which the Court's decisions have given them.

The decline in the power of the State governments, and the increase in the responsibilities of the Federal Government, in large part coincided with the decline in representativeness of the State legislatures. The Nation changed from a 70-percent rural population just after the Civil War to a 70-percent urban—namely, city and suburb—population in mid-20th century. But most of the State legislatures did not keep pace. They refused to obey their own State constitution's requirements that both houses of their legislatures must represent people and be based substantially on population.

As the cities and suburbs grew and became less and less represented in the State legislatures, they naturally bypassed the States and went to the Federal Government for help in meeting the problems of our new metropolitan society. The State legislatures were stalemated, and so Federal power grew.

But the partnership of the States in our Federal system is important, and we want to strengthen it. Until 1962, only a few of the States were able to make their legislatures representative and both conscious of and willing to act upon the needs of an urban society. The Supreme Court, in its Tennessee, Alabama, and Colorado decisions, finally broke the logjam of State legislative reapportionment.

Witness the magnificent result. Unimpeded by the Dirksen amendment, which has been defeated on the floor of the Senate for the last 2 years, in the less than 22 months since the Alabama and Colorado decisions, nearly four-fifths of the State legislatures have been reapportioned in both houses on the basis of population, to take effect in the elections this fall. In a few more months, at least five or six more State legislatures will probably be reapportioned.

A virtual revolution has occurred, giving vast new hope for the future of the American federal system and for effective government decentralized in large part in the States. The bulletin of the National Municipal League reported just the other day, for example, that 32 of the States are already planning exhaustive revision of the staff and operations of their legislatures.

It would be an extraordinary mistake to abandon this great opportunity at the very moment of its achievement. But that is exactly what my colleague and the supporters of his amendment ask us to do.

Let us vote down the Dirksen rotten-borough amendment, and vote it down by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yields?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois on his very cogent and concise attack upon the latest proposal of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to attempt to legalize the rotten borough system of State legislatures.

I think his leadership has been an inspiration to all of those of use who have been trying to make State legislatures representative of the people across the country, and not of the special interests.

I congratulate the Senator from Illinois for pointing out that the issue on this vote is not a battle between urban and rural interests, between cities and suburbs and farms, but is a battle against special interests, big corporate groups, such as utilities, who wish to maintain the status quo in the State legislatures, so they can control the regulatory bodies and keep in effect favorable tax rates. They want to be able to determine the policy of their State government with respect to their own interests, and to the detriment of the American citizens.

I ask the distinguished Senator if he will look at the latest version we have before us; namely, Senate Joint Resolution 103, and at the introductory clause, which states that the proposed constitutional amendment shall be valid when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States, "provided that each such legislature shall include one house apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population," and ask the Senator if it is not possible that, if such a provision were to be enacted into the introductory clause of a proposed constitutional amendment, it would give the rotten borough house of a State legislature the power of political blackmail over that house representing the people, so that it could, in effect, delay all types and manner of legislation, in order to obtain ratification of this amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is completely right. My junior colleague, having been beaten in his effort to insure rotten boroughism in both houses of State legislatures, is now saying it is all right to have such malapportionment in one house of a State legislature. If there is an unrepresentative senate in the State legislature, or as exists in some cases an unrepresentative house of representatives, it can refuse to agree to any apportionment proposal. It can threaten and ultimately exercise a veto, and by being firm and tough, dictate the provisions of any reapportionment referendum will be framed by the legislature. It can also dictate the terms of any referendum proposal and thus largely determine the result.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it not a fact that today, in some of the States, including my own, where one house is malapportioned, that house will hold up vital legislation which is desired and felt to be needed by the representatives of the people in the State in the properly apportioned house? Is it not true that members of the malapportioned house will hold up that type of legislation, refuse to act on it, refuse to pass it, until their pet schemes or pieces of legislation are passed, no matter the public interest?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have had that same situation in my State of Illinois in connection with ordinary legislation. The senate, which was malapportioned more than the house, constantly refused to agree to a great deal of legislation passed by the house and approved by the people, and has been able to negative any action in many areas. The same thing can be true in apportionment matters as well as in the field of legislation. If the powerful private interests are able to control one house, they can control the legislature and exercise a decisive influence over the State government. That is the essence of the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wonder if the Senator would care to comment on the language in section 1 of the proposed constitutional amendment, which states that:

> In the case of a bicameral legislature, the members of one house shall be apportioned among the people on the basis of their numbers and the members of the other house may be apportioned among the people on the basis of the population, geography, and political subdivisions in order to insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate.

I wonder whether the Senator would care to comment on the fact that the phrase "effective representation of the various groups and interests making up the electorate" is a direct quotation from the dissenting decision of Justices Clark and Stewart in the case of Lucas against Colorado, and that 1 week later, after having written that dissenting opinion, these two distinguished Justices could not agree on how to dispose of four of the nine apportionment cases which were before the Court.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Maryland is correct. The indecision of the dissenting justices themselves shows how ambiguous this alleged standard is. In the matter of weighting, how are we going to weight population? How are we going to weight geography? How are we going to weight political subdivisions? How are we going to classify geography?

Are the residents of the Eastern Shore of Maryland or the underpopulated southern counties of New Jersey going to insist that their geography entitles them to greater representation than the cities of Maryland, the suburban counties outside of Washington, and the cities of New Jersey? How are we going to decide on the basis of geography? What this proposal does is to turn legislative apportionment into a political power struggle without effective constitutional guidelines, in which one house, by standing firm, can insist that its house be permanently malapportioned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am so glad that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] gave the source of the language that he just quoted to the Senate. It does come out of the dissenting opinion.

I think my friend, the Senator from Maryland, who is a brilliant lawyer with a distinguished public service record in the office of the U.S. attorney in his State, will agree with me that the language is so ambiguous and is so full of undefinable generalities that I do not see how it could possibly be applied to a reapportionment program, if there were any merit to it, and it is without merit.

I am also glad that the Senator from Maryland pointed out that the two dissenting judges themselves subsequently do not seem to be able to agree on this very problem of giving clear-cut legal definition to terminology that must be considered by a court in any reapportionment case.

I really rose to say to the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Maryland that I wish to commend them both for their leadership in this historic legislative fight that has been waged in the Senate on several occasons and will be waged again this year.

I want the Senators to know that I, as in the past, shall follow their leadership in this controversy, and I will be found with them when the roll is called, not up yonder, but here.

I also wish to say that the people of my State settled this issue in 1951. In 1951 they made very clear that one vote per person should be the basis of maintaining representative government under our constitutional system. I shall always be proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Maryland in this legislative battle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the senior Senator from Oregon. This is characteristic of him. His support is very powerful. As I have said on previous occasions, in one of the battles between the forces of the Commonwealth and King Charles I, Oliver Cromwell rode over the moors, and the Puritan forces gave a great shout, "Cromwell is coming." It was not Cromwell coming to Ireland, I might add. They said, "Cromwell is coming," and it gave great heart to those fighting against Charles I.

Similarly the statement of the Senator gives great heart to us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the inability or refusal of State and local governments to meet many of the needs of citizens of this country in recent years has forced the Federal Government to take the lead in these areas. This situation has caused an ever-increasing growth of the Federal Government.

This growth is a matter of concern among a great many people but not all of them are aware of any action that will alter the situation. We are faced at this time, Mr. President, with a decision which could have an important bearing on the problem.

As Roscoe Drummond pointed out in a column in the Washington Post yesterday, defeat of the reapportionment amendment currently before us would be a big step toward strengthening State and local governments without weakening the Federal Government.

Mr. President, because Mr. Drummond so clearly and briefly makes a point that is essential to proper evaluation of the matter before us, I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reducing Federal Power

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The opinion polls show that most people are acutely concerned at the ever-expanding size of the Federal Government.

The public would like to see the flow of power to Washington reduced. But practically no one does anything about it.

One reason, I think, is that they see it as a hopeless task. But is it hopeless?

There are two lines of action within reach which could greatly strengthen State and local government without weakening the Federal Government, and thus the balance would begin to readjust.

One is to carry speedily forward, without any attempt to block it by the Dirksen amendment, the reapportionment of State legislatures. This is essential since there can be no rebirth of State government until the legislatures are made responsible and responsive to the voters.

The second action is to begin to return to the States a share of the burgeoning Federal revenues so they can have the means to do the things that can be done best on the local level. This step is being endorsed by Governors of both parties, by political scientists, economists, and others.

On the basis of the report of a task force headed by Robert Taft, Jr., of Ohio, and Winthrop Rockefeller, of Arkansas, the Republican coordinating committee has come forward with a carefully drafted plan to take the step.

This is a stout beginning. But one condition must be kept everlastingly in mind if any headway is to be made toward arresting the ever-growing centralization of government.

Just one of these actions will not further the goal significantly.

The Republicans will get nowhere with their initiative until the Dirksen amendment, designed to derail or dilute the Supreme Court one-man, one-vote decision on reapportionment, is scotched. Congress isn't going to share Federal revenues with States in which a minority of voters dominate one house of the legislature and thus exert a veto over the whole legislature—and it shouldn't.

Few realize the vast growth of Federal grant-in-aid programs to State and local projects and institutions. In 31 years, they have mounted from 18 to 140 different programs and in appropriations they have gone from $126 million to more than $10 billion annually.

"At the worst," the Republican task force concludes, "the States will continue to sink into a morass of financial inadequacy and eventual bankruptcy. At best, they will become mere administrative appendages of the National Government.

RECAPPING A RETREAD—REAPPORTIONMENT RECONSIDERED

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I confess some surprise at finding Senator Dirksen's reapportionment amendment the pending business in the Senate for the third time in as many years. I had thought that after we had passed the tire safety bill, it would not be possible to bring this same old retread back before this body. It is apparent, however, that there are some among us who are more concerned about making our highways safe for automobiles than in keeping our State legislatures safe for democracy.

Despite the concerted efforts of a small coterie of rotten borough legislators, and their allies, to preserve their ill-gained seats, there is every indication that their efforts to overrule the Supreme Court's landmark decision requiring fair apportionment of our State legislatures will once again fail. Despite endless reams of propaganda and the machinations of a high-powered California public relations firm, there is every indication that the American public supports the fundamental principle, upon which this Republic was founded, of equality before the law and in the voting booth. Despite the untold, and unreported, thousands of dollars that have been spent on an intensive lobbying campaign in support of the Dirksen amendment, there is every indication that the U.S. Senate, with the support of the American public, will once again reject any effort to permit unconstitutional discrimination among voters in selecting their State representatives.

The wholly unsuccessful efforts of the public relations firm of Whittaker & Baxter on behalf of the Dirksen amendment demonstrates the good sense of the American people. Constitutional amendments cannot be packaged and sold like a package of gum or a high-powered car.

While the vision of a modern day Don Quixote riding off on a tired old Republican nag to tilt the windmill of equal protection has its amusing aspects, there lies behind this effort a deadly serious attempt to perpetuate the minority stranglehold which special interest groups now exert over all too many of our State legislatures.

One need not look deeply into our history to find examples of State legislatures that have been bought, packaged, and delivered by vested interests. Nineteenth-century robber barons all too frequently dominated the State legislative scene through the exercise of disproportionate representation in the State legislature, as well as their own great financial power. While the special interests of the 20th century may be more subtle and their techniques less blatant, I know from more than 6 years' experience in the Maryland Legislature how special interest groups can influence and bend a rotten borough legislature to their will. The people suffer when this happens.

Let there be no mistake about the purpose of Senate joint resolution 103. Despite the trappings of synthetic referendums, despite the high rhetoric of "let the people decide," the basic purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 103 is to permit the special interests, the courthouse gangs and their high-paid lobbyists to continue to manipulate weak, irresolute and unrepresentative State legislatures.

If we are going to meet the needs of the mid-20th century; if we are going to clean up our rivers and decontaminate the air; if we are going to rebuild our cities and staff our schools; if we are going to improve our hospitals and develop our parks; if we are going to provide jobs, opportunity, and hope for all Americans, then our State legislatures must fairly reflect the aspirations of all of the citizens in their State. If State governments are to reexert their historic role in a strong and viable Federal system, we must scrape the barnacles of malapportionment from our ships of state.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as part of my remarks, an article appearing in the April issue of the Atlantic magazine, in a special section on the GOP, entitled "The Struggle for Power," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER

(By David S. Broder)

It is odd, sometimes, how an event will trigger the memory of an almost forgotten earlier occurrence. One day last August, I received a brochure announcing the opening of the Washington office of F. Clifton White and Associates, Inc. Clif White is the brilliant and articulate New Yorker who invented and directed the draft Goldwater movement, one of the most impressive feats of political management in our era.

Now, the brochure said, he had formed a public affairs consulting firm that would offer "on a nationwide basis, an in-depth program designed to generate maximum support for the client's political and governmental objectives in connection with its corporate goals." In short, a superlobby.

As I read this, my mind was jogged backward more than a year to the week of White's triumph, the Goldwater nomination in San Francisco. In the booming confusion of the St. Francis Hotel, I had been talking to Alexander M. Lankler, a Washington lawyer who had worked for Nelson Rockefeller's nomination. We had been debating the Republican future—after the drubbing for Goldwater which both of us believed to be inevitable. I said it might be well to let the conservatives get it out of their system; after the debacle, I thought, the proprietors of the defeat would have no choice but to confess the bankruptcy of their dream.

Lankler shook his head and said, "You're wrong. No matter how badly mauled the party is, they will still want to control it. It may not be much, you see, but it's still bigger, more effective, and more salable than any other lobby they can get hold of."

Odd notion, I thought, to confuse a political party, which exists to elect men to office, with a lobby, which tries to exert influence on behalf of its clients. Odder still to suggest that a national party would abandon its responsibility for the affairs of state and its chief goal, winning the Presidency, and instead transform itself into a superlobby, serving its clientele by marketing influence. But now, a year later, here was the chief organizer of the Goldwater drive setting up his own superlobby.

I began to reflect on some of the things I had seen as a reporter covering the Goldwater phenomenon—seen but not probed. White had been a pioneer in the corporate public affairs field before he nurtured the Goldwater drive. Many of his major associates in the movement were from the same background—men like Charles Barr of Standard Oil of Indiana, Tyrone Gillespie of Dow Chemical, and William McFadzean of Archer-Daniels-Midland.

They had been helped by the thousands of Goldwater volunteers. But equally significant were their allies among the semipermanent Republican cadre in Congress. These congressional Republicans miscalculated political realities to their own peril: out of 54 Representatives who signed a statement in the spring of 1964 saying, "We are convinced that the nomination of Senator Barry Goldwater will result in substantial increases in Republican membership in both Houses of Congress," 21 were not reelected.

Finally, White had the help of the most influential Republican of them all, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, who at a critical juncture rejected Gov. William Scranton's plea for help from the Illinois delegation and agreed, instead, to make the speech that nominated Goldwater.

It appears that Lankler was right when he said that the struggle would continue, and right when he said that the men who had put over Goldwater would try to use the party as a superlobby. What light does this cast on the party's future? What does it tell us about the nature of its internal divisions? The more I thought about it, the more I began to suspect that the real struggle within the Republican Party is more basic than the much publicized differences between liberals and conservatives.

The real struggle is between, on one hand, the relatively few men who are still trying to expand the party's base to the point where it can again compete effectively for the Presidency and, on the other hand, the many Republican officials and officeholders who have long since resigned themselves to a minority role—and do not really desire to have it change. It is a struggle, to put it in the bluntest terms, between the few who want to see the Republican Party again exercise responsibility for the affairs of cities, States, and Nation and the many who are quite content to market its influence to its financial clients.

The first group includes most of those few Republicans who now hold positions of executive responsibility: mayors like John Lindsay, of New York, and Theodore McKeldin, of Baltimore; county officials like Marlow Cook, of Jefferson County, Ky.; and Governors like Scranton, George Romney, of Michigan, Mark Hatfield, of Oregon, Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, Dan Evans, of Washington, Robert Smylie, of Idaho, and John Chafee, of Rhode Island.

Their natural allies are the Republican State chairmen, because State chairmen don't stay in office long and they want a victory to show for their efforts. They are also helped by a certain number of politicians, like Robert Merriam, of Chicago, and George Lodge, of Massachusetts, who had a taste of power in the Eisenhower era and are young enough to want more of it; and by an increasing number of young lawyers and eggheads, like those in the Ripon Society, who happen to be interested in public issues and are stubborn enough to think their own party can contribute to their resolution.

The "Republican Responsibles," if I may call them that, are anything but monolithic in their ideology; indeed, some of their members, like Governor Evans, a civil engineer, are determinedly nonideological. What they share is a common courage about using the tools of government to solve the problems confronting their States and cities; a pragmatic willingness to grapple with people's concerns, not to flee from them; and, most important of all, a willingness—in fact, an ambition—to take responsibility for public needs.

Their typical figure, perhaps, is Governor Romney, not because he is necessarily the smartest, ablest, or strongest of the group, but because he exemplifies their drive for personal power and responsibility, a drive that will probably make him this group's representative in the battle for the 1968 nomination.

THE INFLUENTIALS

On the other side, there are what might be called the "Republican Influentials." This group includes some of the party's chief financial clients, including those organized by White in the 1964 campaign. It also includes most of the members of the Republican National Committee, who are, on the average, older and richer than the State chairmen and less subject to removal for failure to bring victory. But the great strength of the Republican Influentials comes from the Congress and the State legislatures, with Republican lawmakers from safe districts who return election after election, with enhanced seniority, regardless of who is elected President or Governor. Despite the ravages of 1964, dozens of them remain. Men like James Utt, of California, Les Arends, of Illinois, and William Bates, of Massachusetts, in the House; Frank Carlson, Karl Mundt, and Wallace Bennett in the Senate.

The influentials, too, are not altogether united in their ideology. But their relative political immunity inclines them to prefer the status quo to abrupt changes, and their longevity in office promotes a cozy relationship with the interest groups that surround State legislatures and Congress, just as it increases the value of their favors to the lobbyists. Finally, as creatures of the legislative branch, these men have a natural jealousy of the executive, which, together with the other factors already mentioned, generally pits them against the positive, pragmatic use of governmental authority to deal with public problems.

What this group prizes, and what it basically can offer its clientele, is influence, not responsibility. The Republican influentials would rather amend a bill—or block it—than pass it. If a Governor or President from their party is elected, their joy, if any, will be muted by the realization that they may be forced, in the name of party unity, to support legislation they would prefer to oppose. Many of them in Congress were frankly miserable during the Eisenhower years, just as many Republicans in the State legislatures are unhappy under Republican Governors now.

Even more fundamentally, many of the Republican influentials have ceased to believe that their party will ever be anything but the opposition during their lifetime. The will to win a party victory has been drained from them. Many of them gave up the struggle when their hero, Robert Taft, was denied the nomination in 1952. Goldwater may have given them a flicker of life, but his crushing defeat just strengthened their belief that the kind of Republican Party they feel comfortable with will never be the majority.

There are numerous Republican influentials, but the archetype is Senator Dirksen. We will talk more about him in just a moment, but first some notice must be taken of a third group, whose members occupy an interesting sort of middle ground between the responsibles and the influentials. I think here of the young activists in the House of Representatives, men like Gerald Ford, of Michigan, Melvin Laird, of Wisconson, and Charles E. Goodell, of New York.

These men, because they are young and ambitious, are spiritually kin to the Governors and State chairmen who are dissatisfied with the status quo. Gerry Ford, like Charlie Halleck before him, hankers for a vice-presidential nomination, and Laird would like to be Speaker of a Republican House.

But their freedom of action is limited by their congressional colleagues; they are subject to the pressures and temptations of the influence politics of Capitol Hill. When the young activists tried to put up a Republican plan for medical care for the aged, they were balked because many of their colleagues were under contrary instructions from the AMA. When they have tried to force a foreign policy issue with the administration, the cozy relationship of Dirksen and some other Senate Republicans with Lyndon Johnson has interfered.

I hope I have cited enough examples to indicate my views that the split between the Republican responsibles and the Republican influentials is not wholly one of Governors versus Congress, or liberals versus conservatives. Mark Hatfield can be as responsible a Republican in the Senate, for which he is running now, as he has been as Governor. Conversely, Ronald Reagan does not automatically become a responsible by seeking the governorship. No one, I venture, can safely judge what the gentleman-actor will turn out to be politically. But as a general rule, I think, Governors have to be more responsible and can exert greater benefit for their party than Senators.

Thus, it was a matter of regret that good men like THOMAS KUCHEL, of California, and CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, chose to stay in the relative comfort of a minority role in the Senate rather than run for the governorships in their home States. Similarly, it is unfortunately for the party, I think, that Charles Percy was maneuvered into running for the Senate, rather than waiting for another crack at the Illinois governorship. But there are exceptions to every rule: MEL LAIRD, a Congressman and a conservative, is a responsible in my book because he judges ideas by their potential for damaging the Democrats and boosting the Republicans, not by their popularity among the lobbyists. And on the other hand, Gov. James A. Rhodes, of Ohio, despite his great personal popularity, has not exerted himself significantly to build public support for the Republican Party in Ohio or the country.

TWO IN THE MIDDLE

Besides the House leaders there are two other prominent Republicans-in-the-middle: Richard M. Nixon and Ray C. Bliss, the chairman of the Republican National Committee. Nixon is an equivocal figure, successful in every race he has made for legislative office, beaten both times that he ran for a post with executive responsibility. Because he still wants to be President, his political instincts tell him he must support the group trying to expand the party's base. But he has no base himself, except among his old friends in the status quo congressional ranks, for whom he can still perform some campaigning and fund-raising chores. The irony of Nixon's position is that if he runs again for the nomination, as he clearly would like to do, he will probably have the support of the very men who care least whether a Republican is elected President and be opposed by the Governors, the mayors, and the intellectuals who really think the Presidency can be won with the right candidate and policies, and can do the most to make that possible.

Bliss is in a somewhat different position. His entire commitment as a professional politician is to win the big one—the Presidency. His instinct as well as purpose is to expand the base. But his timidity—particularly his deference toward DIRKSEN as the leader of the congressional hierarchy—makes him draw back from the very fights that would point the party toward its presidential objective and away from the influence politics of the permanent Republican minority on Capitol Hill.

One reason for Bliss' caution is the relative weakness of the Republican Responsibles in the intraparty battles. There are 17 Republican Governors, most of them from small States. Of the handful of potentially powerful allies, Scranton is leaving office this year. Rockefeller is in a desperate fight for reelection, and Rhodes, of Ohio, is no friend of Bliss'.

Nor are the State chairmen any tower of strength to Bliss. An astonishing percentage have not yet been through their first election. They don't intimidate anyone.

By contrast, the Republican influentials led by DIRKSEN are, though reduced in numbers, secure in their posts. Anyone who survived 1964 is likely to survive anything, and they have shown no disposition to yield command of party policymaking. Moreover, they are in control of their own financial resources, a point of considerable significance. In April 1964, the National Republican Senatorial Committee raised over $400,000 at a single testimonial dinner for DIRKSEN. In February 1965, they duplicated their success. The lobbyists who bought their $500-a-plate tickets were buying access to the influentials—and specifically to DIRKSEN, the most influential Republican of them all.

Now, influence politics is not restricted to the Republicans. It occurred on the Democratic side under Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson during the Eisenhower years, when Bobby Baker, among other duties, was a liaison man between the lobbyists and the National Democratic Senatorial Committee. The crucial difference is this: The Democrats have never fallen so far out of power that they have been tempted to abandon their pursuit of the Presidency; but Republicans have been so divorced from the responsibility of Executive power for such an extended period that many in their party have resigned themselves to the easy course of influence politics.

A NO WIN POLICY?

Is this unduly harsh on DIRKSEN and his colleagues? I am certain many of my journalistic colleagues will think so, for in the bloodless conformity of Lyndon Johnson's Washington, EVERETT DIRKSEN shines forth as the most delightful, most quotable free spirit still functioning. He also happens to be about the hardest working man on Capitol Hill and the most skilled legislator. On occasions in recent years—as with the civil rights bill and the test ban treaty—he has lent his great talents to projects of major national interest. But his tremendous influence, I am forced to say, is inimical to his party's welfare.

His motives in the test-ban and civil rights episodes, for example, may have been as pure as the day is long. But undeniably, when DIRKSEN shelves "influence politics" for one of his dramatic embraces of "responsibility," he deposits certain "money in the bank" at the White House, for the President must always be alert to opportunities for trading with the opposition. At least in part because of DIRKSEN's support for the administration on major foreign policy and legislative issues, the White House has carefully pulled its punches in several other fights in which DIRKSEN has staked out forthright antiadministration stands. Thus, for a man of DIRKSEN's abilities, does "responsibility" buy "influence."

DIRKSEN's overt intervention into Republican presidential politics have been misguided, from his finger-wagging admonition to nominate Robert Taft instead of Dwight Eisenhower in 1952 to his velvet-voiced pleading for Barry Goldwater at the convention of 1964.

A deliberate no-win policy? I do not know. But it is, I think, unarguable that DIRKSEN's political influence has risen steadily as the position of the Republican Party has declined. He leads 31 other Republican Senators today, 2 fewer than the already depleted group he took command of in 1959; but he is more quoted by the press and more courted by the White House than ever he was when General Eisenhower was President. Is it his deepest desire to see another Republican in the Presidency?

DIRKSEN's desires would be a mere matter of academic interest were it not for the fact that he is setting priorities for Republican policymaking today. Who was it, if not DIRKSEN, who decided that the Senate Republicans would fight a knockdown battle against repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Not, you can be sure, Ray Bliss, who saw disaster overtake the Republican Party in Ohio in 1958 when pressure from business contributors forced GOP candidates for Governor and Senator to endorse a right-to-work referendum in the State. Not the Governors of Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and Michigan, the largest jurisdictions now under Republican administration.

The right-to-work issue is a perfect example of the basic opposition between the Republican influentials and the Republican responsibles. The whole question is more than a little phony. The demonstrable effect of union shop agreements in 31 States, or their ban in 19 others, on the quality of labor relations in the States is much less than the symbolic importance of right-to-work to certain labor and business executives.

The labor leaders, whose attitude toward the Democratic Party is nearly as selfish and shortsighted as some businessmen's attitude toward the Republicans, have pressured incessantly for the repeal of 14(b). But President Johnson put a low priority on the project, delayed it until the rest of his 1965 domestic program was passed, and then contrived to say the absolute minimum about the issue. DIRKSEN, on the other hand, made the retention of 14(b) almost his top objective and organized two filibusters on the subject. The reason, I suggest, is that DIRKSEN is playing influence politics, while Johnson now is playing the politics of party responsibility.

If the Republicans were to deal responsibly with labor policy, they would not have to drop their opposition to repeal of section 14(b). But instead of giving top priority to a phony issue, they would concentrate instead on proposing answers to some labor problems that actually might win their party some votes. Why not a Republican Party plan for avoiding crippling strikes in public service industries, such as newspapers and transit systems? There are votes in that issue; in 14(b) the only rewards are cash from contributors and the continued enmity of organized labor.

THE SUBURBAN VOTER

The battle over apportionment shows even more clearly the undeclared civil war between the Republican influentials and the Republican responsibles. A political party simply cannot fight the population trends and hope to survive. Republicans have every reason to welcome the flight from farm and city to the suburbs; they should thrive in the suburbs if they can thrive anywhere. How they came to be opposed to judicial rulings recognizing the rights of the suburban voter is almost incomprehensible.

A bit of history is useful. On June 16, 1964, the day after the Supreme Court handed down its one-man, one-vote ruling, William E. Miller, then Republican national chairman and later vice-presidential candidate, was asked to comment. Mr. Miller is, Lord knows, anything but an automatic defender of the Court and anything but a liberal. But his comment was: "This [decision] is in the national interest and in the Republican Party's interest."

Miller was talking on the basis of a carefully documented study by the national committee's research division on the political consequences of malapportionment. Andrew Hacker, the political scientist who has made the most painstaking study of the subject, later came to the same conclusion: "Republicans would be well advised to work for the equalization of districts; they can only profit by such a move." Both the Hacker study and that done by the Republican National Committee staff concentrated on congressional districts. But the same major point also applies to State legislative districts. The areas of most rapid recent growth, the areas most underrepresented in the legislatures, are the suburbs and smaller cities, where Republicans should be able to run their best races.

Just 10 days after Miller had accurately stated the Republican Party position on one man, one vote, DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK, then the House Republican leader, issued a statement saying they would take the lead in an effort to overturn the Court decision. "We Republicans," it said, "believe the historic geographic-population-legislative balance which has protected minority rights and interests for 175 years, should be maintained."

That was the start of what has become the celebrated Dirksen amendment, the most publicized issue of the most publicized Republican of them all. Whatever the constitutional merits of the argument, the Dirksen amendment fight has become a classic battle of economic interests.

Until the 1964 decision, conservative business and farm groups could depend on the malapportioned legislatures—and particularly their State senates—for their leverage against the urban and suburban majorities. So long as they could elect (or successfully influence) even one-third of the State senators, they could, under many State constitutions, exercise a veto power over inimical provisions of tax codes, cut the budgets of regulatory agencies, or block appointments of unfriendly administrators. It is this veto power, this tool of the influentials, which they are striving to preserve through the Dirksen amendment.

The groups that are fighting the battle include employers who want to hold down unemployment compensation benefits; truckers who want lenient load limits; insurance companies and private utilities who think that the best regulation is the least regulation; farmers who want no minimum wage for agricultural workers; and every business with a stake in State taxation.

These groups have no special interest in the Republican Party or its future. They have done business with anyone from either party who would help block progressive legislation and strict regulation. But through Senator DIRKSEN, they have identified the Republican Party with their last-ditch fight against the effects of population change.

All this, ironically, has happened at a time when Bliss and the other Republican responsibles are focusing their efforts on the metropolitan areas. Last June, at the first meeting of the Republican National Committee after he became chairman, Bliss arranged for William O. Cowger, then mayor of Louisville, to speak. Cowger was blunt: "Today, over 70 percent of Americans live and work within the urban areas of our country. By 1980, according to the Census Bureau figures, we will be 90 percent urbanized. These are cold, hard facts that should be known to every Republican politician. Yet we find many who would fight against more legislative representation for the urban areas. They support plans that they feel will favor traditional rural Republican sections. Just how shortsighted can we really be?"

In November 1965, just 4 months after his speech, Cowger proved again the validity of his argument. Barred from seeking another term, he managed the campaign that elected a Republican successor as mayor and reelected Marlow Cook to the chief executive post in Jefferson County (Louisville and suburbs) by the biggest margin in history. The election was remarkable for many things, including a near-even split among Negroes, who had gone 97 percent Democratic a year before. But one of the major talking points for Kenneth A. Schmied, Cowger's Republican successor, was the fact that he was the man who filed the lawsuit that forced the reapportionment of the Kentucky Legislature. As a result of that reapportionment, Metropolitan Louisville went from 15 seats to 23 seats in the State house and senate. Twenty of those seats were contested in 1965; Republicans won 18 of them.

The Louisville-Jefferson County victory is one that Bliss has cited as a guidepost on the path to future Republican successes. But Cowger, despite dozens of speeches, letters, and private pleas, has not yet begun to budge the Republican Party from its disastrous marriage to the Dirksen amendment. It has been endorsed at least twice in official statements since the 1964 platform.

Will the Republicans ever learn? Will the Cowgers, the Blisses, the Romneys, the Evanses, and the Scrantons—who want to win and have proved they can win—will they have the courage and the backing required to assert their voice in Republican policy decisions? Will the men who can make Republicanism make sense in the biggest cities and biggest States start making it credible to the Nation?

I do not know the answer, but I think I know where it will be found. Not among the influentials in Congress, who define national Republican doctrine today in the conscious perpetuation of a party that has lost its significance to all but the handful of lobbyists and interest groups who find it useful for their purposes. That Republican Party is a party of perpetual opposition. It is an Avis which is not trying harder.

To find a Republican Party with signs of vitality, with hope of future success, you must leave Washington, and go to the States and cities with Republican Governors and mayors. There, Republican responsibilities are broadening public support for their party, not by old slogans, but by daily innovation in seeking solutions to the people's problems.

One sign of their success is their own remarkable political strength; with one or two exceptions, the incumbent Republican Governors look almost unbeatable this year; several of them have only token opposition. A wise political party would recognize these men for what they are: the only base on which a new party, a responsible party, can be built. But the Republicans have not yet done so.

To one observer who has been watching the internal Republican battle for 5 years now, the choice is clear: It is responsibility or sure extinction. I am rooting for the responsibles, but I am not betting on them.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I would like to go into history of reapportionment a little bit. The distinguished junior Senator from Arizona is on the floor and he will recall a point in the debates of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia where the proposal was made that any new territories the Western States brought in, no matter how populous they might be, should never have as much representation as the first 13 Colonies. That proposal was defeated by Madison, Wilson, Hamilton, and those great men of that day.

That same year, in 1787, the Northwest Ordinance was adopted which provided that the inhabitants of the Northwest Territory shall always be entitled to a trial by jury, to the right of habeas corpus, and to a legislature apportioned substantially on the basis of population. Thirty-eight of our States, when brought into the Union, had both houses based substantially on population.

The Senator will recall how Thomas Jefferson repeatedly denounced, and finally successfully, a provision in the Virginia constitution of 1776 which resulted in inequality of representation. He said, and I quote Thomas Jefferson:

> A government is republican in proportion as every member comprising it has equal voice in the direction of its concerns * * * by representatives chosen by himself.

Again, I quote Thomas Jefferson:

> Equal representation is so fundamental a principle in a true republic that no prejudice can justify its violation because the prejudices themselves cannot be justified.

Mr. President, I point out that throughout the history of our Nation there have been tides of migration. Beginning in the late 19th century people moved in large numbers from rural areas to the urban areas. More recently people have begun to move from the cities to the suburbs.

In the early part of the 19th century repeated efforts were made by the larger city areas, urban complexes on the eastern seaboard to control State legislatures. Our Founding Fathers consistently fought for fair representation for the new areas, the new parts of our country being settled.

In those days, the right to fair representation was deemed to include the protection of the people living primarily in the great farm areas of the country. They deserved no less to be protected because they lived in the farm areas than if they lived in the urban areas.

Since the Civil War, we have seen a migration to the cities. Now we have seen a migration out again. In my State of Maryland, it was not any more right for the city of Baltimore, having a population of 900,000, to have 6 members of the State senate and 36 members of the house of delegates, while our two largest suburban counties, having the same population, had only 2 senators and 12 delegates; than it was for the Eastern Shore of Maryland, having a quarter of that population, to have 9 senators and 29 delegates. It is simply not possible to have fair representation by trying to utilize land boundaries. The only way to be consistent is to have representation of people.

The argument is put forward by the Whittaker-Baxter public relations group that this proposal is something that the people want. The justification used is that it is all right to malapportion a State if the proposal is submitted to a referendum for the people's vote. But it is well known, first, that in a referendum, we are lucky if we get 20 or 30 percent of the registered electorate of a State to vote. It is also known that in a referendum, the financial interests having large amounts of money to spend for television, newspaper advertising, and billboards, all too often can use these media to control the referendum. They fully realize what can be done with dollars and cents. So, to that extent, they know full well that the people will never really have an opportunity to pass on the issue.

Second, let us consider our own history and the birth of our Republic. The United Colonies began their committees of correspondence after the Stamp Act Parliament began to levy taxes on legal documents and other official documents without any representation from this continent in the British Houses of Parliament. The argument was thrown up in Great Britain that "Since they are all Englishmen over there, they don't need any representation; they are already represented."

That brings us to the basic, fundamental principle of any republican system of government; that is, the right of vote. We take great pride in the Bill of Rights, which provides for freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press, and the right to trial by jury. But they are all of no avail if the right of a citizen to vote is taken away.

If a citizen is not given the right to vote, all of his other basic rights can be taken away, and he will have no way in which to protect himself. The right to vote is basic.

There are a number of ways in which a citizen can be deprived of his right to vote. The ballot box can be robbed; ballots can be stolen; and election judges can be corrupted. Or the right of a citizen to vote can be diluted. That is what happens in rotten borough legislatures. If a person lives in county A, his vote may be counted once; but if he lives in county B, his vote may be counted ten times. When the right of a person to vote in A county is diluted or diminished, his basic right in a democracy is taken away. There can never be effective government where there is not a fair and equal right to vote.

The history of our Federal system since 1860 has shown that State after State that has become malapportioned has consistently abrogated its responsibilities in facing up to the needs of the times, in facing up to the needs of the majority of the people. The States come to Washington and ask Congress to do everything.

During the first 9 months I was a Member of the U.S. Senate, we voted on air pollution, water pollution, law enforcement assistance, medicare, and aid to education at the primary and secondary levels. There was not a single subject among them that could not have been just as effectively handled at the State level. But it was not handled at the State level, and the people of the United States sent men and women to Congress in 1964 to enact legislation to fill the gaps where the States had failed to act.

If Senate Joint Resolution 103 should be enacted, its sole purpose would serve to freeze the status quo, to destroy the Federal system in this country as we know it, to maintain and perpetuate State governments as they have developed in the last 100 years as increasingly obsolete parts of the federal system.

There was a time in this country when State legislatures were the great incubators of political ideas and new thoughts. But today, where are the State legislatures and State governments that initiate new proposals to solve the problems of the people? They were active in that way when they were fully representative of all the people in their States and their areas. But gradually through the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century, as the vested interest groups gained their stranglehold on State legislators, the philosophy developed that the best government is the least government. More and more, State legislatives pride themselves, as so many members of the legislature of my State did, when I was a member, on the belief that what they do is not important; they take pride in the legislation that is killed. They do not worry about the problems of the great cities or of the metropolitan and suburban areas; they do not concern themselves about educational television, or about the Chesapeake Bay. Today the philosophy is to keep the status quo; to stop progress.

I sincerely hope that when the votes are cast, Senate Joint Resolution 103 will be buried for good.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the able Senator from Maryland for the work which he has done throughout the last 2 years in helping to bring this issue before the American public. He has been resourceful in debate. His experience has helped him to see what is at stake.

Incidentally, he is the author of the best article on this subject, an article published in the March issue of Harper's magazine and which has been placed in the RECORD. It is the record of what State legislatures can do when they are properly apportioned, a record so far from being discreditable that it shows the progress that has been made, and how the agricultural sections of the State have received full justice and have in no sense been oppressed. The Senator from Maryland has made a fine contribution to the discussion of this subject.

Through his efforts and the efforts of others, there is a better understanding of this issue now than there used to be.

ILLINOIS EDITORIALS OPPOSE DIRKSEN'S AMENDMENT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials published in newspapers of my own State: One is entitled "Equal Vote Issue Crucial to Suburbs," published in Paddock Publications, Inc., which serves the northwest suburbs of Chicago. It is an editorial which makes a powerful case against the Dirksen amendment and points out that the suburbs are the ones which now are most underrepresented in the State legislatures. The Senator from Maryland has pointed that this is also true insofar as the suburbs of Baltimore and Washington are concerned in his own State.

Another editorial is entitled "DIRKSEN Wasting Time With Amendment Fight," and was published in the Illinois State Register of January 24, 1966. The Illinois State Register is the journal which supported Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, for President more than a century ago. The editorial concludes:

> Senator DIRKSEN has many duties. He could spend his time much more profitably—and the whole Congress could spend its time much more profitably—on other matters than trying to override a prefectly proper decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The third editorial is entitled "DIRKSEN Versus the Remap" and was published in the Chicago's American on January 21, 1966. The Chicago American was founded by William Randolph Hearst and is now owned by the Chicago Tribune. The editorial, which is in opposition to the Dirksen amendment, makes the same point that the Senator from Maryland has made and which others of us have tried to make. The editorial states, in part:

> It is surely clear that one of the legislature's most crippling handicaps, particularly in dealing with urban problems, has been domination by downstate rural interests. Senators elected on a basis of geography, not population, swing weight far out of proportion to the number of people they represent, and some have regularly used it to block laws urgently needed by Chicago and the suburbs.
>
> The same is true of many other States with serious metropolitan problems. And the Federal Government has been moving fast to fill the resulting vacuum, using such means as the antipoverty program and the new Departments of Transportation and of Housing and Urban Development. Plainly the crunch is coming; the States will either have to start doing their job more efficiently, or stand aside and let Washington do it.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Paddock Publications, Inc., Mar. 3, 1966]

EQUAL VOTE ISSUE CRUCIAL TO SUBURBS

A few weeks ago a west coast publicity firm was hired to help sell Senator DIRKSEN's proposed constitutional amendment to nullify the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling.

Now we have received their first pamphlet. It is just as unconvincing as previous efforts to prove that a step backward would actually mean progress.

The pamphlet starts by claiming that "most" States "always" have adhered to a system of electing one house of the legislature on a geographical basis. This is not true of Illinois and other neighboring States.

The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 guaranteed equal representation in the Nation. This ordinance is a good indication of the intent of the Founding Fathers.

The Illinois constitutions of 1818, 1848, and 1870 provided for equal representation by population in both houses of the legislature.

But because there was no penalty provided, rural legislators defied the State constitution's mandate to reapportion for half a century, from 1903 to 1954. They forced the acceptance of area representation in 1954 as the only method available at that time to the majority to gain partial relief from malapportionment.

Plainly, tradition in Illinois is on the side of the one-man, one-vote doctrine.

The pamphlet also ignores the Supreme Court's ruling that each individual as a constitutional right to an equal vote.

People cannot properly be deprived of a constitutional right, such as freedom of speech or trial by jury, even by referendum. The right to an equal voice in government is basic and inviolable.

The pamphlet repeats the scare story that big-city bosses will take over if voting is equal. Experience is deflating that bogeyman, however. In a study made recently for the National Municipal League, William J. D. Boyd wrote:

"Rather than being dominated by the big cities, as is commonly supposed, the new legislatures will see suburban representatives increase the most."

Boyd's study showed suburbs gaining in population, big cities losing, and the trend being away from big city domination instead of toward it.

It is worth pointing out, too, that big cities do not have a monopoly of political bossism. Downstate bosses can have a grip as tight as Daley's.

Finally, the Dirksen amendment, in the name of saving State government, would sound its death knell.

A primary cause of the shift of governmental power to Washington has been the failure of State governments to meet the needs of growing populations.

Rural representatives have ignored these problems because they were largely the problems of urban and suburban areas and not of the farms and small towns. Thus, the root of State legislative failure has been in malapportionment resulting from the area representation concept.

The only way to reverse the flow of power and to preserve the federal system is to elect State legislatures which represent the people, know their problems, and will seek solutions.

It is no accident that the last Illinois General Assembly, which had many more suburban legislators than ever before because of the at-large election, was the most productive legislature within memory.

The suburbs cannot afford to go back to the horse and buggy days when urgent problems of schools, mental health, traffic, pollution, highways and tax reform were neglected by an indifferent rural power bloc.

[From the Illinois State Register, Jan. 24, 1966]

DIRKSEN WASTING TIME WITH AMENDMENT FIGHT

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN has announced he plans to make another attempt this year to override the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision.

He failed by seven votes last year to get Senate approval for his constitutional amendment permitting States to apportion their legislatures on a basis other than population, so he's planning a more elaborate campaign for 1966. He describes it as putting "extra ginger and extra troops" into the fight.

The Senate Republican leader and his cohorts have formed something called the "Committee for Government of the People." They have hired the public relations firm of Whittaker & Baxter to conduct an "education" campaign to build public support for the amendment.

What really is planned is a propaganda campaign to convince the people that we should have minority rule—rather than majority rule—in State legislatures. If the Dirksen amendment were approved by Congress and by three-fourths of the State legislatures, it would be possible for the States to return to the system whereby one house of the legislature was apportioned on a basis of area. This would permit a minority of the voters to elect a majority of that house, therefore making some voters' ballots worth more than others.

Fortunately, the odds are extremely great that DIRKSEN will not succeed. Here's why:

Nearly four-fifths of the State legislatures already have been reapportioned to comply with the one-man, one-vote principle. As a result of this, the controversy over the court's ruling seems to have cooled; therefore, it is unlikely DIRKSEN will be able to garner more votes for his proposal that he got last year.

And it's not likely that a legislature which has been reapportioned on a basis of population would vote in favor of any other basis of reapportionment. So even if Congress were to approve the Dirksen amendment—which is most improbable—the States very well might turn it down.

As Illinois' senior Senator, PAUL H. DOUGLAS said, the amendment "is not only constitutionally undesirable, it is too late." And he added that if the amendment forces were as DIRKSEN described them, "Knights Templar going forward to meet the infidels," and "they are riding off to belabor a dead horse."

As Senate Republican leader, Senator DIRKSEN has many duties. He could spend his time much more profitably—and the whole Congress could spend its time much more profitably—on other matters than trying to override a perfectly proper decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

[From Chicago's American, Jan. 21, 1966]

DIRKSEN VERSUS THE REMAP

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN has launched a major campaign for his proposed amendment to the Constitution curbing the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling for State legislatures. At the same time, three different legislative commissions in Springfield are beginning studies on a large scale aimed at finding ways to modernize the legislature. The two facts make us wonder if DIRKSEN is keeping in touch with his party on the State level; they seem to be pulling in opposite directions.

The three bipartisan study commissions are trying to solve an urgent problem that affects many more States besides Illinois. That is the dwindling effectiveness of State governments and the accompanying growth of Federal power, which is taking over more and more of the tasks that once were considered strictly the States' business.

One group is studying the Illinois constitution with an eye toward overhauling it; another is considering ways to modernize the executive branch, and a third is probing into the legislature itself. The whole project was ordered by the general assembly last year because one fact had grown too obvious to avoid: The State government has become a creaky and inefficient instrument which provides good legislation largely by luck, and it needs to be tightened up to serve the State even passably well.

It is surely clear that one of the legislature's most crippling handicaps, particularly in dealing with urban problems, has been domination by downstate rural interests. Senators elected on a basis of geography, not population, swing weight far out of proportion to the number of people they represent, and some have regularly used it to block laws urgently needed by Chicago and the suburbs.

The same is true of many other States with serious metropolitan problems. And the Federal Government has been moving fast to fill the resulting vacuum, using such means as the antipoverty program and the new departments of transportation and of housing and urban development. Plainly the crunch is coming; the States will either have to start doing their job more efficiently, or stand aside and let Washington do it. The one-man, one-vote ruling, and the State reapportionments that have resulted from it, promise to break at least one logjam for the States. DIRKSEN may contend that the Supreme Court had no business telling the States how to elect their legislatures, and we won't argue with that; the point is that the ruling has been made, and will leave the States better able to deal with their own problems.

Senator DIRKSEN, we are sure, does not favor the growth of Federal power at the States' expense. Why, then, spend so much effort fighting a reapportionment ruling that can only modernize and strengthen State governments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and I are trying to do is to enable the States to function in the interests of the people by enabling the people to be adequately represented in their State legislatures.

I thank and congratulate the Senator from Maryland for the magnificent record which he is making in this body and for his alertness, his intelligence, and his skill.

THE OBLIGATIONS, JURISDICTION, AND PROCEDURAL DUTIES OF THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss for a few moments a very delicate matter, a matter that I think falls clearly within the purview of the Senate. It is a matter which places upon this body an obligation to discuss it and to seek to find a solution for it within the rules of the Senate.

I wish to discuss for a few moments what I consider to be the obligations, jurisdiction, and procedural duties of the Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Each committee of the Senate is an agent of the Senate. It is the servant of the Senate, and therefore Members of the Senate have a right, when they think the circumstances warrant it, to express publicly on the floor their advice to any committee. I shall express some views by ways of advice to the select committee this afternoon.

I do not speak as a critic of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, but rather as a stanch supporter of the creation of the committee and as a stanch supporter of the need for such a committee. For many years in this body, I have introduced the Morse resolution bearing upon various phases of the question of senatorial ethics. I have taken the position that of course elected officials of the Senate of the United States truly are the legislative servants of the people of this country, and our course of conduct is a matter of public business.

Let me also say at the very outset of these brief remarks that I am in no way reflecting upon, nor speaking in criticism of, a colleague in this Senate who has been under public attack. Rather, I propose to befriend him. I take the position that any Member of this body who is under attack is entitled to procedural rights in this body in order to provide a full and fair opportunity to set the record straight in regard to any matter for which he is criticized.

This is no new position for the senior Senator from Oregon. In July 1954, the senior Senator from Oregon was involved in the procedural aspects of the so-called McCarthy case. How well I remember the evening here on the floor of the Senate when a resolution was introduced in the hope that there could be obtained immediate passage of the resolution which, as I indicated at the time, in my judgment out-McCarthied McCarthy. In a speech that I made in opposition to the resolution from the standpoint of its procedural proposals, I pointed out that the resolution violated what I considered to be all the basic guarantees of a fair investigation.

I shall not burden the Senate with a repetition of the comments that I made on that evening, Mr. President, but I ask unanimous consent that that brief speech of mine, starting on page 12735 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 10, and extending over to the middle of the third column on page 12736 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my senior colleague (Mr. Cordon) and I do not agree on many matters in the field of American politics, but on the record, Mr. President, it can be shown that we do agree many times on basic procedural safeguards in the administration of American justice.

I wish to say a few words at this time, Mr. President, about one of my deepest convictions concerning the administration of government. I have expressed it before on the Senate floor. It relates to a principle which is in agreement with the major thesis the senior Senator from Oregon has alluded to tonight. That is, Mr. President, our substantive legal rights can never be any better than our procedural rights. Determine the procedure of any body, and you determine in large measure all the substantive rights it can administer or adjudicate or grant.

Mr. President, being a liberal does not mean advocating procedural tyranny, either by the majority or by the minority. In my judgment, after having studied the cases of impeachment in the history of our country as well as the cases of censure or the cases involving the unseating of Members of the Senate of the United States, I cannot escape the fact that those cases are based upon bills of particulars.

Mr. President, let me refer for a moment to the matter of impeachment, as it is provided for in the Constitution of the United States. Oh, I know it can be said that when a Member of the U.S. Senate is censured or ousted, an impeachment procedure is not being conducted under the definition of the Constitution. But it is in effect, Mr. President. Let us not fool ourselves about that. An examination of the cases will reveal a remarkable similarity between the principles of basic procedural safeguards which apply to impeachment cases and those which apply to the cases which, in effect, have tried U.S. Senators.

Let me read what the Constitution of the United States says in regard to impeachment:

"The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present.

"Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States: But the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to law."

Upon what is an impeachment proceeding based in the U.S. Senate when there is an impeachment proceeding? It is based upon a bill of particulars on impeachment drafted by the House of Representatives.

It is easy to argue that we all know the bill of particulars against the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I shall say something about my position with respect to the junior Senator from Wisconsin in a moment, so that no one will have any doubt as to where I stand on the political record he has made to date or what I think of his course of political conduct, which objectionable course of action bothers a great many of us.

But, Mr. President, let us not forget that when it comes to the impeachment of an officer of the Government, it is done upon the basis of a solemn bill of particulars drafted by the House of Representatives. When lynch law is applied, as it has been applied sometimes in the history of this country during the frontier days, and sometimes unfortunately in modern times when vigilante mob rule breaks out, each participant thinks he knows the particular acts of the accused that justify trial by accusation rather than by proof. But, Mr. President, lynch law does not proceed in keeping with a great American safeguard of justice; namely, the protecting of the procedural rights of the guilty as well as of the innocent.

If I make only one point in the brief speech I am making, I wish to drive this one home: Basic in the principles of American criminal law jurisprudence is the guarantee of a procedure which protects the procedural rights of the guilty as well as of the innocent to a fair trial or hearing based upon a bill of particulars and the requirement of the establishment of guilt by proof.

I have studied the very general accusations against the junior Senator from Wisconsin as set forth in the resolution of the Senator from Vermont. It does not set forth a specific bill of particulars. My senior colleague is absolutely right when he puts his finger on that weakness of this particular resolution. It relies upon each Senator reading into the resolution his own views as to what the bill of particulars should be. But there is no official bill of particulars written into the resolution. At best all that can be said is that the Senator from Vermont's speech was an offer of proof of some allegations not made in the resolution. The resolution reads:

"*Resolved*, That the conduct of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. McCarthy) is unbecoming a Member of the U.S. Senate, is contrary to senatorial traditions, and tends to bring the Senate into disrepute, and such conduct is hereby condemned."

What conduct? What specific acts? What violations of his obligations and duties as a Senator?

I think there is ample ground, in my judgment, for the drafting of a resolution based upon specific charges which justifies censure of the Senator from Wisconsin, but it is not contained in this resolution.

I think it would be a great mistake, as my senior colleague has suggested, for the Senate to establish a precedent tonight for the kind of procedure for the trial of a U.S. Senator which would develop under the Flanders resolution. I think this man ought to be tried, so to speak, by the U.S. Senate. I think he ought to be tried on the basis of a resolution which corresponds to the kind of indictment which the House of Representatives must draft when the U.S. Senate proceeds with an impeachment trial. I think that kind of a bill of particulars should be set forth. Then the Senate should follow a regular course of procedure of taking testimony, evidence, and proof on the charges. It should not take very long. It should be done before we adjourn. The country is entitled to it.

But, as I have given thought to the situation, and have reached a final conclusion in regard to it, I wish to raise my voice in protest against establishing what would amount to a form of procedural tyranny in the Senate of the United States if we should proceed to action on the basis of the resolution as it is presently drafted.

Let me illustrate by two assumptions or two hypotheticals. Let us suppose that the resolution in its present form should be adopted. The procedure would not be made right merely because the majority might advocate it. I say that because there is another very precious principle in American jurisprudence. It is that every citizen, no matter how small a minority he may represent, even if he stands alone, is entitled to the protection of a fair procedure, in accordance with which he is charged specifically, with the acts, or the conduct, which, if proved, make him guilty of the crime charged or the wrong complained of.

I speak most respectfully about this, Mr. President, because I intend to fight on this issue on a professional plane, and not on any plane of personal attack. If I refer in the course of my brief remraks to any colleague in the Senate, I shall not do so on a personal basis; it will be only because the particular individual happens to be involved in a principle which I wish to discuss.

We have the very precious principle that even if the minority represents only a minority of one, the majesty of American justice will protect him in seeing to it that if he is convicted, he is convicted on the basis of specific charges. In this case the Senator should not be tried on the basis of a blanket, general charge, into which each individual can read his personal prejudices, his personal beliefs, or his personal understandings in respect to the conduct of a fellow colleague in the U.S. Senate.

I am not now criticizing individual Senators, but I have said for a long time, on platforms across America, that, in my judgment, a Senate committee long before this should have submitted a report on the Senator from Wisconsin, setting forth specific charges, specific findings in relation to the charges, and specific recommendations as to the course of action which the U.S. Senate should follow in regard, first, to the charges; second, in regard to the findings; and, third, in regard to the recommendations relative thereto.

No committee of the U.S. Senate, to date, has ever done so. It may be that the committee now considering the McCarthy matter will. I do not know. There are colleagues of mine in the Senate who believe that if we wait for that committee to report, we shall be waiting a long, long time. But I shall not engage in that presumption. I am not going to engage in the presumption that the Republican members or the Democratic members of the committee, which has been conducting the so-called McCarthy-Army investigation, are going to engage in dilatory tactics. I think they have a clear duty to the Senate and a clear duty to the American people, on the basis of the hearings, to come to a conclusion at an early date. I think we have a right to say to them that we respectfully request that they give us the benefit of their conclusions and their recommendations before we adjourn.

Now for my second assumption let us assume that the committee does come forward with a report finding the junior Senator from Wisconsin guilty of conduct unbecoming a Senator.

Then if they have recommendations based upon certain specific findings of wrongdoing on the part of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, I think those charges, findings, and recommendations should be included in a bill of particulars filed in the Senate, and we should, in effect, go to trial on the issue thus drawn.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin knows that he and I have differed time and time again on a great many of the positions he has taken from the standpoint of political tactics.

So far as I am concerned, the issue to me, on the basis of evidence which I think can be presented in support of a bill of particulars, is whether the Senate of the United States is going to countenance political thuggery in American politics. I think, by and large, that is the best descriptive term I can apply to what I think has been the wrongdoing of the junior Senator from Wisconsin in incident after incident. Too frequently his political tactics and investigation methods have constituted what I consider to be political thuggery.

Mr. President, that calls for due deliberation and consideration by the Senate on the basis of a bill of particulars backed up by proof which supports such a conclusion. We do not have that in the resolution of the Senator from Vermont.

I close by saying that I think there are two courses of action open to us. With the parliamentary situation which now confronts the Senate, the first is to amend the resolution so as to set forth a bill of particulars; and if there is set forth a bill of particulars, the second is to decide then what is fair procedure, not to the Senator from Wisconsin alone, but to 96 Members of this body—not to 96 Senators alone, but to 160 million Americans, because what we are dealing with here tonight, Mr. President, does not happen to be our prerogative alone. What we are dealing with here tonight in my judgment happen to be precious procedural rights of free men and women, 160 million strong.

I think it would be most unfortunate if the Senate were to set a precedent here tonight of bringing in an undefined blanket charge against the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. McCarthy) and then proceeding—and and let us be frank about it—on the basis, I think, primarily of various political motivations to pass judgment on this issue.

This is an issue which I think rises above partisanship. We ought to get it down to a specific bill-of-particulars resolution, so that no one can charge a single Senator, liberal, or conservative, with following a partisan political course of action.

The American people are entitled to know the specific acts for which the Senator from Wisconsin deserves the censure of the Senate. I think there are plenty of such acts, but I think in the first place they ought to be stated in a bill of particulars, just as the House must set out a bill of particulars in the case of an impeachment charge. Then the Senate will decide whether or not that question should be passed upon by the Judiciary Committee before we take it up on the floor of the Senate, or whether we want to exercise—and I emphasize this, Mr. President—our right to turn the Senate into the Committee of the Whole, and proceed as a Committee of the Whole, on specific charges, asking for the proof and reaching a conclusion in a judicial way upon such proof.

I know, Mr. President, how my remarks will be misinterpreted and distorted by many, but I would rather take this position in this fight, as I have reached my conclusion on it, in support of sound procedure which protects the guilty as well as the innocent by way of guaranteeing them a fair trial in the Senate of the United States, than to rely upon the exercise of the political strength of the voting power of any particular group in the Senate, whether it be the majority or the minority.

Of course, there has been much harassment which justifies the expression of criticism of the Senator from Wisconsin, but I think we must rise above that, Mr. President, and recognize, after all, that government by law cannot be retained and maintained in America if Senators undermine it by adopting the kind of arbitrary procedure which I think is inherent in the resolution of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence I pointed out then that resolutions seeking to have the Senate render a judgment upon the conduct of any Member of this body could not be defended unless the resolution were to set forth a bill of particulars. That just happens to be basic in fair trial and fair procedure in our country.

I pointed out also that anyone charged by such a resolution was entitled to a full opportunity and the right to recognized procedural guarantees to answer the charges and present his side of the case.

In that speech I pointed out that no matter how long it took me between that evening meeting and the morning to prepare such a resolution setting forth the guarantees of what some call a bill of particulars, I would bring such a resolution to this body. I did.

That resolution was modified by the Senate to what became known as the Watkins resolution, and the Watkins committee, headed by the then Senator from Utah, Mr. Watkins, was selected by the Senate to investigate the so-called McCarthy charges of conduct unbecoming a Senator.

A great constitutional lawyer in the Senate at that time—in fact, in my years in the Senate he has had no peer on this subject matter—the great Walter George, of Georgia, had some very kind things to say about the position the senior Senator from Oregon took on this procedural matter, as did the then Senator from Texas, Mr. Johnson. I am proud the record shows that on many occasions while he was a U.S. Senator and on some occasions since, he has left this body, he has cited this speech on the part of the senior Senator from Oregon for seeing to it that basic guarantees of fair trial or fair investigation, or fair inquiry, if one prefers that term, must at all times be made available to anyone who is placed under charges by the Senate, or who is subject to investigation by the Senate. In fact, in my many years in the Senate, I have been very critical of the procedure of congressional committees, including senatorial committees, when they sometimes get into the realm of determining guilt or innocence of individuals brought before them, I care not what the subject matter of the charge is.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is laden, probably burdened with a large number of speeches by the senior Senator from Oregon during my many years here, protesting the failure of a congressional investigation to follow those basic elementary guarantees of fair trial and investigation. They are very simple, but they are very precious: That guarantee of a bill of particulars. That guarantee of being allowed to present one's case in chief in an orderly fashion. That guarantee of being allowed to face one's accusers and cross-examine them. That guarantee that does not countenance the rationalization that some congressional committees, and let me say also, some agencies of our Government, are prone to advance in denying confrontation of one's accusers that such confrontations would dry up the source of the material and the information. It is a precious guarantee that the person accused should be allowed to confront his accusers.

I say to the American people today, as I have said so many times from my desk in the Senate, "Watch out for your rights, if your guilt or innocence can be determined by accusers whom you do not have the chance to confront and examine."

There is another guarantee that I have often mentioned; namely, that a committee make an official stenographic record so that one should not be confronted with the statement, as has been done too often in the past by congressional committees when people are charged: "Well, we can't give the source of our information. We can't tell you all the information."

Nothing is more precious to an American from a legal standpoint that his presumption of innocence. Nothing is more precious than his right to have his guilt established by the accusers and sustained by their burden of proof.

I have pleaded, as I plead again tonight, of course, for the right to be represented by counsel, but also, Mr. President, for the right to answer the charges in an orderly fashion, and for the right of appeal. To be represented by counsel does not mean that our rights should be limited to having the body of a counsel in the same room while the investigation is going on. Any time a congressional committee seeks to turn itself into a court, then all the juridical protections of fair procedure should be available to the person accused. If they are not, then he is before a kangaroo court, not an American court, not an American investigatory body which under our system of jurisprudence should be bound by these fair rules of procedure.

That was the position I took on the night of March 30, 1954, and in other statements I made during the historic debate on the McCarthy case.

Tonight, I rise to recall that time, because that will always be my position, and that is going to be my position in connection with any investigation by this body into the conduct of any Member of this body. But let me make clear that no Member of this body occupies a privileged position from the standpoint of having his conduct adjudged. For the Senate happens to be the judge of its Members. Not only has it that right, but it also has that duty. It is very important we see to it that we carry out that constitutional mandate, and I speak of the constitutional mandate that is provided by the Constitution itself.

Let me lay down a few basic legal premises from which I approach this subject tonight. Let me also say that the Senator who is involved in the public controversy now being waged in some of the press of this country is entitled to every single procedural right for which I have pleaded in the years gone by, and I will fight to every degree that I can to protect him in those procedural rights.

The record is perfectly clear, on the basis of my work with this particular Senator, that my friendship is a matter of proven record. There is no man or woman in this body for whom I would not go to the "mat," so to speak, in protecting and fighting to assure a fair hearing for him, guaranteeing to him the procedural rights to which he is entitled.

That is well known by the Senator involved, for, on the basis of my past associations with him, limited to our official relations in the Senate, and to his service on a delegation which went with me to Latin America, I say for the record tonight that I consider myself to be his friend.

If—and I stress the word "if"—it should develop that there is some basis for questioning any action that he has ever taken, that does not change my friendship. To the contrary, let me say that I believe one of the tests of a friend is whether he stands with a friend when he is in trouble—if he is in trouble. But it also carries with it the duty on the part of a Senator never to let friendship in any way interfere with carrying out his responsibilities as a Senator, to carry out the constitutional mandate—when the conduct of a Senator is placed under questioning within the framework of proper procedure—to sit in judgment on the record.

But, it is the record I wish to talk about procedurally tonight. I wish to make certain that we will have a record which will stand up under analysis. When I make these comments about the obligations of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, I am really pleading that it recognize some of the comments which are already getting into print and which, in fairness to the committee and to the Senate, it should clarify the record as to the committee's procedure.

I am sure, with the high regard I have for the estimable members of that committee, including the brilliant lawyer who is its chairman and a former judge from his State, that they, too, will recognize the importance of clearing the atmosphere a bit in regard to the many misunderstandings which I believe are developing in this country concerning the work of the committee in the so-called instant case.

For example, I am disturbed over press reports that the committee expects to conclude its "investigation"—as found in one of the press reports—by the end of this month.

I do not believe that would be fair to the Senator involved, or to the Senate, because I believe that the committee has an obligation to make an official record, and a public one. If it does not do so, then the public is not likely to forget that the Senate dug into the affairs of Bobby Baker, former secretary to the majority in the Senate, for more than 2 years. As is known, I thought that there was a great deal of time wasted in that investigation. I am not suggesting a long investigation in the instant case but I am suggesting a thorough investigation, on the record.

In my judgment, what happened in the Bobby Baker case was that it did drag on, and that sufficient care was not taken in regard to making a record which deals with the procedural guarantees to which I have already alluded; but the committee, in the Baker case, did a remarkable job in many ways. It interviewed, I believe, more than 200 persons. It took sworn testimony from more than 60 witnesses, and pursued leads in 31 States and countries, including Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic.

In fact, I do not believe that the Senate itself ever made the best use that could have been made in that situation of the record that the committee made in the Bobby Baker case. But I believe it is important, before this matter gets out of hand and before a great deal of damage is done by individuals and to the Senate itself, that we obtain a clarification from the select committee as to what procedure it is following and plans to follow toward final culmination of its work on this case. I believe that the Senator involved is entitled to know. I believe that the Senate is also entitled to know.

On the basis of communications already received, conversations already had, and newspaper stories already read, I am worried that the Senate itself may be the sufferer, if the committee does not follow some of the suggestions I am making tonight, procedurewise.

(At this point, Mr. TYDINGS took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the resolution creating the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct gave it broad powers to investigate charges of improper or illegal conduct by Senators or Senate employees. Any hesitation to carry out this responsibility will only damage the reputation of the committee and the Senate.

Mr. President, I turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 13, page 16939, at the time Senate Resolution 338 was agreed to, on July 24, 1964, and ask unanimous consent to have the entire resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

So the resolution (S. Res. 338), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That (a) There is hereby established a permanent select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct (referred to hereinafter as the 'select committee') consisting of six Members of the Senate, of whom three shall be selected from members of the majority party and three shall be selected from members of the minority party. Members thereof shall be appointed by the President of the Senate. The select committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(b) Vacancies in the membership of the select committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments thereto are made.

"(c) A majority of the members of the select committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that the select committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony. The select committee shall adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing standing committees of the Senate.

"SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the select committee to—

"(1) receive complaints and investigate allegations of improper conduct which may reflect upon the Senate, violations of law, and violations of rules and regulations of the Senate, relating to the conduct of individuals in the performance of their duties as Members of the Senate, or as officers or employees of the Senate, and to make appropriate findings of fact and conclusions with respect thereto;

"(2) recommend to the Senate by report or resolution by a majority vote of the full committee disciplinary action to be taken with respect to such violations which the select committee shall determine, after according to the individuals concerned due notice and opportunity for hearing, to have occurred;

"(3) recommend to the Senate, by report or resolution, such additional rules or regulations as the select committee shall determine to be necessary or desirable to insure proper standards of conduct by Members of the Senate, and by officers or employees of the Senate, in the performance of their duties and the discharge of their responsibilities; and

"(4) report violations by a majority vote of the full committee of any law to the proper Federal and State authorities.

"(b) The select committee from time to time shall transmit to the Senate its recommendation as to any legislative measures which it may consider to be necessary for the effective discharge of its duties.

"SEC. 3. (a) The select committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony orally or by deposition; and (7) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable.

"(b) Upon request made by the members of the select committee selected from the minority party, the committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the select committee may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,600 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the members of the committee who are members of the minority party.

"(c) With the prior consent of the department or agency concerned, the select committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of the General Accounting Office or any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis or otherwise the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the select committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the select committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

"(d) Subpenas may be issued by the select committee over the signature of the chairman or any other member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the select committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

"SEC. 4. The expenses of the select committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the select committee.

"SEC. 5. As used in this resolution the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means—

"(1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate;

"(2) an employee of the Senate, any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, or any Member of the Senate;

"(3) the Legislative Counsel of the Senate or any employee of his office;

"(4) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties;

"(5) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate;

"(6) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate; and

"(7) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

The title was amended, so as to read: "Resolution establishing the Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, section 2(a)(1) of the resolution reads as follows:

> Receive complaints and investigate allegations of improper conduct which may reflect upon the Senate, violations of law, and violations of rules and regulations of the Senate relating to the conduct of individuals in the performance of their duties as Members of the Senate, or as officers or employees of the Senate, and to make appropriate findings of fact and conclusions with respect thereto.

Section 2, subsection 2:

> Recommend to the Senate by report on resolution by a majority vote of the full committee, disciplinary action to be taken with respect to such violations which the select committee shall determine, after according the individuals concerned due notice and opportunity for hearing, to have occurred.

Subsection 3:

> Recommended to the Senate, by report or resolution, such additional rules or regulations as the select committee shall determine to be necessary or desirable to insure proper standards of conduct by Members of the Senate, and by officers or employees of the Senate, in the performance of their duties and the discharge of their responsibilities.

Those are the three pertinent subsections that I wanted to read into the Record, although I have already placed the entire matter in the Record.

Thus, it has given me concern to read an Associated Press dispatch that I think clearly and impliedly criticizes the select committee, I think without justification, for I know of no evidence that justifies criticism of the select committee, but, nevertheless, an article that leaves the impression that the select committee is going to rush through this inquiry, and not give it the due deliberation which it now calls for.

The dispatch reads that soon after April 17, "the committee hopes to have in hand the investigators' findings and then to draw up a report to the Senate, setting forth the conclusions and recommendations. Under these plans, no public hearings would be held."

I do not see how they can avoid public hearings. I have not any doubt that in a matter such as this a considerable number of executive hearings are necessary. It may be that the information available to the committee may justify a conclusion of no public hearings, but the record ought to be public. The American people are entitled to it, because it has become public business.

Certainly, witnesses ought to be examined under oath, subject to the penalty for perjury if they lie.

In fact, Mr. President, I think the storm that has brewed over this matter leaves the committee no other course but to make a juridical record—and the able members of the committee know how to do that—because if that kind of record is not made, a report of the committee will not end the case. That will not silence the press.

It may very well feed the storm of criticism.

I fear that the newspapers may continue to publish new charges which the committee in its haste may not have investigated. This might give the impression that the committee had attempted to whitewash some phases of the charges, which would be unfair to the Senator concerned and to the Senate.

Of course, I wish that a controversy such as this had never arisen, but we have to face the facts as we find them. I think, in the interest of the Senator concerned and his friends, those of us who believe in fair play, we should have the type of procedure the senior Senator from Oregon has suggested tonight in his remarks.

I am also concerned about a critical article I read appearing in the press alleging—and I have no reason to believe the allegations are true—that there seems to be a primary interest on the part of the Department of Justice, and on the part of the committee, over the question as to whether or not certain documents were rifled, were copied without permission, or stolen.

I do not know what the facts are, but I know the press and the people are going to continue to ask the controlling question: What about the contents of the documents? Are they true or false?

I do not think I need to tell anybody in this body my feelings about stool pigeons or betrayers of trust, but those questions are irrelevant to the question of determining innocence or guilt.

As we know, our own Government very frequently makes use of the testimony of stool pigeons and promises them immunity.

Many newspapers, congressional committees, law enforcement officers, have access to unauthorized documents.

In the last few days, for example, the Los Angeles Times has published the excerpts from a confidential Senate Preparedness Subcommittee report. The New York Times has published unauthorized information from State Department files on the Abba Schwartz controversy.

There is nothing new about these devices for obtaining information, no matter how we may deplore them.

The continuing cry about stolen documents could open up the charge that a divisionary tactic is being used to avoid facing up to the merits of the truth or falsity of the charges.

As one Member of this body, I think it is the clear responsibility of the select committee to determine whether the charges are true, and take whatever time is necessary, and exercise whatever procedural rights are needed to be exercised, to find an answer to the question.

Mr. President, if we ever start taking the position that, once charges are made, false or true, we are going to consider the charges only on the basis of the source of the information or the circumstances under which it was obtained, then I think we will bring down on the heads of the Members of the Senate a criticism of the Senate of the United States that when our own Members are involved, we have one procedure, and when others are involved, we have another.

We are not guilty of that charge, and I am satisfied we will never become guilty of that charge. But I want to point out tonight that a good many newspaper articles are already making the charge, by one innuendo after another; and I think the best way we can serve any Member of the Senate who is ever under a charge is to follow the type of procedure I have urged here tonight.

I hope the select committee to which I have referred will give a great deal of heed to this suggestion.

Mr. President, I am not alone. I may be alone on the floor, but I am not alone in this body, for many conversations are being carried on among us. There is great concern among us. Senator after Senator has told me that he shares my view that the best way, as friends of the Senator concerned, is to take the stand I am taking tonight for a full, fair investigation, under the basic guarantees of the rules of procedure that protect a person in a fair investigation and a fair hearing.

It has been suggested by some that they think perhaps, under the circumstances, the matter ought to be moved from the forum of the Senate to the forum of the courts, but I do not think that is for us to determine.

That is for individuals involved to determine. My own personal view is that a politician is placed in a difficult position if he has to become the plaintiff in a court action in a charge, for example, of libel.

If I ever paid attention to libelous charges made against me I would be in court most of the time. I have always taken the position that we politicians are fair game when it comes to the matter of libel.

But this is a case far beyond a case of libel, for this case raises an issue within a forum of the Senate of the United States that places responsibility upon the Senate to determine whether or not a constitutional mandate requires implementation. I do not know whether it does or not and we will not know until the record is made. But I want a record made on which I can place reliance, and that is what I am pleading for.

I think the Department of Justice, on the basis of such information as has been given to me, is following a mistaken course of action if it is limiting itself to an investigation of the accusers, and they should not be exempt from investigation. They should fall within the jurisdiction of the case, too, and I take it for granted they would be subpenaed and placed under examination and cross-examination under oath.

I recognize the role that muckrakers have played in American journalism throughout the history of our country. Lincoln Steffens probably has never been exceeded in the contributions he made to journalistic muckraking. Journalistic muckraking is never justified except on the basis of the truth. No journalist is entitled to any protection on the ground of freedom of the press if he does not tell the truth. Freedom of the press does not mean a license to lie.

I do not know what the facts are in regard to the charges and countercharges. I do not know what the facts are in regard to the article appearing in Newsweek for April 11, 1966, which I shall not put in the Record, certainly not at this stage of the controversy, because I think the committee first has an obligation to proceed with its hearings and advise the Senate as to the procedures it is following and proposes to follow in order to answer such charges as are in Newsweek.

I do not know, for example, what the facts are about an editorial in the Los Angeles Times for March 28 entitled "Shadow Falls Across the Senate." I shall not put the editorial in the RECORD as of now. I wish to make this reference to it because it bears upon remarks I made earlier in this speech supporting the justification for my concern about the image of the U.S. Senate that will be created in this Republic if we do not see to it that a fair and full hearing is conducted in regard to the controversy that has been forced upon us. The Senate is not the creator of it.

I do not know what the facts are with regard to an editorial in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of April 3, 1966, but it bears out the point of view of the senior Senator from Oregon that there is concern about this matter in the country; or an editorial that appeared in the Milwaukee Journal for Wednesday, March 9; or an article in the Publishers' Auxiliary entitled "In Our Opinion Stirrings of Cause Celebre Muffled by Ethics Quiz."

I do not know of a scintilla of justification existing for any such allegations. I shall continue to believe that there is no justification for them, but they cannot be swept under the rug and they cannot be answered by running away from them.

The matter must be considered on a strictly professional basis to winnow the truth from falsehood and present a public record.

The Hartford, Conn., Courant of March 20, 1966, printed an article entitled "The Senate Has No Code of Ethics." I do not believe we can permit this unfair evaluation of us to go unanswered.

Therefore, this select committee has a thankless job, and also an exceedingly responsible job. I have made these remarks, which are motivated entirely by feelings of friendliness toward the committee and toward the Senator involved, in the hope that we can stop the spread of misunderstanding in this country in regard to the procedure that is being followed in the handling of this controversy.

If the Department of Justice is going to interest itself in this case, as it has a right to—I am not so sure it does not have a duty—then certainly it should consider the source of material and the circumstances under which it was obtained. All of that is pertinent.

In the last analysis we, as Senators, may very well be members of a jury. I hope not. When one comes as a juryman all of these factors in regard to the source of evidence are important.

The Department of Justice also has an even more important primary obligation, and that is the consideration of the question: What is the truth and what is the falsehood involved? Has a muckraking job been done by taking statements and material out of context, in the sense that it changes truth into falsity? We are entitled to know that.

The individuals involved are entitled to the kind of protection procedurally for which the Senator from Oregon has pleaded tonight. I have taken that stand time and time again in respect to Senate and House committee investigations. I take it now only by way of expressing my friendly advice as a Member of the Senate to an agent of the Senate, the Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I am thankful that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon yielded to me. I concur in the statement he made today on this serious matter.

I would like, Mr. President, to associate myself with each and every statement made in the sound, irrefutable legal argument of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, who is one of the great lawyers in this body.

Many years ago I was the chief criminal prosecuting attorney of Cuyahoga County in Ohio, and I tried many criminal cases, trying only felonies at that time. Over the years, as a trial lawyer, I have defended many men accused of criminal offenses.

Firmly and fervently impressed upon me over the years is the view that every person in our Nation accused of any offense is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty by evidence sufficient to convince beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the person charged with the offense.

Then also, as a result of my experience and training, I have come to the fervent conclusion that punishment, like a shadow, should follow conviction based on proof beyond a reasonable doubt of any offense. We are not talking today about criminal accusations; but in this matter adverted to by the senior Senator from Oregon, adverted to regretfully, as I take the floor regretfully—because in a Senate of 100 Members, we all become good friends and honor and respect one another—I feel as does the great and distinguished Senator from Oregon. He does not envy our colleagues who serve on the Committee on Standards and Conduct the heavy responsibility that is theirs to investigate, at the request of a Member of this body, what the committee has termed "charges of misconduct" against him.

Frankly, I am glad that I am not a member of that committee. However, I am certain that if I were a member of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, I would urge open hearings without unnecessary delay, just as has been urged by the senior Senator from Oregon. I would urge that all available witnesses testify at that hearing, which would be open to the public, after, of course, necessary executive and investigatory sessions of the committee itself were held.

After Senators had considered all the available legal evidence, I would, if I were a member of the select committee, announce my decision among the group of my colleagues in accord with my judgment and conscience.

Our colleagues who are members of the Committee on Standards and Conduct are outstanding Senators of unquestioned integrity. The chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], is one of the great statesmen of this generation. He has been a judge of the courts in his State. It has been mentioned from time to time that he might be selected, if he wished to be selected—he probably does not—to be a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. The Senator from Mississippi, we all agree, would grace the Supreme Court were he a member of that body.

The gravity of this situation cannot be overemphasized. The integrity and dignity of the U.S. Senate is at stake. An accusation of misconduct against one Senator of the United States is a matter of concern on the part of the 99 other Senators.

Since the time our colleague who has been accused asked the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct to take up this matter, it has seemed to some persons, according to statements we hear or read from time to time, that the committee's proceedings have been shrouded in a cloak of secrecy. I hope that that is not true. As a result, there has been a great deal of public misunderstanding and perhaps misinformation concerning the investigation.

There are reports that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is harassing the newspapermen who originally made the allegations which resulted in the investigation, and that knowledgeable individuals who are in a position to testify to the facts have been intimidated by FBI agents. FBI agents are guilty of misconduct if these allegations are factually correct. I am confident that no Senator had a part in the alleged harassment and intimidation, and that all Senators would join me in condemning it.

Other newspaper articles report that greater emphasis is being placed on determining the source of the information allegedly received by certain columnists, instead of determining the validity of the charges. I hope that is not true; it should not be true. However, as a result of these reports and rumors, citizens are confounded and confused, and the reputation of the Senate may be tarnished if they continue. If these reports are accurate, they constitute conduct on the part of FBI agents that is reprehensible.

I have every confidence that any Senator accused of misconduct will obtain justice.

I was interested to hear what the Senator from Oregon said about libelous charges made against him and that they are a part of the life of a politician. Over the years, I have received similar scars, but I have taken them in my stride, or have tried to. I have confidence that in the end, the truth will make itself known.

The Committee on Standards and Conduct is honorbound to determine the validity of the conflicting allegations and charges. Any other action or failure to take appropriate action is out of order at this time. I cannot believe that there will be any evasion by the committee of its clear duty. I feel that it would be in the best interests of the Senate and of the Nation if the committee were to conduct open hearings on this subject without delay. Certainly, were a Senate committee to be investigating similar charges against any high official in the executive branch of the Government, open hearings would be held, and the matter would be fully aired before the American public. Have we the moral right to create a double standard of conduct, one for the executive branch, and another for the legislative branch of our Government?

I am much saddened by the necessity for this investigation as I know all of my colleagues are, and especially, as I know, the senior Senator from Oregon is. The Senator from Oregon adverted to some editorials. I have read some of those editorials, including an excellent editorial published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I shall not ask that it be placed in the Record as a part of my remarks. However, at the outset, the writer of the editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch stated:

> The Senate Committee on Standards and and Conduct ought to be encouraged to get to the bottom of what it has termed "charges of misconduct" * * *. This bipartisan committee established to police senatorial ethics is the proper body to determine (the facts).

What is disturbing about the case, according to the editorial, and this was a matter adverted to by the Senator from Oregon—is the allegation that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Attorney General Katzenbach apparently are questioning some sources to determine how newspapermen obtained the information in the first sentence.

The point is not how columnists obtained any information. The point is, as was stated by the senior Senator from Oregon, whether the charges stand up. That is what the Select Committee is honor bound to determine. Any other inquiry is out of order at this time.

Mr. President, we all agree that public office is a public trust. A great American on a historic occasion said:

> Let no guilty man escape. No personal considerations should stand in the way of performing a public duty.

Let this serve as a guide to us.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Ohio for the statement he has just made. I associate myself with his statement.

The Senator from Ohio is really a teacher of mine. He will not admit it, but his record on law enforcement has been a source of reliance for me as I have sought information since he has been in the Senate with regard to some of the basic procedural questions I have talked about today.

The Senator mentioned one point that I think needs to be stressed in the Record before we adjourn; that is, that the Senator involved is the one who, to his everlasting credit, stated to the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct that he would make available to the committee all his records. He urged the committee to conduct a thorough investigation. That is to his everlasting credit, and it bears out the expressions of regard that I bespoke of him in my remarks.

I think that he is entitled to the very thorough type of investigation that the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Oregon suggested here today by way of advice to the Senate committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. That is a correct statement. I am proud that our colleague did exactly as the Senator from Oregon has stated.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from Oregon for the very fine statement he has made on the responsibility that is ours as Members of this body to seek the truth and to determine just what has happened.

I feel that the recommendations that the senior Senator from Oregon has made are appropriate, and I hope that they will be given every consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona very much. The Senator knows the extremely high regard in which I hold him, as I have demonstrated not only here, but also when we have traveled abroad.

I am not at all surprised by the statement the Senator from Arizona has made. He has demonstrated over and over again that he recognizes that unless we protect the procedural rights of the people, we will never be able to protect their substantive rights.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 14, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 13, 1966:

Department of Labor

Stanley H. Ruttenberg, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

U.S. Attorney

Edward L. Shaheen, of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Louisiana for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Mississippi for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Eugene G. Cushing, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years vice William N. Goodwin.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 13, 1966:

Commissioner of Indian Affairs

Robert LaFollette Bennett, of Alaska, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

SENATE

Thursday, April 14, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable John O. Pastore, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

Rev. Dr. Paul Morrison, assistant minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, we pause humbly and reverently in Thy presence acknowledging that Your world is not a child of chaos or an offspring of chance, but a world of abundance, of beauty, of order, and design. Out of Thy goodness and guidance, Thou hast showered favors upon our beloved land. We thank Thee, O God, for the heritage that has come down to us, and for the great leaders who, in crucial times, have held steadfast, affirming their trust and obedience to Thy divine will.

May each Member of the Senate this day receive Thy blessing and benediction, as they deliberate and legislate together for the common good of our Nation and the benefit of all mankind. Make stable and wise their minds to understand their entrustment. Grant that their every effort be made to turn back war's devastation of human life. Guide and direct each Senator as a lover of peace and concord, a lover of righteousness and justice, to implore Thy divine power that their efforts may lead this Nation, and the nations of the earth, into the path of victory for brotherhood and peace. Out of this moment of silence, speak to their hearts and minds; and stir their souls to good works, we pray through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. John O. Pastore, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PASTORE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 13, 1966, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3218. A bill to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; and to encourage the study and improvement of the care and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of animals used in research, training, or testing; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3219. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Wan; and

S. 3220. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis Osvaldo Martinez-Farinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 3221. A bill to amend section 13a(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the discontinuance or change of certain intrastate operations or services, in order to extend the time for State action prior to petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 3222. A bill for the relief of Dusko Doder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3223. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jesus L. Lastra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. Miller):

S. 3224. A bill to repeal that portion of the act of March 3, 1893, which prohibits the employment, in any Government service or by any officer of the District of Columbia, of any employee of the Pinkerton Detective Agency, or any similar agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3225. A bill to provide that plans and regulations established pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the control of water pollution shall apply to vessels (including boats) and marinas; and

S. 3226. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize Federal assistance in carrying out short-term training programs in treatment work operation and maintenance; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 3227. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to assist in meeting the need for highly trained management personnel for the efficient operation of mass transportation systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

STANDARDS FOR CURTAILMENT OF PETNAPING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to curb the kidnaping of pets for laboratory experiments and to require humane treatment of laboratory animals.

I have received an enormous amount of mail upon this subject.

A bill is pending which I believe tends to be more restrictive of operations for experimentation than is merited by the desire to be humane to animals.

As I should not like to be negative in these matters, but positive, I am introducing my own bill which I ask to have appropriately referred and which I believe, at one and the same time, fully protects the urgent need on the part of our citizens for experimentation with animals in connection with medical and other problems, and at the same time will provide for humane treatment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3218) to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; and to encourage the study and improvement of the care and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of animals used in research, training, or testing, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, medical research involving the use of laboratory animals has contributed to bringing about a significant reduction in human suffering and death. However, it is entirely proper and practical that this research be conducted under humane conditions.

The measure which I am introducing today provides not only for the humane treatment of laboratory animals but also seeks to curb the illicit traffic in them by requiring that they be obtained from legal sources. My bill has the following principal features:

First. Directs the Surgeon General to promulgate standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals by Federal agencies and by recipients of Federal funds. In setting up these standards, the Surgeon General will consult both with government and private scientific groups and with the organizations concerned with the humane treatment of animals. These standards include the care of animals during and following surgical operations as well as standards for animal housing. Laboratories are to be accredited and periodically inspected.

Second. Encourages the study and improvement of the care and treatment of laboratory animals and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort. This includes also Federal information programs relating to the humane treatment and transportation of laboratory animals.

Third. Requires that animals used by accredited laboratories shall be acquired only from dealers licensed under State laws or, where the States have no licensing laws, from dealers approved by the Surgeon General.

Fourth. Requires detailed records of the disposition of animals.

This measure is patterned after legislation suggested by the New York State Society for Medical Research. It has the necessary virtue, I believe, of providing the necessary safeguards for the humane treatment of laboratory animals before, during, and after research without unduly hampering scientific inquiry.

Scientific inquiry and experimentation has proven its worth in the relieving of human suffering, yet this need not—and should not—be accomplished by subjecting animals to unnecessary suffering. The responsible scientific community, I am certain, supports this viewpoint, as illustrated by the fact that the New York State Society for Medical Research suggested this measure.

ADDITIONAL TIME FOR PROCEEDINGS INVOLVING CONTESTED PASSENGER TRAIN DISCONTINUANCES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce for my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] and for myself, a bill to provide additional time for proceedings involving contested passenger train discontinuances.

Our bill would amend section 13a(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act which deals with the discontinuance of passenger trains in intrastate commerce. Under existing law, State proceedings in intrastate cutbacks are restricted to the 120 days which follow a railroad's application for relief.

If, during the 120 days allowed under the existing law, a State public utility commission does not, or cannot, reach a decision on a discontinuance application, the railroad is free to carry its case to the Interstate Commerce Commission. This means that the State, or other representatives of the public, have only 4 months from the time the application is first filed to prepare and present a factual, reasoned case for the public interest in a typically complicated matter.

The bill we propose would extend this period to 180 days—or 6 months.

Four months may seem like a long while, but it is really quite limited, particularly if the carrier is not cooperative in providing data on its profits and losses, and if the public has difficulty in finding a railroad-oriented cost accountant to examine and make sense out of the carrier's balance sheets.

The cost accountant is an important factor because, I am advised, there is only a small handful in the country who specialize in railroad operations.

While the railroad can work on its case for months, if not years, before it files a discontinuance application, few, if any, States have the staff to do this, nor can they afford to keep a firm of consultants on the payroll in anticipation of some future cutback action by a railroad.

The general public is at an even greater disadvantage because it must, first, depend on the State to provide profit-and-loss data which may be late in arriving from the railroad, and second, must organize itself town-by-affected-town, and even organization-by-organization, obtaining witnesses from among knowledgeable volunteers willing and able to take time from their jobs to testify before a public utility commission.

The handicap confronting the public is clearly illustrated in the present effort by the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad to discontinue 287 passenger trains which serve 8 New Jersey counties, a move that would affect 35,000 commuters.

The Erie filed its application with the State PUC on January 5. Hearings began before the PUC on January 26, but it was not until about February 1 that the State could find and engage a Washington, D.C., transportation cost accountant to handle the mammoth job of examining the railroad's books.

This left very little time for the consultant to do his job properly.

Moreover, it was not, in fact, until about March 12—only a few weeks before the PUC hearings concluded—that the consultant received the last of the data supplied by the railroad. Even with a 7-day-a-week research effort throughout this whole period, the consultant found that his staff had been able to examine only about half the documents supplied to it.

It is clear that lack of time to prepare adequately can only serve to damage, if not wreck, the public's effort to prove its case for continuation of a particular railroad service.

Too much is riding on the provision of adequate commuter transportation in this country to permit individual lines to go out of business so easily. The public's convenience and comfort, the economic health of whole regions, and efforts to alleviate traffic congestion and air pollution are at stake.

The public must be given an ample opportunity to prepare and present its case in intrastate railroad discontinuances. The present law does not assure this. It puts time on the side of the carrier rather than where it properly belongs—impartially on the side of the public interest.

If further documentation is required to show why our bill is necessary, it was amply and incisively provided in a recent editorial in the Newark, N.J., Sunday Star-Ledger. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3221) to amend section 13a (2) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the discontinuance or change of certain intrastate operations or services, in order to extend the time for State action prior to petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission, introduced by Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The editorial presented by Mr. CASE is as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Mar. 27, 1966]

TIME FOR STUDY

There are usually two sides to a case but a railroad consultant seriously doubts that this applies to mass transit in New Jersey. It's his belief the public is usually late to know, and when it is apprised of a contemplated commuter service curtailment, it doesn't have enough time to prepare a definitive rebuttal.

Under the law, a railroad can apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission for relief 120 days after it has filed notice of intention with the State public utilities commission, if its petition is denied.

In the consultant's view, the interim does not permit sufficient time for study and for preparation of the public's case against curtailment. The railroads, in the meantime, have the benefit of special studies to buttress their contention that commuter operations are a losing proposition and no longer can be sustained by private operation.

The fiscal operations of a railroad are involved and complicated; there are a number of factors involved, the intricate bookkeeping of profits or losses within specified areas, inside or outside Jersey; the offsetting profits of freight operations; the infusion and effect of State commuter subsidies.

It becomes clear the public, even with expert services of consultants, is severely handicapped in presenting a documented case against cutbacks on commuter runs. It must depend on State-assigned counsel and officials for detailed analyses in opposing curtailment petitions.

The PUC hearings are designed to establish more than a black (profitable) and red (loss) ledger of the applicant's operations. There are subtle, complicated gradations of gray areas that can influence financial statements of railroads. These require minute, careful study that is not available in the time period established by statute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to join with Senator CASE today in introducing an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act which will provide some extra lead-time to the beleaguered New Jersey commuter.

Under existing law, a railroad, after months or years of intensive preparation of a persuasive case, can petition a State regulatory authority for permission to abandon or discontinue its intrastate passenger trains. A period of only 4 months is then allowed for the State regulatory agency to make a final decision on that petition. After that period, the applicant railroad can take its case, which again has received the benefit of lengthy and intensive preparation, to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The ICC takes jurisdiction of the dispute despite the fact that the State regulatory commission may not or cannot rule on the case, or may deny the railroad's petition.

I think that this 4-month period places much too heavy a strain on the resources of the State agency and the public groups which may be opposing the discontinuance petitions. Needless to say, it takes time and much expert knowledge to provide specific rebuttals to the documentary arguments which the applicant railroad will have prepared. And the regulatory agency, after testimony by both sides, needs time to carefully evaluate a long and detailed record and then make a difficult decision.

The 4-month period allowed under the present ICC statute is just not sufficient to allow commuter groups and other interested parties to prepare their testimony. Consequently, Senator CASE and I are today introducing an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act which will lengthen from 120 to 180 days the period of jurisdiction of the State regulatory agency.

There is no question that our amendment merely gives a bit of breathing time to the commuter railroads. And precious little at that.

The fundamental problems affecting commuter transportation—all modes, not just railroads—need a radically different approach for their solution. Under the Mass Transit Act of 1964, which I was proud to author, the Congress provided grants for the acquisition of capital stock—new cars, terminal facilities, buses, and so forth. But our short experience with this legislation has demonstrated that many of our older commuter transit systems were in more serious financial trouble than we had imagined. They simply could not keep operating until the infusions of new capital money could revitalize their services and attract passengers back to their lines.

This year I have introduced legislation to give interim relief to these commuter systems in the form of a temporary operating subsidy. Briefly, the bills would enable the Federal Government to make two-thirds grants to a transit authority to meet operating deficits if that public authority and the carrier had submitted long-range financial plans for placing the commuter system on a financially stable basis. I am convinced that this approach, over the long run, will provide the answer for our ailing commuter systems.

However, we need to keep our railroads in existence before we can help them with constructive legislation. And the bill which Senator CASE and I are introducing today would work toward that end by giving the commuting public more time to prepare answers to discontinuance petitions and State regulatory agencies more time to consider their action.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, with the permission of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the author of the bill, I be permitted to join as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 902) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes.

The bill deals with the right or authority of the Department of Agriculture to test soils in urban communities.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be joined as a cosponsor of S. 2934, the Community Development District Act of 1966, introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], for himself and other Senators. I do this with the permission of the author of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and HUD to designate such districts within States to allow for regional planning grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954. Present 701 grants are allowed for urban planning but this bill would help the smaller communities and rural areas which transcend political boundaries. Planning is concerned with pattern and intensity of land use, public facilities, transportation, open space, housing, fiscal development, and so forth. The planning will enable the rural areas to avoid many of the problems of the existing larger cities which unfortunately were never able to plan ahead.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3153) to make it an unfair labor practice to require a person who conscientiously objects to membership in a labor organization to be a member of such an organization as a condition of employment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND WATER RETARDATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the April issue of the Central States Construction magazine, published at Topeka, Kans., published an excellent article entitled "We Are No Stronger Than Our Soil."

I was a Member of the House of Representatives 35 years ago and voted to establish the Soil Conservation Service. During these 35 years, great progress has been made in the fields of soil conservation and water retardation. Kansas ranks among the top States in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article written by Mr. John B. Reubens, managing editor, printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We Are No Stronger Than Our Soil

(By John B. Reubens)

Once again, as appropriations for fiscal year 1967 come up for review, the Bureau of the Budget has singled out the agricultural conservation program for destructive cutting. This time, using an old political tactic, the announced goal is a total of $100 million, leaving room for compromise at a lower figure than the minimal $220 million proposed.

In view of the tremendous vote for the full appropriation last year, restoring an attempted cut of $100 million, when 354 Representatives voted for the full appropriation and only 41 against it, it is hard to understand why the present administration is going along with a renewed attack on ACP funding.

What makes this attack doubly hard to understand is that one announced goal of Federal policy is the use of American food surpluses as a weapon to win the war for a free world. Even if all the bureaucrats and pencil-pushing accountants in the Bureau of the Budget think that food and crops just grow, President Johnson himself is certainly aware that the preservation and improvement of the soil is essential to agricultural plenty.

Why select ACP funds for a slash? Because, it seems to us, faced with the enormous cost of a war in Vietnam and the Great Society's programs, even the Federal money-managers find cause for alarm. Where will it all come from? A hundred million here, another there soon add up. Furthermore, cutting a program which affects only a relatively small number of voters, spread over many States, does far less political damage than a similar reduction in a program aimed at the urban populations.

This attack on the ACP funds comes, as we have remarked, the year after the urban legislators recognized the need for agricultural conservation and voted to restore the full appropriation. Does the administration think that Members of the Congress are so quick to forget?

But, enough of politics—let us deal in hard facts.

The population of the world and the United States is growing at fantastic rates. In many cases, our enormous surpluses are now whittled down to little more than necessary reserves in the event of total crop failure. For example, there is barely enough wheat to last 8 months. In 1960, the population of the United States was 180 million; by the year 2000, a mere 34 years away, our population is expected to reach 340 million of people. All of them require food to eat and water to drink.

What have we got to do it with? About 523 million acres of usable farmland. Curiously, one of the best chances that we have to keep enough arable land to feed the people to come was given to us by the often criticized and frequently derided practice of taking land out of production. Over the years, we have taken about 50 million acres out of cultivation. Not all can be safely returned but what can is a bonus—a true return on investment in natural resources through conservation.

Thirty-five years ago, this Nation adopted soil conservation, describing it in the legislation that set up the program, as "a matter of national policy." This decision was a wise one, particularly when the history of civilized man shows us that no nation has ever survived the loss or serious impairment of its ability to grow its own food, its agricultural productivity. Today, more than ever, we must do everything we can to improve and conserve our land both as a source of food and, a growing problem, to increase our water supplies.

No amount of Federal study can produce water, all the Federal spending in the Treasury cannot provide as much good water as improved conservation practices provide at relatively low cost. By 1975, expert estimates place industrial demand for water at 1,193 gallons per person per day, and agricultural needs at 821 gallons per person per day.

Where will this water come from? Just where it comes from today unless we can develop some inexpensive method of removing salt from the seas and other saline water sources. And even the oceans, if not considered as a whole and treated with proper biological respect, could prove just as vulnerable to abuse as any other natural resource.

Since our water must come from the same sources tomorrow as it has today and yesterday, rain and snowfall, it seems strange that funds to improve and conserve the supply are up for cutting. We have a good chance to secure our water needs if sound conservation practices are widely adopted. At present, we lose about 25 billion gallons daily of the rainfall that falls on the Great Plains area. We capture just about half the water that falls as rain for the benefit of our crops. The rest goes merrily on downhill, minus evaporation. We can and must correct this, but the doing requires money and the money comes from ACP funds. This is what the Bureau of the Budget's action seeks to curtail.

Speaking at the Kansas Conservation Contractors' Association 15th annual convention, January 1966, Ed Gordon, legislative committee chairman, Land Improvement Contractors of America, reviewed the tremendous cooperative effort it required to preserve the ACP appropriation for 1966. Four million letters poured in from members of the National Farmers Union, National Grange, National Cattleman's Association, Soil Conservation Service Districts, National Association; National Limestone Association, Town and Country Church Association, various associations, and the Land Improvement Contractors of America.

Gordon stressed the need for continued writing to elected representatives to prevent a cut in fiscal 1967 ACP funds. How right he was is altogether too apparent. The bureaucrats are counting on human nature: it is hard to keep plugging, year after year, and victory, such as we enjoyed in 1965, brings a letdown.

We must all act now and write or wire our elected representatives today, telling them why they should support and vote for at least the full ACP appropriation, if not increase it to $300 million. And, we ought not to stop there but we should write our friends in cities and other States, urging them to get their representatives to support a full ACP appropriation.

We cannot countenance anything that will tend to decrease the amount of arable land we have or can have. Every citizen of the United States has a deep interest in conservation for conservation is the key to life itself, let alone abundance. If we do not foster conservation as an approach to the physical world in which we live, we are in a fair way of laying the ground for our extinction, both as a nation and as a species.

The ACP program is vital to continued conservation. Let us make every effort to make sure that adequate funds are available to carry it out in the best possible way.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF VA VOLUNTARY SERVICE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, representatives of 42 national voluntary organizations and their local community counterparts from all over the country will gather in Washington, D.C., April 18–20 for the 20th anniversary meeting of the Veterans' Administration Voluntary Service National Advisory Committee.

This meeting has been planned to commemorate the 20th birthday of VA Voluntary Service, which was founded in April 1946.

Currently, a monthly average of approximately 108,000 citizen volunteers are providing over 8 million hours of service to sick and disabled veterans each year in 164 VA hospitals. They also serve in VA's outpatient clinics, day treatment centers, and nursing home care units, and in the community to help discharged veteran-patients make successful adjustments to home and community.

The VA Voluntary Service Staff which directs and guides this nationwide voluntary service program is headed by James H. Parke, who has been the principal architect and developer of the VAVS plan which has won the support of the Nations leading voluntary organizations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the record further information in regard to the Veterans' Administration Voluntary Service.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION VOLUNTARY SERVICE 20TH ANNIVERSARY

The 20th anniversary of the Veterans' Administration Voluntary Service program of community volunteer participation in the care and treatment of veteran-patients will be observed in April of this year. The official observance will be in conjunction with the April 18–20 meeting of the National VA Voluntary Service Advisory Committee composed of representatives of 42 national voluntary organizations.

Volunteers and officials of the participating voluntary organizations and VA staff throughout the Nation have been invited to attend the meeting which will include special sessions of interest for all attending groups. In addition to commemorating the 20th birthday of VA Voluntary Service the various groups will explore mutual problems and attempt to develop ways and means for providing more effective service and leadership in the program of behalf of veteran patients.

A feature of the meeting will be a dramatization of "The VAVS Story" which presents the program as seen through the eyes of volunteers and officials of the participating organizations and hospital staff.

Another feature will be a luncheon honoring organizations and their representatives who attended the first planning meeting on April 8, 1946 which led to the birth of the official VA Voluntary Service plan. The guest speaker will be Brig. Gen. F. R. Kerr, who served as the first chairman of the National VAVS Committee.

Other highlights include the presentation of national commendations by W. J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to the heads of the 42 national organizations on the national committee in appreciation of their organizations' volunteer assistance in the medical program over the years; an evening devoted to individual meetings of the 42 national organizations; presentations by the VA's Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, W. J. Driver and the Chief Medical Director, Dr. H. M. Engle; and a patriotic program by the U.S. Army Field Band.

The Voluntary Service program which is being commemorated has experienced dynamic growth and development in its two decades of existence. Currently, a monthly average of approximately 108,000 citizen volunteers are providing over 8 million hours of service to sick and disabled veterans each year in VA's 165 hospitals. They also serve in VA's outpatient clinics, day treatment centers, and nursing home care units, and in the community to help discharged veteran-patients make successful adjustments to home and community.

The volunteers, who range from teenagers to octogenarians, are warm-hearted men and women of the community serving those who served. Each is prized for his own particular contribution which might be the enthusiasm and buoyancy of youth or the skill and wisdom of the older or retired person. Because they have time to serve and the desire to continue purposeful activity, retired and older citizens have found a prominent place in VA Voluntary Service.

The volunteers are welcomed in the VA as highly valued members of the hospital team. Under the supervision of the medical staff they perform assigned duties and can be found everywhere in VA's hospitals, supplementing and extending the work of the staff. Their efforts not only make it possible to extend and expand services and programs, but also result in improved quality of care and treatment for veteran-patients.

Volunteers give of themselves in this program of service to those in need. They receive no salaries or wages. The youth volunteers learn about medical and allied fields and become interested in health careers. All of the volunteers witness remarkable recoveries and rehabilitations by patients. They find in this reclaiming of human lives challenge worthy of their best efforts. The knowledge that they, as members of the hospital team, play a vital part in the recovery and rehabilitation of the patient is their basic reward and source of deep personal satisfactions.

Of particular significance is the placement of the Voluntary Service program in the office of the hospital chief of staff, thereby assuring top medical leadership and guidance for the participation of citizen volunteers. At the national level the service is in the office of Dr. Oreon K. Timm, assistant chief medical director for professional services, who serves as chairman of the National VAVS Advisory Committee.

The Voluntary Service staff which directs and guides this nationwide Voluntary Service program is headed by James H. Parke, who served as the principal architect and developer of the VAVS plan which has won the blessing and support of the Nation's leading national welfare, service, and veterans organizations.

ANNUAL DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that I have made an annual practice of disclosing my financial interests, whether direct or indirect, in any securities or combinations which are in any way subject to Federal regulation.

Mr. President, I believe that this should be the rule, at the very least, for all Senators. I believe that we should all be required to show what our financial interests are, directly or indirectly, in a personal sense, because the public is entitled to know. Thus, I feel that in my case—and I feel sure in the case of other Senators—it does not affect our judgment, and the public is, nonetheless, entitled to know.

In pursuance of that belief on my part, I have filed this disclosure of my financial interests for the year 1966, and ask unanimous consent that it may be made a part of the RECORD, as I have done in previous years.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST

For many years, I have urged the Congress to adopt a code of ethics, and on January 12, 1965, I introduced Senate Resolution 26 requiring the Select Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct to draft such a code for Senators and their employees.

My proposal would set basic standards for the conduct of Senators and their staffs, taking into consideration the necessary differences between the responsibilities and financial requirements of members of the executive branch and Members of Congress. I feel it is completely incongruous for Senate committees rigorously to question executive appointees on their financial affairs when those of us in Congress and our staffs are not subject to similar standards and requirements.

Repeating my action of the last several years, I will today abide by the disclosure provision of the interim code of ethics embodied in Senate Resolution 26 as if it were law, and place in the RECORD a current statement of my financial holdings. My proposal would amend the resolution establishing the select committee to require that Members or officers or employees of the Senate "having a financial interest, direct or indirect, which has a value of $5,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a Federal regulatory agency" should make a matter of public record the nature of such interest by filing a statement with the Comptroller General. Since the Comptroller General does not now have the authority to receive and maintain such lists, I am now making a statement for the RECORD to demonstrate my concern with the matter. As of this date, my holdings of the described nature are as follows:

As trustee of a family trust I have an indirect interest in the following companies or their subsidiaries or affiliates, each in an amount exceeding $5,000. These are normal investments in publicly owned corporations and constitute no element of control, alone or in combination with others:

American & Foreign Securities Corp.
Cities Service Corp.
Criterion Insurance Co.
Government Employees Corp.
Government Employees Financial Corp.
Government Employees Insurance Co.
Government Employees Life Insurance Co.
South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.
Southern Co.
Transamerica Corp. of Delaware.
First National City Bank of New York.
Ryder Systems, Inc.
Revlon, Inc.

THE HUMAN INVESTMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, an excellent analysis of the growing crisis of skilled manpower shortage was adopted by the Republican coordinating committee on March 28, 1966. Presented to the coordinating committee by the Task Force on Job Opportunities, the report stresses two aspects of needed governmental action which I and other Republicans consider to be highly important. One is eliminating racial barriers to employment. I have introduced S. 3092, along with Senators CASE and KUCHEL, a measure to strengthen both the substance and the enforceability of title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, banning racial discrimination in employment. The other is an incentive tax credit for investment in manpower training and retraining. I have introduced S. 2343, which would broaden the existing 7-percent credit for investment in equipment and machinery to include investment in manpower, and Senator PROUTY and Congressman CURTIS have also introduced similar measures. The task force report provides an eloquent statement of the need for these steps to overcome the growing shortage of skilled manpower.

I ask unanimous consent to have the task force report, entitled "The Human Investment," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HUMAN INVESTMENT

(Adopted by the Republican coordinating committee, March 28, 1966, presented by the Task Force on Job Opportunities)

TASK FORCE ON JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Chairman: Don Paarlberg, professor of agricultural economics, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.; special assistant to the President and Food for Peace Coordinator, 1958–61.

Vice chairman: George H. Bush, businessman and 1966 candidate for U.S. Congress, Seventh District of Texas.

Members

Yale Brozen, professor of business economics, University of Chicago.

THOMAS B. CURTIS, Member of Congress for the Second District of Missouri.

LEN B. JORDAN, U.S. Senator from Idaho.

Charlton H. Lyons, chairman, Republican State Central Committee of Louisiana.

JAMES D. MARTIN, Member of Congress for the Seventh District of Alabama.

Lee W. Minton, international president, Glass Bottle Blowers Association.

ARCH A. MOORE, JR., Member of Congress for First District of West Virginia.

Mrs. Helene M. Morris, national committeewoman for Florida.

Mrs. Elly M. Peterson, chairman of the Michigan Republican State Central Committee.

John H. Reed, Governor of the State of Maine.

John H. Stender, vice president, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers (AFL–CIO).

PRENTISS L. WALKER, Member of Congress for the Fourth District of Mississippi.

W. O. Walker, director of industrial relations for the State of Ohio.

William P. Young, secretary of labor and industry for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

THE HUMAN INVESTMENT

Our Nation today is facing a crisis in manpower. We are well into a serious skilled labor shortage but the Democratic administration continues to talk of unemployment statistics and is failing to give adequate thought to the problem of matching men to the right jobs.

The nature of the crisis

Today there are some 3 million unemployed Americans. Many more are underemployed. Although job vacancy data is incomplete, most economists agree that the total number of job openings around the country is well over 2 million—and maybe as high as 3 million.

In his manpower message to Congress on March 8, 1966, the President took some cognizance of the problem, saying that "we cannot rest content" as long as we have a condition where "employers seek skilled and experienced workers while thousands cannot find work because they lack proper training and education * * *. Our goal is not just a job for every worker. Our goal is to place every worker in a job where he utilizes his full productive potential, for his own and for society's benefit."

The goal is laudable, but the message contained no real solution to the problem. Instead, the President asked, "What can we do to help employers improve their own on the job training?" He did not answer the question, except to say that the Federal Government next year should spend $10.2 billion for education and training because "the root of most problems of unemployment and underemployment lies in deficiencies in education."

A Republican recommendation

The President also asked how might employers be encouraged "to redefine jobs in a way that employs more of the unskilled or semiskilled?" Again, he offered no answer. Right answers are not obtained by asking wrong questions.

We Republicans believe that the question is incorrectly stated. It is not jobs which should be redefined, but rather employees who must be retrained to fill those jobs. We believe that the real answer has been pending before Congress since February 1965, in the form of legislation sponsored by the entire Republican congressional leadership.

The Republican Party recommends that the Government seek to encourage employers to retrain their present and potential employees so as to improve their skills. We believe that the proper role of the Federal Government is to provide the climate, or the incentives, whereby labor and business can take the lead in reeducation for the industry.

Effects and causes

The present shortage of skilled workers has led to many serious problems:

It has caused an impairment of logistic support for our fighting men in Vietnam.

It has caused a backlog of unfilled orders throughout the domestic economy.

It has forced some companies to take foremen and supervisors away from their duties to work on the production line, with an attendant decline in managerial efficiency.

It has increased costly labor turnover, as desperate efforts to obtain qualified workers lure employees from one company to another and from one industry to another.

It has led to excessive overtime pay, reflected in the cost of the product.

It has encouraged some firms to seek workers abroad and bring them here to fill jobs once filled by Americans.

And as all these factors become more and more serious, costs to the employer are increased. Consumer prices then rise—and inflation is accelerated.

Artificial barriers, such as racial discrimination, are applied against many workers, preventing them from stepping into available openings. The unemployment rate among Negroes, for example, is still 7 percent—almost twice as high as among whites. Republican Members of Congress have attempted to eliminate racial barriers from labor legislation during this present Congress. But the Democratic leadership has refused even to let the issue be debated by the House. Had these Republican efforts to amend the Taft-Hartley Act and the situs picketing proposal been successful, the unemployment rate among minority groups would have dropped considerably. Moreover, it is unfortunate that the Johnson-Humphrey administration has failed to give prompt and effective implementation to title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which bans discrimination by employers and labor unions with more than 100 members. Once again, we Republicans call upon the Democratic administration to enforce this section of the law.

There are also restrictions on the geographic mobility of labor caused in large measure by a natural reluctance on the part of many workers to leave their lifelong homes to accept jobs elsewhere. And there are other factors.

But, by far the most important reason for unemployment at a time when job vacancies are about numerically equal to the people seeking jobs is the scarcity of needed job skills among the unemployed. This condition, called structural unemployment, is the key manpower problem of the 1960's.

"The nature of today's unemployment problem is no less serious because of its structural character," reported Republican members of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee in March 1965:

"Indeed, persistent unemployment that falls with special severity on particular age, education, or racial groups poses a real threat to our democratic system. Unless our efforts to attack structural unemployment succeed in enabling these individuals to lead productive lives, a growing and insurmountable gap may appear between the have's and the have not's in our society, or between those who have a good education and good jobs and those who have little education, inferior jobs or no jobs at all, and who are hostile or indifferent to their society. The increasing emphasis on high skills, on technical competence, and on expertise will increase the problem in years ahead and pose an even greater danger for the survival of our free and open democratic system. It is precisely for this reason that the attack on chronic unemployment takes such high priority among our national goals."

The need for education

In answer to this problem of structural unemployment begins with an increased national dedication to strong basic education, so that every American will have the requisite skills in comprehension, communication, and simple mathematics to qualify for more advanced training. This need becomes evident when it is realized that the unemployment rate among teenagers is 11 percent—three times above the national average.

But a great strengthening of basic education, vital though it is, will never be the complete answer to the problem. This year we must provide for an additional 1.6 million entrants to the labor market. Most of these newcomers will be teenagers or recent college graduates. By and large the jobs created for them—or the jobs made available by those who have moved up the ladder or out of the job market—will require much more skill than the jobs available a decade ago or even a year ago. We are in an age of rapidly advancing technology on all fronts of the economy.

To meet the demand of technology, there must be a broad national effort to upgrade the job skills of the American labor force all along the line—preparing the unskilled and semiskilled for varying types of skilled work, and turning those now classified as skilled workers into advanced technicians.

It goes without saying that, as workers move up the "skill ladder" to better and more demanding jobs, the positions they once filled become open to the less skilled but striving applicant.

The Republican Party has long recognized the need for a major effort to upgrade the Nation's job skills. In 1959, the Republican committee on programs and progress advocated: "* * * programs, particularly of private industry and labor organizations in cooperation with community colleges, adult evening classes, and vocational schools, to help the individual constantly to improve the level and the variety of his skills, and to become more flexible in the job market."

Republicans are also proud that they authored and supported the important Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and its subsequent strengthening amendments.

The role of industry

The most effective job trainer in the Nation has always been the free competitive economy. Through the years business and labor, working together, have demonstrated their ability to conceive, organize, and carry out job training programs superior both in quality and in efficiency to Government-operated programs. Although the Democratic administration is urging expanded governmental training programs, we believe that the emphasis should be redirected to business and labor, where primary responsibility and capability rightfully lie.

The proper role of the Federal Government is to encourage labor organizations and business enterprises to intensify and expand their time-tested programs of job training.

In 1962, Congress adjusted our revenue laws to provide a tax credit toward the cost of plant equipment and machinery in order to spur new investment in these job-creating items. It is now agreed among business analysts that this new provision has made a significant contribution to the increased investment in equipment and machinery.

Republicans believe Congress—and the administration—should now act to encourage a similar investment in human beings—in the American labor force, whose skills are worth far more to the strength of the Nation's economy than machinery can ever be. Certainly we should give the highest priority to an investment in human resources.

Republicans have suggested the tax credit approach to this problem because it can most easily be designed to reduce to a minimum the burdens of redtape, bureaucracy, and governmental intrusion into the affairs of business and labor.

The Democratic proposal of more Federal funds for training and education may be of limited help to the nonskilled in acquiring skills. But, such a proposal makes absolutely no provision for those workers who presently have limited skills to move up the ladder. This can result only in chaos at the bottom of the economic pile—competition for jobs at a level where competition is least desirable. The Republican tax credit approach will have equally beneficial effects at all levels of the skill ladder.

The human investment act

Accordingly, we recommend that the Congress enact and the Nation support Republican-authored legislation to grant a credit against Federal income taxes toward the costs incurred in retraining employees or potential employees in needed new skills.

Republicans in Congress have taken the lead in sponsoring the Human Investment Act. Twenty-two Republican Senators and eighty-three Republican Members of the House are sponsoring such legislation. All 12 members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership are included in this number.

The purpose of the Human Investment Act is to encourage industry to expand its training programs so that the reservoir of available job skills more closely matches the present and anticipated needs of the economy. Private enterprise today is the Nation's largest job trainer, investing about $4.5 billion a year in the various forms of employee training. Over the years, labor and business have shown that they know best what skills will be needed in the economy and what kinds of training will best prepare workers to accept the jobs that become available. It is the goal of the Human Investment Act to provide the type of economic climate through tax incentives which will permit business to enter this field on a major scale.

Unskilled workers today have an unemployment rate twice as high as the overall national rate. In most cases, the unskilled lack only the training necessary to permit them to move into existing vacancies.

The problem is a national one and demands a national solution. The Republican Party believes that the Human Investment Act is a proper, indeed, necessary, response.

This legislation will guarantee an expansion of worthwhile and needed training programs, such as apprenticeship and on-the-job training, while holding redtape and administrative regulation to a minimum. The enactment of this Republican-authored legislation would be a major step toward encouraging our American enterprise system to expand its continuing efforts to alleviate the Nation's manpower shortages and enhance the opportunities for the individual worker to share more fully in the benefits of the American economy.

HARD CHOICES IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the present turbulent political situation in South Vietnam makes it incumbent upon us to discuss once again U.S. policy in Vietnam and the extent of our commitments there. The people of the United States must be prepared for the hard choices and decisions which may be required of us as a result of the existing political uncertainty.

Our own purpose should remain unaltered. Side by side with the ARVN forces of South Vietnam, U.S. troops are waging a struggle for high but limited objectives with the necessary but limited military means. We are seeking a negotiated settlement to preserve freedom of choice for Vietnam. Our goals are threefold: First, pacification of the important and populous areas; second, economic and social development of the Vietnamese people; and, third, the holding of free elections in order to enable the Vietnamese to determine their own governmental future.

Should the Government of Premier Ky remain in office, or should another government with the same plans for Vietnam assume power and responsibility, the United States can continue to play its part in Vietnam. Should, however, a government come into office which is dissatisfied with our help, or with the presence of our forces in the country, or which is unable to continue the South Vietnamese share of the military burden, then we will have to decide whether to first, persist nonetheless and virtually take over the governmental operations in South Vietnam; second, withdraw our troops from the Asian mainland; or, third, redeploy our forces to another Asian location.

If we are so forced to reappraise our position, I urge that we do so in light of our basic policy to date—that is, we are in Vietnam because the actual government and people of that country wish to wage a struggle for their independence and freedom and they desire our help. In no event should the struggle there be a struggle carried on by us without South Vietnam, for it is at their behest that we are helping to defend them. It must be said at once—and I pay tribute to them—that the ARVN forces are carrying a heavy burden in the conflict. Indeed, their casualties are six times our own, grievous as are our own.

Just as I oppose carrying on the effort in Vietnam by ourselves, I also reject complete withdrawal from the Asian mainland. There are still a number of nations in that area which need and desire our help. The Chinese Communists still vow to persist in their so-called wars of aggression which they call wars of national liberation.

Should conditions force us to leave South Vietnam, I believe that our best choice is to redeploy our troops to another Asian country. It is my view that our forces should not be broken up, but should be kept together as an effective unit and redeployed where they can be available to counter any new aggressive move by Communist China. Northern Thailand is so threatened, and should the Government of Thailand request such assistance, I believe that at least some of our troops ought to be restationed there.

One question must be asked: "What would be the effect if we have to do so, not out of choice, of U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam on our other international commitments?" I believe that the United States will already have amply justified by what we have done to this point in South Vietnam—that we are prepared to back our commitments elsewhere. No one could have any right to doubt that we are ready, notwithstanding the difficulties in money and manpower, to support the cause of freedom. Every free nation in Asia and elsewhere in the developing world already has been heartened by our determination.

In these efforts, however, we cannot guarantee success; we can only guarantee the effort itself. It would have been, and would be, disastrous voluntarily to pull out of Vietnam, but it is no disgrace if conditions make our continuance there unwelcome or untenable.

Yesterday, I uttered these same thoughts in a series of speeches in the north country of my own State, and as I have noted that other Senators spoke yesterday, I desire to add my voice to theirs in this, the national record.

AMENDMENT OF VARIOUS PROVISIONS OF LAWS ADMINISTERED BY FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1069, S. 2822.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2822) to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 4, after line 3, to strike out:

Sec. 4. Sections 41 and 34 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1134c and 1134j), are each amended by striking from clause (a) in the first sentence thereof the following: ", for any of the purposes and subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in such Act, as amended".

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Sec. 4. (a) Sections 41 and 34 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1134c and 1134j), are each amended—

(1) by striking from clause (a) in the first sentence thereof the following: ", for

any of the purposes and subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in such Act, as amended"; and

(ii) by adding the following sentence immediately after the first sentence thereof: "Loans to cooperative associations made by any bank for cooperatives shall bear such rates of interest as the board of directors of the bank shall from time to time determine with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, but in no case shall the rate of interest exceed 6 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal of a loan.".

(b) The Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, is amended by deleting subsection (a) of section 8 thereof (12 U.S.C. 1141f(a)).

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration relating to Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, banks for cooperatives, farm credit board elections and compensation of Federal Farm Credit Board, are amended as hereinafter provided.

FEDERAL LAND BANKS

SEC. 2. Title I of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended—

(a) by adding the following subsection at the end of section 10 thereof (12 U.S.C. 751–757):

"(h) To the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal land bank of the district, and the board of directors of a Federal land bank association, a written report and approval by the manager or another employee of the association designated for the purpose shall be acceptable in lieu of the written report and approval otherwise required of the loan committee under this section; and in such cases the favorable report and approval by the manager or other employee shall constitute the applicant a member of the association."

(b) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of paragraph First of section 12 thereof (12 U.S.C. 771 First) and immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence and immediately before the second comma in the second sentence of paragraph Second of section 13 thereof (12 U.S.C. 781 Second) the following: "and which mortgages may include farmland within other farm credit districts to the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration";

(c) by striking "and unless owners of stock in the corporation assume personal liability for the loan to the extent required under rules and regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration" from the fourth sentence of paragraph Sixth of section 12 thereof (12 U.S.C. 771 Sixth); and

(d) by substituting "an amount specified by the Farm Credit Administration" for "$100,000" in paragraph Seventh of section 12 thereof (12 U.S.C. 771 Seventh).

FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS

SEC. 3. Title II of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended—

(a) in section 202(a) thereof (12 U.S.C. 1031), by deleting "and" at the end of paragraph (2), by substituting "; and" for the period at the end of paragraph (3) and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(4) to purchase for investment obligations of the Federal land banks and the banks for cooperatives and, to the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration, obligations of any agencies of the United States."; and

(b) by changing section 208(b) thereof (12 U.S.C. 1092) to read as follows: "The Farm Credit Administration may require reports in such form as it may specify from any or all of the Federal intermediate credit banks whenever in its judgment the same are necessary for a full and complete knowledge of its or their financial condition or operations."

BANKS FOR COOPERATIVES

SEC. 4. (a) Sections 41 and 34 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1134c and 1134j), are each amended—

(i) by striking from clause (a) in the first sentence thereof the following: ", for any of the purposes and subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in such Act, as amended"; and

(ii) by adding the following sentence immediately after the first sentence thereof: "Loans to cooperative associations made by any bank for cooperatives shall bear such rates of interest as the board of directors of the bank shall from time to time determine with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, but in no case shall the rate of interest exceed 6 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal of a loan.".

(b) The Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, is amended by deleting subsection (a) of section 8 thereof (12 U.S.C. 1141f(a)).

FARM CREDIT BOARD ELECTIONS

SEC. 5. The Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting "sixty" for "thirty" in the last sentence of section 5(e) thereof (12 U.S.C. 640e) and in the third last sentence of section 5(f) thereof (12 U.S.C. 640f) and by inserting the following immediately before the period at the end of each of such sentences: ", except that for elections to fill vacancies the Farm Credit Administration may specify a shorter period than sixty days but not less than thirty days". This section shall be effective after the calendar year in which it is enacted.

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

SEC. 6. Section 4(f) of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 (12 U.S.C. 636c(f)) is amended by substituting "$100" for "$50" therein.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an extract from the report accompanying the bill.

There being no objection, the extract of the report (No. 1102) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL (WITH COMMITTEE AMENDMENT)

FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Background: The 12 Federal land banks, 1 in each farm credit district, were established in 1917 to make long-term land mortgage loans to farmers and ranchers as provided in the Federal Farm Loan Act. Each borrower from a Federal land bank is required to become a member of the Federal land bank association through which his loan is made. The borrower buys capital stock of the association in an amount equal to 5 percent of the face amount of the loan and the association is required to purchase an equal amount of stock in the Federal land bank of the district. By this means all the capital stock of the 719 Federal land bank associations is owned by their farmer members and the associations in turn have owned all of the stock of the Federal land banks since 1947 when the last of the Government capital in the banks was retired. The loan funds of the Federal land banks are obtained primarily through the sale of consolidated bonds to the investing public.

A Federal land bank loan must be secured by a first mortgage on the farm or ranch of the borrower. The amount loaned in any case may not exceed 65 percent of the appraised normal value of the farm or ranch offered as security; plus the amount of the stock required to be purchased (5 percent of the face amount of the loan). Since the banks obtain their loan funds chiefly through the sale of consolidated bonds to the investing public, interest on loans made to farmers varies with the cost of money and differences in administrative cost. At the present time, 11 of the banks are making loans at 5½ percent and one charges an interest rate of 5.2 percent. There is a statutory limit of 6 percent. A land bank loan may not be made for more than 40 years but most of them have maturities of 20 to 35 years. Presently there are some 384,000 land bank loans outstanding in the approximate amount of $4.3 billion.

Section 2(a): To obtain a Federal land bank loan, an application is submitted to the bank through the local Federal land bank association. Before a loan is closed, the Federal Farm Loan Act, as it now reads (12 U.S.C. 751–7, 712), requires the following procedure:

1. A written report on the security is made by an appraiser designated or appointed by the Federal land bank of the district. This appraiser may be the manager or another employee of the association.
2. A written report is made by the associate loan committee which consists of three or more members of the association who are borrowers from the land bank. The manager of the association is also eligible for membership on the loan committee. The committee is elected by the board of directors of the association and, in addition to approving loans on behalf of the association, it may also be authorized to elect applicants to membership in the association.
3. Final approval of a loan is by the Federal land bank, but no loan may be made unless the report of the appraiser and the report of the association loan committee are favorable.

Under step (2), the association loan committee report form often must be taken out to the members for approval and signature. This may involve two or three separate trips to the homes of the members in different parts of the association territory. The present amendment would permit this step in the present procedure to be modified. It would do this by rendering report and approval by the manager or another employee of the association acceptable, if duly authorized, in lieu of action by its loan committee. This is claimed to be warranted in many instances because of the training and experience of such personnel. Without minimizing the importance of approval action by members of the association, it is recognized that there are circumstances in which an association would want to and would be justified in giving this responsibility to a competent manager or other employee. To what extent an association chooses to do so would be determined by its own board of directors. It would also be subject to authorization by the board of directors of the Federal land bank of the district and by the Farm Credit Administration. One of the limitations intended by the Farm Credit Administration is that the manager or other employee authorized to act in lieu of the association loan committee shall not act on a loan in which he is interested directly or indirectly. The Farm Credit Administration has indicated, too, that actions by the manager or other employee under the new authority would be reviewed by the association loan committee or board of directors at their next meeting. The committee has been assured that this review will also cover applications on which the recommendation by the manager or other employee was not favorable.

Section 2(b): This amendment concerns an applicant for a Federal land bank loan who owns and is farming as a single operation land in more than one farm credit district. Under existing law, Federal land bank loans "shall be secured by duly recorded first mortgages on farmland within the farm credit district in which the land is situated" (12 U.S.C. 771 First). To the existing law, section 2(b) would add "and which mortgages may include farmland within other farm credit districts to the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration."

An identical addition would be made with reference to first mortgages which a Federal land bank is authorized to acquire otherwise than by making new loans; i.e., by investment or purchase (12 U.S.C. 781 Second). The stated intention is to permit an applicant with a farming operation in more than one district to be served by one land bank instead of borrowing from two or more such banks. There is no intention to permit a Federal land bank to lend on farmland outside of its own district except in connection with farmland in its own district, all being owned and operated by a single eligible applicant. The committee understands, in addition, that Farm Credit Administration regulations will require the concurrence of the Federal land bank for the district in which the land is situated before another Federal land bank may make a loan on it.

Section 2(c): The major statutory eligibility requirements for Federal land bank loans are (12 U.S.C. 771 Sixth):

"No such loan shall be made to any person who is not at the time, or shortly to become, engaged in farming operations or to any other person unless the principal part of his income is derived from farming operations. * * * the term "person" includes an individual or a corporation engaged in farming operations; * * * but no such loan shall be made to a corporation unless the principal part of its income is derived from farming operations and unless owners of stock in the corporation assume personal liability for the loan to the extent required under rules and regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration. * * *"

Section 2(c) would strike out the italicized words. This would eliminate the assumption of personal liability by a stockholder as an eligibility requirement for a Federal land bank loan to a corporation. The stated intention is that such assumption of personal liability may instead be required for credit and policy reasons. Such supervisory guidelines as are deemed necessary in this respect would be covered in rules and regulations issued by the Farm Credit Administration.

Most Federal land bank loans are made to individual farmers or ranchers, although loans to corporations have been authorized since 1935. For the last calendar year, the total of the loans to corporations has been 0.65 percent in number and 4.52 percent in amount of all the loans made by the 12 Federal land banks.

By the present amendment, there is no intention to increase or prefer corporate farming over family or individual farming. It is recognized, though, that there are families and individuals who have organized a corporation for their farming. In most cases it is expected that as least some of them, as stockholders, will continue to be required to provide personal liability for a loan to their corporation for credit or policy reasons. This would have to be done in any cases where the local Federal land bank association, which indorses and thereby incurs liability for the loan, conditions its favorable recommendation on such personal liability being required. However, in instances where such assumption of personal liability is not obtainable, and the loan otherwise meets all requirements, it is thought that the Federal land banks should no longer in every instance be precluded from making a loan for want of such personal liability. While this amendment will enlarge the possible loan service for only a limited number of applicants, any increased lending under it will also benefit the banks and all of their borrowers.

Section 2(d): Under existing law, "The amount of loans to any one borrower may not exceed $100,000 unless approved by the Farm Credit Administration * * *" (12 U.S.C. 771 Seventh). In this requirement section 2(d) would substitute "an amount specified by the Farm Credit Administration" for the "$100,000" limitation. This will leave it for the Farm Credit Administration to specify the size of the loans which a Federal land bank may close without the prior approval of the Farm Credit Administration. The committee sees no objection to giving the Farm Credit Administration such discretion in view of the successful lending experience of the land banks. In the last calendar year, 1,118 out of a total of 58,403 Federal land bank loans were in excess of $100,000. The average size of an outstanding Federal land bank loan is $11,100.

The present amendment refers only to the size of a loan which may be closed by a Federal land bank without the prior approval of the Farm Credit Administration. It has no reference to the maximum loan which may be made. That is now fixed by the Farm Credit Administration as not more than the higher of (1) 10 percent of the net worth of the bank making the loan, or (2) one-twelfth of 10 percent of the combined net worth of all Federal land banks. As recognized under the preceding amendment, sound loan volume benefits both the banks and their borrowers. The committee presently sees no occasion to object to it, so long as the lending is to applicants who are within the letter and spirit of the eligibility requirements quoted under the preceding amendment.

FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS

Background: The 12 Federal intermediate credit banks, 1 in each farm credit district, are organized and operate under title II which was added to the Federal Farm Loan Act by the Agricultural Credits Act of 1923. Their function is to finance the 471 production credit associations and over 100 other financing institutions that make short- and intermediate-term loans to farmers and ranchers. The total of such financing by the credit banks during 1965 was $5.3 billion. Over 90 percent of such business was with the production credit associations.

The credit banks do this financing by discounting for the production credit associations and the other financing institutions, with their endorsement, the notes taken by them from the farmers and ranchers, and also by making loans to the associations and other financing institutions secured by such collateral as may be approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. Loans may also be made to the associations without collateral to the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration. The loan funds of the credit banks are obtained chiefly through the sale of their consolidated debentures to the investing public so that the interest and discount rates which the banks charge depend upon the rates of interest which the banks have to pay on their debentures and differences in administrative cost. The presently approved rates for the different banks range from 5¼ to 5¾ percent.

About 35 percent of the total capital stock of the Federal intermediate credit banks is owned by the production credit associations, and the other 65 percent continues to be owned by the Government. Under amendments enacted in 1956 and 1965, it is intended that the associations eventually will come to own all of the capital stock in such banks as their Government capital is gradually retired.

Section 3(a): To the existing powers of the Federal intermediate credit banks would be added authority "to purchase for investment obligations of the Federal land banks and the banks for cooperatives and, to the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration, obligations of any agencies of the United States." The latter obligations would include consolidated notes of the Federal home loan banks and securities issued by the Federal National Mortgage Association. Similar investments are now permitted for the Federal land banks and the banks for cooperatives.

Under existing law, the credit banks have been limited to investments in U.S. Government bonds for their funds which are not immediately needed for financing the production credit associations and other financing institutions for lending to farmers and ranchers. Such additional investment authority would add flexibility through a wider choice of investment media of various maturities. In most instances, too, it would provide the credit banks with a higher interest yield on such investments. While such additional investments would be mostly for a short term, they nonetheless would be available, if needed, as collateral for debentures issued by the Federal intermediate credit banks and as collateral for other borrowings. If used as collateral for debentures, the additional investments would be a relatively minor part of the debenture collateral which in the main consists of loans discounted for or made to the production credit associations and other financing institutions.

Section 3(b): Existing law (12 U.S.C. 1092) specifically requires each Federal intermediate credit bank to make three reports a year to the Farm Credit Administration as to the resources and liabilities of the banks, verified by an officer, and signed by at least three directors. Such reports must be published in a newspaper where the bank is located and are subject to proof of publication. Special reports may also be required by the Farm Credit Administration. In lieu of the existing requirements, section 3(b) would provide that "the Farm Credit Administration may require reports in such form as it may specify from any or all of the Federal intermediate credit banks whenever in its judgment the same are necessary for a full and complete knowledge of its or their financial condition or operations."

The Farm Credit Administration presently keeps informed of the condition of the banks by requiring monthly reports and through examination of the banks. The amendment would make no change in this respect. What it would do is relieve the banks of locally publishing their separate sworn and attested statements at least three times a year. Inasmuch as the individual banks have not separately issued debentures since 1935, what may once have been deemed a reason for the present local publication requirement no longer exists. In any event, the separate statements of each bank are widely distributed in its district to all who have an interest in the bank and to anyone on request. Since the banks may not accept deposits, there is no depositor group to be considered. Of more interest to the investing public are the consolidated financial and earnings statements of the 12 banks, since the banks are jointly and severally liable for their consolidated debentures. These are available in a brochure that is distributed to debenture dealers, commercial banks, and other interested parties. They also are widely circulated by investment services and periodicals. Among other places, both the individual and the consolidated statements are included in the annual report of the Farm Credit Administration to Congress and in the audit reports of the Comptroller General.

BANKS FOR COOPERATIVES

Background: The 13 banks for cooperatives, 1 in each farm credit district and the Central Bank for Cooperatives in the District of Columbia, were organized under the Farm Credit Act of 1933. They make loans to farmers' marketing, purchasing, and service cooperatives. Three distinct types of loans are made: facility, commodity, and operating capital loans. Since the loan funds of the banks, other than those available from their capital and surplus, are obtained from the sale of consolidated debentures to the investing public, interest rates charged by the banks for cooperatives depend, to a large extent, upon the rates they have to pay on their debentures. Interest rates vary with the type and term of loan and between banks. At the present time, interest rates charged by the banks for cooperatives range from a low of 4¾ percent to a high of 5¾ percent. The legal maximum is 6 percent.

The banks for cooperatives were capitalized by the United States out of the revolving fund from which the Federal Farm Board, previously made loans to cooperatives under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929. Since the Farm Credit Act of 1955, the Government capital in the banks for cooperatives is being systematically retired by the creation of permanent capital provided by the users of the banks. The maximum Government capital ever in the banks has been reduced by about 71 percent. Two of the banks for cooperatives (Berkeley and Houston) retired all of their Government capital in 1965, and the other banks are expected to do so by 1970.

Section 4: As now in effect (12 U.S.C. 1134c, 1134j), the Farm Credit Act of 1933 provides that "subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration," the 12 district banks for cooperatives and the Central Bank for Cooperatives are authorized "(a) to make loans to cooperative associations as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, for any of the purposes and subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in such Act, as amended."

Section 4 of the bill, as introduced, would delete the words "for any of the purposes and subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in such Act, as amended."

With the committee amendment, section 4 would also transfer to the Farm Credit Act of 1933 the sentence, now contained in the Agricultural Marketing Act (12 U.S.C. 1141f (a)), which specifies that the interest rate on loans by any bank for cooperatives may not exceed 6 percent.

The amended authority of the banks for cooperatives in the 1933 act then would be "subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration * * * (a) to make loans to cooperative associations as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended."

The only provision of the Agricultural Marketing Act hereafter applicable would be section 15(a), which defines the farmer cooperative associations that are eligible to borrow (12 U.S.C. 1141j(a)). All other loan provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Act would no longer be applicable.

The more significant provisions that would be rendered inapplicable are those contained in section 7 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1141e). Most of such provisions originated in 1929 when loans were made from the revolving fund established under the act which then also provided for other programs which have since been discontinued. As currently in effect, the provisions that would be rendered inapplicable may be summarized as follows:

1. Under section 7, physical facility loans may not exceed 60 percent of the appraised value of the security therefor (7(c)(1)) and must be repaid upon an amortization plan over a period not in excess of 20 years (7(d)). Further, no loan for the purchase or lease or facilities may be made unless the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration finds that the purchase price or rent to be paid is reasonable (7(c)(2)).

2. The separate references to loans to construct or acquire or refinance physical facilities (7(a)(2)), loans to assist in the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities and food products thereof, and loans to a cooperative association for financing its operations (7(a)(1)), in effect constitute a classification of loans. These have come to be referred to as facility, commodity, and operating capital loans. Starting in 1933 the statutory interest rate provision for commodity and operating capital loans was different than for facility loans. However, in 1955 that distinction was removed, and since then all loans have been subject to the same general interest provision which will continue applicable as noted earlier. If the present separate statutory provisions for facility loans are now to become inapplicable, it is considered to follow that there no longer would be occasion for the present separate classes of loans.

3. At present section 7(b) also provides that the loan shall be in furtherance of the policy declared in section 1 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 (12 U.S.C. 1141), many of the purposes of which have since expired and no longer are relevant. It also requires that the cooperative association applying for the loan have an organization and management, and business policies, of such character as to insure the reasonable safety of the loan and the furtherance of such policy.

Inasmuch as the banks for cooperatives have now had over 33 years of lending experience during which time almost 48,000 loans for a total of about $15 billion have been made, it is thought that the statutory provisions that have just been reviewed no longer serve a useful purpose. Without them, but still subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration, it is thought that the banks for cooperatives will have more flexibility and be in a better position to meet the needs of the farmer cooperatives that are eligible for loans.

At the hearings, the Farm Credit Administration outlined the terms of the regulations it was considering for this lending. Assurance was given that the loans to farmer cooperatives will both meeet their needs and conform to adequate credit standards.

FARM CREDIT BOARD ELECTIONS

Section 5: The Farm Credit Administration conducts polls of the three voting groups in each farm credit district (i.e., Federal land bank associations, production credit associations, and cooperative associations eligible to vote as stockholders of the bank for cooperatives) to elect members to the district farm credit boards and to designate persons for consideration by the President for appointment to the Federal Farm Credit Board. Under existing law (12 U.S.C. 640e, 640f), a ballot may not be counted unless it is received by the Farm Credit Administration within 30 days after it was mailed out. Section 5 would increase the 30-day period to 60, except that for elections to fill vacancies the Farm Credit Administration may specify a shorter period than 60 days but not less than 30 days. This would be effective starting with the next calendar year. The longer period will give the Federal land bank associations and production credit associations more flexibility in scheduling the meetings of their boards of directors at which their vote in those polls is decided upon.

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

Section 6: The Federal Credit Board consists of 13 members, 1 appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate from each of the 12 farm credit districts, and a 13th member who is a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture. This is a part-time Board which has responsibility for the general direction and supervision of the Farm Credit Administration that otherwise consists of the Governor and other employed personnel. The present amendment would increase from "$50" to "$100" the sum that each member of the Federal Farm Credit Board shall receive for each day spent in the performance of his official duties. As provided in the Farm Credit Act of 1953, such compensation may not be paid for more than 75 days in a calendar year (12 U.S.C. 636c(f)). The increased compensation would be more in line with that paid other personnel since the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964 and the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965. As is the case with all administrative expenses of the Farm Credit Administration, the compensation of the members of the Federal Farm Credit Board is paid from assessments against the banks and associations supervised by the Farm Credit Administration.

WORK OF PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, although I am a relatively new members of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, nevertheless, it was highly gratifying to have read an editorial of the New York Times on Monday of this week in which recognition was given for the outstanding service so admirably rendered to the country by its distinguished chairman, Senator Stennis, and the subcommittee staff, in probing and uncovering serious deficiencies of personnel and equipment in the Army.

Under Senator Stennis' judicious and able leadership, the Preparedness Subcommittee sounded warnings well over a year ago that the war in Vietnam could result in an unacceptable drain upon the personnel and equipment resources of our active military forces unless corrective and remedial measures were taken immediately. Because those warnings were not heeded at the time they were made, we must now witness the removal of troops from Europe, the deterioration in the combat readiness of our other forces, and even complaints from our valiant men in Vietnam of shortages of repair parts, clothing, boots, and certain types of ammunition.

I consider it a distinct privilege to be associated with the chairman, the distinguished members and able staff of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. The year-long investigation which prompted the New York Times' editorial required the staff to embark on long journeys within three continents and those with whom they dealt confirmed their professional competency by reporting that they were found to be "thoroughly objective, completely professional, and unusually knowledgeable." No finer tribute could be paid to those who have worked so hard. I have personally been deeply impressed by their dedication and competence and want to take this opportunity to commend them publicly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the New York Times editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 11, 1966]

OVERSTRAINED ARMY

Senator STENNIS and his Preparedness Subcommittee have done the Nation and the Armed Forces a service in pinpointing the Army's serious deficiencies of personnel and materiel. The temporary withdrawal of 15,000 Army specialists from West Germany to meet military needs in Vietnam confirms the strain.

For at least a year the Senator and his associates have been warning that the Vietnamese war has resulted in a major and, in some items, dangerous "drawdown" of available military supplies; that war has also reduced the experience level of virtually all Army units except those actually in Vietnam. The steps taken by the Pentagon to meet the drain have been inadequate to maintain a strong and ready strategic reserve, with the result that the Army is spread thin. Very few trained units are ready to reinforce Vietnam or to meet other emergencies.

Nearly all the Regular Army units in the United States are, in effect, training units; certain types of key specialists in Europe have been tapped for service in Vietnam; two infantry battalions have been shifted from Alaska to the Far East. None of the major National Guard and Reserve units is ready for combat. There are shortages in clothing, illuminating rounds and certain types of fuses as well as in communications equipment and many other items. Many tanks, trucks and other automotive units are at least temporarily "deadlined" because of lack of trained maintenance personnel to maintain them.

The Senate committee has alerted the American people to the perils of the existing situation. What is needed now is quick remedial action by the President and the Pentagon.

THE MEANING OF PATRIOTISM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in these days when demonstrations, campus unrest, and draft card burnings garner the most headlines, many are left with the impression that the spirit of patriotism no longer burns in the hearts of our younger people.

Happily, and fortunately, the headlines only reflect the attitude of a small minority and certainly do not portray the feelings of most of our younger generation.

One who speaks for this generation, who has demonstrated her love of country, is Sue Allely, an eighth-grade student at Warren Harding Junior High School in Des Moines.

Last month, Sue, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. A. W. Allely, of Des Moines, was judged State winner of the Independence Hall Essay Contest sponsored by the Des Moines Jaycees and the Independence Hall of Chicago.

It was appropriate that she won the contest because Sue was born on July 4, Independence Day.

In her essay, Sue made very clear what patriotism, love of country, mean to her. I believe her views represent those of the vast majority of young people.

I ask unanimous consent that the essay, entitled "What My American Patriotism Means to Me," and a related article from the Des Moines Register listing the various school winners be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MY AMERICAN PATRIOTISM MEANS TO ME

(By Sue Allely)

Patriotism, to me, is a feeling of deep desire to see America fulfill the destiny our forefathers must have had in mind at the time of its founding. In this age, and at this very hour, our Nation is beset with countless problems of domestic and international scope, which sometimes are pictured by my elders as being almost beyond solution.

Patriotism, to me, is a deep inner feeling and belief that our country still has the statesmen, and great minds capable of making the right decisions, and charting a correct and safe course for us, as a Nation, to follow. I must believe that at this very moment, when American Armed Forces are fighting and dying in foreign countries, it is for the principle of keeping our country free, and to support the freedom and dignity of individual men everywhere.

Patriotism, to me, means, that I personally must be ready to serve my country in any capacity, and at any time I may be called upon to do so.

Our form of government, no doubt, has faults and weaknesses. However, studying history strengthens my belief that no other form of government has inspired its people to achieve such greatness and self-satisfaction as we presently are privileged to enjoy here in America.

Patriotism, to me, means that I am proud and thankful that I am an American citizen, and able to enjoy a better life than the many less fortunate people in other nations of the world.

However, the privilege of living in a nation such as ours, with individual freedom and equality, demands that I be alert and aware of the fact that there are other people and other nations who are not, as yet, convinced that our democratic way of life is good. They are intent on conquering and enslaving us if possible.

Patriotism, to me, means this must never happen, and that I shall constantly strive to see that it does not. Patriotism shall serve to sustain my faith, that eventually all men in all nations shall learn to live in peace and harmony, so that the good life may be theirs also.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Mar. 11, 1966]

ESSAY EVENT WINNERS TOLD

Sue Allely, eighth-grade student at Warren Harding Junior High School, has been judged State winner of the Independence Hall essay contest sponsored by the Des Moines Jaycees and the Independence Hall of Chicago, Ill.

She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Alton Allely, of 1706 Sixth Avenue.

She was named the winner of the Des Moines contest and her entry was entered in State competition. She will participate with winners of other States in a 10-day expense-paid tour of national shrines beginning April 21 in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, including a 2-day visit to Washington, D.C.

She was awarded a trophy in ceremonies Thursday morning at the school and is to be presented a $25 U.S. savings bond at a noon meeting of the Jaycees.

Fourth-place winner in State competition was Sue Ann Mitchell, a seventh-grader at St. Joseph's Academy. She also was awarded a trophy.

The contest drew 554 entries from 19 junior high and parochial schools. The project is designed to promote patriotism and instill an appreciation of American heritage in young people.

After preliminary judging was completed by members of the Jaycee-ettes, a panel composed of Mayor George Whitmer, John Raife, president-elect of the Polk County Bar Association, and Mrs. Jane Rozsnafszky, English instructor at Drake University, made the final selection.

The winners by school: Pam Nienaber, Washington Irving Junior High; Colleen McKenna, St. Ambrose; Teresa Tedrow, Holy Trinity; Mike Vacco, St. Anthony; Maurine Burke, St. Augustine; Nancy Pilmer, Callanan Junior High; Don Bognanno, Visitation Convent; Dan Schwartz, Meredith Junior High; Stephen Mahoney, All Saints; Sue Ann Mitchell, St. Joseph Academy; Valerie Wolverton, Christ the King; Stanley Holt, Weeks Junior High; Mary Greenwood, Franklin Junior High; Miss Allely, Harding Junior High; Michelle Sommer, St. Theresa, and Donna Book, Merrill Junior High.

Other winners are Fran Synhorst, Knoxville, second place; and Chris Kakert, Davenport, third.

GOV. RALPH M. PAIEWONSKY—COMMENDATORY RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Legislature of the Virgin Islands adopted a resolution on March 17, 1966, by unanimous vote commending Gov. Ralph Paiewonsky for 5 years of distinguished service as Governor of the Virgin Islands.

During Governor Paiewonsky's administration, the islands have made substantial progress in the areas of housing, education, commerce, health, civil rights, and improvement in the governmental administration of the islands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Virgin Islands Legislature be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATURE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Resolution to commend Ralph M. Paiewonsky, Governor of the Virgin Islands

Whereas Ralph M. Paiewonsky, native son of the Virgin Islands, and its 16th Governor under the U.S. flag, will complete an unprecedented 5 years in office on April 5, 1966; and

Whereas during that period Governor Paiewonsky has worked tirelessly to improve the welfare of the people of the Virgin Islands; and

Whereas Governor Paiewonsky has encouraged and fostered a genuine spirit of cooperation between the legislative and executive branches; and

Whereas Governor Paiewonsky has sponsored progressive legislation and immeasurable benefit to the Virgin Islands; and

Whereas under Governor Paiewonsky's leadership the Virgin Islands enjoys the greatest growth and economic stability in the entire Caribbean area; and

Whereas Governor Paiewonsky's dedication, enthusiasm, patience, determination, and resourcefulness has been an inspiration to others; and

Whereas Governor Paiewonsky's administration has compiled a record of achievement and progress unsurpassed in Virgin Islands history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands:

1. That the Legislature of the Virgin Islands on behalf of the people of the Virgin Islands hereby commend Gov. Ralph M. Paiewonsky for his outstanding accomplishments and extends sincere congratulations to Governor Paiewonsky on the occasion of his fifth anniversary as Chief Executive of the Virgin Islands;

2. That a copy of this resolution be printed, framed and presented to Governor Paiewonsky in an appropriate ceremony by the president of the legislature or his delegate. Thus passed by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands on March 17, 1966.

EARL B. OTTLEY,
President of the Legislature.
DAVE PURITZ
Legislative Secretary.

SOVIET NUCLEAR SUBMARINES

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, growing evidence that the Soviet Union is not sitting still in the nuclear submarine field was very ably reported in the Sunday, April 10, edition of the Washington Post.

The article predicts that, before long, the Soviets will have nuclear missile submarine patrols operating within range of our Atlantic and Pacific coasts. If this becomes true, it will undoubtedly be necessary for us to counteract this threat by developing better means of detection and by constructing new types of submarines to enhance our own offensive capabilities.

This appears to me to be strong evidence that we are going to need all the facilities now at our disposal to furnish our Nation with an adequate defense against the Soviet submarine threat. I strongly believe that Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in my home State of New Hampshire is vital to our present defense effort and will become an even more vital facility if the Soviets continue their rapid submarine development program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article describing Soviet submarine development be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY'RE NOT YELLING WOLF ANY MORE ABOUT RED SUBS

(By John G. Norris)

Like the boy who cried wolf too often, the Navy is having some difficulty getting people to believe hard new evidence of a real and growing Russian submarine threat.

More often than not, the beginning of spring has been accompanied by news reports of Russian submarine "contacts" off our shores in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Skeptics noted that the reports coincided with congressional consideration of the defense budget.

Except during the Cuban crisis of October 1962, when several Soviet craft were photographed on the surface, their presence for the most part was detected only on sonar and hence was subject to doubt.

Now, however, there is positive evidence that Moscow is permanently maintaining one or more nuclear missile subs about 1,000 miles off both our Atlantic and Pacific coasts. They could move within missile range of major cities in the seaboard area.

They could be reinforced by a sizable number of other missile submarines that have been built in recent years under a greatly stepped-up Soviet effort in this field.

FORTY-FIVE RED NUCLEAR SUBS

Today, Navy sources report, Russia has about 45 nuclear-powered subs—11 less than the United States has in service. Of these, 25 are missile craft and the rest are attack boats, designed for sinking surface ships or submarines, such as the U.S. Polaris types. Ten of the twenty-five fire ballistic missiles, the rest air-breathing cruise missiles.

In addition, Russia has 75 missile-firing, conventionally powered subs—35 carrying ballistic weapons and 40 armed with guided weapons. The overall Soviet undersea fleet totals about 400 subs. According to recent congressional testimony by Adm. David L. McDonald, more than half are "modern long-range types." The Russian postwar diesel subs have considerably more underwater speed and endurance than World War II-built U.S. craft.

As significant as the buildup is the fact that during the past year Russian submarines, which generally operated close to Eurasia, have extended their patrols all over the world.

Many military men previously discounted the threat of a submarine missile attack on the United States on grounds that if numbers of Russian submarines began moving toward this country from Baltic and Barents Sea ports and other bases, they would be detected well before they got within range, providing warning against a surprise attack, which is the main danger from Russia's missile force.

If the trend toward extensive worldwide patrols continues, as the Navy predicts, prospects of much advance warning will be lessened.

The threat of Soviet undersea power has often been discounted, because their missile submarines each carry only three ballistic missiles or two to six cruise missiles; the range of their missiles is no more than 350 miles; and they can't fire while submerged. American Polaris subs carry 16 missiles each, with ranges of 1,200 to 2,500 miles, and fire while submerged.

However, Polaris missiles would have to reach deep into Eurasia to hit main Soviet targets, whereas many key targets in America are on the seaboard, and there is evidence that Russia is working on longer range missiles.

Moreover, U.S. policy rules out surprise missile attacks by our submarines, but Russia has no such announced policy. It is estimated that from 15 to 45 million Americans would be killed in a surprise submarine attack by existing Soviet forces. The threat, therefore, is much greater than that posed during the Cuban missile crisis.

The United States has 34 Polaris subs in service, plus 22 nuclear-powered attack subs designed to fight enemy submarines. There are 99 conventionally powered U.S. submarines in service.

The approved U.S. nuclear submarine goal is 68 attack craft and 41 Polaris craft. Russia is believed to be laying down 10 to 20 new craft annually, while the current American program calls for 4 to 6 new attack craft yearly beyond those now being built or authorized.

ANTISUBMARINE PROGRAM

To guard against the Soviet threat, the United States is spending about $3 billion annually on the overall antisubmarine program, and could make it difficult for conventional Russian submarines to get into position to attack. Nuclear craft are more difficult targets.

Because Navy chiefs repeatedly said that antisubmarine warfare is their No. 1 program, Congressmen are asking questions about the defense budget for next year. It calls for mothballing one of the Navy's present antisubmarine aircraft carriers as an economy measure—thus cutting back the number of operational antisubmarine task forces from nine to eight.

Substantial sums are being spent on developing defense against submarine-launched ballistic missiles, along with the Army's Nike-X anti-ICBM program. Discarded Army 200-mile ballistic Redstone missiles are being used for targets. No antiballistic missile system officially is deemed ready for production and deployment, however—though defenses against cruise missiles exist.

Red China reportedly has about 30 conventionally powered submarines, all Russian-built—including one missile-firing craft—and there are indications they are building submarines.

Unlike the Russians, who have had submarines since czarist days, China has little experience in this field. However, Admiral McDonald recently told a Senate committee that one torpedo, fired by an unidentified submarine in southeast Asia, could "radically change the entire concept of our operations" on both land and sea.

Despite Russia's long submarine experience, the record of its undersea force in war has been negligible, and entirely confined to coastal or interior sea operations. However, for the past decade, the Soviet Navy has been exploring the ocean depths—off U.S. coasts and worldwide—with trawlers, and probably submarines.

The next step is likely to be regular patrols of nuclear missile subs comparatively close to U.S. coasts, just as we maintain Polaris craft around Russia. This could affect the U.S. defense system to a major degree.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, most of the Nation's leading newspapers have endorsed the truth-in-packaging bill as necessary and good legislation. As my colleagues know, the list includes the New York Times, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Newsday, Kansas City Star, Washington Post, Washington Star, the Kansas City Times, and the Detroit Free Press.

Today I am happy to call to the attention of the Congress the editorial support of the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star for truth in packaging and truth in lending as reported in its March 22, 1966, edition.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Just the Truth, That's All," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST THE TRUTH, THAT'S ALL

Once again President Johnson has urged Congress to pass the so-called truth-in-lending and truth-in-packaging bills.

The aims of these bills are perfectly simple, and perfectly honest:

To require, by law, that consumers buying on the installment plan be told at the outset how much interest and carrying charge they are paying over and above the cost of whatever they buy.

To require, by law, that packaged goods carry labels clearly indicating the nature and quantity of the contents.

There is nothing in either of these objectives from which honest business can demur. We just assume that these are common practices among reputable producers.

Opponents of this legislation, pending in Congress several years, say it isn't necessary, or it would disrupt competition, or it is a matter for the States, or it would invite the Government's big nose into everybody's business, or it would raise prices.

It is true there is a risk in Government regulation of anything. Bureaucrats tend to overdo.

But the evidence strongly suggests the need. Most any consumer knows he has been fooled by label or trick packaging. Almost no long-term buyer has any idea of how much interest he pays.

As for competition, if it is based on guile it is not competition at all, even though it attracts some suckers.

The States' right argument is an old cliche. And if, indeed, any of this legislation would raise prices, the consumer, at least, would know what he is getting for his money.

INFLATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article written by Robert Roth, published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 2, 1966, entitled "President Backs and Fills on Inflation."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

President Backs and Fills on Inflation

(By Robert Roth)

Washington.—If President Johnson wanted to spread confusion about the state of the economy, if he wanted to get people jittery over what might happen next, he could do no better than exactly what he has been doing these last few weeks.

Of course, confusion is not what the President wants. But it is what he has got as a result of his determination to "preserve his options," to keep his plans secret so that he may be free to move in any direction when he decides the time to move has come.

This does no harm when it is applied to such concerns as when the President will next leave for Texas or whether he intends to speak at a political rally in Chicago. But when the policy is pursued with respect to such vital matters as taxation and Federal spending, the effect is anything but reassuring.

A DISTINCTION

No one would dispute the President's right, indeed his duty, to weigh all factors, to wait until all the evidence is in before reaching and announcing a decision which involves the economic interests not only of the United States but of the entire world.

But it is one thing to adopt a wait-and-see stance, to avoid precipitate action which might backfire, and quite another to keep people on edge guessing what they may have to face, to hint at first one course then another, to suggest, that what is to come may be rough indeed or that, on the other hand, it may not be so bad after all.

For several weeks now the President has been talking about inflation and what he might have to do about it. He has talked to business and labor leaders, to public officials and newspapermen. He has talked on the record and off, and his inner circle of advisers has echoed him.

PRESIDENT CAUSTIC

The President has said that there are signs that we are confronted with inflation, and signs that we are not; that Federal spending must be held to a minimum but that essential programs must not be curtailed and that Federal salaries should be increased; that housewives should bring down high prices by refusing to buy at high prices, but that there should not be a buyers' strike; that cities should reduce their spending, but not too much; that he may have to raise taxes and, again he may not.

It would be difficult for anyone hearing or reading what the President has said to escape being confused and concerned about inflation.

"Inflation, inflation, inflation," the President said when he was talking to a national convention of mayors a few days ago.

That, he said, is the topic of conversation at every Washington party.

"A month ago," he said, "it was the pause (in North Vietnam bombing raids). Now it is what do you think about inflation?"

The implication seemed to be that there is something wrong about all this talk. Yet he is himself the author of most of it.

Similarly, the President has been caustic in criticizing the press for bad reporting on the economic situation. He told one audience to "beware of impressionists and alarmists" who predict what the President will do.

GUESSING FOSTERED

But the President himself by leaving open such wide areas of doubt has encouraged speculation of the sort to which he objects. He has told people he is not certain what he should do about something that vitally concerns them, he has asked them to wait patiently until he makes up his mind and meanwhile to stop worrying about it.

It is almost as if a doctor were to say to a patient:

"There is something wrong with you or at least there may be. I'm not sure yet what it is, or whether it's serious. It may clear itself up, or it may require a major operation. When I find out, I'll let you know. Just leave it to me, and don't upset yourself by trying to guess what I have in mind."

The analogy is not farfetched. It is part of the President's political genius that has established a doctor-patient relationship with the country. It is accepted that he knows what is best, and will do it. In the circumstances, it is not good for the patient—that is to say, the country—to try to anticipate the physician or to seek a cure at other hands.

MASSIVE DOSES

There is no question that when the President decides what course is to be followed to keep or restore the health of the economy, the country will adopt that course. There would be a good deal less concern now over what is to be done if the President had been less assiduous in suggesting alternative possibilities.

Granted the President has a responsibility to keep the people posted on complex factors. But when information is ladled out in massive doses, along with conflicting interpretations of what it means and contradictory forecasts of the consequences, the result is not an informed electorate but a confused one.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN U.S. OVERSEAS SPENDING

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star appeared an article by Lee M. Cohn which was captioned "U.S. Overseas Spending Cuts Called a 'Must' by Officials."

The article did not name any officials of the administration; but reports that these officials said the Defense Department will have to switch more buying from foreign suppliers to U.S. sources, even when domestic prices are substantially higher.

This is interesting news, because last February 17 the Defense Department directed that pork and beef for European commissaries and for nonappropriated fund activities be procured from foreign sources to the extent that such procurement can be made through barter for agricultural commodities.

The barter conditions were prescribed so that such foreign procurement would not aggravate the balance-of-payments deficit problem.

However, one wonders why there was any directive to shift from U.S. procurement to European procurement in the first place. Why not just continue U.S. procurement? Pork and beef prices have moved steadily downward since February 17 as a result of higher marketings of animals, and the parity ratios for these commodities over the last 2 years have averaged 89 and 87, respectively, so it is clear that livestock producers have not averaged out with prices that are fair in comparison with prices in other sectors of the economy.

Moreover, if barter goods are used, is not this going to cut down on our dollar exports? Mr. Cohn's article states that the administration had counted on increasing the surplus of exports over imports this year, but the surplus in the early months of the year was running at a rate even below last year. If the goods that will be used for barter in connection with European procurement of pork and beef were sold in export instead, would this not help further the administration's policy?

I find the action of the Defense Department and the statements of officials referred to in Mr. Cohn's article inconsistent. Perhaps more statements by unnamed administration officials will be able to clear up the inconsistency.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Star be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Overseas Spending Cuts Called a "Must" by Officials

(By Lee M. Cohn)

The Government must trim overseas spending for defense and foreign aid to hold down the balance-of-payments deficit, administration officials said today.

They said the Defense Department will have to switch more buying from foreign suppliers to U.S. sources, even when domestic prices are substantially higher.

Countries receiving foreign aid now are required generally to spend 80 percent or more of their grants and loans here, but the officials said aid must be tied even higher to purchases in the United States.

In addition, they said, the administration may try to negotiate agreements for other countries to offset more of the costs of American military operations abroad through increased arms purchases here.

By whittling net military and aid outlays around the world, the administration hopes to compensate for part of the growing dollar drain resulting from the war in Vietnam.

ESTIMATE DOUBLED

The administration estimated last November that the war's cost on the debit side of the balance of payments would increase by about $350 million in 1966. Officials said they now have doubled that estimate.

Surging imports and disappointing exports are an even bigger worry.

The administration had counted on increasing the surplus of exports over imports from $4.8 billion in 1965 to about $6 billion this year. The trade surplus in the early months of 1966 ran at an annual rate below $4.8 billion, however.

Because of trade, Vietnam and other unfavorable factors, the administration unofficially has abandoned the goal of reaching payments equilibrium in 1966.

Equilibrium is defined as a range between a $250 million surplus and a $250 million deficit.

RECALCULATE PROJECTIONS

Analysts are recalculating projections. The tentative consensus is that it will take luck and ingenuity to hold the deficit down to last year's $1.3 billion.

Some forecasts range up to about $2 billion, but officials said they are confident the deficit will be much smaller than that. If developments indicate the deficit is heading close to $2 billion, one source said, the administration will take rough measures to make sure that does not happen.

He said the problem is not so severe, and relatively mild measures should suffice to keep the deficit tolerable.

If U.S. prices do not rise sharply, he said, a deficit around $1.3 billion would be acceptable.

If prices rise rapidly, he warned, a deficit of $1.3 billion would undermine international confidence in the dollar.

"It's the combination of rising prices and a substantial deficit that would be suicide," he said.

The economic boom is the main cause of trouble with the trade surplus. Expanding demand for goods attracts imports and curtails exports.

President Johnson is expected to decide soon whether to recommend tax increases, primarily to cool off the economy and control inflationary pressures.

If the balance of payments deteriorates seriously, the President will have an additional reason to propose higher taxes.

Tourism is a nagging problem. It accounted for a net dollar drain of $1.8 billion last year.

The administration figured last November that the tourist deficit would increase to about $2 billion in 1966. Officials now have raised this estimate by $50 million or $100 million.

This has revived talk of a special tax on tourists going abroad, but officials said the administration is most unlikely to propose such unpopular legislation.

Rather, they said, efforts to promote domestic travel probably would be stepped up.

HEAD TAX ON TOURISTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, 2 days ago there appeared an article in the New York Herald Tribune indicating that the administration is weighing the imposition of a head tax on tourists as a means to reduce the so-called tourist deficit.

Such action on the administration's part would be a major mistake and I would oppose it. It not only would restrict Americans' right to travel but also hurt our trade balance.

It is very disturbing that after years of discussion of the so-called travel gap the administration refuses to recognize the close interconnection between money spent by American tourists abroad and the ability of countries earning these tourist dollars to purchase U.S. goods. As you cut U.S. tourist spending you are more than likely to cut U.S. export earnings.

I fully realize that when the United States is suffering from chronic balance-of-payments difficulties all segments of the U.S. economy must make sacrifices. However, the administration's first priority should be on taking effective and important positive measures in the field of domestic and foreign tourist promotion.

This would include giving the U.S. Travel Service its fully authorized funds—$4.7 million, an amount which has never been appropriated to the USTS largely because the administration has been unwilling to give it adequate backing. Without such funds USTS cannot do an adequate job of getting foreign tourists to come to the United States.

It would also include an effective domestic travel promotion and coordination program. I, with the support of 10 of my colleagues, proposed such a program last July through S. 2305 which since then has been languishing before the Senate Commerce Committee.

I would, therefore, urge the administration that before it decides on imposing a head tax on tourists that it examine the other positive steps it could take.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Herald Tribune article, as well as my statement introducing S. 2305 on July 20, 1965, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 12, 1966]

UNITED STATES WEIGHS A HEAD TAX ON TOURISTS

(By Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor)

WASHINGTON.—The administration is readying fresh measures to cut the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

A special Cabinet committee will discuss the new plans at a White House meeting that is scheduled for next week. Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler heads the Cabinet group.

The proposals range from slapping a bitterly controversial head tax on U.S. tourists to a stepped-up effort to chop military and foreign aid outlays. The officials also are talking about tightening the present restrictions on bank overseas loans and on direct business investment in foreign projects.

"The severity of the new curbs will depend on how bad the payments situation looks," a high official says. "If it's bad bad enough, we will have to cut tourist spending. We can't ask businessmen and banks to do more unless we do something about the tourists."

The administration is actively discussing the need for more curbs because the U.S. balance of payments is not showing an improvement that had been expected at the start of 1966.

The best current guess is that the United States will have a deficit of at least $1.25 billion this year if no additional restrictive steps are taken. Some Government analysts gloomily are predicting that the red-ink entry will jump all the way to $2 billion.

President Johnson had called for achieving "equilibrium" in 1966—a goal that officially is defined as being $250 million on either side of an absolute zero. The United States had slashed its deficit from $2.798 billion in 1964 to $1.301 billion in 1965.

ACCURATE APPRAISAL

The Cabinet committee is waiting until next week to examine the need for further controls because Government experts believe that they will have a reasonably accurate appraisal of 1966 prospects by then. Officials were unable to produce a deficit estimate for the group's last meeting, in late March.

A high administration source predicts that the group will urge Mr. Johnson to support a tourist tax if a $2 billion deficit seems likely but that it will content itself with less abrasive measures if the shortfall is closer to $1.25 billion.

The administration considered adopting a tourist head-tax when Mr. Johnson put forward his emergency payments program 14 months ago. It quickly abandoned the idea, however, in the face of angry protests from travelers, airlines, steamship companies, and travel agencies after the plan was disclosed by the Herald Tribune.

The simplest tourist restriction would impose a set tax, say $100, on each person who travels abroad.

A new administration wrinkle would provide for a per diem levy, instead. The tax could be set at $10 a day, for example, and a traveler then would have to pay $10 for each day that he spends outside the United States.

Any tourist tax proposal immediately raises difficult exemption questions. It is accepted that special provisions would have to be made for Canada, Mexico and the Caribbean but there are hot disputes over whether groups such as teachers, students, and business men should be exempt.

An administration source predicts that the United States can chop tourist spending by at least $750 million a year if it adopts either a $100 head tax or the per diem variation. He predicts that the U.S. tourist deficit will total at least $2 billion this year if the Government does not act.

The expectation is that the Cabinet committee will respond to a $1.25 billion deficit forecast by recommending that Mr. Johnson call for tougher dollar outlay hold-down by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and Aid Administrator David Bell. In addition, it is anticipated that the group will propose that the President try to save several hundred million dollars more by putting additional muscle into the voluntary controls that now are in force on overseas bank lending and on business direct investment in foreign projects.

An administration official predicts that the Government can save $750 million through this three-way crackdown on Federal, business, and bank dollar outlays.

One administration view is that a deficit of up to $1 billion can be "tolerated" on the theory that it could be explained away as the gold price that this country is willing to pay for Vietnam.

Confidential administration estimates indicate that the Vietnam war will cost $750 million in overseas outlays this year. The projections assume that American troop strength in South Vietnam will average 300,000 men, which means that the troop strength will climb above 400,000 before the end of the year.

The booming U.S. economy is an even more important cause than Vietnam of the disappointing 1966 payments performance.

Officials are coming to the unhappy conclusion that the soaring prosperity will slash at least $1.2 billion from the $6 billion trade surplus that they had hoped this country would pile up this year.

They now are assuming that the gross national product will hit at least $730 billion. When they made their original 1966 payments forecasts, they were looking for a $715 billion GNP. The $15 billion jump in GNP translates into a $1.2 billion drop in the trade surplus for the booming domestic economy which will demand more imports and will ship smaller quantities of U.S. merchandise to foreign customers.

If the GNP seems about to skyrocket to even greater heights, officials will begin pushing the panic buttons along Pennsylvania Avenue. The impact on the U.S. payments position will be what one official bluntly calls "disastrous."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 20, 1965]

MAJOR U.S. TOURISM EFFORT ESSENTIAL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk to expand the U.S. Travel Service in order to increase domestic travel, and to make it the focal point for all U.S. activities related to the expansion of domestic and international travel. It will be remembered that the U.S. Travel Service is confined to encouraging foreign travelers to travel in the United States.

I wish to pay tribute to the Vice President of the United States, who has taken an extraordinary leadership in this matter and brought about an arrangement for voluntary private action, through the "See the USA" program, providing $500,000 from private enterprise, in the so-called "Discover America" project which is to develop a nationwide campaign to publicize travel within the United States.

The reason for introducing the bill is that it is very clear to me that the problem is very much greater than this voluntary effort, standing alone, would develop, and it needs action, at a far greater increase in terms of time and on a broader scale than would be the result of the efforts for which the Vice President has been responsible to date.

The bill is necessary because:

First. The present U.S. effort to close the so-called travel gap, which adversely affects our balance of payments to the extent of an estimated $1.6 billion annually is not adequate; foreign visitors here do not find the advanced facilities for foreign guests that are available in practically all major travel centers of the world.

Second. Funds now being spent by a dozen agencies of the Government for the encouragement and promotion of tourism within the United States are not coordinated sufficiently.

Third. There is a great need for a national inventory of domestic travel and tourism needs, and for the development of plans for the future development of this, the third largest industry in the Nation.

Fourth. Extensive State and local efforts in the field of domestic travel and tourism need to be coordinated and facilitated.

The bill introduced today would:

First. Provide for an expanded U.S. Travel Service with a director appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and responsible directly to the Secretary of Commerce. The Director would have two deputies, one responsible for the promotion of foreign travel to the United States, and the other responsible for the administration of the domestic travel program. The functions of the new domestic travel program would be to develop a coherent national travel policy; to coordinate present Federal travel-related activities; to encourage construction of new tourist facilities within the United States and, to coordinate and act as the Federal Government's liaison with State and private tourist organizations.

Second. Increase funds for the national travel program to $15 million; $10 million to be allocated to encourage foreign tourists to visit the United States and $5 million to begin the proposed domestic travel program.

Third. Authorize a national inventory of domestic travel resources to lay the groundwork for a long-term national travel program. The bill calls for the creation of a 15-member National Tourism Resources Review Commission to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce among private citizens knowledgeable and experienced in the travel field.

I hope very much the administration and my congressional colleagues will study this bill with the greatest care, and will support it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill out of order. I ask also that the bill lie at the desk for a week to permit other Members of the Senate an opportunity to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 2305) to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have a few brief remarks on this subject. One of the big problems facing our country is the problem of the balance of payments. I have addressed myself to that problem many times. One of the biggest efforts we can make to reduce our balance-of-payments deficit is to reduce the difference between what the United States earns from and what it pays out for international travel, which in 1964 added $1.6 billion to that deficit. This is the so-called travel gap. That imbalance of payments, though we are not undergoing it at the present time, will soon show up again, according to expectations and probabilities.

The time has now come to mount a major national effort with an eye on the overall aspects of tourism, both as it pertains to the effort of attracting foreign tourists to our shores and as it touches upon a need, which is becoming clearer every day; namely, to gear up this Nation for increasing travel by Americans in America.

The travel industry has hardly touched its potential: 80 percent of our people have never been in an airplane; 80 million Americans took no trip anywhere last year; and more than half of our people have never been more than 200 miles from home.

The U.S. travel industry, composed of thousands of hotels, motels resorts, airlines, national parks and forests, gas stations, seashores, restaurants, is one of our most important national resources. It is a $30 billion industry, ranking as third largest behind manufacturing and agriculture. It is vitally important as an employer of 6 million individuals, 3 million directly and an additional 3 million indirectly, many of them unskilled and semiskilled; as a source of profits to investors and owners, as a source of tax revenue both to the States and the Federal Government. A vigorous domestic travel industry is also vital as the most effective means of dealing with the so-called tourism gap—the difference between money spent by U.S. tourists overseas and foreign tourists in the United States.

By promoting foreign and domestic travel effectively at the National, State, and local levels, we will be in a much better position to attract foreign tourists, confident, for example, that when they arrive they will be able to convert their currency easily at points of entry and in the larger cities, that they will be able to find officials and employees in the hotel and transportation field capable of speaking their language, that the natural and manmade wonders of our country will be made available to them with the least possible difficulty. In short, that they will find facilities awaiting them, similar to the facilities and services available to foreign visitors in Europe for the last half century.

The responsibility to own, invest in, and to promote and manage our travel industry belongs to the private sector. The responsibility to encourage, assist, and to act as a catalyst and spearhead for our travel industry rests with the National, State, and local governments in cooperation with private industry.

Since the end of World War II, European countries, Canada, and Japan, as well as developing countries, have embarked on large-scale efforts to increase foreign travel to their countries, as well as to increase travel within their borders. They realized early the enormous earnings potential of travel and as a source of employment and tax revenues. With this realization in mind, budgets for travel promotion have risen each year.

A few statistics will demonstrate what is at stake here: In 1963, international travel accounted for $8.355 billion in the flow of world trade, of which U.S. tourism generated $3.19 billion, Western Europe, $4.05 billion and the rest of the globe $1.015 billion. Close to 8 million Americans spent this $3.19 billion in Canada, Mexico and to a lesser extent in Europe and the Mediterranean. Some 90 million foreign visitor arrivals were recorded by 68 countries in 1963, including 6 million in the United States earning for the United States $1.05 billion in that year. Here it must be noted that of the 8 million Americans traveling abroad, 6 million traveled in Canada; and of the 6 million visitors here, 5 million were Canadians.

The United States is a late starter in the competition for the foreign traveler. It was not until the creation of USTS in June 1961, that the U.S. Government seriously started to promote foreign travel to our shores. This effort has been extremely successful as is demonstrated by the steep rise in foreign travel to the United States since the USTS went to work. On a budget that has reached $3 million only in the current fiscal year, the USTS has succeeded in increasing foreign travel to the United States by 17 percent in 1962, 22 percent in 1963, and by over 30 percent in 1964.

According to information supplied by John Black, the Director of the USTS, to the House Banking and Currency Committee on November 30, 1964, the estimated number of foreigners whose income level would permit a visit to the United States is 3.5 to 4 million as compared to the 1 million or so who have visited this country from overseas, excluding Canada. It is therefore quite clear that the USTS budget should be sharply increased if an effective travel promotion campaign is to be mounted by the United States.

It is rather obvious that before an effective national effort can be mounted to fully exploit the potential of travel in the United States there must be developed a focal point within the Federal Government to orchestrate the activities of the Government in travel and tourism.

If anyone today attempts to discuss the problem of improving our American travel resources with official Washington he would find it impossible to find any one agency involved with the broad aspect of travel. There is an agency to promote foreign travel to this country, another to encourage outdoor recreation. The Agriculture Department is encouraging farmers to build campsites. Interior is helping Indian reservations to create tourist attractions. ARA is lending money for tourist development in distressed areas. Interior has National Parks, and Agriculture, National Forests. The Commerce Department established transportation policy and so do a number of independent agencies.

More than a dozen Federal departments and agencies spend millions of dollars on travel and tourism functions. Departments or agencies not already named include the Forest Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Armed Forces. The need is obviously great for a central coordinating body which can at least think about the overall state of the American travel industry.

Providing the specialized facilities and services needed by foreign and domestic visitors must also be considered. There is a great need for taking a national inventory of our national travel resources and assessing its adequacy over the next decade. A new initiative must be taken to establish a close relationship between our national efforts to promote domestic and foreign travel in the United States and the efforts of the States.

Such an inventory would be the responsibility of the National Tourism Resources Review Commission which is authorized by the bill I introduce today. The Commission, whose members would be experienced in the tourism and travel industries, would bring into focus our current resources and facilities and help draft long-range plans for the future.

Under my bill, the Commission would be provided with a budget of $2.5 million and would be ordered to report to the President and the Congress within 2 years. The staff of the U.S. Travel Service would be authorized to assist the Commission, but expert consultant hire would also be authorized.

Among the problems that should be considered by the Commission in the course of its study are two which are of vital interest to the travel industry itself: Whether a separate Federal agency should be created to consolidate and coordinate the tourism research, planning and development now handled by many different departments, offices, and agencies; and whether it would be practical to establish a matching-fund program to assist States in developing their own promotion and facilities improvement programs.

The administration has recently started to deal with this problem in earnest. In March 1965, President Johnson appointed Vice President HUMPHREY as chairman of a special Cabinet task force on travel to develop a positive program to encourage foreign travelers to come to the United States and to stimulate greater travel by our own citizens. The task force supported an increase in the budget of U.S. Travel Service from $3 million to $3.5 million. The House cut this request to $3 million, and U.S. Travel service is now attempting to get $500,000 restored in the Senate. It also supported legislation to reduce from $100 to $50 the duty allowance of returning travelers. I believe that this piece of legislation was uncalled for, would have been of little consequence in balance-of-payments terms, but could have caused great harm to international travel. As a result of strong opposition in both the House and the Senate—in which I played an active part—the duty-free allowance of returning travelers was left at $100 retail and the law was made permanent.

Congress also authorizes the President in August 1964 to appoint an unpaid national chairman to coordinate the efforts of private industry in carrying out the purpose of the "See the U.S.A." program. The chairman of the program, Robert Short of Minneapolis, was appointed in May and with strong support from the Vice President mounted the Discover America, Inc. project which will publicize travel within the United States with $500,000 in contributions obtained from key segments of the travel industry.

Efforts by private organizations to cope with this enormous and complex industry have been commendable but successful only in a limited area—public relations advertising and publicity within the United States. This is a job which under our constitutional form of government should be left in private hands. This is how objectives of the U.S. Travel Service are carried out and this is how "See the U.S.A." program is implemented.

At the same time I want to make it entirely and unmistakably clear that I do not think that public relations job financed with $500,000 in private contributions can ever solve our travel problems nor could it provide for an adequate national travel program. This is a job which calls for Federal initiative and financial support. It is a job that calls for an inventory of our travel resources and needs so that our private travel industry can invest and make its own plans with a clear idea of where the opportunities lie in the decade ahead.

This, I feel the bill I am introducing today will do, and I urge that it receive the closest attention of the Congress.

I am offering this measure as a result of a longstanding interest, for I cosponsored, with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Commerce Committee, the bill to establish the U.S. Travel Service in 1961. It followed a longtime effort in which I had been engaged in since 1953, when I was chairman of a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on international economic cooperation, which developed the whole aspect of travel as a major element in our international financial affairs in respect to foreign policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various exhibits relating to this matter be made a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"EXHIBIT 1

"Travel promotion expenditures of 20 countries as compared to their gross national product and gross earnings from travel [1]

"Country	Travel promotion expenditures	GNP	Gross earnings from travel
Austria	$892, 000	$7, 666, 000, 000	$503, 000, 000
Belgium	2, 000, 000	13, 900, 000, 000	(2)
Canada	3, 700, 000	15, 375, 000, 000	609, 000, 000
Denmark	600, 000	7, 970, 000, 000	164, 000, 000
Finland	700, 000	5, 810, 000, 000	(2)
France	4, 500, 000	79, 360, 000, 000	808, 000, 000
Germany	1, 500, 000	94, 200, 000, 000	688, 000, 000
Great Britain	7, 000, 000	84, 170, 000, 000	619, 000, 000
Greece	[3] 12, 400, 000	4, 367, 000, 000	91, 000, 000
Ireland	3, 100, 000	2, 265, 000, 000	165, 000, 000
Italy	2, 900, 000	45, 100, 000, 000	1, 000, 000, 000
Luxembourg	92, 000	525, 000, 000, 000	(2)
Mexico	4, 500, 000	15, 375, 000, 000	656, 000, 000
Netherlands	870, 000	14, 400, 000, 000	(2)
Norway	360, 000	5, 638, 000, 000	78, 000, 000
Spain	2, 000, 000	14, 970, 000, 0^0	939, 000, 000
Sweden	481, 000	15, 560, 000, 000	(2)
Switzerland	2, 000, 000	11, 630, 000, 000	560, 000, 000
Turkey	2, 000, 000	6, 975, 000, 000	8, 300, 000
United States	3, 400, 000	583, 900, 000, 000	1, 005, 000, 000

"[1] Information as pertains to the year 1962.
"[2] Not available.
"[3] Including hotel maintenance costs.

"Source: OECD report, 1964, U.S. Travel Service."

"EXHIBIT 2

"Budgets of Federal agencies dealing with some aspects of travel, fiscal year 1966 [1]

Fish and Wildlife Service	$52, 169, 500
Bureau of Indian Affairs	206, 264, 000
Bureau of Land Management	64, 236, 000
National Park Service	119, 668, 000
Bureau of Reclamation (estimate)	327, 883, 000
Army Corps of Engineers civil works program, fiscal year 1965	1, 253, 748, 200
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation	128, 398, 000
Area Development Administration	73, 200, 000
Forest Service	360, 000, 000

"[1] Funds available for travel promotion or facilities used by travelers are contained within these budgets."

"EXHIBIT 3

"Expenditures of State governments for travel promotion, 1964

"State	Biennial budget	Annual budget
Alabama		$355, 500
Alaska		389, 800
Arizona		150, 880
Arkansas		640, 227
California		None
Colorado		305, 692
Connecticut	$60, 000	30, 000
Delaware		30, 000
Florida		1, 000, 000
Georgia		475, 211
Hawaii		[1] 1, 100, 000
Idaho		[2] 157, 344
Illinois	500, 000	250, 000
Indiana		(3)
Iowa		50, 000
Kansas		[2] 273, 000
Kentucky		680, 000
Louisiana		[3] [4] 230, 000
Maine		$325, 123
Maryland		177, 204
Massachusetts		100, 000
Michigan		691, 096
Minnesota		[4] 183, 847
Mississippi		377, 850
Missouri	$192, 621	96, 310
Montana		126, 000
Nebraska	125, 000	64, 500
Nevada		50, 000
New Hampshire		274, 500
New Jersey		149, 000
New Mexico		216, 639
New York		720, 635
North Carolina		450, 000
North Dakota	125, 000	64, 500
Ohio		None
Oklahoma		402, 000
Oregon		600, 000
Pennsylvania		526, 000
Rhode Island		123, 070
South Carolina		225, 000
South Dakota		408, 000
Tennessee		375, 000
Texas:		
Texas Tourist Development Agency		126, 146
Texas Highway Department, Travel Information Division		310, 000
Utah		150, 000
Vermont		213, 639
Virginia	1, 193, 495	596, 747
Washington	692, 234	346, 117
West Virginia		161, 000
Wisconsin		420, 000
Wyoming	402, 288	201, 144
Total		15, 368, 581

"[1] Paid by State to Hawaii Visitors Bureau.
"[2] For advertising and promotion.
"[3] No budget.
"[4] Approximate.

"Source: '1964 Development Advertising Reports,' edited by Ruth H. Long."

"EXHIBIT 4

"U.S. Travel Service budget and staff

"Fiscal year	Budget	Size of staff in District of Columbia	Overseas	Number of offices
1962	$2,500,000	26	20	7
1963	3,350,000	28	44	9
1964	2,600,000	27	43	9
1965	3,000,000	31	42	9
1966:				
House allowance	3,000,000	30	50	11
Senate appeal	3,345,000	30	50	11

"Source: U.S. Travel Service."

"EXHIBIT 5

"PARTIAL LIST OF PRIVATE TRAVEL ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING PRIMARY TRAVEL INDUSTRY FUNCTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

"American Automobile Association (AAA).

"American Hotel & Motel Association (AH & MA).

"American Motor Hotel Association (AMHA).

"American Petroleum Institute (API).

"Air Transport Association of America (ATA).

"Hotel Sales Managers Association (HSMA).

"National Association of Motor Bus Owners (NAMBO).

"National Association of Travel Organizations (NATO).

"Rail Travel Promotion Agency (RTPA).

"Trans-Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference.

"Trans-Pacific Passenger Conference (steamship).

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may also be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2305) is as follows:

"S. 2305

"(A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States)

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121–2136) is amended—

"(1) by striking out the first and second sections and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally, and by otherwise encouraging and facilitating travel within the United States (including its possessions for the purpose of this Act).

" 'SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall—

" '(1) formulate for the United States a comprehensive policy with respect to domestic travel;

" '(2) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to and within the United States for the purpose of a study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities and as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and the United States;

" '(3) encourage the development of tourist facilities, low-cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of all travelers;

" '(4) foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States and within the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

" '(5) encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination or barriers to travel, and the facilitation of travel to and within the United States generally;

" '(6) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information, including schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to travel and tourism; and

" '(7) establish an office to be known as the Office of Travel Program Coordination, which shall assist the Secretary in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act for the purpose of (A) achieving maximum coordination of the programs of the various departments and agencies of the United States Government to promote the purposes of this Act, (B) consulting with appropriate officers and agencies of State and local governments, and with private organizations and agencies, with respect to programs undertaken pursuant to this Act, and (C) achieving the effective cooperation of Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, and of private organizations and agencies, concerned with such programs.';

"(2) by inserting before the period at the end of section 3(b) the following: 'and shall not otherwise compete with the activities of other public or private agencies';

"(3) by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 4', and by inserting at the end of such section 4 a new subsection as follows:

" '(b) The Secretary may appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of this Act. Such assistant directors shall be compensated at the rate provided for GS–18 in the Classification Act of 1949';

"(4) by redesignating sections 5, 6, and 7 as sections 6, 7, and 8, respectively, and by inserting after section 4 a new section as follows:

" 'SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall establish a National Tourism Resources Review Commission. Such Commission shall be composed of 15 members appointed by the Secretary from among persons who are informed about and concerned with the improvement, development, and promotion of the United States tourism resources and opportunities or who are otherwise experienced in tourism research, promotion, or planning. The Secretary shall appoint a Chairman from among such members. The Commission shall meet at the call of the Secretary.

" '(b) The Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of—

" '(1) determining the domestic travel needs of the people of the United States and of visitors from other lands at the present time and to the year 1980;

" '(2) determining the travel resources of the Nation available to satisfy such needs now and to the year 1980;

" '(3) determining policies and programs which will insure that the domestic travel needs of the present and the future are adequately and efficiently met;

" '(4) determining a recommended program of Federal assistance to the States in promoting domestic travel; and

" '(5) determining whether a separate agency of the Government should be established to consolidate and coordinate tourism research, planning, and development activities presently performed by different existing agencies of the Government.

" 'The Commission shall report the results of such investigation and study to the Secretary not later than two years after the effective date of this section. The Secretary shall submit such report, together with his recommendations with respect thereto, to the President and the Congress.

" '(c) The Secretary is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be necessary to assist the Commission, and the Secretary shall in addition, make available to the Commission such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Commerce as the Commission may require to carry out its functions.

" '(d) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

" '(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,500,000 for the purpose of this section.'

"(5) by striking out '$4,700,000' in the section redesignated as section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof '$15,000,000'; and

"(6) by striking out 'International Travel Act of 1961' in the section redesignated as section 8 and inserting in lieu thereof 'International and Domestic Travel Act'."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his great consideration in allowing me to interrupt a quorum call so that I might present this matter.

THE OUTRAGE AT GLEN ECHO

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I have been interviewed by representatives of news media regarding my reactions to the Easter Monday riot that had its inception at suburban Glen Echo Amusement Park, then spilled into a neighborhood shopping center and left ugly scars along routes back into the city of Washington.

Certainly no responsible citizen can help but be incensed at violence and malicious destruction of property regardless of the locale. Since outbreaks of this nature have been occurring with increasing frequency, it is time for all of us to speak out and put offenders and potential offenders on notice that America will no longer tolerate such barbaric atrocities in Washington or anywhere else in the country.

Vandals are excused for infractions of the law on the theory that their recreational opportunities are too limited. Under prevailing attitudes, I wonder just how many who took part in the Glen Echo ruckus were punished, or even questioned, by their parents? How many parents even inquired into whether their children were at the park that violent night, and how many are voluntarily cooperating with authorities in attempting to bring the leaders to justice?

Enough of the exhortations that seek to excuse such public disorder and wanton vandalism as an offset to frustrations born of impecuniosity and deprivation. Such philosophy, however well intended, serves but to encourage disregard of the law and disrespect of the rights of persons and of society.

Two editorials appearing in local newspapers on April 13 should be required reading for everyone who is concerned with the eruption at Glen Echo and with similar shameful demonstrations. "Glen Echo Riot," in the Washington Evening Star, warns that recurrences can be expected if the sordid outbreak is lightly dismissed.

The Washington Daily News, in an editorial entitled "The Outrage of Glen Echo," reviews in a most rational manner the sorry event that took place.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these editorials be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 13, 1966]

The Outrage at Glen Echo

The Easter Monday eruption of violence, vandalism, and looting at Glen Echo and in the upper Northwest section of the District cannot be passed over for any of the usual reasons given by well-meaning citizens who seek to find excuses for civil unrest.

That eruption of Negro teenagers cannot be laid to poor housing, poor schooling, "police brutality" or lack of recreational facilities. It was, purely and simply, an example of gross irresponsibility and total lack of regard for other people's rights and property. It was not exactly teenage spring madness either. It was outrageous, and no attempt to write it off can have any measure of public support, either from Negroes or whites, adults or teenagers.

It appears now that a relatively small cadre went to Glen Echo on Monday with the intent to start a rumble. In that they certainly succeeded, and for that the thousands of otherwise peaceful kids who were swept along with the tide should hold the minority in deepest blame.

We fervently wish it were possible to seek out the troublemakers and brand them with the utter shame of their actions. Quite likely that is impossible, but we hope equally fervently that the example of Monday at Glen Echo will remain in the minds of Washington kids, to the end that such a thing will not happen again.

Having said so much, there is little to add, save to say that in this instance, as in many others, the police acted with intelligence and circumspection—perhaps, even, too much of these sometime virtues.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 13, 1966]

Glen Echo Riot

The Easter Monday rioting at Glen Echo Park and the subsequent vandalism on the trek back to Washington add up to a performance that was both senseless and disgraceful.

This was definitely not another Watts explosion. It is not subject to the familiar explanations—slum housing, de facto segregation, broken homes or the like. These youngsters went to the recently desegregated park with money to spend. And the parents of many of them, upon hearing the news of the outbreak, drove out in their cars to get their children and take them home.

Nor should there be a blanket indictment of all the 6,000 or 7,000 youngsters who were in the park when the trouble started. Apparently a few hundred at most participated in the looting and vandalism there. Nor is there any way of knowing how many of the 1,500 or more who walked back to Washington smashed windows in homes along the way, hurled rocks through automobile windshields and engaged in other forms of vandalism.

Whether the hoodlums are to be counted in hundreds or more, however, is beside the point. The essential fact is that their behavior is inexcusable. It should be a matter of most serious concern to this city, and especially to the Negro leadership in Washington, several of whom have already begun an investigation. Instead of picketing the Cherry Blossom Festival to inform more than 100,000 out-of-town visitors of the "unenlightened" attitude of the Board of Trade toward home rule for the District, there should be some soul searching with respect to the image of the Nation's Capital which these visitors will take home with them after the Easter Monday spectacle.

One other point remains. Where was the police protection? John E. Winters, head of the Washington Police Youth Aid Division, says that Montgomery County Police were alerted to reports of impending trouble at Glen Echo. Deputy Chief Winters also says "the trouble was not spontaneous; it was planned."

The Montgomery Police, who obviously did not have enough men on the scene, take a different view. The county police chief says "this thing (the riot) certainly was spontaneous, and I don't see how anyone could predict it." The head of Montgomery's juvenile unit says the troublemakers were not an aggressive group. And this despite the fact that the nonaggressive group smashed windows of at least a dozen police cars and damaged two ambulances carrying injured people to hospitals.

Another fact bears on the adequacy or otherwise of the police protection. There were only five arrests. Four of these were among the troublemakers and three of them, being juveniles, were released to the custody of their parents. The fifth was a householder who fired a shot into the ground while vandals were pounding on his automobile. He has been charged with unlawfully discharging a gun in Montgomery County.

Clearly, there should have been better police work. But a much more important question remains. What caused this third riot in recent years? Commissioner Tobriner says the causes are "elusive." No doubt this is true. But if the causes of riots and vandalism are to be shrugged off on the ground that they are elusive, this city can look forward to nothing better than more of the same.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 103.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I especially appreciate the privilege today of addressing the Senate regarding the matter before the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 103, of which I have the privilege of being one of the Senators who joined the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] in sponsoring.

I do not know of any matter which is more vital than that of the people of the States passing on the apportionment of their own State legislatures. I know it is a matter about which men honestly differ, but I am firmly convinced that it is one of the great fundamentals of our form of government. Even though it has been abused somewhat from time to time by some of the States, one being guilty at one time and another at another time, by and large is has worked well. The old system has worked well, and it is entirely consistent with and fundamental to the basic form of our government. Certainly, even though court rulings have changed that concept now, the Congress, the legislative branch, the direct representatives of the people, have a special obligation to let the States pass on this matter so the States can at least be permitted a choice in making a determination in the selection of their own legislatures, as to whether at least one of the houses shall be based strictly on population, or whether it can be based on considerations of population and additional considerations.

As I said, it is a privilege to address this body, as I am glad to do today, and thus get my remarks and my thoughts on the Record for possible consideration over the weekend and prior to the vote next week.

Mr. President, during the past 30 years the Supreme Court has rendered numerous decisions which constitute abrupt departures from interpretations of the Constitution previously established by the Court. None of these decisions, however, has as far-reaching effects and strikes a more damaging blow to our federal system of government than do the recent decisions in the field of legislative apportionment.

The power of a State to determine the apportionment and the composition of its legislature goes to the very essence of State sovereignty, and yet the Court has now rendered that power virtually meaningless.

Prior to the Supreme Court decision in *Baker et al.* v. *Carr et al.*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962), it had been universally held that apportionment cases do not present a justifiable issue. The Court had held many times that such cases constitute political issues over which the Court could not and should not assert jurisdiction. In Baker, however, the Court summarily reversed its prior decisions and held that it had jurisdiction over the subject matter and that the cause of action is justifiable.

In an unanswerable dissent, Mr. Justice Frankfurter clearly and forcefully attacked the majority opinion in Baker against Carr and stated:

> The Court today reverses a uniform course of decision established by a dozen cases, including one by which the very claim now sustained was unanimously rejected only 5 years ago. The impressive body of rulings thus cast aside reflected the equally uniform course of our political history regarding the relationship between political and legislative representation—a wholly different matter

> from denial of the franchise to individuals because of race, color, religion, or sex. Such a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judicial power demands a detailed analysis of the role of this Court in our constitutional scheme.

Subsequent events have proven, Mr. President, that Mr. Justice Frankfurter was not incorrect in describing the Baker decision as a "destructively novel judicial power." That decision, and later cases such as Reynolds against Sims and Lucas against Colorado, have wrecked havoc in the States and extended Federal judicial control to the very heart of local self-government. Mr. Justice Clark very concisely set forth this belief when he stated in the Lucas case that:

> In striking down Colorado's plan of apportionment, the Court, I believe, is exceeding its power under the equal protection clause; it is invading the valid functioning of the procedures of the States, and thereby commits a grievous error which will do irreparable damage to our Federal-State relationship.

I emphasize this situation now to show that there is a tremendous difference of opinion among the members of the Court about the power of the Court to change the old rule. I emphasize that situation to underscore and to show that this resolution only in a small way would restore the law to what it was before these court decisions were made, and at the same time would give every protection to the other side of the question involved by requiring that the people themselves should pass on this matter before the rule would be changed in their States; not only pass on the plan but have two plans submitted to them at the same time so that they might make a choice.

Until the Supreme Court reached these decisions in Reynolds against Sims and companion cases on June 15, 1964, it had always been rightfully assumed that the individual States had the authority to apportion their legislatures on such factors as they saw fit. In Reynolds, however, the Court advanced a wholly new principle. Speaking for the Court, Mr. Chief Justice Warren stated:

> We hold that, as a basic constitutional standard, the equal protection clause requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis. Simply stated, an individual's right to vote for State legislators is unconstitutionally impaired when its weight is in a substantial fashion diluted when compared with votes of citizens living in other parts of the State.

Thus the Court advanced the one-man, one-vote theory that a State legislature must be apportioned strictly on the basis of population. It even held in Lucas et al. against Colorado General Assembly et al., that an apportionment using other factors was unconstitutional notwithstanding the fact that the people of Colorado had approved the plan in a referendum. And in the State of New York, the Federal district court held that members of the legislature should serve for only 1 year even though the State constitution provided for 2-year terms.

I submit, Mr. President, that there is no constitutional basis for the Court's decisions in these cases. The legislative history of the 14th amendment, the practice in effect at the time of its adoption, and the very wording of the amendment itself conclusively support this opinion. In his dissenting opinion in Reynolds against Sims, Mr. Justice Harlan summarized this belief by stating:

> Had the Court paused to probe more deeply into the matter, it would have found that the equal protection clause was never intended to inhibit the States in choosing any democratic method they pleased for the apportionment of their legislatures. This is shown by the language of the 14th amendment taken as a whole, by the understanding of those who proposed and ratified it, and by the political practices of the States at the time the amendment was adopted.

I commend Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent to every Member of the Senate; it is an incisive and, I believe, unanswerable opinion which clearly demonstrates the fallacy of the majority holding.

The essence of Mr. Justice Harlan's opinion is that the 14th amendment expressly recognizes the State's power to deny "or in any way" abridge the right of their inhabitants to vote for the "members of the legislature" and provides an exclusive remedy in such cases. That this is the explicit meaning of the language of section 2 is undeniable, Mr. President, and it is also supported by the legislative history of the amendment. Without exception, sponsors of the amendment in the House and Senate expressly recognized that it was not intended to take from the respective States their power of regulating suffrage.

Although the amendment recognizes this right, it does provide a remedy "when the right to vote is denied or in any way abridged." That remedy is not the right of the Federal judiciary to determine the apportionment of a State's legislature or to order apportionment on the basis of any particular factor. To the contrary, section 2 of the amendment specifically provides that the remedy shall be the reduction of a State's representation in the House of Representatives in proportion to the denial or abridgment of the right to vote. The exclusiveness of this remedy is clear and unmistakable.

In addition to the unequivocal language of the 14th amendment, the practices of the States at the time of the ratification of the amendment, soon after the Civil War, substantiate the opinion that the States are free to apportion their legislatures on factors other than population. For example, of the 23 loyal States which ratified the amendment, 5 had constitutional provisions providing for apportionment of at least one house on the basis of factors other than population; 10 more of those States gave primary emphasis to population, but also considered other factors. As a condition for readmission to the Union, the 10 States that attempted to secede were required to ratify the 14th amendment. As Mr. Justice Harlan states, the constitution of each of those States was studied, and debate over reapportionment was extensive; yet 6 of the 10 States had constitutional provisions which substantially departed from the method of apportionment now required by the Supreme Court.

As Mr. Justice Harlan so well stated in his dissenting opinion:

> It is incredible that Congress would have exacted ratification of the 14th amendment as the price for readmission, would have studied the State constitutions for compliance with the amendment, and would then have disregarded violations of it.

The inescapable conclusion of this legislative history and experience, as well as the judicial precedents prior to the rendering of these decisions on June 15, is that the Constitution does not prohibit the respective States from determining the apportionment and composition of both houses of their legislatures.

In addition to the legal attacks on the constitutional validity of these decisions, I submit that there are other compelling reasons to correct the decisions of the Supreme Court. This is a nation composed of many elements and population groups, each having economic, political, and social interests peculiar to its own circumstances. In a republican form of government, each of these group interests is entitled to recognition in its legislative representation. Citizens in rural areas, for example, have interests different from those of urban and semiurban population groups. Agricultural interests differ from those of industrial organizations, and similar distinctions can be made for the interests of many other groups throughout our Nation.

The factors which should be considered in providing representation for these various interests are susceptible of recognition and definition only by the State legislative bodies. No judicial tribunal, State or Federal, is qualified to pass on these questions and arrive at fair and workable solutions. In his incomparable style, Mr. Justice Frankfurter expressed this belief in his dissent from the majority holding in Baker against Carr when he stated:

> To charge courts with the task of accommodating the incommensurable factors of policy that underlie these mathematical puzzles is to attribute, however flatteringly, omnicompetence to judges. The framers of the Constitution persistently rejected a proposal that embodied this assumption and Thomas Jefferson never entertained it.

Mr. President, I do not propose that any individual be denied proper representation in any legislative body, whether it be at the local, State or Federal level. To the contrary, I believe it is essential that the Congress act immediately to insure that all individuals and interests are fairly and justly heard in the legislative halls throughout our Nation. If the decisions of the Supreme Court in Reynolds against Sims and companion cases are allowed to stand, it will not be long before the large population centers in each State secure absolute control of their government. Those people who live in rural areas will be without a voice in the management of their State. They will be at the mercy of the cities.

Mr. President, I have never had a belief in all my public life that was any firmer or more conclusive than the one which I have just stated.

This is not a matter in which the people of my State are all of the same opinion or all of the same accord. I have had very urgent requests and persistent urging by those who live in our more populated areas and in our cities to oppose this joint resolution, and to let the present Supreme Court decision stand.

As one who has watched public life develop for a good many years, and I believe I have some practical knowledge and experience in this field, I know that the wave of sentiment ebbs and flows, and the wave of sentiment prevailing at one particular time will sweep away and many times unjustly establish political rights which are otherwise in the people.

I am satisfied that we are really crucifying a principle of government here on a slogan, the one-man, one-vote slogan. We are crucifying not only a principle of government, but literally crucifying great areas of the country and assigning them to political oblivion.

Of course, I am as much responsible to the people who live in cities as I am to those who live elsewhere, including the rural areas and the fringe areas. We are not considering a question of individual rights or responsibilities. It is not a question of citizenship or rights as such. It is a question of sound political government and of the exercise of sound judgment by legislative bodies.

I am not pleading a special case for people who live in the rural areas to have any preference over any others, generally; but we know that the political, moral, and spiritual resources of this Nation have for many decades been drawn from those very areas far beyond their proportion in population. We know that their contribution to the basic ideas and fundamental principles of our Government have been far more than merely on a basis of their percentage of the population.

I believe that the decision of the Supreme Court is one step further toward wiping out their influence. Not only that, it is an attempt to discourage them and to leave them to die on the vine, so to speak. It is the single most sweeping change that has taken place in our Government in the last few years, or even the last few decades. Such things are happening fast enough anyway; but this decision of the Supreme Court goes all the way and leaves no ground upon which to build.

I emphasize again that the joint resolution does not propose to kill the Supreme Court decision; it merely puts a fragmentary limitation on it. It permits the people, but does not require them, by their own vote to choose a system based upon some other factor than population alone.

As I said in the beginning, while I recognize that certain inequities have existed in the apportionment of some State legislature, I believe that they are far outweighed by the dangers inherent in the doctrine of Baker against Carr and Reynolds against Sims. Federal judicial control and the complete dominance of urban centers, made possible by those decisions, may well destroy the last vestige of our federal system and true representative government.

These damages may be avoided, however, if Senate Joint Resolution 103 is passed by Congress and is ratified by the requisite number of States. The requisite number of State is three-fourths of the total number. Three-fourths of the States must actually approve the proposal before it can become effective; and that is in addition to two-thirds of this body and two-thirds of the House of Representatives. So that is an additional safeguard that is written into the face of the Constitution itself. I do not believe anything could be plainer or clearer than that three-fourths of the States must ratify the proposal after a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress has submitted the amendment to the States. Nothing could be clearer than that the States already had this right, until it was erroneously taken away by the Supreme Court.

Simply and briefly stated, the pending resolution would restore to the States the right to apportion one house of their respective legislatures on the basis of population, geography, and political subdivisions "in order to insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate."

The twofold purpose of this proposed constitutional amendment is self-evident, Mr. President, first, it would return to the States their historic and constitutional right to determine the apportionment of their legislature; and second, it would insure the effective representation of all groups and interests in the State. While accomplishing these purposes, the amendment also includes substantial procedural requirements which would prevent any State from returning to a so-called rotten borough system of apportionment. It provides that ratification of the amendment must be by the required number of State legislatures in which one house must be apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population. A reapportionment is required after each decennial census, and each plan of apportionment must be approved by a majority vote of those voting in a statewide referendum. And an alternative plan of apportionment based solely on substantial equality of population must be submitted to the people of each State along with any plan which deviates from the one-man, one-vote concept.

What could be fairer, what could be more complete, what could be more fundamental than protections of these kinds?

These precedural requirements clearly would prevent the adoption of any apportionment plan which the people of the respective States do not believe represents a fair and reasonable plan to insure the effective representation of all groups and interests in the State. At the same time, it would enable the people of each State to adopt an apportionment plan which would prevent the complete domination of the legislature by the urban population centers.

Mr. President, I strongly support the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 103. Although I believe it does not go far enough in reversing the recent decisions of the Supreme Court and restoring the right of apportionment to the States, I believe it represents the most nearly acceptable proposal which can be presented to the Congress and the States. Therefore, I will vote for the resolution and strongly urge its passage.

I am one of those who were familiar with the fact that the legislatures of several States failed to respond to their duty, or that the people of the States failed to respond to their duty, to provide for reapportionment. I believe that the abuse of the discretion in those States was what laid the groundwork for this unfortunate Supreme Court decision. I do not make any attack upon the Supreme Court. The dissenting opinions prove that the decision was not unanimous, and they give the best reasons that could be given in this Chamber for the rule that was adopted in those cases.

I am one who was somewhat impatient because my own State failed to reapportion; but in that instance, it was not so bad as it was in other States. But the idea of the Court itself—and I think wrongfully—sweeping away the whole procedure, without authority to do so, and then the failure on the part of Congress to respond and to restore, at least in part, the basic principle that belongs to the people and to the States, will, after all, be regarded as a sad failure of government.

In my opinion, the joint resolution should pass with very little debate and be sent to the States for their consideration and appraisal. Whatever the States do about the proposal will certainly be all right with me. If the joint resolution is passed by Congress, whatever the people do in their respective States will be agreeable to me. If they wish to adopt the one-person, one-vote rule, that is entirely their business and is in the realm of good, solid government.

But for Congress to fail to respond to the immediate urgency of giving the States and the people a chance to correct what I believe is an erroneous opinion will indicate an unwillingness on our part to attempt to solve the problem. The effect would actually be a failure in our form of government; a shrinking from the realization of what the Supreme Court decision means, unless there is a chance to restore this fragment of power to the people at the State level. It is a power that has been taken away from them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It has been a pleasure for me to listen to the Senator from Mississippi address himself to this subject.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When I first came to the Senate, I served with the Senator from Mississippi on the Committee on Rules and Administration. As I recall, I was then the youngest Member of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Louisiana made a mighty good member of that committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Mississippi was my coach. He was to me like an older brother. It might be said that he taught me what I know about the Senate and its operations.

Before the Senator from Mississippi entered this body, he was an outstanding judge in his State. I recall from my service with the Senator from Mississippi on the Committee on Armed Services that on one occasion we listened to the testimony of some legal experts from the Navy Department. The Senator from Mississippi was questioning them concerning their talents and ability as lawyers who had not been in actual practice. The Senator from Mississippi, who had been a judge in his State, said, "I think you ought to have some courthouse judges in your group, people who have tried lawsuits, who have been out among the people; not merely someone who went to law school but did not actually practice law."

The Senator from Mississippi has always had a down-to-earth way of thinking about matters. He is a man of the people. He is a man with an iron conscience. He has always treated fairly and justly the humblest citizen. We are all proud of the Senator. From the day he came to the Senate, he has never digressed from the principles in which he believes. He was recognized as a potentially great Senator when he came to this body, and he has never deviated from the fundamental principles in which he believes.

It is a great honor to serve under the Senator from Mississippi and to follow his leadership as a member of the Rules and Administration Committee and as a member of the Armed Services Committee.

I thank the Senator for his very fine address today, in which he has pointed out the real principles of the American Government. Everybody has the same complaint about government. The most humble citizen has the same complaint that I have. He does not have enough information.

If we refer to the United Nations, 2 billion people are represented there. The point of influence of the most humble citizen is one in 2 billion. If we get a little closer to home, his point of influence in the United States is only 1 in 190 million. As he gets a little closer he has more influence. When we reach the State level, it is on the average of 1 in 3 million. When we reach the county level, the most humble citizen then has more power. He is then 1 in 20,000. He is still not satisfied.

When we reach the most important form of government, the family, he is then 1 in 5, 1 in 4, or perhaps 1 in 2. He still has the same complaint, that he does not have enough influence. Perhaps mamma is deciding how things will be done and is buying the groceries and putting a better cut of meat on the table than he thinks he should pay for. That still involves the same complaint, that a person does not have enough influence.

The Senator is so correct in his statement of principle, that the people ought to make these decisions, that the decisions should not be made for them. Nobody except our Maker has the right to make decisions for us. People can govern themselves better than they can be governed. They would be happier that way, even though they might be wrong.

The Senator has stood for these principles all through the years. I salute him for the devotion that he has given to the sincere principle of local home rule and self-government.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I thank him for the fine service he has rendered on the committees on which we have been privileged to serve together, as well as for the fine service that he is rendering now in carrying such a big load of the business of the Senate.

I am grateful and pleased that we view this matter in the same way and that we are going to vote in the same way.

I count it a privilege to be alined with the Senator. It is seldom that we do disagree on vital matters.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SALE OF STRATEGIC GOODS ON LIBERAL CREDIT TERMS TO COMMUNIST CHINA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, like millions of other Americans, I was shocked last month to read in the newspapers that the German Government had approved the sale of a $176 million steel complex to Communist China.

On March 22, I expressed my dismay here on the floor of the Senate that allies of the United States would supply equipment which might well be used to produce material which would be used to kill American soldiers. I was shocked to think that our allies would, by this act, take such a step which might substantially injure the chances for peace in southeast Asia.

Shortly after making this speech, I received a letter from Hon. Heinrich Knappstein, the Ambassador to the United States from the German Federal Republic. Ambassador Knappstein kindly made available to me a statement on the facts involved in the sale.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the German Embassy, entitled "A German Steel Mill for Red China," which I received from the German Ambassador be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GERMAN STEEL MILL FOR RED CHINA?

Recently a certain resentment against Germany has arisen in the United States because German industrial firms allegedly are about to deliver to Red China a "steel mill," a "steel plant" or a "steel complex" to produce war material that could be shipped to North Vietnam and there be used to threaten the lives of American soldiers. This news item is untrue.

1. German industry does not plan to deliver a "steel mill" nor a "steel complex" to Red China, but two rolling mills. Thus, the steel production of Red China will not be increased, as was alleged, by 2 million tons of steel, since a rolling mill does not produce, but merely processes steel. The steel production of Red China will, therefore, not be increased by a single ton, nor would the rolling mills "greatly bolster Red China's steelmaking capacity."

2. As the construction and installation of the rolling mills will take at least 4 to 5 years, one cannot envisage that the rolling mills will start production before 1971—which is 5 years from now.

3. The contract for the delivery of the rolling mills will be concluded not alone by a group of German firms, but by a consortium of several European firms in which the share of the German group will be approximately $70 million, the share of a Belgian group, $50 million, the share of a French group, $49.75 million, and the share of an Austrian firm $6.25 million, a total of $176 million.

4. If the German industry had declined to participate in the delivery of the rolling mills, they would have been constructed anyway—and within the same period of time—because a British, a French, and a Japanese group of firms have made competitive offers at the same time as the aforementioned European consortium.

5. The hot rolling mill will produce sheet metal at a gage between 1.5 and 10 millimeters (equal approximately one-sixteenth inch and three-eighths inch). The design and outlay of the rolling mill and its continuous mode of operation do not allow the production of sheets with a greater thickness and higher quality—in other words this rolling mill cannot produce high-grade armor plates for military use because the mills cannot generate the pressure necessary for that purpose.

6. The cold rolling mill can only turn out soft metal sheets with a thickness from 0.3 to 3.0 millimeters (equal approximately 0.012 inch to one-eighth inch).

7. What has been pointed out in paragraphs 5 and 6 means in practical terms that the sheets, produced by the rolling mills can only be utilized in the manufacture of automobiles, construction steel, for roofing sheets (corrugated iron), for containers, household appliances, and tin cans.

8. The rolling mills will not be able to produce, for instance, shells, tanks, armor plates, and the like. And it is not correct either "that Red China would get the capacity to produce steel which could be used to manufacture bombs, missiles, guns, and bullets to be used against American boys."

9. It cannot be denied, however, that steel sheets produced in the rolling mills could also be used for certain military purposes, such as for instance the production of jeeps, trucks, and steel helmets, but that is also possible with almost every other commodity imported into Red China from abroad. Even wheat could, and in a totalitarian country would be, used first of all for the supply of armed forces. Such limited use for military purposes is inevitably connected with every trade with Communist countries.

10. The delivery of a rolling mill does not violate the provisions of the so-called Cocom embargo lists, agreed upon by the free world, as these lists include only strategic material but not rolling mills.

11. As the credit, extended in connection with the delivery of the rolling mills to Red China, does not exceed 5 years, the Bern Convention on loans to Communist countries will not be violated either.

12. The contract with Red China for the delivery of the rolling mills has as yet not been concluded.

13. It is a general trend all over the free world—also in the United States—to increase the trade with certain Communist countries to make them less dependent on the Soviet Union, to lessen their isolation and to open them up for a freer exchange with the free world.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, while I appreciate Ambassador Knappstein's frankness in making this statement available to me, I would be less than frank if I were to state that it in any way reassured me as to the intentions of the German Government. If anything, it convinced me that the German Government has taken either an unusually naive and insensitive position with regard to this transaction, or that it has deliberately proceeded to place a fondness for increasing the profits of its domestic producers over the strategic and political needs of the free world. I will let the record speak for itself on this point.

Upon receipt of the statement of the German Embassy, I released a statement in which I indicated that I was far from reassured by the information. Among the disconcerting distinctions drawn by the German statement, I will now mention only a few:

First. While there clearly is a technical distinction between the production of steel and processing of steel, an increase in the capacity of either production or processing of steel must be regarded as an increase in strategic potential.

Second. I am not at all reassured by the claim of the German Government that the rolling-mill complex cannot be used to produce shells, bombs, and weapons, but only such apparently nonstrategic products as, "jeeps, tanks, and steel helmets."

Third. While it is very true that the free world has increased trade with certain Communist countries in an effort to make them less dependent on the Soviet Union, I do not believe for an instant that this same logic can rationally be applied to trade with Communist China. I am aware of no information which indicates that trade with Communist China will bring about a lessening of any strategic dependence on the Soviet Union which may presently exist in Communist China, and if the German Government has any such information it might well be sharing this information with us.

The purpose of my speech today is not, however, to criticize the statement of the German Embassy, but only to discuss it as part of the background of a missive which I have received from the U.S. Department of State.

When I spoke on this subject on March 22, I indicated that I was in the process of drafting a letter to our own Government, expressing my feelings about this threat to the free world. Last week I received a reply from Assistant Secretary of State Douglas MacArthur II, who had been delegated responsibility by the White House to answer my message.

Mr. President, when I was a very young man I once read a book entitled "Alice in Wonderland." The book was then, and, in fact, still is, a delightful, whimsical children's novel about a young lady who is transported to a world in which talking eggs and animals engage in intellectual jousts, selective nibbling of mushrooms produces changes in human height, and other whimsical, fantastic events transport the reader far from the world of reality.

As I read through Ambassador MacArthur's letter, which is certainly couched in the most proper terminology of which the Department of State is capable, my thoughts were carried back to those long-ago days of "Alice in Wonderland."

Here again was the same cheerful disregard of reality which made Lewis Carroll's book a child's masterpiece.

Images came to mind of an "Alice in Wonderland" of the mid-1960's gaily cavorting at a tea party with Communist China in the role of the March Hare, Germany as the smiling Cheshire Cat, the other Western European partners as the Duchess, the dormouse, and the brothers Tweedledee and Tweedledum, and beaming Uncle Sam as the Mad Hatter.

Mr. President, this imperishable piece of literature should not be lost to future generations. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Ambassador MacArthur be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, would the Senator read that letter out loud? I think it is very interesting and that we all ought to know what it contains.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, at the request of my good friend from my neighboring State—almost—the State of Rhode Island, I am happy to read the letter.

The letter reads:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
April 5, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS J. MCINTYRE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCINTYRE: The President has asked me to reply to your telegram of March 24 in which you expressed your concern over reports of a proposed sale of a steel rolling-mill complex to the Communist Chinese by a German-led European consortium.

As you know, the United States forbids virtually all trade and financial transactions, including credit, with Communist China. Other industrialized countries of the free world have adopted a different policy and permit trade in nonstrategic goods with Communist China. There is, however, an informal agreement between the industrialized free world countries on the types of goods which are strategic and which would not be sold to the Soviet bloc or Communist China. As far as credit is concerned, free world countries are not known to have extended credit to Commuist China for periods beyond 5 years.

We were informed several weeks ago of the German proposal to guarantee a credit for delivery of a steel-rolling mill valued at more than $150 million to the Communist Chinese. German firms would deliver less than half the order with the remainder coming from other Western European countries. The German Government told us that this type of mill is not on the agreed list of items subject to embargo. We did not, therefore, have firm, formal grounds to object to the transaction. We told the Germans that the decision was theirs to make, but at the same time expressed our regret that there was no agreement on limiting credit terms for the Communist Chinese and expressed concern over the public implications of this transaction.

Following announcement of German approval of the export credit guarantee for the Communist Chinese, Secretary Rusk commented on the Chinese trade situation on "Face the Nation" on March 20. The Secretary expressed his hope that our friends in Western Europe who have been engaged in conversation about a steel mill would, when the time comes for action, take into account the problem of peace in the Pacific Ocean area and consider whether in fact Peiping is willing to live in peace with its neighbors in the Pacific. The Secretary also expressed the hope that our friends would keep this matter under review. Furthermore, at his press conference on March 25 he said that, although the mill is not on the agreed list, a substantial increase in the steel capacity of mainland China is not a very comfortable idea for us at the time when China is doing nothing to bring about peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I agree unqualifiedly with the Senator in the speech that he is making today and the rationale of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire.

I believe that we are being reconciled to living in a world of fantasy when we do not take a position and follow with firm steps against some of our allies who are doing business with our adversaries. Some of our allies are supplying the bullets which are killing American soldiers in South Vietnam. We shrug it off by saying, "Well, it might develop into something, but we are not too sure."

There is not a single Senator who does not realize that an industrial nation can become a nuclear power. We know that Red China has already exploded two nuclear devices.

The one thing that horrifies the free world is nuclear proliferation. We dread the acquisition on the part of Red China of a nuclear stockpile. We know that the moment she becomes more industrialized, the faster she expands her steel capacity, the sooner will come the day when China will have this complete and devastating nuclear capability.

I say that it is a ridiculous situation. We are living in a fool's paradise not to realize that the pattern of this transaction jeopardizes the security of the United States of America, and we should stand up and say so.

I congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire. I received the same letter from the German Ambassador. Then I was visited by a distinguished gentleman from the German Parliament. I said to him, "Take this statement back to your Ambassador: What would the German people have thought of the United States of America if we extended credit of the same type to East Germany at the time the Russians were building the Berlin wall?"

He had no answer for that.

I repeat it today on the floor of the Senate: What would the German people have thought of America if we had extended credit to East Germany to build a rolling mill for steel production in East Germany at the time the Russians were building the Berlin wall?

They would not have liked it. We do not like it, either. We should stand up to the German Government and say that we do not like it and that we will not be cajoled into liking it.

Ordinarily, it is the sovereign right of the German people and the German Government to do what they please in dealing with other nations in international trade, but these are not ordinary times. We must realize that we have more than 200,000 American boys in West Germany today. They are there, for what reason? To make sure that the Russians do not move in on the Germans.

What does anyone think we are worrying about in South Vietnam? We are worrying about the Red Chinese more than the North Vietnamese. We dread Red China moving in against our American boys who are in a life and death struggle in that faraway land.

A few days ago a decision was made by Robert McNamara to call back a few of our Army's top specialists from Germany.

The purpose is that they shall here train our fresh draftees in the difficult service and sacrifices of Vietnam.

What has happened? How does Germany react?

We received a message from the German Government that they did not like it. They stated their objections to the Secretary of State.

If I had been Secretary of State, when that gentleman from the German Government walked into my office, I would have asked him point blank, "How about your rolling mill in Red China?"

Somehow, we do not get around to making statements of that kind. We have developed a faculty in America by which we understand everyone else's troubles, share them and help solve them, and we forgive everyone else for not understanding ours.

This issue involves the eventual security of America. It involves the safety of our boys and the peace of the world. Steel is the most strategic item in any nation's security.

I say, the quicker Red China is industrialized, especially in steel—and that capacity is increased and their steel capability is further facilitated, so that they can make casings for their bombs, casings for their bullets, and fashion barrels for their guns, and fabricate their cannon, American security is not being helped, the American home is less safe.

Mr. President, we should stand up and tell the German Government just that. We should lay down the law to them, saying, "You either break this consortium or we will bring our people back home." The Europe that we rescued now rejects and resents us.

We took it from De Gaulle and now we are taking it from Bonn. This is bitter fruit to harvest from the men and the money we hurried to them.

I tell the Senate that the American people are beginning to get fed up.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his patience in listening to me.

Mr. McINTYRE. Let me thank the Senator from Rhode Island, whose leadership in this whole field is recognized in the Senate, and also for his strong words of support which he has uttered on the floor of the Senate today. I know that his reaction was probably something like mine.

When I first learned of this matter, it was unbelievable, incredible, that such a transaction should be proposed, of bringing into Red China something of strategic importance that might very well affect seriously our own efforts in trying to bring peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, the remainder of the letter from Mr. MacArthur goes on to say:

> In the light of the views expressed by the Secretary, the German Government, as well as other countries of the free world, has a clear understanding of our position in the matter. To leave no doubt in German minds, we instructed our Embassy in Bonn to raise the question of the steel-rolling mill complex again and to ask the German Government to continue to review the question.
>
> The Embassy has discussed this matter with the Germans as instructed. In preliminary comments on our Embassy's approach, German officials have stated that the equipment would not be suitable for the manufacture of arms and munitions but would produce civilian-type items. They also said negotiations with the Communist Chinese are not yet completed and the contract has not been signed. The German Government will discuss the matter with the Embassy again after further consideration of the Embassy's approach.
>
> I hope that the above information will be helpful. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Douglas MacArthur II,
> *Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.*

Mr. President, I have some comments to make about this letter which reflect the position of the executive branch of our Government.

The State Department letter points out that:

> There is an informal agreement between the industrialized free world countries on the types of goods which are strategic and which should not be sold to the Soviet bloc or Communist China.

Now this statement raises a few questions in my mind. Since steel rollingmills can be used to produce material for such military purposes as jeeps, trucks, and helmets, why have they not been included in the listing of strategic types of goods?

What is the value of such an informal agreement if it does not include such a basic strategic asset?

Why has the United States not attempted since, the announcement of the sale, to have the informal list amended to include steel rollingmills?

The State Department letters go on to mention the agreed list again:

> The German Government told us that this type of mill is not on the agreed list of items subject to embargo. We did not, therefore, have firm, formal grounds to object to the transaction.

Now, Mr. President, this statement has me stumped. Apparently, the State Department has not made its own determination of whether the rollingmills are strategic, or are on the agreed list, but has relied entirely upon the representations of the German Government.

Frankly, Mr. President, I was very much interested in the willingness of the State Department to accept the determination by the selling nation in this transaction that its sale did not violate the agreement. When I consider the large number of employees of the Department of State, many with advanced degrees and vast diplomatic experience, sitting at their desks in Foggy Bottom and daily escaping the need to make their own decisions by placing absolute faith and reliance on the determinations made by our allies, I cease to wonder why we sometimes look like fools to the other nations of the world.

The State Department letter goes on to inform me that the United States has expressed its "regret" and its "concern" over the transaction. Specifically, the letter says that the United States, and I quote, "expressed concern over the public implications of this transaction."

Mr. President, I should like to express my concern over the public implications of the State Department's position. Is the Department of State trying to say that its concern lies in the public knowledge of this deal by the German Government with Communist China? If so, I must say that its concern is well warranted. The American public can have no choice but to regard this action by our German ally as a direct repudiation of the mission for which American boys are being killed by Chinese weapons this very day in Vietnam.

Nevertheless, I am disturbed by the implication that the Department of State might not be so concerned if the deal between Germany and Red China were to be carried out in secret. I should like to reassure both the German Government and the Department of State that the Senate of the United States will be greatly concerned over deals of this sort regardless of their public or secret nature.

I am very much disturbed by this proposed sale and guarantee of credit. I hope that the German Government, on its own, will reconsider its decision in the light of the threat to the international peace which this sale poses.

Here in Washington, I hope that the Department of State will make its own determination of where the national interest lies in preserving peace. I hope that the Department of State will acquire the capability of making its own determinations of the strategic importance of such articles of trade as steel rollingmills. I hope that the Department of State will promptly take such further measures as are necessary to convince the German Government of where that nation's interests lie.

A number of Members of the Senate have indicated their interest in this matter. Among them is the Senator from Maine, who has recently written a letter to the German Ambassador which should be widely read. I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Senator MUSKIE be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> APRIL 7, 1966.
>
> Hon. HEINRICH KNAPPSTEIN,
> *German Embassy,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending me an explanation of the proposed delivery of two steel rollingmills to Red China.
>
> Obviously, the facts are less disturbing than they would be if the proposed plant

would add to the steelmaking capacity of Red China and to her capacity to produce shells, tanks, armorplate, and other military items.

Nevertheless, these plants are intended to enhance Red China's industrial capacity. They can, according to your statement, enhance her capacity to produce jeeps, trucks, and steel helmets, and presumably other items which have military utility.

These facts, which are your facts, will create concern among American citizens who are interested in knowing whether our friends are with us. On my recent visit to Germany, I explored this question with several of your country's leaders and was repeatedly reassured on this point.

This action by your country is not likely to be interpreted by Americans as that of a friend interested in doing what it can, within limitations which are understandable, in supporting the United States in southeast Asia. I still regard it as a most unfortunate development.

The news stories did not indicate that Belgium and Austria were also involved or that Great Britain and Japan were interested. My reaction as to them is the same.

I am sure you would not want me to be other than frank in this reply.

Sincerely,

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, if necessary, I shall propose bills and resolutions specifying sanctions to be taken against nations which aid aggressors in the strengthening of their strategic capacities.

Among such sanctions could be—the further relocation of troops, the suspension or cancellation of military procurement contracts, the imposition of trade sanctions, the suspension of gold conversion privileges, and other sanctions appropriate to the problem of dealing with the suppliers of a criminal regime.

However, Mr. President, I am genuinely hopeful that such measures will not be necessary. I am hopeful that the German Government will be able to reexamine this matter on its own, and will be able to reach its own conclusions about the gravity of approval of this transaction.

Germany has changed since the days when I fought in our Army in Europe. The German people, I believe, have truly indicated their desire to be friends with America, and to help us in our shared goal of a world of peace.

I am certain that a rational and dispassionate reexamination of this question will lead to a solution which will be a contribution, and not an impediment, to this goal.

AMERICAN ECUMENICAL CONCERN WITH RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION ALLEGED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF TURKEY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is apparent that the political tensions of Turkey and Greece over their respective interests in Cyprus are being permitted to boil over into matters purely religious.

This does violence to the ecumenical spirit abroad in the world today—the search of the several faiths to emphasize the truths in which they are all agreed rather than in the things in which they may differ.

When such violence seems to have the instigation and direction of a national government whose actions suddenly make the traditional practices of any ancient faith a matter of personal prohibition and general persecution, the sensibilities of all faiths are attacked.

It is important that the offending nation be made to understand the universal offense of which it is guilty so that its conduct may be corrected and brought into conformity with ecumenism—and the peace that is essential to material and spiritual understanding in a world that God has placed in our care.

Throughout the land the indignation and concern of our religious leaders is a matter of record. Such a record is registered in my State of Rhode Island by a common "Statement of Ecumenical Concern."

The statement appears to be complete as to complaint, detailed, documented, and dignified. The signatories indicate the seriousness of the subject and the sincerity of the great religious figures of my State—the State where long ago Roger Williams set an American standard of religious tolerance and freedom from persecution.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Sunday Journal, Mar. 27, 1966]

A STATEMENT OF ECUMENICAL CONCERN

The unconscionable and unremitting persecution of His Holiness, Athenagoras I, the ecumenical patriarch, by representatives of the Turkish Government has caused a wave of shock and dismay in nearly all quarters of the civilized world. This discrimination which the Government of Turkey has seen fit to execute against His Holiness consists in (1) the continued harassment of those associated with the patriarch in his apostolic work at the patriarchate, (2) the closing and confiscating, of churches and schools, (3) the unprovoked deportation and mass expulsion of both clergy and laity, (4) the recent barring by government authorities of Archbishop Iakovos (primate of the Church in the Americas) to celebrate the Divine Liturgy at the Patriarchal Chapel, (5) the forced discontinuance of its religious printing plant and the humanitarian offices of a religious orphanage, and (6) among other things the public insult and indignity heaped upon those clerics and religious persons who bravely profess the Greek Orthodox faith in Turkey today. These hostilities are viewed to be aimed at diminishing the ecumenical stature of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (Istanbul), a leading spiritual force in the ecumenical movement, to isolate its mission and to render it extinct in the world today.

Such persecution, for whatever motives, is in direct contravention of the Charter of the United Nations, and the Treaty of Lausanne to which Turkey is a signatory in both instances. Moreover, in addition to the wanton disregard of universally respected legal covenants, objections on the grounds of religious and humanitarian considerations that have been voiced in the court of world opinion thus far have been largely ignored. Those who express concern in the present instance can be understandably influenced by the history of persecution and even genocide which has not been unknown in that part of the world in the present century.

The ancient and venerable see headed by His Holiness has deep historical and hallowed associations for all the major faiths of the world. The richness of the tradition which he represents has ennobled the religious patrimony of both East and West. It is an affront to the unity and solidarity of the human family in these days of ecumenism when a religious leader of the stature of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople (Istanbul), and his minority co-religionists in Turkey are being subjected to a persecution which does such violence to the ideals of tolerance cherished by all civilized nations.

As religious leaders in the State of Rhode Island, we feel morally compelled to add our voices to the swelling chorus of indignation already voiced by the Vatican, the World Council of Churches, the American Jewish Committee, and the National Council of Churches, over what we believe is a tragic violation and travesty of a fundamental human right. To remain passive or to be swayed by any consideration of silence would be, as we see it, an abdication of our responsibility, and an intolerable dereliction of duty.

The Most Reverend Russell J. McVinney, D.D., bishop of Providence, Roman Catholic Diocese of Providence.

The Right Reverend John Seville Higgins, D.D., bishop of Rhode Island, Episcopal Diocese of Rhode Island.

Dr. Wayne Artis, executive director, Rhode Island State Council of Churches.

Rabbi Eli A. Bohnen, president, Rhode Island Board of Rabbis.

The Reverend Hale Thornberry, executive secretary, Rhode Island Baptist State Convention.

The Reverend R. Vernon Lawson, conference minister, Rhode Island Congregational Christian Conference, United Church of Christ.

Dr. C. Clifford Sargent, superintendent of Providence district, the New England Southern Conference of the Methodist Church.

The Reverend Carl Banks, president, the Ministerial Alliance of Greater Providence and Vicinity.

The Reverend Birger J. C. Johnson, dean, Rhode Island District, Lutheran Church in America.

The Reverend Haik Donikian, S.S. Sahag & Mesrob.

The Reverend Mesrob Tashjian, St. Vartanantz.

ARMENIAN APOSTOLIC CHURCHES IN PROVIDENCE

The Reverend Arsen A. Goegizian, Euphrates Armenian Evangelical Church.

Mrs. Rozella Switzer, regional director, National Council of Christians and Jews.

The Reverend John A. Limberakis, president, Rhode Island Council of Eastern Orthodox Churches.

PROVIDENCE, R.I., *March 25, 1966.*

Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church, the Reverend J. A. Limberakis, Providence.

Assumption Greek Orthodox Church, the Reverend T. Baglaneas, Pawtucket.

St. John's Romanian Orthodox Church, the Reverend M. Marinescu, Woonsocket.

St. John's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the Reverend M. Mostensky, Providence.

St. Mary's Russian Orthodox Church, the Reverend A. Besmertnuk, Cumberland.

St. Mary's Syrian Orthodox Church, the Right Reverend A. Saliba, Pawtucket.

St. Michael's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the Reverend G. Krasevich, Woonsocket.

St. Spyridon's Greek Orthodox Church, the Reverend S. Papademetriou, Newport.

St. Stephen's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the Reverend J. Zelechewsky, Manville.

Annunciation Parish Council, Attorney G. L. Mihos, president.

Philoptochos Society, Mrs. E. G. Pappas, president.

Annunciation PTA, Mrs. C. Pomadea, president.

Annunciation Building Committee, Attorney E. T. Pliakas, chairman.

Church choir, Mrs. S. Lafanzanis, director.

Annunciation GOYA, Miss M. Kanelos, president.

Annunciation Junior GOYA, C. J. Limberakis, president.

Annunciation school staff, T. J. Demos, superintendent.

Order of AHEPA, T. Cook, president.

Daughters of Penelope, Mrs. J. Hasiotes, president.

Sons of Pericles, J. J. Alexion, president.

Maids of Athena, Miss J. Spires, president.

GAPA Electra Lodge, Mrs. W. Janikies, president.

GAPA Kanaris Lodge, T. J. Demos, president.

Panarcadian Federation, Chapter No. 29, Attorney G. Demopulos, secretary.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

THE 1-MAN, 10-VOTE AMENDMENT; 3 STRIKES AND OUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the field of law, there is a saying that litigation must come to an end. After litigants have had a fair chance to secure a full and just hearing, they cannot continue to consume the valuable time of overworked courts. For the courts must turn to the disputes of other litigants, so that they, too, will have an opportunity to obtain a full and fair hearing.

As it is with the law, so is it with repeated attempts to enact undesirable constitutional amendments: after receiving a full and fair hearing, these attempts must cease in order that the Senate may proceed with constructive work. Twice previously, the 1-man, 10-vote Dirksen amendment has been before the Senate. Twice its merits have been hotly debated. Twice previously it has failed of passage. And never, neither in its 2 previous appearances nor in its present one, has the 1-man, 10-vote amendment obtained a favorable recommendation from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Yesterday the distinguished minority leader, the author of the amendment, made his usual eloquent and persuasive appeal for his amendment, but it seems to me that what he said about the amendment yesterday, while interesting and compelling, was far less appropriate than what he said on another occasion when he was discussing another subject, when he asked "Why thresh old straw? Why beat an old bag of bones?" It seems to me that this classification of the pending amendment is most appropriate.

Mr. President, it is abundantly clear that after two full and fair hearings the Dirksen amendment has been rejected by this Chamber. Therefore, this parade of malapportionment should cease so that the Senate may proceed with its other work.

But though the seemingly endless parade of 1-man, 10-vote amendments should be ended, we find that another proposal, clothed in garb more ambiguous even than that of its predecessors, is now to introduce on the time of the Senate. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, which espouses no partisan position, has pointed out the numerous important points on which the current Dirksen proposal is vague: For instance, though the amendment uses phrases such as "apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population," there is ambiguity concerning the question of who is to decide what constitutes substantial equality of population; there is ambiguity concerning judicial review; there is vagueness concerning the meaning of the phrase "in order to insure effective representation of the various groups and interests making up the electorate"—after all what constitutes effective representation and how is it possible to delineate all the relevant groups and interests; it is unclear whether plans submitted to the people must actually allocate seats or whether it is sufficient if the plan provides a formula for allocating seats; the time at which plans must be submitted to the people is unclear; it is not clear whether "apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population" means total population or registered voters; and there is confusion over the extent to which the amendment would negate the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, the 15th amendment, which relates to race, and the 19th amendment which relates to sex.

Senate Joint Resolution 103, the current 1-man, 10-vote Dirksen proposal, is possessed of a vagueness so vast that even friends of Senator DIRKSEN's previous efforts must admit that to pass Senate Joint Resolution 103 would be to open an electoral situation which we cannot predict except that it would be endlessly confusing. Thus, not only is the Senate's time being taken up by a proposal which twice previously has utterly failed; it is being taken up by a proposal which is even worse than its predecessors—one which would be the beginning of immense confusion.

Consider the methods being used to organize support for Senate Joint Resolution 103. Having been defeated twice in fair hearings, the amendment, thanks to the advertising firm of Whitaker & Baxter, is now being advocated by inaccurate statements. As I have previously pointed out on the floor of the Senate, the materials sent out by Whittaker & Baxter and by Sam Brightman contain the following deceptive statements: that the Judiciary Committee approved Senate Joint Resolution 103, that Senate Joint Resolution 103 is not an attempt to abandon the one-man, one-vote principle, that it imposes no duty or requirement on any State, and that opponents of the amendment will seek to have the Federal Senate apportioned according to the principle of one-man, one vote. Every one of those statements sent out by those propagandists is false. So, Mr. President, we now see that Senators' time is being intruded upon by a terribly vague amendment whose private advocates are using distortions of fact.

Mr. President, I have just returned from a trip to Wisconsin where a number of editors have told me they can recall no occasion when they have been so swamped by propaganda as they have by this Whittaker & Baxter firm for the 1-man, 10-vote Dirksen amendment. Finally, this firm of Whitaker & Baxter, whose accuracy is subject to serious question, has shown a distinct unwillingness to reveal its sources of funds or its channels of expenditure. As the Senator from Maryland and I have previously pointed out in this Chamber, officials connected with Whittaker & Baxter have ducked, dodged, and disappeared when asked about financial arrangements. They have told of independent auditors who are not auditing, of other independent auditors who are not independent, and, eventually, of their outright unwillingness to make the financial disclosures required by law. Mr. President, Senators are being asked to give approval to an amendment which has twice before failed, which is more poorly drafted than the failures which preceded it, whose private advocates resort to gross inaccuracies and refuse to make legally required disclosures.

In the current issue, the April issue, of Washington World, there is an article by Sam Smith, entitled "Mr. DIRKSEN's Old Bag of Bones." It is an appropriate title to an excellent article. I would like to read very briefly from that article. Smith says this:

> In 1964 more than three-fourths of the States had at least one legislative house a majority of whose members could be elected by 40 percent or less of the population.

The argument made is that with the adoption of the Dirksen amendment, the 1-man, 10-vote amendment, there would be all kinds of disarray, tyranny, which would have dire consequences.

As Mr. Smith says:

> Who could tell what evils would occur if democracy were to be introduced into the workings of these institutions?
>
> Well, now we know. More than three-fifths of the States have completed some reapportionment. Nine States have held legislative sessions since reapportionment. And Mr. DIRKSEN's bogiemen have been vaporized by experience.
>
> Even the rural interests, the ones that were supposed to be victimized by reapportionment, are discovering that a fairly elected legislature does not mean disaster for minorities. A spokesman for the Michigan State Farm Bureau—

And there is no group that has been more active for the Dirksen amendment—

> called the newly apportioned Michigan legislature "friendly to the needs of agriculture" and "exceptionally productive of good farm legislation."
>
> The Michigan Farm Grange thought the legislature the best in years.

Mr. Smith also comments on the vagueness and confusion that would arise. He states:

> The amendment—Senate Joint Resoluiton 103—would require one house of a bicameral

> legislature to be apportioned strictly on the basis of population, while the other, subject to regular referendum, could be apportioned on the basis of "population, geography, and political subdivision" in order to "insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate."

As Mr. Smith says:

> Now what in the name of the Senate minority leader does this mean? Associate Dean Robert McKay, of the New York University School of Law, notes that while there was "a certain integrity about the directness of the language in the original version" of the Dirksen amendment defeated last fall, in the new version "the language has become so obscure—almost inarticulate—that the unwary may be deluded into believing that this is in fact a democratic proposal."
>
> It is no such thing. Mr. DIRKSEN simply wants to retain rural domination of State legislatures and has resorted to obfuscation following the failure of three direct assaults.
>
> The amendment sounds nice. Is it not a fair compromise to permit one house to be apportioned on the basis of population, the other on some other grounds? Is it not just, providing one permits the apportionment of the second house to be subject to regular referendums?
>
> It is not—and for a variety of reasons:
>
> While the Dirksen amendment supposedly avoids the possibility of a legislature based on racially or religiously discriminatory grounds, it in reality merely masks such discriminations with the veil of geography. In the north, for example, the cities are the centers of ethnic minority groups. These would not be fairly represented in a legislature in which a rural minority could control one house.
>
> If the Dirksen amendment were adopted, most malapportioned legislatures would probably follow tradition: division based upon geography. Yet there is no reason to believe that such a division would provide a more effective representation than a division based upon occupation, income, education, etc. For example, there are approximately 2 million persons who are foreign born or have foreign born parents, and one million college graduates. Using the Dirksen logic, should they not also have a disproportionate say in the legislature?
>
> A house apportioned on some basis other than population would not only provide a check on its companion body, but would have a virtual veto as well. Either house could pigeonhole legislation passed by the other.

Then, as Mr. Smith pointed out, and as I referred to briefly yesterday:

> Providing for regular referendums on the nature of apportionment would not be an adequate safeguard. On the average, less than 30 percent of the voting age population vote on referendum issues. Further, such referendums often pose issues in confusing or misleading language.

That is a masterpiece of understatement. Anybody who has served in a State legislature knows how vested is the interest of the legislature in protecting its advantages. If there is one body that has a vested interest in reapportionment in our country, it is a State legislature. This amendment guarantees that referendum questions would in many cases be framed in such a way as to be unfair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will be happy to yield in just a moment.

To complete this paragraph:

> Nothing in the Dirksen amendment would require a clear test among voters of the one-man, one-vote issue.

I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I heard the Senator say that the proposal submitted by the legislature might be unfair.

In that case, what would prevent the majority of the people voting in statewide elections from turning it down and making both Houses based on population only? They would have that clear right, would they not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would depend on how the question were framed. If the question were framed in such a way that voters would be inclined to vote in favor of geographical or political basis rather than on the one-man, one-vote basis, then the vote would be distorted. This is a complex issue. It is removed from the interest of most voters. Yet it could elicit a vote which would deprive the voter of his representation in the State legislature or diminish it sharply.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not found any answer to this problem: In the event the majority of the people of the State do not favor the proposal submitted by the legislature all they have to say is that they do not, and then both houses must be apportioned on population. How does the Senator get around that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It depends on how the referendum question is framed.

My contention is that it would often be framed in such a way that a majority of the voters would vote in favor of area or political representation rather than one man, one vote.

Let me give an example. What could possibly be done is to give the voter an option between having members of the State senate elected on an at-large basis, so that no voter would have a representative who represented a particular district, yet this option would put the State senate on a one-man, one-vote basis. Or the other option could be that the voter would have State senators representing him, representing a district, but that district would be organized on a geographic basis or a political basis or some basis not related to population.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not think that the Senator read this sentence of the last section of the proposed joint resolution. It reads:

> In addition to any other plans of apportionment which may be submitted at such election, there shall be submitted to a vote of the people an alternative plan of apportionment based solely on substantial equality of population.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Exactly. That is why I say senators at large to oe on a population basis. If every member of the constituency, if the entire electorate elects all 35 or 40 members of a senate body, then that election is on a population basis.

But in many cases this would be unattractive and unacceptable to the voters. They would have to oppose it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it not a fact that a rotten borough legislature in the State of Colorado framed a referendum for the voters in Colorado along the lines which the distinguished Senator from Florida said would protect the people; that they framed it in such a way that in order to vote for a fairly apportioned State legislature a voter would have to vote for every representative from the city of Denver at large, so that in effect the people of Colorado had no fair choice because the legislature which framed the referendum did not want to give them a fair choice and in effect they were denied the right to choose, and the referendum was a farce?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the Senator from Maryland. It seems to me that this Colorado experience is expressed in point.

Mr. Smith, in his article, cites the Colorado experience as demonstrating how this can be distorted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I beg to differ completely with the Senator from Maryland. The plan submitted in Denver did not permit equality of the vote at all because it required in the city of Denver that all people should vote for all of the representatives in that city. That was a very different matter. The people in districts outside of Denver did not vote in equal numbers; there they were not supposed to vote in equal numbers for representatives of their State.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will yield, it would fit the Dirksen amendment. There is the specific requirement in this amendment that the voters shall have the option of being able to vote in favor of a one-man, one-vote alternative:

Mr. Smith concludes by saying:

> The issue is direct. And Chief Justice Warren expressed it ably in a 1964 reapportionment decision:
>
> "Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests. * * * To the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased, he is that much less a citizen."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Mr. DIRKSEN's Old Bag of Bones," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. DIRKSEN'S OLD BAG OF BONES

(By Sam Smith)

During the acrimonious Senate debate in 1959 on the nomination on Clare Boothe Luce as Ambassadress to Brazil, EVERETT DIRKSEN asked his colleagues: "Why thresh old straw? Why beat an old bag of bones?"

At the time it was a less than choice metaphorical inquiry, but it is not a bad question to ask Mr. DIRKSEN himself as he pursues to the bitter end his defense of malapportioned State legislatures. The junior

Senator from Illinois is fighting an ever lonelier battle to retain one of the least attractive qualities of our State assemblies: government by the few of the many.

It is an old bag of bones that Mr. DIRKSEN bats these days. His proposed constitutional amendment, permitting one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on grounds other than population, is the fourth major attempt to undo the Supreme Court's ruling that an American's vote shall be worth neither more nor less than that of any other American.

DIRKSEN RIDES AGAIN

The Tuck bill, to deny the courts all power to consider apportionment cases; the Dirksen rider to the 1964 foreign aid bill, to stall the courts' intervention into such matters; and the American Legion Baseball Week substitute of last fall were all rejected by Congress. Now EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN mounts the ramparts again, but his forces are in a state of disarray. Reason, rhetoric, and ruse have failed him, yet he stands, defiant to the end, backed mainly by a few peanut politicians, intransigent lobbies claiming to represent rural interests, and the San Francisco public relations firm of Whittaker & Baxter, which has been hired to promote the proposed amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN has a grave problem. He is asking us to amend the Constitution. This is not an easy thing to do. Neither should it be. If we are to agree to his proposal, he must prove that democracy would enjoy some advantage from it.

Unfortunately for his cause, Mr. DIRKSEN is hard pressed on this point. Time and the facts are working against him. A few years ago he could warn of the dire consequences of legislative reapportionment and conjure up frightening images of a "rampant majority" riding roughshod over the interests of various minorities.

In 1964 more than three-fourths of the States had at least one legislative house a majority of whose members could be elected by 40 percent or less of the population. Who could tell what evils would occur if democracy were to be introduced into the workings of these institutions?

Well, now we know. More than three-fifths of the States have completed some reapportionment. Nine States have held legislative sessions since reapportionment. And Mr. DIRKSEN's bogiemen have been vaporized by experience.

Even the rural interests, the ones that were supposed to be victimized by reapportionment, are discovering that a fairly elected legislature does not mean disaster for minorities. A spokesman for the Michigan State Farm Bureau called the newly apportioned Michigan legislature "friendly to the needs of agriculture" and "exceptionally productive of good farm legislation."

The Michigan Farm Grange thought the legislature the best in years.

SLEEPERS WAKE

In other States, reapportionment—while bringing no stunning improvements—has at least permitted long-dormant legislatures to show a nascent concern for progress, not only in the urban areas, but throughout their entire State.

It is hard to find any evidence that Mr. DIRKSEN's fears are justified. His amendment, in the warm light of reality, turns out to be a bad solution to a problem that doesn't exist.

The amendment—Senate Joint Resolution 103—would require one house of a bicameral legislature to be apportioned strictly on the basis of population, while the other, subject to regular referendum, could be apportioned on the basis of "population, geography, and political subdivision" in order to "insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate."

Now what in the name of the Senate minority leader does this mean? Associate Dean Robert McKay of the New York University School of Law notes that while there was "a certain integrity about the directness of the language in the original version" of the Dirksen amendment defeated last fall, in the new version "the language has become so obscure—almost inarticulate—that the unwary may be deluded into believing that this is in fact a democratic proposal."

It is no such thing. Mr. DIRKSEN simply wants to retain rural domination of State legislatures and has resorted to obfuscation following the failure of three direct assaults.

The amendment sounds nice. Is it not a fair compromise to permit one house to be apportioned on the basis of population, the other on some other grounds? Is it not just, providing one permits the apportionment of the second house to be subject to regular referendums?

It is not—and for a variety of reasons:

While the Dirksen amendment supposedly avoids the possibility of a legislature based on racially or religiously discriminatory grounds, it in reality merely masks such discriminations with the veil of geography. In the north, for example, the cities are the centers of ethnic minority groups. These would not be fairly represented in a legislature in which a rural minority could control one house.

If the Dirksen amendment were adopted, most malapportioned legislatures would probably follow tradition: division based upon geography. Yet there is no reason to believe that such a division would provide a more effective representation than a division based upon occupation, income, education, etc. For example, there are approximately 2 million persons who are foreign born or have foreign born parents, and 1 million college graduates. Using the Dirksen logic, should they not also have a disproportionate say in the legislature?

A house apportioned on some basis other than population would not only provide a check on its companion body, but would have a virtual veto as well. Either house could pigeonhole legislation passed by the other.

Providing for regular referendums on the nature of apportionment would not be an adequate safeguard. On the average, less than 30 percent of the voting age population vote on referendum issues. Further, such referendums often pose issues in confusing or misleading language. Nothing in the Dirksen amendment would require a clear test among voters of the one-man-one-vote issue.

COLORADO REFERENDUM

Supporters of the Dirksen amendment like to cite Colorado as an example of the injustice of the Supreme Court's reapportionment decisions. In that State voters approved a referendum providing for one house of the legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than population. The Supreme Court ruled the reapportionment plan unconstitutional.

The Court held, in effect, that citizens in a State could not vote away their constitutional rights. But what was most interesting, in view of the current Dirksen amendment, was the choice presented the voters. The defeated apportionment plan—based on population—contained a feature that many Coloradans considered undesirable: Those counties that had more than one seat in either house had to elect all their legislators at large from the county as a whole. Coloradans did not have a chance to make a realistic decision on the one-man, one-vote issue.

One can foresee similar problems under the Dirksen amendment. It is not inconceivable, as Howard Squadron of the American Jewish Congress has pointed out, that "the submitted proposal might call exclusively for the election of representatives at large, or might limit the membership of a legislative body to 6 or 10 representatives or might be based upon grossly gerrymandered districts."

VOTER AMENDMENT

It is unlikely that any of the States will be faced with the problem of one community which presented a city reorganization referendum to its voters, only to have it defeated in large part because of invalidated ballots. Voter after voter expressed dissatisfaction with portions of the referendum by scribbling in their own amendments. Still the story illustrates the problems that can arise.

In the 1920's, H. L. Mencken wrote that rural overweighting in "barnyard legislatures" was too absurd to last. This absurdity is only now disappearing. State assemblies are being given another opportunity to prove that they can be viable governing bodies. There is reason to hope that fairly apportioned legislatures will be able to find local solutions to problems that the Federal Government has been forced to handle because of the vacuum at the State level. Our State legislatures have not only been poor representatives of urban voters, they have been poor representatives of most of the people in the States. The hot breath of democracy has not been upon them.

If we were to accept the Dirksen amendment, it would help only those who have manipulated State legislatures in the past and who do not wish to relinquish this privilege. It would help neither farmer nor city dweller.

The issue is direct. And Chief Justice Warren expressed it ably in a 1964 reapportionment decision:

"Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests. * * * To the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased, he is that much less a citizen."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what all this fuss is about is very simple. The Supreme Court has decided that every man and woman should have the right to a vote—equal to that of every other man and woman. Now what's wrong with that?

The minority leader argues that we should change the Constitution to permit the legislature of any State to draft a referendum that would enable a majority vote in an election to take that right to an equal vote away from the people of that State.

Having served in a State legislature, having observed the way questions are often contrived—and I use the word contrived deliberately—by State legislatures, I am convinced it would be a tragic and dangerous mistake for us to pass this amendment.

If it should become part of the Constitution, it could and almost certainly would be adopted by some States because of the nature of the referendum process.

As the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] said so well yesterday there are many ways of depriving people of their vote: Stuffing the ballot box, gross discrimination, and another way, which the distinguished Senator from Florida had so much to do with defeating, the poll tax. I pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Florida. It was his amendment which did so much to end the poll tax. This is another way to deprive people of the right to vote.

Now we have the Dirksen amendment which would dilute the vote and diminish the vote, by legalizing malapportionment.

The struggle for equal representation in State legislatures has been long—very long. It has been discouraging. Now at last thanks to the Supreme Court it has been attained. What a tragedy, if now, having achieved this long-sought goal we give it up.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it not a fact that under the Federal law, title 2 of the United States Code, sections 261–270, which is known as the lobbying law, a lobbyist is defined as any individual, partnership or any other organization which by itself or through any other person in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or anything of value for use principally to aid directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. That is the way the law reads.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does not the law require quarterly reports be filed which contain information along the following lines: In the case of any person or organization which receives financial contributions, the name and address of each person who made a contribution of $500 or more?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. The total sum of all contributions during the calendar year made to or for the reporting lobbyist?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. The name and address of each recipient of an aggregate expenditure of $10?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. The total sum expended by or for the lobbyist for the calendar year?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Second, in the case of persons or organizations who do not receive contributions but engage in activity to accomplish the defeat or passage of legislation by Congress, additional information must be filed, including additional quarterly statements?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. It is very specific information and it seems to me information which should be simple to comply with because it is specific and it is limited.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the Senator aware that neither Whittaker & Baxter nor the Committee for Government of the People has registered as a lobbyist or filed quarterly reports required by the act, by the deadline for the first quarter in 1966?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Absolutely. What makes this unusual is that the Senator from Maryland called this matter to the attention of Whittaker & Baxter on the floor of the Senate weeks ago. We had extensive colloquy on that matter. There is no question that they know about this requirement. There may be cases where other lobbyists have not complied perhaps through ignorance. But this is a case where filing by lobbyists becomes an issue. It is an issue in deciding the vote on this amendment. This is a group spending an enormous amount of money, perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars. In Wisconsin we see the results of this spending in newspaper offices of our State. I am sure that it is so all over the country. And yet, they failed to comply with the requirement of the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it the understanding of the Senator that the only report of any type which has been filed by anyone associated with the Committee for Government of the People is a report filed by the law firm of O'Connor, Greene, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, which states they have been employed by the Committee for Government of the People? That report states that law firm has received money, which I understand is for services, amounting to $10,000 and expense money of $1,029.23. They have also made certain expenditures. They report to be around $2,000. But this is the sole report that has been filed. Is that the understanding of the Senator?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. It does not comply in any degree with the requirements of the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report filed by O'Connor, Greene, Thomas, Walters, and Kelly be printed in the RECORD as a part of my questioning of the Senator from Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[P. 1]

File one copy with the Secretary of the Senate and file two copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives: This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "report" heading below:

"Preliminary" report ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"Quarterly" report: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the act.

Report—Pursuant to Federal Regulations of Lobbying Act Year: 1966

[Mark 1 square only]

P	Quarter			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
	XX			

Note on item "A": (a) In general: This "report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee": To file as an "employee," state (in item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer." (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a report as an "employee.")

(ii) "Employer": To file as an "employer," write "None" in answer to item "B."

(b) Separate reports: An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his report with the employers' report:

(i) Employers subject to the act must file separate reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the act must file separate reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this report is for an employer, list names of agents or employees who will file reports for this quarter.

O'Connor, Greene, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, attorneys at law, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C., 20006.

Note on item "B": Reports by agents or employees—An employee is to file, each quarter, as many reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER

State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

Committee for Government of the People,
733 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Note on item "C": (a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—section 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "preliminary" report (registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "quarterly" report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box, so that this office will no longer expect to receive reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the specific legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) description, (*b*) quantity distributed, (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

1. Indefinite.

2. Senate Joint Resolution 103, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

4. If this is a "preliminary" report (registration) rather than a "quarterly" report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "quarterly" report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "preliminary" report (registration) with a "quarterly report."

State or Territory: District of Columbia, ss:

Affidavit

I, the undersigned affiant, being duly sworn, say: (1) That I have examined the attached report, numbered consecutively from page 1 through page ----, and the same is true, correct, and complete as I verily believe. (Be sure to fill in number of last page.)

[If the report is for an individual, strike out paragraph "2."]

(2) That I am a member of the above-named organization, for whom this report is filed, and that I am authorized to make this affidavit for and on behalf of such person.

[Print or type name below signature]

Signed JOHN J. FLYNN, *Affiant*.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on April 1, 1966.

[Print or type name below signature]

Signed FRANCES B. CROWN, (Official authorized to administer oaths).

Issued 6-4-58 by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives. (Superseding form issued 1-1-51).

[P. 2]

Note on item "D."—(a) In general: The term "contribution" includes anything of value. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) If this report is for an employer.—(i) In general: Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) Receipts of business firms and individuals: A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobby Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) Receipts of multipurpose organizations: Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general funds raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) If this report is for an agent or employee.—(i) In general: In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under items "D5" (received for services) and "D12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) Employer as contributor of $500 or more: When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contributions under "D13" and "D14," since the amount has already been reported under "D5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS)

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans):

Loans received—"The term 'contribution' includes a * * * loan * * *"—

1. Dues and assessments	$----------
2. Gifts of money or anything of value	----------
3. Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift	----------
4. Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter	----------
5. Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)	10,000.00
6. Total for this quarter (add items "1" through "5")	10,000.00
7. Received during previous quarters of calendar year	----------
8. Total from Jan. 1 through this quarter (add "6" and "7")	10,000.00
9. Total now owed to others on account of loans	----------
10. Borrowed from others during this quarter	----------
11. Repaid to others during this quarter	----------
12. "Expense money" and reimbursements received this quarter	1,029.23

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": ———.

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last day of this quarter, total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "amount" and "name and address of contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Name and address of contributor: ("period" from Jan. 1 through ———, 19—).

	Amount
John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.	$1,500.00
The Roe Corp., 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.	1,785.00
Total	3,285.00

Note on item "E."—(a) In general: "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) If this report is for an agent or employee: In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) IN CONNECTION WITH LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans):

1. Public relations and advertising services	--------
2. Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")	--------
3. Gifts or contributions made during quarter	--------
4. Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost	$11.80
5. Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)	--------
6. Telephone and telegraph	379.46
7. Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment	1,699.69
8. All other expenditures	7.75
9. Total for this quarter (add "1" through "8")	2,098.70
10. Expended during previous quarters of calendar year	--------
11. Total from Jan. 1 through this quarter (add "9" and "10")	2,098.70
Loans Made to Others—(The term "expenditure" includes a * * * loan * * *)—Section 302(b):	
12. Total now owed to person filing	--------
13. Lent to others during this quarter	--------
14. Repayments received during this quarter	--------

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More: In the case of expenditures made during this quarter by, or on behalf of, the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Date or dates—Name and address of recipient—Purpose:

	Amount
7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill"	$1,750.00
7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Building, Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month	2,400.00
Total	4,150.00

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand that the point made by the Senator from Wisconsin is that the Dirksen amendment would dilute the representation of the people?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Among other things, the Senator from Wisconsin contends that the Dirksen amendment would permit a State, if it chose to do so, to eliminate—rather, to change—the one-man, one-vote principle, which the Supreme Court decided in 1964, and make it possible for one district which had fewer people to have equal representation in a State legislature with another district that had more people. The result would be that the votes of the more populous district would be diluted, or the vote of each resident of the most populous district would be diluted.

Mr. MILLER. The reason I raise the question is that I believe there is much confusion on the part of many people because of the failure to state the point precisely. I am happy that the Senator said that the amendment would "permit" the State to take such action, because I was not certain from his earlier comment whether he believed the amendment was permissive only.

However, I would suggest that we state it more precisely than to say would permit a State to take such action, because many people are concerned about what that means. It is my understanding that the Dirksen amendment would not permit a State as such, but would permit the people of the State, in a general referendum, to take such action. Is not that the understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Dirksen amendment would permit a legislature to submit the question to a referendum, and the question would be framed by the legislature, which, as I have said, has a vested interest in securing a particular result. Then, on the basis of what would in many cases be a rigged referendum, the voters in a particular referendum election decide. The people who voted in that election might include 75 percent of the electorate; they might include only 30 percent. In some elections I know of, as few as 10 or 15 percent of the people voted. It would be possible for a majority of the 10 percent of the electorate who voted to choose an alternative to the one-man, one-vote system, and in so doing dilute or reduce the vote of the rest of the citizens of the State.

Mr. MILLER. Theoretically, I suppose we could say that if only 10 percent of the electorate turned out in a general referendum in Wisconsin, 10 percent could take such action.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is not a hypothetical example. In the most recent election in Wisconsin, 30 percent of the electorate turned out for a spring election, which was a pretty good showing. That would compare well with an election in Iowa, and would compare extremely well with elections in the Southern States. It would be difficult, in my opinion, to cite any spring election in which more than 30 percent of the electorate showed up.

Mr. MILLER. Is the Senator from Wisconsin suggesting that because only 30 percent of the electorate turned out for a referendum, there should never be a referendum?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; I am saying that this right to an equal vote is so sacred and so vital that we should not permit an election in which the question is framed by an interested party to enable those who vote in any particular election to make the choice. The amendment does not specify the November general election, a presidential election, or anything of that kind. We should not permit any election under these circumstances, so as to deprive any of the people of the State of their right to an equal vote.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator says that he is concerned about a legislature framing a question; but I would remind him that under the Dirksen amendment such a question must absolutely include the proposition that one house of a legislature be apportioned strictly on a population basis. So if the people who vote on this question have a choice of voting for that proposal or something else, I cannot understand the Senator's concern about who frames the question, since the people have the power of choice, and they can choose to have one house apportioned strictly on the basis of population. If the people could not have that choice, I would be with the Senator from Wisconsin 100 percent. But I remind him that the Dirksen amendment makes that point very clear. What is wrong with that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is plenty wrong with it. We just discussed that point with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], including the fact that this is a complex issue. This issue is very interesting and clear, perhaps, to Members of Congress and to members of State legislatures; but most Americans do not concern themselves much with apportionment, because it does not affect their lives directly.

Second, we have a specific instance. Colorado is a good example. In Colorado, the people were offered the opportunity to vote for one house based upon population, but with the members of that house being elected at large. In Colorado, the members from the city of Denver would have been elected at large, but there would be nothing to prevent an option from having it the way it was in Illinois. In other words, the citizens were told in the last Illinois State legislative election that they could vote a bedsheet ballot and take an hour to cast their ballot for each of well over a hundred members of the legislature. Nobody has denied that. The courts, over and over again, have found that an at-large election would be a one-man, one-vote election. That could be the option, but it would be an unfair option, because many people would say that rather than to endure the difficulty and the nightmare of voting a very long ballot, they would go for a nonpopulation basis, and vote for a geographic basis, which would dilute their vote.

Mr. MILLER. I am not saying that I disagree with the point that the Senator from Wisconsin just made, because I remember that during the hearings on this subject last year I offered an amendment for the consideration of the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] was the chairman. That amendment would have required a separate district for each legislator. I am sorry to say that I did not hear the Senator from Indiana or any other member of that subcommittee support that amendment, but it might have been supported on the floor of the Senate.

I may inform the Senator from Wisconsin that 2 years ago Iowa had a test vote in which the people had a chance to vote in a general referendum on a proposed plan. The question was whether they would take this plan or would be content with having the one-man, one-vote doctrine apply to both houses. The proposition placed before them diluted very greatly one house to where, I suppose, about 28 percent of the people would have been in control of the legislature. This plan was voted down by the electorate in Iowa by about 2 to 1.

So I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that the people of his State, of my State, and of other States would be well able to evaluate such a proposal as that.

Furthermore, if the choice given were an unreasonable choice, I am inclined to believe that the Supreme Court could look behind the Dirksen amendment and find that there was a deprivation of equal protection of the laws because a fair choice was not given to the people. That is a point that I am afraid has been overlooked in the debate on this proposal. The passage of the Dirksen amendment would not tie the hands of the Supreme Court irrevocably, forever. The Court could go behind a fictitious or unfair choice, and I would expect it to do so quite readily.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa had merit, but, frankly, I would be against any proposal to make equality of vote the subject of a referendum. I say that because it would apply in exactly the same way to a constitutional amendment that would permit a state church, for example. Suppose Congress, by amendment to the Constitution, established a Church of the United States, similar to the Church of England, and prohibited people from belonging to any other church. Then assume Congress said the amendment would not become effective unless a majority of the people voted for it. It might be said that the question would be left up to the people, but it would be an interference with the basic right of freedom of religion.

The same could be said of freedom of speech. We could say that we would sharply circumscribe the people from speaking freely in criticism of the Government, but that the amendment would not go into effect until a majority of the people voted for the amendment. It is conceivable that in a time of war, with patriotic fervor at high pitch, the people might be persuaded to vote for such a resolution.

Similarly, with the one-man, one-vote amendment, in certain circumstances, if newspapers were on the side of the referendum, and if the population option given were a nightmare suggestion, such as all State assemblies now to be elected on an at-large basis, it is perfectly possible that the moneyed interests behind the proposal would persuade the people to vote to dilute their future votes. At any rate it is our responsibility to cast our votes in accordance with our own convictions, not on the alibi that the people should decide.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the opportunity to have this colloquy with the Senator from Wisconsin, because I believe what this proposal boils down to is that some people do not believe in statewide referendums. The fact is that some States do not have the initiative and referendum, which would indicate that there is substantial weight against the passage of such a referendum. However, most States do have the initiative and referendum.

I am one who believes in the power of the referendum of the people. The Senator from Wisconsin apparently does not.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. No; I believe in referendums for some occasions. In the majority of cases, the question should be left to the elected representatives. Actually, this is one of the principles of the Republican Party. It is certainly a principle of a republic that its elected officers should decide and determine the rules of the game and determine what the laws should be. It should not be the overall vote of everyone involved. We are elected to inform ourselves, to vote our convictions, and to vote on the basis of our opportunity to assume responsibility.

But I would agree with the Senator from Iowa that there are rare occasions when it is perfectly appropriate to call for a public referendum; certainly the opportunity to deprive the people of their equal right to vote should not be such an instance.

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, I do not believe that the question of whether one is in favor of a referendum procedure is a partisan matter.

I cannot think of anything in either the principles of the Republican or Democratic Parties which would cause any difference of opinion on a partisan line basis. Some Republican States have an initiative and referendum and others do not. Some Democratic States have the initiative and referendum and others do not. That would seem to bear out the truth of the statement.

I suggest that the Senator may be laying a trap for himself if he talks of all the money and pressures involved in a referendum and then concedes that on certain rare occasions he might go along with a referendum. Pitfalls are contained in any referendum. I think that one ought to be for or against a referendum procedure.

I do not think that the people ought to be subjected to studying a long ballot with many different items on it in a referendum.

It may be desirable that the vote of a certain percentage of voters in a State, perhaps 25 percent of those who voted in the last gubernatorial election, be required to have the initiative on a referendum.

I cannot see that we are faced with that proposition here. It would only come before the voters once every 10 years. It would be required to be on the ballot.

This reapportionment matter is of such major importance that the Senator from Wisconsin would not have to worry about the large turnout of people to vote on this proposition once every 10 years.

I think that the essential arguments, after we cut through all of the side issues that are being tossed around to some extent on both sides of this question, concern the question of whether we believe in the initiative in the referendum of the people. I happen to believe this.

I think it is probably the best way of getting an expression of the will of the people of a State is to have the question put before the people in a referendum.

That is all that the Dirksen amendment would do. It would do that very thing and put the issue before the people in a general referendum and give them a choice, and that choice must include whether the second house should be on a strict population basis. If they do not want their votes to be diluted, they will have that choice.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa. I appreciate his viewpoint. It seems to me that the issue is crystal clear. The issue concerns whether each American, regardless of where he lives or his background, as long as he is a qualified voter, should have an equal vote.

The referendum is strictly a sweetener. It is tossed in because there just are not any valid reasons for depriving people of their right to an equal vote. So what have the Dirksen amendment proponents done? They have cleverly fallen back on the referendum device.

The argument runs: the proposition may be unfair, unwise, retrogressive, and dangerous, but so what? Why not let the people decide?

The answer, Mr. President, is that the people are very likely to be required to vote in a rigged election, an unrepresentative election, because the body that puts the question has a transparently vested interest in securing the answer.

SOUTH VIETNAMESE DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, the demonstrations in South Vietnam are unfortunate and untimely. However, I think they are a basic part of the struggle for self-determination.

While there can be no doubt that the allied military efforts have slowed down as a result of the political unrest, the demonstrations indicate many people of South Vietnam strongly believe democratic government is no longer a remote aspiration but a real possibility.

It is highly significant that these civil disturbances have occurred at a time when the military offensive has been going well. The New York Times of Friday, April 8, 1966, commented:

> All the squabbling factions think the war is going well enough so that they can assume there will be a country to govern. Some are trying to arrange the elections as though Saigon were Boston.

After the tremendous sacrifices the American people have made to assist the Vietnamese people in their long and valiant fight for freedom, the civil strife in Vietnam is especially difficult for us to accept. First, there is a small, isolated but dramatic ingredient of overt anti-Amerianism in the disturbances. Second, the military efforts against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese invaders are definitely impeded. Third, the end result could possibly be a government which would tell the U.S. forces to go home.

Let us not forget that, although we may vigorously disagree with the timing, that the protesters are asking for an election and a constitution. What is wrong with that?

No faction in South Vietnam seeks a caretaker administration or an undertaker administration to preside over the requiem for democracy in Vietnam. These people are predominantly anti-Communist. They want to compete for control, because at long last through the heroic efforts of their own people and the great sacrifice of the United States, there is a government worth governing.

If South Vietnam is to have a real chance for a free and independent future, it must make great progress in land reform and education. Helping to achieve this reform is a great challenge to us, but it is not the greatest challenge we face.

And America's most challenging problem in Vietnam is not military victory. We surely have the power to achieve that objective.

Our toughest challenge is how to assist South Vietnam to achieve the educational and economic progress necessary to make that victory meaningful without the fact or even the appearance of American domination.

American help has to be without strings. We must know it. And, most important, the South Vietnamese must know it.

The South Vietnamese want their own Vietnamese revolution—not an American revolution.

Whether this country has the wisdom and especially the patience to help make this possible is our big test.

MILWAUKEE COURT DECISION ON NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, yesterday a circuit court in Milwaukee handed down a historic decision on major league baseball. I feel very strongly that it is a sound decision.

Organized baseball has previously enjoyed special privilege under the antitrust laws. Now it is on notice—the National League and the Braves specifically—that this privilege carries with it responsibility to the people who have paid its way.

The Roller decision makes it more vital than ever that Congress require major league baseball to divide television revenues as professional football and basketball now do. Without this change there will continue to be immense difficulty in getting and keeping a major league team in Wisconsin.

For 12 years Milwaukee fans supported the Braves in greater numbers than any city in organized baseball. The obvious economic reason for the move to Atlanta is not to secure greater fan support, but to pick up a fat television contract that Milwaukee because of geographical limitations can never match. This is wrong and unfair.

The question has now become whether major league baseball is our national pastime—and truly a sport—or whether it is a commercial television package—like "Peyton Place" or "Get Smart"—to be sold to the highest bidder. This question must and will be answered.

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION TESTIFIES IN FAVOR OF SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I indicated yesterday, one of the highlights of the recent hearings on the Department of Agriculture's appropriations request for fiscal 1967 was the appearance on the last day of the hearings of a number of public witnesses who testified on behalf of their organizations in support of the special milk program for schoolchildren. These witnesses unanimously opposed the proposed Child Nutrition Act of 1966, which I am beginning to believe is the most unpopular piece of legislation proposed by the Johnson administration.

Today I would like to mention the statement made by Pat Healy of the National Milk Producers Federation in support of the school milk program. First the federation points out, as I have so many times on this floor, that in order to limit the program to the needy, as the administration proposes, it will be necessary to use a means test which can "only result in discrimination against all schoolchildren." As the federation indicates, a number of needy children participate under the present program. By redirecting the program to the needy alone, the Child Nutrition Act could result in reduced participation by needy children since funds will have to be used to provide milk on a completely free basis rather than at a reduced price. Of course this means it will take more money to provide less milk.

Perhaps the most significant point made by the federation—especially in view of its expertise in this area—is the impact that an 80 percent cut in the program could have on dairy farmer income as well as Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. Statistics will show that under the school milk program in fiscal 1965, nearly 3 billion half-pints of fluid milk were consumed by children in over 92,000 schools, child-care centers, summer camps, nurseries, and other child-care institutions. This represents 1.6 billion pounds of milk—about 3 percent of total nonfarm consumption of fluid milk in the United States. The federation points out that "without the special milk program for children this quantity of milk will probably be purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the form of manufactured dairy products at a substantial cost to the Government for the product and its storage." This simply means, Mr. President, that a substantial cut in the school milk program will save the taxpayer little or nothing. Additional funds will have to be spent to purchase the milk under the price support program.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall defer until later what I intended to say with reference to the pending business before the Senate.

Mr. President, I am becoming increasingly concerned, as I am sure many of my colleagues are, over misguided actions of the administration which I feel will surely depress the agricultural industry to the degree that many of its producers will find it no longer profitable to operate.

(At this point Mr. Sparkman took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on many occasions I have joined with some of our colleagues on the floor of the Senate to denounce the actions of the Department of Labor with regard to the furnishing of timely off-shore labor to assist in the harvesting of perishable fruits and vegetables. While some relief has been obtained, crop losses running in the millions of dollars have been caused by the lack of understanding of the problems involved, and many acres are going unplanted this year due to the uncertainty of obtaining necessary labor. At the same time many farmers and processors are moving their operations to Mexico, and some to the Bahamas or elsewhere.

Now, the proposal to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as reported out of the Education and Labor Committee in the other body with the support of the administration will, if enacted, establish minimum wages for agriculture employees, never intended when the act was first considered; it also includes unfavorable action toward those engaged in the processing of agricultural commodities. This, Mr. President, is another indication of unfriendly actions aimed at the farmers, growers, and processors.

Now, Mr. President, comes another action of the Department of Agriculture and the Defense Department to limit the purchase of pork by the military in an action designed to further depress farm prices.

Mr. President, what will become of the farmer, the grower, and the processor as a result of these actions which will not allow him to receive an adequate return to keep him in business?

It is my intention to do all possible to protect our agricultural interests and I am sure many of my colleagues feel as I do. We, the greatest agricultural producing nation in the world, called upon to feed millions of undernourished people of the friendly countries of the world—and, recently called upon by the President to increase agriculture assistance to those countries—must preserve the most basic and important industry of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in the Washington Post this morning, entitled "Farmers Seen Squeezed by L.B.J. Policies," which reports on a statement made by the President of the American Farm Bureau, Mr. Charles B. Shuman, and which tells a part of the story of what is happening to our farmers today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Farmers Seen Squeezed By L.B.J. Policies

President Charles B. Shuman of the American Farm Bureau Federation said last night the Johnson administration is making the farmer a whipping boy for inflation generated by the Government's own spending policies.

The farm official said the producer is getting "the double whammy" from the administration in the form of legislative recommendations to force farmers to pay higher wages and in administrative actions designed to pull down farm prices.

In a speech prepared for a Cornell University forum, Shuman said:

"President Johnson knows as well as nearly every taxpayer that his irresponsible spending, which exceeds anything in the history of this country, is the real force driving up prices and deflating the value of the dollar.

"And now that the administration publicly admits that inflation is here, it is seeking the scapegoat to divert public attention from the real culprit."

Shuman said farmers are paying a higher price for inflation than any other group. He said their production costs increased from $26.2 billion in 1960 to $30.3 billion in 1965.

Shuman said that administration actions designed to depress farm prices include curtailment of military purchases of pork; Government "dumping" of surplus grains to force down market price; increased imports of cheese to hold down prices; imposition of tight quotas on exports of hides, mainly cattle hides, and forecasts of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman that farm prices will drop 6 to 10 percent this year.

(At this point Mr. Proxmire took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

REAPPRAISAL OF OUR SELECTIVE SERVICE LAWS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, there has been increasing interest, in recent months, in the workings of the selective service law. This is natural and proper, as draft calls increase, and more and more young men must plan their futures around the probability of military service.

The present draft law has been in effect, without significant change, since 1940. Next year the law expires and must be renewed by Congress. The last three extensions of the draft, each for a 4-year period, passed Congress routinely, without any searching review. This should not happen this time. Next year's expiration date, combined with the great increase in public interest in the draft, make the coming months an excellent time for a thoroughgoing review of draft policy and procedures. If this is done now, when the time for renewal comes, we will be in a position to legislate responsibly and constructively on this important subject. In this connection, I note that the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Forces Committee has said his committee plans to hold hearings on the draft this year.

I have undertaken a preliminary study on my own in the last few weeks. The Selective Service System is cooperating in my requests for certain statistics. I intend, in the near future, to make some suggestions about improvements in the draft law. But today I would like to report to the Senate on one aspect of the present law which, in my opinion, has created very inequitable situations.

Under the present statute, the total monthly requirement for draftees is determined by the Department of Defense, transmitted to Selective Service and then allocated to the States. Each State is given a quota which it must meet; and in turn, each State levies a quota on each local board. The quota is determined in accordance with section 5(b) of the selective service law, which states:

> Quotas of men to be inducted for * * * service * * * shall be determined for each State * * * on the basis of the actual number of men in the several States * * * and the subdivisions thereof, who are liable for such * * * service but who are not deferred after classification * * *

This State quota system has operated in the past, and is operating now, to produce results which are not only unfair, but are expressly contrary to other requirements of the draft law. Its operation specifically contradicts section 1(c), which states:

> Obligations of serving in the Armed Forces should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of the effective national economy.

Let me explain why this is so. All draft calls are made from the pool of draft eligibles classified 1-A. Within this pool, sequence of induction is established by Presidential Executive Order 11421, issued by President Johnson on August 26, 1965.

This order gives first priority to delinquents, second priority to volunteers, third priority to unmarried men and men married after August 26, 1965, fourth priority to men married before that date, fifth priority to men 26 and over, and last to men between 18½ and 19. This is the order in which men classified 1-A are supposed to be called up. However, some men married before August 26, 1965, have been drafted before single men and men married after August 26, 1965. In my own State of Massachusetts, local boards began calling some married men last December, at a time when thousands of single men in other States had not yet been called. Selective Service has informed me that as of January of this year, there were 110,000 men in the third priority ready for induction. Yet 9,700 men in the fourth priority had been called up as of that time. While later figures are not yet available, it can be assumed that thousands of other married men have been inducted since then, while some single men still have not been called.

All this has happened because certain States and certain local boards have not been able to meet their quotas through third priority inductions, and have dipped into the pool of pre-August 26, 1965, married men. Other States with a surplus of third priority 1-A's, have left their married men alone.

Thus the sequence of induction, which was carefully formulated to do equity, and take into consideration the added hardship involved in calling up married men, is being distorted by the working of the State quota system. Thousands of young married men have been drafted considerably earlier than they could have anticipated, simply because of the State they happen to be registered in for the draft. The assurance given them in Executive Order 11421—that they would not be called up until the pool of single 1-A's was exhausted—has turned out to be not quite an assurance at all.

I would now like to give another example of how the State quota system can operate to contravene other provisions of the selective service law:

Selective service regulations provide that within each priority, men shall be drafted in the order of their dates of birth with the oldest being selected first." I am not convinced that drafting oldest men first is the soundest policy. Nevertheless, it is today's policy. It has been for many years. As long as it continues it should be applied uniformly.

Yet because of the State quota system, situations can easily arise where some States, in order to fill their quotas, induct men at a lower age than other States. Several weeks ago I asked the Selective Service System to report to me on the average age of current inductees by State. I expect to have this information shortly and will report on it to the Senate. I expect we will see some discrepancies.

In a different mobilization situation, with higher demands for manpower, the system of allocating draft calls by States quotas could produce even harsher results than it has so far. If Selective Service forced States to meet their quotas, men over 26 could be called up, in some areas, or men below 19, while other areas continued to draw from higher priorities. Some local boards could even be forced to dip into categories of men now deferred.

May I say that these inequities are not the fault of the Selective Service System. Its national office and local boards are doing a good job, in my opinion. They must administer the law passed by Congress. The cause of these inequities lies in section 5(c) of the present law. It has been there for a long time. In 1951, when the Senate Preparedness Committee was reviewing the draft, the flaw was spotted by the then Senator from Texas, who is now the President of the United States. In a colloquy in hearings with General Hershey, the then Senator said:

> Senator JOHNSON. So there is nothing that would keep you from taking a boy 18 years and 11 months in Texas and, at the same time, taking, a boy 18 years and 2 months who lived in Georgia?
>
> General HERSHEY. Well, I do not know as there is anything that stops us. Our regulations provide that we take them by their birthdays, and I am going to plead guilty to 3 or 4 months variation, but not quite 9.
>
> The one thing is the way we operate, obviously our line is not a straight line. It has waves in it. Sometimes one fellow is ahead and sometimes another. It makes for lack of uniformity, and I have no shame in admitting it because we fought two wars in my lifetime to keep from being just like somebody else, and as long as Texas does its duty and Georgia does its duty, if they do it in a little different way, I am glad of it, because it gives us more variety.
>
> Senator JOHNSON. But we are not to understand that all 18-year-and-11-months-old boys will be called before any boy 18 years and 6 months is called?
>
> General HERSHEY. No.

Let me make it clear that I believe in the decentralization of the draft system. The classification of young men should be done by local boards. Given clear guidelines from Selective Service, they are in the best position to judge the merits of individual cases. But I am not speaking of classification of draftees. I am speaking of the sequence of induction, after the men have been classified. This induction, I feel, should be on a more national basis.

Perhaps there was a time in our history when induction had to be accomplished through the States. Perhaps it was important, in General Hershey's terms, that "Texas did its duty and Georgia did its duty." Those were the days when soldiers enlisted in State regiments and fought as State units, and one State did not want the National Government to levy a heavier conscription on it than on others.

But this time has long since passed. Today considerations of equity as between individuals should take precedence in our draft, over equality of sacrifice between the States.

I therefore propose that the appropriate committees of the Congress give serious consideration to revising section 5(b), abolishing the system of State quotas; leaving the classification of registrants in the hands of local draft boards but putting the order of induction on a national and uniform basis. All registrants could be grouped according to the classifications made by their local boards. Induction orders could then remove men evenly from these groups, according to age. Men of identical age and classification would receive identical treatment wherever they lived. All eligible draftees with the same marital and educational status who were born in the same month and year would be called up at the same time.

As long as we have a draft, we will always have difficulties and inequities and disruptions. Most of them we cannot avoid, as they are in the nature of war and the demands of our national security. But this fact makes it all the more important that those that can be avoided should be. Our watchwords should be equality and fairness of treatment. Anything we can do to meet these standards will be significant, not only to the men we ask to serve, but to the country.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, during today's debate, the situation in Colorado with respect to reapportionment was mentioned by several speakers, including the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and I believe the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

I thought it might be helpful if I just recounted in brief what has happened in my State with respect to the problem of reapportionment.

First, let me say that just a couple of weeks ago I had the opportunity and privilege of appearing before the Villanova Political Union, where I participated in a debate on reapportionment very similar to the debate now before the Senate on the Dirksen amendment. The Villanova Political Union is divided into three groups: liberals, moderates, and conservatives. I might add that I am not certain how they define these three groups, but I would be interested in learning.

Prior to the debate the liberals were in opposition to the proposed Dirksen amendment. After I had finished speaking on the Dirksen amendment and explaining that it does not attempt to dictate to any State what form its legislature should be in, but merely gives a State the opportunity to choose the form every 10 years, one of the liberal members from the back bench, as I would call it, said, "I do not see how a liberal can be against giving people the right to vote on the makeup of their State legislature."

I am happy to report that the proponents of the Dirksen amendment carried that debate by a two-thirds majority. I am hopeful some of our colleagues will see the light in the same way and that we can pass this measure when it comes to a vote next week.

I say that for this reason: Each State has a different geographical and economic makeup. Each State has a different set of characteristics which determine, for example, its economy. Each State is different in the makeup of its people. What might be applicable to the State of Rhode Island or the State of Vermont or the State of New Hampshire—the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is now gracing the chair—might not be equally applicable to the State of Alaska, the State of California, the State of Idaho, or my State of Colorado.

In 1962, two groups of people, by initiative proposed constitutional amendments to our State constitution. One proposal was based on the one-man, one-vote concept and one proposal was based on a modified federal plan where the house was apportioned by population and the senate by a combination of factors including geographic area.

These two alternative proposals were put to a vote of the people in the 1962 election. It is interesting to note the results, Mr. President, because the federal plan won by a 2-to-1 majority in every county in the State including the most populous county. The people in the metropolitan areas said in their voting, "We would prefer to have a federal plan for Colorado rather than a one man, one vote."

The people had expressed their desire to have the federal plan implemented and this plan was put into effect. The opponents of the federal plan contested its implementation and the matter was carried to the Supreme Court. The U.S. Supreme Court said, in a very sharply divided opinion, that it did not make any difference how the people of the State of Colorado felt about how their State legislature was made up; that under the 14th amendment the legislature had to be based on the one-man, one-vote principle even if the people in the State opposed the plan and wanted something else.

Being law-abiding citizens, we tried to conform to the U.S. Supreme Court ruling and within a very short period of time our legislature adopted a one-man, one-vote plan. In an attempt to make certain that we complied with the Supreme Court decision, we took the plan before a three-man Federal court, and asked for approval prior to the time our Governor signed the bill. We received approval of this plan from the three-man Federal court and the Governor signed the bill into law. Presumably the plan was going to go into effect.

But the proponents of the one-man, one-vote system were still not satisfied and they took the new plan to the State supreme court saying it was unconstitutional under the State constitution.

The State supreme court ruled that the districting in the new plan made the entire act unconstitutional and, therefore, we did not have any constitutionally designated State legislature.

The State supreme court said it would stay the effect of its decision during the 1964 election, but that we would have to do something in the legislative session of the State legislature for 1965–66 in order to solve this particular problem.

The question immediately comes to mind: What does a State do when it is in this situation? There is a reapportionment plan approved by a Federal court as being in compliance with the conditions established by the U.S. Supreme Court, but the State supreme court says that it is in violation of the State constitution.

Frankly, I have some reservations regarding the constitutionality of any laws passed by the State legislature in the last 2 years because it is, according to the State supreme court, an unconstitutional body under our State constitution.

This is typical of the problems that we get into when the Federal courts are completely in control of what is going to happen on legislative reapportionment in the States. The courts are designed to be a third branch of government under our basic constitutional system in the United States, whether affecting the legislature in this Congress or the State legislatures.

I understand that there may be a referendum on the ballot this fall which will seek the right, under our State constitution, to have subdistricts within the populous counties where we are going to need more than one representative or State senator coming out of a county.

Whether this will be effective, I do not know. It will not be decided until the 1966 election. If it is turned down, heaven only knows what will happen to the State legislature in 1967.

This is part of the problem we get into when a determination has to be made of the makeup in each State. It makes commonsense to me for this body to take the initiative now and say we are going to pass the Dirksen proposal because we want to return to the citizens of each State the right to choose between two different makeups of their State legislatures and to do this each 10 years so that the people can have the right to make this choice in each of our States in each 10-year period.

It is not a question of saying that the Federal plan is better, or that the one-man, one-vote proposition is better. It is simply a question of saying to the American people: We want to give you the right to choose for yourself without trying to prejudge the requirements of any of the States.

It would be my guess that some of the more metropolitan areas would probably like, within their State boundaries, to abide by the one-man, one-vote system which is already in effect in their State legislatures.

It is also my guess that some of the other States, where there are geographical problems, may want to choose a federal plan.

But the point is that there is nothing in this amendment which says one system is better than another. It is an effort to let the American people elect their State legislators and have the right to exercise their own fundamental concern in voting as to who and how their own representation in the State legislature will be presented.

It seems to me this is the only effective way we can possibly erase the chaos which has been created in many States, including my own, by virtue of the Supreme Court decision of the past.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon remarks were made on the Senate floor, in good faith I am sure, with reference to the consideration by the Committee on Standards and Conduct of matters concerning the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

No member of the committee has made any statement on the floor or elsewhere concerning these matters for the very good reason that even though we have given the matter a great deal of attention and have examined many, many documents and our staff has questioned many witnesses, we are far from having concluded our labors. Some news comment has been that the committee has already reached conclusions on the matter. These reports are entirely false. There is no element of truth whatsoever in them.

As the committee has pointed out following its meetings, the membership is individually and collectively pursuing each major item of a mass of charges and is further collecting the real facts upon these charges.

The committee has no thought whatsoever of being anything except complete and thorough in the entire matter. We have no thought of hurrying through the investigation, and our inquiry will be at least of a semijudicial nature, which itself carries the idea of completeness.

Any other report or charge or news item or anything said to the contrary, is entirely false.

I think each member of the committee feels that we will be absolutely nonpartisan in all such matters and if we fail in that respect, then we fail as a committee.

The charges made in this entire case are numerous and far reaching and require a great deal of searching for the true facts. This will require time. We will continue to give the matter our utmost attention.

But we will not be hurried.

I want to make it clear that Senator Dodd has talked freely with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and the Senator from Mississippi in a joint conference about these charges and has been fully cooperative.

Mr. President, no other member of this committee is on the floor of the Senate at the moment, but I am fully satisfied that I speak for all of them and I know that I know their sentiments.

I wish to add another point in connection with this matter. The resolution creating our committee is a new step for the Senate.

It has never been interpreted. There are only a few precedents on the general subject and none under the resolution itself. Therefore, what is done by us may well set many far-reaching precedents that the Senate might have to live with for a long time.

As I stated, the language is broad and sweeping in many major parts of the resolution creating the committee. Therefore I have been seeking, for use on a consultation basis alone, the services of an eminent and distinguished lawyer with an outstanding reputation throughout the Nation, to give the Senate the benefit of his fine knowledge of the law and his great experience in the legal profession.

So this is the status of the entire matter now. We shall continue, unless directed by a contrary majority vote of the Senate, to pursue this subject in the way I have outlined it.

ESTABLISHING STATE STANDARDS TO CONTROL POLLUTION BY VESSELS AND MARINAS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 10(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The bill provides that the criteria and plans to be established by the States under section 10(c) of the act shall include provisions for the control of pollution from vessels and marinas.

Pleasure boating is the most important form of recreation today in terms of dollar volume. Americans spend more money on boating than on baseball, fishing, golf, or any other recreational activity. Today, Americans own 8.5 million registered boats or pleasure craft. This means there is 1 boat for every 25 people in this country. The Wall Street Journal recently reported that production of new pleasure boats was 118.9 percent above the 1957–59 average in 1964 and 124.7 percent above that average in 1965. It was the fourth consecutive yearly advance.

This tremendous increase in boating has resulted in the growth of a related industry that is almost as startling. Over 5,200 marinas now serve the great American boating public on our lakes and along the shores of our rivers and coastlines. The dollar investment represented by this industry is very large, for most of these marinas cost over three-fourths of a million dollars each.

As the number of boats increase, so do the problems of water pollution arising from this source. The wastes discharged from toilet and galley facilities, and from marinas, and the cans, bottles, boxes, and paper tossed overboard by thoughtless boaters has reached serious proportions. Pollution from vessels is now of such significance as to warrant the interest of the Federal, State, and local governments.

Before vessel pollution can be abated, however, proper standards of water quality must be adopted. We must first know a little more about the situation than we do now. To do otherwise would be putting the cart before the horse. These quality standards would serve as guidelines for the establishment of appropriate regulations concerning onboard and on-shore maritime pollution abatement facilities. Until uniform standards are developed, boat owners are unlikely to install available equipment for fear that it might not comply when and if official standards are established.

In the Water Quality Act of 1965, Congress gave the States ample time to establish their own water quality criteria, before permitting the Federal Government to set such standards. The bill I am introducing will merely provide that the standards that the States adopt pursuant to the Water Quality Act apply to maritime pollution, as well to the more familiar problems of municipal and industrial pollution. With passage of this bill, we will have taken a first important step toward the abatement of pollution by the many vessels that ply our Nation's waterways.

If the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], who is now presiding, has ever been around a big marina during a hot summer, he is aware of the stench resulting from the pollution caused by the congregation of many boats in the area. Sometimes it is worse than the stench of a sewage disposal plant. It is time that we took the first step, and the first step should be to assess the problem and to set basic standards. Then the States should be given the opportunity to act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3225) to provide that plans and regulations established pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the control of water pollution shall apply to vessels (including boats) and marinas, introduced by Mr. Tydings, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3225

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(8) State criteria and plans for the purpose of paragraph (1) of this subsection and standards established by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (2) shall include such provisions for the control of pollution from vessels (including boats) and marinas as may be necessary for the purpose of this section."

TRAINING PERSONNEL TO OPERATE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide Federal assistance to local communities to train personnel to operate sewage treatment plants. The bill would amend section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by authorizing $500,000 per year for 3 years to be made available on a 50–50 matching basis. The funds would be used to help cover the expenses of short-term training programs in the field of sewage waste treatment.

The growing urbanization of our country together with the increasing demands for the amenities of modern life has brought about an unprecedented demand for pure water and an ever-increasing problem of water pollution. One of the critical elements in any program of cleaning our rivers is an expanded program for the treatment and disposal of sewage waste. Public awareness is now aroused to this need, and Congress has authorized funds to assist communities in building sewage treatment plants.

But the mere construction of facilities is not enough, for sewage waste treatment plants do not run themselves. They need to be operated and maintained by a trained staff of people. Even with the new, highly mechanized facilities now in operation, skilled manpower is required to provide competent and constant supervision. Without trained staff, the sewage screens and the grit chambers, the skimming tanks, the trickling filters, the chlorinators and sludge incinerators are entirely useless.

The Federal, State, and local governments of the country are now embarked on a costly and wide-ranging attack on the problem of water pollution. Yet, the success of this entire effort is ultimately dependent upon the skill of the staff who operate and maintain the expensive treatment facilities. Dr. Ralph E. Fuhrman, executive secretary of Water Pollution Control Federation—the leading organization in this field—informs me that the investment per man in sewage waste treatment facilities is exceedingly high. In the Washington, D.C., system, for instance, over $100,000 per man is invested in the equipment.

A serious shortage of trained manpower to operate sewage treatment plants now exists. The operation and maintenance of sewage waste treatment facilities is a continuing cost to municipalities, especially hard on the smaller cities and towns of our country. A town of 50,000 population demands a staff of 1 supervisor, 4 operators, 1 maintenance man, and 1 laborer while a town twice as large demands a supervisor, a chemist, 6 operators, 1 maintenance man, 2 laborers, and part-time staff available for research purposes. All of these men must be first trained and then paid for their services. This takes both time and resources.

Unfortunately, not all the people working in sewage water treatment facilities are adequately trained. Some are political appointees, possessing no real qualifications. Others desire to be trained but are unable to do so because their city fathers will not or cannot afford to give these men the time off, with pay, to receive proper instruction.

I well recall as town attorney for the city of Aberdeen, Md., for some 7 years, how difficult it was to persuade the city fathers to appropriate money for the town manager merely to attend the annual State meeting of town managers. The same problem exists with respect to the sending of sewage disposal employees or supervisors to a State university for a short course. It is difficult to persuade a township, because of its own pressing problems, to provide money for such instruction. The purpose of the bill is to provide funds to enable such employees to participate in programs of instruction, which generally take from 3 to 5 days, and cost $10 a day. The funds would be provided so that the towns would be encouraged to send their men to such programs.

Such men, I firmly believe, ought not be prevented from receiving training in such an important area as sewage waste treatment by a simple lack of funds. Certainly, few things are equal in importance to maintaining quality water and insuring a healthy environment.

Only 10 States now run mandatory certification programs for operators of waste treatment facilities. These programs of instruction have been well received. Unfortunately, they do not come close to providing us with a sufficient number of trained people to operate the treatment plants. More than 50,000 men are now engaged in operation and maintenance activities and Dr. Fuhrman tells me that this figure must be doubled in the near future if we are to meet our ever-growing requirements.

The $1.5 million my bill has authorized will double the number of men now being trained. It will provide the States with the means to insure that the cities and towns of our Nation will be provided with men who can competently operate the sewage waste treatment facilities of our communities. Only with this can we be certain of providing quality water and a healthy environment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3226) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize Federal assistance in carrying out short-term training programs in treatment work operation and maintenance introduced by Mr. Tydings, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3226

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by insering at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) (1) The Secretary is authorized during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years, to make grants to any State, municipality, regional or interstate agency to pay not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of a short-term training program in treatment works operation and maintenance for persons employed or to be employed in such works.

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection the term 'cost of a short-term training program' shall include, in addition to the cost of operating such program, the cost of developing such program, and necessary expenses incurred by persons while receiving training under such program.

"(3) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection. The amount appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall be distributed among the various States in accordance with criteria, determined by the Secretary to be best suited to carry out the purpose of this Act in an equitable manner, and established by regulation."

TRAINING RESEARCH AND PLANNING ASSISTANCE FOR URBAN MASS TRANSIT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Since hearings on transit legislation begin before the Banking and Currency Committee next week, I ask that the bill be immediately referred, and that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks.

The bill has three provisions:

First. It would authorize 250 graduate training fellowships annually for managerial, technical, and professional personnel in the mass transportation field.

Second. It would authorize grants to institutions of higher learning to assist them in carrying out research and training in urban transportation problems.

Third. It would direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to prepare a program that is designed to achieve a breakthrough in mass transit technology and to provide national leadership to State, local, and private organizations for the planning, financing, and operation of future urban mass transportation systems.

The cost of these proposals is modest, less than $7 million all together. No new authorizations are required. But in my judgment they represent important new directions for national urban transit policy and will enable us to expend the far larger sums now authorized for urban mass transportation more wisely and effectively.

One need not belabor the obvious point that many of our cities are in trouble. Slums, crime and delinquency, high unemployment, high welfare costs, even uncontrolled violence, are becoming deadly serious matters. The causes of social unrest in our cities are not simple, and their cures are not easy or cheap. Certainly no single approach—whether education, employment, or equal opportunities—will solve all the problems.

One aspect of the urban dilemma that is sometimes overlooked, however, is the need for more and better urban transportation. The McCone Commission, which reported on the Watts riot in Los Angeles, said:

> Our investigation has brought into clear focus the fact that the inadequate and costly public transportation currently existing throughout the Los Angeles area seriously restricts the residents of the disadvantaged areas such as south-central Los Angeles. This lack of adequate transportation handicaps them in seeking and holding jobs, attending schools, shopping, and in fulfilling other needs. It has had a major influence in creating a sense of isolation, with its resultant frustrations, among the residents of south-central Los Angeles, particularly the Watts area. Moreover, the lack of adequate east-west or north-south service through Los Angeles hampers not only the residents of the area under consideration here but also of all the city.

Two years ago, the Congress authorized a pioneering program for grants and loans to urban areas to develop comprehensive and coordinated transportation systems. The bulk of the funds, an authorized $375 million, were to be used for capital improvements—new equipment, improved facilities, extension of existing lines, and the like. Up to $30 million was authorized for research and demonstration grants. Under this law many cities, large and small have received vitally needed assistance. Such towns as Kenner, La.; Vallejo, Calif.; Zanesville, Ohio; Terre Haute, Ind. have received grants. Major cities, including Boston, Memphis, and San Francisco have also benefited.

Capital grants are undoubtedly at the heart of a sound Federal program of assistance to urban transit agencies. But there are other areas which require attention.

The purpose of the bill I introduce today is to bring Federal assistance to bear upon three of the critical aspects of the urban transit dilemma that have not been adequately explored or developed by the public and private agencies in the field or by the Federal Government. All three areas—personnel training, university research, and a long-range planning program for research and development are interrelated. They reflect the fact that this country is now facing an urban transit explosion, that may be as fundamental to the character of our cities and the quality of our lives as the invention of the automobile. Washington, Boston, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Seattle, and other cities have ambitious mass transit programs either in construction, being planned or under active study. More and more cities are looking for a balanced transit system.

This sudden burst of interest in urban transportation has created serious shortages of personnel qualified to plan, construct, and operate efficient, balanced urban transportation systems. This explosion of attention is not able to draw upon a long and carefully constructed framework of research in our universities and foundations. This sudden new interest in urban transit is not based upon the adaptation or development of modern technologies to urban transit problems, or upon long-range national goals for the development of our urban environments. My bill is designed to help meet these needs.

At the First International Conference on Urban Transportation, held in Pittsburgh last February, Under Secretary of Commerce Alan S. Boyd began his remarks, by stating that "there is a crisis in transportation." He continued:

> The crisis that I see in transportation is that, as more and more of us become aware of the needs, of the value, of the importance of transportation, we look around for people who are going to do the work to develop, to promote, to enhance the transportation system we have, and we find that they are woefully lacking throughout the United States.

It is not surprising, really, that we should face this acute shortage of trained personnel to plan and operate our urban transit systems. Almost since the turn of the century, we have let our urban mass transit systems decay, permitting the automobile to bear a greater and greater portion of the transportation job. As car production soared, transit riders declined. By 1957, the average American used public transit only 54 times per year, as compared to 115 times in the late twenties. In constant dollars, Americans spent $1.8 billion per year on public transit and rail commuting in 1929, compared to $1.5 billion in 1956.

In the past decade, the decline of ridership on our subway and urban bus systems has continued. Fewer riders means less revenues, lower levels of service and the inability to modernize equipment. These problems in turn discourage more riders, and the cycle spirals downward.

As we let our subways and bus systems decay, it is no wonder that we failed to attract a fair share of able new people into the urban mass transportation business. Few college graduates wanted to endure the poor salaries, low status, and lack of challenge that most urban transit systems could offer, particularly when major corporations provided the graduate engineer opportunities to conquer the sound barrier, design a computer, or help to land men on the moon. Although many able and dedicated men now operate our urban transit systems, these systems have, in the main, just not been able to compete for top management and professional personnel with such glamor industries as aeronautics and space.

This is beginning to change. Dramatic developments in San Francisco and Boston, ambitious plans in Washington, Atlanta, Seattle, and Baltimore have begun to attract new and able people into the field. But for the most part, the newer transit systems, have recruited their personnel by raiding other cities. Thus transferring the problem, rather than solving it.

My bill would help to alleviate this critical shortage of trained personnel in two ways. First, it would enable hard-pressed transit organizations, often operating at a deficit, to send some of their key managerial, technical, and professional personnel back to school, to upgrade their skills and keep abreast of new developments in their field. Many private corporations do this, but public agencies are reluctant to engage in such frills unless specifically encouraged. My bill would enable 250 urban mass transit executives to attend school each year. The Government would pay 75 percent of the cost of their tuition, plus the amount by which their salary was reduced during the training period, but no grant could exceed $12,000. That means that the program would not cost more than $3 million. No more than 12½ percent of the grants could be made in any one State.

The second way in which my bill would alleviate the critical shortage of trained personnel is to authorize grants to colleges and universities to carry out comprehensive research and training programs in urban mass transportation. In his speech to the Pittsburgh conference to which I referred earlier, Secretary Boyd put his finger on this aspect of the problem:

> I think that the need for people, for trained transportation engineers and economists, for an interdisciplinary approach to transportation is just beginning to dawn on the horizon. A number of institutions would like to do more than they are now, but they need money to do it. I think in this regard, the Federal Government has been somewhat lax, and I certainly hope that in the future, the Federal Government will be able to provide the kind of unrestricted sustaining grants that enable educational institutions to develop the kind of prominence which I think we must have.

Secretary Boyd ably summed up the proper Federal role for stimulating basic research in urban transportation when he said:

> I think the Federal Government has a responsibility to provide through research and demonstration what I would call seed money, to get things started in areas where either there is an interrelationship which cannot reasonably be dealt with by the transportation industry and in areas where the subject is so basic that no one feels willing or able to undertake the responsibility of probing, or in areas where for other reasons the industry has been unwilling to do what patiently needs to be done.

My bill would meet the twin needs for training and research by providing colleges and universities with funds to carry out such programs. This is not a new or radical solution for a national problem. We spend billions each year for university research and development in the fields of health, outer space, national defense, and atomic energy. We recently authorized similar research and training in the field of water resources. I think a modest start along similar lines is now required in the field of urban transportation.

Finally, my bill authorizes an expedited program for research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transport. The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, while it has been of considerable assistance to localities in improving traditional modes of transportation, such as buses and subways, has failed to bring about needed research, development, and demonstration of entirely new systems of coordinated urban transport that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in such a way as to contribute to sound city planning and development.

Section 2 of my bill directs the Secretary of HUD to prepare for the Congress a program, similar to our efforts in the Manhattan project for atomic energy, in the space program to put a man on the moon, in the program to develop a supersonic air transport, and in the Boston-Washington high-speed railway, which will aim at breakthrough results within 5 years of its approval by the Congress.

The proposed program is to concern itself with all aspects of new systems for metropolitan areas of various sizes. It is to concern itself with the technical financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects of the problem.

This proposal is a modification of S. 2599, the bill I introduced last year on behalf of myself and Senators CASE, CLARK, HART, HARTKE, INOUYE, JACKSON, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KUCHEL, RIBICOFF, and SALTONSTALL. That bill was a companion to a bill developed and introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin.

After hearings in the House, and discussions with the administration, Congressman REUSS amended his proposal. The language I have incorporated in my bill closely follows Congressman REUSS' modified proposal. This language has been approved by the Secretary of HUD and is supported by the administration. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Secretary Weaver to the Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TYDINGS. The three proposals embodied in this bill are modest in cost, but will, I believe, provide much needed assistance to urban communities in areas that particularly require Federal aid. I hope the proposals will be considered by the Housing Subcommittee when it takes up the problem of mass transit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3227) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to assist in meeting the need for highly trained management personnel for the efficient operation of mass transportation systems, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Tydings, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3227

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 9 through 12 as sections 11 through 14, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 8 two new sections as follows:

"GRANTS FOR MANAGERIAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

"Sec. 9. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make grants to States, local bodies and agencies thereof to provide fellowships for training of personnel employed in managerial, technical and professional positions in the urban mass transportation field. Fellowships shall be for not more than one year of advanced training in public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education offering programs of graduate study in business or public administration, or in other fields having application to the urban mass transportation industry. Persons shall be selected for such fellowships on the basis of demonstrated ability and for the contribution which they can reasonably be expected to make to an efficient mass transportation operation. Not more than 250 fellowships shall be awarded in any year, and the amount of any such fellowship shall not exceed 75 per centum of the sum of the tuition charges to be incurred plus the amount by which such individual's salary is reduced during the period of his training, or $12,000, whichever is lower.

"(b) Not more than 12½ per centum of the fellowships authorized pursuant to subsection (a) shall be awarded for the training of employees of mass transportation companies in any one State.

"GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND TRAINING IN URBAN TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

"Sec. 10. The Secretary is authorized to make grants, not in excess of $3,000,000 per annum, to public and private nonprofit insitutions of higher learning to assist in establishing or carrying on comprehensive research in the problems of transportation in urban areas. Such grants shall be used to conduct competent and qualified research and investigations into the theoretical or practical problems of urban transportation, or both, and to provide for the training of persons to carry on further research or to obtain employment in private or public organizations which plan, construct, operate, or manage urban transportation systems. Such research and investigations may include, without being limited to, the design and operation of urban mass transit systems; the design and functioning of urban roads and highways; the interrelationship between various modes of urban and interurban transportation; the role of transportation planning in overall urban planning; public preferences in transportation; the economic allocation of transportation resources; and the legal, financial, engineering, and esthetic aspects of urban transportation. In making such grants the Secretary shall give preference to institutions of higher learning that undertake such research and training by bringing together knowledge and expertise in the various social science and technical disciplines that relate to urban transportation problems."

(b) Such Act is further amended—

(1) by striking out "section 10(c)" in section 3(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 12(c)"; and

(2) by striking out "under this Act" in section 12(c) (as redesignated by subsection (a)) and inserting in lieu thereof "under section 3 of this Act".

Sec. 2. Section 6 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating subsection (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), and by adding after subsection (a) a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, undertake a project to study and prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in a manner that will contribute to sound city planning. The program shall (1) concern itself with all aspects of new systems of urban transportation for metropolitan areas of various sizes, including technological, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects; (2) take into account the most advanced available technologies and materials; and (3) provide national leadership to efforts of States, localities, private industry, universities, and foundations. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to the President, for submission to the Congress, as rapidly as possible and in any event not later than 18 months after the effective date of this subsection."

Exhibit 1

The Secretary of Housing
and Urban Development,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1966.

Subject: H.R. 9200, 89th Congress (Representative Reuss).

Hon. Wright Patman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Patman: This is in further reply to your request for a report on H.R. 9200, a bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research.

This bill has been superseded by amendment No. 4 of the amendments which Representatives Reuss, Ashley, and Moorhead recently offered to the demonstration cities bill of 1966 and this Department's other 1966 legislation. Accordingly, I am directing my comments to the proposal as it is contained in amendment No. 4.

This amendment would require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to prepare a program for research, development, and demonstration of new systems of coordinated urban transportation. The program would aim at breakthrough results within 5 years of its inception, concern itself with all aspects of new systems of urban transportation for metropolitan areas of various sizes (including technical, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects), and provide national leadership in this field. The appropriation of up to $1 million would be authorized for this program, which would be submitted to the President and the Congress before January 1, 1967.

We would favor enactment of legislation along the lines of this amendment. It would provide a desirable opportunity more fully to investigate and evaluate the proper Federal role in this extremely important field.

The provision of adequate transportation facilities for our cities, both large and small, is a staggering task and one in which the Federal Government has a substantial responsibility. The Federal programs of assistance in this field must, in order to assure maximum benefit from the limited funds available, take into full consideration various new and improved methods of urban transportation as they are proposed or developed. These presently include "commucars," vacuum tube vehicles, and other types of radically new "hardware," as well as proposals for more effective use of present conventional transportation facilities.

Such a program to evaluate new and improved methods of urban transportation would be closely related to the research, development, and demonstration activities which we are already carrying out under section 6 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. That act authorizes the Secretary to undertake such activities with reference to all phases of urban mass transportation, including the contribution of such service toward meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost.

However, the proposed program would be somewhat broader, in that it would not be limited to mass transportation. Several of the new urban transportation proposals would go beyond the definition of mass transportation applicable to the 1964 act, in that the vehicles might not be restricted to prescribed routes. An example is, again, the commucar—which would incorporate certain aspects of private automobile travel.

If the amendment is adopted, we would certainly attempt to develop a program that would "aim at breakthrough results within 5 years." The time limitation is commensurate with the urgency of our cities' urban transportation problems.

It should be noted that we do not, of course, know in advance the extent to which economically feasible "breakthrough results" can be achieved. To determine the answer to this question is the central purpose of the proposed program itself.

In any case, the proposed program should be prepared in close cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce—or the Secretary of Transportation, his successor in this field under the administration-recommended Department of Transportation bill. As the President's recent transportation message emphasized, "The Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development must cooperate in decisions affecting urban transportation."

It would be difficult to submit the proposed program on January 1, 1967. A little more time in the initial phase will save both time and money over the total period, because a better job of coordination of existing data can be done and a more thorough approach can be prepared. We propose that the program be submitted to the President as soon as possible, but no more than 18 months after the appropriation of funds.

Finally, we would recommend against the authorization of a specific amount of money for this legislation. The development of the program might take more, or might take considerably less, than the specified $1 million; and it would be difficult to estimate closely at this time the amount of money which would be required.

I am enclosing a revised draft of the amendment which incorporates these recommended changes.

The Bureau of the Budget has informed us that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
Robert C. Weaver,
Secretary.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order of Wednesday, April 13, 1966, that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 18, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. E. Franklin Jackson, John Wesley A.M.E. Zion Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Lift up your heads, O gates!
And be lifted up, O Ancient doors!
That the King of Glory may come in.
—Psalms 24:7 (revised standard version)

O Lord, King of glory, we lift our hearts to Thee at day's beginning that Thou mayest enter and fill us with Thy presence for all the day long.

In awareness of that presence may our hearts be aglow, our spirits exalted, and our resolve strengthened. Then let the tasks required of Thy servants be performed in accordance with Thy will.

Forgive us when we are shortsighted and fail to perceive Thy hand at work in the affairs of men. Sharpen our vision, without which we perish, that we realize, whether in matters personal or matters of state, we are Thy servants, even, instruments in Thy hand.

Unite us, O Lord, amid the clash of differing opinions and diversity of interests. May our single thought and corporate effort insure the good of all and the peace of the world.

Lift up our hearts, abide with us, then Thy will for all mankind will be accomplished. Let us recognize that Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 7, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2822. An act to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution congratulating Astronauts Neil Armstrong and David R. Scott.

AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF UTAH

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 265) to authorize conveyance of certain lands to the State of Utah based upon fair market value, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, BARING, KING of Utah, SAYLOR, and BURTON of Utah.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow and the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS, 89TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, AS OF APRIL 18, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain tabulations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, thus far the House has processed four appropriation bills this session—two supplementals for the current fiscal year 1966 and two regular annual bills for fiscal 1967. Barring unforeseen developments that might interfere, we are scheduled to bring an appropriation bill to the House floor virtually every week for several weeks running, beginning next week.

I should say that while not all of the budget is processed through the appropriation bills, most of the spending side of it is handled through them. I am including a table summarizing the totals on the four bills. While the House has shown a slight reduction below the President's budget requests in these bills, thus at least holding the line in that respect, it has, in other bills and actions this session, substantially exceeded the applicable provisions made for those bills in the President's budget. At this point, the House is well above the President's recommendations with respect to fiscal 1967.

Here is the tabulation:

Summary of action on budget estimates in appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 2d sess., Apr. 18, 1966

	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Enacted	Change at latest stage of action
1. Bills for fiscal 1967:					
Interior	$1,329,960,500	$1,295,169,500			−$34,791,000
Borrowing authority	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)			
Treasury-Post Office	7,246,720,000	7,210,177,135			−36,542,865
2. Supplementals for fiscal 1966:					
Defense supplemental (Vietnam)	13,135,719,000	13,135,719,000	$13,135,719,000	$13,135,719,000	
2d supplemental	2,813,552,168	2,564,872,568			[1] −248,679,600
3. Cumulative totals for session:					
House	24,525,951,668	24,205,938,203			[1] −320,013,465
Senate	13,135,719,000		13,135,719,000		
Conference	13,135,719,000			13,135,719,000	

[1] Includes $242,000,000 cut from a repayable advance to the social security medicare trust fund.

Source: Committee on Appropriations, Apr. 11, 1966.

AMENDING IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, I introduced H.R. 14320, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, so that aliens who are deemed ineligible to receive an immigrant visa because of a mental defect may be accorded the same opportunity, under the same conditions, which is given to aliens deemed ineligible because of mental retardation; to request that their exclusion be waived.

In order to present in an intelligible manner the reasons and the need for this legislation, I must review the legislative history of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This section itemizes the general classes of aliens ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission to the United States. For the purposes of H.R. 14320, such review can be limited to the inadmissibility of mentally retarded aliens. It will also be necessary, in justifying the need for the bill, to examine the performance of the U.S. Public Health Service in the development of regulations to guide the medical determinations of mental retardation in the examination of aliens. In order to further explain why I introduced H.R. 14320, I shall review for my colleagues two cases which have been brought to my attention and which demonstrate most graphically why there is a pressing need for change. I also intend to comment on the possibility that the Public Health Service may not need further congressional direction to right the wrongs which now exist.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Senate Report No. 1515 of the 81st Congress, entitled "The Immigration and Naturalization Systems of the United

States," reviewed the history of medical exclusions in our immigration law. Aliens who were "idiots" were barred in 1891. In the act of February 20, 1907, "imbeciles," "feebleminded persons," and persons "afflicted with a mental defect" were added to the list of those excluded on medical grounds. In the act of February 5, 1917, the excludable classes were assembled. Senate Report No. 352 of the 64th Congress contained language which explained reasons for excluding mentally defective persons:

> The real reason for excluding the mentally defective is to prevent the introduction into the country of strains of mental defect that may continue and multiply through succeeding generations.

This change was made only after consultation with persons of knowledge and experience and is in line with the well-established public policy of rigidly excluding the mentally deficient.

Senate Report No. 1515, concluding its review of the medical exclusions, suggested that the phrase "psychopathic personality" be included in new legislation as a substitute for "constitutional psychopathic inferiority," and it also suggested that the classes of mentally defectives be enlarged to include homosexuals and other sex perverts.

House Report No. 1365, which accompanied the Walter-McCarran Act of 1952, stated that the act would make more definitive the excluded classes of undesirable aliens. With respect to the medical exclusions, these were reexamined in the light of information made available by the Public Health Service. That Public Health Service report recommended the basic classification of medically excludable aliens which remains in the law today. Section 212 (a) (1) of the Walter-McCarran Act provided for the exclusion of aliens who are feebleminded. The Public Health Service had suggested the language "aliens who are idiots, imbeciles, or morons," but House Report No. 1365 preferred to use the term "feebleminded," referring to the extensive body of judicial and administrative decisions pertinent to the meaning of the term "feebleminded." The Service gave no indication to the committee that anything had happened in the field of medicine since 1891 to warrant any closer look at this exclusion.

The Public Health Service report had much to say about the exclusions listed in section 212(a) (4); psychopathic personality, epilepsy, or mental defect. However, no remarks were made about this curious grouping evident in paragraph 4. About mental defect, the Public Health Service report said that the term served a useful purpose, that it bore no relationship to mental deficiency which is related to the intellectual status of the individual. The report said that mental defect was a broad and sweeping term used as a safeguard for classifying those aliens who would not fit into any of the previous categories. The report gave some examples of the use of the term; for example, to classify a fairly large group of hereditary disturbances, which at the time of examination could not be included in above classifications, to classify progressive personality disorders occurring in such conditions as infections of the nervous system; for example, in behavior disorders of epidemic encephalitis, to classify more severely disabling neuroses and conduct and habit disorders of adults and children, and to classify those persons who are likely to be brought into repeated conflict with social customs, authority, or society in general.

What the report failed to point out is the fact that the Public Health Service was using and has continued to this day to use mental defect to classify severely mentally retarded children. It is this last usage that has prompted the introduction of H.R. 14320.

This brings us to the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 89-236. This act made it possible for aliens who were excluded and inadmissible because of mental retardation, section 212(a) (1), to request a waiver of their exclusion, in cases where the aliens were close relatives of U.S. citizens. Let me direct your attention to the testimony of Dr. Andrew Sackett, Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Medical Services of the U.S. Public Health Service, before the Immigration Subcommittee of the House. Dr. Sackett, in supporting the change in language from feebleminded to mentally retarded, said that this was a change in nomenclature with significant implications. He said it connotes a change in attitude toward the mentally retarded. He said that the change would fit into the proposed substantive changes which would permit the family with a mentally retarded child to remain together, or to be reunited with assurances that the services necessary for the retarded child will be provided without becoming a public charge. What he did not say was that this progressive and humanitarian gesture applied only to mentally retarded children who are not severely mentally retarded.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

This then is the progress which we have made since 1891, and what it amounts to is this: that an alien who is classified as mentally retarded, according to the Public Health Service "Manual for the Medical Examination of Aliens," may have his exclusion waived under certain conditions, if he is a close family relative of an American citizen.

An additional purpose of H.R. 14320 is to bring out into the open the questionable usage of the term "mental retardation" in that manual. Aliens who are really mentally retarded and who are the children of U.S. citizens are denied the opportunity to make a request for a waiver of the grounds of their exclusion despite the fact that this 89th Congress has made it the law of the land that they have this opportunity.

To be very specific, I am saying that the Public Health Service and its "Manual for the Medical Examination of Aliens" have failed completely to keep abreast of modern developments in terminology and in classification of mental retardation. I want to be completely fair here, and if the Public Health Service feels that the intent of Congress precludes it from taking official note of these developments, then it should bring to the attention of Congress the facts about modern medical developments and ask that the Congress reconsider its intent in light of such developments.

To be even more specific, I am very critical of the Public Health Service because it has seen fit to use the term "mental defect" on children who are, according to progressive medical thinking, mentally retarded. That term "mental defect" which the Public Health Service has described to be very useful, has become perhaps too useful in that it is being used to avoid some very hard and deep thinking on the meaning of mental retardation. Could it be the intent of Congress that such a term be used to classify severely mentally retarded children? Why then is the term linked in the same paragraph with such grounds of exclusion as psychopathic personality and sexual deviation? What, indeed, does the severely mentally retarded child have in common with the psychopathic personality or the sexual deviate?

Senate Report No. 748 of the 89th Congress which accompanied H.R. 2580, stated that the term "feebleminded" was being deleted and the words "mentally retarded" inserted in its place in order to conform the Immigration and Naturalization Act with modern medical terminology. One would hope that there is more to this than just a change in mere nomenclature, but this hope is in vain.

In 1959, 7 long years ago, under the auspices of the American Association on Mental Deficiency, a "Manual on Terminology and Classification in Mental Retardation" was prepared. The development of this manual was supported by a special grant from the Public Health Service. Let me quote the foreword to the manual:

> This manual will prove of much significance to all persons concerned with those who are mentally retarded. For many years progress in research and treatment has been greatly retarded by the chaotic status of terminology and classification in the field of mental retardation. This document contributes substantially to the clarification of this prevailing confusion and, consequently, promises to become a landmark in the course of progress in mental retardation.

The manual defines mental retardation as referring to subaverage general intellectual functioning which originates during the developmental period and is associated with impairment in one or more of the following: First, maturation; second, learning; and third, social adjustment. The manual further indicates that for medical purposes, mental retardation is regarded as a manifestation of some underlying disease process or medical condition. The manual goes on to list a number of etiologic or casual groupings to be used in classifying mental retardation.

Dr. Sackett was questioned about the meaning of the term "mental retardation" during the 1965 hearings before the House Immigration Subcommittee. The actual question regarded the difference between mental retardation and mental defect. Dr. Sackett said that mental retardation involved a deficiency of intellectual capacity that has been lifelong, and he said that mental defect could be intellectual deficiency resulting from a physical cause, such as an injury or disease. What Dr. Sackett describes as mental defect—section 212(a)(4)—the American Association on Mental Deficiency describes as mental retardation. Furthermore, the "Manual for the Medical Examination of Aliens," a Public Health Service manual, says that feeblemindedness is a legal term equivalent to the medical term "mental deficiency." It tells the examining physician that this condition may be defined to exist in a person who exhibits such a degree of mental retardation existing from birth or acquired at an early age that his common knowledge, retentiveness of memory, reasoning power, learning capacities, and general mental reactions are severally and distinctly below those normally exhibited by the average of the same age and race living under similar environment. The manual adds that the condition may be divided into several grades, depending on the severity. However, the Public Health Service cautions the physicians in this manual, prepared in 1963, that there are certain diseases in which mental deficiency is merely a symptom of the basic pathologic process. Now I place this last sentence up against the statement made above that mental retardation, for medical purposes, is regarded as a manifestation of some underlying disease process or medical condition. It would seem to me, as a layman, that some conflict exists here. Perhaps it is the kind of conflict that the American Association on Mental Deficiency attempted to clear up for the sake of progress in 1959 with funds from the Public Health Service. Is it possible that the very Public Health Service which contributed funds to clear up confusion has not yet seen fit to take advantage of what it helped pay for?

It would seem to me, again as a layman, that what Dr. Sackett told the Congress he considered mental defect is what the American Association on Mental Deficiency considers mental retardation. I very strongly urge all of those who are interested in mental retardation and who have some professional competence to read side by side the Public Health Service's manual and the American association's manual to see if my interpretation is right or wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I would be unaware of all this if it were not for the fact that two very tragic cases have been brought to my attention which involve American citizens whose children are not allowed to come to America. I believe that the children are severely mentally retarded, and I am confident that many American physicians who know something about modern developments in mental retardation would be inclined to agree with me. Perhaps not. The point here is that the manual of the Public Health Service gives its examining physicians no choice as to how to classify these children. They have mental defects. I challenge the usage of that term on these children. I believe it is archaic, outmoded, and surrounded with complacent ignorance or incompetence, when it is used in cases like this.

The "Manual on Terminology and Classification in Mental Retardation" makes use of a set of major etiologic or causal divisions which are similar to groupings developed by the American Medical Association in 1952. The manual then sets up a simplified medical classification which delineates mental retardation associated with each of the etiologic groupings. The Public Health Service, however, classified the children of whom I spoke earlier as mental defects and not mentally retarded on the basis of disease or injuries or conditions which are easily found within the simplified medical classification of mental retardation.

Before I conclude my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues here what has happened or what will continue to happen if some changes are not made. It was easy for the Public Health Service before 1965 because it made no difference how you classified a person as long as the person had something which would render him inadmissible into the United States. Now that the Congress has declared that mentally retarded aliens shall be given the opportunity to be reunited with their families in America, it is time for the Public Health Service to find out what the term means. And in that search I recommend to them the manual which they helped to pay for back in 1959. I know that there are conditions to be met with and much to be determined before a waiver can be granted by the Attorney General, and all I want to see happen is that U.S. citizens who have mentally retarded children abroad who they would like to have with them and whose care they are well able to furnish, have the opportunity to ask. What does a Congressman tell a parent—that his or her child is classified along with sex perverts and psychopaths, and therefore the child cannot come to America?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am raising three questions. First, is it the intent of Congress to make a distinction between the mentally retarded alien and the alien whose mental retardation is associated with a certain disorder, disease or injury? Keeping in mind that the American Association on Mental Deficiency believes that mental retardation itself is a manifestation of some underlying disease process or medical condition, I ask this question. Second, if this distincton is not the intent of Congress, why has the Public Health Service maintained it as grounds for excluding from the United States the children of U.S. citizens by labeling the children mental defects? Keeping in mind that mental defect came into the law in 1907 to keep the Nation free from weird and frightful blood lines, I ask this second question. Third, if this was the intent of Congress, is it not the time for this Congress to review the decisions of the past in the light of the tremendous advances of modern medical science?

ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing comment about the construction of anti-ballistic-missile defenses by the Russians. There is growing apprehension that the Russians are ahead of the United States in this important area. At least, our best information tells us they are constructing anti-ballistic-missile defenses, whereas the United States is not doing so. They would hardly be constructing them if they were not confident they had developed an effective defense system. Our defense leaders tell us ballistic missile defenses are at best uncertain and the cost is tremendous. They also state that whether or not we have ballistic missile defenses, a nuclear attack will kill millions of people.

To me it is equally significant that these defenses may save the lives of additional millions, and they would add to the difficulty of a knockout blow by the Russians. Sometimes I wonder if we are directing our emphasis in the right direction. A fully effective anti-ballistic-missile system covering all major areas would cost an estimated $20 to $30 billion. Coincidentally, that is the amount we will spend to get a man on the moon. Which is more important to the survival of America?

The truth of the matter is that America can afford both. Improvements in the art of ballistic missile defense will make it possible for us to get very significant protection for much less money than the amount stated above. More important than money is the fact that the Russians are building such a system. Thus, they have a significant lead on us in a key area, and the United States cannot afford to ignore this situation any longer. We have lost much valuable time already. We should move out significantly in the field of anti-ballistic-missile defense this year. This is what the experts recommend. Certainly if the Russians can afford a man-on-the-moon program and an anti-ballistic-missile program, the United States can do so too.

THE LATE MILTON J. SILBERMAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I announce to the House the passing of a great Chicagoan who was well known to many Members of this body and by all was held in warm affection.

Milton J. Silberman, a vice president of Exchange National Bank of Chicago, La Salle and Adams Streets, and well-known leader in local, national, and international Jewish affairs, died Monday, April 11, 1966, at Sydney R. Forkosh Memorial Hospital, Chicago. He was 56 years old.

For many years he had been my close and valued friend. I shall miss him sorely. His was a life of nobility in its finest expression.

Mr. Silberman joined Exchange National Bank in 1952 as a member of the business development department. He soon rose to the position of vice president.

Born in New York City and educated at Columbia University, he had been a resident of Chicago since 1933. Prior to coming to the bank, he was sole owner of the wholesale drug house of Silver Drugs. During World War II, he was Chairman of the Price Control Board of the Office of Price Administrator, and was commander of Chicago's Civil Defense Corps. He had also served for 5 years on Mayor Daley's Committee on Human Relations.

Milton J. Silberman was especially lauded by Chicagoans for his significant leadership in both national and international Jewish organizations. He served as vice president of the Zionist Organization of America, as vice chairman of its national advisory committee, and as president of the Zionist Organization of Chicago.

He attended the 21st, 22d, 23d, and 24th World Zionist Congresses, and in December 1964 was elected a deputy of the World Zionist Actions Committee in Jerusalem. He also served the Zionist Organization as national vice chairman of its emergency council.

He was significantly active in the Jewish National Fund, having served as Chicago's and the Midwest president and as vice chairman of the Jewish National Fund of America. He was also national chairman of the Jewish National Fund of the Zionist Organization of America.

Mr. Silberman also acted as chairman of the Illinois Conference of Jewish Organizations, a consulting body to all Jewish organizations in the State; as chairman of the Conference of Jewish Organizations for Combined Jewish Appeal; and chairman of the Illinois Committee for Israel's 10th Anniversary in 1958. He was a member of the board of governors of State of Israel bonds, Chicago; chaired the Chicago Yiskor Committee for 6 Million Martyrs for the past 3 years and was chairman at the time of his death; served on the national and administrative committee on the Chicago Council of the American Jewish Congress; served on the national planning committee; and the Chicago Council of the United Synagogues of America; was a member of the Chicago Board of Jewish Education and governor of the College of Jewish Studies; was a member of HIAS—Hebrew Immigration Aid Society—B'nai B'rith and the City of Hope. He was also past president of the Humboldt Boulevard Temple and Congregation Shaare Tikvah of Chicago.

Numerous honors and citations have been extended to him, but he was most proud of the identification of his name with the State of Israel. In his name a forest of trees stands in Israel and a quadrangle of teachers residences bears his name at Kfar Silver, the secondary agricultural school maintained at Ashkelon, Israel, by the Zionist Organization of America.

Mr. Silberman died 3 days prior to his 57th birthday. He is survived by his wife, the former Millie Hymanson, and his two children, Aviva Iris and Alan Harvey. To them I extend my deepest sympathy and in that expression I know I am joined by many of my colleagues.

WELLINGTON WALES

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 10, the life of one of New York's finest journalists came to a sudden and untimely end. Just 2 days after the tragic death of his son, Wellington Wales of the editorial board of the New York Times died of a heart attack.

Wellington Wales' career as a journalist was colorful and varied. He was a war correspondent in southeast Asia, a reporter for the Boston Herald, an editor of a newspaper in the Virgin Islands, and editor of the editorial page of the Knickerbocker News in Albany, N.Y. Last July he became a member of the editorial board of the New York Times.

While on the Times editorial board, Wales was a careful student of city and State politics and very much concerned with problems of health. His editorials and personal warmth will, indeed, be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the Record the New York Times editorial tribute to Wellington Wales and the obituaries from the New York Times and the Herald Tribune, which appeared on April 11.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1966]

Wellington Wales

In 8 brief months as a member of the editorial board of the Times, Wellington Wales made a valued imprint on this page. His death—made doubly tragic by the fatal accident that befell his son only hours earlier—deprives us of a colleague who combined the best qualities of crusader, analyst, and friend.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1966]

Wellington Wales Dead at 48—Was on Times Editorial Board—Writer on Politics Is Stricken Soon After a Train Kills His Son Samuel, 19

Wellington Wales, a member of the editorial board of the New York Times, died yesterday, apparently of a heart attack, in his home at 236 East 32d Street. His age was 48.

His son Samuel G. Wales, 19, a junior at Harvard University, was killed late Friday night when he was struck by a train leaving South Station in Boston.

The father, known as Duke Wales to his friends, had a diversified career as a journalist, publicity man, soldier, and businessman.

He rejoined the Times last July, after an absence of 16 years, to become a member of its editorial board. He wrote editorials on city and State political affairs and interviewed candidates for public office to help determine Times editorial policy about them. He also studied health problems.

Mr. Wales, a husky, friendly man with an air of quiet elegance, was described by a friend as a person with widespread interests "who became fully involved with life wherever he might be."

NATIVE OF CALIFORNIA

He was born in Hollywood. His father was Wellington E. Wales, business manager of Famous Players-Lasky (later Paramount Pictures, Inc.), and his mother was an actress. Duke Wales received an A.B. degree from Dartmouth College in 1938 and an M.S. degree from the Graduate School of Journalism of Columbia University in 1940.

While at Columbia, he became an assistant picture editor for Acme Newspictures. In 1942 he joined the Army as a private. He served 4 years, two of them in the European, Pacific and China-Burma-India theaters. He was a combat photographer and later a photo officer. He was discharged as a captain.

He returned to Acme in 1946 and soon joined the Sunday staff of the Times, where he did captions, rewriting, makeup, and editing.

In 1949, after a brief sojourn as a copy editor on the Reporter magazine, he became editor of a small daily newspaper, the Auburn (N.Y.) Citizen-Advertiser. In 1950–51 he was a Nieman Fellow in journalism at Harvard, specializing in the study of city government. Twice he was a Pulitzer Prize juror. He remained with the Citizen-Advertiser until 1954.

That year he became a reporter for the Boston Herald. Mornings he taught journalism at Boston University. Then he went to the Boston bureau of the United Press. Next he was managing editor of Woman's Day magazine from 1955 to 1957.

In 1957 Mr. Wales was appointed publicity director of the State commerce department.

In August 1958, he went to the Virgin Islands to establish a venture that included spearfishing, glass-bottom boat tours, and deep sea fishing. He also taught water skiing and sailing. Next he bought and operated a bulldozer on the island of St. John. He expanded and founded a roadbuilding concern, Wales Roads, Inc. He also started a liquor business. He was news director of a television station and then associate editor of the Daily News of the Virgin Islands. In 1962 Mr. Wales became chief editorial writer for the Knickerbocker News in Albany, N.Y. A year later he became editor of the editorial page.

Surviving are his widow, the former Helen Woolsey; another son, Heathcote W., and a daughter, Miss Jane MacGregor Wales.

Funeral services for father and son will be held at 9:30 a.m. Wednesday at the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd, 240 East 31st Street. Burial will be in Dosoris Cemetery, Glen Cove, Long Island.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Apr. 11, 1966]

Wellington Wales, a Member of the Times Editorial Board

Wellington Wales, a member of the editorial board of the New York Times died yesterday, apparently of a heart attack, 2 days after his 19-year-old son, Samuel G. Wales, a junior at Harvard, was killed when a train struck him at Boston's South Street station.

The elder Wales, 48, died at his home, 236 East 32d Street. He had been on the Times' editorial board since last July.

It was the second case in 8 days of a New York newspaperman dying of an apparent heart attack shortly after the death of a teenaged son. Last Saturday, George Carroll, 61, aviation editor of the New York Journal-American and the Hearst Newspapers, died 9 weeks after his son, Hilary, 19, was killed in an automobile accident.

Before joining the Times, Mr. Wales had been a newspaperman, publicity man, soldier, and businessman. He was born in Hollywood, Calif., the son of Wellington E. Wales, business manager of Famous Players-Lasky (later Paramount Pictures Inc.) and Mrs. Wales, a character actress.

CAREER

He was graduated from Dartmouth College in 1938 and received a master's degree in 1940 from the Columbia University Journalism School. While at Columbia, he became a caption writer for Acme News Pictures.

Mr. Wales enlisted in the Army in 1942 and served for 4 years, 2 of them overseas, as a combat photographer and photo officer. He was discharged as a captain in 1946 and returned to Acme. Soon afterward, he joined the Sunday staff of the Times, but left in 1949 to become a copy editor on the Reporter magazine.

Moving on, he worked for the Citizens Advertiser in Auburn, N.Y., and in 1954 became a reporter for the Boston Herald and taught journalism at Boston University. From the Traveler, he went to the Boston bureau of United Press.

In 1955 he became managing editor of Woman's Day magazine, and worked there until 1957 when he was appointed State director of publicity in the New York State Commerce Department.

He later moved to the Virgin Islands where he started a liquor business, was news director of a television station and finally joined the staff of the Daily News of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Wales stayed there until 1962, when he moved to Albany to become chief editorial writer for the Knickerbocker News. Later, he was promoted to editorial page editor.

Mr. Wales' specialty on the Times was writing editorials on city and State politics, and interviewing candidates for public office to help shape the Times' editorial policy toward them.

Mr. Wales was a member of the Harvard Club of New York, and the Fort Orange Club of Albany.

He is survived by his wife, the former Helen Woolsey; a son, Heathcote W., and a daughter, Miss Jane MacGregor Wales.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House is not going to schedule implementing legislation—S. 2294—for the International Wheat Agreement at this time because the provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act passed last fall and the CCC Charter Act provide ample authority for U.S. participation in the agreement.

The U.S. Senate last year ratified the protocol extending the treaty until July 31, 1966. Under our Constitution the effect of the ratification by the U.S. Senate is to approve the terms and conditions of the agreement and to permit and authorize our Government to obtain the benefits and to carry out our obligations and responsibilities under the agreement.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, approved November 3, 1965, specifically gives regulatory authority for the United States to live up to its obligations under the International Wheat Agreement. It provides for the regulation of prices on exports through requirements for the acquisition of export marketing certificates so as to cause U.S. wheat and wheat flour to be competitive in the world market, to "avoid disruption of world market price and fulfill the international obligations of the United States." This legislation, passed after consideration of S. 2294 was postponed by the House last October, minimizes the need for enabling International Wheat Agreement legislation to provide specific authority to prevent any disruption in world markets resulting from U.S. wheat supply or prices.

Further, there is ample authority under the Charter Act of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the United States to continue to exercise the rights, obtain the benefits and fulfill its obligations under the International Wheat Agreement through competitive pricing of U.S. wheat in world markets and through the making of export payments at times when domestic prices exceed world prices.

The failure of the House to act on S. 2294 would not preclude future action to enact legislation if conditions were to change or if needed to encourage maximum U.S. wheat exports in a stable world market.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, of all the Federal assistance programs developed over the last 30 years I know of none that has been of greater long-lasting benefit to so many people than the school lunch and special school milk programs. I know of none that has won broader support among people generally.

This makes it hard to understand why President Johnson should seek a 33-percent cut in funds for these programs; why he wants to end the special milk program altogether. But of even great significance is the administration's announced intention of shifting the focus of these programs to a class of children instead of children generally.

Only $21 million is budgeted for the school milk program next year; about one-fifth of the $103 million which Congress appropriated for the current year. If Congress accedes to the President's request, the special milk program as millions of schoolchildren know it today is doomed. For the $21 million would go to buy milk only for certain children and for children in schools where there is presently no lunch program.

Lest there be any misunderstanding of my position, I want to make one thing clear. I wholeheartedly favor sufficient funding of these programs to assure full participation of children from impoverished families and of schools in impoverished areas.

In the same budget that recommended the cuts in school milk and lunch funds, the administration requested $53 million for salaries alone of 6,485 permanent employees to run the much publicized war on poverty. A government that can afford that many bureaucrats to administer an untried program surely can afford extending the successful school lunch and milk programs to all needy children without denying this assistance to the vast majority of children whose family incomes are just about the poverty level. Compassion for the poor should not compel us to sacrifice the health gains we have purchased for a large part of the younger generation through the school lunch and milk programs.

It might be worth while to review the history of these two programs. The Federal Government began contributing to school lunch programs in 1936 through section 32 of Public Law 74–320, but the present program was inaugurated in 1946 with passage of the National School Lunch Act. This program has grown steadily until now it is a $1.5 billion a year business. This is the estimated total of Federal, State, and local governmental contributions plus the children's payments. The prices paid by children for their lunches vary widely; free meals are served to the neediest children. Some 18 million children—more than 36 percent of the children enrolled in school this year—are participating in the national school lunch program. The Federal contribution this year accounted for 22 percent of its total cost—down about one-third from the 32 percent of Federal contribution in the first year of operation.

The National School Lunch Act of 1946 is permanent legislation. But the special school milk program, inaugurated by a Republican Congress during the Eisenhower administration in 1954, is due to expire on June 30, 1967. I have today introduced a bill to establish a permanent special milk program for all children.

Some 25 million children in 93,000 schools received more than 3 billion one-half pints of milk through the special milk program last year. Each child paid from 3 to 4 cents a half pint for this milk. More than $6⅓ million in Federal money is being spent in my State of Illinois for this purpose during the current year. Under the President's proposal, only some children, and children in schools where there is no lunch program, could buy milk at the reduced prices. It is anybody's guess, under such circumstances, how much milk would be sold in schools. Needless to say, with these cuts, school administrators anticipate a rising market for carbonated beverages.

I have received letters and petitions from several hundred school superintendents, principals, teachers, and parents protesting the proposed budget reductions. The following letter, from the head of the Illinois School Food Service Association, is typical of the views expressed by all those who have written to me about this matter:

DEAR MR. SPRINGER: As president of the Illinois School Food Service Association, I am writing you relative to the National School Lunch Act of 1946, and the budget made recently by President Johnson.

Since 1946, schools have been feeding needy children of the school district as well as those whose mothers worked, children who came to school by bus, and those who stayed at school because of the nutritious lunch.

For the past 3 or 4 years, funds allotted for Illinois have not been adequate to pay even a 5 cent per lunch subsidy for any month during the school year, no reimbursement for May or June, and only a partial payment for April.

Due to the high cost of food, high wages, high Federal taxes, and low meal charge to the students, school districts are faced with problems beyond their control. Many school districts are now subsidizing the school lunch program to the limit of their resources. After all, children must be taught as well as fed.

The cut of $80 million in the special milk program funds will drive our State of "milk drinkers" back to soft drinks. The cut in the school lunch program funds of $19 million will necessitate schools going into purely snack services and our health-education program will go down the drain. The increased cost of the lunch to the children will mean more and more children will be unable to pay for their lunches and will have to be fed free. Is this what Congress really wants? Will the proposed Child Nutrition Act do more for our children than the 20 years operations of the school lunch programs have proved?

We are asking your help in combating these drastic cuts in appropriations for such vital programs as the school lunch, special milk, and Government donated commodities.

Sincerely,

ISABELL EATON,
President.

Mr. Speaker, during my 16 years in Congress I have never seen the people back home so deeply concerned about a matter as they are about this issue. I can understand this because the welfare of their children is involved. I bring this to the attention of my colleagues because I understand that the annual agricultural appropriations bill, carrying funds for the school lunch and milk programs, will be reported out later this week. I have talked to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle about this so I know there is strong sentiment for rejecting the budget recommendations and funding these programs on the same basis as in the past. I am certain a large majority of the House itself will support that action.

We should keep the school lunch and milk programs. They are a good investment in America's future.

NATIONAL VETERANS' CEMETERY SYSTEM

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and I are introducing identical bills to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national veterans' cemetery system consisting of all cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried.

In view of the many fatalities incident to the conflict in Vietnam, the need for enactment of this measure is particularly timely.

It is an obvious obligation to prepare a final resting place for our honored dead. Commencing in 1862, our Nation sought to provide this soil in the character of national cemeteries. Since 1890, approximately 17 new national cemeteries have been opened in the United States, adding to the 81 established from 1862 to 1899. The number of veterans eligible for burial in our national cemeteries has increased from 1,341,000 in 1890 to 22,500,000 in 1962 excluding those eligible from the peacetime establishment. The figures, furnished the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1962 during its hearings to establish a national cemetery policy, indicated that 2.6 to 2.7 million veterans deaths will occur in 1972.

My bill will establish in the Veterans' Administration a national veterans' cemeteries system to be operated and maintained by the Administrator. Each grave shall be marked by a headstone bearing the name of the deceased veteran. A register of burials shall be kept at each such cemetery and at the VA office.

The bill sets forth in section 2 the persons to be buried in such national veterans' cemeteries and specifically excludes any person who on the date of his death was a member of a Communist action organization.

The lands needed for national veterans' cemeteries may be acquired by the Administrator by purchase, gift, condemnation, or otherwise as he determines to be in the best interests of the United States.

Each such cemetery shall have a superintendent selected from among meritorious and trustworthy veterans retired for physical disability, discharged or released under honorable conditions and entitled to compensation for a service-connected disability.

These are some of the provisions of section 2, which will add a new subchapter II to chapter 23 of title 38 of the United States Code concerning the administration of national veterans' cemeteries.

Section 3 of the bill provides that all jurisdiction and responsibility for any cemetery under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, and the American Battle Monuments Commission shall be transferred to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, immediately preceding the date of enactment of this bill.

Section 4 of the bill repeals in whole or in part the present statutes concerning national cemeteries not necessary for carrying out the purposes of this bill.

This bill attempts to resolve a situation of growing concern to each of us. I feel certain that this measure will have the support of most veterans and service organizations.

None would deny the Nation's obligation to our war dead, though I question whether the general public is aware of the neglect that has been a natural consequence of the divided responsibilities among offices of the Federal Government charged with the care and maintenance of veterans' cemeteries. Perhaps only the bereaved fully understand the need for expansion of our cemetery system. In this regard I should like to commend those members of the press who have sought to aid in improving the ugly picture that has been developing because of the national neglect of veterans' cemeteries.

I was particularly impressed with a series of articles appearing in the Camden, N.J., Courier-Post by James D. Nicholson, who has shown a remarkable understanding of the problem and its many ramifications. His dedication to the subject is most inspiring, and I am confident that leadership of this nature will be an important influence in expediting to enactment the bills which the chairman and I are introducing today.

The articles follow:

VETERANS, CONGRESSMEN FIGHT "SILENT" CLOSINGS—ECONOMY DOOMS NATIONAL CEMETERY PROGRAM

(By James D. Nicholson)

The Johnson administration has written the epitaph for the entire national cemetery program with a single word—economy.

Arlington will be the only exception to the Government's phaseout plan. A Philadelphia Veterans' Advisory Commission official, who asked that his name be withheld, said:

"This has all been done very discretely. Since no provisions or policy for expansion were made for national cemeteries, naturally they will have to close as they fill up * * * very silently."

Some people have chosen not to remain silent. The veterans and Congressmen from the States the "phaseout" will affect have raised some pointed questions, which the Government has failed to answer to their satisfaction.

Beverly National Cemetery, opened in 1864, will close its gates shortly to new burials. Several thousand graves are reserved only for the spouses of those already interred there. There is resentment in the ranks of veterans in the northeast.

Veterans want to know: Why couldn't Beverly be expanded? Does this mean the Government will not reconsider its position? Are they trying to "buy us off with a burial reimbursement stipend"? Doesn't burial among former comrades mean something?

Most of these questions have since been answered.

On January 6, 1965, Representative WILLIAM T. CAHILL, Republican, of New Jersey, introduced a bill asking the Department of the Army to acquire additional land which would have kept Beverly open to new burials through 1985. The bill died in committee.

As recent as January 10, this year, Representative DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Democrat, of New Jersey, introduced a similar bill.

Another alternative was possible in maintaining available cemetery space in the Delaware Valley by the acquisition of land near Fort Dix.

Senator John E. Hunt, Republican, of Gloucester, first, was appointed to a three-man State commission established to investigate the feasibility of acquiring another tract of land. The commission resulted from a joint assembly resolution, approved November 5, 1964.

"The Army rejected our request for the land" the senator explained. "They said that they needed it in the event that they might one day have to expand their facilities. The one thing that stands out in my mind is that you can't pin anyone down to talk to who will assume the ultimate responsibility for phasing out the cemeteries."

The executive branch's decision to abolish the national cemetery program originated several years ago. It was based on a study of the cemetery system made by the Department of the Army. The report was filed December 15, 1961.

A letter to Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado, dated August 31, 1965, spelled out the administration's position on the expansion or maintenance of the national cemetery program. ASPINALL was chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, whose subcommittee held hearings on the issue in 1962 and again in 1964.

A spokesman for the administration said further expansion would be inadvisable and involve enormous costs in providing burial for the more than 40 million persons eligible under veterans benefits. This year's budget request includes $5.4 billion for veterans benefits.

According to the Veterans' Administration, to be eligible for interment one must be a veteran who has been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, a spouse of the eligible veteran or the minor child of the veteran.

In permitting the national cemeteries to die on the vine, the Government acknowledged a failure—since the Civil War—to expand the facilities to keep pace with the benefits they have extended.

Representative J. T. Rutherford, Republican, of Texas, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks who conducted the hearings, said:

"The entire problem of national cemetery capacity, as opposed to eligible population, has been largely ignored during the last 90 years * * * acquisition of additional cemeteries has not keep pace.

The first few national cemeteries were originated during the Civil War. Since they were established for the burial of war casulaties only, the sites were small and concentrated primarily in the Middle Atlantic States and other areas involved in the war.

From 1862 to 1899, 81 national cemeteries were established. During this period the privilege of burial in a national cemetery was largely restricted to personnel dying while on active duty or who were "honorably discharged soldiers, sailors and marines who had served during the late war." (War Between the States.)

Beginning in 1890, however, either by act of Congress or administrative action, the rules for eligibility were expanded to include widows, widowers, spouses, minor children and peacetime veterans.

Since 1890 the population of eligible veterans has increased from 1,341,000 to 22,500,000, excluding peacetime eligibles (U.S. Government figures, December 1961.)

To cope with this increase, 17 national cemeteries were established.

Beverly National Cemetery, in Edgewater Park Township, was, and perhaps still is, the most recent test case for the advocates of maintaining national cemeteries.

Government statistics indicated there were 2,387,000 veterans in New Jersey and Pennsylvania in 1964. This does not include eligible spouses and minor children.

For these eligible persons, the nearest national cemetery will be either Long Island, N.Y., or Baltimore.

While tremors have been raised by Congressmen and veterans' groups in these two States since the announced phasing out of Beverly, other parts of the Nation have been equally disturbed when they viewed the long-range consequences. Protests, appeals, and proposed legislation were made as early as 1961, when the Army filed its report.

Faced with more than 50 bills from every section of the country urging expansion or creation of national cemeteries, Congress yielded to public opinion.

On March 5, 1962, hearings were conducted with all factions invited to testify. The fight was on.

U.S. CEMETERY HEARINGS INCONCLUSIVE—NO VOTE TAKEN, BATTLE IS RENEWED

(By James D. Nicholson)

As the pressure began to mount throughout the Nation for a general review of the national cemetery policy, the Federal Government knew it had to clarify its position once and for all on the issue.

On March 5, 6, and 7, 1962, hearings were conducted—not on specific bills—but on the entire national cemetery program, Representative J. T. Rutherford, Republican, of Texas, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, headed the hearings.

Opposing expansion of the national cemetery program were the executive branch, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Army and representatives of various national cemetery associations.

VETERANS FOR IT

Favoring expansion of the system and creation of new cemeteries were all of the veterans organizations and Congressmen who had introduced legislation from affected areas.

The Government's defense of its policy (or lack of policy as one Congressman went on record as saying) was based on certain contentions:

First was the uneven distribution of the installations.

Col. Harry D. Temple, of the U.S. Army Quartermaster Corps, said:

"About 83 percent of the burials in national cemeteries were those persons who had died within a 50-mile radius of the cemetery. Even so, only 40 percent of the veterans in the radius chose to be interred there."

The other argument was the cost involved.

During the February 1, 1965, hearings—which were simply a rehash of the 1962 hearings—Col. James C. MacFarland, Chief of the Memorial Division of the Department of the Army, supplied some cost estimates.

He said that to put at least one cemetery in every State would cost about $2 billion. This would not include the acquisition of land. Maintenance and operation for existing cemeteries for 1964 came to some $6.5 million.

The ultimate answer that the Government gave veterans when they continued to appeal was a financial stipend or reimbursement in addition to the social security benefits.

ENTITLED TO $250

Veterans burial benefits entitle a veteran who served a tour of duty during wartime the maximum sum of $250. Social security benefits may be added, bringing the total to $450.

Spokesmen for the veterans and Congressmen in favor of expansion saw inconsistencies in the Government's defense and punched at it with some facts and figures of their own.

Uneven distribution: Spokesmen for the veterans pointed out that burials were being directed under an antiquated system geographically one that was devised more than 100 years ago.

BURY 40 A DAY

Miles D. Kennedy, director of the National Legislative Commission of the American Legion said during the 1962 hearings:

"All of the Northeast section of the United States feeds into the cemetery on Long Island, N.Y., and I understand that the average burial rate there is something like 40 per day, 5 days a week."

Later, during the 1965 hearings, Representative WILLIAM T. CAHILL, Republican, of New Jersey, echoed the same sentiments:

"At the Beverly Cemetery in the month of February, out of every eight funerals that took place, seven of those bodies came from outside the State—some from as far away as Georgia.

ANSWER COST CHARGE

Fifty-mile radius: Kennedy said that "today, with the advent of the automobile and better roads, a family would surely travel more than 50 miles to see the grave of a deceased loved one." (Even if national cemeteries were regionally situated.)

Cost: The veterans rebutted the $2 billion price tag. They said it would not be necessary to put a national cemetery in every State. They claimed, as Kennedy mentioned earlier, that even regional cemeteries would be accessible with today's superhighway system. However, a 1962 census revealed that in the adjoining States of Wyoming, Idaho, Utah, and Nevada, there were 260,000 veterans. In none of these States is there a national cemetery.

VETERANS AROUSED

The $250 VA stipend and social security: This was the point that infuriated the veterans the most. They felt they were being bought off. And cheap too, since private burial costs usually exceed this payment, yet the executive branch still refers to the stipend as the most equitable solution.

This payment, according to the Veterans' Administration, is payable only to those who served during a time of war or to those persons who died while in receipt of Government disability compensation.

This presents a striking paradox, leaving a segment of the eligible population without the stipend or cemetery.

As the cemeteries are phased out in various parts of the Nation, there will be large numbers of veterans who will not be eligible for the stipend. These same persons will find it virtually economically infeasible to reach a distant cemetery.

Representative JAMES A. HALEY, Democrat, of Florida, said before the subcommittee in 1962:

"There are approximately 600,000 veterans in Florida." He said that to ship a body from Miami to Fort Barrancas (the State's only national cemetery) involved a greater distance than from Jacksonville to Arlington, Va.

COULD EXCEED ALLOWANCE

Even for an individual getting the stipend and social security, the cost may well exceed the allowance, especially if there is no national cemetery.

In the following States there are no national cemeteries and the average cost of burial, including undertaker services and lots, are: Alaska, $950; Connecticut, $600; Iowa, $850; Maine, $1,250; Nevada, $915, and Wisconsin, $1,100 (1962 rates according to Government figures).

The 1962 and 1965 hearings adjourned on an inconclusive note.

The clerk of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mrs. Nancy Arnold, said recently:

NO ACTION TAKEN

"There was never any committee action (vote) taken after the hearings. When the chairman of the committee wrote to the Bureau of the Budget, the response was unfavorable (Aug. 31, 1965.)

She also said there was "no pending action to be taken in the matter of national cemeteries and no further hearings were scheduled."

But if the administration was resolved to let the matter suffocate in committee, many interested parties were just as determined to make a fight of it.

That battle appeared to have been renewed when Beverly National Cemetery had to close its doors to all but committed graves. (A committed grave is set aside for the spouse of an eligible already interred there.)

The advocates of national cemeteries began to mass their forces.

HAVE TAPS SOUNDED FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES?

(By James D. Nicholson)

Soon after it was announced that Beverly National Cemetery would be closed to new burials, old warriors, gray haired but full of fight, met with area Congressmen in Philadelphia, to map a battle plan for this session of Congress.

Eighty ranking officers of veteran organizations from the area gathered in Philadelphia city hall last month with several Congressmen or their representatives.

They discussed their legislative failures of the past and arrived at several conclusions:

1. No longer could veterans organizations fight a splinter action against the Government's plan to phase out national cemeteries. They must coordinate their efforts, not just locally, but nationwide.
2. A letterwriting campaign would have to be launched, contacting every member of the Subcommittee on National Parks (which conducted the 1962 and 1965 hearings on the national cemetery program policy).
3. The many individual pieces of legislation which urged sectional consideration must be set aside. Congressmen must give their bipartisan support to one bill that will stipulate a governing national policy.

Representative WILLIAM GREEN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who attended the Philadelphia meeting, said that perhaps the best portions of several bills which have already been introduced could be molded into a single bill that the delegation could unite behind.

"The Government should not turn its back on the whole program simply because it is antiquated" GREEN told the vets. "They should first consider revamping the structure before they decide to scrap it."

Most of the other Congressmen at the meeting pledged their bipartisan support to establish a national cemetery program that would be feasible.

Little did many of those veterans present at that meeting realize that a bill asking for the establishment of a National Cemeteries Selection Board had been already introduced on January 4, 1965, by Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

This Selection Board, if approved, would cut through the maze of redtape which presently minimizes the chances of expanding any national cemetery.

Under SAYLOR's bill, the Selection Board would report to Congress the suitability of a proposed site and if the Secretary of the Army concurs with the Board's findings, the Selection Board would be authorized to spend a maximum of $25,000 on its development.

A Washington official said a few weeks ago that, "nothing is expected to happen on this bill either."

Senator John E. Hunt, Republican, of Gloucester, first, said that the matter "was not settled" as far as he was concerned.

As chairman of the Resolution Commission of New Jersey, Hunt and his commission were recently informed by the Army that the Government could not part with any land in the Fort Dix vicinity for an extension of Beverly.

"I plan to file an interim report shortly," Hunt said. "Not a final one."

Although most of the concern over national cemeteries is concentrated in the Northeast now, other regions of the country are expected to take up the fight as national cemeteries in their districts are filled to capacity and closed to new burials.

Government figures, based on the estimated closing dates of national cemeteries, indicate that by 1970 there will be 12 national cemeteries with available burial space to accommodate 40 million eligible persons in the United States.

Criticisms of the Government's adamant refusal to move legislation beyond even the subcommittee stage, were sounded during the Philadelphia meeting.

John Cramer, commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the State of New Jersey, said a few days after the meeting:

"I do believe that should the day come when the doors of our national cemeteries close, that is the day we become an ungrateful Nation."

But the strongest sentiment which prevailed that day was the wish that many veterans had, and have had since the days of ancient Greece, and that is to be buried among comrades in arms.

Charles H. Harget, U.N. Navy, retired, a past president of the Fleet Reserve Association, drew a rousing applause from the Philadelphia assembly when he said:

"It strikes me as odd that whenever economy becomes the watchword, the poor bear the brunt of the load, the veteran in particular.

"We're spending billions throughout the world trying to make friends and all we get is spit in the face, and our American flag trampled."

Representative CAHILL, Republican, of New Jersey, stated:

"I have strong feelings in favor of remedial legislation to provide for the expansion of national cemeteries, but unless the attitude of the present administration changes, the future outlook is not very encouraging."

Many other persons in Congress would concur with Representative CAHILL's observation. Especially those Congressmen who have watched their bills become lost in the catacombs of committee and never brought to a vote.

The time-honored tradition of being buried among comrades in arms may soon be a thing of the past.

The Johnson administration appears to have sounded the mournful cry of taps for national cemeteries.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING THE INDIAN LONG-TERM LEASING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9070) to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1938, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I interrogate the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] on this bill?

Mr. Speaker, I notice that this land that we are going to make available for business purposes is 35 miles from Reno, Nev. Will the gentleman from Colorado tell the House what type of business enterprise it is contemplated will be installed around this very wonderful lake?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, they will be recreational facilities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Just recreational facilities?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is understood that the tribe of Indians which has this area will enter into contracts for the construction and operation of facilities that may be used by visitors to the area.

Unless the tribe has authority for executing lease contracts for a longer period than present authority permits, they will not be able to get the financing that is necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman sure that in this area, which is 35 miles from Reno, the business enterprises to be installed at this lake will be not just an extension of the gambling casinos and other activities that are taking place in Reno; that it will not be just another "little Reno" around this lake?

Mr. ASPINALL. My personal evaluation is that these would not be the interests with which the tribe of Indians would contract.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Another question: Will safeguards be placed around the leaders of these tribes so that when they make these business contracts they will not be the victims of designing people, or fall into the hands of the wrong people?

Mr. ASPINALL. I can assure my colleague that the Secretary of the Interior will continue to have jurisdiction over this, as the guardian, as it were, of these people, and that they will be protected. That is the reason for the protection that we have thrown up around the Indians throughout the years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with that explanation, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), as amended, is hereby amended as follows: After the words "Fort Mojave Reservation", insert the words "the Pyramid Lake Reservation,".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 9070) was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

PROBLEMS OF MANAGING THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most overlooked aspects of economic policy concerns management of the public debt. An article in the Wall Street Journal on March 30 by Richard F. Janssen performs a useful service in airing some of the pros and cons of removing the interest ceiling on Government bonds. In view of current inflation, this is one of the most important issues of debt management and should receive a thorough discussion.

In the 1966 report of the Joint Economic Committee, the minority members discussed the problems of debt management and unanimously recommend removal of the interest rate ceiling. The Democrats on the committee said that the ceiling should be retained, as Mr. Janssen points out in his article.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the Wall Street Journal article in the Record and the excerpt from the 1966 Annual Report of the Joint Economic Committee in which the minority members discuss debt management issues.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 30, 1966]

Managing the Debt—Treasury Is in no Hurry To Abandon 4¼ Percent Bond Rate Ceiling

(By Richard F. Janssen)

Washington.—Can a rusty financial relic of World War I occupy a prominent place in the Johnson administration's arsenal of newfangled "new economics" weaponry?

You wouldn't think so, especially when the result is to deprive the administration of some of its cherished "flexibility." But because it happens to serve the Johnsonian cause of easy credit, the old weapon isn't apt to be scrapped very readily—if at all.

The device is, of course, the 1917 law that keeps the Treasury from offering more than a 4¼ percent interest rate on bonds. Debt managers can't sell a new long-term bond at a rate that low when investors can buy an older one whose price has gone down enough to yield them as much as 5 percent.

Normally, the inability to borrow money whose repayment can be postponed until distant decades would be considered a cruel and unusual handicap for Treasury debt managers, and certainly they viewed the prospect with dread from afar. But now that it's a reality, Washington's complaints haven't been any more ringing than Treasury Secretary Fowler's muffled February remark to a congressional questioner that he'd eventually have "some suggestions" to make.

Now aides hint that, if the Treasury comes back at all, it'll be with a plan that offers congressional sharpshooters only a blurry target—nothing as drastic as outright repeal of the interest rate ceiling.

To propose repeal, it's reasoned, would only invite an unseemly fight with the President's own "easy money" allies in Congress. The administration's reluctance was reinforced when the Democratic majority of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee warned that it "would be a serious mistake to remove the long-standing ceiling." Its very existence, the Democrats said, "is a clear symbol of the Nation's intention that interest rates be restored to a more reasonable level in the future." As if to add to the awkwardness of any such administration request, it was the committee's Republican minority that urged repeal to "facilitate noninflationary, long-term Government financing."

THE REPUBLICAN POSITION

As expressed by the Republicans, the usual argument is that in times of a boomy economy, the Government should sell long-term debt that is most apt to be bought from savings, either of individuals or of institutions such as life insurance companies. By selling short-term debt (which isn't subject to the ceiling), the reasoning goes, the Government is apt to appeal more to banks as customers, and their purchases are considered inflationary because they pay for them by creating deposits, thus adding to the money supply.

"Sure. That's economics 1," snaps an administration man. "But it isn't practical in the present situation."

The whole capital market is so tight these days, he says, that it wouldn't be smart for the Treasury to sell long-term debt anyhow. "Just think," he muses, "what Congress would say if we did have the freedom to sell a 40-year bond at 5 percent and we went ahead and did it. We could catch an awful lot of heat for committing the Government to pay that high a rate for so far into the future, when we might be able to wait about a year and pay a lot of lower rate." Furthermore, other officials worry about what the real estate industry would think of the Treasury competing for long-term money that might otherwise go into mortgages for the floundering housing market.

Thus, some hopefully less controversial steps are being talked of in the Treasury.

One is a "for the duration" approach, which would entail asking Congress to free the Treasury from the ceiling until the Vietnam conflict subsides and a less steamy domestic economy halts the interest-rate escalation. By draping higher rates on Government bonds with the bunting of patriotic wartime sacrifices, some officials figure, they could more readily win relief from the ceiling and then willingly slip back under when it's comfortable to do so once more.

Or, the Treasury could ask Congress to raise the ceiling for the duration, perhaps up to 5¼ percent. This could have the psychological effect on the markets of sending rates the rest of the way up to the ceiling, but it wouldn't be as bad as permanently placing the ceiling higher, one planner says. Many investors would rush to buy new Treasury bonds at the higher rates before the ceiling plunks back down to 4¼ percent again, he figures, and the consequent surge of demand would push up bond prices, thus reducing the yields somewhat.

Maybe the Treasury would couch a relief request in terms of legally defining the word "bond." The Second Liberty Bond Act which created the ceiling applies it only to bonds, and by long tradition, though not by law, the Treasury won't call one of its securities a bond unless it matures in more than 5 years. So one idea is to have Congress say a Treasury security isn't a bond unless it runs for more than 10 years, doubling the debt-seller's span of ceiling-free years. Some analysts doubt that this would be enough to block out the banks as customers, though, and one adds that "the pension funds and insurance companies don't really get very interested in anything shorter than about 20 years." A related twist would be to redefine Treasury notes (to which the ceiling doesn't apply) so that they could have maturities of 10 or 15 years, instead of the present 5-year limit.

But try any of these, frets one official "and we'll still have Congressmen saying, 'You mean you'd really want to sell long-term bonds in this kind of market?' "

A BACK-ALLEY ROUTE

Conceivably, the Treasury could bypass the ceiling by a more devious back-alley route, and perhaps even ask Congress' approval of the maneuver. At least according to a 1961 opinion of then-Attorney General Robert Kennedy, the 1917 law applies only to the coupon rate on the bonds. So the Treasury could issue a new 4¼-percent bond at less than face value. Coupon clippers would still get only $4.25 a year on each $100 face value, but they would have paid the Treasury a discount price of perhaps $99 per $100, thus bringing the actual yield on the money they've invested to something higher than 4¼ percent.

Secretary Fowler, and Secretary Dillon before him, have insisted they wouldn't deign to travel that route, at least not very far. When the question comes up, Treasury men still recite as their basic position the Dillon declaration that he wouldn't sell bonds "at any substantial discount, without reviewing this matter with the Congress." "Substantial" is defined as anything over 50 cents per $100, Frederick L. Deming, the Treasury's Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, has said; that would only be enough to boost the interest yield by about one-sixteenth of a percentage point.

Deep discounts would have some political drawbacks, too. If the Treasury sold bonds at, say, a discount price of $90 per $100 of face value, it would only take in the $90 but the national debt would go up by the full $100. Joint Economic Committee Chairman Wright Patman has already said such an approach would be "intellectually dishonest;" while it would be "perfectly legal," a Government economist adds, "the only problem is that any Treasury Secretary who decided to do it would spend the rest of his life in congressional hearings."

When they pore over possible routes around the rate barrier, though, Treasury men can't help wondering if the trip will really be necessary at all. True, they're always loath to see the average length of the national debt shrinking, since this means big chunks of it loom up for replacement more often, increasing chances that huge amounts of borrowing must be done at difficult times. By the end of January the average maturity of the salable Treasury securities in private hands (some $217 billion, which doesn't include savings bonds and some special issues sold only to Federal trust funds) was down to 4 years and 10 months from 5 years and 5 months a year before. But it's still respectably longer than the 4 years and 4 months average at the end of 1960 just before the Kennedy-Johnson team moved in. "We could go on for another year without selling any long debt," says one specialist, although he concedes this would make it tougher for future debt stretchers.

FINANCING OUTSIDE THE TREASURY

One reason for the relatively comfortable feeling about the interest-rate ceiling is the Johnson administration's increasing use of a financing method that operates outside the Treasury. Agencies such as the Federal National Mortgage Association sell part interests in loans they hold, cutting their need to draw money from the Treasury and thus cutting the Treasury's need to borrow from the public. Because the law doesn't limit the interest rates on these non-Treasury issues, Fannie Mae was able to sell certificates in mid-March paying as much as 5½ percent interest and with maturities as long as 15 years. If the Government weren't counting on taking in $4.2 billion from selling such "participations" in the next fiscal year (compared with something closer to $1.8 billion of budget deficit to be financed through selling regular new Treasury issues), there'd be a good deal more pressure to poke holes through the ceiling.

Perhaps more important is the administration's unwillingness to make a move that the financial community—and the Federal Reserve Board—would interpret as more or less permanent acceptance of the present high level of interest rates. Yet, as one skeptical official confides:

"Interest rates used to go down sometimes because we had recession. I'm not sure how we'll get them down if we succeed in keeping the economy going up all the time."

The administration philosophy is still, according to one strategist, that "monetary policy must be reversible." Secretary Fowler recently spelled it out for a congressional committee, expressing hope that after Vietnam "we could again look forward to a time in which the cost of money would turn down." The United States has, the Secretary said, "characteristically been a low-cost-of-money country because of the very capable and effective capital-generating institutions that we have in our economy. Being able to get money at a very reasonable cost is a real national asset."

Certainly, the White House may decide that the exigencies of managing the national debt dictate doing away with the interest rate ceiling. But the symbol of a cherished cause would be given up only grudgingly, like those aging artillery pieces on the courthouse lawn.

An Excerpt of Minority Views From the 1966 Report of the Joint Economic Committee

D. DEBT MANAGEMENT

One of the most important but least debated economic issues is the impact of debt management on monetary policy. Although the Treasury-Federal Reserve accord of 1951 was designed to free monetary policy from the iron grip of debt management, the flexibility of open market operations is still impaired to some extent by Treasury debt financing. If monetary policy is to serve its purposes effectively, considerably more understanding is needed of the relationship that exists between the operations of the Federal Reserve and the debt financing of the Treasury. We have consistently advocated that the Joint Economic Committee study this issue as a part of its continuing interest in the tools of monetary policy.

Recent developments point up our concern. Since mid-1965 changes in the composition of the debt have tended to be stimulative because newly issued debt has been relatively short term. The legal interest rate limit on long-term Government bonds is no longer competitive, forcing the Government to borrow in the form of "near money" securities with short or intermediate maturities.

The legal interest ceiling has also affected the term structure of interest rates. Yields on Treasury bills and intermediate-term securities have risen abnormally relative to yields on long-term Government bonds.

We believe that the administration must recommend immediate lifting of the 4¼-percent ceiling on Government bonds. Removal of the ceiling would facilitate noninflationary, long-term Government financing and at lower interest costs than are now possible through financing at shorter term.

ADMINISTRATION PURSUES A POLICY OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC ISOLATIONISM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear that the web of controls and restrictions erected by the Johnson administration over the right of Americans to invest and travel abroad is likely to be tightened again this year.

An article by Joseph Slevin in the Washington Post of April 13 reveals that the administration is now considering a head tax on travel by U.S. citizens overseas, perhaps in the form of a $10 a day levy on visits outside the country. Also under consideration is "putting added muscle" into the so-called voluntary controls on bank lending and business investment overseas.

The imposition of even more stringent controls would signal the complete bankruptcy of the administration's policy to deal with the chronic deficit in our balance of payments. For years the administration has promised that just one more dose of restrictive medicine would produce balance-of-payments equilibrium. The Congress and the American people have gone along with this policy of financial isolationism in the hope that short-term expedients might produce some lasting results.

Promises that new restraints would produce equilibrium have proven false. But the promises continue to be made, and the controls continue to be extended and added to.

The interest equalization tax, once billed as temporary, has already been extended once and can now be considered virtually a permanent part of our tax structure. Efforts to limit tourist spending have been tightened up, and foreign aid has been increasingly tied to U.S. purchases to the detriment of a sound development assistance program. The "voluntary" capital restraints program was extended 1 year and its hoped-for termination date of next February has already been abandoned. Secretary Fowler said in a recent speech in Phoenix, Ariz., that the program would be continued indefinitely, pending the conclusion of the Vietnam war.

The latest flurry of alarm over the balance-of-payments prospects for 1966 comes only weeks after Secretary Fowler triumphantly announced that our accounts would be in "approximate" balance for the year. Now the word among experts within the executive branch is that the deficit this year is actually likely to be nearly 50 percent larger than the $1.3 billion deficit for last year. The most alarming aspect of this picture is that while we may make some temporary gains because of controls, our basic competitive position in world trade—the crucial barometer watched by foreigners—is deteriorating under the impact of domestic inflation.

The administration refuses to recognize the close interrelationship between the various items in our balance of payments. Shutting off foreign investment not only reduces our income from abroad in future years, but it also holds down current exports. This is part of the explanation for the shocking drop of $1.9 billion in our trade surplus last year. A reduction in tourist spending will likewise reduce foreign dollar reserves and result in a smaller volume of foreign travel to and purchases from the United States.

History demonstrates over and over again that controls only beget more controls. As one set of controls proves futile, new ones are developed. Foreign countries ultimately retaliate and finally world trade, travel and investment—with all of their political and economic benefits—is reduced to a trickle.

Ironically, these restrictive actions at home are coming precisely when the administration is engaged in critical trade negotiations in Geneva and in discussions with the Group of Ten on reform of the international monetary system. Little wonder that these negotiations are making so little progress. The administration is slowly whittling away our standing as a key currency country and our role of world financial leadership. No policy could be better calculated to produce this result than placing limitations on the free and unencumbered use of the dollar.

Make no mistake about the fact that the administration is leading us down the road of financial and economic isolationism. It mystifies me how so many of those who profess to have liberal economic views can sit silently by while two decades of progress toward building a more open international economy are eroded away by the administration's inept handling of our foreign economic policy.

How long will it take this administration to realize that controls are not only futile but damaging to ourselves and to other nations? That point has been made repeatedly by scholars, most recently by the National Industrial Conference Board with respect to the capital controls program.

We have an opportunity today to take action that would be appropriate for both our balance of payments and our domestic economy. This calls for Government spending restraint to cool the domestic boom and stop cost and price inflation. Unless this is done—and done soon—we will face increasingly severe economic problems both at home and abroad.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the article by Joseph Slevin from the Washington Post of April 13 in the Record at this point.

Per Diem Levy Suggested: Tourist Curbs Considered Anew in Deficit Strategy

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

The administration is readying fresh measures to cut the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

A special Cabinet Committee will discuss the new plans at a White House meeting that is scheduled for next week. Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler heads the Cabinet group.

The proposals range from slapping a bitterly controversial head tax on U.S. tourists to a stepped-up effort to chop military and foreign aid outlays. The officials also are talking about tightening the present restrictions on bank overseas loans and on direct business investment in foreign projects.

"The severity of the new curbs will depend on how bad the payments situation looks," a high official says. "If it's bad enough, we will have to cut tourist spending. We can't ask businessmen and banks to do more unless we do something about the tourists."

The administration is actively discussing the need for more curbs because the U.S. balance of payments is not showing an improvement that had been expected at the start of 1966.

The best current guess is that the United States will have a deficit of at least $1.25 billion this year if no additional restrictive steps are taken. Some Government analysts gloomily are predicting that the red-ink entry will jump all the way to $2 billion.

> A high administration source predicts that the group will urge Mr. Johnson to support a tourist tax if a $2 billion deficit seems likely but that it will content itself with less abrasive measures if this shortfall is closer to $1.25 billion.
>
> The administration considered adopting a tourist headtax when Mr. Johnson put forward his emergency payments program 14 months ago. It quickly abandoned the idea, however, in the face of angry protests from travelers, airlines, steamship companies, and travel agencies.
>
> The simplest tourist restriction would impose a set tax, say $100, on each person who travels abroad.
>
> A new administration wrinkle would provide for a per diem levy, instead. The tax could be set at $10 a day, for example, and a traveler then would have to pay $10 for each day that he spends outside the United States.
>
> The expectation is that the Cabinet Committee will respond to a $1.25 billion deficit forecast by recommending that Mr. Johnson call for tougher dollar outlay holddown by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and foreign aid administrator David Bell. In addition, it is anticipated that the group will propose that the President try to save several hundred million dollars more by putting additional muscle into the voluntary controls that now are in force on overseas bank lending and on business direct investment in foreign projects.

EVIDENCE OF THE PRESSURE OF DEFENSE PURCHASING ON DOMESTIC PRODUCERS AND THE ECONOMY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the national economy has been operating on a wartime basis since September 1965, when monthly expenditures from the Federal administrative budget leaped up to a new high. Expenditures for that month reached $9.5 billion, the highest level of monthly spending in the Nation's history except for June 1964, which resulted from end-of-fiscal-year spending pressure.

Spending since September has continued at high monthly levels, levels higher than average monthly expenditures since 1961. In October 1965, spending was $8.8 billion, in November $9.1 billion, in December $9.4 billion, in January 1966 $8.8 billion and in February $8.2 billion. In previous years average monthly expenditures were about $7.5 billion.

These high levels of Government expenditures have been in part due to spending to pay for "guns" for the war in Vietnam, in combination with new expenditures for domestic "butter." They have resulted in widely noted increases in the cost of living, increases most evidenced in rising prices for basic consumer items. If the Johnson administration continues its high spending the pressures now generating price increases and shortages in skilled manpower, essential raw materials, and plant capacity will surely continue. Republicans rightly argue that the proper measures to control these inflationary pressures are not specific price control measures justified on the hazy concept of wage-price guideposts, but cuts in redundant and nonessential spending.

The Nation, we argue, can afford both guns and butter. But it cannot afford rancid butter: Redundancy, poorly planned and poorly administered programs and unnecessary frills in programs. Republicans have made many concrete suggestions for areas in which to withhold or cut spending. One area Republicans have not recommended, it is important to note, is in the wages and salaries of Federal employees. Here increases are necessary to compensate for the loss of purchasing power already experienced through inflation. So long as the administration fails to perform its major and historical economic function, namely, to preserve the integrity of the dollar, we must permit our people to preserve their standard of living by cost-of-living increases in their earnings or retirement benefits.

The theory that the Vietnam war has played a major part in influencing the domestic economy has been disputed. One factor I would point out to those who do not agree that war spending has had a deep impact is the difficulty businessmen are having in meeting increasing Government defense orders. Cotton textiles is a specific area where defense demand for certain staple fabrics has overstrained capacity to produce. Unknown to many of us, businessmen face a great complex of procedures when they supply Federal orders, and these procedures are confusing businessmen newly entering the defense supply field.

In response to demands from business, the Commerce Department has scheduled 14 meetings across the Nation at which defense contractors will be briefed on the operation of the defense materials system and priorities.

The Commerce Department's defense materials system and priorities regulate the flow of materials and products to military, atomic energy and space programs and assist defense contractors and suppliers to complete their contract schedules on time.

These meetings were arranged at the request of businessmen throughout the country who hold or expect to get defense contracts, the Department of Commerce said when scheduling the meetings. Businessmen are seeking answers to problems created in their operations by increased military procurement. Industry's questions, reports the Commerce Department, involve the use of priority rated orders under which contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers obtain materials, supplies, and components for Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, and National Space and Aeronautics Agency programs.

This activity is a concrete example that Vietnam spending is having a deep structural effect on the national economy. It is not only generating much new demand, but creating shifts in essential material uses which will have much longer term effects in promoting use of new and alternative materials. I urge that economists and the administration pay much closer attention to these basic economic changes it is directly influencing.

ADMINISTRATION POLICIES ACCELERATE MIGRATION OF FARMERS FROM RURAL AMERICA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 8, the House Minority Task Force on Agriculture issued a statement charging that administration policies are accelerating the migration of farmers from rural America.

In that statement we expressed our deep concern over recent Government actions which, first, lowered the price of hides to livestock producers by limiting exports; second, cost grain farmers millions of dollars in lost income due to heavy dumping of CCC grains; third, held down prices to thousands of sugar producers by opening the door to greater sugar imports; and fourth, threaten to substantially affect the dairy industry further by allowing the expansion of dairy imports. And, we also made note of the fact that now, while pork imports are going up and hog prices are going down, no action is being taken by the administration.

A recent article in the New York Times carried the headline "Freeman Elated Over Price Drop." This is the first time in history, Mr. Speaker, that a Secretary of Agriculture has gone on record as being happy over a drop in farm prices—an attitude which I find really incredible. Perhaps this is part of the reason why over half a million farms have disappeared since he took office, and a clue to why we will see another 100,000 evaporate this year.

It is clear that the administration, in hurriedly looking around for a scapegoat to protect itself from consumer wrath, has chosen to pin the blame for rising living costs upon farmers rather than upon the President's own inflationary policies. Our task force directly challenges the administration's position that rising living costs can be checked by lowering the prices of farm commodities. It is important to note that 61 percent of the cost of the food in the housewife's shopping basket is added after it leaves the farm.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's position here is hypocritical at best. While the President has set wage increase guidelines of 3.2 percent for the rest of the economy, he is depressing prices to the farmer—who even now is earning only about 60 percent as much as the average city worker.

The administration must be reminded that it has an obligation and a responsibility to the farmer. The task force calls on the administration to declare that it will immediately end these price depressing practices which are so inconsistent with the best interests of both farmer and consumer.

Following is the full text of the task force statement:

STATEMENT BY THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE, APRIL 8, 1966

Last year this task force issued a statement deploring the harmful effects—in both the rural and city areas—of the accelerating exodus from the farms of rural America. In that statement we registered our profound concern over the administration's contention, as expressed by both President Johnson and his then Director of the Budget, Kermit Gordon, that 2½ million additional farmers—more than 9 million men, women, and children—would have to leave the land.

MARKET OUTLOOK

In his budget message last year, President Johnson said: "In view of the market outlook for farm commodities at home and abroad, farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than about 1 million farm families, even with continued Government assistance." The President's reference to the "market outlook for farm commodities" was particularly significant, since it has been through Agriculture Secretary Freeman's increasing manipulation of and growing control over the farm marketplace that the administration has managed so successfully to beat down farm prices and keep them at depressed levels. It is easy to see that the most important factors involved in driving our farmers from their land are in fact those economic forces which are being created and fostered by the administration in its deliberate efforts to reduce farm prices and income.

REVERSE MIGRATION

Now, in apparent response to the concern which has been expressed by this task force and many other people over the continuing migration from rural America to our cities, Secretary Freeman has come forward with the suggestion that it might be a good thing if this migration were to be reversed. We heartily concur with this suggestion, but find it highly inconsistent with his policies and actions which have, up to now, achieved exactly the opposite effect.

The record reveals, for instance, that since Secretary Freeman took office, more than half a million farms have disappeared, and about 2½ million men, women, and children have left the farming population. This year approximately 100,000 more farms will evaporate from the face of rural America.

It is not difficult to understand why the farmers are leaving their fields, for the Johnson administration and Secretary Freeman have consistently pursued policies which have depressed the prices of farm commodities. In the recent past, for example, the administration has taken action in four major areas: grains, sugar, hides, and dairy products.

GRAIN DUMPING

Huge quantities of Government-owned grains have been dumped on the market in an effort to depress both grain and livestock prices. Large amounts of corn have been sold from CCC bins, lowering the market price to the farmer. Commodity Credit Corporation wheat has also been used to depress prices, and often just the threat of a Government sale has caused prices to nosedive.

Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, confessed in a nationwide television interview on March 10 that the heavy corn sales were made to "hold down the price of corn. The Government's acquired large stocks of corn in its past price support operation," he said, "now we're releasing them into the market."

Secretary Freeman, however, would not admit that the purpose of the sales was to hold down prices, and referred to such charges as "political noise." His reticence may have been prompted by the desire to avoid a barrage of criticism such as he received last year when he testified before the House Agriculture Committee that the purpose of heavy CCC feed-grain sales in 1961–62 was "to move our prices down far enough so that they would be way below the support level, the loan level, so that we could thereby get compliance."

SUGAR

The administration moved to hold down the prices which thousands of domestic sugarbeet and sugarcane growers could receive for their crops, by opening the door to unlimited imports of foreign sugar during the remainder of the first quarter of the calendar year.

HIDES

The prices of hides to cattlemen were lowered as much as $3 to $4 a head by the administration's sudden action to limit exports. Just 2 years ago when heavy cattle imports glutted the U.S. market and low prices were forcing many cattlemen out of business, Secretary of Commerce Hodges advised the farmers to quit whining and go out and look for new foreign markets for beef and beef products. Livestock producers carefully built up an export market for hides, only to have the administration sharply restrict it.

DAIRY

Dairy farmers, also, have felt the lash of the economic whip. In his 1967 budget, the President seeks an 80-percent slash in school milk funds, which would drop milk consumption by schoolchildren fully one-third, or approximately 1 billion half pints of milk per year. Obviously, the effect of this quantity of milk moving into the marketplace instead of the schools, can only be to hold down dairy prices.

In addition, the administration has to date refused to implement authority in present law to make open market dairy purchases for domestic and foreign donation programs. Also, the Armed Forces have reportedly been ordered in some cases to decrease the use of butter, and in other instances to substitute margarine for butter in rations for military personnel. These actions tend to keep dairy prices from rising.

Finally, dairy farmers received little encouragement from the recent price support and class I price announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture. The prospect of expanded dairy imports being used to force downward the price of milk, butter, and cheese is disturbing.

FARMER SACRIFICED

The Johnson administration apparently feels that the farmer should be sacrificed on the altar of cheap food. The truth of the matter is, however, that neither farmers nor consumers have benefited from this policy of depressing farm prices.

The administration, hurriedly looking around for a scapegoat to protect itself from consumer wrath, has chosen to pin the blame for rising living costs upon farmers rather than upon the President's own inflationary policies.

FOOD COSTS

Housewives are painfully aware of the sharp increases in food prices, especially meat. Many believe the farmer is the principal beneficiary. Yet it is a fact that 61 percent of the cost of the food in the housewife's shopping basket is added after it leaves the farm. Through the years, higher processing, packaging, transportation, and handling costs, along with higher taxes and wages, have accounted for the major upward trend in food prices, as can readily be seen from the table below:

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Total marketing bill	Farm value	Civilian expenditures for farm foods
1950	23.9	17.6	41.5
1955	32.0	18.3	50.3
1960	41.0	20.9	61.9
1965	48.2	24.5	72.7

Source: USDA, Economic Research Service.

Let's compare farm prices and retail food prices of February 1951, when the Korean war was at its height, with today's Vietnam war prices.

U.S. Department of Agriculture figures show that average prices received by farmers for the commodities they market were 13 percent lower in February 1966 than they were in the same month of 1951.

On the other hand, Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show that in 1951, it took $9.54 to buy at retail the same food items and amounts which today cost $11.10—an increase of more than 16 percent.

INFLATION NOT FARM PRICES

With farm prices down 13 percent and retail food prices up 16 percent between America's last two wars, clearly one must look beyond the farmer to find the villain in the piece. The real villain is inflation—creeping inflation at first and now rapidly increasing inflation. These facts have had ample confirmation in the events of recent weeks.

In the case of hides, for example, the administration justified its imposition of export controls on American hides by claiming the action would "prevent a substantial rise in shoe prices. Increases in hide and leather prices," they said, "would have forced an increase in shoe prices of 5 percent or more." Since the export limitation was applied, hide prices to farmers have dropped 15 to 20 percent, but shoe prices are going up 3 to 8 percent anyway.

HIDE COSTS NOT THE PROBLEMS

Particularly revealing is the comment of one shoe industry official who said that "The hide market can go down even lower levels and the prices of shoes is still going to go up. Regardless of the cost of hides, the price of shoes must go up to maintain already low industry profit margins." Industry sources said that increased operating and labor costs have been a primary factor in the shoe price increases.

In the case of pork, hog prices to farmers have declined as much as 15 percent in recent weeks, with no noticeable effect on retail prices. All of the costs which are added from the time the hog leaves the farm until the consumer buys a pound of bacon or pork chops at the retail meat counter continue to mount.

And just last week when the Labor Department announced a major cost-of-living rise for February, Arnold Chase, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics told a news conference that since the middle of February the wholesale price index for farm and processed foods had fallen by one-half of 1 percent, and admitted that the drop in wholesale prices may not have "an immediate impact" on prices paid by consumers. Some of the lower wholesale prices may never reach consumers at all if middlemen increase their take, he said.

HAPPY OVER LOW PRICES

And yet with all this evidence on record, with the farmer earning only about 60 percent as much as the average city worker, with inflationary pressures pushing farm production costs to an all-time record high, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman continues to use his authority to drive the prices of farm commodities downward, and is genuinely elated when he succeeds, as this headline of a recent article in the New York Times reveals—"Freeman Elated Over Price Drops." Meanwhile, other administration spokesmen such as Gardner Ackley continue to claim that the cost-of-living rise can be halted by further depressing farm prices.

For the administration to take such a position is hypocritical at best, and will have tragic consequences for the farmers and businessmen of rural America. The President has set a wage increase guideline of 3.2 percent for the rest of the economy, but is depressing prices to the farmer.

ADMINISTRATION NOT CONCERNED

It seems quite obvious that neither Secretary Freeman nor anyone else in the Johnson administration is even halfway concerned about stemming the migration of farmers and rural Americans to the cities, for if they are, surely they would make use of the most obvious and practical key to the solution of the problem by immediately calling a halt to their price depressing practices. Secretary Freeman's call to reverse the migration would be a welcome note indeed if it were at all believable, but it just doesn't fit into the tune which the Secretary and the rest of the Johnson administration have been playing for so long.

FIRST STEP

The House Republican Task Force on Agriculture enthusiastically endorses the concept of reversing the migration and revitalizing rural America. As we pointed out last year, the decline of rural America is harmful to the entire Nation. But we cannot emphasize too strongly that the first and most important step in "rural revitalization" must be to allow the producers of food and fiber a fair return for their efforts. The Johnson administration has it in its power to do something constructive for the farmer. It can do this by declaring that from this day forward the administration will no longer engage in any price practices inconsistent with the best interests of the farmer—we urge that the administration make this declaration now.

A PROPOSAL TO PROTECT SAVERS AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is indicative of the administration's conflicting and inconsistent economic policies that, on the one hand, President Johnson counsels us all to restrain our urge to spend, while on the other hand, the income tax system has a built-in bias against saving in inflationary times. The incentive to save is certainly weakened when price increases reduce the value of the dollars we set aside and then the interest received on bonds, savings-and-loan shares and time deposits is taxed as fully as real income. It is most unfair to require the saver to pay a tax on that portion of interest he receives which is purely an inflation premium. It also makes little economic sense to discourage saving when a higher level could dampen inflationary demand and at a lower level of interest rates than might otherwise prevail.

Yale professor of economics, Henry C. Wallich, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Eisenhower, offers a proposal worthy of close consideration. Professor Wallich notes that anyone owning income-producing real property is allowed to deduct depreciation of this property from his income for tax purposes. The rationale is that this property depreciates through wear and tear and can be thought of as diminishing the taxpayer's true income. Similarly, income-producing financial property can be said to depreciate by the amount of inflation annually, also diminishing income. In fairness to savers, therefore, the definition of depreciable property ought to be extended to savings deposits and similar assets.

Part of the high interest rates during times of inflation can be thought of as an inflation premium, compensating the saver for the loss in purchasing power resulting from rising price levels, Professor Wallich notes. And it is this premium which should be treated exactly as a depreciation allowance for other property. A taxpayer should be simply allowed to deduct the year's rise in the consumer price index from the average interest he received from his savings and pay tax only on the residual. For instance, if the 2 percent inflation which the Secretary of the Treasury has called tolerable becomes a continual occurrence, then the individual who receives 5 percent interest on his savings deposit should have to pay income tax only on 3 percent interest.

This provision can rationally be made only applicable to individual savers since business in general receives little of its income in interest and banks and other financial institutions are in unique positions. Pension fund and life insurance benefits payable to individuals should also be included if possible and some provision would have to be made for the interest payments which are presently tax deductible.

Professor Wallich maintains that the revenue cost to the Treasury would not be exorbitant. Based on 1963 reported taxable interest, applicable tax rates, the rise in the price index and an interest rate of 4 percent, the amount might be $1.25 billion. Inasmuch as the proposal would induce greater individual saving, the revenue loss would make a definite contribution to fighting inflation while at the same time benefiting those particularly unfairly hit by price level increases.

Now is the time to begin consideration of a tax adjustment to benefit our savers. When the current inflationary boom subsides, fairness to our savers deserves high priority, and the Congress should be prepared to act with dispatch. We might even find that depreciation for savers becomes a useful addition to our battery of economic stabilizers. Certainly it is less oppressive to encourage greater personal saving than to increase Government income taxes.

Under unanimous consent, I include Professor Wallich's description of his proposal, published in Newsweek magazine, April 4, 1966, in the RECORD at this point:

DEPRECIATION FOR SAVERS

(By Henry C. Wallich)

As the traditional spring rite of filling in form 1040 begins, taxpayers will be looking for legitimate ways of holding down their taxable income. One such device is to deduct depreciation on income-producing property. This is open not only to businessmen, but to anyone who owns income-producing property, such as a rental dwelling. The law reasons that this kind of property depreciates through wear and tear. The taxpayer's true income is diminished by depreciation. Hence the law permits depreciation to be deducted in computing taxable income.

This option is not open to the many millions of taxpayers whose income-producing property takes the form of savings deposits or of bonds yielding interest. The law here reasons that assets fixed in dollar terms are not subject to depreciation. Unfortunately, the law is wrong.

Under the policies the Government is pursuing today, a steady depreciation of the dollar is very probable. The Secretary of the Treasury has said that a 2 percent rate of inflation, although unwelcome and undesirable, is tolerable. In fairness to savers, therefore, the definition of depreciable property ought to be extended to savings deposits and similar assets.

INFLATION PREMIUM

If depreciation of the dollar were recognized as a legitimate deduction, savers would gain somewhat better protection against inflation. Present high interest rates already contain what may be called an inflation premium. This compensates the saver in some measure for depreciation of principal. But the premium is partly nullified if he has to pay taxes upon it. The tax collector should treat the inflation premium exactly as he treats the depreciation allowance for other property.

To compute the depreciation allowance for savings would be a good deal simpler than for most other depreciable property. The rate if inflation is known from the consumer price index. The information could be supplied by the Treasury with form 1040.

The taxpayer would also have to know the rate of interest he received on his savings. In the case of bonds, this is stated on the bond and the coupon. In the case of interest on deposits or savings-and-loan shares, the bank or savings-and-loan association could inform the saver of the average rate he received. Since he already gets a statement of his total interest receipts, supplying this information would be no great burden.

Then, if the taxpayer found that the rate of inflation was 2 percent and he received interest at 5 percent, he would deduct the 2 percent and arrive at an income for tax purposes of 3 percent.

BUSINESS TREATMENT

Complications probably would arise if the proposal were to be extended to businesses. For most businesses, interest in any event is not an important form of income. Banks and other financial institutions are in a special position that makes the present proposal inapplicable. Hence the proposal should be limited to individual taxpayers. Life insurance and pension-fund benefits payable to individuals, however, should be included, if the computational difficulties can be overcome.

Whether a corresponding adjustment should be made for interest paid by individuals is an open question. Interest payments now are tax deductible. In time of inflation, this conveys a double benefit; the tax deduction and the reduction in the real value of the debt. In fairness, the tax deduction ought to be reduced in proportion to the depreciation of the debt. For home mortgages, the amounts involved would be easy to compute. They would be almost impossible to compute, however, for consumer credit with its many hidden charges.

The revenue cost of this proposal would not be exorbitant. Based on 1963 reported taxable interest, applicable tax rates, the rise in the price index and interest at 4 percent, the amount might be a billion and a quarter dollars. These benefits would go, however, to those particularly unfairly hit by inflation. Obviously the present is no time to make tax concessions to anyone. But when times change and tax reform once more can be considered, fairness to savers deserves high priority.

CAN THE BOOM BE COOLED?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Ellsworth] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Post is entitled "Can the Boom Be Cooled?" It contains some of the best advice I have seen on how Federal spending projects can be stretched out and cut back in order to effectively bring the forces of inflation under effective control.

I commend it to my colleagues and especially to the White House:

Can the Boom Be Cooled?

Although a number of prominent corporate executives wrote the President that they would reduce outlays for new plant and equipment, the McGraw-Hill survey indicates capital spending during this year will be 19 percent higher than in 1965. Juxtaposing these facts does not impugn the corporate leaders who volunteered their cooperation in the effort to stem inflationary pressures. But it does suggest that presidential suasion may not be very effective in cooling off the capital spending boom.

Unlike water that flows through a faucet, capital spending cannot simply be turned off. The erection of new industrial buildings and the production of industrial equipment requires a good deal of leadtime between the placing of orders and the completion of projects. No details were released by the White House on what types of capital spending may be cut back. But it is a fair presumption that much of the reduction affects projects that are now in the early planning stages and would not in any case affect the demand for labor and materials during this year. Because of the leadtimes, White House suasion could misfire, reducing investment not now but in the future when its rapid growth would be essential to maintenance of income and employment.

A second difficulty stems from the interrelated demands of industry. A high level of demand for autos and other durables places strong pressures on the steel industry to expand its capacity, and the steel industry's requirements in turn affect capital spending in the mining and machinery industries. Business leaders, however strong their desire to make decisions that are consistent with price stability, cannot be immune to the momentum of market forces.

But there are classes of investment projects with shorter leadtimes whose deferral can probably be accomplished without great disruption or inconvenience. The administration proposes to extend by 5 months the October 1972, terminal date for the completion of the $46.8 billion Interstate Highway System. There is still more than $21 billion of work to be done, and since the Federal Government supplies 90 percent of the funds on a matching basis it is in position to affect the pace of the work. Rather than merely extend the terminal date by a few months, action should be taken to slow down the present pace of activity which require annual outlays of over $3 billion. And so long as the markets for construction, labor, and materials are tight, there should also be cutbacks on the public works projects that are drawn from the congressional pork barrel.

Unlike the informal controls that reduce the efficiency of the price system, little harm is done by the exercise of presidential suasion. But its effectiveness in reducing the volume of private investment is limited by forces that operate in a highly impersonal manner.

VETERAN PREFERENCE IN STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Ellsworth] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress, I strongly favored the policy of veteran preference in State Department employment—and still do. Recently I received a letter from Andy Borg, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, about a statement I made in support of veteran preference. I fully agree with Andy Borg that the issue deserves the widest public attention, and commend Mr. Borg's letter to my colleagues:

Veterans of Foreign
Wars of the United States,
April 15, 1966.

Hon. Robert Ellsworth,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Ellsworth: The Veterans of Foreign Wars is presently engaged in an effort to prevent the elimination of veteran preference from the Department of State. As you know, H.R. 6277, which you opposed in the House last year, would accomplish this purpose. Having passed the House, the bill is now scheduled for hearings in the Senate next week.

Your outstanding statement in support of veteran preference during the House debate on H.R. 6277 is of such merit that I am having a copy of it sent to each Member of the Senate. Your concise summary of the basis for veteran preference and the significance of continuing its application throughout the Government today, deserves the widest possible public attention.

The members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars commend you for your leadership.

With all good wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Andy Borg,
Commander in Chief.

MEMORIAL IN PARIS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the French Government will reconsider its decision regarding ceremonies at Les Invalides, so that the annual June 10 ceremony honoring the memory of the first American fatally wounded in the liberation of Paris can be continued.

The French action, as reported, reflects resentment which probably stems from the stern tone of official communications from Washington to Paris and the attempts of our administration to undercut the French Government at home. High administration officials recently granted to Paris periodicals interviews critical of French policies and obviously aimed at local public opinion.

Last year, members of the factfinding mission sent to Paris on NATO problems by the Republican conference of this body had the privilege of participating in the ceremony.

Last week, learning the French Government had tentatively decided to bar future ceremonies of this type from the French national shrine, I sent a cablegram to M. Edmund Giscard d'Estaing, president of the France-Amerique Committee. Our mission, which I served as chairman, had been graciously entertained by M. Giscard d' Estaing and the committee during our visit in Paris. The committee was established 50 years ago to promote French-American friendship.

Others on the mission were Representatives Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts, Alexander Pirnie, of New York, and James Martin, of Alabama.

Text of my cablegram, dated April 14:

I hope your committee will use its influence to persuade the French Government to reconsider its reported decision to bar the annual ceremony June 10 at Les Invalides in Paris, honoring the memory of Sgt. Russell Kelly, of Altoona, Pa., the first American fatally wounded in the liberation of Paris.

It has taken many years to develop French-American friendship but considering the impact of today's press, radio, and TV, the goodwill of centuries can be destroyed in a very brief period. I have observed with great concern the rising tide of anti-French feelings in this country. This tide must be reversed.

Our mission to Paris last June, indeed all the work of our committee, has been directed toward improving relations with France and our other allies. We have been urging our own Government to take the initiative in this. If the annual ceremony at Les Invalides is not permitted, our task will be more difficult. No matter what provocations form the background for the decision, it would assuredly provoke deep resentment and cut wounds that will take years to heal.

Here is an opportunity for France to set a tone of magnanimity and friendship which hopefully will inspire our Government to follow suit.

Paul Findley,
Chairman, House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN BAY AT NATIONAL CATHEDRAL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker on April 15, the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of Washington National Cathedral, announced that a new portion of this great edifice will memorialize Abraham Lincoln. To be known as the Abraham Lincoln Bay, it—like other parts of the cathedral—will be financed from gifts made specifically for that purpose.

The announcement came on the 101st anniversary of the death of the Civil War President. The bay, counterbalancing one already completed in memory of President Washington, is further evidence of the ever-mounting influence of the life of Lincoln. More than a century has passed since the assassin's bullet opened the fatal wound in the back of the Emancipator's head.

With each passing year the Lincoln story grows, inspiring each succeeding generation, not only within this broad land, but around the world. Without question, he has become preeminent in world literature second only to Christ. I am confident that individuals and groups from every land will eventually take part in financing this appropriate recognition.

As the representative of the Lincoln district in Illinois I am highly honored to be listed among the national group of sponsors.

The announcement of the Abraham Lincoln Bay, as issued by John C. Chapin, communications warden at the cathedral, follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 15, 1966.—The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of Washington National Cathedral, has announced the designation of a new portion of the cathedral as the "Abraham Lincoln Bay." His statement was made on April 15, the anniversary of the President's death.

Standing near the eventual site of the great west doors of the cathedral, this location exactly counterbalances the George Washington Bay on the opposite side of the cathedral. The bay is 18 feet wide and 22 feet long, with its walls now standing in place.

The central feature of the bay is expected to be a superb 8 foot statue of Lincoln; stained glass windows will illustrate highlights of his career; and special symbolic stone carving is planned. Scholars among the national sponsors of this undertaking will give their expert advice on these embellishments.

Just as construction of the Washington Bay was made possible by subscriptions of individuals throughout the country, so too can Americans who admire Abraham Lincoln give their support to further this memorial to him.

Since there are no funds currently available for its completion and embellishment, individuals or groups may underwrite portions of the bay, or make memorial gifts of particular items:

Building stones, each	$10
Ornamented stones, each	25
3 stone wall shields, each	70
2 label mould terminations, each	$325
3 carved bosses, each	800
1 lancet window	2,000
Marble flooring	3,000
Carved tympanum (arched space above door)	3,700
1 large window, 3 lancets, each	5,000
Statue of Lincoln (estimated)	34,000

This undertaking is supported by a national group of sponsors which includes many leading Lincoln students and admirers throughout the country: Elden E. Billings, Washington, D.C.; the Honorable Edward W. Brooke, Boston, Mass.; the Honorable Ralph J. Bunche, New York, N.Y.; Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, Pittsfield, Ill.; Arnold Gates, Garden City, N.Y.; Carl Haverlin, Northridge, Calif.; R. Gerald McMurtry, Fort Wayne, Ind.; David C. Mearns, Washington, D.C.; Allan Nevins, San Marino, Calif.; Ralph G. Newman, Chicago, Ill.; C. Percy Powell, Kensington, Md.; the Honorable Fred Schwengel, Washington, D.C.; Wayne C. Temple, Springfield, Ill.; Clyde C. Walton, Springfield, Ill.; Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Austin, Tex.

In commenting on the inclusion of a Lincoln Bay as a memorial in the Washington National Cathedral, Dean Sayre said: "The gaunt face of Abraham Lincoln, graved on the pennies of the poor, musing among the visitors to the marble silence of his memorial by the Potomac, is the image of what every American would like himself to be. No softness hides the hard bone of combat and sacrifice. The mouth is without disguise, the chin firm against adversity. Yet deep in those shadowed eyes is forgiveness and trust and patience infinite. Every furrow of that beloved visage traces the wellspring of understanding that was in him—and deep down in us. The inviolate call of destiny, the hard responsibility of emancipation: this is the glory we see reflected upon his face.

"Every generation of Lincoln's countrymen will build its own memorial to that man who was the prisoner of none. Some through social battle will be true to him; others, reconciling, shall be instruments of his vision. And we who are called in the 20th century to build a great shrine in the Nation's Capital—an eloquent token of its uniting faith—must also reflect the glory that was upon his life.

"Hence the Lincoln memorial in Washington Cathedral. His face in stone, the record of his testing writ in stained glass, a place by the great front door set aside for that man whose life is what we would wish our country's life to be. Abraham Lincoln, rooted in God, servant of all."

CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the April 1 issue of the Washington Post carried an editorial proposing improvements in the police system on Capitol Hill. The editorial was especially gratifying to me because it backs up point by point recommendations that I made immediately after the unfortunate recent incident in which our colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, was attacked, injured, and robbed while working in his office in the Longworth Building.

At that time I recommended that the archaic and inefficient system of personal patronage for the selection of members of the Capitol Hill Police force be abolished, that all officers be required to pass a special training course at the academy conducted by the Metropolitan Police, that all new officers be required to complete this course before going on duty, that the pay, benefits, and working conditions of the Capitol Hill Police be made comparable with the Washington Metropolitan Police.

The Capitol Hill Police force, under present circumstances, is understaffed and underpaid. For the most part it is also badly undertrained. Discipline is impossible because many of the policemen hold their jobs under the personal patronage system. If they get into trouble, all they need do is run to their patron for intercession.

I hope the Committee on House Administration will have the opportunity soon to begin hearings with the objective of making improvements along these lines.

It may be that the best police force in the world would not have prevented the incident in which the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] was involved. It was, however, a very timely reminder that the Capitol Hill Police force needs better training, better pay, and more numbers.

CAPITOL POLICE

When Washington was a relatively quiet village on the banks of the Potomac, students and other inexperienced young men could be made policemen at the Capitol without serious consequences. Now that Washington has become the nucleus of a crime-ridden metropolitan center it is sheer folly to adhere to the same policy.

The question is not whether a professional police force would have prevented the attack on Representative CLEVELAND the other night. The suspect arrested in that case was a janitor in the Longworth Building. Nevertheless, this crime centers attention on the unpreparedness of the Capitol Police to provide the kind of protection that Congress and its various activities ought to have. To our way of thinking, all these officers of the law should be chosen for their experience and aptitude for the work. They should be trained at least as well as are members of the Metropolitan Police, and the pay should be enough to attract men of the proper qualifications.

STOCKPILE BILL DANGEROUS PROPOSAL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in this age of big, centralized government, no segment of the business community is completely free of Federal control and regulation. Big brother is watching everybody—if not all the time, at least some of the time.

Those who deal in farm commodities—whether as merchants, warehousemen, exporters, commission men, traders, or farmers—are given exceptional attention. Not only are they subject to licensing and regulation by big brother—they also have him as their principal competitor.

The $14.5 billion monster which goes by the name of Commodity Credit Corporation is one of the world's biggest business enterprises. In a single day, CCC acquires and sells, stores and ships a larger volume of farm commodities than many dealers will handle in a year, perhaps a lifetime. It can make or break market prices—and it does both with frightening unpredictability. Often, I might add, in an arbitrary manner that smacks of election-day politics.

Congress, in its sometimes not so infinite wisdom, chartered CCC and charged it with the task of "stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices." But in fact, the administration has been employing CCC's vast resources for two quite different purposes: First, to impose extralegal price ceilings on farm commodities; and second, to drive down corn prices as a means of pressuring reluctant farmers to sign up under the feed grains program.

No one, least of all farmers and the Congress itself, could have foreseen such a perversion of the purposes for which CCC was established. To revise the old saying a bit, it just goes to show that if you give a bureaucrat enough rope, he will hang you.

To emphasize my point that CCC is being employed as a price control device, I quote no less an authority than the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley. Parenthetically, it might be remembered that he was among the architects of the administration plan under which Government copper stockpiles were dumped at about one-half of the current replacement price. Mr. Ackley made it all very clear in a television interview on the "Today Show," March 10, 1966, when he said:

> I mentioned the fact that increase in supplies of pork depend on the difference between the price of hogs and the price of corn, and we're trying to hold down the price of corn. The Government's acquired large stocks of corn in past price support operation; now we're releasing them into the market.

In other words, Government-owned corn is being used, and used successfully, to drive farm prices downward.

Now if any one even attempted such manipulation of commodity prices, it would be quite a different story. Agriculture Secretary Freeman's Commodity Exchange Authority would descend in full force. The dealer would be charged with violating CEA regulations and would be called before a hearing examiner. At best he might get off with a suspension of his trading privileges on the Nation's contract markets for a year or so.

I suggest, and not too facetiously, that Orville Freeman's CEA should cite Orville Freeman himself for manipulating commodity prices.

If the prosecution needed any more evidence than Gardner Ackley's statement there is Mr. Freeman's own confession last year when he candidly told the House Agriculture Committee this about the mammoth CCC corn dumping program of 1961–62:

> We purposely sold in order to move our prices down far enough so that they would be way below the support level, the loan level, so that we would thereby get compliance. That was the whole intent and purpose and thrust of the program.

Mr. Freeman freely admitted that, in selling CCC stocks, he was seeking to force farmers into signing up for his 1963 feed grains control program. The current corn-dumping operation has been aimed at clubbing farmers into the 1966 program, with the further objective of extralegal ceilings on livestock prices.

As all know, and especially those who were on the wrong side of the Freeman-manipulated market, the wholesale dumping of CCC corn inventories depressed corn prices by several cents a bushel. The selling pressure spilled over into other pits as well. Even so, many farmers have refused to sign up with Orville for 1966. Intentions to plant indicate a higher corn acreage than last year, instead of the lower figure Mr. Freeman sought.

In the light of past experience, it may well be that farmers in large numbers see no percentage in reducing feed grain acreage if the Department of Agriculture is going to clobber them in the marketplace. Obviously, many farmers have decided the feed grains program is not to their advantage. Some may have concluded that the way to beat lower corn prices is to produce and market more bushels. This would, of course, be self-defeating in the longrun. But was it not Mr. Freeman and the other farm experts such as HUBERT HUMPHREY who argued during the Ezra Benson years that lower prices would force farmers to increase production as a means of maintaining income?

This was economic moonshine then, and it still is. Nevertheless, farmers heard it so often during the 1950's that some of them may still believe it.

An interested person has to look only at the livestock industry to see that farmers normally adjust production in response to price. It should be noted, however, that the livestock industry is free of both production controls and price supports. If production of the price-controlled commodities seems to respond irrationally at times to market prices, it must be remembered that this response is to programs which themselves are often irrational. As someone once suggested in more picturesque language, there must be a better way to run a railroad.

At the current rate of CCC dumping, Mr. Freeman will have about reached the bottom of his cornbin before the 1966 crop is even in the ground. The Government's uncommitted corn inventory today is well below 200 million bushels, little more than a 2-week supply, plus about 354 million reseal corn.

In defending this dumping operation, Secretary Freeman says he is merely carrying out the ever-normal granary concept. He told a St. Louis farm audience recently that this "calls for adding to Government stocks when production exceeds needs and selling them when demand and prices are strong:" That is the principle on which the ever-normal granary rests, but is the CCC carrying it out in practice? The Government has dumped several hundred million bushels of corn into the marketplace right on top of the largest corn crop in history. Sales have been deliberately bunched for maximum adverse effect—as much as 79 million bushels in a single week. The entire operation has been directed toward breaking the price of corn, not strengthening it.

Government regulation of farm prices is by no means confined to decisions to dump or not to dump CCC inventories nor to direct price-fixing programs. The Department of Agriculture also determines which commodities shall be pushed under Public Law 480 programs and in the case of wheat, which particular classes of wheat shall be eligible for programing and which shall not be. In recent years, for example, Soft Red Winter wheat produced in Illinois and surrounding States has been all but excluded from Public Law 480 allocations.

Moreover, to make sure that this class of wheat will move only in Government-regulated quantities for dollar sales abroad, the Department systematically juggles its export subsidy rates so as to discourage exports. This significantly affects Chicago wheat prices. And the Chicago market is still the bellwether for all U.S. and world wheat markets.

It seems to me that supply and demand factors, not the capricious decisions of control-minded Government officials, should determine market prices for the various classes and grades of wheat, and for other commodities, too.

It is interesting to note that at the very time Mr. Freeman has been liquidating the Government's corn reserve, the administration has before Congress a bill, H.R. 12784, which would authorize the establishment and maintenance of agricultural commodity reserves. Such reserves, in the language of the bill, would "assure a continuous, adequate, and stable supply to meet domestic requirements at fair and reasonable prices, and also to meet the requirements of commercial exports, the food-for-freedom program, and domestic feeding."

The administration measure is, in effect, an open end proposal. The commodities to be stockpiled are not specified. Quantities are not indicated. Costs are not estimated. Place and method of storage are not set forth. It is a blank check proposition.

If this bill becomes law, we can throw away the brown-covered book called the compilation of U.S. farm legislation. The Secretary of Agriculture will have ample authority in H.R. 12784 to do almost anything he wants to in the field of supply and farm control.

The stockpiles could be reduced or even liquidated "by sale at such times, for such uses, at such prices not less than those applicable to sales of commodities by Commodity Credit Corporation and upon such conditions as the Secretary may determine to be in the national interest."

The words "as the Secretary may determine" and "as the Secretary may direct" appear repeatedly in the bill. It would confer upon Mr. Freeman broader powers than any previous Secretary of Agriculture has ever sought or, in my opinion, should ever have.

It would permit the Secretary to establish a Government stockpile of every imaginable farm commodity. It would also give him virtually unrestricted power to dump the stockpiles back into the marketplace at any time. The temptation to use these accumulated reserves as a price control mechanism would be irresistible for any Secretary with a passion for Government regulation of the economy. And I would include the present Secretary in that category.

Why does Secretary Freeman want this legislation? The answer is obvious. Government stocks of grain are dwindling and one of these days he may have none to dump.

If stocks are not replenished, Secretary Freeman will lose his most powerful means of controlling commodity prices. If he has no Government stockpiles, he obviously cannot use them to drive down market prices. If he cannot drive down market prices, he will have even greater difficulty getting farmers to comply with planting programs. If he cannot get compliance, a major part of his vast bureaucracy will be out of business. That eventuality, I might add, would be a blessing to American people as taxpayers, consumers and farmers.

Several factors have led to the decline in Government holdings of grain—accelerated overseas giveaways, strengthened cash markets, substitution of direct payments for higher price supports in Federal programs—but it is not my purpose today to discuss why the decline occurred.

Instead, I draw your attention to the fundamental decisions which soon may be required because stocks are dwindling.

Let us suppose that Government stockpiles of grain disappear completely. What then? Certain advantages to the private sector are obvious.

The marketing system for feed and food grains would be able to function in traditional manner, as it does for soybeans, many other farm commodities and most nonfarm supplies and services.

Trade people would no longer have to reckon with the uncertainty about what bureaucrats will do with Government reserves. Under present circumstances, future markets cannot operate properly, nor can the day-to-day merchandiser act with assurance. At any moment his preparations may be undercut by arbitrary release of Government stocks.

Millers, exporters, and feed processors are reluctant to lay in stocks for their own future uses when Government holdings hang by the tiny thread of bureaucratic convenience over the market.

Broad legislative language like "going out of condition" and loopholes like "disaster determination authority" are always a threat to the unprotected market. Who can prove one way or another that corn or wheat is "in danger of going out of condition"? Disasters may be of a political, rather than economic nature, but the unanticipated release of Government stocks has adverse economic effect either way.

Dumping of high-protein Government wheat and the offer to sell all grades was explained recently as needed to fill a critical shortage, but later the real reason was given. It was to prevent an expected rise in bread prices.

Even when legislative excuses are nonexistent, Government stockpiles are sometimes dumped. Copper stockpiles acquired by the Government for the single purpose of assuring adequate supplies for military emergencies were dumped during the past year to drive down market prices. This should be ample warning to those who believe Government stockpiles can be effectively insulated from the competitive marketplace.

How about the broad national interest? Government stockpiles of grain have existed for many years. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been the dominant merchandiser of grain for a generation. Many processors have become accustomed to filling requirements largely from Government sources. To a considerable extent, the grain-merchandising facilities of the private sector have atrophied. The private trade has relied so heavily and so long on Government as the primary source of supply that the thought this might end is disturbing to tradesmen and the general public alike.

Can the private sector pick up where it left off years ago, and do a satisfactory job without leaning on big brother?

What of drought or nuclear war? Time and again I have heard the argument that Government must maintain minimum stockpiles to meet these disasters. It is contended that our food stockpiles are already getting dangerously low and to eliminate them would be to court famine right here at home. Besides, the Government has heavy commitments it must meet to prevent famine abroad.

Is this line of argument valid? I say no.

I am here to declare my confidence that the private sector can meet the feed and food merchandising needs of America in peace and war without leaning on big brother in government. I further believe the transition to private merchandising will occur smoothly and instantaneously the moment Government stockpiles disappear.

The reserves and resources of the private sector would be sufficient to meet any foreseeable requirement.

Consider first the argument that Government-owned stockpiles of food would be needed in the event of a nuclear war. Would these supplies be stored in or near our major population centers? And in what form—as processed food or as grain? With the exception of terminal markets such as Chicago, Minneapolis, and Kansas City, our major population centers do not presently have the required grain storage facilities.

They would have to be built and at a time when total grain storage capacity in the United States is already excessive. Moreover, and this is something none of us even wants to think about, a single hydrogen bomb could wipe out an entire city including people and stockpiled food.

In conventional war, such as the one in which we are involved on a limited scale in Vietnam, the private sector can quickly boost food-and-fiber production. Corn and wheat production could be vastly increased with little strain simply by increasing inputs of land and fertilizer. The taxpayers rented 37 million acres under the feed grains program alone last year, and the farmers of America still produced an alltime record crop of corn on the remaining acres. This illustrates the vast potential in production that could be tapped quickly in wartime in response to market requirements. Government stockpiles at the outset of World War II proved to have little strategic importance.

Drought conditions that would create a serious domestic food shortage are almost inconceivable. Our farmland is widely dispersed. Modern hybrid seeds and fertilizers have been found to be remarkably resistant to drought. Even the severe drought of 1934–36 had limited impact on food supplies. Since then a myriad of agricultural improvements, including conservation practices and supplemental water, make a widespread crop failure unlikely. Statistical information and outlook reports have become refined to a point where most problems can be anticipated months in advance.

But suppose, for speculative purposes, a nationwide drought did occur to such an extent that shortages became imminent.

Normally, the United States has a cattle population of about 100 million, plus substantial numbers of hogs and sheep. Just a partial liquidation of these stocks would carry us through an emergency. Even a meat shortage is most unlikely, as grain can be converted into more poultry and eggs in a few short weeks.

America is the wonder of the world in food production, and it is simply unrealistic and therefore unsound to justify a Government stockpile program on the possibility of a food shortage.

Before the day of Government supply management—and CCC—the producers, handlers and users of food carried their own stocks at no cost to the taxpayer. Farmers hedged in futures markets against grain stored on their own farms. The country elevators, the terminal warehousemen, processors and exporters once carried their own inventories—and the system worked.

We all recognize the validity of Gresham's law, which holds that cheap money tends to drive good money out of circulation. So it is with Government services, as opposed to private services. Where government is in the lending business, government money tends to take over. It is the same in the business of grain merchandising. Big brother government has such immense advantages that the private sector cannot compete effectively, and therefore government merchandising tends to drive out private merchandising.

Once government activity ceases, however, the private sector will move in immediately. Ample talent, know-how and facilities stand ready to go into action in the business of merchandising grain once big brother ceases to be an overpowering competitor.

If the private sector can handle soybeans, why not wheat and corn? Government stockpiles are a convenience to some sectors, but you cannot have the best of both worlds indefinitely.

American agriculture is today at a crossroads of far-reaching importance. One fork marked H.R. 12784. It is the road of permanent Government control of grain markets with built-in inefficiencies. The other fork is marked competitive markets, with assurance of fair prices for producers and consumers alike.

H.R. 12784 would make Commodity Credit Corporation a permanent institution. If this bill is rejected—and if Congress refrains from enacting new nonsense in the way of farm programs—we can soon hope to dissolve the CCC, just as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was phased out some years ago after it had outlived its usefulness. To protect its own future, the trade must face up to its logical responsibility and carry its own inventories.

The goal should be to get Government out of the grain business. Let us not pussyfoot around. Be not beguiled into supporting half measures like H.R. 12784 which let big brother keep his clumsy foot in the door.

Since Government seems determined to undertake a larger and more dominant role in the business, is it not time for all of you to subscribe to the old theory that turnabout is fair play?

I sometimes encounter reluctance on the part of people in the business community to become directly involved in politics. Believe me, the politicians have no such reluctance to involve themselves in the business community.

For the good of the country the business community should take an active role in helping to defeat H.R. 12784 as a step toward the larger goal of getting Government out of the grain business.

A REPORT ON FEDERALLY ASSISTED EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN DADE COUNTY, FLA.

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the launching of the first Soviet sputnik in the fall of 1957 was a boon to our education system here in the United States. Indeed, it did provide the impetus for a reevaluation of our system at all levels. Initially, the concern of those examining American education was directed toward the sciences because of our apparent lack in that area vis-a-vis the Soviet system; as a result, when the Congress passed the National Defense Education Act in 1958, special consideration was given to those who pursued their education in the areas of mathematics, engineering, and the physical sciences.

However, since the enactment of the National Defense Education Act, the whole spectrum of our system has been subjected to the closest scrutiny not only here in the U.S. Congress but also by State and local education authorities and various associations of educators. Out of these studies have come a wide variety of proposals and recommendations which were later incorporated into legislation enacted by the Congress and State legislatures.

At no time in our history has there been such a wide variety of programs available to school districts, colleges, and universities and, in turn, to individuals who might otherwise be denied the full benefits of an education. It seems to me that the culmination of this interest in education occurred during the first session of this Congress when we enacted legislation providing for such bold, purposeful, and farsighted programs as those included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Public Law 89–10—and the Higher Education Act—Public Law 89–329.

During our Easter recess, I received a letter from Dr. Joe Hall in which he reports on the various Federal programs in which the Dade County public school system is participating. Dr. Hall is superintendent of the county school system and, I might add, he is one of the finest school administrators in the country.

Probably no school system in the United States has been subjected to such a rapid expansion in such a short time as that in Dade County; in less than 15 years, the enrollment of the system has almost quadrupled so that it is now the seventh largest system in the Nation. In spite of such rapid growth with its resulting stresses and strains, the Dade County system has been more than able to keep pace largely because of the outstanding job being done by Dr. Hall and his highly skilled staff of teachers and assistants. As the father of three children who have attended the Dade County public school system, I can attest to the high caliber of education the system is providing and to the qualifications of the dedicated men and women who make up the system's teaching corps.

What Dr. Hall has provided in his letter is a realistic appraisal of the benefits being derived from the various Federal programs in which the system is participating while at the same time noting the shortcomings and needs of certain other programs. I would highly recommend Dr. Hall's letter to our colleagues since what Dr. Hall says applies not only to the Dade County system but to school systems throughout the country. In particular, I call their attention to the recommendations Dr. Hall makes.

The text of Dr. Hall's letter follows:

Dade County Public Schools,
Miami, Fla., April 7, 1966.

Hon. Dante Fascell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fascell: Your persistent and effective leadership in the Congress in behalf of education for the boys and girls of Dade County and the Nation is sincerely appreciated. It seemed to us that now might be a good time to report to you on the various federally related school programs and what they have meant to Dade County. We should also like to point out some of the needs and problems as we see them.

Under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 our schools became eligible for $3½ million of supporting funds. Six projects were designed with specific disadvantaged areas of the community as targets for concentrated instructional services designed to meet the particular needs of the children residing in these neighborhoods.

One of these projects is aimed at improving the reading skills. One hundred and twenty-four reading teachers were given 4 weeks of intensive special training and assigned to project schools to augment the teaching of reading in 372 classrooms involving 11,160 elementary age boys and girls. These efforts are supported by both materials and equipment. The full impact on the schools and community served by this project has not been assessed, but the efforts of these teachers have become synonymous with skilled, inspired teaching.

To further assist in overcoming the reading deficiencies of many of these children, 5 mobile reading clinics staffed by 15 specialists travel each day to schools in areas of crucial need to give special diagnostic reading and instructional services. This flexible, highly professional effort is proving most successful.

Guidance and counseling have long been recognized as particular needs of the disadvantaged children. We are now able to assign 36 guidance specialists to work in the target areas to help the boys and girls find educational programs in which they are capable of some degree of success and a feeling of worth regardless of reputed IQ scores and stations in life.

We have been able to add 24 full-time visiting teacher-counselors to work in 25 schools in the poverty area. The services of these counselors are focused on helping the elementary child who is not receiving maximum benefit from his school experience. The visiting teacher-counselors are qualified to provide casework service to the child and work with the teachers and parents in improving the pupil's use of the school experience. The counselors work closely with the neighborhod centers of the economic opportunity program and refer parents who need employment and rehabilitation.

Although we have had a strong program for physically and mentally handicapped boys and girls for many years, additional help has been secured under this legislation. Seven special education teachers are devoting full time to work in the schools, the hospitals, and the psychological wards where these especially disadvantaged young people are to be found.

As a logical sequence to the massive effort in the elementary schools, an intensive program provides inservice training for 150 teachers who are now working in the disadvantaged areas designing curriculum and teaching techniques for the junior high schools. Areas which are being stressed include reading instruction, library utilization and guidance. Seven thousand boys and girls are directly affected in this laboratory-like junior high learning effort. The materials and techniques developed are shared with classrooms beyond this particular project.

A combined use of $1½ million in funds from Public Law 89–10 and $2 million in funds from the Economic Opportunity Act have made possible, for the disadvantaged 5-year-olds, a preschool program described more fully elsewhere in this letter.

An evaluation team has been formed to assess each project serving disadvantaged youth. We are confident that the evaluative information obtained will help strengthen the entire program.

Title I projects referred to in the above paragraphs have demonstrated that things can be done to brighten the present and future for thousands of our disadvantaged young people. These projects are in limited and specific areas of instruction. It is vital that they be continued and, if possible, expanded. There are, of course, many other projects which we hope to initiate for these and other disadvantaged children.

Under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Dade County is working closely with the Florida State Department of Education and with the private schools in this area in originating an application for funds with which to purchase additional school library resources. As you know, our libraries are basic to the educational processes. Neither our public nor private schools have ever had a sufficient number of library books. The acquisition of additional books is particularly important now that we are able to emphasize the reading skills among our boys and girls. It is hoped that funds under title II will be provided to insure growth and extension of our libraries in the coming years.

Under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Dade County has made application for funds to provide a self-instruction center for pupils. Also, a project has been submitted for an inservice training center for instructional personnel. Under title III we have seen for the first time the possibility of obtaining needed educational services by developing exemplary programs, educational centers and supplementary services needed to nourish and vitalize the continuing educational processes.

The Florida State Department of Education has responded to the challenge of providing professional counsel and direction to the schools in initiating and operating the federally related programs. This has been made possible by funds received by that department under title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is vital that this source of support be continued in order to sustain the leadership resources of our State department of education.

To this point my remarks have been addressed to titles I, II, III, and V of Public Law 89-10. We hope the renewal of these titles will be made a matter of urgent priority by the Congress of the United States and that an authorization will be made for at least 4 years in order to assure continuity and uninterrupted progress in the improvement of the educational program. It is most important that the appropriation for the funding of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act be made before June 1, 1966, in order to facilitate budgeting and employment of personnel as well as efficiency in the use of the funds.

Your attention is particularly invited to the need for early appropriation of funds for all of the federally related programs. As you know, every worthwhile endeavor in modern education has consistently demonstrated the fact that time for careful planning is absolutely necessary in initiating programs for quality education.

One major problem which we have in Dade County is the need for facilities in which to house the programs which we are operating and which we plan to initiate. I believe that the school people over the Nation and the citizenry in general recognize that there should be a sizable additional appropriation of moneys under title I or through other means to provide capital outlay funds for buildings. Special programs provide special opportunities for boys and girls. They also provide unquestionable need for additional classrooms and facilities in which to carry out the projects. As a Dade Countian you are well aware that our taxes have gone up dramatically because of the increased, though realistic, assessment of properties for tax purposes. There are a number of indications that the people of Dade County, who have consistently supported public education, feel that their local taxes are now as high as they can stand. Members of the press and other responsible groups have voiced the opinion that local taxes have reached a reasonable limit for this time. A sizable proportion of the funds now available under title I to improve the educational program cannot be well used by local school systems unless some way is found to provide additional facilities.

If pupils in the regular program of a given school system are not to be penalized by the federally related programs, it will be necessary that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 be amended to allow local school systems to recover their indirect costs in connection with programs under title I, II, and III. At the present time no allowance is made for indirect cost associated with federally funded projects under these titles. In Dade County we find that the indirect costs constitute a substantial burden on the regular school budget and, as in the case of planning, moneys to finance these costs must be taken away from other parts of the school program to the detriment of the education of children not touched by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Reference is made to the general administrative expenses, building maintenance, and certain auxiliary services. These expenses are a real and necessary part of any program. They increase with the advent of additional programs. Precedent for paying such costs has been established in the percentage for overhead allowance which is made to colleges and universities under title IV of the act.

Another important phase of planning is that of designing programs for submission pursuant to the various titles of the Federal acts. At the present time local school systems must finance a substantial cost in planning the programs and in writing up the proposals. In Dade County these costs are borne by other parts of the regular school program to the detriment of the programs in general. We feel that it is most desirable that additional funds be provided in title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to the State department of education for allocation to local school systems for financial assistance in planning programs.

Under the Economic Opportunity Act a number of other important programs are underway. Headstart is providing badly needed preschool experience for 3,000 5-year-olds in the poverty areas. The Neighborhood Youth Corps has enrolled 1,050 teenagers in work-learning experiences which not only provide income, but also help them to develop job skills. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act is funding a special educational program for 2,500 migrant children and a number of their parents in the agricultural areas of south Dade County. Basic education is being provided in reading and arithmetic for culturally deprived adults.

A contract under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 funds a work-study program to provide employment and on-the-job experience for 258 vocational students working in various governmental agencies. Another effort under the Vocational Act is the Booker T. Washington Learning Laboratory, where 270 culturally disadvantaged boys and girls in grades 10, 11, and 12 are receiving special training and guidance as preparation for full-time employment or advanced vocational training.

Funded by the Manpower Act, 2,241 students are receiving training in 33 separate occupational areas. This program is designed to help youths and adults who have previously terminated their school experiences.

Pursuant to the Civil Rights Act there is a project with three components which have operated cooperatively to facilitate the massive phasing out of the predominantly Negro secondary schools and the accompanying integration processes.

On the basis of the sound values which are being received by the learners and communities in which these programs are operative, it is felt that the funding of the efforts under the Economic Opportunities Act, the Vocational Education Act, the Civil Rights Act, and the Manpower Act should certainly be as great or greater than at the present time. However, it is recommended that the adult education and Headstart programs which are presently a part of the Economic Opportunity Act, under the jurisdiction of the Office of Economic Opportunity, should be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We also believe that the Manpower Retraining Act should be transferred from the Department of Labor to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as a part of the Vocational Act. These three programs are primarily educational programs and should be administered under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Education.

There is an urgent need for Public Law 874 (81st Cong.), as amended effective July 1, 1962, to be retained in its present form.

The Dade County, Fla., public school system which experienced a population explosion in the 1950's (from 68,500 pupils in 1950 to more than 203,000 today) is the seventh largest metropolitan system in the Nation. To provide educational facilities and programs for these pupils, the system has had to tap every financial source—local, State, and Federal—to the fullest extent possible. For the current year, it was necessary to cut some $10 million from the budget, resulting in a reduction of needed personnel services and the elimination of needed planned facilities.

For the first time in the history of Public Law 874, this school system was able this year to meet the new qualifying percentage requirement of federally connected pupils and has received some $600,000 to assist in providing education for some 6,000 pupils whose parents live on or work on Federal property in the area.

It is imperative that this financial assistance be retained if these pupils are to be provided the education to which they are entitled.

Since proper nutrition is essential to the good health of our schoolchildren, we wish to share with you information relative to the school lunch program. Section 2 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended, states: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school lunch programs."

To sacrifice or curtail the existing policy would create a definite hardship on the school lunch program in Dade County. For the period of July 1, 1965, through February 28, 1966, we operated at a loss of $112,619.15 as compared with an operating gain of $128,248.61 for the same period last year. One of the main factors for this variance is the decrease in the amount of Federal commodities distributed to the schools during the 1965–66 period. Another factor for this loss is the rise in food prices. In spite of these conditions we have been able to maintain the high quality type A lunch required by the National School Lunch Act. If the kind and amount of Federal food commodities and the cash reimbursement we have received were to be reduced or eliminated, we would be faced with the following alternatives: Either the price of lunches would have to be increased, or the quality of the lunches lowered. If we were forced to do either, the present participation of 74 percent which we are now enjoying would likely drop significantly because many children could not afford the higher prices. We have evidence that the school lunches, which many children eat, are the only balanced meals that the children get. If we are to continue to offer nutritious meals to the vast majority of schoolchildren in Dade County at a selling price of 25 cents to elementary children and 35 cents to secondary children, we can only do so if we continue to receive Federal food commodities and cash reimbursement to the same extent that we have in the past.

Pursuant to your active interest in all matters relating to the Cuban refugees and the fusion of their children into the schools of Dade County, it seems in order to review the status of Federal support for Cuban refugee education in Dade County. On October 3, 1965, just prior to the most recent influx, the enrollment of Cuban refugees in the kindergarten to 12th grades totaled 15,501. Only 200 of this group of children have left the Dade County schools. Approximately 1,400 additional Cuban refugee pupils who entered the United States after October 3, 1965, have enrolled in our schools and an acceleration in the rate of new enrollments is expected as the airlift continues. For the great majority of refugee children who enrolled before October 3, 1965, we are receiving from Federal sources 45 percent of the average daily membership cost. We have been advised that these payments will continue through this fiscal year and for the fiscal year 1966–67.

For each Cuban refugee child in membership over and above the 15,501 as of October 3 we are receiving a payment for housing of $600. We are also receiving $518 annual operating funds for each of the refugee children in average daily membership who entered the United States after October 3, 1965. Present agreements with the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare provide for a continuation of these payments through 1966–67.

The education of Cuban refugee children would be an impossible burden for the citizens of Dade County if it were not for this Federal support. It is most important that sufficient Federal funds be available to sustain the present program and to provide for those who enter in the future.

In summary, the following recommendations relative to the federally funded programs are submitted:

1. That the renewals of titles I, II, III, and V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 be made a matter of urgent priority; that the authorization be for at least 4 years and that the appropriations for funding of this act be made before June 1, 1966.

2. That a sizable additional appropriation of moneys be made to provide capital outlay funds for buildings.

3. That additional funds be provided in title V to be allocated to State departments of education for the purpose of allocation to local school systems for financial assistance in planning programs under titles I and III.

4. That the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 be amended to allow local school systems to recover their indirect cost in connection with programs under titles I, II, and III, as well as those programs under other acts and titles.

5. That the Adult Education, Headstart, and Manpower Retraining Acts be transferred from their present department to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

6. That appropriations for Public Law 874 and for the distribution of surplus commodity funds not be discontinued, diminished, or eliminated.

7. That plans for the financing of Cuban refugee education after present agreements have expired be initiated in the fall of 1966.

8. That provisions be made for early appropriations of funds for all of the federally related programs in order to provide adequate time to plan programs and to procure personnel to operate them.

Sincerely yours,

JOE HALL,
Superintendent.

STATEMENT OF ECUMENICAL CONCERN

Mrs. **THOMAS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FOGARTY.** Mr. Speaker, reliable sources here and abroad, although little published in our American newspapers, describe the relentless religious persecution suffered by the Greek Orthodox Christian minority in Istanbul and elsewhere in Turkey at the hand of that Government. The Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople—Istanbul—who is the world spiritual leader of the Eastern Orthodox Church, according to a New York Times editorial, is held a veritable hostage, and in recent times is held under constant police surveillance.

In an effort to arouse public opinion in Rhode Island, the religious leaders of the Roman Catholic, the Protestant, the Jewish and Eastern Orthodox faiths met recently at the invitation of the Reverend John A. Limberakis, pastor of the Annunciation, and president of all Rhode Island Orthodox parishes, and following an extensive, detailed introduction on the situation in Turkey, unanimously issued the following statement of ecumenical concern, which I now wish to to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This document is indeed a historic one because religious persecution is condemned, and the forces of justice and of all that is held precious in this great land of democracy, are summoned to respond to those who at this very hour are living under constant threat and fear. The religious leaders of the State of Rhode Island are on record.

The document reads as follows:

A STATEMENT OF ECUMENICAL CONCERN

The unconscionable and unremitting persecution of His Holiness, Athenagoras I, the Ecumenical Patriarch, by representatives of the Turkish Government has caused a wave of shock and dismay in nearly all quarters of the civilized world. This discrimination which the Government of Turkey has seen fit to execute against His Holiness consists in (1) the continued harassment of those associated with the Patriarch in his apostolic work at the Patriarchate, (2) the closing and confiscating of churches and schools, (3) the unprovoked deportation and mass expulsion of both clergy and laity, (4) the recent barring by government authorities of Archbishop Iakovos (primate of the Church in the Americas) to celebrate the Divine Liturgy at the Patriarchal Chapel, (5) the forced discontinuance of its religious printing plant and the humanitarian offices of a religious orphanage, and (6) among other things the public insult and indignity heaped upon those clerics and religious persons who bravely profess the Greek Orthodox faith in Turkey today. These hostilities are viewed to be aimed at diminishing the ecumenical stature of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (Istanbul), a leading spiritual force in the ecumenical movement, to isolate its mission and to render it extinct in the world today.

Such persecution, for whatever motives is in direct contravention of the Charter of the United Nations, and the Treaty of Lausanne to which Turkey is a signatory in both instances. Moreover, in addition to the wanton disregard of universally respected legal covenants, objections on the grounds of religious and humanitarian considerations that have been voiced in the court of world opinion thus far have been largely ignored. Those who express concern in the present instance can be understandably influenced by the history of persecution and even genocide which has not been unknown in that part of the world in the present century.

The ancient and venerable See headed by His Holiness has deep historical and hallowed associations for all the major faiths of the world. The richness of the tradition which he represents has ennobled the religious patrimony of both East and West. It is an affront to the unity and solidarity of the human family in these days of ecumenism when a religious leader of the stature of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople (Istanbul), and his minority coreligionists in Turkey are being subjected to a persecution which does such violence to the ideals of tolerance cherished by all civilized nations.

As religious leaders in the State of Rhode Island, we feel morally compelled to add our voices to the swelling chorus of indignation already voiced by the Vatican, the World Council of Churches, the American Jewish Committee, and the National Council of Churches, over what we believe is a tragic violation and travesty of a fundamental human right. To remain passive or to be swayed by any consideration of silence would be, as we see it, an abdication of our responsibility, and an intolerable dereliction of duty.

The Most Reverend Russell J. McVinney, D.D., bishop of Providence, Roman Catholic Diocese of Providence.

The Right Reverend John Seville Higgins, D.D., bishop of Rhode Island, Episcopal Diocese of Rhode Island.

Dr. Wayne Artis, executive director, Rhode Island State Council of Churches.

Rabbi Eli A. Bohnen, president, Rhode Island Board of Rabbis.

The Reverend Hale Thornberry, executive secretary, Rhode Island Baptist State Convention.

The Reverend R. Vernon Lawson, conference minister, Rhode Island Congregational Christian Conference, United Church of Christ.

Dr. C. Clifford Sargent, superintendent of Providence District, the New England Southern Conference of the Methodist Church.

The Reverend Carl Banks, president, the Ministerial Alliance of Greater Providence and Vicinity.

The Reverend Birger J. C. Johnson, dean, Rhode Island District, Lutheran Church in America.

The Reverend Haik Donikian, S.S. Sahag & Mesrob.

The Reverend Mesrob Tashjian, St. Vartanantz.

ARMENIAN APOSTOLIC CHURCHES IN PROVIDENCE

The Reverend Arsen A. Goegizian, Euphrates Armenian Evangelical Church.

(Mrs.) Rozella Switzer, regional director, National Council of Christians and Jews.

The Reverend John A. Limberakis, president, Rhode Island Council of Eastern Orthodox Churches.

Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church, the Reverend J. A. Limberakis, Providence.

Assumption Greek Orthodox Church, the Reverend T. Baglaneas, Pawtucket.

St. John's Romanian Orthodox Church, the Reverend M. Marinescu, Woonsocket.

St. John's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the Reverend M. Mostensky, Providence.

St. Mary's Russian Orthodox Church, the Reverend A. Besmertnuk, Cumberland.

St. Mary's Syrian Orthodox Church, the Right Reverend A. Saliba, Pawtucket.

St. Michael's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the Reverend G. Krasevich, Woonsocket.

St. Spyridon's Greek Orthodox Church, the Reverend S. Papademetriou, Newport.

St. Stephen's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the Reverend J. Zelechewsky, Manville.

Annunciation Parish Council, Attorney G. L. Mihos, president.

Philoptochos Society, Mrs. E. G. Pappas, president.

Annunciation PTA, Mrs. C. Pomades, president.

Annunciation Building Committee, Attorney E. T. Pliakas, chairman.

Church choir, Mrs. S. Lafanzanis, director.

Annunciation GOYA, Miss M. Kanelos, president.

Annunciation Junior GOYA, C. J. Limberakis, president.

Order of AHEPA, T. Cook, president.

Daughters of Penelope, Mrs. J. Hasiotes, president.

Sons of Pericles, J. J. Alexion, president.

Maids of Athena, Miss J. Spires, president.

GAPA Electra Lodge, Mrs. W. Janikies, president.

GAPA Kanaris Lodge, T. J. Demos, president.

Panarcadian Federation, Chapter No. 29, Attorney G. Demopulos, secretary.

VERRAZANO DAY

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, we honor a great Italian and a famous navigator and explorer when we observe Verrazano Day, a day that this year marks the 442d anniversary of the exploration of New York Harbor by the intrepid Giovanni da Verrazano. He sailed to an unknown part of North America over uncharted waters. The great bridge that now bears his name is an appropriate monument to the greatness of his achievement.

On April 17, 1524, Verrazano, sailing for the King of France, entered what is now New York Harbor. Reporting to the King, he wrote:

> We found a very agreeable site located within two small prominent hills, between which flowed to the sea a very great river. He described how he had anchored his ship, the *Dauphine*, off the coast in a good shelter, since we did not wish to venture in without knowledge of the entrances.

He had ordered a small boat launched from the *Dauphine*, and his party had proceeded through the Narrows, whose waters were found to be deep. Verrazano's report noted that through the Narrows "any laden ship might have passed." It was discovered that the river "made a very beautiful lake with a circuit of about 3 leagues." The "lake" was, of course, Upper New York Bay, viewed for the first time by white men, men led by a courageous and able Italian sea captain, Giovanni da Verrazano.

By honoring him on Verrazano Day, we salute all of our friends who are Italian-Americans, for we recognize in this way how much their famous countryman Verrazano achieved, and how great a contribution to our way of life they themselves have made.

The new Verrazano Bridge is a vital link in the chain of the Nation's commerce aiding and enhancing rapid transit and its existence has brought new industrial and commercial opportunities to the Borough of Brooklyn.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECHES IN MEXICO

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Chelf] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, as you know, President Johnson, accompanied by Mrs. Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and a House and Senate delegation, flew to Mexico on Friday, April 15, for the unveiling of a statue of Abraham Lincoln which the United States has given to Mexico.

As the Member of Congress representing the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky in which Lincoln was born, near the city of Hodgenville, I was privileged to make this memorable trip.

In my 35 years of holding elective office, I have seen many public demonstrations and this was absolutely the finest I have ever witnessed. It was the greatest experience of my political life to see the demonstration of the warmth and sincerity of feeling which the people of Mexico have for our country and for our President as manifested in the magnificent reception given him upon his arrival in Mexico and throughout his stay there. It is estimated by all those in authority that the crowd greeting the President numbered between 2½ and 3 million people.

My wife, Louise, and I were in car 15 of the 4-hour official motorcade which moved through Mexico City's streets lined with enthusiastic, shouting citizens. As we drove along, my wife shook the hands of all of the people she could on her side and I shook hands, with both hands, on my side of the car, shouting "Viva Mexico" as we proceeded along. As our car stopped upon one occasion, a little, old lady came up and handed me a brown paper sack. My meager knowledge of Spanish permitted me to understand that she was saying: "Please give this to Mrs. Johnson." In my broken Spanish, I was able to assure her that I would see that Mrs. Johnson received it. The little sack contained homemade candy which she especially wanted our First Lady to have and which was deeply appreciated by her.

Those included in the official delegation from the Senate were: The Honorable Mike Mansfield, Hon. Everett Dirksen, Hon. Joseph Montoya, Hon. George Aiken and Hon Paul Douglas, and their wives, and from the House were the Honorable Glenard Lipscomb, Hon. Henry Gonzalez, Hon. Edward R. Roybal, Hon. Eligio de la Garza, and myself along with our wives.

This outpouring of affection, respect and admiration which our President and Mrs. Johnson received made me inordinately proud of both of them and their enormously effective efforts in cementing the bonds of friendship with our neighbors "south of the border."

This enthralling experience provided positive proof that neighbors and nations can live together in peace, harmony, mutual respect, and admiration.

As one of the members of the U.S. House delegation, I would like to go on record here in the Congressional Record in thanking most profusely and from the bottom of my heart President Diaz Ordaz of Mexico, the Presidents of the Permanent Commissions of both the House and the Senate, and all of the Members of the Congress of Mexico for their congeniality, hospitality, kindness, consideration, and sincere best wishes. As long as we have in high office in our neighboring country of Mexico such outstanding, competent, and dedicated men as these herein mentioned, I shall never have any fear for the future relationship of our great peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I include the texts of the three wonderful speeches made by President Johnson in Mexico:

The President's Visit to Mexico City

(Remarks upon arrival at International Airport, Apr. 14, 1966)

Mr. President, Mrs. Diaz Ordaz, members of the First Family, my friends of Mexico, this is almost a homecoming for the Johnson family. Thirty-one years ago we came to Mexico on our honeymoon. Since then, on every occasion possible, we have used the border into your country, visited in your cities and your countryside, and we have enjoyed on many occasions, visits from your leaders and your Presidents.

I first met President Adolfo López Mateos in the late 1950's when he came to the United States. Later, as President, I visited with him in the United States at the Chamizal at El Paso, and in 1964 your own distinguished President honored us with a visit that he and his wife made in our home in Texas.

So when I come to Mexico, I feel that I come to the home of my friends. We are here today to present to your country a statue of one of our most beloved and most respected Presidents, Abraham Lincoln. We present that statue to the people that we consider our most treasured friends.

Mr. President, we are grateful to you for this beautiful reception, for your gracious remarks. We will look forward to exchanging views with you in the hours that we are permitted together.

I said to your distinguished and able Ambassador, Ambassador Margáin, on the way down on the plane today, that while we faced many trying problems in the world today, I did not believe there had ever been a period in the history of the United States and Mexico when we faced fewer problems, when we had better understanding, and when there was a stronger friendship that exists between the people than exists today.

That is because, Mr. President, you and your distinguished predecessors have understood our people and have provided a farsighted leadership for your people that has brought us together in understanding and friendship.

Although in other parts of the world neighbors fight neighbors, neighbors are in dispute with neighbors, there are no armies that patrol our borders, there are no guns that protect the frontiers of Mexico and the United States. Our people cross the boundary freely and work and play together.

If I could have my one wish granted today, it would be that we could live in a world where we had the same peaceful relations with our neighbors as we have with the people of Mexico. But if we are to have peace in the world, we must try to solve the problems that cause the wars, the problems of illiteracy, the problems of ignorance, the problems of disease, the problems of poverty, the problems of misunderstanding.

Mr. President, we salute you for the leadership that you are providing your own great nation and the contribution you are making to other nations in the world in a program that will bring peace to all humankind. While war clouds hover over certain parts of the world as we meet here this afternoon, we truly and genuinely and sincerely hope that the day may soon come when all the world can live together in peace as do the people of the United States and Mexico.

Mr. President, our distinguished Secretary of State, the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, the minority leader of the U.S. Senate, leaders of our House of Representatives, join me on this occasion in thanking you for this very cordial welcome and in saying to you: Muchas gracias, Señor Presidente; muchas gracias, todo Mexico.

THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO MEXICO CITY

(Remarks at the dedication of the Abraham Lincoln statue, Apr. 15, 1966)

Mr. President, my friends, it is impossible for me to tell you how proud I am to be here with you today, in company with the leadership of the U.S. Senate, prominent Members of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Congressmen from the States of Illinois and Kentucky, that gave us Abraham Lincoln.

The President of the United States could ask for no greater honor than to be invited to stand on the soil of our good friend, Mexico, beside a leader as beloved and respected as your great President, Diaz Ordaz.

For me this occasion has a very special meaning. All my life I have known, and lived with, and worked alongside the sons and the daughters of Mexico. I have been here on many different occasions; my wife and I spent the first days of our marriage here in this beautiful city, Mexico City.

To come back now to the people and the scenes of so many pleasant memories, to come as the leader of your sister Republic to the north, where your country is held in such high esteem, is for me a moment never to be forgotten.

The tribute that your great Foreign Secretary Carrillo Flores has just paid to Abraham Lincoln will touch the hearts of all of my countrymen.

All nations rightly praise their own famous men.

But only a truly great people pause to pay tribute to the great of other lands.

And that is what Mexico is doing today.

What Abraham Lincoln stood for is what binds our two nations—and, indeed, this entire hemisphere—together.

More than geography and common economic interests and a regional system of mutual assistance, we are held together by common values and by shared beliefs.

That is why we share equally Bolivar and Washington, San Martin and Jefferson, Juárez and Marti and Lincoln. They were sons of a common heritage.

In his time and place, Abraham Lincoln brought the best in our common civilization to bear on the cruelest problems that ever confronted a leader: civil war and the enslavement of a minority of his people.

In these trials he clung to the belief that every human being was unique and precious—equal in the eyes of God and before the law.

He believed that the pillars of a great society were equality of opportunity, individual freedom to excel, and justice—political and social justice—for every citizen.

And so he walked among us—bearing on his shoulders the burdens of a Nation's greatest test—proving that true greatness lies in loyalty to those universal principles which span every age.

Now, in this age we in this hemisphere are today engaged in another great test—we are engaged in a vast social revolution touching the lives of millions of people on two continents.

Like Lincoln's, this is a test of whether freedom can work.

It is a test of whether men through liberty can overcome the weight of the past and lift from their brothers the blight of hunger, the blindness of ignorance, and the burden of disease.

We are in the midst of that test.

We must demonstrate to our peoples that their destiny is not class struggle but common struggle to achieve that proud and that modern Latin America which is at once the dream of a generation and the interest of the world community.

This is a battle which only the people of Latin America can win.

But it is the desire of my people, our commitment, and our privilege to work side by side in this great human adventure.

History will judge us not only by the nobility of our sentiments or the poetry of our words, but history will judge us by the action that we take to bring these sentiments to life.

For my country's part, we are guided by certain basic convictions upon which our faith in the future rests. Let me be specific about some of those convictions:

First, every member of the American community of nations has a natural right to its independence and sovereignty. No country may abridge those rights. For as your own Benito Juárez said, "Respect for the rights of others is peace."

Second, the United States maintains its commitment to government by consent of the governed—a consent to be granted in free and honest elections. It does not seek to impose on others any form of government. But let us stand determined on this principle—despots are not welcome in this hemisphere.

Third, my administration believes that both stable democracy and effective economic development depend ultimately on social justice. There has never been stable democracy where economic power and privilege were concentrated in the hands of the few. Where the many work let the many earn.

Fourth, we believe the struggle for social justice and more efficient and equitable use of natural resources must be led by each country in its own behalf. My administration will not be deterred by those who tenaciously or selfishly cling to special privileges from the past. We will not be deterred by those who say that to risk change is to risk communism.

Fifth, we do not wish to see communism spread in this hemisphere, but we believe that the threat to the liberty and independence of the Latin American peoples from communism cannot be met merely by force. We will continue to concentrate our assistance mainly in economic and social fields and to encourage our Latin American neighbors, where possible, to limit their outlays for military purposes. We are encouraged that democracy flourishes in countries such as Mexico where expenditures for education and development are high.

Sixth, we are convinced that the future of Latin American industrialization—as well as the basic welfare of the peoples themselves—urgently requires the parallel modernization of rural life. This must combine more equitable forms of land holding and all the measures that are needed to raise production and productivity. And your two Presidents this morning discussed at length steps that we are going to take to do both.

Seventh, we shall continue to work with your own able President Diaz Ordaz and work with our Latin American friends throughout the hemisphere to augment and to stabilize earnings from traditional exports, while assisting efforts to expand those new exports on which Latin American trade will increasingly depend in the future.

Eighth, we believe that the drawing together of the economics of Latin America is critical to this hemisphere's future. Only in this way can the hemisphere develop truly efficient industry; expanded foreign exchange earnings; and a sound foundation for a full Latin American partnership in building a peaceful world community.

One of the challenges of hemisphere integration is the linking of North and South America through the Pan American Highway.

It is one ambition of my Presidency to work with the other nations of this hemisphere toward closing the several hundred miles of the gap that now exists. We must await the studies that are now nearing completion, but together we should look to the day when the old precolonial links across the Isthmus are fully restored, the good lands of Panama are opened for agriculture, and families and commerce can move anywhere between Laredo and the southernmost tip of Argentina.

Señor Presidente Diaz Ordaz, my country takes great heart in what you, in Mexico, are doing. We see today a people who are forging ahead. We see today a nation that is proud and a people that are confident.

You are confident of the future because you are confident that you can secure for your people a constant increase in material well-being and social justice.

You are confident that you can deal with all other neighbors in independence, friendship, and dignity.

You are confident that you can help your less advanced neighbors also to move ahead with you.

And you are confident that you can maintain in the modern world your own personality—loyal to your own traditions and aspirations.

Mexico's progress is witness that the goals of the Alliance are realistic and its methods are valid.

I have served with four American Presidents who showed their concern and their friendship for Mexico and Latin America. Franklin Roosevelt lifted our eyes to the promise and the problems of Latin America with the good neighbor policy. Harry Truman's boldness brought forth point 4 and its compassion to the Western Hemisphere and to the entire world. Dwight Eisenhower plowed new and fertile and productive fields with the Act of Bogotá. And John F. Kennedy, building on and expanding and refining that act, gave fresh impulse to all our ideals in the Alliance.

Twenty-nine months ago, the first week of of my Presidency, my first act as President of the United States was to pledge my country again to the faith and the direction of these four Presidents and their relations with the nations in this hemisphere.

I am proud today to report to the Mexican people and to all of our Latin American friends that our common effort is proving itself with specific results. Our dreams are becoming realities.

As I speak to you here today, I have been involved in the executive branch of my Government for 6 years. The first 3 years, the average growth rate in Latin America was 1 percent. In the last 3 years of my Presidency, that growth rate is now 2½ percent. This achievement, in which Mexico, the United States, and all the other countries of Latin America can take great pride, will continue strong, I predict, in the year 1966. We believe that the growth rate in that year will exceed the 2½ percent of this year.

Ahead, of course, lie many problems that are yet to be overcome. Hard work and perseverance, not hope alone, will bend them to solution.

At the recent meeting of the Economic Ministers in Buenos Aires, we were right to take stock of what we have learned since 1961 and to plan and to chart the course ahead.

Now we must give necessary impulse to, as I said to your President this morning, new and additional initiatives, we must open new paths, we must breathe new energy into our efforts.

And to that end, I will in the months ahead join with Latin American leaders in exploring the proposal of the President of Argentina for a new meeting at the very highest level to examine our common problems and to give the Alliance for Progress increased momentum.

Such a conference should be prepared with the utmost care. We should examine every idea which might advance our common interest, be it old or new. Careful preparation need not be the enemy, however, of imaginative action and new adventures.

It will take time and faith and stubborn effort to achieve together the goals that we set ourselves in the Charter of Punta del Este 5 years ago.

But this we must do. This we will do. There is no other way, in our time and in this hemisphere, to show what freemen and what free nations can do working together.

And so let all of us, let all the world know that we know our challenge. I saw it, riding through the streets of your beautiful city with your great President last evening; I saw it in the hopeful face of young Mexico, in the hundreds of thousands of little children who are the future of this great land; I saw young people, with minds to be educated, with bodies to be protected from disease; I saw young boys and girls who one day will be able to find a job and who will raise their families in peace, and some will lead this great nation tomorrow.

And this is the challenge that faces the people of America and faces the people of Latin America, and this is a challenge that we will—shoulder to shoulder—accept.

Once again, I want to say how very proud and very happy I am to be here with you today, Señor Presidente, you, my good and warm friend, and to be among your gracious people of Mexico.

Very shortly I will return to the other side of the river, but I will leave, to enjoy the hospitality of your great people, Mrs. Johnson and my Secretary of State and the distinguished Delegation from the Congress. And before I leave, I should like to say this: May we all always seek justice and peace together. Come what may, may we always be good neighbors—and may we always be good amigos.

The President's Visit to Mexico City

(Remarks to the staff at the American Embassy, Apr. 15, 1966)

Secretary and Mrs. Rusk, Ambassador and Mrs. Freeman, my friends, ladies, and gentlemen, I drove down the street with great pride as my eyes looked upon this beautiful building put here by the talented hands of architects from my State. As I walked into this building, I looked back over my memories in Government and thought that never in my 35 years in public service in Washington had our country been more fortunate in its selection of a Secretary of State than it is now with Dean Rusk.

He is guiding our relations with other nations with a skill and an understanding and a compassion that is unequaled, in my judgment, in my lifetime. He has built around him 100 or more of the ablest ambassadors that any administration has ever assembled to serve the interests of our Nation. It gives me great pride to pay just tribute to the work being done by Ambassador and Mrs. Freeman here in Mexico.

But what really gives me the greatest pride and the greatest pleasure is to come here and look into the smiling faces that stand around me in this beautiful building and see the folks that take care of the daily chores and that reflect such great credit to the country they serve. No nation ever had more competent or more loyal or more dedicated public employees than the United States of America and no department ever had more of those kinds of employees than the Department of State.

I want to say to each of you at your desk and the tasks that engage you that your President is proud of the work you do, is grateful to you for the loyalty that you give and the sacrifices that you make, and the credit that you reflect upon your country.

I observed the other day a statement my father made to me, when I was a little boy and he was talking about public service. He said, "To understand people, you must know them and to properly speak for them and represent them, you must love them." For that reason he always leaned over backward to be democratic. There was no little farmer from the humblest village in the land that he didn't want to know, because he got more from the farmer than he gave.

I think that each of you who carry on with your work, serving our national interest each day, could profit by remembering that statement: "To know the people of Mexico, you must understand them and to represent them and carry out our program and our purpose with them, you must love them."

I have been coming across this border all my life. I have been working with the people of Mexico ever since I was a child. My first playmate was a little Mexican boy. We raced our horses together, when we were both just learning to ride. I remember he told me he didn't want to run a race with me, because his horse wasn't as fat as mine, and therefore couldn't run as fast.

I said, "I will solve that problem. We will make him as fat." So we got a bucket and got in the oat bin and fed him all afternoon. Then we filled him full of water and then we took him out and ran the race. Then the horse died.

All my life the Mexican people have been my friends and my playmates, my closest associates and my most trusted allies, and my most loyal supporters. They have been intimidated, criticized, browbeaten, sometimes they have been hauled into court for voting for me, but they have always been there.

I brought my bride to Mexico City on our honeymoon. I have come back here at every opportunity. So, we are very thankful we were given the chance to come here again and show the people of this nation the great respect and friendship we have for them, and to say to those of you who serve my administration and your country so well that I am mighty grateful and proud of you.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4(c) OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2729) to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, and that the House recede from its amendments numbered 1 through 7.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that S. 2729 had to be returned to the House of Representatives from the other body. This legislation, which will enable the Small Business Administration to reopen its lending windows, could have been signed into law by now had it not been for the actions of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore]. It is interesting to note that the other body adopted without change all of the amendments to S. 2729 offered by the Banking and Currency Committee and another amendment which I offered on the floor. However, the other body rejected the amendment to the bill which was offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

GENTLEMAN FROM WEST VIRGINIA INCORRECTLY INTERPRETED HIS AMENDMENT

There is no need to go into a complete description of S. 2729 at this point since there were lengthy discussions on the bill when it was first before this body. However, since that time I have informed Members of this House that the gentleman from West Virginia did not correctly interpret the amendment which he offered to S. 2729 and misled the House when he obtained passage of this amendment. I opposed the gentleman from West Virginia's amendment—as did a large number of my colleagues. I opposed his amendment, not because I was against what he said his amendment would do, but because I was against what his amendment would in fact accomplish.

The actions of the gentleman from West Virginia in seeking to inform this House as to the purposes of his amendment recalls the story of the little girl who rushed home from school one day to inform her father that she had won a prize in a contest at school.

"What type of contest?" asked the father.

"Well," replied the little girl, "the teacher asked how many legs on a cow and I won because I said three legs."

"But a cow has four legs," responded the father, "why did you win the prize if you said three legs?"

"Mine was the closest guess," explained the little girl.

Now, I am certain that the gentleman from West Virginia knows how many legs there are on a cow. However, there can be no doubt that he did not know what the amendment that he offered to S. 2729 would accomplish. This fact is brought home even more clearly when the legislation was sent to the other body for action. The gentleman from West Virginia stated that his amendment would merely provide a $100 million ceiling for loans made under title 4 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. However, his amendment did not provide such a ceiling, but rather established a separate revolving fund for loans made under title 4 of the Economic Opportunity Act.

GENTLEMAN FROM WEST VIRGINIA FORSAKES HIS AMENDMENT

Following passage of S. 2729, the gentleman from West Virginia addressed this body and stated that a revolving fund would not be set up under his amendment. On page 7694 of the Congressional Record for April 5, 1966, the gentleman from West Virginia, in a 1-minute address entitled "A Revolving Fund Will Not Be Established," stated that:

> There was no intent on my part to set up [sic] separate revolving fund to the Economic Opportunity loans.

On that same day S. 2729 was considered by the other body. In discussing the legislation, the floor leader of the measure, Senator Proxmire, stated:

> Mr. President, the first seven amendments provide a separate SBA revolving fund for loans under title 4 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This separate fund is not necessary and, I am convinced, was not intended by the House, which only meant to put a ceiling on such loans.

There can be no doubt as to what the Moore amendment accomplished. By rejecting the Moore amendment and placing ceilings on the title 4 loans, the other body has accomplished what the gentleman from West Virginia stated his amendment was designed to accomplish. However, had he been correct in asserting that his amendment and his description of his amendment were identical, it would not have been necessary for the other body to reject the Moore amendment and rewrite it to change the revolving fund into a ceiling limitation.

The gentleman from West Virginia has stated that—

> Because of a certain amount of confusion generated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], an attempt on my part to reword the Moore amendment so as to make this clear was not accomplished.

SENATE REJECTS GENTLEMAN FROM WEST VIRGINIA'S AMENDMENT

Mr. Speaker, if I was one that generated the confusion, why is it that the other body adopted all of the amendments handled by the Banking and Currency Committee and rejected the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia? I will state to the gentleman that he is clearly confused as to the person responsible for the confusion which led to the confusion. I will also say to the gentleman that if he made an attempt to reword his amendment, he did it with such mystery that I have not been able to uncover anyone who knows of any attempt on the part of the gentleman from West Virginia to reword his amendment. I do recall that I asked for unanimous consent to have the Clerk reread the Moore amendment in the hopes that we could work out this situation and clear up the confusion, but I must point out to the gentleman from West Virginia that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino], who sits on the same side of the aisle with the gentleman from West Virginia, objected to a rereading of the amendment. Apparently, even the Republican colleagues of the gentleman from West Virginia did not know of Mr. Moore's desire to reword his amendment.

I will further state to the gentleman from West Virginia that as long as I am chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I will never knowingly sit by while a Member misleads this House on a bill which has originated from the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. Speaker, more than 2 weeks have passed since S. 2729 passed the House of Representatives and was subsequently amended by the other body. Had it not been for the erroneous statements made by the gentleman from West Virginia, this legislation could have been signed by the President and be well on its way toward helping thousands of small businessmen. As it is, these hard-pressed small businessmen will have to wait a little longer for assistance. I sincerely hope that small businessmen throughout America can forgive this body for the delay.

U.S. DEEP OCEAN RECOVERY OF A NUCLEAR WEAPON IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this month the Navy announced recovery of the H-bomb which was lost last January in the ocean off Palomares, Spain. Now that the operation is over, I believe it is important to again call attention to this Nation's woeful lack of preparedness to meet this and any future situation of a similiar nature. It comes as a surprise to many of us that in this day of manned space exploration, the United States does not have a capability of exploring the ocean's bottom; that while we are spending billions each year to build complex vehicles to send men to the moon, we have developed only a handful of research vehicles for penetrating the ocean depths, and even these are in the model T stage of development. I strongly believe this is a matter which should immediately be discussed in Congress, for who knows when another bomb will be lost, or another nuclear submarine and its men trapped on the ocean bottom?

Unfortunately, the U.S. Government has long been slow to react to the challenge of deep ocean operations. In 1915, the Navy lost its first submarine, the *F–4*, in more than 300 feet of water off Hawaii. There was a great hue and cry in the newspapers, and the Navy immediately became interested in deep diving, salvage, and submarine safety—subjects that had taken second place behind big ships and big guns in the naval budgets of that day. Then, in September 1925, another submarine, the *S–51*, was lost off Block Island, N.Y. Most of the crew was trapped, unable to escape. The incident received wide publicity, and caused the Navy to reexamine submarine rescue and salvage procedures. Although the Navy's first submarine rescue and salvage ship was commissioned shortly afterward, events in 1927 again demonstrated our inability to cope with the problem of rescuing survivors from a bottomed submarine. Then, 2 days after Christmas 1927, the submarine *S–4* sank off Provincetown, Mass., in 107 feet of water. Divers were able to communicate with men trapped inside by tapping messages on the boat's hull. The rescue operation, however, was unsuccessful and divers waited helplessly outside as submariners breathed their last gasp of air and perished. Public reaction to this tragedy was so intense that the President directed the Secretary of the Navy to establish a board to review diving and salvage technology and to recommend an operational submarine rescue and escape system.

As a result of the Board's recommendations, the Navy developed the McCann rescue system, a diving chamber capable of reaching a submarine at depths down to 850 feet. The substantial investment for development of the chamber and the rescue ships designed to carry it to the scene of a submarine disaster paid off in May 1939, when 33 survivors of the ill-fated *Squalus* were rescued in 240 feet of water.

However, the United States was again painfully made aware of its inadequacy in the ocean almost 3 years ago this month when the Navy suffered its fourth major submarine disaster of this century. In April 1963, the nuclear submarine *Thresher* went into an uncontrolled dive 240 miles off Boston and was lost with all hands in 8,300 feet of water. Ships reached the scene of the disaster within hours, and cruised helplessly back and forth on the surface knowing that had the submariners miraculously survived, there was no way they could be brought to the surface. To the surprise of many observers, only the oceanographers had instruments capable of searching for *Thresher*, but even these were designed for science, not for submarine location. Many Members of the House remember the days we waited for news of *Thresher's* location; the false leads and reports; the first discovery of debris on the seafloor by underwater photography; and the amazement felt that even if the Navy knew the *Thresher* had gone down within a 10-mile-square area, it took a fleet of searchers weeks to precisely locate the hull. The major part of the submarine's hull was not photographed until 15 months later, despite extensive observations from the deep diving submersible *Trieste*. At the time, the *Trieste* was the only vehicle capable of taking observers to the scene; many of them pointedly remarked at the time that even this submersible was designed and built in Europe.

In the wake of the *Thresher* disaster, the Navy—for the fourth time in 50 years—had to again face up to its inadequacies in deep submergence vehicles. One observer commented in 1963 that the Navy's record depth for salvage was still 306 feet—a record set by divers 48 years previously during the raising of the *F–4*. Clearly, major advancements in diving technology and salvage were urgently needed as at that time no significant progress had been made for 48 years.

Toward this end, the Secretary of the Navy convened a group of civilian and military experts shortly after *Thresher's* loss to study and recommend ways of locating large and small objects on the ocean floor, and of rescuing trapped submarine personnel. The Deep Submergence Systems Review Group recommended a $300 million 5-year program to develop a family of undersea vehicles for rescue of personnel, sea-bottom search and recovery, and to extend limits of manned diving. As conceived by the DSSRG, a worldwide operational system of air transportable, deep diving rescue vehicles and an operational system could be ready to meet any contingency within 5 years. The vehicles, and their surface support ships, would be equipped with advanced instruments capable of searching the sea bottom, and with tools designed for deep ocean salvage.

The DSSRG report was endorsed by the Secretary of the Navy and a deep submergence systems project—DSSP—established to implement the group's recommendations. Meanwhile, the *Thresher* search had stimulated considerable interest in private industry. A number of companies indicated willingess to undertake engineering work related to the Navy's objective. DSSP reviewed the DSSRG recommendations and revised the cost of the recommended program upward to $500 to $600 million, excluding the cost of national test facilities needed to support development of the proposed submersibles. However, the DSSP proposal apparently had tough sledding in the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. DOD subsequently approved $229 million for developing six rescue and five search vehicles. The program also approved development of prototype models of deeper operating search and salvage vehicles. DSSP was further cut back in the Defense Department budget for 1967. I am informed that despite an appeal by the Secretary of the Navy giving deep submergence top program priority, $5 million was cut from the research and development 1967 defense budget submitted to Congress. Consequently, the program was further cut back and development time extended to accommodate the greatly reduced budget. Emphasis was put on developing a capability for rescuing trapped personnel at Continental Shelf depth, using a submersible that could be carried to the rescue area piggyback on the deck of a nuclear submarine. Small object salvage—particularly at deep depth—was given a lower priority and the program for deep ocean salvage technology deferred.

Public attention was again briefly focused on the difficulty of finding objects underwater in August 1965, when a United Airlines jet crashed into Lake Michigan about 30 miles from Chicago. Although an intensive search was made for the plane, wreckage was not found until September. Sonar and underwater television were used in the search. At this time, Lt. Comdr. Don Walsh—who piloted the *Trieste* during its record-breaking dive 35,800 feet into the Marianas Trench—in testimony before the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, called attention to the fact that even in the shallow waters of the Great Lakes we were unable to locate a large sunken airplane hull.

The submergence issue again became a cause of national and international attention on January 17, 1966; when an Air Force B–52 collided with a KC–135 jet air tanker while refueling in flight over southern Spain. Four thermonuclear weapons, reportedly with the yield of 20 megatons each, were involved in the collision and fell to earth. Three were recovered on land near Palomares, although two were heavily damaged. The tail fin of a fourth bomb was also recovered on shore. The bomb's parachute deployed during its 30,000-foot fall. A fisherman sighted a parachute shortly after the crash and noted it fell more rapidly than the crew's parachutes. His attention was diverted to the parachuting survivors but witnesses ashore and on a Spanish hydrographic ship operating nearby also saw the parachute. From these observations, the bomb's probable trajectory was calculated and a narrow search corridor running from the beach 6 miles offshore established, with emphasis on a 1-mile circle around the parachute sighting.

The Navy immediately went into action. The day following the crash, search vessels began scanning the area. Task Force 65 of the 6th Fleet was established. In the U.S. Navy, specialists began rounding up the instruments and equipment they felt needed to recover the bomb. Fortunately, the Navy was in better shape than before the *Thresher* incident. Two deep-diving submersibles were available for the search: *Alvin*, a small two-man submersible built by the Office of Naval Research for the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution; and *Aluminaut*, a larger, deeper diving submarine built and operated by Reynolds International Corp. *Alvin* could operate to 6,000-foot depths up to 10 hours. *Aluminaut* has a 15,000-foot operating depth capability and can cruise submerged up to 72 hours. Both vehicles, along with the smaller Perry-Ocean Systems, Inc. *Cubmarine*—with a 600-foot maximum operating depth—and the Navy's *Deep Jeep*—2,000 feet—were dispatched to the scene. Reynolds Aluminum agreed to furnish the *Aluminaut*, its surface support ship *Privateer*, and personnel for the search. The Navy immediately enlisted the support of industry. The petroleum industry, in particular, was prepared to provide equipment developed for offshore wells and exploration; underwater television cameras and sonars, for example.

From the outset of the search, the Navy was faced with three major problems—the same problems that had confronted *Thresher's* searchers. First, they had only a very sketchy knowledge of the topography of the sea bottom in the search area, and only the most rudimentary methods of underwater navigation. The bomb was apparently in about 2,500 feet of water, although the search area included the sea floor from scuba-diving depths of a 100 to 200 feet out to 4,500-foot depths. The bottom was quite rugged, with granite outcrops and a thick covering of fine, silt-like ooze. This would complicate navigation, since vibrations of the submersibles' propellers would stir up large clouds of silt, making visual search with lights difficult. Therefore, the Navy first had to survey the bottom so Task Force 65 could provide the searchers with accurate maps. A 125-square-mile search area was established on the basis of the survey.

Another problem was the unavailability of sophisticated tools and instruments for deep water search. Although the required capabilities of such tools had been spelled out after *Thresher*, the Navy was still woefully unprepared. It is interesting to note that the magnetometer, a device which detects metallic objects by noting their disturbance in the earth's normal magnetic field, could not be used to search for the weapon, since none of its components were sufficiently magnetic.

Perhaps the biggest obstacle during the search was the weather on the surface, which frequently frustrated the efforts of the searchers. Surface conditions are limiting factors in deep submersible operations which are frequently overlooked by those who question the time needed to conduct even routine research investigations.

Working around the clock, the Navy searched the sea floor for more than a month. Scuba divers and the *Cubmarine* plied the nearshore waters. Here, searchers were able to recover wreckage from the bomber and tanker. Farther out *Alvin* and *Aluminaut* crossed and crisscrossed the rough sea bottom, always on the lookout. The research ship *Mizar* also towed a submerged sensor across the same area. An illustration of the difficulty of maneuvering on the ocean floor can be seen in *Aluminaut's* experience during one of its dives. On one pass through the search area her sonar detected a small object. Maneuvering to return to the spot where the object had been seen, *Aluminaut* began a slow turn. Her propellers kicked up so much silt that the pilot had to wait one-half hour before he could resume his search. Thus, in this, the first sustained sea floor search for a small object at great depth, the operators of the pioneering submersibles quickly gained valuable experience. To their surprise they found that the only reliable instrument for search in the depths was what they referred to as the "Mark I eyeball": the human eye.

Over the weeks that followed, *Alvin* alone made a total of 145 dives. On March 15, the 50-ton submersible was cautiously backing down a 70-degree slope—her observers being unable to look over the nose of *Alvin* at this angle—when the bomb's parachute was spotted. The bomb itself was hidden by the canopy. Depth of location: 2,532 feet. It is interesting to note that the site was about 5 miles offshore, well out of Spain's territorial waters and well within the area where the parachute was predicted to have fallen.

There ensued another 3 weeks of frustration as the Navy attempted to secure lines to the bomb for recovery. Weather continued to hamper salvage operations. The bomb weighed 8 tons, but *Alvin* was able to lift only 20 pounds with her mechanical arm or manipulator. On March 24 a line from the *Mizar*, fastened to the chute by the *Alvin*, fouled on an anchor or around a granite outcropping and snapped. The bomb rolled another 250 feet down the slope to 2,800 feet where it was lost for another 9 days. Weather continued to frustrate search operations. *Alvin* finally relocated the bomb on April 2, by following the bomb's trench formed by the bomb sliding down from the original position. As recovery operations resumed the bomb was in constant danger of rolling into a deeper narrow canyon where salvage could have been impossible. Many times, Navy men commented on how frustrating it was working blind from the surface, with no effective means of grappling or handling the bomb at such great depths. Despite years of thinking about the problem, the Navy found it very difficult to manipulate—to work—at depth and transmit the commands of man to a mechanical arm sufficiently to perform complicated tasks such as securing lines. While attempting to work on the bomb the parachute billowed over *Alvin* and for a time her pilot's vision was impaired to the extent that it was impossible to navigate the submersible. There was considerable anxiety on the surface until *Alvin* could see again.

Eventually, after being modified to work at 3,000 foot depth, *Curv*, an unmanned, remotely controlled vehicle designed for torpedo recovery from up to 2,000 feet was flown from California to the scene. After considerable trial and error, the vehicle was guided into position over the bomb by sonar and television cameras where she was able to fix two grapnels to the parachute. *Curv* also became permanently entangled in the parachute. *Curv*, parachute, and weapon were brought to the surface by the U.S.S. *Petrel*, a submarine rescue vessel, by a winch. As was expected by explosive ordnance disposal technicians, there was no danger of radioactivity. The bomb's multiple fail-safe mechanisms, of course, has prevented accidental detonation when the weapon fell into the sea.

On April 7, at 1:40 a.m. Washington time, 80 days after the operation had begun, the bomb was lifted to the deck of *Petrel*. Task Force 65 had completed a task which may well be a historical landmark in marine technology. For once again—for the sixth time in the past 50 years—the Navy's, the Nation's, and indeed the world's attention was focused on man's inability not only to locate objects on the ocean floor, but to recover them efficiently and economically.

I think we can well ask, Will we be better prepared the next time this happens? I am not confident the lesson has yet penetrated down to those bureaucratic levels where cost-benefit analysis weighs more heavily than the technological realities of our ages. Putting our heads in the sand and hoping that we will not have to recover another bomb or another *Thresher* is absurd. Also, deferring the development of skill needed to locate and recover lost objects seems to be delaying still longer achieving the capability that recent events have demonstrated is not only necessary, but essential to our defense posture.

We should be grateful that we and not another nation found the bomb.

I therefore urge the committee most intimately concerned with deep ocean technology and military preparedness—Armed Services, Appropriations, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the committee on which I am privileged to serve, the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee—to immediately consider the state of deep submergence in the United States, and to invite experts in the field to testify concerning the needs, the problems, and the opportunities of this field. Industry, I am sure, will welcome public hearings on the subject, for it will be to industry that the Federal Government must ultimately look for the technological know-how and leadership in exploring the ocean's depths.

As the Congress studies the deep submergence needs of the United States, I strongly believe we should keep clearly in mind that any additional support we can give the Navy in the form of supplemental appropriations for accelerating the deep submergence project, and for expanding its now limited objectives, will provide the technology which eventually will also be needed for commercial exploitation of the ocean. Thus, while strengthening our ability to meet any future military requirements for small object search and recovery, we will advance and further ocean technology in general and so bring this Nation—belatedly perhaps—closer to that day when man will no longer have to grope in the ocean darkness, but will have the equipment—the systems—designed specifically for the exacting tasks needed to conquer the ocean's deep frontier.

In the face of the lessons so recently learned off Spain, we cannot afford to again economize, to again be penny-pinching in an area so important to our future military and economic posture. We must move forward now. We must develop tools for work underwater. We must gain experience using them. We must again remind the accountants and tradition-bound admirals of the Defense Department of the urgency for immediate action, and of the pressing need to reexamine the inadequate budgets which have been approved for this important but lagging endeavor in the forthcoming fiscal year. If the recent multimillion-dollar H-bomb 80-day recovery operation is any indication of the consequences of inaction, it is highly likely that the Navy's deep submergence budget should be at least doubled, and brought back into line with the earlier recommendations of experts in the field.

I, therefore, propose that deep submergence be carefully studied by all interested committees of the Congress, so that we can profit from the experience of the men of the Navy and industry who—in the face of almost insurmountable obstacles and under the most trying of conditions—were able to find this needle in the haystack, and so helped launch this Nation into a new era of ocean exploration and exploitation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. KELLY (at the request of Mr. HANLEY) for the week of April 18, 1966, on account of illness.

Mr. DOW, for April 18 and 19, on account of committee business in London, England—Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through May 13, on account of illness.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. HANLEY), for the week of April 18, 1966, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mrs. THOMAS) for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. REUSS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. THOMAS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. NIX.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. FISHER in two instances.

Mr. REES in four instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2822. An act to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm

Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 7, 1966, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 959. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 2752. An act for the relief of Kock Kong Fong;

H.R. 2938. An act for the relief of Przemyslaw Nowakowski;

H.R. 2939. An act for the relief of Manojlo Verzich;

H.R. 3875. An act for the relief of Mrs. Panagiota Vastakis and Soteros Vastakis;

H.R. 4743. An act for the relief of Ralph Tingo Edquid;

H.R. 6112. An act for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park);

H.R. 6319. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries, and to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the initial enrollment period for supplementary medical insurance benefits;

H.R. 7813. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to China;

H.R. 8466. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of insurance premium finance companies in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Ki Sook Jun;

H.R. 11029. An act relating to the tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics;

H.R. 11664. An act to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12 (g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

H.J. Res. 837. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning April 17, 1966, as "State and Municipal Road Week"; and

H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 19, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2290. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the report of the Post Office Department, pursuant to section 2304 of title 39, United States Code (H. Doc. No. 420); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2291. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 26, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of the Isle of Palms, Sullivans Island, and Charleston, S.C., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 421); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2292. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 26, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of other coastal beaches, South Carolina, authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 422); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2293. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide additional sources of financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2294. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report relating to the 1965 conservation reserve program, pursuant to the provisions of section 108c of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1832 (c)); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2295. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes for the quarter ending March 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 210(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and to the authority transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by Executive Order 10958, effective August 14, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2296. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, office of the Secretary of the Army transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment for the quarter ending March 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 210(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and the authority transferred to the Secretary of Defense by Executive Order 10952, effective August 1, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2297. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the fourth annual report on the administration of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, covering the calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2298. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of royalties charged to the U.S. Government for use by Government contractors of chemical milling inventions, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2299. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of safety conditions in certain storage areas primarily in the south building of the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2300. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of long-term medical research on aging of aviation personnel, Federal Aviation Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2301. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of opportunities for savings through greater use of available military aircraft parts, Federal Aviation Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2302. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improvements in multiple-award contracting policy, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2303. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings attainable through revisions of construction standards to avoid excess seating capacity in school dining facilities, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2304. A letter from the assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma in docket No. 303 of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2305. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chickasaw Nation of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2306. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a substantive portion of a final report on a long-range economic development plan for the territory of Guam, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–170; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2307. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases, as of February 28, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2308. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting certain amendments to pending legislation authorizing fiscal year 1967 appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

2309. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the court's opinion and findings, *In re Herman Adams, d/b/a Adams Manufacturing Co.* v. *The United States*, Cong. No. 5–59, pursuant to House Resolution 296, 86th Cong., 1st session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2310. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the court's opinion and findings, *In re Aurex Corporation* v. *The United States*, Cong. No. 12–58, pursuant to House Resolution 630, 85th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2311. A letter from the national headquarters, Military Order of the Purple Heart, U.S.A., Inc., transmitting an audit report of the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A., Inc., as of July 31, 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2312. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to the participation of the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2313. A letter from the national adjutant paymaster, Marine Corps League, transmitting reports of the national chairman and committee officers presented to the delegates to the 42d national convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2314. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated

February 25, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on Port Isabel Harbor, Tex., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted August 4, 1958, and House of Representatives, adopted August 14, 1959; no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been approved by the Chief of Engineers for accomplishment under the provisions of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

2315. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to construct buildings for postal purposes, to acquire title to real property therefor, to repair, alter, preserve, renovate, improve, extend, and equip such buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 14432. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 14433. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14434. A bill to designate the main dam of the Carlyle Reservoir on the Kaskaskia River, Ill., as the "Eldon E. Hazlet Dam"; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 14435. A bill to designate the Carlyle Reservoir on the Kaskaskia River, Ill., as the "Eldon E. Hazlet Reservoir"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 14436. A bill to amend the act of October 10, 1949, entitled "an act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes," so as to control all types of illegal transportation of cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14437. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 14438. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national veterans' cemetery system consisting of all cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 14439. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 14440. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national veterans' cemetery system consisting of all cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14441. A bill to provide educational assistance under the war orphans' educational assistance program to certain individuals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 1064. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.J. Res. 1065. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.J. Res. 1066. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

450. By the SPEAKER; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the transfer of jurisdiction over the resources of the Pribilof Islands to the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

451. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to shipping restrictions affecting the Alaska and British Columbia ferries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

452. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to ratification of an interstate boundary compact between the States of Arizona and California and petitioning the Congress of the United States to give its consent to the compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

453. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the Garcia River Delta; to the Committee on Public Works.

454. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the Ventura Marina, Ventura County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Warks.

455. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to ratification of an interstate boundary compact between the States of Arizona and California and petitioning the Congress of the United States to give its consent to the compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

456. Also, memorial from the assistant attorney general of the State of California, relative to the boundary compact entered into between the States of Arizona and California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

457. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to endorsing the policies of the Presidency in the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

458. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to development of the Snake River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

459. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to the enforcing of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14442. A bill for the relief of Ruel Longmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14443. A bill for the relief of Antonio Rapisardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 14444. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Renda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 14445. A bill for the relief of Johnson Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 14446. A bill for the relief of Armando, Rose, Antonella, and Ignazio Nicolosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14447. A bill for the relief of Vinola Cotilda Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14448. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Rocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 14449 A bill for the relief of Theodora Toya Bezates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

370. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Board of Education, Maple Heights, Ohio, relative to continuation of the school milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

371. Also, petition of Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., Medford, Oreg., relative to resolutions relating to Vietnam and un-American activities adopted at a convention held in Miami, Fla.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

372. Also, petition of Division of Peace and World Order, Board of Christian Social Concerns, Central Illinois Conference, the Methodist Church, Bloomington, Ill., relative to Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

373. Also, petition of Andrew J. Fitzpatrick, Greensboro, N.C., relative to a pension for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Paul Leaming, general board of evangelism, north Iowa conference, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

O God, under whose almighty hand we have come to this hour; bless these who also are appointed to write laws on tables of stone. May we order our lives as those who will one day stand before the Judge of all the earth. Above all, write Thy law in our hearts.

Our times are in Thy hand, O Lord. Keep our heritage before us, a reminder that all our freedoms have been bought in blood. We would be neither Red nor dead, but strive for a lasting peace.

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord. Be, then, Lord of our homes, our churches, our schools, our farms, and our factories. Most of all, from the least to the greatest of the commonwealth, we would declare a personal allegiance to Thee. We do here and now so declare it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 14, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

REPORT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Post Office Department, dated April 15, 1966, which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], I present a resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

The Commonwealth of
Massachusetts,
Office of the Secretary,
Boston, April 15, 1966.

Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Repeal Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act

Whereas, in order to end the competitive disadvantages of Massachusetts industry with right-to-work States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, April 5, 1966.

William C. Maiers,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, April 11, 1966.

Thomas A. Chadwick,
Clerk.

Attest:

Kevin H. White,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I present, for proper referral, a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island which memorializes Congress to insure that no reductions are made in the Federal aid to impacted area program under Public Law 874.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

House Resolution 1347

Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to Federal aid to impacted school districts in Rhode Island

Whereas the Congress has before it a proposal to cut by 50 percent the $3 million now received by 23 Rhode Island school districts who qualify as impacted areas; and

Whereas, if approved, the changes would eliminate all payments to nine Rhode Island communities; and

Whereas the hardest hit areas would be larger school systems near the Newport Naval Base and the Quonset Naval Air Station with large numbers of children from Navy families enrolled: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully requested to insure that no reductions are made in the Federal aid to impacted school districts; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is requested to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution in the hope that each will use every endeavor to insure that favorable action is taken by Congress upon this special matter.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Metcalf):

S. 3228. A bill to grant minerals, including oil, gas, and other natural deposits, on certain lands in the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. Anderson, and Mr. Fulbright):

S. 3229. A bill to establish rates of compensation for certain positions within the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Saltonstall when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Fulbright, and Mr. Saltonstall):

S. 3230. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to negotiate cooperative agreements granting concessions at the National Zoological Park to certain nonprofit organizations and to accept voluntary services of such organizations or of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3231. A bill to amend section 3203(b) of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the method of payment of pension, compensation, and retirement pay withheld from a veteran during hospitalization in cases where such veteran dies while mentally incompetent; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 3232. A bill to make certain expenditures by the city of New Haven, Conn., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3233. A bill for the relief of Dr. Roberto E. Parajon and Maria C. Florin Parajon, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 3234. A bill for the relief of Adel Naguib Iskaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

SCHOOL PRAYER

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which expresses the sense of the Senate with respect to religious practice in our public schools.

Basically, this resolution approves provision by any public school system of a time for prayerful meditation, without prescription by any public official and with each individual "permitted to pray as he chooses."

Such a practice, I believe, is thoroughly consonant with the provisions of the Constitution and with its interpretation by the Supreme Court. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution may appear in the Congressional Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 248) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. Res. 248

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(a) notwithstanding the recent Supreme Court decisions relating to the reading of the Bible and the offering of prayer in the public schools, any public school system if it so chooses may provide time during the schoolday for prayerful meditation if no public official prescribes or recites the prayer which is offered; and

(b) providing public school time for prayerful meditation in no way violates the Constitution because each individual participating therein would be permitted to pray as he chooses, but that such practice is consonant with the free exercise of religion protected by the first amendment to the Constitution.

RATES OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS WITHIN THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators

ANDERSON and FULBRIGHT, the three Senate members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish rates of compensation for certain positions within the Smithsonian Institution.

This proposed legislation will allow the Smithsonian Institution to establish salary levels for four senior positions comparable to the levels provided by law for positions in other agencies.

The Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 provides for an executive salary schedule consisting of five levels of compensation above grade GS-18—$25,382. Because of the Government-wide limitations on the number of positions that may be placed in this schedule, the Smithsonian positions have not been included under existing law.

The positions of Assistant Secretary—Science—and Assistant Secretary—History and Art—will be placed in level 4 at $27,000, the level that is generally accorded the Assistant Secretaries of other departments. The positions of Director of the U.S. National Museum and Director of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory—now at $25,382—will be placed in level 5 at $26,000. These two positions are comparable, with respect to their importance and responsibilities, to other positions that are included in level 5.

This act would have no effect on the existing number of supergrades—grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18—now held by the Institution in competition with other Government agencies under civil service regulations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3229) to establish rates of compensation for certain positions within the Smithsonian Institution, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NEGOTIATION OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS GRANTING CONCESSIONS AT THE NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to negotiate cooperative agreements granting concessions at the National Zoological Park to certain nonprofit organizations and to accept voluntary services of such organizations or of individuals, and for other purposes. This proposed legislation is the result of a recent Comptroller General decision that held that the Smithsonian Institution could not grant the Friends of the National Zoological Park, a nonprofit organization promoting educational purposes of the zoo, the privilege of conducting a coin-operated audio tour lecture system concession. The proceeds of the concession were to be used exclusively for educational purposes at the National Zoological Park. In summary of his position, the Comptroller General advised:

> We feel that the proposed arrangements with the Friends of the National Zoo would be unauthorized, however beneficial and desirable it might be. * * *
>
> We believe that authorization for entering such arrangements as proposed should be requested of the Congress.

This proposed legislation will provide the remedy suggested by the Comptroller.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3230) to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to negotiate cooperative agreements granting concessions at the National Zoological Park to certain nonprofit organizations and to accept voluntary services of such organizations or of individuals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INEQUITIES OF LAW WITH RESPECT TO INCOMPETENT VETERANS IN VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, now and then in pursuing a veteran's case, one runs into some rather singular inequities of existing law. I discovered the case of a lieutenant colonel, retired, of Springfield, Ill., who has been in various veterans' hospitals for 7 years as an incompetent. In such cases, the children and relatives of an incompetent veteran do not have the same rights to recovery as those of a competent veteran. I am introducing today a bill that will take care of such inequities.

I can fully understand the logic of the Comptroller General and also the Chief of the Retirement Pay Division of the Army; but I still believe that inequities exist and that, as such, they ought to be remedied.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3231) to amend section 3203(b) of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the method of payment of pension, compensation, and retirement pay withheld from a veteran during hospitalization in cases where such veteran dies while mentally incompetent, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN EXPENDITURES BY CITY OF NEW HAVEN, CONN., AS LOCAL GRANTS-IN-AID FOR PURPOSES OF HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to allow the city of New Haven, Conn., to make certain expenditures to be eligible as local grants-in-aid. The city of New Haven is planning the construction of a coliseum-convention center as part of the Church Street redevelopment and renewal project—Connecticut R-2.

The purpose of the Church Street project is the revitalization of downtown New Haven. Through the project the city seeks to establish the area as a vibrant retail and commercial area. It is a showpiece project for the Nation.

The proposed coliseum-convention center is essential to the success of this project.

First. The center will support and stimulate the retail development of the downtown by attracting large numbers of shoppers. This attraction is of crucial importance to downtown.

Second. The center will provide the area with an architectural focus, dramatically heightening the exciting urban experience that is the goal of the Church Street project. The structure also will be an important element of the gateway to the downtown area, bordering the principal highway access to the city. It will highlight New Haven's resurgence.

Finally, the coliseum-convention center will help downtown New Haven to become more lively and exciting by injecting diversity into the Church Street project.

The proposed coliseum-convention center, of course, will have an impact beyond the boundaries of the Church Street project. The proposed site of the center is approximately the geographical center of the city's 10 federally assisted urban renewal projects. People from these project areas, the Greater New Haven region, and, indeed, the State will utilize the educational, recreational, and convention facilities of the proposed center.

However, because of the provisions of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949, the use of the facilities of the proposed center by persons residing outside of the Church Street project may preclude all or a substantial portion of the eligible cost of the center from being counted as a grant-in-aid to the Church Street project. Yet it is the very fact that this center will bring so many people downtown that makes it so vitally important to the Church Street project, and to the success of New Haven's distinctive urban renewal program.

Therefore, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide that, notwithstanding the extent to which the coliseum-convention center proposed to be built within urban renewal project R-2 in New Haven, Conn., may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of New Haven in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3232) to make certain expenditures by the city of New Haven, Conn., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 537

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I submit the fair warning amendment to S. 3005, the Traffic Safety Act of 1966, on behalf of Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. PELL, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

We believe that an automobile manufacturer has an obligation which should be recognized by law—the obligation to inform car owners of safety hazards in the cars they drive. We believe that the car owner has a legitimate interest which should be recognized by law—the right to be warned of safety defects in his vehicle. The amendment I am submitting today will recognize these two sides of the coin.

This amendment provides for notice to automobile owners whose cars are unsafe, and notice to automobile dealers. It is enforced by the sanctions in S. 3005, the traffic safety bill. These enforcement procedures are civil penalties, injunctive relief, and seizure before the first sale to a purchaser.

The amendment requires that the notification given to the individual car owner contain a clear description of the defect, an evaluation of the risk to traffic safety arising from the defect, and a statement of the measures to be taken to repair the defect.

This is a modest proposal. It will not require huge appropriations. It is not based upon new Federal controls, except insofar as enforcement procedures may become necessary. The primary burden here is on the automobile manufacturer, and it is not a heavy burden.

The manufacturer is in the best position to know of any defects in an auto, since he designed the car, engineered it, produced it, and controls the distribution mechanism. Through the dealership structure, the manufacturer can quickly receive word of problems or complaints, and assess their significance in terms of auto safety.

The manufacturer can and does recall automobiles for modifications and improvements. The evidence indicates that it is not only possible for him to do so, but that he has done so on a number of occasions.

My amendment enlarges upon what is, and can, already be done in two respects. First, notices must be sent in all cases involving a safety hazard; and second, the notification must inform the car owner of the safety risk involved.

The case is clear on the necessity of this amendment. The evidence accumulated so far indicates that when defects are found in a certain model, the automobile industry may correct the defect in the next year's models, or notify the dealers to correct the problem in cars on hand, or notify the owner without making clear the safety factor involved, calling it an "improvement" or a "modification." But seldom, if ever, does the manufacturer tell the owner that the improvement or modification involves a safety factor which could endanger his life or the lives of his wife or children or other motorists. This situation must be rectified.

I believe the owner has a right to know of safety risks, and I believe the manufacturer has an obligation to make them clear so the owner can take whatever steps are necessary to protect himself and others.

Just a week ago, I discovered that some 17,500 1966 Dodge Polaras and Monacos were being called in for a throttle linkage modification. But neither the owners nor dealers were told that a safety factor was involved. I have obtained copies of these notifications and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I call attention to the fact that neither letter mentions the fact that this defect might influence safe operation of these cars or describes how the problem affects the vehicle. My amendment would require that such information be included in notices of this type.

That there is a need for this kind of information is shown in a survey of 19 Dodge dealers in Washington, D.C. and Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn. Only one of them described the problem as a safety factor, as did the service manager of the Dodge Division. However, the other 18 dealers all said there was no safety factor involved. Some dealers went so far as to say there was "absolutely no danger" involved, and that the modification "did not really make a lot of difference."

Certain models of 1965 Plymouths, Chryslers, and Dodges suffered from defective brackets on the steering gear. No notice was sent to the owners.

Thirty thousand 1965 full-sized Fords were recalled because of defective rear suspension arms. Owners were notified that they should bring these cars in to improve the quality of the ride, but no mention was made of the safety factor.

The defects found in automobiles are not always the result of poor engineering or production. Some result from what can only be poor quality control procedures by the manufacturer.

Vehicle inspection statistics from the District of Columbia, and the State of New Jersey indicate that many new cars are sold to customers in an unsafe condition, and that over 20 percent all new cars inspected are rejected for safety shortcomings of varying degrees of seriousness. In the District, 23 percent of the 1966 cars were rejected on their first appearance for inspection, compared with 20 percent of the 1965 new cars.

New Jersey inspection officials report a steady rejection rate of approximately 25 percent. New Jersey has made two comprehensive surveys—one during a 2-month period in 1963 showed a 25 percent rejection rate, while the other, covering a 5-month period in 1959, showed 36 percent rejections.

Both the District of Columbia and New Jersey require that new cars be inspected within 2 weeks after purchase and these inspections are the best guides available as to the condition of new cars on delivery to the average buyer. For only the District of Columbia and New Jersey have government-owned and operated inspection stations where new cars are given a thorough check by professional inspection personnel. About 15 other States also require inspection of new cars, but all of them contract this function out to privately owned garages, service stations and car dealers themselves—and most of them do not maintain data on new car rejections as opposed to older vehicles.

The main reasons for the District of Columbia and New Jersey rejections were improperly aimed headlights, malfunctioning taillights, improper steering alinement, and brakes in need of adjustment. These inspections also revealed, however, more serious hazards involving design and quality control defects which would not be noticed in the average cursory State inspection or by the driver himself until it was too late. These hidden defects were found, for the most part, in the more comprehensive District of Columbia inspection which is recognized as one of the most thorough in the Nation. They include such items as vehicle stability problems; front wheels inadequately secured; rear brakes not functioning, steering linkages which could come apart causing a complete loss of control; and brake hoses which were too long, causing them to rub against a wheel where they would be weakened and susceptible to rupture under stress.

In some cases in the District, the defect was so dangerous that the inspectors would not permit the car to be driven away, requiring instead that it be towed to a garage or back to the dealer.

And in those instances where the defect showed up on many cars of the same make and model, the District of Columbia inspectors notified the manufacturer about the problem. But no one seems to know how widespread these defects were and whether they were corrected throughout the Nation or only in the District to meet the stringent inspection requirements here. I have asked the manufacturer about some of these cases, but the information I have received thus far is inconclusive.

However, it would seem to me, Mr. President, that the District of Columbia and New Jersey experience indicates a need for both professional State inspection of all motor vehicles as well as notification to owners of hidden defects as provided for in the fair warning amendment.

The District and New Jersey experience is substantiated by that of Consumers Union of the United States, an organization which buys new cars for test purposes. And each year, Consumers Union reports that most, if not all, of the cars it buys develop trouble in the first few thousand miles or are riddled with defects on delivery. These defects are mostly minor, but many involve safety hazards.

Here is what Consumers Union had to say last year in the April 1965 edition of

Consumer Reports about defects in the cars it bought:

> "In anything as complicated as a car, pure chance will play a part in the presence or absence of troubles. But something more than chance is at work when 32 out of 32 cars chosen at random for testing show troubles of one kind or another in the first few thousand miles * * *. And CU's automotive consultants know what that something other than chance is—it's bad quality control in the automobile industry."
>
> So wrote CU, speaking of the 1963 models it had tested (Consumer Reports, October 1963). In 1964 things were slightly better; 2 or 3 of the 35 cars purchased for testing didn't develop troubles at least in the first 3,000 miles. This year it looks as though things are back to normal again—that is, all fouled up—in the output of Detroit.
>
> Here's a list of some troubles (of all kinds, not all major but all annoying and some hazardous) that CU has found on the 25 models for 1965 it has so far bought for testing. Some of the troubles (improperly aimed headlights, for example) have shown up on most cars; other troubles (malfunctioning directional signals, for example), have shown up on almost all; no car has been purchased which has not exhibited some trouble.
>
> Front window glass out of channel; trim panel on front door not attached; poor welds in floor pan; wiring harness loose—ignition and lights went out; left stoplight and directional signal inoperative; transmission fluid leaking; water leaking from heater core; airflow through defroster blocked; oil leaking from rear axle housing; engine would not start in park position—transmission had to be torn down; fan belt loose; slipped and squeaked when engine was speeded up; steering column loose at dashboard, steering wheel loose on column; front seat adjuster stuck on passenger's side; ignition timing off specifications; hand brake not connected, warning light not working; hand brake light stayed on at all times; directional signals would not cancel; car slipped out of park position; front door hinge off at bottoms; wheel alinement off specifications; doors not properly adjusted, hard to close or open; heater fan blades hit heater housing; windshield washer pump inoperative; both front wheel bearings loose; dash warning light read "hot" when car was cold; engine noisy, had to be pulled down; headlights improperly aimed; choke stuck open when car was cold, car wouldn't start; choke would not open as car warmed up, engine stalled.

And in the April 1966 issue of Consumer Reports, the organization had this to say about the condition of 1966 automobiles:

> The gremlins in the automobile industry's quality control are still at work, and appear to be just as impartial as ever, judging by the 1966 cars CU bought for testing. It would be some small comfort to find that the defects in cars, as delivered, are all of the trivial if annoying type, such as screws missing from trim or inoperative cigarette lighters. Unfortunately, they aren't: your car is just as likely to be delivered to you with a transmission fluid leak or with the power steering hose almost chafed through by the fanbelt.
>
> As long as manufacturers continue to depend too much on dealer preparation of new cars and dealers skimp that preparation, you can expect to go on finding defects of all degrees of severity in cars of all price levels. Here are some of the defects that CU found in the cars we purchased for testing:
>
> Brake light switch defective; transmission fluid leak at oil cooler fitting; power steering hose badly chafed by fan belt—almost worn through; power tailgate window inoperative on two station wagons; windshield washer pump defective; carburetion too lean, causing "starve-out" or "flat spots" at various speeds on many cars; high spot in brake drum, causing periodic noise when brakes were applied; rain leaks on several cars; ignition and carburetion adjustments not set to specifications on many cars; screws loose or missing from trim or hardware on many cars; defroster control inoperative; turn signals not operating correctly on several cars; cigarette lighter inoperative on three cars; pieces missing from external decorative trim; shock absorber mounting broken off; automatic transmission not shifting properly; poor fit of body sheet metal—doors with poor closure, body interfering with closing of hood or trunk lid—on several cars; engine block defective, requiring replacement; mechanical rapping noises in engine; internal moving parts requiring replacement; one end of front stabilizer bar disconnected; link missing; wheels improperly alined on several cars; tire pressure off specifications by more than 4 pounds per square inch on many cars; tires out of balance or out of round on several cars; horn inoperative; speedometer needle oscillating; fresh air vent door that did not close; carburetor overflowing gasoline—flooded engine; wires reversed on oil warning light and engine heat warning light; headlights improperly aimed on most cars as delivered.

I might note, Mr. President, that one-fourth of the defects found in the 1966 vehicles could involve a safety factor in the operation of these cars.

Consumer's Union also commented on the condition of new cars in another article in the April 1965 issue of Consumer Reports entitled "Quality Control, Warranties, and a Crisis in Confidence."

I would like here to quote the first and last paragraphs of that article:

> The condition of the 1965 cars CU has bought for test is about the worst, so far as sloppiness in production goes, in the whole 10-year stretch of deterioration that began in 1955, the first year in which U.S. new car sales first approached 8 million. (That was also the year in which a heavy emphasis on credit sales raised car output by nearly 2.5 million over the 1954 level and increased consumer indebtedness for autos more than 40 percent.) Complaint in the trade about the condition of the cars as delivered began to get bitter then and it has continued to be bitter ever since. "Overproduction has resulted in poorly engineered and poorly built cars," wrote one dealer in a letter submitted to a congressional hearing in 1961. "We in the retail business," he continued, "have all experienced the exorbitant new car get-ready cost and owner dissatisfaction with some of the creations dreamed up by the factories and then thrown together."
>
> What CU's data reveal is that each of the companies abuses the consumer to one degree or another in this area; and possibly, the data suggest, the degree may be a reflection of company policy. The consequences of poor quality control can affect safety, of course; but there has been little investigation into this particular aspect of the subject, so far as CU knows. It would seem to be a matter calling for attention. Even minor troubles can be important; the driver blinded by the strong beam of a faultily adjusted headlight is a hazard to himself and others. The condition of other cars on the road is, thus, an important part of the environment in which each of us rides. Periodic road checks are a loose control indeed for this kind of threat. And why aren't the threats eliminated at the factory?

Here is what Consumers Union had to say about this situation in an article entitled "The Art of Buying and Maintaining a Car" in the April 1966 issue of Consumer Reports:

> Manufacturers delegate to the dealer make-ready inspections and grooming of new cars. CU's checks on the new cars it buys usually reveal lights out of focus, brakes not evenly adjusted, tires with incorrect pressures, and incorrect front alinement. Badly aimed lights and uneven brakes are self-revealing, and tire pressures can be checked at any service station, but the first sign of wheel misalinement usually appears as excessive tire wear after several thousand miles—too late for redress.

The article then went on to say:

> Most serious, of course, are built-in defects that make a car hazardous to life, but that are not detectable by the owner until too late. Repeatedly auto manufacturers have failed to notify new-car owners of hazardous defects needing repairs or have suggested coming back for alterations without making it clear that a hazard was involved.
>
> The day should come when auto manufacturers are required to file with public officials—for the public record—a list of the specific fixes or repairs they have told their dealers are needed, and, where these involve hazardous defects, to inform the owners about them immediately.

Mr. President, that is exactly what the fair warning amendment is intended to do.

It may be that the driver is to blame for most traffic accidents. But situations such as this and other evidence accumulated in recent months indicate that safety defects may play a much larger role in the accident rate than heretofore estimated. But even if only 1 percent of all accidents is caused by such defects, I think the drivers of these defective cars have a right to know they are riding around in booby traps. And to fail to warn them is to force them to play Russian roulette without their knowing so.

I should like to point out that this amendment supplements both mandatory automobile safety standards and existing State vehicle inspection laws. It assures the basic protection of information to the consumer immediately, while standards may not become effective for some time and while all States still lack comprehensive inspection laws. There is, in addition, always the possibility of safety problems arising which are not covered by standards or undiscoverable even by professional State inspectors.

I do not pretend technical competence as an automotive engineer or to be an expert on the automobile industry, but I do know something about the rights of consumers. Perhaps their most basic right is the right to know what hazards are associated with a particular product. I hardly think that legislation requiring that such information be given to car owners will damage the national economy, or constitute meddling in the affairs of our automotive industry.

Although I am not asking that this amendment lie on the table, I will make a listing of all sponsors in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1 week from today should other Senators wish to join in sponsorship.

I ask unanimous consent that the fair warning amendment be received and referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 537) was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letters presented by Mr. Mondale are as follows:

Dodge Division,
Chrysler Motors Corp.,
February 17, 1966.

To: All Dodge dealers.
Subject: Throttle linkage modification.
Models affected: 1966 Dodge Polara and Monaco with 383-cubic-inch displacement engine and two-barrel carburetor.

We have recently developed a change in the throttle linkage of the subject vehicles. Because this change relates to throttle control, we desire to incorporate this change on all of the affected 1966 Dodge Polara and Monaco models equipped with 383 cubic inch displacement engine and 2 barrel carburetor.

Enclosed for your use is a list of the names and addresses of owners who received the affected models, compiled from the retail sales report cards submitted by you. A sufficient number of parts packages are enclosed to effect the change on each of the cars listed.

You should arrange to make this change on all vehicles of the type involved that were delivered by you. To assist you, we have mailed a letter in the form attached to each of the owners on the enclosed list. We also enclose extra copies of this letter for you to send to owners of vehicles included on the list without the owner's name or address, if these vehicles were sold by you.

If any of the vehicles on the attached list are still in your stock, be sure that the change is made before you sell them. If you have diverted any of these cars to another dealer, please be sure that this dealer is notified so that he may carry out this campaign on those cars involved. Also, we ask that you see that the parts we have enclosed are forwarded to that dealer.

Note.—If you did not receive any of the cars involved in the campaign, there will be no list attached. In such instances, this letter is mailed to you for information only. In the event a transient owner should contact your dealership for assistance the necessary material may be obtained through your regional service office.

Dodge Division,
Chrysler Motor Corps.,
February 24, 1966.

Dear Customer: We have recently developed an important change in the throttle linkage of certain 1966 model passenger cars.

Our records indicate you purchased a car of this type, the serial number of which appears to the right of your address at the top of this letter.

We have requested the dealer from whom you purchased your car to see that this improvement is made. We urge you to immediately contact your dealer and arrange an appointment to have the work performed. There will be no charge to you for this service upon presentation of this letter to your dealer.

If you are unable to return to the dealer from whom you purchased your car, please take it to any nearby authorized Dodge dealer.

Very truly yours,
Robert H. Kline.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) to express the sense of Congress on agreements reducing duties on imported articles under certain conditions, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 5, 1966, the names of Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Moss, M. Mundt, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Thurmond were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 247) to provide for the preparation of an educational film on the U.S. Senate to be shown to visitors to the Capitol, and for other purposes, submitted by Mr. Hartke on April 5, 1966.

NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION HEARINGS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am chairman, will conduct open public hearings on May 9 and 10 on S. 3107, the bill to create a National Water Commission. The hearings will start at 10 a.m. each day in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building.

This tremendously important legislation, proposed by the administration, would establish an independent, seven-member Commission of distinguished Americans outside the Federal Government.

The members, appointed by the President, would study and advise him—and the Water Resources Council—on the entire range of water problems.

Mr. President, we have need for a highly qualified and independent commission to conduct a thorough and complete analysis of our resource problems and programs. Only in this way can we begin to resolve the monumental problems in this field.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Cornelius McQuade, of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of West Virginia, term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of Mississippi, term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Eugene G. Cushing, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney, western district of Washington, term of 4 years, vice William N. Goodwin.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, April 25, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1938) to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 265) to authorize conveyance of certain lands to the State of Utah based upon fair market value, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Aspinall, Mr. Baring, Mr. King of Utah, Mr. Saylor, and Mr. Burton of Utah were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House receded from its amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 to the bill (S. 2729) to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, and concurred therein.

THE CIA AND MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee following the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, I inquired of the CIA regarding the criticisms directed by certain professors of Michigan State University concerning certain activities of the university with relation to a contract with the CIA and the employment of secret agents of the CIA within the university. I believe it is in the interest of accuracy to make public the facts as I get them.

On December 21, 1954, President Eisenhower directed the Operations Coordinating Board to have prepared a report on the status of the U.S. programs to develop foreign police forces to maintain internal security and to destroy the effectiveness of the Communist apparatus in free world countries vulnerable to Communist subversion.

Upon completion of the report on December 8, 1955, the National Security Council directed Mr. John Hollister, then Chief of what is now the Agency for International Development, to assume leadership of U.S. efforts to improve the internal security capability of police in a number of foreign countries. At the same time, the NSC, with the President's approval, instructed the Director of Central Intelligence and other Government agencies to lend all possible assistance to this effort to include assignment of qualified personnel to effect the needed improvements in foreign police forces. The urgency of the situation in Vietnam, which was one of the countries the President had in mind, and the nonavailability of adequate personnel, resulted in AID contracting this responsibility to Michigan State University. It was in this connection that CIA officers with specific MSU agreement participated in the MSU program in Vietnam, a program designed to improve the effectiveness of the police services of that country as a part of the overall effort to preserve that nation's independence. The CIA representatives worked specifically in the training of Vietnamese police services, not in clandestine CIA activities.

TOO MUCH GLOOM AND DOOM ON VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an honest election in South Vietnam establishing civilian authority should be welcomed enthusiastically by the United States.

It is incomprehensible to me why there is so much gloom and doom about the prospect of such an election in South Vietnam.

What have we been fighting for out there, except for the right of the people of South Vietnam to their own government?

Useful as a military junta may have been in the military conflict against communism, an elected government would be far, far better not only in the view of people throughout the world but obviously in the eyes of the people of Vietnam.

It is true that the protests against the Ky government have impeded the war effort. That is a high price to pay. But if the result of these protests is an honest election, the benefit will be worth the price.

It is imperative in any election contest that the United States follow a policy of the strictest possible neutrality. Our only interest should be to assist the Vietnamese, when requested, to help guarantee a thoroughly honest election with maximum participation.

While a countrywide election is something new, local elections are not. The South Vietnamese have held them and abided by the results. There is a good prospect that they would do the same in a national election.

In view of the immense investment this country has made in South Vietnam in the lives of our own soldiers, not to speak of billions of dollars of military assistance, maintaining our neutrality in an election will be extraordinarily difficult.

But the CIA, as well as every other American agency in South Vietnam, must keep hands off every phase of this election. Our total neutrality is imperative.

Of course, we must also abide by the wishes of whatever government is elected, regardless of how unwelcome their wishes might be. If our commitment to self-determination in South Vietnam does not mean this, it means nothing.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Better News," published in the Washington Post on April 15, 1966.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER NEWS

The military government of South Vietnam and the dissident Buddhist leaders seem to be in general agreement on plans to hold an early election of a constituent assembly that will give the country a civil government. This is better news than any but the most optimistic has dared hope for in the past week.

How far the agreement goes beyond the bare accord on holding elections is not altogether clear. But if there is any real meeting of minds on the essentials, the details should not be beyond the ingenuity of the leaders of the different factions.

The United States, for its part, will enormously gain by the presence of a government of civilians enjoying the mantle of legitimacy that only orderly elections can confer. Such a government, no doubt, will make decisions with which the United States may differ. There will be disagreement over many policies in which interests are not the same. It will not be as easy to locate authority or to get it to act. The difficulties of democratic rule lie in a field of knowledge and experience where we do not require instruction. But all the difficulties are outweighed by the single advantage that is enjoyed by a representative and democratic regime that can claim to speak for the people of South Vietnam.

In the trying interval that has led to some agreement, the United States, on the whole, has behaved with commendable detachment and restraint. It will need to exercise the same restraint in the weeks preceding an election. No interest that we may have in particular political leaders will rival our interest in having the South Vietnamese make choices not influenced by a foreign power. A government freely selected is the best hope for the right conduct of civilian affairs and the best hope as well for an energetic and efficient prosecution of the war.

Americans must not expect that a country in the midst of war can suddenly summon forth perfectly functioning democratic institutions. But the South Vietnamese are not without experience with elections and democracy. Local and provincial governments have been proceeding with elections and abiding by democratic methods in parts of the country throughout the war. There is a tradition in the country on which it should be possible to build.

The President of the United States has dealt on a friendly and cordial basis with South Vietnam's present government and will continue to do so while it is in power. His administration will be able to deal in the same manner with the successor government shaped by elections.

Such a government will have before it choices that are difficult for a democratic government to make. It will be confronted by all the harsh alternatives of war; and, sooner or later, by the equally anguishing problems of procuring a peace in South Vietnam. It may wish to deal with some of these problems differently than we would deal with them. But this should confront us with no problems with which we cannot deal. We are in South Vietnam to preserve the right of a small people to govern themselves and make their own choices. That principle will be vindicated whatever the course the people choose. We have undertaken to preserve their opportunity to make a choice. An elected government is a necessary instrument for determining what that choice really is.

PLIGHT OF THE VIETNAMESE FARMER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, after the Honolulu Conference. President Johnson sent 10 agricultural specialists to South Vietnam for a survey of the farmer's plight in that country.

One of those experts was Jim Thomson, editor of the Prairie Farmer and president of the American Agricultural Editors Association.

With an observant eye and skillful pen, Mr. Thomson reported on the poverty, ignorance, and superstition that confronts the farmer in Vietnam. He also told of his hopes and aspirations, and what the American aid mission has done to help realize these ambitions.

I ask the unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this illuminating report as published in the Wisconsin Agriculturist.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM'S FARMING ADVANCES AGAINST HEAVY ODDS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—At the Honolulu Conference, President Johnson announced that he was sending 10 agricultural specialists to Vietnam to see what could be done to help farmers there. As president of the American Agricultural Editors Association, Prairie Farmer Editor Jim Thomson accompanied the group. This is Thomson's report of the trip.)

The farmer's loyalty is the key to the war's end in Vietnam. Communist leaders and U.S. policymakers share this view. Two-thirds of the Vietnamese people are farmers.

But they are weak and unsure where their interests lie under the campaign of aggressive terrorism being waged by the Communists. The Communists are dedicated to the long-term goal of control of all of southeast Asia.

Vietnam farmers also have difficulty understanding U.S. generosity. We are spending more than a million dollars a day on the economic front. They have never seen anything like it.

To gain the support of Vietnamese farmers, President Johnson appointed 10 U.S. agricultural specialists to a mission to Vietnam to study rural conditions and report back to him.

Accompanied by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, the 10 specialists scattered throughout South Vietnam visiting farms and newly organized agricultural institutions.

Each specialist probed for ways in which the U.S.-backed South Vietnamese Government could help the poverty-stricken farmers of that terror-ridden land, now in its 21st year of war.

In some ways a cornbelt hog producer can identify with a Vietnamese farmer. Hogs are their favorite livestock. But they are light years apart in their comprehension of the world around them.

This is changing under the impact of outside agricultural influences, mainly American, but progress is slow in the face of poverty, ignorance, squalor, and tradition.

UNBELIEVABLE TO US

The U.S. farmer would find the primitive world of the Vietnamese farmer unbelievable. Virtually all work is done by hand, from carrying water from open wells to harvesting rice with sickles. Yet they often show incredible ingenuity for a rather static environment.

In spite of the heavy U.S. commitment, the average Vietnamese knows almost nothing about America. Many of them actually know little or nothing about what is going on outside their villages. Their village is often their entire world.

The Vietnamese farmer is illiterate, superstitious, and suspicious of strangers. He dislikes government officials and has no feeling of patriotism or national allegiance as we know it. He may never have seen a newspaper or a magazine and he probably does not own a radio.

His world swarms with spirits and spooks. Dead ancestors supposedly attach themselves to the household and must be cared for through religious ceremonies and offerings, usually in the home.

It is this dead hand of the past that U.S. farmers, agricultural teachers, and experts are trying to get off the Vietnamese farmer's back. This they hope to do through the establishment of schools, hospitals, agriculture and home extension, research stations, and by working with farmers in the field.

The U.S. Agency for International Development is teaching farmers how to increase crop yields with improved seed and fertiilzer, pesticides, and irrigation. AID is also encouraging the formation of co-ops, credit pools, and other farm organizations.

Most of this effort is by Americans, but a considerable contribution is also being made by agricultural teams of Filipinos and Taiwan Chinese.

LOOK FOR OPPORTUNITY

It is difficult to generalize about subsistence farming in Vietnam. By our standards, farmers are backward. Nevertheless there is good reason to believe that they respond to opportunities for better income as well as farmers in other countries.

The Vietnam war is one of the most perplexing problems the United States has faced in recent years. This is mainly due to Government uncertainty and the opposition of many people who mean well but refuse to face the fact that the enemy cannot be trusted.

Trouble started in 1945 when the Japs were driven out after World War II. The French tried to return to their former colony and were driven out in turn. In the confusion the Communists took over North Vietnam and moved in on South Vietnam. Government forces fought back.

Later the Geneva treaty was signed dividing the country permanently into Communist North Vietnam and non-Communist South Vietnam. The ink was hardly dry when the Communists started infiltrating South Vietnam villages and murdering their leaders.

GAVE FARMERS LAND

They also murdered landlords and tried to win the loyalty of the tenant farmers by turning the small farms (4 to 6 acres) over to the landless. At first tenants welcomed the move because land was scarce and expensive, and rates of interest were high—as much as 10 percent a month.

At the same time the country was run by a French-educated elite which saw no need for democracy. At present South Vietnam is governed by a military directorate of 10 generals, most of whom we met personally during our visit to Vietnam. Even the minister of Agriculture, Lam Van Tri, is a military leader.

Many of the Government leaders of the past were large landowners who resisted land reform. But the U.S. administration is pressuring the military directorate for a new deal for the masses.

This includes a constitution, the right to vote, land reform, and a democratic government. To this they have agreed. Elections will be held in 1967.

In the past too much direction has come from the top. So the average small farmer gets little motivation from Saigon officialdom. Nor does he take any responsibility for institutions foisted upon him by government officials.

Provincial chiefs are appointed by the government so they have not been responsive to needs of farmers.

Other divisive forces are constantly at work to encourage instability. These include religious, racial, and language differences, and northern and southern suspicions.

Another fantastic Asiatic practice is the acceptance of graft and political payoffs. But while we were in Saigon an agricultural official was sentenced to be shot for taking graft.

Americans are involved too. An AID official estimated that 15 percent of a shipment disappeared between the port and the destination. There are shortages of everything, including labor. Inflation is rampant. The cost of living rose 5 percent in January.

TREMENDOUS PROGRESS MADE

Yet in spite of graft, terrorism, frustration, and war, Vietnamese agriculture has made tremendous progress.

Rural income in 1964 amounted to 19.6 billion piastres. In 1965 rural income is expected to double. Part of this gain is canceled out by inflation. Yet even a 50-percent real gain in income would be a tremendous advance.

So far the South Vietnam agricultural improvement program with U.S. technical and commodity assistance has brought direct, tangible, and immediate benefits to the people. Here is the evidence:

1. Last year 2 million acres were fertilized and resulted in an increase of $12 million in farm income.

2. Plant pest control, beginning in 1962, saved rice and vegetable farmers $25 million last year.

3. Rodent control saved farmers an estimated $53 million last year. The Mekong Delta swarms with rats. The rat-control program killed more than 10 million rats last year.

4. We provided about 90,000 tons of corn to go with 54,000 pigs, mostly Yorkshires, we have donated since 1963. The farmer returns one pig from the first litter, which in turn is given to another farmer.

5. Vaccinated nearly 3 million animals for disease control at no charge.

6. Multiplied and distributed improved seed varieties of 12 crops. Yield increases averaged nearly 20 percent, with some running as high as 50 percent.

7. Expanded irrigation facilities to encourage double cropping ana sometimes triple cropping.

8. Provided agricultural credit and encouraged the formation of farm co-ops to distribute fertilizer, seed, pigs, pesticides, and low-cost radios.

9. Encouraged land reform to put more land in the hands of producers. Since 1957 work has proceeded to allow landless farmers to buy 3.25 million acres.

JUDGE ROLLER, THE BRAVES' BASEBALL ARBITER, EMINENTLY QUALIFIED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Members of Congress, as well as the general public, who have followed the historic major league baseball controversy between the National League Braves on the one side and the State of Wisconsin and Milwaukee County on the other are concerned about the decision of Circuit Judge Elmer Roller. Judge Roller is the Milwaukee judge who decided last week that the Braves and the National League are in violation of the antitrust laws of Wisconsin.

Judge Roller ordered the Braves back to Milwaukee next month, unless the National League agrees to permit Milwaukee to have a major league baseball team next year.

Some casual observers may not be inclined to give the decision the weight it deserves. If so, they will be wrong, and for several reasons.

Let me point to just one reason. Judge Elmer Roller is an exceedingly able judge. He graduated magna cum laude from Marquette Law School. He was so young when he graduated that he was required to wait 2 years before he could practice law in Wisconsin. He spent those 2 years teaching at the University of Chicago Law School.

Few lawyers or judges have so completely dedicated their lives to the law as has Judge Roller. During the last vacation Judge Roller and his wife enjoyed, he spent virtually the entire time studying legal systems in Europe.

Judge Roller is a remarkably diligent man. His hard and dedicated work has become a legend in Milwaukee. In connection with the Braves' case, he worked day and night for a solid month, working literally an 18-hour day, 7 days a week.

Mr. President, the New York Times has written a perceptive and appealing biography of Judge Roller.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, entitled "Big League Arbiter" printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Big League Arbiter: Elmer William Roller

The last time Judge Elmer William Roller took a vacation, in 1960, he spent a good part of it in and out of courthouses in Warsaw, studying the Polish legal system.

"And when we got to England," his wife, Eunice, said yesterday, "he was like a kid. Why, he spent the whole day in Westminster Abbey, reading all those plaques to me. Every one of them." The judge may finally take another vacation. He allowed himself 15 hours' sleep yesterday, following a month-long immersion in the complicated case that resulted on Wednesday in his historic decision: for the first time, organized baseball was found guilty of a State antitrust violation.

Judge Roller ordered the National League to give him a written plan for expansion by May 16 that would include a team for Milwaukee by 1967. If the league did not comply, he ruled, the Atlanta Braves would have to return to Milwaukee by May 18.

Each day during the trial that produced 7,000 pages of testimony and 600 exhibits, the pink-cheeked, white-haired magistrate would leave his office in branch 5 of the Milwaukee County circuit courthouse laden with two armloads of briefcases, stuffed with papers.

He would arrive in his eight-room white colonial home in the exclusive suburb of Fox Point about 9 p.m. In his study there were books on the floor and books stuffed into ceiling-high cases. There is no room for any more.

No one disturbs the judge. "I learned long ago the best thing for me to do when he's working is to keep quiet," said Mrs. Roller.

There are no late snacks for Judge Roller. He went on the Air Force diet last year and lost 45 pounds ("he did it with the same will power he used to stop smoking").

At about 2 a.m., he would finish for the night. He would set the alarm clock for 6 a.m. Mrs. Roller admitted that she had tried to get up before he did and several times she succeeded. She would reset the alarm clock for an later hour.

"But I couldn't fool him," she added.

"I think," said Mrs. Roller, "he takes his work too seriously."

At the age of 64, he still fascinated by the law. He had decided in high school that law was his calling.

By the time he was 20, he had graduated magna cum laude from Marquette University Law School—too young to practice. He taught for 2 years at the University of Chicago before he was persuaded by a colleague to open a private practice, which he did in Milwaukee in 1923.

In 1953, he was appointed to the circuit court. He lost the post in the election the following year, but was a successful candidate in the 1956 elections.

His decisions have been noted for their scholarly research. Attorneys have remarked that he has never pressured them—or allowed himself to be pressured—during the course of a trial.

The judge stands 5 feet 10½ inches and keeps his weight at 170 pounds by walking his dachshunds, Schatzi and Louie, and by puttering around the garden on his half-acre estate.

He has been a baseball fan since the days of the Milwaukee Brewers of the American Association. After the Braves came to town, he attended about a dozen games a season—about all his heavy court schedule would allow—and followed the team's progress closely by radio and newspaper.

Judge Roller was born in Waukesha, Wis., on September 24, 1901. He married Eunice Wolfe in 1934. They have two daughters, Mrs. Connie Curtin, who is married to a physician in Phoenix, Ariz., and 18-year-old Jeanne, a freshman at Georgetown University.

"I had to do all the disciplining," said Mrs. Roller. "He would never say a cross word to the girls. He never let anything upset him. That's why he can do so much and works best under pressure."

FARM BUREAU OPPOSES CUT IN SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the American Farm Bureau Federation, during its testimony before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee on April 6, indicated its opposition to any cut in the school milk program.

I think that this is indicative of the wide-ranging support the program has received in the face of the administration's proposal to slash it by 80 percent and redirect it to provide it only to the poor as well as those in schools without a lunch program.

In my estimation, one statement made by John Lynn, who testified on behalf of the Farm Bureau, is especially pertinent. It was quoted from a statement of Farm Bureau policy. I should like to repeat it today:

> The national school lunch and special milk programs have proved beneficial to schoolchildren. The programs have helped to establish proper dietary habits among our young people. We recommend their continuation. It is important that the general public understand that the chief beneficiaries of the national school lunch and special milk programs are schoolchildren and not farmers.

Most Americans, especially those with children in school, and benefiting from the school milk program, realize that it is not meant simply as a Federal aid to dairy farmers. Unfortunately, the administration does not seem to realize this fact. I hope that Congress will make clear from its actions on the school milk program this year that it regards the program primarily as a means of maintaining and increasing the nutritional well-being of the Nation's schoolchildren. Certainly, the program should be continued at its present level; at the very least, if we are to keep faith with the children of America who will be the leaders of tomorrow.

CLARIFICATION OF REEMPLOYMENT PROVISIONS OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to S. 2996, a bill introduced by me recently, to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

The bill is presently under consideration by the Committee on Armed Services, headed by my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

I have introduced this legislation in the belief that the men and women of our Active Forces, National Guard and Reserve Forces, deserve every proper consideration in safeguarding their employment rights while they discharge their patriotic duty to their country.

It is they who are carrying the frontline burden of defense in these perilous times, and I feel that the civilian sector of our life and our economy can well accommodate itself to their employment needs so as not to endanger their present and future livelihood as a result of their military service.

The Department of Defense, in response to the request of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has reported that the bill would contribute to the morale and effectiveness of the Active and Reserve Forces of the United States.

The section of the bill that provides that a member of the National Guard or Reserve shall not be denied retention, promotion, or other incident or advantage of employment because of his Reserve status will "help assure that the reservist will not be penalized because of his obligation for Reserve training and call to active duty in emergency," the Defense Department said.

The section of the bill extending reemployment rights entitlement by raising the maximum to 5 years of service where service beyond 4 years is at the request and for the convenience of the Government would be "helpful to all the services in their current efforts to encourage voluntary extension of service terms and voluntary return to active duty of Reserves for temporary periods," the Department said.

The Department of Defense sees a need for this legislation, Mr. President, and I hope that as soon as the distinguished committee has completed its deliberations, the bill will be reported favorably and will be speedily passed by the Senate.

We owe no less than this to the fine men and women who don the Nation's service uniform, whether in an Active or Reserve capacity, and I am pleased to have authored such legislation in the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from South Carolina on his remarks today, and on his continuing work to guarantee the reemployment rights of our servicemen in this time of national crisis. He has performed another great service in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and in pressing for enactment of a bill to remedy inequities in present law.

Although the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL] has been a Member of this body for a relatively short period of time, I know of no Senator who has won more respect from his colleagues. His tireless and courageous effort on behalf of important legislation have made a great contribution to the work of this Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the Senator from North Carolina in praising the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL].

The Senator from South Carolina indeed has scored a high mark for integrity and diligence in looking after and furthering the interests of his State and in attending to the business of the Nation. He is a highly valuable Member of the Senate who quickly has earned the greatest respect of his colleagues. His help and assistance during his period of service has been valued highly by all Senators.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is my wish to associate myself with the statements just made regarding our colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL]. I prefer to call him DON as I have become so well acquainted with him and have been seated close to him for a year, lacking a few days. Like my colleagues I hold him in the highest admiration. For a few weeks I called him Governor, but former Governor and now Senator DONALD RUSSELL is such a fine, friendly, personable man it is natural to call him DON. During the past 12 months he, as Senator, has earned the admiration and respect of all Senators on both sides of the aisle for his industry, competence and, in fact, for all-around knowledge.

I know that our colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], has in the past served his State and Nation in high positions of responsibility. Also, I am informed that he made a magnificent record overseas as an officer in our Armed Forces and that for 5 years, I believe, covering a period from around 1952 on he was president of the University of South Carolina and became known and respected as one of the great university presidents in our Nation. It appears to me that the citizens of South Carolina have every reason to be proud of the life record of our colleague, DONALD RUSSELL, who served as Governor of that sovereign State and is now faithfully representing its citizens in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senators for their kind remarks.

THE 23D ANNIVERSARY OF WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING—MESSAGE BY SENATOR CASE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on April 17, 1966, a program of commemoration by 55 Jewish and non-Jewish groups, attended by 2,000 people, took place in Newark, N.J., on the 23d anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. That infamous incident, in which almost all of Warsaw's Jews perished, will never be forgotten.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following message which I addressed to the audience at Newark's Weequachic High School on April 17.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Deeply regret that longstanding speaking engagement at this hour prevents me from joining you in program sponsored by Jewish and non-Jewish groups to commemorate 23d anniversary of Warsaw ghetto uprising. Though the decades seem to pass by quickly, the memory of that tragic and courageous stand by the Warsaw Jews will live forever in the minds of freedom-loving people. The brave struggle of Warsaw's ghetto is etched in the memory of Jews the world over, indeed of all who lived through that darkest period in recent history. I join with you in spirit as you pay homage to the memory of Warsaw's Jews and their hopeless plight of 23 years ago.

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator.

ANNUAL GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS SEMINAR OF NEW JERSEY JAYCEES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, recently I had the pleasure of speaking at the Annual Governmental Affairs Seminar of the New Jersey Jaycees held at the statehouse in Trenton, N.J.

The opportunity was especially welcome to me because of the initiative that the New Jersey Jaycees have shown in the area of public affairs. At the urging of the New Jersey Jaycees, the national board of Jaycees recently decided to adopt the New Jersey "Ethics in Government" project as a national action project.

To carry out the project, our New Jersey Jaycee officials prepared a code of ethics kit. The organization is pressing for passage of its suggested form of ordinance by every New Jersey community. Since the project has now become a national project, I believe the text of the code is of general interest, and I ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent to include as part of these remarks the partial text of my remarks to the Jaycees in Trenton, N.J., and an article which appeared in the Newark News on December 26, 1965.

There being no objection, the code of ethics, remarks, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY JAYCEES CODE OF ETHICS KIT

LET'S KEEP OUR MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS HIGH ON THE PEDESTAL

*An ordinance promulgating a code of ethics for the officials, appointees, and employees of the town of * * * and providing for penalties for the violation thereof*

Whereas in our democratic form of government it is essential that the conduct of public officers and employees hold the respect and inspire the confidence of the people. Public officers must therefore avoid conduct which is in violation of their trust or which creates a justifiable impression among the public that violates that trust. To this end, conscientious public officials should have specific standards to guide their conduct. It is at the same time recognized that citizens who serve in government cannot and should not be expected to be without any personal interest in the decisions and policies of government and that such citizens who are officials or employees have a right to private interests of a personal, financial, and economic nature.

Now, therefore, be it ordained by the municipal council of the town of * * * that all public officers, officials, employees, and appointees be governed by the following standards and code of ethics:

1. No official, appointee or employee, whether paid or unpaid and whether full or part time, of the town of * * * or any agency, board, committee, or commission thereof shall directly or indirectly use or attempt to use his position to secure any preferential or unlawful rights, benefits, advantages or privileges for himself or for others.

MAINTAIN PUBLIC CONFIDENCE WITH A WORKABLE CODE OF ETHICS

1. No official, appointee or employee, whether paid or unpaid and whether full or part time, of the town of * * * or any agency, board, committee, or commission thereof shall directly or indirectly use or attempt to use his position to secure any preferential or unlawful rights, benefits, advantages, or privileges for himself or for others.

2. No official, appointee or employee, whether paid or unpaid and whether full or part time, of the town of * * * or any agency, board, committee, or commission thereof shall directly or indirectly engage in any business, transaction, public or private, or professional activity, or shall have a financial or other personal interest, direct or indirect, which is in actual or potential conflict with the proper discharge of his duties.

3. No official, appointee or employee, whether paid or unpaid and whether full or part time, of the town of * * * or any agency, board, committee, or commission thereof shall disclose or use confidential information concerning the municipality to promote the financial or other private interest of himself or others.

4. No official, appointee or employee, whether paid or unpaid and whether full or part time, of the town of * * * or any agency, board, committee, or commission thereof shall accept any gift, whether in the form of service, loan, thing, or promise, from any person, firm, or corporation which to his knowledge is interested directly or indirectly in any manner whatsoever in business dealings with the municipality and over which business dealings he has power to take or influence official action.

THE IMPRESSIONS MADE BY PUBLIC OFFICIALS ARE LASTING: SINCERITY, MORALITY, ETHICAL CONDUCT, DEDICATION, INTEGRITY, NONBOSSISM

5. No official, appointee of the municipality or any agency, board, committee, or commission thereof, shall vote for the adoption or defeat of any legislation, or for the payment or nonpayment of any indebtedness owing or allegedly owing by this town which he has a direct or indirect personal pecuniary or private interest.

6. No official, appointee or employee, whether paid or unpaid and whether full or part time, of the town of * * *, or any agency, board, committee, or commission thereof shall represent any private interest before any agency or board of the municipality to the detriment of the municipality or for the purpose of personal gain or in any litigation in which the municipality is a party.

7. An official, appointee or employee, whether paid or unpaid and whether full or part time of the town of * * *, or any agency, board, committee or commission thereof, who has a direct or indirect financial interest in any business entity, transaction, or contract with municipality, or in the sale of real estate, materials, supplies or services to the municipality, the disposition of which may be influenced by his official position shall refrain from voting or deliberating upon such proposed legislation or otherwise participating in such transaction and he shall disclose publicly the nature and extent of his interest.

INSTILL A TRUST IN YOUR PUBLIC SERVANTS

8. No official, appointee or employee, whether paid or unpaid and whether full or part time, of the town of * * * or any agency, board, committee, or commission thereof, shall accept other employment, or professional retainers, or the promise thereof, that might reasonably conflict with the performance of his official duties, or that might reasonably tend to impair his independent or impartial judgment or action in the exercise or performance of his official duties.

9. No official, appointee or employee, whether paid or unpaid and whether full or part time of the town of * * * or any agency, board, committee, directly or indirectly become involved in any business or business transaction, or make any investment in any securities (as such term is defined by the "uniform securities law") which will impair, or reasonably tend to impair his judgment or action in the exercise or performance of his official duties. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to prohibit any bona fide investments in securities traded on a securities exchange registered as a national securities exchange under the Federal Securities Exchange Act of 1934, in shares in an investment company registered under the Federal Investment Company Act of 1940, or in securities of a public utility holding company registered under the Federal Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

10. There is hereby created and established a board of ethics to consist of five members who shall hold no other office or employment under the municipality. At least one of said members shall be an attorney at law of the State of New Jersey. All members shall be residents of the town of * * *.

One member shall be appointed by the mayor and four members shall be appointed by the municipal council. All appointees must be approved by a majority vote of the municipal council at a regular public meeting. Members shall serve for a term of 5 years; *Provided, however,* That those first appointed hereunder shall have terms expiring 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 years, respectively, from the date of commencement of their terms. The members shall elect a chairman annually. The board shall adopt rules for the conduct of the board's business. The board shall select a secretary who shall be paid at the rate of $15 per meeting. Upon the written request of the office or employee concerned, the board shall render written advisory opinions based upon the provisions of this code. The board shall publish its advisory opinions with the power, however, to make such deletions as the board may deem necessary if the board in its discretion shall consider it advisable to prevent disclosure of the identity of the office or employee involved.

11. Upon the sworn complaint of any person alleging facts which, if true, would constitute improper conduct under the provisions of this code, the board shall conduct a public hearing in accordance with all the requirements of due process of law and, in written findings of fact and conclusions

based thereon, make a determination concerning the propriety of the conduct of the official or employee complained of.

12. Where the board of ethics, after a public hearing, shall make a determination, in writing, that the conduct of any official or employee was improper, the municipal council may adopt a resolution of censure, suspension or removal from office of said official or employee.

13. This ordinance shall take effect upon final passage and publication as provided by law.

ADOPT A PRACTICAL CODE OF ETHICS TO RAISE THE MORAL TONE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

1. The local Jaycee chapter should make civic, service, fraternal, and religious groups aware of the desirability and need for a code of ethics as a guide to local officers and employees.
2. Publicity and release to the news media should be encouraged.
3. Local Jaycee chapters should organize the campaign amongst the service groups and consider the possibility of a community forum on ethics in government today.
4. The code should be submitted by the Jaycee to the local governing body.
5. The governing body should be requested both directly and through the news media to act favorably upon such a code.

Partial Text of Remarks by Senator Clifford P. Case to the Annual Governmental Affairs Seminar of the New Jersey Jaycees

Most, if not all of you, I am sure, have been urged at one time or another to take an active part in politics. Quite apart from compelling considerations of earning a living and supporting a family, many of you, have, I suspect, shied at the prospect, possibly out of a feeling that politics, if not exactly dirty, is only semirespectable.

This is a feeling shared by many Americans—to the detriment of politics and to the quality of our public life. That is why the theme of this conference—"Ethics in Government"—seems to me heartening and significant. It is further concrete evidence of the active interest of your members in lifting the level of political life, an interest already manifested in the adoption by the New Jersey Jaycees of the ethics "action" project. That the National Jaycees recently adopted "Ethics in Government" as a national "action" project for the coming year is a tribute to the initiative shown by our New Jersey organization as well as another indication of countrywide concern to protect governmental integrity at every level.

Codes of ethics are increasingly common in professional and business life. And the sanction of law, in greater or lesser degree, is frequently available to undergird them. The maintenance of high standards of conduct by public officials is no less important. It is important for its own sake, the here and now public interest. It is important too for the future in attracting talented men and women of integrity to public service.

I have long urged one proposal that I believe would greatly enhance the effectiveness of a code of ethics at every level of government. This is the adoption of a requirement that all top officials, whether in the legislative or executive branch of government, annually submit a report, open to public inspection, of the amount and sources of their income, their assets and liabilities, and any transactions in property of any kind.

The mere fact of having to make such a report would serve as a stop-and-think signal for public officials contemplating "outside" activities. Awareness that one's financial dealings will become known to the public is the most effective deterrent I know to wrongful or questionable conduct. In this sense, a disclosure requirement would be automatic in its operation. And at the same time it would provide a means for detecting failure to live up to ethical standards. In short, it would both complement and help to enforce a code of ethics.

Opponents of the disclosure requirement usually object to its "drastic" character and argue that it would constitute an invasion of the privacy to which every citizen is entitled. But many citizens in private life are already subject to this requirement. The Securities and Exchange Commission, for example, requires corporate "insiders" to report regularly their transactions in the stock of their corporations. The idea of baring one's financial situation is understandably not an opportunity most people seek. But, as one who has done so, I can assure you, it is not as painful as one might think. And, from the individual's point of view, it has affirmative value, for it is the strongest possible protection against suspicion or smear. From the public's point of view, the advantages are, I believe, clear.

No less than the stockholders of a private corporation, the public at large has a legitimate interest in the financial activities of those to whom they have entrusted the operation of their government. Adoption of a disclosure requirement along the line I have proposed—at every level of government, Federal, State, and local, and for both executive and legislative branches—would put new meaning into our traditional concept of public office as a public trust.

[From the Newark (N.Y.) Sunday News, Dec. 26, 1965]

Junior Chamber Circulates Code of Ethics for Towns

(By Angelo Baglivo)

The New Jersey Junior Chamber of Commerce is acting in an area where politicians, high and low, have long feared to tread—conflict of interest legislation.

As a State action project, the Jaycees recently distributed to their approximately 300 local chapters code of ethics kits—illustrated pamphlets containing a model municipal conflicts of interest ordinance.

The kit urges the local Jaycees to make civic, service, fraternal and religious groups aware of the desirability and need for a code of ethics as a guide to local officers and employees.

The model code should be presented to the municipal governing body and a campaign organized to encourage favorable action on adoption of an ordinance, the kit states.

LOCAL GUIDELINES

Like the weather, conflict of interest legislation in both Washington and Trenton has been something everybody talks about. But the talk has not been translated into meaningful law.

The Jaycee's campaign is aimed at launching a movement for code of ethics legislation for elected and appointed governmental officials and employees at the grassroots level.

A moving force behind the project is Bernard A. Kuttner, corporation counsel of Irvington and president of the Irvington Jaycees. It was Kuttner who was principal draftsman of the model code, but he emphasizes that it is intended only as a suggested guide.

PROVISIONS

The model code states that no official, appointee or employee of the town, paid or unpaid, or member of any municipal board, agency, committee or commission shall:

"Directly or indirectly use or attempt to use his position to secure any preferential or unlawful rights, benefits, advantages or privileges for himself or for others.

"Directly or indirectly engage in any business, transaction, public or private, or professional activity, or shall have a financial or other personal interest, direct or indirect, which is in actual or potential conflict with the proper discharge of his duties.

"Disclose or use confidential information concerning the municipality to promote the financial or other private interest of himself or others.

"Accept any gift, whether in the form of service, loan, thing, or promise, from any person, firm, or corporation which to his knowledge is interested directly or indirectly in any manner whatsoever in business dealings with the municipality and over which business dealings he has power to take or influence official action.

VOTING LIMITS

"Vote for the adoption or defeat of any legislation or for the payment or nonpayment of any indebtedness owed or allegedly owed by this town in which he has a direct or indirect personal pecuniary or private interest.

"Represent any private interest before any agency or board of the municipality to the detriment of the municipality or for the purpose of personal gain, or in any litigation in which the municipality is a party.

"Accept other employment or professional retainers, or the promise thereof, that might reasonably conflict with the performance of his official duties, or that might reasonably tend to impair his independent or impartial judgment or action in the exercise or performance of his official duties."

Another section would prohibit officials who have any direct or indirect financial interest in any transaction or contract before the municipality from voting or deliberating on the matter.

EXCEPTIONS

Local officials also would be barred from involvement or investment in any business "which will impair, or reasonably tend to impair, his judgment or action in the exercise of his official duties." There would be no prohibition against investing in national securities registered under the Federal Securities Exchange Act, in shares of a federally registered investment company or in securities of a registered public utility holding company.

The code proposes the creation of a local board of ethics to supervise the program. The suggested makeup is five members, one named by the mayor and four by the municipal council. One member would have to be a lawyer, but none could hold any other office or employment in the municipality.

The board would issue advisory opinions when questions on potential conflict of interest are raised by any municipal agency or employee.

HEARINGS ASKED

If sworn complaints are made against any official or employee, the board would conduct a public hearing and make a decision on whether there was improper action. If the board finds impropriety, the municipal council then would decide whether to censure, suspend, or fire the official or employee.

Kuttner concedes that the field of conflict of interest legislation has always been a kind of political no man's land. But he said he is hopeful the Jaycees campaign will help to break down this traditional resistance. He reported that 10 communities already have adopted similar legislation.

In 1964, Kuttner participated in an attempt to get the State league of municipalities to adopt officially a model code of ethics for presentation to its nearly 600 member municipalities. It ran into a dead end.

PROTECTION OF PARKLAND

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a few days ago, as I have done before, I urged Brig. Gen. C. M. Duke, Engineer-Commissioner of the District of Columbia, to place in a tunnel the entire leg of a freeway scheduled to run through West Potomac Park, one of the most important and beautiful parks in the Nation.

Immediately following my statement, a Federal roads official publicly attacked the tunneling concept, saying it should be avoided because it is expensive and impairs a motorist's view of the local scenery. According to a newspaper account, he added:

> Parks are not developed for landscape architects or for the exclusive use of a few people living near them, or even for the heads of park departments—and after reading this morning's paper, perhaps I should say "Not for U.S. Senators, either."

Apparently he believes that parks are for one thing only—providing more space for highways. The whole range of needs of the urban human being are of no account; the only thing that matters is that the motorist's view be unobstructed. But what sort of a view of anything does the motorist get while traveling the superhighway at 60 or 70 miles an hour?

The statement of the Federal roads official brings to mind the saying that wars are too important to be left to the generals. Equally, highway building is too important to be left totally to the highway builders. I have no quarrel with their performance of their engineering job. Obviously they know how to build highways.

But I do challenge any assumption that they should have the final say as to where a highway ought to be placed, or how it should be designed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey may have 3 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. I am grateful to the Senator from Montana.

I believe the final determination is a matter for those officials in each community who carry overall responsibility for maintaining its viability and livability. The best highway does not always run from point to point by the shortest distance.

The attack on the tunneling concept ignores the chorus of protest which has arisen in cities across the country. In San Francisco, Philadelphia, New York, and many other places, as well as in New Jersey, responsible citizens are up in arms—and rightly so—over the destructive impact of superhighways on their communities, on their parks, and on historical sites.

Highways are a necessity—but highways must be designed and located so that they do not destroy the livability and individuality of our cities.

This need is especially urgent in our Nation's Capital. If we are to retain Washington's historic heritage, if we are to maintain the livability and charm of our Capital City, extra pains must be taken to make certain in our highway building—and in all other public projects—we give attention to the full range of community needs, both tangible and intangible.

Tunneling highways should be viewed as an opportunity—not as an obstacle. It offers the possibility of improving transportation within our cities and suburbs while at the same time protecting neighborhoods, businesses, parks, and other open spaces.

I called attention to this on the Senate floor last August 2 after reading an article which discussed the feasibility of building tunneled highways. The thrust of the article was that tunnels are getting cheaper to build and operate, and open highways more expensive; therefore, it would be useful to consider putting many of our new roads underground in congested areas.

The concept of tunneling was endorsed last year by Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton at a National Capital Planning Commission meeting on the alinement of the south leg highway through West Potomac Park. And only a few days ago, I might add, Mr. Whitton joined in a statement that found "attractive" a plan to construct another segment of the local highway system under a main thoroughfare.

It is true, indeed, that parks are not the private preserve of anyone. They are for all the people to enjoy. But they will not exist for anyone if we permit them to be overrun by modern, multilane superhighways.

In our increasingly urbanized society, more parks and other recreation areas are needed—not fewer. Too much of our precious and limited park land already has been swallowed up.

I shall shortly introduce legislation designed to stem the steady erosion of park land in the United States. Under my bill, among other things, park land taken for highways and other nonpark purposes would, as a matter of course, have to be replaced by equivalent land elsewhere.

Adoption of this principle of compensation in kind is long overdue. It is certainly desirable everywhere. It is essential in our cities if any urban parks at all are to be saved.

Under my recommendation, the park land taken would have to be replaced acre for acre—or, if you will, foot for foot.

We hear much talk about preservation of natural beauty in this country. Commendably, the First Lady is pressing a campaign to make everyone conscious of the need to do his part in this effort. Yet at the very moment when this campaign is reaching its climax, it is clear from the statement that spurred my remarks and from the threat of highway construction in the midst of the world-famous cherry blossoms, that some Federal officials still have not gotten the message.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the past year, our Armed Forces, by their sacrifices, gave a new lease on life to the non-Communist military and political structure of South Vietnam. But let us not delude ourselves. That new lease on life runs only so long as U.S. support continues and, in present circumstances, continues to grow.

Indeed, the price may be expected to rise once again as a result of the current chain of developments. Certainly, political changes since the death of President Ngo Dinh Diem have tended to increase the cost of support in terms of U.S. lives and aid.

It has been said that the French lost the war not in Indochina, but in Paris. It has been implied, in parallel oversimplification of this most complex problem, that if the present war is lost, it will not be lost in Indochina but in the United States and, more specifically, in Washington, and perhaps even in the Senate of the United States.

I think it is about time to dispense once and for all with glib assertions of that kind. The great need is to probe for the dimensions of this complex and changing situation and for a rational role for the United States. The reality is that if Indochina is lost it cannot be lost by the United States, which has never possessed it, does not possess it now, and would not possess it if it could. The reality is that, in any meaningful sense, Vietnam cannot be won or lost in the United States or Washington. Nor can it be won, in a final or an enduring sense, by Americans in Vietnam who have carried their difficult tasks at such great sacrifice.

But if it comes to that, the future of Vietnam can be won or lost in Saigon by a failure of Vietnamese leadership and by the continuing inadequacies of the present politico-military structure. It can be lost in Saigon, too, if we do not exercise in this matter a wise restraint against overeagerness to help and in this recent crisis President Johnson has acted most commendably. It cannot be said too often that in this day and age, and in matters of political leadership in particular, our efforts cannot be substituted for the efforts which must come from others on behalf of their own peoples.

To sum up, whatever their outcome, recent events tell us that there is trouble in Vietnam. It is deeper and more complex than we have heretofore been prepared to acknowledge. We will do well, now, to face up to that fact and to the fact that we are deeply enmeshed in the trouble. We may be prepared to let alone these inner conflicts in South Vietnam, but they will not let us alone. They may appear peripheral to us in view of the emphasis which has been given to other aspects of the problem. In fact, they may have very little to do with the war in which our forces are engaged. But the fact is, too, that they are inseparable from that war from the Vietnamese point of view. Indeed, for many in South Vietnam, the present difficulties are more central to the problems of Vietnam than the war.

We can ignore these considerations only at the risk of turning the war in Vietnam into one which is, at best, irrelevant to the people of Vietnam and, at worst, one in which their hostility may readily be enlisted against us. We had better recognize, instead, that these recent manifestations of schisms in Vietnam lend added emphasis to the validity of the President's policy. He has designed that policy to serve U.S. interests by an active and continuing search for negotiations in an effort to end the war and so contain our involvement in Vietnam within reasonable limits.

It bears repeating, therefore, at this time that there is only one really basic factor which from the point of view of U.S. policy is essential to a prompt end to the conflict by negotiations and to the withdrawal of U.S. Forces. That factor has been described, in effect, time and again by the President, and without "ifs," "ands," or "buts." That factor is the establishment of conditions, through negotiations, which will assure and safeguard an authentic and free choice to the people of South Vietnam as to their political future and as to their ultimate relationship with North Vietnam. That and that alone is the objective of the United States military effort and the President's policy.

It is most unfortunate that neither the United Nations nor the Cochairmen of the Geneva Conferences—that is the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union—or other participants therein have been able to bring about negotiations looking to a peaceful solution along these lines. It may be, as the Soviet Union and others have said, that conditions do not exist at this time which permit them to take an initiative for negotiations. But it may also be that efforts to bring about negotiations may be pressed more usefully elsewhere than either through the Geneva conferees or the United Nations. It may be that negotiations should be sought with greater vigor precisely in the region where the proximity of the conflict lends a greater sense of urgency to the necessity for its settlement.

It has been said many times and, in my judgment, correctly, that a just settlement of the Vietnamese conflict by negotiations would serve the interests of this Nation as well as other nations which are either painfully involved or threatened with involvement. If that is the case, then perhaps there is something to be said for a direct confrontation across a peace table between ourselves and Hanoi, Peking, and such elements in South Vietnam as may be essential to the making and keeping of a peaceful settlement in that region.

Certainly, there would be no better place to locate a peace table of this kind than in Japan or Burma or some other proximate and appropriate Asian setting. It is not in Europe but in Asia and the United States where the pain of the war is felt. It is in Asia where the implications of this war are most grim. It is in Asia where other nations are immediately threatened by its spread. It is, in short, in Asia where the peace must be made and kept. It may well be, therefore, that it is in Asia where peace must now be—directly and vigorously—sought.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who has followed this problem as closely as he can, what the Senator said makes a great deal of sense.

Is it not also true, in the Senator's opinion, that to have negotiations of that kind, the South Vietnamese must have a government of their own which can join in negotiations, and in which government the people of South Vietnam must have enough confidence so that they will support anything that comes out of negotiations by negotiators of their government?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. Of course, there are elements to be considered in South Vietnam, such as the Catholics, the Buddhists, the Cao Dai, and the Hoa Hao, which over the past several weeks have been involved in the difficulties of the present government in Saigon. They should all be considered, these elements within South Vietnam.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But we cannot negotiate in Japan or Burma, as the Senator said, with Hanoi, Peking, or anybody else unless the South Vietnamese have their own negotiators representing their government and that government has some stability.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). How much time does the Senator request?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I request 3 minutes or such time as I might need.

In regard to what the Senator from Massachusetts has said, I think it is quite obvious that conditions in the South Vietnam Government will either become much better or worse within the next few weeks, and we hope they will be much better.

I would endorse the suggestion of the Senator from Montana as to the Southeast Asian Conference.

It appears that the combatants in this war have subscribed to the terms of the Geneva Conference as the basis for settlement.

But the reason there has been no reconvening of the Geneva Conference is that Russia, being the cochairman with Great Britain, has refused to join with Great Britain in the calling of this Conference in an effort to settle the war in Vietnam.

I see no reason why other countries concerned should any longer wait upon the desires of Russia, whatever they may be. Sometimes it appears that Russia does not want us to leave that area. She has declined to join with Great Britain in calling this Conference. There is no reason why the Conference should not be called to meet in that general area of southeast Asia, and if any nations concerned do not want to show up to participate in the Conference, then that is something we ought to find out.

I hope that there will be progress made along this line, and that we will not feel obligated to wait longer for Russia to do what we think she should have done many months ago.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Vermont. His remarks are always cogent.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator, if I have time remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it should be called to the attention of the Senate that the President of the United States stated in his state of the Union message on January 12 of this year:

> There are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will meet at any conference table, discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and consider the views of any group.

On August 3, 1965, when he laid out his nine points at a press conference, the President stated in response to a question as follows:

> And as I have said so many times, if anyone questions our good faith and will ask us to meet them to try to reason this matter out, they will find us at the appointed place, the appointed time, and the proper chair.

Finally, at the same press conference he made the following statement:

> But we insist and we will always insist that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision, and they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

I cite these statements to indicate that there is a real and personal interest which the President has in bringing this difficulty to an honorable and just conclusion, and I commend him again for the caution and restraint he has shown during the past 4 or 5 troublesome weeks.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I have listened with great admiration to the magnificent statement which has just been made by the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

WHAT IF KY IS OVERTHROWN AND THE NEW GOVERNING BODY IN SAIGON DEMANDS OUR WITHDRAWAL?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recent political agitation and rioting and violence in South Vietnam, with its overtones of insurrection and anti-Americanism, present a vicious situation to our GI's overseas in southeast Asia and to the parents of those boys.

Prime Minister Ky has been in office since June of last year when 10 generals overthrew the civilian government. They chose Ky as Prime Minister.

The political facts of life are that in all of the time since last June, Ky has not initiated nor accomplished any reforms for the unfortunate and landless living in the area over which he claims to be Prime Minister. The facts are, of course, that the Saigon government which he heads does not now and has not controlled at any time even half of the land area of South Vietnam. Ky never had control of the South Vietnamese military commander of the 1st Corps area, Thi. The northern border of the area occupied by the 1st Corps, or supposedly within its responsibility, is at the 17th parallel which, according to the Geneva accords, is not a boundary line but marks the temporary demarcation zone separating North and South Vietnam until there is a general election.

Diem was returned to South Vietnam from the United States and installed as President under the aegis of the United States and by operations of the CIA. He called off the election that was agreed to at the Geneva conference.

Unfortunately, recently at Honolulu, President Johnson in summoning Prime Minister Ky to confer with him, gave him respectability and treated him as leader of all the Vietnamese people of South Vietnam. James Reston of the New York Times wrote that our President said this knowing that this "was not true but hoping he could make it true if he said so but it did not work." Ky apparently had an inflated opinion of his power. He announced a death sentence on the mayor of Da Nang without arrest or trial. Violence broke out to an extent that 50,000 men of our Armed Forces in Da Nang were ordered to remain at the base and for their own safety to stay off the streets of Da Nang.

South Vietnam is not, and historically never was, a nation. Now, an insurrection is raging, not only in Da Nang but in Hue, Saigon and elsewhere. This is a rebellion within a civil war. It may be that our Armed Forces and CIA will manage to keep General Ky in power. It is evident he could not last a week as Prime Minister except for our support and intervention.

When Defense Secretary McNamara says that this war in Vietnam is not a civil war, that there is a direct and flagrant aggression by North Vietnam, his statement is so fantastic as to be humorous. It is well that we Senators, at least most of us, retain our sense of humor. Unfortunately, the Secretary is on untenable ground when he claims aggression from the North. North Vietnam is not a nation foreign to the area termed South Vietnam since the Geneva agreement of 1954. For many hundreds of years there has been a nation—Vietnam. The Geneva agreement provided for a temporary division with reunification following the election agreed upon.

The basis of American intervention in the beginning, and the claim was made, that we are in Vietnam at the request of the ruling government of Saigon against external aggression. The late great President John F. Kennedy said that this is a Vietnamese war and they must win or lose it. He also said that claiming South Vietnam as a bastion for the defense of the United States is ridiculous. If a new government comes into power, even temporarily, in Saigon and demands that the Americans withdraw their forces, where are we? Of course, in all honor, there is only one alternative and that is to withdraw all of our forces to the bases on the coast where our 7th Fleet and air power can readily repel any aggression and then withdraw our forces to the United States in an orderly manner and without undue delay.

Up to this good hour the militarists seem to have prevailed with our President. Our Armed Forces in South Vietnam and off the coast of South Vietnam now exceed 300,000. The entire population of South Vietnam is 14 million. Of the 14 million a very large majority are women and children. In addition, we now have 40,000 men of our Armed Forces in Thailand. Also, the President has said we shall bring in more "from time to time."

Likewise, more troops from North Vietnam probably will cross into South Vietnam. Escalation on our part leads to escalation on the part of the Communists. Escalation from Washington induces escalation from Hanoi and more recruiting and drafting of soldiers by the VC fighting us in South Vietnam. Then escalation grows on both sides. This is an indefensible self-defeating situation leading nowhere.

Earlier this month for the first time during the entire period of 1 week more American GI's were killed in combat than were those of the ARVN forces, or soldiers of our South Vietnam allies. Apparently, the Saigon military administration of Prime Minister Ky has been so weakened and battered by the revolt in Saigon, Da Nang, and Hue and elsewhere its leaders have lost grip of their armed forces and our Vietnamese allies have lost their spirit to fight. It would be surprising if the situation were otherwise.

If a civilian group ousts the militarists of the Ky regime and then demands that Americans get out surely our Commander in Chief would have no alternative other than an orderly withdrawal of our forces to our bases on the coast upon protection of our 7th Fleet and air power and then reassignment to the United States or to some of our bases overseas in Europe. We would not lose face by this disengagement. We have lost face by involving ourselves in a miserable civil war in the territory that was Indochina. To Asiatics we are regarded as the aggressor seeking to perpetrate the Indo-French Colonial Empire from which France withdrew 200,000 soldiers in 1954 and gave up all hope of imperialism and despotism over the area now termed Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

INCOME TAX CREDIT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I am hopeful that the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] to provide an income tax credit of $325 per family for each youngster in college will soon be written into law.

Much necessary legislation has been enacted to assist low-income families. Grants and loans have been made available to needy college students. Various laws have been enacted to lighten the tax burden on businessmen and higher income groups. However, the wage earner in the middle-income group has been largely forgotten when tax bills have been passed. With the cost of higher education becoming excessive, he is finding it increasingly difficult to provide for his youngsters' educations. Likewise, his income bracket makes it difficult or impossible for them to qualify as needy students.

The Ribicoff amendment, so-called, was for a tax credit, not a deduction. While a deduction saves a $15,000-a-year man more tax dollars than one who earns $5,000, a tax credit saves both the same amount of dollars. This credit would afford a tax break for middle-income wage earners.

Mr. President, I recently received a very thoughtful letter on this subject from Donald Faulkner, vice president of Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, one of the great universities in my State of Ohio and the Nation. I commend the views of Donald Faulkner to all Senators and ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY,
Cleveland, Ohio, April 11, 1966.

Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR STEVE: I noted your discussion of the debate and vote on income tax credit for college tuition.

The arguments you presented in "Straight From Washington" certainly tell the story.

We have again in our recruitment procedures this spring increased evidence that the very poor and the very rich are helped through tax arrangements but the great middle professional group in America find little relief.

Western Reserve University still holds its tuition several hundred dollars below the average of those schools with which we compete; i.e., top complex type private universities, the best of the 4-year colleges like Oberlin and Swarthmore and the truly great State universities. The average for the private university, as you know is approaching the $2,700 to $3,000 per year level for tuition, board, and room. Many are today above the $2,700 limit.

Next year Reserve will go to $1,450 tuition from $1,300. The following year we will probably be forced to increase it again since I cannot operate for long on large annual deficits. Each year we are, of course, increasing our financial aid to students but again this advantages the very poor, all formulas generally eliminating the middle group.

I honor you for your stand.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD FAULKNER,
Vice President for Finance.

HOMAGE TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN—ADDRESS BY ANTONIO CARRILLO FLORES, SECRETARY OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, REPUBLIC OF MEXICO

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it was our good fortune to accompany the President of the United States to Mexico City for the dedication of the Abraham Lincoln statue and the dedication of Lincoln Center in the very center of that city of 6 million people.

Homage was rendered to Abraham Lincoln by a very distinguished diplomat whom we all know. He has served in the United States with real distinction as the Mexican Ambassador. I refer to Antonio Carrillo Flores, who is the present Secretary of Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the address that our distinguished neighbor delivered on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Homage to Abraham Lincoln

(Address by Antonio Carrillo Flores, Secretary of Foreign Relations, at the ceremony unveiling the statue of the liberator donated to the Mexican people by the people of the United States.)

Mr. President, I am gratified and honored to fulfill the duty you have entrusted to me of expressing to President Johnson and to each and every one of the members of his delegation the gratitude of the Mexican Government to the people of the United States for the gift of this statue of the liberator, Abraham Lincoln, that Mrs. Johnson has just unveiled.

We recognize as a special proof of friendship the fact that the U.S. Chief of State has come all the way to the Valley of Anahuac, accompanied by such distinguished personages, to participate in this ceremony in which we render homage to a man who is a glory of his country, of America, and of the world.

The President of the Honorable Permanent Commission of Congress, the President of the Honorable Supreme Court of Justice, the Governor of the Federal District, members of the Cabinet, Ambassadors, ladies and gentlemen, Abraham Lincoln arrives to this park, which from today will bear his name, only a few months after Benito Juárez, also in bronze effigy, returned to New Orleans. It is therefore appropriate that I open my speech with the plain words of Luis G. Urbina, a poet whose name is borne by a street near this garden, who said before the monument to the Benemérito Juarez:

"He is here because he was great and because he was just."

Lincoln was a son of Kentucky, as we see him portrayed in this splendid work of art, tall, very tall. He was more than a meter, 90 centimeters in height, spare, with strong arms and hands that with an axe had felled trees. He had gray eyes, unruly black hair, and a constant aspect of melancholy that even his best biographers have not been able completely to explain.

Greatness and humanity are blended in him, naturally, spontaneously, just as are the brook and the woods of New Salem, the Illinois village which was the scene of his youthful dreams. Alongside the vision and character of one of the few who have determined the direction of history, he preserved always the air, the brusk cordiality, of a man born and bred on the prairie.

One of the three women that we know he loved, daughter of a Kentucky farmer, found him even "deficient in those little links which make up a woman's happiness." And history records the bafflement of the elegant New Yorkers present at Cooper Union that snowy night of February 27, 1860, at his disordered dress, his uneven gait, the initial tremor of his voice. But these limitations draw his image nearer to the common man and contribute to his charismatic charm.

He died exactly 101 years ago, at dawn, after the city of Washington had lived through a grievous night. Only a few days before, he had recounted to his wife a strange presentiment:

"About 10 days ago I retired very late * * * [and] soon I began to dream * * * I thought I left my bed and wandered downstairs * * * until I arrived at the East Room, which I entered * * * Before me was a catafalque * * * Around it were stationed soldiers who were acting as guards; and there was a throng of people, some gazing mournfully upon the corpse, whose face was covered, others weeping pitifully. 'Who is dead in the White House?' I demanded of one of the soldiers. 'The President,' was his answer; 'he was killed by an assassin.'"

On the morning of the 14th of April 1865, he met with his Cabinet for the last time, to discuss the policy to follow in relation to the States that had attempted to separate from the Union, as the terrible Civil War that had devastated the United States for 4 years had terminated only 5 days before. "There are men in Congress," he said at this meeting, "possessed of sentiments of hate and vengeance that I do not share and with which I cannot sympathize."

His assassin, an obscure theatrical actor, did not realize that he had destroyed a champion of the spirit of justice and tolerance toward the vanquished and had opened a most bitter period for those in whose interests he believed himself to be acting.

The afternoon preceding that tragic night the President took a short walk with his wife. "Mary," he said, "we have had hard times since we came to Washington; but the war has ended and we can look forward to 4 years of peace and happiness. Afterwards we shall return to Illinois and pass there peacefully the rest of our days." Lincoln did not return alive to his beloved Springfield. That night he went to the Ford Theater and to his death.

Supreme master of the written and spoken word, he had no pretensions as an intellectual or erudite. His reading, of the highest quality was limited: the Bible, Shakespeare, Blackstone's Commentaries on Anglo-Saxon Common Law. And yet, in the utterances of his last year, he reached a nobility, a profoundness of thought, a perfection of form unequaled by any other statesman of the Western World since Pericles' funeral oration 25 centuries before. The brief paragraphs of the Gettysburg Address, preserved in marble on the banks of the Potomac, contain the best definition and eulogy of democracy ever made; "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth," because it is "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." No words can say more than these to the hearts of men of all races, of all beliefs or of none.

Lincoln was a complex and multiple personality; and his rights to greatness are numerous. For his country he was, and is, what he above all wanted to be: the savior of its unity and its democratic institutions in the deepest crisis of its history.

He took office as President in March 1861, after many political reverses, at a time when the problem of slavery was beginning to cleave the country in two. The precarious equilibrium that had permitted the coexistence of the young and steadily stronger industrial economy of the Northern States with the feudal regimes of the South was upset in 1854, when it appeared that slavery was about to be extended to new territories of the Union.

In this situation, Lincoln, who had assumed power through a plurality of electors representing only a regional opinion (as he received not a single popular vote in 10 of the 33 States that formed the Union at that time), understood his most urgent task to be the preservation of the Nation's unity. With admirable courage and fearless as to the criticism of the impatient, he wrote:

"My paramount object is to save the Union, and not either to save or to destroy slavery."

For Lincoln was also an extraordinary politician, with a keen sense of the realities in which he moved. He knew that impatience does not always best serve good causes and was bold to make pronouncements that apparently contradicted his ideals, if in this manner he could weaken the enemies of those ideals.

Often, as did Juarez also, he appeared to waver. But his tolerance, his intentional weakness were only steps in a strategy at once moral and political: he sought that no one should accuse him of having unchained violence if in the end he was unable to prevent it. The Civil War broke out a few days after Lincoln assumed office; but he did not fire the first shot. It was done by others, those who wished to hold back history.

During the first year the fortunes of war went against the Union, so much so—and here there is a link between the history of the United States and ours—that in the opinion of some historians, if Zaragoza had lost the Battle of the Fifth of May and the forces of Napoleon III had occupied Mexico City, it is possible that France and other powers might have recognized the Confederacy formed by the Southern States. In those days Secretary of War Stanton was telegraphing the Governors of the loyal States from the alarmed Capital: "The enemy advances in great force on Washington."

The wise politician who to avoid war had been disposed to compromise with slavery realized then that it was necessary to strengthen the cause of the Union by turning it into a crusade for human liberty—a cause which Europe could not dare oppose—and put forth on September 22, 1862, his proclamation emancipating the slaves. His action was a measure of war in his role as Commander in Chief of the armies; and he was fully aware of its unconstitutionality according to an 1857 decision of the Supreme Court.

He thus gave liberty to 4 million people who until then were not considered persons, but property, of which their owners could not be dispossessed without due process of law and just and adequate compensation (Lincoln acted on the problem of slavery—and here I must modify the simile—as Venustiano Curranza proceeded in Mexico in relation to the agrarian problem in January of 1915).

Of course, neither in his country nor in the outside world did the struggle for human equality end with the proclamation of 1862. A few years ago our Ministry of Foreign Relations published a study supported by the detailed accounts of Matías Romero relating the attempts made, at Lincoln's death, by certain adventurers (and welcomed by Maximilian) to admit plantation owners of the former Confederacy to Mexico with their slaves—an absurd project, which naturally failed.

In the United States the shrewdness of conservative jurists would claim that equality could be achieved while maintaining a separation by color, as long as all citizens were given equal treatment. It was not until 1954, almost a century after Lincoln's death, that this sophistry would be destroyed. It is just to say that President Johnson, ever since his days as Senator, has accomplished much for the rights of racial minorities. To him has fallen the honor of promoting, promulgating, and defending the most liberal U.S. legislation on civil rights that has been passed in this century. The task, of course, is not finished.

On a wider horizon we know that, in spite of the generous statements of the United Nations Charter and of the Declaration of Human Rights of 1951, there are still today parts of the earth where the principle of the equality of all men is incomprehensibly, anachronistically resisted.

The world is living through a revolution in which the old equalitarian ideal no longer suffices in its purely moral or political character, as neither does it on the purely economic side. In the last decades a powerful force has gathered momentum demanding—

at the same time—dignity and well-being for all men. For this reason Lincoln is a living symbol and an active participant in the struggles of our time. When he said in his message to Congress in 1862 that "the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present", he formulated a norm of conduct valid for facing the tremendous difficulties of his time as well as ours of today.

We should be ready, as Lincoln was, to think anew and, when necessary, to act also anew, and as he stated in his second inaugural address, which was almost his testament, "with malice toward none; with charity for all," since only in this manner can we "achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations." Here is, in a different language, the saying that Benito Juárez left to us and which we Mexicans never tire of repeating: "Among men, as among nations, the respect for the rights of others is peace."

And this reminds me that Lincoln, besides the other claims already mentioned, has a special one to our affection: in that he was more than a friend, a brother, in what Justo Sierra called our terrible year. We dedicate our homage this morning to the Liberator and his people and to our cordial and frank friendship for its highest representatives. In this spirit I would like to repeat the words I spoke, as Mexican Ambassador in Washington, on the centenary of Lincoln's departure from Springfield toward struggle, triumph, and martyrdom: Thank you, Mr. Lincoln, in the name of all Mexicans, living and dead and still to be born, for your words in our defense as a member of the House of Representatives when our countries were at war. Your countrymen were angered at that time, refused to reelect you; and for 6 years you were obliged to return to your modest provincial law practice. But they now venerate you and rejoice that the world recognizes you as the most universal of the men of that country, which you saved with your intelligence, your courage, and your blood.

Years later Lincoln had still another occasion to show his affection toward Mexico. On the eve of the Napoleonic aggression, Juárez instructed his representative to visit the then President-elect. The interview took place in Springfield on January 19, 1861. Matías Romero wrote in his diary: "Mr. Lincoln told me that during his administration he will do everything in his power in favor of Mexico's interest, that he will see justice done her in every possible contingency and that he considers her a friend and a sister nation. He added that he could not foresee anything that might cause him to depart from this purpose * * *. He asked me concerning the condition of the peasants in Mexico, as he had heard say that they lived in veritable bondage. He expressed himself strongly against slavery."

I could not discuss Lincoln's ideas in relation to our peasants without going afield from my subject. Suffice it to say that, from afar, Lincoln clearly saw Mexico's central problem, that of the land, which half a century later would be the fundamental cause of the revolution and is, even today, the great challenge and unsolved question of vast poor areas of the world.

Once Civil War broke out in the United States, Mexico's help could be only of a moral nature, at the most a benevolent neutrality. Lincoln, always realistic, knew it was impossible to combat simultaneously the armies of the South, led by one of the greatest American soldiers ever produced, Robert E. Lee, and the forces of Napoleon III. Juárez, also a realistic politician, understood this. He wrote in a letter to his Minister Romero on December 22, 1864, in the third year of an unequal and several times almost lost struggle with the foreign invader. "I believe that we should attempt with that Republic what in good faith and without compromising our dignity we might be able to attain, and not entrust to it exclusively the hope of our triumph. We shall endeavor to accomplish this by our own meager means. In this manner our victory will be more glorious; and if we fall, which I judge very difficult, we shall have saved the honor of freemen as a legacy for our sons."

President Diaz Ordaz, President Johnson, ladies and gentlemen, we Mexicans have often sought the parallel between Benito Juárez and Abraham Lincoln. It is natural, then, that I end with a few reflections on this fascinating theme. They are not, I do not pretend that they are, entirely new.

As men they could not have been more different one from the other. In Lincoln's soul there always remained something of the child, the child that never left off laughing or crying. "On occasions," said his most eminent biographer, Carl Sandburg, in his 1959 eulogy before the Congress of the United States, "he was seen to weep in a way that gave to his tears decorum, majesty." Juárez always displayed the impassibility, the silent stoicism of the ancient Indians. If Lincoln was "steel wrapped in velvet," in the image of Sandburg, Juáez was "steel wrapped in steel." Two or three hours before dying he arose from his bed, dressed neatly, and walked to his office to attend to matters of state with one of his ministers, allowing nothing in his expression to reveal the tremendous pain in his chest.

In their destinies, however, there were remarkable coincidences. Their lives were almost exactly contemporaneous: Juárez was born in 1806, Lincoln in 1809; the latter died in 1865, Juárez in 1872. Both came from the humblest origins. Each became chief of State at the age of 52, at a point when his political career seemed to be finished—Juárez at the end of his term as Governor of Oaxaca in 1852, Lincoln on leaving Congress after a single term of 2 years in 1848. Both reached power through accidents of history—Juárez by the coup d'etat of Comonfort, Lincoln by the division of the opposition party between two candidates. Both more than govern, had to fight for the very existence of Mexico and of the United States. And they were obliged to struggle not only with the declared enemy but also with their generals, their cabinets, their congresses. Another moving similarity: in their most desperate hours as statesmen, each suffers the most overpowering grief, Juárez the death of three of his children, specially of Pepe, whom he calls in a desolate letter "my joy, my pride, and my hope," and Lincoln the loss of his son Willie, perhaps the deepest affection of his life and whose small coffin would travel with his own from Washington to Springfield.

Men of law, both are accused of having used power unconstitutionally, Juárez of having frankly usurped it. And they both had to be intransigent and inexorable, when at heart they would have liked to have avoided extremes. Finally, on dying, each in the presidency, with his work unfinished, they leave their countries politically, socially, and economically different from what they were before. Lincoln, more fortunate, dies an unfair death at the very hour of victory. Juárez must face, after victory, 5 long years more of political hazards and criticisms, which were often bitter and which did not end with his death. But in Mexico and in the United States modern history begins with Benito Juárez and with Abraham Lincoln.

To their glory, both of them, entrusted with the cruel task of leading the struggle of one part of their people against the other, have become symbols of national unity, after being always of the cause of human dignity and liberty. Mexico in cultivating the spirit of Juárez and the United States in maintaining the spirit of Lincoln have the road for a friendship that can be an example for America and the world.

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY BARBARA JEAN CHANCE, OF FRANKFORT, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, annually the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped sponsors an essay contest for the physically handicapped.

This year Miss Barbara Jean Chance of Frankfort, Kans., won fifth place in the national ability counts contest.

I ask unanimous consent that her article, entitled "What Handicapped Workers Are Contributing to My Community," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HANDICAPPED WORKERS ARE CONTRIBUTING TO MY COMMUNITY

(By Barbara Jean Chance, Frankfort High School, Frankfort, Kans.)

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." Last summer I was privileged to read these words molded into the iron of the Liberty Bell. Almost two centuries ago, this bell rang out the birth of a new nation. The Declaration of Independence gave the message that all men are created equal with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is difficult for the youth of my generation to realize the message of the Liberty Bell was ignored for years in regard to the physically handicapped. In our lives they function so normally as teachers, ministers, doctors, cartoonists, and on into an endless list. But through research, I have learned that in the past they were ridiculed and considered of no worth to society. Much progress has been made in changing this concept of the physically handicapped. Mankind is slowly but surely advancing to the time "when ability will be the key word, not disability; when opportunity will belong to all, not just some."

As I survey our small rural community, I am amazed to find so many physically handicapped people. This should not be so surprising, considering that 1 out of every 10 Americans is physically handicapped. These remarkable people are so well adjusted that they do not stand out as disabled individuals but as vital members of our community.

"Named as Leader of the Year," "Awarded Trip to Washington, D.C." These are common headlines seen in newspapers every day; but in our community, they held special significance. The farmer who had received these honors might have been a hopeless cripple today instead of a leader in our community. After he was married and had a small daughter, he was a victim of crippling polio. Through self therapy he was able to walk again with crutches—and later with a cane. He resumed farming and served this community last year as county president of the Farm Bureau. This year he was named as 1 of the 10 Kansas leaders of the year and was awarded a trip to Washington, D.C. This resourceful man is also a leader in his church. He is chairman of the board of trustees and serves as an elder. I asked him if he felt that his being handicapped had enabled him to live a more rewarding life than he might have otherwise. This was his answer: "I believe that a person can live a full life either way; it all depends on his attitude." I was so impressed by his intelligent face, his inspiring philosophy of life, and his many contributions to my community, that I scarcely noticed his cane as he proudly walked away.

Through my community the contributions of the physically handicapped are clearly evident. If one needs overnight lodging, we have an excellent motel. The pleasant voice and the cheerful face that welcome you at the office belong to a polio victim. Although his lower limbs are paralyzed, he and his family contribute to the economic life of our community by caring for tourists. "From the Heart" is the title of a book of poems written by a lady who was bedfast for many years. Her poetry will always remind us of her undaunted spirit. One of the expert operators of heavy equipment in our community is a young man with only one hand. He has been so efficient at his job that he is now a supervisor. A seamstress in our community does enough to keep two ordinary people busy. Besides being an excellent homemaker, she teaches in church school. All this she accomplishes on crutches. The contributions of these individuals bear out the truth in Dr. Howard Rusk's theory: "A man can be truly crippled only in his mind." The physically handicapped have been able to make worthwhile contributions to my community because they have become physically and spiritually adjusted to their handicaps and have concentrated on their abilities that remain. My community has had the foresight to see beyond their handicaps and has given them equal opportunity.

Much remains to be done in your community and in mine. If our country is to remain a leader in the free world, we must first insure the rights of each individual; handicapped and able bodied alike. The Liberty Bell proclaimed equal opportunity unto all men. Has your community heard the message?

PAN AMERICAN CONGRESS ON SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the first Pan American Congress on Soil Conservation is currently being held in Brazil, from April 12 to April 29. While the Congress is sponsored by the Brazilian Government, all American nations except Cuba, are represented by technicians from official parties and private entities.

The purpose of the Soil Conservation Congress is to gather specialists in soil conservation from every Pan American nation for the exchange of new ideas and knowledge, and consequently to stimulate the soil and water conservation programs to make land support expanding populations.

Donald A. Williams, the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, is the official head of the U.S. 22-man delegation to the Soil Conservation Congress, and delivered the keynote address.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman was an official guest of the Soil Conservation Congress in Brazil. He told the Pan American delegates that the greatest single challenge the world faces today is whether the swelling ranks of mankind can produce enough food to sustain life without hunger.

In the keynote address, SCS Administrator Williams told the Pan American delegates that conservation is reaching forth to a larger concept—it is becoming the care of the human habitat, which is the whole planet. He said that conservation is vital to today's world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of both Secretary Freeman's address and SCS Administrator Williams' keynote message to the first Pan American Congress on Soil Conservation printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman Before the Pan American Soil Conservation Congress, São Paulo, Brazil, April 16, 1966

The greatest single challenge the world faces today is whether the swelling ranks of mankind can produce enough food to sustain life without hunger.

Thus far in this decade of the 1960's, man is falling behind in this grim race * * * and we are now confronted with the awesome question:

Can we, will we, catch up and forge ahead * * * or will we run out of food and face mass famine?

I believe we can win that race and triumph in the war on hunger. I have faith that we will.

But to win will demand an urgent, worldwide effort * * * calling for the resources and skills and ingenuity of mankind everywhere.

Latin Americans have a key role to play in this effort, for while you lead the world in population growth * * * you also have a vast, untapped food resources potential which is the envy of much of the world.

With this potential you could lead the world in agricultural progress.

And so I have come here to talk with you about what you can do to help win the global war on hunger.

The need is so compelling, and the hour so late, that I must be bluntly direct.

THE FOOD-POPULATION PROBLEM

The dark shadow of famine gallops across the earth * * * and time is running out.

The race has rounded the turn into the last lap. And now man must redouble his efforts to grow more * * * and distribute better what he grows * * * or he will lose.

But I say to you that man can win that race * * * if he activates and mobilizes every appropriate tool, technique, and resource at his disposal in the few short years between now and the time the finish line comes into view.

The years are short and they are few.

The crisis may be fully upon us within 20 years. For our studies indicate that by that time, unless the hungry nations rapidly accelerate their own production of food, the developed nations of the world will have exhausted their combined capability of feeding the hungry peoples who will populate the developing nations. What will happen then?

Though hunger is not new to the world, the magnitude of its impending dimension is.

Two factors are responsible: First, the number of people in the world is increasing at an accelerating rate. It now seems quite likely that the increase in world population between now and the end of this century—only 34 years away—will equal or exceed the number who now inhabit the world. Second, this is occurring at a time when the amount of new land suitable for cultivation is rapidly diminishing. It is becoming increasingly costly to bring new lands into economic production. The better lands are already under cultivation and much good land is being lost to agriculture by urban development and new highway construction.

The world must prepare to feed a billion people more who will be added to the population over the next 15 years. The number itself is awesome. But even more awesome is the fact that fully four-fifths of this total will be added in the food-short, less-developed regions of the world.

It is timely then to ask at this great conservation Congress, What is the present situation in Latin America? The answer is dramatically clear. The situation in Latin America grows daily more serious.

You have the fastest rate of population growth in the world. Some 15 years ago, in 1950, the populations of North America and South America were about equal at 170 million. The United Nations currently projects a population for North America at about 300 million by the year 2000. The same projection for South America shows the population on this continent reaching almost 600 million. In just 34 years, if the U.N. projections materialize, there will be more than 340 million new mouths to feed on this continent.

Against this rapid population growth, what has been happening to agricultural production in Latin America in recent years? Our economists and those of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations tell us that so far we have been running hard—just to stand in one place. Agricultural production has gone up, but the increase has been wiped out by the new bodies calling for food. In spite of some improvement in some countries, food supplies per capita in Latin America remain near the 1959–61 level—when 14 countries of the hemisphere were deficient in caloric intake. Current per capita production is lower than in prewar years when Latin America was a major food exporter for the world.

Malnutrition and hunger are not limited to India alone, nor to Africa and Asia. They exist in our own hemisphere as well. They are a grim fact in our shining cities with their sordid slums. As you well know they are a fact of life on farmlands that do not produce enough to sustain the families who work them.

I would be less than truthful, if I did not cite these facts.

I would be less than accurate if I did not recognize that the people and governments represented here have taken some steps to accelerate their agricultural development.

THE CHALLENGE IN LATIN AMERICA

You have opened up new lands to cultivation and settled thousands of poor farmers on them;

You have developed institutions for agricultural research and extension and agricultural credits.

You have trained thousands in your vocational agricultural schools and you have sent others abroad for further study. We in the USDA have been training almost a thousand of your agriculturalists every year.

In a few countries, fertilizer production is growing. Price incentives have been formulated to encourage farmers to produce more in a limited number of Latin American countries.

But these steps, commendable as far as they go, are not enough. If we do no more and deploy our resources no better, we will fail. History and the hungry generations to come will hold us accountable.

The people and countries you represent here have the resources to make a dramatic and decisive change from the past—to go forward to make Latin American agricultural development a challenging example for the entire world.

It can be done.

The USDA recently completed a study of agriculture in 26 developing countries, including 6 in Latin America. Of the 26, 10 had annual rates of increase in crop output in excess of 4 percent during the years 1948 to 1962–63. Three countries in Latin America achieved this sustained high rate of agricultural growth: Mexico, Venezula, and Brazil. While the increase in each Latin American country was attributed largely to more acreage sown to crops, there were increases in yield per acre as well—particularly in Mexico.

And it is higher yields that we must turn to—even as we exploit much more fully the possibilities for bringing additional lands under cultivation.

The report cites that the greatest single factor associated with high and sustained growth rates in agricultural production is a national will to take the necessary actions.

The world now has the technology and the resources to win the war against hunger. We can if we will. Ours is the choice and the challenge.

Latin America is rich in resources; it can sustain a growing population. Even more, the peoples and the nations represented here can make a contribution to hungry regions of the world that are not blessed with comparable resources.

Further, it has been demonstrated again and again that by accelerating agricultural growth, we stimulate and reinforce development in other sectors of the society. As rural people produce more and market more they sustain indigenous related industries and contribute to overall economic growth as consumers as well as producers. And, might I add, the path to future commercial markets for a growing agricultural production is to be found in the developing countries of the world with their growing populations. They will buy if they can pay. As demonstrated in Japan, Taiwan, Spain, and Greece, they are able to pay when agricultural development triggers overall economic development and with it increasing per capita income and new demands for food.

THE ROLE OF RESOURCE CONSERVATION

Let us never forget or minimize the importance of soil and water conservation as a basic cornerstone of agricultural development and sustained, permanent agricultural growth. Effective conservation practices help make present agricultural lands more productive; they open the way to economic exploitation of new lands.

Soil conservation is not erosion control alone. It is a sophisticated combination of technologies fitted to the resources and the people involved.

The talents of soil scientists, engineers, geologists, hydrologists, range and woodland conservationists, agronomists, biologists, and economists are all needed to diagnose land problems and prescribe successful treatment and use.

Land resources—soil, water, plants and animals—cannot be effectively used or managed separately. They are completely interdependent. They must be treated as a whole.

In soil conservation work in the United States, people are recognized as the critical factor in each local resource situation. They are the reason for conservation itself. Conservation is carried out by the people who own and work the land as well as by government agencies.

In our country, soil and water conservation districts have been established under State laws to develop conservation programs and enter into working agreements with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other public and private agencies. These districts now cover 96 percent of the farms and ranches in the United States.

The Department of Agriculture provides technical assistance so that sound soil and water conservation practices will be followed by rural landowners and operators who cooperate through their district organizations.

The Soil Conservation Service, as the USDA's technical agency for soil and water conservation, has a staff of conservation technicians and other trained specialists to help landowners carry out sensible conservation practices. Only when we do this can we in the United States meet the needs of our people and fill our commitments abroad.

Through its more than 100 years of service, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has acquired much knowledge and experience that could be of vital importance to agricultural progress in developing countries. For more than 20 years—since the point 4 program in the 1940's—we have shared our agricultural technology with other nations. We have made mistakes in our own country. We can help other nations avoid making the same errors.

WHAT MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE

But the challenge of resource conservation is only one of the necessities if adequate agricultural growth in this hemisphere is to be accomplished.

Agricultural development in Latin America, as in other parts of the world, is beset by many basic problems. I cannot tonight catalog all the problems nor attempt to prescribe in detail what needs to be done about them. Time permits only that I cite those which I believe merit highest priority:

First, strengthen and upgrade the institutions that provide agricultural services.

These institutions include the Ministries of Agriculture as the central, coordinating agencies.

Included, too, are the agencies concerned with conservation, the research and experiment stations, extension and vocational agricultural schools, the agricultural credit and cooperative organizations.

These institutions need to be grouped together and given much more prestige, recognition, and resources than hitherto has been the case. More resources must be budgeted for the operation of these institutions.

Personnel who have the necessary technical and administrative skills to operate them effectively must be selected, trained, and retained.

Marketing facilities and systems must be substantially improved to hold down costs and to reduce waste in the movement of foods from farms to consumers. Current practices in most Latin American countries, in fact in most countries around the world, are often shockingly wasteful and inefficient.

Second, improve public policies that affect agricultural production.

Public policies need to be formulated and carried out which will provide incentives to agricultural producers.

Such policies must provide reasonable and stable income to the farmer. Prices must encourage the use of fertilizers and other inputs to achieve higher yields. Otherwise, the farmer has no incentive to apply modern farming techniques. Incentive is equally if not more important than education.

Needed, too, are tax policies to stimulate a fuller and more intensive use of land resources rather than export levies which inhibit increased production.

Policies are needed, too, which will encourage more public and private investment in agriculture and its related industries. This again dictates a return to agricultural investors that encourages, rather than discourages more production.

In short, public policies must be linked to new, dynamic agricultural technology. Otherwise it will go largely unused. The farmer, like the businessman, will see no reason to buy inputs and produce more unless he can make a profit.

Third, integrate rural populations into national market economies.

Steps need to be taken to increase the incomes of small farmers and farmworkers in most Latin American countries. Higher productivity on the farms, combined with incentive prices, will accomplish this. But in Latin America, as in the United States, opportunities for employment in rural areas for those who are unemployed and underemployed in farming activities are needed.

Even in our developed industrial society in the United States, we have learned that the cities cannot productively employ unskilled millions who migrate from the rural regions because life there offers little opportunity. This migration is today a great unsolved problem in the United States.

Rural populations must have opportunities for education and for health facilities which will increase their ability to work productively in a technological society. They also demand increasingly, and rightfully comparable recreational, social, and cultural opportunities. As rural people gain the means to participate in the market economies of their countries, they will then be able to better sustain indigenous manufacturing, recreation, and service industries, all of which contribute to overall economic growth.

As I have already related by reference to the USDA study, many developing countries already are showing striking progress along these lines. Indeed, some countries are actually increasing their agricultural production at higher rates than those ever achieved in the highly developed nations, including the United States.

Such progress has not happened simply as a consequence of normal economic and social processes. Rather, it has been spurred by aggressive public and private actions, generally national in scope, directed specifically to improving agricultural conditions. I commend this study to every country in Latin America and, for that matter, around the world. It shows what can be done when a nation resolves to expedite its agricultural development and then follows through and does it.

ASSISTANCE BY THE UNITED STATES

The Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Agency for International Development, has been providing technical and other assistance to agricultural development for a long time. Agricultural scientists and technicians have been engaged in this work since the point IV program was first enunciated by President Truman in 1948.

Recently we have taken steps to make this asistance more effective. Recently we have established within the USDA, the International Agricultural Development Service. During fiscal year 1965, in close cooperation with the Agency for International Development, we sent a total of 198 scientists and technicians to 26 countries—in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. In addition, coordinated training in the United States was provided for 4,879 trainees from 118 countries. During the past year we welcomed almost a thousand agriculturalists from the countries of Latin America who sought further technical training. These people came to the United States to learn from our experiment stations, our land-grant universities and our family-farm enterprises.

The USDA's biggest program now is right here in Brazil, where 20 technicians, working closely with AID, are assisting in work on price stabilization, cooperatives, marketing economics and facilities, market news, agricultural economics, credit and agronomy.

In cooperation with AID, the Department of Agriculture is carrying on a number of other country programs in Latin America:

In Nicaragua, a range management specialist is now introducing new varieties of improved grasses and legumes that will stand up better under the drought conditions that prevail.

In El Salvador, USDA specialists and technicians are working on agricultural planning, land tenure, credit, farm management, artificial insemination, irrigation, drainage, bean diseases, livestock diseases, and auditing systems for agricultural credit agencies.

In Ecuador, a USDA team has been helping in agricultural marketing, economics and the organization of agricultural credit.

FOOD-FOR-FREEDOM LEGISLATION

Passage of the foor-for-freedom legislation will mean added emphasis on this type of technical help. President Johnson said when he recommended this new approach to agricultural assistance: "The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Agency for International Development will work together even more closely than they have in the past in the planning and implementing of coordinated programs.

"In the past few years, AID has called upon the U.S. Department of Agriculture to assume increasing responsibilities through its International Agricultural Development Service. That policy will become even more important as we increase our emphasis on assisting developing nations to help themselves."

When President Johnson sent this program to the Congress, he continued a proud tradition. From the time Franklin Roosevelt spelled out the principles of the four freedoms—to the Marshall plan—to point IV—to food for peace—to the Alliance for Progress—and now the food-for-freedom program, the United States has responded to need wherever it arose.

Under the food-for-peace program alone, we have delivered 150 million tons of food * * * valued at $15 billion * * * to needy and disaster-struck nations everywhere around the world. Through this program we have reached out and helped more than a hundred million people a year in more than a hundred countries.

In the process, we have developed many new techniques for using food: economic development—financing the training of those who want to diversify their farming operations or open new lands—payment on the job with food to build schools and hospitals and roads and irrigation and drainage systems.

With the food-for-freedom program we will continue and strengthen our programs of assistance. At the same time, we will continue the safeguards that have protected the channels of commercial trade from impairment by concessional food sales and distribution. The so-called rule of additionality to prevent disruption of commercial trade, as developed under our food-for-peace program, will continue under the food-for-freedom program.

But great as our resources, impressive as our food production, deep as our compassion—we cannot meet the increasing needs of the hungry nations indefinitely. There is a limit to our productive capacity. Unless the developing countries increase their current rate of agricultural development, the capacity of the United States and the rest of the highly developed countries to produce food enough to fill the gap will run out some time in the next two decades. Then we and the world's hungry will confront one another in an impossible, intolerable situation. There simply would not be enough food to meet the demand of the people in the world. Starvation, pestilence, insecurity, disruption and chaos would run amock. This must not, cannot, need not happen.

Hence, the wisdom of the food-for-freedom legislation President Johnson submitted to Congress. The key feature of the Food-for-Freedom Act is self-help, for the plan is designed to stimulate, encourage and assist the developing countries to increase their own agricultural production. There is no other answer.

Under this program, the United States will provide increasing technical and capital assistance to help those countries which demonstrate a determination to undertake effective programs to increase their own ability to provide foor for their people, and will offer food aid as needed to countries determined to help themselves.

Prospects for the future need not be grim. There is a general, worldwide awakening to, and an awareness of, the importance of agricultural development. This relatively new state of affairs is the product of many forces, including the food-for-peace program, the work of the Agency for International Development, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and inspired national and local leadership in many places in Latin America and around the world. This relatively recent awareness is timely. For far too long agriculture has been accorded too little priority in development plans.

I would make it crystal clear that when I comment on what goes on around the world in agriculture that I am fully and sensitively aware that the United States, too, is learning. We are trying to face up to our deficiencies, to make a better life for all of our citizens and to make a more meaningful and sensible contribution to the development of less fortunate countries around the world. We are more clearly recognizing the needs of our own rural people. We are increasingly aware that we have made mistakes in our own development.

We still suffer from polution of our streams and air.

Soil erosion has clogged our waterways, stripped good land of its fertility, and created dust bowls.

We have been working to overcome these.

In more recent decades, we have come to appreciate the necessity of considering the quality of the whole environment in planning the development and use of our natural resources.

We recognize the importance of continually adjusting, redirecting, developing, and improving our agricultural and agriculture-related institutions and programs to meet the changing needs of changing times. Fewer and larger family farms displace more and more agriculture laborers and small farmowners. The United States like Latin America seeks to stem the exodus of these displaced people to the great metropolitan centers where few of them find jobs or a satisfying life. Instead we strive—as do you—to build an economic base in the countryside so they will find jobs and we can live a satisfying and rewarding life. So far, we, like you, are groping for the formula to accomplish this. Here, as in other areas, there is much to learn from each other.

CONCLUSION

Today, the world faces perhaps the most crucial challenge in history. The gap between food needs and food production in the less-developed world is widening steadily. It will take concentrated and concerted effort on the part of all of us—all nations—to close this gap.

Latin America, as the world leader in population growth, must become a world leader in the rate of agricultural progress, if the war on hunger is to be won. You have the resources to do this—not only to satisfy your own needs but to share constructively in the worldwide effort to avert hunger and want.

The task ahead is clear—for all of us. Not only are we neighbors, we are fellow human beings seeking the good life that is possible for all mankind, a good life that is impossible unless there is enough to eat.

We have joined together in an Alliance for Progress. Our countries have met recently and taken a measure of what has been accomplished in 5 years of mutual assistance in this hemisphere.

Country-by-country reports give us encouragement that, cooperatively, much can be achieved. In country after country there have been solid gains in settlement of new lands, in production increases on settled land, and in average incomes. While per capita food production has lagged, we do know how to correct this.

I propose here and now that we take a realistic inventory of where we are and what we must do. It is essential that we look beyond our immediate hemisphere needs. I propose that we give a new meaning, a new dimension to our alliance. Let it signify our resolve to work together to assure for ourselves and our children—not only in this hemisphere—but in other parts of the world, too, a new age of freedom—freedom from hunger and want. Only when we truly have that freedom will we grow in self respect and be able to achieve mankind's self-realization.

This is the American dream—dreamed alike in both South and North America. It is the dream of all men of good will everywhere around the world.

Let us work together, then, to make this dream a reality.

Let us put our minds, and our backs, to the task.

Let us show the world the Americans can lead the way.

If we do this, then I predict that 10 years from now, when this great Congress assembles again, the threat of hunger and malnutrition will have faded * * * and a time of peace and plenty will have begun.

CONSERVATION CHALLENGES IN A CHANGING WORLD

(Address by D. A. Williams, Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the First Pan American Soil Conservation Congress, São Paulo, Brazil, April 18, 1966)

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, delegates to the Pan American Soil Conservation Congress, fellow conservationists:

In casting about for the right words to use in suggesting the significance and timeliness of this Congress, I came upon a paper by Dr. F. Fraser Darling, a distinguished British conservationist known by many of us here. Dr. Darling has written:

"Conservation is reaching forth to a larger concept than caring in an earnest but rather hazy way for animal species, for forests, soils or fresh waters; it is becoming the care of the human habitat, which is the whole planet."

Let me repeat the key words of that passage:

"Conservation is reaching forth to a larger concept * * * it is becoming the care of the human habitat, which is the whole planet."

That indeed is why we are here—or why we should be here.

Not because poor soils yield poor crops but because poor soil makes poor people.

Not because of what soil erosion does to land but because of what it does to men, women, and children, in our crowded cities as well as in our developing rural areas.

Not because of what fire or flood can do to the beauty and productivity of the forest or valley but because of what they can do to hope and dignity of human beings who live and work there.

Not because we need a vanishing species of wildlife for its meat or feathers but because we have no right to deprive future generations of any of the fullness of the world as God created it.

Not because we seek some ethereal harmony between man and nature but because we seek peace between man and man—a peace that rests in large measure upon the conservation and development of soil and water resources from which people draw their sustenance in every part of the world.

So, let us make this Congress a historic one by reaching forth, as Dr. Darling has said, to the larger concept of conservation, which is the building of a better world for all nations and all people.

Let us thoughtfully explore the impacts of a rapidly changing world upon our soil and water resources.

Let us resolve to bring to bear upon these problems the greatest skills and the wisest planning that men's minds can produce.

This is an era of great skills and advancing technology. And yet of all the many skills required of the modern conservationist, none is more essential today than the ability to relate resource conservation and development to the new situations and forces swiftly developing all about us. The impact upon resources, throughout the world, falls into at least three broad categories; population growth, rising living standards, the trend toward urbanism. Let us look at each of these briefly.

We have heard the term population explosion so often that it has become a cliche. But if we could stand on a high tower and look down upon the amount of land required to feed and otherwise serve the needs of one and one-third million people, and if we could see in a single great amount the food and fiber products required by that number, and then be reminded that every week of the year we must provide that much more than in the previous week—then, perhaps, we could begin to comprehend the worldwide impact of population growth upon resources.

I recently spent a month in India, trying to help the leaders of that vast nation take steps to better marshal their land and water resources to meet an almost overwhelming population problem. Theirs is a grave situation, with a population already in excess of 484 million and increasing at a rate that could carry them well past the billion mark by the year 2000.

But what is India's problem today may be ours, in this hemisphere, tomorrow. Latin America is the fastest growing major area in the world today. Fifteen years ago the United States and Latin America each had a population of about 150 million. That figure is expected to double in the United States by the year 2000. But present growth rates indicate the possibility of a population of more than 750 million in Latin America by the end of the century.

Nations in this hemisphere, thankfully, still have ample resources and space. But will they so develop and husband that space and those resource that a doubled, or a quadrupled, population can live decently and with hope? That is a responsibility that rides heavily upon the shoulders of those of us who are responsible for soil and water conservation.

The trend toward urban concentration, in some countries and in some parts of all countries, is another phenomenon that has significant impact upon soil and water use and conservation.

The trend comes about largely as a result of advancing agricultural technology which makes it possible for smaller and smaller numbers of farmworkers to supply the needs of their fellow men. In the United States, in 1940, we had a farm population of 30.5 million people and one farmworker supported 10.7 others.

Today the farm population has dropped to about 15 million, with each farmworker providing food and fiber for about 33 of his fellow citizens.

A consequence of this trend, of course, is the conversion of large amounts of land to nonagricultural uses. Again referring to the United States, we are seeing a million or more acres per year, of our better cultivatable rural land, going into homes, airports, industrial sites, and many other nonfarm uses.

Some loss of good cultivatable land is inevitable, as cities and populations expand. But conservationists today have a great responsibility to help avoid irreversible decisions about the uses to which we put land.

Another consequence of the urbanization of our populations is found in the growing detachment of people from the land.

Just a generation ago, most of our people in the United States either lived on a farm, had once lived on a farm, or had a parent or grandparent who lived on a farm. By 1960 some 70 percent of our population was living in urban areas.

Today, with about 90 percent of our people classified as nonfarm residents, we are finding that farm animals in city zoos are often greater attractives than the exotic species. A sign of the times.

This same trend has added meaning for conservation, obviously in the greater difficulty of gaining understanding and support for conservation programs from city people who, by their numbers, can exert life-or-death influence on policies concerning natural resources. To offset this, conservation education, throughout our schools systems, is an urgent and growing need.

On top of the increased pressures on land resources caused by population growth and urban concentration comes the impact of a rising standard of living.

As people throughout the world get better housing, better food, more laborsaving devices and more leisure time, they consume more of the products of both renewable and nonrenewable resources.

Unfortunately, there are still vast differences between nations in the ability of people to enjoy these fruits of scientific advancement. But the trend is upward, throughout the world, and must be taken into account in planning resource use and conservation.

While advancing technology, which creates new appetites and new demands, places additional demands on resources, we take comfort in the fact that technology is also making possible greater advances in soil and water conservation.

Countless examples could be given. In watershed protection work, modern computers are speeding up the processes of water impoundment, site selection, and structure design. Electronic devices enable us to monitor the moisture content of snow packs in high, inaccessible mountain areas, and thus expedite and improve the accuracy of our water supply forecasting. Electronic devices monitor changes in water quality in streams where pollution control measures are underway.

Indeed, it is the prospect of continuing advances like these in the technology of resource use and development that gives us reason to believe that people around the world can successfully draw upon their soil and water resources to cope with the problems of growing demands. Acceleration of conservation work is our best hope for improving the welfare of millions of rural people. Conservation is, at the same time, an imperative step in the protection of water supplies which spell life or death to cities and industrial areas. It is an important means of increasing foreign exchange, of promoting economic growth, and of otherwise contributing to political stability and world peace.

Yes, we must keep abreast of new methods and alert to new ways of doing old jobs. But at the same time, we must not forget the hard-learned fundamentals that determine the success or failure of soil and water conservation.

The term "soil conservation" has come to signify those combinations of skills and practices needed to develop and sustain the productivity of each kind of soil for whatever purpose it is used—whether that use is for crops, for forest, for recreation or for housing.

Soil conservation means choosing the appropriate use for each piece of land as well as protecting and improving the land after the use has been chosen.

Soil conservation means the careful planning and treatment of entire operating units be they farms or ranches or entire watersheds.

Soil conservation means working out land use and treatment in full recognition of the essential relationships between soil, water, plants, animals and—yes—man himself.

The greatest danger, as conservation technology advances, is that we may fail to involve the human element. (Remember Dr. Darling's allusion to the "human habitat.") Conservation must be people centered. It must not only be carried out for people. It must be carried out by people.

To be fully effective, conservation decisions must always be made by the people who will be responsible for carrying them out. Conservation will never be accomplished by edict. Government can and must be an active partner, but should do for people only what they cannot do for themselves.

Conservation will move forward if it is viewed and accepted by landowners and operators as a means of making more efficient use of their soils, and better management of water with higher yields per acre or hectare, with lower costs per kilo or ton, with better net income for the farmer or rancher.

It will go forward if city people are made partners, if they are helped to see their stake in soil and water resources, and if they are invited to work with rural people in soil and water conservation endeavors.

Rural and urban people both benefit from accelerated soil and water conservation programs. With better income, farmers cannot only afford better education and medical care, but also can purchase more of the products and services offered by urban people. Urban water supplies are improved, flood threats diminished, and the entire community, and thus the Nation, benefits and prospers.

It seems to me that two great challenges emerge to conservationists in this changing world:

To seek out diligently and utilize the best and most advanced technology available to adjust resource use to the mounting demands of population growth and rising living standards.

To educate our people—all our people—in the principles of resource conservation so that they can and will act and exert leadership as informed citizens.

Let us hope that out of this Congress will come other challenges and specific proposals for action within and between our nations.

Is it too much to expect that we might, for example, look forward to a greatly accelerated flow of information between our countries through publications and through conferences between technicians and scientists in specific subject matter fields?

Is it possible that we may find opportunities for further exchanges of technicians and scientists, so that we share to the maximum the experiences of each country?

Could we look toward the formation of international councils or panels that would carry forward, on a permanent basis, the continuing review of hemispheric conservation needs and problems which we have begun to explore at this Congress?

Could there come from this Congress a nonpolitical manifesto that would assert the resolve of our nations to work together with new determination in the development of the science and art of good land use for the benefit of all people, here in this Hemisphere and throughout the world?

I know that my fellow conservationists from the United States join me in expressing our deep appreciation to the sponsors and planners of this great Congress. We pledge to you all the cooperation that lies within our power to achieve our mutual goals.

It is in your hands and mine to carry forward action that could spell survival or destruction of the human race.

It is that important.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN MEDICARE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it was my privilege last year to sponsor a "freedom of choice" amendment to the House-passed version of the medicare bill. Senators will recall that the purpose of my amendment was to recognize, for purposes of reimbursement under the basic medicare plan, the existing customary and freely negotiated arrangements between hospitals and medical specialists who rendered services in those hospitals.

The Finance Committee, and the Senate itself, recognized the equitable nature of that amendment and voted its inclusion in the medicare bill. We agreed that the Federal Government should not interfere in prevailing hospital and medical practice. Unfortunately, however, the amendment was dropped in conference.

We are now confronted with a situation whereby the medicare program will not, in essence, make reimbursement to hospitals for the costs of services rendered by physician-specialists—radiologists, anesthesiologists, pathologists, and physiatrists. I have previously referred to the barbaric English usage of these titles. The situation in which hospitals now find themselves in regard to these specialists is even more barbarous, however.

The prohibition on reimbursement to hospitals will prevail despite the fact that the medical specialist may be employed by the hospital or have a reimbursement arrangement with the hospital. Many of the physicians in the four specialties now bill patients on a direct and individual basis for their services. Many others, however, do not bill for their services—the cost of their work being included in the hospital bill as a routine expense. As the medicare law now stands, it will pay for care essentially on one basis only—direct billing by the specialist for and to each patient. The specialist will then be paid under the voluntary insurance portion of the program. This is the sole method under which such care can be compensated—despite the fact that thousands of hospitals and physicians have voluntarily entered into and developed other acceptable and accepted methods.

I warned the Senate that if my amendment were not adopted we were going to be confronted with a highly inequitable, inflationary, and chaotic situation. And now, I suppose, I am in an "I told you so" position. Even Cassandra has her innings, so to speak.

In Tennessee, the medical specialists and the hospitals are now in a bitter struggle over methods of compensation, a struggle which, undoubtedly, would not have occurred had the Senate-adopted Douglas amendment been retained in the final medicare bill.

Last fall, shortly after enactment of medicare, the Tennessee Medical Association adopted the position that radiologists, pathologists, or other specialists working under percentage contracts—namely, where specialists get a certain percentage of either the gross or net income from all laboratory work depending upon their special agreement—with hospitals after April 1, 1966, would face charges of unethical conduct. How is that for a whip-cracking approach, bordering on conspiracy in restraint of trade?

The hospitals in Tennessee obviously have their backs to the wall. The current issue of Hospitals, the journal of the American Hospital Association, reported:

> Confronted by the prospect of cancellation of existing contracts with physician specialists on April 1, the house of delegates of the Tennessee Hospital Association held a special meeting on February 25 to approve three resolutions recommended by its board of trustees. The following resolutions were adopted:
>
> "That the traditional contract of percentage agreements between hospitals and hospital-based specialists is ethical, in the best interest of the public we serve, and is not inconsistent with the purposes of the laws covering the corporate practice of medicine."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the item in "Hospitals" summarizing the situation in Tennessee be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the tension and disagreement between hospital and specialist is not confined to Tennessee. Similar strains have developed and are developing in other States.

Subsequent to passage of medicare, Mr. President, I reintroduced the Douglas amendment. I was joined in this effort by Senators ANDERSON, GRUENING, KENNEDY of New York, MCNAMARA, MOSS, and NEUBERGER.

S. 2406, the current version of my amendment is waiting in the wings. I anticipate additional sad performances comparable to that being played in Tennessee. I will, of course, review those performances for the Senate. We will then, I believe, want to bring S. 2406 on stage.

EXHIBIT 1

TENNESSEE HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION ACTS ON SPECIALIST BILLINGS

Confronted by the prospect of cancellation of existing contracts with physician specialists on April 1, the house of delegates of the Tennessee Hospital Association held a special meeting on February 25 to approve three resolutions recommended by its board of trustees. The following resolutions were adopted:

"That the traditional contract of percentage agreements between hospitals and hospital-based specialists is ethical, in the best interest of the public we serve, and is not inconsistent with the purposes of the laws covering the corporate practice of medicine.

That should the Tennessee Medical Association retain its present published position regarding separate billing by the medical specialists and/or take positive action, the board of trustees of the Tennessee Medical Association should be invited to join with the board of trustees of the Tennessee Hospital in a public hearing with representatives invited from large manufacturing and industrial firms; other interested segments of the public; and representatives from the news media; in order to give the hospitals and the doctors an opportunity to explain the effect this change would have upon the level of the charge to the patient or to whoever pays the patients' bill.

"That we oppose any lease arrangement as being contrary to the public interest and may give rise to the loss of tax exemption for the leased portion of hospital property."

KOREA TODAY AND COMMUNISM IN THE FAR EAST AND ITS EFFECT UPON THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in recent days a growing number of scholars in the field of Asian affairs have been telling us that the current American role in Vietnam is one which places us outside of our natural sphere of influence. We are, such critics contend, overextended and they point to the alleged lack of support by Asians for our policies as proof of their point.

This lack of support, however, is illusory, for a careful examination of the public pronouncements of the leaders of free nations in Asia provides us with numerous examples of a real understanding of and appreciation for our commitment in that area.

Those who urge an American withdrawal from Vietnam, and an end to the American presence in southeast Asia, simply give support to the basic aims of Chinese expansion. This point was made in a recent speech by You Chan Yang, Ambassador at Large of Korea. He said:

> Over the years the main Communist objective has been to drive the United States to isolationism, to force this Nation to abandon its international commitments and to withdraw its stalwart forces from their posts throughout the world * * *. Over the years, denigration of the United States has been the principal topic of the Kremlin-Peking axis and is now promulgated by each of them independently of the other.

Ambassador Yang points out that:

> The allies of this great Nation around the world must recognize the fact that they have everything to lose and nothing to gain if the United States withdraws into isolationism.

In his address before the new college audience at Sarasota, Fla., Ambassador Yang delivered an address which was both an endorsement of the administration's position in Vietnam, and a warning of what would happen in southeast Asia were we to heed the advice of those who urge an American withdrawal.

This is a powerful and eloquent testimony to the fact that in Asia, freemen and free nations understand that the stakes in Vietnam are not for Vietnam alone, but for all the world. Either aggression will be defeated here, or we will pay a much higher price to defeat it at a later time.

I wish to share this statement with my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA TODAY AND COMMUNISM IN THE FAR EAST AND ITS EFFECT UPON THE UNITED STATES

(Address by Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador at Large, at Sarasota, Fla., January 14, 1966.)

Madame Chairman Ingram, officers of the library committee on the new college, distinguished guests and my dear American friends, it is a privilege and a pleasure to address you tonight on a subject of paramount importance—a subject which is touching all of our lives.

In view of the events of recent weeks, international affairs have become the intimate and pressing concern of everyone. It is natural then, that a diplomat should be your speaker tonight. I have chosen to speak on the subject "Korea Today and Communism in the Far East and Its Effect Upon the United States."

To establish terms of reference for my comments, I should like to recite four beliefs which are firm in the hearts and minds of my beloved Korean people:

First. We believe that Korea must be modernized and industrialized to stabilize our economy and to increase the standard of living for our people.

Second. We believe that to safeguard human rights and democratic freedom one must be willing to fight, if necessary, to defend them.

Third. We believe that in a world governed by the principles of equity and justice, an aggressor should be driven from territory which he has unlawfully seized, when the aggressor is so branded by the United Nations.

Fourth. We believe that the best way to prevent the holocaust of world war III with its attendant nuclear and thermonuclear destruction is to win limited and carefully restricted engagements with projected minimal liabilities against the forces of communism.

Today Asia is a tinderbox, a potential powder keg that could explode at any moment and escalate into a rain of fire and destruction upon the entire free world. Events in Korea or Vietnam or Laos or Cambodia or Thailand or Burma or India might well be a brief forerunner to a deluge of destruction in San Francisco, Chicago, New York, or Washington. We must for the sake of our own lives, those of our children, and those who we hope will follow them take stock of the situation and do something about it. Talk is cheap. Individual speakers, Members of your Congress and leaders of patriotic organizations can expostulate for hours on end, but their learned and sometimes less learned and less valid views mean nothing to the Communists. The Communists take cognizance only of force and action. Patriotic or pious or hopeful or conciliatory mouthings mean nothing to them. They are a hard-boiled gang bent only upon the achievement of one objective—world domination.

In illustration I cite an address by Dimitry Manuilsky, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party who spoke before the Lenin School of Political Warfare in 1931. His words hang like the sword of Damocles over the free world today. I quote him: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course (remember, that was in 1931), we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Where does the United States and the Republic of Korea fit in this determined decision of the Communists, often reiterated in the words of many of their other leaders to "bury us." First, we must examine the facts of history and lay nakedly bare the aspirations of the Communist rulers. Second, we must evaluate the differences in their own back yard in terms of their ultimate objectives. Third, we must adopt unshakable plans for counteraction.

The history of your own great nation, its aspirations and hopes for the future, are well known to you. History is immutable, for neither God nor man can alter the events which occurred yesterday, a week ago or five centuries ago. The future is in the hands of those who face facts, make plans, and above all else carry them out. You are aware of the destiny that your Nation seeks to achieve and earn in the family of nations. What is done about this effort lies in your hands.

I doubt, however, that many of you are aware of the history of my nation, of its contributions to mankind, and of its strategic locale in the "win or die" struggle for the survival of free societies.

Korea was established as a nation in the year 2333 B.C.—220 years before the magnificent contribution of Gutenberg, Korean scholars and technicians invented movable metal type. Subsequently a phonetic alphabet, called Hangul, was devised. It has only 24 letters, 14 consonants, and 10 vowels and has been termed one of the most simple alphabets ever created by man. In 1592 Admiral Yi, of the Korean Navy, perfected a "Turtle Back" ironclad ship and employed it to defeat decisively an invading Japanese armada. Centuries ago Korean scholars and researchers developed profound excellence in the fields of mathematics, astronomy, and the physical sciences. The positions of the heavenly bodies were definitely fixed and a calendar of almost fantastic accuracy was promulgated.

These contributions have been noteworthy. It is not for them, however, that the great powers of the Far East have fought over and for the peninsula of Korea which extends as a dagger from the Asian land mass. In turn, China, Japan, and Russia have imposed upon Korea ruthless occupation and subjugation. As of today all have been evicted with the exception of the Communists. Why do these avaricious wolves—now the Communists—covet Korea? As a result of the political decisions at the conclusion of World War II, they already control the hydroelectric power, the mineral resources, and the manufacturing capability of the north. That for which they are constantly baring their fangs and uttering monstrous threats is their desire for South Korea, with its warm water ports and bases for the mounting of still further aggression. The nation which controls North and South Korea is in a position to devastate Japan, probably decisively menace all of China and undoubtedly bring southeast Asia under its domination. Communist submarines in the warm water ports of South Korea would have the capacity of fanning out over the shipping lanes of the Pacific, obliterating Hong Kong and Manila and bringing your west coast under direct attack. This is unthinkable—if Korea should fall, it will be within the capacity of our implacable adversary to accomplish what I have described.

Over the years the main Communist objective has been to drive the United States to isolationism, to force this Nation to abandon its international commitments and to withdraw its stalwart forces from their posts throughout the world. This Communist policy has been manifested by the notorious "Yankee go home" placards which have been displayed and by the same infamous message scrawled on walls and pavements. As a related tactic Communist agents have infiltrated institutions of higher learning all over the world and have enrolled students in cells espousing American isolationism and have indoctrinated innocent but well-meaning young men and women in ways and means of violent behavior against the United States. Over the years, denigration of the United States has been the principal topic of the Kremlin-Peking axis and is now promulgated by each of them independently of the other.

On both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains we have witnessed systematic attacks organized and led by Communists against American Embassies, libraries, privately owned property and the nationals of this country. For what purpose? The objective of these actions is again to force the United States into a posture of isolationism as a result of sheer disgust and revulsion. Basic Communist aims are the withdrawal of economic and military assistance and the confinement of the American people to this continent. Under these circumstances the way would be paved for the Communists to continue their implacable steps toward world domination and to conquer without bloodshed by propaganda, infiltration, and subversion.

Should this day ever come, the security of the United States will have been obliterated. The final goal of the Communists is to dominate the industrial capacity, the natural resources and the productivity of America. If the United States permits the Communists to advance further toward their goal, this Nation will be woefully weak and helpless in the face of the ultimate onslaught.

The recent Communist attack upon the U.S. Embassy in Saigon with the attendant loss of life by unarmed civilians was heinous. We cannot accept such operations. There is a law of man's relationship to man and also a law of war. Honorable men do not violate either. There is a code of ethics, and there is a code of international relations with respect to the property and persons of a foreign government accredited to a resident government.

The allies of this great Nation around the world must recognize the fact that they have everything to lose and nothing to gain if the United States withdraws into isolationism. In this atomic age disunity spells death, but the unity of strength and determination of the free world will insure life and security.

For the record here and now, I should like to congratulate your great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, for his courage and determination, sometimes in the face of congressional discord and other times in the face of poignant tragedy brought on by the loss of American lives in Vietnam. He has stood steadfast in his noble determination to oppose the further encroachments of communism and to preserve an area of Asia as a portion of the free world. The example of the President has been emulated by the leaders of his administration and by such dedicated patriots as Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut. Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, has given steadfast evidence of his bipartisan support of the national determination enunciated by the President.

Let us examine for a moment the propriety of U.S. actions as contrasted with those of the Communists. Recently when American lives were lost and $30 million worth of aircraft were destroyed on the ground, were there anti-Communist demonstrations in the United States and elsewhere in the world? Why not? Are they scared? The Communists deface an embassy or wreck a library and achieve millions of dollars worth of international publicity for their cause. The Americans make a diplomatic protest and in contrast receive the replacement of broken window panes and defaced walls. This is not quid pro quo. They reap a propadanda harvest and this great Nation receives, in the minds of their stooges, only another black eye.

Permit me to portray for you what will undoubtedly happen if peace is negotiated in Vietnam. Please believe me we are not warmongers but we only want democratic freedom for everybody. In 1954 the Communists requested the convening of a Geneva Conference to settle the Korean question at a political level. At that time it was evident that a malevolent political trick was about to be perpetrated. This was manifestly evident to the Korean Government which declined to attend the conference.

The terms of reference did not include plans for reunification of the country or the establishment of a free democratic government. At the specific request of the U.S. Government, I did attend as one of the representatives of the Republic of Korea. However, I made one request that, after 2 months of negotiation with the Communists and if basic issues were not resolved for which the conference was called, the United States and Korean delegations would withdraw. The U.S. Government assented to this request. After a brief 2 weeks the U.S. delegation was convinced that the Communists did not come to Geneva to settle the Korean question but alternatively to lay the groundwork for further aggression in Vietnam. You are aware of the results of the debacle in Geneva. Korea today is a divided nation as is Vietnam, and 11 million residents of this latter nation have been brought under Communist domination and tyranny. It is good to know that the United States was not a signatory to this agreement. The so-called Geneva modus vivendi serves as but another example of the manner in which free nations are tricked into appeasement and concessions to the Communists.

Since 1954 it has come to my attention that many sincere and honest Americans favor the neutralization of Vietnam. They and all Americans should appraise the situation of a neighboring country—Laos. The experience of the Laotians serves as a frightful reminder of the fact that no neutrality could exist in the land immediately adjacent—Vietnam or anywhere else.

During the course of my stay in your nation, I have traveled the length and breadth of this great country, urging steadfast opposition to communism. Had the Korean war been won, there would be today no problem with the Communists in Korea, Vietnam, or in other nations of southeast Asia. The Korean war is the only war in which the United States has participated in its history which was not concluded by a decisive victory for your nation. A stalemate in Korea has resulted in encouragement to the Communists to carry out their aggressive designs upon not only Indochina but also the Middle East and the continent of Africa.

After signing a cease-fire agreement in Korea, the United States is still maintaining 60,000 soldiers in a rugged line facing the ever hostile Communists across a so-called demilitarized zone. The attitude and conduct of your troops has been punctiliously correct. On the other hand, the Communists continuously violate the armistice agreement and endeavor to infiltrate spies, saboteurs, and provocateurs into the free Republic of Korea. Viewed in the light of the correctness of American conduct, Communist provocations are each day becoming more intolerable. As of June 30, 1965, Communist North Korea had committed 4,457 proved violations but admitted only 2.

I just returned from the U.N. after attending the 20th General Assembly sessions. Many of the delegates criticized the United States and our Korean role in Vietnam. Essentially, the war in Vietnam is a war of defending a peace-loving country, the Republic of Vietnam, against infiltration, subversion, and outright aggression by Communists, supported by foreign Communist powers. The war in Vietnam affects not only the peace in southeast Asia, but the peace of the entire world. In short, the war in Vietnam is a war between freedom and democracy versus tyranny and communism. We have no hesitation in declaring that we are against communism and we shall fight to preserve our way of life and freedom. For this reason Korea sent over 20,000 men to Vietnam to fight alongside your American boys and South Vietnamese. However, we too believe in peaceful settlement of the problem through negotiation. But as the record shows, our adversary, the Communists, have not as yet seen fit to come to the conference table. Perhaps they should be taught a lesson that aggression does not pay and in the end the free world, united in its objective and determination, will triumph over the Communist aggressors.

Today, we are helping Vietnam. Tomorrow we will help any country, be it in Asia or Africa, threatened by Communist imperialism and colonialism. This is our solemn pledge to all peace-loving countries.

What is the solution to the dilemma with which the free world finds itself faced? It is not to be found in appeasement, concessions or retreat either before a propaganda blast or after a politically motivated military assault.

We of the nations of the free world must be willing to hold hands in fellowship and determination to preserve our way of life. We must have understanding, appreciation, mutual respect and an unshakable determination to make secure what we hold dear. When a coach dispatches a football team to the field, he does not instruct the representatives of his alma mater not to cross the 50-yard line. No such restriction has been, and I doubt ever will be, placed upon the predatory forces of communism. They are out to win and to win for keeps. Unrealistic restrictions should not be imposed upon the forces of the free world who today, tomorrow, or 5 years from now may be called upon to defend their wives, children, and homes.

I enjoin you to carry away from our meeting this evening two thoughts: First, any show of weakness on the part of the free world is translated the same day into a further engraved invitation to the Communists to advance their aggressiveness—to reel without reason in their intoxicating sense of dizzy power. Second, the Communists talk loud and act fierce, but when confronted with a determined stand backed by the visible force of the free world they are only "paper dragons."

One of your greatest Presidents said freedom is for those who are strong enough and are willing to fight for it. Your forefathers set the pattern in 1776. If you remember to stand up and be counted, your precious freedom will be cherished by you and your children.

I thank you.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE—PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A COURT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, around the Nation the trains are again rolling, carrying the vital cargoes which feed our people, supply our troops in Vietnam, and keep the wheels of industry turning.

But the problems of labor-management relations spotlighted by the recent rail strike remain. Eight major railroads that operate in 38 States were struck over a dispute with the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen in which the general public had no primary interest. Yet, when the strike came, the average man in the street was the one to feel its effects most keenly.

Two articles from the New York Times of April 4 and April 5 depict some of the economic havoc wreaked by the irresponsible actions of the firemen's union. From a shoeshine boy in an Illinois Central station to 12,000 workers at General Motors plants, countless innocent citizens became the casualties of an economic war whose issues were of little or no concern to the great majority of Americans.

While the articles in the Times make clear the fact that the rail strike was ended in time to avert a major economic catastrophe, it is evident that in future instances, as in the past, a crippling strike could seriously impede this Nation's economic growth and could, in fact, endanger the very lives of our citizens.

Earlier this year, I introduced in the Senate a bill to create a U.S. Court of Labor-Management Relations. This court would have jurisdiction in precisely the sort of deadlocked labor disputes we have just witnessed and would provide the machinery to avoid long and costly work stoppages brought about by the occasional failures in our system of collective bargaining.

I am convinced that Congress cannot wait until another major national strike is upon us before moving to protect the public interest. The time for talking about this matter has past. The time for acting has come.

I urge the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Judiciary Committee to call in immediately the reports from the interested Federal agencies and to schedule early hearings on the establishment of the Court of Labor-Management Relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the two articles from the New York Times printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 4, 1966]

Railroads Claim $20 Million Revenue Loss as Result of Strike

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

Chicago, April 3.—The firemen's strike against 8 major railroads crossing 38 States has had wide but apparently scattered impact on the Nation's economy and a varied effect on the lines themselves.

In Chicago, James E. Wolfe, chief negotiator for the roads in bargaining with the unions, estimated the cost through today at up to $20 million in gross revenues.

Despite the continued picketing after union leaders had agreed to call off the strike, Mr. Wolfe told a reporter:

"So far as we are concerned the firemen's issue is settled in perpetuity."

DEFENSE EFFORT UNHURT

An estimated total of 200,000 persons were put out of work or on short time, and 32,500 Chicago commuters on the Illinois Central were forced into jammed expressways. Among the big industries, automobile companies were the hardest hit.

But in general, alternative rail facilities, trucks, buses, and airlines appeared to have taken up the slack. Some of the struck roads continued to run some freight trains.

In Washington a Defense Department spokesman said today that the strike's effect on shipments of ammunition and other military items for Vietnam had been minimal. Despite some delays, the strike "has not seriously affected our logistics program," the Pentagon spokesman said.

The Post Office Department reported a great many delays, some up to 48 hours, mostly of parcel post on stalled trains before it could be transferred to trucks or operating trains.

Letter mail was moving at a more normal pace. In Philadelphia, for example, Postmaster Anthony I. Lambert put all first-class westbound mail aboard airplanes with or without airmail postage.

The Pennsylvania Railroad, which was struck only west of Harrisburg, Pa., apparently suffered the worst confusion because of its half-in, half-out situation, rather than benefiting from its partial strike.

The Seaboard Air Line Railroad resumed limited freight operations yesterday, with supervisory personnel running 20 trains.

It kept any perishable fruit in stalled cars under refrigeration.

Missouri Pacific supervisory personnel kept about 30 trains running out of a normal 200 a day.

The Union Pacific refused to confirm a report that it had 30 trains, manned by supervisors, operating today.

A Central of Georgia spokesman said some trains were on regular freight runs but refused to elaborate.

In Detroit, the word tonight was that the automobile industry planned, if possible, to operate tomorrow in the face of parts shortages. Parts have been rushed in by truck and airplane.

Industry sources estimated the production loss from the strike at 11,000 to 20,000 cars and trucks.

POTATO GROWERS WORRIED

General Motors, more dependent on rail transportation than other producers, was hard hit. It was reported that 60,300 workers in 17 plants in Michigan, Ohio, Missouri, and Kansas were affected in one way or another.

Ford reportedly has slowed production at Atlanta, Metuchen, N.J., San Jose, Calif., and Wayne, Mich.

Southern Idaho potato growers and processors feared serious consequences because the Union Pacific is their only available carrier. Farmers in California's Imperial Valley also feared setbacks if the strike did not end.

Some southern Illinois coal mine operators announced that a continued strike could mean shutdowns.

In Philadelphia, fruit exchange officials anxiously awaiting 40 cars of Western fruit expressed concern about a possible shortage. And the Budd Co., maker of a variety of products including automobile frames and railroad cars, warned that a continued strike could mean the layoff of as many as 5,000 production workers.

Chicago, the rail hub of the Nation, was however, without reported difficulties except for its Illinois Central commuter jamup. Illinois Central supervisors moved trains short distances to terminals for unloading, especially to get perishables on their way to consumers.

A shoeshine boy in one of the Illinois Central stations who boasted that he made $20 a day was a minor casualty of the strike.

In Denver, four flour mills curtailed operations.

In Omaha, well served with rail transportation, the only reported industrial casualty was the shutdown of a Kellogg Co., breakfast food plant, although 25,000 Union Pacific employees in the general area were reported idle.

The Union Pacific reported that a train leaving an Army ordnance depot with 26 cars of ammunition had been stalled on its way from Oregon. The road said that at one time 54 cars on its system loaded with tanks, munitions and other war items had been stalled. It also reported that at one time 85 cars of mail had been stranded.

In the Kansas City area, the Union Pacific estimated that 100 to 150 industries had been affected by the strike.

In St. Louis, a Missouri Pacific spokesman said a substantial amount of munitions had been stalled on its system, but the exact number of cars and what was in them was not disclosed.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1966]

Eight Railroads Near Normal Service—But Strike Leaves GM With Severe Parts Shortage

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

Chicago, April 4.—Return to normal service on eight railroads after the 4-day firemen's strike proceeded smoothly today, but repercussions were felt in many areas.

The most direct impact was on General Motors, which suffered a parts shortage that made 12,000 workers idle and put uncounted others on short time.

The indirect result was a further shortage of boxcars, flatcars and gondola cars.

However, this fell short of a national economic crisis, reflecting the basic strategy of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen to strike only lines with parallel service.

While they were fearful of future parts shortages, Ford, Chrysler, and American Motors Corp. reported normal operations today. But a General Motors spokesman said, "We'll be several days unsnarling this."

By "this" he meant the parts bottleneck resulting from heavy reliance on rail transport that caused the closing of assembly plants at Arlington, Tex., and South Gate, Calif., and Fisher Body plants at Janesville, Wis., and St. Louis.

SEVENTEEN PLANTS REOPEN

General Motors was without a timetable for normal production, but 17 other General Motors plants that were wholly or partially shut Friday were reported fully reopened.

The General Motors picture was clouded by a switchmen's walkout at Pontiac, Mich., on the Grand Trunk Western. Even before this snag, the Grand Western was apparently in the worst spot of the eight lines, expecting that it would take a week to get back to normal.

"There are literally thousands of freight cars backed up on connecting lines," a Grand Trunk spokesman said. Hope faded that a commuting line between Detroit and Pontiac could resume tomorrow as expected because of the switchmen's dispute. However, the line obtained an injunction in Pontiac ordering the men to return.

It is estimated that 250,000 freight cars were immobilized during the strike in 38 States. Today Edd Hamilton Bailey, president of Union Pacific, one of the lines that was struck, said the additional boxcar shortage caused by the strike put many shippers along our line in "desperate straits."

EXCLUSION ORDER ASKED

Mr. Bailey appealed to the Association of American Railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission for an exclusion order that would shift additional cars to the Union Pacific. In brief, such an order requires other lines to shunt back empty cars to the line that owns them immediately or to use them only for freight going to the owner's lines system.

The strike's end prevented a crisis in Pittsburgh steel mills served by the Pennsylvania, a spokesman for the United States Steel Corp. said.

Scarce gondola cars needed by the steel industry are still a major headache in the reshuffling that is going on throughout the country. Flatcar supplies are also a problem.

Service resumed for 32,500 Illinois Central commuters. Many had jammed expressways with their cars or spent more than 3 hours on buses during the strike. The service clicked off right on schedule, the Illinois Central announced.

But it will take a week to smooth out the backlog of freight cars along the north-south line, although the railroad pledged shippers only minor delays. The long-line passenger trains got off on schedule.

The Department of Defense said only a few Vietnam war matériel shipments had been delayed. It cited one instance where firemen from the Texas & Pacific Railroad, which was not struck, stepped in and handled an 11-car Missouri Pacific war matériel cargo in New Orleans.

GIOVANNI DA VERRAZANO

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that April 17 was the birthday of a great Florentine explorer, who deserves status in the pantheon of those whose great courage opened the Western Hemisphere to European civilization. Born in 1480, Giovanni da Verrazano explored the eastern coast of the United States. His voyage in 1524, extended from Newfoundland to South Carolina, and is the first written record of our Atlantic coastline.

Verrazano discovered amongst other geographical locations, both New York Harbor and Narragansett Bay. Any air passenger into New York is immediately struck by the grandeur of the "Narrows" bridge which is fittingly named for Verrazano.

In my own State of Rhode Island, Verrazano has special importance. The many Rhode Islanders of Italian heritage are proud of the fact that it was a countryman of theirs who discovered Rhode Island's greatest natural resource, Narragansett Bay. While those Rhode Islanders of French extraction are prideful of the fact that Verrazano was sailing under the French flag when he made his epochal voyage of discovery.

Therefore, the birthday of Verrazano, while of national significance, is a special day of pride for Rhode Island in light of Verrazano's discoveries and national affiliations.

MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE HONORS "DIZZY" DEAN

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in these times of trial and tribulation, I think it is fit and proper for us to pause to pay tribute to an American who has dedicated many years of his life to making the world brighter and happier. I am referring to a man whose wit, charm, and spirit have entered into American homes through radio and television for many years, to help bring hours of enjoyment to lovers of our national sport, baseball.

Jerome Herman Dean, better known perhaps by his baseball nickname of "Dizzy," is regrettably no longer to be heard on radio or seen on television, making his play-by-play comments on his beloved sport.

A member of that honored group of baseball players named to the Hall of Fame, "Dizzy" Dean has become a legend in his lifetime.

I am proud to be able to say that "Dizzy" Dean is a resident of Mississippi, and for many years has been one of our most respected and beloved citizens. Recently the Legislature of Mississippi took the time to draft and approve a resolution honoring "Dizzy" Dean.

The resolution presents a concise and moving portrait of this man who has brought so much joy into our American way of life. I call this resolution to the attention of my fellow Senators, so that they may share in this expression of appreciation for a fine American.

Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 120 adopted by the Mississippi Legislature be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 120

Concurrent resolution expressing the warm appreciation of the citizens of the State of Mississippi to Jerome Herman "Dizzy" Dean for his distinguished and phenomenal career in big league baseball, sports telecasting, business, and leadership in motivating the youth of America to attain higher goals of sportsmanship and basic American ideals

Whereas the citizenry and leadership of the State of Mississippi and tens of millions of Americans were shocked and disappointed in recent days by the worldwide news that the ever-popular and internationally known Jerome Herman "Dizzy" Dean would not be telecasting the National Broadcasting Co.'s Baseball "Game of the Week," which, after two decades, had become an integral part of the American weekend favorite entertainment; and

Whereas this outstanding American has achieved such success in the sports world, baseball telecasting, and the business and recreational life of our Nation, that his fame, honor, and respect is deemed comparable to the greatest of leaders in our country's history; and

Whereas "Dizzy" Dean, as he is affectionately known to his lifelong accumulation of friends, as well as millions of admirers who respect his homespun wit and humor, humility and dignity; and his ardent support of the noble principles and ideals which have made America the greatest of all nations; and

Whereas the untimely absence of "Ole Diz" from National Broadcasting Co.'s "Game of the Week" with his wealth of knowledge of baseball and many and varied personal experiences as a professional player for many years attaining for him a place in Baseball's Hall of Fame, will forever leave a vacuum in the hearts of millions of the game's fans; and

Whereas Jerome Herman Dean has adopted the State of Mississippi as his home where his charming, lovely, and devoted wife, Patricia Nash Dean, was reared, and they have recently reconstructed and built their permanent home near the towns of Bond and Wiggins in Stone County, Miss., where they welcome their friends from all walks of life across America; and

Whereas this remarkable man has, through the years, unselfishly and devotedly broadcasted and telecasted true, glowing, and accurate statements about this State, yet realizing countless prejudiced and uninformed persons would attempt to intimidate and undermine him for his personal tribute of his adopted home, its attributes, opportunities, and favorable future; and

Whereas in addition to "Dizzy" Dean's generous personal commendations of Mississippi and the South, including the great athletic achievements in the Southeastern and Southwest Conferences, he has invested his own capital in private enterprise industries in Mississippi, and thence is contributing to the economic, industrial, and educational growth of this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we again express the warm appreciation of ourselves, other public officials, and the citizenry of the State of Mississippi to Jerome Herman "Dizzy" Dean of Stone County, Miss., and "Everywhere, U.S.A.," for his distinguished and phenomenal career in big league baseball, outstanding sports telecasting, and civic leadership which has served to inspire millions of America's youth to higher attainments in good sportsmanship and the basic and noble principles of citizenship which have made America so great; and that we wish for him and his family continued good health, prosperity, and happiness; and be it further

Resolved, That an enrolled copy of this resolution be forwarded to Jerome Herman "Dizzy" Dean and Patricia "Pat" Nash Dean, the president of the National Broadcasting Co., the president of the Falstaff Brewing Corp., the department of archives and history, and copies to the capitol press corps.

Adopted by the senate April 4, 1966.

ARNOLD MARTIN,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives April 6, 1966.

MATTY SILVERS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SOYBEANS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is the year of the soybean in Illinois, the Nation, and the world. Never has the demand for the oil and protein of this versatile crop been so high. I wish to urge farmers to plant more soybeans this spring and to improve their yields through better farm methods and management.

President Johnson requested increased production of soybeans in his food-for-freedom message. Vice President HUMPHREY and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman also made public statements. Mr. Freeman and his associates of the Department of Agriculture are cooperating with the National Soybean Crop Improvement Council in our current drive.

Illinois is far and away the largest soybean producing State, harvesting 174 million bushels last year. But more soybeans are needed to meet the need for its lifesaving protein by millions of undernourished peoples throughout the world.

I wish to commend the National Soybean Council on their efforts and I ask unanimous consent that the attached editorial from the business and finance section of the Washington Post, and the statement of the National Soybean Crop Improvement Council be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Apr. 4, 1966]

SOYBEANS ARE GROWING FAST INTO IMPORTANT PROFIT CROP

(By Eric Wentworth)

They don't grow in amber waves, like grain. They don't get as high as an elephant's eye, like corn.

But soybeans, though overlooked in the songbooks, have swiftly become one of the American farmer's most profitable and important crops.

Their popularity today is spreading especially fast in the South. In fact, the words to "Dixie" might well be "land of soybeans" instead of "land of cotton." For soybean acres top cotton acres today in most Southern States, including such traditional cotton strongholds as Mississippi and Arkansas.

SWAMPLAND DRAINED

In Louisiana alone, acreage planted to soybeans this year will be more than three times the 1960–64 average, Agriculture Department surveys show. Officials in Louisiana say rice farmers have found they can grow the beans as a rotation crop on otherwise idle land. Other large-scale operators are draining hundreds of acres of swampland to grow beans.

Nationally, acreage planted to soybeans has more than doubled from 15.6 million acres during the Korean war to 35.4 million acres last year. Output soared during the same period from 284 million bushels (in 1951) to 844 million, or well over half the world total.

Today soybeans, which first came to this country from China in the early 1800's, swell American farmers' bank accounts by $2 billion a year. As one of the top commercial export crops, they contribute hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the Nation's trade balance.

And demand, both in this country and abroad, keeps growing.

In fact, while Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and his fellow glutbusters began striving to trim costly surpluses of corn, wheat, and cotton after taking office 5 years ago, when it came to soybeans they actually launched steps to encourage output lest dashing demand send prices through the roof.

Freeman took another dramatic stride in this direction a few days ago by announcing an increase in the Government price-support level on this year's crop to an average $2.50 a bushel from the $2.25 level of the past 4 years. Though actual market prices are averaging even higher, the support level, at which farmers can turn their crop over to the Government for loans or eventual sale, will provide more generous insurance against any sharp price dip.

Unlike most Government-controlled crops, farmers don't have to accept production curbs to qualify for soybean price-support privileges.

RISE IN ACREAGE SOUGHT

Thanks to the higher price supports, plus a previously announced scheme to let corn farmers plant soybeans on their regular acreage allotments for corn, administration policymakers hope farmers will increase bean plantings this year to as many as 38.5 million acres and produce from 915 to 925 million bushels. Within a couple of years, it's reckoned, output will probably pass the billion-bushel mark.

Why the incredible demand for soybeans? The adjective most frequently applied to them is "versatile." The list of products made from them seems boundless, from breakfast foods to billiard balls.

Soybeans, which come in many colors from yellow to black, are processed into two basic materials; meal and oil.

The National Soybean Crop Improvement Council estimates that about 98 percent of the meal is fed to poultry and livestock with the rest used in various specialty products for human use. Of the oil, about 90 percent turns up in such familiar forms as margarine, salad dressing, and cooking oil, while the remaining 10 percent goes into paints, plastic, resins, and soap.

HIGH PROTEIN CONTENT

From the food standpoint, probably the soybean's most important value is its high protein content—especially important for the Johnson administration's planned "war" on world hunger and malnutrition.

Most of the 150 million pounds of vegetable oils that President Johnson proposes sending India to meet her famine threat will likely come from soybeans. And scientists have come up with special, high-protein foods made from the beans—one being "soyburgers."

THE U.S. SOYBEAN AND THE HUNGER GAP: REPORT OF NATIONAL SOYBEAN CROP IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

The earliest written record we have of the soybean dates back about 4,300 years when a Chinese emperor listed over 300 human ills which he believed the soybean would cure. The first brought to this country came as a ballast in sailing vessels in the middle of the 19th century.

For almost a century, its potential unknown and its versatility undreamt of, the soybean remained obscure and unappreciated in the United States. Although its possibility as a silage feed for livestock was investigated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 1890, 25 more years passed before the first bushel of soybeans was processed into meal and oil—at a cottonseed mill in Elizabeth City, N.C. In 1940 it was still a minor crop, with less than 5 million acres being harvested for the beans (another 8 million acres in soybeans were grown for forage, or grazed or plowed under to increase soil fertility).

The needs of World War II, when the United States was cut off from vegetable oil imports, and the intensive hurry-up research into all possible ways to meet the needs for oils and fats and protein feed provided the stage on which the soybean would begin playing its proper role.

In the past decade, soybean acreage has almost doubled, while acreages for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, peanuts, potatoes, oats, hay, and flax have decreased. Last year U.S. farmers harvested 34.5 million acres of soybeans—an area larger than Arkansas—with a farm value of more than $2 billion.

But still another 3.5 million acres or more is needed this year.

THE VERSATILE BEAN

Products of the soybean, oil or meal, are used in livestock and poultry feed, breakfast foods, diets for babies and diabetics, macaroni, crackers, sauces, shortening, salad oil, paint, soap, candy, doughnuts, ice cream, cosmetics, textiles, insecticides, and waterproofing—to list a few.

However, wide as is the variety of uses for soybean products, it is important to remember that 98 percent of the bean's high protein meal is fed to livestock and poultry, which turn its protein into meat, milk and eggs, and only 2 percent goes into protein specialties for human consumption. Ninety percent of the oil is put into such edible products as margarine, cooking oil and salad oil, with the remaining 10 percent going for such industrial uses as paints, plastics, resins, and soap.

It is not, then, for cosmetics or candy that the additional 3.5 million acres of soybeans—equivalent to some 100 million bushels—are needed.

What is needed is the oil and the protein, found in abundance in the soybean, for feeding to the world's 1.5 billion undernourished or malnourished persons—a number almost as large as the entire world's population in 1900. This is a need that is recognized not only by President Johnson, members of Congress and the Department of Agriculture, but by demographers and nutritionists everywhere and by international organizations and most governments.

It is clearly understood that the United States cannot by itself appease the hunger of the world, even if it were to marshal all its resources behind the task. But the relief our farmers can provide would be significant, and the soybean may be the most important of our contributions.

HUNGER CLAIMS MILLIONS

Many people in food-poor underdeveloped lands have a normal life expectancy of under 25 years—less by 5 years than the average life expectancy in the Egypt of the Pharoahs. The National Academy of Sciences, reporting on malnutrition of preschool children in underdeveloped countries, has stated that, while infant death rates in these countries may be six to eight times as great as those in more advanced countries, mortality rates in the 1 to 4 age group in backward countries possibly are 50 to 60 times greater. It concluded that literally millions of preschool children die of malnutrition annually.

Those who survive to live their meager and destitute span are stunted in mind as well as in body. The empty belly handicap of billions denies mankind the fruits of their unknown potential, for these can give to society even less than they get from society.

And exploding populations continue to force wider the world's hunger gap. In the first 6 centuries after the birth of Christ, man increased his numbers by only 200 million, to about 500 million. During the next 300 years, ending in 1900, world population more than tripled, reaching 1.6 billion. Now, in a mere 66 years, it has doubled, and it will double again in 35 years.

President Johnson made it plain in his food-for-peace message that the Government will make a major effort to narrow the world hunger gap, and he expects the soybean to play a key role. He noted that demand for soybeans has climbed each year since 1960, and "despite record crops, we have virtually no reserve stocks."

The Department of Agriculture immediately followed this up with a modification of the Government's feed grain program that permits farmers participating in the program this year to plant all of their corn and other feed grain acreage allowed under the program to soybeans and still earn their total feed grain price support payment. This was followed in Congress by the introduction of bills to encourage increased soybean production, and the chairmen of the Agriculture Committees in the House and Senate added their voices to support the call for more soybeans.

SCIENTISTS AT WORK

Research now being conducted by the Government and private industry is seeking new and palatable ways to serve soybean protein, such as a soy beverage. There already has been developed a bland soy flour that, when sprinkled on a bowl of rice or other cereal, can provide a person all of his protein needs for a day.

Even greater than in the underdeveloped countries is the demand in the developed nations. As the Western World's living standards continue to climb, more and more people are finding the means to enjoy more of life's good things. And history is proof that, as living standards improve, diets also improve. This has always meant more meat, eggs, and milk on the dinner table. Nations where bread once was the only staff of life are becoming more deeply involved in livestock and poultry production. More hogs, cattle, and chickens means a larger consumption of mixed feeds, and this, in turn, is greatly increasing the demand for soybean meal.

In the United States alone, Census Bureau projections forecast a 16-percent population increase and greater prosperity over the next 10 years. One survey expects that by 1975 Americans will be consuming 34 percent more beef, 12 percent more pork, and 29 percent more broilers. Milk and egg consumption will also rise. The same study also expects soybean oil demands to increase by about one-third in the next decade.

QUESTIONS FOR FARMERS

Thus, two questions of national concern are to be answered by American farmers this year.

With world demand for oil and protein growing, will it be filled by soybeans grown by U.S. farmers—thus boosting farm income, reducing Government farm program costs and improving the Nation's balance of payments? Or will the demand be filled by oilseeds from elsewhere—sunflower from Argentina and Russia, rapeseed from Canada, or soybeans from Brazil?

Even with record domestic consumption and exports of U.S. corn this year, it appears that costly Government surplus stocks of corn will not be reduced. Will U.S. farmers produce fewer soybeans than the world demands while using the soil instead to grow more corn that will add to surplus stocks?

BIG CAMPAIGN UNDERWAY

It was against this background of need and opportunity that the National Soybean Crop Improvement Council in February launched an intensive campaign aimed at increasing soybean acreage in 1966 by 3.5 million over 1965. This would yield, under normal conditions, an extra 100 million bushels.

Announcing its campaign, the Council released a statement that said in part:

"American farmers would do well to heed the call—not just for humanitarian reasons, but for economic reasons, too. The soybean, requiring less cost and labor than many other profitable crops, has definitely come into its own as a money crop.

"In recent years, many thousands of farmers have learned to plant soybeans for extra profit. They know their acreage limitations for corn, cotton, peanuts, tobacco and rice, and that soybeans will produce the best income on their remaining acres."

Nationally, the average yield per acre of soybeans is about 25 bushels. This can be increased by improved control of weeds and insects, better selection of adaptable seeds, improved harvesting practices and, in Northern States, closer row widths. Acre yields of 35, or even 40, bushels are not unusual. The yield record was set in 1965 by John Reiser, Jr., of Ashland, Ill., who averaged 83 bushels.

The Crop Improvement Council reports that more and more soybean producers have come to realize that, with an added yield of only a few bushels per acre, they can actually double their net profits.

HOW IT'S DONE

It take virtually no more labor, seed, or fertilizer to produce more bushels on an acre. (It does take good management.)

Besides the fact that soybeans are more profitable to produce than many other cash crops, there are other virtues that explain their phenomenal success in recent years: It is a free-market crop; soybeans require less field work, and thus alleviate the farm labor problem; it is a hardy crop that provides "insurance" in periods of bad weather that may damage other crops; soybeans are natural risk spreaders for the diversifying farmer who doesn't want to gamble on a single money crop.

U.S. soybean processing capacity, according to the Department of Agriculture, is now 600 million bushels anually. And with markets expanding rapidly, that capacity is being enlarged significantly for the 1966 crop—indicating that farmers will have no trouble finding buyers for their soybeans.

It is a general rule of thumb that corn land is soybean land, so the heaviest production is found in the States of the Corn Belt. The Southeast and Midsouth in the last few years, however, has also become big production country.

The top producing States are:

[In millions]

	Acres planted, 1965	Bushels produced, 1965
Illinois	6.02	174
Iowa	4.85	123
Arkansas	3.21	69
Minnesota	3.16	58
Missouri	3.11	80
Indiana	2.95	82
Ohio	2.09	51
Mississippi	1.45	32
Kansas	.91	18
South Carolina	.89	20
North Carolina	.81	19
Tennessee	.73	17
Nebraska	.72	17
Louisiana	.62	13

SUPPORT OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we live in an age which has often been described as a "revolution of rising expectations."

Everywhere in the world people yearn for the same things: freedoms, the right to make the important choices in their own lives, an opportunity for a better life.

In much of the world these things are coming to pass, for individuals hold the powers of government in their own hands, and government serves their will. In many parts of the world once autocratic governments are becoming increasingly responsive to the needs of their people.

In Ghana the dictatorship of Nkrumah has been overthrown by a people tired of the cult of personality. In Indonesia, a government which was moving farther and farther down the road to communism has been retrieved for the people by alert and courageous action. In Vietnam hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese fight on to protect their country from Communist expansion.

In the Communist bloc, however, no similar liberalization is evident. In some instances, increased consumer goods have been provided because an outraged population demanded it. In several circumstances, what appeared to be dissent has been overheard. Yet this is really only the false window dressing of a totally autocratic Communist world.

In the Soviet Union nearly half of the working population is engaged in agriculture, yet the people do not have enough to eat. The same is true in China, and in Eastern Europe.

At the very moment when optimistic observers in this country tell us of a growing Soviet liberalization, we see two leading writers condemned to long prison terms because they have spoken their minds.

The nations of Eastern Europe have been robbed of their individuality and their cultural identity, and yet we are told that life in the countries is improving.

I would urge my colleagues to consider that if we in this country support this revolution of rising expectations, we must support if for those who live in virtual slavery behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, as we do for those elsewhere in the world. We cannot, for example, condemn dictatorial rule in Spain or South Africa, or Rhodesia, and stand silent about totalitarian rule in Poland, and Hungary, and Rumania.

At this time I would like to share with my colleagues a report and recommendations presented at the 12th session of the Assembly of Captive European Nations. This report notes:

> Despite the fact that the eyes of the world are at present focused on other crucial problems confronting mankind, the issue of the captive nations belongs in the forefront of international issues.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this statement in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS, 12TH SESSION: SUPPORT OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

MEMORANDUM

In his state of the Union message to the U.S. Congress on January 12, 1966, the President of the United States pointed out that the most important principle of the American foreign policy was "support of national independence—the right of each people to govern themselves—and shape their own institutions" because "the insistent urge toward national independence is the strongest force of today's world." The Assembly of Captive European Nations welcomes the spirit of the Presidential message, which is in full accord with the purpose of the Assembly of Captive European Nations; namely, "to uphold, serve and further the rightful aspirations to freedom, national independence, and social justice of our people."

The assembly believes that, despite the fact that the eyes of the world are at present focused on other crucial problems confronting mankind, the issue of the captive nations belongs in the forefront of international issues. Our conviction is strengthened by the recent developments in East-Central Europe, characterized by new repressive measures against the captive population and by hardening of the Communist line. It is sufficient to point to the recent arrests in Hungary, the campaign against the religious hierarchy in Poland, and the attacks against writers in Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia—an ominous parallel, no doubt, to the writers' trials in the Soviet Union.

The new repressive trends in East-Central Europe indicate that—

1. The Communist regimes invariably draw the line in cultural liberalization whenever the Communist Party's monopoly on ideas is threatened.

2. A large measure of subservience, varying in extent and intensity from country to country, to Soviet (or, in the case of Albania, Chinese) foreign policy still seems to be the price the insecure east-central European regimes must pay for the indispensable Soviet support, which is a key to their remaining in power. It is also a fact that, in spite of the considerably varied alleviations and changes in east-central Europe, the Soviet union continues to heavily influence the domestic and foreign affairs of the captive countries, and that the Communist parties in the area are determined to perpetuate themselves in power.

The repressive Communist policies make it even more imperative that the free world explore every peaceful avenue to reach the east-central European peoples and assist them in their efforts to achieve both an amelioration of their living conditions and their political goals of freedom and self-determination.

The assembly's views on some of these main avenues of approach are as follows:

1. The assembly agrees with the present U.S. policy of denying Communist regimes goods of strategic value. We are also on record in counseling against long-term credits to Communist regimes, since granting long-term credits to the Communists would be tantamount to a foreign aid program.

The assembly welcomes initiatives that tend to help alleviate the plight of the captive peoples. If foreign trade, however, is to support the national aspirations of the now subjugated peoples of east-central Europe, it should be used to strengthen and encourage these peoples. It should not be used by the despotic Communist regimes to bolster their positions in the countries over which they at present rule. The captive peoples would greatly profit if East-West trade were to influence the east-central European economies toward preferential treatment of consumer goods production at the expense of heavy industry. Judging by past Communist performances in keeping tight rein on the captive peoples' quest for political freedoms, Western trade with the East—aimed at political objectives—does not at present appear to have a meaningful chance of success.

There is no clearcut proof that cultural exchanges and trade with the West alone have led to liberalization, relaxation of tensions, or concessions of any kind since Stalin's death. So-called de-Stalinization, and its attendant outgrowth, has been and is initiated and exerted primarily by internal forces—namely, by opposition and resistance on the part of the east-central European peoples to the regimes and regime policies.

2. We believe that full reciprocity should be demanded in cultural exchanges. At present there is a pronounced imbalance between the freedom enjoyed by Communist propaganda and propagandists in the United States and any similar U.S. activities in east-central Europe. A steady flow of Communist propaganda to the communities of peoples of east-central European descent presents many latent dangers. Much of this material is clearly written and its political message is understated. With the free world not being granted similar privileges in east-central Europe, the Communists are in the advantageous position of selecting their target audiences in the West while they are not facing a corresponding challenge at home. The assembly therefore deems it its duty to combat forcefully the effects of such propaganda material.

Trade and cultural exchanges, important as they are as means of helping the internal changes, cannot by themselves secure self-determination in east-central Europe.

It is our conviction, buttressed by first-hand experience, that a policy of peaceful evolution must not digress from the primary objective—an east-central Europe unfettered by the fiats of totalitarian regimes.

It is equally important that the captive European peoples be aware of the continued determination and willingness of the free world governments to lend their full moral and political support to this national objective.

Any notion of permanence of the status quo in east-central Europe runs against the vital interests of both the captive European nations and the absurd idea that the Communist sphere of influence is off limits for the free nations, while the non-Communist world is a private hunting ground for Communist aggression and subversion under the guise of "national wars of liberation" and other spurious labels.

It is our opinion that a clear-cut expression of U.S. nonacceptance of the present illegal and abnormal status quo in east-central Europe would contribute much to the morale of the captive European peoples. The United Nations and major international conferences offer a most appropriate forum for such a policy statement by the United States. Moreover, at the United Nations and before the eyes of the world, Communist methods and wrongdoings can be effectively exposed and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights used as an important weapon to foster the struggle for freedom in the captive countries.

In these days of swift historic changes, when an impressive number of formerly dependent states have gained independence, the plight of the Communist-ruled east-central European nations remains a black mark on the conscience of humanity. Although Communist aggression in other parts of the world may at times divert the free world's attention from the European scene, the new challenge for the forces of freedom lies in their ability of assuring the east-central European peoples that they have not been forgotten.

In this context, the assembly deems it appropriate to draw attention to a report of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives. The report, dated October 29, 1962, recommended, in part, that the United States:

"1. Take prompt, continuous, and energetic steps to make clear to the rest of the world that the United States continues to support the policy of refusing to accept the status quo in Eastern Europe, and the right to self-determination of the peoples of the captive nations;

"2. Avail itself of every opportunity to expose—especially to the peoples of the developing countries—the methods, the implications, and the consequences of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, attaching to this task as much importance as our Government does to the championing of the right to self-determination and national independence of the nations of other continents."

Consequently and in summary, the Assembly of Captive European Nations urges the Government and the Congress of the United States:

(a) To use more extensively the international forums in promoting the respect for the right to self-determination of the captive peoples of east-central Europe;

(b) To reaffirm on all appropriate occasions, and especially on the occasion of the Polish millennium, the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian National Revolution, and the national days of the captive countries, the unflinching stand of the U.S. Government and Congress regarding the restoration of national independence and freedom of the subjugated east-central European nations;

(c) To insist on the principle of full reciprocity in cultural exchanges with the East, be it in the field of publications, art, dissemination of information, or tourism;

(d) To use the apparent eagerness of the Communists to expand trade with the West as a lever to insure that such trade expansion will politically and economically benefit the captive peoples and will not be misused by the regimes to strengthen their hold on the peoples;

(e) To ask the President of the United States to issue a forceful Captive Nations Week proclamation and to support the observance of Captive Nations Week by appropriate manifestations in the Senate and the House of Representatives;

(f) To lend all-out assistance to the Assembly of Captive European Nations and its member organizations—symbols of the continuity of the struggle for liberty of the enslaved nations of east-central Europe.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE NATION'S ELDERLY CITIZENS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senate Special Committee on Aging, of which I am chairman, constantly works on increasing employment opportunities for our Nation's elderly. We find that older Americans who seek employment frequently need advice regarding effective techniques for doing so.

An excellent article entitled "How To Look for a Job," was recently received by our committee and other subscribers to a service known as the P/R Workshop, which is published by the Bureau of Business Practice, 24 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Conn.

This is a service prepared for employers, personnel directors, and employees to provide guidance on successful preparation for retirement and enriching the later years. I ask unanimous consent that this material be inserted in the Congressional Record, at this point of my remarks in order that the excellent advice in it may reach the largest possible number of elderly job seekers.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How To Look for a Job

(Editor's Note.—Job hunting is seldom a bed of roses. It calls for real skill, initiative, and sometimes hard and discouraging pavement pounding. The person well trained in the job of his choice and thoroughly familiar with the various job-hunting techniques always has a better chance of success. For older workers especially being well prepared and knowing how to look for a job is essential. Of course a certain amount of prejudice still exists against hiring older persons. But research education, and actual experience with older workers are beginning to break down this feeling. The main considerations in finding work are the number of job openings, your own skills and abilities, and the desire to work.)

The way to find a job is get out and look for one; waiting at home for employers to come looking for you is unlikely to be productive. Job hunting is hard work, of a kind for which most of us are untrained. We spend too little time making the rounds, we tend to get discouraged too easily, to talk not to the people who could be most helpful, but to those who can do the least for us. In general, we muddle along, muffing some opportunities and failing to recognize others.

To avoid the most common errors, take this quiz, which will tip you off to some important facts about job hunting. The answers are based on the experience and observations of job counselors for older workers.

Your handwriting is good. When you write letters applying for an interview you should:

(a) Write them all by hand, even if it takes a very long time.

(b) Have them typed, even if you have to pay to have this done.

Answer. (b). Unless you are applying for some sort of work in which your handwriting will be a factor, it's better to have your letters typed. They will be easier to read, neater, and more businesslike in appearance.

If you don't know the name of the owner, president or personnel manager of the company to which you are writing, you should:

(a) Address the individual as "Dear Sir."

(b) Phone the company first and ask for the name of the man in charge of employment interviewing.

Answer. (b). It is always better to address a letter to a specific person rather than to a "Dear Sir." It shows that you have taken the trouble to learn something about the company you want to work for, and is more complimentary to the person you are addressing, both of which get you off to a good start.

You should always assume that the person to whom you write or talk is:

(a) Interested in helping you.

(b) Interested in learning as much as possible about your personal problems.

(c) Interested in discovering how you can be of use to him and his company.

Answer. (c). Maybe the interviewer would be sorry for you if he knew that your wife needed an operation, or that you had lost all your savings in the stock market, but sympathy won't get you a job. His main interest is in learning what you can do that his company needs to have done. Don't discuss your personal problems. Talk about what you can do for him.

You are applying for a job as night watchman in a large factory where watchmen wear uniforms. You should show up for your interview wearing:

(a) A rented uniform, resembling as much as possible the uniform worn at this plant.

(b) The new Hawaiian sports shirt your wife gave you for Christmas. She says it looks well on you and will bring you luck.

(c) A suit.

(d) Clean work clothes, such as dungarees, a shirt and slacks, or overalls.

Answer. (c). Most people agree that you will make your best impression, no matter what kind of job you're applying for, if you wear a clean, well-pressed suit. Sports shirts, wild colors, string ties, 10-gallon hats and the like are out. Clean work clothes are better, however, than a soiled or shabby suit.

5. When writing a letter, or being interviewed, you should:

(a) Do everything possible to conceal your age.

(b) Apologize for your age.

(c) Boast about your age, especially if the interviewer is much younger.

(d) Ignore your age and emphasize your experience.

Answer. (d). Your experience is the major asset you have to offer. Your age doesn't count. If you have 40 years of work in your field behind you, it is obvious that you're no youngster—but it is likewise clear that you have something to offer an employer who values experience above youth.

6. You have an appointment with a personnel interviewer. He keeps you waiting for three-quarters of an hour. When you are finally admitted to his office, you should:

(a) Say nothing, just enter in silence.

(b) Tactfully point out that he owes you more respect than he has shown.

(c) Tell him exactly how he has inconvenienced you.

(d) Assume that his tardiness was unavoidable, and was not intended to insult you.

Answer. (b). Experts say that older people looking for work are more sensitive than younger people, that they take offense more readily, and often assume that they have been insulted when no slight was intended. The interviewer should—and probably did—make every effort to keep his appointment with you, and he owes you an explanation or apology for having kept you waiting. But your primary concern right now is not to correct his manners but to get a job. Forget about having been kept waiting, and concentrate on making a favorable impression,

7. Your feet hurt, and you're not feeling particularly cheerful. But you have planned to visit at least one more employment agency or personnel office before giving up for the day You should:

(a) Force yourself to stick to your plan.

(b) Put off the next visit until you're feeling better.

Answer. (b). Low spirits, fatigue, and other negative feelings are often contagious. You yourself probably prefer to have cheerful, confident, friendly people working around you, and the interviewer undoubtedly feels that way, too. Wait until you are at your best before you undertake to apply for a job. Incidentally, one way to avoid discouragement is to recognize, before you start, that you are going to get more "no" than "yes" answers in the course of job hunting, and that patience, endurance, and determination will eventually pay off.

8. If an interviewer asks about your last place of employment, you should:

(a) Tell him frankly what you did and did not like about the company.

(b) Exaggerate the importance of your job and the esteem in which you were held.

(c) Avoid discussing grievances or criticizing management.

(d) Talk about the trouble you had in getting along with younger men in your department.

Answer (c). Whether or not you got along well with others in your last job, it puts you—not them—in a bad light when you complain about your employers or colleagues, especially to strangers. Think of the best things you can truthfully say, and omit everything else.

Because you are older than many of the applicants for a job, you should:

(a) Offer to accept less than the going rate of pay.

(b) Say at once that you are willing to do "anything."

(c) Have some specific ideas as to what you might do for the company and what it should be worth to them.

Answer (c). A frequent complaint from employers is that older people are too vague about the work they can or will do. The fact that you're willing to do anything gives an employer no clue as to where you might fit in his organization. Here's some more sound advice: Don't beg and don't bargain. If you've been working all your life you've acquired skills and habits which are valuable to some employers. Don't underestimate what you have to sell and don't put too low a price tag on it. What you're looking for is the employer who can use what you have to sell. Take the trouble, before you call on any company, to try to find out what kinds of work you could do for it. If it needs someone to do that work, and if you can do it properly, you should get the going rate. If you can't do it, offering yourself as a bargain will ordinarily not help.

GETTING READY FOR THE JOB INTERVIEW

Careful preparation for each interview will increase your chances for a job. It will also make the interview go more smoothly. Have ready the answers to the questions typically asked of the older jobseeker. Questions such as: Age? Salary expected? Reasons for leaving last job? Why are you seeking work? Are you willing to accept a new type of work? Willing to work at a lower level?

Practice sessions with a friend may make you feel more secure during the interview. Have your friend ask you a list of questions you have prepared.

THE JOB APPLICATION

When you apply for a job, you're usually asked to fill out a job application form. The questions asked may vary slightly from company to company, but most forms usually ask the same type of questions: name, age, date of birth, address, telephone, where previously employed, education, relatives employed with company you're seeking to work for.

Don't be in a hurry to fill out the form. Take your time and do a neat job. Make sure you have all the information you need to complete the form. For example, do you know what your social security number is? Take along your card.

SOVIET POLICY OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST JEWISH COMMUNITY OF SOVIET UNION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in the past the Senate has adopted resolutions expressing concern for the Soviet policy of discrimination against the Jewish community of the Soviet Union. Our concern continues.

For this reason, 68 Senators joined me in sending a message to the meeting called by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, which is now in progress in Philadelphia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this message, and the names of the Senators who signed it, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the message and names of Senators were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Message for the Meeting of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, Philadelphia, Pa., April 17–18, 1966

The plight of Soviet Jewry has long been a concern of the U.S. Senate. On more than one occasion the Senate adopted resolutions expressing sympathy for the Jews living in the Soviet Union—and condemning the Soviet policy of discrimination against Jewish culture, religion, and community. They expressed our fervent hope for a reversal of Soviet policy.

We therefore consider it fitting, as U.S. Senators, to register our stanch support of the American Jewish community's protests against the anti-Semitic policies of the Soviet Union. We must continually direct the world's attention to this state of affairs, and put forward the insistent demand that the 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union be allowed to live creatively and in dignity as Jews.

The facts are well known. They have been ably presented by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, which was founded just 2 years ago in our Nation's Capital.

Soviet Jews are prevented from living out their lives freely as Jews—even within the framework of the prerogatives and institutions sanctioned by the Soviet Constitution, by Soviet law and practice. Thus, the Jews, alone among all Soviet ethnic groups, are forbidden schools and other institutions of Jewish learning and research, though all are required if the ancient heritage of the Jews is to be perpetuated. Similarly, the Jews, alone among all Soviet religious groups, are forbidden the right to have any form of nationwide federation of congregation or of clergy. Yet, religious Jews strongly desire contact and communication with their brethren elsewhere in the world. They want and need officially sanctioned ties with coreligionists abroad, just as they want and need to secure necessary religious articles.

Soviet policy seems to be aiming at the obliteration of the Jewish community and Jewish culture. This must be vigorously protested—not only by those who value and revere the ancient Jewish tradition and civilization, but also by every person who respects the fundamental human right of a group to live in peace and security.

Jewish families have been scattered throughout the world, as the result of the many upheavals and changes that have marked this century. In the Soviet Union there are tens of thousands of Jews who desire—after decades of sorrow and tragedy—to be rejoined with their broken families in the United States, in Israel, and other countries. The U.S.S.R. has accepted the principle of the reunification of broken families, and we strongly support the plea that the Soviet Government translate this principle into practice.

So long as these injustices persist, protests will be in order. We in the Senate of the United States will continue to put forward rightful demands and support those of our fellow-Americans in this cause.

We deem it appropriate that you should be meeting today in Independence Hall—a site that is sacred to all men who prize liberty—to deliberate the ways and means of helping the Jewish community in the Soviet Union.

Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff.
Senator Gordon Allott.
Senator E. L. Bartlett.
Senator Birch Bayh.
Senator Wallace F. Bennett.
Senator J. Caleb Boggs.
Senator Daniel B. Brewster.
Senator Quentin N. Burdick.
Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr.
Senator Robert C. Byrd.
Senator Howard W. Cannon.
Senator Clifford P. Case.
Senator Joseph S. Clark.
Senator John Sherman Cooper.
Senator Thomas J. Dodd.
Senator Peter H. Dominick.
Senator Paul H. Douglas.
Senator Paul J. Fannin.
Senator Hiram L. Fong.
Senator Ernest Gruening.
Senator Philip A. Hart.
Senator Vance Hartke.
Senator Spessard L. Holland.
Senator Roman L. Hruska.
Senator Daniel K. Inouye.
Senator Henry M. Jackson.
Senator Jacob K. Javits.
Senator Edward M. Kennedy.
Senator Robert F. Kennedy.
Senator Thomas H. Kuchel.
Senator Frank J. Lausche.
Senator Edward V. Long.
Senator Warren G. Magnuson.
Senator Eugene J. McCarthy.
Senator John L. McClellan.
Senator Gale W. McGee.
Senator George McGovern.
Senator Thomas J. McIntyre.
Senator Lee Metcalf.
Senator Jack Miller.
Senator Walter F. Mondale.
Senator A. S. Mike Monroney.
Senator Joseph M. Montoya.
Senator Wayne Morse.
Senator Thruston B. Morton.
Senator Frank E. Moss.
Senator Karl E. Mundt.
Senator George Murphy.
Senator Maurine Neuberger.
Senator John O. Pastore.
Senator James B. Pearson.
Senator Claiborne Pell.
Senator William Proxmire.
Senator Jennings Randolph.
Senator Leverett Saltonstall.
Senator Hugh Scott.
Senator Milward L. Simpson.
Senator George A. Smathers.
Senator Stuart Symington.
Senator Strom Thurmond.
Senator John G. Tower.
Senator Joseph D. Tydings.
Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr.
Senator Ralph Yarborough.
Senator Stephen M. Young.
Senator Alan Bible.
Senator Winston L. Prouty.
Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen.
Senator Gaylord Nelson.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was very encouraged to see an editorial recently carried by the Kansas City Star in support of President Johnson's recommended protection for the consumer.

The Star's editorial in effect endorses truth in lending and truth in packaging. The editorial states:

> Government, we believe, is obligated to represent the consumer and protect him

against fraud, harmful substances and misrepresentation.

The editorial also urges that consumer safeguards be reasonable and that we refrain from having a maze of regulations and restrictions.

The truth-in-lending bill, as Senators know, requires only the disclosure of the actual costs of credit. In my opinion, it follows the principle of reasonableness which this editorial endorses. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Kansas City Star of March 24, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REASONABLE PROTECTION FOR THE CONSUMER

The President has sent to Congress a long list of proposed corrective measures designed to protect the consumer. The roster includes the large problems of honest packaging and labeling and interest rates on loans and installment purchases. It is specific right down to the point of suggesting that the number of pills in a bottle of children's aspirin be limited.

Government, we believe, is obligated to represent the consumer and protect him against fraud, harmful substances and misrepresentation. For Government to do so is in the fundamental interests of a free enterprise economy. If a consumer cannot determine the contents of a package from its label, if a product is not what its label says it is, then the essence of competitive capitalism is badly damaged. In our society a superior product is supposed to prosper and a poor product is supposed to fall by the wayside. Misleading labels and phony claims can put a premium on inferiority.

At the same time we believe it must be recognized that the distance between a legislative ideal and its bureaucratic reality, when administered, can be very great. We would not like to see arbitrary and stringent regulations enforced by whim and carried to the length that initiative and innovation might suffer. That, in the long run, would be no service to the consumer.

Certainly Government has a place in policing against outright fraud and in doing all it can to prevent the indiscriminate sale of nostrums that can cause physical harm. There are scientific criteria that can be applied and standards of weight and measure that can be insisted upon. But the American consumer is not a complete fool. Government cannot be expected to hold his hand at every turn and to count the change for him.

Reasonable consumer safeguards are in the public interest and in the interest of the economy. A stultifying maze of regulations and restrictions could raise costs and strangle the market in redtape.

THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently I cosponsored S. 1976, Senator HARTKE's bill to repeal the so-called Byrd amendment, which would make available for immediate use funds to complete the interstate highway program. Commissioner John R. Jamieson, department of highways for the State of Minnesota, has sent to me a résumé of the interstate highway program in Minnesota, which clearly points out that the construction program in Minnesota is lagging because of an inadequate supply of Federal aid interstate funds needed to maintain the construction schedule. I believe the summary is worth bringing to the attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN MINNESOTA, JANUARY 1, 1966

There has been considerable information presented from time to time on the status of the interstate construction program, some showing the number of miles completed and open to traffic, miles under construction, and miles in the preliminary design stages. Most of these news releases make for interesting reading, but do not give the reader a clear picture of the status of the interstate program, as to the financing of the program or the possibility of the entire system being completed and open to traffic in accordance with the provisions of the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act which created the Interstate Highway System, as we know it today.

In order to give a little better insight into what is taking place toward completion of the Interstate Highway System in Minnesota, a few statistics will be presented showing the status of Minnesota's Interstate Highways as of January 1, 1966.

Total miles of designated interstate highways in Minnesota, 901 miles.

Open to traffic (includes 52.8 miles not completed to full standards), 277 miles.

Under construction, 184 miles.

Preliminary engineering and/or right of way acquisition in progress, 440 miles.

This means, to complete on schedule, Minnesota must complete and open to traffic an average of over 100 miles of interstate per year during the next 6 years.

It should also be noted from these statistics that Minnesota has some work in progress on every mile of the designated system in the State.

The published construction program has been tailored to complete the entire interstate system in the State by the target date 1972, after giving due consideration to the necessary staging in the more complex construction projects. The Minnesota Highway Department has the capability of placing this work under contract and supervising the construction and it is confident the construction industry has the capability to do its part. The one element that is lacking in order to complete this huge and challenging assignment is an adequate supply of Federal-aid interstate funds as needed to maintain the construction schedule which has been set up to meet the 1972 completion date.

As we see it, there are two things that must be done to make adequate Federal aid interstate funds available when needed.

1. Eliminate quarterly obligation controls to permit States to maintain an orderly construction contract letting schedule.

2. Increased revenue for the Federal Highway Trust Fund so as to provide adequate funds to complete the Interstate Highway System on schedule and increase annual interstate apportionments to the States in such amounts as to permit the States to maintain realistic construction schedules.

The present and future condition of Federal aid interstate funds for Minnesota, as we see it, is as follows:

	Millions
Total Federal aid interstate funds obligated as of Jan. 1, 1966	$514
Balance Federal aid interstate funds required to complete system	442
Unobligated balance of 1967 fiscal year apportionment (Jan. 1, 1966)	[1] 57
Estimated apportionment 1968 fiscal year	68
Estimated apportionment 1969 fiscal year	68
Estimated apportionment 1970 fiscal year	70
Estimated apportionment 1971 fiscal year	67
Total anticipated Interstate Federal aid which will be available to Minnesota under present funding setup	330
Additional Federal aid interstate needed to complete Interstate System in Minnesota	112

[1] See footnote 1 at end of table below.

A nominal 2½ percent annual increase in construction costs would increase the $112 million deficit by another $20 million.

Federal interstate funds needed to implement 5-year program

[In millions of dollars]

	Preliminary engineering right of way, railway, and utilities	Construction contracts	Total needed	Apportionment	Accumulative deficit
1966	16	45	61	[1] [2] 57	−4
1967	24	86	110	68	−46
1968	16	101	117	68	−95
1969	5	84	89	70	−114
1970	1	64	65	67	−112

[1] Total 1967 fiscal year apportionment, $68,000,000.
1st quarter allotment made available Oct. 8, 1965.
2d quarter allotment made available Jan. 3, 1966.
3d quarter allotment expected on or about Apr. 4, 1966.
4th quarter allotment expected on or about June 30, 1966.
Only ¾ of annual apportionment will be available for obligation during this fiscal year (1966).

[2] Balance, Jan. 1, 1966.

Attached copy of "Status of the Highway Trust Fund," a part of a Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, news release, dated February 9, 1966, shows the balance in the trust fund on December 31, 1965, to be less than $9 million, and expenditures exceeded revenue by $260 million during the first half of fiscal year 1966 (July 1–Dec. 31, 1965).

Recommendations: (1) Immediate repeal of Byrd amendment, (2) adequate additional revenue be diverted to the highway trust fund to cover present cost estimates plus a reasonable increase in the construction cost index.

Date: February 16, 1966.

(Attachment: News release by BPR.)

TABLE IV.—*Status of the highway trust fund*

[In thousands of dollars]

	3 months ended Dec. 31, 1965	1st 6 months, fiscal year 1966
Balance at beginning of period	235, 613	284, 858
Income:		
Tax revenue:		
Motor-fuel taxes (net after refunds)	660, 624	1, 441, 651
Less motorboat fuel revenue [1]	11, 000	23, 400
Net for highways	649, 624	1, 418, 251
Trucks, buses, and trailers	106, 102	241, 983
Tires, tubes, and tread rubber	128, 395	254, 054
Vehicle use	10, 564	65, 103
Total excise revenues	894, 685	1, 979, 391
Interest earned	1, 716	4, 605
Advances from general fund	70, 000	70, 000
Total income	966, 401	2, 053, 996
Disbursements for highways	1, 193, 131	2, 329, 971
Balance at end of period	8, 883	8, 883

[1] Transferred to the land and water conservation fund pursuant to title II, sec. 202, Public Law 88-578, effective Jan. 1, 1965.

The Federal share of the Federal-aid highway program is wholly financed by highway users on a pay-as-you-build basis. The Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (as since amended) levied or increased certain Federal excise taxes on motor fuel and automotive products, and earmarked their revenue specifically to a Highway Trust Fund, which is the source of money for Federal highway aid to the States both for the interstate and the ABC programs. The taxes earmarked to the trust fund and their rates (until October 1, 1972) are:

Motor fuel: 4 cents per gallon.

New trucks, buses, and trailers: 10 percent on the manufacturer's wholesale price.

Highway vehicles tires and tubes: 10 cents per pound.

Other tires, and tread rubber: 5 cents per pound.

Heavy vehicle use: $3 per 1,000 pounds annually on the total gross weight of vehicles rated at more than 26,000 pounds gross weight.

Under the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 certain trucks and trailers were exempted from the truck excise after June 21, 1965; and beginning January 1, 1966, the following taxes will also accrue to the Highway Trust Fund:

Lubricating oil: 6 cents per gallon, if used for highway purposes.

Parts and accessories: 8 percent on the manufacturer's wholesale price of truck and bus parts and accessories.

HARASSING TELEPHONE CALLS TO FAMILIES OF MILITARY PERSONNEL SERVING IN VIETNAM

Mr. **SMATHERS**. Mr. President, Hanson Baldwin, the military affairs expert of the New York Times, recently wrote an article on harassing telephone calls to the families of military personnel serving in South Vietnam.

Mr. Baldwin pointed out that, while there are no complete statistics on the number of these calls made, servicemen believe they are more widespread than is generally known. In addition, Mr. Baldwin reminds us that there is currently no Federal statute to deal with these cowardly and seditious acts.

As have several other Senators, I have introduced a bill to cope with this serious problem, which could have significant impact on the morale and effectiveness of our fighting men. Each of the bills seems to approach the matter from a slightly different angle, and, while I believe that mine is the best of these approaches, I urge Congress to begin consideration of all of them as soon as possible so that a major gap in our Federal laws can be closed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Baldwin's article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 4, 1966]

CRANK CALLS HARASS FAMILIES OF GI'S SERVING IN VIETNAM

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

An incomplete Defense Department compilation showed yesterday that families of military personnel serving in Vietnam had received 100 threatening, abusive or crank telephone calls or communications in the last year.

A considerable number of the calls have been made to widows or dependents of men killed in Vietnam. The anonymous callers have used obscenity or abuse, or have gloated over the death of the servicemen involved.

In one case, in a call to a home where the widow of a captain killed in Vietnam had been staying, a man and a woman said in unison over the telephone:

"Slaughtered sheep sound like this * * *."

The words were followed by a bleating noise.

FALSE INJURY REPORT

Many of the ghoulish calls have been much more specific: The caller has said he was glad the serviceman was killed, or has used profanity to express his pleasure.

Other communications have involved threats. One Navy wife in the Norfolk, Va., area was threatened with physical violence if she attended a homecoming celebration for the aircraft carrier *Independence*, which had served in Vietnamese waters.

In the most recent reported incident, on March 11, a bogus officer, dressed in a Marine Corps uniform, visited the home of a Marine officer serving in Vietnam and told his wife that her husband had been seriously wounded. The wife detected the fraud and notified the Federal Bureau of Investigation. So far no arrest has been made.

MOST TO ARMY FAMILIES

According to the Defense Department, there appears to be no common pattern to the calls and letters. However, the servicemen themselves, particularly some of those who have served aboard carriers, believe that the calls are so widespread that organization is evident. They believe that the number is considerably larger than that reported by the dependents to the services and that Communists or leftwing sympathizers in the United States have in part been responsible.

Dependents of Army personnel have received the majority of the recorded telephone calls. Almost 50 have been reported, most of them to dependents of the First Cavalry (Airmobile) Division, and to the next of kin of paratroopers serving in Vietnam. Most of these calls have been made in the Third Army area in the vicinity of Fort Bragg, N.C., and Fort Benning, Ga.

The majority of the calls or communications to Navy and Marine personnel, which total at least 25, were made in the vicinity of the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., and in the Norfolk area. The relatively few recorded calls involving Air Force personnel—about seven—were in scattered geographical areas.

In addition to the calls centrally compiled by the Defense Department, a great many additional calls, letters, or communications have been reported in New York, Pennsylvania, the Middle West, California, and elsewhere.

According to the Defense Department, the types of telephone calls have included "silence, hoarse breathing, obscenity, abuse or gloating over death of the servicemen involved."

"None of the calls," it says, "have been identified, either as to name or association with a group."

Whenever such calls or communications are reported, the local military intelligence services, local police authorities and the FBI have been informed, but so far the originators of the calls or the abusive communications have not been identified.

Legal action that can be taken varies widely with local laws. Apparently there is no Federal statute that applies, although Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, has introduced a bill that would make it a Federal offense to make threatening and abusive communications to members of the Armed Forces and their families.

Vigorous local investigation of each such communication and the voluntary withholding by many public relations media of the home addresses of dependents of Vietnamese casualties has apparently resulted in some diminution of the communications.

The information programs by the services to inform dependents of what to do if such calls are received serves, the Defense Department says, to "reduce the impact of families—however, there is still shock, humiliation, and anger."

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL LOOKS AT SENATOR AIKEN

Mr. **HARTKE**. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is also the dean of all Senators on the Republican side of the aisle, has long since won the admiration and affection of his colleagues with no regard to political labels. A recent newspaper article quoted Senator MANSFIELD in words describing the feeling of many other Members as well:

> GEORGE AIKEN is probably the most solid man in Congress. He has honesty, charm, humaneness and, above all, independence.

The article to which I refer was written by Dan Cordtz for the Wall Street Journal of March 3. Much of the article deals with the view of Senator AIKEN on Vietnam and his role on the Foreign Relations Committee. He has addressed the Senate on the question of Vietnam in the past to the benefit of all who have heard or read his words, and I am sure whenever he takes the floor for such a purpose again, there will be many both in and out of the Senate who weigh his words with care.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I refer may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERMONT'S AIKEN: A RESPECTED SENATOR DISSENTS FROM U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

(By Dan Cordtz)

WASHINGTON.—On his desk one recent day Senator GEORGE AIKEN found two letters from Vermont constituents. The first warmly complimented him for his solid support of President Johnson's policy in Vietnam. The other, equally enthusiastic, extolled his courageous opposition to the administration's conduct of the war.

Relating the incident later, the white-haired Republican patriarch chuckled and said: "I guess it shows I don't know much about Vietnam but I must know something about politics."

Many of his colleagues would disagree. Not over whether he knows something about politics; 25 years in the Senate, after terms as State legislator and Governor, prove his vote-getting ability. But the 73-year-old lawmaker also obviously knows a great deal about Vietnam, and in recent weeks he has played an increasingly important role in the Senate's continuing consideration of our position in southeast Asia.

His role is important for three reasons: First, as second-ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator AIKEN has followed the war closely for many years; he visited the country as recently as late last year, and helped write the resulting gloomy Mansfield report. Second, he is widely respected in the Senate for his levelheaded, down-to-earth views; "his kind of liberalism carries a degree of persuasiveness a doctrinaire liberal can't command," explains a congressional foreign affairs specialist. But, perhaps most important, Senator AIKEN is probably the closest friend and sturdiest sustainer of MIKE MANSFIELD—the majority leader who finds himself in unhappy opposition to his own President and much of his party on Vietnam policy.

PRAISE FROM A COLLEAGUE

Senator MANSFIELD's respect for his friend from the other side of the aisle is boundless. "GEORGE AIKEN is probably the most solid man in the Congress," he declares. "He has honesty, charm, humaneness and, above all, independence."

Planning last year's globe-girdling committee study of the war and the chances for making peace, Senator MANSFIELD insisted that his Republican colleague be included, despite concern about how the old Green Mountain man would stand up to the rigors of the journey. (He needn't have worried about Senator AIKEN's stamina, according to a staff member who went along. "GEORGE AIKEN stood up to it better than any of us," she says.)

The majority leader now describes Senator AIKEN as "the cornerstone on which that committee functioned. As a farmer, and a man who really knows agriculture, he had a special entree and a special insight to the problems of the country none of the rest of us could match."

And his older colleague's judgment unquestionably provided Senator MANSFIELD important support for his own pessimistic conclusions about Vietnam. Where the war is concerned, the introspective majority leader finds himself deserted by most of his own troops and in disagreement with the President. But the calm concurrence of Senator AIKEN, with whom he eats breakfast every working morning in the Senate cafeteria, reassures him of the correctness of his views.

Senator AIKEN's own attitude toward the war is indicated by Senator MANSFIELD's description of him as a wise old owl, flying a steady middle course between the noisy flocks of hawks and doves. He refuses to waste words on what might have been, and recognizes sorrowfully that we are now too far committed merely to withdraw. But he is opposed to further expansion of the war, particularly to any extension of the bombing in North Vietnam.

"I was against bombing up there in the first place," he says, "and I was against the resumption." He is unimpressed by claims that the bombing was necessary to halt infiltration from the north. "There are about three times as many men infiltrating into South Vietnam now as there were before the bombing started, and the supplies have increased also," he explains.

AGAINST RUSK ARGUMENT

Senator AIKEN also takes a dim view of Secretary of State Rusk's argument that our war role is required by our treaty commitments—a line which appears to cast the United States as a worldwide policeman. "I don't think we can undertake to police the whole world," he declares flatly. "I don't think we can undertake to feed the whole world. I don't think we can undertake to improve the economy of the whole world all at one time."

This hardheaded qualification of his basic humanitarian internationalism probably typifies GEORGE AIKEN's public outlook. Descendant of a pre-Revolutionary settler, he was born into a family in which a stern conscience demanded public service. At least one member of each generation was active in politics. Ending his formal education with high school graduation more than half a century ago, he became a farmer—a designation he proudly claims today, although he has sold most of his holdings and now operates "a small orchard. It only yields about 2,000 bushels."

In 1931 he began his formal political career as town representative to the State legislature. Two years later he was elected speaker of the Vermont House of Representatives, then Lieutenant Governor, and, in 1937, Governor.

Members of Senator AIKEN's staff and many Vermonters still call him Governor, and some say it is his preferred title. "I think he feels almost anybody can be a Senator, but to be Governor of the State of Vermont—that's something," remarked an old friend.

As Governor, Mr. AIKEN led a successful fight to break the hold of the electric power monopoly on Vermont's economy, and he won a 1940 election to fill an uncompleted Senate term on the issue of supporting public development of St. Lawrence hydroelectric power. He was an early backer of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, and calls its Senate journey his toughest political battle.

As a farmer, and representing an agricultural State, Senator AIKEN was immediately assigned to the Agriculture Committee, whose chairman he became during the term of GOP control in 1953. Additionally, he went onto the Foreign Relations Committee in 1953.

"It was perfectly natural," he explains, "Vermonters have always been internationalists, and besides it tied in directly with the problems of agriculture. It was always obvious that only world trade was the answer to our surpluses."

Within the committee, according to one member, "AIKEN has never been a man to take initiatives or generate ideas. His practice is more to listen carefully to everything, and then give his own opinion—and it's almost always a straightforward, uncomplicated, and first-rate analysis."

Senator AIKEN has also been a representative to the United Nations (appointed by President Eisenhower) and a delegate to Moscow for the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty (appointed by President Kennedy).

In foreign affairs, the Vermont Republican has been a fairly constant supporter of Chairman WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's liberal views, including the Arkansas Democrat's criticism of U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic. In fact, although his appearance may suggest a Midwestern conservative (except for the bright red neckties he loves), Senator AIKEN has been from the first a member of the Senate's little band of "moderate" Republicans. During the Eisenhower administration, a half dozen younger GOP liberals met regularly in his office to discuss issues and tactics. And he played a central role in the rebellious skirmish which resulted in the 1959 election of liberal Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, of California, as assistant GOP leader. Mr. KUCHEL has described Senator AIKEN to intimates as one of the most important influences on his Senate career.

For all his activity on the national and world scene, however, Senator AIKEN remains rooted to his native Vermont. He misses no opportunity to return, makes a special point of contacting his humblest constituents, and argues that attention to the needs of his own people is the best way he can serve the country's interests.

In fact, his occasional mild critic calls this preoccupation with Vermont Senator AIKEN's one blind spot. It led him, one notes, to balk at provisions of the medicare bill which would have created a problem for Vermont nursing homes.

But, as his current focus on Vietnam demonstrates, Senator AIKEN's concerns do range far beyond his New England hills. A man, in Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN's words, "at peace with himself," he is far from despairing about the future. He remains, however, far from satisfied with the course of events in southeast Asia. And, so long as he continues to speak out, he will embolden his colleagues' own dissents. As Senator MANSFIELD puts it: "Any position Senator AIKEN takes automatically becomes respectable, just because it's held by GEORGE AIKEN."

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CONNECTICUT BOARD OF FISHERIES AND GAME

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, this year Americans are fully realizing the seriousness of the threat to our Nation's natural resources. Therefore, it is especially important that we honor those who have worked to preserve these resources in the past.

This year, the Connecticut Board of Fisheries and Game marks its 100th year of service to the people of my State. On June 29, 1866, the Connecticut General Assembly passed a resolution calling for the appointment of two commissioners to study and make recommendations on the fisheries of Connecticut. From this two-man fish commission has grown a modern fish and game agency, headed by a policymaking citizen board of five commissioners, appointed by the Governor. Since 1959 the board has been a division of the department of agriculture and natural resources, which is headed by Commissioner Joseph N. Gill.

Over the past 100 years, millions of people, residents of Connecticut and visitors from all over the country and the world, have benefited from the work of the board. The present board members—Chairman Norman C. Comollo, Vice Chairman Rudy Frank, Dr. William A. Ellis, Michael J. Stula, and Patrick J. Ward—like their predecessors, serve without compensation. They and Director Theodore B. Bampton, Assistant Director Alfred J. Hunyadi, and the 85 men and women of the staff, have upheld the high standards and traditions of the board of fisheries and game.

During this centennial year, the department will carry out a program of activities and displays to emphasize the need for conservation of our natural resources. In this, as in its regular work of providing, protecting, and preserving fish and wildlife resources for Connecticut, the board deserves the gratitude and cooperation of all Connecticut citizens.

My congratulations, thanks, and best wishes go to all connected with the Connecticut Board of Fisheries and Game. Their skill and dedication bring both honor and pleasure to Connecticut.

TWO UTAHANS—ONE AN ASTRONAUT AND ONE AN ESSAY CONTEST WINNER—DRAW NATIONAL PRAISE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is with considerable pride that I inform the Senate today of the exploits and accomplishments of two Utahans, each a national winner and in two widely different areas of interest, but each also an excellent example of the perseverance, education, quality, and capability of Utah's citizens.

I refer to Ann Dautrich of Salt Lake City, who has just won this year's national writing contest of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and Dr. Don L. Lind, of Midvale, Utah, who has been named one of our astronauts for the Apollo program.

Miss Dautrich, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Dautrich, follows in the footsteps of her sister, Marilyn, who was national winner in 1965.

Ann's 1966 victory in the handicapped essay contest in these days of draft-card burnings, protest marches, and high school dropouts is refreshing representation of the many American teenagers who are not afraid to speak up for the greatness of the American way of life.

The theme of this year's essay was "What Handicapped Workers Are Contributing to My Community." I understand that in preparing the material for her winning essay, Ann interviewed several handicapped members of Salt Lake City who have surmounted their disabilities and have become leading citizens. She writes of them:

> Each might have become a potential burden to society. But with typical determination, courage, and stamina, these men have followed the examples of many disabled citizens before them and have won their private battles for success.

As for Dr. Lind, America's newest member of the astronaut team, it will be difficult indeed to find anywhere a man with more perseverance and drive. A civilian in the space program, he is a rare combination of a nuclear physicist and jet pilot. His first request to become an astronaut was turned down because he was 3 or 4 days older than the allowable limit. When the new program was announced he almost immediately telephoned the space agency, informing them he was resubmitting his application. I am told that the personnel officials screening the applicants told him, "Dr. Lind, we wondered how soon you would call."

Few Americans can claim the educational and scientific background that Dr. Lind will take with him to the space program. He is a member of the "machbusters club" the informal group of pilots who have exceeded the speed of sound. He earned a Ph. D. in physics at the University of California and is a specialist in upper air research. In addition, he served for more than 3 years as a Navy pilot and has kept up his flying as a Navy reservist while obtaining his doctorate in high energy nuclear physics.

One other sidelight to Dr. Lind's career also will interest the Senate. When he and his sister were playing along Main Street in Midvale, Utah, he often used to tell her "That's the moon up there—some day I'm going to go there."

Mr. President, it appears that his predication may not have been too far wrong.

It is highly satisfying to know that these two exceptional people are Utahans—typical of the type being produced in my State.

I would like to congratulate both of them for their accomplishments.

I also would like to ask that Miss Dautrich's winning essay and a number of editorials and newspaper articles about her and about Dr. Lind be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Handicapped Workers Are Contributing to My Community

(By Ann Dautrich)

A grenade explodes on the island of Guam and a young man can no longer see. A cannon, object of a student's curiosity, bursts, and a teenage boy faces the future with an empty sleeve. A football injury and the crippling hand of polio combine to paralyze the body of a young athlete. An enemy shell finds its mark and an American soldier loses a leg in France. A case of spinal meningitis attacks a child's delicate cranial nerves to rob him of his hearing. Five more individuals have become physically disabled.

To the great roster of over 2 million handicapped Americans, 5 more names are added. Each might have become a potential burden to society. But with typical determination, courage, and stamina, these men have followed the examples of many disabled citizens before them and have won their private battles for success. They have shown by their character, intelligence, and desire to serve that handicapped workers are contributing to a better society.

The following impressive examples show what these five men are contributing to my community. Not only are they supporting themselves and their families, but they have achieved some of the more prominent positions within the State and have still found time for community service.

Loren D. Jensen is a missile man at the Tooele Army Depot. Bilnded by an exploding grenade in 1944, he now works entirely by the touch system. Recently he was named the "zero defects worker of the month" for putting together 142 Nike-Hercules missile actuators in 30 days without a single reject. A keen mind and sensitive fingers combine to make Mr. Jensen a valuable addition to Utah's missile industry.

L. C. Romney, a victim of an exploding cannon, has only the facilities of his right arm and three fingers. But a love to serve and a positive outlook on life have made Mr. Romney a valuable contributor to the community. After spending several years as general director of the division of social service at the Salt Lake County Hospital, he devoted 19½ years to the city as a commissioner. Today, still contributing, Mr. Romney serves Utah as the Director of the Federal Housing Administration.

Paralyzed by polio and confined to a wheelchair at age 17, Keith Warshaw is efficiently fulfilling the position of head merchandiser for the Grand Central stores. Although he must meet with buyers, salesmen, and designers continually, Mr. Warshaw still has time and energy for his community. Additional skills and devotion are required for his secretarial responsibilities to the Neuman-Forum, a Catholic youth organization at the University of Utah, where he serves as bookkeeper and chairman of the fundraising committee.

An enemy shell took the left leg of Wollas Macey, an American soldier fighting in France, and left him with a partially paralyzed right leg and a body full of 27 shrapnel holes. Activated by sheer determination, Mr. Macey became general director of the Utah State Fair. Today he is employed as superintendent of the Salt Lake County Roads and Bridges Department, supervising 419 men. He also drives daily to check progression of projects in each of his 16 districts. During the summer months when flood control becomes a problem, it is not unusual for Mr. Macey to put in a 24-hour day while serving his community. And yet with his busy schedule, he still finds time to coach little league football and baseball teams.

Robert G. Sanderson has been totally deaf since the age of 11, but his mind is not hampered nor his body idle. In November of 1965, he became coordinator of the first services to the adult deaf in Utah. Serving as an interpreter and counselor, Mr. Sanderson assists the deaf with personal, financial, educational, and recreational problems. In his new position, Mr. Sanderson is helping many more handicapped persons to become valuable citizens.

The blind, the deaf, the amputees, and the disease-stricken are accepting the challenge of President Kennedy, "Every man can make a difference, and every man must try." Because their bodies are not whole, the physically disabled are more patient and more sensitive to the needs of others. Together they have proved that it is the qualities of one's character and mind over the strength of his body that determines his usefulness to society.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune, Apr. 10, 1966]

Dautrich Girls Tops in United States: Second Salt Lake City Sister Wins Writing Contest

(By Frank Hewlett)

Washington.—17-year-old Ann Dautrich of Salt Lake City, followed in the footsteps of her sister, has won this year's national writing contest of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

The Granite High School senior will receive a $1,000 award, which is contributed annually by the Disabled American Veterans.

Miss Dautrich, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Dautrich, 941 Millcreek Way (3495 Sonth), also gets a trip to the Nation's Capital to receive her award April 28 from Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey.

FIRST FOR FAMILY

Her high school will get a plaque, donated by Mrs. A. B. Cohen, Cincinnati, philanthropist, who is a member of both the President's Committee and Ohio Governor's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped.

Last year's "Ability Counts" contest was won by Miss Dautrich's sister Marilyn.

This was the first time in the 18-year history of the contest that two members of the same family have won any of the prizes.

Theme of the 1965 competition was "What Handicapped Workers Are Contributing to My Community."

Miss Dautrich reported on interviews with five handicapped persons who surmounted their disabilities to become useful members of the community.

They are Loren D. Jensen, a blind missile worker at the Tooele Army Depot; L. C. Romney, Utah Director of the Federal Housing Administration; Woolas Macey, superintendent of the Salt Lake County Roads and Bridges Department.

Keith Warshaw, head merchandiser for the Grand Central stores; Robert G. Sanderson, coordinator of services, to the adult deaf in Utah.

JUNIORS, SENIORS COMPETE

Miss Dautrich competed with juniors and seniors from public, parochial, and private schools from 49 States and territories in this year's competition.

The contest is part of the President's Committee's educational program, aimed at making persons aware of problems faced by the handicapped in obtaining employment, efforts being made to help the handicapped become contributors to the life of their communities and the admirable accomplishments of many severely disabled persons.

The contest is approved by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Catholic Educational Association.

This year's judges were Miss Marie V. Downey, managing editor of the Electrical Worker's Journal; Patrick Healy, Jr., executive director of the National League of Cities, and Robert Sherrod, editor at large of the Saturday Evening Post.

[From the Deseret (Utah) News, Apr. 5, 1966]

A VARIETY OF TITLES FOR UTAH ASTRONAUT

(By Hal Knight)

Dr. Don L. Lind, the Utah astronaut named by the U.S. space agency, is a rare combination of a nuclear physicist and a jet pilot.

One of the few civilians in the program, he was employed as a physicist at the Goddard Space Flight Center in Maryland prior to his selection by NASA.

He served for more than 3 years as a Navy pilot and has kept up his flying as a Navy reservist while obtaining a doctorate in high energy nuclear physics.

Born May 18, 1930, he attended schools in Midvale and was graduated from Jordan High School in 1948. He attended the University of Utah and then filled a mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the New England States Mission in 1950–52.

Returning to the university, he graduated in August 1953 with high honors, magna cum laude and a bachelor's degree in physics and then did postgraduate work at Brigham Young University before entering the Navy. He received his commission at the officer candidate school in Rhode Island and his pilot's wings at the Corpus Christi, Tex., flight school.

After leaving the Navy, Dr. Lind returned to the University of Utah on a fellowship for a year's graduate study in 1957–58 and then moved on to the University of California where he was associated with the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory.

He received his Ph. D. from that institution in 1964, and joined NASA soon after.

A man of many talents, Dr. Lind was active in student affairs at the University of Utah and a leading debater. Active in church affairs, he was second counselor in the mission presidency during his mission and has filled numerous ward and branch positions.

In 1956 he was first-place winner in the church playwriting contest with a work entitled "Day of Trial."

He married Kathleen Maughan, of Logan, and the couple has five children.

Dr. Lind has two sisters, one, Charlene Lind, is a teacher at BYU and the other, Kathleen, is a missionary in the Franco Belgian Mission.

[From the Deseret (Utah) News, April 6, 1966]

HOMETOWN BOY MAKES GOOD

All Utahans can take pride in the appointment of Dr. Don L. Lind as a new astronaut, one of 19 appointed this week. He is one of only three civilians in the group.

Dr. Lind is a homegrown product so far as Utah is concerned. A graduate of Jordan High School, his parents still live in Midvale. He graduated with highest honors from the University of Utah, and did graduate work there and at Brigham Young University before moving along to the University of California where he received his doctor's degree for studies in high energy nuclear physics.

Nor are his interests limited to science. He is a skilled jet pilot. He served in the Navy and is presently a lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve. A man of many parts, he served a mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, has held numerous positions of leadership, won first place honors in a churchwide playwriting contest. He is married to Kathleen Maughan of Logan, and they have five children.

Dr. Lind's first bid to be an astronaut was turned down because he was considered too old—he was 33. This second time he was accepted because he has so many outstanding qualities that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration just couldn't say no.

We congratulate Dr. Lind for his appointment, and wish for him every success. May he be the first man on the moon.

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner, Apr. 6, 1966]

UTAHAN NAMED TO U.S. MOON TEAM

Don Lind's life story is one that should be an inspiration to Americans of all ages, particularly the youngsters.

When he was only 12, he teased his younger sister, saying "I'm going to the moon some day."

This week, Dr. Don L. Lind, now 35, was picked by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to join 49 other men in training for flights to the moon and other targets in outer space.

He's the first Utahan to make the U.S. space team.

How did he succeed in getting this close to his life's goal? By careful training and perseverance. He just wouldn't give up until he made the moonbound squad of astronauts.

After graduation from college, Lind, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Leslie A. Lind of Midvale, joined the Navy. We went through flight school—and there's none tougher than the Navy's—and became a carrier-based pilot.

As a Navy flier—he's still a lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve—he qualified for membership in the informal "machbusters' club" of pilots who had exceeded the speed of sound. He's flown in excess of 1,000 miles an hour.

When Don Lind left the Navy, his eyes were still on the moon.

He earned a Ph. D. in physics at the University of California in the summer of 1964 and that August joined the civilian staff of NASA's Goddard Space Center at Silver Spring, Md., near Washington, D.C.

His specialty is upper air research. He's done experiments in many areas, including a trip a few weeks ago to Fort Churchill in northern Canada, where sounding rockets are fired into the high atmosphere.

Meantime, his name was already on record as a volunteer for space travel.

He went to the NASA Manned Space Flight Center at Houston, Tex., more than 3 years ago, before any civilians had been selected for flight crews. He told officials then that the day was coming when they would need scientists to explore the moon.

A few scientists were selected last year but Dr. Lind was a few days too old to qualify on the initial selections.

This year, when a new call was put out, he got in touch with NASA's Houston staff immediately. The man who answered laughed, saying "we wondered how soon you'd call, Dr. Lind."

This time, he made it. He'll soon move his wife—and the former Kathleen Maughn of Logan—and five children to Texas to begin his lunar training.

The dreams that Utah's Don Lind had more than 20 years ago of flying to the moon will soon come true. This scientist-pilot certainly has the right qualifications.

DEDICATION OF NEW OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH FACILITY ON POINT LOMA, CALIF.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly of a most fitting dedication that has come to my attention.

On March 25, 1966, the University of California's Board of Regents named a new oceanographic research facility on Point Loma, off San Diego, after the late Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

This 6-acre, $1 million facility is considered to be one of the most advanced installations in the world for the study of the sea and the distribution of plant and aquatic animal life.

The new facility, which will be operated by the Scripps Institute of Oceanography, will include a 320-foot floating pier, a 150-foot wharf, and administration and staging building, maintenance and electronic shops, and a warehouse. It will be the home port for many research and training vessels, which already include the *Alpha-Helix*, an ocean going biological laboratory, and the *Thomas Washington*, a research vessel.

Mr. President, I can think of no one more appropriate than the late Admiral Nimitz, a former regent of the University of California and a great naval officer, to be honored by the operation of this new advancement in the exploration of the sea, which we all know to possess vast treasures of unknown wealth.

Also, Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to a column which appeared in the Navy Times concerning what I feel is an excellent and timely proposal by Congressman BOB WILSON, of San Diego to name a nuclear carrier for Fleet Admiral Nimitz. This certainly deserves the consideration of the Congress and would be a fitting and appropriate tribute to this distinguished naval officer. I ask unanimous consent that the attached article be inserted in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Mar. 28, 1966]

CARRIER FOR NIMITZ

(NOTE.—The Navy Times comments on the proposal to name a nuclear carrier for Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.)

There is no question but that the Navy will name a ship for Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz. The other fleet admirals and the deceased four-star fleet commanders of World War II have already been so honored.

Representative Bob Wilson, of California, wants to name the nuclear carrier in the 1967 budget before Congress for Admiral Nimitz—"the man who made the aircraft carrier a potent and formidable element in sea warfare."

Certainly, so far as carrier names go, there is no reason why this should not be done. Though carriers used to be named for great battles or historic ships, such names as "Kitty Hawk" and "Shangri-La" also have crept in and three already have been named for people: Roosevelt, Forrestal, and Kennedy. And to stretch a point, so has *Bon Homme Richard*.

And, though by hitting the history books, one might come up with some names as illustrious as that of Nimitz, we ourselves can't think of any persons who are more outstanding.

So Congress and the Navy should give careful consideration to Mr. Wilson's proposal.

CIA INVOLVEMENT WITH A MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY PROJECT IN VIETNAM FROM 1955 TO 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, my statement concerning reported CIA involvement with a Michigan State University project in Vietnam from 1955 to 1959, which I made in a speech in Oklahoma last Saturday noon, followed a refusal of CIA to discuss this matter with me in private.

After my Saturday statement, I was contacted by Adm. William F. Raborn, CIA Director, with whom I conversed about it, and who, thereafter, sent CIA officials to discuss it with me privately in my office this afternoon.

I expressed to them my strong conviction that university research projects abroad should in no wise have any connection with CIA activities, so that there could be no misunderstanding that research in the social and behavioral science fields, particularly, is unpressured and unconnected with political ends.

I was given the explanation of the Michigan State University situation substantially as was stated today by Senator Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, in the Senate.

I will continue to be very much interested in the future in the freedom of university research from political or other extraneous entanglements.

SUPPORT IN BRITAIN FOR THE AMERICAN COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, demonstrations in foreign capitals have often left the impression that intellectuals, students, and other leaders of opinion in Europe and Asia do not support the American commitment in Vietnam.

Likewise, demonstrations in this country have led observers abroad to believe that opinion here is sharply divided and, in the long run, might stimulate a weakening of determination to maintain a firm position.

Neither view is valid, for informed opinion abroad is no more represented by demonstrations and teach-ins than is informed opinion in this country.

James Fletcher, an American professor studying in England at Oxford University, points out that British opinion over the past year has changed significantly. In a recent article in the National Review, he wrote:

> The consensus in British intellectual circles has changed. A year ago the attitude of the British academic or clergyman or lawyer was likely to be one of despairing disapproval of American intervention in what was thought to be a civil war. Today many of the same people grudgingly acknowledge that the fight has to be made and that civil war is a term that cannot be applied to the externally directed Vietcong subversion.

In his article Mr. Fletcher quotes extensively from such British observers as Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart, P. J. Honey, reader in Vietnamese affairs at the University of London, and Michael Wall of the Manchester Guardian.

Mr. Wall has, states the author of this article, significantly changed the approach taken by the Guardian, which had previously been critical of American efforts in Vietnam.

In the Guardian of January 25, 1966, Wall wrote the following:

> If indeed the struggle is for liberation why has there been no uprising on a national scale by a proud and highly intelligent people? Why have all attempts to paralyze Saigon by strike action dismally failed? Why has the Vietnamese Army continued the struggle after appalling losses and moreover still manages to attract volunteers? * * * Those people who understand what communism is are not attracted by its ideology and are repelled by its methods. They do not believe the lot of those in North Vietnam is better than their own.

I wish to share this interesting and important analysis with my colleagues, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

British Support on Vietnam?

(By James Fletcher)

(Note.—In 8 months' time British opinion on what is going on in Vietnam has changed. Today, they buy the American thesis of Communist aggression.)

One of the tasks sometimes assigned to U.S. citizens living abroad by their Embassy is defending American foreign policy. In England, the organizing body is the U.S. Information Service, situated in the eagle-topped Embassy in Grosvenor Square. Because the USIS is particularly eager to keep relations between Britain and the United States as close as possible, the number of speakers sent out from London in any one week may be quite large. Most of them receive no pay, being recruited for trainfare to fill engagements which cannot be filled by Embassy officials for reasons of manpower or of discretion. A Rhodes scholar may address an organization of retired civil servants on "The Structure of American Government." Or a Fulbright lecturer may discuss the race problem before a women's club in Durham. The operation is a large one and the results cannot be estimated because so many variables are involved.

My own initiation into the role of unofficial spokesman came in late January. The topic was Vietnam and the program a BBC-TV educational venture called "Spotlight." Two or three of my colleagues on the list from which the BBC eventually got my name specialized in foreign affairs, but with the reticence displayed by most American academics they refused to be involved in anything so damaging as defending American foreign policy. So the task fell to me.

"Spotlight" reaches 10,000 schools, once in a live broadcast and once in a recorded relay the next morning. The audience at home receives the program too, the main viewers being housewives eager for a half-hour of education in world affairs or social issues. The schoolchildren viewing have a background lecture beforehand and a discussion period afterward, the program being the focal point of the afternoon. The responsibility of the speakers is, therefore, a large one, and their success depends on their working out a style that will be comprehensible to 15-year-old students (pretty bright) and not condescending to a somewhat self-conscious at-home audience.

I learned later that I was supposed to have spoken well at a Commonwealth conference on race relations, of which I had never heard and in which I had certainly never participated. This eloquent nonappearance, the sources of which I know nothing earned me some little reputation as an authority on international affairs. I accepted the BBC's invitation and set about doing my homework on southeast Asia.

Getting ready proved quite illuminating. The most surprising thing about preparing a defense of American policy in southeast Asia is the ready supply of original sources in England. A large body of useful information may be had quite easily—and most of it bears out the view of the war held by most Americans.

As I delved into the available materials on the Vietnam conflict, I began to discover a subtle change that has taken place in the British attitude toward the Vietnam war in the last 8 months. Two positions have remained consistent: the Labor government has given the United States strong moral support and kept its own leftwing quiet (well, fairly quiet), and the public at large has not cared about Vietnam at all. (The ignominious showing in the Hull North by-election of the Radical Alliance candidate, who opposed British support of the American commitment, demonstrated not so much an endorsement of the Government's foreign policy as a complete lack of interest by the voters in southeast Asia.) But the consensus in British intellectual circles has changed. A year ago the attitude of the British academic or clergyman or lawyer was likely to be one of despairing disapproval of American intervention in what was thought to be a civil war. Today many of the same people grudgingly acknowledge that the fight has to be made and that "civil war" is a term that cannot be applied to the externally directed Vietcong subversion.

At Oxford I had heard of the Foreign Secretary's speech the previous summer. Michael Stewart spoke at the Oxford Union, and everyone admitted he had made a good defense of the war against the Vietcong. But the atmosphere was a hostile one. This teach-in was only one of many, and Americans who feel strongly about their commitment to the independence of South Vietnam can be thankful for once that the forums have existed. In England, where a fair amount of commonsense and a certain degree of skepticism can be counted as typical mental attributes, the teach-ins work very much against their organizers. Few of the confrontations held since last June have given much comfort to the supporters of American withdrawal. In many cases sponsorship is falling to the supporters of the American position.

Just how much things were changing in the autumn could be seen in the controversies that raged in the newspapers and scholarly journals of the period. "Encounter," for example, a fairly safe index of informed opinion, suggested the divisions in the academic camp. In October I read an article by Richard Lowenthal; my main reaction was boredom. Much of what Lowenthal said was old hat—the usual assertions about Vietnam (misunderstanding of the Geneva agreement of 1954, belief in the peaceful intentions of China) without supporting facts.

But in the best tradition of English controversialism, retribution came swiftly. Since I had been led to believe that the English as a people think like the American left, I was surprised and pleased to find two telling refutations of Lowenthal's meanderings. One was a letter from an Indian, Sibnarayan Ray, a member of the Department of Indian Studies at the University of Melbourne. Ray concentrated on dissecting the assumption that the intentions of Communist China are peaceful. His arguments gain force from his nationality and his geographical situation. No Indian can ever let the intentions of Red China—revealed so clearly in the past few years—be easily overlooked; no one living in Australia can avoid sobering thoughts about the rapacious enemy to the north.

The other answer to Lowenthal came from P. J. Honey, reader in Vietnamese Affairs at the University of London. Honey's name was vaguely familiar to me; he had participated in one or two teach-ins and was respected by his opponents. He speaks Vietnamese, unlike most critics of U.S. policy, and has lived in Vietnam. Honey's debater's points are scored by firsthand information: he asserts most Vietnamese are grateful to the Americans who are defending them; he notes that the Vietcong have no real existence as a national movement; and he corrects many of the misassumptions about the Geneva agreements. Lowenthal's reply, which appeared in January, dealt mainly with other critics, not with Honey, whose facts were unassailable.

Strangely enough, though, the most useful preparation I had for "Spotlight" was reading the Guardian. During the peace offensive of late December and January, it had been a constant delight to read Victor Zorza, the house Kremlinologist. Zorza's method is to read the Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi papers and to draw conclusions. The method in itself is a fine one, but Zorza's conclusions provoke only amusement. Most of January was spent finding hints of peace in the Hanoi press: as the other English papers dutifully reported the increasing numbers of men and supplies being sent into South Vietnam from the north, Zorza squirmed day after day to show how the influx was dwindling, all on the evidence that sources in Hanoi had begun to deny North Vietnam was supplying the Vietcong at all. But came mid-January and with it a new approach by Michael Wall.

Wall serves as a roving foreign correspondent for the Guardian. According to Wall, the Vietnamese see the Vietcong as a menace, not as a deliverance. The headlines alone indicate how much the Guardian's readers may have been surprised in recent weeks: "Saigon sees Vietcong increasingly dependent on terrorism" and "U.S. marines winning battle for trust of villagers." A number of people whose political allegiances are at best ambivalent have been having second thoughts over their morning coffee. By January 24, Wall's reports from Saigon had begun to take their toll on the editorial page; Guardian comments have become more guarded and Vietnam editorials sometimes take second place. The change has been brought about by Wall's voluminous body of facts and his skillful use of them.

I came to "Spotlight" feeling that I was very much part of the movement of thought. My opponent in the debate that took up part of the program—a lecturer in political science from Bristol University—sensed, I think, that his own position is shakier than it was several months ago. Like many other British leftists, he pins his hopes on a change of opinion in the United States. It would be a tragedy of major proportions if the case for the American commitment in South Vietnam were to receive less than its due on its home ground while it fares better and better abroad. I suspect, though, that a failure of conviction will not beset the United States in the near future. One of the reasons may be the good materials that dispassionate English skeptics like Wall and Honey provide for the debate.

THE BRITISH SPEAK OUT ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

"The only proposal for settling this problem that has come from North Vietnam and her allies is that first, before any conferences or discussion, all U.S. troops shall leave, and secondly, that the affairs of Vietnam shall be settled in accordance with the principles of the Fatherland Front in the north and the Liberation Front in the south, that is to say, in accordance with the principles of the Communists and the Communists only * * *. It is no good, honorable members, disagreeing with me on this because North Vietnam itself makes no secret of this. This was plainly stated by the Prime Giap. It was plainly stated by the Prime Minister of North Vietnam. It has been publicized in the Peking People's Daily. This is the Communist program. I believe that if we were to say: we will surrender completely to this demand, you would have shown to all the world that a Communist aggression can succeed and you would have caused the very gravest alarm and concern to every non-Communist country in Asia."—from a speech by Michael Stewart, the British Foreign Secretary, at the Oxford Union Society, June 16, 1965.

"It is strange, but true, that perhaps the only country in the world in which the indigenous nature of the Vietcong and its political arm, the National Liberation Front (NLF), commands no credibility at all is South Vietnam. The publicly named leaders of the NLF are held in South Vietnam to be incompetent and insignificant persons who have never achieved anything of note in the past * * *. Only the use of threat or force has been effective in securing cooperation from the South Vietnamese people. The Vietcong movement has never enjoyed a broad basis of popular support in South Vietnam and does not do so today."—P. J. Honey, "Vietnam Argument," Encounter, November 1965.

"One of the most astounding aspects of the South Vietnam situation in the estimation of observers here is that the Communists have not already achieved their aim of taking over the whole of South Vietnam. If indeed the struggle is for liberation why has there been no uprising on a national scale by a proud and highly intelligent people? Why have all attempts to paralyze Saigon by strike action dismally failed? Why has the Vietnamese Army continued the struggle after appalling losses and moreover still manages to attract volunteers?

"These are among the questions that drum though the minds of newcomers to the Vietnam scene. The answers certainly do not lie in any devotion to the successive Saigon governments, in any wish to defend what has been a corrupt, inefficient administration, nor in any desire to adhere to the so-called Western way of life. The answer commonly given is that the war is understood to be what it is—a Communist attempt to unify Vietnam under Communist administration—and the majority of people here are ready to fight to prevent its success. Those people who understand what communism is are not attracted by its ideology and are repelled by its methods. They do not believe the lot of those in North Vietnam is better than their own."—Michael Wall, Guardian, January 25, 1966.

"The people in the village are beginning to learn that if they are in real trouble they can 'turn to the marines.' This was how the U.S. marine company commander saw the beginnings of another small victory—not in terms of ground captured or enemy killed, but because some simple villagers were hesitantly starting to trust him and his men * * *.

"We found countless cases of marines writing home to their families for toys and clothes to be sent out for the children, and of marines buying clothes for poor families. On Da Nang waterfront where two young marines keep a 24-hour radio vigil, three orphan children were sharing their tent with them. A colored soldier has applied to adopt the boy, a bright 12-year-old, and is already spending $28 a month to clothe, feed, and educate him * * *.

"For the politicians and the generals the war here is complex enough. For the ordinary soldier it is deeply perplexing. To be expected to kill and to risk being killed and at the same time to be an ambassador of goodwill and a social worker among the people one is killing is to ask a good deal. From what I have seen of the American marines in the field they seem to be attempting, and indeed achieving, something which has never been demanded of soldiers before."—Michael Wall, Guardian, February 7, 1966.

THE CHALLENGE OF WORLD HUNGER

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging aspects of our growing national awareness of the problem of world hunger is the interest which our food processing industry has taken in doing its part to alleviate human suffering. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the March edition of the Minneapolis Grain Exchange News be printed in the RECORD. This article is entitled "The Challenge of World Hunger," and it is taken from an address by Mr. R. Hal Dean, president of the Ralston Purina Co., to the 20th Annual Farm Forum in Minneapolis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Grain Exchange News, March 1966]

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The challenge of world hunger is a growing concern in every nation on earth. It is a moral and political issue of grave importance in the affluent societies. There is little doubt that if it were not for the war in Asia, the challenge of world hunger would be the gravest international concern today. So spoke R. Hal Dean, president of the Ralston Purina Co. at the 20th annual Farm Forum in Minneapolis this month. The following article contains excerpts of Mr. Dean's speech.)

THE CHALLENGE OF WORLD HUNGER

The world food dilemma which is being experienced today in the developing or emerging nations, and which will continue in the future, is usually related to the nation's ability to produce foodstuffs. It is considered essentially a production problem. At this time, and possibly for years to come, the problem is not only one of production but one of distribution in its broadest economic terms. It is one which requires a total program.

The President of the United States, in his recent message to Congress on "Food for Freedom," suggested that the key to victory over hunger in all nations is self-help. He pointed out that the developing countries must make basic improvements in their own agriculture. He suggested they must bring the great majority of their people who now live in rural areas into the market economy. He indicated that the farmer must be made a better customer of urban industry so that economic development may be accelerated.

In discussing the total program two points must be made. First, there is no easy solution for private industry, for government, or for international agencies in promoting agricultural self-help in developing countries. We cannot paint another country, which has its own peculiar geographic, political, and economic characteristics with the American free enterprise brush and expect another United States of America to emerge. It is essential that the individual problems be identified and the broad concepts and fundamentals be applied.

The second point: The free enterprise system is the major ingredient in the formula necessary to meet the challenge of world hunger. Russia has reached Venus, but where are its food surpluses? Free enterprise methods must always be specifically adapted, not adopted, to fit the unique situations of each region.

THE EXPERIENCE IN COLOMBIA

Ralston Purina today has commercial mixed feed manufacturing plants throughout the Western Hemisphere. Including genetic breeding operations, processing plants, fish canneries, fish meal plants, and receiving stations. Purina's work with agriculture and food production reaches to 40 different countries. All of them represent different private enterprise self-help programs at various stages of development.

The South American country of Colombia, with variations, has the same sort of case history as the other overseas operations. Purina's experience in Colombia, though, provides an example of the problems faced by private enterprise and government and illustrates the need to develop distribution and production simultaneously.

The beginning: The need for more and lower cost meat, milk, and eggs in Colombia was, and is, obvious. The company's first move was to establish one feed mill. A sales organization was formed at the same time, led by trained Purina people. They had the dual role of teaching the local salesmen to become a sort of extension service specialist to the farmer, while also developing a dealer distribution organization of Colombian businessmen.

Resources: Very soon after production and distribution of the feed product was underway, it was clearly evident that the mill was competing for raw materials, specifically corn, with the human population. In search for a different carbohydrate source, the local capabilities for producing milo were investigated. The development of sorghum production had been easy until the harvest of the first crop. The Colombian farmer, though, lost interest at once because there was no marketplace where he could turn his crop into cash.

In order to achieve success in expanding the milo crop the feed mill guaranteed a cash market to the farmer at the time of harvest for his total production. Crop production was augmented by importing selected hybrid seed and financing this seed to the farmer.

Marketing: The growth and development of food production in Colombia is hamstrung by lack of transport and inadequate storage facilities. The private enterprise system, functioning in a developing country, must have the properly oriented help of governmental funds. Often private enterprise cannot afford the investment of massive building programs in these areas. The Colombian Government and the U.S. aid program have tackled, and are tackling, these problems. This serves as an excellent example of the need for coordinated effort between government and private enterprise.

Education: The Purina sales organization, utilizing vast quantities of films, educational programs, and other training devices, produced in Spanish, carried agricultural education to the consumers of animal and poultry feeds, and education on business management and marketing methods to the Colombian dealers.

The broad and practical education program is typical of the unique ability of free enterprise to extend self-help to agriculture in other countries. The fact that it is profit motivated makes it all the more effective at all levels.

As these broad education efforts met with some success they created a new business opportunity for farmers in Colombia in the production of poultry and animals in larger quantity. The distribution production problems that arose were solved by taking advantage of the existing feed organization.

Once again it was clear that the farmer could be educated to produce and could increase his efficiency rather quickly. Soon there was more production than the limited marketing facilities could produce but at this point it was not necessary for Purina to make an investment in a business. The investment instead was education, advice, and persuasion to Colombian businessmen.

Every business decision of this nature came about as a result of need. Each of them relates to the challenge of world hunger. Each decision was aimed at balancing some segment of production and distribution that was temporarily out of adjustment in the developing country.

American agriculture not only has the opportunity but the definite responsibility to carry this knowledge into the developing countries. This responsibility is rooted in the moral and political considerations and in the long-term survival of our own way of life.

"Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man how to fish and you feed him for a lifetime."

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had intended to discuss the pending joint resolution, which proposes a vital constitutional amendment, known as the Dirksen amendment, in much greater detail during this debate than I am able to do in view of the unanimous consent agreement adopted without notice, without my knowledge, and without my approval on Wednesday afternoon of last week. Since I am not able, under the time situation now existing, to speak at length on the pending business, I shall confine myself to the discussion of three points which seem to me to be so compelling that they should be in the mind of every Senator and in the public mind as our people consider this highly important matter.

My first point is that the decision of the majority of the Supreme Court in the Alabama reapportionment case of Reynolds against Sims is the outstanding and the most dangerous decision of the Supreme Court in asserting a new and, I feel, a highly dangerous philosophy which has been adopted by a majority of that Court in recent years. The majority of the Court in most of its decisions on this point successfully avoids any clear statement of its new philosophy as well as any adequate discussion of the historical background of the 14th amendment. Perhaps the nearest approach to discussion by a majority of the Court as to what its new philosophy really means appears in the opinion of the Court delivered by Mr. Justice Douglas on March 24, 1966, in which the Court declared unconstitutional the poll tax of the Commonwealth of Virginia in its application to State and local elections. In speaking for the six members of the Court who joined in knocking out the Virginia poll tax of $1.50 per year as a prerequisite for voting in State and local elections, Mr. Justice Douglas stated the present philosophy of the majority of the Court in the following words:

> Likewise, the Equal Protection Clause is not shackled to the political theory of a particular era. In determining what lines are unconstitutionally discriminatory, we have never been confined to historic notions of equality, any more than we have restricted due process to a fixed catalogue of what was at a given time deemed to be the limits of fundamental rights. See *Malloy* v. *Hogan*, 378 U.S. 1, 5–6. Notions of what constitutes equal treatment for purposes of the Equal Protection Clause *do* change. This Court in 1896 held that laws providing for separate public facilities for white and Negro citizens did not deprive the latter of the equal protection and treatment that the 14th Amendment commands. *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537. Seven of the eight Justices then sitting subscribed to the Court's opinion, thus joining in expressions of what constituted unequal and discriminatory treatment that sound strange to a contemporary ear. When, in 1954—more than a half century later—we repudiated the separate-but-equal doctrine of *Plessy* as respects public education we stated: "In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the Amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written.

I repeat that the clearest statement which I have found of this new and dangerous philosophy of the Court is that of Mr. Justice Douglas, as above quoted, appearing in the opinion of the Court in the Virginia poll tax case. He could not more clearly advise our Nation that the doctrine of stare decisis is dead and that uncertainty as to what the Constitution means must now become the order of the day.

The dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Black in that same case includes a repudiation of this new doctrine of the Court in its closing paragraph which I quote in part as follows:

> For Congress to do this (meaning the passage of specific legislation to protect 14th Amendment rights) fits in precisely with the division of powers originally entrusted to the three branches of Government—Executive, Legislative, and Judicial. But for us to undertake in the guise of constitutional interpretation to decide the constitutional policy question of this case amounts, in my judgment, to a plain exercise of power which the Constitution has denied us but has specifically granted to Congress. I cannot join in holding that the Virginia state poll tax law violates the Equal Protection Clause.

If there is a friend of voting without a poll tax, it is Mr. Justice Black, and he made clear his horror at the adoption of this new philosophy by the majority of the Court.

In the same Virginia poll tax case, Mr. Justice Harlan—joined by Mr. Justice Stewart—in his dissenting opinion calls attention to the danger of this radical new philosophy of the majority of the Court in following words:

> The final demise of state poll taxes, already totally proscribed by the Twenty-fourth Amendment with respect to federal elections and abolished by the states themselves in all but four states with respect to state elections, is perhaps in itself not of great moment. But the fact that the *coup de grace* has been administered by this Court instead of being left to the affected states or to the federal political process should be a matter of continuing concern to all interested in maintaining the proper role of this tribunal under our scheme of government.
>
> I do not propose to retread ground covered in my dissents in *Reynolds* v. *Sims,* 377, U.S. 533, 589, and *Carrington* v. *Rash,* 380 U.S. 89, 97, and will proceed on the premise that the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment now reaches both state apportionment (*Reynolds*) and voter-qualification (*Carrington*) cases. My disagreement with the present decision is that in holding the Virginia poll tax violative of the Equal Protection Clause the Court has departed from long-established standards governing the application of that clause.

In the same dissenting opinion Mr. Justice Harlan later said:

> Property and poll-tax qualifications, very simply, are not in accord with current egalitarian notions of how a modern democracy should be organized. It is of course entirely fitting that legislatures should modify the law to reflect such changes in popular attitudes. However, it is all wrong, in my view, for the Court to adopt the political doctrines popularly accepted at a particular moment of our history and to declare all others to be irrational and invidious, barring them from the range of choice by reasonably minded people acting through the political process.

I feel that the most compelling statement in repudiation of this new philosophy of the majority of the Court is found in the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan in the case of Reynolds against Sims—referred to by him in the earlier statement above quoted—which reads as follows:

> Finally, these decisions give support to a current mistaken view of the Constitution and the constitutional function of this Court. This view, in a nutshell, is that every major social ill in this country can find its cure in some constitutional "principle," and that this Court should "take the lead" in promoting reform when other branches of government fail to act. The Constitution is not a panacea for every blot upon the public welfare, nor should this Court, ordained as a judicial body, be thought of as a general haven for reform movements. The Constitution is an instrument of government, fundamental to which is the premise that in a diffusion of governmental authority lies the greatest promise that this Nation will realize liberty for all its citizens. This Court, limited in function in accordance with that premise, does not serve its high purpose when it exceeds its authority, even to satisfy justified impatience with the slow workings of the political process. For when, in the name of constitutional interpretation, the Court *adds* something to the Constitution that was deliberately excluded from it, the Court in reality substitutes its view of what should be so for the amending process.

My second point, which follows closely the first, is that the control of apportionment of the State legislatures by the Federal courts as laid down by Reynolds against Sims and other cases which have followed, wholly fails to provide the necessary certainty and stability as to the membership of both houses of the legislature which will serve the interests of sound government in each State. I have already quoted heretofore from Mr. Justice Douglas in his statement that the Supreme Court which handed down the decision in the Plessy case in 1896 was reversed and repudiated by the Supreme Court which handed down the decision in the Brown case of 1954. In other words, though the wording of the Constitution had not changed in any respect—not by a single word—the philosophy and decision of the membership of the Supreme Court in 1954 had so changed from that existing in 1896 that a diametrically opposite ruling was issued by the Court, thus substituting for the separate but equal doctrine the present decision requiring integration of the public schools.

In the same way, the Supreme Court in the Virginia poll tax case specifically repudiated its earlier decisions upholding the right of the States to require the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting in State and local elections. Likewise, in the reapportionment cases, the Supreme Court again acknowledged that it was repudiating by its latest and present doctrine the decision of earlier Supreme Courts of just a few years before. There are other instances which I could cite, but I think these three are sufficient to establish the point I am making that even the Supreme Court itself has shown that it changes at will its ruling as to the meaning of important constitutional provisions, particularly in the interpretation of the 14th amendment, thus allowing little hope of stability in the important matter of distribution of seats in both houses of a bicameral State legislature and in the single house of a unicameral legislature.

After all, the Justices of the Supreme Court are only human and they change their minds on important questions. An important instance of this is shown in the "about face" of Mr. Chief Justice Warren on legislative reapportionment. In 1948 as Governor of California, he believed in the traditional system—in 1964 as Chief Justice of the United States he wrote the decision of the Court in Reynolds against Sims overruling his earlier conviction and declaring the present unfortunate interpretation of the 14th Amendment, applying the so-called one-man, one-vote principle to both houses of the State legislatures. I do not question his sincerity. I merely call attention to his change of conviction so that he brought about, with others, the complete change of a longstanding interpretation of the 14th Amendment and the repudiation of his earlier conviction. What could be more disturbing of the permanence, the soundness, the stability of our State governments and the prosperity of our citizens than to have such a situation become the permanent law of this land?

The very fact that the present Supreme Court, itself, has been divided in the reapportionment cases and in the Virginia poll tax case, shows that a relatively small change of membership in the Court and the span of a few short years may easily result in changed interpretations of the 14th Amendment and in an additional change or repeated changes in the application of Federal constitutional law to legislative apportionment in the several States.

But the instability which is already present is much greater than that which results from the facts which I have just stated relative to the Supreme Court. In my own State, the State of Florida, we have had two recent illustrations of the instability of any legislative setup which is based on Federal court decisions. On two occasions within the last few years, indeed since September 1962, decisions in Florida of three-judge district courts of the highest reputation on reapportionment formulas have been reversed and rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court. In each case the three-judge district court had approved a reapportionment program worked out by the Legislature of Florida which in each case was rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court. Meanwhile, time had passed, legislative problems were clouded by uncertainty, the eligibility of many citizens to run for legislative office was questionable, and the whole result has weakened State government and loss of confidence by citizens of my State in both the State government and the Federal judicial processes.

When it is remembered that this same possibility exists as to every State that is now affected by the Supreme Court reapportionment decisions—meaning a large majority of all the States—at this very time, and that all States are affected again and in a different way after every decennial census in the future so long as the present ruling continues to prevail, it must be realized how serious a blow to the stability of our State governments and our Federal courts is present and will continue to be present so long as we tolerate the present conditions.

Still another difficulty is presented in this same field when we recall that questions which must be determined ultimately by the courts under the existing system are frequently questions which should not be decided by judges and many of which cannot properly be decided by judges. On this point I think it is appropriate to quote again from the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan in the case of Reynolds against Sims. Mr. Justice Harlan said:

> It should by now be obvious that these cases do not mark the end of reapportionment problems in the courts. Predictions once made that the courts would never have to face the problem of actually working out an apportionment have proved false. This Court, however, continues to avoid the consequences of its decisions, simply assuring us that the lower courts "can and * * * will work out more concrete and specific standards," * * *. Deeming it "expedient" not to spell out "precise and constitutional tests," the Court contents itself with stating "only a few rather general considerations."
>
> Generalities cannot obscure the cold truth that cases of this type are not amenable to the development of judicial standards. No set of standards can guide a court which has to decide how many legislative districts a State shall have, or what the shape of the districts shall be, or where to draw a particular district line. No judicially manageable standard can determine whether a State should have single-member districts or multimember districts or some combination of both. No such standard can control the balance between keeping up with population shifts and having stable districts. In all these respects, the courts will be called upon to make particular decisions with respect to which a principle of equally populated districts will be of no assistance whatsoever. Quite obviously, there are limitless possibilities for districting consistent with such a principle. Nor can these problems be avoided by judicial reliance on legislative judgments so far as possible. Reshaping or combining one or two districts, or modifying just a few district lines, is no less a matter of choosing among many possible solutions, with varying political consequences, than reapportionment broadside.

I wonder if our friends who oppose the pending resolution realize that if the present situation continues it will not be many months or years before Federal district courts or even the U.S. Supreme Court itself will be charged with having gerrymandered legislative districts in some States or in many States and with having done all sorts of political things in fixing legislative district lines which may not please the State or large groups of citizens therein even though the action of the courts may have been based on good conscience and the best information available. Surely we shall be asking for confusion worse confounded if we permit the present well intended, but ill advised, impractical, and unsound philosophy of the Supreme Court to prevail and become a fixed part, at least for an indefinite time, of the constitutional foundation upon which this Nation is based. The Federal courts are even now rapidly approaching the "political thicket" against which the late Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter warned them so clearly when they were considering an earlier case in which the Federal courts were invited to take jurisdiction of State reapportionment cases.

Is there great value, as we have always thought, in having a written Constitution with fixed standards which would assure us greater stability than that possessed by other nations? Or shall we become the laughingstock of legal scholars throughout the world by approving the continuance of the present governing philosophy by which the Court will be allowed to exercise power which the Constitution has denied it but has specifically granted to Congress? Shall we deliberately encourage a permanent condition in which the changing personnel and changing philosophy of the majority of the Supreme Court may allow an important constitutional provision to have entirely different meanings, from time to time, bringing about profound changes in a highly important branch of the State governments and utmost confusion among our citizens? Or, more generally, shall we approve the ultraliberal philosophy as stated by Mr. Justice Harlan "that every major social ill in this country can find its cure in some constitutional principle" and that the Supreme Court should "take the lead in promoting reform when other branches of government fail to act"?

Mr. President, my third point is that there is no sound reason whatsoever to deprive a majority of the people in each of the many States which have large undeveloped areas from adopting a formula of apportionment of the membership of one house of their legislature which will give effective local representation to the outlying and relatively undeveloped and sparsely settled areas of their State. The decision would of course be made by the whole voting population of the State. The history of our Nation from its very beginning and down to this very time shows clearly that our people have always recognized the need to allow for local representation of residents of the undeveloped areas and to encourage such areas to greater development not only in their own interest but in the interest of the State as a whole.

Perhaps the latest evidence of this appears in the State constitutions of Alaska and Hawaii which have been adopted in relatively recent years and which represent the thinking of the people in those two new States—our 49th and our 50th—as to how best to encourage the development of their areas which require impetus toward greater development.

In Alaska, whose area is more than twice as great as Texas, the State constitution, adopted in 1956, embraces the population concept for the distribution of members in the house of representatives, but not so as to the senate. In the senate the constitution of Alaska provides for a membership of 20 senators distributed by districts in such a way as to allow local representation in the senate for all areas of the State. This was the latest and perhaps the last pioneer State to be admitted to our Union and it should be very clear from looking at the provisions of the State constitution that the people in that State did not want to provide for a control of the State senate by the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, which have more than half of the population of the State, but instead recognized the need for direct representation for the outlying, sparsely populated areas of Alaska. The Congress showed no disposition whatever to interfere with that philosophy and there is every evidence in connection with the admission of Alaska that the longtime and traditional philosophy of our people prevailed again there in insisting that the pioneering people should have representation by their own neighbors whom they could reach with relative ease and who understood their problems, their industries, and their ambitions for greater development.

In Hawaii, the State constitution, framed in 1950, embraces the population concept for membership in the house but not so as to the senate. The constitution provides for 25 members of the senate of whom 13 are to come from the city and county of Honolulu, that is the Island of Oahu, that has four-fifths of the population of the State, or a little more than four-fifths.

The other 12 members of the senate are scattered by the constitution among the other three counties comprising all of the other islands of the State which have among them only one-fifth or less of the population of the State so as to allow for local representation of the people on all the populated islands without requiring them to travel great distances by water to confer with their State senator. The value in representation by a local senator, with knowledge of local problems, who is accessible to his constituents and who understands their ambitions for growth and development, is thus recognized in the provisions of the constitution of Hawaii. Why should not the people of the States of Alaska and Hawaii have the continuing right to apportion one house of their legislature so as to give this kind of recognition and representation to their outlying, sparsely populated and difficult to reach areas?

This same situation applies in varying degrees to many of the older States but I shall mention only three: the States of Arizona, Nevada, and Colorado.

In the State of Arizona, more than half of the population resides in the county of Maricopa, where the city of Phoenix is located. The State is a large one, with many outlying areas which have great potentiality for development of their resources and for increase of their population. Why should the people of Arizona be deprived of the privilege of deciding in their own discretion in a statewide referendum—as they have already decided, heretofore—that they wish to have the people of their outlying areas, far distant from Phoenix, personally represented in one house of the State legislature? Are those Senators who oppose the pending amendment unwilling to allow the people of the State of Arizona to make such a decision if they wish to do so and regard such a decision to be in their own interest and in the interest of better government and speedier development of their own State?

Or let us look at the State of Nevada where much more than half of the people of the State live in the counties in which the cities of Las Vegas and Reno are located. Nevada has been a State more than 100 years and yet there are areas of that good State which are not largely developed and in which the population is still scattered. Who would deprive the citizens of Nevada, including those who live in Las Vegas and Reno, from deciding—as they have heretofore decided—that it is in the interest of their State and all its people to encourage quicker and greater development of the outlying areas by allowing them to have direct representation in one house of the Nevada Legislature? This is substantially the philosophy that has prevailed in this State since it was admitted to statehood and there is no reason whatever why the good people who are there now should not be allowed to make their own decision as to the distribution of membership in one house of their legislature. I am perfectly willing to leave it to them to chart their course of action in this matter. Why is it that there are Members of the Senate who are unwilling to do so?

In the State of Colorado the physical situation is such as to make it quite difficult for the people in one valley to reach nearby people in other valleys because of the height and rugged quality of the mountains. And so the people of this State have repeatedly shown their preference by allowing the scattered population in mountain valleys to have direct representation in one house of their legislature. Is it not in the American tradition to allow them in their own judgment the right to make a decision in this matter and to adopt that course which they think is fairer to all of their people and best calculated to promote speedier development in areas which are not yet greatly developed or heavily populated? I would like to see them have that continuing right. I hate to think that the present passion for Federal control, which seems to dominate so many of our friends, should be allowed to preclude the good people of Colorado, including those who live in the great city of Denver, from deciding that it is to their own best interests to allow direct representation in one house of their legislature to even the people residing in the remote mountain valleys.

The more I think of this problem the more it seems to me that those who support the present decision of the Supreme Court are turning their backs on the whole course of history during the phenomenal development of this country. Our Nation has never imposed a head count in determining whether we should give birth to a new State, allowing it to have equal representation in the U.S. Senate with our most populous States. During the Civil War, which was a time of terrible stress, our people gladly extended statehood to Nevada, which at the time had an estimated population of only 40,000 people. We recognized the value of pioneers in those days and we encouraged them to go out and develop the areas of our great Nation which were undeveloped. We have continuously followed that same course, as anyone can see who looks at the record. When Florida was admitted in 1845, we had only 54,477 people. We have justified the hopes of development by attaining a present population of approximately 6 million.

When Oregon was admitted to the Union in 1859 it had only 52,465 inhabitants, and all of us know the great growth which has occurred there since that time and which has made Oregon one of our wonderful and highly developed States. When Nebraska was admitted just after the terrible Civil War in 1867—and I am happy to see the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] in the Chamber at this time—it had an estimated population of only 60,000, but our Nation encouraged the pioneers who resided there, and they have made a great State of it. We did not count heads to see whether or not the citizens of Nebraska would have undue influence in the U.S. Senate by reason of their having two Members there at the same time our most highly developed and heavily populated States had only two Members each. I could continue to call the roll of the States in this manner, but I close by simply recalling that as late as 1959, when Alaska was admitted to statehood with an estimated population of only 250,000, our Nation showed again its faith in the pioneers who settled there and our belief that the best way to encourage them was to give them direct representation in the councils of the Nation which they were afforded by having two Members of the U.S. Senate and one Member of the House of Representatives. Our faith in the American system will be again demonstrated by the growth and development of Alaska.

And yet there are those now, Mr. President, including a majority of the membership of the Supreme Court, who would set up a system which in many instances would deny to the good people in the less settled portions of our several States the right to have a neighbor representing them in one house of their State legislature where he could plead for the causes which are important to them and which will give them the best chance for speedy growth and development.

Mr. President, I depart from my written text at this time to remark that, looking at the map of our Nation and seeing the vast undeveloped States such as Montana, Nevada, Arizona, Colorado, Wyoming, the two Dakotas, and other States of the West, I do not see how it is possible for a U.S. Senator to take the position that he wants to depart from the traditional system followed in our country with such great success, and which has enabled us to have great governments in all 50 States, that have made them progressive and moving, in which each government has had a chance, almost without exception, and generally up to this good day, to give representation to outlying areas which require representation by neighbors who understand their problems, whom they can reach to talk with, and whom they know when they talk to them.

I deeply regret the fact that this radical change in the philosophy of our country which has contributed so greatly to the building of our country as the most powerful nation on the earth has now been embraced by the majority of our Supreme Court and apparently has sturdy supporters here on the floor of the Senate.

I listened with a great deal of amazement the other day to my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and my friend from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] state conclusions which made it appear, to me at least, that they were fearful to trust the people of the several States. They spoke of trickery in the State legislatures in the submission of amendments which they thought might mislead the people. They spoke of the unwillingness of the people to stand up and be counted when it came to the matter of constitutional provisions affecting them. It appeared to me that they doubt and they question the soundness of those policies of our Government under which our people have gone so far since the adoption of our original Constitution.

There is nothing static about this great country of ours. It has been growing, developing, and will continue to grow and develop. In our Government, both Federal and State, we should continue to follow the philosophy which has always been so typically American and continue to allow recognition and representation to our pioneering citizens who are striving, sometimes against great odds, to develop their own area and thus contribute to the growth and strength of our Nation as a whole. I am deeply disturbed that there are those amongst us who seem to think that we are about to become static and that we should now embrace a philosophy much more appropriate in an old, old country which is fully developed and has no potentiality for added growth in the future. I simply hope that we may repudiate such a change of philosophy, and by submitting the pending amendment, allow the people of this country to again give some measure of freedom to every State in determining for itself what type of distribution of membership it approves for one house of its legislature.

Mr. President, when a constitutional question is involved by an important decision of the Supreme Court, the Congress cannot of itself correct the situation by the passage of new legislation, as it did, for instance, countermand the earlier decisions of the Supreme Court in the so-called tidelands case by the passage of a mere statute known as the Tidelands Act, which was subsequently upheld by the Supreme Court as a proper assertion of congressional authority and jurisdiction. The fact that the Congress cannot cure the situation by statute does not, however, relieve it of responsibility. It seems to me that the Congress is now under a heavy responsibility, at this very time, to do its part by allowing the people, themselves, through the verdict of the 50 States, to correct the dangerous departure which I have just referred to in the changed philosophy and assertion of power by the Supreme Court in the reapportionment cases through the submission of a constitutional amendment which, though recognizing the soundness of the apportionment of one house of every legislature on a basis of population, will still permit the people of each State, in their own discretion and in view of their own problems, to determine that some principle other than strict reliance on population will better serve their State in the apportionment of membership of the second house of their State legislature.

I shall not attempt, in the brief time permitted me, to go into all of the arguments, both legal and practical, on this matter, but it does seem quite clear to me that the Congress is under a heavy duty to submit the pending constitutional amendment to allow the people of the several States to decide through action of their legislatures, in the first place, whether they wish to have available, as a minimum, the machinery which would be afforded by ratification of the pending amendment, and in the second place to decide for themselves by vote of their people, both at an early date and following every Federal census thereafter, what basis of apportionment they feel will best serve them and their States in fixing the membership of one house only of their State legislatures.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution No. 103, the new attempt of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] to interfere with the people's right to equal representation in their State legislatures.

Without the benefit of the close examination that committee hearings would have afforded, Senator Dirksen again seeks to amend the Constitution to overrule the Supreme Court's decision in Reynolds against Sims and related cases.

And what Senator Dirksen asks us to add on to the Constitution of the United States without any committee hearings is a strange proposal indeed—the first constitutional amendment we have ever had which creates an exception to the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, the first constitutional amendment we have ever had which espouses inequality as a virtue, the first time in our constitutional history that we would be acting to limit rather than expand the franchise.

Nor is this year's version any better than last year's.

The wording of Senate Joint Resolution 103 makes it clear that its proponents do not want the courts passing on the malapportionment plans that they would submit to the people. Section 2 implies that the courts will pass on a plan only if it is submitted by a legislature in which neither house has been reapportioned. The reapportionment of one house in a State legislature is sufficient, at least in the minds of the drafters of the amendment, to keep the matter of reapportionment out of the courts. This, of course, is the red flag. Under the vague standard of "effective representation * * * of the various groups and interests making up the electorate," a State legislature can make up a plan in which one house is malapportioned to satisfy the interests of those who control the legislature at the particular time. The purported lack of judicial review, therefore, is as vital to this year's version as it was to last year's.

Those who oppose the malapportionment amendments have often said the aim of the amendments is to perpetuate the old rural control and that that is their vice. The proponents of the malapportionment amendments have said the same aim is the virtue of the proposals. The fact is—and we should all be aware of this—that Senate Joint Resolution 103 could be used by whoever happened to be in power in the State legislature to attempt to perpetuate and extend control. Whatever the party, whatever the area of the State which controls a legislature, Senate Joint Resolution 103 is a vehicle for the perpetuation and extension of control. Thus Senate Joint Resolution 103 is undesirable not so much because it favors one particular group or another, but because it is bad government.

Those who favor Senate Joint Resolution 103 argue that there are minorities in the State which deserve special representation. But the fact is that a State legislature is composed of a series of minorities, and there is no logical reason to make any one of them more equal than the others. Why, for example, should not the urban poor and the racial minorities be given extra representation? They are deserving of the special attention of government and have seldom been effectively represented. The point is that many minorities have a case for representation. Because these claims inevitably compete with one another, and because there is no basis for choosing one over another, the ultimate fact is that no one should be overrepresented.

This year's version of the Dirksen amendment is claimed to have the virtue of requiring that a plan based on equality of representation be submitted to the people along with the plan for malapportionment. This is a slight virtue, but it does not remove the basic vice—that the formulator of the alternatives is the very legislature whose motive would be to extend its control by the plans which it frames for submission to the people.

Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 103 is no better than the proposal which the Senate considered and rejected last year. In the meantime, the process of reapportionment has gone on in the several States, and legislature after legislature has proved that reapportionment is a real force for effective State government. The fact is that the federalism of the future—the hope that the States will play an important and significant role in the federal system in the years to come—rests on the reapportionment process now going on. We must not frustrate that process—we must defeat Senate Joint Resolution 103.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy of New York in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DIRKSEN AMENDMENT TRIES TO PASS BUCK OF SENATE RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Senators may remember that in his speech the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], in discussing the colloquy which took place between the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] and myself on Thursday of last week, said that Senator Tydings and I were fearful to trust the people; that we talked about trickery in State legislatures.

Mr. President, our opposition to the joint resolution is certainly not based on unwillingness to trust the people. As I recall, the Senator from Florida also went on to say that the Senator from Maryland and I talked about the unwillingness of the people to vote and to stand up and be counted. We have never taken this position at all.

But I did say—and I have before me the Congressional Record of Thursday, from which I should like to quote a few brief paragraphs pertaining to the charges made by the distinguished Senator from Florida—that:

> The issue concerns whether each American, regardless of where he lives or his background, as long as he is a qualified voter, should have an equal vote.
>
> The referendum is strictly a sweetener.

It is an appealing sweetener, but just that—a sweetener. It is tossed in because there just are not any valid reasons for depriving the people of their right to an equal vote. So what have the Dirksen amendment proponents done? They have cleverly fallen back on the referendum device.

> The argument runs: The proposition may be unfair, unwise, retrogressive, and dangerous, but so what? Why not let the people decide.

Then I said:

> The answer, Mr. President, is that the people are very likely to be required to vote in a rigged election, an unrepresentative election, because the body that puts the question has a transparently vested interest in securing the answer.

I should like also to suggest an argument that I did not make last Thursday, but which I think is really the best answer to all of this discussion: that we have a one-man, one-vote system of electing legislatures; then the people will decide all legislative matters, because it will be their legislatures, elected on a truly representative basis; whereas if we have a referendum which permits, under rigged circumstances, the legislatures to be apportioned on malapportioned basis, the people will have a distorted, diluted voice for the following 10 years, under the Dirksen amendment.

Finally, on this point, the Constitution specifies that the Senate and the House shall decide, by a two-thirds vote, whether constitutional amendments should be adopted. I do not believe we could find a constitutional father or a constitutional expert who would say that Members of the Senate or the House are absolved of their responsibility to decide amendments with constitutional referenda attached on their merits, if the amendment contains a provision for a referendum which then refers the proposal to the people for a vote. This would mean that we do not assume our own representative, elected responsibility for deciding the case; but if there is a referendum attached, no matter how wrong, how vigorously we may disagree, that we should automatically vote for it; and that if we do not, we would be accused of not representing the people.

I think this is a buckpassing, alibiseeking argument.

Last Wednesday, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] delivered a speech in favor of his joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 103, which would permit State legislatures to be apportioned on a basis other than population alone. As I indicated the following day, the minority leader was as eloquent and persuasive as always. However, there were several points in which the distinguished minority leader was wrong.

First, on page 8104 of the RECORD, the minority leader maintained that, in delivering the one-man, one-vote rule, the Supreme Court has exercised an amendment power which it does not have. But surely the same could be said of Chief Justice Marshall's opinion in Marbury against Madison, which established the right of judicial review, even though the Constitution is silent on the subject. The same could be said of Brown against Board of Education, which struck down segregation in spite of 100 years of contrary history. The same could be said of the Scottsboro case of 1932—Powell against Alabama—where, for the first time, the Supreme Court held that a State must supply counsel to an indigent criminal defendant. The same could also be said of the post-1936 cases in which Congress was given power over the economy immensely greater than its previous power. The point is that there have been many constitutional revolutions which could be described as amendments, and that the term "amendment" is wrongly used when it is used to convey opprobrium.

THE 14TH AMENDMENT FOR, NOT AGAINST, CIVIL RIGHTS

Also, on page 8104 of the RECORD, it is said by the minority leader that the Supreme Court took no account of the historical context or relevant text of the 14th amendment. It is claimed, as appears on page 8105, that the 14th amendment expressly recognizes that a State's right to malapportion, since it provides that a State's representation shall be diminished in the proportion by which it denies the vote to male citizens. It is claimed by the minority leader that the court ignore the long history of malapportionment.

These claims are plainly erroneous. Let us begin with the text. The 14th amendment provides that no States shall deny a citizen equal protection of the laws. Rather than ignoring this context, the Court interpreted it. Moreover, it sounds very peculiar to claim that a provision of the amendment which punishes a State for denying the vote thereby recognize a State's right to deny the vote. If the State has the right to deny the vote, why should it be punished for doing so?

LONG HISTORY OF EXPANDING THE FRANCHISE

In regard to history, both the distinguished minority leader and the eminent Justice whom he cites, Justice Harlan, ignore an immense amount of history themselves. They look only at the long history of malapportionment. But how about the long history of expanding the franchise in order to give more people a more effective voice in government?

When our Government was formed, there were no religious and property qualifications on voting; these have been removed. The President is now elected by the people, not, as was originally the case, by the House of Representatives.

Also, there are presidential primaries and State conventions to select delegates to national presidential conventions. Senators are now elected by primary and general elections instead of by State legislatures. At one time women could not vote; now they can by virtue of the 19th amendment.

At one time Negroes did not vote. Then the 15th amendment was passed to give them the vote; and of late there have been numerous efforts in civil rights acts and in the 24th amendment, the anti-poll-tax amendment, to implement their right to vote. What is more important to note, the Court cited much of this history in Reynolds against Sims, a landmark decision which provides for the one-man, one-vote representation in the State legislatures.

On page 8109 of the RECORD, an article placed in the RECORD by the junior Senator from Illinois says that the problem of malapportionment arose because States did not reapportion their lower houses. This is a half-truth only. Many States, perhaps even the vast majority, had malapportionment in both houses.

DIRKSEN AMENDMENT BRINGS WORSE CONFUSION

On page 8110 of the RECORD of last Wednesday appears a colloquy alleging that instability will occur under the one-man, one-vote rule because lower Federal courts will disagree and because members of the Supreme Court divided.

This is nonsense in the long run. For in the long run the Supreme Court majority will settle problems and we will have stability. The Court, in Reynolds against Sims, has laid down the basic one-man, one-vote rule. In *Fortson* v. *Dorsey*, 379 U.S. 43 3(1965), it held that countywide voting meets the equal population principle so long as the county has a fairly proportioned number of representatives. In the pending Hawaii apportionment case of Burns against Richardson it has taken up the question of whether registered voters or total population must be used as a basis for apportionment; and it will solve other problems as they arise.

Moreover, there would be equal or greater instability under the Dirksen amendment. Under Senate Joint Resolution 103, we could expect at least 50 suits after every decennial census, each suit alleging that particular interests have not been given effective representation. Further, Senate Joint Resolution 103 contains the very large number of ambiguities pointed out by the Library of Congress.

On page 8110, the distinguished Senator from Florida says that Senate Joint Resolution 103 is an attempt to produce an amendment consonant "with the basic philosophy that underlies the American system." This too is a half truth. On the one hand the amendment would, in conformity with our system, let the people decide on malapportionment. On the other hand, the amendment would permit the majority to strip the minority of equality by diminishing one of the most valuable rights of citizenship, the right to vote. It is not consonant with our system to permit a majority to diminish the most basic rights of a minority.

SUBURBS, NOT CITIES, WILL GAIN

On page 8110 an article inserted in the RECORD says metropolitan machines will rule the roost. This is wrong, since the fast mushrooming suburbs will obtain the greatest benefit from the one-man, one-vote rule. Moreover, the Colorado experience detailed in a speech by Allen Dines, the speaker of the Colorado House, gives proof that the article is wrong: Dines pointed out that there was no oppression or control by representatives from cities in the reapportioned Colorado Legislature, that many rurally sponsored and supported bills aimed at aiding rural needs were enacted, and that rural legislators felt they had received fair treatment. Also, the Michigan experience proves exactly the same thing, that is, that fairly apportioned legislatures treat all citizens fairly.

Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that Wisconsin has had a one-man, one-vote provision in its constitution ever since it became a State in 1848. While there have been some periods throughout the years when the legislature has not apportioned itself rapidly after the decennial census, it nevertheless did do so. We are very proud of the fair kind of legislature that we have had.

As one who has served in the State legislature, I know of no farm group or farmer who claims that the Wisconsin Legislature at any time, recently or in the past, has been rigged against them.

In fact, many city people claim that Wisconsin is the only State in the country which still provides full and complete protection for the dairy farmers' butter as against oleo.

It is the city people who want to eliminate the discrimination which exists in Wisconsin in favor of butter. Yet, our one-man, one-vote legislature, in a State which is 90 percent nonfarm, has provided that protection for the farm people.

Moreover, the Colorado and Michigan experiences prove not only that reapportioned legislatures are fair legislatures but also that equally apportioned legislatures do a much better, far more effective job in passing the types of legislation needed in modern States.

On page 8111 an article inserted in the RECORD warns that courts will force the drawing of hasty and ill-advised plans of reapportionment. This is nonsense. In the main, the Federal courts have given legislatures adequate time to draw up plans. The problem is that, due to partisanship, legislatures have sometimes been absolutely unable to agree on a plan. And in regard to Michigan, where the article accuses a Federal court of giving the legislature just 2 days to draw up a plan, the drawing and approval of a final plan of apportionment has already taken several years and is still going on.

The article also denounces the Court for overthrowing the Colorado Federal plan that had been approved by the people. However, the vote on that plan was in a sense rigged, since the plan which would have apportioned both houses by population contained some very undesirable features, for example, there would have been countywide balloting that would have made it necessary for each Denver voter to vote for 8 senators and 17 representatives, that would have caused ballots to be long and cumbersome, and that would have made difficult an intelligent choice among candidates. Thus, as the Supreme Court said:

> The assumption * * * that the Colorado voters made a definitive choice between two contrasting alternatives and indicated that "minority process in the State is what they want" does not appear to be factually justifiable.

FIRST TURN-CLOCK-BACK AMENDMENT

On page 8111, and at length on page 8103, Senator DIRKSEN argues that amendments have often overturned Supreme Court rulings. The usual citations for this type of argument are the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, overturning the Dred Scott case, the 16th amendment overturning the case outlawing an income tax, the 19th amendment overturning the case permitting States to refuse the franchise to women, and the 24th amendment overturning the case permitting States to levy a poll tax. The Senator seeks to bring his amendment within the ambit of these others, saying that here, too, a court ruling should be overturned. But there is a very significant difference between his amendment and the others. All the others were progressive amendments which overturned cases that had preserved a status quo outmoded by historical forces. The case against the income tax was reactionary, the Dred Scott case attempted to hold back an abolition movement that had literally gained worldwide impetus—that is, Britain had abolished slavery—the poll tax was a device to maintain the disenfranchisement of Negroes, and in our society it would be incredible if women could not vote. Amendments 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, and 24 overturned these anachronisms in order to bring the Constitution into line with changed social forces. But Senator DIRKSEN, on the other hand, seeks to do the opposite. For in Reynolds against Sims the Court did not attempt to turn back the clock in order to ward off a new social order, it recognized the new social alinement in a progressive decision. It is the junior Senator from Illinois who seeks to turn back the clock.

PASS-THE-BUCK AMENDMENT

On pages 8111 and 8112 Senator DIRKSEN says let the people decide on his amendment. However, the Constitution also requires the Senate to pass on it, and Senators would not be doing their constitutional duty if, despite their disagreement with the amendment, they voted for it in order to let the people vote on it. Indeed, one of the prime reasons for the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds vote to pass an amendment in Congress is to prevent ill-advised amendments. Thus, Senators are constitutionally required to use their best judgment rather than to simply pass the buck to State legislatures, State conventions, or State referendums.

Mr. President, I have just had called to my attention a letter from Prof. Howard D. Hamilton, chairman of the Department of Political Science, Bowling Green State University, of Bowling Green, Ohio, which shows overwhelming expert opposition to the Dirksen amendment.

It reads as follows:

APRIL 14, 1966.

Memorandum: Judgments of political science professors regarding the Dirksen amendment.

From: Howard D. Hamilton, chairman, Department of Political Science, Bowling Green State University.

A nationwide poll in January of professors of political science regarding the so-called Dirksen amendment shows that the political science profession overwhelmingly disapproves of that proposal by a ratio of about four to one. Of 146 respondents to a mailed questionnaire, 112 expressed disapproval of any constitutional amendment to nullify the decision of the Supreme Court in *Reynolds v. Sims*. Of the 146 respondents, 116 viewed the ruling of that case, that both chambers of State legislatures must be apportioned on the basis of population, as sound public policy.

Two questions regarding the Reynolds case and the Dirksen amendment were a segment of a long questionnaire regarding criteria for apportionment, prepared and circulated by Profs. Charles Barrell, Howard Hamilton, and Byron Marlowe of Bowling Green State University. That section of the questionnaire read:

"I. APPRAISAL OF REYNOLDS V. SIMS

"1. Was the decision that both chambers of a legislature must be districted on the basis of population sound public policy? Yes—. No—.

"2. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to permit apportionment of one house of a bicameral legislature upon the basis of factors other than population? Yes—. No—.

The questionnaire was mailed to two groups: to a random sample of persons listed as State and local government specialists in the biographical directory of the American Political Science Association (pp. 314–316), and to a select (and smaller) group of political scientists who have written books and journal articles or have done unpublished research in the area of legislative apportionment. On those two questions, the judgments of both groups were almost identical.

Tabulation of returns

	Random sample		Select group	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Was the decision	73	19	43	11
2. Do you favor	21	71	13	41

The questionnaires apparently reached 237 persons. (A few others were returned by the post office.) A return rate of 62 percent (80 percent of the random sample) is very high for a formidable questionnaire of 80 questions, and establishes a high degree of statistical reliability.

SHORT FORM

I. Appraisal of "Reynolds v. Sims"

1. Was the decision, that both chambers of a legislature must be districted on the basis of population, sound public policy? Yes —. No —.

2. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to permit apportionment of one house of a bicameral legislature upon the basis of factors other than population? Yes —. No —.

3. Is it your judgment that the Reynolds doctrine of substantial equality of district populations in both chambers (check one):

(a) Virtually precludes application of any other criteria. (1) —.

(b) Allows some room for use of additional criteria. (2) —.

(c) Allows some, but not enough room for additional criteria. (3) —.

(d) Allows adequate scope for the application of other legitimate criteria. (4) —.

II. Equality of district populations: Yardsticks and standards

16. Should one standard be a maximum permissible deviation from the ratio of representation (population: seats)? Yes. —. No. —.

17. If so, what should be the maximum percentage deviation above or below the ratio of representation? (1) 10 percent —. (2) 15 percent — . (3) 20 percent —. (4) 25 percent —. (5) 50 percent —.

IV. Legitimate criteria: The trinity or more?

19. The criteria for districting should be exclusively the familiar trinity—districts of compact and contiguous territory, as nearly equal in population as possible. Yes —. No —.

20. Primary emphasis would be on the trinity, but some notice should be taken of other criteria. Yes —. No —.

21. Districting should be guided by other criteria; the trinity should be merely the outer limits for efforts to achieve other objectives. Yes —. No —.

VIII. Legitimate criteria: Specifies

Which of the following criteria do you regard as valid or invalid in drawing districts for maximizing the representative character of a legislature? For those you regard as valid, check the relative weight.

	(1) Valid	(2) Invalid	(1) Very important	(2) Desirable	(3) Permissible
22. Population equality					
24. Compactness and symmetry					
26. Interest of incumbents					
28. Advantage of majority party					
30. Partisan neutrality					
32. Maintaining political subdivisions as representative units					
34. Not dividing counties					
36. Maximizing homogeneous districts					
38. Maximizing heterogeneous districts					
40. Fostering competitive districts					
42. Fostering safe districts					
44. Minimizing the number of constituents per legislator					
46. At least 1 seat for every county					
48. Assuring some seats for the minority party within each metropolitan county					
50. Fostering a statewide distribution of seats by party generally proportional to vote					
52. Averting minority party control of legislature					
54. Fostering a strong block of minority members					
56. Elimination of multimember districts					
58. Utilization of multimember districts					
60. Assuring ethnic minorities control of some districts					
62. Fostering the strength of residents outside the metropolises					
64. Consideration of economic, social, and regional interests					
66. Following county, city, township, ward lines even at some reduction of population equality					

(Add any others which you regard as valid and check the relative weight.)

XI. Minorities

121. Minorities, particularly ethnic, should be assured representation by designing districts in which they will be preponderant. Yes —. No —.

122. Minorities are better served by not being concentrated in a district. Yes —. No —.

123. Minorities are better served by not being concentrated in a district only if the districts are competitive. Yes —. No —.

124. The allocation of minorities should be disregarded; "reverse discrimination" is illegitimate. Yes —. No —.

XII. Districting agency and discretion

131. Districting should be done by the legislature with broad discretion to select and apply apportionment criteria. Yes —. No —.

133. Districting should be done by ——— in accordance with an apportionment formula for each chamber spelled out in the State constitution, and subject to judicial review (check one):

(1) —Legislature.
(2) —Elective officer or ex officio board.
(3) —Bipartisan board, selected by political parties.
(4) —Special nonpartisan citizens board as in Alaska and Great Britain.
(5) —Other: ______________________

134. Districting should be by automatic and impersonal procedures which minimize discretion. Yes —. No —.

137. Districting should be done by computer programed to maximize compactness and population equality. Yes —. No —.

Mr. President, these political scientists who were polled were selected as the most competent in this field in the Nation.

First, a random sample of persons listed as State and local government specialists were interrogated.

Secondly, a select group of political scientists who have written books and journal articles or have done unpublished research in the area of legislative apportionment.

Mr. President, these are the experts in this reapportionment area if experts can be found.

And they are 4 to 1 against the Dirksen amendment.

CEDAR RAPIDS GAZETTE DEMOLISHES DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. President, the slick Whittaker Baxter public relation firm has swamped many of the Nation's newspapers with propaganda favoring the Dirksen one-man, one-vote amendment.

Fortunately many newspapers are finding this propaganda barrage unconvincing. In a recent trip I took to Wisconsin I found this to be true repeatedly in my State.

In Iowa the Cedar Rapids Gazette is another case in point. The Gazette has carried a series of hard-hitting editorials which in my judgment demolish the Dirksen amendment.

The Gazette properly calls the amendment "perhaps the most important single issue to come before this Congress, for it deals with a cornerstone on which this Nation was founded—that we shall be governed by majority rule with full protection of minority rights."

The Gazette points out that the amendment:

1. Is based on a wholly false premise.
2. Is a blatant attempt to repeal the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision based on the 14th equal rights amendment.
3. Is couched in vague, misleading, ambiguous language.
4. Is an attempt to put the States back into minority-rule straitjackets.

The Gazette says:

> We agree with Dirksen amendment proponents, who say "let the people decide." Under one-man, one-vote apportionment, the people will decide, through their elected representatives, every issue coming before each session of a legislature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of editorials on the Dirksen amendment from the Cedar Rapids Gazette to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Apr. 13, 1966]

THE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

The Dirksen amendment—the one dealing with legislative apportionment, not school prayers—is scheduled for debate in the U.S. Senate this week or next.

It is, perhaps, the most important single issue to come before this Congress. For it deals with a cornerstone on which this Nation was founded—that we shall be governed by majority rule with full protection of minority rights.

Known in legislative language as Senate Joint Resolution 103 (the text may be seen elsewhere on next page), the proposal was introduced August 10, 1965, by Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the Republican leader, only 6 days after an earlier version was defeated in the Senate.

It is a proposal to change the Constitution with an amendment which, advocates say, will "let the people decide" every 10 years in each State whether they want the membership of one house of their legislature based on factors other than population, as now required by the U.S. Supreme Court.

To become effective the proposed amendment must be passed by a two-thirds majority (67) of the 100-member Senate, a two-thirds majority (290) of the 435-Member House and, within 7 years, ratified by three-fourths (38) of the 50 States.

So it has a long row to hoe, which is a good thing since this proposed amendment has no place in the Constitution, because it:

1. Is based on a wholly false premise.
2. Is a blatant attempt to repeal the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision based on the 14th equal rights amendment.
3. Is couched in vague, misleading, ambiguous language.
4. Is an attempt to put the States back into minority-rule straitjackets.

We will explain at greater length in the immediate future these reasons why this proposed amendment should suffer the same fate as the earlier version. That version was defeated August 4, 1965, when 39 Senators (not including Iowa's 2), only 5 more than the one-third necessary, courageously went on record against it.

Meanwhile, suffice it to say that a public relations firm has been paid a handsome sum for the last 3 months to sell the Dirksen amendment to the people, which is a real travesty because fundamental rights are something that can't be sold out from under the people like soap.

This gigantic sales effort is based on the popular slogan "let the people decide." And that, by coincidence is precisely what the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision does—the decision which the Dirksen amendment seeks to repeal.

The big difference between the Court decision and the Dirksen amendment is that the decision lets the people decide, through representatives elected on a population basis, every matter coming before their legislatures, whereas the amendment would let the people decide once in 10 years what kind of legislature they want.

So this sales effort is a snow job, pure and simple. It is an attempt to substitute minority rule for majority rule; to legalize malapportionment; to make area, acres, geography, livestock, buildings, trees, city blocks, or you-name-it, more important then people. It is, in effect, an effort to implant in the fundamental law of our land the idea that some individuals and some groups are entitled to more legislative representation than other individuals and other groups.

In short, it has no place in the Constitution of the United States.

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Apr. 13, 1966]

Dirksen Amendment Boosts Area Representation; Here Is the Text

Scheduled to be debated in the U.S. Senate shortly is Senate Joint Resolution 103, commonly known as the Dirksen amendment, for its chief sponsor, Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the Republican leader in the Senate.

To become a part of the Constitution, the amendment must receive a two-thirds majority vote in both the Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, and be ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Here is the text of the Dirksen amendment as it was introduced by Senator DIRKSEN and 30 cosponsors August 10, 1965, only 6 days after an earlier version failed to muster the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate:

"S.J. RES. 103

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years of its submission to the States by the Congress, provided that each such legislature shall include one house apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population in accordance with the most recent enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The legislature of each State shall be apportioned by the people of that State at each general election for Representatives to the Congress held next following the year in which there is commenced each enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I. In the case of a bicameral legislature, the members of one house shall be apportioned among the people on the basis of their numbers and the members of the other house may be apportioned among the people on the basis of population, geography, and political subdivisions in order to insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate. In the case of a unicameral legislature, the house may be apportioned among the people on the basis of substantial equality of population with such weight given to geography and political subdivisions as will insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate.

" 'SEC. 2. A plan of apportionment shall become effective only after it has been submitted to a vote of the people of the State and approved by a majority of those voting on that issue at a statewide election held in accordance with law and the provisions of this Constitution. If submitted by a bicameral legislature the plan of apportionment shall have been approved prior to such election by both houses, one of which shall be apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population; if otherwise submitted it shall have been found by the courts prior to such election to be consistent with the provisions of this Constitution, including this article. In addition to any other plans of apportionment which may be submitted at such election, there shall be submitted to a vote of the people an alternative plan of apportionment based solely on substantial equality of population. The plan of apportionment approved by a majority of those voting on that issue shall be promptly placed in effect.' "

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Apr. 14, 1966]

The Premise Is False

In an earlier editorial we wrote that the Dirksen amendment dealing with legislative apportionment has no place in the Constitution because it is:

1. Based on a wholly false premise.
2. A blatant attempt to repeal the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision based on the 14th "equal rights" amendment.
3. Couched in vague, misleading, and ambiguous language.
4. An attempt to put the States back into minority-rule straitjackets.

It is based on the false premise that historically and traditionally the makeup of State legislatures has been "just like Congress—one House on area, one House on population."

This is not only a false premise. It is pure fiction. In Congress, the Senate is based on States, not area, and the House is based largely on population.

But, historically and traditionally, the legislatures of a majority (27) States, including Iowa, were based wholly on population and those of 9 other States largely on population. This was true from the time these 36 States were admitted to the Union until legislators broke their oaths of office by refusing to reapportion their seats periodically, as required by the constitutions of their respective States.

After some 60 years of this defiance, the people went to the Court, the only course open. The Court accepted jurisdiction in the now famous Baker-Carr case in 1962. For the Court is as concerned over infringement on minority rights as on majority rights. Especially so when a minority of one inquires whether he is entitled to the same say-so in shaping the laws of his State as the next fellow. The Court held that he is so entitled in its landmark one-man, one-vote decision of 1964.

Now we find many supporters of malapportionment, those who fought reapportionment efforts every step of the way, uniting behind the confusing language of the Dirksen amendment. It is their last hope to restore minority rule to the States—the kind of minority rule that forced States to default many responsibilities, opening the way for the Federal Government to step into the resulting vacuums in response to public demand for programs the States should have provided.

No more objective analysis of the amendment is available than that prepared by the Library of Congress, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 24, 1966, pages 996–1001. The Library takes no position on the amendment's merits, but says emphatically it would be in the interests of all parties, should it be adopted, to clarify its language to make sure it carries out the amendment's intent.

As a good example of what the Library means, take the phrase found in the amendment that one legislative house shall be "apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population." That can be interpreted any way a legislature wants to interpret it. Or take another critical phrase, which provides that a State may deviate from fair apportionment standards "in order to insure effective representation of the various groups and interests making up the electorate."

The Library of Congress asks: "What is 'effective representation'? How many representatives of the total does one need to have effective representation? Does the number vary or remain constant? Is the number of representatives proportionate to the number of people with a particular interest, and, if not, what is the ratio? Are all groups with distinct interests to be insured effective representation or just some? If not, which? How are groups discriminated among? Is 'effective representation' the ability to pass a desired measure? To veto an objectionable one? Only to be heard? Or something else? Is everyone to be given equal votes in the legislature? If not, by what standards is inequality to be introduced?"

We repeat, this proposed amendment has no place in the Constitution.

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Apr. 15, 1966]

The Big City Myth

An argument heavily relied on by proponents to sell the Dirksen amendment on legislative apportionment is that the big cities will take over the government in each State if the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision is not repealed or modified.

Even a cursory examination of the facts exposes this argument as a full-blown myth, whether legislators are elected from single-member, or multimember, districts.

Arizona's House of Representatives offers a good example because it was one of the few in any State to be apportioned on a population basis before the Supreme Court's decision was handed down.

There are 80 members in Arizona's House and exactly half come from single-member districts in the largest county, Maricopa, where the largest city, Phoenix, is located. Another 17 represent the second largest county, Pima, with the second largest city, Tucson. So, between them these 2 big-county, big-city delegations could outvote the rest of the State 57 to 23 and would control every piece of legislation introduced, according to the Dirksen amendment proponents.

But the record shows that the delegations from these two counties have seldom agreed on anything since Phoenix was made the capital city. Moreover, Maricopa County's 40 representatives (or Pima County's 17, for that matter) seldom ever vote as a bloc on any question. More often than not they split every conceivable way on important issues.

This is because they represent different interests and different political parties and each has the same say-so as the next fellow because each represents about the same number of people. So neither the big counties nor the big cities dominate in Arizona.

Even in Iowa, where the house delegations from the two biggest counties (Polk with Des Moines, Linn with Cedar Rapids) were elected at large, there is no evidence of big-county, big-city domination that even closely resembles the small-county, minority-rule domination that existed, without objection from most Dirksen amendment proponents, for the first 60 years of this century.

The facts are that under one-man, one-vote apportionment there seldom are big-city, small-city, big-county or small-county blocs. Instead, small minorities are formed, usually on the basis of constituent, business, personal, or area interests, to deal with each substantive issue.

Minority A may favor a sales tax increase, minority B an increase in the income tax, and minority C an increase in luxury tax, while minority D wants to hold the line on all taxes and minority E wants to increase the school aid appropriation.

When the sales tax increase bill comes up, minorities B, C, and D, like small eddies in a large pool, flow into enough of a temporary majority to beat it. Mission accomplished, they swirl away from the majority to reform into small minority eddies. Then, when the bill to increase the income tax comes, minorities A, C, and D may flow together to block it unless minorities B and E have enough strength to pass it, etc.

And in each minority, one finds representatives from big and small counties, from various areas of the State and from each political party.

Under one-man, one-vote apportionment the big city myth is exploded. So is the equally full-blown myth that small counties have no voice. It provides for each legislator to represent approximately the same number of people as his fellow legislator, and has the same voting power, regardless of where he lives.

So we agree with Dirksen amendment proponents who say "let the people decide." Under one-man, one-vote apportionment, the people will decide, through their elected representatives, every issue coming before each session of a legislature.

But the Dirksen amendment seeks to restore 1-man, 19-vote apportionment to Iowa—and restore apportionment of even greater disparities to some other States. That's another reason why it has no place in the Constitution and should be defeated by the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to refer once again to the questionnaire of political scientists which has just been placed in the Record.

It is interesting that as long ago, I believe, as 2 years ago, the Gallup poll questioned people throughout the country on their position on the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision, and this most highly respected and most scientific of polls found that by an overwhelming majority the people of America supported the Supreme Court's decision.

Now we find the political scientists, the men whose lives are devoted to studying government and specifically State and local government and reapportionment by a most decisive majority of 4 to 1 approve the Supreme Court's decision and disapprove any amendment such as Senate Joint Resolution 103, which is now pending before the Senate, which would set it aside in whole or in part.

It seems to me that this is convincing and impressive testimony. Many people might wonder, under these circumstances, why it is that the House voted so strongly for the Tuck bill, which would have stricken the Reynolds against Sims one-man, one-vote decision, and that the Senate, in its last vote, voted something like 57 to 39 for another version of the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. President, the answer, I think, is that Members of the Senate are, of course, very sympathetic with their good friends who serve in State legislatures, and very responsive to the feelings of State legislators. This is natural, it is predictable, it is understandable. As one who has served in a State legislature, I find myself in great sympathy with these people, who are under pressure, and find it is extremely difficult for them, without destroying their careers or the careers of good friends, to follow a one-man, one-vote principle.

But I believe that Senators should reexamine their positions, recognizing that the position taken by the Supreme Court is sound not only in the judgment of an overwhelming majority of the people when questioned but also in the judgment of the political scientists.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I submit that the most significant single issue in the entire debate over the reapportionment amendment is the extension of the right of franchise involved in the amendment's provision that the people of each State will have the opportunity, by popular vote, to choose, within a well-defined framework, between alternate plans for the composition of their State legislatures.

This issue can be summarized very simply in the phrase, "let the people decide."

I confess that it has been rather wryly amusing to me, and I am sure to many of my colleagues who share my strong feelings in support of the amendment, to note the rather defensive squirming evidenced by opponents over this basic feature of the amendment.

It is not easy for an elected public official to take the position that he is opposed to the right of franchise; or, that he believes that the same people who have exhibited such sterling intelligence, such superb sagacity, such inspired good judgment, in electing him to office cannot be trusted to exercise similar keen percipience in voting on an issue of such grave importance to them as the method of choosing their State legislature.

Indeed, many of the opponents of the reapportionment amendment have chosen to avoid this embarrassing phase of the issue—preferring instead to paint dark pictures of alleged dangers such as wholesale adoption of the rotten borough system of merry old England or of city slickers being conned into legislative pigeon drops by fiendishly clever rural hayseeds, always forgetting that none of these unlikely inequities could possibly take place unless a majority of a State's people, voting on a one-man, one-vote basis, approved them.

Mr. President, there should be at all times during this debate firmly fixed and borne in mind that the proposed amendment in itself does not change the Supreme Court's ruling in Reynolds against Sims. It simply gives to the people of each State an option to modify in a limited way the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution, subject to a carefully worked out procedure designed to safeguard the interests of the governed. The procedure includes the requirement for bicameral legislatures of one house thereof remaining apportioned solely on a population basis, as required by Reynolds against Sims; the option to the legislature to propose a plan for the second house being apportioned on a combination of population and area or political subdivision; the necessity to place such a proposed plan on the ballot where it must be approved by popular vote before it can become effective; and the further requirement that there must be a review by popular vote of such action every 10 years.

Clearly, such a procedure makes provision for deliberate, intelligent, and prudent action on a fundamental policy question by the very people who are most directly concerned and affected thereby, and who are most eminently entitled and most qualified to determine issues of that kind.

And that brings us immediately to the question: Does one really believe that a majority of a State's people, under any circumstances, would vote to impose on themselves, for a 10-year period, a legislative apportionment system contrary to their own best interest?

If one really believes that, then how can one justify the belief that a majority of a State's people can competently choose, for a 6-year period, the best qualified person to represent their interests in the U.S. Senate?

The two positions are incompatible, of course. It is no wonder that few of the opponents of the reapportionment amendment choose to argue against the principle, "let the people decide."

But there are some opponents of the amendment who do—some people who do attempt to justify, on philosophical grounds, their unwillingness to extend the right of franchise to the people on this important issue. I think their arguments deserve attention.

For example, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] has been quoted in the Progressive magazine as stating that:

> Equality of voting is an inalienable right and should not be tampered with. We should not submit a constitutional amendment which would subtract from the inalienable rights of American citizens. Citizens cannot sell themselves into permanent indentured servitude even though they do so contracturally.

We find this curious argument repeated in the views of several Senators contained in the report of the Committee on the Judiciary, which reported Senate Joint Resolution 103 to the full Senate:

> Citizens of this country cannot sell themselves into slavery. The degree of freedom of religion and speech we enjoy have never been considered proper subjects for determination by referendum. Our inalienable rights are protected under the Constitution, and they ultimately derive from the moral law.

There are so many things wrong with this line of argument that it is difficult to decide which of its many inner contradictions to refute first.

Citizens voting by orderly, established process on a specific, well-defined proposal in the secrecy of the voting booth do not sell themselves into slavery. They determine thereby their own destiny in fashion well approved by self-government principles. To deny them that opportunity in the present instance, however, would in harsh reality subjugate them to slavery created by Supreme Court decision if that decision were one which the people did not want for their respective States. Let them have a chance to decide whether they favor that decision or not. The Dirksen amendment gives them a chance to do so. Opponents would deny the people that opportunity.

INALIENABLE RIGHTS UNDER OUR CONSTITUTION

So-called inalienable rights, derived from moral law or natural law, have been the subject of argument by philosophers since the beginning of time.

Our Declaration of Independence states:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and pursuit of Happiness.

Nowhere in the Declaration is the particular definition of "equality of voting" as based exclusively on one man, one vote listed as an inalienable right.

(At this point Mr. HARRIS took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, nor is this alleged inalienable right, which several Senators imply is protected under the Constitution, mentioned in that document. To the contrary, the Constitution specifically prescribes a very different procedure to insure equality of voting with respect to the composition of the legislative branch of the Federal Government—a procedure which balances the one-man, one-vote concept in the selection of one house with the regional concept in the selection of the other house. This procedure, the precedent for which is established in the Constitution, is the very procedure which the reapportionment amendment would make possible in the composition of State legislatures, provided the people of any State desire it.

Furthermore, the 10th amendment of the Constitution, provides:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Under this provision, the people of the United States always have believed they possessed the inalienable right to pattern their State legislatures after the federal system, if they so desired—and they did have that inalienable right until a majority of the Supreme Court decided to take it away.

But it is instructive to remember that the Court based its apportionment decisions on an interpretation of the 14th amendment to the Constitution. And while many able constitutional authorities and members of the Court itself disagree with that interpretation, it is undeniably true that the 14th amendment was not an original part of the Constitution, but like other amendments was added to it by the people themselves, through action of their State legislatures.

In other words, if those who believe that their particular definition of voting equality is an inalienable right under the Constitution, it is a right not determined by moral law, but by the people themselves. And if the people decide that they made a mistake, or that the Court's interpretation of the intent of the 14th amendment with respect to legislative apportionment is a mistake, they have the power and the right, under the amendment procedure, to correct that mistake, and to assert for themselves, if they choose, the prior inalienable right they possessed under the original Constitution, to define voting equality in a manner that is different from the definition sought to be imposed by others.

May I remind the Senate that the people at one time adopted the 18th amendment to the Constitution, then later decided that they had made a mistake; whereupon they adopted the 21st amendment to correct that mistake. In both instances they resorted to article V of our Constitution providing amendment procedures. It cannot be plausibly argued that the adoption of the 18th amendment forever enshrined prohibition against the sale of alcoholic beverages as an inalienable right and the Congress should not have submitted the 21st amendment to the State legislatures for ratification because it would have subtracted from that right.

INALIENABLE RIGHTS UNDER THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Another document dealing with inalienable rights, to which the United States has subscribed, is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the 1948 General Assembly of the United Nations.

This declaration cites an extensive list of rights and freedoms to which everyone, in every country is entitled. Voting rights are set forth as follows:

> Article 21. (1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

And:

> Article 21. (3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Voting rights are not defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as an inalienable right not to be tampered with; neither the U.S. Constitution nor the Universal Declaration enshrines the exclusive procedure of one man, one vote as an inalienable right, as some opponent would have us believe it is. Indeed, the voting procedures practiced in the United Nations itself are distinctly contrary to the Senator's concept of equal suffrage.

According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—

> The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government—

That is the very basis—the rationale—of the reapportionment amendment. It is a restatement of the phrase, "let the people decide"—truly an inalienable right which opponents of the amendment would deny the people.

The opponents of the reapportionment amendment seem to be perfectly content to entrust the matter of the people's rights, not to the people themselves, but to the transient majorities of courts. What are we to make of their statement "the degree of freedom of religion and speech we enjoy have never been considered proper subjects for determination by referendum"?

The freedom of religion and the freedom of speech, of course, have utterly nothing to do with methods of voting procedures in the apportionments of State legislatures. Unlike the latter, which are not specifically defined in our Constitution, religious freedom and the freedom of speech are specifically enunciated in the Constitution. But as everyone knows, they have been subjected to interpretation, and in some instances, restriction, by the courts. And if the people at any time disagreed with these interpretations or restrictions, they would have every right to demand action, through constitutional amendments, to change these interpretations. They would have every right to exercise the privilege acknowledged in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that:

> The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government.

Another constitutional right, the freedom of the press, has been modified by the Supreme Court, in the case of alleged pornographic literature, to exclude published material without redeeming social value. This restriction has been further broadened in a recent decision to include considerations of the motivation of the publisher, based, among other things, on the names of the post offices from which the material is mailed.

It is not my purpose here to comment, pro or con, on the merits of this particular decision, and I know of no great public outcry against it. But if a large segment of the public—a majority of the public—disagreed strongly with this particular limitation of the freedom of the press, would the public not have the right to seek a change, through the constitutional amendment process? Would Senator DOUGLAS argue that this particular interpretation—this particular definition of an inalienable right—should never be subjected, as it were, to referendum?

Finally, in examining the curious line of reasoning by some of the opposition with regard to certain issues, certain positions on which they happen to have a firm opinion, regardless of what the majority opinion of the people might be, that the will of the people should not be the basis of the authority of government, we come to this odd statement that "citizens cannot sell themselves into permanent indentured servitude even though they do so contractually."

PROPRIETY OF SENATORIAL ELECTIONS FOR REFERENDUM

Do the opponents of the reapportionment amendment really believe that a legislative apportionment system based partly on regional consideration is a form of indentured servitude? If they really believe that, how can they be part of such a system? How can they sit here, as Members of the U.S. Senate, if they believe that an apportionment system based on factors other than one man, one vote is a form of indentured servitude?

Does any Senator, in his heart of hearts, regard himself and his fellow

Senators as 20th century Simon Legrees? When he faces his constituency, as some of us will this year, does he regard the voters of his State, underrepresented by his standards in this Senate, as denizens of an ante bellum slave market?

I submit that no Senator can seriously believe his own fanciful contention that a legislative apportionment system based on factors other than population is a form of involuntary servitude.

OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS ON VOTING RIGHTS

Why the innovation at this day and hour of placing a particular interpretation of the Supreme Court in the clothing of an inalienable right not proper for determination by referendum? Thank goodness a similar effort was not successfully invoked at earlier years in our Nation's history. Otherwise some highly valued changes in our Constitution would not be a part of our Constitution today. Three times our Constitution has heretofore been amended on the subject of voting rights: the 15th amendment, forbidding both Federal and State Governments from denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; the 19th amendment, forbidding both Federal and State Governments from denying or abridging the right to vote on account of sex; and the 23d amendment, forbidding both Federal and State Governments from laying a poll tax as a condition of voting.

In each of these instances, the national Constitution had been interpreted and applied in a manner contrary to the provision of these amendments. Not a single opponent of Senate Joint Resolution 103 would be heard to say that any of the cited situations encompassed an inalienable right not proper for determination by referendum. And, of course, in the history of our Constitution, other amendments of very high and far-reaching import were referred to the States for their decision. The instant proposal should also be so submitted pursuant to article V of the Constitution.

Justice Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, spoke to this point very appropriately, only recently:

> Sometimes the decisions of this Court are not approved in the long run. And constitutional amendments are made. For example, our Court held that the graduated income tax was unconstitutional. And we got the 16th amendment—we changed that. Our Court held that a State could lay a poll tax as a condition of voting, and that was changed with respect to Federal elections. Our Court held that a State could keep women from voting and that was changed by the 19th amendment. This is part of the process. People can have such Constitutions—such provisions—as they want.

To those who contend that this particular interpretation of the Constitution—by the Supreme Court in Reynolds against Sims—is not proper for determination by referendum, let there be addressed a simple question: Had the Supreme Court decided that case or Baker against Carr in opposite fashion, would those now opposing the reapportionment amendment have ceased their efforts for a one-man, one-vote rule, socalled?

To ask the question is to answer it in the negative, because the Supreme Court several times—the latest only about 5 years prior to Baker against Carr—refused to assume jurisdiction of the subject of State legislative apportionment. Yet the advocates of the so-called one-man, one-vote rule persisted in behalf of their concept.

Now that they have succeeded by the route of Court decision, they seek to foreclose the governed—the people—who are the ultimate source of political decisions of the highest order, from being given an opportunity to speak on the issue. These opponents say to the people, in substance: "Now that the Supreme Court has spoken in our favor, we will make it our business to block and frustrate any chance for you people to speak on the subject. You must remain forever subject to the Supreme Court interpretation in spite of article V of the Constitution which gives you the right of amendment. We shall deny you the exercise of that right."

To such as those, I earnestly say: have more faith in the people. Come down off your lofty perches of intellectual superiority, climb out of your ivory towers, and mix a bit with the common people. They are not as unqualified or as gullible in matters like this as you think.

This Senator has never been able to agree with the statement of one particular Founding Father, Alexander Hamilton, who said: "Your people, sir, are a great beast."

A mob, of course—any mob—can be a beast. But people, as individual citizens voting at the secret ballot box in a democratic society pursuant to orderly process, are not beasts. It has been my experience and observation that they are thinking, serious-minded citizens, fully qualified to cut through the claims and counterclaims of political and polemical argument, to reach intelligent, thoughtful decisions.

In some circumstances, they may even be more capable of reaching independent conclusions than their elected representatives who are often subjected to the special influences of pressure groups.

This would be especially true of a popular vote on the structure of a State legislature within the narrow limits and carefully safeguarded procedures prescribed in the Dirksen amendment.

THE REFERENDUM PROCESS

One reason, perhaps, why some of my colleagues may have less faith in the people is that they may not have had the experience of watching closely States where direct legislation is available to the people. A number of States have long had a tradition of decision on important issues by the voters at the polls.

It has been possible for the people of these States, through the initiative or referendum process, to bring propositions of high importance before all of the voters for decision. Often this right has been exercised in areas where a legislature itself has failed to act.

Sometimes, it is true, the people have been called upon to vote on highly controversial propositions, some of them of dubious validity. The record will show that by and large the people have acted wisely. And just as a legislature will sometimes enact unconstitutional legislation, the people of California, for instance, recently approved a ban on pay television, which was declared unconstitutional by the courts. In a system of direct legislation, the courts of course must determine constitutionality, just as they are called on to determine the constitutionality of legislation enacted by a legislature.

During recent years, there have been a number of measures placed on the ballot by initiative and referendum having to do with reapportionment. Except in the instance of Oregon, the people of all the States when this subject has been an election issue—voting on a one-man-vote basis—voted against one man, one vote as the exclusive method of apportioning both houses of their State legislatures. This was no paradox—this was the considered judgment of the majority of the people that the interests of all the people were best served by providing meaningful representation for the lesser populated areas in one of the two legislative houses.

Among measures the voters of various States have adopted through direct legislation have been initiatives calling for increased State support of their public schools. Recently the people approved an antifeatherbedding initiative bringing California, Arizona, and South Dakota into line with the Federal award removing unneeded firemen on diesel freight trains. Daylight saving time has been adopted through the direct legislation, initiative system in particular States.

I believe that an impartial analysis of the results of voting on ballot issues by the people will indicate that the people know what they are doing—that given the opportunity they can be trusted to act intelligently and in their own best interests.

With respect to legislative apportionment, I am sure that there are States where the people, unlike the people of Colorado, Michigan, California, and Nebraska, would not opt for another plan. But why not let them decide for themselves—why inflict the decision upon them from on high?

Under the reapportionment amendment, no State would have to adopt the Federal plan of apportionment if its people did not wish it. Similarly, no State—as now, unfortunately is the case—would have to forego adoption of the Federal plan against the wishes of its people.

The reapportionment amendment, purely and simply, extends the people's right of franchise to this important area of legislative apportionment.

In my discussion of direct legislation, I do not wish to imply that statewide elections on ballot issues are, or should be, in any way a substitute for the legislative process. Direct legislation is, rather, a supplement to the legislative process and obviously should be employed sparingly.

The long ballot, sometimes typical of elections in States where issues are voted on at the ballot box, is long only because of the inclusion of relatively unimportant, often technical constitutional amendments submitted to the people by the legislature itself. Sometimes, because of the lack of controversy engendered by such propositions, it is claimed that they are insufficiently understood by the electorate.

But the important ballot propositions—the State bond issues submitted to the people by the legislatures, and the measures presented to the voters by initiative petition—are actively argued pro and con and are thoroughly understood.

Legislative apportionment is such an important issue—an issue that is vital to the people, and an issue that they certainly understand.

To argue against this extension of democracy is to accept the argument that "this is a republic, not a democracy—let us keep it that way." That oversimplified argument refuses to recognize the fact that we are neither a republic, in the strictest sense of the term, nor a democracy in the strictest sense of the term, but an inspired combination of the two—a democratic republic. Adherence to that argument would demonstrate that the opponents of the reapportionment amendment have too little faith in the people, too little confidence in their inherent wisdom.

This Senator has faith in the people. I believe that, with the enactment of the reapportionment amendment, they will make the right decision, the appropriate decision, State by State—based on the special needs and the special situations which exist, State by State. They will also have the option to retain the present Supreme Court interpretation of the Constitution if they so choose.

I trust the people, and fully subscribe to the provisions of our great Constitution providing in its article V for its amendment by the people, and which, in spite of contentions to the contrary, places no limits on the subjects which can be considered by the people in proposed amendments. It is the people who are entitled to decide and should decide which of their rights are inalienable.

It is my sincere hope that opponents of the reapportionment amendment, upon reflection and on reexamination of their innermost feelings with respect to the principles of self-government, will decide that the people of the 50 States can be trusted; and that they will join with us in sending the amendment to the States for their consideration and decision.

They cannot do otherwise if they subscribe to the basic premise expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that "the will of the people shall be the basis of government." In simple words—"let the people decide."

SUBSTANTIAL AND WIDESPREAD SUPPORT OF REAPPORTIONMENT AMENDMENT

Thoughtful, forceful expressions from people in every walk of life throughout the 50 States favor Senate Joint Resolution 103. National leaders have testified before the Congress. Tens of thousands of letters have poured in, speaking for solution of this critical problem.

To the voices of leaders in government, education, the great national, State, and local organizations of this country has been added an overwhelming abundance of newspaper editorial comment urging adoption of a reapportionment constitutional amendment. In a personal survey of just a few of our great newspapers, 102 daily papers to be exact, I find well over two-thirds—of the daily papers, mind you—urging affirmative action. Among the weekly papers, the favorable ratio is far higher. I think this is strongly indicative of the voice of the people of America.

NATIONAL LEADERS IN EDUCATION SUPPORT DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

In the field of education, the concern over this subject is so great that a large number of the Nation's leading and most prominent educators joined in saying:

> As educators, we look upon the decision which must soon be made by the U.S. Senate regarding Senate Joint Resolution 103, as a matter which should and must be made a matter of nationwide concern.
>
> The resolution deals with the subject of how State legislatures may be apportioned, but, to us it raises the alarming question of whether the voters of this Nation are to be denied in perpetuity a right that was being enjoyed in the Colonies in this land even before our Constitution was drafted and which has ever since been a helping guide and balance wheel in our national progress. Simply stated, it is the right of the people to decide—the right to decide how they want to be represented, how much voice they want to give minority groups, how much flexibility they want in their governmental structure, and how threats of political dictatorship shall be curbed.
>
> It behooves all concerned to remember that Senate Joint Resolution 103 is entirely permissive in nature. This is proper and in keeping with democratic processes. The resolution brings back to life the opportunity, through permissive majority expression, to retain and continue in practice, the concept of balanced representation under which most of our States have made their greatest progress.
>
> The decisions of the courts of our land have left us no alternative but to enact a constitutional amendment if we are again to go forward under the principle that all segments of our population should be represented in the body that governs them. Without approval, significant geographic, social, and economic interests will henceforth be denied proper representation even if the majority will of the voters would have it otherwise. Quick approval of Senate Joint Resolution 103 is required if we are to put our time-tested formula of balanced representation back on the track.

The names of educators joining the statement are:

Dr. Leslie Wright, president, Samford University, Birmingham, Ala.;

Dr. Karl Lamb, professor of political science, Cowell College, University of California, Santa Cruz, Calif.;

Dr. Doak S. Campbell, president emeritus, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.;

Dr. Philip M. Crane, professor of history, Bradley University, Peoria, Ill.;

Dr. Noble W. Lee, dean, John Marshall Law School, Chicago, Ill.;

Dr. W. J. Moore, former dean, Eastern State Kentucky College, Richmond, Ky.;

Dr. Philip F. Dur, professor, University of Southwest Louisiana, Lafayette, La.;

Dr. Charles F. Phillips, president, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine.

Prof. James K. Pollock, professor of political science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.;

Dr. D. W. McCain, president, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Miss.;

Dr. Milo Bail, president emeritus, University of Omaha, Nebr.;

Mr. J. A. Pritchett, State board of education, Windsor, N.C.;

Dr. Boyd Sobers, professor of political science, Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio;

G. R. Griffin, superintendent of schools, Ramona, Okla.;

Dr. James H. Jensen, president, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg.;

Dr. Abner McCall, university president, Waco, Tex.;

Dr. William T. Muse, dean, School of Law, University of Richmond, Richmond, Va.; and

Col. J. M. Moore, president, Greenbrier Military School, Lewisburg, W. Va.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS SUPPORT DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Representing government at the local level across the Nation, many active leaders of long experience in their respective jurisdictions, joined in a statement supporting the reapportionment amendment. In part, their statement read:

> There is no question in the minds of most county officials throughout the country that unless Senate Joint Resolution 103 is approved and the "right of the people to decide" is preserved, many drastic changes are in store for local governments. Without the Dirksen amendment urban boss control of State legislatures can be extended on to other units of government, regardless of the will of the majority of voters in the governmental areas so involved. Leaders agree that unless county officials make their views known to their Senators within the next few weeks, county governments will inevitably be faced with months and years of uncertainty and frustration.

Included among those who joined in this statement are the following:

W. W. Dumas, of Baton Rouge, La., president of the National Association of Counties;

Loren Young, of Springfield, Ill., president of the Illinois Association of Supervisors and Commissioners;

Don Cafferty, of Stillwater, Minn., past president, Association of Minnesota Counties;

Farrell Rock, of Rexburg, Idaho, president, Idaho Association of Commissioners and Clerks;

Judge Ellis A. White, of Ontario, Oreg., president Association of Oregon Counties;

Lawrence H. Johnson, of Algoma, Wis., president, Wisconsin County Boards Association;

Jerome E. Dean, secretary-treasurer, North Dakota County Commissioners;

Victor E. Dolenc, president, Wyoming Association of County Officials; and

Francis O'Rourke, Westchester, N.Y., chairman, Westchester County Board of Supervisors.

TESTIMONY OF GOVERNORS FAVORING PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Comments of various Governors of our great States are of added significance as we deliberate this question. These comments are part of the official record of hearings on the subject of reapportionment of State legislatures.

NEVADA GOV. GRANT SAWYER

The Honorable Grant Sawyer, Governor of the State of Nevada, said:

First, I wish to make it clear that I do not dispute the authority of the Supreme Court of the United States to have reached the conclusion which it did in *Baker* v. *Carr* and the subsequent cases dealing with apportionment of State legislatures. The Court has spoken, and we accept the conclusions that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States requires that both houses of a bicameral State legislature be apportioned on the basis of population, unless a State can show that apportionment on some other basis is not arbitrary within the meaning of prior decisions construing the clause. In my opinion, the question raised by the Supreme Court decisions is whether or not a change in the Constitution is desirable.

In Nevada, the 1960 Federal census showed that one county in our State contained about 45 percent of the population of the State. The population of that county—Clark County—has continued to grow, and population estimates indicate that it may now contain more than half of the State's population. It is understandable that the people of the other counties are concerned about the consequences of granting control of both houses of the legislature to one county. They fear rightly or wrongly that their interests will necessarily suffer, not so much as a result of deliberate action by representatives of the one populous county, but because their problems will not be given adequate attention. Senator JAVITS mentioned a moment ago the importance, for example, of agricultural representation. This would be true in our State under the reapportioned legislature. Agriculture would have very little representation. There are many people in the one populous county who are not in favor of control of both houses of the legislature by their representatives.

I am aware that there is a constitutional and historical difference between the apportionment of the Congress and apportionment of State legislatures. The U.S. Senate was created as one means of preserving to the Original Thirteen States some of the sovereignty they enjoyed after the Revolution and before the U.S. Constitution was adopted. Article I, section 3, and the 17th amendment provide for equal suffrage in the Senate. An arrangement, by the way, the people of Nevada are very happy with. The 14th amendment, under which the reapportionment cases were decided, applies only to the States. Nevertheless, the success of the congressional structure suggests that a similar structure in State legislatures may be desirable and the very sovereignty acknowledged in the Federal system should as well be recognized as applicable to the composition of State legislatures. I do not believe that the senators, representatives, and State legislators who voted in favor of adoption of the 14th amendment intended that it be applied in such a manner as to deprive the people of the various States of the right to adopt the Federal system or any other for their legislatures.

I do not mean to suggest that the Federal system should be forced upon the people of the States, nor do I believe that representation on a population basis in both houses should be forced upon the people of the States. There is much to be said in favor of either system. It is my position that the people should be allowed to decide the composition of their respective legislatures. What may be desirable in a State in which the population is evenly spread over the State may not be desirable in a State such as Nevada where the bulk of the population is concentrated in one or two areas. Personally, I favor the Federal system for Nevada, which we have always used in our State, because I think it has provided some of the necessary checks and balances our economic and population structures require, but I am unable to predict with any accuracy how the people of Nevada as a whole would vote on the question. In any event, I believe that the choice should be left to them.

COLORADO GOVERNOR JOHN LOVE

The Honorable John Love, Governor of the State of Colorado, said:

I appreciate this opportunity to appear * * * and bring you some of my thoughts, but also, I think, perhaps more important, to talk to you a little bit about Colorado's reapportionment history, which I think points up the problem more clearly than perhaps any other State. I also think it is true that many of the things that prior witnesses have been talking about are demonstrated very clearly in the population distribution and in the geography of the State of Colorado.

First as to the reapportionment history, on June 15 of last year, in a companion case to *Baker* v. *Carr*, the Supreme Court decided the case of *Lucas* v. *Forty-Fourth General Assembly, et al.*, a case in which, as Governor of the State of Colorado, I was a party defendant. As you know, that case held unconstitutional and void a plan of legislative apportionment adopted by an overwhelming majority of the Colorado electorate less than 2 years earlier, and embodied in our State constitution. The voters of Colorado, in adopting the constitutional amendment which was overturned by the Supreme Court evinced, in my opinion, an appreciation of the diversity of our State and of the necessity of fair representation of the rural minority in our legislature. Our voters had a clear choice between a plan which apportioned seats for both houses of the legislature on a population basis only, and a plan which so apportioned the lower house, but took other factors into consideration in the upper house, the so-called federal plan. In the election which was held in 1962, the voters in every county without exception, and by about a 2-to-1 majority on the statewide basis adopted the second plan, the federal plan.

Nevertheless, this plan was, as I said, declared to be violative of the Federal Constitution by the Supreme Court and we lost no time in complying with the Court's opinion. Pursuant to my call, on July 1, the 44th General Assembly of Colorado convened in its second extraordinary session of 1964. The first extraordinary session, held in April of last year, had been the general assembly redistrict Colorado's congressional districts in obedience to the Supreme Court's mandate in *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1. The legislature thereby reluctantly destroyed the homogeneity of Colorado's unique western slope as a congressional district, represented by Congressman ASPINALL. The second session passed a plan of reapportionment for the State legislature which was approved by the three-judge U.S. district court panel for the district of Colorado, and which I signed into law on July 8, 1964. We subsequently held an election in accordance with this plan. I think Colorado was the first State to comply with the Supreme Court's mandate.

Nevertheless, I appear here today to lend my support to the efforts of this committee to consider a means of allowing States to apportion at least one house of their legislatures by taking into account factors other than population alone. In this respect, I disagree with the philosophy of equal protection, expressed by the majority of the Supreme Court, as well as with its reading of the legislative history of the 14th amendment.

I must disagree with this philosophy because it caused the majority of the Court to disregard the will of the Colorado electorate, which approved the plan of apportionment by a majority in every county of the State, in an election where all votes were given the equal weight now required by the Court's opinion. In effect, this opinion held that the majority of the voters in the urban areas discriminated against themselves in adopting this plan rather than one which apportioned both Houses on a strictly per capita basis. In the words of Circuit Judge Breitenstein, writing for the majority of the court below in the Lucas case:

"The contention that the voters have discriminated against themselves appalls rather than convinces."

It is my firm belief that the Colorado electorate knew exactly what it was doing when it went to the polls in 1962, and I firmly believe that its decision thus to amend the constitution of the sovereign State of Colorado should have stood unaltered, except by another vote of the people.

Gentlemen, I am a firm believer in the protection given to the citizens of the several States by the 14th amendment to the Constitution, and I would not favor any attempt to shrink its protection in any of the important areas of human liberty. But I do not believe that the framers of that amendment ever dreamed that it might be used to accomplish the results which the Supreme Court has reached in the past term. Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent traces the legislative history of the 14th amendment quite carefully, and proves beyond a doubt that it was not intended to deny to the States control over the franchise. Indeed, Mr. Justice Harlan's opinion quotes from speeches which state that while the speakers might personally prefer that the amendment give more protection to the franchise, that it would be impossible to obtain ratification by the required number of States of such an interference with their sovereignty.

But a majority of the Supreme Court having taken an opposite view, I am not here today to engage in a legal debate over issues which are now decided. Rather, it is my purpose to urge upon you the adoption of some form of relief which will return this Nation to the state of law which it thought existed for over 90 years, until this past June 15. As Mr. Justice Stewart stated in his dissent, over four-fifths of the States give effect to nonpopulation factors in apportioning seats in at least one house of their legislatures, indicating that there must be some very compelling and convincing reasons for a departure from the rule now declared by the Court. While I cannot claim to be an expert political scientist, or to be able to give you all the reasons for such a departure, I can, based on our own experience in Colorado, give you some of the reasons which a majority of the voters in every county in my State found decisive in 1962.

Mr. Justice Stewart's dissent gives an excellent one-paragraph description of the diverse nature of the State of Colorado, which I quote:

"The State of Colorado is not an economically or geographically homogeneous unit. The Continental Divide crosses the State in a meandering line from north to south, and Colorado's 104,247 square miles of area are almost equally divided between high plains in the east and rugged mountains in the west. The State's population is highly concentrated in the urbanized eastern edge of the foothills, while farther to the east lies that agricultural area of Colorado which is a part of the Great Plains. The area lying to the west of the Continental Divide is largely mountainous, with two-thirds of the population living in communities of less than 2,500 inhabitants or on farms. Livestock raising, mining, and tourism are the dominant occupations. This area is further subdivided by a series of mountain ranges containing some of the highest peaks in the United States, isolating communities and making transportation from point to point difficult, and in some places during the winter months almost impossible. The fourth distinct region of the State is the south-central region, in which is located the most economically depressed area in the State. A scarcity of water makes a statewide water policy a necessity, with each region affected differently by the problem."

Add to this diversity the fact, according to the 1960 census, the Denver metropolitan area contained more than one-half of the State's population and in listening to Governor Sawyer and considering other States, this is not too unusual across the United States. Now, in addition to this, the three major metropolitan areas of Denver, Colorado Springs, and Pueblo contained two-thirds of the State's total, and you realize that if both houses of the Colorado General Assembly were apportioned solely on a population basis, that urban domination of the legislature can be so strong that the remainder of the legislators, representing one-third of the State's population, would barely be heard. Thus, serious problems confronting citizens in rural areas would, in all probability, not be given the time, study, and deliberation given to problems of more immediate interest to urban legislators and their constituents. In this respect, Colorado's problems are not unlike those of New York or Illinois, or even Arizona, where it is probable that one metropolitan area will not dominate both houses of the State legislature.

It is my feeling that the legislature of the State of Colorado can best represent its citizens as a whole if the legislators individually represent homogeneous, identifiable groups of voters. This was also the conclusion of the majority of the Colorado electorate in 1962, including a majority in the so-called underrepresented Denver metropolitan area, which voted to give somewhat greater representation to many areas of the State than mere numbers would require. They did not intend to have legislators represent trees or acres, but people with distinct problems, backgrounds, and aspirations. These voters recognized that Colorado is made of many groups of citizens with diverse and often conflicting interests, and that these interests sometimes would be without any voice in our legislative councils if measured on a purely numerical basis.

Another reason which justifies departures from strict per capita representation in both houses is recognition of the fact that there may be times of stress and crisis when public feeling runs against a minority, when that minority needs the protection of the legislature. That protection is much more likely to be forthcoming when at least one member of the legislature has a significant number of such a minority among his constituents, than when the minority constitutes only a small fraction of a large, heterogeneous district.

I think it is true that in our history of government in this Nation, we have always expressed a concern that we be protected from what has been called at times the tyranny of the majority.

In Colorado, at least, there is always a possibility that in some areas of legislation the majority of the population may treat the minority unfairly. This can be illustrated in the crucial area of transmountain diversion of our most vital natural resource, water. If the populous portion of the State east of the Continental Divide were to use its heavy representation solely in its own interest, it might divert so much water from the less heavily populated western slope of the mountains that this area's full economic growth and the development of its vast natural resources might be frustrated, thus preventing it from making its full contribution to the growth and welfare of the entire State of Colorado. Such a result can best be avoided by effective representation of western slope water interests. This calls for a departure from pure per capita representation.

The western slope, as I saw, representing approximately half of the area of Colorado, contains only about 10 percent of its population. It contains most of the water. It contains great stores of natural resources, including oil shale. It has a great future which could be frustrated, theoretically and perhaps practically, under the apportionment plan which we have been forced to follow.

While each area of the State tends to have its own problems, the welfare and prosperity of each section affects the welfare and prosperity of the State as a whole. It is, therefore, in the long-term interest of Denver's voters to have a strong and vigorous rural delegation in the Colorado Senate, despite possible temporary conflicts over water or other problems. Denver's voters recognized that fact when they went to the polls in 1962 to reject a plan which was based solely on population (and approved one taking other factors into consideration in apportioning the Colorado Senate.)

As I stated earlier, Colorado has, since June 15, enacted into law a plan of apportionment complying with the Supreme Court's ruling in the Lucas case. The contrast between the senate, as apportioned under the new bill, and as apportioned under the plan adopted by the people in 1962, dramatizes the disadvantages of the rigid, nearly mathematical approach now required. An example of the problems created as in new senate district 35, covering the northwest part of the State. The district measures approximately 175 miles from east to west, and 140 miles from north to south, over rugged mountainous terrain. It contains 10 counties covering 20,514 square miles, an area larger than that of 9 of our States. For example, this district is 10 times the size of Delaware, 4 times the size of Connecticut, and over twice as large as Massachusetts, Hawaii, New Hampshire, New Jersey, or Vermont. The district includes three major river basins, one to the east of the Continental Divide and two to the west. And yet, States smaller in area each have two Senators in the U.S. Senate, while the district in question has only one senator in the Colorado Senate.

Another example of the problems created by this new plan of apportionment is the treatment now accorded the San Luis Valley, in the south central region of Colorado. The six counties in this valley are in the Rio Grande Basin, and are vitally concerned with water rights on the Rio Grande, and with Colorado's relationship with New Mexico, Texas, and Mexico, with respect to the Rio Grande. The rest of Colorado has no direct interest in this great river, whose waters are the economic foundation of the San Luis Valley. This area is also one of the most economically depressed of the State, and contains a high percentage of residents of Spanish-American heritage, with a relatively low educational level, and a relatively high State welfare load. This area, containing 38,000 persons according to the 1960 census, was formerly able to elect a senator to bring to the attention of the legislature its unique problems. But under the new per capita-based apportionment, the legislature was forced to place the counties of the San Luis Valley in three separate senatorial districts, and the residents of this valley are in the minority in each district. This is a clear case of denying a minority any representation at all in one branch of the legislature; it hardly fits our traditional concept of representative government.

One of the districts into which part of the San Luis Valley, Saguache County, had to be placed, illustrates problems of another kind caused by per capita apportionment. District 30 consists of 9 counties, and extends over 150 miles from north to south, from Gilpin and Clear Creek Counties, former gold and silver mining areas now rapidly becoming part of suburban Denver, to Saguache County in the San Luis Valley, which is primarily dependent on agriculture. This district straddles the Continental Divide, and it contains approximately 33 peaks over 14,000 feet in height. It is drained by four river basins, the South Platte, the Arkansas, the Rio Grande, and the Gunnison. These areas have sharply conflicting interests, and no one Senator can adequately represent all of them.

I hope that these examples of the problems we now face in Colorado make clear what the Colorado electorate recognized in 1962, and what most of our States have believed; that effective representation of the diverse interests of the people of the States, and of the States as a whole, is best achieved by representation of these separate interests, and not by overwhelming them in legislatures where their voice is so small as to go unheeded.

It has long been part of the American tradition to allow the several States to engage in experiments within the framework of our Constitution, such as Nebraska's adoption of a unicameral legislature. It is my belief that the framers of the 14th amendment, and certainly the States which ratified it, had no intention to disturb this freedom. Over the years, the systems of apportionment have varied from State to State in accordance with the particular needs and development of the various States. I believe it would be appropriate to restore that freedom of State action now.

There are a number of possible means of achieving this goal. I personally believe that at least one house of a bicameral legislature should be apportioned purely on a population basis, so that growing urban areas will always be assured of sufficient representation to protect their own interests. This, coupled with growing ability of urban areas to control the election of Governors in many States should provide ample protection against minority rule.

My own preference for a remedy is a substantive amendment to the Constitution which would allow the States having bicameral legislatures, by this, I do not mean to limit it to that, Senator **Hruska**—to give reasonable consideration to factors other than population in apportioning seats for one house. I would emphasize that I prefer the phrase "reasonable consideration" because I believe that such language would do no more than restore to the Constitution what most people thought to be its meaning ever since the adoption of the 14th amendment. "Reasonable consideration" would, as I understand it, allow the States to give reasonable weight to factors such as history, geography, economic interests, and effective representation of minority groups, without permitting arbitrary or crazy-quilt apportionment. Such a standard would strike down any invidious discrimination against the majority, while accepting more variation from per capita representation than the Supreme Court would now allow.

The reason why I advocate such a modest amendment is that it would, I hope, allow the courts to protect the citizens of the States from any gross malapportionment of one house of their legislatures, while still allowing the States maximum freedom to engage in the development of a variety of governmental machinery within the framework of representative government. Such an amendment would, I hope, incorporate the well-established standards which most of us thought governed "equal protection," namely, that any deviation from absolute equality should have a rational basis in permissible objectives, and not be simply arbitrary, or related to an invidious discrimination against any group.

GOV. NILS A. BOE, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The Honorable Nils A. Boe, Governor of the State of South Dakota, said:

I am confident that I express the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the people of South Dakota in supporting a constitutional amendment permitting a bicameral legislature of any State to apportion the membership of one house on factors other than population.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing such an amendment was adopted by the Legislature of South Dakota by only one dissenting vote.

It would appear that a refusal to permit the consideration and vote upon such a constitutional amendment pertaining so directly to the internal governmental organization of any State strips away the last vestige of integrity once conferred upon the several States by our constitutional fathers.

OREGON GOV. MARK O. HATFIELD

The Honorable Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of the State of Oregon, said:

The apportionment of Oregon's Legislative Assembly is in substantial accord with the criteria prescribed in recent judicial opinions of the requirements of the U.S. Constitution. Not only is the present apportionment in both houses established on the basis of population but decennial reapportionment is assured by provisions in the State constitution that require administrative or judicial action if legislative action does not take place.

It is not my belief that the public interest would not be well served by any of the pending proposals to limit the jurisdiction of Federal courts or to authorize substantial deviation from the apportionment of representation on the basis of population.

DELAWARE GOV. CHARLES L. TERRY, JR.

The Honorable Charles L. Terry, Jr., Governor of the State of Delaware, said:

Broadly speaking, it is my belief that States with a bicameral legislature should have a house apportioned strictly on the basis of population and a senate where geographical factors are given some weight.

Delaware, as you probably know, reapportioned both houses of its general assembly on a population basis by means of legislative statute enacted last year. The general assembly which we elected in November and which took office in January has representation based on population in both of its houses. The general feeling of Delawareans, is that this reposes too much power in the populous areas of the State.

NORTH CAROLINA GOV. DAN MOORE

The Honorable Dan Moore, Governor of the State of North Carolina, said:

My opinion in brief is that the reapportionment of State legislatures should be left to the States themselves.

CALIFORNIA GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of the State of California, said:

As Governor of California, which, as the most populous State, has almost 10 percent of the Nation's total population, I have special reason to appeal to you today.

California, just as each of the other 49 States, is unique and has unique problems. But because California is the largest of these unique units, its unique problems are larger. And since size inevitably results in complexity, these larger problems are extraordinarily complex. We are additionally confronted by a rate and constancy of immigration unmatched in human history, a growth that feeds and nourishes these complex problems.

When we come, as we have today, to one of the most difficult of these problems, legislative apportionment, we have still another factor with which to contend. The great range and variety of California's geography and the uneven, and often expensive mismatching of population and resources. Almost everything we need we have, but what is needed in the south is often available only in the north; what is required to build great coastal cities must come from the sparsely settled mountains, and even the deserts must slowly be converted into fertile valleys to provide enough food and fiber for all the other areas of California.

I do not intend to discuss all this in detail here today. I know that non-Californians are prehaps understandably less concerned about our great splendors and our lesser miseries than we ourselves. I have repeated these generalizations only because I think they are a necessary background for those who would like to understand how most Californians feel about the matter now before you.

What I have to say about apportionment is remarkably close to what Senator KUCHEL has already told you, and I think this fact is significant. I am a Democrat, he is a Republican. In this instance, I believe we represent a great and still-growing consensus in California on what should be done as a result of the U.S. Supreme Court rulings on apportionment of State legislatures.

My recommendations are not all embodied in the proposed constitutional amendment you are now considering, but they could easily be fitted into that measure or any of a number of others. As Senator KUCHEL did, I offer ways in which to make that measure acceptable—indeed highly desirable—to Californians.

My recommendations are three in number, and I would stress that each bears with sufficient weight on the two others that, in my judgment they are not separable.

First, I would endorse the principle that each State be given a qualified right under a constitutional amendment to apportion one of two houses of its legislature without fully meeting the one-man, one-vote test now established by recent rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Second, I would insist that one of the restrictive qualifications be that the people of each of the 50 States be given the opportunity long denied in many of the States to pass directly on questions of apportionment by initiative and referendum—an opportunity which Californians have both had and exercised on a number of occasions. That right should be reserved to the people of each State by the Federal Constitution as a condition precedent to apportionment of one of the two houses of any State without full adherence to the one-man, one-vote rule.

Third, I would also restrict the use of this new constitutional privilege to States which could meet stringent requirements embodied in the same constitutional amendment requirements which would guarantee that the electorate of the State concerned was not limited by reason of sex, race, creed, color, economic status, or other comparably irrelevant factors.

I cannot tell you that I have exact language or procedures devised to carry out this three-point recommendation. I can tell you, however, that California could qualify immediately so far as the spirit and intent are concerned. I am sure many other States could also qualify and there is no reason why those States who would not immediately be eligible for this privilege could not become so in a reasonable time.

California urgently needs this kind of amendment, and I believe many other States would welcome it. I see no valid reason for stubborn opposition to returning this question of legislative apportionment at a State level to the people of the several States, so long as we can guarantee that all those who qualify as voters under Federal standards can freely participate in making the decision. I would join in objections to measures which did not offer such a guarantee to the full electorate, but I see no valid reason why such guarantees should not be offered.

I do not believe that all States should or would choose to apportion one house on other than a strict one-man, one-vote rule. In many States, I think I might, as an individual, choose to vote against differences between the two houses so far as representing population is concerned. But I think no one anywhere should protest a properly qualified right of the citizens of any State to make their own free decision in that matter.

So far as the ultimate decision in California under such an amendment is concerned, I believe I would support a reasonable modification of the one-man, one-vote rule in the election of the State senate.

That belief is based on the past and the present, but it also has the future in mind.

MONTANA GOV. TIM BABCOCK

The Honorable Tim Babcock, Governor of the State of Montana, said:

Following our joint resolution No. 7, I again want to go on record as follows: I personally, and the people of Montana, am extremely desirous in seeing that our Constitution provides that at least one house of our State legislature may be apportioned on the basis of other than a strict population measurement. A joint statement will be presented to you by a Montana senator and a Montana representative on March 17.

OKLAHOMA GOV. HENRY BELLMON

The Honorable Henry Bellmon, Governor of the State of Oklahoma, said:

As Governor of a State which has been embroiled in the problems of legislative reapportionment, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present my views.

The failure of the Oklahoma Legislature to follow the Oklahoma constitution and reapportion itself following each decennial census understandably caused a great amount of consternation on the part of residents of areas which have become more heavily populated through the years.

Having lived all of my life in a rural area, however, I also am aware of the necessity for assuring residents of the less populous areas that their needs will not be ignored in an increasingly urban society.

The membership of the National Congress, with the Senate based on governmental units and the House on population, has apparently been satisfactory in serving the needs of our citizens. It would appear wise to permit that States follow the same or a similar pattern.

ARKANSAS GOV. ORVAL FAUBUS

The Honorable Orval E. Faubus, Governor of the State of Arkansas, said:

I want to lodge the strongest recommendation possible for the favorable consideration of a constitutional amendment to permit the various States of the Union to apportion at least one house of the State legislature on factors other than population.

In my mind, this so-called one-man, one-vote rule, as laid by the U.S. Supreme Court in a recent decision, is the most unwise and disruptive decision handed down by the Court, perhaps in its whole history.

Any student of history and constitutional government will know without any doubt that if the rule in this decision had been made in 1775 or 1789, the Union of the Thirteen Colonies would never have been formed, and there would not today be in the United States of America.

We all know there are sections and regions distinct and apart from others, with many differences. These differences as well as others, are proper to consider in deciding upon representation in a legislative body. These matters are equally important as mere numbers, so far as legislative representation is concerned.

I strongly feel that the various States of the Union should be permitted the same privilege accorded to the National Congress, where one House is based on population and the other on factors other than population.

If the Members of the Congress do not at this time take steps to permit the people to have a voice in correcting this most unwise decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, then one of the greatest fundamental principles of the Government of this Nation will be destroyed.

ALABAMA GOV. GEORGE C. WALLACE

The Honorable George C. Wallace, Governor of the State of Alabama, said:

It is my sincere hope that this subcommittee will report favorably upon the proposed amendment to restore to the people their sovereign power to structure their State legislatures and to allocate the State legislative powers on the basis of factors other than population, if the people so desire.

MICHIGAN GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY

The Honorable George Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan, said:

The decision on June 15, 1964, of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Reynolds* v. *Sims* has brought a number of proposed statutes and resolutions. In essence, the question that must be decided is whether congressional action in the form of legislation or in the form of a proposed amendment to the Constitution should be enacted to overcome the effects of *Reynolds* v. *Sims*. I urge that a constitutional amendment should be proposed which would call for one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on the basis of population, while the other could contain other bona fide elements of apportionment, bearing in mind, however, that in essence any legislature, regardless of the means or method by which it is apportioned, must represent the people.

The history of apportionment in Michigan is one of a series of political and legal battles which have been fought over many years. In 1952 the people of Michigan had squarely placed before them the question of whether they wished both houses of the legislature to be apportioned strictly on a population basis.

This measure was defeated by over 400,000 votes and simultaneously therewith another constitutional amendment, which set up a senate based on considerations of both area and population, and which fixed in the constitution the senatorial districts, was approved by a majority of almost 300,000 votes. Thereafter, the battle turned to the courts and in June of 1960 the Michigan Supreme Court held that it could not invalidate the amendment that was adopted in 1952. This case was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Supreme Court vacated the Michigan order and remanded the case back to the Michigan Supreme Court. On July 18, 1962, the Michigan Supreme Court held the Michigan State senate to be unconstitutional. On July 27, the Honorable Potter Stewart, Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, entered a stay order so as to allow the 1962 election to proceed.

The people of the State of Michigan in exercising their sovereign will, in the fall of 1960 adopted a constitutional amendment which required that a vote on a constitutional convention be held in April of 1961. This election was held and the voters of the State approved the calling of a constitutional convention. Thereafter, in September of 1961 the delegates to the said convention, 144 in number, were elected and the convention began its deliberations in early October 1961.

One of the main committees of the constitutional convention was the committee on legislative apportionment, which was headed by Dr. John Hannah, president of the Michigan State University and the Chairman of the Federal Civil Rights Commission. This commission for many months held hearings, studied plans, met, argued, and eventually came up with a plan which apportioned the Michigan Legislature on two bases: First, the house of representatives would be apportioned on the basis of population granting one representative to each county or group of counties having seven-tenths of 1 percent of the State's population, and thereafter allocating the seats on the basis of the method of equal proportion. I submit to you that this, in fact, was apportionment on a population basis, and that each metropolitan area, particularly Wayne County, received exactly the number of representatives in the house of representatives which it was entitled to on a percentage basis.

The senate was apportioned on the basis of factors which were given to each county of the State. Factors equal to four times the county's percent of the State population plus its percentage of the State's land area were allocated to each county. Each county or group of counties having 13 or more factors was allocated a senator, with the rest allocated on the basis of equal proportion. I might add that the plan which followed this formula and was adopted by the Michigan Supreme Court on May 26, 1964, required approximately 47 percent of the population to elect a majority of a house of representatives and 42 percent of the State's population to elect a majority to the senate. This total percentage factor was better than any other State in the Union. Some might have had a better ratio in one house but none exceeded Michigan on a combined basis.

The Michigan constitution went further than just setting up a formula for election of a legislature. It provided the means to have periodic reapportionment by a body other than a legislative body. History has proved that it is very difficult for a legislative body to reapportion itself and therefore the constitutional convention set up an eight-man bipartisan commission who had the duty to reapportion the legislature after each decennial census. If the commission could not agree then the matter was to go to the State supreme court and the court was to choose the plan which most nearly complied with the Michigan constitutional requirements.

Happily we thought that the reapportionment problems of Michigan had been solved and that the will of the people had been sustained. However, on June 15, *Reynolds* v. *Sims* came down and the Michigan Supreme Court vacated its order of May 26, 1964, and on June 22, 1964, adopted a plan which has been described by one eminent legislator as looking as if it had been drawn by a drunken potato bug that had been dipped in red ink, and allowed to crawl across the face of the map of Michigan. Every criterion which has been built into the 1963 Michigan constitution to prevent gerrymandering had been violated. The constitution required that the districts had to be compact and contiguous, that boundary lines of local units of government should not be violated, and that the districts had to be contiguous by land. These safeguards were the result of the study made by the legislative apportionment committee, and were adopted on a bipartisan basis in the convention. The plan which the Michigan Supreme Court ultimately adopted does violence to every one of these antigerrymandering safeguards. It splits counties, townships, and cities. It divides one county which has only 4,000 to 5,000 people over the absolute ration, into four different representative districts. Single townships are separated from the rest of the county, and hence, longstanding bonds of economic and political union have been torn asunder. Cities have been split into several legislative districts. I point this out to you not solely to bring to you the miseries of Michigan but to point out what happens when the U.S. Supreme Court makes a broad pronouncement and then leaves it for the State courts or lower Federal courts to carry out the details. I think a number of you can recall not too many years ago when an order by the U.S. Supreme Court provided that certain statements and files in the possession of the FBI had to be opened to defendants. Thereafter, we had a rash of lower court decisions which carried this pronouncement to such a ridiculous extreme that Congress moved in and enacted legislation stating when and under what conditions FBI files can be opened. So here that part of the decision of Chief Justice Warren relating to the use of boundary lines of local units of government to prevent gerrymandering is totally disregarded by a court, and only one criteria, population, is followed.

Mr. Chairman, the State of Michigan is a large State. We have one senatorial district which stretches from Escanaba in the Upper Peninsula to Alpena which is located on the shores of Lake Huron. It is 242 miles from Escanaba, Mich., to Alpena, Mich. I am not talking now about representation in Congress—I am talking about representation in a State senate. I think that a valid consideration of fair apportionment is having one's State legislator available for consultation.

Most important, however, is the method by which the State of Michigan accomplished its legislative reapportionment. It used the historical method of letting the people decide. This was not a hastily drawn constitutional amendment, but rather the apportionment article of the 1963 Michigan constitution was the result of over 7½ months of careful, thoughtful deliberation. First, it was considered by a committee composed of attorneys, educators, farmers, and so forth, people from all over the State of Michigan. Thereafter, it was considered in open debate by a constitutional convention of 144 delegates, then brought before the people from all over the State for an open, thorough, and exhaustive debate, and finally, albeit by a close vote, adopted by the majority of the people as the method that they wished to have used to apportion their State legislature.

Then, because six Justices of the Supreme Court have different ideas as to what constitutes fair legislative apportionment, the work of 7½ months and the deliberative consideration of the Michigan constitutional convention was wiped away. I want to point out to you that this convention was composed of retired judges, college presidents like Dr. John Hannah, eminent political scientists, such as Prof. James K. Pollock, of the University of Michigan, 40 attorneys, farmers, schoolteachers, and businessmen, and union people like the vice president of the State AFL–CIO, Mr. William Marshall.

All of these people took part in this convention—not that they all agreed, not that they all voted for all provisions, but the fact is that there was a full and open discussion in the best American tradition. Yet, because the majority of the U.S. Supreme Court thought otherwise, we now have thrust upon the people a plan which many consider to be gerrymandered for political purposes and which was drawn not by a constitutional convention but rather by two Democrat members of the apportionment commission. The Michigan Supreme Court did not lay any criterion as to what type of plan it wanted, but simply rode roughshod over the four Republican members of the commission because it considered population the only standard in choosing a plan. I think

> that it is vital that the Congress of the United States takes some action in this area. There should be a method by which the people can determine the manner of apportioning their State legislature. One house should be allowed to consider other considerations besides population. It should further be provided that safeguards be given to the people in the form of initiative and petition to amend their constitution. I point out to you that in *Baker* v. *Carr* one of the main reasons for the bringing of the case was that the people had no means to amend the Tennessee constitution other than by having the legislature propose the amendment. This has never been true in Michigan. If the people desire a change they have only to obtain signatures on petitions to bring the matter before the people for a vote. In fact, the matter of reapportionment has been brought before the people several times by this method. With these safeguards the people of a State should be allowed a voice in selecting the manner in which their State legislature is apportioned.
>
> I appreciate this opportunity to be able to present my views and to give you the history of legislative apportionment in Michigan. I believe it is your duty to rescue the courts from this "political thicket" into which they have strayed.

WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

Nor is this matter of reapportionment of concern to men alone. I would cite to you the action of the largest women's organization in the world, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which is strongly on record on behalf of a reapportionment amendment. Mrs. William Hasebroock, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, had these pertinent comments to make:

> Members of the federation believe it is an inherent right of the people, by free and majority vote, to decide how they wish to be represented.
>
> Just as the 19th amendment gave American women the right to vote, the proposed reapportionment amendment, now before the U.S. Senate, would provide the citizens of each State the right to decide on whether they want both houses, or simply one house, of their legislatures composed on a population-only basis. Could anything be more fair than to let the people vote on this issue? It is difficult to understand why some people oppose this proposed amendment and that fundamental right.

SIGNIFICANCE OF SUBSTANTIAL, WIDELY BASED SUPPORT OF DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Thus, we see in every direction to which we turn a widely based preponderance of citizens and Government leaders calling for action. Their large number, their prominence, and their well-stated convictions are highly persuasive as to the merits of having one house of a State legislature based on a combination of population and area. Without discounting this fact in the slightest, however, this Senator cites and relies on the testimony to which I have already referred, for an additional and primary purpose; namely, that such widespread interest and concern on this subject clearly indicates that it is an issue on which the States themselves should be given an opportunity to express themselves as to whether they want such an amendment to the Constitution.

In passing upon joint resolutions for constitutional amendments, it is not for the Congress to judge as to the final and ultimate merit thereof. It is for this body and the other body to consider well the background and history of the issue, its objectives, the kind and degree of reception it receives at the hands of the Nation at large. If there is substantial, widespread, respectable, and intelligent support such as that indicated in the instant situation, it is our duty to approve and submit the joint resolution to the States for their action by approval or rejection, as provided in article 4 of the Constitution.

This is especially true when the occasion for presentment of the joint resolution comes about because of a Supreme Court decision which overturns and reverses a practice, institution, or position long held to be proper and valid. Certainly, that is the case with Reynolds against Sims.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do I understand the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to say that if there is widespread and intelligent support for an amendment to the Constitution that Senators should vote for it and the Senate should approve it?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is exactly correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Regardless of the conviction of the individual Senator?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct, if there is the background to which this Senator has referred. If there is a situation, which arises by reason of a Supreme Court decision overturning a political philosophy which has been followed in this country for almost 200 years, and there is an outpouring of disagreement from across the Nation, with the decision of the Supreme Court, then yes, it is our duty as Members of Congress to let the people speak on that issue.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator interpret the provision in our Constitution requiring a two-thirds vote of the House of Representatives and of the Senate as meaning that the Members of the Senate should not determine the proposition on its merits, but should determine it on the assessment of public opinion, or assessment of feelings of the public in general?

Mr. HRUSKA. Where there is deep-seated and substantial sentiment on each side of an issue of this kind, it is incumbent upon Members of Congress to give the people the opportunity to act on that issue.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator feel that this would be true whether a referendum were provided or not, because the constitutional provision itself provides three-fourths of the State legislatures must act?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct, and in that we have a safeguard.

The vote of two-thirds of the Members here is needed. Ratification by three-fourths of the States is also needed before it can become a part of our Constitution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that it is difficult for Members of Congress to determine public opinion; that hearings are not designed to elicit a competent determination as to how widespread this opinion is?

Is it not true that Congress has not set up any system of ascertaining the views of the public more comprehensively or accurately than the Gallup poll?

The Gallup poll of 1964 found an overwhelming majority of the people favoring the one-man, one-vote system set forth in Reynolds against Sims. I have not seen any documentation that would overturn this view, although many responsible people have testified before the subcommittee.

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not know that Congress has devised any precise system. I do not know that that is necessary.

This Senator is a member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee having to do with constitutional amendments. My colleagues and I sat for days listening to leaders of State governments, State representatives, and many prominent and knowledgeable people who testified on both sides of this issue. The hearings are published.

Reading and consideration of that material lead to the conclusion that here is a situation which for almost 200 years was the accepted way of allowing the States to determine the structure of their legislatures. Suddenly, that concept is cut short, and the direction is reversed, imposing on the people in all the States a new concept of law.

That is what is involved here. It is a situation that is so fundamental and so vital that it is our duty, in the face of that record, to adopt the pending joint resolution by at least a two-thirds majority, so that the States can pass on it. If three-fourths of them ratify, it becomes a part of our Constitution; if they do not, it will not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have the greatest admiration and respect for the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. He is one of the ablest Members of this body.

Frankly, I am surprised that the Senator suggests that an amendment to the Constitution, which does impose a very heavy responsibility, in my view, on the Members of the Senate, shall be decided not fundamentally on the basis of the merits of the proposition, but should be based on whether or not there seems to be a considerable amount of sentiment around the country in support of the proposition.

I have just inserted in the RECORD a poll of political scientists from a State university in Ohio which showed political scientists including specialists in reapportionment were 4 to 1 against the Dirksen amendment.

It would seem to me that a Senator, particularly one who has the heavy responsibility that the Senator from Nebraska has of serving on the Constitutional Amendment Subcommittee, has a responsibility which burdens him when making up his mind on the merits.

After all, we are sent here by our constituencies to use our own intelligence and ability, and we spend our time determining the merits of these matters.

Certainly the republican-democratic form of government would suggest it should be up to us, as elected representatives and it is incumbent upon us to make up our own minds.

If on the basis of the merits two-thirds of the Members of the Senate and two-thirds of the Members of the House think the proposal is appropriate, proper, and desirable, it seems to me it should go to the legislatures. If three-fourths of the legislatures, by a majority vote each, support the constitutional amendment on its merits it certainly should be adopted; and it would be adopted under our Constitution.

But it seems that incumbent upon us is the responsibility to stand up and assume responsibility ourselves, and not pass the buck and say, "Well, we don't know how this will work; we don't know if it will be good or bad. We cannot tell; and if we cannot tell, how can we expect other people, who cannot take the time we can, to make up their minds? As an elected Member of the U.S. Senate, a Senator has to decide for himself.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Wisconsin is a good debater. He has proved that on the floor of the Senate many times. His mind is as keen and incisive in explaining propositions as that of any Member who has graced this Chamber. But he is not going to get me into a position of even intimating that I believe that a majority of the Members of the Senate, when they speak in support of this amendment, have abdicated their responsibility.

On the contrary, I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that Senators who support the amendment have assumed a responsibility to do the States and the citizens of the country the greatest good by deciding the question from the substance of the record, not according to polls of anonymous political scientists or any other organization. We will act according to the actual substance of the testimony of men of long experience in government who have come before the committee and have given solid reasons for and against this proposal.

With that kind of record, we assume our responsibility and say that we want the people to express themselves on this question. Because there is such a substantially deep-rooted division on the question, they are entitled to do so. It is an intelligent expression. While I do not know on which side the strongest expression will be I do know that the expression is substantial on both sides.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I presume that the Senator himself believes that this is a good, sound, appropriate proposition. He has argued in that way.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes, indeed, he feels deeply about it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Disregarding how people might feel or what may be the feeling or sentiment around the country among gifted people, people who have thoughtfully studied this proposal and are familiar with it, the Senator himself feels that it is sound?

Mr. HRUSKA. I certainly do.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I take it that he would not feel that a Senator who has studied the proposal, who has studied it carefully, thoughtfully, and prayerfully, and who has consulted able people and has come to a contrary conclusion—is under those circumstances showing a fear of the people or is failing in his duty under the Constitution to give the people a chance to vote on the proposal, if being thoroughly convinced himself that the proposal is wrong, he votes against it? Would the Senator under those circumstances say that such a Senator was not fulfilling his obligations to the people if he were convinced that the proposal was wrong?

Mr. HRUSKA. I would not presume to attempt to read the minds, the thinking, the convictions, or the motives of other Senators. I know what my feeling is. I know what the feeling of well over 60 Members of the Senate is. They want this issue reported to the States so that the States have a chance to debate it. They can turn it down or they can adopt it.

I think that it is good that political scientists have spoken as they have. But it is also important that 32 States legislatures have either passed resolutions calling for a constitutional convention or have memorialized Congress to enact an amendment such as proposed here.

This represents a protest by those who know State government well. They know the concept and history of State legislatures well enough that when they protest as they have, the problem is of a nature, of a degree, and of such a thrust as to merit referral to the people for their final decision.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. He satisfies me completely when he says he would not challenge the motivation or what is in the mind and heart of a Senator who might disagree with him and vote against the measure. That is all I ask. This has been my entire point: that Senators should decide on the merits, not on whether the amendment is tied to referendum. The motivation, I say, is not because those of us who vote against the proposal fear the people; the motivation is that we feel the amendment is bad. We feel the amendment is not justified. That is the only argument I would make here. I simply want to clarify the situation and make certain that the Senator from Nebraska was not implying in any way that we who oppose the amendment are delinquent in our responsibility or are failing to give the people of the country an opportunity to vote, when we are discharging our responsibility by voting according to our views.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy if I have brought a ray or two of sunshine into the life of the Senator from Wisconsin this afternoon. I am happy when he indicates that there is not necessarily an abdication of all responsibility and a yielding to public pressure only. I was glad to have the Senator express himself on that point.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rose to ask a question. I may have joined this body under a misapprehension. I thought this was a representative Government. I thought I had been sent here by the people of my State to do their will, not my will or the will of some appointee on the Supreme Court, or some political science specialist, or some learned scholars. I thought I was sent here to do the will of the people of my State.

We, jointly, in Congress represent the will of the people of the United States. I can recall hearing, many years ago, something about government of the people, for the people, and by the people. I fail to see, under any circumstances, what is wrong, or whether there is anything wrong, with permitting the people to decide exactly how they want to apportion their State legislatures. Nor do I see anything that should cause us not to be worried by the fact that the legislation or the conditions of legislation were taken from the hands of the elected representatives and apparently placed in the Supreme Court. That has caused me concern, on the one hand; but on the other hand, I think nothing could be more proper than to hand this most important question to the people, who have been the final court of decision in this great country, as I understand it, for the last half century.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly on that point?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin hesitates to argue conservatism with two distinguished Republicans, men who have represented conservatism—and have given their best efforts in the cause of conservatism; but I espouse in this dispute the views of that most eminent of political philosophers, Edmund Burke, who took the position that he would give to his constituents his time, his careful attention, and his very best efforts to do for them whatever he could, but would never yield to his constituents his judgment.

This is something that he reserved to himself, and this is something that this U.S. Senator feels it his duty to do. This U.S. Senator feels that it is his duty to use his own best judgment. I will never surrender my judgment to the people of my State, if they unanimously want something that I think is wrong. I will vote the way I think is right.

I believe that is the reason that the people elected me, to exercise my judgment, and not to conduct a popularity poll in my State.

When the people are right, I will vote with them, and when they are wrong, I will vote against them.

This is a wonderful job, being a U.S. Senator. I have worked hard and long to win it, and even harder and longer to keep it.

But it is a great job—worth the effort, only if I exercise my own judgment.

Before I would vote against my own convictions, I would give up this job.

Mr. HRUSKA. And yet, Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin takes great joy in announcing the 4-to-1 majority among the political scientists in favor of his position.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. The experts happen to agree with my judgment. I welcome that.

Mr. HRUSKA. State after State has enacted apportionment on a basis of one man, one vote in one house of the legislature and a geographical-plus-population basis in the other. That action has been struck down, and we find very few people of such a State protesting that the Supreme Court, by a decision of 6 to 3, has repealed the law of the land on the statute books. It is a constitutional provision.

That is what we predicate our judgment on. We do not abdicate our responsibility.

We do not abdicate our responsibility any more than does a trial judge in a court of law who sends a case to a jury for a verdict, after listening to the evidence presented by both sides and determining it to be sufficient to warrant the jury's deliberation and decision.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The State legislatures have a vested interest in this issue and have had right along. They want malapportionment in order to keep their jobs, and they have wanted it consistently.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is a rather cynical view of the legislatures, virtually all of whom have gone by that point a long time ago. Most legislatures are now reapportioned or are in the process of reapportionment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That has been done under the most strenuous kind of duress from the Court.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is by direct order of the Court.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They have been forced to do it.

Mr. HRUSKA. It has been by a direct order of six members of the Supreme Court, a temporary majority in the Supreme Court.

Under our system of government the Supreme Court is normally the last guesser as to what the Constitution means. When the Supreme Court speaks, we abide by what they say as respectfully as we can.

Mr. Justice Douglas said in recent weeks:

> Sometimes the decisions of this Court are not approved in the long run. And constitutional amendments are made. For example, our Court held that the graduated income tax was unconstitutional. And we got the 16th amendment—we changed that. Our Court held that a State could lay a poll tax as a condition of voting, and that was changed with respect to Federal elections. Our Court held that a State could keep women from voting and that was changed by the 19th amendment. This is part of the process. People can have such constitutions—such provisions—as they want.

Unless we pass Senate Joint Resolution 103, the people of this country will not have a chance to express viewpoints and make a judgment, which they have the right to do under article V of our Constitution, if three-fourths of the States vote to do so.

That is the reason that I cite the many instances of support for this constitutional amendment. I do it not for the purpose of saying that there are more votes in favor of it or against it. I do it for the purpose of demonstrating that there is such a substantial, deep-rooted, and intelligent difference of opinion in the substantial segments on each side, that Congress should refer this issue, at which the Supreme Court has had a trial, to the final political authority in this land, and that is the will of the governed.

We are trying to give the people a chance to express themselves on this proposition. In other words, in our judgment the people can be trusted to decide this question intelligently.

Mr. President, there are those who have been busily engaged in spinning a web, the design of which is that even though Congress proposes the Dirksen amendment, the States would not ratify it. Such persons are entitled to their opinion and appraisal and the right to express them. But the way to determine whether opinion is fact or not is to submit the proposition to the States for decision. Such submission is warranted when we call to mind again the strong, clear, and widespread call for action in favor of such an amendment.

The decision will be made on a State level by legislatures which will have been apportioned upon basis of substantial equality of population in keeping with the Supreme Court's Reynolds against Sims. What better way exists for decision on such a fundamental policy question?

When the issue does come to the States for decision, let those who oppose it in the Congress address their arguments to the State level, where the issue will, and should, be made. Failure to refer it to the States for decision would show a lack of faith and confidence in the people, in the States, and in the constitutional processes by which they are governed. It would also constitute a superimposition by Dirksen amendment opponents of their own desires over an orderly resolution of a vital and closely contested proposition.

MERITS OF ISSUE

Mr. President, there is another factor which calls for the Congress to submit the reapportionment amendment to the States for their decision, in addition to its widespread, respectable, and substantial popular approval which has already been documented.

This additional factor is that the present interpretations of the Constitution by the Supreme Court for assuming and exercising jurisdiction in this political thicket was not reached unanimously by any means, or even overwhelmingly. There were clear, cogent dissenting views. Let me cite some of them specifically.

As Mr. Justice Frankfurter noted in his dissent in Baker against Carr:

> The notion that representation propositioned to the geographic spread of population is so universally accepted as a necessary element of equality between man and man that it must be taken to be the standard of a political equality preserved by the 14th amendment—that it is, in the appellants' words, "the basic principle of representative government"—is, to put it bluntly, not true. However desirable and however desired by some among the great political thinkers and framers of our government, it has never been generally practiced, today or in the past. It was not the English system, it was not the colonial system, it was not the system chosen for the national Government by the Constitution, it was not the system exclusively or even predominantly practiced by the States at the time of adoption of the 14th amendment, it is not predominantly practiced by the States today.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter further noted:

> The Court today reverses a uniform course of decision established by a dozen cases, including one by which the very claim now sustained was unanimously rejected only 5 years ago. The impressive body of rulings thus cast aside reflected the equally uniform course of our political history regarding the relationship between population and legislative representation—a wholly different matter from denial of the franchise to individuals because of race, color, religion, or sex. Such a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judicial power demands a detailed analysis of the role of the Court in our constitutional scheme.
>
> In effect, today's decisions empowers the courts of the country to devise what should constitute the proper composition of the legislatures of the 50 States. If State courts should for one reason or another find themselves unable to discharge this task, the duty of doing so is put on the Federal courts or on this Court, if State views do not satisfy this Court's notion of what is proper districting.
>
> Contemporary apportionment: Detailed recent studies are available to describe the present-day constitutional and statutory status of apportionment in the 50 States. They demonstrate a decided 20th century trend away from population as the exclusive base of representation. Today, only a a dozen State constitutions provide for periodic legislative reapportionment of both houses by a substantially unqualified application of the population standard, and only about a dozen more prescribe such reapportionment for even a single chamber. "Specific provision for county representation in at least one house of the State legislature has been increasingly adopted since the end of the 19th century."
>
> More than 20 States now guarantee each county at least 1 seat in one of their houses regardless of population, and in 9 others, county or town units are given equal representation in 1 legislative branch, whatever the number of each unit's inhabitants. Of course, numerically considered, "There provisions invariably result in overrepresentation of the least populated areas." And in an effort to curb the political dominance of metropolitan regions, at least 10 States now limit the maximum entitlement of any single county (or, in some cases, city) in 1 legislative house—another source of substantial numerical disproportion.
>
> Manifestly, the equal protection clause supplies no clearer guide for judicial examination of apportionment methods than would be the guarantee clause itself. Apportionment, by its character, is a subject of extraordinary complexity, involving—even after the fundamental theoretical issues concerning what is to be represented in a representative legislature have been fought out or compromised—considerations of geography, demography, electoral convenience, economic and social cohesions or divergencies among particular local groups, communications, the practical effects of political institutions like the lobby and the city machine, ancient traditions and ties of settled usage, respect for proven incumbents of long experience and senior status, mathematical mechanics, censuses compiling relevant data, and a host of others.
>
> In all of the apportionment cases which have come before the Court, a consideration which has been weighty in determining their nonjusticiability has been the difficulty or impossibility of devising effective judicial remedies in this class of case. An injunction restraining a general election unless the legislature reapportions would paralyze the critical centers of a State's political system and threaten political dislocation whose consequences are not foreseeable. A declaration devoid of implied

> compulsion of injunctive or other relief would be an idle threat.
>
> Surely, a Federal district court could not itself remap the State: The same complexities which impede effective judicial review of apportionment a fortiori make impossible a court's consideration of these imponderables as an original matter. And the choice of elections at large as opposed to elections by district, however unequal the districts, is a matter of sweeping political judgment having enormous political implications, the nature and reach of which are certainly beyond the informed understanding of, and capacity for appraisal by courts.

That is a quotation from the dissent of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, a brilliant scholar, and one of the most distinguished members of the Supreme Court to sit at any time.

The dissents of Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Harlan in the case of Reynolds against Sims are certainly grounds for saying that this issue is not one which is opened or closed as a completely one-sided proposition. It is an issue on which there are deep feelings and convictions on both sides. The way to resolve the issue is not by continued debate or by an effort to dig up historical material but by taking it to the State level where the problem resides.

I submit that those who inveigh in favor of the one-man one-vote rule as being the fairest of all the philosophies, shall go to the State level and make their argument and have the people of that State make the final decision.

Mr. Justice Harlan also wrote a fine and extensive résumé of the history of the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

In his dissent in Reynolds against Sims, Mr. Justice Harlan commented:

> Since the Court now invalidates the legislative apportionments in six States, and has so far upheld the apportionment in none, it is scarcely necessary to comment on the situation in the States today, which is, of course, as fully contrary to the Court's decision as is the record of every prior period in this Nation's history.
>
> Records such as these in the cases decided today are sure to be duplicated in most of the other States if they have not already. They present a jarring picture of courts threatening to take action in an area which they have no business entering, inevitably on the basis of political judgments which they are incompetent to make. They show legislatures of the States meeting in haste and deliberating and deciding in haste to avoid the threat of judicial interference.
>
> Generalities cannot obscure the cold truth that cases of this type are not amenable to the development of judicial standards. No set of standards can guide a court which has to decide how many legislative districts a State shall have, or what the shape of the districts shall be, or where to draw a particular district line. No judicially manageable standard can determine whether a State should have single-member districts or multimember districts or some combination of both. No such standard can control the balance between keeping up with population shifts and having stable districts. In all these respects, the courts will be called upon to make particular decisions with respect to which a principle of equally populated districts will be of no assistance whatsoever. Quite obviously, there are limitless possibilities for districting consistent with such a principle. Nor can these problems be avoided by judicial reliance on legislative judgments so far as possible. Reshaping or combining one or two districts, or modifying just a few district lines, is no less a matter of choosing among many possible solutions, with varying political consequences, than reapportionment broadside.

DISSENTS OF JUSTICES STEWART AND CLARK

Mr. Justice Stewart, joined by Mr. Justice Clark, summarized the principle in the following manner:

> What the Court has done is to convert a particular political philosophy into a constitutional rule, binding upon each or the 50 States, from Maine to Hawaii, from Alaska to Texas, without regard and without respect for the many individualized and differentiated characteristics of each State, characteristics stemming from each State's distinct history, distinct geography, distinct distribution of population, and distinct political heritage.
>
> My own understanding of the various theories of representative government is that no one theory has ever commanded unanimous assent among political scientists, historians, or others who have considered the problem. But even if it were thought that the rule announced today by the Court is, as a matter of political theory, the most desirable general rule which can be devised as a basis for the makeup of the representative assembly of a typical State, I could not join in the fabrication of a constitutional mandate which imports and forever freezes one theory of political thought into our Constitution, and forever denies to every State any opportunity for enlightened and progressive innovation in the design of its democratic representative government the interests and aspirations of diverse groups of people, without subjecting any group or class to absolute domination by a geographically concentrated or highly organized majority.
>
> Representative government is a process of accommodating group interests through democratic institutional arrangements. Its function is to channel the numerous opinions, interests, and abilities of the people of a State into the making of the State's public policy. Appropriate legislative apportionment, therefore, should ideally be designed to insure effective representation in the State's legislature, in cooperation with other organs of political power, of the various groups and interests making up the electorate. In practice, of course, this ideal is approximated in the particular apportionment system of any State by a realistic accommodation of the diverse and often conflicting political forces operating within the State.
>
> I do not pretend to any specialized knowledge of the myriad of individual characteristics of the several States, beyond the records in the cases before us today. But I do know enough to be aware that a system of legislative apportionment which might be best for South Dakota, might be unwise for Hawaii with its many islands, or Michigan with its northern peninsula. I do know enough to realize that Montana with its vast distances is not Rhode Island with its heavy concentrations of people. I do know enough to be aware of the great variations among the several States in their historic manner of distributing legislative power—of the Governors' Councils in New England, of the broad powers of initiative and referendum retained in some States by the people, of the legislative power which some States give to their Governors, by the right of veto or otherwise, of the widely autonomous home rule which many States give to their cities. The Court today declines to give any recognition to these considerations and countless others, tangible and intangible, in holding unconstitutional the particular systems of legislative apportionment which these States have chosen. Instead, the Court says that the requirements of the equal protection clause can be met in any State only by the uncritical, simplistic, and heavy-handed application of sixth-grade arithmetic.
>
> But legislators do not represent faceless numbers. They represent people, or, more accurately, a majority of the voters in their districts—people with identifiable needs and interests which require legislative representation, and which can often be related to the geographical areas in which these people live. The very fact of geographic districting, the constitutional validity of which the Court does not question, carries with it an acceptance of the idea of legislative representation of regional needs and interests. Yet if geographical residence is irrelevant, as the Court suggests, and the goal is solely that of equally weighted votes, I do not understand why the Court's constitutional rule does not require the abolition of districts and the holding of all elections at large.
>
> The fact is, of course, that population factors must often to some degree, be subordinated in devising a legislative apportionment plan which is to achieve the important goal of insuring a fair, effective, and balanced representation of the regional, social, and economic interests within a State. And the further fact is that throughout our history the apportionments of State legislatures have reflected the strongly felt American tradition that the public interest is composed of many diverse interests, and that in the long run it can better be expressed by a medley of component voices than by the majority's monolithic command.
>
> What constitutes a rational plan reasonably designed to achieve this objective will vary from State to State, since each State is unique, in terms of topography, geography, demography, history, heterogeneity, and concentration of population, variety of social and economic interests, and in the operation and interrelation of its political institutions. But so long as a State's apportionment plan reasonably achieves, in the light of the State's own characteristics, effective and balanced representation of all substantial interests, without sacrificing the principle of effective majority rule, that plan cannot be considered irrational.

DEEP-ROOTED, SUBSTANTIAL DIVISION ON MERITS CALLS FOR LETTING PEOPLE DECIDE

The entire record presents a deep-rooted division on the merits of this proposal, with a substantial, highly respectable segment on each side of a subject which is so vital to all of America and which will keenly thrust itself upon the future destiny of the Republic, of its governmental form and substance, and upon its entire citizenry.

Under such circumstances, the Nation is entitled to an opportunity to express its judgment and preference. The people are properly the ultimate source for such fundamental, far-reaching decision. The first step is resort to the often used procedure afforded in article V of our Constitution.

Approval of Senate Joint Resolution 103 by the Congress will achieve that first step. Then the States and their people will be able to decide whether they want the kind of constitution declared by the Supreme Court in Reynolds against Sims or whether they want to make available the restricted modification thereof pursuant to the Dirksen amendment.

Each State will have before it the question simply whether or not each State will retain control over the destiny, direction, and structure of its own State government. States know, and Congress should know that population, economics, and political power are shifting factors; and that what may be a superb determination of the composition of a State legislature today could prove to be the mistake of its State's history 10 years hence. No State will want to be locked into the status quo without authority to change the composition of its legislature to meet future conditions. The lines of restriction as to available changes are tightly drawn and clearly stated. They must receive approval of the popular vote. They must be reviewed every 10 years.

Mr. President, Nebraska is the only State which at the present time has a unicameral legislature. There is a provision in the Dirksen amendment specifically applicable to such legislatures. It would seem to be in order for me to explain, what is proposed in the case of a unicameral legislature.

In section 1 of the proposed amendment, we have the following language:

> In the case of a bicameral legislature, the members of one house shall be apportioned among the people on the basis of their numbers and the members of the other house may be apportioned among the people on the basis of population, geography, and political subdivisions in order to insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate.

So we have a relatively simple situation as to bicameral legislatures, because, for any plan departing from the rule in Reynolds against Sims, we have a safeguard for the people. Such a proposed plan must be approved by both bodies of the legislature—not just one, but both bodies. One of them is always based upon population under either Reynolds against Sims or the Dirksen amendment. So if the representatives serving on a population only basis in that legislature agree to a plan, it is their best judgment that the interest of their constituents and of the entire State are well served thereby.

In the case of a unicameral legislature, that would not necessarily follow. If there were apportionment on a combination of population and area, there would not be the guarantee that a plan for reapportionment would necessarily represent all of the people within the State. So something must be substituted for that safeguard. That has been done. I am gratified to have been able to help in the drafting of this language. I think it will handle the situation well. Immediately following the language which deals with the bicameral legislature in section 1 of the proposed amendment, which I have already read, we have the following:

> In the case of a unicameral legislature, the house may be apportioned among the people on the basis of substantial equality of population with such weight given to geography and political subdivisions as will insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate.

Mr. President, I call attention to the words "substantial equality of population." Those words were taken from the majority opinion in the case of Reynolds against Sims, as were the words "as will insure effective representation of the various groups and interests making up the electorate."

Those factors must be taken into consideration in proposing a plan which will be submitted to the voters of that State for approval.

Now, how is that done? What precaution is taken to see that the restrictions, standards, and guidelines in section 1 pertaining to unicameral legislatures will be followed?

That is taken care of, Mr. President, in the second sentence of section 2, which reads thus:

> If submitted by a bicameral legislature the plan of apportionment shall have been approved prior to such election by both houses, one of which shall be apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population;

That takes care of the bicameral legislatures. In the case of the unicameral, it is provided:

> If otherwise submitted it shall have been found by the courts prior to such election to be consistent with the provisions of this Constitution, including this article.

The words "otherwise submitted" mean that if it is not submitted by a bicameral legislature, it will be submitted by a unicameral legislature.

So there will be a reference by the legislature of any proposed plan which departs from population as the sole basis of apportionment to the Federal courts, for a decision as to whether or not the provisions and guidelines of the proposed amendment have been abided by. If the plan passes judicial scrutiny, it will be placed on the ballot. If it does not pass judicial scrutiny, it will be sent back to the legislature with the court's opinion. An effort can then be made to comply with the court's opinion.

Mr. President, a decision has been rendered by a three-judge Federal court, approving a new reapportionment plan for the unicameral legislature in Nebraska. That decision allowed for a maximum population deviation in the districts of almost 20 percent.

So when we come to the matter of considering unicameral legislatures, the situation is surrounded by safeguards.

The care taken in drafting the language with reference to unicameral legislatures was not solely on behalf of the State of Nebraska. That language also received a great deal of study and attention because there have been many inquiries by other States as to how our unicameral legislature is working, and whether it would be suitable for adoption in other States. As time goes on, other States may wish to adopt that particular form of State government.

SUMMARY

One of the magnificent honors and deep obligations of election to this wondrous body, the U.S. Senate, is the opportunity to vote.

This simple, meaningful, cherished right to vote puts on brilliant display all the multitudinous facets of human nature. The discerning observer can see courage reflected in a vote—or pettiness, or dignity, or cupidity. In this hallowed Chamber America's great, her mediocre, her strong and her weak have gone on display.

It is perhaps a mark of the destiny of the Nation that here little men have risen above themselves and great men have stumbled.

Yet when the great tests occur, when the vital issues of national or international import are at hand, there nearly always is within us a surging desire to rise to the issue—not as partisans, not as pork-barrel politicians but as Americans true to the cause of the Nation.

When we falter in our historic tasks it is not because we are not up to the issue; it is because we are not acting with the issue in our mind's eye. Plagued with our human frailties, with our preoccupation with the groupings of economic and political power, with ambitions to become President or Vice President, with debilitating zest for playing a part in clique A against clique B, C, D, E, or F—these are the moments when the issue can escape us. These are the moments when we do not cast a vote for the people and for the future.

It is said that within the walls of this Capital great political battles are being waged. It is said that these battles are far beyond the pale of the people. They are battles for ultimate political power—power that can control the very Presidency itself.

In all humbleness I beseech my colleagues today to face one of the great moments in U.S. history with the consensus of greatness out of which this Nation was forged. Our cause is not of the manipulation of men. At issue is our strength as men to vote in the historic concept which brought this Congress, this Nation, into being. We Members of Congress who periodically go to the people and humbly though vigorously seek their votes for ourselves are voting on whether the people shall have the right to vote on the fundamental structure of government within their States.

The issue is as simple as that. It is to enfranchise the people in the determination of the peoples' affairs.

The resolution to give the people this right to vote is a consensus of the safeguards important to the preservation of the principles which have been voiced and advocated by those thoughtful people within and without the Congress who have devoted their energies and talents to a workable solution.

I salute those who have worked and wrangled and toiled to perfect this vehicle. These are men who understand the vision of America. Out of their wisdom has been fashioned a document to meet the true test of viable law intent on preserving, protecting and advancing the rights of the people.

Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 103 is a permissive piece of legislation designed to permit needed flexibility in the composition of one house of State legislatures. It fully protects minority rights. It mandates periodic review of apportionment in the States. It does not usurp judicial authority, but rather provides guidelines where none now exist.

It meets head on the test of apportionment in compliance with existing law as a prerequisite of ratification.

Senate Joint Resolution 103 is not concerned with whether a State legislature is apportioned on a basis of population in both houses or only in one. It does no violence to any existing body of State government.

It is solely and simply a vehicle by which the people of a State may meet their own legislative needs without injury to the rights of any.

Now it comes to pass in wiles of men in debate when one is bereft of legitimate argument.

This is the vexing problem of the minority in this body who would deny the people the right to decide the reapportionment question.

So it is that an ingenuous, new strategy has been unleashed within this body—one that is bold and daring and fills all with awe at its simplicity.

They have talked about almost anything except the merits of Senate Joint Resolution 103.

The trouble with the "do not confuse us with the facts, our minds are made up" strategists is that the people of the United States, in all of the 50 States, have learned about the reapportionment amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 103.

The people of the United States know that a handful of men do not trust them to vote on this issue.

Is it not amazing to campaign on the premise that the people are too gullible to be entrusted with a vote on this issue? I submit that every citizen's ability to comprehend an issue—this issue—far exceeds anyone's ability to ponder fully the minds of those who seek office, for only God can know the mind of man. By the same token, all of us champion the right of the people to vote for candidates for office.

No, the people whom each of us has sworn to represent know what this issue is about, even if a few persons would kid themselves otherwise. They will find out, not incidentally, when they go to the people and ask them for their votes.

Again, let me underscore what we are discussing today.

The question before us is the gravest constitutional question since the founding of the Nation.

The legislation before us is utter simplicity and meets the test of every honest question.

Senate Joint Resolution 103 permits the flexibility needed by the States to adjust to the apportionment needs of the future.

It does not require any State to constitute a legislature in any way except the way the legislature and the people of that State decide.

Let us, by our vote on this resolution, adhere to this precious principle that the reapportionment right must reside in the people. It is my fervent hope that we can join together in preserving the principle by equating any differences in approach which should be resolved. The resolution of this critically important matter demands the best of all of us.

The first three words of our National Constitution are not "We, the Supreme Court," nor are they "We, the Congress." They are "We, the people."

Let us note this well. Let us abide by it in our votes on the measure.

(At this point Mr. MONDALE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT TO SENATE ON INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION CONFERENCE IN CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA—CONCERNING VIETNAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, late last evening, I returned from the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Canberra, Australia, where I listened to a most interesting debate. It was an intense debate. One day, 200 delegates from some 40 countries sat for 5 hours, with scarcely a delegate leaving his seat during debate upon the war in Vietnam.

The Vietnam war seemed to be the subject in which the delegates to this Conference were principally interested.

We undertook to introduce other subjects, but there was little interest shown in any subject except the Vietnam war.

I was surprised to find the extent to which President Johnson's peace offensive around the turn of the year had succeeded in world public opinion. Perhaps those of us close to the scene in Washington had felt it was a bit ostentatious, that its credibility may have been subject to question, particularly by nonfriendly nations—if not by friendly or neutral countries.

However clumsy the peace offensive may have appeared to some, it seems to have had a good effect on world public opinion. During the debate, I felt that the United States was being given credit by all except the Communist-bloc countries, and with sincerity and an earnest intent to find a peaceful solution. This was pleasing to me, and I wish to extend my congratulations to President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk upon this finding, which I believe to be a correct one.

I was also pleased with the extent to which our allies rallied around when propaganda resolutions were being presented, or propaganda points were being advanced by opposition speakers. Indeed, not only did our allies vote with us, but on two occasions I noticed that the delegate from Yugoslavia voted with the United States, or voted the same way as the United States, as did the delegate from Laos. Even the delegate from Indonesia, although he did not vote, made a statement indicating a position of neutrality.

Yet, with all of this rallying around, I invite the attention of the Senate not only to the depth of concern shown by the delegates from around the world but also to their deep apprehension that some unfortunate event, some match in the broom sage, by accident or otherwise, would escalate this unwanted war into a world conflict.

I am not sure that an editorial in the Australian, an outstanding newspaper of Australia, is exactly typical of this apprehension and this view; and yet I did find people holding similar views.

For whatever it may mean, I should like to read to the Senate an editorial that appeared in the Australian the day of our departure from Canberra. It is entitled "The Great Vietnam Dilemma," and I read:

[From the Australian, Apr. 16, 1966]

THE GREAT VIETNAM DILEMMA

The United States is in a unique and terrible quandry in South Vietnam. Allied forces in this campaign now total more than 750,000—500,000 South Vietnamese, 240,000 Americans, and 20,000 from Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea.

These troops are supported by 700 combat aircraft, about 1,600 helicopters, and the most efficient logistic and artillery services the world's leading technology can devise—at a cost to the U.S. taxpayer of $30 million a day.

These forces will increase as the war goes on. The United States is being tied down in a war on the Asian mainland that it can't win politically, even if it can win militarily.

But the effect of this conflict is far greater than this. The chance of a direct confrontation between the United States and China grows. Any good will that has been built up between Russia and America is being dissipated.

In short, the position of the allies in South Vietnam is messy, complicated, and very dangerous.

The United States went into South Vietnam in the first place with the most honorable of intentions, even though its presence there was against the spirit and the text of the 1954 Geneva agreements and its accompanying declaration.

But, by going into South Vietnam, America got itself involved in a conflict with which it had nothing to do.

Its presence there has always been indefensible, for civil war has always been going on in Vietnam, and America and her allies have turned this into a full-scale campaign against Chinese communism.

It is time the Australian Government was honest with us. It must admit openly that we are not in South Vietnam to help a friendly government fight aggression from the north.

We are there because America has asked us to go; and because our Government believes it needs American protection. More crudely, this is insurance.

We are not increasing our forces to 4,500 in the middle of this year because we have been asked by the present South Vietnamese Government. We are doing it because the Americans want us to and need our moral support. Mr. HUBERT HUMPHREY, the U.S. Vice President, made this quite plain during his visit to Australia in February.

There is nothing wrong with the Government admitting this. Surely everybody knows it. And there is surely nothing wrong with the United States and Australian Governments admitting that the real reason the allies are in Souh Vietnam is to contain Chinese communism.

BOGGED DOWN

Both believe China is an aggressive force that has expansive designs on all countries in its neighborhood. Even if we grant this, is involvement in South Vietnam the best way to contain China?

The United States in this area is a maritime power. It has the biggest arsenal of H-bombs in the world, the biggest navy, the strongest air force. But it is allowing these forces to be bogged down on the Asian mainland for an indefinite period. For what purpose? For a united Vietnam? Any united Vietnam would probably be a country under a Communist government or one of Communist sympathizers.

Does South Vietnam want permanent military occupation? What would be the difference between that and what is happening there now? The situation seems hopeless—and the longer it goes on, the worse it will get.

The answer is plain. The Australian Government must tell America that, while the United States stays in South Vietnam, we will stay, too, because we value America's friendship and are committed.

But we must tell America we think it is wrong for the United States and its allies to stay there, and that we must get out as soon as possible, the best way we can.

The United States must be prepared to negotiate with Hanoi and the Vietcong. The negotiations must be conducted on the basis that the United States and its allies are prepared to withdraw from South Vietnam.

But we must be aware of the consequences of this withdrawal. We must be prepared to face the fact that Vietnam will become a united country with an anti-West government.

But will it necessarily be a Chinese-dominated country? Southeast Asia has a long history of anti-Chinese sentiments. The heroes of Vietnam's history are those who fought the Chinese.

The theory is certainly tenable that, if Vietnam goes Communist, so will most of southeast Asia. But the theory is also tenable that, because of the long-standing anti-Chinese feeling in all these countries, they could well be independent of China, although friendly.

Let us face these consequences openly. Let us acknowledge that we will be betraying the trust of some ruling classes in southeast Asia who have become identified in Asian minds with Western power politics. This will certainly not be a pleasant fact to face.

But we also must face the fact that we have got ourselves into an untenable position in Asia. The consequences of withdrawal from South Vietnam will be horrifying. The consequences of staying will be even more tragic.

It is not in the best interests of South Vietnam, the United States or Australia that we go on as we are—wasting a country we are seeking to save, killing people we seek to make free, and risking world war through a conflict that was aimed at peace.

Our Government must tell the United States that we are its ally—but the time has come to stop the bitterness of Vietnam.

Mr. President, by reading the editorial I have not intended to and do not endorse all sentiments contained in the editorial. I thought the Senate and the American people might be interested in this point of view, expressed by a leading journal of an ally.

One would wonder if the soldiers of South Korea are there because the United States has asked South Korea to send them. One would wonder if this is true also of the Phillipines.

This is not to diminish their aid and their assistance. I think the United States should ask them to send men; should ask Great Britain, should ask France, and should ask other of our allies to aid in this conflict.

But the point raised in this editorial is that the Australian forces are not there because the Australian Government believes in the cause; not there at the request of the Government of South Vietnam; but there because the United States has asked that they be sent there, because Australia feels she must have the protection and cooperation of the United States. Australia, New Zealand, and the United States are closely allied.

Upon a brief stop in New Zealand I was impressed with the extent of pro-Americanism existing there. We stopped at a home, went in for a cup of tea, the television was on, and Danny Kaye was going full blast.

I asked what other American television programs they had. They quickly named several of them: "Bonanza," the "Beverly Hillbillies," and some other of these wonderfully cultural programs which we export.

The form of the money in both Australia and New Zealand is being changed to the dollar. As they grow closer to America, our ties, our bonds of friendship, and our mutual interests will become more fixed. I am entirely in favor of this.

But let us be aware that we have responsibilities worldwide. Let us be aware that these responsibilities are wider than the Vietnam conflict. The sun does not rise and set exclusively on Vietnam. Let us keep this war in perspective and relate our difficult challenge there to our responsibilities elsewhere and otherwise.

I was very much interested in the vote of the Yugoslav delegate. I recalled, as I heard him vote with the United States, the bitter fights we had had on the floor of the Senate about giving some modicum of foreign aid to Yugoslavia. As I understood that program, it had dual motivations, good will and eleemosynary intents on the parts of the United States, but that it was also the instrument of U.S. foreign policy that we sought to encourage revisionism within the Communist bloc. We sought to drive a wedge, to chip away from its monolithic solidarity. Revisionism of Yugoslavia and Marshal Tito were vigorously and viciously denounced by the Soviets. They wished Yugoslavia firmly and completely within their camp. Apparently they have not entirely succeeded.

I was also very interested to hear the speech of the Laotian delegate in which he denounced aggression against Laos by the North Vietnamese through use of the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Let me remind you, Mr. President, that Red China wanted Laos and wanted her completely and 100 percent within the Communist bloc. They have not succeeded entirely as was demonstrated by the voice and the vote of the delegate from Laos, and by the position of the Government of Laos.

I do not know that it would be possible for South Vietnam or a unified Vietnam to take a neutral or nonalined position and succeed, but I call to the attention of the Senate, as the content of the editorial which I read will do, that there have been centuries of contests and conflict between the Vietnamese and the Chinese.

The intenseness of this animosity, political, economic, nationalistic, is not known to any but scholars and historians, owing to its existence over a period of hundreds of years.

Now that elections are to be held in South Vietnam—and I hope they are held—I trust my Government will use its influence to permit all citizens to vote without respect to their religion or their political views.

We do not deny in America the right of a citizen to vote because he is a Christian, a Moslem, a Jew, or an infidel. We do not deny the right of a citizen to vote because he holds political views antagonistic to the majority view.

But I suppose, Mr. President, that in making these remarks I am demonstrating personally the messianic character of our culture. We think our system is so precious that we wish to extend it to everyone. The shot that was heard around the world initiated the most revolutionary political event of modern history.

Those who have been nurtured in our democracy hold it so dear and believe it is of such great benefit to all mankind that we wish to extend it to all. But, Mr. President, let us stop short of seeking to impose it upon anyone. If we really believe in self-determination, then let the Vietnamese choose their form of government. I would hope earnestly that they would choose a pattern which would preserve the human dignities, rights, and privileges exemplified so nobly by our system. But, Mr. President, whatever their choice is, they should have the right to determine. We should no more seek to impose upon South Vietnam an American-type state than we should yield to the imposition of a Communist order by force and violence from North Vietnam and Red China.

So, Mr. President, if as a result of these elections there is a coalition government or some other form and order of society which wishes to be rid of war and which wishes to adopt a nonalined or neutral status, could we ask for more? Do we really believe in the right of self-determination?

I recall the anxious voices of those who urged the late President Kennedy to send American combat forces to settle the Laotian conflict and issue in our own way. Indeed, the late President told me one night that he had just received recommendations from all three members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and its Chairman to send forces into Laos. Fortunately, those voices were resisted by the late President.

I recall the dire predictions of many that the compromise settlement and government in Laos would, before nightfall, practically result in that country's becoming a Communist satellite. So as I listened to the speech of the Laotian denouncing the aggression by North Vietnam, and as I listened to him vote with the United States on the resolutions presented, I realized that, at least up to now, the prophets of doom had been proved wrong; that the processes of political accommodation had demonstrated value.

I am not sure that this example provides any solution in South Vietnam. There the conflict is bigger and more far reaching than the problems of the Vietnamese—north and south—because Vietnam has become the focus of a world power struggle. Here, contesting and antagonistic ideologies are in confrontation. I only hope that the situation can be kept in perspective and that the martial attitude, as it continues to rise, will not lead inexorably to a world conflict, of which I found so many world statesmen apprehensive.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the Senator from Tennessee on a most interesting, enlightening, and helpful statement. In particular, I should like to say that I agree wholeheartedly with his emphasis on the importance of our recognizing that we must not try to impose an American system, an American view, an American civilization, an American type of government on the South Vietnamese. Self-determination means nothing, if they are not free to make up their own minds.

Does the distinguished Senator share my feeling that while an election in the next 3, 4, or 5 months undoubtedly will involve certain military problems and might very well result in a diminution of military effort on the part of the South Vietnamese, it could—I do not say it will, but it might—be very helpful for several reasons?

First, it would provide for an elected civilian authority in South Vietnam. Second, it would be an expression by the people of South Vietnam of their support for a government, an expression which we do not have, and certainly do not have in the Ky government.

Third, in the event such a government, as I am convinced it would—I may be wrong—supported the position of the United States and voted willingly to accept our assistance, it would put us in a far stronger position than the position in which we now are. In the event such a government did not do this, in the event that the form of government of South Vietnam was honestly elected and we were requested to withdraw our forces, it seems to me that we would have discharged our obligations under the SEATO pact. We would have done all that this Government honorably could do, and our withdrawal would be under honorable circumstances.

Mr. GORE. First, I wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin for his generous, complimentary references.

Next, in reply to his interrogatories, I wish to express grave doubt that an election of an acceptable sort could possibly be held in Vietnam except under cease-fire conditions.

How, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, can the ballot box be used as an instrument in the areas of Vietnam which are controlled by the Vietcong, unless there be some modus vivendi, some agreement, or some accommodation? An election held only in Saigon would prove but little.

I do not know whether the processes of election are now possible. I hope they are. I am not sure whether the leaders of the military junta were ready for it. I rather have the impression that an election is being forced upon them. But it may be good to try, and I hope that the United States would lend every effort—indeed, would offer—in the interest of a democratic expression of the views of the people of South Vietnam, a cease-fire for the period of a campaign and an election.

As I recall, a period of a fortnight is set aside for the campaign and the election. I am not sure that such an offer on the part of the United States would be acceptable by the Vietcong, but let them reject it.

I took a similar view for a long while before President Johnson's speech at Johns Hopkins, in which speech he finally offered to seek a negotiated settlement.

I pleaded for that for months. Let the other side reject negotiation for peace, I urged. Let us stand for it foursquare. I now find, as I have said earlier, that the President's peace offensive has been successful in bringing world public opinion more favorably to our side. I do not say that it is fully or predominantly on our side, but it has been brought more favorably to our side.

If there are to be elections in South Vietnam, which Secretary Rusk endorsed in his testimony this morning, then let us make an offer that would appear to make them viable, offer a condition without which they may not be viable.

I agree with the Senator that, if a valid expression of public will in South Vietnam were contrary to our wishes and our interests, we would nevertheless be bound to accept the result.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in response to the statement of the Senator from Tennessee, I agree wholeheartedly that an election without a cease-fire would have far less meaning and less significance than would an election with a cease-fire.

A cease-fire is certainly what we should strive for and try to achieve. However, I feel also that the prospect of getting a cease-fire so that an election can be held is virtually nil. Perhaps I am wrong, but to strengthen the Vietnamese would be the last thing that the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese would agree to. However, even if they did not, it would seem to me that an election, limited, and difficult as it may be, held only in the 25 percent of South Vietnam controlled by the government, with 50 percent of the people in that area being in any position to take part—if that is the correct figure—and with only a limited tradition of voting, although they have had local elections which have been reasonably successful, would be an improvement on what we have now. It would be some expression. It would be a beginning. It would provide, if not a more stable government, at least a civilian government with a possibility of the government being more stable.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I concur in the statement of the Senator. I agree that a popular government in even a portion of South Vietnam, would be an improvement over an unabashed military dictatorship, although I should prefer, as I have suggested—and with which suggestion the Senator agrees—conditions obtaining which would permit a popular expression in all of South Vietnam. Nevertheless, I agree with the Senator that, that failing, then an election in such portion of South Vietnam as is possible would be an improvement over the present situation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I welcome that statement very much. The Senator from Tennessee is one of the ablest, shrewdest, and most thoughtful members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He is an expert in that area. The Senator has served on that committee for many years.

The Senator has just visited Australia and has returned from that country with a fresh viewpoint. I very enthusiastically welcome his position that we should not have this gloom and doom attitude about an election. Many people seem to feel that the worst thing that could happen would be an election in Vietnam.

I believe the Senator from Tennessee is right in his perspective, understanding, and knowledge in recognizing that, while there are dangers and risks involved, it is very possible that the situation might conceivably be substantially improved, and that we at least would have a situation in which there would be a government with an elected legitimacy, a government with some civilian control over the military. There would be an opportunity for the people of Vietnam to feel that they had some way of expressing their view other than by these debilitating and divisive protests on which they have been relying.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have listened with some interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and particularly to the Australian article to which he referred.

People always have different points of view in any country. However, I do not have a hard time recalling a time when Australia was tickled to death to see an expansion of the American military effort in the South Pacific. Port Moresby was threatened, and indeed they feared that the whole of northern Australia might be invaded by the Japanese.

The question here is not whether we should permit elections in Vietnam. I think that we must do so if that is what they want. Other factors must be considered. One such factor is whether the elections will be free.

We could have a cease-fire and still have the Vietcong sitting in the woods with guns pointing at everyone, ready to retaliate if the particular village involved does not vote in the manner in which the Vietcong thinks it should vote.

A lot more than meets the eye is involved in this situation.

THE SALE AND REPURCHASE OF BOMBS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to comment very briefly about a situation which has been called to my attention by the Associated Press.

It was disclosed that the United States is buying back from a German firm, Kaus and Steinhausen Co., of Schweinge, Germany, 5,570 of our 750-pound bombs for a price of $21 apiece. These bombs had been sold to them 2 years ago for a cost of $1.70.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Buys Back at $21 Bombs It Sold for $1.70."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES BUYS BACK AT $21 BOMBS IT SOLD FOR $1.70—5,570 SOLD TO GERMANS 2 YEARS AGO FOR FERTILIZER USE BEING REPURCHASED

The United States sold a German firm 7,562 bombs as junk for $13,736, 2 years ago and now, in wartime, is buying back 5,570 of them for $114,500.

The Defense Department provided this information in response to questions about the transactions which Secretary Robert S. McNamara said Thursday indicated no shortage of bombs for the Vietnam war.

McNamara disclosed the repurchase during a press conference to answer charges by House Republican Leader GERALD R. FORD that the war has been shockingly mismanaged and hampered by a bomb shortage.

McNamara denied this, pointing to increasing tonnages of explosives being dropped against the Communists in the southeast Asian country.

Then the defense chief mentioned that the United States was buying back 750-pound bombs from a German firm that bought them in 1964 for fertilizer purposes. The nitrates of bombs are plant nutrients.

In response to a question about the bomb repurchase, McNamara said with a laugh: "Well, I would certainly hope we aren't paying more for them than we sold them for."

The figures provided today show that the United States sold the bombs for about $1.70 each and now is paying approximately $21 apiece to get them back.

The United States halted production of 750-pound bombs, favored for most missions in South Vietnam, in the mid-1950s after the Korean war. Only recently did orders go out for renewed production.

Due to the time required to tool up for production, fresh supplies of the 750-pounders aren't scheduled to be available before July, although the secretary said he believed the timetable can be accelerated.

The repurchased bombs originally cost $330 each, the Pentagon said. A similar size today costs $440.

Here is what the Pentagon said in response to questions about the deal:

"In March 1963 authorization was given to dispose of some excess 750-pound general purpose bombs stored in Europe.

"In January 1964 and April 1964, 7,562 of these excess 750-pound bombs were sold to Kaus & Steinhausen Co., of Schweinge, Germany. At that time this represented about 2 percent of the U.S. supply of 750-pound bombs. It was determined that the storage space for these bombs could be better utilized and the money it cost to store and maintain them could be better spent. This was a year and a half before the B-52's began bombing in Vietnam."

The reply went on to give the prices.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense is quoted as saying that these bombs were declared excess in January 1964, when storage space was short. He pointed out in defense of this action that it was a year and a half before the B-52's began bombing Vietnam.

This is one of the dozens of examples available to us of how we have been waging the war in Vietnam. We have been too little, too late and on again and off again, until we have confused not only the Vietnamese, but also a portion of the world concerning our objectives in Vietnam.

I doubt if very many members of the Committee on Armed Services or of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations did not believe in their hearts in January 1964, and during that entire year, that a buildup in Vietnam was inevitable. In fact, such a buildup had already occurred.

Yet here we were, disposing of bombs in January of 1964, upon which we now pay them a profit of $19.30 a bomb. I do not know how that comes out in percentages, but it represents somewhere around a 1,000 percent profit we pay them for the bombs that we sold them less than 2 years ago.

This has come from that great computer factory across the river, the Pentagon: The know-all, see-all, divine-all of the future.

How we could have been so absurd is beyond me. I do not wish to go into the many such matters, but I shall refer to two instances which occur to me very quickly.

In that same year of 1964—when I say again, it should have been obvious to everybody, even though Secretary McNamara may not have known it, that we were going to have to have a tremendous buildup in South Vietnam, or else lose the boys we have there—what did we do to support that buildup? We waited until May of 1965, when we starting building the port at Cam Ranh Bay. According to the recent testimony of the Secretary of Defense before the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, that port is not operational now, and will not be fully operational until May. That is how we have intelligently faced the problem of South Vietnam and the war we are carrying on there under the great leadership of the Secretary of Defense.

A NEW TYPE OF CARGO AND OBSERVATION PLANE

Mr. ALLOTT. To mention another instance: For several years, there has been discussion in the Defense Subcommittee of the need for a new V/STOL type of cargo and observation plane for use in the South Pacific. Finally, after we had been discussing this need for at least 2 years, and perhaps 3, the Secretary of Defense came to the Appropriations Committee in January of this year, and asked for the reprograming of several hundred millions of dollars, a part of which finally is to be used for that plane, which the committee has been saying all along we need—or many of its members have—and which the Secretary of Defense now says has been long and badly needed. I do not need to remind Senators that there are C-47's over there now equipped with machineguns; and this is just another example of the kind of war we have waged, with far too little, far too late, sadly to the detriment of the welfare and the lives of our boys in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I remind Senators that I make this statement in the context that I believe we were there rightly, legally, and correctly in the first instance; because the question of whether or not we have elections involves whether or not we shall have free elections, and also involves whether or not we shall abandon the principle of resisting the expansion of communism throughout the world. That is the real question, in my opinion. If there are to be free elections, and if we are to step out, I say that it will be the biggest single loss of prestige that this country has suffered in its whole proud history.

But then, that is rather to be expected, when we consider the loss of prestige we suffered during the first Cuban invasion, or that which we suffered at the building of the Berlin wall, first the fence and then the wall, in August of 1961; or when we look at the subsequent action when India took over by force the Portuguese colony of Goa; or when we bowed down in deep obeisance to Sukarno, and abandoned our friends, the Dutch, on West Irian—which most of us know as West New Guinea or Dutch New Guinea—an area to which the Indonesians never have had any political, social, economic or ethnic claim.

Such loss of prestige should not be surprising, when we consider our backdown on our brave words that we would insist on inspections in Cuba, during the second Cuban crisis, and the fact that no one really knows today, I believe, what the missile situation is in Cuba; or when we top all this with the complete backdown and turnaround in the U.S. position with respect to article XIX of the United Nations Charter, which governs the right to vote at the United Nations in New York, in January of this year, even after our own position had been fortified by a decision of the International Court of Justice.

But even with all of this loss of face and loss of faith of the world in the purposes and sincerity of the United States, if we should have to face the eventuality that has been discussed on the floor today, I say it will be the darkest single day for the position of the United States in the history of the world.

Mr. President, as to the matter of the recent discussion on the floor with respect to the right of the people of South Vietnam to choose and select their own form of government, I am also concerned about the rights of Americans to choose and select their own form of government; and I wish that the same yardsticks would be used by those who oppose the present resolution with respect to Americans that they are so anxious to accord to the people of South Vietnam.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in 1964 and in 1965, when we had under consideration in this Chamber other measures to return to the people of the States the question of the composition of their State legislatures, I set forth my basic reasons for supporting those measures. I have found no strong reason to change my position, and I have consequently cosponsored and warmly supported Senate Joint Resolution 103.

On prior occasions, I have detailed the story of what transpired in Colorado, in regard to the apportionment of our legislature, beginning with the general elections of 1962. I wish to repeat that bit of history today, because I feel it is so instructive on the fallacy or the folly involved in depending on the Federal courts to apportion legislatures, rather than having the people of the States do the job for themselves. Further, some ignorance or misunderstanding of the circumstances involved in Colorado has been demonstrated in the Senate, and I should like to set the record straight.

In the general elections of 1962, two proposals to change our State constitution's provisions concerning apportionment of the legislature appeared on the ballot. Both proposals were initiated with the electorate.

I wish to emphasize this, because a great deal of debate has taken place upon the false premise that these were initiated by a rurally controlled legislature, when they were actually initiated by the people of Colorado under the initiative and referendum clauses in our own Constitution and statutes.

The procedure for initiating laws or constitutional amendments in Colorado is quite simple. The proposal is submitted to the secretary of state. He, together with the attorney general of the State and the reporter of the State supreme court, assign a ballot title and submission clause to the proposal. If the persons submitting the proposal are dissatisfied with the titles or the submission clause, they may appeal the matter to the State supreme court, where it is placed at the head of the calendar.

The proposal is published in each county, and any qualified elector is given the right to challenge the title and submission clause, and to appeal the matter to the supreme court in the same way that originators of the proposal may do.

Petitions for the proposal may then be circulated, and the proposal will be submitted to a vote of the people if the signatures of qualified electors equivalent to 8 percent of the votes cast for secretary of state in the preceding general election are obtained.

It was in this manner that the two proposals for constitutional amendments relating to legislative apportionment were placed on the general election ballot in 1962. The proposals were not referred by the legislature, as has been alleged by some Senators. For example, the junior Senator from Maryland, on Thursday of last week, charged that a rotten borough legislature in Colorado framed the referendum on apportionment, and framed it in such a way that the people of Colorado were denied a fair choice, and, in his words, the referendum was a farce. I find the Senator's description of events in my State offensive, and doubly so because it is not accurate.

At any rate, two proposals went on the ballot in 1962. Amendment No. 7 was sponsored by a bipartisan group of distinguished and respected Colorado citizens. The group included Edwin C. Johnson, known to many of my colleagues, a former U.S. Senator and Governor of Colorado, and a Democrat; another former Governor of Colorado, the late John C. Vivian, Republican; Joseph F. Little, lawyer and former Democratic State chairman of Colorado and Democratic cochairman of Denver County; Warwick Downing, an attorney, Democrat; and Wilbur M. Alter, former chief justice of the Colorado Supreme Court, Republican. The amendment provided for a house of representatives based on population and a senate based primarily on population, but taking into account also the distinctive geographical, economic and historical divisions of the State, and maintaining a balance in the strength of urban areas, suburban areas, and rural areas.

Amendment No. 8 called for both the senate and the house to be apportioned on equality of population, although it also recognized geographical features to a limited extent by allowing a larger deviation from the strict population ratio for mountainous senatorial districts.

Let me, at this point, correct another misstatement which has been made here in the Senate about our Colorado election of 1962. It has been said that amendment No. 8, the population-only plan of apportionment, would have required that in multimember districts all candidates for the house would have to run at large. To be absolutely factual about it, the voters of a multimember district could, in a referendum, elect to divide the district into subdistricts. The procedure for subdistricting was, in my opinion, cumbersome, but it was undeniably an improvement over the constitutional provisions which had theretofore governed apportionment, and which flatly forbade subdistricting.

I have gone into this detail, Mr. President, to show the errors which have been made in discussing our situation in Colorado by some of those unfamiliar with it. I believe the record is now clear that both proposals were initiated, not referred by the legislature, and that the question put to the voters was a clear choice between a population-only plan and a weighted representation plan.

Amendment No. 7 was adopted by the voters in that referendum of November 1962, by a statewide vote of 305,700 to 172,725. It won in every county of the State—63 of them—including those counties which the U.S. Supreme Court held were underrepresented when it later considered our apportionment.

Amendment No. 8, the strict population plan—which was in line with the consequent Supreme Court decision—was defeated by a vote of 311,749 to 149,822, or by a ratio of better than 2 to 1.

So here we have two proposals appearing on the same ballot, both initiated by the people, not by the legislature, both subject to the checks and balances and corrections provided by our Constitution as to title and submission, and both protected all the way down the line so far as legality was concerned, and amendment No. 7 carried every one of the 63 counties including those which the Supreme Court stated would be adversely affected, by a majority of almost 2 to 1, and amendment No. 8 was defeated by a majority of over 2 to 1.

After amendment No. 7 was adopted by the voters of Colorado as a part of our Constitution, the legislature enacted the necessary implementing legislation. An opponent of the plan then filed suit in the Federal court for the District of Colorado, claiming violation of his constitutional rights. The three-judge district court convened to hear the case—that is, the Federal court—held that the Colorado plan of apportionment was not violative of the U.S. Constitution, but when the case was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, the case was reversed and remanded to the Federal district court.

Thereafter, we had the following sequence of events: The Federal district court, under the mandate of the June 15 decision of the Supreme Court, decreed that reapportionment must be accomplished by July 15, under threat of the Court itself accomplishing the reapportionment if the legislature was unable to do so.

I invite attention and emphasize that this is the same three-judge Federal court which had previously held it to be constituitonal.

The Governor called the legislature into a special session, and it proceeded to devise a new plan on the guidelines of the Colorado constitution as it stood before the amendment of 1962. The new plan adopted by the legislature provided for subdistricting of multimember districts, such as the city and county of Denver. This plan was approved by the three-judge Federal court and signed by the Governor. Immediately thereafter suit was filed in the Colorado Supreme Court attacking the new apportionment plan on the basis that provision of subdistricting contravened the old Colorado constitutional provisions. Simultaneously, the backers of the amendment No. 7 plan of apportionment appealed the U.S. district court's decision that amendment No. 7 was not severable.

The Colorado Supreme Court held that the old constitutional provision on apportionment prohibited the division of the counties into districts for the election of senators and representatives and held, therefore, that the whole Apportionment Act, approved by the Federal district court, was invalid. Nevertheless, they permitted elections to be held in the fall of 1964 under the invalid act. Subsequently, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on the appeal from the district court, and in a per curiam opinion, said:

> Insofar as the judgment of the district court decides Federal questions, it is affirmed. Insofar as the judgment decides other questions, it is vacated and the cause is remanded for further consideration in light of the supervening decision of the Colorado Supreme Court.

Four Justices, in a concurring opinion, said:

> It is our understanding that the Court's disposition of this case leaves it open to the district court to abstain on the question as to the severability of the various provisions of amendment No. 7 pending resolution of

> that issue with reasonable promptitude in further State court proceedings. We deem it appropriate explicitly to state our view that this is the course which the district court should follow. On this basis we join the Court's opinion.

Senators are certainly aware of some of the difficulties involved in determining what is a Federal question. It seems to me that this last decision of the Supreme Court in the Colorado situation points up the near impossibility of laying down guidelines in the apportionment problem. It clearly points up the Court's unwillingness to lay down such guidelines. Basically, apportionment is a political question and the more the Supreme Court is pinned down to have to provide guidelines, let alone draw apportionment plans, the more they are going to discover the truth of this.

Mr. President, I presume that it is the desire of Senators on both sides of this question to achieve the most workable, fairest representation possible. I feel, however, that we may have allowed slogans to cloud the issues involved.

The slogan of "one man, one vote," for example, is really rather meaningless unless one goes to the factual situations which gave rise to the slogan. No man had been deprived of his right to cast a vote in the cases which spawned the slogan.

But the idea behind the slogan is a valid one. It is that all votes cast in electing representatives to any representative body should be given substantially equal weight. Put as strongly as I can put it, the opponents of the resolution we are debating would say that the right to vote is of such paramount importance that it should not be subject to dilution, even if the dilution were approved by a majority of the eligible voters.

If we examine this proposition, what is really intended is the equal opportunity to have the voter's views reflected in the legislature; ideally, in proportion to the strength of those views in the voting population as a whole.

Let me say, however, that the principle of population-only apportionment is not the infallible guide to triumph of the majority will that the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 103 would have us believe. For example, let us postulate a State where 60 percent of the population is concentrated in one or two areas, with the remaining 40 percent scattered through the balance of the State's land area. Then assume an issue on which the 40 percent are solidly united—let us say they are opposed to passage of a particular piece of legislation. Within the area containing the 60 percent of the population, opinion favors passage of the bill by a margin of 80 to 20.

The legislators representing that 60 percent of the population will certainly be inclined to vote for passage of the bill, since their constituencies favor it 80 to 20, and the bill will pass. But if we look at the sentiment in the electorate as a whole, we find that 52 percent of the population oppose passage—the 40-percent minority group plus the 20 percent of the 60-percent majority group.

The issue will seldom be this simple or clear cut, Mr. President, but it does demonstrate that governing in general, and apportionment in particular, is not quite so simple that the application of slogans, such as "one man, one vote" will assure fairness and justice. And I still do not understand the conviction of my opponents that legislators elected from urban areas under reapportionment will somehow be fairer and wiser in treating all the problems of all the people in their State than legislators from rural areas will be. This is simply an area of human endeavor which, to my mind, cannot be solved by the mechanical application of any principles enunciated from on high.

On the other hand, we have been careful in this country to give protection to minority rights. From the earliest days, we have guaranteed that one who espouses an unpopular cause should not be throttled. And a fair system of representation should, ideally, try to make certain that minority views are also represented in the legislative process.

We find, then, two competing principles, both of which have merit, which we attempt to instill in any plan of representation in a legislative body. We accept the view that majority will should govern, but we also build into our Government a system of checks and balances in order to protect minority and even individual rights.

It is not my purpose to castigate the majority of the Supreme Court for their decision in Reynolds against Sims or in the Colorado case of Lucas against 44th General Assembly, but I believe it will be instructive to review briefly some of the history of apportionment cases prior to Baker against Carr. That history includes a long course of refusal by the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction over apportionment cases, on the basis that such cases involved essentially political questions. The earlier cases had been brought under article IV of the Constitution, which guarantees to the States a republican form of government. The court uniformly held in the cases presented to it that it could not inquire into the "political question" of whether a challenged government was "republican."

Then, in 1962, the Court accepted the case of Baker against Carr, challenging apportionment of the Tennessee Legislature on the basis that voters in the most populous districts were deprived of equal protection of the law by being grossly underrepresented in the legislature. There was, of course, dissent over whether the Court should have accepted jurisdiction on the 14th amendment basis. Mr. Justice Frankfurter warned of the "political thicket." And Mr. Justice Harlan, in later cases, said:

> Had the Court paused to probe more deeply into the matter it would have found that the equal-protection clause was never intended to inhibit the States in choosing any democratic method they pleased for the apportionment of their legislatures. This is shown by the language of the 14th amendment taken as a whole, by the understanding of those who proposed and ratified it, and by the political practices of the States at the time the amendment was adopted. It is confirmed by numerous State and congressional actions since the adoption of the 14th amendment, and by the common understanding of the amendment as evidenced by subsequent constitutional amendments and decisions of this Court before *Baker* v. *Carr*—made an abrupt break with the past in 1962.

I can understand, Mr. President, why the Court was desirous of accepting Baker against Carr. The legislature had not been reapportioned for many years, in either house, despite great changes in population. The voters of the State did not have available to them the initiative which I have referred to and which was used in Colorado. The Court felt that if it did not act, there was no remedy.

But having stepped into the political thicket, it is my feeling that the Court simply lost its bearings and could find no logical stopping place short of declaring that population alone was the only acceptable criterion for the apportionment of a legislature. No other reason explains to me why the case of Lucas against 44th General Assembly was decided as it was.

I really believed, Mr. President, that the Supreme Court would apply a rule of reason to the apportionment cases decided in 1964. Baker against Carr did not demand the result in the Lucas case. Instead, the Supreme Court could, as I said, find no stopping place, having gotten lost in this political thicket, and arrived at a simplistic answer which ignores one aspect of the problem of fair representation. It recognizes the desirability of equality of the vote, but ignores a whole host of other problems in providing a voice for minorities.

Today, Mr. President, we debate whether this simplistic answer is to be the only answer we can give to the question of providing fair representation. Mr. Justice Stewart, in his dissent in the 1964 apportionment cases, summed up my feelings very well:

> What the Court has done is to convert a particular political philosophy into a constitutional rule, binding upon each of the 50 States, from Maine to Hawaii, from Alaska to Texas, without regard and without respect for the many individualized and differentiated characteristics of each State, characteristics stemming from each State's distinct history, distinct geography, distinct distribution of population, and distinct political heritage. My own understanding of the various theories of representative Governments is that no one theory has ever commanded unanimous assent among political scientists, historians, or others who have considered the problem. But even if it were thought that the rule announced today by the Court is, as a matter of political theory, the most desirable general rule which can be devised as a basis for the makeup of the representative assembly of a typical State, I could not join in the fabrication of a constitutional mandate which imports and forever freezes one theory of political thought into our Constitution.

We must, then, decide between two alternatives. The present system of handling legislative apportionment requires that the legislatures reapportion themselves subject to Federal court supervision, or failing to do so, have the court make the apportionment—but in either case, with population as the sole, controlling consideration.

The proposed alternative in Senate Joint Resolution 103 contemplates that the legislature would draw a plan of apportionment and submit it to the voters for their approval, but still subject to review by the Federal judiciary. In addition to population, the plan would be allowed to include consideration of geography and political subdivisions to insure effective representation. I view this, Mr. President, as a return to the "rule of reason" which I had expected the Court to supply in Reynolds against Sims, Lucas against 44th General Assembly, and the companion cases. The proposed resolution would simply "unfreeze" from the Constitution the form of political philosophy which was put there by the Court, and the Court alone, and add the safeguard that if factors other than population are used in apportioning, the plan must be approved by the voters of the State, and when it is approved by the voters of the State, they are really running the State on a one-man, one-vote basis.

There have been objections raised to Senate Joint Resolution 103 which are not primary, but which I find interesting because I believe they show on the part of the opponents of the resolution a decided lack of trust in the good sense of the electorate. For example, it is claimed that a legislature will "rig" the question presented to the voters, perhaps by making the population-only alternative which must, under the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 103, be submitted to the electorate unacceptable in various ways. In this connection let me remind Senators that Colorado has been pointed to as a horrible example, and that the facts do not justify the accusation.

There are, I think, several answers to the contention that the question submitted to the electorate can be "rigged." In my own State, as I have demonstrated, the initiative is readily available to the electorate. This, of course, is a major check on the legislature. In addition to this, Senate Joint Resolution 103 does not withdraw Federal court jurisdiction. Having assumed jurisdiction, I would hope that with the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 103 the courts would apply a rule of reason and require that a plan of apportionment have some rational basis, and that it not be arbitrary.

I might remark, too, that a candidate for public office may sometimes "rig" his position on an issue, be elected and installed in office, and then take action contrary to what he had led the electorate to believe he would take. The remedy is the same in both cases—"vote the rascal out."

Another contention of the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 103 is that malapportioned State legislatures have weakened State government, and have caused urban areas to turn to the Federal Government for help in solving the problems which the rural-dominated State legislatures refused to face up to. They say that with the new court decisions has come a new era in State government, and we can now look for revitalized legislatures to handle these problems on a State level.

Let me answer this contention in two ways. First, let me point out that the U.S. Senate, a body hardly composed on a strict population basis, has had a rather large part in giving attention and help to those urban problems.

Second, I would remark that although the majority of State legislatures have now been apportioned on a strict population basis, I have seen no concerted effort on the part of those legislatures to reclaim jurisdiction over urban problems, nor any effort on the part of the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 103 to return those problems to the States. There appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 2 an article which indicates that the urban areas not only continue to look to the Federal Government for help, but that they will demand a larger share of help.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP FOR THE CITIES—NORTHERN CONGRESSMEN SEEK MORE FEDERAL AID FOR NEEDY URBAN AREAS—THEY WOULD REROUTE FUNDS FROM SOUTH, RURAL WEST TO FINANCE CITY SERVICES—TAPPING EXISTING PROGRAMS

(By Joseph W. Sullivan)

WASHINGTON.—Whatever the total amount of Federal butter this year, northern city Congressmen intend to carve off a bigger slice of it for hard-strapped urban governments.

Not content to wait for the slow-starting flow of extra money heralded in President Johnson's "great cities" proposal last month, the urban boosters are charting ways to fatten the cities' share under existing Federal aid programs. These gains would come at the expense of small towns and rural areas and, in some instances, mean a shift of funds into urban Northern States and away from the South and rural West.

Initial rerouting plans, which call also for some net spending increases, aim at getting extra aid for urban schools, roads, hospitals, sewage treatment plants and certain other public works. Even partial success of these endeavors could channel far more money into city coffers than the $2.3 billion spread over 6 years that Mr. Johnson's new urban aid plan would provide. The extra money flow would be immediate, moreover, instead of starting in mid-1968 and then available only to selected "demonstration" cities.

BOOM FOR LINDSAY?

For New York City alone, shifting of current aid projects could yield an extra $100 million or more annually for bolstering slum schools in Harlem and elsewhere, building new freeways, renovating old hospitals and cleaning up local waters. Such a dollar harvest would amount to a direct political dividend, for new Republican Mayor John Lindsay, whose campaign promises to solve the city's fiscal ills were tied to getting extra Federal help.

But Republican Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York, has plans that extend well beyond New York City and New York State. He plots a declaration of war on Federal aid allotment formulas generally. Present formula-weighting in favor of States with low per-capita income has well served the South, in particular, under many of the more than 100 Federal aid programs now on the lawbooks.

"Favoritism toward the poorer, more rural States may have been justified at some point in the past, but today's most pressing needs are plainly those of the big population centers, asserts a Javits aid.

Such logic is, of course, repugnant to the senior southerners who rule several key aid-dispensing committees in both the House and Senate. The Dixie chieftains have repelled numerous northern attempts to rewrite their pet allocation formulas in years past and will no doubt attempt to hold the line again.

DIXIE DOMINATION DOCTRINES

The southern domination is plainly ebbing though. At the helm of the House's influential Housing Subcommittee, Representative WILLIAM BARRETT, of Philadelphia, last succeeded the masterful Albert Rains of Alabama, who retired. The departure of Oren Harris of Arkansas, long-time chairman of the House Commerce Committee, removes another powerful southerner. And the northern-dominated House Labor Committee is getting bolder in its grappling with Alabama's prestigious Chairman LISTER HILL, of the Senate Labor and Education panel over school aid formulas.

Adding to urban hopes for a breakthrough this year are several external influences on Congress. For one thing, redistricting forced by the population shift toward urban areas and the U.S. Supreme Court's "one-man, one-vote" rulings is prompting greater congressional responsiveness to urban needs. For another, wide publicizing of big-city racial, transport, and pollution problems and general fiscal strains is adding weight to claims that northern population centers, while wealthier than the rest of the country, also have much costlier problems. Among Republicans, moreover, a current accent on wooing the urban vote has brought new stress on promoting city causes.

Furthermore, northern city lawmakers sense they are gaining bargaining power with their southern colleagues. Growing southern reliance on Federal aid is eroding the longstanding tendency of Dixie lawmakers to hold out for extra benefits under an aid program as their price for supporting its enactment. As things now stand, it's reasoned, few southerners can afford to turn against a going program even if Dixie's share of the money is whittled down.

TAKE A SECOND LOOK

"To get these programs underway we had to make a lot of concessions in order to win the votes of the recalcitrants. Now we're in position to take a second look and determine where the money is really most needed," declares Representative HUGH CAREY, a Brooklyn Democrat.

Initial projects to reroute funds are proceeding piecemeal, with the prime planners, tactics and specific objectives varying in each case. In some instances, the aim is to change the formula for computing each State's entitlement under a Federal aid program. In other cases, it's to raise a low ceiling on individual project grants that reduce a program's value to big cities with large-scale requirements. In still others, it's to free a program from rigid formulas and permit financing local projects as administrators see fit. "The big cities are better versed in the game of grantsmanship than small towns or rural areas, so they would stand to gain," explains a proponent of more aid for big cities.

Consider some details of the various urban aid efforts:

Education: Big-city and suburban Democrats seeking more help are pitted against both the Johnson administration and envoys from the smaller, poorer States. City lawmakers will fight for use of an "incentive payments" arrangement authorized by last year's school aid law; the administration wants it annulled. Incentive grants would go to school districts that increased their per-pupil spending by 5 percent or more last year and would total about $400 million in the fiscal year starting in July. Big urban areas, it happens, would get a much higher proportion of the incentive money than they draw under the poverty-based formula for distributing the law's $1.1 billion in annual aid to school districts generally. New York City would receive better than 8 percent of the incentive payments compared to a 5-percent share of the regular funds.

To forge a winning congressional coalition for incentive grants, city strategists are ready to embrace plans of suburban Democrats for helping school systems overcrowded by rapid population growth. The suburban bill, also resisted by the administration, would parcel out school construction funds according to the number of children in oversized classes, outmoded classrooms, or on half-day shifts.

Roads: The U.S. Conference of Mayors is leading the charge to get cities a bigger share of the Federal highway dollar; city spokesmen contend they've been short-changed. Urban driving, they argue, accounts for half of all U.S. auto mileage and for more than half of the Federal gasoline tax receipts that finance the highway program. Thus, it's reasoned, the cities ought to get as much for their arterial street systems as the States draw for their primary and secondary highways; at present, primary and secondary road aid amounts to $750 million yearly while "urban extension" systems are allotted only $250 million. (Allocation of funds for the $3 billion-a-year interstate highway program is not being contested.)

Hospitals: As urban strategists, notably Senator JAVITS and Democratic Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, had hoped, Mr. Johnson's health and education message to Congress yesterday proposed a new loan and grant program to finance hospital modernization, a special big-city need. It remains to be seen, however, whether the not-yet-specified dollar amounts will satisfy the urbanites.

Over $200 million already is being pumped out yearly to the States under the Hill-Burton hospital construction act. Many cities complain, however, that the bulk of the money is going to suburban and rural areas (where the need for more beds is admittedly greater) while older central-city hospitals are deteriorating in New York City. According to a 1965 study, all of the 130 general hospitals need costly modernization.

To northerners generally, moreover, the Hill-Burton allocation formula (which has become the model for several other aid programs) is a little short of iniquitous. It bases each State's entitlement on two factors, its population and its per-capita income. But income matters much more than population; the income figure is used in such a way that low income sharply raises a State's eligibility for Federal aid. As a result, Senator HILL's home State of Alabama gets more than half as much money as New York State, which has mode than five times as many people.

To meet the cities' special hospital modernization needs, and get away from a Hill-Burton division of the money among the States, the urbanites think a separate Federal program is essential, preferably one geared to handle individual project applications from all comers.

Sewage Treatment: The target here is removal of a $1.2 million statutory ceiling on Federal aid to any one project, which compares with costs of $100 million or more for a new treatment works in a city the size of St. Louis. This maximum in Federal help is of minimal value, asserts the recent report of a Senate public works subcommittee. Because of the low ceiling, it's estimated only 9 percent of Federal sewage treatment grants have gone to cities of more than 125,000 people. Yet together these cities hold just under half the total U.S. population.

The subcommittee's recommendation, sure to get legislative attention shortly, is to end the ceiling on individual grants as part of a big expansion of the $150 million-a-year aid program for sewage plants. In his antipollution message to Congress, President Johnson called for partial removal of the ceilings. He asked for authority to make individual grants of unlimited size, but only to localities included in five model river basin cleanup projects.

Economic Development: New Yorkers are leading the campaign to make urban ghettos eligible for help under the renewed aid-to-depressed-areas program Congress approved last year. Currently, only 14 of the 130 U.S. cities with population of over 100,000 qualify for the program's packet of grants for building a variety of public facilities and loans for starting new enterprises; among those excluded are New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia. A big reason for exclusion is that eligibility is based on the economic health of a whole metropolitan area, which may obscure high unemployment in a city's core.

The House Public Works Committee appears favorably disposed toward a proposal to bestow eligibility on any "compact, contiguous areas" with population of over 100,000. This would accommodate the Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant sections of New York City, the Watts area in Los Angeles, the south sides of Chicago and Philadelphia along with such entire cities as Trenton, N.J.

Bolstering current urban hopes are several 1965 successes, including removal of a 50,000-population ceiling on cities eligible for Federal help in planning and building new community facilities; elimination of extra-high eligibility standards that kept nearly all school systems with enrollment of over 35,000 from qualifying for special aid that goes to school districts with heavy concentrations of Federal workers.

An across-the-board assault on alleged abuses in allocation formulas, such as Senator JAVITS plans, isn't likely to make much immediate headway. But the New Yorker appears determined to make the effort anyway, if only to dramatize the cause and give it a Republican cast. His staff is sifting through present formulas in search of flagrant injustices; he has enlisted the help of New York State and New York City officials in the hope of pinpointing instances where their aid requests were axed while smaller States were surfeited with help.

Tentative strategy in the Javits camp is press for elimination of per-capita income factors that now weigh nearly all Federal allocation formulas in favor of the poorer States. At a minimum, Federal aid funds should be divided among the States in direct proportion to their population, Javits men assert. Such "one man, one dollar" funding, it's said, would still give the poorer States a big return on the Federal tax payments since they pay less per capita.

For programs that deal especially with urban problems, Mr. JAVITS probably will aim still higher. "In fields such as air and water pollution, housing, transportation, and mental health, we contend that city dwellers have more than their share of problems and are entitled to an extra share of aid money," says a Javits aid. Toward this end, the Javits camp hopes to devise a "population density" factor that would tilt future allocation formulas in favor of crowded cities.

Mr. ALLOTT. The final objection I have heard made to Senate Joint Resolution 103 is that few people vote in referendums. I am not quite sure what bearing the objection has on the question of the inherent value or fairness of one system of representation as opposed to another. In any case, however, this objection was first raised, I believe, in the 1965 debate on apportionment, and it has been continued into this year. The Colorado elections of 1962 were again cited. I might remark—parenthetically, Mr. President, that the opponents of the resolution are certainly determined to discredit the case of Colorado in this debate, if they can find any way to do so.

To continue, it was stated to prove that few people vote in referendums that in the 1962 elections in Colorado the percentage of the voting-age population on the prevailing vote on the two apportionment questions on the ballot was 31.1 and 32.2 percent, respectively. I feel constrained to point out, however, that if we are to indulge in the numbers game on the Senate floor, as we have seen the Supreme Court do across the Capitol plaza, the figures can be used somewhat differently.

It was in a Colorado general election that these two proposed constitutional amendments were considered. It seems to me very definitely misleading to compare the prevailing vote against the total voting age population. For example, we find that in the same 1962 election cited by opponents of referendums, 36 percent of the voting-age population of Colorado elected the Governor, and 31 percent of the voting-age population elected a supreme court justice to a 10-year term. The raw figures, without explanation, prove little, and certainly do not show, in this case, any less interest in the apportionment questions on the ballot than in the candidates for office on the ballot.

There has never been a single issue before the people of Colorado upon which there was so much debate, so much information, or so much publicity as there was on these two amendments, as can be seen by the high vote compared with the vote which elected the Governor.

I hope, Mr. President, that enough Senators share my faith in the good sense of our people that we may pass Senate Joint Resolution 103, and return to the people the decision on apportionment of their State legislatures. It seems to me that there is ample safeguard in the plan of the joint resolution to satisfy reasonable men that no one would be unjustly deprived of his vote; on the other hand we would restore flexibility and balance by permitting to the people the opportunity to express their will. The people of Colorado, over a long period of time, had worked out and approved in elections our method of apportionment. It is far wiser, I believe, to allow those familiar with all the problems of a State to meet these problems which arise in apportioning the legislature, as we did in Colorado, than to let stand the rigid system which was imported into the 14th amendment when the Supreme Court got lost in a political thicket, and now stands as a constitutional requirement absolute.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 19, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18, 1966:

U.S. MARSHAL

Antonio C. Baza, of Guam, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Guam for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. ATTORNEY

Almeric L. Christian, of the Virgin Islands, to be U.S. attorney for the Virgin Islands for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Environmental Science Services Administration:

To be lieutenants

James P. Brown, Jr.
Walter L. Bradly
Ronald W. Harlan
Richard M. Petryczanko
Leonard T. Lynch, Jr.
William S. Plank
Richard V. O'Connell
Philip L. Richardson
Ralph H. Rhudy
Walter S. Simmons
Frederick G. Paulsen
Jeffrey L. Gammon
Gary E. Rorvig
Bobby D. Edwards
Donald R. Rich
Marshall A. Levitan
A. David Schuldt
George M. Ensign
George C. Chappell
John P. Vandermeulen

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Clifford A. Wells
Thomas F. Scygiel, Jr.
Oliver R. MacIntosh, Jr.
Michael G. Kenny
Vincent Tabbone
William T. McMullen
Gary A. Eskelin
Theodore Wyzewski
Charles R. McIntyre
Edward M. Gelb
Roger A. Moyer
Fidel T. Smith
Kenneth F. Burke
Floyd S. Ito
Charles H. McClure
Christropher C. Mathewson
Claude O. Phipps
Roger H. Kerley
Irving Menessa
Paul M. Hale
William M. Noble
Stanley M. Hamilton
Leonard M. Larese-Casanova
Dennis E. Youngdahl
Kirk P. Patterson
Otto F. Steffin
Carl W. Fisher
Arthur P. Sibold III
John O. Rolland
Phillip F. Dean
Steven M. Erickson
Joseph L. Scott
Lance W. Pape
Glen R. Schaefer
Harold D. Nilsson
Duane D. Helton
Lionel Greve
James L. Murphy
William M. Goodhue, Jr.
William S. Richardson
A. Conrad Weymann III
David L. Sweetland
Gordon P. Dodge
George R. Knecht
Jack L. Wallace
Henry M. Coghlan II
Michael W. Chalfant
Roy K. Matsushige
Richard T. LeRoy
Larry K. Nelson
Arthur D. Ross
Colin L. Campbell
Richard F. Coons
Arthur J. Kuhn
John K. Callahan, Jr.

To be ensigns

Terry C. de la Moriniere
Thomas M. Wesik
Kenneth H. Voigt
David J. Lystrom
Jerome F. Ewen
James L. Ogg
Thomas E. Gerish
Fred S. Long
Todd M. Gates
Leonard D. Goodisman
Melvin N. Maki
Melvin S. Asato
Thomas W. Wells
Joseph R. Avampato
Gary L. Boyack
Robert H. Johns
James E. Walsh
Caroll D. North, Jr.
David M. Wilson
James R. Vandell
William H. Naylor
Stephen M. Mark
Thomas C. Kalil
Ernest D. Harden
Peter M. Hall
Kenith L. Harris
Michael Engel
James E. Clark, II
Donald P. Henneuse
Dino J. Ferralli
Keith A. Boe
Randall B. Cummings

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Malcontents Who Refuse To Pay Income Taxes Because of War in Vietnam Should Be Sent to Prison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the April 14 issue of the Washington Post carried a half-page advertisement signed by some 400 people which announced their intention to refuse to pay their income taxes voluntarily. In that publicity it was contended the United States, in our opposition to Communist aggression in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, was guilty of atrocities against innocent civilians. Our actions were compared to Russia's intervention in Hungary, and other idiotic accusations were included.

By way of retaliation these morbid misfits declared they would refuse to pay their income taxes voluntarily.

This publicity, attributed to a group which includes some well-known pro-Communist, bespeaks an unpatriotic and anti-American attitude which could very well have been written or dictated from Moscow or Peking—or Hanoi.

These characters, who both boast of and abuse freedom, quite obviously prefer the Communist brand of freedom. They talk, write, and preach the Communist line. It would be interesting to know what would happen to these weaklings if they lived in Peking and dared publicize views condemning the Red Chinese policies of aggression in Vietnam. They would, of course, have their heads chopped off. Yet as Americans, smugly hiding behind constitutional guarantees, they whine and squawl like poisoned pups when our Government opposes Communist aggression anywhere in the world.

There is, however, something to be said for these nondescripts who would refuse to pay their income taxes. In that way they at least expose themselves to our penal laws which make each of them subject to fines and imprisonment for deliberate refusal to obey the laws of our land. Surely the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of Justice will give them the full treatment they deserve. The Congress and the American people will undoubtedly demand that every one of these criminals—and that is what each will be who thus violates the law—will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

When that is done our Nation will be relieved, at least temporarily, of the presence of these bellyaching phonies who are obviously quite unhappy with the American brand of freedom and democracy.

The Role of Political Parties in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, a new publication has just been brought to my attention which I believe would be of special interest to my colleagues and to everyone interested in political science. It is the first publication in the "American Government Studies" series by the Institute of Government Research at the University of Arizona entitled "The Role of Political Parties in Congress: A Bibliography and Research Guide."

This very valuable research guide was authored by Prof. Charles O. Jones of the Department of Government, University of Arizona, and Dr. Randall B. Ripley, research associate with the Brookings Institution. I am confident it would be of great benefit to anyone interested in Congress and politics.

Planning Conference Calls for Mid-Decade Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Atlanta, Ga., Region Metropolitan Planning Commission in a meeting on March 25, 1966, passed a resolution supporting a mid-decade census.

The resolution and the statement accompanying it follow:

Resolved, That this conference go on record as strongly favoring a mid-decade census of population and housing.

We realize that this matter has come up frequently in recent years and that certain bills have been introduced in the Congress to provide for a quinquennial census. The need for a population and housing census more frequently than every 10 years arises from the increasing complexity of our urban society and the many programs we are developing to help solve our problems.

The resolution was introduced by Mr. George K. Selden, Jr., of the Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Charlotte, N.C. It was reported unanimously approved by the commission by the executive director, Mr. Glenn E. Bennett.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the resolution is indicative of a general feeling throughout the country that a census of its people, who make us the great Nation we are, is essential every 5 years. And, Mr. Speaker, I encourage action on the legislation before us (H.R. 6183) to bring about a 5-year census at the earliest practicable time.

Parvin/Dohrmann Co. To Be Honored in Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, on July 15 of this year, the community of Los Angeles, Calif. will honor the Parvin/Dohrmann Co. The honors to be extended to Parvin/Dohrmann are well deserved, and all of us in the community would like the Nation to know of this progressive and rapidly growing company.

Parvin/Dohrmann Co. is a publicly held corporation which ranks among the top 75 Los Angeles-based firms in volume of business in southern California.

One of its subsidiaries, Dohrmann Co., has conducted business in the Western United States since its beginning in San Francisco 116 years ago.

Albert Parvin & Co., another subsidiary, conducts business primarily in the Western United States and in other parts of the country, and has been headquartered in Los Angeles for 20 years.

Dohrmann Co., formerly Dohrmann Hotel Supply Co., is the largest firm of its kind in the world, supplying furniture, equipment and other essential items to restaurant, hotel, motel, institutional and other commercial and industrial enterprises. Dohrmann has been noted primarily for supplying to the food and beverage-serving industries, and is also engaged in furnishing, planning, and interior design. The company also fabricates stainless steel equipment.

Albert Parvin & Co. is the foremost interior design and contract furnishings firm in the country, and has contributed in large measure to hotel, motel, restaurant and related industries as a pioneer and leader.

Each of the companies has been the recipient of many national awards from trade publications which have, through the years, recognized their great contributions to the industries they serve.

Parvin/Dohrmann Co. now has under construction a multimillion-dollar Robertson Plaza Building in the Robertson Design Center area of Los Angeles, which I am proud to say is in my district.

Each of these companies and the parent corporation can expect tremendous growth with their ever greater contributions to commerce and industry in the Western United States, and more extensive participation in the development of tourism in our area.

Dohrman Co. has sales showroom facilities in Seattle, Portland, Spokane, San Francisco, Brisbane, Salt Lake City, Reno, Sacramento, San Jose, Fresno, Honolulu, Los Angeles, Long Beach, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Phoenix.

Albert Parvin & Co., headquartered in Los Angeles, also has a sales showroom facility in Phoenix, Ariz.

I ask that the membership of this honorable body join me in extending greetings to: chairman of the board of Parvin/Dohrmann Co. and president of Albert Parvin & Co., Mr. Harry A. Goldman; president and chief executive officer of Parvin/Dohrmann Co. and chairman of the board of Albert Parvin & Co., Mr. A. B. Parvin; and president of Dohrmann Co. based at Crocker Industrial Park, San Francisco, Mr. H. B. Lawson.

These men and their employees deserve the commendation and respect of all of us for their dedication to their community and for the example they have shown in contributing to the industrial leadership and rapid growth of California.

The United States Must Crack Down on Foreign Cruise Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American traveling public has witnessed two fires at sea in the past 5 months, both aboard foreign-flag cruise vessels operating out of Florida ports. The *Yarmouth Castle*, flying the flag of Panama, took almost 90 lives when it sunk. The *Viking Princess*, from which some 490 passengers miraculously escaped as the vessel blazed, was flying the Norwegian flag.

Neither of these ships was subject to the same safety standards imposed on U.S. passenger vessels. They both complied only with the minimal safety standards of the 1960 Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, an international treaty desperately in need of reform, as these two floating infernos showed.

In the wake of these disasters, some U.S.-based foreign cruise ships have begun to advertise in deceptive language that they meet U.S. standards. Two such vessels, the *Bahama Star*, about the same age the *Yarmouth Castle* was, and the *Ariadne*, about the same age the *Viking Princess* was, both state in their advertising "ships comply with all Coast Guard regulations." This misleading statement clearly gives the impression to the public that the ships meet U.S. safety specifications.

Neither of these ships does meet U.S. specifications. I am advised by the U.S. Coast Guard that vessels, both just inspected this month, meet only the same standards imposed upon the ill-fated *Yarmouth Castle* and the *Viking Princess*. Federal law forbids unauthorized use of the Coast Guard's name, and I urge that these vessels be investigated for such false claims. Furthermore, I urge the Congress to enact foreign cruise ship truth-in-advertising legislation such as I have introduced as H.R. 13126 to protect the traveling public against floating firetraps.

Verrazano Day, April 17, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week as the country salutes the memory of Giovanni da Verrazano, Americans of Italian lineage have a right to a special pride. Over 400 years ago the 29-year-old Florentine navigator sailing under a French flag explored and charted the east coast of the United States from South Carolina to Newfoundland and historians credit him with discovering New York Harbor and Narragansett Bay.

The quest for knowledge was strong in young Verrazano and, not content with what he had already accomplished, he set off on another exploration, this time to the Southern Hemisphere of the Americas. What happened to him is shrouded in the mists but it is generally accepted that he met death at the hands of cannibals on an island in the Caribbean.

In recent years the interest in Verrazano has quickened due to the magnificent bridge which now spans a portion of the harbor he discovered. All who cross the Narrows from Brooklyn to Staten Island are reminded of the important role this Italian seaman played in the history of the New World. In fact it is impossible to consider the early days of the New World without realizing the importance of Italians in its development. It was discovered by one, named for another and charted and explored by still others.

But the role of Italians did not stop when the age of exploration ceased. Far from it. By the millions they have come to these shores and they have made this country a better place by their presence.

To think of Americans of Italian heritage, or any other group for that matter, leads inevitably to thoughts of immigration. I think we can all be proud, Mr. Speaker, of the role this 89th Congress has fulfilled in passing our new immigration law which President Johnson signed into being at the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor on October 3, 1965. To my colleagues, who, like myself, had been introducing improved immigration legislation for more than a decade, it was a moment of sincere satisfaction.

On December 1, 1965, Mr. Speaker, I had another moment of satisfaction when the first visa was issued under the new law. It went to, coincidentally enough, another 29-year-old Italian seaman, one Salvatore Esposito who now resides in my district. Is it not ironic, Mr. Speaker, that on an island in a harbor discovered by a 29-year-old Italian seaman over 400 years ago President Johnson in 1965 signed a law which allowed another 29-year-old Italian seaman to join his family in the United States?

The new immigration bill passed by this Congress and signed into law by President Johnson was a measure dear to his heart. In the fall of 1964 President Johnson met with a group of civic leaders of Italian heritage who were seeking approval of a commemorative stamp in honor of Verrazano. President Johnson said at that time:

> We are committed to eliminating discrimination in our society. I believe we should also eliminate discrimination in the laws relating to those who would join our society from abroad. The strength of our Nation has been built from many groups from many lands. No group has contributed more—few have contributed so much—as the sons and daughters of Italy.

As we join with our friends of Italian background in gratitude and tribute to Verrazano, we can do so proudly, Mr. Speaker, knowing that the barrier of prejudice has finally been lifted on those who would be Americans.

Mrs. Lilly Gresham, a Distinguished Texan, Celebrates 90th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Lilly Gresham of San Angelo, Tex., who counts her friends in the thousands, celebrates her 90th birthday on April 19. Still in excellent health, she thinks in terms of more service to the community and to the Democratic Party with which she has been associated during most of her lifetime. Her goal is to achieve a better community, better government, and a better life for the average American. She has devoted much of her life to such worthy causes.

Mrs. Gresham was recently recognized by her San Angelo friends, and was given an award which reads:

> Tom Green County Democratic Executive Committee and Tom Green County Democratic Club presents this meritorious service award to Lilly Gresham, beloved lady of the Democrats of all Texas in grateful appreciation of her unselfish service and outstanding loyalty to the Democratic Party.
>
> Signed and presented at San Angelo, Tex., this the 4th day of April, 1966.

The award was signed by Hon. E. E. (Pat) Murphy, chairman, Tom Green, County Democratic Executive Committee; Jack Linworth, president, Tom Green County Democratic Club; Hon. Earl W. Smith, executive secretary, and Hon. Otho Crawford, secretary of the Democratic Club.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in extending congratulations to my friend, Mrs. Gresham, and wishing her many happy returns.

California Nonpartisan Voter Registration Committee, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. REES
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to a remarkable thing that is happening in California, which speaks highly for the progressive California industrial community and for our Governor.

A steering committee, made up of seven prominent Californians was appointed by Governor Brown on November 2, 1965. E. Hornsby Wasson, Pacific Telephone & Telegraph president, was named chairman. The purpose of the committee was to launch a broad based nonpartisan program aimed toward registering as many as possible of the over 3 million adult Californians ineligible to vote because they are not registered.

The presidents of both the California County Clerks Association and the California County Supervisors Association are members of the steering committee. Both organizations are very actively supporting the work of the committee.

A nonprofit corporation was formed January 5, 1966, and was accepted by the California Franchise Tax Board as a tax exempt corporation and in counsel's opinion will be exempt from Federal taxes.

Invitations were sent by Governor Brown to over 100 business, labor, religious, and educational leaders, and prominent organization heads throughout the State requesting they become general committee members. As a result, a committee of 106 was formed.

A comprehensive statewide information-educational program was developed by Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne, a well-known advertising agency employing all major news media. Their services have been donated. Promotional kits were sent to 670 newspapers, 300 radio stations, and 38 TV stations. Billboards and bus card space in the metropolitan areas have also been donated. The theme of the program is simple: "You Can't Vote Unless You're Registered." All media have been very cooperative. The estimated value of the donated space and time is over $1 million.

Through its general committee of 106 members, a person-to-person program, reaching every segment of the State is moving ahead through chambers of commerce, labor unions, churches, minority groups, service clubs, house organs, women's organizations, and so forth.

Each committee member accepted the responsibility for motivating others within his or her sphere of influence. For example: Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, president of the California Institute of Technology, personally wrote the nearly 50 other independent colleges in the State requesting their cooperation in voter registration. Similar action was taken by Dr. William B. Langsdorf, president of the California State College at Fullerton, for all State colleges in California. The response was excellent. Another good example of this approach was the combined registration effort of the Los Angeles League of Women Voters and Parent Teacher Association in the Los Angeles City School District. This concerted program, culminating by keeping the schools open on the evening of March 29 with deputy registrars present, resulted in about 18,000 registrations.

Telephone utilities, in cooperation with the county clerks or registrars, mailed about 4 million desire to register cards with telephone bills in 36 counties during March. The participating counties contain over 70 percent of the Californians eligible to register. About 50,000 of these cards were returned to the utilities who delivered the cards to the appropriate registration official. He assumed the responsibility of aiding the individuals in registering.

In Contra Costa and Los Angeles Counties a test was made using a computerized tape comparison of names in the telephone directory with the names of registered voters. The result was a list of nonregistered utility subscribers. Duplicate copies were turned over, the end of February, to the State Democratic and Republican Party headquarters for their use. This computer analysis program produced 38,000 names in Contra Costa County and 622,000 in Los Angeles County.

The Field Research Corp. is making a pilot study to determine the answers to two heretofore unanswered basic questions: "Why don't people register?" and "Who are they?" The answers to these questions may well constitute the most important legacy of the committee. All administrative and developmental costs of the study are being donated.

The committee expects to carry on this statewide campaign through September 15, 1966, the last day to register for the California general election on November 8. The budget for this all-out effort is estimated at only $75,000. The amount is small because there is no paid staff and all time and services are donated.

Contributions to the committee have been received from various firms and individuals throughout the State. It is the policy of the committee to accept no contribution in excess of $5,000 or from a political party or candidate.

To our knowledge no similar statewide nonpartisan effort on this scale has ever before been attempted anywhere in the United States. The results so far are gratifying.

On April 14, the deadline for registering for the June primary, Secretary of State Frank Jordan said:

> Voter registration will hit a record 7,850,000 at today's deadline * * * an in-

crease of about 10 percent over the 1964 primary registration.

All of us in California are extremely proud of this effort, and we hope that other States will follow us in the magnificent effort to increase citizenship participation in our Government.

Congressman Zablocki Recommends a Plan on Representation of China in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, recently the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] commented in a press interview on the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations. As reported in an article by Joseph R. L. Sterne of the Baltimore Sun, Representative ZABLOCKI proposed that membership in the United Nations General Assembly be open to both mainland China and Taiwan—Formosa—and that neither state necessarily be a member of the Security Council.

Representative ZABLOCKI is chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific whose recent hearings have included expert testimony underscoring the need for reconsideration of the U.S. policy toward China.

The Milwaukee Journal on Sunday, April 10, reprinted the report of Mr. Sterne's interview with Congressman ZABLOCKI and excerpts from my speech in the House urging consideration of a two-China policy in the United Nations.

The Journal also commented on China policy in an accompanying editorial, saying:

> There is growing realization that if the problem of China is to be solved the United States will have to adopt more flexible policies toward that country—or, rather, toward two countries, Nationalist and Communist China.

The two articles and the editorial follow:

HOW MANY CHINAS FOR ROLES IN U.N.?

(NOTE.—Last week the call for rethinking of United States China policy grew louder in many quarters, including the councils of the Ripon Society, a group of young Republicans in the east who issued a position paper suggesting a more flexible approach. Among the influential Democratic voices, proposing policy shifts were those of two Wisconsin Congressmen, Representative REUSS, who urged a "two China" position for the United States on the United Nations question, and Representative ZABLOCKI, who proposed a "no China" formula for the U.N. Security Council, with two Chinas in the General Assembly. Here are statements of their positions. From an interview with Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI in Washington by Joseph R. L. Sterne of the Baltimore Sun, reprinted by permission.)

Revision of the United Nations Charter is suggested by Representative ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, as a way to finesse the "two Chinas" problem that has blocked efforts toward a better relationship between the United States and Peking.

The chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia said it is "wishful thinking" to suppose either the Mao Tse-tung or Chiang Kai-shek government would ever accept that "two Chinas" are entitled to United Nations membership.

He raised the possibility, therefore, that this obstacle could be bypassed through temporary adoption of a virtual "no Chinas" formula for the Security Council.

THREE-POINT PLAN

ZABLOCKI offered the following plan:

1. Membership in the General Assembly would be open both to mainland China and Formosa, either as separate countries or, eventually, as one country if they so wish.

2. The present system under which the United States, Britain, France, the Soviet Union, and China are "permanent" members of the Security Council in perpetuity would be abandoned.

3. Every 20 years the General Assembly would be given the opportunity to elect seven or nine "permanent" Security Council members who would serve with "temporary" members elected annually.

ZABLOCKI speculated that if a plan of this nature were to be adopted it would be unlikely that either of the "two Chinas" would be elected to the Security Council for the first 20-year period.

If the General Assembly were given a chance to elect nine "permanent" members, ZABLOCKI guessed it would choose the United States, Britain, the Soviet Union, France, Canada, India, Pakistan, Ethiopia, and Brazil.

Thus, he said, it would not matter if Peking were to spurn an early invitation to join the United Nations, since the lure of election to a "permanent" seat 20 years hence would eventually bring Red China into the world organization.

FAVORS EXCHANGE VISITS

The Wisconsin Congressman said his highly tentative suggestion would attack the United States-China problem "where it really is—in the Charter of the United Nations."

Witnesses before his subcommittee repeatedly suggested more direct U.S. moves toward Communist China.

ZABLOCKI said he would favor a greater exchange of people—including businessmen who could take a closer look at the China market.

But he questioned whether U.S. interest now would be served by inviting the humiliating rebuff from Peking that an offer to trade or extend recognition would bring.

Viewing the situation as a politician, he said no administration could afford to change the present bilateral stance between Washington and Peking while the Vietnam war is going on.

ZABLOCKI said he was delighted that hearings before House and Senate committees brought the question of Communist China to the forefront after years in which many public officials hardly dared to talk about it.

RECALLS STALIN ERA

"Obviously we must find some way to deal with Red China, directly or indirectly," he remarked. "We just can't sweep mainland China under the rug."

If war between the United States and China can be avoided, the Congressman said, the situation in time should improve.

"Nobody thought United States-Soviet relations could be changed in the years before Stalin died," he said.

"But after he died there was a change, a major change, and many people hope our relations with China some day will improve in the same way."

On the basis of testimony his subcommittee is taking, ZABLOCKI said he doubted the Chinese will enter the Vietnam war unless the United States bombs Chinese territory or there is a land invasion of North Vietnam.

(NOTE.—Condensed from a speech by Representative HENRY S. REUSS in the House of Representatives.)

For close to a generation our policy with respect to Communist China has been one of containment and isolation—containment, by opposing adventurism, direct or by proxy, in Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, and India; isolation, by declaring an embargo on trade, by substantially prohibiting exchange of persons, by withholding recognition, and most of all by opposing membership for Communist China in the United Nations.

Now, suddenly, American public opinion, though still supporting the containment part of our policy, is beginning to take a second look at the isolation part. A number of thoughtful and informed witnesses within the last few weeks before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and before Congressman ZABLOCKI's Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, have testified that our policy of isolation is not working.

Vice President HUMPHREY described "containment without necessarily isolation" as an emerging policy. The President has said as much.

It is time to consider whether persistence in a policy of attempting to deny the 700 million people of mainland China any voice in the United Nations is in our national interest or in the interest of the stability of Asia and the peace of the world.

OUR ALLIES DISAGREE

Other aspects of our policy toward China likewise demand our reconsideration—questions of whether we should recognize Red China, trade with it, and exchange persons with it.

But there is a special urgency for Congress to consider the question of American policy on the representation of Red China in the United Nations.

The question will be at the top of the agenda when the United Nations General Assembly reconvenes next September.

The issue over Chinese representation has sometimes been presented as a battle between the United States and the Communist voting bloc in the United Nations to win over the support of unalined nations. But there is also a good deal of disagreement on this matter among members of the Western alliance.

The 20th General Assembly of the United Nations voted on the question of seating Communist China in the United Nations in place of Nationalist China on November 17, 1965. Forty-seven nations voted in favor; 47 voted against; 20 abstained; one did not participate, and 1 was absent. The vote came after a resolution declaring the issue an important matter requiring a two-thirds majority; thus, the Communist Chinese were not admitted to the United Nations in 1965.

The two-China approach has gained more and more ground in the United Nations within the last few years. Those who support the policy recognize Communist China as the legitimate government of the mainland and the Nationalist government as the legitimate government of Formosa.

It would only take a switch in four votes to change the procedural situation to require only a simple majority to decide on Communist China's admission at the 21st General Assembly in 1966. And in 1965, that vote ended in a tie.

But there are reasons for the United States to reexamine its position quite apart from the possibility of a United Nations vote next September opposed to our policy of no representation for mainland China.

Universality of membership in the United Nations is more than an ideal. It is a practical necessity if the organization is to make its maximum contribution to the establishment and maintenance of world peace. With the absence of important countries, the United Nations is hamstrung.

Acceptance of China as a member of the international community may well in time help induce a moderation in Chinese foreign policy.

A two-China position by the United States, adopted by the United Nations, would not result in Communist China's immediate acceptance of membership. Rather, there would be a contemptuous turndown.

But such a two-China position would serve the enormously important function of demonstrating that the United States is not bent on isolating Red China and that it is Red China, not the United Nations, which is indulging in fantasies. It would then be open to a less belligerent Communist Chinese regime to respond to the light in the window at a later time.

ZABLOCKI AND REUSS TAKE NEW LOOK AT CHINA PROBLEM

There is growing realization that if the problem of China is to be solved the United States will have to adopt more flexible policies toward that country—or, rather, toward two countries, Nationalist and Communist China. Recent congressional hearings have resulted in widespread discussion of the problem and proposals for meeting it.

Two Wisconsin Democratic Congressmen, CLEMENT ZABLOCKI and HENRY REUSS, have been active in stimulating this new look at China. REUSS, in a recent House speech, advocated a "two-China" policy in the United Nations. Communist China would be admitted to the U.N. Assembly and eventually Nationalist China would be replaced on the Security Council by a large Asian power such as India. Nationalist China would remain an Assembly member .

ZABLOCKI who conducted the House subcommittee hearings, has long opposed allowing Communist China in the U.N. However, in an interview with the Baltimore Sun, he endorses what has been called a "no China" policy. He would admit both Chinas to the Assembly. He would abandon the present Security Council makeup and elect 7 or 9 permanent members each 20 years. He doubts that either China would be elected a Security Council member the first time. But after 20 years they would be eligible to election individually or as one country.

The ZABLOCKI and REUSS proposals are to be found in detail in this section. Both represent thoughtful opinions that add substantially to the debate. Neither Congressman is sanguine about Communist China accepting any proposal. But like so many other Americans they seem to feel that something should be tried.

Hughes Aircraft Co. and Its Employees Promote Active Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. REES
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in order to encourage more active participation by its employees in the process of government, Hughes Aircraft Co. has instituted an in-plant active citizenship campaign.

The Hughes active citizenship campaign is designed to stimulate employee interest in political candidates and issues, to promote and facilitate employee contributions to candidates or parties, and to encourage all employees to register and vote in local, State, and national elections.

As a result of the active citizenship campaign, 97 percent of all Hughes employees eligible to vote did register to vote, as opposed to a national average of 78 percent, and 98 percent of those registered did vote on election day, 1964, as opposed to a national average of 78 percent.

In the 1964 election campaign, Hughes employees contributed more than $86,000 to political parties and candidates, and thousands attended in-plant political rallies to acquaint themselves with issues and candidates.

The Hughes active citizenship campaign jealously guards each employee's right to freely choose sides and engage in political activity on behalf of a candidate or party.

The Hughes active citizenship campaign has received the support of the chairmen of both the Democratic and Republican National Committees.

A new Hughes active citizenship campaign is underway which will continue through the June primary and culminate in the general election in November.

I feel that all of us should recognize the important contribution which the Hughes active citizenship campaign has made to the cause of political freedom and representative government, and through this medium I ask all the Members of Congress to join me in commending Hughes Aircraft Co.

The firms which do not have such a program should be encouraged to initiate them in order to stimulate their employees to take a more active part through campaign work and financial contributions in the electoral process.

Veterans' Administration Voluntary Service 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this week, Washington is hosting the 1966 meeting of the Veterans' Administration National Voluntary Service Advisory Committee. I would like to call special attention to the planned observance of the 20th anniversary of the Veterans' Administration voluntary service program by presenting the following tribute to all who have given so generously of their time and energy in order that our deserving veterans might be comforted.

The 20th anniversary of the Veterans' Administration voluntary service program of community volunteer participation in the care and treatment of veteran-patients will be observed in April of this year. The official observance will be in conjunction with the April 18 to 20 meeting of the National VA Voluntary Service Advisory Committee composed of representatives of 42 national voluntary organizations.

Volunteers and officials of the participating voluntary organizations and VA staff throughout the Nation have been invited to attend the meeting which will include special sessions of interest for all attending groups. In addition to commemorating the 20th birthday of VA voluntary service the various groups will explore mutual problems and attempt to develop ways and means for providing more effective service and leadership in the program on behalf of veteran patients.

A feature of the meeting will be a dramatization of "The VAVS Story" which presents the program as seen through the eyes of volunteers and officials of the participating organizations and hospital staff.

Another feature will be a luncheon honoring organizations and their representatives who attended the first planning meeting on April 8, 1946, which led to the birth of the official VA voluntary service plan. The guest speaker will be Brig. Gen. F. R. Kerr, who served as the first chairman of the National VAVS Committee.

Other highlights include the presentation of national commendations by W. J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to the heads of the 42 national organizations on the national committee in appreciation of their organizations' volunteer assistance in the medical program over the years; an evening devoted to individual meetings of the 42 national organizations; presentations by the VA's Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, W. J. Driver and the Chief Medical Director, Dr. H. M. Engle; and a patriotic program by the U.S. Army Field Band.

The voluntary service program which is being commemorated has experienced dynamic growth and development in its two decades of existence. Currently, a monthly average of approximately 108,000 citizen volunteers are providing over 8 million hours of service to sick and disabled veterans each year in VA's 165 hospitals. They also serve in VA's outpatient clinics, day treatment centers, and nursing home care units, and in the community to help discharged veteran-patients make successful adjustments to home and community.

The volunteers, who range from teenagers to octogenarians, are warmhearted men and women of the community serving those who served. Each is prized for his own particular contribution which might be the enthusiasm and buoyancy of youth or the skill and wisdom of the older or retired persons. Because they have time to serve and the desire to continue purposeful activity, retired and older citizens have found a prominent place in VA voluntary service.

The volunteers are welcomed in the VA as highly valued members of the hospital team. Under the supervision of the medical staff they perform assigned duties and can be found everywhere in VA's hospitals, supplementing and extending the work of the staff. Their efforts not only make it possible to extend and expand services and programs, but also result in improved quality of care and treatment for veteran-patients.

Volunteers give of themselves in this program of service to those in need. They receive no salaries or wages. The youth volunteers learn about medical and allied fields and become interested in health careers. All of the volunteers witness remarkable recoveries and rehabilitations by patients. They find in this reclaiming of human lives challenge worthy of their best efforts. The knowledge that they, as members of the hospital team, play a vital part in the recovery and rehabilitation of the patient is their basic reward and source of deep personal satisfactions.

Of particular significance is the placement of the voluntary service program in the office of the hospital chief of staff, thereby assuring top medical leadership and guidance for the participation of citizen volunteers. At the national level the service is in the office of Dr. Oreon K. Timm, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Professional Services, who serves as chairman of the National VAVS Advisory Committee.

The voluntary service staff which directs and guides this nationwide voluntary service program is headed by James H. Parke, who served as the principal architect and developer of the VAVS plans which has won the blessing and support of the Nation's leading national welfare, service, and veterans organizations.

Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg Recipient of Passover-Liberty Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, Temple Beth Zion in Los Angeles, Calif., honored U.S. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg by presenting to him the temple's 1966-5627 Passover-Liberty Award.

For the past 10 years Temple Beth Zion has celebrated the Passover festival on the second evening of this holiday with the presentation of a dramatized Haggadah—"The Story of Passover"—authored by Temple Beth Zion's spiritual leader, Rabbi Franklin Cohn of Los Angeles, Calif.

In this dramatized version of the Passover story, Rabbi Cohn has interwoven the traditional content of the Haggadah with its narrative of the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, the liberation of the Hebrew slaves from their bondage to the ancient Pharaohs, with the historic accounts of liberation of oppressed people everywhere in the world and their search for freedom. This fascinating drama recalls the promises for man's ultimate freedom from physical as well as psychological, economic as well as political, slavery.

Rabbi Cohn's Passover drama cites the events of persecution and oppression of the Jewish people and their dream for a messianic era; it recalls the great contributions which America has made to bring democracy as a most important part of the messianic dream to every corner of the world.

This modern version of the ancient Haggadah recounts how the spirit of Passover crept into the souls of all peoples, how this spirit was enunciated by Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, how the 20th century began on a note of hope.

Medicine had found a cure for the most crippling diseases. Sigmund Freud launched a battle against the tyrant that dwells in all of us—the unconscious that can enslave man if not understood; how Albert Einstein found truth relative, the universe finite, and how he showed that God governs by law. The struggle for better working conditions, shorter hours, higher wages, the fight for the abolition of child labor is recalled.

But then the promise of democracy, the march forward was shattered by the First World War, and in the 1930's, up came the fences, the barbed wire, the watchtower, the machineguns, the arc lights. The frenzied rage of a house painter, Hitler, started the Second World War. And Jews were killed by the millions. Yet those who survived kept the messianic dream alive.

The author speaks of the great dream of the American Negro, that dream so eloquently expressed by Dr. Martin Luther King on August 28, 1963, on the steps of our Capitol. And, finally, the rabbi speaks with awe of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy who believed in an America where religious intolerance will someday end, how President Kennedy strove to promote the American ideal of brotherhood, of universal peace—by signing the nuclear test-ban treaty—and how President Kennedy spoke out for freedom and peace.

The dramatized Haggadah—"The Story of Passover"—as presented in Rabbi Franklin Cohn's script ends with the notes of hope and optimism which, the author assures us, Jews have always proclaimed.

Together with this dramatic presentation of the Passover story, Temple Beth Zion presents an annual Passover-Liberty Award. Among the former recipients are the late President of the State of Israel, Yitzchak Ben Z'vi, California's Gov. Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, Dr. Linus Pauling, Dr. Joseph Kaplan, Mr. Steve Allen, Los Angeles Times Commentator Paul Coates, and last year's recipient, the Honorable James Roosevelt. Among those who have narrated the dramatized Haggadah in previous years are Miss Shelley Winters, and actors Lou Ayres, Francis Lederer, and Edward G. Robinson.

On Tuesday evening, April 5, 1966, Temple Beth Zion welcomed Mr. Carl Reiner, actor-director-writer-producer as narrator and presented its annual award to Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg.

Ambassador Goldberg, not being able to be present in person, appointed Mr. Justice Stanley Mosk of the California State Supreme Court to receive the award. Mr. Lester H. Aaronson, president of Temple Beth Zion, handed to Justice Mosk two volumes of "The Book of Tribute" containing letters and telegrams of congratulations to Ambassador Goldberg and a beautiful plaque which bears an original photograph of the granite wall of the United Nations Building, presented to the U.N. by the city of New York, with the inscription of the Hebrew Prophet Micah's words:

> They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they learn war any more.

It was, indeed, a magnificent tribute paid by this Los Angeles Jewish congregation to Ambassador Goldberg and as such it was acclaimed by Mr. Justice Stanley Mosk.

Those who sent telegrams or letters of congratulations to and for Ambassador Goldberg were:

U.S. Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN.

The Honorable CARL ALBERT, Member of Congress.

U.S. Senator GORDON ALLOTT.

U.S. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

Her Excellency Ambassador Eugenie Anderson.

Lt. Gov. Glenn M. Anderson, California.

Mr. Lester H. Aaronson, president of Temple Beth Zion.

His Excellency Ambassador J. K. Waller, Australia.

His Excellency Ambassador Dr. Ernst Lemberger, Austria.

U.S. Senator BIRCH BAYH.

His Excellency Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary C. Schuurmans, Belgium.

The Honorable ALPHONZO BELL, Member of Congress.

U.S. Senator ALAN BIBLE.

Mr. Justice Hugo L. Black, U.S. Supreme Court.

His Excellency Ambassador Sr. Fernando Ortiz Sanz, Bolivia, to U.N.

His Excellency José Sette Camara, Ambassador to the U.N., Brazil.

U.S. Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER.

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of the State of California.

The Honorable GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Member of Congress.

His Excellency Ralph J. Bunche, United Nations.

His Excellency Ambassador Charles A. Ritchie, Canada.

U.S. Senator HOWARD W. CANNON.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, Member of Congress.

His Excellency Ambassador M. Michel Gallin-Douathe, Central Africa Republic, to U.N.

Mr. Justice Tom C. Clarke, U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Paul Coates, Los Angeles Times commentator.

The Honorable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce.

The Honorable JAMES C. CORMAN, Member of Congress.

U.S. Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, U.S. Supreme Court.

The Honorable LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Member of Congress.

Rabbi Dr. Louis Finkelstein, president, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

Mr. Justice Abe Fortas, U.S. Supreme Court.

The Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury.

The Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

His Excellency Ambassador Roger Seydoux, head of the French mission to the United Nations.

The Honorable Samuel N. Friedel, Member of Congress.

The Honorable John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. Nelson Glueck, president, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio.

U.S. Senator Ernest Gruening.

The Honorable Seymour Halpern, Member of Congress.

His Excellency Hubert H. Humphrey, the Vice President of the United States.

His Excellency Ambassador B. K. Nehru, India.

U.S. Senator Daniel K. Inouye.

His Excellency Ambassador Dr. Khosro Khosrovani, Iran.

His Excellency Ambassador Mehdi Vakil, Iran.

His Excellency Ambassador C. C. Cremin, Ireland.

His Excellency Ambassador Avraham Harman, Israel.

His Excellency Ambassador Michael Comay, Israel.

His Excellency Ambassador Piero Vinci, Italy.

His Excellency Ambassador Neville Ashenheim, Jamaica.

U.S. Senator Jacob K. Javits.

Dr. Joseph Kaplan, president, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics.

The Honorable Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, U.S. Atttorney General.

U.S. Senator Edward M. Kennedy.

U.S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

His Excellency Ambassador Hyun Chul Kim, Korea.

U.S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel.

The Honorable Melvin R. Laird, Member of Congress.

His Excellency Chargé d'Affaires A. Spekka, Latvia.

U.S. Senator George McGovern.

U.S. Senator Tom McIntyre.

U.S. Senator Lee Metcalf.

His Excellency Ambassador Francisco Cuevas Cancino, Mexico.

U.S. Senator Walter F. Mondale.

U.S. Senator Frank E. Moss.

The Honorable Abraham J. Multer, Member of Congress.

U.S. Senator Edmund S. Muskie.

His Excellency Ambassador James M. Nabrit, Jr., U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

U.S. Senator Maurine B. Neuberger.

His Excellency Ambassador Osman Ahmadu-Suka, Nigeria.

His Excellency Ambassador Hans Engen, Norway.

The Honorable Lawrence F. O'Brien, Postmaster General.

His Excellency Ambassador Ricardo M. Arias E., Panama.

U.S. Senator Claiborne Pell.

His Excellency Ambassador Carlos Mackenzie, Peru.

The Right Reverend James A. Pike, bishop, San Francisco.

His Excellency Vasco Vieira Garin, Ambassador of Portugal.

The Honorable Melvin Price, Member of Congress.

U.S. Senator Winston L. Prouty.

U.S. Senator William Proxmire.

The Honorable Thomas M. Rees, Member of Congress.

U.S. Senator Abraham Ribicoff.

The Honorable John J. Rooney, Member of Congress.

His Excellency Ambassador James Roosevelt, Ambassador to the United Nations.

The Honorable Edward R. Roybal, Member of Congress.

The Honorable William F. Ryan, Member of Congress.

U.S. Senator Leverett Saltonstall.

U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson.

His Excellency Ambassador Marquis of Merry del Val, Spain.

Mr. Justice Potter Stewart, U.S. Supreme Court.

U.S. Senator Stuart Symington.

U.S. Senator Herman E. Talmadge.

The Honorable Olin E. Teague, Member of Congress.

The Honorable John V. Tunney, Member of Congress.

His Excellency Orhan Eralp, Ambassador of Turkey to the United Nations.

The Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior.

His Excellency Ambassador Enrique Téjera Paris, Venezuela.

The Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. Justice Byron R. White, U.S. Supreme Court.

The Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor.

The Honorable Lester L. Wolff, Member of Congress.

U.S. Senator Ralph W. Yarborough.

His Excellency Ambassador H. L. Soko, Zambia.